

Federated Minimax Optimization with Client Heterogeneity

Pranay Sharma, Rohan Panda, and Gauri Joshi
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering,
Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213
{pranaysh, rohanpan, gaurij}@andrew.cmu.edu

February 10, 2023

Abstract

Minimax optimization has seen a surge in interest with the advent of modern applications such as GANs, and it is inherently more challenging than simple minimization. The difficulty is exacerbated by the training data residing at multiple edge devices or *clients*, especially when these clients can have heterogeneous datasets and local computation capabilities. We propose a general federated minimax optimization framework that subsumes such settings and several existing methods like Local SGDA. We show that naive aggregation of heterogeneous local progress results in optimizing a mismatched objective function – a phenomenon previously observed in standard federated minimization. To fix this problem, we propose normalizing the client updates by the number of local steps undertaken between successive communication rounds. We analyze the convergence of the proposed algorithm for classes of nonconvex-concave and nonconvex-nonconcave functions and characterize the impact of heterogeneous client data, partial client participation, and heterogeneous local computations. Our analysis works under more general assumptions on the intra-client noise and inter-client heterogeneity than so far considered in the literature. For all the function classes considered, we significantly improve the existing computation and communication complexity results. Experimental results support our theoretical claims.

1 Introduction

The massive surge in machine learning (ML) research in the past decade has brought forth new applications that cannot be modeled as simple minimization problems. Many of these problems, including generative adversarial networks (GANs) [Goodfellow et al. \(2014\)](#); [Arjovsky et al. \(2017\)](#); [Sanjabi et al. \(2018\)](#), adversarial neural network training [Madry et al. \(2018\)](#), robust optimization [Namkoong & Duchi \(2016\)](#); [Mohajerin Esfahani & Kuhn \(2018\)](#), distributed nonconvex optimization [Lu et al. \(2019\)](#), and fair machine learning [Madras et al. \(2018\)](#); [Mohri et al. \(2019\)](#), have an underlying min-max structure. However, the underlying problem is often nonconvex, while classical minimax theory deals almost exclusively with convex-concave problems.

Another feature of modern ML applications is the inherently distributed nature of the training data [Xing et al. \(2016\)](#). The data collection is often outsourced to edge devices or *clients*. However, the clients may then be unable (due to resource constraints) or unwilling (due to privacy concerns) to share their data with a *central server*. Federated Learning (FL) [Konečný et al. \(2016\)](#); [Kairouz et al. \(2019\)](#) was proposed to alleviate this problem. In exchange for retaining control of their data, the clients shoulder some of the computational load, and run part of the training process locally, using only their own data. The communication with the server is infrequent, leading to further resource savings. Since its introduction, FL has been an active area of research, with some remarkable successes [Li et al. \(2020\)](#); [Wang et al. \(2021\)](#). Research has shown practical benefits of, and provided theoretical justifications for commonly used practical techniques, such as, multiple local updates at the clients [Stich \(2018\)](#); [Khaled et al. \(2020\)](#); [Koloskova et al. \(2020\)](#); [Wang & Joshi \(2021\)](#), partial client participation [Yang et al. \(2021\)](#), communication compression [Hamer et al. \(2020\)](#); [Chen et al. \(2021\)](#). Further, impact of heterogeneity in the clients' local data [Zhao et al. \(2018\)](#); [Sattler et al. \(2019\)](#), as well as their system capabilities [Wang et al. \(2020\)](#); [Mitra et al. \(2021\)](#) has been studied. However, all this research has been focused almost solely on simple minimization problems.

Table 1: Comparison of (**per client**) stochastic gradient complexity and the number of communication rounds needed to reach an ϵ -stationary solution (see Definition 1), for different classes of nonconvex minimax problems. Here n is the total number of clients. For a fair comparison with existing works, our results in this table are specialized to the case when all clients (i) have equal weights ($p_i = 1/n$), (ii) perform equal number of local updates ($\tau_i = \tau$), and (iii) use the same local update algorithm SGDA. However, our results (Section 4) apply under more general settings when (i)-(iii) do not hold.

Work	Setting and Assumptions		Full Client Participation (FCP)	
	System Heterogeneity ^a	Partial Client Participation	Stochastic Gradient Complexity	Communication Rounds
Nonconvex-Strongly-concave (NC-SC)/Nonconvex-Polyak-Łojasiewicz (NC-PL)				
$(n = 1)$ Lin et al. (2020a)	-	-	$\mathcal{O}(1\ell^4)$	-
Sharma et al. (2022)	\times	\times	$\mathcal{O}(1/(\epsilon^4))$	$\mathcal{O}(1\ell^3)$
Yang et al. (2022a) ^b	\times	\checkmark	$\mathcal{O}(1/(\epsilon^4))$	$\mathcal{O}(1\ell^2)$
Our Work (Theorem 1, Corollary 1.2)	\checkmark	\checkmark	$\mathcal{O}(1/(\epsilon^4))$	$\mathcal{O}(1\ell^2)$
Nonconvex-Concave (NC-C)				
$(n = 1)$ Lin et al. (2020a)	-	-	$\mathcal{O}(1\ell^8)$	-
Sharma et al. (2022)	\times	\times	$\mathcal{O}(1/(\epsilon^8))$	$\mathcal{O}(1\ell^7)$
Our Work: (Theorem 2, Corollary 2.2)	\checkmark	\checkmark	$\mathcal{O}(1/(\epsilon^8))$	$\mathcal{O}(1\ell^4)$
Nonconvex-One-point-concave (NC-IPC)				
Deng & Mahdavi (2021)	\times	\times	$\mathcal{O}(1\ell^{12})$	$\mathcal{O}(n^{1/6}\ell^8)$
Sharma et al. (2022)	\times	\times	$\mathcal{O}(1\ell^8)$	$\mathcal{O}(1\ell^7)$
Our Work: (Theorem 3)	\checkmark	\checkmark	$\mathcal{O}(1/(\epsilon^8))$	$\mathcal{O}(1\ell^4)$

^a Individual clients can run an unequal number of local iterations, using different local optimizers (see Section 4).

^b We came across Yang et al. (2022a) during the preparation of this paper. Our algorithm Fed-Norm-SGDA (Algorithm 1) strictly generalizes their algorithm FSGDA.

With its increasing usage in large-scale applications, FL systems must adapt to a wide range of clients. Data heterogeneity has received significant attention from the community. However, system-level heterogeneity remains relatively unexplored. The effect of client variability or *heterogeneity* can be controlled by forcing all the clients to carry out an equal number of local updates and utilize the same local optimizer Yu et al. (2019); Haddadpour et al. (2019). However, this approach is inefficient if the client dataset sizes are widely different. Also, it would entail faster clients sitting idle for long durations Reiszadeh et al. (2022); Tziotis et al. (2022), waiting for stragglers to finish. Additionally, using the same optimizer might be inefficient or expensive for clients, depending on their system capabilities. Therefore, adapting to system-level heterogeneity forms a desideratum for real-world FL schemes.

Contributions. We consider a general federated minimax optimization framework, in presence of both inter-client data and system heterogeneity. We consider the problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \{F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \sum_{i=1}^n p_i f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\}, \quad (1)$$

where f_i is the local loss of client i , p_i is the weight assigned to client i , which is often the relative sample size at client i , and n is the total number of clients. We study several classes of nonconvex minimax problems. Further,

- In our generalized federated minimax algorithm, the participating clients in a round may each perform different number of local steps, potentially with different local optimizers. In this setting, naive aggregation of local model updates (as done in existing methods like Local Stochastic Gradient Descent Ascent) can lead to convergence in terms of a mismatched global objective. We propose a simple normalization strategy to fix this problem.
- Using independent server and client learning rates, we achieve order-optimal or state-of-the-art computation complexity, and significantly improve the communication complexity of existing methods.

- Under the special case where all the clients (i) are assigned equal weights $p_i = 1/n$ in (1), (ii) carry out equal number of local updates ($\tau_i = \tau$ for all i), and (iii) utilize the same local-update algorithm, our results become directly comparable with existing work (see Table 1) and improve upon them as follows.
 1. For nonconvex-strongly-concave (NC-SC) and nonconvex-PL (NC-PL) problems, our method has the order-optimal gradient complexity $\mathcal{O}(1/(n\epsilon^4))$. Further, we improve the communication from $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^3)$ in Sharma et al. (2022) to $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$.¹
 2. For nonconvex-concave (NC-C) and nonconvex-one-point-concave (NC-1PC) problems, we achieve state-of-the-art gradient complexity, while significantly improving the communication costs from $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^7)$ in Sharma et al. (2022) to $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^4)$. For NC-1PC functions, we prove the linear speedup in gradient complexity with n that was conjectured in Sharma et al. (2022), thereby solving an open problem.
 3. As an intermediate result in our proof, we prove the theoretical convergence of Local SGD for one-point-convex function minimization (see Lemma C.5 in Appendix C.4). The achieved convergence rate is the same as that achieved for convex minimization problems. Therefore, we generalize the convergence of Local SGD to a much larger class of functions.

2 Related Work

2.1 Single-client minimax

Nonconvex-Strongly-concave (NC-SC). To our knowledge, Lin et al. (2020a) is the first work to analyze a single-loop algorithm for stochastic (and deterministic) NC-SC problems. Although the $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^3/\epsilon^4)$ complexity shown is optimal in ϵ , the algorithm required $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ batch-size. Qiu et al. (2020) utilized momentum to achieve $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ convergence with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ batch-size. Recent works Yang et al. (2022c); Sharma et al. (2022) achieve the same rate without momentum. Yang et al. (2022c) also improved the dependence on the condition number κ . Second-order stationarity for NC-SC has been recently studied in Luo & Chen (2021). Lower bounds for this problem class have appeared in Luo et al. (2020); Li et al. (2021); Zhang et al. (2021).

Nonconvex-Concave (NC-C). Again, Lin et al. (2020a) was the first to analyze a single-loop algorithm for stochastic NC-C problems, proving $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-8})$ complexity. In deterministic problems, this has been improved using nested Nouiehed et al. (2019); Thekumparampil et al. (2019) as well as single-loop Xu et al. (2020); Zhang et al. (2020) algorithms. For stochastic problems, Rafique et al. (2021) and the recent work Zhang et al. (2022) improved the complexity to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-6})$. However, both the algorithms have a nested structure, which at every step, solve a simpler problem iteratively. Achieving $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-6})$ complexity with a single-loop algorithm has so far proved elusive.

2.2 Distributed/Federated Minimax

Recent years have also seen an increasing body of work in distributed minimax optimization. Some of this work is focused on decentralized settings, as in Rogozin et al. (2021); Beznosikov et al. (2021b,c); Metelev et al. (2022).

Of immediate relevance to us is the federated setting, where clients carry out multiple local updates between successive communication rounds. The relevant works which focused on convex-concave problems include Reisizadeh et al. (2020); Hou et al. (2021); Liao et al. (2021); Sun & Wei (2022). Special classes of nonconvex minimax problems in the federated setting have been studied in recent works, such as, nonconvex-linear Deng et al. (2020), nonconvex-PL Deng & Mahdavi (2021); Xie et al. (2021), and nonconvex-one-point-concave Deng & Mahdavi (2021). The complexity guarantees for several function classes considered in Deng & Mahdavi (2021) were further improved in Sharma et al. (2022). However, all these works consider specialized federated settings, either assuming full-client participation, or system-wise identical clients, each carrying out equal number of local updates. As we see in this paper, partial client

¹During the preparation of this manuscript, we came across the recent work Yang et al. (2022a), which proposes FSGDA algorithm and achieves $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ communication cost for NC-PL functions. However, our work is more general since we allow a heterogeneous number of local updates at the clients.

participation is the most source of error in simple FL algorithms. Also, system-level heterogeneity can have crucial implications on the algorithm performance.

Differences from Related Existing Work. Wang et al. (2020) was the first work to consider the problem of system heterogeneity in simple minimization problems, and proposed a normalized averaging scheme to avoid optimizing an inconsistent objective. Compared to Wang et al. (2020), we consider a more challenging problem and achieve higher communication savings (Table 1). Yang et al. (2021) analyzed partial client participation in FL and demonstrated the theoretical benefit of using separate client/server learning rates. Deng & Mahdavi (2021); Sharma et al. (2022) studied minimax problems in the federated setting but assumed a homogeneous number of local updates, with full client participation. The very recent work Yang et al. (2022a) considers NC-SC problem and achieves similar communication savings as ours. However, our work considers a more general minimax FL framework with system-level client heterogeneity, and partial client participation. We consider several classes of functions and improve the communication and computation complexity of existing minimax algorithms.

3 Preliminaries

Notations. We let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_2$. Given a positive integer m , the set $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ is denoted by $[m]$. Vectors at client i are denoted with subscript i , e.g., \mathbf{x}_i , while iteration indices are denoted using superscripts, e.g., $\mathbf{y}^{(t)}$ or $\mathbf{y}^{(t,k)}$. Given a function g , we define its gradient vector as $[\nabla_x g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})^\top, \nabla_y g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})^\top]^\top$, and its stochastic gradient as $\nabla g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \xi)$, where ξ denotes the randomness.

Convergence Metrics. In presence of nonconvexity, we can only prove convergence to an *approximate* stationary point, which is defined next.

Definition 1 (ϵ -Stationarity). A point \mathbf{x} is an ϵ -stationary point of a differentiable function g if $\|\nabla g(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \epsilon$.

Definition 2. Stochastic Gradient (SG) complexity is the total number of gradients computed by a single client during the course of the algorithm.

Definition 3 (Communication Rounds). During a single communication round, the server sends its *global* model to a set of clients, which carry out multiple local updates starting from the same model, and return their *local* vectors to the server. The server then aggregates these local vectors to arrive at a new global model. Throughout this paper, we denote the number of communication rounds by T .

Next, we discuss some assumptions used in the paper.

Assumption 1 (Smoothness). Each local function f_i is differentiable and has Lipschitz continuous gradients. That is, there exists a constant $L_f > 0$ such that at each client $i \in [n]$, for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ and $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$,

$$\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')\| \leq L_f \|(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')\|.$$

Assumption 2 (Local Variance). The stochastic gradient oracle at each client is *unbiased*. Also, there exist constants $\sigma_L, \beta_L \geq 0$ such that at each client $i \in [n]$, for all \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_i}[\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \xi_i)] &= \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \\ \mathbb{E}_{\xi_i} \|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \xi_i) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|^2 &\leq \beta_L^2 \|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|^2 + \sigma_L^2. \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 3 (Global Heterogeneity). For any set of non-negative weights $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 1$, there exist constants $\beta_G \geq 1, \sigma_G \geq 0$ such that for all \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq \beta_G^2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \right\|^2 + \sigma_G^2,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq \beta_G^2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \right\|^2 + \sigma_G^2.$$

If all f_i 's are identical, we have $\beta_G = 1$, and $\sigma_G = 0$.

Most existing work uses simplified versions of Assumptions 2, 3, assuming $\beta_L = 0$ and/or $\beta_G = 0$.

4 Algorithm for Heterogeneous Federated Minimax Optimization

In this section, we propose a federated minimax algorithm to handle system heterogeneity across clients.

4.1 Limitations of Local SGDA

Following the success of FedAvg McMahan et al. (2017) in FL, Deng & Mahdavi (2021) was the first to explore a simple extension Local stochastic gradient descent-ascent (SGDA) in minimax problems. Between successive communication rounds, clients take multiple simultaneous descent/ascent steps to respectively update the min-variable \mathbf{x} and max-variable \mathbf{y} . Subsequent work in Sharma et al. (2022) improved the convergence results and showed that LocalSGDA achieves optimal gradient complexity for several classes of nonconvex minimax problems. However, existing work on LocalSGDA also assumes the participation of all n clients in every communication round. More crucially, as observed with simple minimization problems Wang et al. (2020), if clients carry out an unequal number of local updates, or if their local optimizers are not all the same, LocalSGDA (like FedAvg) might converge to the stationary point of a different objective. This is further discussed in Section 5.1, 5.2, and illustrated in Figure 1, where the learning process gets disproportionately skewed towards the clients carrying out more local updates.




Figure 1: FedAvg with heterogeneous local updates. The green (red) triangle represents the local optimizer of f_1 (f_2), while $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is the global optimizer. The number of local updates at client i is τ_i , where $\tau_1 = 2$, $\tau_2 = 5$.

