# A Note for L-BFGS Method on Large-Scale Optimization

Jiazheng Liu

April 11, 2018

This is a summary about L-BFGS method on Large-Scale Optimization.Main part of this note is related to arXiv:1401.7020v2, by R.H. Byrd, S.L.Hansen, Jorge Nocedal, Y. Singer.

# 1 Background

In many applications of machine learning and other relative fields, one constructs very large models from massive amounts of training data. Learning such models imposes high computational and memory demands on the optimization algorithms employed to learn the models. At the same time, it still needs the accuracy and speed. How to make a trade off between speed and accuracy is an important topic in large-scale optimization.

Taking machine learning as example, the most famous and most successful optimal algorithm is (first-order) gradient method.

### 1.1 Why first order

Since the size of data is huge, if a program intends to apply a second-order method, the costing time will be extremely long, which is unacceptable in practice.

## 1.2 Why stochastic gradient descent (SGD)

The input data indeed has uncertainty, it is a natural way to regard the objective problem as:

$$min_{w \in R^n} F(w) = \mathbf{E}[f(w; \zeta)] \tag{1}$$

where  $\zeta$  is a parameter list, and a random vector at the same time. This expression is very common in machine learning application. f typically takes the form

$$f(w;\zeta) = f(w;x_i,z_i) = l(h(w;x_i),z_i)$$
(2)

where l is lost function into  $R_+$ , and and h is a prediction model parametrized by w. Thus the gradient has the form:

$$F(w) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} f(w; x_i, z_i)$$
 (3)

In learning applications with very large amounts of training data, it is common to use a mini-batch stochastic gradient based on b := ||S|| << N input-output instances.

$$\bar{\nabla}F(w) = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{i \in S} \nabla f(w; x_i, z_i) \tag{4}$$

And this kind of implement is called batch gradient method.

# 1.3 why L-BFGS

L-BFGS method can use second-order information on local area, which means it has much more possibility to have a faster convergence rate. At same time, it is designed for a limited memory situation, and that makes it suitable for modifying into large-scale computation situation.

# 2 Idea and Algorithm

In Byrd,s paper, the main idea is very simple. If one wants to use Hessian matrix but not hope to make program too slow, what he/she can do? -Just slow down the updating frequency. They choose to decouple the stochastic gradient and curvature estimate calculations.

```
Algorithm 1 Stochastic Quasi-Newton Method (SQN)
Input: initial parameters w^1, positive integers M, L, and step-length sequence \alpha^k > 0
                                    \triangleright Records number of correction pairs currently computed
 1: Set t = -1
 2: \bar{w}_t = 0
 3: for k = 1, ..., do
         Choose a sample \mathcal{S} \subset \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}
          Calculate stochastic gradient \widehat{\nabla} F(w^k) as defined in (1.4)
 5:
 6:
          \bar{w}_t = \bar{w}_t + w^k
         if k \leq 2L then w^{k+1} = w^k - \alpha^k \widehat{\nabla} F(w^k)
 7:
 8:

⊳ Stochastic gradient iteration

 9:
              w^{k+1} = w^k - \alpha^k H_t \widehat{\nabla} F(w^k), where H_t is defined by Algorithm 2
10:
          end if
11:
         if mod(k, L) = 0 then
                                                    \triangleright Compute correction pairs every L iterations
12:
13:
              t = t + 1
              \bar{w}_t = \bar{w}_t/L
14.
              if t > 0 then
15:
                   Choose a sample S_H \subset \{1, \dots, N\} to define \widehat{\nabla}^2 F(\bar{w}_t) by (2.3)
16:
                   Compute s_t = (\bar{w}_t - \bar{w}_{t-1}), \ y_t = \widehat{\nabla}^2 F(\bar{w}_t)(\bar{w}_t - \bar{w}_{t-1}) \triangleright \text{correction pairs}
17:
              end if
18:
              \bar{w}_t = 0
19:
          end if
20:
21: end for
```

