

Complexity of Minimizing Regularized Convex Quadratic Functions *

Daniel Berg Thomsen [†] Nikita Doikov [‡]

EPFL

April 29, 2024

Abstract

In this work, we study the iteration complexity of gradient methods minimizing the class of uniformly convex regularized quadratic functions. We prove lower bounds on the functional residual of the form $\Omega(N^{-2p/(p-2)})$, where $p > 2$ is the power of the regularization term, and N is the number of calls to a first-order oracle. A special case of our problem class is $p = 3$, which is the minimization of cubically regularized convex quadratic functions. It naturally appears as a subproblem at each iteration of the cubic Newton method. The corresponding lower bound for $p = 3$ becomes $\Omega(N^{-6})$. Our result matches the best-known upper bounds on this problem class, rendering a sharp analysis of the minimization of uniformly convex regularized quadratic functions. We also establish new lower bounds on minimizing the gradient norm within our framework.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider regularized quadratic optimization problems of the following form, for $p \geq 2$:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[f(x) := \frac{1}{2} x^\top A x - b^\top x + \frac{s}{p} \|x\|^p \right], \quad (1)$$

where $A = A^\top \succeq 0$ is a symmetric and positive semidefinite matrix, $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $s > 0$ is a regularization parameter. The norm $\|\cdot\|$ is the standard Euclidean. We denote by $L \geq \mu \geq 0$ the largest and the smallest eigenvalues of the matrix: $L = \lambda_{\max}(A)$, $\mu = \lambda_{\min}(A)$, which are important parameters of our problem class.

The most popular example of problem (1) is when $p = 2$. In this case, the problem is strongly convex, and a closed-form expression for the solution is given by

$$x_\star = (A + sI)^{-1} b. \quad (2)$$

In general, for arbitrary $p \geq 2$, the problem is *uniformly convex* [29] and always has the unique solution x_\star . However, for $p > 2$, we do not have an explicit expression for x_\star using only a matrix

*École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Machine Learning and Optimization Laboratory (MLO), Switzerland. This work was supported by the Swiss State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (SERI) under contract number 22.00133.

[†]danielbergthomsen@gmail.com

[‡]nikita.doikov@epfl.ch

inversion operation. In this case, the solution to (1) can be found by solving a univariate nonlinear equation and employing matrix factorization techniques from computational linear algebra [8, 33].

In a large-scale setting, an alternative approach consists of applying first-order gradient methods to (1). These methods typically have a low per-iteration complexity, with the main operation being a computation of a matrix-vector product. However, they might require a significant number of iterations to converge. Therefore, it is crucial to study worst-case bounds for the convergence rate of these methods.

The first *lower bounds* on the number of oracle calls required to solve an optimization problem, and the notion of *problem class*, were introduced in [27], initiating the development of the complexity theory of optimization. Such results are important because they give information about the fundamental difficulty of a given optimization problem, and, in the presence of an upper bound, show how far it is from the optimal one. Complexity-theoretic results allow us to characterize how much computational resources are required for minimizing functions from a particular problem class.

For problem (1), the best-known convergence rate in terms of the functional residual was established [35, 32] for the composite version of the Fast Gradient Method [28], which is, for $p > 2$ and $s > 0$:

$$\mathcal{O}\left(1/N^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}\right), \quad (3)$$

where N is the number of iterations of the method. Thus, we see that first-order methods can exploit the uniform convexity of the problem and achieve faster rates of convergence than $\mathcal{O}(1/N^2)$, which is for minimizing a convex smooth objective ($s = 0$). It is widely known that the Fast Gradient Method is *optimal* for the standard classes of convex and strongly convex functions with Lipschitz continuous gradient [30], but it has remained an open question whether convergence rate (3) is the best possible for first-order methods minimizing regularized quadratic functions of the form (1).

A line of work has focused on justifying complexity lower bounds for the function classes with non-standard smoothness or convexity assumptions [25, 18, 1, 2, 9]. Lower bounds matching (3) were recently proven for the classes of uniformly convex functions with Hölder continuous gradient in [10]. However, the construction of this lower bound employs a smoothing technique, while the target resisting function is not a regularized quadratic function of the form (1). It has therefore been unknown whether rate (3) is tight for quadratic objectives.

Contributions. In this paper, we address this open question and establish the matching complexity lower bound for first-order methods of $\Omega(1/N^{\frac{2p}{p-2}})$, by proving the following theorem:

Theorem. *Let $p > 2$, $s > 0$, and $L > 0$. For any first-order method running for $N \leq \frac{d-1}{2}$ iterations, there is a function f of the form in (1) with $\lambda_{\max}(A) = L$ such that*

$$f(x_N) - f_{\star} \geq \Omega\left(\frac{L}{s^{2/p}N^2}\right)^{\frac{p}{p-2}}. \quad (4)$$

The full theorem statement with proof can be found in Section 3.1. More general results that apply broadly to our class of problems are proven in Section 2. Our result is continuous in $2 \leq p \leq +\infty$ and thus it also recovers the known complexity bounds for the class of smooth strongly convex functions ($p = 2$) in Section 3.2, and convex functions ($p = +\infty$) in Section 3.3.

Related work. Oracle lower bounds for the class of smooth convex functions frequently employ quadratic functions in their constructions. A classic example is a lower bound of $\Omega(N^{-2})$ for gradient methods minimizing smooth convex functions that is built by using a particular quadratic

function with a tridiagonal matrix, and assuming that the iterates of the method remain within the span of the observed gradients [30]. A similar construction can also be used to prove the corresponding lower bound for smooth strongly convex functions. These rates are achieved by the Fast Gradient Method [30, 28].

