

# Zeroth-Order Alternating Gradient Descent Ascent Algorithms for a Class of Nonconvex-Nonconcave Minimax Problems

Zi Xu · Zi-Qi Wang · Jun-Lin Wang · Yu-Hong Dai

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** In this paper, we consider a class of nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems, i.e., NC-PL minimax problems, whose objective functions satisfy the Polyak-Lojasiewicz (PL) condition with respect to the inner variable. We propose a zeroth-order alternating gradient descent ascent (ZO-AGDA) algorithm and a zeroth-order variance reduced alternating gradient descent ascent (ZO-VRAGDA) algorithm for solving NC-PL minimax problem under the deterministic and the stochastic setting, respectively. The number of iterations to obtain an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of ZO-AGDA and ZO-VRAGDA algorithm for solving NC-PL minimax problem is upper bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$ , respectively. To the best of our knowledge, they are the first two zeroth-order algorithms with the iteration complexity guarantee for solving NC-PL minimax problems.

---

This work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under the grants 12071279, 12021001, 11991021 and by General Project of Shanghai Natural Science Foundation (No. 20ZR1420600).

---

Zi Xu  
Department of Mathematics, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, People's Republic of China  
E-mail: xuzi@shu.edu.cn

Zi-Qi Wang  
Department of Mathematics, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, People's Republic of China  
E-mail: colwzq@shu.edu.cn

Jun-Lin Wang  
Department of Mathematics, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, People's Republic of China  
E-mail: wjl37@shu.edu.cn

Yu-Hong Dai  
LSEC, ICMSEC, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China;  
Corresponding author. E-mail: dyh@lsec.cc.ac.cn

## 1 Introduction

Consider nonconvex minimax problems under both the deterministic setting, i.e.,

$$\min_x \max_y f(x, y), \quad (1.1)$$

and the stochastic setting with the objective function being an expectation function, i.e.,

$$\min_x \max_y g(x, y) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim \mathcal{P}} G(x, y; \xi), \quad (1.2)$$

where  $f(x, y), G(x, y; \xi) : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are smooth functions, possibly nonconvex in variable  $x$  and nonconcave in variable  $y$ ,  $\xi$  is a random variable following an unknown distribution  $\mathcal{P}$ , and  $\mathbb{E}$  denotes the expectation function.

Recently, many applications such as adversarial attacks on deep neural networks (DNNs), reinforcement learning, robust training, hyperparameters tuning and bandit convex optimization in machine learning or deep learning fields [6, 14, 45] are nonconvex minimax optimization problems in which only the objective function but not the gradient information is available. In this paper, we consider the same setting that the gradient of the function in the problems (1.1) and (1.2) cannot be obtained directly, and the corresponding algorithm is called zeroth-order algorithm.

There are some existing works that focus on zeroth-order algorithms for solving minimax optimization problems under the nonconvex-strongly concave setting. For example, for solving (1.1) (resp. (1.2)), Wang et al. [50] proposed two single-loop algorithms, i.e., ZO-GDA and ZO-GDMSA (resp. ZO-SGDA and ZO-SGDMSA), and the total number of calls of the zeroth-order oracle to obtain an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point is bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^5(d_1 + d_2)\epsilon^{-2})$  (resp.  $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^5(d_1 + d_2)\epsilon^{-4})$ ) and  $\mathcal{O}(\kappa(d_1 + \kappa d_2 \log(\epsilon^{-1}))\epsilon^{-2})$  (resp.  $\mathcal{O}(\kappa(d_1 + \kappa d_2 \log(\epsilon^{-1}))\epsilon^{-4})$ ) respectively, where  $\kappa$  is the condition number. For solving (1.2), Liu et al. [29] proposed an alternating projected stochastic gradient descent-ascent method called ZO-Min-Max which can find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point with the total complexity of  $\mathcal{O}((d_1 + d_2)\epsilon^{-6})$ . There are some multi-loop algorithms combined with variance-reduced or momentum techniques are also proposed to solve (1.2). For example, Xu et al. [51] proposed a variance reduced gradient descent ascent (ZO-VRGDA) algorithm, which achieves the total complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3(d_1 + d_2)\epsilon^{-3})$ , and Huang et al. [18] proposed an accelerated momentum-based descent ascent (Acc-ZOMDA) method with the total complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3(d_1 + d_2)^{3/2}\epsilon^{-3})$ .

Under nonconvex-concave setting, the only zeroth-order algorithm that we know is the ZO-AGP algorithm proposed by Xu et al. [52] and its iteration complexity is bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$  with the number of function value estimation per iteration being bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(d_1\epsilon^{-4} + d_2\epsilon^{-6})$ .

## 1.1 Related Works

We give a brief review on first-order algorithms for solving minimax optimization problems. For solving convex-concave minimax optimization problems, there are many existing works. For instance, Nemirovski [33] proposed a mirror-prox algorithm and Nesterov [34] proposed a dual extrapolation algorithm to solve smooth convex-concave minimax problems. An extra-gradient algorithm and an optimistic gradient descent ascent algorithm to solve bilinear and strongly convex-strongly concave minimax optimization problems were proposed in [32], and both of them own the iteration complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\kappa \log(1/\varepsilon))$ . Lin et al. [26] proposed a near optimal algorithm for solving convex-concave minimax optimization problems, which achieves a iteration complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ . For nonconvex-strongly concave minimax problems, Luo et al. [31] proposed a stochastic recursive gradient descent ascent (SREDA) algorithm, and the gradient complexity of which is  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^3 \varepsilon^{-3})$ . For general nonconvex-concave minimax problem, many nested-loop algorithms have been proposed in [42, 38, 46, 24, 39, 54]. To the best of our knowledge, Lin et al. [26] proposed an accelerated algorithms called MINIMAX-PPA, which has the best iteration complexity of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-2.5})$  till now. Several single-loop methods were also proposed to solve the problem. GDA-type algorithms [5, 17, 7, 8, 16, 25, 27, 30, 40, 44], which run a gradient descent step on  $x$  and a gradient ascent step on  $y$  simultaneously at each iteration. Xu et al. [53] proposed a unified single-loop alternating gradient projection (AGP) algorithm for solving nonconvex-(strongly) concave and (strongly) convex-nonconcave minimax problems, which can find an  $\varepsilon$ -stationary point with the gradient complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-4})$ .

Now we give a brief introduction about variance reduced algorithms for minimax optimization. The variance reduced technique was first proposed for solving general minimization optimization problem, and many classical algorithms including SAGA, SVRG, SARAH, SPIDER and SpiderBoost all employ variance reduced technique [9, 43, 20, 2, 1, 35, 36, 37, 12, 49]. For nonconvex-strongly concave minimax optimization, several variance reduction methods have been proposed for solving minimax optimization, such as PGSVRG [42], the SAGA-type algorithm [48], and SREDA [31]. However, to the best of our knowledge, there are no zeroth-order algorithms utilizing variance reduction techniques for solving general nonconvex-concave minimax optimization problems.

In this paper, we consider a class of nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems, i.e., the nonconvex-PL (NC-PL) minimax problems, for which we assume  $f(x, y)$  in (1.1) and (1.2) satisfies the Polyak-Lojasiewicz (PL) condition with respect to  $y$ , which is the same as in [38, 54, 55]. This condition was originally introduced by [41] and is proved to be weaker than strong convexity in [22]. The PL condition has also drawn much attention in machine learning and deep learning problems [13, 4, 11, 28]. For NC-PL minimax problems, we propose a zeroth-order alternating gradient descent ascent (ZO-AGDA) algorithm and a zeroth-order variance reduced alternating gradient descent ascent (ZO-VRAGDA) algorithm for solving (1.1) and (1.2) with the total complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-3})$  respectively. To the best of our knowledge, they are

the first two zeroth-order algorithms with the complexity guarantee for solving NC-PL minimax problems under both the deterministic and the stochastic setting.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Notations

Throughout the paper, we use the following notations.  $\langle x, y \rangle$  denotes the inner product of two vectors of  $x$  and  $y$ .  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the Euclidean norm. We use  $\mathbb{R}^{d_1}$  to denote the space of  $d_1$  dimension real valued vectors.  $\mathbb{E}_u(\cdot)$  means the expectation over the random vector  $u$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{(u,\xi)}(\cdot)$  means the joint expectation over the random vector  $u$  and the random variable  $\xi$ , and  $\mathbb{E}_{(U,\mathcal{B})}$  denotes the joint expectation over the set  $U$  of random vectors and the set  $\mathcal{B}$  of random variables  $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_b\}$ . Denote  $\Phi(x) = \max_y f(x, y)$ ,  $\Phi^* = \min_x \Phi(x)$  and  $\Psi(x) = \max_y g(x, y)$ ,  $\Psi^* = \min_x \Psi(x)$ .