Generalized Local SGDA Update Rule. To understand this mismatched convergence phenomenon with naive aggregation in local SGDA, recall that Local SGDA updates are of the form

$$\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{x}^{(t)} + \gamma_x^s \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \Delta_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \quad \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{y}^{(t)} + \gamma_y^s \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \Delta_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)},$$

where γ_x^s, γ_y^s are the server learning rates, $\Delta_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\eta_x^c} (\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,\tau_i^{(t)})} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)})$, $\Delta_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\eta_y^c} (\mathbf{y}_i^{(t,\tau_i^{(t)})} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)})$ are the scaled local updates. $\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,\tau_i^{(t)})}$ is the iterate at client i after taking $\tau_i^{(t)}$ local steps, and η_x^c, η_y^c are the client learning rates. Let us

consider a generalized version of this update rule where $\Delta_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \Delta_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}$ are linear combinations of local stochastic gradients computed by client i , as $\Delta_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i^{(t)}-1} a_i^{(t,k)} \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)})$, where $a_i^{(t,k)} \geq 0$. Commonly used client optimizers, such as, SGD, local momentum, variable local learning rates can be accommodated in this general form (see Appendix A.1 for some examples). For this more general form, we can rewrite the \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} updates at the server as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} &= \mathbf{x}^{(t)} - \gamma_x^s \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \frac{\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)}}{\|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)}\|_1} \|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)}\|_1 \\ &= \mathbf{x}^{(t)} - \underbrace{\left(\sum_{j=1}^n p_j \|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_j^{(t)}\|_1 \right)}_{\tau_{\text{eff}}^{(t)}} \gamma_x^s \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{\frac{p_i \|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)}\|_1}{\sum_{j=1}^n p_j \|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_j^{(t)}\|_1}}_{w_i} \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{G}_i^{(t)} \bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)}}{\|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)}\|_1}}_{\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}}, \\ \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} &= \mathbf{y}^{(t)} + \tau_{\text{eff}}^{(t)} \gamma_y^s \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} = [\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)})]_{k=0}^{\tau_i^{(t)}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times \tau_i^{(t)}}$ contains the $\tau_i^{(t)}$ stochastic gradients stacked column-wise, $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)} = [a_i^{t,0}, a_i^{t,1}, \dots, a_i^{t,\tau_i^{(t)}-1}]^\top$, $\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}$ are the normalized aggregates of the stochastic gradients and $\tau_{\text{eff}}^{(t)}$ is the *effective* number of local steps. Similar to the observation for simple minimization problems in Wang et al. (2020),




Figure 2: Generalized update rule in (2). Note that $(\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}) = \frac{1}{\tau_i} (\Delta_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \Delta_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)})$. Also, at the server, the weighted sum $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}$ gets scaled by $\tau_{\text{eff}}^{(t)}$.

we see in Theorems 1, 2 that the resulting iterates of this general algorithm end up converging to the stationary point of a different objective $\tilde{F} = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i f_i$. Further, in Corollary 1.1, we observe that this mismatch is a result of using weights w_i in (2) to weigh the clients' contribution.

4.2 Proposed Normalized Federated Minimax Algorithm

From the generalized update rule, we can see that setting the weights w_i equal to p_i will ensure that the surrogate objective \tilde{F} matches with the original global objective F . Setting $w_i = p_i$ results in normalization of the local progress at each client before their aggregation at the server. As a result, we can preserve convergence to a stationary point of the original objective function F , even with heterogeneous $\{\tau_i^{(t)}\}$, as we see in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

The algorithm follows the steps given in Algorithm 1. In each communication round t , the server selects a client set $\mathcal{C}^{(t)}$ and communicates its model parameters $(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})$ to these clients. The selected clients then run multiple local stochastic gradient steps. The number of local steps $\{\tau_i^{(t)}\}$ can vary across clients and across rounds. At the end of $\tau_i^{(t)}$ local steps, client i aggregates its local stochastic gradients into $\{\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}\}$, which are then sent to the server. Note that the gradients at client i , $\{\nabla f_i(\cdot, \cdot; \xi_i^{(t,k)})\}_{k=0}^{\tau_i^{(t)}}$, are normalized by $\|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)}\|_1$, where $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)} = [a_i^{t,0}, a_i^{t,1}, \dots, a_i^{t,\tau_i^{(t)}-1}]^\top$ is

Algorithm 1 Fed-Norm-SGDA and Fed-Norm-SGDA+

- 1: **Input:** initialization $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}^{(0)}$, Number of communication rounds T , learning rates: client $\{\eta_x^c, \eta_y^c\}$, server $\{\gamma_x^s, \gamma_y^s\}$, #local-updates $\{\tau_i^{(t)}\}_{i,t}$, $S, s = -1$
 - 2: **for** $t = 0$ to $T - 1$ **do**
 - 3: Server selects client set $\mathcal{C}^{(t)}$; sends them $(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})$
 - 4: **if** $t \bmod S = 0$ **then**
 - 5: $s \leftarrow s + 1$
 - 6: Server sends $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)} = \mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ to clients in $\mathcal{C}^{(t)}$
 - 7: **end if**
 - 8: $\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,0)} = \mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,0)} = \mathbf{y}^{(t)}$ for $i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}$
 - 9: **for** $k = 0, \dots, \tau_i^{(t)} - 1$ **do**
 - 10: $\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k+1)} = \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \eta_x^c a_i^{(t,k)} \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)})$
 - 11: $\mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k+1)} = \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} + \eta_y^c a_i^{(t,k)} \nabla_y f_i(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)})$ # y-update for Fed-Norm-SGDA+
 - 12: $\mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k+1)} = \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} + \eta_y^c a_i^{(t,k)} \nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)})$ # y-update for Fed-Norm-SGDA
 - 13: **end for**
 - 14: Client i aggregates its gradients to compute $\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}$
 - 15: $\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i^{(t)}-1} \frac{a_i^{(t,k)}}{\|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)}\|_1} \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)})$
 - 16: $\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i^{(t)}-1} \frac{a_i^{(t,k)}}{\|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)}\|_1} \nabla_y f_i(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)})$
 - 17: $\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i^{(t)}-1} \frac{a_i^{(t,k)}}{\|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)}\|_1} \nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)})$
 - 18: Clients $i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}$ communicate $\{\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}\}$ to the server
 - 19: Server computes aggregate vectors $\{\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)}\}$ using (3)
 - 20: Server step: $\left\{ \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{x}^{(t)} - \tau_{\text{eff}}^{(t)} \gamma_x^s \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{y}^{(t)} + \tau_{\text{eff}}^{(t)} \gamma_y^s \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)} \right.$
 - 21: **end for**
 - 22: **Return:** $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(T)}$ drawn uniformly at random from $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t)}\}_{t=1}^T$
-

the vector of weights assigned to individual stochastic gradients in the local updates.² The server aggregates these local vectors to compute global direction estimates $\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)}$, which are then used to update the server model parameters $(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})$.

Client Selection. In each round t , the server samples $|\mathcal{C}^{(t)}|$ clients uniformly at random *without replacement* (WOR). While aggregating client updates at the server, client i update is weighed by $\tilde{w}_i = w_i n / |\mathcal{C}^{(t)}|$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \quad \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}. \quad (3)$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}^{(t)}}[\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}] = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}^{(t)}}[\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)}] = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}$.

²For LocalSGDA Deng & Mahdavi (2021); Sharma et al. (2022), $a_i^{(t,k)} = 1$ for all $i \in [n], t \in [T], k \in [\tau_i^{(t)}]$ and $\|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)}\|_1 = \tau_i^{(t)}$. Therefore, $\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}$ are simply the average of the stochastic gradients computed in the t -th round.

5 Convergence Results

Next, we present the convergence results for different classes of nonconvex minimax problems. For simplicity, throughout this section we assume the parameters utilized in Algorithm 1 to be fixed across t . Therefore, $a_i^{(t,k)} \equiv a_i^{(k)}$, $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)} \equiv \mathbf{a}_i$, $\tau_i^{(t)} \equiv \tau_i$, $\tau_{\text{eff}}^{(t)} \equiv \tau_{\text{eff}}$ and $|\mathcal{C}^{(t)}| = P$, for all t .

5.1 Non-convex-Strongly-Concave (NC-SC) Case

Assumption 4 (μ -Strong-concavity (SC) in \mathbf{y}). A function f is μ -strong concave ($\mu > 0$) in \mathbf{y} if for all $\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{y}_2$,

$$-f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_2) \geq -f(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) - \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}), \mathbf{y}_2 - \bar{\mathbf{y}} \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{y}_2 - \bar{\mathbf{y}}\|^2.$$

General Convergence Result. We first show that using the local updates of Algorithm 1, the iterates converge to the stationary point of a surrogate objective \tilde{F} , $\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n w_i f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. See Appendix B for the full statement.

Theorem 1. Suppose the local loss functions $\{f_i\}_i$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4. Suppose the server selects $|\mathcal{C}^{(t)}| = P$ clients in each round t . Given appropriate choices of client and server learning rates, (η_x^c, η_y^c) and (γ_x^s, γ_y^s) respectively, the iterates generated by Fed-Norm-SGDA satisfy

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 \leq \underbrace{\mathcal{O}\left(\kappa^2 \frac{(\bar{\tau}/\tau_{\text{eff}}) + A_w \sigma_L^2 + B_w \beta_L^2 \sigma_G^2}{\sqrt{P\bar{\tau}T}}\right)}_{\text{Error with full synchronization}} + \underbrace{\mathcal{O}\left(\kappa^2 \frac{C_w \sigma_L^2 + D \sigma_G^2}{\bar{\tau}^2 T}\right)}_{\text{Error due to local updates}} + \underbrace{\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \cdot \frac{\kappa^2 E_w \tau_{\text{eff}} \sigma_G^2}{\sqrt{P\bar{\tau}T}}\right)}_{\text{Partial Participation Error}}. \quad (4)$$

where, $\kappa = L_f/\mu$ is the condition number, $\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is the envelope function, $\bar{\tau} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i$, $A_w \triangleq n\tau_{\text{eff}} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}$, $B_w \triangleq n\tau_{\text{eff}} \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}$, $C_w \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n w_i (\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2 - [\alpha_i^{(t, \tau_i-1)}]^2)$, $D \triangleq \max_i (\beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2)$, where $\mathbf{a}_{i,-1} \triangleq [a_i^{(0)}, a_i^{(1)}, \dots, a_i^{(\tau_i-2)}]^\top$ for all i and $E_w \triangleq n \max_i w_i$.

See Appendix B for the proof. The first term in the bound in (4) represents the optimization error for a centralized algorithm (see Appendix C.3 in Lin et al. (2020a)). The second term represents the error if at least one of the clients carries out multiple ($\tau_i > 1$) local updates. The last term results from client subsampling. This also explains its dependence on the data heterogeneity σ_G .

Theorem 1 states convergence for a surrogate objective \tilde{F} . Next, we see convergence for the true objective F .

Corollary 1.1 (Convergence in terms of F). Given $\Phi(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{y}} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, under the conditions of Theorem 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{t \in [T]} \|\nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 &\leq 2 \left(2\chi_{\mathbf{p}\|\mathbf{w}}^2 \beta_H^2 + 1 \right) \epsilon_{\text{opt}} + 4\chi_{\mathbf{p}\|\mathbf{w}}^2 \sigma_G^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{4L_f^2}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\chi_{\mathbf{p}\|\mathbf{w}}^2 \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(p_i - w_i)^2}{w_i}$, $\epsilon_{\text{opt}} \triangleq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2$ denotes the optimization error in (4). If $p_i = w_i$ for all $i \in [n]$, then $\chi_{\mathbf{p}\|\mathbf{w}}^2 = 0$. Also, then $\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \equiv F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. Therefore, $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ are identical, for all \mathbf{x} . Hence, (5) yields $\min_{t \in [T]} \|\nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 \leq 2\epsilon_{\text{opt}}$.

It follows from Corollary 1.1 that if we replace $\{w_i\}$ with $\{p_i\}$ in the server updates in Algorithm 1, we get convergence in terms of the true objective F .

Remark 1. If clients are weighted equally ($w_i = 1/n$ for all i), with each carrying out τ steps of local SGDA, we get $\bar{\tau} = \tau, A_w = B_w = 1, C_w = \tau - 1$, and $D = (\tau - 1)(\tau - 1 + \beta_L^2)$. Therefore, the bound in (4) can be greatly simplified to

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 \sigma_G^2}{\sqrt{P\bar{\tau}T}} + \frac{\sigma_L^2 + \tau \sigma_G^2}{\tau T} + \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1}\right) \sigma_G^2 \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{PT}}\right). \quad (6)$$

Several key insights can be derived from (6).

- Partial Client Participation (PCP) error $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \cdot \sigma_G^2 \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{PT}}\right)$ is the *most significant* component of convergence error. Further, unlike the other two errors, the error due to PCP actually increases with local updates τ . Consequently, we do not observe communication savings by performing multiple local updates at the clients, except in the special case when $\sigma_G = 0$ (see Table 1). Similar observations have been made for minimization Yang et al. (2021); Jhunjunwala et al. (2022) and very recently for minimax problems Yang et al. (2022a).
- In the absence of multiple local updates (i.e., $\tau_i = 1$ for all i) and with full participation ($P = n$), the resulting error $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 \sigma_G^2}{\sqrt{n\tau T}}\right)$ depends on the global heterogeneity σ_G despite full synchronization. This is owing to the more general local variance bound (Assumption 2). For $\beta_L > 0$, this dependence on σ_G is unavoidable. This observation holds for all the results in this paper. See Remark 6 (Appendix A.2) for a justification.

Corollary 1.2 (Improved Communication Savings). *Suppose all the clients are weighted equally ($p_i = 1/n$ for all i), with each carrying out τ steps of local SGDA. To reach an ϵ -stationary point, i.e., \mathbf{x} such that $\mathbb{E}\|\nabla\Phi(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \epsilon$,*

- *Under full participation, the per-client gradient complexity of Fed-Norm-SGDA is $T\tau = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\kappa^4}{n\epsilon^4}\right)$. The number of communication rounds required is $T = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\kappa^2}{\epsilon^2}\right)$.*
- *Under partial participation, in the special case when inter-client data heterogeneity $\sigma_G = 0$, the per-client gradient complexity of Fed-Norm-SGDA is $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^4/(P\epsilon^4))$, while the communication cost is $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^2/\epsilon^2)$.*

Remark 2. The gradient complexity in Corollary 1.2 is optimal in ϵ , and achieves linear speedup in the number of participating clients. The communication complexity is also optimal in ϵ and improves the corresponding results in Deng & Mahdavi (2021); Sharma et al. (2022). We match the communication cost in the very recent work Yang et al. (2022a). However, our work addresses a more realistic FL setting with disparate clients.

Extending the Results to Nonconvex-PL Functions

Assumption 5. A function f satisfies μ -PL condition in \mathbf{y} ($\mu > 0$), if for any fixed \mathbf{x} :

1. $\max_{\mathbf{y}'} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')$ has a nonempty solution set;
2. $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|^2 \geq 2\mu(\max_{\mathbf{y}'} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}') - f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$, for all \mathbf{y} .

Remark 3. If the local functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 3, and the global function F satisfies Assumption 5, then for appropriately chosen learning rates (see Appendix B.5), the bounds in Theorem 1 hold for μ -PL functions as well.

5.2 Non-convex-Concave (NC-C) Case

In this subsection, we consider smooth nonconvex functions which satisfy the following assumptions.

Assumption 6 (Concavity). The function f is concave in \mathbf{y} if for a fixed $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$, for all $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$,

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}') + \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}'), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}' \rangle.$$

Assumption 7 (Lipschitz continuity in \mathbf{x}). Given a function f , there exists a constant $G_{\mathbf{x}}$, such that for each $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$, and all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$,

$$\|f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})\| \leq G_{\mathbf{x}} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|.$$

The envelope function $\Phi(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{\mathbf{y}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ used so far, may no longer be smooth in the absence of a unique maximizer. Instead, we use the alternate definition of stationarity, proposed in Davis & Drusvyatskiy (2019), utilizing the Moreau envelope of Φ , which is defined next.

Definition 4 (Moreau Envelope). The function ϕ_{λ} is the λ -Moreau envelope of ϕ , for $\lambda > 0$, if for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$,

$$\phi_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) = \min_{\mathbf{x}'} \phi(\mathbf{x}') + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|^2.$$

Drusvyatskiy & Paquette (2019) showed that a small $\|\nabla\phi_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x})\|$ indicates the existence of some point $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ in the vicinity of \mathbf{x} , that is *nearly stationary* for ϕ . Hence, in our case, we focus on minimizing $\|\nabla\Phi_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x})\|$.

Proposed Algorithm. For nonconvex-concave functions, we use Fed-Norm-SGDA+. The \mathbf{x} -updates are identical to Fed-Norm-SGDA. For the \mathbf{y} updates however, the clients compute stochastic gradients $\nabla_y f_i(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)})$ keeping the x -component fixed at $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}$ for S communication rounds. This *trick*, originally proposed in [Deng & Mahdavi \(2021\)](#), gives the analytical benefit of a double-loop algorithm (which update \mathbf{y} several times before updating \mathbf{x} once) while also updating \mathbf{x} simultaneously.

Theorem 2. Suppose the local loss functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, $\|\mathbf{y}^{(t)}\|^2 \leq R$ for all t , and the server selects $|\mathcal{C}^{(t)}| = P$ clients for all t . With appropriate client and server learning rates, (η_x^c, η_y^c) and (γ_x^s, γ_y^s) respectively, the iterates of Fed-Norm-SGDA+ satisfy

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \widetilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 \leq \underbrace{\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(\bar{\tau}/\tau_{\text{eff}})^{1/4}}{(\bar{\tau}PT)^{1/4}} + \frac{(\tau_{\text{eff}}P)^{1/4}}{T^{3/4}}\right)}_{\text{Error with full synchronization}} + \underbrace{\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{C_w\sigma_L^2 + D(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2)}{\bar{\tau}^2T^{3/4}}\right)}_{\text{Local updates error}} + \underbrace{\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \cdot \frac{E_w}{PT}\right)^{1/4}\right)}_{\text{Partial participation error}}, \quad (7)$$

where $\Phi_{1/2L_f}$ is the Moreau envelope of Φ . The constants $C_w, D, \bar{\tau}$ are defined in Theorem 1.

See Appendix C for the proof. Theorem 2 states convergence for a surrogate objective \widetilde{F} . Next, we see convergence for the true objective F .

