

Prox-DBRO-VR: A Unified Analysis on Decentralized Byzantine-Resilient Composite Stochastic Optimization with Variance Reduction and Non-Asymptotic Convergence Rates

Jinhui Hu, Guo Chen, Huaqing Li

Abstract— Decentralized Byzantine-resilient stochastic gradient algorithms resolve efficiently large-scale optimization problems in adverse conditions, such as malfunctioning agents, software bugs and cyber attacks. This paper investigates a class of generic composite optimization problems over multi-agent cyberphysical systems (CPSs), with the existence of an unknown number of Byzantine agents. Based on the proximal mapping method, two variance-reduced (VR) techniques and a norm-penalized approximation strategy, we propose a decentralized Byzantine-resilient proximal-gradient algorithmic framework, dubbed *Prox-DBRO-VR*, which achieves an optimization and control goal using only local computation and communication. To reduce asymptotically the variance generated by evaluating the noisy stochastic gradients, we incorporate two localized variance-reduced techniques (*SAGA* and *LSVRG*) into *Prox-DBRO-VR*, to design *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*. Via analyzing the contraction relationships among the gradient-learning error, robust consensus condition and optimal gap, the theoretical result demonstrates that both *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*, with a well-designed constant (resp., decaying) step-size, converge linearly (resp., sub-linearly) inside an error ball around the optimal solution to the optimization problem under standard assumptions. The trade-offs between the convergence accuracy and the number of Byzantine agents in both linear and sub-linear cases are characterized. In simulation, we show the effectiveness and practicability of the proposed algorithms via handling decentralized learning problems based on logistic regression and neural networks, respectively.

Index Terms—Decentralized optimization and learning, Byzantine-resilient algorithms, CPSs security, variance reduction, stochastic gradients, proximal gradient methods

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Literature Review

Recent years witness intensive research and significant advancement on decentralized optimization in the field of machine learning [1]–[3], smart grid [4], cooperative control [5] and uncooperative game [6]. Decentralized optimization

This work is supported in part by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities of Central South University, in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62073344. (Corresponding author: Guo Chen.)

J. Hu and G. Chen are with the Department of Automation, Central South University, Changsha 410083, P.R. China. E-mail: jinhuihu@csu.edu.cn; guochen@ieee.org

H. Li is with Chongqing Key Laboratory of Nonlinear Circuits and Intelligent Information Processing, College of Electronic and Information Engineering, Southwest University, Chongqing 400715, P. R. China. E-mail: huaqingli@swu.edu.cn.

algorithms have the advantages of high-efficiency for massive-scale optimization problems, good scalability over large-scale intelligent systems, and a lower cost in local computation and short-distance communication.

With the rapid expansion of multi-agent systems (MASs) and cyberphysical systems (CPSs), there are unavoidable security issues in the process of optimization and control, such as poisoning data, software bugs, malfunctioning devices and cyber attacks [7], [8]. All these issues in the course of multi-agent optimization and control are generalized as a node-level problem model, namely Byzantine problems [9], while the malfunctioning or compromised agents are called Byzantine agents. Byzantine agents are able to deviate the decision variable of decentralized optimization algorithms [1], [1], [2], [4]–[6], [10]–[16] away from the optimal solution to the optimization problem [17], or even cause disagreement and divergence [18]. For example, if an honest agent is attacked and controlled by adversaries, the attacker can manipulate the agent to send various misleadingly falsified information to its different reliable neighboring agents constantly. This can easily deter the reliable agents from achieving consensus, and even the decision variable will be infinite if the received malicious information contains extremely large elements. Therefore, researchers have been concentrating on designing decentralized resilient algorithms [19]–[27] to alleviate or counteract the negative impact caused by Byzantine agents. In fact, there are various approaches to guarantee decentralized Byzantine resilience. One popular line is to combine various screening or filtration techniques with decentralized algorithms. To name a few, *ByRDiE* [28] requires that every agent at each iteration discards a subset of the largest and smallest messages in the received information, which follows by a coordinate gradient descent step. One imperfection of *ByRDiE* is its higher computational cost and low efficiency in dealing with large-scale optimization problems, due to the implementation of one-coordinate-at-one-iteration update. Therefore, *BRIDGE* [22] combines respectively four screening techniques including coordinate-wise trimmed-mean, coordinate-wise median, Krum function and a combination of Krum and coordinate-wise trimmed mean, with decentralized gradient descent (*DGD*) [29] to devise a Byzantine-resilient algorithmic framework. The analysis on *BRIDGE* [22] covers both convex and non-convex objective functions under typical assumptions. The follow-up literature

[30] incorporates a self-centered clipping technique (adapted from the centered clipping [31]) into *DGD* to not only realize Byzantine resilience, but resolve a category of generic non-convex objective functions. However, the decentralized algorithm proposed in [30] assumes that each agent has the prior knowledge of global parameters, for instance, the subset of Byzantine agents. This may be impractical in real large-scale CPSs, since the information exchange is only available in a decentralized manner. Another literature [17] designs a two-stage technique to filter out the Byzantine attacks, which can work in a network with an arbitrary quantity of Byzantine agents without any clairvoyant knowledge of the identities of Byzantine agents. Recent work [25] systematically analyzes the effects from two critical points, i.e., doubly stochastic weight matrix and consensus, in developing decentralized Byzantine-resilient methods. A screening-based robust aggregation rule, dubbed iterative outlier scissor (*IOS*), is designed in [25], which achieves Byzantine resilience and a controllable convergence error relied on the assumptions of bounded inner (node-level noisy stochastic gradients) and outer (network-level aggregated gradients) variations.

All of the above mentioned decentralized Byzantine algorithms [17], [22], [25], [28], [30] achieve Byzantine resilience via adopting various screening or filtering techniques. Nevertheless, the screening or filtration-based methods may not only impose restrictions on the minimum number of neighboring agents, but incur at least an additional computational cost of $\mathcal{O}(n|\mathcal{N}_i|)$ (n and \mathcal{N}_i denote the dimension of single data sample and the number of neighboring agents of the reliable agent i , respectively) to each reliable agent i at each iteration (see [22, TABLE II]). This could be prohibitively expensive for large-scale multi-agent CPSs or high-dimensional training tasks. One possible solution to avoid introducing extra computational costs for decentralized Byzantine-resilient optimization is developed by *RSA* [27], which combines an a -norm-penalized ($a \geq 1$) approximation method with the stochastic sub-gradient descent method to realize robust aggregation in a distributed fashion. [26] is a decentralized extension of *RSA* [27], which concentrates on the 1-norm approximation penalty. Via integrating with a noise-shuffle strategy, [32] extends [27] to distributed federated learning with a concern of users' differential privacy. However, both *RSA* [27] and the literature [26], [32] establish only sub-linear convergence rates of the proposed algorithms, which are rather slow and have huge potential to be accelerated. A recent decentralized Byzantine-resilient algorithm *DECEMBER* [33] accelerates the convergence rate via incorporating two variance-reduced techniques. Although *DECEMBER* realizes simultaneously Byzantine resilience and linear convergence, it is still confined to resolving optimization problems with only a single smooth objective function.

B. Motivations

All aforementioned decentralized Byzantine-resilient methods [17], [22], [25]–[28], [30], [32], [33] are not available to handling optimization problems with the existence of any non-smooth objective, which is indispensable in many practical

applications, such as sparse machine learning [34], [35], model predictive control [5], and energy resource coordination [12]. On the other hand, despite that there are various decentralized algorithms [3], [12], [34]–[36] providing different insights and tactics to resolve the composite optimization problem, they all fail to consider any possible security issues over MASs or CPSs, which renders the reliable agents under the algorithmic framework of [12], [34]–[36] easily misled by Byzantine failures and vulnerable to Byzantine attacks. Therefore, to close this gap, this paper focuses on studying a category of composite optimization problems in the presence of Byzantine agents, where the local objective function associated with each agent consists of both smooth and non-smooth parts. In a nutshell, the study on decentralized Byzantine-resilient composite stochastic optimization is non-trivial, which features the main motivation of this paper.

C. Contributions

- 1) This paper first designs a decentralized Byzantine-resilient and proximal gradient algorithmic framework, dubbed *Prox-DBRO-VR*, to resolve a class of composite (smooth + non-smooth) optimization problems over multi-agent CPSs under the worst case of Byzantine attacks. The worst case indicates that the number of Byzantine agents is unlimited and any information relevant to their identities is not necessary known by reliable agents. To achieve a lower the per-iteration computational cost than decentralized Byzantine-resilient batch-gradient methods [19], [22], [28], [37], [38], we propose two decentralized stochastic gradient algorithms *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*, via incorporating the localized versions of two variance-reduced techniques *SAGA* [39] and *LSVRG* [40], into *Prox-DBRO-VR*. Owing to the employment of the variance-reduced techniques, *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG* reduce asymptotically the variance incurred by the local stochastic gradients, which also eliminates the bounded-variance assumption required by [14], [25]–[27], [41].
- 2) In contrast to recent works [19], [22]–[25], [33], [37], [38], this paper considers a more general composite optimization problem model with local non-smooth objective functions. This superiority also brings challenges in theoretical analysis, which have been addressed by exploring the contraction properties of proximal operators over decentralized Byzantine-resilient optimization. Different with [26], [27], [32], [33], a unified convergence analysis is conducted in this paper to obtain more intuitive and complete theoretical results, including both a sub-linear convergence rate (with a smaller convergence error) and a linear convergence rate (with a larger convergence error), which provides in-depth knowledge of the trade-off between convergence speed and convergence accuracy. Furthermore, the uncoordinated parameter setup is considered in algorithm development, i.e., uncoordinated penalty parameters of *Prox-DBRO-VR* and uncoordinated triggered probabilities of *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*, which not only allows each

agent to decide independently their own parameters, but contributes to attaining the more complete convergence result.

3) The screening or filtration-based Byzantine-resilient methods, such as [17], [18], [22]–[25], [28], [37], may impose a rigorous assumption on the number of neighboring agents of the reliable agents, which may be impractical in the large-scale CPSs with a complex system structure. To eliminate this requirement, *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG* adopt a generalized penalized-norm approximation method to realize Byzantine resilience. Moreover, both *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG* achieve Byzantine resilience without incurring any additional costs in contrast to the decentralized Byzantine-resilient methods [17]–[19], [22]–[25], [28], [38] that result in either prohibitively expensive screening or observation costs, especially when facing large-scale or high-dimensional optimization problems. Besides, the theoretical analysis of *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG* only requires one potential connected network among reliable agents, which is much relaxed than the observation-based methods [19], [38] relying heavily on the clairvoyant observation probability.

