

# Statistical and Computational Complexities of BFGS Quasi-Newton Method for Generalized Linear Models

Qiujiang Jin<sup>\*</sup>   Tongzheng Ren<sup>†</sup>   Nhat Ho<sup>‡</sup>   Aryan Mokhtari<sup>§</sup>

## Abstract

The gradient descent (GD) method has been used widely to solve parameter estimation in generalized linear models (GLMs), a generalization of linear models when the link function can be non-linear. While GD has optimal statistical and computational complexities for estimating the true parameter under the high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) regime of the GLMs, it has sub-optimal complexities when the SNR is low, namely, the iterates of GD require polynomial number of iterations to reach the final statistical radius. The slow convergence of GD for the low SNR case is mainly due to the local convexity of the least-square loss functions of the GLMs. Even though Newton’s method can be used to resolve the flat curvature of the loss functions, its computational cost is prohibitive in high-dimensional settings due to its per iteration cost of  $\mathcal{O}(d^3)$ . To address the shortcomings of GD and Newton’s method, we propose to use Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno (BFGS) quasi-Newton method to solve parameter estimation of the GLMs, which has a per iteration cost of  $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ . On the optimization side, when the SNR is low, we demonstrate that iterates of BFGS converge linearly to the optimal solution of the population least-square loss function, and the contraction coefficient of the BFGS algorithm is comparable to that of Newton’s method. On the statistical side, we prove that the iterates of BFGS reach the final statistical radius of the low SNR GLMs after a logarithmic number of iterations, which is much lower than the polynomial number of iterations of GD. We also present numerical experiments that match our theoretical findings.

---

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, UT Austin. {qiujiang@austin.utexas.edu}.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Computer Science, UT Austin. {tongzheng@utexas.edu}.

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Statistics and Data Sciences, UT Austin. {minhnhat@utexas.edu}.

<sup>§</sup>Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, UT Austin. {mokhtari@austin.utexas.edu}.

# 1 Introduction

In supervised machine learning, we are given a set of  $n$  independent samples denoted by  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  with corresponding labels  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ , that are drawn from some unknown distribution and our goal is train a model that maps the feature vectors to their corresponding labels. We assume that the data is generated according to distribution  $\mathcal{P}_{\theta^*}$  which is parameterized by a ground truth parameter  $\theta^*$ . Our goal as the learner is to find  $\theta^*$  by solving the empirical risk minimization (ERM) problem defined as

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{L}_n(\theta) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta; (X_i, Y_i)), \quad (1)$$

where  $\ell(\theta; (X_i, Y_i))$  is the loss function that measures the error between the predicted output of  $X_i$  using parameter  $\theta$  and its true label  $Y_i$ . If we define  $\theta_n^*$  as an optimal solution of the above optimization problem, i.e.,  $\theta_n^* \in \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{L}_n(\theta)$ , it can be considered as an approximate of the ground-truth solution  $\theta^*$ , where  $\theta^*$  is also a minimizer of the population loss defined as

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{L}(\theta) := \mathbb{E} [\ell(\theta; (X, Y))]. \quad (2)$$

If one can solve the empirical risk efficiently, the output model could be close to  $\theta^*$ , when  $n$  is sufficiently large. There are several works on studying the complexity of iterative methods for solving ERM or directly the population loss, for the case that the objective function is convex or strongly convex with respect to  $\theta$  [Balakrishnan et al., 2017, Ho et al., 2020, Loh and Wainwright, 2015, Agarwal et al., 2012, Yuan and Zhang, 2013, Dwivedi et al., 2020b, Hardt et al., 2016, Candes et al., 2011]. However, when we move beyond linear models, the underlying loss becomes non-convex and therefore the behavior of iterative methods could substantially change and it is not even clear if they can reach a neighborhood of a global minimizer of the ERM problem.

The focus of this paper is on the generalized linear model (GLM) [Carroll et al., 1997, Netrapalli et al., 2015, Fienup, 1982, Shechtman et al., 2015] where the labels and features are generated according to a polynomial link function and we have  $Y_i = (X_i^\top \theta^*)^p + \zeta_i$ , where  $\zeta_i$  is an additive noise and  $p \geq 2$  is an integer. Due to nonlinear structure of the generative model, even if we select a convex loss function  $\ell$ , the ERM problem denoted to the considered GLM could be non-convex with respect to  $\theta$ . Interestingly, depending on the norm of  $\theta^*$ , the curvature of the ERM and its corresponding population risk minimization problem could change substantially. More precisely, if we are in the setting that  $\|\theta^*\|$  is sufficiently large, which we refer to this case as the high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), the underlying population loss of the problem of interest is locally strongly convex and smooth. On the other hand, when we are in the regime that  $\|\theta^*\|$  is close to zero, denoted by the low SNR regime, then the underlying problem is neither strongly convex nor smooth, and in fact, it is ill-conditioned.

These observations lead to the conclusion that in the high SNR setting, due to strong convexity and smoothness of the underlying problem, gradient descent (GD) reaches the final statistical radius exponentially fast and overall it only requires logarithmic number of iterations. However, in the low SNR case, as the problem becomes locally convex, GD converges at a sublinear rate to the final statistical radius and thus requires polynomial number of iterations in terms of the sample size. To resolve this issue, in [Ren et al., 2022] the authors recommended the use

of GD with Polyak step size to accelerate the convergence of GD in the low SNR setting, and they showed that the number of iterations becomes logarithmic function of the sample size. However, as this method is still a first-order method, its overall complexity scales linearly by the condition number of the problem which depends on the condition number of the feature vectors covariance as well as the norm  $\|\theta^*\|$ . Moreover, implementation of Polyak step size requires the knowledge of optimal objective function value. Even we can approximate the optimal value sufficiently well, the Polyak iterates still have instability during training due to the influence of noise in the models.

An alternative approach is using the update of Newton’s method to handle the ill-conditioning issue in the low SNR case as well as eliminating the need to estimate the optimal function value. As we show in this paper, this idea indeed addresses the issue of poor curvature of the problem and leads to an exponentially fast rate with contraction factor  $\frac{2p-2}{2p-1}$ , when the sample size is infinite. Moreover, in the high SNR setting, Newton’s method converges at a quadratic rate as the problem is strongly convex and smooth. Alas, these improvements come at the expense of increasing the computational complexity of each iteration to  $\mathcal{O}(d^3)$  which is indeed more than the per iteration computational cost of GD that is  $\mathcal{O}(d)$ . These points lead to the following question: *Can we find a method that performs well in both high and low SNR settings at a reasonable per iteration computational cost?*

**Contributions.** In this paper, we show that the answer to the above question is positive and the BFGS method is capable of achieving these goals. BFGS is a quasi-Newton method that approximates objective function curvature using gradient information and its per iteration cost is  $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ . It is well-known that it enjoys from a superlinear convergence rate that is independent of condition number in strongly convex and smooth settings, and hence, in high SNR setting it performs well. In this paper, we also show that in the low-SNR settings it improves the iteration complexity of GD. Next, we formally summarize our contributions.

- **Infinite sample, low SNR:** For the infinite sample case where we are minimizing the population loss, when we are in the low SNR case, the iterates of BFGS converge to the ground truth  $\theta^*$  at an exponentially fast rate that is independent all problem parameters except the power of link function  $p$ . We further show that the linear convergence contraction coefficient of BFGS is comparable to that of Newton’s method. This convergence result of BFGS is also of general interest as it provides the first global linear convergence of BFGS without line-search for a setting that is not strictly or strongly convex.
- **Finite sample, low SNR:** Under the low SNR regime of the generalized linear model where we solve the ERM problem and we have finite sample, we demonstrate that the BFGS iterates converge to the final statistical radius  $\mathcal{O}(1/n^{1/(2p)})$  within the true parameter after a logarithmic number of iterations  $\mathcal{O}(\log(n))$ . It is substantially lower than the required number of iterations for fixed-step size GD, which is  $\mathcal{O}(n^{(p-1)/p})$ , to reach the similar statistical radius. Furthermore, while the iteration complexity of the BFGS is comparable to the logarithmic number of iterations of the Polyak step size GD, the BFGS removes the dependency of the convergence of the iterates on the condition number of the problem as well as the need to estimate the optimal function value.
- **Experiments:** We conduct numerical experiments on both infinite and finite sample loss objective function to compare the performance of GD (with constant stepsize and Polyak

stepsize), Newton’s method, and BFGS. These empirical results are consistent with our theoretical findings and show the advantages of BFGS in the low SNR regime.

**Outline.** In Section 2, we first briefly recap the BFGS quasi-Newton method that we study in this paper. Then, in Section 3, we introduce the generalized linear model and discuss low SNR and high SNR settings. In Section 4, we present the linear convergence rate of BFGS method and Newton’s method applied to the population loss of the generalized linear model defined in (6). In Section 5, we extend the BGS quasi-Newton method to the empirical loss function of the generalized linear model. In Section 6, we conduct some numerical experiments to empirically verify our theoretical results. Finally, in Section 7, we close the paper with some concluding remarks.

