

# Negative curvature obstructs acceleration for geodesically convex optimization, even with exact first-order oracles

Christopher Criscitiello, Nicolas Boumal

Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL)  
Institute of Mathematics  
{christopher.criscitiello, nicolas.boumal}@epfl.ch

First posted on arXiv November 25, 2021; updated on January 14, 2022.

## Abstract

[Hamilton and Moitra \(2021\)](#) showed that, in certain regimes, it is not possible to accelerate Riemannian gradient descent in the hyperbolic plane if we restrict ourselves to algorithms which make queries in a (large) bounded domain and which receive gradients and function values corrupted by a (small) amount of noise. We show that acceleration remains unachievable for any deterministic algorithm which receives exact gradient and function-value information (unbounded queries, no noise). Our results hold for the classes of strongly and nonstrongly geodesically convex functions, and for a large class of Hadamard manifolds including hyperbolic spaces and the symmetric space  $SL(n)/SO(n)$  of positive definite  $n \times n$  matrices of determinant one. This cements a surprising gap between the complexity of convex optimization and geodesically convex optimization: for hyperbolic spaces, Riemannian gradient descent is optimal on the class of smooth and strongly geodesically convex functions, in the regime where the condition number scales with the radius of the optimization domain. The key idea for proving the lower bound consists of perturbing the hard functions of [Hamilton and Moitra \(2021\)](#) with sums of bump functions chosen by a resisting oracle.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Key ideas: building hard $g$ -convex functions . . . . .	6
1.2	Problem classes . . . . .	7
1.3	Main results . . . . .	8

1.4	Curvature dependence . . . . .	10
1.5	Comparison to Riemannian Gradient Descent . . . . .	11
1.6	Further literature review . . . . .	12
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries and the ball-packing property</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1	Hadamard manifolds and Toponogov’s theorem . . . . .	13
2.2	Geodesic convexity . . . . .	15
2.3	The ball-packing property . . . . .	17
<b>3</b>	<b>Main theorem and proof of key lemma</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1	Lower bound for algorithms with bounded queries . . . . .	19
3.2	Key lemma: Pièce de résistance . . . . .	20
3.3	Proof of the key lemma 3.6 . . . . .	22
3.3.1	Case 1: $x_k$ is not close to any previous query point . . . . .	27
3.3.2	Case 2: $x_k$ is close to a previous query point . . . . .	28
3.4	Algorithms using function-value information . . . . .	29
<b>4</b>	<b>Unbounded queries—proof of Theorem 3.3</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>The nonstrongly g-convex case</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1	Proof of Theorem 1.5 . . . . .	32
5.2	Comparison to RGD . . . . .	36
<b>6</b>	<b>Reduction to Euclidean convexity when <math>r \leq O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}})</math></b>	<b>36</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Perspectives</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Technical fact from proof of Theorem 3.5</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Unbounded queries: technical details</b>	<b>40</b>
B.1	Verifying $f_{r,\mathcal{R}}$ is in the function class . . . . .	40
B.2	Technical fact about the function $t: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the interval $(0, 1)$ . . . . .	44
<b>C</b>	<b>The nonstrongly convex case: technical details</b>	<b>45</b>
C.1	Verifying $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is $\tilde{L}$ -smooth and strictly g-convex in $\mathcal{M}$ . . . . .	46
C.2	Technical facts about the function $u_{\mathcal{R}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . . . . .	47
C.3	Technical fact from Section 5: $x_k \notin B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ implies $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x_k) \geq 2\hat{\epsilon}Lr^2$ . . . . .	48
<b>D</b>	<b>Incorporating function-value queries</b>	<b>48</b>
D.1	Proof of Lemma D.1 . . . . .	50
D.1.1	Case 1 (for function-value queries) . . . . .	52
D.1.2	Case 2 (for function-value queries) . . . . .	53
<b>E</b>	<b>Bump functions</b>	<b>54</b>
E.1	Proof of Lemma 3.8 . . . . .	54

E.1.1	Bump function construction . . . . .	54
E.1.2	Bounding the function values and gradients of the bump functions	55
E.1.3	Bounding the Hessian of the bump functions . . . . .	56
E.2	Bump functions for function-value queries . . . . .	57
<b>F</b>	<b>Technical details for the ball-packing property</b>	<b>59</b>
F.1	Geodesics diverge: Proof of Lemma 2.4 . . . . .	59
F.2	Placing well-separated points on the unit sphere . . . . .	59
<b>G</b>	<b>Geometry influences the objective function</b>	<b>60</b>
G.1	Proof of Proposition 2.10 . . . . .	60
G.2	Proof of Proposition 2.11 . . . . .	62
<b>H</b>	<b>Positive definite matrices</b>	<b>63</b>
H.1	Proof of Lemma H.3 . . . . .	64
H.2	For positive definite matrices, $\tilde{c} \leq O(n^{3/2})$ . . . . .	65
<b>I</b>	<b>Comparison to Riemannian gradient descent</b>	<b>66</b>
I.1	Proof of Proposition 1.7 . . . . .	66
I.2	Proof of Proposition 1.8 . . . . .	66
I.3	Proof of Proposition 5.4 . . . . .	66
<b>J</b>	<b>Deriving Theorems 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 from Theorems 3.3 and 5.3</b>	<b>67</b>
J.1	Deriving Theorem 1.3 from Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 2.12 . . . . .	67
J.2	Deriving Theorem 1.4 from Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 2.14 . . . . .	68
J.3	Deriving Theorem 1.5 from Theorem 5.3 and Lemma 2.12 . . . . .	69

# 1 Introduction

We consider optimization problems of the form

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{M}} f(x) \tag{P}$$

where  $\mathcal{M}$  is a Riemannian manifold and  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a differentiable geodesically convex (g-convex) function. When  $\mathcal{M}$  is a Euclidean space, problem (P) amounts to smooth convex optimization. There are several problems of interest which are non-convex but can be recast as g-convex optimization problems, which means global solutions can be found efficiently. Examples and applications in data science, statistics and machine learning include: computing intrinsic averages on Riemannian manifolds (Karcher, 1977; Yuan et al., 2020), metric learning (Zadeh et al., 2016), computing optimistic likelihoods (Nguyen et al., 2019), parameter estimation for mixture models (Hosseini and Sra, 2015), robust covariance estimation and subspace recovery (Wiesel, 2012; Zhang, 2012; Wiesel and Zhang, 2014; Sra and Hosseini, 2015; Franks and Moitra, 2020), estimation for matrix normal models (Tang and Allen, 2021; Amendola et al., 2021;

Franks et al., 2021), sampling on Riemannian manifolds (Goyal and Shetty, 2019), and landscape analysis (for matrix completion) (Ahn and Suarez, 2021). In mathematics and theoretical computer science, applications of g-convex optimization include computing Brascamp-Lieb constants (Sra et al., 2018), the null cone membership problem and polynomial identity testing—see (Allen-Zhu et al., 2018; Bürgisser et al., 2019; Franks and Reichenbach, 2021) and references therein. More generally, optimization on manifolds also has applications in scientific computing, imaging, communications and robotics (Absil et al., 2008; Hu et al., 2020; Boumal, 2020).

Given these applications, it is natural to ask for fast algorithms for the g-convex optimization problem (P). We consider algorithms which have access to an oracle providing first-order information, meaning an algorithm may query a point  $x$  and will then receive the value and gradient of the objective at  $x$ . In classical convex optimization on Euclidean spaces, it is well known that gradient descent (GD) has suboptimal oracle complexity on the class of smooth convex functions, while the optimal complexity is achieved by Nesterov’s accelerated gradient method (NAG) (Nesterov, 1983).

Precisely, consider the following computational task. Let  $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an  $L$ -smooth<sup>1</sup> and  $\mu$ -strongly convex function, whose minimizer  $x^*$  lies in a ball  $B$  of radius  $r$  centered at the origin of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The radius  $r$  represents our uncertainty (or ignorance) about the location of the minimizer of  $f$ . The number  $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$  represents the conditioning of the problem. What is the least number of queries an algorithm must make in order to find a ball of radius  $\frac{r}{5}$  containing  $x^*$ ?<sup>2</sup> In other words, how many queries are required to reduce our uncertainty to  $\frac{r}{5}$ ? GD initialized in  $B$  uses at most  $O(\kappa)$  queries, while NAG uses only  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\kappa})$  queries<sup>3</sup>, and that is optimal (Nesterov, 2004, Ch. 2). Note that the complexity of smooth strongly convex optimization depends only on the condition number  $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$ , and is independent of the radius  $r$ . As we will see, this is not the case for smooth strongly g-convex optimization, which depends on both  $\kappa$  and  $r$ .

On a Riemannian manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  we can similarly define notions of  $L$ -smoothness and  $\mu$ -strong g-convexity—see Section 2.2. We can also define the corresponding computational task for g-convex functions—see Section 1.2. For the moment, let us consider the case where  $\mathcal{M}$  is a hyperbolic space of curvature  $K < 0$ . Given a function  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is  $L$ -smooth and  $\mu$ -strongly g-convex in a (geodesic) ball  $B \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  of radius  $r$  containing the minimizer  $x^*$  of  $f$ , Zhang and Sra (2016) show that (projected) Riemannian gradient descent (RGD) initialized in  $B$  uses at most  $\tilde{O}(\kappa)$  gradient queries to find a point  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  within distance  $\frac{r}{5}$  of the minimizer  $x^*$ .<sup>4</sup> This matches the rate of gradient descent in Euclidean spaces. We are led to the following question:

<sup>1</sup>We say a function is  $L$ -smooth if it has  $L$ -Lipschitz gradient. When we say a function is smooth, we mean that it is  $L$ -smooth for some  $L \geq 0$ . We say a function is  $C^\infty$  to mean it is infinitely differentiable.

<sup>2</sup>For the strongly convex case ( $\mu > 0$ ), it suffices to ask how many queries are required to reduce the uncertainty radius  $r$  by a factor  $\epsilon$ , for any fixed  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Throughout we take  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{5}$ , following Hamilton and Moitra (2021).

<sup>3</sup>Throughout,  $\tilde{O}$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}$  hide logarithmic factors in the condition number  $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$ . We use  $\tilde{O}$  here because Nesterov’s accelerated gradient method provides a guarantee on  $f(x_k) - f(x^*)$ , not on  $\|x_k - x^*\|$ .

<sup>4</sup>See Section 1.5 for a review of the best known rates for RGD.

*Is there an algorithm for g-convex optimization on, say, hyperbolic spaces which matches the improved rate of Nesterov’s accelerated gradient method?*

Several researchers have developed generalizations of NAG to Riemannian manifolds. Most notable for our purposes are the algorithms of [Ahn and Sra \(2020\)](#) and [Martínez-Rubio \(2021\)](#) (see Section 1.6 for further discussion of the literature). The algorithm of [Ahn and Sra \(2020\)](#) is strictly faster than RGD, and requires only  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\kappa})$  queries when the uncertainty radius  $r$  is small; specifically: when  $r \leq O(\frac{1}{\kappa^{3/4}})$ . In general ( $r$  not small), the algorithm of [Ahn and Sra \(2020\)](#) still requires  $\tilde{O}(\kappa)$  gradient queries to find  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\text{dist}(x, x^*) \leq \frac{r}{5}$ . Intuitively this makes sense because Riemannian manifolds are locally Euclidean, so in a small enough ball the effects of curvature are negligible. In Section 6 we make this intuition precise by showing that whenever  $r \leq O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}})$ , then we can reduce the g-convex problem to a convex problem in a Euclidean space (and in particular get an accelerated rate). In short, curvature of the manifold has no impact on *local* convergence rates. Therefore, when investigating the role of curvature in complexity of Riemannian optimization algorithms, *global* convergence rates are the natural object of study.

The guarantees for the algorithm provided by [Ahn and Sra \(2020\)](#) hold for Hadamard manifolds of bounded curvature. For hyperbolic spaces in particular, [Martínez-Rubio \(2021\)](#) improves upon these guarantees by providing an algorithm requiring  $e^{\tilde{O}(r)}\sqrt{\kappa}$  queries to solve the computational task; in particular, this algorithm is accelerated when  $r \leq O(1)$ .

Despite this progress, the following question has thus remained open:

*Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a hyperbolic space. For every  $r > 0$  and  $L \geq \mu > 0$ , does there exist a “fully accelerated” algorithm on the class of functions which are  $L$ -smooth in a geodesic ball  $B$  of radius  $r$  and  $\mu$ -strongly g-convex in  $\mathcal{M}$ , and which have minimizer in  $B$ ?*

By “fully accelerated,” we mean an algorithm which requires at most  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\kappa})$  function and gradient queries to find a point  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  within distance  $\frac{r}{5}$  of the function’s minimizer. In this paper, we show that *no such accelerated algorithm exists*, and in fact *RGD is optimal* for smooth strongly g-convex optimization on hyperbolic spaces in the regime  $r = \Theta(\kappa)$ . For a precise statement of our main results, see Section 1.3.

Our analysis builds on the recent work of [Hamilton and Moitra \(2021\)](#), who show that acceleration on the hyperbolic plane is impossible when function values and gradients are corrupted by noise, even when this noise is very small. Their argument introduces a number of important ideas, most notably a key geometric property of the hyperbolic plane which we call the “ball-packing property”: for  $r > 0$  sufficiently large, any geodesic ball of radius  $r$  in the hyperbolic plane contains  $N = e^{\Theta(r)}$  disjoint open geodesic balls of radius  $\frac{r}{4}$ . Using several of [Hamilton and Moitra \(2021\)](#)’s ideas, plus additional ideas we introduce, we prove that acceleration is impossible even when function values and gradients are known exactly, i.e., not corrupted by noise.

In addition to proving lower bounds for queries yielding exact information (our main contribution), we improve upon the results of [Hamilton and Moitra \(2021\)](#) in several ways:

- In [Section 2.3](#), we establish the ball-packing property for a large class of Hadamard manifolds, including the symmetric space of positive definite matrices  $\text{SL}(n)/\text{SO}(n)$ . In turn, we show that acceleration is impossible on this large class of Hadamard manifolds.
- [Hamilton and Moitra \(2021\)](#) assume that all algorithms query in a bounded domain (the reasons for this are closely related to their noise model). We remove this assumption in [Section 4](#). As a result, our lower bounds hold for all deterministic algorithms.
- [Hamilton and Moitra \(2021\)](#) prove lower bounds for strongly g-convex optimization. In [Section 5](#), we extend our lower bounds to nonstrongly g-convex optimization. In the appropriate regime, acceleration remains impossible.
- We provide a careful comparison of our lower bounds to the best known rates for RGD, showing that RGD is optimal in the settings we consider. This is important because, in general, the best known rates for RGD depend on curvature—see [Section 1.5](#).

## 1.1 Key ideas: building hard g-convex functions

[Hamilton and Moitra \(2021\)](#) establish their lower bound by exhibiting a distribution on strongly g-convex functions which is challenging for any algorithm receiving function information corrupted by a small amount of noise. Amazingly, the hard distribution [Hamilton and Moitra \(2021\)](#) consider is simply a uniform distribution over a finite number of Riemannian squared distance functions. Intuitively, this distribution is difficult for algorithms because geodesics diverge rapidly in hyperbolic space, so a small amount of noise in a gradient is magnified due to negative curvature. However, like in Euclidean spaces, the Riemannian gradient of a squared distance function points directly towards the function’s minimizer. Therefore, squared distance functions are not enough to go beyond noisy oracles—we need more complex classes of g-convex functions.

Classical lower bounds in smooth convex optimization—“worst function in the world” arguments ([Nesterov, 2004](#), Ch. 2)—are based on quadratic functions. Thus, we at first considered classes of quadratic-like functions on hyperbolic spaces which generalize the Riemannian squared distance functions. Ultimately, we were unable to make this work.

Instead, the key idea we introduce is to use squared distance functions *perturbed by a resisting oracle*. That is functions of the form  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, x^*)^2 + H(x)$  with  $\|\text{Hess}H(x)\|$  small. The perturbations  $H$  are not g-convex, but since their Hessian is small, the perturbed functions retain strong g-convexity and smoothness. Each pertur-

bation is constructed as a *sum of bump functions*, that is,  $C^\infty$  functions with compact support.

We note that the hard functions [Hamilton and Moitra \(2021\)](#) construct (as well as the ones we construct) are significantly different from the hard functions typically used to construct lower bounds for smooth convex optimization in Euclidean space. In those “worst function in the world” arguments, it is crucial that the dimension of the underlying Euclidean space is allowed to be arbitrarily large. This is not the case here. For example, even in the hyperbolic plane (dimension  $d = 2$ ), [Theorem 1.3](#) rules out acceleration.

[Hamilton and Moitra \(2021\)](#) prove their lower bound for algorithms which make queries in a bounded domain. To allow algorithms to make unbounded queries, we introduce a *reduction* which, starting from hard functions designed for algorithms making bounded queries, produces hard functions for algorithms which can make unbounded queries. Reductions—which are certainly not new to complexity analysis—feature prominently in applications of our main technical theorem (stated and proved in [Section 3](#)). For example, in [Section 3](#) we focus on deriving lower bounds for strongly  $g$ -convex functions. Then, in [Section 5](#), we provide a reduction which shows how to extend our results to the differentiable nonstrongly  $g$ -convex case ( $\mu = 0$ ).

## 1.2 Problem classes

This paper considers lower bounds. As such, it is crucial to define the classes of functions for which we prove lower bounds. For strongly  $g$ -convex optimization ( $\mu > 0$ ), a natural function class to consider is the set of functions  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which are  $L$ -smooth and  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex on all of  $\mathcal{M}$ . However, if  $\mathcal{M}$  has sectional curvatures upper bounded by some  $K_{\text{up}} < 0$ , then this class is empty—see [Proposition 2.10](#).

A simple remedy for this issue is to consider minimizing functions  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which are  $L$ -smooth and  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in a ball of finite radius  $r$ . This is especially natural since, as we have already alluded to, whether acceleration is possible depends on  $r$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold (see [Definition 2.1](#)). Let  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  denote the geodesic ball centered at  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$  of radius  $r$ .

**Definition 1.1.** *For every  $\kappa \geq 1, r > 0$  and  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ , define  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  to be the set of all  $C^\infty$  functions  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which*

- *are  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in all of  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $\mu > 0$ ;*
- *are  $L$ -smooth in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$  with  $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$ ; and*
- *have a unique global minimizer  $x^*$  which lies in the ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$ .*<sup>5</sup>

The function class captures our knowledge and ignorance about the cost function. For example,  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  expresses knowledge we have about (1) the conditioning of  $f$  and (2) the rough location of the minimizer of  $f$ .

<sup>5</sup>We assume  $x^* \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$  so that the ball  $B(x^*, \frac{r}{5})$  is contained in the interior of  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ .

Given  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$ , we ask:

*How many queries are required for an algorithm to find a point  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  within distance  $\frac{r}{5}$  of  $x^*$ ?*

When  $\mathcal{M}$  is a Euclidean space, this computational task can be solved in  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\kappa})$  queries using NAG adapted to the ball domain—see Theorem 6.2 due to Nesterov (2013). In contrast, we show that, in general,  $\tilde{\Omega}(\kappa)$  queries are necessary when  $\mathcal{M}$  is a negatively curved space.

We also prove lower bounds about nonstrongly g-convex optimization ( $\mu = 0$ ). The class of functions which are  $L$ -smooth and (nonstrongly) g-convex on all of  $\mathcal{M}$  is not empty, so we do not encounter the same issue as in the strongly g-convex case. We prove lower bounds about the subset of  $L$ -smooth and g-convex functions which are strictly g-convex on  $\mathcal{M}$  and have a unique minimizer. As a result, our lower bounds also apply to the class of functions which are  $L$ -smooth and nonstrongly g-convex.

**Definition 1.2.** For every  $L > 0, r > 0$  and  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ , define  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  to be the set of all  $C^\infty$  functions  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which

- are strictly g-convex in all of  $\mathcal{M}$ ;
- are  $L$ -smooth in all of  $\mathcal{M}$ ; and
- have a unique global minimizer  $x^*$  which lies in the ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ .

Given  $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$ , we ask:

*For  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , how many queries are required for an algorithm to find a point  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $f(x) - f(x^*) \leq \epsilon \cdot \frac{1}{2}Lr^2$ ?*

Note that prior to making any queries,  $x_{\text{ref}}$  is our best guess for  $x^*$ , and we know that  $f(x_{\text{ref}}) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{2}Lr^2$ . Therefore, we are asking how many queries are required to reduce our ignorance about the optimality gap by a factor  $\epsilon$ . When  $\mathcal{M}$  is a Euclidean space, this computational task can be solved in  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}})$  queries using NAG (Nesterov, 1983). In contrast, we show that, in general,  $\tilde{\Omega}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$  queries are necessary when  $\mathcal{M}$  is a negatively curved space.

### 1.3 Main results

We now state our main results about the impossibility of acceleration for the function class in Definition 1.1. There is some leeway in choosing the constants below.



**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold of dimension  $d \geq 2$  whose sectional curvatures are in the interval  $[K_{\text{lo}}, K_{\text{up}}]$  with  $K_{\text{up}} < 0$ . Let  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\kappa \geq 1000\sqrt{\frac{K_{\text{lo}}}{K_{\text{up}}}}$  and define  $r > 0$  such that  $\kappa = 12r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 9$ .*

*For every deterministic first-order algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$ ,<sup>6</sup> there is a function  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\kappa, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  such that algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  requires at least*

$$\left\lfloor \sqrt{\frac{K_{\text{up}}}{K_{\text{lo}}}} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{1000 \log(10\kappa)} \right\rfloor = \tilde{\Omega}\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_{\text{up}}}{K_{\text{lo}}}} \cdot \kappa\right)$$

*queries in order to find a point  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  within distance  $\frac{r}{5}$  of the minimizer of  $f$ .*

For example, let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a hyperbolic space. Then this theorem implies Riemannian gradient descent is optimal on this function class (up to log factors)—see Section 1.5.

Let  $\mathcal{P}_n$  be the symmetric space of  $n \times n$  positive definite matrices (with real entries), endowed with the affine-invariant metric (see Section 2.3 for a definition).<sup>7</sup> Let  $\mathcal{SLP}_n = \text{SL}(n)/\text{SO}(n)$  be the totally geodesic submanifold of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  consisting of those matrices of determinant one. Both  $\mathcal{P}_n$  and  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  are important in applications (Bhatia, 2007; Sra and Hosseini, 2015; Moakher, 2005; Moakher and Batchelor, 2006; Allen-Zhu et al., 2018). Neither have strictly negative curvature as required in Theorem 1.3, however we still show that acceleration is unachievable if  $n$  is held fixed as  $\kappa$  grows. We establish the key geometric property underlying this result in Section 2.3.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $n \geq 2$ . Let  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{SLP}_n$ ,  $\kappa \geq 1000n$  and define  $r > 0$  such that  $\kappa = 6r\sqrt{2} + 9$ . For every deterministic first-order algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$ , there is a function  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\kappa, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{SLP}_n)$  such that the algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  requires at least*

$$\left\lfloor \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{1000 \log(10\kappa)} \right\rfloor = \tilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{1}{n} \cdot \kappa\right)$$

*queries in order to find a point  $x$  within distance  $\frac{r}{5}$  of the minimizer of  $f$ .*

Since  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is isometric to  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{SLP}_n$  (Dolcetti and Pertici, 2018), it is easy to see that the same  $\tilde{\Omega}(\frac{\kappa}{n})$  lower bound holds for  $\mathcal{P}_n$ —see Appendix H.

For the nonstrongly g-convex case, we have the following theorem for the function class in Definition 1.2. Recall the computational task we consider after that definition.

**Theorem 1.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold of dimension  $d \geq 2$  whose sectional curvatures are in the interval  $[K_{\text{lo}}, K_{\text{up}}]$  with  $K_{\text{up}} < 0$ . Let  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $L > 0$ , and choose  $\epsilon \in (0, 2^{-16}]$  so that  $\epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 \leq 2^{-25}\sqrt{\frac{K_{\text{up}}}{K_{\text{lo}}}}$ . Let  $r = \frac{1}{2^{19}\epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}$ .<sup>8</sup>*

<sup>6</sup>For a precise definition of deterministic first-order algorithm, see Section 3.

<sup>7</sup>The affine-invariant metric arises naturally as the Fisher-Rao information metric for covariance matrices of Gaussian distributions (Skovgaard, 1984).

<sup>8</sup>Observe that with this choice of  $r$ , the upper bound on  $\epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2$  is equivalent to  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}} \geq 64$ .

For every deterministic first-order algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$ , there is a function  $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  such that  $\mathcal{A}$  requires at least

$$\left\lceil \sqrt{\frac{K_{\text{up}}}{K_{\text{lo}}}} \cdot \frac{1}{2^{25}\epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^3} \right\rceil = \tilde{\Omega}\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_{\text{up}}}{K_{\text{lo}}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$$

queries in order to find a point  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $f(x) - f(x^*) \leq \epsilon \cdot \frac{1}{2} Lr^2$ .

For hyperbolic spaces, this theorem implies a version of Riemannian gradient descent is optimal on this function class (up to log factors)—see Section 5. We can similarly prove the lower bound  $\tilde{\Omega}(\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon})$  for nonstrongly  $g$ -convex functions on  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  and  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . We omit a detailed statement.

## 1.4 Curvature dependence

Let us study the influence of curvature in the lower bound from Theorem 1.3. For simplicity, let us assume  $\mathcal{M}$  is a hyperbolic space of curvature  $K = K_{\text{up}} = K_{\text{lo}}$ . Theorem 1.3 becomes:

**Corollary 1.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a hyperbolic space of curvature  $K < 0$ . Given  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\kappa \geq 1000$ , define  $r > 0$  such that  $\kappa = 12r\sqrt{-K} + 9$ .*

*For every deterministic first-order algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$ , there is a function  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  such that algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  requires at least*

$$\left\lceil \frac{\kappa}{1000 \log(10\kappa)} \right\rceil$$

*queries in order to find a point  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  within distance  $\frac{r}{5}$  of the minimizer of  $f$ .*

We see that the curvature  $K$  influences the lower bound *only* through the uncertainty radius  $r$ . This is expected because the function class we consider only depends on  $r$  and  $K$  through  $r\sqrt{-K}$ . More precisely, let  $\mathcal{M}_1 = (\mathcal{M}, g)$  be a hyperbolic space of curvature  $K_1 < 0$ , and scale the metric  $g$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  to get a hyperbolic space  $\mathcal{M}_2 = (\mathcal{M}, \frac{K_1}{K_2}g)$  of curvature  $K_2$ . Then it is easy to see that the function classes  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r_1}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r_2}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M}_2)$  are identical provided  $r_1\sqrt{-K_1} = r_2\sqrt{-K_2}$ . This also shows that there is a certain *equivalence between the radius  $r$  and the curvature  $K$* . Increasing the uncertainty radius  $r$  has the same effect on optimization as making the space more curved.

Whether acceleration is possible depends on how  $r$  scales as the condition number  $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$  grows. There are now known results for two regimes:

- ( $r \leq O(\frac{1}{\kappa^{3/4}})$ ) In this regime, we can achieve acceleration due to the results of Zhang and Sra (2018) and Ahn and Sra (2020) (also see Section 6). For hyperbolic spaces in particular, Martínez-Rubio (2021) shows that we can achieve acceleration when  $r \leq O(1)$ .
- ( $r = \Theta(\kappa)$ ) In this regime, our results show we cannot achieve acceleration.

## 1.5 Comparison to Riemannian Gradient Descent

In order to compare our lower bounds from Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 to upper bounds for RGD, let us first recap the best known rates for RGD in the strongly  $g$ -convex case (we do the same for the nonstrongly  $g$ -convex case in Section 5). Zhang and Sra (2016) show that, for a bounded  $g$ -convex domain  $D$  with diameter  $2r$ , projected RGD initialized in  $D$  finds a point  $x$  within  $\frac{r}{5}$  of the minimizer of  $f$  in no more than  $\tilde{O}(\max\{\kappa, r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}\})$  queries. This rate depends on curvature. However, if  $\mathcal{M}$  is a hyperbolic space of curvature  $K < 0$ , Proposition 2.10 implies  $\kappa \geq \Omega(r\sqrt{-K})$ .<sup>9</sup> Hence, RGD uses at most  $\tilde{O}(\kappa)$  queries when  $\mathcal{M}$  is a hyperbolic space—this is a curvature-independent rate.<sup>10</sup> More precisely, we have the following proposition, which we prove in Appendix I.1.

**Proposition 1.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a hyperbolic space of curvature  $K < 0$ , and let  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $L \geq \mu > 0$ ,  $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$ , and  $r > 0$ . Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\kappa, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}$  be  $L$ -smooth and have minimizer  $x^*$ . Then projected RGD*

$$x_{k+1} = \text{Proj}_D \left( \exp_{x_k} \left( -\frac{1}{L} \text{grad} f(x_k) \right) \right), \quad x_0 = x_{\text{ref}}, \quad D = B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$$

satisfies

$$\text{dist}(x_k, x^*)^2 \leq 4 \left( 1 - \frac{1}{100} \cdot \frac{1}{\kappa} \right)^{k-2} \kappa r^2, \quad \forall k \geq 2.$$

Here,  $\text{Proj}_D$  denotes metric projection on to the geodesic ball  $D$ , and  $\exp$  denotes the exponential map (see Section 2.1).

