

# Federated Empirical Risk Minimization via Second-Order Method

Song Bian\*

Zhao Song†

Junze Yin‡

## Abstract

Many convex optimization problems with important applications in machine learning are formulated as empirical risk minimization (ERM). There are several examples: linear and logistic regression, LASSO, kernel regression, quantile regression,  $p$ -norm regression, support vector machines (SVM), and mean-field variational inference. To improve data privacy, federated learning is proposed in machine learning as a framework for training deep learning models on the network edge without sharing data between participating nodes. In this work, we present an interior point method (IPM) to solve a general ERM problem under the federated learning setting. We show that the communication complexity of each iteration of our IPM is  $\tilde{O}(d^{3/2})$ , where  $d$  is the dimension (i.e., number of features) of the dataset.

---

\*BianSongHZ@gmail.com. University of Wisconsin, Madison.

†zsong@adobe.com. Adobe Research.

‡junze@bu.edu. Boston University.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Related Work</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Notations . . . . .	4
3.2	Empirical Risk Minimization . . . . .	5
3.3	Central Path Method . . . . .	5
3.4	Newton Step . . . . .	6
<b>4</b>	<b>IPM under FL</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1	Sketching Techniques . . . . .	7
4.2	Our Algorithm . . . . .	8
<b>5</b>	<b>Theoretical Analysis</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Compared to Standard Methods</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion and Discussion</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Probability Tools and Basic Properties of Random Sketching Matrices</b>	<b>14</b>
A.1	Concentration inequalities . . . . .	14
A.2	Properties obtained by random projection . . . . .	15
<b>B</b>	<b>Sketch more than once</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Bounding error of sketching</b>	<b>19</b>
C.1	Definition of $P$ , $\hat{P}$ , and $\tilde{P}$ . . . . .	20
C.2	Proof sketch . . . . .	20
C.3	Bounding $ g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h $ . . . . .	21
C.4	Tools for bounding $ g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h $ . . . . .	21
C.5	Bounding $ g^\top \tilde{P}h - g^\top \hat{P}h $ . . . . .	23
C.6	Tools for Bounding $ g^\top \tilde{P}h - g^\top \hat{P}h $ . . . . .	23
C.7	Bounding $ g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h $ . . . . .	24
<b>D</b>	<b>Main Result</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>Central Path</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>Initial Point and Termination Condition</b>	<b>28</b>

# 1 Introduction

Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM) is one of the key problems in machine learning research. ERM appears in many machine learning problems including LASSO [Tib96], logistic regression [Cox58, HJLS13], support vector machines [CV95], AdaBoost [FS97], kernel regression [Nad64, Wat64], etc. Due to its wide applications, a great number of works have considered this problem. They not only study the statistical convergence properties but also investigate how to develop efficient algorithms for ERM. Among these efficient algorithms, Interior Point Methods is one of the most widely-used optimization algorithm. IPM is first proposed by [Kar84]. After that, IPM has become an active area in optimization research. There is a long line of work using IPM to speedup optimization problems, such as linear programming [CLS19, JSWZ21, SY21], semi-definite programming [JKL<sup>+</sup>20a], and cutting plane method [JLSW20]. Recently, [LSZ19] develops a fast and robust algorithm to solve Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM).

However, users are not willing to share data with others. Therefore, Federated Learning, which is a general framework for distributed learning on sensitive data, is paid more attention to recently. Motivated by the SKETCHED-SGD [IRU<sup>+</sup>19] and FETCHSGD [RPU<sup>+</sup>20], there exists a large number of works focus on reducing the communication cost [JST<sup>+</sup>14, KMY<sup>+</sup>16, LHM<sup>+</sup>17]. In addition, some works [LSZ<sup>+</sup>20] develop optimization algorithms under federated learning. Nevertheless, all of them develop distributed SGD, which is a first-order optimization algorithm. Due to the reason that first-order algorithms for ERM always depend polynomially on the Lipschitz constant of the gradient and the running time will also have to depend on the strong convexity of the optimization function [LSZ19]. In view of this, we focus on developing distributed second-order optimization algorithms in this paper. As for the distributed second-order optimization algorithm, [GGD<sup>+</sup>21] develops a distributed second-order method, which could address the bottleneck of distributed setting. However, in order to present convergence analysis, they make several strong assumptions that are unrealistic in practice.

In this work, we mainly study the ERM under FL, we called it FERM (Federated Empirical Risk Minimization). We develop an IPM framework under FL settings to address FERM first. Then, considering the communication issue of the IPM framework under FL settings, we use sketching techniques to reduce the communication cost. In the end, we present the convergence analysis of our algorithm.

**Challenges.** We have witnessed the success of the first-order optimization algorithm under FL. Nevertheless, it is non-trivial to design an IPM under FL. Especially, we need to use the sketching technique to reduce the communication cost and provide convergence analysis for IPM under FL. In the following sections, we focus on answering the following problems:

- *How to design a distributed IPM algorithm without data sharing?*
- *How to use sketch matrices to compress the Hessian information under distributed setting?*
- *Is it possible to present convergence guarantees of IPM under FL?*

Before we show the specific algorithms and analysis, we first state our main result here:

**Theorem 1.1** (Informal Main Result, see Appendix D for details). *If the following conditions hold*

- *Consider a convex problem under the FL setting  $\min_{Ax=b, x \in \Pi_{i=1}^m K_i} c^\top x$ , where  $K_i$  is compact convex sets.*
- *For each  $i \in [m]$ , we are given a  $\nu_i$ -self concordant barrier function  $\phi_i$  for  $K_i$ .*

Then, there exists a FL algorithm (see Algorithm 1) runs in  $O(\sqrt{\nu} \log^2 m \log(\frac{\nu}{\delta}))$  iterations and each iteration sends  $O(b_{\max} n)$  bits to find a vector  $x$  up to  $\delta$  error, where  $b_{\max}$  is determined by the size of sketch matrices.

**Contributions.** Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, we first study the ERM under FL settings. And we propose an IPM under FL to solve FERM.
- We are also the first one to sketch Hessian information of the IPM algorithm under the FL setting. Previous works only either sketch the gradient information under the FL setting or Hessian information under the classical distributed computing setting.
- We show convergence guarantees of IPM under FL, which compresses the Hessian via sketching methods to reduce communication costs. Due to the reason that IPM is a second-order optimization method, it is non-trivial for us to present such convergence without making strong assumptions.

**Organization.** We present related work in Section 2. In Section 3, we present the background of this paper. And in Section 4, we formulate the problem first. Next, we give the sketching technique we used in our algorithm and the overview of our main algorithm. In Section 5, we present the theoretical analysis of our algorithm. In Section 6, we compare our algorithm with some naive models. And we conclude this paper in Section 7.

## 2 Related Work

**Distributed Optimization Methods.** Nowadays, distributed optimization methods have gained popularity. As for the distributed first-order optimization methods, a large number of works focus on developing communication-efficient distributed SGD. These work includes that distributed variants of stochastic gradient descent [ZWSL10, NRRW11, MKSB13], accelerated SGD [SS14], variance reduction SGD [LLMY17, RHS<sup>+</sup>15], dual coordinate ascent algorithms [Yan13, RT16, ZWX<sup>+</sup>17], and stochastic coordinate descent methods [FR16]. As for the distributed second-order optimization methods, DANE [SSZ14], AIDE [RKR<sup>+</sup>16], and DiSCO [ZL15] are well-known work. CoCoA [JST<sup>+</sup>14, MSJ<sup>+</sup>15, SFC<sup>+</sup>18] is similar to the second-order method, but it does not use any second-order information.

**Federated Learning.** Federated learning is a special case of distributed machine learning. Federated learning allows clients to train machine learning models without data sharing. The applications of federated learning include healthcare [LGD<sup>+</sup>20, RHL<sup>+</sup>20], financial area [YZY<sup>+</sup>19], and autonomous vehicle [LLC<sup>+</sup>19]. Although federated learning has numerous advantages, the federated learning is always limited by the communication issue. In view of this, a great number of methods [IRU<sup>+</sup>19, RPU<sup>+</sup>20] are developed to reduce communication cost in federated learning. FEDAVG [MMR<sup>+</sup>17] is the first work focus on solving communication efficiency problem in federated learning. After that, a great number of gradient compression methods [IRU<sup>+</sup>19, RPU<sup>+</sup>20] have been proposed. Communication-efficient algorithms achieve success in practice. However, it is not easy to present convergence analysis for communication-efficient algorithms. Recently, [RPU<sup>+</sup>20] presents convergence analysis for SGD under federated learning. Federated learning convergence

on one-layer neural networks is investigated in [LJZ<sup>+</sup>21]. Furthermore, [HLSY21] gives convergence guarantees of the general federated learning on neural networks. [SWYZ23] studies federated learning for convex, Lipschitz, and smooth functions. [LSY23] proposes an federated algorithm for adversarial training in deep learning. Another interesting angle of federated learning is differential privacy, a number of works [HSLA20, HSC<sup>+</sup>20, CLSZ21, CSTZ22] have studied the privacy inspired question related to federated learning. Privacy is not the major task in this paper.

**Sketching Technique.** Sketching technique has been widely applied to many applications in machine learning, such as low-rank approximation [CW13, NN13, MM13, BW14, SWZ17, ALS<sup>+</sup>18], linear regression, distributed problems [WZ16, BWZ16], reinforcement learning [WZD<sup>+</sup>20], tensor decomposition [SWZ19], sparsification of attention matrix [DMS23], discrepancy minimization [DSW22], clustering [EMZ21], online bipartite matching [SWY23, HST<sup>+</sup>22], exponential and softmax regression [LSZ23, DLS23a, LSX<sup>+</sup>23, GSY23], integral optimization [JLSZ23], submodular problem [QSW23], generative adversarial networks [XZZ18], symmetric norm estimation [DSWZ22], optimizing neural tangent kernel [BPSW21, SYZ21, SZZ21, HSWZ22, Zha22, GQSW22, ALS<sup>+</sup>22], database [QJS<sup>+</sup>22], fast attention computation [AS23], dynamic kernel computation [QRS<sup>+</sup>22, DJS<sup>+</sup>22], matrix completion [GSYZ23], matrix sensing [DLS23b, QSZ23]. Count Sketch [CCF02] is used in [IRU<sup>+</sup>19, RPU<sup>+</sup>20] to reduce the cost of communication at each iteration. Count Sketch is able to approximate every coordinate of a vector with an  $\ell_2$  guarantee. And it is also possible to recover an approximate vector from Count Sketch. In this paper, we use AMS matrices [AMS99] to compress the model updates at each iteration to reduce the communication cost of FL.

### 3 Background

In Section 3.1, we explain the notations that we use. In Section 3.2, we introduce empirical risk minimization. In Section 3.3, we explain the central path method and the properties of the self-concordant barrier function. In Section 3.4, we present the Newton method.

#### 3.1 Notations

Given a positive value  $n$ , we use  $[n]$  to denote  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . We use  $m$  to denote the number of clients. For each client  $i \in [m]$ , it contains dataset  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n_i}$ . We also assume that  $\sum_{i=1}^m n_i = n$ . Moreover, we define  $x$  as the main variable, and  $s$  as the slack variable. We use  $x_i$ ,  $s_i$ ,  $W_i$  and  $A_i$  to denote the variables that are computed in client  $c_i$ . And we use  $x_i^t$ ,  $s_i^t$ ,  $W_i^t$ , and  $A_i^t$  to denote the variables that are computed in client  $c_i$  at  $t$ -th iteration.

Next, we define two operations here. The operation  $\oplus$  denotes concatenation operation, which indicates that  $x = \oplus_{i=1}^m x_i = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m]^\top$  and  $s = \oplus_{i=1}^m s_i = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m]^\top$ . And we use  $\otimes$  to denote the following operation:  $W = \otimes_{i=1}^m W_i = \text{diag}(W_1, W_2, \dots, W_m)$ .

Given that  $f$  and  $g$  are two functions,  $f \lesssim g$  means that  $f \leq Cg$ , where  $C$  is a constant. Let  $v$  be a vector.  $\|v\|$  represents the standard Euclidean norm.  $\mathbf{E}[\cdot]$  represents the expectation and  $\Pr[\cdot]$  denotes the probability. We use  $\nabla f(x)$  to denote the gradient of  $f$ , namely  $\frac{df}{dx}$ .

