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ABSTRACT

We study the problem of stochastic optimization for deep learning in the parallel computing environment under communication constraints. A new algorithm is proposed in this setting where the communication and coordination of work among concurrent processes (local workers), is based on an elastic force which links the parameter vectors they compute with a center variable stored by the parameter server (master). The algorithm enables the local workers to perform more exploration, i.e. the algorithm allows the local variables to fluctuate further from the center variable by reducing the amount of communication between local workers and the master. We empirically demonstrate that in the deep learning setting, due to the existence of many local optima, allowing more exploration can lead to the improved performance. We propose synchronous and asynchronous variants of the new algorithm. We provide the theoretical analysis of the synchronous variant in the quadratic case and prove it achieves the highest possible asymptotic rate of convergence for the center variable. We additionally propose the momentum-based version of the algorithm that can be applied in both synchronous and asynchronous settings. An asynchronous variant of the algorithm is applied to train convolutional neural networks for image classification on the CIFAR and ImageNet datasets. Experiments demonstrate that the new algorithm accelerates the training of deep architectures compared to DOWNPOUR and other common baseline approaches and furthermore is very communication efficient.

1 INTRODUCTION

One of the most challenging problems in large-scale machine learning is how to parallelize the training of large models that use a form of stochastic gradient descent (SGD) [Bottou, 1998]. There have been attempts to parallelize SGD-based training for large-scale deep learning models on large number of CPUs, including the Google’s Distbelief system [Dean et al., 2012]. But practical image recognition systems consist of large-scale convolutional neural networks trained on one GPU card (or a small number of GPU cards) sitting in a single computer [Krizhevsky et al., 2012; Sermanet et al., 2013]. The main challenge is to devise parallel SGD algorithms to train large-scale deep learning models (particularly convolutional networks) that yield a significant speedup when run on multiple GPU cards (modern machines can host four, or even eight, high-end GPU cards). This optimization problem remains very open in deep learning and to the best of our knowledge there exists only one successful approach in the literature [Dean et al., 2012].
In this paper we introduce the Elastic Averaging SGD method (EASGD) and its variants. EASGD is motivated by quadratic penalty method [Nocedal & Wright (2006), but is re-interpreted as a parallelized extension of the averaging SGD algorithm Polyak & Juditsky (1992). The basic idea is to let each worker, i.e. a GPU card, maintain its own local parameter vector, and the communication and coordination of work among the local workers is based on an elastic force which links the parameter vectors they compute with a center variable stored by the master. The center variable is updated as a moving average where the average is taken in time and also in space over the parameter vectors computed by local workers. The main contribution of this paper is a new algorithm that provides fast convergent minimization while outperforming DOWNPOUR method [Dean et al. (2012) and other baseline approaches in practice. Simultaneously it reduces the communication overhead between the master and the local workers while at the same time it maintains high-quality performance measured by the test error. The new algorithm applies to deep learning settings such as parallelized training of convolutional neural networks.

The article is organized as follows. Section 2 explains the problem setting more in details. Section 3, 4 and 5 presents the EASGD algorithm and its variants (asynchronous variant in Section 4 and momentum-based variant in Section 5). Section 6 shows the theoretical analysis of the convergence of the synchronous variant of EASGD. Section 7 provides experimental results and Section 8 concludes. The Supplement contains proofs and additional material.

2 PROBLEM SETTING

Consider minimizing a function $F(x)$ in a parallel computing environment [Bertsekas & Tsitsiklis (1989) with $p \in \mathbb{N}$ workers (each worker uses a single GPU processor) and a master. In this paper we focus on the stochastic optimization problem of the following form

$$\min_x F(x) := \mathbb{E}[f(x, \xi)],$$

where $x$ is the model parameter to be estimated and $\xi$ is a random disturbance that follows the probability distribution $P$ on the sample space $\Omega$ such that $F(x) = \int_{\Omega} f(x, \xi) P(d\xi)$. The optimization problem in Equation 1 can be reformulated as follows

$$\min_{x', \bar{x}} \sum_{i=1}^{p} \mathbb{E}[f(x', \xi^i)] + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x' - \bar{x}\|^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x^i = \bar{x}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, p,$$

where each $\xi^i$ follows the same distribution $P$. In the paper we refer to $x^i$’s as local variables and we refer to $\bar{x}$ as a center variable. The equivalence of both problems comes from the fact that for any feasible solution the term added to the objective is zero. The problem in Equation 2 appears in the literature as a global variable consensus optimization problem [Boyd et al. (2011)], Bertsekas & Tsitsiklis (1989). The quadratic penalty term in Equation 2 is expected to ensure that local workers will not fall into different local optima that are far away from the center variable. Note that we do not use Lagrangian multipliers in the objective function and we focus on how fast the center variable converges to the local optimum. As opposed to other methods used for solving the consensus problem, which split the data among the workers, we assume each worker has access to the entire dataset. This paper focuses on the problem of reducing the parameter communication overhead [Shamir (2014) in the stochastic deep learning setting [Dean et al. (2012), Yadan et al. (2013), Paine et al. (2013)]. The problem of data communication when the data is distributed among the workers [Bekkerman et al. (2011), Bertsekas & Tsitsiklis (1989)] is a more general problem and is not addressed in this work (we explain the details of sampling the entire dataset in parallel in Section 7). We however emphasize that to the best of our knowledge the problem of stochastic optimization in the parallel deep learning setting under the communication constraints was never addressed in the literature before (and thus as well a more general problem when the data is distributed).

3 EASGD UPDATE RULE

Note that we focus on a stochastic setting as shown in Equation 2. The standard methods for solving the consensus problem such as ADMM [Boyd et al. (2011), Zhang & Kwok (2014), Wei & Ozdaglar ...]
(2012) therefore no longer apply. Let us introduce the following notation

\[ \Phi(x^i, \tilde{x}) := \mathbb{E}[f(x^i, \xi^i)] + \frac{1}{2}\|x^i - \tilde{x}\|^2. \]

To obtain the EASGD algorithm we linearize \( \Phi(x^i, \tilde{x}) \) as follows

\[ L^i(x^i, \tilde{x}) = \left[ (g^i_1(x^i_1) + \rho(x^i_1 - \tilde{x}_i), x^i_1 - \tilde{x}_i) + \frac{1}{2\eta}\|x^i_1 - \tilde{x}_i\|^2 \right] + \left[ \rho(\tilde{x}_i - \bar{x}_i, \bar{x} - \tilde{x}_i) + \frac{1}{2\eta}\|\bar{x} - \tilde{x}_i\|^2 \right], \quad (3) \]

where the first component of the summand captured in the first squared brackets in Equation 3 comes from linearizing \( \Phi(x^i, \tilde{x}) \) with respect to \( x^i \) and the second one comes from linearizing \( \Phi(x^i, \tilde{x}) \) with respect to \( \tilde{x} \). \( t \) is the iteration index, \( g^i_1(x^i_1) \) denotes the stochastic gradient of \( f \) with respect to \( x^i \) evaluated at iteration \( t \), \( x^i_1 \) and \( \tilde{x}_i \) denote respectively the value of variables \( x^i \) and \( \tilde{x} \) at iteration \( t \), and \( \eta \) is the learning rate. Linearization directly leads to the update rule used by the EASGD algorithm of the following form

\begin{align*}
    x^i_1 &+ 1 = x^i_1 - \eta (g^i_1(x^i_1) + \rho(x^i_1 - \tilde{x}_i)), \quad (4) \\
    \tilde{x}_{i+1} &+ 1 = \tilde{x}_i + \eta \sum_{i=1}^{p} \rho(x^i_1 - \tilde{x}_i). \quad (5)
\end{align*}

