Accelerated gradient methods with absolute and relative noise in the gradient
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Abstract In this paper, we investigate accelerated first-order methods for smooth convex optimization problems under inexact information on the gradient of the objective. The noise in the gradient is considered to be additive with two possibilities: absolute noise bounded by a constant, and relative noise proportional to the norm of the gradient. We investigate the accumulation of the errors in the convex and strongly convex settings with the main difference with most of the previous works being that the feasible set can be unbounded.
1 Introduction

We consider convex optimization problem on a closed convex (not necessarily bounded) set $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\min_{x \in Q} f(x).$$ (1)

We assume that the objective $f$ is $L_f$-smooth and strongly convex with the parameter $\mu \geq 0$, i.e., for all $x, y \in Q$:

$$\|\nabla f(y) - \nabla f(x)\|_2 \leq L_f \|y - x\|_2,$$

$$f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|y - x\|_2^2 \leq f(y).$$

In the convergence rate analysis of different first-order methods these assumptions are typically used in the form of an upper and lower quadratic bounds [16,10,7,30,5,28,41,38,54,22,51,25,14] for the objective:

$$f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|y - x\|_2^2 \leq f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L_f}{2} \|y - x\|_2^2.$$ (2)

Note, that the last relation is a consequence of the $L_f$-smoothness and, in general, is not equivalent, to it [53,28].

In many applications, instead of an access to the exact gradient $\nabla f(x)$ an algorithm has access only to its inexact approximation $\tilde{\nabla} f(x)$. Typical examples include gradient-free (or zeroth-order) methods which use a gradient estimator based on finite differences [12,48,8], and optimization problems in infinite-dimensional spaces related to inverse problems [35,29]. The two most popular definitions of gradient inexactness in practice are [46] as follows: for all $x \in Q$ it holds that

$$\|\tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x)\|_2 \leq \delta,$$ or (3)

$$\|\tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x)\|_2 \leq \alpha \|\nabla f(x)\|_2, \quad \alpha \in [0, 1).$$ (4)

Under assumption (3) many results exist for non-accelerated and accelerated first-order methods, see, e.g., [56,13,11,11]. These results are in a sense pessimistic in general with the explanation going back to the analysis in [45]. We can explain this reason by a very simple example. Consider the following problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ f(x) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \cdot (x_i)^2 \right\},$$ (5)

where $0 \leq \mu = \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_n = L_f$, $L_f \geq 2\mu$. Clearly, the solution of this problem is $x^* = 0$. Assume that the inexactness takes place only in
the first component $x_1$, i.e., instead of $\partial f(x)/\partial x^1 = \mu x^1$ we have access to $\tilde{\partial} f(x)/\partial x^1 = \mu x^1 - \delta$, where $\delta$ is the error. For the simple gradient descent

$$x_k = x_{k-1} - \frac{1}{L_f} \tilde{\nabla} f(x_{k-1}),$$

we can conclude that if $x^1_0 \geq 0$, then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, i.e., $k \gg L/\mu$, it holds that

$$x^1_k \geq \frac{\delta}{L} \frac{1 - (1 - \mu/L_f)^k}{1 - (1 - \mu/L_f)} \approx \frac{\delta}{\mu}.$$  (6)

Hence

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \gtrsim \frac{\delta^2}{2\mu}.$$

From this result, we see that it may be problematic to approximate $f(x^*)$ with any desired accuracy, especially in the ill-conditioned setting when the strong convexity constant $\mu$ is smaller than the desired accuracy $\varepsilon$. For accelerated gradient methods the situation may be even worse since they are more sensitive to the gradient errors and such errors may even be accumulated by the algorithm [17,23,28]. This drawback may be overcome by proposing a certain stopping rule so that the algorithm does not try to minimize below some threshold given by the gradient error or by adding a strongly convex regularizer with coefficient $\mu$ of the same order as the desired accuracy $\varepsilon$, see [45,46,39,28]. Roughly speaking, for non-accelerated algorithms it was proved in [45,46] that if $\delta$ is of the order $\varepsilon^2$, then it is possible to reach $\varepsilon$-accuracy in the objective residual function in almost the same number of iterations as in the exact case $\delta = 0$ by applying a computationally convenient stopping rule.

In this paper, we analyze an accelerated gradient method in both convex and strongly convex settings and estimate how the gradient error defined in (3) influences the convergence rate. An important part of our contribution is that our analysis is made without an assumption that the feasible set $Q$ is bounded. In particular, our results imply that it is sufficient to assume that $\delta$ is of the order $\varepsilon$ in order to obtain objective residual of the order $\varepsilon$. We also present a stopping rule and prove that if it is satisfied at some iteration, the algorithm solves problem (1) with certain accuracy. Moreover, we prove that until this rule is fulfilled, the trajectory of the algorithm is bounded and that it is fulfilled for sure in a number of iterations which is optimal for the class of smooth convex optimization problems.

Under assumption (4), non-accelerated gradient method for strongly convex problems is shown in [46] to have linear convergence with condition number $O\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot \frac{L_f}{\mu}\right)$, i.e. $\frac{1}{1-\alpha}$ worse than in the exact case. Yet, convergence to any small error is guaranteed unlike the case of inexactness (3). This result holds

\*This bound corresponds to the worst-case philosophy, i.e., choosing the worst example for the considered class of methods [10,41,10,28]. We expect more interesting results by considering average-case complexity [39,44].
also under the relaxed strong convexity assumption [28] known as Polyak–Lojasiewicz or gradient dominating condition. We are not aware of any such results for accelerated gradient methods.

In this paper, we analyze accelerated gradient method under inexact gradients satisfying (4) and answer the question of what is the maximum value of $\alpha$ such that the accelerated algorithm with inexact gradients converges with the same rate as the exact accelerated algorithm. For the case $\mu \neq 0$ our answer is that $\alpha$ should satisfy $\alpha = O\left( \frac{\mu}{L_f} \right)$. We hypothesise that this bound can be improved to $\alpha = O\left( \left( \frac{\mu}{L_f} \right)^{3/4} \right)$ and, for the case $\mu = 0$, the iteration-dependent value $\alpha_k$ should satisfy $\alpha_k = O\left( \left( \frac{1}{k} \right)^{3/2} \right)$, where $k$ is the iteration counter. Numerical experiments demonstrate that in general for $\alpha$ larger than mentioned above thresholds the convergence may slow down a lot up to divergence for considered accelerated method.

Close results with the bound $\alpha = O\left( \left( \frac{\mu}{L_f} \right)^{5/4} \right)$ in the case $\mu \gg \epsilon$ were recently obtained using another techniques in stochastic optimization with decision dependent distribution [19] and policy evaluation in reinforcement learning via reduction to stochastic variational inequality with Markovian noise [37]. In [37,19], the authors assumed that

$$
\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(x)\|_2 \leq B\|x - x^*\|_2, \quad \alpha \in [0, 1).
$$

Since $x^*$ is a solution, when $Q = \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $\nabla f(x^*) = 0$. Therefore,

$$
\|\nabla f(x)\|_2 = \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(x^*)\|_2 \leq L_f\|x - x^*\|_2.
$$

Thus, if (4) holds, then (7) also holds with $B = \alpha L_f$.

2 Ideas behind the results

Important results on gradient error accumulation for first-order methods were developed in a series of works of O. Devolder, F. Glineur and Yu. Nesterov 2011–2014 [15,17,18,16]. In these works, the authors were motivated by inequalities (2). Their idea is to relax (2), assuming inexactness in the gradient, introducing the inexact gradient $\tilde{\nabla} f(x)$, satisfying for all $x, y \in Q$

$$
f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|y - x\|_2^2 - \delta \leq f(y)
\leq f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L_f}{2} \|y - x\|_2^2 + \delta.
$$

This assumption allows to develop a theory for error accumulation for first-order methods.

In particular, they obtained convergence rates for non-accelerated gradient methods:

$$
f(x_k) - f(x^*) = O \left( \min \left\{ \frac{L_f R^2}{k}, L_f R^2 \exp\left( -\frac{\mu}{L_f} k \right) + \delta \right\} \right),
$$

(9)
and for accelerated methods:

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) = O \left( \min \left\{ \frac{L_f R^2}{k^2} + k \delta, L_f R^2 \exp \left(-\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{L_f}} \frac{k}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{L_f}{\mu}} \delta \right) \right\} \right),$$

(10)

where $R$ is such that $\|x_{\text{start}} - x^*\|_2 \leq R$, i.e. an estimate for the distance between the starting point $x_{\text{start}}$ and a solution $x^*$. If $x^*$ is not unique, one may take $x_{\text{start}}$ to be the closest to $x_{\text{start}}$. Both of these bounds are unimprovable [17,18]. See also [16,23,36] for “intermediate” situations between accelerated and non-accelerated methods and extensions for stochastic optimization.

Following [18], it is possible to reduce inexactness in the sense of (3) to inexactness in the sense of (8) by setting

$$\delta = \delta(3) = \frac{\delta(3)^2}{2L_f} + \frac{\delta(3)^2}{\mu} \approx \frac{\delta(3)^2}{\mu},$$

(11)

and changing 2-times constant $\mu, L_f$. The key observations here are

$$\langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2L_f} \| \tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x) \|_2^2 + \frac{L_f}{2} \| y - x \|_2^2,$$

and

$$\langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle \geq \frac{1}{\mu} \| \tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x) \|_2^2 - \frac{\mu}{4} \| y - x \|_2^2.$$

From this reduction, we see that when $\mu > 0$ for non-accelerated methods the result (9) is almost the same as for the example in (5). To guarantee that $f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \varepsilon$ for non-accelerated method when $\mu = \Omega(\varepsilon)$ we should set $\delta(3) = O(\varepsilon)$, which is an expected result. Unfortunately, for accelerated methods from this approach we have that we should set $\delta(3) = O(\varepsilon^{3/2})$, which is worse than our bound indicated in Section 1. Our key to the improvement is a more refined version of (8).

In the works [17,20,21,52,51] the following refined version of (8) is used:

$$f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \| y - x \|_2^2 - \delta_1 \| y - x \|_2 \leq f(y)$$

$$\leq f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L_f}{2} \| y - x \|_2^2 + \delta_2.$$  (12)

In this case, (9) and (10) are changed to the following bound for non-accelerated gradient methods:

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) = O \left( \min \left\{ \frac{L_f R^2}{k^2} + \tilde{R} \delta_1 + \delta_2, L_f R^2 \exp \left(-\frac{\mu}{L_f} k \right) + \tilde{R} \delta_1 + \delta_2 \right\} \right),$$

(13)

If $\mu \leq \varepsilon$, we can regularize the problem and guarantee the required condition [28]. Another advantage of strong convexity is possibility to use the norm of inexact gradient for the stopping criteria [29], like in [30]. Yet, regularization requires some prior knowledge about the distance to the solution [28]. Since we typically do not have such information the procedure becomes more difficult via applying the restarts [20,25].
and the following bound for accelerated methods:\cite{17,21}

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) = O\left(\min\left\{\frac{L_f R^2}{k^2} + \hat{R} \delta_1 + k \delta_2, L_f R^2 \exp\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{L_f}}\right) + \hat{R} \delta_1 + \sqrt{\frac{L_f}{\mu}} \delta_2\right\}\right),$$

(14)

where $\hat{R}$ is the maximum distance between the sequences of the algorithm and the solution $x^*$.

