

Randomized Minimization of Eigenvalue Functions*

Yurii Nesterov[†] Anton Rodomanov[‡]

January 19, 2023

Abstract

We propose new probabilistic approximations of several eigenvalue functions related to the maximal eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix. For each of these approximations, there exists a simple unbiased stochastic subgradient oracle which is closely related to the standard Power Method for computing the leading eigenvector. We show how to apply these new tools for solving large-scale SDP problems by the Stochastic Subgradient Method using only matrix-vector products. For the resulting algorithm, we establish very attractive efficiency estimates for solving the problem with a given relative accuracy.

Keywords: convex optimization, eigenvalues, convergence guarantees, relative accuracy, gradient methods, randomization, power method

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Semidefinite Programming (SDP) is an important class of optimization problems. The standard methods for solving SDP problems are Interior-Point Methods (IPMs) [7]. These methods are based on Newton steps and are very efficient for small- and medium-size problems. In many cases, IPMs are able to find an approximate solution with a high accuracy in several dozen of iterations. However, IPMs have a significant drawback: they cannot be used for large-scale problems that often arise in modern applications and for which computing even one Newton step becomes too expensive.

The only way to solve large-scale SDP problems is to use first-order methods relying on matrix-vector products. Compared to IPMs, these methods have much cheaper iterations and compute less accurate solutions. However, the accuracy is usually not a problem since, in the majority of applications involving large-scale problems, there is no need for high accuracy.

In this work, we are interested in constructing new first-order methods for large-scale SDP problems, that are *provably* efficient in the sense that we can quantify how many

*This paper has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 788368).

[†]Center for Operations Research and Econometrics (CORE), Catholic University of Louvain (UCL). E-mail: yurii.nesterov@uclouvain.be.

[‡]Institute of Information and Communication Technologies, Electronics and Applied Mathematics (ICTEAM), Catholic University of Louvain (UCL). E-mail: anton.rodomanov@uclouvain.be.

operations the algorithm needs to make to solve the problem with a required accuracy. It is worth noting that the topic is not entirely novel and there has been some work on it recently (e.g., see [1, 8] and references therein).

In this paper, we develop new approaches for solving SDP problems in *relative scale*. Our developments are based on new probabilistic approximations of eigenvalue functions such as the maximal eigenvalue, the squared spectral norm, etc. For each such an approximation, we show how to construct an *unbiased* stochastic subgradient oracle. This oracle turns out to be closely related to the classical Power Method for computing the leading eigenvector but with a slightly different scaling factor. We then show how one can use the new oracle inside the Stochastic Gradient Method for minimization in relative scale.

1.2 Notation and Generalities

In what follows, we denote by \mathbb{E} a finite-dimensional real vector space, and by \mathbb{E}^* its dual space, formed by all linear functions on \mathbb{E} . The value of function $s \in \mathbb{E}^*$ at point $x \in \mathbb{E}$ is denoted by $\langle s, x \rangle$.

Given a self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator $B: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^*$, we can define the following Euclidean seminorm in \mathbb{E} :

$$\|x\|_B := \langle Bx, x \rangle^{1/2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{E}. \quad (1.1)$$

An important subspace for the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_B$ is the kernel $\ker B$. For any $x \in \mathbb{E}$, it holds that $\|x\|_B = 0$ iff $x \in \ker B$. Hence, the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_B$ is a norm iff B is nondegenerate. More generally, for (any) complementary subspace $(\ker B)^c \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ to $\ker B$, the restriction of $\|\cdot\|_B$ onto $(\ker B)^c$ is a norm. Note that $\|\cdot\|_B$ is constant along $\ker B$:

$$\|x + h\|_B = \|x\|_B, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{E}, \forall h \in \ker B. \quad (1.2)$$

Each seminorm $\|\cdot\|_B$ induces the following (generalized) dual norm in \mathbb{E}^* :

$$\|s\|_B^* := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{E}} \{\langle s, x \rangle : \|x\|_B \leq 1\}, \quad s \in \mathbb{E}^*. \quad (1.3)$$

Strictly speaking, $\|\cdot\|_B^*$ is not a norm in \mathbb{E}^* , as it can take infinite values at certain points:¹

$$\|s\|_B^* < +\infty \iff s \in (\ker B)^\perp, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{E}^*. \quad (1.4)$$

Nevertheless, when restricted to $(\ker B)^\perp$, $\|\cdot\|_B^*$ is indeed a norm. In the special case when B is nondegenerate, $(\ker B)^\perp = \mathbb{E}^*$ and $\|\cdot\|_B^*$ becomes a norm in \mathbb{E}^* given by $\|s\|_B^* = \langle s, B^{-1}s \rangle^{1/2}$ for all $s \in \mathbb{E}^*$. The following identity is often useful:

$$\frac{1}{2}(\|s\|_B^*)^2 = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{E}} \left[\langle s, x \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\|x\|_B^2 \right], \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{E}^*. \quad (1.5)$$

If $E = \mathbb{R}^n$, the space of n -dimensional real column vectors, then we often use the standard scalar product

$$\langle x, y \rangle = x^T y = \sum_{i=1}^n x^{(i)} y^{(i)}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

¹Hereinafter, for a linear subspace $\mathbb{L} \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, $\mathbb{L}^\perp := \{s \in \mathbb{E}^* : \langle s, x \rangle = 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{L}\}$ denotes the orthogonal complement of \mathbb{L} in \mathbb{E} .

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the standard Euclidean norm is defined as $\|x\| = \langle x, x \rangle^{1/2}$. Since this notation is used for different n , its sense depends on the space containing the arguments.

Sometimes, we use ℓ_p -norms, where $p \geq 1$ is a real parameter:

$$\|x\|_p := \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x^{(i)}|^p \right)^{1/p}, \quad \|x\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x^{(i)}|, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Its conjugate norm is defined by parameter $q \geq 1$ satisfying the equation $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$:

$$\|s\|_q = \max_{\|x\|_p \leq 1} \langle s, x \rangle, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (1.6)$$

Thus, we have an important Hölder inequality:

$$\langle s, x \rangle \leq \|s\|_q \cdot \|x\|_p, \quad s, x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (1.7)$$

To denote the standard unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n , we use notation \mathcal{S}^{n-1} .

We denote by \mathbb{R}_+^n the cone of vectors with nonnegative coordinates. If the coordinates are positive, we use notation \mathbb{R}_{++}^n . For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the inequality $x \leq y$ is understood in the coordinate-wise sense.

Similarly, notation $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is used for the space of real $n \times m$ -matrices with scalar product

$$\langle X, Y \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m X^{(i,j)} Y^{(i,j)}, \quad X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}.$$

Thus, the sense of notation $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is defined by the spaces containing the arguments. For $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, its standard Frobenius norm is defined as $\|X\|_F = \langle X, X \rangle^{1/2}$. We always denote matrices by capital letters, reserving the corresponding small letters for their columns:

$$X = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}.$$

For the space of symmetric $n \times n$ -matrices, we use notation \mathbb{S}^n . All eigenvalues of matrix $X \in \mathbb{S}^n$ are real and we denote by $\lambda_{\max}(X)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(X)$ the maximal and the minimal ones:

$$\lambda_{\max}(X) \geq \lambda^{(i)}(X) \geq \lambda_{\min}(X), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

For the vector $\lambda(X) = (\lambda^{(1)}(X), \dots, \lambda^{(n)}(X))^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we assume that its entries are decreasing. In this case, we have von Neumann inequality for symmetric matrices:

$$\langle \lambda(X), \lambda(Y) \rangle \geq \langle X, Y \rangle, \quad X, Y \in \mathbb{S}^n. \quad (1.8)$$

The matrix $X \in \mathbb{S}^n$ is positive semidefinite if $\lambda_{\min}(X) \geq 0$ (notation $X \succeq 0$). The convex cone of positive semidefinite matrices is denoted by \mathbb{S}_+^n .

For every matrix $X \in \mathbb{S}^n$, we can define its eigenvalue decomposition $X = U\Lambda U^T$, where $UU^T = I_n$ with I_n being a unit $n \times n$ -matrix, and Λ being a diagonal matrix filled by eigenvalues: $\Lambda = \text{Diag}(\lambda(X))$. Then we denote $|X| = U|\Lambda|U^T \in \mathbb{S}_+^n$, where the entries of diagonal matrix $|\Lambda|$ are equal to the absolute values of entries of Λ . Note that for $X \succeq 0$ we have $|X| = X$.

In this paper, we often use the properties of *singular-value decomposition* (SVD) of matrices. Recall that any matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ can be represented in the following form:

$$A = U^T \Sigma H, \quad (1.9)$$

where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ and $H \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times m}$ are orthogonal matrices: $UU^T = HH^T = I_r$, and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is a diagonal matrix with positive entries disposed in the decreasing order. They are called *singular values* of matrix A . Note that $\text{rank } A \leq r = \min\{n, m\}$. The value $\sigma_1 = \sigma_1(A)$ is called the *maximal singular value* of matrix A . We assume that $\Sigma = \text{Diag}(\sigma(X))$ with $\sigma(X) \in \mathbb{R}_+^r$.

Using SVD, we can find the best *low-rank approximations* of the matrices. Indeed, for matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and $p \leq r$, by Eckart-Young theorem [2] we can find the optimal solution of the following minimization problem

$$\min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}} \{\|A - X\|_F : \text{rank } X \leq p\} \quad (1.10)$$

in terms of its SVD. This is

$$X_p^* = \sum_{k=1}^p \sigma_k U^T e_k e_k^T H, \quad \|A - X_p^*\|_F = \left[\sum_{k=p+1}^r \sigma_k^2 \right]^{1/2}. \quad (1.11)$$

Note that SVD is computable by the standard tools of Linear Algebra.

Singular values of matrices are often used for defining the matrix norms (also known as *Schatten norms*). For example, for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, the value

$$\|A\|_\infty := \sigma_1(A) = \max_{\|x\|=1} \|Ax\| = \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(A^T A). \quad (1.12)$$

is called the *infinity norm* of matrix A . The norm dual to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is called ℓ_1 -norm. It is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\|_1^2 &:= \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \sigma_k(A) \right)^2 = \langle (A^T A)^{1/2}, I_m \rangle^2 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{1/2}(A^T A) \right)^2 \\ &= \inf_{X \succ 0} \{ \langle X^{-1}, A^T A \rangle : \langle X, I_m \rangle = 1 \}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.13)$$

Objective function of the optimization problem in (1.13) is jointly convex in X and A . Note also that $\|A\|_F^2 = \sum_{k=1}^m \sigma_k^2(A) = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i(A^T A)$. If $A \in \mathbb{S}^n$, then $\|A\|_p = \|\lambda(X)\|_p$, $p \geq 1$.

In our analysis, we need some facts on special mathematical functions. Namely, we will use so-called gamma function,

$$\Gamma(x) = \int_0^\infty \tau^{x-1} e^{-\tau} d\tau, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_{++}, \quad (1.14)$$

which is closely linked to the beta function

$$B(x, y) = \int_0^1 \tau^{x-1} (1-\tau)^{y-1} d\tau, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}_{++}. \quad (1.15)$$

The values of these two functions are related as follows:

$$B(x, y) = \frac{\Gamma(x)\Gamma(y)}{\Gamma(x+y)}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}_{++}. \quad (1.16)$$

Gamma function satisfies the important Wendel inequality:

$$\left(\frac{x}{x+s}\right)^{1-s} \leq \frac{\Gamma(x+s)}{x^s\Gamma(x)} \leq 1, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_{++}, s \in (0, 1). \quad (1.17)$$

2 Optimization in Relative Scale

2.1 Stochastic Gradient Method

Consider the following optimization problem:

$$f^* := \min_{x \in Q} f(x), \quad (2.1)$$

where $f: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function and $Q \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ is a nonempty convex set.

For measuring distances in the space \mathbb{E} , we will use the Euclidean seminorm $\|\cdot\|_B$, where $B: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^*$ is a fixed self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator.