The above update\(^3\) can be easily implemented in the parallel computing environment with one master and \( p \) workers where the updates performed by the workers, each one having the form captured in Equation 4 can be carried out independently, in parallel, and the master performs the update captured in Equation 5. Note that as opposed to stochastic ADMM\(^4\) \cite{azadi2014stochastic, ouyang2013asynchronous} we also linearize the term \( \frac{1}{2}\|x^i - \tilde{x}\|^2 \). The linearization of the penalty term leads to the update rule for the center \( \tilde{x} \) of the form of moving average where the average is taken over both space and time. To see this note that if \( \alpha = \eta \rho \) (in the paper we refer to \( \alpha \) as a moving rate) then

\[ \tilde{x}_{i+1} = (1 - p\alpha)\tilde{x}_i + p\alpha \left( \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} x^i_1 \right). \quad (6) \]

The magnitude of \( \rho \) represents the amount of exploration we allow in the model. In particular, small \( \rho \) allows for more exploration as it allows \( x^i \)'s to fluctuate further from the center \( \tilde{x} \). In the non-convex setting, e.g. deep learning setting, due to the existence of local optima we want to allow for more exploration (small \( \rho \)). In particular we demonstrate in the experimental section that EASGD and its momentum-based variant allow to increase the amount of exploration by reducing the communication between local workers and the master. Note that standard approaches in the literature, like stochastic ADMM\(^4\) \cite{azadi2014stochastic}, use the original squared penalty term (without linearizing it) and typically explore large values of \( \rho \) to heavily push local \( x^i \)'s to the center \( \tilde{x} \) preventing exploration. This is because these approaches care how fast the local variables converge to the local optimum. In our setting we instead focus on how fast the center variable converges. Thus our goal is the same as for the DOWNPOUR method\(^5\) \cite{dean2012large}. To summarize, the distinctive feature of EASGD is that it allows the local workers for significantly more exploration as opposed to ADMM-like methods, DOWNPOUR and many others\(^6\) \cite{borkar1998asynchronous, nedic2001stochastic, langford2009epochagibbs, agarwal2011measuring, recht2011hogwild, zinkevich2010parallelizing}.

Finally note that we use the same learning rate \( \eta \) when linearizing \( \Phi(x^i, \tilde{x}) \) with respect to \( x^i \) and \( \tilde{x} \). This leads to a simple algorithm where there exists an elastic force equal to \( \alpha(x^i_1 - \tilde{x}_i) \) between the update of each \( x^i_1 \) and \( \tilde{x} \). Note that using different \( \eta \)'s in Equation 5 may lead to more complicated update rules with preconditioning of the gradients of \( \Phi(x^i, \tilde{x}) \). This is a more complicated approach that we do not analyze in this paper. We emphasize however that our algorithm can still achieve the asymptotic optimal convergence rate of the center variable as will be shown in Section 6.

### 4 Asynchronous EASGD

In Section 5 we showed the synchronous version of the EASGD algorithm, where the workers update the local variables in parallel such that the \( i^{th} \) worker reads the current value of the center variable

\(^3\) In the literature the update for the master involves \( x^i_{1+1} \) instead of \( x^i_1 \). However we obtained better experimental performance in the asynchronous case when having \( x^i_1 \) in the update rule for the master.
and use it to update local variable \(x^i\) using Equation 1. All workers share the same global clock. The master has to wait for the \(x^i\) updates from all \(\rho\) workers before being allowed to update the value of the center variable \(\hat{x}\) according to Equation 2.

In this section we instead show the asynchronous variant of the EASGD algorithm. The local workers are still responsible for updating the local variables \(x^i\)’s, whereas the master is updating the center variable \(\hat{x}\). Since the algorithm is fully asynchronous, every worker has its own clock \(t^i\), which starts from 0 and is incremented by 1 after each stochastic gradient update of \(x^i\) as shown in Algorithm 1. The master performs an update whenever the local workers finished \(\tau\) steps of their gradient updates, where we refer to \(\tau\) as the communication period. As can be seen in Algorithm 1, whenever \(\tau\) divides the local clock of the \(i\)th worker, the \(i\)th worker communicates with the master and requests the current value of the center variable \(\hat{x}\). The worker then waits until the master sends back the requested parameter value, and computes the elastic difference \(\alpha(x - \hat{x})\) (this entire procedure is captured in step a) in Algorithm 1). The elastic difference is then sent back to the master (step b) in Algorithm 1 who then updates \(\hat{x}\).

The communication period \(\tau\) controls the frequency of the communication between every local worker and the master. In this paper we are interested in reducing the communication overhead in the parallel computing environment where the parameter vector is very large. As will be seen in the experimental section, the EASGD algorithm and its momentum-based variant achieve good performance with large \(\tau\) (less frequent communication).

### Algorithm 1: Asynchronous EASGD

**Processing by worker \(i\) and the master**

**Input:** learning rate \(\eta\), moving rate \(\alpha\), communication period \(\tau \in \mathbb{N}\)

**Initialize:** \(\hat{x}\) is initialized randomly, \(x^i = \hat{x}\), \(t^i = 0\)

**Repeat**

1. \(x \leftarrow x^i\)
2. if \((\tau\) divides \(t^i\)) then
   1. \(x^i \leftarrow x^i - \alpha(x - \hat{x})\)
   2. \(\hat{x} \leftarrow \hat{x} + \alpha(x - \hat{x})\)
3. end
4. \(x^i \leftarrow x^i - \eta g_{t^i}^i(x)\)
5. \(t^i \leftarrow t^i + 1\)

**Until forever**

### Algorithm 2: Asynchronous EAMSGD

**Processing by worker \(i\) and the master**

**Input:** learning rate \(\eta\), moving rate \(\alpha\), communication period \(\tau \in \mathbb{N}\), momentum term \(\delta\)

**Initialize:** \(\hat{x}\) is initialized randomly, \(x^i = \hat{x}\), \(v^i = 0, t^i = 0\)

**Repeat**

1. \(x \leftarrow x^i\)
2. if \((\tau\) divides \(t^i\)) then
   1. \(x^i \leftarrow x^i - \alpha(x - \hat{x})\)
   2. \(\hat{x} \leftarrow \hat{x} + \alpha(x - \hat{x})\)
3. end
4. \(v^i \leftarrow \delta v^i - \eta g_{t^i}^i(x + \delta v^i)\)
5. \(x^i \leftarrow x^i + v^i\)
6. \(t^i \leftarrow t^i + 1\)

**Until forever**

5 **Momentum EASGD**

The momentum EASGD (EAMSGD) is a variant of our Algorithm 1 and is captured in Algorithm 2. It is based on the Nesterov’s momentum scheme [Nesterov (2005), Lan (2012), Sutskever et al. (2013)], where the update of the local worker of the form captured in Equation 2 is replaced by the following update

\[
\begin{align*}
v_{t^i+1}^i &= \delta v_t^i - \eta g_t^i(x_t^i + \delta v_t^i) \\
x_{t^i+1}^i &= x_t^i + v_{t^i+1}^i - \eta p(x_t^i - \hat{x}_t),
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\delta\) is the momentum term. Note that when \(\delta = 0\) we recover the original EASGD algorithm.

6 **Convergence analysis of synchronous EASGD**

In this section we provide the convergence analysis of the synchronous EASGD algorithm for the quadratic case, i.e. where the function \(f\) is assumed to have a quadratic form. The style of our analysis resembles the convergence analysis of ASGD [Polyak & Juditsky (1992)] and is focused on the convergence of the center variable to the local optimum. Since, as opposed to other popular approaches focusing on distributed optimization (e.g. [Azadi & Sra (2014), Nedić et al. (2001)]), we
allow the workers to fluctuate further from the center performing the exploration of the space (as we do not split the data among the workers), the form of our theoretical results is fundamentally different from the existing guarantees for these other approaches.

Assume each of the $p$ local workers $x^i_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ observes a noisy gradient at (discrete) time $t \geq 0$ of the linear form given in Equation (8)

$$g^j_i(x^i_t) = Ax^i_t - b - \xi^i_t, \quad i \in \{1, \ldots, p\},$$

where the matrix $A$ is positive-definite (each eigenvalue is strictly positive) and $\{\xi^i_t\}$’s are i.i.d. random variables, with zero mean and positive-definite covariance $\Sigma$. Let $x^*$ denote the optimum solution, where $x^* = A^{-1}b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In this section we analyze the behavior of the mean squared error (MSE) of the center $\hat{x}_t$, where this error is denoted as $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{x}_t - x^*\|^2]$, as a function of $t$, $p$, $\eta$, $\alpha$ and $\beta$, where $\beta = p\alpha$. Note that the MSE error can be decomposed as (squared) bias and variance.