D. Organization

We provide the remainder of the paper in this part. Section II presents the basic notation, problem statement, problem reformulation and setup of its robust variant. The connection of the proposed algorithms with existing methods and the algorithm development are elaborated in Section III. Section IV details the convergence results of the proposed algorithms. Two case studies on decentralized learning problems to illustrate the effectiveness and performance of the proposed algorithms are carried out in Section V. Section VI concludes the paper and states our future direction. Some detailed derivations are placed in Appendix.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Basic Notation

Throughout the paper, we assume all vectors are column vectors if no other specified. For arbitrary three vectors $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a positive scalar a , and a closed, proper, convex function, $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the proximal operator is defined as: $\text{prox}_{a,g}\{\tilde{x}\} = \arg \min_{\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{g(\tilde{y}) + \frac{1}{2a} \|\tilde{y} - \tilde{x}\|^2\}$; let $\partial g(\tilde{x})$ denote the sub-differential of the proper, closed and convex function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at \tilde{x} , such that

$$\partial g(\tilde{x}) = \{\tilde{y} | \forall \tilde{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n, g(\tilde{x}) + \langle \tilde{y}, \tilde{z} - \tilde{x} \rangle \leq g(\tilde{z})\};$$

denote $\partial_x g(\tilde{x})$ by the sub-gradient of non-smooth convex function g at \tilde{x} . The remaining basic notations of this paper are summarized in Table I.

B. Problem Statement

A network of m agents connect with each other over an undirected network $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{B}$, where \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{B} indicate the

Symbols	Definitions
$\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$	the set of real numbers, n -dimensional column real vectors, $m \times n$ real matrices, respectively
I_n	the $n \times n$ identity matrix
0_n	an n -dimensional column vector with all-zero elements
1_m	an m -dimensional column vector with all-one elements
$(\cdot)^\top$	transpose of any matrices or vectors
$\text{diag}\{\nu\}$	a diagonal matrix with all the elements of vector $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ laying on its main diagonal
$X \leq Y$	each element in $Y - X$ is nonnegative, where X and Y are two vectors or matrices with same dimensions
$\tilde{x} \otimes \tilde{y}$	the Kronecker product of vectors \tilde{x} and \tilde{y}
$\ \nu\ _a$	the a -norm of $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ equivalent to $(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i ^a)^{\frac{1}{a}}$, $a \geq 1$
$[\nu]_j$	the j -th element of any vector ν
$\lambda_{\min}(X)$	the minimum nonzero singular value of any matrix X
$\lambda_{\max}(X)$	the maximum singular value of any matrix X

TABLE I
BASIC NOTATIONS.

sets of reliable and Byzantine agents, respectively. Therefore, we can formulate a decentralized composite optimization problem as follows:

$$\min_{\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} f_i(\tilde{x}) + g_i(\tilde{x}), \quad (1)$$

where \tilde{x} is the decision variable and the local objective function can be further decomposed as $f_i(\tilde{x}) = \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l(\tilde{x})/q_i$. Note that via fixing $g_1 = g_2 = \dots = g_{|\mathcal{R}|} = g/|\mathcal{R}|$, the problem model (1) degrades to the composite optimization problem model with a non-smooth shared part in [34]–[36]. Denote the optimal solution to (1) by \tilde{x}^* and the local sample set associated with agent i as $\mathcal{Q}_i = \{1, \dots, q_i\}$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$. To specify the problem, we need to make the following assumptions (1).

Assumption 1: (Convexity and Smoothness).

(a) For $i \in \mathcal{R}$, the local objective function f_i is μ_i -strongly convex and the local component objective function f_i^l , is L_i -smooth, $\forall l \in \mathcal{Q}_i$, i.e., $\forall \tilde{x}, \tilde{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mu_i \|\tilde{x} - \tilde{z}\|_2^2 \leq (\nabla f_i(\tilde{x}) - \nabla f_i(\tilde{z}))^\top (\tilde{x} - \tilde{z}), \quad (2a)$$

$$\|\nabla f_i^l(\tilde{x}) - \nabla f_i^l(\tilde{z})\|_2 \leq L_i \|\tilde{x} - \tilde{z}\|_2, \quad (2b)$$

where $\mu := \min_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \{\mu_i\}$ and $L := \max_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \{L_i\}$, with $\kappa_f := L/\mu$;

(b) For $i \in \mathcal{R}$, the local objective function g_i is convex and not necessarily smooth.

Remark 1: Assumption 1-(a) is standard in recent literature [10], [12]–[16]. According to [42, Chapter 3], we know that $0 < \mu \leq L$, which indicates $\kappa_f \geq 1$. Moreover, in view of (2a), it is not difficult to verify that the local objective function f_i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, is L -smooth as well. Under Assumption 1, the optimal solution \tilde{x}^* to (1) exists uniquely. The consideration of the possibly non-smooth term g_i is meaningful, which finds substantial applications in various fields, such as the standard 1-norm regularization term in sparse machine learning [34], [35], the non-smooth indicator function in model predictive control [5], and the non-differentiable emission cost in energy resource coordination over smart grids [12].

Assumption 2: (Network Connectivity). All reliable agents form a static network, denoted as $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{R}})$, which is bidirectionally connected.

C. Problem Reformulation

In this section, we aim to transform the original optimization problem (2) into an equivalently decentralized fashion. To achieve this goal, a global decision vector $x = [x_1^\top, x_2^\top, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{R}|}^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}$ local copies of the decision variable \tilde{x} , is introduced, subject to the consensus constraint $x_i = x_j, (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$. Therefore, it is natural to rewrite (2) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}} F(x) + G(x), \\ & \text{s.t. } x_i = x_j, (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_R, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $F(x) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} f_i(x_i)$ and $G(x) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} g_i(x_i)$.

D. Robust Consensus Problem Setup

To enhance the robustness in the consensual aggregation process, we extend a scalar-valued consensus technique designed in [43] to its vector-valued domain. We can solve for the globally optimal solution x^* of (3) via the following norm-penalized approximation

$$x^* := \arg \min_x \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \left(f_i(x_i) + g_i(x_i) + \phi_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_i} \|x_i - x_j\|_a \right), \quad (4)$$

where $p \geq 1$ and ϕ_i is the local uncoordinated penalty parameter associated with each reliable agent i , $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$. The introduction of the TV norm penalty provides a resilient replacement of the consensus constraint, i.e., the controllable distance between x_i and x_j . The distance is controlled by the uncoordinated penalty parameter ϕ_i , which means that a larger ϕ_i can bring a small gap between x_i and x_j , $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_R$. To a certain extent, (1) can be considered as a soft relaxation of (4), because the former tolerates the dissimilarity among agents, for instance, the disagreement between reliable agents and Byzantine agents. The equivalence between the norm-penalized approximation problem (4) and the original optimization problem (1) is proved in Theorem 1.

III. ALGORITHM DEVELOPMENT

A. Connection with Existing Works

Lian et al. in [44] design a decentralized stochastic gradient descent algorithm, namely *DPSGD*, to resolve efficiently the transformed optimization problem (3), in an ideal situation. The ideal situation fails to consider the presence of any malfunctioning or malicious agents, which may not be avoided in practical applications [9], [19]–[23], [25], [45]. We next find out the reason why *DPSGD* cannot be applied directly to solving (3) when there are Byzantine agents in the network, and then seek out a feasible improvement, based on *DPSGD*, to maintain Byzantine resilience. We first recap the updates of the generalized *DPSGD* as follows:

$$\bar{x}_{i,k} = x_{i,k} - \alpha_k \nabla f_i(x_{i,k}), \quad (5a)$$

$$x_{i,k+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cup \{i\}} w_{ij} \bar{x}_{j,k}, \quad (5b)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_i = \mathcal{R}_i \cup \mathcal{B}_i$, α_k denotes a constant or decaying step-size, $\nabla f(x_{i,k})$ is the local batch gradient, w_{ij} is the i -th

row and j -th column element of a doubly stochastic weight matrix, meeting $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ji} = 1$. If there is a Byzantine agent o with one reliable agent i , $\tilde{x}_{o,k}$ could be an incorrect or misleading information (depending on whether agent o is out of action or manipulated by adversaries), to its reliable neighboring agents, at k -th iteration. Then, $x_{i,k+1}$ can be arbitrarily deviate from its true model, if Byzantine agent o is manipulated, since the adversary may send a maliciously falsifying message to agent i . For instance, Byzantine agent o , $o \in \mathcal{B}_i$, can blow $x_{i,k+1}$ up to infinity through transmitting continually a vector with infinite elements to its reliable neighbor i . Another example is that Byzantine agent o can deter all reliable agents from achieving consensus at iteration k , via sending various values $\tilde{x}_{io,k}$ to its different reliable neighboring agents $i \in \mathcal{R}_o$. The main reason of the above mentioned issues comes to the fact that the aggregation step (5b) is rather vulnerable to Byzantine problems. In fact, similar problems also prevail in decentralized work [1], [2], [10]–[16], [41]. Therefore, the SGD family contains two important extensions, RSA [27] and [26], both of which achieve Byzantine resilience based on a robust consensus method [43]. [26] is an decentralized extension of RSA [27]. The theoretical analysis of both RSA [27] and [26] is based on a bounded-variance assumption on the local stochastic gradient. With this assumption and the other standard assumptions (see [26] for details), the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ generated by the decentralized algorithm proposed in [26] exhibit a convergence property of

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|x_{k+1} - 1_{|\mathcal{R}|} \otimes \tilde{x}^* \|_2^2 \right] & \leq (1 - \eta \alpha_k) \mathbb{E} \left[\|x_k - 1_{|\mathcal{R}|} \otimes \tilde{x}^* \|_2^2 \right] \\ & + \alpha_k^2 \Delta_0 + \alpha_k \Delta_1, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\Delta_0 = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} 32n\phi^2 |\mathcal{R}_i|^2 + 4n\phi^2 |\mathcal{B}_i|^2 + 2\sigma_i^2$ and $\Delta_1 = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} n\phi^2 |\mathcal{B}_i|^2 / \gamma$. Based on (6), one can establish either a sub-linear convergence rate of a convergent error determined by the number of Byzantine agents, or a linear convergence rate with a convergent error determined jointly by the number of Byzantine agents and reliable agents, together with the bounded variance σ_i . In fact, this bounded variance σ_i exists commonly in recent literature, such as [14], [26], [27], [41]. Therefore, this paper aims to reduce asymptotically this bounded variance in the linear convergence result and discard the bounded-variance assumption as well. Inspired by the recent exploration of decentralized variance-reduced stochastic gradient algorithms *diffusion-AVRG* [2], *S-DIGing* [15], *GT-SAGA/GT-SVRG* [11], *GT-SARAH* [1] and *Push-LSVRG-UP* [16] that seek the solution to the optimization problem under an ideal Byzantine-free situation, we consider introducing two popular localized variance-reduction techniques *SAGA* [39] and *LSVRG* [40] to reduce asymptotically the variance arising in the course of evaluating the noisy stochastic gradients.

