

# On the Condition Number Dependency in Bilevel Optimization

Lesi Chen

Jingzhao Zhang

IIIS, Tsinghua University

chenlc23@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn, jingzhaoz@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

December 1, 2025

## Abstract

Bilevel optimization minimizes an objective function, defined by an upper-level problem whose feasible region is the solution of a lower-level problem. We study the oracle complexity of finding an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point with first-order methods when the upper-level problem is nonconvex and the lower-level problem is strongly convex. Recent works (Ji et al., ICML 2021; Arbel and Mairal, ICLR 2022; Chen et al., JMLR 2025) achieve a  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^4\epsilon^{-2})$  upper bound that is near-optimal in  $\epsilon$ . However, the optimal dependency on the condition number  $\kappa$  is unknown. In this work, we establish a new  $\Omega(\kappa^2\epsilon^{-2})$  lower bound and  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa^{7/2}\epsilon^{-2})$  upper bound for this problem, establishing the first provable gap between bilevel problems and minimax problems in this setup. Our lower bounds can be extended to various settings, including high-order smooth functions, stochastic oracles, and convex hyper-objectives: (1) For second-order and arbitrarily smooth problems, we show  $\Omega(\kappa_y^{13/4}\epsilon^{-12/7})$  and  $\Omega(\kappa^{17/10}\epsilon^{-8/5})$  lower bounds, respectively. (2) For convex-strongly-convex problems, we improve the previously best lower bound (Ji and Liang, JMLR 2022) from  $\Omega(\kappa/\sqrt{\epsilon})$  to  $\Omega(\kappa^{5/4}/\sqrt{\epsilon})$ . (3) For smooth stochastic problems, we show an  $\Omega(\kappa^4\epsilon^{-4})$  lower bound.

## 1 Introduction

We study the first-order oracle complexity for solving the bilevel optimization

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} F(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})), \quad \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}). \quad (1)$$

The goal is to minimize the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x})$ , which is implicitly defined by two explicit objectives  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  and  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  and the argmin operator in  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  with respect to  $\mathbf{y}$ . This formulation originates from the two-player general-sum Stackelberg game [57], and reflects the sequential nature of the decision process of two players  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ . Bilevel optimization of this form got extensive attention in the machine learning community due to its wide applications, such as meta-learning [54], hyper-parameter tuning [8, 19, 46], generative adversarial networks [22], and reinforcement learning [25, 33, 64].

To ensure that Problem (1) is well-defined, we follow [21, 25, 28] to study the standard nonconvex-strongly-convex (NC-SC) setting, where the lower-level function  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is strongly convex in  $\mathbf{y}$  while the upper-level function  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  can be nonconvex. In NC-SC bilevel problems, a first-order method applied to the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x})$  acts as a second-order method on  $g$  because

$$\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) [\nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))]^{-1} \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})). \quad (2)$$

In large-scale problems, directly inverting the Hessian matrix  $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}}^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is very expensive. There are mainly two lines of work to address this issue. The first line studies algorithms based on Hessian-vector product (HVP) oracles. Among them, the best-known theoretical guarantees [4, 28] show that they can find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of  $F(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^4\epsilon^{-2})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^9\epsilon^{-4})$  first-order oracle complexity for smooth deterministic and stochastic problems, respectively, where  $\bar{\kappa}_y$  is the global condition number for the problem (see Definition 2.2). In addition, Yang et al. [59] showed an improved upper bound of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{13/4}\epsilon^{-7/4})$  for second-order smooth deterministic problems.

Table 1: We present the oracle complexities of different **deterministic** methods for finding an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point for **smooth** NC-SC bilevel problems.

Oracle	Method	Complexity
HVP	BA [21]	$\mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^5 \epsilon^{-5/2})$
	AID/ITD [28]	$\mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^4 \epsilon^{-2})$
	AmIGO [4]	$\mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^4 \epsilon^{-2})$
	Lower Bound (Theorem 3.1)	$\Omega(\kappa_y^2 \epsilon^{-2})$
	F <sup>2</sup> SA [34]	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^7 \epsilon^{-3})$
Gradient	F <sup>2</sup> BA [14]	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^4 \epsilon^{-2})$
	F <sup>2</sup> BA <sup>+</sup> (Theorem 4.1)	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{7/2} \epsilon^{-2})$
	Lower Bound <sub><math>f=-g</math></sub> [37]	$\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y} \epsilon^{-2})$
	Lower Bound (Theorem 3.1)	$\Omega(\kappa_y^2 \epsilon^{-2})$

Since HVP oracles are more expensive than gradient oracles, another line of work [34, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 53, 55] directly uses gradients to optimize  $F(x)$  by solving the penalty function:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + \lambda(g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))), \quad (3)$$

where  $\lambda = \Omega(\epsilon^{-1})$  is a large penalty coefficient. Among them, Kwon et al. [34] developed the first fully first-order method that can find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of  $F(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\text{poly}(\bar{\kappa}_y)\epsilon^{-3})$  first-order oracles for smooth deterministic problems. In a follow-up work, Chen et al. [14] improved the complexity to  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^4 \epsilon^{-2})$ , which achieves the near-optimal dependency on  $\epsilon$ . This result was also extended to  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{15/4} \epsilon^{-7/4})$  for second-order smooth deterministic problems [14], and to  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{11} \epsilon^{-6})$  for smooth stochastic problems [14, 35].

Although both HVP-based and gradient-based methods can achieve (near)-optimal  $\epsilon^{-2}$  rates for NC-SC bilevel problems, their upper bounds have high  $\bar{\kappa}_y$  dependencies compared with NC-SC minimax problems, which are special bilevel problems with  $f = -g$ . For instance, Lin et al. [40] proposed an algorithm with a  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sqrt{\kappa_y} \epsilon^{-2})$  complexity for smooth NC-SC deterministic minimax problems, where  $\kappa_y \leq \bar{\kappa}_y$  is the condition number of the lower-level problem (see Definition 2.2). Under the same setting, Li et al. [37], Zhang et al. [66] proved a nearly matching lower bound of  $\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y} \epsilon^{-2})$ . However, the state-of-art methods for deterministic smooth NC-SC bilevel problems requires an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^4 \epsilon^{-2})$  complexity. Given this, we wonder *whether NC-SC bilevel problems are provably more challenging than NS-SC minimax problems measured by the condition number dependency*.

To answer this question, we first provide lower bounds for NC-SC bilevel problems. Almost all previously applicable lower bounds are attained in minimax problems where  $f = -g$ . In this work, by leveraging the asymmetry of the objectives  $f$  and  $g$ , we modify the chain-like hard instance for NC-SC minimax problems [37] to create a longer effective chain in  $\mathbf{x}$ . Our construction leads to larger  $\kappa_y$  dependencies in various setups:

1. For deterministic NC-SC bilevel problems, we show lower bounds of  $\Omega(\kappa_y^2 \epsilon^{-2})$  and  $\Omega(\kappa_y^{25/14} \epsilon^{-12/7})$  under first- and second-order smoothness assumptions, respectively, both improving the trivial lower bounds of  $\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y} \epsilon^{-2})$  [37] and  $\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y} \epsilon^{-12/7})$  [58] from minimax problems.
2. For stochastic NC-SC bilevel problems, we prove a lower bound of  $\Omega(\kappa_y^4 \epsilon^{-4})$ , improving the lower bound of  $\Omega(\kappa_y^{1/3} \epsilon^{-4})$  from minimax problems [37].
3. For convex-strongly-convex (C-SC) and strongly-convex-strongly-convex (SC-SC) bilevel problems, we also show lower bounds of  $\Omega(\kappa_y^{5/4}/\sqrt{\epsilon})$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}(\kappa_y^{5/4} \sqrt{\kappa_x})$ , respectively, improving prior results [27] of  $\tilde{\Omega}(\min\{\kappa_y, \epsilon^{-3/2}\}/\sqrt{\epsilon})$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}(\kappa_y \sqrt{\kappa_x})$ .

Then, we provide improved upper bounds to reduce the gap between existing ones and our lower bounds. For smooth NC-SC problems, we show an improved upper bound of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{7/2}\epsilon^{-2})$  by solving the lower-level problems in the F<sup>2</sup>BA method [14] using accelerated gradient descent (AGD) [49]. Our result improves the best-known  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^4\epsilon^{-2})$  results [4, 14, 28] by a factor of  $\sqrt{\kappa_y}$ . Moreover, if we further applied nonconvex AGD [38] in the upper level, the upper bounds can be improved to  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{13/4}\epsilon^{-7/4})$  for second-order smooth NC-SC problems, which matches the state-of-the-art guarantee [59] without directly using any HVP oracles or their finite difference approximations [61].

To summarize, we compare our lower and upper bounds with existing results for smooth deterministic, second-order smooth deterministic, and smooth stochastic bilevel problems in Table 1, 2, and 3, respectively. In addition, since we prove our lower bounds on lower-level quadratic problems, all our lower bounds hold for both gradient- and HVP-based methods (see Lemma 2.1). In this simpler setting, where  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is quadratic, our upper bounds can also be refined to  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa_y^{5/2}\epsilon^{-2})$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{9/4}\epsilon^{-7/4})$  for first- and second-order smooth deterministic problems, respectively, indicating the gaps of  $\sqrt{\kappa_y}$  and  $\kappa_y^{13/28}\epsilon^{-1/28}$  still exist for quadratic lower-level problems.

Table 2: We present the oracle complexities of different **deterministic** methods for finding an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point for **second-order smooth** NC-SC bilevel problems.

Oracle	Method	Complexity
HVP	AIPUN [58]	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{19/4}\epsilon^{-7/4})$
	RAHGD [59]	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{13/4}\epsilon^{-7/4})$
	Lower Bound (Theorem 3.1)	$\Omega(\kappa_y^{25/14}\epsilon^{-12/7})$
Gradient	AccF <sup>2</sup> BA [14]	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{15/4}\epsilon^{-7/4})$
	AccF <sup>2</sup> BA <sup>+</sup> (Theorem 4.2)	$\mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{13/4}\epsilon^{-7/4})$
	Lower Bound $f=-g$ [58]	$\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y}\epsilon^{-12/7})$
	Lower Bound (Theorem 3.1)	$\Omega(\kappa_y^{25/14}\epsilon^{-12/7})$

Table 3: We present the oracle complexities of different **stochastic** methods for finding an  $\epsilon$ -first-order stationary point for **smooth** NC-SC bilevel problems.

Oracle	Method	Complexity
HVP	BSA [21]	$\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(\bar{\kappa}_y)\epsilon^{-6})$
	TTSA [25]	$\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(\bar{\kappa}_y)\epsilon^{-5})$
	stocBiO [28]	$\mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^9\epsilon^{-4})$
	AmIGO [4]	$\mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^9\epsilon^{-4})$
	Lower Bound (Theorem 3.4)	$\Omega(\kappa_y^4\epsilon^{-4})$
Gradient	F <sup>2</sup> SA [34]	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\text{poly}(\bar{\kappa}_y)\epsilon^{-7})$
	F <sup>2</sup> SA [35]	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\text{poly}(\bar{\kappa}_y)\epsilon^{-6})$
	F <sup>2</sup> BSA [14]	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{11}\epsilon^{-6})$
	Lower Bound $f=-g$ [37]	$\Omega(\kappa_y^{1/3}\epsilon^{-4})$
	Lower Bound (Theorem 3.4)	$\Omega(\kappa_y^4\epsilon^{-4})$

## 1.1 Additional Related Work

In addition to the works discussed above, we further review the closely related work on lower bounds, including lower bounds for minimization, minimax, and bilevel problems.

**Lower bounds for minimization problems** In the textbooks, Nemirovskij and Yudin [48], Nesterov et al. [51] established tight lower bounds for convex optimization using chain-like quadratic functions. Recently, Carmon et al. [11, 12] further abstracted the above idea into the concept of zero-chain as a generic approach for proving lower bounds. By carefully constructing zero-chains, Carmon et al. [11] proved the tight  $\Omega(\epsilon^{-p/(p+1)})$  lower bound for  $p$ th-order methods to find  $\epsilon$ -stationary points of  $p$ th-order smooth nonconvex functions. In the same series of work, Carmon et al. [12] proved  $\Omega(\epsilon^{-12/7})$  and  $\Omega(\epsilon^{-8/5})$  lower bounds for first-order methods to optimize second-order smooth and arbitrarily smooth nonconvex functions, respectively. Many advancements were made following these seminal works. Arjevani et al. [7] proved the tight  $\Omega(\epsilon^{-4})$  and  $\Omega(\epsilon^{-3})$  lower bounds for nonconvex stochastic first-order optimization under the general expectation and the mean-squared smooth setting, respectively. Fang et al. [18], Li et al. [39] proved the tight  $\Omega(n + \sqrt{n}\epsilon^{-2})$  lower bound for nonconvex finite-sum first-order optimization; Arjevani et al. [6] proved the tight  $\Omega(\epsilon^{-7/2})$  and  $\Omega(\epsilon^{-3})$  lower bounds for first-order stochastic nonconvex optimization on second-order smooth objectives, and high-order stochastic nonconvex optimization on arbitrarily smooth objectives, respectively.

**Lower bounds for minimax problems** Inspired by the lower bounds in minimization problems, researchers also proved tight lower bounds for (first-order) minimax optimization under many setups. Nemirovski [47] gave tight  $\Omega(\epsilon^{-1})$  lower bound for convex-concave minimax problems. Ouyang and Xu [52], Zhang et al. [65] proved the tight  $\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y}/\epsilon)$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{\kappa_x\kappa_y})$  lower bounds for C-SC and SC-SC problems, respectively. Han et al. [24] extended those results to the finite-sum setting. Li et al. [37], Zhang et al. [66] proved the tight  $\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y}\epsilon^{-2})$  lower bound for nonconvex-strongly-convex (NC-SC) problems. Their results have also been extended to  $\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y}\epsilon^{-12/7})$ ,  $\Omega(n + \sqrt{n\kappa_y}\epsilon^{-2})$ , and  $\Omega(\kappa_y^{1/3}\epsilon^{-4})$  for second-order smooth problems [58], finite-sum problems [66], and general stochastic problems [37], respectively.

**Lower bounds for bilevel problems** Although the lower bounds for both minimization and minimax problems have been extensively studied, we find there are only a few works on the lower complexity bounds of bilevel optimization, except for the following ones. In their novel work, Ji and Liang [27] proved lower bounds for (S)C-SC bilevel problems instead of the more common NC-SC problems. They established the lower bound of  $\tilde{\Omega}(\min\{\kappa_y, \epsilon^{-3/2}\}/\sqrt{\epsilon})$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}(\kappa_y\sqrt{\kappa_x})$  for C-SC and SC-SC setups, respectively. Kwon et al. [35] established tight upper and lower bounds for  $r$ - $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$ -aware optimization, where the oracle only gives  $r$ -estimates of  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$  along with  $r$ -locally reliable gradients. This setting recovers stochastic bilevel optimization if  $r = +\infty$ , but requires  $r = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ , which is different from the setting of bilevel optimization with standard oracles. Chen et al. [13] considered bilevel problems without lower-level strong convexity, and constructed a hard instance such that any first-order algorithm will get stuck at  $\mathbf{x}_0$  within finite iterations. Dagr  ou et al. [17] proved a lower bound for finite-sum NC-SC problems, but the  $\Omega(n + \sqrt{n}\epsilon^{-2})$  lower bound misses the condition number dependency and is subsumed by the  $\Omega(n + \sqrt{n\kappa_y}\epsilon^{-2})$  lower bound from NC-SC minimax optimization [66].

