

Provably Accelerated Decentralized Gradient Method Over Unbalanced Directed Graphs *

Zhuoqing Song¹, Lei Shi², Shi Pu^{†3}, and Ming Yan^{†4}

¹Shanghai Center for Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

²School of Mathematical Sciences, Shanghai Key Laboratory for Contemporary Applied Mathematics, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

³School of Data Science, Shenzhen Research Institute of Big Data, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China

⁴Department of Computational Mathematics, Science and Engineering and Department of Mathematics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA

{zqsong19, leishi}@fudan.edu.cn, pushi@cuhk.edu.cn, myan@msu.edu

Abstract

In this work, we consider the decentralized optimization problem in which a network of n agents, each possessing a smooth and convex objective function, wish to collaboratively minimize the average of all the objective functions through peer-to-peer communication in a directed graph. To solve the problem, we propose two accelerated Push-DIGing methods termed APD and APD-SC for minimizing non-strongly convex objective functions and strongly convex ones, respectively. We show that APD and APD-SC respectively converge at the rates $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ and $O\left(\left(1 - C\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{L}}\right)^k\right)$ up to constant factors depending only on the mixing matrix. To the best of our knowledge, APD and APD-SC are the first decentralized methods to achieve provable acceleration over unbalanced directed graphs. Numerical experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of both methods.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following decentralized optimization problem over a system of n agents:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p} f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{x}), \quad (1)$$

where $f_i(\mathbf{x})$ is a private smooth and convex function possessed by agent i , and \mathbf{x} is the global decision variable. Decentralized optimization has found wide applications in many modern scientific

*This work was partially supported by the Shenzhen Research Institute of Big Data (SRIBD) under Fund No. J00120190011, the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) grant No. 62003287, NSF grant DMS-2012439, and Shanghai Science and Technology Research Program (20JC1412700 and 19JC1420101). Most work was done while the first author was visiting School of Data Science, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen.

[†]Co-corresponding authors.

computing and engineering applications, such as large-scale machine learning [5, 7, 10, 14, 33], wireless networks [2, 9, 29], cognitive networks [8, 28], among many others. For example, in large-scale distributed machine learning, gathering all the data to a central server is sometimes unrealistic due to large volume of data, limited communication bandwidth, and data privacy concerns. In this work, we assume the agents communicate through an unbalanced directed graph to solve the problem (1), where each agent can only receive/send information from/to its in/out-neighbors.

The research on decentralized optimization can be traced back to the 1980s [4, 50, 51]. In recent years, the problem has been extensively studied thanks to the rapid development of big data applications and the need for large-scale distributed computing. Some notable developments include the distributed subgradient descent (DGD) method proposed in [34], which solves the problem (1) over an undirected network for both strongly convex and non-strongly convex objective functions. The DGD-based methods [30, 31, 34, 43, 62] use diminishing stepsizes and suffer from sublinear convergence rates even for smooth and strongly convex objective functions. Dual-based methods [16, 27, 45, 48] often require gradients of the dual functions that are usually hard to compute in practice. EXTRA [46], NIDS [25], and gradient tracking based methods [40, 60] enjoy linear convergence rates for smooth and strongly convex functions over undirected networks with (symmetric) doubly stochastic mixing matrices. Variants of the aforementioned methods involving communication compression, asynchronous updates, and stochastic gradients can be found for instance in [26, 38, 52].

However, considering doubly-stochastic mixing matrices that rely on either undirected graphs or balanced directed graphs may not be practical for some real-world applications [32, 53, 55, 56, 59]. For instance, in wireless sensor networks, sensors broadcasting at different power levels will lead to directed communication [56]. Removing slow communication links in an undirected network could cause communication with directionality [53], and computer networks are also intrinsically directed [59]. Constructing a doubly stochastic matrix for a general directed graph is often impractical. The existing strategies to construct doubly stochastic matrices for directed graphs rely on carefully designed procedures which are quite expensive and require ideal communication environments; see for instance [15]. Moreover, even if these strategies can be applied, the constructed doubly stochastic matrices may have worse spectral properties, resulting in inefficient information fusion. As a result, the weighted mixing matrix for directed communication are usually constructed to be row or column stochastic [39, 53, 56].

Many efforts have been made to solve the decentralized optimization problem over an unbalanced directed graph. Subgradient-Push [31] combines the push-sum protocol [19] with DGD to obtain a sublinear convergence rate over time-varying unbalanced directed graphs. The Push-DIGing/ADD-OPT methods proposed in [32, 55] combine the push-sum protocol with the gradient tracking technique and achieve linear convergence for smooth and strongly convex functions using only column stochastic mixing matrices. There are also works that use only row stochastic matrices [53, 56]. The Push-Pull/ \mathcal{AB} methods introduced in [39, 56] employ a row stochastic matrix to mix the decision variables and a column stochastic matrix to mix the gradient trackers. They also achieve linear convergence for smooth and strongly convex objectives. See [31, 37, 42, 44, 47, 49, 54, 58, 63] and the references therein for more related works. Nevertheless, the convergence rates of the aforementioned dual-free methods cannot be better than $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$ for non-strongly convex objective functions and $O\left(\left(1 - C\left(\frac{\mu}{L}\right)\right)^k\right)$ for strongly convex objectives up to constant factors.

The celebrated Nesterov’s accelerated gradient descent method, which was originally proposed in [35], achieves optimal convergence rate for smooth and convex objective functions in terms of first-order oracle complexity. In recent years, there have been constant efforts in developing accelerated decentralized gradient descent methods, most of which work with undirected graphs or

more generally, use doubly stochastic mixing matrices [12, 13, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 41, 61]. Among these works, OPAPC [20] simultaneously achieves the lower bounds on the gradient computation complexity and the communication complexity over undirected graphs which were given in [45]. Some works [12, 17, 22, 23, 61] rely on an inner loop of multiple consensus steps to guarantee the accelerated convergence. The use of inner loops may limit the applications of these methods due to the communication bottleneck in decentralized computation [21, 24, 41]. The single-loop based methods considered in [41] achieve $O\left(\frac{1}{k^{1.4-\epsilon}}\right)$ and $O\left(\left(1 - C\left(\frac{\mu}{L}\right)^{\frac{5}{7}}\right)^k\right)$ convergence rates for non-strongly convex and strongly convex objective functions, respectively, assuming doubly stochastic mixing matrices. A recent work [24] establishes the $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ and $O\left(\left(1 - C\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{L}}\right)^k\right)$ convergence rates over time-varying balanced graphs. With row stochastic mixing matrices and column stochastic mixing matrices, the previous work [57] proposes an accelerated \mathcal{AB} method and establishes linearly convergent properties under strongly convex objectives. But it is not shown to match the optimal convergence rate enjoyed by Nesterov’s acceleration.

In this paper, we propose two novel decentralized gradient descent methods, accelerated Push-DIGing (APD) for non-strongly convex objective functions and its variant APD-SC for strongly convex objective functions. Specifically, we combine the Push-DIGing/ADD-OPT methods [32, 55] with the accelerated first-order scheme AGM [1]. APD and APD-SC use only column stochastic mixing matrices and achieve the convergence rates of $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ and $O\left(\left(1 - C\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{L}}\right)^k\right)$ for non-strongly convex objectives and strongly convex objectives, respectively. To the best of our knowledge, these are the first decentralized methods to achieve such accelerated convergence rates and match the central optimal convergence rates (up to constant factors depending only on the mixing matrix) over unbalanced directed graphs.

2 Notations and Assumptions

We denote the Euclidean norm by $\|\cdot\|$, and the inner product in the Euclidean space is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. We use $\mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{0}$ to denote the all-ones vector and all-zeros vector, respectively. Their dimensions are ignored when it is clear from the context. The operators $=, \leq, \geq$ are overloaded for vectors and matrices in the entrywise sense.

The set of agents is denoted by $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We use lowercase bold letters to denote the local variables and subscripts to distinguish the iteration and owner of the variables. For instance, $\mathbf{x}_{k,i}$ denotes the value of agent i ’s local variable \mathbf{x} in the k -th iteration. We concatenate local variables into n -by- p matrices which are denoted by uppercase bold letters. For instance,

$$\mathbf{X}_k = (\mathbf{x}_{k,1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{k,n})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}, \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{X}_k) = \left(\nabla f_1(\mathbf{x}_{k,1})^\top, \dots, \nabla f_n(\mathbf{x}_{k,n})^\top \right)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}.$$

To help analyze these concatenated n -by- p matrices, we define the following matrix norms for n -by- p matrices and n -by- n matrices, respectively.

Definition 1. Given a vector norm $\|\cdot\|_*$, we define the corresponding matrix norm on an n -by- p matrix \mathbf{A} as

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_* = \left\| \left(\|\mathbf{A}_{:,1}\|_*, \|\mathbf{A}_{:,2}\|_*, \dots, \|\mathbf{A}_{:,p}\|_* \right) \right\|.$$

Specifically, when $\|\cdot\|_* = \|\cdot\|$, $\|\mathbf{A}\|$ coincides with the Frobenius norm.

Definition 2. Given a vector norm $\|\cdot\|_*$, the induced norm of an n -by- n matrix \mathbf{A} is defined as

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_* = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \neq 0} \frac{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_*}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_*}.$$

Lemma 1 (Lemma 5 in [39]). *For any matrices $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and a vector norm $\|\cdot\|_*$, we have $\|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}\|_* \leq \|\mathbf{W}\|_* \|\mathbf{A}\|_*$. For any vectors $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\|\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}^\top\|_* \leq \|\mathbf{a}\|_* \|\mathbf{b}\|$.*

The following lemma can be derived directly by the elementary inequality: $2\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \leq (\lambda - 1)\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda - 1}\|\mathbf{b}\|^2$ ($\forall \lambda > 1$) and Definition 1.

Lemma 2. *For any vector norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ induced by the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_*$, and any $\lambda > 1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}\|_*^2 &\leq \lambda \|\mathbf{a}\|_*^2 + \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - 1} \|\mathbf{b}\|_*^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p, \\ \|\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}\|_*^2 &\leq \lambda \|\mathbf{A}\|_*^2 + \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - 1} \|\mathbf{B}\|_*^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}. \end{aligned}$$

Epecially, $\|\cdot\|_$ can be taken as $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_C$.*

The communication between the agents are characterized by a strongly-connected directed graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ is the edge set. We assume the mixing matrix \mathbf{C} satisfies the following assumption.

Assumption 1. *The matrix \mathbf{C} is supported by \mathcal{G} , i.e., the indices of all nonzero entries in \mathbf{C} are in the set \mathcal{E} . The matrix \mathbf{C} is a regular and column stochastic matrix, i.e., all entries of \mathbf{C} are nonnegative, $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{1}^\top$ and there is some $\ell \geq 0$ such that all entries of \mathbf{C}^ℓ are positive.*

Such column stochastic matrix \mathbf{C} can be constructed as follows: each agent i assigns a positive weight \mathbf{C}_{ij} to each agent j in its out-neighborhood and also a positive weight \mathbf{C}_{ii} to itself. For any i and j disconnected, let $\mathbf{C}_{ij} = 0$ by default. Then each agent i conducts a scaling step to let $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbf{C}_{ij} = 1$. Now, a column stochastic matrix \mathbf{C} has been constructed in a distributed manner with no communication needed. Since \mathcal{G} is strongly-connected, the matrix \mathbf{C} is irreducible. Irreducibility and the positiveness of the diagonal entries in \mathbf{C} implies that \mathbf{C} is regular.

From the Perron-Frobenius theorem [3], we know that \mathbf{C} has a unique positive right eigenvector \mathbf{p} with respect to eigenvalue 1 such that $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{p} = n$. The following lemma can be derived in a similar way to Lemma 3, Lemma 4 and Lemma 15 in [39], where $\rho(\cdot)$ denotes the spectral radius.

Lemma 3. *The spectral radius of $\mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}$ satisfies*

$$\rho\left(\mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}\right) < 1.$$

For any $0 < \theta < 1 - \rho\left(\mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}\right)$, there is an invertible matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ inducing a vector norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_C = \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\mathbf{x}\|$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}\|_C &\leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq \delta_C \|\mathbf{x}\|_C, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ \|\mathbf{A}\|_C &\leq \|\mathbf{A}\| \leq \delta_C \|\mathbf{A}\|_C, \quad \forall \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\delta_C \geq 1$ is a constant, and the corresponding matrix norm $\|\cdot\|_C$ satisfies

$$\left\| \mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n} \right\|_C \leq 1 - \theta, \quad \left\| \mathbf{I} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n} \right\|_C = 1. \tag{3}$$

In addition, for any diagonal matrix \mathbf{V} , $\|\mathbf{V}\|_C = \|\mathbf{V}\|$.

We have the following global assumption on the objective functions in the problem (1).

Assumption 2. For each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $f_i(\mathbf{x})$ is convex and L -smooth, i.e., for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq f_i(\mathbf{y}) \leq f_i(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2.$$

3 The Accelerated Push-DIGing Methods

In this section, we present the proposed methods APD and APD-SC. The methods APD and APD-SC are illustrated in Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, where we denote $\mathbf{V}_k = \mathbf{Diag}(\mathbf{v}_k)$ for any $0 \leq k \leq K$.

Algorithm 1: APD: an accelerated decentralized gradient descent method for smooth and convex functions

Input: parameters: w_1, w_2, c_+ ; stepsize: η ; iteration number: K ; initial values: $\mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{v}_0$ with $\mathbf{v}_0 > \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{v}_0 = n$; mixing matrix: \mathbf{C}

Output: $\mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K$

1 Initialize $\mathbf{Y}_0 = \mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{Z}_0 = \mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{G}_0 = \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{X}_0)$.

