arXiv:1610.06702v1 [math.OC] 21 Oct 2016

Random constraint sampling and duality for convex optimization

William B. Haskell and Yu Pengqian

October 24, 2016

Abstract

We are interested in solving convex optimization problems with large numbers of constraints. Randomized algorithms, such as random constraint sampling, have been very successful in giving nearly optimal solutions to such problems. In this paper, we combine random constraint sampling with the classical primal-dual algorithm for convex optimization problems with large numbers of constraints, and we give a convergence rate analysis. We then report numerical experiments that verify the effectiveness of this algorithm.

1 Introduction

A large family of algorithms have been developed for convex optimization problems, and efficient algorithms for convex optimization continues to be an active area of research. Optimization problems with a large number of constraints pose a particular challenge, because even evaluating the feasibility of a candidate solution for such problems is computationally demanding. In this paper, we use random constraint sampling along with the classical primal-dual algorithm to solve convex optimization problems with large numbers of constraints.

Random constraint sampling has already been studied from several perspectives. As in [7], one can put a probability distribution over the set of constraints and then randomly sample from this distribution to produce a finite relaxation. The resulting guarantees in [7] on feasibility and optimality are probabilistic rather than exact. The same idea is used in [13, 3] to compute an approximate optimal value function in a Markov decision process with function approximation. Both [7] and [13, 3] assume that an idealized constraint sampling distribution is given at the outset. In [7], the sampling distribution is assumed to be either the actual probability of different constraints being realized or a measure of the relative importance of constraints. In [13, 3], the sampling distribution is assumed to be the occupation measure corresponding to the optimal policy. We depart from this assumption and show how to iteratively construct a good sampling distribution by appealing to semi-infinite programming duality theory. We must find a way to construct a good sampling distribution because the ideal sampling distribution requires knowledge that we do not have in practice.

We mention that randomized algorithms have enjoyed considerable success in convex optimization outside of the specific issue of constraint sampling:

- Many randomized convex optimization algorithms are based on randomly sampling the problem's feasible region. In [2], convex optimization problems are solved by sampling from a random walk on the feasible region. Simulated annealing is applied to convex optimization in [17]. The works [9, 10, 11] use randomized cutting planes based on uniformly sampling the problem feasible region. Markov chain sampling methods are combined with barrier methods for optimization in [23]. An interior point method for linear programming is developed in [18] in conjunction with a Markov chain algorithm to sample uniformly from a polytope.

- Stochastic gradient descent (SGD) and its variants are well studied in the stochastic optimization and machine learning literature. SGD uses one random sample in each iteration to approximate the gradient and is based on stochastic approximation (see [25, 29]). Reference [1] studies general gradient descent methods with error and gives asymptotic convergence guarantees, which includes SGD as a special case. In [24], stochastic subgradient algorithms for nonsmooth functions are proposed and almost sure convergence is guaranteed. A quasi-Newton SGD algorithm that uses second-order information about the objective function is proposed in [5] which focuses on support vector machines. Stochastic variance reduced gradient descent (SVRGD) (see [16, 32]) is proposed to overcome the problems with the high variance of SGD. It makes use of previous samples in addition to generating a new sample at each iteration.

- Stochastic dual methods have also been considered for optimization, which are especially useful in machine learning problems with large training sets. [28] gives a convergence analysis for stochastic dual coordinate ascent and shows that its performance is at least as good as SGD. [26, 27] study proximal dual coordinate ascent for regularized loss minimization and establish convergence guarantees on the expected optimality gap. The alternating direction method of multiplies (ADMM) algorithm applies to optimization problems with special block structure. [33] provides a new ADMM algorithm for two blocks that comes with linear convergence rate guarantees. [31] combines stochastic dual coordinate ascent with ADMM for two blocks and establishes exponential convergence. In [8], an example is developed which shows that the deterministic ADMM algorithm does not converge in general for three or more blocks. However, [30] shows that a randomly perturbed ADMM algorithm does converge in expectation for three or more blocks.

As our main contribution, we combine the technique of random constraint sampling with the classical primal-dual method. This algorithm is a powerful and well understood tool for solving constrained convex optimization problems. However, it is computationally difficult to extend this algorithm to settings with large numbers of constraints. We show that combining this algorithm with random constraint sampling leads to a practical computational scheme. Furthermore, we are able to give a convergence rate analysis.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the classical constrained convex optimization problem and its Lagrangian duality theory. The following Section 3 then discusses the connection between the dual problem and random constraint sampling, this connection is the foundation of our paper. Section 4 presents our algorithms and reports their convergence rates. In Section 5, we develop the proofs of our main results using martingale methods. Section 6 extends our main development to the special case of semi-infinite programming. Section 7 reports and discusses detailed numerical experiments, and the paper concludes in Section 8.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we review the classical constrained convex optimization problem and its Lagrangian dual. We will use the following standard notation throughout our paper:

- $\|x\|_p \triangleq \left(\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i|^p\right)^{1/p}$ for $p \in [1, \infty)$ is the $p-$norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$;
- $\langle x, y\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i y_i$ is the Euclidean inner product;
- e_i is the i^{th} unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$;
- $\mathrm{val}\,(\cdot)$ denotes the optimal value of an optimization problem.

Our optimization problem has the following ingredients:

- a set of admissible decisions $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$;
- an objective function $x \to f(x)$;
- a collection of constraint functions $g_i : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ for a finite (but possibly very large) index set $\mathcal{I}$;
- the constraint function $G : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ defined by $G(x) = (g_i(x))_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$.

We obtain the constrained optimization problem

$$\mathbb{P} : \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{ f(x) \, : \, g_i(x) \leq 0, \, \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \}.$$

Problem $\mathbb{P}$ is the central object of attention in this paper. We can also write Problem $\mathbb{P}$ more compactly as $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{ f(x) \, : \, G(x) \leq 0 \}$, where $G(x) \leq 0$ is understood as a component-wise inequality.

We make the following assumptions on the ingredients of Problem $\mathbb{P}$, that we collect together for ease of reference.