For any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ,  $\|A\|_2$  represents its operator norm and  $\|A\|_F$  stands for its Frobenius norm. We also use some facts that  $\|AB\|_2 \leq \|A\|_2 \cdot \|B\|_2$ ,  $\|A\|_F \leq \sqrt{n}\|A\|_2$ . Moreover, if the matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a block diagonal matrix, then  $A$  could be expressed as  $\text{diag}(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m)$ , where  $A_1$  is a matrix whose dimensions is  $n_1 \times n_1$ ,  $A_2$  is a matrix whose dimensions is  $n_2 \times n_2$ , and  $A_m$  is a matrix whose dimensions is  $n_m \times n_m$ . In addition,  $\sum_{i=1}^m n_i = n$ . If  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a symmetric positive semi-definite (PSD) matrix, i.e.,  $A \succeq 0$  if for all vectors  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $x^\top A x \geq 0$ , and we

use  $\|v\|_A$  to denote  $(v^\top Av)^{1/2}$ . If we are given a convex function  $f$ , we use  $\|v\|_x$  to denote  $\|v\|_{\nabla^2 f(x)}$  and  $\|v\|_x^*$  to denote  $\|v\|_{\nabla^2 f(x)^{-1}}$  for simplicity.

In general, we use  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times d}$  or  $S \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times d}$  to denote sketches that are used to compress model updates. In order to distinguish different sketches, we use  $R_i \in \mathbb{R}^{b_i \times d}$  and  $S_i \in \mathbb{R}^{b_i \times d}$ .

Furthermore, in this paper, we consider the computation model to be word RAM model. In this model, each word has  $O(\log n)$  bits and all the basic computation can be done in  $O(1)$ . This is standard in the literature of algorithm design [CLRS09] and distributed algorithm [WZ16, BWZ16].

### 3.2 Empirical Risk Minimization

We give the definition of traditional Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM) as below:

**Definition 3.1** (Empirical Risk Minimization). Given a convex function  $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n_i}$ ,  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$  and  $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\forall i \in [m]$ , we call the following optimization problem as Empirical Risk Minimization problem  $\min_x \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(A_i x_i + b_i)$ .

Then, we could rewrite the original problem by defining  $y_i = A_i x_i + b_i$ ,  $z_i = f_i(A_i x_i + b_i)$ . After that, we could get the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x, y, z} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^m z_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Ax + b = y \\ & (y_i, z_i) \in K_i = \{(y_i, z_i) : f_i(y_i) \leq z_i\}, \forall i \in [m] \end{aligned}$$

In this paper, we mainly consider the following question, when the dimension of  $K_i$  could be arbitrary:  $\min_{x \in \prod_{i=1}^m K_i, Ax=b} c^\top x$ .

In the next section, we briefly introduce the solutions to address the general form under centralized setting.

### 3.3 Central Path Method

In this section, we introduce the central path method. First, we recap the problem that we analyze:

$$\min_{x \in \prod_{i=1}^m K_i, Ax=b} c^\top x \tag{1}$$

For each  $i \in [m]$ ,  $K_i$  is a convex set and  $x_i$  is the  $i$ -th block of  $x$  respect to  $K_i$ . The interior point methods (IPM) consider the following path of solutions:

$$x(t) = \arg \min_{Ax=b} c^\top x + t \sum_{i=1}^m \phi_i(x_i) \tag{2}$$

where  $\phi_i(\cdot)$  is called self-concordant barrier function. (Fig. 3 is an example of barrier function). And the path is always called central path. The IPM solves Eq. (1) by decreasing  $t \rightarrow 0$  (See Fig. 1).

The running time of the central path based algorithm is determined by the self-concordant barrier function. In view of this, we first present the definition and properties of self-concordant barrier function here.




Figure 1: Here is an example of the central path. The curve denotes the central path. The hexagon denotes the feasible region. The start point of the central path is  $x(1)$ , and the end point of the central path is  $x(0)$ . Then we follow the path  $x(t)$  to from  $x(1)$  to  $x(0)$ .

**Definition 3.2.** Given a function  $\phi$ , if any  $x \in \text{dom}\phi$  and any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the following inequality holds  $|\nabla^3\phi(x)[u, u, u]| \leq 2\|u\|_x^{3/2}$ ,  $\|\nabla\phi(x)\|_x^* \leq \sqrt{\nu}$  where  $\|v\|_x := \|v\|_{\nabla^2\phi(x)}$  and  $\|v\|_x^* := \|v\|_{\nabla^2\phi(x)^{-1}}$ , for any vector  $v$ . Then, the function  $\phi$  is called as a  $\nu$  self-concordant barrier for  $K$ , where  $K = \text{dom}\phi$ .

*Remark 3.3.* In general,  $\nu \geq 1$  for any self-concordant barrier function.

[Nes98] demonstrates that for any open convex set  $K$  contained in the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , there exists a  $O(n)$  self-concordant barrier function. We focus on a specific convex set  $K_i$  which has a dimension of  $O(1)$  in this paper. We make the assumption that a  $\nu_i$  self-concordant barrier function  $\phi_i$  is given, and we can efficiently compute its gradient  $\nabla\phi_i$  and Hessian  $\nabla^2\phi_i$  in constant time ( $O(1)$ ). An important result we rely on regarding self-concordance is the stability of the norm  $\|\cdot\|_x$  when we alter the value of  $x$ . Subsequently, we proceed to present certain properties of the self-concordant barrier function.

**Theorem 3.4** (Theorem 4.1.6 in [Nes98]). *If the following conditions hold*

- *Suppose  $\phi$  represents a self-concordant barrier function.*
- *the norm  $\|y - x\|_x$  is less than 1*

*Then, the following inequalities hold true:  $\nabla^2\phi(y) \succeq (1 - \|y - x\|_x)^2 \nabla^2\phi(x)$  and  $\nabla^2\phi(y) \preceq (1 - \|y - x\|_x)^{-2} \nabla^2\phi(x)$ .*

Now, we consider the way to go along with the path from  $x(1)$  to  $x(\epsilon)$ , where  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , in the next section.

### 3.4 Newton Step

In this section, we briefly introduce the Newton method in central path. It is a standard method, for details of the background, the readers could refer [NW06].

In order to follow the path from  $x(1)$  to  $x(\epsilon)$  and control in error that caused in the progress, we consider the following problem

$$\begin{aligned} s/t + \nabla\phi(x) &= \mu \\ Ax &= b \\ A^\top y + s &= t\mu + c \end{aligned}$$

where  $\nabla\phi(x) = (\nabla\phi_1(x_1), \phi_2(x_2), \dots, \nabla\phi_m(x_m))$  and  $\mu$  stands for the error that is caused in the progress. In order to control the error, the Newton step to move from  $\mu$  to  $\mu + h$  is given below:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_s^*/t + \nabla^2\phi(x) \cdot \delta_x^* &= h \\ A\delta_x^* &= 0 \\ A^\top\delta_y^* + \delta_s^* &= 0\end{aligned}$$

where  $\nabla^2\phi(x) = \text{diag}(\nabla^2\phi_1(x_1), \nabla^2\phi_2(x_2), \dots, \nabla^2\phi_m(x_m))$ .

Then, we define that  $W := (\nabla^2\phi(x))^{-1}$  and we define the projection matrix  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  below:

$$P := W^{1/2}A^\top(AWA^\top)^{-1}AW^{1/2} \quad (3)$$

We could get the following solutions:

$$\delta_x^* = W^{1/2}(I - P)W^{1/2}h, \quad \delta_y^* = -t \cdot (AWA^\top)^{-1}AWh, \quad \delta_s^* = t \cdot W^{-1/2}PW^{1/2}h$$

## 4 IPM under FL

In this section, we develop the interior point methods under FL. Before we introduce our algorithm, we first introduce the sketching technique used in section 4.1. Then, we give the overview of our algorithm in section 4.2.

### 4.1 Sketching Techniques

In this subsection, we give the definition of AMS matrix [AMS99] and show the statistical properties of using the AMS matrix to sketch a fixed vector. See Appendix A for rigorous proof.

**Definition 4.1** (AMS sketch matrices [AMS99]). Let  $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_b$  be  $b$  random hash functions. The hash functions are picked from a 4-wise independent hash family  $\mathcal{H} = \{h : [n] \rightarrow \{-1/\sqrt{b}, +1/\sqrt{b}\}\}$ . Then  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times n}$  is an AMS sketch matrix if we set  $R_{i,j} = h_i(j)$ .

The AMS matrix has great statistical properties to sketch a fixed vector. We provide the statement in the following lemma, which is standard in literature [LSZ19, SY21].

**Lemma 4.2** (Statistical properties for sketching a fixed vector). *If the following conditions hold*

- $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a fixed vector.
- $R$  is defined as in Definition 4.1.

*Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}[R^\top Rh] &= h, \quad \mathbf{E}[(R^\top Rh)_i^2] \leq h_i^2 + \frac{1}{b}\|h\|_2^2 \\ \Pr \left[ |(R^\top Rh)_i - h_i| > \|h\|_2 \frac{\log(n/\delta)}{\sqrt{b}} \right] &\leq \delta\end{aligned}$$

**Note.** Although AMS sketch matrix is also used in [LSZ19], there exists some difference between our paper and the previous work: Both of our work and that use AMS sketch matrix. However, the previous work uses the AMS sketch matrix outside of the projection matrix  $P$  to accelerated the whole process, where  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times n}$  is an AMS matrix and  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a projection matrix. And we add the AMS sketch matrix inside the projection matrix. The projection matrix with AMS sketch matrix in our paper is defined in Def. 4.3. There is a major issue we need to tackle: how to bound the error that is caused by adding sketching matrices outside the inverse part  $(AWA^\top)$ ?






Figure 2:  $P$  is an ideal case of the projection matrix. However, it is infeasible to construct  $P$  under FL. In view of this, we construct  $\tilde{P}$ . In order to analyze that  $P$  is close to  $\tilde{P}$ , which means that  $\|g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h\|$  could be bounded by  $g$ ,  $h$ ,  $A$ , and  $W$ . We create an artificial matrix  $\hat{P}$ . Note that  $\hat{P}$  is only used in analysis. The way how our analysis working is, we first show that  $P$  is close  $\hat{P}$ , then we show  $\hat{P}$  is close to  $\tilde{P}$ . Combining two steps together, we finally prove that  $P$  is close to  $\tilde{P}$ .

## 4.2 Our Algorithm

In view of the properties of AMS sketch matrices, we could use AMS sketch matrices to bound the error caused by the sketching techniques.

Next, we define the following notations to differentiate the projection matrices used in IPM:

**Definition 4.3** ( $\hat{P}$  and  $\tilde{P}$ ). Given four independent AMS matrices,  $R_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1 \times d}$ ,  $R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2 \times d}$ ,  $R_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_3 \times d}$ ,  $R_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_4 \times d}$ , the matrix  $\hat{P}$  and  $\tilde{P}$  are defined as below:

$$\hat{P} = W^{1/2} A^\top (R_1^\top R_1 A W A^\top R_2^\top R_2)^{-1} A W^{1/2}$$

and

$$\tilde{P} = W^{1/2} A^\top R_3^\top R_3 (R_1^\top R_1 A W A^\top R_2^\top R_2)^{-1} R_4^\top R_4 A W^{1/2}$$

We want to remark that  $\hat{P}$  is only being used for the purpose of analysis. But, we use  $\tilde{P}$  for both analysis and algorithm.

The algorithm to address ERM under FL could be divided into several steps (Fig. 4 gives an overview of the algorithm):

**Setup.** First, we give server and each client the same random seed. Then, for each client  $c_i$ , the client generates four independent sketching matrices  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$ ,  $R_3$ , and  $R_4$ .

**Local update.** For any  $i \in [m]$ , the detailed process of local update in each client  $c_i$  is shown as below:

- Each client  $c_i$  updates  $x_i^{t-1}$  and  $s_i^{t-1}$  by gradient descent  $\delta_{x_i}^{t-1}$  and  $\delta_{s_i}^{t-1}$  respectively. Then, we get that  $x_i^t = x_i^{t-1} + \delta_{x_i}^{t-1}$  and  $s_i^t = s_i^{t-1} + \delta_{s_i}^{t-1}$ .
- Each client  $c_i$  computes  $W_i^t$ .
- Each client  $c_i$  computes  $\mu_i^t(x, s) = s_i^t / t + \nabla \phi_i(x_i)$  and  $\gamma_i^t(x, s) = \|\mu_i^t(x, s)\|_{\nabla^2 \phi_i(x_i)}^{-1}$ .
- Each client  $c_i$  computes  $h_i^t = -\alpha \cdot c_i^t(x, s) \mu_i^t(x, s)$ .
- Each client  $c_i$  sends its  $(W_i^t)^{1/2} A_i^\top R_1^\top$ ,  $R_2 A_i W_i^t A_i^\top R_3^\top$ ,  $R_4 A_i (W_i^t)^{1/2}$  and  $h_i^t$  to the server.