It is possible to avoid the assumption that the method produces iterates from the span of previous queries, using the idea of a *resisting oracle* and constructing the worst-case quadratic function adversarially [26]. Therefore, the same lower complexity bounds hold for even large families of first-order algorithms, including the composite gradient methods [30] and quasi-Newton methods [34]. The framework developed in the lecture notes [26] has been adapted to analyze regularized quadratic functions of the form given in (1) in an unpublished master's thesis [3], and this paper contains a shortened version of the proof.

An important example of a problem of form (1) is the subproblem of the cubically regularized Newton method [17, 33, 5]. For minimizing a twice-differentiable function g , the next iteration of the cubic Newton is chosen according to the rule

$$x_{k+1} := x_k + \arg \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} z^\top \nabla^2 g(x_k) z + \nabla g(x_k)^\top z + \frac{s}{3} \|z\|^3 \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where s is the Lipschitz constant of $\nabla^2 g(x_k)$. Thus, when $\nabla^2 g(x_k) \succeq 0$, the subproblem in (5) exactly corresponds to our class of functions (1) for $p = 3$.

Another interesting case is $2 \leq p \leq 3$, which is related to subproblems of regularized Newton methods that have been studied in [15, 16], and the case $p = 4$, which is important in the context of high-order tensor methods [31].

In the previous work [4], the authors also considered cubically regularized quadratic functions, allowing $\mu := \lambda_{\min}(A) < 0$, *i.e.*, non-convex problems. Note that due to the regularization term, for $p > 2$, the non-convex problems with $\mu < 0$ are still tractable and attain the global minima. Therefore we can consider the complexity of finding it by the first-order methods. Lower bounds corresponding to both linear and sublinear rates were derived in [4], by finding the correspondence between the global minimum of the original problem and to the minimum of an associated trust-region problem. However, in our work, we assume that our function is always convex ($\mu \geq 0$), and therefore we are able to derive tight rates, which are significantly better than the corresponding ones for the general non-convex case.

A closely related and equivalent problem to the cubic Newton subproblem is the trust-region subproblem [8, 12, 13, 14]. It corresponds to a constrained optimization problem on a quadratic, where solution candidates are restricted to a closed ball of some given radius from the origin. Once reformulated as a trust-region subproblem, it can be solved by further reformulating it as a sequence of eigenvalue problems [20] or by solving a corresponding smooth, convex function [21]. The cubic Newton subproblem can also be solved by formulating it as a linear system and applying iterative solvers [5].

Another instance in which we see problems of the form described in (1) is the case of finding the global minimizer of the ℓ_2 -regularized linear regression problem

$$\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|Xw - y\|^2 + \lambda \|w\|^p,$$

where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ is a given data matrix and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a given set of observations. This includes higher degrees of regularization than *ridge regression* [19], where $p = 2$ but does not generalize beyond the case where the number of training samples is equal to the dimensionality of the problem $n = d$. The state-of-the-art methods are sketching algorithms [7, 23], and there are probabilistic computational lower bounds for this problem [23].

Notation. We denote by $\|v\|$ the standard Euclidean norm of the vector v . For a matrix B , we use the notation $\|B\|$ for the spectral norm. We say that a matrix U is b -invariant, where b is a given vector, if $Ub = b$. We denote the standard simplex by $\Delta_d := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d : e^\top x = 1\}$, where e is the vector of all ones. We denote the standard orthonormal basis by e_1, \dots, e_d , and by I the identity matrix. \mathcal{P}_n refers to the space of polynomials with degree $\leq n$.

2 Lower Bounds

2.1 Trajectories of First-order Methods

In this section, let us study the trajectory of any first-order method when applied to our regularized quadratic problem (1). We start with a formal notion of the *first-order black-box oracle* \mathcal{I}_f , originating from [27]. For any given point, the oracle returns local information about the objective function of the first order, which is the function value and the gradient vector:

$$\mathcal{I}_f(x) = \{f(x), \nabla f(x)\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then, any first-order method \mathcal{M} can be uniquely characterized by a sequence of mappings: $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \dots)$. Each mapping \mathcal{M}_k defines the next point x_{k+1} of the algorithm, given all information known prior to the current iteration:

$$x_{k+1} := \mathcal{M}_k(\mathcal{I}_f(x_0), \mathcal{I}_f(x_1), \dots, \mathcal{I}_f(x_k)), \quad k \geq 0.$$

We assume that $x_0 = 0$, and that the number of iterations $N \geq 1$ is fixed. Then, without loss of generality, we always assume that the last iterate x_N is *the result of the method* when applied to a particular objective f . For a fixed method \mathcal{M} , we will design a resisting objective function from our class (1), which will provide us with the lower bound for the performance of any first-order method.

Let us introduce the following matrix:

$$A_\star := A + s\|x_\star\|^{p-2}I, \quad (6)$$

where x_\star is the unique solution to our problem (1). Note that the first-order stationarity condition provides us with the following expression for the solution:

$$x_\star = A_\star^{-1}b. \quad (7)$$

An object that will be central to our analysis is the notion of the *i -th order Krylov subspace* $\mathcal{E}_i(f)$, where $i \geq 0$, which is associated with regularized quadratic functions of the form (1). We define:

$$\mathcal{E}_i(f) := \text{span}\{b, A_\star b, A_\star^2 b, \dots, A_\star^{i-1} b\}. \quad (8)$$

Due to the structure of the matrix A_\star , it is easy to see that $\mathcal{E}_i(f)$ are equal to the standard Krylov subspaces associated with matrix A and vector b . Thus, we have $\mathcal{E}_i(f) = \text{span}\{b, Ab, A^2b, \dots, A^{i-1}b\}$.