Assumption 2.1. *(i) $\mathcal{X}$ is convex and closed.*
(ii) $0 \in \mathcal{X}$.
(iii) $\|x\| \leq \kappa_r$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
(iv) $x \to f(x)$ is convex.
(v) $x \to f(x)$ is continuously differentiable on $\mathcal{X}$.
(vi) $x \to g_i(x)$ is convex for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$.
(vii) $x \to g_i(x)$ is continuously differentiable on $\mathcal{X}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

Problem $\mathbb{P}$ is a convex optimization problem under Assumptions **2.1**(i)(iv)(vi) since the implicit constraints $\mathcal{X}$ are convex, the objective function is convex, and the explicit constraints are all convex. Assumptions **2.1**(ii)(iii) require the set of implicit constraints $\mathcal{X}$ to be compact and to contain $x = 0$ (which makes it easier to bound the optimality gap and constraint violation later). Assumptions **2.1**(v)(vii) require the objective and all the constraint functions to be continuously differentiable.

The dual to Problem $\mathbb{P}$ will play a major role in our upcoming development. We define the Lagrange multiplier $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ corresponding to the constraint $G(x) \leq 0$, and then we define the Lagrangian $L : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|} \to \mathbb{R}$ to be

$$L(x, \, \lambda) \triangleq f(x) + \langle \lambda, \, G(x) \rangle.$$

The dual to Problem $\mathbb{P}$ is then

$$\mathbb{D} : \max_{\lambda \geq 0} d(\lambda) \triangleq \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} L(x, \, \lambda),$$

where $d(\lambda)$ is the dual functional. The dual functional $\lambda \to d(\lambda)$ is always concave since it is the minimum of linear functions $\lambda \to L(x, \, \lambda)$ indexed by $x \in \mathcal{X}$. We define:

- $Q^* \triangleq \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|} \, : \, d(\lambda) \geq d^* \right\}$ to be the set of dual optimal solutions.

We make the following assumptions on Problem $\mathbb{D}$ to continue.

Assumption 2.2. *(i) There exists $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\gamma = \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \{ -g_i(\tilde{x}) \} > 0$.*
(ii) There is a constant κ_q such that $\|\lambda\| \leq \kappa_q$ for all $\lambda \in Q^*$.

Assumption 2.2(i) is called the Slater condition and is a common constraint qualification for convex optimization (see [6, Chapter 5] for example). Assumption 2.2(ii) requires that the set of optimal solutions to Problem $\mathbb{D}$ be bounded. This assumption is quite useful because it means that we can restrict our search for the optimal dual solution to a bounded set. Later, we will show that Assumption 2.2(ii) follows from Assumption 2.2(i). We have the following strong duality result under Assumption 2.2(i).

Theorem 2.3. *[6, Subsection 5.3.2] Suppose Assumption 2.2(i) holds, then* $val(\mathbb{P}) = val(\mathbb{D})$.

The upcoming algorithm that we consider, which is a variant of the classical primal-dual algorithm, can be understood as techniques for solving Problems $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{D}$ simultaneously.

3 Duality and random sampling

The key idea behind both of our upcoming algorithms is to randomly sample the constraint index set $\mathcal{I}$. We hypothesize that constraint sampling distributions are intimately connected to feasible region of the dual Problem $\mathbb{D}$. In this section we explore this connection to set the stage for our random primal-dual and dual subgradient algorithms.

To motivate this discussion, consider the minimax problem

$$\mathbb{P}_m : \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} g_i(x),$$

which is convex under Assumptions **2.1**(i)(iii). Problem $\mathbb{P}_m$ can be understood as minimizing the worst-case constraint violation corresponding to Problem $\mathbb{P}$. Problem $\mathbb{P}_m$ has an immediate connection to probability distributions over the constraint index set $\mathcal{I}$. For this result, let

$$\Delta \triangleq \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|} : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i = 1 \right\}$$

be the unit simplex in $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$. Notice that Δ is equivalent to the set of all probability distributions on $\mathcal{I}$.

Theorem 3.1. *(i) The dual to Problem* $\mathbb{P}_m$ *is*

$$\mathbb{D}_m : \max_{\lambda \in \Delta} \vartheta(\lambda) \triangleq \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \langle \lambda, G(x) \rangle.$$

(ii) $val(\mathbb{P}_m) = val(\mathbb{D}_m)$.

Proof. (i) We can rewrite Problem $\mathbb{P}_m$ as the constrained optimization problem

$$\min_{(x,\, s) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}} \{ s : g_i(x) \leq s, \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \} \tag{1}$$

by introducing the auxiliary variable $s \in \mathbb{R}$. The Lagrangian for Problem (1) is

$$L(x,\, s,\, \lambda) \triangleq s + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i (g_i(x) - s) = \langle \lambda, G(x) \rangle + s \left(1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i \right),$$

and the dual problem is then

$$\max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}} \min_{(x,\, s) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}} L(x,\, s,\, \lambda).$$

Since $s \in \mathbb{R}$ is unrestricted, we see the constraint $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i = 1$ must hold in the dual and the desired result follows.

(ii) Problem $\mathbb{P}_m$ is equivalent to Problem (1), and strong duality between Problems (1) and $\mathbb{D}_m$ is automatic since the auxiliary variable $s \in \mathbb{R}$ is unrestricted. In particular, we can fix any $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ and choose $\tilde{s} > \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} g_i(\tilde{x})$. □

Note that the dual functional in Problem $\mathbb{D}_m$ is $\vartheta(\lambda)$ rather than $d(\lambda)$ since the objective function f is not included in Problem $\mathbb{P}_m$. Theorem 3.1 reveals that the dual to the minimax Problem $\mathbb{P}_m$ is an optimization problem over probability distributions. We can thus interpret Problem $\mathbb{D}_m$ as searching for "optimal" probability distributions in Δ in some sense.

For the more general constrained Problem $\mathbb{P}$, we recognize that the Lagrange multiplier $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ for the constraint $G(x) \leq 0$ can be viewed as a scaled probability distribution.

Proposition 3.2. *Choose $\lambda \geq 0$ with $\lambda \neq 0$ and define Q such that $Q_i = \lambda_i / \|\lambda\|_1$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Then*

$$\langle \lambda, G(x) \rangle = \|\lambda\|_1 \mathbb{E}_Q [g_I(x)],$$

where I is distributed on $\mathcal{I}$ according to Q.

Proof. Compute

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \lambda, G(x) \rangle &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i g_i(x) \\ &= \|\lambda\|_1 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (\lambda_i / \|\lambda\|_1) g_i(x) \\ &= \|\lambda\|_1 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} Q_i g_i(x) \\ &= \|\lambda\|_1 \mathbb{E}_Q [g_I(x)], \end{aligned}$$

where I has distribution Q in the above expectation $\mathbb{E}_Q [g_I(x)]$. □

Proposition 3.2 shows that the term $\langle \lambda, G(x) \rangle$ can be estimated with random sampling on $\mathcal{I}$ according to the probability distribution Q induced by a dual feasible λ.