---

**Algorithm 1** Second-Order Algorithm for Empirical Risk Minimization in Federated Learning (Theorem 1.1)

---

```

1: Both Server and Client have the random seed for sketching matrix  $R_1, R_2, R_3$ , and  $R_4$ .
2: Initial  $\delta_x^0 \leftarrow 0, \delta_s^0 \leftarrow 0, \lambda \leftarrow 2^{16} \log(m), \alpha \leftarrow 2^{-20} \lambda^{-2}, \xi \leftarrow 2^{-10} \alpha, \tilde{t} \leftarrow 1$ .
3: for  $t = 1 \rightarrow T$  do
4:   /* Client */
5:   for  $i = 1 \rightarrow N$  do
6:     /* Update local parameters for  $x$  and  $s$  */
7:      $x_i^t \leftarrow x_i^{t-1} + \delta_{x_i}^{t-1}$ .
8:      $s_i^t \leftarrow s_i^{t-1} + \delta_{s_i}^{t-1}$ .
9:      $W_i^t \leftarrow (\nabla^2 \phi_i(x_i^t))^{-1}$ .
10:    Compute  $\mu_i^t(x, s) \leftarrow s_i / \tilde{t} + \nabla \phi_i(x_i^t)$ 
11:    Compute  $\gamma_i^t(x, s) \leftarrow \|\mu_i^t(x, s)\|_{\nabla^2 \phi_i(x_i^t)}^{-1}$ 
12:    Compute  $c_i^t(x, s) \leftarrow \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(\lambda \gamma_i^t(x, s)) / \gamma_i^t(x, s)}{(\sum_{i=1}^m \exp(2\lambda \gamma_i^t(x, s)))^{1/2}} & \text{if } \gamma_i^t(x, s) \geq 96\sqrt{\alpha} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ 
13:    Compute  $h_i^t \leftarrow -\alpha \cdot c_i^t(x, s) \mu_i^t(x, s)$ 
14:    Send  $(W_i^t)^{1/2} A_i^\top R_1^\top, R_2 A_i W_i^t A_i^\top R_3^\top, R_4 A_i (W_i^t)^{1/2}$  and  $h_i^t$  to server.
15:  end for
16:  /* Server */
17:  Construct  $h^t \leftarrow \oplus_{i=1}^m h_i^t$   $\triangleright h^t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ 
18:  Construct  $\tilde{P}^t \leftarrow (W^t)^{1/2} A^\top R_1^\top R_1 (R_2^\top R_2 A W^t A^\top R_3^\top R_3)^{-1} R_4^\top R_4 A (W^t)^{1/2}$   $\triangleright \tilde{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ 
19:  Compute  $\delta_x^t \leftarrow (W^t)^{1/2} (I - \tilde{P}^t) (W^t)^{1/2} h^t$ .  $\triangleright \delta_x^t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ 
20:  Compute  $\delta_s^t \leftarrow \tilde{t} \cdot (W^t)^{-1/2} \tilde{P}^t (W^t)^{1/2} h^t$ .  $\triangleright \delta_s^t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ 
21:  Send  $\delta_x^t$  and  $\delta_s^t$  to every client.
22:   $\tilde{t} = (1 - \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{\nu}}) \tilde{t}$ .
23: end for
24: Return an approximation solution to the convex problem.

```

---

**Global update.** In each global communication round, the detailed process of global update is shown as below:

- The server constructs  $\tilde{P}$  as below

$$\tilde{P} = W^{1/2} A^\top R_1^\top R_1 (R_2^\top R_2 A W A^\top R_3^\top R_3)^{-1} R_4^\top R_4 A W^{1/2} \quad (4)$$

- The server computes  $\delta_x^t$  and  $\delta_s^t$  as below:

$$\delta_x^t = W^{1/2} (I - \tilde{P}) W^{1/2} h^t, \quad \delta_s^t = \tilde{t} \cdot W^{-1/2} \tilde{P} W^{1/2} h^t$$

- The server sends  $\delta_x^t$  and  $\delta_s^t$  to every client.

**Communication cost.** In this paper, we always assume that  $d \geq n$ . The Algorithm 1 seeds  $O(b_{\max} n)$  words at each iteration, where  $b_{\max} = \max\{b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4\}$ . Generally, we choose  $b_{\max} = O(\sqrt{n})$ . Compared with the naive algorithm mentioned in Model 3, the Algorithm 1 is more practical due to the reason that FL is always limited by the network bandwidth.

## 5 Theoretical Analysis

In our algorithm, the main problem is how to handle the matrix  $P$  that is defined as Eq. (3), which is used in our IPM where  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a block diagonal matrix and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ .

The core of Theorem 5.3 is to show the equation  $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h|$  could be bounded by  $g, h, A$ , and  $W$ . In order to prove Theorem 5.3, we divide the proof into the following steps. Given two vectors  $g, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . (In the following statement and proof, we assume that  $g = h$ ). We want to prove that

- $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h|$  could be bounded by  $g, h, A$  and  $W$ . We prove this by using Lemma C.3 with  $C = W^{1/2}A^\top$ ,  $B = (AWA^\top)^{-1}$ ,  $R = R_1$  and  $S = R_2$ .
- $|g^\top \tilde{P}h - g^\top \hat{P}h|$  could be bounded by  $g, h, A, W$ , and  $\tilde{B}$ , we prove this by using Lemma C.5 with  $C = W^{1/2}A^\top$ ,  $\tilde{B} = (R_1^\top R_1 A W A^\top R_2^\top R_2)^{-1}$ ,  $R = R_3$ , and  $S = R_4$ .
- Finally, we could use

$$|g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h| \leq |g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h| + |g^\top \hat{P}h - g^\top \tilde{P}h|$$

to obtain that  $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h|$  is bounded by  $g, h, A$  and  $W$ .

In order to achieve the above-mentioned steps, we need to use the following lemmas. The detailed proof of the following lemma is deferred to Appendix C.

**Lemma 5.1.** *If the following conditions hold*

- $\tilde{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  are two matrices.
- $R \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1 \times d}$  and  $S \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2 \times d}$  are defined as in Definition 4.1.
- $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$  are vectors.
- $b_{\min} = \{b_1, b_2\}$ .

Then, we have

$$g^\top C(R^\top R)\tilde{B}(S^\top S)C^\top h - g^\top C\tilde{B}C^\top h \lesssim K_0,$$

with probability at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$  and  $K_0$  is defined as follows:

$$K_0 := \frac{\log^{1.5} d}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} \cdot (\|g^\top C\|_2 \|\tilde{B}C^\top h\|_2 + \|g^\top C\tilde{B}\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2) + \frac{\log^3 d}{b_{\min}} \cdot \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|\tilde{B}\|_F$$

By using the above lemma, we could obtain the following result by setting  $\tilde{B} = (R_1^\top R_1 A W A^\top R_2^\top R_2)^{-1}$  and  $C = W^{1/2}A^\top$ , where both  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are independent AMS matrices.

$$|g^\top \tilde{P}h - g^\top \hat{P}h| \lesssim K_0.$$

Although the above lemma could be used to bound the error of the second step. However, it does not show that  $\tilde{B}$  could be bounded by  $A$  and  $W$ . It is non-trivial to prove it.

In order to bound the error, we first use the above lemma to obtain that

$$|x^\top R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S x - x^\top B^{-1} x| \leq \epsilon_0 \lambda_{\min}(B^{-1})$$

where  $b_{\min} = \{b_1, b_2\}$ ,  $\kappa = \lambda_{\max}(B)/\lambda_{\min}(B)$ ,  $\epsilon_0 = O(\sqrt{n} \log^3 d / b_{\min}) \kappa \in (0, 1/10)$ ,  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1 \times d}$  and  $S \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2 \times d}$  are matrices defined as in Definition 4.1 and  $B = (AWA^\top)^{-1}$ .

Then we use the following lemma to bound the error that is caused by adding sketching matrices in the inverse part.

**Lemma 5.2.** *If the following conditions hold:*

- $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is a matrix.
- $R \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1 \times d}$  and  $S \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2 \times d}$  are defined as in Definition 4.1.
- $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$  are vectors.
- $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1/10)$ .

*Then, we have*

$$(1 - 2\epsilon_0)B \preceq (R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S)^{-1} \preceq (1 + 2\epsilon_0)B$$

*with probability at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ .*

By using the above lemma, we could obtain that

$$|g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h| \leq 2\epsilon_0 \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2$$

with probability  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ , where  $C = W^{1/2}A^\top$  and  $B = (AWA^\top)^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ .

Finally, we combine the result of Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2 together to get the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.3.** *If the following conditions hold*

- Given  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  and  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ .
- Let  $R_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1 \times d}$ ,  $R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2 \times d}$ ,  $R_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_3 \times d}$  and  $R_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_4 \times d}$  be four independent AMS matrices.
- $P$  is defined as in Eq. (3).
- $\tilde{P}$  is defined as in Def. 4.3.
- Let  $g, h \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be two vectors.
- Let  $b_{\min} := \min\{b_1, b_2\}$ .

*Then, we have*

$$|g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h| \lesssim \log^6 d \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} + \frac{n}{b_{\min}^2} \right) \cdot \kappa \cdot \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2$$

*with probability at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ . Note that  $C = W^{1/2}A^\top$ ,  $B = (AWA^\top)^{-1}$ , and  $\kappa = \lambda_{\max}(B)/\lambda_{\min}(B)$ .*

Due to the reason that  $\kappa > 1$ , we could choose that  $b_{\min} = \epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{n} \kappa^2 \log^3 d$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$ . Then, we could obtain that  $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h| \leq \epsilon \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2$ .

## 6 Compared to Standard Methods

In order to show the effectiveness and efficiency of our algorithm, we discuss the following three naive models and point out the disadvantages of each model respectively.

We introduce the following three straightforward methods: Model 1 and Model 2 cannot get the right result under their respective framework. Model 3 can get the correct result, but it needs to send  $O(n^2)$  words at each iteration. Moreover, Model 3 also requires clients to share their data with the untrusted server, which is not allowed under FL setting.

**Model 1:** In the  $t$ -th step, each client does the following operations: (1) Compute  $W_i^t$  and  $h_i$ ; (2) Compute local  $P_i^t$ , where  $P_i^t = (W_i^t)^{1/2} A_i^\top (A_i W_i^t A_i^\top)^{-1} A_i (W_i^t)^{1/2}$ ; (3) By using local  $P_i^t$  and  $h_i$ , the client could compute local update  $\delta_{x,i}$  and  $\delta_{s,i}$ ; (4) Finally, client sends its local update  $\delta_{x,i}$  and  $\delta_{s,i}$  to the server.

The Server combines all gradients together. However, the main issue is that

$$\oplus_{i=1}^m [(W_i^t)^{1/2} (I - P_i^t) (W_i^t)^{1/2} h_i] \neq (W^t)^{1/2} (I - P^t) (W^t)^{1/2} h$$

and

$$\oplus_{i=1}^m [(W_i^t)^{-1/2} P_i^t (W_i^t)^{1/2} h_i] \neq (W^t)^{-1/2} P^t (W^t)^{1/2} h$$

where  $P = (W^t)^{1/2} A^\top (A W^t A^\top)^{-1} A (W^t)^{1/2}$ , and  $I$  is an identify matrix.

**Model 2:** In the  $t$ -th step, each client does the following operations: (1) Compute  $W_i^t$  and  $h_i$  locally; (2) Send  $(A_i W_i^t A_i^\top)^{-1}$  and  $h_i$  to the server. However, this method does not work well. The reason is that

$$\begin{aligned} & \otimes_{i=1}^m [(W_i^t)^{1/2} A_i^\top (A_i W_i^t A_i^\top)^{-1} A_i (W_i^t)^{1/2}] \oplus_{i=1}^m h_i \\ & \neq [(W^t)^{1/2} A^\top (A W^t A^\top)^{-1} A (W^t)^{1/2}] h \end{aligned}$$

where  $W^t = \otimes_{i=1}^m W_i^t$ ,  $A = \oplus_{i=1}^m A_i$ , and  $h = \oplus_{i=1}^m h_i$ .

**Model 3:** Each client sends data to the server at the 0-th iteration. Then, in the  $t$ -th step, each client does the following operations: (1) Compute locally  $W_i^t$  and  $h_i$ ; (2) Send  $W_i^t$  and  $h_i$  to the server.

The server computes  $P$  by the following equation:

$$P = (\otimes_{i=1}^m (W_i^t)^{1/2} A^\top) (A \otimes_{i=1}^m W_i^t A^\top)^{-1} (A \otimes_{i=1}^m (W_i^t)^{1/2})$$

Compared to the above-mentioned two models, this method could get the correct result in the end. However, it has to send  $O(n^2)$  words at each iteration. In reality, the distributed machine learning is always limited by the network bandwidth. Moreover, people usually are not willing to share their private data with the untrusted system because of data privacy. In view of this, we propose a communication-efficient distributed interior point method under FL.