If  $D$  is a sublevel set of  $f$ , then RGD (without projection) has a curvature-independent rate. We formalize this in the next proposition using ideas which are essentially present in (Zhang et al., 2018); these ideas are also present in (Chewi et al., 2020). A short proof is provided in Appendix I.2.

**Proposition 1.8.** *Assume  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is differentiable and  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex on a Hadamard manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ . Assume  $f$  is  $L$ -smooth in  $D = \{x \in \mathcal{M} : f(x) \leq f(x_0)\}$ , and let  $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$ . Then RGD with stepsize  $\eta = \frac{1}{L}$ , i.e.,  $x_{k+1} = \exp_{x_k}(-\eta \text{grad} f(x_k))$ , satisfies:*

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\kappa} \right)^k (f(x_0) - f(x^*))$$

for all  $k \geq 0$ .

This shows that the worst-case complexity of (projected) RGD is  $\tilde{O}(\kappa)$ , which matches our lower bounds up to log factors.

<sup>9</sup>Alternatively, see (Hamilton and Moitra, 2021, Thm. A.1) or (Martínez-Rubio, 2021, Prop. C.6).

<sup>10</sup>We emphasize, however, that for a general Hadamard manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ , the best known-rates for RGD depend on curvature.

## 1.6 Further literature review

Liu et al. (2017) were the first to claim acceleration on Riemannian manifolds. However, their algorithm requires solving nonlinear equations at each iteration which a priori might be as difficult as the optimization problem itself.

The results of Ahn and Sra (2020) mentioned previously are an improvement on the results of Zhang and Sra (2018) who also show that acceleration is possible if the initial iterate is sufficiently close to the minimizer  $x^*$ . Ahn and Sra (2020) additionally give an algorithm that converges globally and is guaranteed to eventually achieve acceleration if run for a sufficiently long time. Recently, Jin and Sra (2021) propose a framework for generating and analyzing algorithms which eventually achieve acceleration; the algorithm of Ahn and Sra (2020) is a particular instance of this framework.

Martínez-Rubio (2021) presents algorithms for acceleration on the sphere and hyperbolic space. For hyperbolic spaces, Martínez-Rubio (2021) proves the rates  $e^{\tilde{O}(r)}\sqrt{\kappa}$  for the strongly g-convex case, and  $e^{\tilde{O}(r)}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$  for the nonstrongly g-convex case. The key idea introduced consists of pulling back the optimization problem to a vector space via a geodesic map; the pullback is non-convex, but satisfies a weak version of convexity. This idea is similar in spirit to the method of trivializations, introduced in (Lezcano-Casado and Martínez-Rubio, 2019; Lezcano-Casado, 2019) and applied to momentum methods in (Lezcano-Casado, 2020).

Alimisis et al. (2021) tackle the problem of acceleration on the class of smooth nonstrongly convex functions. In certain scenarios (when  $r$  and curvature are sufficiently small), their algorithm outperforms RGD; however, in general their algorithm requires  $O(\frac{r^2}{\epsilon})$  iterations to solve the problem, which is not better than RGD. Nevertheless, the experimental results of Alimisis et al. (2021) show promise. Huang and Wei (2021) develop an algorithm for Riemannian optimization based on FISTA (Beck and Teboulle, 2009) which also demonstrates promising experimental results.

Alimisis et al. (2020) construct an ordinary differential equation (ODE) to model a Riemannian version of Nesterov’s accelerated gradient method. They prove that this ODE achieves an accelerated rate. It is unclear whether the discretization of this ODE preserves a similar acceleration. Recently, techniques from dynamical systems and symplectic geometry have been used to derive ODEs (Duruiseaux and Leok, 2021) and discretize such ODEs to obtain algorithms on Riemannian manifolds (Franca et al., 2021a,b). It is also unclear whether such algorithms achieve acceleration.

In stark contrast to the results presented in this paper, on non-convex functions it is possible to achieve acceleration *for finding (first- and second-order) critical points* on Riemannian manifolds, even negatively curved manifolds (Crisitiello and Boumal, 2020).

In this paper, we consider optimization on nonlinear spaces whose geometry is determined by a Riemannian metric. One can also sometimes model non-Euclidean geometries using a Bregman distance function; such spaces generally have different properties than Riemannian manifolds. For example, the functions in consideration are still convex in the Euclidean sense (unlike g-convex functions); instead, the Bregman geometry

alters the notion smoothness and conditioning of these functions. Dragomir et al. (2021) recently showed that, in general, acceleration is not possible in this setting. The techniques they use and the key geometric obstructions to acceleration are significantly different from the Riemannian setting we consider.

## 2 Preliminaries and the ball-packing property

In this section we introduce preliminary tools used to prove the main results. For a comprehensive introduction to smooth manifolds and Riemannian manifolds see (Lee, 2012, 2018). For introductions to these topics from an optimization perspective see (Absil et al., 2008; Boumal, 2020).

### 2.1 Hadamard manifolds and Toponogov’s theorem

Throughout,  $\mathcal{M}$  denotes a smooth manifold which has tangent bundle  $T\mathcal{M}$  and tangent spaces  $T_x\mathcal{M}$ . Intuitively,  $T_x\mathcal{M}$  is the linear space of directions one can move on  $\mathcal{M}$  at the point  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . We also assume  $\mathcal{M}$  is equipped with a Riemannian metric, which is a smoothly-varying inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_x$  on each tangent space  $T_x\mathcal{M}$ . Throughout, we drop the subscript and simply denote these inner products by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . The Riemannian metric allows us to define the gradient  $\text{grad}f$  and Hessian  $\text{Hess}f$  of the cost function  $f$  (see, for example, Chapters 3 and 5 of (Boumal, 2020)). The Riemannian gradient  $\text{grad}f(x)$  at  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  is an element of  $T_x\mathcal{M}$ . The Riemannian Hessian of  $f$  at  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  is a self-adjoint linear operator  $\text{Hess}f(x): T_x\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_x\mathcal{M}$ .

We write  $\|v\| = \sqrt{\langle v, v \rangle}$  for  $v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ . For a linear operator  $A: T_x\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_y\mathcal{M}$ ,  $\|A\|$  always denotes the operator norm (induced by the Riemannian metric). The adjoint of  $A$  is the unique linear map  $A^*: T_y\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_x\mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $\langle Av, w \rangle_y = \langle v, A^*w \rangle_x$  for all  $v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$  and  $w \in T_y\mathcal{M}$ . We use  $I_x$  to denote the identity linear operator from  $T_x\mathcal{M}$  to  $T_x\mathcal{M}$ . Often we omit the subscript and just write  $I_x = I$ .

The Riemannian metric gives  $\mathcal{M}$  a notion of distance  $\text{dist}$ , volume  $\text{Vol}$ , and geodesics which are curves which locally minimize distance on  $\mathcal{M}$ . In a Euclidean space, the geodesics are straight lines. The metric also gives us a notion of the *intrinsic curvature* of a Riemannian manifold. Euclidean spaces have zero curvature. In spaces of negative curvature (our focus), geodesics diverge quickly—see Lemma 2.4. The definition of g-convexity (Section 2.2), the conditioning of the g-convex problem (P), and the function classes  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  all depend on the metric.

We focus our attention on nonpositively curved Riemannian manifolds because they provide a natural space for g-convex analysis (Bacák, 2014).

**Definition 2.1.** *A Riemannian manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  is a Hadamard manifold if  $\mathcal{M}$  is complete, simply connected and has nonpositive sectional curvature everywhere.*

---

<sup>11</sup>Recall that  $\gamma: t \mapsto \exp_x(tv)$  is the unique geodesic on  $\mathcal{M}$  which passes through  $\gamma(0) = x$  with velocity  $\gamma'(0) = v$ .

By the Cartan-Hadamard Theorem, all  $d$ -dimensional Hadamard manifolds  $\mathcal{M}$  are diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (Lee, 2018, Thm. 12.8). The Hopf-Rinow Theorem implies that the exponential map  $\exp: T\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is well-defined on the entire tangent bundle,<sup>11</sup> and moreover every pair of points can be connected by a unique geodesic and this geodesic is minimal (Lee, 2018, Prop. 12.9). This means that the inverse of the exponential map  $\exp_x^{-1}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_x\mathcal{M}$  is also well defined for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

For  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $P_{x \rightarrow y}: T_x\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_y\mathcal{M}$  denotes parallel transport along the geodesic connecting  $x$  and  $y$ . The closed (geodesic) ball of radius  $r$  centered at  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  is denoted by  $B(x, r)$ . The closed ball in  $T_x\mathcal{M}$  centered at  $g \in T_x\mathcal{M}$  with radius  $r$  is denoted by  $B_x(g, r)$ . Throughout, we occasionally use  $\mathcal{M}_K^d$  to denote the complete simply connected  $d$ -dimensional ‘‘model’’ space of constant sectional curvature  $K$ . For  $K = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_K^d$  is a Euclidean space. For  $K < 0$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_K^d$  is a hyperbolic space. For  $K > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_K^d$  is a sphere.

We repeatedly use the following geometric propositions, which are consequences of the Euclidean law of cosines, the hyperbolic law of cosines (Ratcliffe, 2019, Thm. 3.5.3), and Toponogov’s triangle comparison theorem (see (Lee, 2018, Thm. 11.10), (Burago et al., 2001, Sec. 6.5), or (Alexander et al., 2019, Thm. 8.13.3)).

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold. Let  $xyz$  be a geodesic triangle of  $\mathcal{M}$  with vertices  $x, y, z \in \mathcal{M}$  and side lengths  $\text{dist}(y, z) = a, \text{dist}(x, z) = b, \text{dist}(x, y) = c$ . Also let the angle at  $x$  be  $\alpha$ , i.e.,  $\alpha = \arccos\left(\frac{\langle \exp_x^{-1}(y), \exp_x^{-1}(z) \rangle}{\text{dist}(x, y)\text{dist}(x, z)}\right)$ . Then  $a^2 \geq b^2 + c^2 - 2bc \cos(\alpha)$  (Lee, 2018, Prop. 12.10). Equivalently,*

$$\text{dist}(y, z)^2 \geq \text{dist}(x, z)^2 + \text{dist}(x, y)^2 - 2 \langle \exp_x^{-1}(y), \exp_x^{-1}(z) \rangle = \|\exp_x^{-1}(y) - \exp_x^{-1}(z)\|^2.$$

**Proposition 2.3.** *Consider the same setting as Proposition 2.2. In addition, assume the sectional curvatures of  $\mathcal{M}$  are in the interval  $(-\infty, K_{\text{up}}]$  with  $K_{\text{up}} < 0$ . Then*

$$\cosh(a\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}) \geq \cosh(b\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}) \cosh(c\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}) - \sinh(b\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}) \sinh(c\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}) \cos(\alpha).$$

The next lemma is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.3. It expresses the fact that when the underlying space is negatively curved, geodesics diverge quickly. Lemma 2.4 forms the basis of Lemma 2.12 (spaces with sufficient negative curvature satisfy the ball-packing property), which in turn is the most important geometric fact underlying Theorems 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5. A proof of Lemma 2.4 can be found in Appendix F.1.

**Lemma 2.4** (Geodesics diverge). *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold whose sectional curvatures are in the interval  $(-\infty, K_{\text{up}}]$  with  $K_{\text{up}} < 0$ . Let  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\theta = e^{1-\frac{2}{3}s}\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}$  where  $s \geq 0$  is large enough so that  $\theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ . Let  $v_1, v_2 \in T_{x_{\text{ref}}}\mathcal{M}$  such that the angle between  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  is at least  $\theta$ , and  $\|v_1\| = \|v_2\| = s$ . Let  $z_i = \exp_{x_{\text{ref}}}(v_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then  $\text{dist}(z_1, z_2) \geq \frac{2}{3}s$ .*

It is instructive to compare this lemma to the Euclidean case, where the law of cosines implies  $\|z_1 - z_2\|^2 \leq 2s^2 - 2s^2 \cos(\theta) = \Theta(s^2\theta^2)$ . Therefore, if  $\theta = \Theta(e^{-s})$ , then  $\|z_1 - z_2\| = \Theta(se^{-s})$ .

## 2.2 Geodesic convexity

There are many references for g-convex optimization on manifolds, see (Udriște, 1994) or (Rapcsák, 1997). We follow definitions as in (Boumal, 2020).

**Definition 2.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold. A set  $D \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  is said to be g-convex if for all  $x, y \in D$ , the unique geodesic segment connecting  $x, y$  is contained in  $D$ .*

If  $\mathcal{M}$  is Hadamard, then  $D = \mathcal{M}$  is a g-convex set and the ball  $B(x, r)$  is g-convex for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $r \geq 0$ . We note that there are several notions of g-convex sets used in the literature. However, when dealing with Hadamard manifolds, all these definitions are equivalent.

**Definition 2.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold, and let  $D \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  be g-convex. A function  $f: D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be  $\mu$ -strongly g-convex if for all  $x, y \in D$*

$$f(\gamma(t)) \leq (1-t)f(x) + tf(y) - \frac{\mu}{2}t(1-t)\text{dist}(x, y)^2$$

where  $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the geodesic with  $\gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = y$ .

If  $\mu = 0$ , we say that  $f$  is nonstrongly g-convex, or sometimes just  $f$  is g-convex.

**Definition 2.7.** *Let  $D \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  (not necessarily g-convex). A differentiable function  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be  $L$ -smooth in  $D$  if*

$$\|\text{grad}f(x) - P_{y \rightarrow x}\text{grad}f(y)\| \leq L\text{dist}(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in D.$$

We have the following useful characterizations of  $L$ -smoothness and  $\mu$ -strong g-convexity.

**Lemma 2.8.** (Boumal, 2020, Sec. 11.3) *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold, and  $D \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  be a g-convex set. Let  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be twice continuously differentiable.*

1.  *$f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly g-convex in  $D$  if and only if, for all  $x, y \in D$ ,*

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle \text{grad}f(x), \exp_x^{-1}(y) \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2}\text{dist}(x, y)^2.$$

2.  *$f$  is  $L$ -smooth in  $D$  if and only if, for all  $x, y \in D$ ,*

$$|f(y) - f(x) - \langle \text{grad}f(x), \exp_x^{-1}(y) \rangle| \leq \frac{L}{2}\text{dist}(x, y)^2.$$

3.  *$f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly g-convex in  $D$  if and only if  $\text{Hess}f(x) \succeq \mu I$  for all  $x \in D$ .*

4.  *$f$  is  $L$ -smooth in  $D$  if and only if  $\|\text{Hess}f(x)\| \leq L$  for all  $x \in D$ .*

Finally, we need the following well-known properties of the squared distance function of Hadamard manifolds.

**Lemma 2.9.** (*Alimisis et al., 2020, Lem. 2 in App. B*) Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold with sectional curvatures in the interval  $[K_{\text{lo}}, 0]$ . Fix  $z \in \mathcal{M}$ , and let  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, z)^2$ . Then  $f$  is  $C^\infty$ , and:

1.  $\text{grad}f(x) = -\exp_x^{-1}(z)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ;
2.  $f$  is 1-strongly  $g$ -convex in  $\mathcal{M}$ , i.e.,  $\text{Hess}f(x) \succeq I$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ;
3. for any  $r > 0$ ,  $f$  is  $\frac{r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}{\tanh(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})}$ -smooth in  $B(z, r)$ , i.e.,

$$\|\text{Hess}f(x)\| \leq \frac{r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}{\tanh(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})} \leq (1 + r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}), \quad \forall x \in B(z, r).$$

Hamilton and Moitra (2021) show that there is no strongly  $g$ -convex function which has bounded condition number on all of the hyperbolic plane. This statement is of course not true in Euclidean space. Using a different technique, Martínez-Rubio (2021) proves a similar result (see Proposition C.6 therein). We extend the result of Hamilton and Moitra (2021) to Hadamard spaces with bounded curvature. See Appendix G.1 for a proof of the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.10.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold whose sectional curvatures are in the interval  $(-\infty, K_{\text{up}}]$  with  $K_{\text{up}} < 0$ . Let  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a differentiable function which is  $L$ -smooth and  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in a ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ . Then

$$\frac{L}{\mu} \geq \frac{1}{8} \left( r\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}} - 1 \right)$$

provided  $r \geq \frac{4}{\mu} \|\text{grad}f(x_{\text{ref}})\| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}$ .

In other words,  $\frac{L}{\mu} \geq \Omega(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})$  for  $r$  sufficiently large.

The following proposition is another result showing that the geometry of the underlying space can strongly influence the cost function. We do not use Proposition 2.11 in this paper, but we suspect it might be relevant to algorithms and lower bounds for second-order methods for  $g$ -convex optimization, which have recently received a surge of interest (Allen-Zhu et al., 2018; Bürgisser et al., 2019; Franks and Reichenbach, 2021).

**Proposition 2.11.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold whose sectional curvatures are in the interval  $(-\infty, K_{\text{up}}]$  with  $K_{\text{up}} < 0$ . Let  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a three-times differentiable function which is  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Assume the Hessian of  $f$  is  $\rho$ -Lipschitz in a ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ , that is:

$$\|P_{x \rightarrow y}^* \text{Hess}f(y) P_{x \rightarrow y} - \text{Hess}f(x)\| \leq \rho \text{dist}(x, y), \quad \forall x, y \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, r).$$

Then,  $\rho \geq r\mu |K_{\text{up}}|/2$ .

See Appendix G.2 for a proof of Proposition 2.11.



## 2.3 The ball-packing property

In order to show that acceleration is not possible, we require our space satisfies the following geometric property.

**A1** (Ball-packing property). *There is a point  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ , an  $\tilde{r} > 0$  and a  $\tilde{c} > 0$  such that for all  $r \geq \tilde{r}$ , there exist  $N \geq e^{\tilde{c}r}$  points  $z_1, \dots, z_N$  in the ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$  so that all pairs of points are separated by a distance of at least  $\frac{r}{2}$ :  $\text{dist}(z_i, z_j) \geq \frac{r}{2}$  for all  $i \neq j$ . In this case, we say  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies the ball-packing property with  $\tilde{r}, \tilde{c}$  and  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ .*

We think of the points  $z_1, \dots, z_N$  as centers of balls of radius  $\frac{r}{4}$ , each of which is contained in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ . Clearly no Euclidean space satisfies the ball-packing property as the volume of a ball of radius  $r$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  scales polynomially as  $r^d$ , not exponentially. Most Riemannian manifolds we consider satisfy the following stronger property.

**A2** (Strong ball-packing property). *There is an  $\tilde{r} > 0$  and a  $\tilde{c} > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies the ball-packing property with  $\tilde{r}, \tilde{c}$  and every  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ .*

**Lemma 2.12.** *Let  $d \geq 2$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a  $d$ -dimensional Hadamard manifold whose sectional curvatures are in the interval  $(-\infty, K_{\text{up}}]$  with  $K_{\text{up}} < 0$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies the strong ball-packing property A2 for  $\tilde{r} = \frac{4}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}$  and  $\tilde{c} = \frac{d\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{8}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $r \geq \tilde{r}$  and let  $s = \frac{3}{4}r$ . Let  $\theta = e^{1-\frac{2}{3}s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}$ . Consider the sphere  $\mathbb{S}_{x_{\text{ref}}}^{d-1}(s) = \{v \in T_{x_{\text{ref}}}\mathcal{M} : \|v\| = s\}$ .

We know  $\theta = e^{1-\frac{2}{3}s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}} \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$  because  $s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}} \geq 1$ . Therefore using  $d \geq 2$  and a standard covering number argument adapted to our setting (see Lemma F.1 in the appendix), we find there exist

$$N \geq \theta^{-(d-1)} = e^{(d-1)(\frac{2}{3}s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}-1)} \geq e^{\frac{1}{2}d(\frac{1}{2}r\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}-1)} \geq e^{\frac{1}{8}dr\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}$$

tangent vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_N \in \mathbb{S}_{x_{\text{ref}}}^{d-1}(s)$  such that the angle between vectors  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  is at least  $\theta$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Define  $z_j = \exp_{x_{\text{ref}}}(v_j)$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Therefore,  $z_j \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$  for all  $j$ . Moreover,  $\text{dist}(z_i, z_j) \geq \frac{2}{3}s = \frac{r}{2}$  for all  $i \neq j$  owing to Lemma 2.4 (geodesics diverge).  $\square$

**Remark 2.13.** *For the particular case where  $\mathcal{M}$  is a hyperbolic space, we can argue Lemma 2.12 using a simple volume argument, combined with the fact that the covering number is less than the packing number (Vershynin, 2018, Lem. 4.2.8). However, that line of reasoning does not hold beyond hyperbolic spaces. Indeed, in order to estimate the number of disjoint balls of radius  $\frac{r}{4}$  we can pack into a ball of radius  $r$ , we would need an upper bound on the volume of balls of radius  $\frac{r}{4}$  (which is dictated by  $K_{\text{lo}}$ ) and a lower bound on the volume of balls of radius  $r$  (which is dictated by  $K_{\text{up}}$ ) (Lee, 2012, Thm. 11.14). To deduce a packing number from those bounds, we would need an assumption on the ratio of  $K_{\text{lo}}$  to  $K_{\text{up}}$ . Notice that Lemma 2.12 does not make such an assumption.*

Let  $\mathcal{P}_n = \{P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : P^\top = P, P \succ 0\}$  be the symmetric space of  $n \times n$  positive definite matrices (with real entries), endowed with the so-called affine-invariant metric

$$\langle X, Y \rangle_P = \text{Tr}(P^{-1}XP^{-1}Y) \quad \text{for } P \in \mathcal{P}_n, \text{ and } X, Y \in T_P\mathcal{P}_n \cong \text{Sym}(n),$$

where  $\text{Sym}(n)$  is the set of  $n \times n$  real symmetric matrices. Let  $\mathcal{SLP}_n = \text{SL}(n)/\text{SO}(n)$  be the totally geodesic submanifold of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  consisting of those matrices of determinant one. Since  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is isometric to  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{SLP}_n$ , all results stated about  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  hold for  $\mathcal{P}_n$  also, only with different constants.

The symmetric space  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  is a homogeneous Hadamard manifold which does not have strictly negative curvature, so we cannot apply Lemma 2.12. However,  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  contains an  $(n - 1)$ -dimensional totally geodesic submanifold isometric to a hyperbolic space (Bridson and Haefliger, 1999, Ch. II.10). This allows us to show  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  satisfies the following ball-packing property. Franks and Reichenbach (2021) independently use the observation that  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  contains a hyperbolic plane as a totally geodesical submanifold for a similar purpose. We prove Lemma 2.14 in Appendix H.

**Lemma 2.14.** *For  $n \geq 3$ , both  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  and  $\mathcal{P}_n$  satisfy the strong ball-packing property A2 with  $\tilde{r} = 8\sqrt{2}$ ,  $\tilde{c} = \frac{n-1}{16\sqrt{2}}$ . Both  $\mathcal{SLP}_2$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  satisfy the strong ball-packing property with  $\tilde{r} = 4\sqrt{2}$ ,  $\tilde{c} = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}$ .*

We do not know if the constant  $\tilde{c}$  stated in Lemma 2.14 is the best possible constant (i.e., is as large as possible). However, we argue in Appendix H.2 that we must have  $\tilde{c} \leq O(n^{3/2})$  due to the Bishop-Gromov volume comparison theorem (Lee, 2018, Thm. 11.19). In particular,  $\tilde{c} = o(\dim(\mathcal{SLP}_n))$  which has important implications for the lower bounds we prove.

### 3 Main theorem and proof of key lemma

A first-order algorithm is allowed to query points  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , and for each query  $x$ , it receives the function value  $f(x)$  and the gradient  $\text{grad}f(x)$  from the oracle.

**Definition 3.1.** *The (first-order) oracle for a differentiable function  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the map  $\mathcal{O}_f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \text{TM}$  given by  $\mathcal{O}_f(x) = (f(x), (x, \text{grad}f(x)))$ .*

**Definition 3.2.** *A deterministic (first-order) algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  is an initial point  $x_0$  together with a sequence of functions  $(\mathcal{A}_k: (\mathbb{R} \times \text{TM})^k \rightarrow \mathcal{M})_{k \geq 1}$ .*

Running  $\mathcal{A}$  on a cost function  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  produces iterates  $x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots$  as follows. The algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  queries  $x_0$ , and receives  $f_0 = f(x_0)$  and  $g_0 = \text{grad}f(x_0)$ . That information is passed to  $\mathcal{A}_1$  which produces  $x_1 = \mathcal{A}_1((x_0, f_0, g_0))$ .<sup>12</sup> That point is queried to obtain  $f_1 = f(x_1)$  and  $g_1 = \text{grad}f(x_1)$ . Subsequently, the algorithm uses all the information gathered thus far to produce each iterate  $x_k = \mathcal{A}_k((x_0, f_0, g_0), \dots, (x_{k-1}, f_{k-1}, g_{k-1}))$ .

<sup>12</sup>With a slight abuse of notation, we are identifying the triplet  $(x, f, g)$  with  $(f, (x, g)) \in \mathbb{R} \times \text{TM}$ .

We now have the tools to state and prove our main theorem, from which the theorems in the introduction follow. Theorem 1.3 follows from Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 2.12 (see Appendix J.1 for the details). Theorem 1.4 follows from Theorem 3.3, Lemma 2.14, and the fact that  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  has sectional curvatures in the interval  $[-\frac{1}{2}, 0]$  (Criscitiello and Boumal, 2020, Prop. I.1) (see Appendix J.2 for the details). For the statement below, recall the definition of the function class  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  from Section 1.2.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold of dimension  $d \geq 2$  which satisfies the ball-packing property A1 with constants  $\tilde{r}, \tilde{c}$  and point  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Also assume  $\mathcal{M}$  has sectional curvatures in the interval  $[K_{\text{lo}}, 0]$  with  $K_{\text{lo}} < 0$ . Let  $r \geq \max\{\tilde{r}, \frac{8}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, \frac{4(d+2)}{\tilde{c}}\}$ . Define*

$$\kappa = 4r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 3. \quad (1)$$

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be any deterministic algorithm.

There is a function  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{3\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  with minimizer  $x^*$  such that running  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $f$  yields iterates  $x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots$  satisfying  $\text{dist}(x_k, x^*) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$ , where

$$T = \left\lfloor \frac{\tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r}{\log(2000\tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))} \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor \frac{\tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r}{\log(2 \cdot 10^6 \cdot \tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2)} \right\rfloor$$

with  $\mathcal{R} = 2^9 r \log(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2$ .

Moreover,  $f$  is  $\frac{1}{6}$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $[2\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + \frac{3}{2}]$ -smooth in the ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . Outside of the ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ ,  $f$  is simply half the squared distance to  $x_{\text{ref}}$ , i.e.,  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})^2$  for all  $x \notin B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ .

The last paragraph about the structure of the hard function  $f$  is included because it is useful for proving Theorem 1.5 (see Section 5).

We prove Theorem 3.3 in two steps. First, we build a resisting oracle in Theorem 3.4 which provides a lower bound for algorithms that are constrained to query points in a bounded domain. Second, in Section 4 we use a reduction to prove lower bounds even when the algorithm is allowed to query in all of  $\mathcal{M}$ .

### 3.1 Lower bound for algorithms with bounded queries

**Theorem 3.4.** *Consider the same setting as Theorem 3.3. In addition, let  $\mathcal{R} \geq r$  and assume that the algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  always makes queries in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ .<sup>13</sup>*

There is a function  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  with minimizer  $x^*$  such that running  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $f$  yields iterates  $x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots$  satisfying  $\text{dist}(x_k, x^*) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$ , where

$$T = \left\lfloor \frac{\tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r}{\log(2000\tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))} \right\rfloor. \quad (2)$$

<sup>13</sup>By “same setting,” we mean the first paragraph of Theorem 3.3. In particular,  $\mathcal{R}$  is any number greater than  $r$ ; we do not define  $\mathcal{R}$  as in Theorem 3.3.

Moreover,  $f$  is of the form  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, x^*)^2 + H(x)$  where  $x^* \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$  and  $H: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $C^\infty$  function satisfying

$$|H(x)| \leq \frac{r}{64\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, \quad \|\text{grad}H(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, \quad \|\text{Hess}H(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (3)$$

Inequalities (3) are included because they are useful for the second part of the proof for Theorem 3.3 (see Section 4).

For ease of exposition, we prove the following slightly simpler theorem in the main part of the paper. For this theorem, we assume the algorithm only receives gradient information (no function values). The modifications to the proof of Theorem 3.5 required to prove Theorem 3.4 are provided in Section 3.4 as well as Appendix D.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Consider the same setting as Theorem 3.3. Further assume that the algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  only makes gradient queries (no function values), and that  $\mathcal{A}$  always makes queries in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ , with  $\mathcal{R} \geq r$ .*

*Then there is a function  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\kappa, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  with minimizer  $x^*$  such that running  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $f$  yields iterates  $x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots$  satisfying  $\text{dist}(x_k, x^*) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$ , where*

$$T = \left\lceil \frac{\frac{1}{2}\tilde{c}d^{-1}r}{\log\left(2000 \cdot \frac{1}{2}\tilde{c}d^{-1}r(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2)\right)} \right\rceil. \quad (4)$$

We prove this theorem in the next section.