Note that the following inclusion clearly holds:

$$\mathcal{E}_i(f) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{i+1}(f), \quad i \geq 0.$$

Moreover, if one of these inclusions is an equality (i.e., $\mathcal{E}_i(f) = \mathcal{E}_{i+1}(f)$), then so are the following. This implies that the preceding inclusions are strict until we arrive at a subspace invariant to further applications of A_\star . Hence, we obtain the following chain:

$$\mathcal{E}_0(f) \subset \mathcal{E}_1(f) \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{E}_\ell(f) = \mathcal{E}_{\ell+1}(f) = \dots$$

The dimension of the subspace at index ℓ where the following Krylov subspaces are equal is commonly referred to as the *maximal dimension* of the sequence of Krylov subspaces.

The classic Cayley-Hamilton theorem [22], implies that $x_\star = A_\star^{-1}b$ can be represented in a polynomial form: $x_\star = c_0b + c_1A_\star b + \dots + c_{d-1}A_\star^{d-1}b$, for some sequence of real coefficients $c_0, \dots, c_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore,

$$x_\star = A_\star^{-1}b \in \mathcal{E}_\ell(f). \quad (9)$$

We will construct an instance of problem (1), using the spectral representation

$$A = U\Lambda U^\top, \quad (10)$$

where $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$, and U is an orthogonal matrix: $UU^\top = I$. The matrix Λ is our *fixed parameter*, while the matrix U will be constructed adversarially to ensure that the trajectory of the method lies in the Krylov subspaces. This construction is classical, and it was developed initially for quadratic problems in the works of Nemirovski [26], and adapted for analysis on functions of form (1) in an unpublished master's thesis [3]. For the sake of completeness, we provide proofs of our statements in what follows.

For a fixed arbitrary $r > 0$ and a vector $\pi \in \Delta_d$ from the standard simplex, we set

$$b := r(\Lambda + sr^{p-2}I)\sqrt{\pi} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (11)$$

where $\sqrt{\pi} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the vector whose entries are square roots of the corresponding entries of π : $[\sqrt{\pi}]_i \equiv \sqrt{\pi_i}$. This choice of b is justified by the following simple lemma.

Lemma 1. *For any $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d \geq 0$, $r > 0$, and $\pi \in \Delta_d$, let $\Lambda := \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be chosen according to (11). Then, for an arbitrary orthogonal b -invariant matrix U , we have that the solution x_\star to the corresponding regularized quadratic problem is*

$$x_\star = rU\sqrt{\pi}, \quad (12)$$

and, consequently,

$$\|x_\star\| = r. \quad (13)$$

Proof. Using the first-order stationarity condition and uniform convexity, we know that the solution x_\star to (1) is the unique solution of the following nonlinear equation,

$$Ax_\star + s\|x_\star\|^{p-2}x_\star = b. \quad (14)$$

Now, let us consider the vector

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x} &:= (A + sr^{p-2}I)^{-1}b = U(\Lambda + sr^{p-2}I)^{-1}U^\top b \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} U(\Lambda + sr^{p-2}I)^{-1}b \stackrel{(11)}{=} rU\sqrt{\pi}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used in (*) that U is b -invariant, thus $U^\top b = b$. Hence, $\|\bar{x}\|^2 = r^2\|\sqrt{\pi}\|^2 = r^2$, and we conclude that $x_\star = \bar{x}$, which completes the proof. \square

Corollary 2. *For any choice of the parameter $r > 0$, there exists a regularized quadratic function from our family, such that $\|x_\star\| = r$.*

Under suitable conditions, our choice of b implies that the associated Krylov subspaces are strictly nested in one another until the Krylov subspace is of the d -th order (thus covering the whole space). We formalize this notion in the following lemma:

Lemma 3. Let $\lambda_d > \dots > \lambda_2 > \lambda_1 \geq 0$. Then, for $A = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$ and b given by (11), we have

$$\mathcal{E}_0(f) \subset \mathcal{E}_1(f) \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{E}_\ell(f) = \mathcal{E}_{\ell+1}(f) = \dots \quad (15)$$

and

$$x_\star \in \mathcal{E}_\ell(f), \quad (16)$$

where ℓ is the number of non-zero components in the vector b .

Proof. Consider the following Krylov matrix associated with a d -th order Krylov subspace:

$$K_d(f) = \text{diag}(b_1, \dots, b_d)V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d},$$

where $b_i = r\sqrt{\pi_i}(\lambda_i + sr^{p-2})$ are the entries of the vector b , and V is the Vandermonde matrix:

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda_1 & \dots & \lambda_1^{d-1} \\ 1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_2^{d-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \lambda_d & \dots & \lambda_d^{d-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is known that the Vandermonde matrix has full rank if $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j, \forall i, j$. Clearly, $\text{diag}(b_1, \dots, b_d)$ has the rank equal to the number of non-zero components of b . Consequently, the rank of $K_d(f)$ is equal to the rank of $\text{diag}(b_1, \dots, b_d)$, which we denote by ℓ . The d -th order Krylov subspace is the column space of $K_d(f)$, and as a result, we have $\dim \mathcal{E}_d(f) = \ell$. The whole chain in (15) now follows from the fact that the dimension of every next Krylov subspace can be increased no more than by one, and $\dim \mathcal{E}_0(f) = 0$. Therefore, all Krylov subspaces of lower orders are strictly nested within $\mathcal{E}_\ell(f)$, and the higher order subspaces are all equal. \square

Remark 4. Note that Lemma 3 extends to any matrix $A = U\Lambda U^\top$ with orthogonal b -invariant matrix U , due to the simple observation:

$$\text{span}\{b, U\Lambda U^\top b, \dots, (U\Lambda U^\top)^k b\} = U \text{span}\{b, \Lambda b, \dots, \Lambda^k b\}.$$

Therefore, under the same conditions, we have the strict inclusion of the Krylov subspaces for any regularized quadratic, whose matrix A is of the form in (10) with b -invariant U .