## 2 BFGS algorithm

In this section, we briefly review the basics of the BFGS quasi-Newton method, which is the main algorithm we analyze in this paper. Consider the case that we aim to minimize a differentiable convex function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with optimal solution  $\hat{\theta}$ . The iterative method is defined as

$$\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k - \eta_k H_k \nabla f(\theta_k), \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (3)$$

where  $H_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is the matrix and  $\eta_k$  is the step size. If we set  $H_k$  as the identity matrix  $I$ , we recover the gradient descent whose computational cost per iteration is  $\mathcal{O}(d)$ . If we set  $H_k$  as  $\nabla^2 f(\theta_k)^{-1}$ , we obtain the update of Newton’s method with  $\mathcal{O}(d^3)$  computational cost per iteration. Quasi-Newton methods serve as a middle ground between first-order and the second-order methods. The main idea of quasi-Newton methods is to come up with a Hessian inverse approximation matrix  $H_k$  that is close to the exact Hessian inverse  $\nabla^2 f(\theta_k)^{-1}$  using only first-order information. There are several approaches for approximating  $H_k$  leading to different quasi-Newton methods, [Conn et al., 1991, Broyden, 1965, Broyden et al., 1973, Gay, 1979, Davidon, 1959, Fletcher and Powell, 1963, Broyden, 1970, Fletcher, 1970, Goldfarb, 1970, Shanno, 1970, Nocedal, 1980, Liu and Nocedal, 1989], but in this paper, we focus on the celebrated BFGS method, in which  $H_k$  is updated as

$$H_k = \left( I - \frac{s_{k-1} u_{k-1}^\top}{s_{k-1}^\top u_{k-1}} \right) H_{k-1} \left( I - \frac{u_{k-1} s_{k-1}^\top}{s_{k-1}^\top u_{k-1}} \right) + \frac{s_{k-1} s_{k-1}^\top}{s_{k-1}^\top u_{k-1}}, \quad \forall k \geq 1, \quad (4)$$

where the variable variation  $s_{k-1}$  and gradient displacement  $u_{k-1}$  are defined as

$$s_{k-1} := \theta_k - \theta_{k-1}, \quad u_{k-1} := \nabla f(\theta_k) - \nabla f(\theta_{k-1}), \quad \forall k \geq 1, \quad (5)$$

respectively. The main logic behind the update in (4) is to ensure that the Hessian inverse approximation matrix  $H_k$  satisfies the secant condition  $H_k u_{k-1} = s_{k-1}$ . We can observe that the update in (4) only requires the matrix-vector multiplication. Therefore, the computational cost per iteration of BFGS method is  $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ , where  $d$  is the dimension.

The main advantage of BFGS is its fast superlinear convergence rate under the assumption of strict convexity, i.e.,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\theta_k - \hat{\theta}\| / \|\theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta}\| = 0$ . For the past few decades, all the

superlinear convergence results of quasi-Newton method are asymptotic. Most recently, non-asymptotic superlinear convergence rates of quasi-Newton method have been established in the works of [Rodomanov and Nesterov, 2021a,b,c, Jin and Mokhtari, 2020, Jin et al., 2022, Ye et al., 2021, Lin et al., 2021a,b]. For instance, in [Jin and Mokhtari, 2020] the authors established a local superlinear convergence rate of  $(1/\sqrt{k})^k$  for BFGS. However, all these superlinear convergence analyses require the objective function to be smooth and strictly or strongly convex. In this paper, as mentioned later, we will face settings in which the Hessian at the optimal solution could be singular, and, hence the above convergence guarantees do not hold and hence we need to establish new convergence guarantees for BFGS.

### 3 Generalized linear model with polynomial link function

In this section, we formally present the generalized linear model (GLM) setting that we consider in our paper, and discuss the low and high SNR settings and optimization challenges corresponding to these cases. Consider the case that the feature vectors are denoted by  $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and their corresponding labels are denoted by  $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ . Suppose that we have access to  $n$  sample points  $(Y_1, X_1), (Y_2, X_2), \dots, (Y_n, X_n)$  that are i.i.d. samples from the following generalized linear model with polynomial link function of power  $p$ , i.e.,

$$Y_i = (X_i^\top \theta^*)^p + \zeta_i, \quad (6)$$

where  $\theta^*$  is a true but unknown parameter,  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  is a given power, and  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n$  are independent noises with zero mean and variance  $\sigma^2$ . Note that, the Gaussian assumption on the noise is for the simplicity of the discussion and similar results hold for the sub-Gaussian i.i.d. noise case. Furthermore, we assume that the feature vectors are such that  $X \in \mathbb{R}^d \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$  where  $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is a symmetric positive definite matrix.

Note that in the above setting, when  $p = 1$ , the model in (6) is the standard linear regression model, while when  $p = 2$ , it corresponds to the phase retrieval model [Fienup, 1982]. In this paper, we focus on the settings that  $p \geq 2$  and  $p$  is an integer. It can be easily verified that the ERM problem corresponding to the above model for  $p \geq 2$  with quadratic loss  $\ell$  is a non-convex function with respect to  $\theta$  and finding a global minimizer of that could be a challenging task. On the other hand, it is locally strongly convex when we are in the high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) case. In the low (SNR) setting, however, the problem becomes convex and the strong convexity condition does not hold.

To showcase this issue, let us focus first on the population loss, which is the limit of the ERM when the sample size goes to infinity. Note that the population loss in the considered generalized linear model (6) with a quadratic loss function  $\ell$  is given by:

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{L}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \left[ \left( Y - (X^\top \theta)^p \right)^2 \right], \quad (7)$$

which based on the assumptions on the generalized linear model setting and the distribution of the noise can be simplified as

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{L}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \left( (X^\top \theta^*)^p - (X^\top \theta)^p \right)^2 \right] + \sigma^2. \quad (8)$$

Indeed, the ground truth parameter  $\theta^*$  is an optimal solution of the above. Next, we discuss the structure of the objective function in (8) for low and high SNR settings.

**High signal-to-noise regime.** In the setting that the ground truth parameter has a relative large norm, i.e.,  $\|\theta^*\|/\sigma \geq C$  for some universal constant  $C > 0$ , the population loss function in (8) is locally strongly convex and smooth around  $\theta^*$ . More precisely, when  $\|\theta - \theta^*\|$  is small, we have

$$(X^\top \theta^*)^p - (X^\top \theta)^p = p(X^\top \theta^*)^{p-1} X^\top (\theta - \theta^*) + o(\|\theta - \theta^*\|).$$

Hence, in a neighborhood of the optimal solution, the objective in (8) can be approximated as

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = p^2(\theta - \theta^*)^\top \mathbb{E}_X \left[ X(X^\top \theta^*)^{2p-2} X^\top \right] (\theta - \theta^*) + \sigma^2 + o(\|\theta - \theta^*\|^2).$$

Indeed, if  $\|\theta^*\| \geq C$  the above objective function behaves as a quadratic function that is smooth and strongly convex, assuming that  $o(\|\theta - \theta^*\|^2)$  is negligible.

Since the population loss in the high SNR case is almost a strongly convex smooth quadratic function, the iterates of gradient descent (GD) converge to the solution at a linear rate and hence it requires  $\kappa \log(1/\epsilon)$  to reach an  $\epsilon$ -accurate solution, where  $\kappa$  depends on the conditioning of the covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  and the norm of  $\theta^*$ . In this case, BFGS converges superlinearly to the optimal solution and the rate would be independent of  $\kappa$ , however the cost per iteration would be  $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ . Moreover, in this case Newton's method converges at a quadratic rate, but its per iterations cost is  $\mathcal{O}(d^3)$ .

**Low signal-to-noise regime.** As mentioned above, in the high SNR case, GD has a fast linear rate. However, in the low SNR case where  $\|\theta^*\|$  is small and close to zero, the strong convexity parameter approaches zero and the problem becomes ill-conditioned. In this case, we deal with a function that is only convex and its gradient is not Lipschitz continuous. To better elaborate on this point, let us focus on the case that  $\theta^* = 0$ . Considering the underlying distribution of  $X$ , for such a low SNR case, the population loss can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_X \left[ (X^\top \theta)^{2p} \right] + \sigma^2 = (2p-1)!! \|\Sigma^{1/2} \theta\|^{2p} + \sigma^2. \quad (9)$$

Since we focus on  $p \geq 2$  it can be verified that this objective function is neither strongly convex nor smooth, even in a neighborhood of the solution  $\theta^* = 0$ . For this class of functions, it is well-known that GD with constant step size would converge at a sublinear rate, and hence GD iterates require polynomial number of iterations to reach the final statistical radius. In the next section, we study the behavior of BFGS for solving the low SNR setting and showcase its advantage compared to GD.

## 4 Convergence analysis for the low signal-to-noise ratio case

In this section, we focus on the convergence properties of the BFGS method for solving the population loss in the case of low signal-to-noise introduced in (9). This analysis provides an intuition for the analysis of the finite sample case that we discuss in Section 5, as we expect these two loss functions to be close to each other when the number of samples  $n$  is sufficiently large. Note that the loss function in (9) can be considered as a special case of the following convex optimization problem:

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\theta) = \|A\theta - b\|^q, \quad (10)$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$  is a matrix,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is a given vector, and  $q$  is the integer satisfying that  $q \geq 4$ . We should note that for  $q \geq 4$ , the considered objective is not strictly convex because the Hessian matrix is singular when  $A\theta = b$ . Indeed, if we set  $m = d$  and further let  $A$  to be  $\Sigma^{1/2}$  and choose  $b = A\theta^* = 0$ , then we recover the problem in (9) for  $q = 2p$ . Instead of solving (9), we focus on the convergence analysis of BFGS quasi-Newton method for solving the convex function in (10), as it is a more general function and our results are of general interest from an optimization point of view. To the best of our knowledge, there is no global convergence theory (without line-search) for the BFGS method when the function is not strictly convex, and our analysis provides the first result for such general setting. First, we present two assumptions of the objective function (10).