Lemma 6.1. Let $\hat{x}_0$, and $\{x^i_0\}_{i=1}^p$ be arbitrary constants. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{x}_t - x^*] = \gamma t (\hat{x}_0 - x^*) + \frac{\gamma t - \phi t}{\gamma - \phi} \eta u_0,$$

where $u_0 = \sum_{i=1}^p (x^i_0 - x^* - \frac{a}{2 - \alpha^2} (x^i_0 - x^*)), a = \eta h(p+1)\alpha, c^2 = \eta h(\gamma^2 - 2\gamma\beta + \beta^2 - 2\eta h), \gamma = 1 - \sqrt{a^2 - 4c^2}$, and $\phi = 1 - \frac{a + \sqrt{a^2 - 4c^2}}{2}.$

It follows from Equations (9) and (10) that for the MSE to converge the following condition has to hold

$$-1 < \phi < \gamma < 1.$$  (11)

Note that $\phi$ and $\gamma$ are the two zero-roots of the polynomial in $\lambda$ of the form: $\lambda^2 - (2 - a)\lambda + (1 - a + c^2)$. Recall that $\phi$ and $\lambda$ are the functions of $\eta$ and $\beta$. Thus condition in Equation (11) implies that

- $\gamma < 1$ iff $c^2 > 0$ (i.e. $\eta > 0$ and $\beta > 0$).
- $\phi > -1$ iff $(2 - \eta h)(2 - \beta) > 2\beta/p$ and $(2 - \eta h) + (2 - \beta) > \beta/p$.
- $\phi = \gamma$ iff $a^2 = 4c^2$ (i.e. $\eta h = \beta = 0$).

In particular, the necessary condition for Equation (11) to hold is that $\eta \in (0, 2/h)$ and $\beta \in (0, 2)$, i.e. $\alpha \in (0, 2/p).$ For the purpose of the analysis recall that $\beta = p\alpha$.

Corollary 6.1. When $\beta$ is fixed then the following holds

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} p\mathbb{E}[(\hat{x}_t - x^*)^2] = \frac{\beta \eta h}{(2 - \beta)(2 - \eta h)} \cdot \frac{2 - \beta - \eta h + \beta \eta h}{\beta + \eta h - \beta \eta h} \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{h^2}.$$  (12)

The crucial point of Corollary 6.1 is that the MSE in the limit $t \to \infty$ is in the order of $1/p$ which implies that as the number of processors $p$ grows, the MSE will decrease for the EASGD algorithm. Also note that the smaller the $\beta$ is (recall that $\beta = p\alpha = p\eta h$), the more exploration is allowed (small $p$) and simultaneously the smaller the MSE is. The next lemma (Lemma 6.2) shows that EASGD algorithm achieves the highest possible rate of convergence when we consider the double averaging sequence (similarly to Polyak & Juditsky (1992)) $\{z_1, z_2, \ldots\}$ defined as below

$$z_{t+1} = \frac{1}{t+1} \sum_{k=0}^t \hat{x}_k.$$  (12)

Lemma 6.2 (Weak convergence). If the condition in Equation (11) holds, then the normalized double averaging sequence defined in Equation (12) converges weakly to the normal distribution with zero mean and variance $\sigma^2 / ph^2$.

$$\sqrt{t}(z_t - x^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{\sigma^2}{ph^2}), \quad t \to \infty.$$  (13)
The asymptotic variance in the Lemma 6.2 is optimal with any fixed $\eta$ and $\beta$ for which Equation 11 holds. The next lemma (Lemma 6.3) extends the result in Lemma 6.2 to the multi-dimensional setting.

**Lemma 6.3** (Weak convergence). Let $h$ denote the largest eigenvalue of $A$. If $(2 - \eta h)(2 - \beta) > 2\beta/p$, $(2 - \eta h) + (2 - \beta) > \beta/p$, $\eta > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, then the normalized double averaging sequence converges weakly to the normal distribution with zero mean and the covariance matrix $V = A^{-1}\Sigma(A^{-1})^T$,

$$\sqrt{tp}(z_t - x^*) \rightarrow N(0, V), \quad t \rightarrow \infty.$$  

As before, the asymptotic covariance in the Lemma 6.3 is optimal, i.e. meets the Fisher information lower-bound, when the conditions of the lemma are satisfied. The fact that this asymptotic covariance matrix $V$ does not contain any term involving $\rho$ is quite remarkable, since the penalty term $\rho$ does have an impact on the condition number of the Hessian in Equation 2.

7 **Experiments**

In this section we compare the performance of EASGD and EAMSGD with various competitor methods listed below:

- **DOWNPOUR** [Dean et al. (2012)]: the pseudo-code of the implementation of DOWNPOUR used in this paper is enclosed in the Supplementary material.
- **Momentum DOWNPOUR (MDOWNPOUR)**, where the Nesterov’s momentum scheme is applied to the master’s update (note it is unclear how to apply it to the local workers). The pseudo-code is in the Supplementary material.
- A method that we call ADOWNPOUR, where we compute the average over time of the center variable $\tilde{x}$ as follows:

$$z_{t+1} = \alpha_{t+1} z_t + (1 - \alpha_{t+1})\tilde{x}_t,$$

and $\alpha_{t+1} = \frac{t}{t+1}$ is a moving rate, and $z_0 = \tilde{x}$. $t$ denotes the master clock, which is initialized to 0 and incremented every time the center variable $\tilde{x}$ gets updated.
- A method that we call MVADOWNPOUR, where we compute the moving average of the center variable $\tilde{x}$ as follows:

$$z_{t+1} = \alpha z_t + (1 - \alpha)\tilde{x}_t,$$

and the moving rate $\alpha$ was chosen to be constant, and $z_0 = \tilde{x}$. $t$ denotes the master clock and is defined in the same way as for the ADOWNPOUR method.
- **SGD** [Bottou (1998)] with constant learning rate $\eta$.
- **Momentum SGD (MSGD)** [Sutskever et al. (2013)] with constant momentum term.
- **ASGD** [Polyak & Juditsky (1992)] with moving rate $\alpha_{t+1} = \frac{t}{t+1}$.
- **MVASGD** [Polyak & Juditsky (1992)] with moving rate $\alpha$ set to a constant.

**SGD, MSGD, ASGD** and **MVASGD** are run on a single GPU processor ($p = 1$). Remaining methods are run on multiple GPU processors with different settings of $p$ as will be shown later. We perform experiments in a deep learning setting on two benchmark datasets: CIFAR-10 (we refer to it as CIFAR) and ImageNet ILSVRC 2013 (we refer to it as ImageNet). We focus on the classification task with deep convolutional neural networks. We next explain the experimental setup and details regarding data sampling.

7.1 **Experimental setup**

For all our experiments we use 4 computing nodes interconnected with InfiniBand. Each node has 4 Titan GPU processors where each local worker corresponds to one GPU processor. The center

\footnote{It is implemented for the case when $\tau = 1$ as it is unclear how to apply it otherwise.}

\footnote{Downloaded from http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~kriz/cifar.html.}

\footnote{Downloaded from http://image-net.org/challenges/LSVRC/2013.}
variable of the master is stored and updated on the centralized parameter server, which keeps the current state of center variable sharded across $p$ CPU's ($p$ is the number of local workers). This concept of a centralized sharded parameter server is identical to the common implementation of DOWNPOUR [Dean et al. (2012)]. All the methods we use are implemented in Torch [http://torch.ch] The Message Passing Interface (MPI) implementation MVAPICH [http://mvapich.cse.ohio-state.edu] is used for the GPU-CPU communication.