From \ref{13}, \ref{14}, we see that if $\hat{R}$ is bounded\footnote{In many situations this is true. For example, when $Q$ is bounded or when $\mu \gg \varepsilon$.}, then by setting

$$\delta_1 = \delta \frac{\delta_2}{L_f}, \delta_2 = \frac{\delta_2}{2L_f},$$

we obtain the desired result: it is possible to guarantee $f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \varepsilon$ with $\delta \ll O(\varepsilon)$.

In general, the drawback of the previous works is the assumption that $\hat{R}$ is bounded. As we may see from example \ref{5}, in general, when the strong convexity parameter $\mu$ is small relatively to the desired accuracy $\varepsilon$, only a bound

$$\hat{R} \simeq R + \frac{\delta_1}{\mu} \gtrsim R + \frac{\delta_1}{\varepsilon}$$

is possible to obtain \cite{28}. This bound leads to very pessimistic estimates. Moreover, the growth of $\hat{R}$ is observed in different numerical experiments. Below we investigate this problem and, in particular, propose an alternative to regularization\footnote{By using regularization we can guarantee $\mu \sim \varepsilon$ and therefore with $\delta_1 \sim \varepsilon$ we have the desired estimate $\hat{R} \approx R$.} approach that is based on “early stopping” of considered iterative procedure by developing proper stopping rule.

We now explain a way to reduce the relative inexactness in the sense of \ref{4} to the inexactness in the sense of \ref{8} and to apply \ref{10} when $\mu \gg \varepsilon$. Since $f(x)$ has Lipschitz gradient, from \ref{4}, \ref{8}, we can derive that after $k$ iterations (where $k$ is greater than $\sqrt{L_f/\mu}$ by a logarithmic factor $\log(L_f R^2/\varepsilon)$ with $\varepsilon$ being the desired level of the objective residual):

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \xrightarrow{\frac{10}{11}} \varepsilon + \sqrt{\frac{L_f \delta^2}{\mu}} \approx \sqrt{\frac{L_f \delta^2}{\mu}}$$

\cite{4,5} $\xrightarrow{\frac{8}{5}} \sqrt{\frac{L_f \alpha^2 \max_{t=1,...,k} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2}{\mu}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{L_f}{\mu} \frac{2L_f \alpha^2 \max_{t=1,...,k} (f(x_k) - f(x^*))}{\mu}}$

\cite{4,5,10} $\xrightarrow{\frac{15}{16}} \sqrt{\frac{L_f 4L_f \alpha^2 (f(x_0) - f(x^*))}{\mu}}$.\footnote{This terminology is popular also in Machine Learning community, where “early stopping” is used also as an alternative to regularization to prevent overfitting \cite{32}.}
Choosing \( \alpha = O \left( \left( \frac{\mu}{L_f} \right)^{3/4} \right) \), we guarantee that the following restart condition holds

\[
f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{2} (f(x_0) - f(x^*)).
\]

When the restart condition holds, we restart the method. Then, after \( \log (\Delta f/\varepsilon) \) restarts we can guarantee the desired \( \varepsilon \)-accuracy in terms of the objective residual. In ill-conditioned setting when \( \mu \) is small, the calculations are more involved. Yet, the main idea remains the same and replacing \( \sqrt{L_f/\mu} \) with \( k \) (cf. (10)) we obtain \( \alpha_k \lesssim \left( \frac{1}{k} \right)^{3/2} \).

Among many types of accelerated gradient methods, we choose methods with one projection (Similar Triangles Methods (STM)), see [31,11,33,52,25] and references therein. We choose this method since: 1) it is primal-dual [24, 31]; 2) it is possible to bound \( \hat{R} \) in the absence of noise [31,41,52] and when the noise is present [34,33]; 3) has previously been intensively investigated, see [25] and references therein.

### 3 Some motivation for inexact gradients

In this section, we describe only two research directions where inexact gradient play an important role. We emphasise that, although the results below are not new, the way they are presented is of some value in our opinion and can be useful for the specialists in these directions.

#### 3.1 Gradient-free methods

In this section, we consider convex optimization problem:

\[
\min_{x \in Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n} f(x).
\]

In some applications we do not have an access to gradient \( \nabla f(x) \) of the objective function, but can calculate the value of \( \tilde{f}(x) \) with accuracy \( \delta_f [12] \):

\[
|\tilde{f}(x) - f(x)| \leq \delta_f.
\]

In this case, a number of options exist for approximating the gradient, see, e.g., [8] and references therein. We consider the following examples, assuming that \( f \) has \( L_p \)-Lipschitz \( p \)-th order derivatives w.r.t. the Euclidean norm.

---

\footnote{The approach we describe requires that the function values is available not only in \( Q \), but also in some (depends on a particular approach) vicinity of \( Q \). This problem can be solved in two different ways. The first one is “margins inward approach” [8]. The second one is “continuation” of \( f \) to \( \mathbb{R}^n \) with preserving of its convexity and Lipschitz continuity [18]: \( f_{\text{new}}(x) := f(\text{proj}_Q(x)) + \alpha \min_{y \in Q} \|x - y\|_2 \).}
– (p-th order finite-differences) The gradient approximation is constructed as
\[ \tilde{\nabla}_i f(x) = \frac{f(x + h e_i) - f(x - h e_i)}{2h} \text{ for } p = 2, \]
where \( e_i \) is the \( i \)-th coordinate vector. In this case, we have that (3) holds with
\[ \delta = \sqrt{n} O \left( L_p h^p + \frac{\delta_f}{h} \right), \]
see [8]. Optimal choice of \( h \) guarantees that \( \delta O \left( \sqrt{n} \delta_f^{\frac{p}{2}} \right) \). From Section 1, we know that it is possible to solve problem (1) with accuracy \( \varepsilon = O(\delta) \) in terms of the objective value. Hence, we should choose
\[ \delta_f \sim \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}. \]
Unfortunately, such simple idea does not give tight lower bound in the class of algorithms that has sample complexity \( \text{Poly}(n, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \) [48]
\[ \delta_f \sim \max \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{\varepsilon}{n} \right\}. \quad (16) \]
Note that, instead of finite-difference approximation approach, in some applications we can use kernel approach [47,4] which have recently a renowned interest [3,43].
– (Gaussian Smoothed Gradients) constructed as
\[ \nabla f(x) = \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E} \tilde{f}(x + he)e, \]
where \( e \in N(0, I_n) \) is standard normal random vector. In this case, we have that (3) holds with
\[ \delta = O \left( n^{p/2} L_p h^p + \sqrt{n} \delta_f \right), \]
see [12,8]. Optimal choice of \( h \) guarantees \( \delta O \left( (n \delta_f)^{\frac{p}{p+1}} \right) \). Hence, we should choose
\[ \delta_f = O \left( \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{p+1}{p}}}{n} \right). \]
This bound also does not match the lower bound mentioned above. Moreover, here (and in the approach below) we have additional difficulty since we need to estimate \( \tilde{f}(x) \). This is only possible inexact, for example, by using the Monte Carlo approach [8], which leads to additional computational price for the better quality of approximation.
− (Sphere Smoothed Gradients) constructed as
\[ \tilde{\nabla} f(x) = \frac{n}{h} \mathbb{E} \tilde{f}(x + he) e, \]
where \( e \) is random vector with uniform distribution in the unit sphere in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) with center at 0. In this case, (3) holds with
\[ \delta = O \left( L_p h^p + \frac{n \delta f}{h} \right), \]
see [8]. Optimal choice of \( h \) guarantees \( \delta = O \left( (n \delta f)^{\frac{p+1}{p}} \right) \). Hence, we should choose
\[ \delta_f = O \left( \frac{\varepsilon^{p+1}}{n} \right). \]
This bound also does not match the lower bound. One may have a feeling that the last two approaches are almost the same, but below we give a more accurate result for the Sphere smoothing. We do not know how to obtain such a result for Gaussian smoothing. The result is as follows [17, 48]: for the Sphere smoothed gradient, we have that (8) holds with
\[ \delta \simeq 2 L_0 h + \frac{\sqrt{n} \delta f \tilde{R}}{h}, \] (17)
where \( L_0 \) is the Lipschitz constant of \( f \) and in [8] \( L_f = \min \left\{ L_1, \frac{7L_2}{h} \right\} \) when \( p = 1 \) and \( L_f = \frac{7L_2}{h} \), when \( p = 0 \). The bound (17) is more accurate than the previous ones since it corresponds to the first part of the lower bound (16). Indeed, by choosing a proper \( h \) in (17) we obtain \( \varepsilon \sim \delta \sim n^{1/4} \delta_f^{1/2} \). Hence, we should choose
\[ \delta_f = O \left( \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\sqrt{n}} \right). \]
The other part, i.e. the case when \( \delta_f = \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{n} \right) \) of the lower bound (16) is also tight, see [6].

The bound in (17) and its consequences additionally illustrate that the inexactness and algorithms we describe in section 2 and develop below are also tight (optimal) enough. Otherwise, it would not be possible to achieve the lower bound using the reduction of gradient-free methods to gradient methods with inexact oracle and the proposed analysis of the error accumulation for gradient-type methods.
3.2 Inverse problems

Another rather important research direction where gradients are typically available only approximately is optimization in a Hilbert space [55]. Such optimization problems arise, in particular, in inverse problems theory [35].

We start by recalling how to calculate a derivative in a general Hilbert space. Let

\[ J(q) := J(q, u(q)), \]

where \( u(q) \) is the unique solution of the equation \( G(q, u) = 0 \). Assume that \( G_q(q, u) \) is invertible. Then, we have

\[ G_q(q, u) + G_u(q, u) \nabla u(q) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla u(q) = -[G_u(q, u)]^{-1} G_q(q, u). \]

Therefore,

\[ \nabla J(q) := J_q(q, u) + J_u(q, u) \nabla u(q) = J_q(q, u) - J_u(q, u) [G_u(q, u)]^{-1} G_q(q, u). \]

The same result can be obtained by considering the Lagrange functional

\[ L(q, u; \psi) = J(q, u(q)) + \langle \psi, G(q, u) \rangle \]

with

\[ L_u(q, u; \psi) = 0, G_q(q, u) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla J(q) = L_q(q, u; \psi). \]

Indeed, by simple calculations we can connect these two approaches by setting

\[ \psi(q, u) = -[G_u(q, u)^{T}]^{-1} J_u(q, u)^{T}. \]

Now we demonstrate this technique on inverse problem for elliptic initial-boundary value problem. Let \( u \) be the solution of the following problem (P)

\[
\begin{align*}
&u_{xx} + u_{yy} = 0, \quad x, y \in (0, 1), \\
&u(1, y) = q(y), \quad y \in (0, 1), \\
&u_x (0, y) = 0, \quad y \in (0, 1), \\
&u (x, 0) = u (x, 1) = 0, \quad x \in (0, 1).
\end{align*}
\]

The first two relations

\[ -u_{xx} - u_{yy} = 0, \quad x, y \in (0, 1), \]

\[ q(y) - u (1, y) = 0, \quad y \in (0, 1), \]

constitute the system of equations \( G(q, u) = G(q, u) = 0 \), and the last two constitute the feasible set \( Q \).

