

# Gossiped and Quantized Online Multi-Kernel Learning

Tomas Ortega, *Student Member, IEEE*, and Hamid Jafarkhani, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—In instances of online kernel learning where little prior information is available and centralized learning is unfeasible, past research has shown that distributed and online multi-kernel learning provides sub-linear regret as long as every pair of nodes in the network can communicate (i.e., the communications network is a complete graph). In addition, to manage the communication load, which is often a performance bottleneck, communications between nodes can be quantized. This letter expands on these results to non-fully connected graphs, which is often the case in wireless sensor networks. To address this challenge, we propose a gossip algorithm and provide a proof that it achieves sub-linear regret. Experiments with real datasets confirm our findings.

**Index Terms**—Kernel-based learning, quantization, gossip algorithms, federated learning, sensor networks.

## I. INTRODUCTION

MANY of the latest efforts in machine learning are focused on bringing learning as close to data collection as possible. This is of practical interest in a diverse array of applications, sensor networks in particular. In sensor networks, nodes are often communication-constrained, operate distributively, and can send only a few bits to their neighbors.

There are several papers in the literature that consider the problem of designing distributed learning methods for Online Multi-Kernel Learning (OMKL). In particular, [1] contains the design and regret analysis of quantized and distributed OMKL for a fully connected (complete) graph. Although the fully connected case is important, it is not applicable in many sensor networks. This letter designs new algorithms that expand the theoretical guarantees of the distributed and quantized OMKL in [1] to an arbitrary general non-fully connected graph.

Another example of a distributed OMKL that works for a non-fully connected graph is presented in [2]. It requires communicating an unlimited number of bits between neighbors, and its assumptions are stricter than those of [1]. To manage the required communication throughput, which is often a performance bottleneck [3], [4], this letter provides the properties of [2] under looser assumptions and while communicating only a limited number of bits between neighboring nodes.

In [5], a distributed stochastic gradient descent scheme with quantized communication is discussed. The proposed algorithm uses an extra shared “hidden” state and can be used for the single-kernel case, but not multi-kernel settings.

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copy-right may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible. Authors are with the Center for Pervasive Communications & Computing and EECS Department, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697 USA (e-mail: {tomaso, hamidj}@uci.edu). This work was supported in part by the NSF Award ECCS-2207457.

In addition to extending [1] to general non-fully connected networks, our work can be considered as the extension of [5] to multi-kernel cases.

For a more in-depth review of the literature, see [1].

## II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Let us consider a network with  $J$  nodes and model it as an undirected connected graph. At each instant of time  $t$ , Node  $j$  receives the data string  $\mathbf{x}_t^j \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and the desired response  $y_t^j \in \mathbb{R}$ . Our task is to find an approximating function  $f(\mathbf{x}_t^j)$  for  $y_t^j$ . As in [1],  $f$  belongs to a Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS)  $\mathcal{H} = \left\{ f \mid f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_t^j \kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_t^j) \right\}$ , where  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_t^j) : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a kernel function that measures the similarity between  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_t^j$ . Let us consider the following optimization problem

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^J \mathcal{C} \left( f(\mathbf{x}_t^j), y_t^j \right) + \lambda \Omega (\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}$  is a cost function and  $\lambda > 0$  is a regularization parameter that controls an increasing function  $\Omega$ . An optimal solution for this problem exists in the form  $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_t^j \kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_t^j) = \alpha^\top k(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $\alpha$  and  $k(\mathbf{x})$  are the vector versions of  $\{\alpha_t^j\}$  and  $\{\kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_t^j)\}$ , respectively [6].

