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- convex equality constrained optimization problem

$$
\begin{array}{rc}
\operatorname{minimize} & f(x) \\
\text { subject to } & A x=b
\end{array}
$$

- $f$ is separable

$$
f(x)=f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)+\cdots+f_{N}\left(x_{N}\right), x=\left(x_{1}, \cdots, x_{N}\right)
$$

- $N$ large

Goals: robust methods for

- arbitrary-scale optimization
- big data
- dynamic optimization on large-scale network
- decentralized optimization
- parallel computing, by passing relatively small messages.
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- convex equality constrained optimization problem

$$
\begin{array}{rc}
\operatorname{minimize} & f(x) \\
\text { subject to } & A x=b
\end{array}
$$

- Lagrangian: $L(x, y)=f(x)+y^{\top}(A x-b)$
- dual function: $g(y)=\inf _{x} L(x, y)$
- dual problem:

$$
\text { maximize } g(y)
$$

- recover:

$$
x^{*}=\arg \min _{x} L\left(x, y^{*}\right)
$$

## Dual descent

- gradient method for dual problem: $y_{k+1}=y_{k}+\alpha_{k} \nabla g\left(y_{k}\right)$
- $\nabla g\left(y_{k}\right)=A \tilde{x}-b$, where $\tilde{x}=\arg \min _{x} L\left(x, y_{k}\right)$
- dual ascent method is

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{k+1} & :=\arg \min _{x} L\left(x, y_{k}\right) \rightarrow x \text {-minimization } \\
y_{k+1} & :=y_{k}+\alpha_{k}\left(A x_{k+1}-b\right) \rightarrow \text { dual update }
\end{aligned}
$$

- works, but with lots of strong assumptions
- $f$ be convex, finite and have compact lower level sets.


## Dual Decomposition

- if $f$ is separable, then $L$ is separable

$$
L(x, y)=L_{1}\left(x_{1}, y\right)+\cdots+L_{N}\left(x_{N}, y\right)-y^{\top} b
$$

where $L_{i}\left(x_{i}, y\right)=f_{i}\left(x_{i}\right)+y^{\top} A_{i} x_{i}$ and $A=\left[A_{1}, A_{2}, \cdots, A_{N}\right]$

- x-minimization in dual ascent splits into $N$ separate minimizations

$$
x_{i, k+1}:=\arg \min _{x_{i}} L_{i}\left(x_{i}, y_{k}\right)
$$

which can be done in parallel.

## Dual Decomposition

- dual decomposition

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{i}^{k+1} & :=\arg \min _{x_{i}} L_{i}\left(x_{i}, y^{k}\right), i=1,2, \cdots, N \\
y^{k+1} & :=y^{k}+\alpha_{k}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_{i} x_{i}^{k+1}-b\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

- update $x_{i}$ in parallel, gather $A_{i} x_{i}^{k+1}$; scatter $y^{k}$ (limited communication among parallel processes)
- To solve a large problem by dual decomposition
- by iteratively solving the $x$-minimization subproblems (in parallel)
- dual variable update provides coordination
- works, but with lots of assumptions; often slow.
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## Method of Multipliers

- a method to make dual ascent robust
- based on augmented Lagrangian (Hestense, Powell 1969), given $\rho>0$

$$
L_{\rho}(x, y)=f(x)+y^{\top}(A x-b)+\frac{\rho}{2}\|A x-b\|_{2}^{2}
$$

- method of multipliers can be formalized as

$$
\begin{aligned}
x^{k+1} & :=\arg \min _{x} L_{\rho}\left(x, y^{k}\right) \\
y^{k+1} & :=y^{k}+\rho\left(A x^{k+1}-b\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

compared to dual decomposition

- converges under much more relaxed conditions ( $f$ can be nondifferentiable, can take on value $+\infty$, etc.), but
- quadratic penalty destroys splitting of the $x$-update, so decomposition is not attainable, thus no good for large scale optimization
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## Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM)

- ADMM problem form (assume $f, g$ are convex)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{minimize} f(x)+g(z) \\
& \text { subject to } A x+B z=c
\end{aligned}
$$

- $L_{\rho}(x, z, y)=f(x)+g(z)+y^{\top}(A x+B z-c)+\frac{\rho}{2}\|A x+B z-c\|_{2}^{2}$
- ADMM

$$
\begin{aligned}
x^{k+1} & :=\arg \min _{x} L_{\rho}\left(x, z^{k}, y^{k}\right) \rightarrow x \text {-minimization } \\
z^{k+1} & :=\arg \min _{z} L_{\rho}\left(x^{k+1}, z, y^{k}\right) \rightarrow z \text {-minimization } \\
y^{k+1} & :=y^{k}+\rho\left(A x^{k+1}+B z^{k+1}-c\right) \rightarrow \text { dual update }
\end{aligned}
$$