Corollary 2.1 (Convergence in terms of F). Given envelope functions $\Phi(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{y}} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{y}} \widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, under the conditions of Theorem 2,

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \|\nabla \Phi_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 \leq \epsilon'_{\text{opt}} + \frac{8L_f^2}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}\|^2,$$

where $\Phi_{1/2L_f}$ is the Moreau envelope of Φ , $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} \triangleq \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}'} \{\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}') + L_f \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2\}$, $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} \triangleq \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}'} \{\Phi(\mathbf{x}') + L_f \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2\}$, for all t , ϵ'_{opt} is the error bound in (7).

Similar to Corollary 1.1, if we replace $\{w_i\}$ with $\{p_i\}$ for all $i \in [n]$ in the server updates in Algorithm 1, then $\widetilde{F} \equiv F$, and $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}$ are identical for all t . Consequently, Theorem 2 gives us $\min_{t \in [T]} \|\nabla \Phi_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 \leq \epsilon'_{\text{opt}}$.

Remark 4. Some existing works do not require Assumption 7 for NC-C functions, and also improve the convergence rate. However, these methods either have a double-loop structure [Rafique et al. \(2021\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2022\)](#), or work with deterministic problems [Xu et al. \(2020\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2020\)](#). Proposing a single-loop method for stochastic NC-C problems with the same advantages is an open problem.

Corollary 2.2 (Improved Communication Savings). Suppose all the clients are weighted equally ($p_i = 1/n$ for all i), with each carrying out τ steps of local SGDA. To reach an ϵ -stationary point, i.e., \mathbf{x} such that $\mathbb{E} \|\nabla \Phi_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \epsilon$,

- Under full participation, the per-client gradient complexity of Fed-Norm-SGDA+ is $T\tau = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n\epsilon^8}\right)$. The number of communication rounds required is $T = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^4}\right)$.
- Under partial participation, in the special case when inter-client data heterogeneity $\sigma_G = 0$, the per-client gradient complexity of Fed-Norm-SGDA is $\mathcal{O}(1/(P\epsilon^8))$, while the communication cost is $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^4)$.

In terms of communication requirements, we achieve massive savings (compared to $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^7)$ in [Sharma et al. \(2022\)](#)). Our gradient complexity results achieve linear speedup in the number of participating clients.

5.3 Nonconvex-1-Point-Concave (NC-1PC) Case

One-point-convexity has been observed in SGD dynamics during neural network training.

Assumption 8 (One-point-Concavity in \mathbf{y}). The function f is said to be one-point-concave in \mathbf{y} if fixing $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$, for all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$,

$$\langle \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}'), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) \rangle \leq f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})),$$

where $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$.

Owing to space limitations, we only state the per-client gradient complexity, and communication complexity results under the special case when all the clients are weighted equally ($p_i = 1/n$ for all i), with each carrying out τ steps of local SGDA. See Appendix C.4 for more details.

Theorem 3. *Suppose the local loss functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 7. Suppose for all \mathbf{x} , all the f_i 's satisfy Assumption 8 at a common global minimizer $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$, and that $\|\mathbf{y}^{(t)}\|^2 \leq R$ for all t . Then, to reach an ϵ -accurate point, the stochastic gradient complexity of Fed-Norm-SGDA+ (Algorithm 1) is $\mathcal{O}(1/(n\epsilon^8))$, and the number of communication rounds required is $T/\tau = \mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^4)$.*

Remark 5. Theorem 3 proves the conjecture posed in Sharma et al. (2022) that linear speedup should be achievable for NC-1PC functions. Further, we improve their communication complexity from $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^7)$ to $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^4)$. As an intermediate result in our proof, we show convergence of Local SGD for one-point-convex functions, extending convex minimization bounds to a much larger class of functions.

6 Experiments

In this section, we evaluate the empirical performance of the proposed algorithms. We consider a robust neural training problem Sinha et al. (2017); Madry et al. (2018), and a fair classification problem Mohri et al. (2019); Deng et al. (2020). Due to space constraints, additional details of our experiments, and some additional results are included in Appendix D. Our experiments were run on a network of $n = 15$ clients, each equipped with an NVIDIA TitanX GPU. We model data heterogeneity across clients using Dirichlet distribution Wang et al. (2019) with parameter α , $\text{Dir}_n(\alpha)$. Small $\alpha \Rightarrow$ higher heterogeneity across clients.

Robust NN training. We consider the following robust neural network (NN) training problem.

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_{\|\mathbf{y}\|^2 \leq 1} \sum_{j=1}^N \ell(h_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{a}_j + \mathbf{y}), b_j), \quad (8)$$

where \mathbf{x} denotes the NN parameters, (a_i, b_i) denote the feature and label of the i -th sample, \mathbf{y} denotes the adversarially added feature perturbation, and $h_{\mathbf{x}}$ denotes the NN output.




Figure 3: Comparison of the effect of heterogeneous number of local updates $\{\tau_i\}$ on the performance of Fed-Norm-SGDA+ (Algorithm 1), Local SGDA+, and Local SGDA+ with momentum, while solving (8) on CIFAR10 dataset, with VGG11 model. The solid (dashed) curves are for $E = 5$ ($E = 7$), and $\alpha = 0.1$.

Impact of system heterogeneity. In Figure 3, we compare the effect of heterogeneous number of local updates across clients, on the performance of our proposed Fed-Norm-SGDA+. We compare with Local SGDA+ [Deng & Mahdavi \(2021\)](#), and Local SGDA+ with momentum [Sharma et al. \(2022\)](#). Clients sample the number of epochs they run locally via $\tau_i \sim Unif[2, E]$. We observe that Fed-Norm-SGDA+ adapts well to system heterogeneity and outperforms both existing methods.




Figure 4: Comparison of the effects of partial client participation (PCP) on the performance of Fed-Norm-SGDA+, for the robust NN training problem on the CIFAR10 dataset, with the VGG11 model. The figure shows the robust test accuracy. The solid (dashed) curves are for $\alpha = 0.1$ ($\alpha = 1.0$).

Impact of partial participation and heterogeneity. Next, we compare the impact of different levels of partial client participation on performance. We compare the full participation setting ($n = 15$) with $P = 5, 10$. Clients sample the number of epochs they run locally via $\tau_i \sim Unif[2, 5]$. We plot the results for two different values of the data heterogeneity parameter $\alpha = 0.1, 1.0$. As seen in all our theoretical results where partial participation was the most significant component of convergence error, smaller values of P result in performance loss. Further, higher inter-client heterogeneity (modeled by smaller values of α) results in worse performance. We further explore the impact of α on performance in Appendix D.




Figure 5: Comparison of Local SGDA, Local SGDA with momentum, and Fed-Norm-SGDA, for the fair classification task on the CIFAR10 dataset, with the VGG11 model. The solid (dashed) curves are for $E = 5$ ($E = 7$), $\alpha = 0.1$.

Fair Classification. We consider minimax formulation of the fair classification problem [Mohri et al. \(2019\)](#); [Nouiehed et al. \(2019\)](#).

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{c=1}^C y_c F_c(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{y}\|^2, \quad (9)$$

where \mathbf{x} denotes the parameters of the NN, $\{F_c\}_{c=1}^C$ denote the loss corresponding to class c , and Δ_C is the C -dimensional probability simplex. In [Figure 5](#), we plot the worst distribution test accuracy achieved by Fed-Norm-SGDA, Local SGDA [Deng & Mahdavi \(2021\)](#) and Local SGDA with momentum [Sharma et al. \(2022\)](#). As in [Figure 3](#), clients sample $\tau_i \sim \text{Unif}[2, E]$. We plot the test accuracy on the worst distribution in each case. Again, Fed-Norm-SGDA outperforms existing methods.

7 Conclusion

In this work, we considered nonconvex minimax problems in the federated setting, where in addition to inter-client data heterogeneity and partial client participation, there is system heterogeneity as well. We observed that existing methods, such as Local SGDA, might converge to the stationary point of an objective quite different from the original intended objective. We show that normalizing individual client contributions solves this problem. We analyze several classes of nonconvex minimax functions, and significantly improve existing computation and communication complexity results. Potential future directions include analyzing federated systems with unpredictable client presence [Yang et al. \(2022b\)](#).

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by NSF grants CCF 2045694, CNS-2112471, and ONR N00014-23-1-2149. Jiarui Li helped with some figures in the paper.

References

- Arjovsky, M., Chintala, S., and Bottou, L. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 214–223. PMLR, 2017.
- Beznosikov, A., Richtárik, P., Diskin, M., Ryabinin, M., and Gasnikov, A. Distributed methods with compressed communication for solving variational inequalities, with theoretical guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.03313*, 2021a.
- Beznosikov, A., Rogozin, A., Kovalev, D., and Gasnikov, A. Near-optimal decentralized algorithms for saddle point problems over time-varying networks. In *International Conference on Optimization and Applications*, pp. 246–257. Springer, 2021b.
- Beznosikov, A., Scutari, G., Rogozin, A., and Gasnikov, A. Distributed saddle-point problems under similarity. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, 2021c.
- Beznosikov, A., Sushko, V., Sadiev, A., and Gasnikov, A. Decentralized personalized federated min-max problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.07289*, 2021d.
- Chen, M., Shlezinger, N., Poor, H. V., Eldar, Y. C., and Cui, S. Communication-efficient federated learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(17):e2024789118, 2021.
- Chen, Z., Zhou, Y., Xu, T., and Liang, Y. Proximal gradient descent-ascent: Variable convergence under kl geometry. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.

- Cho, H. and Yun, C. Sgda with shuffling: faster convergence for nonconvex-p $\{L\}$ minimax optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05995*, 2022.
- Davis, D. and Drusvyatskiy, D. Stochastic model-based minimization of weakly convex functions. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(1):207–239, 2019.
- Deng, Y. and Mahdavi, M. Local stochastic gradient descent ascent: Convergence analysis and communication efficiency. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1387–1395. PMLR, 2021.
- Deng, Y., Kamani, M. M., and Mahdavi, M. Distributionally robust federated averaging. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 15111–15122, 2020.
- Drusvyatskiy, D. and Paquette, C. Efficiency of minimizing compositions of convex functions and smooth maps. *Mathematical Programming*, 178(1):503–558, 2019.
- Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., and Bengio, Y. Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, volume 27, 2014.
- Haddadpour, F., Kamani, M. M., Mahdavi, M., and Cadambe, V. Local sgd with periodic averaging: Tighter analysis and adaptive synchronization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32:11082–11094, 2019.
- Hamer, J., Mohri, M., and Suresh, A. T. Fedboost: A communication-efficient algorithm for federated learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3973–3983. PMLR, 2020.
- Hou, C., Thekumparampil, K. K., Fantì, G., and Oh, S. Efficient algorithms for federated saddle point optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.06333*, 2021.
- Jhunjhunwala, D., Sharma, P., Nagarkatti, A., and Joshi, G. FedVARP: Tackling the variance due to partial client participation in federated learning. In *The 38th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2022.
- Jin, C., Netrapalli, P., and Jordan, M. What is local optimality in nonconvex-nonconcave minimax optimization? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4880–4889. PMLR, 2020.
- Kairouz, P., McMahan, H. B., Avent, B., Bellet, A., Bennis, M., Bhagoji, A. N., Bonawitz, K., Charles, Z., Cormode, G., Cummings, R., et al. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04977*, 2019.
- Karimi, H., Nutini, J., and Schmidt, M. Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the polyak-łojasiewicz condition. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pp. 795–811. Springer, 2016.
- Khaled, A., Mishchenko, K., and Richtárik, P. Tighter theory for local sgd on identical and heterogeneous data. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 4519–4529. PMLR, 2020.
- Koloskova, A., Loizou, N., Boreiri, S., Jaggi, M., and Stich, S. A unified theory of decentralized sgd with changing topology and local updates. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5381–5393. PMLR, 2020.
- Konečný, J., McMahan, H. B., Ramage, D., and Richtárik, P. Federated optimization: Distributed machine learning for on-device intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02527*, 2016.
- Lee, S. and Kim, D. Fast extra gradient methods for smooth structured nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, 2021.
- Lei, Y., Yang, Z., Yang, T., and Ying, Y. Stability and generalization of stochastic gradient methods for minimax problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 6175–6186. PMLR, 2021.
- Li, H., Tian, Y., Zhang, J., and Jadbabaie, A. Complexity lower bounds for nonconvex-strongly-concave min-max optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, 2021.

- Li, T., Sahu, A. K., Talwalkar, A., and Smith, V. Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 37(3):50–60, 2020.
- Liao, L., Shen, L., Duan, J., Kolar, M., and Tao, D. Local adagrad-type algorithm for stochastic convex-concave minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.10022*, 2021.
- Lin, T., Jin, C., and Jordan, M. On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 6083–6093. PMLR, 2020a.
- Lin, T., Jin, C., and Jordan, M. I. Near-optimal algorithms for minimax optimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 2738–2779. PMLR, 2020b.
- Liu, W., Mokhtari, A., Ozdaglar, A., Pattathil, S., Shen, Z., and Zheng, N. A decentralized proximal point-type method for saddle point problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.14380*, 2019.
- Lu, S., Tsaknakis, I., and Hong, M. Block alternating optimization for non-convex min-max problems: algorithms and applications in signal processing and communications. In *ICASSP 2019-2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 4754–4758. IEEE, 2019.
- Lu, S., Tsaknakis, I., Hong, M., and Chen, Y. Hybrid block successive approximation for one-sided non-convex min-max problems: algorithms and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 68:3676–3691, 2020.
- Luo, L. and Chen, C. Finding second-order stationary point for nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04814*, 2021.
- Luo, L., Ye, H., Huang, Z., and Zhang, T. Stochastic recursive gradient descent ascent for stochastic nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax problems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 20566–20577, 2020.
- Luo, L., Xie, G., Zhang, T., and Zhang, Z. Near optimal stochastic algorithms for finite-sum unbalanced convex-concave minimax optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01761*, 2021.
- Madras, D., Creager, E., Pitassi, T., and Zemel, R. Learning adversarially fair and transferable representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3384–3393. PMLR, 2018.
- Madry, A., Makelov, A., Schmidt, L., Tsipras, D., and Vladu, A. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- McMahan, B., Moore, E., Ramage, D., Hampson, S., and y Arcas, B. A. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- Metevlev, D., Rogozin, A., Gasnikov, A., and Kovalev, D. Decentralized saddle-point problems with different constants of strong convexity and strong concavity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.00090*, 2022.
- Mitra, A., Jaafar, R., Pappas, G. J., and Hassani, H. Linear convergence in federated learning: Tackling client heterogeneity and sparse gradients. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:14606–14619, 2021.
- Mohajerin Esfahani, P. and Kuhn, D. Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the wasserstein metric: Performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Mathematical Programming*, 171(1):115–166, 2018.
- Mohri, M., Sivek, G., and Suresh, A. T. Agnostic federated learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4615–4625. PMLR, 2019.
- Namkoong, H. and Duchi, J. C. Stochastic gradient methods for distributionally robust optimization with f-divergences. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 29, 2016.
- Nesterov, Y. *Lectures on convex optimization*, volume 137. Springer, 2018.

- Nouiehed, M., Sanjabi, M., Huang, T., Lee, J. D., and Razaviyayn, M. Solving a class of non-convex min-max games using iterative first order methods. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pp. 14934–14942, 2019.
- Ouyang, Y. and Xu, Y. Lower complexity bounds of first-order methods for convex-concave bilinear saddle-point problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 185(1):1–35, 2021.
- Qiu, S., Yang, Z., Wei, X., Ye, J., and Wang, Z. Single-timescale stochastic nonconvex-concave optimization for smooth nonlinear TD learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.10103*, 2020.
- Rafique, H., Liu, M., Lin, Q., and Yang, T. Weakly-convex–concave min–max optimization: provable algorithms and applications in machine learning. *Optimization Methods and Software*, pp. 1–35, 2021.
- Reisizadeh, A., Farnia, F., Pedarsani, R., and Jadbabaie, A. Robust federated learning: The case of affine distribution shifts. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 21554–21565, 2020.
- Reisizadeh, A., Tziotis, I., Hassani, H., Mokhtari, A., and Pedarsani, R. Straggler-resilient federated learning: Leveraging the interplay between statistical accuracy and system heterogeneity. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, 2022.
- Rogozin, A., Beznosikov, A., Dvinskikh, D., Kovalev, D., Dvurechensky, P., and Gasnikov, A. Decentralized distributed optimization for saddle point problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.07758*, 2021.
- Sanjabi, M., Ba, J., Razaviyayn, M., and Lee, J. D. On the convergence and robustness of training gans with regularized optimal transport. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- Sattler, F., Wiedemann, S., Müller, K.-R., and Samek, W. Robust and communication-efficient federated learning from non-iid data. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 31(9):3400–3413, 2019.
- Sharma, P., Panda, R., Joshi, G., and Varshney, P. Federated minimax optimization: Improved convergence analyses and algorithms. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 19683–19730. PMLR, 2022.
- Sinha, A., Namkoong, H., and Duchi, J. Certifiable distributional robustness with principled adversarial training. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- Stich, S. U. Local sgd converges fast and communicates little. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Sun, Z. and Wei, E. A communication-efficient algorithm with linear convergence for federated minimax learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.01132*, 2022.
- Thekumparampil, K. K., Jain, P., Netrapalli, P., and Oh, S. Efficient algorithms for smooth minimax optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, 2019.
- Tran-Dinh, Q., Liu, D., and Nguyen, L. M. Hybrid variance-reduced sgd algorithms for minimax problems with nonconvex-linear function. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 11096–11107, 2020.
- Tziotis, I., Shen, Z., Pedarsani, R., Hassani, H., and Mokhtari, A. Straggler-resilient personalized federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.02078*, 2022.
- Wang, H., Yurochkin, M., Sun, Y., Papailiopoulos, D., and Khazaeni, Y. Federated learning with matched averaging. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Wang, J. and Joshi, G. Cooperative SGD: A unified framework for the design and analysis of local-update sgd algorithms. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(213):1–50, 2021.

