

Efficient implementation of incremental proximal-point methods

Alex Shtoff

Yahoo Research

Haifa, Israel

ALEX.SHTOFF@YAHOOINC.COM

Abstract

Model training algorithms which observe a small portion of the training set in each computational step are ubiquitous in practical machine learning, and include both stochastic and online optimization methods. In the vast majority of cases, such algorithms typically observe the training samples via the gradients of the cost functions the samples incur. Thus, these methods exploit are the *slope* of the cost functions via their first-order approximations.

To address limitations of gradient-based methods, such as sensitivity to step-size choice in the stochastic setting, or inability to exploit small function variability in the online setting, several streams of research attempt to exploit more information about the cost functions than just their gradients via the well-known proximal framework of optimization. However, implementing such methods in practice poses a challenge, since each iteration step boils down to computing a proximal operator, which may not be easy. In this work we provide efficient algorithms and corresponding implementations of proximal operators in order to make experimentation with incremental proximal optimization algorithms accessible to a larger audience of researchers and practitioners, and in particular to promote additional theoretical research into these methods by closing the gap between their theoretical description in research papers and their use in practice.

Keywords: convex optimization, duality, proximal-point

1. Introduction

Incremental optimization is the ‘bread and butter’ of the theory and practice of modern machine learning, where we aim to minimize a *cost* function of the model’s parameters, and can be roughly classified into two major regimes. In the stochastic optimization regime it is assumed that the cost functions are sampled from a stationary distribution, our objective is to design algorithms which minimize the expected cost, the theoretical analysis typically produces bounds on the expected cost, and typical algorithms are variants of the stochastic gradient method (Robbins and Monro, 1951). In the online regime cost functions from a pre-defined family are chosen by an adversary, our objective is minimizing the cumulative cost incurred by the sequence of the cost functions we observe, the theoretical analysis tool is the performance relatively to a theoretical optimum called *regret*, and typical algorithms are variants of the online gradient method (Zinkevich, 2003), or follow the leader (Kalai and Vempala, 2005) based methods operating on linearly approximated costs.

Both in the stochastic and online regime, these methods follow the following incremental protocol: (a) observe the cost function incurred by a small subset of training samples; (b) update the model’s parameters. Since the focus of this paper is on the *implementation* of the computational steps of each iteration, the exact regime plays no role, and thus we treat

both regimes under the same umbrella, and refer to these methods as *incremental* methods, e.g. incremental gradient descent.

These methods rely on linear approximations of the cost functions, which convey only the information that is encoded in the slope of each cost function. To be concrete, consider the incremental gradient method having observed the cost function f :

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_t - \eta \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t).$$

The common view of the above is "make a small step in the negative gradient direction". However, the above formula can be equivalently written using the well-known *proximal view*:

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \underset{\mathbf{x}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ f(\mathbf{x}_t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \right\},$$

which can be interpreted as "minimize a linear approximation of f , but stay close to \mathbf{x}_t ". The step-size η balances these two opposing forces. A different approach is using the cost directly instead of its linear approximation:

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \operatorname{prox}_{\eta f}(\mathbf{x}_t) := \underset{\mathbf{x}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ f(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \right\}, \quad (\text{PROX})$$

where $\operatorname{prox}_{\eta f}$ is the well-known *proximal operator*, which dates back to Moreau (1962, 1965b). In theory, the computational step above exploits the entire cost function, instead of just its slope, and thus intuitively has the potential to produce improved results. The idea is not new, and dates back to the first proximal iteration algorithm of Martinet (1970), which was designed as a theoretical method for the non-incremental regime, where f is the entire function being minimized. In the stochastic optimization regime this idea is known as stochastic proximal point, and in the online regime as implicit online learning. Of course, we do not have to use the cost itself, and f in (PROX) may be any approximation which is not necessarily linear. In line with our aim to use the same terminology for stochastic and online algorithms, we call the idea above *incremental proximal iteration*.

In the online regime, incremental proximal iteration was first proposed by Kivinen and Warmuth (1997), and later analyzed by Kulis and Bartlett (2010) where it was termed 'implicit online learning'. The latter paper showed similar or improved regret guarantees in comparison to regular first order methods, devised an implementation, and showed improved empirical performance on some problem classes. Karampatziakis and Langford (2011) showed that proximal iteration is robust compared to first order methods when training samples need to be weighted by their importance, and recently Campolongo and Orabona (2020) showed that proximal iteration has improved regret when the cost functions the algorithm observes have a bounded rate of change, which is termed *temporal variability*. These examples show that using finer approximations in the online regime, we either gain improved regret guarantees, or improved robustness.

In the stochastic regime, incremental proximal iteration was first proposed and analyzed for the finite-sum optimization problem by Bertsekas (2011). However, significant advantages over first order methods were discovered later. Ryu and Boyd (2014) showed stability results of proximal iteration, stating that the iterates stay in a noise-dominated region around the set of optimal solutions, whereas the distance of SGD iterates from the

optimal set may grow extremely large at the initial iterations of the algorithm if the initial step-size is too large. An improved stability analysis was performed by Asi and Duchi (2019a) by considering a broader family of cost approximations, in addition to the cost itself, which was later extended to the mini-batch setting by Asi et al. (2020), and numerical experiments showed that these methods are significantly less sensitive to the choice of step sizes, and are able to obtain good solutions for a wide range, in direct contrast to classical first order methods. Consequently, hyper-parameter tuning becomes significantly cheaper when using certain proximal point based methods to train models, and consequently the computational and energetic footprint of the training process is reduced.

Using a finer model instead of a linear approximation bears a cost - since f can be arbitrarily complex, computing the proximal operator may be arbitrarily hard, or even infeasible to do in practice. Thus, there is a trade-off between any advantage a finer approximation may provide, and the difficulty of proximal operator computation.

In contrast to the above-mentioned works, rather than theoretical analysis, our aim is to substantially reduce the difficulty of computing the proximal operator devising efficient algorithms to do so in a variety of setups, and providing Python code implementing those algorithms. We show that for some families of functions f , computing $\text{prox}_{\eta f}$ may even be as cheap as a regular gradient step. It is our aim, and hope, that the above contributions make it easier to apply these methods in practice, while also motivate more research by making numerical experimentation with incremental proximal point methods easily accessible to the research community. We'd like to emphasize that the aim of this paper is deriving algorithms for *implementing* proximal operators of useful functions in machine learning, rather than *using* proximal operators to derive better converging algorithms, in order to make such implementations accessible to the research community. In addition to efficiency, we use extensive mathematical theory to derive *modular* implementations, so that researchers may compose the functions they desire from atomic building blocks. For example, a L1 regularized logistic regression problem's cost function is composed of a linear function, composed onto the convex logistic function $t \rightarrow \ln(1 + \exp(t))$, and with the L1 regularizer. Thus, the code for training such models will look like this:

```
x = torch.zeros(x_star.shape)
optimizer = IncRegularizedConvexOnLinear(x, Logistic(), L1Reg(0.01)) # <-- note the modular composition
epoch_loss = 0.
for t, (a, b) in enumerate(my_data_set, start=1):
    step_size = 1. / math.sqrt(t)
    epoch_loss += optimizer.step(step_size, a, b)
```

Since this paper is aimed mainly at an audience partially unfamiliar with convex analysis theory, we will briefly introduce the concepts we need throughout the paper, and refer to additional literature for an in-depth treatment. Thus, some derivations and proofs in this paper may appear trivial to readers well versed in convex analysis and optimization.

1.1 Notation

Scalars are denoted by lowercase latin or greek letters, e.g., a, α . Vectors are denoted by lowercase boldface letters, e.g. \mathbf{a} , and matrices by uppercase boldface letters, e.g. \mathbf{A} . Vector or matrix components are denoted like scalars, e.g. v_i, A_{ij} .

1.2 Extended real-valued functions

Optimization problems are occasionally described using extended real-valued functions, which are functions that can take any real value, in addition to the infinite values $-\infty$ and ∞ . An extended real-value function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ has an associated effective domain $\text{dom}(\phi) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \phi(\mathbf{x}) < \infty\}$, and it's natural to use such functions to encode constrained minimization problems. Indeed, assuming $\phi(\mathbf{x}) > -\infty$ everywhere, any minimizer \mathbf{x}^* of ϕ must satisfy $\phi(\mathbf{x}^*) < \infty$, and therefore the set $\text{dom}(\phi)$ can be viewed as the problem's constraints. Naturally, when maximization problems are considered, $\text{dom}(-\phi)$ encodes the problem's constraints. Throughout this paper, we implicitly assume that any extended real-valued function ϕ is:

- *proper* - it's $-\infty$ nowhere, and $\text{dom}(\phi) \neq \emptyset$, and
- *closed* - it's epigraph $\text{epi}(f) = \{(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} : \phi(\mathbf{x}) \leq t\}$ is a closed set.

When ϕ is used in the context of a maximization problem, we make those assumptions about $-\phi$. Any reasonable function of practical interest is proper, and the vast majority of functions useful in practice are closed as well. An extensive introduction to extended real-valued function can be found, for example, in (Beck, 2017, chap. 2).

1.3 Our contributions

In this work, we consider the following families of functions f when computing $\text{prox}_{\eta f}$. For each family of functions we show examples of machine learning models for whose training it might be useful, devise an algorithm for computing its proximal operator, and provide a Python implementation.

A convex onto linear composition

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = h(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b), \tag{CL}$$

where $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is a convex extended real-valued function.

Regularized convex onto linear composition

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = h(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b) + r(\mathbf{x}), \tag{RCL}$$

where $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$, and $r : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ are convex extended real-valued functions.

Mini-batch of convex onto linear compositions

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m h(\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x} + b_i), \tag{CL-B}$$

where $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is a convex extended real-valued function, and m is small.

Convex Lipschitz onto quadratic composition

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = h\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{x} + c\right), \quad (\text{QL})$$

where $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is a convex and Lipschitz-continuous function, namely,

$$|h(t) - h(s)| \leq L|t - s| \quad \forall t, s \in \text{dom}(f)$$

and \mathbf{A} is a symmetric matrix.

1.4 Previous work

There has been a significant body of research into the analysis of incremental proximal iteration algorithms in various settings and approximating models, which in addition to the examples we provided above also include Duchi and Ruan (2018); Asi and Duchi (2019b); Tran-Dinh et al. (2020); Davis and Drusvyatskiy (2019); Davis et al. (2018); Asi and Duchi (2019c). However, to the best of our knowledge, finding generic algorithms for efficient implementation of incremental proximal algorithms received little attention, and the issue has been partially addressed in the papers focused on the analysis.

Exceptions to the above rule are methods based on the proximal gradient approach, original proposed by Passty (1979), where the approximating function is of the form:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + r(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $r(x)$ is some 'simple' function, usually a regularizer, for which a closed form solution for the proximal operator of r is known. See, for example, the works of Parikh and Boyd (2014); Beck (2017) and references therein for examples. In this work we consider a significantly broader family of functions, aimed at machine learning applications, by building on existing theory in convex analysis, and functions whose proximal operator is known.

Proximal operators of functions belonging to the (CL) family is covered to some extent in the literature. For example, Kulis and Bartlett (2010) show an explicit formula for the case when the 'outer' function h is the ℓ_2 cost $h(t) = \frac{1}{2}t^2$. The case of $h(t) = \max(t, 0)$ has an explicit formula in the work of Asi and Duchi (2019a), while $h(t) = |t|$ is treated in Davis and Drusvyatskiy (2019). While Ryu and Boyd (2014) show an explicit method for the entire family, they do not show how the method is derived, and provide neither concrete examples, nor code. We treat this family using a uniform framework based on duality, show its benefits from a software engineering perspective of decoupling concerns, and provide explicit code for examples which are useful in machine learning.

The work of Ryu and Boyd (2014) briefly discusses an algorithm for a simplified version (RCL) case where the regularizer is assumed to be separable. Their idea is similar to ours, but we devise an algorithm for a more general case, and provide explicit examples and code which is useful for machine learning practitioners. Moreover, they provide a 'switch to SGD heuristic' for improving computational efficiency by switching to a regular stochastic gradient method. This heuristic is orthogonal to the contributions of our paper.

Davis and Drusvyatskiy (2019) provide algorithms for computing the proximal operator of functions belonging to two concrete examples of image-processing problems, phase retrieval and blind de-convolution. In our paper, these functions belong to the (QL) class.

In our paper we cover the entire family, devise an implementation for concrete examples, and provide code. Thus, we give practitioners a more complete set of tools.

Finally, the (CL-B) family is tackled in Asi et al. (2020) for the special case of $h(t) = \max(0, t)$. We devise a uniform framework for a broader family which covers a wide variety of functions h , and give several examples which may be useful to practitioners.

2. A convex onto linear composition

In this section we first present some applications of the convex onto linear family described in (CL), and then describe a generic framework for designing and implementing algorithms for computing the proximal point of this function family.

2.1 Applications

Compositions of convex onto linear functions appear in a wide variety of classical machine learning problems, but also appear to be useful for other applications as well. This family is useful when training on *one* training sample in each iteration.

Linear regression In the simplest case, least-squares regression, we aim to minimize a sum, or an expectation, of costs of the form

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b)^2,$$

where $(\mathbf{a}, b) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ are the data of a training sample, and \mathbf{x} is the model parameters vector. In this case we have $h(t) = \frac{1}{2}t^2$. Different regression variants are obtained by choosing a different function h , for example, using $h(t) = |t|$ we obtain robust regression:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b|,$$

and using the $h(t) = \max((p-1)t, pt)$ for some $p \in (0, 1)$, we obtain linear *quantile regression*.