**Notations** For a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we let  $x_i$  be its  $i$ th coordinate; define its support by  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) = \{i \mid \mathbf{x}_i \neq 0\}$  and its progress by  $\text{prog} = \max\{i \geq 0 \mid \mathbf{x}_i \neq 0\}$ . We use  $\|\cdot\|$  to denote both the Euclidean norm of a vector and the operator norm of a matrix/tensor. Given an event  $A$ , we let  $\mathbf{1}_A$  denote its indicator function. We let  $\mathbf{e}_i$  be the vector with its  $i$ th element being 1 and all the other elements being 0. Given functions  $f, g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , we use  $f = \mathcal{O}(g)$  to denote there exists a numerical constant  $C < +\infty$  such that  $f(x) \leq Cg(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $f = \Omega(g)$  to denote  $g = \mathcal{O}(f)$ , and  $f = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(g)$  to denote  $f = \mathcal{O}(g \max\{1, \log g\})$ . We also denote  $f \asymp g$  when  $f = \mathcal{O}(g)$  and  $f = \Omega(g)$  both holds.

## 2 Problem Setup

In this section, we introduce the bilevel function class considered in this paper, the algorithm class to which our lower bound applies, and the complexity measurement of the algorithms.

## 2.1 Function Class

Our main focus is the general high-order smooth nonconvex-strongly-convex (NC-SC) bilevel problems as follows, where the case  $p = 1$  is introduced by Ghadimi and Wang [21], and the case  $p = 2$  is recently introduced by Huang et al. [26].

**Definition 2.1** (*p*th-order smooth NC-SC problem). *Given  $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$ ,  $L_0, \dots, L_{p+1} > 0$ ,  $\Delta > 0$ , and  $\mu_y \in (0, L_1]$ , we use  $\mathcal{F}^{nc-sc}(L_0, \dots, L_{p+1}, \mu_y, \Delta)$  to denote the set of all bilevel problems  $(f, g)$ , where the upper-level function  $f : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and lower-level function  $g : \mathbb{R}^{d_y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy the following assumptions:*

1.  *$f$  have  $L_q$ -Lipschitz continuous  $q$ th-order derivative for all  $q = 1, \dots, p$ ; and  $g$  have  $L_q$ -Lipschitz continuous  $q$ th-order derivative for all  $q = 1, \dots, p+1$ , that is, for every  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^q f(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1) - \nabla^q f(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_2)\| &\leq L_q \|(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1) - (\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_2)\|, \quad q = 0, \dots, p; \\ \|\nabla^q g(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1) - \nabla^q g(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_2)\| &\leq L_q \|(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1) - (\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_2)\|, \quad q = 1, \dots, p+1. \end{aligned}$$

2. *For any fixed  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ ,  $g$  is  $\mu_y$ -strongly convex in  $\mathbf{y}$ , that is, for any  $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ ,*

$$g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_2) \geq g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_1) + \langle \nabla_y g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_1), \mathbf{y}_2 - \mathbf{y}_1 \rangle + \frac{\mu_y}{2} \|\mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}_2\|^2.$$

3. *The hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$  in Eq. (1) is lower bounded and*

$$F(\mathbf{0}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} F(\mathbf{x}) \leq \Delta.$$

For these problems, we define the lower-level and global condition numbers  $\kappa_y$  and  $\bar{\kappa}_y$  as follows. By definition, we have  $\kappa_y \leq \bar{\kappa}_y$ .

**Definition 2.2.** *For the  $p$ th-order smooth NC-SC function class in Definition 2.1, we define  $\kappa_y := L_1/\mu_y$  as the condition number of  $g$  and  $\bar{\kappa}_y := \bar{L}/\mu_y$  as the global condition number of the bilevel problem, where  $\bar{L} = \max_{q=0, \dots, p+1} L_q$ .*

In our lower bound analyses, we construct bilevel problems with quadratic lower-level functions, which are formally defined in Definition 2.3 below. Note that for this subclass, we do not make assumptions on the boundedness of  $L_0$  since both the lower and upper bounds do not depend on it.

**Definition 2.3** (Quadratic lower-level problem). *For  $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$ ,  $L_1, \dots, L_p > 0$ ,  $\mu_y \in (0, L_1]$ , and  $\Delta > 0$ , we denote  $\mathcal{F}^{nc-scq}(L_1, \dots, L_p, \mu_y, \Delta) \subseteq \mathcal{F}^{nc-sc}(+\infty, L_1, \dots, L_p, 0, \mu_y, \Delta)$  as the subset of NC-SC problems, where the lower-level function takes the form of*

$$g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{H} \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{J} \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mu_y \mathbf{I}_{d_y} \preceq \mathbf{H} \preceq L_1 \mathbf{I}_{d_y}$  and  $-L_1 \mathbf{I}_{d_y} \preceq \mathbf{J} \preceq L_1 \mathbf{I}_{d_y}$ .

From a complexity theory perspective, it is natural to consider quadratic functions as optimizing convex quadratics is usually as hard as general convex functions [51, Theorem 2.1.13]. Therefore, understanding the complexity of quadratic problems is essential to tackle more complex setups. From a practical perspective, this problem class already covers many useful applications in reinforcement learning, meta-learning, robust optimization, and graph neural network training, as detailed in Appendix A.

## 2.2 Algorithm Class

Following the seminal framework proposed by Nemirovskij and Yudin [48], we model the algorithmic complexity by the number of oracle accesses, where first-order oracles reveal the gradient information at the query points, defined as follows.

**Definition 2.4** (First-order oracle). *Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two continuous differentiable functions. We define the first-order oracle for the bilevel problem  $(f, g)$  as the mapping  $\mathbb{O}^{\text{fo}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\nabla_x f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$ .*

We then define the (deterministic) first-order algorithms as follows, which generalizes the algorithm classes defined in [1, 6, 7, 11] from a single objective to two objectives. Our definition encompasses almost all existing first-order algorithms for bilevel optimization [34, 41, 45, 55].

**Definition 2.5** (First-order algorithm). *A first-order algorithm  $\mathbf{A}$  consists of a sequence of measurable mappings  $\{\mathbf{A}^t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\mathbf{A}^t$  takes in the first  $t-1$  oracle responses to product the  $t$ -th query  $\mathbf{w}^t = (\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)$ , such that  $\mathbf{w}^0 = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$  and*

$$\mathbf{w}^t = \mathbf{A}^t(\mathbb{O}^{\text{fo}}(\mathbf{w}^0), \dots, \mathbb{O}^{\text{fo}}(\mathbf{w}^{t-1})), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}_+. \quad (5)$$

We denote  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{fo}}$  as the set of all deterministic algorithms that follow protocol (5).

In addition to first-order algorithms, all of our lower bounds also apply to the following algorithm class in Definition 2.7, which includes many standard HVP-based algorithms [21, 25, 28]. These algorithms introduce an additional variable  $\mathbf{v}$  that tracks  $-(\nabla_{yy}^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))^{-1} \nabla_y g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  via gradient updates on the quadratic function  $\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{v}^\top \nabla_{yy}^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{v} - \nabla_y g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{v}$  and then use the approximate hyper-gradient  $\nabla_x f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + \nabla_{xy}^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{v}$  to update  $\mathbf{x}$ . Formally, we define the deterministic HVP oracle and HVP-based methods as follows.

**Definition 2.6** (HVP oracle). *Let  $f$  be differentiable and  $g$  be twice differentiable. We define the HVP oracle for the bilevel problem  $(f, g)$  as the mapping*

$$\mathbb{O}^{\text{hvp}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v}) = (\nabla_x f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \nabla_{xy}^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{v}, \nabla_{yy}^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{v}).$$

**Definition 2.7** (HVP-based algorithm). *An HVP-based algorithm  $\mathbf{A}$  consists of a sequence of measurable mappings  $\{\mathbf{A}^t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\mathbf{A}^t$  takes in the first  $t-1$  oracle responses to product the  $t$ -th query  $\mathbf{w}^t = (\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{v}^t)$ , such that  $\mathbf{w}^0 = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$  and*

$$\mathbf{w}^t = \mathbf{A}^t(\mathbb{O}^{\text{hvp}}(\mathbf{w}^0), \dots, \mathbb{O}^{\text{hvp}}(\mathbf{w}^{t-1})), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}_+. \quad (6)$$

We denote  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{hvp}}$  as the set of all deterministic algorithms that follow protocol (5).

Definition 2.7 subsumes the hyper-gradient-based algorithm class previously defined in [27, Definition 2]. Since the HVP and gradient oracles for quadratic functions are equivalent, proving lower bounds for first-order algorithms on lower-level quadratic problems implies that the same lower bound applies to HVP-based algorithms. Formally, we have the following statement.

**Lemma 2.1.** *If  $g$  is a quadratic function of the form (4), then  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{hvp}} = \mathcal{A}^{\text{fo}}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $g$  is a quadratic function of the form (4), then we have that  $\nabla_y g(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{b}$ ,  $\nabla_{yy}^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{H}$ , and  $\nabla_{xy}^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{J}$ . Therefore, it holds that

$$\begin{cases} \nabla_{yy}^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{H} \mathbf{v} = \nabla_y g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) + \nabla_y g(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}), \\ \nabla_{xy}^2 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{J} \mathbf{v} = \nabla_x g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}). \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Then, for any sequence  $\{(\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{y}^0, \mathbf{v}^0), \dots, (\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{v}^t)\}$  generated by an HVP-based algorithm that satisfies Eq. (6), we know from the above equation that the expanded sequence  $\{(\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{y}^0), (\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{v}^0), \dots, (\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t), (\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{v}^t)\}$  satisfies Eq. (5), which means that  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{hvp}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{\text{fo}}$ . Conversely, for any sequence  $\{(\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{y}^0), \dots, (\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)\}$  generated by a first-order algorithm that satisfies Eq. (5), we also know from Eq. (7) that the expanded sequence  $\{(\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{y}^0, \mathbf{v}^0), \dots, (\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{v}^t)\}$  satisfies Eq. (6), which means that  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{fo}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{\text{hvp}}$ .  $\square$

## 2.3 Complexity Measure

The ultimate goal of bilevel optimization is to optimize the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x})$  implicitly defined in Eq. (1). Given that  $F(\mathbf{x})$  is nonconvex in general, finding its approximate minima requires exponential complexity in the worst case [48]. Hence, we follow [7, 11, 12] to measure the complexity of an algorithm by the number of oracle calls to find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point.

**Definition 2.8.** We call a point  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of  $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  if

$$\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \epsilon.$$

**Definition 2.9.** Given a bilevel function class  $\mathcal{F}$  and the associated first-order oracle  $\mathbb{O}$ , we define the worst-case complexity of an algorithm class  $\mathcal{A}$  to find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point as

$$\text{Compl}_\epsilon(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{O}) = \sup_{(f,g) \in \mathcal{F}} \inf_{\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}} \inf \{t \in \mathbb{N} \mid \mathbb{E} \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^t)\| \leq \epsilon\},$$

where  $\{\mathbf{z}^t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $\mathbf{z}^t = (\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)$  is the sequence generated by  $\mathbf{A}$  running on  $(f, g)$ .

## 3 Lower Bounds

In this section, we establish new lower bounds for bilevel optimization. We begin in Section 3.1 by introducing a generic framework for deriving these lower bounds. We then apply this framework to obtain lower bounds across various setups. Specifically, Section 3.2 presents lower bounds for deterministic nonconvex-strongly-convex (NC-SC) and (S)C-SC problems under different orders of smoothness. Section 3.3 uses a slightly different construction to prove lower bounds for randomized and stochastic algorithms in NC-SC problems.

### 3.1 Construction Overview

We construct hard instances with chain-like structures to prove optimization lower bounds. Such functions are known as zero-chains, which are formally introduced by Carmon et al. [11] as an abstraction of the idea in [51].

**Definition 3.1** (Zero-chain). A function  $f : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a (first-order) zero-chain if

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) \subseteq \{1, \dots, t-1\} \implies \text{supp}(\nabla f(\mathbf{x})) \subseteq \{1, \dots, t\}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^T.$$

We say a coordinate is activated if it becomes non-zero from zero. As shown in [5, 11], if  $f(\mathbf{x})$  is a zero-chain, then for any deterministic algorithm  $\mathbf{A}$ , one can adversarially rotate the  $f(\mathbf{x})$  such that  $\mathbf{A}$  running on the rotated function can only activate its coordinates one by one. This leads to a generic recipe for proving lower bounds: Construct a function  $f : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that meets two criteria: (1) it is a zero-chain, and (2) a point  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^T$  cannot be an  $\epsilon$ -solution unless its  $T$ -th coordinate is activated.

We apply this framework to prove lower bounds for bilevel problems, with the intention of maximizing the chain length  $T$  while ensuring that the constructed instance remains in the function class of interest. To achieve this goal, we make novel changes to the constructions in (near)-optimal NC-SC minimax lower bounds [37, 58], amplifying their  $\kappa_y$  dependency by leveraging the bilevel structure.

First, we recap the constructions for NC-SC minimax problems in [37, 58]. Let  $\tilde{f}_{\nu,r}^{\text{nc}} : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the NC zero-chain [12] for minimization problems (see Definition 3.2). Li et al. [37] set  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}$  as the minimization (upper-level) variables and  $\mathbf{y}$  as the maximization (lower-level) variable, and constructed functions such that (1) every progress from  $\mathbf{z}_i$  to  $\mathbf{x}_i$  requires traversing a lower-level strongly-convex sub-chain with length  $K = \Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y})$ ; (2) the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \max_{\mathbf{y}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})$  has similar properties to  $\tilde{f}_{\nu,r}^{\text{nc}}(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Such a construction leads to a zero-chain with a total length  $KT$ . The analysis in [12] indicates that the largest possible value of  $T$  that ensures  $\tilde{f}_{\nu,r}^{\text{nc}}(\mathbf{0}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^T} f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \Delta$  is  $T = \Omega(\epsilon^{-2})$  and  $T = \Omega(\epsilon^{-12/7})$  under first- and second-order smoothness, which leads to the lower bounds of  $\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y} \epsilon^{-2})$  [37] and  $\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y} \epsilon^{-12/7})$  [58] for first- and second-order smooth NC-SC minimax problems, respectively.

In this work, we modify the previous construction in NC-SC minimax optimization as follows (also illustrated in Figure 1):





**Definition 3.2** (NC zero-chain [12]). Let  $\bar{f}_{\nu,r}^{\text{nc}} : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be

$$\bar{f}_{\nu,r}^{\text{nc}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{2}(x_1 - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=2}^T (x_i - x_{i-1})^2 + \nu \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \Upsilon_r(x_i),$$

where the nonconvex regularizer  $\Upsilon_r(x) = 120 \int_1^x \frac{t^2(t-1)}{1+(t/r)^2} dt$ .