For the ImageNet experiment we use the similar approach to [Sermanet et al. (2013)]. To be more precise, we re-size each RGB image so that the smallest dimension is 256 pixels. We also re-scale each pixel value to the interval $[0, 1]$. We then extract random crops (and their horizontal flips) of size $3 \times 221 \times 221$ pixels and present these to the network in mini-batches of size 128. We will now explain the details of the network architecture. In all our experiments we use the cross-entropy error criterion with a network having a softmax output non-linearity. All layers use rectified linear units. To provide the details of the architecture of the network we will first introduce some notation. Let $(c, y)$ denotes the sizes of the input to each layer, where $c$ is the number of color channels and $y$ is the horizontal and, at the same time, vertical dimension of the input (thus the input size is really $c \times y \times y$). Let $C(a, b)$ denotes the fully-connected convolutional layer with the filter size $a \times a$ and stride $b \times b$ and let $P(a, b)$ denotes the max pooling layer with the pool size $a \times a$ and stride $b \times b$. DO$(a)$ is a shortcut for the fully connected layer with dropout rate equal to $a$ and $SMax$ is the shortcut for the fully connected layer with softmax output non-linearity. For the ImageNet experiment we then use the following network architecture

**Input:** $(3, 221) \rightarrow C(7, 2) \rightarrow (96, 108) \rightarrow P(3, 3) \rightarrow (96, 36) \rightarrow C(5, 1) \rightarrow (256, 32) \rightarrow P(2, 2) \rightarrow (256, 16) \rightarrow C(3, 1) \rightarrow (384, 14) \rightarrow C(2, 1) \rightarrow (384, 13) \rightarrow C(2, 1) \rightarrow (256, 12) \rightarrow P(2, 2) \rightarrow (256, 6) \rightarrow DO(0.5) \rightarrow (4096, 1) \rightarrow DO(0.5) \rightarrow (4096, 1) \rightarrow SMax \rightarrow (1000, 1).

For the CIFAR experiment we use the similar approach to [Wan et al. (2013)]. We use the original RGB image of size $3 \times 32 \times 32$. As before, we re-scale each pixel value to the interval $[0, 1]$. We then extract random crops (and their horizontal flips) of size $3 \times 28 \times 28$ pixels and present these to the network in mini-batches of size 128. The network architecture that we use for the CIFAR experiment can then be summarized as follows

**Input:** $(3, 28) \rightarrow C(5, 1) \rightarrow (64, 24) \rightarrow P(2, 2) \rightarrow (64, 12) \rightarrow C(5, 1) \rightarrow (128, 8) \rightarrow P(2, 2) \rightarrow (128, 4) \rightarrow C(3, 1) \rightarrow (64, 2) \rightarrow DO(0.5) \rightarrow (256, 1) \rightarrow SMax \rightarrow (10, 1).

In our experiments all the methods we run use the same initial parameter vector chosen randomly, except that we set all the biases to zero for CIFAR case and to 0.1 for ImageNet case. This parameter is used to initialize the master and all the local workers. We also use $l_2$-regularization for the loss function with the regularization parameter $\lambda$. For ImageNet we use $\lambda = 10^{-5}$ and for CIFAR we use $\lambda = 10^{-4}$. We will next explain precisely how the dataset is sampled by each local worker.

### 7.2 Sampling the Dataset by the Local Workers

The general parallel data loading scheme on a single machine is as follows: we use $k$ CPUs, where $k = 8$, to load the data in parallel. Each data loader reads from the memory-mapped (mmap) file a chunk of $c$ raw images (preprocessing was described in the previous subsection) and their labels (for CIFAR $c = 512$ and for ImageNet $c = 64$). For the CIFAR, the mmap file of each data loader contains the entire dataset whereas for ImageNet, each mmap file of each data loader contains different $1/k$ fractions of the entire dataset. A chunk of data is always sent by one of the data loaders to the first worker who requests the data. The next worker requesting the data from the same data loader will get the next chunk. Each worker requests in total $k$ data chunks from $k$ different data loaders and then process them before asking for new data chunks. Notice that each data loader cycles through the data in the mmap file, sending consecutive chunks to the workers in order in which it receives requests from them. When the data loader reaches the end of the mmap file, it selects the address in memory uniformly at random from the interval $[0, s]$, where $s = \text{(number of images in the mmap file modulo mini-batch size)}$, and uses this address to start cycling again through the data in the mmap file. After the local worker receives the $k$ data chunks from the data loaders, it shuffles them and divides it into mini-batches of size 128.
7.3 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

For all experiments in this section we use EASGD with \( \beta = 0.9 \) \(^9\) for all momentum-based methods we use the momentum term \( \delta \) set to \( \delta = 0.99 \) and finally for MVADOWNPOUR we use the moving rate \( \alpha \) set to \( \alpha = 0.999 \). We start with the experiment on CIFAR dataset with \( p = 4 \) local workers running on the one computing node. For all the methods, except MDOWNPOUR, we examined the communication periods from the following set \( \tau = \{1, 4, 16, 64\} \) (recall that for MDOWNPOUR \( \tau \) is equal to \( \tau = 1 \)). For comparison we also report the performance of MSGD which outperformed SGD, ASGD and MVASGD as shown in Figure 6 in the Supplementary material (all figures should be read in color). For each method we examined a wide range of learning rates (those are summarized in Table 1 in the Supplementary material). The experiment was re-run 3 times independently and for each method we report its best performance measured by the smallest achievable test error.

Figure 1 captures the convergence of the training and test loss (negative log-likelihood) and the test error computed for the center variable as a function of wallclock time for different values of \( \tau \) on the CIFAR experiment. \( p = 4 \).

\(^9\)Intuitively one can think of the ‘effective \( \beta \)’ as being proportional to \( \beta/\tau \) in the asynchronous setting. Also recall that \( \beta \approx \alpha \).

\(^{10}\)The training and test loss and the test error are computed from the center patch \( 28 \times 28 \) for the CIFAR experiment and the center patch \( 221 \times 221 \) for the ImageNet experiment. For the ImageNet experiment, the training loss is measured on a fixed subset of the training data of size 50,000.
of $\tau$. We conclude that all $DOWNPOUR$-based methods, i.e. $DOWNPOUR$, $ADOWNPOUR$, $MVADOWNPOUR$ and $MDOWNPOUR$, achieve their best performance (test error) for small $\tau$ ($\tau \in \{1, 4\}$). Also $DOWNPOUR$ and $ADOWNPOUR$ become highly instable for $\tau \in \{16, 64\}$ whereas in this case $MVADOWNPOUR$ has stable but very slow convergence. Simultaneously, $EAMSGD$ significantly outperforms comparator methods for all values of $\tau$ by having faster convergence. It also finds better-quality solution measured by the test error and this advantage becomes more significant for $\tau \in \{16, 64\}$. For $\tau = 1$ and $\tau = 4$ we observe a pronounced overfitting effect for the $EAMSGD$ method. We conjecture that these values of $\tau$ are too small to allow local workers to perform exploration which hurts the test performance of the algorithm. Note that the tendency to achieve worst test performance with smaller $\tau$ is also characteristic for the $EASGD$ algorithm which simultaneously outperforms all $DOWNPOUR$-based methods for higher values of $\tau$ ($\tau \in \{16, 64\}$).
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**Figure 2:** Convergence of the training and test loss (negative log-likelihood) and the test error computed for the center variable as a function of wallclock time for different values of $p$ on the CIFAR.

We next explore different number of local workers $p$ from the set $p = \{4, 8, 16\}$ for the CIFAR experiment, and $p = \{4, 8\}$ for the ImageNet experiment. The CIFAR experiment was again re-run 3 times independently whereas for the ImageNet experiment we report the results of one run. We compared $EASGD$, $EAMSGD$, $DOWNPOUR$ and $MDOWNPOUR$ methods for the CIFAR experiment, and we compared $EASGD$, $EAMSGD$ and $DOWNPOUR$ methods for the ImageNet experiment. We also show the best performer $MSGD$ from among the following methods: $SGD$, $MSGD$, $ASGD$ and $MVASGD$ (see Figure 6 and Figure 7 in the Supplementary material). $EASGD$ and $EAMSGD$ were run with $\tau = 10$ whereas $DOWNPOUR$ and $MDOWNPOUR$ were run with $\tau = 1$. Table 2 and 3 in the Supplementary material summarizes the learning rates explored for respectively the CIFAR and ImageNet experiments. For the ImageNet experiment we used the rule of the thumb to decrease the initial learning rate twice, first time we divided it by 5 and the second time by 2, when we observed that the decrease of the training loss saturates.

