

R-spider: A Nonconvex Stochastic Riemannian Algorithm with Curvature Independent Rate

aaaa

Abstract

We study optimization of smooth functions on Riemannian manifolds. Via adapting the recently proposed SPIDER algorithm to Riemannian manifold, we are able to achieve faster rate than known algorithms in both finite sum settings and stochastic settings under various assumptions. Unlike previous works, our proposed analysis show that the convergence rate is curvature independent in both nonconvex and strongly convex cases.

1 Introduction

We study the following class of unconstrained stochastic optimization problems:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{M}} f(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\xi}[f(x; \xi)] \quad (1)$$

where $(\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{g})$ is a Riemannian manifold with the Riemannian metric \mathbf{g} . ξ is a random variable. We assume that each $\forall \xi, f(\cdot; \xi) : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is geodesically L -smooth (see Section 2). This class of function includes as special cases important problems such as principal component analysis (PCA), independent component analysis (ICA), dictionary learning, mixture modeling, among others. Moreover, the finite sum problem ($f(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x)$) is a special case in which finite number of component functions are chosen uniformly at random.

When solving problems with manifold constraints, one common approach is to alternate between optimizing in the ambient Euclidean space and “projecting” onto the manifold. For example, two well-known methods to compute the leading eigenvector of symmetric matrices, power iteration and Oja’s algorithm (36), are in essence projected gradient and projected stochastic gradient algorithms. For certain manifolds (e.g., positive definite matrices), projections can be quite expensive to compute.

An effective alternative is to use *Riemannian optimization*, which directly operates on the manifold in question. This mode of operation allows Riemannian optimization to view the constrained optimization problem (1) as an unconstrained problem on a manifold, and thus, to be “projection-free.” More important is its conceptual value: viewing a problem through the Riemannian lens, one can discover insights into problem geometry, which can translate into better optimization algorithms.

The Euclidean version of (1) where $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^d$ and \mathbf{g} is the Euclidean inner-product has been the subject of intense algorithmic development in machine learning and optimization, starting with the classical work of Robbins and Monro (39). However, the batch and stochastic gradient methods in suffer from high computation load. For solving finite sum problems with n components, the full-gradient method requires n derivatives at each step; the stochastic method requires only one derivative but at the expense of slower $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ convergence to an ϵ -accurate solution. These issues have motivated much of the progress on faster stochastic optimization in vector spaces by using variance reduction (42; 27; 15; 29). Along with many recent works (we summarize in related work), these algorithms achieve faster convergence than vanilla gradient descent in multiple settings.

The Riemannian counterpart of gradient methods and variance reduction has also caught attentions recently. Zhang and Sra (54) developed the first global complexity analysis of batch and stochastic gradient methods for geodesically convex functions. Later work (56; 28; 41) improved the convergence rate for finite sum problems by using variance reduction techniques. In this paper, we follow this line of work and improve rates based on the recent paper Fang et al. (17). Moreover, via a slightly different analysis, we are able to remove the assumption that all iterates remain in a compact subset of the Riemannian manifold. Such assumption appeared in many works but not always fully justified.

Contributions. We summarize the key contributions of this paper below.

- We introduce Riemannian SPIDER(R-SPIDER) algorithm, a variance reduced Riemannian stochastic gradient method based on SPIDER (17). We analyze R-SPIDER for optimizing geodesically

	Nonconvex stochastic	Nonconvex finite sum	Strongly convex finite sum	Gradient dominated finite sum
Previous work (56; 41; 28)	$\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\epsilon^4})$	$\mathcal{O}(n + \frac{n^{2/3}\zeta^{1/2}}{\epsilon^2})$	$\mathcal{O}((n + \kappa^2\zeta) \log(1/\epsilon))$	$\mathcal{O}((n + n^{2/3}\zeta^{1/2}\kappa) \log(1/\epsilon))$
Our work	$\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3})$	$\mathcal{O}(n + \frac{n^{1/2}}{\epsilon^2})$	$\mathcal{O}((n + \kappa^2) \log(1/\epsilon))$	$\mathcal{O}((n + \kappa^2) \log(1/\epsilon))$

Table 1: Iteration complexity bounds comparison of our work compared to previous works. κ denotes the condition number of a strongly convex function. ζ is a constant determined by the manifold curvature and diameter. Please See Zhang et al. (56) for more details.

smooth nonconvex functions. Up to our knowledge, we obtain the first accelerated rate as compared to stochastic gradient descent in nonconvex stochastic Riemannian optimization.

- We applied the algorithm to nonconvex finite-sum problems. Our rate improves best known rates and attained the lower bound as in the Euclidean case.
- We modified the R-SPIDER algorithm to solve strongly convex problems and gradient dominated problems on Riemannian manifold. In both case, we achieved the best known rates in terms of number of samples n and function condition number κ .
- In all cases, our analysis provides convergence guarantees that are *independent of the Riemannian manifold's diameter and its sectional curvature*. This is important in two aspects. First, the theoretical upper bound is improved. Second, the algorithm no longer assumes bounded diameter of the Riemannian manifold. Hence we relaxed the assumption in previous work that all the iterates remain in a compact set.

We briefly summarize the rate results in Table 1.

Related Work. Variance reduction techniques, such as *control variates*, are widely used in Monte Carlo simulations (40). In linear spaces, variance reduced methods for solving finite-sum problems have recently witnessed a huge surge of interest (e.g. 42; 27; 15; 7; 29; 52; 21). They have been shown to accelerate finite sum optimization for strongly convex objectives and convex objectives. Later work by (31; 3) further accelerates the rates in convex problems using techniques similar to Nesterov's acceleration method(34). For nonconvex problems, (38; 4; 30; 17) also achieved faster rate than the vanilla (stochastic) gradient descent method in both finite sum settings and stochastic settings. Our analysis is inspired mainly by (17; 56). Our analysis can also be applied to (50) and achieve matching rate assuming access to proximal oracle on Riemannian manifold.

Another line of work(19; 25; 26; 12; 6) studies convergence to second order stationary points (see (19)) in Euclidean space. In our work, however, we focus on first order stationary points. Up to our knowledge, theoretical guarantees on convergence to second order stationary points on Riemannian manifolds are still open.

References of Riemannian optimization can be found in (48; 1), where analysis is limited to asymptotic convergence (except (48, Theorem 4.2) which proved linear rate convergence for first-order line search method with bounded and positive definite hessian). Stochastic Riemannian optimization has been previously considered in (10; 32), though with only asymptotic convergence analysis, and without any rates. Many applications of Riemannian optimization are known, including matrix factorization on fixed-rank manifold (49; 46), dictionary learning (13; 45), optimization under orthogonality constraints (16; 33), covariance estimation (51), learning elliptical distributions (57; 44), Poincaré embeddings (35) and Gaussian mixture models (22). Notably, some nonconvex Euclidean problems are geodesically convex, for which Riemannian optimization can provide similar guarantees to convex optimization. Zhang and Sra (54) provide the first global complexity analysis for first-order Riemannian algorithms, but their analysis is restricted to geodesically convex problems with full or stochastic gradients. Boumal et al. (11) analyzed the problem using retraction mappings instead of exponential mappings and also attained nonasymptotic convergence rate. Bonnabel (10); Tripuraneni et al. (47); Zhang and Sra (55) analyzed different aspects of first order optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds. (56; 41) analyzed variance reduction techniques on Riemannian manifolds, and their rate has remain best-known up to our knowledge. In this work, we improve upon their results.

2 Preliminaries

Before formally discussing Riemannian optimization, let us recall some foundational concepts of Riemannian geometry. For a thorough review one can refer to any classic text, e.g., (37).