We summarize the key properties of this function in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.1** (Carmon et al. [12, Lemma 2 and 3]). The functions  $\Upsilon_r$  and  $\bar{f}_{\nu,r}^{\text{nc}}$  satisfy the following:

1. We have  $\Upsilon_r'(0) = \Upsilon_r'(1) = 0$ .
2. For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have  $\Upsilon_r(x) > \Upsilon_r(1) = 0$ , and for all  $r$ ,  $\Upsilon_r(0) \leq 10$ .
3. For every  $r \geq 1$  and every  $p \geq 1$ , the  $p$ th-order derivatives of  $\Upsilon_r$  are  $r^{3-p}\ell_p$ -Lipschitz continuous, where  $\ell_p \leq \exp(3p \log(p)/2 + c_0 p)$  for a numerical constant  $c_0 > 0$ .
4. Let  $r \geq 1$  and  $\nu \leq 1$ , then for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^T$  such that  $x_{T-1} = x_T = 0$ , we have

$$\|\nabla \bar{f}_{\nu,r}^{\text{nc}}(\mathbf{x})\| > \nu^{3/4}/4.$$

To extend the above NC hard instance for minimization to an NC-SC hard instance for NC-SC bilevel problems, we set  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^T$ ,  $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^T \times \mathbb{R}^{K(T-1)}$  be the upper- and lower-level variables, respectively, partition  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{(T-1)K}$  into  $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(T-1)})$  so that  $\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , and define the (unscaled and unrotated) upper- and lower-level functions  $\bar{f}^{\text{nc-sc}}, \bar{g}^{\text{sc}} : \mathbb{R}^T \times \mathbb{R}^T \times \mathbb{R}^{K(T-1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}^{\text{nc-sc}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) &:= \frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{2} \left( \frac{z_1}{\sqrt{K}} - 1 \right)^2 + \nu \sum_{i=1}^T \Upsilon_r \left( \frac{z_i}{\sqrt{K}} \right) + h(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}), \\ \bar{g}^{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) &:= \frac{1}{2K^2} \|\mathbf{z}\|^2 - \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} h^{\text{sc}}(x_i, x_{i+1}, \mathbf{y}^{(i)}), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where  $\Upsilon_r : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  follows from Definition 3.2. For the function  $h : \mathbb{R}^T \times \mathbb{R}^{K(T-1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in the upper level, we design it as

$$h(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) := \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \frac{a_K}{2} (z_i^2 + z_{i+1}^2) + \frac{b_K}{2} (z_i y_1^{(i)} - z_{i+1} y_K^{(i)}), \tag{9}$$

where the constants  $a_K, b_K \in \mathbb{R}$  depend on  $K$ , with specific values provided in Lemma 3.3. For the function  $h^{\text{sc}} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in the lower level, we set it as

$$\begin{aligned} h^{\text{sc}}(x_1, x_2, \mathbf{y}) &:= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} (y_i - y_{i+1})^2 + \frac{1}{2K^2} \|\mathbf{y}\|^2 - (x_1 y_1 - x_2 y_K) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^\top \left( \frac{1}{K^2} \mathbf{I}_K + \mathbf{A}_K \right) \mathbf{y} - \langle x_1 \mathbf{e}_1 - x_2 \mathbf{e}_K, \mathbf{y} \rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where the matrix  $\mathbf{A}_K \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$  is

$$\mathbf{A}_K = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & & & \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & & \\ & -1 & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & 2 & -1 \\ & & & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

The strongly-convex sub-chain  $h^{\text{sc}}$  aligns with those used in [58] except that the affine term is scaled by  $\sqrt{K}$ . This sub-chain ensures that every progress from  $x_1$  to  $x_2$  needs to pass the chain  $y_1 \rightarrow y_2 \rightarrow \dots y_K$ . In Eq. (8), we mark the main changes we made to the hard NC-SC minimax instance [37, 58] in blue, which are crucial to obtain our improved lower bound on condition number dependency. In the following lemma, we present the basic properties of our hard instance in Eq. (8).

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\nu \in (0, 1]$ ,  $r \geq 1$  and  $K \geq 1$ . The hard instance  $(\bar{f}^{\text{nc-sc}}, \bar{g}^{\text{sc}})$  satisfies:*

1. *Let  $\ell_p$  be the constant defined in Lemma 3.1. For every  $p \geq 1$ , the  $p$ th-order derivatives of  $\bar{f}^{\text{nc-sc}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})$  are  $\ell_p$ -Lipchitz continuous, where*

$$\bar{\ell}_p = \begin{cases} 1 + |a_K| + |b_K| + \nu r^2 \ell_1, & p = 1 \\ \nu r^{3-p} \ell_p, & p \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

*And  $\bar{g}^{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})$  has 5-Lipschitz continuous gradients and 0 higher-order derivatives.*

2.  *$\bar{g}^{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})$  is  $(1/K^2)$ -strongly convex jointly in  $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})$ .*

*Proof.* In our construction, both the upper- and lower-level functions are quadratic except for the nonconvex regularizer  $\Upsilon_r$ . Therefore, we can separately bound the Lipschitz constant of the quadratic and non-quadratic parts. For the quadratic part, the Lipschitz constant of the gradient can be bounded by the spectral norm of the Hessian, and all of the higher-order derivatives are zero. For the non-quadratic part, we know from Lemma 3.1 that its  $p$ th-order derivative of  $\Upsilon_r$  is  $r^{3-p}\ell_p$ -Lipschitz continuous. This proves items 1 and 2. Finally, item 3 immediately follows from the form of Eq. (10).  $\square$

Let  $(\mathbf{z}^*(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^T, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{K(T-1)}} \bar{g}^{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})$  be the lower-level solution. We carefully choose the coefficients  $\alpha_K$  and  $\beta_K$  in the function  $h(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})$  such that  $H(\mathbf{x}) := h(\mathbf{z}^*(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$  admits a simple quadratic form up to scaling.

**Lemma 3.3.** *If  $K \geq 10$ , then there exists some values  $a_K, b_K$  satisfying  $|a_K| \leq 20$  and  $|b_K| \leq 10$  such that  $H(\mathbf{x}) = h(\mathbf{z}^*(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$  is equivalent to*

$$H(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{K^3}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} (x_i - x_{i+1})^2. \quad (12)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix B for the complete proof.  $\square$

Using Lemma 3.3 in Eq. (8), we can observe that the hyper-objective is

$$\bar{F}^{\text{nc}}(\mathbf{x}) := \bar{f}^{\text{nc-sc}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^*(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) = \bar{f}_{\nu, r}^{\text{nc}}(K^{3/2}\mathbf{x}),$$

where  $\bar{f}_{\nu, r}^{\text{nc}} : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the NC zero-chain in Definition 3.2. Now, we can rescale and rotate the hard instance as in Eq. (20) and (21), then apply a similar analysis to that in [12, Theorem 2] to prove lower bounds for NC-SC bilevel problems under different orders of smoothness.

**Theorem 3.1** (NC-SC lower bound). *There exists a numerical constants  $a_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that, for any  $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$ ,  $L_1, \dots, L_p > 0$ ,  $\Delta > 0$  and  $\mu_y \in (0, a_0 L_1]$ , there exists a lower-level-quadratic bilevel problem  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{nc-scq}}(L_1, \dots, L_p, \mu_y, \Delta)$  such that, to find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x})$ , any deterministic first-order algorithm  $A \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{fo}}$  or HVP-based algorithm  $A \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{hvp}}$  requires*

$$\begin{cases} \Omega(\kappa_y^2 L_1 \Delta \epsilon^{-2}), & p = 1; \\ \Omega(\kappa_y^{25/14} (L_1)^{3/7} (L_2)^{2/7} \Delta \epsilon^{-12/7}), & p = 2; \\ \Omega(\kappa_y^{17/10} (L_1)^{3/5} L_*^{1/5} \Delta \epsilon^{-8/5}), & p \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

*calls of first-order oracles when  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , where  $\kappa_y = L_1/\mu_y$  is the condition number of the lower-level problem,  $L_* = \min_{q=2, \dots, p} (L_q/L_1)^{2/(q-1)}$ .*

*Proof.* See Appendix C for the complete proof.  $\square$

Compared with known lower bounds for NC-SC minimax problems whose optimal condition number dependency is both  $\sqrt{\kappa_y}$  for  $p = 1$  [37, 66] and  $p = 2$  [58], our lower bounds for NC-SC bilevel problems exhibit much larger  $\kappa_y$  dependencies. Our results show that NC-SC bilevel optimization is provably more challenging than NC-SC minimax optimization, with the increased  $\kappa_y$  dependency reflecting a fundamental difficulty stemming from the bilevel problem structure.

### 3.2.2 Lower Bounds for Deterministic C-SC and SC-SC Problems

Ji and Liang [27] proved lower bounds of  $\tilde{\Omega}(\min\{\kappa_y, \epsilon^{-3/2}\}/\sqrt{\epsilon})$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}(\kappa_y\sqrt{\kappa_x})$  for the convex-strongly-convex (C-SC) problems and strongly-convex-strongly-convex (SC-SC) in Definition 3.3 and 3.4, which demonstrates the first larger  $\kappa_y$  dependency than the lower bounds of  $\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y}/\epsilon)$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{\kappa_y\kappa_x})$  for C-SC and SC-SC minimax problems [52, 65]. However, the optimality of the lower bounds in [27] remains unknown, as they still have a gap between the upper bounds of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^2/\sqrt{\epsilon})$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^2\sqrt{\kappa_x})$  established in [27].

In this subsection, we show that our hard NC-SC instance in the previous section can also be extended to C-SC and SC-SC problems [21, 27] and achieve improved lower bounds of  $\Omega(\kappa_y^{5/4}/\sqrt{\epsilon})$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}(\kappa_y^{5/4}\sqrt{\kappa_x})$ , respectively. To begin with, we formally define smooth and quadratic (S)C-SC bilevel problems as follows.

**Definition 3.3** (Smooth (S)C-SC problems). *Given  $L_0, L_1, L_2 > 0$ ,  $\mu_x \in [0, L_1]$ ,  $\mu_y \in (0, L_1]$ , and  $D > 0$ , we use  $\mathcal{F}^{sc-sc}(L_0, L_1, L_2, \mu_x, \mu_y, D)$  to denote the subset of all bilevel problems  $(f, g)$  that satisfies items 1 and 2 in Definition 2.1, i.e.,  $\mathcal{F}^{sc-sc}(L_0, L_1, L_2, \mu_x, \mu_y, D) \subset \mathcal{F}^{nc-sc}(L_0, L_1, L_2, \mu_y, +\infty)$ , and the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x})$  also satisfies*

1.  $F(\mathbf{x})$  is  $\mu_x$ -strongly convex in  $\mathbf{x}$ .
2.  $\min\{\|\mathbf{x}\| : \mathbf{x} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}} F(\mathbf{x})\} \leq D$ .

If  $\mu_x = 0$ , we call them C-SC problems:  $\mathcal{F}^{c-sc}(L_0, L_1, L_2, \mu_y, D) = \mathcal{F}^{sc-sc}(L_0, L_1, L_2, 0, \mu_y, D)$ .

We note that the (S)C-SC problems are not defined by the convexity of the upper-level function  $f$ , but instead by the convexity of the hyper-objective function  $F$ , making the definition potentially difficult to check in practice, as discussed in [25].

**Definition 3.4** (Quadratic (S)C-SC problems). *Given  $L_1, L_2 > 0$ ,  $\mu_x, \mu_y \in (0, L_1]$ , and  $D > 0$ , we denote  $\mathcal{F}^{scq-scq}(L_1, \mu_x, \mu_y, D) \subseteq \mathcal{F}^{sc-sc}(+\infty, L_1, 0, \mu_x, \mu_y, D)$  as the subset of SC-SC problems such that both the upper- and lower-level functions are quadratic. If  $\mu_x = 0$ , we call them quadratic C-SC problems:  $\mathcal{F}^{cq-scq}(L_1, \mu_y, D) = \mathcal{F}^{scq-scq}(L_1, 0, \mu_y, D)$ .*

To see how our NC-SC hard instance can be modified to the C-SC settings, we first note that if the NC regularizers in the NC zero-chain  $\bar{f}_{\nu,r}^{nc}$  in Definition 3.2 are removed, the function becomes a finite version of Nesterov's convex zero-chain in Definition 3.5 and has the following property stated in Lemma 3.4.

**Definition 3.5** (Convex zero-chain [12]). *Let  $\bar{f}^c : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the nonconvex function  $\bar{f}_{1,0}^{nc}$  in Definition 3.2 with the NC regularizer  $\Upsilon_r$  removed, i.e.,*

$$\bar{f}^c(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^\top (\mathbf{A}_T + \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^\top) \mathbf{x} - \langle \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{x} \rangle + \frac{1}{2}.$$

**Lemma 3.4** (Carmon et al. [12, Lemma 1]). *For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^T$  such that  $x_T = 0$ ,*

$$\|\nabla \bar{f}^c(\mathbf{x})\| > 1/T^{3/2}.$$

Now, if we remove the NC regularizer term  $\nu \sum_{i=1}^T \Upsilon_r(z_i/\sqrt{K})$  in the upper-level function in Eq. (8) and keep the lower-level function unchanged, we know that the resulting (unscaled) hyper-objective is  $\bar{F}(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{f}^c(K^{3/2}\mathbf{x})$ . Then, we can apply similar lower bound arguments in convex and strongly-convex minimization problems [12, 51] to prove the following result.

**Theorem 3.2** (C-SC lower bound). *There exists a numerical constants  $a_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that, for any  $L_1 > 0$ ,  $\Delta > 0$  and  $\mu_y \in (0, a_0 L_1]$ , there exists a quadratic bilevel problem  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}^{cq-scq}(L_1, \mu_y, \Delta)$ , such that, to find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x})$ , any deterministic first-order algorithm  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{fo}}$  or HVP-based algorithm  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{hvp}}$  requires at least*

$$\Omega\left(\kappa_y^{5/4} \sqrt{L_1 D / \epsilon}\right)$$

*calls of first-order oracle when  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , where  $\kappa_y = L_1 / \mu_y$ .*

*Proof.* See Appendix D for the complete proof.  $\square$

For SC-SC problems, we slightly modify the hard instance for C-SC problems to let  $\bar{F}(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{f}^c(K^{3/2}\mathbf{x}) + \mu_x \|\mathbf{x}\|^2/2$ , which implies the following result by careful calculation.

**Theorem 3.3** (SC-SC lower bound). *There exists a numerical constants  $a_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that, for any  $L_1 > 0$ ,  $\Delta > 0$ ,  $\mu_x \in (0, L_1]$ ,  $\mu_y \in (0, a_0 L_1]$ , there exists a quadratic bilevel problem  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}^{scq-scq}(L_1, \mu_x, \mu_y)$  such that, to find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x})$ , any deterministic first-order algorithm  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{fo}}$  or HVP-based algorithm  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{hvp}}$  requires at least*

$$\Omega\left(\kappa_y^{5/4} \sqrt{\kappa_x} \ln\left(\frac{\mu_x D^2}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$$

*calls of first-order oracle when  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , where  $\kappa_x = L_1 / \mu_x$  and  $\kappa_y = L_1 / \mu_y$ .*

*Proof.* See Appendix E for the complete proof.  $\square$

As all functions in our construction are quadratic, these lower bounds also apply to objectives with higher-order smoothness. Unlike NC-SC problems, higher-order smoothness does not provide faster convergence for first-order methods under the (S)C-SC setting.

**Comparison to [27].** Theorem 3.2 and 3.3 improve the previous lower bounds of  $\tilde{\Omega}(\min\{\kappa_y, \epsilon^{-3/2}\}/\sqrt{\epsilon})$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}(\kappa_y \sqrt{\kappa_x})$  for C-SC and SC-SC problems [27] by a factor of  $\kappa_y^{1/4}$ . The improvement comes from the two-source characterization of  $\kappa_y$  dependency in our hard instance, where we jointly use the rescaling variable  $\mathbf{z}$  to capture the  $\kappa_y$  dependency in the smoothness of the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x})$ , and the coupling variable  $\mathbf{y}$  to capture the  $\kappa_y$  dependency  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$  in the computation of  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$ . In contrast, the lower-level variable of the hard instance in [27] only plays a role as rescaling, making  $\bar{F}(\mathbf{x})$  behave like  $\bar{f}^c(\kappa_y \mathbf{x})$ , but does not couple additional sub-chains to give a better bound. Next, we turn to discuss the gap between our lower bounds and upper bounds established in [27] for (S)C-SC problems.

**Remark 3.1** (Known C-SC and SC-SC upper bounds). *Ji and Liang [27] proposed HVP-based methods with the  $\tilde{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^2/\sqrt{\epsilon})$  and  $\tilde{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^2 \sqrt{\kappa_x})$  upper bounds for C-SC and SC-SC bilevel problems, respectively. In addition, for lower-level quadratic problems, their upper bounds can be refined to  $\tilde{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{3/2}/\sqrt{\epsilon})$  and  $\tilde{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{3/2} \sqrt{\kappa_x})$ , respectively. However, compared to our lower bounds, the gaps of  $\kappa_y^{3/4}$  for the general case and  $\kappa_y^{1/4}$  for the lower-level quadratic case still exist even when  $\bar{\kappa}_y = \kappa_y$ .*

All our lower bounds in Section 3.2 apply to deterministic algorithms. In Section 3.3, we will use a different construction to extend our NC-SC lower bound for  $p = 1$  to randomized algorithms. It is open whether our other results (SC-SC/C-SC lower bounds and NC-SC lower bounds for  $p \geq 2$ ) can also be extended to the randomized algorithms, which may relate to some open problems in minimization problems [12, Section 6.2].

