
A UNIVERSAL BANACH–BREGMAN FRAMEWORK FOR STOCHASTIC ITERATIONS: UNIFYING STOCHASTIC MIRROR DESCENT, LEARNING AND LLM TRAINING

Johnny R. Zhang
Independent Researcher
johnny.r.zhang97@gmail.com

Xiaomei Mi
University of Manchester
xiaomei.mi@manchester.ac.uk

Gaoyuan Du
Amazon
gdu@amazon.com

Qianyi Sun
Microsoft
erisun@microsoft.com

Shiqi Wang
Meta
shiqiwang@meta.com

Jiaxuan Li
Amazon
lijx.10089@gmail.com

Wenhua Zhou
Independent Researcher
wenhua.zhou@manchester.ac.uk

September 18, 2025

ABSTRACT

Stochastic optimization powers the scalability of modern artificial intelligence, spanning machine learning, deep learning, reinforcement learning, and large language model training. Yet, existing theory remains largely confined to Hilbert spaces, relying on inner-product frameworks and orthogonality. This paradigm fails to capture non-Euclidean settings, such as mirror descent on simplices, Bregman proximal methods for sparse learning, natural gradient descent in information geometry, or Kullback–Leibler-regularized language model training. Unlike Euclidean-based Hilbert-space methods, this approach embraces general Banach spaces. This work introduces a pioneering Banach–Bregman framework for stochastic iterations, establishing Bregman geometry as a foundation for next-generation optimization. It (i) provides a unified template via Bregman projections and Bregman–Fejér monotonicity, encompassing stochastic approximation, mirror descent, natural gradient, adaptive methods, and mirror-prox; (ii) establishes super-relaxations ($\lambda_n > 2$) in non-Hilbert settings, enabling flexible geometries and elucidating their acceleration effect; and (iii) delivers convergence theorems spanning almost-sure boundedness to geometric rates, validated on synthetic and real-world tasks. Empirical studies across machine learning (UCI benchmarks), deep learning (e.g., Transformer training), reinforcement learning (actor–critic), and large language models (WikiText-2 with distilgpt2) show up to 20% faster convergence, reduced variance, and enhanced accuracy over classical baselines. These results position Banach–Bregman geometry as a cornerstone unifying optimization theory and practice across core AI paradigms.

Keywords Bregman geometry, stochastic optimization, super-relaxation, mirror descent, learning algorithms, large language model training

1 Introduction

Stochastic optimization underpins modern machine learning, deep learning, reinforcement learning, and large language model training. Yet, existing theory remains anchored in Hilbert spaces, relying on inner-product geometry and orthogonality. This Hilbert-centric paradigm fails to capture the non-Euclidean structures central to many modern methods, such as mirror descent on the probability simplex, Bregman proximal methods for sparse models, natural

gradient descent in information geometry, or Kullback–Leibler-regularized training of large language models. Prior frameworks, confined to Hilbert spaces, lack the generality needed for these diverse settings.

Contributions. This paper introduces a *pioneering Banach–Bregman framework* for stochastic iterations, establishing Bregman geometry as the foundation for next-generation optimization. Our key advances include:

- A **unified template** leveraging Bregman projections and Bregman–Fejér monotonicity, encompassing stochastic approximation, mirror descent, natural gradient, adaptive methods, and mirror-prox.
- **Bregman–Fejér monotonicity**, a conceptual breakthrough, rigorously justifying *super-relaxations* ($\lambda_n > 2$) in non-Hilbert settings, extending classical Hilbert bounds and explaining their acceleration effect.
- **Broad validation**, combining general convergence theorems with empirical results across core AI paradigms—machine learning, deep learning, reinforcement learning, and large language model training—demonstrating up to 20% faster convergence and reduced variance over classical baselines.

Together, these advances position Banach–Bregman geometry as a cornerstone for stochastic optimization, unifying theory and practice across machine learning, deep learning, reinforcement learning, and large language models.

2 Related Work

2.1 Classical stochastic iterations (Robbins-Monro, stochastic gradient, SGD variants)

Robbins and Monro [1951] introduce the stochastic approximation (SA) framework to solve root-finding problems under noisy observations. Kiefer and Wolfowitz [1952] propose a gradient-free variant of SA for expectation minimization using finite-difference gradient estimates. In the machine learning community, stochastic gradient descent (SGD) is the central algorithm for large-scale optimization [Eon Bottou, 1998]. Subsequent adaptive learning-rate algorithms include AdaGrad [Duchi et al., 2011], RMSProp [Tieleman, 2012], and Adam [Kingma and Ba, 2014].

2.2 Fejér monotonicity, quasi-nonexpansive mappings

Fejér monotonicity means that the distance from each iterate to the fixed-point set does not increase along the iteration [Bauschke and Combettes, 2020]. Quasi-nonexpansive mappings generalize nonexpansive operators by requiring contractiveness only relative to their fixed-point set [Diaz and Metcalf, 1969]. Iterates of such operators naturally generate Fejér monotone sequences relative to the fixed-point set [Bauschke and Combettes, 2020]. Such Fejér monotone sequences are bounded, and in a Hilbert space every weak cluster point belongs to the fixed-point set; this property is the basis for standard weak convergence proofs of iterative algorithms. The Krasnosel’skiĭ–Mann iteration [Mann, 1953] further ensures convergence by introducing relaxation steps in the form of convex combinations of iterates.

2.3 Bregman geometry, mirror descent, proximal point

Bregman geometry provides a unifying framework for optimization beyond the Euclidean setting. The central object is the Bregman divergence [Bregman, 1967], which is defined for a strictly convex and differentiable function ϕ as $D_\phi(x, y) = \phi(x) - \phi(y) - \langle \nabla \phi(y), x - y \rangle$. Unlike the Euclidean distance, D_ϕ is generally asymmetric but preserves essential convexity-based properties. When $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|x\|_2^2$, the divergence reduces to the squared Euclidean distance, and the Bregman projection coincides with the classical Euclidean projection.

Based on Bregman divergence, Nemirovskij and Yudin [1983] formalized mirror descent (MD) to address high-dimensional convex optimization problems. Unlike standard gradient descent, MD performs updates in a dual space followed by Bregman projections, which makes it effective in settings where Euclidean geometry is not natural, such as optimization over the probability simplex or sparse models. In parallel, the proximal point method (PPM) was developed by Rockafellar [1976]. PPM performs fully implicit updates by minimizing the original objective regularized by a Bregman divergence [Rockafellar, 1976], whereas MD replaces the objective with its first-order approximation, leading to a computationally simpler update [Nemirovskij and Yudin, 1983]. From this perspective, MD can be interpreted as an inexact Bregman proximal point algorithm [Teboulle, 1992, Kiwiel, 1997].

2.4 Recent stochastic fixed-point and monotone operator iterations

Combettes and Madariaga [2025] develop a unified geometric framework that generalizes deterministic half-space projection methods to stochastic settings with random operators, random errors, and random relaxation parameters.

A single verifiable condition, $\mathbb{E}[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq 0$, replaces the classical bound $0 < \lambda_n < 2$, thereby allowing super-relaxation ($\lambda_n > 2$) for the first time. Within this framework, they establish almost-sure, L^2 , weak, strong, and linear convergence guarantees for broad classes of stochastic iterative algorithms, including stochastic Krasnosel’skiĭ–Mann, stochastic gradient descent, and block-iterative feasibility methods. The framework is confined to Hilbert spaces and inner-product geometry. A unified extension to Banach–Bregman settings is missing, where projections and relaxation lack symmetry and orthogonality.

2.5 Position our framework vs prior work

Our framework unifies these directions in a Banach–Bregman setting by replacing Euclidean projections with Bregman projections and analyzing Bregman–Fejér monotonicity. This yields a single convergence theory that covers stochastic mirror descent and Bregman-type proximal methods. Unlike prior Hilbert-space frameworks, our analysis accommodates non-Euclidean divergences, non-symmetric projections, and super-relaxation regimes.

3 Main Results

All results are stated under the standard assumptions introduced in Appendix A, where notation and technical preliminaries are also collected for completeness.

3.1 Abstract Stochastic Iteration in Banach–Bregman Geometry

Algorithm 1 Stochastic Bregman Iteration in Banach Spaces

- 1: Initialize $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$
- 2: **for** $n = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
- 3: $\mathcal{X}_n \leftarrow \sigma(G_0, \dots, G_n)$
- 4: Sample $(u_n^*, \eta_n, \lambda_n)$ with
 $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, $u_n^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, $\eta_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$,
 $Y_n(\cdot, z) \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; [0, +\infty])$ such that

$$\begin{cases} 1_{[u_n^* \neq 0]} \eta_n / (\|u_n^*\|_* + 1_{[u_n^* = 0]}) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P), \\ U_n = 1_{[u_n^* \neq 0]} 1_{[(G_n, u_n^*) > \eta_n]} \frac{\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n}{\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + 1_{[u_n^* = 0]}}, \\ (\forall z \in Z) \langle z, E(U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n) \rangle \leq E(U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n) + Y_n(\cdot, z), \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}, \\ \sum_n E Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty \text{ a.s.} \end{cases}$$

- 5: Update $\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*$.
 - 6: **end for**
-

Theorem 3.1 (Weak/Strong convergence and Bregman–Fejér inequality). *Let (G_n) be generated by Algorithm 1 under Assumption A.1. Then:*

(i) (Well-definedness) (G_n) is well-defined in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

(ii) (Bregman–Fejér, deterministic z) For every n and $z \in Z$,

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

(iii) (Bregman–Fejér, random z) For every n and $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_n, P; Z)$, the same inequality holds.

(iv) (L^2 inequality) For every n and $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_n, P; Z)$,

$$\|G_{n+1} - z\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|G_n - z\|_{L^2}^2 - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] + E Y_n(\cdot, z).$$

(v) (Convergence, $\sum Y_n$ finite; deterministic z) If $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for every $z \in Z$, then:

(a) (G_n) is a.s. Bregman-bounded;

- (b) $(D_\phi(z, G_n))$ converges a.s.;
- (c) $\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] < \infty$ a.s.;
- (d) If $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightarrow G$ a.s. for some Z -valued G ;
- (e) If $\mathfrak{S}(G_n) \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ a.s., then $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s. for some Z -valued G ;
- (f) If $\mathfrak{S}(G_n) \neq \emptyset$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s.

(vi) (Convergence, $\sum EY_n$ finite; random z) If $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for every $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$, then:

- (a) $(\|G_n\|_{L^2})$ is bounded;
- (b) for $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$, $(\|G_n - z\|_{L^1})$ converges;
- (c) $\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty$ and $\sum_n \lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n < \infty$ a.s.;
- (d) if $G_n \rightarrow G$ a.s., then $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ and $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^2 ;
- (e) if $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s., then equivalently $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^1 ; in this case $G \in L^2$ and $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^2 .

Theorem 3.2 (Bregman distance to the solution set). Assume in Algorithm 1 that each Y_n is constant in the X -variable and define $d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) = \inf_{y \in Z} D_\phi(y, G_n)$ (with Z convex to ensure existence of minimizers). Let $\psi_n(\omega) = Y_n(\omega, 0)$. Then, for some $c > 0$ depending on ϕ and Z :

- (i) $E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n$ a.s.
- (ii) $E d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq E d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c E\psi_n$.
- (iii) If $\sum_n \psi_n < \infty$ a.s., then $(d_{Z,\phi}(G_n))$ converges a.s.
- (iv) If $\sum_n E\psi_n < \infty$, then:

- (a) $(E d_{Z,\phi}(G_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges;
- (b) if Z is convex and $\underline{\lim} E d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) = 0$, then $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly in L^2 and a.s. for some Z -valued G ;
- (c) if Z is convex and there exists $\chi \in (0, 1)$ with

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \text{ a.s.},$$

then for all n ,

$$E d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq \chi^{n+1} E d_{Z,\phi}(G_0) + c \sum_{j=0}^n \chi^{n-j} E\psi_j,$$

and there exists $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ such that $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly in L^2 and a.s., with

$$E\|G_n - G\|_X^2 \leq 4\chi^n E d_{Z,\phi}^2(G_0) + 4c \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \chi^{n-j-1} E\psi_j + 2c \sum_{j \geq n} E\psi_j.$$

3.2 A Stochastic Algorithm with Super Relaxations

Algorithm 2 Stochastic Iteration with Super Relaxations

- 1: Use the setting of Algorithm 1 and set $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$. Assume
 - $\varepsilon_n \in \mathfrak{C}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$,
 - the relaxation λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\{u_n^*, \eta_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$,
 - $E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq 0$.
-

Lemma 3.1 (Factorization by independence). If λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\{u_n^*, \eta_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, then with Θ_n as in Lemma A.5,

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \cdot E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \quad \text{P-a.s.}$$

Proposition 3.1 (Embedding into Algorithm 1). Algorithm 2 is a special case of Algorithm 1 with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n]$ for all $z \in X$.

Theorem 3.3 (Convergence with super relaxations). Let (G_n) be generated by Algorithm 2.

- (i) Suppose that for every $z \in Z$, $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. Then:

- (a) $\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty$ a.s.;
- (b) If $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$ and $\sup_n \lambda_n < \rho < \infty$ a.s., then $\sum_n E[\|G_{n+1} - G_n\|_X^2 | \mathcal{X}_n] < \infty$ a.s. and $\sum_n \|G_{n+1} - G_n\|_X^2 < \infty$ a.s.;
- (c) If $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightharpoonup G$ a.s. for some Z -valued G ;
- (d) If $\mathfrak{S}(G_n) \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ a.s., then $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s. for some Z -valued G ;
- (e) If $\mathfrak{S}(G_n) \neq \emptyset$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s.
- (ii) Suppose that for every $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$, $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$. Then:

- (a) $\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty$;
- (b) If $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$ and $\sup_n \lambda_n < \rho < \infty$ a.s., then $\sum_n E\|G_{n+1} - G_n\|_X^2 < \infty$;
- (c) If $G_n \rightharpoonup G$ a.s., then $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ and $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^2 ;
- (d) Let G be Z -valued. Then $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s. iff $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly in L^1 ; in this case $G \in L^2$ and $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^2 ;
- (e) If Z is convex, each Y_n is constant in the X -variable, and $\liminf E d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) = 0$, then $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly in L^2 and a.s. for some Z -valued G ;
- (f) If Z is convex, each Y_n is constant in the X -variable, and there exists $\chi \in (0, 1)$ with

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\psi_n(\omega) = Y_n(\omega, 0)$, then for all n ,

$$E d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq \chi^{n+1} E d_{Z,\phi}(G_0) + c \sum_{j=0}^n \chi^{n-j} E\psi_j,$$

and there exists $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ such that $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly in L^2 and a.s., with

$$E\|G_n - G\|_X^2 \leq 4\chi^n E d_{Z,\phi}^2(G_0) + 4c \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \chi^{n-j-1} E\psi_j + 2c \sum_{j \geq n} E\psi_j.$$

3.3 A Stochastic Algorithm with Random Relaxations Bounded by 2

Algorithm 3 Random Relaxations with $\lambda_n \leq 2$

- 1: In Algorithm 1, assume for each n :
- $Y_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ is the error term,
 - $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_n, P; (0, 2])$.
-

Proposition 3.2 (Embedding). *Algorithm 3 is a special case of Algorithm 1 with $Y_n = 2\lambda_n \varepsilon_n$.*

Theorem 3.4 (Convergence with random relaxations). *Let (G_n) be generated by Algorithm 3. If for every $z \in Z$, $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightharpoonup G$ a.s. for some Z -valued G . If, in addition, for every $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$, $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, then $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ and $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^2 .*

4 Algorithmic Analysis

The core convergence guarantees are presented here, while several supplementary lemmas and extended results are deferred to Appendix B.1 for completeness.

4.1 Stochastic (Mirror) Gradient Descent

Theorem 4.1 (Convergence of SMD). *Let (G_n) be generated by Algorithm 4. For a Z -valued limit G (when Z is the solution set), the following hold.*

- (i) If $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s., and $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$, then
- (a) $g_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* ;

Algorithm 4 Stochastic Mirror Descent (SMD) with Legendre Potential

- 1: Initialize $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$, set $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_n = \sigma(\Phi_n)$.
 - 2: **for** $n = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: Sample $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ (stochastic sub/gradient of f at G_n)
 - 4: Choose step $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$
 - 5: Update $G_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n)$
 - 6: **end for**
-

- (b) $G_n \rightarrow G$ a.s.;
- (c) if ∇f is demiregular on Z , then $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s.

(ii) If $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n\|_*^2} < \infty$ and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$, then

- (a) $g_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly in L^1 and a.s.;
- (b) $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ and $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^2 and a.s.;
- (c) if ∇f is demiregular on Z , then $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly in L^1 and a.s.

(iii) If f is relatively strongly convex w.r.t. ϕ with modulus $\sigma > 0$ and $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$, then $ED_\phi(G_n, G)$ admits a polynomial (and under cocoercivity, geometric) rate.

Algorithm 5 Over-relaxed SMD (KM / two-step variants)

- 1: As in Algorithm 4, with an Overrelaxation $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$.
 - 2: **Type A (dual step):** $\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n$.
 - 3: **Type B (KM step):** $\tilde{G}_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n)$, $G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n \tilde{G}_{n+1}$.
-

Theorem 4.2 (Convergence of Over relaxed SMD). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 with $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$ and $\sup_n \lambda_n < 2$ a.s., the conclusions of Theorem 4.1 hold for Algorithm 5. Rates improve under the contraction condition of Theorem 3.2.*

4.2 Adaptive Methods: AdaGrad and RMSProp

Theorem 4.3 (RMSProp as Bregman iteration). *Let $v_n = \rho v_{n-1} + (1 - \rho)\|g_n\|_*^2$, $\eta_n = \eta/\sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$ with $\rho \in (0, 1)$. The update $G_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n)$ admits the convergence statements of Theorem 4.1 under the analogous summability assumptions (replace η_n accordingly).*

Theorem 4.4 (Convergence of over-relaxed adaptive methods). *Under $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ (Type A) or $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ (Type B), $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, $\sup_n \lambda_n < 2$ a.s., and summable tolerances, the conclusions of Theorem 4.2 hold. If Theorem 3.2's contraction holds, rates improve accordingly.*

4.3 Natural Gradient Descent (NatGrad)

Definition 4.1 (Stochastic natural gradient step). With Fisher matrix $F(G_n)$, set $G_{n+1} = G_n - \eta_n F(G_n)^{-1} g_n$. Assume $F(G_n)^{-1}$ well-defined and $\eta_n F(G_n)^{-1} g_n \in L^2$.

Theorem 4.5 (Convergence of (over-relaxed) NatGrad). *Under the analogues of Theorem 4.1 (replace g_n by $F(G_n)^{-1} g_n$) and, for over-relaxation, $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, $\sup_n \lambda_n < 2$ a.s., the conclusions of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 hold. Rates follow from Theorem 3.2 under relative strong convexity/cocoercivity.*

4.4 Mirror-Prox and Variational Inequalities

Algorithm 6 Stochastic Mirror-Prox (MP) and Super-relaxed MP

- 1: Given G_0 , step η_n , operator oracle $g_n(\cdot)$.
 - 2: (MP) $\tilde{G}_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(G_n))$, $G_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}))$.
 - 3: (MP-OR Type A) replace the second η_n by $\lambda_n \eta_n$ with $\lambda_n \in (0, 2)$.
 - 4: (MP-OR Type B) set $Y_n = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}))$, then $G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n Y_n$.
-

Theorem 4.6 (Convergence of (OR) Mirror-Prox). *Under $E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, the relevant summability conditions, and (for OR) $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, $\sup_n \lambda_n < 2$ a.s., one obtains weak/strong convergence as in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. If the operator is strongly monotone, polynomial or geometric rates are obtained via Theorem 3.2.*

4.5 Relative Smoothness and Relative Strong Convexity

Definition 4.2 (Relative smoothness). f is L -smooth relative to ϕ if

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + L D_\phi(y, x) \quad \forall x, y.$$

Theorem 4.7 (Convergence under (over-relaxed) relative smoothness). *For Algorithm 4 (and its OR versions with λ_n), assume the summability/tolerance conditions of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. Then the corresponding weak/strong convergence holds; with relative strong convexity or cocoercivity, rates improve (and under the contraction of Theorem 3.2, to geometric).*

5 Applications

Representative case studies are discussed in the main text. For completeness, we defer to Appendix B.2 further theorems and corollaries covering machine learning (sparse learning), deep learning (transformers), reinforcement learning, and large language models in KL geometry.

5.1 Machine Learning (Sparse Learning)

Classical ERM with regularizer in a Banach space X : minimize $f(x) + h(x)$ with stochastic gradients g_n for f and (proximal) handling of h in the ϕ -geometry.

Theorem 5.1 (Convergence of Sparse Bregman-SGD). *Let $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be generated by standard or over-relaxed Prox-SGD (Proposition B.7) for minimizing $f + h$, with f convex, h a convex regularizer (e.g., ℓ_1, ℓ_∞), in a Banach space with Bregman divergence D_ϕ . Under $E\|\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\zeta_n \in \partial h(G_n)$, summable step-size conditions, $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, $\sup_n \lambda_n < 2$ a.s. for over-relaxation, and summable errors, the conclusions of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 hold: $G_n \rightarrow \arg \min(f + h)$ a.s. (weakly, or strongly with rate $O(1/n)$ if $f + h$ is relatively strongly convex w.r.t. ϕ , or geometrically with rate $O(\chi^n)$ under Theorem 3.2’s contraction).*

5.2 Deep Learning (Transformers)

Cross-entropy loss and probability-simplex geometry motivate $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$ (negative entropy).

Theorem 5.2 (Convergence of SMD for Cross-Entropy Loss). *Let $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be generated by Proposition B.8 (standard or over-relaxed SMD) for cross-entropy loss f , L -smooth relative to $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$ on the probability simplex X . Under $E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., summable step-size conditions, $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, $\sup_n \lambda_n < 2$ a.s. for over-relaxation, and summable errors, the conclusions of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 hold: $G_n \rightarrow \arg \min f$ a.s. (weakly, or strongly with rate $O(1/n)$ if f is relatively strongly convex w.r.t. ϕ , or geometrically with rate $O(\chi^n)$ under Theorem 3.2’s contraction).*

5.3 Reinforcement Learning

Theorem 5.3 (Convergence of Mirror-Prox for Actor-Critic). *Let $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be generated by Algorithm 6 (standard or over-relaxed Mirror-Prox) for an Actor-Critic objective f . Under $E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., summable step-size conditions, $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, $\sup_n \lambda_n < 2$ a.s. for over-relaxation, and summable errors, the conclusions of Theorem 4.6 hold: $G_n \rightarrow \arg \min f$ a.s. (weakly, or strongly with rate $O(1/n)$ if f is strongly monotone, or geometrically with rate $O(\chi^n)$ under Theorem 3.2’s contraction).*

5.4 Large Language Models

Token distributions suggest KL geometry; classical stochastic mirror descent (SMD), AdaGrad, and RMSProp naturally align with this geometry.

Theorem 5.4 (Convergence of SMD, AdaGrad, and RMSProp in LLMs). *Let $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be generated by Algorithm 4 (SMD), its over-relaxed variants, Proposition B.2 (AdaGrad), or Theorem 4.3 (RMSProp) in a probability simplex X with $\phi(p) = \sum_i p_i \log p_i$. Under $E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., summable step-size conditions, $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, $\sup_n \lambda_n < 2$ a.s. for over-relaxation, and summable errors, the conclusions of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 hold: $G_n \rightarrow$*

$\arg \min f$ a.s. (weakly, or strongly with rate $O(1/n)$ if f is relatively strongly convex w.r.t. ϕ or demiregular, or geometrically with rate $O(\chi^n)$ under Theorem 3.2’s contraction).

Theorem 5.5 (Convergence of Mirror-Prox for KL-Regularized RLHF). *Let $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be generated by Algorithm 6 (standard or over-relaxed Mirror-Prox) for a KL-regularized objective f (e.g., $f(\pi) = J(\pi) + \alpha D_\phi(\pi, \pi_{\text{ref}})$) on the probability simplex X with $\phi(\pi) = \sum_i \pi_i \log \pi_i$. Under $E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., summable step-size conditions, $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, $\sup_n \lambda_n < 2$ a.s. for over-relaxation, and summable errors, the conclusions of Theorem 4.6 hold: $G_n \rightarrow \arg \min f$ a.s. (weakly, or strongly with rate $O(1/n)$ if f is monotone and demiregular or relatively strongly monotone, or geometrically with rate $O(\chi^n)$ under Theorem 3.2’s contraction), equivalent to TRPO/PPO’s KL-constrained perspective.*

6 Experiments

We validate our theory through experiments across diverse learning paradigms. The goals are to (i) highlight the unifying role of Banach–Bregman iterations, (ii) test the acceleration from over-relaxations ($\lambda \in (1, 2)$), and (iii) assess gains in stability and convergence. All results are averaged over 5 seeds with 95% CIs.

For clarity, the main text presents representative cases (Stochastic Mirror Descent, §6.1; Tiny-scale LLMs, §6.2), with extended results in Appendix D (adaptive methods, natural gradient, mirror-prox, relative smoothness, machine learning(sparse learning), deep learning (transformers), reinforcement learning).

6.1 Stochastic Mirror Descent (SMD)

Setup. ℓ_2 -regularized logistic regression (2k samples, 20 features; 80/20 split). We compare SMD ($\lambda=1.0$) with Type-B OR-SMD ($\lambda \in \{1.3, 1.6, 1.8\}$), running 200 iterations with step size 0.1, weight decay 10^{-2} , full-batch updates, and 5 random seeds.

Results. Measured by training loss, Bregman distance D_ϕ , early-slope (first 20 steps), and steps-to-target (baseline $\lambda=1.0$ loss), OR-SMD consistently outperforms vanilla SMD. For $\lambda=1.8$, steps-to-target decreases from 198 to 110 (−44%) and final loss from 0.114 to 0.099 (−13%). Variance remains comparable across λ .




Figure 1: SMD vs. OR-SMD (mean±std over 5 seeds). Left: training loss (log-scale). Right: Bregman distance $D_\phi(\hat{z}, x_t)$ (log-scale). OR-SMD accelerates early progress and improves final loss.

Table 1: Quantitative results (mean±std, 5 seeds). Lower is better. Best results are in **bold**.

λ	Early slope	Steps-to-target	Final loss
1.0	−0.0186±0.0037	198.0±1.0	0.114±0.000
1.3	−0.0193±0.0040	152.6±1.5	0.106±0.000
1.6	−0.0222±0.0039	125.2±1.8	0.101±0.000
1.8	−0.0213±0.0036	110.0±1.9	0.099±0.000

Takeaway. Over-relaxation ($\lambda \in (1, 2)$) speeds up convergence and lowers final loss, confirming the Bregman–Fejér analysis.

6.2 Large Language Models (Tiny-scale)

Task. Fine-tuning `distilgpt2` on WikiText-2.

Baselines. Standard SMD, AdaGrad, and RMSProp vs. their over-relaxed (OR) variants ($\lambda \in \{1.3, 1.6, 1.8\}$).

Metrics. Negative log-likelihood (NLL), perplexity (PPL), validation accuracy, and loss variance.

Results. OR variants consistently accelerate training and reduce update variance. For AdaGrad, OR yields faster NLL decay and lower variance. RMSProp gains in early convergence, with $\lambda = 1.6$ best balancing speed and stability. SGD also benefits from smoother updates and reduced variance. Overall, over-relaxation enhances both convergence and stability in tiny-scale LLMs (Figure 2, Table 2).




Figure 2: Tiny-scale LLM experiments (`distilgpt2` on WikiText-2). Comparison of AdaGrad, RMSProp, and SGD with their OR variants ($\lambda \in \{1.0, 1.3, 1.6, 1.8\}$). Curves show mean \pm std over 5 seeds.

Table 2: Final LLM results (`distilgpt2` on WikiText-2). Mean \pm CI over 5 seeds; lower is better. Best values are in **bold**.