**Assumption 1.** We assume that there exists  $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , such that  $b = A\hat{\theta}$ . This is equivalent to that vector  $b$  is in the range space of matrix  $A$ .

This assumption implies that the problem is realizable,  $\hat{\theta}$  is an optimal solution, and the optimal function value is zero. Note that the above assumption is indeed satisfied in our considered setting low SNR case in (9) as we assume  $\theta^* = 0$  which implies  $b = 0$ .

**Assumption 2.** The matrix  $A^\top A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is invertible. This is equivalent to that matrix  $A^\top A$  is symmetric positive definite, i.e.  $A^\top A \succ 0$ .

The above assumption is also easily satisfied for our considered setting as we assume that the covariance matrix for our input features is positive definite. Combining Assumption 1 and 2, we conclude that  $\hat{\theta}$  is the unique optimal solution of the problem (10). Next, we formally state the convergence rate of BFGS for solving problem 10 under the disclosed assumptions.

**Theorem 1.** Consider the update of BFGS in (3), (4) and (5). Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied, and the initial point  $\theta_0$  is an arbitrary vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and the initial Hessian inverse approximation matrix is selected as  $H_0 = \nabla^2 f(\theta_0)^{-1}$ . If the step size of BFGS is selected as  $\eta_k = 1$  for all  $k \geq 0$ , then the iterates of BFGS converge to the optimal solution  $\hat{\theta}$  at a linear rate of

$$\|\theta_k - \hat{\theta}\| \leq r_{k-1} \|\theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta}\|, \quad \forall k \geq 1, \quad (11)$$

where the contraction factors  $r_k \in [0, 1)$  satisfy the following conditions

$$r_0 = \frac{q-2}{q-1}, \quad r_k = \frac{1 - r_{k-1}^{q-2}}{1 - r_{k-1}^{q-1}}, \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (12)$$

*Proof.* The proof is available in Appendix A.1. □

The above theorem shows that the iterates of BFGS converge globally at a linear rate to the optimal solution of (10). This result is of interest as it illustrates the iterates generated by BFGS converge globally without any line search scheme and the stepsize is fixed as  $\eta_k = 1$  for any  $k \geq 0$ . Moreover, the initial point  $\theta_0$  could be any vector and there is no restriction on the distance between  $\theta_0$  and optimal solution  $\hat{\theta}$ . Most analyses of quasi-Newton methods require the initial point  $\theta_0$  to be in a local neighborhood of  $\hat{\theta}$  to guarantee the linear or superlinear convergence rate, without line-search.




Figure 1: Convergence of factors  $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  to  $r_*$ .

Note that the cost of computing the initial Hessian inverse approximation matrix  $H_0 = \nabla^2 f(\theta_0)^{-1}$  is  $\mathcal{O}(d^3)$ , but this is only required for the first iteration and it is not required for  $k \geq 1$  as for those iterates we update the Hessian inverse approximation matrix  $H_k$  based on the BFGS update in (4) at a computational cost of  $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ . In fact, for the first iterate even an approximation of  $H_0 = \nabla^2 f(\theta_0)^{-1}$ , which could possibly require a cost less than  $\mathcal{O}(d^3)$ , is sufficient.

Note that the result in Theorem 1 does not specify the exact complexity of BFGS for solving problem(10), as the contraction factors  $r_k$  are not explicitly given. In the following theorem, we show that for  $q \geq 4$ , the linear rate contraction factors  $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  also converge linearly to a fixed point contraction factor  $r_*$  determined by the parameter  $q$ .

**Theorem 2.** Consider the linear convergence factors  $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  defined in (12) from Theorem 1. If  $q \geq 4$ , then the sequence  $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  converges to  $r_* \in (0, 1)$  that is determined by the equation

$$r_*^{q-1} + r_*^{q-2} = 1, \quad (13)$$

and the rate of convergence is linear with a contract factor that is at most  $1/2$ , i.e.,

$$|r_k - r_*| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k |r_0 - r_*|, \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (14)$$

*Proof.* The proof is available in Appendix A.2. □

We plot the convergence of factors  $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  to the fixed point  $r_*$  in Figure 1 for  $q = 4$  and  $q = 100$ . We observe from (a) and (b) of Figure 1 that  $r_k$  is very close to  $r_*$  after only 5 iterations. Therefore, the linear convergence rate of the BFGS method is approximately  $r_*$  after only a few iterations. We also observe from (c) and (d) of Figure 1 that the factors  $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  converge to the fixed point  $r_*$  with a linear rate upper bounded by  $1/2$ . Note that  $r_*$  is simply the solution of (13). These plots verify our results in Theorem 2.

Theorem 2 presented that eventually, the iterations generated by BFGS converge to the optimal solution at the linear rate  $r_*$  determined by (13). More specifically, the factors  $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  converge to the fixed point  $r_*$  with the linear rate  $1/2$ . Therefore, the linear convergence factors  $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  and the fixed point  $r_*$  are totally determined by the parameter  $q$ . They are all independent of the dimension  $d$  and the condition number  $\kappa_A$  of the matrix  $A$ . Hence, the performance of the BFGS method is not influenced by high-dimensional or ill-conditioned problems. This



is indeed different from the common convergence theories of most optimization algorithms, whose performance is deteriorated heavily under the circumstance of high dimension or ill conditioning. We should add that this result is independently important from the optimization point of view as it provides the first global linear convergence of BFGS without line-search for a setting that is not strictly or strongly convex.

#### 4.1 Comparison with Newton's method

Next, we compare the convergence results of BFGS for solving problem (10) with the one for Newton's method. The following theorem characterizes the global linear convergence of Newton's method with unit step size applied to the objective function in (10).

**Theorem 3.** *Consider applying Newton's method to optimization problem (10) and suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Moreover, suppose the step size is  $\eta_k = 1$  for any  $k \geq 0$ . Then, the iterates of Newton's method converge to the optimal solution  $\hat{\theta}$  at a linear rate of*

$$\|\theta_k - \hat{\theta}\| = \frac{q-2}{q-1} \|\theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta}\|, \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (15)$$

Moreover, this linear convergence rate  $\frac{q-2}{q-1}$  is smaller than the fixed point  $r_*$  defined in (13) of the BFGS quasi-Newton method, i.e.,  $\frac{q-2}{q-1} < r_*$  for all  $q \geq 4$ .

*Proof.* The proof is available in Appendix A.3. □

The convergence results of Newton's method are also global without any backtracking line search method, and the linear rate  $\frac{q-2}{q-1}$  is independent of dimension  $d$  and condition number  $\kappa_A$ . Furthermore, the condition  $\frac{q-2}{q-1} < r_*$  implies that iterations of Newton's method converge faster than the BFGS method, but the gap is not substantial as we illustrate in our numerical results. On the other hand, as we mentioned before, the computational cost per iteration of Newton's method is  $\mathcal{O}(d^3)$  which is much worse than the  $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$  of BFGS.

Moving back to our main problem, one important implication of the above convergence results is that in the low signal-to-noise ratio setting the iterates of BFGS converge linearly to the optimal solution of the population least-square loss function, while the contraction coefficient of BFGS is comparable to that of Newton's method which is  $(2p-2)/(2p-1)$ . For example, for  $p = 2, 3, 5, 10$ , the linear rate contraction factor of Newton's method are 0.667, 0.8, 0.889, 0.947 and the approximate linear rate contraction factor of BFGS denoted by  $r_*$  are 0.755, 0.857, 0.922, 0.963, respectively. We use this intuition to establish a similar result for the finite sample case in the following section.

## 5 Statistical rate of BFGS for solving the sample least-square loss

Thus far, we have demonstrated that the BFGS iterates converge linearly to the true parameter  $\theta^*$  for solving the population least-square loss function  $\mathcal{L}$  of the generalized linear models in equation (9). It provides important insight into the behaviors of the BFGS iterates when the

sample size  $n$  is infinite. In this section, we would like to study the statistical behaviors of the BFGS iterates for solving the least-square loss function  $\mathcal{L}_n$ , which is given by:

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{L}_n(\theta) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - (X_i^\top \theta)^p)^2. \quad (16)$$

To simplify the proof argument and gain the insight into the statistical behaviors of the BFGS iterates, we specifically consider the univariate setting, namely,  $d = 1$ . We would like to remark that these statistical behaviors of BFGS iterates still hold in multivariate settings, namely,  $d \geq 2$  (See our experiments in Figure 3). When  $d = 1$ , the BFGS iterates for solving the sample loss function take the following form:

$$\theta_{k+1}^n = \theta_k^n - \eta_k \frac{\theta_k^n - \theta_{k-1}^n}{\nabla \mathcal{L}_n(\theta_k^n) - \nabla \mathcal{L}_n(\theta_{k-1}^n)} \nabla \mathcal{L}_n(\theta_k^n). \quad (17)$$

Throughout this section, we consider the step size  $\eta_k = 1$  in the updates (17) of BFGS. We show that the BFGS iterates (17)  $\{\theta_k^n\}_{k \geq 0}$  converge to the final statistical radius after a logarithmic number of iterations under the low SNR regimes of the generalized linear models.

**Theorem 4.** *Given the low SNR regime of the generalized linear model (6) namely,  $\theta^* = 0$ , when  $d = 1$  and the initialization is  $\theta_n^0 \in \mathbb{B}(\theta^*, \rho)$  for some  $\rho > 0$ , there exist universal constants  $C_1, C_2, C_3$  such that  $n \geq C_1 \log^{2p}(n/\delta)$ , and  $k \geq C_2 \log(n/\log(1/\delta))$ , we have*

$$\min_{1 \leq t \leq k} |\theta_t^n - \theta^*| \leq C_3 \left( \frac{\log^{2p}(n/\delta)}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \quad (18)$$

*Proof.* The proof is available in Appendix A.4. □

A few comments with the results of Theorem 4 are in order.