### 3.3 Lower Bounds for Stochastic Problems

In this subsection, we present a different construction for proving lower bounds in first-order smooth NC-SC problems. The advantage of our second construction is that it further encompasses the randomized and stochastic algorithms defined according to [7]. Here, “randomness” means that the algorithm can query random points during its execution, and “stochasticity” means that the algorithm has access to noisy first-order oracles instead of the exact gradients. Below, we formally define the stochastic first-order oracle (SFO) and the algorithm class.

**Definition 3.6** (Stochastic first-order oracle). Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two continuous differentiable functions. We define the stochastic first-order oracle (SFO) for the bilevel problem  $(f, g)$  as the mapping  $\mathbb{O}^{\text{sfo}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\hat{\nabla}f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \hat{\nabla}g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$ , where  $\hat{\nabla}f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  and  $\hat{\nabla}g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  are random vectors that satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\hat{\nabla}f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), & \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\nabla}f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|^2 &\leq \sigma^2; \\ \mathbb{E}\hat{\nabla}g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \nabla g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), & \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\nabla}g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \nabla g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|^2 &\leq \sigma^2,\end{aligned}$$

and  $\sigma^2 > 0$  is the variance of SFO.

**Definition 3.7** (Randomized stochastic first-order algorithm). A stochastic first-order algorithm  $\mathbf{A}$  consists of a distribution  $\mathbb{P}_r$  over a measurable set  $\mathcal{R}$  and a sequence of measurable mappings  $\{\mathbf{A}^t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\mathbf{A}^t$  takes in the first  $t-1$  oracle responses and the random seed  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  to produce the  $t$ -th query  $\mathbf{w}^t$ , such that  $\mathbf{w}^0 = \mathbf{0}$  and

$$\mathbf{w}^t = \mathbf{A}^t(r, \mathbb{O}^{\text{sfo}}(\mathbf{w}^0), \dots, \mathbb{O}^{\text{sfo}}(\mathbf{w}^{t-1})), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}_+. \quad (13)$$

We denote  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{sfo}}$  as the set of all randomized algorithms that follow protocol (13).

To derive our lower bounds for stochastic bilevel problems, we leverage the following stochastic NC zero-chains [7]. The first chain in Definition 3.8 can give an  $\Omega(\epsilon^{-4})$  lower bound for any algorithm following protocol (13) with a fixed random seed  $r$ , and the second one in Definition 3.9 further amplifies the first one with random rotation and a soft projection to give lower bounds for any  $r \sim \mathbb{P}_r$ .

**Definition 3.8** (Stochastic NC zero-chain [7]). Let  $\bar{f}^{nc-s} : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and its stochastic first-order oracle  $\mathbb{O} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{nc-s}(\mathbf{x})$  be

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{f}^{nc-s}(\mathbf{x}) &= \left( -\Psi(1)\Phi(\mathbf{x}_1) + \sum_{i=2}^T [\Psi(-\mathbf{x}_{i-1})\Phi(-\mathbf{x}_i) - \Psi(\mathbf{x}_{i-1})\Phi(\mathbf{x}_i)] \right), \\ \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{nc-s}(\mathbf{x}) &= [\nabla \bar{f}^{nc-s}(\mathbf{x})]_j \left( 1 + \mathbf{1}_{j=\text{prog}(\mathbf{x})+1} \left( \frac{\xi}{p} - 1 \right) \right), \quad \xi \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p),\end{aligned}$$

where the component functions  $\Psi, \Phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are

$$\Psi(x) = \mathbf{1}_{x>1/2} \exp\left(1 - \frac{1}{(2x-1)^2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(x) = \sqrt{e} \int_{-\infty}^x \exp(-t^2/2) dt.$$

**Definition 3.9** (Randomized stochastic NC zero-chain [7]). Let the matrix  $\mathbf{U}$  be uniformly sampled from  $\text{Orth}(d, T) := \{\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times T} \mid \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}_T\}$ . And Let  $\bar{f}^{nc-rs} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and its stochastic first-order oracle  $\mathbb{O} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{nc-rs}(\mathbf{x})$  be

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{f}^{nc-rs}(\mathbf{x}) &= \bar{f}^{nc-s}(\mathbf{U}^\top \rho(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{10} \|\mathbf{x}\|^2, \\ \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{nc-rs}(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{U} \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{nc-s}(\mathbf{U}^\top \rho(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{5} \mathbf{x}.\end{aligned}$$

where  $R = 230\sqrt{T}$ ,  $\rho(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} / \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 / R^2}$ , and  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}) = \left[ \frac{\partial \rho_i(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \right]_{i,j}$  is the Jacobian of  $\rho$ .

Next, we recall the following properties of the hard instance  $\bar{f}^{nc-rs}$ .

**Lemma 3.5** (Arjevani et al. [7, Lemma 6 and 7]).  $\bar{f}^{nc-rs}$  and the associated stochastic first-order oracle  $\mathbb{O} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{nc-rs}(\mathbf{x})$  satisfy:

1. We have  $\bar{f}^{nc-rs}(\mathbf{0}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^T} \bar{f}^{nc-rs}(\mathbf{x}) \leq 12T$ ;
2.  $\bar{f}^{nc-rs}(\mathbf{x})$  has 155-Lipschitz continuous gradients,
3. The SFO  $\mathbb{O}$  is unbiased for  $\nabla \bar{f}^{nc-rs}$ , has variance bounded by  $23^2(1-p)/p$ .

4. Let  $\{\mathbf{x}^t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the sequence generated by a randomized algorithm  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{sfo}}$ . For all  $t \leq (T - \log(2/\delta))/(2p)$  and any deterministic mapping  $\mathcal{M} : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^T$ , with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have  $\|\nabla \bar{f}^{\text{nc-sc}}(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}^t))\| \geq 1/2$ .

Now, we are ready to present our hard instance for stochastic NC-SC bilevel problems. Compared with our construction in the deterministic case, we abandon the coupling variable  $\mathbf{y}$  in Eq. (8) since the sub-chain  $h^{\text{sc}}$  in Eq. (10) has unbounded gradients, which can cause higher variance as in the stochastic setting [37]. By only using the rescaling variable  $\mathbf{z}$ , our upper- and lower-level functions  $f, g : \mathbb{R}^T \times \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and the associated stochastic first-order oracle  $\mathbb{O} : (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \mapsto (\hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}), \hat{\nabla} g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}))$  are formally defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &:= \frac{L_1 \beta^2}{155} \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}(\mathbf{z}/\beta) \quad \text{and} \quad g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) := \frac{\mu_y}{2} \|\mathbf{z}\|^2 - L_1 \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \rangle, \\ \hat{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &= \left( \mathbf{0}_T, \frac{L_1 \beta}{155} \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}(\mathbf{z}/\beta) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\nabla} g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \nabla g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}), \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where both  $\bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}$  and  $\hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}$  are from Definition 3.8. Let  $\epsilon^{-\gamma}$  be the lower bound for nonconvex stochastic optimization [7], where  $\gamma = 2$  if  $\sigma = 0$  and  $\gamma = 4$  if  $\sigma > 0$ . Since our construction above ensures that  $\mathbf{z}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \kappa_y \mathbf{x}$  and  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^*(\mathbf{x})) = (L_1 \beta^2 / 155) \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}(\kappa_y \mathbf{x} / \beta)$ , we can follow the analysis of [7] to obtain the lower bound of  $\Omega((\kappa_y / \epsilon)^\gamma)$  by invoking Lemma 3.5 and appropriately choosing the parameters  $\beta$  and  $T$ . We state the formal theorem below.

**Theorem 3.4** (Stochastic NC-SC lower bound). *For any  $L_1 \geq \mu_y > 0$ ,  $\sigma > 0$ , and  $\Delta > 0$ , the bilevel problem instance  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{nc-scq}}(L_1, \mu_y, \Delta)$  equipped with a stochastic first-order oracle (SFO) with variance  $\sigma^2$  such that, to find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^*(\mathbf{x}))$ , any randomized stochastic first-order algorithm  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{sfo}}$  requires at least*

$$\Omega(\kappa_y^2 L_1 \Delta \epsilon^{-2} + \kappa_y^4 L_1 \sigma^2 \Delta \epsilon^{-4})$$

SFO calls, where  $\kappa_y = L_1 / \mu_y$  is the condition number of the lower-level problem.

*Proof.* See Appendix F for the complete proof. □

As the first-order oracle of our lower-level function is deterministic, we can still apply Lemma 2.1 to obtain the same lower bounds for stochastic HVP-based methods. Under the noiseless setting ( $\sigma = 0$ ), the result of Theorem 3.4 aligns with that of Theorem 3.1 when  $p = 1$ , but allows for randomization in the execution of algorithms. Under the noisy (stochastic) setting ( $\sigma > 0$ ), Theorem 3.4 indicates that the dependencies on  $\kappa_y$  and  $1/\epsilon$  both become larger than the noiseless lower bound. Compared with the lower bound of  $\Omega(\sqrt{\kappa_y} \epsilon^{-2} + \kappa_y^{1/3} \sigma^2 \epsilon^{-4})$  in NC-SC minimax problems [37], we again find that the condition number dependency is provably larger in NC-SC bilevel problems. Now, we compare our stochastic NC-SC lower bound with the best-known upper bounds.

**Remark 3.2** (Known stochastic NC-SC upper bounds). *The current best upper bound for stochastic NC-SC bilevel problems is  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^9 \epsilon^{-4})$ , achieved by an HVP method [28]. If the estimator  $\hat{\nabla} g$  is mean-squared smooth, one can turn their upper bound on HVP calls to SFO calls by approximating the HVP oracle via finite difference of gradients [61]. Without the mean-squared smoothness assumption on  $\hat{\nabla} g$ , the best-known upper bound of first-order methods is  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{11} \epsilon^{-6})$  [14, 35]. Notably, significant gaps exist in the condition number dependency compared to our lower bound even when  $\bar{\kappa}_y = \kappa_y$ .*

## 4 Upper Bounds

We observe a significant gap between the current best upper bounds and the lower bounds we established in the previous section in the condition number dependency even for deterministic smooth NC-SC bilevel problems: Specifically, our lower bound is  $\Omega(\kappa_y^2 \epsilon^{-2})$ , while the state-of-the-art upper bound [14, 28] is  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^4 \epsilon^{-2})$ . In this section, we show that the upper bound achieved by fully first-order method in [14] can be improved to  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{7/2} \epsilon^{-2})$  by solving the lower-level problem with AGD [49]. Furthermore, we also obtain a  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{13/4} \epsilon^{-7/4})$  upper bound for second-order smooth NC-SC problems, using fully first-order oracles to achieve the same complexity given by the accelerated HVP-based method in [59].

## 4.1 Algorithm Overview

The main challenge of designing fully first-order method for bilevel optimization is that the algorithm only has access to first-order oracles of  $f$  and  $g$ , while the calculation of hyper-gradient  $\nabla F$  in Eq. (2) requires second-order information of  $g$ . To address this issue, we follow Kwon et al. [34] to use the following fully first-order estimator:

$$\nabla F_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla_x f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_\lambda^*(\mathbf{x})) + \lambda(\nabla_x g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_\lambda^*(\mathbf{x})) - \nabla_x g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))), \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathbf{y}_\lambda^*(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + \lambda g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')\}$ . Kwon et al. [34] showed that  $\nabla F_\lambda$  is a good approximation to  $\nabla F$  for a large penalty  $\lambda$ , as we recall below.

**Lemma 4.1** (Kwon et al. [34, Lemma 3.1]). *Let  $\lambda \geq 2L_1/\mu_y$ . For first-order smooth NC-SC bilevel problem  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}^{nc-sc}(L_0, L_1, L_2, \mu_y, \Delta)$ ,  $\nabla F_\lambda$  is well-defined and satisfies*

$$\|\nabla F_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x})\| \leq 8\bar{\kappa}_y^3 L_1/\lambda.$$

Based on the above lemma, Kwon et al. [34] proposed a fully first-order method that can find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point in  $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(\bar{\kappa}_y)\epsilon^{-3})$  first-order oracle calls. Later on, Chen et al. [14] proposed the Fully First-order Bilevel Approximation (F<sup>2</sup>BA) method that improved the complexity to  $\tilde{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^4\epsilon^{-2})$ . The F<sup>2</sup>BA method consists of two loops: (1) The outer loop performs gradient descent (GD) on  $\mathbf{x}$  using the hyper-gradient estimator  $\nabla F_\lambda$ , under the setting  $\lambda = \Omega(\epsilon^{-1})$  that ensures  $\|\nabla F_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \epsilon$ . (2) The inner loop computes the lower-level solutions  $\mathbf{y}_\lambda^*(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$  by GD and uses them to construct the estimator  $\nabla F_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ .

These loops introduce two sources of condition number dependency in the complexity: (1) The outer-loop complexity depends on  $L_F$ , the smoothness of the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x})$ , which further depends on  $\bar{\kappa}_y$ . (2) Both the computation of  $\mathbf{y}_\lambda^*(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})$  requires solving a strongly-convex sub-problem, whose complexity depends on  $\kappa_y$ . However, the lower-level GD sub-solver used in [14] has a suboptimal  $\tilde{O}(\kappa_y)$  complexity.

In this work, we obtain better upper bounds by replacing GD with AGD [49], which only requires  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\kappa_y})$  gradient steps to solve the strongly-convex lower-level problems. This naturally results in an improvement of a  $\sqrt{\kappa_y}$  factor in the total complexity. The procedure of AGD is presented in Algorithm 1, with its guarantee stated in Lemma 4.2.

---

### Algorithm 1 AGD ( $h, K, \mathbf{z}_0$ )

---

```

1:  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0 = \mathbf{z}_0$ 
2: for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$ 
3:    $\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k - \frac{1}{L} \nabla h(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k)$ 
4:    $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_{k+1} = \mathbf{z}_{k+1} + \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_h}-1}{\sqrt{\kappa_h}+1} (\mathbf{z}_{k+1} - \mathbf{z}_k)$ 
5: end for
6: return  $\mathbf{z}_K$ 
```

---

**Lemma 4.2** (Nesterov et al. [51, Theorem 2.2.4]). *Running Algorithm 1 on an  $L_h$ -gradient Lipschitz and  $\mu_h$ -strongly convex objective  $h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  outputs  $\mathbf{z}_K$  satisfying*

$$\|\mathbf{z}_K - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2 \leq (1 + \kappa_h) \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_h}}\right)^K \|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|^2,$$

where  $\mathbf{z}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d} h(\mathbf{z})$  and  $\kappa_h = L_h/\mu_h$  is the condition number of  $h$ .