Logistic regression For the binary classification problem, we are given an input features $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a label $y \in \{-1, 1\}$. The probability of $y = 1$ is modeled using

$$\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x})},$$

where \mathbf{x} is the model's parameter vector. The cost incurred by each training sample is computed using the *binary cross-entropy loss*:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} -\ln(\sigma(\mathbf{x})) & y = -1 \\ -\ln(1 - \sigma(\mathbf{x})) & y = 1, \end{cases}$$

which after some algebraic manipulation can be written as:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \ln(1 + \exp(-y\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x})).$$

Defining $h(t) = \ln(1 + \exp(t))$, we obtain the convex-onto-linear form.

The APROX model (Asi and Duchi, 2019a) A cost function ϕ which is bounded below, where w.l.o.g we assume that it is bounded below by zero, is approximated by:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \max(\phi(\mathbf{x}_t) + \langle \nabla \phi(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle, 0).$$

It's similar to a linear approximation, but it also incorporates knowledge about the function's lower bound: if a cost function is non-negative, its approximation should also be. Taking $h(t) = \max(t, 0)$, $\mathbf{a} = \nabla \phi(\mathbf{x}_t)$, and $b = \phi(\mathbf{x}_t) - \langle \nabla \phi(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{x}_t \rangle$, we obtain the convex-onto-linear form (CL).

The prox-linear approximation Assume we are given a cost function of the form

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = h(g(\mathbf{x})),$$

where the *outer* function h is convex, and the *inner* function g is an arbitrary function, such as a deep neural network. For instance, suppose we're solving a classification problem using a neural network u , whose output is fed to the sigmoid, and then to the binary cross-entropy loss. Similarly to the logistic regression setup above, given a label $y \in \{-1, 1\}$, and an input \mathbf{w} , we obtain:

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \ln(1 + \exp(-yu(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}))).$$

Taking $h(t) = \ln(1 + \exp(t))$ and $g(\mathbf{x}) = -yu(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$ we have the desired form.

The idea of the prox-linear method is to linearly approximate the inner function around the current iterate, while leaving the outer function as is. Thus, we obtain the following approximation of the cost ϕ

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = h(g(\mathbf{x}_t) + \langle \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle),$$

and taking $\mathbf{a} = \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)$, and $b = g(\mathbf{x}_t) - \langle \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{x}_t \rangle$ we obtain the desired convex-onto-linear form (CL). See the recent work of Drusvyatskiy and Paquette (2019) and references therein for extensive analysis and origins of the method.

2.2 The proximal operator

Having shown a variety of potential applications, let's explore the proximal operator of convex-onto-linear functions. Its computation amounts to solving the following problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \quad h(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2. \quad (1)$$

We'll tackle this problem, and most of the remaining cost families, using the well known *convex duality* framework, which we briefly introduce here for completeness. An extensive introduction and can be found in many optimization textbooks, such as Beck (2017).

2.2.1 CONVEX DUALITY

Since we don't need most generic convex duality theory this paper, we introduce a simplification. Suppose we're given an optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \quad f(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}, \quad (\text{Q})$$

where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is a matrix, and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is a closed and convex extended real-valued function. Define

$$q(\mathbf{s}) = \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \{ \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) := f(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{s}^T(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}) \},$$

namely, we replace the j^{th} linear constraint by a "price" s_j for its violation, and define q to be the optimal value as a function of these prices. The modified cost function \mathcal{L} is called the *Lagrangian* associated with the constrained problem (Q).

First, it's apparent that $q(\mathbf{s})$ is *concave*, since it is a minimum of linear functions of \mathbf{s} . Moreover, it's easy to see that $q(\mathbf{s})$ is a lower bound for the optimal value of (Q), using the simple observation that minimizing over a subset of \mathbb{R}^n produces a value that is higher or equal to the minimization over the entire space:

$$\begin{aligned} q(\mathbf{s}) &= \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \{ f(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{s}^T(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}) \} \\ &\leq \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \{ f(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{s}^T(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}) : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b} \} \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \{ f(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b} \} \end{aligned}$$

The problem of finding the "best" lower bound is called the *dual problem* associated with (Q), namely:

$$\max_{\mathbf{s}} q(\mathbf{s}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad q(\mathbf{s}) > -\infty, \quad (\text{D})$$

whereas the original problem (Q) is called the *primal* problem. A well known result in convex analysis is that with slight technical conditions, the optimal values of the primal and the dual problems coincide:

Theorem 1 (Strong Duality) *Suppose that f is a convex closed extended real-valued function, that the optimal value of (Q) is finite, namely,*

$$f_{\text{opt}} = \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \{ f(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b} \} > -\infty,$$

and that there exists some feasible solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$. Then,

- (i) *The optimal value of the dual problem (D) is attained at some optimal solution \mathbf{s}^* , and it is equal f_{opt} .*
- (ii) *The optimal solutions of (Q) are $\mathbf{x}^* \in \text{argmin}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}^*)$ which are feasible. In particular, if $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}^*)$ has a unique minimizer, then it must be an optimal solution of (Q).*

Proof (i) is a special case of Theorem A.1 and (ii) is a special case of Theorem (ii) in (Beck, 2017). ■

The strong duality theorem has an important consequence for the case when the dual problem (D) significantly easier to solve than the primal problem (Q). Having obtained its optimal solution \mathbf{s}^* , we can recover the optimal solution of the primal problem by minimizing the Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}^*)$ over \mathbf{x} .

2.2.2 EMPLOYING DUALITY

Duality requires a constrained optimization problem, whereas the proximal operator in Equation (1) aims to solve an unconstrained problem. However, constraints are easily added with the help of an auxiliary variable, and we can equivalently solve:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}, z} h(z) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad z = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b$$

The dual objective is therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} q(s) &= \inf_{\mathbf{x}, z} \left\{ h(z) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + s(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b - z) \right\} \\ &= \underbrace{\min_{\mathbf{x}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + s\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \right\}}_A + \underbrace{\inf_z \{h(z) - sz\}}_B + sb \end{aligned}$$

The term denoted by A is a strictly convex quadratic function, whose minimizer is

$$\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{x}_t - \eta s \mathbf{a}, \quad (2)$$

and the minimum itself is

$$A = -\frac{\eta \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2}{2} s^2 + (\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_t) s.$$

The term denoted by B can be alternatively written as

$$B = -\sup_z \{sz - h(z)\} = -h^*(s),$$

where h^* is a well-known object in optimization called the *convex conjugate* of h . A catalogue of pairs of convex conjugate functions is available in a variety of standard textbooks on optimization, e.g. Beck (2017). For completeness, in Table 1 we show conjugate pairs which are useful for the machine-learning oriented examples in this paper. Convex con-

$h(z)$	$\text{dom}(h)$	$h^*(s)$	$\text{dom}(h^*)$	Useful for
$\frac{1}{2}z^2$	\mathbb{R}	$\frac{1}{2}s^2$	\mathbb{R}	Linear least squares
$\ln(1 + \exp(z))$	\mathbb{R}	$s \ln(s) + (1 - s) \ln(1 - s)$ where $0 \ln(0) \equiv 0$	$[0, 1]$	Logistic regression
$\max(z, 0)$	\mathbb{R}	$\begin{cases} 0 & s \in [0, 1] \\ \infty & \text{else} \end{cases}$	$[0, 1]$	AProx model, Hinge loss

Table 1: Example convex conjugate pairs

jugates possess two important properties. First, under mild technical conditions, we have $(h^*)^* = h$, i.e. the bi-conjugate of a convex function is the function itself. These conditions hold for most functions we care about in practice, including the functions in Table 1. Second, the conjugate is always convex.

Summarizing the above, the dual problem aims to solve the following *one dimensional* and *strongly concave* maximization problem:

$$\max_s q(s) \equiv - \underbrace{\frac{\eta \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2}{2}}_{\frac{\alpha}{2}} s^2 + \underbrace{(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_t + b)}_{\beta} s - h^*(s). \quad (3)$$

Strong concavity implies the existence of a unique maximizer s^* , while the strong duality theorem implies we can recover the proximal operator we seek by substituting the above maximizer into equation (2).

We implement the above idea the `IncConvexOnLinear` class below using the PyTorch library.

```
import torch

class IncConvexOnLinear:
    def __init__(self, x, h):
        self._h = h
        self._x = x

    def step(self, eta, a, b):
        """
        Performs the optimizer's step, and returns the loss incurred.
        """
        h = self._h
        x = self._x

        # compute the dual problem's coefficients
        alpha = eta * torch.sum(a**2)
        beta = torch.dot(a, x) + b

        # solve the dual problem
        s_star = h.solve_dual(alpha.item(), beta.item())

        # update x
        x.sub_(eta * s_star * a)

        return h.eval(beta.item())

    def x(self):
        return self._x
```

Note, that from a software engineering perspective, we encode the function h using an object which has two operations: compute the value of h , and solve the dual problem. In the next sub-sections we will implement three such objects: `HalfSquared` for $h(z) = \frac{1}{2}z^2$, `Logistic` for $h(z) = \ln(1 + \exp(z))$, and `Hinge` for $h(z) = \max(z, 0)$.

As an example, applying the implicit online learning idea of Kulis and Bartlett (2010) to the linear least squares problem looks like this:

```
x = torch.zeros(d)
optimizer = IncConvexOnLinear(x, HalfSquared())
for t, (a, b) in enumerate(my_data_set):
    eta = get_step_size(t)
    optimizer.step(eta, a, b)

print('The parameters are: ' + str(x))
```

2.2.3 THE HALF-SQUARED FUNCTION

For $h(z) = \frac{1}{2}z^2$, according to Table 1, we have $h^*(s) = \frac{1}{2}s^2$, and thus the dual problem in Equation (3) amounts to maximizing

$$q(s) = -\frac{\alpha}{2}s^2 + \beta s - \frac{1}{2}s^2 = -\frac{1+\alpha}{2}s^2 + \beta s.$$

Hence, in this case $q(s)$ is a simple concave parabola, maximized at

$$s^* = \frac{\beta}{1+\alpha}.$$

Consequently, our `HalfSquared` class is:

```
import torch
import math

class HalfSquared:
    def solve_dual(self, alpha, beta):
        return beta / (1 + alpha)

    def eval(self, z):
        return 0.5 * (z ** 2)
```

2.2.4 THE LOGISTIC FUNCTION

For $h(z) = \ln(1 + \exp(z))$, according to Table 1, the dual problem in Equation (3) amounts to maximizing

$$q(s) = -\frac{\alpha}{2}s^2 + \beta s - s \ln(s) - (1-s) \ln(1-s). \quad (4)$$

The following simple result paves the way towards maximizing q .

Proposition 2 *The function q defined in Equation (4) has a unique maximizer inside the open interval $(0, 1)$.*

Proof Note that $\text{dom}(q) = [0, 1]$, thus maximizing q is done over a compact interval. Its continuity with the Weirstrass theorem ensures that it has a maximizer in $[0, 1]$, and its strict concavity ensures that the maximizer is unique. The derivative $q'(s) = -\alpha s + \beta - \ln(s) + \ln(1+s)$ is continuous, decreasing, and satisfies:

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} q'(s) = \infty, \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} q'(s) = -\infty.$$

Hence, there must be a unique point in the open interval $(0, 1)$ where $q'(s) = 0$. Since q is concave, that point must be the maximizer. \blacksquare

Proposition 1 implies that we can maximize q by employing the well-known *bisection method* to its derivative. Its initial interval $[l, u]$ can be found by:

- $l = 2^{-k}$ for the smallest positive integer k such that $q'(2^{-k}) > 0$.
- $u = 1 - 2^{-k}$ for the smallest positive integer k such that $q'(1 - 2^{-k}) < 0$.

The resulting `Logistic` class is listed below:

```
class Logistic:
    def solve_dual(self, alpha, beta, tol = 1e-16):
        def qprime(s):
            return -alpha * s + beta + math.log(1-s) - math.log(s)

        # compute [l,u] containing a point with zero qprime
        l = 0.5
        while qprime(l) <= 0:
            l /= 2

        u = 0.5
        while qprime(1 - u) >= 0:
            u /= 2
        u = 1 - u

        # bisection starting from [l, u] above
        while u - l > tol:
            mid = (u + l) / 2
            if qprime(mid) == 0:
                return mid
            if qprime(l) * qprime(mid) > 0:
                l = mid
            else:
                u = mid

        return (u + l) / 2

    def eval(self, z):
        return math.log(1 + math.exp(z))
```

2.2.5 THE HINGE FUNCTION

For $h(t) = \max(0, t)$, according to Table 1, the dual problem in Equation (3) amounts to solving the following constrained problem:

$$\max_s \quad q(s) = -\frac{\alpha}{2}s^2 + \beta s \quad \text{s.t.} \quad s \in [0, 1].$$

The above is a maximum of a concave parabola over an interval, and it's easy to see that its maximizer is

$$s^* = \max\left(0, \min\left(1, \frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)\right).$$

The resulting `Hinge` class is therefore:

```
class Hinge:
    def solve_dual(self, alpha, beta):
        return max(0, min(1, beta / alpha))

    def eval(self, z):
        return max(0, z)
```

2.3 Summary

Typical optimizers for machine learning rely on a well-established tool from analysis - the gradient. Using duality, we were able to design an optimizer for the convex onto linear setup

using another well established tool - the convex conjugate. Moreover, duality allowed us to decouple the complexity associated with the convex function h into a separate class whose only purpose is using the conjugate to solve a one dimensional optimization problem. Thus the framework is extensible with additional functions h , and designing a class for such h comprises of two steps: obtaining the conjugate h^* , preferably from a textbook, and figuring out how to solve the resulting dual problem.

