

# A SINGLE-LOOP STOCHASTIC RIEMANNIAN ADMM FOR NONSMOOTH OPTIMIZATION

JIACHEN JIN\*, KANGKANG DENG\*, AND HONGXIA WANG\*†

**Abstract.** We study a class of nonsmooth stochastic optimization problems on Riemannian manifolds. In this work, we propose MARS-ADMM, the first stochastic Riemannian alternating direction method of multipliers with provable near-optimal complexity guarantees. Our algorithm incorporates a momentum-based variance-reduced gradient estimator applied exclusively to the smooth component of the objective, together with carefully designed penalty parameter and dual stepsize updates. Unlike existing approaches that rely on computationally expensive double-loop frameworks, MARS-ADMM operates in a single-loop fashion and requires only a constant number of stochastic gradient evaluations per iteration. Under mild assumptions, we establish that MARS-ADMM achieves an iteration complexity of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ , which improves upon the previously best-known bound of  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-3.5})$  for stochastic Riemannian operator-splitting methods. As a result, our analysis closes the theoretical complexity gap between stochastic Riemannian operator-splitting algorithms and stochastic methods for nonsmooth optimization with nonlinear constraints. Notably, the obtained complexity also matches the best-known bounds in deterministic nonsmooth Riemannian optimization, demonstrating that deterministic-level accuracy can be achieved using only constant-size stochastic samples.

**Key words.** Stochastic optimization, Riemannian optimization, ADMM, single loop, complexity

**AMS subject classifications.** 65K05, 65K10, 90C15, 90C26

**1. Introduction.** We consider the nonsmooth stochastic optimization problem on manifolds:

$$(1.1) \quad \min_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \{F(x) := \mathbb{E}_\xi[f(x, \xi)]\} + g(Ax),$$

where  $\mathcal{M}$  is a Riemannian submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\xi$  is a random variable in the probability space  $\Xi$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_\xi$  is the expectation with respect to the random variable  $\xi$ ,  $f(\cdot, \xi) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a smooth function for each  $\xi$ ,  $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a convex and possibly nonsmooth function, and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ . In practice, calculating the expectation may be computationally expensive, or the distribution of  $\xi$  may be unknown. Such problems arise in numerous machine learning and signal processing applications, including online sparse principal component analysis [42], dictionary recovery [40] and tensor factorization [23], where the data are inherently stochastic and the parameter space exhibits nonlinear geometric constraints.

Owing to the separable structure of the objective function, operator-splitting methods have become a standard and powerful tool for solving problem (1.1). For the general composite case, a standard reformulation introduces an auxiliary variable  $y = Ax$ , resulting in a block-separable problem:

$$(1.2) \quad \min_{x \in \mathcal{M}, y} F(x) + g(y), \text{ s.t. } Ax = y.$$

In the deterministic setting, a broad class of operator-splitting algorithms has been extensively investigated; see, for example, [27, 26, 13, 15, 14, 43, 44, 46, 29, 18]. Among them, Riemannian alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) has attracted particular attention due to its intrinsic decoupling property and strong empirical performance. However, extending Euclidean ADMM to Riemannian manifolds is highly nontrivial. Due to the inherent nonconvexity induced by manifold constraints, several early attempts fail to guarantee convergence; see, e.g., [27, 26]. To address these challenges, several variants of Riemannian ADMM have been proposed recently [46, 29, 14], together with rigorous

\*College of Science, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, 410073, China ([jinjiachen@nudt.edu.cn](mailto:jinjiachen@nudt.edu.cn), [freedeng1208@gmail.com](mailto:freedeng1208@gmail.com), [wanghongxia@nudt.edu.cn](mailto:wanghongxia@nudt.edu.cn))

†Corresponding author.

convergence analyses. Nevertheless, all existing Riemannian ADMM algorithms are restricted to deterministic setting.

In contrast, the development of stochastic operator-splitting methods [50, 13] for solving (1.2) remains rather limited. In particular, [50] proposed a stochastic primal-dual algorithm on manifolds; however, the resulting subproblems are computationally challenging and the analysis relies on a strong structural assumption, namely, that the last block variable does not appear in the nonsmooth term of the objective. When applied to problem (1.2), it attains an iteration complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ . [13] developed a stochastic manifold augmented Lagrangian method with an iteration complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3.5})$ ; however, this algorithm adopts a double-loop framework, which significantly increases computational cost, thereby limiting its practical scalability. On the other hand, when manifold constraints are treated as general nonlinear constraints, [39, 22] achieve an iteration complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$ . This contrast reveals a distinct theoretical complexity gap between existing stochastic Riemannian operator-splitting methods and state-of-the-art stochastic algorithms. This observation naturally leads to the following fundamental question:

*Can we design a stochastic Riemannian operator-splitting algorithm that closes this complexity gap?*

In this paper, we provide an affirmative answer to this question by proposing a stochastic Riemannian ADMM that achieves an iteration complexity of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-3})$ , thereby matching the best-known complexity bound with a dependence of a log factor for stochastic nonsmooth nonlinear constrained optimization. The main contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

- We propose MARS-ADMM, the first stochastic Riemannian ADMM algorithm with provable complexity guarantees for solving problem (1.2). The algorithm adopts a momentum-based variance-reduced gradient estimator applied exclusively to the smooth objective component, together with carefully designed updates of the penalty parameter and dual stepsizes. This design is critical in preventing the variance bound from depending on the penalty parameter, which enables better complexity guarantees in the stochastic Riemannian setting. In contrast to existing stochastic Riemannian augmented Lagrangian methods [13], which rely on a double-loop framework, MARS-ADMM operates in a single-loop fashion and requires only  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  stochastic gradient samples per iteration, leading to substantially improved computational and sampling efficiency.
- Under mild assumptions, our algorithm achieves an iteration complexity of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-3})$ , which improves upon the best-known complexity bounds of  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3.5})$  for stochastic Riemannian operator-splitting algorithms [13]. Owing to its single-loop structure and constant per-iteration sampling cost, the oracle complexity and sample complexity match the same order as the iteration complexity. As a consequence, our results close the theoretical complexity gap between stochastic Riemannian operator-splitting methods and the best-known stochastic algorithms for nonsmooth optimization under general nonlinear constraints [39, 38]. Moreover, the obtained complexity matches the best-known bounds for deterministic nonsmooth Riemannian optimization [14, 3], demonstrating that deterministic-level accuracy can be attained using only constant-size stochastic samples.

Table 1 summarizes our algorithm and several stochastic methods to obtain an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point, where  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$  denotes the asymptotic upper bound that ignores log factors. We do not list the R-ProxSPB in [41] since each of its oracle calls involves a semismooth Newton subroutine whose overall complexity is unclear.

**1.1. Literature Review. Riemannian ADMM.** Due to the separable block structure of problem (1.2), the ADMM is a widely used operator-splitting algorithm for obtaining stationary points.

Table 1: Comparison of the oracle complexity of several methods to solve stochastic composite problems  $\min_x \{F(x) := \mathbb{E}_\xi[f(x, \xi)]\} + g(Ax)$ , where  $F$  and  $c$  are smooth but possibly nonconvex functions,  $g$  and  $h$  are convex but possibly nonsmooth functions, and  $d$  is smooth and convex function. Note that the result of MLALM requires an initial near-feasibility; otherwise, it is  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ .

Algorithms	Constraints	Online	Single-loop	Complexity
finite-sum ADMM [50]	compact submanifold	No	No	$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$
subgradient [31]	Stiefel manifold	Yes	Yes	$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$
smoothing [36]	compact submanifold	Yes	Yes	$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-5})$
StoManIAL [13]	compact submanifold	Yes	No	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-3.5})$
LCSPG [6]	$c(x) + h(x) \leq 0$	Yes	No	$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$
CoSTA [22]	$c(x) \leq 0, d(x) \leq 0$	Yes	Yes	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-3})$
MLALM [39]	$c(x) \leq 0$	Yes	Yes	$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$
<b>MARS-ADMM (this paper)</b>	compact submanifold	Yes	Yes	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-3})$

However, it has primarily been studied in deterministic settings. One of the earliest attempts to decouple the manifold constraints and the nonsmooth term is the splitting orthogonality constraints (SOC) in [27], which involves solving an unconstrained subproblem and a manifold projection subproblem. Manifold ADMM (MADMM) in [26] builds on this by treating the subproblem as smooth Riemannian optimization and applying a proximal operator to the nonsmooth term  $g$  in the subproblem. Despite promising empirical results, both SOC and MADMM lack theoretical guarantees. Later work in [29] applied Moreau smoothing to the nonsmooth term  $g$  to provide theoretical guarantees, a strategy that was subsequently refined with adaptive smoothing [46]. However, such smoothing techniques essentially convert the original nonsmooth problem into a smooth one. This alters the nature of the ADMM algorithm, as the smoothed approximation no longer contains difficult coupling and can be addressed directly using gradient-based methods [3]. An adaptive Riemannian ADMM in [14] was subsequently proposed to solve the original nonsmooth problem directly, proving convergence without smoothing. While certain non-convex Riemannian ADMM methods with convergence guarantees exist for specific smooth applications, they are not suitable for nonsmooth problems [33, 10]. In addition to the above deterministic methods, a finite-sum variant in [50] with complexity  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$  is proposed for a specific stochastic problem that excludes the last block variable from nonsmooth terms and manifold constraints. This contrasts sharply with problem (1.2). Relaxing this condition results in a higher complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$  for solving (1.2).

**Stochastic Riemannian optimization.** There exist several methods for solving Riemannian optimization with nonsmooth expectation objectives in problem (1.1) directly. If the nonsmooth term  $g$  vanishes in (1.1), Riemannian stochastic gradient descent (R-SGD) is an efficient algorithm for solving smooth stochastic problems [5]. Furthermore, R-SVRG [49], R-SRG [25], R-SPIDER [51] and R-SRM [19] utilize the variance reduction technique to improve the convergence rate of R-SGD and achieve the optimal oracle complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$ . On the other hand, the nonsmooth term  $g$  makes developing stochastic algorithms for problem (1.1) challenging. [31] designed a Riemannian stochastic subgradient method for weakly convex problems on the Stiefel manifold with a certain complexity  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ . [41] proposed Riemannian stochastic proximal gradient methods for solving the nonsmooth optimization over the Stiefel manifold. While these methods achieve the best-known result of  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$ , each oracle calls involves a subroutine whose overall complexity is unspecified. By leveraging Moreau smoothing,

[36] presented a Riemannian stochastic smoothing algorithm with  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-5})$  complexity. Recent work by [13] developed a stochastic ALM incorporating Riemannian momentum with improved complexity of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-3.5})$ .