- minimize over $x$ and $z$ jointly, ADMM reduces to method of multipliers
- decomposition becomes available on x-minimization and z-minimization
- optimality conditions for differentiable $f, g$ are satisfied by ADMM
- primal feasibility: $A x+B z-c=0$
- dual feasibility: $\nabla f(x)+A^{\top} y=0, \nabla g(z)+B^{\top} z=0$


## ADMM with scaled dual variables

- combine linear and quadratic terms in augmented Lagrangian

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_{\rho}(x, z, y) & =f(x)+g(z)+y^{\top}(A x+B z-c)+\frac{\rho}{2}\|A x+B z-c\|_{2}^{2} \\
= & f(x)+g(z)+\frac{\rho}{2}\|A x+B z-c+u\|_{2}^{2}+\text { const } .
\end{aligned}
$$

with $u=(1 / \rho) y$. This holds because (let $r=A x+B z-c$ )

$$
y^{\top} r+\frac{\rho}{2}\|r\|_{2}^{2}=\frac{\rho}{2}\left\|r+\frac{1}{\rho} y\right\|_{2}^{2}-\frac{\rho}{2}\|y\|_{2}^{2}=\frac{\rho}{2}\|r+u\|_{2}^{2}-\frac{\rho}{2}\|u\|_{2}^{2}
$$

- ADMM (scaled dual form)

$$
\begin{aligned}
x^{k+1} & :=\arg \min _{x}\left(f(x)+(\rho / 2)\left\|A x+B z^{k}-c+u^{k}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right. \\
z^{k+1} & :=\arg \min _{z}\left(g(z)+(\rho / 2)\left\|A x^{k+1}+B z-c+u^{k}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right. \\
u^{k+1} & :=u^{k}+\left(A x^{k+1}+B z^{k+1}-c\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Convergence

- assumptions: $f, g$ convex, closed, proper, $L_{0}$ has a saddle point
- then ADMM converges


## Related Algorithms

- operator splitting methods
- proximal point algorithm
- Dykstra's alternating projections algorithm
- proximal methods
- Bregman iterative methods
- ...


## Common Patterns

- $x$-update step requires minimizing $f(x)+(\rho / 2)\|A x-v\|^{2}$ (with $v=B z^{k}-c+u^{k}$, which is constant during $x$-update)
- similar for $z$-update
- several special cases come up often, can simplify update by exploit structure in these cases


## Decomposition

- suppose $f$ is block-separable

$$
f(x)=f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)+f_{2}\left(x_{2}\right)+\cdots+f_{N}\left(x_{N}\right), x=\left[x_{1}, \cdots, x_{N}\right]
$$

- $A$ is block-separable, i.e. $A^{\top} A$ is block-diagnoal
- then $x$-update splits into $N$ parallel updates of $x_{i}$
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## Proximal Operator

- consider $x$-minimization when $A=I$

$$
x^{+}=\arg \min _{x}\left(f(x)+\frac{\rho}{2}\|x-v\|_{2}^{2}\right)=\operatorname{prox}_{f, \rho}(v)
$$

where $v=-B z+c-u$

- some special cases
$f=I_{C}($ indicator fct. of $C) \quad x^{+}:=\Pi_{C}(v)($ projection onto $C)$

$$
f=\lambda\|\cdot\|_{1}\left(\ell_{1} \text { norm }\right) \quad x_{i}^{+}:=S_{\lambda / \rho}\left(v_{i}\right)(\text { soft thresholding })
$$

where $C$ is closed, non-empty and convex, and

$$
S_{a}(v)=(v-a)_{+}-(-v-a)_{+}
$$

## Quadratic Objective

- $f(x)=1 / 2 x^{\top} P x+q^{\top} x+r$
- $x^{+}:=\left(P+\rho A^{\top} A\right)^{-1}\left(\rho A^{\top} v-q\right)$
- use matrix inversion lemma when computationally advantageous

$$
\left(P+\rho A^{\top} A\right)^{-1}=P^{-1}-\rho P^{-1} A^{\top}\left(I+\rho A P^{-1} A^{\top}\right)^{-1} A P^{-1}
$$

- (direct method) cache factorization $P+\rho A^{\top} A$ or $I+\rho A P^{-1} A^{\top}$
- (iterative method) warm start, early stopping, reducing tolerances.


