

Dual Smoothing for Decentralized Optimization

Alexander Rogozin^[0000–0003–3435–2680], Nhat Trung Nguyen[□], Hamed Azami
Zenuzagh[□], and Alexander Gasnikov^[0000–0002–7386–039X]

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology

Abstract. Decentralized optimization is widely used in different fields of study such as distributed learning, signal processing, and various distributed control problems. In these types of problems, nodes of the network are connected to each other and seek to optimize some objective function. In this article, we present a method for smoothing the non-smooth and non-strongly convex problems. This is done using the dual smoothing technique. We study two types of problems: consensus optimization of linear models and coupled constraints optimization. It is shown that these two problem classes are dual to each other.

Keywords: Convex optimization · Decentralized optimization · Coupled constraints · Lagrangian multipliers method

1 Introduction

Decentralized optimization is used in multi-agent systems control [15,16], large-scale data processing [6], power systems control [4,14]. Is it assumed that no centralized server is present and therefore the nodes communicate only to their immediate neighbors in the network, which is represented by a connected and undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. Each node locally holds an objective function and can perform local computations. We study two types of problems given below.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x_1 \in Q, \dots, x_n \in Q} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(A_i x_i - b_i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x_1 = \dots = x_n \end{aligned} \tag{Con}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x_1 \in Q_1, \dots, x_n \in Q_n} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i) = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{Coupl}$$

Here f_i are convex functions locally held by the nodes, x_i are local variables and Q, Q_1, \dots, Q_n are closed convex sets. Problem (Con) is consensus optimization of linear models and (Coupl) is optimization with coupled constraints. In (Con),

each agent locally stores data (A_i, b_i) and a loss function f_i . The nodes collectively solve the optimization problem while keeping their local trajectories close to consensus, i.e. the constraint $x_1 = \dots = x_n$. In problem (Coupl), the agents' local variables are tied by an affine constraint, but the constraint itself is stored in a distributed way between the nodes. Problem (Con) can be stated as a special case of (Coupl) if matrices A_i are taken as slices of the graph Laplacian matrix [22]. Moreover, problems (Con) and (Coupl) are dual to each other up to redefinition of f_i and transposition of A_i . In this work we focus on convex nonsmooth objectives. Let us discuss several examples of problems (Con) and (Coupl).

Decentralized mean absolute error optimization. Consider a special case of (Con) with $f_i(y_i) = \|y_i\|_1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x_1 \in Q, \dots, x_n \in Q} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n \|A_i x_i - b_i\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x_1 = \dots = x_n \end{aligned}$$

Set Q may be either a unit simplex or the whole space \mathbb{R}^d , where d is the dimension of x_1, \dots, x_n . Moreover, we may use Huber smoothing instead of 1-norm, i.e. set

$$f_i(y) = [g(y_1) \dots g(y_n)]^\top, \text{ where } g(y_i) = \begin{cases} \frac{y_i^2}{2}, & |y_i| < 1, \\ |y_i| - \frac{1}{2}, & |y_i| \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Decentralized basis pursuit. This problem is seeking the solution of a linear system with the least 1-norm. It can be seen as a special case of (Coupl) with $f_i(y_i) = \|y_i\|_1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x_1 \in Q_1, \dots, x_n \in Q_n} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Of our interest is only the case $Q_1 = \dots = Q_n = \mathbb{R}^d$.

Related work. Decentralized consensus optimization (i.e. problem (Con) with A_i identity matrices) can be called a theoretically well-studied field for synchronous first-order methods (i.e. methods requiring only gradient information and performing synchronous communication rounds). Decentralized methods that we consider operate two types of steps – (synchronous) communication rounds and local gradient updates. The number of communication rounds required to achieve the given accuracy is called communication complexity, and the corresponding number of gradient steps is named computational complexity.