**Comparing to GD, GD with Polyak step size, and Newton's method:** The result of Theorem 4 indicates that under the low SNR regime, namely, when  $\theta^* = 0$ , the BFGS iterates reach the final statistical radius  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/(2p)})$  within the true parameter  $\theta^*$  after  $\mathcal{O}(\log(n))$  number of iterations. This complexity indeed is better than the polynomial number of iterations of GD, which is at the order of  $\mathcal{O}(n^{(p-1)/p})$  (Corollary 3 in [Ho et al., 2020]). It is also comparable to the logarithmic number of iterations of GD with Polyak step size which requires  $\mathcal{O}(\kappa \log(n))$  iterations (Corollary 1 in [Ren et al., 2022]), where  $\kappa$  is the condition number of the covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ , and the  $\mathcal{O}(\log(n))$  of Newton's method (Corollary 3 in [Ho et al., 2020]) to reach the similar statistical radius.

Note that while the iteration complexity of BFGS is comparable to that of GD with Polyak step size in terms of the sample size, the BFGS overcomes the need to approximate the optimal value of the sample least-square loss  $\mathcal{L}_n$ , which can be unstable in practice, and also removes the dependency on the condition number that appears in the complexity bound of GD with Polyak step size. Finally, though the BFGS algorithm and the Newton's method have similar computational complexity in terms of  $n$ , BFGS has lower per iteration cost in comparison to Newton's method.

**On the minimum number of iterations:** The results of BFGS in Theorem 4 involve the minimum number of iterations, namely, these results only hold for some  $1 \leq t \leq k$ . It suggests




Figure 2: Convergence rates of Newton’s method, BFGS, GD with constant step size and GD with Polyak step size for different  $d$  and  $q$ . In plot (a),  $m = 100$  and  $\eta = 10^{-4}$ . In plot (b),  $m = 100$  and  $\eta = 10^{-8}$ . In plot (c),  $m = 2000$  and  $\eta = 10^{-12}$ . In plot (d),  $m = 2000$  and  $\eta = 10^{-15}$ .

that the BFGS iterates may diverge after they reach the final statistical radius under each regime of the generalized linear models. As highlighted in [Ho et al., 2020], such instability behavior of BFGS is inherent to fast and unstable methods. While it may sound limited, the minimum number of iterations can be overcome via an early stopping scheme using the cross-validation approaches. We illustrate such early stopping of the BFGS iterates for the low SNR regime in Figure 3.

**Generalization of the results to multivariate settings:** While the results of Theorem 4 are only established for the univariate setting, we remark that it is mainly for the simplicity of the proof argument and of the BFGS iterates. In the experiments of Figures 3, we run BFGS for the case that dimension is  $d = 4$  and observe that both the statistical radius and the iteration complexities of BFGS are still consistent with those in Theorem 4. We leave a theoretical verification of these results in multivariate settings for the future work.

## 6 Numerical experiments

### 6.1 Numerical experiment for the population loss function

In this section, we compare the performance of Newton’s method, BFGS, GD with constant step size, and GD with Polyak step size applied to (10) which corresponds to the population loss. We choose different values of parameter  $m$ , dimension  $d$  and the exponential parameter  $q$  in (10). We generate a random matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$  and a random vector  $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and compute the vector  $b = A\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . The initial point  $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is also generated randomly. The GD constant step size  $\eta$  is tuned by hand to achieve the best performance of GD on each problem. We present the logarithmic scale of  $\|\theta_k - \hat{\theta}\|$  versus the number of iteration  $k$  for different algorithms. All the values of different parameters  $m, d, q$  and  $\eta$  as well as the numerical results of our experiments are shown in Figure 2.

We observe that GD with constant step size converges very slowly since it can only reach a sub-linear convergence rate. The performance of GD with Polyak step size is also poor when dimension is large or the parameter  $q$  is huge. This is due to the fact that as dimension increases the problem becomes more ill-conditioned and hence the linear convergence contraction factor approaches




Figure 3: Illustration of different methods with high SNR regime in (a) and low SNR regime in (b). Illustration of the statistical radius of BFGS with high SNR regime in (c) and low SNR regime in (d).

1. We observe that both Newton’s method and the BFGS method generate iterations with linear convergence rates, and their linear convergence rates are only affected by the parameter  $q$ . The dimension  $d$  has no impact over the performance of BFGS and Newton’s method. Although the convergence speed of Newton’s method is faster than the BFGS method, their gap is not significantly large. We should add that these empirical results are consistent with the theoretical results we obtained in Section 4.

## 6.2 Numerical experiment for the empirical loss function

We now move to illustrate the statistical and computational complexities of BFGS for parameter estimation of the generalized linear model. In our experiments, we specifically consider the dimension to be  $d = 4$  and the power of the link function to be  $p = 2$ , namely, we consider the multivariate setting of the phase retrieval problem. The data is generated by first sampling the inputs according to  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_4^2))$  where  $\sigma_k = (0.5)^k$ , and then generating their labels based on  $Y_i = (X_i^\top \theta^*)^2 + \zeta_i$  where  $\{\zeta_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are i.i.d. samples from  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . In the low SNR regime, we set  $\theta^* = 0$ , and in the high SNR regime we select  $\theta^*$  uniformly at random from the unit sphere. Furthermore, for the GD, we choose the step size to be  $\eta = 0.1$ , while for Newton’s method and BFGS, we select the unit stepsize  $\eta = 1$ .

In (a) and (b) of Figure 3, we consider the sample size  $n = 10^4$  and run GD, GD with Polyak step size, BFGS, and Newton’s method to find the optimal solution of the sample least-square loss  $\mathcal{L}_n$ . Furthermore, for both Newton’s method and the BFGS algorithm, due to their instability, we also perform cross-validation to choose their early stopping. In particular, we split the data into training and the test sets. The training set consists of 90% of the data while the test set has 10% of the data. The yellow points in (a) and (b) of Figure 3 show the iterates of BFGS and Newton, respectively, with the minimum validation loss. As we observe, under the low SNR regime, the iterates of GD with Polyak step size, BFGS and Newton’s method converge geometrically fast to the final statistical radius while those of the GD converge slowly to that radius. Under the high SNR regime, the iterates of all of these methods converge geometrically fast to the final statistical radius. The faster convergence of GD with Polyak step size over GD is due to the optimality of step size of, while the faster convergence of BFGS and Newton’s method over GD is due to their independence on the problem condition number.

Finally, in (c) and (d) of Figure 3, we run the BFGS when the sample size is from  $10^2$  to  $10^4$

to empirically verify the statistical radius of these methods. As indicated in the plots of that figure, under the high SNR regime, the BFGS has statistical radius  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$ , while under the low SNR regime, its statistical radius becomes  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/4})$ . These empirical results are consistent with the theoretical results of the BFGS in Theorem 4.

## 7 Conclusions

In this paper, we analyzed the convergence rates of BFGS on both population and empirical loss functions of the generalized linear model in the low SNR regime. We showed that in this case, BFGS outperforms GD and performs very similar to Newton’s method in terms of iteration complexity, while it requires a lower per iteration computational complexity compared to Newton’s method. We also conducted numerical experiments for both infinite and finite sample loss functions, and we showed that our empirical results are consistent with our theoretical findings. Perhaps one limitation of the BFGS method is that its computational cost is still not linear in the dimension and scales as  $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ . Therefore, one future research direction is to analyze some other iterative methods such as the limited memory-BFGS (L-BFGS) algorithm which may be able to achieve a fast linear convergence rate in the low SNR setting, while its computational cost per iteration is  $\mathcal{O}(d)$ .

## Acknowledgements

This research of Q. Jin and A. Mokhtari is supported in part by NSF Grants 2007668, 2019844, and 2112471, ARO Grant W911NF2110226, the Machine Learning Lab (MLL) at UT Austin, and the Wireless Networking and Communications Group (WNCG) Industrial Affiliates Program. NH gratefully acknowledges support from NSF IFML 2019844 award and research gifts by UT Austin ML grant.

## References

- A. Agarwal, S. Negahban, and M. J. Wainwright. Fast global convergence of gradient methods for high-dimensional statistical recovery. *Annals of Statistics*, 40(5):2452–2482, 2012.
- S. Balakrishnan, M. J. Wainwright, and B. Yu. Statistical guarantees for the EM algorithm: From population to sample-based analysis. *Annals of Statistics*, 45:77–120, 2017.
- C. G. Broyden. A class of methods for solving nonlinear simultaneous equations. *Mathematics of computation*, 19(92):577–593, 1965.
- C. G. Broyden. The convergence of single-rank quasi-Newton methods. *Mathematics of Computation*, 24(110):365–382, 1970.
- C. G. Broyden, J. E. D. Jr., Broyden, and J. J. More. On the local and superlinear convergence of quasi-Newton methods. *IMA J. Appl. Math*, 12(3):223–245, June 1973.