3. Regularized convex onto linear composition

Often, machine learning models are trained by using a regularized loss function. Thus, the applications of the regularized convex-onto-linear model (RCL) are identical to the described in Section 2.1, e.g. regularized linear least squares, or regularized logistic regression. It's also interesting to note that, using $h(z) = \max(0, z)$ and $r(\mathbf{x}) = \mu\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$ we can also formulate the problem of training an SVM (Cortes and Vapnik, 1995). Since the applications are obvious, we dive directly into the computation of the proximal operator, by solving

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} h(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b) + r(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2\eta}\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2, \quad (5)$$

where $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$, $r : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$, are convex extended real-valued functions. We also assume that the regularizer r is "simple", meaning that we can efficiently compute its proximal operator $\text{prox}_r(\mathbf{x})$. Explicit formulae for the proximal operators can be found in a variety of textbooks on optimization, e.g. Beck (2017, chap. 6). Examples include the squared Euclidean norm $r(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mu}{2}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$, the Euclidean norm $r(\mathbf{x}) = \mu\|\mathbf{x}\|_2$, or the ℓ_1 norm $r(\mathbf{x}) = \mu\|\mathbf{x}\|_1$. For completeness, we include a short table of proximal operators of the above-mentioned functions in Table 2.

$r(\mathbf{x})$	$\text{prox}_{\mu r}(\mathbf{x})$	Remarks
$\ \mathbf{x}\ _1$	$\max(\mathbf{x} - \mu\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0}) \cdot \text{sgn}(\mathbf{x})$	Absolute value, max, sgn, and \cdot are component-wise operations. Available as the <code>softshrink</code> function in PyTorch.
$\frac{1}{2}\ \mathbf{x}\ _2^2$	$\frac{1}{1+\mu}\mathbf{x}$	
$\ \mathbf{x}\ _2$	$\left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\max(\mu, \ \mathbf{x}\ _2)}\right)\mathbf{x}$	

Table 2: Proximal operators of commonly used regularizers

3.1 A dual problem

Following the path paved in Section 2, we begin from deriving a dual to the problem in Equation (5). Adding the auxiliary variable $z = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b$, we obtain the equivalent optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}, z} h(z) + r(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2\eta}\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad z = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b$$

Minimizing the Lagrangian, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} q(s) &= \inf_{\mathbf{x}, z} \left\{ \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, z, s) \equiv h(z) + r(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + s(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + b - z) \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \left\{ r(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + s\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \right\} + \inf_z \{h(z) - sz\} + sb \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The remaining challenge is the computing the first infimum. To that end, we need to introduce another well-known concept in optimization - a close relative of the proximal operator.

Definition 3 (Moreau Envelope (Moreau, 1965a)) *Let $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ be a convex extended real-valued function. The Moreau envelope of ϕ with parameter η , denoted by $M_\eta\phi$, is the function:*

$$M_\eta\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \min_{\mathbf{u}} \left\{ \phi(\mathbf{u}) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \right\}.$$

Since the proximal operator is the minimizer of the minimum in the definition above, which is Moreau proved that is always attained, an alternative way to write the Moreau envelope of a function is

$$M_\eta\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \phi(\text{prox}_{\eta\phi}(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\text{prox}_{\eta\phi}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2. \quad (7)$$

Thus, whenever we have an explicit formula of the proximal operator, we also have an explicit formula of the Moreau envelope. How does it help us with our challenge of minimizing \mathcal{Q} over \mathbf{x} ? The following proposition provides the answer.

Proposition 4 *Let $q(s)$ and the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, z, s)$ be as defined in Equation (6). Then,*

$$q(s) = M_\eta r(\mathbf{x}_t - \eta s\mathbf{a}) + (\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_t + b)s - \frac{\eta \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2}{2} s^2 - h^*(s).$$

Moreover, the unique minimizer of the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} w.r.t \mathbf{x} is

$$\mathbf{x}^* = \text{prox}_{\eta r}(\mathbf{x}_t - \eta s\mathbf{a}).$$

Proof Recall, that for any \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} we can open the squared Euclidean norm using the formula

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{y} + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2,$$

and re-arranging the above leads to the *square completion* formula

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + a^T b = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2.$$

Using the above two formulas, we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
r(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} & \\
= \frac{1}{\eta} \left[\eta r(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + \eta \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \right] & \quad \leftarrow \text{Factoring out } \frac{1}{\eta} \\
= \frac{1}{\eta} \left[\eta r(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 - (\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a})^T \mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \right] & \quad \leftarrow \text{opening } \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \\
= \frac{1}{\eta} \left[\eta r(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a})\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \right] & \quad \leftarrow \text{square completion} \\
= \left[r(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a})\|_2^2 \right] - \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 & \quad \leftarrow \text{Multiplying by } \frac{1}{\eta} \\
= \left[r(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a})\|_2^2 \right] + (\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_t) s - \frac{\eta \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2}{2} s^2 & \quad \leftarrow \text{re-arranging}
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging the above expression into the formula of $q(s)$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
q(s) &= \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \left\{ r(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a})\|_2^2 \right\} + (\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_t + b) s - \frac{\eta \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2}{2} s^2 - h^*(s) \\
&= M_\eta r(\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a}) + (\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_t + b) s - \frac{\eta \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2}{2} s^2 - h^*(s)
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since the infimum over \mathbf{x} above is attained, we can replace it with a minimum, and by definition the minimizer is

$$\mathbf{x}^* = \text{prox}_{\eta r}(\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a})$$

■

The significance of Proposition 4 is due to the fact that we can design an algorithm for computing the proximal operator of regularized convex onto linear losses using three textbook concepts: the Moreau envelope of r , the convex conjugate of h , and the proximal operator of r . The only thing we need to manually derive ourselves is a way to maximize the dual objective q . The basic method, directly applying Proposition 4 and the strong duality theorem (Theorem 1) consists of the following three steps:

- Form $q(s) = M_\eta r(\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a}) + (\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_t + b) s - \frac{\eta \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2}{2} s^2 - h^*(s)$.
- Solve the dual problem: find a maximizer s^* of $q(s)$
- Compute $\text{prox}_f(\mathbf{x}_t) = \text{prox}_{\eta r}(\mathbf{x}_t - \eta s^* \mathbf{a})$

3.2 Computing the proximal operator

An important aspect of solving the dual problem is figuring out $\text{dom}(-q)$, since this set encodes the constraints of the dual problem. It turns out that Moreau envelopes are finite everywhere (see Beck, 2017, Theorem 6.55), and thus $\text{dom}(-q) = \text{dom}(h^*)$. Moreover, the

strong duality theorem (Theorem 1) ensures that q attains its maximum, so a maximizer $s^* \in \text{dom}(h^*)$ must exist.

The dual problem is *one dimensional*, and there is a variety of reliable algorithms and their implementations for maximizing such functions. Indeed, this time we will not bother implementing a procedure to maximize q , but use a readily available implementations in the SciPy package. When $\text{dom}(-q)$ is a compact interval, we will employ the `scipy.optimize.minimize_scalar` function on $-q$, which uses Brent’s method (see Brent, 2013, chap. 5), and requires us to provide a function, and a compact interval where its maximizer must lie.

When the interval $\text{dom}(-q)$ is not compact, we will have to locate a compact interval which contains a maximizer of q . To that end, we will require h^* do be continuously differentiable, strictly convex, and $\text{dom}(h^*)$ to be open. The object representing h needs to provide two sequences $l_1 > l_2 > \dots$ converging to the left endpoint of $\text{dom}(-q)$, and $u_1 < u_2 < \dots$ converging to the right endpoint of $\text{dom}(-q)$. We will shortly see the details, but the general idea of using these sequences is similar to our search for an initial interval in case of the `Logistic` class we implemented in Section 2.2.4, where the sequences were $2^{-1}, 2^{-2}, \dots$, and $1 - 2^{-1}, 1 - 2^{-2}, \dots$. Having found an interval containing a maximizer, we will, again, employ the `scipy.optimize.minimize_scalar` on $-q$ function to find our maximizer.

Remark Note, that the `scipy.optimize.minimize_scalar` function also supports finding the initial *bracket* for Brent’s method when we don’t possess a compact interval containing a minimizer. However, as of the time of writing of this paper, the `minimize_scalar` function is not able to handle half-infinite, such as $[0, \infty)$. It supports either a compact domain, or the entire real line. Thus, to be as generic as possible, we resort to finding the initial interval ourselves using the above-mentioned pairs of sequences.

The case of a compact domain To employ Brent’s method for finding a maximizer s^* of q , we need to be able to evaluate the function q . To that end, we require an oracle for evaluating the Moreau envelope of r , and the convex conjugate h^* . Moreover, to recover the solution of the primal problem, we need an oracle for computing the proximal operator of r .

The case of a non-compact domain This case requires us to employ an additional result about Moreau envelopes.

Proposition 5 *Let $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ be a convex extended real-valued function, and let $M_\mu\phi$ be its Moreau envelope. Then $M_\mu\phi$ is continuously differentiable with gradient*

$$\nabla M_\mu\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\mu} (\mathbf{x} - \text{prox}_{\mu\phi}(\mathbf{x})) \quad (8)$$

Proof (see Beck, 2017, Theorem 6.55) ■

Recall, that we require h^* do be continuously differentiable, strictly convex, and $\text{dom}(h^*)$ to be open. Using (8) and the chain rule to compute the derivative of $q(s)$, and then simplifying, we obtain:

$$q'(s) = \mathbf{a}^T \text{prox}_{\eta r}(\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{s}\mathbf{a}) - h^{*'}(s) + b \quad (9)$$

For the non-compact domain case, we will require that there is a unique maximizer s^* in the *interior* of $\text{dom}(h)$, which also implies that $q'(s^*) = 0$. The above is satisfied when, for example, when h^* is strictly concave and $\text{dom}(h)$ is open, or when h^* is a *convex function of Legendre type* (see Rockafellar, 1970, sect. 26), which is a condition satisfied by, for example, by $h^*(s) = \frac{1}{2}s^2$ in the least-squares setup. Strict convexity implies that q' is strictly decreasing, and thus any point $l < s^*$ has a positive derivative, whereas any $u > s^*$ has a negative derivative. Thus, we can find an interval $[l, u]$ containing s^* just by scanning to the left until we find a point whose derivative is positive, and to the right until we find a point whose derivative is negative. And that's exactly why we need the sequences $\{l_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ for - to tell us how to scan towards the left and right boundaries of $\text{dom}(-q) = \text{dom}(h^*)$.

The implementation Combining the two cases above, here is an implementation of our optimizer.

```

from scipy.optimize import minimize_scalar
import torch

class IncRegularizedConvexOnLinear:
    def __init__(self, x, h, r):
        self._x = x
        self._h = h
        self._r = r

    def step(self, eta, a, b):
        x = self._x
        h = self._h
        r = self._r

        if torch.is_tensor(b):
            b = b.item()

        lin_coef = (torch.dot(a, x) + b).item()
        quad_coef = eta * a.square().sum().item()
        loss = h.eval(lin_coef) + r.eval(x).item()

        def qprime(s):
            prox = r.prox(eta, x - eta * s * a)
            return torch.dot(a, prox).item() \
                - h.conjugate_prime(s) \
                + b

        def q(s):
            return r.envelope(eta, x - eta * s * a) \
                + lin_coef * s \
                - quad_coef * (s ** 2) \
                - h.conjugate(s)

        if h.conjugate_has_compact_domain():
            l, u = h.domain()
        else:
            # scan left until a positive derivative is found
            l = next(s for s in h.lower_bound_sequence() if qprime(s) > 0)

            # scan right until a negative derivative is found
            u = next(s for s in h.upper_bound_sequence() if qprime(s) < 0)

        min_result = minimize_scalar(lambda s: -q(s), bounds=(l, u), method='bounded')

```

```

s_prime = min_result.x
x.set_(r.prox(eta, x - eta * s_prime * a))

return loss

```

Let's look at a usage example. Assuming that $h(z) = \frac{1}{2}z^2$ is represented using the `HalfSquared` class, and $r(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|_1$ is represented using the `L1Reg` class, we can perform an epoch of training an L1 regularized least-squares model (Lasso) with regularization parameter 0.1 using the following code:

```

x = torch.zeros(d)

optimizer = IncRegularizedConvexOnLinear(x, HalfSquared(), L1Reg(0.1))
epoch_loss = 0.
for t, (a, b) in enumerate(get_training_data()):
    eta = get_step_size(t)
    epoch_loss += optimizer.step(eta, a, b)

print('Model parameters = ', x)
print('Average epoch loss = ', epoch_loss / t)

```

3.2.1 THE HALFSQUARED CLASS

For $h(z) = \frac{1}{2}z^2$, looking at the Table 1, we see that $h^*(s) = \frac{1}{2}s^2$ with $\text{dom}(h^*) = \mathbb{R}$, i.e. its conjugate is itself. Since the domain is non-compact and open, and h^* is strictly convex, we perfectly fit the non-compact case. We will use the sequence $-1, -2, -2^2, -2^3, \dots$ for the lower bounds, and $1, 2, 2^2, 2^3, \dots$ for upper bounds. The implementation is below:

```

from itertools import count

class HalfSquared:
    def eval(self, z):
        return (z ** 2) / 2

    def conjugate_has_compact_domain(self):
        return False

    def lower_bound_sequence(self):
        return (-2 ** j) for j in count()

    def upper_bound_sequence(self):
        return ((2 ** j) for j in count())

    def conjugate(self, s):
        return (s ** 2) / 2

    def conjugate_prime(self, s):
        return s

```

3.2.2 THE LOGISTIC CLASS

For $h(z) = \ln(1 + \exp(z))$, looking at Table 1, we see that $h^*(s) = s \ln(s) + (1 - s) \ln(1 - s)$ with the convention that $0 \ln(0) = 0$, and that the domain of h^* is the compact interval $[0, 1]$. Based on the above, we implement the `Logistic` class below:

```

import math

```

```

class Logistic:
    def eval(self, z):
        return math.log1p(math.exp(z))

    def conjugate_has_compact_domain(self):
        return True

    def domain(self):
        return (0, 1)

    def conjugate(self, s):
        def entr(u):
            if u == 0:
                return 0
            else:
                return u * math.log(u)

        return entr(s) + entr(1 - s)

```

Note that since we're not going to be searching for an initial interval, we don't need to implement the methods returning upper bound and lower bound sequences.