**Nonlinear constrained stochastic optimization.** If the manifold constraints are expressed as equality constraints  $c(x) = 0$ , problem (1.1) can be viewed as a general constrained optimization problem with a nonconvex nonsmooth objective function. When the nonsmooth term  $g$  is absent, recent single-loop momentum-based algorithms in [2] achieve a certain complexity bound  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-4})$ . Another method in [34] uses truncated recursive momentum and increasing penalty parameters to attain better complexity  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-3})$ . Recently, [11] studied an exact penalty method within a double-loop algorithm framework that establish an oracle complexity  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$ . For stochastic composite problems with general constraints  $c(x) + h(x) \leq 0$ , a level constrained stochastic proximal gradient method with an increasing constraint level scheme that guarantees an  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$  oracle complexity under certain constraints qualifications [6]. An accelerated successive convex approximation algorithm with recursive momentum achieves improved complexity  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-3})$  under a parameterized constraint qualification [22]. Additionally, using a linearized augmented Lagrangian function with recursive momentum yields a stochastic algorithm in [39] with a complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ , which can be improved to  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$  if the initial point is nearly feasible.

**1.2. Notation.** The  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space is denoted by  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and the inner product is denoted by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ .  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the Euclidean norm of a vector or  $\|A\|_2 = \max_{\|x\|=1} \|Ax\|$  of a matrix  $A$ .  $\|\cdot\|_1$  denotes the  $\ell_1$  norm of a vector or  $\|A\|_1 = \sum_{ij} |A_{ij}|$  for a matrix  $A$ . The distance from  $x$  to set  $\mathcal{C}$  is denoted by  $\text{dist}(x, \mathcal{C}) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{C}} \|x - y\|$ .  $\nabla F(x)$  and  $\text{grad}F(x)$  denote the Euclidean gradient and Riemannian gradient of a function  $F$ , respectively.  $\text{grad}_x \mathcal{L}_\rho(x, y, \lambda)$  denotes the Riemannian gradient of  $\mathcal{L}_\rho(x, y, \lambda)$  with respect to  $x$ .

**1.3. Organization.** The outline of this paper is as follows: In Section 2, we introduce the preliminaries concerning notation and terminology. In Sections 3 and 4, we present a momentum-based adaptive Riemannian stochastic ADMM algorithm and analyze its convergence. Section 5 illustrates the efficiency of our proposed method through several numerical experiments. Section 6 provides a brief conclusion.

**2. Preliminaries.** This section begins by presenting the basic setup and mathematical tools of Riemannian optimisation. Further details can be found in [1, 7]. Next, we state the proximal operator and define the optimality measure.

**2.1. Riemannian Optimization.** An  $n$ -dimensional smooth manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  is a topological space equipped with a smooth structure, where each point has a neighborhood that is a diffeomorphism of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**DEFINITION 2.1 (Tangent Space).** Consider a manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  embedded in Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , the tangent space  $T_x \mathcal{M}$  at  $x$  is a linear subspace that consists of the derivatives of all differentiable curves on  $\mathcal{M}$  passing through  $x$ :

$$(2.1) \quad T_x \mathcal{M} = \{\gamma'(0) : \gamma(0) = x, \gamma([-\delta, \delta]) \subset \mathcal{M} \text{ for some } \delta > 0, \gamma \text{ is differentiable}\}.$$

If  $\mathcal{M}$  is a Riemannian submanifold of Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , the inner product is defined as the Euclidean inner product. The Riemannian gradient  $\text{grad}F(x) \in T_x \mathcal{M}$  is a tangent vector satisfying

$$\langle v, \text{grad}F(x) \rangle = \left. \frac{d(F(\gamma(t)))}{dt} \right|_{t=0}, \forall v \in T_x \mathcal{M},$$

where  $\gamma(t)$  is a curve as described in (2.1). If  $\mathcal{M}$  is a embedded compact Riemannian submanifold, the Riemannian gradient is given by  $\text{grad}F(x) = \mathcal{P}_{T_x\mathcal{M}}(\nabla F(x))$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_{T_x\mathcal{M}}$  is the projection onto  $T_x\mathcal{M}$ . The retraction turns an element of  $T_x\mathcal{M}$  into a point in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

DEFINITION 2.2 (Retraction). *A retraction on a manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  is a smooth mapping  $\mathcal{R} : T\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  with the following properties. Let  $\mathcal{R}_x : T_x\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be the restriction of  $\mathcal{R}$  at  $x$ . It satisfies  $\mathcal{R}_x(0_x) = x$  and  $d\mathcal{R}_x(0_x) = \text{id}_{T_x\mathcal{M}}$ , where  $0_x$  is the zero element of  $T_x\mathcal{M}$  and  $\text{id}_{T_x\mathcal{M}}$  is the identity mapping on  $T_x\mathcal{M}$ .*

We have the Lipschitz-type inequalities on the retraction on compact submanifold.

LEMMA 2.3. [8] *Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a retraction operator on a compact submanifold  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then, there exist two constants  $p, q > 0$  such that for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}, u \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ , we have*

$$\|\mathcal{R}_x(u) - x\| \leq p\|u\|, \quad \|\mathcal{R}_x(u) - x - u\| \leq q\|u\|^2.$$

LEMMA 2.4. [8] *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  is a compact Riemannian submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  be a retraction on  $\mathcal{M}$ . If the function  $f(x)$  has Lipschitz continuous gradient in the convex hull of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then there exists constant  $L_f \geq 0$  independent of  $x$  such that, for all  $x_k$  among  $x_0, x_1, \dots$  generated by a specified algorithm, the composition  $\hat{f}_k = f \circ \mathcal{R}_{x_k}$  satisfies for all  $\eta \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ ,*

$$\|\hat{f}_k(\eta) - f(x_k) + \langle \eta, \text{grad}f(x_k) \rangle\| \leq \frac{L_f}{2}\|\eta\|^2.$$

The vector transport  $\mathcal{T}_x^y$  is an operator that transports a tangent vector  $v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$  to the tangent space  $T_y\mathcal{M}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{T}_x^y(v) \in T_y\mathcal{M}$ .

DEFINITION 2.5 (Vector Transport). *The vector transport  $\mathcal{T}$  is a smooth mapping  $T\mathcal{M} \oplus T\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T\mathcal{M} : (\eta_x, \xi_x) \mapsto \mathcal{T}_{\eta_x}(\xi_x) \in T\mathcal{M}$  satisfying the following properties for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ : (1) for any  $\xi_x \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ ,  $T_{0_x}\xi_x = \xi_x$ . (2)  $\mathcal{T}_{\eta_x}(a\xi_x + b\omega_x) = a\mathcal{T}_{\eta_x}(\xi_x) + b\mathcal{T}_{\eta_x}(\omega_x)$ .*

When there exists  $\mathcal{R}$  such that  $y = \mathcal{R}_x(\eta_x)$ , we write  $\mathcal{T}_x^y(\xi_x) = \mathcal{T}_{\eta_x}(\xi_x)$ . This paper considers the isometric vector transport  $\mathcal{T}_x^y$ , which satisfies  $\langle u, v \rangle = \langle \mathcal{T}_x^y u, \mathcal{T}_x^y v \rangle$  for all  $u, v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ . The following lemma shows that the Lipschitz continuity of Riemannian gradient can be deduced by the Lipschitz continuity of Euclidean gradient.

LEMMA 2.6. [13] *Suppose that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a compact submanifold embedded in the Euclidean space, given  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $u \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ , the vector transport  $\mathcal{T}$  is defined as  $\mathcal{T}_x^y(u) = d\mathcal{R}_x[\omega](u)$ , where  $y = \mathcal{R}_x(\omega)$ . Denote  $\zeta = \max_{x \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{M})} \|d^2\mathcal{R}_x(\cdot)\|$  and  $G = \max_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \|\nabla f(x)\|$ . Let  $L_p$  be the Lipschitz constant of  $\mathcal{P}_{T_x\mathcal{M}}$  over  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  in sense that for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}, \omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,*

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{T_x\mathcal{M}}(\omega) - \mathcal{P}_{T_y\mathcal{M}}(\omega)\| \leq L_p\|\omega\|\|x - y\|.$$

*For a function  $F$  with Lipschitz gradient with constant  $L_F$ , i.e.,  $\|\nabla F(x) - \nabla F(y)\| \leq L_F\|x - y\|$ , then we have*

$$\|\text{grad}F(x) - \mathcal{T}_x^y \text{grad}F(y)\| \leq ((pL_p + \zeta)G + pL_F)\|\omega\|,$$

*where  $p$  is defined in Lemma 2.3.*

Next we give the definition of retraction smoothness.

DEFINITION 2.7. [8] *A function  $F$  is said to retraction  $L_F$ -smooth with respect to retraction  $\mathcal{R}$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ , if there exists a positive constant  $L_F$  such that for all  $x, y = \mathcal{R}_x(\omega) \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $w \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ , it holds that*

$$(2.2) \quad F(y) \leq F(x) + \langle \text{grad}F(x), \omega \rangle + \frac{L_F}{2}\|\omega\|^2.$$

**2.2. Proximal Operator and Optimality Measure.** The following lemma defines the proximal operator for a convex function and its related properties.

LEMMA 2.8. [4] *Let  $g$  be a convex function. The proximal operator of  $g$  with  $\mu > 0$  is given by*

$$\text{prox}_{\mu g}(y) = \arg \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^m} \{g(z) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|z - y\|^2\}.$$

If  $g$  is  $L_g$ -Lipschitz continuous, it holds that

$$\|y - \text{prox}_{\mu g}(y)\| \leq \mu L_g.$$

We give the optimality measure for problem (1.2). Define the Lagrangian function of (1.2):

$$l(x, y, \lambda) = F(x) + g(y) - \langle \lambda, Ax - y \rangle,$$

where  $\lambda$  is the Lagrange multiplier. Based on the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) condition, we define the  $\epsilon$ -stationary point for problem (1.2).

DEFINITION 2.9 ( $\epsilon$ -Stationary). *Given an  $\epsilon > 0$ , we say that  $x^* \in \mathcal{M}$  is an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of problem (1.2) if there exist  $y^*$  and  $\lambda^*$  such that*

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathcal{P}_{T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}}(-A^\top \lambda^*) + \text{grad}F(x^*)\| \right] \leq \epsilon, \\ \mathbb{E} [\text{dist}(-\lambda^*, \partial g(y^*))] \leq \epsilon, \\ \mathbb{E} [\|Ax^* - y^*\|] \leq \epsilon. \end{cases}$$

In other words,  $(x^*, y^*, \lambda^*)$  is an  $\epsilon$ -KKT point of problem (1.2).