The following lemma is the main tool of analyzing the trajectory of any first-order method when applied to our regularized quadratic function.

Lemma 5. Let parameters $p \geq 2$, $s \geq 0$, $\lambda_d > \dots > \lambda_1 \geq 0$, $r > 0$, and $\pi \in \Delta_d$ be fixed. Let ℓ be the maximal dimension of the sequence of Krylov subspaces. For any method \mathcal{M} that performs $N \leq \frac{\ell}{2}$ iterations, there exists a regularized quadratic function from our family, such that the full trajectory $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^N$ of the method when applied to f belongs to the Krylov subspaces:

$$x_k \in \mathcal{E}_{2k}(f), \quad 0 \leq k \leq N. \quad (17)$$

Proof. We construct a sequence of functions f_0, \dots, f_N , each of the form

$$f_k(x) := \frac{1}{2}x^\top A_k x - b^\top x + \frac{s}{p}\|x\|^p, \quad (18)$$

where $A_k = U_k \Lambda U_k^\top$, and $\{U_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is a sequence of orthogonal b -invariant matrices, generated in an adversarial way in response to the iterations of the method. We start with $U_0 := I$. Let us denote by x_\star^k the solution to (18), which according to Lemma 1 has the following explicit representation:

$$x_\star^k = rU_k \sqrt{\pi}.$$

Thus, all x_\star^k have the same length: $\|x_\star^k\| = r$.

We are going to ensure the following key property: any pair of functions f_k and f_ℓ for $\ell > k$ are *informationally indistinguishable* by the first-order oracle during the first k iterations of the method, *i.e.*,

$$f_k(x_i) = f_\ell(x_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla f_k(x_i) = \nabla f_\ell(x_i), \quad 0 \leq i \leq k, \quad (19)$$

where $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^k$ are iterations of \mathcal{M} when applied to the function f_k . In other words, the method cannot recognize whether it runs on f_k or on f_ℓ , $\ell > k$, when performing the first k steps.

Let us verify by induction the following statement: for every $0 \leq k \leq N$, we have

$$x_0, \dots, x_k \in \mathcal{E}_{2k}(f_k). \quad (20)$$

Then, we will choose $f \equiv f_N$, and (17) will follow immediately.

Inclusion (20) trivially holds for $k = 0$, since we always choose $x_0 := 0$, and, by definition, $\mathcal{E}_0 \equiv \{0\}$. Now, assume that (20) holds for some $k \geq 0$, and consider one step of our resisting strategy.

Due to our assumption that $k + 1 \leq N \leq \ell/2$, by Lemma 3 we have a strictly increasing sub-chain of Krylov subspaces:

$$\mathcal{E}_{2k}(f_k) \subset \mathcal{E}_{2k+1}(f_k) \subset \mathcal{E}_{2k+2}(f_k).$$

Let us build an orthogonal matrix H such that it is identical on $\mathcal{E}_{2k+1}(f_k)$: $H|_{\mathcal{E}_{2k+1}(f_k)} \equiv I$, and $x_{k+1} \in H\mathcal{E}_{2k+2}(f_k)$. We can construct such a matrix explicitly, as follows. First, we choose an orthonormal basis $v_1, \dots, v_{2k+1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in $\mathcal{E}_{2k+1}(f_k)$ and complement it by a vector $v_{2k+2} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to have an orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{E}_{2k+2}(f_k)$. Consider the corresponding projector onto $\mathcal{E}_{2k+1}(f_k)$:

$$\Pi := \sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} v_i v_i^\top.$$

Then, the vector x_{k+1} can be decomposed into a direct sum of two vectors: $x_{k+1} = \Pi x_{k+1} \oplus (I - \Pi)x_{k+1}$. Let $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be a Householder reflection that sends the vector v_{2k+2} to $y := \frac{(I - \Pi)x_{k+1}}{\|(I - \Pi)x_{k+1}\|}$, defined by the following formula:

$$H := I - 2ww^\top, \quad \text{where} \quad w := \frac{v_{2k+2} - y}{\|v_{2k+2} - y\|}.$$

It is immediate to check that such H satisfies the required properties, and we set $U_{k+1} := HU_k$.

Let us verify that f_k and f_{k+1} remain informationally indistinguishable for the first k iterates of the method. Indeed, we have $A_{k+1} = HA_k H^\top$, and due to our inductive assumption (20),

$$A_{k+1}x_i \equiv A_k x_i, \quad 0 \leq i \leq k.$$

Therefore, (19) is satisfied. It remains to check (20), which follows from the following representation:

$$\mathcal{E}_{2(k+1)}(f_{k+1}) = H\mathcal{E}_{2(k+1)}(f_k).$$

This completes the proof. \square

As a consequence, we can represent the result of the method, when applied to our constructed function f in the following form:

$$x_N = q(A_\star)b, \quad (21)$$

where $q \in \mathcal{P}_{2N}$ is a $2N$ -degree polynomial. This reduction allows us to state the following proposition, which is the main result used in the next section.

