

# **Multi-agent Online Optimization**

**Other titles in Foundations and Trends® in Optimization**

*An Invitation to Deep Reinforcement Learning*

Bernhard Jaeger and Andreas Geiger

ISBN: 978-1-63828-440-6

*Constrained Reinforcement Learning with Average Reward Objective:  
Model-Based and Model-Free Algorithms*

Vaneet Aggarwal, Washim Uddin Mondal and Qinbo Bai

ISBN: 978-1-63828-396-6

*Stochastic Optimization Methods for Policy Evaluation in Reinforcement  
Learning*

Yi Zhou and Shaocong Ma

ISBN: 978-1-63828-370-6

*Numerical Methods for Convex Multistage Stochastic Optimization*

Guanghui Lan and Alexander Shapiro

ISBN: 978-1-63828-350-8

*A Tutorial on Hadamard Semidifferentials*

Kenneth Lange

ISBN: 978-1-63828-348-5

*Massively Parallel Computation: Algorithms and Applications*

Sungjin Im, Ravi Kumar, Silvio Lattanzi, Benjamin Moseley and Sergei  
Vassilvitskii

ISBN: 978-1-63828-216-7

# Multi-agent Online Optimization

---

**Deming Yuan**

Nanjing University of Science and Technology  
dmyuan1012@njust.edu.cn

**Alexandre Proutiere**

KTH Royal Institute of Technology  
alepro@kth.se

**Guodong Shi**

The University of Sydney  
guodong.shi@sydney.edu.au

**now**

the essence of knowledge

Boston — Delft

## Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Optimization

*Published, sold and distributed by:*

now Publishers Inc.  
PO Box 1024  
Hanover, MA 02339  
United States  
Tel. +1-781-985-4510  
[www.nowpublishers.com](http://www.nowpublishers.com)  
[sales@nowpublishers.com](mailto:sales@nowpublishers.com)

*Outside North America:*

now Publishers Inc.  
PO Box 179  
2600 AD Delft  
The Netherlands  
Tel. +31-6-51115274

The preferred citation for this publication is

D. Yuan *et al.*. *Multi-agent Online Optimization*. Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Optimization, vol. 7, no. 2-3, pp. 81–263, 2024.

ISBN: 978-1-63828-483-3

© 2025 D. Yuan *et al.*

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Photocopying. In the USA: This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by now Publishers Inc for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC). The 'services' for users can be found on the internet at: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com)

For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license, a separate system of payment has been arranged. Authorization does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as that for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. In the rest of the world: Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to now Publishers Inc., PO Box 1024, Hanover, MA 02339, USA; Tel. +1 781 871 0245; [www.nowpublishers.com](http://www.nowpublishers.com); [sales@nowpublishers.com](mailto:sales@nowpublishers.com)

now Publishers Inc. has an exclusive license to publish this material worldwide. Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright license holder. Please apply to now Publishers, PO Box 179, 2600 AD Delft, The Netherlands, [www.nowpublishers.com](http://www.nowpublishers.com); e-mail: [sales@nowpublishers.com](mailto:sales@nowpublishers.com)

**Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Optimization**  
Volume 7, Issue 2-3, 2024  
**Editorial Board**

**Editors-in-Chief**

**Garud Iyengar**  
Columbia University

**Editors**

Dimitris Bertsimas  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

John R. Birge  
*The University of Chicago*

Robert E. Bixby  
*Rice University*

Emmanuel Candes  
*Stanford University*

David Donoho  
*Stanford University*

Laurent El Ghaoui  
*University of California, Berkeley*

Donald Goldfarb  
*Columbia University*

Michael I. Jordan  
*University of California, Berkeley*

Zhi-Quan (Tom) Luo  
*University of Minnesota, Twin Cities*

George L. Nemhauser  
*Georgia Institute of Technology*

Arkadi Nemirovski  
*Georgia Institute of Technology*

Yurii Nesterov  
*HSE University*

Jorge Nocedal  
*Northwestern University*

Pablo A. Parrilo  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

Boris T. Polyak  
*Institute for Control Science, Moscow*

Tamás Terlaky  
*Lehigh University*

Michael J. Todd  
*Cornell University*

Kim-Chuan Toh  
*National University of Singapore*

John N. Tsitsiklis  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

Lieven Vandenbergh  
*University of California, Los Angeles*

Robert J. Vanderbei  
*Princeton University*

Stephen J. Wright  
*University of Wisconsin*

## Editorial Scope

Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Optimization publishes survey and tutorial articles in the following topics:

- algorithm design, analysis, and implementation (especially, on modern computing platforms)
- models and modeling systems, new optimization formulations for practical problems
- applications of optimization in machine learning, statistics, and data analysis, signal and image processing, computational economics and finance, engineering design, scheduling and resource allocation, and other areas

### Information for Librarians

Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Optimization, 2024, Volume 7, 4 issues. ISSN paper version 2167-3888. ISSN online version 2167-3918. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.