2 Set $\tau_k = \frac{w_2}{1+w_1 k}$ and $\alpha_k = \frac{c_+}{\tau_k}, 0 \leq k \leq K$.

3 for $k = 0$ to $K - 1$ do

4 | Update

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{v}_{k+1} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{v}_k, \end{array} \right. \quad (4a)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{Y}_{k+1} = \mathbf{C} (\mathbf{X}_k - \eta \mathbf{G}_k), \end{array} \right. \quad (4b)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{Z}_{k+1} = \mathbf{C} (\mathbf{Z}_k - \alpha_k \eta \mathbf{G}_k), \end{array} \right. \quad (4c)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{X}_{k+1} = (1 - \tau_{k+1}) \mathbf{Y}_{k+1} + \tau_{k+1} \mathbf{Z}_{k+1}, \end{array} \right. \quad (4d)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{G}_{k+1} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{G}_k + \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{V}_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{V}_k^{-1} \mathbf{X}_k). \end{array} \right. \quad (4e)$$

5 end

6 Return $\mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K$.

In every iteration, each agent i maintains 5 local variables: $\mathbf{x}_{k,i}, \mathbf{y}_{k,i}, \mathbf{z}_{k,i}, \mathbf{g}_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathbf{v}_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R}$. For both APD and APD-SC, after K iterations, the variable $\mathbf{v}_{K,i}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{K,i}$ is computed locally and used as the local estimate of \mathbf{x}^* by each agent i . The formal convergence guarantees are stated in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

The ingredients of APD are the AGM scheme introduced in [1] and the Push-DIGing/ADD-OPT method [32, 55]. AGM is an extraordinary reconstruction of Nesterov's accelerated gradient methods which combines gradient descent with mirror descent. Here, we only use its simplified version in the Euclidean space and replace the mirror descent step with gradient descent.

(i) Simplified AGM:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{y}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k) \\ \mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \mathbf{z}_k - \frac{\alpha_k}{L} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k) \\ \mathbf{x}_{k+1} = (1 - \tau_{k+1}) \mathbf{y}_{k+1} + \tau_{k+1} \mathbf{z}_{k+1} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $\alpha_k = O(k)$ and $\tau_k = O(\frac{1}{k})$.

Algorithm 2: APD-SC: an accelerated decentralized gradient descent method for smooth and strongly convex functions

Input: parameters: α, β, τ ; stepsize: η ; iteration number: K ; initial values: $\mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{v}_0$ with $\mathbf{v}_0 > \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{v}_0 = n$; mixing matrix: \mathbf{C}

Output: $\mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K$

1 Initialize $\mathbf{Y}_0 = \mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{Z}_0 = \mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{G}_0 = \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{X}_0)$.

2 for $i = 0$ to $K - 1$ do

3 Update

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_{k+1} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{v}_k, & (5a) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Y}_{k+1} = \mathbf{C} (\mathbf{X}_k - \eta \mathbf{G}_k), & (5b) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Z}_{k+1} = \mathbf{C} ((1 - \beta) \mathbf{Z}_k + \beta \mathbf{X}_k - \alpha \eta \mathbf{G}_k), & (5c) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{X}_{k+1} = (1 - \tau) \mathbf{Y}_{k+1} + \tau \mathbf{Z}_{k+1}, & (5d) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{G}_{k+1} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{G}_k + \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{V}_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{V}_k^{-1} \mathbf{X}_k). & (5e) \end{cases}$$

4 end

5 Return $\mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K$.

(ii) Push-DIGing/ADD-OPT:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_{k+1} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{v}_k \\ \mathbf{X}_{k+1} = \mathbf{C} (\mathbf{X}_k - \eta \mathbf{G}_k) \\ \mathbf{G}_{k+1} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{G}_k + \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{V}_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{V}_k^{-1} \mathbf{X}_k) \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{V}_k = \mathbf{Diag}(\mathbf{v}_k)$.

Combining (6) and (7) naturally gives the update rule (4).

Similar to many previous gradient tracking based works [39, 40, 41], we decompose the variables $\mathbf{X}_k, \mathbf{Y}_k, \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{G}_k$ as its ‘‘average parts’’ and consensus errors. To this end, we define

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_C = \mathbf{I} - \frac{\mathbf{p} \mathbf{1}^\top}{n}, \quad \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k), \quad \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{X}_k, \quad \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Y}_k, \quad \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Z}_k.$$

In addition, we denote $\mathbf{U}_k = \mathbf{V}_k^{-1} \mathbf{X}_k$ for simplicity. Then, we have the decompositions as below:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}_k &= \mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_k & + & \mathbf{p} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k, \\ \mathbf{Y}_k &= \mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{Y}_k & + & \mathbf{p} \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k, \\ \mathbf{Z}_k &= \mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{Z}_k & + & \mathbf{p} \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k, \\ \mathbf{G}_k &= \underbrace{\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{G}_k}_{\text{consensus errors}} & + & \underbrace{\mathbf{p} \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k}_{\text{‘‘average parts’’}}, \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{C}^k = \mathbf{p} \mathbf{1}^\top$, the mixing steps $\mathbf{C} \mathbf{v}_k$ and $\mathbf{C} \mathbf{X}_k$ indicate that \mathbf{v}_k and \mathbf{X}_k are approaching \mathbf{p} and $\mathbf{p} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$. It implies that $\mathbf{U}_k = \mathbf{V}_k^{-1} \mathbf{X}_k$ are getting close to $\mathbf{1} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$. The variable \mathbf{G}_k is used to track the gradients due to the following relation derived by the column stochasticity of \mathbf{C} and induction:

$$\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k).$$

When \mathbf{U}_k approaches $\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$, $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k$ will be close to $\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}^\top \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) = \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)$, which is the gradient of objective function at $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$. If $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k = \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)$, the update rule (4) will reduce to (6). This implies the difference between APD and the centralized method (6) can be controlled by the difference between $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k$ and $\nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)$, which can be further bounded by $\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|$ using the L -smoothness of objective functions. A simple decomposition as in Lemma 9 yields the following relation:

$$\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \leq 2\delta_C^2 v_-^2 \left(\|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + (1-\theta)^{2k} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right).$$

The first term above is the consensus error of \mathbf{X}_k . By constructing a Lyapunov function, we can bound this term by weighted summation of $\eta^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_j)\|^2 (j \leq k)$, which can be approximated by $\eta^2 \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j)\|^2$ when \mathbf{U}_k are approaching $\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$. Notice that the gradient difference occurs frequently in variance reduction methods. Similar to an important step in SVRG [18], we will use the following elementary lemma to bound the gradient difference by the Bregman divergence. Its proof can be found in the convex optimization book [6].

Lemma 4. *For any convex and L -smooth function $g(x)$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla g(x) - \nabla g(y)\|^2 \leq g(y) - g(x) - \langle \nabla g(x), y - x \rangle, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^p. \quad (8)$$

Using the above lemma (and taking average of (30)), we obtain:

$$\frac{\eta^2}{2nL} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j)\|^2 \leq \eta^2 (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j) - \langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j), \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j \rangle). \quad (9)$$

We remark that $\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j)\|^2$ is the most troublesome term because the difference between $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$ contains some history gradients and could be large. In [41], the authors bound this term by $L^2 n \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j\|^2$. Then, they use diminishing stepsizes to guarantee the convergence and obtain suboptimal convergence rates. In a recent work [24], the authors bound the term $\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j)\|^2$ by Bregman divergence in another form, which is similar to our inequality (9) intrinsically.

Analogously, the term $(1-\theta)^{2k} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2$ can be bounded by weighted summation of $\eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_j\|^2 (j \leq k)$. Note that the terms $f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j+1})$, $f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j)$, the expansion of $\langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j), \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j \rangle$ and $\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2$ are all ingredients in the analysis of convergence rate of AGM. Since these terms have been multiplied by η^2 , by choosing a small η , we can find a proper relation between α_k and τ_k to eliminate these terms. We remark that AGM has an additional tunable parameter τ_k compared with many accelerated gradient descent schemes, see for instance [36], in which τ_k is usually replaced by $\frac{1}{\alpha_k}$. This additional tunable parameter in AGM helps us eliminate the aforementioned terms caused by consensus errors.

4 Convergence Analysis of APD

In this section, we analyze the convergence of Algorithm 1. We use the convexity and smoothness with inexact gradients (Lemma 6) to characterize the evolution of ‘‘average parts’’ in Section 4.1. All additional errors compared with the central accelerated gradient descent (6) are bounded by $\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2$. Then, we construct Lyapunov functions to bound $\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2$ in Section 4.2. The Lyapunov functions decay exponentially with additional errors which can be eliminated by the descent of the ‘‘average parts’’ with proper parameters. The ‘‘linear coupling’’ in Section 4.3 has two layers of meanings. Firstly, our analysis can be viewed as an inexact version of AGM [1] in

the Euclidean space. Remark that AGM is an optimal first-order method which conducts “linear coupling” of gradient descent and mirror descent. Secondly, we do “linear coupling” for the inequalities characterizing the evolution of the “average parts” and the Lyapunov functions to prove the convergence rate.

4.1 Evolution of the “average part”

As \mathbf{C} is a column stochastic matrix, by multiplying $\frac{\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}$ on both sides of (4b)-(4e), we have

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \eta \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, & (10a) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} = \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \alpha_k \eta \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, & (10b) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} = (1 - \tau_{k+1}) \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1} + \tau_{k+1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1}, & (10c) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\mathbf{g}}_{k+1} = \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k + \frac{\mathbf{1}^\top (\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k))}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}), & (10d) \end{cases}$$

where we also used $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_0 = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_0)$ and the induction to derive the second equality in (10d).

It follows from (10b) that

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 = \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - 2\alpha_k \eta \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + \alpha_k^2 \eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2. \quad (11)$$

Combining the fact $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_0 = \bar{\mathbf{y}}_0 = \bar{\mathbf{z}}_0$ and (10c), there holds

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k = \frac{1 - \tau_k}{\tau_k} (\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

We will use $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k$ as an estimator of $\nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)$, the next lemma provides bounds for the closeness of $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k$ and $\nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)$.

Lemma 5. For any $0 \leq k < K$,

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k - \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)\| \leq \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|, \quad (13)$$

$$\langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 - \frac{L^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2, \quad (14)$$

$$\langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) \rangle \leq \frac{3}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2. \quad (15)$$

Proof. By the L -smoothness of $\{f_i\}$ in Assumption 2, we have

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k - \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)\| = \frac{1}{n} \left\| \mathbf{1}^\top \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k) - \mathbf{1}^\top \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) \right\| \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{1}\|}{n} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)\| \leq \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|.$$

Then, by the inequality $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} (\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\|^2)$, we have

$$\langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 - \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k - \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)\|^2 \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 - \frac{L^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2.$$

Finally, by the inequality $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \leq \frac{3}{2} \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\|^2$, we have

$$\langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) \rangle \leq \frac{3}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k - \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{3}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2.$$

The lemma is proved. \square

The next lemma shows the convexity and smoothness with inexact gradients. Similar results have been derived by [17, 40, 41]. We give its proof in Appendix for completeness.

Lemma 6. For any $0 \leq k < K$ and any row vectors $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we have

$$f(\mathbf{a}) - f(\mathbf{b}) \leq \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} \rangle + \frac{L}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{a}\|^2.$$

Proof. See Appendix A.1. □

The lemma below bound the difference of gradient descent between the direction $\nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)$ and the direction $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k$.

Lemma 7. For any $0 \leq k < K$, if $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2L}$,

$$f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + \frac{L}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2, \quad (16)$$

$$\langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k \rangle \leq \frac{1 - \tau_k}{\tau_k} \left(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) + \frac{L}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right), \quad (17)$$

$$\eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \leq 4(f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) + \frac{2\eta L^2}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2, \quad (18)$$

$$f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) \leq f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + \eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2. \quad (19)$$

Proof. The inequality (16) follows by applying Lemma 6 with $\mathbf{a} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$, $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{x}^*$.

By setting $\mathbf{a} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$, $\mathbf{b} = \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k$ in Lemma 6, we obtain.

$$f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) \leq \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k \rangle + \frac{L}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2. \quad (20)$$

Combining (20) with (12), we obtain (17).

By the L -smoothness of $f(\mathbf{x})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) &\geq \langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1} \rangle - \frac{L}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}\|^2 = \eta \langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k \rangle - \frac{\eta^2 L}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(14)}{\geq} \frac{\eta(1 - \eta L)}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 - \frac{\eta L^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{\eta}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 - \frac{\eta L^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality (18) follows by rearranging the above equation. And the inequality (19) is by setting $\mathbf{a} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$, $\mathbf{b} = \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}$ in Lemma 6. □

4.2 Construction of Lyapunov functions

To begin with, we analyze the convergence of \mathbf{v}_k .