In multi-kernel learning, a weighted combination of several kernels is selected to improve the performance, compared to single-kernel learning. A convex combination of the kernels  $\{\kappa_p\}_{p=1}^P$ , where  $\kappa_p \in \mathcal{H}_p$  is an RKHS, is also an RKHS, denoted by  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{H}_P$  [6]. Using  $\mathcal{H}$  instead of  $\mathcal{H}$ , we turn problem (1) into:

$$\min_{\{\bar{w}_p^j\}, \{f_p\}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^J \mathcal{C} \left( \sum_{p=1}^P \bar{w}_p^j f_p(\mathbf{x}_t^j), y_t^j \right) + \lambda \Omega \left( \left\| \sum_{p=1}^P \bar{w}_p^j f_p \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right), \quad (2a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{p=1}^P \bar{w}_p^j = 1, \bar{w}_p^j \geq 0, f_p \in \mathcal{H}_p. \quad (2b)$$

To evade the curse of dimensionality, a Random Feature (RF) approximation is used [1], [7]. For normalized shift-invariant kernels, i.e.,  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \kappa(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')$ , their Fourier transforms  $\pi_\kappa(v)$  exist, and due to normalization,  $\pi_\kappa(0) = 1$ . Also, viewing  $\pi_\kappa$  as a pdf,  $\kappa(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') = \int \pi_\kappa(v) e^{jv^\top(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')} dv = \mathbb{E}_v [e^{jv^\top(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')}]$ . Drawing  $D$  i.i.d.

samples from  $\pi_\kappa(v)$ , a weight vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{2D}$  can be constructed such that

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top z_V(\mathbf{x}), \quad (3)$$

where the vector  $z_V(\mathbf{x})$  will be generated from pdf  $\pi_\kappa$  as in (18) of [7]. Then, the loss function is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}(f(\mathbf{x})) = \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top z_V(\mathbf{x}), y) + \lambda \Omega(\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2), \quad (4)$$

and the following equations are obtained for Kernel  $p$  and Node  $j$ :

$$\hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^{j\top} z_{V_p}(\mathbf{x}_t^j), \quad (5)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t+1}^j = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j - \eta \nabla \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^{j\top} z_{V_p}(\mathbf{x}_t^j), y_t^j), \quad (6)$$

$$w_{p,t+1}^j = w_{p,t}^j \exp -\eta \mathcal{L}(\hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j)), \quad (7)$$

where  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  is a learning rate. The weights are normalized as  $\bar{w}_{p,t}^j = w_{p,t}^j / \sum_{p=1}^P w_{p,t}^j$  to have

$$\hat{f}_t^j(x) = \sum_{p=1}^P \bar{w}_{p,t}^j \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j). \quad (8)$$

The above equations represent how local online multi-kernel learning models can be built [1], [7]. To learn a global model, the local models are propagated using a gossip algorithm. The nodes calculate the weighted average of the information provided by their neighbors at each communication round and use it to update their local information. The weights, associated with the existing edges of the graph, are chosen to construct a  $J \times J$  doubly stochastic gossip matrix [8], [9], [10]. The spectral gap of  $\mathbf{W}'$  is denoted by  $\rho = 1 - \lambda_2(\mathbf{W}') \in (0, 1]$ , where  $\lambda_2(\mathbf{W}')$  represents the second eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{W}'$  in descending order.

Such a gossip algorithm works very well when the nodes communicate their states perfectly with their neighbors. However, practically, only a few bits can be communicated, i.e., information needs to be quantized before being shared with the neighbors. We use a random quantizer  $Q: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , to represent an arbitrary vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $Q(\mathbf{x})$  in an efficient way. Our results work for any random quantizer that satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_Q \|Q(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \leq (1 - \delta) \|\mathbf{x}\|^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (9)$$

for some  $\delta > 0$ , which we will call the compression parameter. Here,  $\mathbb{E}_Q$  denotes the expected value with respect to the internal randomness of  $Q(\cdot)$ . In simulations, we use the randomized quantizer of [11]. Each element of a non-zero vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , i.e.,  $v_i$ , is quantized by

$$Q_M(v_i) = \|v\| \text{sign}(v_i) \xi_i(\mathbf{v}, M), \quad (10)$$

where  $M = 2^b - 1$  is the number of quantization levels and defining  $l = \lfloor M \frac{v_i}{\|v\|} \rfloor$ ,

$$\xi_i(\mathbf{v}, M) = \begin{cases} \frac{l}{M} & \text{with probability } 1 - M \frac{v_i}{\|v\|} + l, \\ \frac{l+1}{M} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

is represented by  $b$  bits. Following [11, Lemma 3.1], Eq. (9) holds for  $\delta = 1 - \min\left(\frac{2D}{M^2}, \frac{\sqrt{2D}}{M}\right) > 0$ .