Proposition 6. *Let \mathcal{M} be a first-order method that performs N iterations. Let $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$, where $\lambda_d > \dots > \lambda_2 > \lambda_1 \geq 0$, and b be given by (11), such that $\pi \in \Delta_d$. Then, for any $p \geq 2$ and $s \geq 0$, there exists a regularized convex quadratic function f of the form (1) with the given parameters, such that the distance between the solution x_\star to f and the result of the method x_N , when applied to f , is bounded as:*

$$\|x_N - x_\star\| \geq \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_{2N}} \|q(A_\star)b - x_\star\|. \quad (22)$$

Proof. We divide the proof of this proposition into two cases. Let us first consider the case when $2N \leq \ell$, where ℓ is the maximal dimension of the sequence of Krylov subspaces. Then we use Lemma 5 to create an instance of a regularized quadratic function f such that $x_N \in \mathcal{E}_{2N}(f)$. This allows us to write $x_N = q(A_\star)b$, for some $q \in \mathcal{P}_{2N}$. For this specific polynomial, we have

$$\|x_N - x_\star\| = \|q(A_\star)b - x_\star\|,$$

and the statement follows from minimizing the right-hand side over the space of $2N$ -degree polynomials.

Let us now consider the case $2N > \ell$. We already know that $x_\star \in \mathcal{E}_\ell(f)$ by (9). We can therefore select a $2N$ -degree polynomial q such that $x_\star = q(A_\star)b$, and (22) becomes the trivial lower bound:

$$\|x_N - x_\star\| \geq \|q(A_\star)b - x_\star\| \equiv 0,$$

which completes the proof. \square

2.2 Complexity Lower Bound

In this section, we use the fact that Lemma 1 leaves us a degree of freedom to choose the norm of the solution $\|x_\star\|$ for the construction. We assume that $\|x_\star\| > 0$, since we always start at $x_0 = 0$, and therefore if $x_\star = 0$ the solution would be found in 0 iterations.

We use the following standard notion of *uniform convexity* [29]. We say that a differentiable function f is uniformly convex of degree $p \geq 2$ if there exists a constant $\sigma_p > 0$, such that

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + \nabla f(x)^\top (y - x) + \frac{\sigma_p}{p} \|y - x\|^p, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (23)$$

Note that the power of the Euclidean norm, $g(x) := \frac{s}{p} \|x\|^p$, $p \geq 2$, is uniformly convex with constant (see, e.g., Lemma 2.5 in [11]):

$$\sigma_p = s2^{2-p}. \quad (24)$$

As a consequence, our regularized quadratic objective (1) is uniformly convex with the same parameter (24). Substituting $x := x_\star$ into (23), we obtain the following useful bound on the functional residual,

$$f(y) - f_\star \geq \frac{\sigma_p}{p} \|y - x_\star\|^p, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (25)$$

A further useful consequence follows from minimizing both sides of (23) with respect to y (see (5) of [11]):

$$f(x) - f_\star \leq \frac{p-1}{p} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \|\nabla f(x)\|^{\frac{p}{p-1}}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (26)$$

In order to prove our lower bound, we will also need the following technical result, which characterizes the solution to the problem of the best uniform polynomial approximation. We provide it without the proof.

Lemma 7. *Let $n \geq 1$, $0 < a \leq b$ and $c = b/a$. Then*

$$\min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_n} \max_{a \leq t \leq b} |1 - tq(t)| = \Theta(c) := 2 \left[\left(\frac{\sqrt{c+1}}{\sqrt{c-1}} \right)^n - \left(\frac{\sqrt{c-1}}{\sqrt{c+1}} \right)^n \right]^{-1}. \quad (27)$$

Moreover, there exist a finite grid $a \leq t_1 < \dots < t_{n+1} \leq b$, and a set of coefficients π_1, \dots, π_{n+1} from the standard simplex Δ_{n+1} such that

$$\min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \pi_i [1 - t_i q(t_i)]^2 = [\Theta(c)]^2. \quad (28)$$

Note that (27) is a classical result from the field of approximation theory [24, 6]. The problem on the left-hand-side is equivalent to the normalized uniform approximation problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{u \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}} \max_{a \leq t \leq b} |u(t)|, \\ \text{s.t. } u(0)=1 \end{aligned}$$

and it is known that the solution to this problem is the polynomial $u^*(t) = \Theta(c) \cdot T_n \left(\frac{c+1-\frac{2}{a}t}{c-1} \right)$, where T_n is the Chebyshev polynomial of the first kind [24, 26, 4]. Equation (28) similarly follows by the fact that the solution to (27) is given by Chebyshev polynomials. These have $n+1$ extrema of the same magnitude in the given range, allowing us to represent the problem using a convex combination of these $n+1$ points [24, 4]. See Lemma 4 of [4] for a complete proof of these results.

We are now in a position where we can prove a general complexity lower bound using our construction on problems of the form (1):

Theorem 8. *Let $p \geq 2$, $s > 0$, $0 \leq \mu \leq L$ and fix $r > 0$. For any first-order method running for $N \leq \frac{d-1}{2}$ iterations, there is a regularized quadratic function f such that $\|x_\star\| = r$, $\lambda_{\min}(A) = \mu$, $\lambda_{\max}(A) = L$, and*

$$\|x_N - x_\star\| \geq 2r \exp \left(-\frac{2N}{\sqrt{Q_\star-1}} \right), \quad (29)$$

where

$$Q_\star := \frac{L+sr^{p-2}}{\mu+sr^{p-2}} \geq 1,$$

is a modified condition number of the associated problem. Furthermore, the functional residual of the last iteration satisfies the lower bound:

$$f(x_N) - f_\star \geq \frac{4s}{p} r^p \exp \left(-\frac{2pN}{\sqrt{Q_\star-1}} \right), \quad (30)$$

and the gradient norm is bounded as:

$$\|\nabla f(x_N)\| \geq \frac{2s}{(p-1)^{(p-1)/p}} r^{p-1} \exp \left(-\frac{2(p-1)N}{\sqrt{Q_\star-1}} \right). \quad (31)$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{M} be a fixed first-order method running for N iterations, where $2N+1 \leq d$. Furthermore, let A be of the form in (10), where $\mu = \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_d = L$, and we construct U in accordance with Lemma 5. This choice of U lets us represent the last iteration using a polynomial in $A_\star = A + s\|x_\star\|^{p-2}I = A + sr^{p-2}I$, with eigenvalues $\lambda_i^* = \lambda_i + sr^{p-2}$. We continue defining b as in (11), leaving us the choice of the coefficients π_i and the eigenspectrum of A before we have a

