

Nested Primal-dual Gradient Algorithms for Distributed Constraint-coupled Optimization

Jingwang Li and Housheng Su

Abstract—We study a class of distributed optimization problems with a globally coupled equality constraint. A novel nested primal-dual gradient algorithm (NPGA) is proposed from the dual perspective, which can achieve linear convergence under a quite weak condition. Furthermore, the upper bounds of the step-sizes and the converge rate are explicitly given. It is worth noting that NPGA is not only an algorithm but also an algorithmic framework. By choosing different parameter matrices, we can obtain many different versions of NPGA, which offers us a chance to design more efficient algorithms. Finally, the convergence rates of NPGA and existing algorithms are compared in numerical experiments.

Index Terms—Constraint-coupled optimization, nested primal-dual gradient algorithm, linear convergence, algorithmic framework.

I. INTRODUCTION

Consider a networked system composing of n agents, the network topology is denoted by an undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ are the node and edge sets respectively. Specifically, $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ if agents i and j can communicate with each other. The distributed constraint-coupled optimization problem considered in this work is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n A_i x_i = b, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{P1})$$

where $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d_i}$ and $f_i(x) : \mathbb{R}^{d_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are completely private for agent i (which implies that agent i cannot share these information with any other agents in the system), while $b \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is public for all agents. Without loss of generality, assume that there exist at least one finite optimal solution of (P1). Different from the classical distributed unconstrained optimization problem, which is given as

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(x), \quad (\text{P2})$$

(P1) has an extra equality constraint that couples all agents' decision variables, which is the reason that we call it a distributed constraint-coupled optimization problem [1]. Many real optimization problems have the same form with (P1) or can be reformulated as (P1), including vertically distributed

regression [2], [3], distributed basis pursuit [4], distributed model predictive control [5], [6], and distributed resource allocation [7], [8], [9].

In this work, we focus on designing linearly convergent distributed algorithms for (P1). Though there have been some linearly convergent distributed algorithms, most of them can only handle special cases of (P1), including $A_i = 1$ [10] and $A_i = I$ [7], [8], [9], [11]. It worth noting that the algorithm proposed in [11] needs each agent to exchange the gradient information with its neighbors, which is not allowable in our scenario since it may lead to the leakage of the private objective function. The problem considered in [3] and [12] is quite similar to (P1), where a distributed version of ADMM–IDC–ADMM and the dual coupled diffusion algorithm (DCDA) are proposed respectively. In particular, IDC–ADMM and DCDA can both converge linearly under the condition that A_i has full row rank. Obviously, A_i has full row rank is far more general than $A_i = I$, nevertheless, this condition is still too strong and cannot be satisfied by lots of real optimization problems, which limits the application scope of IDC–ADMM and DCDA tremendously. For example, in vertically distributed regression, the numbers of the rows and the columns of A_i corresponds to the numbers of the samples and the features that agent i owns respectively. As is well known, the number of the samples is usually far larger than that of the features, which implies that the above condition cannot be satisfied. Recently, some progress has been made in [13], where a kind of distributed augmented primal-dual gradient dynamics–IDEA is proposed, which can achieve linear convergence under the condition that $A = [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ has full row rank. Compared with the condition that A_i has full row rank, the above condition is quite weak, which enables IDEA to be applied to many scenarios, including the above mentioned vertically distributed regression.

The major contributions of this paper are summarized as follows.

- (i) A novel nested primal-dual gradient algorithm, i.e. NPGA, is proposed. NPGA can achieve linear convergence under the condition that $A = [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ has full row rank, which is the most weak condition as far as we know. Furthermore, the upper bounds of the step-sizes and the convergence rate are explicitly given. Though the convergence condition of NPGA is the same with that of IDEA, we should notice that IDEA is a continuous-time algorithm, which means we can only use IDEA's discretization, like the Euler discretization, for the execution on digital computers. However, the discretization of IDEA has not been studied in [13], hence we do not

J. Li and H. Su are with the Key Laboratory of Imaging Processing and Intelligence Control, School of Artificial Intelligence and Automation, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430074, China. Email: jingwangli@outlook.com, houshengsu@gmail.com.

know the bounds of the discretization step-sizes and the convergence rate. In addition, NPGA shows a far faster convergence rate than IDEA in numerical experiments.

- (ii) NPGA is not only an algorithm, but also an algorithmic framework. By choosing different parameter matrices, we can obtain many different versions of NPGA, one of whom is DCDA that mentioned above. In particular, the convergence rates of different versions of NPGA usually have significant differences in numerical experiments. Therefore, NPGA can offer us a chance to design more efficient distributed algorithms for (P1).

Notations: $\mathbf{1}_n$ and $\mathbf{0}_n$ denote the vectors of n ones and zeros respectively. I_n and $\mathbf{0}_{m \times n}$ denote the identity matrix with dimension n and the zero matrix with dimension $m \times n$ respectively. Notice that we would not indicate the dimensions of the vectors of n ones and zeros, the identity matrix, and the zero matrix, if they could be inferred from the context. Given a positive semi-definite matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\|x\|_B^2 = x^\top Bx$. For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $A \succ B$ ($A \succeq B$) denotes that $A - B$ is positive definite (positive semi-definite). For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\eta_1(A)$, $\underline{\eta}(A)$, and $\bar{\eta}(A)$ denote the smallest, smallest non-zero, and largest eigenvalues of A respectively. For $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $\underline{\sigma}(B)$ and $\bar{\sigma}(B)$ denote the smallest non-zero and largest singular values of B respectively, and $\text{Col}(B)$ denotes column space of B . $\text{diag}\{\cdot\}$ denotes the (block) diagonal matrix.

II. ALGORITHM DESIGN

(P1) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i) \\ \text{s.t. } \mathbf{Ax} &= b, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{P3})$$

where $\mathbf{x} = [x_1^\top, \dots, x_n^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $A = [A_1, \dots, A_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d}$, and $d = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i$. The following assumptions are adopted in this work.

Assumption 1: \mathcal{G} is undirected and connected.

Assumption 2: f_i is μ_i -strongly convex and l_i -smooth, where μ_i and l_i are both positive constants, $\forall i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Assumption 2 implies the μ -strongly convexity and l -smoothness of f , where $\mu = \min_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mu_i$ and $l = \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} l_i$, it follows that [14]

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla f(w) - \nabla f(w^*))^\top (w - w^*) &\geq \mu \|w - w^*\|^2, \\ \|\nabla f(w) - \nabla f(w^*)\|^2 &\leq l (\nabla f(w) - \nabla f(w^*))^\top (w - w^*), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

for any $w, w^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Assumption 3: $A = [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ has full row rank.