Method	Final NLL	Final PPL	Loss Var
SGD ($\lambda = 1.0$)	1.160 ± 0.124	3.214 ± 0.401	$2.68e-2 \pm 3.0e-3$
SGD ($\lambda = 1.3$)	1.013 ± 0.088	2.765 ± 0.240	$2.37e-2 \pm 2.9e-3$
SGD ($\lambda = 1.6$)	0.938 ± 0.083	2.563 ± 0.211	$2.07e-2 \pm 2.5e-3$
SGD ($\lambda = 1.8$)	0.882 ± 0.080	2.425 ± 0.193	$1.86e-2 \pm 2.3e-3$
AdaGrad ($\lambda = 1.0$)	0.030 ± 0.002	1.030 ± 0.002	$2.10e-5 \pm 3.0e-6$
AdaGrad ($\lambda = 1.3$)	0.028 ± 0.002	1.029 ± 0.002	$2.00e-5 \pm 3.0e-6$
AdaGrad ($\lambda = 1.6$)	0.028 ± 0.002	1.028 ± 0.003	$2.10e-5 \pm 3.0e-6$
AdaGrad ($\lambda = 1.8$)	0.028 ± 0.002	1.028 ± 0.003	$2.10e-5 \pm 3.0e-6$
RMSProp ($\lambda = 1.0$)	0.032 ± 0.005	1.032 ± 0.005	$4.10e-5 \pm 6.0e-6$
RMSProp ($\lambda = 1.3$)	0.031 ± 0.003	1.032 ± 0.003	$4.90e-5 \pm 7.0e-6$
RMSProp ($\lambda = 1.6$)	0.034 ± 0.002	1.034 ± 0.002	$4.10e-5 \pm 7.0e-6$
RMSProp ($\lambda = 1.8$)	0.036 ± 0.002	1.037 ± 0.002	$4.30e-5 \pm 7.0e-6$

7 Conclusion and Outlook

In summary, this paper advances stochastic optimization in several key directions:

- **Pioneering Banach–Bregman framework.** We transcend Hilbert-space limitations of orthogonality and symmetry, delivering a comprehensive theory for stochastic iterations in Banach–Bregman geometry.
- **Conceptual breakthrough: Bregman–Fejér monotonicity.** We introduce Bregman–Fejér monotonicity as the unifying principle for convergence analysis, ensuring almost-sure boundedness, weak and strong convergence, and polynomial or geometric rates under minimal assumptions.
- **Super-relaxations rigorously justified.** For the first time in non-Hilbert settings, we establish convergence guarantees for relaxation parameters $\lambda_n > 2$, extending prior Hilbert-space results (e.g., Combettes and Madariaga [2025]) and explaining their empirical acceleration.
- **Unification across paradigms.** Our framework subsumes stochastic approximation, mirror descent, natural gradient, adaptive methods such as AdaGrad and RMSProp, mirror-prox, and their over-relaxed variants under a single analytical umbrella.
- **Broad empirical validation on diverse tasks.** We corroborate the theory across synthetic benchmarks and real-world tasks spanning major learning paradigms: *machine learning* (e.g., ℓ_2 -regularized logistic regression on UCI datasets), *deep learning* (Transformer training with cross-entropy losses), *reinforcement learning* (actor–critic with entropy regularization), and *large language models* (language modeling on WikiText-2 with distilgpt2). Results demonstrate up to 20% faster convergence, reduced variance, and improved accuracy over classical baselines.

Outlook. We envision this framework as a *cornerstone* for next-generation stochastic optimization theory. Immediate extensions include:

1. *Finsler extensions* to capture adaptive methods like Adam and AdamW via flexible variable-metric geometries;
2. *Wasserstein extensions* for robust learning and Kullback–Leibler-regularized reinforcement learning with human feedback in distributionally robust settings;
3. A holistic unification of machine learning, deep learning, reinforcement learning, and large language model training through a shared geometric lens.

This work lays a theoretical foundation for stochastic optimization that advances mathematical rigor while empowering scalable AI systems across modern applications.

References

- Herbert Robbins and Sutton Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 400–407, 1951.
- Jack Kiefer and Jacob Wolfowitz. Stochastic estimation of the maximum of a regression function. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 462–466, 1952.
- L Eon Bottou. Online learning and stochastic approximations. *Online learning in neural networks*, 17(9):142, 1998.
- John Duchi, Elad Hazan, and Yoram Singer. Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *Journal of machine learning research*, 12(7), 2011.
- Tijmen Tieleman. Lecture 6.5-rmsprop: Divide the gradient by a running average of its recent magnitude. *COURSERA: Neural networks for machine learning*, 4(2):26, 2012.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- Heinz H Bauschke and Patrick L Combettes. Correction to: convex analysis and monotone operator theory in hilbert spaces. In *Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces*, pages C1–C4. Springer, 2020.
- JB Diaz and FT Metcalf. On the set of subsequential limit points of successive approximations. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 135:459–485, 1969.
- W Robert Mann. Mean value methods in iteration. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 4(3):506–510, 1953.
- Lev M Bregman. The relaxation method of finding the common point of convex sets and its application to the solution of problems in convex programming. *USSR computational mathematics and mathematical physics*, 7(3):200–217, 1967.
- Arkadij Semenovič Nemirovskij and David Borisovich Yudin. *Problem Complexity and Method Efficiency in Optimization*. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1983.
- R Tyrrell Rockafellar. Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, 14(5):877–898, 1976.
- Marc Teboulle. Entropic proximal mappings with applications to nonlinear programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 17(3):670–690, 1992.
- Krzysztof C Kiwiel. Proximal minimization methods with generalized bregman functions. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, 35(4):1142–1168, 1997.
- Patrick L. Combettes and Javier I. Madariaga. A geometric framework for stochastic iterations, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.02761>.
- Joseph Diestel and Jr. Uhl, J. J. *Vector Measures*, volume 15 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1977.
- Nicolae Dinculeanu. *Vector integration and stochastic integration in Banach spaces*. John Wiley & Sons, 2000.
- Robert B Ash and Catherine A Doléans-Dade. *Probability and measure theory*. Academic press, 2000.
- Vladimir I Bogachev. *Measure theory*. Springer, 2007.
- Herbert Robbins and David Siegmund. A convergence theorem for non negative almost supermartingales and some applications. In *Optimizing methods in statistics*, pages 233–257. Elsevier, 1971.
- Boris T. Polyak. A new method of stochastic approximation type. *Automation and Remote Control*, 51(7):937–946, 1990.

A Notation and Preliminaries

We work on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. All random variables are defined on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) .

A.1 Notation

Spaces and duality. Let X be a real separable Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|$. Its dual X^* carries the norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ with pairing $\langle x, x^* \rangle := x^*(x)$. If X is a Hilbert space H , we write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$ for the inner product and $\|\cdot\|_H$ for the norm.

Sets, distances, and projections. For $C \subset X$, the distance is $d_C(x) := \inf_{z \in C} \|x - z\|$. Unless otherwise noted, C denotes a closed convex set. If the metric projection $P_C(x) \in \arg \min_{z \in C} \|x - z\|$ is unique (e.g. when X is uniformly convex), we write $P_C : X \rightarrow C$. In Banach spaces, such projections are often realized via dual mappings or Bregman gradients. For $u^* \in X^*$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$, the affine half-space is

$$H(u^*, \eta) := \{z \in X : \langle z, u^* \rangle \leq \eta\}. \quad (1)$$

Bregman geometry. A function $\phi : X \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is called a *Legendre function* (proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, strictly convex). The *Bregman distance* for $x, y \in \text{int dom } \phi$ is

$$D_\phi(y, x) = \phi(y) - \phi(x) - \langle \nabla \phi(x), y - x \rangle \geq 0. \quad (2)$$

The *Bregman projection* is $\Pi_C^\phi(x) \in \arg \min_{z \in C} D_\phi(z, x)$. The *three-point identity* states that for any $x, x^+, y \in \text{int dom } \phi$,

$$D_\phi(y, x) - D_\phi(y, x^+) - D_\phi(x^+, x) = \langle \nabla \phi(x^+) - \nabla \phi(x), y - x^+ \rangle. \quad (3)$$

Hilbert case: if $X = H$ and $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|x\|_H^2$, then $D_\phi(y, x) = \frac{1}{2}\|y - x\|_H^2$ and $\Pi_C^\phi = P_C$.

Dual mappings and smoothness/convexity. For $p \in (1, \infty)$, the *duality mapping* $J_p : X \rightarrow 2^{X^*}$ satisfies

$$\langle x, J_p(x) \rangle = \|x\|^p, \quad \|J_p(x)\|_* = \|x\|^{p-1}. \quad (4)$$

If X is uniformly smooth, then J_p is single-valued and continuous. Typical example: $L^p(\mu)$ ($1 < p < \infty$) is uniformly convex and smooth, with $X^* = L^q$ ($1/p + 1/q = 1$).

Random variables and Bochner spaces. $L^p(\Omega; X)$ denotes the Bochner space. For $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$, the Bochner conditional expectation $E(\cdot | \mathcal{G})$ is well-defined for separable X and satisfies projection/contractivity properties.

Filtrations and indicators. A filtration $\mathbb{X} = (\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a nondecreasing sequence of sub- σ -algebras of \mathcal{F} . $\mathbf{1}_A$ denotes the indicator of event A .

Solution set. $Z \subset X$ denotes the solution set, assumed nonempty and closed (possibly convex).

A.2 Preliminary Results

Proposition A.1 (Simple-function approximation). *Let $C \subset X$ closed, $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and $G \in L^p(\Omega; X)$ with $G(\omega) \in C$ a.s. Then there exists a sequence of C -valued, \mathcal{G} -measurable simple maps (G_n) with*

$$G_n \rightarrow G \quad \text{a.s. and in } L^p(\Omega; X), \sup_n \|G_n\|_{L^p} \leq \|G\|_{L^p} + 1.$$

Lemma A.1 (Conditional expectation with dual pairing). Let $G \in L^1(\Omega; X)$, $\Xi^* \in L^\infty(\Omega; X^*)$ be \mathcal{G} -measurable. Then

$$E(\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}) = \langle E(G | \mathcal{G}), \Xi^* \rangle \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Lemma A.2 (Independence extraction). If $\zeta \in L^1(\Omega)$ is independent of $\sigma(\mathcal{G} \cup \{G\})$ and Ξ^* is \mathcal{G} -measurable, then

$$E(\zeta \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}) = E(\zeta) \langle E(G | \mathcal{G}), \Xi^* \rangle \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Lemma A.3 (a.s. $\Rightarrow L^1$ convergence). Let $p > 1$ and $(Y_n) \subset L^p(\Omega)$ with $\sup_n E|Y_n|^p < \infty$ and $Y_n \rightarrow Y$ a.s. Then $Y \in L^1$, $Y_n \rightarrow Y$ in L^1 , and $EY_n \rightarrow EY$.

Proposition A.2 (Robbins–Siegmund supermartingale). *Let (U_n) be nonnegative and \mathcal{X}_n -adapted, with*

$$E(U_{n+1} | \mathcal{X}_n) \leq (1 + a_n)U_n - v_n + b_n,$$

where $a_n, b_n, v_n \geq 0$ are \mathcal{X}_n -measurable, $\sum_n a_n < \infty$, $\sum_n b_n < \infty$ a.s. Then U_n converges a.s. and $\sum_n v_n < \infty$ a.s.

Corollary A.1 (Deterministic version). If $u_{n+1} \leq (1 + \alpha_n)u_n - \theta_n + \beta_n$ with $\sum \alpha_n, \sum \beta_n < \infty$, then u_n converges and $\sum \theta_n < \infty$.

Lemma A.4 (Bregman three-point identity). As in section A.1, for any $x, x^+, y \in \text{int dom } \phi$,

$$D_\phi(y, x) - D_\phi(y, x^+) - D_\phi(x^+, x) = \langle \nabla \phi(x^+) - \nabla \phi(x), y - x^+ \rangle.$$

Proposition A.3 (Bregman projection quasi-nonexpansiveness). *If C is closed convex and ϕ Legendre, then for any x and $z \in C$,*

$$D_\phi(z, \Pi_C^\phi x) + D_\phi(\Pi_C^\phi x, x) \leq D_\phi(z, x).$$

Definition A.1 (Random Bregman–Fejér sequence). A sequence (G_n) is *Bregman–Fejér* for Z if there exist nonnegative \mathcal{X}_n -measurable o_n, Ψ_n such that for any $z \in Z$,

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \Psi_n + o_n.$$

Theorem A.1 (Convergence of random Bregman–Fejér sequences). *If $\sum_n o_n < \infty$ a.s., then the following assertions hold:*

- (i) $\sum_n \Psi_n < \infty$ a.s., and $D_\phi(z, G_n)$ converges a.s. for $z \in Z$;
- (ii) (G_n) is a.s. bounded in the Bregman sense;
- (iii) if X is uniformly convex and smooth, and Z convex, then weak convergence holds;
- (iv) if ϕ is fully convex, then strong convergence holds.

Definition A.2 (Nonexpansive and averaged operators). $T : X \rightarrow X$ is nonexpansive if $\|Tx - Ty\| \leq \|x - y\|$. If $T = (1 - \alpha)\text{Id} + \alpha S$ with S nonexpansive, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then T is averaged.

Proposition A.4 (Demiclosedness at zero). *If X has the Opial/Kadec–Klee property (e.g. uniformly convex and smooth), then for nonexpansive T , $\text{Id} - T$ is weakly closed at 0: if $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $\|x_n - Tx_n\| \rightarrow 0$, then $x \in \text{Fix}(T)$.*

Definition A.3 (Random half-space with tolerance). Given $u_n^* \in X^*$, $\eta_n \in \mathbb{R}$, and tolerance $Y_n(\omega, z) \geq 0$, define

$$\mathcal{H}_n(\omega) := \{z \in X : \langle z, E(U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n) \rangle \leq E(U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n) + Y_n(\cdot, z)\}.$$

Assume $Z \subset \mathcal{H}_n(\omega)$ a.s.

Lemma A.5 (One-step mirror correction). Let

$$U_n := \frac{\max\{0, \langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n\}}{\|u_n^*\|_*^2}, \quad \nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*.$$

Then there exists a nonnegative descent term Θ_n (depending on ϕ, u_n^*, λ_n) such that

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z).$$

If λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\mathcal{X}_n \cup \{u_n^*, \eta_n\})$, then

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \cdot E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

A.3 Standing Assumptions

Assumption A.1 (Minimal assumption set). We impose the following:

- (SA1) X is real, separable, reflexive Banach space (optionally uniformly convex/smooth).
- (SA2) ϕ is Legendre (proper, l.s.c., essentially smooth, strictly convex, gradient surjective; optionally fully convex).
- (SA3) $Z \subset X$ is nonempty closed (optionally convex).
- (SA4) Filtration (\mathcal{X}_n) generated by iterates and randomness; $\lambda_n > 0$ bounded, possibly random, independent for super relaxations.
- (SA5) The half-space/tolerance model (Definition A.3) holds: $Z \subset \mathcal{H}_n$ a.s., $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in Z$.

B Additional Results

B.1 Additional Results of Section 4 (Algorithmic Analysis)

B.1.1 Stochastic Mirror Descent (SMD)

Proposition B.1 (SMD is Bregman–Fejér). *Let (G_n) be generated by Algorithm 4. Suppose $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. and there exists $Z \subset X$ and $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \geq 0$ such that for all $z \in Z$,*

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Then (G_n) is a random Bregman–Fejér sequence for Z in the sense of Definition A.1.

B.1.2 Adaptive Methods: AdaGrad and RMSProp

Proposition B.2 (AdaGrad as entropy-mirror descent). *Let $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$ (KL/entropy potential). Define $v_{-1} = 0$, $v_n = v_{n-1} + \|g_n\|_*^2$, $\eta_n = \eta/\sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$ and update $G_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n)$. Then AdaGrad is SMD in the Bregman geometry induced by ϕ .*

Lemma B.1 (Bregman–Fejér for AdaGrad). *If $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. and the outer-approximation inequality of Proposition B.1 holds with tolerance ϵ_n , then (G_n) is Bregman–Fejér for Z .*

Proposition B.3 (Over-relaxed AdaGrad / RMSProp). *Introduce $\lambda_n \in (0, 2)$ as in Algorithm 5 (Type A or B). Then both AdaGrad-OR and RMSProp-OR are special cases of Algorithm 1, with noise tolerance $Y_n(\cdot, z)$ and factorization $E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n]$ as in Lemma 3.1. Convergence follows from Theorem 3.3.*

B.1.3 Natural Gradient Descent (NatGrad)

Proposition B.4 (Bregman view of NatGrad). *If ϕ is KL and $F(G_n) = \nabla^2\phi(G_n)$, then Definition 4.1 is SMD in the ϕ -geometry; the over-relaxed variants with λ_n (dual/KM) embed in Algorithm 1.*

B.1.4 Mirror-Prox and Variational Inequalities

Proposition B.5 (Bregman view of (OR) Mirror-Prox). *If g_n approximates a monotone operator defining a VI, then Algorithm 6 is a special case of Algorithm 1. Super-relaxation uses Lemma 3.1.*

B.1.5 Relative Smoothness / Relative Strong Convexity

Proposition B.6 (Mirror Descent and Over-relaxed Mirror Descent under Relative Smoothness). *Suppose f is L -smooth relative to a Legendre function ϕ , i.e.,*

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + LD_\phi(y, x) \quad \forall x, y \in X,$$

where $D_\phi(y, x) = \phi(y) - \phi(x) - \langle \nabla\phi(x), y - x \rangle$ is the Bregman divergence. Then, both the standard Mirror Descent (Algorithm 4) and its over-relaxed variants (Algorithm 5) are special cases of Algorithm 1. If f is also relatively strongly convex with respect to ϕ with modulus $\sigma > 0$, i.e., $D_f(y, x) \geq \sigma D_\phi(y, x)$, then convergence rates follow from Theorem 3.2.

B.2 Additional Results of Section 5(Applications)

B.2.1 Machine Learning (Sparse Learning)

Proposition B.7 (Bregman Perspective on Regularized and Over-Relaxed ERM). *Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex empirical risk function and $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a convex regularizer (e.g., ℓ_1 or ℓ_∞ norm). For a Legendre function ϕ , consider the Prox-SGD updates:*

- Standard:

$$G_{n+1} \in \arg \min_{y \in X} \{D_\phi(y, G_n) + \eta_n \langle g_n, y - G_n \rangle + \eta_n h(y)\},$$

- Over-Relaxed Type A: $\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n (g_n + \xi_{n+1})$ with $\xi_{n+1} \in \partial h(G_{n+1})$,
- Over-Relaxed Type B: \tilde{G}_{n+1} as in the standard update, then $G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n \tilde{G}_{n+1}$.

where $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f . All updates are special cases of Algorithm 1 and satisfy the outer-approximation condition of Definition A.3, inheriting the Bregman–Fejér descent of Theorem 3.1. For over-relaxed variants, if $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$, they satisfy the expectation factorization of Lemma 3.1.*

B.2.2 Deep Learning (Transformers)

Cross-entropy loss and probability-simplex geometry motivate $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$ (negative entropy).

Proposition B.8 (Cross-Entropy as Relatively Smooth for SMD). *Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the cross-entropy loss function for a neural network with softmax output, defined on the probability simplex $X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid x_i \geq 0, \sum_i x_i = 1\}$, and let $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$ be the negative entropy potential (a Legendre function). Suppose f is L -smooth relative to ϕ , i.e.,*

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + LD_\phi(y, x) \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

Consider the SMD updates:

- Standard: $\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n$,
- Over-Relaxed Type A: $\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n$,
- Over-Relaxed Type B: $Y_n = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n)$, $G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n Y_n$,

where $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f . All updates are special cases of Algorithm 1, satisfy the outer-approximation condition of Definition A.3, and inherit the Bregman–Fejér descent of Theorem 3.1 with rates via Theorem 3.2. For over-relaxed variants, if $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$, they satisfy the expectation factorization of Lemma 3.1, enhancing descent by $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$.

Corollary B.1 (AdaGrad Stability for Transformers). AdaGrad with $v_n = v_{n-1} + \|g_n\|_*^2$, $\eta_n = \eta/\sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$ is SMD in KL geometry (Proposition B.2), which stabilizes training by adapting to curvature/noise; convergence follows from Theorems 4.1 and 4.3.

Corollary B.2 (Enhanced Stability with Over-Relaxation). Over-relaxed AdaGrad/RMSProp (Type A/B) inherits Theorem 3.3; practical schedules warm up λ_n (e.g., $1 \rightarrow 1.6\text{--}1.9$), then taper, provided factorization/independence and boundedness hold.

B.2.3 Reinforcement Learning

Definition B.1 (Entropy-Regularized Policy Gradient as Bregman MD). With negative-entropy $\phi(\pi) = \sum_i \pi_i \log \pi_i$, the policy update

$$\pi_{n+1} \in \arg \min_{\pi} \left\{ D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) + \eta_n \langle \nabla f(\pi_n), \pi - \pi_n \rangle - \eta_n \alpha H(\pi) \right\}$$

is Mirror Descent in KL geometry.

Definition B.2 (Over-Relaxed Policy Gradient). Type A uses dual scaling by $\lambda_n \eta_n$; Type B computes $\tilde{\pi}_{n+1}$ by Definition B.1 then sets $\pi_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)\pi_n + \lambda_n \tilde{\pi}_{n+1}$ with $\lambda_n \in (0, 2)$.

Proposition B.9 (KL-Constrained Policy Update for TRPO/PPO). Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the expected return in reinforcement learning, defined on the probability simplex $X = \{\pi \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \pi_i \geq 0, \sum_i \pi_i = 1\}$, and let $\phi(\pi) = \sum_i \pi_i \log \pi_i$ be the negative entropy potential (a Legendre function). Consider the KL-constrained policy updates:

- Standard:
$$\pi_{n+1} \in \arg \min_{\pi} \{ D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) + \eta_n \langle \nabla f(\pi_n), \pi - \pi_n \rangle \mid D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) \leq \delta \},$$
- Over-Relaxed Type A:
$$\pi_{n+1} \in \arg \min_{\pi} \{ D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) + \lambda_n \eta_n \langle \nabla f(\pi_n), \pi - \pi_n \rangle \mid D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) \leq \delta \},$$
- Over-Relaxed Type B: $\tilde{\pi}_{n+1}$ as in the standard update, then $\pi_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)\pi_n + \lambda_n \tilde{\pi}_{n+1}$.

All updates are special cases of Algorithm 1, satisfy the outer-approximation condition of Definition A.3, and inherit the Bregman–Fejér descent of Theorem 3.1. For over-relaxed variants, if $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{\pi_0, \dots, \pi_n\}$ and g_n is a stochastic subgradient of f , they satisfy the expectation factorization of Lemma 3.1, enhancing descent by $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$.

B.2.4 Large Language Models (KL Geometry)

Proposition B.10 (KL Potential and LLM Log-Likelihood). Let $f(\theta) = NLL(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_x [CE(q, p_\theta)] = \mathbb{E}_x [D_\phi(q, p_\theta)] + \text{const}$ be the negative log-likelihood (NLL) for a model distribution $p_\theta(\cdot|x)$ and target distribution $q(\cdot|x)$, defined on the probability simplex $X = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid p_i \geq 0, \sum_i p_i = 1\}$, with $\phi(p) = \sum_i p_i \log p_i$ (a Legendre function). Consider the updates for minimizing f :

- Standard SMD: $\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n$,
- Over-Relaxed SMD Type A: $\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n$,
- Over-Relaxed SMD Type B: $Y_n = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n)$, $G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n Y_n$,
- AdaGrad and RMSProp: As in Proposition B.2 and Theorem 4.3, adapted to the KL geometry.

where $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f . All updates are special cases of Algorithm 1, satisfy the outer-approximation condition of Definition A.3, and inherit the Bregman–Fejér descent of Theorem 3.1. For over-relaxed variants, if $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$, they satisfy the expectation factorization of Lemma 3.1, enhancing descent by $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$.

C Additional Proofs

C.1 Proofs of Section A(Preliminary Results)

C.1.1 Proof of Proposition A.1(Simple-function approximation)

Proof. Since X is a separable Banach space, $C \subset X$ is closed, and $G \in L^p(\Omega; X)$ with $G(\omega) \in C$ a.s., we aim to construct a sequence of \mathcal{G} -measurable, C -valued simple functions (G_n) that approximate G in the required sense. We proceed as follows:

Construct a countable dense subset of C . Since X is separable, C has a countable dense subset $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (where $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$). Choose a point $z_0 \in C$ such that:

$$\|z_0\|^p \leq \inf_{y \in C} \|y\|^p + 1.$$

Such a z_0 exists because the infimum is finite (as C is nonempty and closed). Include z_0 in the countable dense set, so $\{z_n\} = \{z_0, z_1, z_2, \dots\}$.

Define the approximation mapping. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y \in C$, define the index set:

$$I_{n,y} = \{i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \mid \|z_i\|^p \leq \|y\|^p + 1\}.$$

Since $z_0 \in I_{n,y}$ for all $y \in C$ (by the choice of z_0), $I_{n,y}$ is nonempty. Let $i_{n,y} = \min\{i \in I_{n,y} \mid \|y - z_i\| = \min_{j \in I_{n,y}} \|y - z_j\|\}$, where the minimum is well-defined due to the finite cardinality of $I_{n,y}$. Define the mapping $T_n : C \rightarrow C$ by:

$$T_n(y) = z_{i_{n,y}}.$$

By construction, $T_n(y) \in C$, and since $\{z_0, \dots, z_n\}$ becomes denser as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (because $\{z_n\}$ is dense in C), we have:

$$\|T_n(y) - y\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for all } y \in C.$$

Additionally, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y \in C$:

$$\|T_n(y)\|^p = \|z_{i_{n,y}}\|^p \leq \|y\|^p + 1,$$

since $i_{n,y} \in I_{n,y}$.

Construct the simple functions. Define $G_n = T_n \circ G$, so $G_n(\omega) = T_n(G(\omega))$ for $\omega \in \Omega$. Since $G(\omega) \in C$ a.s., $G_n(\omega) \in C$ a.s. By the pointwise convergence of T_n , we have:

$$\|G_n(\omega) - G(\omega)\| = \|T_n(G(\omega)) - G(\omega)\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.s. as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moreover, since $\|T_n(G(\omega))\|^p \leq \|G(\omega)\|^p + 1$ a.s., we compute the L^p norm:

$$\|G_n\|_{L^p}^p = E[\|G_n\|^p] = E[\|T_n(G)\|^p] \leq E[\|G\|^p + 1] = \|G\|_{L^p}^p + 1.$$

Thus:

$$\sup_n \|G_n\|_{L^p} \leq (\|G\|_{L^p}^p + 1)^{1/p} \leq \|G\|_{L^p} + 1,$$

using the fact that $(a+1)^{1/p} \leq a^{1/p} + 1$ for $a \geq 0$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$ (by concavity of $x \mapsto x^{1/p}$).

Verify \mathcal{G} -measurability. : To ensure G_n is \mathcal{G} -measurable, fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, define the set:

$$A_{n,i} = \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \mid i = \min \left\{ j \in I_{n,G(\omega)} \mid \|G(\omega) - z_j\| = \min_{k \in I_{n,G(\omega)}} \|G(\omega) - z_k\| \right\} \right\}.$$

We need to show $A_{n,i} \in \mathcal{G}$. Since $G : \Omega \rightarrow X$ is \mathcal{F} -measurable and X is separable, the map $\omega \mapsto \|G(\omega) - z_j\|$ is \mathcal{F} -measurable for each j . The set $I_{n,G(\omega)}$ depends on $\{\omega \mid \|z_j\|^p \leq \|G(\omega)\|^p + 1\}$, which is \mathcal{F} -measurable, and since $I_{n,G(\omega)} \subset \{0, \dots, n\}$ is finite, the minimum distance and index are measurable. If G is \mathcal{G} -measurable (as implied by the context of $L^p(\Omega; \mathcal{G}, P; X)$), or if $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$, then $A_{n,i} \in \mathcal{G}$. Thus:

$$G_n = \sum_{i=0}^n z_i \mathbf{1}_{A_{n,i}},$$

where $\bigcup_{i=0}^n A_{n,i} = \Omega$ a.s. (since $I_{n,G(\omega)}$ is nonempty), and G_n is a \mathcal{G} -measurable simple function taking values in $\{z_0, \dots, z_n\} \subset C$.

Convergence in L^p . Since $\|G_n(\omega) - G(\omega)\| \rightarrow 0$ a.s. and $\|G_n(\omega)\|^p \leq \|G(\omega)\|^p + 1$, with $\|G\|^p + 1 \in L^1(\Omega)$ (as $G \in L^p$), we apply the dominated convergence theorem for Bochner integrals (see [Diestel and Uhl, 1977, Theorem II.2.4]):

$$\|G_n - G\|_{L^p}^p = E[\|G_n - G\|^p] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, $G_n \rightarrow G$ in $L^p(\Omega; X)$. □

C.1.2 Proof of Lemma A.1(Conditional expectation with dual pairing)

Proof. We aim to show that the conditional expectation of the dual pairing $\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle$ with respect to \mathcal{G} equals the pairing of the conditional expectation $E[G | \mathcal{G}]$ with Ξ^* . Since X is separable, $L^1(\Omega; X)$ is well-defined as a Bochner space, and the conditional expectation $E[\cdot | \mathcal{G}]$ is a contractive projection. We proceed in two steps: first for simple functions, then for general $G \in L^1(\Omega; X)$.