4 The algorithm and main results

We propose a randomized primal-dual algorithm in this section. The innovation of this algorithm lies in using the candidate dual solution at each iteration to construct a constraint sampling distribution. To analyze the performance of this algorithm, we give bounds in probability on the optimality gap and the constraint violation.

We proceed by constructing a saddle-point problem corresponding to Problems $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{D}$. We let:

- $\theta > 0$ be a constant used later to bound the constraint violation in our randomized algorithms;
- $\Lambda \triangleq \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|} : \|\lambda\|_2 \leq \kappa_d \triangleq \kappa_q + \theta \right\}$ be a set that contains the set of dual optimal solutions Q^*.

We are then interested in the saddle-point problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} L(x, \lambda), \tag{2}$$

which is equivalent to Problem $\mathbb{P}$ under Assumption 2.2(ii).

We introduce our final set of assumptions before presenting our algorithm.

Algorithm 1 Primal-dual algorithm

Input: total iterations $T \geq 1$, iteration counter $t = 1$, step size $\eta > 0$, $x_1 = 0$, and $\lambda_1 = e$.

1. Construct sampling distribution $Q_t = \lambda_t / \|\lambda_t\|_1$.
2. Draw a random sample I_t from $\mathcal{I}$ according to Q_t.
3. Compute approximate gradients:
   (a) $s_t = \nabla_x f(x_t) + \|\lambda_t\|_1 \nabla_x g_{I_t}(x_t)$.
   (b) $\gamma_t = \begin{cases} g_i(x_t)\, e_i / Q_{t,\,i}, & i = I_t, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$
4. Update: $x_{t+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(x_t - \eta\, s_t)$ and $\lambda_{t+1} = \Pi_{\Lambda}(\lambda_t + \eta\, \gamma_t)$.
5. Increment $t \Leftarrow t + 1$ and return to Step 2.
6. Return $\hat{x}_T = \sum_{t=1}^{T} x_t / T$ and $\hat{\lambda}_T = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \lambda_t / T$.

Assumption 4.1. *(i)* $e \in \Lambda$.
(ii) There is a constant κ_g *such that* $\max\{\|\nabla_x L(x,\, \lambda)\|,\, \|\nabla_\lambda L(x,\, \lambda)\|\} \leq \kappa_g$ *for all* $(x,\, \lambda) \in \mathcal{X} \times \Lambda$.

Assumption 4.1(i) gives us a simple dual feasible solution to initialize our upcoming algorithm. Assumption 4.1(ii) bounds the gradients of the Lagrangian (in both x and λ) over the feasible region of Problem (2).

Let:

- $\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}$ be the projection operator onto $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$;
- Π_{Λ} be the projection operator onto Λ in $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$.

Next we give the details for our randomized primal-dual algorithm.

Steps 2, 3, and 4 comprise the novelty in our primal-dual algorithm. Rather than computing the exact gradients of the Lagrangian, we compute approximate gradients by first doing random sampling over the constraint index set $\mathcal{I}$. As is typical in many online stochastic optimization algorithms, our random primal-dual algorithm outputs the average primal and dual solutions $\hat{x}_T = \sum_{t=1}^{T} x_t / T$ and $\hat{\lambda}_T = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \lambda_t / T$.

Our main convergence result is next.

Theorem 4.2. *Let* $\eta = \left(\sqrt{(\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2)\,/\,(2\,T)}\right) / \kappa_g$, *then*

$$f(\hat{x}_T) - p^* \leq \frac{2\,\kappa_g \sqrt{\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\,\kappa_g\,(\kappa_r + \kappa_d)}{\sqrt{T}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}}$$

and

$$g_i(\hat{x}_T) \leq \frac{2\,\kappa_g \sqrt{\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2}}{\theta\,\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\,\kappa_g\,(\kappa_r + \kappa_d)}{\theta\,\sqrt{T}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}},\ \forall i \in \mathcal{I},$$

with probability $1 - (2\,|\mathcal{I}| + 1)\,\delta$.

Some remarks on the statement of Theorem 4.2 are in order. First, note that the size of $\mathcal{I}$ appears in $1-(2\,|\mathcal{I}|+1)\,\delta$, so we cannot completely escape the dependence on the size of $\mathcal{I}$. Also, note that the constant θ used earlier to define Λ shows up to bound the constraint violation of $\{g_i\,(\hat{x}_T)\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$.

We can restate Theorem 4.2 in the following alternative form which emphasizes the dependence on the number of constraints.

Corollary 4.3. *Choose $T \geq 1$ and let $\eta = \left(\sqrt{(\kappa_r^2+\kappa_d^2)\,/\,(2\,T)}\right)/\kappa_g$, then*

$$f\,(\hat{x}_T) - f\,(x^*) \leq \frac{2\,\kappa_g\sqrt{\kappa_r^2+\kappa_d^2}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\,\kappa_g\,(\kappa_r+\kappa_d)}{\sqrt{T}}\sqrt{\ln\left(\frac{2\,|\mathcal{I}|+1}{\sigma}\right)}$$

and

$$g_i\,(\hat{x}_T) \leq \frac{2\,\kappa_g\sqrt{\kappa_r^2+\kappa_d^2}}{\theta\,\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\,\kappa_g\,(\kappa_r+\kappa_d)}{\theta\,\sqrt{T}}\sqrt{\ln\left(\frac{2\,|\mathcal{I}|+1}{\sigma}\right)},\ \forall i\in\mathcal{I},$$

with probability $1-\sigma$.

Corollary 4.3 reveals that the optimality gap and constraint violation scale gracefully with the constraint index set for a fixed confidence $\sigma \in (0,\,1)$, i.e. on the order of $O\left(\sqrt{\ln\left(|\mathcal{I}|\right)}\right)$. This result is significant, and has implications for semi-infinite programming that we detail later in the paper.

5 Proofs of main results

We now present the proofs of our main results here in this section. The reader will see that our convergence analysis is based on the classical convex/concave analysis for saddle-point problems as well as martingale methods, which are a common tool in online stochastic optimization (see [12, 20] for example). The main difference here is that the stochasticity over the constraint index set $\mathcal{I}$ is "artificial", rather than arising from a truly random process. Additionally, the artificial stochasticity (which is drawn from the Lagrange multipliers) is changing in each iteration of our algorithm.

First we confirm that we may bound the dual feasible region as described in Assumption 2.2(ii) and the construction of Λ.