fully-defined construction of a regularized quadratic function. Using Proposition 6 and Lemma 1 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_N - x_\star\|^2 &\geq \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_{2N}} \|q(A_\star)b - x_\star\|^2 \\
&= \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_{2N}} \|[q(A_\star)A_\star - I]x_\star\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(12)}{=} \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_{2N}} \|[q(A_\star)A_\star - I]Ur\sqrt{\pi}\|^2 \\
&= r^2 \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_{2N}} \sum_{i=1}^d \pi_i [1 - \lambda_i^* q(\lambda_i^*)]^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

which holds for any $\pi \in \Delta_d$ on the standard simplex. Since the choice of π is arbitrary, we can lower bound the resulting expression by a simplex of a smaller number of terms (cutting the index off at $i > 2N + 1$):

$$\|x_N - x_\star\|^2 \geq r^2 \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_{2N}} \sum_{i=1}^d \pi_i [1 - \lambda_i^* q(\lambda_i^*)]^2 \geq r^2 \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_{2N}} \sum_{i=1}^{2N+1} \pi_i [1 - \lambda_i^* q(\lambda_i^*)]^2.$$

Now, we can simply use Lemma 7 with $\mu_\star := \mu + sr^{p-2}$, $L_\star := L + sr^{p-2}$, and $Q_\star := L_\star/\mu_\star$. Taking the square root, we obtain the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_N - x_\star\| &\geq r \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_{2N}} \max_{\mu_\star \leq t \leq L_\star} |1 - tq(t)| = 2r \left[\left(\frac{\sqrt{Q_\star+1}}{\sqrt{Q_\star-1}} \right)^{2N} - \left(\frac{\sqrt{Q_\star-1}}{\sqrt{Q_\star+1}} \right)^{2N} \right]^{-1} \\
&\geq 2r \left(\frac{\sqrt{Q_\star-1}}{\sqrt{Q_\star+1}} \right)^{2N} \geq 2r \exp\left(-\frac{2N}{\sqrt{Q_\star-1}}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

completing the first part of the theorem. The final part of the theorem now follows from the uniform convexity inequalities, for the functional residual,

$$f(x_N) - f_\star \stackrel{(25),(24)}{\geq} \frac{s}{p2^{p-2}} \|x_N - x_\star\|^p \stackrel{(33)}{\geq} \frac{4s}{p} r^p \exp\left(-\frac{2pN}{\sqrt{Q_\star-1}}\right), \tag{34}$$

and for the gradient norm:

$$\|\nabla f(x_N)\|_{\frac{p}{p-1}} \stackrel{(26),(24)}{\geq} \frac{p}{p-1} (s2^{2-p})^{\frac{1}{p-1}} (f(x_N) - f_\star) \stackrel{(34)}{\geq} \frac{(2s)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}}{p-1} r^p \exp\left(-\frac{2pN}{\sqrt{Q_\star-1}}\right).$$

□

Remark 9. Note that setting $\mu = 0$ and ensuring that $Q_\star \geq 4$, we obtain the following simplified expressions for our lower bounds:

$$f(x_N) - f_\star \geq \frac{4sr^p}{p} \exp\left(-\frac{4pN}{\sqrt{Q_\star}}\right) \geq \frac{4sr^p}{p} \exp\left(-4pN\sqrt{\frac{sr^{p-2}}{L}}\right), \tag{35}$$

and

$$\|\nabla f(x_N)\| \geq \frac{2sr^{p-1}}{(p-1)^{(p-1)/p}} \exp\left(-4(p-1)N\sqrt{\frac{sr^{p-2}}{L}}\right). \tag{36}$$

3 Implications for Specific Classes of Functions

3.1 Uniformly Convex Functions

Throughout this section, we assume that $p > 2$ and $s > 0$. We can set the smallest eigenvalue $\mu = \lambda_{\min}(A)$ to be 0. In this scenario, our function is uniformly convex (but not strongly convex).

Note that $r > 0$ is a free parameter of Theorem 8, which means that we can maximize the lower bounds with respect to it. Let us look at the simplified expression of the lower bound provided by (35). We denote

$$\mathcal{L}(r) := r^p \exp\left(-4pN\sqrt{\frac{sr^{p-2}}{L}}\right),$$

and consider its extremum values. The first-order optimality condition gives

$$\mathcal{L}'(r) = pr^{p-1} \exp\left(-4pN\sqrt{\frac{sr^{p-2}}{L}}\right) \left[1 - 2N(p-2)\sqrt{\frac{s}{L}} r^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\right] = 0,$$

which, taking into account $r > 0$, implies that the optimum value is

$$r^* = \left[\frac{1}{2N(p-2)}\sqrt{\frac{L}{s}}\right]^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \propto \left[\frac{L}{sN^2}\right]^{\frac{1}{p-2}}.$$