A *Riemannian manifold* $(\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{g})$ is a real smooth manifold \mathcal{M} equipped with a Riemannian metric \mathbf{g} . The metric \mathbf{g} induces an inner product structure in each tangent space $T_x\mathcal{M}$ associated with every $x \in \mathcal{M}$. We denote the inner product of $u, v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ as $\langle u, v \rangle \triangleq \mathbf{g}_x(u, v)$; and the norm of $u \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ is defined as $\|u\| \triangleq \sqrt{\mathbf{g}_x(u, u)}$. The angle between u, v is defined as $\arccos \frac{\langle u, v \rangle}{\|u\|\|v\|}$. A geodesic is a constant speed curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ that is locally distance minimizing. An exponential map $\text{Exp}_x : T_x\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ maps v in $T_x\mathcal{M}$ to y on \mathcal{M} , such that there is a geodesic γ with $\gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = y$ and $\dot{\gamma}(0) \triangleq \frac{d}{dt}\gamma(0) = v$. If between any two points in $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{M}$ there is a unique geodesic, the exponential map has an inverse $\text{Exp}_x^{-1} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow T_x\mathcal{M}$ and the geodesic is the unique shortest path with $\|\text{Exp}_x^{-1}(y)\| = \|\text{Exp}_x^{-1}(x)\|$ the geodesic distance between $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$.

Parallel transport $\Gamma_x^y : T_x\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_y\mathcal{M}$ maps a vector $v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ to $\Gamma_x^y v \in T_y\mathcal{M}$, while preserving norm, and roughly speaking, “direction,” analogous to translation in \mathbb{R}^d . A tangent vector of a geodesic γ remains tangent if parallel transported along γ . Parallel transport preserves inner products.




Figure 1: Illustration of manifold operations. (Left) A vector v in $T_x\mathcal{M}$ is mapped to $\text{Exp}_x(v)$; (right) A vector v in $T_x\mathcal{M}$ is parallel transported to $T_y\mathcal{M}$ as $\Gamma_x^y v$.

Function Classes. We now define some key terms. A set \mathcal{X} is called *geodesically convex* if for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, there is a geodesic γ with $\gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = y$ and $\gamma(t) \in \mathcal{X}$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. Throughout the paper, we assume that the function f in (1) is defined on a Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} .

In the following we do not explicitly write Riemannian metric \mathbf{g} or the index x of tangent space $T_x\mathcal{M}$ to simplify notation, as they should be obvious from the context: inner product of $u, v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ is defined as $\langle u, v \rangle \triangleq \mathbf{g}_x(u, v)$; norm of $u \in T\mathcal{M}_x$ is defined as $\|u\| \triangleq \sqrt{\mathbf{g}_x(u, u)}$.

Based on the above notations, we define the following properties of the function f in (1).

Definition 1 (Geodesic convexity). A function $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be geodesically convex if for any $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$, a geodesic γ such that $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(1) = y$, and $t \in [0, 1]$, it holds that

$$f(\gamma(t)) \leq (1-t)f(x) + tf(y).$$

It can be shown that an equivalent definition is that for any $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle g_x, \text{Exp}_x^{-1}(y) \rangle,$$

where g_x is a subgradient of f at x , or the gradient if f is differentiable.

Definition 2 (Strong convexity). A function $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be geodesically μ -strongly convex if for any $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle g_x, \text{Exp}_x^{-1}(y) \rangle_x + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\text{Exp}_x^{-1}(y)\|^2.$$

Definition 3 (Smoothness). A differentiable function $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be geodesically L -smooth if its gradient is L_g -Lipschitz, i.e. for any $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$\|g_x - \Gamma_y^x g_y\| \leq L \|\text{Exp}_x^{-1}(y)\|$$

where Γ_y^x is the parallel transport from y to x .

Observe that compared to the Euclidean setup, the above definition requires a parallel transport operation to “transport” g_y to g_x . It can be proved that if f is L -smooth, then for any $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle g_x, \text{Exp}_x^{-1}(y) \rangle_x + \frac{L}{2} \|\text{Exp}_x^{-1}(y)\|^2.$$

Definition 4 (PL inequality). $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is τ -gradient dominated if x^* is a global minimizer of f and for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$

$$f(x) - f(x^*) \leq \tau \|\nabla f(x)\|^2. \quad (2)$$

As in the Euclidean case, τ -gradient dominated is implied by μ -strongly convex.

An *Incremental First-order Oracle (IFO)* (2) in (1) a point $x \in \mathcal{M}$, and generates a random sample ξ . The oracle then returns a pair $(f(x; \xi), \nabla f(x; \xi)) \in \mathbb{R} \times T_x \mathcal{M}$. In finite sum setting, ξ takes values in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and each random sample $f(\cdot; \xi)$ corresponds to one of n component functions. We measure non-asymptotic complexity in terms of IFO calls.

3 Riemannian SPIDER

In this section we introduce the R-SPIDER algorithm. In particular, we propose one variant for nonconvex problems, and two for gradient-dominated problems. Each variation aims to optimize a particular dependency on function parameters. Our proposed algorithm differs from the Euclidean SPIDER(17) in two key aspects: the variance reduction step uses parallel transport to combine gradients from different tangent spaces; and the exponential map is used (instead of the update $x_t^{s+1} - \eta v_t^{s+1}$).

3.1 Nonconvex functions

Our proposed algorithm for solving nonconvex Riemannian optimization problems is shown in Algorithm 1. We first analyze the global complexity for solving nonconvex stochastic Riemannian optimization problems. In particular, we make the following assumptions

Assumption 1 (Smoothness). For any fixed ξ , $f(x; \xi)$ is L -smooth in x .

Assumption 2 (Bounded objective). Function f is bounded below. Define $M := f(x_0) - f^* \leq \infty$ where $f^* = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{M}} f(x)$

Assumption 3 (Bounded variance). $\forall x, \mathbb{E}_\xi [\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(x; \xi)\|^2] \leq \sigma^2$

Under the above assumptions, we make the following choice of parameters

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = 2\sigma^2/\epsilon^2, \quad \mathcal{S}_2 = 2/\epsilon, \quad \eta = \epsilon/L, \quad q = 1/\epsilon \quad (3)$$

We now state the following theorem.

Theorem 1. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and parameter setting in (3), Algorithm 1 terminates in ML/ϵ^2 iterations. The output x satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x)\|] \leq 4\epsilon.$$

Furthermore, the algorithm makes at most $\frac{2(\sigma^2+1)ML}{\epsilon^3}$ IFO calls.

Proof. content... □

3.2 Convergence analysis for strongly g-convex functions

In this section, we analyze global complexity of RSVRG for solving (??), where each f_i ($i \in [n]$) is g -smooth and f is strongly g -convex. In this case, we show that RSVRG has linear convergence rate. This is in contrast with the $O(1/t)$ rate of Riemannian stochastic gradient algorithm for strongly g -convex functions (54).

Theorem 2. Assume in (??) each f_i is L - g -smooth, and f is μ -strongly g -convex, then if we run Algorithm ?? with Option I and parameters that satisfy

$$\alpha = \frac{3\zeta\eta L^2}{\mu - 2\zeta\eta L^2} + \frac{(1 + 4\zeta\eta^2 - 2\eta\mu)^m (\mu - 5\zeta\eta L^2)}{\mu - 2\zeta\eta L^2} < 1$$

then with S outer loops, the Riemannian SVRG algorithm produces an iterate x_a that satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}d^2(x_a, x^*) \leq \alpha^S d^2(x^0, x^*).$$

Algorithm 1 R-SPIDER-nonconvex($x_0, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, q, \eta, \epsilon, f$)

```
for  $t = 0, 1, \dots$ , do
  if  $\text{mod}(t, q) = 0$  then
    draw  $\mathcal{S}_1$  samples
     $v_k \leftarrow \nabla f_{\mathcal{S}_1}(x_k)$ 
  else
    draw  $\mathcal{S}_2$  samples
     $v_k \leftarrow \nabla f_{\mathcal{S}_2}(x_k) - \Gamma_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k}[\nabla f_{\mathcal{S}_2}(x_{k-1}) - v_{k-1}]$ 
  end if
  if  $\|v_k\| \leq 2\epsilon$  then
    return  $x_k$ 
  else
     $x_{k+1} \leftarrow \text{Exp}_{x_k}(-\eta(v_k/\|v_k\|))$ 
  end if
end for
```

The proof of Theorem 2 is in the appendix, and takes a different route compared with the original SVRG proof (27). Specifically, due to the nonlinear Riemannian metric, we are not able to bound the squared norm of the variance reduced gradient by $f(x) - f(x^*)$. Instead, we bound this quantity by the squared distances to the minimizer, and show linear convergence of the iterates. A bound on $\mathbb{E}[f(x) - f(x^*)]$ is then implied by L -g-smoothness, albeit with a stronger dependence on the condition number. Theorem 2 leads to the following more digestible corollary on the global complexity of the algorithm:

Corollary 1. With assumptions as in Theorem 2 and properly chosen parameters, after $O\left((n + \frac{\zeta L^2}{\mu^2}) \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})\right)$ IFO calls, the output x_a satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x_a) - f(x^*)] \leq \epsilon.$$

We give a proof with specific parameter choices in the appendix. Observe the dependence on ζ in our result: for $\kappa_{\min} < 0$, we have $\zeta > 1$, which implies that negative space curvature adversarially affects convergence rate; while for $\kappa_{\min} \geq 0$, we have $\zeta = 1$, which implies that for nonnegatively curved manifolds, the impact of curvature is not explicit. In the rest of our analysis we will see a similar effect of sectional curvature; this phenomenon seems innate to manifold optimization (also see (54)).