### 2.2 Zeroth-order gradient estimator

For solving problems (1.1) and (1.2), since the gradient information is not available directly, we first introduce the idea of uniform smoothing gradient estimator (UniGE). Specifically, for (1.1), the UniGE of  $\nabla_x f(x, y)$  and  $\nabla_y f(x, y)$  are respectively defined as

$$\hat{\nabla}_x f(x, y) = \frac{f(x + \mu_1 u, y) - f(x, y)}{\mu_1/d_1} u, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\hat{\nabla}_y f(x, y) = \frac{f(x, y + \mu_2 v) - f(x, y)}{\mu_2/d_2} v, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  are two smoothing parameters,  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$  are random vectors that are generated from the uniform distribution over  $d_1$ -dimensional and  $d_2$ -dimensional unit sphere respectively. For convenience, for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ , we denote

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\mu_1}(x, y) &= \mathbb{E}_u f(x + \mu_1 u, y), \\ f_{\mu_2}(x, y) &= \mathbb{E}_v f(x, y + \mu_2 v). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\mathbb{E}_u(\hat{\nabla}_x f(x, y)) = \nabla_x f_{\mu_1}(x, y)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_v(\hat{\nabla}_y f(x, y)) = \nabla_y f_{\mu_2}(x, y)$  by Lemma 5 in [21].

Similarly, for (1.2), given  $\mathcal{B} = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r\}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{B}} = \{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_r\}$  drawn i.i.d. from an unknown distribution  $\mathcal{P}$ , we respectively define the UniGE of  $\nabla_x G(x, y, \xi)$  and  $\nabla_y G(x, y, \zeta)$  as

$$\hat{\nabla}_x G(x, y; \mathcal{B}) = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{\nabla}_x G(x, y; \xi_i) = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{G(x + \mu_1 u_i, y; \xi_i) - G(x, y; \xi_i)}{\mu_1/d_1} u_i,$$

$$\hat{\nabla}_y G(x, y; \bar{\mathcal{B}}) = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{\nabla}_y G(x, y; \zeta_i) = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{G(x, y + \mu_2 v_i; \zeta_i) - G(x, y; \zeta_i)}{\mu_2/d_2} v_i,$$

where  $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$  and  $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$  are random vectors generated from the uniform distribution over  $d_1$ -dimensional and  $d_2$ -dimensional unit sphere respectively. We also denote that

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\mu_1}(x, y) &= \mathbb{E}_{(u, \xi)} G(x + \mu_1 u, y; \xi), \\ g_{\mu_2}(x, y) &= \mathbb{E}_{(v, \zeta)} G(x, y + \mu_2 v; \zeta) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ .

Note that for any random variable  $\xi$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{(u, \xi)}[\hat{\nabla}_x G(x, y; \xi)] = \nabla_x g_{\mu_1}(x, y)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{(v, \zeta)}[\hat{\nabla}_y G(x, y; \zeta)] = \nabla_y g_{\mu_2}(x, y)$  by Lemma 5 in [21]. Then obviously we have  $\mathbb{E}_{(U, \mathcal{B})}[\hat{\nabla}_x G(x, y; \mathcal{B})] = \nabla_x g_{\mu_1}(x, y)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{(V, \bar{\mathcal{B}})}[\hat{\nabla}_y G(x, y; \bar{\mathcal{B}})] = \nabla_y g_{\mu_2}(x, y)$  where  $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$  and  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ .

### 3 A Zeroth-order Algorithm for Deterministic NC-PL Minimax Problems

The alternating gradient descent ascent (AGDA) algorithm is a well-known method for solving minimax problems, and has widely been studied in [25, 5, 7, 8, 27]. ZO-AGDA algorithm is a randomized version of AGDA algorithm, and is not a new algorithm, which has been proposed in [29, 50]. However, the two existing zeroth-order versions of the AGDA algorithm are designed and analyzed for solving nonconvex-strongly concave minimax problems. For NC-PL minimax problems, there is no existing algorithms with complexity guarantee before. In this section, we propose a zeroth-order alternating gradient descent ascent (ZO-AGDA) algorithm for solving (1.1), i.e., the deterministic NC-PL problem, and analyze its iteration complexity. The detailed algorithm is listed as follows. For simplicity, in the following analysis, we denote  $s_t = \hat{\nabla}_x f(x_t, y_t)$

---

#### Algorithm 1 (ZO-AGDA Algorithm)

---

Step 1 Input  $x_1, y_1, \alpha, \beta$ ; Set  $t = 1$ .

Step 2 Perform the following update for  $x_t$ :

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha \hat{\nabla}_x f(x_t, y_t) \quad (3.1)$$

with  $\hat{\nabla}_x f(x_t, y_t)$  being defined as in (2.1);

Step 3 Perform the following update for  $y_t$ :

$$y_{t+1} = y_t + \beta \hat{\nabla}_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t) \quad (3.2)$$

with  $\hat{\nabla}_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t)$  being defined as in (2.2);

Step 4 If converges, stop; otherwise, set  $t = t + 1$ , go to Step 2.

---

and  $w_t = \hat{\nabla}_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t)$ .

### 3.1 Technical Preparations

In this section, we analyze the iteration complexity of the ZO-AGDA algorithm for solving (1.1).

Firstly, we give some mild assumptions for (1.1).

**Assumption 3.1** For any fixed  $x$ ,  $\max_y f(x, y)$  has a nonempty solution set and a finite optimal value.  $f(x, y)$  satisfies the Polyak-Lojasiewicz (PL) condition in  $y$ , i.e.,  $\forall x, y$ , there exists a  $\mu > 0$  such that  $\|\nabla_y f(x, y)\|^2 \geq 2\mu [\max_y f(x, y) - f(x, y)]$ .

**Assumption 3.2**  $f(x, y)$  has Lipschitz continuous gradients, i.e., there exists a constant  $l > 0$  such that  $\forall x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ ,  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_x f(x_1, y_1) - \nabla_x f(x_2, y_2)\| &\leq l[\|x_1 - x_2\| + \|y_1 - y_2\|], \\ \|\nabla_y f(x_1, y_1) - \nabla_y f(x_2, y_2)\| &\leq l[\|x_1 - x_2\| + \|y_1 - y_2\|]. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.1** (Lemma 4.1(a) in [15]) If Assumption 3.2 holds, then  $f_{\mu_1}(x, y)$  and  $f_{\mu_2}(x, y)$  have Lipschitz continuous gradients, and it holds that

$$\|\nabla_x f_{\mu_1}(x, y) - \nabla_x f(x, y)\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu_1^2 d_1^2 l^2}{4}, \quad (3.3)$$

$$\|\nabla_y f_{\mu_2}(x, y) - \nabla_y f(x, y)\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu_2^2 d_2^2 l^2}{4}, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{d_1 [f(x + \mu_1 u, y) - f(x, y)]}{\mu_1} u \right\|^2 \leq 2d_1 \|\nabla_x f(x, y)\|^2 + \frac{\mu_1^2 d_1^2 l^2}{2}, \quad (3.5)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{d_2 [f(x, y + \mu_2 v) - f(x, y)]}{\mu_2} v \right\|^2 \leq 2d_2 \|\nabla_y f(x, y)\|^2 + \frac{\mu_2^2 d_2^2 l^2}{2}. \quad (3.6)$$

**Lemma 3.2** (Lemma A.5 in [38]) If Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold, then  $\nabla \Phi(x) = \nabla_x f(x, y^*(x))$ , for any  $y^*(x) \in \arg \max_y f(x, y)$ , and  $\Phi(\cdot)$  is  $L$ -smooth with  $L := l + \frac{l^2}{2\mu}$ .

**Lemma 3.3** If Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold, then for any given  $x$  and  $y$ , we have

$$\|\nabla_x f(x, y) - \nabla \Phi(x)\|^2 \leq \kappa^2 \|\nabla_y f(x, y)\|^2, \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\kappa = l/\mu$ .

*Proof* If Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold, then by Theorem 1 in [22], for any given  $x$ , and  $\forall y$ ,

$$\|\nabla_y f(x, y)\| \geq \mu \|\hat{y}^*(x, y) - y\|, \quad (3.8)$$

where  $\hat{y}^*(x, y) = \arg \min\{\|y - y^*(x)\| \mid y^*(x) \in \arg \max_y f(x, y)\}$ . Then, by

Assumption 3.2 and (3.8), we obtain

$$\|\nabla_x f(x, y) - \nabla \Phi(x)\|^2 \leq l^2 \|y - \hat{y}^*(x, y)\|^2 \leq \kappa^2 \|\nabla_y f(x, y)\|^2.$$

### 3.2 Complexity Analysis

We first give the  $\epsilon$ -stationary point definition of (1.1) as follows, which is also used in [56].

**Definition 3.1**  $\hat{x}$  is an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of (1.1) if  $\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Phi(\hat{x})\| \leq \epsilon$ .

**Lemma 3.4** Denote  $V_t = \frac{3}{2}\Phi(x_t) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_t, y_t)$ . If Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold, and if  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{4d_2L}$ ,  $\alpha \leq \min\{\frac{\beta}{32\kappa^2}, \frac{1}{10d_1L}\}$ , we get

$$\mathbb{E}V_t - \mathbb{E}V_{t+1} \geq \frac{\alpha}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Phi(x_t)\|^2 - \frac{\theta_1}{4}\mu_1^2 - \frac{3d_2^2L^2\beta}{16}\mu_2^2, \quad (3.9)$$

where  $\theta_1 = (5d_1L + \frac{3}{2\alpha} + \frac{3}{2}L + d_2L)d_1^2L^2\alpha^2$ .