## 4.2 Upper Bounds for First-order Smooth Problems

We present the F<sup>2</sup>BA<sup>+</sup> method in Algorithm 2 for NC-SC bilevel problems, which uses AGD to solve the lower-level problem in the F<sup>2</sup>BA method [14]. The analysis mainly follows that of [14] and relies on the following two lemmas. The first lemma gives the smoothness of  $F(\mathbf{x})$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** F<sup>2</sup>BA<sup>+</sup> ( $f, g, \eta_x, T, K, \mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{z}_0$ )

---

```

1:  $\mathbf{z}_0 = \mathbf{y}_0$ 
2: for  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$ 
3:    $\mathbf{z}_{t+1} = \text{AGD}(g(\mathbf{x}_t, \cdot), K, \mathbf{z}_t)$ 
4:    $\mathbf{y}_{t+1} = \text{AGD}(f(\mathbf{x}_t, \cdot) + \lambda g(\mathbf{x}_t, \cdot), K, \mathbf{y}_t)$ 
5:    $\hat{\nabla} F_\lambda(\mathbf{x}_t) = \nabla_x f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{y}_{t+1}) + \lambda(\nabla_x g(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \nabla_x g(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{z}_{t+1}))$ 
6:    $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_t - \eta_x \hat{\nabla} F_\lambda(\mathbf{x}_t)$ 
7: end for
8: return  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{out}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{x}_t$ 

```

---

**Lemma 4.3.** *For first-order smooth NC-SC bilevel problem  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{nc-sc}}(L_0, L_1, L_2, \mu_y, \Delta)$ , the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$  satisfies*

$$\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}')\| \leq L_F \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \quad (16)$$

where  $L_F = \mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^3 L_1)$  and  $\bar{\kappa}_y = \max\{L_0, L_1, L_2\}/\mu_y$ . In particular, if the lower-level function is quadratic and  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{nc-scq}}(L_1, \mu_y, \Delta)$ , we have  $L_F = \mathcal{O}(\kappa_y^2 L_1)$ , where  $\kappa_y = L_1/\mu_y$ .

*Proof.* In the general case,  $L_F = \mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^3 L_1)$  can be verified by Eq. (2). See, for example, [21, Lemma 2.2]. For quadratic lower-level problems defined in Eq. (4), we have  $F(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla_x f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})) - \mathbf{J}\mathbf{H}^{-1}\nabla_y f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$ . Then, from the facts  $\|\mathbf{J}\| \leq L_1$ ,  $\|\mathbf{H}^{-1}\| \leq 1/\mu_y$ , and  $\|\nabla \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \kappa_y$ , we can easily prove that  $L_F = \mathcal{O}(\kappa_y^2 L_1)$ .  $\square$

The second lemma from [14], states that if the lower-level solver achieves sufficient accuracy, then the outer loop of Algorithm 2 requires  $\mathcal{O}(L_F \Delta \epsilon^{-2})$  iterations to find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point.

**Lemma 4.4** (Chen et al. [14, Theorem 4.1]). *For first-order smooth NC-SC bilevel problem  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{nc-sc}}(L_0, L_1, L_2, \mu_y, \Delta)$ , if in each iteration  $t$  of Algorithm 2 the lower-level solver outputs  $\mathbf{z}_t^K$  and  $\mathbf{y}_t^K$  such that*

$$\|\mathbf{z}_{t+1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_{t+1} - \mathbf{y}_\lambda^*(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2 \leq \gamma \|\mathbf{z}_t - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{y}_\lambda^*(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2$$

with  $\gamma \lesssim \min\{1/2, \epsilon^2/(\bar{\kappa}_y^3 L_1^3)\}/\lambda^2$ , then setting  $\lambda \asymp L_1 \bar{\kappa}_y^3 \epsilon^{-1}$  and  $\eta_x \asymp 1/L_F$  can ensure the algorithm to find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of  $F(\mathbf{x})$  in  $T = \mathcal{O}(L_F \Delta \epsilon^{-2})$  outer-loop iterations.

Combining Lemma 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4, we can easily prove that the total complexity of F<sup>2</sup>BA<sup>+</sup> is  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sqrt{\kappa_y} L_F \Delta \epsilon^{-2})$ , where  $L_F = \mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^3 L_1)$  for general lower-level functions and  $L_F = \mathcal{O}(\kappa_y^2 L_1)$  for quadratic lower-level functions. We summarize the complexity of F<sup>2</sup>BA<sup>+</sup> in the following, which improves the  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa_y L_F \Delta \epsilon^{-2})$  complexity of F<sup>2</sup>BA [14] by a  $\sqrt{\kappa_y}$  factor due to the use of lower-level AGD.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Under the setting of Lemma 4.4, Algorithm 2 can find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of  $F(\mathbf{x})$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{7/2} L_1 \Delta \epsilon^{-2})$  first-order oracle complexity. In particular, if the lower-level function  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is quadratic as in Eq. (4), the complexity can be refined to  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa_y^{5/2} L_1 \Delta \epsilon^{-2})$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that  $\mathbf{y}_\lambda^*(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + \lambda g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . For any  $\lambda \geq 2L_1/\mu_y$ , we know that sub-problem for variable  $\mathbf{y}$  is  $2\lambda L_1$ -smooth and  $\lambda\mu_y/2$ -strongly convex. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 4.2 with condition number  $4L_1/\mu_y$ , in conjunction with 4.4, to prove the upper complexity bound of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa_y L_F \Delta \epsilon^{-2})$ , where  $L_F$  is given by Lemma 4.3.  $\square$

Compared with the  $\Omega(\kappa_y^2 \epsilon^{-2})$  lower bound in Theorem 3.1 when  $p = 1$ , our upper bounds in Theorem 4.1 still have a gap of  $\kappa_y^{3/2}$  even when  $\bar{\kappa}_y = \kappa_y$  for general lower-level problems, and a gap of  $\sqrt{\kappa_y}$  for quadratic lower-level problems.



---

**Algorithm 3** AccF<sup>2</sup>BA<sup>+</sup>

---

```
1:  $\mathbf{z}_0 = \mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{x}_{-1} = \mathbf{x}_0$ 
2: while  $t < T$ 
3:    $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t = \mathbf{x}_t + (1 - \theta)(\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_{t-1})$ 
4:    $\mathbf{z}_{t+1} = \text{AGD}(g(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t, \cdot), K_t, \mathbf{z}_t)$ 
5:    $\mathbf{y}_{t+1} = \text{AGD}(f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t, \cdot) + \lambda g(\mathbf{x}_t, \cdot), K_t, \mathbf{y}_t)$ 
6:    $\hat{\nabla} F_\lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t) = \nabla_x f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t, \mathbf{y}_{t+1}) + \lambda(\nabla_x g(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t, \mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \nabla_x g(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t, \mathbf{z}_{t+1}))$ 
7:    $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t - \eta_x \hat{\nabla} F_\lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t)$ 
8:    $t = t + 1$ 
9:   if  $t \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 \geq B^2$ 
10:     $t = 0, \mathbf{x}_{-1} = \mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}_t + \xi_t \mathbf{1}_{\|\hat{\nabla} F_\lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t)\| \leq \frac{B}{2\eta_x}}, \text{ where } \xi_t \sim \mathbb{B}(r)$ 
11:  end if
12: end while
13:  $T_0 = \arg \min_{\lfloor \frac{T}{2} \rfloor \leq t \leq T-1} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\|$ 
14: return  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{out}} = \frac{1}{T_0+1} \sum_{t=0}^{T_0} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t$ 
```

---

### 4.3 Upper Bounds for Second-order Smooth Problems

Now, we consider second-order smooth NC-SC bilevel problems, where the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x})$  is proved to have Lipschitz continuous Hessians.

**Lemma 4.5** (Huang et al. [26, Lemma 2.4]). *For second-order smooth NC-SC bilevel problem  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}^{nc-sc}(L_0, \dots, L_3, \mu_y, \Delta)$ , the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$  satisfies*

$$\|\nabla^2 F(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla^2 F(\mathbf{x}')\| \leq \rho_F \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \quad (17)$$

where  $\rho_F = \mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^5 L_2)$  and  $\bar{\kappa}_y = \max\{L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3\}/\mu_y$ . In particular, if the lower-level function is quadratic and  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}^{nc-scq}(L_1, L_2, \mu_y, \Delta)$ , we have  $\rho_F = \mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^3 L_2)$ .

Following [50], we target to find stronger solutions known as second-order stationary points for Hessian smooth nonconvex functions. Compared with first-order stationary points in Definition 2.8, the second-order stationary points in the following Definition 4.1 exclude saddle points and can be equivalent to global minimizers in certain applications [20].

**Definition 4.1.** *We call a point  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  an  $\epsilon$ -second-order stationary point of  $F$  if*

$$\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^2 F(\mathbf{x}) \succeq -\sqrt{\rho_F \epsilon} \mathbf{I}_d$$

For second-order smooth problems, Chen et al. [14] proposed AccF<sup>2</sup>BA to achieve a  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\kappa_y \sqrt{L_F} \rho_F^{1/4} \epsilon^{-7/4})$  upper bound by applying nonconvex AGD [10, 30, 38] in the upper level. But again, their lower-level GD sub-solver is suboptimal. Based on this observation, we propose AccF<sup>2</sup>BA<sup>+</sup> in Algorithm 3, which replaces the GD sub-solver in AccF<sup>2</sup>BA with AGD. By keeping the outer loop unchanged, we can directly apply the results from [14] to obtain the following guarantee of the outer loop, provided that the lower-level sub-solver achieves sufficient accuracy.

**Lemma 4.6.** [14, Theorem 5.2] *Let  $\sqrt{\epsilon \rho_F} \leq L_F$ . For second-order smooth NC-SC bilevel problem  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}^{nc-sc}(L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3, \mu_y, \Delta)$ , if in each iteration  $t$  of Algorithm 3 the lower-level solver outputs  $\mathbf{z}_{t+1}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_{t+1}$  such that*

$$\|\mathbf{z}_{t+1} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_{t+1} - \mathbf{y}_\lambda^*(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2 \leq \gamma \|\mathbf{z}_t - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{y}_\lambda^*(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2$$

with  $\gamma \lesssim \text{poly}(\epsilon)/\text{poly}(\log d_x, \bar{\kappa}_y, L_1)$ , then setting the hyper-parameters as

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda &\asymp \max\{L_1 \bar{\kappa}_y^3/\epsilon, \bar{\kappa}_y^{7/2} \sqrt{L_2/\epsilon}\}, \quad \eta_x \asymp 1/L_F, \quad \chi \asymp \log(d_x/\delta\epsilon), \\ \theta &\asymp \sqrt{\eta_x}(L_F \epsilon)^{1/4}, \quad T \asymp \chi/\theta, \quad B \asymp \sqrt{\epsilon/\rho_F}/\chi^2, \quad \text{and} \quad r \asymp \epsilon\end{aligned}$$

ensures the algorithm to output an  $\epsilon$ -second-order stationary point with probability  $1 - \delta$  in no more than  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{L_F} \rho_F^{1/4} \Delta \epsilon^{-7/4} \log^6(d_x/\delta\epsilon))$  steps of update in the upper-level variable  $\mathbf{x}$ .

Now, by combining Lemma 4.2, 4.5, and 4.6, we naturally arrive at the following theorem for the total complexity of  $\text{AccF}^2\text{BA}^+$ .

**Theorem 4.2.** *Under the same setting of Lemma 4.6, Algorithm 3 can find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of  $F(\mathbf{x})$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{13/4} \sqrt{L_1} L_2^{1/4} \Delta \epsilon^{-7/4})$  first-order oracle complexity. In particular, if the lower-level function  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is quadratic as in Eq. (4), the complexity can be refined to  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{9/4} \sqrt{L_1} L_2^{1/4} \Delta \epsilon^{-7/4})$ .*

*Proof.* By combining Lemma 4.2 and 4.6, we know that the total complexity of Algorithm 3 is no more than  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\kappa_y} L_F \rho_F^{1/4} \Delta \epsilon^{-7/4} \log^6(d_x/\delta\epsilon))$ . Then we can obtain the claimed complexity by substituting the value of  $L_F = \mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^3 L_1)$ ,  $\rho_F = \mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^5 L_2)$  for general lower-level problems and  $L_F = \mathcal{O}(\kappa_y^2 L_1)$ ,  $\rho_F = \mathcal{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^3 L_2)$  according to Lemma 4.3 and 4.5.  $\square$

Our upper bounds in Theorem 4.2 still have gaps compared to the lower bound of  $\Omega(\kappa_y^{25/14} \epsilon^{-12/7})$  in Theorem 3.1 when  $p = 2$ . Even assuming  $\bar{\kappa}_y = \kappa_y$ , there remains a gap of  $\kappa_y^{41/28} \epsilon^{-1/28} \approx \kappa_y^{1.464} \epsilon^{-0.036}$  for general lower-level problems, and a gap of  $\kappa_y^{13/28} \epsilon^{-1/28} \approx \kappa_y^{0.464} \epsilon^{-0.036}$  for quadratic lower-level problems.




Figure 2: Performances of different algorithms when learning the optimal regularization.

#### 4.4 Numerical Experiments

Our improved upper bounds are simply obtained by plugging the guarantee of AGD into existing analysis of fully first-order methods [14]. In this section, we conduct experiments to verify the benefit of using AGD to solve the lower-level problems.

Following Chen et al. [14], Grazi et al. [23], Ji et al. [28], Liu et al. [41], we consider the “learn-to-regularize” problem on the “20 Newsgroup” dataset, which solves the following bilevel optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \ell_i^{\text{val}}(\mathbf{Y}), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{Y} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i^{\text{tr}}(\mathbf{Y}) + \|\mathbf{W}_x \mathbf{Y}\|_F^2,$$

where  $\mathbf{W}_x = \text{diag}(\sqrt{\exp(\mathbf{x})})$ ,  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$  is the parameter matrix of a multi-class logistic model for  $p$  features and  $q$  classes,  $\{\ell_i^{\text{val}}\}_{i=1}^m$  and  $\{\ell_i^{\text{tr}}\}_{i=1}^n$  are the validation and training loss on every sample each sample with

$m, n$  being the size of the datasets. In our experiments, we have  $p = 130, 107$ ,  $q = 20$ , and  $m = n = 5, 657$ . We compare six algorithms, including a baseline without learning the regularization “w/o Reg”, the HVP-based method AID [28], two gradient-based methods F<sup>2</sup>BA and AccF<sup>2</sup>BA [14], and our improved versions with lower-level AGD denoted by F<sup>2</sup>BA<sup>+</sup> and AccF<sup>2</sup>BA<sup>+</sup>. The experiment result is presented in Figure 2. From the figure, we can observe a significant gain by solving the lower-level problem with AGD, confirming our theoretical claims.

## 5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, we provide lower bounds and accelerated fully first-order algorithms in NC-SC bilevel optimization. For deterministic first-order smooth problems, we prove an  $\Omega(\kappa_y^2 \epsilon^{-2})$  lower bound and a  $\tilde{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{7/2} \epsilon^{-2})$  upper bound. For deterministic second-order smooth problems, we prove an  $\Omega(\kappa_y^{25/14} \epsilon^{-12/7})$  lower bound and a  $\tilde{O}(\bar{\kappa}_y^{13/4} \epsilon^{-7/4})$  upper bound. We also extend our lower bound for many other setups, including deterministic arbitrarily smooth NC-SC problems, deterministic smooth (S)C-SC problems, and stochastic smooth NC-SC problems, demonstrating the gaps between existing upper bounds.

Definitely, closing the gaps between our lower and upper bounds is an important future work and may require new techniques. It would also be interesting to study other setups, such as mean-squared smooth problems [15, 16, 31, 60, 61], structured NC-NC problems [13, 29, 36], and zeroth-order bilevel optimization [2, 3] in the future.

## Acknowledgments

We greatly thank Jeongyeol Kwon for his helpful comments on the preliminary version of this manuscript.