In the analysis we do not assume each f_i to be g-convex, which resulted in a worse dependence on the condition number. We note that a similar result was obtained in linear space (18). However, we will see in the next section that by generalizing the analysis for gradient dominated functions in (38), we are able to greatly improve this dependence.

3.3 Convergence analysis for geodesically nonconvex functions

In this section, we analyze global complexity of RSVRG for solving (??), where each f_i is only required to be L -g-smooth, and neither f_i nor f need be g-convex. We measure convergence to a stationary point using $\|\nabla f(x)\|^2$ following (20). Note, however, that here $\nabla f(x) \in T_x \mathcal{M}$ and $\|\nabla f(x)\|$ is defined via the inner product in $T_x \mathcal{M}$. We first note that Riemannian-SGD on nonconvex L -g-smooth problems attains $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ convergence as SGD (20) holds; we relegate the details to the appendix.

Recently, two groups independently proved that variance reduction also benefits stochastic gradient methods for nonconvex smooth finite-sum optimization problems, with different analysis (5; 38). Our analysis for nonconvex RSVRG is inspired by (38). Our main result for this section is Theorem 3.

Theorem 3. Assume in (??) each f_i is L -g-smooth, the sectional curvature in \mathcal{X} is lower bounded by κ_{\min} , and we run Algorithm ?? with Option II. Then there exist universal constants $\mu_0 \in (0, 1), \nu > 0$ such that if we set $\eta = \mu_0/(Ln^{\alpha_1}\zeta^{\alpha_2})$ ($0 < \alpha_1 \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \alpha_2 \leq 2$), $m = \lfloor n^{3\alpha_1/2}/(3\mu_0\zeta^{1-2\alpha_2}) \rfloor$ and $T = mS$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x_a)\|^2] \leq \frac{Ln^{\alpha_1}\zeta^{\alpha_2}[f(x^0) - f(x^*)]}{T\nu},$$

where x^* is an optimal solution to (??).

The key challenge in proving Theorem 3 in the Riemannian setting is to incorporate the impact of using a nonlinear metric. Similar to the g-convex case, the nonlinear metric impacts the convergence, notably through the constant ζ that depends on a lower-bound on sectional curvature.

Reddi et al. (38) suggested setting $\alpha_1 = 2/3$, in which case we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2. With assumptions and parameters in Theorem 3, choosing $\alpha_1 = 2/3$, the IFO complexity for achieving an ϵ -accurate solution is:

$$\text{IFO calls} = \begin{cases} O(n + (n^{2/3}\zeta^{1-\alpha_2}/\epsilon)), & \text{if } \alpha_2 \leq 1/2, \\ O(n\zeta^{2\alpha_2-1} + (n^{2/3}\zeta^{\alpha_2}/\epsilon)), & \text{if } \alpha_2 > 1/2. \end{cases}$$

Setting $\alpha_2 = 1/2$ in Corollary 2 immediately leads to Corollary 3:

Corollary 3. With assumptions in Theorem 3 and $\alpha_1 = 2/3, \alpha_2 = 1/2$, the IFO complexity for achieving an ϵ -accurate solution is $O(n + (n^{2/3}\zeta^{1/2}/\epsilon))$.

The same reasoning allows us to also capture the class of gradient dominated functions (2), for which Reddi et al. (38) proved that SVRG converges linearly to a global optimum. We have the following corresponding theorem for RSVRG:

Theorem 4. Suppose that in addition to the assumptions in Theorem 3, f is τ -gradient dominated. Then there exist universal constants $\mu_0 \in (0, 1), \nu > 0$ such that if we run Algorithm ?? with $\eta = \mu_0/(Ln^{2/3}\zeta^{1/2}), m = \lfloor n/(3\mu_0) \rfloor, S = \lceil (6 + \frac{18\mu_0}{n-3})L\tau\zeta^{1/2}\mu_0/(\nu n^{1/3}) \rceil$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x^K)\|^2] &\leq 2^{-K} \|\nabla f(x^0)\|^2, \\ \mathbb{E}[f(x^K) - f(x^*)] &\leq 2^{-K} [f(x^0) - f(x^*)]. \end{aligned}$$

We summarize the implication of Theorem 4 as follows (note the dependence on curvature):

Corollary 4. With Algorithm ?? and the parameters in Theorem 4, the IFO complexity to compute an ϵ -accurate solution for a gradient dominated function f is $O((n + L\tau\zeta^{1/2}n^{2/3})\log(1/\epsilon))$.

A typical example of gradient dominated function is a strongly g-convex function (see appendix). Specifically, we have the following corollary, which prove linear convergence rate of RSVRG with the same assumptions as in Theorem 2, improving the dependence on the condition number.

Corollary 5. With Algorithm ?? and the parameters in Theorem 4, the IFO complexity to compute an ϵ -accurate solution for a μ -strongly g-convex function f is $O((n + \mu^{-1}L\zeta^{1/2}n^{2/3})\log(1/\epsilon))$.

4 Applications

4.1 Computing the leading eigenvector

In this section, we apply our analysis of RSVRG for gradient dominated functions (Theorem 4) to fast eigenvector computation, a fundamental problem that is still being actively researched in the big-data setting (43; 18; 24). For the problem of computing the leading eigenvector, i.e.,

$$\min_{x^\top x=1} -x^\top \left(\sum_{i=1}^n z_i z_i^\top \right) x \triangleq -x^\top A x = f(x), \quad (4)$$

existing analyses for state-of-the-art algorithms typically result in $O(1/\delta^2)$ dependence on the eigengap δ of A , as opposed to the conjectured $O(1/\delta)$ dependence (43), as well as the $O(1/\delta)$ dependence of power iteration. Here we give new support for the $O(1/\delta)$ conjecture. Note that Problem (4) seen as one in \mathbb{R}^d is nonconvex, with negative semidefinite Hessian everywhere, and has nonlinear constraints. However, we show that on the hypersphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} Problem (4) is unconstrained, and has *gradient dominated* objective. In particular we have the following result:

Theorem 5. Suppose A has eigenvalues $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d$ and $\delta = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$, and x^0 is drawn uniformly randomly on the hypersphere. Then with probability $1 - p$, x^0 falls in a Riemannian ball of a global optimum of the objective function, within which the objective function is $O(\frac{d}{p^2\delta})$ -gradient dominated.

We provide the proof of Theorem 5 in appendix. Theorem 5 gives new insights for why the conjecture might be true – once it is shown that with a constant stepsize and with high probability (both independent of δ) the iterates remain in such a Riemannian ball, applying Corollary 4 one can immediately prove the $O(1/\delta)$ dependence conjecture. We leave this analysis as future work.