Assume that we want to estimate \( q(y) \in L_2(0, 1) \) by observing \( b(y) = u(0, y) \in L_2(0, 1), \) where \( u(x, y) \in L_2 \left( (0, 1) \times (0, 1) \right) \) is the (unique) solution of (P) [35]. This is an inverse problem. We can reduce this problem to an optimization problem [35]:

\[
\min_{y} \left\{ J(q) := \min_{u: \hat{G}(q, u) = 0, u \in Q} J(q, u) := J(u) = \int_0^1 |u(0, y) - b(y)|^2 dy \right\}.
\] (18)
We can solve (18) numerically since it is a convex quadratic optimization problem. We can also directly apply Lagrange multipliers principle to (18), see [55]:

\[
L(q,u;\psi) = \langle \psi, \bar{G} \cdot (q,u) \rangle = \int_0^1 |u(0,y) - b(y)|^2 dy - \\
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 (u_{xx} + u_{yy}) \psi(x,y)dxdy + \int_0^1 (q(y) - u(1,y)) \lambda(y) dy.
\]

To obtain conjugate problem for \(\psi\), we need to vary \(L(q,u;\psi)\) in \(\delta u\) satisfying \(u \in Q\):

\[
\delta u L(q,u;\psi) = 2 \int_0^1 (u(0,y) - b(y)) \delta u(0,y) dy - \\
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 (\delta u_{xx} + \delta u_{yy}) \psi(x,y)dxdy - \int_0^1 \delta u(1,y) \lambda(y) dy,
\]

where

\[
\delta u_x(0,y) = 0, \quad y \in (0,1),
\]
\[
\delta u_x(1,y) = \delta u(x,1) = 0, \quad x \in (0,1).
\]

Using the integration by part, from [19], we can derive

\[
\delta u L(q,u;\psi) = \int_0^1 (2 (u(0,y) - b(y)) - \psi_x(0,y)) \delta u(0,y) dy - \\
\int_0^1 \psi(1,y) \delta u_x(1,y) dy - \int_0^1 \psi(x,1) \delta u_y(x,1) dx + \int_0^1 \psi(x,0) \delta u_y(x,0) dy + \\
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 (\psi_{xx} + \psi_{yy}) \delta u(x,y)dxdy + \int_0^1 (\psi_x(1,y) - \lambda(y)) \delta u(1,y) dy.
\]

Consider now the corresponding conjugate problem (D):

\[
\psi_{xx} + \psi_{yy} = 0, \quad x, y \in (0,1),
\]
\[
\psi_x(0,y) = 2 (u(0,y) - b(y)), \quad y \in (0,1),
\]
\[
\psi(1,y) = 0, \quad y \in (0,1),
\]
\[
\psi(x,0) = \psi(x,1) = 0, \quad x \in (0,1)
\]

and additional relation between Lagrange multipliers

\[
\lambda(y) = \psi_x(1,y), \quad y \in (0,1).
\]

These relations appear since \(\delta u L(q,u;\psi) = 0\), and \(\delta u(0,y), \delta u_x(1,y), \delta u(1,y) \in L_2(0,1)\); \(\delta u_y(x,1), \delta u_y(x,0) \in L_2(0,1)\); \(\delta u(x,y) \in L_2((0,1) \times (0,1))\) are arbitrary.
Since by \[49\] we have
\[ J(q) = \min_{u: (q,u) \in (P)} J(u) = \min_{u: \tilde{G}(q,u) = 0, u \in Q} \min_{u \in Q, \psi \in (D)} \max_{L(q,u;\psi)} \] 
from the Demyanov–Danskin’s theorem \[49\], we have
\[ \nabla J(q) = \nabla q \min_{u \in Q} \max_{\psi \in (D)} L(q,u;\psi), \]
where \(u(q)\) is the solution of (P) and \(\psi(q)\) is the solution of (D), where
\[ \psi_x(0,y) = 2(u(0,y) - b(y)), \quad y \in (0, 1) \]
and \(u(0,y)\) depends on \(q(y)\) via (P) and, at the same time, the pair \((u(q), \psi(q))\)
is the solution of the saddle-point problem
\[ \min_{u \in Q} \max_{\psi \in (D)} L(q,u;\psi) \]
and \(\delta_{\psi} L(q,u;\psi) = 0\) entails \(\tilde{G} \cdot (q,u) = 0\), that is from (P), if we add \(u \in Q\)and \(\delta_{u} L(q,u;\psi) = 0\), then \(u \in Q\) entails (D) as we have shown above. Note also that
\[ L(q,u(q);\psi(q))(y) = \lambda(y), \quad y \in (0, 1). \]
Hence, due to (20),
\[ \nabla J(q)(y) = \psi_x(1,y), \quad y \in (0, 1). \]
Thus we reduced the calculation of \(\nabla J(q)(y)\) to the solution of two correct initial-boundary value problems for elliptic equation in a square, namely problems (P) and (D) \[35\].

This result can be also interpreted in a slightly different manner if we introduce a linear operator
\[ A : q(y) := u(1,y) \mapsto u(0,y). \]
Here \(u(x,y)\) is the solution of problem (P). It was shown in \[35\] that
\[ A : L^2(0,1) \rightarrow L^2(0,1). \]
The conjugate operator is \[35\]
\[ A^* : p(y) := \psi_x(0,y) \mapsto \psi_x(1,y), \quad A^* : L^2(0,1) \rightarrow L^2(0,1). \]
Here \(\psi(x,y)\) is the solution of the conjugate problem (D). So, by considering
\[ \mathcal{J}(q)(y) = \|Aq - b\|_2^2, \]
we can write
\[ \nabla J(q)(y) = A^* (2(Aq - b)), \]
\[**\]

The same result in a more simple situation (without additional constraint \(u \in Q\))we considered at the beginning of this section. In that case we do not apply Demyanov–Danskin’s theorem and use the inverse function theorem.
that completely corresponds to the same scheme as described above:

1. Based on \(q(y)\) we solve (P) and obtain \(u(0, y) = Aq(y)\) and define \(p(y) = 2(u(0, y) - b(y))\).

2. Based on \(p(y)\) we solve (D) and calculate \(\nabla^3 q(y) = A^*p(y) = \psi_x(1, y)\).

Summarizing, the inexactness in the gradient \(\nabla^3 q\) arises since we can solve (P) and (D) only numerically up to some accuracy.

The described above technique can be applied to many different inverse problems [35] and optimal control problems [55]. Note that, for optimal control problems, in practice another strategy widely used. Namely, instead of approximate calculation of the gradient, optimization problem is replaced by an approximate one (for example, by using finite-differences schemes). For this reduced (finite-dimensional) problem the gradient is typically available precisely [26]. Moreover, in [26] the described above Lagrangian approach is used to explain the core of automatic differentiation, where the function calculation tree is represented as system of explicitly solvable interlocking equations.

4 Absolute noise in the gradient

In this section, we consider problem (1) in the absolute noise setting (see [3]), i.e. we assume that the inexact gradient \(\tilde{\nabla} f(x)\) satisfies uniformly in \(x \in \mathcal{Q}\) the inequality

\[
\|\tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x)\|_2 \leq \delta. \tag{21}
\]

We underline that \(\mathcal{Q}\) can be unbounded, for example \(\mathbb{R}^n\). Under this assumption we present several important relations concerning "inexact smoothness" and "inexact strong convexity". Then we present and analyze an accelerated gradient method and study its error accumulation.

4.1 Auxiliary facts

We start with some auxiliary facts and assumptions. Let \(x_{\text{start}}\) be some starting point for an algorithm and assume that there is a constant \(R\) such that

\[
\|x_{\text{start}} - x^*\|_2 \leq R,
\]

where \(x^*\) is a solution to problem (1). If \(x^*\) is not unique we take such \(x^*\) that is the closest to \(x_{\text{start}}\). We assume that the function \(f\) has Lipschitz gradient with constant \(L_f\), i.e. is \(L_f\)-smooth:

\[
\forall x, y \in \mathcal{Q}, \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|_2 \leq L_f\|x - y\|_2. \tag{22}
\]

This implies inequality

\[
\forall x, y \in \mathcal{Q}, f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L_f}{2}\|x - y\|_2^2. \tag{23}
\]

In what follows we use following simple lemma.
Lemma 1 (Fenchel inequality) Let $(\mathcal{E}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ be a Euclidean space, then for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+, \forall u, v \in \mathcal{E}$ the inequality holds:

$$\langle u, v \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda} ||u||_2^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} ||v||_2^2.$$

Let us introduce several constants, which will be used below in this section:

$$L = 2L_f,$$
$$\delta_1 = \delta,$$
$$\delta_2 = \frac{\delta^2}{L}.$$

From the $L_f$-smoothness assumption, we obtain the following upper bound for the objective through the inexact oracle.

Claim 1 For all $x, y \in Q$, the following estimate holds:

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L_f}{2} ||x - y||_2^2 + \delta_2,$$

where $L = 2L_f, \delta_2 = \frac{\delta^2}{2L_f}$.

Proof The proof follows from the following chain of inequalities:

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L_f}{2} ||x - y||_2^2 \leq$$
$$\leq f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{1}{2L_f} ||\nabla f(x) - \tilde{\nabla} f(x)||_2^2 + \frac{L_f}{2} ||x - y||_2^2 + \frac{L_f}{2} ||x - y||_2^2 \leq$$
$$\leq f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L_f}{2} ||x - y||_2^2 + \delta_2.$$

We also assume that $f$ is strongly convex with parameter $\mu \geq 0$, where the case $\mu = 0$ corresponds to just convexity of $f$. This means that for all $x, y \in Q$:

$$f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} ||x - y||_2^2 \leq f(y). \quad (24)$$

Based on this assumption and our assumption in the inexactness of the oracle, we can obtain two lower bounds for the objective. The first one is given by the following result.

Claim 2 For all $x, y \in Q$, the following estimate holds:

$$f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} ||x - y||_2^2 - \delta_1 ||x - y||_2 \leq f(y),$$

where $\delta_1 = \delta$. 
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Proof Using the Cauchy inequality and (24) we obtain:

\[
f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \| x - y \|^2 - \delta_1 \| x - y \|^2 \leq f(x) +
\]

\[
+ \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \| x - y \|^2 - \| \tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x) \|_2 \| x - y \|^2 \leq
\]

\[
\leq f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \| x - y \|^2 - \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle \leq f(y) \Rightarrow
\]

\[
f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \| x - y \|^2 - \delta_1 \| x - y \|^2 \leq f(y).
\]

For the second estimate we assume that \( \mu \neq 0 \) and introduce:

\[
\delta_3 = \frac{\delta^2}{\mu}, \mu \neq 0.
\]

Claim 3 For all \( x, y \in Q \), if in (24) \( \mu \neq 0 \), the following estimate holds:

\[
f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{4} \| y - x \|^2 - \delta_3 \leq f(y),
\]

where \( \delta_3 = \frac{\delta^2}{\mu} \).

