

From Mixing to Tearing: Graph Decomposition in Decentralized Optimization via Message Passing

Kuangyu Ding · Gesualdo Scutari

Abstract We study the minimization of sums of smooth strongly convex functions over undirected graphs, with each function held by one agent and communication restricted to neighbors in the graph. Existing decentralized methods, whether based on gossip or on routing over spanning trees, typically use the network to mix or aggregate information to enable *prescribed* local optimization updates. What this communication-centered viewpoint lacks is a general framework that uses graph structure to *jointly* design the optimization subproblems and the cooperative computation and communication through which agents solve them cooperatively. We develop such a framework from first principles, jointly designing the linear representation of agreement constraints, the blocks of the resulting dual variables (jointly optimized), and connected cluster of agents that cooperatively solve each block subproblem over the assigned subgraph. GATE (Graph-Tearing message passing) is a first instance of this framework: one variable per edge and tree blocks. At each iteration, agents update their assigned edge variables by minimizing the sum of the two endpoint cost-to-go messages and relaxing the result. The messages are updated through local minimizations following the tree recursion. To reduce per-iteration computational and communication costs, we develop GATE-S, a surrogate variant using tractable local models and lightweight message parametrizations. We establish linear convergence with a rate explicit in the interplay among function regularity, network topology, and the chosen partition, revealing the effects of graph decomposition. Numerical experiments are conducted to validate the theoretical results and evaluate the efficiency of our algorithms.

K. Ding
Edwardson School of Industrial Engineering, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN. E-mail: ding433@purdue.edu.

G. Scutari
Edwardson School of Industrial Engineering & Elmore Family School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN. E-mail: gscutari@purdue.edu.

The work of Ding and Scutari has been supported by the ONR Grant # N00014-24-1-2751.

1 Introduction

The paper studies decentralized optimization over an undirected, connected, and simple graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V}$ is the set of nodes (hereafter, agents), with $|\mathcal{V}| = m$, and $\mathcal{E}$ is the set of edges; neighboring agents can exchange information over single-hop links. Each agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$ knows only its own cost function $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, assumed strongly convex and smooth on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The agents seek to solve cooperatively the following optimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} F(x) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} f_i(x). \quad (\text{P})$$

This class of problems and setting arise in several applications of interest, including signal processing, machine learning, multi-agent systems, and communications.

Early proposals in the literature solved (P) via decentralizations of the gradient algorithm; examples include the Distributed Gradient Descent (DGD), introduced in [9] for least squares and later generalized to nonquadratic functions in [10], with a refined rate analysis in [23]. These schemes share a common structure: each iteration couples a weighted average of the neighbors' variables—each representing its owner's estimate of the solution—with a local gradient step controlled by a stepsize, the schemes differing in how the two operations are interleaved. The stepsize governs a dilemma between speed and accuracy: a constant stepsize α achieves a *linear* rate, but only to an $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ -neighborhood of the solution [10, 15, 23], whereas exact convergence requires a vanishing stepsize, inducing a *sublinear* rate.

The speed–accuracy dilemma motivated a second generation of schemes converging to the *exact* solution with a *constant* stepsize. Two routes have been followed. Both assign each agent a local copy x_i of x ; they differ in how the local gradient direction is corrected. **(i)** The first acts in the primal domain, either by tracking the global gradient ∇F [4, 12, 14, 17, 20, 22], or through correction terms based on past iterates and gradients [1, 19]. **(ii)** The second explicitly enforces consensus among the local copies x_i 's through linear constraints; the multipliers of a suitable (augmented) Lagrangian then adjust the local gradient direction [2, 6, 7, 16, 18]. Methods from both routes converge linearly to the minimizer of F , with different dependence on network and optimization parameters. We refer to the tutorials [11, 21] and the monograph [15] for further discussion.

These two routes are not independent: several primal exact methods also admit a dual interpretation [8]. The common approach is to rewrite (P) as a *centralized* problem with linear consensus constraints, making centralized optimization techniques readily applicable. The constraints are chosen to support implementation over the network; the resulting formulation also determines the dual variables on which the algorithm operates. Specifically, stack the agents' copies $X = [x_1^\top; \dots; x_m^\top]$, and call $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$ *faithful* if $\ker(A^\top) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}\}$ ($\mathbf{1}$ is the all-ones vector). Then, $A^\top X = 0$ enforces exactly consensus. With a suitable sign convention for the multipliers, the lifted problem of (P) and its dual read

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} f_i(x_i) \quad & \text{s.t.} \quad A^\top X = 0, \\ \min_{Y \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times d}} g_A(Y) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} f_i^*((AY)_i). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D})$$

Here, f_i^* is the Fenchel conjugate of f_i , and each column j of $\mathbf{A}$ introduces one multiplier row $Y_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$. A dual solution Y^* recovers the primal solution through $x_i^* = \nabla f_i^*((\mathbf{A}Y^*)_i)$, $i \in \mathcal{V}$.

Faithful choices used in the decentralized methods discussed above include (i) $\mathbf{A} = I - W$, for a symmetric gossip matrix W with $\ker(I - W) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}\}$ [4, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20, 22]; (ii) the graph Laplacian or operators built from it [6, 7, 16]; and (iii) edge-indexed choices—the oriented node-edge incidence matrix B of $\mathcal{G}$, or that of a spanning tree. These representations all enforce the *same* consensus constraint among the x_i ’s in (D), but generally induce *different* algorithms. Each column j of $\mathbf{A}$ creates a dual variable Y_j , and its support identifies the conjugates f_i^* that depend on it; grouping columns determines which dual variables are optimized jointly. This is a design layer preceding the block partition, and not present in classical (centralized) block-coordinate methods (e.g., of Jacobi or Gauss-Seidel type), where the variables are given and only their grouping is a design choice. Here the representation $\mathbf{A}$ first determines the variables available for grouping and their dependencies. *Choosing $\mathbf{A}$ must therefore be part of algorithm design*, not merely a mean of enforcing consensus or selecting the communication protocol.

An unexplored design layer. This design layer is unexplored in the literature: once $\mathbf{A}$ is fixed to enforce consensus, *the network serves only as a communication medium* over which algorithmic variables are exchanged, mixed, or reconciled. Agents may have different neighbors and employ different weights, but they all perform the same type of update, irrespective of their position in the graph: *the topology never determines how the optimization is decomposed* (long paths, dense regions, and sparse interfaces are assigned no distinct optimization roles). This uniformity can impose a severe cost: mixing becomes the convergence rate bottleneck, and the network enters the guarantees through one global scalar—the spectral gap—which measures how fast averaging propagates information, but does not reveal what optimization structure particular subgraphs may offer. Graphs like paths or rings make this price concrete: stationary nearest-neighbor mixing has inverse gap $\Theta(m^2)$ [13], and (non-accelerated) consensus-based optimization methods inherit this quadratic iteration growth [16]—becoming the bottleneck for non accelerated optimization schemes. Yet the ring itself suggests a different decomposition. Instead of treating every edge as an averaging link, let “open” the ring into a path: one long path of edges is optimized jointly, with the remaining edges defining separate, individual subproblems. As it will be shown by our new design in [Sec. ?](#), the path subproblem can be solved *exactly* by eliminating one node after another in $O(m)$ steps—structural grounds for $O(m)$ overall complexity, rather than $O(m^2)$.

1.1 From algorithm execution on a graph to graph decomposition over the graph

We rethink decentralized decomposition methods from the foundations, accounting for the graph as part of the algorithm rather than its medium. Building it is the novel path taken in this paper. The major contributions are summarized next.

(i) graph decomposition. We introduce a formal paradigm of algorithmic decomposition over graphs, as unified framework to device decentralized algorithms solving (P) on networks. Two observations shape the construction.

- (a) **The algebraic factor graph:** The representation $\mathbf{A}$ determines which dual coordinates Y_j enter each conjugate term $f_i^*((\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Y})_i)$ —this dependency is itself a graph: the bipartite *factor graph* induced by $\mathbf{A}$:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{A}} := (\mathcal{V} \sqcup \{1, \dots, q\}, \{(i, j) : \mathbf{A}_{ij} \neq 0\}),$$

with one factor node per conjugate f_i^* , one variable node per dual coordinate Y_j , and an edge exactly when Y_j enters f_i^* . An algebraic decomposition is then obtained by selecting p nonempty blocks of dual coordinates: a block $\mathcal{J}_r \subseteq \{1, \dots, q\}$ specifies the coordinates optimized jointly, while its neighborhood in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{A}}$ identifies the conjugate terms entering the resulting block subproblem.

- (b) **Blocks on the physical network:** The factor graph records algebraic dependencies, not communication links. Because $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{A}}$ need not respect adjacency in $\mathcal{G}$, the agents touched by a block need not induce a connected subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$. Connectivity of $\mathcal{G}$ nevertheless guarantees a connected set containing them—at worst, all of $\mathcal{V}$ —but such a support may be highly nonlocal, inducing an unaffordable communication overhead. We therefore assign to each block a *connected carrier* $\mathcal{C}_r \subseteq \mathcal{V}$: a connected region of the network hosting its subproblem, which contains all agents involved in the block.

The joint choice of the three—representation, blocks, and carriers—is a *graph decomposition* of (P) over $\mathcal{G}$: a triple

$$\left(\underbrace{\mathbf{A}}_{\text{representation}}, \underbrace{\{\mathcal{J}_r\}_{r=1}^p}_{\text{dual-coordinate blocks}}, \underbrace{\{\mathcal{C}_r\}_{r=1}^p}_{\text{physical carriers}} \right).$$

Here, $\mathbf{A}$ is faithful and has no zero column; the nonempty blocks $\mathcal{J}_r$ cover $\{1, \dots, q\}$ and need not be disjoint; and each carrier $\mathcal{C}_r \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ contains every agent i such that $\mathbf{A}_{i, \mathcal{J}_r} \neq 0$ and induces a connected subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$. The three layers have distinct roles: the representation creates the variables and their dependencies; the blocks fix *what* is optimized jointly; the carriers fix *where* it is executed. Sec. 2 develops this definition and its algebraic consequences.

(ii) **GATE as an instance.** Within the graph decomposition framework above, we propose a decentralized algorithm GATE (Graph-Tearing message passing).

- (a) **Choice of the graph decomposition:** The representation is chosen so that the agents whose conjugate terms share a dual variable can communicate directly. Therefore, we associate one dual variable with each physical edge and let it enter only the conjugate terms of the two endpoint agents, which is achieved by choosing $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}$, where $\mathbf{B}$ is the node–edge incidence matrix of $\mathcal{G}$. The edge set $\mathcal{E}$ is partitioned into disjoint nonempty edge sets $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{E}_r\}_{r=1}^p$, with each subgraph $(\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r)$ required to be a tree, where $\mathcal{V}_r$ is the set of endpoints of $\mathcal{E}_r$. With dual coordinates indexed by edges, $\mathcal{J}_r = \mathcal{E}_r$ and $\mathcal{C}_r = \mathcal{V}_r$: the variables indexed by $\mathcal{E}_r$ are optimized jointly by the agents in $\mathcal{V}_r$.
- (b) **Solving block subproblems via message passing:** Starting from the block fixed-point decomposition, we fix an edge variable and minimize over the remaining variables in each of the two subtrees obtained by removing that edge. Their cost-to-go functions define the two endpoint messages, which can be computed recursively along the tree to the leaves. Then, each edge variable minimizes the sum of the two messages from its endpoints. Iterating the message recursion and edge minimizations, with relaxed edge updates, yields GATE.

(iii) Convergence analysis, surrogate variant, and numerical validation.**(a) Linear convergence with an explicit decomposition-dependent rate:**

We establish linear convergence of GATE with a rate ρ explicit in the interplay among function regularity, the local structure of the network, and the graph decomposition $\mathcal{P}$. This rate quantifies how convergence depends on graph decomposition, a design layer unexplored by consensus-based methods, where mixing can limit convergence through the global spectral gap.

For tree-dominant graphs of diameter D , the explicit rate guides partition selection to achieve $(1-\rho)^{-1} = O(D)$. For example, on rings, this becomes $O(m)$, compared with $O(m^2)$ for the (nonaccelerated) consensus-based methods, with such improved scalability arising as a byproduct of graph decomposition.

(b) Surrogate variant: To reduce per-iteration computational and communication costs, we propose GATE-S, a surrogate variant of GATE. We present practical surrogate choices and their message implementations, and provide an analogous linear convergence rate and scalability analysis.**(c) Numerical experiments:** We conduct numerical experiments to validate the theoretical results and evaluate the iteration and communication efficiency of GATE and its surrogate variants relative to consensus-based methods.

1.2 Notation

For a positive integer q , write $[q] := \{1, \dots, q\}$, and use $\sqcup$ for disjoint union. For functions $F(x, y)$ and $G(x, y)$, write $F \sim_x G$ when $F - G$ is independent of x . When the variable is clear from context, we write $F \sim G$.

We use row-stacked matrices for d -vectors. If the rows of a matrix A are indexed by a finite set $\mathcal{J}$, then A_α denotes the row indexed by $\alpha \in \mathcal{J}$, and A_S denotes the submatrix of rows indexed by $S \subseteq \mathcal{J}$. For matrices with both row and column indices, $A_{I,S}$ denotes the submatrix with rows I and columns S . Whenever such a row vector appears as an argument of f_i^* , in an inner product, or in a norm, it is identified with the corresponding vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$. For node variables $(x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$, X denotes the row-stacked matrix whose i -th row is $x_i^\top$. Inner products between row-stacked matrices use the Frobenius convention. For scalar functions on row-stacked matrices, $\nabla \Phi(A)^\top$ denotes the row-stacked gradient. We write $\mathbb{S}^d$ for the space of $d \times d$ symmetric matrices, and $\mathbb{S}_+^d$ and $\mathbb{S}_{++}^d$ for its positive semidefinite and positive definite cones. For a scalar differentiable function ϕ , $\nabla \phi$ is the column gradient and $\nabla^2 \phi$ is the Hessian. For a vector-valued map $F = (F_1, \dots, F_k) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, we set $\nabla F(x) := [\nabla F_1(x), \dots, \nabla F_k(x)] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$; hence $\nabla F(x)^\top$ is the Jacobian and $\nabla F(x)^\top h$ is the directional variation along h . For a matrix-valued map H , $\nabla H(x)[h]$ denotes the directional derivative in direction h .