Lemma 5.1. *[22, Lemma 1] Suppose Assumption* **2.2(i)** is satisfied by $\tilde{x}\in\mathcal{X}$ and let $\gamma = \min_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\{-g_i\,(\tilde{x})\} > 0$, then $\max\{\|\lambda\|_2 :\, \lambda\in Q^*\} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}\,(f\,(\tilde{x}) - d^*)$.

Our upcoming martingale arguments depend on the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, which we review here for completeness. A discrete-time martingale is a stochastic process $\{X_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\,[|X_t|] < \infty, t \geq 0,\\ \mathbb{E}\,[X_{t+1}\,|\,X_t,\ldots,\,X_0] = X_t, t\geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

We say that a martingale $\{X_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ has bounded differences if $|X_{t+1}-X_t| < \beta_t$ almost surely for all $t\geq 1$ for finite constants $\{\beta_t\}_{t\geq 1}$.

Theorem 5.2. *(Azuma-Hoeffding Inequality) Suppose $\{X_t\}_{t\geq 1}$ is a martingale such that $X_0 = 0$ and $|X_t - X_{t-1}| \leq \beta_t$ for all $t\geq 1$ almost surely. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have*

$$Pr\{|X_T| > \varepsilon\} \leq 2\,\exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\,\sum_{t=1}^{T}\beta_t^2}\right).$$

The Azuma-Hoeffding inequality is the source of our bounds in probability in each of our main results. The following lemma develops two key inequalities that are satisfied by the iterates of our algorithm.

Lemma 5.3. *For all $t = 1, \ldots, T$.*

(i) We have

$$\langle x - x_t,\, s_t \rangle \leq \frac{\|x - x_t\| - \|x - x_{t+1}\|}{2\,\eta} + \frac{\eta}{2}\|s_t\|.$$

(ii) We have

$$\langle \lambda - \lambda_t,\, \gamma_t \rangle \leq \frac{\|\lambda - \lambda_t\| - \|\lambda - \lambda_{t+1}\|}{2\,\eta} + \frac{\eta}{2}\|\gamma_t\|.$$

Proof. (i) Let $w_{t+1} = x_t + \eta\, s_t$. Using

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x - w_{t+1}\|^2 &= \langle x - x_t + x_t - w_{t+1},\, x - x_t + x_t - w_{t+1} \rangle \\
&= \langle x - x_t,\, x - x_t \rangle + \langle x - x_t,\, z_t - w_{t+1} \rangle + \langle x_t - w_{t+1},\, x - x_t \rangle + \langle x_t - w_{t+1},\, x_t - w_{t+1} \rangle \\
&= \|x - x_t\|^2 + 2\langle x_t - w_{t+1},\, x - x_t \rangle + \|x_t - w_{t+1}\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
2\eta\langle x - x_t,\, s_t \rangle &= 2\langle x - x_t,\, w_{t+1} - x_t \rangle \\
&= \langle x - x_t,\, x - x_t \rangle + \langle x_t - w_{t+1},\, x_t - w_{t+1} \rangle - \langle x - w_{t+1},\, x - w_{t+1} \rangle \\
&= \|x - x_t\|^2 + \|x_t - w_{t+1}\|^2 - \|x - w_{t+1}\|^2 \\
&\leq \|x - x_t\|^2 + \|x_t - w_{t+1}\|^2 - \|x - x_{t+1}\|^2 \\
&= \|x - x_t\|^2 + \eta^2\|s_t\|^2 - \|x - x_{t+1}\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

(ii) Now let $y_{t+1} = \lambda_t - \eta\,\gamma_t$. Using the same reasoning,

$$\begin{aligned}
2\eta\langle \lambda - \lambda_t,\, \gamma_t \rangle &= 2\langle \lambda - \lambda_t,\, y_{t+1} - \lambda_t \rangle \\
&= \langle \lambda - \lambda_t,\, \lambda - \lambda_t \rangle + \langle \lambda_t - y_{t+1},\, \lambda_t - y_{t+1} \rangle - \langle \lambda - y_{t+1},\, \lambda - y_{t+1} \rangle \\
&= \|\lambda - \lambda_t\|^2 + \|\lambda_t - y_{t+1}\|^2 - \|\lambda - y_{t+1}\|^2 \\
&\leq \|\lambda - \lambda_t\|^2 + \|\lambda_t - y_{t+1}\|^2 - \|\lambda - \lambda_{t+1}\|^2 \\
&= \|\lambda - \lambda_t\|^2 + \eta^2\|\gamma_t\|^2 - \|\lambda - \lambda_{t+1}\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We next prove that a certain stochastic process induced by our primal-dual algorithm is a martingale. Let $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 1}$ be a filtration that reflects the evolution of information in this algorithm.

Lemma 5.4. *For any $(x,\, \lambda) \in \mathcal{X} \times \Lambda$,*

$$\{\langle x_t - x,\, \nabla_x L\,(x_t,\, \lambda_t) - s_t \rangle - \langle \lambda_t - \lambda,\, \nabla_\lambda L\,(x_t,\, \lambda_t) - \gamma_t \rangle\}_{t\geq 1}$$

is a martingale difference sequence.

Proof. First we check

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\,[s_t \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{E}\,[\nabla_x f\,(x_t) + \nabla_x g_{I_t}\,(x_t) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\
&= \nabla_x f\,(x_t) + \|\lambda_t\|_1 \mathbb{E}_{Q_t}\,[\nabla_x g_I\,(x_t)] \\
&= \nabla_x f\,(x_t) + \|\lambda_t\|_1 \sum_{i\in I} Q_{t,\,i} \nabla_x g_i\,(x_t) \\
&= \nabla_x L\,(x_t,\, \lambda_t)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\gamma_t \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(g_i\left(x_t\right) e_i / Q_{t,\,i}\right)_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \\ &= \left(\mathbb{E}_{Q_t}\left[g_i\left(x_t\right)/Q_{t,\,i}\right]\right)_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \\ &= \left(g_i\left(x_t\right)\right)_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \\ &= \nabla_\lambda L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right),\end{aligned}$$

to confirm that we have a martingale difference sequence.