- Wang, J., Liu, Q., Liang, H., Joshi, G., and Poor, H. V. Tackling the objective inconsistency problem in heterogeneous federated optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 7611–7623, 2020.
- Wang, J., Charles, Z., Xu, Z., Joshi, G., McMahan, H. B., Al-Shedivat, M., Andrew, G., Avestimehr, S., Daly, K., Data, D., et al. A field guide to federated optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06917*, 2021.
- Wang, Y. and Li, J. Improved algorithms for convex-concave minimax optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 4800–4810, 2020.
- Woodworth, B. E., Patel, K. K., and Srebro, N. Minibatch vs local sgd for heterogeneous distributed learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:6281–6292, 2020.
- Xie, G., Luo, L., Lian, Y., and Zhang, Z. Lower complexity bounds for finite-sum convex-concave minimax optimization problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 10504–10513. PMLR, 2020.
- Xie, J., Zhang, C., Zhang, Y., Shen, Z., and Qian, H. A federated learning framework for nonconvex-pl minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14216*, 2021.
- Xing, E. P., Ho, Q., Xie, P., and Wei, D. Strategies and principles of distributed machine learning on big data. *Engineering*, 2(2):179–195, 2016.
- Xu, Z., Zhang, H., Xu, Y., and Lan, G. A unified single-loop alternating gradient projection algorithm for nonconvex-concave and convex-nonconcave minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.02032*, 2020.
- Yang, H., Fang, M., and Liu, J. Achieving linear speedup with partial worker participation in non-iid federated learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Yang, H., Liu, Z., Zhang, X., and Liu, J. Sagda: Achieving $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ communication complexity in federated min-max learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00611*, 2022a.
- Yang, H., Zhang, X., Khanduri, P., and Liu, J. Anarchic federated learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 25331–25363. PMLR, 2022b.
- Yang, J., Zhang, S., Kiyavash, N., and He, N. A catalyst framework for minimax optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 5667–5678, 2020.
- Yang, J., Orvieto, A., Lucchi, A., and He, N. Faster single-loop algorithms for minimax optimization without strong concavity. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 5485–5517. PMLR, 2022c.
- Yoon, T. and Ryu, E. K. Accelerated algorithms for smooth convex-concave minimax problems with $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ rate on squared gradient norm. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 12098–12109. PMLR, 2021.
- Yu, H., Jin, R., and Yang, S. On the linear speedup analysis of communication efficient momentum SGD for distributed non-convex optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 7184–7193. PMLR, 2019.
- Yun, C., Rajput, S., and Sra, S. Minibatch vs local sgd with shuffling: Tight convergence bounds and beyond. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Zhang, J., Xiao, P., Sun, R., and Luo, Z. A single-loop smoothed gradient descent-ascent algorithm for nonconvex-concave min-max problems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 7377–7389, 2020.
- Zhang, S., Yang, J., Guzmán, C., Kiyavash, N., and He, N. The complexity of nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax optimization. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 482–492. PMLR, 2021.
- Zhang, X., Aybat, N. S., and Gurbuzbalaban, M. Sapd+: An accelerated stochastic method for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15084*, 2022.
- Zhao, Y., Li, M., Lai, L., Suda, N., Civin, D., and Chandra, V. Federated learning with non-iid data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.00582*, 2018.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Related Work	3
2.1	Single-client minimax	3
2.2	Distributed/Federated Minimax	3
3	Preliminaries	4
4	Algorithm for Heterogeneous Federated Minimax Optimization	5
4.1	Limitations of Local SGDA	5
4.2	Proposed Normalized Federated Minimax Algorithm	6
5	Convergence Results	8
5.1	Non-convex-Strongly-Concave (NC-SC) Case	8
5.2	Non-convex-Concave (NC-C) Case	9
5.3	Nonconvex-1-Point-Concave (NC-IPC) Case	10
6	Experiments	11
7	Conclusion	13
A	Background	19
A.1	Gradient Aggregation with Different Solvers at Clients	19
A.2	Auxiliary Results	20
A.3	Useful Inequalities	20
A.4	Comparison of Convergence Rates	21
B	Convergence of Fed-Norm-SGDA for Nonconvex-Strongly-Concave Functions (Theorem 1)	21
B.1	Intermediate Lemmas	22
B.2	Proof of Theorem 1	24
B.3	Proofs of the Intermediate Lemmas	26
B.4	Auxiliary Lemmas	37
B.5	Convergence under Polyak Łojasiewicz (PL) Condition	38
C	Convergence of Fed-Norm-SGDA+ for Nonconvex Concave Functions (Theorem 2)	39
C.1	Intermediate Lemmas	39
C.2	Proof of Theorem 2	41
C.3	Proofs of the Intermediate Lemmas	46
C.4	Extending the result for Nonconvex One-Point-Concave (NC-IPC) Functions (Theorem 3)	50
D	Additional Experiments	51

Appendix

The appendix are organized as follows. In Section A we mention some basic mathematical results and inequalities which are used throughout the paper. In Appendix B we prove the non-asymptotic convergence of Fed-Norm-SGDA (Algorithm 1) for smooth nonconvex-strongly-concave (and nonconvex-PL) functions, and derive gradient complexity and communication cost of the algorithm to achieve an ϵ -stationary point. In Appendix C, we prove the non-asymptotic convergence of Fed-Norm-SGDA+ (Algorithm 1) for smooth nonconvex-concave and nonconvex-one-point-concave functions. Finally, in Appendix D we provide the details of the additional experiments we performed.

A Background

A.1 Gradient Aggregation with Different Solvers at Clients

Local SGDA. Suppose $\tau_i^{(t)} = \tau_{\text{eff}}^{(t)} = \tau$ for all $i \in [n]$, $t \in [T]$. Also, $a_i^{(t,k)} = 1$ for all $k \in [\tau]$, t . Then, the local iterate updates in Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA reduce to (the updates for Fed-Norm-SGDA+ are analogous)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k+1)} &= \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \eta_x^c \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)}), \\ \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k+1)} &= \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} + \eta_y^c \nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)}),\end{aligned}$$

for $k \in \{0, \dots, \tau - 1\}$ and the gradient aggregate vectors $(\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)})$ are simply the average of individual gradients

$$\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau-1} \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)}), \quad \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau-1} \nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)})$$

Note that these are precisely the iterates of LocalSGDA proposed in Deng & Mahdavi (2021); Sharma et al. (2022), with the only difference that in LocalSGDA, the clients communicate the iterates $\{\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,\tau)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,\tau)}\}$ to the server, which averages them to compute $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)}\}$. While here, the clients communicate $\{\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}\}$. Also, in Fed-Norm-SGDA, the clients and server use separate learning rates, which results in tighter bounds on the local-updates error.

With Momentum in Local Updates. Suppose each local client uses a momentum buffer with momentum scale ρ . Then, for $k \in \{0, \dots, \tau_i^{(t)} - 1\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{t,k+1} &= \rho \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{t,k} + \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)}), & \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k+1)} &= \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \eta_x^c \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{t,k+1} \\ \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{t,k+1} &= \rho \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{t,k} + \nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)}), & \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k+1)} &= \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} + \eta_y^c \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{t,k+1},\end{aligned}$$

Simple calculations show that the coefficient of $\nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)})$ and $\nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)})$ in the gradient aggregate vectors $(\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)})$ is

$$\sum_{j \geq k}^{\tau_i^{(t)}-1} = 1 + \rho + \dots + \rho^{\tau_i^{(t)}-1-k} = \frac{1 - \rho^{\tau_i^{(t)}-k}}{1 - \rho}.$$

Therefore, the aggregation vector is $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)} = \frac{1}{1-\rho} [1 - \rho^{\tau_i^{(t)}}, 1 - \rho^{\tau_i^{(t)}-1}, \dots, 1 - \rho]$, and

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i^{(t)}\|_1 = \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i^{(t)}-1} \frac{1 - \rho^{\tau_i^{(t)}-k}}{1 - \rho} = \frac{1}{1 - \rho} \left[\tau_i^{(t)} - \frac{\rho(1 - \rho^{\tau_i^{(t)}})}{1 - \rho} \right].$$

A.2 Auxiliary Results

Remark 6 (Impact of heterogeneity σ_G even with $\tau = 1$). Consider two simple minimization problems:

$$\textbf{(P1): } \min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad \textbf{(P2): } \min_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}).$$

(P1) is a simple distributed minimization problem, with n clients, which we solve using synchronous distributed SGD. At iteration t , each client i computes stochastic gradient $\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}; \xi_i^{(t)})$, and sends it to the server, which averages these, and takes a step in the direction $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}; \xi_i^{(t)})$. On the other hand, **(P2)** is a centralized minimization problem, where at each iteration t , the agent computes a stochastic gradient estimator with batch-size n , $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}; \xi_i^{(t)})$. We compare the variance of the two global gradient estimators as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \textbf{(P1)} & \textbf{(P2)} \\ \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}; \xi_i^{(t)}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 & \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}; \xi_i^{(t)}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\ \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 \mathbb{E} \|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 \right] & \text{vs} \quad = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}; \xi_i^{(t)}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 \\ \leq \frac{\sigma_L^2}{n} + \frac{\beta_L^2}{n} \left[\beta_H^2 \mathbb{E} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 + \sigma_G^2 \right] & \leq \frac{\sigma_L^2}{n} + \frac{\beta_L^2}{n} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2. \end{array}$$

Since almost all the existing works consider the local variance bound (Assumption 2) with $\beta_L = 0$, the global gradient estimator in both synchronous distributed SGD **(P1)** and single-agent minibatch SGD **(P2)** have the same $\frac{\sigma_L^2}{n}$ variance bound. Therefore, in most existing federated works on minimization Wang et al. (2020); Yang et al. (2021) and minimax problems Sharma et al. (2022), the full synchronization error only depends on the local variance σ_L^2 . However, as seen above, for $\beta_L > 0$, this *apparent equivalence* breaks down. Koloskova et al. (2020), which considers similar local variance assumption as ours for minimization problems, also show similar dependence on heterogeneity σ_G .

A.3 Useful Inequalities

Lemma A.1 (Young's inequality). *Given two same-dimensional vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the Euclidean inner product can be bounded as follows:*

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2\gamma} + \frac{\gamma \|\mathbf{v}\|^2}{2}$$

for every constant $\gamma > 0$.

Lemma A.2 (Strong Concavity). *A function $g : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is strongly concave in \mathbf{y} , if there exists a constant $\mu > 0$, such that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, and for all $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y}$, the following inequality holds.*

$$g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}') + \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}'), \mathbf{y}' - \mathbf{y} \rangle - \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}'\|^2.$$

Lemma A.3 (Jensen's inequality). *Given a convex function f and a random variable X , the following holds.*

$$f(\mathbb{E}[X]) \leq \mathbb{E}[f(X)].$$

Lemma A.4 (Sum of squares). *For a positive integer K , and a set of vectors x_1, \dots, x_K , the following holds:*

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^K x_k \right\|^2 \leq K \sum_{k=1}^K \|x_k\|^2.$$

Lemma A.5 (Quadratic growth condition Karimi et al. (2016)). *If function g satisfies Assumptions 1, 4, then for all x , the following conditions holds*

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) - \min_z g(z) &\geq \frac{\mu}{2} \|x_p - x\|^2, \\ \|\nabla g(x)\|^2 &\geq 2\mu \left(g(x) - \min_z g(z) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.6. For L -smooth, convex function g , the following inequality holds

$$\mathbb{E} \|\nabla g(\mathbf{y}) - \nabla g(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \leq 2L [g(\mathbf{y}) - g(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla g(\mathbf{x})^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})]. \quad (10)$$

Lemma A.7 (Proposition 6 in [Cho & Yun \(2022\)](#)). For L -smooth function g which is bounded below by g^* , the following inequality holds for all \mathbf{x}

$$\mathbb{E} \|\nabla g(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \leq 2L [g(\mathbf{x}) - g^*]. \quad (11)$$

A.4 Comparison of Convergence Rates

Table 2: Comparison of the convergence rates for different classes of nonconvex minimax problems. n is the total number of clients, while P is the number of clients sampled in each round under partial client participation. T is the number of communication rounds, τ is the number of local updates per client, σ_L^2, σ_G^2 are the stochastic gradient variance and global heterogeneity, respectively (Assumption 2, 3). $\kappa = L_f/\mu$ is the condition number. For a fair comparison with existing works, our results in this table are specialized to the case when all clients (i) have equal weights ($p_i = 1/n$), (ii) perform equal number of local updates ($\tau_i = \tau$), and (iii) use the same local update algorithm SGDA. However, our results (Section 4) apply under more general settings when (i)-(iii) do not hold.

Work	Partial Participation	System Heterogeneity	Convergence Rate
Nonconvex-Strongly-concave (NC-SC)/Nonconvex-Polyak-Łojasiewicz (NC-PL)			
Sharma et al. (2022)	\times	\times	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n\tau T}} + \frac{n\tau(\sigma_L^2 + \sigma_G^2)}{T}\right)$
Yang et al. (2022a)	\checkmark	\times	$\left(\frac{(n-P)(\sigma_G^2)}{n} \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{PT}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{P\tau T}} + \frac{(\sigma_L^2 + \tau\sigma_G^2)}{\tau T}\right)$
Our Work: Theorem 1	\checkmark	\checkmark	$\left(\frac{(n-P)\sigma_G^2}{(n-1)} \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{PT}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{P\tau T}} + \frac{\sigma_L^2 + \tau\sigma_G^2}{\tau T}\right)$
Nonconvex-Concave (NC-C)			
Sharma et al. (2022)	\times	\times	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{(\tau n T)^{1/4}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(n\tau)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{T}}\right)$
Our Work: Theorem 2	\checkmark	\checkmark	$\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt[4]{\frac{n-P}{(n-1)PT}} + \frac{1}{(\tau PT)^{1/4}} + \frac{(P\tau)^{1/4}}{T^{3/4}}\right)$
Nonconvex-One-point-concave (NC-IPC)			
Sharma et al. (2022)	\times	\times	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{(\tau T)^{1/4}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\tau^{3/2}}{\sqrt{T}}\right)$
Our Work: Theorem 3	\checkmark	\checkmark	$\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt[4]{\frac{n-P}{(n-1)PT}} + \frac{1}{(\tau PT)^{1/4}} + \frac{(P\tau)^{1/4}}{T^{3/4}}\right)$

B Convergence of Fed-Norm-SGDA for Nonconvex-Strongly-Concave Functions (Theorem 1)

We organize this section as follows. First, in Appendix B.1 we present some intermediate results, which we use to prove the main theorem. Next, in Appendix B.2, we present the proof of Theorem 1, which is followed by the proofs of the intermediate results in Appendix B.3. Appendix B.4 contains some auxiliary results. Finally, in Appendix B.5 we discuss the convergence result for nonconvex-PL functions.

The problem we solve is

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_{\mathbf{y}} \left\{ \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n w_i f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \right\}.$$

We define $\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x}) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. Since $\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ is μ -strongly concave, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ is unique. In Fed-Norm-SGDA (Algorithm 1), the client updates are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} &= \mathbf{x}^{(t)} - \eta_x^c \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)}; \xi_i^{(t,j)}), \\ \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} &= \mathbf{y}^{(t)} + \eta_y^c \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)}; \xi_i^{(t,j)}),\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

where $1 \leq k \leq \tau_i$. These client updates are then aggregated to compute $\{\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} &= \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)}); & \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} &= \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) \\ \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} &= \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)}); & \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} &= \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}).\end{aligned}$$

Remark 7. Note that we have made explicit, the dependence on k in $a_i^{(j)}(k)$ above. This was omitted in the main paper to avoid tedious notation. However, for some local optimizers, such as local momentum at the clients (Appendix A.1), the coefficients $a_i^{(j)}(k)$ change with k . We assume in our subsequent analysis that $a_i^{(j)}(k) \leq \alpha$ for all $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$ and for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, \tau_i\}$. Further, we assume that $\|\mathbf{a}_i(k)\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{a}_i(k)\|_1$ and $\|\mathbf{a}_i(k+1)\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{a}_i(k+1)\|_2$ for feasible k . We also use the notation $\|\mathbf{a}_i\| \triangleq \|\mathbf{a}_i(\tau_i)\|$.

At iteration t , the server samples $|\mathcal{C}^{(t)}|$ clients *without* replacement (**WOR**) uniformly at random. While aggregating at the server, client i update is weighed by $\tilde{w}_i = w_i n / |\mathcal{C}^{(t)}|$. The aggregates $(\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)})$ computed at the server are of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \quad \text{such that} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}^{(t)}}[\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}) \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \\ \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}, \quad \text{such that} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}^{(t)}}[\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}) \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

For simplicity of analysis, unless stated otherwise, we assume that $|\mathcal{C}^{(t)}| = P$ for all t . Finally, server updates the \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} variables as

$$\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{x}^{(t)} - \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}, \quad \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{y}^{(t)} + \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)}.$$

B.1 Intermediate Lemmas

We begin with the following result from [Nouiehed et al. \(2019\)](#) about the smoothness of $\tilde{\Phi}(\cdot)$.