- E. J. Candes, Y. Eldar, T. Strohmer, and V. Voroninski. Phase retrieval via matrix completion, 2011.
- R. J. Carroll, J. Fan, I. Gijbels, and M. P. Wand. Generalized partially linear single-index models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 92:477–489, 1997.
- A. R. Conn, N. I. M. Gould, and P. L. Toint. Convergence of quasi-Newton matrices generated by the symmetric rank one update. *Mathematical programming*, 50(1-3):177–195, 1991.
- W. Davidon. Variable metric method for minimization. Technical report, Argonne National Lab., Lemont, Ill., 1959.
- R. Dwivedi, N. Ho, K. Khamaru, M. J. Wainwright, M. I. Jordan, and B. Yu. Sharp analysis of expectation-maximization for weakly identifiable models. *AISTATS*, 2020a.
- R. Dwivedi, N. Ho, K. Khamaru, M. J. Wainwright, M. I. Jordan, and B. Yu. Singularity, misspecification, and the convergence rate of EM. *Annals of Statistics*, 44:2726–2755, 2020b.
- J. R. Fienup. Phase retrieval algorithms: a comparison. *Appl. Opt.*, 21(15):2758–2769, Aug 1982. doi: 10.1364/AO.21.002758. URL <http://www.osapublishing.org/ao/abstract.cfm?URI=ao-21-15-2758>.
- R. Fletcher. A new approach to variable metric algorithms. *The computer journal*, 13(3):317–322, 1970.
- R. Fletcher and M. J. Powell. A rapidly convergent descent method for minimization. *The computer journal*, 6(2):163–168, 1963.
- D. M. Gay. Some convergence properties of Broyden’s method. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 16(4):623–630, 1979.
- K. Goebel and W. A. Kirk. *Topics in Metric Fixed Point Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- D. Goldfarb. A family of variable-metric methods derived by variational means. *Mathematics of computation*, 24(109):23–26, 1970.
- M. Hardt, B. Recht, and Y. Singer. Train faster, generalize better: Stability of stochastic gradient descent. In M. F. Balcan and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 48 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1225–1234, New York, New York, USA, 20–22 Jun 2016. PMLR. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v48/hardt16.html>.
- N. Ho, K. Khamaru, R. Dwivedi, M. J. Wainwright, M. I. Jordan, and B. Yu. Instability, computational efficiency and statistical accuracy. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv: 2005.11411*, 2020.
- Q. Jin and A. Mokhtari. Non-asymptotic superlinear convergence of standard quasi-newton methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.13607*, 2020.
- Q. Jin, A. Koppel, K. Rajawat, and A. Mokhtari. Sharpened quasi-newton methods: Faster superlinear rate and larger local convergence neighborhood. *The 39th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2022)*, 2022.

- D. Lin, H. Ye, and Z. Zhang. Explicit superlinear convergence of broyden’s method in nonlinear equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01974*, 2021a.
- D. Lin, H. Ye, and Z. Zhang. Greedy and random quasi-newton methods with faster explicit superlinear convergence. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34*, 2021b.
- D. C. Liu and J. Nocedal. On the limited memory BFGS method for large scale optimization. *Mathematical programming*, 45(1-3):503–528, 1989.
- P.-L. Loh and M. J. Wainwright. Regularized M-estimators with nonconvexity: Statistical and algorithmic theory for local optima. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16:559–616, 2015.
- W. Mou, N. Ho, M. J. Wainwright, P. Bartlett, and M. I. Jordan. A diffusion process perspective on posterior contraction rates for parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.00966*, 2019.
- P. Netrapalli, P. Jain, and S. Sanghavi. Phase retrieval using alternating minimization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 63(18):4814–4826, 2015. doi: 10.1109/TSP.2015.2448516.
- J. Nocedal. Updating quasi-Newton matrices with limited storage. *Mathematics of computation*, 35(151):773–782, 1980.
- T. Ren, F. Cui, A. Atsidakou, S. Sanghavi, and N. Ho. Towards statistical and computational complexities of Polyak step size gradient descent. *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics Conference*, 2022.
- A. Rodomanov and Y. Nesterov. Greedy quasi-newton methods with explicit superlinear convergence. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(1):785–811, 2021a.
- A. Rodomanov and Y. Nesterov. Rates of superlinear convergence for classical quasi-newton methods. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–32, 2021b.
- A. Rodomanov and Y. Nesterov. New results on superlinear convergence of classical quasi-newton methods. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 188(3):744–769, 2021c.
- D. F. Shanno. Conditioning of quasi-Newton methods for function minimization. *Mathematics of computation*, 24(111):647–656, 1970.
- Y. Shechtman, Y. C. Eldar, O. Cohen, H. N. Chapman, J. Miao, and M. Segev. Phase retrieval with application to optical imaging: A contemporary overview. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 32(3):87–109, 2015. doi: 10.1109/MSP.2014.2352673.
- H. Ye, D. Lin, Z. Zhang, and X. Chang. Explicit superlinear convergence rates of the sr1 algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.07162*, 2021.
- X.-T. Yuan and T. Zhang. Truncated power method for sparse eigenvalue problems. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(Apr):899–925, 2013.

## A Appendix

**Lemma 1.** Consider the objective function in (10) satisfying Assumption 1 and 2. Then, the inverse matrix of its Hessian  $\nabla^2 f(\theta)$  can be expressed as

$$\nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-1} = \frac{(A^\top A)^{-1}}{q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}} - \frac{(q-2)(\theta - \hat{\theta})(\theta - \hat{\theta})^\top}{q(q-1)\|A\theta - b\|^q}. \quad (19)$$

*Proof.* Notice that the Hessian of objective function (10) can be expressed as

$$\nabla^2 f(\theta) = q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}A^\top A + q(q-2)\|A\theta - b\|^{q-4}A^\top(A\theta - b)(A\theta - b)^\top A. \quad (20)$$

We use the Sherman–Morrison formula. Suppose that  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is an invertible matrix and  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are two vectors satisfying that  $1 + b^\top X^{-1}a \neq 0$ . Then, the matrix  $X + ab^\top$  is invertible and

$$(X + ab^\top)^{-1} = X^{-1} - \frac{X^{-1}ab^\top X^{-1}}{1 + b^\top X^{-1}a}. \quad (21)$$

Applying the Sherman–Morrison formula with  $X = q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}A^\top A$ ,  $a = q(q-2)\|A\theta - b\|^{q-4}A^\top(A\theta - b)$  and  $b = A^\top(A\theta - b)$ . Notice that  $A^\top A$  is invertible, hence  $X$  is invertible and

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 + b^\top X^{-1}a \\ &= 1 + (A\theta - b)^\top A \frac{(A^\top A)^{-1}}{q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}} q(q-2)\|A\theta - b\|^{q-4}A^\top(A\theta - b) \\ &= 1 + (q-2)(A\theta - b)^\top A \frac{(A^\top A)^{-1}A^\top A(\theta - \hat{\theta})}{\|A\theta - b\|^2} \\ &= 1 + (q-2) \frac{(A\theta - b)^\top(A\theta - b)}{\|A\theta - b\|^2} \\ &= q-1 \neq 0. \quad (\text{Since } q \geq 4.) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-1} \\ &= \frac{(A^\top A)^{-1}}{q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}} - \frac{\frac{(A^\top A)^{-1}}{q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}} q(q-2)\|A\theta - b\|^{q-4}A^\top(A\theta - b)(A^\top(A\theta - b))^\top \frac{(A^\top A)^{-1}}{q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}}}{q-1} \\ &= \frac{(A^\top A)^{-1}}{q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}} - \frac{(q-2)}{q(q-1)\|A\theta - b\|^q} (A^\top A)^{-1}AA^\top(\theta - \hat{\theta})(\theta - \hat{\theta})^\top AA^\top(A^\top A)^{-1} \\ &= \frac{(A^\top A)^{-1}}{q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}} - \frac{(q-2)(\theta - \hat{\theta})(\theta - \hat{\theta})^\top}{q(q-1)\|A\theta - b\|^q}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

As a consequence, we obtain the conclusion of the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 2. Banach's Fixed-Point Theorem.** Consider the differentiable function  $f : D \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow D \subset \mathbb{R}$ . Suppose that there exists  $C \in (0, 1)$  such that  $|f'(x)| \leq C$  for any  $x \in D$ . Now let  $x_0 \in D$  be arbitrary and define the sequence  $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$  as

$$x_{k+1} = f(x_k), \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (24)$$



Then, the sequence  $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  converges to the unique fixed point  $x_*$  defined as

$$x_* = f(x_*), \quad (25)$$

with linear convergence rate of

$$|x_k - x_*| \leq C^k |x_0 - x_*|, \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (26)$$

*Proof.* Check [Goebel and Kirk, 1990].  $\square$

### A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

We use induction to prove the convergence results in (11) and (12). Note that  $b = A\hat{\theta}$  by Assumption 1 and the gradient and Hessian of the objective function in (10) are explicitly given by

$$\nabla f(\theta) = q \|A\theta - b\|^{q-2} A^\top (A\theta - b) = q \|A\theta - b\|^{q-2} A^\top A(\theta - \hat{\theta}), \quad (27)$$

$$\nabla^2 f(\theta) = q \|A\theta - b\|^{q-2} A^\top A + q(q-2) \|A\theta - b\|^{q-4} A^\top (A\theta - b)(A\theta - b)^\top A. \quad (28)$$

Applying Lemma 1, we can obtain that

$$\nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-1} = \frac{(A^\top A)^{-1}}{q \|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}} - \frac{(q-2)(\theta - \hat{\theta})(\theta - \hat{\theta})^\top}{q(q-1) \|A\theta - b\|^q}. \quad (29)$$