To conclude, we have

$$\left|\langle x_t - x,\, \nabla_x L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - s_t\rangle\right| \leq \|x_t - x\|_2 \|\nabla_x L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - s_t\|_2 \leq 2\,\kappa_r\kappa_g$$

by Assumptions 2.1(iii) and 4.1(ii), and we have

$$\left|\langle \lambda_t - \lambda,\, \nabla_\lambda L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - \gamma_t\rangle\right| \leq 2\,\|\lambda_t - \lambda\|_2 \|\nabla_\lambda L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - \gamma_t\|_2 \leq 2\,\kappa_d\kappa_g$$

by Assumptions 2.2(ii) and 4.1(ii). It then follows that

$$\left|\langle x_t - x,\, \nabla_x L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - s_t\rangle - \langle \lambda_t - \lambda,\, \nabla_\lambda L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - \gamma_t\rangle\right| \leq 2\,\kappa_g\left(\kappa_r + \kappa_d\right),$$

for all $t \geq 1$. □

The following lemma uses the standard convex-concave analysis for primal-dual algorithms to develop a key inequality that appears in our analysis. The Azuma-Hoeffding inequality is used to obtain this bound in probability.

Lemma 5.5. *Let* $\eta = \left(\sqrt{\left(\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2\right)/\left(2\,T\right)}\right)/\kappa_g$, *then for any* $(x,\,\lambda) \in \mathcal{X}\times\Lambda$,

$$L\left(\hat{x}_T,\,\lambda\right) - L\left(x,\,\hat{\lambda}_T\right) \leq 2\,\kappa_g\sqrt{\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2}/\sqrt{T} + 2\,\kappa_g\left(\kappa_r + \kappa_d\right)\sqrt{\frac{2}{T}\ln\frac{1}{\delta}}, \tag{3}$$

with probability $1-\delta$.

Proof. The Lagrangian $L\left(x,\,\lambda\right)$ is convex in x, and is automatically concave (linear) in λ. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$ we then have

$$\begin{aligned}L\left(x_t,\,\lambda\right) - L\left(x,\,\lambda_t\right) &= L\left(x_t,\,\lambda\right) - L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) + L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - L\left(x,\,\lambda_t\right) \\ &\leq \langle x_t - x,\, \nabla_x L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right)\rangle - \langle \lambda_t - \lambda,\, \nabla_\lambda L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right)\rangle \\ &= \langle x_t - x,\, s_t\rangle - \langle \lambda_t - \lambda,\, \gamma_t\rangle \\ &\quad + \langle x_t - x,\, \nabla_x L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - s_t\rangle - \langle \lambda_t - \lambda,\, \nabla_\lambda L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - \gamma_t\rangle \\ &\leq \frac{\|x - x_t\|^2 - \|x - x_{t+1}\|^2}{2\,\eta} + \frac{\|\lambda - \lambda_t\|^2 - \|\lambda - \lambda_{t+1}\|^2}{2\,\eta} + \frac{\eta}{2}\left(\|s_t\|^2 + \|\gamma_t\|^2\right) \\ &\quad + \langle x_t - x,\, \nabla_x L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - s_t\rangle - \langle \lambda_t - \lambda,\, \nabla_\lambda L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - \gamma_t\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Add these inequalities over all $t = 1, \ldots, T$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left[L\left(x_t,\,\lambda\right) - L\left(x,\,\lambda_t\right)\right] \leq \frac{\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2}{2\,\eta} + \frac{\eta}{2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left[\|s_t\|^2 + \|\gamma_t\|^2\right] \\ + \sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\langle x_t - x,\, \nabla_x L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - s_t\rangle - \langle \lambda_t - \lambda,\, \nabla_\lambda L\left(x_t,\,\lambda_t\right) - \gamma_t\rangle\right).\end{aligned}$$

We use Lemma 5.4 and the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality to bound the stochastic term above, and we get

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \left[L\left(x_t,\, \lambda\right) - L\left(x,\, \lambda_t\right) \right] \leq \frac{\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2}{2\,\eta} + \eta\,\kappa_g^2 T + 2\,\kappa_g\left(\kappa_r + \kappa_d\right)\sqrt{2\,T\,\ln\frac{1}{\delta}}$$

with probability $1-\delta$. Now substitute the stated value of η and use Jensen's inequality to obtain the desired result. □

We conclude this subsection with the proof of our main result Theorem 4.2.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. (i) Take $x = x^*$ and $\lambda = 0$ in inequality (3) to obtain

$$L\left(\hat{x}_T,\, 0\right) - L\left(x^*,\, \hat{\lambda}_T\right) \leq 2\,\kappa_g\sqrt{\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2}/\sqrt{T} + 2\,\kappa_g\left(\kappa_r + \kappa_d\right)\sqrt{\frac{2}{T}\ln\frac{1}{\delta}},$$

which gives

$$f\left(\hat{x}_T\right) - f\left(x^*\right) \leq f\left(\hat{x}_T\right) - f\left(x^*\right) - \langle \hat{\lambda}_T,\, G\left(x^*\right)\rangle \leq 2\,\kappa_g\sqrt{\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2}/\sqrt{T} + 2\,\kappa_g\left(\kappa_r + \kappa_d\right)\sqrt{\frac{2}{T}\ln\frac{1}{\delta}},$$

using the fact that $\langle \hat{\lambda}_T,\, G\left(x^*\right)\rangle \leq 0$ by feasibility of x^*.

(ii) Next we check satisfaction of the constraints. Choose $i \in I$, set $\lambda_i = \lambda_i^* + \theta$ and $\lambda_j = \lambda_j^*$ for all $j \neq i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& f\left(\hat{x}_T\right) + \left(\lambda_i^* + \theta\right) g_i\left(\hat{x}_T\right) + \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_j^* g_j\left(\hat{x}_T\right) - L\left(x^*,\, \hat{\lambda}_T\right) \\
\geq\; & f\left(\hat{x}_T\right) + \left(\lambda_i^* + \theta\right) g_i\left(\hat{x}_T\right) + \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_j^* g_j\left(\hat{x}_T\right) - L\left(x^*,\, \lambda^*\right) \\
\geq\; & \theta\, g_i\left(\hat{x}_T\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses $L\left(x^*,\, \hat{\lambda}_T\right) \leq L\left(x^*,\, \lambda^*\right)$ and the second inequality uses $L\left(\hat{x}_T,\, \lambda^*\right) \geq L\left(x^*,\, \lambda^*\right)$. Inequality (3) and the union bound then give the desired result. □

6 Variations and extensions

In this section we discuss variations and extensions of our main development. First, we explain how our development applies to constrained *stochastic* optimization problems. Second, we comment on how our method extends to semi-infinite programming (SIP), that is, optimization problems with finitely many decision variables and infinitely many constraints.

