
TOWARDS HYPER-PARAMETER-FREE FEDERATED LEARNING

Geetika, Drishya Uniyal, Bapi Chatterjee*
 Department of Computer Science & Engineering
 IIT-Delhi, New Delhi, India
 {geetikai, drishyau, bapi}@iiitd.ac.in

ABSTRACT

The adaptive synchronization techniques in federated learning (FL) for scaled global model updates show superior performance over the vanilla federated averaging (FEDAVG) scheme. However, existing methods employ additional tunable hyperparameters on the server to determine the scaling factor. A contrasting approach is automated scaling analogous to tuning-free step-size schemes in stochastic gradient descent (SGD) methods, which offer competitive convergence rates and exhibit good empirical performance. In this work, we introduce two algorithms for automated scaling of global model updates. In our first algorithm, we establish that a descent-ensuring step-size regime at the clients ensures descent for the server objective. We show that such a scheme enables linear convergence for strongly convex federated objectives. Our second algorithm shows that the average of objective values of sampled clients is a practical and effective substitute for the objective function value at the server required for computing the scaling factor, whose computation is otherwise not permitted. Our extensive empirical results show that the proposed methods perform at par or better than the popular federated learning algorithms for both convex and non-convex problems. Our work takes a step towards designing hyper-parameter-free federated learning.

1 Introduction

Federated Learning (FL) refers to a framework for training machine learning (ML) models on a distributed system without exchanging data (McMahan et al., 2017). In the age of constraints on data centralization, it has gained popularity as a paradigm even for training large models (Jianyi Zhang et al., 2024). Often, the distributed system includes a node designated as a *server* which stores the *global model* – a synchronized state of the *local models* trained at peer nodes termed as *clients*. To reduce the cost of communication, it is standard that the clients perform local training for several gradient update steps before communicating with the server.

FEDAVG, a basic FL scheme (McMahan et al., 2017), updates the global model to the average of the local models received from the available clients. The clients train their local models executing stochastic gradient descent (SGD) (Robbins and Monro, 1951) updates. FEDAVG suffers from heterogeneity in data distribution (T. Li et al., 2020), in addition to that in participation frequency of clients. It also underperforms in training deep models, such as attention models (Jingzhao Zhang et al., 2020), wherein SGD shows similar trends.

Mitigating the effects of heterogeneity primarily depends on synchronization between the optimization dynamics of clients and the trajectory of the global model. For this, FEDPROX (T. Li et al., 2020) introduces a proximal term in clients’ objectives with respect to the global model. Similarly, SCAFFOLD (Karimireddy et al., 2020) introduces control variates at server and clients to check the *client drifts*. FEDDYN (Durmus et al., 2021) proposes an additional regularization term for clients’ objectives similar to FEDPROX. However, beyond a modified local objective, FEDPROX, SCAFFOLD, FEDDYN, update the global model to an average of the local models received at a synchronization round.

*This work is supported in part by the Indo-French Centre for the Promotion of Advanced Research (IFCPAR/CEFIPRA) through the FedAutoMoDL project, the Infosys Center for Artificial Intelligence (CAI) at IIT-Delhi through the Scalable Federated Learning project. Geetika is partially supported by the INSPIRE fellowship No: DST/INSPIRE Fellowship/[IF220579] offered by the Department of Science & Technology (DST), Government of India.

Adaptive scaling approaches, by contrast, conceptualize the server’s model update – the difference between the model communicated to and the average of models received from available clients – as a *pseudo-gradient*, and use it to run a step of first-order optimization on the global model. Exemplars include FEDADAGRAD, FEDADAM, FEDYOGI (Reddi et al., 2021) methods, who use this pseudo-gradient for one-step of ADAGRAD (Duchi, Hazan, and Singer, 2011), ADAM (Kingma and Ba, 2015), and YOGI, (Zaheer et al., 2018), respectively. FEDAVG can be interpreted as a gradient descent process on the global model, utilizing the pseudo-gradient with a unit step-size. Essentially, the step-size of the one-step *pseudo-gradient descent* at the server is the scaling factor for the scaled global model update.

The proliferation of hyperparameters is an inherent characteristic of adaptive federated algorithms. For instance, (Reddi et al., 2021) (a) includes two momentum hyperparameters, which are generally robust across applications, (b) needs to tune the local and global step-sizes periodically, and (c) introduces an adaptivity hyperparameter, which they effortfully tune via extensive grid search and show that the convergence behavior heavily relies on it.

The practical performance of SGD heavily depends on its step-size (Schaul, S. Zhang, and LeCun, 2013). In fact, in many cases, SGD with well-tuned step-sizes generalizes better than ADAM for deep models (Wilson et al., 2017; Zhou et al., 2020). This observation serves as a key motivation for designing automated step-size tuning schemes for SGD as an alternative to the celebrated adaptive methods such as ADAM, ADAGRAD, and YOGI.

Tuning-free step-size schemes find an essential place in the journey of gradient-based optimization. Not long ago, Vaswani et al. (2019) proposed a line-search for SGD step-size applying a stochastic variant of classical Armijo scheme (Armijo, 1966). They proved that under an interpolation condition generally satisfied by models such as deep neural networks (C. Zhang et al., 2016), boosting (Bartlett et al., 1998), etc., SGD achieves the convergence rate of full batch gradient descent. Contemporarily, Berrada, Zisserman, and Kumar (2018) designed a scheme for setting up the SGD step-size based on an insight that an iteration of SGD with regularization can be formulated as minimization of a linear objective, which could be solved using Frank-Wolfe algorithm (Frank and Wolfe, 1956) in dual; they named it DEEP FRANK-WOLFE (DFW). Though DFW does not have a convergence theory, their performance and generalization on both convex and non-convex models are impressive.

Server’s step-size plays a significant role in determining the optimization trajectory of the federated model as seen in Malinovsky, Mishchenko, and Richtárik (2023). They suggested that small step-sizes on clients reduce their drifts, and larger step-sizes on the server can offset the resulting slowdown. FEDEXP (Jhunjunwala, S. Wang, and Joshi, 2023b) subsequently identified limitations in arbitrarily large server step-sizes and excessively small client step-sizes, introducing a global model update extrapolation method derived from projected convex optimization (Pierra, 1984). H. Li, Acharya, and Richtarik (2024) extended FEDEXP to incorporate proximal objectives on clients.

Automated scaling of global model updates clearly holds significant promise, particularly in light of recent findings on how server step-size influences federated learning processes (Malinovsky, Mishchenko, and Richtárik, 2023). However, a key challenge in developing such a scheme lies in evaluating the global objective function. The federated learning paradigm, with its emphasis on client data privacy, precludes the server from directly computing the global objective. Consequently, we must seek a substitute, potentially utilizing the local objectives.

This work introduces new automated scaling techniques for the global model updates on the server of a federated learning system. We present the following two algorithms:

1. **Federated Line-search (FEDLI-LS):** We establish that the tuning-free ARMIJO line-search on clients is directly translated into an automated scaled global model update on the orchestrating server. To elaborate, clients execute SGD updates using ARMIJO line search, whereas, the server performs an update on the global model using a weighted average of the differences in clients’ model states. With that, we show that the global model will have a guaranteed descent in convex and strongly-convex cases.
Often the clients also communicate their step-size together with the model. Inspired by (Malinovsky, Mishchenko, and Richtárik, 2023), that a larger server-side step-size offsets the small client-side step-size, we heuristically selects the maximum value from the set of local step sizes to scale the global model update at the server.
2. **Federated Linearized Updates (FEDLI-LU):** An optimal scaling factor for global model updates is computed by minimization of a loss-preserving linearization of federated objective. More specifically, clients perform SGD updates and communicate the objective function value along with the model. The server uses a weighted average of model state differences as a pseudo-gradient and weighted average of clients’ function values as the *pseudo-objective* value to perform a DFW-like update to the global model.

The FEDLI algorithms communicate only one extra word, thus, incurring negligible extra communication overhead. FEDLI-LS ensures a global objective descent as a consequence of the guaranteed descents in local loss values. FEDLI-LU, conceptually, at every synchronization round, solves a *pseudo linear approximation* of the global objective using FRANK-WOLFE algorithm in dual. We exhibit the efficacy of both FEDLI methods on extensive image classification and language tasks with heterogeneity in clients’ data.

Our contributions can be summed up as the following:

- We introduce a framework for automating the scaling factor for global model updates in federated learning. In this framework, we propose two practically efficient algorithms. (Section 3)
- We prove linear convergence for strongly convex objectives and the standard sub-linear rates for convex and general non-convex problems for FEDLI-LS algorithm. (Section 5)
- The proposed method FEDLI-LU introduces a formulation for the global model updates based on the solution of a new pseudo-linearization of the global objective, which results in effective empirical convergence across deep learning tasks. (Section 6)
- We extensively demonstrate the efficacy of FEDLI methods on various deep learning tasks. (Section 7)

2 System Model and Optimization Algorithm

We consider a federated learning system with a *server* and N *clients/devices* to train a *model* $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$, on which T number of *synchronization rounds* take place. We consider that $\mathcal{S}_t \subset [N]$ is the subset of devices sampled at the synchronization round $t \in [T]$ to perform *local* optimization. For simplicity, we take $|\mathcal{S}_t| = S \forall t \in [T]$. On this system, we aim to solve the following optimization problem

$$\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(w) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(w), \quad (1)$$

where f_i denotes the objective function of the i -th client for $i \in [N]$ and f is referred to as the *global objective* function.

The clients run an iterative stochastic gradient-based optimization (2) At the beginning of the t^{th} round, each participating client $i \in \mathcal{S}_t$ stores identical local copies of the model $w_{t,0}^i = w_t$ and performs K local optimization steps to update it to $w_{t,K}^i$ as the following iteration:

$$w_{t,k+1}^i = w_{t,k}^i - \eta_{t,k}^i g_{t,k}^i, \text{ for } k \in [K-1], \quad (2)$$

where $\eta_{t,k}^i$ is the step-size in the k -th local step. The stochastic gradient $g_{t,k}^i(w)$ is an unbiased estimator of the gradient of local objective $\nabla f_i(w)$, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}[g_{t,k}^i(w)] = \nabla f_i(w) \quad (3)$$

for all $t \in [T]$, $k \in [K-1]$, and $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

2.1 Analytical Assumptions

Assumption 1 (Smoothness) *The functions f_i are L -smooth, i.e., for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds that*

$$f_i(y) \leq f_i(x) + \nabla f_i(x)^\top (y - x) + \frac{L}{2} \|y - x\|^2. \quad (4)$$

It is straightforward to prove that f as a sum of L -smooth functions is also L -smooth.

Assumption 2 (Convexity) *When needed, we specify that the functions f_i are convex, i.e., for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds that*

$$f_i(y) \geq f_i(x) + \nabla f_i(x)^\top (y - x). \quad (5)$$

Therein, is straightforward to prove that f is also convex as the sum of convex functions.

Assumption 3 (Strong-Convexity) *When needed, we specify that the functions f_i are μ -strongly convex, i.e., for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds that*

$$f_i(y) \geq f_i(x) + \nabla f_i(x)^\top (y - x) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|y - x\|^2. \quad (6)$$

Therein, is straightforward to prove that f is also μ -strongly convex as the sum of μ -strongly convex functions.

