Stochastic Optimization Algorithms Beyond SG

Frank E. Curtis[1], Lehigh University

involving joint work with

Léon Bottou, Facebook AI Research
Jorge Nocedal, Northwestern University

"Optimization Methods for Large-Scale Machine Learning"
http://arxiv.org/abs/1606.04838

Google NYC

3 November 2016




[1] Mike's older brother

Outline

Outline

Stochastic optimization

Over a parameter vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and given

$$\ell(\cdot; y) \circ h(x; w) \quad \text{(loss w.r.t. "true label" } \circ \text{ prediction w.r.t. "features")},$$

consider the unconstrained optimization problem

$$\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \; f(w), \quad \text{where} \quad f(w) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}[\ell(h(w; x), y)].$$

Stochastic optimization

Over a parameter vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and given

$$\ell(\cdot; y) \circ h(x; w) \quad \text{(loss w.r.t. "true label" } \circ \text{ prediction w.r.t. "features")},$$

consider the unconstrained optimization problem

$$\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \; f(w), \quad \text{where} \quad f(w) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}[\ell(h(w; x), y)].$$

Given training set $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, approximate problem given by

$$\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \; f_n(w), \quad \text{where} \quad f_n(w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(h(x_i; w), y_i).$$

Stochastic optimization

Over a parameter vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and given

$$\ell(\cdot; y) \circ h(x; w) \quad \text{(loss w.r.t. "true label" } \circ \text{ prediction w.r.t. "features")},$$

consider the unconstrained optimization problem

$$\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \; f(w), \quad \text{where} \quad f(w) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}[\ell(h(w; x), y)].$$

Given training set $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, approximate problem given by

$$\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \; f_n(w), \quad \text{where} \quad f_n(w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(h(x_i; w), y_i).$$

For this talk, let's assume

- f is continuously differentiable, bounded below, and potentially nonconvex;
- ∇f is L-Lipschitz continuous, i.e., $\|\nabla f(w) - \nabla f(\overline{w})\|_2 \leq L\|w - \overline{w}\|_2$.

Focus on optimization algorithms, not data fitting issues, regularization, etc.

Gradient descent

Algorithm GD : Gradient Descent

1: choose an initial point $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and stepsize $\alpha > 0$
2: **for** $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ **do**
3: set $w_{k+1} \leftarrow w_k - \alpha \nabla f(w_k)$
4: **end for**



Gradient descent

Algorithm GD : Gradient Descent

1: choose an initial point $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and stepsize $\alpha > 0$
2: **for** $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ **do**
3: set $w_{k+1} \leftarrow w_k - \alpha \nabla f(w_k)$
4: **end for**



Gradient descent

Algorithm GD : Gradient Descent

1: choose an initial point $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and stepsize $\alpha > 0$
2: **for** $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ **do**
3: set $w_{k+1} \leftarrow w_k - \alpha \nabla f(w_k)$
4: **end for**



Gradient descent

Algorithm GD : Gradient Descent

1: choose an initial point $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and stepsize $\alpha > 0$
2: **for** $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ **do**
3: set $w_{k+1} \leftarrow w_k - \alpha \nabla f(w_k)$
4: **end for**



GD theory

Theorem GD

If $\alpha \in (0, 1/L]$, *then* $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\nabla f(w_k)\|_2^2 < \infty$, *which implies* $\{\nabla f(w_k)\} \to 0$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} f(w_{k+1}) &\leq f(w_k) + \nabla f(w_k)^T (w_{k+1} - w_k) + \tfrac{1}{2} L \|w_{k+1} - w_k\|_2^2 \\ &\leq f(w_k) - \tfrac{1}{2} \alpha \|\nabla f(w_k)\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

GD theory

Theorem GD

If $\alpha \in (0, 1/L]$, *then* $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\nabla f(w_k)\|_2^2 < \infty$, *which implies* $\{\nabla f(w_k)\} \to 0$.

If, in addition, f *is* c*-strongly convex, then for all* $k \geq 1$*:*

$$f(w_k) - f_* \leq (1 - \alpha c)^k (f(x_0) - f_*).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} f(w_{k+1}) &\leq f(w_k) + \nabla f(w_k)^T (w_{k+1} - w_k) + \tfrac{1}{2} L \|w_{k+1} - w_k\|_2^2 \\ &\leq f(w_k) - \tfrac{1}{2} \alpha \|\nabla f(w_k)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq f(w_k) - \alpha c (f(w_k) - f_*). \end{aligned}$$

$$\implies f(w_{k+1}) - f_* \leq (1 - \alpha c)(f(w_k) - f_*).$$

GD illustration



Figure: GD with fixed stepsize

Stochastic gradient ~~descent~~

Approximate gradient only; e.g., random i_k and $\nabla_w \ell(h(w; x_{i_k}), y_{i_k}) \approx \nabla f(w)$.