*Proof* By Assumption 3.2 and (3.2), we can get

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_{t+1}, y_{t+1}) &\geq f(x_{t+1}, y_t) + \langle \nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t), y_{t+1} - y_t \rangle - \frac{l}{2}\|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^2 \\ &= f(x_{t+1}, y_t) + \langle \nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t), \beta\omega_t \rangle - \frac{l}{2}\beta^2\|\omega_t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by Assumption 3.2 and (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_{t+1}, y_t) &\geq f(x_t, y_t) + \langle \nabla_x f(x_t, y_t), x_{t+1} - x_t \rangle - \frac{l}{2}\|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 \\ &= f(x_t, y_t) - \langle \nabla_x f(x_t, y_t), \alpha s_t \rangle - \frac{l}{2}\alpha^2\|s_t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation of the above two inequalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}f(x_{t+1}, y_{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}f(x_{t+1}, y_t) \\ &\geq \beta\mathbb{E}\langle \nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t), \nabla_y f_u(x_{t+1}, y_t) \rangle - \frac{l}{2}\beta^2\mathbb{E}\|\omega_t\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}f(x_{t+1}, y_t) - \mathbb{E}f(x_t, y_t) \\ &\geq -\alpha\mathbb{E}\langle \nabla_x f(x_t, y_t), \nabla_x f_u(x_t, y_t) \rangle - \frac{l}{2}\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|s_t\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Combining (3.10) and (3.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}f(x_{t+1}, y_{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}f(x_t, y_t) \\ &\geq \beta\mathbb{E}\langle \nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t), \nabla_y f(x_t, y_t) \rangle - \frac{l}{2}\beta^2\mathbb{E}\|\omega_t\|^2 \\ &\quad - \alpha\mathbb{E}\langle \nabla_x f(x_t, y_t), \nabla_x f_u(x_t, y_t) \rangle - \frac{l}{2}\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|s_t\|^2 \\ &= \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t) - \nabla_y f_u(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{\beta}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y f_\mu(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{l}{2} \beta^2 \mathbb{E} \|\omega_t\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t) - \nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
& - \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{l}{2} \alpha^2 \mathbb{E} \|s_t\|^2, \tag{3.12}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to a simple fact that  $2\langle a, b \rangle = \|a + b\|^2 - \|a\|^2 - \|b\|^2$ . By  $L$ -smoothness of  $\Phi$  in Lemma 3.2 and (3.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi(x_{t+1}) & \leq \Phi(x_t) + \langle \nabla \Phi(x_t), x_{t+1} - x_t \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 \\
& = \Phi(x_t) - \alpha \langle \nabla \Phi(x_t), s_t \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \alpha^2 \|s_t\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation of both side and using the fact that  $2\langle a, b \rangle = \|a + b\|^2 - \|a\|^2 - \|b\|^2$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\Phi(x_{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}\Phi(x_t) \\
& \leq -\alpha \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla \Phi(x_t), \nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t) \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \alpha^2 \mathbb{E} \|s_t\|^2 \\
& = \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Phi(x_t) - \nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \tag{3.13} \\
& \quad - \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Phi(x_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \frac{L}{2} \alpha^2 \mathbb{E} \|s_t\|^2 \\
& \leq \alpha \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Phi(x_t) - \nabla_x f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \alpha \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t) - \nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Phi(x_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \frac{L}{2} \alpha^2 \mathbb{E} \|s_t\|^2 \\
& \leq \alpha \kappa^2 \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \alpha \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t) - \nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Phi(x_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \frac{L}{2} \alpha^2 \mathbb{E} \|s_t\|^2, \tag{3.14}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second last inequality is by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the last inequality is by Lemma 3.3. Combining (3.12) and (3.14) and by the definition of  $V_t$ , after rearranging the terms, we can get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}V_t - \mathbb{E}V_{t+1} \\
& \geq \frac{3\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Phi(x_t)\|^2 + \frac{3\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{3L}{4} \alpha^2 \mathbb{E} \|s_t\|^2 - \frac{3\alpha}{2} \kappa^2 \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{3\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t) - \nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{l^2}{4} \beta^2 \mathbb{E} \|\omega_t\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{l}{4} \alpha^2 \mathbb{E} \|s_t\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{\beta}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t) - \nabla_y f_\mu(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
& \geq \frac{3\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Phi(x_t)\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - L\alpha^2 \mathbb{E} \|s_t\|^2
\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{3\alpha}{2}\kappa^2\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{3\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t) - \nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
& + \left(\frac{\beta}{4} - \frac{\beta^2}{2}d_2L\right)\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{\beta}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t) - \nabla_y f_\mu(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 \\
& - \frac{\alpha}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{L^3}{8}\beta^2\mu_2^2d_2^2, \tag{3.15}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to that  $\frac{\beta}{4} - \frac{\beta^2}{2}d_2L > 0$  when  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{4d_2L}$  and by replacing  $l$  with  $L$  since  $l \leq L$  and (3.6) in Lemma 3.1. On the other hand, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (3.7) in Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 & \leq 2\|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t) - \nabla\Phi(x_t)\|^2 + 2\|\nabla\Phi(x_t)\|^2 \\
& \leq 2\kappa^2\|\nabla_y f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + 2\|\nabla\Phi(x_t)\|^2. \tag{3.16}
\end{aligned}$$

By using a simple inequality that  $\|a\|^2 \geq \|b\|^2/2 - \|a - b\|^2$ , Assumption 3.2 and the definition of  $s_t$ , we can easily get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 & \geq \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla_y f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \|\nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t) - \nabla_y f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla_y f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - l^2\alpha^2\|s_t\|^2. \tag{3.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Denote  $G_1 = L\alpha^2 + (\frac{\beta}{4} - \frac{\beta^2}{2}d_2L)L^2\alpha^2$  and  $G_2 = \frac{\beta}{8} - \frac{L}{4}d_2\beta^2 - 2\alpha\kappa^2$ . By plugging (3.16) and (3.17) into (3.15) and rearranging all the terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}V_t - \mathbb{E}V_{t+1} \\
& \geq \frac{\alpha}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Phi(x_t)\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - G_1\mathbb{E}\|s_t\|^2 \\
& \quad + G_2\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{3\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t) - \nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{\beta}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t) - \nabla_y f_\mu(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{L^3}{8}\beta^2\mu_2^2d_2^2. \tag{3.18}
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.5) in Lemma 3.1, we can compute that

$$\mathbb{E}\|s_t\|^2 \leq 4d_1\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t) - \nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + 4d_1\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \frac{\mu_1^2d_1^2l^2}{2}. \tag{3.19}$$

By plugging (3.19) into (3.18),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}V_t - \mathbb{E}V_{t+1} \\
& \geq \frac{\alpha}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Phi(x_t)\|^2 + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - 4d_1G_1\right)\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
& \quad + G_2\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y f(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \left(\frac{3\alpha}{2} + 4d_1G_1\right)\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x f(x_t, y_t) - \nabla_x f_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{\beta}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y f(x_{t+1}, y_t) - \nabla_y f_\mu(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{\mu_1^2}{2}G_1d_1^2l^2 - \frac{L^3}{8}\beta^2\mu_2^2d_2^2. \tag{3.20}
\end{aligned}$$

When  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{4d_2L} \leq \frac{1}{L}$  and  $\alpha \leq \min\{\frac{\beta}{32\kappa^2}, \frac{1}{10d_1L}\}$ , it can be easily checked that  $\frac{\alpha}{2} - 4d_1G_1 \geq 0$ ,  $\frac{3\alpha}{2} + 4d_1G_1 \leq \frac{3}{2}\alpha + 4d_1\alpha^2L + d_1\beta L^2\alpha^2$ , and  $G_2 = \frac{\beta}{8}(1 - 2\beta Ld_2) - 2\alpha\kappa^2 \geq \frac{\beta}{16} - 2\alpha\kappa^2 \geq 0$ . The proof is then completed by combining (3.20) and (3.4) in Lemma 3.1.

Denote  $T(\epsilon) := \min\{t \mid \mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Phi(x_t)\| \leq \epsilon\}$ , which means the minimal number of iterations to obtain an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point.

**Theorem 3.1** *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold, and  $\Phi^*$  exists and is a finite value. Let  $\mu_1 = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha\epsilon}}{2\sqrt{\theta_1}}$ ,  $\mu_2 = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha\epsilon}}{\sqrt{3\beta d_2L}}$ . If  $\alpha \leq \min\{\frac{\beta}{32\kappa^2}, \frac{1}{10d_1L}\}$  and  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{4d_2L}$ , we have*

$$T(\epsilon) \leq \frac{4[3\Phi(x_0) - f(x_0, y_0) - 2\Phi^*]}{\alpha\epsilon^2}.$$

*Proof* Telescoping and rearranging (3.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=0}^{T(\epsilon)-1} \mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Phi(x_t)\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{4}{\alpha} \left[ V_0 - \min_{x,y} \left( \frac{3}{2}\Phi(x) - \frac{1}{2}f(x,y) \right) \right] + \frac{\theta_1}{\alpha} \mu_1^2 T(\epsilon) + \frac{3d_2^2 L^2 \beta}{4\alpha} \mu_2^2 T(\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

By the definitions of  $T(\epsilon)$ ,  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2 & \leq \frac{4}{\alpha T(\epsilon)} \left[ V_0 - \min_{x,y} \left( \frac{3}{2}\Phi(x) - \frac{1}{2}f(x,y) \right) \right] + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \\ & \leq \frac{4}{\alpha T(\epsilon)} [V_0 - \Phi^*] + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

$$= \frac{2}{\alpha T(\epsilon)} [3\Phi(x_0) - f(x_0, y_0) - 2\Phi^*] + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}, \quad (3.22)$$

where the second inequality is due to  $\Phi(x) \geq f(x, y)$  by the definition of  $\Phi(x)$ . The proof is completed by (3.22).