Organization. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 develops the graph decomposition framework. Section 3 specializes it to the incidence representation and tree blocks to derive GATE. Section 4 establishes linear convergence and partition-dependent rate bounds. Section 5 develops the surrogate variant of GATE and establishes its convergence. Section 6 presents numerical experiments, and Section 7 concludes.

2 Graph Decomposition Framework

2.1 Problem and graph setting

We study (P) over the graph $\mathcal{G}$ under the following standard assumptions.

Assumption 1 (problem class) *For every $i \in \mathcal{V}$, $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is μ_{f_i} -strongly convex and L_{f_i} -smooth for some $\mu_{f_i}, L_{f_i} > 0$. Define*

$$\mu := \min_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \mu_{f_i}, \quad L := \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} L_{f_i}, \quad \kappa := \frac{L}{\mu}.$$

Consequently, each f_i^* is finite-valued, differentiable, $1/L_{f_i}$ -strongly convex and $1/\mu_{f_i}$ -smooth.

Assumption 2 (Network) *The graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is undirected, connected, and simple.*

Fix an arbitrary orientation of $\mathcal{E}$ and let $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times |\mathcal{E}|}$ be the node–edge incidence matrix, with

$$\mathbf{B}_{ve} := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v \text{ is the tail of } e, \\ -1, & \text{if } v \text{ is the head of } e, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $e \in \mathcal{E}$, let

$$\mathcal{A}_v := \{e \in \mathcal{E} : e \text{ is incident to } v\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_e := \{v \in \mathcal{V} : v \text{ is an endpoint of } e\}.$$

The node-edge incidence graph of a graph is the bipartite graph on its nodes and edges in which a node and an edge are adjacent exactly when the node is an endpoint of the edge.

For a physical subgraph $\mathcal{G}_s \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, write $V(\mathcal{G}_s)$ and $E(\mathcal{G}_s)$ for its vertex and edge sets; for $S \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, $\mathcal{G}[S]$ denotes the subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$ induced by S .

2.2 Graph decomposition

This section builds the proposed decomposition framework.

2.2.1 Representations and their factor graphs

Recall from Sec. 1 that a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$ is *faithful* if $\ker(\mathbf{A}^\top) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}\}$, so that $\mathbf{A}^\top X = 0$ holds exactly for consensual stacked copies $X = [x_1^\top; \dots; x_m^\top]$. As derived there, the lifted consensus form of the problem has the dual from (D), with one multiplier row $Y_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ per column j of $\mathbf{A}$. Every faithful $\mathbf{A}$ represents the same consensus set, but the dual (D) depends on $\mathbf{A}$ itself: the columns create the dual coordinates, and the sparsity pattern of $\mathbf{A}$ decides which coordinates enter which conjugate. This dependency structure is captured by the factor graph.

Definition 1 (Factor graph) The *factor graph induced by $\mathbf{A}$* is the bipartite graph

$$\mathcal{H}_\mathbf{A} := (\mathcal{V} \sqcup \{1, \dots, q\}, \{(i, j) : \mathbf{A}_{ij} \neq 0\}),$$

whose factor node i represents the term $f_i^*((\mathbf{A}Y)_i)$ and whose variable node j represents the dual coordinate Y_j .

The two sides of $\mathcal{H}_A$ are not symmetric: each factor node is anchored at a physical agent, whereas a variable node need not have a prescribed physical location on $\mathcal{G}$. Consequently, a single variable Y_j -column $A_{:,j}$ -may enter the conjugates of nonadjacent agents.

Example 1 Given the path graph $1 - 2 - 3$, with both edges oriented from left to right (Figure 1(a)), consider the following three faithful choices of A :

$$A = A_{\text{ex}} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & -2 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A = L := \frac{1}{3}BB^\top, \quad \text{or} \quad A = B. \quad (1)$$

Here, B is the incidence matrix of $\mathcal{G}$, and L is its scaled Laplacian. The three matrices enforce the same consensus constraint, yet they induce the distinct factor graphs of Figure 1(b)-(d).¹ For A_{ex} , the coordinate Y_1 enters the factors of the *nonadjacent* agents 1 and 3. For L , Y_1 and Y_2 both enter f_1^* and f_2^* , so $\mathcal{H}_L$ contains a *cycle* although $\mathcal{G}$ is a path. For B , each coordinate corresponds to *one physical edge* and enters exactly its endpoint factors, so $\mathcal{H}_B$ is the node-edge incidence graph of $\mathcal{G}$, that is, the bipartite graph on $\mathcal{V} \sqcup \mathcal{E}$ in which i and e are adjacent exactly when $i \in \mathcal{I}_e$. This distinction matters when the dual coordinates are grouped and optimized jointly: a group of coordinates of B is a set of physical edges, one per coordinate; whereas a group under L or A_{ex} may couple nonadjacent agents.

2.2.2 Block covers and conditional responses

To minimize g_A *blockwise*, we group the dual coordinates into (possibly overlapping) blocks. Each block-subproblem minimizes g_A over its block coordinates, holding the remaining coordinates fixed.

Definition 2 (Block cover and conditional responses) For a fixed A , a *block cover* is a family $\{\mathcal{J}_r\}_{r=1}^p$ of nonempty subsets covering $[q]$ (the index set of the dual coordinates). Let $\bar{\mathcal{J}}_r := [q] \setminus \mathcal{J}_r$. For each block $\mathcal{J}_r$, define its touched factor set and block factor graph by

$$\mathcal{V}_{A,r} := \{i \in \mathcal{V} : A_{i,\mathcal{J}_r} \neq 0\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{A,r} := \mathcal{H}_A[\mathcal{V}_{A,r} \sqcup \mathcal{J}_r]. \quad (2)$$

Here, $\mathcal{H}_A[S]$ denotes the subgraph of $\mathcal{H}_A$ induced by the vertex set S .

The conditional response of block r is

$$\text{BR}_{A,r}(Y_{\bar{\mathcal{J}}_r}) := \underset{W \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}_r| \times d}}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_{A,r}} f_i^*(A_{i,\mathcal{J}_r}W + A_{i,\bar{\mathcal{J}}_r}Y_{\bar{\mathcal{J}}_r}). \quad (3)$$

Under Assumption 1, $\text{BR}_{A,r}(Y_{\bar{\mathcal{J}}_r})$ is nonempty for every $r \in [p]$ and $Y_{\bar{\mathcal{J}}_r}$, but need not be a singleton. When A is fixed, we suppress it and write $\mathcal{V}_r$, $\mathcal{F}_r$, and BR_r .

Thus $\mathcal{J}_r$ identifies the coordinates optimized jointly, $\mathcal{V}_{A,r}$ the agents whose conjugates enter the block subproblem, and $\mathcal{F}_{A,r}$ records which block coordinates enter each conjugate.

Proposition 1 (Block fixed points) *Let Assumption 1 hold, let A be faithful, and let $\{\mathcal{J}_r\}_{r=1}^p$ be a block cover. Then,*

$$Y^* \in \underset{Y \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times d}}{\text{argmin}} g_A(Y) \iff Y_{\mathcal{J}_r}^* \in \text{BR}_r(Y_{\bar{\mathcal{J}}_r}^*) \quad \forall r \in [p]. \quad (4)$$

¹ In panels (b) and (c), the subscripts of Y index the columns of A_{ex} and L , respectively; in panel (d), Y_{12} and Y_{23} are indexed by the physical edges (1, 2) and (2, 3).




Fig. 1: Three faithful representations (see (1)) of the same path graph $1 - 2 - 3$ induce distinct factor graphs: the generic A_{ex} couples nonadjacent factors, the Laplacian L produces a cyclic factor graph, and the incidence matrix B reproduces the node-edge incidence structure.

Proposition 1 holds for *every* faithful A and *every* block cover: optimality restricts neither choice. Different choices produce different response maps $\text{BR}_{A,r}(Y_{\mathcal{J}_r})$ —hence, potentially, different algorithms—but the algebraic decomposition $(A, \{\mathcal{J}_r\})$ does not specify where these responses are computed on $\mathcal{G}$.

Since f_i^* is available only at agent i , computing BR_r requires the agents indexed by $\mathcal{V}_r$ to exchange information over the links of $\mathcal{G}$. These exchanges can be confined to the agents of $\mathcal{V}_r$ only if $\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{V}_r]$ is connected, which Definition 2 does not guarantee. In Example 1, the subproblem of the block $\{1\}$ (the variable Y_1) of A_{ex} contains the conjugates f_1^* and f_3^* , stored at the nonadjacent agents 1 and 3, which can communicate only through agent 2, whose conjugate does not enter the subproblem. The computation of a block response thus involves, besides the agents of $\mathcal{V}_r$, those that relay between them; the set of all agents taking part in it must induce a connected subgraph containing $\mathcal{V}_r$. This is formalized next.

2.2.3 Carriers and realizability

We associate with each block $\mathcal{J}_r$ a set of agents $\mathcal{C}_r$ that enable the joint computation of the conditional response BR_r of the block on $\mathcal{G}$. This set, called the *carrier* of $\mathcal{J}_r$, must induce a connected subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$ and contain the agents in $\mathcal{V}_r$, whose conjugates enter the block subproblem (3). We formalize the joint choice of representation, block cover, and carriers as a *graph decomposition*.

Definition 3 (Graph decomposition) A graph decomposition over $\mathcal{G}$ is a triple

$$\mathcal{D} := (\mathbf{A}, \{\mathcal{J}_r\}_{r=1}^p, \{\mathcal{C}_r\}_{r=1}^p), \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{A}$ is faithful, $\{\mathcal{J}_r\}_{r=1}^p$ is a block cover of $g_{\mathbf{A}}$, and the set $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{C}_r \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ is the carrier of block r satisfying

$$\mathcal{V}_r \subseteq \mathcal{C}_r \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{C}_r] \text{ is connected.} \quad (6)$$

The three components have distinct roles: $\mathbf{A}$ creates the dual coordinates and their dependencies, $\mathcal{J}_r$ fixes what is optimized jointly, and $\mathcal{C}_r$ specifies the subgraph on which that computation is performed. The agents indexed by $\mathcal{C}_r \setminus \mathcal{V}_r$ contribute no term to the subproblem (3): their only role is to relay information between agents of $\mathcal{V}_r$ that are not adjacent in $\mathcal{G}$ (as agent 2 does for the block $\{1\}$ of $\mathbf{A}_{\text{ex}}$ in Example 1). When $\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{V}_r]$ is connected, the carrier can be taken equal to $\mathcal{V}_r$ and no additional relay agents are required.

For a subgraph $\mathcal{G}_s = (\mathcal{V}_s, \mathcal{E}_s) \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, let $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{G}_s} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times |\mathcal{E}_s|}$ be the matrix obtained from $\mathbf{B}$ by retaining the columns indexed by $\mathcal{E}_s$. The rows indexed by $\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}_s$ are zero. The carrier conditions (6) admit the following equivalent matrix factorization.

Proposition 2 (realizability) Fix $r \in [p]$. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be faithful, let $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{J}_r \subseteq [q]$, and let $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{C}_r \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. Conditions (6) hold if and only if there exist a connected subgraph $\mathcal{G}_r \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, with $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{G}_r) = \mathcal{C}_r$, and a matrix $M_r \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}_r| \times |\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G}_r)|}$ such that

$$\mathbf{A}_{:, \mathcal{J}_r} = \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{G}_r} M_r^\top. \quad (7)$$

Proposition 2 decomposes the linear couplings recorded by adjacency in the block factor graph $\mathcal{F}_r$ (see (2))—which agents’ conjugate terms depend on each dual coordinate Y_j —into couplings between adjacent agents in the connected physical subgraph $\mathcal{G}_r$ (with vertex set $\mathcal{C}_r$). This opens the way to design methods that compute $\mathbf{BR}_r$ through neighbor-to-neighbor communication within the carrier.

To make the connection explicit, recall from (3) that each block coordinate Y_j enters the argument of f_i^* with coefficient $\mathbf{A}_{ij}$. By (7), $\mathbf{A}_{:,j}$ is a linear combination of the columns of $\mathbf{B}$ indexed by the edges of $\mathcal{G}_r$, with coefficients given by the corresponding row of M_r ; its nonzero entries are the agents whose factor nodes are adjacent to the variable node j in $\mathcal{F}_r$. If the row of M_r corresponding to Y_j has a single nonzero entry, Y_j appears only in the conjugates f_i^* of the two endpoint agents of one physical edge, which are neighbors in $\mathcal{G}$ and can communicate directly. If that row has several nonzero entries, Y_j may appear in the conjugates of nonadjacent agents or of more than two agents; these agents can exchange information along the edges of $\mathcal{G}_r$, with intermediate agents relaying it when needed. At agents in $\mathcal{C}_r \setminus \mathcal{V}_r$, the linear combinations in (7) vanish for every block coordinate: their conjugate terms are independent of the block variables, and these agents can serve as relays. Example 1 revisited and Figure 2 illustrate these distinctions.

Example 1 revisited. Let $e_1 = \{1, 2\}$ and $e_2 = \{2, 3\}$, with both edges oriented from left to right. For each representation in Example 1, choose the singleton block cover, with one block per dual coordinate. We examine the blocks $\{1\}$ and




Fig. 2: Example 1 revisited. Top: block factor graphs. Bottom: carrier subgraphs $\mathcal{G}_r$, with the entries of M_r on the edges.