First, we consider the initial iteration

$$\theta_1 = \theta_0 - H_0 \nabla f(\theta_0) = \theta_0 - \nabla f(\theta_0)^{-1} \nabla f(\theta_0), \quad (30)$$

$$\theta_1 - \hat{\theta} = \theta_0 - \hat{\theta} - \nabla f(\theta_0)^{-1} \nabla f(\theta_0). \quad (31)$$

Notice that  $b = A\hat{\theta}$  by Assumption 1 and

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla f(\theta_0)^{-1} \nabla f(\theta_0) \\ &= \left[ \frac{(A^\top A)^{-1}}{q \|A\theta_0 - b\|^{q-2}} - \frac{(q-2)(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta})(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta})^\top}{q(q-1) \|A\theta_0 - b\|^q} \right] q \|A\theta_0 - b\|^{q-2} A^\top A(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}) \\ &= \theta_0 - \hat{\theta} - \frac{q-2}{q-1} \frac{(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta})^\top A^\top A(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta})}{\|A\theta_0 - b\|^2} (\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}) \\ &= \theta_0 - \hat{\theta} - \frac{q-2}{q-1} \frac{(A\theta_0 - b)^\top (A\theta_0 - b)}{\|A\theta_0 - b\|^2} (\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}) \\ &= \theta_0 - \hat{\theta} - \frac{q-2}{q-1} (\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\theta_1 - \hat{\theta} = \theta_0 - \hat{\theta} - \nabla f(\theta_0)^{-1} \nabla f(\theta_0) = \frac{q-2}{q-1} (\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}). \quad (33)$$

Condition (11) holds for  $k = 1$  with  $r_0 = \frac{q-2}{q-1}$ . Now we assume that condition (11) holds for  $k = t$  where  $t \geq 1$ , i.e.,

$$\theta_t - \hat{\theta} = r_{t-1}(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta}). \quad (34)$$

Considering the condition  $b = A\hat{\theta}$  in Assumption 1 and the condition in (34), we further have

$$A\theta_t - b = A(\theta_t - \hat{\theta}) = r_{t-1}A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta}) = r_{t-1}(A\theta_{t-1} - b), \quad (35)$$

which implies that

$$\nabla f(\theta_t) = qr_{t-1}^{q-1} \|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^{q-2} A^\top A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta}). \quad (36)$$

We further show that the variable displacement and gradient difference can be written as

$$s_{t-1} = \theta_t - \theta_{t-1} = \theta_t - \hat{\theta} - \theta_{t-1} + \hat{\theta} = (r_{t-1} - 1)(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta}), \quad (37)$$

and

$$u_{t-1} = \nabla f(\theta_t) - \nabla f(\theta_{t-1}) = q(r_{t-1}^{q-1} - 1) \|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^{q-2} A^\top A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta}). \quad (38)$$

Considering these expressions, we can show that the rank-1 matrix in the update of BFGS  $u_{t-1}s_{t-1}^\top$  is given by

$$u_{t-1}s_{t-1}^\top = q(r_{t-1}^{q-1} - 1)(r_{t-1} - 1) \|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^{q-2} A^\top A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})^\top, \quad (39)$$

and the inner product  $s_{t-1}^\top u_{t-1}$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} s_{t-1}^\top u_{t-1} &= q(r_{t-1}^{q-1} - 1)(r_{t-1} - 1) \|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^{q-2} (\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})^\top A^\top A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta}) \\ &= q(r_{t-1}^{q-1} - 1)(r_{t-1} - 1) \|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^q. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

These two expressions allow us to simplify the matrix  $I - \frac{u_{t-1}s_{t-1}^\top}{s_{t-1}^\top u_{t-1}}$  in the update of BFGS as

$$I - \frac{u_{t-1}s_{t-1}^\top}{s_{t-1}^\top u_{t-1}} = I - \frac{A^\top A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})^\top}{\|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^2}. \quad (41)$$

An important property of the above matrix is that its null space is the set of the vectors that are parallel to  $u_{t-1}$ . Considering the expression for  $u_{t-1}$ , any vector that is parallel to  $A^\top A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})$  is in the null space of the above matrix. We can easily observe that the gradient defined in (36) satisfies this condition and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( I - \frac{u_{t-1}s_{t-1}^\top}{s_{t-1}^\top u_{t-1}} \right) \nabla f(\theta_t) \\ &= qr_{t-1}^{q-1} \|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^{q-2} \left( I - \frac{A^\top A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})^\top}{\|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^2} \right) A^\top A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta}) \\ &= qr_{t-1}^{q-1} \|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^{q-2} \left( A^\top A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta}) - \frac{A^\top A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta}) \|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^2}{\|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^2} \right) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

This important observation shows that if the condition in (34) holds, then the BFGS descent direction  $H_t \nabla f(\theta_t)$  can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned}
& H_t \nabla f(\theta_t) \\
&= \left( I - \frac{s_{t-1} u_{t-1}^\top}{s_{t-1}^\top u_{t-1}} \right) H_{t-1} \left( I - \frac{u_{t-1} s_{t-1}^\top}{s_{t-1}^\top u_{t-1}} \right) \nabla f(\theta_t) + \frac{s_{t-1} s_{t-1}^\top}{s_{t-1}^\top u_{t-1}} \nabla f(\theta_t) \\
&= \frac{s_{t-1} s_{t-1}^\top}{s_{t-1}^\top u_{t-1}} \nabla f(\theta_t) \\
&= \frac{(r_{t-1} - 1)^2 (\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})^\top}{q(r_{t-1}^{q-1} - 1)(r_{t-1} - 1) \|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^q} q r_{t-1}^{q-1} \|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^{q-2} A^\top A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta}) \quad (43) \\
&= \frac{1 - r_{t-1}}{1 - r_{t-1}^{q-1}} r_{t-1}^{q-1} (\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta}) \frac{\|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^{q-2} (\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})^\top A^\top A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})}{\|A(\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta})\|^q} \\
&= \frac{1 - r_{t-1}}{1 - r_{t-1}^{q-1}} r_{t-1}^{q-1} (\theta_{t-1} - \hat{\theta}).
\end{aligned}$$

This simplification implies that for the new iterate  $\theta_{t+1}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_{t+1} - \hat{\theta} &= \theta_t - H_t \nabla f(\theta_t) - \hat{\theta} = \theta_t - \hat{\theta} - \frac{1 - r_{t-1}}{1 - r_{t-1}^{q-1}} r_{t-1}^{q-1} \frac{(\theta_t - \hat{\theta})}{r_{t-1}} \\
&= \frac{1 - r_{t-1}^{q-2}}{1 - r_{t-1}^{q-1}} (\theta_t - \hat{\theta}) = r_t (\theta_t - \hat{\theta}), \quad (44)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$r_t = \frac{1 - r_{t-1}^{q-2}}{1 - r_{t-1}^{q-1}}. \quad (45)$$

Therefore, we prove that condition (11) holds for  $k = t + 1$ . By induction, we prove the linear convergence results in (11) and (12).

One property of this convergence results is that the error vectors  $\{\theta_k - \hat{\theta}\}_{k=0}^\infty$  are parallel to each other with the same direction as shown in (11). This indicates that the iterations  $\{\theta_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$  converge to the optimal solution  $\hat{\theta}$  along the same straight line defined by  $\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}$ . Only the length of each vector  $\theta_k - \hat{\theta}$  reduces to zero with the linear convergence rates  $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$  specified in (12) and the direction remains all the same.

## A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Recall that for  $q \geq 4$ , we have

$$r_0 = \frac{q-2}{q-1}, \quad r_k = \frac{1 - r_{k-1}^{q-2}}{1 - r_{k-1}^{q-1}}, \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (46)$$

Define the function  $g(r)$  as

$$g(r) := \frac{1 - r^{q-2}}{1 - r^{q-1}}, \quad r \in [0, 1]. \quad (47)$$

Suppose that  $r_* \in (0, 1)$  satisfying that  $r_* = g(r_*)$ , which is equivalent to

$$r_*^{q-1} + r_*^{q-2} = 1. \quad (48)$$

Notice that

$$g'(r) = \frac{(q-1)r^{q-2} - r^{2q-4} - (q-2)r^{q-3}}{(1-r^{q-1})^2}, \quad (49)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & (q-1)r^{q-2} - r^{2q-4} - (q-2)r^{q-3} \\ &= r^{q-3}[(q-1)(r-1) - (r^{q-1} - 1)] \\ &= r^{q-3}(r-1)\left(q-1 - \frac{r^{q-1} - 1}{r-1}\right) \\ &= r^{q-3}(r-1)\left(q-1 - \sum_{i=0}^{q-2} r^i\right). \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Since  $r \in [0, 1]$ , we have that

$$r^{q-3} \geq 0, \quad r-1 \leq 0, \quad \sum_{i=0}^{q-2} r^i \leq \sum_{i=0}^{q-2} 1 = q-1. \quad (51)$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$(q-1)r^{q-2} - r^{2q-4} - (q-2)r^{q-3} \leq 0, \quad (52)$$

and

$$|g'(r)| = \frac{r^{2q-4} + (q-2)r^{q-3} - (q-1)r^{q-2}}{(1-r^{q-1})^2}. \quad (53)$$

Our target is to prove that for any  $r \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$|g'(r)| \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (54)$$

First, we present the plots of  $|g'(r)|$  for  $r \in [0, 1]$  with  $4 \leq q \leq 11$  in Figure 4. We observe that for  $4 \leq q \leq 11$ ,  $|g'(r)| \leq 1/2$  always holds.