This expression suggests the right choice for the value of r . Now, let us simply set

$$r := \left[\frac{L}{3sN^2}\right]^{\frac{1}{p-2}}. \quad (37)$$

Then, for any $N \geq 1$, it holds that $3sr^{p-2} = \frac{L}{N^2} \leq L$. Thus, we ensure that $Q_\star = \frac{L+sr^{p-2}}{sr^{p-2}} \geq 4$ and we can use the simplified bounds from Remark 9. Substituting our choice (37) into (35), we get

$$f(x_N) - f_\star \geq \frac{4s}{p} \left[\frac{L}{3sN^2}\right]^{\frac{p}{p-2}} \exp\left(-4pN\sqrt{\frac{s}{L} \left[\frac{L}{3sN^2}\right]}\right) = \left[\frac{L}{s^{2/p}N^2}\right]^{\frac{p}{p-2}} \cdot \frac{4}{p} \exp\left(-\frac{4p}{\sqrt{3}}\right),$$

and substituting it into (36), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(x_N)\| &\geq \frac{2s}{(p-1)(p-1)/p} \left[\frac{L}{3sN^2}\right]^{\frac{p-1}{p-2}} \exp\left(-4(p-1)N\sqrt{\frac{s}{L} \left[\frac{L}{3sN^2}\right]}\right) \\ &= \left[\frac{L}{s^{1/(p-1)}N^2}\right]^{\frac{p-1}{p-2}} \cdot \frac{2}{(p-1)(p-1)/p 3^{(p-1)/(p-2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{4(p-1)}{\sqrt{3}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have established our main result on the lower bound of minimizing regularized convex quadratic functions by first-order methods:

Theorem 10. *Let $p > 2$, $s > 0$ and $L > 0$. For any first-order method that performs $1 \leq N \leq \frac{d-1}{2}$ iterations, there exists a regularized quadratic function f with $\lambda_{\max}(A) = L$, such that the functional residual is bounded as:*

$$f(x_N) - f_\star = \Omega\left(\left[\frac{L}{s^{2/p}N^2}\right]^{\frac{p}{p-2}}\right). \quad (38)$$

And for minimizing the gradient norm, we have the following lower bound:

$$\|\nabla f(x_N)\| = \Omega\left(\left[\frac{L}{s^{1/(p-1)}N^2}\right]^{\frac{p-1}{p-2}}\right). \quad (39)$$

Note that lower bound (38) for the functional residual is the same as it was established in [10] for a general smooth uniformly convex functions, with a non-quadratic worst-case instance of the resisting function. Therefore, our result confirms that *regularized quadratic functions* remain some of the *the most difficult objectives* for the gradient methods.

Moreover, the convergence rate from (38) was established for the composite version of the Fast Gradient Method [35, 32]. Therefore, our result shows that this rate is tight for regularized quadratic objectives. It remains an interesting open question, whether it is possible to achieve the corresponding bound (39) for minimizing the gradient norm.

3.2 Strongly Convex Functions

Now, let us demonstrate that our main Theorem 8 also allows us to recover the classical lower bounds well-known in the literature. We set $p = 2$ to analyze the class of strongly convex functions with Lipschitz continuous gradients. A direct consequence of Theorem 8 is the following statement.

Corollary 11. *Let $r > 0$, $s > 0$, $\mu > 0$, and $L > \mu$. For any first-order method that performs $1 \leq N \leq \frac{d-1}{2}$ iterations, there is a strongly convex quadratic function f with $\lambda_{\min}(A) = \mu$, $\lambda_{\max}(A) = L$, and $\|x_\star\| = r$, such that the functional residual of the last iteration is lower bounded by*

$$f(x_N) - f_\star \geq 2sr^2 \exp\left(-\frac{4N}{Q_\star^{1/2}-1}\right),$$

and

$$\|\nabla f(x_N)\| \geq 2sr \exp\left(-\frac{2N}{Q_\star^{1/2}-1}\right),$$

where $r = \|x_\star\|$ and $Q_\star = \frac{L+s}{\mu+s}$ is the modified condition number of f .

For $s > 0$, this bound is stronger than the classic bound for smooth strongly convex functions as the numerator and denominator of our modified condition number have been shifted by the regularization parameter s . One should note that when $p = 2$,

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^\top Ax - b^\top x + \frac{s}{p}\|x\|^2 = \frac{1}{2}x^\top (A + sI)x - b^\top x,$$

and problems of the form in (1) correspond directly to instances of quadratic functions. The theory we present thus also recovers existing complexity results from the literature on smooth strongly convex functions.

3.3 Convex Functions

Let us now consider a setting in which problems of the form in (1) are equivalent to instances of the trust-region subproblem. For this section, we let $s = \frac{1}{D^p}$, where $D > 0$ is a fixed parameter, and consider what happens when $p \rightarrow +\infty$. Then the problem of the form in (1) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ \|x\| \leq D}} \left[f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^\top Ax - b^\top x \right],$$

and becomes an instance of a constrained optimization problem. The corresponding bound from Theorem 10 is

$$f(x_N) - f_\star = \Omega\left(\left[\frac{LD^2}{N^2}\right]^{\frac{p}{p-2}}\right) \xrightarrow{p \rightarrow +\infty} \Omega\left(\frac{LD^2}{N^2}\right),$$

which is the standard bound for minimizing smooth convex functions over the Euclidean ball. At the same time, it is also known that the accelerated version of the projected gradient method [30] achieves the convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(\frac{LD^2}{N^2})$, which matches the lower bound. We conclude that our theory appears consistent with existing results on this class of trust-region subproblems.

4 Discussion

In this paper, we present the oracle complexity for gradient methods minimizing the class of uniformly convex regularized quadratic functions. It contains a shortened version of a broader framework adapted from a set of lecture notes by Arkadi Nemirovski [26], and developed in an unpublished master’s thesis [3]. It covers both existing results for smooth and strongly convex functions and establishes new rates for the classes of uniformly convex functions.

Our results confirm that quadratic functions constitute the main computational difficulty for the first-order methods. At the same time, exploiting the uniform convexity of the problem, we see that the rate can be significantly improved compared to purely convex rates. Thus, for the case $p = 3$ (cubically regularized convex quadratic functions), the optimal rate becomes $\mathcal{O}(1/N^6)$, which is significantly better than the standard rate of the order $\mathcal{O}(1/N^2)$.