By choosing  $\beta = \frac{1}{4d_2L}$  and  $\alpha = \min\{\frac{\beta}{32\kappa^2}, \frac{1}{10d_1L}\}$  in Theorem 3.1, we can easily compute that  $\mu_1 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\frac{\kappa^2 d_2 + d_1}{d_2 + d_1}} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{d_1 L})$ ,  $\mu_2 = \mathcal{O}(\frac{\mu}{1 + \mu\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{d_2 L^2})$  and  $T(\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}((\kappa^2 d_2 + d_1)L\epsilon^{-2})$ . Hence, the iteration complexity of Algorithm 1 to find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point for (1.1) is  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ .

#### 4 A Zeroth-order Algorithm for Stochastic NC-PL Minimax Problems

In this section, we propose a new zeroth-order gradient descent ascent method with variance reduction (ZO-VRAGDA) for solving (1.2), under the setting

that only noisy function values can be used. At each iteration, we approximate the the first order gradient by a zeroth-order gradient estimator, and using variance reduction technique to improve the algorithm which is similar to that in [12]. Detailedly, we choose a relatively large batch size in zeroth-order gradient estimator every  $q$  iterations, while a small batch size at other iterations. The detailed algorithm is shown as in Algorithm 2.

---

**Algorithm 2** (ZO-VRAGDA)
 

---

Step 1 Input  $x_0, y_0, q, \alpha, \beta, B, b$ ; Set  $t = 0$ .

Step 2 If  $\text{mod}(t, q) = 0$ , generate  $B$  samples, i.e.,  $\mathcal{B}_t = \{\xi_t^i\}_{i=1}^B$  and compute

$$m_t = \hat{\nabla}_x G(x_t, y_t; \mathcal{B}_t); \quad (4.1)$$

Otherwise, generate  $b$  samples, i.e.,  $\mathcal{I}_t = \{\xi_t^i\}_{i=1}^b$  and compute

$$m_t = \hat{\nabla}_x G(x_t, y_t; \mathcal{I}_t) - \hat{\nabla}_x G(x_{t-1}, y_{t-1}; \mathcal{I}_t) + m_{t-1}; \quad (4.2)$$

Update  $x_{t+1}$ :

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha m_t. \quad (4.3)$$

Step 3 If  $\text{mod}(t, q) = 0$ , generate  $B$  samples, i.e.,  $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_t = \{\zeta_t^i\}_{i=1}^B$  and compute

$$n_t = \hat{\nabla}_y G(x_{t+1}, y_t; \bar{\mathcal{B}}_t); \quad (4.4)$$

Otherwise, generate  $b$  samples, i.e.,  $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_t = \{\zeta_t^i\}_{i=1}^b$  and compute

$$n_t = \hat{\nabla}_y G(x_{t+1}, y_t; \bar{\mathcal{I}}_t) - \hat{\nabla}_y G(x_t, y_{t-1}; \bar{\mathcal{I}}_t) + n_{t-1}. \quad (4.5)$$

Update  $y_{t+1}$ :

$$y_{t+1} = y_t + \beta n_t. \quad (4.6)$$

Step 4 If converges, stop; otherwise, set  $t = t + 1$ , go to Step 2.

---

Note that the first-order version of Algorithm 2 is similar to the VR-SMDA algorithm proposed in [19]. The main difference is that  $y_t$  in Algorithm 2 is updated by  $x_t$  instead of  $x_{t-1}$  that used in the VR-SMDA algorithm. In other words, Algorithm 2 is a zeroth-order alternating GDA algorithm, whereas the VR-SMDA algorithm is a first-order simultaneous GDA algorithm.

Next, we give some mild assumptions for (1.2) which are also used in [56].

**Assumption 4.1**  $g(x, y)$  satisfies all the assumptions in Assumption 3.1.

**Assumption 4.2** The variance of the zeroth-order stochastic gradient estimator is bounded, i.e., there exists a constant  $\sigma > 0$  such that for all  $x$  and  $y$ , it has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(u, \xi)} \|\hat{\nabla}_x G(x, y; \xi) - \nabla_x g_{\mu_1}(x, y)\|^2 &\leq \sigma^2, \\ \mathbb{E}_{(v, \zeta)} \|\hat{\nabla}_y G(x, y; \zeta) - \nabla_y g_{\mu_2}(x, y)\|^2 &\leq \sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 4.2, we can easily compute that  $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\nabla}_x G(x, y; \mathcal{B}) - \nabla_x g_{\mu_1}(x, y)\|^2 \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{r}$  and  $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\nabla}_y G(x, y; \bar{\mathcal{B}}) - \nabla_y g_{\mu_2}(x, y)\|^2 \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{r}$ .

**Assumption 4.3** For each component  $G(x, y; \xi)$  has Lipschitz continuous gradients, i.e., there exists a constant  $\bar{l} > 0$  such that  $\forall x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_x G(x_1, y_1; \xi) - \nabla_x G(x_2, y_2; \xi)\| &\leq \bar{l}[\|x_1 - x_2\| + \|y_1 - y_2\|], \\ \|\nabla_y G(x_1, y_1; \zeta) - \nabla_y G(x_2, y_2; \zeta)\| &\leq \bar{l}[\|x_1 - x_2\| + \|y_1 - y_2\|]. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.1**  $g(x, y)$  has Lipschitz continuous gradients with constant  $\bar{l}$ . Moreover,  $\Psi(\cdot)$  is  $\bar{L}$ -smooth with  $\bar{L} := \bar{l} + \frac{\bar{l}^2}{2\mu}$ .

*Proof* By Jensen's inequality and Assumption 4.3,  $\forall x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla_x g(x_1, y_1) - \nabla_x g(x_2, y_2)\| \\ &= \|\mathbb{E}[\nabla_x G(x_1, y_1, \xi) - \nabla_x G(x_2, y_2, \xi)]\| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x G(x_1, y_1, \xi) - \nabla_x G(x_2, y_2, \xi)\| \\ &\leq \bar{l}[\|x_1 - x_2\| + \|y_1 - y_2\|]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can prove that  $\|\nabla_y g(x_1, y_1) - \nabla_y g(x_2, y_2)\| \leq \bar{l}[\|x_1 - x_2\| + \|y_1 - y_2\|]$ . Moreover, we can similarly prove that  $\Psi(\cdot)$  is  $\bar{L}$ -smooth with  $\bar{L} := \bar{l} + \frac{\bar{l}^2}{2\mu}$  by Lemma 3.2.

Next, we analyze the iteration complexity of the ZO-VRAGDA algorithm for solving (1.2).

**Definition 4.1**  $\bar{x}$  is an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of (1.2) if  $\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Psi(\bar{x})\| \leq \epsilon$ .

**Lemma 4.2** If Assumption 4.3 holds, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}g(x_{t+1}, y_{t+1}) &\geq \mathbb{E}g(x_t, y_t) + \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t) - n_t\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t) - m_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta}{2}(1 - \bar{l}\beta)\mathbb{E}\|n_t\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}(1 + \alpha\bar{l})\mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

*Proof* Firstly, by Lemma 4.1 and (4.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}g(x_{t+1}, y_{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}g(x_{t+1}, y_t) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\langle \nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t), y_{t+1} - y_t \rangle - \frac{\bar{l}}{2}\mathbb{E}\|y_{t+1} - y_t\|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\langle \nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t), \beta n_t \rangle - \frac{\bar{l}}{2}\beta^2\mathbb{E}\|n_t\|^2 \\ &= \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}\|n_t\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t) - n_t\|^2 - \frac{\bar{l}\beta^2}{2}\mathbb{E}\|n_t\|^2 \\ &= \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t) - n_t\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2}(1 - \bar{l}\beta)\mathbb{E}\|n_t\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

where the second last equality is by a simple fact that  $\langle \bar{a}, \bar{b} \rangle = \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{a}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{b}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{a} - \bar{b}\|^2$ ,  $\forall \bar{a}, \bar{b}$ . Similarly, by Lemma 4.1 and (4.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}g(x_{t+1}, y_t) - \mathbb{E}g(x_t, y_t) \\
& \geq \mathbb{E}\langle \nabla_x g(x_t, y_t), x_{t+1} - x_t \rangle - \frac{\bar{l}}{2}\mathbb{E}\|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 \\
& = -\mathbb{E}\langle \nabla_x g(x_t, y_t), \alpha m_t \rangle - \frac{\bar{l}}{2}\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2 \\
& = \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t) - m_t\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2 - \frac{\bar{l}}{2}\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2 \\
& = \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t) - m_t\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}(1 + \alpha\bar{l})\mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2. \quad (4.9)
\end{aligned}$$

We complete the proof by adding (4.8) and (4.9).