Our main assumptions on problem (2.1) are as follows. First, we assume that the objective function is consistent with the seminorm, in the sense that there exists a point $\hat{x}_0 \in Q$ and a constant $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that

$$f(x) \geq \gamma_0 \|x - \hat{x}_0\|_B^2, \quad \forall x \in Q. \quad (2.2)$$

Second, we assume we have access to a stochastic gradient oracle for the objective function, specified by a random variable $\xi \sim P_\xi$ taking values in a certain set S_ξ and a mapping $g: \mathbb{E} \times S_\xi \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^*$. We assume that the stochastic gradient oracle is unbiased,

$$f'(x) := \mathcal{E}_\xi[g(x, \xi)] \in \partial f(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{E}, \quad (2.3)$$

and is consistent with the objective function, in the sense that there is a constant $L > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}_\xi[(\|g(x, \xi)\|_B^*)^2] \leq 2Lf(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{E}. \quad (2.4)$$

The point x_0 and the constants γ_0 and L are supposed to be known. Finally, we also need the following technical assumption to guarantee that problem (2.1), as well as certain auxiliary subproblems arising in the method, are well-posed.

Assumption 2.1. *The set $Q + \ker B$ is closed.*

Assumption 2.1 is satisfied, in particular, when Q is closed and B is nondegenerate, or when Q is an affine subspace (and B is arbitrary).

Let us show that, under our assumptions, problem (2.1) is guaranteed to have a solution.

Lemma 2.2. *There exists a solution to problem (2.1).*

Proof. From (2.4), it follows that $\|g(x, \xi)\|_B^* < +\infty$ (a.s.) for all $x \in \mathbb{E}$. According to (1.4), it means that $g(x, \xi) \in (\ker B)^\perp$ (a.s.) for all $x \in \mathbb{E}$. Therefore, in view of (2.3), $f'(x) \in \partial f(x) \cap (\ker B)^\perp$ for all $x \in \mathbb{E}$. According to Lemma A.3, it means that f is constant along $\ker B$, i.e., $f(x+h) = f(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{E}$ and all $h \in \ker B$.

Let us show that the restriction of f onto $P_{(\ker B)^c}(Q)$ has bounded sublevel sets, where $(\ker B)^c \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ is a complementary subspace to $\ker B$ and $P_{(\ker B)^c}: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow (\ker B)^c$ is the projector of \mathbb{E} onto $(\ker B)^c$ corresponding to the decomposition $\mathbb{E} = \ker B \oplus (\ker B)^c$. To that end, let us fix an arbitrary $u \in P_{(\ker B)^c}(Q)$. Let $x \in Q$ be such that $u = P_{(\ker B)^c}x$. Since f is constant along $\ker B$ and since (2.2) holds, we have

$$f(u) = f(x) \geq \gamma_0 \|x - \hat{x}_0\|_B^2 = \gamma_0 \|u - \hat{x}_0\|_B^2 \geq \gamma_0 (\|u\|_B - \|\hat{x}_0\|_B)^2,$$

where the second identity is due to the constancy of $\|\cdot\|_B$ along $\ker B$ (see (1.2)), and the final inequality is due to the reverse triangle inequality $\|u - \hat{x}_0\|_B \geq |\|u\|_B - \|\hat{x}_0\|_B|$. Since $\|\cdot\|_B$ is a norm on $(\ker B)^c$ (rather than a seminorm, see Section 1.2), this proves that the restriction of f onto $P_{(\ker B)^c}(Q)$ has bounded sublevel sets.

Note that f is a closed function since it is convex and its domain is the entire space.

Combining the above observations with Assumption 2.1, we see that all the assumptions of Lemma A.4 are satisfied, and thus problem (2.1) indeed has a solution. \square

The main auxiliary operation in our method will be the following gradient step:

$$T_Q(\bar{x}, g) := \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in Q} \left\{ \langle g, x \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|_B^2 \right\}, \quad \bar{x} \in \mathbb{E}, g \in (\ker B)^\perp. \quad (2.5)$$

Note that problem (2.5) may have multiple solutions (when B is degenerate); in this case, we allow $T_Q(\bar{x}, g)$ to be chosen arbitrarily among them. Nevertheless, a solution to (2.5) always exists.

Lemma 2.3. *The point $T := T_Q(\bar{x}, g)$ is well-defined for any $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{E}$ and any $g \in (\ker B)^\perp$, in the sense that problem (2.5) has a solution. This point is characterized by the following equivalent optimality conditions:*

$$\langle g + B(T - \bar{x}), x - T \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in Q, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\langle g, x - T \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|_B^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|T - \bar{x}\|_B^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|x - T\|_B^2, \quad \forall x \in Q. \quad (2.7)$$

Proof. Let $\phi: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function $\phi(x) := \langle g, x \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|_B^2$. Clearly, ϕ is closed. Also, ϕ is constant along $\ker B$ (i.e., $\phi(x+h) = \phi(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{E}$ and all $h \in \ker B$) since so is $\|\cdot\|_B$ (see Section 1.2) and since $g \in (\ker B)^\perp$. Further, it is not difficult to see that the restriction of ϕ onto $(\ker B)^c$ (a complementary subspace to $\ker B$) has bounded sublevel sets as $\|\cdot\|_B$ is a norm on $(\ker B)^c$ (rather than a seminorm, see Section 1.2). In particular, ϕ restricted to any subset of $(\ker B)^c$ also has bounded sublevel sets. Applying now Lemma A.4 (taking into account Assumption 2.1), we conclude that ϕ has a minimizer on Q , and thus the point T is well-defined.

Inequality (2.6) is the standard first-order optimality condition: a point $T \in Q$ is a minimizer of a differentiable convex function ϕ on a convex set Q iff $\langle \nabla \phi(T), x - T \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in Q$. Inequality (2.7) is equivalent to (2.6) in view of the identity

$$\langle B(T - \bar{x}), T - x \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \|T - \bar{x}\|_B^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|x - T\|_B^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|_B^2$$

which can be easily verified directly. \square

Let us present our method for finding an approximate solution to problem (2.1) in relative scale.

Algorithm 2.1: Stochastic Gradient Method
Input: Stochastic oracle g , initial point $x_0 \in Q$, constant $L > 0$.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set $v_0 := x_0$, $C_0 := 0$ ($\in \mathbb{R}$). 2. Iterate for $k \geq 0$: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Compute stochastic gradient $g_k := g(v_k, \xi_k)$, where $\xi_k \sim P_\xi$. b) Choose step size $a_k \in (0, 1/L)$ in a deterministic way. c) Compute coefficients $c_k := a_k(1 - La_k)$, $C_{k+1} := C_k + c_k$ and the new output point $x_{k+1} := (C_k x_k + c_k v_k)/C_{k+1}$. d) Update prox center $v_{k+1} := T_Q(v_k, a_k g_k)$.

Algorithm 2.1 constructs a sequence of random points $(x_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ each of which depends on the realization of i.i.d. random variables ξ_1, \dots, ξ_k . Recall from (2.5) that, in order for Step 2d in this method to be well-defined, the stochastic subgradient g_k should belong to the subspace $(\ker B)^\perp$ at each iteration $k \geq 0$. Let us show that this is indeed the case, and follows from assumption (2.4).

Lemma 2.4. *In Algorithm 2.1, we have $g_k \in (\ker B)^\perp$ (a.s.) for all $k \geq 0$. Thus, at each iteration $k \geq 0$, the computation of v_{k+1} is well-defined (a.s.).*

Proof. Let $k \geq 0$ be arbitrary. According to the definition of g_k at Step 2a and (2.4),

$$\mathcal{E}_{\xi_k}(\|g_k\|_B^*)^2 = \mathcal{E}_{\xi_k}(\|g(v_k, \xi_k)\|_B^*)^2 \leq 2Lf(v_k) < +\infty.$$

This means that $\|g_k\|_B^* < +\infty$ (a.s.). Hence, in view of (1.4), $g_k \in (\ker B)^\perp$ (a.s.). Thus, $a_k g_k \in (\ker B)^\perp$ (a.s.), and hence, by Lemma 2.3, v_{k+1} is well-defined (a.s.). \square

Observe that, by definition, for each $k \geq 0$, the point x_{k+1} is a convex combination of x_k and v_k . Since the set Q is convex, and $x_0 = v_0 \in Q$ and $v_k \in Q$ (by its definition at Step 2d) for all $k \geq 0$, we therefore have $x_{k+1} \in Q$ for all $k \geq 0$. Thus, the points $(x_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ constructed by Algorithm 2.1 are all feasible.

Let us now establish a general convergence guarantee for Algorithm 2.1, which is valid for any choice of the coefficients $(a_k)_{k=0}^\infty$.

Lemma 2.5. *In Algorithm 2.1, at any iteration $k \geq 1$, we have, for all $x \in Q$,*

$$\left[\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i(1 - La_i) \right] \mathcal{E}[f(x_k)] \leq \frac{1}{2} \|x - x_0\|_B^2 + \left[\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i \right] f(x). \quad (2.8)$$

Furthermore, if $x_0 = \hat{x}_0$ (where $\hat{x}_0 \in Q$ satisfies (2.2)), then, at any iteration $k \geq 1$,

$$(1 - \delta_k) \mathcal{E}[f(x_k)] \leq f^*, \quad \text{where } \delta_k := \frac{1 + 2\gamma_0 L \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i^2}{1 + 2\gamma_0 \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i} (< 1). \quad (2.9)$$

Proof. i. Let $x \in Q$ and $k \geq 0$ be arbitrary. By the definition of v_{k+1} at Step 2d and Lemma 2.3, we have

$$a_k \langle g_k, x - v_{k+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x - v_k\|_B^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|v_{k+1} - v_k\|_B^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|x - v_{k+1}\|_B^2.$$

Rearranging and using (1.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \|x - v_{k+1}\|_B^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|x - v_k\|_B^2 &\leq a_k \langle g_k, x - v_{k+1} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \|v_{k+1} - v_k\|_B^2 \\ &= a_k \langle g_k, x - v_k \rangle + a_k \langle g_k, v_{k+1} - v_k \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \|v_{k+1} - v_k\|_B^2 \\ &\leq a_k \langle g_k, x - v_k \rangle + \frac{1}{2} a_k^2 (\|g_k\|_B^*)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $g_k = g(v_k, \xi_k)$ (see Step 2a). Further, by the construction of Algorithm 2.1, a_k is deterministic, while v_k and x_{k+1} are independent of ξ_{k+1} . Therefore, passing to expectations w.r.t. ξ_{k+1} in the above display and using (2.3) and (2.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}_{\xi_{k+1}} [\|x - v_{k+1}\|_B^2] - \frac{1}{2} \|x - v_k\|_B^2 &\leq a_k \langle f'(v_k), x - v_k \rangle + L a_k^2 f(v_k) \\ &\leq a_k [f(x) - f(v_k)] + L a_k^2 f(v_k) = a_k f(x) - c_k f(v_k). \end{aligned}$$

(The final identity follows from the definition of c_k at Step 2c.) Passing to full expectations and rearranging, we therefore get

$$\mathcal{E}[c_k f(v_k)] + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}[\|x - v_{k+1}\|_B^2] \leq a_k f(x) + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}[\|x - v_k\|_B^2].$$

Note that this inequality is valid for any $k \geq 0$.