3.2.3 THE HINGE CLASS

For $h(z) = \max(0, z)$, looking at Table 1, we see that $h^*(s)$ is just the indicator of the interval $[0, 1]$, and we again fall into the compact domain case. Below is the implementation:

```

import math

class Hinge:
    def eval(self, z):
        return max(0, z)

    def conjugate_has_compact_domain(self):
        return True

    def domain(self):
        return (0, 1)

    def conjugate(self, s):
        if s < 0 or s > 1:
            return math.inf
        else:
            return 0

```

3.2.4 THE L2REG CLASS

First, note that for all regularizers we need to be able to compute their Moreau envelope and their proximal operator. Hence, we first define a common base class:

```

from abc import ABC, abstractmethod

class Regularizer(ABC):
    @abstractmethod
    def prox(self, eta, x):
        pass

    @abstractmethod
    def eval(self, x):

```

```

    pass

    def envelope(self, eta, x):
        prox = self.prox(eta, x)
        result = self.eval(prox) + 0.5 * (prox - x).square().sum() / eta
        return result.item()

```

Now we can use it to implement our `L2Reg` class, which represents $r(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mu}{2}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$, using the proximal operator in Table 2.

```

class L2Reg(Regularizer):
    def __init__(self, mu):
        self._mu = mu

    def prox(self, eta, x):
        return x / (1 + self._mu * eta)

    def eval(self, x):
        return self._mu * x.square().sum() / 2.

```

3.2.5 THE L1REG CLASS

Using the `Regularizer` base class above, and on Table 2, we can also implement the `L1Reg` class for representing $r(\mathbf{x}) = \mu\|\mathbf{x}\|_1$.

```

from torch.nn.functional import softshrink

class L1Reg(Regularizer):
    def __init__(self, mu):
        self._mu = mu

    def prox(self, eta, x):
        softshrink(x, eta * self._mu)

    def eval(self, x):
        return self._mu * x.abs().sum()

```

3.3 The L2NormReg class

The following class represents the $r(\mathbf{x}) = \mu\|\mathbf{x}\|_2$ class.

```

from torch.linalg import norm

class L2NormReg(Regularizer):
    def __init__(self, mu):
        self._mu = mu

    def prox(self, eta, x):
        nrm = norm(x)
        eta = eta * self._mu
        return (1 - eta / max(eta, nrm)) * x

    def eval(self, x):
        return self._mu * norm(x)

```

3.4 Summary

Throughout this paper, our aim is to design implementations of proximal point algorithms with two objectives in mind: (a) make the algorithms extensible by decoupling concerns into separate modules, and (b) use existing text-book concepts and software libraries to help build these modules. In the case of convex onto linear composition, we were able to decouple the function h and the regularizer r into separate modules which provide oracles to a central algorithm. The oracles are implemented using three textbook concepts: the convex conjugate of h , the Moreau envelope of r , and the proximal operator of r . Using textbook concepts allows easier extension of our library with additional functions h and r , since we stand on the shoulders of the giants who already developed tables and calculus rules of convex conjugates and proximal operators for a variety of useful functions.

4. Mini-batch convex onto linear composition

The mini-batch convex onto linear compositions are useful when extending the scenarios described in Section 2.1 to handling mini-batches of data, instead of individual data points. For example, suppose we're aiming to minimize

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(\mathbf{x}),$$

and that the size of the data-set N is huge. A standard practice with incremental optimization methods, such as SGD, is to use mini-batches of items: a mini-batch $B \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$ is chosen in each iteration, and the model's parameters are updated using the gradient of the function

$$F_B(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{j \in B} f_j(\mathbf{x}).$$

The idea above is equivalent to using a linear approximation of F_B in each iteration. For example, the steps of mini-batch SGD are:

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_t - \eta \nabla F_B(\mathbf{x}_t) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x}} \left\{ F_B(\mathbf{x}_t) + \langle \nabla F_B(\mathbf{x}_t), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \right\}.$$

If our functions f_i are of the form $h(\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x} + b_i)$ with h being a convex extended real-valued function, or if we chose to approximate f_i using such functions, then by replacing the linear approximation \mathbf{x}_{t+1} is computed by solving

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_x \left\{ \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{i \in B} h(\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x} + b_i) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \right\}.$$

Assuming w.l.o.g that $B = \{1, \dots, m\}$, the above is exactly of the form in Equation (CL-B). As was the case with our previous derivations, convex duality plays a central role in computing the above proximal operator.

4.1 A dual problem

Embedding the vectors $\mathbf{a}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m^T$ into the rows of the matrix \mathbf{A} , and the scalars b_1, \dots, b_m into the vector \mathbf{b} , and introducing the auxiliary variable $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}$, our optimization problem can be equivalently written as

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m h(z_i) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}.$$

The corresponding dual problem aims to maximize

$$\begin{aligned} q(\mathbf{s}) &= \inf_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}} \left\{ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m h(z_i) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + \mathbf{s}^T (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{z}) \right\} \\ &= \underbrace{\inf_{\mathbf{x}} \left\{ (\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{s})^T \mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \right\}}_{(*)} + \sum_{z_i=1}^m \underbrace{\inf_{z_i} \left\{ \frac{1}{m} h(z_i) - z_i s_i \right\}}_{(**)} + \mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{b} \end{aligned}$$

The term denoted by (*) above, despite its "hairy" appearance, is the minimum of a simple convex quadratic function, which is computed by comparing the gradient of the term inside the inf with zero, which leads to

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{s}, \quad (10)$$

and the corresponding minimum is

$$(*) = -\frac{\eta}{2} \|\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{s}\|_2^2 + (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_t)^T \mathbf{s}.$$

The terms denoted by (**) can be equivalently written as

$$\inf_{z_i} \left\{ \frac{1}{m} h(z_i) - z_i s_i \right\} = -\frac{1}{m} \sup_{z_i} \{(m s_i) z_i - h(z_i)\} = -\frac{1}{m} h^*(m s_i),$$

where, again, h^* denotes the convex conjugate of h . To summarize, the dual aims to solve:

$$\max_{\mathbf{s}} \quad q(\mathbf{s}) = -\frac{\eta}{2} \|\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{s}\|_2^2 + (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{b})^T \mathbf{s} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m h^*(m s_i).$$

4.2 Computing the proximal operator

Recall, that the strong duality theorem (Theorem 1) ensures that q has a maximizer, and that Equation (10) recovers the primal minimizer, which is what we aim to compute. Thus, computing our proximal operator amounts to the following three steps:

1. Form $q(\mathbf{s}) = -\frac{\eta}{2} \|\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{s}\|_2^2 + (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{b})^T \mathbf{s} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m h^*(m s_i)$
2. Solve the dual problem: find a maximizer \mathbf{s}^* of $q(\mathbf{s})$
3. Recover the desired solution: $\mathbf{x}_t - \eta \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{s}^*$

Note, that in the mini-batch setting, the dual problem is no longer *one dimensional*, but when the size of the mini-batch m is small, it is still a *low dimensional* problem, whose solution should be pretty quick. As was the case in Section 2, our representation of the function h amounts to a class which provides two oracles: (a) evaluate the function h , and (b) maximize functions of the form $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{P}\mathbf{s}\|_2^2 + \mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{s} - \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m h^*(ms_i)$. Let's first implement a generic optimizer, and then dive into the implementation of concrete functions h .

```
import torch

class MiniBatchConvLinOptimizer:
    def __init__(self, x, phi):
        self._x = x
        self._phi = phi

    def step(self, step_size, A_batch, b_batch):
        # helper variables
        x = self._x
        phi = self._phi

        # compute dual problem coefficients
        P = math.sqrt(step_size) * A_batch.t()
        c = torch.addmv(b_batch, A_batch, x)

        # solve dual problem
        s_star = phi.solve_dual(P, c)

        # perform step
        step_dir = torch.mm(A_batch.t(), s_star)
        x.sub_(step_size * step_dir.reshape(x.shape))

        # return the mini-batch losses w.r.t the params before making the step
        return phi.eval(c)
```

We will shortly implement $h(z) = \frac{1}{2}z^2$ in the `HalfSquared` class, $h(z) = \ln(1 + \exp(z))$ in the `Logistic` class, and $h(z) = \max(0, z)$ in the `Hinge` class. With the above we can now, for example, solve a linear least-squares problem using mini-batches of training samples:

```
x = torch.zeros(dim)
optimizer = MiniBatchConvLinOptimizer(x, HalfSquared())
dataset = get_my_dataset()
for t, (A_batch, b_batch) in enumerate(DataLoader(dataset, batch_size=32)):
    step_size = get_step_size(t)
    optimizer.step(step_size, A_batch, b_batch)

print('The model parameter vector is', x)
```

Now, let's implement concrete classes for various functions h .

4.2.1 THE HALFSQUARED CLASS

For $h(z) = \frac{1}{2}z^2$, we have $h^*(s) = \frac{1}{2}s^2$. Hence, our dual problem is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} q(\mathbf{s}) &= -\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{P}\mathbf{s}\|_2^2 + \mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{s} - \frac{m}{2}\|\mathbf{s}\|_2^2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{s}^T (\mathbf{P}^T\mathbf{P} + m\mathbf{I}) \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{s}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix of the appropriate size. It's a simple strictly concave quadratic function, which can be minimized by equating its gradient with zero:

$$\nabla q(\mathbf{s}) = -(\mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{P} + m\mathbf{I})\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{c} = 0.$$

Re-arranging the above equation leads to the maximizer

$$\mathbf{s} = (\mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{P} + m\mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{c}.$$

It's also easy to see that $\mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{P} + m\mathbf{I}$ is a symmetric positive-definite matrix, and thus \mathbf{s} can be obtained using the well-known Cholesky decomposition. Fortunately, PyTorch has all the necessary machinery to do exactly that.

```
class HalfSquared:
    def solve_dual(self, P, c):
        m = P.shape[1] # number of columns = batch size

        # construct lhs matrix P*P + m I
        lhs_mat = torch.mm(P.t(), P)
        lhs_mat.diagonal().add_(m)

        # solve positive-definite linear system using Cholesky factorization
        lhs_factor = torch.cholesky(lhs_mat)
        rhs_col = c.unsqueeze(1) # make rhs a column vector, so that cholesky_solve works
        return torch.cholesky_solve(rhs_col, lhs_factor)

    def eval(self, lin):
        return 0.5 * (lin ** 2)
```

4.2.2 THE LOGISTIC CLASS

In direct contrast to the case of the half-squared function, for $h(z) = \ln(1 + \exp(z))$ with $h^*(s) = s \ln(s) + (1 - s) \ln(1 - s)$ we don't have a formula for computing a maximizer s^* . However, convex optimization is a mature technology, and a variety of extremely fast and efficient software packages exists to do exactly that - minimize convex functions, or equivalently, maximize concave functions. In this paper we'll use one such package, CVXPY (Diamond and Boyd, 2016; Agrawal et al., 2018), which in fact is an interface to a variety of lower-level convex optimization solvers.

```
import torch
import cvxpy as cp

class Logistic:
    def solve_dual(self, P, c):
        # extract information and convert tensors to numpy. CVXPY
        # works with numpy arrays
        dtype = P.dtype
        m = P.shape[1]
        P = P.data.numpy()
        c = c.data.numpy()

        # define the dual optimization problem using CVXPY
        s = cp.Variable(m)
        objective = 0.5 * cp.sum_squares(P @ s) - \
            cp.sum(cp.multiply(c, s)) - \
```



```

        (cp.sum(cp.entr(m * s)) + cp.sum(cp.entr(1 - m * s))) / m

    prob = cp.Problem(cp.Minimize(objective))

    # solve the problem, and extract the optimal solution
    prob.solve()

    # recover optimal solution, and ensure it's cast to the same type as
    # the input data.
    return torch.tensor(s.value).to(dtype=dtype).unsqueeze(1)

def eval(self, lin):
    return torch.log1p(torch.exp(lin))

```

4.2.3 THE HINGE CLASS

As was the case with the `Logistic` class, there is no closed-form solution for solving the dual. The conjugate of $h(z) = \max(0, z)$ is the indicator of the interval $[0, 1]$, and thus the dual problem aims to solve

$$\max_{\mathbf{s}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{P}\mathbf{s}\|_2^2 + \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{s} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad 0 \leq s_i \leq \frac{1}{m}$$

The corresponding Python code using CVXPY is below.

```

import torch
import torch.nn.functional
import cvxpy as cp

class Hinge:
    def solve_dual(self, P, c):
        # extract information and convert tensors to numpy. CVXPY
        # works with numpy arrays
        dtype = P.dtype
        m = P.shape[1]
        P = P.data.numpy()
        c = c.data.numpy()

        # define the dual optimization problem using CVXPY
        s = cp.Variable(m)
        objective = 0.5 * cp.sum_squares(P @ s) - cp.sum(cp.multiply(c, s))

        constraints = [s >= 0, s <= 1. / m]
        prob = cp.Problem(cp.Minimize(objective), constraints)

        # solve the problem, and extract the optimal solution
        prob.solve()
        return torch.tensor(s.value).to(dtype=dtype).unsqueeze(1)

    def eval(self, lin):
        return torch.nn.functional.relu(lin)

```

4.3 Summary

Duality played a central role here as well, but instead of reducing the proximal operator problem to a one-dimensional problem, we reduced the proximal operator to a, hopefully, low dimensional problem whose dimension is the size of the mini-batch. In practice, mini-batches typically have less than 128 samples, and thus our dual problems are of very low

dimensions and can be solved extremely quickly. There is, of course, an additional overhead incurred by using a commodity optimization package such as CVXPY, and a dedicated solver for each dual problem could be substantially faster. However, writing robust and efficient convex optimization solvers is out of the scope of this paper.