In this work, the algorithm complexity is measured by the total number of stochastic first-order oracles (SFO) to achieve  $\epsilon$ -approximate solution, defined as follows.

DEFINITION 2.10. *For the problem (1.2), a stochastic first-order oracle can be defined as follows: compute the Euclidean gradient  $\nabla f(x, \xi)$  given an input  $x$  and a sample  $\xi$  from  $\Xi$ , the proximal operator  $\text{prox}_g(y)$  and the retraction operator  $\mathcal{R}$ .*

**3. Momentum-based Adaptive Riemannian Stochastic ADMM.** In this section, we propose a novel Riemannian stochastic ADMM algorithm for solving problem (1.2). This method builds upon the general framework of Riemannian ADMM [46, 29, 14] but introduces a fundamentally different gradient estimation strategy to that used in Euclidean stochastic ADMM methods [47, 16].

We begin with the augmented Lagrangian function for problem (1.2):

$$\mathcal{L}_\rho(x, y, \lambda) = F(x) + g(y) - \langle \lambda, Ax - y \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|Ax - y\|^2,$$

where  $\rho > 0$  is a penalty parameter. As a powerful operator-splitting algorithm, ADMM solves the augmented Lagrangian function by optimizing blocks of variables alternately, thereby decoupling the subproblems. Directly applying deterministic ADMM to solve problem (1.2) can be nontrivial and is updated as follows:

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} y_{k+1} = \arg \min_y \{\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_k, y, \lambda_k)\}, \\ x_{k+1} = \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \{\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k)\}, \\ \lambda_{k+1} = \lambda_k - \rho_k (Ax_{k+1} - y_{k+1}). \end{cases}$$

In the stochastic setting, the updates for  $y$  and  $\lambda$  remain similar, but the  $x$ -subproblem must be modified due to the presence of stochastic variables. A common strategy in Euclidean optimization is to linearize  $F$  at  $x_k$  using a stochastic gradient estimator  $G_k$ :

$$x_{k+1} = \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ F(x_k) + G_k^\top(x - x_k) - \langle \lambda_k, Ax - y_{k+1} \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|Ax - y_{k+1}\|^2 \right\}.$$

However, due to the nonlinearity of  $\mathcal{M}$ , this subproblem is still computationally challenging. Instead, we update  $x$  in (3.1) via a single Riemannian stochastic gradient step:

$$x_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}_{x_k}(-\eta_k \text{grad}_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_k, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k)).$$

The Riemannian gradient  $\text{grad}_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_k, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k)$  can be decomposed as:

$$\text{grad}_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_k, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) = \text{grad}F(x_k) + \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}}(\rho_k A^\top(Ax_k - y_{k+1} - \lambda_k/\rho_k)).$$

To efficiently approximate this, we construct a variance-reduced estimator  $\mathcal{G}_k$ :

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{G}_k = v_k + \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}}(\rho_k A^\top(Ax_k - y_{k+1} - \lambda_k/\rho_k)),$$

where  $v_k$  is a stochastic estimator for  $\text{grad}F(x_k)$ , computed recursively as follows:

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} v_k &= \alpha_k \text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_k) + (1 - \alpha_k)(\text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_k) - \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k}(\text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_{k-1}) - v_{k-1})) \\ &= \text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_k) + (1 - \alpha_k)\mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k}(v_{k-1} - \text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_{k-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\mathcal{S}_k = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{|\mathcal{S}_k|}\}$  is a sampling set with cardinality  $|\mathcal{S}_k|$  and the Riemannian stochastic gradient  $\text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_k|} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{S}_k} \text{grad}f(x, \xi)$ . Motivated by [12, 19], the parameter  $\alpha_k \in (0, 1]$  controls the blending of the current stochastic gradient and past estimators information. Setting  $\alpha_k = 1$ ,  $v_k$  recovers the standard Riemannian SGD estimator. This recursive design reduces variance adaptively without requiring large-batch restarts. The complete algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 3.1.

REMARK 3.1. *We conclude this section with several remarks on Algorithm 3.1.*

(i) *The update for  $y_{k+1}$  in (3.4) corresponds to a proximal operator:*

$$y_{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\frac{g}{\rho_k}} \left( Ax_k - \frac{\lambda_k}{\rho_k} \right).$$

(ii) *Unlike the estimator  $\mathcal{G}_k$  for the Riemannian stochastic gradient step (3.5) in [13], where a recursive momentum scheme is applied directly to the entire augmented Lagrangian function  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$ , which is also adopted to update the linearized primal subproblem in [39], and is obtained by*

$$\mathcal{G}_k = \text{grad}\psi_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_k) + (1 - \alpha_k)\mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1} - \text{grad}\psi_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_{k-1})),$$

where  $\psi_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_k)$  is a stochastic gradient estimate of  $\text{grad}_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_k, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k)$ , our method treats the stochastic part  $F(x)$  and the deterministic part  $g(y) - \langle \lambda, Ax - y \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|Ax - y\|^2$  of  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$  separately. Specifically, we approximate  $\text{grad}F(x_k)$  using the recursive momentum estimator  $v_k$  from (3.3), while the deterministic term  $g(x_k) - \langle \lambda_k, Ax_k - y_{k+1} \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|Ax_k - y_{k+1}\|^2$  is computed exactly as  $\mathcal{P}_{T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}}(\rho_k A^\top(Ax_k - y_{k+1} - \lambda_k/\rho_k))$ . Combining these two components yields the gradient estimator  $\mathcal{G}_k$  in (3.2). This separation allows for more efficient variance reduction, which is tailored to the stochastic part of the problem.

**Algorithm 3.1** Momentum-based Adaptive Riemannian Stochastic ADMM (MARS-ADMM)

---

**Require:** initialization  $(x_1, y_1, \lambda_1)$  and parameters  $c_\rho, c_\eta, c_\beta, c_\alpha, \beta_1 > 0$ .

- 1: Sample  $\mathcal{S}_1$  from  $\Xi$  and compute  $v_1 = \text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_1}(x_1)$ .
- 2: **for**  $k = 1, \dots, K$  **do**
- 3:   Update auxiliary variable  $y_{k+1}$  via  $\rho_k = c_\rho k^{1/3}$  and

$$(3.4) \quad y_{k+1} = \arg \min_y \{\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_k, y, \lambda_k)\}.$$

- 4:   Compute stochastic gradient estimator  $\mathcal{G}_k$  by (3.2) and update primal variable  $x_{k+1}$  via  $\eta_k = c_\eta k^{-1/3}$  and

$$(3.5) \quad x_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}_{x_k}(-\eta_k \mathcal{G}_k).$$

- 5:   Update dual stepsize  $\beta_{k+1}$  via

$$(3.6) \quad \beta_{k+1} = \min \left( \frac{\beta_1 \|Ax_1 - y_1\|}{\|Ax_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\|(k+2)^2 \ln(k+3)}, \frac{c_\beta}{k^{1/3} \ln^2(k+2)} \right),$$

- 6:   Update dual variable  $\lambda_{k+1}$  via

$$(3.7) \quad \lambda_{k+1} = \lambda_k - \beta_{k+1} (Ax_{k+1} - y_{k+1}).$$

- 7:   Sample  $\mathcal{S}_{k+1}$  from  $\Xi$  and compute  $v_{k+1}$  by (3.3) with  $\alpha_{k+1} = c_\alpha k^{-2/3}$ .

---

**8: end for**

(iii) *Convergence analysis of nonconvex ADMM typically relies on bounding the dual variable using the smoothness of at least one of the objective components. If  $\nabla F(x)$  is accessible, the optimality condition of the  $x$ -subproblem in (3.1) yields*

$$\mathcal{P}_{T_{x_{k+1}}\mathcal{M}}(\nabla F(x_{k+1}) - A^\top \lambda_k + \rho_k A^\top (Ax_{k+1} - y_{k+1})) = \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_{k+1}}\mathcal{M}}(\nabla F(x_{k+1}) - A^\top \lambda_{k+1}) = 0.$$

*In the Euclidean case, this expression yields  $A^\top \lambda_{k+1} = \nabla F(x_{k+1})$ , meaning that  $\|\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k\|$  can be bounded by  $\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|$  via the Lipschitz continuity of  $\nabla F(x)$  and the full-rank assumption on the matrix  $A$ . However, in the manifold case, the varying tangent space  $T_x\mathcal{M}$  invalidates this argument. Algorithm 3.1 shares a similar bounding technique with [13, 14] that carefully tunes the penalty parameter  $\rho_k$  and dual stepsize  $\beta_k$  to overcome this issue. The update rule in (3.6), where the first term is designed to bound the dual variable and the second term is designed to guarantee the convergence, balances dual update stabilization with convergence guarantees, enabling a near-optimal complexity result.*

**4. Convergence Analysis.** This section analyses the convergence properties of Algorithm 3.1. First, the necessary assumptions are introduced below.

ASSUMPTION 4.1. (i) *The manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  is compact and complete, embedded in Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with diameter  $\mathcal{D}$ .*

(ii) *The gradient function  $\nabla F$  is  $L_{\nabla F}$ -Lipschitz continuous. The function  $g$  is convex and  $L_g$ -Lipschitz continuous.*

(iii)  *$F(x)$  and  $g(y)$  are both lower bounded, and let  $F^* = \inf_x F(x) > -\infty$  and  $g^* = \inf_y g(y) > -\infty$ .*

Assumption 4.1 (i) implies that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a bounded and closed set, i.e., there exists a finite constant  $\mathcal{D}$  such that  $\mathcal{D} = \max_{x,y \in \mathcal{M}} \|x - y\|$ . It covers common manifolds such as the sphere, Stiefel, and Grassmann manifold. Assumption 4.1 (ii) implies that for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ , it holds that

$$\|\nabla F(x) - \nabla F(y)\| \leq L_{\nabla F} \|x - y\|.$$

The following is a standard assumption regarding the stochastic gradient in stochastic optimization.

ASSUMPTION 4.2. *The stochastic gradient  $\text{grad}f(x, \xi)$  is unbiased and has bounded variance. That is, for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  and some  $\sigma > 0$ , it satisfies that*

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi[\text{grad}f(x, \xi)] = \text{grad}F(x), \quad \mathbb{E}_\xi[\|\text{grad}f(x, \xi) - \text{grad}F(x)\|^2] \leq \sigma^2.$$

To achieve faster convergence, generalizing from the Euclidean case, we assume the mean-squared retraction is Lipschitz continuous, which is the minimal additional requirement to achieve the optimal complexity. [19, 20, 13].