$\{2\}$ of A_{ex} , the block $\{2\}$ of L , and the block $\{e_1\}$ of B . Their conditional responses, with terms in g_A independent of W omitted, are

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BR}_{A_{\text{ex}},\{1\}}(Y_2) &= \underset{W}{\text{argmin}} \{f_1^*(W + Y_2) + f_3^*(-W + Y_2)\}, \\ \text{BR}_{A_{\text{ex}},\{2\}}(Y_1) &= \underset{W}{\text{argmin}} \{f_1^*(Y_1 + W) + f_2^*(-2W) + f_3^*(-Y_1 + W)\}, \\ \text{BR}_{L,\{2\}}(Y_1, Y_3) &= \underset{W}{\text{argmin}} \{f_1^*\left(\frac{1}{3}(Y_1 - W)\right) + f_2^*\left(\frac{1}{3}(2W - Y_1 - Y_3)\right) + f_3^*\left(\frac{1}{3}(Y_3 - W)\right)\}, \\ \text{BR}_{B,\{e_1\}}(Y_{e_2}) &= \underset{W}{\text{argmin}} \{f_1^*(W) + f_2^*(Y_{e_2} - W)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The factor sets touched by the four blocks, read off from the responses, are $\mathcal{V}_r = \{1, 3\}$ for the first, as in Figure 2(a); $\{1, 2, 3\}$ for the second and third, with the Laplacian case shown in panel (b); and $\{1, 2\}$ for the last, as in panel (c). Only the first fails to induce a connected subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$. Its carrier must therefore contain agent 2, giving $\mathcal{C}_r = \{1, 2, 3\}$ (panel (d)): this agent relays between agents 1 and 3 without contributing a conjugate to the subproblem. For the other three blocks, choose $\mathcal{C}_r = \mathcal{V}_r$; panels (e),(f) illustrate the Laplacian and incidence cases. Taking $\mathcal{G}_r = \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{C}_r]$ gives the whole path for the first three blocks and the single edge e_1 for the last, so that $B_{\mathcal{G}_r} = B_{:,e_1}$ there. The corresponding factorizations from Proposition 2 are

$$\begin{aligned} (A_{\text{ex}})_{:,1} &= B_{:,e_1} + B_{:,e_2}, & (A_{\text{ex}})_{:,2} &= B_{:,e_1} - B_{:,e_2}, \\ L_{:,2} &= \frac{1}{3}(-B_{:,e_1} + B_{:,e_2}), & B_{:,e_1} &= B_{\mathcal{G}_r}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The matrices M_r are respectively $(1, 1)$, $(1, -1)$, $\frac{1}{3}(-1, 1)$, and (1) ; their entries label the physical edges in Figure 2(d)–(f) for the illustrated blocks. In the first identity, the two columns of B have opposite entries at agent 2, which cancel. Thus $f_2^*(-2Y_2)$ is independent of W : agent 2 is absent from the block factor graph but present in the physical subgraph as a relay. The second and third combinations have nonzero entries at all three agents, so every agent contributes a conjugate to the response. For the last block, $M_r = (1)$ uses only e_1 , whose endpoint agents are neighbors and communicate directly. Here f_3^* is absent because e_1 is not incident to agent 3, rather than through cancellation.

3 Graph Tearing Along Edges: Message Passing on Tree Blocks

Proposition 1 holds for every faithful $\mathbf{A}$ and every block cover, while Proposition 2 characterizes the admissible carriers (i.e., satisfying (6)). The framework leaves these choices and the methods for computing the block responses open, with different communication and computation costs. Choices range from Laplacian-type representations in which a coordinate couples an agent with all its neighbors, to the incidence representation, in which a coordinate couples one pair of neighbors.

We now use this freedom to design a decentralized algorithm, termed GATE (Graph-Tearing message passing). We choose a graph decomposition in which *selecting dual coordinates amounts to selecting edges of $\mathcal{G}$* , so that each coordinate appears in the conjugates of two neighboring agents, and a block response can be computed by exchanges between the neighboring agents whose conjugates enter it, without relay agents. More formally we have the following.

- (i) **Representation:** We choose $\mathbf{A}$ so that, for each block, the factorization (7) admits a matrix M_r with *one nonzero entry per row* and with *different rows selecting distinct edges*. Each coordinate then enters exactly the conjugates at the two endpoints of its selected edge, avoiding redundant coordinates on the same edge. Let $\mathcal{E}_r$ denote the set of these edges. Indexing the coordinates by $\mathcal{E}_r$ and absorbing each nonzero coefficient into its coordinate (a change of variables in the dual (D)) gives $\mathbf{A}_{:, \mathcal{J}_r} = \mathbf{B}_{:, \mathcal{E}_r}$.
- (ii) **Partition:** We retain one coordinate for every physical edge, leaving the whole network available for block selection. We partition the edge-set $\mathcal{E}$ into nonempty sets $\mathcal{P} := \{\mathcal{E}_r\}_{r=1}^p$, so that each variable receives one block update. Write $\mathcal{T}_r := (\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r)$ for the subgraph selected by block r ; by Definition 2, $\mathcal{V}_r$ is the set of endpoints of $\mathcal{E}_r$. We take each $\mathcal{T}_r$ to be connected, without loss of generality (the response (3) of a disconnected $\mathcal{T}_r$ separates into independent responses on its connected components, which can be taken as separate blocks.).
- (iii) **Carriers:** We use only the agents whose conjugates enter the response: take $\mathcal{C}_r := \mathcal{V}_r$. Connectivity of $\mathcal{T}_r$ makes $\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{V}_r]$ connected, so the carrier conditions (6) hold, and no additional relay agents are needed.

The three design choices are summarized by

$$\mathbf{A}_{:, \mathcal{J}_r} = \mathbf{B}_{:, \mathcal{E}_r}, \quad \bigsqcup_{r=1}^p \mathcal{E}_r = \mathcal{E}, \quad \mathcal{C}_r = \mathcal{V}_r, \quad r \in [p]. \quad (9)$$

After ordering the columns, $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}$, with $\ker(\mathbf{B}^\top) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}\}$ (under Assumption 2); hence $\mathbf{A}$ is faithful. Since $\{\mathcal{E}_r\}_{r=1}^p$ is a block cover and (6) holds with $\mathcal{C}_r = \mathcal{V}_r$, (9) defines a graph decomposition over $\mathcal{G}$ (Definition 3): the block factor graph $\mathcal{F}_r$ is the node-edge incidence graph of $\mathcal{T}_r$, that is, the bipartite graph on $\mathcal{V}_r \sqcup \mathcal{E}_r$ in which i and e are adjacent exactly when $i \in \mathcal{I}_e$; and (7) holds with $\mathcal{G}_r = \mathcal{T}_r$ and $M_r = I$. The partition remains a design choice: finer partitions give smaller block subproblems but may need more rounds to resolve the coupling between blocks. The convergence analysis in Sec. 4 will quantify the effect of the partition on the rate and guide this computation-communication tradeoff.

The remainder of this section derives the algorithm GATE: the structure of the blocks is specified, and the block fixed-point conditions of Proposition 1 are rewritten as relations for individual edge variables and local messages. Their relaxed parallel iteration yields GATE.

3.1 Tree-block responses and message equations

Fix a block $r \in [p]$ and the exterior coordinates $Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}$; under (9), the conditional response becomes

$$\text{BR}_r(Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}) = \underset{W \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}_r| \times d}}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} f_i^*(\mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{E}_r} W + \mathbf{B}_{i, \bar{\mathcal{E}}_r} Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}). \quad (10)$$

The conjugates in (10) are held by different agents. We seek subgraphs $\mathcal{T}_r$ that enable the computation of BR_r through exchanges between neighboring agents only. Fixing the coordinate Y_e separates the remaining minimization in (10) into two independent subproblems *whenever removing e disconnects $\mathcal{T}_r$* . **Trees** permit this separation at *every* edge. They also eliminate coordinate redundancy: minimizing over the $|\mathcal{V}_r| - 1$ edge variables of a spanning tree, while fixing those on the other edges of $\mathcal{T}_r$, gives the same optimal value as minimizing over the entire block. This is established in the following proposition.

Proposition 3 *Let $\mathcal{T}_r$ be connected and let $\mathcal{E}'_r$ be the edge set of any spanning tree of $\mathcal{T}_r$. Then $\text{Range}(\mathbf{B}_{:, \mathcal{E}'_r}) = \text{Range}(\mathbf{B}_{:, \mathcal{E}_r})$ and $\ker(\mathbf{B}_{:, \mathcal{E}'_r}) = \{0\}$. Furthermore, under Assumption 1, the response $\text{BR}_r(Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r})$ is a singleton for every fixed $Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}$ if and only if $\mathcal{T}_r$ is a tree.*

We therefore choose each $\mathcal{T}_r$ to be a tree.

Assumption 3 *For every block $r \in [p]$, the associated subgraph $\mathcal{T}_r$ is a tree.*

We now express the block-optimality conditions (4) through quantities that the two endpoints of each edge can form and exchange. To distinguish edges inside and outside the block, define, for $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_i^\circ &:= \mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{E}_r, & \mathcal{A}_i^\partial &:= \mathcal{A}_i \cap \bar{\mathcal{E}}_r, \\ \mathcal{V}_r^\circ &:= \{i \in \mathcal{V}_r : \mathcal{A}_i^\partial = \emptyset\}, & \mathcal{V}_r^\partial &:= \mathcal{V}_r \setminus \mathcal{V}_r^\circ. \end{aligned}$$

Relative to $\mathcal{T}_r$, agents in $\mathcal{V}_r^\circ$ are *interior*: all their incident edges belong to $\mathcal{E}_r$. Agents in $\mathcal{V}_r^\partial$ are *boundary*: they also have incident edges outside $\mathcal{E}_r$. In (10), only the conjugate terms of boundary agents depend on the exterior coordinates; these terms may also depend on several block variables.


Splitting at the edge. For each block r , uniqueness of the conditional response (Proposition 3) gives the following equivalent conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\mathcal{E}_r}^* \in \text{BR}_r(Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^*) \\ \iff Y_e^* \in \underset{y_e \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ \min_{\substack{Y_{\mathcal{E}_r} \\ Y_e = y_e}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} f_i^*(\mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_{\mathcal{E}_r} + \mathbf{B}_{i, \bar{\mathcal{E}}_r} Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^*) \right\} \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_r. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

By Proposition 1, Y^* solves (D) if and only if these conditions hold for every block. To decompose the inner minimization in (11), fix $Y_e = y_e$. Removing e from $\mathcal{T}_r$ separates this minimization into two decoupled subproblems, one on each resulting connected subgraph. We solve them recursively from the leaves toward e .

For each endpoint $i \in \mathcal{I}_e$ of e , let $\mathcal{V}_e(i)$ and $\mathcal{E}_e(i)$ denote the vertex and edge sets of the resulting connected subgraph containing i . Figure 3(a) illustrates the two resulting subgraphs. Every block edge other than e lies in one of these two

(a) **Splitting at the edge**
 $(\mathcal{V}_e(i), \mathcal{E}_e(i))$



(b) **Recursive elimination at i**




Fig. 3: Messages on the same tree block: (a) fixing $Y_e = y_e$ separates the minimization into two subgraphs; (b) eliminating Y_{h_1}, Y_{h_2} combines the two incoming messages with f_i^* , while the dashed exterior-edge coordinates remain fixed at $Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^*$.

subgraphs. Thus, with $Y_e = y_e$, no remaining block variable enters conjugates from both subgraphs, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\substack{Y_{\mathcal{E}_r} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}_r| \times d} \\ Y_e = y_e}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_r} f_k^*(\mathbf{B}_{k, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_{\mathcal{E}_r} + \mathbf{B}_{k, \bar{\mathcal{E}}_r} Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^*) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_e} \underbrace{\min_{Y_{\mathcal{E}_e(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}_e(i)| \times d}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_e(i)} f_k^*(\mathbf{B}_{k, \mathcal{E}_e(i)} Y_{\mathcal{E}_e(i)} + \mathbf{B}_{k, e} y_e + \mathbf{B}_{k, \bar{\mathcal{E}}_r} Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^*)}_{=: \mu_{i \rightarrow e}(y_e)}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The sum over $\mathcal{I}_e$ in (12) reads $\mu_{i \rightarrow e}(y_e) + \mu_{i' \rightarrow e}(y_e)$, where i and i' are the two endpoints of e ; $\mu_{i \rightarrow e}(y_e)$ [resp. $\mu_{i' \rightarrow e}(y_e)$] represents the cost-to-go for the subgraph $(\mathcal{V}_e(i), \mathcal{E}_e(i))$ [resp. $(\mathcal{V}_e(i'), \mathcal{E}_e(i'))$]; together, they determine Y_e^* through (11). We call them *messages*, as this information is exchanged between the endpoints of e ; the arrows in Figure 3(a) indicate the two messages. Their dependence on $Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^*$ is suppressed for notational convenience.

Computing $\mu_{i \rightarrow e}$ via recursive elimination along the subtrees. We evaluate the minimization defining $\mu_{i \rightarrow e}(y_e)$ by successively eliminating the edge variables $Y_{\mathcal{E}_e(i)}$ of the subgraph $(\mathcal{V}_e(i), \mathcal{E}_e(i))$, proceeding from its leaves toward e (through the endpoint i), while $Y_e = y_e$ and $Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^*$ remain fixed.

(i) *Leaves.* If $\mathcal{V}_e(i) = \{i\}$, then $\mathcal{E}_e(i) = \emptyset$, and

$$\mu_{i \rightarrow e}(y_e) = f_i^*(\mathbf{B}_{i,e}y_e + \mathbf{B}_{i,\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^*). \quad (13)$$

The message is finite-valued and strongly convex by Assumption 1, since $\mathbf{B}_{i,e} = \pm 1$.

(ii) *Remaining agents.* Otherwise, $|\mathcal{V}_e(i)| > 1$. Removing i from $(\mathcal{V}_e(i), \mathcal{E}_e(i))$ leaves $|\mathcal{A}_i^\circ| - 1$ connected subgraphs, one for each edge $h \in \mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\}$. For each such h , let j be its endpoint other than i , so that $\{j\} = \mathcal{I}_h \setminus \{i\}$. The resulting subgraph containing j is $(\mathcal{V}_h(j), \mathcal{E}_h(j))$: its agents k are exactly those whose unique path from i to k in $\mathcal{T}_r$ begins with h . As h varies over $\mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\}$, the sets $\mathcal{V}_h(j)$, are pairwise disjoint and, together with $\{i\}$, form a partition of $\mathcal{V}_e(i)$. The corresponding edge sets $\{h\} \cup \mathcal{E}_h(j)$ partition $\mathcal{E}_e(i)$: any additional edge would join two distinct subgraphs $(\mathcal{V}_h(j), \mathcal{E}_h(j))$ and create a cycle in $\mathcal{T}_r$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_e(i) &= \{i\} \sqcup \bigsqcup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\} \\ j \in \mathcal{I}_h \setminus \{i\}}} \mathcal{V}_h(j), \\ \mathcal{E}_e(i) &= \bigsqcup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\} \\ j \in \mathcal{I}_h \setminus \{i\}}} (\{h\} \sqcup \mathcal{E}_h(j)). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

We proceed by induction on $|\mathcal{V}_e(i)|$, starting from the leaf case (13). For each $h \in \mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\}$, let $\{j\} = \mathcal{I}_h \setminus \{i\}$. Since $|\mathcal{V}_h(j)| < |\mathcal{V}_e(i)|$, the induction hypothesis ensures that $\mu_{j \rightarrow h}$ is finite-valued and strongly convex, and its defining minimum is uniquely attained for every fixed Y_h .