Algorithm SG : Stochastic Gradient

1: choose an initial point $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and stepsizes $\{\alpha_k\} > 0$
2: **for** $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ **do**
3: set $w_{k+1} \leftarrow w_k - \alpha_k g_k$, where $g_k \approx \nabla f(w_k)$
4: **end for**

Stochastic gradient ~~descent~~

Approximate gradient only; e.g., random i_k and $\nabla_w \ell(h(w; x_{i_k}), y_{i_k}) \approx \nabla f(w)$.

Algorithm SG : Stochastic Gradient

1: choose an initial point $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and stepsizes $\{\alpha_k\} > 0$
2: **for** $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ **do**
3: set $w_{k+1} \leftarrow w_k - \alpha_k g_k$, where $g_k \approx \nabla f(w_k)$
4: **end for**

Not a descent method!
. . . but can guarantee *eventual descent in expectation* (with $\mathbb{E}_k[g_k] = \nabla f(w_k)$):

$$\begin{aligned} f(w_{k+1}) &\leq f(w_k) + \nabla f(w_k)^T (w_{k+1} - w_k) + \tfrac{1}{2} L \|w_{k+1} - w_k\|_2^2 \\ &= f(w_k) - \alpha_k \nabla f(w_k)^T g_k + \tfrac{1}{2} \alpha_k^2 L \|g_k\|_2^2 \\ \implies \mathbb{E}_k[f(w_{k+1})] &\leq f(w_k) - \alpha_k \|\nabla f(w_k)\|_2^2 + \tfrac{1}{2} \alpha_k^2 L \mathbb{E}_k[\|g_k\|_2^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Markov process: w_{k+1} depends only on w_k and random choice at iteration k.

SG theory

Theorem SG

If $\mathbb{E}_k[\|g_k\|_2^2] \leq M + \|\nabla f(w_k)\|_2^2$, *then*

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1}{L} \qquad \Longrightarrow \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\|\nabla f(w_j)\|_2^2\right] \to M$$

$$\alpha_k = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) \qquad \Longrightarrow \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{k}\alpha_j\|\nabla f(w_j)\|_2^2\right] < \infty.$$

(*Assumed unbiased gradient estimates; see paper for more generality.)

SG theory

Theorem SG

If $\mathbb{E}_k[\|g_k\|_2^2] \leq M + \|\nabla f(w_k)\|_2^2$, *then*

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1}{L} \qquad \Longrightarrow \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\|\nabla f(w_j)\|_2^2\right] \to M$$

$$\alpha_k = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) \qquad \Longrightarrow \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{k}\alpha_j\|\nabla f(w_j)\|_2^2\right] < \infty.$$

If, in addition, f *is* c*-strongly convex, then*

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1}{L} \qquad \Longrightarrow \mathbb{E}[f(w_k) - f_*] \to \frac{(M/c)}{2}$$

$$\alpha_k = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) \qquad \Longrightarrow \mathbb{E}[f(w_k) - f_*] = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(L/c)(M/c)}{k}\right).$$

(*Assumed unbiased gradient estimates; see paper for more generality.)

SG illustration



Figure: SG with fixed stepsize (left) vs. diminishing stepsizes (right)

Outline

Why SG over GD for large-scale machine learning?

We have seen:

GD:	$\mathbb{E}[f_n(w_k) - f_{n,*}] = \mathcal{O}(\rho^k)$	linear convergence
SG:	$\mathbb{E}[f_n(w_k) - f_{n,*}] = \mathcal{O}(1/k)$	sublinear convergence

So why SG?

Why SG over GD for large-scale machine learning?

We have seen:

$$\text{GD:} \quad \mathbb{E}[f_n(w_k) - f_{n,*}] = \mathcal{O}(\rho^k) \qquad \text{linear convergence}$$

$$\text{SG:} \quad \mathbb{E}[f_n(w_k) - f_{n,*}] = \mathcal{O}(1/k) \qquad \text{sublinear convergence}$$

So why SG?