ASSUMPTION 4.3. *The objective function  $f$  is mean-squared retraction  $\tilde{L}$  Lipschitz. That is, there exists a positive constant  $\tilde{L}$  such that for all  $x, y = \mathcal{R}_x(\omega) \in \mathcal{M}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi[\|\text{grad}f(x, \xi) - \mathcal{T}_y^x \text{grad}f(y, \xi)\|^2] \leq \tilde{L}^2 \|\omega\|^2$$

holds with vector transport  $\mathcal{T}_y^x$  along the retraction curve  $c(t) := \mathcal{R}_x(t\omega)$ .

Using Lemma 2.8 and updating the dual stepsizes  $\beta_k$  adaptively, the following lemma provides an effective bound on the dual difference. In contrast to previous Riemannian ADMM methods [46, 29], this approach helps our method avoid the use of any smoothing techniques to address the nonsmooth nature of the term  $g$ .

LEMMA 4.4. *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds and consider Algorithm 3.1. Then we can bound dual by primal as*

$$\|\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k\| \leq \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{\rho_k} (L_g + \lambda_{\max}) + \beta_{k+1} \|A\| \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|,$$

where  $\lambda_{\max} = \|\lambda_1\| + \frac{\pi^2}{6} \beta_1 \|Ax_1 - y_1\|$  and  $\beta_1 > 0$ .

*Proof.* We first show that  $\lambda_k$  is bounded. By (3.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\lambda_{k+1}\| &\leq \|\lambda_k\| + \beta_{k+1} \|Ax_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\| \\ &\leq \|\lambda_{k-1}\| + \beta_k \|Ax_k - y_k\| + \beta_{k+1} \|Ax_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\| \\ &\leq \|\lambda_1\| + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \beta_i \|Ax_i - y_i\| \\ &\leq \|\lambda_1\| + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \beta_i \|Ax_i - y_i\| \\ &\stackrel{(3.6)}{\leq} \|\lambda_1\| + \beta_1 \|Ax_1 - y_1\| \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(i+1)^2 \ln(i+2)} \leq \lambda_{\max}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by  $\ln(i+2) > 1$  for  $i \geq 1$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(i+1)^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6}$ . Then the dual difference

can be bounded by the primal difference,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k\| &= \beta_{k+1} \|Ax_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\| \\
&\leq \beta_{k+1} \left\| Ax_k - y_{k+1} - \frac{\lambda_k}{\rho_k} \right\| + \beta_{k+1} \|A\| \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{\rho_k} \|\lambda_k\| \\
&\stackrel{(3.4)}{\leq} \beta_{k+1} \left\| Ax_k - \frac{\lambda_k}{\rho_k} - \text{prox}_{\frac{g}{\rho_k}} \left( Ax_k - \frac{\lambda_k}{\rho_k} \right) \right\| + \beta_{k+1} \|A\| \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{\rho_k} \|\lambda_k\| \\
&\leq \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{\rho_k} (L_g + \lambda_{\max}) + \beta_{k+1} \|A\| \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by Lemma 2.8. The proof is completed.  $\square$

Then we demonstrate that  $\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k)$  is retraction smooth.

LEMMA 4.5. *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds and let  $c_\rho \geq 1$ . Then the augmented Lagrangian function  $\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k)$  is retraction smooth with respect to  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , i.e., for all  $\eta \in T_x \mathcal{M}$ ,*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(\mathcal{R}_x(\eta), y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) \leq \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) + \langle \eta, \text{grad}_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) \rangle + \frac{M \rho_k}{2} \|\eta\|^2,$$

where  $M = (L_{\nabla F} + \|A\|^2)p^2 + 2q\Theta$ ,  $\Theta = \mathcal{B} + \|A\|^2\mathcal{D} + \|A\|(L_g + \lambda_{\max} + 2\|A\|\mathcal{D}) + \|A\|\lambda_{\max}$ ,  $p$  and  $q$  are defined in Lemma 2.3, and  $\mathcal{B}$  is constant.

*Proof.* The Euclidean gradient of  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$  with respect to  $x$  has the following form:

$$\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) = \nabla F(x) + \rho_k A^\top (Ax - y_{k+1} - \lambda_k/\rho_k).$$

One can easily shows that  $\nabla \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k)$  is Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L_{\nabla F} + \rho_k \|A\|^2$ . Since  $\nabla F(x)$  is continuous on the compact manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ , there exists  $\mathcal{B} > 0$  such that  $\|\nabla F(x)\| \leq \mathcal{B}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . By Lemma 4.4, we have

$$(4.1) \quad \|Ax_k - y_k\| \stackrel{(3.7)}{=} \frac{1}{\beta_k} \|\lambda_k - \lambda_{k-1}\| \leq \frac{L_g + \lambda_{\max}}{\rho_{k-1}} + \|A\| \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|,$$

and  $\|y_{k+1}\|$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\|y_{k+1}\| &\leq \|y_{k+1} - Ax_{k+1}\| + \|Ax_{k+1}\| \\
&\stackrel{(4.1)}{\leq} \frac{L_g + \lambda_{\max}}{\rho_k} + \|A\| \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \|A\| \|x_{k+1}\| \\
&\leq L_g + \lambda_{\max} + 2\|A\|\mathcal{D},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by Assumption 4.1 (i) and  $c_\rho \geq 1$ ,  $\rho_k = c_\rho k^{1/3} \geq 1$  for  $k \geq 1$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k)\| &\leq \|\nabla F(x)\| + \rho_k \|A\|^2 \|x\| + \rho_k \|A\| \|y_{k+1}\| + \|A\| \|\lambda_k\| \\
&\leq \mathcal{B} + \rho_k \|A\|^2 \mathcal{D} + \rho_k \|A\| (L_g + \lambda_{\max} + 2\|A\|\mathcal{D}) + \|A\| \lambda_{\max} \leq \rho_k \Theta,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\|\lambda_k\|$  is bounded by Lemma 4.4 and  $\|x\|$  is bounded by Assumption 4.1 (i). Then the proof is completed by Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4.  $\square$

Next, we give the following lemma regarding the decrease of the augmented Lagrangian function  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$ .

LEMMA 4.6. *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds. Consider the sequence  $\{w_k := (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}$  generated by Algorithm 3.1. Define  $\varepsilon_k = v_k - \text{grad}F(x_k)$  and let  $c_\rho \geq 1$ ,  $\nu_k = c_\nu k^{1/3}$ ,  $0 < c_\nu \leq c_\rho$  and  $0 < c_\eta \leq \frac{1}{(1+M)c_\rho}$ , where  $M$  is defined in Lemma 4.5. Then we have*

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k+1}}(w_{k+1}) - \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(w_k) \leq -\frac{\eta_k}{2} \|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\nu_k} \|\varepsilon_k\|^2 + \left( \frac{c_\rho^3}{6\beta_{k+1}^2 \rho_k^2} + \frac{1}{\beta_{k+1}} \right) \|\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k\|^2.$$

*Proof.* By (3.4), we have

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_k, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) \leq \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k).$$

It follows from Lemma 4.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) - \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_k, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) \\ & \leq \langle \text{grad}_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_k, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k), -\eta_k \mathcal{G}_k \rangle + \frac{M \rho_k \eta_k^2}{2} \|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2 \\ & = \langle \text{grad}F(x_k) - v_k + v_k + \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}}(\rho_k A^\top (Ax_k - y_{k+1} - \lambda_k/\rho_k)), -\eta_k \mathcal{G}_k \rangle + \frac{M \rho_k \eta_k^2}{2} \|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2 \\ & \stackrel{(3.2)}{=} \langle \text{grad}F(x_k) - v_k, -\eta_k \mathcal{G}_k \rangle - \eta_k \|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2 + \frac{M \rho_k \eta_k^2}{2} \|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2\nu_k} \|\varepsilon_k\|^2 - \eta_k \|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2 + \frac{(\nu_k + M \rho_k) \eta_k^2}{2} \|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2 \\ (4.4) \quad & \leq \frac{1}{2\nu_k} \|\varepsilon_k\|^2 - \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by  $\nu_k = c_\nu k^{1/3}$ ,  $0 < c_\nu \leq c_\rho$  and  $c_\eta \leq \frac{1}{(1+M)c_\rho}$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}$  and (3.7), we have

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) - \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) = \frac{1}{\beta_{k+1}} \|\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k\|^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k+1}}(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) - \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) \\ (4.6) \quad & = \frac{\rho_{k+1} - \rho_k}{2} \|Ax_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\|^2 \stackrel{(3.7)}{=} \frac{\rho_{k+1} - \rho_k}{2\beta_{k+1}^2} \|\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k\|^2 \leq \frac{c_\rho^3}{6\beta_{k+1}^2 \rho_k^2} \|\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by  $\rho_k = c_\rho k^{1/3}$ , and

$$\rho_{k+1} - \rho_k = c_\rho ((x+1)^{1/3} - x^{1/3}) \leq \frac{c_\rho}{3} k^{-2/3} = \frac{c_\rho^3}{3\rho_k^2}.$$

Combining (4.3)-(4.6), we get the inequality (4.2). The proof is completed.  $\square$

Define an increasing sigma-algebra  $\mathcal{F}_k = \{\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{k-1}\}$ . Hence by updates in Algorithm 3.1,  $x_k$  and  $v_{k-1}$  are measurable in  $\mathcal{F}_k$ . Then we bound the estimation error  $\|\varepsilon_k\|$  in (4.2).

LEMMA 4.7. *Suppose that Assumptions 4.2 and 4.3 hold, and consider Algorithm 3.1. Then we can bound the expected estimation error as*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2] \leq (1 - \alpha_k)^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_{k-1}\|^2] + 2\alpha_k^2 \sigma^2 + 2(1 - \alpha_k)^2 \eta_{k-1}^2 \tilde{L}^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\|^2].$$

*Proof.* From the definition of  $\mathcal{F}_k$  and  $v_k$  in (3.3), we have  $\mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon_k\|^2 = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k]]$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\|\text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_k) + (1 - \alpha_k)\mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k}(v_{k-1} - \text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_{k-1})) - \text{grad}F(x_k)\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\|(1 - \alpha_k)\mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k}(v_{k-1} - \text{grad}F(x_{k-1})) + \alpha_k(\text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_k) - \text{grad}F(x_k)) \\ & \quad + (1 - \alpha_k)(\text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_k) - \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} \text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_{k-1}) + \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} \text{grad}F(x_{k-1}) - \text{grad}F(x_k))\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} (1 - \alpha_k)^2 \|\varepsilon_{k-1}\|^2 + 2\alpha_k^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_k) - \text{grad}F(x_k)\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] \\ & \quad + 2(1 - \alpha_k)^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_k) - \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} \text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_{k-1}) + \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} \text{grad}F(x_{k-1}) - \text{grad}F(x_k)\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} (1 - \alpha_k)^2 \|\varepsilon_{k-1}\|^2 + 2\alpha_k^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_k) - \text{grad}F(x_k)\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] \\ & \quad + 2(1 - \alpha_k)^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_k) - \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} \text{grad}f_{\mathcal{S}_k}(x_{k-1})\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} (1 - \alpha_k)^2 \|\varepsilon_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{2\alpha_k^2 \sigma^2}{|\mathcal{S}_k|} + \frac{2(1 - \alpha_k)^2 \eta_{k-1}^2 \tilde{L}^2}{|\mathcal{S}_k|} \|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where (i) holds by isometry property of vector transport  $\mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k}$  and the fact that it is measurable in  $\mathcal{F}_k$ ; (ii) follows from Assumption 4.2 and  $\mathbb{E}\|x - \mathbb{E}[x]\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\|x\|^2$ ; (iii) holds by Assumptions 4.2 and 4.3. By taking full expectation and  $|\mathcal{S}_k| \geq 1$ , we get the desired result.  $\square$

Define a merit function  $\psi_k = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(w_k) + \gamma_k \|\varepsilon_k\|^2]$  with  $\gamma_{k+1} = c_\gamma k^{1/3}$ ,  $c_\gamma > 0$ . The following lemma shows that  $\psi$  is lower bounded.