Next we show that variance reduced PCA (VR-PCA) (43) is closely related to RSVRG. We implement Riemannian SVRG for PCA, and use the code for VR-PCA in (43). Analytic forms for exponential map and parallel transport on hypersphere can be found in (1, Example 5.4.1; Example 8.1.1). We conduct well-controlled experiments comparing the performance of two algorithms. Specifically, to investigate the dependence of convergence on δ , for each $\delta = 10^{-3}/k$ where $k = 1, \dots, 25$, we generate a $d \times n$ matrix $Z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ where $d = 10^3, n = 10^4$ using the method $Z = UDV^\top$ where U, V are orthonormal matrices and D is a diagonal matrix, as described in (43). Note that A has the same eigenvalues as D^2 . All the data matrices share the same U, V and only differ in δ (thus also in D). We also fix the same random initialization x^0 and random seed. We run both algorithms on each matrix for 50 epochs. For every five epochs, we estimate the number of epochs required to double its accuracy¹. This number can serve as an indicator of the global complexity of the algorithm. We plot this number for different epochs against $1/\delta$, shown in Figure 2. Note that the performance of RSVRG and VR-PCA with the same stepsize is very similar, which implies a close connection of the two. Indeed, the update $\frac{x+v}{\|x+v\|}$ used in (43) and others is a well-known approximation to the exponential map $\text{Exp}_x(v)$ with small stepsize (a.k.a. retraction). Also note the complexity of both algorithms seems to have an asymptotically linear dependence on $1/\delta$.




Figure 2: **Computing the leading eigenvector.** Left: RSVRG and VR-PCA are indistinguishable in terms of IFO complexity. Middle and right: Complexity appears to depend on $1/\delta$. x -axis shows the inverse of eigengap δ , y -axis shows the estimated number of epochs required to double the accuracy. Lines represent different epoch index. All variables are controlled except for δ .

4.2 Computing the Riemannian centroid

In this subsection we validate that RSVRG converges linearly for averaging PSD matrices under the Riemannian metric. The problem for finding the Riemannian centroid of a set of PSD matrices $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is $X^* = \arg \min_{X \succeq 0} \left\{ f(X; \{A_i\}_{i=1}^n) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n \|\log(X^{-1/2} A_i X^{-1/2})\|_F^2 \right\}$ where X is also a PSD matrix. This is a geodesically strongly convex problem, yet nonconvex in Euclidean space. It has been studied both in matrix computation and in various applications (8; 23). We use the same experiment setting as described in (54)², and compare RSVRG against Riemannian full gradient (RGD) and stochastic gradient (RSGD) algorithms (Figure 3). Other methods for this problem include the relaxed Richardson iteration algorithm (9), the approximated joint diagonalization algorithm (14), and Riemannian Newton and quasi-Newton type methods, notably the limited-memory Riemannian BFGS (53). However, none of these methods were shown to greatly outperform RGD, especially in data science applications where n is large and extremely small optimization error is not required.

Note that the objective is sum of squared Riemannian distances in a nonpositively curved space, thus is $(2n)$ -strongly g -convex and $(2n\zeta)$ - g -smooth. According to the proof of Corollary 1 (see appendix) the optimal stepsize for RSVRG is $O(1/(\zeta^3 n))$. For all the experiments, we initialize all

¹Accuracy is measured by $\frac{f(x) - f(x^*)}{|f(x^*)|}$, i.e. the relative error between the objective value and the optimum. We measure how much the error has been reduced after each five epochs, which is a multiplicative factor $c < 1$ on the error at the start of each five epochs. Then we use $\log(2)/\log(1/c) * 5$ as the estimate, assuming c stays constant.

²We generate 100×100 random PSD matrices using the Matrix Mean Toolbox (9) with normalization so that the norm of each matrix equals 1.

the algorithms using the arithmetic mean of the matrices. We set $\eta = \frac{1}{100n}$, and choose $m = n$ in Algorithm ?? for RSVRG, and use suggested parameters from (54) for other algorithms. The results suggest RSVRG has clear advantage in the large scale setting.




Figure 3: **Riemannian mean of PSD matrices.** N : number of matrices, Q : conditional number of each matrix. x -axis shows the actual number of IFO calls, y -axis show $f(X) - f(X^*)$ in log scale. Lines show the performance of different algorithms in colors. Note that RSVRG achieves linear convergence and is especially advantageous for large dataset.

5 Discussion

We introduce Riemannian SVRG, the first variance reduced stochastic gradient algorithm for Riemannian optimization. In addition, we analyze its global complexity for optimizing geodesically strongly convex, convex, and nonconvex functions, explicitly showing their dependence on sectional curvature. Our experiments validate our analysis that Riemannian SVRG is much faster than full gradient and stochastic gradient methods for solving finite-sum optimization problems on Riemannian manifolds.

Our analysis of computing the leading eigenvector as a Riemannian optimization problem is also worth noting: a nonconvex problem with nonpositive Hessian and nonlinear constraints in the ambient space turns out to be gradient dominated on the manifold. We believe this shows the promise of theoretical study of Riemannian optimization, and geometric optimization in general, and we hope it encourages other researchers in the community to join this endeavor.

Our work also has limitations – most practical Riemannian optimization algorithms use retraction and vector transport to efficiently approximate the exponential map and parallel transport, which we do not analyze in this work. A systematic study of retraction and vector transport is an important topic for future research. For other applications of Riemannian optimization such as low-rank matrix completion (49), covariance matrix estimation (51) and subspace tracking (16), we believe it would also be promising to apply fast incremental gradient algorithms in the large scale setting.

References

- [1] P.-A. Absil, R. Mahony, and R. Sepulchre. *Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [2] A. Agarwal and L. Bottou. A lower bound for the optimization of finite sums. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-15)*, pages 78–86, 2015.
- [3] Z. Allen-Zhu. Katyusha: The first direct acceleration of stochastic gradient methods. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1200–1205. ACM, 2017.
- [4] Z. Allen-Zhu. Natasha 2: Faster non-convex optimization than sgd. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.08694*, 2017.
- [5] Z. Allen-Zhu and E. Hazan. Variance reduction for faster non-convex optimization. *arXiv:1603.05643*, 2016.
- [6] Z. Allen-Zhu and Y. Li. Neon2: Finding local minima via first-order oracles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.06673*, 2017.
- [7] F. Bach and E. Moulines. Non-strongly-convex smooth stochastic approximation with convergence rate $o(1/n)$. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 773–781, 2013.
- [8] R. Bhatia. *Positive Definite Matrices*. Princeton University Press, 2007.