Motivation	Explanation
Intuitive	data "redundancy"
Practical	SG vs. L-BFGS with batch gradient (below)
Theoretical	$\mathbb{E}[f_n(w_k) - f_{n,*}] = \mathcal{O}(1/k)$ and $\mathbb{E}[f(w_k) - f_*] = \mathcal{O}(1/k)$



Work complexity

Time, not data, as limiting factor; Bottou, Bousquet (2008) and Bottou (2010).

	Convergence rate		Cost per iteration		Cost for ϵ-optimality
GD:	$\mathbb{E}[f_n(w_k) - f_{n,*}] = \mathcal{O}(\rho^k)$	$+$	$\mathcal{O}(n)$	$\Longrightarrow$	$n \log(1/\epsilon)$
SG:	$\mathbb{E}[f_n(w_k) - f_{n,*}] = \mathcal{O}(1/k)$	$+$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\Longrightarrow$	$1/\epsilon$

Work complexity

Time, not data, as limiting factor; Bottou, Bousquet (2008) and Bottou (2010).

	Convergence rate		Cost per iteration		Cost for ϵ-optimality
GD:	$\mathbb{E}[f_n(w_k) - f_{n,*}] = \mathcal{O}(\rho^k)$	+	$\mathcal{O}(n)$	$\Longrightarrow$	$n \log(1/\epsilon)$
SG:	$\mathbb{E}[f_n(w_k) - f_{n,*}] = \mathcal{O}(1/k)$	+	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\Longrightarrow$	$1/\epsilon$

Considering total (estimation + optimization) error as

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{E}[f(w^n) - f(w^*)] + \mathbb{E}[f(\tilde{w}^n) - f(w^n)] \sim \tfrac{1}{n} + \epsilon$$

and a time budget $\mathcal{T}$, one finds:

- SG: Process as many samples as possible ($n \sim \mathcal{T}$), leading to

$$\mathcal{E} \sim \frac{1}{\mathcal{T}}.$$

- GD: With $n \sim \mathcal{T}/\log(1/\epsilon)$, minimizing $\mathcal{E}$ yields $\epsilon \sim 1/\mathcal{T}$ and

$$\mathcal{E} \sim \frac{1}{\mathcal{T}} + \frac{\log(\mathcal{T})}{\mathcal{T}}.$$

Outline

End of the story?

SG is great! Let's keep proving how great it is!

- Stability of SG; Hardt, Recht, Singer (2015)
- SG avoids steep minima; Keskar, Mudigere, Nocedal, Smelyanskiy (2016)

End of the story?

SG is great! Let's keep proving how great it is!

- Stability of SG; Hardt, Recht, Singer (2015)
- SG avoids steep minima; Keskar, Mudigere, Nocedal, Smelyanskiy (2016)

No, we should want more...

- SG requires a lot of tuning
- Sublinear convergence is not satisfactory
- ... "linearly" convergent method eventually wins
- ... with higher budget, faster computation, parallel?, distributed?

Also, any "gradient"-based method is not scale invariant.

What can be improved?



What can be improved?



Two-dimensional schematic of methods



2D schematic: Noise reduction methods



2D schematic: Second-order methods



Even more...

- momentum
- acceleration
- (dual) coordinate descent
- trust region / step normalization
- exploring negative curvature

Outline

Scale invariance

Neither SG nor GD are invariant to linear transformations.

$$\min_{w\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(w) \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad w_{k+1} \leftarrow w_k - \alpha_k \nabla f(w_k)$$

$$\min_{\tilde{w}\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(B\tilde{w}) \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \tilde{w}_{k+1} \leftarrow \tilde{w}_k - \alpha_k B \nabla f(B\tilde{w}_k) \quad \text{(for given } B \succ 0\text{)}$$

Scale invariance

Neither SG nor GD are invariant to linear transformations.

$$\min_{w\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(w) \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad w_{k+1} \leftarrow w_k - \alpha_k \nabla f(w_k)$$

$$\min_{\tilde{w}\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(B\tilde{w}) \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \tilde{w}_{k+1} \leftarrow \tilde{w}_k - \alpha_k B \nabla f(B\tilde{w}_k) \quad \text{(for given } B \succ 0\text{)}$$

Scaling latter by B and defining $\{w_k\} = \{B\tilde{w}_k\}$ yields

$$w_{k+1} \leftarrow w_k - \alpha_k B^2 \nabla f(w_k)$$

- Algorithm is clearly affected by choice of B
- Surely, some choices may be better than others