LEMMA 4.8. *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds. Consider the sequence  $\{w_k\}$  generated by Algorithm 3.1 and let  $\psi^* := F^* + g^* - \lambda_{\max}(L_g + \lambda_{\max} + \|A\|\mathcal{D})$ . Then the sequence  $\{\psi_k\}$  is uniformly lower bounded by  $\psi^*$ .*

*Proof.* From the definition of  $\psi_k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_k &= F(x_k) + g(y_k) - \langle \lambda_k, Ax_k - y_k \rangle + \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|Ax_k - y_k\|^2 + \gamma_k \|\varepsilon_k\|^2 \\ &\geq F(x_k) + g(Ax_k) - \|\lambda_k\| \|Ax_k - y_k\| \\ &\stackrel{(4.1)}{\geq} F^* + g^* - \lambda_{\max} \left( \frac{L_g + \lambda_{\max}}{\rho_{k-1}} + \|A\| \|x_k - x_{k-1}\| \right) \geq \psi^*, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by Assumption 4.1.  $\square$

The following lemma gives an upper bound for  $\partial\mathcal{L}_\rho$ .

LEMMA 4.9. *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds. Consider the sequence  $\{w_k\}$  generated by Algorithm 3.1 and denote  $\bar{\lambda}_k = \lambda_{k-1} - \rho_{k-1}(Ax_k - y_k)$ . Let  $c_\rho \geq 1$  and  $0 < c_\eta \leq \min\{\frac{1}{1+M}, \frac{1}{N}\} \frac{1}{c_\rho}$ , where*

$M$  is a constant defined in Lemma 4.5,  $N = (pL_p + \zeta)G + p(L_{\nabla F} + \|A\|^2)$  and  $p, L_p, \zeta, G$  are constants defined in Lemma 2.6. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}_{T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}}(-A^\top \bar{\lambda}_k) + \text{grad}F(x_k)\| &\leq 2(\|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\| + \|\varepsilon_{k-1}\|), \\ \text{dist}(-\bar{\lambda}_k, \partial g(y_k)) &\leq p\|A\|\|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\|, \\ \|Ax_k - y_k\| &\leq \frac{L_g + \lambda_{\max}}{\rho_{k-1}} + p\eta_{k-1}\|A\|\|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\|. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* It follows from the formulas of  $\bar{\lambda}_k$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$  that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{P}_{T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}}(\nabla F(x_k) - A^\top \bar{\lambda}_k) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}}\left(\nabla F(x_k) + \rho_{k-1}A^\top(Ax_k - y_k - \frac{\lambda_{k-1}}{\rho_{k-1}})\right) \\ &= \text{grad}F(x_k) + \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}}\left(\rho_{k-1}A^\top(Ax_k - y_k - \frac{\lambda_{k-1}}{\rho_{k-1}})\right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k}\left(\text{grad}F(x_{k-1}) + \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_{k-1}}\mathcal{M}}(\rho_{k-1}A^\top(Ax_{k-1} - y_k - \frac{\lambda_{k-1}}{\rho_{k-1}}))\right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k}(\text{grad}F(x_{k-1}) - v_{k-1}) + \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k}\left(v_{k-1} + \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_{k-1}}\mathcal{M}}(\rho_{k-1}A^\top(Ax_{k-1} - y_k - \frac{\lambda_{k-1}}{\rho_{k-1}}))\right) \\ &= \text{grad}_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x_k, y_k, \lambda_{k-1}) - \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} \text{grad}_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x_{k-1}, y_k, \lambda_{k-1}) + \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} \varepsilon_{k-1} + \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} \mathcal{G}_{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x, y_k, \lambda_{k-1})$  is Lipschitz continuous with the constant  $L_{\nabla F} + \rho_{k-1}\|A\|^2$ , it follows Lemma 2.6 that  $\text{grad}_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x, y_k, \lambda_{k-1})$  is Lipschitz continuous with the constant

$$\ell_k = (pL_p + \zeta)G + p(L_{\nabla F} + \rho_{k-1}\|A\|^2) \leq N\rho_{k-1},$$

where  $N := (pL_p + \zeta)G + p(L_{\nabla F} + \|A\|^2)$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{P}_{T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}}(\nabla F(x_k) - A^\top \bar{\lambda}_k)\| \\ &\leq \|\text{grad}_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x_k, y_k, \lambda_{k-1}) - \mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} \text{grad}_x \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x_{k-1}, y_k, \lambda_{k-1})\| \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} \varepsilon_{k-1}\| + \|\mathcal{T}_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} \mathcal{G}_{k-1}\| \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} N\rho_{k-1}\|\eta_{k-1}\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\| + \|\varepsilon_{k-1}\| + \|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\| \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} 2(\|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\| + \|\varepsilon_{k-1}\|), \end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows from Lemma 2.6 and the fact that  $\mathcal{T}$  is isometric; (ii) holds by  $c_\eta \leq \frac{1}{Nc_\rho}$ . It follows from the optimality condition of (3.4) that

$$0 \in \partial g(y_k) + \lambda_{k-1} - \rho_{k-1}(Ax_{k-1} - y_k).$$

By the definition of  $\bar{\lambda}_k$ , we have that

$$\text{dist}(-\bar{\lambda}_k, \partial g(y_k)) = \rho_{k-1}\|A\|\|x_k - x_{k-1}\| \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} p\rho_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}\|A\|\|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\| \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} p\|A\|\|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\|,$$

where (i) holds by Lemma 2.3; (ii) holds by follows  $c_\eta \leq \frac{1}{(1+M)c_\rho} \leq \frac{1}{c_\rho}$ . Similarly, we have

$$\|Ax_k - y_k\| \stackrel{(4.1)}{\leq} \frac{L_g + \lambda_{\max}}{\rho_{k-1}} + \|A\| \|x_k - x_{k-1}\| \leq \frac{L_g + \lambda_{\max}}{\rho_{k-1}} + p\eta_{k-1} \|A\| \|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\|.$$

The proof is completed.  $\square$

Now we prove the convergence of Algorithm 3.1.

**THEOREM 4.10.** *Suppose that Assumptions 4.1-4.3 hold. Denote  $\bar{\lambda}_k = \lambda_{k-1} - \rho_{k-1}(Ax_k - y_k)$  and consider the sequence  $\{w_k\}_{k=1}^K$  generated by Algorithm 3.1. Let  $c_\rho \geq 2\sqrt{2}$ ,  $0.8 \leq c_\alpha \leq 1$ ,  $0 < c_\beta \leq \frac{c_\rho}{3}$ ,  $0 < c_\nu \leq c_\rho$ ,  $0 < c_\gamma \leq c_\rho$ ,  $c_\nu c_\gamma \geq 8$  and  $c_\eta \leq \min\{\frac{1}{8p^2\|A\|^2}, \frac{1}{1+M}, \frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{8L^2}\} \frac{1}{c_\rho}$ , where  $M$  and  $N$  are constants defined in Lemmas 4.5 and 4.9, respectively. Then we have*

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{c_\alpha c_\gamma}{2} k^{-1/3} \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2] + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{c_\eta}{8} k^{-1/3} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2] \leq \mathcal{C}.$$

where  $\mathcal{C} = \psi_1 - \psi^* + 2c_\gamma c_\alpha^2 \sigma^2 \ln(K) + (\frac{c_1}{3c_\rho} + \frac{2c_\beta c_2}{c_\rho^2})(L_g + \lambda_{\max})^2$  and  $c_1, c_2$  are constants.

*Proof.* By Lemmas 2.3 and 4.4-4.7, taking full expectation on (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi_{k+1} - \psi_k \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k+1}}(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1})] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)] + \gamma_{k+1} \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_{k+1}\|^2] - \gamma_k \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2] \\ &\leq \left( \frac{c_\rho^3}{6\beta_{k+1}^2\rho_k^2} + \frac{1}{\beta_{k+1}} \right) \mathbb{E}[\|\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k\|^2] + \frac{1}{2\nu_k} \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2] - \frac{\eta_k}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2] + \gamma_{k+1} \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_{k+1}\|^2] - \gamma_k \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2] \\ &\leq \left( \frac{c_\rho^3}{6\rho_k^2} + \beta_{k+1} \right) \left( 2p^2\eta_k^2\|A\|^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2] + \frac{2}{\rho_k^2}(L_g + \lambda_{\max})^2 \right) + \left( \frac{1}{2\nu_k} - \gamma_k \right) \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2] - \frac{\eta_k}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2] \\ &\quad + \gamma_{k+1}(1 - \alpha_{k+1})^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2] + 2\gamma_{k+1}\alpha_{k+1}^2\sigma^2 + 2\gamma_{k+1}(1 - \alpha_{k+1})^2\eta_k^2\tilde{L}^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2] \\ &= 2\gamma_{k+1}\alpha_{k+1}^2\sigma^2 - \underbrace{\left( \frac{\eta_k}{2} - 2\left( \frac{c_\rho^3}{6\rho_k^2} + \beta_{k+1} \right) p^2\eta_k^2\|A\|^2 - 2\gamma_{k+1}(1 - \alpha_{k+1})^2\eta_k^2\tilde{L}^2 \right) \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2]}_{\Gamma_1} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{2\nu_k} + \gamma_{k+1}(1 - \alpha_{k+1})^2 - \gamma_k \right) \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2]}_{\Gamma_2} + \underbrace{\left( \frac{c_\rho^3}{6\rho_k^2} + \beta_{k+1} \right) \frac{2}{\rho_k^2}(L_g + \lambda_{\max})^2}_{\Gamma_3}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Next we bound the terms  $\Gamma_1$ ,  $\Gamma_2$  and  $\Gamma_3$  in (4.7), respectively. For  $\Gamma_1$ , since  $\eta_k = c_\eta k^{-1/3}$ ,  $\gamma_{k+1} = c_\gamma k^{1/3}$  and  $\beta_{k+1} \leq c_\beta k^{-1/3}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_1 &\stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \frac{c_\eta}{2} k^{-1/3} - 2\left( \frac{c_\rho}{6} k^{-1/3} + c_\beta k^{-1/3} \right) p^2 \|A\|^2 \eta_k^2 - 2c_\gamma k^{1/3} \tilde{L}^2 c_\eta^2 k^{-2/3} \\ &= \left( \frac{c_\eta}{2} - 2c_\gamma \tilde{L}^2 c_\eta^2 \right) k^{-1/3} - \left( \frac{c_\rho}{3} + 2c_\beta \right) k^{-1/3} p^2 \|A\|^2 \eta_k^2 \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\geq} \frac{\eta_k}{4} - \left( \frac{c_\rho}{3} + 2c_\beta \right) p^2 \|A\|^2 c_\eta \eta_k \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\geq} \frac{\eta_k}{8}, \end{aligned}$$