Lemma 8. For any $0 \leq k < K$,

$$\|\mathbf{v}_{k+1} - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}} \leq (1 - \theta)^k \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}. \quad (21)$$

In addition, there is a positive constant $v_- \geq 1$ such that for any $k \geq 0$,

$$\|\mathbf{V}_k^{-1}\| = \|\mathbf{V}_k^{-1}\|_{\mathbb{C}} \leq v_-.$$

Proof. Since \mathbf{C} is column stochastic,

$$\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{v}_{k+1} = \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{C} \mathbf{v}_k = \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{v}_k = \dots = \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{v}_0 = n.$$

Thus, we have $\mathbf{\Pi}_C(\mathbf{v}_k - \mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{v}_k - \mathbf{p}$. Multiplying $\mathbf{\Pi}_C$ on both sides of (4a) and using the fact that $\mathbf{\Pi}_C(\mathbf{v}_{k+1} - \mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{v}_{k+1} - \mathbf{p}$ yields

$$\mathbf{v}_{k+1} - \mathbf{p} = \left(\mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n} \right) (\mathbf{v}_k - \mathbf{p}). \quad (22)$$

Then, it follows by (3) and (22) that

$$\|\mathbf{v}_{k+1} - \mathbf{p}\|_C \leq \left\| \mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n} \right\|_C \|\mathbf{v}_k - \mathbf{p}\|_C \leq (1 - \theta) \|\mathbf{v}_k - \mathbf{p}\|_C \leq \dots \leq (1 - \theta)^k \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{v}_k = \mathbf{p}.$$

By induction, it is easy to see that $\mathbf{v}_k > 0, \forall k \geq 0$. Combining with the fact that \mathbf{p} is a positive vector, we have

$$\inf_{k \geq 0, i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbf{v}_{k,i} > 0.$$

By defining $v_- = \frac{1}{\inf_{k \geq 0, i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbf{v}_{k,i}}$, we have $\|\mathbf{V}_k^{-1}\| \leq v_-$. $\|\mathbf{V}_k^{-1}\|_C = \|\mathbf{V}_k^{-1}\|$ is from Lemma 3. As $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{v}_0 = n$ and \mathbf{v}_0 is a positive vector, the minimum entry of \mathbf{v}_0 is in $(0, 1]$. Then, $v_- \geq 1$ follows by the definition of v_- . □

With Lemma 8, we have the following bound for $\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|$.

Lemma 9. For any $0 \leq k < K$,

$$\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \leq 2\delta_C^2 v_-^2 \left(\|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + (1 - \theta)^{2k} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right).$$

Proof. From the definition of \mathbf{U}_k ,

$$\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k = \mathbf{V}_k^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_k - \mathbf{p}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) + \mathbf{V}_k^{-1}(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{v}_k)\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k = \mathbf{V}_k^{-1}\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_k + \mathbf{V}_k^{-1}(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{v}_k)\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 &\leq \delta_C^2 \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|_C^2 \leq 2\delta_C^2 \left(\|\mathbf{V}_k^{-1}\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + 2\delta_C^2 \|\mathbf{V}_k^{-1}(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{v}_k)\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|_C^2 \right) \\ &\leq 2\delta_C^2 v_-^2 \left(\|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + \|\mathbf{v}_k - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) \\ &\stackrel{(21)}{\leq} 2\delta_C^2 v_-^2 \left(\|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + (1 - \theta)^{2k} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The lemma is proved. □

Then, we will bound the terms $(1 - \theta)^{2k} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2$ and $\|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C$, respectively. The lemma below constructs a Lyapunov function to bound $(1 - \theta)^{2k} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2$.

Lemma 10. For any $0 \leq k < K$,

$$\Phi_{k+1}^{(1)} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \Phi_k^{(1)} + \frac{20(1+c_+)^2}{\theta^3} \eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2,$$

where the Lyapunov function

$$\Phi_k^{(1)} = (1 - \theta)^{2k} \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{8}{\theta^2} \tau_k^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 \right).$$

Proof. Firstly, we expand $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} &\stackrel{(10c)}{=} (1 - \tau_{k+1}) \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1} + \tau_{k+1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} \\ &\stackrel{(10a), (10b)}{=} (1 - \tau_{k+1}) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k + \tau_{k+1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - (1 - \tau_{k+1} + \alpha_k \tau_{k+1}) \eta \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

By applying Lemma 2 with $\lambda = 1 + \theta$ to (23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}\|^2 &\leq (1 + \theta) (1 - \tau_{k+1})^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\theta}\right) \|\tau_{k+1} \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - (1 - \tau_{k+1} + \alpha_k \tau_{k+1}) \eta \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 + \theta) \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{4}{\theta} \tau_k^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 + \frac{4(1+c_+)^2}{\theta} \eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is from $\tau_{k+1} \leq \tau_k$, $\alpha_k \tau_{k+1} \leq \alpha_k \tau_k = c_+$ and $\theta < 1$.

Again, applying Lemma 2 with $\lambda = 1 + \theta$ to (10b) gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{k+1}^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1}\|^2 &\leq (1 + \theta) \tau_{k+1}^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\theta}\right) \tau_{k+1}^2 \alpha_{k+1}^2 \eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 + \theta) \tau_k^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 + \frac{2c_+^2}{\theta} \eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by combining the above equations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{k+1}^{(1)} &= (1 - \theta)^{2(k+1)} \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{8}{\theta^2} \tau_{k+1}^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1}\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq (1 - \theta^2) (1 - \theta)^{2k+1} \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{8}{\theta^2} \tau_k^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 \right) + \frac{4(1-\theta)^{2(k+1)}}{\theta} \tau_k^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 + \left(\frac{4(1+c_+)^2}{\theta} + \frac{16c_+^2}{\theta^3} \right) \eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) (1 - \theta)^{2k} \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{8}{\theta^2} \tau_k^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 \right) + \frac{20(1+c_+)^2}{\theta^3} \eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \Phi_k^{(1)} + \frac{20(1+c_+)^2}{\theta^3} \eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

The next lemma constructs a Lyapunov function to bound the term $\|\|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2$.

Lemma 11. For any $0 \leq k < K - 1$,

$$\Phi_{k+1}^{(2)} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \Phi_k^{(2)} + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|_C\|^2,$$

where the Lyapunov function

$$\Phi_k^{(2)} = \|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{6}{\theta^2} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\theta^4} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2,$$

and

$$c_1 = 3(\theta^2 + 2c_+^2 \theta + 4c_+^2) \leq 3(1 + 6c_+^2).$$

Proof. For $0 \leq k < K - 1$, multiplying Π_C on both sides of (4) and using the equality $\Pi_C \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n} = \left(\mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}\right) \Pi_C$, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_C \mathbf{Y}_{k+1} = \left(\mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}\right) (\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k - \eta \Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k), & (24a) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_{k+1} = \left(\mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}\right) (\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_k - \alpha_k \eta \Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k), & (24b) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_C \mathbf{X}_{k+1} = (1 - \tau_{k+1}) \Pi_C \mathbf{Y}_{k+1} + \tau_{k+1} \Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_{k+1}, & (24c) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_C \mathbf{G}_{k+1} = \left(\mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}\right) \Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k + \Pi_C (\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)), & (24d) \end{cases}$$

For (24a), by using (3) and setting $\lambda = \frac{1}{1-\theta}$ in Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Y}_{k+1}\|_C^2 &\leq (1 - \theta)^2 \|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k - \eta \Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2 \\ &\leq (1 - \theta) \|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{\eta^2}{\theta} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

It follows by similar arguments that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{k+1}^2 \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_{k+1}\|_C^2 &\leq (1 - \theta) \tau_{k+1}^2 \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{\tau_{k+1}^2 \alpha_k^2 \eta^2}{\theta} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2 \\ &\leq (1 - \theta) \tau_k^2 \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{c_+^2 \eta^2}{\theta} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

$$\|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_{k+1}\|_C^2 \leq (1 - \theta) \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{1}{\theta} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|_C^2. \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_{k+1}\|_C^2 &\leq (1 - \tau_{k+1})^2 \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Y}_{k+1}\|_C^2 + \frac{3\tau_{k+1}^2}{\theta} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_{k+1}\|_C^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Y}_{k+1}\|_C^2 + \frac{3\tau_{k+1}^2}{\theta} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_{k+1}\|_C^2 \\ &\stackrel{(25), (26)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{3}{\theta} \tau_k^2 \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_k\|_C^2 + \left(\frac{3\eta^2}{2\theta} + \frac{3c_+^2 \eta^2}{\theta^2}\right) \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

We rewrite (26), (27), (28) into a compact form as follows

$$\mathbf{b}_{k+1} \leq \mathbf{A} \mathbf{b}_k + \frac{1}{\theta} \mathbf{d}_k,$$

where

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{\theta}{2} & \frac{3}{\theta} & \frac{3\eta^2}{2\theta} + \frac{3c_+^2 \eta^2}{\theta^2} \\ 0 & 1 - \theta & \frac{c_+^2 \eta^2}{\theta} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 - \theta \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{b}_k &= \left(\|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2, \tau_k^2 \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_k\|_C^2, \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2 \right)^\top, \\ \mathbf{q} &= \left(1, \frac{6}{\theta^2}, \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\theta^4} \right)^\top, \\ \mathbf{d}_k &= \left(0, 0, \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|_C^2 \right)^\top.\end{aligned}$$

It follows by direct calculations that

$$\mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{A} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \mathbf{q}^\top.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{k+1}^{(2)} &= \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{b}_{k+1} \leq \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{b}_k + \frac{1}{\theta} \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{d}_k \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{b}_k + \frac{1}{\theta} \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{d}_k \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \Phi_k^{(2)} + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|_C^2.\end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we proceed to provide a relatively tight bound for $\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|_C^2$.

Lemma 12. *For any $0 \leq k < K - 1$, if $\eta \leq 1/L$,*

$$\begin{aligned}& \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|_C^2 \\ & \leq 6nL \left(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+2}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) \right) \\ & \quad + 9n(1 + c_+) \eta L \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + 6n\eta L \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{k+1}\|^2 + 3L^2(4 + c_+) \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + 6L^2 \|\mathbf{U}_{k+1} - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We decompose $\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)$ as

$$\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k) = \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) + \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k) + \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k).$$

Then, by the L -smoothness and (2),

$$\begin{aligned}& \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|_C^2 \leq \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq 3\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)\|^2 + 3\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1})\|^2 + 3\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq 3\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)\|^2 + 3L^2 \|\mathbf{U}_{k+1} - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}\|^2 + 3L^2 \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2.\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

Now, we analyze the first term on the RHS of (29). By Lemma 8, we have

$$\frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - \nabla f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)\|^2 \leq f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - \langle \nabla f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \rangle.\tag{30}$$

Taking average over $i \in \mathcal{N}$ on both sides of (30), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2nL} \|\|\nabla F(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)\|\|^2 \\
& \leq f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - \langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \rangle \\
& \stackrel{(23)}{=} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - \tau_{k+1} \langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \rangle + (1 - \tau_{k+1} + \alpha_k \tau_{k+1}) \eta \langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k \rangle \\
& \stackrel{(15)}{\leq} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - \tau_{k+1} \langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \rangle + \frac{(1 - \tau_{k+1} + \alpha_k \tau_{k+1}) \eta}{2} \left(3 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) \\
& \leq f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - \tau_{k+1} \langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \rangle + \frac{(1 + c_+) \eta}{2} \left(3 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) \\
& \stackrel{(12)}{=} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) + \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k} \langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \rangle + \frac{(1 + c_+) \eta}{2} \left(3 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) \\
& \leq f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) + \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) + \frac{(1 + c_+) \eta}{2} \left(3 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) \\
& \stackrel{(18)}{\leq} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + \frac{\eta L^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k} \left(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + \frac{\eta L^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{(1 + c_+) \eta}{2} \left(3 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) \\
& \stackrel{(19)}{\leq} f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+2}) + \eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{L}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_{k+1} - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}\|^2 - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + \frac{\eta L^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k} \left(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + \frac{\eta L^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{(1 + c_+) \eta}{2} \left(3 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) \\
& \leq f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+2}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) + \frac{3(1 + c_+) \eta}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{k+1}\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{(3 + c_+) \eta L^2}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_{k+1} - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the convexity of $f(\mathbf{x})$ in the fourth inequality and the fact $\tau_{k+1} \leq \tau_k$ in the last inequality.

By substituting the above equation into (29) and using $\eta \leq 1/L$, we complete this proof. \square

4.3 Linear coupling

In this section, we use similar analysis as AGM [1] to provide bounds for the descent of the ‘‘average’’ parts but with additional errors induced by inexact gradients that come from consensus errors. We use the Lyapunov functions constructed in Section 4.2 to control these additional errors. And we do ‘‘linear coupling’’ on the ‘‘average parts’’ and Lyapunov functions to prove the convergence rate of Algorithm 1.

As preparation, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 13. For any $j \geq -1$, if $0 < w_1 \leq 1$, then

$$\sum_{k=j+1}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{k-j-1} \leq \frac{c_2 \alpha_{j+1}}{\theta^3 \tau_{j+1}} \leq \frac{4c_2 \alpha_j}{\theta^3 \tau_j},$$

where $c_2 = 26\sqrt{e}$.