Figure 2 captures the convergence of the training and test loss and the test error computed for the center variable as a function of wallclock time for different values of $p$ on the CIFAR. Analogous results are captured in Figure 3 for the ImageNet experiment. From the CIFAR experiment we conclude that $EASGD$ converges faster than $DOWNPOUR$ and $MDOWNPOUR$ while $EAMSGD$ significantly outperforms comparator methods for $p = 8$ and $p = 16$. Also the lowest
achieviable test error by either EASGD or EAMSGD decreases with larger $p$ which again can potentially be explained by the fact that larger $p$ allows for more exploration of the parameter space. The results obtained for the ImageNet experiment again shows the advantage of EAMSGD over the competitor methods. To make sense of the wallclock time, we report in the Table 4 of Supplementary material its breakdown into computation time, data loading time and parameter communication time. We also summarize in the Supplementary material (Figure 8 and 9) the wall clock time needed to achieve the same level of the test error for all the methods.
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Figure 3: Convergence of the training and test loss (negative log-likelihood) and the test error computed for the center variable as a function of wallclock time for different values of $p$ on the ImageNet.

The results showed so far suggest that more exploration lead to better test performance. It should be remembered however that there exists a trade-off between exploration and exploitation. Figure 4 shows this trade-off. We compare the performance of respectively EAMSGD and EASGD for different learning rates $\eta$ when $p = 16$ and $\tau = 10$. We observe from Figure 5 that higher learning rates $\eta$ lead to better test performance for the EAMSGD algorithm which potentially can be justified by the fact that they sustain higher fluctuations of the local workers. We conjecture that higher fluctuations lead to more exploration and simultaneously they also impose higher regularization. This picture however seems to be opposite for the EASGD algorithm for which larger learning rates hurt the performance of the method and lead to overfitting. Interestingly in this experiment for both EASGD and EAMSGD algorithm, the learning rate for which the worst training performance was achieved simultaneously led to the best test performance.

![Graph](image)

Figure 4: Convergence of the training loss (negative log-likelihood) and the test error computed for the center variable as a function of wallclock time for EAMSGD and EASGD run with different values of $\eta$ on the CIFAR experiment. $p = 16$, $\tau = 10$.

## 8 Conclusion

In this paper we describe a new algorithm called EASGD and its variants for training deep neural networks in the stochastic setting when the computations are parallelized over multiple GPUs. Experiments demonstrate that this new algorithm quickly achieves improvement in test error compared to more common baseline approaches such as DOWNPOUR and its variants. We show that our approach is plausible under communication constraints. The different behavior of the EASGD algo-
rithm from its momentum-based variant $\text{EAMSGD}$ is intriguing and will be a subject of our future studies.
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Deep learning with Elastic Averaging SGD
(Supplementary Material)

9 Theoretical proofs

9.1 Proof of Lemma 6.1

Proof. Substituting the gradient from Equation 8 into the update rule used by each local worker in the synchronous EASGD algorithm (Equation 4) we obtain
\[ x_{t+1}^i = x_t^i - \eta (Ax_t^i - b - \xi_t^i) - \alpha (x_t^i - \hat{x}_t), \]  \tag{15}
\[ \hat{x}_{t+1} = \hat{x}_t + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha (x_t^i - \hat{x}_t), \]  \tag{16}
where \( \eta \) is the learning rate, and \( \alpha \) is the moving rate. Recall that \( \alpha = \eta \rho \) and \( A = h. \)

For the ease of notation we redefine \( \hat{x}_t \) and \( x_t^i \) as follows:
\[ \hat{x}_t \triangleq \hat{x}_t - x^* \text{ and } x_t^i \triangleq x_t^i - x^*. \]
We prove the lemma by explicitly solving the linear equations (15) and (16). Let \( x_t = (x_t^1, \ldots, x_t^p, \hat{x}_t)^T \). We rewrite the recursive relation captured in Equation (15) and (16) as simply
\[ x_{t+1} = M x_t + b_t, \]
where the drift matrix \( M \) is defined as
\[ M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \alpha - \eta h & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \alpha \\ 0 & 1 - \alpha - \eta h & \cdots & 0 & \alpha \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 - \alpha - \eta h & \alpha \\ \alpha & \alpha & \cdots & \alpha & 1 - p\alpha \end{bmatrix}, \]
and the (diffusion) vector \( b_t = (\eta \xi_t^1, \ldots, \eta \xi_t^p, 0)^T \).

Note that one of the eigenvalues of matrix \( M \), that we call \( \phi \), satisfies
\[ (1 - \alpha - \eta h - \phi)(1 - p\alpha - \phi) = p\alpha^2 . \]
The corresponding eigenvector is \( (1, 1, \ldots, 1, -p\alpha - \phi)^T \). Let \( u_t \) be the projection of \( x_t \) onto this eigenvector. Thus \( u_t = \sum_{i=1}^p (x_t^i - \frac{\alpha}{1-p\alpha-\phi} \hat{x}_t) \). Let furthermore \( \xi_t = \sum_{i=1}^p \xi_t^i \). Therefore we have
\[ u_{t+1} = \phi u_t + \eta \xi_t. \]  \tag{17}

By combining Equation (16) and (17) as follows
\[ \hat{x}_{t+1} = \hat{x}_t + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha (x_t^i - \hat{x}_t) = (1 - p\alpha) \hat{x}_t + \alpha (u_t + \frac{p\alpha}{1 - p\alpha - \phi} \hat{x}_t) \]
\[ = (1 - p\alpha + \frac{p\alpha^2}{1 - p\alpha - \phi}) \hat{x}_t + \alpha u_t = \gamma \hat{x}_t + \alpha u_t, \]
where the last step results from the following relations:
\[ \frac{p\alpha^2}{1 - p\alpha - \phi} = 1 - \alpha - \eta h - \phi \text{ and } \phi + \gamma = 1 - \alpha - \eta h + 1 - p\alpha. \]
Thus we obtained
\[ \hat{x}_{t+1} = \gamma \hat{x}_t + \alpha u_t. \]  \tag{18}

Based on Equation (17) and (18) we can then expand \( u_t \) and \( \hat{x}_t \) recursively,
\[ u_{t+1} = \phi^{t+1} u_0 + \phi^t (\eta \xi_0) + \ldots + \phi^0 (\eta \xi_t), \]  \tag{19}
\[ \hat{x}_{t+1} = \gamma^{t+1} \hat{x}_0 + \gamma^t (\alpha u_0) + \ldots + \gamma^0 (\alpha u_t). \]  \tag{20}
Substituting \( u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_t \), each given through Equation \([19]\) into Equation \([20]\) we obtain
\[
\tilde{x}_t = \gamma^t \tilde{x}_0 + \gamma^t - \phi^t \alpha u_0 + \alpha \eta \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \frac{\gamma^{t-i} - \phi^{t-i}}{\gamma - \phi} \xi_{i-1}. \tag{21}
\]

To be more specific, the Equation \([21]\) is obtained by integrating by parts,
\[
\tilde{x}_{t+1} = \gamma^{t+1} \tilde{x}_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{t} \gamma^{t-i} (\alpha u_i)
\]
\[
= \gamma^{t+1} \tilde{x}_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{t} \gamma^{t-i} (\phi^i u_0 + \sum_{l=0}^{i-1} \phi^{i-l} \eta \xi_l)
\]
\[
= \gamma^{t+1} \tilde{x}_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{t} \gamma^{t-i} \phi^i (\alpha u_0) + \sum_{l=0}^{t} \gamma^{t-i} \phi^{i-l} (\alpha \eta \xi_l)
\]