5. A convex Lipschitz onto quadratic composition

We first enumerate some applications of function of the form (QL), and then dive into the computation of the proximal operator and its implementation.

5.1 Applications

Among the problems whose cost functions follow convex Lipschitz onto quadratic composition, we consider two examples: phase retrieval, and factorization-machine based CTR prediction for content recommendation.

5.1.1 PHASE RETRIEVAL

Phase retrieval problems (Eldar and Mendelson, 2014) aim to recover the phase, in frequency domain, of some signal given its magnitudes, and has a wide variety of applications in science and engineering. One formulation aims to minimize functions of the form

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |\langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2 - y_i|.$$

When m is huge, it's favorable to use an incremental optimization algorithm, such as the ones discussed in this paper. Each function in the sum can be written as:

$$|\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T (2\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_i^T) \mathbf{x} - y_i|,$$

and thus taking $h(z) = |z|$ we recover the desired convex Lipschitz onto quadratic form in Equation (QL) with $\mathbf{A} = 2\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_i^T$, $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$, and $c = -y_i$.

5.1.2 FACTORIZATION-MACHINE BASED CTR PREDICTION

Factorization machines (Rendle, 2010) and their variants, such as field-aware factorization machines (Juan et al., 2016), are widely used models for content recommendation, due to their ability to effectively deal with data sparsity. They are trained on past interactions of users with content items, and aim to assist recommending items to newly arriving users. The prediction ϕ that factorization machines produce are typically quadratic function of the model's parameters

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{x} + c,$$

where $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b}, c$ depend on the features of the user and the content item. We elaborate on the exact structure of this function later in this section.

Click-through rate prediction is a task where we aim to predict the probability that a user clicks on a content item, which is modeled by composing the output of a base model, a factorization machine in our case, with the sigmoid function:

$$\text{CTR}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\phi(\mathbf{x})}}.$$

As was the case in the Logistic Regression example in Section 2.1, the *binary cross entropy loss* $\text{CE}(x, y) = y \ln(\frac{y}{x}) + (1 - y) \ln(\frac{1-y}{1-x})$ is used during training on labeled past events, where the label $y = 1$ means the user clicked on an item, whereas $y = 0$ means the user saw the item but chose not to click. The resulting cost function is

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \ln \left(1 + \exp \left((1 - 2y) \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{x} + c \right) \right) \right).$$

Taking $h(z) = \ln(1 + \exp(z))$, and observing that h is both convex and 1-Lipschitz continuous, we obtain the desired form.

5.2 Computing the proximal operator

Our aim is solving solving

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} h\left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{x} + c\right) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2, \quad (11)$$

where h is a convex and a Lipschitz continuous function, and \mathbf{A} is a symmetric matrix, \mathbf{b} is a vector, and c a scalar. Note, that the minimization objective above is non-convex in general, and may even be unbounded below. Thus, the set of minimizers may not be a singleton, and might even be empty. In this section we will both discover conditions on the step size η which ensure that there is a unique minimizer, and devise an algorithm for finding it. Duality will, again, play a central role, but in a slightly different form.

Since $h(z) = \max_s \{zs - h^*(s)\}$ where h^* is the convex conjugate of h , we can equivalently solve the following *saddle point* problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_s \left\{ \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}, s) \equiv s\left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{x} + c\right) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 - h^*(s) \right\}. \quad (12)$$

Such saddle point problems are typically tractable when the function \mathcal{Q} is *convex* in \mathbf{x} and *concave* in s . Concavity in s is trivial, since conjugates are convex, and thus $-h^*$ is a concave. However, convexity in \mathbf{x} requires an additional assumption on the step-size η , and thus the method will describe here works only when the step-size is small enough, as pointed out by the following lemma:

Lemma 6 *Suppose that h is Lipschitz-continuous with a constant L , namely:*

$$|h(w) - h(z)| \leq L|w - z|,$$

and denote by $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ the eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} . Then the following hold:

- (i) $\text{dom}(h^*) \subseteq [-L, L]$,
- (ii) *if $\eta < \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \frac{1}{L|\lambda_i|}$, then \mathcal{Q} defined in Equation (12) is strictly convex in \mathbf{x} for any $s \in \text{dom}(h^*)$,*
- (iii) *if $\lambda_i \geq 0$ for all i , and $\text{dom}(h^*) \subseteq [0, L]$, then \mathcal{Q} is strictly convex in \mathbf{x} for any $s \in \text{dom}(h^*)$ and any step-size η .*

Proof Fix some $z_0 \in \text{dom}(h)$. Using the triangle inequality and Lipschitz-continuity, for any $z \in \text{dom}(h)$ we have:

$$|h(z)| \leq |h(z) - h(z_0)| + |h(z_0)| \leq |h(z_0)| + L|z - z_0| \leq \underbrace{|h(z_0)| + L|z_0|}_C + L|z|$$

Thus, for any s with $|s| > L$ and any $\alpha > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h^*(s) &= \sup_z \{sz - h(z)\} \\ &\geq \alpha s^2 - h(\alpha s) && \leftarrow \text{Take } z = \alpha s \\ &\geq \alpha s^2 - \alpha L|s| - C \\ &= \alpha|s|(|s| - L) - C \end{aligned}$$

Since by assumption $|s| > L$ and α can be arbitrarily large, we conclude that $h^*(s) = +\infty$, proving (i).

Algebraic manipulations lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}, s) &= s\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{x} + c\right) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 - h^*(s) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^T \left(s\mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I} \right) \mathbf{x} + s(\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{x} + c) + \frac{1}{2\eta} (\|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 - 2\mathbf{x}_t^T \mathbf{x}) - h^*(s), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{I} is an identity matrix of the appropriate size. Clearly, strict convexity in \mathbf{x} is obtained if and only if the smallest eigenvalue of $s\mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I}$ is positive. By the spectral decomposition theorem, the above matrix has real eigenvalues which are $s\lambda_i + \frac{1}{\eta}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

If $\lambda_i \geq 0$ and $\text{dom}(h^*) \subseteq [0, L]$, then $s\lambda_i$ must be non-negative, and the above eigenvalues are positive, proving (iii).

If $\eta < \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \frac{1}{L|\lambda_i|}$, these eigenvalues are also positive, proving (ii). ■

According to Lemma 6, if the conditions of (ii) hold, then we will not be able to use arbitrarily large step sizes, and we have an explicit bound on the maximum allowable step-size that depends on the eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} . However, if the conditions of (iii) hold, then we may use any step-size we desire. From this point we assume that following blanket assumption.

Assumption A The step-size η is chosen such that \mathcal{Q} is strictly convex in \mathbf{x} .

The first consequence of the above convexity property is that our original minimization objective in Equation (11) is, in fact, convex, since it is a pointwise maximum of convex function of \mathbf{x} .

Another consequence is the existence of saddle-points, and properties that help us to compute them. A pair (\mathbf{x}^*, s^*) is a saddle-point of \mathcal{Q} if

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}^*, s) \leq \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}^*, s^*) \leq \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}, s^*) \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}, s) \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{Q})$$

First, the existence of saddle points is related to our ability of switching the order of the min and max operators in Equation (12), as formally pointed out by the following well-known result.

Lemma 7 A pair (\mathbf{x}^*, s^*) is a saddle point of \mathcal{Q} if and only if the mini-max inequality

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_s \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}, s) = \max_s \min_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}, s) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}^*, s^*)$$

holds, and \mathbf{x}^* is an optimal solution of

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}, s^*),$$

while s^* is an optimal solution of

$$\min_s \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}^*, s).$$

Proof (see Bertsekas et al., 2003, Proposition 2.6.1) ■

This means that if we show that there is a saddle point of \mathcal{Q} , then we'll be able to switch the order of minimization and maximization, find s^* by solving *one dimensional* optimization problem

$$\max_s \left\{ q(s) \equiv \min_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}, s) \right\}, \quad (13)$$

and then recover our desired optimal solution \mathbf{x}^* by minimizing $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}, s^*)$ over \mathbf{x} , which is what we want to compute. Hence, tractability of the problem is built on two important pillars: showing that a saddle point exists, and obtaining a formula for $q(s)$ and a corresponding minimizer $\mathbf{x}^*(s)$.

Existence of saddle points is ensured by the following result.

Lemma 8 Suppose that a function $\omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})$ is closed¹ and convex in \mathbf{x} for each \mathbf{s} , and closed and concave in \mathbf{s} for each \mathbf{x} . Let S be the effective domain of ω over \mathbf{s} . Then, if S is compact, and there exist $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$, and a scalar γ such that the level set

$$\{\mathbf{x} : \omega(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{s}}) \leq \gamma\}$$

is compact, then the set of saddle points of ω is non-empty and compact.

Proof (see Bertsekas et al., 2003, Proposition 2.6.9) ■

By Lemma 6 the effective domain of \mathcal{Q} over s , which is $\text{dom}(h^*)$, is indeed compact. Moreover, since we assume that \mathcal{Q} is strictly convex in \mathbf{x} , and since it's also a quadratic function of \mathbf{x} , its level sets, which are ellipsoids, are compact for any $s \in \text{dom}(h^*)$. Thus, the conditions of Lemma 8 hold, and hence the set of saddle points of \mathcal{Q} is indeed non-empty.

Deriving a formula for $q(s)$ is quite simple as well, since \mathcal{Q} is a convex quadratic function of \mathbf{x} , whose minimizer is obtained by solving the linear system

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}, s) = s\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{\eta}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_t) + s\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0},$$

whose solution is

$$\mathbf{x}^*(s) = \left(s\mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{x}_t - s\mathbf{b} \right). \quad (14)$$

1. A function f is closed if its epigraph $\{(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} : f(\mathbf{x}) \leq t\}$ is a closed set. Most functions of practical interest in machine learning and many other applications are closed.

Hence, the function $q(s) = \min_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}, s)$, which we are going to maximize, is

$$\begin{aligned} q(s) &= \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}^*(s), s) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^*(s)^T \left(s\mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I} \right) \mathbf{x}^*(s) - \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{x}_t - s\mathbf{b} \right)^T \mathbf{x}^*(s) + sc + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 - h^*(s) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{x}_t - s\mathbf{b} \right)^T \left(s\mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{x}_t - s\mathbf{b} \right) + sc - h^*(s) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Since we assumed that the function \mathcal{Q} is strictly convex in \mathbf{x} , all eigenvalues of $s\mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I}$ must be positive, and thus it must be invertible. Hence $q(s)$ is well defined, and $\text{dom}(q) = \text{dom}(h^*)$.

Despite the fact that $q(s)$ above is a function of just one real variable, its maximization poses a challenge, since even computing $q(s)$ requires inverting a matrix. However, in some cases of practical interest, multiplying by its inverse can be done very efficiently, as we will shortly see. The existence of an efficient algorithm for multiplying by the inverse of $s\mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I}$ is crucial for a practical implementation of an incremental proximal point method, it depends on the problem at hand, and we'll hide it behind an oracle the user will have to provide.

Finally, note that $q(s)$ is a strictly concave function having a bounded domain, and since by Lemma 7 we know that its maximum is attained due to the existence of a saddle point of \mathcal{Q} , we conclude that it must have a unique maximizer which can be found by a variety of univariate function maximization algorithms. As was the case in Section 3.2, we will differentiate between two cases: (i) $\text{dom}(h^*)$ is compact, or (ii) $\text{dom}(h^*)$ is not compact, but we can locate a compact interval containing the maximizer of q using two sequences approaching the boundaries of $\text{dom}(h^*)$.

To be as generic as possible with minimizing $q(s)$, we also require access to its derivative to employ generic 1D minimization algorithms for the above two cases. The first term of $q(s)$, the quadratic form, poses the main challenge, which is resolved by the following Lemma.