6.1 Stochastic programming

Much of the literature on online algorithms is concerned with stochastic optimization problems. In particular, [20] develops a primal-dual algorithm for constrained stochastic optimization. In this subsection we show that the approach in [20] can be combined with our present development with only minor modification.

We now extend the setting for Problem $\mathbb{P}$ to the stochastic case. Let:

- $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a (measurable) support for random noise;

- $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})$ be the Borel $\sigma-$algebra on $\mathcal{Z}$;
- P be a probability distribution on $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}))$;
- Z be a random variable on $\mathcal{Z}$ with distribution P;
- $F : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$ be an objective function that depends on both decisions x and random noise Z, and define $\bar{f}(x) = \mathbb{E}_{Z\sim P}[F(x, Z)]$;
- $G_i : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a constraint function that depends on both decisions x and random noise Z, and define $\bar{g}_i(x) = \mathbb{E}_{Z\sim P}[G_i(x, Z)]$, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$;
- $G(x, Z) = (G_i(x, Z))_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be the vector of constraint functions.

We then have the constrained stochastic optimization problem:

$$\mathbb{P}_s : \min_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \left\{ \bar{f}(x) : \bar{g}_i(x) \leq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \right\},$$

which emphasizes that the objective and constraint functions are expectations. For Lagrange multipliers $\lambda \geq 0$, we then let

$$\bar{L}(x, \lambda) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{Z\sim P}[F(x, Z) + \langle \lambda, G(x, Z)\rangle]$$

be the Lagrangian for Problem $\mathbb{P}_s$. The Lagrangian dual problem is then

$$\mathbb{D}_s : \max_{\lambda\geq 0} \bar{d}(\lambda) \triangleq \min_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \bar{L}(x, \lambda).$$

We define:

- $Q_s^* \triangleq \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|} : \bar{d}(\lambda) \geq d_s^* \right\}$ to be the set of optimal solutions to Problem $\mathbb{D}_s$.

We introduce the following necessary assumptions for Problems $\mathbb{P}_s$ and $\mathbb{D}_s$.

Assumption 6.1. *(i) $x \to F(x, z)$ is convex for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$.*
(ii) $x \to F(x, z)$ is continuously differentiable for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$.
(iii) $x \to G_i(x, z)$ is convex for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$.
(iv) $x \to G_i(x, z)$ is continuously differentiable for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$.
(v) There exists $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\gamma = \max_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\{-\bar{g}_i(\tilde{x})\} > 0$.
(vi) There is a constant κ_q such that $\|\lambda\| \leq \kappa_q$ for all $\lambda \in Q_s^*$.

Problem $\mathbb{P}_s$ is a convex optimization problem under Assumptions 2.1(i) and 6.1(i)(iii). Strong duality holds between Problems $\mathbb{P}_s$ and $\mathbb{D}_s$ under Assumption 6.1(v).

We then consider the saddle-point problem

$$\min_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \max_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \bar{L}(x, \lambda), \tag{4}$$

where Λ is as defined earlier for Algorithm 1. Next we give the details for our stochastic primal-dual algorithm for solving Problem (4).

Algorithm 2 is similar to Algorithm 1 in most major respects. The main differences come in Step 3, where a new random sample of Z is taken in each iteration, and in Step 4, where the estimates of the Lagrangian now depend on the sample of Z.

Our convergence results for Algorithm 2 parallel those of Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 2 Stochastic primal-dual algorithm

Input: total iterations $T \geq 1$, iteration counter $t = 1$, step size $\eta > 0$, $x_1 = 0$, and $\lambda_1 = e$.

1. Construct sampling distribution $Q_t = \lambda_t / \|\lambda_t\|_1$.
2. Draw a random sample I_t from $\mathcal{I}$ according to Q_t.
3. Draw a random sample Z_t from $\mathcal{Z}$ according to P.
4. Compute approximate gradients:
   (a) $s_t = \nabla_x F(x_t, Z_t) + \|\lambda_t\|_1 \nabla_x G_{I_t}(x_t, Z_t)$.
   (b) $\gamma_t = \begin{cases} G_i(x_t, Z_t)\, e_i / Q_{t,i}, & i = I_t, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$
5. Update: $x_{t+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(x_t - \eta\, s_t)$ and $\lambda_{t+1} = \Pi_{\Lambda}(\lambda_t + \eta\, \gamma_t)$.
6. Increment $t \Leftarrow t + 1$ and return to Step 2.
7. Return $\hat{x}_T = \sum_{t=1}^{T} x_t / T$ and $\hat{\lambda}_T = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \lambda_t / T$.

Theorem 6.2. *Let* $\eta = \left(\sqrt{(\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2) / (2T)} \right) / \kappa_g$, *then*

$$\bar{f}(\hat{x}_T) - p_s^* \leq \frac{2\,\kappa_g \sqrt{\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\,\kappa_g\,(\kappa_r + \kappa_d)}{\sqrt{T}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}}$$

and

$$\bar{g}_i(\hat{x}_T) \leq \frac{2\,\kappa_g \sqrt{\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2}}{\theta\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\,\kappa_g\,(\kappa_r + \kappa_d)}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}},\ \forall i \in \mathcal{I},$$

with probability $1 - (2|\mathcal{I}| + 1)\,\delta$.

Proof. The proof here is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.2. We need to confirm that Algorithm 2 produces a martingale difference sequence. Using the law of total expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[s_t \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{E}_{Q_t}[\mathbb{E}_{Z\sim P}[s_t]] \\ &= \nabla_x \bar{f}(x_t) + \|\lambda_t\|_1 \mathbb{E}_{Q_t}[\nabla_x \bar{g}_I(x_t)] \\ &= \nabla_x \bar{f}(x_t) + \|\lambda_t\|_1 \sum_{i \in I} Q_{t,i} \nabla_x \bar{g}_i(x_t) \\ &= \nabla_x \bar{L}(x_t, \lambda_t), \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\mathbb{E}_{Z\sim P}[s_t] = \nabla_x \bar{f}(x_t) + \|\lambda_t\|_1 \nabla_x \bar{g}_{I_t}(x_t)$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\gamma_t \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{E}_{Q_t}[\mathbb{E}_{Z\sim P}[\gamma_t]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\bar{g}_{I_t}(x_t)\, e_{I_t} / Q_{t,I_t} \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= (\mathbb{E}_{Q_t}[\bar{g}_i(x_t)/Q_{t,i}])_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \\ &= (\bar{g}_i(x_t))_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \\ &= \nabla_\lambda \bar{L}(x_t, \lambda_t), \end{aligned}$$

using $\mathbb{E}_{Z\sim P}[\gamma_t] = \bar{g}_i(x_t)\, e_i / Q_{t,i}$. ∎

We can restate Theorem 6.2 in exactly the same form as Corollary 4.3 to emphasize the dependence on the number of constraints.