Proof. Recall that $\tau_k = \frac{w_2}{1+w_1k}$ and $\alpha_k = \frac{c_+}{\tau_k}$. Firstly, for any $k \geq j+1$ and $j \geq -1$, we have

$$\left(\frac{1+w_1k}{1+w_1(j+1)}\right)^2 = \left(1 + \frac{w_1(k-j-1)}{1+w_1(j+1)}\right)^2 \leq (1+w_1(k-j-1))^2 \leq (k-j)^2.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} = \frac{\alpha_{j+1}}{\tau_{j+1}} \left(\frac{1+w_1k}{1+w_1(j+1)}\right)^2 \leq (k-j)^2 \frac{\alpha_{j+1}}{\tau_{j+1}}.$$

The following inequality is derived by direct calculations

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} (1+k)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^k &\leq \int_0^{+\infty} (1+x)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{x-1} dx \leq \int_{-1}^{+\infty} (2+y)^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\theta y}{2}\right) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta^3} \int_{-1}^{+\infty} (2\theta + \theta y)^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\theta y}{2}\right) d(\theta y) \leq \frac{1}{\theta^3} \int_{-1}^{+\infty} (2+z)^2 \exp\left(-\frac{z}{2}\right) dz \\ &= \frac{c_2}{\theta^3}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\sum_{k=j+1}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{k-j-1} \leq \frac{\alpha_{j+1}}{\tau_{j+1}} \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} (1+k)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^k \leq \frac{c_2 \alpha_{j+1}}{\theta^3 \tau_{j+1}}.$$

Using the relation $\frac{\alpha_{j+1}}{\tau_{j+1}} \leq \frac{4\alpha_j}{\tau_j}$ derived from $w_1 \leq 1$ completes this proof. □

Lemma 14. If η satisfies

$$0 < \eta \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{c_+} \theta^4}{\sqrt{96(15+9c_+)c_1c_2\delta_C v_- L}}, \frac{nc_+ \theta^6}{1920 \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \delta_C^2 v_-^2 (1+c_+)^2 c_2 L}, \frac{1}{8c_+ L}, \frac{\theta^4}{12\delta_C v_- \sqrt{c_1 c_2 (6+c_+) L}} \right\}. \quad (31)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{3\alpha_k^2 \eta}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_k L}{2n\tau_k} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(\Phi_k^{(2)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_k^{(1)}\right) \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k^2 (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n} \frac{c_2 \alpha_0}{\theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(2)} + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2}{n} \frac{c_2 \alpha_0}{\theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(1)} \\ &\quad + \frac{72c_1 c_2 \delta_C^2 v_-^2 \eta^2 L^2}{\theta^8} \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+2}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + \frac{(1-\tau_k)\tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}))\right). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Proof. Using Lemma 11 recursively, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_k^{(2)} &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \Phi_{k-1}^{(2)} + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k-1})\|^2 \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^2 \Phi_{k-2}^{(2)} + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k-1})\|^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k-1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k-2})\|^2 \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^k \Phi_0^{(2)} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{k-j-1} \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_j)\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \Phi_k^{(2)} &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^k \Phi_0^{(2)} + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{k-j-1} \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_j)\|^2 \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^k \Phi_0^{(2)} + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\theta^5} \sum_{j=0}^{K-2} \sum_{k=j+1}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{k-j-1} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_j)\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{c_2 \alpha_0}{\theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(2)} + \frac{4c_1 c_2 \eta^2}{\theta^8} \sum_{j=0}^{K-2} \frac{\alpha_j}{\tau_j} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_j)\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is from Lemma 13.

Analogously,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \Phi_k^{(1)} \leq \frac{c_2 \alpha_0}{\theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(1)} + \frac{80(1+c_+)^2 c_2 \eta^2}{\theta^6} \sum_{j=0}^{K-2} \frac{\alpha_j}{\tau_j} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_j\|^2.$$

By (18), we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k^2 \eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \leq 4 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k^2 (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) + \frac{2\eta L^2}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k^2 \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2.$$

By Lemma 9, we have

$$\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \leq 2\delta_C^2 v_-^2 \left(\|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + (1-\theta)^{2k} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) \leq 2\delta_C^2 v_-^2 \left(\Phi_k^{(2)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_k^{(1)} \right).$$

Combining the above equations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k^2 \eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k L}{n \tau_k} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(\Phi_k^{(2)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_k^{(1)} \right) \\
&\leq 4 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k^2 (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) + \frac{2\eta L^2}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k^2 \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(\Phi_k^{(2)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_k^{(1)} \right) \\
&\leq 4 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k^2 (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) + \frac{2\eta L^2}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k^2 \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n} \left(\frac{c_2 \alpha_0}{\theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(2)} + \frac{4c_1 c_2 \eta^2}{\theta^8} \sum_{j=0}^{K-2} \frac{\alpha_j}{\tau_j} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_j)\|^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2}{n} \left(\frac{c_2 \alpha_0}{\theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(1)} + \frac{80(1+c_+)^2 c_2 \eta^2}{\theta^6} \sum_{j=0}^{K-2} \frac{\alpha_j}{\tau_j} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_j\|^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above equation with Lemma 12 and rearranging yield

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k^2 \eta \left(1 - \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 \eta L}{nc_+} \left(\frac{4c_1 c_2 \eta L}{\theta^8} (9n(1+c_+) + 6n) + \frac{80 \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 (1+c_+)^2 c_2}{\theta^6} \right) \right) \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k L}{n\tau_k} \left(1 - 2c_+ \eta L - \frac{12\delta_C^2 v_-^2 c_1 c_2 \eta^2 L^2}{\theta^8} (3(4+c_+) + 6) \right) \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\
& + \frac{\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(\Phi_k^{(2)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_k^{(1)} \right) \\
& \leq 4 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k^2 (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L c_2 \alpha_0}{n \theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(2)} + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 c_2 \alpha_0}{n \theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(1)} \\
& + \frac{72c_1 c_2 \delta_C^2 v_-^2 \eta^2 L^2}{\theta^8} \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+2}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + \frac{(1-\tau_k)\tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

When deriving the above equation, we also used the facts $\frac{\alpha_{k+1}}{\tau_{k+1}} \geq \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k}$, $\alpha_k \tau_k = c_+$ to simplify some constants.

It follows by direct calculations that when η satisfies (31), the LHS of the above equation can be lower bounded by the LHS of (32). The proof concludes. \square

The next theorem is the main result of Section 4.

Theorem 1. *By setting $c_+ = \frac{1}{4}$, $w_2 \in (0, 1]$, $0 < w_1 \leq \frac{w_2}{4}$ and let η satisfies (31) and*

$$0 < \eta \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{w_2} \theta^4}{12\sqrt{3}w_1 c_1 c_2 \delta_C v_- L}, \frac{\theta^4}{12\delta_C v_- \sqrt{c_1 c_2} L} \right\}, \quad (33)$$

then the output of Algorithm 1 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} f(\mathbf{v}_{K,i}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{K,i}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_{K-1}^2} \left(1 + 3c_+ + \frac{12v_-^2 \delta_C^2 (1-\theta)^{2K} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \eta L}{n} \right) \\
& \cdot \left(\frac{2(1-\tau_0)\alpha_0}{\tau_0} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L c_2 \alpha_0}{n \theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(2)} + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 c_2 \alpha_0}{n \theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(1)} + \frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2}{2\eta} \right), \quad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_0^{(1)} &= \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_0\|^2 + \frac{8}{\theta^2} \tau_0^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_0\|^2 \right) \leq \left(1 + \frac{8}{\theta^2} \right) \|\mathbf{X}_0\|^2, \\
\Phi_0^{(2)} &= \left(1 + \frac{6}{\theta^2} \right) \|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_0\|_C^2 + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\theta^4} \|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{G}_0\|_C^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{6}{\theta^2} + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\theta^4 L^2} \right) \|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_0\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

are defined in Lemma 10 and Lemma 11.

Proof. We have the follow inequalities for any $0 \leq k < K$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \alpha_k (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) \\
(16) \quad & \leq \alpha_k \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + \frac{\alpha_k L}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\
& = \alpha_k \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k \rangle + \alpha_k \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + \frac{\alpha_k L}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\
(11) \quad & = \alpha_k \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k \rangle + \frac{\alpha_k^2 \eta}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2}{2\eta} + \frac{\alpha_k L}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\
(17) \quad & \leq \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \alpha_k}{\tau_k} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) + \frac{\alpha_k^2 \eta}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2}{2\eta} + \frac{\alpha_k L}{2n\tau_k} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Telescoping on both sides of the above equation and substituting (32) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) \\
& \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\frac{(1 - \tau_k) \alpha_k}{\tau_k} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) + \frac{\alpha_k^2 \eta}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_k L}{2n\tau_k} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) + \frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_K - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2}{2\eta} \\
(32) \quad & \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \alpha_k}{\tau_k} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) + 4 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \alpha_k^2 (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) \\
& \quad + \frac{72c_1 c_2 \delta_C^2 v_-^2 \eta^2 L^2}{\theta^8} \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+2}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L c_2 \alpha_0}{n \theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(2)} + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 c_2 \alpha_0}{n \theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(1)} + \frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2}{2\eta} \\
& \quad - \frac{\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(\Phi_k^{(2)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_k^{(1)} \right) - \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k^2 \eta}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

After rearranging the above equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \psi_K (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \frac{\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(\Phi_k^{(2)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_k^{(1)} \right) + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k^2 \eta}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\
& \leq \psi_0 (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \psi_1 (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \sum_{k=2}^{K-2} \psi_k (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \psi_{K-1} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{K-1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) \\
& \quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \phi_k (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L c_2 \alpha_0}{n \theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(2)} + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 c_2 \alpha_0}{n \theta^3 \tau_0} \Phi_0^{(1)} + \frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2}{2\eta},
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_0 &= \frac{(1-\tau_0)\alpha_0}{\tau_0} + \frac{72c_1c_2\delta_C^2v_-^2\eta^2L^2}{\theta^8} \frac{(1-\tau_0)\alpha_0\tau_1}{\tau_0^2}, \\
\psi_1 &= \frac{(1-\tau_1)\alpha_1}{\tau_1} - 4\alpha_0^2 + \frac{72c_1c_2\delta_C^2v_-^2\eta^2L^2}{\theta^8} \left(-\frac{\alpha_0}{\tau_0} - \frac{(1-\tau_0)\alpha_0\tau_1}{\tau_0^2} + \frac{(1-\tau_1)\alpha_1\tau_2}{\tau_1^2} \right), \\
\psi_k &= \frac{(1-\tau_k)\alpha_k}{\tau_k} - 4\alpha_{k-1}^2 + \frac{72c_1c_2\delta_C^2v_-^2\eta^2L^2}{\theta^8} \left(\frac{\alpha_{k-2}}{\tau_{k-2}} - \frac{\alpha_{k-1}}{\tau_{k-1}} + \frac{(1-\tau_k)\alpha_k\tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k^2} - \frac{(1-\tau_{k-1})\alpha_{k-1}\tau_k}{\tau_{k-1}^2} \right), \\
&\quad 2 \leq k \leq K-2, \\
\psi_{K-1} &= \frac{(1-\tau_{K-1})\alpha_{K-1}}{\tau_{K-1}} - 4\alpha_{K-2}^2 + \frac{72c_1c_2\delta_C^2v_-^2\eta^2L^2}{\theta^8} \left(\frac{\alpha_{K-3}}{\tau_{K-3}} - \frac{\alpha_{K-2}}{\tau_{K-2}} - \frac{(1-\tau_{K-2})\alpha_{K-2}\tau_{K-1}}{\tau_{K-2}^2} \right), \\
\psi_K &= 4\alpha_{K-1}^2 - \frac{72c_1c_2\delta_C^2v_-^2\eta^2L^2}{\theta^8} \frac{\alpha_{K-2}}{\tau_{K-2}}, \\
\phi_k &= 4\alpha_k^2 - \frac{(1-\tau_k)\alpha_k}{\tau_k} - \alpha_k, \quad 0 \leq k < K.
\end{aligned}$$

As we choose $c_+ = \frac{1}{4}$,

$$\phi_k = 4\alpha_k^2 - 4\alpha_k^2 + \alpha_k - \alpha_k = 0. \quad (36)$$

To analyze ψ_k , firstly, we can derive the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{(1-\tau_k)\alpha_k\tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k^2} - \frac{(1-\tau_{k-1})\alpha_{k-1}\tau_k}{\tau_{k-1}^2} \\
&= \frac{\alpha_k\tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k^2} - \frac{\tau_{k+1}\alpha_k}{\tau_k} - \frac{\alpha_{k-1}\tau_k}{\tau_{k-1}^2} + \frac{\tau_k\alpha_{k-1}}{\tau_{k-1}} \\
&= \frac{c_+}{w_2^2} \frac{(1+w_1k)^3}{1+w_1(k+1)} - \frac{c_+}{w_2} \frac{(1+w_1k)^2}{1+w_1(k+1)} - \frac{c_+}{w_2^2} \frac{(1+w_1(k-1))^3}{1+w_1k} + \frac{c_+}{w_2} \frac{(1+w_1(k-1))^2}{1+w_1k} \\
&\leq \frac{c_+}{w_2^2} \frac{(1+w_1k)^3 - (1+w_1(k-1))^3}{1+w_1k} + \frac{c_+}{w_2} \frac{(1+w_1(k-1))^2(1+w_1(k+1)) - (1+w_1k)^3}{(1+w_1k)(1+w_1(k+1))} \\
&\leq \frac{3c_+w_1(1+w_1k)}{w_2^2}.
\end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

To derive the last inequality above we use the convexity of x^3 ($x > 0$) to bound the first term on the second last line and the second term on the second last line is negative.