## Contents

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Online Optimization . . . . .	2
1.2	Multi-agent Optimization . . . . .	4
1.3	Multi-agent Online Optimization . . . . .	6
1.4	Scope and Organization . . . . .	7
1.5	Notation and Basic Definitions . . . . .	8
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1	Graph Theory . . . . .	9
2.2	Distributed Averaging Algorithms . . . . .	11
2.3	Distributed Multi-agent Optimization . . . . .	14
2.4	Online Optimization . . . . .	20
2.5	Bibliographic Remarks . . . . .	27
<b>3</b>	<b>Full Information Feedback</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1	Distributed Online Gradient Descent . . . . .	30
3.2	Distributed Online Mirror Descent . . . . .	35
3.3	Distributed Online Dual Averaging . . . . .	41
3.4	Bibliographic Remarks . . . . .	47
<b>4</b>	<b>Bandit Feedback</b>	<b>48</b>
4.1	Distributed Online Bandit Gradient Descent . . . . .	49
4.2	Distributed Online Bandit Mirror Descent . . . . .	58

4.3	Distributed Online Bandit Dual Averaging . . . . .	65
4.4	Bibliographic Remarks . . . . .	69
<b>5</b>	<b>Decisions Under Long-term Constraints</b>	<b>70</b>
5.1	Long-term Constraints . . . . .	70
5.2	Full Information Feedback Under Long-term Constraints . . . . .	71
5.3	Bandit Feedback Under Long-term Constraints . . . . .	80
5.4	Bibliographic Remarks . . . . .	91
<b>6</b>	<b>Multi-agent Online Linear Regressions</b>	<b>92</b>
6.1	Full Information Feedback . . . . .	93
6.2	Bandit Feedback . . . . .	105
6.3	Adaptive Adversaries . . . . .	117
6.4	Exact Regressions . . . . .	121
6.5	Bibliographic Remarks . . . . .	129
<b>7</b>	<b>Decisions Over Compressed Communications</b>	<b>130</b>
7.1	Data Compressor . . . . .	131
7.2	Full Information Feedback . . . . .	131
7.3	Bandit Feedback . . . . .	147
7.4	Bibliographic Remarks . . . . .	150
<b>8</b>	<b>Decisions Over Dynamic Networks</b>	<b>152</b>
8.1	Averaging Over Time-Dependent Networks . . . . .	152
8.2	Online Optimization Over Dynamic Networks . . . . .	154
8.3	Online Optimization Over Random Networks . . . . .	156
8.4	Bibliographic Remarks . . . . .	169
	<b>References</b>	<b>171</b>



# Multi-agent Online Optimization

Deming Yuan<sup>1</sup>, Alexandre Proutiere<sup>2</sup> and Guodong Shi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Nanjing University of Science and Technology, China;*  
*dmyuan1012@njust.edu.cn*

<sup>2</sup>*KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden; alepro@kth.se*

<sup>3</sup>*The University of Sydney, Australia; guodong.shi@sydney.edu.au*

---

## ABSTRACT

This monograph provides an overview of distributed online optimization in multi-agent systems. Online optimization approaches planning and decision problems from a robust learning perspective, where one learns through feedback from sequentially arriving costs, resembling a game between a learner (agent) and the environment. Recently, multi-agent systems have become important in diverse areas including smart power grids, communication networks, machine learning, and robotics, where agents work with decentralized data, costs, and decisions to collectively minimize a system-wide cost. In such settings, agents make distributed decisions and collaborate with neighboring agents through a communication network, leading to scalable solutions that often perform as well as centralized methods. The monograph offers a unified introduction, starting with fundamental algorithms for basic problems, and gradually covering state-of-the-art techniques for more complex settings. The interplay between individual agent learning rates, network structure, and communication complexity is highlighted in the overall system performance.

# 1

---

## Introduction

---

### 1.1 Online Optimization

Online optimization treats the optimization process as one where data and cost functions are introduced sequentially. This approach traces back to classical work on sequential decision-making, particularly in multi-armed bandit problems. Recently, online optimization has become an important tool in machine learning, addressing problems such as recommender systems and spam filtering [38]. In this framework, decisions are made to optimize time-varying cost functions, with the process evolving through feedback, allowing the learner to improve over time. Performance is typically evaluated against a static optimal decision that could have been made in hindsight. Formally, online optimization is modeled as a game between a learner and an adversary, played over a finite time horizon  $t = 1, \dots, T$ .

**Online Optimization Paradigm [77]**

**Initialize**  $\mathcal{X}$  as a convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

For  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , DO

- (i) The adversary selects a convex cost function  $\ell_t(\cdot) : \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and keeps it to itself;
- (ii) The learner makes a decision  $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{X}$ ;
- (iii) The learner suffers a loss  $\ell_t(\mathbf{x}_t)$ , and receives the cost function  $\ell_t(\cdot)$  (full information), or just the value of the loss  $\ell_t(\mathbf{x}_t)$  (bandit information).

In classical optimization (i.e., a classical learner), the loss function  $\ell_t(\cdot)$  at step  $t$  is revealed before the learner attempts to minimize it. In contrast, online optimization acknowledges the difficulty in knowing  $\ell_t(\cdot)$  or even a model of it before decisions are made. The learner receives information about  $\ell_t(\cdot)$  after she has taken a decision and this information can be the whole function, a scenario referred to as *full information*; or the learner only experiences losses at selected decisions, and in this case, we talk about *bandit information*. The loss functions  $\ell_t(\cdot)$  are generally assumed to be arbitrary (but chosen from a given function class). Hence, it is impossible for the learner to infer  $\ell_t(\cdot)$  before the decisions are made. As a result, it is sensible for the learner to identify  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_T \in \mathcal{X}$  so that the *regret*, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{Reg}(T) := \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(\mathbf{x}) \quad (1.1)$$

is minimized. In the above definition,  $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(\mathbf{x})$  is the minimal accumulated loss of an oracle making a static decision to whom all  $\ell_t(\cdot)$  are known before  $t = 1$ . Therefore,  $\mathbf{Reg}(T)$  represents the difference between the actual accumulated loss experienced by the learner compared to that of such an oracle.