- [9] D. A. Bini and B. Iannazzo. Computing the karcher mean of symmetric positive definite matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 438(4):1700–1710, 2013.
- [10] S. Bonnabel. Stochastic gradient descent on Riemannian manifolds. *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, 58(9):2217–2229, 2013.
- [11] N. Boumal, P.-A. Absil, and C. Cartis. Global rates of convergence for nonconvex optimization on manifolds. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 2016.
- [12] Y. Carmon, J. C. Duchi, O. Hinder, and A. Sidford. Accelerated methods for nonconvex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(2):1751–1772, 2018.
- [13] A. Cherian and S. Sra. Riemannian dictionary learning and sparse coding for positive definite matrices. *arXiv:1507.02772*, 2015.
- [14] M. Congedo, B. Afsari, A. Barachant, and M. Moakher. Approximate joint diagonalization and geometric mean of symmetric positive definite matrices. *PloS one*, 10(4):e0121423, 2015.
- [15] A. Defazio, F. Bach, and S. Lacoste-Julien. Saga: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives. In *NIPS*, pages 1646–1654, 2014.
- [16] A. Edelman, T. A. Arias, and S. T. Smith. The geometry of algorithms with orthogonality constraints. *SIAM journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 20(2):303–353, 1998.
- [17] C. Fang, C. J. Li, Z. Lin, and T. Zhang. Spider: Near-optimal non-convex optimization via stochastic path integrated differential estimator. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01695*, 2018.
- [18] D. Garber and E. Hazan. Fast and simple pca via convex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.05647*, 2015.
- [19] R. Ge, F. Huang, C. Jin, and Y. Yuan. Escaping from saddle points—online stochastic gradient for tensor decomposition. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 797–842, 2015.
- [20] S. Ghadimi and G. Lan. Stochastic first-and zeroth-order methods for nonconvex stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(4):2341–2368, 2013.
- [21] P. Gong and J. Ye. Linear convergence of variance-reduced stochastic gradient without strong convexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1102*, 2014.
- [22] R. Hosseini and S. Sra. Matrix manifold optimization for Gaussian mixtures. In *NIPS*, 2015.
- [23] B. Jeuris, R. Vandebril, and B. Vandereycken. A survey and comparison of contemporary algorithms for computing the matrix geometric mean. *Electronic Transactions on Numerical Analysis*, 39:379–402, 2012.
- [24] C. Jin, S. M. Kakade, C. Musco, P. Netrapalli, and A. Sidford. Robust shift-and-invert preconditioning: Faster and more sample efficient algorithms for eigenvector computation. *arXiv:1510.08896*, 2015.
- [25] C. Jin, R. Ge, P. Netrapalli, S. M. Kakade, and M. I. Jordan. How to escape saddle points efficiently. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.00887*, 2017.
- [26] C. Jin, P. Netrapalli, and M. I. Jordan. Accelerated gradient descent escapes saddle points faster than gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.10456*, 2017.
- [27] R. Johnson and T. Zhang. Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 315–323, 2013.
- [28] H. Kasai, H. Sato, and B. Mishra. Riemannian stochastic variance reduced gradient on grassmann manifold. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07367*, 2016.
- [29] J. Konečný and P. Richtárik. Semi-stochastic gradient descent methods. *arXiv:1312.1666*, 2013.
- [30] L. Lei, C. Ju, J. Chen, and M. I. Jordan. Non-convex finite-sum optimization via scsg methods. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2348–2358, 2017.
- [31] H. Lin, J. Mairal, and Z. Harchaoui. A universal catalyst for first-order optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3384–3392, 2015.
- [32] X. Liu, A. Srivastava, and K. Gallivan. Optimal linear representations of images for object recognition. *IEEE TPAMI*, 26(5):662–666, 2004.
- [33] M. Moakher. Means and averaging in the group of rotations. *SIAM journal on matrix analysis and applications*, 24(1):1–16, 2002.

- [34] Y. Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [35] M. Nickel and D. Kiela. Poincaré embeddings for learning hierarchical representations. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 6338–6347, 2017.
- [36] E. Oja. Principal components, minor components, and linear neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 5(6):927–935, 1992.
- [37] P. Petersen. *Riemannian geometry*, volume 171. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [38] S. J. Reddi, A. Hefny, S. Sra, B. Póczós, and A. Smola. Stochastic variance reduction for nonconvex optimization. *arXiv:1603.06160*, 2016.
- [39] H. Robbins and S. Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22:400–407, 1951.
- [40] R. Y. Rubinstein and D. P. Kroese. *Simulation and the Monte Carlo method*, volume 707. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [41] H. Sato, H. Kasai, and B. Mishra. Riemannian stochastic variance reduced gradient. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.05594*, 2017.
- [42] M. Schmidt, N. L. Roux, and F. Bach. Minimizing finite sums with the stochastic average gradient. *arXiv:1309.2388*, 2013.
- [43] O. Shamir. A Stochastic PCA and SVD Algorithm with an Exponential Convergence Rate. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-15)*, pages 144–152, 2015.
- [44] S. Sra and R. Hosseini. Geometric optimisation on positive definite matrices for elliptically contoured distributions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2562–2570, 2013.
- [45] J. Sun, Q. Qu, and J. Wright. Complete dictionary recovery over the sphere ii: Recovery by riemannian trust-region method. *arXiv:1511.04777*, 2015.
- [46] M. Tan, I. W. Tsang, L. Wang, B. Vandereycken, and S. J. Pan. Riemannian pursuit for big matrix recovery. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-14)*, pages 1539–1547, 2014.
- [47] N. Tripuraneni, N. Flammarion, F. Bach, and M. I. Jordan. Averaging stochastic gradient descent on riemannian manifolds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.09128*, 2018.
- [48] C. Udriste. *Convex functions and optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds*, volume 297. Springer Science & Business Media, 1994.
- [49] B. Vandereycken. Low-rank matrix completion by Riemannian optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(2):1214–1236, 2013.
- [50] Z. Wang, K. Ji, Y. Zhou, Y. Liang, and V. Tarokh. Spiderboost: A class of faster variance-reduced algorithms for nonconvex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.10690*, 2018.
- [51] A. Wiesel. Geodesic convexity and covariance estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 60(12):6182–6189, 2012.
- [52] L. Xiao and T. Zhang. A proximal stochastic gradient method with progressive variance reduction. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(4):2057–2075, 2014.
- [53] X. Yuan, W. Huang, P.-A. Absil, and K. Gallivan. A riemannian limited-memory bfgs algorithm for computing the matrix geometric mean. *Procedia Computer Science*, 80:2147–2157, 2016.
- [54] H. Zhang and S. Sra. First-order methods for geodesically convex optimization. *arXiv:1602.06053*, 2016.
- [55] H. Zhang and S. Sra. Towards riemannian accelerated gradient methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.02812*, 2018.
- [56] H. Zhang, S. J. Reddi, and S. Sra. Riemannian svrg: Fast stochastic optimization on riemannian manifolds. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4592–4600, 2016.
- [57] T. Zhang, A. Wiesel, and M. S. Greco. Multivariate generalized Gaussian distribution: Convexity and graphical models. *Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, 61(16):4141–4148, 2013.

Appendix: Fast Stochastic Optimization on Riemannian Manifolds

A Proofs for Section 3.2

Theorem 2. Assume in (??) each f_i is L -g-smooth, and f is μ -strongly g-convex, then if we run Algorithm ?? with Option I and parameters that satisfy

$$\alpha = \frac{3\zeta\eta L^2}{\mu - 2\zeta\eta L^2} + \frac{(1 + 4\zeta\eta^2 - 2\eta\mu)^m(\mu - 5\zeta\eta L^2)}{\mu - 2\zeta\eta L^2} < 1$$

then with S outer loops, the Riemannian SVRG algorithm produces an iterate x_a that satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}d^2(x_a, x^*) \leq \alpha^S d^2(x^0, x^*).$$

Proof. We start by bounding the squared norm of the variance reduced gradient. Since $v_t^{s+1} = \nabla f_{i_t}(x_t^{s+1}) - \Gamma_{\tilde{x}^s}^{x_t^{s+1}}(\nabla f_{i_t}(\tilde{x}^s) - g^{s+1})$, conditioned on x_t^{s+1} and taking expectation with respect to i_t , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|v_t^{s+1}\|^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left\|\nabla f_{i_t}(x_t^{s+1}) - \Gamma_{\tilde{x}^s}^{x_t^{s+1}}(\nabla f_{i_t}(\tilde{x}^s) - g^{s+1})\right\|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\|\left(\nabla f_{i_t}(x_t^{s+1}) - \Gamma_{\tilde{x}^s}^{x_t^{s+1}}\nabla f_{i_t}(\tilde{x}^s)\right) + \Gamma_{\tilde{x}^s}^{x_t^{s+1}}\left(\nabla f(\tilde{x}^s) - \Gamma_{x^*}^{\tilde{x}^s}\nabla f(x^*)\right)\right\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\left\|\nabla f_{i_t}(x_t^{s+1}) - \Gamma_{\tilde{x}^s}^{x_t^{s+1}}\nabla f_{i_t}(\tilde{x}^s)\right\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}\left\|\Gamma_{\tilde{x}^s}^{x_t^{s+1}}\left(\nabla f(\tilde{x}^s) - \Gamma_{x^*}^{\tilde{x}^s}\nabla f(x^*)\right)\right\|^2 \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}\left\|\nabla f_{i_t}(x_t^{s+1}) - \Gamma_{\tilde{x}^s}^{x_t^{s+1}}\nabla f_{i_t}(\tilde{x}^s)\right\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}\left\|\nabla f(\tilde{x}^s) - \Gamma_{x^*}^{\tilde{x}^s}\nabla f(x^*)\right\|^2 \\ &\leq 2L^2\left\|\text{Exp}_{x_t^{s+1}}^{-1}(\tilde{x}^s)\right\|^2 + 2L^2\left\|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x^*)\right\|^2 \\ &\leq 2L^2\left(\left\|\text{Exp}_{x_t^{s+1}}^{-1}(x^*)\right\| + \left\|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x^*)\right\|\right)^2 + 2L^2\left\|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x^*)\right\|^2 \\ &\leq 4L^2\left\|\text{Exp}_{x_t^{s+1}}^{-1}(x^*)\right\|^2 + 6L^2\left\|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x^*)\right\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

We use $\|a + b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$ twice, in the first and fourth inequalities. The second equality is due to $\nabla f(x^*) = 0$. The second inequality is due to the L -g-smoothness assumption. The third inequality is due to triangle inequality.