For μ -strongly convex objectives with L -Lipschitz gradient and a static network with condition number χ , primal [8] and dual [18] methods are known that achieve communication complexity $O\left(\sqrt{\chi L/\mu} \ln(1/\varepsilon)\right)$, which is also shown to match the lower complexity bound [18]. For time-varying graphs with worst-case condition number χ , methods requiring $O(\chi\sqrt{L/\mu} \ln(1/\varepsilon))$ communication rounds are also known [7,9,11]. These algorithms are also theoretically optimal, i.e. matching the lower complexity bound derived in [7]. For nonsmooth convex problems, where the gradient norm is uniformly bounded by M , a penalty method with sliding technique [10] was applied to achieve communication complexity $O(\sqrt{\chi}MR/\varepsilon)$ [19,20], which is an optimal complexity. For time-varying networks, optimal algorithms were proposed with complexity $O(\chi MR/\varepsilon)$ for convex setup and $O(\chi M/\sqrt{\mu\varepsilon})$ for μ -strongly convex setup.

Coupled constraints optimization, i.e. problem (Coupl), is not studied as extensively as consensus optimization. Prior to first-order methods, coupled constraints problem was solved by ADMM approaches [1,3,12,21]. Gradient methods were used in [2], and in [22] a first-order method optimal for L -smooth μ -strongly convex objectives was proposed. It has communication complexity $O(\sqrt{\chi\kappa_A L/\mu} \ln(1/\varepsilon))$, where κ_A is related to condition numbers of the constraint matrices.

Paper contribution. In this work, we show how dual smoothing technique [13] can be applied to consensus optimization of linear models (Con) and to coupled constraints optimization (Coupl). The idea of dual smoothing is based on the fact that a Fenchel conjugate of a μ -strongly convex function is $1/\mu$ -smooth [5]. Therefore, we can regularize a problem, take its dual and get a smooth problem. We show the transition between problems (Con) and (Coupl) and their regularized versions via duality.

Notation. We let \mathbb{R}^d the Euclidean d -dimension space. We let $\text{col}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_1^\top \dots x_n^\top)^\top$ be a column-stacked vector. We denote by m the dimension of the stacked vector, i.e. $m = nd$ or $m = d_1 + \dots + d_n$ depending on the context. Maximal eigenvalue and singular value of matrix C are denoted as $\lambda_{\max}(C)$ and $\sigma_{\max}(C)$, respectively. Minimal nonzero eigenvalue and singular value of M are denoted $\lambda_{\min+}(C)$, $\sigma_{\min+}(C)$, respectively. The network is represented by a connected undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with $|\mathcal{V}| = n$ nodes and $|\mathcal{E}| = \ell$ edges. Given a closed convex function h , closed convex set Q and a scalar $\lambda > 0$, prox operator is defined as $\text{prox}_{\lambda h}^Q(x) = \arg \min_{y \in Q} \left[\lambda h(y) + \frac{1}{2} \|y - x\|_2^2 \right]$. We also introduce «prox value» as $\text{proxv}_{\lambda h}^Q(x) = \min_{y \in Q} \left[\lambda h(y) + \frac{1}{2} \|y - x\|_2^2 \right]$. A Kronecker product of matrices B and C is denoted $B \otimes C$.

Set \mathbf{Q} is defined either as $\mathbf{Q} = Q_1 \times \dots \times Q_n$ or $\mathbf{Q} = Q^n$ depending on the context. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\|_p$ denotes its p -norm for $p \geq 0$. After that, $\mathbf{1}_n$ is a vector of length n such that all of its components are one and e_i is the i -th coordinate vector the dimension of which is clear from the context.

Also let $\text{dist}(x, S)$ denote the Euclidean distance from point x to set S . Let $B_\infty(x, R) = \{y : \|y - x\|_\infty \leq R\}$ denote the ball in sup-norm with cen-

ter at x and radius R . The indicator function for set S is defined as $\mathbb{I}(x) = \{0 \text{ if } x \in S; +\infty \text{ if } x \notin S\}$.

Generally, the vectors are denoted in lower case and matrices in upper case. Unless otherwise stated, we write $\mathbf{x} = \text{col}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{b} = \text{col}(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ and $\mathbf{A} = \text{diag}(A_1, \dots, A_n)$.