## 3.2 Key lemma: Pièce de résistance

To prove Theorem 3.5 we use Lemma 3.6, stated below. Before we state the lemma, let us provide motivation. At a high-level, we show that as long as the algorithm has made at most  $T$  queries, the oracle can always answer these queries in such a way that there exist two cost functions consistent with these queries and yet whose minimizers are significantly far away from each other.

Let us be more precise. Consider a Hadamard manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying the ball-packing property A1 with  $\tilde{r}, \tilde{c} > 0$  and  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_N$ , with  $N \geq e^{\tilde{c}r}$ , be points in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ ,  $r \geq \tilde{r}$ , so that all pairs of points are separated by a distance of at least  $\frac{r}{2}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a first-order optimization algorithm. One can even give the list of points  $z_1, \dots, z_N$  to the algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$ . The algorithm makes queries at points  $x_0, x_1, \dots$  and our job (as the resisting oracle) is to choose gradients  $g_0 \in T_{x_0}\mathcal{M}, g_1 \in T_{x_1}\mathcal{M}, \dots$  to return to the algorithm.

At each iteration  $k \geq 0$ , we maintain a list of “active candidate functions”  $f_{j,k}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  indexed by  $j \in A_k \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$ . The notation  $A_k$  stands for “active” set at iteration  $k$ . Each of the functions  $f_{j,k}, j \in A_k$ , is differentiable, strongly  $g$ -convex, and has minimizer at  $z_j$  with  $z_j$  a distance of at least  $\frac{r}{4}$  from all queried points. Additionally, the functions  $f_{j,k}, j \in A_k$ , are consistent with the  $k$  gradient queries  $(x_0, g_0), \dots, (x_{k-1}, g_{k-1})$  answered so far, meaning  $\text{grad}f_{j,m}(x_m) = g_m$  for all  $m < k$  and  $j \in A_k$ . Therefore, any

of the functions  $f_{j,k}$ , with  $j \in A_k$ , can be the actual function being optimized. Any of the minimizers  $z_j$ , with  $j \in A_k$ , can be the minimizer of the actual function being optimized. We call the collection  $\{z_j : j \in A_k\}$  the set of “active candidate minimizers” at iteration  $k$ . Therefore, as long as  $A_k$  is nonempty, we can conclude that the algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  has not queried a point less than distance  $\frac{r}{4}$  of the minimizer up to iteration  $k$ .

The resisting oracle chooses the gradients  $g_k$  adversarially. Given the queries  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k$  made by the algorithm and the current active set  $A_k$ , the resisting oracle chooses  $g_k \in \mathbb{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$  in such a way that the algorithm gains as little information about the location of  $x^*$  as possible. This amounts to choosing  $g_k$  so that the cardinality of  $A_{k+1}$  is as large as possible (we always have  $A_{k+1} \subseteq A_k$ ). For example, if  $\mathcal{M}$  is a  $d$ -dimensional hyperbolic space of curvature  $K < 0$ , we show  $|A_{k+1}| \geq |A_k| / \text{poly}(r\sqrt{-K})$ . Since  $|A_0| = N \geq e^{cr}$  is so large due to the ball-packing property, this allows us to conclude the desired lower bound.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold of dimension  $d \geq 2$  with sectional curvatures in the interval  $[K_{\text{lo}}, 0]$  with  $K_{\text{lo}} < 0$ . Let  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $r \geq \frac{8}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}$ ,  $\mathcal{R} \geq r$ . Let  $z_1, \dots, z_N \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$  be distinct points in  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $\text{dist}(z_i, z_j) \geq \frac{r}{2}$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Define  $A_0 = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be any first-order algorithm which only makes gradient queries and only queries points in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . Finally let  $w \geq 1$  (this is a tuning parameter we will set later).*

*For every nonnegative integer  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor 2w \rfloor$ , the algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  makes the query*

$$x_k = \mathcal{A}_k((x_0, g_0), \dots, (x_{k-1}, g_{k-1}))$$

*and there is a tangent vector  $g_k \in \mathbb{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$  and a set  $A_{k+1} \subseteq A_k$  satisfying*

$$|A_{k+1}| \geq \frac{|A_k| - 1}{(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))^d} \quad (5)$$

*such that for each  $j \in A_{k+1}$  there is a  $C^\infty$  function  $f_{j,k+1}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of the form*

$$f_{j,k+1}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x, z_j)^2 + H_{j,k+1}(x) \quad (6)$$

*satisfying:*

**L1**  $f_{j,k+1}$  is  $(1 - \frac{k+1}{4w})$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $[2r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 1 + \frac{k+1}{4w}]$ -smooth in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ ;

**L2**  $\text{grad}f_{j,k+1}(z_j) = 0$  (hence in particular, the minimizer of  $f_{j,k+1}$  is  $z_j$ );

**L3**  $\text{grad}f_{j,k+1}(x_m) = g_m$  for  $m = 0, 1, \dots, k$ ;

**L4**  $\text{dist}(x_m, z_j) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  for all  $m = 0, 1, \dots, k$ ;

**L5**  $\|\text{grad}H_{j,k+1}(x)\| \leq \frac{(k+1)w^{-1}}{4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}$  and  $\|\text{Hess}H_{j,k+1}(x)\| \leq \frac{k+1}{4w}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

We note that this lemma does not assume  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies the ball-packing property, and so in particular it applies to Euclidean spaces.

With this lemma, Theorem 3.5 follows easily.

*Proof of Theorem 3.5.* Let us apply Lemma 3.6 to the manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  and algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$ . Let the points  $z_1, \dots, z_N$  be provided by the ball-packing property so that  $N \geq e^{\tilde{c}r}$ . Set  $w = \tilde{c}d^{-1}r/4$  in Lemma 3.6.

It is easy to show by induction that inequality (5) along with  $|A_0| \geq e^{\tilde{c}r}$  and  $r \geq \frac{4(d+2)}{\tilde{c}}$  imply that  $|A_k| \geq 2$  for all  $k \leq \min\{T, \lfloor 2w \rfloor\} = T$ . For completeness, we provide a short explicit proof of this in Appendix A.

In particular,  $A_T$  is nonempty. Thus we can choose  $j \in A_T$  and let  $f = f_{j,T}$ . By property **L1** and  $T \leq 2w$ ,  $f$  is  $\frac{1}{2}$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $[2r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + \frac{3}{2}]$ -smooth in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ . Moreover, property **L2** implies  $f$  has minimizer  $z_j$  which is contained in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$ . Therefore,  $f$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  with  $\kappa = 4r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 3$  as in (1).

On the other hand, properties **L3** and **L4** imply running  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $f$  produces iterates  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{T-1}$  satisfying  $\text{dist}(x_k, z_j) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$ .  $\square$

### 3.3 Proof of the key lemma 3.6

We prove by induction on  $k$  that there is a set  $A_{k+1}$  and functions  $f_{j,k+1}, j \in A_{k+1}$ , satisfying the properties **L1**, **L2**, **L3**, **L4**, **L5**. As we do this, we also construct the gradients  $g_0, g_1, \dots$ , and we show that inequality (5) holds for each  $k \geq 0$ .

Our **base case** is  $k+1 = 0$ . At the start (no queries), we simply define

$$f_{j,0}(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, z_j)^2, \quad \forall j \in A_0 = \{1, \dots, N\}. \quad (7)$$

Clearly  $\text{grad}f_{j,0}(z_j) = 0$  (**L2** is satisfied), and  $f_{j,0}$  is 1-strongly  $g$ -convex and  $[2r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 1]$ -smooth in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$  by Lemma 2.9 (**L1** is satisfied). At iteration 0, all the functions  $f_{j,0}$  are trivially consistent with the set of past queries because there are no past queries (**L3** and **L4** are satisfied). Finally,  $H_{j,0}$  is identically zero (**L5** is satisfied).

Now let us move on to the **inductive step**. The remainder of this section is devoted to the inductive step. We are at iteration  $k \in [0, \lfloor 2w \rfloor]$ , and there have been  $k$  past queries at the points  $x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}$ , along with the  $k$  gradients  $g_0, \dots, g_{k-1}$  returned by the oracle.

The algorithm queries a point  $x_k$ . If  $k \geq 1$ , let  $x_\ell$ , with  $\ell < k$ , be a previous query point closest to  $x_k$ , i.e.,

$$x_\ell \in \arg \min_{x \in \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}} \text{dist}(x_k, x). \quad (8)$$

If  $x_k = x_\ell$  (i.e., the algorithm repeats a query), just return  $g_k = g_\ell$ , take  $A_{k+1} = A_k$ , and we are done. Otherwise, we can assume  $x_k \neq x_\ell$ .

By the inductive hypothesis (**IH**), we have a set  $A_k$  such that for each  $j \in A_k$  there is an infinitely differentiable function  $f_{j,k}$  for which:

- IH1**  $f_{j,k}$  is  $(1 - \frac{k}{4w})$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in  $M$  and  $[2r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 1 + \frac{k}{4w}]$ -smooth in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ ;
- IH2**  $\text{grad}f_{j,k}(z_j) = 0$ ;
- IH3**  $\text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_m) = g_m$  for  $m = 0, \dots, k-1$ ;
- IH4**  $\text{dist}(x_m, z_j) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  for all  $m = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ ;
- IH5**  $\|\text{grad}H_{j,k}(x)\| \leq \frac{kw^{-1}}{4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}$  and  $\|\text{Hess}H_{j,k}(x)\| \leq \frac{k}{4w}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

We want to choose a set  $A_{k+1} \subseteq A_k$ . Then, for  $j \in A_{k+1}$ , we construct the function  $f_{j,k+1}$  inductively as

$$f_{j,k+1} = f_{j,k} + h_{j,k}, \quad (9)$$

where  $h_{j,k}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an appropriately chosen function. What properties do we want the functions  $h_{j,k}$  to satisfy? Compare the properties **IH1**, **IH2**, **IH3**, **IH4**, **IH5** satisfied by  $f_{j,k}$ , with the properties **L1**, **L2**, **L3**, **L4**, **L5** we want  $f_{j,k+1}$  to satisfy. Let us look at each property in turn.

- In order to ensure  $f_{j,k+1}$  satisfies **L4**, we simply need to choose  $A_{k+1}$  so that  $\text{dist}(x_k, z_j) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  for all  $j \in A_{k+1}$ . Define

$$\tilde{A}_k = \left\{ j \in A_k : \text{dist}(x_k, z_j) \geq \frac{r}{4} \right\}. \quad (10)$$

Since any pair of minimizers  $z_i, z_j$  are separated by a distance of at least  $r/2$ , there is at most one  $j \in A_k$  such that  $\text{dist}(x_k, z_j) < r/4$ . Therefore  $|\tilde{A}_k| \geq |A_k| - 1$ . Below we define  $A_{k+1}$  as a particular subset of  $\tilde{A}_k$ .

- Let us look at property **L3**. If  $k = 0$ , then  $f_{j,k+1}$  is trivially consistent with the past queries (because there have been no past queries). Assume  $k \geq 1$ . In order for  $f_{j,k+1}$  to remain consistent with the past queries  $x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}$ , it is sufficient to enforce that the closed support<sup>14</sup>  $\overline{\text{supp}(h_{j,k})}$  does not contain  $x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}$ . Of course  $h_{j,k}$  vanishes identically on the complement of its closed support  $\mathcal{M} \setminus \overline{\text{supp}(h_{j,k})}$ . Further,  $\mathcal{M} \setminus \overline{\text{supp}(h_{j,k})}$  is an open set, so

$$\text{grad}h_{j,k}(x) = 0, \quad \text{Hess}h_{j,k}(x) = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \overline{\text{supp}(h_{j,k})}.$$

Using  $\text{grad}f_{j,k+1} = \text{grad}f_{j,k} + \text{grad}h_{j,k}$  and the inductive hypothesis **IH3**, this ensures that  $f_{j,k+1}$  is consistent with the queries  $x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}$ .

In order to gain control of the gradient of  $f_{j,k+1}$  at  $x_k$ , we also want the support of  $h_{j,k}$  to contain  $x_k$ . So using that  $x_\ell$  (8) is the past query point closest to  $x_k$ , it is enough to enforce that the support of  $h_{j,k}$  remains in the ball  $B(x_k, \frac{1}{4}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell))$ .

<sup>14</sup>We use the notation  $\text{supp}(f) = \{x \in \mathcal{M} : f(x) \neq 0\}$  to denote the support of a function  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\bar{S}$  to denote the closure of the set  $S$ .

- In the previous item we saw that if  $k \geq 1$ , we want the support of  $h_{j,k}$  to be contained in a ball centered at  $x_k$  and whose radius is no more than  $\frac{1}{4}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)$ . For **L2**, it is convenient to require that this radius is no more than  $\frac{r}{8}$ . Precisely, we shall ensure that the support of  $h_{j,k}$  is contained in the ball  $B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)})$  where

$$R_{\text{ball}}^{(0)} = \frac{r}{8}, \quad R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)} = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell), \frac{r}{8} \right\} \quad \text{if } k \geq 1. \quad (11)$$

Let us now show that this choice of  $R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}$  guarantees **L2**, i.e.,  $\text{grad}f_{j,k+1}(z_j) = 0$ . We know  $\text{grad}f_{j,k}(z_j) = 0$ . Therefore, to satisfy **L2** it is sufficient to impose that the closed support of  $h_{j,k}$  does not contain  $z_j$ . We know that  $\text{dist}(x_k, z_j) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  for all  $j \in \tilde{A}_k$ . Since  $R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)} \leq \frac{r}{8}$ , we have  $z_j \notin B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)})$  for all  $j \in \tilde{A}_k$ .

- The following hold pointwise on  $\mathcal{M}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{grad}f_{j,k+1} &= \text{grad}f_{j,k} + \text{grad}h_{j,k}, & \text{Hess}f_{j,k+1} &= \text{Hess}f_{j,k} + \text{Hess}h_{j,k}, \\ \text{grad}H_{j,k+1} &= \text{grad}H_{j,k} + \text{grad}h_{j,k}, & \text{Hess}H_{j,k+1} &= \text{Hess}H_{j,k} + \text{Hess}h_{j,k}. \end{aligned}$$

These imply  $\text{Hess}f_{j,k} - \|\text{Hess}h_{j,k}\| I \preceq \text{Hess}f_{j,k+1} \preceq \text{Hess}f_{j,k} + \|\text{Hess}h_{j,k}\| I$  and

$$\|\text{grad}H_{j,k+1}\| \leq \|\text{grad}H_{j,k}\| + \|\text{grad}h_{j,k}\|, \quad \|\text{Hess}H_{j,k+1}\| \leq \|\text{Hess}H_{j,k}\| + \|\text{Hess}h_{j,k}\|.$$

Therefore (using Lemma 2.8), for  $f_{j,k+1}$  to satisfy **L1** and  $H_{j,k+1}$  to satisfy **L5**, it is enough to require  $\|\text{Hess}h_{j,k}(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{4w}$  and  $\|\text{grad}h_{j,k}(x)\| \leq \frac{w^{-1}}{4\sqrt{-K_{10}}}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Since we are looking for a function  $h_{j,k}$  with support contained in a ball, we are looking to construct a *bump function*.

**Definition 3.7.** A bump function is a  $C^\infty$  function on  $\mathcal{M}$  whose closed support is compact.

We have the following lemma which, given a point  $x_k \in \mathcal{M}$  and a radius  $R_{\text{ball}} > 0$ , provides a family of bump functions  $\{h_g\}$  that are supported in  $B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}})$ , have  $\text{grad}h_g(x_k) = g$  and in addition satisfy the bounds  $\|\text{Hess}h_g(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{4w}$  and  $\|\text{grad}h_g(x)\| \leq \frac{w^{-1}}{4\sqrt{-K_{10}}}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . The proof of Lemma 3.8 is in Appendix E.

**Lemma 3.8** (Family of bump functions). *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold with sectional curvatures in the interval  $[K_{10}, 0]$  with  $K_{10} < 0$ . Let  $R_{\text{ball}} > 0, w > 0, x_k \in \mathcal{M}$ . Define*

$$g_{\text{norm}} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad g_{\text{norm}}(R) = \frac{8R}{e^{1/3}(1485 + 72R\sqrt{-K_{10}})}.$$

There is a family of functions

$$\{h_g : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{g \in B_{x_k}(0, w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}))},$$

satisfying for each  $g \in B_{x_k}(0, w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}})) \subseteq T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$ :



**BF1**  $\text{grad}h_g(x_k) = g$ ;

**BF2** the support of each  $h_g$  is contained in  $B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}})$ ;

**BF3**  $\|\text{grad}h_g(x)\| \leq \frac{w^{-1}}{4\sqrt{-K_{10}}}$ ,  $\|\text{Hess}h_g(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{4w}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ;

**BF4**  $h_g(x_k) = \frac{3}{8} \|g\| g_{\text{norm}}^{-1}(w \|g\|)$ , and  $|h_g(x)| \leq w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , where  $a: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined in equation (29).<sup>15</sup>

So far we have not chosen  $g_k \in T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$ . However, using the bump functions provided by Lemma 3.8, we have shown for any choice of  $g \in B_{x_k}(0, w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}))$  and  $j \in \tilde{A}_k$ , the function  $f_{j,k+1} = f_{j,k} + h_g$  satisfies properties **L1**, **L2**, **L4**, **L5**, as well as  $\text{grad}f_{j,k+1}(x_m) = g_m$  for  $m = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$  (this is part of property **L3**). It remains to choose  $g_k \in T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$  and  $A_{k+1} \subseteq \tilde{A}_k$  so that  $\text{grad}f_{j,k+1}(x_k) = g_k$  for all  $j \in A_{k+1}$ , and so that inequality (5) is satisfied.

Around each gradient  $\text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k)$ ,  $j \in \tilde{A}_k$ , there is a small ball  $B_{j,k}$  which is the set of possible gradients of  $f_{j,k+1} = f_{j,k} + h_g$  at  $x_k$ . More precisely, the balls  $B_{j,k} \subseteq T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$  are defined by

$$B_{j,k} = B_{x_k}(\text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k), w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)})), \quad \forall j \in \tilde{A}_k. \quad (12)$$

Some of these balls overlap, and we want to choose  $g_k \in T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$  which simultaneously lies in as many of the balls as possible—see Figure 1. This is because the oracle only gets to pick one  $g_k$  and we would like  $g_k$  to be compatible with as many  $f_{j,k+1}$ ,  $j \in \tilde{A}_k$ , as possible. Therefore, choose

$$g_k \in \arg \max_{g \in T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}} \left| \{j \in \tilde{A}_k : g \in B_{j,k}\} \right|. \quad (13)$$

Define  $A_{k+1}$  to be the set of  $j \in \tilde{A}_k$  such that  $g_k \in B_{j,k}$ , i.e.,  $A_{k+1} = \{j \in \tilde{A}_k : g_k \in B_{j,k}\}$ . The number of balls  $\{B_{j,k}\}$  which intersect at the common vector  $g_k$  equals  $|A_{k+1}|$ . For each  $j \in A_{k+1}$  the vector  $g_{j,k} = g_k - \text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k)$  is in  $B_{x_k}(0, w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}))$  and so

$$\text{grad}(f_{j,k} + h_{g_{j,k}})(x_k) = \text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k) + \text{grad}h_{g_{j,k}}(x_k) = \text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k) + g_{j,k} = g_k$$

using property **BF1** of Lemma 3.8. Therefore, defining  $h_{j,k} = h_{g_{j,k}}$ , we have

$$\text{grad}f_{j,k+1}(x_k) = \text{grad}(f_{j,k} + h_{j,k})(x_k) = g_k, \quad \text{for all } j \in A_{k+1}.$$

It remains to show inequality (5), i.e., a large enough subset of the balls  $B_{j,k}$  do indeed intersect at a common point. For this, we use the following simple geometric lemma.

---

<sup>15</sup>This property is not used for the present proof, so we do not define  $a(\cdot)$  here. We include property **BF4** because it is useful in Appendix D when analyzing queries which also return function values.

**Lemma 3.9.** Consider  $n$  closed balls  $B_1, \dots, B_n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  of radius  $q$  each, and assume each of the balls is also contained in a larger closed ball  $B$  of radius  $r$ :  $B_j \subseteq B$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . For each  $x \in B$ , let  $N(x)$  be the number of smaller balls which contain  $x$ :

$$N(x) = |\{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} : x \in B_j\}|.$$

Choose  $g \in \arg \max_{y \in B} N(y)$  and let  $A = \{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} : g \in B_j\}$ . Then  $|A| \geq n \text{Vol}(B_1) / \text{Vol}(B) = nq^d / r^d$ .

*Proof.* The sum of the volumes of the smaller balls is

$$n \text{Vol}(B_1) = \int_{x \in B} N(x) dV(x) \leq \int_{x \in B} \left( \max_{y \in B} N(y) \right) dV(x) = \left( \max_{y \in B} N(y) \right) \text{Vol}(B).$$

So  $|A| = \max_{y \in B} N(y) \geq n \text{Vol}(B_1) / \text{Vol}(B) = nq^d / r^d$ .  $\square$




Figure 1: A depiction of how we choose the gradient  $g_k$  in the proof of Lemma 3.6 (Section 3.3). The balls  $B_{j,k} \subset T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$  are centered at the gradients  $\{\text{grad} f_{j,k}(x_k)\}_{j \in \tilde{A}_k}$  (the dashed arrows). The gradient  $g_k \in T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$  (the bolded blue arrow), is chosen in the intersection of as many balls  $B_{j,k}$  as possible. The set of balls  $B_{j,k}$  containing  $g_k$  determines the subsequent active set  $A_{k+1}$ . In the figure,  $|A_{k+1}| = 3$ .

To use Lemma 3.9, we need to find a ball  $B_k \subseteq T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$  containing all the balls  $B_{j,k}, j \in \tilde{A}_k$ , and we want the radius of  $B_k$  to be small. This is the last step of the proof. Care has to be taken in bounding the radius of  $B_k$  because the distance between  $x_k$  and  $x_\ell$  (8) can be arbitrarily small. If  $\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)$  is very small, then the radius of the balls  $B_{j,k}$  is very small, and so we must show that the radius of  $B_k$  is also sufficiently small for Lemma 3.9 to be useful. We upper bound the radius of the ball  $B_k$  in two cases:

1. **Case 1:** either  $k = 0$ , or  $k \geq 1$  and  $\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) > 4$ . This captures the scenario where either there are no previous query points, or the algorithm queries  $x_k$  not close to any previous query.
2. **Case 2:**  $k \geq 1$  and  $\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) \leq 4$ . This captures the scenario where the algorithm queries  $x_k$  close to a previous query.

In each case, we show below that

$$\frac{\text{Vol}(B_{j,k})}{\text{Vol}(B_k)} \geq \frac{1}{(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))^d}.$$

Therefore, using Lemma 3.9,  $g_k$  (13) is contained in

$$|A_{k+1}| \geq |\tilde{A}_k| \frac{\text{Vol}(B_{j,k})}{\text{Vol}(B_k)} \geq \frac{|A_k| - 1}{(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))^d}$$

of the balls  $B_{j,k}, j \in \tilde{A}_k$ . This concludes the inductive step, proving Lemma 3.6.

### 3.3.1 Case 1: $x_k$ is not close to any previous query point

In this case, the overarching idea is as follows:  $f_{j,k}$  is a perturbed version of the squared distance function  $x \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, z_j)^2$ . Therefore, the gradient of  $f_{j,k}$  at  $x_k$  (which is the center of  $B_{j,k}$ ) is approximately  $-\exp_{x_k}^{-1}(z_j)$  (see Lemma 2.9). The points  $\{z_j\}_{j \in \tilde{A}_k}$  are clustered around  $x_{\text{ref}}$  in a ball of radius  $r$ . Therefore the vectors  $\{-\exp_{x_k}^{-1}(z_j)\}_{j \in \tilde{A}_k}$  are clustered around  $-\exp_{x_k}^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}})$ . Consequently the same is true for the gradients  $\{\text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k)\}_{j \in \tilde{A}_k}$ . We use this intuition to work out the details below.

By Proposition 2.2, nonpositive curvature yields:

$$\|\exp_{x_k}^{-1}(z_j) - \exp_{x_k}^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}})\| \leq \text{dist}(z_j, x_{\text{ref}}) \leq r.$$

By the inductive hypothesis and  $k \leq 2w$

$$\|\text{grad}H_{j,k}(x_k)\| \leq k \frac{w^{-1}}{4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}.$$

Therefore, using the definition of  $H_{j,k}$  (equation (6)),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k) - \exp_{x_k}^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}})\| &= \|\exp_{x_k}^{-1}(z_j) + \text{grad}H_{j,k}(x_k) - \exp_{x_k}^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}})\| \\ &\leq r + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \leq \frac{3r}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

For the last inequality we used  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \geq 8$ .

Since  $g_{\text{norm}}(\cdot)$  is increasing on  $[0, \infty)$ ,

$$w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}) \leq w^{-1} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g_{\text{norm}}(t) = \frac{w^{-1}}{9e^{1/3}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \leq \frac{1}{9e^{1/3}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \leq \frac{r}{9e^{1/3}} \leq \frac{r}{2}.$$

So each  $B_{j,k}$  is contained in the ball

$$B_{x_k} \left( \exp_{x_k}^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}), \frac{3r}{2} + w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}) \right) \subseteq B_{x_k}(\exp_{x_k}^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}), 2r).$$

Defining,  $B_k = B_{x_k}(\exp_{x_k}^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}), 2r)$ , we have

$$\frac{\text{Vol}(B_{j,k})}{\text{Vol}(B_k)} = \frac{w^{-d}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)})^d}{(2r)^d}.$$

Now assume  $k = 0$  or  $\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) > 4$ , where  $x_\ell$  is defined in equation (8). Using  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \geq 8$  and the definition of  $R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}$  (11), this assumption implies  $R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)} \geq 1/\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}$ . Therefore,

$$g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}) \geq g_{\text{norm}}(1/\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}) \geq \frac{8/\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}{e^{1/3}(1485 + 72)} \geq \frac{1}{300\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}.$$

We conclude

$$\frac{\text{Vol}(B_{j,k})}{\text{Vol}(B_k)} = \frac{w^{-d}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)})^d}{(2r)^d} \geq \frac{w^{-d}}{(300\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^d \cdot (2r)^d} = \frac{1}{(600wr\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^d}. \quad (14)$$

### 3.3.2 Case 2: $x_k$ is close to a previous query point

All the functions  $f_{j,k}, j \in \tilde{A}_k$ , have the same gradient at  $x_\ell$ , namely  $g_\ell$ . Therefore, since  $\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)$  is small, gradient-Lipschitzness of the functions  $f_{j,k}$  (see Definition 2.7) implies that the gradients  $\{\text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k)\}_{j \in \tilde{A}_k}$  are all clustered around  $P_{x_\ell \rightarrow x_k}g_\ell$  (the parallel transport of  $g_\ell$  to  $T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$ ). This intuition guides the details below.

Assume  $\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) \leq 4$ , where  $x_\ell$  is defined in equation (8). Since  $r \geq 8/\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}$ ,  $R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{4}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)$ . By assumption,  $\text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}}) \leq \mathcal{R}$ . Since  $\text{dist}(z_j, x_{\text{ref}}) \leq r$  and  $\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) \leq 4/\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \leq r/2$ , the triangle inequality implies  $\text{dist}(x_k, z_j)$  and  $\text{dist}(x_\ell, z_j)$  are both at most  $\mathcal{R} + r + r/2 \leq 3\mathcal{R}$ .

The inductive hypothesis **IH5** implies

$$f_{j,k}(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, z_j)^2 + H_{j,k}(x), \quad \text{with} \quad \|\text{Hess}H_{j,k}(x)\| \leq \frac{k}{4w} \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (15)$$

using  $k \leq 2w$ . So by Lemma 2.9,

$$\|\text{Hess}f_{j,k}(x)\| \leq \max\{\text{dist}(x_k, z_j), \text{dist}(x_\ell, z_j)\}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + \frac{3}{2} \leq 3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + \frac{3}{2} \quad (16)$$

for all  $x \in B(z_j, \max\{\text{dist}(x_k, z_j), \text{dist}(x_\ell, z_j)\})$ . Additionally, the inductive hypothesis **IH3** implies  $\text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_\ell) = g_\ell$  for all  $j \in \tilde{A}_k$ . Therefore, by Definition 2.7 and Lemma 2.8:

$$\|\text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k) - P_{x_\ell \rightarrow x_k}g_\ell\| \leq \left(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + \frac{3}{2}\right)\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) \quad \text{for all } j \in \tilde{A}_k.$$

We have shown that all the gradients  $\text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k), j \in \tilde{A}_k$ , are contained in a ball in  $\mathbb{T}_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$  centered at  $P_{x_\ell \rightarrow x_k}g_\ell$  with radius  $(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + \frac{3}{2})\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)$ .