B. A General Algorithmic Framework

Based on the above analysis, we propose a decentralized Byzantine-resilient stochastic-gradient algorithmic framework in Algorithm 1 to resolve (4) in the presence of Byzantine agents.

Remark 2: The Byzantine resilience of *Prox-DBRO-VR* is attained by adopting the robust consensus aggregation

Algorithm 1 *Prox-DBRO-VR* Framework

Require: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, initializes with an arbitrary starting point $x_{i,0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a well-designed constant or decaying step-size $\alpha_k > 0$, and proper uncoordinated penalty parameters $\phi_i > 0$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$.

- 1: **for all** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
- 2: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, sends its updated local model $x_{i,k}$ to its neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and receives the possible delayed reliable information $x_{j,k}$ or malicious information $z_{ij,k}$ from its neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$.
- 3: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, evaluates the local stochastic gradient $r_{i,k}$.
- 4: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, updates an intermediate variable according to the local robust stochastic gradient descent step:

$$\bar{x}_{i,k} = x_{i,k} - \alpha_k r_{i,k} - \alpha_k \phi_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \partial_{x_i} \|x_{i,k} - v_{ij,k}\|_a,$$

$$\text{with } v_{ij,k} = \begin{cases} x_{j,k}, & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{R}_i \\ z_{ij,k}, & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{B}_i \end{cases}.$$

- 5: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, updates its current local model according to the local proximal mapping step:

$$x_{i,k+1} = \text{prox}_{\alpha_k, g_i} \{\bar{x}_{i,k}\}.$$

- 6: **end for**

based on total variation, which is initially studied in [43]. The literature [27], [32] extends this strategy to handling distributed federated learning problems and [26] studies it in a decentralized manner. However, all these works [26], [27], [32] not only rely on a bounded-variance assumption in theoretical analysis, but establish slower sub-linear convergence rates. Thus, the most important goal of designing *Prox-DBRO-VR* is to achieve linear convergence and remove the bounded-variance assumption, with the help of VR techniques.

C. Prox-DBRO-SAGA and Prox-DBRO-LSVRG

We introduce the localized version of two popular centralized VR techniques, *SAGA* [39] and *LSVRG* [40], into *Prox-DBRO-VR*, to develop *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*. The detailed updates of *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG* are presented in Algorithms 2-3, respectively.

Remark 3: All steps in *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*, together with *Prox-DBRO-VR*, are executed in parallel among all reliable agents. It is also worthwhile to mention that the expected cost in evaluating the stochastic gradient under *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG* is triple that of *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* at every iteration. However, this computational advantage of *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* is at the expense of an expensive storage cost of $\mathcal{O}(nq_i)$ for each agent i owing to the employment of the gradient table, while *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG* does not need extra storage to save the local batch gradients. Therefore, adopting either *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* or *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG* in practice involves a trade-off between per-iteration computational cost and storage. Users can also implement *Prox-DBRO-*

Algorithm 2 *Prox-DBRO-SAGA*

Require: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, initializes with an arbitrary starting point $x_{i,0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the auxiliary variable $u_{i,1}^l = u_{i,0}^l = x_{i,0}$, $\forall l \in \mathcal{Q}$, gradient tables $\{\nabla f_i^l(u_{i,0}^l)\}_{l=1}^{q_i}$, a well-designed constant or decaying step-size $\alpha_k > 0$, and proper uncoordinated penalty parameters $\phi_i > 0$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$.

- 1: **for all** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
- 2: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, sends its updated local model $x_{i,k}$ to its neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and receives the possible delayed reliable information $x_{j,k}$ or malicious information $z_{ij,k}$ from its neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$.
- 3: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, selects uniformly a random sample with index $s_{i,k}$ from the set \mathcal{Q}_i , and evaluates the stochastic gradient

$$r_{i,k}^u = \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(u_{i,k}^{s_{i,k}}) + \frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} \nabla f_i^l(u_{i,k}^l).$$

- 4: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, takes $u_{i,k+1}^{s_{i,k}} = x_{i,k}$ and replaces $\nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(u_{i,k+1}^{s_{i,k}})$ by $\nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(x_{i,k})$ in the corresponding position of the gradient table, while keeps $\nabla f_i^l(u_{i,k+1}^l) = \nabla f_i^l(u_{i,k}^l)$, $l \in \{\mathcal{Q} - s_{i,k}\}$.
- 5: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, updates its current model according to Steps 4-5 in Algorithm 1.
- 6: **end for**

Algorithm 3 *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*

Require: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, initializes with an arbitrary starting point $x_{i,0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $w_{i,0} = x_{i,0}$, a well-designed constant or decaying step-size $\alpha_k > 0$, and proper uncoordinated penalty parameters $\phi_i > 0$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$.

- 1: **for all** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
- 2: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, sends its updated local model $x_{i,k}$ to its neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$, and receives the possible delayed reliable information $x_{j,k}$ or malicious information $z_{ij,k}$ from its neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$.
- 3: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, selects uniformly a random sample with index $s_{i,k}$ from the set \mathcal{Q}_i , and evaluates the stochastic gradient

$$r_{i,k}^w = \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(w_{i,k}) + \frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} \nabla f_i^l(w_{i,k}).$$

- 4: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, takes $w_{i,k+1} = x_{i,k}$ with the uncoordinated probability p_i , and keeps $w_{i,k+1} = w_{i,k}$ with the probability $1 - p_i$.
- 5: Each reliable agent i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, updates its current model according to Steps 4-5 of Algorithm 1.
- 6: **end for**

VR algorithms via incorporating different categories of VR techniques based on their customized needs.

IV. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

For the simplicity of notation, we denote \mathcal{F}_k as the filter of the history with respect to the dynamical system generated by the sequence $\{s_k^i\}_{k \geq 0}^{i=1,2,\dots,|\mathcal{R}|}$, and the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[s_k | \mathcal{F}_k]$ is shortly denoted by $\mathbb{E}_k[\cdot]$ in the sequel analysis. To facilitate the subsequent analysis, we give the sequel definitions.

$$\begin{aligned}
x_k &:= \left[x_{1,k}^\top, x_{2,k}^\top, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{R}|,k}^\top \right]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}, \\
r_k &:= \left[r_{1,k}^\top, r_{2,k}^\top, \dots, r_{|\mathcal{R}|,k}^\top \right]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}, \\
\nabla F(x_k) &:= \left[\nabla f_1(x_{1,k})^\top, \nabla f_2(x_{2,k})^\top, \dots, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \nabla f_{|\mathcal{R}|}(x_{|\mathcal{R}|,k})^\top \right]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}, \\
\partial_x G(x_k) &:= \left[\partial_{x_1} g(x_{1,k})^\top, \partial_{x_2} g(x_{2,k})^\top, \dots, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \partial_{x_{|\mathcal{R}|}} g(x_{|\mathcal{R}|,k})^\top \right]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}, \\
\chi(x_k) &:= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \phi_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_i} \|x_{i,k} - x_{j,k}\|_a \in \mathbb{R}, \\
\delta(x_k) &:= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \phi_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}_i} \|x_{i,k} - z_{ij,k}\|_a \in \mathbb{R}, \\
\partial_{x_i} \chi(x_{i,k}) &:= \phi_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_i} \partial_{x_i} \|x_{i,k} - x_{j,k}\|_a \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\
\partial_x \chi(x_k) &:= \left[\partial_{x_1} \chi(x_{1,k})^\top, \partial_{x_2} \chi(x_{2,k})^\top, \dots, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \partial_{x_{|\mathcal{R}|}} \chi(x_{|\mathcal{R}|,k})^\top \right]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}, \\
\partial_{x_i} \delta(x_{i,k}) &:= \phi_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_i} \partial_{x_i} \|x_{i,k} - z_{ij,k}\|_a \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\
\partial_x \delta(x_k) &:= \left[\partial_{x_1} \delta(x_{1,k})^\top, \partial_{x_2} \delta(x_{2,k})^\top, \dots, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \partial_{x_{|\mathcal{R}|}} \delta(x_{|\mathcal{R}|,k})^\top \right]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Based on these definitions, we next give briefly a compact form of *Prox-DBRO-VR* for the subsequent convergence analysis as follows:

$$\bar{x}_k = x_k - \alpha_k (r_k + \partial_x \chi(x_k) + \partial_x \delta(x_k)), \quad (7a)$$

$$x_{k+1} = \mathbf{prox}_{\alpha_k, G} \{ \bar{x}_k \}. \quad (7b)$$

In the sequel, we utilize $\mathbb{E}_k[\cdot]$ to shortly denote the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_k]$, where \mathcal{F}_k serves as a filter of the history of the dynamical system yielded by the sequence $\{s_{i,k}\}_{k \geq 0}^{i=1,2,\dots,|\mathcal{R}|}$.

A. Auxiliary Results

Inspired by the unified analysis framework for centralized stochastic gradient descent methods in [46], we introduce the following two lemmas. To begin with, we define respectively two sequences for *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG* in the following. For *Prox-DBRO-SAGA*, we define

$$t_{i,k}^u := \frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l(u_{i,k}^l) - f_i^l(\tilde{x}^*) - \nabla f_i^l(\tilde{x}^*)^\top (u_{i,k}^l - \tilde{x}^*).$$

For *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*, we define

$$t_{i,k}^w := \frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l(w_{i,k}) - f_i^l(\tilde{x}^*) - \nabla f_i^l(\tilde{x}^*)^\top (w_{i,k} - \tilde{x}^*).$$

Note that both sequences $\{t_{i,k}^u\}_{i \in \mathcal{R}, k \geq 0}$ and $\{t_{i,k}^w\}_{i \in \mathcal{R}, k \geq 0}$ are non-negative according to the convexity of the local component function f_i^l , $l \in \mathcal{Q}$. For the sequel analysis, we define respectively the gradient-learning quantities $t_k^u := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} t_{i,k}^u$ and $t_k^w := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} t_{i,k}^w$ for *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*, the largest and smallest number of local samples $q_{\min} := \min_{i \in \mathcal{R}} q_i$ and $q_{\max} := \max_{i \in \mathcal{R}} q_i$, the minimum and maximum triggered probabilities $p_{\min} := \min_{i \in \mathcal{R}} p_i$ and $p_{\max} := \max_{i \in \mathcal{R}} p_i$, while $\kappa_q := q_{\max}/q_{\min} \geq 1$.

Lemma 1: (Gradient-learning Quantity) Suppose that Assumptions 1-2 hold. For $k \geq 0$, we have for *Prox-DBRO-SAGA*,

$$\mathbb{E}_k [t_{k+1}^u] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_{\max}} \right) t_k^u + \frac{D_F(x_k, x^*)}{q_{\min}}, \quad (8)$$

and for *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*,

$$\mathbb{E}_k [t_{k+1}^w] \leq (1 - p_{\min}) t_k^w + p_{\max} D_F(x_k, x^*), \quad (9)$$

where $D_F(x_k, x^*) := F(x_k) - F(x^*) - \nabla F(x^*)^\top (x_k - x^*)$ is known as the Bregman divergence of the convex cost function F due to the convexity preservation.