The central premise of online optimization lies in the possibility of achieving an infinitesimal regret on average in the asymptotic sense, i.e.,

$$\text{Reg}(T)/T = o(1)$$

for carefully crafted algorithms as  $T$  grows large. Typically, one may achieve  $\text{Reg}(T) = \mathcal{O}(T^\alpha)$  for some  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , implying a robust learning process.

## 1.2 Multi-agent Optimization

Multi-agent optimization arises from emerging applications in smart grids, machine learning, robotics, etc., where data and decisions are spread over physically separated subsystems represented by agents. The agents are interconnected through a communication network, aiming to minimize a system-level cost [12]. In the simplest form, the communication network is modeled as an undirected graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ , where  $\mathcal{V}$  is a finite set of indices representing agents, and  $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}$  indicates that nodes  $i$  and  $j$  can communicate.

**Example 1.1.** (Optimal Power Flow [30]) Consider an electrical network with  $n$  nodes indexed in  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathbf{i}_i \in \mathbb{C}$  be the voltage and inflow current at node  $i$ . The network structure is captured by an admittance matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ . Then  $\mathbf{x}_i := \text{Re}(\mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{i}_i^\dagger)$  defines the active power at node  $i$ , where  $\dagger$  is the complex conjugate. Let  $\ell_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$  denote the cost associated with the power allocation at node  $i$ . An optimal power flow problem seeks to minimize the cost of electric power generation while satisfying operating constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x}} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & \mathbf{x}_i = \text{Re}(\mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{i}_i^\dagger), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \\ & \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{i}_i^\dagger = \mathbf{v}_i \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{A}_{ij}^\dagger \mathbf{v}_j^\dagger, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

**Example 1.2.** (Collaborative Learning [29]) Consider  $n$  data owners indexed in  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Each data owner  $i$  holds a private data set  $\{(\mathbf{y}_{ik}, \mathbf{z}_{ik}) : k = 1, \dots, K_i\}$ , where  $\mathbf{y}_{ik}$  represents input data, and  $\mathbf{z}_{ik}$  is the corresponding label. When  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is a local model for the learning representation, the local cost for agent  $i$  is

$$\ell_i(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{k=1}^{K_i} g(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{y}_{ik}, \mathbf{z}_{ik}),$$

where  $g$  is a loss function quantifying the accuracy of the local models. A collaborative learning problem is then described by

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x}} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2 = \dots = \mathbf{x}_n \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

where the agents collectively train a model from all data sets.

**Example 1.3.** (Multi-robot Localization and Mapping [89]) Consider a team of robots indexed in  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Each robot  $i$  is modeled as a 3D rigid body described by a pose  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . A conventional representation of  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is via a  $4 \times 4$  transformation matrix that combines the translation of the center of the mass  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$  and the rotation of the robot body  $R_i \in \text{SO}(3)$ :

$$\mathbf{x}_i := \begin{bmatrix} R_i & x_i \\ 0_{3 \times 1} & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

There are also  $k$  features  $m_1, \dots, m_k$  used as landmarks for the environment. Each robot  $i$  observes its relative pose  $y_{is}$  to landmark  $s$ . The robots aim to solve the following optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}, m_1, \dots, m_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^k \|\ell_i(\mathbf{x}_i, m_s) - y_{is}\|_2^2 \quad (1.4)$$

to estimate the robot poses and map features in the ground frame. Here  $\ell_i(\mathbf{x}_i, m_s)$  is the measurement model. For example, if the observation  $y_{is}$  is from a monocular camera [100], we have

$$\ell_i(\mathbf{x}_i, m_s) = R_i^\top (m_s - x_i) / \|R_i^\top (m_s - x_i)\|_2.$$

The premise of multi-agent optimization lies in the possibility that all agents in  $\mathcal{V}$ , only knowing their local cost functions, solve the network-level optimization problem by exchanging their decisions with neighbors (i.e., nodes that share a link) over the communication graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ . For a large-scale network where nodes are physically separated, multi-agent optimization brings scalability while providing global optimality.

### 1.3 Multi-agent Online Optimization

The multi-agent online optimization attempts to combine the strengths of online optimization and multi-agent optimization, creating robust and scalable optimization frameworks for complex multi-agent systems. The agents in  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$  experience local and sequential losses  $\ell_{i,t}(\cdot)$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , and they locally implement and exchange their local decisions  $\mathbf{x}_i(t) \in \mathcal{X}$  with neighbors over the communication graph  $\mathcal{G}$ . Now the network-level goal is to minimize the accumulated system-wide loss, defined as the worst possible regret among agents:

$$\text{SReg}(T) := \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^n \ell_{j,t}(\mathbf{x}_i(t)) - \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^n \ell_{j,t}(\mathbf{x}^*) \right] \quad (1.5)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^n \ell_{j,t}(\mathbf{x})$  is the system-level decision taken by a static optimal oracle.