Then, for any $1 \leq k \leq K-1$, by the fact $\frac{\alpha_{k-1}}{\tau_{k-1}} \leq \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_k &\leq \frac{(1-\tau_k)\alpha_k}{\tau_k} - 4\alpha_{k-1}^2 + \frac{72c_1c_2\delta_C^2v_-^2\eta^2L^2}{\theta^8} \left(\frac{(1-\tau_k)\alpha_k\tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k^2} - \frac{(1-\tau_{k-1})\alpha_{k-1}\tau_k}{\tau_{k-1}^2} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(37)}{\leq} \frac{(1-\tau_k)\alpha_k}{\tau_k} - 4\alpha_{k-1}^2 + \frac{72c_1c_2\delta_C^2v_-^2\eta^2L^2}{\theta^8} \frac{3c_+w_1(1+w_1k)}{w_2^2} \\
&\stackrel{(33)}{\leq} 4\alpha_k^2 - \alpha_k - 4\alpha_{k-1}^2 + \frac{\alpha_k}{2} \\
&\leq 8\alpha_k(\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1}) - \frac{\alpha_k}{2} \\
&\leq 0,
\end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where we used the facts $w_1 \leq \frac{w_2}{4}$, $c_+ = \frac{1}{4}$ in the last inequality.

By (33), we have

$$\psi_0 \leq \frac{(1-\tau_0)\alpha_0}{\tau_0} + \frac{72c_1c_2\delta_C^2v_-^2\eta^2L^2(1-\tau_0)\alpha_0\tau_1}{\theta^8\tau_0^2} \leq \frac{2(1-\tau_0)\alpha_0}{\tau_0}. \quad (39)$$

Again, by (33), we have

$$\psi_K \geq 2\alpha_{K-1}^2. \quad (40)$$

Substituting (36), (38), (39) and (40) into (35) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\alpha_{K-1}^2(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \frac{\delta_C^2v_-^2L}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(\Phi_k^{(2)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_k^{(1)} \right) + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k^2}{4} \eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2(1-\tau_0)\alpha_0}{\tau_0} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \frac{3\delta_C^2v_-^2L}{n} \frac{c_2\alpha_0}{\theta^3\tau_0} \Phi_0^{(2)} + \frac{3\delta_C^2v_-^2L}{n} \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 c_2\alpha_0}{\theta^3\tau_0} \Phi_0^{(1)} + \frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2}{2\eta}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Next, we upper bound $\|\mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K\|$ by the second and third terms on the LHS of (41). We decompose $\mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K &= \mathbf{V}_K^{-1} (\mathbf{Y}_K - \mathbf{p}\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K) + \mathbf{V}_K^{-1} (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{v}_K) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{K-1} + \mathbf{V}_K^{-1} (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{v}_K) (\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{K-1}) \\ &= \mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{Y}_K + \mathbf{V}_K^{-1} (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{v}_K) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{K-1} - \eta \mathbf{V}_K^{-1} (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{v}_K) \bar{\mathbf{g}}_{K-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K\|^2 \leq \delta_C^2 \|\mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K\|_C^2 \\ & \leq 3v_-^2 \delta_C^2 \left(\|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{Y}_K\|_C^2 + \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{v}_K\|_C^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{K-1}\|^2 + \eta^2 \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{v}_K\|_C^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{K-1}\|^2 \right) \\ & \leq 3v_-^2 \delta_C^2 \|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{Y}_K\|_C^2 + 3v_-^2 \delta_C^2 (1-\theta)^{2K} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{K-1}\|^2 + \eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{K-1}\|^2 \right) \\ & \stackrel{(25)}{\leq} 3v_-^2 \delta_C^2 \left(\|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_{K-1}\|_C^2 + \frac{\eta^2}{\theta} \|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{G}_{K-1}\|_C^2 \right) + 3v_-^2 \delta_C^2 (1-\theta)^{2K} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{K-1}\|^2 + \eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{K-1}\|^2 \right) \\ & \leq 3v_-^2 \delta_C^2 \Phi_{K-1}^{(2)} + 3v_-^2 \delta_C^2 \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_{K-1}^{(1)} + 3v_-^2 \delta_C^2 (1-\theta)^{2K} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{K-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\alpha_{K-1}^2 L}{n} \|\mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K\|^2 \\ & \leq 3c_+ \left(\frac{\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n} \frac{\alpha_{K-1}}{\tau_{K-1}} \left(\Phi_{K-1}^{(2)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_{K-1}^{(1)} \right) \right) + \frac{12v_-^2 \delta_C^2 (1-\theta)^{2K} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \eta L}{n} \left(\frac{\alpha_{K-1}^2}{4} \eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{K-1}\|^2 \right) \\ & \leq \left(3c_+ + \frac{12v_-^2 \delta_C^2 (1-\theta)^{2K} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \eta L}{n} \right) \left(\frac{\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{\tau_k} \left(\Phi_k^{(2)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_k^{(1)} \right) + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\alpha_k^2}{4} \eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

By the L -smoothness, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{v}_{K,i}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{K,i}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) &\leq f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \left\langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K), \mathbf{v}_{K,i}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{K,i} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_K \right\rangle + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \mathbf{v}_{K,i}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{K,i} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_K \right\|^2 \\ &\leq f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K)\|^2 + L \left\| \mathbf{v}_{K,i}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{K,i} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_K \right\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(8)}{\leq} 2(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + L \left\| \mathbf{v}_{K,i}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{K,i} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_K \right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking average for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ yields

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} f\left(\mathbf{v}_{K,i}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{K,i}\right) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq 2(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \frac{L}{n} \|\mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K\|^2. \quad (43)$$

Combining (41), (42) and (43) gives us (34). \square

Remark 1. The choice $c_+ = \frac{1}{4}$ simplifies our proof. For any $0 < c_+ < 1$, by making some changes to the constants in the proofs of (18), Lemma 14, and Lemma 1, the same convergence rate can still be achieved (regarding c_+ as a constant). Analogously, the relation $w_1 \leq w_2/4$ can be relaxed to $w_1 < w_2$ with the same convergence rate guaranteed.

Remark 2. As $\alpha_k = O(k)$, APD converges at the rate of $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ when the assumptions of Theorem 1 are met. To the best of our knowledge, without the use of doubly stochastic mixing matrices, no previous work has been shown with convergence rate $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$. To satisfy the requirements of Theorem 1, we can choose $\eta = O\left(\frac{\theta^4}{\delta_C v_- L \left(1 + \frac{\delta_C v_- \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2}{\theta^2}\right)}\right)$. Then by Lemma 10, we have

$\Phi_0^{(1)} = O\left(\frac{1}{\theta^2}\right)$. By Lemma 11 and the fact $v_- \geq 1$, $\delta_C \geq 1$, we have $\Phi_0^{(2)} = O\left(\frac{\|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_0\|^2}{\theta^2}\right)$. Then, to get ϵ -optimal solutions, the gradient computation complexity and communication complexity of APD are both

$$O\left(\sqrt{\frac{L}{\epsilon}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\delta_C v_-}}{\theta^2} + \frac{\delta_C v_- \|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_0\|}{\theta^{2.5}} + \frac{\delta_C v_- \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C}{\theta^3}\right)\right).$$

Specifically, when the mixing matrix \mathbf{C} is doubly stochastic, we have $\delta_C = 1$, $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}_C = \mathbf{I} - \frac{\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}$. By choosing $\mathbf{v}_0 = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{0,1} = \dots = \mathbf{x}_{0,n}$, we have $v_- = 1$, $\|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_0\| = 0$ and $\|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C = 0$. Then, the complexity reduces to $O\left(\frac{1}{\theta^2} \sqrt{\frac{L}{\epsilon}}\right)$ which is the same as Acc-GT in [24] and reaches the currently best complexity of single-loop methods on balanced digraphs for minimizing smooth convex functions.

5 Convergence Analysis of APD-SC

In this section, we show the convergence rate of Algorithm 2 when the objective functions are smooth and strongly convex. The strong convexity assumption is given as follows.

Assumption 3. For each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $f_i(\mathbf{x})$ is μ -strongly convex for some $\mu > 0$, i.e., for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$\langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}, \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}) \rangle \geq \mu \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2.$$

Similar to what we did in Section 4, we use a three-step proof. First, we provide bounds for the descent of the ‘‘average parts’’ with additional errors. Second, we construct Lyapunov functions to bound these additional errors. Third, we couple the ‘‘average parts’’ with Lyapunov functions linearly to prove the convergence rate of APD-SC.

5.1 Evolution of the ‘‘average part’’

Since \mathbf{C} is column stochastic, by multiplying $\frac{\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}$ on both sides of (5b)-(5e), we have

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \eta \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, & (44a) \\ \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} = (1 - \beta) \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k + \beta \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \alpha \eta \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, & (44b) \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} = (1 - \tau) \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1} + \tau \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1}, & (44c) \\ \bar{\mathbf{g}}_{k+1} = \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k + \frac{\mathbf{1}^\top (\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k))}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}), & (44d) \end{cases}$$

where we also used the fact $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_0 = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}^\top \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_0)$ and induction to derive the second inequality in (44d). Combining the fact $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_0 = \bar{\mathbf{y}}_0 = \bar{\mathbf{z}}_0$ and (44c), there holds

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k = \frac{1 - \tau}{\tau} (\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (45)$$

Lemma 15. *For any $0 \leq k < K$,*

$$2\alpha\eta \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \leq (1 - \beta) \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \beta \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2. \quad (46)$$

Proof. Rearranging (44b) yields

$$\alpha\eta \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k = (1 - \beta) (\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1}) + \beta (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1}).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\alpha\eta \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \\ &= 2(1 - \beta) \langle \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + 2\beta \langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \\ &= (1 - \beta) \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1}\|^2 \right) + \beta \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1}\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq (1 - \beta) \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \beta \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma is proved. \square

5.2 Construction of Lyapunov functions

First, we construct Lyapunov functions to bound the terms $(1 - \theta)^{2k} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2$ and $\|\Pi_{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{X}_k\|^2$.

Lemma 16. *For any $0 \leq k < K$, if $\beta^2 \tau^2 \leq \frac{\theta^4}{64}$,*

$$\Phi_{k+1}^{(3)} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \Phi_k^{(3)} + \frac{36}{\theta^3} (1 + \alpha\tau)^2 \eta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2,$$

where

$$\Phi_k^{(3)} = (1 - \theta)^{2k} \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{8}{\theta^2} \tau^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 \right).$$

Proof. Substituting (44a), (44b) into (44c) yields

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} = (1 - \tau) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k + \tau \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - (1 - \tau + \alpha\tau) \eta \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k.$$

Using Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}\|^2 &\leq (1+\theta)(1-\tau)^2\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + 2\left(1+\frac{1}{\theta}\right)\tau^2\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 + 2\left(1+\frac{1}{\theta}\right)(1-\tau+\alpha\tau)^2\eta^2\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\ &\leq (1+\theta)\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{4}{\theta}\tau^2\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 + \frac{4}{\theta}(1+\alpha\tau)^2\eta^2\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemma 2 to (44b), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tau^2\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1}\|^2 &\leq (1+\theta)(1-\beta)^2\tau^2\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 + 2\left(1+\frac{1}{\theta}\right)\beta^2\tau^2\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + 2\left(1+\frac{1}{\theta}\right)\tau^2\alpha^2\eta^2\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\ &\leq (1+\theta)\tau^2\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 + \frac{4}{\theta}\beta^2\tau^2\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{4}{\theta}\alpha^2\tau^2\eta^2\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

As $\beta^2\tau^2 \leq \frac{\theta^4}{64}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{k+1}^{(3)} &= (1-\theta)^{2(k+1)}\left(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{8}{\theta^2}\tau^2\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1}\|^2\right) \\ &\leq (1-\theta^2)(1-\theta)^{2k+1}\left(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{8}{\theta^2}\tau^2\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2\right) \\ &\quad + (1-\theta)^{2(k+1)}\left(\frac{4}{\theta}\tau^2\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2 + \frac{4}{\theta}(1+\alpha\tau)^2\eta^2\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{32}{\theta^3}\beta^2\tau^2\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{32}{\theta^3}\alpha^2\tau^2\eta^2\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2\right) \\ &\leq \left(1-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)(1-\theta)^{2k}\left(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{8}{\theta^2}\tau^2\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k\|^2\right) + \frac{36}{\theta^3}(1+\alpha\tau)^2\eta^2\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\ &= \left(1-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\Phi_k^{(3)} + \frac{36}{\theta^3}(1+\alpha\tau)^2\eta^2\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

The lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 17. For any $0 \leq k < K-1$, if $\beta^2\tau^2 \leq \frac{7\theta^4}{384}$,

$$\Phi_{k+1}^{(4)} \leq \left(1-\frac{\theta}{8}\right)\Phi_k^{(4)} + \frac{c_3\eta^2}{\theta^5}\|\|\nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|\|^2,$$

where

$$\Phi_k^{(4)} = \|\|\Pi_C\mathbf{X}_k\|\|_C^2 + \frac{24}{7\theta^2}\|\|\Pi_C\mathbf{Z}_k\|\|_C^2 + \frac{c_3\eta^2}{\theta^4}\|\|\Pi_C\mathbf{G}_k\|\|_C^2$$

and

$$c_3 = \frac{8}{7}\left(\frac{3\theta}{2} + 6\alpha^2\tau^2\theta + \frac{48\alpha^2\tau^2}{7}\right) \leq \frac{12}{7} + \frac{720\alpha^2\tau^2}{49}.$$

Proof. By multiplying Π_C on both sides of (5b)-(5e), we have

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_C\mathbf{Y}_{k+1} = \left(\mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}\right)(\Pi_C\mathbf{X}_k - \eta\Pi_C\mathbf{G}_k), & (47a) \\ \Pi_C\mathbf{Z}_{k+1} = \left(\mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}\right)((1-\beta)\Pi_C\mathbf{Z}_k + \beta\Pi_C\mathbf{X}_k - \alpha\eta\Pi_C\mathbf{G}_k), & (47b) \\ \Pi_C\mathbf{X}_{k+1} = (1-\tau)\Pi_C\mathbf{Y}_{k+1} + \tau\Pi_C\mathbf{Z}_{k+1}, & (47c) \\ \Pi_C\mathbf{G}_{k+1} = \left(\mathbf{C} - \frac{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}\right)\Pi_C\mathbf{G}_k + \Pi_C(\nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)). & (47d) \end{cases}$$

Applying (3) and Lemma 2 to (47a) yields

$$\|\Pi_C \mathbf{Y}_{k+1}\|_C^2 \leq (1 - \theta) \|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{\eta^2}{\theta} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2. \quad (48)$$

Analogously,

$$\tau^2 \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_{k+1}\|_C^2 \leq (1 - \theta) \tau^2 \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{2\beta^2 \tau^2}{\theta} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2 \tau^2 \eta^2}{\theta} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2, \quad (49)$$

$$\|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_{k+1}\|_C^2 \leq (1 - \theta) \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{1}{\theta} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|_C^2, \quad (50)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_{k+1}\|_C^2 &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Y}_{k+1}\|_C^2 + \frac{3\tau^2}{\theta} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_{k+1}\|_C^2 \\ &\stackrel{(48), (49)}{\leq} \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{2}\right) (1 - \theta) \|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \frac{\eta^2}{\theta} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{3\tau^2}{\theta} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{6\beta^2 \tau^2}{\theta^2} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{6\alpha^2 \tau^2 \eta^2}{\theta^2} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{4}\right) \|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{3\tau^2}{\theta} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_k\|_C^2 + \frac{(3 + 12\alpha^2 \tau^2) \eta^2}{2\theta^2} \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where we also used the fact $\beta^2 \tau^2 \leq \frac{\theta^3}{24}$ in the last inequality above.