Lemma 9 *Let*

$$\omega(s) = -\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{a} - s\mathbf{b})^T (s\mathbf{A} + \mu\mathbf{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{a} - s\mathbf{b}),$$

where \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} are vectors, \mathbf{A} is a symmetric matrix of appropriate size, and \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix of appropriate size. Let s_0 be such that the matrix $s_0\mathbf{A} + \mu\mathbf{I}$ is invertible, and let

$$\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{a} - s\mathbf{b}, \quad \mathbf{K} = (s\mathbf{A} + \mu\mathbf{I})^{-1}, \quad \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{g}.$$

Then,

$$\omega'(s_0) = \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{z} \right) \Big|_{s=s_0} \quad (16)$$

Proof Let $\mathbf{H} = s\mathbf{A} + \mu\mathbf{I}$, meaning that $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{H}^{-1}$, and $\omega(s) = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{g}$. Using the differential form of matrix derivatives (Minka, 1997, See), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbf{g} &= -\mathbf{b}ds, \\ d\mathbf{H} &= \mathbf{A}ds, \\ d\mathbf{K} &= -\mathbf{K}d\mathbf{H}\mathbf{K}, \end{aligned}$$

and moreover, using also the symmetry of \mathbf{K} we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d\omega &= -\frac{1}{2} (d\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{g}^T d\mathbf{K} \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{K} d\mathbf{g}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} (-\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{g} - \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{g} - \mathbf{g} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{b}) ds \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{g} \right) ds \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{z} \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\omega'(s_0) = \left. \frac{d\omega}{ds} \right|_{s=s_0},$$

which concludes our proof. ■

As a direct consequence, the following steps compute the derivative $q'(s)$, assuming differentiability of h^* , at any given point:

1. Compute the vector $\mathbf{g} = \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{s} \mathbf{b}$,
2. Compute the vector $\mathbf{z} = \left(s \mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{g}$,
3. Compute $q'(s) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{z} + c - h^{*'}(s)$.

Consequently, if we can efficiently invert $s \mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I}$ and compute the quadratic form $\mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{z}$ for any vector \mathbf{z} , then we can efficiently compute $q(s)$ and $q'(s)$ at any point.

We'll encapsulate the problem's data, which contains the ingredients of $q(s)$, behind two objects: the quadratic function, and the function h . For the quadratic function, the oracle follows directly from our desire to the parts of q which do not depend on h^* , and should provide the following methods:

- evaluating the quadratic function via the `eval` method;
- computing $\phi(s) = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{s} \mathbf{b} \right)^T \left(s \mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{s} \mathbf{b} \right) + sc$ via the `dual_eval` method;
- computing the derivative $\phi'(s)$ w.r.t s , preferably using Lemma 9, via the `dual_deriv` method;
- computing $\mathbf{x}^*(s)$ according to formula (14) via the `solve_system` method.

Note that the last method can be used to compute both $\omega(s)$ and its derivative. However, for some applications, it's more efficient to compute $\omega(s)$ and its derivative directly. The oracle describing the function h should tell us about the domain of h^* , which is also the domain of q , and allow us to evaluate h^* and its derivative. Similarly to what we saw in Section 3.2, our oracle for h should provide the following information:

- evaluating h via the `eval` method;
- telling if $\text{dom}(h^*)$ is compact via the `conjugate_has_compact_domain` method;
- $\text{dom}(h^*)$ is compact: providing $\text{dom}(h^*)$ and evaluating $h^*(s)$ for any s via the `conjugate` method;
- $\text{dom}(h^*)$ is not compact, but h^* is differentiable:
 - Providing two sequences ℓ_1, ℓ_2, \dots and u_1, u_2, \dots approaching left and right endpoints of $\text{dom}(h^*)$ via the `lower_bound_sequence` and `upper_bound_sequence` methods;
 - evaluating the derivative $h^{*'}(s)$ via the `conjugate_prime` method.

In fact, the above interface is exactly the same as we used in Section 3.2 for regularized convex-onto-linear losses, and we may re-use these classes for the family we are currently considering - convex Lipschitz onto quadratic. For the phase retrieval problem described above we are missing $h(z) = |z|$, which we will shortly implement.

Given the above oracles, we can devise a generic training algorithm for convex-Lipschitz onto quadratic cost functions.

```
import torch
import cvxpy as cp

class ConvexLipschitzOntoQuadratic:
    def __init__(self, x):
        self._x = x

    def step(self, step_size, cvx_oracles, quad_oracles):
        x = self._x
        loss = cvx_oracles.eval(quad_oracles.eval(x))

    def q(s):
        return quad_oracles.dual_eval(s, step_size, x) - cvx_oracles.conjugate(s)

    def q_prime(s):
        return quad_oracles.dual_deriv(s, step_size, x) - cvx_oracles.conjugate_prime(s)

    # compute an initial maximization interval
    if cvx_oracles.conjugate_has_compact_domain():
        l, u = cvx_oracles.domain()
    else:
        # scan left until a positive derivative is found
        l = next(s for s in cvx_oracles.lower_bound_sequence() if q_prime(s) > 0)

        # scan right until a negative derivative is found
        u = next(s for s in cvx_oracles.upper_bound_sequence() if q_prime(s) < 0)

    # ss = [s.item() for s in torch.linspace(l, u, 1000)]
    # qs = [q(s) for s in ss]

    # compute a maximizer of q
    min_result = minimize_scalar(lambda s: -q(s), bounds=(l, u), method='bounded')
    s_star = min_result.x

    # recover the primal optimal solution
```



```
x.set_(quad_oracles.solve_system(s_star, step_size, x))

return loss
```

Now, assuming that we have an oracle class for the phase retrieval problem’s quadratic function, and a class for the absolute value function, we can solve a phase retrieval problem using the following code:

```
x = torch.zero(dim)
opt = ConvexLipschitzOntoQuadratic(x)
for t, (a, b) in enumerate(dataset):
    step_size = compute_step_size(t)
    opt.step(step_size, PhaseRetrievalOracle(a, b), AbsValue())
```

In the next sections we will derive concrete implementations to cover our examples - the `AbsValue` class, an oracle for the quadratic function of phase retrieval problems in the `PhaseRetrievalOracle` class, and another oracle for training factorization machines in the `FMOracle` class.

5.3 The `AbsValue` class

We have

$$|z| = \max_s \{sz : -1 \leq s \leq 1\} = \max_s \{sz - \delta_{[-1,1]}(s)\}.$$

Consequently, the convex conjugate of $h(z) = |z|$ is the function $h^*(s) = \delta_{[-1,1]}(s)$, the indicator of the interval $[-1, 1]$, which is zero inside the interval and infinity outside. Its domain is the compact interval $[-1, 1]$. Based on the above, implementation of the `AbsValue` class is below:

```
import math

class AbsValue:
    def eval(self, z):
        return abs(z)

    def conjugate_has_compact_domain(self):
        return True

    def domain(self):
        return (-1, 1)

    def conjugate(self, s):
        if -1 <= s <= 1:
            return 0
        else:
            return math.inf
```

5.4 Phase retrieval

When minimizing incrementally, each function in the phase retrieval problem is of the form

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = |\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2 - y|.$$

The 'outer' function is the absolute value, which will be modeled by the above `AbsValue` class. The quadratic part can be written as

$$\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2 - y = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T \underbrace{(2\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T)}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{x} + \underbrace{\mathbf{0}^T}_{\mathbf{b}} \mathbf{x} + \underbrace{(-y)}_c$$

We need to address two challenges: use Lemma 6 to devise an upper bound on the step-size given the training data; implement the `PhaseRetrievalOracles` class by implementing the required oracles efficiently.

The eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A} = 2\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T$ are simple - there is one eigenvalue equal to $2\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2$, while the remaining eigenvalues are zero. The Lipschitz constant of $h(z) = |z|$ is $L = 1$. Hence, according to Lemma 6 part (ii) we conclude that the step-sizes η must satisfy

$$\eta < \frac{1}{2\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2}.$$

Thus, we either must have some knowledge about the vectors \mathbf{a} in the training set, or we must make at least one pass over the training set to compute an upper bound on η .

The main challenge in implementing the `PhaseRetrievalOracles` class is devising an algorithm for computing

$$\left(2s\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{p},$$

for a given vector \mathbf{p} . This facilitates both the `dual_eval` and `dual_deriv` methods of the oracle. Fortunately, the well-known Sherman-Morrison matrix inversion formula (Sherman and Morrison, 1950) provides the remedy, and we have

$$\left(2s\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{p} = \left[\eta\mathbf{I} - \frac{2s\eta^2\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T}{1 + 2\eta s\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2}\right] \mathbf{p} = \eta \left[\mathbf{p} - \frac{2\eta s(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{p})}{1 + 2\eta s\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2} \mathbf{a}\right]$$

Taking $\mathbf{p} = \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{x}_t + s\mathbf{b}$, and recalling that $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$, we obtain

$$\left(2s\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{x}_t + s\mathbf{b}\right) = \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{2\eta s(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_t)}{1 + 2\eta s\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2} \mathbf{a}$$

The above will be implemented in a `solve_system` method in our class. Note that the above can be performed by simple operations on vectors, such as multiplying by a scalar, adding, and computing an inner product, and can be done in time linear in the dimension of \mathbf{p} . No actual matrix inversion needs to be computed. Below is the implementation of the class.

```
class PhaseRetrievalOracles:
    def __init__(self, a, y):
        self._a = a
        self._y = y

    def eval(self, x):
        return torch.inner(self._a, x).square() - self._y

    def scalar(self):
        return -self._y
```

```

def dual_eval(self, s, step_size, x):
    g = x / step_size
    result = -0.5 * torch.inner(g, self.solve_system(s, step_size, x))
    return result.item() - s * self._y

def dual_deriv(self, s, step_size, x):
    z = self.solve_system(s, step_size, x)
    return torch.inner(z, self._a.square().item()) - self._y

def solve_system(self, s, step_size, x):
    t = 2 * step_size * s
    a = self._a
    numerator = t * (a * x).sum()
    denominator = 1 + t * a.square().sum()
    return x - (numerator / denominator) * a

```

5.5 Factorization machine for CTR prediction

In Section 5.1.2 we described a factorization machine using a generic quadratic function. However, this time we have to understand the precise structure of the quadratic function, in order to implement the required oracles. This example is an extreme case of what’s possible within the framework, and most applications should require an very simple analysis which directly leads to code, as in the phase retrieval example. The reason we include this example is twofold: first, training a factorization machine is an interesting application of practical interest that researchers may include as a numerical example demonstrating their algorithm; second, it demonstrates that with some creativity, proximal iteration is possible even for models which go beyond the simple examples researchers typically include in papers, and should inspire applying proximal iteration to such models given that some part of the ”heavy lifting” was done by the `ConvexLipschitzOntoQuadratic` class we implemented above.

So let’s make a brief introduction to factorization machines. The parameters of a factorization machine are a global bias w_0 , a vector of biases $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and a set of latent vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d \in \mathbb{R}^k$, where k is called the *embedding dimension*. Given an input vector \mathbf{a} , the model computes:

$$\Phi(w_0, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d; \mathbf{a}) = w_0 + \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{a} \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=i+1}^d a_i a_j \langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \rangle. \quad (17)$$

A typical scenario is that the vectors \mathbf{a} are one-hot indicators of categorical features, and thus \mathbf{a} is a very sparse vectors of zeroes and ones. This scenario will be given special attention in the various parts of this section, where we aim to utilize this sparsity to provide extremely efficient implementations of the corresponding classes.

In the click-through rate (CTR) prediction setting, our events are either clicks or skips, and we are training by solving a logistic regression problem, whose underlying model is a factorization machine, as opposed to the typically occurring linear model. Namely, given a label $y \in \{-1, 1\}$, where 1 signifies a click and -1 signifies a skip, we are aiming to minimize a sum of cost functions of the form:

$$f(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d; \mathbf{a}, y) = \ln(1 + \exp(-y\Phi(w_0, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d; \mathbf{a}))).$$

The 'outer' function h is $h(z) = \ln(1 + \exp(z))$, which we already implemented in the `Logistic` class in Section 3.2. The 'inner' quadratic function, whose oracles will be represented by the `FMCTR` class below, is:

$$g(w_0, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d) = -y\Phi(w_0, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d; \mathbf{a}, y) \\ = -yw_0 - y\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{a} \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=i+1}^d ya_i a_j \langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \rangle \quad (18)$$

To put a factorization machine into the framework we devised, we concatenate the scalar w_0 , the vector \mathbf{w} , and the latent vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d$ into one large vector \mathbf{x} , which contains all of the model's parameters. Assuming we have implemented the `FMCTR` class providing oracles for the above quadratic function of \mathbf{x} , we can now train our factorization machine using, for example, an online algorithm:

```
# model parameters vector should contain w_0, w, and v_1, ..., v_{num_features}
x = torch.zeros(1 + num_features * (1 + embedding_dim))
opt = ConvexLipschitzOntoQuadratic(x)
for t, (a, y) in enumerate(dataset):
    step_size = compute_step_size(t)
    opt.step(step_size, FMCTR(a, y, num_features, embedding_dim), Logistic())

# print the trained model parameters
w_0, w, V = x.split_with_sizes([1, num_features, num_features * embedding_dim])
print(f'w_0 = {w_0}, w = {w}, V = {V}')
```

Again, we need to address two challenges. First, we need to use Lemma 6 to devise an upper bound on the step-sizes η for which our implementation is guaranteed to work. Second, we need to find an efficient way to implement the quadratic oracles for the function g defined in Equation (18). Let's begin from the step-size analysis.