#### Multi-agent Online Convex Optimization

**Initialize**  $\mathcal{X}$  as a convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

For  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , agents in  $\mathcal{V}$  DO

- Each agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  selects  $\mathbf{x}_i(t) \in \mathcal{X}$ , and a local adversary chooses  $\ell_{i,t}(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as a convex cost function;
- Each agent experiences a loss  $\ell_{i,t}(\mathbf{x}_i(t))$ ;
- The function  $\ell_{i,t}$  is revealed to agent  $i$ ;
- The decisions of the neighbors of the agent  $i$  are revealed to  $i$  from the communication network  $\mathcal{G}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{x}_j(t)$  for  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i := \{j : \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}\}$ .

The first challenge in multi-agent online optimization is whether and how the robustness of online optimization and the scalability of distributed multi-agent optimization comply with each other in the algorithm design. Multi-agent online optimization algorithms delicately adapt existing online optimization algorithms to the new decentralized

settings, and the achievable global performance  $\text{SReg}(T)$  depends on the learning rate, network structure, and communication complexity, leading to new challenges in performance evaluations.

## 1.4 Scope and Organization

We present a unified introduction to the state-of-the-art distributed optimization algorithms for multi-agent systems under full information or bandit information feedback. We also provide a full and self-contained analysis for their achievable regret bounds, where distributed decisions planned and executed by agents over a communication graph provide scalable solutions with performances often matching their centralized counterparts. For the majority of the monograph, we adopt a simple problem setting, where the cost functions are continuously differentiable, and the communication graph does not change over time. This allows us to present the fundamental algorithms and their analysis as directly as possible. We then move to more complex settings and report the state-of-the-art results in the literature.

The remainder of the monograph is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the technical preliminaries on graph theory, distributed multi-agent optimization, and online optimization that will be used in subsequent discussions. Section 3 presents three fundamental distributed online gradient-based algorithms under full information feedback: the Distributed Online Gradient Descent, Distributed Online Mirror Descent, and Distributed Online Dual Averaging algorithms. Section 4 then moves to bandit feedback and presents the bandit variations of the three algorithms, where gradient estimators allow gradient descent without access to the true gradient information. Sections 5 and 6 explore two important extensions of the basic problem settings on long-term constraints and online linear regressions, respectively. Finally, Sections 7 and 8 move to recently reported results for compressed node-to-node communications and dynamic networks.

## 1.5 Notation and Basic Definitions

We denote scalars and vectors with lowercase letters (e.g.,  $a$ ) and boldface letters (e.g.,  $\mathbf{x}$ ), respectively. We use  $\mathbb{R}$  to denote the set of real numbers,  $\mathbb{R}_+$  to denote the set of nonnegative real numbers. The set of  $d$ -dimensional real vectors is denoted  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We use  $\mathbb{R}_+^d$  to denote the nonnegative orthant, i.e.,  $\mathbb{R}_+^d = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid [\mathbf{x}]_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, d\}$ . The  $i$ -th element of a vector  $\mathbf{x}$  is denoted  $[\mathbf{x}]_i$ . The set of real  $n \times n$  matrices is denoted  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . We use  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2$  and  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1$  to denote the Euclidean (or  $\ell_2$ ) norm and  $\ell_1$  norm of a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , respectively; for the Euclidean norm, we omit the subscript when it is clear from the context. A generic norm of a vector is denoted by  $\|\mathbf{x}\|$  and its dual norm is defined by  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_* = \sup_{\|\mathbf{y}\|=1} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y}$ . The definition of the dual norm immediately implies  $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y} \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{y}\|_*$ . We use  $[N]$  to denote the set  $\{1, \dots, N\}$  for any  $N \geq 2$ . We denote  $\mathbb{B}_R = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq R\}$  with  $0 < R < \infty$ . Denote  $\mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{1}$ , and  $\mathbf{I}$  as the all-zero vector, the all-one vector, and the identity matrix, respectively, where their dimensions are implied in the context.

A set  $\mathcal{X}$  is convex if for any  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}$  and any  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ , we have  $\theta \mathbf{x}_1 + (1 - \theta) \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ . When  $\mathcal{X}$  is closed,  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x})$  denotes the Euclidean projection of point  $\mathbf{x}$  onto a convex set  $\mathcal{X}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_2$ . A function  $\ell : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex if its domain is a convex set and for any  $\mathbf{x}_1$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2$  in the domain and  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$\ell(\theta \mathbf{x}_1 + (1 - \theta) \mathbf{x}_2) \leq \theta \ell(\mathbf{x}_1) + (1 - \theta) \ell(\mathbf{x}_2).$$

When  $\ell$  is differentiable, it is convex if and only if for any  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\ell(\mathbf{x}_1) \geq \ell(\mathbf{x}_2) + \nabla \ell(\mathbf{x}_2)^\top (\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2).$$

A function is called  $G$ -Lipschitz over  $\mathcal{X}$  with respect to a norm  $\|\cdot\|$  if for all  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}$  we have

$$|\ell(\mathbf{x}_1) - \ell(\mathbf{x}_2)| \leq G \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|.$$



## References

---

- [1] A. Agarwal, O. Dekel, and L. Xiao, “Optimal algorithms for online convex optimization with multi-point bandit feedback.”, in *Colt*, Citeseer, pp. 28–40, 2010.
- [2] A. F. Aji and K. Heafield, “Sparse communication for distributed gradient descent”, in *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 440–445, 2017.
- [3] M. Akbari, B. Ghahsifard, and T. Linder, “Distributed online convex optimization on time-varying directed graphs”, *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2015, pp. 417–428.
- [4] S. S. Alaviani and A. G. Kelkar, “Distributed convex optimization with state-dependent interactions over random networks”, in *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 3149–3153, 2021. DOI: [10.1109/CDC45484.2021.9683412](https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC45484.2021.9683412).
- [5] D. Alistarh, D. Grubic, J. Li, R. Tomioka, and M. Vojnovic, “Qsgd: Communication-efficient sgd via gradient quantization and encoding”, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, Eds., vol. 30, Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.