In the minimization defining $\mu_{i \rightarrow e}(y_e)$ in (12), first hold $Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\}}$ fixed. By (14), the sum of conjugates on each $\mathcal{V}_h(j)$ can be minimized independently over $Y_{\mathcal{E}_h(j)}$, giving $\mu_{j \rightarrow h}(Y_h)$, since every block edge of an agent of $\mathcal{V}_h(j)$ lies in $\{h\} \cup \mathcal{E}_h(j)$. Minimizing the sum of these messages and agent i 's conjugate over $Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\}}$, while $Y_e = y_e$ and $Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^*$ remain fixed, gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{i \rightarrow e}(y_e) &= \min_{Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\}}} \left\{ f_i^*(\mathbf{B}_{i,e}y_e + \mathbf{B}_{i,\mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\}}Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\}} + \mathbf{B}_{i,\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^*) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_h \setminus \{i\}} \mu_{j \rightarrow h}(Y_h) \right\}, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}_r, \quad e \in \mathcal{A}_i^\circ. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Figure 3(b) illustrates this recursion for two edges incident to i other than e .

The objective in this recursion is finite-valued and jointly strongly convex in $(y_e, Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\}})$. For each y_e , its minimum is therefore uniquely attained, and partial minimization yields a finite-valued, strongly convex $\mu_{i \rightarrow e}$. Once the minimizing values Y_h , $h \in \mathcal{A}_i^\circ \setminus \{e\}$, are fixed, the induction hypothesis uniquely determines the minimizing $Y_{\mathcal{E}_h(j)}$, where $\{j\} = \mathcal{I}_h \setminus \{i\}$. By (14), these variables constitute the unique minimizer $Y_{\mathcal{E}_e(i)}$ in (12), completing the induction. The same induction shows that any family satisfying (15) coincides with the messages defined in (12).

Proposition 4 (Message fixed points) *Under Assumptions 1, 2, and 3, consider the decomposition (9). For $Y^* \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times d}$, let $\mu_{i \rightarrow e}$ be the messages defined in (12), with $Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^*$ fixed in each block. Then Y^* solves (D) if and only if*

$$\{Y_e^*\} = \operatorname{argmin}_{y_e \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_e} \mu_{i \rightarrow e}(y_e), \quad e \in \mathcal{E}_r, \quad r \in [p]. \quad (16)$$

Algorithm 1: GATE: Graph-Tearing message passing

Input: Edge assignment $\mathbf{a}$ with ownership sets $\{\mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}}\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$; edge partition $\{\mathcal{E}_r\}_{r=1}^p$; initial edge variables Y^0 ; finite-valued strongly convex initial messages $\mu_{i \rightarrow e}^0$, $e \in \mathcal{E}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}_e$; relaxation parameters $\tau_r^\nu \in [0, 1]$; $N \geq 1$.

for $\nu = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ do

Each node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ executes the following steps, in parallel with the other nodes:

(1) Assigned edge-variable update.

foreach $r \in [p]$ and $e \in \mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathcal{E}_r$, compute

$$\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{y_e \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_e} \mu_{j \rightarrow e}^\nu(y_e) \right\}, \quad (17a)$$

$$Y_e^{\nu+1} = Y_e^\nu + \tau_r^\nu (\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} - Y_e^\nu). \quad (17b)$$

Send $Y_e^{\nu+1}$ to the other endpoint of e .

(2) Node-to-edge message update: foreach $r \in [p]$ and $e \in \mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{E}_r$, compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{i \rightarrow e}^{\nu+1}(y_e) = & \min_{Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}} \setminus \{e\}}} \left\{ f_i^* \left(\mathbf{B}_{i,e} y_e + \mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}} \setminus \{e\}} Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}} \setminus \{e\}} + \mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}}} Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}}}^{\nu+1} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}} \setminus \{e\}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_h \setminus \{i\}} \mu_{j \rightarrow h}^\nu(Y_h) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Send $\mu_{i \rightarrow e}^{\nu+1}$ to the other endpoint of e .

Primal recovery. Each node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ computes $x_i^N := \nabla f_i^*((\mathbf{B}Y^N)_i)$.

The message recursion (15) and the edge conditions (16) form the fixed-point system whose relaxed parallel iteration defines GATE. This is formalized next.

3.2 The node-owned GATE algorithm

GATE iterates the edge conditions (16) and the recursion (15), with relaxed edge updates, as summarized in Algorithm 1. To avoid an edge-level coordinator, an edge-node assignment is introduced, $\mathbf{a} : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ with $\mathbf{a}(e) \in \mathcal{I}_e$. Define $\mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}} := \{e \in \mathcal{A}_i : \mathbf{a}(e) = i\}$. These sets are pairwise disjoint and cover $\mathcal{E}$. Node i updates Y_e for $e \in \mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}}$, while both endpoint-nodes retain a copy. For each edge e , r denotes its block index, and $\mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}}$, $\mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}}$ are understood relative to that block.

GATE is fully decentralized: each agent computes locally and communicates only with its neighbors, without a central coordinator. This is discussed next.

Initialization. For each edge e , its owner $\mathbf{a}(e)$ chooses Y_e^0 arbitrarily and sends it to the other endpoint. Each node i then selects a finite-valued strongly convex message $\mu_{i \rightarrow e}^0$ for every $e \in \mathcal{A}_i$ and sends it to the other endpoint of e . For instance, one local choice is $\mu_{i \rightarrow e}^0(y_e) = f_i^*(\mathbf{B}_{i,e} y_e + \mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}} \setminus \{e\}} Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a}} \setminus \{e\}}^0)$.

Local computations and communications. Step (1): Each node updates only its assigned edges, using the two endpoint messages at round ν . Relaxation damps the edge update, which is then shared with the other endpoint. **Step (2):** Each node updates a message on every incident edge, whether or not it owns that edge. The local minimization uses its conjugate and the incoming messages μ^ν , with incident exterior coordinates fixed at the newly available $Y^{\nu+1}$. Its minimizing variables are local to this computation and do not overwrite the stored edge iterates. The outgoing messages are sent to the other endpoints for round $\nu+1$.

Nodes work in parallel within each step, once the required data have arrived. Each round advances every message once, and sends one d -vector and two functions per edge. Primal recovery uses only the incident edge coordinates.

4 Convergence Analysis

In this section, we establish convergence of Algorithm 1. We begin with the quantities the analysis is built on.

4.1 Image variables and block error bound

For the incidence representation $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}$, write $g := g_{\mathbf{B}}$ and define

$$G(W) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} f_i^*(W_i), \quad W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}.$$

Under Assumption 1, G is strongly convex. On loopy graphs, however, the incidence map is not injective and $g(Y) = G(\mathbf{B}Y)$ is constant along $\ker \mathbf{B}$: it is not strongly convex in the edge variables Y . The analysis therefore runs in the image variable $Z := \mathbf{B}Y$, which ranges over the subspace

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\mathbf{B}Y : Y \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times d}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times d}.$$

Changing $Y_{\mathcal{E}_r}$ alone moves Z along the affine subspace $Z + \mathcal{U}_r$, where

$$\mathcal{U}_S := \{\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}, S} H : H \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times d}\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}.$$

In particular, we write $\mathcal{U}_r := \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{E}_r}$.

For $Z \in \mathcal{S}$, let $O_r(Z)$ denote the unique minimizer

$$O_r(Z) = \underset{U \in Z + \mathcal{U}_r}{\operatorname{argmin}} G(U), \quad (19)$$

which is well defined and unique because G is strongly convex and $Z + \mathcal{U}_r$ is closed, and let

$$\Delta_r(Z) := G(Z) - G(O_r(Z)) \geq 0$$

be the progress of one exact minimization of block r from Z ; it vanishes exactly when Z minimizes G over $Z + \mathcal{U}_r$. Let $G^* := \min_{U \in \mathcal{S}} G(U)$, attained because G is strongly convex and $\mathcal{S}$ is closed. The analysis rests on the following condition, which bounds the optimality gap $G(Z) - G^*$ by the progress of all blocks.

Assumption 4 (block error bound) *There exists a partition-dependent constant $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} < \infty$ such that*

$$G(Z) - G^* \leq \kappa_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{r=1}^p \Delta_r(Z), \quad Z \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (20)$$

Equivalently, the same condition can be written in edge variables. For Y , choose

$$\bar{Y}_{\mathcal{E}_r} \in \mathbf{BR}_r(Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}), \quad \delta_r(Y) := g(Y) - g(\bar{Y}_{\mathcal{E}_r}, Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}).$$

Then $\delta_r(Y) = \Delta_r(\mathbf{B}Y)$. Hence, with $g^* := \min_Y g(Y) = G^*$, (20) is equivalently

$$g(Y) - g^* \leq \kappa_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{r=1}^p \delta_r(Y), \quad Y \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times d}.$$

Remark 1 The block error bound is tailored to the decomposition underlying Algorithm 1: it controls the full gap $g(Y) - g^*$ by the aggregate exact block gap $\sum_{r=1}^p \delta_r(Y)$, thereby capturing the coupling among the blocks under the partition $\mathcal{P}$. The smallest admissible constant in Assumption 4 is

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} = \sup_{Y \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times d}: g(Y) > g^*} \frac{g(Y) - g^*}{\sum_{r=1}^p \delta_r(Y)}.$$

$\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}$ admits a generic bound based on global curvature estimates for F and spectral estimates for $\mathbf{B}$, which, however, does not exploit the partition underlying Algorithm 1 and is therefore often conservative. For example, with the single-block partition $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{E}\}$ on a tree, block minimization solves the dual problem exactly, so $\delta_1(Y) = g(Y) - g^*$ and $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} = 1$, which is independent of the curvature of F and the spectral properties of $\mathbf{B}$. Exploiting this partition dependence can yield substantially sharper bounds in favorable graph/partition regimes, as shown in Section 4.4.

The proof separates into two steps. Step 1 eliminates the recursive tree messages and identifies the implemented update as a delayed block-Jacobi step; Step 2 proves linear convergence of the resulting delayed block-Jacobi scheme.

4.2 Step 1: Equivalence to a delayed block-Jacobi scheme

The delayed block-Jacobi scheme is obtained by recursively expanding the messages in the edge update (17a) using the node-to-edge recursion (18). Each substitution replaces one message by the corresponding local node factor and the incoming messages from the preceding round; iterating this expansion along the tree eliminates the recursive messages, while the exterior edge variables entering at boundary nodes remain fixed at the corresponding delayed iterates. This yields the following delayed block-Jacobi representation.

Proposition 5 *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 3 hold. Then, for all $\nu \geq \max_{r \in [p]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_r)$, Algorithm 1 can be rewritten in the equivalent form: for any $e \in \mathcal{E}_r$ and $r \in [p]$,*

$$Y_e^{\nu+1} = Y_e^{\nu} + \tau_r^{\nu} (\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} - Y_e^{\nu}), \quad (21a)$$

$$\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} \in \underset{Y_e}{\operatorname{argmin}} \min_{Y_{\mathcal{E}_r \setminus \{e\}}} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} f_i^* \left(\mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{A}_i^{\circ}} Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^{\circ}} + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{A}_i^{\partial}} \mathbf{B}_{i,h} Y_h^{\nu - \delta_{e,i}} \right) \right\}. \quad (21b)$$

The delay is defined by

$$\delta_{e,i} := \frac{\text{dist}_{\mathcal{F}_r}(e, i) - 1}{2}, \quad e \in \mathcal{E}_r, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}_r^{\partial}. \quad (22)$$

Proof See Appendix A.1. $\square$

4.3 Step 2: Convergence of the delayed block-Jacobi scheme

We now establish convergence for the delayed block-Jacobi scheme in (21). For $r \in [p]$, introduce the virtual *non-delayed* block update:

$$\bar{Y}_{\mathcal{E}_r}^{\nu+1} \in \underset{Y_{\mathcal{E}_r}}{\operatorname{argmin}} g(Y_{\mathcal{E}_r}, Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^{\nu})$$

Throughout, if $i \in \mathcal{V}$ is a node index, $Z_i^{\nu} := (Z^{\nu})_i$ denotes the i -th row of Z^{ν} . For the block index r , write

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{\nu} &:= \mathbf{B}Y^{\nu}, \quad Z_r^{\nu} := \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_{\mathcal{E}_r}^{\nu}, \\ \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} &:= \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_r} \hat{Y}_{\mathcal{E}_r}^{\nu+1}, \quad \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1} := \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_r} \bar{Y}_{\mathcal{E}_r}^{\nu+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Varying $Y_{\mathcal{E}_r}$ with $Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^{\nu}$ fixed maps, under $Y \mapsto \mathbf{B}Y$, onto the slice $Z^{\nu} + \mathcal{U}_r$. Since $g = G \circ \mathbf{B}$, the non-delayed block replacement satisfies

$$Z^{\nu} - Z_r^{\nu} + \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1} = \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_r} \bar{Y}_{\mathcal{E}_r}^{\nu+1} + \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}, \bar{\mathcal{E}}_r} Y_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r}^{\nu} = O_r(Z^{\nu}) \in \underset{U \in Z^{\nu} + \mathcal{U}_r}{\operatorname{argmin}} G(U).$$

The stepsize bounds below depend on the overlap of active node sets:

$$\omega_{\mathcal{P}} := \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} |\{r \in [p] : i \in \mathcal{V}_r\}|. \quad (23)$$

It satisfies $1 \leq \omega_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \min\{p, \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} |\mathcal{A}_i|\}$. The first result is the descent of G along the iterates $\{Z^{\nu}\}$, summarized next.

Lemma 1 *Under Assumptions 1 and 4, if $0 \leq \tau_r^{\nu} \leq 1/\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$ for every $r \in [p]$, then*

$$G(Z^{\nu+1}) \leq G(Z^{\nu}) - \sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^{\nu} \Delta_r(Z^{\nu}) + \sum_{r=1}^p \frac{\tau_r^{\nu}}{2\mu_r} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2, \quad (24)$$

where $\bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}$ is the exact non-delayed image-space block minimizer.