Summing up the above inequalities for all indices $0 \leq k' \leq k-1$, where $k \geq 1$ is arbitrary, dropping the term $\mathcal{E}[\|x - v_k\|_B^2] \geq 0$ and recalling that $v_0 = x_0$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{E} \left[\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i f(v_i) \right] \leq \left[\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i \right] f(x) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - x_0\|_B^2.$$

On the other hand, from the definitions at Step 2c, it follows that $C_k x_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i v_i$ with $C_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i$ being a deterministic coefficient (since each a_i is assumed to be so). Hence, by the convexity of f , the left-hand side in the above display is $\geq C_k \mathcal{E}[f(x_k)]$. Replacing now C_k with its explicit definition via the coefficients a_i , we obtain (2.8).

ii. Let us prove (2.9). Let $k \geq 1$ and $x \in Q$ be arbitrary. Putting together (2.8) and (2.2), we get

$$C_k \mathcal{E}[f(x_k)] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma_0} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i \right) f(x).$$

According to the definitions at Step 2c, $C_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i (1 - L a_i)$. Hence,

$$\frac{C_k}{\frac{1}{2\gamma_0} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i (1 - L a_i)}{\frac{1}{2\gamma_0} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i} = 1 - \frac{1 + 2\gamma_0 L \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i^2}{1 + 2\gamma_0 \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i} = 1 - \delta_k$$

Combining the above two displays, we get $(1 - \delta_k) \mathcal{E}[f(x_k)] \leq f(x)$. This proves (2.9) in view of the definition of f^* in (2.1) and the fact that $x \in Q$ was arbitrary. \square

Thus, after $k \geq 1$ iterations, Algorithm 2.1 generates a point $x_k \in Q$ which is a δ_k -approximate solution to (2.1) in relative scale, as specified by (2.9). Let us show that, by appropriately choosing coefficients a_k in the method, we can make δ_k as small as needed (for sufficiently large k).

First, observe that the expression for δ_k in (2.9) is very similar to that which arises in the convergence rate guarantee of the standard subgradient method (see, e.g., Theorem 3.2.2 in [6]). In general, to guarantee that $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, it suffices to choose the coefficients a_k in such a way that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k = \infty, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k^2 < \infty.$$

Let us now derive an optimal choice of coefficients for Algorithm 2.1. This is easier when we fix the total number of steps, say, $N \geq 1$. Note that δ_N from (2.9) is a symmetric convex function of the coefficients $(a_i)_{i=0}^{N-1}$. Hence, its minimum is attained at $a_i = a_N^*$, $0 \leq i \leq N-1$, where a_N^* minimizes the ratio

$$\delta_N(a) := \frac{1 + 2\gamma_0 N L a^2}{1 + 2\gamma_0 N a} \quad (2.10)$$

over all $a \in (0, \frac{1}{L})$. Differentiating $\delta_N(a)$ in a and setting the derivative to zero, we come to the following equation for a_N^* :

$$2L a_N^* (1 + 2\gamma_0 N a_N^*) = 1 + 2\gamma_0 N L (a_N^*)^2. \quad (2.11)$$

This is the quadratic equation $2\gamma_0 N L (a_N^*)^2 + 2L a_N^* = 1$ with a unique positive solution

$$a_N^* = \frac{\sqrt{8\gamma_0 N L + 4L^2} - 2L}{4\gamma_0 N L} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\gamma_0 N L + L^2} + L} \quad \left(< \frac{1}{L} \right). \quad (2.12)$$

Substituting this value into (2.10) and taking into account (2.11), we obtain

$$\delta_N^* := \delta_N(a_N^*) = 2L a_N^* = \frac{2L}{\sqrt{2\gamma_0 N L + L^2} + L} = \frac{2\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{2\gamma_0 N + L} + \sqrt{L}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2L}{\gamma_0 N}}.$$

Thus, for generating a point $x_N \in Q$, such that $(1 - \delta)\mathcal{E}[f(x_N)] \leq f^*$ for a given $\delta \in (0, 1)$, it suffices to make

$$N \geq N(\delta) := \frac{2L}{\gamma_0 \delta^2} \quad (2.13)$$

iterations of Algorithm 2.1 with coefficients (2.12).

Instead of the optimal coefficients (2.12), we can use another (simpler) choice that leads to the same complexity guarantee (2.13) but requires only the knowledge of the relative accuracy δ we want to obtain and the constant L .

Theorem 2.6. *Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Then, in Algorithm 2.1 with constant coefficients*

$$a_k := \frac{\delta}{2L} \quad \left(< \frac{1}{L} \right), \quad k \geq 0, \quad (2.14)$$

and the initial point $x_0 = \hat{x}_0$ (where $\hat{x}_0 \in Q$ satisfies (2.2)), for any integer

$$N \geq N(\delta) := \frac{2L}{\gamma_0 \delta^2}, \quad (2.15)$$

we have $(1 - \delta)\mathcal{E}[f(x_N)] \leq f^*$.

Proof. Substituting (2.14) into (2.9), we obtain, for any $N \geq N(\delta)$,

$$\delta_N = \frac{1 + 2\gamma_0 L N \frac{\delta^2}{4L^2}}{1 + 2\gamma_0 N \frac{\delta}{2L}} = \frac{2L + \gamma_0 N \delta^2}{2L + 2\gamma_0 N \delta} \leq \frac{L}{\gamma_0 N \delta} + \frac{\delta}{2} \leq \frac{L}{\gamma_0 N(\delta) \delta} + \frac{\delta}{2} = \delta,$$

where the final identity follows from (2.15). It remains to apply Lemma 2.5. \square

Remark 2.7. Expressions (2.13) and (2.15) can both be improved up to

$$N(\delta) = \frac{2L(1 - \delta)}{\gamma_0 \delta^2}.$$

2.2 Approximating Original Problem

Let us now generalize our previous setting. As before, we consider the problem

$$f^* := \min_{x \in Q} f(x), \quad (2.16)$$

where $Q \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ is a nonempty convex set and $f: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function satisfying the following consistency condition:

$$f(x) \geq \gamma_0 \|x - \hat{x}_0\|_B^2, \quad \forall x \in Q, \quad (2.17)$$

where $\hat{x}_0 \in Q$, $\gamma_0 > 0$, and $B: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^*$ is a fixed self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator inducing the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_B$. We also make the following regularity assumption:

Assumption 2.8. *The set $Q + \ker B$ is closed.*

However, now, instead of assuming that we have an unbiased stochastic oracle for f , we make a different assumption. Specifically, we assume that there exists a sequence $(f_p)_{p=1}^\infty$ of convex functions $f_p: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ approximating f :

$$\beta_p f(x) \leq f_p(x) \leq f(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{E}, \forall p \geq 1. \quad (2.18)$$

where $(\beta_p)_{p=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of coefficients in $(0, 1]$ such that

$$\beta_p \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } p \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.19)$$

and that, for each $p \geq 1$, we have access to an unbiased and consistent stochastic gradient oracle for the function f_p , specified by a random variable $\xi \sim P_\xi$ taking values in a certain set S_ξ and a mapping $g_p: \mathbb{E} \times S_\xi \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^*$:

$$f'_p(x) := \mathcal{E}_\xi[g_p(x, \xi)] \in \partial f_p(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{E}, \forall p \geq 1, \quad (2.20)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_\xi[(\|g_p(x, \xi)\|_B^*)^2] \leq 2L_p f_p(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{E}, \forall p \geq 1, \quad (2.21)$$

where $L_p > 0$ is a certain known constant. Clearly, the setting in Section 2.1 is a particular case of our new setting corresponding to the case $f_p := f$ and $\beta_p := 1$ for all $p \geq 1$.

Let us show that, under our new assumptions, problem (2.16) is still guaranteed to have a solution.

Lemma 2.9. *There exists a solution to problem (2.16).*

Proof. The proof is almost the same as that of Lemma 2.2. First, from (2.20) and (2.21), it follows that, for each $p \geq 1$, the function f_p is constant along $\ker B$: $f_p(x+h) = f_p(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{E}$ and all $h \in \ker B$. Passing to the limit in this identity as $p \rightarrow \infty$ and taking into account that, in view of (2.18) and (2.19), $f_p \rightarrow f$ (pointwise) as $p \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that f is also constant along $\ker B$. The rest of the proof is the same as that of Lemma 2.2. \square

In view of (2.18) and (2.19), the function f can be approximated by f_p with any required accuracy when p is sufficiently large. Furthermore, according to our assumptions, the problem

$$\min_{x \in Q} f_p(x) \tag{2.22}$$

satisfies the corresponding assumptions from Section 2.1. A natural approach for solving problem (2.16) is therefore to pick a sufficiently large value of p , run Algorithm 2.1 to approximately solve problem (2.22), and take its output as an approximate solution to our original problem (2.16). The following result shows how to select various parameters in this approach to have appropriate guarantees on the quality of the final solution.

Theorem 2.10. *Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and let p be sufficiently large so that*

$$\beta_p \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta. \tag{2.23}$$

Then, Algorithm 2.1 with the stochastic oracle $g := g_p$, constant $L := L_p$, initial point $x_0 := \hat{x}_0$, and coefficients

$$a_k := \frac{\delta}{4\beta_p L_p} \quad \left(< \frac{1}{2L_p} \right), \quad k \geq 0, \tag{2.24}$$

generates a random point $x_N \in Q$ such that $(1 - \delta)\mathcal{E}[f(x_N)] \leq f^$ after the following number of iterations:*

$$N \geq N(\delta) := \frac{8\beta_p^2 L_p}{\gamma_0 \delta^2}. \tag{2.25}$$

Proof. The inequality in (2.24) follows from the fact that $\beta_p < \frac{1}{2}$ in view of (2.23) and the fact that $\delta < 1$. Therefore, (2.24) is a valid choice of coefficients for Algorithm 2.1 with constant $L := L_p$.

Let $N \geq N(\delta)$ be integer. By Lemma 2.5, we have

$$C_N \mathcal{E}[f_p(x_N)] \leq \frac{1}{2} \|x - \hat{x}_0\|_B^2 + \left[\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a_i \right] f_p(x), \quad \forall x \in Q,$$

where $C_N := \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a_i(1 - L_p a_i)$. Combining this with (2.17) and (2.18), we obtain

$$\beta_p C_N \mathcal{E}[f(x_N)] \leq C_N \mathcal{E}[f_p(x_N)] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma_0} + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a_i \right) f(x), \quad \forall x \in Q.$$

Note that

$$\frac{C_N}{\frac{1}{2\gamma_0} + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a_i} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a_i(1 - L_p a_i)}{\frac{1}{2\gamma_0} + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a_i} = 1 - \frac{\frac{1}{2\gamma_0} + L_p \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a_i^2}{\frac{1}{2\gamma_0} + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a_i}.$$

Combining this with the previous display and using the definition of f^* from (2.16), we come to

$$\beta_p(1 - \delta_{p,N})\mathcal{E}[f(x_N)] \leq f^*, \quad \delta_{p,N} := \frac{1 + 2\gamma_0 L_p \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a_i^2}{1 + 2\gamma_0 \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a_i}.$$

According to (2.23), we have

$$\beta_p(1 - \delta_{p,N}) = \beta_p - \beta_p \delta_{p,N} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta - \beta_p \delta_{p,N}.$$

Hence, to prove that $(1 - \delta)\mathcal{E}[f(x_N)] \leq f^*$, it remains to show that

$$\delta_{p,N} \leq \frac{\delta}{2\beta_p} =: \delta_p.$$

But this can be done as in the proof of Theorem 2.6. Indeed, according to (2.24) and (2.25), we have $a_k = \frac{\delta_p}{2L_p}$ for all $k \geq 0$ and $N(\delta) = \frac{2L_p}{\gamma_0 \delta_p^2}$. Therefore,

$$\delta_{p,N} = \frac{1 + 2\gamma_0 L_p N \frac{\delta_p^2}{4L_p^2}}{1 + 2\gamma_0 N \frac{\delta_p}{2L_p}} = \frac{2L_p + \gamma_0 N \delta_p^2}{2L_p + 2\gamma_0 N \delta_p} \leq \frac{L_p}{\gamma_0 N \delta_p} + \frac{\delta_p}{2} \leq \frac{L_p}{\gamma_0 N(\delta) \delta_p} + \frac{\delta_p}{2} = \delta_p. \quad \square$$

Remark 2.11. Expressions (2.24) and (2.25) correspond to (2.14) and (2.15), respectively, for $L := L_p$ and $\delta' := \frac{\delta}{2\beta_p}$. A slight disadvantage of this choice is that it does not coincide with the previous one when $\beta_p = 1$ (exact approximation): it gives us $\delta' = \frac{1}{2}\delta$ instead of $\delta' = \delta$. However, if needed, we can easily rectify this by choosing δ' more carefully: $\delta' := \frac{\delta - (1 - \beta_p)}{\beta_p}$ (assuming that $\beta_p > 1 - \delta$ instead of (2.23)).