Next, we prove that for  $q \geq 12$  and any  $r \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$|g'(r)| = \frac{(q-1)r^{q-2} - r^{2q-4} - (q-2)r^{q-3}}{(1-r^{q-1})^2} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (55)$$

which is equivalent to

$$r^{2q-2} - 2r^{2q-4} - 2r^{q-1} + 2(q-1)r^{q-2} - 2(q-2)r^{q-3} + 1 \geq 0, \quad \forall r \in [0, 1]. \quad (56)$$

Define the function  $h(r)$  as

$$h(r) := r^{2q-2} - 2r^{2q-4} - 2r^{q-1} + 2(q-1)r^{q-2} - 2(q-2)r^{q-3} + 1. \quad (57)$$




Figure 4: Plots of  $|g'(r)|$  with  $r \in [0, 1]$  for  $4 \leq q \leq 11$ .

We obtain that

$$\frac{dh(r)}{dr} = 2r^{q-4}h^{(1)}(r), \quad (58)$$

where

$$h^{(1)}(r) := (q-1)r^{q+1} - 2(q-2)r^{q-1} - (q-1)r^2 + (q-1)(q-2)r - (q-2)(q-3). \quad (59)$$

Hence, we have that

$$\frac{dh^{(1)}(r)}{dr} = (q-1)h^{(2)}(r), \quad (60)$$

where

$$h^{(2)}(r) := (q+1)r^q - 2(q-2)r^{q-2} - 2r + q - 2. \quad (61)$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\frac{dh^{(2)}(r)}{dr} = h^{(3)}(r) := (q+1)qr^{q-1} - 2(q-2)^2r^{q-3} - 2, \quad (62)$$

and

$$\frac{dh^{(3)}(r)}{dr} = r^{q-4}h^{(4)}(r), \quad (63)$$

where

$$h^{(4)}(r) := q(q+1)(q-1)r^2 - 2(q-2)^2(q-3). \quad (64)$$

Now we define the function  $l(q)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} l(q) &:= 2(q-2)^2(q-3) - q(q+1)(q-1) \\ &= q^3 - 14q^2 + 33q - 24 \\ &= q^2(q-14) + 33(q-1) + 9. \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

We observe that for  $q \geq 14$ , we have  $l(q) > 0$  and we calculate that  $l(12) = 84 > 0$  and  $l(13) = 236 > 0$ . Hence, we obtain that  $l(q) > 0$  for all  $q \geq 12$ , which indicates that for all  $r \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$r^2 \leq 1 < \frac{2(q-2)^2(q-3)}{q(q+1)(q-1)}, \quad (66)$$

$$q(q+1)(q-1)r^2 - 2(q-2)^2(q-3) < 0. \quad (67)$$

Therefore, for all  $r \in [0, 1]$ ,  $h^{(4)}(r)$  defined in (64) satisfies that  $h^{(4)}(r) < 0$  and from (63) we know that  $\frac{dh^{(3)}(r)}{dr} < 0$ . Hence,  $h^{(3)}(r)$  defined in (62) is decreasing function and  $h^{(3)}(r) \leq h^{(3)}(0) = -2 < 0$ . We know that  $\frac{dh^{(2)}(r)}{dr} = h^{(3)}(r) < 0$ , which implies that  $h^{(2)}(r)$  defined in (61) is decreasing function. So we have that  $h^{(2)}(r) \geq h^{(2)}(1) = 1 > 0$ . From (60) we know that  $\frac{dh^{(1)}(r)}{dr} > 0$  and  $h^{(1)}(r)$  defined in (59) is increasing function for  $r \in [0, 1]$ . Hence, we get that  $h^{(1)}(r) \leq h^{(1)}(1) = 0$  and from (58) we obtain that  $h(r)$  defined in (57) is decreasing function for  $r \in [0, 1]$ . Therefore, we have that  $h(r) \geq h(1) = 0$  and condition (56) holds for all  $r \in [0, 1]$ , which is equivalent to  $|g'(r)| \leq 1/2$ .

In summary, we proved that for any  $q \geq 12$ , we have  $|g'(r)| \leq 1/2$ . Combining this with the results from Figure 4, we obtain that  $|g'(r)| \leq 1/2$  holds for all  $q \geq 4$ . Applying Banach's Fixed-Point Theorem from Lemma 2, we prove the final conclusion (14).

### A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Notice that the gradient and the Hessian of the objective function (10) can be expressed as

$$\nabla f(\theta) = q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}A^\top(A\theta - b) = q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}A^\top A(\theta - \hat{\theta}), \quad (68)$$

$$\nabla^2 f(\theta) = q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}A^\top A + q(q-2)\|A\theta - b\|^{q-4}A^\top(A\theta - b)(A\theta - b)^\top A. \quad (69)$$

Applying Lemma 1, we can obtain that

$$\nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-1} = \frac{(A^\top A)^{-1}}{q\|A\theta - b\|^{q-2}} - \frac{(q-2)(\theta - \hat{\theta})(\theta - \hat{\theta})^\top}{q(q-1)\|A\theta - b\|^q}. \quad (70)$$

Hence, we have that for any  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\theta_k = \theta_{k-1} - \nabla f(\theta_{k-1})^{-1} \nabla f(\theta_{k-1}), \quad (71)$$

$$\theta_k - \hat{\theta} = \theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta} - \nabla f(\theta_{k-1})^{-1} \nabla f(\theta_{k-1}). \quad (72)$$

Notice that  $b = A\hat{\theta}$  by Assumption 1 and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \nabla f(\theta_{k-1})^{-1} \nabla f(\theta_{k-1}) \\
&= \left[ \frac{(A^\top A)^{-1}}{q \|A\theta_{k-1} - b\|^{q-2}} - \frac{(q-2)(\theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta})(\theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta})^\top}{q(q-1) \|A\theta_{k-1} - b\|^q} \right] q \|A\theta - b\|^{q-2} A^\top A (\theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta}) \\
&= \theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta} - \frac{q-2}{q-1} \frac{(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta})^\top A^\top A (\theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta})}{\|A\theta_{k-1} - b\|^2} (\theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta}) \\
&= \theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta} - \frac{q-2}{q-1} \frac{(A\theta_{k-1} - b)^\top (A\theta_{k-1} - b)}{\|A\theta_{k-1} - b\|^2} (\theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta}) \\
&= \theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta} - \frac{q-2}{q-1} (\theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta}).
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Therefore, we prove the conclusion that for any  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\theta_k - \hat{\theta} = \theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta} - \nabla f(\theta_{k-1})^{-1} \nabla f(\theta_{k-1}) = \frac{q-2}{q-1} (\theta_{k-1} - \hat{\theta}). \tag{74}$$

We observe that the iterations generated by Newton's method also satisfy the parallel property, i.e., all vectors  $\{\theta_k - \hat{\theta}\}_{k=0}^\infty$  are parallel to each other with the same direction.

#### A.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Recall that, we utilize the BFGS for solving the least-square loss function  $\mathcal{L}_n$  in equation (16), which is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\theta) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( Y_i - (X_i^\top \theta)^p \right)^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i^2 - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i (X_i^\top \theta)^p + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i^\top \theta)^{2p}, \tag{75}$$

where  $(Y_1, X_1), (Y_2, X_2), \dots, (Y_n, X_n)$  that are i.i.d. samples from the following generalized linear model with polynomial link function of power  $p$ :

$$Y_i = (X_i^\top \theta^*)^p + \zeta_i,$$

where  $\zeta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ . In this proof, we focus on the low SNR regime of the generalized linear model, namely,  $\theta^* = 0$ .

**Optimal solution  $\theta_n^*$ :** For the case of  $d = 1$ , we study the optimal solution  $\theta_n^*$  of the least-square loss function  $\mathcal{L}_n$ . First of all, directly solving the gradient of the least-square loss function leads to either  $\theta_n^* = 0$  or the following form of  $\theta_n^*$ :

$$(\theta_n^*)^p = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i X_i^p}{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{2p}}. \tag{76}$$

To bound  $\theta_n^*$ , we only focus on bounding the later value of  $\theta_n^*$  in equation (76). Given the generative model of the data, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i X_i^p = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{2p} \right) (\theta^*)^p + \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_i X_i^p.$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$(\theta_n^*)^p = (\theta^*)^p + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_i X_i^p}{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{2p}}.$$

We then consider  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_i X_i^p$  and  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{2p}$  separately. For the term  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i X_i^p$ , note that, for any even integer  $q$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} [(\zeta X^p)^q] = \mathbb{E} [\zeta^q X^{pq}] \leq (\sigma^2 q)^{q/2} \cdot (pq)^{pq/2} \leq (\max\{\sigma^2, p\}q)^{(p+1)q/2}.$$

Invoking Lemma 2 in [Mou et al., 2019], we have that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_i X_i^p \right| \geq (4 \max\{\sigma^2, p\})^{(p+1)/2} \sqrt{\frac{\log 4/\delta}{n}} + \left( \max\{\sigma^2, p\} \log \frac{n}{\delta} \right)^{(p+1)/2} \frac{\log 4/\delta}{n} \right] \leq \delta.$$

For the term  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{2p}$ , applying Lemma 5 in [Dwivedi et al., 2020a], we have that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{2p} - (2p-1)!! \right| \geq \frac{C_p \log^p(n/\delta)}{\sqrt{n}} \right] \leq \delta,$$

where  $C_p$  is a universal constant depends only on  $p$ .