**Lemma 4.3** *Suppose Assumptions 4.2 and 4.3 hold. Set  $p_t = \lceil t/q \rceil$ . We have*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g_\mu(x_t, y_t) - m_t\|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{3d_1\bar{l}^2}{b} \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} (\mathbb{E}\|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2) + \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} \frac{3\bar{l}^2\mu_1^2 d_1^2}{2b} + \frac{\sigma^2}{B}, \quad (4.10)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y g_\mu(x_{t+1}, y_t) - n_t\|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{3d_2\bar{l}^2}{b} \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} (\mathbb{E}\|x_{i+2} - x_{i+1}\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2) + \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} \frac{3\bar{l}^2\mu_2^2 d_2^2}{2b} + \frac{\sigma^2}{B}. \quad (4.11)
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof* Denote  $\nabla_x G_I(x, y) = \nabla_x g_\mu(x, y) - \hat{\nabla}_x G(x, y; I)$  for a given index set  $I$ . Firstly, by (4.2), for any index  $j_t$  that satisfies  $(p_t - 1)q + 1 \leq j_t \leq t - 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g_\mu(x_{j_t}, y_{j_t}) - m_{j_t}\|^2 \\
& = \mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g_\mu(x_{j_t}, y_{j_t}) - m_{j_t-1} - (m_{j_t} - m_{j_t-1})\|^2 \\
& = \mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g_\mu(x_{j_t-1}, y_{j_t-1}) - m_{j_t-1} + \nabla_x G_{I_{j_t}}(x_{j_t}, y_{j_t}) - \nabla_x G_{I_{j_t}}(x_{j_t-1}, y_{j_t-1})\|^2 \\
& = \mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g_\mu(x_{j_t-1}, y_{j_t-1}) - m_{j_t-1}\|^2 \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x G_{I_{j_t}}(x_{j_t}, y_{j_t}) - \nabla_x G_{I_{j_t}}(x_{j_t-1}, y_{j_t-1})\|^2, \quad (4.12)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to  $\mathbb{E}[\nabla_x G_{I_{j_t}}(x, y)] = 0$ . Note that if  $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^b$  are i.i.d. random variables with zero mean, then  $\mathbb{E}\|\frac{1}{b}\sum_{i=1}^b \xi_i\|^2 = \frac{1}{b}\mathbb{E}\|\xi_i\|^2$  for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, b\}$ . Then, by using this fact, for any element  $\xi'_{j_t} \in I_{j_t}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x G_{I_{j_t}}(x_{j_t}, y_{j_t}) - \nabla_x G_{I_{j_t}}(x_{j_t-1}, y_{j_t-1})\|^2 \\
& = \frac{1}{b}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g_\mu(x_{j_t}, y_{j_t}) - \hat{\nabla}_x G(x_{j_t}, y_{j_t}; \xi'_{j_t})\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\nabla_x g_\mu(x_{j_t-1}, y_{j_t-1}) + \hat{\nabla}_x G(x_{j_t-1}, y_{j_t-1}; \xi'_{j_t}) \|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{b} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{\nabla}_x G(x_{j_t}, y_{j_t}; \xi'_{j_t}) - \hat{\nabla}_x G(x_{j_t-1}, y_{j_t-1}; \xi'_{j_t}) \|^2, \tag{4.13}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to  $\mathbb{E}\|\xi - \mathbb{E}[\xi]\|^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\xi\|^2 - \|\mathbb{E}[\xi]\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\|\xi\|^2$ . On the other hand, by Assumption 4.3 and (102) in the proof of Lemma 29 in [18], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \|\hat{\nabla}_x G(x_{j_t}, y_{j_t}; \xi'_{j_t}) - \hat{\nabla}_x G(x_{j_t-1}, y_{j_t-1}; \xi'_{j_t}) \|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{3\bar{l}^2 \mu_1^2 d_1^2}{2} + 3d_1 \bar{l}^2 \mathbb{E}(\|x_{j_t} - x_{j_t-1}\|^2 + \|y_{j_t} - y_{j_t-1}\|^2). \tag{4.14}
\end{aligned}$$

Combing (4.12), (4.13) and (4.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x_{j_t}, y_{j_t}) - m_{j_t}\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x_{j_t-1}, y_{j_t-1}) - m_{j_t-1}\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{b} \left[ \frac{3\bar{l}^2 \mu_1^2 d_1^2}{2} + 3d_1 \bar{l}^2 \mathbb{E}(\|x_{j_t} - x_{j_t-1}\|^2 + \|y_{j_t} - y_{j_t-1}\|^2) \right]. \tag{4.15}
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of (4.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g_\mu(x_{j_t+1}, y_{j_t}) - n_{j_t}\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g_\mu(x_{j_t}, y_{j_t-1}) - n_{j_t-1}\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{b} \left[ \frac{3\bar{l}^2 \mu_2^2 d_2^2}{2} + 3d_2 \bar{l}^2 \mathbb{E}(\|x_{j_t+1} - x_{j_t}\|^2 + \|y_{j_t} - y_{j_t-1}\|^2) \right]. \tag{4.16}
\end{aligned}$$

Telescoping (4.15) and (4.16) over  $j_t$  from  $(p_t - 1)q + 1$  to  $t$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x_t, y_t) - m_t\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x_{(p_t-1)q}, y_{(p_t-1)q}) - m_{(p_t-1)q}\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{3d_1 \bar{l}^2}{b} \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} (\mathbb{E}\|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2) + \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} \frac{3\bar{l}^2 \mu_1^2 d_1^2}{2b} \tag{4.17}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g_\mu(x_{t+1}, y_t) - n_t\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g_\mu(x_{(p_t-1)q+1}, y_{(p_t-1)q}) - n_{(p_t-1)q}\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{3d_2 \bar{l}^2}{b} \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} (\mathbb{E}\|x_{i+2} - x_{i+1}\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2) + \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} \frac{3\bar{l}^2 \mu_2^2 d_2^2}{2b}. \tag{4.18}
\end{aligned}$$

After plugging (4.1) and (4.4) into (4.17) and (4.18) respectively, by Assumption 4.2, and combing (4.17) and (4.18), we complete the proof.

**Lemma 4.4** *Suppose Assumptions 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 hold. Let  $F_t = \frac{3}{2}\Psi(x_t) - \frac{1}{2}g(x_t, y_t)$ . Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}F_t - \mathbb{E}F_{t+1} \\
& \geq \frac{\alpha}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Psi(x_t)\|^2 + \left[\frac{\alpha}{2}(1 - 2\alpha\bar{L}) - \frac{\beta}{4}\bar{l}^2\alpha^2\right]\mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{15\alpha d_1\bar{l}^2}{2b} \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} (\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|m_i\|^2 + \beta^2\mathbb{E}\|n_i\|^2) \\
& \quad - \frac{3\beta d_2\bar{l}^2}{2b} \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} [(2\alpha^2 + 6d_1\bar{l}^2\alpha^4)\mathbb{E}\|m_i\|^2 + (6d_1\bar{l}^2\alpha^2\beta^2 + \beta^2)\mathbb{E}\|n_i\|^2] \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{\beta}{8} - 2\alpha\kappa^2\right)\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{4}(1 - \bar{l}\beta)\mathbb{E}\|n_t\|^2 - \frac{5\alpha\mu_1^2\bar{l}^2 d_1^2}{8} - \frac{\beta\mu_2^2\bar{l}^2 d_2^2}{8} \\
& \quad - \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} \left(\frac{9\mu_1^2\alpha^2\beta d_1^2 d_2\bar{l}^4}{2b} + \frac{15\alpha\bar{l}^2\mu_1^2 d_1^2}{4b} + \frac{3\beta\bar{l}^2\mu_2^2 d_2^2}{4b}\right) - \left(\frac{5\alpha}{2} + \frac{\beta}{2}\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{B}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