2.3 Composition with Affine Mapping

Let us make one more step in generalizing our setting. Consider the problem

$$f^* := \min_{x \in Q} [f(x) := F(Ax + b)], \quad (2.26)$$

where $Q \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ is a nonempty convex set, $A: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_1$ is a linear operator, $b \in \mathbb{E}_1$, and $F: \mathbb{E}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function satisfying assumptions from Section 2.2 on the set

$$Q_1 := A(Q) + b \quad (\subseteq \mathbb{E}_1). \quad (2.27)$$

Specifically, we assume the space \mathbb{E}_1 is equipped with a certain Euclidean seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{B_1}$, where $B_1: \mathbb{E}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_1^*$ is a self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator, and that the function F is consistent with this seminorm:

$$F(y) \geq \gamma_0 \|y - \hat{y}_0\|_{B_1}^2, \quad \forall y \in Q_1, \quad (2.28)$$

where $\hat{y}_0 \in \mathbb{E}_1$ and $\gamma_0 > 0$. We assume the following regularity condition is satisfied.

Assumption 2.12. *The set $Q_1 + \ker B_1$ is closed.*

Assumption 2.12 is satisfied, in particular, when Q is an affine subspace (e.g., when problem (2.26) is unconstrained, i.e., $Q = \mathbb{E}$).

We also assume there exists a sequence $(F_p)_{p=1}^\infty$ of convex functions $F_p: \mathbb{E}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ approximating F :

$$\beta_p F(y) \leq F_p(y) \leq F(y), \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{E}_1, \forall p \geq 1, \quad (2.29)$$

where $(\beta_p)_{p=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of coefficients in $(0, 1]$ such that

$$\beta_p \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } p \rightarrow \infty,$$

and that each function F_p is represented by a stochastic gradient oracle (G_p, ξ) which is unbiased and consistent with F_p :

$$F'_p(y) := \mathcal{E}_\xi[G_p(y, \xi)] \in \partial F_p(y), \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{E}_1, \forall p \geq 1, \quad (2.30)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_\xi[(\|G_p(y, \xi)\|_{B_1}^*)^2] \leq 2L_p F_p(y), \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{E}_1, \forall p \geq 1, \quad (2.31)$$

where $L_p > 0$ is a certain constant.

Note that the setting from Section 2.2 is a particular case of our new setting corresponding to $\mathbb{E}_1 := \mathbb{E}$, $A := I_{\mathbb{E}}$ (identity operator in \mathbb{E}), and $b := 0$.

We are going to solve problem (2.26) using the recipe from Section 2.2. Let us show that this problem satisfies all the required assumptions.

First, let us introduce a sequence $(f_p)_{p=1}^\infty$ of convex functions approximating f . A natural choice is, of course,

$$f_p(x) := F_p(Ax + b), \quad x \in \mathbb{E}, p \geq 1. \quad (2.32)$$

According to (2.29), these approximations have the same approximation coefficients as F_p :

$$\beta_p f(x) \leq f_p(x) \leq f(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{E}, \forall p \geq 1.$$

We can easily equip each function f_p with a stochastic gradient oracle (g_p, ξ) defined by

$$g_p(x, \xi) := A^* G_p(Ax + b, \xi), \quad x \in \mathbb{E}, p \geq 1, \quad (2.33)$$

From (2.30) and standard subgradient calculus rules, it follows that this oracle is unbiased:

$$\mathcal{E}_\xi[g_p(x, \xi)] = A^* \mathcal{E}_\xi[G_p(Ax + b, \xi)] = A^* F'_p(Ax + b) \in \partial f_p(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{E}, \forall p \geq 1.$$

Now let us introduce a Euclidean seminorm in the space \mathbb{E} . A good choice is

$$\|x\|_B := \|Ax\|_{B_1}, \quad x \in \mathbb{E}, \quad (2.34)$$

which is the seminorm induced by the operator

$$B := A^* B_1 A. \quad (2.35)$$

This choice is good for several reasons. First, it correctly “translates” our closedness assumption 2.12 from the space \mathbb{E}_1 into \mathbb{E} .

Lemma 2.13. *Under Assumption 2.12, the set $Q + \ker B$ is closed.*

Proof. Note from (2.35) that $\ker B = \ker(B_1 A)$ (B_1 is positive semidefinite). Combining this with (2.27) and the fact that closedness is a translation-invariant property, we see that we need to prove the following implication:

$$A(Q) + \ker B_1 \text{ is closed} \implies Q + \ker(B_1 A) \text{ is closed.}$$

But this follows from Lemma A.1. \square

Second, our choice of the seminorm preserves the consistency constants γ_0 and L_p . Indeed, let us define \hat{x}_0 in the following way:

$$\hat{x}_0 := \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in Q} \|Ax + b - \hat{y}_0\|_{B_1}^2 = T_Q(0, A^* B_1(b - \hat{y}_0)), \quad (2.36)$$

where T_Q is the gradient step defined in (2.5) (w.r.t. the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_B$ with B given by (2.35)). The identity in (2.36) follows from the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ax + b - \hat{y}_0\|_{B_1}^2 &= \|Ax\|_{B_1}^2 + \langle B_1 Ax, b - \hat{y}_0 \rangle + \|b - \hat{y}_0\|_{B_1}^2 \\ &= \|x\|_B^2 + \langle A^* B_1(b - \hat{y}_0), x \rangle + \|b - \hat{y}_0\|_{B_1}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $A^* B_1(b - \hat{y}_0) \in (\ker(B_1 A))^\perp = (\ker B)^\perp$, hence, according to Lemma 2.3, the point \hat{x}_0 is well-defined.

Lemma 2.14. *It holds that*

$$f(x) \geq \gamma_0 \|x - \hat{x}_0\|_B^2, \quad \forall x \in Q. \quad (2.37)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_\xi[(\|g_p(x, \xi)\|_B^*)^2] \leq 2L_p f_p(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{E}, \forall p \geq 1. \quad (2.38)$$

Proof. Let us prove (2.37). Let $x \in Q$ be arbitrary. From (2.26) and (2.28), we get

$$f(x) = F(Ax + b) \geq \gamma_0 \|Ax + b - \hat{y}_0\|_{B_1}^2.$$

It remains to prove that $\|Ax + b - \hat{y}_0\|_{B_1} \geq \|x - \hat{x}_0\|_B$, or, more generally, that

$$\|Ax + b - \hat{y}_0\|_{B_1}^2 \geq \|A\hat{x}_0 + b - \hat{y}_0\|_{B_1}^2 + \|x - \hat{x}_0\|_B^2. \quad (2.39)$$

This follows from (2.36). Indeed, by Lemma 2.3, we have

$$2\langle A^* B_1(b - \hat{y}_0), x - \hat{x}_0 \rangle + \|x\|_B^2 \geq \|\hat{x}_0\|_B^2 + \|x - \hat{x}_0\|_B^2.$$

Rearranging and using (2.34), we can rewrite this as follows:

$$2\langle B_1 Ax, b - \hat{y}_0 \rangle + \|Ax\|_{B_1}^2 \geq 2\langle B_1 A\hat{x}_0, b - \hat{y}_0 \rangle + \|A\hat{x}_0\|_{B_1}^2 + \|x - \hat{x}_0\|_B^2.$$

Adding $\|b - \hat{y}_0\|_{B_1}^2$ to both sides and completing the squares, we get (2.39).

Let us prove (2.38). Let $x \in \mathbb{E}$ and $p \geq 1$ be arbitrary. According to (1.3), (2.33) and (2.34),

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_p(x, \xi)\|_B^* &= \sup_{h \in \mathbb{E}} \{ \langle g_p(x, \xi), h \rangle : \|h\|_B \leq 1 \} \\ &= \sup_{h \in \mathbb{E}} \{ \langle G_p(Ax + b, \xi), Ah \rangle : \|Ah\|_{B_1} \leq 1 \} \leq \|G_p(Ax + b, \xi)\|_{B_1}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (2.31) and (2.32), we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_\xi[(\|g_p(x, \xi)\|_B^*)^2] \leq \mathcal{E}_\xi[(\|G_p(Ax + b, \xi)\|_{B_1}^*)^2] \leq 2L_p F_p(Ax + b) = 2L_p f_p(x). \quad \square$$

Thus, problem (2.26) satisfies all the assumptions from Section 2.2. Applying now Lemma 2.9 and Theorem 2.10 to problem (2.26), we get the following results.

Lemma 2.15. *There exists a solution to problem (2.26).*

Theorem 2.16. *Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and let p be sufficiently large so that*

$$\beta_p \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta.$$

Then, Algorithm 2.1 with the stochastic gradient oracle $g := g_p$ (given by (2.33)), constant $L := L_p$, seminorm $\|\cdot\|_B$ (given by (2.34) and defining the gradient step T_Q in (2.5)), initial point $x_0 := \hat{x}_0$ (given by (2.36)), and coefficients

$$a_k := \frac{\delta}{4\beta_p L_p}, \quad k \geq 0,$$

generates a random point $x_N \in Q$ such that $(1 - \delta)\mathcal{E}[f(x_N)] \leq f^$ after the following number of iterations:*

$$N \geq N(\delta) := \frac{8\beta_p^2 L_p}{\gamma_0 \delta^2}.$$

3 Applications in Semidefinite Optimization

The main goal of this section consists in justification of stochastic approximations of different eigenvalue characteristics of matrices. They are defined as expectations of some easily computable random variables. Thus, they can be used directly in the corresponding stochastic optimization methods. In this section, our random vectors belong to \mathbb{R}^n . Therefore, we will use notation $\|\cdot\|$ for the standard Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_2$.

3.1 Maximal eigenvalue of symmetric matrix

Denote by $u \sim \text{Unif}(\mathcal{S}^{n-1})$ the random variable uniformly distributed on the Euclidean unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n . Let us fix a real parameter $p \geq 1$, and consider the following function:

$$E_p(X) = \mathcal{E}_u(f_u^p(X)), \quad f_u^p(X) := \langle X^p u, u \rangle^{1/p}, \quad X \in \mathbb{S}_+^n, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_u(\cdot)$ denotes the expectation of the internal function of random vector u .

Note that the definition (3.1) does not fit the standards of Stochastic Optimization. Usually, in this field we deal with expectations of *convex functions* dependent on random parameters. However, in (3.1) function $f_u^p(\cdot)$ is *non-convex* for $p > 2$. Still, we can prove several important facts.

First of all, let us show that function $f_u^p(\cdot)$ manifests some regularity.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $1 \leq q \leq p$. Then for any $u \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ and $X \succeq 0$, we have*

$$f_u^q(X) \leq f_u^p(X) \leq \lambda_{\max}(X). \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Indeed, let us represent X in its eigenvalue basis: $X = U\Lambda U^T$. Denote $v = U^T u$. Then, since $\sum_{i=1}^n (v^{(i)})^2 = 1$ and function τ^γ , $\tau \geq 0$, is concave for $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, we have

$$\lambda_{\max}^q(X) \geq (f_u^p(X))^q = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^p(X) (v^{(i)})^2 \right)^{q/p} \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^q(X) (v^{(i)})^2 = (f_u^q(X))^q. \quad \square$$

It is important that the expectation of these functions is convex.