Combining (49), (50), (51) yields

$$\mathbf{b}_{k+1} \leq \mathbf{A} \mathbf{b}_k + \frac{1}{\theta} \mathbf{d}_k,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}_k &= \left(\|\Pi_C \mathbf{X}_k\|_C^2, \tau^2 \|\Pi_C \mathbf{Z}_k\|_C^2, \|\Pi_C \mathbf{G}_k\|_C^2 \right)^\top, \\ \mathbf{d}_k &= \left(0, 0, \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|_C^2 \right)^\top, \\ \mathbf{A} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{\theta}{4} & \frac{3}{\theta} & \frac{(3+12\alpha^2\tau^2)\eta^2}{2\theta^2} \\ \frac{2\beta^2\tau^2}{\theta} & 1 - \theta & \frac{2\alpha^2\tau^2\eta^2}{\theta} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 - \theta \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact $\beta^2 \tau^2 \leq \frac{7\theta^4}{384}$, we have

$$\mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{A} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{8}\right) \mathbf{q}^\top,$$

where

$$\mathbf{q} = \left(1, \frac{24}{7\theta^2}, \frac{c_3 \eta^2}{\theta^4}\right)^\top.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{k+1}^{(4)} &= \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{b}_{k+1} \leq \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{b}_k + \frac{1}{\theta} \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{d}_k \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{8}\right) \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{b}_k + \frac{1}{\theta} \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{d}_k \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{8}\right) \Phi_k^{(4)} + \frac{c_3 \eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|_C^2. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma is proved. \square

Next, we bound the term $\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|^2$ occurred above.

Lemma 18. *For any $0 \leq k < K$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k)\|_C^2 \\ & \leq 6nL(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+2}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + (1-\tau)(1-\beta)(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}))) \\ & \quad + 9n(1+\alpha\tau)\eta L\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + 6n\eta L\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{k+1}\|^2 + 3(4+\alpha\tau)L^2\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + 6L^2\|\mathbf{U}_{k+1} - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Firstly, we expand $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k & \stackrel{(44c)}{=} (1-\tau)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) + \tau(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) \\ & \stackrel{(44a), (44b)}{=} - (1-\tau)\eta\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k + \tau(1-\beta)(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - \alpha\tau\eta\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k \\ & \stackrel{(45)}{=} (1-\tau)(1-\beta)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - (1-\tau+\alpha\tau)\eta\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

By similar arguments in the proof of Lemma 12, Equations (29), (30) still hold here. And by the L -smoothness, Equations (15), (18), (19) also hold in this proof. Taking average over $i \in \mathcal{N}$ on both sides of (30), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2nL}\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)\|^2 \\ & \leq f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - \langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \rangle \\ & \stackrel{(52)}{=} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) + (1-\tau)(1-\beta)\langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \rangle + (1-\tau+\alpha\tau)\eta\langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k \rangle \\ & \leq f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) + (1-\tau)(1-\beta)(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) + (1-\tau+\alpha\tau)\eta\langle \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k), \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k \rangle \\ & \stackrel{(15)}{\leq} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) + (1-\tau)(1-\beta)(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) + (1+\alpha\tau)\eta\left(\frac{3}{2}\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2}{2n}\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2\right) \\ & \stackrel{(18)}{\leq} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) - \frac{\eta}{4}\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{\eta L^2}{2n}\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + (1-\tau)(1-\beta)\left(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) - \frac{\eta}{4}\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{\eta^2 L}{2n}\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2\right) \\ & \quad + (1+\alpha\tau)\eta\left(\frac{3}{2}\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2}{2n}\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2\right) \\ & \stackrel{(19)}{\leq} f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+2}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + \eta\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{L}{2n}\|\mathbf{U}_{k+1} - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{4}\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{\eta L^2}{2n}\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + (1-\tau)(1-\beta)\left(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) - \frac{\eta}{4}\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{\eta^2 L}{2n}\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2\right) \\ & \quad + (1+\alpha\tau)\eta\left(\frac{3}{2}\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2}{2n}\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2\right) \\ & \leq f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+2}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + (1-\tau)(1-\beta)(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) \\ & \quad + \frac{3(1+\alpha\tau)\eta}{2}\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{(3+\alpha\tau)\eta L^2}{2n}\|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \eta\|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{L}{2n}\|\mathbf{U}_{k+1} - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above equation with (12) and using the condition $\eta \leq \frac{1}{L}$ complete the proof. \square

5.3 Linear coupling

The following lemma is a variant of Lemma 6. Similar results can also be found in [17, 40, 41]. We provide its proof in Appendix for completeness.

Lemma 19. For any $0 \leq k < K$,

$$f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) \leq f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle - \frac{\mu}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \frac{L}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2. \quad (53)$$

Proof. See Appendix A.2 □

Lemma 20. If $\beta \leq \frac{\theta}{16}$ and η satisfies

$$0 < \eta \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\alpha\tau n\theta^4}{2160\delta_C^2 v_-^2 (1 + \alpha\tau)^2 \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 L}, \frac{\sqrt{\alpha\tau}\theta^3}{8\sqrt{5}c_3 (15 + 9\alpha\tau)\delta_C v_- L}, \frac{1}{24\alpha\tau L}, \frac{\theta^3}{8\sqrt{5}c_3 (18 + 3\alpha\tau)\delta_C v_- L} \right\}, \quad (54)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k} 2\alpha\eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k} \frac{L}{n\tau} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \frac{\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n\tau} \left(\Phi_k^{(4)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_k^{(3)} \right) \\ \leq & \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} 12\alpha (1-\beta)^{-k+1} (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) + \frac{80\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n\theta\tau} \Phi_0^{(4)} + \frac{15\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2}{n\theta\tau} \Phi_0^{(3)} \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} (1-\beta)^{-k} \frac{480c_3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 \eta^2 L^2}{\tau\theta^6} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+2}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + (1-\tau)(1-\beta)(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}))). \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Proof. Using Lemma 17 recursively yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_k^{(4)} & \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{8}\right) \Phi_{k-1}^{(4)} + \frac{c_1\eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k-1})\|^2 \\ & \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{8}\right)^2 \Phi_{k-2}^{(4)} + \frac{c_1\eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_k) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k-1})\|^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{8}\right) \frac{c_1\eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k-1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{k-2})\|^2 \\ & \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{8}\right)^k \Phi_0^{(4)} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{8}\right)^{k-j-1} \frac{c_1\eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_j)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

As $\beta \leq \frac{\theta}{16}$, we have $\frac{1-\frac{\theta}{8}}{1-\beta} \leq 1 - \frac{\theta}{16}$. Thus,

$$\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{8}\right)^{k-j-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} = (1-\beta)^{-j} \left(\frac{1-\frac{\theta}{8}}{1-\beta}\right)^{k-j-1} \leq (1-\beta)^{-j} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{16}\right)^{k-j-1}. \quad (56)$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \Phi_k^{(4)} \\
& \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{8}\right)^k (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \Phi_0^{(4)} + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{8}\right)^{k-j-1} \frac{c_3 \eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_j)\|^2 \\
& \stackrel{(56)}{\leq} \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{16}\right)^k \Phi_0^{(4)} + \sum_{j=0}^{K-2} \sum_{k=j+1}^{+\infty} (1-\beta)^{-j} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{16}\right)^{k-j-1} \frac{c_3 \eta^2}{\theta^5} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_j)\|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{16}{\theta} \Phi_0^{(4)} + \frac{16c_3 \eta^2}{\theta^6} \sum_{j=0}^{K-2} (1-\beta)^{-j} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_j)\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously, using $\frac{1-\frac{\theta}{2}}{1-\beta} \leq 1 - \frac{\theta}{3}$, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \Phi_k^{(3)} \leq \frac{3}{\theta} \Phi_0^{(3)} + \frac{108(1+\alpha\tau)^2 \eta^2}{\theta^4} \sum_{j=0}^{K-2} (1-\beta)^{-j} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_j\|^2.$$

Then, combining the above equations with (18) and Lemma 9 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \left(3\alpha\eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{2L}{n\tau} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n\tau} \left(\Phi_k^{(4)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \Phi_k^{(3)} \right) \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \left(3\alpha\eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{5\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n\tau} \left(\Phi_k^{(4)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \Phi_k^{(3)} \right) \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \left(12\alpha \left(f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) \right) + \frac{6\alpha\eta L^2}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{5\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n\tau} \left(\Phi_k^{(4)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \Phi_k^{(3)} \right) \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \left(12\alpha \left(f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) \right) + \frac{6\alpha\eta L^2}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{5\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n\tau} \left(\frac{16}{\theta} \Phi_0^{(4)} + \frac{16c_3 \eta^2}{\theta^6} \sum_{j=0}^{K-2} (1-\beta)^{-j} \|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_{j+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_j)\|^2 \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{5\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2}{n\tau} \left(\frac{3}{\theta} \Phi_0^{(3)} + \frac{108(1+\alpha\tau)^2 \eta^2}{\theta^4} \sum_{j=0}^{K-2} (1-\beta)^{-j} \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_j\|^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

After combining with Lemma 18 and rearranging, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k} \eta \left(3\alpha(1-\beta) - \frac{5\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 \eta L}{n\tau} \left(\frac{108(1+\alpha\tau)^2 \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2}{\theta^4} + \frac{16c_3 \eta L}{\theta^6} (9n(1+\alpha\tau) + 6n) \right) \right) \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k} \frac{L}{n\tau} \left(2(1-\beta) - 6\alpha\tau\eta L - \frac{80c_3\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 \eta^2 L^2}{\theta^6} (3(4+\alpha\tau) + 6) \right) \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \frac{\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 L}{n\tau} \left(\Phi_k^{(4)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \Phi_k^{(3)} \right) \\
\leq & \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} 12\alpha(1-\beta)^{-k+1} (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) + \frac{80\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 L}{n\theta\tau} \Phi_0^{(4)} + \frac{15\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2}{n\theta\tau} \Phi_0^{(3)} \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} (1-\beta)^{-k} \frac{480c_3\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 \eta^2 L^2}{\tau\theta^6} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+2}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + (1-\tau)(1-\beta)(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}))).
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

The LHS of (57) can be lower bounded by the LHS of (55), which completes the proof. \square

The next theorem gives the main result of Section 5.

Theorem 2. *If $\alpha\tau = \frac{1}{12}$, $\tau \in (0, 1)$, η satisfies (54) and*

$$0 < \eta \leq \frac{\theta^3}{8\sqrt{15}c_3\delta_{\mathbb{C}}v_-L}, \tag{58}$$

and β satisfies

$$0 < \beta \leq \min \left\{ \tau, \frac{\theta}{16}, \frac{\theta^2}{8\tau}, \frac{\mu\alpha\eta}{2} \right\}, \tag{59}$$

then the output of Algorithm 2 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} f(\mathbf{v}_{K,i}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{k,i}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) \\
\leq & (1-\beta)^{K-2} \left(\frac{7}{12} + \frac{3\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 (1-\theta)^{2K} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \eta L}{n} \right) \\
& \cdot \left(18(1-\beta)(1-\tau)(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \frac{960\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 L}{n\theta} \Phi_0^{(4)} + \frac{180\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2}{n\theta} \Phi_0^{(3)} + \frac{1-\beta}{2\alpha^2\eta} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_0^{(3)} &= \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_0\|^2 + \frac{8}{\theta^2} \tau^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_0\|^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{8}{\theta^2} \right) \|\mathbf{X}_0\|^2, \\
\Phi_0^{(4)} &= \left(1 + \frac{24}{7\theta^2} \right) \|\mathbf{X}_0\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2 + \frac{c_3\eta^2}{\theta^4} \|\mathbf{\Pi}_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbf{G}_0\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{24}{7\theta^2} + \frac{c_3\eta^2}{\theta^4 L^2} \right) \|\mathbf{\Pi}_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbf{X}_0\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2
\end{aligned}$$

are defined in Lemma 16 and Lemma 17.