Define the Lagrangian of (P3) as

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda) = f(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda^\top (\mathbf{Ax} - b),$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the Lagrange multiplier. Since (P3) is a convex optimization problem and the optimal solution exists, Slater's condition is satisfied, it follows that the strong duality holds. Therefore, if $(\mathbf{x}^*, \lambda^*)$ is a saddle point of the Lagrangian, then \mathbf{x}^* and λ^* must be the optimal solutions of (P3) and its dual problem respectively, vice versa. As a

consequence, we can obtain the optimal solution of (P3) by solving its corresponding saddle-point problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^p} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda). \quad (2)$$

As is well known, an efficient and popular algorithm to solve the saddle-point problems, like (2), is the the primal-dual gradient algorithm (PGA):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{x}^k - \alpha \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda), \\ \lambda^{k+1} &= \lambda^k + \beta \nabla_{\lambda} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda), \end{aligned}$$

substituting $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda)$ and $\nabla_{\lambda} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda)$ gives that

$$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} = \mathbf{x}^k - \alpha (\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) + A^\top \lambda^k), \quad (3a)$$

$$\lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k + \beta (\mathbf{Ax}^{k+1} - b), \quad (3b)$$

which has been widely studied in many works (in continuous-time or discrete-time forms) [15], [16], [17], [18]. However, we can easily see that PGA is not a distributed algorithm, since the update of λ needs the violation of the coupled equality constraint: $\mathbf{Ax}^{k+1} - b = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i x_i^{k+1} - b$, which is global information and cannot be accessed by any agent.

Let b_i satisfies that $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i = b$ (we can simply let $b_i = \frac{b}{n}$), then the dual function of (P3) can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} G(\lambda) &= \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda^\top (\mathbf{Ax} - b) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \inf_{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}} f_i(x_i) + \lambda^\top (A_i x_i - b_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

hence we can reformulate the dual problem of (P3) as

$$\max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\lambda). \quad (4)$$

Obviously (4) has the same form with the classical distributed unconstrained optimization problem (P2), which has been widely studied in recent years [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], [25], [26], [27], [28], [29], [30]. Naturally, we can use numerous distributed unconstrained optimization algorithms to solve (4). Since the strong duality holds, once (4) is solved, it is not difficult to get the optimal solution of (P3). The problem is which distributed unconstrained optimization algorithms to be chosen to solve (4), though any one is feasible theoretically, the performance of different algorithms may have significant differences in different scenarios. Therefore, we are interested in the general primal-dual algorithm framework—unified decentralized algorithm (UDA) [19], which can unify lots of existing distributed unconstrained optimization algorithms.

Before presenting UDA, it is necessary to introduce two symmetric matrices $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. For any $x = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, B and C satisfy

$$Bx = \mathbf{0} \iff x_1 = \dots = x_n,$$

$$Cx = \mathbf{0} \text{ or } Cx = \mathbf{0} \iff Bx = \mathbf{0},$$

where $C \succeq \mathbf{0}$. Recall the distributed unconstrained optimization problem (P2), let $\mathbf{x} = [x_1^\top, \dots, x_n^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$ and define

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(x_i),$$

TABLE I: [19] Existing distributed unconstrained optimization algorithms that UDA can unify. $L \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are the Laplacian and mixing matrices associated with \mathcal{G} respectively, and $c > 0$ is a tuneable constant. The last column denotes the number of communication rounds at each iteration.

Existing algorithms		B^2	C	D	Communication rounds
CTA algorithms	DIGing[20], [21]	$(I - W)^2$	$I - W^2$	I	2
	EXTRA [22]	$\frac{1}{2}(I - W)$	$\frac{1}{2}(I - W)$	I	1
	DLM [23]	$c\alpha L$	$c\alpha L$	I	1
	P2D2 [24]	$\frac{c}{2}(I - W)$	$\frac{1}{2}(I - W)$	I	1
ATC algorithms	Aug-DGM [25], [26]	$(I - W)^2$	$\mathbf{0}$	W^2	2
	ATC tracking [27], [28]	$(I - W)^2$	$I - W$	W	2
	Exact diffusion [29]	$\frac{1}{2}(I - W)$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\frac{1}{2}(I + W)$	1
	NIDS [30]	$c(I - W)$	$\mathbf{0}$	$I - c(I - W)$	1

in light of the property of B and C , we can easily verify that (P2) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}} \quad & h(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{B} = B \otimes I_m$, $\mathbf{C} = C \otimes I_m$, and $\alpha > 0$ is a constant. Define the Lagrangian of (5) as

$$\mathcal{L}_c(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{y}) = h(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x},$$

where $\mathbf{y} = [y_1^\top, \dots, y_n^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$ is the Lagrangian multiplier. Naturally, we can employ PGA to solve (5) (let $\beta = 1$), which gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}^k - \alpha \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^k), \\ \mathbf{y}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{y}^k + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In fact, UDA is a general version of (6), which is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}^k - \alpha \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^k), \\ \mathbf{y}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{y}^k + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}^{k+1}, \\ \mathbf{x}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{D}\mathbf{v}^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{D} = D \otimes I_m$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a symmetric doubly stochastic matrix. Obviously, UDA will degenerate to (6) if taking $D = I$, more than that, we can recover many existing distributed unconstrained optimization algorithms by choosing different B , C , and D , as shown in Table I. The detailed derivation of the equivalence between UDA and existing algorithms can be found in [19].

Remark 1: UDA can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}^{k+1} &= (I - \mathbf{B}^2)\mathbf{v}^k + (I - \mathbf{C})(\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^{k-1}) \\ &\quad - \alpha(\nabla h(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{k-1})), \\ \mathbf{x}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{D}\mathbf{v}^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

As a matter of fact, $D = I$ and $D \neq I$ represent the Combine-then-Adapt (CTA) and Adapt-then-Combine (ATC) forms of UDA respectively, where CTA and ATC are two different information diffusion strategies over networks [31]. Existing distributed unconstrained optimization algorithms can be divided into two categories: CTA algorithms and ATC algorithms, as shown in Table I. ■

Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = [\lambda_1^\top, \dots, \lambda_n^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ and define

$$g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\lambda_i),$$

if g is differentiable, we can employ UDA to solve (4), which gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}^{k+1} &= \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}^k + \beta \nabla g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k), \\ \mathbf{y}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{y}^k + \gamma \mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}^{k+1}, \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{D}\mathbf{v}^{k+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{B} = B \otimes I_p$, $\mathbf{C} = C \otimes I_p$, $\mathbf{D} = D \otimes I_p$, and $\beta > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ are constant step-sizes. In particular, different from the standard UDA, we add a step-size γ in the dual update. Define

$$x_i^*(\lambda_i) = \arg \min_{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}} \left\{ f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i^\top (A_i x_i - b_i) \right\},$$

since f_i is strictly convex, for any $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $x_i^*(\lambda_i)$ is unique, which implies that g_i is differentiable and [32]

$$\nabla g_i(\lambda_i) = A_i x_i^*(\lambda_i) - b_i.$$

As a result, g is differentiable and

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= [\nabla g_1(\lambda_1)^\top, \dots, \nabla g_n(\lambda_n)^\top]^\top \\ &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) - \mathbf{b}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{A} = \text{diag}\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$, $\mathbf{b} = [b_1^\top, \dots, b_n^\top]^\top$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= [x_1^*(\lambda_1)^\top, \dots, x_n^*(\lambda_n)^\top]^\top \\ &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ f(\mathbf{x}) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (8) can be unfolded as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k) &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ f(\mathbf{x}) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k\top} (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}) \right\}, \\ \mathbf{v}^{k+1} &= \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}^k + \beta (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k) - \mathbf{b}), \\ \mathbf{y}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{y}^k + \gamma \mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}^{k+1}, \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{D}\mathbf{v}^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

At each iteration of (9), we need to solve a subproblem exactly to obtain the dual gradient $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k) - \mathbf{b}$. However, solving an optimization problem exactly is usually quite costly and difficult [33]. Therefore, we further design an inexact version of (9)–NPGA:

$$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} = \mathbf{x}^k - \alpha (\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k), \quad (10a)$$

$$\mathbf{v}^{k+1} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}^k + \beta (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{b}), \quad (10b)$$

$$\mathbf{y}^{k+1} = \mathbf{y}^k + \gamma \mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}^{k+1}, \quad (10c)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{v}^{k+1}. \quad (10d)$$

TABLE II: Different versions of NPGA. $L \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are the Laplacian and mixing matrices associated with \mathcal{G} respectively, and $c > 0$ is a tuneable constant. The last column denotes the number of communication rounds at each iteration.