Proof Since $Z^{\nu} - Z_r^{\nu} + \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}$ minimizes G over $Z^{\nu} + \mathcal{U}_r$, the first-order condition gives

$$\left\langle \nabla G(Z^{\nu} - Z_r^{\nu} + \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1})^{\top}, H \right\rangle = 0, \quad H \in \mathcal{U}_r.$$

Since $\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1} \in \mathcal{U}_r$, $1/\mu_r$ -smoothness and the preceding condition give

$$G(Z^{\nu} - Z_r^{\nu} + \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1}) \leq G(Z^{\nu} - Z_r^{\nu} + \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}) + \frac{1}{2\mu_r} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2.$$

Note that $(\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^{\nu})_i = 0$ for every $i \notin \mathcal{V}_r$. Hence,

$$Z_i^{\nu+1} = \left(1 - \sum_{r \in [p]: i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \tau_r^{\nu}\right) Z_i^{\nu} + \sum_{r \in [p]: i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \tau_r^{\nu} (Z^{\nu} - Z_r^{\nu} + \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1})_i. \quad (25)$$

Since $\tau_r^{\nu} \leq 1/\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$, applying Jensen's inequality to (25) gives

$$f_i^*(Z_i^{\nu+1}) \leq \left(1 - \sum_{r \in [p]: i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \tau_r^{\nu}\right) f_i^*(Z_i^{\nu}) + \sum_{r \in [p]: i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \tau_r^{\nu} f_i^*\left((Z^{\nu} - Z_r^{\nu} + \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1})_i\right).$$

For $i \notin \mathcal{V}_r$, $(Z^\nu - Z_r^\nu + \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1})_i = Z_i^\nu$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
G(Z^{\nu+1}) - G(Z^\nu) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \left[f_i^*(Z_i^{\nu+1}) - f_i^*(Z_i^\nu) \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{r \in [p]: i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \tau_r^\nu \left[f_i^* \left((Z^\nu - Z_r^\nu + \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1})_i \right) - f_i^*(Z_i^\nu) \right] \\
&= \sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^\nu \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \left[f_i^* \left((Z^\nu - Z_r^\nu + \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1})_i \right) - f_i^*(Z_i^\nu) \right] \\
&= \sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^\nu \left[G(Z^\nu - Z_r^\nu + \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1}) - G(Z^\nu) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this inequality with the definition of $\Delta_r(Z^\nu)$ gives

$$G(Z^{\nu+1}) - G(Z^\nu) \leq - \sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^\nu \Delta_r(Z^\nu) + \sum_{r=1}^p \frac{\tau_r^\nu}{2\mu_r} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Applying Assumption 4 to (24) yields a global-gap contraction, a descent term in the block increments, and a delay-induced mismatch term.

Lemma 2 *Under Assumptions 1 and 4, assume $0 < \tau_r^\nu \leq 1/\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$ for every $r \in [p]$, and let $\underline{\tau}^\nu := \min_{r \in [p]} \tau_r^\nu$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
G(Z^{\nu+1}) - G^* &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\underline{\tau}^\nu}{2\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}} \right) (G(Z^\nu) - G^*) - \sum_{r=1}^p \frac{1}{8L_r\tau_r^\nu} \|Z_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu\|^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^\nu \frac{2/\mu_r + 1/L_r}{4} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Proof Split $\sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^\nu \Delta_r(Z^\nu)$ in (24) into two halves. By Assumption 4,

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^\nu \Delta_r(Z^\nu) \geq \frac{\underline{\tau}^\nu}{2\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}} (G(Z^\nu) - G^*).$$

Since $Z^\nu - Z_r^\nu + \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}$ minimizes G over $Z^\nu + \mathcal{U}_r$, $1/L_r$ -strong convexity on this slice gives

$$\Delta_r(Z^\nu) \geq \frac{1}{2L_r} \|\bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{4L_r} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu\|^2 - \frac{1}{2L_r} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2.$$

Multiplying the last bound by $\tau_r^\nu/2$, using $Z_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu = \tau_r^\nu(\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu)$, and substituting both estimates into Lemma 1 gives (26). $\square$

Tree-cluster mismatch estimate. Lemma 2 leaves the delayed mismatch $\|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2$ to control. By Proposition 5, it is driven by delayed boundary-edge variables and can therefore be bounded by recent increments $\|Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell\|$

from the neighboring blocks containing those edges. For block r , define the exterior edge set and the neighboring-block set by

$$\partial_r := \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \mathcal{A}_i^\partial, \quad \mathcal{M}_r := \{s \in [p] \setminus \{r\} : \mathcal{E}_s \cap \partial_r \neq \emptyset\},$$

write $J_r := |\partial_r|$, and set $D_r := \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}_r, i \in \mathcal{V}_r^\partial} \delta_{e,i}$ if $\partial_r \neq \emptyset$, and $D_r := 0$ otherwise. Then $D_r \leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_r) - 1$. To index the boundary values, define

$$\widehat{\partial}_r := \{(i, h) : i \in \mathcal{V}_r^\partial, h \in \mathcal{A}_i^\partial\}, \quad \widehat{J}_r := |\widehat{\partial}_r|.$$

For a boundary value $b \in \mathbb{R}^{\widehat{J}_r \times d}$ with rows indexed by $\widehat{\partial}_r$, define the solution mapping

$$Y_r(b) \in \underset{Y_{\mathcal{E}_r}}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} f_i^* \left(\mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{A}_i^\circ} Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^\circ} + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{A}_i^\partial} \mathbf{B}_{i,h} b_{i,h} \right), \quad (27)$$

and define

$$\mathbf{Y}_{r,e}(b) := (Y_r(b))_e, \quad \mathbf{Z}_{r,v}(b) := (\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_r(b))_v, \quad e \in \mathcal{E}_r, v \in \mathcal{V}_r.$$

The mismatch estimate compares the two minimizers by changing the boundary argument of $Y_r(\cdot)$. For $\nu \geq \max_{r \in [p]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_r)$, let $(b_r^\nu)_{(i,h)} := Y_h^\nu$ and $(\widehat{b}_{r,e}^\nu)_{(i,h)} := Y_h^{\nu - \delta_{e,i}}$ for $(i, h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r$. Then $\bar{Y}_{\mathcal{E}_r}^{\nu+1} = Y_r(b_r^\nu)$, $\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} = \mathbf{Y}_{r,e}(\widehat{b}_{r,e}^\nu)$, where $\bar{Y}_{\mathcal{E}_r}^{\nu+1}$ is the non-delayed block minimizer and $\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1}$ is the delayed edge minimizer in Proposition 5. For $e \in \mathcal{E}_r$, extend $\mathcal{V}_e(i)$ in (12) from $i \in \mathcal{I}_e$ to $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$ by taking the vertex set of the component of $\mathcal{T}_r \setminus \{e\}$ containing i , and set $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i) := \mathcal{V}_r \setminus \mathcal{V}_e(i)$.

We now quantify how a boundary perturbation propagates through the solution mapping $Y_r(\cdot)$. For $T : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, write $\text{Lip}(T) := \sup_{\eta \neq \eta'} \|T(\eta) - T(\eta')\| / \|\eta - \eta'\|$ for its global Lipschitz modulus. Let

$$\chi_r(\eta) := \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \nabla f_i \right)^{-1}(\eta),$$

where χ_r is well defined because $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \nabla f_i$ is strongly monotone. For nonempty $S \subseteq \mathcal{V}_r$, set

$$\mathcal{L}_{r,S}(\eta) := \sum_{i \in S} \nabla f_i(\chi_r(\eta)).$$

Consider the following family of vertex subsets:

$$\mathcal{R}_r := \{\{v\} : (i, h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r, v \in \mathcal{V}_r \setminus \{i\}\} \cup \{\bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i) : e \in \mathcal{E}_r, (i, h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r\}.$$

Write $N_r := |\mathcal{V}_r|$. If $\partial_r = \emptyset$, set $\kappa_{\partial,r} = 0$. Otherwise, let

$$\kappa_{\partial,r} := \max_{S \in \mathcal{R}_r} \frac{N_r}{|S|} \text{Lip}(\mathcal{L}_{r,S}), \quad (28)$$

The factor $N_r/|S|$ offsets the $1/N_r$ scale of χ_r , which comes from inverting the sum of N_r strongly monotone node maps. Hence $\kappa_{\partial,r}$ can remain $O(1)$ in the network size, and can be much smaller than local condition-number bounds. The smooth and quadratic cases below make this sharper behavior explicit.

Remark on $\kappa_{\partial,r}$. The constant $\kappa_{\partial,r}$ measures how boundary perturbations propagate through the tree cluster. When $f_i \in C^2$, for every $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\nabla \mathcal{L}_{r,S}(\eta)^\top = \left(\sum_{i \in S} H_i(\eta) \right) H_\Sigma(\eta)^{-1}, \quad H_i(\eta) := \nabla^2 f_i(\chi_r(\eta)), \quad H_\Sigma(\eta) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} H_i(\eta),$$

and hence,

$$\kappa_{\partial,r} \leq \sup_{\eta} \max_{S \in \mathcal{R}_r} \frac{N_r}{|S|} \left\| \left(\sum_{i \in S} H_i(\eta) \right) H_\Sigma(\eta)^{-1} \right\|. \quad (29)$$

For quadratic $f_i(x) = \frac{1}{2} x^\top Q_i x - c_i^\top x$, $Q_i \succ 0$, $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$, the modulus is the normalized matrix quotient constant

$$\max \left\{ \max_{(i,h)} \frac{N_r}{|\bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)|} \left\| \left(\sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)} Q_j \right) \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_r} Q_j \right)^{-1} \right\|, \max_{\substack{(i,h) \\ v \neq i}} N_r \left\| Q_v \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_r} Q_j \right)^{-1} \right\| \right\}.$$

From (29), a crude bound of $\kappa_{\partial,r}$ can be given in terms of the condition number of local functions, which can be much larger than the matrix quotient constant. For example, if $Q_i = Q$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$, then the right-hand side of (29) is independent of Q , while $\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)}$ can be arbitrarily large.

The resulting boundary sensitivity estimate is as follows.

Lemma 3 *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 3 hold. For every block r , the block solution mapping $Y_r(\cdot)$ is single-valued. If two boundary vectors b, b' differ only in coordinate (i, h) , then*

$$\|Y_{r,e}(b') - Y_{r,e}(b)\| \leq \kappa_{\partial,r} \frac{|\bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)|}{N_r} \|b'_{i,h} - b_{i,h}\|, \quad (30a)$$

$$\|Z_{r,v}(b') - Z_{r,v}(b)\| \leq \kappa_{\partial,r} \frac{1}{N_r} \|b'_{i,h} - b_{i,h}\|, \quad v \neq i. \quad (30b)$$

Proof See Appendix A.2. $\square$

For $s \in [p]$, the tree-block structure gives full column rank of $B_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_s}$. For $s \in \mathcal{M}_r$, let $\mathcal{B}_{r,s} := \mathcal{E}_s \cap \partial_r$ collect the edges of block s touching block r , which contribute delayed boundary values in Proposition 5, and set

$$A_{r,s} := \text{Diag}(|\mathcal{I}_h \cap \mathcal{V}_r| : h \in \mathcal{B}_{r,s}).$$

To count each exterior increment once per boundary incidence, define

$$\gamma_{r,s} := \lambda_{\max} \left((A_{r,s})^{1/2} \left[(B_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_s}^\top B_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_s})^{-1} \right]_{\mathcal{B}_{r,s}, \mathcal{B}_{r,s}} (A_{r,s})^{1/2} \right),$$

$$\Gamma_r := \max_{s \in \mathcal{M}_r} \gamma_{r,s},$$

with $\Gamma_r = 0$ if $\mathcal{M}_r = \emptyset$. For single-contact interfaces, $A_{r,s} = I$.

Lemma 4 Under Assumptions 1 and 3, for every block r and every iteration $\nu \geq \max_{r \in [p]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_r)$,

$$\|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2 \leq 4\kappa_{\partial,r}^2 \hat{J}_r \Gamma_r \sum_{\ell=\nu-D_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{M}_r} \|Z_s^{\ell+1} - Z_s^\ell\|^2. \quad (31)$$

The sum over ℓ is understood to be zero when $D_r = 0$.

Proof See Appendix A.3. $\square$

Combining this mismatch estimate with the delayed recursion gives the main convergence theorem.

Theorem 1 Suppose Assumptions 1, 3, and 4 hold, with $p > 1$. Define

$$A := \max_{s \in [p]} \sum_{r \in [p]: D_r > 0, s \in \mathcal{M}_r} \left[\left(\frac{2}{\mu_r} + \frac{1}{L_r} \right) \kappa_{\partial,r}^2 \hat{J}_r \Gamma_r \right], \quad D := \max_{r \in [p]} D_r. \quad (32)$$

Let $X^* = \mathbf{1}(x^*)^\top$ be the consensus primal optimizer. If $\tau_r^\nu \equiv \tau$ and

$$\tau \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\omega_{\mathcal{P}}}, \frac{2\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}}{2D+1}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{8L(2D+1)A}} \right\}, \quad (33)$$

then, for some constant $C \in (0, \infty)$ and all $\nu \geq \max_{r \in [p]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_r)$,

$$\|X^\nu - X^*\|^2 \leq C\rho^\nu, \quad \rho := 1 - \frac{\tau}{2\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}}. \quad (34)$$

Proof Lemmas 2 and 4, after regrouping delayed increments by block index, give

$$\begin{aligned} G(Z^{\nu+1}) - G^* &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{2\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}}\right) (G(Z^\nu) - G^*) - \frac{1}{8L\tau} \sum_{r=1}^p \|Z_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu\|^2 \\ &\quad + \tau A \sum_{\ell=\nu-D}^{\nu-1} \sum_{r=1}^p \|Z_r^{\ell+1} - Z_r^\ell\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking the standard delay-window inequality (e.g., [5, Lemma 5]) under (33) from this starting index yields, for some $C_0 > 0$ depending on the finite initial history,

$$g(Y^\nu) - g^* = G(Z^\nu) - G^* \leq C_0 \rho^\nu. \quad (35)$$

Let Z^* minimize G over $\mathcal{S}$, and let X^* be given by $x_i^* = \nabla f_i^*(Z_i^*)$, $i \in \mathcal{V}$. Since G is $1/L$ -strongly convex on $\mathcal{S}$, and each ∇f_i^* is $1/\mu$ -Lipschitz,

$$\|X^\nu - X^*\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\mu^2} \|Z^\nu - Z^*\|^2 \leq \frac{2LC_0}{\mu^2} \rho^\nu.$$

Absorbing constants gives (34). $\square$

Remark 2 Theorem 1 gives linear convergence with a rate ρ explicit in function regularity, network topology, and the chosen partition. The works on consensus-based methods typically give rates with explicit spectral-gap dependence, which however captures only global topology rather than local structure. The stepsize restriction (33) has three components: the overlap of active node sets through $1/\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$, delay/diameter through $(2D+1)^{-1}$, and mismatch through A .

If the communication graph is a tree, take $\mathcal{E}_1 = \mathcal{E}$ and $\tau_1^\nu \equiv 1$. Then Algorithm 1 reduces to ordinary min-sum message passing on $\mathcal{F}_1$ and terminates in finitely many rounds.