*Proof* By  $\bar{L}$ -smoothness of  $\Psi$  in Lemma 4.1, (4.3) and  $\langle \bar{a}, \bar{b} \rangle = \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{a}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{b}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{a} - \bar{b}\|^2$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\Psi(x_{t+1}) \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}\Psi(x_t) + \mathbb{E}\langle \nabla\Psi(x_t), x_{t+1} - x_t \rangle + \frac{\bar{L}}{2}\mathbb{E}\|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 \\
& = \mathbb{E}\Psi(x_t) - \mathbb{E}\langle \nabla\Psi(x_t), \alpha m_t \rangle + \frac{\bar{L}}{2}\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2 \\
& = \mathbb{E}\Psi(x_t) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Psi(x_t) - m_t\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Psi(x_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2 + \frac{\bar{L}}{2}\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2 \\
& = \mathbb{E}\Psi(x_t) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Psi(x_t) - m_t\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Psi(x_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}(1 - \alpha\bar{L})\mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}\Psi(x_t) + \alpha\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Psi(x_t) - \nabla_x g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \alpha\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t) - m_t\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Psi(x_t)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}(1 - \alpha\bar{L})\mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

where in the last inequality we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Next, by multiplying  $\frac{3}{2}$  and  $-\frac{1}{2}$  on both sides of (4.20) and (4.7) respectively and then adding them together, after rearranging the terms and by the definition of  $F_t$ , we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}F_t - \mathbb{E}F_{t+1} \\
& \geq \frac{3\alpha}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Psi(x_t)\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{4}(2 - 3\alpha\bar{L} - \alpha\bar{l})\mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{3\alpha}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Psi(x_t) - \nabla_x g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{5\alpha}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t) - m_t\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{\beta}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{\beta}{4}\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t) - n_t\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{4}(1 - \bar{l}\beta)\mathbb{E}\|n_t\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \frac{\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Psi(x_t)\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} (1 - 2\alpha \bar{L}) \mathbb{E} \|m_t\|^2 - 2\alpha \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Psi(x_t) - \nabla_x g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{5\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t) - m_t\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t) - n_t\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{4} (1 - \bar{l}\beta) \mathbb{E} \|n_t\|^2, \tag{4.21}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is by  $\bar{l} \leq \bar{L}$  and the fact that  $-\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \geq -\|\nabla \Psi(x_t) - \nabla_x g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \|\nabla \Psi(x_t)\|^2$ . Next, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (4.3) and Assumption 4.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t) - \nabla_y g(x_t, y_t) + \nabla_y g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
&\geq \frac{\mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_t, y_t)\|^2}{2} - \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t) - \nabla_y g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
&\geq \frac{\mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_t, y_t)\|^2}{2} - \bar{l}^2 \alpha^2 \mathbb{E} \|m_t\|^2. \tag{4.22}
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.7) in Lemma 3.3, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Psi(x_t) - \nabla_x g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \leq \kappa^2 \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_t, y_t)\|^2. \tag{4.23}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t) - m_t\|^2 &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t) - \nabla_x g_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x_t, y_t) - m_t\|^2, \tag{4.24}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t) - n_t\|^2 &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, n_t) - \nabla_y g_\mu(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g_\mu(x_{t+1}, y_t) - n_t\|^2. \tag{4.25}
\end{aligned}$$

By plugging (4.22)-(4.25) into (4.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} F_t - \mathbb{E} F_{t+1} \\
&\geq \frac{\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Psi(x_t)\|^2 + \left[ \frac{\alpha}{2} (1 - 2\alpha \bar{L}) - \frac{\beta}{4} \bar{l}^2 \alpha^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \|m_t\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{5\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x g(x_t, y_t) - \nabla_x g_\mu(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{5\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x_t, y_t) - m_t\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_{t+1}, y_t) - \nabla_y g_\mu(x_{t+1}, y_t)\|^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g_\mu(x_{t+1}, y_t) - n_t\|^2 \\
&\quad + \left[ \frac{\beta}{8} - 2\alpha \kappa^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{4} (1 - \bar{l}\beta) \mathbb{E} \|n_t\|^2 \\
&\geq \frac{\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Psi(x_t)\|^2 + \left[ \frac{\alpha}{2} (1 - 2\alpha \bar{L}) - \frac{\beta}{4} \bar{l}^2 \alpha^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \|m_t\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{15\alpha d_1 \bar{l}^2}{2b} \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} (\mathbb{E} \|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2) - \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} \frac{15\alpha \bar{l}^2 \mu_1^2 d_1^2}{4b} \\
&\quad - \frac{3\beta d_2 \bar{l}^2}{2b} \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} (\mathbb{E} \|x_{i+2} - x_{i+1}\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2) - \sum_{i=(p_t-1)q}^{t-1} \frac{3\beta \bar{l}^2 \mu_2^2 d_2^2}{4b}
\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{5\alpha\mu_1^2\bar{l}^2d_1^2}{8} - \frac{\beta\mu_2^2\bar{l}^2d_2^2}{8} + \left(\frac{\beta}{8} - 2\alpha\kappa^2\right)\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_y g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{4}(1 - \bar{l}\beta)\mathbb{E}\|n_t\|^2 \\
& - \left(\frac{5\alpha}{2} + \frac{\beta}{2}\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{B}, \tag{4.26}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by Lemma 4.3 and (3.4) in Lemma 3.1. Next, we estimate the upper bound for  $\mathbb{E}\|x_{i+2} - x_{i+1}\|^2$ ,  $\mathbb{E}\|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}\|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2$  in the right hand side of (4.26) when  $(p_t - 1)q \leq i \leq t - 1$ . By (4.3), (4.2) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\|x_{i+2} - x_{i+1}\|^2 \\
& = \alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|m_{i+1}\|^2 \leq 2\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|m_i\|^2 + 2\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|m_{i+1} - m_i\|^2 \\
& = 2\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|m_i\|^2 + 2\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\nabla}_x G(x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}; I_i) - \hat{\nabla}_x G(x_i, y_i; I_i)\|^2 \\
& \leq 2\alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|m_i\|^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2}{b} \sum_{j=1}^b \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\nabla}_x G(x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}; \xi_i^j) - \hat{\nabla}_x G(x_i, y_i; \xi_i^j)\|^2, \tag{4.27}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by the fact that  $\mathbb{E}\|\sum_{i=1}^b \eta_i\|^2 \leq b \sum_{i=1}^b \mathbb{E}\|\eta_i\|^2$  for i.i.d random variables  $\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_b\}$ . By (102) in the proof of Lemma 29 in [18], we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\nabla}_x G(x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}; \xi_i^j) - \hat{\nabla}_x G(x_i, y_i; \xi_i^j)\|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{3\bar{l}^2\mu_1^2d_1^2}{2} + 3d_1\bar{l}^2\mathbb{E}(\|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2 + \|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2). \tag{4.28}
\end{aligned}$$

By plugging (4.28) into (4.27), and using (4.3) and (4.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\|x_{i+2} - x_{i+1}\|^2 \\
& \leq (2\alpha^2 + 6d_1\bar{l}^2\alpha^4)\mathbb{E}\|m_i\|^2 + 6d_1\bar{l}^2\alpha^2\beta^2\mathbb{E}\|n_i\|^2 + 3\bar{l}^2\alpha^2\mu_1^2d_1^2. \tag{4.29}
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is then completed by plugging (4.29) into (4.26), and using  $\mathbb{E}\|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2 = \alpha^2\mathbb{E}\|m_i\|^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}\|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2 = \beta^2\mathbb{E}\|n_i\|^2$ .

Set  $\mu_1 = \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{35d_1^2\bar{l}^2 + 576\kappa^2d_1^2d_2\bar{l}^2}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\kappa d_1 d_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{l}}\right)$ ,  $\mu_2 = \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{112\kappa^2d_2^2\bar{l}^2}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\kappa d_2 \bar{l}}\right)$ ,  $q = b = \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon}$  and  $B = \frac{(40+128\kappa^2)\sigma^2}{\epsilon^2}$ .

**Theorem 4.1** *Suppose Assumptions 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 hold. If  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{C}$  with  $C = \bar{L} + 30d_1\bar{L} + 6d_2\bar{L} + 36d_1d_2\bar{L}$ ,  $\alpha = \frac{\beta}{16\kappa^2}$ , we have*

$$T(\epsilon) \leq \frac{8[3\Psi(x_0) - g(x_0, y_0) - 2\Psi^*]}{\alpha\epsilon^2}. \tag{4.30}$$

*Proof* Telescoping and rearranging (4.19), by  $\bar{l} \leq \bar{L}$  and  $q = b$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& F_0 - \mathbb{E}F_{T(\epsilon)} \\
& \geq \frac{\alpha}{4} \sum_{t=0}^{T(\epsilon)-1} \mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Psi(x_t)\|^2 + H_1 \sum_{t=0}^{T(\epsilon)-1} \mathbb{E}\|m_t\|^2 + H_2 \sum_{t=0}^{T(\epsilon)-1} \mathbb{E}\|n_t\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left[\frac{\beta}{8} - 2\alpha\kappa^2\right] \sum_{t=0}^{T(\epsilon)-1} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_y g(x_t, y_t)\|^2 - \left[\frac{5\alpha}{2} + \frac{\beta}{2}\right] \frac{\sigma^2}{B} T(\epsilon) - \frac{15\alpha\bar{L}^2 d_1^2}{4} \mu_1^2 T(\epsilon) \\
& - \frac{3\beta\bar{L}^2 d_2^2}{4} \mu_2^2 T(\epsilon) - \frac{5\alpha\bar{L}^2 d_1^2}{8} \mu_1^2 T(\epsilon) - \frac{\beta\bar{L}^2 d_2^2}{8} \mu_2^2 T(\epsilon) - \frac{9\alpha^2 \beta d_1^2 d_2 \bar{L}^4}{2} \mu_1^2 T(\epsilon),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