Paper organization

In Section 2 we introduce the problems of interest and deduce their duals. We continue in Section 3 with methods and complexity bounds. Concluding remarks are provided in Section 4.

2 Problem statement and assumptions

Firstly, we make a standard convexity assumption for optimization and recall the basic definitions.

Definition 1. Let $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a closed convex set. Function $h : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is μ -strongly convex, where $\mu > 0$, if for any $x, y \in Q$ it holds

$$h(y) \geq h(x) + \langle \nabla h(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|y - x\|_2^2.$$

If μ is put $\mu = 0$ in the equation above, the function is called just convex.

Definition 2. A function $h : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is called L -smooth for some $L \geq 0$ if for any $x, y \in Q$ it holds

$$h(y) \leq h(x) + \langle \nabla h(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|y - x\|_2^2.$$

Assumption 1 Functions f_i are convex.

We also introduce a gossip matrix that is widely used in decentralized optimization.

Assumption 2 Gossip matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ associated with graph \mathcal{G} has the following properties.

1. W is symmetric positive semi-definite.
2. W is network compatible, i.e. $W_{ij} = 0$ if $(i, j) \notin \mathcal{E}$.
3. $Wx = 0$ if and only if $x_1 = \dots = x_n$.

An example of gossip matrix is the graph Laplacian defined as $L = D - A$, where D is a diagonal matrix holding node degrees and A is the graph adjacency matrix. To equivalently formulate consensus constraints for vectors, we use $\mathbf{W} = W \otimes \mathbf{I}_d$. For vector $\mathbf{x} = \text{col}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have $W\mathbf{x} = 0$ if and only if $x_1 = \dots = x_n$.

After that, we introduce spectral properties for matrices W and A_1, \dots, A_n . For gossip matrix W , we let

$$L_W = \lambda_{\max}(W), \quad \mu_W = \lambda_{\min^+}(W), \quad \kappa_W = \frac{L_W}{\mu_W}. \quad (1)$$

For matrices A_1, \dots, A_n we define

$$L_A = \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \lambda_{\max}(A_i A_i^\top), \quad \mu_A = \lambda_{\min^+} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n A_i A_i^\top \right), \quad \kappa_A = \frac{L_A}{\mu_A}. \quad (2)$$

Note that μ_A may differ from minimal positive eigenvalues of each A_i separately.

Let each node hold regularizers g_i and h_i along with objective function f_i . Introduce $F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i)$, $G(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(x_i)$, $H(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(x_i)$. We now define regularized versions for consensus and coupled constraints problems. Given a gossip matrix, we rewrite problems (Con) and (Coupl) the following way.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Q}} F(\mathbf{y}) + \lambda G(\mathbf{y}) + \mu H(\mathbf{x}) & \quad (\text{ConR}) & \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Q}} F(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda G(\mathbf{x}) + \mu H(\mathbf{y}) & \quad (\text{CouplR}) \\ \text{s.t. } \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} = 0, \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b} & & \text{s.t. } \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b} & \end{aligned}$$

We now pass to dual problem formulation. Let us introduce a conjugate function w.r.t. a regularizer.

Definition 3. For given convex functions φ and ψ , closed convex set S and scalar $\gamma > 0$, we define

$$\varphi_{\gamma\psi, S}^*(v) = \max_{u \in S} \left(\langle u, v \rangle - \varphi(u) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \psi(u) \right).$$

If $\psi \equiv 0$, we write

$$\varphi_S^*(v) = \max_{u \in S} (\langle u, v \rangle - \varphi(u)).$$

Lemma 1. Dual problems to (ConR), (CouplRD) write as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}} F_{\lambda G, \mathbb{R}^m}^*(\mathbf{z}) + \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle & \quad (\text{ConRD}) & \min_{\mathbf{z}} F_{\lambda G, \mathbf{Q}}^*(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}) - \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle & \quad (\text{CouplRD}) \\ \text{s.t. } \mathbf{W}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z} = 0 & & \text{s.t. } \mathbf{W}\mathbf{z} = 0 & \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us deduce a dual function to (ConR) up to a sign.