References

- [1] Naman Agarwal and Elad Hazan. Lower bounds for higher-order convex optimization. In Sébastien Bubeck, Vianney Perchet, and Philippe Rigollet, editors, *Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory*, volume 75 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 774–792. PMLR, 06–09 Jul 2018.
- [2] Yossi Arjevani, Ohad Shamir, and Ron Shiff. Oracle complexity of second-order methods for smooth convex optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 178(1):327–360, November 2019.
- [3] Daniel Berg Thomsen. Oracle lower bounds for minimizing regularized quadratic functions. Master’s thesis, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, January 2024.
- [4] Yair Carmon and John C Duchi. Analysis of Krylov Subspace Solutions of Regularized Non-Convex Quadratic Problems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- [5] Coralie Cartis, Nicholas I. M. Gould, and Philippe L. Toint. Adaptive cubic regularisation methods for unconstrained optimization. Part I: motivation, convergence and numerical results. *Mathematical Programming*, 127(2):245–295, April 2011.
- [6] E.W. Cheney. *Introduction to Approximation Theory*. AMS Chelsea Publishing Series. AMS Chelsea Pub., 1998.
- [7] Agniva Chowdhury, Jiasen Yang, and Petros Drineas. An Iterative, Sketching-based Framework for Ridge Regression. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 989–998. PMLR, July 2018. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- [8] Andrew R. Conn, Nicholas I. M. Gould, and Philippe L. Toint. *Trust Region Methods* | SIAM Publications Library, 2000.

- [9] Jelena Diakonikolas and Cristóbal Guzmán. Complementary composite minimization, small gradients in general norms, and applications. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–45, 2024.
- [10] Nikita Doikov. Lower Complexity Bounds for Minimizing Regularized Functions, February 2022. arXiv:2202.04545 [math].
- [11] Nikita Doikov and Yurii Nesterov. Minimizing Uniformly Convex Functions by Cubic Regularization of Newton Method. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 189(1):317–339, April 2021.
- [12] Jennifer B. Erway and Philip E. Gill. A Subspace Minimization Method for the Trust-Region Step. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(3):1439–1461, January 2010. Publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [13] Nicholas I. M. Gould, Stefano Lucidi, Massimo Roma, and Philippe L. Toint. Solving the Trust-Region Subproblem using the Lanczos Method. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 9(2):504–525, January 1999. Publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [14] Nicholas I. M. Gould, Daniel P. Robinson, and H. Sue Thorne. On solving trust-region and other regularised subproblems in optimization. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 2(1):21–57, March 2010.
- [15] Geovani N. Grapiglia and Yurii Nesterov. Regularized Newton Methods for Minimizing Functions with Hölder Continuous Hessians. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 27(1):478–506, January 2017. Publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [16] Geovani N. Grapiglia and Yurii Nesterov. Accelerated Regularized Newton Methods for Minimizing Composite Convex Functions. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(1):77–99, January 2019. Publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [17] Andreas Griewank. The modification of Newton’s method for unconstrained optimization by bounding cubic terms. Technical report, 1981.
- [18] Cristóbal Guzmán and Arkadi Nemirovski. On lower complexity bounds for large-scale smooth convex optimization. *Journal of Complexity*, 31(1):1–14, February 2015.
- [19] Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, and Jerome Friedman. Linear Methods for Regression. In *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*, Springer Series in Statistics, pages 43–99. Springer, New York, NY, 2009.
- [20] Elad Hazan and Tomer Koren. A linear-time algorithm for trust region problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 158(1):363–381, July 2016.
- [21] Nam Ho-Nguyen and Fatma Kilingç-Karzan. A Second-Order Cone Based Approach for Solving the Trust-Region Subproblem and Its Variants. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 27(3):1485–1512, January 2017. Publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [22] K. Hoffman and R.A. Kunze. *Linear Algebra*. Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- [23] Praneeth Kacham and David Woodruff. Sketching Algorithms and Lower Bounds for Ridge Regression. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10539–10556. PMLR, June 2022. ISSN: 2640-3498.

- [24] J. C. Mason and David C. Handscomb. *Chebyshev Polynomials*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, New York, September 2002.
- [25] Arkaddi S Nemirovski and Yurii Nesterov. Optimal methods of smooth convex minimization. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 25(2):21–30, 1985.
- [26] Arkadi Nemirovski. *Information-based complexity of convex programming*. 1994.
- [27] Arkadi Nemirovski and David Yudin. Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization. 1983. Publisher: Wiley-Interscience.
- [28] Yurii Nesterov. A method for solving the convex programming problem with convergence rate $O(1/k^2)$. *Proceedings of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, 1983.
- [29] Yurii Nesterov. Accelerating the cubic regularization of Newton’s method on convex problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 112(1):159–181, March 2008.
- [30] Yurii Nesterov. *Lectures on Convex Optimization*, volume 137 of *Springer Optimization and Its Applications*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018.
- [31] Yurii Nesterov. Implementable tensor methods in unconstrained convex optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 186(1):157–183, March 2021.
- [32] Yurii Nesterov. Inexact basic tensor methods for some classes of convex optimization problems. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 37(3):878–906, May 2022. Publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- [33] Yurii Nesterov and Boris T. Polyak. Cubic regularization of Newton method and its global performance. *Mathematical Programming*, 108(1):177–205, August 2006.
- [34] Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J Wright. Conjugate gradient methods. *Numerical optimization*, pages 101–134, 2006.
- [35] Vincent Roulet and Alexandre d’Aspremont. Sharpness, restart and acceleration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.