Recall the definition of the balls  $B_{j,k}$  defined in equation (12). We conclude all the balls  $B_{j,k}, j \in \tilde{A}_k$ , are contained in a ball  $B_k \subseteq \mathbb{T}_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$  centered at  $P_{x_\ell \rightarrow x_k}g_\ell$  with radius

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + \frac{3}{2}\right)\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) + w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}\left(\frac{1}{4}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)\right) \\ & \leq (3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2)\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell), \end{aligned}$$

using that  $w \geq 1$  and

$$g_{\text{norm}}\left(\frac{1}{4}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)\right) \leq \frac{8\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)/4}{e^{1/3}(1485)} \leq \frac{\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)}{1000}. \quad (17)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{Vol}(B_{j,k})}{\text{Vol}(B_k)} &= \frac{w^{-d}g_{\text{norm}}(\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)/4)^d}{((3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2)\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell))^d} \geq \frac{w^{-d}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)^d}{(2000(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2)\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell))^d} \\ &= \frac{1}{(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))^d}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

using

$$g_{\text{norm}}\left(\frac{1}{4}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)\right) \geq \frac{2\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)}{e^{1/3}(1485 + 72)} \geq \frac{\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)}{2000} \quad (19)$$

which follows from the assumption  $\frac{1}{4}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) \leq 1/\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}$ .

### 3.4 Algorithms using function-value information

In Sections 3.2 and 3.3, we proved Theorem 3.5, which provides a lower bound for algorithms which use gradient information but do not use function-value information. In this section, we sketch the main ideas to prove Theorem 3.4, i.e., to prove a lower bound for algorithms which use both function-value and gradient information. Details are provided in Appendix D.

In the case where the oracle only returns a gradient, Lemma 3.8 gives us a family of bump functions indexed by vectors  $g$  such that for each  $g$  in a ball of  $\mathbb{T}_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$  there is a bump function  $h_g: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $\text{grad}h_g(x_k) = g$  (and a number of other properties). This allowed us to use Lemma 3.9 to choose the vector  $g_k$ . In the case where the oracle also returns function values, we need a lemma which gives us a family of bump functions indexed by pairs  $(f, g)$  lying in a *cylinder*  $I \times B$ , where  $I$  is a closed interval of the real line and  $B$  is a closed ball in  $\mathbb{T}_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$ . For each pair  $(f, g)$ , the lemma should provide a bump function  $h_{f,g}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $h_{f,g}(x_k) = f$  and  $\text{grad}h_{f,g}(x_k) = g$ . Lemma D.2 in Appendix D does exactly this.

Lemma D.2 works by constructing a bump function  $h_{f,g}$  as a sum of two bump functions  $\hat{h}_f$  and  $h_g$  (the latter from Lemma 3.8), the first controlling the function value of  $h_{f,g}$ , the second controlling its gradient. We can then use Lemma D.3, which is analogous to Lemma 3.9, to choose a pair  $(f_k, g_k)$  to return to the algorithm. Since we are now comparing the volumes of sets of the form  $I \times B$  which live in a space of dimension larger than  $d$ , we end up showing that  $|A_{k+1}| \geq \Omega(|A_k| / (\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^{d+2})$  instead of  $|A_{k+1}| \geq \Omega(|A_k| / (\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^d)$ . However, this is not an issue, because  $d+2 = \Theta(d)$ . See Appendix D for additional details.

**Remark 3.10.** *Would allowing algorithms to query Hessian-vector products change the picture? We expect not because, with exact arithmetic, a finite difference of two gradient vectors is enough to approximate a Hessian-vector product to arbitrary precision (Boumal, 2020, Ch. 10).*

## 4 Unbounded queries—proof of Theorem 3.3

Our goal is to extend the lower bound from Theorem 3.4, which holds for algorithms querying only in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ , to algorithms which can query anywhere. This will prove Theorem 3.3. The high-level idea is to modify all hard instances  $f$  from Theorem 3.4 so that  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})^2$  for  $x \notin B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$  (recall  $\mathcal{R} \geq r$ ). This way, the algorithm gains no information by querying outside the ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . On the other hand, we still want the hard functions  $f$  to remain untouched in the ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ . In the annulus between radii  $r$  and  $\mathcal{R}$ , we smoothly interpolate between these two choices of functions. We show that we can choose  $\mathcal{R}$  appropriately so that the lower bound  $\tilde{\Omega}(r)$  still holds and the modified functions are still strongly  $g$ -convex. This argument was inspired by (Carmon et al., 2019, Sec. 5.2).

Define  $\mathcal{D}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\mathcal{D}(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})^2$ . Given any  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (think from Theorem 3.4), define the function  $f_{r,\mathcal{R}}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x) = s_{r,\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x))f(x) + \left[1 - s_{r,\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x))\right]\mathcal{D}(x) \quad (20)$$

where  $s_{r,\mathcal{R}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $C^\infty$  function which is 1 on  $(-\infty, \frac{1}{2}r^2]$  and 0 on  $[\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2, \infty)$ . See Appendix B for the definition of  $s_{r,\mathcal{R}}$ . In Appendix B, we show that if we set  $\mathcal{R} = 2^9 r \log(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2$  and if  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  is from Theorem 3.4, then  $f_{r,\mathcal{R}} \in \mathcal{F}_{3\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$ .

Recall Definition 3.1 for the oracle of a function. Given the oracle  $\mathcal{O}_f$  of any function  $f$ , we can use  $\mathcal{O}_f$  to emulate the oracle  $\mathcal{O}_{f_{r,\mathcal{R}}}$  using equation (20), and the following formula for  $\text{grad}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}$ :

$$\text{grad}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x) = \begin{cases} -\exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) & \text{if } d(x, x_{\text{ref}}) > \mathcal{R}; \\ \text{grad}f(x) & \text{if } d(x, x_{\text{ref}}) \leq r; \\ -s'_{r,\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x))(f(x) - \mathcal{D}(x))\exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) \\ \quad - (1 - s_{r,\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)))\exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) \\ \quad + s_{r,\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x))\text{grad}f(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

See Appendix B.1 for the derivation of this formula for  $\text{grad}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}$ .

To prove a lower bound for an algorithm  $\mathcal{B}$  querying anywhere, we make  $\mathcal{B}$  interact with the oracle  $\mathcal{O}_{f_{r,\mathcal{R}}}$  (which we simulate using  $\mathcal{O}_f$ ). This implicitly defines an algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  which interacts with  $\mathcal{O}_f$ —see Figure 2. Explicitly, the algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  internally runs the algorithm  $\mathcal{B}$  as a subroutine as follows:

- if  $\mathcal{B}$  outputs  $y_k \notin B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  does not query the oracle  $\mathcal{O}_f$ , but simply passes

$$(f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(y_k), \text{grad}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(y_k)) = \left( \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(y_k, x_{\text{ref}})^2, -\exp_{y_k}^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) \right)$$

to  $\mathcal{B}$ ; this corresponds to path 1'-2'-3' in Figure 2;

- if  $\mathcal{B}$  outputs  $y_k \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  queries  $\mathcal{O}_f$  at  $x_i = y_k$ , receives  $(f(x_i), \text{grad}f(x_i))$  from  $\mathcal{O}_f$ , and passes  $(f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x_i), \text{grad}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x_i))$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  (which it computes using  $(f(x_i), \text{grad}f(x_i))$ ); this corresponds to path 1-2-3-4-5 in Figure 2.

Inside of  $\mathcal{A}$ , the algorithm  $\mathcal{B}$  outputs the sequence  $y_0, y_1, y_2, \dots$ . The algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  produces the sequence of queries  $x_0 = y_{k_0}, x_1 = y_{k_1}, \dots \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$  where  $0 \leq k_0 < k_1 < k_2 < \dots$  are integers. Let  $\mathcal{K}_T = \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{T-1}\}$ .




Figure 2: A diagram of the reduction used in Section 4. The algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  first internally runs  $\mathcal{B}$  to get an iterate  $y_k$ . Then, depending on the distance between  $y_k$  and  $x_{\text{ref}}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  either queries the oracle  $\mathcal{O}_f$  (path 1-2-3-4-5) or does not query the oracle (path 1'-2'-3'). The box  $\mathcal{C}_{r,\mathcal{R}}$  represents a map which when given a pair  $(f(x), \text{grad}f(x))$ , outputs  $(f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x), \text{grad}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x))$ . At step 2',  $\mathcal{A}$  computes  $(\frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(y_k, x_{\text{ref}})^2, -\exp_{y_k}^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}))$  (not shown for clarity) which it then returns to  $\mathcal{B}$ .

By design, algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  makes queries only in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . Therefore, we can apply Theorem 3.4 to  $\mathcal{A}$ . That theorem implies there is a function  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  with

minimizer  $x^*$  for which running  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $f$  yields  $x_0 = y_{k_0}, x_1 = y_{k_1}, \dots, x_{T-1} = y_{k_{T-1}} \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$  satisfying  $\text{dist}(x^*, x_k) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$ . Here,  $\kappa = 4r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 3$  as in (1), and  $T$  is given by Theorem 3.4 with  $\mathcal{R} = 2^9 r \log(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2$ , that is,

$$T = \left\lfloor \frac{\tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r}{\log(2000\tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))} \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor \frac{\tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r}{\log(2 \cdot 10^6 \cdot \tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2)} \right\rfloor,$$

using that  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \geq 8$ . In other words,

$$\text{dist}(x^*, y_k) \geq \frac{r}{4} \text{ for all } k \in \mathcal{K}_T.$$

On the other hand, we know that

$$\text{dist}(x_{\text{ref}}, y_k) \geq \mathcal{R} \text{ for all } k \in \{0, 1, \dots, T-1\} \setminus \mathcal{K}_T.$$

Therefore, using that  $\mathcal{R} \geq r$  and  $x^* \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$ ,

$$\text{dist}(x^*, y_k) \geq \frac{r}{4} \text{ for all } k \in \{0, 1, \dots, T-1\} \setminus \mathcal{K}_T.$$

We conclude  $\text{dist}(x^*, y_k) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$ . Finally, observe that (by our construction of  $\mathcal{A}$ ) if we run  $\mathcal{B}$  on the function  $f_{r, \mathcal{R}}$  then we get exactly the sequence  $y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{T-1}$ . Since  $f_{r, \mathcal{R}} \in \mathcal{F}_{3\kappa, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  if  $\mathcal{R} = 2^9 r \log(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2$ , as stated above, this proves Theorem 3.3.

## 5 The nonstrongly g-convex case

In this section we prove Theorem 1.5, which provides lower bounds for optimizing functions which are nonstrongly g-convex and  $L$ -smooth on all of  $\mathcal{M}$ . We further assume the functions admit a unique minimizer  $x^* \in \mathcal{M}$ . Specifically, recall the function class  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{L, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  from Definition 1.2 and the computational task described after that definition. Given  $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{L, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$ , we ask: for  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , how many queries are required for an algorithm to find a point  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $f(x) - f(x^*) \leq \epsilon \cdot \frac{1}{2} L r^2$ ?

When  $\mathcal{M}$  is a Euclidean space, GD uses at most  $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$  queries to solve this problem, whereas NAG uses only  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}})$ , and this is optimal. Addressing the dependency in  $\epsilon$ , in Section 5.1 we prove the lower bound  $\tilde{\Omega}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$  for the nonstrongly g-convex problem. In Section 5.2, we first review known upper bounds for the nonstrongly g-convex problem. Then we show that a version of RGD solves this problem in  $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$  queries, meaning RGD is optimal (up to logs) in the setting we consider.

### 5.1 Proof of Theorem 1.5

Recall the function classes  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{L, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  defined in Section 1.2. We define an additional function class  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{L, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}$  as follows.



**Definition 5.1.** For every  $L > 0, r > 0$  and  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ , define  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  to be the set of all  $C^\infty$  functions  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which

- are strictly  $g$ -convex in all of  $\mathcal{M}$ ;
- are  $L$ -smooth in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ ; and
- have a unique global minimizer  $x^*$  which lies in the ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$ .

We use this function class as an intermediary between the function class  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}$ , for which we have lower bounds, and the function class  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}$  for which we want to derive lower bounds. Let us use Theorem 3.3 to prove lower bounds for the intermediary function class  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold of dimension  $d \geq 2$  which satisfies the ball-packing property A1 with constants  $\tilde{r}, \tilde{c}$  and point  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Also assume  $\mathcal{M}$  has sectional curvatures in the interval  $[K_{\text{lo}}, 0]$  with  $K_{\text{lo}} < 0$ . Let  $L > 0$  and let  $\hat{\epsilon} \in \left(0, \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2^{10}\tilde{r}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, 2^{-13}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{2^{12}(d+2)\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \right\}\right)$ . Define

$$\mu = 64\hat{\epsilon}L, \quad r = \frac{L/\mu}{16\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} = \frac{1}{\hat{\epsilon}} \cdot \frac{1}{2^{10}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be any deterministic algorithm.

There is a function  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}$  with minimizer  $x^*$  such that running  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $f$  yields iterates  $x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots$  satisfying  $f(x_k) - f(x^*) \geq 2\hat{\epsilon}Lr^2$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$ , where

$$T = \left\lfloor \frac{\tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r}{\log(2000\tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}+2))} \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor \frac{\tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r}{\log(2 \cdot 10^6 \cdot \tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2)} \right\rfloor$$

with  $\mathcal{R} = 2^9 r \log(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2$ .

Moreover,  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mu[12\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}+9]$ -smooth in the ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . Outside of the ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ ,  $f(x) = 3\mu \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})^2$  for all  $x \notin B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ .

Notice that  $T = \tilde{\Theta}(r) = \Theta(\frac{1}{\hat{\epsilon}})$ .

*Proof.* Due to the definition of  $r$  and the assumed upper bound on  $\hat{\epsilon}$ , we can apply Theorem 3.3 to  $\mathcal{A}$ . After scaling by  $6\mu$ ,<sup>16</sup> that theorem provides a function  $f$  which is  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in all  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mu[12r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}+9]$ -smooth in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$  with minimizer  $x^* \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$  such that

$$\text{dist}(x_k, x^*) \geq \frac{r}{4} \quad \forall k \leq T-1,$$

<sup>16</sup>Scaling by  $6\mu$  is legitimate by a simple reduction argument: given an algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$ , we can create an algorithm  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  which internally runs  $\mathcal{A}$  to query an oracle  $\mathcal{O}_f$  and multiplies the outputs of  $\mathcal{O}_f$  by  $6\mu$  before forwarding them to  $\mathcal{A}$ . We call upon Theorem 3.3 to claim there exists a hard function  $\hat{f}$  for  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is effectively interacting with  $\mathcal{O}_{6\mu\hat{f}}$ , we find  $f = 6\mu\hat{f}$  is a hard function for  $\mathcal{A}$ .

where  $x_0, x_1, \dots$  denote the queries produced by running  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $f$ . Observe that  $L \geq \mu[12r\sqrt{-K_{10}} + 9]$  by the definition of  $\mu$  and  $r$ . Thus,  $f$  is in  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}$ .

Also, using  $\text{dist}(x_k, x^*) \geq \frac{r}{4}$ ,

$$2\hat{\epsilon} \cdot Lr^2 = \frac{1}{32}\mu r^2 \leq \frac{\mu}{2}\text{dist}(x_k, x^*)^2 \leq f(x_k) - f(x^*), \quad \forall k \leq T - 1.$$

For the last inequality we used the  $\mu$ -strong g-convexity of  $f$ .  $\square$

Using a reduction, we next prove lower bounds for the function class  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}$ . The idea is that given a hard function  $f$  from Lemma 5.2, we modify  $f$  so that it remains the same inside  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ , and outside  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$  it is not strongly g-convex but is strictly g-convex and also  $L$ -smooth. We know that  $f(x)$  is proportional to  $\text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})^2$  outside  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . We modify  $f$  so that it behaves similarly to  $\text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})$  instead outside  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . This works because the function  $x \mapsto \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})$  is g-convex and (outside a sufficiently large ball surrounding  $x_{\text{ref}}$ ) that same function is  $2\sqrt{-K_{10}}$ -smooth (Lee, 2018, Thm. 11.7).

Define  $\mathcal{D}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\mathcal{D}(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})^2$ . Given any  $C^\infty$  function  $f$ , define the  $C^\infty$  function  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x) = u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x))f(x), \quad (21)$$

where  $u_{\mathcal{R}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $C^\infty$  function which is 1 on  $(-\infty, \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2]$  and scales as  $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2 \cdot t^{-1}}$  for  $t > \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2$  sufficiently large. See Appendix C for the definition of  $u_{\mathcal{R}}$ . Suppose  $f$  is a hard function from Lemma 5.2. Since  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}} = f$  in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ , we know  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is  $\mu$ -strongly g-convex and  $\mu[12\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}} + 9]$ -smooth in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . Lemma 5.2 also guarantees  $f(x) = 3\mu\text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})^2$  for all  $x \notin B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . In Appendix C.1, we use this fact to show that  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is  $\mu[24\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}}]$ -smooth and strictly g-convex outside of  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . Using the definitions of  $\mu, r, \mathcal{R}$  in Lemma 5.2 as well as the bound  $\hat{\epsilon} \leq 2^{-13}$ , we conclude  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tilde{L},r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}$  where  $\tilde{L} = L \cdot 2^{10} \log(\hat{\epsilon}^{-1})^2$ .

Given the oracle  $\mathcal{O}_f$  of any function  $f$ , we can use  $\mathcal{O}_f$  to emulate the oracle  $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}}$  using equation (21) and the following formula for  $\text{grad}\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}$ :

$$\text{grad}\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x) = \begin{cases} \text{grad}f(x) & \text{if } \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}}) \leq \mathcal{R}; \\ u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x))\text{grad}f(x) & \\ -f(x)u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x))\exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

To prove a lower bound for an algorithm  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  designed to minimize nonstrongly g-convex functions, we make  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  interact with the oracle  $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}}$  (which we simulate using  $\mathcal{O}_f$ ). This implicitly defines an algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  which interacts with  $\mathcal{O}_f$ —see Figure 3. Explicitly, the algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  internally runs  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  as a subroutine as follows. If  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  outputs  $x_k$ , then  $\mathcal{A}$  queries  $\mathcal{O}_f$  at  $x_k$ , receives  $(f(x_k), \text{grad}f(x_k))$  from  $\mathcal{O}_f$ , and then passes  $(\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x_k), \text{grad}\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x_k))$  to  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ , which it computes using  $(f(x_k), \text{grad}f(x_k))$  and equations (21) and (22).




Figure 3: A diagram of the reduction used in Section 5. The box  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{R}}$  represents a map which when given a pair  $(f(x), \text{grad}f(x))$ , outputs  $(\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x), \text{grad}\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x))$  using equations (21) and (22).

Applying Lemma 5.2 to the algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$ , we know there is a function  $f \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  with minimizer  $x^*$  so that  $f(x_k) - f(x^*) \geq 2\hat{\epsilon}Lr^2$  for all  $k \leq T - 1$ . Since  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}} = f$  in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$  and  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is strictly g-convex on  $\mathcal{M}$ , we know the minimizer of  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is also  $x^*$  and that  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x_k) - \tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x^*) = f(x_k) - f(x^*)$  if  $x_k \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . In Appendix C.3, we show that  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x_k) - \tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x^*) \geq 2\hat{\epsilon}Lr^2$  if  $x_k \notin B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . Lastly, observe that (by design) if we run  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  on the function  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}$  then we get exactly the sequence  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{T-1}$ . We have proved the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold of dimension  $d \geq 2$  which satisfies the ball-packing property A1 with constants  $\tilde{r}, \tilde{c}$  and point  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Also assume  $\mathcal{M}$  has sectional curvatures in the interval  $[K_{\text{lo}}, 0]$  with  $K_{\text{lo}} < 0$ . Let  $\tilde{L} > 0$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, 2^{-16})$  such that  $2^9 \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2^{10} \tilde{r} \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, 2^{-13}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{2^{12} (d+2) \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \right\}$ . Define*

$$\hat{\epsilon} = 2^9 \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2, \quad L = \frac{\tilde{L}}{2^{10} \log(\hat{\epsilon}^{-1})^2}.$$

Define  $r = \frac{1}{\hat{\epsilon}} \cdot \frac{1}{2^{10} \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}$  as in Lemma 5.2. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be any deterministic algorithm.

There is a function  $\tilde{f} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}$  with minimizer  $x^*$  such that running  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $\tilde{f}$  yields iterates  $x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots$  satisfying

$$\tilde{f}(x_k) - \tilde{f}(x^*) \geq 2\hat{\epsilon}Lr^2 \geq \epsilon\tilde{L}r^2$$

for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$ , where  $T = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\hat{\epsilon}} \cdot \frac{1}{\log(\hat{\epsilon}^{-1})}\right) = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\hat{\epsilon}} \cdot \frac{1}{\log(\epsilon^{-1})^3}\right)$  is as in Lemma 5.2.

Theorem 1.5 now follows directly from Theorem 5.3 by using Lemma 2.12 for the values of  $\tilde{r}$  and  $\tilde{c}$  in the ball-packing property (see Appendix J.3 for the details).

## 5.2 Comparison to RGD

Let us compare the lower bound  $\tilde{\Omega}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ , proved in the previous section, with known upper bounds for RGD. For g-convex optimization on a Hadamard manifold with sectional curvatures in the interval  $[K_{\text{lo}}, 0]$ , [Zhang and Sra \(2016\)](#) show that (projected) RGD uses at most  $O(\frac{r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}{\epsilon})$  queries to solve the nonstrongly g-convex computational task. There remains a gap (due to the factor  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}$ ) between the upper bound  $O(\frac{r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}{\epsilon})$  for RGD due to [Zhang and Sra \(2016\)](#) and our lower bound  $\tilde{\Omega}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ . We can resolve this issue by tightening the upper bound for RGD (or more precisely a regularized version of RGD). We use a simple reduction from the strongly g-convex rate for RGD stated in [Proposition 1.7](#) (which is essentially due to [Zhang and Sra \(2016\)](#)). Also see ([Martínez-Rubio, 2021](#), Sec. 3) for alternative reductions of this flavor.

**Proposition 5.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a hyperbolic space of curvature  $K < 0$ , and let  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $L > 0, r > 0$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Let  $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  have minimizer  $x^*$ . Define the regularized function  $\tilde{f}(x) = f(x) + \frac{\sigma}{2} \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})^2$  where  $\sigma = \frac{\epsilon L}{2}$ . Define  $\zeta_{2r,K} = \frac{2r\sqrt{-K}}{\tanh(2r\sqrt{-K})}$ .*

*Then projected RGD*

$$x_{k+1} = \text{Proj}_D \left( \exp_{x_k} \left( - \frac{1}{L + \sigma \zeta_{2r,K}} \text{grad} \tilde{f}(x_k) \right) \right), \quad x_0 = x_{\text{ref}}, \quad D = B(x_{\text{ref}}, 2r)$$

*finds a point  $x$  with  $f(x) - f(x^*) \leq \epsilon \cdot \frac{1}{2} L r^2$  in at most  $O((\frac{1}{\epsilon} + r\sqrt{-K}) \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon} + r\sqrt{-K}))$  queries.*

*In particular, if  $\epsilon \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{r\sqrt{-K}})$ , then the number of queries is  $\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ . This gives a curvature independent rate for the setting of [Theorem 1.5](#).*

The proof of this proposition is in [Appendix I.3](#). [Proposition 5.4](#) shows that a regularized version of RGD is optimal (up to log factors) for the nonstrongly g-convex problem we consider.

## 6 Reduction to Euclidean convexity when $r \leq O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}})$

In this section we show that if the optimization is carried out in a small enough region, that is, if  $r$  is small, then geodesically convex optimization essentially reduces to Euclidean convex optimization; hence, *local* acceleration is possible. To state the following proposition, we need certain properties of the Riemannian curvature tensor  $R$  and its covariant derivative  $\nabla R$  which are worked out in ([Crisitiello and Boumal, 2020](#), Sec. 2). In particular, the assumption  $\|\nabla R\| \leq F$  is satisfied with  $F = 0$  for all locally symmetric spaces, which includes all hyperbolic spaces,  $\mathcal{P}_n$  and  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$ .

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a complete Riemannian manifold which has sectional curvatures in the interval  $[-K, K]$  with  $K \geq 0$  and also satisfies  $\|\nabla R(x)\| \leq F$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .*

Let  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a twice continuously differentiable function which has a minimizer  $x^*$ . Assume  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex and  $L$ -smooth in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ ,  $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$ , and  $x^*$  is contained in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ , where  $r \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \cdot \min\{\frac{1}{4\sqrt{K}}, \frac{K}{4F}\})$ . Define the pullback  $\hat{f} = f \circ \exp_{x_{\text{ref}}}$ . Then,  $\hat{f}$  is  $\frac{\mu}{2}$ -strongly convex and  $\frac{3}{2}L$ -smooth in the Euclidean sense in  $B_{x_{\text{ref}}}(0, r) \subseteq \mathbb{T}_{x_{\text{ref}}}\mathcal{M}$ .

*Proof.* Following (Criscitiello and Boumal, 2020, Sec. 2), if  $\|s\| \leq \min\{\frac{1}{4\sqrt{K}}, \frac{K}{4F}\}$  then

$$\left\| \nabla^2 \hat{f}(s) - P_{x_{\text{ref}}, s}^* \text{Hess}f(y) P_{x_{\text{ref}}, s} \right\| \leq \frac{7}{9}LK \|s\|^2 + \frac{3}{2}K \|s\| \|\text{grad}f(y)\|$$

where  $y = \exp_{x_{\text{ref}}}(s)$  and  $P_{x, s}$  denotes parallel transport along the curve  $c(t) = \exp_x(ts)$  from  $t = 0$  to  $t = 1$ . Using  $L$ -smoothness of  $f$  and  $x^* \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ ,

$$\|\text{grad}f(y)\| = \|\text{grad}f(y) - P_{x^* \rightarrow y} \text{grad}f(x^*)\| \leq L \text{dist}(y, x^*) \leq 2Lr.$$

Therefore, we determine that if  $\|s\| \leq r$  then

$$\left\| \nabla^2 \hat{f}(s) - P_{x_{\text{ref}}, s}^* \text{Hess}f(y) P_{x_{\text{ref}}, s} \right\| \leq 4LKr^2 \leq \frac{\mu}{2}$$

by our choice of  $r$ .

By  $\mu$ -strong  $g$ -convexity and  $L$ -smoothness of  $f$ , we know all eigenvalues of the symmetric operator  $P_{x_{\text{ref}}, s}^* \text{Hess}f(y) P_{x_{\text{ref}}, s}$  are in  $[\mu, L]$ . Hence, all eigenvalues of  $\nabla^2 \hat{f}(s)$  are in the interval  $[\frac{\mu}{2}, L + \frac{\mu}{2}]$  for all  $\|s\| \leq r$ .  $\square$

## Simple upper bound $O(\sqrt{\kappa})$ when $r$ is small

Using Proposition 6.1, we can easily construct an algorithm which achieves acceleration when initialized sufficiently close to  $x^*$ . To do so we rely on the fact that it is possible to accelerate gradient descent in Euclidean spaces even when smoothness and strong convexity hold only in some convex set containing the minimizer, as stated in the following theorem due to Nesterov (2013).

**Theorem 6.2.** (Nesterov, 2013) *Let  $D$  be a convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and let  $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a differentiable function which has a minimizer  $x^*$ . Assume  $f$  is  $L$ -smooth and  $\mu$ -strongly convex in  $D$  and  $x^*$  is contained in  $D$ . Let  $x_0 \in D$  and  $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$ . There is an algorithm producing iterates  $x_k \in D$  such that  $f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq c_1 \kappa (1 - c_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}})^k (f(x_0) - f(x^*))$  for all  $k \geq 0$ . Here,  $c_1 > 0, c_2 \in (0, 1)$  are absolute constants. The algorithm makes one gradient query per iterate. Given access to projection onto  $D$ , each step of this algorithm can be computed efficiently.*

This theorem is a consequence of (Nesterov, 2013, Thm. 6) and (Nesterov, 2013, Sec. 5.1). Although not explicitly stated in (Nesterov, 2013), we note that the convergence proof of this algorithm only uses  $L$ -smoothness and  $\mu$ -strong convexity of  $f$  in  $D$ . In short, this is because all the iterates produced by the algorithm (including the auxiliary

iterates called  $y_k$  and  $v_k$ ) remain in  $D$  (note that the same cannot be said of the algorithm in (Nesterov, 2004, Sec. 2.2.4)).