- [6] P. L. Bartlett, W. M. Koolen, A. Malek, E. Takimoto, and M. K. Warmuth, “Minimax fixed-design linear regression”, in *Proceedings of The 28th Conference on Learning Theory*, P. Grünwald, E. Hazan, and S. Kale, Eds., ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 40, pp. 226–239, Paris, France: PMLR, Mar. 2015.
- [7] D. Basu, D. Data, C. Karakus, and S. Diggavi, “Qsparse-local-sgd: Distributed sgd with quantization, sparsification and local computations”, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [8] A. S. Berahas, L. Cao, K. Choromanski, and K. Scheinberg, “A theoretical and empirical comparison of gradient approximations in derivative-free optimization”, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, vol. 22, no. 2, 2022, pp. 507–560.
- [9] A. Bernstein, E. Dall’Anese, and A. Simonetto, “Online primal-dual methods with measurement feedback for time-varying convex optimization”, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 8, 2019, pp. 1978–1991. DOI: [10.1109/TSP.2019.2896112](https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2019.2896112).
- [10] J. Bernstein, Y.-X. Wang, K. Azizzadenesheli, and A. Anandkumar, “Signsgd: Compressed optimization for non-convex problems”, in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, pp. 560–569, 2018.
- [11] S. Boyd, A. Ghosh, B. Prabhakar, and D. Shah, “Randomized gossip algorithms”, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 6, 2006, pp. 2508–2530. DOI: [10.1109/TIT.2006.874516](https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2006.874516).
- [12] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein, “Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers”, *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, vol. 3, no. 1, Jan. 2011, pp. 1–122. DOI: [10.1561/22000000016](https://doi.org/10.1561/22000000016).
- [13] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, J. Eckstein, *et al.*, “Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers”, *Foundations and Trends® in Machine learning*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2011, pp. 1–122.
- [14] S. Bubeck, “Introduction to online optimization”, *Lecture notes*, vol. 2, 2011, pp. 1–86.

- [15] M. Castiglioni, A. Celli, A. Marchesi, G. Romano, and N. Gatti, “A unifying framework for online optimization with long-term constraints”, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, 2022, pp. 33 589–33 602.
- [16] N. Cesa-Bianchi, P. Long, and M. Warmuth, “Worst-case quadratic loss bounds for prediction using linear functions and gradient descent”, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, vol. 7, no. 3, 1996, pp. 604–619. DOI: [10.1109/72.501719](https://doi.org/10.1109/72.501719).
- [17] N. Cesa-Bianchi and G. Lugosi, *Prediction, learning, and games*. Cambridge university press, 2006.
- [18] N. Cesa-Bianchi, T. Cesari, and C. Monteleoni, “Cooperative online learning: Keeping your neighbors updated”, in *Algorithmic learning theory*, PMLR, pp. 234–250, 2020.
- [19] N. Cesa-Bianchi and F. Orabona, “Online learning algorithms”, *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2021, pp. 165–190.
- [20] T.-H. Chang, M. Hong, and X. Wang, “Multi-agent distributed optimization via inexact consensus admm”, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 2, 2014, pp. 482–497.
- [21] T. Chen and G. B. Giannakis, “Bandit convex optimization for scalable and dynamic iot management”, *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2018, pp. 1276–1286.
- [22] Y. S. Chow and H. Teicher, *Probability theory: independence, interchangeability, martingales*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [23] F. R. Chung, *Spectral graph theory*, vol. 92. American Mathematical Soc., 1997.
- [24] J. C. Duchi, A. Agarwal, and M. J. Wainwright, “Dual averaging for distributed optimization: Convergence analysis and network scaling”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic control*, vol. 57, no. 3, 2011, pp. 592–606.
- [25] J. C. Duchi, M. I. Jordan, M. J. Wainwright, and A. Wibisono, “Optimal rates for zero-order convex optimization: The power of two function evaluations”, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, no. 5, 2015, pp. 2788–2806.

- [26] J. C. Duchi, A. Agarwal, and M. J. Wainwright, “Dual averaging for distributed optimization: Convergence analysis and network scaling”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 3, 2012, pp. 592–606. DOI: [10.1109/TAC.2011.2161027](https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2011.2161027).
- [27] J. C. Duchi, S. Shalev-Shwartz, Y. Singer, and A. Tewari, “Composite objective mirror descent”, in *Annual Conference Computational Learning Theory*, 2010.
- [28] A. Dutta, E. H. Bergou, A. M. Abdelmoniem, C.-Y. Ho, A. N. Sahu, M. Canini, and P. Kalnis, “On the discrepancy between the theoretical analysis and practical implementations of compressed communication for distributed deep learning”, in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, pp. 3817–3824, 2020.
- [29] E. El-Mhamdi, S. Farhadkhani, R. Guerraoui, A. Guirguis, L. N. Hoang, and S. Rouault, “Collaborative learning as an agreement problem”, *CoRR*, vol. abs/2008.00742, 2020. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.00742>.
- [30] T. Erseghe, “Distributed optimal power flow using admm”, *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 29, no. 5, 2014, pp. 2370–2380. DOI: [10.1109/TPWRS.2014.2306495](https://doi.org/10.1109/TPWRS.2014.2306495).
- [31] A. D. Flaxman, A. T. Kalai, and H. B. McMahan, “Online convex optimization in the bandit setting: Gradient descent without a gradient”, in *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, ser. SODA '05, pp. 385–394, Vancouver, British Columbia: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2005.
- [32] D. P. Foster, “Prediction in the worst case”, *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1991, pp. 1084–1090. (accessed on 07/19/2024).
- [33] M. Franceschelli and P. Frasca, “Stability of open multiagent systems and applications to dynamic consensus”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 5, 2020, pp. 2326–2331.
- [34] C. M. de Galland, S. Martin, and J. M. Hendrickx, “Open multi-agent systems with variable size: The case of gossiping”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.02970*, 2020.