## 7 Conclusion and Discussion

In a nutshell, we present the first distributed interior point method algorithm (FL-IPM) that is used to address empirical risk minimization under FL. There are differences between our algorithm and existing algorithms and the novelty of our work is shown below: (1) There exist a large number of works related to the distributed first-order optimization algorithms. However, our algorithm is

a second-order optimization problem under federated learning settings. (2) We use the sketching technique to reduce the communication cost of federated learning, which is the bottleneck of federated learning. (3) Compared with the existing distributed second-order optimization algorithms, we can provide convergence analysis for our solution without making strong assumptions.

As for future work, there are several things we need to consider, if we want to apply our algorithm in the real system: First, we need to consider the stragglers and device heterogeneity in the real system environment. We need to design robust algorithms to deal with stragglers during the training. In addition, the scalability of large networks is also very important, especially the latency and throughput of the network. Finally, the computational cost of the devices and server should be taken into consideration. We present theoretical results in this paper, and we are not aware of any negative societal impact.

# Appendix

**Roadmap.** The structure of the appendix is outlined as follows:

- Section A claims the probability tools used in this paper and shows the properties of random sketching matrix.
- Section B presents how to bound the error of adding two sketching matrices.
- Section C shows that  $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h|$  is small.
- Section D presents the primary outcome of this paper along with its corresponding proof.
- Section E shows several basic results of Algorithm 1.
- Section F states some basic results of self-concordance function.

## A Probability Tools and Basic Properties of Random Sketching Matrices

In this paper, we care less about the running time of each client in our application. The issue we want to address in this paper is the limitation of the network bandwidth (bandwidth between server and clients). In view of this, we use subsampled randomized Hadamard/Fourier matrix<sup>1</sup> and AMS matrices.

The basic ideas of handling randomness in sketching matrices have been used in a number of previous work [PSW17, LSZ19, JSWZ21, SY21, SYYZ23]. However, in our case, we have more different sketching matrices and also need to apply sketching matrices inside inversion.

In Section A.1, we introduce the concentration inequalities. In Section A.2, we present the properties obtained from random projection.

### A.1 Concentration inequalities

We first state several useful inequalities.

**Lemma A.1** (Lemma 1 on page 1325 of [LM00]). *If the following conditions hold*

- $X \sim \mathcal{X}_k^2$  is a random variable, which is a chi-squared distribution and has  $k$  degrees of freedom.
- Each of them has a mean of 0 and a variance of  $\sigma^2$ .

*Then, we have*

$$\Pr[X - k\sigma^2 \geq (2\sqrt{kt} + 2t)\sigma^2] \leq \exp(-t)$$

*and*

$$\Pr[k\sigma^2 - X \geq 2\sqrt{kt}\sigma^2] \leq \exp(-t).$$

---

<sup>1</sup>We want to remark that SRHT has fast computation advantage compared to AMS. Using SRHT [LDFU13] allows multiplying the matrix with  $k$  vectors only takes  $kn \log n$  time. This is much faster compared to AMS. In our application, we only use nice statistical properties of SRHT matrices without using any fast Fourier transform [CT65], or more fancy sparse Fourier transform [HIKP12b, HIKP12a, Pri13, IKP14, IK14, PS15, CKPS16, Kap16, Kap17, NSW19, GSS22, SSWZ22a, SSWZ22b].




Figure 3: An example of the barrier function:  $-(\ln(1+x) + \ln(2x))$ . The variable is changed from 0.5 to 10. In this case,  $A = [-1, -2]^\top$ , and  $b = [1, 0]^\top$ .

**Lemma A.2** (Khintchine's Inequality). *If the following conditions hold*

- $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$  are the independent and identically distributed sign random variables.
- $z_1, \dots, z_n$  are real numbers.

*Then, there exists positive constants, namely  $C$  and  $C'$ , satisfying that:*

$$\Pr \left[ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \sigma_i \right| \geq Ct \|z\|_2 \right] \leq \exp(-C't^2)$$

**Lemma A.3** (Bernstein Inequality). *If the following conditions hold*

- $X_1, \dots, X_n$  is a set of independent random variables with zero means.
- For any arbitrary  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let the absolute value of each  $X_i$  is almost surely bounded by a constant  $M$ .

*Then, for any positive value  $t$ , the following inequality holds:*

$$\Pr \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n X_i > t \right] \leq \exp \left( - \frac{t^2/2}{\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{E}[X_j^2] + Mt/3} \right)$$

## A.2 Properties obtained by random projection

Here, we formally define the SRHT matrix and AMS sketching matrix and analyze their properties.

**Definition A.4** (Subsampled randomized Hadamard/Fourier transform (SRHT) matrix [LDFU13]).

The SRHT matrix, denoted as  $R = \sqrt{n/b} \cdot SHD$ , where  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times n}$ , and  $S \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times n}$  represents a random matrix whose rows are  $b$  uniform samples (without replacement) from the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a normalized Walsh-Hadamard matrix, and  $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are i.i.d. Rademacher random variables.



**Definition A.5** (AMS sketch matrix [AMS99]). Let  $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_b$  be  $b$  random hash functions picking from a 4-wise independent hash family  $\mathcal{H} = \{h : [n] \rightarrow \{-1/\sqrt{b}, +1/\sqrt{b}\}\}$ . Then,  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times n}$  is a AMS sketch matrix if we set  $R_{i,j} = h_i(j)$ .

**Lemma A.6** (Lemma E.5 in [LSZ19]). *If the following conditions hold*

- Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a fixed vector.
- Let  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times n}$  be a SRHT or AMS sketch matrix as in Definition A.4 and A.5.

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[R^\top R h] &= h, \quad \mathbf{E}[(R^\top R h)_i^2] \leq h_i^2 + \frac{1}{b} \|h\|_2^2 \\ \Pr \left[ |(R^\top R h)_i - h_i| > \|h\|_2 \frac{\log(n/\delta)}{\sqrt{b}} \right] &\leq \delta \end{aligned}$$

## B Sketch more than once




Figure 4: This is an overview of our framework. In our framework, there is no need for clients to share data with the server. Clients share partial Hessian information with the server. And the server computes the update information by using Hessian information, then sends the update information to the client.

Now, we can bound the error of adding two sketching matrices.

**Lemma B.1** (Error bound of adding two sketching matrices). *If the following conditions hold*

- $R \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1 \times n}, S \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2 \times n}$  are defined as in Def. A.5.
- $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a matrix.
- $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  are vectors.

Then, with probability  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &|u^\top R^\top R B S^\top S v - u^\top B v| \\ &\lesssim \frac{\log^{1.5} n}{\sqrt{b_1}} \cdot \|u\|_2 \|B v\|_2 + \frac{\log^{1.5} n}{\sqrt{b_2}} \cdot \|u^\top B\|_2 \|v\|_2 + \frac{\log^3 n}{\sqrt{b_1 b_2}} \cdot \|u\|_2 \|v\|_2 \|B\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

holds.

*Proof.* Let  $i$  be in  $[n]$ .

Let the  $i$ -th column of  $R$  be  $R_i \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1}$ .

Let the  $i$ -th column of  $S$  be  $S_i \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2}$ .

Let  $\sigma_i$  be a random sign.

Let  $R$  be an AMS matrix.

Every column  $R_i$  of  $R$  follows the same distribution as  $\sigma_i R_i$ .

We have that  $R$  satisfies:

$$1. \langle R_i, R_i \rangle = 1, \forall i \in [n]. \quad (5)$$

$$2. \Pr[\langle R_i, R_j \rangle \leq \frac{\sqrt{\log(n/\delta)}}{\sqrt{b_1}}, \forall i \neq j \in [n]] \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (6)$$

Likewise,  $S$  is an AMS matrix, and the distribution of each column  $S_i$  of  $S$  is identical to  $\sigma'_i S_i$ , where  $\sigma'_i$  represents a random sign. Additional information can be found in [AMS99].

Then, we can get

$$u^\top (R^\top R) B (S^\top S) v = \sum_{i,j,i',j'} u_i v_{j'} \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma'_{i'} \sigma'_{j'} \langle R_i, R_j \rangle B_{j,i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \quad (7)$$

Therefore, we can divide the summation in equation Eq. (7) into three components:

1. The first part involves two pairs of indices being identical:  $j = i$  and  $j' = i'$ .
2. The second part occurs when one pair of indices is the same: either  $j = i$  and  $j' \neq i'$ , or conversely,  $j \neq i$  and  $j' = i'$ .
3. The third part arises when no pair of indices are the same:  $j \neq i$  and  $j' \neq i'$ .

**Proof of Part 1.**

Suppose  $j = i$  and  $j' = i'$ .

We can get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=j,i'=j'} u_i v_{j'} \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma'_{i'} \sigma'_{j'} \langle R_i, R_j \rangle B_{j,i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i,i'} u_i v_{i'} B_{i,i'} \\ &= u^\top B v \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

For the first step, we use the fact that  $\langle R_i, R_i \rangle = \langle S_{i'}, S_{i'} \rangle = 1$  for all  $i$  and  $i'$  in  $[n]$ , as shown in Eq. (5).

**Proof of Part 2.**

Suppose that either  $j = i$  and  $j' \neq i'$ , or conversely,  $j \neq i$  and  $j' = i'$ .

Without loss of generality, we suppose  $j = i$  and  $j' \neq i'$ .

Then, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=j,i' \neq j'} u_i v_{j'} \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma'_{i'} \sigma'_{j'} \langle R_i, R_j \rangle B_{j,i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i,i' \neq j'} u_i v_{j'} \sigma'_{i'} \sigma'_{j'} B_{i,i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{j'} \sigma'_{j'} v_{j'} \sum_{i' \neq j'} \sigma'_{i'} (B^\top u)_{i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle,$$

For the first step, we use the fact that  $\langle R_i, R_i \rangle = 1$  for all  $i$  in  $[n]$ , as shown in Eq. (5). For the second step, we use  $\sum_i u_i B_{i,i'} = (B^\top u)_{i'}$ .

By the Union bound and Lemma A.2, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_{j'} \sigma'_{j'} v_{j'} \sum_{i' \neq j'} \sigma'_{i'} (B^\top u)_{i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \right)^2 \\ & \lesssim \log n \cdot \sum_{j'} v_{j'}^2 \left( \sum_{i' \neq j'} \sigma'_{i'} (B^\top u)_{i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \right)^2 \\ & \lesssim \log^2 n \cdot \sum_{j'} v_{j'}^2 \sum_{i' \neq j'} (B^\top u)_{i'}^2 \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle^2 \\ & \lesssim \log^3 n / b_2 \cdot \sum_{j'} v_{j'}^2 \sum_{i' \neq j'} (B^\top u)_{i'}^2 \\ & \lesssim \log^3 n / b_2 \cdot \|v\|_2^2 \|B^\top u\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ , where the first step follows from  $t = O(\sqrt{\log n})$  and Lemma A.2, the second step is obtained by  $t = O(\sqrt{\log n})$  and Lemma A.2 again, and the third step is derived from Eq. (6).

Combining the previous two equations, and considering the symmetry of the case where  $i' = j'$  and  $i \neq j$ , we can get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{i=j, i' \neq j' \\ \text{or } i' = j', i \neq j}} u_i v_{j'} \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma'_{i'} \sigma'_{j'} \langle R_i, R_j \rangle B_{j,i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \\ & \lesssim \log^{1.5} n / \sqrt{b_1} \cdot \|u\|_2 \|Bv\|_2 + \log^{1.5} n / \sqrt{b_2} \cdot \|u^\top B\|_2 \|v\|_2 \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with a probability of at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ .

### Proof of Part 3.

Suppose  $j \neq i$  and  $j' \neq i'$ .

We can show

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_{i \neq j, i' \neq j'} u_i v_{j'} \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma'_{i'} \sigma'_{j'} \langle R_i, R_j \rangle B_{j,i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \right)^2 \\ & = \left( \sum_i \sigma_i u_i \sum_{j'} \sigma'_{j'} v_{j'} \sum_{i' \neq j'} \sigma'_{i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \sum_{j \neq i} \sigma_i \langle R_i, R_j \rangle B_{j,i'} \right)^2 \\ & \lesssim \log n \cdot \sum_i u_i^2 \left( \sum_{j'} \sigma'_{j'} v_{j'} \sum_{i' \neq j'} \sigma'_{i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \sum_{j \neq i} \sigma_i \langle R_i, R_j \rangle B_{j,i'} \right)^2 \\ & \lesssim \log^2 n \cdot \sum_i u_i^2 \sum_{j'} v_{j'}^2 \left( \sum_{i' \neq j'} \sigma'_{i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \sum_{j \neq i} \sigma_i \langle R_i, R_j \rangle B_{j,i'} \right)^2 \\ & \lesssim \log^3 n \cdot \sum_i u_i^2 \sum_{j'} v_{j'}^2 \sum_{i' \neq j'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle^2 \left( \sum_{j \neq i} \sigma_i \langle R_i, R_j \rangle B_{j,i'} \right)^2 \\ & \lesssim \log^4 n \cdot \sum_i u_i^2 \sum_{j'} v_{j'}^2 \sum_{i' \neq j'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle^2 \sum_{j \neq i} \langle R_i, R_j \rangle^2 B_{j,i'}^2 \\ & \lesssim \log^6 n / (b_1 b_2) \cdot \|u\|_2^2 \|v\|_2^2 \|B\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

with probability  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ , where 2nd step follows from  $t = O(\sqrt{n})$  and Lemma A.2, the 3rd comes from  $t = O(\sqrt{n})$ , Lemma A.2, for all  $i \in [n]$ , and employing the Union bound to combine the  $n$  inequalities, the 4th and 5th step can be justified based on the same reasoning as the 3rd step.