Proof 1: See Appendix A.

We next seek the upper bound of the distance between the stochastic gradient estimator r_k and the optimal gradient $\nabla F(x^*)$ for both *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* and *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*.

Lemma 2: (Gradient-learning Error) Suppose that Assumptions 1-2 hold. For $k \geq 0$, we have for *Prox-DBRO-SAGA*,

$$\mathbb{E}_k [\|r_k^u - \nabla F(x^*)\|_2^2] \leq 4L t_k^u + 2(2L - \mu) D_F(x_k, x^*), \quad (10)$$

and for *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*,

$$\mathbb{E}_k [\|r_k^w - \nabla F(x^*)\|_2^2] \leq 4L t_k^w + 2(2L - \mu) D_F(x_k, x^*), \quad (11)$$

where $r_k^u := \left[(r_{1,k}^u)^\top, (r_{2,k}^u)^\top, \dots, (r_{|\mathcal{R}|,k}^u)^\top \right]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}$

and $r_k^w := \left[(r_{1,k}^w)^\top, (r_{2,k}^w)^\top, \dots, (r_{|\mathcal{R}|,k}^w)^\top \right]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}$.

Proof 2: See Appendix B.

The following proposition is an important result for the analysis of arbitrary norm approximation.

Proposition 1: Consider two positive constants $a \geq 1$ and b , such that $1/a + 1/b = 1$. For an arbitrary vector $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote the sub-differential $\partial\|\tilde{x}\|_a = \{\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle \tilde{z}, \tilde{x} \rangle = \|\tilde{x}\|_a, \|\tilde{z}\|_b \leq 1\}$.

Proof 3: We refer interested readers to the supplementary document of [27] for the proof of Proposition 1.

Proposition 2: Recalling the definition of $\mathbf{prox}_{\alpha, g} \{x_i\}$, we know that $[\mathbf{prox}_{\alpha, G} \{x\}]_i = \mathbf{prox}_{\alpha, g} (x_i)$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{V}$, and

$$\|\mathbf{prox}_{\alpha, G} \{x\} - \mathbf{prox}_{\alpha, G} \{y\}\|_2 \leq \|x - y\|_2, \quad (12)$$

where $x = [x_1^\top, x_2^\top, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{R}|}^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}$ and $y = [y_1^\top, y_2^\top, \dots, y_{|\mathcal{R}|}^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}$.

Proof 4: See Appendix C.

B. Main Results

We next derive a feasible range for the uncoordinated penalty parameters to enable the equivalence between the decentralized consensus optimization problem (3) and norm-penalized approximation problem (4) as follows, which further guarantees the equivalence between the original optimization problem (1) and norm-penalized approximation problem (4).

Theorem 1: (Robust Consensus Condition) Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Given any $\tilde{g}_i^* \in \partial_{\tilde{x}} g_i(\tilde{x}^*)$, if we choose $\underline{\phi} \geq \phi_{\min} := |\mathcal{R}|^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{R}}|} \max_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \|\nabla f_i(\tilde{x}^*) + \tilde{g}_i^*\|_{\infty} / \lambda_{\min}(\Pi)$, the optimal solution to the original optimization problem (1) is equivalent to the globally optimal solution to norm-penalized approximation problem (4), i.e., $x^* = 1_{|\mathcal{R}|} \otimes \tilde{x}^*$.

Proof 5: See Appendix D.

Remark 4: Theorem 1 demonstrates that the selection of sufficiently large uncoordinated penalty parameters guarantees the equivalence between the original optimization problem (1) and norm-penalized approximation problem (4). However, the sequel convergence results will show that a larger $\underline{\phi}$ causes a bigger convergence error. Therefore, the notion of sufficiently large uncoordinated penalty parameters is tailored for theoretical results and one can hand-tune this parameter to obtain better algorithm performances in practice.

For simplicity, we fix the minimum and maximum uncoordinated triggered probabilities as $p_{\min} = 1/q_{\max}$ and $p_{\max} = 1/q_{\min}$, respectively. The following analysis considers $r_k := \begin{cases} r_k^u, & \text{for Prox-DBRO-SAGA} \\ r_k^w, & \text{for Prox-DBRO-LSVRG} \end{cases}$ and $t_k := \begin{cases} t_k^u, & \text{for Prox-DBRO-SAGA} \\ t_k^w, & \text{for Prox-DBRO-LSVRG} \end{cases}$, such that the theoretical results for both Prox-DBRO-SAGA (Algorithm 2) and Prox-DBRO-LSVRG (Algorithm 3) can be unified in a general framework. Before deriving a linear convergence rate for Algorithms 2-3, we first define the sequel parameters: $\underline{\phi} := \min_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \phi_i$, $\bar{\phi} := \max_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \phi_i$, $\gamma := \mu L / (\mu + L)$, $P_1^c := 16n\bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{R}_i|^2 + 4n\bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2$, $P_2 := n\bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2 / \gamma$, $E := 4P_2 / \gamma$.

Theorem 2: (Linear Convergence) Suppose that Assumptions 1-2 hold. Under the condition of Theorem 1, if the constant step-size meets $0 < \alpha_k \equiv \alpha \leq 1 / (\kappa_q (32(1 + \kappa_f)^2 + q_{\min}) \mu)$, then the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ generated by Algorithms 2-3, converges linearly to an error ball around the optimal solution to the original optimization problem (1) at a linear rate of $(1 - \mathcal{O}(\gamma\alpha))^k$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [\|x_k - 1_m \otimes \tilde{x}^*\|_2^2] \\ & \leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}\alpha\right)^k U_0 + 4 \left(\frac{P_1^c}{\gamma}\alpha + E\right) \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}\alpha\right)^k\right), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $U_0 = \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2 + q_{\min} \gamma \alpha t_0 / (q_{\max} L)$ and the radius of the error ball is no more than $4(P_1^c \alpha / \gamma + E)$.

Proof 6: See Appendix E.

We continue to derive the sub-linear convergence rate of Algorithms 2-3 with the aid of the following bounded-gradient

assumption on the local non-smooth objective function g_i , $i \in \mathcal{R}$, which is standard in literature [47], [48].

Assumption 3: (Bounded Gradient) For $i \in \mathcal{R}$, the sub-gradient $\partial_{\tilde{x}} g_i(\tilde{x})$ at any point $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is bounded, i.e., $\max_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \|\partial_{\tilde{x}} g_i(\tilde{x})\|_2^2 \leq \hat{G}$, where \hat{G} can be an arbitrarily large but finite constant.

To proceed, we define $P_1^d := 16|\mathcal{R}|\hat{G} + 16n\bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{R}_i|^2 + 4n\bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2$, $\Xi := \max \left\{ \frac{\theta^2 P_1^d}{\eta\theta - 1}, (\xi - \frac{\gamma}{4}\theta) \left[\|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2 \right] + \frac{\theta^2}{\xi} P_1^d + \theta P_2 - \xi E \right\}$ and $\xi := \kappa_q (64(1 + \kappa_f)^2 + q_{\min}) \mu \theta$ with $\theta > 4/\gamma$.

Theorem 3: (Sub-linear Convergence) Suppose that Assumptions 1-3 hold. Under the condition of Theorem 1, if the decaying step-size is chosen as $\alpha_k = \theta / (\xi + k)$, then the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ generated by Algorithms 2-3 converges to an error ball around the optimal solution to the original optimization problem (1), at a sub-linear rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/(k+1))$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E} [\|x_k - 1_{|\mathcal{R}|} \otimes \tilde{x}^*\|_2^2] \leq \frac{\Xi}{\xi + k} + E, \forall k \geq 0, \quad (14)$$

where the radius of the error ball is E .

Proof 7: See Appendix F.

Remark 5: The convergence results established in Theorems 2-3 assert that the proposed algorithms achieve linear convergence at the expense of a larger larger convergence error. It is also clear from Theorem 3 that the convergence error of Prox-DBRO-SAGA and Prox-DBRO-LSVRG for the sub-linear convergence case is determined by the number of Byzantine agents. That is to say, the exact convergence of Prox-DBRO-SAGA and Prox-DBRO-LSVRG can be recovered, when the number of Byzantine agents goes to zero. However, the convergence error of Prox-DBRO-SAGA and Prox-DBRO-LSVRG is determined jointly by the number of Byzantine agents and reliable agents in the linear convergence case.

V. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A. Decentralized Logistic Regression with Sparsity

B. Decentralized Neural Networks

VI. CONCLUSIONS

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Lemma 1

According to Step 4 in Algorithm 3, at iteration k , $\forall k \geq 1$, the auxiliary variables $u_{i,k+1}^l$, $i \in \mathcal{R}$, take value $u_{i,k}^l$ or $x_{i,k}$, associated with probabilities $1 - 1/q_i$ and $1/q_i$, respectively. This observation is owing to the fact that selection of the random sample for Prox-DBRO-SAGA, at each iteration $k \geq 1$, is uniformly and independently executed. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} \nabla f_i^l(\tilde{x}^*)^\top (u_{i,k+1}^l - \tilde{x}^*) \right] \\ & = \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_i}\right) \frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} \nabla f_i^l(\tilde{x}^*)^\top (u_{i,k}^l - \tilde{x}^*) + \frac{1}{q_i} \nabla f_i(\tilde{x}^*)^\top \\ & \quad \times (x_{i,k} - \tilde{x}^*). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Similarly, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_k [f_i^l (u_{i,k+1}^l)] = \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_i}\right) f_i^l (u_{i,k}^l) + \frac{1}{q_i} f_i^l (x_{i,k}). \quad (16)$$

Via summing (16) over index l for all $l = 1, \dots, q_i$, we can further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l (u_{i,k+1}^l) \right] \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_i}\right) \frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l (u_{i,k}^l) + \frac{1}{q_i} \frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l (x_{i,k}) \quad (17) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_i}\right) \frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l (u_{i,k}^l) + \frac{1}{q_i} f_i (x_{i,k}). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition of $t_{i,k}^u$ and combining Eqs. (15) and (17) give

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k [t_{i,k+1}^u] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_k \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l (u_{i,k+1}^l) - f_i (\tilde{x}^*) - \nabla f_i^l (\tilde{x}^*)^\top (u_{i,k+1}^l - \tilde{x}^*) \right] \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_i}\right) \frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l (u_{i,k}^l) - \nabla f_i^l (\tilde{x}^*)^\top (u_{i,k}^l - \tilde{x}^*) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{q_i} f_i (x_{i,k}) - f_i (\tilde{x}^*) - \frac{1}{q_i} \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*)^\top (x_{i,k} - \tilde{x}^*) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_i}\right) t_{i,k} + \frac{1}{q_i} (f_i (x_{i,k}) - f_i (\tilde{x}^*)) - \frac{1}{q_i} \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*)^\top \\ & \quad \times (x_{i,k} - \tilde{x}^*). \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