Notice that $\mathbb{E}v_t^{s+1} = \nabla f(x_t^{s+1})$ and $x_{t+1}^{s+1} = \text{Exp}_{x_t^{s+1}}(-\eta v_t^{s+1})$, we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}d^2(x_{t+1}^{s+1}, x^*) &\leq d^2(x_t^{s+1}, x^*) + 2\eta\langle \text{Exp}_{x_t^{s+1}}^{-1}(x^*), \mathbb{E}v_t \rangle + \zeta\eta^2\mathbb{E}\|v_t\|^2 \\ &\leq d^2(x_t^{s+1}, x^*) + 2\eta\langle \text{Exp}_{x_t^{s+1}}^{-1}(x^*), \nabla f(x_t^{s+1}) \rangle \\ &\quad + \zeta\eta^2 L^2 (4d^2(x_t^{s+1}, x^*) + 6d^2(\tilde{x}^s, x^*)) \\ &\leq (1 + 4\zeta\eta^2 L^2 - \eta\mu) d^2(x_t^{s+1}, x^*) + 6\zeta\eta^2 L^2 d^2(\tilde{x}^s, x^*) \\ &\quad + 2\eta(f(x^*) - f(x_t^{s+1})) \\ &\leq (1 + 4\zeta\eta^2 L^2 - 2\eta\mu) d^2(x_t^{s+1}, x^*) + 6\zeta\eta^2 L^2 d^2(\tilde{x}^s, x^*) \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality uses the trigonometric distance lemma, the second one uses previously obtained bound for $\mathbb{E}\|v_t\|^2$, the third and fourth use the μ -strong g-convexity of $f(x)$.

We now denote $u_t \triangleq \mathbb{E}d^2(x_t^{s+1}, x^*)$, $q \triangleq 1 + 4\zeta\eta^2 L^2 - 2\eta\mu$, $p \triangleq 6\zeta\eta^2 L^2 / (1 - q)$. Hence by taking expectation with all the history, and noting $\tilde{x}^s = x_0^{s+1}$, we have $u_{t+1} \leq qu_t + p(1 - q)u_0$, i.e. $u_{t+1} - pu_0 \leq q(u_t - pu_0)$. Therefore, $u_m - pu_0 \leq q^m(u_0 - pu_0)$, hence we get

$$u_m \leq (p + q^m(1 - p))u_0,$$

where $p + q^m(1 - p) = \frac{3\zeta\eta L^2}{\mu - 2\zeta\eta L^2} + \frac{(1 + 4\zeta\eta^2 L^2 - 2\eta\mu)^m(\mu - 5\zeta\eta L^2)}{\mu - 2\zeta\eta L^2} = \alpha$. It follows directly from the algorithm that after S outer loops, $\mathbb{E}d^2(x_a, x^*) = \mathbb{E}d^2(\tilde{x}^S, x^*) \leq \alpha^S d^2(x^0, x^*)$. \square

Corollary 1. With assumptions as in Theorem 2 and properly chosen parameters, after $O\left((n + \frac{\zeta L^2}{\mu^2}) \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})\right)$ IFO calls, the output x_a satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x_a) - f(x^*)] \leq \epsilon.$$

Proof. Assume we choose $\eta = \mu/(17\zeta L^2)$ and $m \geq 10\zeta L^2/\mu^2$, it follows that $q = 1 - 30\mu^2/(289\zeta L^2) \leq 1 - \mu^2/(10\zeta L^2)$, $p = 1/5$ and therefore

$$u_m \leq \left(\frac{1}{5} + \frac{4}{5} (1 - \mu^2/(10\zeta L^2))^{10\zeta L^2/\mu^2}\right) u_0 \leq \left(\frac{1}{5} + \frac{4}{5e}\right) u_0 \leq \frac{u_0}{2},$$

where the second inequality is due to $(1 - x)^{1/x} \leq 1/e$ for $x \in (0, 1)$. Applying Theorem 2 with $\alpha = 1/2$, we have $\mathbb{E}d^2(x_a, x^*) \leq 2^{-S}d^2(x^0, x^*)$. Note that by using the L -g-smooth assumption, we also get $\mathbb{E}[f(x_a) - f(x^*)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{2}Ld^2(x_a, x^*)] \leq 2^{-S-1}Ld^2(x^0, x^*)$. It thus suffices to run $\log_2(Ld^2(x^0, x^*)/\epsilon) - 1$ outer loops to guarantee $\mathbb{E}[f(x_a) - f(x^*)] \leq \epsilon$.

For the s -th outer loop, we need n IFO calls to evaluate the full gradient at \tilde{x}^s , and $2m$ IFO calls when calculating each variance reduced gradient. Hence the total number of IFO calls to reach ϵ accuracy is $O\left((n + \frac{\zeta L^2}{\mu^2}) \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})\right)$. \square

B Proofs for Section 3.3

Theorem 6. Assuming the inverse exponential map is well-defined on \mathcal{X} , $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a geodesically L -smooth function, stochastic first-order oracle $\nabla \tilde{f}(x)$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\nabla \tilde{f}(x^t)] = \nabla f(x^t)$, $\|\nabla \tilde{f}(x^t)\|^2 \leq \sigma^2$, then the SGD algorithm $x^{t+1} = \text{Exp}_{x^t}(-\eta \nabla \tilde{f}(x^t))$ with $\eta = c/\sqrt{T}$, $c = \sqrt{\frac{2(f(x^0) - f(x^*))}{L\sigma^2}}$ satisfies

$$\min_{0 \leq t \leq T-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x^t)\|^2] \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(f(x^0) - f(x^*))L}{T}} \sigma.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(x^{t+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(x^t) + \langle \nabla f(x^t), \text{Exp}_{x^t}^{-1}(x^{t+1}) \rangle] + \frac{L}{2} \|\text{Exp}_{x^t}^{-1}(x^{t+1})\|^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(x^t)] - \eta \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x^t)\|^2] + \frac{L\eta^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \tilde{f}(x^t)\|^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(x^t)] - \eta \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x^t)\|^2] + \frac{L\eta^2}{2} \sigma^2 \end{aligned}$$

After rearrangement, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x^t)\|^2] \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbb{E}[f(x^t) - f(x^{t+1})] + \frac{L\eta}{2} \sigma^2$$

Summing up the above equation from $t = 0$ to $T - 1$ and using $\eta = c/\sqrt{T}$ where

$$c = \sqrt{\frac{2(f(x^0) - f(x^*))}{L\sigma^2}}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \min_t \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x^t)\|^2] &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[\|f(x^t)\|^2] \leq \frac{1}{T\eta} \mathbb{E}[f(x^0) - f(x^T)] + \frac{L\eta}{2} \sigma^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T\eta} (f(x^0) - f(x^*)) + \frac{L\eta}{2} \sigma^2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2(f(x^0) - f(x^*))L}{T}} \sigma \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 1. Assume in (??) each f_i is L -g-smooth, the sectional curvature in \mathcal{X} is lower bounded by κ_{\min} , and we run Algorithm ?? with Option II. For $c_t, c_{t+1}, \beta, \eta > 0$, suppose we have

$$c_t = c_{t+1} (1 + \beta\eta + 2\zeta L^2 \eta^2) + L^3 \eta^2$$

and

$$\delta(t) = \eta - \frac{c_{t+1}\eta}{\beta} - L\eta^2 - 2c_{t+1}\zeta\eta^2 > 0,$$

then the iterate x_t^{s+1} satisfies the bound:

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2] \leq \frac{R_t^{s+1} - R_{t+1}^{s+1}}{\delta_t}$$

where $R_t^{s+1} := \mathbb{E}[f(x_t^{s+1}) + c_t \|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}(x_t^{s+1})\|^2]$ for $0 \leq s \leq S-1$.