Proof Clearly,

\[
f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{4} \| x - y \|^2 - \delta_3 = f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle +
\]

\[
+ \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{4} \| x - y \|^2 - \delta_3.
\]

Using Lemma 1 we obtain:

\[
f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{4} \| x - y \|^2 - \delta_3 \leq f(x) +
\]

\[
+ \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\delta^2}{\mu} + \frac{\mu}{4} \| x - y \|^2 + \frac{\mu}{4} \| y - x \|^2 - \delta_1 \| x - y \|^2 \leq \delta_3 =
\]

\[
= f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \| y - x \|^2 \leq f(y).
\]

To unify the derivations based on Claims 2 and 3, we use notation \( \mu_\tau \), \( \tau \in \{1, 2\} \), where \( \tau = 1 \) and \( \mu_1 = \mu \) correspond to the bound in Claim 2 and \( \tau = 2 \) and \( \mu_2 = \frac{\mu}{2} \) correspond to the bound in Claim 3 and the case when \( \mu \neq 0 \).
4.2 Similar Triangles Method and its properties

In this section we introduce an accelerated gradient method, which we will analyze in the presence of absolute inexactness in the gradient.

**Algorithm 1** STM \((L, \mu, x_{\text{start}}), Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\)

**Input:** Starting point \(x_{\text{start}}\), number of steps \(N\).

- Set \(\tilde{x}_0 = x_{\text{start}}, a_0 = \frac{1}{2}, A_0 = \frac{1}{2}\).
- Set \(\psi_0(x) = \frac{1}{2} \|x - \tilde{x}_0\|^2 + a_0 \left( f(\tilde{x}_0) + \langle \nabla f(\tilde{x}_0), x - \tilde{x}_0 \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - \tilde{x}_0\|^2 \right)\).
- Set \(z_0 = \arg\min_{y \in Q} \psi_0(y), x_0 = z_0\).

**for** \(k = 1 \ldots N \) **do**

- Find \(\alpha_k\) from \((1 + \mu + A_{k-1})(A_{k-1} + \alpha_k) = L\alpha_k^2\), or equivalently \(\alpha_k = \frac{1 + \mu + A_{k-1}}{2L} + \sqrt{\frac{(1 + \mu + A_{k-1})^2}{4L^2} + \frac{A_{k-1}(1 + \mu + A_{k-1})}{L}}\), \(A_k = A_{k-1} + \alpha_k\), \(\tilde{x}_k = \frac{A_{k-1}x_{k-1} + \alpha_k z_{k-1}}{A_k}\), \(\psi_k(x) = \psi_{k-1}(x) + \alpha_k \left( f(\tilde{x}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\tilde{x}_k), x - \tilde{x}_k \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - \tilde{x}_k\|^2 \right)\), \(z_k = \arg\min_{y \in Q} \psi_k(y), x_k = \frac{A_{k-1}x_{k-1} + \alpha_k z_k}{A_k}\).

**end for**

**Output:** \(x_N\).
Figure 4.2 illustrates the iterates of the algorithm and justifies the name Similar Triangles Method (STM). When $Q = \mathbb{R}^n$, the main step of the algorithm can be simplified to

$$z_k = z_{k-1} - \frac{\alpha_k}{1 + A_k \mu} \left( \nabla f(\tilde{x}_k) + \mu \tau (z_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_k) \right)$$

using the first-order optimality condition in the definition of $z_k$.

In the analysis we use the following identities that easily follow from the construction of the algorithm.

$$A_k (x_k - \tilde{x}_k) = \alpha_k (z_k - \tilde{x}_k) + A_{k-1} (x_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_k),$$

$$\frac{1 + \mu \tau A_{k-1}}{2 A_k} \| z_k - z_{k-1} \|^2 = \frac{L}{2} \| x_k - \tilde{x}_k \|^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

$$A_{k-1} \| \tilde{x}_k - x_{k-1} \|_2 = \alpha_k \| \tilde{x}_k - z_{k-1} \|_2.$$

The following is the main technical result which will be used later in the analysis.

**Lemma 2** For all $k \geq 1$, the following inequality holds:

$$\psi_k(z_k) \geq \psi_{k-1}(z_{k-1}) + \frac{1 + \mu \tau A_{k-1}}{2} \| z_k - z_{k-1} \|^2 + \alpha_k \left( f(\tilde{x}_k) + (\nabla f(\tilde{x}_k), z_k - \tilde{x}_k) + \frac{\mu \tau}{2} \| z_k - \tilde{x}_k \|^2 \right).$$

**Proof** By the definition of $\psi_k$, we have

$$\psi_k(z_k) = \psi_{k-1}(z_k) + \alpha_k \left( f(\tilde{x}_k) + (\nabla f(\tilde{x}_k), z_k - \tilde{x}_k) + \frac{\mu \tau}{2} \| z_k - \tilde{x}_k \|^2 \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \| z_k - \tilde{x}_0 \|^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \alpha_j \left( f(\tilde{x}_j) + (\nabla f(\tilde{x}_j), z_k - \tilde{x}_j) + \frac{\mu \tau}{2} \| z_k - \tilde{x}_j \|^2 \right)$$

$$+ \alpha_k \left( f(\tilde{x}_k) + (\nabla f(\tilde{x}_k), z_k - \tilde{x}_k) + \frac{\mu \tau}{2} \| z_k - \tilde{x}_k \|^2 \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

Further, by construction, the function $\psi_{k-1}$ has its minimum at the point $z_{k-1}$, which implies, by the optimality condition,

$$\langle \nabla \psi_{k-1}(z_{k-1}), z_{k-1} - z_k \rangle \geq 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \langle z_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_0, z_{k-1} - z_k \rangle \geq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \alpha_j \langle \nabla f(\tilde{x}_j), z_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_j \rangle, z_{k-1} - z_k \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

We also have the identity

$$\frac{1}{2} \| z_k - \tilde{x}_0 \|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \| z_{k-1} - z_k \|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| z_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_0 \|^2 + \langle z_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_0, z_{k-1} - z_k \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)
Combining the above, we have

$$
\psi_k(z_k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|z_{k-1} - x_0\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|z_{k-1} - x_0, z_k - z_{k-1}\| + \frac{1}{2} \|z_{k-1} - z_k\|^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \alpha_j \left( f(\bar{x}_j) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}_j), z_k - \bar{x}_j \rangle + \frac{\mu\tau}{2} \|z_k - \bar{x}_j\|^2 \right) + \alpha_k \left( f(\bar{x}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}_k), z_k - \bar{x}_k \rangle + \frac{\mu\tau}{2} \|z_k - \bar{x}_k\|^2 \right)
$$

Applying the identity

$$
\langle z_{k-1} - \bar{x}_j, z_{k-1} - z_k \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \|z_{k-1} - \bar{x}_j\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|z_k - z_{k-1}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|z_k - \bar{x}_j\|^2,
$$

and the definition of the sequence $A_k$, we finally get

$$
\psi_k(z_k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|z_{k-1} - x_0\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu\tau A_{k-1}}{2} \|z_{k-1} - z_k\|^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \alpha_j \left( f(\bar{x}_j) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}_j), z_{k-1} - \bar{x}_j \rangle + \frac{\mu\tau}{2} \|z_{k-1} - \bar{x}_j\|^2 \right) + \alpha_k \left( f(\bar{x}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}_k), z_k - \bar{x}_k \rangle + \frac{\mu\tau}{2} \|z_k - \bar{x}_k\|^2 \right) = \psi_{k-1}(z_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu\tau A_{k-1}}{2} \|z_k - z_{k-1}\|^2 + \alpha_k \left( f(\bar{x}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}_k), z_k - \bar{x}_k \rangle + \frac{\mu\tau}{2} \|z_k - \bar{x}_k\|^2 \right).
$$

**Remark 1** In the case when $\mu = 0$, we obtain the following particular case of the result of the previous Lemma:

$$
\psi_k(z_k) = \psi_{k-1}(z_{k-1}) + \alpha_k \left( f(\bar{x}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}_k), z_k - \bar{x}_k \rangle \right) \Rightarrow \psi_k(z_k) \geq \psi_{k-1}(z_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2} \|z_k - z_{k-1}\|^2 + \alpha_k \left( f(\bar{x}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}_k), z_k - \bar{x}_k \rangle \right).
$$

We finish this subsection by a series of technical results that estimate the growth of the sequence $A_k$ and relates sequences.
Claim 4 If $\mu \neq 0$, then for all $k \geq 1$ the following inequality holds:

$$A_k \geq A_{k-1} \lambda_{\mu L},$$

where

$$\theta_{\mu L} = \frac{\mu \tau}{L}, \quad \lambda_{\mu L} = \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\theta_{\mu L} + \sqrt{\theta_{\mu L}}\right).$$

Proof Using relation between $\alpha_k, A_k, A_{k-1}$

$$A_k(1 + \mu \tau A_{k-1}) = L \alpha_k^2,$$

we obtain a quadratic equation for $A_k$:

$$A_k(1 + \mu \tau A_{k-1}) = L(A_k - A_{k-1})^2,$$

$$A_k(1 + \mu \tau A_{k-1}) = L A_k^2 - 2 L A_{k-1} A_k + L A_{k-1}^2,$$

$$LA_k^2 - A_k(1 + \mu \tau A_{k-1} + 2 L A_{k-1}) = 0 + L A_{k-1}^2.$$

Solving this equation, we get

$$A_k \geq A_{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{\mu \tau + 1}{L} + \sqrt{\frac{\mu \tau}{L}}\right) \geq A_{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{\mu \tau + 1}{2L} + \sqrt{\frac{\mu \tau}{L}}\right).$$

Using that, for $x < 1$, $1 + x \geq e^x$, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 1

$$\lambda_{\mu L} = \left(1 + \frac{\mu \tau}{2L} + \sqrt{\theta_{\mu L}}\right) \geq \left(1 + \sqrt{\theta_{\mu L}}\right) \geq e^{\frac{\mu \tau}{2L}} \sqrt{\theta_{\mu L}}.$$

Claim 5 If $\mu \neq 0$, then for all $k \geq 1$ the following inequality holds:

$$\frac{1}{A_k} \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j \leq 1 + \left(1 + \frac{\mu \tau}{2L} + \sqrt{\theta_{\mu L}}\right).$$

Proof Using the previous claim, we get $A_k \geq A_{k-1} \lambda_{\mu L}^j$, and, hence, $\frac{A_{k-1}}{A_k} \leq \lambda_{\mu L}^{-j}$. This gives

$$\frac{1}{A_k} \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k} \lambda_{\mu L}^{-j} = \frac{\lambda_{\mu L}^{k+1} - 1}{\lambda_{\mu L}^{k+1} - 1 - \lambda_{\mu L}^k} \leq \frac{\lambda_{\mu L} - 1}{\lambda_{\mu L}^{k+1} - 1} \leq 1 + \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu \tau}}.$$