Newton scaling

Consider the function below and suppose that $w_k = (0, 3)$:



Newton scaling

GD step along $-\nabla f(w_k)$ ignores curvature of the function:



Newton scaling

Newton scaling ($B = (\nabla^2 f(w_k))^{-1/2}$): gradient step moves to the minimizer:





Newton scaling

. . . corresponds to minimizing a quadratic model of f in the original space:





$$w_{k+1} \leftarrow w_k + \alpha_k s_k \quad \text{where} \quad \nabla^2 f(w_k) s_k = -\nabla f(w_k)$$

Deterministic case

What is known about Newton's method for deterministic optimization?

- local rescaling based on inverse Hessian information
- unit steps are good near strong minimizer (no tuning!)
- ... locally quadratically convergent
- global convergence rate better than gradient method (*when regularized*)

Deterministic case to stochastic case

What is known about Newton's method for deterministic optimization?

- local rescaling based on inverse Hessian information
- unit steps are good near strong minimizer (no tuning!)
- ... locally quadratically convergent
- global convergence rate better than gradient method (*when regularized*)

However, it is way too expensive.

- But all is not lost: scaling can be practical.
- Wide variety of scaling techniques improve performance.
- ...could hope to remove condition number (L/c) from convergence rate!
- Added costs can be minimial when coupled with noise reduction.

Quasi-Newton

Only *approximate* second-order information with gradient displacements:



Secant equation $H_k v_k = s_k$ to match gradient of f at w_k, where

$$s_k := w_{k+1} - w_k \quad \text{and} \quad v_k := \nabla f(w_{k+1}) - \nabla f(w_k)$$

Balance between extremes

For deterministic, smooth optimization, a nice balance achieved by quasi-Newton:

$$w_{k+1} \leftarrow w_k - \alpha_k M_k g_k,$$

where

- $\alpha_k > 0$ is a stepsize;
- $g_k \leftarrow \nabla f(w_k)$;
- $\{M_k\}$ is updated dynamically.

Background on quasi-Newton:

- local rescaling of step (overcome ill-conditioning)
- only first-order derivatives required
- no linear system solves required
- global convergence guarantees (say, with line search)
- superlinear local convergence rate

How can the idea be carried over to a stochastic setting?

Previous work: BFGS-type methods

Much focus on the secant equation ($H_{k+1} \sim$ Hessian approximation)

$$H_{k+1} s_k = y_k \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{cases} s_k := w_{k+1} - w_k \\ y_k := \nabla f(w_{k+1}) - \nabla f(w_k) \end{cases}$$

and an appropriate replacement for the gradient displacement:

$$y_k \leftarrow \underbrace{\nabla f(w_{k+1}, \xi_k) - \nabla f(w_k, \xi_k)}_{\substack{\text{use same seed} \\ \text{oLBFGS, Schraudolph et al. (2007)} \\ \text{SGD-QN, Bordes et al. (2009)} \\ \text{RES, Mokhtari \& Ribeiro (2014)}}}$$

$$\text{or} \quad y_k \leftarrow \underbrace{\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_k^H} \nabla^2 f(w_{k+1}, \xi_{k+1,i}) \right) s_k}_{\substack{\text{use action of step on subsampled Hessian} \\ \text{SQN, Byrd et al. (2015)}}}$$

Is this the right focus? Is there a better way (especially for nonconvex f)?

Proposal

Propose a quasi-Newton method for stochastic (nonconvex) optimization

- exploit self-correcting properties of BFGS-type updates
  - Powell (1976)
  - Ritter (1979, 1981)
  - Werner (1978)
  - Byrd, Nocedal (1989)
- properties of Hessians offer useful bounds for inverse Hessians
- motivating convergence theory for convex and nonconvex objectives
- dynamic noise reduction strategy
- limited memory variant

Observed stable behavior and overall good performance

Outline

BFGS-type updates

Inverse Hessian and Hessian approximation updating formulas ($s_k^T v_k > 0$):

$$M_{k+1} \leftarrow \left(I - \frac{v_k s_k^T}{s_k^T v_k}\right)^T M_k \left(I - \frac{v_k s_k^T}{s_k^T v_k}\right) + \frac{s_k s_k^T}{s_k^T v_k}$$

$$H_{k+1} \leftarrow \left(I - \frac{s_k s_k^T H_k}{s_k^T H_k s_k}\right)^T H_k \left(I - \frac{s_k s_k^T H_k}{s_k^T H_k s_k}\right) + \frac{v_k v_k^T}{s_k^T v_k}$$