where (i) holds by  $\frac{c_\rho^3}{6\rho_k^2} = \frac{c_\rho}{6}k^{-2/3} \leq \frac{c_\rho}{6}k^{-1/3}$ ; (ii) holds by  $0 < c_\gamma \leq c_\rho$  and  $c_\eta \leq \frac{1}{8c_\rho L^2} \leq \frac{1}{8c_\gamma L^2}$ ; (iii) holds by  $0 < c_\beta \leq \frac{c_\rho}{3}$  and  $0 < c_\eta \leq \frac{1}{8p^2\|A\|^2c_\rho}$ . For  $\Gamma_2$ , since  $\nu_k = c_\nu k^{1/3}$  and  $\alpha_{k+1} = c_\alpha k^{-2/3}$ ,  $0 < c_\alpha \leq 1$ , we have

$$(4.8) \quad \Gamma_2 \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2\nu_k} + \gamma_{k+1} - \gamma_k - \alpha_{k+1}\gamma_{k+1} \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \left(\frac{1}{2c_\nu} + \frac{c_\gamma}{3}\right)(k-1)^{-2/3} - c_\alpha c_\gamma k^{-1/3},$$

where (i) holds by  $(1-\alpha_{k+1})^2 \leq 1-\alpha_{k+1}$  and (ii) holds by  $\gamma_{k+1} - \gamma_k \leq \frac{c_\gamma}{3}(k-1)^{-2/3}$  (the concavity of the function  $x^{1/3}$ ). Here we consider two cases for (4.8). When  $k \neq 2$ , one has  $(k-1)^{-2/3} \leq k^{-2/3} \leq k^{-1/3}$ . From (4.8), we have

$$\Gamma_2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{2c_\nu} + \frac{c_\gamma}{3}\right)k^{-1/3} - c_\alpha c_\gamma k^{-1/3} \leq -\frac{c_\alpha c_\gamma}{2}k^{-1/3},$$

where last inequality holds by setting  $\frac{1}{c_\nu c_\gamma} + \frac{2}{3} \leq c_\alpha \leq 1$  and  $c_\nu c_\gamma \geq 3$ . If  $k = 2$ , we can choose  $c_\alpha = 1$  and  $c_\nu c_\gamma \geq (\frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{2}} - \frac{2}{3})^{-1} \approx 7.87$  such that  $\frac{1}{2c_\nu} + \frac{c_\gamma}{3} \leq \frac{c_\alpha c_\gamma}{2\sqrt[3]{2}}$ , then

$$\frac{1}{2c_\nu} + \frac{c_\gamma}{3} - \frac{c_\alpha c_\gamma}{\sqrt[3]{2}} \leq -\frac{c_\alpha c_\gamma}{2\sqrt[3]{2}}.$$

In conclusion, we can choose  $c_\nu c_\gamma \geq 8$  and  $\frac{1}{c_\nu c_\gamma} + \frac{2}{3} < 0.8 \leq c_\alpha \leq 1$  such that

$$\Gamma_2 \leq -\frac{c_\alpha c_\gamma}{2}k^{-1/3}.$$

For  $\Gamma_3$ , since  $\beta_{k+1} \leq \frac{c_\beta}{k^{1/3} \ln^2(k+2)}$ , we have

$$\Gamma_3 \leq \left(\frac{1}{3c_\rho}k^{-4/3} + \frac{2c_\beta k^{-1}}{c_\rho^2 \ln^2(k+2)}\right)(L_g + \lambda_{\max})^2,$$

Plugging these bounds into (4.7) yields

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_{k+1} - \psi_k &\leq 2c_\gamma c_\alpha^2 \sigma^2 k^{-1} - \frac{\eta_k}{8} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2] - \frac{c_\alpha c_\gamma}{2} k^{-1/3} \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2] \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{3c_\rho}k^{-4/3} + \frac{2c_\beta k^{-1}}{c_\rho^2 \ln^2(k+2)}\right)(L_g + \lambda_{\max})^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.8, telescoping (4.9) from  $k = 1, \dots, K$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{c_\alpha c_\gamma}{2} k^{-1/3} \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2] + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{c_\eta}{8} k^{-1/3} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2] \\ &\leq \psi_1 - \psi_* + 2c_\gamma c_\alpha^2 \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^K k^{-1} + \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{1}{3c_\rho}k^{-4/3} + \frac{2c_\beta k^{-1}}{c_\rho^2 \ln^2(k+2)}\right)(L_g + \lambda_{\max})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sum_{k=1}^K k^{-4/3}$  is convergence, there exists a constant  $\mathcal{C}_1$  such that  $\sum_{k=1}^K k^{-4/3} \leq \mathcal{C}_1$ . Following [37], there exists a constant  $\mathcal{C}_2$  such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{k^{-1}}{\ln^2(k+2)} \leq \mathcal{C}_2.$$

Let  $\mathcal{C} := \psi_1 - \psi_* + 2c_\gamma c_\alpha^2 \sigma^2 \ln(K) + \left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_1}{3c_\rho} + \frac{2c_\beta \mathcal{C}_2}{c_\rho^2}\right) (L_g + \lambda_{\max})^2$ . Thus, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{c_\alpha c_\gamma}{2} k^{-1/3} \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_k\|^2] + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{c_\eta}{8} k^{-1/3} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_k\|^2] \leq \mathcal{C}.$$

The proof is completed.  $\square$

**THEOREM 4.11** (Complexity of MARS-ADMM). *Under the setting of Theorem 4.10. Then for any given positive integer  $K > 2$ , there exists  $\kappa \in [\lceil K/2 \rceil, K]$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{P}_{T_{x_\kappa} \mathcal{M}}(-A^\top \bar{\lambda}_\kappa) + \text{grad}F(x_\kappa)\|] &\leq 4\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}}(K+1)^{-1/3}, \\ \mathbb{E}[\text{dist}(-\bar{\lambda}_\kappa, \partial g(y_\kappa))] &\leq 2p\|A\|\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}}(K+1)^{-1/3}, \\ \mathbb{E}[\|Ax_\kappa - y_\kappa\|] &\leq 2 \left( 2p\|A\|c_\eta\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} + \frac{L_g + \lambda_{\max}}{c_\rho} \right) (K-2)^{-1/3}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{Q} = \frac{8\mathcal{C}}{\min\{4c_\alpha c_\gamma, c_\eta\}}$ ,  $\mathcal{C} = \psi_1 - \psi^* + 2c_\gamma c_\alpha^2 \sigma^2 \ln(K) + \left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_1}{3c_\rho} + \frac{2c_\beta \mathcal{C}_2}{c_\rho^2}\right) (L_g + \lambda_{\max})^2$  and  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$  are constants.

*Proof.* It follows from Theorem 4.10 that

$$\min_{\lceil K/2 \rceil \leq k \leq K} (\mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_{k-1}\|^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\|^2]) \sum_{k=\lceil K/2 \rceil}^K k^{-1/3} \leq \sum_{k=\lceil K/2 \rceil}^K k^{-1/3} (\mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_{k-1}\|^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_{k-1}\|^2]) \leq \mathcal{Q},$$

where  $\mathcal{Q} = \frac{8\mathcal{C}}{\min\{4c_\alpha c_\gamma, c_\eta\}}$ . Then we bound  $\sum_{k=\lceil K/2 \rceil}^K k^{-1/3}$  as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=\lceil K/2 \rceil}^K k^{-1/3} &\stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \sum_{k=\lceil K/2 \rceil}^K \int_k^{k+1} x^{-1/3} \, dx \\ &= \sum_{k=\lceil K/2 \rceil}^K \frac{3}{2} \left[ (k+1)^{2/3} - k^{2/3} \right] \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \left[ (K+1)^{2/3} - (\lceil K/2 \rceil)^{2/3} \right] \\ &\geq \frac{3}{2} \left[ (K+1)^{2/3} - (K/2 + 1)^{2/3} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\geq} \frac{3}{2} \left[ \frac{2}{3}(K+1)^{-1/3}((K+1) - (K/2 + 1)) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}K(K+1)^{-1/3} \geq \frac{1}{4}(K+1)^{2/3}, \end{aligned}$$

where (i) holds because the function  $x^{-1/3}$  is monotonically decreasing and (ii) uses the concavity of the function  $x^{2/3}$ . Thus there exists  $\kappa \in [\lceil K/2 \rceil, K]$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_{\kappa-1}\|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_{\kappa-1}\|^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_{\kappa-1}\|^2] \leq 4\mathcal{Q}(K+1)^{-2/3},$$

This together with Lemma 4.9, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{P}_{T_{x_\kappa} \mathcal{M}}(-A^\top \bar{\lambda}_\kappa) + \text{grad}F(x_\kappa)\|^2] \leq 4(\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_{\kappa-1}\|^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_{\kappa-1}\|^2]) \leq 16\mathcal{Q}(K+1)^{-2/3},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{dist}^2(-\bar{\lambda}_\kappa, \partial g(y_\kappa))] \leq p^2 \|A\|^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_{\kappa-1}\|^2] \leq 4p^2 \|A\|^2 \mathcal{Q}(K+1)^{-2/3}.$$