- [35] C. Godsil and G. F. Royle, *Algebraic Graph Theory*, ser. Graduate Texts in Mathematics Book 207. Springer, 2001. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4613-0163-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-0163-9).
- [36] R. M. Gray, “Toeplitz and circulant matrices: A review”, *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, vol. 2, no. 3, 2006, pp. 155–239. DOI: [10.1561/01000000006](https://doi.org/10.1561/01000000006).
- [37] D. Han, K. Liu, H. Sandberg, S. Chai, and Y. Xia, “Privacy-preserving dual averaging with arbitrary initial conditions for distributed optimization”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 6, 2021, pp. 3172–3179.
- [38] E. Hazan *et al.*, “Introduction to online convex optimization”, *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, vol. 2, no. 3-4, 2016, pp. 157–325.
- [39] E. Hazan, A. Agarwal, and S. Kale, “Logarithmic regret algorithms for online convex optimization”, *Machine Learning*, vol. 69, no. 2, 2007, pp. 169–192.
- [40] R. Hegselmann and U. Krause, “Opinion dynamics and bounded confidence: Models, analysis and simulation”, *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, vol. 5, no. 3, 2002.
- [41] J. M. Hendrickx and S. Martin, “Open multi-agent systems: Gossiping with random arrivals and departures”, in *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, pp. 763–768, 2017.
- [42] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- [43] S. Hosseini, A. Chapman, and M. Mesbahi, “Online distributed optimization via dual averaging”, in *52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, IEEE, pp. 1484–1489, 2013.
- [44] S. Hosseini, A. Chapman, and M. Mesbahi, “Online distributed convex optimization on dynamic networks”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 11, 2016, pp. 3545–3550. DOI: [10.1109/TAC.2016.2525928](https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2016.2525928).
- [45] Y.-G. Hsieh, F. Iutzeler, J. Malick, and P. Mertikopoulos, “Optimization in open networks via dual averaging”, in *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, pp. 514–520, 2021.

- [46] Y.-G. Hsieh, F. Iutzeler, J. Malick, and P. Mertikopoulos, “Multi-agent online optimization with delays: Asynchronicity, adaptivity, and optimism”, *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 23, no. 78, 2022, pp. 1–49.
- [47] R. Jenatton, J. Huang, and C. Archambeau, “Adaptive algorithms for online convex optimization with long-term constraints”, in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, pp. 402–411, 2016.
- [48] J. Jiang, F. Fu, T. Yang, and B. Cui, “Sketchml: Accelerating distributed machine learning with data sketches”, in *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data*, pp. 1269–1284, 2018.
- [49] P. Joulani, A. Gyorgy, and C. Szepesvári, “Online learning under delayed feedback”, in *International conference on machine learning*, PMLR, pp. 1453–1461, 2013.
- [50] J. Kivinen and M. K. Warmuth, “Exponentiated gradient versus gradient descent for linear predictors”, *Inf. Comput.*, vol. 132, 1997, pp. 1–63.
- [51] A. Koloskova, S. Stich, and M. Jaggi, “Decentralized stochastic optimization and gossip algorithms with compressed communication”, in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, K. Chaudhuri and R. Salakhutdinov, Eds., ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 97, pp. 3478–3487, PMLR, Sep. 2019. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/koloskova19a.html>.
- [52] S. Lee and M. M. Zavlanos, “Distributed primal-dual methods for online constrained optimization”, in *2016 American Control Conference (ACC)*, IEEE, pp. 7171–7176, 2016.
- [53] J. Lei, P. Yi, Y. Hong, J. Chen, and G. Shi, “Online convex optimization over erdős-rényi random networks”, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, and H. Lin, Eds., vol. 33, pp. 15 591–15 601, Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- [54] X. Li, L. Xie, and N. Li, “A survey on distributed online optimization and online games”, *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 56, 2023, p. 100 904.