- Satisfy secant-type equations

$$M_{k+1} v_k = s_k \quad \text{and} \quad H_{k+1} s_k = v_k,$$

  but these are not relevant for our purposes here.
- Choosing $v_k \leftarrow y_k := g_{k+1} - g_k$ yields standard BFGS, but in this talk

$$v_k \leftarrow \beta_k s_k + (1 - \beta_k)\alpha_k y_k \quad \text{for some} \quad \beta_k \in [0, 1].$$

  This scheme is important to preserve self-correcting properties.

Geometric properties of Hessian update

Consider the matrices (which only depend on s_k and H_k, not g_k!)

$$P_k := \frac{s_k s_k^T H_k}{s_k^T H_k s_k} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_k := I - P_k.$$

Both H_k-orthogonal projection matrices (i.e., idempotent and H_k-self-adjoint).

- P_k yields H_k-orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}(s_k)$.
- Q_k yields H_k-orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}(s_k)^{\perp_{H_k}}$.

Geometric properties of Hessian update

Consider the matrices (which only depend on s_k and H_k, not g_k!)

$$P_k := \frac{s_k s_k^T H_k}{s_k^T H_k s_k} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_k := I - P_k.$$

Both H_k-orthogonal projection matrices (i.e., idempotent and H_k-self-adjoint).

- P_k yields H_k-orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}(s_k)$.
- Q_k yields H_k-orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}(s_k)^{\perp_{H_k}}$.

Returning to the Hessian update:

$$H_{k+1} \leftarrow \underbrace{\left(I - \frac{s_k s_k^T H_k}{s_k^T H_k s_k}\right)^T H_k \left(I - \frac{s_k s_k^T H_k}{s_k^T H_k s_k}\right)}_{\text{rank } n-1} + \underbrace{\frac{v_k v_k^T}{s_k^T v_k}}_{\text{rank } 1}$$

- Curvature projected out along $\text{span}(s_k)$
- Curvature corrected by $\frac{v_k v_k^T}{s_k^T v_k} = \left(\frac{v_k v_k^T}{\|v_k\|_2^2}\right)\left(\frac{\|v_k\|_2^2}{v_k^T M_{k+1} v_k}\right)$ (inverse Rayleigh).

Self-correcting properties of Hessian update

Since curvature is constantly projected out, what happens after many updates?

Self-correcting properties of Hessian update

Since curvature is constantly projected out, what happens after many updates?

Theorem SC (Byrd, Nocedal (1989))

Suppose that, for all k, there exists $\{\eta, \theta\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that

$$\eta \leq \frac{s_k^T v_k}{\|s_k\|_2^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\|v_k\|_2^2}{s_k^T v_k} \leq \theta. \tag{KEY}$$

Then, for any $p \in (0,1)$, there exist constants $\{\iota, \kappa, \lambda\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that, for any $K \geq 2$, the following relations hold for at least $\lceil pK \rceil$ values of $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$:

$$\iota \leq \frac{s_k^T H_k s_k}{\|s_k\|_2 \|H_k s_k\|_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa \leq \frac{\|H_k s_k\|_2}{\|s_k\|_2} \leq \lambda.$$

Proof technique.

Building on work of Powell (1976), etc., involves bounding growth of

$$\gamma(H_k) = \mathrm{tr}(H_k) - \ln(\det(H_k)).$$

Self-correcting properties of inverse Hessian update

Rather than focus on superlinear convergence results, we care about the following.

Corollary SC

Suppose the conditions of Theorem SC hold. Then, for any $p \in (0,1)$, there exist constants $\{\mu, \nu\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that, for any $K \geq 2$, the following relations hold for at least $\lceil pK \rceil$ values of $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$:

$$\mu \|g_k\|_2^2 \leq g_k^T M_k g_k \quad \text{and} \quad \|M_k g_k\|_2^2 \leq \nu \|g_k\|_2^2$$

Proof sketch.

Follows simply after algebraic manipulations from the result of Theorem SC, using the facts that $s_k = -\alpha_k M_k g_k$ and $M_k = H_k^{-1}$ for all k.