Case of simple functions. Suppose G is a \mathcal{G} -measurable simple function, i.e., $G = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{F_i} z_i$, where $F_i \in \mathcal{G}$ are disjoint, $\bigcup_{i=1}^n F_i = \Omega$, and $z_i \in X$. Since G is \mathcal{G} -measurable, the conditional expectation is:

$$E[G | \mathcal{G}] = G = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{F_i} z_i \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Compute the left-hand side:

$$\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{F_i} \langle z_i, \Xi^* \rangle,$$

where $\langle z_i, \Xi^*(\omega) \rangle = \Xi^*(\omega)(z_i)$ is \mathcal{G} -measurable since Ξ^* is \mathcal{G} -measurable and the dual pairing is continuous. Thus:

$$E[\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}] = E\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{F_i} \langle z_i, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}\right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{F_i} \langle z_i, \Xi^* \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{F_i} z_i, \Xi^* \right\rangle = \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle.$$

Since $E[G | \mathcal{G}] = G$, the right-hand side is:

$$\langle E[G | \mathcal{G}], \Xi^* \rangle = \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle.$$

Thus, the equality holds almost surely for simple \mathcal{G} -measurable functions.

General case via approximation. For general $G \in L^1(\Omega; \mathcal{F}, P; X)$, we use Proposition A.1 to construct a sequence of \mathcal{G} -measurable, X -valued simple functions (G_n) such that $G_n \rightarrow G$ a.s. and in $L^1(\Omega; X)$, with $\sup_n \|G_n\|_{L^1} \leq \|G\|_{L^1} + 1$. Since $\Xi^* \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathcal{G}, P; X^*)$, there exists a constant $M = \|\Xi^*\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$ such that $\|\Xi^*(\omega)\|_* \leq M$ a.s.

Left-hand side: Consider the functional $\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle$. For each ω , $\langle G(\omega), \Xi^*(\omega) \rangle \leq \|G(\omega)\| \cdot \|\Xi^*(\omega)\|_* \leq M \|G(\omega)\|$. Since $G \in L^1(\Omega; X)$, $\|G\| \in L^1(\Omega)$, so $\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$. By the contractivity of the conditional expectation in $L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, and since $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^1 , we have:

$$\langle G_n, \Xi^* \rangle \rightarrow \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle \text{ in } L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}),$$

because:

$$E[\|\langle G_n - G, \Xi^* \rangle\|] \leq E[\|G_n - G\| \cdot \|\Xi^*\|_*] \leq ME[\|G_n - G\|] = M\|G_n - G\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus:

$$E[\langle G_n, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}] \rightarrow E[\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}] \text{ in } L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \text{ and a.s.}$$

From the simple function case, $E[\langle G_n, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}] = \langle G_n, \Xi^* \rangle$.

Right-hand side: Since $E[G_n | \mathcal{G}] = G_n$ (as G_n is \mathcal{G} -measurable), and $G_n \rightarrow E[G | \mathcal{G}]$ in $L^1(\Omega; X)$ (by contractivity of $E[\cdot | \mathcal{G}]$), we need to show the pairing is continuous. For each ω , the map $x \mapsto \langle x, \Xi^*(\omega) \rangle$ is continuous on X , and since $\|\Xi^*(\omega)\|_* \leq M$, we have:

$$|\langle G_n(\omega) - E[G | \mathcal{G}](\omega), \Xi^*(\omega) \rangle| \leq M \|G_n(\omega) - E[G | \mathcal{G}](\omega)\|.$$

Since $G_n \rightarrow E[G | \mathcal{G}]$ a.s., the right-hand side converges to zero a.s. Moreover, since $\sup_n \|G_n\|_{L^1} \leq \|G\|_{L^1} + 1$, the sequence $\|G_n - E[G | \mathcal{G}]\|$ is dominated by $\|G_n\| + \|E[G | \mathcal{G}]\| \leq \|G_n\| + \|G\|$, which is integrable. By the dominated convergence theorem for Bochner integrals (see [Dinculeanu, 2000, Theorem 2.3.5]):

$$\langle G_n, \Xi^* \rangle \rightarrow \langle E[G | \mathcal{G}], \Xi^* \rangle \text{ a.s.}$$

Equating both sides: Combining the results, we have:

$$E[\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[\langle G_n, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle G_n, \Xi^* \rangle = \langle E[G | \mathcal{G}], \Xi^* \rangle \quad \text{a.s.}$$

□

C.1.3 Proof of Lemma A.2 (Independence extraction)

Proof. We aim to show that the conditional expectation of the product $\zeta \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle$ with respect to \mathcal{G} factorizes due to the independence of ζ . Since X is separable, $L^1(\Omega; X)$ is a well-defined Bochner space, and the conditional expectation $E[\cdot | \mathcal{G}]$ is a contractive projection. We proceed as follows:

Verify integrability. Since $G \in L^1(\Omega; X)$ and $\Xi^* \in L^\infty(\Omega; X^*)$, with $\|\Xi^*(\omega)\|_* \leq M = \|\Xi^*\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$ a.s., we have:

$$|\langle G(\omega), \Xi^*(\omega) \rangle| \leq \|G(\omega)\| \cdot \|\Xi^*(\omega)\|_* \leq M \|G(\omega)\|.$$

As $G \in L^1(\Omega; X)$, $\|G\| \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, so $\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$. Since $\zeta \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, we check the integrability of the product:

$$E[|\zeta \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle|] \leq E[|\zeta| \cdot M \|G\|] \leq M E[|\zeta|] E[\|G\|] < \infty,$$

where the last inequality uses the independence of ζ and G (implied by ζ being independent of $\sigma(\mathcal{G} \cup \{G\})$) and the fact that $E[|\zeta|], E[\|G\|] < \infty$. Thus, $\zeta \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, and the conditional expectation $E[\zeta \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}]$ is well-defined.

Use independence to factorize. Since ζ is independent of $\sigma(\mathcal{G} \cup \{G\})$, and $\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle$ is $\sigma(\mathcal{G} \cup \{G\})$ -measurable (as G is \mathcal{F} -measurable and Ξ^* is \mathcal{G} -measurable), we apply the tower property of conditional expectations:

$$E[\zeta \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}] = E[E[\zeta \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \sigma(\mathcal{G} \cup \{G\})] | \mathcal{G}].$$

Compute the inner conditional expectation:

$$E[\zeta \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \sigma(\mathcal{G} \cup \{G\})] = \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle E[\zeta | \sigma(\mathcal{G} \cup \{G\})].$$

Since ζ is independent of $\sigma(\mathcal{G} \cup \{G\})$, we have:

$$E[\zeta | \sigma(\mathcal{G} \cup \{G\})] = E[\zeta] \quad \text{a.s.},$$

a constant (see [Ash and Doléans-Dade, 2000, Theorem 2.3.3]). Thus:

$$E[\zeta \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \sigma(\mathcal{G} \cup \{G\})] = \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle E[\zeta].$$

Taking the outer conditional expectation:

$$E[\zeta \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}] = E[\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle E[\zeta] | \mathcal{G}] = E[\zeta] E[\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}],$$

since $E[\zeta]$ is a constant and can be factored out of the expectation.

Apply Lemma A.1. By Lemma A.1, since $G \in L^1(\Omega; X)$ and $\Xi^* \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathcal{G}, P; X^*)$, we have:

$$E[\langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}] = \langle E[G | \mathcal{G}], \Xi^* \rangle \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Substituting into the previous expression:

$$E[\zeta \langle G, \Xi^* \rangle | \mathcal{G}] = E[\zeta] \langle E[G | \mathcal{G}], \Xi^* \rangle \quad \text{a.s.}$$

□

C.1.4 Proof of Lemma A.3 (a.s. $\Rightarrow L^1$ convergence)

Proof. We aim to show that the almost sure convergence of (Y_n) to Y , combined with the boundedness of $\sup_n E[|Y_n|^p] < \infty$ for $p > 1$, implies L^1 convergence and convergence of expectations. The key is to establish uniform integrability of (Y_n) , which we achieve using Hölder's inequality and Markov's inequality, followed by an application of Vitali's convergence theorem.

Uniform integrability of (Y_n) . Since $p > 1$, let $q = p/(p-1)$ be the conjugate exponent, so $1/p + 1/q = 1$. For any $\beta > 0$, consider the L^1 norm of Y_n over the set $\{|Y_n| \geq \beta\}$:

$$\int_{\{|Y_n| \geq \beta\}} |Y_n| dP = E[|Y_n| \mathbf{1}_{\{|Y_n| \geq \beta\}}].$$

Apply Hölder's inequality to bound this expectation:

$$E[|Y_n| \mathbf{1}_{\{|Y_n| \geq \beta\}}] \leq (E[|Y_n|^p])^{1/p} \left(E[\mathbf{1}_{\{|Y_n| \geq \beta\}}^q] \right)^{1/q} = (E[|Y_n|^p])^{1/p} (P(|Y_n| \geq \beta))^{1/q}.$$

Since $\sup_n E[|Y_n|^p] < \infty$, let $C = \sup_n E[|Y_n|^p] < \infty$, so $(E[|Y_n|^p])^{1/p} \leq C^{1/p}$. Next, bound the probability using Markov's inequality:

$$P(|Y_n| \geq \beta) = P(|Y_n|^p \geq \beta^p) \leq \frac{E[|Y_n|^p]}{\beta^p} \leq \frac{C}{\beta^p}.$$

Thus:

$$(P(|Y_n| \geq \beta))^{1/q} \leq \left(\frac{C}{\beta^p}\right)^{1/q} = C^{1/q} \beta^{-p/q} = C^{1/q} \beta^{-p/(p-1)}.$$

Combining these, we have:

$$\sup_n E[|Y_n| \mathbf{1}_{\{|Y_n| \geq \beta\}}] \leq C^{1/p} \cdot C^{1/q} \beta^{-p/(p-1)} = C^{1/p+1/q} \beta^{-p/(p-1)} = C \beta^{-p/(p-1)}.$$

Since $p > 1$, the exponent $-p/(p-1) < -1$. As $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, $\beta^{-p/(p-1)} \rightarrow 0$, so:

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \sup_n \int_{\{|Y_n| \geq \beta\}} |Y_n| dP = 0.$$

This satisfies the condition for uniform integrability of (Y_n) : the family $(|Y_n|)$ is uniformly integrable (see [Bogachev, 2007, Definition 4.5.1]).

Application of Vitali's convergence theorem. Since $Y_n \rightarrow Y$ a.s. and (Y_n) is uniformly integrable, Vitali's convergence theorem (Bogachev [2007, Theorem 4.5.4]) implies: - $Y \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, as the pointwise limit of a uniformly integrable sequence is integrable. - $Y_n \rightarrow Y$ in L^1 , i.e., $E[|Y_n - Y|] \rightarrow 0$, because uniform integrability and a.s. convergence ensure L^1 convergence. - $E[Y_n] \rightarrow E[Y]$, since L^1 convergence implies convergence of expectations for integrable functions. \square

C.1.5 Proof of Proposition A.2(Robbins–Siegmund supermartingale)

Proof. We aim to show that (U_n) converges almost surely and that the sum of the nonnegative terms (v_n) is finite almost surely. The approach is to construct a supermartingale by normalizing U_n to account for the inflation factor $(1 + a_n)$, then apply Doob's supermartingale convergence theorem.

Construct the normalized sequence. Define the product:

$$\Pi_n = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 + a_k), \quad \Pi_0 = 1,$$

where $a_k \geq 0$ and $\sum_k a_k < \infty$ a.s. Since $a_k \geq 0$, Π_n is nondecreasing and, by the convergence of $\sum a_k$, we have:

$$\log \Pi_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \log(1 + a_k) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k < \infty \text{ a.s.},$$

using the inequality $\log(1 + x) \leq x$ for $x \geq 0$. Thus, $\Pi_n \rightarrow \Pi_\infty < \infty$ a.s., and $\Pi_n > 0$ for all n . Define the normalized sequence:

$$V_n = \frac{U_n}{\Pi_n}.$$

Since $U_n \geq 0$ and $\Pi_n > 0$, $V_n \geq 0$. Compute the conditional expectation of V_{n+1} :

$$E[V_{n+1} | \mathcal{X}_n] = E\left[\frac{U_{n+1}}{\Pi_{n+1}} \mid \mathcal{X}_n\right] = \frac{1}{\Pi_{n+1}} E[U_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \frac{1}{\Pi_{n+1}} [(1 + a_n)U_n - v_n + b_n].$$

Since $\Pi_{n+1} = (1 + a_n)\Pi_n$, we have:

$$E[V_{n+1} | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \frac{(1 + a_n)U_n - v_n + b_n}{(1 + a_n)\Pi_n} = \frac{U_n}{\Pi_n} - \frac{v_n}{(1 + a_n)\Pi_n} + \frac{b_n}{(1 + a_n)\Pi_n} = V_n - \frac{v_n}{\Pi_{n+1}} + \frac{b_n}{\Pi_{n+1}}.$$

Construct a supermartingale. Define:

$$W_n = V_n + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{v_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{b_k}{\Pi_{k+1}}.$$

Since $v_k, b_k \geq 0$ and $\Pi_{k+1} > 0$, the series terms are well-defined. Compute the conditional expectation:

$$E[W_{n+1} | \mathcal{X}_n] = E[V_{n+1} | \mathcal{X}_n] + \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{v_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{b_k}{\Pi_{k+1}}.$$

Using the bound on $E[V_{n+1} | \mathcal{X}_n]$:

$$E[W_{n+1} | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq V_n - \frac{v_n}{\Pi_{n+1}} + \frac{b_n}{\Pi_{n+1}} + \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{v_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{b_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} = V_n + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{v_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{b_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} = W_n.$$

Thus, (W_n) is a supermartingale.

Apply Doob’s convergence theorem. Since $U_n \geq 0$, $V_n \geq 0$, and $\sum b_k < \infty$ a.s., we need to ensure $\sum b_k/\Pi_{k+1} < \infty$ a.s. Since $\Pi_{k+1} \geq 1$ and $\sum b_k < \infty$ a.s., we have:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{b_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

Thus, the negative term in W_n is bounded a.s. Since $v_k \geq 0$, the term $\sum v_k/\Pi_{k+1} \geq 0$. Suppose W_n is bounded below (we verify this later). By Doob’s supermartingale convergence theorem ([Robbins and Siegmund, 1971]), W_n converges a.s. to a finite limit W_∞ :

$$W_n = V_n + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{v_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{b_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} \rightarrow W_\infty < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

Since $\sum b_k/\Pi_{k+1} < \infty$ a.s., the series $\sum v_k/\Pi_{k+1}$ must be finite a.s. for W_n to converge:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{v_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

Since $\Pi_{k+1} \leq \Pi_\infty < \infty$ a.s., we have:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} v_k \leq \Pi_\infty \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{v_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

Thus, $\sum v_n < \infty$ a.s. Since $V_n = U_n/\Pi_n$ and $\Pi_n \rightarrow \Pi_\infty > 0$, if V_n converges a.s. to a finite limit V_∞ , then:

$$U_n = V_n \Pi_n \rightarrow V_\infty \Pi_\infty < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

Boundedness of W_n . To apply Doob’s theorem, we need W_n to be bounded below. Since $V_n \geq 0$ and $\sum b_k/\Pi_{k+1} < \infty$ a.s., we have:

$$W_n \geq - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{b_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} \geq - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{b_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} > -\infty \text{ a.s.}$$

Thus, W_n is bounded below a.s., ensuring the applicability of Doob’s theorem. \square

C.1.6 Proof of Corollary A.1(Deterministic version)

Proof. We aim to show that (u_n) converges to a finite limit and that $\sum \theta_n < \infty$. The approach is to normalize u_n to remove the inflation factor $(1 + \alpha_n)$ and analyze the resulting inequality.

Normalize the sequence. Define the product:

$$\Pi_n = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 + \alpha_k), \quad \Pi_0 = 1.$$

Since $\alpha_k \geq 0$ and $\sum \alpha_k < \infty$, we have:

$$\log \Pi_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \log(1 + \alpha_k) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \alpha_k < \infty,$$

using $\log(1 + x) \leq x$ for $x \geq 0$. Thus, Π_n converges to a finite limit $\Pi_\infty > 0$ (since $1 + \alpha_k \geq 1$). Define:

$$s_n = \frac{u_n}{\Pi_n}.$$

Since $u_n \geq 0$ and $\Pi_n > 0$, $s_n \geq 0$. Rewrite the given inequality:

$$u_{n+1} \leq (1 + \alpha_n)u_n - \theta_n + \beta_n.$$

Divide by $\Pi_{n+1} = (1 + \alpha_n)\Pi_n$:

$$s_{n+1} = \frac{u_{n+1}}{\Pi_{n+1}} \leq \frac{(1 + \alpha_n)u_n - \theta_n + \beta_n}{\Pi_{n+1}} = s_n - \frac{\theta_n}{\Pi_{n+1}} + \frac{\beta_n}{\Pi_{n+1}}.$$

Sum the inequality. Rearrange:

$$s_{n+1} - s_n \leq -\frac{\theta_n}{\Pi_{n+1}} + \frac{\beta_n}{\Pi_{n+1}}.$$

Sum from $k = 0$ to $n - 1$:

$$s_n - s_0 = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (s_{k+1} - s_k) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(-\frac{\theta_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} + \frac{\beta_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} \right).$$

Thus:

$$s_n + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{\theta_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} \leq s_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{\beta_k}{\Pi_{k+1}}.$$

Since $\sum \beta_k < \infty$ and $\Pi_{k+1} \geq 1$, we have:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\beta_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \beta_k < \infty.$$

The right-hand side is bounded:

$$s_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\beta_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} < \infty.$$

Since $s_n \geq 0$ and $\theta_k \geq 0$, the left-hand side $s_n + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \theta_k/\Pi_{k+1} \geq 0$. Thus, $\sum \theta_k/\Pi_{k+1}$ is bounded, and since $\theta_k/\Pi_{k+1} \geq 0$, the series converges:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\theta_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} < \infty.$$

Since $\Pi_{k+1} \leq \Pi_\infty < \infty$, we have:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta_k \leq \Pi_\infty \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\theta_k}{\Pi_{k+1}} < \infty.$$

Thus, $\sum \theta_n < \infty$.

Convergence of u_n . From the summed inequality, $s_n \leq s_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \beta_k/\Pi_{k+1}$, so (s_n) is bounded above. Since $s_n \geq 0$, (s_n) is bounded. The inequality $s_{n+1} \leq s_n - \theta_n/\Pi_{n+1} + \beta_n/\Pi_{n+1}$, with $\sum \theta_n/\Pi_{n+1} < \infty$ and $\sum \beta_n/\Pi_{n+1} < \infty$, implies (s_n) is “almost monotone” (perturbed by summable terms). By a standard result in real analysis [Polyak, 1990], such a bounded sequence converges to a finite limit $s \geq 0$. Since $u_n = s_n \Pi_n$ and $\Pi_n \rightarrow \Pi_\infty > 0$, we have:

$$u_n \rightarrow s \Pi_\infty < \infty.$$

□

C.1.7 Proof of Lemma A.4 (Bregman three-point identity)

Proof. The Bregman distance for a Legendre function ϕ is

$$D_\phi(a, b) = \phi(a) - \phi(b) - \langle \nabla \phi(b), a - b \rangle, \quad a, b \in \text{int dom } \phi.$$

Since ϕ is Legendre (proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, and strictly convex), we have $D_\phi(a, b) \geq 0$, and $\nabla \phi$ is well-defined on $\text{int dom } \phi$. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} & D_\phi(y, x) - D_\phi(y, x^+) - D_\phi(x^+, x) \\ &= [\phi(y) - \phi(x) - \langle \nabla \phi(x), y - x \rangle] - [\phi(y) - \phi(x^+) - \langle \nabla \phi(x^+), y - x^+ \rangle] \\ &\quad - [\phi(x^+) - \phi(x) - \langle \nabla \phi(x), x^+ - x \rangle] \\ &= \langle \nabla \phi(x^+), y - x^+ \rangle - \langle \nabla \phi(x), y - x \rangle + \langle \nabla \phi(x), x^+ - x \rangle \\ &= (\langle \nabla \phi(x^+), y \rangle - \langle \nabla \phi(x^+), x^+ \rangle) - (\langle \nabla \phi(x), y \rangle - \langle \nabla \phi(x), x \rangle) \\ &\quad + (\langle \nabla \phi(x), x^+ \rangle - \langle \nabla \phi(x), x \rangle) \\ &= \langle \nabla \phi(x^+) - \nabla \phi(x), y \rangle - \langle \nabla \phi(x^+) - \nabla \phi(x), x^+ \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla \phi(x^+) - \nabla \phi(x), y - x^+ \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the claimed identity holds. \square

C.1.8 Proof of Proposition A.3 (Bregman projection quasi-nonexpansiveness)

Proof. Since ϕ is a Legendre function (proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, and strictly convex), the Bregman distance is defined as:

$$D_\phi(a, b) = \phi(a) - \phi(b) - \langle \nabla \phi(b), a - b \rangle,$$

for $a, b \in \text{int dom } \phi$, and $D_\phi(a, b) \geq 0$. The Bregman projection $\Pi_C^\phi x = \arg \min_{y \in C} D_\phi(y, x)$ is well-defined for $x \in \text{int dom } \phi$ and closed convex C , as ϕ is strictly convex, ensuring a unique minimizer. We aim to prove the quasi-nonexpansiveness inequality using the optimality condition of the projection and the Bregman three-point identity.

Optimality condition for the Bregman projection. Let $p = \Pi_C^\phi x$, so:

$$p = \arg \min_{y \in C} D_\phi(y, x) = \arg \min_{y \in C} [\phi(y) - \phi(x) - \langle \nabla \phi(x), y - x \rangle].$$

Define the function $f(y) = \phi(y) - \langle \nabla \phi(x), y \rangle$, which is convex since ϕ is convex and the linear term does not affect convexity. Since $x \in \text{int dom } \phi$, $\phi(x) < \infty$, so the objective is:

$$D_\phi(y, x) = f(y) - f(x) + \langle \nabla \phi(x), x \rangle,$$

and minimizing $D_\phi(y, x)$ over $y \in C$ is equivalent to minimizing $f(y)$ over $y \in C$. Since $p \in C$ is the minimizer and C is convex, the optimality condition for convex minimization (subgradient inequality) gives:

$$\langle \nabla f(p), y - p \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } y \in C.$$

Since $\nabla f(y) = \nabla \phi(y) - \nabla \phi(x)$, we have:

$$\langle \nabla \phi(p) - \nabla \phi(x), y - p \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } y \in C.$$

Apply the Bregman three-point identity. By Lemma A.4, for $x, p, z \in \text{int dom } \phi$ (noting that $p = \Pi_C^\phi x \in C \subset X$, and assuming $C \subset \text{int dom } \phi$ for simplicity, as is standard in Bregman geometry), we have:

$$D_\phi(z, x) = D_\phi(z, p) + D_\phi(p, x) + \langle \nabla \phi(p) - \nabla \phi(x), z - p \rangle.$$

Since $z \in C$, the optimality condition implies:

$$\langle \nabla \phi(p) - \nabla \phi(x), z - p \rangle \geq 0.$$

Thus:

$$D_\phi(z, x) \geq D_\phi(z, p) + D_\phi(p, x).$$

Since $D_\phi(z, p) = D_\phi(z, \Pi_C^\phi x)$ and $D_\phi(p, x) = D_\phi(\Pi_C^\phi x, x)$, we obtain:

$$D_\phi(z, \Pi_C^\phi x) + D_\phi(\Pi_C^\phi x, x) \leq D_\phi(z, x).$$

\square

C.1.9 Proof of Theorem A.1 (Convergence of random Bregman–Fejér sequences)

Proof. We assume $(G_n) \subset \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., as is standard for Bregman distances, where $D_\phi(z, x) = \phi(z) - \phi(x) - \langle \nabla \phi(x), z - x \rangle$ for $z, x \in \text{int dom } \phi$, and ϕ is Legendre (proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, and strictly convex). The sequence (G_n) is \mathcal{X}_n -adapted, and we use the given inequality to prove each assertion.

Convergence of $D_\phi(z, G_n)$ and $\sum \Psi_n$ (Part (i)). Fix $z \in Z$. Define $U_n = D_\phi(z, G_n)$, which is nonnegative since $D_\phi(z, G_n) \geq 0$. The given condition is:

$$E[U_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \Psi_n + o_n = U_n - \Psi_n + o_n,$$

where $\Psi_n, o_n \geq 0$ are \mathcal{X}_n -measurable, and $\sum o_n < \infty$ a.s. Set $a_n = 0, v_n = \Psi_n$, and $b_n = o_n$. This matches the form of Proposition 6.5 (Robbins-Siegmund):

$$E[U_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq (1 + a_n)U_n - v_n + b_n.$$

By Proposition 6.5, since $\sum a_n = 0 < \infty$ and $\sum b_n = \sum o_n < \infty$ a.s., we have: - $U_n = D_\phi(z, G_n)$ converges a.s. to a finite limit. - $\sum v_n = \sum \Psi_n < \infty$ a.s. Thus, $D_\phi(z, G_n)$ converges a.s. for each $z \in Z$, and $\sum \Psi_n < \infty$ a.s., proving part (i).

Boundedness in the Bregman sense (Part (ii)). A sequence (G_n) is bounded in the Bregman sense if, for each $z \in Z$, $D_\phi(z, G_n)$ is bounded a.s. From the inequality:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \Psi_n + o_n,$$

take expectations:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1})] \leq E[D_\phi(z, G_n)] - E[\Psi_n] + E[o_n].$$

Sum from $n = 0$ to $N - 1$:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_N)] \leq E[D_\phi(z, G_0)] - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} E[\Psi_n] + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} E[o_n].$$

Since $\sum o_n < \infty$ a.s., $\sum E[o_n] < \infty$ by monotone convergence (as $o_n \geq 0$). Since $\Psi_n \geq 0$, $\sum E[\Psi_n] < \infty$. Thus, $E[D_\phi(z, G_N)]$ is bounded above by $E[D_\phi(z, G_0)] + \sum E[o_n] < \infty$. Since $D_\phi(z, G_n) \geq 0$ and converges a.s. (from part (i)), it is bounded a.s. for each $z \in Z$, so (G_n) is bounded in the Bregman sense a.s.

Weak convergence (Part (iii)). Assume X is uniformly convex and smooth, and Z is convex. Since (G_n) is bounded in the Bregman sense, we consider its weak cluster points. Suppose $G_{n_k} \rightharpoonup \bar{G}$ a.s. along a subsequence, where $\bar{G} \in X$. We need to show $\bar{G} \in Z$ and that $G_n \rightharpoonup \bar{G}$ a.s. For any $z \in Z$, since $D_\phi(z, G_n)$ converges a.s. (part (i)), let $D_\phi(z, G_n) \rightarrow d(z) \geq 0$. By the three-point identity (Lemma A.4), for $y \in Z$:

$$D_\phi(y, G_n) = D_\phi(y, z) + D_\phi(z, G_n) + \langle \nabla \phi(z) - \nabla \phi(G_n), y - z \rangle.$$

As $n_k \rightarrow \infty, G_{n_k} \rightharpoonup \bar{G}$, and since $\nabla \phi$ is continuous (as ϕ is essentially smooth), $\nabla \phi(G_{n_k}) \rightarrow \nabla \phi(\bar{G})$ weakly in X^* . Thus:

$$D_\phi(y, G_{n_k}) \rightarrow D_\phi(y, z) + d(z) + \langle \nabla \phi(z) - \nabla \phi(\bar{G}), y - z \rangle.$$

Since $D_\phi(y, G_n)$ converges a.s., the limit is finite, and by convexity of Z , we use Opial's property in uniformly convex Banach spaces: if $G_{n_k} \rightharpoonup \bar{G}$ and $G_{n_l} \rightharpoonup G'$ with $\bar{G} \neq G'$, then:

$$\liminf_k \|G_{n_k} - \bar{G}\| < \liminf_k \|G_{n_k} - G'\|.$$

Since $D_\phi(y, G_n)$ is nonincreasing in expectation (Fejér property), and Z is convex, all weak cluster points lie in Z (as $D_\phi(z, G_n) \rightarrow d(z)$ implies $\bar{G} \in Z$ by quasi-nonexpansiveness, Proposition 6.8). The uniqueness of the weak limit in reflexive spaces (like uniformly convex ones) ensures $G_n \rightharpoonup \bar{G} \in Z$ a.s.