5.5.1 STEP-SIZE ANALYSIS

It's easy to verify that the Lipschitz constant of $h(z) = \ln(1 + \exp(z))$ is $L = 1$. It remains to analyze the eigenvalues of the matrix associated with the quadratic function g as a function of the model parameters vector \mathbf{x} . Note, that the function is linear in the parameters w_0 and \mathbf{w} , and thus the corresponding rows and columns in the matrix will be zero. It remains to analyze g as a function of $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d$. Suppose we concatenate the above vectors into one long vector $\boldsymbol{\nu}$:

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{v}_d \end{bmatrix}$$

The pairwise inner products can therefore be written as

$$-\sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=i+1}^d ya_i a_j \langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\nu}^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & -ya_1 a_2 \mathbf{I} & \dots & -ya_1 a_n \mathbf{I} \\ -ya_2 a_1 \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & -ya_2 a_n \mathbf{I} \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ -ya_n a_1 \mathbf{I} & \dots & -ya_n a_{n-1} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu}$$

The matrix in the square brackets can be written as

$$-y \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_1 a_2 & \dots & a_1 a_n \\ a_2 a_1 & 0 & \dots & a_2 a_n \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_n a_1 & \dots & a_n a_{n-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{A}} \otimes \mathbf{I} \quad (19)$$

where \otimes is the well-known Kronecker matrix product. Since for two square matrices, the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}$ are the products of the eigenvalues for \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , it remains to analyze the eigenvalues of the matrix denoted by $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ above.

Lemma 10 *Let $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $y \in \{-1, 1\}$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ be as defined in Equation (19). Then $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ has d real eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ which satisfy*

$$|\lambda_i| \leq \max \{ \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty^2, \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty^2 \} \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Proof² We have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = -y (\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T - \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T)),$$

where $\text{diag}(\mathbf{P})$ is a diagonal matrix obtained by taking only the diagonal of \mathbf{P} . By construction, the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T$ are $\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2$ and $0, \dots, 0$, whereas the eigenvalues of the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T)$ are a_1^2, \dots, a_d^2 . By Weyl's inequality (Bhatia, 2013, cor III.2.2), the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ of $\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T - \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T)$ satisfy

$$-a_i^2 \leq \lambda_i \leq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 - a_i^2 \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Since $y \in \{-1, 1\}$, the eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_d$ of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ satisfy:

$$|\tilde{\lambda}_i| \leq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 - a_i^2, \quad |\tilde{\lambda}_i| \leq a_i^2,$$

or equivalently

$$|\tilde{\lambda}_i| \leq \max \{ \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 - a_i^2, a_i^2 \}.$$

Taking the maximum over $i = 1, \dots, d$, and noting that $\max_i a_i^2 = \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty^2$, we obtain the desired result. \blacksquare

A direct conclusion of the above eigenvalue bound and from Lemma 6 is that the step-sizes must satisfy:

$$\eta < \frac{1}{\max \{ \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty^2, \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty^2 \}}.$$

If we would like a uniform bound on the step-size for the entire training set, before doing any training we need to go over all vectors \mathbf{a} in our training set, and compute an upper bound on the maximum allowable step-size. Otherwise, we might be using a step-size which is too large for our training algorithm to be well-defined. Alternatively, if the training set

2. Proper credit should be given to the answer by Ben Grossman in <https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/4329115/bound-on-eigenvalues-of-a-certain-symmetric-dpr1-matrix>

isn't available, such as in the online setting, we must have some prior knowledge about the vectors \mathbf{a} .

In the special case of \mathbf{a} being a vector of feature indicators, our bound becomes

$$\eta < \frac{1}{\text{number of features} - 1},$$

where the number of features is the largest number of features occurring in any training sample in the entire training set. Consequently, more features lead to smaller steps we can take. Intuitively, it makes sense as well - a more complex model with more features requires a more "gentle" training procedure. Moreover, the above bound is useful in the online setting when we know a-priori what is the structure of our training data.

5.5.2 IMPLEMENTING QUADRATIC ORACLES

Writing the function g in Equation (18) using the model's parameter vector \mathbf{x} , which is a concatenation of w_0 , \mathbf{w} , and the latent vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d$, and using $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ defined in Equation (19), we obtain:

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{x} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} -y & -y\mathbf{a} & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (kd)} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{b}^T} \mathbf{x} \quad (20)$$

So, the scalar c of the quadratic function at hand is zero, whereas the matrix and the linear coefficients vector are given above. Let's begin by implementing a helper class which will provide various utilities which are dimension dependent, such as: construct and decompose a model parameter vector \mathbf{x} into its sub-pieces w_0 , \mathbf{w} , and $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d$; compute the output value of a factorization machine Φ in Equation (17) given its parameters \mathbf{x} and a vector of input features \mathbf{a} ; produce various dimension-dependent but data independent values:

```
class FMHelper:
    def __init__(self, num_features, embedding_dim):
        self._num_features = num_features
        self._embedding_dim = embedding_dim
        self._pairwise_dim = embedding_dim * num_features
        self._linear_dim = 1 + num_features
        self._eye = None

    def embedding_dim(self):
        return self._embedding_dim

    def num_features(self):
        return self._num_features

    def linear_dim(self):
        return self._linear_dim

    def pairwise_dim(self):
        """The total dimension of the vectors v_1, ..., v_d"""
        return self._pairwise_dim

    def total_dim(self):
        """The total dimension of the model's parameters"""
        return self._pairwise_dim + self._linear_dim
```

```

def eye_embedding_dim(self):
    """An identity matrix of size embedding_dim x embedding_dim"""
    if self._eye is None:
        self._eye = torch.eye(self._embedding_dim, self._embedding_dim)
    return self._eye

def decompose(self, x):
    """
    Decomposes the parameter vector x of dimension `total_dim` into the bias w_0,
    the linear coefficients w, and the matrix of embedding vectors as its _columns_.
    """
    w_0, w, nu = x.split_with_sizes([1, self._num_features, self._pairwise_dim])
    vs = nu.view(self._embedding_dim, self._num_features)

    return w_0, w, vs

def eval(self, x, a):
    """
    Computes the value produced by the factorization machine whose model parameter vector is `x`
    and input features `a`. Uses a computational trick for a fast implementation, introduced
    in the original paper by Rendle et. al. 2010 (IEEE International Conference on Data Mining)
    """
    w_0, w, vs = self.decompose(x)

    lin_term = torch.sum(w * a)
    vs_mult = vs * a
    quad_term = vs_mult.sum(dim=1).square().sum() - vs_mult.square().sum()

    return w_0 + lin_term + 0.5 * quad_term

```

Now we proceed to implementing our quadratic oracle class for training CTR prediction models using factorization machines. Evaluating g in (18) is quite straightforward - we evaluate the factorization machine, and multiply the result by $-y$. The remaining parts of the quadratic oracle require multiplying by the inverse of $s\mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I}$, which is the matrix we shall analyze next. Due to the special block structure of \mathbf{A} , as is apparent from Equation (20), we have

$$\left(s\mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \eta\mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \left(s\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k} + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

where the top-left block corresponds to the components of the parameter vector which contain the biases, whereas the bottom-right block corresponds to the latent vectors. Hence, it's convenient to design the implementation $\left(s\mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{z}$ for a vector \mathbf{z} by decomposing \mathbf{z} into the biases and the latent vectors parts, namely

$$\left(s\mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{z} = \begin{bmatrix} \eta \mathbf{z}_{\text{biases}} \\ \left(s\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k} + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{\text{vecs}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (22)$$

For that exactly we have the `decompose` method of the `FMHelper` class above. In our case, we'll use $\mathbf{z} = \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{x}_t + s\mathbf{b}$. It turns out we can use properties of Kronecker products to devise an efficient way to multiply by the inverse of $s\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k} + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I}$ as well. To that end, let's recall a few properties of Kronecker product which will be useful in our endeavor.

Lemma 11 (See Loan (2000)) *Let \mathbf{P} , \mathbf{Q} , and \mathbf{R} be arbitrary matrices. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *Left distributivity:* $\mathbf{P} \otimes (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{R}) = \mathbf{P} \otimes \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{P} \otimes \mathbf{R}$
- (ii) *Right distributivity:* $(\mathbf{P} + \mathbf{Q}) \otimes \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{P} \otimes \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{Q} \otimes \mathbf{R}$
- (iii) *Inverse:* \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q} are invertible if and only if $\mathbf{P} \otimes \mathbf{Q}$ is invertible, and $(\mathbf{P} \otimes \mathbf{Q})^{-1} = \mathbf{P}^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{Q}^{-1}$.
- (iv) *Vectorization:* $\text{vec}(\mathbf{PQR}^T) = (\mathbf{R} \otimes \mathbf{P}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{Q})$, where $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ is the vectorization operator which concatenates the columns of a matrix into one long column. In particular, $(\mathbf{R} \otimes \mathbf{I}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{Q}) = \text{vec}(\mathbf{QR}^T)$

Now, we are ready to prove the following technical result:

Lemma 12 *Let $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y \in \{-1, 1\}$. Let s, η satisfy the conditions:*

$$s \in [0, 1],$$

$$\eta < \frac{1}{\max\{\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty^2, \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty^2\}},$$

and let $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ be as defined in Equation (19). Define

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\eta}{1+\eta y s a_1^2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\eta}{1+\eta y s a_2^2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{\eta}{1+\eta y s a_d^2} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{r} \equiv \mathbf{D}\mathbf{a} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\eta a_1}{1+\eta y s a_1^2} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\eta a_d}{1+\eta y s a_d^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\gamma = \frac{y s}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\eta y s a_i^2}{1+\eta y s a_i^2}},$$

Then, for any vector $\mathbf{u} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{U})$, we have

$$\left(s \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{u} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{D} + \gamma \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}^T)).$$

Before proving the lemma, let's first grasp its meaning - we can compute the "inverse-times-vector" product in *linear time*, since we only require multiplying by a diagonal matrix and by an outer product of two vectors. Moreover, if \mathbf{a} is sparse, then the columns of $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{D} + \gamma \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}^T)$ corresponding to the zero entries of \mathbf{a} do *not* depend on s , which as we will see, eventually leads to the conclusion that we do not need to compute them. Hence if \mathbf{a} is a vector of feature indicators, the results which depend on "inverse-times-vector" can be computed extremely efficiently.

Proof Using the definition of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, we can be equivalently write:

$$\begin{aligned}
 s\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I} &= s\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I}_{d \times d} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k} \\
 &= \left(s\tilde{\mathbf{A}} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I}_{d \times d} \right) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k} && \leftarrow \text{Distributivity} \\
 &= \left[-ys(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T - \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T)) + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I}_{d \times d} \right] \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k} && \leftarrow \text{Definition of } \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \\
 &= \left[-ys(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T) + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I}_{d \times d} + ys \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T) \right] \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k}
 \end{aligned}$$

By the inverse property in Lemma 11, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left(\left[-ys(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T) + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I}_{d \times d} + ys \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T) \right] \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k} \right)^{-1} \\
 = \left[-ys(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T) + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I}_{d \times d} + ys \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T) \right]^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k}
 \end{aligned}$$

We decompose the matrix in the brackets into a "diagonal + low-rank" form

$$\underbrace{(-ys\mathbf{a})\mathbf{a}^T}_{\text{Low rank}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I}_{d \times d} + ys \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T)}_{\text{Diagonal}}.$$

Now we can employ the Sherman-Morrison matrix inversion lemma (Sherman and Morrison, 1950). However, the Sherman-Morrison lemma requires the diagonal part to be invertible. The diagonal entries in the diagonal part are $\frac{1+\eta y s a_i^2}{\eta}$, and our step-size choice indeed ensures that these entries are all non-zero. Hence, the diagonal part is indeed invertible, and its inverse is the diagonal matrix

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\eta}{1+\eta y s a_1^2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\eta}{1+\eta y s a_2^2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{\eta}{1+\eta y s a_d^2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using the Sherman-Morrison inversion formula, we obtain:

$$\left[-ys(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T) + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I}_{d \times d} - ys \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^T) \right]^{-1} = \mathbf{D} + \frac{ys}{1 - ys\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{a}} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{D}.$$

Using the definition of \mathbf{D} , note that

$$\mathbf{D} \mathbf{a} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\eta a_1}{1+\eta y s a_1^2} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\eta a_d}{1+\eta y s a_d^2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{a} = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\eta a_i^2}{1 + \eta y s a_i^2}$$

Using $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{D} \mathbf{a}$, our inverse is

$$\mathbf{D} + \underbrace{\frac{y s}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\eta y s a_i^2}{1 + \eta y s a_i^2}}}_{\equiv \gamma} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}^T.$$

Finally, by the vectorization property in Lemma 11, for $\mathbf{u} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{U})$ we obtain:

$$((\mathbf{D} + \gamma \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}^T) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{k \times k}) \mathbf{u} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{D} + \gamma \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}^T)).$$

Which is our desired result. ■

The Lemma allows us to re-write Equation 22 as:

$$\left(s \mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{z} = \begin{bmatrix} \eta \mathbf{z}^{\text{biases}} \\ \text{vec}(\mathbf{Z}_{\text{vecs}}(\mathbf{D} + \gamma \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}^T)) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

where \mathbf{Z}_{vecs} is the "latent vectors" component of \mathbf{z} arranged as a matrix of latent vector columns, and $\mathbf{D}, \gamma, \mathbf{r}$ are defined in Lemma 12 above.