Theorem 3.2. *Function $E_p(X)$, $X \in \mathbb{S}_+^n$, is convex and positively homogeneous of degree one. It has the following eigenvalue representation:*

$$E_p(X) = \mathcal{E}_u \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\lambda^{(i)}(X) \right)^p (u^{(i)})^2 \right)^{1/p} \right). \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. Denote by V_n the surface area of \mathcal{S}^{n-1} . Then $E_p(X) = V_n^{-1} \int_{u \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \langle X^p u, u \rangle^{1/p} du$. Using the eigenvalues decomposition

$$X = U\Lambda U^T, \quad \Lambda = \text{Diag}(\lambda(X)),$$

we can define new variables $v = U^T u$. Then $\langle X^p u, u \rangle = \langle \Lambda^p v, v \rangle$. Since U is orthogonal, we conclude that

$$E_p(X) = \mathcal{E}_v \left(\langle \Lambda^p v, v \rangle^{1/p} \right).$$

This is the representation (3.3). Since for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ function $\langle \text{Diag}^p(\lambda)v, v \rangle^{1/p}$ is a convex function in $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ with degree of homogeneity one, the same is true for function $\varphi_p(\lambda) = \mathcal{E}_v (\langle \text{Diag}^p(\lambda)v, v \rangle^{1/p})$. It remains to note that $\varphi_p(\cdot)$ is a symmetric function. Hence, function $E_p(X) = \varphi_p(\lambda(X))$ is convex [4]. \square

The following relations follow from convexity and homogeneity of function $E_p(\cdot)$:

$$\begin{aligned} E_p(X) &= \langle \nabla E_p(X), X \rangle, \quad X \in \mathbb{S}^n, \\ E_p(Y) &\geq E_p(X) + \langle \nabla E_p(X), Y - X \rangle = \langle \nabla E_p(X), Y \rangle, \quad X, Y \in \mathbb{S}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Note that function $E_p(X)$ approximates the maximal eigenvalue of matrix $X \succeq 0$.

Theorem 3.3. *For any $X \succeq 0$, we have*

$$\beta_p \|\lambda(X)\|_p \leq E_p(X) \leq \lambda_{\max}(X), \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$\beta_p := \frac{p}{p+2} \left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^{1/p}. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. Since $f_U^p(X) \leq \lambda_{\max}(X)$, the second inequality in (3.5) is evident. In order to prove the first one, note that

$$\begin{aligned} E_p(X) &\stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \|\lambda(X)\|_p \cdot \mathcal{E}_u \left(\left(\|\lambda(X)\|_p^{-p} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\lambda^{(i)}(X) \right)^p (u^{(i)})^2 \right)^{1/p} \right) \\ &\geq \|\lambda(X)\|_p \cdot \mathcal{E}_u \left(\|\lambda(X)\|_p^{-p} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\lambda^{(i)}(X) \right)^p (u^{(i)})^{2/p} \right) \\ &= \|\lambda(X)\|_p \cdot A_p, \end{aligned}$$

where $A_p := \mathcal{E}_u (|u^{(i)}|^{2/p})$. It remains to find the lower bound for this value.

Denote by V_n the surface area of \mathcal{S}^{n-1} . Then

$$A_p = \frac{1}{V_n} \int_{-1}^1 |\xi|^{2/p} (1 - \xi^2)^{(n-3)/2} V_{n-1} d\xi = \frac{2}{V_n} \int_0^1 \xi^{2/p} (1 - \xi^2)^{(n-3)/2} V_{n-1} d\xi.$$

On the other hand, $V_n = \int_{-1}^1 (1 - \xi^2)^{(n-3)/2} V_{n-1} d\xi$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} A_p &= \int_0^1 \xi^{2/p} (1 - \xi^2)^{(n-3)/2} d\xi \left[\int_0^1 (1 - \xi^2)^{(n-3)/2} d\xi \right]^{-1} \\ &\stackrel{(\xi^2 \rightarrow \tau)}{=} \int_0^1 \tau^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}} (1 - \tau)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} d\tau \left[\int_0^1 \tau^{-\frac{1}{2}} (1 - \tau)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} d\tau \right]^{-1} \\ &= B\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}, \frac{n-1}{2}\right) / B\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{n-1}{2}\right) \stackrel{(1.16)}{=} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{p}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of inequalities (1.17), we have

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)} \geq \frac{p}{p+2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}\right)^{1/p}, \quad \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{p}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)} \leq \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{1/p}.$$

Hence,

$$A_p \geq \frac{p}{p+2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}\right)^{1/p} \cdot \left(\frac{2}{n}\right)^{1/p} \geq \frac{p}{p+2} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad \square$$

Thus, we can use function $E_p(\cdot)$ for replacing the maximal eigenvalues of symmetric matrices in the corresponding optimization problems. Let us look at complexity of its stochastic approximation. It is clear that for integer values of p , computation of the value $f_u^p(X)$ needs only p matrix/vector multiplications. The same is true for its gradient:

$$\nabla f_u^p(X) = \frac{1}{p} \langle X^p u, u \rangle^{\frac{1}{p}-1} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} X^i u u^T X^{p-1-i}, \quad X \succeq 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Since function $f_u^p(\cdot)$ is homogeneous, it satisfies Euler identity:

$$\langle \nabla f_u^p(X), X \rangle = f_u^p(X), \quad X \succeq 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Let us prove that the random vector $\nabla f_u^p(X)$ is an unbiased estimate for the gradient of convex function $E_p(X)$ (despite to the fact that the function $f_u^p(\cdot)$ itself is not convex).

Theorem 3.4. *For all $X \succeq 0$ we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_u (\nabla f_u^p(X)) = \nabla E_p(X) \succeq 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Proof. Let matrix X has the following eigenvalue decomposition: $X = U\Lambda U^T$. Introducing new variables $v = U^T u$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g &:= \mathcal{E}_u(\nabla f_u^p(X)) = \frac{1}{pV_n} \int_{v \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} U\Lambda^i \frac{vv^T dv}{\langle \Lambda^p v, v \rangle^{(p-1)/p}} \Lambda^{p-1-i} U^T \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} U\Lambda^i \left(\frac{1}{V_n} \int_{v \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \frac{vv^T dv}{\langle \Lambda^p v, v \rangle^{(p-1)/p}} \right) \Lambda^{p-1-i} U^T. \end{aligned}$$

Denote the matrix in the brackets by J . In view of sign symmetry of the unit sphere, this is a diagonal matrix with the diagonal elements

$$J^{(i,i)} = \frac{1}{V_n} \int_{v \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \frac{(v^{(i)})^2 dv}{\langle \Lambda^p v, v \rangle^{(p-1)/p}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Since the diagonal matrices commute, we conclude that $g = U(\Lambda^{p-1}J)U^T$. Defining symmetric function $\varphi_p(\lambda) = \mathcal{E}_v(\langle \text{Diag}^p(\lambda)v, v \rangle^{1/p})$, we can see that

$$\Lambda^{p-1}J = \text{Diag}(\nabla \varphi_p(\lambda)) \succeq 0.$$

Hence, $g = \nabla E_p(X) \succeq 0$, where $E_p(X) = \varphi_p(\lambda(X))$ (see Theorem 1.1 in [5]). \square

However, to be able to use the stochastic gradient $\nabla f_u^p(\cdot)$ in optimization schemes, we need to make sure its squared norm is uniformly bounded in expectation. And this cannot be done without employing the lower and upper bounds onto the spectrum of matrix X . This is the reason why we are going to use an alternative stochastic approximation of the gradient $\nabla E_p(\cdot)$.

Let us fix an *odd* integer value $p \geq 1$. For a random vector $u \sim \text{Unif}(\mathcal{S}^{n-1})$, define

$$\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(X) := \frac{X^{(p-1)/2} u u^T X^{(p-1)/2}}{\langle X^p u, u \rangle^{(p-1)/p}} \in \mathbb{S}_+^n, \quad X \succeq 0. \quad (3.10)$$

Theorem 3.5. *For any odd $p \geq 1$ and all $X \succeq 0$, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_u(\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(X)) = \nabla E_p(X). \quad (3.11)$$

Moreover, for any $u \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$, we have

$$\|\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(X)\|_1 \leq 1. \quad (3.12)$$

Proof. Let us represent X in the basis of eigenvalues: $X = U\Lambda U^T$. Introducing new variables $v = U^T u$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g &:= \mathcal{E}_u(\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(X)) = \frac{1}{V_n} \int_{v \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} U\Lambda^{(p-1)/2} \frac{vv^T dv}{\langle \Lambda^p v, v \rangle^{(p-1)/p}} \Lambda^{(p-1)/2} U^T \\ &= U\Lambda^{(p-1)/2} \left(\frac{1}{V_n} \int_{v \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \frac{vv^T dv}{\langle \Lambda^p v, v \rangle^{(p-1)/p}} \right) \Lambda^{(p-1)/2} U^T. \end{aligned}$$

Denote the matrix in the brackets by J . In view of sign symmetry of the unit sphere, this is a diagonal matrix with the diagonal elements

$$J^{(i,i)} = \frac{1}{V_n} \int_{v \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \frac{(v^{(i)})^2 dv}{\langle \Lambda^p v, v \rangle^{(p-1)/p}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Since the diagonal matrices commute, we conclude that $g = U(\Lambda^{p-1}J)U^T$. Defining symmetric function $\varphi_p(\lambda) = \mathcal{E}_v(\langle \text{Diag}^p(\lambda)v, v \rangle^{1/p})$, we can see that

$$\Lambda^{p-1}J = \text{Diag}(\nabla \varphi_p(\lambda)) \succeq 0.$$

Hence, $g = \nabla E_p(X) \succeq 0$, where $E_p(X) = \varphi_p(\lambda(X))$ (see Theorem 1.1 in [5]).

In order to prove bound (3.12), note that $\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(X) \succeq 0$ is a rank-one matrix. Hence,

$$\|\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(X)\|_1 = \lambda_{\max}(\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(X)) \stackrel{(3.10)}{=} \frac{\langle X^{p-1}u, u \rangle}{\langle X^p u, u \rangle^{(p-1)/p}} \stackrel{(3.2)}{\leq} 1. \quad \square$$

Note that matrix $\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(X)$ is not a gradient of function $f_u^p(\cdot)$ at X . Still, it turns out to be an unbiased estimate of $\nabla E_p(X)$.

Direct computation of matrix $\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(X)$ by the definition (3.10) may cause numerical instability in view of the presence of high powers of matrices. However, since the norm of the required matrix is small (see (3.12)), we can organize its computation in a stable way.

Indeed, denote $k := (p-1)/2$ and consider the following classical *Power Method*:

1. Choose randomly $u \in \text{Unif}(\mathcal{S}^{n-1})$. Set $y_0 = u$.
2. For $i = 1, \dots, k$, iterate: $y_i = X y_{i-1} / \|X y_{i-1}\|$.

It is not difficult to see that $y_i = \frac{X^i u}{\|X^i u\|}$, $i = 0, \dots, k$. Consequently,

$$\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(X) = y_k y_k^T \cdot \frac{\|X^k u\|^2}{\langle X^{2k+1} u, u \rangle^{2k/(2k+1)}} = \frac{\tau_k}{\langle X y_k, y_k \rangle} y_k y_k^T, \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$\tau_k := \langle X^{2k+1} u, u \rangle^{1/(2k+1)} = [\langle X y_k, y_k \rangle \|X^k u\|^2]^{1/(2k+1)}.$$

At the same time, $\frac{\|X^{i+1} u\|^2}{\|X^i u\|^2} = \|X y_i\|^2$, $i = 0, \dots, k-1$. Therefore,

$$\sigma_k := \ln \|X^k u\|^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \ln \|X y_i\|^2.$$

Thus, we can compute the required factor in (3.14) by the following expression:

$$\tau_k = \exp \left\{ \frac{\ln \langle X y_k, y_k \rangle + \sigma_k}{2k+1} \right\}. \quad (3.15)$$

Note that the common practice today is to use in the minimization schemes directly the matrix $y_k y_k^T$. This idea is supported by the fact that, in general, this matrix converges linearly to the subdifferential

$$\partial \lambda_{\max}(X) = \text{conv} \{ y y^T : \langle X y, y \rangle = \lambda_{\max}(X), y \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1} \}, \quad X \succeq 0.$$

However, since usually it is impossible to guarantee a certain rate of convergence, justification of the corresponding methods remain on heuristic level.

3.2 Squared infinity norm of matrices

Let $n \leq m$. For an integer parameter $p \geq 1$, define

$$Q_p(X) = E_p(XX^T) = \mathcal{E}_u \left(\langle (XX^T)^p u, u \rangle^{1/p} \right), \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}. \quad (3.16)$$

We will see that this is a probabilistic approximation of the squared infinity norm of the rectangular matrix X . Let us mention the main properties of this function.