Summing Eq. (18) over i yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{E}_k [t_{i,k+1}^u] \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \frac{1}{q_i} \left(f_i (x_{i,k}) - f_i (\tilde{x}^*) - \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*)^\top (x_{i,k} - \tilde{x}^*) \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_i}\right) t_{i,k}^u \\ &\leq \frac{1}{q_{\min}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} f_i (x_{i,k}) - f_i (\tilde{x}^*) - \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*)^\top (x_{i,k} - \tilde{x}^*) \\ & \quad + \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_{\max}}\right) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} t_{i,k}^u \\ &= \frac{1}{q_{\min}} D_F (x_k, x^*) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_{\max}}\right) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} t_{i,k}^u, \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality uses $1 \leq q_{\min} \leq q_i \leq q_{\max}$ and the last equality is according to $f(x) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} f_i(x_i)$ and the definition of $D_F(x_k, x^*)$. Substituting the definition of t_k^u obtains the relation (8). In view of Step 4 in Algorithm 2, we know that at iteration k , $\forall k \geq 1$, the auxiliary variables $w_{i,k+1}$, $i \in \mathcal{R}$, take value $x_{i,k}$ with probability p_i , or keep the

most recent update $w_{i,k}$ with probability $1 - p_i$. Therefore, it can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} \nabla f_i^l (\tilde{x}^*)^\top (w_{i,k+1} - \tilde{x}^*) \right] \\ &= \frac{p_i}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} \nabla f_i^l (\tilde{x}^*)^\top (x_{i,k} - \tilde{x}^*) + (1 - p_i) \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*)^\top (w_{i,k} - \tilde{x}^*). \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_k \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l (w_{i,k+1}) \right] = (1 - p_i) \frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l (w_{i,k}) + p_i f_i (x_{i,k}). \quad (21)$$

Recalling the definition of $t_{i,k}^w$ and combining Eq. (20) with (21) give

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k [t_{i,k+1}^w] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_k \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l (w_{i,k+1}) - f_i (\tilde{x}^*) - \nabla f_i^l (\tilde{x}^*)^\top (w_{i,k+1} - \tilde{x}^*) \right] \\ &= (1 - p_i) t_{i,k}^w + p_i (f_i (x_{i,k}) - f_i (\tilde{x}^*) - \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*)^\top (x_{i,k} - \tilde{x}^*)), \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

where we apply $f_i (\tilde{x}^*) = (1/q_i) \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l (\tilde{x}^*)$ in the last equality. The relation (9) is reached through summing Eq. (22) over i and substituting the definitions of t_k^w and $D_F(x_k, x^*)$.

B. Proof of Lemma 2

According to Step 3 in Algorithm 2, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_{i,k}^u - \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| r_{i,k}^u - \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*) - \nabla f_i (x_{i,k}) + \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \quad (23) \\ & \quad + \left\| \nabla f_i (x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality is due to the standard variance decomposition $\mathbb{E}_k [\|A\|_2^2] = \|\mathbb{E}_k [A]\|_2^2 + \mathbb{E}_k [\|A - \mathbb{E}_k [A]\|_2^2]$, with $A = r_{i,k}^u - \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*)$. We continue to handle the first term in the right-hand-side of Eq. (23) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| r_{i,k}^u - \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*) - \nabla f_i (x_{i,k}) + \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}} (x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}} (\tilde{x}^*) - \nabla f_i (x_{i,k}) + \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \quad + 2 \mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}} (u_{i,k}^{s_{i,k}}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}} (\tilde{x}^*) - \frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} \nabla f_i^l (u_{i,k}^l) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}} (x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}} (\tilde{x}^*) - \nabla f_i (x_{i,k}) + \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \quad + 2 \mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}} (u_{i,k}^{s_{i,k}}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}} (\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= 2 \mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}} (x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}} (\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \quad + 2 \mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}} (u_{i,k}^{s_{i,k}}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}} (\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \quad - 2 \left\| \nabla f_i (x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i (\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2, \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality utilizes $\mathbb{E}_k \left[\|B - \mathbb{E}_k[B]\|_2^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|B\|_2^2 \right]$, with $B = \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(u_{i,k}^{s_{i,k}}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(\tilde{x}^*)$, and the last equality applies the standard variance decomposition again. We proceed with substituting (24) into (23) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_{i,k}^u - \nabla f_i(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}_k \left[\|\nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(u_{i,k}^{s_{i,k}}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \quad - \|\nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Summing Eq. (25) over i reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k^u - \nabla f(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|\nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \quad + 2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(u_{i,k}^{s_{i,k}}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \quad - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \|\nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Since the local component objective function f_i^l , $\forall l \in \mathcal{Q}_i$ and $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$, is L -smooth according to Assumption 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f_i^l(u_{i,k}^l) - \nabla f_{i,l}(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2 \\ & \leq f_i^l(u_{i,k}^l) - f_i^l(\tilde{x}^*) - \nabla f_i^l(\tilde{x}^*)^\top (u_{i,k}^l - \tilde{x}^*). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Summing the both sides of (27) over l from 1 to q_i reduces to

$$\frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} \|\nabla f_i^l(u_{i,k}^l) - \nabla f_i^l(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2 \leq 2L t_{i,k}^u. \quad (28)$$

Since the local component function $f_i^{s_{i,k}}$, has a uniform distribution over the set $\{f_i^1, \dots, f_i^{q_i}\}$, it is natural to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(u_{i,k}^{s_{i,k}}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{q_i} \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} \|\nabla f_i^l(u_{i,k}^l) - \nabla f_i^l(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Combining Eq. (29) and (28) and then summing over i yield

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(u_{i,k}^{s_{i,k}}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \leq 2L t_k^u. \quad (30)$$

Summarizing (26) and (30) obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k^u - \nabla f(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \leq 4L t_k^u + 2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|\nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \quad - \|\nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x^*)\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where we simplify $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \|\nabla f_i(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2$ as $\|\nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x^*)\|_2^2$. Via applying the Lipschitz continuity of ∇f_i^l again, we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{E}_k \left[\left\| \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(x_{i,k}) - \nabla f_i^{s_{i,k}}(\tilde{x}^*) \right\|_2^2 \right] \leq 2L D_F(x_k, x^*), \quad (32)$$

where we use the fact that $f_i(x_{i,k}) = (1/q_i) \sum_{l=1}^{q_i} f_i^l(x_{i,k})$ and $f(x_k) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} f_i(x_{i,k})$. Plugging (32) into (31) generates

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k^u - \nabla f(\tilde{x}^*)\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \leq 4L t_k^u + 4L D_F(x_k, x^*) - \|\nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x^*)\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Considering the μ -strong convexity of the local objective function f_i , $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$, we have

$$2\mu D_F(x_k, x^*) \leq \|\nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x^*)\|_2^2. \quad (34)$$

Finally, one can obtain (10) via plugging the relation (34) into (33). For *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*, we replace $u_{i,k}^l$ with $w_{i,k}$ to obtain (11), which completes the proof.

C. Proof of Proposition 2

According to the definition of $\text{prox}_{\alpha,G}\{x\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{prox}_{\alpha,G}\{x\} \\ &= \arg \min_y \left\{ G(y) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|y - x\|_2^2 \right\} \\ &= \arg \min_y \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} g_i(y_i) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \|y_i - x_i\|_2^2 \right\} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \arg \min_{\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ g_1(\tilde{y}) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|\tilde{y} - x_1\|_2^2 \right\} \\ \arg \min_{\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ g_2(\tilde{y}) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|\tilde{y} - x_2\|_2^2 \right\} \\ \vdots \\ \arg \min_{\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ g_{|\mathcal{R}|}(\tilde{y}) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|\tilde{y} - x_{|\mathcal{R}|}\|_2^2 \right\} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

which indicates $[\text{prox}_{\alpha,G}\{x\}]_i = \text{prox}_{\alpha,g_i}\{x_i\}$. Based on this equality, it is straightforward to verify (12) with the help of the non-expansiveness of the proximal operator prox_{α,g_i} , which completes the proof.

D. Proof of Theorem 1

The optimal solution to (4) satisfies the optimality condition

$$0_n \in \nabla f_i(x_i^*) + \partial_{x_i} g(x_i^*) + \frac{\phi_i}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_i} \partial \|x_i^* - x_j^*\|_a, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{R}. \quad (36)$$

According to the definition of the sub-differential $\partial \|x_i^* - x_j^*\|_a = \{y_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^n | \langle y_{ij}, x_i^* \rangle = \|x_i^*\|_a, \|y_{ij}\|_b \leq 1\}$, there exist $g_i^* \in \partial_{x_i} g(x_i^*)$ and $\tilde{y}_{ij} \in \partial \|x_i^* - x_j^*\|_a$, such that for $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$

$$\nabla f_i(x_i^*) + g_i^* + \phi_i \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_i, i < j} \tilde{y}_{ij} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_i, i > j} \tilde{y}_{ji} \right) = 0_n. \quad (37)$$

We next need to prove that the optimal solution \tilde{x}^* satisfies (37), such that

$$\nabla f_i(\tilde{x}^*) + \tilde{g}_i^* + \phi_i \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_i, i < j} \tilde{y}_{ij} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_i, i > j} \tilde{y}_{ji} \right) = 0_n, \quad (38)$$

where $\tilde{g}_i^* \in \partial_{\tilde{x}} g(\tilde{x}^*)$. Since (38) can be decomposed into element-wise, without loss of generality, the rest proof assumes $n = 1$, i.e., the scalar case. Via denoting $\Phi := \text{diag}\{\phi\} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}| \times |\mathcal{R}|}$ with $\phi := [\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_{|\mathcal{R}|}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|}$, together with $\psi_i := \nabla f_i(\tilde{x}^*) + \tilde{g}_i^*$, the task to prove (38) reduces to solving for a vector Ψ with $\Psi := [\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_{|\mathcal{R}|}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|}$, such that the following relation holds

$$\Phi \Pi \tilde{y} + \Psi = 0_{|\mathcal{R}|}, \quad (39)$$

where $\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{R}}|}$ is the collected form of \tilde{y}_{ij} according to the order of edges in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{R}}$. We need to solve for at least one solution \tilde{y} meeting $\|\tilde{y}_{ij}\|_b \leq 1$ with $b > 1$, such that (39) holds true. To proceed, we decompose the task into two parts.