Proof. Firstly, we have the following expansion

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} \rangle &\stackrel{(44b)}{=} (1 - \beta) \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k \rangle + \alpha\eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(45)}{=} \frac{(1 - \beta)(1 - \tau)}{\tau} \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \rangle + \alpha\eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{(1 - \beta)(1 - \tau)}{\tau} \left(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) + \frac{L}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) + \alpha\eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

where the last inequality is by setting $\mathbf{a} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$, $\mathbf{b} = \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k$ in Lemma 6.

We have the following inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
&f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) \\
&\stackrel{(53)}{\leq} \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle - \frac{\mu}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \frac{L}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\
&= \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} \rangle + \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle - \frac{\mu}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \frac{L}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(46)}{\leq} \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} \rangle + \left(\frac{\beta}{2\alpha\eta} - \frac{\mu}{4} \right) \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \frac{L}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{1 - \beta}{2\alpha\eta} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha\eta} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(59)}{\leq} \langle \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} \rangle + \frac{L}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{1 - \beta}{2\alpha\eta} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha\eta} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(61)}{\leq} \frac{(1 - \beta)(1 - \tau)}{\tau} \left(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) + \frac{L}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) + \alpha\eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L}{n} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1 - \beta}{2\alpha\eta} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha\eta} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{(1 - \beta)(1 - \tau)}{\tau} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) + \alpha\eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L}{n\tau} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 + \frac{1 - \beta}{2\alpha\eta} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha\eta} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking weighted average over $i \in \mathcal{N}$ on both sides of the above equation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \beta)^{-k} (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) \\
&\leq \frac{(1 - \beta)(1 - \tau)}{\tau} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \beta)^{-k} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \beta)^{-k} \left(\alpha\eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \frac{L}{n\tau} \|\mathbf{U}_k - \mathbf{1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\alpha\eta} \left((1 - \beta) \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 - (1 - \beta)^{-K+1} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_K - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \right) \\
&\stackrel{(55)}{\leq} \frac{(1 - \beta)(1 - \tau)}{\tau} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \beta)^{-k} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)) + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} 12\alpha(1 - \beta)^{-k+1} (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1})) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} (1 - \beta)^{-k} \frac{480c_3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 \eta^2 L^2}{\tau\theta^6} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+2}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}) + (1 - \tau)(1 - \beta)(f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}))) \\
&\quad + \frac{80\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n\theta\tau} \Phi_0^{(4)} + \frac{15\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2}{n\theta\tau} \Phi_0^{(3)} + \frac{1 - \beta}{2\alpha\eta} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \beta)^{-k} \alpha\eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 - \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1 - \beta)^{-k+1} \frac{\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n\tau} \left(\Phi_k^{(4)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_k^{(3)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

After rearranging the above equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \psi_K (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k} \alpha \eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \frac{2\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 L}{n\tau} \left(\Phi_k^{(4)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \Phi_k^{(3)} \right) \\
\leq & \psi_0 (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \psi_1 (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \sum_{k=2}^{K-2} \psi_k (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \psi_{K-1} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{K-1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \phi_k (f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \frac{80\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 L}{n\theta\tau} \Phi_0^{(4)} + \frac{15\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2}{n\theta\tau} \Phi_0^{(3)} + \frac{1-\beta}{2\alpha\eta} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_0 &= \frac{(1-\beta)(1-\tau)}{\tau} \left(1 + \frac{480c_3\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 \eta^2 L^2}{\theta^6} \right), \\
\psi_1 &= \frac{1-\tau}{\tau} - 12\alpha(1-\beta) + \frac{480c_3\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 \eta^2 L^2}{\tau\theta^6} (\beta - \tau\beta - 1), \\
\psi_k &= \frac{1-\tau}{(1-\beta)^{k-1}\tau} - \frac{12\alpha}{(1-\beta)^{k-2}} - \frac{480c_3\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 \eta^2 L^2 \beta}{\theta^6 (\beta-1)^{k-1}}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq K-2, \\
\psi_{K-1} &= \frac{(1-\tau)}{(1-\beta)^{K-2}\tau} - \frac{12\alpha}{(1-\beta)^{K-3}} + \frac{480c_3\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 \eta^2 L^2}{\tau\theta^6 (1-\beta)^{K-2}} (\tau - 1 - \tau\beta), \\
\psi_K &= 12\alpha(1-\beta)^{-K+2} - (1-\beta)^{-K+2} \frac{480c_3\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 \eta^2 L^2}{\tau\theta^6}, \\
\phi_k &= \frac{12\alpha}{(1-\beta)^{k-1}} - \frac{(1-\tau)}{(1-\beta)^{k-1}\tau} - \frac{1}{(1-\beta)^k}, \quad 0 \leq k < K.
\end{aligned}$$

As $\alpha\tau = \frac{1}{12}$, we have for any $0 \leq k < K$,

$$\phi_k = \frac{1}{(1-\beta)^{k-1}\tau} \left(12\alpha\tau - 1 + \tau - \frac{\tau}{1-\beta} \right) < 0.$$

As $0 < \beta \leq \tau < 1$, it follows that for any $1 \leq k \leq K-1$,

$$\psi_k \leq \frac{1-\tau}{(1-\beta)^{k-1}\tau} - \frac{12\alpha}{(1-\beta)^{k-2}} = \frac{1-\tau - 12\alpha\tau(1-\beta)}{(1-\beta)^{k-1}\tau} = \frac{\beta - \tau}{(1-\beta)^{k-1}\tau} \leq 0.$$

Since η satisfies (58), we have

$$\psi_K \geq 6\alpha(1-\beta)^{-K+2}$$

and

$$\psi_0 \leq \frac{3(1-\beta)(1-\tau)}{2\tau}.$$

Now, by combining the above equations, we have obtained

$$\begin{aligned}
& 6\alpha(1-\beta)^{-K+2} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_K) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k} \alpha \eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \frac{\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 L}{n\tau} \left(\Phi_k^{(4)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \Phi_k^{(3)} \right) \\
\leq & \frac{3(1-\beta)(1-\tau)}{2\tau} (f(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) + \frac{80\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 L}{n\theta\tau} \Phi_0^{(4)} + \frac{15\delta_{\mathbb{C}}^2 v_-^2 L \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2}{n\theta\tau} \Phi_0^{(3)} + \frac{1-\beta}{2\alpha\eta} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Next, we upper bound $\|\mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K - \mathbf{1} \bar{\mathbf{y}}_K\|$ by the second and third terms on the LHS of (62). Similar to (42), we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{(1-\beta)^{-K+2} L}{n} \|\mathbf{V}_K^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_K - \mathbf{1} \bar{\mathbf{y}}_K\|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{4\alpha} \cdot \frac{\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L (1-\beta)^{-K+2}}{n\tau} \left(\Phi_{K-1}^{(4)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_{K-1}^{(3)} \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{3(1-\beta) \delta_C^2 v_-^2 (1-\theta)^{2K} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \eta L}{\alpha n} \left((1-\beta)^{-K+1} \alpha \eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_{K-1}\|^2 \right) \\
& \leq \left(\frac{1}{4\alpha} + \frac{3\delta_C^2 v_-^2 (1-\theta)^{2K} \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \eta L}{\alpha n} \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k} \alpha \eta \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (1-\beta)^{-k+1} \frac{\delta_C^2 v_-^2 L}{n\tau} \left(\Phi_k^{(4)} + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2 \Phi_k^{(3)} \right) \right). \tag{63}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (62), (63) with (43) results in (60). \square

Remark 3. The condition $\alpha\tau = \frac{1}{12}$ simplifies our proof. If $\alpha\tau \in (0, 1)$, by making some changes to the constants in the proofs of (18), Lemma 20, and Theorem 2, the same convergence rate can still be achieved.

Remark 4. To satisfy the requirements of Theorem 2, we can choose $\eta = O\left(\frac{\theta^3}{\delta_C v_- L \left(1 + \frac{\delta_C v_- \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2}{\theta}\right)}\right)$,

$\alpha = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu\eta}}\right)$, $\tau = O(\sqrt{\mu\eta})$ and $\beta = O(\sqrt{\mu\eta})$. Then APD-SC converges linearly at the rate $O((1-\beta)^k) = O\left(\left(1 - C\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{L}}\right)^k\right)$, where $C = O\left(\theta^{1.5} \left(\delta_C v_- \left(1 + \frac{\delta_C v_- \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2}{\theta}\right)\right)^{-0.5}\right)$. To our knowledge, APD-SC is the first decentralized method on unbalanced graphs with the provable convergence rate of $O\left(\left(1 - C\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{L}}\right)^k\right)$ for some $C > 0$ that depends on the mixing matrix. We also have $\Phi_0^{(3)} = O\left(\frac{1}{\theta^2}\right)$ and $\Phi_0^{(4)} = O\left(\frac{\|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_0\|^2}{\theta^2}\right)$. Then, to get ϵ -optimal solutions, the complexity of APD-SC is

$$O\left(\frac{\sqrt{\delta_C v_-}}{\theta^{1.5}} \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu} \left(1 + \frac{\delta_C v_- \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2}{\theta}\right)} \log \frac{1 + \delta_C^2 v_-^2 \theta^{-3} \left(\|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_0\|^2 + \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C^2\right)}{\epsilon}\right).$$

Specifically, when the graph is balanced, we have $\delta_C = 1$, $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}_C = \mathbf{I} - \frac{\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top}{n}$. By setting $\mathbf{v}_0 = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{0,1} = \dots = \mathbf{x}_{0,n}$, we have $v_- = 1$, $\|\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{p}\|_C = 0$ and $\|\mathbf{\Pi}_C \mathbf{X}_0\| = 0$, then, the complexity reduces to $O\left(\frac{1}{\theta^{1.5}} \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$, which is the same as Acc-GT in [24] and achieves the currently best complexity of single-loop methods over balanced digraphs for smooth and strongly-convex functions.

6 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we test APD and APD-SC on a real data set and compare their performance with some existing methods using only column stochastic matrices including Subgradient-Push [31] and

Push-DIGing/ADD-OPT [32, 55]¹.

The objective function is from the (ℓ^2 -penalized) logistic regression model:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{j=1}^d \log \left(1 + \exp \left(-\lambda_{i,j} \mathbf{z}_{i,j}^\top \mathbf{x} \right) \right) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|^2,$$

where $\mathbf{z}_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a 4-dimensional feature vector and $\lambda_{i,j} \in \{-1, +1\}$ is the label. The data is from Banknote Authentication Data Set in UCI Machine Learning Repository [11] whose data were extracted from images that were taken for the evaluation of an authentication procedure for banknotes. And we set $d = 50$ here, i.e., each agent possesses 50 training examples. The penalty parameter μ is set to be 0 for the non-strongly convex case and 0.05 for the strongly convex case. The system we use for numerical experiments here contains $n = 20$ agents. The directed graph \mathcal{G} is constructed by randomly adding 50 directed links to the undirected cycle. To construct the column stochastic matrix, each agent assign the same weight for any out-neighbors and itself, i.e., $\mathbf{C}_{ij} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C},i}^+ \cup \{i\}|}$ if $j \in \{i\} \cup \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C},i}^+$ and $\mathbf{C}_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Here, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C},i}^+$ is the set of out-neighbors of agent i in graph \mathcal{G} . Each entry in the initial position $\mathbf{x}_{0,i}$ are taken from standard Gaussian distribution independently. And $\{\mathbf{x}_{0,i}\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$ are independent with each other. The initial vector \mathbf{v}_0 is set to be the all-ones vector.

We hand-tune the parameters and stepsizes to let each method converge to high accuracy as fast as possible. Specifically, in the non-strongly convex case, we set $\eta = 0.012$, $c_+ = 0.92$, $w_1 = 0.006$, $w_2 = 1$ for APD; $\eta = 0.025$ for Push-DIGing; $\eta_k = \frac{0.18}{\sqrt{k}}$ for Subgradient-Push. And in the strongly convex case, we set $\eta = 0.0125$, $\alpha = 6$, $\beta = 0.1$, $\tau = 0.1$ for APD-SC; $\eta = 0.025$ for Push-DIGing; $\eta_k = \frac{0.18}{\sqrt{k}}$ for Subgradient-Push. The performance is illustrated in Fig 1 and Fig 2, where the x -axis represents the number of iterations and the y -axis is the loss function defined as

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} f \left(\mathbf{v}_{K,i}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{K,i} \right) - f(\mathbf{x}^*).$$

Subgradient-Push uses diminishing stepsize and converges in a sublinear rate. In the non-strongly convex and strongly convex cases, both APD (APD-SC) and Push-DIGing/ADD-OPT converge linearly. Both APD (APD-SC) and Push-DIGing converge faster in the strongly convex case than in the non-strongly convex case. This is predictable because the penalty term in the objective functions could give strongly convex functions larger gradients than the non-strongly convex ones. In the about first 600 iterations for the non-strongly convex case and about first 200 iterations for the strongly convex case, Push-DIGing converges even faster than APD (APD-SC). This is reasonable because the η we choose for Push-DIGing is larger than that of APD (APD-SC). And later, APD (APD-SC) surpasses Push-DIGing and reaches solutions with loss less than 10^{-14} within 1300 iterations and 1000 iterations in non-strongly convex and strongly convex cases, respectively. To get such accuracy, Push-DIGing needs around 2800 and 1600 iterations. This is linear because combinations of history gradients are restored in the variable $\mathbf{z}_{k,i}$. As time goes, the history information contained in $\mathbf{z}_{k,i}$ gradually shows its effect and helps the accelerated methods APD (APD-SC) outperform the non-accelerated method Push-DIGing.