Now we're ready to dive into the details of implementing our quadratic oracle. Looking at the definition of \mathbf{g} in Equation (20), assuming $\mathbf{z} = \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{x}_t + s \mathbf{b}$ we have

$$\mathbf{z}^{\text{biases}} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\eta} w_{0,t} + s y \\ \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{w}_t + s y \mathbf{a} \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$\mathbf{z}_{\text{vecs}} = \frac{1}{\eta} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_{1,t} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{v}_{d,t} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note, that in our case, \mathbf{z}_{vecs} doesn't depend on s . For the `dual_eval` method, we need to be able to compute

$$\phi(s) = \mathbf{z}^T \left(s \mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{z} = \underbrace{\eta \|\mathbf{z}^{\text{biases}}\|_2^2}_{\text{biases part}} + \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{Z}_{\text{vecs}}(\mathbf{D} + \gamma \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}^T), \mathbf{Z}_{\text{vecs}} \rangle}_{\text{vectors part}}. \quad (24)$$

The "biases" part is, according to equation (23), is

$$\frac{1}{\eta} (w_{0,t} + \eta s y)^2 + \frac{1}{\eta} \|\mathbf{w}_t + \eta s y \mathbf{a}\|_2^2. \quad (25)$$

Note, that when the vector \mathbf{a} is sparse, most of the summands in the squared norm $\|\mathbf{w}_t + \eta s y \mathbf{a}\|_2^2$ do *not* depend on s , since we are maximizing over s , we can avoid computing those summands. Hence, the non-constant terms in the expression above follow the sparsity

pattern of \mathbf{a} , and in particular, when \mathbf{a} contains feature indicators, the computational time is proportional to the actual number of features used.

Now let's take care of the "vectors part" in Equation (24). When the input vector \mathbf{a} is *sparse*, meaning that some of its entries are zeros, according to the definition of \mathbf{D} and \mathbf{r} in Lemma 12, the corresponding rows and columns of the $(\mathbf{D} + \gamma\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}^T)$ matrix are *independent of s* . Since we aim to maximize ϕ over s , we can use a reduced matrix $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}_{\text{vecs}}$ with the corresponding columns removed, a reduced matrix $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ with the corresponding rows and columns removed, and a reduced vector $v\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ with the corresponding entries removed, and obtain:

$$\phi(s) = \mathbf{z}^T \left(s\mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{\eta}\mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{z} = \underbrace{\eta\|\mathbf{z}_{\text{biases}}\|_2^2}_{\text{biases part}} + \underbrace{\langle \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_{\text{vecs}}(\hat{\mathbf{D}} + \gamma\hat{\mathbf{r}}\hat{\mathbf{r}}^T), \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_{\text{vecs}} \rangle}_{\text{vectors part}} + \text{CONST}, \quad (26)$$

where *CONST* is some term which does not depend on s . Finally, note that multiplying by a diagonal matrix amounts to multiplying each column by the corresponding diagonal entry, and multiplying by the rank-one matrix $\hat{\mathbf{r}}\hat{\mathbf{r}}^T$ can also be done efficiently, since we can first multiply by the column vector $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$, and then by the row vector $\hat{\mathbf{r}}^T$. Consequently, the term

$$\langle \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_{\text{vecs}}(\hat{\mathbf{D}} + \gamma\hat{\mathbf{r}}\hat{\mathbf{r}}^T), \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_{\text{vecs}} \rangle$$

can be computed in time *linear* in the number of non-zero features in our input vector \mathbf{a} , namely, $O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{a}) \cdot k)$, where k is the embedding dimension of the latent vectors. With the above in mind, we can efficiently implement the `dual_eval` and `solve_system` methods required for our oracle. A similar technique can be used to derive the `dual_deriv` method, but we will not need it for CTR prediction, and thus skip it in this paper to avoid adding more complexity to an already very complex section. Having derived the algorithms to implement our oracle, the code is below:

```
class FMCTR:
    def __init__(self, a, y, helper):
        self._a = a
        self._y = y
        self._mask = (a != 0)
        self._helper = helper

    def eval(self, x):
        """
        g(x) is the output of the FM, multiplied by the negative label. See Equation (18)
        """
        return -self._y * self._helper.eval(x, self._a)

    def scalar(self):
        return 0. # the scalar part of g(x) is zero.

    def dual_eval(self, s, step_size, x):
        """
        See Equation (26)
        """
        z_0, z_biases, z_vecs = self.decompose_z_masked(s, step_size, x)
        sol_0, sol_biases, sol_vecs = self.solve_system_masked(s, step_size, x)

        result = -0.5 * (
            z_0 * sol_0 + (z_biases * sol_biases).sum() + (z_vecs * sol_vecs).sum()
```

```

)
return result.item()

def dual_deriv(self, s, step_size, x):
    raise NotImplementedError("At this stage, we don't suppose dual derivatives. We don't need them.")

def solve_system(self, s, step_size, x):
    """
    See Equation (22) and Lemma 12
    """
    mask = self._mask
    w_0, w, vs = self._helper.decompose(x)
    w_star_0, w_star_masked, vs_star_masked = self.solve_system_masked(s, step_size, x)

    w_star = w.clone().detach()
    vs_star = vs.clone().detach()

    w_star[mask] = w_star_masked
    vs_star[:, mask] = vs_star_masked

    return torch.cat([w_star_0, w_star, vs_star.view(-1)])

def solve_system_masked(self, s, step_size, x):
    a = self._a[self._mask]
    y = self._y

    z_0, z_biases, z_vecs = self.decompose_z_masked(s, step_size, x)

    w_star_0 = step_size * z_0
    w_star = step_size * z_biases

    diagonal = step_size / (1 + step_size * y * s * a.square())
    r = (diagonal * a).reshape(-1, 1)
    gamma_sum_part = step_size * y * s * (a.square() / (1 + step_size * y * s * a.square()))
    gamma = (y * s) / (1 - gamma_sum_part.sum())

    times_diag = z_vecs * diagonal # equivalent to torch.mm(vs, torch.diag(diagonal))
    times_rank_one = (z_vecs @ r) @ r.T
    vs_star = times_diag + gamma * times_rank_one

    return w_star_0, w_star, vs_star

def decompose_z_masked(self, s, step_size, x):
    """
    z_0, z_biases, and z_vecs, excluding zero features - used to make the implementation
    fast for sparse input vectors, as discussed in the paper.
    """
    a = self._a[self._mask]
    y = self._y

    w_0, w, vs = self._helper.decompose(x)
    w = w[self._mask]
    z_vecs = vs[:, self._mask]

    z_0 = w_0 / step_size + s * y
    z_biases = w / step_size + s * y * a

    return z_0, z_biases, z_vecs / step_size

```

References

- A. Agrawal, R. Verschueren, S. Diamond, and S. Boyd. A rewriting system for convex optimization problems. *Journal of Control and Decision*, 5(1):42–60, 2018.
- H. Asi and J. C. Duchi. Stochastic (approximate) proximal point methods: Convergence, optimality, and adaptivity. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(3):2257–2290, 2019a. doi: 10.1137/18M1230323. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1230323>.
- H. Asi and J. C. Duchi. The importance of better models in stochastic optimization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(46):22924–22930, 2019b. ISSN 0027-8424. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1908018116. URL <https://www.pnas.org/content/116/46/22924>.
- H. Asi and J. C. Duchi. Modeling simple structures and geometry for better stochastic optimization algorithms. In K. Chaudhuri and M. Sugiyama, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 89 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2425–2434. PMLR, 16–18 Apr 2019c. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v89/asi19a.html>.
- H. Asi, K. Chadha, G. Cheng, and J. C. Duchi. Minibatch stochastic approximate proximal point methods. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 21958–21968. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/fa2246fa0fdf0d3e270c86767b77ba1b-Paper.pdf>.
- A. Beck. *First-Order Methods in Optimization*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2017. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611974997. URL <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611974997>.
- D. Bertsekas, A. Nedic, and A. Ozdaglar. *Convex Analysis and Optimization*. Athena Scientific optimization and computation series. Athena Scientific, 2003. ISBN 9781886529458. URL <https://books.google.co.il/books?id=Da0FQgAACAAJ>.
- D. P. Bertsekas. Incremental proximal methods for large scale convex optimization. *Mathematical programming*, 129(2):163–195, 2011.
- R. Bhatia. *Matrix analysis*, volume 169. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- R. P. Brent. *Algorithms for minimization without derivatives*. Courier Corporation, 2013.
- N. Campolongo and F. Orabona. Temporal variability in implicit online learning. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 12377–12387. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/9239be5f9dc4058ec647f14fd04b1290-Paper.pdf>.
- C. Cortes and V. Vapnik. Support-vector networks. *Machine learning*, 20(3):273–297, 1995.
- D. Davis and D. Drusvyatskiy. Stochastic model-based minimization of weakly convex functions. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(1):207–239, 2019. doi: 10.1137/18M1178244. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1178244>.

- D. Davis, D. Drusvyatskiy, and K. J. MacPhee. Stochastic model-based minimization under high-order growth, 2018.
- S. Diamond and S. Boyd. CVXPY: A Python-embedded modeling language for convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(83):1–5, 2016.
- D. Drusvyatskiy and C. Paquette. Efficiency of minimizing compositions of convex functions and smooth maps. *Mathematical Programming*, 178(1):503–558, Nov 2019. ISSN 1436-4646. doi: 10.1007/s10107-018-1311-3. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-018-1311-3>.
- J. C. Duchi and F. Ruan. Stochastic methods for composite and weakly convex optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(4):3229–3259, 2018. doi: 10.1137/17M1135086. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/17M1135086>.
- Y. C. Eldar and S. Mendelson. Phase retrieval: Stability and recovery guarantees. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 36(3):473–494, 2014. ISSN 1063-5203. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acha.2013.08.003>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1063520313000717>.
- Y. Juan, Y. Zhuang, W.-S. Chin, and C.-J. Lin. Field-aware factorization machines for ctr prediction. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, RecSys '16*, page 43–50, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450340359. doi: 10.1145/2959100.2959134. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2959100.2959134>.
- A. Kalai and S. Vempala. Efficient algorithms for online decision problems. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 71(3):291–307, 2005. ISSN 0022-0000. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2004.10.016>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022000004001394>. Learning Theory 2003.
- N. Karampatziakis and J. Langford. Online importance weight aware updates, 2011.
- J. Kivinen and M. K. Warmuth. Exponentiated gradient versus gradient descent for linear predictors. *Information and Computation*, 132(1):1–63, 1997. ISSN 0890-5401. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1006/inco.1996.2612>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0890540196926127>.
- B. Kulis and P. L. Bartlett. Implicit online learning. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-10)*, pages 575–582, 2010.
- C. F. Loan. The ubiquitous kronecker product. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 123(1):85–100, 2000. ISSN 0377-0427. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-0427\(00\)00393-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-0427(00)00393-9). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377042700003939>. Numerical Analysis 2000. Vol. III: Linear Algebra.

- B. Martinet. Brève communication. régularisation d'inéquations variationnelles par approximations successives. *Revue française d'informatique et de recherche opérationnelle. Série rouge*, 4(R3):154–158, 1970.
- T. Minka. Old and new matrix algebra useful for statistics. September 1997. URL <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/old-new-matrix-algebra-useful-statistics>
- J. J. Moreau. Fonctions convexes duales et points proximaux dans un espace hilbertien. *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de l'Académie des sciences*, 255:2897–2899, 1962.
- J. J. Moreau. Proximité et dualité dans un espace hilbertien. *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, 93:273–299, 1965a. doi: 10.24033/bsmf.1625. URL <http://www.numdam.org/articles/10.24033/bsmf.1625/>.
- J.-J. Moreau. Proximité et dualité dans un espace hilbertien. *Bulletin de la Société mathématique de France*, 93:273–299, 1965b.
- N. Parikh and S. Boyd. Proximal algorithms. *Found. Trends Optim.*, 1(3):127–239, Jan. 2014. ISSN 2167-3888. doi: 10.1561/2400000003. URL <https://doi.org/10.1561/2400000003>.
- G. B. Passty. Ergodic convergence to a zero of the sum of monotone operators in hilbert space. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 72(2):383–390, 1979. ISSN 0022-247X. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X\(79\)90234-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X(79)90234-8). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022247X79902348>.
- S. Rendle. Factorization machines. In *2010 IEEE International conference on data mining*, pages 995–1000. IEEE, 2010.
- H. Robbins and S. Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22(3):400–407, 1951. ISSN 00034851. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2236626>.
- R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, 1970. ISBN 9780691015866. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt14bs1ff>.
- E. K. Ryu and S. Boyd. Stochastic proximal iteration: a non-asymptotic improvement upon stochastic gradient descent. *Author website, early draft* (<https://web.stanford.edu/boyd/papers/pdf/spi.pdf>), 2014.
- J. Sherman and W. J. Morrison. Adjustment of an Inverse Matrix Corresponding to a Change in One Element of a Given Matrix. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 21(1):124 – 127, 1950. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177729893. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729893>.
- Q. Tran-Dinh, N. Pham, and L. Nguyen. Stochastic Gauss-Newton algorithms for non-convex compositional optimization. In H. D. III and A. Singh, editors, *Proceedings*

of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 9572–9582. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/tran-dinh20a.html>.

M. Zinkevich. Online convex programming and generalized infinitesimal gradient ascent. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML'03, page 928–935. AAAI Press, 2003. ISBN 1577351894.