Part I: We first show that (39) has at least one solution. In view of the rank of the node-edge incidence matrix Π is $|\mathcal{R}| - 1$ and the null space of the columns is spanned by the all-one vector $1_{|\mathcal{R}|}$. Recalling the definition of ψ_i , the optimality condition of (1) is $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \psi_i = 0$. Therefore, we know that the columns of Π and those of $[\Phi \Pi, \Psi]$ share the same null space, which indicates the same rank of Π and $[\Phi \Pi, \Psi]$. The existence of solutions to (39) can be demonstrated according to the property of non-homogeneous linear equations.

Part II: In this part, a solution with the b -norm of its elements no larger than 1 is sought. Suppose that $y \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{R}}|}$ is a solution to (39), such that $\Phi \Pi y + \Psi = 0_{|\mathcal{R}|}$. We consider the least-squares solution $y = -\Pi^\dagger \Phi^{-1} \Psi$, where Π^\dagger is the pseudo inverse of Π . Then, it suffices to prove that $\|y\|_b \leq 1$. Since

$$\|y\|_b = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{R}|} |y_i|^b \right)^{1/b}, \forall b > 1, \text{ we know that } \|y\|_b \leq \|y\|_1. \text{ Therefore, we derive}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|y\|_b &\leq \|\Pi^\dagger \Phi^{-1} \Psi\|_1 \\ &\leq \|\Pi^\dagger\|_1 \|\Phi^{-1}\|_1 \|\Psi\|_1 \\ &\leq |\mathcal{R}| \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{R}}|} \underline{\phi}^{-1} \|\Pi^\dagger\|_2 \|\Psi\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where the second inequality uses the vector-matrix norm compatibility, and the last inequality applies the facts that $\|\Psi\|_1 \leq |\mathcal{R}| \|\Psi\|_2$ and $\|\Pi^\dagger\|_1 \leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{R}}|} \|\Pi^\dagger\|_2$. Consider $\lambda_{\max}(\Pi^\dagger)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\Pi)$ as the maximum and minimum singular values of matrices Π^\dagger and Π , respectively. Based on (40), we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|y\|_b &\leq \lambda_{\max}(\Pi^\dagger) \frac{|\mathcal{R}| \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{R}}|}}{\underline{\phi}} \|\Psi\|_2 \\ &= \frac{|\mathcal{R}| \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{R}}|}}{\underline{\phi} \lambda_{\min}(\Pi)} \|\Psi\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Since $\|\Psi\|_2 \leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{R}|} \|\Psi\|_\infty$, we further have

$$\|y\|_b \leq \frac{|\mathcal{R}|^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{R}}|}}{\lambda_{\min}(\Pi) \underline{\phi}} \max_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\psi_i|. \quad (42)$$

If we consider $n \geq 1$, i.e., the arbitrary dimension case, (42) becomes

$$\|y\|_b \leq \frac{|\mathcal{R}|^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{R}}|}}{\lambda_{\min}(\Pi) \underline{\phi}} \max_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \|\nabla f_i(\tilde{x}^*) + \tilde{g}_i^*\|_\infty. \quad (43)$$

The proof is completed by choosing an appropriate $\underline{\phi}$ to meet

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}|^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{R}}|}}{\lambda_{\min}(\Pi) \underline{\phi}} \max_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \|\nabla f_i(\tilde{x}^*) + \tilde{g}_i^*\|_\infty \leq 1.$$

E. Proof of Theorem 2

Based on Proposition 2 and the optimality condition (36), we know that

$$x^* = \text{prox}_{\alpha, G} \{x^* - \alpha(\nabla F(x^*) + \partial_x \chi(x^*))\}. \quad (44)$$

In view of the compact form (7), it holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_k \left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|\text{prox}_{\alpha, G} \{\bar{x}_k\} - \text{prox}_{\alpha, G} \{x^* - \alpha \nabla F(x^*) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \alpha \partial_x \chi(x^*)\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|\bar{x}_k - (x^* - \alpha(\nabla F(x^*) + \partial_x \chi(x^*)))\|_2^2 \right] \quad (45) \\ &= \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 - 2\alpha \mathbb{E}_k \left[\langle x_k - x^*, r_k - \nabla F(x^*) \rangle \right] \\ &\quad - 2\alpha \langle x_k - x^*, \partial_x \chi(x_k) - \partial_x \chi(x^*) + \partial_x \delta(x_k) \rangle \\ &\quad + \alpha^2 \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k - \nabla F(x^*) + \partial_x \chi(x_k) - \partial_x \chi(x^*) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality applies the relationship (12). We continue to seek an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k - \nabla F(x^*) + \partial_x \chi(x_k) - \partial_x \chi(x^*) + \partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2 \right]$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k - \nabla F(x^*) + \partial_x \chi(x_k) - \partial_x \chi(x^*) + \partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\leq 4\mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k - \nabla F(x^*)\|_2^2 \right] + 2 \|\partial_x \chi(x_k) - \partial_x \chi(x^*)\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + 4 \|\partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq 4(4L t_k + 2(2L - \mu) D_F(x_k, x^*)) + 4 \|\partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \|\partial_x \chi(x_k) - \partial_x \chi(x^*)\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where the first inequality applies $\|c + d\|^2 \leq 2c^2 + 2d^2$ twice and the second equality employs Lemma 2. To proceed, we bound $\|\partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2 &= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \phi_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}_1} \partial_{x_1} \|x_{1,k} - z_{1j,k}\|_a \\ \phi_2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}_2} \partial_{x_2} \|x_{2,k} - z_{2j,k}\|_a \\ \vdots \\ \phi_{|\mathcal{R}|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}_{|\mathcal{R}|}} \partial_{x_{|\mathcal{R}|}} \|x_{|\mathcal{R}|,k} - z_{|\mathcal{R}|j,k}\|_a \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \left\| \phi_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}_i} \partial_{x_i} \|x_{i,k} - z_{ij,k}\|_a \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq n \bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where the inequality holds true, since the b -norm ($b \geq 1$) of $\partial_{x_i} \|x_{i,k} - z_{ij,k}\|_a$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$, is no larger than 1 owing to Proposition 1, i.e.,

$$|\partial_{x_i} \|x_{i,k} - z_{ij,k}\|_a| \leq 1, \forall e = 1, \dots, n. \quad (48)$$

Following the same technical line of (47)-(48), it is not difficult to verify

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\partial_x \chi(x_k) - \partial_x \chi(x^*)\|_2^2 \\
&= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \left\| \phi_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_i} \left(\partial_{x_i} \|x_{i,k} - x_{j,k}\|_a - \partial_{x_i} \|x_i^* - x_j^*\|_a \right) \right\|_2^2 \\
&\leq 4n\bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{R}_i|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Combining (46), (47) and (49) obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k - \nabla F(x^*) + \partial_x \chi(x_k) - \partial_x \chi(x^*) + \partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2 \right] \\
&\leq 4(2Lt_k + (2L - \mu) D_F(x_k, x^*)) + 8n\bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{R}_i|^2 \\
&\quad + 4n\bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Since the local objective function $f_i(x_i)$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$, is μ -strongly convex and L -smooth according to Assumption 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\mathbb{E}_k [\langle x_k - x^*, r_k - \nabla F(x^*) \rangle] \\
&= -\langle x_k - x^*, \nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x^*) \rangle \\
&\leq \frac{\mu L}{\mu + L} \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{\mu + L} \|\nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x^*)\|_2^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Recalling the definition of $\chi(x_k)$, we know that $\chi(x_k)$ is a convex function. Therefore, it is straightforward to obtain

$$-\langle x_k - x^*, \partial_x \chi(x_k) - \partial_x \chi(x^*) \rangle \leq 0. \tag{52}$$

We next analyze the term $-2\langle x_k - x^*, \partial \delta(x_k) \rangle$ with the aid of an arbitrary constant $\gamma > 0$,

$$-2\langle x_k - x^*, \partial \delta(x_k) \rangle \leq \gamma \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + \frac{n\bar{\phi}^2}{\gamma} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2, \tag{53}$$

where we apply the Young's inequality and (47). Plugging the results (50)-(53) into (45) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right] \\
&\leq \left(1 - \left(\frac{2\mu L}{\mu + L} - \gamma \right) \alpha \right) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + 8n\bar{\phi}^2 \alpha^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{R}_i|^2 \\
&\quad + 4\alpha^2 (2Lt_k + (2L - \mu) D_F(x_k, x^*)) + 4n\bar{\phi}^2 \alpha^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{n\alpha}{\gamma} \bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Via setting $\gamma = \mu L / (\mu + L)$, we can rewrite (54) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right] \\
&\leq (1 - \gamma\alpha) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + 4\alpha^2 (2Lt_k + (2L - \mu) D_F(x_k, x^*)) \\
&\quad + 8n\bar{\phi}^2 \alpha^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{R}_i|^2 + 4n\bar{\phi}^2 \alpha^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2 + \frac{n\alpha}{\gamma} \bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

According to (8), we have for any $c > 0$,

$$c(\mathbb{E}_k [t_{k+1}] - t_k) \leq -\frac{c}{q_{\max}} t_k + \frac{c}{q_{\min}} D_F(x_k, x^*). \tag{56}$$

Recall the definitions of P_1^c and P_2 . Combining (55) and (56) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right] + c(\mathbb{E}_k [t_{k+1}] - t_k) \\
&\leq (1 - \gamma\alpha) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + 4n\bar{\phi}^2 \alpha^2 (2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{R}_i|^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2) \\
&\quad + \frac{n\bar{\phi}^2}{\gamma} \alpha \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2 + 8L\alpha^2 t_k + 4(2L - \mu) \alpha^2 D_F(x_k, x^*) \\
&\quad - \frac{c}{q_{\max}} t_k + \frac{c}{q_{\min}} D_F(x_k, x^*) \\
&\leq \left(1 - \left(\gamma\alpha - \frac{L}{2} \left(4(2L - \mu) \alpha^2 + \frac{c}{q_{\min}} \right) \right) \right) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + P_1^c \alpha^2 + P_2 \alpha + \left(8L\alpha^2 - \frac{c}{q_{\max}} \right) t_k,
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

where the last inequality employs the L -smoothness of the local objective function f_i , $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$. We proceed by choosing $0 < \alpha \leq \gamma / (8L(2L - \mu))$ and setting $c = \tilde{c}\alpha$ with $0 < \tilde{c} \leq q_{\min}\gamma/L$, such that (57) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right] + \frac{q_{\min}\gamma\alpha}{L} (\mathbb{E}_k [t_{k+1}] - t_k) \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}\alpha \right) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + \left(8L\alpha^2 - \frac{c}{q_{\max}} \right) t_k + P_1^c \alpha^2 \\
&\quad + P_2 \alpha.
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