## References

- [1] Naman Agarwal and Elad Hazan. Lower bounds for higher-order convex optimization. In *COLT*, pages 774–792. PMLR, 2018.
- [2] Alireza Aghasi and Saeed Ghadimi. Fully zeroth-order bilevel programming via gaussian smoothing. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 205(2):31, 2025.
- [3] Alireza Aghasi, Jeongyeol Kwon, and Saeed Ghadimi. Optimal zeroth-order bilevel optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.03646*, 2025.
- [4] Michael Arbel and Julien Mairal. Amortized implicit differentiation for stochastic bilevel optimization. In *ICLR*, 2022.
- [5] Yossi Arjevani, Ohad Shamir, and Ron Shiff. Oracle complexity of second-order methods for smooth convex optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 178(1):327–360, 2019.
- [6] Yossi Arjevani, Yair Carmon, John C. Duchi, Dylan J. Foster, Ayush Sekhari, and Karthik Sridharan. Second-order information in non-convex stochastic optimization: Power and limitations. In *COLT*, 2020.
- [7] Yossi Arjevani, Yair Carmon, John C. Duchi, Dylan J. Foster, Nathan Srebro, and Blake Woodworth. Lower bounds for non-convex stochastic optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 199(1):165–214, 2023.
- [8] Fan Bao, Guoqiang Wu, Chongxuan Li, Jun Zhu, and Bo Zhang. Stability and generalization of bilevel programming in hyperparameter optimization. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [9] Michael Brückner and Tobias Scheffer. Stackelberg games for adversarial prediction problems. In *SIGKDD*, 2011.
- [10] Yair Carmon, John C. Duchi, Oliver Hinder, and Aaron Sidford. “convex until proven guilty”: Dimension-free acceleration of gradient descent on non-convex functions. In *ICML*, 2017.

- [11] Yair Carmon, John C. Duchi, Oliver Hinder, and Aaron Sidford. Lower bounds for finding stationary points I. *Mathematical Programming*, 184(1):71–120, 2020.
- [12] Yair Carmon, John C. Duchi, Oliver Hinder, and Aaron Sidford. Lower bounds for finding stationary points II: first-order methods. *Mathematical Programming*, 185(1):315–355, 2021.
- [13] Lesi Chen, Jing Xu, and Jingzhao Zhang. On finding small hyper-gradients in bilevel optimization: Hardness results and improved analysis. In *COLT*, 2024.
- [14] Lesi Chen, Yaohua Ma, and Jingzhao Zhang. Near-optimal nonconvex-strongly-convex bilevel optimization with fully first-order oracles. *JMLR*, 2025.
- [15] Tianshu Chu, Dachuan Xu, Wei Yao, and Jin Zhang. SPABA: A single-loop and probabilistic stochastic bilevel algorithm achieving optimal sample complexity. In *ICML*, 2024.
- [16] Mathieu Dagr  ou, Pierre Ablin, Samuel Vaiter, and Thomas Moreau. A framework for bilevel optimization that enables stochastic and global variance reduction algorithms. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [17] Mathieu Dagr  ou, Thomas Moreau, Samuel Vaiter, and Pierre Ablin. A lower bound and a near-optimal algorithm for bilevel empirical risk minimization. In *AISTATS*, 2024.
- [18] Cong Fang, Chris Junchi Li, Zhouchen Lin, and Tong Zhang. Spider: Near-optimal non-convex optimization via stochastic path-integrated differential estimator. In *NeurIPS*, 2018.
- [19] Luca Franceschi, Paolo Frasconi, Saverio Salzo, Riccardo Gra  zi, and Massimiliano Pontil. Bilevel programming for hyperparameter optimization and meta-learning. In *ICML*, 2018.
- [20] Rong Ge, Furong Huang, Chi Jin, and Yang Yuan. Escaping from saddle points—online stochastic gradient for tensor decomposition. In *COLT*, 2015.
- [21] Saeed Ghadimi and Mengdi Wang. Approximation methods for bilevel programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.02246*, 2018.
- [22] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(11):139–144, 2020.
- [23] Riccardo Gra  zi, Luca Franceschi, Massimiliano Pontil, and Saverio Salzo. On the iteration complexity of hypergradient computation. In *ICML*, 2020.
- [24] Yuze Han, Guangzeng Xie, and Zhihua Zhang. Lower complexity bounds of finite-sum optimization problems: The results and construction. *JMLR*, 25(2):1–86, 2024.
- [25] Mingyi Hong, Hoi-To Wai, Zhaoran Wang, and Zhuoran Yang. A two-timescale stochastic algorithm framework for bilevel optimization: Complexity analysis and application to actor-critic. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 33(1):147–180, 2023.
- [26] Minhui Huang, Xuxing Chen, Kaiyi Ji, Shiqian Ma, and Lifeng Lai. Efficiently escaping saddle points in bilevel optimization. *JMLR*, 26(1):1–61, 2025.
- [27] Kaiyi Ji and Yingbin Liang. Lower bounds and accelerated algorithms for bilevel optimization. *JMLR*, 24(22):1–56, 2022.
- [28] Kaiyi Ji, Junjie Yang, and Yingbin Liang. Bilevel optimization: Convergence analysis and enhanced design. In *ICML*, 2021.
- [29] Liuyuan Jiang, Quan Xiao, Lisha Chen, and Tianyi Chen. Beyond value functions: Single-loop bilevel optimization under flatness conditions. In *NeurIPS*, 2025.
- [30] Chi Jin, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Michael I. Jordan. Accelerated gradient descent escapes saddle points faster than gradient descent. In *COLT*, 2018.

- [31] Prashant Khanduri, Siliang Zeng, Mingyi Hong, Hoi-To Wai, Zhaoran Wang, and Zhuoran Yang. A near-optimal algorithm for stochastic bilevel optimization via double-momentum. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [32] Thomas N. Kipf and Max Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *ICLR*, 2016.
- [33] Vijay Konda and John Tsitsiklis. Actor-critic algorithms. *NeurIPS*, 12, 1999.
- [34] Jeongyeol Kwon, Dohyun Kwon, Stephen Wright, and Robert D. Nowak. A fully first-order method for stochastic bilevel optimization. In *ICML*, 2023.
- [35] Jeongyeol Kwon, Dohyun Kwon, and Hanbaek Lyu. On the complexity of first-order methods in stochastic bilevel optimization. In *ICML*, 2024.
- [36] Jeongyeol Kwon, Dohyun Kwon, Stephen Wright, and Robert D. Nowak. On penalty methods for nonconvex bilevel optimization and first-order stochastic approximation. In *ICLR*, 2024.
- [37] Haochuan Li, Yi Tian, Jingzhao Zhang, and Ali Jadbabaie. Complexity lower bounds for nonconvex-strongly-concave min-max optimization. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [38] Huan Li and Zhouchen Lin. Restarted nonconvex accelerated gradient descent: No more polylogarithmic factor in the in the  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-7/4})$  complexity. *JMLR*, 2023.
- [39] Zhize Li, Hongyan Bao, Xiangliang Zhang, and Peter Richtárik. PAGE: A simple and optimal probabilistic gradient estimator for nonconvex optimization. In *ICML*, 2021.
- [40] Tianyi Lin, Chi Jin, and Michael I. Jordan. Near-optimal algorithms for minimax optimization. In *COLT*, 2020.
- [41] Bo Liu, Mao Ye, Stephen Wright, Peter Stone, and Qiang Liu. Bome! bilevel optimization made easy: A simple first-order approach. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [42] Risheng Liu, Pan Mu, Xiaoming Yuan, Shangzhi Zeng, and Jin Zhang. A generic first-order algorithmic framework for bi-level programming beyond lower-level singleton. In *ICML*, 2020.
- [43] Risheng Liu, Xuan Liu, Xiaoming Yuan, Shangzhi Zeng, and Jin Zhang. A value-function-based interior-point method for non-convex bi-level optimization. In *ICML*, 2021.
- [44] Risheng Liu, Yaohua Liu, Shangzhi Zeng, and Jin Zhang. Towards gradient-based bilevel optimization with non-convex followers and beyond. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [45] Zhaosong Lu and Sanyou Mei. First-order penalty methods for bilevel optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 34(2):1937–1969, 2024.
- [46] Matthew Mackay, Paul Vicol, Jonathan Lorraine, David Duvenaud, and Roger Grosse. Self-tuning networks: Bilevel optimization of hyperparameters using structured best-response functions. In *ICLR*, 2019.
- [47] Arkadi Nemirovski. Prox-method with rate of convergence  $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$  for variational inequalities with lipschitz continuous monotone operators and smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 15(1):229–251, 2004.
- [48] Arkadij Semenovič Nemirovskij and David Borisovich Yudin. Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization. 1983.
- [49] Yurii Nesterov. A method for solving the convex programming problem with convergence rate  $O(1/k^2)$ . In *Dokl akad nauk Sssr*, volume 269, page 543, 1983.
- [50] Yurii Nesterov and Boris T Polyak. Cubic regularization of newton method and its global performance. *Mathematical programming*, 108(1):177–205, 2006.

- [51] Yurii Nesterov et al. Lectures on convex optimization. 137, 2018.
- [52] Yuyuan Ouyang and Yangyang Xu. Lower complexity bounds of first-order methods for convex-concave bilinear saddle-point problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 185(1):1–35, 2021.
- [53] Rui Pan, Jipeng Zhang, Xingyuan Pan, Renjie Pi, Xiaoyu Wang, and Tong Zhang. ScaleBiO: Scalable bilevel optimization for llm data reweighting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19976*, 2024.
- [54] Aravind Rajeswaran, Chelsea Finn, Sham M. Kakade, and Sergey Levine. Meta-learning with implicit gradients. In *NeurIPS*, volume 32, 2019.
- [55] Han Shen and Tianyi Chen. On penalty-based bilevel gradient descent method. In *ICML*, 2023.
- [56] Rayadurgam Srikant and Lei Ying. Communication networks: An optimization, control and stochastic networks perspective. 2014.
- [57] Heinrich von Stackelberg. Marktform und gleichgewicht. 1934.
- [58] Nuozhou Wang, Junyu Zhang, and Shuzhong Zhang. Efficient first order method for saddle point problems with higher order smoothness. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 34(4):3342–3370, 2024.
- [59] Haikuo Yang, Luo Luo, Chris Junchi Li, and Michael I Jordan. Accelerating inexact hypergradient descent for bilevel optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.00126*, 2023.
- [60] Junjie Yang, Kaiyi Ji, and Yingbin Liang. Provably faster algorithms for bilevel optimization. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [61] Yifan Yang, Peiyao Xiao, and Kaiyi Ji. Achieving  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1.5})$  complexity in hessian/jacobian-free stochastic bilevel optimization. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [62] Yongyi Yang, Tang Liu, Yangkun Wang, Jinjing Zhou, Quan Gan, Zhewei Wei, Zheng Zhang, Zengfeng Huang, and David Wipf. Graph neural networks inspired by classical iterative algorithms. In *ICML*, 2021.
- [63] Sihan Zeng and Thinh Doan. Fast two-time-scale stochastic gradient method with applications in reinforcement learning. In *COLT*, 2024.
- [64] Sihan Zeng, Thinh Doan, and Justin Romberg. A two-time-scale stochastic optimization framework with applications in control and reinforcement learning. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 34(1):946–976, 2024.
- [65] Junyu Zhang, Mingyi Hong, and Shuzhong Zhang. On lower iteration complexity bounds for the convex concave saddle point problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 194(1):901–935, 2022.
- [66] Siqi Zhang, Junchi Yang, Cristóbal Guzmán, Negar Kiyavash, and Niao He. The complexity of nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax optimization. In *UAI*, 2021.

## A Examples with Lower-Level Quadratics

This section provides a collection of (S)C-SC and NC-SC bilevel optimization applications in which the lower-level function is quadratic.

### A.1 Convex-Strongly-Convex Examples

The (S)C-SC setting is often assumed without any examples in the literature [21, 25]. To the best of our knowledge, the only example is a fair resource allocation problem [56] given by Ji and Liang [27]. In the following, we provide several machine learning problems that provably satisfy the assumptions, which verify the rationality of assuming the (strong) convexity of the hyper-objective in previous work [21, 25].

Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b})$  denote a dataset with  $n$  samples, where each row of  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  represents a  $d$ -dimensional feature of a sample, and the corresponding element in  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  represents the corresponding label. We consider the following examples.

**Example A.1.** Given  $T$  different tasks, with each task  $i$  corresponds to a training set  $(\mathbf{A}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathbf{b}_i^{\text{tr}})$  and a testing set  $(\mathbf{A}_i^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{b}_i^{\text{test}})$ . Define the covariance matrices of each task as  $\mathbf{G}_i^{\text{test}} = (\mathbf{A}_i^{\text{test}})^\top \mathbf{A}_i^{\text{test}}$  and  $\mathbf{G}_i^{\text{tr}} = (\mathbf{A}_i^{\text{tr}})^\top \mathbf{A}_i^{\text{tr}}$ . We consider the meta-learning for linear regression [54]:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \quad & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}_i^{\text{tr}} \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{b}_i^{\text{tr}}\|^2, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}_i^{\text{test}} \mathbf{y}' - \mathbf{b}_i^{\text{test}}\|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{y}' - \mathbf{x}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In this example, the hyper-objective  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$  is (strongly) convex.

*Proof.* The lower-level solution has a closed form

$$\mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{G}_i^{\text{test}} + \lambda \mathbf{I}_d)^{-1} \left( \lambda \mathbf{x} + (\mathbf{A}_i^{\text{test}})^\top \mathbf{b}_i^{\text{test}} \right).$$

Plugging the above equation into the upper-level function gives the closed form of  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ , which is a convex quadratic function because since its Hessian matrix is positive (semi)definite:

$$\mathbf{H} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \lambda^2 (\mathbf{G}_i^{\text{test}} + \lambda \mathbf{I}_d)^{-1} \mathbf{G}_i^{\text{tr}} (\mathbf{G}_i^{\text{test}} + \lambda \mathbf{I}_d)^{-1} \succeq \mathbf{O}_d.$$

□

**Example A.2.** Given a dataset  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b})$  with  $n$  samples, we consider the Stackelberg game [9] for robust linear regression. In this model, the learner's goal is to learn to good linear predictor  $\mathbf{x}$  with small error, but the label  $\mathbf{y}$  is modified by an adversarial data provider, whose goal is to make the loss (per sample weighted by  $w_i^2$ ) high, with a cost to modify the original label  $\mathbf{b}$ . Let  $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(w_1, \dots, w_n)$ . It can be formulated as the following bilevel problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathbb{R}^n} -\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}')\|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{y}' - \mathbf{b})\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In this example, the hyper-objective  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$  is (strongly) convex if  $\lambda > 1$ .

*Proof.* When  $\lambda > 1$ , the lower-level solution has a closed form

$$\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{D}(\lambda \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x})}{\lambda - 1}.$$

Plugging the above equation into the upper-level function gives the closed form of  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ , which is a convex quadratic function because since its Hessian matrix is positive (semi)definite:

$$\mathbf{H} = \frac{1}{(\lambda - 1)^2} \mathbf{A}^\top ((\lambda - 1)^2 \mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{D}_n^2) \mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{O}_d.$$

□

**Example A.3.** Yang et al. [62] reformulates graph convolution network (GCN) training [32] into a bilevel optimization problem, where the lower-level problem is to find the optimal node embeddings that minimize a graph energy function, and the upper-level problem is the loss of the embedding. For the node regression problem, we have the dataset  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b})$  with  $n$  nodes. The bilevel problem is:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{b}\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{L} \mathbf{y}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{L}$  is the graph Laplacian matrix. In this example, the hyper-objective  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}))$  is (strongly) convex if  $\lambda > 0$ .

*Proof.* When  $\lambda > 0$ , the lower-level solution has a closed form

$$\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{I}_n + \lambda \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}.$$

Plugging the above equation into the upper-level function gives the closed form of  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ , which is a convex quadratic function because since its Hessian matrix is positive (semi)definite:

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{I}_n + \lambda \mathbf{L})^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_n + \lambda \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{O}_d.$$

□

## A.2 Nonconvex-Strongly-Convex Examples

The NC-SC bilevel problems have many applications in the actor-critic method [33], which is a class of important algorithms in reinforcement learning. For this algorithm class, there is an actor in the upper level that optimizes a (typically nonconvex) cost function to select a good policy, and a critic in the lower level that evaluates by estimating the Q-function. The Q-function can be calculated based on the Bellman equation, which corresponds to solving a strongly convex function in the basic linear Markov decision process (MDP) setup.

