SAN: Stochastic Average Newton Algorithm for Minimizing Finite Sums

Jiabin Chen^{1,6}, Rui Yuan^{2,5,6}, Guillaume Garrigos³, Robert M. Gower^{4,5,6}

¹Baidu Inc., ²Meta AI, ³Université de Paris, Sorbonne Université, CNRS, LPSM ⁴CCM, Flatiron Institute, ⁵LTCI, Télécom Paris, ⁶Institut Polytechnique de Paris.

International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS), 2022



 \blacksquare Minimizing a finite sum with $n,d\gg 1$

$$w^* \in \arg\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(w) \stackrel{\mathsf{def}}{=} f(w) \tag{1}$$

• Minimizing a finite sum with $n, d \gg 1$

$$w^* \in \arg\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(w) \stackrel{\mathsf{def}}{=} f(w) \tag{1}$$

 First-order methods: SVRG [Johnson and Zhang, 2013], SAG [Schmidt et al., 2017], etc. Issue: require parameter tuning, and/or the knowledge of the parameters of the problem

• Minimizing a finite sum with $n, d \gg 1$

$$w^* \in \arg\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(w) \stackrel{\mathsf{def}}{=} f(w) \tag{1}$$

- First-order methods: SVRG [Johnson and Zhang, 2013], SAG [Schmidt et al., 2017], etc. Issue: require parameter tuning, and/or the knowledge of the parameters of the problem
- Second-order methods: Stochastic Quasi-Newton [Gower et al., 2016], IQN [Mokhtari et al., 2018], SNM [Kovalev et al., 2019]
 Issues: not incremental, or too expensive even for GLMs (O(d²) per iteration)

• Minimizing a finite sum with $n, d \gg 1$

$$w^* \in \arg\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(w) \stackrel{\mathsf{def}}{=} f(w) \tag{1}$$

 First-order methods: SVRG [Johnson and Zhang, 2013], SAG [Schmidt et al., 2017], etc. Issue: require parameter tuning, and/or the knowledge of the parameters of the problem

Second-order methods: Stochastic Quasi-Newton [Gower et al., 2016], IQN [Mokhtari et al., 2018], SNM [Kovalev et al., 2019]
 Issues: not incremental, or too expensive even for GLMs (O(d²) per iteration)

Develop a second order method for solving (1) that is *incremental*, *efficient*, scales well with the dimension d, and that requires no *knowledge from the problem*, neither *parameter tuning*.

SAN: Stochastic Average Newton (1/2)

1) Rewrite the optimality conditions $\nabla f(w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla f_i(w) = 0$ as follows

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha_i = 0,\tag{2}$$

$$\alpha_i = \nabla f_i(w), \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$
(3)

SAN: Stochastic Average Newton (1/2)

1) Rewrite the optimality conditions $\nabla f(w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla f_i(w) = 0$ as follows

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha_{i}=0,$$
(2)

$$\alpha_i = \nabla f_i(w), \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$
(3)

Motivation:

- Each gradient lies on a separate equation.
- This motivates us to sample one equation per iteration, and project our current iterate on the linearization of this equation.

SAN: Stochastic Average Newton (2/2)

(*n*+1) equations: (2):
$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i = 0$$
, (3): $\alpha_i = \nabla f_i(w)$, $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$

2) 🖒 Subsampled Newton Raphson 🖉 [Yuan et al., 2021]

SAN: Stochastic Average Newton (2/2)

(*n*+1) equations: (2):
$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i = 0$$
, (3): $\alpha_i = \nabla f_i(w)$, $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$

2) 🖒 Subsampled Newton Raphson 🗐 [Yuan et al., 2021]

• With probability $\frac{1}{n+1}$, sample equation (2) and project onto its set of solutions:

$$\alpha_1^{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_n^{k+1} = \underset{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathcal{R}^d}{\arg \min} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\alpha_i - \alpha_i^k\|^2$$

s.t. $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 0$

SAN: Stochastic Average Newton (2/2)

(*n*+1) equations: (2):
$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i = 0$$
, (3): $\alpha_i = \nabla f_i(w)$, $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$

$$\alpha_1^{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_n^{k+1} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathcal{R}^d} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\alpha_i - \alpha_i^k\|^2$$

s.t. $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 0$

• With probability $\frac{1}{n+1}$, sample the *j*-th equation of (3), and project onto the set of solutions of its *linearization* at w_k :

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_j^{k+1}, w^{k+1} &= \underset{\alpha_j, w \in \mathcal{R}^d}{\arg\min} \|\alpha_j - \alpha_j^k\|^2 + \|w - w^k\|_{\nabla^2 f_j(w^k)}^2 \\ \text{s.t. } \nabla f_j(w^k) + \nabla^2 f_j(w^k)(w - w^k) = \alpha_j \end{aligned}$$

It turns out that SAN

■ is *incremental*, i.e. samples only one single data point per iteration

It turns out that SAN

- **i** is *incremental*, i.e. samples only one single data point per iteration
- is *efficient* and scales well with the dimension *d*, i.e. costs *O*(*d*) per iteration for generalized linear models

It turns out that SAN

- is *incremental*, i.e. samples only one single data point per iteration
- is *efficient* and scales well with the dimension d, i.e. costs O(d) per iteration for generalized linear models
- requires no parameter tuning (e.g. learning rate), neither knowledge from the problem (no smoothness constant)

It turns out that SAN

is *incremental*, i.e. samples only one single data point per iteration

• is *efficient* and scales well with the dimension d, i.e. costs O(d) per iteration for generalized linear models

requires no parameter tuning (e.g. learning rate), neither knowledge from the problem (no smoothness constant)

We provide a *global linear convergence theory* of SAN

It turns out that SAN

is *incremental*, i.e. samples only one single data point per iteration

• is *efficient* and scales well with the dimension d, i.e. costs O(d) per iteration for generalized linear models

requires no parameter tuning (e.g. learning rate), neither knowledge from the problem (no smoothness constant)

We provide a *global linear convergence theory* of SAN

Experiments for SAN (see paper for additional experiments)

Logistic regression for binary classification with the datasets from LibSVM



Figure: Experiments for SAN applied for generalized linear model.

Details are in our paper:

SAN: Stochastic Average Newton Algorithm for Minimizing Finite Sums

Jiabin Chen, Rui Yuan, Guillaume Garrigos, Robert M. Gower

Thank you

- Robert M. Gower, Donald Goldfarb, and Peter Richtárik. Stochastic block BFGS: Squeezing more curvature out of data. *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2016.
- Rie Johnson and Tong Zhang. Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, pages 315–323. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.
- Dmitry Kovalev, Konstantin Mishchenko, and Peter Richtarik. Stochastic Newton and cubic Newton methods with simple local linear-quadratic rates. *arxiv:1912.01597*, 2019.
- Aryan Mokhtari, Mark Eisen, and Alejandro Ribeiro. Iqn: An incremental quasi-newton method with local superlinear convergence rate. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 28(2):1670–1698, 2018. doi: 10.1137/17M1122943.
- Mark Schmidt, Nicolas Le Roux, and Francis Bach. Minimizing finite sums with the stochastic average gradient. Mathematical Programming, 162(1):83–112, Mar 2017.

Rui Yuan, Alessandro Lazaric, and Robert M. Gower. Sketched newton-raphson, 2021.