1. Function $Q_p(X)$ is positively homogeneous of degree two:

$$Q_p(\tau X) = \tau^2 Q_p(X), \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}, \quad \tau \geq 0. \quad (3.17)$$

Consequently, it satisfies the Euler identity of degree two:

$$\langle \nabla Q_p(X), X \rangle = 2Q_p(X), \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}. \quad (3.18)$$

2. Derivative of function $Q_p(\cdot)$ along direction $H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ can be computed as follows:

$$DQ_p(X)[H] = \langle \nabla E_p(XX^T), XH^T + HX^T \rangle = 2\langle \nabla E_p(XX^T)X, H \rangle.$$

Thus,

$$\nabla Q_p(X) = 2\nabla E_p(XX^T)X, \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}. \quad (3.19)$$

Consequently, we conclude that

$$\nabla Q_p(X) \stackrel{(3.9)}{=} \mathcal{E}_u \left(2\nabla f_u^p(XX^T)X \right), \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}. \quad (3.20)$$

3. Function $Q_p(\cdot)$ is convex on $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$. Indeed, for two arbitrary matrices X and Y from $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &:= Q_p(X) + \langle \nabla Q_p(X), Y - X \rangle \stackrel{(3.18)}{=} \langle \nabla Q_p(X), Y \rangle - Q_p(X) \\ &\stackrel{(3.19)}{=} 2\langle \nabla E_p(XX^T)X, Y \rangle - Q_p(X) = \langle \nabla E_p(XX^T), YX^T + XY^T \rangle - Q_p(X). \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 \preceq (X - Y)(X - Y)^T$, we conclude that $YX^T + XY^T \preceq XX^T + YY^T$. Therefore, in view of inequality (3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &\leq \langle \nabla E_p(XX^T), XX^T + YY^T \rangle - Q_p(X) \\ &\stackrel{(3.4)}{=} \langle \nabla E_p(XX^T), YY^T \rangle \stackrel{(3.4)}{\leq} E_p(YY^T) = Q_p(Y). \end{aligned}$$

Let us estimate now the quality of approximation of $\|X\|_\infty^2$ by the value $Q_p(X)$.

Theorem 3.6. *For any $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and $p \geq 1$, we have*

$$\beta_p \|X\|_{2p}^2 \leq Q_p(X) \leq \|X\|_\infty^2, \quad (3.21)$$

where β_p is defined in (3.6).

Proof. Indeed, $Q_p(X) = E_p(XX^T) \stackrel{(3.5)}{\leq} \lambda_{\max}(XX^T) = \sigma_1^2(X)$, and this is the second inequality in (3.21). For the first one, it is enough to note that $\|\lambda(XX^T)\|_p = \|X\|_{2p}^2$ and use the second inequality in (3.5). \square

Let us discuss now our possibilities in stochastic approximation of the gradient $\nabla Q_p(X)$ by matrices with bounded norms. In accordance to the recipes of Section 3.1 and representation (3.19), we need to look at the matrices

$$\widehat{\nabla}_u Q_p(X) := \frac{2(XX^T)^{(p-1)/2}uu^T(XX^T)^{(p-1)/2}X}{\langle (XX^T)^p u, u \rangle^{(p-1)/p}} \equiv 2[\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(XX^T)]X, \quad (3.22)$$

where $u \sim \text{Unif}(\mathcal{S}^{n-1})$ and $p \geq 1$ is an odd integer.

Let us show that stochastic gradient oracle (3.22) is unbiased and consistent with Q_p . For measuring the consistency parameter, we use the Frobenius norm.

Theorem 3.7. *For any $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and any odd integer $p \geq 1$, we have*

$$\|X\|_{\infty}^2 \geq \gamma_0 \|X\|_F^2, \quad (3.23)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_u[\widehat{\nabla}_u Q_p(X)] = \nabla Q_p(X), \quad (3.24)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_u[\|\widehat{\nabla}_u Q_p(X)\|_F^2] \leq 2L_p Q_p(X), \quad (3.25)$$

where

$$\gamma_0 := \frac{1}{n}, \quad L_p := \frac{2}{\beta_p},$$

and β_p is given by (3.6).

Proof. Inequality (3.23) follows from the standard inequality between ℓ_2 and ℓ_{∞} norms in \mathbb{R}^n applied to the vector of eigenvalues:

$$\|X\|_{\infty}^2 = \|\lambda(X)\|_{\infty}^2 \geq \frac{1}{n} \|\lambda(X)\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{n} \|\lambda(X)\|_F^2.$$

Identity (3.24) is a simple consequence of Theorem 3.5 and formula (3.19).

Finally, note that

$$\widehat{\nabla}_u Q_p(X) [\widehat{\nabla}_u Q_p(X)]^T = \frac{4(XX^T)^{(p-1)/2}uu^T(XX^T)^{(p-1)/2}}{\langle (XX^T)^p u, u \rangle^{(p-2)/p}}.$$

Hence, in view of (3.2),

$$\|\widehat{\nabla}_u Q_p(X)\|_F^2 = 4 \frac{\langle (XX^T)^{p-1}u, u \rangle}{\langle (XX^T)^p u, u \rangle^{(p-2)/p}} \leq 4 \frac{\langle (XX^T)^{p-1}u, u \rangle}{\langle (XX^T)^{p-2}u, u \rangle} \leq 4\|X\|_{\infty}^2.$$

Applying Theorem 3.6, we get (3.25). \square

An alternative way of approximating $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ consists in using $\tilde{Q}_p(X) = E_p(X^T X)$. Then inequality (3.21) is valid with replacement of n by m in (3.6). Thus, we can always work in dimension $\min\{n, m\}$.

To conclude this section, let us show how the construction (3.16) works for symmetric matrices. Consider the following function:

$$R_p(S) = E_p(S^2) = \mathcal{E}_u \left(\langle S^{2p}u, u \rangle^{1/p} \right) = \mathcal{E}_u \left(\|S^p u\|^{2/p} \right), \quad S \in \mathbb{S}^n. \quad (3.26)$$

Since $R_p(\cdot)$ is a restriction of function $Q_p(\cdot)$ onto the subspace of symmetric matrices, it inherits the convexity and satisfies identities (3.17) and (3.18). For its derivative along direction $H \in \mathbb{S}^n$, we have the following representation:

$$DR_p(S)[H] = \langle \nabla E_p(S^2), SH + HS \rangle = \langle S \nabla E_p(S^2) + \nabla E_p(S^2) S, H \rangle.$$

Thus,

$$\nabla R_p(S) = S \nabla E_p(S^2) + \nabla E_p(S^2) S \stackrel{(3.9)}{=} \mathcal{E}_u \left(S \nabla f_u^p(S^2) + \nabla f_u^p(S^2) S \right), \quad S \in \mathbb{S}^n. \quad (3.27)$$

Clearly, function $R_p(\cdot)$ satisfies the bounds (3.21). It remains to estimate the size of its stochastic approximation.

Let us choose an odd integer $p \geq 1$. Consider the following rank-two matrices:

$$\widehat{\nabla}_u R_p(S) := \frac{S^{p-1} (uu^T S + S uu^T) S^{p-1}}{\langle S^{2p}u, u \rangle^{(p-1)/(p+1)}} \equiv S[\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(S^2)] + [\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(S^2)]S. \quad (3.28)$$

Then, in view of Theorem 3.5, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_u(\widehat{\nabla}_u R_p(S)) = \nabla R_p(S), \quad S \in \mathbb{S}^n. \quad (3.29)$$

On the other hand, for any $u \in \text{Unif}(\mathcal{S}^{n-1})$, we have

$$\|\widehat{\nabla}_u R_p(S)\|_\infty \stackrel{(3.28)}{\leq} 2 \max_{\|u\| \leq 1} \langle [\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(S^2)]u, Su \rangle \stackrel{(3.12)}{\leq} 2 \max_{\|u\| \leq 1} \|Su\| = 2\|S\|_\infty. \quad (3.30)$$

For using the function $R_p(S)$ for optimization in relative scale, we can get the similar values of all necessary constants. Indeed, as before,

$$\|S\|_\infty^2 \geq \frac{1}{n} \|S\|_F^2.$$

On the other hand, since the rank of matrix $\widehat{\nabla}_u R_p(S)$ is equal to two, we have

$$\|\widehat{\nabla}_u R_p(S)\|_F^2 \leq 2\|\widehat{\nabla}_u R_p(S)\|_\infty^2 \stackrel{(3.30)}{\leq} 8\|S\|_\infty^2 \stackrel{(3.21)}{\leq} 8\beta_p R_p(S).$$

Thus, for function $R_p(S)$ we can use the following parameters:

$$\gamma_0 = \frac{1}{n}, \quad L = \frac{4}{\beta_p}. \quad (3.31)$$

4 Spectral Linear Regression

Consider the problem of linear approximation of a given matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ by a given collection of matrices $A_1, \dots, A_d \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ w.r.t. the matrix infinity norm:

$$f^* := \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x), \quad f(x) := \left\| \sum_{i=1}^d x_i A_i - C \right\|_{\infty}. \quad (4.1)$$

Note that problem (4.1) is very similar to a classical linear regression problem. The only difference is that we measure the residual between matrices in the *spectral* norm instead of the Frobenius one. In view of this analogy, we refer to problem (4.1) as a *spectral linear regression* problem.

In what follows, without loss of generality, we assume that $n \leq m$ (otherwise, we can simply transpose all matrices).

We are going to find an approximate solution to problem (4.1) in *relative scale*. For this, however, it will be convenient to first transform this problem into an equivalent one by squaring the objective function:

$$(f^*)^2 = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f^2(x), \quad f^2(x) = \|Ax - C\|_{\infty}^2, \quad (4.2)$$

where $A: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is the linear operator

$$Ax := \sum_{i=1}^d x_i A_i, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.3)$$

Let us show that problem (4.2) fits the setting from Section 2.3. For this, let us equip the space $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ with the standard Frobenius norm:

$$\|X\| := \|X\|_F, \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}.$$

In the notation of Section 2.3, this is the Euclidean seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{B_1}$ with $B_1 = I$ (identity operator in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$).

Clearly, we have

$$f^2(x) = F(Ax - C), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $F: \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the squared spectral norm:

$$F(Y) := \|Y\|_{\infty}^2.$$

From Theorem 3.7, we know that function F is consistent with the norm $\|\cdot\|$. The corresponding consistency parameters are

$$\gamma_0 := \frac{1}{n}, \quad \hat{Y}_0 := 0. \quad (4.4)$$

Further, Assumption 2.12 is satisfied as problem (4.2) is unconstrained.

It remains to approximate function F by a sequence of functions F_p that admit an (efficient) unbiased and consistent stochastic gradient oracle G_p . Once this has been done, we may conclude (from Lemma 2.15) that problem (4.2) has a solution (and hence

so does our original problem (4.1)). Furthermore, we can apply Algorithm 2.1 for solving problem (4.2) with a specified relative accuracy $\Delta \in (0, 1)$.

According to Theorem 2.16, the parameters in this method should be chosen as follows (where β_p and L_p are the corresponding approximation and consistency constants):

- Oracle degree p such that

$$\beta_p \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\Delta. \quad (4.5)$$

- Stochastic gradient oracle

$$g_p(x, u) := A^*G_p(Ax - C, u), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where u is the random variable used by the stochastic oracle G_p , and A^* is the adjoint operator (see (4.3))

$$A^*H := (\langle A_i, H \rangle)_{i=1}^d \quad (\in \mathbb{R}^d), \quad H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}.$$

- Matrix $B := A^*A$. This is the matrix with elements (see (4.3))

$$B_{i,j} = \langle A_i, A_j \rangle, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq d,$$

i.e., the Gram matrix of the system of matrices A_1, \dots, A_d . The matrix B defines the gradient step operation:

$$T(\bar{x}, g) := \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \langle g, x \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|_B^2 \right\}, \quad \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad g \in (\ker B)^\perp.$$

Note that $T := T(\bar{x}, g)$ can be computed by solving the following linear system (which is guaranteed to be solvable):

$$B(T - \bar{x}) = -g.$$

- Initial point $x_0 = T(0, A^*(-C - \hat{Y}_0)) = T(0, -A^*C)$ (see (4.4)).
- Constant $L := L_p$.
- Step sizes $a_k := \Delta / (4\beta_p L_p)$, $k \geq 0$.