Lemma B.1. *If a function $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies Assumptions 1, 4 (L_f -smoothness and μ -strong concavity in \mathbf{y}), then $\phi(\cdot) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{y}} f(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ is L_{Φ} -smooth with $L_{\Phi} = \kappa L_f / 2 + L_f$, where $\kappa = L_f / \mu$ is the condition number.*

Lemma B.2. *Suppose the local client loss functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 3, and the stochastic oracles for the local functions satisfy Assumption 2. Suppose the server selects P clients in each round. Then the iterates generated by*

Fed-Norm-SGDA (Algorithm 1) satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} \right\|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \frac{n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 \left[\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{n(n-P)}{n-1} \left[\frac{2L_f^2}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + (\max_i w_i) \frac{2}{P} \left(\beta_G^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + \sigma_G^2 \right) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where, $\Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)}\|^2 \right]$ is the iterate drift for client i , at local iteration k in the t -th communication round.

Lemma B.3. Suppose the local client loss functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 3, 4, and the stochastic oracles for the local functions satisfy Assumption 2. Also, the server learning rate γ_x^s satisfies $64\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_\Phi \beta_L^2 \beta_G^2 \frac{n}{P} (\max_i w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2 / \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2) \leq 1$, $8\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_\Phi (\max_i w_i) \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \right) \max\{8\beta_G^2, 1\} \leq 1$, and $8\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_\Phi \beta_L^2 \frac{n}{P} (\max_{i,k} w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) / \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1) \leq 1$. Then the iterates generated by Algorithm 1 satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) - \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right] &\leq -\frac{7\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s}{16} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s}{2} \left(1 - \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_\Phi \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{5}{4} \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + \frac{9\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_f^2}{4\mu} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{2} \frac{n}{P} \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \sigma_G^2 \left(2(\max_i w_i) \frac{n-P}{n-1} + 2\beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Remark. The bound in Equation (15) looks very similar to the corresponding one-step decay bound for simple smooth minimization problems. The major difference is the presence of $\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right]$, which quantifies the inaccuracy of $\mathbf{y}^{(t)}$ in solving the $\max_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y})$. The term $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i)$ is the client drift and is bounded in Lemma B.4.

Lemma B.4. Suppose the local loss functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 3, 4, and the stochastic oracles for the local functions satisfy Assumption 2. Further, in Algorithm 1, we choose learning rates η_x^c, η_y^c such that $\max\{\eta_x^c, \eta_y^c\} \leq \frac{1}{2L_f (\max_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1) \sqrt{2(1+\beta_L^2)}}$. Then, the iterates $\{\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t)}\}$ generated by Fed-Norm-SGDA (Algorithm 1) satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) &\leq 2([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 4L_f^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \sigma_G^2 \\
&\quad + 8L_f^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \beta_G^2 [\eta_x^c]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + 8L_f^3 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \beta_G^2 (2\kappa[\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \triangleq \max_i \left(\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \right)$.

Lemma B.5. Suppose the local loss functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 3, 4, and the stochastic oracles for the local functions satisfy Assumption 2. The server learning rates γ_x^s, γ_y^s satisfy the following conditions:

$$2\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s L_f \leq 1, \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s \kappa L_f \beta_G^2 \frac{n}{P} \max \left\{ \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}, \frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i \right\} \leq \frac{1}{64} \gamma_x^s \leq \frac{\gamma_y^s}{156\kappa^2},$$

$$8\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_\Phi \beta_L^2 \frac{n}{P} \max \left\{ \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1}, \frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i \right\} \leq 1, \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_f \beta_G \sqrt{\frac{n}{P}} \max \left\{ \frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i, \beta_L \sqrt{\max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{40\kappa}$$

The client learning rates η_x^c, η_y^c satisfy $\eta_y^c L_f \beta_G \leq \frac{1}{16\sqrt{\kappa} M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}}}$ and $\eta_x^c: \eta_x^c L_f \beta_G \leq \frac{1}{64\kappa\sqrt{M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}}}}$, respectively. Then the iterates generated by Fed-Norm-SGDA (Algorithm 1) satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\ & \leq \frac{4 \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}^{(0)}) \right]}{\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s \mu T} + \frac{1}{12\mu\kappa^2} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + \frac{8\tau_{\text{eff}}[\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{\gamma_y^s \mu} \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\ & \quad + 6\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s \kappa \frac{n}{P} \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + 2\sigma_G^2 \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] \\ & \quad + 18\kappa L_f \left([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2 \right) \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2\sigma_G^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{8\tau_{\text{eff}}[\gamma_x^s]^2 \kappa}{\gamma_y^s} \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right) \left([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2 \right) L_f^2 \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2\sigma_G^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

B.2 Proof of Theorem 1

For the sake of completeness, we first state the full statement of Theorem 1 here.

Theorem. Suppose the local loss functions $\{f_i\}_i$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4. Suppose the server selects clients using without-replacement sampling scheme (WOR). Also, the server learning rates γ_x^s, γ_y^s and the client learning rates η_x^c, η_y^c satisfy the conditions specified in Lemma B.5. Then the iterates generated by Fed-Norm-SGDA (Algorithm 1) satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{t \in [0:T-1]} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 & \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \leq \underbrace{\mathcal{O} \left(\kappa^2 \left[\frac{\Delta_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s T} + \frac{\gamma_y^s L_f}{P} (A_w \sigma_L^2 + B_w \beta_L^2 \sigma_G^2) \right] \right)}_{\text{Error with full synchronization}} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\mathcal{O} \left(\kappa^2 ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 [C_w \sigma_L^2 + D \sigma_G^2] \right)}_{\text{Error due to local updates}} + \underbrace{\mathcal{O} \left(\kappa^2 \frac{n-P}{n-1} \frac{\gamma_y^s L_f E_w \tau_{\text{eff}} \sigma_G^2}{P} \right)}_{\text{Partial Participation Error}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa = L_f/\mu$ is the condition number, $\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is the envelope function, $\Delta_{\tilde{\Phi}} \triangleq \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \min_{\mathbf{x}} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x})$, $A_w \triangleq n\tau_{\text{eff}} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}$, $B_w \triangleq n\tau_{\text{eff}} \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}$, $C_w \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n w_i (\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2 - [\alpha_i^{(t, \tau_i-1)}]^2)$, $D \triangleq \max_i (\beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2)$, where $\mathbf{a}_{i,-1} \triangleq [a_i^{(0)}, a_i^{(1)}, \dots, a_i^{(\tau_i-2)}]^\top$ for all i and $E_w \triangleq n \max_i w_i$.

Using $\gamma_y^s = \Theta(\frac{1}{L_f} \sqrt{\frac{P}{\bar{\tau}T}})$ and $\eta_x^c \leq \eta_y^c = \Theta(\frac{1}{L_f \bar{\tau} \sqrt{T}})$, where $\bar{\tau} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i$ in the bounds above, we get

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \leq \underbrace{\mathcal{O} \left(\kappa^2 \frac{(\bar{\tau}/\tau_{\text{eff}}) + A_w \sigma_L^2 + B_w \beta_L^2 \sigma_G^2}{\sqrt{P\bar{\tau}T}} \right)}_{\text{Error with full synchronization}} + \underbrace{\mathcal{O} \left(\kappa^2 \frac{C_w \sigma_L^2 + D \sigma_G^2}{\bar{\tau}^2 T} \right)}_{\text{Local updates error}} + \underbrace{\mathcal{O} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \cdot \frac{\kappa^2 E_w \tau_{\text{eff}} \sigma_G^2}{\sqrt{P\bar{\tau}T}} \right)}_{\text{Partial participation error}}.$$

Proof. Using Lemma B.3, and substituting in the bound on iterates' drift from Lemma B.4, we can bound

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) - \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right] \leq -\frac{7\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s}{16} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s}{2} \left(1 - \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_\Phi \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{9\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_f^2}{4\mu} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\
& + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{2} \frac{n}{P} \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \sigma_G^2 \left(2(\max_i w_i) \frac{n-P}{n-1} + 2\beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] \\
& + \frac{5}{2} \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \left([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2 \right) L_f^2 \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2\sigma_G^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \right] \\
& + 10\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \beta_G^2 \left[[\eta_x^c]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + L_f (2\kappa [\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \right]. \quad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

Summing (17) over $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, substituting the bound on $\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right]$ from Lemma B.5, and rearranging the terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\
& = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\kappa^2 \Delta_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s T} + \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f \kappa^2 \frac{n}{P} \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \sigma_G^2 \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] \right) \\
& + \mathcal{O} \left(\kappa^2 ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \left(\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2 - [a_i^{(t, \tau_i-1)}]^2 \right) + \sigma_G^2 \max_i \left(\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \right) \right] \right) \quad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, using constants A_w, B_w, C_w, D, E_w , (18) can be simplified to

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\kappa^2 \left[\frac{\Delta_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s T} + \frac{\gamma_y^s L_f}{P} (A_w \sigma_L^2 + (B_w \beta_L^2 + E_w \tau_{\text{eff}}) \sigma_G^2) \right] + \kappa^2 ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 [C_w \sigma_L^2 + D \frac{\sigma_G^2}{G}] \right).$$

which completes the proof. \square

Convergence in terms of F

Proof of Corollary 1.1. According to the definition of $F(\mathbf{x})$ and $\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n [p_i \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - w_i \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x}))] \quad (\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n p_i [\nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x}))] + \sum_{i=1}^n (p_i - w_i) \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x})) \\
&= [\nabla_x F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \nabla_x F(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x}))] + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{p_i - w_i}{\sqrt{w_i}} \cdot \sqrt{w_i} \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x})).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking norm, using L_f -smoothness and applying Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) \right\|^2 &\leq 2L_f^2 \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + 2 \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(p_i - w_i)^2}{w_i} \right] \left[\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x}))\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq 2L_f^2 \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + 2\chi_{\mathbf{p}\|\mathbf{w}}^2 \left[\beta_G^2 \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) \right\|^2 + \sigma_G^2 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses Assumption 3. Next, note that

$$\left\| \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}) \right\|^2 \leq 2 \left\| \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) \right\|^2 + 2 \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) \right\|^2.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{t \in [T]} \left\| \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left\| \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \left[2\chi_{\mathbf{p}\|\mathbf{w}}^2 \beta_G^2 + 1 \right] \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + 4 \left[\chi_{\mathbf{p}\|\mathbf{w}}^2 \sigma_G^2 + L_f^2 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left\| \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \right] \\
&= 2 \left[2\chi_{\mathbf{p}\|\mathbf{w}}^2 \beta_G^2 + 1 \right] \epsilon_{\text{opt}} + 4 \left[\chi_{\mathbf{p}\|\mathbf{w}}^2 \sigma_G^2 + L_f^2 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left\| \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

where ϵ_{opt} denotes the optimization error in the right hand side of (4) in Theorem 1. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.2. If clients are weighted equally ($w_i = p_i = 1/n$ for all i), with each carrying out τ steps of local SGDA, as seen in (6) we get

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \left\| \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 \sigma_G^2}{\sqrt{P\tau T}} + \frac{\sigma_L^2 + \tau \sigma_G^2}{\tau T} + \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \right) \sigma_G^2 \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{PT}} \right).$$

- For full client participation, this reduces to

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n\tau T}} + \frac{1}{T} \right).$$

To reach an ϵ -stationary point, assuming $n\tau \leq T$, the per-client gradient complexity is $T\tau = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{n\epsilon^4} \right)$. Since $\tau \leq T/n$, the minimum number of communication rounds required is $T = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \right)$.

- For partial participation, $\mathcal{O} \left(\left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \right) \sigma_G^2 \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{PT}} \right)$ is the dominant term, and we do not get any convergence benefit of multiple local updates. Consequently, per-gradient client complexity and number of communication rounds are both $T\tau = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{P\epsilon^4} \right)$, for $\tau = \mathcal{O}(1)$. However, if the data across clients comes from identical distributions ($\sigma_G = 0$), then we recover per-client gradient complexity of $\mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{P\epsilon^4} \right)$, and number of communication rounds $= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \right)$. \square

B.3 Proofs of the Intermediate Lemmas

Proof of Lemma B.2.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \left(\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} - \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} + \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \left(\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} - \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i^2 \left\| \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} - \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \quad (\text{sampling scheme}) \\
&= \frac{n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} - \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \quad (\because \tilde{w}_i = w_i n / P)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 \left[\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) \right\|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2. \quad (19)$$

where the last inequality follows from Assumption 1 and 2. Further, we can bound the second term as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} + \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}) \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \quad ((\text{WOR}) \text{ sampling}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left((\mathbb{I}(i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}))^2 \tilde{w}_i^2 + w_i^2 - 2\mathbb{I}(i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}) \tilde{w}_i w_i \right) \left\| \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E} \left\langle (\mathbb{I}(i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}) \tilde{w}_i - w_i) \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, (\mathbb{I}(j \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}) \tilde{w}_j - w_j) \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},j}^{(t)} \right\rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[w_i^2 \left(\frac{n}{P} - 1 \right) \left\| \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{I}(i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}) \cdot \mathbb{I}(j \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}) \tilde{w}_i \tilde{w}_j - \mathbb{I}(j \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}) \tilde{w}_j w_i - \mathbb{I}(i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}) \tilde{w}_i w_j + w_i w_j \right) \left\langle \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},j}^{(t)} \right\rangle \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \left(\frac{n}{P} - 1 \right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[w_i^2 \left\| \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] + \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E} \left[w_i w_j \left(\frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} \right) - 1 \right) \left\langle \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},j}^{(t)} \right\rangle \right] \\ &= \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \frac{n}{P} \frac{n-P}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2, \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound the second term in (20).

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} - \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) + \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\ & \leq 2L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 2(\max_i w_i) \left(\beta_G^2 \left\| \nabla_x \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + \sigma_G^2 \right), \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

using Assumption 3. $\Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \left\| \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right]$. Substituting (21) in (20), and using the resulting bound in (19) we get the bound in (14). \square

Proof of Lemma B.3. Since the local functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumption 4, $F(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ is μ -SC for any \mathbf{x} . In the proof, we use the quadratic growth property of μ -SC function $F(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$, i.e., for any given \mathbf{x}

$$\frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \leq F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{y}, \quad (22)$$

where $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. Using $L_{\tilde{\Phi}}$ -smoothness of $\tilde{\Phi}(\cdot)$,

$$\mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) \leq \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \mathbb{E} \left\langle \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}), \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}^{(t)}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\rangle + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}^{(t)}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \mathbb{E} \left\langle \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}), \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\rangle + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \quad (\text{using Assumption 2 and (3)}) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} \right\|^2. \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \left(\nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})) - \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) + \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) - \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2 \\
&\quad (\text{since } \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}'} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')) \\
&\leq 2L_f^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + 2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \left(\nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) - \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) \right) \right\|^2 \\
&\quad (\text{Jensen's inequality; } L_f\text{-smoothness; Young's inequality}) \\
&\leq \frac{4L_f^2}{\mu} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) - \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) \right\|^2 \\
&\quad (\text{Quadratic growth of } \mu\text{-SC functions (22); Jensen's inequality}) \\
&\leq \frac{4L_f^2}{\mu} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] + 2L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \left\| \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\quad (L_f\text{-smoothness}) \\
&= \frac{4L_f^2}{\mu} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] + 2L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i). \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \left\| \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right]$. Further, the term containing $\left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) \right\|^2$ in (14) is bounded in Lemma B.7.

substituting the bounds from (24), (14) and Lemma B.7 into (23), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) &\leq \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s}{2} \left[\frac{4L_f^2}{\mu} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] + 2L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{2} \left[\frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \right) 2L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{2} \frac{n \sigma_L^2}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{2} \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \right) 2(\max_i w_i) \left(\beta_G^2 \left\| \nabla_x \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + \sigma_G^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{2} \frac{n}{P} \beta_L^2 \left[2L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 2\sigma_G^2 \left(\max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{2} \frac{n}{P} \beta_L^2 4\beta_G^2 \left(\max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \left[\frac{2L_f^2}{\mu} \mathbb{E} \left(\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right) + \left\| \nabla_x \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \frac{7\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s}{16} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s}{2} \left(1 - \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} \right) \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_\Phi \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\
& + \frac{9\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f^2}{4\mu} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] + \frac{5}{4} \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \\
& + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{2} \frac{n}{P} \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \sigma_G^2 \left(2(\max_i w_i) \frac{n-P}{n-1} + 2\beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where, the coefficients are simplified, using assumptions on the learning rate γ_x^s

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_\Phi \left[(\max_i w_i) \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \right) + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right] & \leq \frac{P}{4n} \\
\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_\Phi \left[(\max_i w_i) \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \right) + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right] & \leq \frac{P}{32\beta_G^2 n}.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of. \square

Proof of Lemma B.4. We use the client update equations for individual iterates (12). To bound $\Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i)$, first we bound a single component term $\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2$. For $1 \leq k \leq \tau_i$, Using modified variance assumption

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2 & = [\eta_x^c]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \left(\nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)}; \xi_i^{(t,j)} \right) - \nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)} \right) + \nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)} \right) \right) \right\|^2 \\
& = [\eta_x^c]^2 \left[\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \left(\nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)}; \xi_i^{(t,j)} \right) - \nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)} \right) \right) \right\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)} \right) \right\|^2 \right] \\
& \hspace{15em} \text{(using unbiasedness in Assumption 2)} \\
& = [\eta_x^c]^2 \left[\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} [a_i^{(j)}(k)]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)}; \xi_i^{(t,j)} \right) - \nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)} \right) \right\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)} \right) \right\|^2 \right] \\
& \leq [\eta_x^c]^2 \left[\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} [a_i^{(j)}(k)]^2 \left(\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 \left\| \nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)} \right) \right\|^2 \right) + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \right) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)} \right) \right\|^2 \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where the last inequality follows from Jensen's inequality (Lemma A.3). Next, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} [a_i^{(j)}(k)]^2 & \leq \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-2} [a_i^{(j)}(k)]^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-2} [a_i^{(j)}(k)]^2 \leq \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2 - [a_i^{(t,\tau_i-1)}(\tau_i)]^2, \\
\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) & \leq \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-2} a_i^{(j)}(k) = \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-2} a_i^{(j)}(k) \leq \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1 - [a_i^{(t,\tau_i-1)}(\tau_i)], \\
\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} [a_i^{(j)}(k)]^2 & \leq \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \sum_{j=0}^{\tau_i-2} [a_i^{(j)}(k)]^2 \leq \alpha \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-2} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i),
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

We define $\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \triangleq \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2 - [a_i^{(t,\tau_i-1)}(\tau_i)]^2$, $\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1 \triangleq \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1 - [a_i^{(t,\tau_i-1)}(\tau_i)]$ for the sake of brevity. Using (26), we bound the individual terms in (25).