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a complete Riemannian manifold with constants  $K$  and  $F$  as in Proposition 6.1. Consider a function  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with a minimizer  $x^*$ . Assume  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex and  $L$ -smooth in some  $g$ -convex set  $D$  containing the ball  $B(x^*, r)$  where  $r = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \cdot \min\{\frac{1}{4\sqrt{K}}, \frac{K}{4F}\}$ . Suppose  $x_0 \in B(x^*, r)$  and  $B(x_0, r) \subseteq D$ . Then consider the algorithm which simply runs on  $\hat{f} = f \circ \exp_{x_0}$  the algorithm from Theorem 6.2 in the ball  $B_{x_0}(0, r) \subseteq T_{x_0}\mathcal{M}$ . Since  $\hat{f}$  has condition number at most  $3\kappa$  in this ball by Proposition 6.1 with  $x_{\text{ref}} = x_0$ , this algorithm decreases the suboptimality gap of  $\hat{f}$  (and thus also of  $f$ ) at an accelerated rate.

This gives a simple proof that when  $\text{dist}(x_0, x^*) \leq O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}})$ , there is an accelerated algorithm. We can combine<sup>17</sup> this algorithm with RGD to get a globally convergent algorithm which performs at least as well as RGD and which is eventually accelerated, like the algorithm of Ahn and Sra (2020). Precisely, consider running  $T = \tilde{\Theta}(\kappa)$  steps of the algorithm we just described (with  $r = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \cdot \min\{\frac{1}{4\sqrt{K}}, \frac{K}{4F}\}$ ) in parallel with  $T$  steps of projected RGD, both initialized at the same point  $x_0$ . After these  $T$  steps, we set  $x_1 \in \mathcal{M}$  to be the last iterate produced by one of the algorithms based on function value and we repeat starting from  $x_1$ , etc. By design, this algorithm performs at least as well as RGD in terms of function value. By our choice of  $T = \tilde{\Theta}(\kappa)$ , once an iterate  $x_k$  of the algorithm enters  $B(x^*, r)$ , then the distance to the minimizer of the subsequent outer iterates  $x_{k+1}, x_{k+2}, \dots$  is decreasing. So once this method is restarted in  $B(x^*, r)$ , it stays in this ball, and the NAG sequence in a tangent space provides cost function value decrease at an accelerated rate. Therefore this algorithm is eventually accelerated. We note that the algorithms of Zhang and Sra (2018) and Ahn and Sra (2020) do not require a bound on  $\|\nabla R\|$  while the algorithm we presented does.

**Remark 6.3.** *Our main results show the query complexity lower bound  $\tilde{\Omega}(\kappa)$  for the function class  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  when  $r$  is large, but say nothing about the case when  $r$  is small. When  $r$  is small, the discussion above highlights that it is possible to achieve a rate of  $O(\sqrt{\kappa})$ . Proposition 6.1 also suggests that the  $\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa})$  lower bound from Euclidean spaces also holds for Riemannian manifolds, provided  $r$  is sufficiently small. Since manifolds are locally Euclidean, this is of course expected.*

*The central idea is that any algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  querying points  $x$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  can be converted into an algorithm  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  querying points in a fixed tangent space  $T_{x_{\text{ref}}}\mathcal{M}$  using the exponential map in the obvious way. The lower bound for Euclidean spaces provides a hard function  $\tilde{f}: T_{x_{\text{ref}}}\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ . In turn, the function  $f = \tilde{f} \circ \exp_{x_{\text{ref}}}^{-1}$  is a hard function for  $\mathcal{A}$ . Proposition 6.1 guarantees  $f$  is  $g$ -convex on  $\mathcal{M}$  in a small enough ball of radius  $r$ . There is a caveat: the minimizer of  $\tilde{f}$  may not be within a distance  $r$  of the origin of the tangent space. However, this can be fixed, at no expense, by scaling the linear term in the “worst function in the world” (Nesterov, 2004, p. 67) used for proving lower bounds in Euclidean spaces.*

---

<sup>17</sup>This was suggested by David Martínez-Rubio.

## 7 Perspectives

In concluding, we mention some open questions closely related to the present paper.

- Which Riemannian manifolds admit accelerated algorithms for g-convex optimization? Does every Riemannian manifold with nonnegative curvature admit acceleration? If we have an accelerated algorithm for the Riemannian manifolds  $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ , is there an accelerated algorithm for the Riemannian product  $\mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ ?
- For the Hadamard manifold  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$ , can we improve upon the lower bound  $\tilde{\Omega}(\frac{\kappa}{n})$ ? Why does optimization seem to be easier as  $n$  increases? Is this an artifact of the proof technique?
- Our results only hold for deterministic algorithms. The results of [Hamilton and Moitra \(2021\)](#) hold for randomized algorithms in a noisy setting. Can we prove that acceleration is impossible for randomized algorithms which receive exact information?
- Is acceleration possible for some g-convex problems which arise in applications?
- Consider the constant-curvature model spaces  $\mathcal{M}_K^d$ , and fix points  $x_{\text{ref}}^{(d)} \in \mathcal{M}_K^d$  for each  $d \geq 2$ . We know acceleration is possible on the function class  $\bigcup_{d=2}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_{\kappa, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}^{(d)}}(\mathcal{M}_K^d)$  provided  $r$  is sufficiently small. What is the largest  $r$  such that acceleration is possible on this function class? For any  $\kappa \geq 1$  and  $r > 0$ , what are *tight* lower bounds for  $\bigcup_{d=2}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_{\kappa, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}^{(d)}}(\mathcal{M}_K^d)$  depending on *both*  $\kappa$  and  $r$ ? Even proving the lower bound  $\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa})$  for this function class for *all*  $\kappa$  and *all*  $r$  is open.

## Acknowledgments

We thank David Martínez-Rubio for helpful discussions and feedback on a version of this paper.

## A Technical fact from proof of Theorem 3.5

We show that the inequality (5) implies  $|A_k| \geq 2$  for all  $k \leq T$ , where  $T$  is given by (4). We induct on  $k \geq 0$ . By the ball-packing property,  $|A_0| \geq e^{\tilde{c}r} \geq 2$  since  $r \geq \frac{4(d+2)}{\tilde{c}} \geq \frac{4}{\tilde{c}}$ . Assume  $k+1 \leq T$ , and  $|A_m| \geq 2$  for all  $m \leq k$ . Therefore,  $|A_m| - 1 \geq |A_m|/2$  for all  $m \leq k$ . The bounds  $r \geq \frac{4(d+2)}{\tilde{c}}$  and  $k+1 \leq T$  imply that  $k+1 \leq \lfloor 2w \rfloor$ . So Lemma 3.6 implies

$$|A_{m+1}| \geq \frac{|A_m|/2}{(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))^d} \quad \forall m \leq k.$$

Unrolling these inequalities and using  $|A_0| \geq e^{\tilde{c}r}$ , we get

$$|A_{k+1}| \geq \frac{e^{\tilde{c}r}/2^{k+1}}{(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))^{(k+1)d}}.$$

On the other hand,  $k+1 \leq T$  implies

$$\frac{e^{\tilde{c}r/2}}{(4000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))^{(k+1)d}} \geq 1.$$

Using that  $e^{\tilde{c}r/2} \leq e^{\tilde{c}r}/2$  and  $2^{k+1} \leq 2^{d(k+1)}$ , we see that  $|A_{k+1}| \geq 2$ .

## B Unbounded queries: technical details

Following Lee (2012, Lem. 2.20, 2.21), we define the  $C^\infty$  function  $t: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$t(\tau) = \begin{cases} 1 & \tau \in (-\infty, 0] \\ \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{1-\tau}}}{e^{-\frac{1}{1-\tau}} + e^{-\frac{1}{\tau}}} & \tau \in (0, 1) \\ 0 & \tau \in [1, \infty) \end{cases}$$

and define  $s_{r,\mathcal{R}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$s_{r,\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) = t\left(\frac{\mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{2}r^2}{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2 - \frac{1}{2}r^2}\right) \quad \forall \mathcal{D} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In the following Section B.1, we abbreviate  $s = s_{r,\mathcal{R}}$ .

### B.1 Verifying $f_{r,\mathcal{R}}$ is in the function class

To finish the proof of Theorem 3.3 (from Section 4), it remains to show that if  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  is a hard function from Theorem 3.4, then  $f_{r,\mathcal{R}} \in \mathcal{F}_{3\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  for a suitable choice of  $\mathcal{R}$ . To do this, we use that a hard function  $f$  from Theorem 3.4 is  $\frac{1}{2}$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $[2r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + \frac{3}{2}]$ -smooth in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ . We also use that  $f$  has the form

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, x^*)^2 + H(x), \quad \text{with } x^* \in B\left(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r\right),$$

and for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

- $\|\text{grad}H(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \leq \frac{r}{16}$  (since we assume  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \geq 8$ ); and
- $|H(x)| \leq \frac{r}{64\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \leq \frac{r^2}{512}$  (again since we assume  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \geq 8$ ).

Recall Definition 1.1 for the function classes  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{3\kappa,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$ . Since  $f(x) =$



$f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x)$  for all  $x \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ , it suffices to show that  $\text{Hess}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x) \succeq \frac{1}{6}I$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . We just need to check that this is true when  $r \leq \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}}) \leq \mathcal{R}$ . Let's compute  $\text{grad}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x)$  and  $\text{Hess}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x)$  when  $r \leq \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}}) \leq \mathcal{R}$ .

Let  $\gamma(t)$  be a geodesic with  $\gamma(0) = x, \gamma'(0) = v$  and  $\|v\| = 1$ . For the moment, define  $\mathcal{D}(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})^2$ , keeping in mind that  $\mathcal{D}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  depends on  $x_{\text{ref}}$ . Additionally, define

$$\tau(x) = \frac{\mathcal{D}(x) - \frac{1}{2}r^2}{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2 - \frac{1}{2}r^2}$$

so that

$$s(\mathcal{D}(x)) = t(\tau(x)), \quad s'(\mathcal{D}(x)) = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2 - \frac{1}{2}r^2}t'(\tau(x)), \quad s''(\mathcal{D}(x)) = \frac{1}{(\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2 - \frac{1}{2}r^2)^2}t''(\tau(x)).$$

For the gradient, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, \text{grad}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x) \rangle &= \frac{d}{dt} \left[ f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)))f(\gamma(t)) + [1 - s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)))]\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} (f(x) - \mathcal{D}(x)) + s(\mathcal{D}(x)) \frac{d}{dt} \left[ f(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} \\ &\quad + [1 - s(\mathcal{D}(x))] \frac{d}{dt} \left[ \mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} \\ &= s'(\mathcal{D}(x)) \langle v, -\exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) \rangle (f(x) - \mathcal{D}(x)) + s(\mathcal{D}(x)) \langle v, \text{grad}f(x) \rangle \\ &\quad + [1 - s(\mathcal{D}(x))] \langle v, -\exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For the Hessian, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, \text{Hess}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x)v \rangle &= \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)))f(\gamma(t)) + [1 - s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)))]\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} f(x) + 2 \frac{d}{dt} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \frac{d}{dt} \left[ f(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} \\ &\quad + s(\mathcal{D}(x)) \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ f(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} - \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \mathcal{D}(x) \\ &\quad - \frac{d}{dt} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \frac{d}{dt} \left[ \mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} + [1 - s(\mathcal{D}(x))] \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ \mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} \\ &= s(\mathcal{D}(x)) \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ f(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} + [1 - s(\mathcal{D}(x))] \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ \mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} \\ &\quad + \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} (f(x) - \mathcal{D}(x)) \\ &\quad + 2 \frac{d}{dt} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \left[ f(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} - \frac{d}{dt} \left[ \mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using that  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, x^*)^2 + H(x)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle v, \text{Hess}f_{r, \mathcal{R}}(x)v \rangle &= s(\mathcal{D}(x)) \langle v, \text{Hess}f(x)v \rangle + [1 - s(\mathcal{D}(x))] \langle v, \text{Hess}\mathcal{D}(x)v \rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \left( \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, x^*)^2 + H(x) - \mathcal{D}(x) \right) \\
&\quad - 2 \frac{d}{dt} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \left( \langle v, \exp_x^{-1}(x^*) - \exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) \rangle - \langle v, \text{grad}H(x) \rangle \right) \\
&= t(\tau(x)) \langle v, \text{Hess}f(x)v \rangle + [1 - t(\tau(x))] \langle v, \text{Hess}\mathcal{D}(x)v \rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \frac{1}{2} \left( \text{dist}(x, x^*) - \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}}) \right) \left( \text{dist}(x, x^*) + \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}}) \right) \\
&\quad - 2 \frac{d}{dt} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \langle v, \exp_x^{-1}(x^*) - \exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) \rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} H(x) + 2 \frac{d}{dt} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \langle v, \text{grad}H(x) \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Using  $r \leq \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}}) \leq \mathcal{R}$ , we have

$$|\langle v, \exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) \rangle| \leq \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}}) \leq \mathcal{R}.$$

Using Proposition 2.2,

$$|\langle v, \exp_x^{-1}(x^*) - \exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) \rangle| \leq \|\exp_x^{-1}(x^*) - \exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}})\| \leq \text{dist}(x^*, x_{\text{ref}}) \leq r.$$

Using the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \left( \text{dist}(x, x^*) - \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}}) \right) \left( \text{dist}(x, x^*) + \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}}) \right) \right| \\
&\leq \text{dist}(x^*, x_{\text{ref}}) \left( \text{dist}(x_{\text{ref}}, x^*) + 2\text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}}) \right) \leq r(r + 2\mathcal{R}) \leq 3r\mathcal{R}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle v, \text{Hess}f_{r, \mathcal{R}}(x)v \rangle &\geq t(\tau(x)) \langle v, \text{Hess}f(x)v \rangle + [1 - t(\tau(x))] \langle v, \text{Hess}\mathcal{D}(x)v \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{3}{2}r\mathcal{R} \left| \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \right| - 2r \left| \frac{d}{dt} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \right| \\
&\quad - \frac{r^2}{512} \left| \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \right| - \frac{r}{8} \left| \frac{d}{dt} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \right| \\
&\geq t(\tau(x)) \langle v, \text{Hess}f(x)v \rangle + [1 - t(\tau(x))] \langle v, \text{Hess}\mathcal{D}(x)v \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{8}{5}r\mathcal{R} \left| \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \right| - 3r \left| \frac{d}{dt} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Additionally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{d}{dt} \left[ s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))) \right]_{t=0} \right| &= \left| s'(\mathcal{D}(x)) \frac{d}{dt} \left[ \mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)) \right]_{t=0} \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2 - \frac{1}{2}r^2} |t'(\tau(x)) \langle v, -\exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) \rangle| \leq \frac{\mathcal{R}}{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2 - \frac{1}{2}r^2} |t'(\tau(x))|
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d^2}{dt^2} [s(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)))] \Big|_{t=0} \right| &= \left| s''(\mathcal{D}(x)) \left( \frac{d}{dt} [\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))] \Big|_{t=0} \right)^2 + s'(\mathcal{D}(x)) \frac{d^2}{dt^2} [\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))] \Big|_{t=0} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\mathcal{R}^2}{(\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2 - \frac{1}{2}r^2)^2} |t''(\tau(x))| + \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2 - \frac{1}{2}r^2} |t'(\tau(x))| \langle v, \text{Hess}\mathcal{D}(x)v \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we set  $\mathcal{R} = 2^9 r \log(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2$ . This choice of  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \geq 8$  implies

$$\mathcal{R} = 2^9 r \log(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2 \geq 2^9 \log(8)^2 r \geq 2^{11} r.$$

Since  $\mathcal{R} \geq 2^{11} r$ , we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, \text{Hess}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x)v \rangle &\geq t(\tau(x)) \langle v, \text{Hess}f(x)v \rangle \\ &\quad + \left[ 1 - t(\tau(x)) - \frac{2r\mathcal{R}}{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2 - \frac{1}{2}r^2} |t'(\tau(x))| \right] \langle v, \text{Hess}\mathcal{D}(x)v \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{\frac{8}{5}r\mathcal{R}^3}{(\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2 - \frac{1}{2}r^2)^2} |t''(\tau(x))| - \frac{3r\mathcal{R}}{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2 - \frac{1}{2}r^2} |t'(\tau(x))| \\ &\geq t(\tau(x)) \langle v, \text{Hess}f(x)v \rangle \\ &\quad + \left[ 1 - t(\tau(x)) - \frac{2r\mathcal{R}}{\frac{1}{2}(1 - 2^{-22})\mathcal{R}^2} |t'(\tau(x))| \right] \langle v, \text{Hess}\mathcal{D}(x)v \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{\frac{8}{5}r\mathcal{R}^3}{(\frac{1}{2}(1 - 2^{-22})\mathcal{R}^2)^2} |t''(\tau(x))| - \frac{3r\mathcal{R}}{\frac{1}{2}(1 - 2^{-22})\mathcal{R}^2} |t'(\tau(x))| \\ &= t(\tau(x)) \langle v, \text{Hess}f(x)v \rangle \\ &\quad + \left[ 1 - t(\tau(x)) - \frac{4.5r}{\mathcal{R}} |t'(\tau(x))| \right] \langle v, \text{Hess}\mathcal{D}(x)v \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{\frac{32}{5}r}{(1 - 2^{-22})^2 \mathcal{R}} |t''(\tau(x))| - \frac{7r}{\mathcal{R}} |t'(\tau(x))|. \end{aligned}$$

One can check that  $-2 \leq t'(\tau) \leq 0$  and  $|t(\tau)''(0)| \leq 16$  for all  $\tau \in (0, 1)$ . Therefore, since  $\mathcal{R} \geq 2^{11} r$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, \text{Hess}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x)v \rangle &\geq t(\tau(x)) \langle v, \text{Hess}f(x)v \rangle \\ &\quad + \left[ 1 - t(\tau(x)) - \frac{4.5r}{\mathcal{R}} |t'(\tau(x))| \right] \langle v, \text{Hess}\mathcal{D}(x)v \rangle - \frac{1}{16}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we make two observations about the univariate function  $t$ :

- if  $\tau \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , then  $1 - t(\tau) - \frac{4.5}{2^{11}} |t'(\tau)| \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{4.5}{2^{10}}$ ;
- if  $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $\mathcal{R} \geq 9 \cdot 4.5r$ , then  $1 - t(\tau) - \frac{4.5r}{\mathcal{R}} |t'(\tau)| \geq -2e^{-\sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{R}}{9r}}}$ . We prove this fact in the next Section [B.2](#).

Using these facts, if  $\tau(x) \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  then (using  $\langle v, \text{Hess}\mathcal{D}(x)v \rangle \geq 1$  and  $\mathcal{R} \geq 2^{11}r$ )

$$\langle v, \text{Hess}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x)v \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{4.5}{2^{10}} - \frac{1}{16} \geq \frac{1}{6}.$$

If  $\tau(x) \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ , then (using  $\langle v, \text{Hess}f(x)v \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\langle v, \text{Hess}\mathcal{D}(x)v \rangle \leq 1 + \mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}$ )

$$\langle v, \text{Hess}f_{r,\mathcal{R}}(x)v \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} - 2e^{-\sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{R}}{9r}}} \cdot 2\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} - \frac{1}{16} \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^6} - \frac{1}{16} \geq \frac{1}{6}.$$

where the last inequality follows from choosing  $\mathcal{R} = 2^9 r \log(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2$  and  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \geq 8$ :

$$\begin{aligned} 2e^{-\sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{R}}{9r}}} \cdot 2\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} &= 4e^{-\sqrt{\frac{2^9}{9} \log(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})}} \cdot 2^9 r \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \log(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2 \\ &= 2^{11} (r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^{-\sqrt{\frac{2^9}{9}} r \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \log(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2 \leq \frac{1}{2^6}. \end{aligned}$$

## B.2 Technical fact about the function $t: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the interval $(0, 1)$

**Lemma B.1.** *If  $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $c \geq 9$ , then  $1 - t(\tau) - \frac{1}{c} |t'(\tau)| \geq -2e^{-\sqrt{c/2}}$ .*

*Proof.* We have

$$t'(\tau) = \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\tau-\tau^2}}}{\left(e^{\frac{1}{1-\tau}} + e^{\frac{1}{\tau}}\right)^2} \cdot \frac{(-2\tau^2 + 2\tau - 1)}{(\tau - 1)^2 \tau^2} \leq 0$$

so

$$|t'(\tau)| = \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\tau-\tau^2}}}{\left(e^{\frac{1}{1-\tau}} + e^{\frac{1}{\tau}}\right)^2} \cdot \frac{(2\tau^2 - 2\tau + 1)}{(\tau - 1)^2 \tau^2}. \quad (23)$$

Consider  $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  and also take  $c \geq 9$ . Using (23) we find

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - t(\tau) - \frac{1}{c} |t'(\tau)| &= \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\tau-\tau^2}}}{\left(e^{\frac{1}{1-\tau}} + e^{\frac{1}{\tau}}\right)^2} \frac{(c\tau^4 - 2c\tau^3 + c\tau^2 - 2\tau^2 + 2\tau - 1)}{c(\tau - 1)^2 \tau^2} + \frac{e^{\frac{2}{1-\tau}}}{\left(e^{\frac{1}{1-\tau}} + e^{\frac{1}{\tau}}\right)^2} \\ &\geq \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\tau-\tau^2}}}{\left(e^{\frac{1}{1-\tau}} + e^{\frac{1}{\tau}}\right)^2} \frac{(c\tau^4 - 2c\tau^3 + c\tau^2 - 2\tau^2 + 2\tau - 1)}{c(\tau - 1)^2 \tau^2} \\ &\geq \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\tau-\tau^2}}}{\left(e^{\frac{1}{1-\tau}} + e^{\frac{1}{\tau}}\right)^2} \left( \frac{c-1}{2c} - \frac{1}{c\tau^2} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\tau-\tau^2}}}{\left(e^{\frac{1}{1-\tau}} + e^{\frac{1}{\tau}}\right)^2} \min \left\{ \frac{c-1}{2c} - \frac{1}{c\tau^2}, 0 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where for the penultimate inequality we used the fact

$$\frac{c\tau^4 - 2c\tau^3 + c\tau^2 - 2\tau^2 + 2\tau - 1}{c(\tau - 1)^2\tau^2} \geq \frac{c-1}{2c} - \frac{1}{c\tau^2} \quad \forall \tau \leq \frac{1}{2}, c \geq 7.$$

This algebraic inequality can be verified by a computer algebra system, such as Mathematica.

For  $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ , we have

$$\frac{e^{\frac{1}{\tau-\tau^2}}}{\left(e^{\frac{1}{1-\tau}} + e^{\frac{1}{\tau}}\right)^2} \leq \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\tau-\tau^2}}}{\left(e^{\frac{1}{\tau}}\right)^2} = e^{\frac{1}{\tau-\tau^2} - \frac{2}{\tau}} \leq e^{2-\frac{1}{\tau}} \quad (24)$$

where for the last inequality we used that  $\frac{1}{\tau-\tau^2} - \frac{2}{\tau} \leq 2 - \frac{1}{\tau}$  for  $\tau \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . Therefore, using (24), we have

$$1 - t(\tau) - \frac{1}{c} |t'(\tau)| \geq e^{2-\frac{1}{\tau}} \min \left\{ \frac{c-1}{2c} - \frac{1}{c\tau^2}, 0 \right\} = \min \left\{ e^{2-\frac{1}{\tau}} \left( \frac{c-1}{2c} - \frac{1}{c\tau^2} \right), 0 \right\}.$$

We know  $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$  and  $\frac{c-1}{2c} - \frac{1}{c\tau^2} \leq 0$  if and only if  $0 < \tau \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{c-1}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Additionally,  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} e^{2-\frac{1}{\tau}} \left( \frac{c-1}{2c} - \frac{1}{c\tau^2} \right) = 0$ . Therefore the minimum of  $\tau \mapsto \min \left\{ e^{2-\frac{1}{\tau}} \left( \frac{c-1}{2c} - \frac{1}{c\tau^2} \right), 0 \right\}$  for  $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  must occur at a critical point of  $\tau \mapsto e^{2-\frac{1}{\tau}} \left( \frac{c-1}{2c} - \frac{1}{c\tau^2} \right)$ . Let's compute that point:

$$0 = \frac{d}{d\tau} \left[ e^{2-\frac{1}{\tau}} \left( \frac{c-1}{2c} - \frac{1}{c\tau^2} \right) \right] = \frac{e^{2-\frac{1}{\tau}} (c\tau^2 - \tau^2 + 4\tau - 2)}{2c\tau^4} \implies \tau = \frac{1}{\frac{\sqrt{c+1}}{\sqrt{2}} + 1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - t(\tau) - \frac{1}{c} |t'(\tau)| &\geq \min \left\{ \left[ e^{2-\frac{1}{\tau}} \left( \frac{c-1}{2c} - \frac{1}{c\tau^2} \right) \right]_{\tau=\frac{1}{\frac{\sqrt{c+1}}{\sqrt{2}}+1}}, 0 \right\} = -\frac{2e^2 \left( 1 + \frac{\sqrt{c+1}}{\sqrt{2}} \right)}{ce^{1+\frac{\sqrt{c+1}}{\sqrt{2}}}} \\ &\geq -\frac{2}{e^{\frac{\sqrt{c+1}}{\sqrt{2}}}} \geq -\frac{2}{e\sqrt{c/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

## C The nonstrongly convex case: technical details

Define the  $C^\infty$  function  $u_{\mathcal{R}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) = 1$  for all  $\mathcal{D} \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2$  and  $u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) = 1 - e^{-4/\sqrt{2\mathcal{D}/\mathcal{R}^2-1}}$  for all  $\mathcal{D} > \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2$ . That  $u_{\mathcal{R}}$  is  $C^\infty$  can be using the same method used in the proof of Lemma 2.20 from (Lee, 2012, Ch. 2).

## C.1 Verifying $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is $\tilde{L}$ -smooth and strictly g-convex in $\mathcal{M}$

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.5 (from Section 5), we show that given  $f \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}$  with  $f(x) = 3\mu \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})^2$  for  $x \notin B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ , the function  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}$  defined by (21) is strictly g-convex and  $24\mu\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}}$ -smooth outside of the ball  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ .

Let  $\gamma(t)$  be a geodesic with  $\gamma(0) = x, \gamma'(0) = v$  and  $\|v\| = 1$ . For the moment, define  $\mathcal{D}(x) = \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}})^2$ . For the gradient, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \text{grad}\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x), v \right\rangle &= \frac{d}{dt}[f(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} = \frac{d}{dt}[u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)))f(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} \\ &= u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) \frac{d}{dt}[f(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} + \frac{d}{dt}[u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)))]_{t=0} f(x) \\ &= u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) \langle \text{grad}f(x), v \rangle + f(x) u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) \frac{d}{dt}[\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} \\ &= u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) \langle \text{grad}f(x), v \rangle - f(x) u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) \langle \exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}), v \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which verifies formula (22).

For the Hessian we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle v, \text{Hess}\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x)v \right\rangle &= \frac{d^2}{dt^2}[\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} = \frac{d^2}{dt^2}[u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)))f(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{d^2}{dt^2}[u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)))]_{t=0} f(x) + u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) \frac{d^2}{dt^2}[f(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} \\ &\quad + 2 \frac{d}{dt}[u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)))]_{t=0} \frac{d}{dt}[f(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} \\ &= f(x) u''_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) \left( \frac{d}{dt}[\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} \right)^2 + f(x) u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) \frac{d^2}{dt^2}[\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} \\ &\quad + u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) \frac{d^2}{dt^2}[f(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} + 2 \frac{d}{dt}[u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(\gamma(t)))]_{t=0} \frac{d}{dt}[f(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} \\ &= f(x) u''_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) \langle \exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}), v \rangle^2 + f(x) u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) \langle v, \text{Hess}d(x)v \rangle \\ &\quad + u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) \frac{d^2}{dt^2}[f(\gamma(t))]_{t=0} - 2 \langle \exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}), v \rangle \langle \text{grad}f(x), v \rangle \\ &= 6\mu \left( [u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) + \mathcal{D}(x)u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x))] \langle v, \text{Hess}\mathcal{D}(x)v \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + [2u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) + \mathcal{D}(x)u''_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x))] \langle \exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}), v \rangle^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Lemmas C.1 and C.2 from Appendix C.2 shows that  $u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) + \mathcal{D}u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) \geq 0$  and  $2u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) + \mathcal{D}u''_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) \leq 0$  for all  $\mathcal{D} > \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2$ . Therefore,  $\left\langle v, \text{Hess}\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x)v \right\rangle$  is at least

$$6\mu \left( [u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) + \mathcal{D}(x)u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x))] + [2u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) + \mathcal{D}(x)u''_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x))]2\mathcal{D} \right).$$

Lemma C.3 shows that this is strictly greater than zero, verifying strict g-convexity.

Likewise, Lemma C.4 along with Lemma 2.9 imply  $\langle v, \text{Hess} \tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x)v \rangle$  is at most

$$6\mu \left( [u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x)) + \mathcal{D}(x)u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}(x))]2\sqrt{-K_{10}}\sqrt{2\mathcal{D}} \right) \leq 24\mu\sqrt{-K_{10}}\mathcal{R}.$$

## C.2 Technical facts about the function $u_{\mathcal{R}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

In the following lemmas, we use the change of variables

$$\tau = 1/\sqrt{\frac{2\mathcal{D}}{\mathcal{R}^2} - 1} \iff \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{R}^2 \frac{1 + \tau^2}{2\tau^2}.$$

for  $\mathcal{D} \in (\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2, \infty)$  and  $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ .

**Lemma C.1.**  $u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) + \mathcal{D}u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) \geq 0, \quad \forall \mathcal{D} \in (\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* Computing we find:

$$u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) + \mathcal{D}u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) = 1 - e^{-4\tau}(1 + 2\tau + 2\tau^3).$$

On the other hand, we know  $1 + 4\tau + 8\tau^2 + \frac{32}{3}\tau^3 \geq 1 + 2\tau + 2\tau^3$  for all  $\tau \geq 0$  (which can be verified with Mathematica), so

$$e^{4\tau} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j!}(4\tau)^j \geq \sum_{j=0}^3 \frac{1}{j!}(4\tau)^j = 1 + 4\tau + 8\tau^2 + \frac{32}{3}\tau^3 \geq 1 + 2\tau + 2\tau^3, \quad \forall \tau \geq 0,$$

which allows us to conclude.  $\square$

**Lemma C.2.**  $2u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) + \mathcal{D}u''_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) \leq 0, \quad \forall \mathcal{D} \in (\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* Computing we find:

$$2u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) + \mathcal{D}u''_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) = 2\mathcal{R}^{-2}e^{-4\tau}\tau^3(-1 - 4\tau + 3\tau^2 - 4\tau^3)$$

and one can check that  $-1 - 4\tau + 3\tau^2 - 4\tau^3 \leq 0$  for all  $\tau \geq 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma C.3.**  $[u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) + \mathcal{D}u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D})] + [2u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) + \mathcal{D}u''_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D})]2\mathcal{D} > 0, \quad \forall \mathcal{D} \in (\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* Computing we find:

$$[u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) + \mathcal{D}u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D})] + [2u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) + \mathcal{D}u''_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D})]2\mathcal{D} = 1 - e^{-4\tau}(1 + 4\tau + 8\tau^2 - 2\tau^3 + 16\tau^4 - 6\tau^5 + 8\tau^6).$$

On the other hand, we know  $\sum_{j=0}^7 \frac{1}{j!}(4\tau)^j > 1 + 4\tau + 8\tau^2 - 2\tau^3 + 16\tau^4 - 6\tau^5 + 8\tau^6$  for all  $\tau > 0$  (which can be verified with Mathematica), which allows us to conclude.  $\square$

**Lemma C.4.**  $(u_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}) + \mathcal{D}u'_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}))2\sqrt{2\mathcal{D}} \leq 4\mathcal{R}, \quad \forall \mathcal{D} \in (\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}^2, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* This follows from a calculation similar to the proof of Lemma C.1.  $\square$

### C.3 Technical fact from Section 5: $x_k \notin B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ implies $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x_k) \geq 2\hat{\epsilon}Lr^2$

Recall Lemma 5.2 provides a  $\mu = 64\hat{\epsilon}L$ -strongly  $g$ -convex function  $f \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{L,r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$ , with minimizer  $x^*$ , satisfying  $f(x_k) - f(x^*) \geq 2\hat{\epsilon}Lr^2$  for all  $k \leq T - 1$ .

If  $x_k \notin B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ , then consider the geodesic segment  $\gamma_{x^* \rightarrow x_k}: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  given by  $\gamma_{x^* \rightarrow x_k}(t) = \exp_{x^*}(t \exp_{x^*}^{-1}(x_k))$ . Continuity of  $t \mapsto \text{dist}(\gamma_{x^* \rightarrow x_k}(t), x_{\text{ref}})$  implies there exists a  $t \in (0, 1)$  so that  $\mathcal{R} = \text{dist}(\gamma_{x^* \rightarrow x_k}(t), x_{\text{ref}})$ . Let  $y = \gamma(t)$ . Geodesic convexity of  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}$  implies

$$\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(y) \leq (1-t)\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x^*) + t\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x_k) \leq (1-t)\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(y) + t\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x_k),$$

which implies  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(y) \leq \tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x_k)$ . On the other hand, we know  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}} = f$  in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . Therefore  $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ , so

$$\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(x_k) \geq \tilde{f}_{\mathcal{R}}(y) \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \text{dist}(y, x^*)^2 \geq \frac{\mu}{2} (\mathcal{R} - r)^2 \geq 32\hat{\epsilon}L(2^{11}r)^2 \geq 2\hat{\epsilon}Lr^2.$$

## D Incorporating function-value queries

In this section we prove Theorem 3.4. For this we need Lemma D.1, which is analogous to Lemma 3.6 except it also includes function-value queries.

**Lemma D.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold of dimension  $d \geq 2$  with sectional curvatures in the interval  $[K_{\text{lo}}, 0]$  with  $K_{\text{lo}} < 0$ . Let  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $r \geq 8/\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}$ ,  $\mathcal{R} \geq r$ . Let  $z_1, \dots, z_N \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$  be distinct points in  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $\text{dist}(z_i, z_j) \geq \frac{r}{2}$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Define  $A_0 = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be any first-order algorithm which only queries points in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, \mathcal{R})$ . Finally, let  $w \geq 1$  (this is a tuning parameter we will set later).*

*For every nonnegative integer  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor w \rfloor$ , the algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  makes the query*

$$x_k = \mathcal{A}_k((x_0, f_0, g_0), \dots, (x_{k-1}, f_{k-1}, g_{k-1}))$$

*and there exists  $f_k \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $g_k \in T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$  and a set  $A_{k+1} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$  satisfying*

$$|A_{k+1}| \geq \frac{12000w(|A_k| - 1)}{\left(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2)\right)^{d+2}} \quad (25)$$

*such that for each  $j \in A_{k+1}$  there is a  $C^\infty$  function  $f_{j,k+1}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of the form*

$$f_{j,k+1}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x, z_j)^2 + H_{j,k+1}(x)$$

*satisfying:*

**Lfv1**  $f_{j,k+1}$  is  $(1 - \frac{k+1}{2w})$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $[2r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 1 + \frac{k+1}{2w}]$ -smooth in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ ;



**Lfv2**  $\text{grad}f_{j,k+1}(z_j) = 0$  (hence in particular the minimizer of  $f_{j,k+1}$  is  $z_j$ );

**Lfv3**  $f_{j,k+1}(x_m) = f_m$  and  $\text{grad}f_{j,k+1}(x_m) = g_m$  for  $m = 0, 1, \dots, k$ ;

**Lfv4**  $\text{dist}(x_m, z_j) \geq \frac{r}{4}$  for all  $m = 0, 1, \dots, k$ .

**Lfv5**  $|H_{j,k+1}(x)| \leq \frac{(k+1)w^{-1}r}{64\sqrt{-K_{10}}}$ ,  $\|\text{grad}H_{j,k+1}(x)\| \leq \frac{(k+1)w^{-1}}{2\sqrt{-K_{10}}}$ ,  $\|\text{Hess}H_{j,k+1}(x)\| \leq \frac{k+1}{2w}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

The proof of Theorem 3.4 is an immediate consequence of Lemma D.1.

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.* Let us apply Lemma D.1 to the manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  and algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$ . Let the points  $z_1, \dots, z_N$  be provided by the ball-packing property so that  $N \geq e^{\tilde{c}r}$ .

Set  $w = \tilde{c}r(d+2)^{-1}$  in Lemma D.1, and observe that

$$\min\{\lfloor w \rfloor, T\} = \min\left\{\lfloor \tilde{c}r(d+2)^{-1} \rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{\tilde{c}r(d+2)^{-1}}{\log(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}}+2))} \right\rfloor\right\} = T$$

because  $w = \tilde{c}r(d+2)^{-1} \geq 4$  and  $\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}} \geq 8$ .

For the same reasons as in the proof of Theorem 3.5, it suffices to show that  $|A_k| \geq 2$  for all  $k \leq T$ . We induct on  $k$ . By the ball-packing property,  $|A_0| \geq e^{\tilde{c}r} \geq 2$  since  $r \geq 4(d+2)/\tilde{c}$ . Assume  $|A_m| \geq 2$  for all  $m \leq k$  and  $k+1 \leq T$ . Therefore,  $|A_m| - 1 \geq |A_m|/2$  for all  $m \leq k$ .

Lemma D.1 implies

$$|A_{m+1}| \geq \frac{6000w|A_m|}{\left(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}}+2)\right)^{d+2}} \geq \frac{2|A_m|}{\left(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}}+2)\right)^{d+2}} \quad \forall m \leq k.$$

Unrolling these inequalities and using  $|A_0| \geq e^{\tilde{c}r}$ , we get

$$|A_{k+1}| \geq \frac{e^{\tilde{c}r}2^{k+1}}{\left(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}}+2)\right)^{(k+1)(d+2)}}.$$

On the other hand,  $k+1 \leq T$  implies

$$\frac{e^{\tilde{c}r}}{\left(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}}+2)\right)^{(k+1)(d+2)}} \geq 1.$$

So  $|A_{k+1}| \geq 2$ .

Lastly, note that Lemma D.1 and our choice of  $T$  implies for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$

$$|H_{j,T}(x)| \leq \frac{r}{64\sqrt{-K_{10}}}, \quad \|\text{grad}H_{j,T}(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-K_{10}}}, \quad \|\text{Hess}H_{j,T}(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

□

## D.1 Proof of Lemma D.1

In this section we prove Lemma D.1. The proof approach is very similar to the proof presented in Section 3.3, so we are more succinct, primarily focusing on the additional technical analysis needed to handle function-value queries.

Before we prove this lemma, we state two lemmas which we use. The following lemma is analogous to Lemma 3.8, and its proof can be found in Appendix E.2.

**Lemma D.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold with sectional curvatures in the interval  $[K_{\text{lo}}, 0]$  with  $K_{\text{lo}} < 0$ . Let  $R_{\text{ball}} > 0, w > 0, x_k \in \mathcal{M}$ . Define*

$$a: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad a(R) = \frac{R}{4(4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 55/R)},$$

$$g_{\text{norm}}: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad g_{\text{norm}}(R) = \frac{8R}{e^{1/3}(1485 + 72R\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})}.$$

There is a family of bump functions  $\{h_{f,g}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$  indexed by  $(f, g)$  satisfying

$$f \in \left[ -w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}) + \frac{3}{8}w^{-1}R_{\text{ball}}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}), w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}) \right], \quad g \in B_{x_k}(0, w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}))$$

such that for each such  $(f, g)$ :

- $h_{f,g}(x_k) = f$ ;
- $\text{grad}h_{f,g}(x_k) = g$ ;
- the support of each  $h_{f,g}$  is contained in  $B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}})$ ;
- $|h_{f,g}(x)| \leq 2w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})$ ,  $\|\text{grad}h_{f,g}(x)\| \leq \frac{w^{-1}}{2\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}$ ,  $\|\text{Hess}h_{f,g}(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{2w}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

The interval

$$\left[ -w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}) + \frac{3}{8}w^{-1}R_{\text{ball}}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}), w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}) \right]$$

has length at least  $w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})$ .

By cylinder, we mean any subset  $C$  of a Euclidean space of the form  $C = I \times B$ , where  $I$  is a closed interval of  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $B$  is a closed Euclidean ball. Note that these cylinders include their interior—there is a distinction between a cylinder and the surface of a cylinder. The height of a cylinder  $C = I \times B$  is the length of  $I$ ; the radius of  $C$  is the radius of the ball  $B$ .

**Lemma D.3.** *In the following  $I, I_j$  denote closed intervals of  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $B, B_j$  denote closed  $d$ -dimensional balls of Euclidean space.*

*Let  $C_1 = I_1 \times B_1, \dots, C_n = I_n \times B_n$  be  $n$  cylinders of radius  $q$  and height  $a$  each.*

Assume each of the cylinders is also contained in a larger cylinder  $C = I \times B$  of radius  $r$  and height  $b$ :  $C_j \subseteq C$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Choose

$$(f, g) \in \arg \max_{(t,y) \in C} |\{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} : (t, y) \in C_j\}|,$$

and let  $A = \{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} : (f, g) \in C_j\}$ . Then

$$|A| \geq n \frac{\text{Vol}(C_1)}{\text{Vol}(C)} = n \frac{\text{Vol}(B_1)}{\text{Vol}(B)} \cdot \frac{a}{b} = n \frac{r^d}{r^d} \cdot \frac{a}{b}.$$

The proof of Lemma D.3 is essentially identical to the proof of the analogous Lemma 3.9, so we omit it.

Let us now prove Lemma D.1. We construct the function values  $f_0, f_1, \dots$ , gradients  $g_0, g_1, \dots$ , sets  $A_0, A_1, \dots$ , and functions  $f_{j,0}, f_{j,1}, \dots$  inductively. We prove the claim by induction on  $k$ . The **base case** is the same as in Section 3.3. In particular, we define  $f_{j,0}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x, z_j)^2$  for all  $j \in A_0 = \{1, \dots, N\}$ .

Let's consider the **inductive step**. We are at iteration  $k \geq 0$ , and we assume properties **Lfv1**, **Lfv2**, **Lfv3**, **Lfv4**, **Lfv5** hold with  $k$  replacing  $k+1$  in all expressions (the inductive hypothesis). The algorithm queries a point  $x_k$ . If  $k \geq 1$ , let  $x_\ell, \ell < k$ , be a previous query point closest to  $x_k$ . We can assume  $x_\ell \neq x_k$ . Define  $\tilde{A}_k$  as in equation (10).

We shall define  $f_{j,k+1} = f_{j,k} + h_{j,k}$  where  $h_{j,k}$  is an appropriately chosen bump function. We want  $h_{j,k}$  to be a bump function whose support is contained in  $B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)})$  where  $R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}$  is defined by equation (11). With this choice for  $R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}$ , we set  $h_{j,k}$  to be one of the bump functions  $h_{f,g}$  supplied by Lemma D.2 (which one remains to be determined). With this setup, we immediately know the function  $f_{j,k+1} = f_{j,k} + h_{f,g}$  satisfies properties **Lfv2** and **Lfv4**, as well as  $f_{j,k+1}(x_m) = f_m$  and  $\text{grad} f_{j,k+1}(x_m) = g_m$  for  $m = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ , for the reasons given in Section 3.3. Additionally, using

$$2w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}) \leq 2w^{-1}a\left(\frac{r}{8}\right) \leq 2w^{-1} \frac{r/8}{4(4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})} = \frac{w^{-1}r}{64\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}},$$

we see the function  $f_{j,k+1} = f_{j,k} + h_{f,g}$  satisfies properties **Lfv1** and **Lfv5**. It remains to choose  $A_{k+1} \subseteq \tilde{A}_k$ ,  $f_k \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $g_k \in \mathbb{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$  so that  $f_{j,k+1}(x_k) = f_k$ ,  $\text{grad} f_{j,k+1}(x_k) = g_k$  for all  $j \in A_{k+1}$ , and inequality (25) is satisfied.

Consider the cylinders in  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$  defined by

$$C_{j,k} = I_{j,k} \times B_{j,k}$$

where we define

$$I_{j,k} = \left[ f_{j,k}(x_k) - w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}) + \frac{3}{8}w^{-1}R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}), f_{j,k}(x_k) + w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}) \right] \quad (26)$$

and recall that  $B_{j,k} = B_{x_k}(\text{grad} f_{j,k}(x_k), w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}))$ . Let

$$(f_k, g_k) \in \arg \max_{(f,g) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}_{x_k} \mathcal{M}} \left| \{j \in \tilde{A}_k : (f, g) \in C_{j,k}\} \right|.$$

Define  $A_{k+1} = \{j \in \tilde{A}_k : (f_k, g_k) \in C_{j,k}\}$ .

For each  $j \in A_{k+1}$  define  $g_{j,k} = g_k - \text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k)$  and  $f_{j,k}^{(\text{f.v.})} = f_k - f_{j,k}(x_k)$ . Then Lemma D.2 implies for each  $j \in A_{k+1}$  there is a bump function  $h_{j,k} := h_{f_{j,k}^{(\text{f.v.})}, g_{j,k}}$  satisfying

$$h_{j,k}(x_k) = f_{j,k}^{(\text{f.v.})} = f_k - f_{j,k}(x_k) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{grad}h_{j,k}(x_k) = g_{j,k} = g_k - \text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k).$$

Therefore for all  $j \in A_{k+1}$ ,  $f_{j,k+1}(x_k) = f_{j,k}(x_k) + h_{j,k}(x_k) = f_k$  and  $\text{grad}f_{j,k+1}(x_k) = \text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_k) + \text{grad}h_{j,k}(x_k) = g_k$ .

It remains to verify inequality (25). To do so, we use Lemma D.3. To use this lemma, we need (a) a good upper bound on the radius of a ball  $B_k \subseteq T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$  containing the balls  $B_{j,k}, j \in \tilde{A}_k$ , and (b) a good upper bound for the length of an interval  $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  containing the intervals  $I_{j,k}, j \in \tilde{A}_k$ . We've already done (a) in the proof from Section 3.3. Recall that we showed (using lines (14) and (18))

$$\frac{\text{Vol}(B_{j,k})}{\text{Vol}(B_k)} \geq \frac{1}{(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))^d}.$$

For (b), we upper bound the length of an interval  $I_k$  containing  $I_{j,k}, j \in \tilde{A}_k$  in two cases, as in Section 3.3:

1. **Case 1:** either  $k = 0$ , or  $k \geq 1$  and  $\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) > 4$ .
2. **Case 2:**  $k \geq 1$  and  $\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) \leq 4$ .

In each case, we show that

$$\frac{\text{Length}(I_{j,k})}{\text{Length}(I_k)} \geq \frac{12000w}{(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))^2}.$$

Therefore, using Lemma D.3,  $(f_k, g_k)$  is contained in

$$|A_{k+1}| \geq |\tilde{A}_k| \frac{\text{Vol}(B_{j,k})}{\text{Vol}(B_k)} \cdot \frac{\text{Length}(I_{j,k})}{\text{Length}(I_k)} \geq \frac{12000w(|A_k| - 1)}{(2000w(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2))^{d+2}}$$

of the cylinders  $C_{j,k}, j \in \tilde{A}_k$ . This concludes the inductive step, proving Lemma D.1.

### D.1.1 Case 1 (for function-value queries)

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \text{dist}(x_k, z_j)^2 - \text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}})^2 \right| \\ &= (\text{dist}(x_k, z_j) + \text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}})) |\text{dist}(x_k, z_j) - \text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}})| \\ &\leq (\text{dist}(x_k, z_j) + \text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}})) \text{dist}(z_j, x_{\text{ref}}) \\ &\leq (2\text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}}) + \text{dist}(z_j, x_{\text{ref}})) \text{dist}(z_j, x_{\text{ref}}) \\ &\leq (2\text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}}) + r)r. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

By the inductive hypothesis and  $k \leq w$ ,  $|H_{j,k}(x_k)| \leq \frac{kw^{-1}r}{64\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \leq \frac{r}{64\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}$ . Combining this with inequality (27), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \left| f_{j,k}(x_k) - \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}})^2 \right| &= \left| H_{j,k}(x_k) + \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x_k, z_j)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}})^2 \right| \\ &\leq \frac{r}{64\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} + \frac{1}{2} (2 \text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}}) + r)r \leq (\text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}}) + r)r \leq (\mathcal{R} + r)r \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

using  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \geq 8$  for the penultimate inequality. Therefore, all function values  $f_{j,k}(x_k), j \in A_k$ , are contained in an interval centered at  $\frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}})^2$  of length at most  $2(\mathcal{R} + r)r$ . This implies that all the intervals  $I_{j,k}, j \in \tilde{A}_k$ , are contained in an interval  $I_k$  centered at  $\frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x_k, x_{\text{ref}})^2$  of length at most

$$\begin{aligned} 2(\mathcal{R} + r)r + 2w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}) &\leq 2(\mathcal{R} + r)r + 2w^{-1}a\left(\frac{r}{8}\right) \leq 2(\mathcal{R} + r)r + \frac{r}{64\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \\ &\leq 2(\mathcal{R} + 2r)r \leq 6\mathcal{R}r \end{aligned}$$

using that  $w \geq 1$  and  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \geq 8$ .

Now assume  $k = 0$  or  $\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) > 4$ , where  $x_\ell$  is defined in equation (8). Using  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \geq 8$  and the definition of  $R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)}$  (11), this assumption implies  $R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)} \geq 1/\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{Length}(I_{j,k})}{\text{Length}(I_k)} &\geq \frac{w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)})}{6\mathcal{R}r} \geq \frac{w^{-1}a(1/\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})}{6\mathcal{R}r} = \frac{w^{-1}/\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}{4(59\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}) \cdot 6\mathcal{R}r} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2000w(\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})}. \end{aligned}$$

### D.1.2 Case 2 (for function-value queries)

Assume  $k \geq 1$  and  $\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) \leq 4$ . Since  $r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} \geq 8$ ,  $R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)} = \text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)/4$ . The analysis for this case is similar to Case 2 in Section 3.3.2.

The inductive hypothesis implies  $\|\text{Hess}H_{j,k}(x)\| \leq \frac{k}{2w} \leq \frac{1}{2}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , using  $k \leq w$ . So as in equation (16), we know  $\|\text{Hess}f_{j,k}(x)\| \leq 3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + \frac{3}{2}$  for all  $x \in B(z_j, \max\{\text{dist}(x_k, z_j), \text{dist}(x_\ell, z_j)\})$ . Additionally, the inductive hypothesis implies  $f_{j,k}(x_\ell) = f_\ell$  and  $\text{grad}f_{j,k}(x_\ell) = g_\ell$  for all  $j \in \tilde{A}_k$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2.8

$$\|f_{j,k}(x_k) - f_\ell - \langle g_\ell, \exp_{x_\ell}^{-1}(x_k) \rangle\| \leq \left(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + \frac{3}{2}\right) \text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)^2, \quad \forall j \in \tilde{A}_k.$$

We have shown that all the function-values  $f_{j,k}(x_k), j \in \tilde{A}_k$ , are contained in an interval centered at  $f_\ell + \langle g_\ell, \exp_{x_\ell}^{-1}(x_k) \rangle$  with length at most  $2(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + \frac{3}{2})\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)^2$ .

Therefore, all the intervals  $I_{j,k}, j \in \tilde{A}_k$ , are contained in an interval  $I_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  of length

$$2\left(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + \frac{3}{2}\right) \text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)^2 + 2w^{-1}a(\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)/4) \leq 2\left(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} + 2\right) \text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)^2$$

using  $w \geq 1$  and  $a(\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)/4) = \frac{(\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)/4)^2}{4(\sqrt{-K_{10}}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) + 55)} \leq \frac{\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)^2}{64(55)}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{Length}(I_{j,k})}{\text{Length}(I_k)} &\geq \frac{w^{-1}a(\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)/4)}{2\left(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}} + 2\right)\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)^2} \geq \frac{w^{-1}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)^2}{8000\left(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}} + 2\right)\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)^2} \\ &= \frac{3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}} + 2}{24} \cdot \frac{12000w}{\left(2000w\left(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}} + 2\right)\right)^2} \geq \frac{12000w}{\left(2000w\left(3\mathcal{R}\sqrt{-K_{10}} + 2\right)\right)^2} \end{aligned}$$

using  $R_{\text{ball}}^{(k)} = \text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)/4$  and

$$a(\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)/4) = \frac{(\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)/4)^2}{4(\sqrt{-K_{10}}\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) + 55)} \geq \frac{(\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)/4)^2}{4(4 + 55)} \geq \frac{\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell)^2}{4000},$$

which itself follows from  $\text{dist}(x_k, x_\ell) \leq 4/\sqrt{-K_{10}}$ .

## E Bump functions

### E.1 Proof of Lemma 3.8

Define  $\phi_R: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\phi_R(t) = e \cdot \exp\left(-1/\left(1 - \frac{2t}{R^2}\right)\right) = \exp(2t/(2t - R^2)) \quad \text{for } t \in (-\infty, R^2/2),$$

and  $\phi_R(t) = 0$  elsewhere. The function  $\phi_R: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $C^\infty$  (Lee, 2012, Lem. 2.20). We consider bump functions supported in  $B(p, R)$  of the form  $h(x) = a \cdot \phi_R(\text{dist}(x, p)^2/2)$  for  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . As a composition of  $C^\infty$  functions, these bump functions are also  $C^\infty$ .

**Remark E.1.** *Since  $\text{dist}(x, p)^2/2 \geq 0$ , the values of  $\phi_R$  on  $(-\infty, 0)$  are irrelevant. All that matters is that  $\phi_R$  is infinitely differentiable in a neighborhood of the origin.*

We have  $\phi(R^2/8) = e^{-1/3}$ , and for  $t \in (-\infty, R^2/2)$

$$\phi'_R(t) = -\phi_R(t) \cdot 2R^2/(R^2 - 2t)^2, \quad \phi''_R(t) = \phi_R(t) \cdot 4R^2(4t - R^2)/(R^2 - 2t)^4.$$

For clarity, we have partitioned the proof of Lemma 3.8 into several subsections: E.1.1, E.1.2 and E.1.3.

#### E.1.1 Bump function construction

For each  $p \in B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}}/3)$ : let  $R = 2\text{dist}(x_k, p)$  and define  $\tilde{h}_{x_k, p}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\tilde{h}_{x_k, p}(x) = w^{-1}a(R)\phi_R(\text{dist}(x, p)^2/2), \quad a(R) = \frac{R}{4(4\sqrt{-K_{10}} + 55/R)}. \quad (29)$$

By construction,  $\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}$  is supported in the closed ball  $B(p, R) \subseteq B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}})$ .

We have

$$\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x) = -w^{-1}a(R)\phi'_R(\text{dist}(x,p)^2/2)\exp_x^{-1}(p).$$

So using that  $\|\exp_{x_k}^{-1}(p)\| = \text{dist}(x_k,p) = R/2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x_k)\right\| &= w^{-1}a(R)|\phi'_R(R^2/8)|R/2 \\ &= w^{-1}a(R)\phi(R^2/8)\frac{32}{9R^2}R/2 = w^{-1}e^{-1/3}a(R)\frac{16}{9R} \\ &= w^{-1}\frac{4e^{-1/3}}{9R(4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}/R + 55/R^2)} = w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}\left(\frac{3}{2}R\right) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where  $R$  can take any value in  $[0, 2R_{\text{ball}}/3]$ . Since the function  $g_{\text{norm}}$  is strictly increasing on  $[0, \infty)$  and  $g_{\text{norm}}(0) = 0$ , we see that  $\left\|\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x_k)\right\|$  takes all values in the interval  $[0, w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}})]$  (as  $p$  varies).

On the other hand,  $\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x_k) = \left\|\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x_k)\right\| \frac{\exp_{x_k}^{-1}(p)}{\|\exp_{x_k}^{-1}(p)\|}$ . Therefore,

$$\{\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x_k) : p \in B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}}/3)\} = B_{x_k}(0, w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}})).$$

More precisely, for each  $g \in B_{x_k}(0, w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}))$  there is exactly one  $p \in B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}}/3)$  such that  $g = \text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x_k)$ , and vice versa. Finally, define

$$h_{\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x_k)} := \tilde{h}_{x_k,p} \quad \forall p \in B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}}/3).$$

This defines the family of functions in Lemma 3.8, and also establishes property **BF1**.

By construction, property **BF2** is also satisfied.

We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x_k)}(x_k) &= \tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x_k) = w^{-1}a(R)\phi_R(\text{dist}(x_k,p)^2/2) = w^{-1}a(R)\phi_R(R^2/8) \\ &= w^{-1}a(R)e^{-1/3} = \left\|\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x_k)\right\| \frac{9R}{16} \\ &= \left\|\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x_k)\right\| \frac{9}{16} \cdot \frac{2}{3}g_{\text{norm}}^{-1}\left(w\left\|\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x_k)\right\|\right) \end{aligned}$$

where we used equation (30) for the last two equalities. This shows the first part of property **BF4**.

### E.1.2 Bounding the function values and gradients of the bump functions

The maximum of  $\left|\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x)\right|$  is attained when  $x = p$  and equals  $w^{-1}a(R)$ , which is at most  $w^{-1}a(2R_{\text{ball}}/3) \leq w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})$ . This shows the second part of property **BF4**.

By Section E.1.1, we know that

$$\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x) = -w^{-1}a(R)\phi'_R(\text{dist}(x,p)^2/2)\exp_x^{-1}(p)$$

if  $\text{dist}(x, p) \leq R$  and  $\text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x) = 0$  otherwise. Therefore, for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x) \right\| &\leq w^{-1}a(R) \max_{t \in [0, R]} |\phi'_R(t^2/2)| t \\ &= w^{-1}a(R) \max_{t \in [0, R]} t \cdot \phi_R(t^2/2) \cdot 2R^2/(R^2 - t^2)^2 \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the maximizer of this problem is  $t = R/3^{1/4}$ , which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \text{grad}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x) \right\| &\leq w^{-1}a(R)R^{-1}\sqrt{36 + 21\sqrt{3}}e^{-1/2-\sqrt{3}/2} \leq 3w^{-1}a(R)R^{-1} \\ &\leq w^{-1}\frac{R}{55 + 4R\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \leq w^{-1}\frac{1}{4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first part of property **BF3**.