Claim 6 If $\mu = 0$, then for all $k \geq 1$

$$A_k \geq \frac{(k + 1)^2}{4L}.$$
Proof If $\mu = 0$, then $A_k = Lo_k^2$, and, solving the quadratic equation, we get

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4L^2\alpha_{k-1}^2}}{2L} \geq \frac{1 + 2L\alpha_{k-1}}{2L} = \frac{1}{2L} + \alpha_{k-1}.$$ 

Then by induction it is easy to get that:

$$\alpha_k \geq \frac{k + 1}{2L} \Rightarrow A_k = Lo_k^2 \geq \frac{(k + 1)^2}{2L}.$$

Claim 7 If $\mu = 0$, then for all $k \geq 1$

$$\frac{1}{A_k} \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j \leq k + 1.$$

Proof The proof follows from the simple calculations since $A_k$ is non-decreasing:

$$\frac{1}{A_k} \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j \leq \frac{1}{A_k} (k + 1)A_k = k + 1.$$

4.3 Convergence rates under the absolute inexactness

In this section we obtain main convergence rate results for Algorithm 1. We will use the following sequence

$$\tilde{R}_k = \max_{0 \leq j \leq k} \{ \|z_j - x^*\|_2, \|x_j - x^*\|_2, \|\tilde{x}_j - x^*\|_2 \}.$$ 

Theorem 1 The sequences generated by Algorithm 1 satisfy for all $k \geq 0$ the inequality

$$A_k f(x_k) \leq \psi_k(z_k) + \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j + \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j \|\tilde{x}_j - z_{j-1}\|_2.$$

Proof We prove the result by induction. The induction basis for $k = 0$ follows from the facts that $A_0 = \alpha_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ and

$$\psi_0(x) = \alpha_0 \left( f(\tilde{x}_0) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(\tilde{x}_0), x - \tilde{x}_0 \rangle + \frac{\mu \tau}{2} \|x - \tilde{x}_0\|_2^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - \tilde{x}_0\|_2^2,$$

which imply, by Claim 1 and since $x_0 = z_0$ that

$$f(x_0) \leq f(\tilde{x}_0) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(\tilde{x}_0), x_0 - \tilde{x}_0 \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|x_0 - \tilde{x}_0\|_2^2 + \delta_2$$

$$= L\psi_0(z_0) - \frac{\mu \tau}{2} \|z_0 - \tilde{x}_0\|_2^2 + \delta_2 \leq L\psi_0(z_0) + \delta_2.$$
To make the induction step we start from the following corollary of Claim 1:

\[ A_k f(x_k) - A_{k-1} \delta_1 \|x_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_k\|_2 \]
\[ \leq A_k \left( f(\tilde{x}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\tilde{x}_k), x_k - \tilde{x}_k \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|x_k - \tilde{x}_k\|^2_2 + \delta_2 \right) - A_{k-1} \delta_1 \|x_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_k\|_2. \]

Using equations (25), this gives

\[ A_k f(x_k) - A_{k-1} \delta_1 \|x_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_k\|_2 \]
\[ \leq A_{k-1} \left( f(\tilde{x}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\tilde{x}_k), x_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_k \rangle \right) + \alpha_k \left( f(\tilde{x}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\tilde{x}_k), z_k - \tilde{x}_k \rangle \right) \]
\[ + \frac{(1 + \mu \tau A_k - 1)}{2} \|z_k - z_{k-1}\|^2_2 + A_k \delta_2 - A_{k-1} \delta_1 \|x_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_k\|_2 \]
\[ \leq A_{k-1} f(x_{k-1}) + \alpha_k (f(\tilde{x}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\tilde{x}_k), z_k - \tilde{x}_k \rangle) \]
\[ + \frac{1 + \mu \tau A_k - 1}{2} \|z_k - z_{k-1}\|^2_2 + A_k \delta_2. \]

By the induction hypothesis and since \( \frac{\mu \tau}{2} \|z_k - \tilde{x}_k\|^2_2 \geq 0 \), we further obtain

\[ A_k f(x_k) - A_{k-1} \delta_1 \|x_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_k\|_2 \leq \psi_{k-1}(z_{k-1}) + \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} A_j + \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \alpha_j \|\tilde{x}_j - z_{j-1}\|_2 \]
\[ + \alpha_k \left( f(\tilde{x}_k) + \langle \nabla f(\tilde{x}_k), z_k - \tilde{x}_k \rangle + \frac{\mu \tau}{2} \|z_k - \tilde{x}_k\|^2_2 \right) + \frac{1 + \mu \tau A_k - 1}{2} \|z_k - z_{k-1}\|^2_2 + A_k \delta_2. \]

Using Lemma 2 we get

\[ A_k f(x_k) \leq A_{k-1} \delta_1 \|x_{k-1} - \tilde{x}_k\|_2 + \psi_k(z_k) + \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j + \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j \|\tilde{x}_j - z_{j-1}\|_2 \]
\[ + \psi_k(z_k) + \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j + \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j \|\tilde{x}_j - z_{j-1}\|_2 + \alpha_k \delta_1 \|\tilde{x}_k - z_{k-1}\|_2, \]

which finishes the induction step and the proof.

Using the definition of \( \tilde{R}_k \) and \( A_k \), we obtain the following simple corollary of the above theorem:

\[ A_k f(x_k) \leq \psi_k(z_k) + \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j + \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j \|\tilde{x}_j - z_{j-1}\|_2 \]
\[ \leq \psi_k(z_k) + \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j + \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j (\|z_{k-1} - x^*\|_2 + \|\tilde{x}_k - x^*\|_2) \]
\[ \leq \psi_k(z_k) + \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j + 2\tilde{R}_k \delta_1 A_k. \quad (29) \]
We note that the above estimates hold both in the case of $\mu \neq 0$ and in the case of $\mu = 0$.

The proof of the following result repeats verbatim the proof of Theorem 1 except for Claim 2 being replaced by Claim 3.

**Theorem 2** If $\mu \neq 0$, the sequences generated by Algorithm 1 satisfy for all $k \geq 0$ the inequality

$$A_k f(x_k) \leq \psi_k(z_k) + \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j + \delta_3 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} A_j.$$  

**Theorem 3** Assume that the oracle error $\delta$ satisfies $\delta = 0$ and that $\|\bar{x}_0 - x^*\|_2 \leq R$ for some $R$. Then, for all $k \geq 1$, $\bar{R}_k \leq R$.

**Proof** We first prove that, for all $k \geq 0$, $\|z_k - x^*\|_2 \leq R$. Let us fix $k \geq 0$. By Theorem 1 we have $A_k f(x_k) \leq \psi_k(z_k)$. Further, $\psi_k(x)$ is strongly convex with a constant at least 1. At the same time, by the strong convexity of $f$, we have

$$f(\bar{x}_j) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}_j), x^* - \bar{x}_k \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^* - \bar{x}_k\|^2 \leq f(x^*) \leq f(x_k).$$

Using these three facts and the definition of $\psi_k(x)$, we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{2} \|z_k - x^*\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|z_k - x^*\|^2 + A_k f(x_k) - A_k f(x_k) \leq \psi_k(z_k) + \frac{1}{2} \|z_k - x^*\|^2 - A_k f(x_k) \leq \psi_k(x^*) - A_k f(x_k) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k} \alpha_j \left(f(\bar{x}_j) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}_j), x^* - \bar{x}_k \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^* - \bar{x}_k\|^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \|x^* - \bar{x}_0\|^2 - A_k f(x_k) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k} \alpha_j f(x^*) + \frac{1}{2} R^2 - A_k f(x_k) = A_k (f(x^*) - f(x_k)) + \frac{1}{2} R^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} R^2.$$

For the remaining two sequences, $\bar{x}_k$ and $x_k$ the proof is by induction. Clearly, $\|\bar{x}_0 - x^*\| \leq R$. Since, by construction, $x_0 = z_0$, we have $\|x_0 - x^*\| \leq R$. Then, by construction of the algorithm and the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\|x_k - x^*\|_2 \leq \left\| \frac{A_{k-1}}{A_k} (x_{k-1} - x^*) + \frac{\alpha_k}{A_k} (z_k - x^*) \right\|_2 \leq \frac{A_{k-1}}{A_k} \|x_{k-1} - x^*\|_2 + \frac{\alpha_k}{A_k} \|z_k - x^*\|_2 \leq R.$$

In the same way, we obtain $\|\bar{x}_k - x^*\| \leq R$ using the definition

$$\bar{x}_k = \frac{\alpha_k}{A_k} z_k - 1 + \frac{A_{k-1}}{A_k} x_{k-1}.$$
Theorem 4 Let $\|\tilde{x}_0 - x^*\|_2 \leq R$ for some $R$. If $\mu \neq 0$, the sequences generated by Algorithm 1 satisfy for all $k \geq 0$ the inequalities

$$f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq LR^2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{H_1}{L}} N\right) + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_1}}\right) \delta_2 + 3\tilde{R}_N \delta_1,$$

$$f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq LR^2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_2}{L}} N\right) + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_2}}\right) \delta_2 + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_2}}\right) \delta_3.$$

If $\mu = 0$, the sequences generated by Algorithm 1 satisfy for all $k \geq 0$ the inequality

$$f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{4LR^2}{N^2} + 3\tilde{R}_N \delta_1 + N \delta_2.$$

Proof The proofs of the first and second inequalities are nearly the same with the only difference that the proof of the first inequality is based on Theorem 1 and Claim 2 whereas the proof of the second inequality is based on Theorem 2 and Claim 3. Thus, we give only the proof of the first inequality. From (29), by the definition of $z_N$ and $\psi_N$, and Claim 2, we have

$$A_N f(x_N) \leq \psi_N(z_N) + \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^N A_j + 2\tilde{R}_N \delta_1 A_N \leq \frac{1}{2} \|x^* - \tilde{x}_0\|^2 +$$

$$+ \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^N A_j + 2\tilde{R}_N \delta_1 A_N + \sum_{j=0}^N \alpha_k(f(\tilde{x}_j) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(\tilde{x}_j), x^* - \tilde{x}_j \rangle) + \frac{H_1}{2} \|x^* - x_i\|^2 \leq$$

$$\leq \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^N A_j + 2\tilde{R}_N \delta_1 A_N + \sum_{j=0}^N \alpha_k(\tilde{R}_j \delta_1 + f(x^*)) + \frac{1}{2} R^2 =$$

$$= \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^N A_j + 3\tilde{R}_N \delta_1 A_N + A_N f(x^*) + \frac{1}{2} R^2 \iff$$

$$\iff f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{R^2}{2A_N} + \delta_2 \frac{1}{A_N} \sum_{j=0}^N A_N + 3\tilde{R}_N \delta_1.$$

Using Claim 4 with Corollary 1 and Claim 5 we get:

$$f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq LR^2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{H_1}{L}} N\right) + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_1}}\right) \delta_2 + 3\tilde{R}_N \delta_1.$$

Repeating the same steps and using Claim 6 and 7, we prove the third inequality.