Figure 1

In the algorithm, (1.4) is

$$\bar{\nabla}F(w) = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{i \in S} \nabla f(w; x_i, z_i)$$

(2.3) is

$$\bar{\nabla}^2 F(w) := \frac{1}{b_H} \sum_{i \in S_H} \nabla^2 f(w; x_i, z_i)$$

S and  $S_H$  are samples, b and  $b_H$  are their sizes.

```
Algorithm 2 Hessian Updating
```

Input: Updating counter t, memory parameter M, and correction pairs  $(s_j, y_j)$ ,  $j = t - \tilde{m} + 1, \dots t$ , where  $\tilde{m} = \min\{t, M\}$ .

Output: new matrix  $H_t$ 

1: Set  $H = (s_t^T y_t)/(y_t^T y_t)I$ , where  $s_t$  and  $y_t$  are computed in Step 17 of Algorithm 1.

2: for  $j = t - \tilde{m} + 1, ..., t$  do

$$\begin{split} \rho_j &= 1/y_j^T s_j. \\ \text{Apply BFGS formula:} \end{split}$$

$$H \leftarrow (I - \rho_j s_j y_j^T) H (I - \rho_j y_j s_j^T) + \rho_j s_j s_j^T$$
(2.4)

5: end for

6: return  $H_t \leftarrow H$ 

Figure 2

#### 3 **Computation Cost**

This part what I get is slightly different from the original paper. Compare SGD and the new stochastic quasi-Newton method.

SGD: 
$$w^{k+1} = w^k - \frac{\beta}{k} \bar{\nabla} F(w^k)$$
 (5)

SQN: 
$$w^{k+1} = w^k - \frac{\beta}{k} H_t \cdot \bar{\nabla} F(w^k)$$
 (6)

In SGD, the mainly computationally hard part is to generate the each gradient, we have n dimension of variable, then we do a summation (for b different gradients), the main cost is bn.

In SQN, the main part is divided into three part:

- summation of gradient bn.
- computation of  $y_t = \bar{\nabla}^2 F(\bar{w_t})(\bar{w_t} w_{t-1}^-)$ . Since  $\bar{\nabla}^2 F(w) := \frac{1}{b_H} \sum_{i \in S_H} \nabla^2 f(w; x_i, z_i)$ , we get it approximately will cost  $b_H \cdot n^2$
- generating  $H_t$ , we pick m = M as iteration time, M denotes the memory limit. Thanks to the symmetry of matrix updating, we can find an algorithm computing  $H \leftarrow (I - \rho_j s_j y_j^T) H (I - \rho_j y_j s_j^T) + \rho_j s_j s_j^T$  in  $n^2$ . This part we have  $M \cdot n^2$ .

Thanks to the low frequency of updating Hessian matrix, the total cost will be:

$$bn + \frac{b_H n^2 + Mn^2}{L} \tag{7}$$

# 4 Convergence Analysis

We assume that the objective function F is strongly convex and twice continuously differentiable. The first assumption may appear to be unduly strong because in certain settings (such as logistic regression) the component functions  $f(w;x_i;z_i)$  are convex, but not strongly convex. However, since the lack of strong convexity can lead to very slow convergence, it is common in practice to either add an  $l_2$  regularization term, or choose the initial point (or employ some other mechanism) to ensure that the iterates remain in a region where the F is strongly convex. If regularization is used, the objective function takes the form:

$$\frac{1}{2}||w||^2 + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}f(w;x_i,z_i)$$
 (8)

and sample Hessian is:

$$\sigma I + \frac{1}{b_H} \sum_{i \in S_H} \nabla^2 f(w; x_i, z_i)$$
(9)

Under some specific condition:

## **Assumptions 1**

- The objective function F is twice continuously differentiable.
- There exist positive constants  $\lambda$  and  $\Lambda$  such that  $\lambda I \prec \bar{\nabla}^2 F(w) \prec \Lambda I$ , for all  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and for all  $S_H \subset 1,...,N$