## Constrained convex optimization

- consider ADMM for generic problem

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{minimize} f(x) \\
& \text { subject to } x \in \mathcal{C}
\end{aligned}
$$

- ADMM form: take $g$ to be indicator of $\mathcal{C}$, i.e. $g(z)=I_{C}(z)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{minimize} f(x)+g(z) \\
& \text { subject to } x-z=0
\end{aligned}
$$

- algorithm

$$
\begin{aligned}
x^{k+1} & :=\arg \min _{x}\left(f(x)+\frac{\rho}{2}\left\|x-z^{k}+u^{k}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right) \\
z^{k+1} & :=\Pi_{C}\left(x^{k+1}+u^{k}\right) \\
u^{k+1} & :=u^{k}+x^{k+1}-z^{k+1}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Lasso

- lasso problem

$$
\operatorname{minimize} \frac{1}{2}\|A x-b\|_{2}^{2}+\lambda\|x\|_{1}
$$

- ADMM form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{minimize} \frac{1}{2}\|A x-b\|_{2}^{2}+\lambda\|z\|_{1} \\
& \text { subject to } x-z=0
\end{aligned}
$$

- algorithm

$$
\begin{aligned}
x^{k+1} & :=\left(A^{\top} A+\rho /\right)^{-1}\left(A^{\top} b+\rho z^{k}-u^{k}\right) \\
z^{k+1} & :=S_{\lambda / \rho}\left(x^{k+1}+u^{k} / \rho\right) \\
u^{k+1} & :=u^{k}+\rho\left(x^{k+1}-z^{k+1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Sparse inverse covariance selection

- $S$ : empirical covariance of samples from $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, with $\Sigma^{-1}$ sparse (i.e., Gaussain Markov random field)
- estimate $\Sigma^{-1}$ via $\ell_{1}$ regularized maximum likelihood

$$
\text { minimize } x \operatorname{Tr}(S X)-\log \operatorname{det} X+\lambda\|X\|_{1}
$$

- ADMM form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { minimize } \operatorname{Tr}(S X)-\log \operatorname{det} X+\lambda\|Z\|_{1} \\
& \text { subject to } X-Z=0
\end{aligned}
$$

- algorithm

$$
\begin{aligned}
X^{k+1} & :=\arg \min _{X} \operatorname{Tr}(S X)-\log \operatorname{det} X+(\rho / 2)\left\|X-Z^{k}+U^{k}\right\|_{F}^{2} \\
Z^{k+1} & :=S_{\lambda / \rho}\left(X^{k+1}+U^{k} / \rho\right) \\
U^{k+1} & :=U^{k}+\rho\left(X^{k+1}-Z^{k+1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Analytical Solution for $X$-update

- first-order optimality condition

$$
S-X^{-1}+\rho\left(X-Z^{k}+U^{k}\right)=0
$$

i.e.

$$
\rho X-X^{-1}=\rho\left(Z^{k}-U^{k}\right)-S
$$

- eigendecomposition $\rho\left(Z^{k}-U^{k}\right)-S=Q \wedge Q^{\top}$
- form diagonal matrix $\tilde{X}=Q^{\top} X Q$ with

$$
\tilde{X}_{i i}=\frac{\lambda_{i}+\sqrt{\lambda_{i}^{2}+4 \rho}}{2 \rho}
$$

- let $X^{k+1}:=Q \tilde{X} Q^{\top}$
- cost of $X$-update is an eigendecomposition
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## Consensus optimization

- to solve problem with $N$ objective terms

$$
\operatorname{minimize} \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_{i}(x)
$$

e.g. $f_{i}$ is the loss function for the $i$ th block (mini-batch) of training data

- ADMM form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{minimize} \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_{i}\left(x_{i}\right) \\
& \text { subject to } x_{i}-z=0
\end{aligned}
$$

here

- $x_{i}$ s are local variables
- $z$ is the global variable
- $x_{i}-z=0$ are consistency or consensus constraints
- can add regularization using a $g(z)$ term.