To proceed, via fixing $\tilde{c} = q_{\min}\gamma/L$ and $0 < \alpha \leq \gamma / (8L(2L - \mu))$, (58) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right] + \frac{q_{\min}\gamma\alpha}{L} (\mathbb{E}_k [t_{k+1}] - t_k) \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}\alpha \right) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + 4n\bar{\phi}^2 \alpha^2 (2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{R}_i|^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2) \\
&\quad + \frac{n\bar{\phi}^2}{\gamma} \alpha \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2 + \left(8L\alpha - \frac{\gamma q_{\min}}{L q_{\max}} \right) \alpha t_k.
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

We continue to define $U_k := \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + q_{\min}\gamma\alpha t_k/L$, which is non-negative due to $t_k \geq 0$. Based on this definition, if we select the constant step-size $0 < \alpha \leq 4\gamma / (\kappa_q (32L^2 + q_{\min}\gamma^2))$, then it is natural to convert (59) into

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_k [U_{k+1}] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right] + \frac{q_{\min}\gamma\alpha}{L} \mathbb{E}_k [t_{k+1}] \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}\alpha \right) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}\alpha \right) \frac{q_{\min}\gamma\alpha}{L} t_k + P_1^c \alpha^2 \\
&\quad + P_2 \alpha \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}\alpha \right) U_k + P_1^c \alpha^2 + P_2 \alpha.
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Summarizing all the upper bounds on the constant step-size generates a feasible selection range as follows:

$$0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{\kappa_q (32(1 + \kappa_f)^2 + q_{\min})} \frac{1}{\mu}. \tag{61}$$

Based on (61), taking the full expectation on the both sides of (60) obtains

$$\mathbb{E}[U_{k+1}] \leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}\alpha\right) \mathbb{E}[U_k] + \alpha^2 P_1^c + \alpha P_2. \quad (62)$$

For $\forall k \geq 0$, applying telescopic cancellation to (62) obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}\alpha\right)^{k+1} U_0 + 4 \left(\frac{P_1}{\gamma} \alpha + E \right) \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}\alpha\right)^{k+1} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where $U_0 = \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2 + q_{\min} \gamma \alpha t_0 / L$. It is worthwhile to mention that by specifying r_k and t_k as r_k^u and t_k^u (resp., r_k^w and t_k^w), the linear convergence rate is established for *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* (resp., *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*).

F. Proof of Theorem 3

In view of the compact form (7) associated with the proposed algorithms, we make a transformation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} = \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|n}} & \left\{ G(y) + \frac{1}{2\alpha_k} \|y - x_k + \alpha_k(r_k + \partial_x \chi(x_k) + \partial_x \delta(x_k))\|_2^2 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0_{|\mathcal{R}|n} \in & x_{k+1} - x_k + \alpha_k(r_k + \partial_x \chi(x_k) + \partial_x \delta(x_k)) \\ & + \alpha_k \partial_x G(x_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that if x_{k+1} is the minimizer of the next update of the proposed algorithm, we are guaranteed to obtain a vector $G_{k+1} \in \partial_x G(x_{k+1})$, such that

$$0_{|\mathcal{R}|n} = x_{k+1} - x_k + \alpha_k(r_k + G_{k+1} + \partial_x \chi(x_k) + \partial_x \delta(x_k)),$$

which can further rearranged as

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \alpha_k(r_k + G_{k+1} + \partial_x \chi(x_k) + \partial_x \delta(x_k)). \quad (64)$$

We next analyze the transformed version (64) of the compact form (7) in the following.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right] \\ & = \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 - 2\alpha_k \mathbb{E}_k [\langle x_k - x^*, r_k + \partial_x \chi(x_k) + G_{k+1} \rangle] \\ & \quad + \alpha_k^2 \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k + G_{k+1} + \partial_x \chi(x_k) + \partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \quad - 2\alpha_k \langle x_k - x^*, \partial_x \delta(x_k) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Considering $G^* \in \partial_x G(x^*)$ and the optimality condition $\nabla F(x^*) + G^* + \partial_x \chi(x^*) = 0_{mn}$, we continue to seek an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k + G_{k+1} + \partial_x \chi(x_k) + \partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2 \right]$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k + G_{k+1} + \partial_x \chi(x_k) + \partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2 \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k - \nabla F(x^*) + G_{k+1} - G^* + \partial_x \chi(x_k) - \partial_x \chi(x^*) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \leq 4 \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k - \nabla F(x^*)\|_2^2 \right] + 4 \|G_{k+1} - G^*\|_2^2 \\ & \quad + 4 \|\partial_x \chi(x_k) - \partial_x \chi(x^*)\|_2^2 + 4 \|\partial_x \delta(x_k)\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq 4 \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|r_k - \nabla F(x^*)\|_2^2 \right] + 4 \|G_{k+1} - G^*\|_2^2 \\ & \quad + 16n\bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{R}_i|^2 + 4n\bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2 \\ & \leq 16L t_k + 8(2L - \mu) D_F(x_k, x^*) + 16|\mathcal{R}|\bar{G} \\ & \quad + 16n\bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{R}_i|^2 + 4n\bar{\phi}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{B}_i|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where the second inequality uses the results (47) and (49), and the last inequality is owing to Lemma 2 and Assumption 3. To proceed, recalling the definition of $\partial_x G(x_k)$, it is not difficult to verify

$$-\langle x_k - x^*, G_{k+1} - G^* \rangle \leq 0, \quad (67)$$

which is owing to the convexity of $g_i(\tilde{x})$ and $\chi_i(\tilde{x})$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$. Based on the relationships (52) and (67), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} & -2\mathbb{E}_k [\langle x_k - x^*, r_k + G_{k+1} + \partial_x \chi(x_k) \rangle] \\ & = -2\mathbb{E}_k [\langle x_k - x^*, r_k - \nabla F(x_k) + \nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x^*) \rangle] \\ & \quad -2\mathbb{E}_k [\langle x_k - x^*, G_{k+1} - G^* + \partial_x \chi(x_k) - \partial_x \chi(x^*) \rangle] \\ & \leq -2\langle x_k - x^*, \nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x^*) \rangle \\ & \leq -2 \frac{\mu L}{\mu + L} \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 - \frac{2}{\mu + L} \|\nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x^*)\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where the last inequality follows (51). To recap, plugging the results (53), (66) and (68) into (65) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \leq (1 - \gamma\alpha_k) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + 16L\alpha_k^2 t_k + P_1^d \alpha_k^2 + P_2 \alpha_k \\ & \quad + 8(2L - \mu) \alpha_k^2 D_F(x_k, x^*). \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

According to Lemma 1, we introduce an iteration-shifting variable $c_k > 0$, such that

$$c_k (\mathbb{E}_k [t_{k+1}] - t_k) \leq -\frac{c_k}{q_{\max}} t_k + \frac{c_k}{q_{\min}} D_F(x_k, x^*). \quad (70)$$

Combining (69) and (70) obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right] + c_k (\mathbb{E}_k [t_{k+1}] - t_k) \\ & \leq (1 - \gamma\alpha_k) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + \left(16L\alpha_k^2 - \frac{c_k}{q_{\max}} \right) t_k + P_1^d \alpha_k^2 \\ & \quad + P_2 \alpha_k + \left(\frac{c_k}{q_{\min}} + 8(2L - \mu) \alpha_k^2 \right) D_F(x_k, x^*) \\ & \leq \left(1 - \left(\gamma\alpha_k - \frac{L}{2} \left(8(2L - \mu) \alpha_k^2 + \frac{c_k}{q_{\min}} \right) \right) \right) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 \\ & \quad + \left(16L\alpha_k^2 - \frac{c_k}{q_{\max}} \right) t_k + P_1^d \alpha_k^2 + P_2 \alpha_k, \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where the last inequality uses L -smoothness of the local objective function f_i , $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$. Via setting $c_k = \tilde{c}\alpha_k$ and $0 < \alpha_k \leq \gamma / (16L(2L - \mu))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right] + \frac{\gamma q_{\min} \alpha_k}{L} \mathbb{E}_k [t_{k+1}] \\ & \leq (1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + \left((1 - \frac{1}{q_{\max}}) \frac{q_{\min} \gamma}{L} + 16L\alpha_k \right) \alpha_k t_k \\ & \quad + P_1^d \alpha_k^2 + P_2 \alpha_k. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

We define $U_k := \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 + q_{\min} \gamma \alpha_k t_k / L$, which is non-negative, since t_k is non-negative. We further set $0 < \alpha_k \leq 4\gamma / (\kappa_q (64L^2 + q_{\min} \gamma^2))$ and take the full expectation on the both sides of (72) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U_{k+1}] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2\right] + \frac{q_{\min} \gamma \alpha_k}{L} \mathbb{E}[t_{k+1}] \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4} \alpha_k\right) \mathbb{E}[U_k] + P_1^d \alpha_k^2 + P_2 \alpha_k, \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

where the first inequality is due to the fact that the step-size α_k is decaying. Via summarizing all the upper bounds on the decaying step-size, we attain a feasible selection range as follows:

$$0 < \alpha_k \leq \frac{1}{\kappa_q (64(1 + \kappa_f)^2 + q_{\min})} \frac{1}{\mu}. \quad (74)$$

According to (74), we set $\alpha_k = \theta / (\xi + k)$, $\forall k \geq 0$, with $\theta > 4/\gamma$ and $\xi = \kappa_q (64(1 + \kappa_f)^2 + q_{\min}) \mu \theta$. We next prove

$$\mathbb{E}[U_k] \leq \Xi / (\xi + k) + \tilde{E}, \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (75)$$

by induction. Firstly, for $k = 0$, we know that

$$U_0 \leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4} \alpha_0\right) U_0 + \alpha_0^2 P_1^d + \alpha_0 P_2. \quad (76)$$

Therefore, for a sufficient large but bounded constant \tilde{E} , if $\Xi \geq (\xi - \gamma \theta / 4) U_0 + \theta^2 P_1^d / \xi + \theta P_2 - \xi \tilde{E}$, we have

$$\left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4} \alpha_0\right) U_0 + \alpha_0^2 P_1^d + \alpha_0 P_2 \leq \frac{\Xi}{\xi} + \tilde{E}, \quad (77)$$

with $\alpha_0 = \theta / \xi$. We assume that for $k = k'$, $k' \geq 1$, it satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U_{k'+1}] &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4} \alpha_{k'}\right) \mathbb{E}[U_{k'}] + \alpha_{k'}^2 P_1 + \alpha_{k'} P_2 \\ &\leq \frac{\Xi}{\xi + k'} + \tilde{E}. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

