

# Non-convex online learning via algorithmic equivalence

Udaya Ghai<sup>1,2</sup>, Zhou Lu<sup>1,2</sup>, Elad Hazan<sup>1,2</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>Google AI Princeton <sup>2</sup>Department of Computer Science, Princeton University

## Motivation

To explain the success of modern deep learning, the study of **global convergence** of gradient descent for **non-convex** objectives is increasingly important, because in practice gradient descent and its variants can achieve zero error on a highly non-convex loss function of a deep neural network.

Inspired by recent results in continuous-time, we investigate a **algorithmic equivalence** methodology for proving convergence of non-convex functions that are **reparameterizations** of convex functions.

## Continuous-time Reparameterization

[1] analyzes equivalence of **gradient flow** and **mirror flow**. In particular, the **ODE** for mirror flow on  $f$  with regularizer  $R$

$$\dot{\nabla} R(x(t)) = -\eta \nabla f(x(t))$$

is equivalent to gradient flow on  $\tilde{f} = f \circ u$  with  $x(t) = q(u(t))$

$$u(t) = -\eta \tilde{f}(u(t)),$$

where

$$[\nabla^2 R(x)]^{-1} = J_q(u) J_q(u)^\top.$$

mirror flow on **convex**  $f$



gradient flow on **nonconvex** function  $\tilde{f}$

In a follow-up work [2], the analysis for continuous-time was extended to discrete-time, on some specific algorithms with relative-entropy regularization.

Canonical example: **Exponentiated Gradient (EG)**

- $R$  is negative entropy,  $q(u) = u \odot u$
- Analyzed in discrete online settings in [2]

**Open question by [1,2]:** can we extend this reparameterization approach to **general online convex optimization**, in the discrete-time setting?

## Our Result

We show that in the **discrete-time** setting, online gradient descent applied to **non-convex** functions is an **approximation** of online mirror descent applied to convex functions under reparameterization, through a new **algorithmic equivalence** technique.

## 2 Algorithm

### Algorithm 1 Online Mirror Descent

- 1: Input: Initialization  $x_1 \in \mathcal{K}$ , regularizer  $R$ .
- 2: **for**  $t = 1, \dots, T$  **do**
- 3:   Predict  $x_t$ , observe  $\nabla f_t(x_t)$
- 4:   Update

$$y_{t+1} = (\nabla R)^{-1}(\nabla R(x_t) - \eta \nabla f_t(x_t))$$

$$x_{t+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{K}}^R(y_{t+1})$$

- 5: **end for**



### Algorithm 2 Online Gradient Descent

- 1: Input: Initialization  $u_1 \in \mathcal{K}' = q^{-1}(\mathcal{K})$ .
- 2: **for**  $t = 1, \dots, T$  **do**
- 3:   Predict  $u_t$ , observe  $\nabla \tilde{f}_t(u_t) = \nabla f_t(q(u_t))$
- 4:   Update

$$v_{t+1} = u_t - \eta \nabla \tilde{f}_t(u_t)$$

$$u_{t+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{K}'}(v_{t+1})$$

- 5: **end for**

## Main Theorem

**Theorem:** Given an instance of **convex OMD** (Alg. 1) which satisfies some assumptions on the smoothness of  $q, q^{-1}, R$ , and

$$[\nabla^2 R(x)]^{-1} = J_q(u) J_q(u)^\top,$$

the **regret** of **Alg. 2** is bounded by  $O(T^{2/3})$  by setting  $\eta = \Theta(T^{-2/3})$ .

## Algorithmic Equivalence Analysis

- MD Bregman divergence approximately equivalent to **Euclidean** in reparameterized space

$$D_R(x||y) \approx \frac{1}{2} \|q^{-1}(x) - q^{-1}(y)\|_2^2$$

- The OMD and OGD **iterates are close** after a **single step**:

$$x_t = q(u_t) \Rightarrow \|x_{t+1} - q(u_{t+1})\|_2 = O(\eta^{3/2}).$$

- View the OGD update as a **perturbed** version of OMD, and combine it with the fact that the OMD algorithm can tolerate bounded noise per trial.

## Reverse Direction

The other direction from OGD to OMD is even more interesting: given a non-convex OGD, can we show its **global convergence** by showing the **existence** of a convex OMD which corresponds to OGD **implicitly**?

**A necessary condition:**

- There exists a function  $q$  such that  $\tilde{f}_t(u)$  can be written as  $f_t(q(u))$  where  $f_t$  is convex.
- $q$  is a  $C^3$ -**diffeomorphism**, and  $J_q(u)$  is **diagonal**.
- $q(\mathcal{K}')$  is convex and compact.

**Theorem:** running Algorithm 2 on loss  $\tilde{f}_t(u)$  has regret upper bound  $\tilde{O}(T^{2/3})$ .

## Open Problem

Can this technique get **optimal**  $O(\sqrt{T})$  regret bounds? Closeness of MD and GD are not close enough by existing analysis because of **projection**. Tighter analysis may be possible.

## References

- [1] Ehsan Amid and Manfred Warmuth Reparameterizing mirror descent as gradient descent Neurips 2020
- [2] Ehsan Amid and Manfred Warmuth Winothing with gradient descent COLT 2020