### E.1.3 Bounding the Hessian of the bump functions

For  $v \in T_x M$  and  $\text{dist}(x, p) \leq R$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, \text{Hess}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x)v \rangle &= w^{-1}a(R)\phi''_R(t^2/2)\langle v, -\exp_x^{-1}(p) \rangle^2 + w^{-1}a(R)\phi'_R(t^2/2)\langle v, \mathcal{H}(x)v \rangle \\ &= (\text{term 1}) + (\text{term 2}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $t = \text{dist}(x, p)$  and  $\mathcal{H}(x)$  is the Hessian of the function  $x \mapsto \text{dist}(x, p)^2/2$ .

We have  $t = \text{dist}(x, p) = \|\exp_x^{-1}(p)\|$  and

$$\|\mathcal{H}(x)\| \leq 1 + \text{dist}(x, p)\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}} = 1 + t\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}},$$

by Lemma 2.9. So for  $t \in [0, R]$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{term 1}| &\leq (w^{-1}a(R)\|v\|^2) \left[ \phi(t^2/2) \frac{4R^2 |2t^2 - R^2| t^2}{(R^2 - t^2)^4} \right] \\ &\leq (w^{-1}a(R)\|v\|^2) \left[ 4R^6 \frac{\phi(t^2/2)}{(R^2 - t^2)^4} \right] \\ &\leq (w^{-1}a(R)\|v\|^2) \left[ 4R^6 \cdot 256e^{-3}/R^8 \right] \leq (w^{-1}a(R)\|v\|^2) \left[ 51/R^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{term 2}| &\leq (w^{-1}a(R)\|v\|^2) \left[ \phi(t^2/2)(1 + t\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}) \frac{2R^2}{(R^2 - t^2)^2} \right] \\ &\leq (w^{-1}a(R)\|v\|^2) \left[ 2(1 + R\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})R^2 \frac{\phi(t^2/2)}{(R^2 - t^2)^2} \right] \\ &\leq (w^{-1}a(R)\|v\|^2) \left[ 2(1 + R\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})R^2 \cdot 4e^{-1}/R^4 \right] \\ &\leq (w^{-1}a(R)\|v\|^2) \left[ 4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}/R + 4/R^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$



Of course  $\|\text{Hess}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x)\| = 0$  for  $x \notin B(p, R)$ . So for all  $x$ , we have

$$\|\text{Hess}\tilde{h}_{x_k,p}(x)\| \leq w^{-1}a(R)(4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}/R + 55/R^2) = \frac{1}{4w}.$$

We have proven the second part of property **BF3**.

## E.2 Bump functions for function-value queries

In this section, we construct a family of bump functions parametrized by both function value and gradient, as explained in Section 3.4. To do this, we first prove Lemma E.2. Then we prove Lemma D.2.

**Lemma E.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold with sectional curvatures bounded below by  $K_{\text{lo}} < 0$ . Let  $R_{\text{ball}} > 0, w > 0, x_k \in \mathcal{M}$ . Define  $a: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as in equation (29). There is a family of bump functions*

$$\{\hat{h}_f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{f \in [-w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}), w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})]},$$

satisfying for each  $f \in [-w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}), w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})]$ :

- $\hat{h}_f(x_k) = f$ ;
- $\text{grad}\hat{h}_f(x_k) = 0$ ;
- the support of each  $\hat{h}_f$  is contained in  $B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}})$ ;
- $\|\hat{h}_f(x)\| \leq w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})$ ,  $\|\text{grad}\hat{h}_f(x)\| \leq \frac{w^{-1}}{4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}$ ,  $\|\text{Hess}\hat{h}_f(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{4w}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

*Proof.* We use the notation established in Section E.1. For  $f \in [-w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}), w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})]$ , define the smooth functions  $\hat{h}_f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:

$$\hat{h}_{cw^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})}(x) = cw^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})\phi_{R_{\text{ball}}}(\text{dist}(x, x_k)^2/2), \quad \forall c \in [-1, 1], \forall x \in \mathcal{M}.$$

For each  $f \in [-w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}), w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})]$ , we know:

- $\hat{h}_f$  is supported in  $B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}})$ ;
- $\hat{h}_f(x_k) = cw^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}) = f$ ;
- $\text{grad}\hat{h}_f(x_k) = 0$ , since  $x \mapsto \text{dist}(x, x_k)^2/2$  has zero gradient at  $x = x_k$ ;
- using the calculations from Section E.1.2 and  $|c| \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{grad}\hat{h}_f(x)\| &= |c| w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}) |\phi'_{R_{\text{ball}}}(\text{dist}(x, x_k)^2/2)| \cdot \|\exp_x^{-1}(x_k)\| \\ &\leq |c| w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}) \max_{t \in [0, R_{\text{ball}}]} |\phi'_{R_{\text{ball}}}(t^2/2)| \cdot t \leq w^{-1} \frac{1}{4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}; \end{aligned}$$

- using the calculations from Section E.1.3 and  $|c| \leq 1$ ,

$$\left\| \text{Hess} \hat{h}_f(x) \right\| \leq |c| w^{-1} a(R_{\text{ball}}) (4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}/R_{\text{ball}} + 55/R_{\text{ball}}^2) \leq \frac{1}{4w}.$$

□

We now use Lemmas 3.8 and E.2 to prove Lemma D.2.

*Proof of Lemma D.2.* For all

$$\hat{f} \in [-w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}), w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})], \quad g \in B_{x_k}(0, w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}})),$$

Lemmas 3.8 (property BF4) and E.2 imply  $(\hat{h}_f + h_g)(x_k) = \hat{f} + \frac{3}{8} \|g\| g_{\text{norm}}^{-1}(w \|g\|)$  and  $\text{grad}(\hat{h}_f + h_g)(x_k) = 0 + g = g$ .

We know that  $\|g\| \in [0, w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}})]$ . Additionally,  $g_{\text{norm}}(0) = 0$  and  $g_{\text{norm}}$  is strictly increasing. Therefore (introducing the change of variables  $g_{\text{norm}}(t) = w \|g\|$ )

$$\min_{t \in [0, R_{\text{ball}}]} \frac{3}{8} w^{-1} g_{\text{norm}}(t) \cdot t \leq \frac{3}{8} \|g\| g_{\text{norm}}^{-1}(w \|g\|) \leq \max_{t \in [0, R_{\text{ball}}]} \frac{3}{8} w^{-1} g_{\text{norm}}(t) \cdot t.$$

Using that  $t \mapsto g_{\text{norm}}(t)$  is increasing,

$$0 \leq \frac{3}{8} \|g\| g_{\text{norm}}^{-1}(w \|g\|) \leq \frac{3}{8} w^{-1} R_{\text{ball}} g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}).$$

Therefore, for any

$$f \in [-w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}}) + \frac{3}{8} w^{-1} R_{\text{ball}} g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}), w^{-1}a(R_{\text{ball}})]$$

and for any  $g \in B_{x_k}(0, w^{-1}g_{\text{norm}}(R_{\text{ball}}))$ , we can define

$$h_{f,g} = \hat{h}_{f - \frac{3}{8} \|g\| g_{\text{norm}}^{-1}(w \|g\|)} + h_g.$$

By construction, we have  $h_{f,g}(x_k) = f$  and  $\text{grad} h_{f,g}(x_k) = g$ . Moreover, Lemmas 3.8 and E.2 imply

- the support of each  $h_{f,g}$  is contained in  $B(x_k, R_{\text{ball}})$ ;
- $\|\text{grad} h_{f,g}(x)\| \leq w^{-1} \frac{1}{4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} + w^{-1} \frac{1}{4\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \leq w^{-1} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ;
- $\|\text{Hess} h_{f,g}(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{4w} + \frac{1}{4w} \leq \frac{1}{2w}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

□

## F Technical details for the ball-packing property

### F.1 Geodesics diverge: Proof of Lemma 2.4

Proposition 2.3 implies

$$\cosh(\text{dist}(z_1, z_2)\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}) \geq \cosh(s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})^2 - \sinh(s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})^2 \cos(\theta). \quad (31)$$

Note that  $e^{1-\frac{2}{3}t} \geq \sqrt{3\left(1 - \frac{\cosh(t)^2 - \cosh(2t/3)}{\sinh(t)^2}\right)}$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Therefore,

$$\theta = e^{1-\frac{2}{3}s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}} \geq \sqrt{3\left(1 - \frac{\cosh(s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})^2 - \cosh(2s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}/3)}{\sinh(s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})^2}\right)}$$

which implies

$$\frac{\cosh(s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})^2 - \cosh(2s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}/3)}{\sinh(s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})^2} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{3}\theta^2 \geq \cos(\theta). \quad (32)$$

Rearranging inequality (32) and applying inequality (31),

$$\cosh(2s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}/3) \leq \cosh(s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})^2 - \sinh(s\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})^2 \cos(\theta) \leq \cosh(\text{dist}(z_1, z_2)\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}).$$

We conclude  $\text{dist}(z_1, z_2) \geq \frac{2}{3}s$ .

### F.2 Placing well-separated points on the unit sphere

To prove Lemma 2.12, we used the following lemma about placing well-separated points on the unit sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\| = 1\}$ . For  $x, y \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ ,  $\text{dist}_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(x, y)$  equals the angle between the vectors  $x$  and  $y$ :  $\text{dist}_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(x, y) = \arccos(x^\top y)$ .

Below, we use  $\text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$  to denote the volume of the ‘‘surface’’ of the sphere (with the usual metric). Note that  $\text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$  does *not* denote the volume of the unit Euclidean ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Remember that the volume of a (measurable) set on a Riemannian manifold is determined by the Riemannian metric.

**Lemma F.1.** *For any  $d \geq 2$  and  $\theta \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ , there are  $N \geq \frac{1}{\theta^{d-1}}$  vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_N$  on the  $d - 1$ -dimensional unit sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  satisfying  $\text{dist}_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(v_i, v_j) \geq \theta \quad \forall i \neq j$ .*

*Proof.* The sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  is a metric space. The packing number on any metric space is lower bounded by the covering number (Vershynin, 2018, Lem. 4.2.8). More precisely (Vershynin, 2018, Lem. 4.2.8) implies there exist  $N$  distinct vectors  $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N\}$  with  $v_j \in \mathbb{S}^d$  such that

1.  $\text{dist}_{\mathbb{S}^d}(v_i, v_j) \geq \theta$  for all  $i \neq j$ ;

2. and moreover the geodesic balls on the sphere (spherical caps) of radius  $\theta$  centered at  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  cover  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ , i.e.,  $\bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} B_v^{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(\theta) \supseteq \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ .

(The set  $\mathcal{V}$  is said to be a maximally  $\theta$ -separated net.) Therefore, the sum of the volumes of the balls  $\{B_v^{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(\theta)\}_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$  must at least be the volume of the unit sphere, i.e.,

$$N \cdot \text{Vol}\left(B^{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(\theta)\right) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \text{Vol}\left(B_v^{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(\theta)\right) \geq \text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) = \frac{2\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})}.$$

The last equality is the standard formula for the surface area of a sphere in Euclidean space. The volume of a geodesic ball of radius  $\theta$  on  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  is

$$\text{Vol}\left(B^{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(\theta)\right) = \text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-2}) \int_0^\theta \sin^{d-2}(\eta) d\eta = \frac{2\pi^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})} \int_0^\theta \sin^{d-2}(\eta) d\eta,$$

see (Lee, 2018, Cor. 10.17) or (Gual-Aenau and Naveira, 1999, p. 314). Using that  $\theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$  and  $\sin(\eta) \leq \eta$  for all  $\eta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ ,  $\text{Vol}\left(B^{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(\theta)\right) \leq \frac{2\pi^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})} \frac{1}{d-1} \theta^{d-1}$ . Therefore,

$$N \geq \pi^{1/2} \frac{(d-1)\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})} \frac{1}{\theta^{d-1}} \geq \pi^{1/2} \frac{(d-1)\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})} \frac{1}{\theta^{d-1}} \geq \frac{1}{\theta^{d-1}}.$$

□

## G Geometry influences the objective function

### G.1 Proof of Proposition 2.10

The proof is very similar to the proof of Hamilton and Moitra (2021). The main difference is we have to be a little careful because the manifold no longer necessarily has the same symmetries as a hyperbolic space. Denote  $\partial B(x_{\text{ref}}, r) = \{x \in \mathcal{M} : \text{dist}(x, x_{\text{ref}}) = r\}$ .

Let  $c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}$ . Let  $x \in \arg \min_{y \in \partial B(x_{\text{ref}}, r-c)} f(y)$ . Geodesic convexity of  $f$  implies

$$\frac{r-c}{r} f(y) + \frac{c}{r} f(x_{\text{ref}}) \geq f\left(\exp_{x_{\text{ref}}}\left(\frac{r-c}{r} \exp_{x_{\text{ref}}}^{-1}(y)\right)\right) \geq f(x) \quad \forall y \in \partial B(x_{\text{ref}}, r).$$

Therefore,

$$f(y) - f(x_{\text{ref}}) \geq \frac{r}{r-c} (f(x) - f(x_{\text{ref}})) \quad \forall y \in \partial B(x_{\text{ref}}, r). \quad (33)$$

On the other hand,  $\mu$ -strong g-convexity of  $f$  implies

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) - f(x_{\text{ref}}) &\geq \langle \text{grad} f(x_{\text{ref}}), \exp_{x_{\text{ref}}}^{-1}(x) \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} (r-c)^2 \\ &\geq -\|\text{grad} f(x_{\text{ref}})\| (r-c) + \frac{\mu}{2} (r-c)^2 \geq \frac{\mu}{4} (r-c)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

provided  $r - c \geq \frac{4}{\mu} \|\text{grad}f(x_{\text{ref}})\|$ .

Consider any geodesic  $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  with  $\gamma(0) = x$ ,  $\|\gamma'(0)\| = 1$  and  $\langle \gamma'(0), \exp_{x_{\text{ref}}}^{-1}(x) \rangle = 0$ . We claim that  $\gamma(\mathbb{R})$  intersects  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$  in at least two distinct points  $y_+, y_- \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ . Indeed, by Proposition 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\gamma(t), x_{\text{ref}})^2 &\geq \text{dist}(\gamma(t), x)^2 + (r - c)^2 - 2 \langle \exp_x^{-1}(\gamma(t)), \exp_x^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) \rangle \\ &= \text{dist}(\gamma(t), x)^2 + (r - c)^2 = t^2 + (r - c)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $t$  so that  $t^2 + (r - c)^2 > r$ , continuity of  $\gamma$  implies that we must have  $\gamma(t_+), \gamma(t_-) \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$  for some  $t_+ > 0$  and  $t_- < 0$ . Let  $y_+ = \gamma(t_+)$  and  $y_- = \gamma(t_-)$ . It is clear that  $y_+ \neq y_-$  as geodesics do not form closed loops in Hadamard manifolds (Lee, 2018, Prop. 12.9). Finally, observe that

$$\exp_x^{-1}(y_+) = t_+ \gamma'(0), \quad \text{and} \quad \exp_x^{-1}(y_-) = t_- \gamma'(0). \quad (35)$$

By  $L$ -smoothness of  $f$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f(y_+) &\leq f(x) + \langle \text{grad}f(x), \exp_x^{-1}(y_+) \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \text{dist}(x, y_+)^2, \\ f(y_-) &\leq f(x) + \langle \text{grad}f(x), \exp_x^{-1}(y_-) \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \text{dist}(x, y_-)^2 \end{aligned}$$

which summed yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{-t_-}{t_+ - t_-} f(y_+) + \frac{t_+}{t_+ - t_-} f(y_-) &\leq f(x) + \frac{L}{2} \left( \frac{-t_-}{t_+ - t_-} \text{dist}(x, y_+)^2 + \frac{t_+}{t_+ - t_-} \text{dist}(x, y_-)^2 \right) \\ &\leq f(x) + \frac{L}{2} \left( \text{dist}(x, y_+)^2 + \text{dist}(x, y_-)^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used equation (35) to cancel the terms  $\langle \text{grad}f(x), \exp_x^{-1}(y_{\pm}) \rangle$ . Using inequality (33),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{r}{r - c} (f(x) - f(x_{\text{ref}})) &\leq \frac{-t_-}{t_+ - t_-} (f(y_+) - f(x_{\text{ref}})) + \frac{t_+}{t_+ - t_-} (f(y_-) - f(x_{\text{ref}})) \\ &\leq f(x) - f(x_{\text{ref}}) + \frac{L}{2} \left( \text{dist}(x, y_+)^2 + \text{dist}(x, y_-)^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which rearranging and applying inequality (34) becomes

$$\frac{\mu}{4} c (r - c) = \frac{c}{r - c} \cdot \frac{\mu}{4} (r - c)^2 \leq \frac{c}{r - c} (f(x) - f(x_{\text{ref}})) \leq \frac{L}{2} \left( \text{dist}(x, y_+)^2 + \text{dist}(x, y_-)^2 \right)$$

provided  $r - c \geq \frac{4}{\mu} \|\text{grad}f(x_{\text{ref}})\|$ .

For the last step we shall upper bound  $\text{dist}(y_+, x)^2$  and  $\text{dist}(y_-, x)^2$ . Let us focus on  $\text{dist}(y_+, x)^2$  since the exact same reasoning applies to  $\text{dist}(y_-, x)^2$ . Consider the

geodesic triangle  $x_{\text{ref}}xy_+$ . Again, note that the angle at  $x$  is  $\frac{\pi}{2}$ . So by Proposition 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}) &= \cosh(\text{dist}(x_{\text{ref}}, y_+)\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}) \\ &\geq \cosh(\text{dist}(x, y_+)\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}) \cosh(\text{dist}(x_{\text{ref}}, x)\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}) \\ &= \cosh(\text{dist}(x, y_+)\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}) \cosh((r-c)\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}). \end{aligned}$$

Using that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $q \geq 0$

$$e^q \cosh(t-q) = \frac{1}{2}(e^{2q-t} + e^t) \geq \frac{1}{2}(e^{-t} + e^t) = \cosh(t),$$

we get

$$\cosh(\text{dist}(x, y_+)\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}) \leq \frac{\cosh(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})}{\cosh((r-c)\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})} \leq e^{c\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}} = e$$

i.e.,  $\text{dist}(x, y_+) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}} \text{arccosh}(e)$ .

We conclude that if  $r-c \geq \frac{4}{\mu} \|\text{grad}f(x_{\text{ref}})\|$ , then

$$\frac{\mu}{4}c(r-c) \leq \frac{L}{-K_{\text{up}}} \text{arccosh}(e)^2.$$

Rearranging,

$$\frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}(r - \frac{1}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})}}{8} \leq \frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}(r - \frac{1}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}})}}{4 \text{arccosh}(e)^2} \leq \frac{L}{\mu},$$

provided  $r - \frac{1}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}} \geq \frac{4}{\mu} \|\text{grad}f(x_{\text{ref}})\|$ .

## G.2 Proof of Proposition 2.11

We can define the Riemannian third derivative  $\nabla^3 f$  (a tensor of order three), see (Boumal, 2020, Ch. 10) for details. We write  $\|\nabla^3 f(x)\| \leq \rho$  to mean  $|\nabla^3 f(x)(u, v, w)| \leq \rho$  for all unit vectors  $u, v, w \in T_x \mathcal{M}$ . Hessian Lipschitzness of  $f$  implies  $\|\nabla^3 f(x)\| \leq \rho$ .

On the other hand, we have the following observation made in passing in (Criscitiello and Boumal, 2020, Remark 3.2), and for which we provide a proof here.

**Lemma G.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Riemannian manifold whose sectional curvatures are all larger than or equal to  $K > 0$  in absolute value. If  $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is three times differentiable in  $\mathcal{M}$ , then  $K \|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq 2 \|\nabla^3 f(x)\|$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .*

*Proof.* We can assume  $\text{grad}f(x) \neq 0$ , otherwise the claim is clear. Applying the Ricci identity (Lee, 2018, Thm 7.14) to  $\text{grad}f$  yields:

$$\nabla^3 f(x)(u, w, v) - \nabla^3 f(x)(u, v, w) = \text{Rm}(w, v, u, \text{grad}f(x)) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{M}, \forall u, v, w \in T_x \mathcal{M},$$

where  $\text{Rm}$  is the Riemannian curvature 4-tensor (Lee, 2018, Ch. 7, p. 198). Hence, letting  $v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$  be a unit vector orthogonal to  $\text{grad}f(x)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \|\nabla^3 f(x)\| \|\text{grad}f(x)\| &\geq |\nabla^3 f(x)(v, \text{grad}f(x), v) - \nabla^3 f(x)(v, v, \text{grad}f(x))| \\ &= |\text{Rm}(\text{grad}f(x), v, v, \text{grad}f(x))| \geq K \|\text{grad}f(x)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by  $\|\text{grad}f(x)\|$ , the claim follows.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Proposition 2.11. Let  $x^*$  be the unique minimizer of  $f$ . We know  $f$  satisfies a PL-inequality (36) since  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex (see Appendix I.2 below). Therefore Lemma G.1 implies

$$[2\|\nabla^3 f(x)\|]^2 \geq K_{\text{up}}^2 \|\text{grad}f(x)\|^2 \geq 2K_{\text{up}}^2 \mu(f(x) - f(x^*)) \geq K_{\text{up}}^2 \mu^2 \text{dist}(x, x^*)^2.$$

Hence,

$$\rho \geq \|\nabla^3 f(x)\| \geq \frac{\mu |K_{\text{up}}|}{2} \text{dist}(x, x^*) \quad \forall x \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, r).$$

There must exist  $y \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$  such that  $\text{dist}(y, x^*) \geq r$ . Taking  $x = y$  yields  $\rho \geq r \frac{\mu |K_{\text{up}}|}{2}$ .

## H Positive definite matrices

**Lemma H.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a Hadamard manifold of dimension  $d$  which contains a totally geodesic submanifold  $\mathcal{N}$  of dimension  $d_1$ . Assume that all the sectional curvatures of the submanifold  $\mathcal{N}$  are upper bounded by  $K_{\text{up}}$ , with  $K_{\text{up}} < 0$ . Then,  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies the ball-packing property for  $\tilde{r} = \frac{4}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}$ ,  $\tilde{c} = \frac{d_1 \sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{8}$  and any  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{N}$ . If in addition  $\mathcal{M}$  is a homogeneous manifold, then  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies the strong ball-packing property with the same constants  $\tilde{r}$  and  $\tilde{c}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{N}$ . By Lemma 2.12, there are at least  $e^{\frac{d_1 \sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{8} r}$  points in  $B_{\mathcal{M}}(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$  which are pairwise separated by a distance of  $\frac{r}{2}$ , provided  $r \geq \tilde{r}$ . Note that here we have used that distance on  $\mathcal{N}$  is equal to distance on  $\mathcal{M}$  because  $\mathcal{N}$  is totally geodesic.

If  $\mathcal{M}$  is homogenous, then by definition for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$  there is an isometry  $\phi: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\phi(x) = y$ . In particular, this implies that every  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  is an element of a totally geodesic submanifold isometric to  $\mathcal{N}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma H.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}_1$  be a  $d_1$ -dimensional Hadamard manifold whose sectional curvatures are upper bounded by  $K_{\text{up}}$  everywhere, with  $K_{\text{up}} < 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}_2$  be a Hadamard manifold. Then  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$  satisfies the strong ball-packing property for  $\tilde{r} = \frac{4}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}$ ,  $\tilde{c} = \frac{d_1 \sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{8}$  and  $x_{\text{ref}}$  any point in  $\mathcal{M}$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from Lemma H.1 by noting that for every  $x_2 \in \mathcal{M}_2$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_1 \times \{x_2\}$  is a totally geodesic submanifold, so we can apply the same logic from Lemma H.1.  $\square$

Recall the Hadamard manifolds  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  and  $\mathcal{P}_n$  from Section 2.3. We know  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  is a symmetric space and Hadamard manifold (Dolcetti and Pertici, 2018, Prop. 3.1) whose sectional curvatures are between  $-\frac{1}{2}$  and 0 (Criscitiello and Boumal, 2020, Prop. I.1). Since it is symmetric,  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  is also a homogeneous manifold (Lee, 2018, prob. 6-19).

It is well-known that  $\mathcal{SLP}_2$  is isomorphic to the hyperbolic plane of curvature  $-\frac{1}{2}$  (Chossat and Faugeras, 2009; Dolcetti and Pertici, 2018), and thus satisfies the strong ball property by Lemma H.2. For  $n \geq 3$ , Bridson and Haefliger (1999, Ch. II.10) show that  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  contains a totally geodesic submanifold containing the identity matrix  $I$  which is isomorphic to an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional hyperbolic space for some  $K < 0$ . We show that  $K = -\frac{1}{8}$ , see Lemma H.3. Therefore applying Lemmas H.2 and H.1,  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  satisfies the strong ball-packing property with:

- $\tilde{r} = \frac{4}{\sqrt{1/2}} = 4\sqrt{2}, \tilde{c} = 2\frac{\sqrt{1/2}}{8} = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}$  if  $n = 2$ ;
- $\tilde{r} = \frac{4}{\sqrt{1/8}} = 8\sqrt{2}, \tilde{c} = \frac{(n-1)\sqrt{1/8}}{8} = \frac{n-1}{16\sqrt{2}}$  if  $n \geq 3$ .

This proves Lemma 2.14.

**Lemma H.3.** *For  $n \geq 3$ ,  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  contains a totally geodesic submanifold containing  $I$  which is isomorphic to the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional hyperbolic space of curvature  $-\frac{1}{8}$ .*

*Proof.* See appendix H.1. □

## H.1 Proof of Lemma H.3

Theorem 10.58 and Remark 10.60(4) of (Bridson and Haefliger, 1999) state that

$$\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{P}_n \cap O(n-1, 1)$$

is a totally geodesic submanifold of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  which is isometric to a  $(n-1)$ -dimensional hyperbolic space of some constant sectional curvature  $K < 0$ . Here,

$$O(n-1, 1) = \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : A^\top J A = J\}$$

is an indefinite orthogonal group (symmetries of the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional hyperboloid model in Minkowski space), where  $J = \text{diag}(1, 1, \dots, 1, -1)$  (Bridson and Haefliger, 1999, Ex. 10.20(4)).

Note that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{SLP}_n \cap O(n-1, 1)$  since  $A^\top J A = J \implies \det(A)^2 = 1$ , and any positive definite matrix has positive determinant. Therefore,  $\mathcal{N}$  is also a totally geodesic submanifold of  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$ .

We have  $\text{T}_I O(n-1, 1) = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : X^\top J = -JX\}$ . Therefore,

$$\text{T}_I \mathcal{N} = \text{Sym}_0(n) \cap \text{T}_I O(n-1, 1) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0_{(n-1) \times (n-1)} & s \\ s^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} : s \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \right\}$$



where  $\text{Sym}_0(n)$  is the set of  $n \times n$  real symmetric matrices with vanishing trace.

Let  $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  with  $\|s_1\|^2 = \|s_2\|^2 = 1/2$ ,  $s_1^\top s_2 = 0$ . Let

$$X_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{(n-1) \times (n-1)} & s_1 \\ s_1^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad X_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{(n-1) \times (n-1)} & s_2 \\ s_2^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore  $\langle X_1, X_2 \rangle = 0$ ,  $\|X_1\|^2 = \|X_2\|^2 = 1$ , and

$$[X_1, X_2] = \begin{pmatrix} s_1 s_2^\top - s_2 s_1^\top & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Proposition 2.3 of (Dolcetti and Pertici, 2018), the curvature tensor of  $\mathcal{SLP}_d$  is

$$\text{Rm}(W, X, Y, Z)(P) = -\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}([P^{-1}W, P^{-1}X][P^{-1}Y, P^{-1}Z]), \quad \text{for } W, X, Y, Z \in \text{Sym}_0(n)$$

where  $[X, Y] = XY - YX$  is the matrix commutator of  $X, Y$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \text{Rm}(X_1, X_2, X_2, X_1)(I) = -\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}([X_1, X_2][X_2, X_1]) = \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}([X_1, X_2]^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}((s_1 s_2^\top - s_2 s_1^\top)^2) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(-s_1 s_1^\top - s_2 s_2^\top) = -\frac{1}{8}. \end{aligned}$$

## H.2 For positive definite matrices, $\tilde{c} \leq O(n^{3/2})$

Dolcetti and Pertici (2018) show that  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  is an Einstein manifold with constant Ricci curvature  $-\frac{n}{4}$ . Therefore, by the Bishop-Gromov volume comparison theorem (Lee, 2018, Thm. 11.19), the volume of a geodesic ball of radius  $r$  in  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  is at most the volume of a geodesic ball in a  $\dim(\mathcal{SLP}_n)$ -dimensional hyperbolic space of sectional curvature  $-\frac{n}{4(\dim(\mathcal{SLP}_n)-1)}$ . Hence, the volume of a geodesic ball of radius  $r$  in  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  is at most

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\left(\Theta\left(\dim(\mathcal{SLP}_n)r\sqrt{\frac{n}{4(\dim(\mathcal{SLP}_n)-1)}}\right)\right) &= \exp(\Theta(r\sqrt{n}\sqrt{\dim(\mathcal{SLP}_n)})) \\ &= \exp(\Theta(rn^{3/2})). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for  $r$  sufficiently large, the volume of a geodesic ball of radius  $\frac{r}{4}$  in  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  is at least 1. So the number of disjoint balls of radius  $\frac{r}{4}$  we can pack into a ball of radius  $r$  in  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$  is at most  $\exp(\Theta(rn^{3/2}))$ , which implies  $\tilde{c} \leq \Theta(n^{3/2})$ .