Outline

Algorithm SC : Self-Correcting BFGS Algorithm

Choose $w_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
Set $g_1 \approx \nabla f(w_1)$.
Choose a symmetric positive definite $M_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.
Choose a positive scalar sequence $\{\alpha_k\}$.
for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
    Set $s_k \leftarrow -\alpha_k M_k g_k$.
    Set $w_{k+1} \leftarrow w_k + s_k$.
    Set $g_{k+1} \approx \nabla f(w_{k+1})$.
    Set $y_k \leftarrow g_{k+1} - g_k$.
    Set $\beta_k \leftarrow \min\{\beta \in [0,1] : v(\beta) := \beta s_k + (1-\beta)\alpha_k y_k$ satisfies (KEY)$\}$.
    Set $v_k \leftarrow v(\beta_k)$.
    Set

$$M_{k+1} \leftarrow \left(I - \frac{v_k s_k^T}{s_k^T v_k}\right)^T M_k \left(I - \frac{v_k s_k^T}{s_k^T v_k}\right) + \frac{s_k s_k^T}{s_k^T v_k}.$$

end for

Global convergence theorem

Theorem (Bottou, Curtis, Nocedal (2016))

Suppose that, for all k, there exists a scalar constant $\rho > 0$ such that

$$-\nabla f(w_k)^T \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[M_k g_k] \leq -\rho \|\nabla f(w_k)\|_2^2,$$

and there exist scalars $\sigma > 0$ and $\tau > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\|M_k g_k\|_2^2] \leq \sigma + \tau \|\nabla f(w_k)\|_2^2.$$

Then, $\{\mathbb{E}[f(w_k)]\}$ converges to a finite limit and

$$\liminf_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\nabla f(w_k)] = 0.$$

Proof technique.

Follows from the critical inequality

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[f(w_{k+1})] - f(w_k) \leq -\alpha_k \nabla f(w_k)^T \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[M_k g_k] + \alpha_k^2 L \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\|M_k g_k\|_2^2].$$

Reality

The conditions in this theorem cannot be verified in practice.

- They require knowing $\nabla f(w_k)$.
- They require knowing $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[M_k g_k]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\|M_k g_k\|_2^2]$
- . . . but M_k and g_k are not independent!
- That said, Corollary SC ensures that they hold with $g_k = \nabla f(w_k)$; recall

$$\mu\|g_k\|_2^2 \leq g_k^T M_k g_k \quad \text{and} \quad \|M_k g_k\|_2^2 \leq \nu\|g_k\|_2^2.$$

Reality

The conditions in this theorem cannot be verified in practice.

- They require knowing $\nabla f(w_k)$.
- They require knowing $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[M_k g_k]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k}[\|M_k g_k\|_2^2]$
- ...but M_k and g_k are not independent!
- That said, Corollary SC ensures that they hold with $g_k = \nabla f(w_k)$; recall

$$\mu\|g_k\|_2^2 \leq g_k^T M_k g_k \quad \text{and} \quad \|M_k g_k\|_2^2 \leq \nu\|g_k\|_2^2.$$

Stabilized variant (SC-s): Loop over (stochastic) gradient computation until

$$\rho\|\hat{g}_{k+1}\|_2^2 \leq \hat{g}_{k+1}^T M_{k+1} g_{k+1}$$
$$\text{and} \quad \|M_{k+1} g_{k+1}\|_2^2 \leq \sigma + \tau\|\hat{g}_{k+1}\|_2^2.$$

Recompute g_{k+1}, $\hat{g}_{k+1}$, and M_{k+1} until these hold.

Numerical Experiments: a1a



logistic regression, data `a1a`, diminishing stepsizes

Numerical Experiments: rcv1

SC-L and SC-L-s: limited memory variants of SC and SC-s, respectively:



logistic regression, data `rcv1`, diminishing stepsizes

Numerical Experiments: mnist



deep neural network, data `mnist`, diminishing stepsizes

Outline

Contributions

Proposed a quasi-Newton method for stochastic (nonconvex) optimization

- exploited self-correcting properties of BFGS-type updates
- properties of Hessians offer useful bounds for inverse Hessians
- motivating convergence theory for convex and nonconvex objectives
- dynamic noise reduction strategy
- limited memory variant

Observed stable behavior and overall good performance

⋆ F. E. Curtis.
A Self-Correcting Variable-Metric Algorithm for Stochastic Optimization.
In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, New York, NY, USA, 2016. JMLR.