**Theorem .1.** If Assumptions 1 hold, there exist constants  $0 < \mu_1 \le \mu_2$  such that the Hessian approximations  $\{H_t\}$  generated by Algorithm 1 satisfy:

$$\mu_1 I \prec H_t \prec \mu_2 I \tag{10}$$

Furthermore, we have assumption 2:

## **Assumptions 2**

- The objective function F is twice continuously differentiable.
- There exist positive constants  $\lambda$  and  $\Lambda$  such that  $\lambda I \prec \bar{\nabla}^2 F(w) \prec \Lambda I$ , for all  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and for all  $S_H \subset 1,...,N$
- There is a constant  $\gamma$  such that, for all  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{E}_{\zeta}[||\nabla f(w^k;\zeta)||]^2 \leq \gamma^2$

**Theorem .2.** Suppose that Assumptions 2 hold. Let wk be the iterates generated by the Newton-like method, where for k = 1, 2, ...,

$$\mu_1 I \prec H_k \prec \mu_2 I \tag{11}$$

and,

$$\alpha^k = \beta/k, \text{ with, } \beta > 1/(2\mu_1\lambda). \tag{12}$$

Then for all k > 1,

$$\mathbf{E}[F(w^k) - F(w^*)] \le Q(\beta)/k \tag{13}$$

where.

$$Q(\beta) = \max\{\frac{\Lambda \mu_2^2 \beta^2 \gamma^2}{2(2\mu_1 \lambda \beta - 1)}, F(w^1) - F(w^*)\}$$
 (14)

## 5 Remark

This paper has a very complete work, containing a simple but effective method, a cost approximation and convergence rate analysis.

About the improvement, my naive idea is adjust the "window size" of updating Hessian matrix, just like Armijo line search, making the parameter *L* adjustable.

We can use a line model to measure a "successful" decent and a "not so good" try. In a good case, we do not need to update the Hessian matrix so frequently, however in a bad case, we need to adjust matrix as soon as possible to make objective function escape from saddle point.

Algorithm 1: Adjustable Length Stochastic Quasi-Newton Method

```
Input: initial parameters w_1, positive integers M,L, step-length sequence
                 \alpha^k > 0, reduction rate 0 < \eta < 1, and size rate \tau > 1
 1 Set t = -1;
 2 \bar{w_t} = 0;
 j = 0;
 4 for k = 1,..., do do
         Choose a sample S \subset \{1,..,N\};
         Calculate stochastic gradient \bar{\nabla}F(w^k) as defined in (1.4);
 6
         \bar{w_t} = \bar{w_t} + w^k \; ;
 7
         if k < 2L then
 8
              w^{k+1} = w^k - \alpha^k \bar{\nabla} F(w^k):
 9
10
              w^{k+1} = w^k - \alpha^k H_t \bar{\nabla} F(w^k);
11
         end
12
         j=j+1;
13
         if j = L then
14
15
              t = t + 1;
              \bar{w_t} = \bar{w_t}/L;
16
              if t > 0 then
17
                    Choose a sample S_H \subset \{1,...,N\} to define \bar{\nabla}^2 F(\bar{w_t});
18
                    Compute s_t = (\bar{w_t} - \bar{w_{t-1}}), y_t = \bar{\nabla}^2 F(\bar{w_t})(\bar{w_t} - \bar{w_{t-1}});
19
              end
20
              j = 0;
21
22
              Define line model G_t(w) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in S} [f(\bar{w}_t; x_i, z_i) + \nabla f(\bar{w}_t; x_i, z_i)(w - \bar{w}_t)];
              if F(\bar{w_{t-1}}) - F(\bar{w_t}) \ge \eta(G_{t-1}(\bar{w_{t-1}})G_t(\bar{w_t})) then L = \tau L;
23
              else L = L / \tau;
24
         end
25
26 end
```

The convergence rate and computation cost are basically as same. However owing to the flexible window size, it becomes a bit hard to analysis.