6.2 Semi-infinite programming

There are many numerical algorithms for SIP such as discretization ([14]), cutting plane ([19, 21]), and dual parametrization ([15]). In this section, we show that our randomized primal-dual algorithm also applies to this problem class.

We introduce the following new ingredients:

- a constraint index set $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}^n$;
- a constraint mapping $g : \mathcal{X} \times \Xi \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\xi \to g(x, \xi)$ is continuous for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

The standard SIP is then

$$\mathbb{P}_{sip} : \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{f(x) : g(x, \xi) \leq 0, \forall \xi \in \Xi\}.$$

A feasible solution to Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}$ must satisfy both the implicit constraints $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and the continuum of explicit constraints $g(x, \xi) \leq 0$ for all $\xi \in \Xi$. Assumptions 2.1(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(v) continue to hold for Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}$, and we make the following additional assumptions for Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}$.

Assumption 6.3. *(i) Ξ is compact with $\|\xi\|_2 \leq \kappa_x$ for all $\xi \in \Xi$.*
(ii) $x \to g(x, \xi)$ is convex for all $\xi \in \Xi$.
(iii) $x \to g(x, \xi)$ is continuously differentiable for all $\xi \in \Xi$.
(iv) $\xi \to g(x, \xi)$ is Lipschitz continuous with constant κ_c for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Assumption 6.3(i) is common in the SIP literature (see [4, Section 5.4] for example) and leads to a well developed duality theory for Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}$. Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}$ is a convex optimization problem under Assumptions **2.1**(i)(iv) and **6.3**(ii). Assumption **6.3**(iii) requires the constraint function to be continuously differentiable for every constraint index $\xi \in \Xi$. Assumption 6.3(iv) states that the constraint function is Lipschitz continuous in the constraint index for all fixed $x \in \mathcal{X}$ (and that the Lipschitz constant is the same for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$). Assumption 6.3(iv) plays a key role in approximating Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}$ with a finite nonlinear programming problem.

Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}$ is intimately connected to its finite nonlinear relaxations. We let:

- $\mathcal{B}(\Xi)$ be the Borel $\sigma-$algebra on Ξ;
- $\mathbb{D}(B) \triangleq \sup_{\xi, \xi' \in \Xi} \|\xi - \xi'\|_2$ be the diameter of a set $B \in \mathcal{B}(\Xi)$;
- $\Theta \subset \Xi$ be a finite subset of constraint indices.

Given a finite subset $\Theta \subset \Xi$, we define the discretization

$$\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta) : \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{f(x) : g(x, \xi_i) \leq 0, \forall \xi \in \Theta\}$$

of Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}$. In general, we want Θ to be large enough so that Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)$ is a good approximation of Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}$ but we also want Θ to be small enough so that Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)$ is tractable.

The following properties of Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)$ are immediate.

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose Assumptions **2.1**(i)(iv) and **6.3**(i) hold.*
(i) For any $\Theta \subset \Xi$, Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)$ is a convex optimization problem.
(ii) For any $\Theta \subset \Xi$, $val(\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)) \leq val(\mathbb{P}_{sip})$.
(iii) Choose $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\{B_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \subset \mathcal{B}(\Xi)$ be a cover of Ξ with $\mathbb{D}(B_j) < \varepsilon$ for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$, let $\xi_j \in B_j$ for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$, and let $\Theta = \{\xi_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$. Suppose x is feasible for Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)$, then $g(x, \xi) \leq \kappa_c \varepsilon$ for all $\xi \in \Xi$.

Proof. (i) All of the constraints of Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)$ are convex under Assumption **6.3**(i).

(ii) Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)$ is automatically a relaxation of Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}$ for any $\Theta \subset \Xi$.

(iii) Choose any $\xi \in \Xi$. We have $\xi \in B_{j^*}$ for some $j^* \in \mathcal{J}$ since $\{B_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}}$ covers Ξ, and thus $\|\xi - \xi_{j^*}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$. Finally,

$$g(x,\,\xi) \leq g(x,\,\xi_{j^*}) + |g(x,\,\xi) - g(x,\,\xi_{j^*})| \leq \kappa_c \varepsilon,$$

since $g(x,\,\xi_{j^*}) \leq 0$ since x is feasible for Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)$ and $|g(x,\,\xi) - g(x,\,\xi_{j^*})| \leq \kappa_c \|\xi - \xi_{j^*}\|_2$ by Lipschitz continuity of $\xi \to g(x,\,\xi)$. □

Lemma 6.4(iii) reveals the connection between the granularity of Θ and the fidelity of Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)$. As we choose a finer cover $\{B_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}}$ of Ξ, the resulting construction of Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)$ becomes a more accurate approximation of Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}$.

In general, the computational effort required to solve Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)$ increases quickly with $|\Theta|$. However, our earlier result Corollary 4.3 shows that the complexity of Algorithm 1 increases as $O\left(\sqrt{\ln(|\Theta|)}\right)$. We explore this issue in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.5. *Choose $\varepsilon > 0$, $T \geq 1$, and let $\eta = \left(\sqrt{(\kappa_r^2 + \kappa_d^2)/(2T)}\right)/\kappa_g$, then*

$$f(\hat{x}_T) - val\mathbb{P}_{sip} \leq \frac{2\,\kappa_g\sqrt{\kappa_r^2+\kappa_d^2}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\,\kappa_g\,(\kappa_r+\kappa_d)}{\sqrt{T}}\sqrt{\ln\left(\frac{2\,\kappa_x^n\,(1+2/\varepsilon)^n+1}{\sigma}\right)}$$

and

$$g(\hat{x}_T,\,\xi) \leq \frac{2\,\kappa_g\sqrt{\kappa_r^2+\kappa_d^2}}{\theta\sqrt{T}} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\,\kappa_g\,(\kappa_r+\kappa_d)}{\theta\sqrt{T}}\sqrt{\ln\left(\frac{2\,\kappa_x^n\,(1+2/\varepsilon)^n+1}{\sigma}\right)} + \kappa_c\varepsilon,\ \forall \xi \in \Xi,$$

with probability $1-\sigma$.