## Consensus optimization via ADMM

- $L_{\rho}(x, z, y)=\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(f_{i}\left(x_{i}\right)+y_{i}^{\top}\left(x_{i}-z\right)+(\rho / 2)\left\|x_{i}-z\right\|_{2}^{2}\right)$
- ADMM

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{i}^{k+1} & :=\arg \min _{x_{i}}\left(f_{i}\left(x_{i}\right)+\left(y_{i}^{k}\right)^{\top}\left(x_{i}-z^{k}\right)+(\rho / 2)\left\|x_{i}-z^{k}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right. \\
z^{k+1} & :=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(x_{i}^{k+1}+(1 / \rho) y_{i}^{k}\right) \\
y_{i}^{k+1} & :=y_{i}^{k}+\rho\left(x_{i}^{k+1}-z^{k+1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

- if regularization term included, averaging in $z$ update is followed by prox ${ }_{g, \rho}$

The z-update can be written as

$$
z^{k+1}=\bar{x}^{k+1}+\frac{1}{\rho} \bar{y}^{k}
$$

Similarly, averaging the y-update, we have

$$
\bar{y}^{k+1}=\bar{y}^{k}+\rho\left(\bar{x}^{k+1}-z^{k+1}\right)
$$

substituting $z^{k+1}$ to $\bar{y}^{k+1}$ leads to $\bar{y}^{k+1}=0$, which means
the dual variables have average value zero after the first iteration

## Consensus optimization via ADMM

- using $\sum_{i} y_{i}^{k}=0$, algorithm simplifies to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x_{i}^{k+1}:=\arg \min _{x_{i}}\left(f_{i}\left(x_{i}\right)+\left(y_{i}^{k}\right)^{\top}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}^{k}\right)+(\rho / 2)\left\|x_{i}-\bar{x}^{k}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right) \\
& y_{i}^{k+1}:=y_{i}^{k}+\rho\left(x_{i}^{k+1}-\bar{x}^{k+1}\right) \\
& \text { where } \bar{x}^{k}=(1 / N) \sum_{i} x_{i}^{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

- in each iteration
- gather $x_{i}^{k}$ and average to get $\bar{x}^{k}$
- scatter the average $\bar{x}^{k}$ to processors
- update $y_{i}^{k}$ locally (in each processor, in parallel)
- update $x_{i}$ locally


## Statistical interpretation

- $f_{i}$ is negative log-likelihood for parameter $x$ given $i$ th data block
- $x_{i}^{k+1}$ is an MAP estimate under prior $\mathcal{N}\left(\bar{x}^{k}+\frac{1}{\rho} y_{i}^{k}, \rho l\right)$
- prior mean is previous iteration's consensus shifted by 'price' of processor $i$ disagreeing with previous consensus
- processors only need to support a Gaussian MAP method
- type or number of data in each block not relevant
- consensus protocol yields global maximum-likelihood estimate


## Consensus classification

- data (examples) $\left(a_{i}, b_{i}\right), i=1, \cdots, N, a_{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, b_{i} \in\{+1,-1\}$
- linear classifier $\operatorname{sign}\left(a^{\top} w+v\right)$, with weight $w$, offset $v$
- margin for $i$ th example is $b_{i}\left(a_{i}^{\top} w+v\right)$; want margin to be positive
- loss for ith example is $\ell\left(b_{i}\left(a_{i}^{\top} w+v\right)\right)$
- $\ell$ is loss function, could be hinge, logistic, probit, exponential, etc...
- choose $w, v$ to minimize

$$
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ell\left(b_{i}\left(a_{i}^{\top} w+v\right)\right)+r(w)
$$

- split data and use ADMM consensus to solve

In case of SVM with hinge loss and $\ell_{2}$-regularization, the ADMM algorithm

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{i}^{k+1} & =\arg \min _{x_{i}}\left(1^{\top}\left(A_{i} x_{i}+\mathbf{1}\right)_{+}+\frac{\rho}{2}\left\|x_{i}-z^{k}+u_{i}^{k}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right) \\
z^{k+1} & =\frac{\rho}{(1 / \lambda)+N \rho}\left(\bar{x}^{k+1}+\bar{u}^{k}\right) \\
u_{i}^{k+1} & =u_{i}^{k}+x_{i}^{k+1}-z^{k+1}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Interpretation

- each $x_{i}$-update involves fitting a SVM to local data $A_{i}$ with an offset in the regularization term
- the dual variable $z$ gathers the solutions for consensus
- the dual variable $u$ update the offset


## Consensus SVM example

- hinge loss $\ell(u)=(1-u)_{+}$with $\ell_{2}$ regularization
- toy problem with $n=2, N=400$ to illustrate
- examples split into 20 groups, in worst possible way: each group contains only positive or negative examples




Figure: training iterations $1,5,40$
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- ADMM gives simple single-processor algorithms that can be competitive with state-of-the-art
- can be used to coordinate many processors, each solving a substantial problem, to solve a very large problem
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8 Conclusions and Research Avenues

- big data techniques
- computational statistics, machine learning
- especially on large data sets
- data fusion
- heterogeneous and homogeneous data sets
- stream data
- small data learning
- optimization
- loss function - data associated, summation form, task-specific, determined by data modelling