$$\begin{aligned} & - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{y}} [F(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda G(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{b} \rangle] \\ & = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Q}} [\langle \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x} \rangle - F(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda G(\mathbf{x})] + \max_{\mathbf{y}} [\langle \mathbf{W}\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y} \rangle] - \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \\ & = F_{\lambda G, \mathbf{Q}}^*(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}) - \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle + \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{z} = 0). \end{aligned}$$

Analogously for (CouplR) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{y}} [F(\mathbf{y}) + \lambda G(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} \rangle] \\ & = \max_{\mathbf{y}} [\langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y} \rangle - F(\mathbf{y}) - \lambda G(\mathbf{y})] + \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Q}} [\langle \mathbf{x}, -\mathbf{W}\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z} \rangle] + \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \\ & = F_{\lambda G, \mathbb{R}^m}^*(\mathbf{z}) + \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle + \mathbb{I}(-\mathbf{W}\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z} = 0) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1 shows that consensus optimization and coupled constraints optimization problems are dual to each other up to the usage of \mathbf{A}^\top instead of \mathbf{A} and factors $\langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle$ and \mathbf{b} .

3 Algorithms and complexity

3.1 Preliminaries and base algorithm

Decentralized optimization algorithms that we will use are based on optimization methods for affinely constrained problems. We recall the basic method APAPC [8,17] which is a state-of-the-art method for this class of problems. We are interested in problem statement

$$\min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} P(u) \quad \text{s.t. } Ku = c. \quad (3)$$

Algorithm 1 APAPC

```

1: Parameters:  $u^0 \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $\eta, \theta, \alpha > 0$ ,  $\tau \in (0, 1)$ 
2: Set  $u_f^0 = u^0$ ,  $z^0 = 0 \in \mathcal{U}$ 
3: for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  do
4:    $u_g^k = \tau u^k + (1 - \tau) u_f^k$ 
5:    $u^{k+\frac{1}{2}} = (1 + \eta\alpha)^{-1} (u^k - \eta(\nabla P(u_g^k) - \alpha u_g^k + z^k))$ 
6:    $z^{k+1} = z^k + \theta K^\top (K u^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - c)$ 
7:    $u^{k+1} = (1 + \eta\alpha)^{-1} (u^k - \eta(\nabla P(u_g^k) - \alpha u_g^k + z^{k+1}))$ 
8:    $u_f^{k+1} = u_g^k + \frac{2\tau}{2-\tau} (u^{k+1} - u^k)$ 
9: end for

```

Algorithm 1 has an optimal linear convergence rate, which we recall below.

Proposition 1 ([17], Proposition 1). *Assume that $c \in \text{Im } K$ and put $\kappa_K = \frac{\lambda_{\max}(K^\top K)}{\lambda_{\min}(K^\top K)}$. Also assume that the function P is L_P -smooth and μ_P -strongly convex. Set the parameter values of 1 as $\tau = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\kappa_K}{\kappa_P}} \right\}$, $\eta = \frac{1}{4\tau L_P}$, $\theta = \frac{1}{\eta L_K}$ and $\alpha = \mu_P$ and let u^* be the solution of (3). Then in order to yield u^N such that $\|u^N - u^*\| \leq \varepsilon$, Algorithm 1 requires $O(\sqrt{\kappa_P \kappa_K} \ln(1/\varepsilon))$ communication rounds.*

Algorithm 1 was applied to consensus optimization in [8] and to coupled constraints optimization in [22].

Proposition 1 is formulated for strongly convex smooth objectives. In order to use this result for non-strongly convex functions, we use a regularization technique.