Versions	B^2	C	D	Communication rounds
NPGA-DIGing	$(I - W)^2$	$I - W^2$	I	2
NPGA-EXTRA	$\frac{1}{2}(I - W)$	$\frac{1}{2}(I - W)$	I	1
NPGA-DLM	$c\beta L$	$c\beta L$	I	1
NPGA-P2D2	$\frac{c}{2}(I - W)$	$\frac{1}{2}(I - W)$	I	1
NPGA-Aug-DGM	$(I - W)^2$	$\mathbf{0}$	W^2	2
NPGA-ATC tracking	$(I - W)^2$	$I - W$	W	2
NPGA-Exact diffusion	$\frac{1}{2}(I - W)$	$\mathbf{0}$	$\frac{1}{2}(I + W)$	1
NPGA-NIDS	$c(I - W)$	$\mathbf{0}$	$I - c(I - W)$	1
NPGA-1	$I - W$	$\mathbf{0}$	W^2	2
NPGA-2	$I - W$	$I - W$	W	2

The reason that NPGA is regarded as an inexact version of (9) is that NPGA uses $\mathbf{x}^{k+1} = \mathbf{x}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k)$ as an inexact substitute of the optimal solution of the subproblem $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{f(\mathbf{x}) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k\top}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b})\}$. NPGA is essentially a distributed version of PGA, where (10a) and (10b)-(10d) corresponds to the primal and dual updates of PGA respectively. Furthermore, when $D = I$, (10b)-(10d) can be regraded as a special case of PGA. Therefore, NPGA includes two PGAs, and one is contained in the other one, which is the reason we call it NPGA.

As mentioned before, by choosing different B , C , and D , UDA can recover many existing distributed unconstrained optimization algorithms. As an inexact dual version of UDA, NPGA does inherit this property of UDA, and we can obtain many different versions of NPGA by choosing different B , C , and D , as shown in Table II. In fact, the earlier algorithm-DCDA [12] is essentially a special case of NPGA: NPGA-Exact diffusion with $\gamma = 1$. In numerical experiments, it is shown that the convergence rates of different versions NPGA usually have significant differences. Therefore, NPGA can offer us a chance to design more efficient distributed algorithms for (P1).

Remark 2: For undirected and connected graphs, the corresponding mixing matrix $W = [w_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ [22] satisfies

- (i) $w_{ij} = 0$ if $i \neq j$ and $(i, j) \notin \mathcal{E}$;
- (ii) $W = W^\top$;
- (iii) for any $x = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $(I - W)x = \mathbf{0} \iff x_1 = \dots = x_n$.

Given the above three properties, we can easily verify that $-I \prec W \preceq I$ [22]. There are many methods to construct W that satisfies the above properties, one is the Laplacian method [34]:

$$W = I - \frac{L}{\tau},$$

where $\tau = \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} e_i + c$, e_i is the degree of agent i , and $c > 0$ is a constant. ■

Note that NPGA is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{x}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k), \\ \mathbf{v}^{k+1} &= (I - \mathbf{C})(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k) + (I - \gamma \mathbf{B}^2)\mathbf{v}^k \\ &\quad + \beta \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k), \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{D}\mathbf{v}^{k+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

we now take NPGA-EXTRA and NPGA-Exact diffusion as examples to illustrate how to implement NPGA distributedly.

For NPGA-EXTRA, substituting B^2 , C , and D (which NPGA-EXTRA corresponds to) in Table II into (11) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{x}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k), \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1} &= \frac{(3 - \gamma)I + (1 + \gamma)\mathbf{W}}{2} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \frac{I + \mathbf{W}}{2} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k-1} \\ &\quad + \beta \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{W} = W \otimes I_p$, hence NPGA-EXTRA is implemented as

$$\begin{aligned} x_i^{k+1} &= x_i^k - \alpha(\nabla f_i(x_i^k) + A_i^\top \lambda_i^k), \\ \lambda_i^{k+1} &= \frac{3 - \gamma}{2} \lambda_i^k + \frac{1 + \gamma}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} \lambda_j^k - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_i^{k-1} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} \lambda_j^{k-1} + \beta A_i(x_i^{k+1} - x_i^k), \end{aligned}$$

at agent i , note that $w_{ij} = 0$ if agent j is not the neighbor of agent i .

For NPGA-Exact diffusion, substituting B^2 , C , and D (which NPGA-Exact diffusion corresponds to) in Table II into (11) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{x}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k), \\ \mathbf{v}^{k+1} &= \frac{1 - \gamma}{2} \mathbf{v}^k + (1 + \gamma)\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k-1} + \beta \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k), \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1} &= \frac{I + \mathbf{W}}{2} \mathbf{v}^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{x}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k), \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1} &= \frac{1 - \gamma}{2} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k + \frac{I + \mathbf{W}}{2} ((1 + \gamma)\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k-1} \\ &\quad + \beta \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^k)), \end{aligned}$$

hence NPGA-Exact diffusion is implemented as

$$\begin{aligned} x_i^{k+1} &= x_i^k - \alpha(\nabla f_i(x_i^k) + A_i^\top \lambda_i^k), \\ \varphi_i^{k+1} &= (1 + \gamma)\lambda_i^k - \lambda_i^{k-1} + \beta A_i(x_i^{k+1} - x_i^k), \\ \lambda_i^{k+1} &= \frac{1 - \gamma}{2} \lambda_i^k + \frac{1}{2} \varphi_i^{k+1} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} \varphi_j^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

at agent i . The distributed implementations of other versions of NPGA can be derived by a similar way.

III. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

In this section, the linear convergences of NPGA under two cases: $D = I$ and $D \neq I$, are analysed respectively.

A. Case I: $D = I$

When $D = I$, NPGA can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{x}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k), \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1} &= \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}^k + \beta(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^{k+1} - \mathbf{b}), \\ \mathbf{y}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{y}^k + \gamma\mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Assumption 4: For any $x = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, B and C satisfy

$$Bx = \mathbf{0} \iff Cx = \mathbf{0} \iff x_1 = \dots = x_n, \quad (13a)$$

$$\mathbf{0} \preceq B^2 \preceq C \prec I. \quad (13b)$$

According to Assumption 4 and the property of Kronecker product, we can easily verify that for any $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{np}$, \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{C} satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0} &\iff \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0} \iff \lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_n, \\ \mathbf{0} \preceq \mathbf{B}^2 &\preceq \mathbf{C} \prec I. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3: In cases of undirected and connected graphs, it is not difficult to construct B and C that satisfy Assumption 4. Usually, B and C can be constructed based on the Laplacian matrix L or the mixing matrix W associated with \mathcal{G} , as shown in Table II. As mentioned in Remark 2, $-I \prec W \preceq I$, hence $\mathbf{0} \preceq I - W \prec 2I$, then we have $I - W = \sqrt{I - W}\sqrt{I - W} = (\sqrt{I - W})^2$, where $\sqrt{I - W} = P\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}P^\top$, P is an orthogonal matrix, and Λ is the diagonal matrix composing of the eigenvalues of $I - W$. It follows that