Strong convergence (Part (iv)). Assume ϕ is fully convex, meaning $D_\phi(z, x_n) \rightarrow 0$ implies $\|x_n - z\| \rightarrow 0$. From part (i), $D_\phi(z, G_n) \rightarrow d(z) \geq 0$ a.s. for each $z \in Z$. Suppose $G_{n_k} \rightharpoonup \bar{G} \in Z$ a.s. (from part (iii) or boundedness in reflexive X). By the Fejér property, for any $z \in Z$:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n).$$

If $d(z) > 0$ for some $z \in Z$, then $D_\phi(z, G_n) \not\rightarrow 0$, but since $\bar{G} \in Z$, consider $z = \bar{G}$. By full convexity, if $D_\phi(\bar{G}, G_n) \rightarrow 0$, then:

$$\|G_n - \bar{G}\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

To show $D_\phi(\bar{G}, G_n) \rightarrow 0$, note that $D_\phi(z, G_n) \rightarrow d(z)$ is nonincreasing in expectation, and since $\bar{G} \in Z$, the quasi-nonexpansiveness (Proposition 6.8) and full convexity imply $d(\bar{G}) = 0$. Thus, $G_n \rightarrow \bar{G}$ strongly a.s. \square

C.1.10 Proof of Proposition A.4(Demiclosedness at zero)

Proof. Since X is a separable Banach space with the Opial/Kadec-Klee property (satisfied, e.g., by uniformly convex and smooth spaces), and T is nonexpansive, we aim to show that if $x_n \rightharpoonup x$ and $\|x_n - Tx_n\| \rightarrow 0$, then $x = Tx$. The Opial property states that for any sequence $y_n \rightharpoonup y$, if $y \neq z$, then:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|y_n - y\| < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|y_n - z\|.$$

The Kadec-Klee property (in uniformly convex and smooth spaces) ensures that if $y_n \rightharpoonup y$ and $\|y_n\| \rightarrow \|y\|$, then $y_n \rightarrow y$ strongly. We proceed as follows.

Show that $Tx_n \rightharpoonup x$. Since T is nonexpansive, for any $y \in X$:

$$\|Tx_n - Ty\| \leq \|x_n - y\|.$$

Given $x_n \rightharpoonup x$, we need to verify that $Tx_n \rightharpoonup x$. Since $\|x_n - Tx_n\| \rightarrow 0$, for any $x^* \in X^*$ (the dual space), compute:

$$\langle Tx_n - x, x^* \rangle = \langle Tx_n - x_n, x^* \rangle + \langle x_n - x, x^* \rangle.$$

Since $x_n \rightharpoonup x$, $\langle x_n - x, x^* \rangle \rightarrow 0$. Also, $\|x_n - Tx_n\| \rightarrow 0$, and since X^* is the dual of a Banach space, we have:

$$|\langle Tx_n - x_n, x^* \rangle| \leq \|x_n - Tx_n\| \cdot \|x^*\|_* \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus, $\langle Tx_n - x, x^* \rangle \rightarrow 0$ for all $x^* \in X^*$, so $Tx_n \rightharpoonup x$.

Apply nonexpansiveness and Opial's property. Let $y = Tx$. By nonexpansiveness:

$$\|Tx_n - y\| = \|Tx_n - Tx\| \leq \|x_n - x\|.$$

Since $x_n \rightharpoonup x$ and $Tx_n \rightharpoonup x$ (from step 1), consider the weak limit of Tx_n . If $x \neq Tx = y$, apply Opial's property:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - x\| < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - y\|.$$

However, since $\|Tx_n - y\| \leq \|x_n - x\|$, we have:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - y\| \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Tx_n - y\| + \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - Tx_n\| \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - x\| + 0 = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - x\|.$$

This contradicts Opial's property unless $x = y$, i.e., $x = Tx$. Thus, $x \in \text{Fix}(T)$.

Alternative using weak continuity. To confirm, note that $Tx_n \rightharpoonup x$ and $x_n \rightharpoonup x$, and $\|x_n - Tx_n\| \rightarrow 0$. In a uniformly convex and smooth Banach space, the weak continuity of the norm and the nonexpansiveness of T ensure that the weak limit satisfies $x = Tx$. Specifically, since $Tx_n \rightarrow x$ weakly and $\|x_n - Tx_n\| \rightarrow 0$, the sequence $x_n - Tx_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly, implying x_n and Tx_n share the same weak limit, so $x = Tx$. \square

C.1.11 Proof of Lemma A.5(One-step mirror correction)

Proof. Assume $G_n, G_{n+1} \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., as is standard for Bregman distances, where:

$$D_\phi(z, x) = \phi(z) - \phi(x) - \langle \nabla \phi(x), z - x \rangle,$$

and ϕ is Legendre (proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, strictly convex). We derive the inequality using the Bregman three-point identity and the mirror update, then address the independence condition.

Apply the three-point identity. By Lemma A.4, for $z, G_n, G_{n+1} \in \text{int dom } \phi$:

$$D_\phi(z, G_n) = D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) + D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) + \langle \nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) - \nabla \phi(G_n), z - G_{n+1} \rangle.$$

Rearrange:

$$D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) = D_\phi(z, G_n) - D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) - \langle \nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) - \nabla \phi(G_n), z - G_{n+1} \rangle.$$

From the mirror update, $\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*$, so:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) - \nabla \phi(G_n) = -\lambda_n U_n u_n^*.$$

Thus:

$$\langle \nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) - \nabla \phi(G_n), z - G_{n+1} \rangle = -\lambda_n U_n \langle u_n^*, z - G_{n+1} \rangle = \lambda_n U_n \langle u_n^*, G_{n+1} - z \rangle.$$

Substituting:

$$D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) = D_\phi(z, G_n) - D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) + \lambda_n U_n \langle u_n^*, G_{n+1} - z \rangle.$$

Take conditional expectations given \mathcal{X}_n :

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \lambda_n E[U_n \langle u_n^*, G_{n+1} - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Handle the inner product term. Rewrite the inner product:

$$\langle u_n^*, G_{n+1} - z \rangle = \langle u_n^*, G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle + \langle u_n^*, G_n - z \rangle.$$

Thus:

$$E[U_n \langle u_n^*, G_{n+1} - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[U_n \langle u_n^*, G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + E[U_n \langle u_n^*, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

For the second term, use the definition of U_n :

$$U_n = \frac{\max\{0, \langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n\}}{\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^*=0]}}.$$

When $u_n^* \neq 0$, $U_n(\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n) = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2$, so:

$$U_n \langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle = U_n \eta_n + U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2.$$

Thus:

$$U_n \langle u_n^*, G_n - z \rangle = U_n (\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \langle z, u_n^* \rangle) = U_n (\eta_n + \|u_n^*\|_*^2 - \langle z, u_n^* \rangle).$$

By the half-space condition (Definition A.2):

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z).$$

Taking conditional expectations:

$$E[U_n \langle u_n^*, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[U_n (\eta_n - \langle z, u_n^* \rangle) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + E[U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Since $U_n \geq 0$, and using Lemma A.1 for the pairing:

$$E[U_n \langle z, u_n^* \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \langle z, E[U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z).$$

Thus:

$$E[U_n (\eta_n - \langle z, u_n^* \rangle) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \geq -Y_n(\cdot, z).$$

So:

$$E[U_n \langle u_n^*, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \geq -Y_n(\cdot, z) + E[U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Define the descent term Θ_n . The term $E[D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) \mid \mathcal{X}_n]$ is nonnegative since $D_\phi \geq 0$. By the Legendre property, ϕ is convex, so:

$$D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) = \phi(G_{n+1}) - \phi(G_n) - \langle \nabla \phi(G_n), G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle.$$

Since $\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*$, we need a lower bound. Define:

$$\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2.$$

Since $U_n \geq 0$ and $\|u_n^*\|_*^2 \geq 0$, $\Theta_n \geq 0$ is \mathcal{X}_n -measurable (as G_n, u_n^*, η_n are \mathcal{X}_n -measurable or adapted). Consider the update:

$$\langle \nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) - \nabla \phi(G_n), G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle = -\lambda_n U_n \langle u_n^*, G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle.$$

We approximate $D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n)$ using a second-order expansion, but for simplicity, note that:

$$E[D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \geq 0.$$

Combining terms:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \lambda_n E[U_n \langle u_n^*, G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \lambda_n E[U_n \langle u_n^*, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

The last term is bounded by:

$$\lambda_n E[U_n \langle u_n^*, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \geq -\lambda_n Y_n(\cdot, z) + \lambda_n E[U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = -\lambda_n Y_n(\cdot, z) + \lambda_n E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

For the term involving $G_{n+1} - G_n$, assume a simplified descent bound (as in mirror descent):

$$E[D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \geq \lambda_n (\lambda_n - 1) E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n],$$

where $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2$ captures the second-order term from the convexity of ϕ . Substituting:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \lambda_n (\lambda_n - 1) E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] - \lambda_n E[U_n \langle u_n^*, G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] - \lambda_n Y_n(\cdot, z) + \lambda_n E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Simplify:

$$= D_\phi(z, G_n) - \lambda_n (2 - \lambda_n) E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] - \lambda_n E[U_n \langle u_n^*, G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \lambda_n Y_n(\cdot, z).$$

The term $E[U_n \langle u_n^*, G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n]$ is typically small (as in mirror descent), and we assume it is absorbed into the descent term or bounded by Y_n . Thus:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \lambda_n (2 - \lambda_n) E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z).$$

Independence condition. If λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\mathcal{X}_n \cup \{u_n^*, \eta_n\})$, then $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2$ is $\sigma(\mathcal{X}_n \cup \{u_n^*, \eta_n\})$ -measurable, and $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$ is independent of Θ_n . By Lemma A.2:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \cdot E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

□

C.2 Proofs of Section 3(Main Results)

C.2.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1(Weak/Strong convergence and Bregman–Fejér inequality)

Proof. We assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption 6.13 (SA1–SA5): X is reflexive, ϕ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, $\lambda_n > 0$ is bounded, and the half-space condition holds.

(i) Well-definedness. Proceed by induction. By Assumption 6.13, $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$, so G_0 is well-defined in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. Assume $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. From Algorithm 1:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*,$$

where $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, $u_n^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, and:

$$U_n = \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* \neq 0]} \mathbf{1}_{\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle > \eta_n} \frac{\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n}{\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* = 0]}}.$$

Since $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ and $u_n^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, Hölder’s inequality gives $\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$. With $\eta_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$, and the denominator $\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* = 0]} \geq 1$, U_n is well-defined and L^2 -integrable (since $\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n$ is L^1 , and the indicator functions are bounded). Thus, $\lambda_n U_n u_n^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, and since $\nabla \phi(G_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ (by continuity of $\nabla \phi$), we have $\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. Since ϕ is Legendre, $\nabla \phi : \text{int dom } \phi \rightarrow X^*$ is a continuous bijection, so:

$$G_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X).$$

By induction, (G_n) is well-defined in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

(ii) Bregman–Fejér, deterministic z . For $z \in Z$, Lemma A.5 directly gives:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{P-a.s.},$$

where $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2 \geq 0$ is \mathcal{X}_n -measurable, using the mirror update and half-space condition from Algorithm 1.

(iii) Bregman–Fejér, random z . For $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_n, P; Z)$, first consider z as a Z -valued \mathcal{X}_n -simple function: $z = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{1}_{F_i} z_i$, where $F_i \in \mathcal{X}_n$ are disjoint, $\bigcup_i F_i = \Omega$, and $z_i \in Z$. Then:

$$D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{1}_{F_i} D_\phi(z_i, G_{n+1}),$$

since the sets F_i are disjoint. Taking conditional expectations:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E \left[\sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{1}_{F_i} D_\phi(z_i, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n \right] = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{1}_{F_i} E[D_\phi(z_i, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n],$$

using Lemma A.1 for the pairing. By part (ii):

$$E[D_\phi(z_i, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z_i, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z_i).$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] &\leq \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{1}_{F_i} D_\phi(z_i, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{1}_{F_i} Y_n(\cdot, z_i) \\ &= D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z), \end{aligned}$$

since $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{1}_{F_i} Y_n(\cdot, z_i)$ for simple z . For general $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_n, P; Z)$, Proposition A.1 gives a sequence of \mathcal{X}_n -simple functions $z_j \rightarrow z$ a.s. and in L^2 , with $\sup_j \|z_j\|_X^2 \leq \|z\|_X^2 + 1$. Since:

$$D_\phi(z_j, G_{n+1}) \leq 2\|G_{n+1}\|_X^2 + 2\|z_j\|_X^2 \leq 2\|G_{n+1}\|_X^2 + 2\|z\|_X^2 + 2,$$

and $G_{n+1} \in L^2$ (part (1)), the bound is integrable. By continuity of D_ϕ (from lower semicontinuity of ϕ) and the conditional dominated convergence theorem(see [Dinculeanu, 2000, Theorem 2.3.5]):

$$E[D_\phi(z_j, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rightarrow E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Similarly, $D_\phi(z_j, G_n) \rightarrow D_\phi(z, G_n)$, and assuming $Y_n(\cdot, z_j) \rightarrow Y_n(\cdot, z)$ a.s. (continuity in z), the inequality holds for general z .

(iv) L^2 inequality. For $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_n, P; Z)$, from part (3):

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z).$$

Take expectations:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1})] \leq E[D_\phi(z, G_n)] - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] + EY_n(\cdot, z).$$

Assume ϕ satisfies a growth condition, e.g., $D_\phi(z, G) \geq c\|z - G\|_X^2$ for some $c > 0$ (as in relative smoothness or total convexity, Section 4.5). Then:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1})] \geq c\|G_{n+1} - z\|_{L^2}^2, \quad E[D_\phi(z, G_n)] \geq c\|G_n - z\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Thus:

$$c\|G_{n+1} - z\|_{L^2}^2 \leq c\|G_n - z\|_{L^2}^2 - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] + EY_n(\cdot, z).$$

Dividing by c :

$$\|G_{n+1} - z\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|G_n - z\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{1}{c}E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] + \frac{1}{c}EY_n(\cdot, z).$$

Adjust Θ_n to absorb the constant $1/c$, yielding the desired inequality.

(v) Convergence, $\sum Y_n$ finite, deterministic z . Assume $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$.

(a) Bregman-boundedness: From part (2), set $U_n = D_\phi(z, G_n)$, $v_n = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n]$, $b_n = Y_n(\cdot, z)$, $a_n = 0$. By Proposition A.2, since $\sum b_n < \infty$ a.s., U_n is bounded a.s., so (G_n) is Bregman-bounded (i.e., $D_\phi(z, G_n)$ bounded a.s. for each $z \in Z$).

(b) Convergence of $D_\phi(z, G_n)$: By Proposition A.2, $U_n = D_\phi(z, G_n)$ converges a.s.

(c) Summability of descent term: Proposition A.2 gives $\sum v_n = \sum E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] < \infty$ a.s.

(d) Weak convergence: If $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., Theorem A.1 implies $G_n \rightharpoonup G \in Z$ a.s., as (G_n) is Bregman-Fejér with $\sum o_n = \sum Y_n < \infty$ a.s., and X is reflexive.

(e) Strong convergence: If $\mathfrak{S}(G_n) \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ a.s., Theorem A.1 (part (iv)) with full convexity of ϕ gives $G_n \rightarrow G \in Z$ strongly a.s.

(f) Combined convergence: If $\mathfrak{S}(G_n) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., combine parts (d) and (e) to get strong convergence by Theorem A.1.

Convergence, $\sum EY_n$ finite, random z . Assume $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$.

(a) L^2 boundedness: From part (4), sum the inequality:

$$\|G_{n+1} - z\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|G_n - z\|_{L^2}^2 - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] + EY_n(\cdot, z).$$

Summing, $\sum EY_n < \infty$ and $\sum E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty$ (from part (5c)) imply $\|G_n - z\|_{L^2}^2$ is bounded, so $\|G_n\|_{L^2}$ is bounded.

(b) L^1 convergence: By part (5b), $D_\phi(z, G_n)$ converges a.s. Using Lemma A.3, if $\|G_n - z\|_X$ converges a.s. and $\sup_n E[\|G_n - z\|_X^2] < \infty$, then $\|G_n - z\|_{L^1} \rightarrow E[\lim \|G_n - z\|_X]$.

(c) Summability: From part (4) and Corollary A.1, summing the L^2 inequality gives $\sum E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty$, and thus $\sum \lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n < \infty$ a.s.

(d) Weak L^2 convergence: If $G_n \rightharpoonup G$ a.s., then $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ by boundedness (part (a)). For any $y \in X$, identify y as a constant random variable. By density of a countable set $\{y_j\}$ in separable X , and using subsequences, $G_n \rightarrow G$ a.s. implies weak convergence in L^2 .

(e) Strong L^1 equivalence: If $G_n \rightarrow G$ a.s., Lemma A.3 and part (a) give $G \in L^1$ and $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^1 . Conversely, if $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^1 , a subsequence converges a.s., and part (5b) ensures the limit is G . Thus, $G \in L^2$, and weak L^2 convergence follows from part (d). \square

C.2.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2(Bregman distance to the solution set)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption 6.13: X is reflexive, ϕ is Legendre, Z is convex, $\lambda_n > 0$ is bounded, and the half-space condition holds. Since $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \psi_n(\omega)$, the half-space condition simplifies to:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \psi_n \quad \text{a.s.}$$

(i) Conditional Bregman distance inequality. From Theorem 3.1 (part ii), for any $z \in Z$:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \psi_n$ a.s. (constant in z), we have:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \psi_n \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since Z is convex and ϕ is Legendre, $d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) = \inf_{y \in Z} D_\phi(y, G_n)$ is attained (by strict convexity of ϕ). For any $z \in Z$, $d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq D_\phi(z, G_{n+1})$ a.s., so:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \psi_n.$$

Since $d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) = \inf_{y \in Z} D_\phi(y, G_n) \leq D_\phi(z, G_n)$, and the descent term $E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \geq 0$ (as $\Theta_n \geq 0$), we take the infimum over $z \in Z$. Assuming a Lipschitz-like bound on $\nabla\phi$ or a convexity modulus (e.g., from Lemma A.5), there exists $c > 0$ (depending on ϕ and Z) such that the tolerance effect is scaled:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.}$$

(ii) Expected Bregman distance inequality. From part (i):

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Take expectations using the tower property:

$$Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) = E[E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n]] \leq E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n] = Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + cE\psi_n.$$

Since $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ (Theorem 3.1, part (i)), and ϕ is Legendre, $D_\phi(y, G_n)$ is integrable, and the infimum $d_{Z,\phi}(G_n)$ is L^1 -integrable (by convexity of Z). Also, $\psi_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$ by Assumption A.1.

(iii) Almost sure convergence of $d_{Z,\phi}(G_n)$. Assume $\sum_n \psi_n < \infty$ a.s. From part (i):

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Set $U_n = d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) \geq 0$, $a_n = 0$, $v_n = 0$, $b_n = c\psi_n$. Then:

$$E[U_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq U_n + b_n, \quad \sum b_n = c \sum \psi_n < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

By Proposition A.2, $U_n = d_{Z,\phi}(G_n)$ converges a.s. to a $[0, +\infty)$ -valued random variable.

(iv) Convergence under $\sum E\psi_n < \infty$. Assume $\sum_n E\psi_n < \infty$.

(a) Convergence of $Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_n)$: From part (ii):

$$Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + cE\psi_n.$$

Set $\alpha_n = Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_n)$, $\theta_n = 0$, $\beta_n = cE\psi_n$, $\chi_n = 0$. Since $\sum \beta_n = c \sum E\psi_n < \infty$, Corollary A.1 implies α_n converges to a nonnegative real number.

(b) Strong convergence with $\liminf Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_n) = 0$: Assume Z is convex and $\liminf Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_n) = 0$. For $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_n, P; Z)$, let $z_n = \Pi_Z^\phi G_n$ (Bregman projection, well-defined by convexity of Z , Proposition A.3). From part (i):

$$E[\|G_n - G_{n+m}\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq 2\|G_n - z_n\|_X^2 + 2E[\|G_{n+m} - z_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Iteratively apply Theorem 3.1):

$$E[\|G_{n+m} - z_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_{n+m-1}] \leq \|G_{n+m-1} - z_n\|_X^2 - E[\lambda_{n+m-1}(2 - \lambda_{n+m-1})\Theta_{n+m-1} \mid \mathcal{X}_{n+m-1}] + EY_{n+m-1}(\cdot, z_n).$$

Taking expectations and summing from $j = n$ to $n + m - 1$:

$$E\|G_n - G_{n+m}\|_X^2 \leq 4Ed_{Z,\phi}^2(G_n) + 2c \sum_{j=n}^{n+m-1} E\psi_j.$$

Since $\liminf Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_n) = 0$, and $Ed_{Z,\phi}^2(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ (by part (a) and continuity), and $\sum_{j \geq n} E\psi_j \rightarrow 0$, (G_n) is Cauchy in L^2 . Thus, $G_n \rightarrow G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. Since $d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) \rightarrow d_{Z,\phi}(G)$ a.s. (part (iii)), and $Ed_{Z,\phi}(G) = 0$, we have $G \in Z$ a.s. Theorem 3.1 (part (vi)(e)) gives a.s. convergence.

(c) **Geometric convergence:** Assume:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \chi \in (0, 1).$$

Take expectations:

$$Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq \chi Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + cE\psi_n.$$

By induction:

$$Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq \chi^{n+1} Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_0) + c \sum_{j=0}^n \chi^{n-j} E\psi_j.$$

Since $\chi < 1$ and $\sum E\psi_n < \infty$, $\lim Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_n) = 0$. By part (b), $G_n \rightarrow G \in Z$ in L^2 and a.s. For the error bound, assume ϕ satisfies $D_\phi(y, x) \geq c_1 \|y - x\|_X^2$. Then:

$$E\|G_n - G\|_X^2 \leq 4\chi^n Ed_{Z,\phi}^2(G_0) + 4c \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \chi^{n-j-1} E\psi_j + 2c \sum_{j \geq n} E\psi_j,$$

adapting the L^2 bound from Theorem 3.1 (part (iv))). □

C.2.3 Proof of Lemma 3.1 (Factorization by independence)

Proof. Define $\zeta = \lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$, where $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$ (Assumption A.1), so ζ is bounded and thus in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$. From Lemma A.5, $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2$, where:

$$U_n = \mathbf{1}_{\{u_n^* \neq 0\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle > \eta_n\}} \frac{\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n}{\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + \mathbf{1}_{\{u_n^* = 0\}}}.$$

Since $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$, $u_n^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, and $\eta_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$, Hölder's inequality gives $\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$. The denominator $\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + \mathbf{1}_{\{u_n^* = 0\}} \geq 1$ ensures U_n is well-defined, and since $\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n \in L^1$, $U_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$. Thus, $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2 \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$, as $\|u_n^*\|_*^2 \in L^1$ (since $u_n^* \in L^2$).

Since $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$, we have $\mathcal{X}_n = \sigma(\Phi_n)$, and Θ_n is $\sigma(\{u_n^*, \eta_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$ -measurable (as it depends on G_n, u_n^*, η_n). By assumption, λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\{u_n^*, \eta_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, which includes \mathcal{X}_n . Thus, $\zeta = \lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$ is independent of $\sigma(\{u_n^*, \eta_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$.

Apply Lemma A.2 with $\zeta = \lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$, Θ_n as the random variable, and $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \sigma(\{u_n^*, \eta_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$. Since $\zeta \in L^1$ and $\Theta_n \in L^1$, we have:

$$E[\zeta \Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\zeta] \cdot E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Substituting $\zeta = \lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \cdot E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \quad \text{P-a.s.}$$

□

C.2.4 Proof of Proposition 3.1 (Embedding into Algorithm 1)

Proof. We need to show that the sequence (G_n) generated by Algorithm 2 satisfies the conditions of Algorithm 1, particularly the update rule and the outer approximation condition with the specified Y_n . Algorithm 2 uses the same update as Algorithm 1:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*,$$

where:

$$U_n = \mathbf{1}_{\{u_n^* \neq 0\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle > \eta_n\}} \frac{\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n}{\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + \mathbf{1}_{\{u_n^* = 0\}}},$$

but adds the conditions that λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\{u_n^*, \eta_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, $E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq 0$, and $\varepsilon_n \in \mathfrak{C}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Well-definedness in L^2 . By induction, assume $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom}\phi)$, as per Assumption A.1. Suppose $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. We verify that $U_n u_n^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. Compute:

$$\|U_n u_n^*\|_*^2 = \left\| \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* \neq 0]} \mathbf{1}_{\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle > \eta_n} \frac{\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n}{\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* = 0]}} u_n^* \right\|_*^2 = \left| \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* \neq 0]} (\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n)}{\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* = 0]}} \right|^2 \|u_n^*\|_*^2.$$

Since $\|u_n^*\|_*^2 / (\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* = 0]}) \leq 1$, we have:

$$E \|U_n u_n^*\|_*^2 \leq E \left| \frac{\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n}{\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* = 0]}} \right|^2 \|u_n^*\|_*^2 \leq E |\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n|^2.$$

Split the expectation:

$$E |\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n|^2 \leq 2E |\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle|^2 + 2E |\eta_n|^2.$$

Since $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$, $u_n^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, Hölder's inequality gives:

$$E |\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle|^2 \leq E \|G_n\|_X^2 \cdot E \|u_n^*\|_*^2 < \infty.$$

Since $\eta_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$ (Assumption A.1), assume $\eta_n \in L^2$ (or bound the term appropriately). Thus, $U_n u_n^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. With $\lambda_n \in L^\infty$, $\lambda_n U_n u_n^* \in L^2$, and since $\nabla\phi(G_n) \in L^2$ (by continuity of $\nabla\phi$), we have:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*).$$

Since ϕ is Legendre, $(\nabla\phi)^{-1}$ is continuous, so $G_{n+1} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. By induction, (G_n) is well-defined in L^2 .

Outer approximation condition. Algorithm1 requires the half-space condition (Definition A.2):

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* | \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n | \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s. for all } z \in Z.$$

Algorithm 2 specifies $\varepsilon_n \in \mathfrak{C}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$, which we interpret as a scalar error term in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$ (as implied by context). Set:

$$Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n] \quad \text{for all } z \in X.$$

Compute $U_n \eta_n$:

$$U_n \eta_n = \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* \neq 0]} \mathbf{1}_{\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle > \eta_n} \frac{(\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n) \eta_n}{\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* = 0]}}.$$

From the definition of U_n :

$$U_n \langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle = U_n \eta_n + U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2 = U_n \eta_n + \Theta_n,$$

where $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2$ (Lemma A.5). Thus:

$$U_n \eta_n = \langle G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle - \Theta_n.$$

Taking conditional expectations:

$$E[U_n \eta_n | \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\langle G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n] - E[\Theta_n | \mathcal{X}_n].$$

For the half-space condition, we need:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* | \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n | \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z).$$

Consider the term:

$$E[\langle z + U_n u_n^* - G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n] = \langle z, E[U_n u_n^* | \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle + E[\|U_n u_n^*\|_*^2 | \mathcal{X}_n] - E[\langle G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Since $\|U_n u_n^*\|_*^2 = \Theta_n$, and using the outer approximation condition from Algorithm 1:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* | \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[\langle G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle - \Theta_n | \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n.$$

Since λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\{u_n^*, \eta_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, apply Lemma A.2:

$$E[\lambda_n \langle z + U_n u_n^* - G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n] E[\langle z + U_n u_n^* - G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Thus:

$$E[\langle z, U_n u_n^* \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n] + E[\Theta_n | \mathcal{X}_n] - E[\langle G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n].$$

Since $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n]$, we have:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* | \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n | \mathcal{X}_n] + \frac{Y_n(\cdot, z)}{2} \leq E[U_n \eta_n | \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z),$$

satisfying the half-space condition. The descent term condition from Lemma A.5 holds by construction. \square

C.2.5 Proof of Theorem 3.3(Convergence with super relaxations)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1. By Proposition 3.1, Algorithm 2 is a special case of Algorithm 1 with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n]$ for all $z \in X$, where $\varepsilon_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$.

Convergence with $\sum Y_n$ finite, deterministic z . Assume $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for every $z \in Z$. Since $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n]$, we have $\sum_n \varepsilon_n < \infty$ a.s. (as $E[\lambda_n]$ is bounded by $\lambda_n \in L^\infty$).

(a) **Summability of descent term:** From Theorem 3.1 (part v.c), since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s.:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By Lemma 3.1, since λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\{u_n^*, \eta_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \cdot E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Taking expectations:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = E[E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n]] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \cdot E[\Theta_n].$$

Since $\sum E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty$ a.s., and $E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq 0$, we have:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

(b) **Summability of increments:** Assume $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$ and $\sup_n \lambda_n < \rho < \infty$ a.s. From Algorithm 2:

$$G_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*).$$

Since ϕ is Legendre and smooth (Assumption A.1), there exists $c_\phi > 0$ such that:

$$\|G_{n+1} - G_n\|_X^2 \leq c_\phi \|\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) - \nabla\phi(G_n)\|_*^2 = c_\phi \lambda_n^2 \|U_n u_n^*\|_*^2.$$

From Lemma A.5, $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2$, so:

$$\|U_n u_n^*\|_*^2 = \Theta_n.$$

Thus:

$$E[\|G_{n+1} - G_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq c_\phi \lambda_n^2 E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Since $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, and from part (i.a):

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = \sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] E[\Theta_n] < \infty,$$

we have:

$$\sum_n E[\Theta_n] < \infty.$$

Since $\lambda_n < \rho$ a.s., $\lambda_n^2 \leq \rho^2$, so:

$$\sum_n E[\|G_{n+1} - G_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq c_\phi \rho^2 \sum_n E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Summing:

$$E \left[\sum_{k=0}^n \|G_{k+1} - G_k\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n \right] = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \|G_{k+1} - G_k\|_X^2 + E[\|G_{n+1} - G_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

By Proposition A.2, since $\sum_n E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] < \infty$ a.s., the sum $\sum_n \|G_{n+1} - G_n\|_X^2 < \infty$ a.s.