Remark 2 We can reduce the setting when $\mu = 0$ to the setting when $\mu \neq 0$. Indeed, suppose that $\mu = 0$ and consider the following regularized problem:

$$\min_{x \in Q} \left\{ f^\mu(x) := f(x) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - \tilde{x}_0\|^2 \right\}.$$
Then, we have
\[
\nabla f^\mu(x) = \nabla f(x) + \mu(x - \bar{x}_0), \\
\tilde{\nabla} f^\mu(x) = \tilde{\nabla} f(x) + \mu(x - \bar{x}_0),
\]
\[
\|\tilde{\nabla} f^\mu(x) - \nabla f^\mu(x)\|_2 = \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(x)\|_2 \leq \delta.
\]

Clearly, \( f^\mu(x) \) has Lipschitz gradient. Indeed, \( \forall x, y \in Q \):
\[
\|\nabla f^\mu(x) - \nabla f^\mu(y)\|_2 = \|(\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)) + \mu(x - y)\|_2 \leq \\
\leq \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|_2 + \mu\|x - y\|_2 \leq \\
\leq L_f\|x - y\|_2 + \mu\|x - y\|_2 \leq (L_f + \mu)\|x - y\|_2.
\]

Since \( \mu \leq L \), we have that \( f^\mu(x) \) is \( L^\mu \)-smooth with \( L^\mu = 4L_f = 2L \). Moreover, \( f^\mu(x) \) is strongly convex and we can apply the derivations corresponding to the case \( \tau = 2 \). Using Theorem 4, and setting \( x^*_\mu = \arg\min_{x \in Q} f^\mu(x), R_\mu \) s.t. \( \|x^*_\mu - \bar{x}_0\|_2 \leq R_\mu \), we obtain the following inequalities
\[
f^\mu(x_k) - f^\mu(x^*_\mu) \leq 2LR^2_\mu \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{4L}}k\right) + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{4L}{\mu}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2L} + \frac{1}{\mu}\right) \delta^2,
\]
\[
f^\mu(x^*_\mu) \leq f(x^*) + \frac{\mu}{2} R^2.
\]

Translating this to the original objective \( f \), we obtain
\[
f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq f^\mu(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq f^\mu(x_k) - f(x^*_\mu) + \frac{\mu}{2} R^2 \leq \\
\leq 2LR^2_\mu \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{2L}}k\right) + \\
\quad + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{4L}{\mu}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2L} + \frac{1}{\mu}\right) \delta^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} R^2.
\]

By the strong convexity of the function \( f^\mu \) we get:
\[
f(x^*) + \frac{\mu}{2} R^2_\mu \leq f(x^*_\mu) + \frac{\mu}{2} R^2_\mu = f^\mu(x^*_\mu) \leq f^\mu(x^*) = f(x^*) + \frac{\mu}{2} R^2 \Rightarrow \\
R_\mu \leq R.
\]

Finally, we get the convergence rate as follows:
\[
f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq 2LR^2 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{2L}}k\right) + \\
\quad + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{4L}{\mu}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2L} + \frac{1}{\mu}\right) \delta^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} R^2.
\]

To obtain an error \( \epsilon \) in the r.h.s., we choose \( \mu = \frac{2}{3}\frac{\epsilon}{R^2} \).
4.4 Stopping rule under the absolute inexactness

In this subsection, we consider the setting with $\tau = 1$ and $\mu = 0$. In this case a possible drawback of the convergence rate obtained in Theorem 4 can be that the sequence $\tilde{R}_N$ may increase as $N$ increases. To overcome this, we formulate a certain condition (stopping rule) and prove that if it is satisfied at iteration $N$, the algorithm solves problem (1) with certain accuracy, and if is not satisfied at iteration $N$, then $\tilde{R}_N \leq R$. Moreover, we estimate the maximum number of iterations to satisfy this condition.

**Theorem 5** Consider the setting $\tau = 1$ and $\mu = 0$ and assume that for some $R$, $\|\tilde{x}_0 - x^*\|_2 \leq R$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be the desired solution accuracy. Let $N$ be the first iteration such that

$$f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{4LR^2}{N^2} + 3\tilde{R}_N\delta_1 + N\delta_2.$$  

(30)

Then, for all $k \in \{0, \ldots, N - 1\}$, we have that $\tilde{R}_{N-1} \leq R$. Moreover,

$$N \leq N_{\text{max}} := \left\lceil \sqrt{\frac{2LR^2}{\epsilon}} \right\rceil.$$  

(31)

**Proof** Fixing any $k \geq 0$, applying Theorem 1, the fact that 1-strongly convex function $\psi_k(x)$ attains its minimum at $z_k$, the definition of this function, and Claim 2, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\|z_k - x^*\|^2_2 + A_k f(x_k)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}\|z_k - x^*\|^2_2 + \psi_k(z_k) + 2 \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j + \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j \|\tilde{x}_j - z_{j-1}\|_2$$

$$\leq \psi_k(x^*) + \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j + \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j \|\tilde{x}_j - z_{j-1}\|_2$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\|\tilde{x}_0 - x^*\|^2_2 + \sum_{j=0}^{k} \alpha_j (f(\tilde{x}_j) + \langle \nabla f(\tilde{x}_j), x^* - \tilde{x}_j \rangle)$$

$$+ \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j + \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j \|\tilde{x}_j - z_{j-1}\|_2$$

$$\leq \frac{R^2}{2} + A_k f(x^*) + \delta_1 \sum_{j=0}^{k} \alpha_j \|\tilde{x}_j - x^*\|_2 + \delta_2 \sum_{j=0}^{k} A_j$$

$$+ \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j \|\tilde{x}_j - z_{j-1}\|_2.$$  

(32)
Whence,

\[
\frac{1}{2} \|z_k - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{R^2}{2} + A_k \left( f(x^*) - f(x_k) + \frac{\delta_1 \alpha_0}{A_k} \|\tilde{x}_0 - x^*\|_2 + \frac{\delta_1}{A_k} \sum_{j=0}^k \alpha_j (2\|\tilde{x}_j - x^*\|_2 + \|z_{j-1} - x^*\|_2) + \frac{\delta_2}{A_k} \sum_{j=0}^k A_j \right). \quad (33)
\]

Setting \(k = 0\), since \(\|\tilde{x}_0 - x^*\|_2 \leq R\) and, by the Theorem assumption, inequality \((30)\) does not hold for \(k \leq N - 1\), we obtain

\[
\frac{1}{2} \|z_0 - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{R^2}{2} + A_0 \left( f(x^*) - f(x_0) + \frac{\delta_1 \alpha_0}{A_0} R + \delta_2 \right) \leq \frac{R^2}{2} + A_0 \left( -\delta_2 - 3R\delta_1 - \varepsilon + \frac{\delta_1 \alpha_0}{A_0} R + \delta_2 \right) \leq \frac{R^2}{2},
\]

where we also used that \(\alpha_0 = A_0\). Thus, we obtain that \(\|z_0 - x^*\|_2 \leq R\), and, since \(x_0 = z_0\), that \(\|x_0 - x^*\|_2 \leq R\). Hence, \(\tilde{R}_0 \leq R\). Let us now assume that for some \(k \leq N - 1\), \(\tilde{R}_k \leq R\) (see \((4.3)\) for the definition of \(\tilde{R}_k\)). Then, by the definition of \(\tilde{x}_k\) in Algorithm 1 and convexity of the norm, we have that \(\|\tilde{x}_k - x^*\|_2 \leq R\). Further, since \(k \leq N - 1\), we have that inequality \((30)\) does not hold. Thus, from \((33)\), we have

\[
\frac{1}{2} \|z_k - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{R^2}{2} + A_k \left( f(x^*) - f(x_k) + \frac{\delta_1 \alpha_0 R}{A_k} + \frac{\delta_1}{A_k} \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j : 3R + \frac{\delta_2}{A_k} \sum_{j=0}^k A_j \right). \leq \frac{R^2}{2} + A_k \left( -\frac{\delta_2}{A_k} \sum_{j=0}^k A_j - 3R\delta_1 - \varepsilon + 3R\delta_1 + \frac{\delta_2}{A_k} \sum_{j=0}^k A_j \right) \leq \frac{R^2}{2}.
\]

This implies that \(\|z_k - x^*\|_2 \leq R\), and, by the definition of \(x_k\) and the convexity of the norm, that \(\|x_k - x^*\|_2 \leq R\). Hence, \(\tilde{R}_k \leq R\). In summary, we obtain by induction that for all \(k \in \{0, \ldots, N - 1\}\), \(\tilde{R}_{N-1} \leq R\). This also implies that \(\|x_N - x^*\|_2 \leq R\).

We now prove the statement of the Theorem. Let us assume the opposite, i.e. \(N > N_{\text{max}}\). We use \((32)\) with \(k = N - 1\) and obtain, since \(\tilde{R}_{N-1} \leq R\), that

\[
f(x_{N-1}) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{R^2}{2A_{N-1}} + 3R\delta_1 + \frac{\delta_2}{A_{N-1}} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} A_j \leq \frac{2LR^2}{N^2} + 3R\delta_1 + \frac{\delta_2}{A_{N-1}} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} A_j < \varepsilon + 3R\delta_1 + \frac{\delta_2}{A_{N-1}} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} A_j,
\]
where we used Claim 6 and that $N > N_{\text{max}}$. Thus we see that after $N - 1$ iterations, inequality (30) holds. This is a contradiction with the definition of $N$ as the first iteration number for which this inequality holds. This finishes the proof.

Combining (30) with Claim 7 and the fact that $N \leq N_{\text{max}}$, we obtain that

$$f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq \delta_2 (N_{\text{max}} + 1) + 3R\delta_1 + \varepsilon.$$

Thus, if we redefine $\varepsilon \rightarrow \frac{\varepsilon}{7}$, and set $\delta_2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3(N_{\text{max}} + 1)}$, $\delta_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{9R}$, we guarantee that $f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq \varepsilon$.

**Remark 3** In some situations we have at our disposal the value of $f(x^*)$ or its estimate. For example, when solving systems of linear equations:

$$Ax = b,$$

$$\min_x \left\{ f(x) = \|Ax - b\|_2^2 \right\},$$

if a solution exist, we have $f^* = f(x^*) = 0$. This allows, based on (32) to change the inequality (30) to a more adaptive version, which can be checked online and which can fulfill much earlier than (30). Such counterpart of (30) reads as

$$f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{\delta_2}{A_N} \sum_{j=0}^{N} A_j + R\delta_1 + \delta_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j \|\tilde{x}_j - z_{j-1}\|_2 + \varepsilon. \quad (34)$$

If this inequality is not fulfilled at iteration $k$, we have that $\tilde{R}_k \leq R$. If is fulfilled at iteration $k$, we obtain that

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \delta_2 (k + 1) + 3R\delta_1 + \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, we also obtain that (34) holds after no more than $N_{\text{max}}$ iterations.