For the 6th step, we use the fact that for all  $i' \neq j' \in [n]$  and  $i \neq j \in [n]$ , with a probability of at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ ,

$$\langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \lesssim \sqrt{(\log n)/b_2}$$

and

$$\langle R_i, R_j \rangle \lesssim \sqrt{(\log n)/b_1}.$$

For all  $i, j, i'$ , and  $j'$  in  $[n]$ , we apply the Union bound to combine  $2n^2$  such bounds.

Therefore, we can get

$$\sum_{i \neq j, i' \neq j'} u_i v_{j'} \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma_{i'} \sigma_{j'} \langle R_i, R_j \rangle B_{j,i'} \langle S_{i'}, S_{j'} \rangle \lesssim \log^3 n / \sqrt{b_1 b_2} \cdot \|u\|_2 \|v\|_2 \|B\|_F. \quad (10)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ .

**Combining Part 1, Part 2, and Part 3.**

First, we add Eq. (8), (9), and (10) together.

Then, we plug their sum into Eq. (7).

Finally, through Union bound, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} & u^\top (R^\top R) B (S^\top S) v - u^\top B v \\ & \lesssim \frac{\log^{1.5} n}{\sqrt{b_1}} \cdot \|u\|_2 \|Bv\|_2 + \frac{\log^{1.5} n}{\sqrt{b_2}} \cdot \|u^\top B\|_2 \|v\|_2 + \frac{\log^3 n}{\sqrt{b_1 b_2}} \cdot \|u\|_2 \|v\|_2 \|B\|_F, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ .

Therefore, we complete the proof.  $\square$

## C Bounding error of sketching

This section is arranged as follows:

- Section C.1 gives the definition of  $P$ ,  $\hat{P}$ , and  $\tilde{P}$ .
- Section C.2 presents the steps to prove that  $P \approx \tilde{P}$ .
- Section C.3 shows that  $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h|$  is small.
- Section C.4 presents the tools that we use to bound  $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h|$ .
- Section C.5 shows that  $|g^\top \tilde{P}h - g^\top \hat{P}h|$  is small.
- Section C.6 presents the tools that we use to bound  $|g^\top \tilde{P}h - g^\top \hat{P}h|$ .
- Section C.7 shows that  $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h|$  is small by combining the result of  $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h|$  and  $|g^\top \tilde{P}h - g^\top \hat{P}h|$ .

### C.1 Definition of $P$ , $\hat{P}$ , and $\tilde{P}$

In this section, we formally define  $P$ ,  $\hat{P}$ , and  $\tilde{P}$ .

**Definition C.1** (Definition of Projection Matrices). We define  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $\hat{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , and  $\tilde{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P &:= W^{1/2} A^\top (A W A^\top)^{-1} A W^{1/2} \\ \hat{P} &:= W^{1/2} A^\top (R_1^\top R_1 A W A^\top R_2^\top R_2)^{-1} A W^{1/2} \\ \tilde{P} &:= W^{1/2} A^\top R_3^\top R_3 (R_1^\top R_1 A W A^\top R_2^\top R_2)^{-1} R_4^\top R_4 A W^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

where  $R_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1 \times d}$ ,  $R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2 \times d}$ ,  $R_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_3 \times d}$ , and  $R_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_4 \times d}$  are sketching matrices.

Among them,  $P$  is the ideal case of the projection matrix.  $\tilde{P}$  is the projection matrix we use under FL. We construct  $\hat{P}$  to analyze that  $|g^\top P h - g^\top \tilde{P} h|$  is bounded by  $g$ ,  $h$ ,  $A$ , and  $W$ , for any  $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

### C.2 Proof sketch

In this section, we show that  $P \approx \tilde{P}$ .

Our goal is to show that

$$|g^\top P h - g^\top \tilde{P} h|$$

is bounded by  $g$ ,  $h$ ,  $A$  and  $W$ .

We split it into following steps. For any two vectors  $g, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we want to prove that

- $|g^\top P h - g^\top \hat{P} h|$  is small, we prove this by using Lemma C.3 with
  - $C = W^{1/2} A^\top$ ,
  - $B = (A W A^\top)^{-1}$ ,
  - $R = R_1$ , and
  - $S = R_2$ .
- $|g^\top \tilde{P} h - g^\top \hat{P} h|$  is small, we prove this by using Lemma C.5 with
  - $B = (R_1^\top R_1 A W A^\top R_2^\top R_2)^{-1}$ ,
  - $C = W^{1/2} A^\top$ ,
  - $R = R_3$ , and
  - $S = R_4$ .
- $|g^\top P h - g^\top \tilde{P} h|$  is small, we could prove it by using
  - $|g^\top P h - g^\top \tilde{P} h| \leq |g^\top P h - g^\top \hat{P} h| + |g^\top \hat{P} h - g^\top \tilde{P} h|$ ,
  - $\|\tilde{B} C^\top h\|_2 \leq \|\tilde{B}\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \leq (1 + \epsilon_0) \|B\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2$ , and
  - $\|\tilde{B}\|_F \leq \sqrt{n} \|\tilde{B}\|_2 \leq (1 + \epsilon_0) \sqrt{n} \|B\|_2$

### C.3 Bounding $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h|$

The goal of this section is to prove the following lemma to indicate that we could bound  $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h|$ . Note that we assume that  $g = h$  in this lemma. However, in order to make other lemma more general, we do not assume that  $g = h$  in other lemma in this section.

**Lemma C.2** ( $P$  and  $\hat{P}$  are close). *If the following conditions hold*

- Let  $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be two vectors.
- Let  $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1/10)$ .

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h| &\leq 2\epsilon_0 g^\top C B C^\top h \\ &\leq 2\epsilon_0 \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ , where  $C = W^{1/2}A^\top$  and  $B = (AWA^\top)^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ .

*Proof.* We assume that  $f(B, R, S) = R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S$ . By using Lemma C.3, we could obtain that

$$(1 - 2\epsilon_0)B \preceq (f(B, R, S))^{-1} \preceq (1 + 2\epsilon_0)B$$

Then, for any two vectors  $g, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we could obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - 2\epsilon_0)g^\top C B C^\top h &\leq g^\top C (f(B, R, S))^{-1} C^\top h \\ &\leq (1 + 2\epsilon_0)g^\top C B C^\top h \end{aligned}$$

According to the above inequality, it is easy for us to get that  $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h| \leq 2\epsilon_0 g^\top C B C^\top h$ .

We could obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} g^\top C B C^\top h &\leq \sqrt{g^\top C B C^\top g} \cdot \sqrt{h^\top C B C^\top h} \\ &= \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

by using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Therefore, we could get that

$$|g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h| \leq 2\epsilon_0 \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2$$

This finishes the proof. □

### C.4 Tools for bounding $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h|$

In this section, we present the tools for bounding  $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h|$ .

**Lemma C.3** (Tools for showing  $P$  and  $\hat{P}$  are close). *If the following conditions hold*

- $R \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1 \times d}$ ,  $S \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2 \times d}$  are defined as in Definition 4.1.
- $g, h \in \mathbb{R}^n$  are two vectors.

Then, we have that

$$(1 - 2\epsilon_0)B \preceq (R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S)^{-1} \preceq (1 + 2\epsilon_0)B$$

with probability at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ , where  $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1/10)$ , and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ .

*Proof.* Given any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\|x\|_2 = 1$ , we could use Lemma B.1 to prove that

$$|x^\top R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S x - x^\top B^{-1} x| \leq \epsilon_0 \lambda_{\min}(B^{-1}),$$

where  $b_{\min} = \{b_1, b_2\}$ ,  $\kappa = \lambda_{\max}(B)/\lambda_{\min}(B)$  and  $\epsilon_0 = O(\sqrt{n} \log^3 d / b_{\min}) \kappa$ . Then, we have to prove two cases:

**Case 1:** From  $|x^\top R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S x - x^\top B^{-1} x| \leq \epsilon_0 \lambda_{\min}(B^{-1})$ , we could get that  $\lambda_{\max}(R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S - B^{-1}) \leq \epsilon_0 \kappa \lambda_{\min}(B^{-1})$ . Then, we could the following derivation process:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \lambda_{\max}(R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S - B^{-1}) - \epsilon_0 \lambda_{\min}(B^{-1}) \\ &\geq \lambda_{\max}(R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S - (1 + \epsilon_0) B^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

where the first step holds, because of we use Lemma B.1 to obtain the intermediate result. And the second step holds due to the properties of eigenvalue of the matrix. Finally, we could obtain that

$$R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S \preceq (1 + \epsilon_0) B^{-1}$$

**Case 2:**

From

$$|x^\top R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S x - x^\top B^{-1} x| \leq \epsilon_0 \lambda_{\min}(B^{-1}),$$

we could get that

$$\lambda_{\min}(R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S - B^{-1}) \geq -\epsilon_0 \kappa \lambda_{\min}(B^{-1}).$$

Then, we could the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \lambda_{\min}(R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S - B^{-1}) + \epsilon_0 \lambda_{\min}(B^{-1}) \\ &\leq \lambda_{\min}(R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S - (1 - \epsilon_0) B^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

where the first step holds, because we use Lemma B.1 to obtain the intermediate result. The second step holds because of the properties of eigenvalue.

Finally, according to the above equation, we could obtain that

$$(1 - \epsilon_0) B^{-1} \preceq R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S$$

Combining two above results, due to the reason that  $\epsilon_0 = O(\sqrt{n} \log^3 d / b_{\min}) \kappa$ , we could get that

$$(1 - \epsilon_0) B^{-1} \preceq R^\top R B^{-1} S^\top S \preceq (1 + \epsilon_0) B^{-1}$$

for any vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\|x\|_2 = 1$ . Finally, we could choose  $b_{\min} = \epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{n} \kappa^2 \log^3 d$ , where  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$ , to make  $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1/10)$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

### C.5 Bounding $|g^\top \tilde{P}h - g^\top \hat{P}h|$

We show that  $|g^\top \tilde{P}h - g^\top \hat{P}h|$  can be bounded.

**Lemma C.4** ( $\tilde{P}$  and  $\hat{P}$  are close). *If the following conditions hold*

- $\tilde{B} = (R_1^\top R_1 A W A^\top R_2^\top R_2)^{-1}$ .
- $C = W^{1/2} A^\top$ .
- Let  $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be two vectors.
- Let  $R_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1 \times d}$ ,  $R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2 \times d}$  are two sketching matrices.
- Let  $b_{\min} = \{b_1, b_2\}$ .

Then, We have

$$\begin{aligned} & |g^\top \tilde{P}h - g^\top \hat{P}h| \\ & \lesssim \frac{\log^{1.5} d}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} \cdot (\|g^\top C\|_2 \|\tilde{B} C^\top h\|_2 + \|g^\top C \tilde{B}\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2) \\ & + \frac{\log^3 d}{b_{\min}} \cdot \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|\tilde{B}\|_F \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ .

*Proof.* We could using Lemma C.5 to prove the above lemma. By setting  $\tilde{B} = (R_1^\top R_1 A W A^\top R_2^\top R_2)^{-1}$ , and  $C = W^{1/2} A^\top$  where  $R_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1 \times d}$  and  $R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2 \times d}$  are two sketching matrices.  $\square$

### C.6 Tools for Bounding $|g^\top \tilde{P}h - g^\top \hat{P}h|$

We present the tools for bounding  $|g^\top \tilde{P}h - g^\top \hat{P}h|$ .

**Lemma C.5** (Tools for showing  $\tilde{P}$  and  $\hat{P}$  are close). *If the following conditions hold*

- Let  $\tilde{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  be two matrices.
- $R \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1 \times d}$ ,  $S \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2 \times d}$  are defined as in Definition 4.1.
- $g, h \in \mathbb{R}^n$  are vectors.
- Let  $b_{\min} = \{b_1, b_2\}$ .