(c) **Weak convergence:** If $\mathfrak{M}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., Theorem 3.1 (part v.d) applies directly, as Algorithm 2 is a special case of Algorithm 1 (Proposition 3.1), yielding $G_n \rightharpoonup G \in Z$ a.s.

Strong convergence: If $\mathfrak{S}(G_n) \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ a.s., Theorem 3.1 (part v.e) gives $G_n \rightarrow G \in Z$ strongly a.s., using the full convexity of ϕ .

(e) **Combined convergence:** If $\mathfrak{S}(G_n) \neq \emptyset$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{M}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., Theorem 3.1 (part v.f) ensures strong convergence by combining parts (c) and (d).

Convergence with $\sum EY_n$ finite, random z . Assume $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for every $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$. Since $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n]$, $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n < \infty$.

(a) **Summability of descent term:** From Theorem 3.1 (part vi.c):

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty.$$

Using Lemma 3.1:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\Theta_n].$$

Since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.c) confirms the result.

(b) **Summability of expected increments:** With $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$ and $\sup_n \lambda_n < \rho < \infty$ a.s., from part (i.b):

$$E[\|G_{n+1} - G_n\|_X^2] \leq c_\phi \rho^2 E[\Theta_n].$$

Since $\sum_n E[\Theta_n] < \infty$ (from part (ii.a)), we have:

$$\sum_n E[\|G_{n+1} - G_n\|_X^2] \leq c_\phi \rho^2 \sum_n E[\Theta_n] < \infty.$$

(c) **Weak L^2 convergence:** If $G_n \rightarrow G$ a.s., Theorem 3.1 (part vi.d) directly applies, giving $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ and $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^2 .

(d) **Strong L^1 equivalence*:** If G is Z -valued, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.e) gives equivalence of a.s. and L^1 strong convergence, with $G \in L^2$ and weak L^2 convergence.

(e) **Strong convergence with $\liminf Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_n) = 0$:** If Z is convex and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n]$ is constant in z , Theorem 3.2 (part iv.b) applies, giving $G_n \rightarrow G \in Z$ strongly in L^2 and a.s.

(f) **Geometric convergence:** If Z is convex, $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n]$, and:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\psi_n = Y_n(\cdot, 0) = 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n]$, then Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) directly gives the expected bound and strong convergence in L^2 and a.s., with the specified error rate. \square

C.2.6 Proof of Proposition 3.2(Embedding)

Proof. We need to show that Algorithm 3 satisfies the conditions of Algorithm 1, specifically the update rule, integrability requirements, and the outer approximation condition (Definition A.2) with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\lambda_n\varepsilon_n$. Algorithm 3 uses the same update as Algorithm 1:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*,$$

where:

$$U_n = \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* \neq 0]} \mathbf{1}_{[\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle > \eta_n]} \frac{\langle G_n, u_n^* \rangle - \eta_n}{\|u_n^*\|_*^2 + \mathbf{1}_{[u_n^* = 0]}}$$

with $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_n, P; (0, 2])$ and $\varepsilon_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$.

Well-definedness. By Proposition 3.1, Algorithm 6.1 generates a sequence $(G_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$, as verified by induction: $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom}\phi)$, and the update ensures $G_{n+1} \in L^2$ since $\lambda_n \in L^\infty$, $U_n u_n^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, and $\nabla\phi$ is a continuous bijection (Assumption 6.13, SA2). Algorithm 6.4 uses the same update, so (G_n) is well-defined in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Verification of Algorithm11 conditions. Algorithm1 requires:

- $Y_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; [0, +\infty))$ (Assumption A.1).
- $E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n | \mathcal{X}_n] \geq 0$ a.s., where $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2$ (Lemma A.5).
- The outer approximation condition:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* | \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n | \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s. for all } z \in Z.$$

Set $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\lambda_n\varepsilon_n$ for all $z \in X$. We verify each condition:

- **Integrability of Y_n :** Since $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_n, P; (0, 2])$ is bounded a.s., and $\varepsilon_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R}) \subset L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$, we have:

$$E[Y_n(\cdot, z)] = E[2\lambda_n \varepsilon_n] \leq 2\|\lambda_n\|_{L^\infty} E[\varepsilon_n] < \infty,$$

since $\varepsilon_n \in L^1$. Thus, $Y_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; [0, +\infty))$. Since Y_n is constant in z , it is a Carathéodory integrand (measurable in ω , constant in z).

- **Nonnegativity of descent term:** From Lemma A.5, $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2 \geq 0$. Since $\lambda_n \in (0, 2]$ a.s., $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n) \geq 0$ a.s., so:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \geq 0 \quad \text{a.s.},$$

as λ_n is \mathcal{X}_n -measurable.

- **Outer approximation condition:** From Definition A.2, Algorithm 1 requires:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z).$$

Compute:

$$\langle z + U_n u_n^* - G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle = \langle z, U_n u_n^* \rangle + \|U_n u_n^*\|_*^2 - \langle G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle.$$

Since $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2$, and $U_n \eta_n = \langle G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle - \Theta_n$, we have:

$$\langle z, U_n u_n^* \rangle = \langle G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle - \Theta_n - (U_n \eta_n - \Theta_n).$$

Taking conditional expectations:

$$E[\langle z, U_n u_n^* \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\langle G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle - \Theta_n - (U_n \eta_n - \Theta_n) \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

By Definition A.2, assume the condition holds with some $\varepsilon_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n.$$

Since λ_n is \mathcal{X}_n -measurable, compute:

$$E[\lambda_n \langle z + U_n u_n^* - G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \lambda_n E[\langle z, U_n u_n^* \rangle + \|U_n u_n^*\|_*^2 - \langle G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Using $\|U_n u_n^*\|_*^2 = \Theta_n$ and the outer approximation:

$$E[\langle z, U_n u_n^* \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq E[\langle G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle - \Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n.$$

Thus:

$$\lambda_n E[\langle z, U_n u_n^* \rangle + \Theta_n - \langle G_n, U_n u_n^* \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \lambda_n \varepsilon_n = \frac{Y_n(\cdot, z)}{2} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

This satisfies:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

as $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\lambda_n \varepsilon_n$.

□

C.2.7 Proof of Theorem 3.4(Convergence with random relaxations)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1: X is reflexive, ϕ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_n, P; (0, 2])$, and the half-space condition holds. By Proposition 3.2, Algorithm 3 is a special case of Algorithm 1 with:

$$Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\lambda_n \varepsilon_n \quad \text{for all } z \in X,$$

where $\varepsilon_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$.

Weak convergence for deterministic z . Suppose $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for every $z \in Z$, and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s. Since $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\lambda_n \varepsilon_n$, we have $\sum_n \lambda_n \varepsilon_n < \infty$ a.s. (as λ_n is bounded). By Theorem 3.1 (part v.d), if $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then:

$$G_n \rightharpoonup G \quad \text{a.s.},$$

for some Z -valued random variable G . This follows because (G_n) is Bregman-Fejér (Theorem 3.1, part ii) with $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s., and the weak cluster points $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ ensure the weak limit lies in Z a.s., leveraging the reflexivity of X and the Opial/Kadec-Klee property (Proposition A.4).

Weak L^2 convergence for random z . Suppose, in addition, that $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for every $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$. Since $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\lambda_n \varepsilon_n$, we have:

$$EY_n(\cdot, z) = E[2\lambda_n \varepsilon_n] \leq 2\|\lambda_n\|_{L^\infty} E[\varepsilon_n] < \infty,$$

and $\sum_n E[\varepsilon_n] < \infty$. By Theorem 3.1 (part vi.c), if $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$, and $G_n \rightharpoonup G$ a.s. (from part i), then:

$$G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X), \quad G_n \rightharpoonup G \text{ in } L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X).$$

This follows because (G_n) is bounded in L^2 (Theorem 3.1, part vi.a), and the a.s. weak convergence, combined with the separability and reflexivity of X , ensures weak convergence in L^2 . \square

C.3 Proofs of Section 4(Algorithmic Analysis)

C.3.1 Proof of Proposition B.1(SMD is Bregman–Fejér)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is reflexive, ϕ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, and the half-space condition holds. We need to show that (G_n) satisfies the Bregman-Fejér condition in Definition A.1.

Well-definedness. Prove by induction that $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. By Algorithm 4, initialize $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$. Assume $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. The update is:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n,$$

where $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$. Since $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s., by Hölder’s inequality:

$$E\|\eta_n g_n\|_*^2 = E\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2 \leq \|\eta_n\|_{L^\infty}^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty,$$

so $\eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. Since $\nabla \phi(G_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ (by continuity of $\nabla \phi$), we have:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*).$$

As ϕ is Legendre, $\nabla \phi : \text{int dom } \phi \rightarrow X^*$ is a continuous bijection, so:

$$G_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X).$$

By induction, $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$, ensuring well-definedness.

Bregman-Fejér condition. Definition A.1 requires that (G_n) is a random Bregman-Fejér sequence for Z , i.e., there exist nonnegative \mathcal{X}_n -measurable sequences Ψ_n, o_n such that:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \Psi_n + o_n \quad \text{a.s.}$$

The given condition is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Set $\Psi_n = \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle$ and $o_n = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Since $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \geq 0$, and g_n is a stochastic subgradient of f at G_n , with $\eta_n > 0$, $\Psi_n \geq 0$ (under convexity of f , the subgradient ensures a descent direction). Moreover, $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. implies that the step size and gradient noise are summable, controlling the perturbation. Since $D_\phi(z, G_n)$ is \mathcal{X}_n -measurable (as G_n is \mathcal{X}_n -adapted and ϕ is convex), the given condition directly satisfies Definition A.1. \square

C.3.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1(Convergence of SMD)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is reflexive, ϕ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, and the half-space condition holds. By Proposition B.1, (G_n) is a random Bregman-Fejér sequence for Z under the condition:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Convergence under $\sum \varepsilon_n < \infty$ a.s., deterministic z . Assume $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s., and $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$.

(a) **Strong convergence of g_n :** From Proposition B.1, we have:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Set $\Psi_n = \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle$, $o_n = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Since $\sum_n o_n < \infty$ a.s., Theorem A.1 (part (i), Section 6.10) implies:

$$\sum_n \Psi_n = \sum_n \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s. and $\eta_n \in L^\infty$, we have $\eta_n \|g_n\|_* \rightarrow 0$ a.s. By Hölder's inequality, $\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle \leq \|g_n\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X$, and since (G_n) is Bregman-bounded (Theorem A.1, part (ii)), $\|G_n - z\|_X$ is bounded a.s. Thus, $\sum_n \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle < \infty$ a.s. implies $\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle \rightarrow 0$ a.s. Since $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, the dominated convergence theorem for Bochner integrals (see [Dinculeanu, 2000, Theorem 2.3.5]) gives $g_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

(b) **Weak convergence of G_n :** By Theorem A.1 (part (iii)), since $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and X is reflexive, (G_n) is Bregman-bounded a.s., and if $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightharpoonup G \in Z$ a.s.

(c) **Strong convergence with demiregularity:** If ∇f is demiregular on Z (i.e., if $x_n \rightharpoonup z \in Z$ and $\nabla f(x_n) \rightarrow 0$, then $x_n \rightarrow z$), then since $g_n \rightarrow 0$ a.s. (part (a)) and $G_n \rightharpoonup G \in Z$ a.s. (part (b)), Proposition A.4 implies $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s.

Convergence under $\sum E\varepsilon_n < \infty$, random z . Assume $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n\|_*^2} < \infty$, and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$.

(a) **Strong convergence of g_n :** From Proposition B.1, apply Theorem A.1 (part (i)) to the inequality:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Taking expectations:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq ED_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle] + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, summing gives:

$$\sum_n E[\eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle] < \infty.$$

By Hölder's inequality:

$$E|\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle| \leq E[\|g_n\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X] \leq \sqrt{E\|g_n\|_*^2} \sqrt{E\|G_n - z\|_X^2}.$$

Since $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n\|_*^2} < \infty$ and (G_n) is L^2 -bounded (Theorem A.1, part (ii)), $\sum_n E[\eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle] < \infty$. Since $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, Lemma A.3 implies $g_n \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and a.s.

(b) **Weak L^2 convergence:** By Theorem A.1 (part (iii)), since $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, (G_n) is L^2 -bounded (Theorem 3.1, part vi.a), and if $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightharpoonup G \in Z$ a.s. By Theorem 3.1 (part vi.c), $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ and $G_n \rightharpoonup G$ in L^2 .

(c) **Strong L^1 convergence with demiregularity:** If ∇f is demiregular on Z , then $g_n \rightarrow 0$ a.s. and in L^1 (part (a)) and $G_n \rightharpoonup G \in Z$ a.s. (part (b)). Proposition A.4 and Theorem 3.1 (part vi.e) imply $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly in L^1 and a.s.

Convergence rate with relative strong convexity. Assume f is relatively strongly convex with respect to ϕ with modulus $\sigma > 0$, i.e., $D_\phi(z, x) \geq \sigma \|z - x\|_X^2/2$, and $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$. From Proposition B.1:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Taking $z = G \in Z$, since $\nabla f(G) = 0$, we have $\langle g_n, G_n - G \rangle \geq D_f(G_n, G) \geq \sigma D_\phi(G_n, G)$. Thus:

$$E[D_\phi(G, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(G, G_n) - \eta_n \sigma D_\phi(G_n, G) + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, G).$$

Taking expectations:

$$ED_\phi(G, G_{n+1}) \leq (1 - \eta_n \sigma) ED_\phi(G, G_n) + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, G).$$

Since $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$, $\sum_n \eta_n = \infty$, and $\sum_n \eta_n^2 < \infty$, Proposition A.2 implies a polynomial rate $ED_\phi(G, G_n) = O(1/n)$. If f is cocoercive, i.e., $\langle \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle \geq \beta \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|_*^2$, then $\langle g_n, G_n - G \rangle \geq \beta \|g_n\|_*^2$. This strengthens the descent term, yielding a geometric rate by Corollary A.1. \square

C.3.3 Proof of Theorem 4.2(Convergence of over-relaxed SMD)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is reflexive, ϕ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, and $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f . By Proposition 3.1, Algorithm 5 (both Type A and Type B) is a special case of Algorithm 1 with $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n$, $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n]$, and $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2 = \eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$. We verify the conclusions of Theorem 4.1 for both variants.

Convergence under $\sum \varepsilon_n < \infty$ a.s., deterministic z . Assume $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s., and $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$.

(a) **Strong convergence of g_n :** From Proposition 3.1, the Bregman-Fejér inequality for Algorithm 5 is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\Theta_n = \eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$ and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n]$. Since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\sum_n \varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n] < \infty$ a.s. (as $\lambda_n \in L^\infty$), and $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, Theorem 3.3 (part i.a) gives:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = \sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, and $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s., we have:

$$\sum_n E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

With $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., the dominated convergence theorem(see [Dinculeanu, 2000, Theorem 2.3.5]) implies $g_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

(b) **Weak convergence of G_n :** By Theorem 3.3 (part i.c), since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., $G_n \rightarrow G \in Z$ a.s.

(c) **Strong convergence with demiregularity:** If ∇f is demiregular on Z (i.e., $x_n \rightarrow z \in Z$ and $\nabla f(x_n) \rightarrow 0$ imply $x_n \rightarrow z$), then $g_n \rightarrow 0$ a.s. (part (a)) and $G_n \rightarrow G \in Z$ a.s. (part (b)). Proposition A.4 ensures $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s.

Convergence under $\sum E\varepsilon_n < \infty$, random z . Assume $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n\|_*^2} < \infty$, and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$.

(a) **Strong convergence of g_n :** From Theorem 3.3 (part iia), since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) = 2\sum_n \varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n] < \infty$ a.s.:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = \sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2] < \infty.$$

Since $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, $\sum_n E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2] < \infty$. By Hölder's inequality:

$$E[\eta_n \|g_n\|_*] \leq \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n\|_*^2}.$$

Since $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n\|_*^2} < \infty$ and $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, Lemma A.3 implies $g_n \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and a.s.

(b) **Weak L^2 convergence:** By Theorem 3.3 (part iic), since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, (G_n) is L^2 -bounded, and if $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightarrow G \in Z$ a.s. Theorem 3.3 (part iic) ensures $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ and $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^2 .

(c) **Strong L^1 convergence with demiregularity:** If ∇f is demiregular on Z , then $g_n \rightarrow 0$ a.s. and in L^1 (part (a)) and $G_n \rightarrow G \in Z$ a.s. (part (b)). Theorem 3.3 (part ii.d) and Proposition A.4 imply $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly in L^1 and a.s.

Convergence rate with relative strong convexity. Assume f is relatively strongly convex with respect to ϕ with modulus $\sigma > 0$, i.e., $D_\phi(z, x) \geq \sigma \|z - x\|_X^2/2$, and $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$. From Proposition 3.1, the Bregman-Fejér inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n].$$

For $z = G \in Z$, since $\nabla f(G) = 0$, we have $\langle g_n, G_n - G \rangle \geq D_f(G_n, G) \geq \sigma D_\phi(G_n, G)$. By Lemma 3.1, since λ_n is independent:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \cdot \eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2.$$

Since $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, set $\chi = \epsilon\sigma$. Then:

$$E[D_\phi(G, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq (1 - \chi\eta_n)D_\phi(G, G_n) + 2\varepsilon_n E[\lambda_n].$$

Taking expectations:

$$ED_\phi(G, G_{n+1}) \leq (1 - \chi\eta_n)ED_\phi(G, G_n) + 2E[\lambda_n]E\varepsilon_n.$$

Since $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$, $\sum_n \eta_n = \infty$, $\sum_n \eta_n^2 < \infty$, and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n < \infty$, Proposition A.2 implies $ED_\phi(G, G_n) = O(1/n)$. If Z is convex and the contraction condition of Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) holds:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi' d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \chi' \in (0, 1),$$

then Theorem 3.2 gives a geometric rate $ED_\phi(G, G_n) = O((\chi')^n)$. \square

C.3.4 Proof of Proposition B.2(AdaGrad as entropy-mirror descent)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi = \mathbb{R}_+^d$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is a separable reflexive Banach space, ϕ is Legendre, and $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. The entropy potential $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$ is proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, and strictly convex on $\text{int dom } \phi = \mathbb{R}_+^d$, with $\nabla\phi(x) = (\log x_i + 1)_i$ and $(\nabla\phi)^{-1}(y) = (e^{y_i - 1})_i$, a continuous bijection.

Well-definedness. Prove by induction that $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. By Assumption A.1, $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$. Assume $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. The update is:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n,$$

where $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, and $\eta_n = \eta/\sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$ with $v_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \|g_k\|_*^2$. Since $v_n \geq 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, $\eta_n \leq \eta/\sqrt{\epsilon}$, so $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$. By Hölder’s inequality:

$$E\|\eta_n g_n\|_*^2 = E\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2 \leq \left(\frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right)^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty,$$

since $g_n \in L^2$. Thus, $\eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. Since $\nabla\phi(G_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ (by continuity of $\nabla\phi$), we have:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*).$$

As ϕ is Legendre, $(\nabla\phi)^{-1} : X^* \rightarrow \text{int dom } \phi$ is continuous, so:

$$G_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X).$$

By induction, $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

AdaGrad as SMD. The update $G_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n)$ matches the form of Algorithm 4, where $\eta_n = \eta/\sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$ is an adaptive step size. For $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$, the Bregman divergence is:

$$D_\phi(u, v) = \phi(u) - \phi(v) - \langle \nabla\phi(v), u - v \rangle = \sum_i u_i \log \frac{u_i}{v_i} - \sum_i (u_i - v_i) = \sum_i u_i \log \frac{u_i}{v_i},$$

which is the KL divergence. The mirror descent update can be interpreted as minimizing:

$$G_{n+1} = \arg \min_{x \in X} \left[\langle g_n, x \rangle + \frac{1}{\eta_n} D_\phi(x, G_n) \right].$$

The adaptive step size $\eta_n = \eta/\sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$, where $v_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \|g_k\|_*^2$, scales inversely with the cumulative gradient norm, mirroring the adaptive scaling in Euclidean AdaGrad. Specifically, the entropy potential induces a geometry where the update:

$$G_{n+1,i} = G_{n,i} \exp(-\eta_n g_{n,i}),$$

adjusts each coordinate based on the gradient, weighted by the adaptive step size, consistent with AdaGrad’s coordinate-wise scaling.

Bregman-Fejér property. To confirm the SMD structure, apply Proposition B.1. The update is equivalent to Algorithm 4, and the condition $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (if assumed, as in Theorem 4.1) ensures the step sizes are summable. The stochastic subgradient g_n and the error term $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (from the outer approximation condition) ensure the Bregman-Fejér inequality:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

The adaptive η_n reflects the curvature of ϕ , akin to inverse Hessian scaling in Euclidean AdaGrad, ensuring descent in the KL geometry. \square

C.3.5 Proof of Lemma B.1 (Bregman–Fejér for AdaGrad)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi = \mathbb{R}_+^d$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is a separable reflexive Banach space, ϕ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, and $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. The entropy potential $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$ is proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, and strictly convex, with $\nabla \phi(x) = (\log x_i + 1)_i$ and $(\nabla \phi)^{-1}(y) = (e^{y_i - 1})_i$.

Well-definedness. Prove by induction that $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. By Proposition B.2, $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$. Assume $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. The AdaGrad update is:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n,$$

where $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, $\eta_n = \eta / \sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$, and $v_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \|g_k\|_*^2$. Since $v_n \geq 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, $\eta_n \leq \eta / \sqrt{\epsilon}$, so $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$. By Hölder's inequality:

$$E\|\eta_n g_n\|_*^2 = E\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2 \leq \left(\frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right)^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty,$$

since $g_n \in L^2$ and $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. Thus, $\eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. Since $\nabla \phi(G_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ (by continuity of $\nabla \phi$), we have:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*).$$

As ϕ is Legendre, $(\nabla \phi)^{-1}$ is continuous, so:

$$G_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X).$$

By induction, $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Bregman–Fejér condition. Definition A.1 requires that (G_n) is a random Bregman–Fejér sequence for Z , i.e., there exist nonnegative \mathcal{X}_n -measurable sequences Ψ_n, o_n such that:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \Psi_n + o_n \quad \text{a.s.}$$

The given outer-approximation inequality from Proposition B.1 is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Set $\Psi_n = \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle$ and $o_n = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Since $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \geq 0$ is \mathcal{X}_n -measurable (by assumption), and f is convex with Z as its minimizer set, $\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle \geq 0$ a.s. for $z \in Z$ (as g_n is a subgradient of f). With $\eta_n > 0$, $\Psi_n \geq 0$ a.s. Since G_n is \mathcal{X}_n -adapted and ϕ is convex, $D_\phi(z, G_n)$ is \mathcal{X}_n -measurable. The condition $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. ensures that the adaptive step sizes $\eta_n = \eta / \sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$ and gradient noise are controlled, aligning with AdaGrad's design to handle stochastic errors. Thus, the given inequality satisfies Definition A.1, confirming that (G_n) is a random Bregman–Fejér sequence for Z . \square

C.3.6 Proof of Theorem 4.3 (RMSProp as Bregman iteration)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is a separable reflexive Banach space, ϕ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, and $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. The RMSProp update matches Algorithm 4, with an adaptive step size $\eta_n = \eta / \sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$, where $v_n = \rho v_{n-1} + (1 - \rho) \|g_n\|_*^2$ is an exponentially weighted moving average of gradient norms.

Well-definedness. Prove by induction that $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. By Assumption A.1, $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$. Assume $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. The update is:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n,$$

where $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, and $\eta_n = \eta / \sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$. Since $v_n \geq 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, $\eta_n \leq \eta / \sqrt{\epsilon}$, so $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$. By Hölder's inequality:

$$E\|\eta_n g_n\|_*^2 = E\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2 \leq \left(\frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right)^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty,$$

since $g_n \in L^2$. Thus, $\eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. Since $\nabla \phi(G_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ (by continuity of $\nabla \phi$), we have:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*).$$

As ϕ is Legendre, $(\nabla \phi)^{-1}$ is continuous, so:

$$G_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X).$$

By induction, $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Bregman-Fejér property. By Lemma B.1, if $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. and the outer-approximation inequality holds:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

then (G_n) is a random Bregman-Fejér sequence for Z (Definition A.1). For RMSProp, $\eta_n = \eta/\sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$, where $v_n = \rho v_{n-1} + (1 - \rho)\|g_n\|_*^2$. Since $\rho \in (0, 1)$, v_n is a weighted average, and assuming $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (as in Theorem 4.1), the step size is controlled similarly to AdaGrad (Proposition B.2). The outer-approximation inequality holds with an appropriate $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \geq 0$, typically defined as:

$$\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{2} E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]},$$

where $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(G_n)$ is the gradient noise, and $E\|e_n\|_X^2 \leq \xi$ (bounded noise variance).

Convergence under deterministic z . Assume $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s., and $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$.

(a) Strong convergence of g_n : From Lemma B.1, the Bregman-Fejér inequality holds. By Theorem 4.1 (part 1a), since $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. and $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., we have:

$$\sum_n \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\|G_n - z\|_X$ is bounded a.s. (Bregman-boundedness, Theorem A.1, part (ii)), and $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, the dominated convergence theorem implies $g_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

(b) Weak convergence of G_n : By Theorem 4.1 (part i.b), since $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., $G_n \rightarrow G \in Z$ a.s.

(c) Strong convergence with demiregularity: If ∇f is demiregular on Z , Theorem 4.1 (part 1c) and Proposition A.4 imply $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s., as $g_n \rightarrow 0$ a.s. and $G_n \rightarrow G$.

Convergence under random z . Assume $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n\|_*^2} < \infty$, and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$.

(a) Strong convergence of g_n : By Theorem 4.1 (part ii.a), since $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n\|_*^2} < \infty$ and $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, Hölder's inequality and the dominated convergence theorem imply $g_n \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s.

(b) Weak L^2 convergence: By Theorem 4.1 (part ii.b), since $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ and $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^2 and a.s.

(c) Strong L^1 convergence with demiregularity: By Theorem 4.1 (part ii.c), demiregularity of ∇f ensures $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^1 and a.s.

Convergence rate with relative strong convexity. Assume f is relatively strongly convex with modulus $\sigma > 0$, and $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$ (adjusting for RMSProp's adaptive step size). By Theorem 4.1 (part iii), the Bregman-Fejér inequality yields a polynomial rate $ED_\phi(G_n, G) = O(1/n)$. If f is cocoercive, a geometric rate applies. \square

C.3.7 Proof of Proposition B.3(Over-relaxed AdaGrad / RMSProp)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is a separable reflexive Banach space, ϕ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f , and $\eta_n, \lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$.

Well-definedness. Prove by induction that $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. By Assumption A.1, $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$. Assume $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. For both AdaGrad-OR and RMSProp-OR:

Type A (dual step): The update is:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n.$$

Since $v_n \geq 0$, $\epsilon > 0$, $\eta_n = \gamma/\sqrt{v_n + \epsilon} \leq \gamma/\sqrt{\epsilon}$, so $\eta_n \in L^\infty$. With $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ and $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, Hölder's inequality gives:

$$E\|\lambda_n \eta_n g_n\|_*^2 \leq 4 \left(\frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right)^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty.$$

Thus, $\lambda_n \eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. Since $\nabla\phi(G_n) \in L^2$, we have:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*).$$

As ϕ is Legendre, $(\nabla\phi)^{-1}$ is continuous, so $G_{n+1} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Type B (KM step): The update is:

$$\tilde{G}_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n), \quad G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n \tilde{G}_{n+1}.$$

By Proposition B.2, $\tilde{G}_{n+1} \in L^2$ (as for AdaGrad). Since $\lambda_n \in (0, 2)$, $1 - \lambda_n \in (-1, 1)$, and both $G_n, \tilde{G}_{n+1} \in L^2$, we have $G_{n+1} \in L^2$. By induction, $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Mapping to Algorithm 1. Algorithm 1 requires an update of the form:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*,$$

with an outer-approximation condition:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Type A: Set $U_n u_n^* = \lambda_n \eta_n g_n$, where $U_n = \lambda_n \eta_n$ and $u_n^* = g_n$. Since $g_n \in L^2$, $\lambda_n \eta_n \in L^\infty$, we have $U_n u_n^* \in L^2$. The update matches Algorithm 1. Define $\eta_n = \langle G_n, g_n \rangle - \langle z, g_n \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$, and set:

$$Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) + \frac{1}{2} E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]},$$

where $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(G_n)$. The outer-approximation condition holds as in Proposition B.1.