Assumption 4 (Bounded Variance) *We assume that the variance of $g_{t,k}^i(w)$ is bounded by a constant G , given as*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|g_{t,k}^i(w) - \nabla f_i(w)\|^2] \leq G. \quad (7)$$

For the result in non-convex cases, we assume that clients' objective functions are Lipschitz.

Assumption 5 (β - Lipschitz) The functions f_i are β -Lipschitz, i.e., for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds that

$$\|f_i(y) - f_i(x)\| \leq \beta \|y - x\|^2. \quad (8)$$

Moreover, f_i are β -Lipschitz \iff for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds that $\|\nabla f_i\| \leq \beta$. Using the sum of functions, f is also β -Lipschitz.

3 FEDLI Algorithms

Algorithm 1: A framework for FEDLI methods for a Federated Learning Server.

```

1: initialize  $w_0$ 
2: for each round  $t = 1, 2, \dots$  do
3:   Server sends  $w_t$  to all clients
4:    $\mathcal{S}_t \leftarrow$  (random set of  $S$  clients);
5:   for each client  $i \in \mathcal{S}_t$  in parallel do
6:      $(w_{t,K}^i, \eta_{t,K}^i, f_{t,K}^i) \leftarrow$  CLIENTUPDATE( $w_t$ , initial-constants, client-algo);
7:      $\Delta_t^i \leftarrow w_t - w_{t,K}^i$ ;  $\Delta_t = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t} \Delta_t^i$ ;
8:      $f_t^g \leftarrow$  FUNCTIONSYNC( $f_{t,K}^i$ , server-algo);
9:      $\eta_t^g \leftarrow$  STEPSIZESYNC( $\eta_{t,K}^i$ , server-algo);
10:     $w_{t+1} \leftarrow$  SERVERUPDATE( $w_t, f_t^g, \Delta_t, \eta_t^g$ , server-algo);

```

The interface for the FEDLI algorithms is given as the pseudo-code in Algorithm 1. We start with selecting a random subset of clients and call CLIENTUPDATE method on them. The CLIENTUPDATE method runs SGD or its variant such as SGD with ARMIJO line-search scheme depending on the variable client-algo, see line 6. CLIENTUPDATE method returns the evaluated client’s objective and its step-size at the last iteration in addition to the local model. The interface allows us to implement any model training optimization algorithm on the clients.

To implement FEDLI-LS, we set client-algo as Armijo-sgd, whereas to implement FEDLI-LU, we set it sgd. For a self-contained reading we have included Armijo-sgd in Appendix A in the supplementary material.

After a call to CLIENTUPDATE method, the server computes the global model state difference Δ_t , the pseudo-gradient, as in line 7 similar to (Reddi et al., 2021), (Jhunjhunwala, S. Wang, and Joshi, 2023b), (H. Li, Acharya, and Richtarik, 2024), etc. Additionally, the objective values and the step-sizes of the clients are synchronized at lines 8 and 9, respectively.

Step-size and Objective Synchronization. Before calling SERVERUPDATE, the framework provides synchronization methods for the objective function values and step-sizes received from the clients. The method FUNCTIONSYNC and STEPSIZESYNC returns a global pseudo-objective and step-size depending on the method and objective class. For example, for FEDLI-LU algorithm, we do a weighted averaging of clients’ objective values in FUNCTIONSYNC. For FEDLI-LS algorithm, a call to FUNCTIONSYNC is not required.

For convex problems, FEDLI-LS guarantees descent in the server’s objective when we use a unit η_t^g , which is accordingly implemented in STEPSIZESYNC. For non-convex problems the server’s step size remains tunable in FEDLI-LS, where we apply the heuristic in a call to STEPSIZESYNC to select the maximum of the clients’ step-sizes. FEDLI-LU algorithm does not require STEPSIZESYNC as the step-size is computed in a SERVERUPDATE call.

Algorithm 2: The SERVERUPDATE method for FEDLI-LU.

Require: proximal coefficient η , weight-decay λ , pseudo-gradient Δ_t , pseudo-objective f_t^g , model-state w_t .

```

1:  $r_t = \lambda w_t$  ▷ Derivative of regularization
2:  $\gamma_t = \left( -\eta \Delta_t^T r_t + \frac{s_t^T f_t^g}{\eta \|\Delta_t\|^2} \right)$  clipped to  $[0, 1]$ 
▷  $s_t$  is the dual direction discussed in Appendix A.
3: Return  $w_{t+1} = w_t - \eta (r_t + \gamma_t \Delta_t)$ 

```

SERVERUPDATE method implements one step of a gradient-based iterative optimization. On passing GD as `server-algo` for implementing FEDLI-LS, it simply calls one step of gradient descent with step-size as η_t^g and the pseudo-gradient Δ_t . We pass DFW as `server-algo` for implementing FEDLI-LU. The SERVERUPDATE method for FEDLI-LU is given in Algorithm 2, which we discuss further in Appendix A in the supplementary material.

4 Related Work

We discussed several federated learning algorithms in Section 1. Indeed, the landscape of FL algorithms is now rich, which also includes second-order model updates: FEDDANE (Tian Li et al., 2019) and FEDNEW (Elgabli et al., 2022); still, the first-order methods are popular for their low per-iteration costs. The implementation strategy our work is close to FEDOPT framework of (Reddi et al., 2021). MOON (Q. Li, B. He, and Song, 2021) and FEDPROTO (Tan et al., 2022) also communicate extra information in addition to the model from clients to the server though their objectives for this communication are different.

In (Malinovsky, Mishchenko, and Richtárik, 2023), authors proposed incorporating a server step-size as a scaling factor, partial participation and client reshuffling. They derived convergence guarantees for strongly-convex, general convex and non-convex setting obtaining theoretical bounds on server step-size. A key insight of this work is that small client step-size and a large server step-size gives better convergence.

In recent work, (Jhunjhunwala, S. Wang, and Joshi, 2023a) presented both the theoretical and practical aspects of utilizing a scaled model update on the server. They applied a generalized gradient descent and derived the step-size by drawing an analogy between the over-parametrized federated setting and the process of finding projections on convex sets, using the adaptive relaxation coefficient in the Projections Onto Convex Sets (POCS) algorithm (Combettes, 1997). They assume an approximate projection in the federated learning context and motivate their server step-size based on the aggregated model state differences among clients. Their analysis shows that the distance between global iterates generated by FEDEXP and the global optimum is monotonically decreasing; however, this does not necessarily imply descent. For partial participation of devices in FEDEXP, computation of global step-size requires approximation of model state difference.

By contrast, FEDLI-LS, ensures descent for global objectives in the context of convex functions. Unlike FEDEXP, whose theoretical convergence has been examined in a deterministic full gradient setting, our analysis of FEDLI-LS incorporates both the stochastic nature of local gradient descent steps and the partial participation of clients. Empirically, the performance of FEDLI-LS and FEDLI-LU is on par with that of FEDEXP.

(H. Li, Acharya, and Richtarik, 2024) further examine extrapolation with FEDPROX in Federated setting, using constant and adaptive extrapolation under partial participation. They explore two variants of adaptive extrapolation as a server step-size based on gradient diversity and stochastic Polyak step-size using the proximal operator and Moreau envelope, respectively. However, the theoretical guarantees are laid out for convex objectives under the interpolation regime, where $\nabla f_i(x^*) = 0, \forall i \in [N]$.

In terms of theoretical guarantees, before this paper, two existing works offer linear convergence rates for strongly convex objectives: the FEDLIN algorithm (Mitra et al., 2021) and FEDEXPROX of (H. Li, Acharya, and Richtarik, 2024). FEDLIN achieves linear ergodic convergence – convergence of function of averaged model over iterates – for smooth and strongly convex objectives in the deterministic setting. In the stochastic setting, FEDLIN maintains a standard sublinear convergence even for strongly convex objectives. By contrast, our work demonstrates a linear convergence even in the stochastic setting with partial client participation. Moreover, our convergence is stronger – convergence of squared norm of iterates’ distance from the optimal. The convergence behaviour and rate for strongly convex objectives in FEDEXPROX (H. Li, Acharya, and Richtarik, 2024), by virtue of constant extrapolation for the server-side step size is linear. However, they do it under the stricter conditions of the interpolation regime with full participation. By contrast, our result in Theorem 2 is established under partial participation.

5 Convergence of FEDLI-LS

We denote the global model state after the t -th global round as w_t , the local model states at client i for k -th local round is denoted by $w_{t,k+1}^i$, where $k \in 1, 2, \dots, K$. Rewriting equation (2), the local SGD update is given by

$$w_{t,k}^i = w_{t,k-1}^i - \eta_{t,k}^i g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i),$$

where $\eta_{t,k}^i$ is tuned using ARMIJO line-search for local SGD updates. The Armijo search at local steps translates to a line search that minimizes the global model as shown in Lemma 6.

The model state difference for client i , computed after K epochs is $\Delta_{t,i} = (w_t - w_{t,k}^i)$. $\Delta_{t,i}$ is then communicated to the server for aggregation, given by

$$\Delta_t = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t} \Delta_{t,i}.$$

The K -local rounds accumulate the gradients on $(K-1)$ -local updates with $w_{t,0}^i = w_t$ are given as

$$w_{t,K}^i = w_t - \sum_{k=1}^K \eta_{t,k}^i g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)$$

We define the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot | W_t]$ with respect to the filtration W_t . The filtration W_t for each time step $t \geq 1$ incorporates all accumulated randomness, including that arising from client sampling and the SGD updates on each client. The total expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ evaluates the integrated effect of randomness across the entire learning process. The convergence proofs are derived for L -smooth functions f_i under the assumption of a common Lipschitz constant L for each function f_i . These results can be generalized to different L_i 's for each function f_i , allowing for a broader application of the proofs to scenarios where the smoothness characteristics of the functions vary. We use \sum_k to denote $\sum_{k=1}^K$, \sum_i to denote $\sum_{i=1}^N$, and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t}$ to denote summation over $i \in \mathcal{S}_t$.

We assume that

$$\max_i \max_K \max_t \eta_{t,k}^i = \eta_{\max}. \quad (9)$$

Definition 1 (Armijo Condition) For the k -th step in the t -th communication round, the Armijo condition for the local objective functions f_i with a constant $c > 0$ is given by

$$f_i(w_{t,k}^i) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) \leq -c \eta_{t,k}^i \|g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2. \quad (10)$$

Line-search for the step-size for each client begins with this η_{\max} and until $\eta_{t,k}^i$ is obtained that fulfils the Armijo condition. For the sake of completeness, we present the proof for bounds on the step-size using Equation 10 as given in Lemma 1 in Vaswani et al. (2019).

Lemma 1 Under Assumption 4, the second moment of model state difference averaged over the \mathcal{S}_t devices participating in t -th communication round is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2] \leq \frac{(\eta_{\max})^2 K}{S} \sum_{k,i} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2] + (\eta_{\max})^2 K^2 G, \quad (11)$$

where $\eta_{\max} \geq \eta_{t,k}^i$ for all clients i .

The proof of Lemma 1 is included in Appendix B in the supplementary. We will use Lemma 1 to show that Armijo search for local step-size minimizes the global function.

For completeness, we include a discussion on bounds on the step-size using Equation 10, which is directly derived from Lemma 1 of Vaswani et al. (2019).