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & g^\top C (R^\top R) \tilde{B} (S^\top S) C^\top h - g^\top C \tilde{B} C^\top h \\ & \lesssim \frac{\log^{1.5} d}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} \cdot (\|g^\top C\|_2 \|\tilde{B} C^\top h\|_2 + \|g^\top C \tilde{B}\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2) \\ & + \frac{\log^3 d}{b_{\min}} \cdot \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|\tilde{B}\|_F \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ .

*Proof.* This can be proved by using Lemma B.1.  $\square$



### C.7 Bounding $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h|$

We show that  $|g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h|$  can be bounded.

**Lemma C.6** ( $P$  and  $\tilde{P}$  are close). *If the following conditions hold*

- Given  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  and  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ .
- Let  $R_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_1 \times d}$ ,  $R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_2 \times d}$ ,  $R_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_3 \times d}$ , and  $R_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{b_4 \times d}$  be four matrices, defined as in Definition 4.1.
- Let  $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be two vectors.
- Let  $P$  be defined as Eq. (3),  $\hat{P}$  and  $\tilde{P}$  be defined as Def. 4.3.
- Let  $b_{\min} = \min\{b_1, b_2\}$ .

Then, we have that

$$|g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h| \lesssim \log^6 d \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} + \frac{n}{b_{\min}^2} \right) \kappa \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2$$

with probability at least  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ , where  $C = W^{1/2}A^\top$ ,  $B = (AWA^\top)^{-1}$ , and  $\kappa = \lambda_{\max}(B)/\lambda_{\min}(B)$ .

*Proof.* In order to simplify the proof, we first define  $B$  as follows:

$$\tilde{B} := (R_1^\top R_1 A W A^\top R_2^\top R_2)^{-1}.$$

We define  $C$  as follows:

$$C := W^{1/2}A^\top.$$

We define  $B$  as follows:

$$B := (AWA^\top)^{-1}.$$

By using triangle inequality, we could obtain that

$$|g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h| \leq |g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h| + |g^\top \hat{P}h - g^\top \tilde{P}h|.$$

By using Lemma C.3 and Lemma C.5, we could obtain that

$$|g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h| \leq 2\epsilon_0 \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & |g^\top \hat{P}h - g^\top \tilde{P}h| \\ & \lesssim \frac{\log^{1.5} d}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} \cdot (\|g^\top C\|_2 \|\tilde{B}C^\top h\|_2 + \|g^\top C\tilde{B}\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2) + \frac{\log^3 d}{b_{\min}} \cdot \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|\tilde{B}\|_F \end{aligned}$$

According to some facts, we could get that  $\|AB\|_2 \leq \|A\|_2 \cdot \|B\|_2$  and  $\|A\|_2 \leq \|A\|_F \leq \sqrt{n}\|A\|_2$ , for  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ .

Then, we could get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |g^\top Ph - g^\top \tilde{P}h| \\
& \leq |g^\top Ph - g^\top \hat{P}h| + |g^\top \hat{P}h - g^\top \tilde{P}h| \\
& \lesssim 2\epsilon_0 \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2 \\
& + \frac{\log^{1.5} d}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} \cdot (\|g^\top C\|_2 \|\tilde{B}C^\top h\|_2 + \|g^\top C\tilde{B}\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2) \\
& + \frac{\log^3 d}{b_{\min}} \cdot \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|\tilde{B}\|_F \\
& \lesssim 2\epsilon_0 \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2 \\
& + \frac{\log^{1.5} d}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} \cdot (1 + 2\epsilon_0) \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2 \\
& + \frac{\log^3 d}{b_{\min}} \cdot (1 + 2\epsilon_0) \sqrt{n} \cdot \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2 \\
& \lesssim \left( \frac{\log^{1.5} d}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} + \frac{\log^3 d}{b_{\min}} + \frac{\sqrt{n} \log^{4.5} d}{b_{\min}^{1.5}} + \frac{n \log^6 d}{b_{\min}^2} \right) \cdot \kappa \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2 \\
& \lesssim \log^6 d \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} + \frac{n}{b_{\min}^2} \right) \cdot \kappa \|g^\top C\|_2 \|C^\top h\|_2 \|B\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step derives from the triangle inequality and the second step is due to Lemma C.3 and Lemma C.5. The third step comes from  $\|\tilde{B}\|_F \leq \sqrt{n} \|\tilde{B}\|_2 \leq (1 + \epsilon_0) \sqrt{n} \|B\|_2$ .

Next, we show the reason that the fourth step holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\log^{1.5} d}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} + \frac{\log^3 d}{b_{\min}} + \frac{\sqrt{n} \log^{4.5} d}{b_{\min}^{1.5}} + \frac{n \log^6 d}{b_{\min}^2} \\
& \lesssim \log^6 d \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} + \frac{1}{b_{\min}} + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_{\min}^{1.5}} + \frac{n}{b_{\min}^2} \right) \\
& \lesssim \log^6 d \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{b_{\min}}} + \frac{n}{b_{\min}^2} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from  $\log^6 d$  is the dominate item in the numerator, and the second step follows from  $1/\sqrt{b_{\min}} > 1/b_{\min}, \forall b_{\min} \geq 1$  and  $\sqrt{n}/b_{\min}^{1.5} < n/b_{\min}^2, \forall b_{\min} \leq n$ .  $\square$

## D Main Result

In this section, we state the main result of this paper. Next, we give the proof of this statement.

**Theorem D.1** (Formal Main Result). *If the following conditions hold*

- $\min_{Ax=b, x \in \prod_{i=1}^m K_i} c^\top x$  is a convex problem under the federated learning setting, where  $K_i$  is compact convex sets.
- For each  $i \in [m]$ , we are given a  $\nu_i$ -self concordant barrier function  $\phi_i$  for  $K_i$ .
- We have  $x^{(0)} = \arg \min_x \sum_{i=1}^m \phi_i(x_i)$ .
- For all  $x \in \prod_{i=1}^m K_i$ , we have that  $\|x\|_2$  is bounded by  $R$  (Diameter of the set).

- $\|c\|_2$  is bounded by  $L$  (Lipschitz constant of the program).

Then, there exists a federated learning algorithm (see Algorithm 1) that runs in  $O(\sqrt{\nu} \log^2 m \log(\frac{\nu}{\delta}))$  iterations and each iteration sends  $O(bn)$  words to find a vector  $x$  such that

$$c^\top x \leq \min_{Ax=b, x \in \Pi_{i=1}^m K_i} c^\top x + LR \cdot \delta$$

$$\|Ax - b\|_1 \leq 3\delta(R \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^n |A_{i,j}| + \|b\|_1)$$

where  $\|c\|_2 \leq L$ ,  $\|x\|_2 \leq R$ , and  $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^m \nu_i$ .

*Proof.* By combining Lemma E.3, Lemma F.2 and Lemma F.3, we could get that a vector  $x$  which satisfies the above conditions after  $O(\sqrt{\nu} \log^2 m \log(\frac{\nu}{\delta}))$  iterations. In addition, the Algorithm 1 sends  $O(bn)$  words at each iteration (Line 14 in Algorithm 1). This finishes the proof.  $\square$

## E Central Path

Here, we introduce some basic result of central path in Algorithm 1, which could be used to prove the guarantee of  $W$  and the main result of this paper. Central path algorithm is a very standard method for solving linear programming [CLS19, LSZ19, Son19, Bra20, DLY21, JSWZ21, SY21, GS22, QSZZ23], semi-definite programming [JKL<sup>+</sup>20b, HJS<sup>+</sup>22b, HJS<sup>+</sup>22a, GS22].

We first give the definition of some parameters here:

**Definition E.1.** For any  $i \in [m]$ , we let  $\phi_i(x)$  be defined as in Definition 3.2 and let  $\mu_i^t(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ ,  $\gamma_i^t(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $c_i^t(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}$  be defined as below:

$$\mu_i^t(x, s) = s_i / \tilde{t} + \nabla \phi_i(x_i) \quad (11)$$

$$\gamma_i^t(x, s) = \|\mu_i^t(x, s)\|_{\nabla^2 \phi_i(x_i)^{-1}} \quad (12)$$

$$c_i^t(x, s) = \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(\lambda \gamma_i^t(x, s)) / \gamma_i^t(x, s)}{(\sum_{i=1}^m \exp(2\lambda \gamma_i^t(x, s)))^{1/2}} & \text{if } \gamma_i^t(x, s) \geq 96\sqrt{\alpha} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where  $\lambda = O(\log m)$ ,  $\tilde{t} = (1 - \xi / \sqrt{\nu})^{t-1}$ , and  $\xi = O(\log^{-2}(m))$ .

According to the Definition E.1 and Algorithm 1, we could obtain that

$$h_i^t = -\alpha \cdot c_i^t(\bar{x}, \bar{s}) \mu_i^t(\bar{x}, \bar{s}) \quad (14)$$

where  $\alpha = O(1 / \log^2 m)$ . In addition, we define that

$$\Phi^t(x^t, s^t) = \sum_{i=1}^m \exp(\lambda \|\mu_i^t(x^t, s^t)\|_{\nabla^2 \phi_i(x_i^t)^{-1}})$$

where  $\lambda = O(\log m)$ . Then, we could obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma E.2** (Bounding  $\alpha_i$ ). *If the following conditions hold*

- $\alpha$  represents the parameter in Algorithm 1.
- For any  $i$  in  $[m]$ , we have  $\alpha_i = \|\delta_{x,i}\|_{\bar{x}_i}$ .

Then, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^2 \leq 4\alpha^2.$$

*Proof.* Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^2 &= \|\delta_x\|_{\bar{x}}^2 \\ &= h^\top \tilde{V}^{1/2} (I - \tilde{P}) \tilde{V}^{1/2} \nabla^2 \phi(\bar{x}) \tilde{V}^{1/2} (I - \tilde{P}) \tilde{V}^{1/2} h. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the reason that

$$(1 - 2\alpha)(\nabla^2 \phi_i(\bar{x}_i))^{-1} \preceq \tilde{V}_i \preceq (1 + 2\alpha)(\nabla^2 \phi_i(\bar{x}_i))^{-1}$$

we have that

$$(1 - \alpha)(\nabla^2 \phi(\bar{x}))^{-1} \preceq \tilde{V} \preceq (1 + \alpha)(\nabla^2 \phi(\bar{x}))^{-1}.$$

Using  $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{10000}$ , we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^2 \leq 2h^\top \tilde{V}^{1/2} (I - \tilde{P}) (I - \tilde{P}) \tilde{V}^{1/2} h \leq 2h^\top \tilde{V} h$$

where we used that  $I - \tilde{P}$  is an orthogonal projection at the end.

Finally, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} &h^\top \tilde{V} h \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \|h_i^t\|_{\bar{x}_i}^{*2} \\ &= 2\alpha^2 \sum_{i=1}^m c_i^t(\bar{x}, \bar{s})^2 \|\mu_i^t(\bar{x}, \bar{s})\|_{\bar{x}_i}^{*2} \\ &\leq 2\alpha^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \frac{\exp(2\lambda\gamma_i^t(\bar{x}, \bar{s})) / \gamma_i^t(\bar{x}, \bar{s})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m \exp(2\lambda\gamma_i^t(\bar{x}, \bar{s}))} \|\mu_i^t(\bar{x}, \bar{s})\|_{\bar{x}_i}^{*2} \right) \\ &= 2\alpha^2 \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \exp(2\lambda\gamma_i^t(\bar{x}, \bar{s}))}{\sum_{i=1}^m \exp(2\lambda\gamma_i^t(\bar{x}, \bar{s}))} \\ &= 2\alpha^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the second step is from the definition of  $h_i^t$  (Eq. (14)), the third step follows from the definition of  $c_i^t$  (Eq. (13)), the fourth step follows from definition of  $\gamma_i^t$  (See Eq. (12)).

Therefore, putting it all together, we can show

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^2 \leq 4\alpha^2.$$

□

**Lemma E.3** (Lemma A.8 in [LSZ19]). *If  $\Phi^t(x^t, s^t) \leq 80\frac{m}{\alpha}$ , then*

$$\Phi^{t+1}(x^{t+1}, s^{t+1}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\lambda}{40\sqrt{m}}\right) \Phi^t(x^t, s^t) + \sqrt{m}\lambda \cdot \exp(192\lambda\sqrt{\alpha}).$$

*In particularly, we have  $\Phi^{t+1}(x^{t+1}, s^{t+1}) \leq 80\frac{m}{\alpha}$ .*

## F Initial Point and Termination Condition

Now, we state some basic results of self-concordance function, which could be used to prove the main result of this paper.

