## Unified analysis of gradient/subgradient descent APPM 5630 Spring 2021 Advanced Convex Optimization

**Instructor**: Prof. Becker **Revision date**: 3/30/22

We'll solve  $\min_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x})$  via the following generic algorithm, with  $R = \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}^*\|$ ,

Require:  $x_1$ 

1: **for** k = 1, 2, ..., K **do** 

 $2: \quad \mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k - t\mathbf{v}_k$ 

3: end for

where  $\mathbf{v}$  is "gradient-like" (e.g., a gradient, subgradient, or a gradient in expectation, like  $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{v}_k = \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)$ ).

**Lemma 1** (Lemma 14.1 in Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David). Let  $\{\mathbf{v}_k\}_{k=1}^K$  be arbitrary. No assumptions on f (need not be convex or smooth). The generic algorithm sequence satisfies

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} \langle \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{v}_k \rangle \le \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2}{2t} + \frac{t}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\mathbf{v}_k\|^2$$

$$\tag{1}$$

*Proof.* (Sketch: just the good parts)

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} \langle \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}^{\star}, \mathbf{v}_k \rangle = \frac{1}{2t} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left( -\|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}^{\star}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}^{\star}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{v}_k\|^2 \right) \quad \text{complete-the-square and algebra}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2t} \left( \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}^{\star}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}_{K+1} - \mathbf{x}^{\star}\|^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2t} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\mathbf{v}_k\|^2 \quad \text{via telescoping sum}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2t} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}^{\star}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2t} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\mathbf{v}_k\|^2.$$

Corollary 2. If  $\|\mathbf{v}_k\| \leq \rho$  (e.g., if f is  $\rho$ -Lipschitz) and  $t = \frac{R}{\rho\sqrt{K}}$  then

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \langle \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{v}_k \rangle \le \rho \frac{R}{\sqrt{K}}$$

Now we'll see how to use these results

## $\mathbf{1} \ f$ is convex but not smooth

Assume f is  $\rho$ -Lipschitz so the corollary applies. If f is convex, then we have a well-defined subdifferential, so we'll choose  $\mathbf{v}_k \in \partial f(\mathbf{x}_k)$  to give us **subgradient descent**. By convexity and definition of subgradients,

$$f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^* \le \langle \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{v}_k \rangle \tag{2}$$

so combining this with Corollary 2 immediately yields

Corollary 3 (sub-gradient descent). If f is convex and  $\rho$ -Lipschitz, then subgradient descent yields

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} (f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^*) \le \rho \frac{R}{\sqrt{K}}$$

hence

$$f(\mathbf{x}_{best}) - f^* \le \rho \frac{R}{\sqrt{K}} \tag{3}$$

and

$$f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - f^* \le \rho \frac{R}{\sqrt{K}} \tag{4}$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x} \in \{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_K\}} f(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{x}_k$ . If possible, we should use  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}$ , but in some situations this is not easy. Subgradient descent is not a descent method, so it's not necessarily true that  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}} = \mathbf{x}_K$ . Couldn't we just evaluate  $f(\mathbf{x}_k)$  and record the best iterate seen so far? Often we can do this, but sometimes f is very expensive to evaluate (as will especially be the case when we do stochastic gradients which sample, and the true loss function f is a population expectation that we can never calculate). In these case, we can do iterate averaging to get  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}$ , and this result follows because  $f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K f(\mathbf{x}_k)$  via Jensen's inequality.

**Commentary** Unlike gradient descent in the smooth case, here we have slower convergence  $1/\sqrt{K}$  vs 1/K in the smooth case (or  $1/K^2$  for Nesterov acceleration). Furthermore, we need to know the maximum number of iterations K in advance in order to set the stepsize. In practice, like stochastic gradient methods, one might use a constant stepsize for a while, then reduce it: a stepsize "schedule."