4.4 Rate discussions

Theorem 1 gives a convergence rate with explicit dependence on the block error-bound constant $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}$, the overlap $\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$, the delay diameter D , and the mismatch coefficient A . Taking the largest admissible constant stepsize gives

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{1}{2\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\omega_{\mathcal{P}}}, \frac{2\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}}{2D+1}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{8L(2D+1)A}} \right\}. \quad (36)$$

The discussion below examines how the graph and the chosen partition determine these quantities and, consequently, the network-size scaling of the rate.

Scaling of tree-dominant graph. By (36), if $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} = O(1)$, $\omega_{\mathcal{P}} = O(1)$, and $A = O(D)$, then $(1 - \rho)^{-1} = O(D)$. One typical class is tree-dominant graphs, with the partition taking the dominant tree as one block and every remaining edge as a singleton. Exact minimization over the tree block removes the large connected component, so only the $O(1)$ singleton edges carry the remaining coupling. Thus one obtains network-size independent constants $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} = O(1)$ and $A = O(1)$, as made precise below with proof in Appendix A.4.

Proposition 6 *Consider a connected graph sequence $\mathcal{G}_m = (\mathcal{V}_m, \mathcal{E}_m)$, $|\mathcal{V}_m| = m$, each containing a tree subgraph $\mathcal{T}_m = (\mathcal{V}_{0,m}, \mathcal{E}_{0,m})$. Write $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_{0,m} := \mathcal{E}_m \setminus \mathcal{E}_{0,m}$ and suppose, for a fixed q ,*

$$|\bar{\mathcal{E}}_{0,m}| \leq q.$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_m := \{\mathcal{E}_{0,m}\} \cup \{\{h\} : h \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}_{0,m}\}$ be the edge partition. Set $\mathcal{I}_{\partial,m} := \bigcup_{h \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}_{0,m}} \mathcal{I}_h$. Under Assumption 3, assume $f_i \in C^2$ for $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\partial,m}$, and there are constants $0 < \underline{\alpha}_{\partial,m} \leq \bar{\alpha}_{\partial,m}$ and a positive definite matrix $R_{\partial,m}$ such that,

$$\underline{\alpha}_{\partial,m} R_{\partial,m} \preceq \nabla^2 f_i(x) \preceq \bar{\alpha}_{\partial,m} R_{\partial,m}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}_{\partial,m}, \quad \bar{\alpha}_{\partial,m} / \underline{\alpha}_{\partial,m} = O(1),$$

and assume that L and μ_1^{-1} are uniformly bounded, where block 1 denotes the dominant tree block. Then $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}_m} = O(1)$ and $A = O(1)$, and $(1 - \rho)^{-1} = O(\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_m))$.

Note that $\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_m) \leq m - 1$ and can be much smaller than m for low-diameter dominant trees. The two examples below have $\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_m) = \Theta(m)$, hence $(1 - \rho)^{-1} = O(m)$:

- *Ring.* For a ring $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with $|\mathcal{E}| = m$, choose one path block with $|\mathcal{E}_1| = m - q$ and $q = O(1)$ singleton edge blocks. The Hessian bounds in Proposition 6 are required only on the $O(q)$ nodes incident to the singleton edges, and $\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_m) = \Theta(m - q)$; hence $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} = O(1)$, $A = O(1)$, and $(1 - \rho)^{-1} = O(m)$.
- *Barbell.* For two $O(1)$ -node cliques connected by a $\Theta(m)$ -length path, let $\mathcal{T}_m$ be this path, and put all clique edges in singleton blocks. Then the off-tree edges and interface nodes are $O(1)$, $\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_m) = \Theta(m)$, and Proposition 6 yields $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} = O(1)$, $A = O(1)$, and $(1 - \rho)^{-1} = O(m)$.

Scaling of ring with equal-length partitions. For a ring partitioned into $p \geq 2$ consecutive equal-length path blocks, $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}$ admits the following estimate, proved in Appendix A.5.

Proposition 7 *Let $\mathcal{P}_m$ be an edge partition of a ring with m edges into $p = m/(D+1) \geq 2$ consecutive path blocks, each with graph diameter $D+1$. Assume $f_i \in C^2$ for $i \in \mathcal{V}$, and there are constants $0 < \underline{\alpha}_m \leq \bar{\alpha}_m$ and a positive definite matrix R_m such that*

$$\underline{\alpha}_m R_m \preceq \nabla^2 f_i(x) \preceq \bar{\alpha}_m R_m, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad \bar{\alpha}_m / \underline{\alpha}_m = O(1).$$

Then the block error bound (20) holds with $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}_m} = O(m^2/D)$.

By Proposition 7, (32), and $\omega_{\mathcal{P}} = 2$, (36) gives

$$(1 - \rho)^{-1} = O\left(\max\left\{\frac{m^2}{D}, D, \frac{m^2}{\sqrt{D}}\right\}\right).$$

Substituting $D = \Theta(m^\gamma)$, $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, into the bound above shows that $\gamma = 1$ minimizes this upper bound, and hence $D = \Theta(m)$ and $(1 - \rho)^{-1} = O(m^{3/2})$, whereas Proposition 6 gives the sharper $O(m)$ bound for the long-path partition.

5 Surrogate enhancement

In this section, we introduce a surrogate variant of GATE to reduce per-iteration computational and communication costs. The updates in (17a) and (18) of Algorithm 1 require solving local minimization problems exactly, and each intra-cluster message $\mu_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu(\cdot)$ is a function of the receiving edge variable Y_e , which can be expensive to compute and transmit. This is particularly acute in the nonquadratic case, where messages need not admit compact finite-dimensional parametrizations; even in the quadratic case, exact messages may carry dense matrix parameters. Our approach is to replace each $g_i(Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}) = f_i^*((\mathbf{B}Y)_i)$ by a tractable surrogate: this makes the block subproblems cheaper to solve and induces messages with lightweight parametrizations.

More formally, for each node $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\tilde{g}_i : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}_i|d} \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}_i|d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}, \bar{Y}_{\mathcal{A}_i}) \mapsto \tilde{g}_i(Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}; \bar{Y}_{\mathcal{A}_i})$, be a surrogate of $g_i(Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}) = f_i^*(\mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{A}_i} Y_{\mathcal{A}_i})$. While we can directly work on the general $\tilde{g}_i$, we mainly focus on a structured choice obtained from a surrogate of the local conjugate f_i^* : choose $\tilde{f}_i^* : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(U_i, Z_i) \mapsto \tilde{f}_i^*(U_i; Z_i)$, and set

$$\tilde{g}_i(Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}; \bar{Y}_{\mathcal{A}_i}) := \tilde{f}_i^*(\mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{A}_i} Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}; \mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{A}_i} \bar{Y}_{\mathcal{A}_i}), \quad (37)$$

where $\mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{A}_i}$ only gives the composition with the edge variables $Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}$ and their center $\bar{Y}_{\mathcal{A}_i}$; $\tilde{f}_i^*$ is chosen from the local conjugate f_i^* alone and is graph-independent. At iteration ν , write $Z^\nu := \mathbf{B}Y^\nu$ and $Z_i^\nu := (Z^\nu)_i$. Replacing the exact local terms in the edge-variable update (17a) and the message update (18) by these surrogates gives Algorithm 2. When $\tilde{f}_i^*(U; Z) \equiv f_i^*(U)$, Algorithm 1 is recovered.

5.1 Surrogate regularity conditions

We impose the mild regularity conditions on the local surrogates to guarantee the convergence of Algorithm 2.

Assumption 5 *For each node $i \in \mathcal{V}$, the local surrogate $\tilde{f}_i^*$ is differentiable and satisfies the following conditions:*

Algorithm 2: GATE-S: Graph-Tearing message passing with surrogates

Input: Edge assignment $\mathbf{a}$ with ownership sets $\{\mathcal{A}_i^a\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$; edge partition $\{\mathcal{E}_r\}_{r=1}^p$; initial edge variables Y^0 ; finite-valued strongly convex initial messages $\tilde{\mu}_{i \rightarrow e}^0$, $e \in \mathcal{E}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}_e$; local surrogates $\tilde{f}_i^*(\cdot; \cdot)$; relaxation parameters $\tau_r^\nu \in [0, 1]$; $N \geq 1$.

for $\nu = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ **do**

Each node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ **executes the following steps, in parallel with the other nodes:**

 (1) Assigned edge-variable update.

foreach $r \in [p]$ **and** $e \in \mathcal{A}_i^a \cap \mathcal{E}_r$, **compute**

$$\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{y_e \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_e} \tilde{\mu}_{j \rightarrow e}^\nu(y_e) \right\}, \quad (38a)$$

$$Y_e^{\nu+1} = Y_e^\nu + \tau_r^\nu (\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} - Y_e^\nu). \quad (38b)$$

 Send $Y_e^{\nu+1}$ to the other endpoint of e .

 (2) Node-to-edge message update.

foreach $r \in [p]$ **and** $e \in \mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{E}_r$, **compute**

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_{i \rightarrow e}^{\nu+1}(y_e) = & \min_{Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^a \setminus \{e\}}} \left\{ \tilde{f}_i^* \left(B_{i,e} y_e + B_{i, \mathcal{A}_i^a \setminus \{e\}} Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^a \setminus \{e\}} + B_{i, \mathcal{A}_i^a} Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^a}^{\nu+1}; B_{i, \mathcal{A}_i} Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}^{\nu+1} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{A}_i^a \setminus \{e\}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_h \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\mu}_{j \rightarrow h}^\nu(Y_h) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

 Send $\tilde{\mu}_{i \rightarrow e}^{\nu+1}$ to the other endpoint of e .

Primal recovery. Each node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ computes $x_i^N := \nabla f_i^*((BY^N)_i)$.

(i) (*touching and gradient consistency*). For all $Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\tilde{f}_i^*(Z_i; Z_i) = f_i^*(Z_i), \quad \nabla_U \tilde{f}_i^*(Z_i; Z_i) = \nabla f_i^*(Z_i).$$

(ii) (*majorization*). For all $U_i, Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$f_i^*(U_i) \leq \tilde{f}_i^*(U_i; Z_i).$$

(iii) (*strong convexity and smoothness in U_i*). There exist constants $\tilde{\mu}_i^*, \tilde{L}_i^* \in (0, +\infty)$ such that, for every center Z_i , the map $U_i \mapsto \tilde{f}_i^*(U_i; Z_i)$ is $\tilde{\mu}_i^*$ -strongly convex and $\tilde{L}_i^*$ -smooth.

For each block r , define $\tilde{\mu}_r^* := \min_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \tilde{\mu}_i^*$, $\tilde{L}_r^* := \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \tilde{L}_i^*$. For a center $Z \in \mathcal{S}$, let $\tilde{O}_r(Z)$ denote the unique minimizer

$$\tilde{O}_r(Z) = \operatorname{argmin}_{U \in Z + \mathcal{U}_r} \tilde{G}(U; Z) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \tilde{f}_i^*(U_i; Z_i),$$

and define the corresponding surrogate block progress

$$\tilde{\Delta}_r(Z) := G(Z) - \min_{U \in Z + \mathcal{U}_r} \tilde{G}(U; Z) = G(Z) - \tilde{G}(\tilde{O}_r(Z); Z) \geq 0. \quad (40)$$

As a counterpart of the exact block error bound in Assumption 4, we impose the following surrogate variant, where the exact block progress Δ_r is replaced by $\tilde{\Delta}_r$.

Assumption 6 *There exists $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}} < \infty$ such that, with $G^* := \min_{U \in \mathcal{S}} G(U)$,*

$$G(Z) - G^* \leq \tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{r=1}^p \tilde{\Delta}_r(Z), \quad Z \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (41)$$

Equivalently, the same condition can be written in edge variables. For Y , set

$$\tilde{\delta}_r(Y) := \tilde{\Delta}_r(\mathbf{B}Y).$$

Hence, with $g^* = G^*$, Assumption 6 is equivalently

$$g(Y) - g^* \leq \tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{r=1}^p \tilde{\delta}_r(Y), \quad Y \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times d}.$$

As in the exact case, we take $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}}$ to be the smallest admissible constant, namely

$$\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}} := \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{S}: G(Z) > G^*} \frac{G(Z) - G^*}{\sum_{r=1}^p \tilde{\Delta}_r(Z)}. \quad (42)$$

This constant enters the rate of Algorithm 2; it plays for the surrogate method a similar role as $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}$ for Algorithm 1, and as a condition number in classical first-order methods. The explicit surrogate rate is given later in Theorem 2. By touching, optimality, and majorization,

$$0 \leq \tilde{\Delta}_r(Z) \leq G(Z) - G(\tilde{O}_r(Z)) \leq \Delta_r(Z).$$

Consequently, $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}}$ whenever both constants are finite. If there exists $\eta \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\tilde{\Delta}_r(Z) \geq \eta \Delta_r(Z), \quad \forall Z \in \mathcal{S}, \quad r \in [p],$$

then $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \kappa_{\mathcal{P}}/\eta$. Thus, the price of using surrogate block updates is captured by this relative progress fraction: if η remains bounded away from zero, the network-size scaling of the exact block error bound is preserved up to a constant factor.

5.2 Surrogate examples

The following are two practical choices of $\tilde{f}_i^*$ satisfying Assumption 5: a first-order surrogate with fixed metric, and a second-order surrogate that uses second-order information and allows the preconditioner to vary with the center.

Example 2 (First-order surrogate) For a fixed $M_i \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$, set

$$\tilde{f}_i^*(U_i; Z_i) := f_i^*(Z_i) + \langle \nabla f_i^*(Z_i), U_i - Z_i \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle U_i - Z_i, M_i(U_i - Z_i) \rangle. \quad (43)$$

A special case is the scalar metric: $M_i = \alpha_i^{-1} I_d$, with $\alpha_i > 0$.

Example 3 (Second-order surrogate) Let $H_i(Z_i) \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$ be chosen from second-order information, for instance $H_i(Z_i) = \nabla^2 f_i^*(Z_i) + \zeta_i I_d$ with $\zeta_i \geq 0$, and define

$$\tilde{f}_i^*(U_i; Z_i) := f_i^*(Z_i) + \langle \nabla f_i^*(Z_i), U_i - Z_i \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle U_i - Z_i, H_i(Z_i)(U_i - Z_i) \rangle.$$

5.2.1 Regularity and block error bound comparison

Surrogate regularity. Let $H_i(Z_i)$ denote the quadratic metric in the surrogate, with $H_i(Z_i) \equiv M_i$ in Example 2 and center-dependent H_i in Example 3. Touching and gradient consistency are immediate. Majorization holds whenever the chosen quadratic metric $H_i(Z_i)$ majorizes the curvature of f_i^* on the relevant region. Assumption 5(iii) holds with $\tilde{\mu}_i^* := \inf_{Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{\min}(H_i(Z_i))$ and $\tilde{L}_i^* := \sup_{Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{\max}(H_i(Z_i))$ whenever $0 < \tilde{\mu}_i^* \leq \tilde{L}_i^* < \infty$.