Since  $\eta_{\kappa-1} = c_\eta(\kappa-1)^{-1/3} \leq c_\eta(\frac{K-2}{2})^{-1/3} \leq 2c_\eta(K-2)^{-1/3}$  and  $\rho_{\kappa-1} = c_\rho(\kappa-1)^{1/3} \geq c_\rho(\frac{K-2}{2})^{1/3} \geq \frac{c_\rho}{2}(K-2)^{1/3}$ , it is easily shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|Ax_\kappa - y_\kappa\|] &\leq p\eta_{\kappa-1}\|A\|\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{G}_{\kappa-1}\|] + \frac{L_g + \lambda_{\max}}{\rho_{\kappa-1}} \\ &\leq 4p\|A\|c_\eta\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}}(K-2)^{-1/3}(K+1)^{-1/3} + \frac{2(L_g + \lambda_{\max})}{c_\rho}(K-2)^{-1/3} \\ &\leq 2\left(2p\|A\|c_\eta\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} + \frac{L_g + \lambda_{\max}}{c_\rho}\right)(K-2)^{-1/3}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed.  $\square$

Theorem 4.11 establishes that, given  $\epsilon > 0$ , MARS-ADMM algorithm achieves an oracle complexity of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-3})$ . Specifically, in the noiseless case where  $\sigma^2 = 0$ , this result can be improved to  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$ . Although StoManIAL [13] applies the same strategies to the augmented Lagrangian method, it achieves only  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-3.5})$  in the stochastic setting, falling short of the result  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$  attained by its deterministic counterpart. In contrast, our stochastic method achieves the same order of complexity, matching the deterministic counterpart from [14]. This improvement is due to the single-loop structure of MARS-ADMM, in which the stepsize  $\eta_k$  is explicitly coupled to the penalty parameter  $\rho_k$  as  $\eta_k \propto 1/\rho_k$ . This coupling in (3.5) stabilizes the update magnitude  $\|x_{k+1} - x_k\| \approx \|\eta_k \mathcal{G}_k\| \approx (c_\eta/\rho_k)\mathcal{O}(\rho_k) = \mathcal{O}(1)$ , thereby neutralizing the adverse effect of an increasing  $\rho_k$ . Conversely, StoManIAL uses an inner solver whose condition number worsens as  $\rho_k$  increases, resulting in a poorer complexity for the double-loop framework.

The penalty parameter  $\rho_k = c_\rho k^{1/3}$  is designed to increase monotonically, a strategy that is well supported in theory [21, 32, 17]. Its growth is moderate in practice; for example, after  $K = 1000$  iterations,  $\rho_K = 10\rho_1$ , thus avoiding the numerical instability of more aggressive schedules. As some algorithmic conditions depend on  $c_\rho$ , we recommend determining this value via grid searches prior to tuning other parameters.

Finally, our complexity bounds are independent of the batch size  $|\mathcal{S}_k|$  and remain valid even for a minimal batch size of  $O(1)$ . This provides considerable flexibility in implementation, particularly in settings with limited resources. In practice, however, extremely small batch sizes can lead to erratic convergence and heightened parameter sensitivity despite the asymptotic guarantees. We therefore recommend choosing a batch size that balances computational cost with practical stability, rather than the minimum size.

**5. Experiments.** This section demonstrates the performance of our MARS-ADMM algorithm. All experiments are performed in MATLAB R2023b on a 64-bit laptop equipped with Intel i9-13900HX CPU and 32.0 GB RAM. In each numerical experiment, the results are averaged across 10 repeated experiments with random initializations. We compare MARS-ADMM with three existing Riemannian stochastic algorithms: Riemannian stochastic subgradient method (R-Subgrad) in [31], Riemannian stochastic proximal gradient descent method (R-ProxSGD) and Riemannian proximal SpiderBoost method (R-ProxSPB) in [41].

**5.1. Sparse Principal Component Analysis.** Sparse principal component analysis (SPCA) [24, 45] is a key technique for high-dimensional data analysis, identifying principal components with

sparse loadings. Given a dataset  $\{z_1, \dots, z_m\} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , a formulation of SPCA problem on the Stiefel manifold  $\text{St}(n, p) := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} : X^\top X = I_p\}$  is as follows:

$$(5.1) \quad \min_{X \in \text{St}(n, p)} \sum_{i=1}^m \|z_i - XX^\top z_i\|^2 + \mu \|X\|_1,$$

where  $\mu > 0$  is a regularization parameter. The tangent space of  $\text{St}(n, p)$  is defined as  $T_x \text{St}(n, p) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} : X^\top \theta + \theta^\top X = 0\}$ . Given any  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ , the projection of  $U$  onto  $T_x \text{St}(n, p)$  is  $\mathcal{P}_{T_x \text{St}(n, p)}(U) = U - \frac{1}{2}(U^\top X + X^\top U)X$  [1].

In this experiment, we first run the MARS-ADMM and terminate it when either the objective function value satisfies  $\|F(X_k) - F(X_{k-1})\| \leq 10^{-6}$  or the maximum of 1500 iterations is reached. Denote the obtained function value of MARS-ADMM as  $F_{\text{ADMM}}$ . We terminate the other algorithms when either the objective function value satisfies  $F(X_k) \leq F_{\text{ADMM}}$  or the iteration limit is reached. All algorithms use the same random initializations in each test. For R-Subgrad, we use the diminishing stepsize  $\eta_k = \frac{\eta_0}{\sqrt{k+1}}$  with  $\eta_0 = 0.001$ . For R-ProxSGD and R-ProxSPB, we use the same settings as in the original paper. For MARS-ADMM, we set  $\beta_1 = c_\rho = 50$ ,  $c_\eta = 0.01$ ,  $c_\alpha = 0.8$ ,  $c_\beta = 0.75$  and  $|\mathcal{S}_k| \equiv 50$ .




Fig. 1: Comparison of R-Subgrad, R-ProxSGD, R-ProxSPB and MARS-ADMM for solving problem (5.1) with synthetic data. The first row:  $\mu = 0.4$  and the second row:  $\mu = 0.8$ .

**Synthetic dataset:** We set  $m = 5000$  and  $n = 500$  to randomly generate the data matrix, in which all entries follow a standard Gaussian distribution. The columns are then shifted to have a zero mean, after which the column vectors are normalized. Figure 1 clearly shows that MARS-ADMM outperforms all the other methods.




Fig. 2: Comparison of R-Subgrad, R-ProxSGD, R-ProxSPB and MARS-ADMM for solving SPCA problem (5.1) with real data. The first row is *coil100* and the second row is *MNIST*.

**Real dataset:** We conduct experiments on two real datasets: *coil100* [35] and *MNIST* [28]. The *coil100* dataset contains  $m = 7200$  RGB images of 100 objects taken from different angles with  $n = 1024$ . The *MNIST* dataset contains  $m = 60000$  grayscale digit images, each measuring  $n = 784$  pixels. As Figure 2 shows, both MARS-ADMM and R-ProxSPB achieve better performance. Moreover, MARS-ADMM converges faster with a single-loop structure than R-ProxSPB, which uses periodic full-gradient evaluations.

**5.2. Regularized Linear Classification Over Sphere.** Optimization over sphere manifolds arises in empirical risk minimization when the model parameters represent probability distributions, proportions, or normalized weights [30]. Consider a classification problem with  $N$  training examples  $\{a_i, b_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , where  $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 1}$  and  $b_i \in \{-1, 1\}$  for all  $i \in [N]$ . The goal is to estimate a linear classifier parameter in the sphere manifold,  $x \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : x^\top x = 1\}$ , that minimizes a smooth nonconvex loss function [48] with  $\ell_1$ -regularization as

$$(5.2) \quad \min_{x \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-b_i x^\top a_i)} \right)^2 + \mu \|x\|_1.$$

**Synthetic dataset:** To simulate the data, the true parameter  $x$  is sampled from  $\mathcal{N}(0, I_m)$  and normalized to  $\mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ . The features  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^N$  are drawn uniformly at random, and the corresponding

labels  $b_i$  to  $a_i$  are assigned as

$$b_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x^\top a_i + \epsilon_i > 0, \\ -1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where the noise  $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ . The batch sizes for R-ProxSGD, R-ProxSPB and MARS-ADMM are all set to 100. The stepsizes for R-Subgrad, R-ProxSGD and R-ProxSPB are set to  $\frac{0.005}{\sqrt{k}}$ ,  $\frac{0.01}{\sqrt{k}}$  and  $\frac{0.015}{\sqrt{k}}$ , respectively. R-ProxSPB uses a snapshot frequency of 50. For MARS-ADMM, we use the same settings as in the SPCA experiments. Figure 3 shows that MARS-ADMM achieves lower objective values at a faster rate than the existing methods, demonstrating its efficiency and solution quality.




Fig. 3: Comparison of R-Subgrad, R-ProxSGD, R-ProxSPB and MARS-ADMM for solving problem (5.2) with synthetic data and  $\mu = \sigma^2 = 0.5$ .

Table 2 reports the performance for different levels of noise added to the simulated data. Here, we only compare MARS-ADMM with R-ProxSPB since the former uses variance reduction technology and outperformed both R-Subgrad and R-ProxSGD in Figure 3. The batch size was adjusted to 500 for both R-ProxSPB and MARS-ADMM. As can be seen, both MARS-ADMM and R-ProxSPB achieve a comparable decrease in the objective function, but MARS-ADMM is faster. This suggests that the recursive momentum and adaptive dual parameters effectively enable the proposed algorithm to converge in all scenarios.

Table 2: Effect of the added noise on the performance of R-ProxSPB and MARS-ADMM for solving problem (5.2) with  $m = 10$  and  $N = 5 \times 10^5$ .

Setting ( $\mu, \sigma^2$ )	R-ProxSPB		MARS-ADMM	
	Obj	Time (s)	Obj	Time (s)
(0.01, 0.01)	0.2872	40.17	0.2735	38.48
(0.25, 1)	0.7590	41.26	0.7144	39.32
(0.5, 5)	1.0924	42.01	0.9897	40.22
(0.75, 10)	1.3505	43.61	1.2288	42.59

**Real dataset:** We conduct experiments on three real datasets: *phishing*, *a9a* and *w8a*. The test instances are sourced from the LIBSVM datasets [9]. The phishing dataset has  $m = 68$  and  $N = 11055$ . The *a9a* dataset has  $m = 123$  and  $N = 32561$ . The *w8a* dataset has  $m = 300$  and  $N = 49749$ . From the Figure 4, it can be observed that R-ProxSGD and R-ProxSPB address this problem very well, albeit still needing multiple inner iterations to converge. In contrast, MARS-ADMM achieves convergence in a single loop, outperforming all compared algorithms. Furthermore, when applied to different datasets with same parameter settings, MARS-ADMM exhibits robust performance, indicating its general applicability.