$$\sqrt{I - W}x = \mathbf{0} \iff (I - W)x = \mathbf{0} \iff x_1 = \dots = x_n,$$

hence $\sqrt{I - W}$ also satisfies Property (iii). Similarly, we can verify that $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(I - W)}$ and $\sqrt{c\beta L}$ satisfy Property (iii) as well. Therefore, NPGA-DIGing, NPGA-EXTRA, NPGA-DLM, and NPGA-P2D2 satisfy (13a). Since $L \succeq \mathbf{0}$, NPGA-DLM can always satisfy (13b) if c or β is small enough. Notice that $\mathbf{0} \preceq \frac{1}{2}(I - W) \prec I$, hence NPGA-EXTRA also satisfies (13b), and NPGA-P2D2 satisfies (13b) as long as $c \leq 1$. For NPGA-DIGing, substituting B and C of (13b) gives that

$$\mathbf{0} \preceq (I - W)^2 \preceq I - W^2 \prec I,$$

which holds if $0 \prec W \preceq I$. Notice that $0 \prec \frac{1}{2}(I + W) \preceq I$, hence (13b) can be satisfied by NPGA-DIGing via redefining $W \triangleq \frac{1}{2}(I + W)$. ■

The relation between the saddle point of \mathcal{L} and the fixed point of (12) is given in the following lemma.

Lemma 1: Suppose Assumption 4 hold, $(\mathbf{x}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$ is the saddle point of \mathcal{L} if and only if there exists $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{np}$ such that $(\mathbf{x}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is the fixed point of (12), where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$.

Proof. If $(\mathbf{x}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is a fixed point of (12), then it must satisfy

$$\mathbf{0} = \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \quad (14a)$$

$$\mathbf{0} = -\mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}^* + \beta(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{b}), \quad (14b)$$

$$\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*. \quad (14c)$$

If $(\mathbf{x}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$ is a saddle point of \mathcal{L} , then it must satisfy

$$\mathbf{0} = \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \quad (15a)$$

$$\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{b}. \quad (15b)$$

According to Assumption 4 and (14c), obviously $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$, where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$, then we can obtain (15a) from (14a). Left multiplying (14b) with $\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_p$, (15b) can be obtained, the sufficiency is proved.

Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$, obviously (14c) holds and (14a) can be derived from (15a). In light of (15b), we have

$$(\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_p)(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0},$$

which implies that $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{b} \in \text{Null}(\mathbf{1}_n \otimes I_p) = \text{Col}(\mathbf{B})$. As a result, there must exist $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{np}$ such that (14b) holds, the necessity is proved, which completes the proof. ■

Given Assumptions 2 and 3, it is easy to verify the uniqueness of the saddle point of \mathcal{L} . Let $(\mathbf{x}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ be a fixed point of (12), according to Lemma 1, we can verify that \mathbf{x}^* and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$ are unique and \mathbf{x}^* is the optimal solution of (P3). However, due to the singularity of \mathbf{B} , \mathbf{y}^* is not necessarily unique. Nevertheless, we can easily verify that \mathbf{y}_c^* , the projection of \mathbf{y}^* onto $\text{Col}(\mathbf{B})$, is unique. Notice that $\mathbf{y}^k \in \text{Col}(\mathbf{B})$, $\forall k \geq 0$, if $\mathbf{y}^0 = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, in the case of $\mathbf{y}^0 = \mathbf{0}$, if (12) converges to one of its fixed points, then that fixed point must be $(\mathbf{x}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \mathbf{y}_c^*)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k &= \mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*, \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k &= \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k &= \mathbf{y}^k - \mathbf{y}_c^*, \end{aligned}$$

then (12) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} &= \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)) - \alpha\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k, \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1} &= \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1} &= \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k + \gamma\mathbf{B}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Before presenting the main result, it is necessary to introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 2: Under Assumption 3, $C \succeq \mathbf{0}$, and $Cx = \mathbf{0} \iff x_1 = \dots = x_n$, then $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top + c\mathbf{C} \succ \mathbf{0}$, where $c > 0$ is a constant.

Notice that C has the same property with L , hence the proof of Lemma 2 is similar with Lemma 6 in [13] and we omit it.

Based on the error system (16), the following theorem establishes the linear convergence of NPGA in the case of $D = I$, and gives the upper bounds of the step-sizes and the convergence rate.

Theorem 1: Under Assumptions 1 to 4, if $\mathbf{y}^0 = \mathbf{0}$ and the positive step-sizes satisfy

$$\alpha < \frac{1}{l}, \quad \beta \leq \frac{\mu(1 - \bar{\sigma}(C))}{\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}, \quad \gamma < 1, \quad (17)$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_{c_1 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|_{c_2 M}^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|_{c_3 I}^2 \\ \leq \delta \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{c_2 M}^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{c_3 I}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\delta = \max \{1 - \alpha\mu(1 - \alpha l), 1 - \alpha\beta\eta(E), 1 - \gamma\bar{\sigma}^2(B)\} < 1,$$

$$c_1 = 1 - \frac{\alpha\beta\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}{1-\bar{\sigma}(C)}, c_2 = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}, c_3 = \frac{\alpha}{\beta\gamma}, M = I - \gamma\mathbf{B}^2, E = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top + \frac{1-\gamma}{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{C}.$$

Proof. According to (16), we have

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 = \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))\|^2 + \alpha^2\|\mathbf{A}^\top\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 - 2\alpha\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k\top}\mathbf{A}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))), \quad (18)$$

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|^2 = \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2 - 2\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k\top}\mathbf{B}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}), \quad (19)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2 + \gamma^2\|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|^2 + 2\gamma\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k\top}\mathbf{B}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1} \\ &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2 + \gamma^2\|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|^2 - 2\gamma\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{\mathbf{B}^2}^2 \\ &\quad + 2\gamma\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k\top}\mathbf{B}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

In light of Assumption 4 and (17), we know that $I - \gamma\mathbf{B}^2 \succ \mathbf{0}$, hence $I - \gamma\mathbf{B}^2 \succ \mathbf{0}$. Combining (19) with (20) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &= \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \gamma\|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &= \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + \|\beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 - 2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 + 2\beta\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k\top}\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} \\ &= \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + \|\beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 - 2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 - 2\alpha\beta\|\mathbf{A}^\top\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\beta\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k\top}\mathbf{A}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &= \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + \|\beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 - 2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 \\ &\quad - 2\alpha\beta\|\mathbf{A}^\top\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + 2\beta\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k\top}\mathbf{A}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

combining it with (18) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 + c_2 \left(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \right) \\ &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))\|^2 - \alpha^2\|\mathbf{A}^\top\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + c_2\|\beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 - 2c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 + \frac{c_2}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{C}) = \bar{\sigma}(C)$, $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}^2}^2 \leq \bar{\sigma}(C)\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2$. Furthermore, Assumption 4 implies that $0 < \bar{\sigma}(C) < 1$, by applying Jensen's inequality, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 &\leq \frac{\beta^2}{1-\bar{\sigma}(C)}\|\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\bar{\sigma}(C)}\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}^2}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\beta^2\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}{1-\bar{\sigma}(C)}\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Notice that $\mu \leq l$ and (17) implies that