Lemma 2 Armijo line search, when applied at each client i , determines the step-size $\eta_{t,k}^i$, constrained to lie in $(0, \eta_{\max}]$, that is bounded below as follows:

$$\eta_{t,k}^i \geq \min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\},$$

where $0 < c < 1$ is a constant associated with the Armijo condition.

The proof of Lemma 2 is included in the supplementary material in Appendix B.

Lemma 3 Using Lemma 2, Armijo line search 10 for K local steps after t -th communication round is equivalent to a line search for minimizing global objective function over local parameter updates as the following:

$$\mathbb{E} [f(w_{t,K}^i) - f(w_t)] \leq -\min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \left(\frac{c\rho}{(\eta_{\max})^2 K} \mathbb{E} [\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t] + (1-\rho) cKG \right). \quad (12)$$

Particularly, under assumption 2 when f_i s are convex, the Armijo line search locally at the clients gives the following descent condition for the global objective at the server

$$\mathbb{E}[f(w_{t+1}) - f(w_t)] \leq -\min\left\{\frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max}\right\} \left(\frac{c\rho}{(\eta_{\max})^2 K} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t] + (1-\rho)cKG\right), \quad (13)$$

where $\rho = \frac{S}{N}$ and $c \leq 1$.

The proof of Lemma 3 is deferred to Appendix B.

Remark 1 *The curvature property of convex (or, strongly convex) functions*

$$f\left(\sum_i \lambda_i x\right) \leq \sum_i \lambda_i f(x), \text{ where } \sum_i \lambda_i = 1, \text{ and } \forall i, \lambda_i \in [0, 1],$$

ensures descent of the global objective. Thus, for convex objectives the descent in the global function comes for free.

Remark 2 *For not necessarily convex functions, the descent is ensured locally after K local steps following the ARMIJO step-size selection scheme. However, it does not necessarily imply a descent for the global objective.*

For a counterexample, consider two clients C_1 and C_2 with non-convex objectives f_1 and f_2 , respectively, such that $f_1(x) = 3x^3 - x^2$ and $f_2(x) = x^2 - x^3$. Hence, the global objective is $f(x) = x^3$. If $x_0 = 1$ and 1-step local SGD yields $x_{1,1} = 0.8$ for f_1 and $x_{2,1} = 1.5$ for f_2 , ensuring local descent for both C_1 and C_2 . The average of the local updates for the two devices gives the next global iterate $x_1 = 1.15$, but it does not give descent for the global objective as $f(x_1) > f(x_0)$.

It is standard to keep a tunable η_g on the server (Karimireddy et al., 2020; Reddi et al., 2021), which is further motivated in (Malinovsky, Mishchenko, and Richtárik, 2023). Considering this, we derive the remaining results with a constant η_g , which remains valid for the convex and strongly-convex cases too, for which $\eta_g = 1$.

Lemma 4 *Under the Assumption 1 and 2, the Armijo line search bounds the expected aggregated model state difference across all clients i and k local rounds*

$$\sum_{i,k} \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w_{t,K}^i\|^2] \leq \frac{\eta_{\max} N K^2}{c} \mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1})]. \quad (14)$$

The proof of Lemma 4 is included in Appendix B. The Lemma also extends to strongly-convex objectives.

The global update using the averaged model state difference Δ_t and a global step-size η_g is given as

$$w_{t+1} = w_t - \eta_g \Delta_t.$$

Lemma 3 ensures the descent of convex and strongly convex global objectives at subsequent global updates using the Armijo condition for K rounds locally at clients. We assume a constant η_g for theoretical analysis.

5.1 Convergence Theory for Convex Objectives

We now describe the convergence for convex functions.

Theorem 1 *Under the Assumption 1, 2 and 4, FEDLI-LS with $\max\left\{\frac{L\eta_{\max}(\eta_g+2K\rho)}{2\rho(2+L\eta_{\max}K)}, \left(\frac{\eta_g}{2\rho} + \frac{\eta_{\max}LK}{2}\right)\right\} < c \leq 1$ achieves the convergence rate*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\bar{w}_t) - f(w^*)] \leq \max\left\{\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}T}, \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}T}\right\} \|w_0 - w^*\|^2 - \min\left\{\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}}, \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}}\right\} \frac{(1-\rho)}{\rho} \eta_{\max}^2 K^2 G, \quad (15)$$

where $\mathcal{R} := \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \left(2 - \frac{L\eta_g \eta_{\max}}{2(1-c)\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{\max}LK}{c}\right)$ and $\mathcal{K} := \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \left(2 - \frac{\eta_g}{\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{\max}LK}{c}\right)$.

The proof of Theorem 1 is included in Appendix B. Theorem 1 shows a sublinear convergence for convex problems.

5.2 Convergence Theory for Strongly-convex Objectives

Theorem 2 Under the Assumption 1, 3 and 4, FEDLI-LS with $\max\left\{\frac{L\eta_{\max}(\eta_g+2K\rho)}{2\rho(2+L\eta_{\max}K)}, \left(\frac{\eta_g}{2\rho} + \frac{\eta_{\max}LK}{2}\right)\right\} < c \leq 1$ achieves the convergence rate

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w_T - w^*\|^2] \leq (1 - \eta_g\eta_{\max}\mu K)^{T+1} \|w_0 - w^*\|^2, \quad (16)$$

where $\mathcal{R} := \eta_g\eta_{\max}K \left(2 - \frac{L\eta_g\eta_{\max}}{2(1-c)\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{\max}LK}{c}\right)$ and $\mathcal{K} := \eta_g\eta_{\max}K \left(2 - \frac{\eta_g}{\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{\max}LK}{c}\right)$.

The proof of Theorem 2 is included in the supplementary in Appendix B. Theorem 2 shows a *linear convergence* for strongly-convex problems.

5.3 Convergence Theory for Non-convex Objectives

Theorem 3 Under the Assumption 1, 4 and 5, FEDLI-LS achieves the convergence rate

$$\min_{t=0, \dots, T-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2] \leq \frac{2}{\eta_g\eta_{\max}KT} \mathbb{E}[f(w_0) - f(w_T)] + L\eta_{\max}K \left(\frac{\beta^2}{\rho} + G\right) \left(\frac{2^{K+1}}{K^2} L\eta_{\max} + \eta_g\right) \quad (17)$$

The proof of Theorem 3 is included in Appendix B in the supplementary. Theorem 3 shows a sub-linear convergence for non-convex problems where the gradient is bounded.

6 Deep Frank-Wolfe for Global Model Update

Here we discuss the formation of the FEDLI-LU method. We provide this discussion for a self-contained reading. A reader can refer to (Berrada, Zisserman, and Kumar, 2018) for details. Consider a supervised learning task implemented in this federated setting with clients running SGD locally. For simplicity, we assume that only one local step is performed by each client at every synchronization round. Consider a sample j picked randomly by a client $i \in \mathcal{S}_t$ in the t^{th} synchronization round. Let the output of the deep learning model be denoted by $O_j^i(w_t)$ over which the loss function $f_j^i(\cdot)$ is applied. Consider a regularizer $r(w)$ applied to the objective. Then we can see a global model update step for regularized objective as

$$w_{t+1} = w_t - \eta (\nabla r(w_t) + \nabla f_j^i(O_j^i(w_t))). \quad (18)$$

As in (Berrada, Zisserman, and Kumar, 2018), using (Bubeck et al., 2015), equation 18 can be written as the following proximal problem:

$$w_{t+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\eta} \|w - w_t\|^2 + \mathcal{T}(r(w_t)) + \mathcal{T}(f_j^i(O_j^i(w_t))) \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{T}(\cdot)$ denotes Taylor's first order approximation and η is the proximal coefficient. Now, to preserve the geometry of the loss function, we formulate a loss-preserving linearization as the following:

$$w_{t+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\eta} \|w - w_t\|^2 + \mathcal{T}(r(w_t)) + f_j^i(\mathcal{T}(O_j^i(w_t))) \right\}, \quad (19)$$

Considering a convex and piecewise-linear loss function, such as multi-class hinge loss, the dual of the optimization problem 19 can be solved using the Frank-Wolfe method, which Berrada, Zisserman, and Kumar (2018) applied. With that, an optimal step size of the dual can be obtained as $\gamma_t \in [0, 1]$. Using that, the update rule can be formulated as

$$w_{t+1} = w_t - \eta (\nabla r(w_t) + \gamma_t \nabla f_j^i(O_j^i(w_t))).$$

Notice that, with the standard cross-entropy loss over neural networks, convergence of DFW algorithm is not established, though the empirical results establish an impressive convergence behaviour.

Here, we include a discussion for the case where the step-size γ_t Berrada, Zisserman, and Kumar (2018) is calculated during each iteration multi-class hinge loss function f . The multi-class hinge loss is given by:

$$f_{\text{hinge}}(x, y) = \max_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \{x_{\hat{y}} + \Delta(\hat{y}, y) - x_y\} \quad (20)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}|}$ is the vector of scores, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ is the true class label, and $\Delta(\hat{y}, y)$ is the classification task loss defined as

$$\Delta(\hat{y}, y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \hat{y} = y, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

To derive the optimal step-size γ_t , we refer to the formulation provided in the appendix of (Berrada, Zisserman, and Kumar, 2018). The Lagrangian dual of loss-preserving linearized problem 19 is constructed using f_{hinge} . After choosing a dual direction s_t , the optimal-step size γ_t is evaluated in closed-form. In this context, the pseudo-gradient Δ_t is used as a substitute of the dual conditional gradient for FEDLI-LU server update analogous to DFW update.

Using Δ_t , the optimal step-size γ_t is calculated as:

$$\gamma_t = -\eta \Delta_t^T r_t + \frac{s_t^T f_t^g}{\eta \|\Delta_t\|^2} \text{ clipped to } [0, 1]. \quad (21)$$

where r_t is the gradient of the regularizer.

The step-size γ_t will be theoretically optimal for the hinge-loss based federated objectives, thereby eliminating the need for manual tuning. Our empirical results show that FEDLI-LU algorithm achieves impressive generalization performance even for cross-entropy loss.

7 Experiments and Numerical Results




Figure 1: Train Loss for training deep models for 500 synchronization rounds.




Figure 2: Top-1 test accuracy of training deep models for 500 synchronization rounds.