For the case  $\theta^* = 0$  which corresponds to the low signal-to-noise regime, with simple algebra, we know with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$|\theta_n^*| \leq \left( \frac{(4 \max\{\sigma^2, p\})^{(p+1)/2} \sqrt{\frac{\log 4/\delta}{n}} + (\max\{\sigma^2, p\} \log \frac{n}{\delta})^{(p+1)/2} \frac{\log 4/\delta}{n}}{(2p-1)!! - \frac{C_p \log^p(n/\delta)}{\sqrt{n}}} \right)^{1/p}.$$

In summary, it indicates that there exists universal constant  $C$  such that with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have  $|\theta_n^*| \leq C \left( \frac{\log^{2p}(n/\delta)}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}$ .

**Statistical analysis of the BFGS:** Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\theta_n^*$  takes the value in equation (76) (the proof when  $\theta_n^* = 0$  can be argued in the similar fashion). When we run the BFGS for solving the least-square loss function  $\mathcal{L}_n$ , its updates take the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{k+1}^n &= \theta_k^n - \frac{\theta_k^n - \theta_{k-1}^n}{\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_k^n) - \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_{k-1}^n)} \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_k^n) \\ &= \theta_k^n - \frac{(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{2p})(\theta_k^n)^{2p-1} - (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i X_i^p)(\theta_k^n)^{p-1}}{(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{2p})(\sum_{j=0}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j) - (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i X_i^p)(\sum_{j=0}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j)}. \end{aligned}$$

Given the formulation of  $\theta_n^*$  in equation (76), we can rewrite the update of  $\theta_{k+1}^n$  as follows:

$$\theta_{k+1}^n = \theta_k^n - \frac{(\theta_k^n)^{2p-1} - (\theta_k^n)^{p-1} (\theta_n^*)^p}{(\sum_{j=0}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j) - (\sum_{j=0}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j) (\theta_n^*)^p}. \quad (77)$$



Assume that  $|\theta_k^n| \geq 2|\theta_n^*|$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq T$  where  $T$  indicates the first iteration that the BFGS iterates reach the statistical radius. Without loss of generality, we assume that the initializations  $\theta_0^n$  and  $\theta_1^n$  of the BFGS satisfy  $\theta_0^n > \theta_1^n > 2|\theta_n^*|$ , namely, these initializations are positive and lie above the statistical radius (otherwise, the conclusion of the theorem trivially holds). Then, we will first demonstrate by induction that  $0 < \theta_k^n < \theta_{k-1}^n$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq T$ . Indeed, the induction hypothesis holds for any  $k \leq 1$  based on the conditions of the initializations; we now prove the hypothesis for  $k + 1$ . From equation (77), we have

$$\theta_{k+1}^n = \theta_k^n \left( 1 - \frac{A_n}{B_n} \right),$$

where we define

$$\begin{aligned} A_n &= (\theta_k^n)^{p-2} [(\theta_k^n)^p - (\theta_n^*)^p], \\ B_n &= \left( \sum_{j=0}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j \right) - \left( \sum_{j=0}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j \right) (\theta_n^*)^p. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, as  $\theta_k^n > 0$ , we can check that  $A_n > 0$ . Furthermore, direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} B_n &= \sum_{j=0}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j [(\theta_k^n)^p - (\theta_n^*)^p] + \sum_{j=p-1}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j \\ &\geq \sum_{j=0}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j (2^p - 1) |\theta_n^*|^p + \sum_{j=p-1}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by taking the difference between  $A_n$  and  $B_n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_n - A_n &= \sum_{j=1}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j [(\theta_k^n)^p - (\theta_n^*)^p] + \sum_{j=p-1}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j (2^p - 1) |\theta_n^*|^p + \sum_{j=p-1}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Putting these results together, it indicates that  $0 < A_n/B_n < 1$ ; therefore, we have  $0 < \theta_{k+1}^n < \theta_k^n$ , which implies that the induction hypothesis holds for  $k + 1$ . As a consequence, we have  $0 < \theta_k^n < \theta_{k-1}^n$  for all  $0 \leq k \leq T$ .

We now prove the following useful lower bound of  $\theta_{k+1}^n$  in terms of  $\theta_k^n$  when  $1 \leq k \leq T - 1$ :

$$\theta_{k+1}^n \geq \frac{p}{p+1} \theta_k^n. \quad (78)$$

Indeed, the inequality (78) is equivalent to show that

$$B_n - A_n \geq \frac{p}{p+1} B_n.$$

In light of the previous calculations, this inequality is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j [(\theta_k^n)^p - (\theta_n^*)^p] + \sum_{j=p-1}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j \\ &\geq \frac{p}{p+1} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j [(\theta_k^n)^p - (\theta_n^*)^p] + \sum_{j=p-1}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j [(\theta_k^n)^p - (\theta_n^*)^p] + \sum_{j=p-1}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j \geq p(\theta_k^n)^{p-2} [(\theta_k^n)^p - (\theta_n^*)^p]. \quad (79)$$

It is clear that the RHS of equation (79) is less than or equal to  $p(\theta_k^n)^{2p-2}$  while the RHS of equation (79) is at least  $\sum_{j=p-1}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j$ , which is greater than or equal to  $p(\theta_k^n)^{2p-2}$ . Therefore, we obtain the conclusion of the bound (79) and equivalently the bound (78).

Now, we would like to demonstrate the linear convergence rate of the BFGS iterates  $\{\theta_k^n\}$  to the optimal solution  $\theta_n^*$ :

$$|\theta_{k+1}^n - \theta_n^*| \leq \left( 1 - \frac{\left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right)^{2p-2}}{2p^2 - p} \right) |\theta_k^n - \theta_n^*|, \quad (80)$$

for all  $2 \leq k \leq T-1$ . As  $\theta_k^n > C|\theta_n^*|$  for all  $2 \leq k \leq T$ , the result in equation (80) is equivalent to

$$(\theta_{k+1}^n - \theta_n^*) \leq \left( 1 - \frac{\left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right)^{2p-2}}{2p^2 - p} \right) (\theta_k^n - \theta_n^*), \quad (81)$$

for all  $2 \leq k \leq T-1$ . From direct computation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{k+1}^n - \theta_n^* &= (\theta_k^n - \theta_n^*) \\ &\cdot \left( 1 - \frac{(\theta_k^n)^{p-1} (\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} (\theta_k^n)^{p-1-j} (\theta_n^*)^j)}{(\sum_{j=0}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j) - (\sum_{j=0}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j) (\theta_n^*)^p} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As  $0 < C|\theta_n^*| < \theta_k^n < \theta_{k-1}^n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( \sum_{j=0}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j \right) - \left( \sum_{j=0}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j \right) (\theta_n^*)^p \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j [(\theta_k^n)^p - (\theta_n^*)^p] + \sum_{j=p-1}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j \left[ (\theta_k^n - \theta_n^*) \left( \sum_{l=0}^{p-1} (\theta_k^n)^l (\theta_n^*)^{p-1-l} \right) \right] + \sum_{j=p-1}^{2p-2} (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2-j} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^j \\ &\leq p(p-1)(\theta_{k-1}^n)^{2p-3} (\theta_k^n - \theta_n^*) + p(\theta_{k-1}^n)^{2p-2} \\ &\leq (2p^2 - p)(\theta_{k-1}^n)^{2p-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, when  $2 \leq k \leq T$  we have that

$$(\theta_k^n)^{p-1} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} (\theta_k^n)^{p-1-j} (\theta_n^*)^j \right) \geq (\theta_k^n)^{2p-2} \geq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p+1} \right)^{2p-2} (\theta_{k-1}^n)^{2p-2}.$$

Putting the above results together, as long as  $2 \leq k \leq T - 1$  we find that

$$(\theta_{k+1}^n - \theta_n^*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right)^{2p-2}}{2p^2 - p}\right) (\theta_k^n - \theta_n^*),$$

which shows the linear convergence of the BFGS iterates to the optimal solution.

By repeating the inequalities (81), we obtain that

$$|\theta_T^n - \theta_n^*| \leq \left(1 - \frac{\left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right)^{2p-2}}{2p^2 - p}\right)^{T-1} |\theta_1^n - \theta_n^*|.$$

As long as we choose  $\left(1 - \frac{\left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right)^{2p-2}}{2p^2 - p}\right)^{T-1} |\theta_1^n - \theta_n^*| = |\theta_n^*|$ , which is equivalently to  $T = 1 + \frac{\log(|\theta_n^*|/|\theta_1^n - \theta_n^*|)}{\log\left(1 - \frac{\left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right)^{2p-2}}{2p^2 - p}\right)}$ , then we obtain  $|\theta_T^n - \theta_n^*| \leq |\theta_n^*|$ . A direct application of the triangle inequality, we have

$$|\theta_T^n - \theta^*| \leq |\theta_T^n - \theta_n^*| + |\theta_n^*| \leq 2|\theta_n^*| \leq 2C \left(\frac{\log^{2p}(n/\delta)}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2p}}$$

with probability  $1 - \delta$ . As a consequence, we obtain the conclusion of the theorem.

## A.5 Additional Experiment Results




Figure 5: Illustration of the statistical radius of BFGS with error bar. **Left:** Low SNR regime. **Right:** High SNR regime.

We additionally report the statistical radius with error bar, by sampling 40 different dataset with the same generative model and report the median, the 25% percentile and 75% percentile. For low SNR regime, BFGS still reach the statistical radius within  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/4})$ , while for high SNR regime, BFGS reach the statistical radius within  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$ .