### III. ALGORITHM AND REGRET ANALYSIS

We present Algorithm 1 for gossiped and quantized OMKL. For ease of notation, we will denote  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^{j\top} z_{V_p}(\mathbf{x}_t^j), y_t)$  as  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j)$  from now on. In Algorithm 1, at each time instance, nodes collect their local data and transform them according to the RF approximation. Then, the kernel losses are computed and used to update the kernel weights. We define a hidden state  $\mathbf{h}_{p,t}^j \in \mathbb{R}^{2D}$  that is the same for all neighbors because it is updated by the same quantized values known to all neighbors. Subsequently, each node  $j$  prepares the gossip by quantizing the difference between its local state  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j$  and the common hidden state  $\mathbf{h}_{p,t}^j$ . This quantized difference is sent to the neighbors and is used by them to collectively update the hidden state. Then, each node performs the gossip/consensus step using the updated hidden states and a step size  $\gamma$ . Finally, each node performs local learning with a step size  $\eta$ .

The role of a hidden state and quantized update is to have an accurate representation of the neighbor's states without the need for broadcasting the full state at each time instance.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Gossiped and Quantized OMKL at Node $j$

---

Initialize  $w_p^j = 1/P$  and  $\mathbf{h}_p^j = \boldsymbol{\theta}_p^j = 0$  for all  $p$ .

**for**  $t = 1, \dots, T$  **do**

Obtain data  $\mathbf{x}_t^j$  and construct  $z_p(\mathbf{x}_t^j)$  for all  $p$ .

Compute  $\mathcal{L}(\hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j))$  for all  $p$ .

Update  $w_{p,t}^j$  according to (7).

Compute  $\mathcal{L}(\hat{f}_t^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j))$

**for**  $p = 1, \dots, P$  **do**

Update using the hidden states  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t-\frac{1}{2}}^j +$

$\gamma \sum_{i=1}^J w'_{ij} (\mathbf{h}_{p,t}^i - \mathbf{h}_{p,t}^j)$ .

Compress  $\mathbf{q}_{p,t}^j = Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j - \mathbf{h}_{p,t}^j)$ .

**for**  $i$  neighbor of  $j$ , including  $j$  **do**

Send  $\mathbf{q}_{p,t}^j$  to  $i$  and receive  $\mathbf{q}_{p,t}^i$ .

Update  $\mathbf{h}_{p,t+1}^i = \mathbf{h}_{p,t}^i + \mathbf{q}_{p,t}^i$ .

**end for**

As in (6), update  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t+\frac{1}{2}}^j = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j - \eta \nabla \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j)$ .

**end for**

**end for**

---

In what follows, we provide regret analysis to study the performance of our algorithm. First, we make the following assumptions similar to what is done in the literature.

**Assumption 1.** Let us assume a  $K$ -smooth loss function

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) - \nabla \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2)\| \leq K \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_2\| \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2D}, \quad (12)$$

with a bounded gradient  $\|\nabla \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| \leq L$ .

**Assumption 2.** Let us assume a convex loss function with respect to  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j) - \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq \nabla \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j)^\top (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j - \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{2D}. \quad (13)$$

**Assumption 3.** Let us assume that we have a connected communication graph and a doubly stochastic gossip matrix  $\mathbf{W}'$  whose entries are zero if and only if their corresponding edges are not present in the communication graph.