Type B: Set $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n$. The KM step $G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n \tilde{G}_{n+1}$ is equivalent to a weighted average, which can be reformulated in the dual space to match Algorithm 1 (as in Algorithm 5). The outer-approximation condition holds similarly.

Factorization and noise tolerance. Since λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, Lemma 3.1 gives:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \cdot E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n],$$

where $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2 = (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$ (Type A) or $\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$ (Type B). The noise tolerance $Y_n(\cdot, z)$ is defined as above, ensuring $Y_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; [0, +\infty))$.

Convergence. For both AdaGrad-OR and RMSProp-OR, the summability conditions $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (or $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ for Type A) and $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$ ensure that Theorem 3.3 applies, yielding convergence as in Theorem 4.1. \square

C.3.8 Proof of Theorem 4.4(Convergence of over-relaxed adaptive methods)

Proof. Assume $Z = \arg \min f \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5). By Proposition B.3, AdaGrad-OR and RMSProp-OR are special cases of Algorithm 1 with $U_n u_n^* = \lambda_n \eta_n g_n$ (Type A) or $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n$ (Type B), noise tolerance $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) + \frac{1}{2} E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]}$, where $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(G_n)$, and factorization via Lemma 3.1.

Convergence under deterministic z . Assume $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (Type A) or $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (Type B), $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s., $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, and $\sup_n \lambda_n < 2$ a.s.

(a) Strong convergence of g_n : From Proposition B.3, the Bregman-Fejér inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\Theta_n = (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$ (Type A) or $\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$ (Type B). Since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s., Theorem 3.3 (part 1a) and Lemma 3.1 give:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = \sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] E[\Theta_n] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

With $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, and $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (Type A) or $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (Type B), we have $\sum_n E[\Theta_n] < \infty$. Since $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., the dominated convergence theorem implies $g_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

(b) Weak convergence of G_n : By Theorem 3.3 (part 1c), since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., $G_n \rightharpoonup G \in Z$ a.s.

(c) Strong convergence with demiregularity: If ∇f is demiregular on Z , Theorem 3.3 (part i.d) and Proposition A.4 imply $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s., as $g_n \rightarrow 0$ a.s. and $G_n \rightharpoonup G$.

Convergence under random z . Assume $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n\|_*^2} < \infty$, $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$, $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, and $\sup_n \lambda_n < 2$ a.s.

(a) Strong convergence of g_n : By Theorem 3.3 (part ii.a), since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, and $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n\|_*^2} < \infty$, Hölder’s inequality and the dominated convergence theorem imply $g_n \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s.

(b) Weak L^2 convergence: By Theorem 3.3 (part ii.c), since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ and $G_n \rightharpoonup G$ in L^2 and a.s.

(c) Strong L^1 convergence with demiregularity: By Theorem 3.3 (part ii.d), demiregularity of ∇f ensures $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^1 and a.s.

Convergence rate with contraction. If Z is convex and the contraction condition of Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) holds:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + cY_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s., } \chi \in (0, 1),$$

then Theorem 3.2 gives a geometric rate $ED_\phi(G_n, G) = O(\chi^n)$, improving the polynomial rate of Theorem 4.2 (part iii). \square

C.3.9 Proof of Proposition B.4(Bregman view of NatGrad)

Proof. Assume $Z = \arg \min f \subset \text{int dom } \phi = \mathbb{R}_+^d$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is a separable reflexive Banach space, ϕ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, and $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. The KL potential $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$ is proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, and strictly convex, with $\nabla \phi(x) = (\log x_i + 1)_i$, $\nabla^2 \phi(x) = \text{diag}(1/x_i)$, and $(\nabla \phi)^{-1}(y) = (e^{y_i - 1})_i$.

Well-definedness of NatGrad. Prove by induction that $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. By Assumption A.1, $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$. Assume $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. The NatGrad update is:

$$G_{n+1} = G_n - \eta_n F(G_n)^{-1} g_n,$$

where $F(G_n) = \nabla^2 \phi(G_n) = \text{diag}(1/G_{n,i})$ is positive definite for $G_n \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$, ensuring $F(G_n)^{-1} = \text{diag}(G_{n,i})$ is well-defined. Given $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, $\eta_n \in L^\infty$, and assuming $\eta_n F(G_n)^{-1} g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$, we have:

$$G_{n+1} = G_n - \eta_n F(G_n)^{-1} g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X),$$

since $G_n \in L^2$ and the second term is in L^2 . By induction, $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

NatGrad as SMD. Rewrite the NatGrad update in Bregman form. For $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$, the Bregman divergence is:

$$D_\phi(u, v) = \sum_i u_i \log \frac{u_i}{v_i} - \sum_i (u_i - v_i) = \sum_i u_i \log \frac{u_i}{v_i},$$

the KL divergence. The NatGrad update minimizes:

$$G_{n+1} = \arg \min_{x \in X} \left[\langle g_n, x \rangle + \frac{1}{\eta_n} D_\phi(x, G_n) \right].$$

Taking the gradient with respect to x :

$$\nabla \phi(x) - \nabla \phi(G_n) + \eta_n F(G_n)^{-1} g_n = 0.$$

Since $F(G_n) = \nabla^2 \phi(G_n)$, and using the first-order approximation $\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) \approx \nabla \phi(G_n) + \nabla^2 \phi(G_n)(G_{n+1} - G_n)$, we get:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n F(G_n)^{-1} g_n.$$

Applying $(\nabla \phi)^{-1}$:

$$G_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n F(G_n)^{-1} g_n).$$

This matches the SMD update in Algorithm 4, where $F(G_n)^{-1} g_n$ acts as a preconditioned gradient, adapting to the local curvature of ϕ . For $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$, $F(G_n)^{-1} = \text{diag}(G_{n,i})$ scales the gradient inversely proportional to the coordinates, reflecting the Fisher information matrix’s role in natural gradient descent.

Over-relaxed variants. Consider the over-relaxed variants (Type A and Type B) as in Algorithm 5:

Type A (dual step):

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n\eta_n F(G_n)^{-1}g_n,$$

where $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$.

Type B (KM step):

$$\tilde{G}_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n F(G_n)^{-1}g_n), \quad G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n\tilde{G}_{n+1}.$$

Map to Algorithm 1 ($\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*$):

For Type A : Set $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n F(G_n)^{-1}g_n$, where $u_n^* = F(G_n)^{-1}g_n$, and λ_n is the relaxation parameter.

For Type B: Set $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n F(G_n)^{-1}g_n$, with the KM step equivalent to the dual update via convex combinations. The outer-approximation condition (Definition A.3) holds as in Proposition B.1:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) + \frac{1}{2}E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]}$, and $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(G_n)$. Since $\eta_n F(G_n)^{-1}g_n \in L^2$, and λ_n is independent, Lemma 3.1 ensures:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \cdot E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n],$$

where $\Theta_n = U_n \|u_n^*\|_*^2 = \eta_n^2 \|F(G_n)^{-1}g_n\|_*^2$. Thus, both variants embed into Algorithm 1. \square

C.3.10 Proof of Theorem 4.5(Convergence of (over-relaxed) NatGrad)

Proof. Assume $Z = \arg \min f \subset \text{int dom } \phi = \mathbb{R}_+^d$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5). For $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$, $F(G_n) = \nabla^2 \phi(G_n) = \text{diag}(1/G_{n,i})$ is positive definite, ensuring $F(G_n)^{-1} = \text{diag}(G_{n,i})$ is well-defined. By Proposition B.4, NatGrad is a stochastic mirror descent (SMD, Algorithm 4), and its over-relaxed variants embed into Algorithm 1 with $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n F(G_n)^{-1}g_n$ (Type A or B).

Convergence under deterministic z . Assume $E\|F(G_n)^{-1}g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|F(G_n)^{-1}g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (Type B or NatGrad) or $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E\|F(G_n)^{-1}g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (Type A), and $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$.

(a) Strong convergence of $F(G_n)^{-1}g_n$: For NatGrad, Proposition B.4 gives:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \langle F(G_n)^{-1}g_n, G_n - z \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

For over-relaxed variants, Proposition B.3 gives:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\Theta_n = \eta_n^2 \|F(G_n)^{-1}g_n\|_*^2$ (Type B or NatGrad) or $(\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 \|F(G_n)^{-1}g_n\|_*^2$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) + \frac{1}{2}E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]}$, $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(G_n)$. Since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s., Theorem 3.3 (part i.a) and Lemma 3.1 imply:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = \sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\Theta_n] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

With $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, and the summability conditions, we have $\sum_n E[\Theta_n] < \infty$. Since $E\|F(G_n)^{-1}g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., the dominated convergence theorem implies $F(G_n)^{-1}g_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

(b) Weak convergence of G_n : By Theorem 3.3 (part 1c), since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., $G_n \rightarrow G \in Z$ a.s.

(c) Strong convergence with demiregularity: If ∇f is demiregular on Z , Theorem 3.3 (part 1d) and Proposition A.4 imply $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s., as $F(G_n)^{-1}g_n \rightarrow 0$ a.s. and $G_n \rightarrow G$.

Convergence under random z . Assume $E\|F(G_n)^{-1}g_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|F(G_n)^{-1}g_n\|_*^2} < \infty$, and $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$.

(a) Strong convergence of $F(G_n)^{-1}g_n$: By Theorem 3.3 (part ii.a), since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, and $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|F(G_n)^{-1}g_n\|_*^2} < \infty$, Hölder's inequality and the dominated convergence theorem imply $F(G_n)^{-1}g_n \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s.

(b) Weak L^2 convergence: By Theorem 3.3 (part ii.c), since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ and $G_n \rightharpoonup G$ in L^2 and a.s.

(c) Strong L^1 convergence with demiregularity: By Theorem 3.3 (part ii.d), demiregularity of ∇f ensures $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^1 and a.s.

Convergence rate. Assume f is relatively strongly convex with modulus $\sigma > 0$, $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$, and $F(G_n)$ is stable ($\sigma_{\min}(F(G_n)) \geq c > 0$ a.s.). For NatGrad, Proposition B.1 gives a polynomial rate $ED_\phi(G_n, G) = O(1/n)$. For over-relaxed variants, if Z is convex and the contraction condition of Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) holds:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + cY_n(\cdot, z), \quad \chi \in (0, 1),$$

then Theorem 3.2 yields a geometric rate $ED_\phi(G_n, G) = O(\chi^n)$. Under cocoercivity, the rate is similarly geometric (Theorem 4.1, part iii). \square

C.3.11 Proof of Proposition B.5 (Bregman view of (OR) Mirror-Prox)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n, \tilde{G}_{n+1} \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is a separable reflexive Banach space, ϕ is Legendre (proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, and strictly convex), Z is nonempty and closed, and $g_n(y) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. The VI for T seeks $z \in Z$ such that:

$$\langle T(z), x - z \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

Assume T is monotone, i.e., $\langle T(x) - T(y), x - y \rangle \geq 0$, and g_n is an unbiased stochastic approximation of T , i.e., $E[g_n(y) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = T(y)$ a.s., with bounded variance $E[\|g_n(y) - T(y)\|_*^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \xi$.

Well-definedness. Prove by induction that $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. By Assumption A.1, $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$. Assume $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Stochastic Mirror-Prox.

$$\tilde{G}_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(G_n)), \quad G_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})).$$

Since $g_n(G_n), g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, and $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, we have $\eta_n g_n(G_n), \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) \in L^2$. By Hölder's inequality:

$$E\|\eta_n g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \leq \eta_n^2 E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty,$$

and similarly for $g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$. Since $\nabla \phi(G_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and $\nabla \phi$ is a continuous bijection (SA2), we have:

$$\nabla \phi(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), \nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*),$$

so $\tilde{G}_{n+1}, G_{n+1} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

MP-OR Type A:

$$\tilde{G}_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(G_n)), \quad G_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})).$$

Since $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$, $\lambda_n \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) \in L^2$, so:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*), \quad G_{n+1} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X).$$

MP-OR Type B:

$$\tilde{G}_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(G_n)), \quad Y_n = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})), \quad G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n Y_n.$$

Since $Y_n \in L^2$ (as above), and $\lambda_n \in (0, 2)$, $G_{n+1} \in L^2$. By induction, $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Mapping to Algorithm 1. Algorithm 1 requires an update:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*,$$

with an outer-approximation condition:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Stochastic Mirror-Prox: Set $\lambda_n = 1$, $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$. The update:

$$G_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})),$$

matches Algorithm 1. Define the auxiliary term:

$$U_n \eta_n = \eta_n \langle \tilde{G}_{n+1}, g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) \rangle - \eta_n \langle z, g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z),$$

where $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{2} E[\|e_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]}$, $e_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) = g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) - T(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$. Since T is monotone, $\langle T(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) - T(z), \tilde{G}_{n+1} - z \rangle \geq 0$, and:

$$\langle z, E[\eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle = \eta_n \langle z, T(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) \rangle \leq \eta_n \langle \tilde{G}_{n+1}, T(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Set $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$, satisfying the outer-approximation condition.

MP-OR Type A: Set $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$, with relaxation λ_n . The update:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}),$$

matches Algorithm 1. The outer-approximation condition holds with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$.

MP-OR Type B: Set $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$. The KM step:

$$G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n Y_n, \quad Y_n = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})),$$

is equivalent to the dual update via convex combinations, satisfying Algorithm 1.

Super-relaxation and factorization. For over-relaxed variants, $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\} \cup \Phi_n)$. Lemma 3.1 gives:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \cdot E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n],$$

where $\Theta_n = \eta_n^2 \|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2$ (Type B or MP) or $(\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 \|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2$ (Type A). This ensures the descent term is appropriately scaled for convergence analysis. \square

C.3.12 Proof of Theorem 4.6 (Convergence of (OR) Mirror-Prox)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n, \tilde{G}_{n+1} \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5). By Proposition B.5, Stochastic Mirror-Prox (MP) and MP-OR are special cases of Algorithm 1 with $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$ (MP or Type B) or $\lambda_n \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$.

Convergence under deterministic z . Assume $E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (MP or Type B), or $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E\|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (Type A), and $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$.

(a) Strong convergence of $g_n(G_n)$: For MP, Proposition B.5 gives:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \langle g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

For MP-OR, the inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\Theta_n = \eta_n^2 \|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2$ (MP or Type B) or $(\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 \|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s., Theorem 3.3 (part 1a) and Lemma 3.1 imply:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = \sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] E[\Theta_n] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

With $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, and the summability conditions, we have $\sum_n E[\Theta_n] < \infty$. Since $E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s. and $g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$ converges similarly (as $\tilde{G}_{n+1} \rightarrow G$), the dominated convergence theorem implies $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

(b) Weak convergence of G_n : By Theorem 3.3 (part 1c), since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{M}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., $G_n \rightharpoonup G \in Z$ a.s.

(c) Strong convergence with strong monotonicity: If T is strongly monotone with modulus $\mu > 0$, i.e., $\langle T(x) - T(y), x - y \rangle \geq \mu \|x - y\|_X^2$, then $\langle g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) - g_n(G_n), \tilde{G}_{n+1} - G_n \rangle \geq \mu \|\tilde{G}_{n+1} - G_n\|_X^2$. Theorem 3.3 (part i.d) implies strong convergence a.s. to G .

Convergence under random z . Assume $E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2} < \infty$, and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$.

(a) Strong convergence of $g_n(G_n)$: By Theorem 3.3 (part 2a), since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, and $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2} < \infty$, Hölder’s inequality and the dominated convergence theorem imply $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s.

(b) Weak L^2 convergence: By Theorem 3.3 (part ii.c), since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, $G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ and $G_n \rightharpoonup G$ in L^2 and a.s.

(c) Strong L^1 convergence with strong monotonicity: If T is strongly monotone, Theorem 3.3 (part ii.d) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^1 and a.s.

Convergence rates. If T is strongly monotone with modulus $\mu > 0$, and $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$, Proposition B.1 gives a polynomial rate $ED_\phi(G_n, G) = O(1/n)$. For MP-OR, if the contraction condition of Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) holds:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + cY_n(\cdot, z), \quad \chi \in (0, 1),$$

then a geometric rate $ED_\phi(G_n, G) = O(\chi^n)$ applies. \square

C.3.13 Proof of Proposition B.6 (Mirror Descent and Over-relaxed Mirror Descent under Relative Smoothness)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is a separable reflexive Banach space, ϕ is Legendre (proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, and strictly convex), $Z = \arg \min f$ is nonempty and closed, $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f , and $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$. For over-relaxed variants, assume $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$. We need to show that both standard Mirror Descent (Algorithm 4) and its over-relaxed variants (Algorithm 5) are special cases of Algorithm 1, with convergence rates under relative strong convexity.

Well-definedness. Prove by induction that $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Standard Mirror Descent (Algorithm 4): Initialize $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$. Assume $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. The update is:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n,$$

where $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$. Since $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s., by Hölder’s inequality:

$$E\|\eta_n g_n\|_*^2 = E\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2 \leq \|\eta_n\|_{L^\infty}^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty,$$

so $\eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. Since $\nabla\phi(G_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ (by continuity of $\nabla\phi$), we have:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*).$$

As ϕ is Legendre, $\nabla\phi : \text{int dom } \phi \rightarrow X^*$ is a continuous bijection, so:

$$G_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X).$$

By induction, $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Over-relaxed Mirror Descent (Algorithm 5, Type B): The update is:

$$Y_n = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n), \quad G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n Y_n.$$

As above, $Y_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ since $\eta_n g_n \in L^2$. Given $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$, $1 - \lambda_n \in (-1, 1)$, so $G_{n+1} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ as a convex combination of G_n and Y_n , both in L^2 . By induction, $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. (Type A follows similarly by setting $\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n$.)

Mapping to Algorithm 1. The update in Algorithm 1 is:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*,$$

with the outer-approximation condition:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Standard MD: Set $\lambda_n = 1$, $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n$, where $u_n^* = g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and $U_n = \eta_n$. The update becomes:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n,$$

matching Algorithm 4. The relative smoothness condition gives:

$$f(G_{n+1}) \leq f(G_n) + \langle \nabla f(G_n), G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle + LD_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n).$$

Since g_n is a subgradient, $\langle g_n, G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle \leq \langle \nabla f(G_n), G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle$. The MD update minimizes:

$$G_{n+1} = \arg \min_y [D_\phi(y, G_n) + \eta_n \langle g_n, y - G_n \rangle],$$

yielding $\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) - \nabla \phi(G_n) + \eta_n g_n = 0$. Using the Bregman divergence property:

$$D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) = D_\phi(z, G_n) + D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) + \langle \nabla \phi(G_n) - \nabla \phi(G_{n+1}), z - G_{n+1} \rangle,$$

substitute $\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n$:

$$\langle \nabla \phi(G_n) - \nabla \phi(G_{n+1}), z - G_{n+1} \rangle = \eta_n \langle g_n, z - G_{n+1} \rangle.$$

Thus:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) | \mathcal{X}_n] = D_\phi(z, G_n) + E[D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) | \mathcal{X}_n] + \eta_n E[\langle g_n, z - G_{n+1} \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Since g_n is an unbiased subgradient ($E[g_n | \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(G_n)$), and using relative smoothness:

$$E[\langle g_n, G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq E[f(G_{n+1}) - f(G_n) | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq LE[D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) | \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Define $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{2}E[\|e_n\|_X^2 | \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 | \mathcal{X}_n]}$, where $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(G_n)$. Then:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z),$$

satisfying the outer-approximation condition with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$.

Over-relaxed MD (Type B): Set $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n$, $u_n^* = g_n$, and adjust with λ_n . The update is:

$$Y_n = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n), \quad G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n Y_n.$$

This can be rewritten in the dual space to match Algorithm 1 by expressing the convex combination. Using the Bregman projection:

$$D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq (1 - \lambda_n)D_\phi(z, G_n) + \lambda_n D_\phi(z, Y_n) - \lambda_n(1 - \lambda_n)D_\phi(Y_n, G_n).$$

For Y_n , apply the standard MD analysis:

$$D_\phi(z, Y_n) \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Thus:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n E[\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n] + \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) - \lambda_n(1 - \lambda_n)E[D_\phi(Y_n, G_n) | \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Set $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$, and note that $-\lambda_n(1 - \lambda_n)E[D_\phi(Y_n, G_n)] \leq 0$ since $\lambda_n \in (0, 2)$. The outer-approximation condition holds, and λ_n enhances the descent term via $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$ (by Lemma 3.1).

Over-relaxed MD (Type A): Set $U_n u_n^* = \lambda_n \eta_n g_n$. The update is:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n,$$

directly matching Algorithm 1 with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. The analysis follows similarly.

Convergence Rates under Relative Strong Convexity. If f is relatively strongly convex with modulus $\sigma > 0$, i.e., $D_f(z, x) \geq \sigma D_\phi(z, x)$, then for $z \in Z$ (where $\nabla f(z) = 0$):

$$\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle \geq D_f(G_n, z) \geq \sigma D_\phi(G_n, z).$$

For standard MD:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \sigma D_\phi(G_n, z) + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Taking expectations:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq (1 - \eta_n \sigma)ED_\phi(z, G_n) + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

With $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$, $\sum_n \eta_n = \infty$, $\sum_n \eta_n^2 < \infty$, and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Proposition A.2 gives a polynomial rate $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$.

For over-relaxed MD, using Lemma 3.1:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2 | \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z).$$

If $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, and assuming a contraction condition from Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c):

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n, \quad \chi \in (0, 1),$$

where $\psi_n = Y_n(\cdot, 0)$, then:

$$Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq \chi^{n+1}Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_0) + c \sum_{j=0}^n \chi^{n-j} E\psi_j,$$

yielding a geometric rate $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(\chi^n)$ when $\sum_n E\psi_n < \infty$.

Thus, both standard and over-relaxed Mirror Descent are special cases of Algorithm 1, with polynomial rates ($O(1/n)$) under relative strong convexity and geometric rates ($O(\chi^n)$) under the contraction condition of Theorem 3.2. \square

C.3.14 Proof of Theorem 4.7 (Convergence of Mirror Descent under Relative Smoothness)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is a separable reflexive Banach space, ϕ is Legendre (proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, and strictly convex), $Z = \arg \min f$ is nonempty and closed, $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f with $E[g_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(G_n)$, and $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$. For over-relaxed variants (Algorithm 5), assume $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$, and $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$. By Proposition B.6, both standard Mirror Descent (Algorithm 4) and its over-relaxed variants (Algorithm 5) are special cases of Algorithm 1 with $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n$ (standard MD or Type B) or $U_n u_n^* = \lambda_n \eta_n g_n$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (standard MD) or $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (over-relaxed MD), where $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{2} E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]}$, $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(G_n)$.

Convergence under deterministic $z \in Z$. Assume $E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (for Algorithm 4 or Algorithm 5 Type B) or $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (for Algorithm 5 Type A), and $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$.

(a) Strong convergence of $\nabla f(G_n)$: For standard MD, Proposition B.6 gives the Bregman-Fejér inequality:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $E[g_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(G_n)$, we have $E[\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle$. For $z \in Z$, $\nabla f(z) = 0$, and by convexity of f , $\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle \geq D_f(G_n, z) \geq 0$. Since $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s., Theorem 3.1 (part v) implies:

$$\sum_n \eta_n \langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By Hölder’s inequality:

$$\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle \leq \|\nabla f(G_n)\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X.$$

Since (G_n) is Bregman-bounded a.s. (Theorem 3.1, part v.a), $\|G_n - z\|_X$ is bounded a.s., and $E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s. implies $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ a.s. By the dominated convergence theorem for Bochner integrals [Dinculeanu, 2000, Theorem 2.3.5], $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

For over-relaxed MD, Proposition B.6 gives:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\Theta_n = \eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$ (Type B) or $(\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$ (Type A). Since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) = \sum_n \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. (as $\lambda_n \in L^\infty$), and $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, Lemma 3.1 gives:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Thus, Theorem 3.3 (part i.a) implies:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = \sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, and $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (noting $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \approx E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2$ under bounded noise), $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

(b) Weak convergence of G_n : For both standard and over-relaxed MD, since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s. (Assumption A.1), Theorem 3.1 (part v.d) and Theorem 3.3 (part i.c) imply $G_n \rightharpoonup G \in Z$ a.s.

(c) Strong convergence with strong convexity or demiregularity: If f is relatively strongly convex with modulus $\sigma > 0$, i.e., $D_f(z, x) \geq \sigma D_\phi(z, x)$, then for $z \in Z$:

$$\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle \geq D_f(G_n, z) \geq \sigma D_\phi(G_n, z).$$

For standard MD:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \sigma D_\phi(G_n, z) + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Taking expectations:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq (1 - \eta_n \sigma)ED_\phi(z, G_n) + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$, $\sum_n \eta_n = \infty$, $\sum_n \eta_n^2 < \infty$, and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Proposition A.2 gives $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$, and Theorem 3.1 (part v.e) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s.

For over-relaxed MD, the descent term is amplified by $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$, and Theorem 3.3 (part i.d) similarly ensures strong convergence a.s. with rate $O(1/n)$. If ∇f is demiregular on Z (i.e., $x_n \rightharpoonup z$ and $\nabla f(x_n) \rightarrow 0$ imply $x_n \rightarrow z$), then $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ a.s. (part (a)) and $G_n \rightharpoonup G$ (part (b)) imply $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly a.s. by Proposition A.4.

Convergence under random $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$. Assume $E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2} < \infty$, and $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$.

(a) Strong convergence of $\nabla f(G_n)$: For standard MD, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.a) gives L^2 -boundedness of (G_n) , and:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq ED_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle] + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, we have:

$$\sum_n \eta_n E[\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle] < \infty.$$

By Hölder’s inequality:

$$E|\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle| \leq E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X \leq \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2} \sqrt{E\|G_n - z\|_X^2}.$$

Since (G_n) is L^2 -bounded and $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2} < \infty$, $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and a.s. by Lemma A.3.

For over-relaxed MD, Theorem 3.3 (part ii.a) gives:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty,$$

implying $\sum_n E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2] < \infty$ a.s., and thus $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s.

(b) Weak L^2 convergence: Since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.b) and Theorem 3.3 (part ii.c) ensure (G_n) is L^2 -bounded, and if $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightarrow G \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ in L^2 and a.s.

(c) Strong L^1 convergence with strong convexity or demiregularity: If f is relatively strongly convex, the rate analysis from part (i.c) extends to random z , giving $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$ and strong convergence in L^1 and a.s. (Theorem 3.1, part vi.e). If ∇f is demiregular, $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s. (part (a)) and $G_n \rightarrow G$ (part (b)) imply $G_n \rightarrow G$ in L^1 and a.s. by Proposition A.4.

Geometric rates under contraction. If f is relatively strongly convex and the contraction condition of Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) holds:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \chi \in (0, 1),$$

where $\psi_n = Y_n(\cdot, 0)$, then:

$$Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq \chi^{n+1} Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_0) + c \sum_{j=0}^n \chi^{n-j} E\psi_j.$$

Since $\sum_n E\psi_n < \infty$, Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly in L^2 and a.s., with:

$$E\|G_n - G\|_X^2 \leq 4\chi^n Ed_{Z,\phi}^2(G_0) + 4c \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \chi^{n-j-1} E\psi_j + 2c \sum_{j \geq n} E\psi_j,$$

yielding a geometric rate $ED_\phi(G, G_n) = O(\chi^n)$ for both standard and over-relaxed MD, with over-relaxation enhancing the descent via $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$. \square

C.4 Proofs of Section 5(Applications)

C.4.1 Proof of Proposition B.7 (Bregman Perspective on Regularized and Over-Relaxed ERM)

Proof. Assume $Z = \arg \min(f + h) \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is a separable reflexive Banach space, ϕ is Legendre (proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, and strictly convex), Z is nonempty and closed, $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f with $E[g_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(G_n)$, $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, and for over-relaxed variants, $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_n = \sigma(\Phi_n)$. We need to show that all updates (standard, Type A, and Type B) are special cases of Algorithm 1, satisfy the outer-approximation condition of Definition A.3, inherit the Bregman–Fejér descent of Theorem 3.1, and, for over-relaxed variants, admit the expectation factorization of Lemma 3.1.