$$\alpha\beta < \frac{\mu(1-\bar{\sigma}(C))}{l\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})} \leq \frac{1-\bar{\sigma}(C)}{\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}, \quad (24)$$

thus $\frac{\alpha\beta\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}{1-\bar{\sigma}(C)} < 1$, i.e., $c_1 > 0$. Since Assumptions 3 and 4 hold and $\gamma < 1$, applying Lemma 2 gives that $E \succ \mathbf{0}$. Given $\mathbf{y}^0 = \mathbf{0}$, it holds that $\mathbf{y}^k \in \mathbf{Col}(\mathbf{B})$, $\forall k \geq 0$. Recall that $\mathbf{y}_c^* \in \mathbf{Col}(\mathbf{B})$, hence $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k \in \mathbf{Col}(\mathbf{B})$, it follows that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{\mathbf{B}^2}^2 \geq \sigma^2(B)\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2$. Recall that f is strongly convex and smooth, applying (1) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))\|^2 \\ &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 - 2\alpha\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k\top}(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)) \\ &\quad + \alpha^2\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 - \alpha(2 - \alpha l)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k\top}(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)) \\ &\leq (1 - \alpha\mu(2 - \alpha l))\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

With the help of the above four conditions, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_{c_1I}^2 + c_2 \left(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))\|^2 - \alpha^2\|\mathbf{A}^\top\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 - c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 + \frac{c_2}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 \\ &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))\|^2 - \alpha^2\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k\top}E\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k \\ &\quad + c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 - \gamma c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 + \frac{c_2}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 \\ &\leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))\|^2 - \alpha^2\eta(E)\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 - \gamma c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 + (1 - \gamma\sigma^2(B))\frac{c_2}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 - \alpha\mu(2 - \alpha l))\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 + c_2(1 - \alpha\beta\eta(E))\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + (1 - \gamma\sigma^2(B))\frac{c_2}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Let $\delta_1 = 1 - \alpha\mu(2 - \alpha l)$, it is easy to verify $0 < \delta_1 < 1$ and $\mu > \frac{\beta\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}{1-\bar{\sigma}(C)}$ from (17), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(1 - \alpha\mu(2 - \alpha l))\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 \\ &= \delta_1\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 - \alpha\mu\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 \\ &= \delta_1\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1I}^2 - \alpha \left(\mu - \delta_1 \frac{\beta\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}{1-\bar{\sigma}(C)} \right) \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 \\ &\leq \delta_1\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1I}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

In light of Weyl's inequality [35] and the positive definiteness of E , it holds that

$$\eta(E) = \eta_1(E) \leq \eta_1 \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{C} \right) + \bar{\eta}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top) = \bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A}).$$

Let $\delta_2 = 1 - \alpha\beta\eta(E)$, (24) implies that $\alpha\beta\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A}) < 1$, hence $0 < \delta_2 < 1$. Note that $B^2 \preceq C$, it follows that $\mathbf{B}^2 \preceq \mathbf{C}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &c_2(1 - \alpha\beta\eta(E))\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 - \gamma c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 \\ &= \delta_2 c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 + \delta_2 c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{B}^2}^2 - \gamma c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 \\ &\leq \delta_2 c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 - \gamma c_2(1 - \delta_2)\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 \\ &\leq \delta_2 c_2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Let $\delta_3 = 1 - \gamma\sigma^2(B)$, Assumption 4 implies that $\sigma^2(B) < 1$ and $M = I - \gamma\mathbf{B}^2 \succ \mathbf{0}$, hence $0 < \delta_3 < 1$. Combining (26) to (28) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_{c_1I}^2 + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|_{c_2M}^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|_{c_3I}^2 \\ & \leq \delta_1 \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1I}^2 + \delta_2 \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{c_2M}^2 + \delta_3 \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{c_3I}^2 \\ & \leq \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\} \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1I}^2 + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{c_2M}^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{c_3I}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof. \blacksquare

B. Case II: $D \neq I$

In light of the proof of Theorem 1, $Cx = \mathbf{0} \iff x_1 = \dots = x_n$ is a necessary condition for $E \succ \mathbf{0}$, which is critical for the linear convergence of NPGA under the condition that A has full row rank. Actually, when $D \neq I$, the condition about C is still necessary, as shown in the following assumption.

Assumption 5: For any $x = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, B, C , and D satisfy

$$Bx = \mathbf{0} \iff Cx = \mathbf{0} \iff x_1 = \dots = x_n, \quad (29a)$$

$$D^2 \preceq I - B^2, \quad \mathbf{0} \preceq C \prec I. \quad (29b)$$

According to Assumption 5 and the property of Kronecker product, we can easily verify for any $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{np}$, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C} , and \mathbf{D} satisfy

$$\mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0} \iff \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0} \iff \lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_n,$$

$$\mathbf{D}^2 \preceq I - \mathbf{B}^2, \quad \mathbf{0} \preceq \mathbf{C} \prec I.$$

Remark 4: Recall the discussion in Remark 2, we can easily verify that NPGA-ATC tracking and NPGA-2 both satisfy (29a). Furthermore, (29b) can be satisfied by NPGA-ATC tracking and NPGA-2 if $\mathbf{0} \preceq W \preceq I$, which could be done by redefining $W \triangleq \frac{1}{2}(I + W)$. It is worth noting that some versions of NPGA, where $C = \mathbf{0}$, do not satisfy Assumption 5. In fact, for those versions with $C = \mathbf{0}$, the linear convergence can only be guaranteed when \mathbf{A} has full row rank, which will be studied later. \blacksquare

Similar to Case I, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3: Under Assumption 5, $(\mathbf{x}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$ is a saddle point of \mathcal{L} if and only if there exist $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{np}$ and $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{np}$ such that $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{y}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$ is a fixed point of NPGA, where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \lambda^*$.

Proof. If $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{y}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$ is a fixed point of NPGA, then it must satisfy

$$\mathbf{0} = \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \quad (30a)$$

$$\mathbf{v}^* = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}^* + \beta(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{b}), \quad (30b)$$

$$\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}^*, \quad (30c)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{v}^*. \quad (30d)$$

Assumption 5 and (30c) implies that $\mathbf{v}^* = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes v^*$, where $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Note that D is a doubly stochastic matrix, hence $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{v}^* = \mathbf{v}^*$. The rest of the proof is the same with Lemma 1, thus we omit it for brevity. \blacksquare

Similar to the discussion in Case I, in the case of $\mathbf{y}^0 = \mathbf{0}$, if NPGA converges to one of its fixed points, then that fixed point must be $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{y}_c^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$. Let

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k = \mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^*,$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^k = \mathbf{v}^k - \mathbf{v}^*,$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k = \mathbf{y}^k - \mathbf{y}_c^*,$$

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*,$$

then NPGA can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} &= \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)) - \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1} &= \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1} &= \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k + \gamma\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}, \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1} &= \mathbf{D}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Based on the error system (31), the following theorem establishes the linear convergence of NPGA in the case of $D \neq I$.

