

# The convergence of the Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) : a self-contained proof

Gabriel TURINICI  
CEREMADE - CNRS  
Université Paris Dauphine - PSL Research University  
Gabriel.Turinici@dauphine.fr

November 22, 2021

## Abstract

We give here a proof of the convergence of the Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) in a self-contained manner.

## 1 Introduction

The Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) or other algorithms derived from it are used extensively in Deep Learning, a branch of Machine Learning; but the proof of convergence is not always easy to find. The goal of this paper is to adapt various proofs from the literature in a simple format. In particular no claim of originality is made (see [1–4] for some of my recent research papers in this area); on the contrary please cite this work if you find it useful (arxiv or DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4638695).

This proof can be used in any domain where a self-contained presentation is needed.

## 2 Recall of the general framework

Suppose  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is a probability space,  $L : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a function depending on a random argument  $\omega$  and a parameter  $X$  (second argument) to be optimized. Denote

$$\mathcal{L}(X) = \mathbb{E}_\omega[L(\omega, X)]. \quad (1)$$

The goal of the SGD is to find a minimum of  $\mathcal{L}$ . It operates iteratively by taking at iteration  $n$ :

- a (deterministic) "learning rate"  $\rho_n$  (schedule fixed *a priori*)
- a random  $\omega_n \in \Omega$  independent of any other previous random variables is drawn (following the law  $\mathbb{P}$ )
- and updating by the formula

$$X_{n+1} = X_n - \rho_n \nabla_x L(\omega_n, X_n). \quad (2)$$

### 3 Hypothesis on $L$ and $\mathcal{L}$

In order to prove the convergence we need some hypothesis that are detailed below

1. The gradient of  $L$  is bounded:

$$\exists B > 0 : \sup_{\omega} \|\nabla_X L(\omega, X)\|^2 \leq B, \forall X \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (3)$$

2.  $\mathcal{L}$  is strongly convex:

$$\exists \mu > 0 : \mathcal{L}(Y) \geq \mathcal{L}(X) + \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}(X), Y - X \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|X - Y\|^2, \forall X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (4)$$

Note that for  $\mu = 0$  this is just the usual convexity, i.e. the function is above its tangent. For general  $\mu$  this tells that the function is even above a parabola centered in any  $X$ . For regular functions this means that the Hessian  $D^2\mathcal{L}$  of  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies  $D^2\mathcal{L} \geq \mu \cdot I_N^1$ .

### 4 A convergence result and its proof

We will prove the following

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that each  $L(\omega, \cdot)$  is differentiable (a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ )<sup>2</sup> and that  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies the hypothesis (3) and (4). Then*

1. the function  $\mathcal{L}$  has an unique minimum  $X_*$ ;
2. For any  $n \geq 0$  denote

$$d_n = \mathbb{E} [\|X_n - X_*\|^2]. \quad (5)$$

Then

$$d_{n+1} \leq (1 - \rho_n \mu) d_n + \rho_n^2 B. \quad (6)$$

3. For any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a  $\rho > 0$  such that if  $\rho_n = \rho$  then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [\|X_{n+1} - X_*\|^2] \leq \epsilon. \quad (7)$$

4. Take  $\rho_n$  a sequence such that:

$$\rho_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } \sum_{n \geq 1} \rho_n = \infty. \quad (8)$$

Then  $d_n \rightarrow 0$ , that is  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n = X_*$ , where the convergence is the  $L^2$  convergence of random variables.

---

<sup>1</sup>Here  $I_N$  is the  $N \times N$  identity matrix.

<sup>2</sup>This requirement can be largely weakened. For instance in the case of ReLU activation, which corresponds to the positive part  $x \mapsto x_+$ , one can employ any suitable sub-gradient of the  $x_+$  function and in particular take at the non-regular point  $x = 0$  any value between 0 and 1.

*Proof. Item 1:* The existence and uniqueness of the optimum is guaranteed by the assumptions of strong convexity and smoothness of  $\mathcal{L}$ .

**Item 2:** We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} [\|X_{n+1} - X_*\|^2] &= \mathbb{E} [\|X_n - X_* - \rho_n \nabla_x L(\omega_n, X_n)\|^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\|X_n - X_*\|^2] + \rho_n^2 \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla_x L(\omega_n, X_n)\|^2] - 2\rho_n \mathbb{E} [\langle X_n - X_*, \nabla_x L(\omega_n, X_n) \rangle].\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

First we remark that<sup>3</sup>

$$\mathbb{E} [\langle X_n - X_*, \nabla_x L(\omega_n, X_n) \rangle] = \mathbb{E} [\langle X_n - X_*, \nabla \mathcal{L}(X_n) \rangle].$$

But at its turn

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} [\langle X_n - X_*, \nabla \mathcal{L}(X_n) \rangle] &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{L}(X_n) - \mathcal{L}(X_*) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|X_n - X_*\|^2 \right] \\ &\geq \frac{\mu}{2} \mathbb{E} [\|X_n - X_*\|^2],\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

the last inequality being guaranteed by the fact that  $X_*$  is the minimum. Putting together all relations proved so far one obtains the relation (6).