### 5 Relative noise in the gradient

In this section, we consider problem (1) in the relative noise setting (see (4)), i.e. we assume that the inexact gradient $\tilde{\nabla} f(x)$ satisfies uniformly in $x \in Q$ the inequality

$$\|\tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x)\| \leq \alpha \|\nabla f(x)\|_2.$$

We also assume that $\mu \neq 0$ and that $Q = \mathbb{R}^n$. For this setting, we analyze a slightly different version of accelerated gradient method, adopted from [52].
Further, a different error setting of relative inexactness (4), in each iteration of this algorithm we have a particular case of Algorithm 2 in [52]. Since in this section, we are in the $x \in Q$ space, we assumed that Definition 3.3 of [52] can be set to $\mu = 2$. Applying Theorem 3.4 of [52], we obtain the following convergence rate for $x^*$. Combining Definition 3.3 of [52] with Claims 1, 3 and particular choice of $\delta_k$ in our paper, Algorithm 2 is a particular case of Algorithm 2 in [52]. Since in this section, we are in the setting of relative inexactness (3), in each iteration of this algorithm we have a different error $\delta_k = \alpha \| \nabla f(y_k) \|_2$, which gives the following expression for $\delta_k$ in Algorithm 2 in [52]: $\delta_k = \frac{3\alpha^2 \| \nabla f(u) \|^2}{2\mu^2}$.

Applying Theorem 3.4 of [52], we obtain the following convergence rate for all $N \geq 0$:

$$f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{R^2}{A_N} + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{3\alpha^2 A_k \| \nabla f(y_k) \|_2^2}{\mu_2 A_N} := \kappa A_N,$$

$$\|u_N - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{1 + A_N \mu_2} \left[ \frac{R^2}{A_N} + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{3\alpha^2 A_k \| \nabla f(y_k) \|_2^2}{\mu_2} \right] := \kappa \frac{R^2}{1 + A_N \mu_2}.$$

Since we assumed that $Q = \mathbb{R}^n$, we have that $\| \nabla f(x^*) \| = 0$ and that, for all $x \in Q$, $f(x) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{L}{4} \| x - x^* \|_2^2$, and $\delta = \frac{3\alpha^2 \| \nabla f(u) \|^2}{2\mu^2}$, for all $u \in Q$. Then, using convergence rate for $\delta_k$, we obtain

$$f(u_k) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{L}{4} \| u_k - x^* \|_2^2 \leq \frac{L \kappa}{4(1 + A_k \mu_2)}.$$
Using the convexity of $f$ and the definition of the sequence $y_k$ we get:

$$f(y_{N+1}) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{\alpha_{N+1}}{A_{N+1}} [f(u_N) - f(x^*)] + \frac{A_N}{A_{N+1}} [f(x_N) - f(x^*)]$$

$$\leq \frac{\alpha_{N+1}}{A_{N+1}} \cdot \frac{L \kappa}{4(1 + A_k \mu_2)} + \frac{A_N}{A_{N+1}} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{A_N}.$$

Our next goal is to estimate $\frac{\alpha_{N+1}}{A_{N+1}} \cdot \frac{L}{4(1 + A_k \mu_2)}$ from above. Using the inequalities

$$A_k \leq \frac{1}{\mu_2} \text{ and } \sqrt{x + y} \leq \sqrt{x} + \sqrt{y},$$

and the definition of the sequence $\alpha_k$:

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1 + \mu_2 A_{k-1}}{2L} + \sqrt{\left( \frac{1 + \mu_2 A_{k-1}}{4L^2} + \frac{A_{k-1}(1 + \mu_2 A_{k-1})}{L} \right)},$$

we have

$$\frac{\alpha_{N+1}}{A_{N+1}} \cdot \frac{L}{4(1 + A_k \mu_2)} = \frac{L}{4A_{N+1} (1 + \mu_2 A_N)} \left( \frac{1 + \mu_2 A_N}{2L} + \sqrt{\frac{(1 + \mu_2 A_N)^2}{4L^2} + \frac{A_N(1 + \mu_2 A_N)}{L}} \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{L}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{A_{N+1}} \cdot \frac{1}{L \mu_2} \left( 2L + \frac{1}{2L} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{L \mu_2}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{4A_{N+1}} \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_2}}.$$

This gives us the following estimate

$$f(y_{N+1}) - f^* \leq \frac{\kappa}{4A_{N+1}} \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_2}} + \frac{\kappa}{A_{N+1}} \leq$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_2}} \left( \frac{5R^2}{A_{N+1}} + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{15A_k^2 \| \nabla f(y_k) \|^2}{\mu_2 A_{N+1}} \right),$$

where we used that $L/\mu_2 \geq 1$ and the definition of $\kappa$.

Since $f$ is $L_f$-smooth, $L = 2L_f$ and $\nabla f(x^*) = 0$, we obtain for any $x \in Q$ that

$$\| \nabla f(x) \|^2 \leq L (f(x) - f(x^*)).$$

Whence, using the previous bound,

$$f(y_{N+1}) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_2}} \left( \frac{5R^2}{A_{N+1}} + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{15A_k^2 \| \nabla f(y_k) \|^2}{\mu_2 A_{N+1}} \right).$$

Introducing the following notations $\lambda = \frac{5R^2}{4} \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_2}}$, $\theta = \frac{15A^2}{4} \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_2}}$, $\Delta_k = f(y_k) - f(x^*)$, we obtain the following recurrence

$$\Delta_N \leq \frac{\lambda}{A_N} + \theta \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{A_k}{A_N} \Delta_k,$$

where we add the term corresponding to $k = 0$ to the sum to simplify the proof that will follow. Analyzing this recurrence, we obtain.
Claim 8 For all \( k \geq 1 \) it holds that
\[
\Delta_k \leq \frac{(1 + \theta)^{k-1}}{A_k} \lambda + \theta \frac{A_0}{A_k} (1 + \theta)^{k-1} \Delta_0.
\]

Proof The induction basis \( k = 1 \) is obvious. Induction step:
\[
\Delta_k \leq \frac{\lambda}{A_k} + \theta \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \left( \frac{A_j}{A_k} \right)^j + \theta \frac{A_0}{A_k} \Delta_0
\]
\[
\leq \frac{\lambda}{A_k} + \theta \sum_{j=1}^{k-2} \left( \frac{(1 + \theta)^{j-1}}{A_k} + \theta \frac{A_0 (1 + \theta)^{j-1}}{A_k} \Delta_0 \right) + \frac{A_0}{A_k} \Delta_0
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{A_k} \left( \lambda + \lambda \left[(1 + \theta)^{k-1} - 1\right] + \theta A_0 \Delta_0 \left[(1 + \theta)^{k-1} - 1\right] + A_0 \Delta_0 \right)
\]
\[
= \frac{(1 + \theta)^{k-1}}{A_k} \lambda + \theta \frac{A_0}{A_k} (1 + \theta)^{k-1} \Delta_0.
\]

This gives us the following result
\[
f(y_k) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{\lambda (1 + \theta)^k}{A_k} + \theta \frac{A_0 (1 + \theta)^k}{A_k} (f(y_0) - f(x^*)).
\]

By the definition of \( \theta = \frac{5\alpha^2}{4} \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu^2}} \) we obtain, that if we choose \( \alpha \) as
\[
\alpha \leq \frac{1}{7} \frac{\mu_2}{L} = \Theta \left( \frac{\mu}{L} \right),
\]

then
\[
1 + \sqrt{\frac{\mu_2}{L}} \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{15}{196} + \frac{15}{392} \right) \leq 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\mu_2}{L}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \iff \frac{1 + \theta}{2 \sqrt{\frac{\mu_2}{L}}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_2}{L}} \iff \frac{1 + \theta}{2 \sqrt{\frac{\mu_2}{L}}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_2}{L}}.
\]

Combining this with Claim 4 and Corollary 1, we obtain that
\[
\frac{(1 + \theta)^k}{A_k} \leq \left( \frac{1 + \theta}{1 + \sqrt{\frac{\mu_2}{L}}} \right)^k \frac{1}{A_0} \leq \left( \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_2}{L}}} \right)^k \frac{1}{A_0} \leq L \exp \left( - \frac{k}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_2}{L}} \right).
\]

As a result, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 6 Assume that the inexactness is described by \( (4) \) and that \( \mu \neq 0 \). Also assume that \( \alpha \) is chosen according to \( (35) \). Then, for all \( k \geq 1 \),
\[
f(y_k) - f(x^*) \leq \left( \frac{5LR^2}{4} + \frac{15}{196} \sqrt{\frac{2L}{\mu}} [f(y_0) - f(x^*)] \right) \exp \left( - \frac{k}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{2L}} \right).
\]
6 Conclusions and observations

Remark 4

Using Theorem 3 and assume, that $Q$ – compact set we can denote $R$ as diam($Q$) instead of $\|x_0 - x^*\|_2$, then we can also bound $\tilde{R} \leq R$ and this will simplify bounds in Theorem 4.

Remark 5

With the same assumption $\mu \neq 0$ we obtain a comparison of the two convergences in the Theorem 4. Recall that:

$$\delta_1 = \delta, \quad \delta_2 = \frac{\delta^2}{L}, \quad \delta_3 = \frac{\delta^2}{\mu}.$$ 

So if

$$\delta < \frac{3\tilde{R}}{\frac{1}{\mu} + \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{L} (\sqrt{2} - 1)}.$$

Then the accumulation of noise in the model corresponding to $\tau = 2$, that described in (3) is less than in model $\tau = 1$, described in (2).