Proof. By Assumption 6.3(i), Ξ is contained in a ball $B = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\xi\|_2 \leq \kappa_x\}$ of radius κ_x. We want to construct an $\varepsilon-$net for B, the size of this $\varepsilon-$net is bounded above by $\kappa_x^n\,(1+2/\varepsilon)^n$. We then choose Θ to be this $\varepsilon-$net, and so $|\Theta| \leq \kappa_x^n\,(1+2/\varepsilon)^n$. The desired result then follows from Corollary 4.3 applied to Problem $\mathbb{P}_{sip}(\Theta)$ and Lemma 6.4(iii). □

Theorem 6.5 reveals the graceful dependence on the granularity ε through the term $\sqrt{\ln\left(\left(2\,\kappa_x^n\,(1+2/\varepsilon)^n+1\right)/\sigma\right)}$. We do mention however that the approach in this subsection does require the explicit construction of an $\varepsilon-$net of Ξ, which does add to the overall computational demand.

7 Numerical experiments

We report numerical experiments for our methods in this section.

8 Conclusion

This paper offers a new perspective on random constraint sampling for constrained convex optimization. Earlier work on random constraint sampling such as [7] assumes that an idealized constraint sampling distribution is already available. In contrast, our algorithms dynamically updates the sampling distribution via the dual problem. We have two directions for future research. First, we would like to develop further online algorithms for constrained convex optimization that surpass that $O\left(1/\sqrt{T}\right)$ convergence rate given in this paper. Second, we would like to develop an online algorithm for SIP that does not require any discretization.

References

[1] Dimitri P Bertsekas and John N Tsitsiklis. Gradient convergence in gradient methods with errors. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 10(3):627–642, 2000.

[2] Dimitris Bertsimas and Santosh Vempala. Solving convex programs by random walks. *J. ACM*, 51(4):540–556, July 2004.

[3] Nikhil Bhat, Vivek Farias, and Ciamac C Moallemi. Non-parametric approximate dynamic programming via the kernel method. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 386–394, 2012.

[4] J. Frederic Bonnans and Alexander Shapiro. *Perturbation Analysis of Optimization Problems*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., 2000.

[5] Antoine Bordes, Léon Bottou, and Patrick Gallinari. Sgd-qn: Careful quasi-newton stochastic gradient descent. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10:1737–1754, 2009.

[6] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[7] Giuseppe Calafiore and M.C. Campi. Uncertain convex programs: randomized solutions and confidence levels. *Mathematical Programming Series A*, 102:25–46, 2005.

[8] Caihua Chen, Bingsheng He, Yinyu Ye, and Xiaoming Yuan. The direct extension of admm for multi-block convex minimization problems is not necessarily convergent. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–23, 2014.

[9] F. Dabbene. A randomized cutting plane scheme for convex optimization. In *Computer-Aided Control Systems, 2008. CACSD 2008. IEEE International Conference on*, pages 120 –125, sept. 2008.

[10] F. Dabbene, P. Shcherbakov, and B.T. Polyak. A randomized cutting plane scheme with geometric convergence: Probabilistic analysis and sdp applications. In *Decision and Control, 2008. CDC 2008. 47th IEEE Conference on*, pages 3044 –3049, dec. 2008.

[11] F. Dabbene, P. S. Shcherbakov, and B. T. Polyak. A randomized cutting plane method with probabilistic geometric convergence. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(6):3185–3207, 2010.

[12] John C Duchi, Shai Shalev-Shwartz, Yoram Singer, and Ambuj Tewari. Composite objective mirror descent. In *COLT*, pages 14–26. Citeseer, 2010.

[13] Daniela Pucci de Farias and Benjamin Van Roy. On constraint sampling in the linear programming approach to approximate dynamic programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 29(3):462–478, 08 2004.

[14] R. Hettich and K. O. Kortanek. Semi-infinite programming: Theory, methods, and applications. *Society of Industrial and Applied Mathematics Review*, 35(3):380–429, 1993.

[15] S. Ito, Y. Liu, and K. L. Teo. A dual parametrization method for convex semi-infinite programming. *Annals of Operations Research*, 98:189–213, 2000.

[16] Rie Johnson and Tong Zhang. Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 315–323, 2013.

[17] Adam Tauman Kalai and Santosh Vempala. Simulated annealing for convex optimization. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 31(2):253–266, 05 2006.

[18] Ravindran Kannan and Hariharan Narayanan. Random walks on polytopes and an affine interior point method for linear programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 37(1):1–20, February 2012.

[19] KO Kortanek and Hoon No. A central cutting plane algorithm for convex semi-infinite programming problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 3(4):901–918, 1993.

[20] Mehrdad Mahdavi, Tianbao Yang, and Rong Jin. Online stochastic optimization with multiple objectives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.6013*, 2012.

[21] Sanjay Mehrotra and Dávid Papp. A cutting surface algorithm for semi-infinite convex programming with an application to moment robust optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(4):1670–1697, 2014.

[22] Angelia Nedic and Asuman Ozdaglar. Approximate primal solutions and rate analysis for dual subgradient methods. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19(4):1757–1780, 2009.

[23] B.T. Polyak and E.N. Gryazina. Markov chain monte carlo method exploiting barrier functions with applications to control and optimization. In *Computer-Aided Control System Design (CACSD), 2010 IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 1553 –1557, sept. 2010.

[24] S Sundhar Ram, Angelia Nedic, and Venugopal V Veeravalli. Incremental stochastic subgradient algorithms for convex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(2):691–717, 2009.

[25] H. Robbins and S. Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 400–407, 1951.

[26] Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Tong Zhang. Proximal stochastic dual coordinate ascent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.2717*, 2012.

[27] Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Tong Zhang. Accelerated proximal stochastic dual coordinate ascent for regularized loss minimization. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–41, 2013.

[28] Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Tong Zhang. Stochastic dual coordinate ascent methods for regularized loss. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(1):567–599, 2013.

[29] A Shapiro and Y Wardi. Convergence analysis of gradient descent stochastic algorithms. *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, 91(2):439–454, 1996.

[30] Ruoyu Sun, Zhi-Quan Luo, and Yinyu Ye. On the expected convergence of randomly permuted admm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.06387*, 2015.

[31] Taiji Suzuki. Stochastic dual coordinate ascent with alternating direction method of multipliers. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-14)*, pages 736–744, 2014.

[32] Lin Xiao and Tong Zhang. A proximal stochastic gradient method with progressive variance reduction. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(4):2057–2075, 2014.

[33] Leon Wenliang Zhong and James T Kwok. Fast stochastic alternating direction method of multipliers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1308.3558*, 2013.