Formally, we define the MDP as a tuple with five elements  $(S, A, \gamma, P, R)$ , where  $S$  is the state space,  $A$  is the action space,  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  is the discount factor of the rewards,  $P$  defines the transition kernel such that  $P(s' | s, a)$  denotes the probability of transitioning to state  $s'$  after taking action  $a$  in state  $s$ , and  $R$  defines the reward function such that  $R(s, a)$  denotes the immediate reward received after taking action  $a$  in state  $s$ . Let  $Q^\pi$  denote the Q-function for policy  $\pi$ . Under the linear setup,  $Q^\pi$  is assumed to have a linear representation  $Q^\pi(s, a) = \langle \theta^\pi, \phi(s, a) \rangle$ , where  $\theta^\pi \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the weight vector of parameters and  $\phi(s, a) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the feature vector for the state-action pair  $(s, a)$ . Then we can show that the induced bilevel optimization problem is nonconvex-strongly-convex with a quadratic lower-level problem.

**Example A.4** (Actor-critic for linear MDP). Let the initial state  $s_0$  be drawn from a fixed distribution  $\rho_0$ , and let  $\Pi \subset \mathbb{R}^{|S| \times |A|}$  be the policy space. We consider the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \quad & \sum_{a \in A} Q^\pi(s_0, a) \pi(a | s_0) \rho_0(s_0). \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Q^\pi(s, a) = R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in S} \sum_{a \in A} Q^\pi(s', a) P(s' | s, a) \pi(a | s). \end{aligned}$$

Using linear function approximation to  $Q^\pi$ , the lower-level function is a linear system in  $\theta^\pi$ , which can also be reformulated as a equivalent (strongly) convex quadratic optimization.

There are many similar examples in reinforcement learning, where the lower-level problem is exactly a linear system using linear function approximation. Interested readers can refer to references [25, 63, 64].



## B Proof of Lemma 3.3

To prove the result, we first recall the following fact about the matrix  $\mathbf{A}_K$ .

**Lemma B.1** (Li et al. [37, Lemma 7]). *Let  $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{I}_K/K^2 + \mathbf{A}_K)^{-1}$ . If  $K \geq 10$ , we have for all  $i = 1, \dots, K$  that*

$$0.1K \leq B_{1,i} \leq 20K.$$

Now, we give the proof of Lemma 3.3.

*Proof of Lemma 3.3.* Because the lower-level function  $\bar{g}^{\text{sc}}$  is separable in  $\mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathbf{z}$ , it is easy to see that  $\mathbf{z}^*(\mathbf{x}) = K^2\mathbf{x}$ , and  $\mathbf{y}^*(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{y}_*^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \mathbf{y}_*^{(T-1)}(\mathbf{x}))$  satisfies

$$\mathbf{y}_*^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{B}(x_i\mathbf{e}_1 - x_{i+1}\mathbf{e}_K), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, T-1.$$

Note that  $B_{1,K} = B_{K,1}$  and  $B_{1,1} = B_{K,K}$ . We have

$$H(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \frac{a_K}{2} \cdot K^4(x_i^2 + x_{i+1}^2) + \frac{b_K}{2} \cdot K^2(B_{1,1}x_i^2 - 2B_{1,n}x_ix_{i+1} + B_{1,1}x_{i+1}^2). \quad (18)$$

According to the above equation, we can let  $H(\mathbf{x})$  be equivalent to Eq. (12) by setting

$$a_K = \frac{1}{K} \left(1 - \frac{B_{1,1}}{B_{1,K}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad b_K = \frac{K}{B_{1,K}}. \quad (19)$$

Finally, by Lemma B.1 it is easy to see that the ranges of  $a_K$  and  $b_K$  satisfy that

$$|a_K| \leq 20 \quad \text{and} \quad |b_K| \leq 10.$$

□

## C Proof of Theorem 3.1

*Proof.* From Lemma 3.2, we know that the hard instance we construct has  $\bar{\ell}_1$ -Lipschitz continuous gradients if we set  $\nu r^{3-p} \leq 1$ , where  $\bar{\ell}_1 := 124 + \nu r^{3-p}\ell_1$ . When  $T \geq 2$ , we let  $m = 2T + K(T-1)$  and  $n = T(K+1) - K$  be the dimensions of  $\bar{f}^{\text{nc-sc}}, \bar{g}^{\text{sc}}$  and effective lower bound dimension, respectively. We have  $n \geq m$ . Let  $\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ . For any given  $L_1 \geq \mu_y > 0$ , we define the following rescaled and rotated functions  $f, g : \mathbb{R}^{6n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$f(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{L_1\beta^2}{\bar{\ell}_1} \bar{f}^{\text{nc-sc}} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{w}}{\beta} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad g(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{L_1\beta^2}{\bar{\ell}_1} \bar{g}^{\text{sc}} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{w}}{\beta} \right) \quad (20)$$

to ensure that both  $f$  and  $g$  have  $L_1$ -Lipschitz continuous gradients for any  $\beta > 0$ , where the matrix  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{6n} \times \mathbb{R}^m$  satisfies  $\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_m$  and is defined as  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{E}$ , where

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}_x & & \\ & \mathbf{P}_z & \\ & & \mathbf{P}_y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_x \mathbf{E}_x & & \\ & \mathbf{U}_z \mathbf{E}_x & \\ & & \mathbf{U}_y \mathbf{E}_y \end{bmatrix} \quad (21)$$

In the above, we let  $\mathbf{E}_x \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times T}, \mathbf{E}_y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times K(T-1)}$  be

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_x &= (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_{K+2}, \mathbf{e}_{2K+3}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{n-(K+1)}, \mathbf{e}_n) \\ \text{and } \mathbf{E}_y &= (\mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{K+1}, \mathbf{e}_{K+3}, \mathbf{e}_{K+4}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{2(K+1)}, \mathbf{e}_{2K+4}, \mathbf{e}_{2K+5}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{T(K+1)}), \end{aligned}$$

respectively, and adversarially select  $\mathbf{U}_x, \mathbf{U}_z, \mathbf{U}_y \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times n}$  as three matrices with orthogonal columns  $(\mathbf{u}_x^0, \dots, \mathbf{u}_x^n), (\mathbf{u}_z^0, \dots, \mathbf{u}_z^n)$ , and  $(\mathbf{u}_y^0, \dots, \mathbf{u}_y^n)$  according to the procedure below:

1. Pick  $(\mathbf{u}_x^0, \mathbf{u}_z^0, \mathbf{u}_y^0)$  as three arbitrary unit vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ . At the initialization  $\mathbf{w}^0 = (\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{z}^0, \mathbf{y}^0) = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$ , we know from the zero-chain structure of Eq. (8) that the oracle response  $\mathbb{O}(\mathbf{w}^0)$  only depends on  $(\mathbf{u}_x^0, \mathbf{u}_z^0, \mathbf{u}_y^0)$ , which is already fixed. Since the algorithm is deterministic, we know the next query  $\mathbf{w}^1 = (\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{y}^1, \mathbf{z}^1)$  is also fixed.
2. For any  $t = 1, \dots, n$ , we repeat the following process: We compute  $\mathbf{w}^t = (\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)$  from the algorithm, and pick  $\mathbf{u}_x^t, \mathbf{u}_z^t$  and  $\mathbf{u}_y^t$  as the unit vectors satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{u}_x^t, \mathbf{u}_x^i \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{u}_z^t, \mathbf{u}_z^i \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}_y^t, \mathbf{u}_y^i \rangle = 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, t-1; \\ \text{and } \langle \mathbf{u}_x^t, \mathbf{x}^i \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{u}_z^t, \mathbf{z}^i \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}_y^t, \mathbf{y}^i \rangle = 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, t; \end{aligned}$$

We know such vectors  $\mathbf{u}_x^t, \mathbf{u}_z^t$ , and  $\mathbf{u}_y^t$  always exist in the space  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  since  $2t-1 < 2n$ . Assuming that the subsequent construction will always ensure that all the vectors  $(\mathbf{u}_x^{t+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_x^n)$ ,  $(\mathbf{u}_z^{t+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_z^n)$ , and  $(\mathbf{u}_y^{t+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_y^n)$  are orthogonal to  $\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{z}^t$ , and  $\mathbf{y}^t$ , respectively. we know from the zero-chain structure of Eq. (8) that the oracle response  $\mathbb{O}(\mathbf{w}^t)$  only depends on  $(\mathbf{u}_x^0, \dots, \mathbf{u}_x^t)$ ,  $(\mathbf{u}_y^0, \dots, \mathbf{u}_y^t)$ , and  $(\mathbf{u}_z^0, \dots, \mathbf{u}_z^t)$ , which are already fixed. Since the algorithm is deterministic, it means that the next query  $\mathbf{w}^{t+1}$  is also fixed.

Let  $n' = n - (K+1) = (T-1)(K+1) - K = \Omega(KT)$ . From the above procedure, any first-order deterministic algorithm with  $t \leq n'$  must satisfy  $\langle \mathbf{u}_x^n, \mathbf{x}^t \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}_x^{n'}, \mathbf{x}^t \rangle = 0$ . We also choose  $K = \left\lfloor \sqrt{L_1 / (\bar{\ell}_1 \mu_y)} \right\rfloor$  to ensure that  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})$  is  $\mu_y$ -strongly convex jointly in  $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})$ . If  $\mu_y \lesssim L_1$  then we have  $K \geq 10$ , which satisfies the condition of Lemma B.1. Combining Lemma 3.3, we know the hyper-objective after our rescaling and rotation is

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{L_1 \beta^2}{\bar{\ell}_1} \bar{f}_{\nu, r}^{\text{nc}}(K^{3/2} \mathbf{P}_x^\top \mathbf{x} / \beta), \quad \text{where } \mathbf{P}_x = \mathbf{U}_x \mathbf{E}_x. \quad (22)$$

Since  $\langle \mathbf{u}_x^n, \mathbf{x}^t \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}_x^{n'}, \mathbf{x}^t \rangle = 0$ , Lemma 3.1 (item 4) means that for any  $t \leq n'$  we have

$$\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^t)\| = \frac{L_1 \beta K^{3/2}}{\bar{\ell}_1} \|\nabla \bar{f}_{\nu, r}^{\text{nc}}(K^{3/2} \mathbf{P}_x^\top \mathbf{x}^t / \beta)\| > \frac{L_1 \beta K^{3/2} \nu^{3/4}}{4\bar{\ell}_1} \geq \epsilon, \quad (23)$$

where the last inequality holds if we set

$$\beta = \frac{4\bar{\ell}_1 \epsilon}{K^{3/2} \nu^{3/4} L_1}. \quad (24)$$

It implies an  $\Omega(KT)$  lower bound for any first-order zero-respecting algorithm to find an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of  $F(\mathbf{x})$ . To make the lower bound as large as possible, we choose  $T$  to be the largest possible value that satisfies the constraint  $F(\mathbf{0}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}} F(\mathbf{x}) \leq \Delta$ . By Lemma 3.1, we know that  $\Upsilon_r(0) \leq 10$  and  $\Upsilon_r(x) > \Upsilon_r(1) = 0$ . Therefore, the minimizer of  $\bar{f}_{\nu, r}^{\text{nc}}(\mathbf{x})$  is obtained at  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{1}$  with  $\bar{f}_{\nu, r}^{\text{nc}}(\mathbf{1}) = 0$ , which further leads to

$$F(\mathbf{0}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}} F(\mathbf{x}) = F(\mathbf{0}) \leq \frac{L_1 \beta^2}{\bar{\ell}_1} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{2} + 10\nu(T-1) \right). \quad (25)$$

It means that we can fulfill the constraint  $F(\mathbf{0}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^T} F(\mathbf{x}) \leq \Delta$  by setting

$$T = \left\lceil \left( \frac{\bar{\ell}_1 \Delta}{L_1 \beta^2} - \frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{2} \right) / (10\nu) \right\rceil + 1. \quad (26)$$

Now, it remains to determine the setting of  $\nu$  and  $r$ , which we choose to satisfy the smoothness conditions under the following three different cases.

1. **The case  $p = 1$ .** We simply set  $\nu = r = 1$  to obtain the lower bound

$$\Omega(KT) = \Omega(\kappa_y^2 L_1 \Delta \epsilon^{-2}).$$

2. **The case  $p = 2$ .** We let  $r = 1$ , then the condition  $\nu r^{3-p} \leq 1$  still holds if  $\nu \leq 1$ , which means both  $f$  and  $g$  have  $L_1$ -Lipschitz continuous gradients. Next, we ensure that  $f$  has  $L_2$ -Lipschitz continuous Hessians by setting

$$\nu = \frac{\beta \bar{\ell}_1 L_2}{L_1 \ell_2}. \quad (27)$$

Combining with the setting of  $\beta$  in Eq. (24), we can solve that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &= \left(4\epsilon/K^{3/2}\right)^{4/7} (\bar{\ell}_1/L_1)^{8/7} (L_2/\ell_2)^{4/7}, \\ \beta &= \left(4\epsilon/K^{3/2}\right)^{4/7} (\bar{\ell}_1/L_1)^{1/7} (\ell_2/L_2)^{3/7}. \end{aligned}$$

Under our parameter settings, and  $\nu \leq 1$  holds if

$$\epsilon \lesssim \kappa_y^{3/4} (L_1/\bar{\ell}_1)^2 (\ell_2/L_2).$$

Finally, we substitute  $\beta$  and  $\nu$  into Eq. (26) to calculate  $T$ . We assume that

$$\frac{\bar{\ell}_1 \Delta}{L_1 \beta^2} \gtrsim \sqrt{\nu}, \quad (28)$$

which implies that  $T \geq 2$  and is true under the condition

$$\epsilon \lesssim \kappa_y^{3/4} \Delta^{7/10} (\bar{\ell}_1/L_1)^{1/10} (L_2/\ell_2)^{2/5}.$$

Then we have

$$T + 1 \geq \frac{\bar{\ell}_1 \Delta}{40\nu L_1 \beta^2} = \frac{\ell_2 \Delta}{40\beta^3 L_2} = \frac{\Delta K^{18/7}}{40 \cdot 4^{12/7}} (L_1/\bar{\ell}_1)^{3/7} (L_2/\ell_2)^{2/7} \epsilon^{-12/7},$$

which indicates the lower bound of

$$\Omega(KT) = \Omega(\kappa_y^{25/14} L_1^{3/7} L_2^{2/7} \Delta \epsilon^{-12/7}).$$

3. **The case  $p \geq 3$ .** Let  $r = \sqrt{1/\nu}$  then the condition  $\nu r^{3-p} \leq 1$  still holds if  $\nu \leq 1$ , which means both  $f$  and  $g$  have  $L_1$ -Lipschitz continuous gradients. For  $q = 2, \dots, p$ , the  $q$ th-order derivative of  $g$  is zero and the  $q$ th-order derivatives of  $f$  is  $(L_1/\bar{\ell}_1)\beta^{1-q}\nu^{(q-1)/2}\ell_q$ -Lipschitz continuous, where  $\ell_q$  is the numerical constant defined in Lemma 3.1. Hence, we can ensure that the  $q$ th-order derivative of  $f$  is  $L_q$ -Lipschitz continuous for all  $q = 2, \dots, p$  by setting

$$\nu = \beta^2 \min_{q=2, \dots, p} \left( \frac{\bar{\ell}_1 L_q}{L_1 \ell_q} \right)^{2/(q-1)} := \beta^2 L_*. \quad (29)$$

Combining with the setting of  $\beta$  in Eq. (24), we can solve that

$$\beta = L_*^{-3/10} \left( \frac{4\bar{\ell}_1 \epsilon}{K^{3/2} L_1} \right)^{2/5} \quad \text{and} \quad \nu = L_*^{2/5} \left( \frac{4\bar{\ell}_1 \epsilon}{K^{3/2} L_1} \right)^{4/5}.$$