**Item 3:** When  $\rho_n$  is constant equal to  $\rho$  inequality (6) is equivalent to

$$d_{n+1} - \rho \frac{B}{\mu} \leq (1 - \rho\mu) \left( d_n - \rho \frac{B}{\mu} \right).$$

Since the function  $x \mapsto x_+$  (the positive part) is increasing we obtain for  $\rho < 1/\mu$ :

$$\left( d_{n+1} - \rho \frac{B}{\mu} \right)_+ \leq (1 - \rho\mu) \left( d_n - \rho \frac{B}{\mu} \right)_+,$$

and by iteration, for any  $k \geq 1$ :

$$\left( d_{n+k} - \rho \frac{B}{\mu} \right)_+ \leq (1 - \rho\mu)^k \left( d_n - \rho \frac{B}{\mu} \right)_+.$$

Taking  $k \rightarrow \infty$  we obtain  $\limsup_k \left( d_k - \rho \frac{B}{\mu} \right)_+ = 0$  hence the conclusion (7) for  $\rho$  smaller than  $1/\mu$  and  $\epsilon\mu/B$ .

**Item 4:** For non-constant  $\rho_n$  and arbitrary fixed  $\epsilon$  we obtain from (6)

$$d_{n+1} - \epsilon \leq (1 - \rho_n\mu)(d_n - \epsilon) + \rho_n(\rho_n B - \mu\epsilon).$$

When  $n$  is large enough  $\rho_n(\rho_n B - \mu\epsilon) \leq 0$  and thus

$$d_{n+1} - \epsilon \leq (1 - \rho_n\mu)(d_n - \epsilon),$$

therefore

$$(d_{n+k} - \epsilon)_+ \leq (1 - \rho_n\mu) (d_n - \epsilon)_+.$$

---

<sup>3</sup>The formal justification is as follows: denote by  $\mathcal{F}_n$  the sigma algebra generated by  $X_1, \dots, X_n, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_{n-1}$ . In particular  $\omega_n$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_n$ . Recall now that for any random variables  $U$  measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{F}_n$  and  $V$  independent of  $\mathcal{F}_n$ :  $\mathbb{E}[g(U, V)|\mathcal{F}_n] = \int g(v, U)P_V(dv)$  and in particular  $\mathbb{E}[g(U, V)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[g(U, V)|\mathcal{F}_n]] = \mathbb{E}[\int g(v, U)P_V(dv)]$ .

Iterating such inequalities we obtain

$$(d_{n+k} - \epsilon)_+ \leq \prod_{\ell=n}^{n+k-1} (1 - \rho_\ell \mu) (d_n - \epsilon)_+.$$

From the Lemma 2 we obtain  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (d_k - \epsilon)_+ = 0$  and since this is true for any  $\epsilon$  the conclusion follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\mu > 0$  and  $\rho_n$  a sequence of positive real numbers such that  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$  and  $\sum_{n \geq 1} \rho_n = \infty$ . Then for any  $n \geq 0$ :*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{\ell=n}^{n+k} (1 - \rho_\ell \mu) = 0. \quad (11)$$

*Proof.* Recall that for any  $x \in ]0, 1[$  we have  $\log(1 - x) \leq -x$ ; then:

$$0 \leq \prod_{\ell=n}^{n+k} (1 - \rho_\ell \mu) = e^{\sum_{\ell=n}^{n+k} \log(1 - \rho_\ell \mu)} \leq e^{\sum_{\ell=n}^{n+k} (-\rho_\ell \mu)} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\infty} = 0, \quad (12)$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 5 Concluding remarks

We make here some remarks concerning the hypothesis and the use in Neural Networks.

First, consider the hypothesis  $\sum_n \rho_n = \infty$ ; at first it may seem strange but this is not really so. Note that in particular it is true when  $\rho_n$  is a constant. But in general, if we forget the stochastic part<sup>4</sup>, one can interpret the SGD as following some continuous time dynamics of the type  $X'(t) = -\nabla \mathcal{L}(X)$ ; for the simple quadratic function  $\mathcal{L}(X) = \alpha \|X\|^2/2$  the dynamics is  $X'(t) = -\alpha X(t)$  with solution  $X(t) = e^{-\alpha t} X(0)$  needs an infinite 'time'  $t$  to converge to the minimum  $X_* = 0_N$ . Or here  $\sum_n \rho_n$  is the discrete version of the time and thus it is not a surprise to need infinite time to obtain  $X_*$  with infinite precision. On the other hand if a finite precision is needed one can just take a constant time step as indicated in the theorem<sup>5</sup>.

On the other hand, an important example that satisfies (8) is  $\rho_n = \frac{c_1}{c_2 + n}$ , with  $c_1, c_2 > 0$ . In general giving a functional form for  $\rho_n$  is termed 'choosing a decay rate', but it may not be clear what the best decay rate is in general.

## References

- [1] Imen Ayadi and Gabriel Turinici. Stochastic Runge-Kutta methods and adaptive SGD-G2 stochastic gradient descent, 2020. arxiv:2002.09304, ICPR2020 paper.

<sup>4</sup>This can be made precise when the stochastic part is added, see [1].

<sup>5</sup>but in this case one may spend a too long time to wait for the convergence to this small neighborhood to arrive see [1] for some ways to accelerate the convergence.

- [2] Gabriel Turinici. Stochastic learning control of inhomogeneous quantum ensembles. *Phys. Rev. A*, 100:053403, Nov 2019.
- [3] Gabriel Turinici. Convergence dynamics of generative adversarial networks: the dual metric flows, 2020. arXiv:2012.10410; CADL-ICPR 2020 workshop paper.
- [4] Gabriel Turinici. X-Ray Sobolev Variational Auto-Encoders, 2020. arxiv:1911.13135.