For the above choice of parameters, from Theorem 2.16, we know that Algorithm 2.1 produces a random point $x_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$ which is a Δ -approximate solution (in relative scale) to problem (4.2), i.e.,

$$(1 - \Delta)\mathcal{E}[f^2(x_N)] \leq (f^*)^2, \quad (4.6)$$

after the following number of iterations:

$$N \geq N(\Delta) := \frac{8\beta_p^2 L_p}{\gamma_0 \Delta^2} = \frac{8\beta_p^2 L_p n}{\Delta^2}, \quad (4.7)$$

where we have used (4.4) for the final identity.

Recall, however, that our initial problem was (4.1), not (4.2). Let us therefore see what guarantees we have for the point x_N in terms of our initial problem. Using Jensen's inequality in (4.6), we get

$$\sqrt{1 - \Delta} \mathcal{E}[f(x_N)] \leq \sqrt{(1 - \Delta) \mathcal{E}[f^2(x_N)]} \leq f^*.$$

Hence, for any given $\delta \in (0, 1)$, choosing

$$\Delta := (2 - \delta)\delta \quad (\in (0, 1)), \tag{4.8}$$

we can guarantee that the point x_N is a δ -approximate solution (in relative scale) to our original problem (4.1):

$$(1 - \delta) \mathcal{E}[f(x_N)] \leq f^*.$$

Let us now consider two possibilities for approximating function F and defining the corresponding stochastic gradient oracle G_p .

4.1 Power Iteration Oracle

First, let us forget for a moment about our developments in Section 3.2 and consider the following “naive” approach for approximating F . Specifically, let us choose the function itself as its own approximation:

$$F_p := F, \quad \forall p \geq 1.$$

In this case, the approximation parameter is the best we can hope for:

$$\beta_p = 1, \quad \forall p \geq 1. \tag{4.9}$$

Representing now F in a variational form,

$$F(Y) = \|Y\|_\infty^2 = \lambda_{\max}(YY^T) = \max_{v \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \langle YY^T v, v \rangle, \quad \forall Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m},$$

and using standard subgradient calculus rules, we can easily write down the formula for a subgradient of F :

$$F'(Y) := 2v(Y)[v(Y)]^T Y \in \partial F(Y), \quad Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m},$$

where $v(Y) \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ is (a certainly chosen) leading eigenvector of the matrix YY^T . Although the subgradient mapping F' defined above is deterministic, we may, in principle, treat it as stochastic. This gives us a stochastic gradient oracle for our function F , which is, clearly, unbiased. Furthermore, it is also consistent with F : for any $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, we have, denoting for brevity $v := v(Y)$,

$$\|F'(Y)\|_*^2 = \|F'(Y)\|^2 = 4\langle vv^T Y, vv^T Y \rangle = 4\langle YY^T v, v \rangle = 4F(Y). \tag{4.10}$$

The corresponding consistency parameter is thus

$$L := 2. \tag{4.11}$$

Of course, the main problem with the above approach is that, usually, we cannot compute $F'(Y)$ exactly since we cannot compute exactly the leading eigenvector $v(Y)$. Nevertheless, we may approximate it using the classical *Power Method*:

$$v(Y) \approx \hat{v}_u^q(Y) := \frac{(YY^T)^q u}{\|(YY^T)^q u\|} \quad (\in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}), \quad Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}, \quad u \sim \text{Unif}(\mathcal{S}^{n-1}), \quad (4.12)$$

where $q \geq 1$ is a sufficiently large integer. Then, we can approximate

$$F'(Y) \approx \hat{G}_u^q(Y) := 2\hat{v}_u^q(Y)[\hat{v}_u^q(Y)]^T Y, \quad Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}, \quad u \sim \text{Unif}(\mathcal{S}^{n-1}). \quad (4.13)$$

Thus, we get the following *Power Iteration* stochastic gradient oracle:

$$G_q(Y, u) := \hat{G}_u^q(Y) = \frac{2(YY^T)^q u u^T (YY^T)^q Y}{\langle (YY^T)^q u, u \rangle}, \quad Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}, \quad u \sim \text{Unif}(\mathcal{S}^{n-1}). \quad (4.14)$$

Note that this oracle is very similar to our oracle from (3.22) when

$$q = \frac{1}{2}(p-1) \quad (4.15)$$

for some odd integer $p \geq 1$. The only difference between them is the choice of normalization factor.

It is not difficult to see (using exactly the same argument as in (4.10)) that the Power Iteration oracle is still consistent with the function F with exactly the same consistency parameter: $L_q := 2$ for all $q \geq 1$. However, in general, the Power Iteration oracle does *not* give us an unbiased estimate of the subgradient of F . Moreover, up to know, it is not even clear whether $\mathcal{E}_u[\hat{G}_u^q(Y)]$ is a gradient of a certain convex function (that approximates F). This remains an interesting open question.

Thus, unfortunately, the method with the Power Iteration oracle is only a heuristic, and we do not have any theoretical complexity estimate for it similar to (4.18). Nevertheless, as we will see in the next subsection, we do have an alternative that works—our new oracle (3.22).

4.2 Our New Oracle

As we know from Section 3.2, we can approximate our function F by a sequence of functions $(Q_p)_{p=1}^\infty$, each equipped with an unbiased and consistent stochastic gradient oracle. This gives us the following stochastic oracle:

$$G_p(Y, u) := \hat{\nabla}_u Q_p(Y), \quad Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}, \quad u \sim \text{Unif}(\mathcal{S}^{n-1}), \quad (4.16)$$

where $p \geq 1$ is an odd integer, and $\hat{\nabla}_u Q_p(Y)$ is defined in (3.22). The corresponding approximation constant and consistency parameter are as follows:

$$\beta_p := \frac{p}{p+2} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{1/p}, \quad L_p := \frac{2}{\beta_p}. \quad (4.17)$$

Substituting the above values into (4.7), we thus get the following iteration complexity bound for solving problem (4.1) with relative accuracy δ :

$$N = \frac{8\beta_p^2 L_p n}{\Delta^2} = \frac{16\beta_p n}{\Delta^2} \leq \frac{16n}{\Delta^2}, \quad (4.18)$$

where Δ is given by (4.8).

Recall that the oracle degree p needs to be chosen sufficiently large so that (4.5) holds. Let us do this. From (4.17), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_p &= \frac{p}{p+2} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{1/p} = \frac{p}{p+2} \exp\left(-\frac{\ln n}{p}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{p}{p+2} \left(1 - \frac{\ln n}{p}\right) = \frac{p - \ln n}{p+2} = 1 - \frac{\ln n + 2}{p+2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we need to choose p satisfying

$$p + 2 \geq \frac{2}{\Delta}(\ln n + 2).$$

At the same time, p must be an odd integer. A reasonable choice is thus

$$p := 2k + 1, \quad k := \lceil (\ln n + 2)/\Delta \rceil. \quad (4.19)$$

Substituting now (4.8) into (4.19) and (4.18), we see that the total number of matrix-vector multiplications required by our approach is at most

$$N(\Delta)p \sim \frac{16\beta_p n}{\Delta^2} \cdot \frac{2}{\Delta}(\ln n + 2) \sim \frac{n \ln n}{\Delta^3} \sim \frac{n \ln n}{\delta^3}.$$

5 Numerical Experiments

Let us now present preliminary computational results for Algorithm 2.1, as applied for solving the spectral linear regression problem (4.1) using the setup from Sections 4 and 4.2. We set the target relative accuracy to 1 percent:

$$\delta := 0.01, \quad (5.1)$$

which is a typical choice in most engineering applications. For computing the stochastic gradient oracle (4.16), we use formula (3.22) and compute $\widehat{\nabla}_u E_p(\cdot)$ with the numerically stable algorithm described in (3.13)–(3.15).

To be able to assess the performance of our optimization method, we generate data for problem (4.1) in a special way. Specifically, we choose the matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ to be diagonal such that its largest element (in absolute value) is fixed and is located in the top left corner:

$$C = \text{Diag}(1, c_2, \dots, c_n), \quad |c_i| \leq 1, \quad 2 \leq i \leq n, \quad (5.2)$$

while the matrices $A_1, \dots, A_d \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ are constructed in such a way so that each of them has zero in the top left corner:

$$A_i^{(1,1)} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq d. \quad (5.3)$$

This way of generating data ensures that we know an optimal value for our problem.

Lemma 5.1. *Problem (4.1) with data satisfying requirements (5.2) and (5.3) has an optimal solution $x^* = 0$ and the following optimal value:*

$$f^* = f(0) = \|C\|_\infty = 1.$$

Proof. It suffices to show that f has a zero subgradient at $x^* = 0$. Note that, for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have $f(x) = F(Ax - C)$, where $F: \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the spectral norm function $F(X) = \|X\|_\infty = \max_{u \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}, v \in \mathcal{S}^{m-1}} \langle Xv, u \rangle$ and $A: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is the linear operator defined in (4.3). By standard calculus rules for subgradients, we know that, for any $F'(-C) \in \partial F(-C)$, we have $A^*F'(-C) \in \partial f(0)$, and, for any $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, we have $F'(X) := u(X)[v(X)]^T \in \partial F(X)$, where $u(X) \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ and $v(X) \in \mathcal{S}^{m-1}$ are such that $\langle Xv(X), u(X) \rangle = F(X)$. According to (5.2), we can take $u(-C) := -e_{1,n}$ and $v(-C) = e_{1,m}$, where $e_{1,n} := (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $e_{1,m} := (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^m$. This gives us $F'(-C) = -e_{1,n}e_{1,m}^T$. Consequently, $f'(0) = -A^*(e_{1,n}e_{1,m}^T)$ is the vector with elements $[f'(0)]^{(i)} = -\langle A_i, e_{1,n}e_{1,m}^T \rangle = -A_i^{(1,1)} = 0$ (see (5.3)) for any $1 \leq i \leq d$. \square

The other diagonal elements c_2, \dots, c_n of C and all nonzero elements of matrices A_1, \dots, A_d are generated randomly from the standard uniform distribution on the interval $[-1, 1]$.

In what follows, we present our results in form of convergence plots for our method. Each such a plot displays the dependence of the relative accuracy $\delta_k \in (0, 1)$ of the current approximate solution x_k versus the number of iteration k . The accuracy δ_k is defined as the smallest number such that $(1 - \delta_k)f(x_k) \leq f^*$, i.e.,

$$\delta_k = 1 - f(x_k)/f^*. \tag{5.4}$$

Note from (4.1) that we cannot compute $f(x_k)$ exactly as it requires computing the largest singular value of the (potentially big) matrix $X_k := Ax_k - C$. Therefore, in practice, we actually approximate it by running the standard Power Method for a sufficiently large number of iterations (until the eigenvalue approximation stabilizes) to compute the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $X_kX_k^T$ and then take the square root. Such an approximation is quite efficient and is sufficiently accurate for any practical purposes (which will be additionally confirmed in Section 5.1).

The code for our experiments is written in C++ and uses the Eigen 3 library [3] for matrix computations. All our tests are run on a laptop with the Intel Core i7-8650U CPU, 16 GiB RAM and the Ubuntu 20.04 OS.

Let us now look at the results.

5.1 Dense Data

In the first experiment, we work with dense matrices A_1, \dots, A_d , i.e., apart from the top left corner, all elements in each matrix are nonzero.