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} [a_i^{(j)}(k)]^2 \beta_L^2 \left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)}) \right\|^2 \\ & \leq 2\beta_L^2 \alpha L_f^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\tau_i-2} [a_i^{(j)}(k)] \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,j)} + 2\beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \right) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)}) \right\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\tau_i-2} a_i^{(j)}(k) \right) \sum_{j=0}^{\tau_i-2} a_i^{(j)}(k) \left[L_f^2 \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,j)} + \left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1 L_f^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\tau_i-2} a_i^{(j)}(k) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,j)} + 2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 \left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Substituting (27), (28) in (25), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2 & \leq [\eta_x^c]^2 \sigma_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2[\eta_x^c]^2 L_f^2 (\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1 + \beta_L^2 \alpha) \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \\ & \quad + 2[\eta_x^c]^2 \left(\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Similarly, we can bound the y error

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right\|^2 & \leq [\eta_y^c]^2 \sigma_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2[\eta_y^c]^2 L_f^2 (\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1 + \beta_L^2 \alpha) \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \\ & \quad + 2[\eta_y^c]^2 \left(\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Combining the two bounds in (29) and (30), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \left\| \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] \leq ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \sigma_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \\ & \quad + 2([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1 (\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1 + \beta_L^2 \alpha) \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \\ & \quad + 2 \left(\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \right) \left[[\eta_x^c]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_y f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Define $A_m \triangleq 2L_f^2 ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \max_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1 (\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1 + \beta_L^2 \alpha)$. Rearranging the terms in (31), and taking the weighted sum over agents, we get

$$L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \sigma_L^2}{1 - A_m} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{2L_f^2}{1 - A_m} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \left(\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \right) \left[[\eta_x^c]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_y f_i \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2}{1 - A_m} \sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + \frac{2L_f^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}}}{1 - A_m} [\eta_x^c]^2 \left(\beta_G^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \nabla_x f_i \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2 + \sigma_G^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{2L_f^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}}}{1 - A_m} [\eta_y^c]^2 \left(\beta_G^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \nabla_y f_i \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2 + \sigma_G^2 \right). \tag{32}
\end{aligned}$$

where (32) follows from Assumption 3, and we define $M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \triangleq \max_i \left(\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \right)$. We bounded $\mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x F \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2$ in Lemma B.6. Similarly, we can bound $\mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_y F \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_y F \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_y F \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) - \nabla_y F \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^* \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right) \right) \right\|^2 \quad (\because \mathbf{y}^* \left(\mathbf{x} \right) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}'} F \left(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}' \right)) \\
&\leq 2L_f \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right) - \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) \right]. \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

using L_f -smoothness and concavity of $F(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ (Lemma A.6). Also, for the choice of η_x^c, η_y^c , we get $A_m \leq 1/2$. Consequently, substituting the two bounds in (32), we complete the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma B.5. Using L_f -smoothness (Assumption 1) of $F(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) &\leq \mathbb{E} \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} \right) - \mathbb{E} \left\langle \nabla_y \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right), \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right\rangle + \frac{L_f}{2} \left\| \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} \right) - \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \mathbb{E} \left\langle \nabla_y \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right), \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} \right\rangle + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)} \right\|^2, \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} \right) - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla_y \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2 + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 - \left\| \nabla_y \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)} \right\|^2. \tag{34}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound the individual terms in (34). Using quadratic growth of μ -SC functions (Lemma A.5)

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_y \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2 \geq 2\mu \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} \right) - \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) \right].$$

Next, we bound $\left\| \nabla_y \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2$, using similar reasoning as in (24).

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_y \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) - \nabla_y \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) + \nabla_y \tilde{F} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\
&\leq 2L_f^2 \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \left(\nabla_y f_i \left(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right) - \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} \right) \right\|^2 \\
&\leq 2L_f^2 \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + 2L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)} (\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i), \tag{35}
\end{aligned}$$

We can bound $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}\|^2$ using (14) in Lemma B.2 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}\|^2 &\leq \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)}\mathbb{E}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}\right\|^2 + \frac{\sigma_L^2 n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \frac{2\sigma_G^2}{P} \left(\frac{n(n-P)}{n-1} \max_i w_i\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\beta_L^2 n}{P} \left[2L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 4\beta_G^2 \left(\max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}\right) \mathbb{E}\|\nabla_x \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{\beta_L^2 n}{P} 2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \left[\sigma_G^2 + 4\beta_G^2 L_f \kappa \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})] \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{n(n-P)}{n-1} \frac{2L_f^2}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{n(n-P)}{n-1} \max_i w_i\right) \frac{2\beta_G^2}{P} \left[4L_f \kappa \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})] + 2\|\nabla_x \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)}\mathbb{E}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}\right\|^2 + \frac{\sigma_L^2 n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \frac{2n\sigma_G^2}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}\right) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1}\right) \frac{2nL_f^2}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \\
&\quad + \frac{4n\beta_G^2}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}\right) \|\nabla_x \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{8n\beta_G^2 L_f \kappa}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}\right) \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})]. \tag{36}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can bound $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)}\|^2$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)}\|^2 &\leq \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)}\mathbb{E}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}\right\|^2 + \frac{\sigma_L^2 n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \frac{2\sigma_G^2 n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}\right) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1}\right) \frac{2nL_f^2}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \\
&\quad + \frac{4\beta_G^2 L_f n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}\right) \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})]. \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (35), (36), (37) and Lemma B.4 in (34), and rearranging the terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)}) - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s}{2} \left(1 - \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)}\right) \mathbb{E}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)}\right\|^2 + \tau_{\text{eff}}^3 [\gamma_x^s]^2 \gamma_y^s L_f^2 \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \mathbb{E}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}\right\|^2 \\
&\quad - \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \mu \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})] \\
&\quad + \tau_{\text{eff}}^3 [\gamma_x^s]^2 \gamma_y^s L_f^2 \frac{4n\beta_G^2}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}\right) \|\nabla_x \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2\tau_{\text{eff}} [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f}{\gamma_y^s}\right) \left[\frac{\sigma_L^2 n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \frac{2\sigma_G^2 n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left[\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f n}{P} \left(\frac{2\tau_{\text{eff}} [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f}{\gamma_y^s} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right) \right] L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \\
& + 2\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f \left(\frac{4\tau_{\text{eff}} [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f \kappa}{\gamma_y^s} + 1 \right) \frac{\beta_G^2 n L_f}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\
\leq & \mathbb{E} \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)}) - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s}{2} \left(1 - \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y}, i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \tau_{\text{eff}}^3 [\gamma_x^s]^2 \gamma_y^s L_f^2 \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x}, i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\
& - \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \mu \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\
& + \tau_{\text{eff}}^3 \gamma_y^s [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f^2 \frac{4\beta_G^2 n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\
& + \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f \left[\frac{\sigma_L^2 n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \frac{2\sigma_G^2 n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] \\
& \quad (\because 4\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f \leq 1, \gamma_x^s \kappa \leq \gamma_y^s) \\
& + 2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \quad (\because 8\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f \leq P) \\
& + 4\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f^2 \frac{\beta_G^2 n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \tag{38}
\end{aligned}$$

where we simplify some coefficients using $4\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f \leq 1$, $\gamma_x^s \leq \kappa \gamma_y^s$. We rearrange the terms and use the bound in Lemma B.4 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)}) \right] \\
\leq & (1 - \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \mu) \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\
& - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s}{2} \left(1 - \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y}, i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \tau_{\text{eff}}^3 [\gamma_x^s]^2 \gamma_y^s L_f^2 \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x}, i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\
& + 4\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f^2 \beta_G^2 \left[\frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) + 4M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} [\eta_x^c]^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\
& + \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f \left[\frac{\mathbf{a}}{P} \frac{2}{L} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \frac{2\mathbf{a}}{P} \frac{2}{G} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] \\
& + 4\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \sigma_G^2 \right] \\
& + 4\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f^2 \beta_G^2 \left[\frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) + 4L_f M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} (2\kappa [\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) - \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) + \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) + \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right]. \tag{40}
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the bound from Lemma B.4 into Lemma B.3, $\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) - \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right]$ can be bounded as follows.

$$\mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq (1 - \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s\mu) \left[1 + \frac{3\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_f^2}{\mu} + \frac{5\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_f^2}{2\mu} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\
&+ 4\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s L_f^2 \beta_G^2 \left[\frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) + 4L_f M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} (2\kappa[\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\
&+ 4\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s L_f^2 \beta_G^2 \left[\frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}[\gamma_x^s]^2 n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) + 4M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}}[\eta_x^c]^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\
&- \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s}{2} \left(1 - \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s L_f \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \tau_{\text{eff}}^3 [\gamma_x^s]^2 \gamma_y^s L_f^2 \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\
&+ (1 - \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s\mu) \left[\frac{13\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s}{8} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2}{2} (L_\Phi + L_f) \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] \\
&+ \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f \left[\frac{\sigma_L^2 n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \frac{2\sigma_G^2 n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] \\
&+ 4\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \sigma_G^2 \right] \\
&+ (1 - \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s\mu) \frac{\sigma_L^2 \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f}{2} \frac{n}{P} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + 4 \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right) ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \right] \\
&+ (1 - \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s\mu) \sigma_G^2 \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f \frac{n}{P} \left[\left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) + 4 \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right) L_f^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \right] \\
&+ (1 - \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s\mu) \frac{5}{2} \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \sigma_G^2 \right] \\
&+ (1 - \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s\mu) \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{2} \frac{n}{P} \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \sigma_G^2 \left(2(\max_i w_i) \frac{n-P}{n-1} + 2\beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] \tag{43}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we simplify the coefficients of different terms in (43).

- Coefficient of $\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right]$ can be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1 - \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s\mu) \left(1 + \frac{11\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_f^2}{2\mu} \right) \\
&+ 4\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s L_f^2 \beta_G^2 \left[\frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) + 4L_f M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} (2\kappa[\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \right] \\
&\leq 1 - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s\mu}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

using $\gamma_x^s \leq \frac{\gamma_y^s}{11\kappa^2}$, $\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s \kappa L_f \beta_G^2 \frac{n}{P} \max \left\{ \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}, \frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i \right\} \leq \frac{1}{64}$, $\kappa L_f \beta_G \eta_x^c \leq \frac{1}{16\sqrt{2M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}}}}$ and $L_f \beta_G \eta_y^c \leq \frac{1}{16\sqrt{\kappa M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}}}}$.

- Coefficient of $\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2$ can be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tau_{\text{eff}}^3 [\gamma_x^s]^2 \gamma_y^s L_f^2 \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2}{2} (L_\Phi + L_f) \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \\
&\leq 2\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)}. \quad (\because L_f \leq L_\Phi, \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s L_f \leq 1)
\end{aligned}$$

- Coefficient of $\mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2$ can be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \mu) \frac{13}{8} \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s + 4 \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f^2 \beta_G^2 \left[\frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) + 4 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} [\eta_x^c]^2 \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s}{48 \kappa^2}. \end{aligned} \quad \left(\frac{\gamma_x^s}{\gamma_y^s} \leq \frac{1}{49 \kappa^2} \right)$$

using $\gamma_x^s \leq \frac{\gamma_y^s}{156 \kappa^2}$, $\eta_x^c L_f \beta_G \leq \frac{1}{64 \kappa \sqrt{M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}}}}$ and $\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f \beta_G \sqrt{\frac{n}{P}} \max \left\{ \frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i, \beta_L \sqrt{\max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{40 \kappa}$.

- Coefficient of σ_L^2 can be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right) ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \\ & + \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f \frac{n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 (L_\Phi + L_f)}{2} \frac{n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \\ & + \tau_{\text{eff}} \left(4 \gamma_y^s + \frac{5}{2} \gamma_x^s \right) ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \frac{3}{2} \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f \frac{n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \frac{9}{2} \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \\ & + 2 \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right) ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

- Coefficient of σ_G^2 can be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2 \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 n}{P} ([\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f + [\gamma_x^s]^2 (L_f + L_\Phi)) \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \\ & + \tau_{\text{eff}} L_f^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \left(8 \gamma_y^s + 4 \tau_{\text{eff}} [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right) + 5 \gamma_x^s \right) \\ & \leq \frac{3 \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 L_f n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) + 9 \gamma_y^s \tau_{\text{eff}} L_f^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \\ & + 4 \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f^3 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, substituting these coefficients in (43), summing over $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ and rearranging the terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\ & \leq \frac{4}{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \mu} \left[\frac{\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}^{(0)})}{T} - \frac{\mathbb{E} \left(\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)}) - F(\mathbf{x}^{(T)}, \mathbf{y}^{(T)}) \right)}{T} \right] + \frac{1}{12 \mu \kappa^2} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\ & + \frac{8 \tau_{\text{eff}} [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_\Phi}{\gamma_y^s \mu} \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + 18 \kappa L_f ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2 \sigma_G^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{8\tau_{\text{eff}}[\gamma_x^s]^2 \kappa}{\gamma_y^s} \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right) ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2\sigma_G^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \right] \\
& + 6\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \kappa \frac{n}{P} \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + 2\sigma_G^2 \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right], \tag{44}
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

B.4 Auxiliary Lemmas

Lemma B.6. *If the local client function $f_i(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 4 (L_f -smoothness and μ -strong concavity in \mathbf{y}), then the function F satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E} \|\nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + \frac{4L_f^2}{\mu} \mathbb{E} [\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|^2 & \leq 2\mathbb{E} \|\nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \\
& \leq 2\mathbb{E} \|\nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + 2L_f^2 \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y}\|^2 && (L_f\text{-smoothness (Assumption 1)}) \\
& \leq 2\mathbb{E} \|\nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + \frac{4L_f^2}{\mu} \mathbb{E} [\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]. && (\text{Assumption 4})
\end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma B.7. *If the local client function $f_i(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 3 and 4, then the iterates $\{\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}\}_{i,(t,k)}$ generated by Algorithm 1 satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)})\|^2 \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 L_f^2 \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 2\sigma_G^2 \left(\max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \\
& \quad + 4\beta_G^2 \left(\max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \left[\frac{2L_f^2}{\mu} \mathbb{E} (\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})) + \|\nabla_x \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) \pm \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 L_f^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)}\|^2 \right] + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})\|^2 \\
& && (L_f\text{-smoothness}) \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 L_f^2 \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 2 \left(\max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \left[\beta_G^2 \|\nabla_x \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})\|^2 + \sigma_G^2 \right] && (\text{Assumption 3})
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma B.6 gives the result. \square

Lemma B.8. *If the local client function $f_i(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 3 and 4, then the iterates $\{\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}\}_{i,(t,k)}$ generated by Algorithm 1 satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)})\|^2 \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 L_f^2 \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 2 \left(\max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \left[\sigma_G^2 + 2\beta_G^2 L_f \mathbb{E} \left(\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Following closely the proof of Lemma B.7,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) \pm \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 L_f^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)}\|^2 \right] + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\ & \hspace{25em} (L_f\text{-smoothness}) \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 L_f^2 \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 2 \left(\max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \left[\beta_G^2 \left\| \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + \sigma_G^2 \right] \quad (\text{Assumption 3}) \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 L_f^2 \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 2 \left(\max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \left[\sigma_G^2 + 2\beta_G^2 L_f \mathbb{E} \left(\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from smoothness and concavity of F in \mathbf{y} . \square

B.5 Convergence under Polyak Łojasiewicz (PL) Condition

In case the global function satisfies Assumption 5, the results in this section follow with minor modifications. The crucial difference is that Lemma A.6 no longer holds. Lemma B.2 and Lemma B.3 follow exactly. The statement of Lemma B.4 needs some modification, since we use Lemma A.6 in the proof.