## **2** f is smooth ( $\nabla f$ is *L*-Lipschitz continuous)

We use the descent Lemma, which applies whenever  $\nabla f$  is L-Lipschitz continuous, regardless of convexity:

$$f(\mathbf{y}) \le f(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} ||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}||_2^2$$

so when applied to  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}_k - t\mathbf{v}_k$  with  $\mathbf{v}_k = \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)$  and  $t = L^{-1}$  (this is **gradient descent**) which after a bit of algebra gives

$$f(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) \le f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \frac{1}{2L} \| \underbrace{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)}_{\mathbf{y}_k} \|^2$$
 (5)

If we don't assume f is convex, we can't expect to converge to the global minimizer, so there isn't a result about  $f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^* \to 0$ . Instead, we show convergence to a stationary point, meaning  $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \to 0$ .

 $\textbf{Corollary 4} \ (\text{gradient descent, non-convex}). \ \textit{If} \ \nabla f \ \textit{L-Lipschitz, then gradient descent with} \ t = L^{-1} \ \textit{yields}$ 

$$\min_{k=1,\dots,K} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \le \frac{2L}{K} (f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f^*)$$

*Proof.* Sum Eq. (5) from k = 1, ..., K after re-arranging to get

$$\frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \le \sum_{k=1}^{K} f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) = f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_{K+1}) \le f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f^*$$

since we had a telescoping series, and use  $\min_{k=1,...,K} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \le \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2$  since the min is less than the average.

In the convex case, we expect to converge to the global minimizer:

Corollary 5 (gradient descent, convex). If  $\nabla f$  L-Lipschitz, and f is convex, then gradient descent with  $t = L^{-1}$  yields

$$f(\mathbf{x}_K) - f^* \le \frac{L}{2K} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2.$$

*Proof.* Using the main Lemma (Eq. 1) and replacing  $\langle \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{v}_k \rangle$  with the bound in Eq. (2) (since gradients are subgradients) gives

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^* \le \frac{1}{2t} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \frac{t}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\underbrace{\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)}_{\mathbf{y}_k}\|^2$$
 (6)

and the descent lemma Eq. (5) gives  $f(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \le f(\mathbf{x}_k)$ , so combining with the above equation gives

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} \left( f(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 - f^* \right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{K} f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^* \quad \text{via descent lemma}$$

$$\leq \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \quad \text{via Eq. (6)}$$

where we used t = 1/L. Now canceling the  $\frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2$  from both sides gives

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^* \le \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2$$

hence

$$f(\mathbf{x}_K) = f(\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}) \le \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^* \le \frac{L}{2K} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_K = \mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}$  follows because the descent lemma implies that this is a descent method.

Our last case to consider is if we're strongly convex, in which case we expect faster convergence, and  $\mathbf{x}^*$  is unique, and we expect a bound on  $\|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}^*\|$ . Note that if f is  $\mu$  strongly convex, then f satisfies the  $\mu$  Polyak-Lojasiewicz (PL) inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \ge \mu(f(\mathbf{x}) - f^*) \tag{7}$$

(see Nesterov's 2018 book, Thm 2.1.5 and Eq 2.1.10 for a proof). Our result is

Corollary 6 (gradient descent, strongly convex). If  $\nabla f$  L-Lipschitz, and f is  $\mu$  strongly convex, then gradient descent with  $t = L^{-1}$  yields

$$f(\mathbf{x}_{K+1}) - f^* \leq \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^{K-1}}_{c} \left(f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f^*\right).$$

This is linear convergence, which is asymptotically better than sublinear convergence. We think of  $\kappa = \frac{L}{\mu}$  as the condition number, so  $c = 1 - \kappa^{-1}$ . We won't show it here, but Nesterov acceleration can improve c to  $c \approx 1 - \kappa^{-1/2}$  when  $\kappa \gg 1$ .

Proof.

$$f(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}_k) \le \frac{-1}{2L} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \le \frac{-\mu}{L} \left( f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^* \right)$$

using the descent lemma for the first inequality and the PL inequality for the second inequality. Re-arranging and recursing gives

$$f(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) - f^* \le \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right) (f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^*) \le \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{L}\right)^{t-1} (f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f^*).$$