Theorem 2: Under Assumptions 1 to 3 and 5, if $\mathbf{y}^0 = \mathbf{0}$ and the positive step-sizes satisfy

$$\alpha < \frac{1}{l}, \quad \beta \leq \frac{\mu(1 - \bar{\sigma}(C))}{\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}, \quad \gamma < 1, \quad (32)$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_{c_1I}^2 + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|_{c_2I}^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|_{c_3I}^2 \\ & \leq \delta \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1I}^2 + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{c_2I}^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{c_3I}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\delta = \max\{1 - \alpha\mu(1 - \alpha l), 1 - \alpha\beta\eta(E), 1 - \gamma\sigma^2(B)\} < 1,$$

$$c_1 = 1 - \frac{\alpha\beta\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}{1 - \bar{\sigma}(C)}, \quad c_2 = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}, \quad c_3 = \frac{\alpha}{\beta\gamma}, \quad E = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top + \frac{1-\gamma}{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{C}.$$

Proof. According to (31), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))\|^2 + \alpha^2\|\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\alpha\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{\top} \mathbf{A}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 &= \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k\top} \mathbf{B}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2 + \gamma^2\|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 + 2\gamma\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k\top} \mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1} \\ &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2 + \gamma^2\|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 - 2\gamma\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{\mathbf{B}^2}^2 \\ &\quad + 2\gamma\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k\top} \mathbf{B}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

In light of Assumption 5 and (32), we know that $I - \gamma\mathbf{B}^2 \succ \mathbf{0}$, hence $I - \gamma\mathbf{B}^2 \succ \mathbf{0}$. Combining (34) with (35) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &= \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \gamma\|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I - \gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

applying (21) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|_{I - \gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &= \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + \|\beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} - \mathbf{C}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 - 2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{\mathbf{C}}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I - \gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 \\ &\quad - 2\alpha\beta\|\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + 2\beta\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{\top} \mathbf{A}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))). \end{aligned}$$

Since $I - \gamma B^2 \succ \mathbf{0}$, (23) still holds, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|_{I-\gamma B^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \\ & \leq \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + \frac{\beta^2 \bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}{1 - \bar{\sigma}(C)} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 - \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_C^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I-\gamma B^2}^2 \\ & \quad - 2\alpha\beta \|\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + 2\beta \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\top \mathbf{A} (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Let $\delta_1 = 1 - \alpha\mu(1 - \alpha l)$, $\delta_2 = 1 - \alpha\beta\eta(E)$, and $\delta_3 = 1 - \gamma\bar{\sigma}^2(B)$, recall (32), it is easy to see $0 < \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 < 1$ and $c_1 = 1 - \frac{\alpha\beta\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}{1 - \bar{\sigma}(C)} > 0$. Combining (25), (27), (33), and (36) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_{c_1 I}^2 + c_2 \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|_{I-\gamma B^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \right) \\ & \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))\|^2 - \alpha^2 \|\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + c_2 \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 \\ & \quad - c_2 \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_C^2 + \frac{c_2}{\gamma} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I-\gamma B^2}^2 \\ & = \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))\|^2 - \alpha^2 \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k\top} E \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k \\ & \quad + c_2 \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 - \gamma c_2 \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_C^2 + \frac{c_2}{\gamma} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I-\gamma B^2}^2 \\ & \leq (1 - \alpha\mu(1 - \alpha l)) \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1 I}^2 + c_2 (1 - \alpha\beta\eta(E)) \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 \\ & \quad + (1 - \gamma\bar{\sigma}^2(B)) \frac{c_2}{\gamma} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2, \\ & \leq \delta_1 \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1 I}^2 + \delta_2 \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{c_2 I}^2 + \delta_3 \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{c_3 I}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Recall Assumption 5 and (32), we then have $I - \gamma B^2 \succeq I - B^2 \succeq D^2$, hence

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{D}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|_{I-\gamma B^2}^2,$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_{c_1 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|_{c_2 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|_{c_3 I}^2 \\ & \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_{c_1 I}^2 + c_2 \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|_{I-\gamma B^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \right) \\ & \leq \delta_1 \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1 I}^2 + \delta_2 \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{c_2 I}^2 + \delta_3 \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{c_3 I}^2 \\ & \leq \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\} \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{c_2 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{c_3 I}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof. \blacksquare

As mentioned in Remark 4, when $C = \mathbf{0}$, the linear convergence of NPGA cannot be guaranteed under the condition that A has full row rank, instead, we need the condition that \mathbf{A} has full row rank, which is equivalent to A_i has full row rank, $\forall i \in \mathcal{N}$. We now introduce the following assumption, which is the same as Assumption 5, except that $C = \mathbf{0}$.

Assumption 6: For any $x = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, B , C , and D satisfy

$$Bx = \mathbf{0} \iff x_1 = \dots = x_n, \quad (37a)$$

$$D^2 \preceq I - B^2, C = \mathbf{0}. \quad (37b)$$

According to Assumption 6 and the property of Kronecker product, we can easily verify for any $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{np}$, \mathbf{B} , \mathbf{C} , and \mathbf{D} satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0} & \iff \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0} \iff \lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_n, \\ \mathbf{D}^2 \preceq I - \mathbf{B}^2, \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5: It is easy to verify that all versions of NPGA with $C = \mathbf{0}$ satisfy (37a), and NPGA-Exact diffusion and NPGA-NIDS satisfy (37b). To make NPGA-Aug-DGM and NPGA-2 satisfy (37b), we only need to let $\mathbf{0} \preceq W \preceq I$, which could be done by redefining $W \triangleq \frac{1}{2}(I + W)$. \blacksquare

When $C = \mathbf{0}$, (31) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} & = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)) - \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1} & = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k - \mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1} & = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k + \gamma\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}, \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1} & = \mathbf{D}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Based on the above error system, the following theorem establishes the linear convergence of NPGA in the case of $C = \mathbf{0}$.

Theorem 3: Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 6, if A_i has full row rank, $\forall i \in \mathcal{N}$, $\mathbf{y}^0 = \mathbf{0}$, and the positive step-sizes satisfy

$$\alpha < \frac{1}{l}, \beta \leq \frac{\mu}{\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}, \gamma \leq 1, \quad (39)$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_{c_1 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{k+1}\|_{c_2 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|_{c_3 I}^2 \\ & \leq \delta \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|_{c_2 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{c_3 I}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\delta = \max\{1 - \alpha\mu(1 - \alpha l), 1 - \alpha\beta\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A}), 1 - \gamma\bar{\sigma}^2(B)\} < 1,$$

$$c_1 = 1 - \frac{\alpha\beta\bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A})}{1 - \bar{\sigma}(C)}, c_2 = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}, \text{ and } c_3 = \frac{\alpha}{\beta\gamma}.$$

Proof. According to (38), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 & = \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))\|^2 + \alpha^2 \|\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 \\ & \quad - 2\alpha \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\top \mathbf{A} (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 & = \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2 \\ & \quad - 2\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k\top} \mathbf{B} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 & = \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2 + \gamma^2 \|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 + 2\gamma \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k\top} \mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1} \\ & = \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2 + \gamma^2 \|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 - 2\gamma \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{\mathbf{B}^2}^2 \\ & \quad + 2\gamma \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k\top} \mathbf{B} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

In light of Assumption 6 and (39), it is easy to see $I - \gamma B^2 \succ \mathbf{0}$, hence $I - \gamma B^2 \succ \mathbf{0}$. Combining (41) with (42) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \\ & = \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k + \beta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \gamma \|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I-\gamma B^2}^2 \\ & = \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + \beta^2 \|\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \gamma \|\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I-\gamma B^2}^2 \\ & \quad - 2\alpha\beta \|\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + 2\beta \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\top \mathbf{A} (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))), \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|_{I-\gamma B^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \\ & \leq \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + \beta^2 \bar{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{A}) \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I-\gamma B^2}^2 \\ & \quad - 2\alpha\beta \|\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^k\|^2 + 2\beta \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\top \mathbf{A} (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$




Fig. 1: The result of Experiment I.