Lemma B.9. *Suppose the local loss functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 3, 5, and the stochastic oracles for the local functions satisfy Assumption 2. Under the conditions of Lemma B.9, the iterates $\{\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t)}\}$ generated by Algorithm 1 satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{p_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) & \leq 2 ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 4L_f^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \sigma_G^2 \\ & \quad + 8L_f^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \beta_G^2 [\eta_x^c]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + 8\kappa L_f^3 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \beta_G^2 (2[\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \triangleq \max_i \left(\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \right)$.

The bound in Lemma B.8 also changes to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 \mathbb{E} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)})\|^2 \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 L_f^2 \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 2 \left(\max_i \frac{p_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \left[\sigma_G^2 + 2\beta_G^2 \kappa L_f \mathbb{E} \left(\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The same bound in Lemma B.5 holds, but with more stringent conditions on learning rates, namely $\eta_y^c L_f \beta_G \leq \frac{1}{16\kappa\sqrt{M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}}}}$ and $\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \kappa L_f \beta_G^2 \frac{1}{P} \max \left\{ \kappa \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}, 1 \right\} \leq \frac{1}{64}$. Consequently, the bounds in Theorem 1 hold, under slightly more stringent conditions on the learning rates.

C Convergence of Fed-Norm-SGDA+ for Nonconvex Concave Functions (Theorem 2)

We organize this section as follows. First, in Appendix C.1 we present some intermediate results, which we use in the proof of Theorem 2. Next, in Appendix C.2, we present the proof of Theorem 2, which is followed by the proofs of the intermediate results in Appendix C.3. Finally, we discuss the extension of our results to nonconvex-one-point-concave functions in Appendix C.4.

The problem we solve is

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_{\mathbf{y}} \left\{ \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n w_i f_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \right\}.$$

We define $\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*(\mathbf{x}) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. Since $\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ is no longer strongly concave, $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$ need not be unique. In Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+, the client updates are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} &= \mathbf{x}^{(t)} - \eta_x^c \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,j)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)}; \xi_i^{(t,j)}), \\ \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} &= \mathbf{y}^{(t)} + \eta_y^c \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \nabla_y f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,j)}; \xi_i^{(t,j)}), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where $1 \leq k \leq \tau_i$. The server updates are given by

$$\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{x}^{(t)} - \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}, \quad \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{y}^{(t)} + \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)}, \quad (46)$$

where $\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}, \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)}$ are defined in (3). The normalized (stochastic) gradient vectors are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} &= \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)}); \quad \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}), \\ \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} &= \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \nabla_y f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}; \xi_i^{(t,k)}); \quad \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \nabla_y f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

C.1 Intermediate Lemmas

As discussed in Section 5.2, we analyze the convergence of the smoothed envelope function $\tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}$. We begin with a bound on the one-step decay of this function.

Lemma C.1 (One-step decay of Smoothed-Envelope). *Suppose the local loss functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 6, and 7. Then, the iterates generated by Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+ satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right] + \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f \frac{n}{P} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2) + G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} + \frac{n-P}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \right) \right] \\ &\quad + 2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \left\{ L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + L_f \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \right\} - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s}{8} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) = \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)}\|^2 \right]$ is the drift of client $i \in [n]$, at the k -th local step of epoch t .

Between two successive synchronization time instants (for example, $t, t + 1$), the clients drift apart due to local descent/ascent steps, resulting in the $\{\Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i)\}_{i,k}$ terms. Also, $\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right]$ quantifies the error of the inner maximization. In the subsequent lemmas, we bound both these error terms.

Lemma C.2 (Consensus Error). *Suppose the local loss functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 3, 6, and 7. The stochastic oracles for the local functions satisfy Assumption 2. Further, in Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+, we choose the client learning rate η_y^c such that $\eta_y^c \leq \frac{1}{2L_f(\max_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1)\sqrt{2\max\{1, \beta_L^2\}}}$. Then, the iterates $\{\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t)}\}$ generated by Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+ satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) &\leq 2([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 4L_f^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}}([\eta_x^c]^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2 \sigma_G^2) \\ &\quad + 8[\eta_y^c]^2 L_f^3 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \beta_G^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \triangleq \max_i (\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2)$.

Note that consensus error depends on the difference $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})]$. This is different from the term $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})]$ in Lemma C.1. Since in Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+, the \mathbf{x} -component stays fixed at $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}$ for S communication rounds while updating $\mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}$, the difference

$$\sum_{t=kS}^{(k+1)S-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right]$$

can be interpreted as the optimization error, when maximizing the concave function $F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \cdot)$ over S communication rounds. Next, we bound this error. The following result essentially extends the analysis of FedNova (Wang et al. (2020)) to concave maximization (analogously, convex minimization) problems. We also generalize the corresponding analyses in Khaled et al. (2020); Koloskova et al. (2020) to heterogeneous local updates.

Lemma C.3 (Local SG updates for Concave Maximization). *Suppose the local functions satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 6. Further, let $\|\mathbf{y}^{(t)}\|^2 \leq R$ for all t . We run Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+ with client step-size η_y^c such that $64[\eta_y^c]^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} L_f^2 \beta_G^2 \frac{n}{P} \leq 1$. Further, the server step-size γ_y^s satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f \frac{n}{P} \max\{\beta_G^2, 1\} \max \left\{ \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}, \frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i \right\} &\leq \frac{1}{8}, \\ 2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f \frac{n}{P} \max \left\{ \frac{P-1}{n-1}, \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right\} &\leq \frac{1}{8}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the iterates generated by Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{S} \sum_{t=sS}^{(s+1)S-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{4R}{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s S} + \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \frac{n}{P} \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + 2\sigma_G^2 \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + 4L_f([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}}(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \triangleq \max_i (\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2)$.

Remark 8. It is worth noting that the proof of Lemma C.3 does not require global concavity of local functions. Rather, given \mathbf{x} , we only need concavity of local functions $\{f_i\}$ at some point $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$. This is precisely the one-point-concavity assumption (Assumption 8) discussed earlier in Deng & Mahdavi (2021); Sharma et al. (2022). Therefore, Lemma C.3 for a much larger class of functions. Further, the bound in Lemma C.3 improves the corresponding bounds derived in existing work. As we discuss in Appendix C.4, this helps us achieve improve complexity results for nonconvex-one-point-concave (NC-1PC) functions.

Next, we bound the difference $\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right]$.

Lemma C.4. *Suppose the local functions satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 7. Then the iterates generated by Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+ satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=0}^{T/S-1} \sum_{t=sS}^{(s+1)S-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\ &+ 2\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s G_{\mathbf{x}}(S-1) \sqrt{\frac{n}{P}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2)} + G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} + \frac{n-P}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

C.2 Proof of Theorem 2

For the sake of completeness, we first state the full statement of Theorem 2 here.

Theorem 4. *Suppose the local loss functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 6, 7. Further, let $\|\mathbf{y}^{(t)}\|^2 \leq R$ for all t . We run Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+ with client step-size η_y^c such that $64[\eta_y^c]^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} L_f^2 \max\{\beta_G^2 \frac{n}{P}, 1\} \leq 1$. Further, the server step-size γ_y^s satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s L_f \frac{n}{P} \max\{\beta_G^2, 1\} \max \left\{ \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}, \frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i \right\} &\leq \frac{1}{8}, \\ 2\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s L_f \frac{n}{P} \max \left\{ \frac{P-1}{n-1}, \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right\} &\leq \frac{1}{8}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the iterates generated by Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 &\leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\bar{\Delta}_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s T} + \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_f \left[\frac{A_w}{P\tau_{\text{eff}}} (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2) + G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} + F_w \right) \right] \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left(\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_x^s L_f G_{\mathbf{x}}(S-1) \sqrt{\frac{A_w}{P\tau_{\text{eff}}} (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2) + G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} + F_w \right)} \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{L_f R}{\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s S} + \frac{\gamma_y^s L_f}{P} \left(A_w \sigma_L^2 + \sigma_G^2 \left(\tau_{\text{eff}} \frac{n-P}{n-1} E_w + B_w \beta_L^2 \right) \right) \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 [C_w \sigma_L^2 + D (G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2)] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where $\tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \min_{\mathbf{x}'} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}') + L_f \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|^2$ is the envelope function, $\bar{\Delta}_{\tilde{\Phi}} \triangleq \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}_0) - \min_{\mathbf{x}} \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x})$, $A_w \triangleq n\tau_{\text{eff}} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}$, $B_w \triangleq n\tau_{\text{eff}} \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2}$, $E_w \triangleq n \max_i w_i$, $C_w \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n w_i (\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2 - [\alpha_i^{(t, \tau_i-1)}]^2)$, and $D \triangleq \max_i (\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2)$, $F_w \triangleq \frac{n(n-P)}{P(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2$. With the following parameter values:

$$\eta_x^c = \eta_y^c = \Theta \left(\frac{1}{L_f \bar{\tau} T^{3/8}} \right), \quad \gamma_x^s = \Theta \left(\frac{P^{1/4}}{(\tau_{\text{eff}} T)^{3/4}} \right), \quad \gamma_y^s = \Theta \left(\frac{P^{3/4}}{(\tau_{\text{eff}} T)^{1/4}} \right), \quad S = \Theta \left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\tau_{\text{eff}} P}} \right),$$

$n \max_i w_i$, $C_w \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2$, $D \triangleq M_{\mathbf{a}-1}$, $F_w \triangleq \frac{n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2$ and drop the numerical constants, for simplicity, to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\
& \lesssim \frac{\bar{\Delta}_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s T} + \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f \left[\frac{A_w}{P \tau_{\text{eff}}} (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2) + G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} + \frac{(n-P)}{(n-1)} F_w \right) \right] \\
& \quad + \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f G_{\mathbf{x}} (S-1) \sqrt{\frac{A_w}{P \tau_{\text{eff}}} (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2) + G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} + \frac{(n-P)}{(n-1)} F_w \right)} \\
& \quad + \frac{L_f R}{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s S} + \frac{\gamma_y^s L_f}{P} \left(A_w \sigma_L^2 + \sigma_G^2 \left(\tau_{\text{eff}} \frac{n-P}{n-1} E_w + B_w \beta_L^2 \right) \right) + ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 [C_w \sigma_L^2 + D(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2)] \\
& = \frac{\bar{\Delta}_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s T} + \gamma_x^s L_f \mathcal{I}_1^2 + \frac{\gamma_y^s L_f \mathcal{I}_2}{P} + L_f \left[\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s G_{\mathbf{x}} (S-1) \mathcal{I}_1 + \frac{R}{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s S} \right] \\
& \quad + ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 [C_w \sigma_L^2 + D(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2)], \tag{50}
\end{aligned}$$

where in (50), to simplify notation, we have defined $\mathcal{I}_1 \triangleq \sqrt{\frac{A_w}{P \tau_{\text{eff}}} (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2) + G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} + \frac{(n-P)}{(n-1)} F_w \right)}$, $\mathcal{I}_2 \triangleq A_w \sigma_L^2 + (B_w \beta_L^2 + \tau_{\text{eff}} \frac{n-P}{n-1} E_w) \sigma_G^2$.

Next, we optimize the algorithm parameters $S, \gamma_x^s, \gamma_y^s, \eta_y^c, \eta_x^c$ to achieve a tight bound on (50). If $R = 0$, we let $S = 1$. Else, let $S = \sqrt{\frac{R}{\tau_{\text{eff}}^2 \gamma_x^s \gamma_y^s G_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{I}_1}}$. Substituting this in (50), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 & \lesssim \frac{\bar{\Delta}_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s T} + \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f \mathcal{I}_1^2 + \frac{\gamma_y^s L_f \mathcal{I}_2}{P} + L_f \sqrt{\frac{R \gamma_x^s G_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{I}_1}{\gamma_y^s}} \\
& \quad + ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 [C_w \sigma_L^2 + D(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2)], \tag{51}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we focus on the terms in (51) containing γ_y^s : $L_f \left[\frac{\gamma_y^s \mathcal{I}_2}{P} + \sqrt{\frac{R \gamma_x^s G_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{I}_1}{\gamma_y^s}} \right]$. To optimize these, we choose $\gamma_y^s = \left(\frac{P}{2\mathcal{I}_2} \right)^{2/3} (R \gamma_x^s G_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{I}_1)^{1/3}$. Substituting in (51), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 & \lesssim \frac{\bar{\Delta}_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s T} + \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f \mathcal{I}_1^2 + L_f \left(\frac{\mathcal{I}_2}{P} R \gamma_x^s G_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{I}_1 \right)^{1/3} \\
& \quad + ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 [C_w \sigma_L^2 + D(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2)], \tag{52}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we focus on the terms in (52) containing γ_x^s : $\frac{\bar{\Delta}_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s T} + L_f \left(\frac{\mathcal{I}_2}{P} R \gamma_x^s G_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{I}_1 \right)^{1/3}$. We ignore the higher order linear term. With $\gamma_x^s = \left(\frac{3\bar{\Delta}_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\tau_{\text{eff}} L_f T} \right)^{3/4} \left(\frac{\mathcal{I}_2}{P} R G_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{I}_1 \right)^{-1/4}$, and absorbing numerical constants inside $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$ we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \lesssim \frac{(\mathcal{I}_1 \mathcal{I}_2 R G_{\mathbf{x}})^{1/4}}{(\tau_{\text{eff}} P T)^{1/4}} + \frac{(\tau_{\text{eff}} P)^{1/4}}{T^{3/4}} (\mathcal{I}_1 \mathcal{I}_2 R G_{\mathbf{x}})^{-1/4} \mathcal{I}_1^2 \\
& \quad + ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 [C_w \sigma_L^2 + D(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2)], \\
& = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{(\mathcal{I}_1 \mathcal{I}_2)^{1/4}}{(\tau_{\text{eff}} P T)^{1/4}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{(\tau_{\text{eff}} P)^{1/4}}{T^{3/4}} \mathcal{I}_2^{3/4} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 [C_w \sigma_L^2 + D(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2)] \right), \\
& \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{(\bar{\tau}/\tau_{\text{eff}})^{1/4}}{(\bar{\tau} P T)^{1/4}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\left(\frac{n(n-P)}{n-1} \max_i w_i \right)^{1/4} \sigma_G}{(P T)^{1/4}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{(\tau_{\text{eff}} P)^{1/4}}{T^{3/4}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \mathcal{O} \left(([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 [C_w \sigma_L^2 + D(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2)] \right), \quad (53)$$

where in (53), we have shown dependence only on τ, n, P, T . Lastly, we specify the algorithm parameters in terms of $n, T, \tau_{\text{eff}}, \bar{\tau}$.

$$\gamma_x^s = \Theta \left(\frac{P^{1/4}}{(\tau_{\text{eff}} T)^{3/4}} \right), \quad \gamma_y^s = \Theta \left(\frac{P^{3/4}}{(\tau_{\text{eff}} T)^{1/4}} \right), \quad S = \Theta \left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\tau_{\text{eff}} P}} \right).$$

Finally, choosing the client learning rates $\eta_x^c = \eta_y^c = \frac{1}{L_f \bar{\tau} T^{3/8}}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 &\leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{(\bar{\tau}/\tau_{\text{eff}})^{1/4}}{(\bar{\tau} P T)^{1/4}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{(P T)^{1/4}} \left(\frac{n(n-P)}{(n-1)} \max_i w_i \right)^{1/4} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{(\tau_{\text{eff}} P)^{1/4}}{T^{3/4}} \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{C_w \sigma_L^2 + D(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2)}{\bar{\tau}^2 T^{3/4}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Convergence in terms of F

Proof of Corollary 2.1. Following Lin et al. (2020a), we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}) &\triangleq \min_{\mathbf{x}'} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}') + L_f \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right\}; & \tilde{\mathbf{x}} &\triangleq \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}'} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}') + L_f \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right\}, \\ \Phi_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}) &\triangleq \min_{\mathbf{x}'} \left\{ \Phi(\mathbf{x}') + L_f \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right\}; & \bar{\mathbf{x}} &\triangleq \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}'} \left\{ \Phi(\mathbf{x}') + L_f \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Also, it follows from Lemma 2.2 in Davis & Drusvyatskiy (2019) that $\nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}) = 2L_f(\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ and $\nabla \Phi_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}) = 2L_f(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \nabla \Phi_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}) \right\|^2 &\leq 2 \left\| \nabla \Phi_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}) \right\|^2 + 2 \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}) \right\|^2 \\ &= 8L_f^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 + 2 \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}) \right\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{t \in [T]} \left\| \nabla \Phi_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left\| \nabla \Phi_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left[\left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + 4L_f^2 \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}$ follow the same definition as in (54), with \mathbf{x} replaced with $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$. □

Proof of Corollary 2.2. If clients are weighted equally ($w_i = p_i = 1/n$ for all i), with each carrying out τ steps of local SGDA+, then (7) reduces to

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \Phi_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{(\tau P T)^{1/4}} + \frac{(\tau P)^{1/4}}{T^{3/4}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\sigma_L^2 + \tau(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2)}{\tau T^{3/4}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \cdot \frac{1}{P T} \right)^{1/4} \right).$$

- For full client participation, this reduces to

$$\min_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \Phi_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{(\tau n T)^{1/4}} + \frac{(\tau n)^{1/4}}{T^{3/4}} \right).$$

To reach an ϵ -stationary point, assuming $n\tau \leq T$, the per-client gradient complexity is $T\tau = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{n\epsilon^8} \right)$. Since $\tau \leq T/n$, the minimum number of communication rounds required is $T = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^4} \right)$.