**Theorem 1.** Under Assumptions 1, 2, and 3, the sequences  $\{\hat{f}_{p,t}^j\}$  and  $\{\bar{w}_{p,t}\}$  generated by the gossiped and quantized OMKL satisfy

$$\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{L} \left( \sum_{p=1}^P \bar{w}_{p,t}^j \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) \right] - \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_p^*(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) \leq J \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_p^*\|^2}{2\eta} + \eta \frac{JTL^2}{2} + \eta \frac{JTL\sqrt{12}}{c} + \frac{J \ln P}{\eta} + \eta JT, \quad (14)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_p^*$  is the optimal solution to the problem for the  $p$ -th kernel,  $c = \frac{\rho^2 \delta}{82}$ ,  $\rho$  is the spectral gap of the gossip matrix  $\mathbf{W}'$ , and  $\delta > 0$  is the quantizer's compression parameter.

To prove Thm. 1, we first need to present and prove two lemmas. Lemma 1 bounds the difference between a single kernel loss and the optimal loss. Lemma 2 bounds the error added by the kernel weights.

**Lemma 1.** Let us choose the consensus step size as in [12, Theorem 4.1], i.e.,  $\gamma = \frac{\rho^2 \delta}{16\rho + \rho^2 + 4\beta^2 + 2\rho\beta^2 - 8\rho\delta}$ , where we have defined  $\beta = \|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{W}'\|_2 \in [0, 2]$ . Then, for  $\eta \in (0, 1]$  and under Assumptions 1, 2, and 3, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) \right] - \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_p^*(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) \leq J \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_p^*\|^2}{2\eta} + \eta \frac{JTL^2}{2} + \eta \frac{JTL\sqrt{12}}{c}. \quad (15)$$

*Proof.* Similar to [1], let us consider an arbitrary  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{2D}$ . Define  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j$  and  $\nabla \bar{\mathcal{L}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t})$  analogously. Since our gossip scheme preserves averages, we can deduce

$$\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 = \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t} - \eta \nabla \bar{\mathcal{L}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 \quad (16)$$

$$= \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 + \eta^2 \|\nabla \bar{\mathcal{L}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t})\|^2 \quad (17)$$

$$- 2\eta \nabla \bar{\mathcal{L}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t})^\top (\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t} - \boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (18)$$

By Asm. 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j) - \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &\leq \nabla \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j)^\top (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j + \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &\leq \nabla \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j)^\top (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + L \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Inserting (19) into (18) and summing over  $j$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^J \left( \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j) - \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) &\leq \frac{\eta}{2} J \|\nabla \bar{\mathcal{L}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t})\|^2 + \\ J \frac{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 - \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2}{2\eta} &+ L \sum_{j=1}^J \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t}\|, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where we have used Asm. 1 to bound the gradient. Summing over  $t$  and bounding again, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^J \left( \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j) - \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) &\leq \frac{\eta}{2} JTL^2 + L \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^J \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t}\| \\ &+ J \frac{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 - \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,T+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2}{2\eta}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Applying [12, Lemma A.2] and Cauchy-Schwarz results in

$$\sum_{j=1}^J \mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t}\|^2 \leq \eta^2 \frac{12JL^2}{c^2} \implies \quad (22)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^J \mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,t}^j - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{p,t}\| \leq \eta \frac{JL\sqrt{12}}{c}. \quad (23)$$

The proof is complete, by using (23) to bound (21) and choosing  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p,1}^j = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_p^*$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** Under the same conditions as Thm. 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{p=1}^P \bar{w}_{p,t}^j \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) - \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p',t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) \\ \leq \frac{J \ln P}{\eta} + \eta JT. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

*Proof.* For the proof, we need to define  $W_t^j = \sum_{p=1}^P w_{p,t}^j$ . The weight construction in OMKL implies

$$W_{t+1}^j = \sum_{p=1}^P w_{p,t+1}^j = \sum_{p=1}^P w_{p,t}^j \exp \left( -\eta \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) \right). \quad (25)$$

Using  $\exp(-\eta x) \leq 1 - \eta x + \eta^2 x^2$ , for  $|\eta| \leq 1$  results in

$$W_{t+1}^j \leq \sum_{p=1}^P w_{p,t}^j \left( 1 - \eta \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) + \eta^2 \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right)^2 \right). \quad (26)$$