Since the random variables \( \xi_l \) are i.i.d, we may sum the variance term by term as follows
\[
\sum_{l=0}^{t} \left( \frac{\gamma^{t-l} - \phi^{t-l}}{\gamma - \phi} \right)^2 = \sum_{l=0}^{t} \frac{\gamma^{2(l-t)} - 2 \gamma^{l-t} \phi^{t-l} + \phi^{2(t-l)}}{\gamma - \phi^2}
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\gamma - \phi^2} \left( \frac{\gamma^2 - \gamma^2(1 + \phi)}{1 - \gamma^2} - 2 \frac{\gamma \phi - (\gamma \phi + 1)}{1 - \gamma \phi} + \frac{\phi^2 - \phi^2(1 + \phi)}{1 - \phi^2} \right). \tag{22}
\]

Note that \( \mathbb{E}[\xi_t] = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \mathbb{E}[\xi_i] = 0 \) and \( \mathbb{V}[\xi_t] = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \mathbb{V}[\xi_i] = p \sigma^2 \). These two facts, the equality in Equation \([21]\) and Equation \([22]\) can then be used to compute \( \mathbb{E}[\tilde{x}_t] \) and \( \mathbb{V}[\tilde{x}_t] \) as given in Equation \([8]\) and \([10]\) in Lemma \([6.1]\).

\[
\square
\]

### 9.2 Proof of Corollary \([6.1]\)

**Proof.** Note that when \( \beta \) is fixed, \( \lim_{p \to \infty} \alpha = \eta h + \beta \) and \( c^2 = \eta h \beta \). Then \( \lim_{p \to \infty} \phi = \min(1 - \beta, 1 - \eta h) \) and \( \lim_{p \to \infty} \gamma = \max(1 - \beta, 1 - \eta h) \). Also note that using Lemma \([6.1]\) we obtain
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{x}_t] = \frac{\beta^2 \eta^2}{(\gamma - \phi)^2} \left( \frac{\gamma^2 + \phi^2}{1 - \gamma^2} - \frac{2 \gamma \phi}{1 - \gamma^2} \right) \frac{\sigma^2}{p}
\]
\[
= \frac{\beta^2 \eta^2}{(\gamma - \phi)^2} \left( \frac{\gamma^2(1 - \phi^2)(1 - \phi)}{(1 - \gamma^2)(1 - \phi^2)(1 - \gamma \phi)} \right) \frac{\sigma^2}{p}
\]
\[
= \frac{\beta^2 \eta^2}{(\gamma - \phi)^2} \left( \frac{(\gamma - \phi)(1 + \phi)}{(1 - \gamma^2)(1 - \phi^2)(1 - \gamma \phi)} \right) \frac{\sigma^2}{p}
\]
\[
= \frac{\beta^2 \eta^2}{(1 - \gamma^2)(1 - \phi^2)} \frac{1 + \gamma \phi}{1 - \gamma \phi} \frac{\sigma^2}{p}.
\]

Corollary \([6.1]\) is obtained by plugining in the limiting values of \( \phi \) and \( \gamma \). \( \square \)

### 9.3 Visualizing the Lemma \([6.1]\)

In Figure \([3]\) we illustrate the dependence of MSE on \( \beta, \eta \) and the number of processors \( p \) over time \( t \). We consider the large-noise setting where \( \tilde{x}_0 = x_0 = 1 \), \( h = 1 \) and \( \sigma = 10 \). The MSE error is color-coded such that the deep blue color corresponds to the MSE equal to \( 10^{-3} \), the green color corresponds to the MSE equal to \( 1 \), the red color corresponds to MSE equal to \( 10^2 \) and the dark red color corresponds to the divergence of algorithm EASGD (condition in Equation \([11]\) is then violated). The plot shows that we can achieve more significant variance reduction effect by increasing the number of local workers \( p \).
Figure 5: Theoretical mean squared error (MSE) of the center $\tilde{x}$ in the quadratic case, with various choices of the learning rate $\eta$ (horizontal within each block), and the moving rate $\beta = p\alpha$ (vertical within each block), the number of processors $p = \{1, 10, 100, 1000, 10000\}$ (vertical across blocks), and the time steps $t = \{1, 2, 10, 100, \infty\}$ (horizontal across blocks). The MSE is plotted in log scale, ranging from $10^{-3}$ to $10^4$ (from deep blue to red). The dark red (i.e. on the upper-right corners) indicates divergence.

9.4 Proof of Lemma 6.2

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 6.1, for the ease of notation we redefine $\tilde{x}_t$ and $x_t^i$ as follows:

$$\tilde{x}_t \triangleq \tilde{x}_t - x^* \quad \text{and} \quad x_t^i \triangleq x_t^i - x^*.$$  

Also recall that $\{z_t^i\}$’s are i.i.d. random variables (noise) with zero mean and the same covariance $\Sigma > 0$. We are interested in the asymptotic behavior of the double averaging sequence $\{z_1, z_2, \ldots\}$ defined as

$$z_{t+1} = \frac{1}{t+1} \sum_{k=0}^t \tilde{x}_k.$$  

Recall the Equation 21 from the proof of Lemma 6.1 (for the convenience it is provided below):

$$\tilde{x}_k = \gamma^k \tilde{x}_0 + \alpha u_0 \frac{\gamma^k - \phi^k}{\gamma - \phi} + \alpha \eta \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \frac{\gamma^{k-l} - \phi^{k-l}}{\gamma - \phi} \xi_{l-1},$$

where $\xi_t = \sum_{i=1}^p \xi_t^i$. Therefore

$$\sum_{k=0}^t \tilde{x}_k = \frac{1 - \gamma^{t+1}}{1 - \gamma} \tilde{x}_0 + \alpha u_0 \frac{1}{\gamma - \mu} \left( \frac{1 - \gamma^{t+1}}{1 - \gamma} - \frac{1 - \phi^{t+1}}{1 - \phi} \right) + \alpha \eta \sum_{l=1}^{t-1} \sum_{k=l+1}^t \frac{\gamma^{k-l} - \phi^{k-l}}{\gamma - \phi} \xi_{l-1}$$

$$= O(1) + \alpha \eta \sum_{l=1}^{t-1} \frac{1}{\gamma - \phi} \left( \frac{1 - \gamma^{t-l}}{1 - \gamma} - \frac{1 - \phi^{t-l}}{1 - \phi} \right) \xi_{l-1}$$

$$= O(1) + \alpha \eta \sum_{l=1}^{t-1} \frac{\gamma^{t-l} - \phi^{t-l}}{\gamma - \phi} \xi_{l-1}.$$
Note that the only non-vanishing term (in weak convergence) of \(1/\sqrt{t} \sum_{k=0}^{t} \tilde{x}_k\) as \(t \to \infty\) is

\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \alpha \eta \sum_{l=1}^{t-1} \frac{1}{\gamma - \phi} \left( \frac{\gamma}{1 - \gamma} - \frac{\phi}{1 - \phi} \right) \xi_{l-1}.
\] (24)

Also recall that \(\nabla[\xi_{l-1}] = p \sigma^2\) and

\[
\frac{1}{\gamma - \phi} \left( \frac{\gamma}{1 - \gamma} - \frac{\phi}{1 - \phi} \right) = \frac{1}{(1 - \gamma)(1 - \phi)} = \frac{1}{\eta \phi \alpha}.
\]

Therefore the expression in Equation 24 is asymptotically normal with zero mean and variance \(\sigma^2/\phi h^2\).

\[\square\]

9.5 Proof of Lemma 6.3

Proof. Since \(A\) is symmetric, one can use the proof technique of Lemma 6.2 to prove Lemma 6.3 by diagonalizing the matrix \(A\). We will not go into the details of this proof as we will provide a more general way to look at the system. As in the proof of Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2, for the ease of notation we redefine \(\tilde{x}_t\) and \(x^*_t\) as follows:

\[
\tilde{x}_t \triangleq \tilde{x}_t - x^* \quad \text{and} \quad x^*_t \triangleq x^*_t - x^*.
\]

Let the spatial average of the local parameters at time \(t\) be denoted as \(y_t\) where \(y_t = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} x^*_i\), and let the average noise be denoted as \(\xi_t\), where \(\xi_t = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} \xi^*_i\). Equations 15 and 16 can then be reduced to the following

\[
y_{t+1} = y_t - \eta(Ay_t - \xi_t) + \alpha(\tilde{x}_t - y_t), \quad (25)
\]

\[
\tilde{x}_{t+1} = \tilde{x}_t + \beta(y_t - \tilde{x}_t). \quad (26)
\]

We focus on the case where the learning rate \(\eta\) and the moving rate \(\alpha\) are kept constant over time. Recall \(\beta = \eta \alpha\) and \(\alpha = \eta \phi\).