Lemma 2. *Let $h : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex and L -smooth function and introduce regularized function $h_\mu(x) = h(x) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^0 - x\|^2$. Suppose that there exists solution $x^* \in \text{Arg min}_x h(x)$ and $x_\mu^* = \arg \min_{x: Kx=c} h_\mu(x)$. Define $M_h = h(x^*) - \min_x h(x)$. Assume that $\|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \leq R^2$. If regularization parameter is set to $\mu = \varepsilon/R^2$ and regularized problem is solved up to accuracy $\delta = O(\varepsilon^2)$, i.e. some method yields \hat{x} such that $\|\hat{x} - x_\mu^*\|_2^2 \leq \delta$, then $h(\hat{x}) - h(x^*) \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
h(\hat{x}) - h(x^*) &\leq h_\mu(\hat{x}) - h_\mu(x_\mu^*) + h_\mu(x_\mu^*) - h(x^*) \\
&\leq h_\mu(\hat{x}) - h_\mu(x_\mu^*) + h_\mu(x^*) - h(x^*) \\
&= h_\mu(\hat{x}) - h_\mu(x_\mu^*) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \\
&\leq \langle \nabla h_\mu(x_\mu^*), x - x_\mu^* \rangle + \frac{L + \mu}{2} \|x - x_\mu^*\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \\
&\leq \|\nabla h_\mu(x_\mu^*)\| \cdot \|x - x_\mu^*\| + \frac{L + \mu}{2} \|x - x_\mu^*\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{2(L + \mu) \left(h_\mu(x_\mu^*) - \min_x h_\mu(x) \right) \|x - x_\mu^*\|^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{L + \mu}{2} \|x - x_\mu^*\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{2(L + \mu) \left(h_\mu(x^*) - \min_x h(x) \right) \|x - x_\mu^*\|^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{L + \mu}{2} \|x - x_\mu^*\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{2(L + \mu) \left(h(x^*) - \min_x h(x) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \right) \|x - x_\mu^*\|^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{L + \mu}{2} \|x - x_\mu^*\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{2(L + \mu) \left(M + \frac{\mu R^2}{2} \right) \delta} + \frac{(L + \mu)\delta}{2} + \frac{\mu R^2}{2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{2(L + \mu) \left(M + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \delta} + \frac{(L + \mu)\delta}{2} + \frac{\mu R^2}{2} \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{64} + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, for non-strongly convex objectives problem (3) can be solved using regularization.

Corollary 1. *Let assumptions of Proposition 1 hold except strong convexity. Then solving regularized problem $\min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} h(u) + \mu \|u\|_2^2/2$ s.t. $Ku = c$ requires $O(\sqrt{\kappa_K L_G R^2/\varepsilon} \ln(1/\varepsilon))$ iterations of Algorithm 1 and yields \hat{u} such that $\|\hat{u} - u^*\|_2^2 \leq \varepsilon$.*

Apart from convergence result for affinely constrained optimization, we recall a property for smoothness of Fenchel conjugate functions.

Proposition 2. [5] *Let $h : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a γ -strongly convex function. Then its Fenchel conjugate h^* is $1/\gamma$ -smooth.*

3.2 Algorithms and complexities for dual smoothed problems

Let us begin with problem (ConRD). We will apply APAPC (Algorithm 1) in the modification of paper [22], where it was applied to coupled constraints optimization of strongly convex smooth functions.

Theorem 3. *Let \mathbf{z}^* be the solution of (ConRD) and let $\|\mathbf{z}^0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|_2^2 \leq R^2$. Also assume that regularizer G is strongly convex. Then APAPC requires*

$$N = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{R^2}{\lambda \varepsilon}} \kappa_W \kappa_A \ln \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right) \right)$$

communication rounds in order to yield \mathbf{z}^N such that $\|\mathbf{z}^N - \mathbf{z}^\|_2^2 \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2, function F^* is $1/\lambda$ -smooth. After that, adding a regularization term $\varepsilon \|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2 / (2R^2)$ we obtain a $(1/\lambda + \varepsilon/R^2)$ -smooth and ε/R^2 -strongly convex function. From Proposition 1 we get the desired number of iterations.

We now pass to problem (CouplRD).