- [55] X. Li, X. Yi, and L. Xie, “Distributed online optimization for multi-agent networks with coupled inequality constraints”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 8, 2021, pp. 3575–3591. DOI: [10.1109/TAC.2020.3021011](https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2020.3021011).
- [56] N. Liakopoulos, A. Destounis, G. Paschos, T. Spyropoulos, and P. Mertikopoulos, “Cautious regret minimization: Online optimization with long-term budget constraints”, in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, pp. 3944–3952, 2019.
- [57] Y. Liao, Z. Li, K. Huang, and S. Pu, “Compressed gradient tracking methods for decentralized optimization with linear convergence”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.13748*, 2021.
- [58] H. Lim, D. G. Andersen, and M. Kaminsky, “3lc: Lightweight and effective traffic compression for distributed machine learning”, *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, vol. 1, 2019, pp. 53–64.
- [59] S. Liu, P.-Y. Chen, B. Kailkhura, G. Zhang, A. O. Hero III, and P. K. Varshney, “A primer on zeroth-order optimization in signal processing and machine learning: Principals, recent advances, and applications”, *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 37, no. 5, 2020, pp. 43–54.
- [60] I. Lobel, A. Ozdaglar, and D. Feijer, “Distributed multi-agent optimization with state-dependent communication”, *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 129, no. 2, 2011, pp. 255–284. DOI: [10.1007/s10107-011-0467-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-011-0467-x).
- [61] J. Lu and C. Y. Tang, “A distributed algorithm for solving positive definite linear equations over networks with membership dynamics”, *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2018, pp. 215–227. DOI: [10.1109/TCNS.2016.2594487](https://doi.org/10.1109/TCNS.2016.2594487).
- [62] K. Lu and L. Wang, “Online distributed optimization with non-convex objective functions via dynamic regrets”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 11, 2023, pp. 6509–6524.

- [63] M. Mahdavi, R. Jin, and T. Yang, “Trading regret for efficiency: Online convex optimization with long term constraints”, *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2012, pp. 2503–2528.
- [64] A. Malek and P. L. Bartlett, “Horizon-independent minimax linear regression”, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, Eds., vol. 31, Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- [65] D. Mateos-Nunez and J. Cortés, “Distributed online convex optimization over jointly connected digraphs”, *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2014, pp. 23–37.
- [66] S. Mou, J. Liu, and A. S. Morse, “A distributed algorithm for solving a linear algebraic equation”, in *2013 51st Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pp. 267–274, 2013. DOI: [10.1109 / Allerton.2013.6736534](https://doi.org/10.1109/Allerton.2013.6736534).
- [67] A. Nedić and J. Liu, “Distributed optimization for control”, *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2018, pp. 77–103.
- [68] A. Nedić and A. Olshevsky, “Distributed optimization over time-varying directed graphs”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 3, 2015, pp. 601–615.
- [69] A. Nedić, A. Olshevsky, A. Ozdaglar, and J. N. Tsitsiklis, “Distributed subgradient methods and quantization effects”, in *2008 47th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, IEEE, pp. 4177–4184, 2008.
- [70] A. Nedić, A. Olshevsky, and M. G. Rabbat, “Network topology and communication-computation tradeoffs in decentralized optimization”, *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 5, 2018, pp. 953–976.
- [71] A. Nedić and A. Ozdaglar, “Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 1, 2009, pp. 48–61.



- [72] A. Nedić, A. Ozdaglar, and P. A. Parrilo, “Constrained consensus and optimization in multi-agent networks”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 4, 2010, pp. 922–938.
- [73] A. Nedić, A. Ozdaglar, and P. A. Parrilo, “Constrained consensus and optimization in multi-agent networks”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 4, 2010, pp. 922–938.
- [74] Y. Nesterov, “Primal-dual subgradient methods for convex problems”, *Mathematical programming*, vol. 120, no. 1, 2009, pp. 221–259.
- [75] Y. Nesterov, *Introductory Lectures on Convex Optimization: A Basic Course*, 1st ed. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2014.
- [76] Y. Nesterov and V. Spokoiny, “Random gradient-free minimization of convex functions”, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2017, pp. 527–566.
- [77] F. Orabona, “A modern introduction to online learning”, *CoRR*, vol. abs/1912.13213, 2019. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1912.13213>.
- [78] A. Pananjady, M. J. Wainwright, and T. A. Courtade, “Linear regression with shuffled data: Statistical and computational limits of permutation recovery”, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 5, 2018, pp. 3286–3300. DOI: [10.1109/TIT.2017.2776217](https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2017.2776217).
- [79] S. Paternain, S. Lee, M. M. Zavlanos, and A. Ribeiro, “Constrained online learning in networks with sublinear regret and fit”, in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 5486–5493, 2019. DOI: [10.1109/CDC40024.2019.9030193](https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC40024.2019.9030193).
- [80] K. Quanrud and D. Khashabi, “Online learning with adversarial delays”, *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 28, 2015.
- [81] S. S. Ram, A. Nedić, and V. V. Veeravalli, “Distributed Stochastic Subgradient Projection Algorithms for Convex Optimization”, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 147, no. 3, Dec. 2010, pp. 516–545. DOI: [10.1007/s10957-010-9737-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-010-9737-7).