Under our parameter settings,  $\nu \leq 1$  holds if

$$\epsilon \lesssim L_*^{-1/2} \kappa_y^{3/4} (L_1/\bar{\ell}_1).$$

Finally, we substitute  $\beta$  and  $\nu$  into Eq. (29) to calculate  $T$ . As the case  $p = 2$ , we also assume that Eq. (28) holds, which is now true under the condition

$$\epsilon \lesssim \kappa_y^{3/4} \Delta^{5/6} (L_1/\bar{\ell}_1)^{1/6} L_*^{1/3}.$$

Then we have

$$T + 1 \geq \frac{\bar{\ell}_1 \Delta}{40\nu L_1 \beta^2} = \frac{\bar{\ell}_1 \Delta}{40 L_1 \beta^4 L_*} = \frac{\Delta K^{12/5}}{40 \cdot 4^{8/5}} (L_1 / \bar{\ell}_1)^{3/5} L_*^{1/5} \epsilon^{-8/5},$$

which indicates the lower bound of

$$\Omega(KT) = \Omega(\kappa_y^{17/10} L_1^{3/5} L_*^{1/5} \Delta \epsilon^{-8/5}).$$

□

## D Proof of Theorem 3.2

*Proof.* To give lower bounds for C-SC problems, let us consider the following instance, which modifies the rescaled and rotated NC upper-level function in Eq. (20) to

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}) := \frac{L_1 \beta^2}{2\bar{\ell}_1} \left( \left( \frac{\langle \mathbf{p}_z^1, \mathbf{z} \rangle}{\beta \sqrt{K}} - 1 \right)^2 + h \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_z^\top \mathbf{z}}{\beta}, \frac{\mathbf{P}_y^\top \mathbf{y}}{\beta} \right) \right), \quad (30)$$

where  $\mathbf{P} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{P}_x, \mathbf{P}_z, \mathbf{P}_y)$  be the same column-orthogonal matrix defined in Eq. (21) and  $\mathbf{p}_z^1$  be the first column of  $\mathbf{P}_z$ . Both the component  $h : \mathbb{R}^T \times \mathbb{R}^{K(T-1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in Eq. (9) and the SC lower-level function  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$  in Eq. (20) remain unchanged as in the NC-SC case:

$$g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) := \frac{L_1 \beta^2}{\bar{\ell}_1} \bar{g}^{\text{sc}} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_x^\top \mathbf{x}}{\beta}, \frac{\mathbf{P}_z^\top \mathbf{z}}{\beta}, \frac{\mathbf{P}_y^\top \mathbf{y}}{\beta} \right).$$

Note that both Lemma 3.2 and 3.3 still apply to the above instance, indicating that both  $f$  and  $g$  have  $L_1$ -Lipschitz continuous gradients for any  $\beta > 0$ , and the hyper-objective  $F$  is

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{L_1 \beta^2}{\bar{\ell}_1} \bar{f}^c \left( \frac{K^{3/2} \mathbf{P}_x^\top \mathbf{x}}{\beta} \right), \quad (31)$$

where  $\bar{f}^c : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the convex zero-chain in Definition 3.5. We can observe that the minimizer of the hyper-objective  $F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is achieved at  $\mathbf{P}_x^\top \mathbf{x}^* = \beta \mathbf{1} / K^{3/2}$ . Then, setting  $\beta = K^{3/2} D / \sqrt{T}$  satisfies the constraint that  $\min\{\|\mathbf{x}\| : \mathbf{x} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}} F(\mathbf{x})\} \leq D$ . As in the proof of NC-SC lower bound, our construction of  $\mathbf{P} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{P}_x, \mathbf{P}_z, \mathbf{P}_y)$  ensures that any first-order deterministic algorithm with  $t \leq n$  must satisfy  $\langle \mathbf{u}_x^n, \mathbf{x}^t \rangle = 0$ , where  $n = T(K+1) - K = \Omega(TK)$ . Hence, by Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^t)\| = \frac{L_1 \beta K^{3/2}}{\bar{\ell}_1} \|\nabla \bar{f}_1^c(K^{3/2} \mathbf{P}_x^\top \mathbf{x}_t / \beta)\| > \frac{K^3 L_1 D}{\bar{\ell}_1 T^2}.$$

Setting  $K = \Theta(\sqrt{\kappa_y})$  and  $T = \Theta(\sqrt{K^3 L_1 D / \epsilon})$  proves the lower bound of

$$\Omega(KT) = \Omega\left(\kappa_y^{5/4} \sqrt{L_1 D / \epsilon}\right).$$

□

## E Proof of Theorem 3.3

*Proof.* To give lower bounds for SC-SC problems, we add the quadratic regularizer  $\mu_x \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 / 2$  to the upper-level function  $f$  of C-SC problems in Eq. (30), that is,

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}) := \frac{L_1 \beta^2}{2\bar{\ell}_1} \left( \left( \frac{\langle \mathbf{p}_z^1, \mathbf{z} \rangle}{\beta \sqrt{K}} - 1 \right)^2 + h \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_z^\top \mathbf{z}}{\beta}, \frac{\mathbf{P}_y^\top \mathbf{y}}{\beta} \right) \right) + \frac{\mu_x}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|^2,$$

and keep the lower-level function  $g$  unchanged. Then, the hyper-objective in Eq. (31) is

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{L_1 \beta^2}{\bar{\ell}_1} \bar{f}^c \left( \frac{K^{3/2} \mathbf{P}_x^\top \mathbf{x}}{\beta} \right) + \frac{\mu_x}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|^2.$$

Recall  $\mathbf{A}_T$  is the matrix defined in Eq. (11) with  $K = T$ . We solve the minimizer  $\mathbf{x}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}} F(\mathbf{x})$  by taking gradient in Eq. (31) and set it to be zero, yielding that

$$\left( \mathbf{P}_x (\mathbf{A}_T + \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^\top) K^{3/2} \mathbf{P}_x^\top + \alpha \mathbf{I}_{2n} \right) \mathbf{x}^* = \beta \mathbf{e}_1, \quad \text{where} \quad \alpha = \frac{\bar{\ell}_1 \mu_x}{L_1 K^3}. \quad (32)$$

Recall  $\mathbf{P}_x \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times T}$  is a matrix with  $T$  orthogonal columns  $(\mathbf{p}_x^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_x^T)$ . Since  $T \leq 2n$ , according to the extension theorem, it can be extended to a basis  $(\mathbf{p}_x^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_x^T, \mathbf{p}_x^{T+1}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_x^{2n})$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_x \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$  be the matrix whose columns consist of the basis. Define the rotated minimizer  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^* = \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_x^\top \mathbf{x}^*$ . Then, expanding Eq. (32) gives

$$\begin{cases} -\beta/K^{3/2} + (2 + \alpha)\tilde{x}_1^* - \tilde{x}_2^* = 0 \\ -\tilde{x}_1^* + (2 + \alpha)\tilde{x}_2^* - \tilde{x}_3^* = 0 \\ -\tilde{x}_2^* + (2 + \alpha)\tilde{x}_3^* - \tilde{x}_4^* = 0 \\ \vdots \\ -\tilde{x}_{T-1}^* + (2 + \alpha)\tilde{x}_T^* = 0, \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

and  $\tilde{x}_i^* = 0$  for all the remaining  $i = T + 1, \dots, 2n$ .

Let  $q \in (0, 1)$  be the smallest root of the quadratic equation  $-1 + (2 + \alpha)q - q^2 = 0$ , i.e.,

$$q = \frac{2 + \alpha - \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\alpha}}{2}.$$

We can observe that the variable  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^* \in \mathbb{R}^T$  defined by  $\hat{x}_i^* = \beta q^i / K^{3/2}$  satisfies Eq. (33) except the last line with a residual of  $\beta q^{T+1} / K^{3/2}$ , which means

$$(\mathbf{A}_T + \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^\top + \alpha \mathbf{I}_T) K^{3/2} \hat{\mathbf{x}}^* = \beta q^{T+1} \mathbf{e}_T / K^{3/2}$$

Compared with Eq. (32), we know that

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}^* - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^* = (\mathbf{A}_T + \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^\top + \alpha \mathbf{I}_T)^{-1} \beta q^{T+1} \mathbf{e}_T / K^3.$$

By the inequality  $(\mathbf{A}_T + \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^\top + \alpha \mathbf{I}_T)^{-1} \succeq \alpha^{-1} \mathbf{I}_T$ , taking norm on both sides above gives

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}^* - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*\| \leq \beta q^{T+1} / (K^3 \alpha). \quad (34)$$

If  $\alpha \leq 1/2$  and  $T \geq 4$ . We let  $T$  also satisfies

$$T \geq 2 \ln \left( 4 \left( 1 + \frac{1-q}{\alpha K^{3/2}} \right) \right) / \ln(q^{-1}). \quad (35)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^*\| &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*\| \leq \|\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*\| + \|\hat{\mathbf{x}}^* - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*\| \\ &\leq \frac{\beta q(1 - q^T)}{(1 - q)K^{3/2}} + \frac{\beta q^{T+1}}{\alpha K^3} \leq \frac{2\beta q}{(1 - q)K^{3/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality uses  $\hat{x}_i^* = \beta q^i / K^{3/2}$  and Eq. (34), and the last one uses Eq. (35) that  $q^T \leq \alpha / ((1 - q)K^{3/2})$ . From the above inequality, we know that letting  $\beta = K^{3/2}(1 - q)D / (2q)$  satisfies the constraint  $\min\{\|\mathbf{x}\| : \mathbf{x} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}} F(\mathbf{x})\} \leq D$ . As in the proof of NC-SC lower bound, our construction of  $\mathbf{P} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{P}_x, \mathbf{P}_z, \mathbf{P}_y)$  ensures that any first-order deterministic algorithm with  $t \leq n'$  must satisfy

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^t = 0, \quad \forall i = \lfloor T/2 \rfloor + 1, \dots, T,$$

where  $n' = \lfloor T/2 \rfloor (K+1) - K = \Omega(KT)$ . This further gives the following lower bound of the hyper-gradient norm:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla F(\mathbf{P}_x^\top \mathbf{x}^t)\| \geq \mu_x \|\mathbf{P}_x^\top \mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{x}^*\| \geq \mu_x \|\mathbf{P}_x^\top \mathbf{x}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*\| \\
& \geq \mu_x (\|\mathbf{P}_x^\top \mathbf{x}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*\| - \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^* - \hat{\mathbf{x}}^*\|) \\
& \geq \mu_x \left( \frac{\beta q^{\lfloor T/2 \rfloor + 1} (1 - q^{T - \lfloor T/2 \rfloor})}{(1 - q)K^{3/2}} - \frac{\beta q^{T+1}}{\alpha K^3} \right) \\
& = \frac{\mu_x D q^{\lfloor T/2 \rfloor}}{2} \left( 1 - \left( 1 + \frac{1 - q}{\alpha K^{3/2}} \right) q^{T - \lfloor T/2 \rfloor} \right) \geq \frac{\mu_x D q^{\lfloor T/2 \rfloor}}{8}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, the first inequality uses the  $\mu_x$ -strong convexity of  $F(\mathbf{x})$ , the second last inequality uses  $\hat{x}_i^* = \beta q^i / K^{3/2}$  and Eq. (34), and the last one uses the condition of  $T$  in Eq. (35). To let  $\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^t)\| > \epsilon$  we require that

$$T \leq 2 \ln \left( \frac{\mu_x D}{8\epsilon} \right) / \ln(q^{-1}). \quad (36)$$

Recall that  $K = \Theta(\sqrt{\kappa_y})$  and  $\alpha^{-1} = \Theta(\kappa_y^{3/2} \kappa_x)$ . We can derive that

$$\ln(q^{-1}) \geq \frac{q}{1 - q} = \frac{2 + \alpha - \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\alpha}}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\alpha} - \alpha} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\alpha} - \alpha} - 1 \geq \sqrt{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - 1, \quad (37)$$

where the last inequality uses  $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$ . If the accuracy  $\epsilon$  satisfies that  $\epsilon \lesssim \alpha \mu_x D$ , or equivalent to  $\epsilon \lesssim \mu_x D / (\kappa_x \kappa_y)$ , then we know there exists  $T$  that jointly fulfills Eq. (35) and (36). Now, we let  $T$  be the smallest value that fulfills Eq. (36), and by Eq. (37), we have  $T = \Omega(\kappa_y^{3/4} \sqrt{\kappa_x} \ln(\mu_x D / \epsilon))$ , which implies the final lower bound of

$$\Omega(KT) = \Omega\left(\kappa_y^{5/4} \sqrt{\kappa_x} \ln(\mu_x D / \epsilon)\right).$$

□

## F Proof of Theorem 3.4

*Proof.* From Eq. (14) it is clear that  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{nc-scq}}(L_1, \mu_y, \Delta)$ . By Definition 2.5, a randomized algorithm  $\mathbf{A}$  consists of the mappings  $\{\mathbf{A}^t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  recursively defined as

$$(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{z}^t) = \mathbf{A}^t(r, \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}(\mathbf{z}^0), \nabla g(\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{z}^0), \dots, \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}(\mathbf{z}^{t-1}), \nabla g(\mathbf{x}^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}^{t-1}))$$

Note that  $\nabla g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is a deterministic mapping of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ . We know that there exists mappings  $\{\mathbf{A}_1^t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  that satisfy the recursion

$$(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{z}^t) = \mathbf{A}_1^t(r, \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}(\mathbf{z}^0), \mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{z}_0, \dots, \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}(\mathbf{z}^{t-1}), \mathbf{x}^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}^{t-1})$$

Expanding the recursion for  $(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{z}_t)$ , we can observe that the above fact implies some mappings  $\{\mathbf{A}_2^t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfying

$$(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{z}^t) = \mathbf{A}_2^t(r, \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}(\mathbf{z}^0), \dots, \hat{\nabla} \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}(\mathbf{z}^{t-1})).$$

Then we can invoke Lemma 3.5 (item 4) to conclude that for all  $t \leq (T - \log 4)/(2p)$  and any deterministic mapping  $\mathcal{M} : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^T$ , with probability at least  $1/2$ , we have  $\|\nabla \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}^t))\| \geq 1/2$ . By observation, we have  $F(\mathbf{x}) = (L_1 \beta^2 / 155) \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}(\kappa_y \mathbf{x} / \beta)$ . Thus,

$$\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}^t)\| = \frac{L_1 \beta \kappa_y}{155} \|\nabla \bar{f}^{\text{nc-rs}}(\kappa_y \mathbf{x}^t / \beta)\| \geq \frac{L_1 \beta \kappa_y}{310},$$

which means we can set

$$\beta = \frac{310\epsilon}{L_1\kappa_y} \quad (38)$$

to obtain an  $\Omega(T/p)$  lower bound for finding an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of  $F(\mathbf{x})$ . Next, by Lemma 3.5 (item 1), we have that

$$F(\mathbf{0}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^T} F(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{12L_1\beta^2T}{155},$$

which means that we can fulfill the constraint  $F(\mathbf{0}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^T} F(\mathbf{x}) \leq \Delta$  by setting

$$T = \left\lfloor \frac{155\Delta}{12L_1\beta^2} \right\rfloor. \quad (39)$$

By Lemma 3.5 (item 3), the variance of the SFO for  $(f, g)$  is upper bounded by  $(23L_1\beta/155)^2 (1-p)/p$ , which means that we can let the variance be bounded by  $\sigma^2$  by setting

$$p = \min \left\{ 1, \left( \frac{23L_1\beta}{\sigma 155} \right)^2 \right\}. \quad (40)$$

Finally, we can conclude the lower bound of

$$\Omega(T/p) = \Omega \left( \frac{\Delta}{L_1\beta^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{L_1^2\beta^2} \right) \right) = \Omega \left( \frac{\kappa_y^2 L_1 \Delta}{\epsilon^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma^2 \kappa_y^2}{\epsilon^2} \right) \right).$$

□