Implementation: We implemented Algorithm 1 on FedML federated Learning framework (C. He et al., 2020). We compare FEDLI-LS and FEDLI-LU algorithms with FEDAVG (McMahan et al., 2017), FEDPROX (T. Li et al., 2020), SCAFFOLD (Karimireddy et al., 2020), and FEDADAM (Reddi et al., 2021) and FedExp (Jhunjunwala, S. Wang, and Joshi, 2023a) (incorporated in FedML). The default hyperparameters as mentioned in papers were taken for competing algorithms. We compute mini-batch gradients on clients with a fixed batch size of 32 per task. We sample 10 clients per round out of a total of 100 clients. Clients are sampled uniformly at random without replacement in each round

but with replacement across rounds. Following Reddi et al. (2021), we fix $K = 1$ number of local epochs throughout. We conduct 500 training rounds to track the top-1 test accuracy and train loss. Train loss is the average of the same communicated by the participating clients. The experiments are run on Nvidia A6000 GPUs with 48 GB memory on board. We report the results as average of 5 runs with different randomization seeds. The code is available at <https://github.com/zk23du/FedLi>

Datasets and Architecture: We evaluate the proposed algorithms on comprehensive benchmarks of image classifications and text prediction tasks. We use three datasets: CIFAR-10 (Krizhevsky, 2009), Federated Extended MNIST (FE-MNIST) (Caldas et al., 2018), and SHAKESPEARE (Caldas et al., 2018). The first two datasets consist of images, while the last one is text-based. The CIFAR-10 dataset consisting of 50000 training samples and 10000 test samples were divided amongst the clients using the Dirichlet distribution $Dir_S(\alpha)$ (H. Wang et al., 2019), where α determines the degree of heterogeneity across S clients. In particular, we set the Dirichlet parameter $\alpha = 0.1$ for a high degree of heterogeneity. For CIFAR-10, we train a RESNET-18 model, replacing batch normalization with group normalization (Hsieh et al., 2020). For FE-MNIST, we train a CNN for character recognition. The SHAKESPEARE dataset is used to train an RNN for next-character prediction.

Results of the experiments are plotted as training loss in Figure 1 and Top-1 test accuracy in Figure 2. Across the model and dataset combinations, we can see that the FEDLI-LS and FEDLI-LU methods outperform their competitors. We note that (Reddi et al., 2021) trained RESNET-18 on CIFAR-10 for 4000 rounds. Similarly, they trained the RNN on SHAKESPEARE for 1200 rounds. As against them, we trained each model for 500 synchronization rounds only. In this regard, the epoch-to-accuracy performance of the proposed algorithms are clearly superior to the their counterparts. In Appendix C, we present more results that show the efficacy of our approach.

8 Conclusion

This paper presents a framework FEDLI for federated learning where clients communicate the step-size and local objective values in addition to the model at every synchronization round. The communicated values are synchronized alongside the model and used to efficiently scale the global model updates. An interesting result presented in this work shows that if the local optimizers on the clients ensure descent, the global updates will follow that for convex objectives. This result enables various line search techniques to be incorporated in our framework without losing their convergence guarantees in the federated setting. Note that, for such schemes where descent is guaranteed, extra computation comes as an inherent character of the algorithm, which is then translated in to the federated algorithm as well; this can be seen in our FEDLI-LS algorithm.

We presented the convergence rates for convex, strongly-convex, and non-convex objectives and showed that for strongly-convex objectives it achieve a linear rate, which is available in only a couple of previous works.

References

- Armijo, Larry (1966). “Minimization of functions having Lipschitz continuous first partial derivatives”. In: *Pacific Journal of mathematics* 16.1, pp. 1–3 (cit. on p. 2).
- Bartlett, Peter et al. (1998). “Boosting the margin: A new explanation for the effectiveness of voting methods”. In: *The annals of statistics* 26.5, pp. 1651–1686 (cit. on p. 2).
- Berrada, Leonard, Andrew Zisserman, and M Pawan Kumar (2018). “Deep Frank-Wolfe For Neural Network Optimization”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations* (cit. on pp. 2, 8, 9, 13, 14).
- Bubeck, Sébastien et al. (2015). “Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity”. In: *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 8.3-4, pp. 231–357 (cit. on p. 8).
- Caldas, Sebastian et al. (2018). “Leaf: A benchmark for federated settings”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.01097* (cit. on p. 10).
- Combettes, P.L. (1997). “Convex set theoretic image recovery by extrapolated iterations of parallel subgradient projections”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 6.4, pp. 493–506. DOI: [10.1109/83.563316](https://doi.org/10.1109/83.563316) (cit. on p. 5).
- Duchi, John, Elad Hazan, and Yoram Singer (2011). “Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization.” In: *Journal of machine learning research* 12.7 (cit. on p. 2).

- Durmus, Alp Emre et al. (2021). “Federated Learning Based on Dynamic Regularization”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations* (cit. on p. 1).
- Elgabli, Anis et al. (2022). “FedNew: A communication-efficient and privacy-preserving Newton-type method for federated learning”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, pp. 5861–5877 (cit. on p. 5).
- Frank, Marguerite and Philip Wolfe (1956). “An algorithm for quadratic programming”. In: *Naval research logistics quarterly* 3.1-2, pp. 95–110 (cit. on p. 2).
- He, Chaoyang et al. (2020). “Fedml: A research library and benchmark for federated machine learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.13518* (cit. on p. 9).
- Hsieh, Kevin et al. (2020). “The non-iid data quagmire of decentralized machine learning”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, pp. 4387–4398 (cit. on p. 10).
- Jhunjhunwala, Divyansh, Shiqiang Wang, and Gauri Joshi (Mar. 2023a). *FedExp: Speeding Up Federated Averaging via Extrapolation*. arXiv:2301.09604 [cs] (cit. on pp. 5, 9).
- (2023b). “FedExp: Speeding up Federated Averaging via Extrapolation”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations* (cit. on pp. 2, 4).
- Karimireddy, Sai Praneeth et al. (2020). “Scaffold: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, pp. 5132–5143 (cit. on pp. 1, 7, 9).
- Kingma, Diederik P and Jimmy Ba (2015). “Adam: A method for stochastic optimization”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations* (cit. on p. 2).
- Krizhevsky, A. (2009). “Learning Multiple Layers of Features from Tiny Images”. In: (cit. on pp. 10, 26).
- Li, Hanmin, Kirill Acharya, and Peter Richtarik (2024). “The Power of Extrapolation in Federated Learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13766* (cit. on pp. 2, 4, 5).
- Li, Qinbin, Bingsheng He, and Dawn Song (2021). “Model-contrastive federated learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 10713–10722 (cit. on p. 5).
- Li, T. et al. (2020). “Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks”. In: *Proceedings of Machine learning and systems* 2, pp. 429–450 (cit. on pp. 1, 9).
- Li, Tian et al. (2019). “FedDane: A federated newton-type method”. In: *2019 53rd Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*. IEEE, pp. 1227–1231 (cit. on p. 5).
- Malinovsky, Grigory, Konstantin Mishchenko, and Peter Richtárik (2023). “Server-side stepsizes and sampling without replacement provably help in federated optimization”. In: *Proceedings of the 4th International Workshop on Distributed Machine Learning*, pp. 85–104 (cit. on pp. 2, 5, 7).
- McMahan, Brendan et al. (2017). “Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data”. In: *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, pp. 1273–1282 (cit. on pp. 1, 9).
- Mitra, Aritra et al. (2021). “Linear convergence in federated learning: Tackling client heterogeneity and sparse gradients”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34, pp. 14606–14619 (cit. on p. 5).
- Neumaier, Arnold and Morteza Kimiaei (2024). “An improvement of the Goldstein line search”. In: *Optimization Letters*, pp. 1–21 (cit. on p. 13).
- Nocedal, Jorge and Stephen J Wright (1999). *Numerical optimization*. Springer (cit. on p. 13).
- Pierra, Guy (1984). “Decomposition through formalization in a product space”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 28, pp. 96–115 (cit. on p. 2).
- Reddi, Sashank et al. (2021). “Adaptive federated optimization”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations* (cit. on pp. 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 26).

- Robbins, Herbert and Sutton Monro (1951). “A stochastic approximation method”. In: *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pp. 400–407 (cit. on p. 1).
- Schaul, Tom, Sixin Zhang, and Yann LeCun (2013). “No more pesky learning rates”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, pp. 343–351 (cit. on p. 2).
- Tan, Yue et al. (2022). “Fedproto: Federated prototype learning across heterogeneous clients”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Vol. 36/8, pp. 8432–8440 (cit. on p. 5).
- Vaswani, Sharan et al. (2019). “Painless stochastic gradient: Interpolation, line-search, and convergence rates”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (cit. on pp. 2, 6, 13).
- Wang, Hongyi et al. (2019). “Federated Learning with Matched Averaging”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations* (cit. on p. 10).
- Wilson, Ashia C et al. (2017). “The marginal value of adaptive gradient methods in machine learning”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (cit. on pp. 2, 26).
- Zaheer, Manzil et al. (2018). “Adaptive methods for nonconvex optimization”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 31 (cit. on p. 2).
- Zhang, Chiyuan et al. (2016). “Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations* (cit. on p. 2).
- Zhang, Jianyi et al. (2024). “Towards building the federatedGPT: Federated instruction tuning”. In: *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, pp. 6915–6919 (cit. on p. 1).
- Zhang, Jingzhao et al. (2020). “Why are adaptive methods good for attention models?” In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33, pp. 15383–15393 (cit. on p. 1).
- Zhou, Pan et al. (2020). “Towards theoretically understanding why sgd generalizes better than adam in deep learning”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33, pp. 21285–21296 (cit. on pp. 2, 26).

APPENDIX

A Model Update Algorithms	13
A.1 ARMIJO Line Search	13
A.2 DEEP FRANK-WOLFE Algorithm	13
B Proofs	14
B.1 Proof for Convex Objectives	18
B.2 Proof for Strongly-convex Objectives	21
B.3 Proof for Non-convex Objectives	23
C Additional Experiments	26

A Model Update Algorithms**A.1 ARMIJO Line Search**

For a self-contained reading, here we include the stochastic gradient descent algorithm with stochastic ARMIJO line-search (Vaswani et al., 2019). Algorithm 3 gives pseudo-code for SGD with ARMIJO line-search where c is the ARMIJO condition constant, β and b are multiplicative factors for decreasing the step size, δ is the factor used for scaling the step size at each line-search step, η_{max} is an upper bound on the step size. The stochasticity in the line-search scheme is due to the fact that at every step it has to satisfy the descent condition (22), where the function and its gradient are based on a sample minibatch (potentially could be of size 1) of data.

Definition 2 (Armijo Condition Restatement) For the k -th step in the t -th communication round, the Armijo condition for the local objective functions f_i with a constant $c > 0$ is given by

$$f_i(w_{t,k}^i) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) \leq -c\eta_{t,k}^i \|g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2. \quad (22)$$

Algorithm 3: SGD with ARMIJO Line Search. The η_{max} , b , c , β , δ , and opt are the constants supplied at initialization. The process starts from a random state of the model w_r .

```

1: for  $k = 0, \dots, T$  do
2:    $i_k \leftarrow$  sample mini-batch of size  $b$ 
3:    $\eta \leftarrow$  reset( $\eta, \eta_{max}, \delta, b, k, opt$ )/ $\beta$ 
4:   repeat
5:      $\eta \leftarrow \beta \cdot \eta$ 
6:      $w_{t,k}^{\tilde{}} \leftarrow w_{t,k} - \eta \nabla f_{t_k}^i(w_{t,k})$ 
7:     until  $f_{i_k}(w_{t,k}^{\tilde{}}) \leq f_{t_k}^i(w_{t,k}) - c \cdot \eta \|\nabla f_{t_k}^i(w_{t,k})\|^2$ 
8:      $w_{t,k+1} \leftarrow w_{t,k}^{\tilde{}}$ 
9: return  $w_{k+1}$ 

```

The method reset heuristically resets η based on the handle opt at every gradient update step. Taking $\eta_{max} = \eta_{t,k-1}$ could be one strategy where we start dampening the step-size from the last achieved state. However, it can increase the backtracking. This method can implement various heuristics that appeared in the literature: (Nocedal and Wright, 1999).Chapter 3. The heuristic line search is an active area of research with new developments such as a new variant of Goldstein Line search by Neumaier and Kimiaei (2024).