Proof. Since f is L -smooth we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(x_{t+1}^{s+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(x_t^{s+1}) + \langle \nabla f(x_t^{s+1}), \text{Exp}_{x_t^{s+1}}^{-1}(x_{t+1}^{s+1}) \rangle] + \frac{L}{2} \|\text{Exp}_{x_t^{s+1}}^{-1}(x_{t+1}^{s+1})\|^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(x_t^{s+1}) - \eta \|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2 + \frac{L\eta^2}{2} \|v_t^{s+1}\|^2] \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Consider now the Lyapunov function

$$R_t^{s+1} := \mathbb{E}[f(x_t^{s+1}) + c_t \|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}(x_t^{s+1})\|^2]$$

For bounding it we will require the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x_{t+1}^{s+1})\|^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x_t^{s+1})\|^2 + \zeta \|\text{Exp}_{x_t^{s+1}}^{-1}(x_{t+1}^{s+1})\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\langle \text{Exp}_{x_t^{s+1}}^{-1}(x_{t+1}^{s+1}), \text{Exp}_{x_t^{s+1}}^{-1}(\tilde{x}^s) \rangle] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x_t^{s+1})\|^2 + \zeta \eta^2 \|v_t^{s+1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\eta \langle \nabla f(x_t^{s+1}), \text{Exp}_{x_t^{s+1}}^{-1}(\tilde{x}^s) \rangle] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x_t^{s+1})\|^2 + \zeta \eta^2 \|v_t^{s+1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + 2\eta \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2\beta} \|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x_t^{s+1})\|^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the first inequality is due to Lemma ??, the second due to $2\langle a, b \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \|a\|^2 + \beta \|b\|^2$. Plugging Equation (5) and Equation (6) into R_{t+1}^{s+1} , we obtain the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{t+1}^{s+1} &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(x_t^{s+1}) - \eta \|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2 + \frac{L\eta^2}{2} \|v_t^{s+1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + c_{t+1} \mathbb{E}[\|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x_t^{s+1})\|^2 + \zeta \eta^2 \|v_t^{s+1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + 2c_{t+1} \eta \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2\beta} \|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x_t^{s+1})\|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[f(x_t^{s+1}) - \left(\eta - \frac{c_{t+1}\eta}{\beta} \right) \|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{L\eta^2}{2} + c_{t+1}\zeta\eta^2 \right) \mathbb{E} [\|v_t^{s+1}\|^2] \\ &\quad + (c_{t+1} + c_{t+1}\eta\beta) \mathbb{E} [\|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x_t^{s+1})\|^2] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

It remains to bound $\mathbb{E} [\|v_t^{s+1}\|^2]$. Denoting $\Delta_t^{s+1} = \nabla f_{i_t}(x_t^{s+1}) - \Gamma_{\tilde{x}^s}^{x_t^{s+1}} \nabla f_{i_t}(\tilde{x}^s)$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^{s+1}] = \nabla f(x_t^{s+1}) - \Gamma_{\tilde{x}^s}^{x_t^{s+1}} \nabla f(\tilde{x}^s)$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|v_t^{s+1}\|^2] &= \mathbb{E} [\|\Delta_t^{s+1} + \Gamma_{\tilde{x}^s}^{x_t^{s+1}} \nabla f(\tilde{x}^s)\|^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\|\Delta_t^{s+1} - \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^{s+1}] + \nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t^{s+1} - \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^{s+1}]\|^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t^{s+1}\|^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2] \\ &\leq 2L^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x_t^{s+1})\|^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2] \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the first inequality is due to $\|a + b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$, the second due to $\mathbb{E}\|\xi - \mathbb{E}\xi\|^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\xi\|^2 - \|\mathbb{E}\xi\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\|\xi\|^2$ for any random vector ξ in any tangent space, the third due to L -g-smooth assumption. Substituting Equation (8) into Equation (7) we get

$$\begin{aligned} R_{t+1}^{s+1} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[f(x_t^{s+1}) - \left(\eta - \frac{c_{t+1}\eta}{\beta} - L\eta^2 - 2c_{t+1}\zeta\eta^2 \right) \|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + (c_{t+1} (1 + \beta\eta + 2\zeta L^2\eta^2) + L^3\eta^2) \mathbb{E} [\|\text{Exp}_{\tilde{x}^s}^{-1}(x_t^{s+1})\|^2] \\ &= R_t^{s+1} - \left(\eta - \frac{c_{t+1}\eta}{\beta} - L\eta^2 - 2c_{t+1}\zeta\eta^2 \right) \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2] \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Rearranging terms completes the proof. \square

Theorem 7. With assumptions as in Lemma 1, let $c_m = 0, \eta > 0, \beta > 0$, and $c_t = c_{t+1} (1 + \beta\eta + 2\zeta L^2\eta^2) + L^3\eta^2$ such that $\delta(t) > 0$ for $0 \leq t \leq m-1$. Define the quantity $\delta_n := \min_t \delta(t)$, and let $T = mS$. Then for the output x_a from Option II we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x_a)\|^2] \leq \frac{f(x^0) - f(x^*)}{T\delta_n}$$

Proof. Using Lemma 1 and telescoping the sum, we obtain

$$\sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2] \leq \frac{R_0^{s+1} - R_m^{s+1}}{\delta_n}$$

Since $c_m = 0$ and $x_0^{s+1} = \tilde{x}^s$, we thus have

$$\sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[f(\tilde{x}^s) - f(\tilde{x}^{s+1})]}{\delta_n}, \quad (10)$$

Now sum over all epochs to obtain

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=0}^{S-1} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x_t^{s+1})\|^2] \leq \frac{f(\tilde{x}^0) - f(x^*)}{T\delta_n} \quad (11)$$

Note the definition of x_a implies that the left hand side of (11) is exactly $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x_a)\|^2]$. \square

Theorem 3. Assume in (??) each f_i is L -g-smooth, the sectional curvature in \mathcal{X} is lower bounded by κ_{\min} , and we run Algorithm ?? with Option II. Then there exist universal constants $\mu_0 \in (0, 1), \nu > 0$ such that if we set $\eta = \mu_0/(Ln^{\alpha_1}\zeta^{\alpha_2})$ ($0 < \alpha_1 \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \alpha_2 \leq 2$), $m = \lfloor n^{3\alpha_1/2}/(3\mu_0\zeta^{1-2\alpha_2}) \rfloor$ and $T = mS$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x_a)\|^2] \leq \frac{Ln^{\alpha_1}\zeta^{\alpha_2}[f(x^0) - f(x^*)]}{T\nu},$$

where x^* is an optimal solution to the problem in (1).