Block error bound comparison. Given a partition $\mathcal{P}$, we next compare $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}}$ in (42) with the exact constant $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}$ for the fixed-metric surrogate in Example 2. Fix r and write a block variation as $U = Z + P$ with $P \in \mathcal{U}_r$. By (40) and the change of variables $U = Z + P$, $\tilde{\Delta}_r(Z) = G(Z) - \min_{P \in \mathcal{U}_r} \tilde{G}(Z + P; Z)$. For $i \notin \mathcal{V}_r$, $\mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{E}_r} = 0$, so every $P \in \mathcal{U}_r$ satisfies $P_i = 0$. Hence (43) gives

$$\tilde{G}(Z + P; Z) = G(Z) + \left\langle (\nabla G(Z)^\top)_{\mathcal{V}_r}, P_{\mathcal{V}_r} \right\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \langle P_i, M_i P_i \rangle.$$

Substituting this identity into the definition gives

$$\tilde{\Delta}_r(Z) = - \min_{P \in \mathcal{U}_r} \left\{ \left\langle (\nabla G(Z)^\top)_{\mathcal{V}_r}, P_{\mathcal{V}_r} \right\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \langle P_i, M_i P_i \rangle \right\}, \quad (44)$$

If the fixed metrics on $\mathcal{V}_r$ satisfy the curvature sandwich

$$\rho_i^{-1} M_i \preceq \nabla^2 f_i^*(z) \preceq M_i, \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}_r, \quad (45)$$

with $\rho_i \geq 1$ and $\rho_r := \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \rho_i$, then the lower curvature bound in (45) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_r(Z) &\leq - \min_{P \in \mathcal{U}_r} \left\{ \left\langle (\nabla G(Z)^\top)_{\mathcal{V}_r}, P_{\mathcal{V}_r} \right\rangle + \frac{1}{2\rho_r} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \langle P_i, M_i P_i \rangle \right\} \\ &= \rho_r \left[- \min_{Q \in \mathcal{U}_r} \left\{ \left\langle (\nabla G(Z)^\top)_{\mathcal{V}_r}, Q_{\mathcal{V}_r} \right\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \langle Q_i, M_i Q_i \rangle \right\} \right] \\ &= \rho_r \tilde{\Delta}_r(Z), \end{aligned}$$

where the equality uses $P = \rho_r Q$, the linearity of $\mathcal{U}_r$, and (44). Hence

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \rho_{\max} \kappa_{\mathcal{P}}, \quad \rho_{\max} := \max_{r \in [p]} \rho_r.$$

Note that $\rho_{\max}$ is independent of graph and partition. Hence $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}$ have the same network scaling. If the surrogate Hessian M_i matches $\nabla^2 f_i^*$ well (i.e., $\rho_i \approx 1$), the resulting degradation from $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}$ to $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is only a small factor. In the scalar case, choosing $M_i = \mu_{f_i}^{-1} I_d$ ensures (45) with $\rho_i = L_{f_i} / \mu_{f_i}$, thereby retaining the network scaling of the block error bound up to a local condition number.

5.2.2 Quadratic message implementation

The surrogates in Examples 2 and 3 are quadratic in U_i . Therefore, under the updates in Algorithm 2, the messages remain quadratic and can be encoded by a vector and a Hessian matrix. Concretely, each message can be written as

$$\tilde{\mu}_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu(Y_e) \sim \frac{1}{2} \langle Y_e, H_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu Y_e \rangle + \langle P_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu, Y_e \rangle, \quad H_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu \in \mathbb{S}_+^d, \quad P_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (46)$$

For $h, h' \in \mathcal{A}_i$, $\nabla_{Y_h Y_{h'}}^2 \tilde{g}_i = \mathbf{B}_{i,h} \mathbf{B}_{i,h'} M_i$ in Example 2, and $\nabla_{Y_h Y_{h'}}^2 \tilde{g}_i = \mathbf{B}_{i,h} \mathbf{B}_{i,h'} H_i(Z_i^\nu)$ in Example 3. These Hessians can be dense, and so can the message Hessians $H_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu$.

Stabilization of message Hessians. In Example 2, the Hessian recursion does not depend on the surrogate centers. On the tree cluster, it is time-independent and stabilizes after finitely many sweeps. After this stabilization phase, the Hessian matrices no longer need to be transmitted; subsequent iterations update and send only the vectors $P_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu$.

Scalar-metric messages. The scalar metric even avoids matrix-valued Hessian communication entirely. Take $M_i = \alpha_i^{-1} I_d$, with $\alpha_i > 0$, then $\nabla_{Y_h Y_{h'}}^2 \tilde{g}_i = \alpha_i^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{i,h} \mathbf{B}_{i,h'} I_d$, and Schur complements preserve this isotropic form. Therefore every message has the scalar-quadratic form

$$\tilde{\mu}_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu(Y_e) \sim \frac{h_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu}{2} \|Y_e\|^2 + \langle P_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu, Y_e \rangle, \quad h_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad P_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Only one scalar Hessian coefficient and one d -vector are needed to transmit.

Slice-wise Hessian communication. The communication bottleneck is dense Hessian transmission. In both Examples 2 and 3, $H_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu$ in (46) can be a full $d \times d$ matrix. In Example 2, full-matrix transmission is confined to a finite Hessian-stabilization phase. In contrast, Example 3 has no such finite stabilization guarantee: $H_i(Z_i^\nu)$ varies with the center, so the message Hessians can remain dense and time-varying. To avoid this repeated full-matrix transmission in practice, we propose the following slice-wise Hessian communication strategy, in which only a slice of the Hessian is sent at each round.

Using the quadratic message representation (46), the vector $P_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu$ is sent every round, while the receiving node maintains a Hessian cache $\mathbf{H}_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu$. Decompose $\mathbb{S}^d$ as the direct sum $\mathbb{S}^d = \bigoplus_{k=1}^K \mathbb{S}_k$, where each $\mathbb{S}_k$ is chosen to admit a low-cost parametrization for communication and Π_k denotes the projection onto $\mathbb{S}_k$. Examples include diagonal bands, matrix rows or columns, and low-rank subspaces. When node i computes $\tilde{\mu}_{i \rightarrow e}^{\nu+1}$ by (39), each incoming message $\tilde{\mu}_{j \rightarrow h}^\nu$ in the local minimization is evaluated with the current vector $P_{j \rightarrow h}^\nu$ and the cached Hessian $\mathbf{H}_{j \rightarrow h}^\nu$. After this minimization, node i has computed the full Hessian $H_{i \rightarrow e}^{\nu+1}$ of $\tilde{\mu}_{i \rightarrow e}^{\nu+1}$, but sends only the slice indexed by $s(\nu) \in [K]$. The receiving node then updates only that slice of its cache:

$$\Pi_{s(\nu)} \mathbf{H}_{i \rightarrow e}^{\nu+1} = \Pi_{s(\nu)} H_{i \rightarrow e}^{\nu+1}, \quad \Pi_k \mathbf{H}_{i \rightarrow e}^{\nu+1} = \Pi_k \mathbf{H}_{i \rightarrow e}^\nu \quad (k \neq s(\nu)).$$

Thus each round sends one slice of each dense message Hessian, while the receiving node keeps the remaining slices from its Hessian cache. For the fixed-metric surrogate (43), if the updates are well defined and each slice is used at least once

in every S consecutive rounds, all Hessian caches in cluster r equal the stabilized message Hessians after at most

$$S \left(\left\lceil \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{F}_r)}{2} \right\rceil + 1 \right)$$

rounds. Note that the cached Hessians may be indefinite. In practice, if necessary, we can add δI_d to each cache with $\delta > 0$ chosen to keep the local subproblem well defined.

5.3 Convergence analysis

We now establish the convergence of Algorithm 2. As in the tree-cluster mismatch estimate in Section 4.3, we control the surrogate mismatch by perturbing the solution map defined later in its boundary vector and surrogate centers. Fix a block r . For $e \in \mathcal{E}_r$, extend the delays in (22) to all $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$ by

$$\delta_{e,i} := \frac{\text{dist}_{\mathcal{F}_r}(e,i) - 1}{2}, \quad e \in \mathcal{E}_r, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}_r, \quad (47)$$

$\tilde{D}_r := \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}_r, i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \delta_{e,i}$, and $\tilde{D} := \max_{r \in [p]} \tilde{D}_r$. For a boundary value b and centers $\vartheta = (\vartheta_i)_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r}$, define

$$\tilde{Y}_r(b, \vartheta) \in \underset{Y_{\mathcal{E}_r}}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \tilde{f}_i^* \left(\mathbf{B}_{i, \mathcal{A}_i^\circ} Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^\circ} + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{A}_i^\vartheta} \mathbf{B}_{i,h} b_{i,h}; \vartheta_i \right).$$

Set

$$\tilde{Y}_{r,e}(b, \vartheta) := [\tilde{Y}_r(b, \vartheta)]_e, \quad \tilde{Z}_{r,v}(b, \vartheta) := (\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r} \tilde{Y}_r(b, \vartheta))_v.$$

At iteration ν , define $b_r^\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{\mathcal{J}}_r \times d}$ by $(b_r^\nu)_{(i,h)} := Y_h^\nu$ for $(i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r$, and let $Z_{\mathcal{V}_r}^\nu$ denote the restriction of $Z^\nu = \mathbf{B}Y^\nu$ to $\mathcal{V}_r$. For $e \in \mathcal{E}_r$ and $\nu \geq \max_{r \in [p]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_r)$, let

$$(b_{r,e}^\nu)_{(i,h)} := Y_h^{\nu - \delta_{e,i}} \quad ((i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r), \quad Z_{r,e}^\nu := (Z_i^{\nu - \delta_{e,i}})_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r}.$$

Set the nondelayed image block and write the edge updates generated by Algorithm 2 as

$$\bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1} := \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_r} \tilde{Y}_r(b_r^\nu, Z_{\mathcal{V}_r}^\nu), \quad \hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} := [\tilde{Y}_r(b_{r,e}^\nu, Z_{r,e}^\nu)]_e, \quad \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} := \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_r} \hat{Y}_{\mathcal{E}_r}^{\nu+1}.$$

We now introduce the frozen-center counterparts of $\kappa_{\partial,r}$. For fixed centers ϑ , let $\tilde{\chi}_r(\cdot; \vartheta)$ be defined by

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} (\nabla_u \tilde{f}_i^*(\cdot; \vartheta_i))^{-1} (\tilde{\chi}_r(\eta; \vartheta)) = \eta,$$

where $\tilde{\chi}_r(\cdot; \vartheta)$ is well defined by strong monotonicity. For nonempty $S \subseteq \mathcal{V}_r$, set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,S}(\eta; \vartheta) := \sum_{i \in S} (\nabla_u \tilde{f}_i^*(\cdot; \vartheta_i))^{-1} (\tilde{\chi}_r(\eta; \vartheta)). \quad (48)$$

The relevant boundary subsets are

$$\mathcal{R}_r := \{ \{v\} : (i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r, v \in \mathcal{V}_r \setminus \{i\} \} \cup \{ \bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i) : e \in \mathcal{E}_r, (i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r \}.$$

If $\partial_r = \emptyset$, set $\tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r} = 0$. Otherwise, let

$$\tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r} := \sup_{\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_r \times d}} \max_{S \in \mathcal{R}_r} \frac{N_r}{|S|} \text{Lip}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,S}(\cdot; \vartheta)). \quad (49)$$

As in (28), the factor $N_r/|S|$ in (49) offsets the $1/N_r$ scale that comes from inverting the sum of N_r strongly monotone frozen surrogate node maps. Hence $\tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r}$ can remain $O(1)$ in the network size.

For a map $F(\eta; \vartheta)$, let $\text{Lip}_{\vartheta_i} F(\eta; \vartheta)$ denote its Lipschitz modulus in the i -th center coordinate of ϑ , with η and the other center coordinates fixed. Define the normalized center-coordinate modulus

$$\tilde{\kappa}_{c,r} := \sup_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d, \vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_r \times d}} \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \max \left\{ \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}_r} \frac{N_r}{|\bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)|} \text{Lip}_{\vartheta_i}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,\bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)}(\eta; \vartheta)), \right. \\ \left. \text{Lip}_{\vartheta_i}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,\{i\}}(\eta; \vartheta)), \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r \setminus \{i\}} N_r \text{Lip}_{\vartheta_i}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,\{v\}}(\eta; \vartheta)) \right\}. \quad (50)$$

As with $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}}$, we assume $\tilde{\kappa}_{c,r} < \infty$ for every $r \in [p]$. The modulus $\tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}$ measures the center sensitivity of the aggregate maps and can reflect the surrogate approximation quality. It vanishes for the exact surrogate $\tilde{f}_i^*(U_i; Z_i) = f_i^*(U_i)$. A more detailed interpretation is given in Appendix B.1. The resulting surrogate sensitivity estimate is as follows.

Lemma 5 *Suppose Assumptions 3 and 5 hold. For every block r , the frozen surrogate tree oracle $\tilde{Y}_r(\cdot, \cdot)$ is single-valued. If two boundary vectors b, b' differ only in coordinate (i, h) , then, for any center ϑ ,*

$$\|\tilde{Y}_{r,e}(b', \vartheta) - \tilde{Y}_{r,e}(b, \vartheta)\| \leq \tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r} \frac{|\bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)|}{N_r} \|b'_{i,h} - b_{i,h}\|, \quad (51a)$$

$$\|\tilde{Z}_{r,v}(b', \vartheta) - \tilde{Z}_{r,v}(b, \vartheta)\| \leq \tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r} \frac{1}{N_r} \|b'_{i,h} - b_{i,h}\|, \quad v \neq i. \quad (51b)$$

If two centers $\vartheta, \hat{\vartheta}$ differ only in coordinate i , then, for any boundary vector b ,

$$\|\tilde{Y}_{r,e}(b, \hat{\vartheta}) - \tilde{Y}_{r,e}(b, \vartheta)\| \leq \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r} \frac{|\bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)|}{N_r} \|\hat{\vartheta}_i - \vartheta_i\|, \quad (52a)$$

$$\|\tilde{Z}_{r,i}(b, \hat{\vartheta}) - \tilde{Z}_{r,i}(b, \vartheta)\| \leq \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r} \|\hat{\vartheta}_i - \vartheta_i\|, \quad (52b)$$

$$\|\tilde{Z}_{r,v}(b, \hat{\vartheta}) - \tilde{Z}_{r,v}(b, \vartheta)\| \leq \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}}{N_r} \|\hat{\vartheta}_i - \vartheta_i\|, \quad v \neq i. \quad (52c)$$

Proof See Appendix B.1. $\square$

As in Lemma 4, these sensitivity bounds yield the following image-space mismatch estimate for the surrogate update.

