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## Online gradient descent

## 1 Background

In this lecture, we will present Zinkevich's Online Convex Optimization analysis of gradient descent. As background, let us recall the definition of the gradient of a function $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The gradient itself is a function $\nabla f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$, which, evaluated at $x$ is:

$$
\nabla f(x)=\left(\frac{d f}{d x_{1}}(x), \frac{d f}{d x_{2}}(x), \ldots, \frac{d f}{d x_{n}}(x)\right) .
$$

In one dimension, the gradient is just the derivative. A function is differentiable if the gradient exists.

Also a function $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex if

$$
f\left(\alpha x+(1-\alpha) x^{\prime}\right) \leq \alpha f(x)+(1-\alpha) f\left(x^{\prime}\right), \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, \alpha \in[0,1] .
$$

Geometrically, this means that if you draw a line segment between the vectors $(x, f(x))$ and $\left(x^{\prime}, f\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right)$, the function lies below this line segment. Also, for a convex differentiable function, we have at any $x$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f\left(x^{\prime}\right)-f(x) \geq(\nabla f(x)) \cdot\left(x^{\prime}-x\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Geometrically, the above statement means that if you draw the tangent plane to the function at point $x$, the function lies above it. (Think about it in one dimension....)

The gradient of a function gives the direction of steepest increase. Thus a natural minimization algorithm is to go in the direction opposite the gradient a certain amount. For any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$, the gradient descent algorithm (for minimizing a function $f$ ) with learning rate $\eta$, chooses a sequence of points $x^{1}, x^{2}, \ldots$, such that,

$$
x^{t+1}=x^{t}-\eta \nabla f\left(x^{t}\right) .
$$

In many cases we are restricted to a bounded convex set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$, which is the range of $f: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In this case, the above rule may lead us to choose a point $x \notin S$, which is a problem. A common trick is to move to the closest point to $x$ in the set $S$, which we call $\Pi_{S}(x)$, i.e.,

$$
\Pi_{S}(x)=\arg \min _{x^{\prime} \in S}\left\|x-x^{\prime}\right\| .
$$

So the official gradient descent update is,

$$
x^{t+1}=\Pi_{S}\left(x^{t}-\eta \nabla f\left(x^{t}\right)\right) .
$$

The parameter $\eta$ is often called the learning rate and the set $S$ is the feasible set.

## 2 Foreground

Zinkevich gave a nice analysis of online gradient descent. He showed the following. Assume $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is a closed convex set of diameter at most $D$. This means that for every $x, x^{\prime} \in S,\left\|x-x^{\prime}\right\| \leq D$. Then,

Theorem 1 (Zinkevich 02) Consider any sequence of differentiable functions $f^{1}, f^{2}, \ldots, f^{T}$ : $S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\left\|\nabla f^{t}(x)\right\| \leq G$ for any $1 \leq t \leq T, x \in S$, i.e. $G$ is an upper bound on the gradient magnitudes (known in advance). Then for the following sequence, $x^{1}, x^{2}, \ldots, x^{T}$,

$$
x^{t+1}=\Pi_{S}\left(x^{t}-\eta \nabla f^{t}\left(x^{t}\right)\right),
$$

where $\eta=\frac{D}{G \sqrt{T}}$, the total of the functions is,

$$
\sum_{t=1}^{T} f^{t}\left(x^{t}\right) \leq \min _{x \in S}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T} f^{t}(x)\right)+D G \sqrt{T}
$$

Proof. The convex function has a minimum (at least 1) somewhere in $S$. Translate space so that 0 is this minimum. This is without loss of generality because translations will not change how the algorithm works. We now need to bound the regret with respect to $\sum f^{t}(0)$.

We use the "potential function" method of proof. Define the potential $\Phi_{t}=-\frac{1}{2 \eta}\left\|x^{t}\right\|^{2}$. We will show that,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{t}\left(x^{t}\right)-f^{t}\left(x^{\star}\right)+\Phi_{t+1}-\Phi_{t} \leq \eta G^{2} / 2 . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Intuitively, we cannot guarantee that on any particular function $f^{t}\left(x^{t}\right)$ won't be much larger than $f^{t}\left(x^{\star}\right)$. However, if it is, this means that $x^{t+1}$ will be much closer to $x^{\star}$ than $x^{t}$ was.

Summing from $t=1$ to $T$, the sum telescopes and we have,

$$
\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(f^{t}\left(x^{t}\right)-f^{t}(0)\right)+\Phi_{T+1}-\Phi_{1} \leq \eta G^{2} T / 2 .
$$

Since $-\frac{D^{2}}{2 \eta} \leq \Phi_{t} \leq 0$, this gives,

$$
\sum_{t=1}^{T} f^{t}\left(x^{t}\right) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} f^{t}(0)+\frac{D^{2} T}{2 \eta}+\frac{\eta G^{2} T}{2}
$$

Plugging in $\eta=\frac{D}{G \sqrt{T}}$ gives the theorem.
It remains to prove (2). This requires two parts. First, we argue that $\left\|\Pi_{S}(x)\right\| \leq\|x\|$. This will follow from the convexity of $S$ and the fact that the origin is assumed to be in $S$.

Using the vector law of cosines, $\|u+v\|^{2}=\|u\|^{2}+\|v\|^{2}+2 u \cdot v$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{t+1}-\Phi_{t} & =\frac{1}{2 \eta}\left(\left\|x^{t+1}\right\|^{2}-\left\|x^{t}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2 \eta}\left(\left\|x^{t}-\eta \nabla f^{t}\left(x^{t}\right)\right\|^{2}-\left\|x^{t}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{2 \eta}\left(\left\|x^{t}\right\|^{2}+\eta^{2}\left\|\nabla f^{t}\left(x^{t}\right)\right\|^{2}-2 \eta \nabla f^{t}\left(x^{t}\right) \cdot x^{t}-\left\|x^{t}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \eta G^{2}-\nabla f^{t}\left(x^{t}\right) \cdot x^{t}
\end{aligned}
$$

Using (1), we have that

$$
f^{t}(0)-f^{t}\left(x^{t}\right) \geq \nabla f^{t}\left(x^{t}\right) \cdot\left(0-x^{t}\right) .
$$

Combining the last two inequalities gives (2).