Remark 6

If we use model $\tau = 2$, described in Theorem 4 one can set the desired accuracy of the solution.

$$f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Then we get from Theorem 4 that:

$$f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq LR^2 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{2L}} N \right) + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_2}} \right) \delta_2 + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_2}} \right) \delta_3,$$

$$f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq LR^2 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{2L}} N \right) + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_2}} \sqrt{\mu} \right) \delta_2 + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_2}} (\sqrt{2} + 1) \right) \delta^2.$$
That is we can get estimates for $\delta$ value and number of steps $N$:

$$
\left(\frac{L + \mu}{\sqrt{\mu^3L}} (\sqrt{2} + 1)\right) \delta^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2},
$$

$$
\delta \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{2} + 1}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{L + \mu}{\sqrt{\mu^3L}}},
$$

$$
\delta = O \left(\frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon} (L + \mu)^{3/2}}{(\mu^3L)^{3/4}}\right);
$$

$$
LR^2 \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{2L} N}\right) \leq \varepsilon^2,
$$

$$
N \geq 2 \sqrt{\frac{2L}{\mu}} \left(\ln 2LR^2 + \ln \varepsilon^{-1}\right),
$$

$$
N = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu}} \ln \frac{LR^2}{\varepsilon}\right).
$$

**Remark 7**

Using Remark 2 and previous Remark 6, we can found similar bounds. Remind that:

$$
f(x_N) - f(x^*) \leq LR^2 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{2(L + 2)}} N\right) +
$$

$$
+ \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{2L + 4}{\mu}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{L + \frac{1}{\mu}}\right) \delta^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} R^2.
$$

However we should value of the parameter $\mu$. We will let:

$$
\mu = \frac{2 \varepsilon}{3 R^2}.
$$

Using inequality:

$$
\delta^2 \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{2L + 4}{\mu}}\right) \left(\frac{\mu + L}{\mu L}\right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.
$$

And the selected value of the parameter $\mu$ we get required value of error $\delta$:

$$
\delta \leq \left(\frac{2}{243}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \sqrt{2L + 4}}} R^{-\frac{3}{2}} \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{4}},
$$

$$
\delta = O \left(L^{-\frac{1}{2}} R^{-\frac{3}{2}} \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{4}}\right).
$$
Similarly, get an estimate of the number of steps:

\[ LR^2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{2(L+2)}} \right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \]

\[ N \geq \sqrt{12L + 24R \ln 2LR^2 + 2\sqrt{2L + 4} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}, \]

\[ N = O \left( \sqrt{\frac{LR^2}{\varepsilon}} \ln \frac{LR^2}{\varepsilon} \right). \]

**Remark 8**

Using Theorem 5 we can apply it to problem:

\[ Ax = b, \]

\[ A \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R}). \]

Solving such a problem is equivalent to solving the convex optimization problem:

\[ f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2 \rightarrow \min, \]

\[ \nabla f(x) = A^T (Ax - b). \]

We will assume similarly the estimate of the norm \( x^* \):

\[ \|x^*\|_2 \leq R_*. \]

Let the original problem be solved with an \( \varepsilon_1 \) accuracy in the sense:

\[ \|Ax - b\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_1, \]

\[ f(x) - f(x^*) = \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2 \leq \varepsilon, \]

\[ \varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_1^2. \]

When the algorithm stops, we get the convergence:

\[ f(x_{\text{stop}}) - f(x^*) \leq N \delta_2 + 3\delta_1 R_*, \]

\[ N_{\text{stop}} = \left[ 2 \sqrt{\frac{LR^2}{\zeta}} \right] + 1. \]

Then we choose \( \delta, \zeta \) from the following conditions:

\[
\begin{cases}
\zeta \leq \frac{\varepsilon_1}{\gamma}, \\
\delta \leq \left( \frac{L + \frac{1}{6\sqrt{3R}}}{{}\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{3}{7}}, \\
\delta \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{4}}. 
\end{cases}
\]
For example, we can let:

\[ \delta = C_{R,R_*,L}\varepsilon, \]
\[ C_{R,R_*,L} = \min \left\{ \frac{L^2}{6\sqrt{3R}}, \frac{1}{9R_*} \right\}. \]

Then the number of steps required is expressed as:

\[ N_\varepsilon = \left\lceil \frac{3LR^2}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil + 1. \]

Accordingly, the estimate required for solving the problem of linear equations:

\[ N_{\varepsilon_1} = \left\lceil \frac{2\sqrt{3LR^2}}{\varepsilon_1} \right\rceil + 1. \]

**Remark 9**

The work considered a model of additive noise in equation (21), similar to [45], that is we can consider that:

\[ \tilde{\nabla} f(x) = \nabla f(x) + r_x, \]
\[ \|r_x\|_2 \leq \delta. \]

Similarly to this work, a stopping criterion was proposed for the STM algorithm, as was proposed for gradient descent.

\[ x_{k+1} = x_k - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(x_k). \]

Note that in the same noise model, the convergence estimate in both considered cases will be:

\[ j_N = \arg\min_{1 \leq k \leq N} f(x_k), \]
\[ y_N = x_{j_N}, \]
\[ f(y_N) - f(x^*) = O \left( \frac{LR^2}{N} + \frac{\delta^2}{L} + \tilde{R}\delta \right), \]
\[ f(y_N) - f(x^*) = O \left( LR^2 \exp\left( -\frac{\mu}{2L} N \right) + \frac{\delta^2}{L} + \tilde{R}\delta \right). \]
\[ f(y_N) - f(x^*) = O \left( LR^2 \exp\left( -\frac{\mu}{2L} N \right) + \frac{\delta^2}{L} + \frac{\delta^2}{\mu} \right), \]
\[ \tilde{R} = \max_{k \leq N} \|x_k - x^*\|_2. \]

Despite the fact that in the work [18], a slightly different model was considered, namely \((\delta, L)\) and \((\delta, L, \mu)\) oracle (equation 3.1 Definition 1 in [18]), similar orders of convergence were obtained, that is Theorem [4]. Namely, function
satisfies the \((\delta, L, \mu)\) model at point \(x \in Q\) means, that exists functions \(f_\delta(x)\) and \(\psi_\delta(x, y)\), such that:

\[
\forall y \in Q \\
\frac{\mu}{2} \|x - y\|_2^2 \leq f(x) - f_\delta(y) - \psi_\delta(x, y) \leq \frac{L}{2} \|x - y\|_2^2 + \delta.
\]

Similarly to papers \[52\], \[18\], the results also hold in the case of an unbounded set \(Q\) (result in \[52\] is on the page 26, obtained for fast adaptive gradient method page 13). Stopping criteria are also formulated, which give an estimate on \(\tilde{R}\) for a non-compact \(Q\), remind that:

\[
\tilde{R} = \max_{0 \leq k \leq N} \{ \|x_k - x^*\|_2, \|\tilde{x}_k - x^*\|_2, \|z_k - x^*\|_2 \}.
\]

We also note that a similar models of \((\delta, \Delta, L)\) and \((\delta, \Delta, L, \mu)\) oracle was considered in the work \[51\]. Moreover, the function satisfies \((\delta, \Delta, L, \mu)\)–model

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{f}(y) & \leq f_\delta + \psi(y, x) + \Delta \|x - y\| + \delta + LV(y, x), \\
f_\delta + \psi(x^*, x) + \mu V(y, x) & \leq f(x^*), \\
f(x) - \delta & \leq f_\delta(x) \leq f(x), \\
\psi(x, x) & = 0.
\end{align*}
\]

Here \(V(x, y)\) – Bregman divergence. At the same time, an adaptive analogue of STM was considered. As well as similar estimations for a \(\delta\) and number of steps \(N\), following \[18\] (page 24, remarks 11 – 14), namely there are remarks 6, 7, 8. Also considered an example of using regularization to obtain convergence in the model \(\tau = 1\), for the case \(\mu = 0\).

**Remark 10**

Similarly, accelerated methods in the Euclidean prox-structure in the presence of relative inaccuracy were considered in the work \[27\]. For the triple momentum method, the following bound was obtained,

\[
\chi = \frac{L}{\mu}, \\
\alpha < \frac{\sqrt{\chi} + 1}{4\chi - 3\sqrt{\chi} + 1}, \\
\alpha = O\left(\sqrt[14]{\frac{\mu}{L}}\right)
\]

However, as experiments show, STM is more stable to the relative noise model, that is, calculating the dependence of the largest alpha \(\alpha^*\) for the given parameters of the problem \(\mu, L\), we get bigger upper bound. More detailed information in Section \[4\].
7 Numerical experiments

For the experiments, an independent unbiased uniform noise with a given value of norm was generated. Remind, that we consider two models of noise - additive and relative, namely:

$$\|\tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x)\|_2 \leq \delta,$$
$$\|\tilde{\nabla} f(x) - \nabla f(x)\|_2 \leq \alpha \|\nabla f(x)\|_2$$

Combination of these errors was described in detail in the paper [2] for biased oracle. Note that in the notation of article [56], the relative inaccuracy corresponds to the case of strong growth condition:

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \|\nabla f(x, \xi)\|_2^2 \leq \rho \|\nabla f(x)\|_2^2$$

For testing $STM$ for degenerate problems, the function described in [41] on page 69, that is:

$$f(x) = \frac{L}{8} \left( x_1^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (x_j - x_{j+1})^2 + x_k^2 \right) - \frac{L}{4} x_1,$$

$$x^* = \left( 1 - \frac{1}{k + 1}, \ldots, 1 - \frac{k}{k + 1}, 0, \ldots, 0 \right)^T,$$

$$1 \leq k \leq \text{dim } x.$$

These two plots reflect the convergence of the method at the first 50 000 and 10 000 iterations, respectively, at different $\delta$.

![Graph showing convergence of the method](image)

Fig. 2 First test – first 50 000 steps.
Accelerated gradient methods with absolute and relative noise in the gradient

**Fig. 3** First test – first 10,000 steps.

Let’s also consider a drawing with two types of noise.

**Fig. 4** Second test – relative and additive types of noises comparison.
To compare the convergence of a degenerate problem with different $\alpha$ parameters in the case of relative noise, consider the following graph.

![Graph showing function residual against iterations for different relative noise levels with $\alpha$ parameter varying.](image)

**Fig. 5** Third test – relative noise with different values of $\alpha$ for $\mu = 0$.

The last figure shows that for $\alpha \leq 0.71$ the convergence of the method does not deteriorate, but we can assume the existence of such a threshold value $\alpha^* \approx 0.71$, that at large of $\alpha$ values the method diverges.

Also for testing on strongly convex functions, an analogue of the finite-dimensional Nesterov function was used from [41] on page 78, that is:

$$f(x) = \frac{\mu (\chi - 1)}{8} \left( x_1^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (x_j - x_{j+1})^2 - 2x_1 \right) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x\|^2,$$

$$\chi = \frac{L}{\mu},$$

$$\nabla f(x) = \left( \frac{\mu (\chi - 1)}{4} A + \mu E \right) x - \frac{\mu (\chi - 1)}{4} e_1,$$

$$e_1 = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)^T,$$

where $E$ – identity operator, $A$ is the matrix defined as:

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
2 & -1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
-1 & 2 & -1 & 0 & \ldots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & \ldots & 0 & -1 & 2 \\
0 & \ldots & 0 & -1 & 2
\end{pmatrix}
$$
Then minimum $f$, $x^*$, can be found from systems of linear equations. Let us consider the graphs of the residuals for different parameters of the delta additive noise.

**Fig. 6** Fourth test – $\delta \in \{0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9, 1.0\}$.

**Fig. 7** Fifth test – mean of 30 tests, level of approximation and required number of steps.
The last plot confirms Theorem 4 and Remark 6. Similarly to the degenerate case, consider the behavior of the method for different parameters $\alpha$.

![Fig. 8](image) Sixth test – relative noise with different values of $\alpha$ for $\mu > 0$.

Note that in the strongly convex case, we obtain a property similar to the degenerate case: for $\alpha$ values less than a certain threshold value $\alpha^*$.

![Fig. 9](image) Seventh test – relative noise with different values of $\alpha$ for other $L$ and $\mu$. 
Comparing STM and triple momentum method we get the following plots:

**Fig. 10** Eighth test – threshold $\alpha^*$ for different $L$ and $\mu = 0.1$, for STM algo

**Fig. 11** Ninth test – threshold $\alpha^*$ for different $L$ and $\mu = 0.1$, for triple momentum algo
Figures [10] and [11] show, that for the same parameters of the problem, STM is capable of converging at a much higher noise level than triple momentum algorithm.
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