Let $\delta_1 = 1 - \alpha\mu(1 - \alpha l)$, $\delta_2 = 1 - \alpha\beta\sigma^2(\mathbf{A})$, $\delta_3 = 1 - \gamma\sigma^2(B)$, in light of Assumption 6 and (39), we can obtain that $0 < \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 < 1$, $c_1 = 1 - \alpha\beta\sigma^2(\mathbf{A}) > 0$, and $\mu \geq \beta\sigma^2(\mathbf{A})$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (1 - \alpha\mu(2 - \alpha l))\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 \\
 &= \delta_1\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 - \alpha\mu\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 \\
 &= \delta_1\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1 I}^2 - \alpha(\mu - \delta_1\beta\sigma^2(\mathbf{A}))\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 \\
 &\leq \delta_1\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1 I}^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Note that A_i has full row rank, $\forall i \in \mathcal{N}$, hence \mathbf{A} has full row rank, which implies that $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top \succ \mathbf{0}$ and $\|\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\lambda}^k\|^2 \geq \sigma^2(\mathbf{A})\|\tilde{\lambda}^k\|^2$. Combining (40), (43), and (44) gives that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_{c_1 I}^2 + c_2 \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \right) \\
 &\leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k - \alpha(\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*))\|^2 - \alpha^2\|\mathbf{A}^\top \tilde{\lambda}^k\|^2 \\
 &\quad + c_2\|\tilde{\lambda}^k\|^2 + \frac{c_2}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 \\
 &\leq (1 - \alpha\mu(2 - \alpha l))\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 + c_2(1 - \alpha\beta\sigma^2(\mathbf{A}))\|\tilde{\lambda}^k\|^2 \\
 &\quad + (1 - \gamma\sigma^2(B))\frac{c_2}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2, \\
 &\leq \delta_1\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1 I}^2 + \delta_2\|\tilde{\lambda}^k\|_{c_2 I}^2 + \delta_3\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{c_3 I}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Recall Assumption 6 and (39), obviously $I - \gamma\mathbf{B}^2 \succeq I - \mathbf{B}^2 \succeq \mathbf{D}^2$, we then have

$$\|\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{D}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|^2 \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2,$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_{c_1 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}\|_{c_2 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|_{c_3 I}^2 \\
 &\leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_{c_1 I}^2 + c_2 \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}\|_{I-\gamma\mathbf{B}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\|^2 \right) \\
 &\leq \delta_1\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1 I}^2 + \delta_2\|\tilde{\lambda}^k\|_{c_2 I}^2 + \delta_3\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{c_3 I}^2 \\
 &\leq \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\} \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\|_{c_1 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\lambda}^k\|_{c_2 I}^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^k\|_{c_3 I}^2 \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \blacksquare

Remark 6: When $C = \mathbf{0}$, we need a stronger condition (i.e., A_i has full row rank) to guarantee the linear convergence of NPGA. Nevertheless, NPGA does have some new interesting properties in the case of $C = \mathbf{0}$:

- (i) The upper bounds of the step-sizes are independent of the network topology;
- (ii) For the convergence rate δ , the effects of the objective functions $(1 - \alpha\mu(1 - \alpha l))$, the constraints $(1 - \alpha\beta\sigma^2(\mathbf{A}))$, and the network topology $(1 - \gamma\sigma^2(B))$ are separate. If $B^2 = I - W^k$, where $k \geq 1$, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} 1 - \gamma\sigma^2(B) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} 1 - \gamma\eta(I - W^k) = 1 - \gamma$, which implies that the effect of the network topology on the convergence rate can be ignored if k is sufficient large.

It is worth noting that the above properties of NPGA are inherited from UDA [19]. \blacksquare

IV. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In order to validate the obtained theoretical results and compare the convergence rates of NPGA and existing algorithms, we consider two numerical experiments in this section.

A. Experiment I

Let $X = [x_1, \dots, x_p]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d}$ and $Y = [y_1, \dots, y_p]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ($y_i \in \{1, -1\}$) be the regression data matrix and the corresponding binary label vector respectively, the logistic regression problem is given by

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \ln(1 + \exp(-y_i \theta^\top x_i)) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|\theta\|^2, \tag{45}$$

where $\rho > 0$ is the regularization parameter. Suppose that the regression data is vertically distributed over the network [2], which means that each agent only knows partial features. \blacksquare This can be formulated as: $X = [X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}]$, where $X_i \in$




Fig. 2: The result of Experiment II.

$\mathbb{R}^{p \times d_i}$ is only known by agent i and $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d_i = d$. Let $X_i = [x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip}]^\top$, then (45) can be rewritten as

$$\min_{\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \ln \left(1 + \exp \left(-y_j \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \theta_i^\top x_{ij} \right) \right) + \frac{\rho}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \|\theta_i\|^2. \quad (46)$$

If we add a slack variable $z = [z_1, \dots, z_p]^\top = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \theta_i$, then (46) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}, z \in \mathbb{R}^p} & \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \ln(1 + \exp(-y_j z_j)) + \frac{\rho}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \|\theta_i\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} X_i \theta_i - z = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Obviously (47) has the same form with (P1), where

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(x_i) &= \frac{\rho}{2} \|x_i\|^2, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n-1, \\ f_n(x_n) &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \ln(1 + \exp(-y_j x_{nj})), \\ A_i &= X_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad A_n = -I_p, \quad b = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $A_n = -I_p$ implies that $A = [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ always has full row rank.

We consider the real dataset–Covtype.binary¹, which has 54 features and all of whom have been normalized in advance. Specifically speaking, 100 samples of Covtype.binary are chosen to construct the regression data matrix X , hence $X \in \mathbb{R}^{100 \times 55}$, where the last column of X is $\mathbf{1}_{100}$. Furthermore, X is divided into $[X_1, \dots, X_{27}]$, where $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{100 \times 2}$, $\forall i = 1, \dots, 26$, and $X_{27} \in \mathbb{R}^{100 \times 3}$. The regularization parameter ρ is set to 10^{-2} . We consider a network composing of 28 agents and employ the Erdos–Renyi model [36] with the connectivity probability 0.3 to generate the network topology. The mixing matrix W is then constructed by the Laplacian method.

¹<https://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvmtools/datasets/binary.html>

According to Theorems 1 and 2, NPGA-DIGing, NPGA-EXTRA, NPGA-DLM, NPGA-P2D2, NPGA-ATC tracking, and NPGA-2 can converge linearly when A has full row rank. Therefore, we run the above algorithms and IDEA to solve (47), and compare the convergence rates of them. In particular, for each algorithm, different combinations of the step-sizes are tried to acquire the fastest convergence speed. The result is shown in Fig. 1, where the optimality gap is defined by $\frac{\|x^k - x^*\|}{\|x^0 - x^*\|}$. It is easy to see that the convergence rates of different versions of NPGA have significant differences and all of whom have better performance than IDEA. Since two rounds of communication are needed at each iteration, NPGA-2 and NPGA-ATC tracking are less communication-efficient than NPGA-P2D2 and NPGA-EXTRA (which is essentially a special case of NPGA-P2D2), though they have the fastest convergence rates.