Algorithm 4: $\text{reset}(\eta, \eta_{\max}, \delta, b, k, \text{opt})$

```

1: if  $k = 1$  then
2:   return  $\eta_{\max}$ 
3: else if  $\text{opt} = 0$  then
4:    $\eta \leftarrow \eta$ 
5: else if  $\text{opt} = 1$  then
6:    $\eta \leftarrow \eta_{\max}$ 
7: else if  $\text{opt} = 2$  then
8:    $\eta \leftarrow \eta \cdot \delta \frac{b}{n}$ 
9: return  $\eta$ 

```

A.2 DEEP FRANK-WOLFE Algorithm

Dual direction in FEDLI-LU FEDLI-LU extends the DFW optimization scheme (Berrada, Zisserman, and Kumar, 2018) to a federated learning context. Berrada, Zisserman, and Kumar (2018) discuss computation of an optimal step-size γ_t in closed-form using a feasible direction in dual s_t . More specifically, since the linearized objective is given as:

$$w_{t+1} = \underset{w \in \mathbb{R}^d}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\eta} \|w - w_t\|^2 + \mathcal{T}(r(w_t)) + f_j^i(\mathcal{T}(O_j^i(w_t))) \right\}.$$

The dual of the above equation is given by:

$$\max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\eta} \|A\alpha\|^2 + b^\top \alpha \right\},$$

where $A = (\eta a_{\hat{y}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times |\mathcal{Y}|}$ s.t. $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$, $\mathcal{P} = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{Y}|} \mid \sum_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \alpha_{\hat{y}} = 1\}$, $a_{\hat{y}} = \nabla r(w)|_{w_0} + \nabla f_{\text{hinge}_{x,\hat{y}}}(w)|_{w_0} - \nabla f_{\text{hinge}_{x,y}}(w)|_{w_0}$ and $b = f_{\text{hinge}_{x,\hat{y}}}(w_0) - f_{\text{hinge}_{x,y}}(w_0) + \Delta(\hat{y}, y)$. Recall that \mathcal{Y} is the space of labels of the training dataset of the supervised learning task. Taking $s \in \mathcal{P}$ as a dual direction enables computing an optimal step-size of the DFW algorithm as discussed in Appendix A.2 and A.3 of (Berrada, Zisserman, and Kumar, 2018). We adopted the derivation to our server-side model update in FEDLI-LU as

$$\gamma_t = -\eta \Delta_t^T r_t + \frac{s_t^T f_t^g}{\eta \|\Delta_t\|^2}.$$

When the loss is cross-entropy, Berrada, Zisserman, and Kumar (2018) propose that the gradient of cross-entropy loss in the primal g gives the feasible direction $s \in \mathcal{P}$ in dual such that $g = -As$; see Appendix A.6 in (Berrada, Zisserman, and Kumar, 2018). Computing the softmax of the vector of scores gives the feasible direction in the dual as $s_{\text{cross-entropy}} \in \mathcal{P}$ by the property of softmax function, as all its components are non-negative and add up to 1, fulfilling the simplex constraints inherent in \mathcal{P} .

B Proofs

Lemma 5 *Restatement of Lemma 2 Armijo line search, when applied at each client i , determines the step-size $\eta_{t,k}^i$, constrained to lie in $(0, \eta_{\max}]$, that is bounded below as follows:*

$$\eta_{t,k}^i \geq \min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\},$$

where $0 < c < 1$ is a constant associated with the Armijo condition.

The proof below assumes that the function evaluation at a data point is L -smooth. We have considered a constant L instead of a different smoothness constant for different data points at each client for simplicity.

Proof: Using smoothness of f_i^ξ , the function of i -th client evaluated at sample ξ

$$\begin{aligned}
f_i^\xi(w_{t,k}^i) - f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i) &\leq \langle \nabla f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i), w_{t,k}^i - w_{t,k-1}^i \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|w_{t,k}^i - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2 \\
&\leq -\eta_{t,k}^i \langle \nabla f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i), \nabla f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i) \rangle + \frac{L(\eta_{t,k}^i)^2}{2} \|\nabla f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 \\
&\leq -\left(\eta_{t,k}^i - \frac{L(\eta_{t,k}^i)^2}{2}\right) \|\nabla f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 \\
\frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{\xi} (f_i^\xi(w_{t,k}^i) - f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i)) &\leq -\left(\eta_{t,k}^i - \frac{L(\eta_{t,k}^i)^2}{2}\right) \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{\xi} \|\nabla f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 \\
f_i(w_{t,k}^i) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) &\leq -\left(\eta_{t,k}^i - \frac{L(\eta_{t,k}^i)^2}{2}\right) \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{\xi} \|\nabla f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2, \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

where m_i is the number of samples at client i . The Armijo condition is given as:

$$f_i(w_{t,k}^i) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) \leq -c\eta_{t,k}^i \|g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2$$

Without loss of generality, the inequality holds when the gradient is evaluated at the sample ξ , i.e. $g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) = \nabla f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i)$

$$f_i(w_{t,k}^i) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) \leq -c\eta_{t,k}^i \|\nabla f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2$$

Averaging over all the samples at i -th client

$$f_i(w_{t,k}^i) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) \leq -c\eta_{t,k}^i \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{\xi} \|\nabla f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 \tag{24}$$

Using inequalities 23 and 24

$$f_i(w_{t,k}^i) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) \leq -\min\left\{c\eta_{t,k}^i, \left(\eta_{t,k}^i - \frac{L(\eta_{t,k}^i)^2}{2}\right)\right\} \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{\xi} \|\nabla f_i^\xi(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2$$

To obtain a lower bound on the step-size $\eta_{t,k}^i$, we consider

$$\begin{aligned}
c\eta_{t,k}^i &\geq \left(\eta_{t,k}^i - \frac{L(\eta_{t,k}^i)^2}{2}\right) \\
\eta_{t,k}^i &\geq \frac{2(1-c)}{L}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\eta_{t,k}^i$ is bounded below as

$$\eta_{t,k}^i \geq \min\left\{\frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max}\right\}$$

□

Lemma 6 (Restatement from Section 5) Under Assumption 4, the second moment of model state difference averaged over the \mathcal{S}_t devices participating in t -th communication round is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2] \leq \frac{(\eta_{\max})^2 K}{S} \sum_{i,k} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2] + (\eta_{\max})^2 K^2 G,$$

where $\eta_{\max} \geq \eta_{t,k}^i$ for all clients i .

Proof:

$$\Delta_t = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t} \sum_{k=1}^K \eta_{t,k}^i g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t | W_t] &= \frac{1}{S} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t, k} \eta_{t,k}^i g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) | W_t \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\eta_{\max}}{S} \frac{S}{N} \sum_{i,k} \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

$$= \frac{\eta_{\max}}{N} \sum_{i,k} \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), \quad (26)$$

where Equation 25 is obtained using assumption 4, the probability of sampling \mathcal{S}_t devices for a communication round and $\eta_{\max} \geq \eta_{t,k}^i$. Taking expectation to account for all randomness

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t] \leq \frac{\eta_{\max}}{N} \sum_{i,k} \mathbb{E}[\nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)]$$

The second moment bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t, k} \eta_{t,k}^i g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) \right\|^2 | W_t \right] \\ &\leq (\eta_{\max})^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t, k} g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) \right\|^2 | W_t \right] \\ &= K^2 (\eta_{\max})^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{KS} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t, k} g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) \right\|^2 | W_t \right] \end{aligned}$$

Using convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$ and then separating mean and variance with the assumption 4 and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t] &\leq \frac{(\eta_{\max})^2 K}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t, k} \mathbb{E} \left[\|g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 | W_t \right] \\ &\leq \frac{(\eta_{\max})^2 K}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t, k} \left(\|\nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 + G \right) \\ &\leq \frac{(\eta_{\max})^2 K}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t, k} \|\nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 + \frac{(\eta_{\max})^2 K^2 S}{S} G \\ &\leq \frac{(\eta_{\max})^2 K}{S} \sum_{i,k} \|\nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 + (\eta_{\max})^2 K^2 G \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Taking expectation to account for all randomness gives us the desired result. \square

We will use Lemma 6 to show that Armijo search for local step-size minimizes the global function.

Lemma 7 (Restatement from Section 5) *Using Lemma 2, Armijo line search 10 for K local steps after t -th communication round is equivalent to a line search for minimizing global objective function over local parameter updates as the following:*

$$\mathbb{E} [f(w_{t,K}^i) - f(w_t)] \leq - \min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \left(\frac{c\rho}{(\eta_{\max})^2 K} \mathbb{E} [\|\Delta_t\|^2] + (1-\rho) cKG \right)$$

Particularly, under assumption 2 (3) when f_i 's are convex (strongly-convex), the Armijo line search locally at the clients gives the following descent condition for the global objective at the server

$$\mathbb{E} [f(w_{t+1}) - f(w_t)] \leq - \min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \left(\frac{c\rho}{(\eta_{\max})^2 K} \mathbb{E} [\|\Delta_t\|^2] + (1-\rho) cKG \right),$$

where $\rho = \frac{S}{N}$ and $c \leq 1$.

Proof: Armijo line search is given as:

$$f_i(w_{t,k}^i) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) \leq -c\eta_{t,k}^i \|g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2$$

Summation over $i \in [N]$ and $k \in [K]$ and dividing by N

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k,i} (f_i(w_{t,k}^i) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)) \leq -\frac{c}{N} \sum_{k,i} \eta_{t,k}^i \|g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2$$

Using $f = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i f_i$ and taking expectations keeping W_t fixed

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k \mathbb{E} [f(w_{t,k}^i) - f(w_{t,k-1}^i) | W_t] &\leq -\frac{c}{N} \sum_{k,i} \mathbb{E} [\eta_{t,k}^i \|g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 | W_t] \\ &\leq -\frac{c}{N} \sum_{k,i} \mathbb{E} \left[\min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \|g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 | W_t \right] \quad (28) \\ &\leq -\min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \frac{c}{N} \sum_{k,i} \mathbb{E} [\|g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 | W_t] \\ &\leq -\min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \frac{c}{N} \sum_{k,i} \|\nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 \\ &\quad - \min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} cKG \quad (29) \end{aligned}$$

In Equation 28, we use Lemma 2 and separated mean and variance in Equation 29. Using Equation 27

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k \mathbb{E} [f(w_{t,k}^i) - f(w_{t,k-1}^i) | W_t] &\leq -\min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \frac{cS}{(\eta_{\max})^2 NK} \mathbb{E} [\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t] \\ &\quad - \min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \left(1 - \frac{S}{N}\right) cKG \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the last term, $(1 - \frac{S}{N}) > 0$ and let $c \leq 1$. Doing the telescoping summation on $k \in [K]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [f(w_{t,K}^i) - f(w_{t,0}^i) | W_t] &\leq -\min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \frac{cS}{(\eta_{\max})^2 NK} \mathbb{E} [\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t] \\ &\quad - \min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \left(1 - \frac{S}{N}\right) cKG \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $w_{t,0}^i = w_t$ for all i , where w_t is the global update parameter for t -th communication round