Fig. 4: Comparison of R-Subgrad, R-ProxSGD, R-ProxSPB and MARS-ADMM for solving problem (5.2) with real data. The first row:  $\mu = 0.4$  and the second row:  $\mu = 0.6$ .

**6. Conclusions.** This paper investigated the design of a stochastic ADMM algorithm for non-smooth composite optimization over Riemannian manifolds. We proposed the MARS-ADMM method, which integrates a momentum-based stochastic gradient estimator with an adaptive penalty update tailored for the manifold constraint. Our analysis shows that the algorithm finds an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point with a near-optimal oracle complexity of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-3})$ . This establishes the first stochastic Riemannian ADMM with theoretical guarantees and improves upon the best-known bounds for stochastic Riemannian operator-splitting methods. It also demonstrates that deterministic-level convergence can be attained using only a constant number of stochastic gradient samples per iteration. Extensive experiments on sparse PCA and regularized classification over the sphere manifold demonstrate the algorithm's superior performance.

## REFERENCES

- [1] P.-A. ABSIL, R. MAHONY, AND R. SEPULCHRE, *Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds*, in Optimization Algorithms on Matrix Manifolds, Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [2] A. ALACAOGLU AND S. J. WRIGHT, *Complexity of single loop algorithms for nonlinear programming with stochastic objective and constraints*, in International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, PMLR, 2024, pp. 4627–4635.
- [3] A. BECK AND I. ROSSET, *A dynamic smoothing technique for a class of nonsmooth optimization problems on manifolds*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 33 (2023), pp. 1473–1493.
- [4] A. BÖHM AND S. J. WRIGHT, *Variable smoothing for weakly convex composite functions*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 188 (2021), pp. 628–649.
- [5] S. BONNABEL, *Stochastic gradient descent on Riemannian manifolds*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 58 (2013), pp. 2217–2229.
- [6] D. BOOB, Q. DENG, AND G. LAN, *Level constrained first order methods for function constrained optimization*, Mathematical Programming, 209 (2025), pp. 1–61.
- [7] N. BOUMAL, *An introduction to optimization on smooth manifolds*, Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- [8] N. BOUMAL, P.-A. ABSIL, AND C. CARTIS, *Global rates of convergence for nonconvex optimization on manifolds*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, 39 (2019), pp. 1–33.
- [9] C.-C. CHANG AND C.-J. LIN, *LIBSVM: A library for support vector machines*, ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology, 2 (2011), pp. 1–27.
- [10] X. CHEN, C. CUI, D. HAN, AND L. QI, *Non-convex pose graph optimization in SLAM via proximal linearized Riemannian ADMM*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 206 (2025), pp. 1–43.
- [11] Y. CUI, Q. SHI, X. WANG, AND X. XIAO, *An exact penalty method for stochastic equality-constrained optimization*, Optimization Online, November, (2025).
- [12] A. CUTKOSKY AND F. ORABONA, *Momentum-based variance reduction in non-convex SGD*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 32, 2019, pp. 15236–15245.
- [13] K. DENG, J. HU, J. WU, AND Z. WEN, *Oracle complexities of augmented Lagrangian methods for nonsmooth composite optimization on a compact submanifold*, Mathematics of Operations Research, (2025), <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.2024.0498>.
- [14] K. DENG, J. JIN, J. HU, AND H. WANG, *Adaptive Riemannian ADMM for nonsmooth optimization: Optimal complexity without smoothing*, in The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, 2025.
- [15] K. DENG AND Z. PENG, *A manifold inexact augmented Lagrangian method for nonsmooth optimization on Riemannian submanifolds in Euclidean space*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, 43 (2023), pp. 1653–1684.
- [16] K. DENG, S. ZHANG, B. WANG, J. JIN, J. ZHOU, AND H. WANG, *Stochastic momentum ADMM for nonconvex and nonsmooth optimization with application to PnP algorithm*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.08223, (2025).
- [17] M. V. DOLGOPOLIK, *Exact penalty functions with multidimensional penalty parameter and adaptive penalty updates*, Optimization Letters, 16 (2022), pp. 1281–1300.
- [18] L. EL BOURKHISSI AND I. NECOARA, *Convergence rates for an inexact linearized admm for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization with nonlinear equality constraints*, Computational Optimization and Applications, (2025), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-025-00737-1>.
- [19] A. HAN AND J. GAO, *Riemannian stochastic recursive momentum method for non-convex optimization*, in Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 2021, pp. 2505–2511.
- [20] A. HAN AND J. GAO, *Improved variance reduction methods for Riemannian non-convex optimization*, IEEE

Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, 44 (2022), pp. 7610–7623.

[21] B. HE, H. YANG, AND S. WANG, *Alternating direction method with self-adaptive penalty parameters for monotone variational inequalities*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 106 (2000), pp. 337–356.

[22] B. M. IDREES, L. ARORA, AND K. RAJAWAT, *Constrained stochastic recursive momentum successive convex approximation*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 73 (2025), pp. 3331–3345.

[23] M. ISHTEVA, P.-A. ABSIL, S. VAN HUFFEL, AND L. DE LATHAUWER, *Best low multilinear rank approximation of higher-order tensors, based on the Riemannian trust-region scheme*, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 32 (2011), pp. 115–135.

[24] M. JOURNÉE, Y. NESTEROV, P. RICHTÁŘIK, AND R. SEPULCHRE, *Generalized power method for sparse principal component analysis.*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 11 (2010).

[25] H. KASAI, H. SATO, AND B. MISHRA, *Riemannian stochastic recursive gradient algorithm*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2018, pp. 2516–2524.

[26] A. KOVNATSKY, K. GLASHOFF, AND M. M. BRONSTEIN, *MADMM: A generic algorithm for non-smooth optimization on manifolds*, in European Conference on Computer Vision, Springer, 2016, pp. 680–696.

[27] R. LAI AND S. OSHER, *A splitting method for orthogonality constrained problems*, Journal of Scientific Computing, 58 (2014), pp. 431–449.

[28] Y. LECEUN, *The MNIST database of handwritten digits*, <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>, (1998).

[29] J. LI, S. MA, AND T. SRIVASTAVA, *A Riemannian alternating direction method of multipliers*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 50 (2025), pp. 3222–3242.

[30] P. LI, S. S. RANGAPURAM, AND M. SLAWSKI, *Methods for sparse and low-rank recovery under simplex constraints*, Statistica Sinica, 30 (2020), pp. 557–577.

[31] X. LI, S. CHEN, Z. DENG, Q. QU, Z. ZHU, AND A. MAN-CHO SO, *Weakly convex optimization over Stiefel manifold using Riemannian subgradient-type methods*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 31 (2021), pp. 1605–1634.

[32] Z. LIN, R. LIU, AND Z. SU, *Linearized alternating direction method with adaptive penalty for low-rank representation*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 24, 2011, pp. 612–620.

[33] C. LU, J. FENG, Z. LIN, AND S. YAN, *Nonconvex sparse spectral clustering by alternating direction method of multipliers and its convergence analysis*, in Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, vol. 32, 2018, pp. 3714–3721.

[34] Z. LU, S. MEI, AND Y. XIAO, *Variance-reduced first-order methods for deterministically constrained stochastic nonconvex optimization with strong convergence guarantees*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.09906, (2024).

[35] S. A. NENE, S. K. NAYAR, AND H. MURASE, *Columbia object image library (coil-100)*, tech. report, NO. CUCS-006-96, Department of Computer Science, Columbia University, 1996.

[36] Z. PENG, W. WU, J. HU, AND K. DENG, *Riemannian smoothing gradient type algorithms for nonsmooth optimization problem on compact Riemannian submanifold embedded in Euclidean space*, Applied Mathematics and Optimization, 88 (2023), p. 85.

[37] M. F. SAHIN, A. EFTEKHARI, A. ALACAOGLU, F. LATORRE, AND V. CEVHER, *An inexact augmented Lagrangian framework for nonconvex optimization with nonlinear constraints*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 32, 2019, pp. 13965–13977.

[38] Q. SHI, X. WANG, AND H. WANG, *Bregman linearized augmented Lagrangian method for nonconvex constrained stochastic zeroth-order optimization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.09409, (2025).

[39] Q. SHI, X. WANG, AND H. WANG, *A momentum-based linearized augmented Lagrangian method for nonconvex constrained stochastic optimization*, Mathematics of Operations Research, (2025), <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.2022.0193>.

[40] J. SUN, Q. QU, AND J. WRIGHT, *Complete dictionary recovery over the sphere II: Recovery by Riemannian trust-region method*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 63 (2016), pp. 885–914.

[41] B. WANG, S. MA, AND L. XUE, *Riemannian stochastic proximal gradient methods for nonsmooth optimization over the Stiefel manifold*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 23 (2022), pp. 1–33.

[42] C. WANG AND Y. M. LU, *Online learning for sparse PCA in high dimensions: Exact dynamics and phase transitions*, in 2016 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW), IEEE, 2016, pp. 186–190.

[43] M. XU, B. JIANG, Y.-F. LIU, AND A. M.-C. SO, *A Riemannian alternating descent ascent algorithmic framework for nonconvex-linear minimax problems on Riemannian manifolds*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.19588, (2024).

[44] M. XU, B. JIANG, Y.-F. LIU, AND A. M.-C. SO, *On the oracle complexity of a Riemannian inexact augmented Lagrangian method for nonsmooth composite problems over Riemannian submanifolds*, Optimization Letters, (2025), pp. 1–19.

[45] W. YANG AND H. XU, *Streaming sparse principal component analysis*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2015, pp. 494–503.

[46] G. YUAN, *ADMM for nonsmooth composite optimization under orthogonality constraints*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15129, (2024).

- [47] Y. ZENG, J. BAI, S. WANG, Z. WANG, AND X. SHEN, *A hybrid stochastic alternating direction method of multipliers for nonconvex and nonsmooth composite optimization*, European Journal of Operational Research, 329 (2026), pp. 63–78.
- [48] D. ZHANG AND S. DAVANLOO TAJBAKHSH, *Riemannian stochastic variance-reduced cubic regularized newton method for submanifold optimization*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 196 (2023), pp. 324–361.
- [49] H. ZHANG, S. J REDDI, AND S. SRA, *Riemannian SVRG: Fast stochastic optimization on Riemannian manifolds*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 29, 2016, pp. 4592–4600.
- [50] J. ZHANG, S. MA, AND S. ZHANG, *Primal-dual optimization algorithms over Riemannian manifolds: An iteration complexity analysis*, Mathematical Programming, 184 (2020), pp. 445–490.
- [51] J. ZHANG, H. ZHANG, AND S. SRA, *R-SPIDER: A fast Riemannian stochastic optimization algorithm with curvature independent rate*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.04194, (2018).