Then, we will prove that for $k = k' + 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}[U_{k'+2}] \leq \frac{\Xi}{\xi + k' + 1} + \tilde{E}, \quad (79)$$

holds true. Define $\tilde{\gamma} := \gamma / 4$, and set $\tilde{E} \geq P_2 / \tilde{\gamma}$ and $\Xi \geq \theta^2 P_1 / (\tilde{\gamma} \theta - 1)$ with $\theta > 1 / \tilde{\gamma}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[U_{k'+2}] \\ &\leq (1 - \tilde{\gamma} \alpha_{k'+1}) \mathbb{E}[U_{k'+1}] + \alpha_{k'+1}^2 P_1 + \alpha_{k'+1} P_2 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{\gamma} \theta}{\xi + k' + 1}\right) \left(\frac{\Xi}{\xi + k'} + \tilde{E}\right) + \frac{\theta^2}{(\xi + k' + 1)^2} P_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{\theta}{\xi + k' + 1} P_2 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{\gamma} \theta}{\xi + k' + 1}\right) \frac{\Xi}{\xi + k'} + \tilde{E} + \frac{\theta^2}{(\xi + k' + 1)^2} P_1 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{\gamma} \theta}{\xi + k' + 1}\right) \frac{\Xi}{\xi + k'} + \tilde{E} + \frac{\Xi(\tilde{\gamma} \theta - 1)}{(\xi + k' + 1)^2} \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{\gamma} \theta}{\xi + k' + 1}\right) \frac{\Xi}{\xi + k'} + \frac{\Xi(\tilde{\gamma} \theta - 1)}{(\xi + k' + 1)(\xi + k')} + \tilde{E} \\ &= \frac{\Xi}{\xi + k' + 1} + \tilde{E}, \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

which means the relation (75) holds true. Via replacing \tilde{E} with its lower bound $E = P_2 / \tilde{\gamma}$, it is straightforward to verify

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|x_k - x^*\|_2^2\right] \leq \frac{\Xi}{\xi + k} + E, \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (81)$$

owing to $t_k \geq 0$. Through specifying r_k and t_k as r_k^u and t_k^u (resp., r_k^w and t_k^w), the sub-linear convergence rate is established for *Prox-DBRO-SAGA* (resp., *Prox-DBRO-LSVRG*).

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Xin, U. A. Khan, and S. Kar, "Fast decentralized nonconvex finite-sum optimization with recursive variance reduction," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 1–28, 2022.
- [2] K. Yuan, B. Ying, J. Liu, and A. H. Sayed, "Variance-reduced stochastic learning under random reshuffling," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 1390–1408, 2020.
- [3] R. Xin, S. Das, U. A. Khan, and S. Kar, "A stochastic proximal gradient framework for decentralized non-convex composite optimization: Topology-independent sample complexity and communication efficiency," *arXiv:2110.01594*, 2021.
- [4] J. Zhai, Y. Jiang, Y. Shi, C. N. Jones, and X. P. Zhang, "Distributionally robust joint chance-constrained dispatch for integrated transmission-distribution systems via distributed optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 2132–2147, 2022.
- [5] H. Li, S. Member, L. Zheng, Z. Wang, Y. Li, and L. Ji, "Asynchronous distributed model predictive control for optimal output consensus of high-order multi-agent systems," *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, vol. 7, pp. 689–698, 2021.
- [6] S. Huang, J. Lei, and Y. Hong, "A linearly convergent distributed Nash equilibrium seeking algorithm for aggregative games," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 1753–1759, 2022.
- [7] Q. Guo, S. Xin, J. Wang, and H. Sun, "Comprehensive security assessment for a cyber physical energy system: a lesson from Ukraine's blackout," *Automation of electric power systems*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 145–147, 2016.
- [8] J. Yan, C. Deng, and C. Wen, "Resilient output regulation in heterogeneous networked systems under Byzantine agents," *Automatica*, vol. 133, p. 109872, 2021.
- [9] L. Lamport, R. Shostak, and M. Pease, "The Byzantine generals problem," in *Concurrency: the Works of Leslie Lamport*, 2019, pp. 203–226.
- [10] F. Saadatnaki, R. Xin, and U. A. Khan, "Decentralized optimization over time-varying directed graphs with row and column-stochastic matrices," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 11, pp. 4769–4780, 2020.
- [11] R. Xin, U. A. Khan, and S. Kar, "Variance-reduced decentralized stochastic optimization with accelerated convergence," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 6255–6271, 2020.
- [12] H. Li, J. Hu, L. Ran, Z. Wang, Q. Lü, Z. Du, and T. Huang, "Decentralized dual proximal gradient algorithms for non-smooth constrained composite optimization problems," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 32, no. 10, pp. 2594–2605, 2021.
- [13] S. Pu, W. Shi, J. Xu, and A. Nedic, "Push-Pull gradient methods for distributed optimization in networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2021.
- [14] M. I. Qureshi, R. Xin, S. Kar, and U. A. Khan, "S-ADDOPT: Decentralized stochastic first-order optimization over directed graphs," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 953–958, 2021.
- [15] H. Li, L. Zheng, Z. Wang, Y. Yan, L. Feng, and J. Guo, "S-DIGing : A stochastic gradient tracking algorithm for distributed optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 53–65, 2022.
- [16] J. Hu, G. Chen, H. Li, Z. Shen, and W. Zhang, "Push-LSVRG-UP: Distributed stochastic optimization over unbalanced directed networks with uncoordinated triggered probabilities," *arXiv:2305.09181*, pp. 1–16, 2023.
- [17] S. Guo, T. Zhang, H. Yu, X. Xie, T. Xiang, and Y. Liu, "Byzantine-resilient decentralized stochastic gradient descent," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 4096–4106, 2021.
- [18] S. Sundaram and B. Gharesifard, "Distributed optimization under adversarial nodes," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 1063–1076, 2019.

[19] M. Yemini, A. Nedić, A. J. Goldsmith, and S. Gil, “Resilient distributed optimization for multi-agent cyberphysical systems,” *arXiv:2212.02459*, 2022.

[20] Z. Zuo, X. Cao, Y. Wang, and W. Zhang, “Resilient consensus of multiagent systems against denial-of-service attacks,” *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 2664–2675, 2022.

[21] E. M. El-Mhamdi, R. Guerraoui, A. Guirguis, L. N. Hoang, and S. Rouault, “Genuinely distributed Byzantine machine learning,” *Distributed Computing*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 305–331, 2022.

[22] C. Fang, Z. Yang, and W. U. Bajwa, “BRIDGE: Byzantine-resilient decentralized gradient descent,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, vol. 8, pp. 610–626, 2022.

[23] J. Li, W. Abbas, M. Shabbir, and X. Koutsoukos, “Byzantine resilient distributed learning in multirobot systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 3550–3563, 2022.

[24] R. Wang, Y. Liu, and Q. Ling, “Byzantine-resilient decentralized resource allocation,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 70, pp. 4711–4726, 2022.

[25] Z. Wu, T. Chen, and Q. Ling, “Byzantine-resilient decentralized stochastic optimization with robust aggregation rules,” *arXiv:2206.04568*, 2022.

[26] J. Peng, W. Li, and Q. Ling, “Byzantine-robust decentralized stochastic optimization over static and time-varying networks,” *Signal Processing*, vol. 183, p. 108020, 2021.

[27] L. Li, W. Xu, T. Chen, G. B. Giannakis, and Q. Ling, “RSA: Byzantine-robust stochastic aggregation methods for distributed learning from heterogeneous datasets,” in *Proceedings of AAAI*, 2019, pp. 1544–1551.

[28] Z. Yang and W. U. Bajwa, “ByRDiE: Byzantine-resilient distributed coordinate descent for decentralized learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 611–627, 2019.

[29] A. Nedic, “Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization,” in *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 1, 2009, pp. 48–61.

[30] L. He, S. P. Karimireddy, and M. Jaggi, “Byzantine-robust decentralized learning via self-centered clipping,” *arXiv:2202.01545*, 2022.

[31] S. Praneeth, K. Lie, and H. Martin, “Learning from history for Byzantine robust optimization,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021, pp. 5311–5319.

[32] X. Ma, X. Sun, Y. Wu, Z. Liu, X. Chen, and C. Dong, “Differentially private Byzantine-robust federated learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 33, no. 12, pp. 3690–3701, 2022.

[33] J. Peng, W. Li, and Q. Ling, “Variance reduction-boosted Byzantine robustness in decentralized stochastic optimization,” in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 4283–4287.

[34] H. Ye, W. Xiong, and T. Zhang, “PMGT-VR: A decentralized proximal-gradient algorithmic framework with variance reduction,” *arXiv:2012.15010*, 2020.

[35] S. A. Alghunaim, E. K. Ryu, K. Yuan, and A. H. Sayed, “Decentralized proximal gradient algorithms with linear convergence rates,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 2787–2794, 2021.

[36] J. Xu, Y. Tian, Y. Sun, and G. Scutari, “Distributed algorithms for composite optimization: Unified framework and convergence analysis,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 69, pp. 3555–3570, 2021.

[37] L. An and G. H. Yang, “Byzantine-resilient distributed state estimation: A min-switching approach,” *Automatica*, vol. 129, p. 109664, 2021.

[38] M. Yemini, A. Nedic, A. Goldsmith, and S. Gil, “Characterizing trust and resilience in distributed consensus for cyberphysical systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 71–91, 2022.

[39] A. Defazio, F. Bach, and S. Lacoste-Julien, “SAGA: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2014, pp. 1646–1654.

[40] D. Kovalev, S. Horvath, and P. Richtarik, “Don’t jump through hoops and remove those loops: SVRG and Katyusha are better without the outer loop,” in *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, 2020, pp. 451–467.

[41] R. Xin, A. K. Sahu, U. A. Khan, and S. Kar, “Distributed stochastic optimization with gradient tracking over strongly-connected networks,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2019, pp. 8353–8358.

[42] S. Bubeck, “Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity,” *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 8, no. 3-4, pp. 231–357, 2015.

[43] W. Ben-ameur, P. Bianchi, and J. Jakubowicz, “Robust distributed consensus using total variation,” vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 1550–1564, 2016.

[44] X. Lian, C. Zhang, H. Zhang, C. J. Hsieh, W. Zhang, and J. Liu, “Can decentralized algorithms outperform centralized algorithms? A case study for decentralized parallel stochastic gradient descent,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017, pp. 5331–5341.

[45] P. Ramanan, D. Li, and N. Gebraeel, “Blockchain-based decentralized replay attack detection for large-scale power systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 4727–4739, 2022.

[46] E. Gorbunov, F. Hanzely, and P. Richtárik, “A unified theory of SGD: Variance reduction, sampling, quantization and coordinate descent,” in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2019, pp. 680–690.

[47] X. Li, Z. Zhu, A. M.-c. So, and J. D. Lee, “Incremental methods for weakly convex optimization,” *arXiv:1907.11687*, 2022.

[48] C. Xi and U. A. Khan, “Distributed subgradient projection algorithm over directed graphs,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 3986–3992, 2017.