**Lemma F.1** (Theorem 4.1.7, Lemma 4.2.4 in [Nes98]). *Let  $\phi$  be any  $\nu$ -self-concordant barrier.*

*Then, for any  $x, y \in \text{dom}\phi$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla \phi(x), y - x \rangle &\leq \nu, \\ \langle \nabla \phi(y) - \nabla \phi(x), y - x \rangle &\geq \frac{\|y - x\|_x^2}{1 + \|y - x\|_x}. \end{aligned}$$

*Let  $x^* = \arg \min_x \phi(x)$ . For any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $\|x - x^*\|_{x^*} \leq 1$ , we have that  $x \in \text{dom}\phi$ .*

$$\|x^* - y\|_{x^*} \leq \nu + 2\sqrt{\nu}.$$

**Lemma F.2** (Lemma D.2 in [LSZ19]). *If the following conditions hold*

- $\min_{Ax=b, x \in \prod_{i=1}^m K_i} c^\top x$  is a convex problem where for each  $i$ ,  $K_i$  is a compact convex set.
- $\phi_i$  is defined as in Definition 3.2 for  $K_i$ , where  $i$  is in  $[m]$ .
- We have  $x^{(0)} = \arg \min_x \sum_{i=1}^m \phi_i(x_i)$ .
- Diameter of the set: For any  $x \in \prod_{i=1}^m K_i$ , we have that  $\|x\|_2 \leq R$ .
- Lipschitz constant of the program:  $\|c\|_2 \leq L$ .

*Then, the modified program  $\min_{\bar{A}\bar{x}=\bar{b}, \bar{x} \in \prod_{i=1}^m K_i \times \mathbb{R}_+} \bar{c}^\top \bar{x}$  with*

$$\bar{A} = [A \mid b - Ax^{(0)}], \bar{b} = b, \text{ and } \bar{c} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\delta}{LR} \cdot c \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

*satisfies the following, for any  $\delta > 0$ :*

1.  $\bar{x} = \begin{bmatrix} x^{(0)} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $\bar{y} = 0_d$  and  $\bar{s} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\delta}{LR} \cdot c \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$  are feasible primal dual vectors with  $\|\bar{s} + \nabla \bar{\phi}(\bar{x})\|_{\bar{x}}^* \leq \delta$  where  $\bar{\phi}(\bar{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \phi_i(\bar{x}_i) - \log(\bar{x}_{m+1})$ .
2. For any  $\bar{x}$  such that  $\bar{A}\bar{x} = \bar{b}$ ,  $\bar{x} \in \prod_{i=1}^m K_i \times \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\bar{c}^\top \bar{x} \leq \min_{\bar{A}\bar{x}=\bar{b}, \bar{x} \in \prod_{i=1}^m K_i \times \mathbb{R}_+} \bar{c}^\top \bar{x} + \delta^2$ , the vector  $\bar{x}_{1:n}$  ( $\bar{x}_{1:n}$  is the first  $n$  coordinates of  $\bar{x}$ ) is an approximate solution to the original convex program in the following sense

$$\begin{aligned} c^\top \bar{x}_{1:n} &\leq \min_{Ax=b, x \in \prod_{i=1}^m K_i} c^\top x + LR \cdot \delta, \\ \|A\bar{x}_{1:n} - b\|_1 &\leq 3\delta \cdot \left( R \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^n |A_{i,j}| + \|b\|_1 \right), \\ \bar{x}_{1:n} &\in \prod_{i=1}^m K_i. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma F.3** (Lemma D.3 in [LSZ19]). *If the following conditions hold*

- $\phi_i(x_i)$  is defined as in Definition 3.2.
- For any  $i \in [m]$ , we possess  $\frac{s_i}{t} + \nabla \phi_i(x_i) = \mu_i$ ,  $A^\top y + s = c$ , and  $Ax = b$ .
- $\|\mu_i\|_{x,i}^* \leq 1$  for all  $i$ .

Then, we have that

$$\langle c, x \rangle \leq \langle c, x^* \rangle + 4t\nu$$

where  $x^* = \arg \min_{Ax=b, x \in \prod_{i=1}^m K_i} c^\top x$  and  $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^m \nu_i$ .

## References

- [ALS<sup>+</sup>18] Alexandr Andoni, Chengyu Lin, Ying Sheng, Peilin Zhong, and Ruiqi Zhong. Subspace embedding and linear regression with orlicz norm. In *ICML*, pages 224–233, 2018.
- [ALS<sup>+</sup>22] Josh Alman, Jiehao Liang, Zhao Song, Ruizhe Zhang, and Danyang Zhuo. Bypass exponential time preprocessing: Fast neural network training via weight-data correlation preprocessing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.14227*, 2022.
- [AMS99] Noga Alon, Yossi Matias, and Mario Szegedy. The space complexity of approximating the frequency moments. *Journal of Computer and system sciences*, 58(1):137–147, 1999.
- [AS23] Josh Alman and Zhao Song. Fast attention requires bounded entries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13214*, 2023.
- [BPSW21] Jan van den Brand, Binghui Peng, Zhao Song, and Omri Weinstein. Training (over-parametrized) neural networks in near-linear time. In *ITCS*, 2021.
- [Bra20] Jan van den Brand. A deterministic linear program solver in current matrix multiplication time. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 259–278. SIAM, 2020.
- [BW14] Christos Boutsidis and David P Woodruff. Optimal cur matrix decompositions. In *STOC*, pages 353–362, 2014.
- [BWZ16] Christos Boutsidis, David P Woodruff, and Peilin Zhong. Optimal principal component analysis in distributed and streaming models. In *STOC*, pages 236–249, 2016.
- [CCF02] Moses Charikar, Kevin Chen, and Martin Farach-Colton. Finding frequent items in data streams. In *Automata, Languages and Programming*, pages 693–703. Springer, 2002.
- [CKPS16] Xue Chen, Daniel M Kane, Eric Price, and Zhao Song. Fourier-sparse interpolation without a frequency gap. In *FOCS*, pages 741–750, 2016.
- [CLRS09] Thomas H Cormen, Charles E Leiserson, Ronald L Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to algorithms*. MIT press, 2009.
- [CLS19] Michael B Cohen, Yin Tat Lee, and Zhao Song. Solving linear programs in the current matrix multiplication time. In *STOC*, 2019.

- [CLSZ21] Sitan Chen, Xiaoxiao Li, Zhao Song, and Danyang Zhuo. On instahide, phase retrieval, and sparse matrix factorization. In *ICLR*, 2021.
- [Cox58] David R Cox. The regression analysis of binary sequences. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 215–242, 1958.
- [CSTZ22] Sitan Chen, Zhao Song, Runzhou Tao, and Ruizhe Zhang. Symmetric sparse boolean matrix factorization and applications. In *ITCS*, 2022.
- [CT65] James W Cooley and John W Tukey. An algorithm for the machine calculation of complex Fourier series. *Mathematics of computation*, 19(90):297–301, 1965.
- [CV95] Corinna Cortes and Vladimir Vapnik. Support-vector networks. *Machine learning*, 20(3):273–297, 1995.
- [CW13] Kenneth L. Clarkson and David P. Woodruff. Low rank approximation and regression in input sparsity time. In *STOC*, 2013.
- [DJS<sup>+</sup>22] Yichuan Deng, Wenyu Jin, Zhao Song, Xiaorui Sun, and Omri Weinstein. Dynamic kernel sparsifiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.14825*, 2022.
- [DLS23a] Yichuan Deng, Zhihang Li, and Zhao Song. Attention scheme inspired softmax regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10411*, 2023.
- [DLS23b] Yichuan Deng, Zhihang Li, and Zhao Song. An improved sample complexity for rank-1 matrix sensing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.06895*, 2023.
- [DLY21] Sally Dong, Yin Tat Lee, and Guanhao Ye. A nearly-linear time algorithm for linear programs with small treewidth: A multiscale representation of robust central path. In *STOC*, 2021.
- [DMS23] Yichuan Deng, Sridhar Mahadevan, and Zhao Song. Randomized and deterministic attention sparsification algorithms for over-parameterized feature dimension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04397*, 2023.
- [DSW22] Yichuan Deng, Zhao Song, and Omri Weinstein. Discrepancy minimization in input-sparsity time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.12468*, 2022.
- [DSWZ22] Yichuan Deng, Zhao Song, Omri Weinstein, and Ruizhe Zhang. Fast distance oracles for any symmetric norm. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [EMZ21] Hossein Esfandiari, Vahab Mirrokni, and Peilin Zhong. Almost linear time density level set estimation via dbscan. In *AAAI*, 2021.
- [FR16] Olivier Fercoq and Peter Richtárik. Optimization in high dimensions via accelerated, parallel, and proximal coordinate descent. *SIAM Review*, 58(4):739–771, 2016.
- [FS97] Yoav Freund and Robert E Schapire. A decision-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting. *Journal of computer and system sciences*, 1997.
- [GGD<sup>+</sup>21] Vipul Gupta, Avishek Ghosh, Michal Derezinski, Rajiv Khanna, Kannan Ramchandran, and Michael Mahoney. Localnewton: Reducing communication bottleneck for distributed learning. *.*, 2021.

- [GQSW22] Yeqi Gao, Lianke Qin, Zhao Song, and Yitan Wang. A sublinear adversarial training algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.05395*, 2022.
- [GS22] Yuzhou Gu and Zhao Song. A faster small treewidth sdp solver. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.06033*, 2022.
- [GSS22] Yeqi Gao, Zhao Song, and Baocheng Sun. An  $o(k \log n)$  time Fourier set query algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.09634*, 2022.
- [GSY23] Yeqi Gao, Zhao Song, and Junze Yin. An iterative algorithm for rescaled hyperbolic functions regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00660*, 2023.
- [GSYZ23] Yuzhou Gu, Zhao Song, Junze Yin, and Lichen Zhang. Low rank matrix completion via robust alternating minimization in nearly linear time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11068*, 2023.
- [HIKP12a] Haitham Hassanieh, Piotr Indyk, Dina Katabi, and Eric Price. Nearly optimal sparse fourier transform. In *STOC*, pages 563–578, 2012.
- [HIKP12b] Haitham Hassanieh, Piotr Indyk, Dina Katabi, and Eric Price. Simple and practical algorithm for sparse Fourier transform. In *SODA*, pages 1183–1194, 2012.
- [HJLS13] David W Hosmer Jr, Stanley Lemeshow, and Rodney X Sturdivant. *Applied logistic regression*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- [HJS<sup>+</sup>22a] Baihe Huang, Shunhua Jiang, Zhao Song, Runzhou Tao, and Ruizhe Zhang. A faster quantum algorithm for semidefinite programming via robust ipm framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.11154*, 2022.
- [HJS<sup>+</sup>22b] Baihe Huang, Shunhua Jiang, Zhao Song, Runzhou Tao, and Ruizhe Zhang. Solving sdp faster: A robust ipm framework and efficient implementation. In *FOCS*, 2022.
- [HLSY21] Baihe Huang, Xiaoxiao Li, Zhao Song, and Xin Yang. Fl-ntk: A neural tangent kernel-based framework for federated learning analysis. In *ICML*, pages 4423–4434, 2021.
- [HSC<sup>+</sup>20] Yangsibo Huang, Zhao Song, Danqi Chen, Kai Li, and Sanjeev Arora. Texthide: Tackling data privacy in language understanding tasks. 2020.
- [HSLA20] Yangsibo Huang, Zhao Song, Kai Li, and Sanjeev Arora. Instahide: Instance-hiding schemes for private distributed learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4507–4518. PMLR, 2020.
- [HST<sup>+</sup>22] Hang Hu, Zhao Song, Runzhou Tao, Zhaozhuo Xu, and Danyang Zhuo. Sublinear time algorithm for online weighted bipartite matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.03367*, 2022.
- [HSWZ22] Hang Hu, Zhao Song, Omri Weinstein, and Danyang Zhuo. Training overparametrized neural networks in sublinear time. In *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2208.04508*, 2022.
- [IK14] Piotr Indyk and Michael Kapralov. Sample-optimal fourier sampling in any constant dimension. In *FOCS*, pages 514–523, 2014.
- [IKP14] Piotr Indyk, Michael Kapralov, and Eric Price. (Nearly) Sample-optimal sparse Fourier transform. In *SODA*, pages 480–499, 2014.