Proof. Let $\beta = L\zeta^{1-\alpha_2}/n^{\alpha_1/2}$. From the recurrence relation $c_t = c_{t+1} (1 + \beta\eta + 2\zeta L^2\eta^2) + L^3\eta^2$ and $c_m = 0$ we have

$$c_0 = \frac{\mu_0^2 L}{n^{2\alpha_1}\zeta^{2\alpha_2}} \frac{(1 + \theta)^m - 1}{\theta},$$

where

$$\theta = \eta\beta + 2\zeta\eta^2 L^2 = \frac{\mu_0\zeta^{1-2\alpha_2}}{n^{3\alpha_1/2}} + \frac{2\mu_0^2\zeta^{1-2\alpha_2}}{n^{2\alpha_1}} \in \left(\frac{\mu_0\zeta^{1-2\alpha_2}}{n^{3\alpha_1/2}}, \frac{3\mu_0\zeta^{1-2\alpha_2}}{n^{3\alpha_1/2}} \right).$$

Notice that $\theta < 1/m$ so that $(1 + \theta)^m < e$. We can thus bound c_0 by

$$c_0 \leq \frac{\mu_0 L}{n^{\alpha_1/2}\zeta} (e - 1)$$

and in turn bound δ_n by

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_n &= \min_t \left(\eta - \frac{c_{t+1}\eta}{\beta} - \eta^2 L - 2c_{t+1}\zeta\eta^2 \right) \\
&\geq \left(\eta - \frac{c_0\eta}{\beta} - \eta^2 L - 2c_0\zeta\eta^2 \right) \\
&\geq \eta \left(1 - \frac{\mu_0(e-1)}{\zeta^{2-\alpha_2}} - \frac{\mu_0}{n^{\alpha_1}\zeta^{\alpha_2}} - \frac{2\mu_0^2(e-1)}{n^{3\alpha_1/2}\zeta^{\alpha_2}} \right) \\
&\geq \frac{\nu}{Ln^{\alpha_1}\zeta^{\alpha_2}}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds for small enough μ_0 , as $\zeta, n \geq 1$. For example, it holds for $\mu_0 = 1/10, \nu = 1/20$. Substituting the above bound in Theorem 7 concludes the proof. \square

Corollary 2. With assumptions and parameters in Theorem 3, choosing $\alpha_1 = 2/3$, the IFO complexity for achieving an ϵ -accurate solution is:

$$\text{IFO calls} = \begin{cases} O(n + (n^{2/3}\zeta^{1-\alpha_2}/\epsilon)), & \text{if } \alpha_2 \leq 1/2, \\ O(n\zeta^{2\alpha_2-1} + (n^{2/3}\zeta^{\alpha_2}/\epsilon)), & \text{if } \alpha_2 > 1/2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Note that to reach an ϵ -accurate solution, $O(n^{\alpha_1}\zeta^{\alpha_2}/(m\epsilon)) = O(1 + n^{-1/3}\zeta^{1-\alpha_2}/\epsilon)$ epochs are required. On the other hand, one epoch takes $O(n(1 + \zeta^{2\alpha_2-1}))$ IFO calls. Thus the total amount of IFO calls is $O(n(1 + \zeta^{2\alpha_2-1})(1 + n^{-1/3}\zeta^{1-\alpha_2}/\epsilon))$. Simplify to get the stated result. \square

Theorem 4. Suppose that in addition to the assumptions in Theorem 3, f is τ -gradient dominated. Then there exist universal constants $\mu_0 \in (0, 1), \nu > 0$ such that if we run Algorithm ?? with $\eta = \mu_0/(Ln^{2/3}\zeta^{1/2}), m = \lfloor n/(3\mu_0) \rfloor, S = \lceil (6 + \frac{18\mu_0}{n-3})L\tau\zeta^{1/2}\mu_0/(\nu n^{1/3}) \rceil$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x^K)\|^2] &\leq 2^{-K} \|\nabla f(x^0)\|^2, \\
\mathbb{E}[f(x^K) - f(x^*)] &\leq 2^{-K} [f(x^0) - f(x^*)].
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 3. Observe that for each run of Algorithm ?? with Option II we now have $T = mS \geq 2L\tau n^{2/3}\zeta^{1/2}/\nu$, which implies

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}[f(x^{k+1}) - f(x^*)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x^{k+1})\|^2] \leq \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathbb{E}[f(x^k) - f(x^*)] \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(x^k)\|^2]$$

The theorem follows by recursive application of the above inequality. \square

Corollary 4. With Algorithm ?? and the parameters in Theorem 4, the IFO complexity to compute an ϵ -accurate solution for gradient dominated function f is $O((n + L\tau\zeta^{1/2}n^{2/3}) \log(1/\epsilon))$.

Proof. We need $O((n + m)S) = O(n + L\tau\zeta^{1/2}n^{2/3})$ IFO calls in a run of Algorithm ?? to double the accuracy, thus in Algorithm ??, $K = O(\log(1/\epsilon))$ runs are needed to reach ϵ -accuracy. \square

Corollary 5. With Algorithm ?? and the parameters in Theorem 4, the IFO complexity to compute an ϵ -accurate solution for a μ -strongly g-convex function f is $O((n + \mu^{-1}L\zeta^{1/2}n^{2/3}) \log(1/\epsilon))$.

Proof. Assume x^* is the minimizer of f and f is μ -strongly g-convex, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x^*) &= \min_y f(y) \\
&\geq \min_y f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), \text{Exp}_x^{-1}(y) \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\text{Exp}_x^{-1}(y)\|^2 \\
&= f(x) - \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\nabla f(x)\|^2 + \min_y \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\nabla f(x) + \mu \text{Exp}_x^{-1}(y)\|^2 \\
&\geq f(x) - \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\nabla f(x)\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

where we get the first inequality by strong g-convexity, the second equality by completing the squares, and the second inequality by choosing $y = \text{Exp}_x\left(-\frac{1}{\mu}\nabla f(x)\right)$. Thus $f(x)$ is $(1/(2\mu))$ -gradient dominated, and choosing $\tau = 1/(2\mu)$ in Corollary 4 concludes the proof. \square

C Proof for Section 4.1

Theorem 5. Suppose A has eigenvalues $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d$ and $\delta = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$, and x^0 is drawn uniformly randomly on the hypersphere. Then with probability $1 - p$, x^0 falls in a Riemannian ball of a global optimum of the objective function, within which the objective function is $O(\frac{d}{p^2\delta})$ -gradient dominated.

Proof. We write x in the basis of A 's eigenvectors $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ with corresponding eigenvalues $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d$, i.e. $x = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i v_i$. Thus $Ax = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \lambda_i v_i$ and $f(x) = -\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i^2 \lambda_i$. The Riemannian gradient of $f(x)$ is $P_x \nabla f(x) = -2(I - xx^\top)Ax = -2(Ax + f(x)x) = -2\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i(\lambda_i - \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j^2 \lambda_j)v_i$ (see (1, Example 3.6.1)). Now consider a Riemannian ball on the hypersphere defined by $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon \triangleq \{x : x \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \alpha_1 \geq \epsilon\}$, note that the center of \mathcal{B}_ϵ is the first eigenvector. We apply a case by case argument with respect to $f(x) - f(x^*)$. If $f(x) - f(x^*) \geq \frac{\delta}{2}$, we can lower bound the gradient by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \|P_x \nabla f(x)\|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i^2 \left(\lambda_i - \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j^2 \lambda_j \right)^2 \geq \alpha_1^2 \left(\lambda_1 - \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j^2 \lambda_j \right)^2 = \alpha_1^2 (f(x) - f(x^*))^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \alpha_1^2 \delta (f(x) - f(x^*)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \delta (f(x) - f(x^*)) \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the fact that $f(x^*) = -\lambda_1$ and $f(x) = -\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i^2 \lambda_i$. On the other hand, if $f(x) - f(x^*) < \frac{\delta}{2}$, for $i = 2, \dots, d$, since $-\lambda_i - f(x^*) \geq \delta$, we have $-\lambda_i - f(x) > \frac{1}{2}(-\lambda_i - f(x^*)) \geq \delta/2$. We can, again, lower bound the gradient by

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_x \nabla f(x)\|^2 &= 4 \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i^2 \left(\lambda_i - \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j^2 \lambda_j \right)^2 \geq 4 \sum_{i=2}^d \alpha_i^2 \left(\lambda_i - \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j^2 \lambda_j \right)^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{i=2}^d \alpha_i^2 (\lambda_1 - \lambda_i)^2 \geq \delta \sum_{i=2}^d \alpha_i^2 (\lambda_1 - \lambda_i) = \delta (f(x) - f(x^*)) \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two cases, we have that within \mathcal{B}_ϵ the objective function (4) is $\max\{\frac{1}{2\epsilon^2\delta}, \frac{1}{\delta}\}$ -gradient dominated. Finally, observe that if x^0 is chosen uniformly at random on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} , then with probability at least $1 - p$, $\alpha_1^2 = \Omega(\frac{p^2}{d})$, i.e. there exists some constant $c > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \leq \frac{cd}{p^2}$. \square