Let’s introduce the block notation \(U_t = (y_t, \tilde{x}_t), \Xi_t = (\eta \xi_t, 0), M = I - \eta L\) and

\[
L = \begin{pmatrix}
A + \frac{\alpha}{\eta} I & -\frac{\alpha}{\eta} I \\
-\beta I & \beta I
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

From Equations 25 and 26 it follows that \(U_{t+1} = MU_t + \Xi_t\). Note that this linear system has a degenerate noise \(\Xi_t\) which prevents us from directly applying results of Polyak & Juditsky (1992). Expanding this recursive relation and summing by parts, we have

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{t} U_k = M^0 U_0 + M^1 U_0 + M^2 U_0 + M^3 U_0 + \cdots + M^t U_0 + M^{t-1} \Xi_0 + \cdots + M^0 \Xi_{t-1}.
\]

By Lemma 9.1, \(\|M\|_2 < 1\) and thus

\[
M^0 + M^1 + \cdots + M^t + \cdots = (I - M)^{-1} = \eta^{-1} L^{-1}.
\]

\[\text{As a side note, notice that the center parameter } \tilde{x}_t \text{ is tracking the spatial average } y_t \text{ of the local parameters with a non-symmetric spring. To be more precise note that the update on } y_{t+1} \text{ contains } (\tilde{x}_t - y_t) \text{ scaled by } \alpha, \text{ whereas the update on } \tilde{x}_{t+1} \text{ contains } -(\tilde{x}_t - y_t) \text{ scaled by } \beta. Since } \alpha = \beta/\rho \text{ the impact of the center } \tilde{x}_{t+1} \text{ on the spatial local average } y_{t+1} \text{ becomes more negligible as } p \text{ grows.}\]
Since $A$ is invertible, we get

$$L^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} A^{-1} & \frac{\alpha}{\beta} A^{-1} \\ A^{-1} & \frac{\alpha}{\beta} A^{-1} \end{pmatrix};$$

thus

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \sum_{k=0}^{t} U_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} U_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \eta L^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{t} \Xi_{k-1} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \sum_{k=1}^{t} M^{k+1} \Xi_{k-1}. \quad (27)$$

Note that the only non-vanishing term (in weak convergence) of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \sum_{k=0}^{t} U_k$ is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} (\eta L)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{t} \Xi_{k-1}$ thus we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} (\eta L)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{t} \Xi_{k-1} \to \mathcal{N} \left( \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ V \\ V \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} V & V \\ V & V \end{pmatrix} \right), \quad (27)$$

where $V = A^{-1} \Sigma (A^{-1})^T$.

**Lemma 9.1.** If the following conditions hold:

$$
(2 - \eta h)(2 - p\alpha) > 2\alpha \\
(2 - \eta h) + (2 - p\alpha) > \alpha \\
\eta > 0 \\
\alpha > 0
$$

then $\|M\|_2 < 1$.

**Proof.** The eigenvalue $\lambda$ of $M$ and the (non-zero) eigenvector $(y, z)$ of $M$ satisfy

$$M \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

Recall that

$$M = I - \eta L = \begin{pmatrix} I - \eta A - \alpha I & \alpha I \\ \beta I & I - \beta I \end{pmatrix}. \quad (29)$$

From the Equations 28 and 29 we obtain

$$\begin{cases}
y - \eta Ay - \alpha y + \alpha z = \lambda y \\
\beta y + (1 - \beta) z = \lambda z
\end{cases} \quad (30)$$

Since $y$ and $z$ are assumed to be non-zero, we can write $z = \beta y / (\lambda + \beta - 1)$. Then the Equation 30 can be reduced to

$$\eta Ay = (1 - \alpha - \lambda)y + \frac{\alpha \beta}{\lambda + \beta - 1} y. \quad (31)$$

Thus note that $y$ is the eigenvector of $A$ as well. Let $\lambda_A$ be the eigenvalue of matrix $A$ such that $Ay = \lambda_A y$. Thus based on Equation 31 it follows that

$$\eta \lambda_A = (1 - \alpha - \lambda) + \frac{\alpha \beta}{\lambda + \beta - 1}. \quad (32)$$

Equation 32 is equivalent to

$$\lambda^2 - (2 - a)\lambda + (1 - a + c^2) = 0, \quad (33)$$

where $a = \eta \lambda_A + (p + 1)\alpha$, $c^2 = \eta \lambda_A p\alpha$. It follows from the condition in Equation 11 that $-1 < \lambda < 1$ if $\eta > 0$, $\beta > 0$, $(2 - \eta \lambda_A)(2 - \beta) > 2\beta/p$ and $(2 - \eta \lambda_A) + (2 - \beta) > \beta/p$. Let $h$ denote the maximum eigenvalue of $A$ and note that $2 - \eta \lambda_A \geq 2 - \eta h$. This implies that the condition of our lemma is sufficient. \qed
9.6 Condition in Equation \[11\]

We are going to show that

- \( \gamma < 1 \) iff \( c^2 > 0 \) (i.e. \( \eta > 0 \) and \( \beta > 0 \)).
- \( \phi > -1 \) iff \( (2 - \eta h)(2 - \beta) > 2/\beta \) and \( (2 - \eta h) + (2 - \beta) > \beta / \eta \).
- \( \phi = \gamma \) iff \( a^2 = 4c^2 \) (i.e. \( \eta h = \beta = 0 \)).

Recall that \( a = \eta h + (p + 1)\alpha \), \( c^2 = \eta h p \alpha \), \( \gamma = 1 - a - \sqrt{a^2 - 4c^2} \), \( \phi = 1 - a + \sqrt{a^2 - 4c^2} \), and \( \beta = p \alpha \).

We have

- \( \gamma < 1 \) \iff \( a - \sqrt{a^2 - 4c^2} > 0 \) \iff \( a > \sqrt{a^2 - 4c^2} \) \iff \( a^2 > a^2 - 4c^2 \) \iff \( c^2 > 0 \).
- \( \phi > -1 \) \iff \( 2 - \sqrt{a^2 - 4c^2} > 0 \) \iff \( 2 > \sqrt{a^2 - 4c^2} \) \iff \( 4 - a > 0 \) \iff \( (4 - a)^2 > a^2 - 4c^2 \) \iff \( 4 - a > 0 \) \iff \( 4 > \eta h + \beta + \alpha \).
- \( \phi = \gamma \) \iff \( \sqrt{a^2 - 4c^2} = 0 \) \iff \( a^2 = 4c^2 \).

10 Additional pseudo-codes of the algorithms

10.1 Downpour pseudo-code

Algorithm 3 captures the pseudo-code of the implementation of the Downpour used in this paper.