- [82] G. Raskutti, M. J. Wainwright, and B. Yu, “Minimax rates of estimation for high-dimensional linear regression over  $\ell_q$ -balls”, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 10, 2011, pp. 6976–6994. DOI: [10.1109/TIT.2011.2165799](https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2011.2165799).
- [83] F. Seide, H. Fu, J. Droppo, G. Li, and D. Yu, “1-bit stochastic gradient descent and its application to data-parallel distributed training of speech dnns”, in *Fifteenth Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*, Citeseer, 2014.
- [84] S. Shahrampour and A. Jadbabaie, “Distributed online optimization in dynamic environments using mirror descent”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 3, 2018, pp. 714–725. DOI: [10.1109/TAC.2017.2743462](https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2017.2743462).
- [85] S. Shalev-Shwartz *et al.*, “Online learning and online convex optimization”, *Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Machine Learning*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2012, pp. 107–194.
- [86] O. Shamir, “An optimal algorithm for bandit and zero-order convex optimization with two-point feedback”, *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 18, no. 52, 2017, pp. 1–11.
- [87] G. Shi, B. D. O. Anderson, and U. Helmke, “Network flows that solve linear equations”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 6, 2017, pp. 2659–2674. DOI: [10.1109/TAC.2016.2612819](https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2016.2612819).
- [88] W. Shi, Q. Ling, G. Wu, and W. Yin, “Extra: An exact first-order algorithm for decentralized consensus optimization”, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 25, no. 2, 2015, pp. 944–966.
- [89] O. Shorinwa, T. Halsted, J. Yu, and M. Schwager, *Distributed optimization methods for multi-robot systems: Part i – a tutorial*, 2023. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.11313>.
- [90] N. Singh, D. Data, J. George, and S. Diggavi, “Sparq-sgd: Event-triggered and compressed communication in decentralized optimization”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2022.
- [91] S. U. Stich, J.-B. Cordonnier, and M. Jaggi, “Sparsified sgd with memory”, in *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS’18, pp. 4452–4463, Montréal, Canada: Curran Associates Inc., 2018.

- [92] H. Tang, S. Gan, C. Zhang, T. Zhang, and J. Liu, “Communication compression for decentralized training”, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [93] K. I. Tsianos, S. Lawlor, and M. G. Rabbat, “Push-sum distributed dual averaging for convex optimization”, in *2012 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, pp. 5453–5458, 2012.
- [94] J. Tsitsiklis, D. Bertsekas, and M. Athans, “Distributed asynchronous deterministic and stochastic gradient optimization algorithms”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 31, no. 9, 1986, pp. 803–812.
- [95] Z. Tu, X. Wang, Y. Hong, L. Wang, D. Yuan, and G. Shi, “Distributed online convex optimization with compressed communication”, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, Eds., vol. 35, pp. 34 492–34 504, Curran Associates, Inc., 2022.
- [96] V. Vovk, “Competitive online linear regression”, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, M. Jordan, M. Kearns, and S. Solla, Eds., vol. 10, MIT Press, 1997.
- [97] L. Xiao, “Dual averaging method for regularized stochastic learning and online optimization”, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 22, 2009.
- [98] F. Yan, S. Sundaram, S. Vishwanathan, and Y. Qi, “Distributed autonomous online learning: Regrets and intrinsic privacy-preserving properties”, *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 11, 2012, pp. 2483–2493.
- [99] T. Yang, X. Yi, J. Wu, Y. Yuan, D. Wu, Z. Meng, Y. Hong, H. Wang, Z. Lin, and K. H. Johansson, “A survey of distributed optimization”, *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 47, 2019, pp. 278–305.
- [100] B. Yi, C. Jin, and I. R. Manchester, “Globally convergent visual-feature range estimation with biased inertial measurements”, *Automatica*, vol. 146, 2022, p. 110 639.

- [101] X. Yi, X. Li, L. Xie, and K. H. Johansson, “Distributed online convex optimization with time-varying coupled inequality constraints”, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, 2020, pp. 731–746.
- [102] X. Yi, X. Li, T. Yang, L. Xie, T. Chai, and K. H. Johansson, “Distributed bandit online convex optimization with time-varying coupled inequality constraints”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 10, 2020, pp. 4620–4635.
- [103] D. Yin, R. Pedarsani, Y. Chen, and K. Ramchandran, “Learning mixtures of sparse linear regressions using sparse graph codes”, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 3, 2019, pp. 1430–1451. DOI: [10.1109/TIT.2018.2864276](https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2018.2864276).
- [104] D. Yuan, Y. Hong, D. W. C. Ho, and S. Xu, “Distributed mirror descent for online composite optimization”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 2, 2021, pp. 714–729. DOI: [10.1109/TAC.2020.2987379](https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2020.2987379).
- [105] D. Yuan, Y. Hong, D. W. Ho, and G. Jiang, “Optimal distributed stochastic mirror descent for strongly convex optimization”, *Automatica*, vol. 90, 2018, pp. 196–203.
- [106] D. Yuan, A. Proutiere, and G. Shi, “Distributed online linear regressions”, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 1, 2021, pp. 616–639. DOI: [10.1109/TIT.2020.3029304](https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2020.3029304).
- [107] D. Yuan, A. Proutiere, and G. Shi, “Distributed online optimization with long-term constraints”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 3, 2021, pp. 1089–1104.
- [108] D. Yuan, L. Wang, A. Proutiere, and G. Shi, “Distributed zeroth-order optimization: Convergence rates that match centralized counterpart”, *Automatica*, vol. 159, 2024, p. 111 328.
- [109] J. Yuan and A. Lamperski, “Online convex optimization for cumulative constraints”, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [110] J. Zhang, K. You, and L. Xie, “Innovation compression for communication-efficient distributed optimization with linear convergence”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.06697*, 2021.

- [111] W. Zhang, P. Zhao, W. Zhu, S. C. H. Hoi, and T. Zhang, “Projection-free distributed online learning in networks”, in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, D. Precup and Y. W. Teh, Eds., ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 70, pp. 4054–4062, PMLR, Jun. 2017.
- [112] M. Zhu and S. Martinez, “On distributed convex optimization under inequality and equality constraints”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 1, 2011, pp. 151–164.
- [113] M. Zinkevich, “Online convex programming and generalized infinitesimal gradient ascent”, in *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on machine learning (icml-03)*, pp. 928–936, 2003.