where  $H_1 = [\frac{\alpha}{2}(1 - 2\alpha\bar{L}) - \frac{\alpha^2\beta\bar{L}^2}{4} - \frac{15\alpha^3 d_1 \bar{L}^2}{2} - \frac{3\beta d_2 \bar{L}^2}{2}(2\alpha^2 + 6\alpha^4 d_1 \bar{L}^2)]$ ,  $H_2 = [\frac{\beta}{4}(1 - \bar{L}\beta) - \frac{15\alpha\beta^2 d_1 \bar{L}^2}{2} - \frac{3\beta^3 d_2 \bar{L}^2}{2} - 9\alpha^2 \beta^3 d_1 d_2 \bar{L}^4]$ . If  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{C}$  and  $\alpha = \frac{\beta}{16\kappa^2} \leq \frac{1}{C}$ , then  $H_1 \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} - \alpha^2 \bar{L}(\frac{5}{4} + \frac{15}{2}d_1 + 3d_2 + 9d_1 d_2) \geq 0$ ,  $H_2 \geq \frac{\beta}{4} - \beta^2 \bar{L}(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{15}{2}d_1 + \frac{3}{2}d_2 + 9d_1 d_2) \geq 0$  and  $\frac{\beta}{8} - 2\alpha\kappa^2 = 0$ . Then from (4.31), we immediately have

$$\begin{aligned}
& F_0 - \mathbb{E}F_{T(\epsilon)} \\
& \geq \frac{\alpha}{4} \sum_{t=0}^{T(\epsilon)-1} \|\nabla \Psi(x_t)\|^2 - \left(\frac{5}{2}\alpha + 8\alpha\kappa^2\right) \frac{\sigma^2}{B} T(\epsilon) - \frac{35}{8} \alpha \bar{L}^2 \mu_1^2 d_1^2 T(\epsilon) \\
& \quad - 14\alpha\kappa^2 \bar{L}^2 \mu_2^2 d_2^2 T(\epsilon) - 72\alpha\kappa^2 \bar{L}^2 \mu_1^2 d_1^2 d_2 T(\epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of  $T(\epsilon)$ , and the setting of  $\mu_1$ ,  $\mu_2$  and  $B$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon^2 & \leq \frac{4}{\alpha T(\epsilon)} \left[ F_0 - \min_{x,y} \left( \frac{3}{2} \Psi(x) - \frac{1}{2} g(x,y) \right) \right] + \frac{3}{4} \epsilon^2 \\
& \leq \frac{4}{\alpha T(\epsilon)} [F_0 - \Psi^*] + \frac{3}{4} \epsilon^2 \\
& \leq \frac{2}{\alpha T(\epsilon)} [3\Psi(x_0) - g(x_0, y_0) - 2\Psi^*] + \frac{3}{4} \epsilon^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

where the second inequality is due to  $\Psi(x) \geq g(x, y)$  by the definition of  $\Psi(x)$ . The proof is completed by (4.32).

By choosing  $\beta = \frac{1}{C}$  in Theorem 4.1, we can easily compute that  $T(\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^2 d_1 d_2 \bar{L} \epsilon^{-2})$  which implies a total sample complexity of  $T(\epsilon)(\frac{B}{q} + \frac{(q-1)b}{q}) = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^3 d_1 d_2 \bar{L} \epsilon^{-3})$  for Algorithm 2 to find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point for (1.2).


## 5 Numerical Experiments

We test two numerical experiments to show the efficiency of ZO-AGDA algorithm and ZO-VRAGDA algorithm for solving a Wasserstein GAN problem and a robust polynomial optimization problem.

### 5.1 Wasserstein GAN problem

In this section, we first consider the following WGAN problem [3],

$$\min_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2} \max_{\phi_1, \phi_2} f(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \phi_1, \phi_2) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{(x^{real}, z) \sim \mathcal{D}} (D_\phi(x^{real}) - D_\phi(G_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2}(z))) - \lambda \|\phi\|^2,$$



**Fig. 1** Performance of five tested algorithms for solving WGAN problem.

where  $G_{\varphi_1, \varphi_2}(z) = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 z$ ,  $D_\phi(x) = \phi_1 x + \phi_2 x^2$ ,  $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ ,  $x^{real}$  is generated from a normal distribution with mean  $\varphi_1^* = 0$  and variance  $\varphi_2^* = 0.1$  which are also the optimal solutions, and variable  $z$  is generated from a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 1. Set  $\lambda = 0.001$  which is the same as that in [56].

We compare Algorithms 1 and 2 with three first-order algorithms, i.e., SAGDA [56], Adam [23] and RMSprop [47]. We set  $B = 100$ ,  $q = b = 10$ ,  $\alpha = 0.1$ ,  $\beta = 0.5$  in ZO-VRAGDA,  $\alpha = 0.1$ ,  $\beta = 0.5$  in ZO-AGDA and  $\tau_1 = 0.1$ ,  $\tau_2 = 0.5$  in SAGDA respectively. All the parameters of Adam algorithm and RMSprop algorithm are chosen the same as that in [23] and [47] respectively.


Figure 1 shows the average distance between  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi^*$ , the average change of the gradient of the objective function with respect to  $x$  and  $y$  respectively of all the five test algorithms as the number of iterations changes over 10 independent runs. The shaded part around 5 curves denotes the standard deviation. From Figure 1, we can find that both the proposed ZO-AGDA algorithm and the ZO-VRAGDA algorithm outperform Adam algorithm and RMSprop algorithm, and approximate the performance of SAGDA algorithm which is a first-order GDA algorithm.

## 5.2 Robust Polynomial Optimization Problem

We consider the following robust polynomial optimization problem ([10]),

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}} \min_{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq 0.5} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := & -2(x_1 - y_1)^6 + 12.2(x_1 - y_1)^5 - 21.2(x_1 - y_1)^4 \\
 & - 6.2(x_1 - y_1) + 6.4(x_1 - y_1)^3 + 4.7(x_1 - y_1)^2 - (x_2 - y_2)^6 \\
 & + 11(x_2 - y_2)^5 - 43.3(x_2 - y_2)^4 + 10(x_2 - y_2) + 74.8(x_2 - y_2)^3 \\
 & - 56.9(x_2 - y_2)^2 + 4.1(x_1 - y_1)(x_2 - y_2) + 0.1(x_1 - y_1)^2(x_2 - y_2)^2 \\
 & - 0.4(x_2 - y_2)^2(x_1 - y_1) - 0.4(x_1 - y_1)^2(x_2 - y_2), \quad (5.1)
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{C} = \{x_1 \in (-0.95, 3.2), x_2 \in (-0.45, 4.4)\}$ .



**Fig. 2** Performance of three algorithms for solving robust polynomial optimization problem.

We use the following regret function versus iteration  $t$  to measure the quality of the solution obtained by three tested algorithms, which is also used in [29], i.e.,

$$\text{Regret}(t) = \min_{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq 0.5} f(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}) - \min_{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq 0.5} f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}), \quad (5.2)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$  is the  $t$ th iteration point generated by the tested algorithm,  $\mathbf{x}^* = [-0.195, 0.284]^T$  and  $\min_{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq 0.5} f(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}) = -4.33$ .

We compare Algorithms 1 and 2 with the SAGDA algorithm [56], which is a first-order algorithm. We set  $B = 50$ ,  $q = 2$ ,  $b = 10$ ,  $\alpha = 0.1$ ,  $\beta = 0.1$  in ZO-VRAGDA,  $\alpha = 0.1$ ,  $\beta = 0.1$  in ZO-AGDA and  $\tau_1 = 0.1$ ,  $\tau_2 = 0.1$  in SAGDA respectively. Note that, for ZO-AGDA algorithm and ZO-VRAGDA algorithm, instead of the exact function value, we use the noisy function value with an additional normal distribution random noise with mean 0 and variance 0.5 at each iteration.

Figure 2 shows the average minimum achieved regret function value and the number of function queries up to the  $t$ th iteration over 5 independent runs, which is the same as that used in [29]. From Figure 2, we can find that the performance of ZO-AGDA algorithm and ZO-VRAGDA algorithm is similar to that of SAGDA algorithm, which is a first order algorithm. Moreover, the number of function value computation of ZO-VRAGDA algorithm is much less than that of ZO-AGDA algorithm at each iteration.

## 6 Conclusions and Discussions

In this paper, we propose a zeroth-order alternating gradient descent ascent (ZO-AGDA) algorithm and a zeroth-order variance reduced alternating gradient descent ascent (ZO-VRAGDA) algorithm for solving a class of nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems, i.e., NC-PL minimax problem, under the deterministic and the stochastic setting respectively. The number of iterations to obtain an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of ZO-AGDA and ZO-VRAGDA algorithm for solving NC-PL minimax problem is upper bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$

respectively, both of which match the iteration complexity of the corresponding first-order algorithms. To the best of our knowledge, ZO-AGDA and ZO-VRAGDA are the first two zeroth-order algorithms with the complexity guarantee for solving NC-PL minimax problems. Our numerical results further demonstrate the efficiency of the proposed algorithms which approximate the performance of the corresponding first-order algorithms.

Furthermore, note that there is another zeroth-order gradient estimator based on Gaussian smoothing technique that proposed in [57] which can be used to estimate the true gradient similar as that in (2.1) and (2.2). For the corresponding algorithms, we also can obtain the same iteration complexity result with Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.1 that shown in Section 3 and Section 4 respectively. For the brevity of the article, we omit the detailed proofs.

For more general nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems that the PL conditions are not satisfied, it is worthy of further in-depth study whether the iteration complexity of the proposed algorithm can be guaranteed or not.