- For partial participation, $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \cdot \frac{1}{PT}\right)^{1/4}\right)$ is the dominant term, and we do not get any convergence benefit of multiple local updates. Consequently, per-gradient client complexity and number of communication rounds are both $T\tau = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{P\epsilon^8}\right)$, for $\tau = \mathcal{O}(1)$. However, if the data across clients comes from identical distributions ($\sigma_G = 0$), then we recover per-client gradient complexity of $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{P\epsilon^8}\right)$, and number of communication rounds $= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^4}\right)$.

□

Special Cases

- Centralized, deterministic case ($\sigma_L = \sigma_G = 0, \beta_G = 1, \tau_{\text{eff}} = n = 1$): in this case $A_w = B_w = 1, C_w = D = 0$. Also, $\mathcal{I}_1 = G_{\mathbf{x}}\sqrt{\beta_L^2 + 1}, \mathcal{I}_2 = 0$. The bound in (48) reduces to

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\bar{\Delta}_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\gamma_x^s T} + \gamma_x^s L_f G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left[(\beta_L^2 + 1) + (S-1)\sqrt{\beta_L^2 + 1} \right] + \frac{L_f R}{\gamma_y^s S} \right). \quad (56)$$

For $\beta_L = 0$, (56) yields the convergence result in Lin et al. (2020a).

- Single node, stochastic case ($\sigma_G = 0, \beta_G = 1, \tau_{\text{eff}} = n = 1$): in this case $A_w = B_w = 1, C_w = D = 0$. Also, $\mathcal{I}_1 = \sqrt{\sigma_L^2 + (\beta_L^2 + 1)G_{\mathbf{x}}^2}, \mathcal{I}_2 = \sigma_L^2$. The bound in (48) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 &\leq \Theta \left(\frac{\bar{\Delta}_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\gamma_x^s T} + \gamma_x^s L_f (\sigma_L^2 + (\beta_L^2 + 1)G_{\mathbf{x}}^2) + \gamma_y^s L_f \sigma_L^2 \right) \\ &+ \Theta \left(L_f \left[\gamma_x^s G_{\mathbf{x}} (S-1) \sqrt{\sigma_L^2 + (\beta_L^2 + 1)G_{\mathbf{x}}^2} + \frac{R}{\gamma_y^s S} \right] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Again, for $\beta_L = 0$, (57) yields the convergence result in Lin et al. (2020a).

- Multiple equally weighted ($w_i = 1/n, \forall i \in [n]$) clients, full client participation, stochastic case with synchronous client updates ($\tau_{\text{eff}} = 1$): in this case $A_w = 1, B_w = 1, C_w = D = 0, 0$. The bound in (48) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 &\leq \Theta \left(\frac{\bar{\Delta}_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\gamma_x^s T} + \gamma_x^s L_f \left(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \frac{\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2}{n} \right) \right) \\ &+ \Theta \left(\frac{\gamma_y^s L_f}{n} (\sigma_L^2 + \sigma_G^2 \beta_L^2) + \gamma_x^s L_f G_{\mathbf{x}} (S-1) \sqrt{G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \frac{\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2}{n}} + \frac{RL_f}{\gamma_y^s S} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Note that unlike existing analyses of synchronous update algorithms Woodworth et al. (2020); Yun et al. (2022); Sharma et al. (2022), the bound in (58) depends on the inter-client heterogeneity σ_G^2 . This is due to the more general noise assumption (Assumption 2). In the existing works, β_L^2 is assumed zero, in which case, the bound in (58) is also independent of σ_G^2 . See Appendix A.2 for a more detailed explanation.

- Multiple, equally weighted ($w_i = 1/n, \forall i \in [n]$) clients, full client participation, multiple, but equal number of client updates ($\tau_i = \tau_{\text{eff}} = \tau, \forall i \in [n]$). In this case $A_w = B_w = 1, C_w = \tau - 1, D = (\tau - 1)(\tau - 1 + \beta_L^2)$. The bound in (48) then reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 &\leq \Theta \left(\frac{\bar{\Delta}_{\tilde{\Phi}}}{\tau \gamma_x^s T} + \tau \gamma_x^s L_f \left(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \frac{\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2}{n} \right) + \frac{\gamma_y^s L_f (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 \sigma_G^2)}{n} \right) \\ &+ \Theta \left(L_f \left[\tau \gamma_x^s G_{\mathbf{x}} (S-1) \sqrt{G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \frac{\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2}{n}} + \frac{R}{\tau \gamma_y^s S} \right] + (\tau - 1) ([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 [\sigma_L^2 + (\tau - 1 + \beta_L^2)(G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2)] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

For $\beta_L = \beta_G = 0$, this setting reduces to the one considered in Sharma et al. (2022). However, as stated earlier, our bound on the local update error is tighter.

C.3 Proofs of the Intermediate Lemmas

Proof of Lemma C.1. Using the definition in (54) $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) + L_f \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2$. Also, note that

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) \leq \tilde{\Phi}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}) + L_f \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}\|^2. \quad (60)$$

Using the \mathbf{x} updates in (46),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}\|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} + \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 + \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + 2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \mathbb{E} \left\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\rangle \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 + 2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \mathbb{E} \left\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \nabla_x \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\rangle + \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{L_f}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 + \frac{2}{L_f} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \left(\nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) - \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 + \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

$$+ \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{L_f}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 + 2L_f \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 2 \left\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \nabla_x \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\rangle \right], \quad (62)$$

where (62) follows from L_f -smoothness (Assumption 1) and Jensen's inequality. From (19), (20), we can bound $\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t')}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t')} \right\|^2$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^{(t')}} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t')} \right\|^2 &\leq \frac{n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)]^2 \left[\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_x f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + \frac{n}{P} \frac{n-P}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x},i}^{(t)}\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2) + \frac{n(P-1)}{P(n-1)} G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \frac{n(n-P)}{P(n-1)} G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where the final inequality by using Assumption 7. Next, we bound the inner product term in (62). Using L_f -smoothness of F (Assumption 1):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \nabla_x \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\rangle &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{F}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) + \frac{L_f}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}) + L_f \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 \right] - \mathbb{E} \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) - \frac{L_f}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) + L_f \|\mathbf{x}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 \right] - \mathbb{E} \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) - \frac{L_f}{2} \mathbb{E} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|^2 \quad (\text{by definition of } \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) - \frac{L_f}{2} \left\| \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right]. \quad (64)$$

Substituting the bounds from (62) and (64) into (60), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}) \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}) + L_f \left\| \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \right] \\ &+ \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f \frac{n}{P} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2) + G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} + \frac{n-P}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \right) \right] \\ &+ 2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s L_f^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right] + \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_x^s]^2 L_f \frac{n}{P} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2) + G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} + \frac{n-P}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \right) \right] \\ &+ 2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \left\{ L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + L_f \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \right\} - \frac{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s}{8} \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\nabla \tilde{\Phi}_{1/2L_f}(\mathbf{x}) = 2L_f(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})$ from (54). \square

Proof of Lemma C.2. We use the client update equations for individual iterates in (45). To bound $\Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i)$, first we bound the \mathbf{x} -error $\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2$. Starting from (25), using Assumption 7, for $1 \leq k \leq \tau_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{x}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2 &\leq \frac{[\eta_x^c]^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \left[\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} [a_i^{(j)}(k)]^2 (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2) + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) \right) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_i^{(j)}(k) G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \right] \\ &\leq [\eta_x^c]^2 \left[\sigma_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \right) \right], \quad (65) \end{aligned}$$

where we use (26). Next, we bound $\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right\|^2$, using the bound from (30), to get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \right\|^2 &\leq [\eta_y^c]^2 \sigma_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2[\eta_y^c]^2 L_f^2 (\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1 + \beta_L^2 \alpha) \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \\ &+ 2[\eta_y^c]^2 \left(\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \right) \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2. \quad (66) \end{aligned}$$

Compared to (30), the difference is the presence of $\Delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i)$ in (66), rather than $\Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i)$. Taking a weighted sum over agents in (66), we get

$$L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \leq 2[\eta_y^c]^2 L_f^2 \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \left(\beta_G^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 + \sigma_G^2 \right) \right]. \quad (67)$$

where, we choose η_y^c such that $A_m \triangleq 2L_f^2 [\eta_y^c]^2 \max_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1 (\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1 + \beta_L^2 \alpha) \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and define $M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \triangleq \max_i \left(\|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_1^2 + \beta_L^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 \right)$. Next, it follows from L_f -smoothness (Assumption 1) and Lemma A.7 that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \leq 2L_f \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right].$$

Subsequently, combining (65) and (67), we get

$$L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) \leq 2([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2) L_f^2 \sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 4L_f^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} ([\eta_x^c]^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2 \sigma_G^2) + 8[\eta_y^c]^2 L_f^3 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \beta_G^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right].$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma C.3. We define $\mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) \right\|^2 \stackrel{(46)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}^{(t)} + \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)} - \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) \right\|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}^{(t)} - \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) \right\|^2 + \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)} \right\|^2 + 2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathbf{y}^{(t)} - \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}), \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

$\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)} \right\|^2$ is bounded in (37). We only need to further bound $\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2$ which appears in (37).

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} \right\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)] \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) + \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right) \right\|^2 \\ & \leq 2L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)] \Delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 2 \left\| \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right\|^2 \quad (\text{Jensen's inequality}) \\ & \leq 2L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)] \Delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) + 4L_f \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Next, we bound the third term in (68).

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathbf{y}^{(t)} - \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}), \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{y},i}^{(t)} \right\rangle = \mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathbf{y}^{(t)} - \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}), \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)] \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)] \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathbf{y}^{(t)} - \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}, \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) \right\rangle + \left\langle \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} - \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}), \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) \right\rangle \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)] \mathbb{E} \left[f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) - f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) + \frac{L_f}{2} \left\| \mathbf{y}^{(t)} - \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)} \right\|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_i^{(t,k)}) - f_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)})) \right] \quad (\text{Concavity in } \mathbf{y}) \\ &= \frac{L_f}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)] \Delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) - \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Substituting (37), (69), (70) in (68), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) \right\|^2 \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}^{(t)} - \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) \right\|^2 + \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 \left[\frac{\sigma_L^2 n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \frac{2\sigma_G^2 n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s \left(1 - 2\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s L_f \frac{n}{P} \left[\frac{P-1}{n-1} + \beta_G^2 \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\
& + \tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s L_f \left[1 + 2\tau_{\text{eff}}\gamma_y^s L_f \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} + \frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right) \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} [a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)] \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i),
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

since $\Delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)} \leq \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}$. Using the bound on $\Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}$ from Lemma C.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i) \Delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}^{(t,k)}(i) & \leq 2 \left([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2 \right) \sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 4M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \left([\eta_x^c]^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2 \sigma_G^2 \right) \\
& + 8[\eta_y^c]^2 L_f M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} \beta_G^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

We substitute (72) in (71), and simplify the terms using the choice of γ_y^s, η_y^c to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) \right\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}^{(t)} - \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) \right\|^2 + \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 [\gamma_y^s]^2 \left[\frac{\sigma_L^2 n}{P} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + \frac{2\sigma_G^2 n}{P} \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] \\
& \quad - \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] + 4\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f \left([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2 \right) \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} (G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

using γ_y^s, η_y^c that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f \frac{n}{P} \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} + \frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_{i,k} \frac{w_i a_i^{(k)}(\tau_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1} \right) & \leq 1, \\
2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s L_f \frac{n}{P} \left[\frac{P-1}{n-1} + \beta_G^2 \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] & \leq \frac{1}{4}, \\
2L_f \frac{n}{P} [8[\eta_y^c]^2 M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} L_f \beta_G^2] & \leq \frac{1}{4}
\end{aligned}$$

Then the coefficient of $\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right]$ can be bounded by $-\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s$. Consequently, by rearranging the terms and summing over t , we get the result.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{S} \sum_{t=sS}^{(s+1)S-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\
& \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}^{sS} - \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) \right\|^2}{\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s S} + \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_y^s \frac{n}{P} \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} + 2\sigma_G^2 \left(\frac{n-P}{n-1} \max_i w_i + \beta_L^2 \max_i \frac{w_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} \right) \right] \\
& \quad + 4L_f \left([\eta_x^c]^2 + [\eta_y^c]^2 \right) \left[\sigma_L^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\mathbf{a}_{i,-1}\|_2^2 + 2M_{\mathbf{a}_{-1}} (G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \sigma_G^2) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma C.4. Let $t = sS, sS+1, \dots, (s+1)S-1$, where k is a positive integer. Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}$ is the latest snapshot iterate for the \mathbf{y} -update in Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)})) + \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)})) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) + \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)})) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] + G_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(t)} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)} \right\| \\
&\leq 2G_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(t)} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)} \right\| + \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right]. \tag{73}
\end{aligned}$$

where, $\mathbf{y}^*(\cdot) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} \tilde{F}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ and (73) follows from $G_{\mathbf{x}}$ -Lipschitz continuity of $F(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ (Assumption 7). Next, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\| &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \right\|^2} && \text{(Jensen's inequality)} \\
&\stackrel{(46)}{=} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left\| \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \sum_{t'=sS}^{t-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}(t')} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}, i}^{(t')} \right\|^2} \\
&\leq \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s \sqrt{(S-1) \sum_{t'=sS}^{t-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}(t')} \tilde{w}_i \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}, i}^{(t')} \right\|^2} \\
&\leq \tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s (S-1) \sqrt{\frac{n}{P} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2)} + G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} + \frac{n-P}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \right)}. && \text{(from (63))}
\end{aligned}$$

Using this bound in (73), and summing over t , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{S} \sum_{t=sS}^{(s+1)S-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] &\leq \frac{1}{S} \sum_{t=sS}^{(s+1)S-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}) - \tilde{F}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \right] \\
&\quad + 2\tau_{\text{eff}} \gamma_x^s G_{\mathbf{x}} (S-1) \sqrt{\frac{n}{P} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i^2 \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_1^2} (\sigma_L^2 + \beta_L^2 G_{\mathbf{x}}^2)} + G_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \left(\frac{P-1}{n-1} + \frac{n-P}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, summing over $s = 0$ to $T/S - 1$ we get the result. \square

C.4 Extending the result for Nonconvex One-Point-Concave (NC-1PC) Functions (Theorem 3)

Carefully revisiting the proof of Theorem 2, we notice that Lemma C.1 and Lemma C.2 do not rely on the concavity assumption. Lemma C.3 does use concavity of local functions $\{f_i\}$. However, it is only needed to derive (70). Further, this only requires concavity of local functions at a global point $\mathbf{y}^*(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)})$. Therefore, as mentioned earlier in Remark 8, it holds even for NC-1PC functions. This is an independent result in itself, since we have extended the existing convergence result of local stochastic gradient method for convex minimization (concave maximization) problems, to a much more general one-point-convex minimization (or one-point-convex maximization) problem. Therefore, we restate it here for the more general case.

Lemma C.5 (Local SG updates for One-Point-Concave Maximization). *Suppose the local loss functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 7. Suppose for all \mathbf{x} , all the f_i 's satisfy Assumption 8 at a common global minimizer $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$, and that $\|\mathbf{y}^{(t)}\|^2 \leq R$ for all t . If we run Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+ with same conditions on the client and server step-sizes η_y^c, γ_y^s respectively, as in Lemma C.3, then the iterates generated by Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+ also satisfy the bound in Lemma C.3.*

Next, Lemma C.4 also holds irrespective of concavity. Therefore, the resulting convergence result in Theorem 2 for nonconvex-concave minimax problems holds for a much larger class of functions. We restate the modified theorem statement briefly.

Theorem. Suppose the local loss functions $\{f_i\}$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 7. Suppose for all \mathbf{x} , all the f_i 's satisfy Assumption 8 at a common global minimizer $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$, and that $\|\mathbf{y}^{(t)}\|^2 \leq R$ for all t . If we run Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+ with the same conditions on the client and server step-sizes η_y^c, γ_y^s respectively, as in Theorem 4, then the iterates generated by Algorithm 1-Fed-Norm-SGDA+ also satisfy the bound in Theorem 4.

Remark 9. Again, choosing client weights $\{w_i\}$ the same as in the original global objective $\{p_i\}$, we get convergence in terms of the original objective F .

D Additional Experiments

For communicating parameters and related information amongst the clients, ethernet connections were used. Our algorithm was implemented using parallel training tools in PyTorch 1.0.0 and Python 3.6.3.

For both robust NN Training and fair classification experiments, we use batch-size of 32 in all the algorithms. Momentum parameter 0.9 is used only in Momentum Local SGDA(+).

Robust NN Training Here we further explore performance of Fed-Norm-SGDA+ on the robust NN training problem. We use VGG-11 model to classify CIFAR10 dataset. In Figure 6, we demonstrate the effect of increasing data heterogeneity across clients, while in Figure 7 we show the advantage of using multiple clients for the federated minimax problem. With k -fold increase in n , we observe an almost k -fold drop in the number of communication rounds needed to reach a target test accuracy (70% here.).




Figure 6: Effect of inter-client data heterogeneity (quantified by α) on the performance of Fed-Norm-SGDA+.




Figure 7: Effect of increasing client-set on the performance of Fed-Norm-SGDA+ in a robust NN training task.




Figure 8: Effect of partial client participation on the performance of Fed-Norm-SGDA in a fair image classification task.

Fair Classification We also demonstrate the impact of partial client participation in the fair classification problem. Figure 8 complements Figure 8 in the main paper, evaluating fairness of a VGG11 model on CIFAR10 dataset. We have plotted the test accuracy of the model over the worst distribution. With an increasing number of participating clients, the performance consistently improves.