**Algorithm 3: Downpour: Processing by worker \( i \) and the master**

**Input:** learning rate \( \eta \), communication period \( \tau \in \mathbb{N} \)

**Initialize:** \( \hat{x} \) is initialized randomly, \( x^i = \hat{x}, v^i = 0, t^i = 0 \)

**Repeat**

- if \( \tau \text{ divides } t^i \) then
- \( \hat{x} \leftarrow \hat{x} + v^i \)
- \( x^i \leftarrow \hat{x} \)
- \( v^i \leftarrow 0 \)
- end
- \( x^i \leftarrow x^i - \eta g^i_{x^i}(x^i) \)
- \( v^i \leftarrow v^i - \eta g^i_{v^i}(x^i) \)
- \( t^i \leftarrow t^i + 1 \)

**Until forever**

10.2 MDownpour pseudo-code

Algorithms 4 and 5 capture the pseudo-codes of the implementation of momentum Downpour (MDownpour) used in this paper. Algorithm 4 shows the behavior of each local worker and Algorithm 5 shows the behavior of the master.

**Algorithm 4: MDownpour: Processing by worker \( i \)**

**Initialize:** \( x^i = \hat{x} \)

**Repeat**

- Receive \( \hat{x} \) from the master: \( x^i \leftarrow \hat{x} \)
- Compute gradient \( g^i = g^i(x^i) \)
- Send \( g^i \) to the master

**Until forever**
Algorithm 5: MDOWNPOUR: Processing by the master

| Input: learning rate $\eta$, momentum term $\delta$ |
|---|
| Initialize: $\tilde{x}$ is initialized randomly, $v^i = 0$. |
| Repeat |
| Receive $g^i$ |
| $v \leftarrow \delta v - \eta g^i$ |
| $\tilde{x} \leftarrow \tilde{x} + \delta v$ |
| Until forever |

11 Experiments - Additional Material

11.1 Learning Rates

In Table 1 we summarize the learning rates $\eta$ explored for each method shown in Figure 1. For all values of $\tau$ the same set of learning rates was explored for each method.

Table 1: Learning rates explored for each method shown in Figure 1 (CIFAR experiment).

| $\eta$ | EASGD | EAMSGD | DOWNPOUR | ADOWNPOUR | MVADOWNPOUR | MDOWNPOUR | SGD, ASGD, MVASGD | MSGD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| {0.05, 0.01, 0.005} | {0.01, 0.005, 0.001} | {0.005, 0.001, 0.0005} | {0.00005, 0.00001, 0.000005} | {0.05, 0.01, 0.005} | {0.001, 0.0005, 0.0001} |

In Table 2 we summarize the learning rates $\eta$ explored for each method shown in Figure 2. For all values of $p$ the same set of learning rates was explored for each method.

Table 2: Learning rates explored for each method shown in Figure 2 (CIFAR experiment).

| $\eta$ | EASGD | EAMSGD | DOWNPOUR | MDOWNPOUR | SGD, ASGD, MVASGD | MSGD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| {0.05, 0.01, 0.005} | {0.01, 0.005, 0.001} | {0.005, 0.001, 0.0005} | {0.00005, 0.00001, 0.000005} | {0.05, 0.01, 0.005} | {0.001, 0.0005, 0.0001} |

In Table 3 we summarize the initial learning rates $\eta$ we use for each method shown in Figure 3. For all values of $p$ the same set of learning rates was explored for each method.

Table 3: Initial learning rates used for each method shown in Figure 3 (CIFAR experiment).

| $\eta$ | EASGD | EAMSGD | DOWNPOUR | MDOWNPOUR | SGD, ASGD, MVASGD | MSGD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| {0.05, 0.01, 0.005} | {0.01, 0.005, 0.001} | {0.005, 0.001, 0.0005} | {0.00005, 0.00001, 0.000005} | {0.05, 0.01, 0.005} | {0.001, 0.0005, 0.0001} |
Table 3: Learning rates explored for each method shown in Figure 3 (ImageNet experiment).

| Method       | \( \eta \) |
|--------------|------------|
| EASGD        | 0.1        |
| EAMSGD       | 0.001      |
| DOWNPOUR     | for \( p = 4 \): 0.02 for \( p = 8 \): 0.01 |
| SGD, ASGD, MVASGD | 0.05     |
| MSGD         | 0.0005     |

11.2 Comparison of SGD, ASGD, MVASGD and MSGD

For all CIFAR experiments we always start the averaging for the ADownpour and ASGD methods from the very beginning of each experiment. For all ImageNet experiments we start the averaging for the ASGD at the same time when we first reduce the initial learning rate.

Figure 6 shows the convergence of the training and test loss (negative log-likelihood) and the test error computed for the center variable as a function of wallclock time for SGD, ASGD, MVASGD and MSGD \((p = 1)\) on the CIFAR experiment.
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Figure 6: Convergence of the training and test loss (negative log-likelihood) and the test error (original and zoomed) computed for the center variable as a function of wallclock time for SGD, ASGD, MVASGD and MSGD \((p = 1)\) on the CIFAR experiment.

Figure 7 shows the convergence of the training and test loss (negative log-likelihood) and the test error computed for the center variable as a function of wallclock time for SGD, ASGD, MVASGD and MSGD \((p = 1)\) on the ImageNet experiment.
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Figure 7: Convergence of the training and test loss (negative log-likelihood) and the test error (original and zoomed) computed for the center variable as a function of wallclock time for SGD, ASGD, MVASGD and MSGD \((p = 1)\) on the ImageNet experiment.

11.3 Breakdown of the wallclock time

In addition, we report in the Table 4 the breakdown of the total running time for EASGD when \( \tau = 10 \) (the time breakdown for EAMSGD is almost identical) and DOWNPOUR when \( \tau = 1 \) into computation time, data loading time and parameter communication time. For the CIFAR experiment the reported time corresponds to processing \( 400 \times 128 \) data samples whereas for the ImageNet experiment it corresponds to processing \( 1024 \times 128 \) data samples. For \( \tau = 1 \) and \( p \in \{8, 16\} \) we observe that the communication time accounts for significant portion of the total running time whereas for \( \tau = 10 \) the communication time becomes negligible compared to the total running time (recall that based on previous results EASGD and EAMSGD achieve best performance with larger \( \tau \) which is ideal in the setting when communication is time-consuming).
Table 4: Approximate computation time, data loading time and parameter communication time [sec] for DOWNPOUR (top line for \( \tau = 1 \)) and EASGD (the time breakdown for EAMSGD is almost identical) (bottom line for \( \tau = 10 \)). Left time corresponds to CIFAR experiment and right table corresponds to ImageNet experiment.

11.4 Time speed-up

In the next two figures (Figure 8 and 9) the wall clock time needed to achieve the same level of the test error for all the methods (EASGD, EAMSGD, DOWNPOUR and respectively MSGD and MDOWNPOUR) for the CIFAR experiment and MSGD for the ImageNet experiment as a function of the number of local workers \( p \). For the CIFAR (Figure 8) we examined the following levels: \{21\%, 20\%, 19\%, 18\%\} and for the ImageNet (Figure 9) we examined: \{49\%, 47\%, 45\%, 43\%\}. If some method does not appear on the figure for a given test error level, it indicates that this method never achieved this level. For the CIFAR experiment we observe that from among EASGD, DOWNPOUR and MDOWNPOUR methods, the EASGD method needs less time to achieve a particular level of test error. We observe that with higher \( p \) each of these methods does not necessarily need less time to achieve the same level of test error. This seems counter intuitive though recall that the learning rate for the methods is selected based on the smallest achievable test error. For larger \( p \) smaller learning rates were selected than for smaller \( p \) which explains our results. Meanwhile, the EAMSGD method achieves significant speed-up over other methods for all the test error levels. For the ImageNet experiment we observe that all methods outperform MSGD and furthermore with \( p = 4 \) or \( p = 8 \) each of these methods requires less time to achieve the same level of test error. The EAMSGD consistently needs less time than any other method, in particular DOWNPOUR, to achieve any of the test error levels.
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Figure 8: The wall clock time needed to achieve the same level of the test error \( thr \) as a function of the number of local workers \( p \) on the CIFAR experiment. From left to right: \( thr = \{21\%, 20\%, 19\%, 18\%\} \).
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Figure 9: The wall clock time needed to achieve the same level of the test error \( thr \) as a function of the number of local workers \( p \) on the ImageNet experiment. From left to right: \( thr = \{49\%, 47\%, 45\%, 43\%\} \).