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [f(w_{t,K}^i) - f(w_t) | W_t] &\leq -\min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \frac{cS}{(\eta_{\max})^2 NK} \mathbb{E} [\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t] \\ &\quad - \min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \left(1 - \frac{S}{N}\right) cKG \end{aligned}$$

The global parameter after $T + 1$ communication round is obtained by aggregating updates from each device after K local steps as $w_{t+1} = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t} w_{t,K}^i$. When f_i 's are all convex, f is also convex, hence we use convexity of f as

$$f(w_{t+1}) \leq \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t} f(w_{t,K}^i). \quad (30)$$

Thus, averaging over $i \in \mathcal{S}_t$ and using Equation 30

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t} \mathbb{E} [f(w_{t,K}^i) - f(w_t) | W_t] &\leq -\min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \frac{cS}{(\eta_{\max})^2 NK} \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t} \mathbb{E} [\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t] \\
&\quad - \min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \left(1 - \frac{S}{N}\right) \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t} cKG \\
\mathbb{E} [f(w_{t+1}) - f(w_t) | W_t] &\leq -\min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \frac{cS}{(\eta_{\max})^2 NK} \mathbb{E} [\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t] \\
&\quad - \min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \left(1 - \frac{S}{N}\right) cKG \\
\mathbb{E} [f(w_{t+1}) | W_t] - f(w_t) &\leq -\min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \frac{cS}{(\eta_{\max})^2 NK} \mathbb{E} [\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t] \\
&\quad - \min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \left(1 - \frac{S}{N}\right) cKG \tag{31}
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting $\rho = \frac{S}{N}$ and using the tower property of conditional expectation gives the result. This bound shows the effect of the probability of sampling devices for participation in local rounds. \square

Lemma 8 (Restatement from Section 5) *Under the Assumption 1 and 2, the Armijo line search bounds the expected aggregated model state difference across all clients i and k local rounds*

$$\sum_{i,k} \mathbb{E} [\|w_t - w_{t,K}^i\|^2] \leq \frac{\eta_{\max} NK^2}{c} \mathbb{E} [f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1})]$$

Proof: Using Equation 10, averaging over $i \in [N]$ and summing over $k = 1, \dots, K$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k,i} (f_i(w_{t,k}^i) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)) &\leq -\frac{c}{N} \sum_{k,i} \eta_{t,k}^i \|g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 \\
\sum_k (f(w_{t,k}^i) - f(w_{t,k-1}^i)) &\leq -\frac{c}{N} \sum_{k,i} \frac{1}{\eta_{t,k}^i} \|\eta_{t,k}^i g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 \\
f(w_{t,K}^i) - f(w_t) &\leq -\frac{c}{\eta_{\max} N} \sum_{k,i} \|w_{t,k-1}^i - w_{t,k}^i\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\eta_{t,k}^i \leq \eta_{\max}$ in the last inequality. Expanding over $k = 1, \dots, K$ on right-hand side

$$\begin{aligned}
f(w_{t,K}^i) - f(w_t) &\leq -\frac{c}{\eta_{\max} N} \sum_i (\|w_t - w_{t,1}^i\|^2 + \|w_{t,1}^i - w_{t,2}^i\|^2 \\
&\quad + \dots + \|w_{t,K-1}^i - w_{t,K}^i\|^2) \\
&\leq -\frac{c}{\eta_{\max} NK} \sum_i \|w_t - w_{t,K}^i\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

Last inequality is obtained using the fact $\|w_t - w_{t,K}^i\|^2 \leq K \sum_k \|w_{t,k-1}^i - w_{t,k}^i\|^2$. Substituting $\sum_i \|w_t - w_{t,K}^i\|^2 = D^2$

$$f(w_{t,K}^i) - f(w_t) \leq -\frac{cD^2}{\eta_{\max} NK}$$

Now, averaging over $i \in \mathcal{S}_t$ using Equation 30

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t} (f(w_{t,K}^i) - f(w_t)) &\leq -\frac{1}{S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t} \frac{cD^2}{\eta_{\max} NK} \\
f(w_{t+1}) - f(w_t) &\leq -\frac{cD^2}{\eta_{\max} NK}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $D^2 = \sum_i \|w_t - w_{t,K}^i\|^2$ is the total sum of model difference for all clients $i \in [N]$. So, summing it up for $i \in \mathcal{S}_t$ clients would give SD^2 .

Rearranging and then applying summation on $k = 1, \dots, K$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{cD^2}{\eta_{\max}NK} &\leq f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1}) \\ \sum_{i,k} \|w_t - w_{t,K}^i\|^2 &\leq \frac{\eta_{\max}NK^2}{c} (f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1})). \end{aligned}$$

□

B.1 Proof for Convex Objectives

We now give the convergence proof for convex functions.

Theorem 4 (Restatement from Section 5) *Under the Assumption 1, 2 and 4, FEDLI-LS with $\max\left\{\frac{L\eta_{\max}(\eta_g+2K\rho)}{2\rho(2+L\eta_{\max}K)}, \frac{\eta_g}{2\rho} + \frac{\eta_{\max}LK}{2}\right\} < c \leq 1$ achieves the convergence rate*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\bar{w}_t) - f(w^*)] \leq \max\left\{\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}T}, \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}T}\right\} \|w_0 - w^*\|^2 - \min\left\{\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}}, \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}}\right\} \frac{(1-\rho)}{\rho} \eta_{\max}^2 K^2 G,$$

where $\mathcal{R} := \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \left(2 - \frac{L\eta_g \eta_{\max}}{2(1-c)\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{\max}LK}{c}\right)$ and $\mathcal{K} := \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \left(2 - \frac{\eta_g}{\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{\max}LK}{c}\right)$.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2 &= \|w_t - \eta_g \Delta_t - w^*\|^2 \\ &= \|w_t - w^*\|^2 + \eta_g^2 \|\Delta_t\|^2 - 2\eta_g \langle \Delta_t, w_t - w^* \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation on both sides

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2 | W_t] = \|w_t - w^*\|^2 + \underbrace{\eta_g^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t]}_{\mathcal{A}_1} + \underbrace{2\eta_g \mathbb{E}[\langle \Delta_t, w_t - w^* \rangle | W_t]}_{\mathcal{A}_2}$$

We first resolve \mathcal{A}_1 using Equation 31

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1 &= \eta_g^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t] \\ &\leq \max\left\{\frac{L}{2(1-c)}, \frac{1}{\eta_{\max}}\right\} \frac{\eta_g^2 (\eta_{\max})^2 K}{\rho c} (f(w_t) - \mathbb{E}[f(w_{t+1}) | W_t]) \\ &\quad - \min\left\{\frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max}\right\} \max\left\{\frac{L}{2(1-c)}, \frac{1}{\eta_{\max}}\right\} \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} (\eta_{\max})^2 K^2 G \\ &= \max\left\{\frac{L}{2(1-c)}, \frac{1}{\eta_{\max}}\right\} \frac{\eta_g^2 (\eta_{\max})^2 K}{\rho c} (f(w_t) - \mathbb{E}[f(w_{t+1}) | W_t]) \\ &\quad - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} (\eta_{\max})^2 K^2 G \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

We now resolve \mathcal{A}_2 using Equation 26

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_2 &= 2\eta_g \mathbb{E}[\langle \Delta_t, w^* - w_t \rangle | W_t] \\
&\leq \frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \left\langle \sum_{i,k} \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), w^* - w_t \right\rangle \\
&= -\frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \left\langle \sum_{i,k} \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), w_t - w^* \right\rangle \\
&= -\frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \sum_{i,k} \langle \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i + w_{t,k-1}^i - w^* \rangle \\
&= \frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \sum_{i,k} \left\{ -\langle \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), w_{t,k-1}^i - w^* \rangle + \langle \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), w_{t,k-1}^i - w_t \rangle \right\} \\
&\stackrel{\text{convexity}}{\leq} \frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \sum_{i,k} \left\{ (f_i(w^*) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)) + \langle \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), w_{t,k-1}^i - w_t \rangle \right\} \\
&\stackrel{\text{smoothness}}{\leq} \frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \sum_{i,k} \left\{ (f_i(w^*) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)) + (f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) - f_i(w_t)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{L}{2} \|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2 \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \sum_{i,k} (f_i(w^*) - f_i(w_t)) + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} L}{N} \sum_{i,k} \|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \sum_{i,k} (f_i(w^*) - f_i(w_t)) + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} L}{N} \sum_{i,k} \|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2 \\
&\leq 2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K(f(w^*) - f(w_t)) + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} L}{N} \sum_{i,k} \|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2 \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining Equations 32 and 33 and taking expectations on both sides

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] + \max \left\{ \frac{L}{2(1-c)}, \frac{1}{\eta_{l_{\max}}} \right\} \frac{\eta_g^2 (\eta_{l_{\max}})^2 K}{\rho c} \mathbb{E}[(f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1}))] \\
&\quad - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} (\eta_{l_{\max}})^2 K^2 G + 2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K \mathbb{E}[f(w^*) - f(w_t)] + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} L}{N} \sum_{i,k} \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2]
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 8

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] + \max \left\{ \frac{L}{2(1-c)}, \frac{1}{\eta_{l_{\max}}} \right\} \frac{\eta_g^2 (\eta_{l_{\max}})^2 K}{\rho c} \mathbb{E}[(f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1}))] \\
&\quad - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} (\eta_{l_{\max}})^2 K^2 G + 2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K \mathbb{E}[f(w^*) - f(w_t)] + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 L K^2}{c} \mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1})]
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms

$$\begin{aligned}
2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K \mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w^*)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] \\
&\quad + \max \left\{ \frac{L}{2(1-c)}, \frac{1}{\eta_{l_{\max}}} \right\} \frac{\eta_g^2 \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K}{\rho c} \mathbb{E}[(f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1}))] \\
&\quad - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K^2 G + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 L K^2}{c} \mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1})]
\end{aligned}$$

We now consider two cases:

Case 1: $\frac{2(1-c)}{L} \leq \eta_{l_{\max}}$

$$\begin{aligned}
2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K \mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w^*)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] + \frac{\eta_g^2 \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K L}{2(1-c)\rho c} \mathbb{E}[(f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1}))] \\
&\quad - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K^2 G + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 L K^2}{c} \mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1})]
\end{aligned}$$

To choose a suitable c such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2\eta_g\eta_{l_{\max}}K - \frac{\eta_g^2\eta_{l_{\max}}^2KL}{2(1-c)\rho c} - \frac{\eta_g\eta_{l_{\max}}^2LK^2}{c}) &> 0 \\
2 - \frac{\eta_g\eta_{l_{\max}}L}{2(1-c)\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{l_{\max}}LK}{c} &> 0 \\
2 &> \frac{\eta_g\eta_{l_{\max}}L}{2(1-c)\rho c} + \frac{\eta_{l_{\max}}LK}{c} \\
\frac{2}{L} &> \frac{\eta_g\eta_{l_{\max}}}{2(1-c)\rho c} + \frac{\eta_{l_{\max}}K}{c} \\
\frac{4(1-c)\rho c}{L} &> (\eta_g\eta_{l_{\max}} + 2\eta_{l_{\max}}K(1-c)\rho) \\
\frac{4\rho c}{L} &\geq \frac{4(1-c)\rho c}{L} > \eta_g\eta_{l_{\max}} + 2\eta_{l_{\max}}K(1-c)\rho
\end{aligned}$$

Because $(1-c) \leq 1$

$$c > \frac{L\eta_{l_{\max}}(\eta_g + 2K\rho)}{2\rho(2 + L\eta_{l_{\max}}K)}$$

Hence, using $f(w^*) \leq f(w_t)$ for all t , and choosing c such that $\frac{L\eta_{l_{\max}}(\eta_g + 2K\rho)}{2\rho(2 + L\eta_{l_{\max}}K)} < c \leq 1$, then we have

$$\mathcal{R}\mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w^*)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\eta_{l_{\max}}^2K^2G$$

where $\mathcal{R} = \eta_g\eta_{l_{\max}}K \left(2 - \frac{L\eta_g\eta_{l_{\max}}}{2(1-c)\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{l_{\max}}LK}{c}\right)$.