B. Experiment II

According to Theorem 3, some versions of NPGA (where $C = \mathbf{0}$), including NPGA-Aug-DGM, NPGA-NIDS, NPGA-Exact diffusion, and NPGA-1, can only guarantee linear convergence when A_i has full row rank. To evaluate their performance, we consider the following quadratic programming problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^2} & \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^\top Q_i x_i + c_i^\top x_i \\ \text{s.t.} & \sum_{i=1}^n A_i x_i = b, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where $n = 50$, $Q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ is positive definite, and $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ has full row rank, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Specifically, Q_i , c_i , A_i , and b are all generated randomly. The network topology and the mixing matrix are constructed by the same methods with Experiment I. The result is shown in Fig. 2. It is easy to see that NPGA-1 has the fastest convergence rate and NPGA-NIDS is the most communication-efficient one.

V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we study a class of distributed constraint-coupled optimization problems and design a novel nested primal-dual gradient algorithm—NPGA. The linear convergence of NPGA is proved under a quite weak condition, and the upper bounds of the step-sizes and the converge rate are explicitly given. NPGA is not only an algorithm, but also an algorithmic framework. By choosing different parameter matrices, we can obtain many different versions of NPGA, which offers us a chance to design more efficient algorithms. In numerical experiments, NPGA shows a faster convergence rate than existing algorithms.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Falsone, I. Notarnicola, G. Notarstefano, and M. Prandini, “Tracking-admm for distributed constraint-coupled optimization,” *Automatica*, vol. 117, p. 108962, 2020.
- [2] S. Sundhar Ram, A. Nedić, and V. V. Veeravalli, “A new class of distributed optimization algorithms: Application to regression of distributed data,” *Optimization Methods and Software*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 71–88, 2012.
- [3] T. Chang, M. Hong, and X. Wang, “Multi-agent distributed optimization via inexact consensus admm,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 482–497, 2014.
- [4] J. F. Mota, J. M. Xavier, P. M. Aguiar, and M. Puschel, “Distributed basis pursuit,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 1942–1956, 2011.
- [5] Z. Zhao, J. Guo, C. S. Lai, H. Xiao, K. Zhou, and L. L. Lai, “Distributed model predictive control strategy for islands multimicrogrids based on noncooperative game,” *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 3803–3814, 2020.
- [6] C. E. Luis, M. Vukosavljev, and A. P. Schoellig, “Online trajectory generation with distributed model predictive control for multi-robot motion planning,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 604–611, 2020.
- [7] P. Yi, Y. Hong, and F. Liu, “Initialization-free distributed algorithms for optimal resource allocation with feasibility constraints and application to economic dispatch of power systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 74, pp. 259–269, 2016.
- [8] Y. Zhu, W. Ren, W. Yu, and G. Wen, “Distributed resource allocation over directed graphs via continuous-time algorithms,” *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 1097–1106, 2019.
- [9] J. Zhang, K. You, and K. Cai, “Distributed dual gradient tracking for resource allocation in unbalanced networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 2186–2198, 2020.
- [10] S. S. Kia, “Distributed optimal in-network resource allocation algorithm design via a control theoretic approach,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 107, pp. 49–57, 2017.
- [11] A. Nedić, A. Olshevsky, and W. Shi, “Improved convergence rates for distributed resource allocation,” in *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 172–177, IEEE, 2018.
- [12] S. A. Alghunaim, K. Yuan, and A. H. Sayed, “A proximal diffusion strategy for multiagent optimization with sparse affine constraints,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 11, pp. 4554–4567, 2019.
- [13] J. Li and H. Su, “Implicit tracking-based distributed constraint-coupled optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.07627*, 2022.
- [14] Y. Nesterov, *Lectures on convex optimization*, vol. 137. Springer, 2018.
- [15] K. J. Arrow, L. Hurwicz, and H. Uzawa, *Studies in linear and nonlinear programming*. Stanford University Press, 1958.
- [16] D. Feijer and F. Paganini, “Stability of primal-dual gradient dynamics and applications to network optimization,” *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 12, pp. 1974–1981, 2010.
- [17] G. Qu and N. Li, “On the exponential stability of primal-dual gradient dynamics,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 43–48, 2018.
- [18] S. A. Alghunaim and A. H. Sayed, “Linear convergence of primal-dual gradient methods and their performance in distributed optimization,” *Automatica*, vol. 117, p. 109003, 2020.
- [19] S. A. Alghunaim, E. K. Ryu, K. Yuan, and A. H. Sayed, “Decentralized proximal gradient algorithms with linear convergence rates,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 2787–2794, 2020.
- [20] G. Qu and N. Li, “Harnessing smoothness to accelerate distributed optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1245–1260, 2017.
- [21] A. Nedić, A. Olshevsky, and W. Shi, “Achieving geometric convergence for distributed optimization over time-varying graphs,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 2597–2633, 2017.
- [22] W. Shi, Q. Ling, G. Wu, and W. Yin, “Extra: An exact first-order algorithm for decentralized consensus optimization,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 944–966, 2015.
- [23] Q. Ling, W. Shi, G. Wu, and A. Ribeiro, “Dlm: Decentralized linearized alternating direction method of multipliers,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 15, pp. 4051–4064, 2015.
- [24] S. A. Alghunaim, K. Yuan, and A. H. Sayed, “A linearly convergent proximal gradient algorithm for decentralized optimization,” in *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2848–2858, 2019.
- [25] J. Xu, S. Zhu, Y. C. Soh, and L. Xie, “Augmented distributed gradient methods for multi-agent optimization under uncoordinated constant stepsizes,” in *2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 2055–2060, IEEE, 2015.
- [26] A. Nedić, A. Olshevsky, W. Shi, and C. A. Uribe, “Geometrically convergent distributed optimization with uncoordinated step-sizes,” in *2017 American Control Conference*, pp. 3950–3955, IEEE, 2017.
- [27] P. Di Lorenzo and G. Scutari, “Next: In-network nonconvex optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 120–136, 2016.
- [28] G. Scutari and Y. Sun, “Distributed nonconvex constrained optimization over time-varying digraphs,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 176, no. 1, pp. 497–544, 2019.
- [29] K. Yuan, B. Ying, X. Zhao, and A. H. Sayed, “Exact diffusion for distributed optimization and learning-part i: Algorithm development,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 708–723, 2018.
- [30] Z. Li, W. Shi, and M. Yan, “A decentralized proximal-gradient method with network independent step-sizes and separated convergence rates,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 17, pp. 4494–4506, 2019.
- [31] A. H. Sayed, “Diffusion adaptation over networks,” in *Academic Press Library in Signal Processing*, vol. 3, pp. 323–453, Elsevier, 2014.
- [32] D. P. Bertsekas, *Nonlinear programming*. Athena Scientific, 1999.
- [33] O. Devolder, F. Glineur, and Y. Nesterov, “First-order methods of smooth convex optimization with inexact oracle,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 146, no. 1, pp. 37–75, 2014.
- [34] L. Xiao and S. Boyd, “Fast linear iterations for distributed averaging,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 65–78, 2004.
- [35] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2012.
- [36] P. Erdos and A. Rényi, “On the evolution of random graphs,” *Publications of the Mathematical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 17–60, 1960.