Theorem 4. *Let \mathbf{z}^* be the solution of (CouplRD) and let $\|\mathbf{z}^0 - \mathbf{z}^*\|_2^2 \leq R^2$. Also assume that regularizer G is strongly convex. Then APAPC requires*

$$N = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{L_A R^2}{\lambda \varepsilon}} \kappa_W \right) \ln \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)$$

communication rounds in order to yield \mathbf{z}^N such that $\|\mathbf{z}^N - \mathbf{z}^\|_2^2 \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proof. The proof is analogical to proof of Theorem 3.

3.3 Examples

Decentralized basis pursuit. Consider a special case of (CouplRD) with $F(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|_1$, $Q = \mathbb{R}^m$, $G(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 / 2$.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} \quad & \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b} \end{aligned}$$

Fenchel conjugate $F_{\lambda G, Q}^*(\mathbf{y})$ is computed as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\lambda G, Q}^*(\mathbf{y}) &= \max_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle - \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2}{2\lambda} - \lambda \operatorname{prox}_{\|\cdot\|_1/\lambda} \left(\frac{\mathbf{y}}{\lambda} \right) \\ &= \frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2}{2\lambda} - \frac{1}{\lambda} \|\max(|\mathbf{y}| - 1, 0)\|_1 + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|\mathbf{y} - \operatorname{sign} \mathbf{y} \odot \max(|\mathbf{y}| - 1, 0)\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Problem (CouplRD) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{z}} \quad & \left[\frac{\|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}\|_2^2}{2} - \|\max(|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}| - 1, 0)\|_1 \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z} - \text{sign}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}) \odot \max(|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}| - 1, 0)\|_2^2 - \lambda \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \right] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{W}\mathbf{z} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Decentralized basis pursuit via double duality. In the previous example, we regularized the decentralized basis pursuit problem and then took the dual. Now we first take the dual and then regularize it.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{z}} \quad & \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle + \mathbb{I}(\|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}\|_\infty \leq 1) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{W}\mathbf{z} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

The problem above is an instance of (ConRD) with $F(\mathbf{z}) = \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle + \mathbb{I}(\|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}\|_\infty \leq 1)$ and $F(\mathbf{z}) = \|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2/2$. Let us take its dual one more time. We get

$$F_{\lambda G}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}\|_2^2}{2\lambda} - \lambda \left[\mathbf{1}_m^\top \cdot \max\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}|}{\lambda}, 0\right) \right]^2.$$

Therefore, the second dual takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{y}} \quad & \frac{\|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{b}\|_2^2}{2\lambda} - \lambda \left[\mathbf{1}_m^\top \cdot \max\left(\frac{|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{b}|}{\lambda}, 0\right) \right]^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{W}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{y} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Decentralized mean squared error minimization. Consider an instance of consensus optimization with $F(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|_1$ and $G(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2/2$.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x}} \quad & \|\mathbf{y}\|_1 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} = 0, \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b} \end{aligned}$$

Its dual is an instance (CouplRD) writes as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}} \quad & \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2}{2} - \|\max(|\mathbf{z}| - 1, 0)\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \text{sign}(\mathbf{z}) \odot \max(|\mathbf{z}| - 1, 0)\|_2^2 + \lambda \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{W}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Decentralized mean squared error minimization via double duality. Consider the problem similar to the previous example but first take its dual and

then regularize. The dual with regularization writes as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \quad & \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle + \mathbb{I}(\|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty \leq 1) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{u} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

The problem above has type (CouplR) with $F(\mathbf{z}) = \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{b} \rangle + \mathbb{I}(\|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty \leq 1)$, $G(\mathbf{z}) = \|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2/2$. Taking the dual for the second time, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x}} \quad & \frac{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}\|_2^2}{2\lambda} - \lambda \left[\mathbf{1}_m^\top \cdot \max \left(0, \frac{|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}|}{\lambda} \right) \right]^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

4 Conclusion

In this paper we tried to systemize the dual approach to decentralized optimization. We considered two problem classes: consensus optimization of linear models and coupled constraints optimization. We showed that consensus and coupled constraints problems are dual to each other. We also deduced the dual problem formulations of regularized initial problems and analyzed how known decentralized optimization methods work on these problems. Finally, we illustrated our approach on decentralized basis pursuit problem and decentralized mean absolute error optimization.