- [IRU<sup>+</sup>19] Nikita Ivkin, Daniel Rothchild, Enayat Ullah, Vladimir Braverman, Ion Stoica, and Raman Arora. Communication-efficient distributed sgd with sketching. ., 2019.
- [JKL<sup>+</sup>20a] Haotian Jiang, Tarun Kathuria, Yin Tat Lee, Swati Padmanabhan, and Zhao Song. A faster interior point method for semidefinite programming. In *FOCS*, 2020.
- [JKL<sup>+</sup>20b] Haotian Jiang, Tarun Kathuria, Yin Tat Lee, Swati Padmanabhan, and Zhao Song. A faster interior point method for semidefinite programming. In *FOCS*, 2020.
- [JLSW20] Haotian Jiang, Yin Tat Lee, Zhao Song, and Sam Chiu-wai Wong. An improved cutting plane method for convex optimization, convex-concave games and its applications. In *STOC*, 2020.
- [JLSZ23] Haotian Jiang, Yin Tat Lee, Zhao Song, and Lichen Zhang. Convex minimization with integer minima in  $\tilde{O}(n^4)$  time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03426*, 2023.
- [JST<sup>+</sup>14] Martin Jaggi, Virginia Smith, Martin Takáč, Jonathan Terhorst, Sanjay Krishnan, Thomas Hofmann, and Michael I Jordan. Communication-efficient distributed dual coordinate ascent. ., 2014.
- [JSWZ21] Shunhua Jiang, Zhao Song, Omri Weinstein, and Hengjie Zhang. Faster dynamic matrix inverse for faster lps. In *STOC*, 2021.
- [Kap16] Michael Kapralov. Sparse Fourier transform in any constant dimension with nearly-optimal sample complexity in sublinear time. In *STOC*, 2016.
- [Kap17] Michael Kapralov. Sample efficient estimation and recovery in sparse fft via isolation on average. In *FOCS*, 2017.
- [Kar84] Narendra Karmarkar. A new polynomial-time algorithm for linear programming. In *STOC*, pages 302–311, 1984.
- [KMY<sup>+</sup>16] Jakub Konečný, H Brendan McMahan, Felix X Yu, Peter Richtárik, Ananda Theertha Suresh, and Dave Bacon. Federated learning: Strategies for improving communication efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.05492*, 2016.
- [LDFU13] Yichao Lu, Paramveer Dhillon, Dean P Foster, and Lyle Ungar. Faster ridge regression via the subsampled randomized hadamard transform. In *NIPS*, pages 369–377, 2013.
- [LGD<sup>+</sup>20] Xiaoxiao Li, Yufeng Gu, Nicha Dvornek, Lawrence H Staib, Pamela Ventola, and James S Duncan. Multi-site fmri analysis using privacy-preserving federated learning and domain adaptation: Abide results. *Medical Image Analysis*, 65:101765, 2020.
- [LHM<sup>+</sup>17] Yujun Lin, Song Han, Huizi Mao, Yu Wang, and William J Dally. Deep gradient compression: Reducing the communication bandwidth for distributed training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.01887*, 2017.
- [LJZ<sup>+</sup>21] Xiaoxiao Li, Meirui Jiang, Xiaofei Zhang, Michael Kamp, and Qi Dou. Fedbn: Federated learning on non-iid features via local batch normalization. ., 2021.
- [LLC<sup>+</sup>19] Xinle Liang, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, Ming Liu, and Qiang Yang. Federated transfer reinforcement learning for autonomous driving. ., 2019.

- [LLMY17] Jason D Lee, Qihang Lin, Tengyu Ma, and Tianbao Yang. Distributed stochastic variance reduced gradient methods by sampling extra data with replacement. *JMLR*, 18(1):4404–4446, 2017.
- [LM00] Beatrice Laurent and Pascal Massart. Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1302–1338, 2000.
- [LSX<sup>+</sup>23] Shuai Li, Zhao Song, Yu Xia, Tong Yu, and Tianyi Zhou. The closeness of in-context learning and weight shifting for softmax regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13276*, 2023.
- [LSY23] Xiaoxiao Li, Zhao Song, and Jiaming Yang. Federated adversarial learning: A framework with convergence analysis. In *ICML*, 2023.
- [LSZ19] Yin Tat Lee, Zhao Song, and Qiuyu Zhang. Solving empirical risk minimization in the current matrix multiplication time. In *COLT*, pages 2140–2157, 2019.
- [LSZ<sup>+</sup>20] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 2:429–450, 2020.
- [LSZ23] Zhihang Li, Zhao Song, and Tianyi Zhou. Solving regularized exp, cosh and sinh regression problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15725*, 2023.
- [MKS13] Dhruv Mahajan, S Sathya Keerthi, S Sundararajan, and Léon Bottou. A parallel sgd method with strong convergence. *..*, 2013.
- [MM13] Xiangrui Meng and Michael W Mahoney. Low-distortion subspace embeddings in input-sparsity time and applications to robust linear regression. In *STOC*, pages 91–100, 2013.
- [MMR<sup>+</sup>17] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *AISTATS*, 2017.
- [MSJ<sup>+</sup>15] Chenxin Ma, Virginia Smith, Martin Jaggi, Michael Jordan, Peter Richtárik, and Martin Takáč. Adding vs. averaging in distributed primal-dual optimization. In *ICML*, pages 1973–1982, 2015.
- [Nad64] Elizbar A Nadaraya. On estimating regression. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 9(1):141–142, 1964.
- [Nes98] Yurii Nesterov. Introductory lectures on convex programming volume i: Basic course. *Lecture notes*, 1998.
- [NN13] Jelani Nelson and Huy L Nguyễn. Osnap: Faster numerical linear algebra algorithms via sparser subspace embeddings. In *FOCS*, pages 117–126, 2013.
- [NRRW11] Feng Niu, Benjamin Recht, Christopher Ré, and Stephen J Wright. Hogwild!: A lock-free approach to parallelizing stochastic gradient descent. *..*, 2011.
- [NSW19] Vasileios Nakos, Zhao Song, and Zhengyu Wang. (nearly) sample-optimal sparse fourier transform in any dimension; ripless and filterless. In *FOCS*, pages 1568–1577, 2019.

- [NW06] Jorge Nocedal and Stephen Wright. *Numerical optimization.* ., 2006.
- [Pri13] Eric C. Price. *Sparse recovery and Fourier sampling.* PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2013.
- [PS15] Eric Price and Zhao Song. A robust sparse Fourier transform in the continuous setting. In *FOCS*, pages 583–600, 2015.
- [PSW17] Eric Price, Zhao Song, and David P. Woodruff. Fast regression with an  $\ell_\infty$  guarantee. In *ICALP*, 2017.
- [QJS<sup>+</sup>22] Lianke Qin, Rajesh Jayaram, Elaine Shi, Zhao Song, Danyang Zhuo, and Shumo Chu. Adore: Differentially oblivious relational database operators. In *VLDB*, 2022.
- [QRS<sup>+</sup>22] Lianke Qin, Aravind Reddy, Zhao Song, Zhaozhuo Xu, and Danyang Zhuo. Adaptive and dynamic multi-resolution hashing for pairwise summations. In *BigData*, 2022.
- [QSW23] Lianke Qin, Zhao Song, and Yitan Wang. Fast submodular function maximization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08367*, 2023.
- [QSZZ23] Lianke Qin, Zhao Song, and Ruizhe Zhang. A general algorithm for solving rank-one matrix sensing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12298*, 2023.
- [QSZZ23] Lianke Qin, Zhao Song, Lichen Zhang, and Danyang Zhuo. An online and unified algorithm for projection matrix vector multiplication with application to empirical risk minimization. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, pages 101–156. PMLR, 2023.
- [RHL<sup>+</sup>20] Nicola Rieke, Jonny Hancox, Wenqi Li, Fausto Milletari, Holger R Roth, Shadi Albarqouni, Spyridon Bakas, Mathieu N Galtier, Bennett A Landman, Klaus Maier-Hein, et al. The future of digital health with federated learning. *NPJ digital medicine*, 3(1):1–7, 2020.
- [RHS<sup>+</sup>15] Sashank J Reddi, Ahmed Hefny, Suvrit Sra, Barnabas Poczos, and Alex Smola. On variance reduction in stochastic gradient descent and its asynchronous variants. ., 2015.
- [RKR<sup>+</sup>16] Sashank J Reddi, Jakub Konečný, Peter Richtárik, Barnabás Póczós, and Alex Smola. Aide: Fast and communication efficient distributed optimization. ., 2016.
- [RPU<sup>+</sup>20] Daniel Rothchild, Ashwinee Panda, Enayat Ullah, Nikita Ivkin, Ion Stoica, Vladimir Braverman, Joseph Gonzalez, and Raman Arora. Fetchsgd: Communication-efficient federated learning with sketching. In *ICML*, pages 8253–8265, 2020.
- [RT16] Peter Richtárik and Martin Takáč. Distributed coordinate descent method for learning with big data. *JMLR*, 17(1):2657–2681, 2016.
- [SFC<sup>+</sup>18] Virginia Smith, Simone Forte, Ma Chenxin, Martin Takáč, Michael I Jordan, and Martin Jaggi. Cocoa: A general framework for communication-efficient distributed optimization. *IMLR*, 18:230, 2018.
- [Son19] Zhao Song. *Matrix theory: optimization, concentration, and algorithms.* The University of Texas at Austin, 2019.

- [SS14] Ohad Shamir and Nathan Srebro. Distributed stochastic optimization and learning. In *2014 52nd Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pages 850–857, 2014.
- [SSWZ22a] Zhao Song, Baocheng Sun, Omri Weinstein, and Ruizhe Zhang. Quartic samples suffice for fourier interpolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.12495*, 2022.
- [SSWZ22b] Zhao Song, Baocheng Sun, Omri Weinstein, and Ruizhe Zhang. Sparse fourier transform over lattices: A unified approach to signal reconstruction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.00658*, 2022.
- [SSZ14] Ohad Shamir, Nati Srebro, and Tong Zhang. Communication-efficient distributed optimization using an approximate newton-type method. In *ICML*, 2014.
- [SWY23] Zhao Song, Weixin Wang, and Chenbo Yin. Fast and efficient matching algorithm with deadline instances. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08353*, 2023.
- [SWYZ23] Zhao Song, Yitan Wang, Zheng Yu, and Lichen Zhang. Sketching for first order method: Efficient algorithm for low-bandwidth channel and vulnerability. In *ICML*, 2023.
- [SWZ17] Zhao Song, David P Woodruff, and Peilin Zhong. Low rank approximation with entry-wise  $\ell_1$ -norm error. In *STOC*, 2017.
- [SWZ19] Zhao Song, David P Woodruff, and Peilin Zhong. Relative error tensor low rank approximation. In *SODA*, 2019.
- [SY21] Zhao Song and Zheng Yu. Oblivious sketching-based central path method for linear programming. In *ICML*, 2021.
- [SYYZ23] Zhao Song, Mingquan Ye, Junze Yin, and Lichen Zhang. A nearly-optimal bound for fast regression with  $\ell_\infty$  guarantee. In *ICML*, 2023.
- [SYZ21] Zhao Song, Shuo Yang, and Ruizhe Zhang. Does preprocessing help training over-parameterized neural networks? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 34, 2021.
- [SZZ21] Zhao Song, Lichen Zhang, and Ruizhe Zhang. Training multi-layer over-parametrized neural network in subquadratic time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.07628*, 2021.
- [Tib96] Robert Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 267–288, 1996.
- [Wat64] Geoffrey S Watson. Smooth regression analysis. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, pages 359–372, 1964.
- [WZ16] David P Woodruff and Peilin Zhong. Distributed low rank approximation of implicit functions of a matrix. In *ICDE*, 2016.
- [WZD<sup>+</sup>20] Ruosong Wang, Peilin Zhong, Simon S Du, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Lin F Yang. Planning with general objective functions: Going beyond total rewards. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [XZZ18] Chang Xiao, Peilin Zhong, and Changxi Zheng. Bourgan: generative networks with metric embeddings. In *NeurIPS*, 2018.

- [Yan13] Tianbao Yang. Trading computation for communication: Distributed stochastic dual coordinate ascent. In *NIPS*, 2013.
- [YZY<sup>+</sup>19] Wensi Yang, Yuhang Zhang, Kejiang Ye, Li Li, and Cheng-Zhong Xu. Ffd: a federated learning based method for credit card fraud detection. In *International Conference on Big Data*, pages 18–32, 2019.
- [Zha22] Lichen Zhang. Speeding up optimizations via data structures: Faster search, sample and maintenance. Master’s thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, 2022.
- [ZL15] Yuchen Zhang and Xiao Lin. Disco: Distributed optimization for self-concordant empirical loss. In *ICML*, pages 362–370, 2015.
- [ZWSL10] Martin Zinkevich, Markus Weimer, Alexander J Smola, and Lihong Li. Parallelized stochastic gradient descent. In *NIPS*, 2010.
- [ZWX<sup>+</sup>17] Shun Zheng, Jialei Wang, Fen Xia, Wei Xu, and Tong Zhang. A general distributed dual coordinate optimization framework for regularized loss minimization. *JMLR*, 18(1):4096–4117, 2017.