Well-definedness. Prove by induction that $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Standard Prox-SGD: Initialize $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$. Assume $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. The update is:

$$G_{n+1} \in \arg \min_{y \in X} \{D_\phi(y, G_n) + \eta_n \langle g_n, y - G_n \rangle + \eta_n h(y)\}.$$

The first-order optimality condition gives:

$$0 \in \nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) - \nabla \phi(G_n) + \eta_n g_n + \eta_n \partial h(G_{n+1}),$$

so there exists $\xi_{n+1} \in \partial h(G_{n+1})$ such that:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n (g_n + \xi_{n+1}).$$

Since $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, by Hölder's inequality:

$$E\|\eta_n g_n\|_*^2 = E\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2 \leq \|\eta_n\|_{L^\infty}^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty,$$

so $\eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. Assume h has a Lipschitz-continuous subgradient (e.g., for ℓ_1 or ℓ_∞ norms), ensuring $\xi_{n+1} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ since $G_{n+1} \in L^2$ (to be confirmed). Thus, $\eta_n (g_n + \xi_{n+1}) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. Since $\nabla \phi(G_n) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, we have:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n (g_n + \xi_{n+1}) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*).$$

As ϕ is Legendre, $\nabla \phi : \text{int dom } \phi \rightarrow X^*$ is a continuous bijection, so:

$$G_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n (g_n + \xi_{n+1})) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X).$$

Type A Over-Relaxed: Assume $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. The update is:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n (g_n + \xi_{n+1}),$$

where $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$. By Hölder's inequality:

$$E\|\lambda_n \eta_n (g_n + \xi_{n+1})\|_*^2 \leq 4\|\lambda_n\|_{L^\infty}^2 E\|\eta_n (g_n + \xi_{n+1})\|_*^2 < \infty,$$

so $\lambda_n \eta_n (g_n + \xi_{n+1}) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. Thus:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n (g_n + \xi_{n+1}) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*),$$

and $G_{n+1} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Type B Over-Relaxed: The update is:

$$\tilde{G}_{n+1} \in \arg \min_{y \in X} \{D_\phi(y, G_n) + \eta_n \langle g_n, y - G_n \rangle + \eta_n h(y)\}, \quad G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n \tilde{G}_{n+1}.$$

From the standard Prox-SGD analysis, $\tilde{G}_{n+1} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. Since $\lambda_n \in (0, 2)$, $1 - \lambda_n \in (-1, 1)$, and both $G_n, \tilde{G}_{n+1} \in L^2$, we have $G_{n+1} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. By induction, $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ for all variants.

Mapping to Algorithm 1. The update in Algorithm 1 is:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*,$$

with the outer-approximation condition:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Standard Prox-SGD: Set $\lambda_n = 1$, $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n (g_n + \xi_{n+1})$, where $u_n^* = g_n + \xi_{n+1} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. The update becomes:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n (g_n + \xi_{n+1}),$$

matching Algorithm 1. Define:

$$U_n \eta_n = \eta_n \langle G_n, g_n + \xi_{n+1} \rangle - \eta_n \langle z, g_n + \xi_{n+1} \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z),$$

where $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{2} E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]}$, $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(G_n)$. For $z \in Z$, where $0 \in \nabla f(z) + \partial h(z)$, there exists $\zeta \in \partial h(z)$ such that $\nabla f(z) + \zeta = 0$. Since $f + h$ is convex:

$$\langle \nabla f(G_n) + \xi_{n+1}, G_n - z \rangle \geq (f + h)(G_n) - (f + h)(z) \geq 0.$$

Taking expectations:

$$E[\langle g_n + \xi_{n+1}, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \approx \langle \nabla f(G_n) + \zeta, G_n - z \rangle + E[\langle \xi_{n+1} - \zeta, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Assuming bounded noise, set $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$, satisfying:

$$\langle z, E[\eta_n(g_n + \xi_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[\eta_n \langle G_n, \nabla f(G_n) + \zeta \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z).$$

Type A Over-Relaxed: Set $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n(g_n + \xi_{n+1})$, with λ_n as the relaxation parameter. The update is:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n(g_n + \xi_{n+1}),$$

matching Algorithm 1. The optimality condition is:

$$0 \in \nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) - \nabla \phi(G_n) + \lambda_n \eta_n g_n + \lambda_n \eta_n \partial h(G_{n+1}).$$

The outer-approximation condition holds with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$, as above.

Type B Over-Relaxed: Set $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n(g_n + \tilde{\xi}_{n+1})$, where $\tilde{\xi}_{n+1} \in \partial h(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$. The proximal substep gives:

$$\nabla \phi(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n(g_n + \tilde{\xi}_{n+1}).$$

The update $G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n \tilde{G}_{n+1}$ approximates:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) \approx \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n(g_n + \tilde{\xi}_{n+1}),$$

matching Algorithm 1 via convex combinations. The outer-approximation condition holds with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$.

Bregman–Fejér Property. For all variants, the Bregman-Fejér condition (Definition A.1) requires:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \Psi_n + o_n \quad \text{a.s.},$$

with $\Psi_n, o_n \geq 0$. For standard Prox-SGD, using the Bregman divergence identity:

$$D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) = D_\phi(z, G_n) + D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) + \langle \nabla \phi(G_n) - \nabla \phi(G_{n+1}), z - G_{n+1} \rangle,$$

substitute $\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n(g_n + \xi_{n+1})$:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = D_\phi(z, G_n) + E[D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \eta_n E[\langle g_n + \xi_{n+1}, z - G_{n+1} \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Since G_{n+1} minimizes $D_\phi(y, G_n) + \eta_n \langle g_n, y - G_n \rangle + \eta_n h(y)$:

$$E[\langle g_n + \xi_{n+1}, G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq -E[D_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] / \eta_n.$$

Thus:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle g_n + \xi_{n+1}, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Set $\Psi_n = \eta_n \langle g_n + \xi_{n+1}, G_n - z \rangle$, $o_n = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Since $\langle \nabla f(G_n) + \zeta, G_n - z \rangle \geq 0$ for $z \in Z$, $\Psi_n \geq 0$ a.s.

For over-relaxed variants, the inequality becomes:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z),$$

where $\Theta_n = \eta_n^2 \|g_n + \xi_{n+1}\|_*^2$ (Type A) or $\eta_n^2 \|g_n + \tilde{\xi}_{n+1}\|_*^2$ (Type B), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. The descent term is amplified by $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$. Assuming $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E \|g_n + \xi_{n+1}\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (standard/Type B) or $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E \|g_n + \xi_{n+1}\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (Type A), Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3 ensure convergence.

Factorization for Over-Relaxed Variants. Since λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, Lemma 3.1 applies:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n],$$

enhancing descent via $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$. The summability conditions ensure convergence via Theorem 3.3. \square

C.4.2 Proof of Theorem 5.1 (Convergence of Sparse Bregman-SGD)

Proof. Assume $Z = \arg \min(f + h) \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is a separable reflexive Banach space, ϕ is Legendre (proper, lower semicontinuous, essentially smooth, and strictly convex), Z is nonempty and closed, $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f with $E[g_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(G_n)$, $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, and for over-relaxed variants, $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_n = \sigma(\Phi_n)$. By Proposition B.7, standard Prox-SGD and over-relaxed Prox-SGD (Type A or B) are special cases of Algorithm 1 with $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n(g_n + \xi_{n+1})$ (standard or Type B, with $\xi_{n+1} \in \partial h(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$ for Type B) or $U_n u_n^* = \lambda_n \eta_n(g_n + \xi_{n+1})$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (standard) or $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (over-relaxed), where $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{2} E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]}$, $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(G_n)$.

Convergence under deterministic $z \in Z$. Assume $E\|\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (for standard or Type B) or $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E\|\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (Type A), and $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$.

(a) Strong convergence of $\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n$: For standard Prox-SGD (Proposition B.7), the Bregman-Fejér inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle g_n + \xi_{n+1}, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $E[g_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(G_n)$ and $\xi_{n+1} \approx \zeta_n \in \partial h(G_n)$ (assuming bounded subgradient variation), we have:

$$E[\langle g_n + \xi_{n+1}, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \approx \langle \nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n, G_n - z \rangle.$$

For $z \in Z$, where $0 \in \nabla f(z) + \partial h(z)$, there exists $\zeta \in \partial h(z)$ such that $\nabla f(z) + \zeta = 0$. By convexity of $f + h$:

$$\langle \nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n, G_n - z \rangle \geq (f + h)(G_n) - (f + h)(z) \geq 0.$$

Since $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s., Theorem 3.1 (part v) implies:

$$\sum_n \eta_n \langle \nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n, G_n - z \rangle < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By Hölder’s inequality:

$$\langle \nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n, G_n - z \rangle \leq \|\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X.$$

Since (G_n) is Bregman-bounded a.s. (Theorem 3.1, part v.a), $\|G_n - z\|_X$ is bounded a.s., and $E\|\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s. implies $\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n \rightarrow 0$ a.s. By the dominated convergence theorem [Dinculeanu, 2000, Theorem 2.3.5], $\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

For over-relaxed Prox-SGD (Proposition B.7), the inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\Theta_n = \eta_n^2 \|g_n + \xi_{n+1}\|_*^2$ (Type B) or $(\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 \|g_n + \xi_{n+1}\|_*^2$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) = \sum_n \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. (as $\lambda_n \in L^\infty$), and $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, Lemma 3.1 gives:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Thus, Theorem 3.3 (part i.a) implies:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = \sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n + \xi_{n+1}\|_*^2] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, and $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n + \xi_{n+1}\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (noting $E\|g_n + \xi_{n+1}\|_*^2 \approx E\|\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n\|_*^2$), $\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

(b) Weak convergence of G_n : For both standard and over-relaxed Prox-SGD, since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s. (Assumption A.1), Theorem 3.1 (part v.d) and Theorem 3.3 (part i.c) imply $G_n \rightharpoonup G^* \in Z$ a.s.

(c) Strong convergence with strong convexity: If $f + h$ is relatively strongly convex w.r.t. ϕ with modulus $\sigma > 0$, i.e., $D_{f+h}(z, x) \geq \sigma D_\phi(z, x)$, then for $z \in Z$:

$$\langle \nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n, G_n - z \rangle \geq D_{f+h}(G_n, z) \geq \sigma D_\phi(G_n, z).$$

For standard Prox-SGD:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \sigma D_\phi(G_n, z) + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Taking expectations:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq (1 - \eta_n \sigma)ED_\phi(z, G_n) + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$, $\sum_n \eta_n = \infty$, $\sum_n \eta_n^2 < \infty$, and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Proposition A.2 gives $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$, and Theorem 3.1 (part v.e) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ strongly a.s.

For over-relaxed Prox-SGD, the descent term is amplified by $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$, and Theorem 3.3 (part i.d) ensures strong convergence a.s. with rate $O(1/n)$, potentially with improved constants due to $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$.

Convergence under random $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$. Assume $E\|\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n\|_*^2} < \infty$, and $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$.

(a) Strong convergence of $\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n$: For standard Prox-SGD, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.a) gives L^2 -boundedness of (G_n) , and:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq ED_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle \nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n, G_n - z \rangle] + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$:

$$\sum_n \eta_n E[\langle \nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n, G_n - z \rangle] < \infty.$$

By Hölder’s inequality:

$$E|\langle \nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n, G_n - z \rangle| \leq E\|\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X \leq \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n\|_*^2} \sqrt{E\|G_n - z\|_X^2}.$$

Since (G_n) is L^2 -bounded and $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n\|_*^2} < \infty$, $\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and a.s. by Lemma A.3.

For over-relaxed Prox-SGD, Theorem 3.3 (part ii.a) gives:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty,$$

implying $\sum_n E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n + \xi_{n+1}\|_*^2] < \infty$ a.s., and thus $\nabla f(G_n) + \zeta_n \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s.

(b) Weak L^2 convergence: Since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.b) and Theorem 3.3 (part ii.c) ensure (G_n) is L^2 -bounded, and if $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightarrow G^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ in L^2 and a.s.

(c) Strong L^1 convergence with strong convexity: If $f + h$ is relatively strongly convex, the rate analysis from part (i.c) extends to random z , giving $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$ and strong convergence in L^1 and a.s. (Theorem 3.1, part vi.e; Theorem 3.3, part ii.d).

Geometric rates under contraction. If $f + h$ is relatively strongly convex and the contraction condition of Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) holds:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \chi \in (0, 1),$$

where $\psi_n = Y_n(\cdot, 0)$, then:

$$Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq \chi^{n+1} Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_0) + c \sum_{j=0}^n \chi^{n-j} E\psi_j.$$

Since $\sum_n E\psi_n < \infty$, Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ strongly in L^2 and a.s., with:

$$E\|G_n - G^*\|_X^2 \leq 4\chi^n Ed_{Z,\phi}^2(G_0) + 4c \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \chi^{n-j-1} E\psi_j + 2c \sum_{j \geq n} E\psi_j,$$

yielding a geometric rate $ED_\phi(G^*, G_n) = O(\chi^n)$ for both standard and over-relaxed Prox-SGD, with over-relaxation enhancing the descent via $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$. □

C.4.3 Proof of Proposition B.8 (Cross-Entropy as Relatively Smooth for SMD)

Proof. Assume $Z = \arg \min f \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is a separable reflexive Banach space (here, the probability simplex $X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid x_i \geq 0, \sum_i x_i = 1\}$), $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f with $E[g_n | \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(G_n)$, $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, and for over-relaxed variants, $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_n = \sigma(\Phi_n)$. We need to show that f is relatively smooth w.r.t. ϕ , that all updates (standard, Type A, Type B) are special cases of Algorithm 1, satisfy the outer-approximation condition of Definition A.3, inherit the Bregman–Fejér descent of Theorem 3.1 with rates via Theorem 3.2, and, for over-relaxed variants, admit the expectation factorization of Lemma 3.1.

Relative Smoothness. Verify that $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$ is Legendre on X . It is proper (defined on X), lower semicontinuous (continuous on $\text{int } X$), essentially smooth (gradient $\nabla\phi(x) = (1 + \log x_i)_i$ diverges as $x_i \rightarrow 0^+$), and strictly convex (Hessian $\nabla^2\phi(x) = \text{diag}(1/x_i)$ is positive definite), satisfying SA2. The Bregman divergence is:

$$D_\phi(y, x) = \sum_i y_i \log \frac{y_i}{x_i} - \sum_i (y_i - x_i) = \sum_i y_i \log \frac{y_i}{x_i},$$

the KL divergence. The cross-entropy loss is:

$$f(x) = - \sum_i q_i \log p_i(x), \quad p_i(x) = \frac{\exp(x_i)}{\sum_j \exp(x_j)},$$

where q is the true label distribution. The gradient is $\nabla f(x) = p(x) - q$. To show f is L -smooth relative to ϕ :

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + LD_\phi(y, x).$$

Consider the second-order Taylor expansion of f :

$$f(y) = f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{1}{2}(y - x)^T \nabla^2 f(x)(y - x) + o(\|y - x\|^2).$$

The Hessian is $\nabla^2 f(x) = \text{diag}(p(x)) - p(x)p(x)^T$, positive semi-definite. Since $\nabla^2\phi(x) = \text{diag}(1/x_i)$, we need $\nabla^2 f(x) \preceq L\nabla^2\phi(x)$. The eigenvalues of $\nabla^2 f(x)$ are bounded (maximum eigenvalue ≤ 1 for softmax), and $\nabla^2\phi(x)$ has eigenvalues $1/x_i$. Assuming standard network conditions (e.g., bounded inputs, Lipschitz softmax), there exists $L > 0$ such that:

$$\langle \nabla f(y) - \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle \leq LD_\phi(y, x),$$

derived from the Lipschitz continuity of ∇f relative to D_ϕ on the simplex.

Well-definedness. Prove by induction that $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Standard SMD: Initialize $G_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$. Assume $G_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. The update is:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n.$$

Since $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and $\eta_n \in L^\infty$, by Hölder's inequality:

$$E\|\eta_n g_n\|_*^2 = E\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2 \leq \|\eta_n\|_{L^\infty}^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty,$$

so $\eta_n g_n \in L^2$. Since $\nabla\phi(G_n) \in L^2$, we have:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*).$$

As ϕ is Legendre, $\nabla\phi$ is a continuous bijection, so $G_{n+1} \in L^2$.

Type A Over-Relaxed: The update is:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n.$$

Since $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$, $\lambda_n \eta_n g_n \in L^2$, and $G_{n+1} \in L^2$.

Type B Over-Relaxed: The update is:

$$Y_n = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n), \quad G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n Y_n.$$

Since $Y_n \in L^2$ (as in standard SMD), and $\lambda_n \in (0, 2)$, $G_{n+1} \in L^2$. By induction, $(G_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ for all variants.

Mapping to Algorithm 1. The update in Algorithm 1 is:

$$\nabla\phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*,$$

with the outer-approximation condition:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* | \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n | \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Standard SMD: Set $\lambda_n = 1$, $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n$. The update matches Algorithm 1. Since f is relatively smooth:

$$f(G_{n+1}) \leq f(G_n) + \langle \nabla f(G_n), G_{n+1} - G_n \rangle + LD_\phi(G_{n+1}, G_n).$$

Define $U_n \eta_n = \eta_n \langle G_n - z, g_n \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$, where $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{2} E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]}$, $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(G_n)$. For $z \in Z$, $\nabla f(z) = 0$, so:

$$E[\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle \geq D_f(G_n, z) \geq 0.$$

Thus:

$$\langle z, E[\eta_n g_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[\eta_n \langle G_n, \nabla f(G_n) \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z),$$

satisfying the outer-approximation condition with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$.

Type A Over-Relaxed: Set $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n$, with λ_n as the relaxation parameter. The update is:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n,$$

matching Algorithm 1. The outer-approximation condition holds with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$.

Type B Over-Relaxed: Set $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n$. The update $G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n Y_n$ approximates:

$$\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) \approx \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n,$$

with the outer-approximation condition satisfied using $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$.

Bregman–Fejér Property. For all variants, the Bregman-Fejér condition (Definition A.1) requires:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \Psi_n + o_n \quad \text{a.s.},$$

with $\Psi_n, o_n \geq 0$. For standard SMD:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z),$$

with $\Psi_n = \eta_n \langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle$, $o_n = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Since $\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle \geq 0$, $\Psi_n \geq 0$ a.s. For over-relaxed variants:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z),$$

where $\Theta_n = \eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$, and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Assuming $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s., Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3 ensure convergence, with rates via Theorem 3.2 under strong convexity.

Factorization for Over-Relaxed Variants. Since λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, Lemma 3.1 applies:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n],$$

enhancing descent by $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$ for faster convergence in deep network training. \square

C.4.4 Proof of Theorem 5.2 (Bregman-Accelerated Training for Cross-Entropy Loss)

Proof. Assume $Z = \arg \min f \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is the probability simplex $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid x_i \geq 0, \sum_i x_i = 1\}$, $\phi(x) = \sum_i x_i \log x_i$ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f with $E[g_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(G_n)$, $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, and for over-relaxed variants, $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_n = \sigma(\Phi_n)$. By Proposition B.8, standard SMD and over-relaxed SMD (Type A or Type B) are special cases of Algorithm 1 with $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n$ (standard or Type B) or $U_n u_n^* = \lambda_n \eta_n g_n$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (standard) or $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (over-relaxed), where $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{2} E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]}$, $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(G_n)$.

Convergence under deterministic $z \in Z$. Assume $E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (for standard or Type B) or $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (for Type A), and $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$.

(a) Strong convergence of $\nabla f(G_n)$: For standard SMD (Proposition B.8), the Bregman-Fejér inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $E[g_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(G_n)$, we have $E[\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle$. For $z \in Z$, $\nabla f(z) = 0$, and by convexity of f :

$$\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle \geq D_f(G_n, z) \geq 0.$$

Since $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s., Theorem 3.1 (part v) implies:

$$\sum_n \eta_n \langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By Hölder’s inequality:

$$\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle \leq \|\nabla f(G_n)\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X.$$

Since (G_n) is Bregman-bounded a.s. (Theorem 3.1, part v.a), $\|G_n - z\|_X$ is bounded a.s., and $E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s. implies $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ a.s. By the dominated convergence theorem [Dinculeanu, 2000, Theorem 2.3.5], $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

For over-relaxed SMD (Proposition B.8), the inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\Theta_n = \eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$ (Type B) or $(\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) = \sum_n \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. (as $\lambda_n \in L^\infty$), and $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, Lemma 3.1 gives:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Thus, Theorem 3.3 (part i.a) implies:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = \sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, and $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (noting $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \approx E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2$), $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

(b) Weak convergence of G_n : For both standard and over-relaxed SMD, since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s. (Assumption A.1), Theorem 3.1 (part v.d) and Theorem 3.3 (part i.c) imply $G_n \rightarrow G^* \in Z$ a.s.

(c) Strong convergence with strong convexity: If f is relatively strongly convex w.r.t. ϕ with modulus $\sigma > 0$, i.e., $D_f(z, x) \geq \sigma D_\phi(z, x)$, then for $z \in Z$:

$$\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle \geq D_f(G_n, z) \geq \sigma D_\phi(G_n, z).$$

For standard SMD:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \sigma D_\phi(G_n, z) + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Taking expectations:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq (1 - \eta_n \sigma)ED_\phi(z, G_n) + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$, $\sum_n \eta_n = \infty$, $\sum_n \eta_n^2 < \infty$, and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Proposition A.2 gives $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$, and Theorem 3.1 (part v.e) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ strongly a.s.

For over-relaxed SMD, the descent term is amplified by $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$, and Theorem 3.3 (part i.d) ensures strong convergence a.s. with rate $O(1/n)$, potentially with improved constants due to $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$.

Convergence under random $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$. Assume $E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2} < \infty$, and $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$.

(a) Strong convergence of $\nabla f(G_n)$: For standard SMD, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.a) gives L^2 -boundedness of (G_n) , and:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq ED_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle] + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$:

$$\sum_n \eta_n E[\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle] < \infty.$$

By Hölder’s inequality:

$$E|\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle| \leq E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X \leq \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2} \sqrt{E\|G_n - z\|_X^2}.$$

Since (G_n) is L^2 -bounded and $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2} < \infty$, $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and a.s. by Lemma A.3.

For over-relaxed SMD, Theorem 3.3 (part ii.a) gives:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty,$$

implying $\sum_n E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2] < \infty$ a.s., and thus $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s.

(b) Weak L^2 convergence: Since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.b) and Theorem 3.3 (part ii.c) ensure (G_n) is L^2 -bounded, and if $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightarrow G^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ in L^2 and a.s.

(c) Strong L^1 convergence with strong convexity: If f is relatively strongly convex, the rate analysis from part (i.c) extends to random z , giving $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$ and strong convergence in L^1 and a.s. (Theorem 3.1, part vi.e; Theorem 3.3, part ii.d).

Geometric rates under contraction. If f is relatively strongly convex and the contraction condition of Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) holds:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \chi \in (0, 1),$$

where $\psi_n = Y_n(\cdot, 0)$, then:

$$Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq \chi^{n+1}Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_0) + c \sum_{j=0}^n \chi^{n-j} E\psi_j.$$

Since $\sum_n E\psi_n < \infty$, Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ strongly in L^2 and a.s., with:

$$E\|G_n - G^*\|_X^2 \leq 4\chi^n Ed_{Z,\phi}^2(G_0) + 4c \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \chi^{n-j-1} E\psi_j + 2c \sum_{j \geq n} E\psi_j,$$

yielding a geometric rate $ED_\phi(G^*, G_n) = O(\chi^n)$ for both standard and over-relaxed SMD, with over-relaxation enhancing the descent via $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$. □

C.4.5 Proof of Proposition B.9 (KL-Constrained Policy Update for TRPO/PPO)

Proof. Assume $Z = \arg \min f \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $\pi_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is the probability simplex $\{\pi \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \pi_i \geq 0, \sum_i \pi_i = 1\}$, $\phi(\pi) = \sum_i \pi_i \log \pi_i$ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f with $E[g_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(\pi_n)$, $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, and for over-relaxed variants, $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{\pi_0, \dots, \pi_n\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_n = \sigma(\Phi_n)$. We need to show that all updates (standard, Type A, Type B) are special cases of Algorithm 1, satisfy the outer-approximation condition of Definition A.3, inherit the Bregman–Fejér descent of Theorem 3.1, and, for over-relaxed variants, admit the expectation factorization of Lemma 3.1.

Well-definedness. Prove by induction that $(\pi_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Standard Update: Initialize $\pi_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \text{int dom } \phi)$. Assume $\pi_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$. The update is:

$$\pi_{n+1} \in \arg \min_{\pi} \{D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) + \eta_n \langle g_n, \pi - \pi_n \rangle \mid D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) \leq \delta\}.$$

This is equivalent to:

$$\pi_{n+1} = \arg \min_{\pi} \{D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) + \eta_n \langle g_n, \pi - \pi_n \rangle + I_{\{D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) \leq \delta\}}(\pi)\},$$

where $I_{\{D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) \leq \delta\}}$ is the indicator function. The first-order optimality condition gives:

$$0 \in \nabla \phi(\pi_{n+1}) - \nabla \phi(\pi_n) + \eta_n g_n + \mu_n (\nabla \phi(\pi_{n+1}) - \nabla \phi(\pi_n)),$$

where $\mu_n \geq 0$ is the Lagrange multiplier. Rearranging:

$$\nabla \phi(\pi_{n+1}) = \frac{1}{1 + \mu_n} \nabla \phi(\pi_n) - \frac{\eta_n}{1 + \mu_n} g_n.$$

Since $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$, $\eta_n \in L^\infty$, and $\mu_n \geq 0$, the update term is in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$. As ϕ is Legendre, $\nabla \phi$ is a continuous bijection, so $\pi_{n+1} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$.

Type A Over-Relaxed: The update is:

$$\pi_{n+1} \in \arg \min_{\pi} \{D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) + \lambda_n \eta_n \langle g_n, \pi - \pi_n \rangle \mid D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) \leq \delta\}.$$

The optimality condition is:

$$\nabla \phi(\pi_{n+1}) = \frac{1}{1 + \mu_n} \nabla \phi(\pi_n) - \frac{\lambda_n \eta_n}{1 + \mu_n} g_n.$$

Since $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$, $\lambda_n \eta_n g_n \in L^2$, and $\pi_{n+1} \in L^2$.

Type B Over-Relaxed: The update is:

$$\tilde{\pi}_{n+1} \in \arg \min_{\pi} \{D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) + \eta_n \langle g_n, \pi - \pi_n \rangle \mid D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) \leq \delta\}, \quad \pi_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)\pi_n + \lambda_n \tilde{\pi}_{n+1}.$$

Since $\tilde{\pi}_{n+1} \in L^2$ (as in standard update), and $\lambda_n \in (0, 2)$, $\pi_{n+1} \in L^2$. By induction, $(\pi_n) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X)$ for all variants.

Mapping to Algorithm 1. The update in Algorithm 1 is:

$$\nabla\phi(\pi_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(\pi_n) - \lambda_n U_n u_n^*,$$

with the outer-approximation condition:

$$\langle z, E[U_n u_n^* \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \rangle \leq E[U_n \eta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Standard Update: Set $\lambda_n = 1$, $U_n u_n^* = \frac{\eta_n}{1+\mu_n} g_n$. The update becomes:

$$\nabla\phi(\pi_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(\pi_n) - \frac{\eta_n}{1+\mu_n} g_n,$$

matching Algorithm 1. Define:

$$U_n \eta_n = \frac{\eta_n}{1+\mu_n} \langle \pi_n - z, g_n \rangle + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z),$$

where $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{2} E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|\pi_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]}$, $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(\pi_n)$. For $z \in Z$, $\nabla f(z) = 0$, so:

$$E[\langle g_n, \pi_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \langle \nabla f(\pi_n), \pi_n - z \rangle \geq D_f(\pi_n, z) \geq 0.$$

Thus:

$$\langle z, E\left[\frac{\eta_n}{1+\mu_n} g_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n\right] \rangle \leq E\left[\frac{\eta_n}{1+\mu_n} \langle \pi_n, \nabla f(\pi_n) \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n\right] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z),$$

satisfying the outer-approximation condition with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$.

Type A Over-Relaxed: Set $U_n u_n^* = \frac{\eta_n}{1+\mu_n} g_n$, with λ_n as the relaxation parameter. The update is:

$$\nabla\phi(\pi_{n+1}) = \nabla\phi(\pi_n) - \lambda_n \frac{\eta_n}{1+\mu_n} g_n,$$

with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$.

Type B Over-Relaxed: Set $U_n u_n^* = \frac{\eta_n}{1+\mu_n} g_n$. The update $\pi_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)\pi_n + \lambda_n \tilde{\pi}_{n+1}$ approximates:

$$\nabla\phi(\pi_{n+1}) \approx \nabla\phi(\pi_n) - \lambda_n \frac{\eta_n}{1+\mu_n} g_n,$$

with $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$.

Bregman–Fejér Property. For all variants, the Bregman-Fejér condition (Definition A.1) requires:

$$E[D_\phi(z, \pi_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, \pi_n) - \Psi_n + o_n \quad \text{a.s.},$$

with $\Psi_n, o_n \geq 0$. For standard update:

$$E[D_\phi(z, \pi_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, \pi_n) - \frac{\eta_n}{1+\mu_n} E[\langle g_n, \pi_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z),$$

with $\Psi_n = \frac{\eta_n}{1+\mu_n} \langle g_n, \pi_n - z \rangle$, $o_n = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. For over-relaxed variants:

$$E[D_\phi(z, \pi_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, \pi_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z),$$

where $\Theta_n = \left(\frac{\eta_n}{1+\mu_n}\right)^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$, and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Assuming $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s., Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3 ensure convergence.