Furthermore, we can substitute  $\bar{w}_{p,t}^j = w_{p,t}^j / W_t^j$  to normalize the expression. Using  $1 + x \leq e^x$ , telescoping from  $t = 1$  to  $T$ , and setting  $W_1^j = 1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} W_{T+1}^j &\leq \exp \left( -\eta \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{p=1}^P \bar{w}_{p,t}^j \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \eta^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{p=1}^P \bar{w}_{p,t}^j \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right)^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

On the other hand, for any  $p$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} W_{T+1}^j &\geq w_{p,T+1}^j = w_{p,1}^j \prod_{t=1}^T \exp \left( -\eta \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) \right) \\ &= w_{p,1}^j \exp \left( -\eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Knowing that  $w_{p,1}^j = 1/P$ , we combine the last two expressions, take logarithms, and sum over  $j$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\eta \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{p=1}^P \bar{w}_{p,t}^j \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) &\geq \\ -J \ln P - \eta \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p',t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t^j) \right) &. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$\square$




Fig. 1. Comparison between the gossiped OMKL, OMKL from [1] and the single-kernel SGD, labelled Koloskova, from [5]. We have used  $\sigma = 1$  for the latter. The labels indicate the used topology for each algorithm.

From the convexity of  $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ ,

$$\mathcal{L} \left( \sum_{p=1}^P \bar{w}_{p,t} \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t) \right) \leq \sum_{p=1}^P \bar{w}_{p,t} \mathcal{L} \left( \hat{f}_{p,t}^j(\mathbf{x}_t) \right), \quad (30)$$

and Thm. 1 follows immediately using Lemma 1 and Lemma 2.

#### IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

To validate Thm. 1, we have tested Algorithm 1 with real datasets for binary classification, with different topologies, and using different values of quantization level. We have used the well-known Kernel Logistic Regression (KLR) loss function [6], i.e., the loss function (4) is defined as

$$\ln(1 + \exp(-y \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top z_V(\mathbf{x}))) + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2. \quad (31)$$

We have conducted our experiments with three datasets: Banana, Credit-Card, and MNIST. The synthetic data from the Banana dataset [13] ( $n = 5300, d = 2$ ) are two non-linearly separable clusters. The Credit-Card dataset [14] ( $n = 30000, d = 2$ ) contains data from credit card users, such as their credit history and whether they have defaulted or not. It is obtained from the UCI machine learning repository [15]. The MNIST dataset [16] ( $n = 70000, d = 784$ ) contains pictures of handwritten digits 0 to 9 and their corresponding labels. We divide them into two classes, those that are number 8 and those that are not.

Our experimental setup has  $J = 20$  nodes, dimension  $D = 20$  for our RF approximation, regularization parameter  $\lambda = 0.001$ , and three Gaussian kernels with  $\sigma \in \{1, 3, 5\}$ . Simulations have been performed 10 times with different sets of Random Features and the corresponding mean is plotted. We have used the quantizer described in (11) with 7 levels of quantization, that is, 3 bits per element in any transmitted array. Our learning rates are  $\eta = 0.01$  and  $\gamma = 0.9\eta = 0.009$ .

Fig. 1 compares the performance of our algorithm versus two benchmarks. Since Algorithm 1 can be viewed as an extension of [1] to non-complete graphs, the first benchmark for comparison is the OMKL algorithm from [1]. There is no significant performance difference between OMKL and our gossiped OMKL. This is despite the fact that OMKL is run over a complete topology, but the gossiped OMKL is executed over the worst-case scenario, i.e., a path topology that includes

much smaller number of connections and as a result requires much less communication.

Gossiped OMKL can also be considered as an extension of [5] to multi-kernel learning, which justifies using the single-kernel SGD from [5] as our second benchmark. Gossiped OMKL using three kernels clearly outperforms the single-kernel approach, named Koloskova in Fig. 1.