¹Though not mentioned in the original papers, it can be proved that Push-DIGing/ADD-OPT has $O(1/k)$ convergence rate for non-strongly convex functions.




Figure 1: Performance comparison in the non-strongly convex case




Figure 2: Performance comparison in the strongly convex case

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose two accelerated decentralized gradient descent methods APD and APD-SC for minimizing non-strongly convex and strongly convex objective functions, respectively. APD and APD-SC use only column stochastic matrices for information fusion and achieve the convergence rates of $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ and $O\left(\left(1 - C\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{L}}\right)^k\right)$ respectively. To the best of our knowledge, APD and APD-SC are the first decentralized methods over unbalanced directed graphs to match the optimal convergence rate of first-order methods (up to constant factors depending only on the mixing matrix). The effectiveness of the proposed methods have been confirmed by numerical experiments.

A Appendix

A.1 Proof of Lemma 6

For any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f_i(\mathbf{a}) - f_i(\mathbf{b}) &= f_i(\mathbf{a}) - f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}) + f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}) - f_i(\mathbf{b}) \\
&\leq \langle \nabla f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}), \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{u}_{k,i} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{u}_{k,i}\|^2 + f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}) - f_i(\mathbf{b}) \\
&\leq \langle \nabla f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}), \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{u}_{k,i} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{u}_{k,i}\|^2 + \langle \nabla f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}), \mathbf{u}_{k,i} - \mathbf{b} \rangle \\
&= \langle \nabla f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}), \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{u}_{k,i}\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first and second inequalities are due to the L -smoothness and convexity. Taking average over $i \in \mathcal{N}$ completes this proof.

A.2 Proof of Lemma 19

For any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, by the μ -strong convexity,

$$\begin{aligned}
f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}) &\leq f_i(\mathbf{x}^*) + \langle \nabla f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}), \mathbf{u}_{k,i} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle - \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_{k,i} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \\
&\leq f_i(\mathbf{x}^*) + \langle \nabla f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}), \mathbf{u}_{k,i} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle - \frac{\mu}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_{k,i} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k\|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

where the last inequality is from the elementary inequality: $-\|\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}\|^2 \leq -\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|^2$.

By the L -smoothness, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) &\leq f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}) + \langle \nabla f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}), \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{u}_{k,i} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{u}_{k,i}\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(64)}{\leq} f_i(\mathbf{x}^*) + \langle \nabla f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}), \mathbf{u}_{k,i} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle - \frac{\mu}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \langle \nabla f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}), \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{u}_{k,i} \rangle + \frac{L + \mu}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{u}_{k,i}\|^2 \\
&\leq f_i(\mathbf{x}^*) + \langle \nabla f_i(\mathbf{u}_{k,i}), \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle - \frac{\mu}{4} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + L \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{u}_{k,i}\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact $\mu \leq L$. Taking average over $i \in \mathcal{N}$ completes the proof.

References

- [1] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu and Lorenzo Orecchia. Linear coupling: An ultimate unification of gradient and mirror descent. In *8th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2017)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2017.
- [2] Brian Baingana, Gonzalo Mateos, and Georgios B Giannakis. Proximal-gradient algorithms for tracking cascades over social networks. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 8(4):563–575, 2014.
- [3] Abraham Berman and Robert J Plemmons. *Nonnegative Matrices in the Mathematical Sciences*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematic, 1994.
- [4] Dimitri P Bertsekas. Distributed asynchronous computation of fixed points. *Mathematical Programming*, 27(1):107–120, 1983.
- [5] Stephen Boyd, Neal Parikh, and Eric Chu. *Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers*. Now Publishers Inc, 2011.
- [6] Sébastien Bubeck. Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 8(3-4):231–357, 2015.
- [7] Volkan Cevher, Stephen Becker, and Mark Schmidt. Convex optimization for big data: Scalable, randomized, and parallel algorithms for big data analytics. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 31(5):32–43, 2014.
- [8] Ruiliang Chen, J-M Park, and Kaigui Bian. Robust distributed spectrum sensing in cognitive radio networks. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2008-The 27th Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 1876–1884. IEEE, 2008.
- [9] Kobi Cohen, Angelia Nedić, and R Srikant. Distributed learning algorithms for spectrum sharing in spatial random access wireless networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(6):2854–2869, 2017.
- [10] Kobi Cohen, Angelia Nedić, and R Srikant. On projected stochastic gradient descent algorithm with weighted averaging for least squares regression. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(11):5974–5981, 2017.
- [11] Helene Daorksen and Volker Lohweg. Banknote authentication. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 2013.
- [12] Darina Dvinskikh and Alexander Gasnikov. Decentralized and parallel primal and dual accelerated methods for stochastic convex programming problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09015*, 2019.
- [13] Alireza Fallah, Mert Gurbuzbalaban, Asuman Ozdaglar, Umut Simsekli, and Lingjiong Zhu. Robust distributed accelerated stochastic gradient methods for multi-agent networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.08701*, 2019.
- [14] Alexander IJ Forrester, András Söbester, and Andy J Keane. Multi-fidelity optimization via surrogate modelling. In *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, volume 463, pages 3251–3269. The Royal Society, 2007.

- [15] Bahman Ghahesifard and Jorge Cortés. Distributed strategies for generating weight-balanced and doubly stochastic digraphs. *European Journal of Control*, 18(6):539–557, 2012.
- [16] Franck Iutzeler, Pascal Bianchi, Philippe Ciblat, and Walid Hachem. Explicit convergence rate of a distributed alternating direction method of multipliers. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(4):892–904, 2015.
- [17] Dušan Jakovetić, Joao Xavier, and José MF Moura. Fast distributed gradient methods. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(5):1131–1146, 2014.
- [18] Rie Johnson and Tong Zhang. Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26:315–323, 2013.
- [19] David Kempe, Alin Dobra, and Johannes Gehrke. Gossip-based computation of aggregate information. In *44th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2003. Proceedings.*, pages 482–491. IEEE, 2003.
- [20] Dmitry Kovalev, Adil Salim, and Peter Richtárik. Optimal and practical algorithms for smooth and strongly convex decentralized optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.
- [21] Guanghui Lan, Soomin Lee, and Yi Zhou. Communication-efficient algorithms for decentralized and stochastic optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 180(1):237–284, 2020.
- [22] Huan Li, Cong Fang, Wotao Yin, and Zhouchen Lin. Decentralized accelerated gradient methods with increasing penalty parameters. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 68:4855–4870, 2020.
- [23] Huan Li and Zhouchen Lin. Revisiting extra for smooth distributed optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 30(3):1795–1821, 2020.
- [24] Huan Li and Zhouchen Lin. Accelerated gradient tracking over time-varying graphs for decentralized optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.02596*, 2021.
- [25] Zhi Li, Wei Shi, and Ming Yan. A decentralized proximal-gradient method with network independent step-sizes and separated convergence rates. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 67(17):4494–4506, 2019.
- [26] Xiaorui Liu, Yao Li, Rongrong Wang, Jiliang Tang, and Ming Yan. Linear convergent decentralized optimization with compression. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [27] Ali Makhdoumi and Asuman Ozdaglar. Convergence rate of distributed admm over networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(10):5082–5095, 2017.
- [28] Gonzalo Mateos, Juan Andrés Bazerque, and Georgios B Giannakis. Distributed sparse linear regression. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 58(10):5262–5276, 2010.
- [29] Gonzalo Mateos and Georgios B Giannakis. Distributed recursive least-squares: Stability and performance analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 60(7):3740–3754, 2012.
- [30] Angelia Nedic. Asynchronous broadcast-based convex optimization over a network. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(6):1337–1351, 2010.

- [31] Angelia Nedić and Alex Olshevsky. Distributed optimization over time-varying directed graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 60(3):601–615, 2014.
- [32] Angelia Nedic, Alex Olshevsky, and Wei Shi. Achieving geometric convergence for distributed optimization over time-varying graphs. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 27(4):2597–2633, 2017.
- [33] Angelia Nedić, Alex Olshevsky, and César A Uribe. Fast convergence rates for distributed non-bayesian learning. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(11):5538–5553, 2017.
- [34] Angelia Nedic and Asuman Ozdaglar. Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(1):48–61, 2009.
- [35] Yurii Nesterov. A method for unconstrained convex minimization problem with the rate of convergence $o(1/k^2)$. In *Doklady an ussr*, volume 269, pages 543–547, 1983.
- [36] Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [37] Alex Olshevsky, Ioannis Ch Paschalidis, and Artin Spiridonoff. Fully asynchronous push-sum with growing intercommunication intervals. In *2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 591–596. IEEE, 2018.
- [38] Shi Pu and Angelia Nedić. Distributed stochastic gradient tracking methods. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–49, 2020.
- [39] Shi Pu, Wei Shi, Jinming Xu, and Angelia Nedic. Push-pull gradient methods for distributed optimization in networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2020.
- [40] Guannan Qu and Na Li. Harnessing smoothness to accelerate distributed optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 5(3):1245–1260, 2017.
- [41] Guannan Qu and Na Li. Accelerated distributed nesterov gradient descent. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(6):2566–2581, 2019.
- [42] Muhammad I Qureshi, Ran Xin, Soumya Kar, and Usman A Khan. S-adapt: Decentralized stochastic first-order optimization over directed graphs. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 5(3):953–958, 2020.
- [43] S Sundhar Ram, Angelia Nedić, and Venugopal V Veeravalli. Distributed stochastic subgradient projection algorithms for convex optimization. *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, 147(3):516–545, 2010.
- [44] Fakhteh Saadatniaki, Ran Xin, and Usman A Khan. Decentralized optimization over time-varying directed graphs with row and column-stochastic matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(11):4769–4780, 2020.
- [45] Kevin Scaman, Francis Bach, Sébastien Bubeck, Yin Tat Lee, and Laurent Massoulié. Optimal algorithms for smooth and strongly convex distributed optimization in networks. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 3027–3036. PMLR, 2017.
- [46] Wei Shi, Qing Ling, Gang Wu, and Wotao Yin. Extra: An exact first-order algorithm for decentralized consensus optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(2):944–966, 2015.

- [47] Zhuoqing Song, Lei Shi, Shi Pu, and Ming Yan. Compressed gradient tracking for decentralized optimization over general directed networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.07243*, 2021.
- [48] Hakan Terelius, Ufuk Topcu, and Richard M Murray. Decentralized multi-agent optimization via dual decomposition. *IFAC proceedings volumes*, 44(1):11245–11251, 2011.
- [49] Konstantinos I Tsianos, Sean Lawlor, and Michael G Rabbat. Consensus-based distributed optimization: Practical issues and applications in large-scale machine learning. In *2012 50th annual allerton conference on communication, control, and computing (allerton)*, pages 1543–1550. IEEE, 2012.
- [50] John Tsitsiklis, Dimitri Bertsekas, and Michael Athans. Distributed asynchronous deterministic and stochastic gradient optimization algorithms. *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, 31(9):803–812, 1986.
- [51] John Nikolas Tsitsiklis. Problems in decentralized decision making and computation. Technical report, Massachusetts Inst of Tech Cambridge Lab for Information and Decision Systems, 1984.
- [52] Tianyu Wu, Kun Yuan, Qing Ling, Wotao Yin, and Ali H Sayed. Decentralized consensus optimization with asynchrony and delays. *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, 4(2):293–307, 2017.
- [53] Chenguang Xi, Van Sy Mai, Ran Xin, Eyad H Abed, and Usman A Khan. Linear convergence in optimization over directed graphs with row-stochastic matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(10):3558–3565, 2018.
- [54] Chenguang Xi, Qiong Wu, and Usman A Khan. On the distributed optimization over directed networks. *Neurocomputing*, 267:508–515, 2017.
- [55] Chenguang Xi, Ran Xin, and Usman A Khan. Add-opt: Accelerated distributed directed optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(5):1329–1339, 2017.
- [56] Ran Xin and Usman A Khan. A linear algorithm for optimization over directed graphs with geometric convergence. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2(3):315–320, 2018.
- [57] Ran Xin and Usman A Khan. Distributed heavy-ball: A generalization and acceleration of first-order methods with gradient tracking. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(6):2627–2633, 2019.
- [58] Ran Xin, Anit Kumar Sahu, Usman A Khan, and Soumya Kar. Distributed stochastic optimization with gradient tracking over strongly-connected networks. In *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 8353–8358. IEEE, 2019.
- [59] Yongyang Xiong, Jinming Xu, Keyou You, Jianxing Liu, and Ligang Wu. Privacy-preserving distributed online optimization over unbalanced digraphs via subgradient rescaling. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 7(3):1366–1378, 2020.
- [60] Jinming Xu, Shanying Zhu, Yeng Chai Soh, and Lihua Xie. Augmented distributed gradient methods for multi-agent optimization under uncoordinated constant stepsizes. In *2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 2055–2060. IEEE, 2015.
- [61] Haishan Ye, Ziang Zhou, Luo Luo, and Tong Zhang. Decentralized accelerated proximal gradient descent. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.

- [62] Kun Yuan, Qing Ling, and Wotao Yin. On the convergence of decentralized gradient descent. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 26(3):1835–1854, 2016.
- [63] Jiaqi Zhang and Keyou You. Fully asynchronous distributed optimization with linear convergence in directed networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08215*, 2021.