## References

1. Z. Allen-Zhu. Natasha: faster non-convex stochastic optimization via strongly non-convex parameter. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 89–97, 2017.
2. Z. Allen-Zhu and E. Hazan. Variance reduction for faster non-convex optimization. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 699–707, 2016.
3. M. Arjovsky, S. Chintala, and L. Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 214–223, 2017.
4. Q. Cai, M. Hong, Y. Chen, and Z. Wang. On the global convergence of imitation learning: A case for linear quadratic regulator. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.03674*, 2019.
5. A. Chambolle and T. Pock. On the ergodic convergence rates of a first-order primal–dual algorithm. *Mathematical Programming*, 159:253–287, 2016.
6. P. Chen, H. Zhang, Y. Sharma, J. Yi, and C. Hsieh. Zoo: Zeroth order optimization based black-box attacks to deep neural networks without training substitute models. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM workshop on artificial intelligence and security*, pages 15–26, 2017.
7. C. Daskalakis, A. Ilyas, V. Syrgkanis, and H. Zeng. *Training GANs with optimism*. ICLR, Vancouver Canada, 2018.
8. C. Daskalakis and I. Panageas. The limit points of (optimistic) gradient descent in min-max optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 9236–9246, 2018.
9. A. Defazio, F. Bach, and S. Lacoste-Julien. SAGA: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 1646–1654, 2014.
10. B. Dimitris, N. Omid, K. Teo. Robust optimization for unconstrained simulation-based problems. *Operations research*, 2010, 58(1): 161-178.
11. S. Du, J. Lee, H. Li, L. Wang, and X. Zhai. Gradient descent finds global minima of deep neural networks. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 1675–1685, 2019.
12. C. Fang, C. Li, Z. Lin, and T. Zhang. Spider: Near-optimal non-convex optimization via stochastic path integrated differential estimator. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 9236–9246, 2018.
13. M. Fazel, R. Ge, S. Kakade, and M. Mesbahi. Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 1467–1476, 2018.

14. C. Finlay and A. Oberman. Scaleable input gradient regularization for adversarial robustness. *Machine Learning with Applications*, 3:100017, 2021.
15. X. Gao, B. Jiang, and S. Zhang. On the information-adaptive variants of the admn: an iteration complexity perspective. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 76(1):327–363, 2018.
16. G. Gidel, H. Berard, G. Vignoud, P. Vincent, and S. Lacoste-Julien. A variational inequality perspective on generative adversarial networks. *ICLR*, New Orleans, 2019.
17. M.J. Ho and S. Ermon. Generative adversarial imitation learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 4565–4573, 2016.
18. F. Huang, S. Gao, J. Pei, and H. Huang. Accelerated zeroth-order momentum methods from mini to minimax optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23:1–70, 2021.
19. F. Huang, X. Wu and H. Huang Efficient mirror descent ascent methods for nonsmooth minimax problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 10431–10443, 2021.
20. R. Johnson and T. Zhang. Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 315–323, 2013.
21. K. Ji, Z. Wang Y. Zhou and Y. Liang. Improved zeroth-order variance reduced algorithms and analysis for nonconvex optimization. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 3100–3109, 2019.
22. H. Karimi, J. Nutini, and M. Schmidt. Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the polyak-lojasiewicz condition. *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 795–811, 2016.
23. D. Kingma and J. Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
24. W. Kong and R. Monteiro. An accelerated inexact proximal point method for solving nonconvex-concave min-max problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(4):2558–2585, 2021.
25. A. Letcher, D. Balduzzi, S. Racaniere, J. Martens, J. Foerster, K. Tuyls, and T. Graepel. Differentiable game mechanics. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20:1–40, 2019.
26. T. Lin, C. Jin, and M. Jordan. Near-optimal algorithms for minimax optimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2738–2779, 2020.
27. T. Lin, C. Jin, and M. Jordan. On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 6083–6093, 2020.
28. C. Liu, L. Zhu, and M. Belkin. Loss landscapes and optimization in over-parameterized non-linear systems and neural networks. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 59:85–116, 2022.
29. S. Liu, S. Lu, X. Chen, Y. Feng, K. Xu, A. Al-Dujaili, M. Hong, and UM. O’Reilly. Min-max optimization without gradients: Convergence and applications to black-box evasion and poisoning attacks. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 6282–6293, 2020.
30. S. Lu, I. Tsaknakis, M. Hong, and Y. Chen. Hybrid block successive approximation for one-sided non-convex min-max problems: algorithms and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 68:3676–3691, 2020.
31. L. Luo, H. Ye, Z. Huang, and T. Zhang. Stochastic recursive gradient descent ascent for stochastic nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 20566–20577, 2020.
32. A. Mokhtari, A. Ozdaglar, and S. Pattathil. A unified analysis of extra-gradient and optimistic gradient methods for saddle point problems: Proximal point approach. *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1497–1507, 2020.
33. A. Nemirovski. Prox-method with rate of convergence  $O(1/t)$  for variational inequalities with lipschitz continuous monotone operators and smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 15:229–251, 2004.
34. Y. Nesterov. Dual extrapolation and its applications to solving variational inequalities and related problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 109:319–344, 2007.

35. L. Nguyen, J. Liu, K. Scheinberg, and M. Takáč. SARAH: A novel method for machine learning problems using stochastic recursive gradient. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 2613–2621, 2017.
36. L. Nguyen, J. Liu, K. Scheinberg, and M. Takáč. Stochastic recursive gradient algorithm for nonconvex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07261*, 2017.
37. L. Nguyen, J. Liu, K. Scheinberg, and M. Takáč. Inexact SARAH algorithm for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.10105*, 2018.
38. M. Nouiehed, M. Sanjabi, T. Huang, J. Lee, and M. Razaviyayn. Solving a class of non-convex min-max games using iterative first order methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 14934–14942, 2019.
39. D. Ostrovskii, A. Lowy, and M. Razaviyayn. Efficient search of first-order nash equilibria in nonconvex-concave smooth min-max problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(4):2508–2538.
40. W. Pan, J. Shen, Z. Xu. An efficient algorithm for nonconvex-linear minimax optimization problem and its application in solving weighted maximin dispersion problem. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 78(1):287–306, 2021.
41. B. Polyak. Gradient methods for minimizing functionals. *Zhurnal Vychislitel'noi Matematiki i Matematicheskoi Fiziki*, 3(4):643–653, 1963.
42. H. Rafique, M. Liu, Q. Lin, and T. Yang. Weakly-convex-concave min-max optimization: provable algorithms and applications in machine learning. *Optimization Methods and Software*, pages 1–35, 2021.
43. S. Reddi, A. Hefny, S. Sra, B. Póczos, and A. Smola. Stochastic variance reduction for nonconvex optimization. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 314–323, 2016.
44. J. Shen, Z. Wang, and Z. Xu. Zeroth-order single-loop algorithms for nonconvex-linear minimax problems. *Journal of Global Optimization*, doi:10.1007/s10898-022-01169-5, 2022.
45. J. Snoek, H. Larochelle, and R. Adams. Practical bayesian optimization of machine learning algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 2951–2959, 2012.
46. K. Thekumparampil, P. Jain, P. Netrapalli, and S. Oh. Efficient algorithms for smooth minimax optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 12680–12691, 2019.
47. T. Tieleman, G. Hinton, et al. Lecture 6.5-rmsprop: Divide the gradient by a running average of its recent magnitude. *COURSERA: Neural networks for machine learning*, 4(2):26–31, 2012.
48. H. Wai, M. Hong, Z. Yang, Z. Wang, and K. Tang. Variance reduced policy evaluation with smooth function approximation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 5784–5795, 2019.
49. Z. Wang, K. Ji, Yi Zhou, Y. Liang, and V. Tarokh. SpiderBoost: A class of faster variance-reduced algorithms for nonconvex optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 2406–2416, 2019.
50. Z. Wang, K. Balasubramanian, S. Ma, and M. Razaviyayn. Zeroth-order algorithms for nonconvex minimax problems with improved complexities. *Journal of Global Optimization*, doi:10.1007/s10898-022-01160-0, 2020.
51. T. Xu, Z. Wang, Y. Liang, and P. Vincent. Enhanced first and zeroth order variance reduced algorithms for min-max optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09361*, 2020.
52. Z. Xu, J. Shen, Z. Wang, and Y. Dai. Zeroth-order alternating randomized gradient projection algorithms for general nonconvex-concave minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.00473*, 2021.
53. Z. Xu, H. Zhang, Y. Xu, and G. Lan. A unified single-loop alternating gradient projection algorithm for nonconvex-concave and convex-nonconcave minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.02032*, 2020.
54. J. Yang, S. Zhang, N. Kiyavash, and N. He. A catalyst framework for minimax optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 5667–5678, 2020.
55. J. Yang, N. Kiyavash, and N. He. Global convergence and variance-reduced optimization for a class of nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 1153–1165, 2020.

- 
56. J. Yang, A. Orvieto, A. Lucchi, and N. He. Faster single-loop algorithms for minimax optimization without strong concavity. *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 5485–5517, 2022.
  57. N. Yurii, S. Vladimir. Random Gradient-Free Minimization of Convex Functions. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 17, 527–566, 2017.