Acknowledgments

The research was supported by Russian Science Foundation (project No. 23-11-00229), <https://rscf.ru/en/project/23-11-00229/>.

References

1. T.-H. Chang. A proximal dual consensus admm method for multi-agent constrained optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 64(14):3719–3734, 2016.
2. T. T. Doan and A. Olshevsky. Distributed resource allocation on dynamic networks in quadratic time. *Systems & Control Letters*, 99:57–63, 2017.
3. A. Falsone, I. Notarnicola, G. Notarstefano, and M. Prandini. Tracking-admm for distributed constraint-coupled optimization. *Automatica*, 117:108962, 2020.
4. L. Gan, U. Topcu, and S. H. Low. Optimal decentralized protocol for electric vehicle charging. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 28(2):940–951, 2012.
5. S. Kakade, S. Shalev-Shwartz, and A. Tewari. On the duality of strong convexity and strong smoothness: Learning applications and matrix regularization. *Unpublished Manuscript*, <http://ttic.uchicago.edu/shai/papers/KakadeShalevTewari09.pdf>, 2(1), 2009.
6. J. Konečný, H. B. McMahan, F. X. Yu, P. Richtárik, A. T. Suresh, and D. Bacon. Federated learning: Strategies for improving communication efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.05492*, 2016.

7. D. Kovalev, E. Gasanov, A. Gasnikov, and P. Richtarik. Lower bounds and optimal algorithms for smooth and strongly convex decentralized optimization over time-varying networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
8. D. Kovalev, A. Salim, and P. Richtárik. Optimal and practical algorithms for smooth and strongly convex decentralized optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.
9. D. Kovalev, E. Shulgin, P. Richtárik, A. V. Rogozin, and A. Gasnikov. Adom: Accelerated decentralized optimization method for time-varying networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5784–5793. PMLR, 2021.
10. G. Lan. Gradient sliding for composite optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 159(1):201–235, Sep 2016.
11. H. Li and Z. Lin. Accelerated gradient tracking over time-varying graphs for decentralized optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.02596*, 2021.
12. H. Li, Q. Lü, X. Liao, and T. Huang. Accelerated convergence algorithm for distributed constrained optimization under time-varying general directed graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 50(7):2612–2622, 2018.
13. Y. Nesterov. Smooth minimization of non-smooth functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 103(1):127–152, 2005.
14. S. S. Ram, V. V. Veeravalli, and A. Nedic. Distributed non-autonomous power control through distributed convex optimization. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2009*, pages 3001–3005. IEEE, 2009.
15. W. Ren. Consensus based formation control strategies for multi-vehicle systems. In *2006 American Control Conference*, pages 6–pp. IEEE, 2006.
16. W. Ren and R. W. Beard. *Distributed consensus in multi-vehicle cooperative control*, volume 27. Springer, 2008.
17. A. Salim, L. Condat, D. Kovalev, and P. Richtárik. An optimal algorithm for strongly convex minimization under affine constraints. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 4482–4498. PMLR, 2022.
18. K. Scaman, F. Bach, S. Bubeck, Y. T. Lee, and L. Massoulié. Optimal algorithms for smooth and strongly convex distributed optimization in networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 3027–3036. JMLR. org, 2017.
19. K. Scaman, F. Bach, S. Bubeck, L. Massoulié, and Y. T. Lee. Optimal algorithms for non-smooth distributed optimization in networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2740–2749, 2018.
20. C. A. Uribe, S. Lee, A. Gasnikov, and A. Nedić. Optimal algorithms for distributed optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.00232*, 2017.
21. X. Wu, H. Wang, and J. Lu. Distributed optimization with coupling constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(3):1847–1854, 2022.
22. D. Yarmoshik, A. Rogozin, N. Kiselev, D. Dorin, A. Gasnikov, and D. Kovalev. Decentralized optimization with coupled constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.02020*, 2024.