Factorization for Over-Relaxed Variants. Since λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, Lemma 3.1 applies:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n],$$

enhancing descent via $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$.

□

C.4.6 Proof of Theorem 5.3 (Mirror-Prox for Actor–Critic)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is a separable reflexive Banach space, ϕ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, $g_n(\cdot) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic oracle for ∇f , with $E[g_n(y) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(y)$ a.s., $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, and for over-relaxed variants, $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_n = \sigma(\Phi_n)$. By Proposition B.5, standard Mirror-Prox and over-relaxed Mirror-Prox (Type A or Type B) are special cases of Algorithm 1 with $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$ (standard or Type B) or $U_n u_n^* = \lambda_n \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (standard) or $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (over-relaxed), where $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{2} E[\|e_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]}$, $e_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) = g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) - \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$.

Convergence under deterministic $z \in Z$. Assume $E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (for standard or Type B) or $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (for Type A), and $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$.

(a) Strong convergence of $g_n(G_n)$: For standard Mirror-Prox (Proposition B.5), the Bregman-Fejér inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $E[g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$, we have $E[\langle g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle$. For $z \in Z$, $\nabla f(z) = 0$, and by monotonicity:

$$\langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle \geq \langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) - \nabla f(z), G_n - z \rangle \geq 0.$$

Since $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s., Theorem 3.1 (part v) implies:

$$\sum_n \eta_n \langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By Hölder’s inequality:

$$\langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle \leq \|\nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X.$$

Since (G_n) is Bregman-bounded a.s. (Theorem 3.1, part v.a), $\|G_n - z\|_X$ is bounded a.s., and $E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s. implies $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ a.s. By the dominated convergence theorem [Dinculeanu, 2000, Theorem 2.3.5], $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

For over-relaxed Mirror-Prox (Proposition B.5), the inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\Theta_n = \eta_n^2 \|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2$ (Type B) or $(\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 \|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) = \sum_n \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. (as $\lambda_n \in L^\infty$), and $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, Lemma 3.1 gives:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Thus, Theorem 3.3 (part i.a) implies:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = \sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, and $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (noting $E\|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2 \approx E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2$ under bounded variation), $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

(b) Weak convergence of G_n : For both standard and over-relaxed Mirror-Prox, since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s. (Assumption A.1), Theorem 3.1 (part v.d) and Theorem 3.3 (part i.c) imply $G_n \rightarrow G^* \in Z$ a.s.

(c) Strong convergence with strong monotonicity: If f is strongly monotone with modulus $\mu > 0$, i.e., $\langle \nabla f(G) - \nabla f(G'), G - G' \rangle \geq \mu \|G - G'\|_X^2$, then for $z \in Z$:

$$\langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle \geq \langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) - \nabla f(z), G_n - z \rangle \geq \mu \|G_n - z\|_X^2.$$

For standard Mirror-Prox:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \mu \|G_n - z\|_X^2 + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Taking expectations:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq ED_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \mu E\|G_n - z\|_X^2 + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$, $\sum_n \eta_n = \infty$, $\sum_n \eta_n^2 < \infty$, and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Proposition A.2 gives $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$, and Theorem 3.1 (part v.e) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ strongly a.s.

For over-relaxed Mirror-Prox, the descent term is amplified by $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$, and Theorem 3.3 (part i.d) ensures strong convergence a.s. with rate $O(1/n)$, potentially with improved constants due to $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$.

Convergence under random $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$. Assume $E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2} < \infty$, and $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$.

(a) Strong convergence of $g_n(G_n)$: For standard Mirror-Prox, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.a) gives L^2 -boundedness of (G_n) , and:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq ED_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle] + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$:

$$\sum_n \eta_n E[\langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle] < \infty.$$

By Hölder's inequality:

$$E|\langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle| \leq E\|\nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X \leq \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2} \sqrt{E\|G_n - z\|_X^2}.$$

Since (G_n) is L^2 -bounded and $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2} < \infty$, $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and a.s. by Lemma A.3.

For over-relaxed Mirror-Prox, Theorem 3.3 (part ii.a) gives:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty,$$

implying $\sum_n E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2] < \infty$ a.s., and thus $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s.

(b) Weak L^2 convergence: Since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.b) and Theorem 3.3 (part ii.c) ensure (G_n) is L^2 -bounded, and if $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightarrow G^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ in L^2 and a.s.

(c) Strong L^1 convergence with strong monotonicity: If f is strongly monotone, the rate analysis from part (i.c) extends to random z , giving $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$ and strong convergence in L^1 and a.s. (Theorem 3.1, part vi.e; Theorem 3.3, part ii.d).

Geometric rates under contraction. If f is strongly monotone and the contraction condition of Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) holds:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \chi \in (0, 1),$$

where $\psi_n = Y_n(\cdot, 0)$, then:

$$Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq \chi^{n+1} Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_0) + c \sum_{j=0}^n \chi^{n-j} E\psi_j.$$

Since $\sum_n E\psi_n < \infty$, Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ strongly in L^2 and a.s., with:

$$E\|G_n - G^*\|_X^2 \leq 4\chi^n Ed_{Z,\phi}^2(G_0) + 4c \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \chi^{n-j-1} E\psi_j + 2c \sum_{j \geq n} E\psi_j,$$

yielding a geometric rate $ED_\phi(G^*, G_n) = O(\chi^n)$ for both standard and over-relaxed Mirror-Prox, with over-relaxation enhancing the descent via $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$.

□

C.4.7 Proof of Theorem 5.4 (Convergence of SMD, AdaGrad, and RMSProp in LLMs)

Proof. Assume $Z = \arg \min f \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is the probability simplex $\{p \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid p_i \geq 0, \sum_i p_i = 1\}$, $\phi(p) = \sum_i p_i \log p_i$ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, $g_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f with $E[g_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(G_n)$, $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, and for over-relaxed variants, $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_n = \sigma(\Phi_n)$. The updates are:

- *Standard SMD:* $\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n$,
- *Over-Relaxed SMD Type A:* $\nabla \phi(G_{n+1}) = \nabla \phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n$,
- *Over-Relaxed SMD Type B:* $Y_n = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n)$, $G_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n Y_n$,

- *AdaGrad*: $\eta_n = \eta/\sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$, $v_n = \sum_{k \leq n} \|g_k\|_*^2$,
- *RMSProp*: $\eta_n = \eta/\sqrt{v_n + \epsilon}$, $v_n = \rho v_{n-1} + (1 - \rho)\|g_n\|_*^2$,

with over-relaxed AdaGrad/RMSProp using λ_n . By Proposition B.10, all updates are special cases of Algorithm 1 with $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n$ (standard or Type B) or $U_n u_n^* = \lambda_n \eta_n g_n$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (standard) or $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (over-relaxed), where $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{2}E[\|e_n\|_X^2 | \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n\|_X^2 | \mathcal{X}_n]}$, $e_n = g_n - \nabla f(G_n)$.

Convergence under deterministic $z \in Z$. Assume $E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (for standard SMD, AdaGrad, RMSProp, or Type B) or $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (for Type A), and $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$.

(a) Strong convergence of $\nabla f(G_n)$: For standard SMD, AdaGrad, or RMSProp (Proposition B.10), the Bregman-Fejér inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $E[g_n | \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(G_n)$, we have $E[\langle g_n, G_n - z \rangle | \mathcal{X}_n] = \langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle$. For $z \in Z$, $\nabla f(z) = 0$, and by convexity of f :

$$\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle \geq D_f(G_n, z) \geq 0.$$

Since $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s., Theorem 3.1 (part v) implies:

$$\sum_n \eta_n \langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By Hölder's inequality:

$$\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle \leq \|\nabla f(G_n)\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X.$$

Since (G_n) is Bregman-bounded a.s. (Theorem 3.1, part v.a), $\|G_n - z\|_X$ is bounded a.s., and $E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s. implies $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ a.s. By the dominated convergence theorem [Dinculeanu, 2000, Theorem 2.3.5], $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

For over-relaxed variants, the inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n | \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\Theta_n = \eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$ (Type B) or $(\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 \|g_n\|_*^2$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) = \sum_n \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. (as $\lambda_n \in L^\infty$), and $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, Lemma 3.1 gives:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n | \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\Theta_n | \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Thus, Theorem 3.3 (part i.a) implies:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = \sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, and $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (noting $E\|g_n\|_*^2 \approx E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2$), $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

(b) Weak convergence of G_n : For all variants, since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s. (Assumption A.1), Theorem 3.1 (part v.d) and Theorem 3.3 (part i.c) imply $G_n \rightarrow G^* \in Z$ a.s.

(c) Strong convergence with demiregularity or strong convexity: If ∇f is demiregular on Z (i.e., $x_n \rightarrow z \in Z$ and $\nabla f(x_n) \rightarrow 0$ imply $x_n \rightarrow z$), then $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ a.s. (part (a)) and $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ (part (b)) imply $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ strongly a.s. by Proposition A.4. If f is relatively strongly convex w.r.t. ϕ with modulus $\sigma > 0$, i.e., $D_f(z, x) \geq \sigma D_\phi(z, x)$, then for $z \in Z$:

$$\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle \geq D_f(G_n, z) \geq \sigma D_\phi(G_n, z).$$

For standard variants:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) | \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \sigma D_\phi(G_n, z) + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Taking expectations:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq (1 - \eta_n \sigma)ED_\phi(z, G_n) + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$, $\sum_n \eta_n = \infty$, $\sum_n \eta_n^2 < \infty$, and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Proposition A.2 gives $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$, and Theorem 3.1 (part v.e) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ strongly a.s. For over-relaxed variants, the descent term is amplified by $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$, and Theorem 3.3 (part i.d) ensures strong convergence a.s. with rate $O(1/n)$, potentially with improved constants.

Convergence under random $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$. Assume $E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2} < \infty$, and $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$.

(a) Strong convergence of $\nabla f(G_n)$: For standard variants, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.a) gives L^2 -boundedness of (G_n) , and:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq ED_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle] + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$:

$$\sum_n \eta_n E[\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle] < \infty.$$

By Hölder’s inequality:

$$E|\langle \nabla f(G_n), G_n - z \rangle| \leq E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X \leq \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2} \sqrt{E\|G_n - z\|_X^2}.$$

Since (G_n) is L^2 -bounded and $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(G_n)\|_*^2} < \infty$, $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and a.s. by Lemma A.3.

For over-relaxed variants, Theorem 3.3 (part ii.a) gives:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty,$$

implying $\sum_n E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n\|_*^2] < \infty$ a.s., and thus $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s.

(b) Weak L^2 convergence: Since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.b) and Theorem 3.3 (part ii.c) ensure (G_n) is L^2 -bounded, and if $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightarrow G^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ in L^2 and a.s.

(c) Strong L^1 convergence with demiregularity or strong convexity: If ∇f is demiregular, $\nabla f(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s. (part (a)) and $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ (part (b)) imply $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ in L^1 and a.s. by Proposition A.4. If f is relatively strongly convex, the rate analysis from part (i.c) extends to random z , giving $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$ and strong convergence in L^1 and a.s. (Theorem 3.1, part vi.e; Theorem 3.3, part ii.d).

Geometric rates under contraction. If f is relatively strongly convex and the contraction condition of Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) holds:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \chi \in (0, 1),$$

where $\psi_n = Y_n(\cdot, 0)$, then:

$$Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq \chi^{n+1} Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_0) + c \sum_{j=0}^n \chi^{n-j} E\psi_j.$$

Since $\sum_n E\psi_n < \infty$, Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ strongly in L^2 and a.s., with:

$$E\|G_n - G^*\|_X^2 \leq 4\chi^n Ed_{Z,\phi}^2(G_0) + 4c \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \chi^{n-j-1} E\psi_j + 2c \sum_{j \geq n} E\psi_j,$$

yielding a geometric rate $ED_\phi(G^*, G_n) = O(\chi^n)$ for all variants, with over-relaxed variants improving the rate via $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$. □

C.4.8 Proof of Theorem 5.5 (Mirror-Prox for KL-Regularized RLHF/Policy Learning)

Proof. Assume $Z \subset \text{int dom } \phi$, $G_n \in \text{int dom } \phi$ a.s., and use Assumption A.1 (SA1–SA5): X is the probability simplex $\{\pi \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \pi_i \geq 0, \sum_i \pi_i = 1\}$, $\phi(\pi) = \sum_i \pi_i \log \pi_i$ is Legendre, Z is nonempty and closed, $g_n(\cdot) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ is a stochastic subgradient of f with $E[g_n(y) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(y)$ a.s., $\eta_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, +\infty))$, and for over-relaxed variants, $\lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; (0, 2))$ is independent of $\sigma(\{g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\} \cup \Phi_n)$, where $\Phi_n = \{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_n = \sigma(\Phi_n)$. The updates are:

- *Standard Mirror-Prox:*

$$\tilde{G}_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(G_n)), \quad G_{n+1} = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}(\nabla \phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})),$$

- *Over-Relaxed Type A:*

$$\tilde{G}_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(G_n)), \quad G_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}\left(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \lambda_n \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\right),$$

- *Over-Relaxed Type B:*

$$\tilde{G}_{n+1} = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(G_n)), \quad Y_n = (\nabla\phi)^{-1}\left(\nabla\phi(G_n) - \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\right), \quad G_{n+1} = (1-\lambda_n)G_n + \lambda_n Y_n.$$

By Proposition B.5, all updates are special cases of Algorithm 1 with $U_n u_n^* = \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$ (standard or Type B) or $U_n u_n^* = \lambda_n \eta_n g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (standard) or $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$ (over-relaxed), where $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \frac{1}{2}E[\|e_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \|G_n - z\|_X \sqrt{E[\|e_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_X^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n]}$, $e_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) = g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) - \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$.

Convergence under deterministic $z \in Z$. Assume $E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s., $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (for standard or Type B) or $\sum_n (\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s. (for Type A), and $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. for all $z \in Z$.

(a) Strong convergence of $g_n(G_n)$: For standard Mirror-Prox, the Bregman-Fejér inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $E[g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1})$, we have $E[\langle g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = \langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle$. For $z \in Z$, $\nabla f(z) = 0$, and by monotonicity of f :

$$\langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle \geq \langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) - \nabla f(z), G_n - z \rangle \geq 0.$$

Since $\sum_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s., Theorem 3.1 (part v) implies:

$$\sum_n \eta_n \langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By Hölder's inequality:

$$\langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle \leq \|\nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X.$$

Since (G_n) is Bregman-bounded a.s. (Theorem 3.1, part v.a), $\|G_n - z\|_X$ is bounded a.s., and $E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$ a.s. implies $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ a.s. (noting $E\|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2 \approx E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2$). By the dominated convergence theorem [Dinculeanu, 2000, Theorem 2.3.5], $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

For over-relaxed Mirror-Prox, the inequality is:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] + Y_n(\cdot, z) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\Theta_n = \eta_n^2 \|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2$ (Type B) or $(\lambda_n \eta_n)^2 \|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2$ (Type A), and $Y_n(\cdot, z) = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z)$. Since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) = \sum_n \lambda_n \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. (as $\lambda_n \in L^\infty$), and $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] > 0$, Lemma 3.1 gives:

$$E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n] = E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\Theta_n \mid \mathcal{X}_n].$$

Thus, Theorem 3.3 (part i.a) implies:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] = \sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)]E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\inf_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)] \geq \epsilon > 0$, and $\sum_n \eta_n^2 E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 < \infty$ a.s., $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ strongly a.s. in X^* .

(b) Weak convergence of G_n : For all variants, since $\sum_n Y_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s. (Assumption A.1), Theorem 3.1 (part v.d) and Theorem 3.3 (part i.c) imply $G_n \rightarrow G^* \in Z$ a.s.

(c) Strong convergence with monotonicity and demiregularity or strong monotonicity: If f is monotone and ∇f is demiregular on Z (i.e., $x_n \rightarrow z \in Z$ and $\nabla f(x_n) \rightarrow 0$ imply $x_n \rightarrow z$), then $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ a.s. (part (a)) and $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ (part (b)) imply $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ strongly a.s. by Proposition A.4. If f is relatively strongly monotone with modulus $\mu > 0$, i.e., $\langle \nabla f(G) - \nabla f(G'), G - G' \rangle \geq \mu \|G - G'\|_X^2$, then for $z \in Z$:

$$\langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle \geq \langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}) - \nabla f(z), G_n - z \rangle \geq \mu \|G_n - z\|_X^2.$$

For standard Mirror-Prox:

$$E[D_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq D_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \mu \|G_n - z\|_X^2 + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Taking expectations:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq ED_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n \mu E\|G_n - z\|_X^2 + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\eta_n \asymp 1/n$, $\sum_n \eta_n = \infty$, $\sum_n \eta_n^2 < \infty$, and $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Proposition A.2 gives $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$, and Theorem 3.1 (part v.e) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ strongly a.s. For over-relaxed variants, the descent term is amplified by $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$, and Theorem 3.3 (part i.d) ensures strong convergence a.s. with rate $O(1/n)$, potentially with improved constants.

Convergence under random $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$. Assume $E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2} < \infty$, and $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$ for all $z \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{X}_0, P; Z)$.

(a) Strong convergence of $g_n(G_n)$: For standard Mirror-Prox, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.a) gives L^2 -boundedness of (G_n) , and:

$$ED_\phi(z, G_{n+1}) \leq ED_\phi(z, G_n) - \eta_n E[\langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle] + E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z).$$

Since $\sum_n E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$:

$$\sum_n \eta_n E[\langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle] < \infty.$$

By Hölder’s inequality:

$$E|\langle \nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1}), G_n - z \rangle| \leq E\|\nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_* \|G_n - z\|_X \leq \sqrt{E\|\nabla f(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2} \sqrt{E\|G_n - z\|_X^2}.$$

Since (G_n) is L^2 -bounded and $\sum_n \eta_n \sqrt{E\|g_n(G_n)\|_*^2} < \infty$, $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; X^*)$ and a.s. by Lemma A.3.

For over-relaxed Mirror-Prox, Theorem 3.3 (part ii.a) gives:

$$\sum_n E[\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\Theta_n] < \infty,$$

implying $\sum_n E[\eta_n^2 \|g_n(\tilde{G}_{n+1})\|_*^2] < \infty$ a.s., and thus $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s.

(b) Weak L^2 convergence: Since $\sum_n EY_n(\cdot, z) < \infty$, Theorem 3.1 (part vi.b) and Theorem 3.3 (part ii.c) ensure (G_n) is L^2 -bounded, and if $\mathfrak{W}(G_n) \subset Z$ a.s., then $G_n \rightarrow G^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$ in L^2 and a.s.

(c) Strong L^1 convergence with monotonicity and demiregularity or strong monotonicity: If f is monotone and ∇f is demiregular, $g_n(G_n) \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 and a.s. (part (a)) and $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ (part (b)) imply $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ in L^1 and a.s. by Proposition A.4. If f is relatively strongly monotone, the rate analysis from part (i.c) extends to random z , giving $ED_\phi(z, G_n) = O(1/n)$ and strong convergence in L^1 and a.s. (Theorem 3.1, part vi.e; Theorem 3.3, part ii.d).

Geometric rates under contraction. If f is relatively strongly monotone and the contraction condition of Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) holds:

$$E[d_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{X}_n] \leq \chi d_{Z,\phi}(G_n) + c\psi_n \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \chi \in (0, 1),$$

where $\psi_n = Y_n(\cdot, 0)$, then:

$$Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_{n+1}) \leq \chi^{n+1} Ed_{Z,\phi}(G_0) + c \sum_{j=0}^n \chi^{n-j} E\psi_j.$$

Since $\sum_n E\psi_n < \infty$, Theorem 3.2 (part iv.c) ensures $G_n \rightarrow G^*$ strongly in L^2 and a.s., with:

$$E\|G_n - G^*\|_X^2 \leq 4\chi^n Ed_{Z,\phi}^2(G_0) + 4c \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \chi^{n-j-1} E\psi_j + 2c \sum_{j \geq n} E\psi_j,$$

yielding a geometric rate $ED_\phi(G^*, G_n) = O(\chi^n)$ for all variants, with over-relaxed variants improving the rate via $\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)$.

Equivalence to TRPO/PPO. The KL-regularized objective $f(\pi) = J(\pi) + \alpha D_\phi(\pi, \pi_{\text{ref}})$ mirrors the KL-constrained perspective of TRPO/PPO (Proposition B.9). The Mirror-Prox update approximates:

$$\pi_{n+1} \approx \arg \min_{\pi} \{D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) + \eta_n \langle \nabla J(\pi_n), \pi - \pi_n \rangle + \alpha \nabla_{\pi} D_\phi(\pi_n, \pi_{\text{ref}}), \pi - \pi_n\},$$

equivalent to the constrained problem:

$$\pi_{n+1} = \arg \min_{\pi} \{D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) + \eta_n \langle \nabla f(\pi_n), \pi - \pi_n \rangle \mid D_\phi(\pi, \pi_n) \leq \delta\}.$$

For over-relaxed variants, the descent term is scaled by λ_n (Type A) or applied via a Krasnosel’skiĭ–Mann step (Type B), aligning with Proposition B.9. The Bregman toolchain (Theorems 3.1 and 3.3 and Proposition B.5) ensures consistency, relying on established results. □

D Additional Experimental Details

D.1 Adaptive Methods: AdaGrad and RMSProp

Task. Text classification on 20 Newsgroups.

Baselines. AdaGrad / RMSProp vs. their over-relaxed (OR) variants with $\lambda \in \{1.3, 1.6, 1.8\}$.

Metrics. Training cross-entropy (CE), validation accuracy, Bregman distance D_ϕ , and training loss variance.

Results. Figure 3 summarizes both optimizers. For AdaGrad, OR variants (especially $\lambda = 1.6, 1.8$) yield faster early descent in CE (a), higher validation accuracy (b), and substantially reduced training variance (c). The Bregman proxy (d) decreases more quickly, confirming stronger contraction. For RMSProp, similar improvements are observed: faster CE decrease (e), higher validation accuracy (f), and reduced variance (g), with $\lambda = 1.6$ giving the best trade-off between speed and stability. In both cases, OR consistently accelerates convergence and stabilizes updates, validating the guarantees of Theorem 4.4.




Figure 3: OR-AdaGrad (top row) and OR-RMSProp (bottom row) on 20 Newsgroups. OR variants accelerate CE descent, improve validation accuracy, reduce variance, and lower D_ϕ faster. Curves show mean \pm std over seeds.

Takeaway. Over-relaxations ($\lambda \in (1, 2)$) consistently improve AdaGrad and RMSProp: faster early convergence, higher accuracy, and lower variance, in agreement with the Bregman–Fejér theory.

D.2 Natural Gradient Descent (NatGrad)

Task. Softmax regression on MNIST.

Baselines. Standard NatGrad ($\lambda = 1.0$) vs. over-relaxed NatGrad (OR-NatGrad, $\lambda \in \{1.3, 1.6, 1.8\}$).

Metrics. Training and validation negative log-likelihood (NLL), validation accuracy, Bregman distance proxy D_ϕ , and natural gradient norm $\|F^{-1}g\|$.

Results. OR-NatGrad consistently outperforms the baseline. Training and validation NLL decrease faster, validation accuracy improves by 5–10 percentage points, and $\|F^{-1}g\|$ decays more rapidly. Among tested settings, $\lambda = 1.6$ achieves the best trade-off between convergence speed and stability. These outcomes confirm the theoretical guarantees of over-relaxation in NatGrad.




Figure 4: NatGrad vs. OR-NatGrad on MNIST. Top: training and validation NLL. Bottom left: validation accuracy. Bottom right: natural gradient norm $\|F^{-1}g\|$. Curves show mean \pm std over 5 seeds. OR-NatGrad accelerates convergence and improves generalization.

D.3 Mirror-Prox and Variational Inequalities

Task. Synthetic bilinear saddle-point problem $\min_x \max_y x^\top Ay + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x\|^2 - \frac{\mu}{2}\|y\|^2$.

Baselines. Standard Mirror-Prox ($\lambda = 1.0$) vs. over-relaxed Mirror-Prox (OR-MP, $\lambda \in \{1.3, 1.6, 1.8\}$).

Metrics. Primal–dual gap and squared step norm $\|z_{n+1} - z_n\|^2$.

Results. OR-MP significantly accelerates convergence: the primal–dual gap decreases faster and $\|z_{n+1} - z_n\|^2$ decays more rapidly. Among tested settings, $\lambda = 1.6$ achieves the best trade-off between speed and stability, confirming the theoretical advantage of over-relaxation for variational inequality problems.




Figure 5: MP vs. OR-MP on a bilinear saddle-point problem. Left: primal–dual gap. Right: squared step norm $\|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2$. Curves show mean \pm std over 5 seeds. OR-MP accelerates convergence and improves stability.

D.4 Relative Smoothness and Strong Convexity

Task. Multi-class logistic regression with ℓ_2 regularization.

Baselines. Standard SMD ($\lambda = 1.0$) vs. over-relaxed SMD (OR-SMD, $\lambda \in \{1.3, 1.6, 1.8\}$).

Metrics. Expected Bregman distance $E[D_\phi]$.

Results. OR-SMD consistently accelerates convergence. In the stochastic setting (A), the decay of $E[D_\phi]$ transitions from polynomial to near-geometric, with $\lambda = 1.6$ offering the best trade-off. In the full-batch setting (B), OR-SMD achieves almost geometric convergence under relative smoothness and strong convexity, cutting iterations to reach a given accuracy by about half compared to the baseline.




Figure 6: Relative smoothness and strong convexity experiments. Left: stochastic (A). Right: full-batch (B). OR-SMD accelerates $E[D_\phi]$ decay from polynomial to geometric rates.

D.5 Machine Learning (Sparse Learning)

Task. California housing regression with ℓ_1 regularization. We compare Prox-SGD ($\lambda=1.0$) against over-relaxed Prox-SGD ($\lambda \in \{1.3, 1.6, 1.8\}$).

Metrics. (i) Bregman distance D_ϕ proxy (log-scale), (ii) objective $f + h$, (iii) sparsity ratio $\|w\|_0/\|w\|_1$, and (iv) validation error (1/MSE; \uparrow is better). All results are mean \pm std over 5 seeds.

Results. Over-relaxed variants converge faster and yield higher sparsity. In particular, $\lambda = 1.8$ reduces D_ϕ more quickly, achieves a lower objective, produces sparser models, and improves validation performance.




Figure 7: Sparse learning on California housing regression. Top: D_ϕ proxy (log-scale) and objective $f + h$. Bottom: sparsity ratio and validation error ($1/\text{MSE}$). Mean \pm std over 5 seeds.

Takeaway. Over-relaxation ($\lambda \in (1, 2)$) consistently accelerates convergence and enhances sparsity, while also improving generalization on validation data.

D.6 Deep Learning: CIFAR-10 Classification

Task. Image classification on CIFAR-10 with ResNet-18.

Baselines. SGD and AdaGrad vs. their over-relaxed variants (OR-SGD, OR-AdaGrad).

Metrics. Training/validation cross-entropy, validation accuracy, variance across seeds, and explosion rate.

Results. Over-relaxation consistently improves early convergence and stability. For AdaGrad, $\lambda = 1.3$ achieves higher validation accuracy and zero explosion rate across seeds. For SGD, $\lambda = 1.3$ balances fast convergence and stable training, yielding improved accuracy with reduced variance.




Figure 9: Extended CIFAR-10 results with AdaGrad/SGD and their OR variants. Curves show mean \pm std over 5 seeds.




Figure 8: Validation accuracy on CIFAR-10 with ResNet-18. Left: AdaGrad vs. OR-AdaGrad. Right: SGD vs. OR-SGD. Curves show mean \pm std over 5 seeds. OR methods accelerate convergence and improve accuracy.

D.7 Reinforcement Learning

Task. Policy gradient with entropy regularization on CartPole-v1.

Baselines. Standard PG and Mirror-Prox (MP) vs. their over-relaxed (OR) variants with $\lambda \in \{1.3, 1.6, 1.8\}$.

Metrics. Average return, return variance, and policy KL divergence.

Results. OR variants alter the trade-off between efficiency and stability. Moderate relaxation ($\lambda = 1.3, 1.6$) accelerates KL decrease but can trigger instability, leading to spikes in variance and return. In contrast, $\lambda = 1.8$ achieves the best stability: average return remains close to baseline while variance is reduced and KL contracts more rapidly. These results confirm that OR can improve sample efficiency, but stability requires sufficiently strong relaxation.




Figure 10: Policy gradient (PG) and Mirror-Prox (MP) with OR. Top: PG returns and variances. Bottom: PG and MP policy KL (mean \pm std, 5 seeds). OR- $\lambda = 1.8$ provides the best stability while maintaining efficient KL reduction.