The papers (Maire and Page, 2020) and (Gual-Aenau and Naveira, 1999) provide formulas which can be used to compute the volume of a geodesic ball of  $\mathcal{SLP}_n$ . However, we were unable to use these formulas to get a tighter bound for  $\tilde{c}$  than provided in Lemma 2.14 or to prove that  $\tilde{c}$  cannot be improved.

# I Comparison to Riemannian gradient descent

## I.1 Proof of Proposition 1.7

Zhang and Sra (2016) prove

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq (1 - \delta)^{k-2} \frac{1}{2} L(2r)^2 = 2(1 - \delta)^{k-2} Lr^2 \quad \forall k \geq 2$$

where  $\delta^{-1} = \max\{\frac{L}{\mu}, \frac{r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}{\tanh(r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})}\}$ . Note that by  $\mu$ -strong  $g$ -convexity,  $\frac{\mu}{2} \text{dist}(x_k, x^*)^2 \leq f(x_k) - f(x^*)$ .

First, assume  $r\sqrt{-K} < 8$ . Then,  $\frac{r\sqrt{-K}}{\tanh(r\sqrt{-K})} \leq 1 + r\sqrt{-K} \leq 9 \leq 9\frac{L}{\mu}$ . Hence,  $\delta^{-1} \leq 9\frac{L}{\mu} \leq 100\frac{L}{\mu}$ .

Second, assume  $r\sqrt{-K} \geq 8$ . This implies  $\frac{r}{4}\sqrt{-K} - 1 \geq \frac{r}{8}\sqrt{-K}$ . Proposition 2.10 applied to the ball  $B = B(x^*, \frac{1}{4}r)$  implies that the condition number of  $f$  in  $B$  is at least  $\frac{1}{8}(\frac{r}{4}\sqrt{-K} - 1) \geq \frac{1}{8}(\frac{r}{8}\sqrt{-K}) = \frac{r}{64}\sqrt{-K}$ . On the other hand, we know  $x^* \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, \frac{3}{4}r)$  because  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\kappa, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}$ . Therefore,  $B \subset B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$ , which implies  $\frac{L}{\mu} \geq \frac{r}{64}\sqrt{-K}$ . We conclude  $\frac{r\sqrt{-K}}{\tanh(r\sqrt{-K})} \leq 1 + r\sqrt{-K} \leq 1 + 64\frac{L}{\mu} \leq 65\frac{L}{\mu} \leq 100\frac{L}{\mu}$ , and so  $\delta^{-1} \leq 100\frac{L}{\mu}$ .

## I.2 Proof of Proposition 1.8

Since  $f$  is  $\mu$ -strongly  $g$ -convex,  $f$  has a unique minimizer  $x^*$  and satisfies a PL-inequality (Zhang et al., 2018, Sec. 2):

$$\|\text{grad}f(x)\|^2 \geq 2\mu(f(x) - f^*) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (36)$$

The proof of this fact is essentially the same as in the Euclidean case.

Since  $\text{grad}f$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz and RGD is a descent method, all  $x_k$  are in  $D$  and we have sufficient decrease along the sequence:  $f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq \frac{1}{2L} \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^2$ . Therefore,

$$f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq \frac{1}{2L} \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^2 = \frac{\mu}{L} \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^2 \geq \frac{\mu}{L} (f(x_k) - f^*)$$

which rearranging becomes  $(1 - \frac{\mu}{L})(f(x_k) - f^*) \geq f(x_{k+1}) - f^*$ .

## I.3 Proof of Proposition 5.4

The function  $\tilde{f}$  is  $\sigma$ -strongly  $g$ -convex in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $[L + \sigma\zeta_{2r, K}]$ -smooth in  $B(x_{\text{ref}}, 2r)$  by Lemma 2.9. Thus, it has a unique minimizer  $\tilde{x}^* \in \mathcal{M}$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\text{dist}(\tilde{x}^*, x_{\text{ref}}) - \text{dist}(x^*, x_{\text{ref}})) &\leq \sigma \text{dist}(x^*, \tilde{x}^*) \leq \left\| \text{grad}\tilde{f}(x^*) \right\| \\ &= \left\| -\sigma \exp_{x^*}^{-1}(x_{\text{ref}}) \right\| = \sigma \text{dist}(x^*, x_{\text{ref}}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $\text{dist}(\tilde{x}^*, x_{\text{ref}}) \leq 2\text{dist}(x^*, x_{\text{ref}})$ . We know  $x^* \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, r)$  because  $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{L, r}^{x_{\text{ref}}}(\mathcal{M})$ ; therefore,  $\tilde{x}^* \in B(x_{\text{ref}}, 2r)$ .

Zhang and Sra (2016) prove

$$\tilde{f}(x_k) - \tilde{f}(\tilde{x}^*) \leq (1 - \delta)^{k-2} \frac{1}{2} (L + \sigma \zeta_{2r,K}) (4r)^2 = 8(1 - \delta)^{k-2} (2 + \epsilon \zeta_{2r,K}) \frac{1}{2} Lr^2, \quad \forall k \geq 2,$$

where  $\delta^{-1} = \max \left\{ \frac{L + \sigma \zeta_{2r,K}}{\sigma}, \zeta_{2r,K} \right\} = \frac{L}{\sigma} + \zeta_{2r,K} = \frac{2}{\epsilon} + \zeta_{2r,K}$ .

In particular, this algorithm uses at most

$$O\left(\delta^{-1} \log\left(\frac{16(2 + \epsilon \zeta_{2r,K})}{\epsilon}\right)\right) = O\left(\left(\frac{2}{\epsilon} + \zeta_{2r,K}\right) \log\left(\frac{2}{\epsilon} + \zeta_{2r,K}\right)\right)$$

queries to find a point  $x$  with  $\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}^* \leq \epsilon \cdot \frac{1}{4} Lr^2$ , where  $\tilde{f}^* = \tilde{f}(\tilde{x}^*)$ . Since

$$\tilde{f}^* \leq \tilde{f}(x^*) = f^* + \frac{\epsilon L}{4} \text{dist}(x^*, x_{\text{ref}})^2 \leq f^* + \frac{\epsilon L}{4} r^2$$

we have

$$f(x) - f^* - \frac{\epsilon L}{4} r^2 \leq f(x) - \tilde{f}^* \leq \tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}^* \leq \epsilon \cdot \frac{1}{4} Lr^2,$$

that is,  $f(x) - f^* \leq \epsilon \cdot \frac{1}{2} Lr^2$ .

## J Deriving Theorems 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 from Theorems 3.3 and 5.3

### J.1 Deriving Theorem 1.3 from Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 2.12

We use the values for  $\tilde{r}$  and  $\tilde{c}$  given by Lemma 2.12. First, we have to check that the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 imply  $r \geq \max \left\{ \tilde{r}, \frac{8}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, \frac{4(d+2)}{\tilde{c}} \right\}$ . Indeed, the bound  $\kappa \geq 1000 \sqrt{\frac{K_{\text{lo}}}{K_{\text{up}}}}$  implies  $\kappa \geq 1000$ , and so

$$\begin{aligned} r &= \frac{\kappa - 9}{12\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \geq \frac{\frac{99}{100}\kappa}{12\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \geq \frac{990}{12\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}} \geq \frac{64}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}} \\ &\geq \max \left\{ \tilde{r}, \frac{8}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, \frac{4 \cdot 8(d+2)}{d\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}} \right\} = \max \left\{ \tilde{r}, \frac{8}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, \frac{4(d+2)}{\tilde{c}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Second, we have to verify the lower bound in Theorem 1.3 follows from the lower bound for  $T$  given in Theorem 3.3. We have

$$\frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{8} \frac{\kappa}{12\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \geq \tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1} r = \frac{d\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{8(d+2)} \frac{\kappa - 9}{12\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{16} \frac{\frac{99}{100}\kappa}{12\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
T &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{16} \frac{\frac{99}{100}\kappa}{12\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\log(2 \cdot 10^6 \cdot \frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{8} \frac{\kappa}{12\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} (r\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2)} \right\rfloor \\
&\geq \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{16} \frac{\frac{99}{100}\kappa}{12\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\log(2^{-2} \cdot 10^6 \cdot \frac{\kappa}{12} (\frac{\kappa}{12})^2)} \right\rfloor \\
&\geq \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{16} \frac{\frac{99}{100}\kappa}{12\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \cdot \frac{1}{3\log(10\kappa)} \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor \sqrt{\frac{K_{\text{up}}}{K_{\text{lo}}}} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{1000\log(10\kappa)} \right\rfloor.
\end{aligned}$$

## J.2 Deriving Theorem 1.4 from Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 2.14

We use the values for  $\tilde{r}$  and  $\tilde{c}$  given by Lemma 2.14, and  $K_{\text{lo}} = -\frac{1}{2}$ . First, we have to check that the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 imply  $r \geq \max\{\tilde{r}, \frac{8}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, \frac{4(d+2)}{\tilde{c}}\}$ . Indeed, the bound  $\kappa \geq 1000n$  implies  $\kappa \geq 1000$ , and so

$$\begin{aligned}
r = \frac{\kappa - 9}{6\sqrt{2}} &\geq \frac{\frac{99}{100}\kappa}{6\sqrt{2}} \geq \frac{990n}{6\sqrt{2}} \geq \max\left\{8\sqrt{2}, \frac{8}{\sqrt{1/2}}, \frac{2(n(n+1)+2)}{\tilde{c}}\right\} \\
&\geq \max\left\{\tilde{r}, \frac{8}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, \frac{4(d+2)}{\tilde{c}}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second to last inequality, we used:

- $\frac{990n}{6\sqrt{2}} \geq \frac{2(n(n+1)+2) \cdot 16\sqrt{2}}{n-1}$  for all  $n \geq 3$ ; and
- $\frac{990n}{6\sqrt{2}} \geq 2(n(n+1)+2)4\sqrt{2}$  if  $n = 2$ .

For the last inequality, we used  $d = \dim(\mathcal{SLP}_n) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - 1$ .

Second, we have to verify the lower bound in Theorem 1.4 follows from the lower bound for  $T$  given in Theorem 3.3. We have for  $n \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{n-1}{4\sqrt{2}} \frac{2}{n(n+1)+2} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{6\sqrt{2}} &\geq \tilde{c}(d+2)^{-1}r = \frac{n-1}{c_n\sqrt{2}} \frac{2}{n(n+1)+2} \cdot \frac{\kappa-9}{6\sqrt{2}} \\
&\geq \frac{n-1}{16c_n\sqrt{2}} \frac{2}{n(n+1)+2} \cdot \frac{\frac{99}{100}\kappa}{6\sqrt{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $c_n = 1$  if  $n \geq 3$  and  $c_2 = 1/4$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
T &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{16c_n\sqrt{2}} \frac{2}{n(n+1)+2} \cdot \frac{\frac{99}{100}\kappa}{6\sqrt{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{\log(2 \cdot 10^6 \cdot \frac{n-1}{4\sqrt{2}} \frac{2}{n(n+1)+2} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{6\sqrt{2}} (\frac{\kappa}{6\sqrt{2}})^2)} \right\rfloor \\
&\geq \left\lfloor \frac{1}{16\sqrt{2}} \frac{2}{\frac{7}{3}n} \cdot \frac{\frac{99}{100}\kappa}{6\sqrt{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{\log(2 \cdot 10^6 \cdot \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} \frac{2}{7} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{6\sqrt{2}} (\frac{\kappa}{6\sqrt{2}})^2)} \right\rfloor \\
&\geq \left\lfloor \frac{1}{16\sqrt{2}} \frac{2}{\frac{7}{3}n} \cdot \frac{\frac{99}{100}\kappa}{6\sqrt{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{3\log(10\kappa)} \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{1000\log(10\kappa)} \right\rfloor.
\end{aligned}$$

For the third to last inequality, we used that  $\frac{3c_n}{7n} \leq \frac{n-1}{n(n+1)+2} \leq 3$  for all  $n \geq 2$ .

### J.3 Deriving Theorem 1.5 from Theorem 5.3 and Lemma 2.12

We use the values for  $\tilde{r}$  and  $\tilde{c}$  given by Lemma 2.12. First, we have to check that the assumptions of Theorem 1.5 imply  $2^9 \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2^{10} \tilde{r} \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, 2^{-13}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{2^{12} (d+2) \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \right\}$ .

Indeed, the bound  $\epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 \leq 2^{-25} \sqrt{\frac{K_{\text{up}}}{K_{\text{lo}}}}$  implies

$$\begin{aligned} 2^9 \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 &\leq 2^{-16} \sqrt{\frac{K_{\text{up}}}{K_{\text{lo}}}} \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{2^{12} \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, 2^{-13}, \frac{d \sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{2^{15} (d+2) \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2^{10} \tilde{r} \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}, 2^{-13}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{2^{12} (d+2) \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Second, we have to verify the lower bound in Theorem 1.5 follows from the lower bound for  $T$  given in Theorem 5.3. We have

$$\frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}{8} r \geq \tilde{c} (d+2)^{-1} r = \frac{d \sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{8(d+2)} \frac{1}{2^{19} \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \frac{1}{2^{23} \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} T &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{\frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{up}}}}{\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}} \frac{1}{2^{23} \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\log(2 \cdot 10^6 \cdot \frac{\sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}}}{8} r (r \sqrt{-K_{\text{lo}}})^2)}}{\left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{K_{\text{up}}}}{K_{\text{lo}}} \frac{1}{2^{23} \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\log(2^{-2} \cdot 10^6 \cdot (\frac{1}{2^{19} \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2})^3)} \right\rfloor} \right\rfloor \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{\frac{\sqrt{K_{\text{up}}}}{K_{\text{lo}}} \frac{1}{2^{23} \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\log(2^{-2} \cdot 10^6 \cdot (\frac{1}{2^{19} \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2})^3)}}{\left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{K_{\text{up}}}}{K_{\text{lo}}} \frac{1}{2^{23} \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\log(2^{-2} \cdot 10^6 \cdot (\frac{1}{2^{19} \epsilon})^3)} \right\rfloor} \right\rfloor \\ &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{\frac{\sqrt{K_{\text{up}}}}{K_{\text{lo}}} \frac{1}{2^{23} \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\log(2^{-2} \cdot 10^6 \cdot (\frac{1}{2^{19} \epsilon})^3)}}{\left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{K_{\text{up}}}}{K_{\text{lo}}} \frac{1}{2^{25} \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\log(\epsilon^{-1})} \right\rfloor} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

## References

P.-A. Absil, R. Mahony, and R. Sepulchre. *Optimization Algorithms on Matrix Manifolds*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2008. ISBN 978-0-691-13298-3. (Cited on pages 4 and 13.)

K. Ahn and S. Sra. From nesterov's estimate sequence to riemannian acceleration. In J. Abernethy and S. Agarwal, editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Third Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 84–118. PMLR, 09–12 Jul 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v125/ahn20a.html>. (Cited on pages 5, 10, 12, and 38.)

K. Ahn and F. Suarez. Riemannian perspective on matrix factorization. *arXiv: 2102.00937*, 2021. (Cited on page 4.)

- S. Alexander, V. Kapovitch, and A. Petrunin. Alexandrov geometry: preliminary version no. 1. *arXiv: 1903.08539*, 2019. (Cited on page 14.)
- F. Alimisis, A. Orvieto, G. Becigneul, and A. Lucchi. A continuous-time perspective for modeling acceleration in riemannian optimization. In S. Chiappa and R. Calandra, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 108 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1297–1307. PMLR, 26–28 Aug 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v108/alimisis20a.html>. (Cited on pages 12 and 16.)
- F. Alimisis, A. Orvieto, G. Becigneul, and A. Lucchi. Momentum improves optimization on riemannian manifolds. In A. Banerjee and K. Fukumizu, editors, *Proceedings of The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 130 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1351–1359. PMLR, 13–15 Apr 2021. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v130/alimisis21a.html>. (Cited on page 12.)
- Z. Allen-Zhu, A. Garg, Y. Li, R. Oliveira, and A. Wigderson. Operator scaling via geodesically convex optimization, invariant theory and polynomial identity testing. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC 2018)*, 2018. doi:[10.1145/3188745.3188942](https://doi.org/10.1145/3188745.3188942). (Cited on pages 4, 9, and 16.)
- C. Amendola, K. Kohn, P. Reichenbach, and A. Seigal. Invariant theory and scaling algorithms for maximum likelihood estimation. *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry*, 5(2):304–337, 2021. (Cited on page 3.)
- M. Bacák. *Convex analysis and optimization in Hadamard spaces*, volume 22 of *De Gruyter Series in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG, 2014. (Cited on page 13.)
- A. Beck and M. Teboulle. A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 2(1):183–202, 2009. (Cited on page 12.)
- R. Bhatia. *Positive definite matrices*. Princeton University Press, 2007. (Cited on page 9.)
- N. Boumal. An introduction to optimization on smooth manifolds. Available online, 2020. URL <http://www.nicolasboumal.net/book>. (Cited on pages 4, 13, 15, 30, and 62.)
- M. R. Bridson and A. Haefliger. *Metric Spaces of Non-Positive Curvature*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1999. doi:[10.1007/978-3-662-12494-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-12494-9). (Cited on pages 18 and 64.)
- D. Burago, Y. Burago, and S. Ivanov. *A course in metric geometry*. Graduate studies in mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence (R.I.), 2001. ISBN 0-8218-2129-6. (Cited on page 14.)

- P. Bürgisser, C. Franks, A. Garg, R. Oliveira, M. Walter, and A. Wigderson. Towards a theory of non-commutative optimization: Geodesic 1st and 2nd order methods for moment maps and polytopes. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 845–861, 2019. doi:[10.1109/FOCS.2019.00055](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2019.00055). (Cited on pages [4](#) and [16](#).)
- Y. Carmon, J. Duchi, O. Hinder, and A. Sidford. Lower bounds for finding stationary points I. *Mathematical Programming*, 2019. doi:[10.1007/s10107-019-01406-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-019-01406-y). (Cited on page [30](#).)
- S. Chewi, T. Maunu, P. Rigollet, and A. Stromme. Gradient descent algorithms for Bures-Wasserstein barycenters. In J. Abernethy and S. Agarwal, editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Third Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1276–1304. PMLR, 09–12 Jul 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v125/chewi20a.html>. (Cited on page [11](#).)
- P. Chossat and O. Faugeras. Hyperbolic planforms in relation to visual edges and textures perception. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 5(12):e1000625, Dec 2009. ISSN 1553-7358. doi:[10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000625](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000625). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000625>. (Cited on page [64](#).)
- C. Criscitiello and N. Boumal. An accelerated first-order method for non-convex optimization on manifolds. *arXiv 2008.02252*, 2020. (Cited on pages [12](#), [19](#), [36](#), [37](#), [62](#), and [64](#).)
- A. Dolcetti and D. Pertici. Differential properties of spaces of symmetric real matrices. *arXiv: 1807.01113*, 2018. (Cited on pages [9](#), [64](#), and [65](#).)
- R.-A. Dragomir, A. Taylor, A. D’Aspremont, J. Bolte, and A. d’Aspremont. Optimal Complexity and Certification of Bregman First-Order Methods. *Mathematical Programming*, Apr. 2021. doi:[10.1007/s10107-021-01618-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-021-01618-1). URL <https://hal.inria.fr/hal-02384167>. (Cited on page [13](#).)
- V. Duruisseaux and M. Leok. A variational formulation of accelerated optimization on riemannian manifolds. *arXiv: 2101.06552*, 2021. (Cited on page [12](#).)
- G. Franca, A. Barp, M. Girolami, and M. I. Jordan. Optimization on manifolds: A symplectic approach. *arXiv: 2107.11231*, 2021a. (Cited on page [12](#).)
- G. Franca, M. I. Jordan, and R. Vidal. On dissipative symplectic integration with applications to gradient-based optimization. *arXiv: 2004.06840*, 2021b. (Cited on page [12](#).)
- C. Franks and P. Reichenbach. Barriers for recent methods in geodesic optimization. In *Proceedings of the 36th Computational Complexity Conference (CCC 2021)*, pages 13:1–13:54, 2021. (Cited on pages [4](#), [16](#), and [18](#).)

- C. Franks, R. Oliveira, A. Ramachandran, and M. Walter. Near optimal sample complexity for matrix and tensor normal models via geodesic convexity. *arXiv: 2110.07583*, 2021. (Cited on page 4.)
- W. C. Franks and A. Moitra. Rigorous guarantees for tyler’s m-estimator via quantum expansion. In *33rd Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1–32. PMLR, 2020. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v125/franks20a/franks20a.pdf>. (Cited on page 3.)
- N. Goyal and A. Shetty. Sampling and optimization on convex sets in riemannian manifolds of non-negative curvature. In *32nd Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 99 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1–43. PMLR, 2019. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v99/goyal19a/goyal19a.pdf>. (Cited on page 4.)
- X. Gual-Aenau and A. M. Naveira. Volume of tubes in noncompact symmetric spaces. *Publ. Math. Debrecen*, 54:313–320, 1999. (Cited on pages 60 and 65.)
- L. Hamilton and A. Moitra. No-go theorem for acceleration in the hyperbolic plane. *arXiv: 2101.05657*, 2021. (Cited on pages 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 16, 39, and 60.)
- R. Hosseini and S. Sra. Matrix manifold optimization for Gaussian mixtures. In C. Cortes, N. D. Lawrence, D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28*, pages 910–918. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015. URL <http://papers.nips.cc/paper/5812-matrix-manifold-optimization-for-gaussian-mixtures.pdf>. (Cited on page 3.)
- J. Hu, X. Liu, Z.-W. Wen, and Y.-X. Yuan. A brief introduction to manifold optimization. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of China*, 8(2):199–248, Apr. 2020. doi:[10.1007/s40305-020-00295-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40305-020-00295-9). (Cited on page 4.)
- W. Huang and K. Wei. An extension of fista to riemannian optimization for sparse pca. *arXiv: 1909.05485*, 2021. (Cited on page 12.)
- J. Jin and S. Sra. A riemannian accelerated proximal extragradient framework and its implications. *arXiv: 2111.02763*, 2021. (Cited on page 12.)
- H. Karcher. Riemannian center of mass and mollifier smoothing. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 30(5):509–541, 1977. (Cited on page 3.)
- J. Lee. *Introduction to Smooth Manifolds*, volume 218 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag New York, 2nd edition, 2012. doi:[10.1007/978-1-4419-9982-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-9982-5). (Cited on pages 13, 17, 40, 45, and 54.)
- J. Lee. *Introduction to Riemannian Manifolds*, volume 176 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2018. doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-91755-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91755-9). (Cited on pages 13, 14, 18, 34, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, and 65.)



- M. Lezcano-Casado. Trivializations for gradient-based optimization on manifolds. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 9157–9168, 2019. (Cited on page 12.)
- M. Lezcano-Casado. Adaptive and momentum methods on manifolds through trivializations. *arXiv: 2010.04617*, 2020. (Cited on page 12.)
- M. Lezcano-Casado and D. Martínez-Rubio. Cheap orthogonal constraints in neural networks: A simple parametrization of the orthogonal and unitary group. In K. Chaudhuri and R. Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3794–3803. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/lezcano-casado19a.html>. (Cited on page 12.)
- Y. Liu, F. Shang, J. Cheng, H. Cheng, and L. Jiao. Accelerated first-order methods for geodesically convex optimization on Riemannian manifolds. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/file/6ef80bb237adf4b6f77d0700e1255907-Paper.pdf>. (Cited on page 12.)
- C. Maire and A. Page. Codes from unit groups of division algebras over number fields. *arXiv: 1804.07108*, 2020. (Cited on page 65.)
- D. Martínez-Rubio. Global Riemannian acceleration in hyperbolic and spherical spaces. *arXiv: 2012.03618*, 2021. (Cited on pages 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, and 36.)
- M. Moakher. A differential geometric approach to the geometric mean of symmetric positive-definite matrices. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 26(3):735–747, Mar. 2005. doi:[10.1137/S0895479803436937](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0895479803436937). (Cited on page 9.)
- M. Moakher and P. Batchelor. *Symmetric Positive-Definite Matrices: From Geometry to Applications and Visualization*, pages 285–298. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. doi:[10.1007/3-540-31272-217](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-31272-217). (Cited on page 9.)
- Y. Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87 of *Applied optimization*. Springer, 2004. ISBN 978-1-4020-7553-7. (Cited on pages 4, 6, and 38.)
- Y. E. Nesterov. A method of solving a convex programming with convergence rate  $o(1/k^2)$ . *Soviet Mathematics Doklady*, 2(27):372–376, 1983. (Cited on pages 4 and 8.)
- Y. E. Nesterov. Gradient methods for minimizing composite functions. *Math. Program.*, 140(1):125–161, 2013. doi:[10.1007/s10107-012-0629-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-012-0629-5). URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-012-0629-5>. (Cited on pages 8 and 37.)

- V. Nguyen, S. Shafieezadeh-Abadeh, M.-C. Yue, D. Kuhn, and W. Wiesemann. Calculating optimistic likelihoods using (geodesically) convex optimization. 2019. (Cited on page 3.)
- T. Rapcsák. *Smooth Nonlinear Optimization in  $\mathbb{R}^n$* , volume 19 of *Nonconvex Optimization and Its Applications*. Springer, 1997. doi:[10.1007/978-1-4615-6357-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-6357-0). (Cited on page 15.)
- J. G. Ratcliffe. *Foundations of Hyperbolic Manifolds*. Springer International Publishing, 2019. doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-31597-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31597-9). (Cited on page 14.)
- L. T. Skovgaard. A riemannian geometry of the multivariate normal model. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 11(4):211–223, 1984. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4615960>. (Cited on page 9.)
- S. Sra and R. Hosseini. Conic geometric optimization on the manifold of positive definite matrices. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(1):713–739, 2015. doi:[10.1137/140978168](https://doi.org/10.1137/140978168). (Cited on pages 3 and 9.)
- S. Sra, N. K. Vishnoi, and O. Yildiz. On geodesically convex formulations for the brascamp-lieb constant. In E. Blais, K. Jansen, J. D. P. Rolim, and D. Steurer, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques, APPROX/RANDOM 2018, August 20-22, 2018 - Princeton, NJ, USA*, volume 116 of *LIPICs*, pages 25:1–25:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018. doi:[10.4230/LIPICs.APPROX-RANDOM.2018.25](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.APPROX-RANDOM.2018.25). URL <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.APPROX-RANDOM.2018.25>. (Cited on page 4.)
- T. M. Tang and G. I. Allen. Integrated principal components analysis. *arXiv:1810.00832*, 2021. (Cited on page 3.)
- C. Udriște. *Convex functions and optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds*, volume 297 of *Mathematics and its applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994. doi:[10.1007/978-94-015-8390-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-8390-9). (Cited on page 15.)
- R. Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2018. doi:[10.1017/9781108231596](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108231596). (Cited on pages 17 and 59.)
- A. Wiesel. Geodesic convexity and covariance estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 60(12):6182–6189, 2012. doi:[10.1109/TSP.2012.2218241](https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2012.2218241). (Cited on page 3.)
- A. Wiesel and T. Zhang. Structured robust covariance estimation. *Foundations and Trends in Signal Processing*, 8(3):127–216, 2014. doi:[10.1561/20000000053](https://doi.org/10.1561/20000000053). (Cited on page 3.)
- X. Yuan, W. Huang, P. Absil, and K. A. Gallivan. Computing the matrix geomet-

- ric mean: Riemannian versus euclidean conditioning, implementation techniques, and a riemannian BFGS method. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, 27(5), 2020. doi:[10.1002/nla.2321](https://doi.org/10.1002/nla.2321). URL <https://doi.org/10.1002/nla.2321>. (Cited on page 3.)
- P. Zadeh, R. Hosseini, and S. Sra. Geometric mean metric learning. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML, pages 2464–2471. JMLR.org, 2016. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3045390.3045650>. (Cited on page 3.)
- H. Zhang and S. Sra. First-order methods for geodesically convex optimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1617–1638, 2016. (Cited on pages 4, 11, 36, and 66.)
- H. Zhang and S. Sra. An estimate sequence for geodesically convex optimization. In S. Bubeck, V. Perchet, and P. Rigollet, editors, *Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory*, volume 75 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1703–1723. PMLR, 06–09 Jul 2018. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v75/zhang18a.html>. (Cited on pages 10, 12, and 38.)
- J. Zhang, H. Zhang, and S. Sra. R-spider: A fast Riemannian stochastic optimization algorithm with curvature independent rate. *arXiv: 1811.04194*, 2018. (Cited on pages 11 and 66.)
- T. Zhang. Robust subspace recovery by geodesically convex optimization. 2012. doi:[10.1.1.759.6576](https://doi.org/10.1.1.759.6576). (Cited on page 3.)