The specific values of parameters d , n and m , that we consider in this experiment, are shown in Fig. 5.1a, together with the corresponding oracle degree p and the theoretical number of iterations N that were computed according to our setup (see Section 4). In what follows, we will refer to a particular instance of our test problem that was generated for the given parameters d , n and m as a *task*.

d	n	m	p	N
50	100	200		
200	100	200	663	4000269
100	200	400		
400	200	400	773	8000577
800	200	400		


(a)

d	n	m	p	N
1000	500	1000		
2000	500	1000	825	20001419
2000	1000	2000		
4000	1000	2000	895	40002992

(b)



(c)



(d)

Figure 5.1: Results of experiments: a, c: dense data; b, d: sparse data.

The results are shown in Fig. 5.1c. For each task (labeled as “ $d, n \times m$ ” in the legend), we display two curves of the same color: the solid one and the dashed one. The solid curve corresponds to the “exact” computation of function value $f(x_k)$ in (5.4) using SVD. The dashed curve is the approximate value obtained by the Power Method.

We can see that, in all cases, the dashed and solid lines basically coincide. This means that the approximation of function value produced by the Power Method is quite accurate. We also see that, in all cases, the method has successfully found an approximate solution with required target accuracy (5.1). Moreover, comparing the actual number of iterations it took to complete the task with the theoretical estimate N shown in Fig. 5.1a, we see that, in each case, the method was actually much faster than was predicted by the worst-case theoretical estimate: the actual number of iterations is usually better by *two orders of magnitude*.

For each task in this experiment, the total computational time was in the interval from a dozen of seconds to a dozen of minutes, depending on the particular task.

5.2 Sparse Data

We now perform a similar experiment to that from Section 5.1 but with bigger dimensions and *sparse* data. Specifically, each of the matrices A_1, \dots, A_d now contains only $s := 5$ nonzero elements in each column. The s row indices of nonzero elements in each column $1 \leq j \leq m$ are randomly selected (without repetition) from the uniform distribution on the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ if $j > 1$ and $\{2, \dots, n\}$ if $j = 1$ (so that constraint (5.3) is respected).

The results are presented in Figs. 5.1b and 5.1d. This time we only display one solid curve for each task, corresponding to the approximate computation of function value $f(x_k)$




Figure 5.2: Comparison with the Power Iteration oracle.

in (5.4) using the Power Method.

The computational time for each task in this experiment was much bigger than previously: in the interval from a dozen of minutes to a couple of hours. Apart from that, we see that the results are very similar to those from the previous experiment. Furthermore, this time the method was faster by approximately *three orders of magnitude* than our worst-case theoretical prediction.

5.3 Comparison with Power Iteration Oracle

As we saw in Section 4.1, there is also another (in some sense, more classical) stochastic gradient oracle which can be used in our method, namely, the Power Iteration oracle (4.14). Even though we do not have any theoretical guarantees for this oracle, it is still interesting to see how it performs in practice.

Recall that the only difference between the two oracles is the choice of the normalization coefficient. Let us see what effect this choice has on the performance of the method.

In this experiment, we use four tasks from our previous experiments, corresponding to the first two rows from Figs. 5.1a and 5.1b. For each task, we run two instances of Algorithm 2.1. The first instance is exactly what we have been using all this time: the one with oracle (4.16) and constants (4.17). The second instance uses the Power Iteration oracle (4.14) with parameter (4.15) and constants (4.9) and (4.11). All other parameters for both instances of our algorithm are the same.

For computing the Power Iteration oracle, we use formula (4.13). The auxiliary vector $\hat{v}_u^q(Y)$ participating in this formula (and defined in (4.12)) is computed in a numerically stable way by the standard Power Method (3.13).

The results are displayed in Fig. 5.2. For each task, there are two curves of the same color: the solid one corresponds to oracle (4.16), and the dashed one corresponds to the Power Iteration oracle.

Quite surprisingly, we see that, in all cases, the solid and dashed curves practically coincide. Thus, there is virtually *no difference* between the two oracles. This important observation makes us hypothesize that, contrary to our original belief, it may indeed be possible to prove a certain worst-case theoretical complexity bound for the Power

Iteration oracle, similar to that which we have proved for our new oracle. We leave it as an interesting open question for future research.

A Auxiliary Results

Lemma A.1. *Let $Q \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ be a set, and let $A: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_1$ and $C: \mathbb{E}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_2$ be linear transformations. Then, the following implication² holds:*

$$A(Q) + \ker C \text{ is closed} \implies Q + \ker(CA) \text{ is closed.}$$

Proof. Let $A(Q) + \ker C$ be closed, and let $(z_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in $Q + \ker(CA)$ converging to a point $z \in \mathbb{E}$. Let us prove that $z \in Q + \ker(CA)$. Note that, for any $k \geq 1$, we have $Az_k \in A(Q) + A\ker(CA) \in A(Q) + \ker C$. Since A is a continuous mapping (as a linear transformation between finite-dimensional vector spaces) and $z_k \rightarrow z$, it holds that $Az_k \rightarrow Az$. Furthermore, $Az \in A(Q) + \ker C$ since $A(Q) + \ker C$ is a closed set. Thus, $Az = Ax + h$ for some $x \in Q$ and $h \in \ker C$. Consequently, $CA(z - x) = Ch = 0$, which means that $z - x \in \ker(CA)$. But then $z = x + (z - x) \in Q + \ker(CA)$. \square

Lemma A.2. *Let $Q \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ be a set, $\mathbb{L} \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ be a linear subspace, $\mathbb{L}^c \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ be a complementary subspace to \mathbb{L} , and let $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}^c$ be the projector³ of \mathbb{E} onto \mathbb{L}^c corresponding to the decomposition $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{L} \oplus \mathbb{L}^c$. Then,*

$$Q + \mathbb{L} \text{ is closed} \iff P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q) \text{ is closed.}$$

Proof. Suppose $Q + \mathbb{L}$ is closed. Let $(u_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be an arbitrary sequence in $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)$ converging to a point $u \in \mathbb{E}$. Let us prove that $u \in P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)$. Clearly, $u \in \mathbb{L}^c$ since $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q) \subseteq \mathbb{L}^c$ and \mathbb{L}^c is a closed set (as a linear subspace). On the other hand, since $u_k \in P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)$ for all $k \geq 1$, there exists a sequence $(x_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ in Q such that $u_k = P_{\mathbb{L}^c}x_k$ for all $k \geq 1$. Then, $u_k = x_k - P_{\mathbb{L}}x_k \in Q + \mathbb{L}$ for all $k \geq 1$. Since $Q + \mathbb{L}$ is a closed set and $u_k \rightarrow u$, we have $u \in Q + \mathbb{L}$, i.e., $u = x - h$ for some $x \in Q$ and $h \in \mathbb{L}$. Combining this with the fact that $u \in \mathbb{L}^c$, we conclude that $u = P_{\mathbb{L}^c}u = P_{\mathbb{L}^c}x \in P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)$. This proves the “ \implies ” implication.

The “ \impliedby ” implication follows from Lemma A.1 applied to $A := P_{\mathbb{L}^c}$ and $C := I_{\mathbb{E}}$ (the identity operator in \mathbb{E}) as $\ker A = \mathbb{L}$ and $\ker C = \{0\}$. \square

Lemma A.3. *Let $\mathbb{L} \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ be a linear subspace, and let $f: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function such that*

$$\partial f(x) \cap \mathbb{L}^{\perp} \neq \emptyset, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{E}.$$

Then, f is constant along \mathbb{L} :

$$f(x + h) = f(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{E}, \forall h \in \mathbb{L}.$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{E}$ and $h \in \mathbb{L}$. By our assumption, there is $f'(x) \in \partial f(x) \cap \mathbb{L}^{\perp}$. Hence,

$$f(x + h) \geq f(x) + \langle f'(x), h \rangle = f(x).$$

Similarly, there exists $f'(x + h) \in \partial f(x + h) \cap \mathbb{L}^{\perp}$, and hence

$$f(x) \geq f(x + h) + \langle f'(x + h), h \rangle = f(x + h).$$

Thus, $f(x + h) = f(x)$. \square

²Hereinafter, $A(Q) := \{Ax : x \in Q\}$ is the image of the set Q under the linear transformation A .

³Specifically, if $x = x_{\mathbb{L}} + x_{\mathbb{L}^c}$ is the unique decomposition of $x \in \mathbb{E}$ into the sum of elements from \mathbb{L} and \mathbb{L}^c , respectively, then $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}x := x_{\mathbb{L}^c}$.

Lemma A.4. Let $f: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function, $Q \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ be a nonempty set, $\mathbb{L} \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ be a linear subspace, \mathbb{L}^c be a complementary subspace to \mathbb{L} , and let $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}^c$ be the projector of \mathbb{E} onto \mathbb{L}^c corresponding to the decomposition $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{L} \oplus \mathbb{L}^c$. Suppose that:

- (i) f is constant along \mathbb{L} , i.e., $f(x + h) = f(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{E}$ and all $h \in \mathbb{L}$.
- (ii) $Q + \mathbb{L}$ is a closed set.
- (iii) f is a closed function.
- (iv) f restricted to $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)$ has bounded sublevel sets⁴.

Then, f has a minimizer on Q .

Proof. In view of assumption (i), we can reduce the problem of minimizing f on Q to that of minimizing f on $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{x \in Q} f(x) &= \inf_{u \in \mathbb{L}^c, h \in \mathbb{L}} \{f(u + h) : u + h \in Q\} = \inf_{u \in \mathbb{L}^c, h \in \mathbb{L}} \{f(u) : u + h \in Q\} \\ &= \inf_{u \in \mathbb{L}^c} \{f(u) : u + h \in Q \text{ for some } h \in \mathbb{L}\} = \inf_{u \in P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)} f(u). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if f has a minimizer u^* on $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)$, then f also has a minimizer on Q , which is given by any $x^* \in Q$ such that $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}x^* = u^*$ (at least one such x^* exists by the definition of $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)$).

It remains to prove that f has a minimizer on $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)$. According to assumption (ii) and Lemma A.2, the set $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)$ is closed. Moreover, it is nonempty since Q is assumed to be nonempty. Let $u_0 \in P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)$ be an arbitrary point. It suffices to show that f has a minimizer on the set $L_0 := \{u \in P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q) : f(u) \leq f(u_0)\}$. Clearly, $L_0 \neq \emptyset$ (it contains u_0). Furthermore, L_0 is bounded (by assumption (iv)) and closed as the intersection of two closed sets: $P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q)$ and $\{u \in \mathbb{E} : f(u) \leq f(u_0)\}$ (whose closedness follows from assumption (iii)). Thus, L_0 is a nonempty compact set and f is a closed function. Hence, by the Weierstrass extreme value theorem, there indeed exists a minimizer of f on L_0 . \square

References

- [1] A. d’Aspremont and N. El Karoui. A Stochastic Smoothing Algorithm for Semidefinite Programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(3):1138–1177, 2014. DOI: 10.1137/12088728X.
- [2] C. Eckart and G. Young. The approximation of one matrix by another of lower rank. *Psychometrika*, 1(3):211–218, 1936. DOI: 10.1007/BF02288367.
- [3] G. Guennebaud, B. Jacob, et al. Eigen v3, 2010. URL: <http://eigen.tuxfamily.org>.
- [4] A. S. Lewis. Convex Analysis on the Hermitian Matrices. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 6(1):164–177, 1996. DOI: 10.1137/0806009.
- [5] A. S. Lewis. Derivatives of Spectral Functions. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 21(3):576–588, 1996. DOI: 10.1287/moor.21.3.576.

⁴This means that, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the set $\{u \in P_{\mathbb{L}^c}(Q) : f(u) \leq \alpha\}$ is bounded.

- [6] Y. Nesterov. *Lectures on Convex Optimization*, volume 137. Springer, second edition, 2018.
- [7] Y. Nesterov and A. Nemirovskii. *Interior-Point Polynomial Algorithms in Convex Programming*. Studies in Applied and Numerical Mathematics. SIAM, 1994.
- [8] A. Yurtsever, J. A. Tropp, O. Fercoq, M. Udell, and V. Cevher. Scalable Semidefinite Programming. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 3(1):171–200, 2021. DOI: 10.1137/19M1305045.