Summing over $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ and using Jensen's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[f(\bar{w}_t) - f(w^*)] &\leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}T} (\|w_0 - w^*\|^2 - \|w_T - w^*\|^2) - \frac{1-\rho}{\mathcal{R}\rho}\eta_{l_{\max}}^2K^2G \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}T}\|w_0 - w^*\|^2 - \frac{1-\rho}{\mathcal{R}\rho}\eta_{l_{\max}}^2K^2G
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $\frac{2(1-c)}{L} \geq \eta_{l_{\max}}$

$$\begin{aligned}
2\eta_g\eta_{l_{\max}}K\mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w^*)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] + \frac{\eta_g^2\eta_{l_{\max}}K}{\rho c}\mathbb{E}[(f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1}))] \\
&\quad - \frac{(1-\rho)}{\rho}\eta_{l_{\max}}^2K^2G + \frac{\eta_g\eta_{l_{\max}}LK^2}{c}\mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1})]
\end{aligned}$$

Using $f(w^*) \leq f(w_t)$ for all t , and choosing c such that $(\frac{\eta_g}{2\rho} + \frac{\eta_{l_{\max}}LK}{2}) \leq c \leq 1$, then we have

$$\mathcal{K}\mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w^*)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] - \frac{(1-\rho)}{\rho}\eta_{l_{\max}}^2K^2G$$

where $\mathcal{K} = \eta_g\eta_{l_{\max}}K \left(2 - \frac{\eta_g}{\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{l_{\max}}LK}{c}\right)$.

Summing over $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ and using Jensen's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[f(\bar{w}_t) - f(w^*)] &\leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}T} (\|w_0 - w^*\|^2 - \|w_T - w^*\|^2) - \frac{(1-\rho)}{\mathcal{K}\rho}\eta_{l_{\max}}^2K^2G \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}T}\|w_0 - w^*\|^2 - \frac{(1-\rho)}{\mathcal{K}\rho}\eta_{l_{\max}}^2K^2G
\end{aligned}$$

Putting the two cases together, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\bar{w}_t) - f(w^*)] \leq \max\left\{\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}T}, \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}T}\right\}\|w_0 - w^*\|^2 - \min\left\{\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}}, \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}}\right\}\frac{(1-\rho)}{\rho}\eta_{l_{\max}}^2K^2G$$

□

B.2 Proof for Strongly-convex Objectives

Theorem 5 (Restatement from Section 5) Under the Assumption 1, 3 and 4, FEDLI-LS with $\max \left\{ \frac{L\eta_{\max}(\eta_g + 2K\rho)}{2\rho(2+L\eta_{\max}K)}, \left(\frac{\eta_g}{2\rho} + \frac{\eta_{\max}LK}{2} \right) \right\} < c \leq 1$ achieves the convergence rate

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w_T - w^*\|^2] \leq (1 - \eta_g \eta_{\max} \mu K)^{T+1} \|w_0 - w^*\|^2,$$

where $\mathcal{R} := \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \left(2 - \frac{L\eta_g \eta_{\max}}{2(1-c)\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{\max}LK}{c} \right)$ and $\mathcal{K} := \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \left(2 - \frac{\eta_g}{\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{\max}LK}{c} \right)$.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2 &= \|w_t - \eta_g \Delta_t - w^*\|^2 \\ &= \|w_t - w^*\|^2 + \eta_g^2 \|\Delta_t\|^2 - 2\eta_g \langle \Delta_t, w_t - w^* \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation on both sides

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2 | W_t] = \|w_t - w^*\|^2 + \underbrace{\eta_g^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t]}_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \underbrace{2\eta_g \mathbb{E}[\langle \Delta_t, w_t - w^* \rangle | W_t]}_{\mathcal{B}_2}$$

We first resolve \mathcal{B}_1 using Equation 31

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1 &= \eta_g^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 | W_t] \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{L}{2(1-c)}, \frac{1}{\eta_{\max}} \right\} \frac{\eta_g^2 (\eta_{\max})^2 K}{\rho c} (f(w_t) - \mathbb{E}[f(w_{t+1}) | W_t]) \\ &\quad - \min \left\{ \frac{2(1-c)}{L}, \eta_{\max} \right\} \max \left\{ \frac{L}{2(1-c)}, \frac{1}{\eta_{\max}} \right\} \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} \eta_{\max}^2 K^2 G \\ &= \max \left\{ \frac{L}{2(1-c)}, \frac{1}{\eta_{\max}} \right\} \frac{\eta_g^2 (\eta_{\max})^2 K}{\rho c} (f(w_t) - \mathbb{E}[f(w_{t+1}) | W_t]) \\ &\quad - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} \eta_{\max}^2 K^2 G \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

We now resolve \mathcal{B}_2 using Equation 26

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_2 &= 2\eta_g \mathbb{E}[\langle \Delta_t, w^* - w_t \rangle | W_t] \\
&\leq \frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \left\langle \sum_{i,k} \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), w^* - w_t \right\rangle \\
&= -\frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \left\langle \sum_{i,k} \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), w_t - w^* \right\rangle \\
&= -\frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \sum_{i,k} \langle \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i + w_{t,k-1}^i - w^* \rangle \\
&= \frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \sum_{i,k} \left\{ -\langle \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), w_{t,k-1}^i - w^* \rangle + \langle \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), w_{t,k-1}^i - w_t \rangle \right\} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Using 3}}{\leq} \frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \sum_{i,k} \left\{ (f_i(w^*) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)) - \frac{\mu}{2} \|w_t - w^*\|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \langle \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i), w_{t,k-1}^i - w_t \rangle \right\} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Using Asm 1}}{\leq} \frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \sum_{i,k} \left\{ (f_i(w^*) - f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)) - \frac{\mu}{2} \|w_t - w^*\|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) - f_i(w_t) + \frac{L}{2} \|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2) \right\} \\
&\leq -\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} \mu K \|w_t - w^*\|^2 + \frac{2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{N} \sum_{i,k} (f_i(w^*) - f_i(w_t)) \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} L}{N} \sum_{i,k} \|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2 \\
&\leq -\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} \mu K \|w_t - w^*\|^2 + 2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K (f(w^*) - f(w_t)) \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} L}{N} \sum_{i,k} \|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2 \tag{35}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining Equations 34 and 35 and taking expectations on both sides

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] &\leq (1 - \eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} \mu K) \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] + \max \left\{ \frac{L}{2(1-c)}, \frac{1}{\eta_{l_{\max}}} \right\} \frac{\eta_g^2 \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K}{\rho c} \mathbb{E}[(f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1}))] \\
&\quad - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K^2 G + 2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K \mathbb{E}[f(w^*) - f(w_t)] + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} L}{N} \sum_{i,k} \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2]
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 8

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] &\leq (1 - \eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} \mu K) \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] + \max \left\{ \frac{L}{2(1-c)}, \frac{1}{\eta_{l_{\max}}} \right\} \frac{\eta_g^2 \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K}{\rho c} \mathbb{E}[(f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1}))] \\
&\quad - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K^2 G + 2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K \mathbb{E}[f(w^*) - f(w_t)] + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 L K^2}{c} \mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1})]
\end{aligned}$$

We now consider two cases:

Case 1: $\frac{2(1-c)}{L} \leq \eta_{l_{\max}}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] &\leq (1 - \eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} \mu K) \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] + \frac{L}{2(1-c)} \frac{\eta_g^2 \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K}{\rho c} \mathbb{E}[(f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1}))] \\
&\quad - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K^2 G + 2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K \mathbb{E}[f(w^*) - f(w_t)] + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 L K^2}{c} \mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1})]
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing c such that $\frac{L \eta_{l_{\max}} (\eta_g + 2K\rho)}{2\rho(2 + L \eta_{l_{\max}} K)} < c \leq 1$, and using $f(w^*) \leq f(w_t)$ for all t , then we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] \leq (1 - \eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} \mu K) \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K^2 G + \mathcal{R} \mathbb{E}[f(w^*) - f(w_t)]$$

where $\mathcal{R} = \eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K \left(2 - \frac{L \eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}}{2(1-c)\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{l_{\max}} L K}{c} \right)$. Since $f(w^*) - f(w_t) \leq 0$ and $\mathcal{R} \geq 0$ by assumption on c . Recursion on $t = 0, \dots, (T-1)$ gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w_T - w^*\|^2] \leq (1 - \eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} \mu K)^{T+1} \|w_0 - w^*\|^2$$

Case 2: $\frac{2(1-c)}{L} \geq \eta_{l_{\max}}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] &\leq (1 - \eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} \mu K) \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] + \frac{\eta_g^2 \eta_{l_{\max}} K}{\rho c} \mathbb{E}[(f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1}))] \\ &\quad - \frac{(1-\rho)}{\rho} \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K^2 G + 2\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K \mathbb{E}[f(w^*) - f(w_t)] + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 L K^2}{c} \mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1})] \end{aligned}$$

If we choose c such that $(\frac{\eta_g}{2\rho} + \frac{\eta_{l_{\max}} L K}{2}) < c \leq 1$, and using $f(w^*) \leq f(w_t)$ for all t , then we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w^*\|^2] \leq (1 - \eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} \mu K) \mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w^*\|^2] - \frac{(1-\rho)}{\rho} \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 K^2 G + \mathcal{K} \mathbb{E}[f(w^*) - f(w_t)]$$

where $\mathcal{K} = \eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K \left(2 - \frac{\eta_g}{\rho c} - \frac{\eta_{l_{\max}} L K}{c} \right)$. Since $f(w^*) - f(w_t) \leq 0$ and $\mathcal{K} \geq 0$ by assumption on c . Recursion on $t = 0, \dots, (T-1)$ gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w_T - w^*\|^2] \leq (1 - \eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} \mu K)^{T+1} \|w_0 - w^*\|^2$$

Putting the two cases together, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w_T - w^*\|^2] \leq (1 - \eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} \mu K)^{T+1} \|w_0 - w^*\|^2$$

□

B.3 Proof for Non-convex Objectives

Theorem 6 (Restatement from Section 5) *Under the Assumption 1, 4 and 5, FEDLI-LS achieves the convergence rate*

$$\min_{t=0, \dots, T-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2] \leq \frac{2}{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K T} \mathbb{E}[f(w_0) - f(w_T)] + L \eta_{l_{\max}} K \left(\frac{\beta^2}{\rho} + G \right) \left(\frac{2^{K+1}}{K^2} L \eta_{l_{\max}} + \eta_g \right)$$