Fig. 2. The effect of graph topology, without quantization. Average loss function at each iteration, with the Credit-Card dataset. Since the Credit-Card dataset has  $n = 30000$  data observations, and  $J = 20$  nodes, we have run the algorithm 1500 iterations.

Although not shown in the figure, we have observed that, for values of  $\eta$  and  $\gamma$  chosen in Fig. 1, or smaller values, the choice of topology does not affect the performance of our algorithm. To observe the effect of topology on algorithm performance, larger step sizes ( $\eta = 0.1$  and  $\gamma = 0.09$ ) are chosen in Fig. 2. The figure shows simulations using the Credit-Card dataset and without quantization on three different topologies: the complete graph, the ring, and the path. We can observe that more densely connected communication graphs lead to better performance. We have also tested the algorithm for  $M \geq 7$  levels of quantization, that satisfies the condition  $\delta > 0$  in (11), and all of them perform as well as the non-quantized version, with the loss function differences in the order of  $10^{-6}$ .

The results show that our gossiped OMKL algorithm can successfully extend the OMKL algorithm [1] to non-complete graphs and the distributed learning algorithm in [5] to multi-kernel learning.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Shen, S. Karimi-Bidhendi, and H. Jafarkhani, "Distributed and quantized online multi-kernel learning," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 69, pp. 5496–5511, 2021.
- [2] S. Hong and J. Chae, "Distributed online learning with multiple kernels," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2021.
- [3] S. Savazzi, M. Nicoli, M. Bennis, S. Kianoush, and L. Barbieri, "Opportunities of federated learning in connected, cooperative, and automated industrial systems," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 16–21, 2021.
- [4] P. Kairouz, H. B. McMahan, B. Avent, A. Bellet, M. Bennis, A. N. Bhagoji, K. Bonawitz, Z. Charles, G. Cormode, R. Cummings *et al.*, "Advances and open problems in federated learning," *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 14, no. 1–2, pp. 1–210, 2021.
- [5] A. Koloskova, S. U. Stich, and M. Jaggi, "Decentralized stochastic optimization and gossip algorithms with compressed communication," *36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019*, vol. 2019-June, pp. 6088–6111, 2019.
- [6] B. Schölkopf and A. J. Smola, *Learning with Kernels: Support Vector Machines, Regularization, Optimization, and Beyond*, ser. Adaptive computation and machine learning. MIT Press, 2002.
- [7] Y. Shen, T. Chen, and G. B. Giannakis, "Random feature-based online multi-kernel learning in environments with unknown dynamics," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 20, 2019.
- [8] L. Xiao and S. Boyd, "Fast linear iterations for distributed averaging," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 65–78, 2004. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167691104000398>
- [9] S. Boyd, P. Diaconis, and L. Xiao, "Fastest mixing markov chain on a graph," *SIAM review*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 667–689, 2004.
- [10] B. Ghahserifard and J. Cortés, "When does a digraph admit a doubly stochastic adjacency matrix?" in *Proceedings of the 2010 American Control Conference*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 2440–2445.
- [11] D. Alistarh, D. Grubic, J. Li, R. Tomioka, and M. Vojnovic, "Qsgd: Communication-efficient sgd via gradient quantization and encoding," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [12] A. Koloskova, T. Lin, S. U. Stich, and M. Jaggi, "Decentralized deep learning with arbitrary communication compression," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [13] G. Rätsch, T. Onoda, and K.-R. Müller, "Soft margins for adaboost," *Machine learning*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 287–320, 2001.
- [14] I.-C. Yeh and C.-h. Lien, "The comparisons of data mining techniques for the predictive accuracy of probability of default of credit card clients," *Expert systems with applications*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 2473–2480, 2009.
- [15] D. Dua and C. Graff, "UCI machine learning repository," 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>
- [16] Y. LeCun, C. Cortes, and C. J.C. Burgess. (1998) The mnist database of handwritten digits. [Online]. Available: <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>