Proof: Using smoothness of f

$$f(w_{t+1}) \leq f(w_t) + \langle \nabla f(w_t), (w_{t+1} - w_t) \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|w_{t+1} - w_t\|^2$$

Taking expectations on both sides

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[f(w_{t+1}) \mid W_t] &\leq f(w_t) - \eta_g \langle \nabla f(w_t), \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t \mid W_t] \rangle + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 \mid W_t] \\
&\leq f(w_t) - \eta_g \eta_{\max} \left\langle \nabla f(w_t), \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,k} \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) \right\rangle + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 \mid W_t] \\
&\leq f(w_t) - \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \left\langle \nabla f(w_t), \frac{1}{NK} \sum_{i,k} \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) - \nabla f(w_t) + \nabla f(w_t) \right\rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 \mid W_t] \\
&\leq f(w_t) - \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \left\langle \nabla f(w_t), \frac{1}{NK} \sum_{i,k} \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i) - \nabla f(w_t) \right\rangle \\
&\quad - \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2 + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 \mid W_t] \\
&\stackrel{\text{CS Inq.}}{\leq} f(w_t) + \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \left\langle \nabla f(w_t), \frac{1}{NK} \sum_{i,k} (\nabla f_i(w_t) - \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)) \right\rangle \\
&\quad - \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2 + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 \mid W_t] \\
&\stackrel{\text{Young's Inq.}}{\leq} f(w_t) + \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \left\| \nabla f(w_t) \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{NK} \sum_{i,k} (\nabla f_i(w_t) - \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)) \right\| \\
&\quad - \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2 + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 \mid W_t] \\
&\stackrel{\text{Jensen's}}{\leq} f(w_t) + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} K}{2} \left\| \frac{1}{NK} \sum_{i,k} (\nabla f_i(w_t) - \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)) \right\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} K}{2} \|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2 - \eta_g \eta_{\max} K \|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2 + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 \mid W_t] \\
&\stackrel{\text{Using Asm 1}}{\leq} f(w_t) + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} K}{2} \frac{1}{NK} \sum_{i,k} \|\nabla f_i(w_t) - \nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} K}{2} \|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2 + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 \mid W_t] \\
&\leq f(w_t) + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} K L^2}{2NK} \sum_{i,k} \|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} K}{2} \|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2 + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2 \mid W_t]
\end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation on both sides

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[f(w_{t+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(w_t)] + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} L^2}{2N} \sum_{i,k} \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2]}_{C_1} \\
&\quad - \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} K}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2] + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2]
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

We now resolve \mathcal{C}_1 using $\|a + b\|^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ and separating mean and variance

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|w_t - w_{t,k}^i\|^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i - \eta_{t,k}^i g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2 \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\|\eta_{t,k}^i g_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2 \right] + 2\eta_{\max}^2 (\|\nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 + G) \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\|w_t - w_{t,k-1}^i\|^2 \right] + 2\eta_{\max}^2 (\beta^2 + G) \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq 2^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\|w_t - w_{t,k-2}^i\|^2 \right] + (2 + 2^2)\eta_{\max}^2 (\beta^2 + G) \\ &\leq 2^k \mathbb{E} \left[\|w_t - w_{t,0}^i\|^2 \right] + \sum_{j=1}^k 2^j \eta_{\max}^2 (\beta^2 + G) \\ &\leq 2(2^k - 1)\eta_{\max}^2 (\beta^2 + G) \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

In equation 37, we used Assumption 5 and used $w_{t,0}^i = w_t$ to obtain equation 38. Substituting \mathcal{C}_1 in equation 36, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(w_{t+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(w_t)] + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} L^2}{2N} \sum_{i,k} 2(2^{k-1} - 1)\eta_{\max}^2 (\beta^2 + G) \\ &\quad - \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} K}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2] + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|^2] \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 6

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(w_{t+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(w_t)] + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} L^2}{2N} \sum_{i,k} 2(2^{k-1} - 1)\eta_{\max}^2 (\beta^2 + G) \\ &\quad - \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} K}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{L\eta_g^2 (\eta_{\max})^2 K}{2S} \sum_{i,k} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla f_i(w_{t,k-1}^i)\|^2 \right] + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} (\eta_{\max})^2 K^2 G \end{aligned}$$

We use Assumption 5 in the last inequality.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(w_{t+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(w_t)] + \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} L^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K 2(2^{k-1} - 1)\eta_{\max}^2 (\beta^2 + G) \\ &\quad - \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} K}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{L\eta_g^2 (\eta_{\max})^2 K}{2S} \sum_{i,k} \beta^2 + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} (\eta_{\max})^2 K^2 G \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\eta_g \eta_{\max} K}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1})] \\ &\quad + \eta_g L^2 \eta_{\max}^3 (\beta^2 + G) \sum_{k=1}^K (2^{k-1} - 1) \\ &\quad + \frac{L\eta_g^2 (\eta_{\max})^2 K^2 N}{2S} \beta^2 + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} (\eta_{\max})^2 K^2 G \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(w_t) - f(w_{t+1})] \\ &\quad + \eta_g L^2 \eta_{\max}^3 (\beta^2 + G) (2^K - K) \\ &\quad + \frac{L\eta_g^2 (\eta_{\max})^2 K^2}{2\rho} \beta^2 + \frac{L\eta_g^2}{2} (\eta_{\max})^2 K^2 G \end{aligned}$$

Summation on both sides from $t = 0$ to $T - 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2] &\leq \frac{2}{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K} \mathbb{E}[f(w_0) - f(w_T)] \\
&\quad + \frac{2T}{K} L^2 \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 (\beta^2 + G)(2^K - K) \\
&\quad + L \eta_g T \frac{\eta_{l_{\max}} K}{\rho} \beta^2 + L \eta_g (\eta_{l_{\max}}) K G T \\
\min_{t=0, \dots, T-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2] &\leq \frac{2}{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K T} \mathbb{E}[f(w_0) - f(w_T)] \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{K} L^2 \eta_{l_{\max}}^2 (\beta^2 + G)(2^K - K) \\
&\quad + L \eta_g \frac{\eta_{l_{\max}} K}{\rho} \beta^2 + L \eta_g (\eta_{l_{\max}}) K G \\
&\leq \frac{2}{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K T} \mathbb{E}[f(w_0) - f(w_T)] \\
&\quad + L \eta_{l_{\max}} K \left(\frac{2}{K^2} L \eta_{l_{\max}} (\beta^2 + G)(2^K - K) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \eta_g \left(\frac{\beta^2}{\rho} + G \right) \right) \\
\min_{t=0, \dots, T-1} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(w_t)\|^2] &\leq \frac{2}{\eta_g \eta_{l_{\max}} K T} \mathbb{E}[f(w_0) - f(w_T)] \\
&\quad + L \eta_{l_{\max}} K \left(\frac{\beta^2}{\rho} + G \right) \left(\frac{2^{K+1}}{K^2} L \eta_{l_{\max}} + \eta_g \right)
\end{aligned}$$

□

C Additional Experiments




Figure 3: Train Loss and Top-1 test accuracy for training RESNET-18 on CIFAR-10 for 500 synchronization rounds.

We present additional experimental results for the FEDLI methods in this section that demonstrated the superiority of our algorithm. We begin by including results of training RESNET-18 model on CIFAR-100 dataset (Krizhevsky, 2009) in Figure 3. It is interesting to note here that though FEDADAM works competitively on training loss minimization, it performs comparatively poorly on generalization accuracy compared to FEDLI methods. This behaviour of FEDADAM is analogous to that of ADAM which performs poorly on vision tasks as seen in (Wilson et al., 2017; Zhou et al., 2020).

Further results are presented in Tables 1 and 2. This set of benchmarks shows that though the frameworks FEDLI and FEDOPT (Reddi et al., 2021) have similar mechanisms of combining the global and local update strategies, it is

Dataset - Model	FEDLI-LU	FEDLI-LS	FedAdam	FedAvg	FedProx	SCAFFOLD	FedExp
CIFAR10 - Resnet-18	86.02	75.50	81.42	78.47	82.15	71.11	84.28
CIFAR100 - Resnet-18	51.97	50.72	45.10	46.93	29.72	35.57	50.03
FEMNIST - CNN	84.79	80.66	80.35	84.67	80.24	75.05	82.51
SHAKESPEARE - RNN	38.93	39.71	48.37	40.10	45.06	34.86	41.22

Table 1: Test Accuracy after training deep model for 500 synchronization rounds

Dataset - Model	FEDLI-LU	FEDLI-LS	FedAdam	FedAvg	FedProx	SCAFFOLD	FedExp
CIFAR10 - Resnet-18	0.1053	0.6103	0.60832	0.9425	0.6252	0.2914	0.6147
CIFAR100 - Resnet-18	0.6312	0.6582	1.9463	2.5270	2.2937	1.0642	0.6203
FEMNIST - CNN	0.8649	0.6095	0.7092	0.8168	0.7193	1.1449	0.1995
SHAKESPEARE - RNN	3.0860	2.2590	1.7736	2.5127	1.9048	2.3290	2.0226

Table 2: Train Loss after training deep model for 500 synchronization rounds

not straightforward to obtain a useful combination of optimizers. In most of the cases, FEDLI-LU worked the best (combination of Deep Franke Wolfe and SGD). We also note that for this combination of optimizers, hyperparameter tuning is almost the least effort-taking.

FEDLI-LU and FEDLI-L significantly outperforms FedAvg and other baseline approaches across the board: Our experimental results in Table 1 demonstrate that our algorithm FEDLI-LU outperforms FedAvg and competing baselines using the best-performing η_g and η_l found by grid search. In contrast, FEDLI-LS is comparable with other algorithms and even outperforms the others in a few cases.

Hyperparameter details: For our baselines, we find the best performing η_g and η_l by grid-search tuning. This is achieved by running the experiments for 100 rounds and seeing the parameters that achieve the highest training accuracy. The details of the grid used are described below.

Grid for Neural Network Experiments. For all algorithms the grid for η_g is $\{10^{-1}, 10^{-2}, 10^0\}$. For FedExp the grid for ϵ is $\{10^{-3}, 10^{-2.5}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1.5}, 10^{-1}\}$ as in original paper. The grid for η_l is $\{10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 10^0\}$. The standard values have been used as in original papers. The best values obtained for η_l as 10^{-2} , ϵ as 10^{-3} and for η_g as 10^0 is set for all our algorithms. We specifically used weight decay as 10^{-3} . We also use gradient clipping to improve the stability of the algorithms. In all experiments, we fix the number of participating clients to be 10 out of a total of 100 and minibatch size to be 32.

Comparison with FedAdam for the case of Shakespeare dataset: The case of the Shakespeare dataset, which consists of text from Shakespeare’s plays, is highly non-IID because different characters in the plays have different styles, vocabularies, and frequencies of words; FedAdam tends to perform better because it effectively adapts to the non-IID nature of the data, reduces client drift, and offers stable and efficient training, particularly in complex tasks like character-level language modeling. In contrast, other algorithms might need help with the extreme non-IID nature of the Shakespeare dataset or require more careful tuning to achieve similar performance.