Lemma 6 *Under Assumptions 3 and 5, for each block r , define*

$$\tilde{M}_{r,\partial} := \Gamma_r \left(8\tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r}^2 \hat{J}_r + 8J_r(N_r + \tilde{D}_r)\tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \right), \\ \tilde{M}_{r,c} := 8(N_r + \tilde{D}_r)\tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2.$$

Then, for every iteration $\nu \geq \max_{r \in [p]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_r)$,

$$\|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2 \leq \widetilde{M}_{r,\partial} \sum_{\ell=\nu-\widetilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{M}_r} \|Z_s^{\ell+1} - Z_s^\ell\|^2 + \widetilde{M}_{r,c} \sum_{\ell=\nu-\widetilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \|Z_r^{\ell+1} - Z_r^\ell\|^2. \quad (53)$$

The sums over ℓ are understood to be zero when $\widetilde{D}_r = 0$.

Proof See Appendix B.2. $\square$

Using this mismatch estimate, we obtain the following convergence theorem.

Theorem 2 Suppose Assumptions 1, 3, 5, and 6 hold, with $p > 1$. Define $\underline{\tilde{\mu}}^* := \min_{r \in [p]} \tilde{\mu}_r^*$ and

$$\tilde{A} := \max_{s \in [p]} \left[\sum_{r \in [p]: \widetilde{D}_r > 0, s \in \mathcal{M}_r} \frac{2\tilde{L}_r^* + \tilde{\mu}_r^*}{4} \widetilde{M}_{r,\partial} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\widetilde{D}_s > 0\}} \frac{2\tilde{L}_s^* + \tilde{\mu}_s^*}{4} \widetilde{M}_{s,c} \right]. \quad (54)$$

Let $X^* = \mathbf{1}(x^*)^\top$ be the consensus primal optimizer. If $\tau_r^\nu \equiv \tau$ and

$$\tau \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\omega_{\mathcal{P}}}, \frac{2\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}}}{2\widetilde{D} + 1}, \sqrt{\frac{\underline{\tilde{\mu}}^*}{8(2\widetilde{D} + 1)\tilde{A}}} \right\}, \quad (55)$$

then, for some constant $C \in (0, \infty)$ and all $\nu \geq \max_{r \in [p]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_r)$,

$$\|X^\nu - X^*\|^2 \leq C\tilde{\rho}^\nu, \quad \tilde{\rho} := 1 - \frac{\tau}{2\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}}}. \quad (56)$$

Proof See Appendix B.3. $\square$

Remark 3 Theorem 2 parallels Theorem 1: Algorithm 2 converges linearly, with contraction factor $\tilde{\rho}$ now given by (56). Relative to the exact case (Theorem 1), the stepsize restriction (55) retains the same three-way structure as (33): the overlap of active node sets through $1/\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$, delay/diameter through $(2\widetilde{D} + 1)^{-1}$, and mismatch through $\tilde{A}$. The main differences are that the exact constants $(1/L_r, 1/\mu_r, A)$ are replaced by $(\tilde{\mu}_r^*, \tilde{L}_r^*, \tilde{A})$, and that $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}$ is replaced by $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}}$, which may be larger when the surrogate captures less exact block progress. The resulting deviation from the exact constants is the rate price for cheaper local computation and communication.

5.4 Comparison with consensus-based methods

We now compare the convergence rate of Algorithm 2 with those of consensus-based methods, such as DGD [24], EXTRA [19], and SONATA [20], in terms of network-size scaling. We show that, for a class of tree-dominant graphs, sufficiently accurate surrogates yield an acceleration in network-size scaling relative to these consensus baselines; moreover, for general graphs, their spectral-gap scaling can be recovered by a proximal-linear surrogate.

Acceleration in tree-dominant graphs. For tree-dominant graph families equipped with a partition $\mathcal{P}$ that has a dominant tree block and only $O(1)$ remaining singleton edge blocks, the analysis in Section 4.4 gives $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} = O(1)$, $A = O(1)$.

Theorem 1 then yields $(1 - \rho)^{-1} = O(D)$. For the ring and barbell examples, the exact rate scaling is $O(m)$. In contrast, consensus baselines have $O(m^2)$ rate scaling on these graphs through the inverse spectral-gap factor $1/\lambda_{\min}^+(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top)$. The exact $O(m)$ rate scaling therefore gives network-size acceleration over those baselines.

The constant $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}}$ preserves the network-size scaling of $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}$ whenever the surrogate block progress captures the exact block progress up to a constant fraction. Indeed, if, for some network-independent $\eta \in (0, 1]$, $\delta_r(Y) \geq \eta \delta_r(Y)$ holds for all $r \in [p]$, then $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \kappa_{\mathcal{P}}/\eta$. For example, once a quadratic surrogate satisfies the Hessian sandwich inequality (45), it gives $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \rho_{\max} \kappa_{\mathcal{P}}$ with network-independent $\rho_{\max}$. Consequently, for the tree-dominant families and partitions above, $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}} = O(1)$ and Lemma 6 gives $\tilde{A} = O(m)$. then Theorem 2 gives $(1 - \tilde{\rho})^{-1} = O(\sqrt{m\tilde{D}})$ by Theorem 2, with $\tilde{D} = \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_m) - 1$. This matches the exact method's $O(m)$ scaling for the ring and barbell examples, where $\tilde{D} = \Theta(m)$.

Consensus scaling recovery. On general graphs, the consensus scaling is recovered by choosing a direct proximal-linear surrogate for $g_i(Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}) = f_i^*(\mathbf{B}_{i,\mathcal{A}_i} Y_{\mathcal{A}_i})$, outside the structured subclass (37). Specifically, for sufficiently large $c_{i,e} > 0$, set

$$\tilde{g}_i(Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}; Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}^\nu) := g_i(Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}^\nu) + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_i} \langle \nabla_{Y_e} g_i(Y_{\mathcal{A}_i}^\nu), Y_e - Y_e^\nu \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_i} c_{i,e} \|Y_e - Y_e^\nu\|^2. \quad (57)$$

Since (57) is separable in $\{Y_e : e \in \mathcal{A}_i\}$, the message update satisfies

$$\tilde{\mu}_{i \rightarrow e}^{\nu+1}(Y_e) \sim \left\langle \mathbf{B}_{i,e} \nabla f_i^*((\mathbf{B}Y^{\nu+1})_i), Y_e - Y_e^{\nu+1} \right\rangle + \frac{c_{i,e}}{2} \|Y_e - Y_e^{\nu+1}\|^2.$$

For $\nu \geq 1$ and $e \in \mathcal{E}_r$ with $\mathcal{I}_e = \{i, j\}$, the edge update is the dual-gradient step

$$\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} = Y_e^\nu - \frac{\mathbf{B}_{i,e} \nabla f_i^*(Z_i^\nu) + \mathbf{B}_{j,e} \nabla f_j^*(Z_j^\nu)}{c_{i,e} + c_{j,e}},$$

followed by $Y_e^{\nu+1} = Y_e^\nu + \tau_r^\nu (\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} - Y_e^\nu)$. The associated surrogate block progress is

$$\tilde{\delta}_r(Y) = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_r} \frac{\|\nabla_{Y_e} g(Y)\|^2}{2(c_{i,e} + c_{j,e})}, \quad \nabla_{Y_e} g(Y) = \mathbf{B}_{i,e} \nabla f_i^*((\mathbf{B}Y)_i) + \mathbf{B}_{j,e} \nabla f_j^*((\mathbf{B}Y)_j).$$

Consequently, the corresponding block error bound constant is

$$\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}} = \sup_{g(Y) > g^*} \frac{g(Y) - g^*}{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} (c_{i,e} + c_{j,e})^{-1} \|\nabla_{Y_e} g(Y)\|^2},$$

and is independent of the partition $\mathcal{P}$. Since $\nabla g(Y)^\top = \mathbf{B}^\top \nabla G(\mathbf{B}Y)^\top$, strong convexity and smoothness of G on $\mathcal{S}$ give

$$g(Y) - g^* \leq \frac{L}{2\lambda_{\min}^+(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top)} \|\nabla g(Y)\|^2.$$

If L and the coefficients $c_{i,e} + c_{j,e}$ are bounded independently of network size, then

$$\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}^+(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top)}\right), \quad (58)$$

where $\lambda_{\min}^+$ is the smallest positive eigenvalue. Thus, on general graphs, this surrogate recovers the usual consensus spectral-gap rate scaling $O(1/\lambda_{\min}^+(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top))$, matching classical consensus-based methods.

6 Numerical experiments

In this section, we evaluate GATE and its surrogate variants on strongly convex quadratic and regularized logistic regression problems over various graphs, with and without a dominant tree structure. The quadratic instances have the form

$$f_i(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^\top H_i x + q_i^\top x, \quad H_i \succ 0.$$

The non-quadratic instances have the form

$$f_i(x) = \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} \log\left(1 + \exp\left(-b_{ij}a_{ij}^\top x\right)\right) + \frac{1}{2}x^\top R_i x - h_i^\top x, \quad R_i \succ 0.$$

Performance is measured by the primal error $\|X^\nu - \mathbf{1}(x^*)^\top\|$.

6.1 Scaling verification and partition effects

In this part, we verify the scaling with network size and dominant-tree diameter and examine the effect of the partition.

Network-size scaling on rings. We first verify network-size scaling for quadratic problems on ring networks with $d = 20$. Each H_i is generated as a random symmetric Gaussian matrix with a positive diagonal correction chosen so that $\kappa(H_i) = 2$. The edge partition consists of one $(m-2)$ -edge path cluster and two singleton-edge clusters. GATE-S1 uses the fixed diagonal metric $M_i = \text{Diag}(H_i^{-1}) + \delta I_d$, with δ tuned. Figure 4(a) shows that GATE and GATE-S1 are faster than EXTRA and SONATA, with the gap widening as m grows. Figure 4(b) indicates linear scaling for the GATE variants and quadratic scaling for the consensus baselines, which is consistent with the theoretical comparison in Section 5.4.




Fig. 4: Network-size scaling for quadratic problems on a ring. Panel (a) reports the iteration counts versus the number of agents m , while panel (b) presents the same data on log-log axes to make their dependence on m more apparent. Panel (c) shows the graph and edge partition. The stopping criterion is $\|X^\nu - \mathbf{1}(x^*)^\top\| < 10^{-4}$.

To test whether the scaling observed above persists beyond the quadratic setting, we next consider the non-quadratic logistic regression problem, for which

neither GATE surrogate is exact. We use $d = 10$, $N_i = 40$, and the same partition as in the quadratic experiment. The Hessian condition number is set to five. The quadratic-surrogate metrics are $\nabla^2 f_i^*(Z_i^\nu) + \delta I_d$ for GATE-S2 and $\text{Diag}(\nabla^2 f_i^*(Z_i^\nu)) + \delta I_d$ for GATE-S1, with δ tuned separately for each method. Figure 5(a) shows that GATE-S1 and GATE-S2 remain faster than EXTRA and SONATA, with the gap widening as m grows. Figure 5(b) indicates near-linear scaling for the GATE surrogates, whereas the consensus baselines approach quadratic scaling over the upper range.




Fig. 5: Network-size scaling for logistic-regression problems on a ring. Panel (a) reports the iteration counts versus the number of agents m , while panel (b) presents the same data on log-log axes to make their dependence on m more apparent. Panel (c) shows the graph and edge partition. The stopping criterion is $\|X^\nu - 1(x^*)^\top\| < 10^{-4}$.

Dependence on the dominant-tree diameter. We next study the dependence of the convergence rate on the diameter D for a quadratic problem over a non-ring graph. The graph consists of two three-node cliques connected by a growing non-path tree, with the partition containing one dominant tree cluster and six singleton-edge clusters. We set $H_i = H_0 \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^5$ for all i , where H_0 is dense and $\kappa(H_0) = 2$. For GATE-S1, we use a diagonal metric with entries $(M_i)_{kk} = (H_0^{-1})_{kk} + \sum_{\ell \neq k} |(H_0^{-1})_{k\ell}|$, so $M_i \succeq H_0^{-1}$.

With m fixed, Figure 6(b) indicates the $O(D)$ and $O(\sqrt{Dm})$ rate scalings for GATE and GATE-S1, respectively, consistent with Theorems 1 and 2. Figure 6(a) then considers $D = \Theta(\sqrt{m})$ as m varies and exhibits the corresponding $m^{1/2}$ and $m^{3/4}$ scalings for GATE and GATE-S1, respectively, further confirming the theoretical scaling.

Effect of the partition. We next examine the effect of the partition for a quadratic problem on a ring. For each network size, we compare three partitions: P1 contains one $(m-2)$ -edge path and two singleton-edge clusters; P2 arranges two paths of length $(m/2-1)$; and P3 contains $\sqrt{m}$ consecutive path blocks of $\sqrt{m}$ edges each.

Figure 7 shows that P1 and P2 substantially outperform P3, while P1 is modestly faster than P2. This ordering is consistent with the discussion following Proposition 7: $D = \Theta(m)$ minimizes the rate bound for equal-length partitions of the ring, whereas Proposition 6 gives the sharper $O(m)$ rate for the long-path partition.




Fig. 6: Network-size and diameter scaling for quadratic problems on a non-ring graph family. Panel (a) reports the iteration counts versus the number of agents m for graphs with $D = \Theta(\sqrt{m})$. Panel (b) reports the iteration counts versus the dominant-tree diameter D at fixed $m = 406$. Panel (c) shows the graph and edge partition. The stopping criterion is $\|X^\nu - \mathbf{1}(x^*)^\top\| < 10^{-4}$.




Fig. 7: Effect of the partition on GATE for quadratic problems on a ring ($d = 10$). Panel (a) reports the iteration counts versus the number of agents m for P1, P2, and P3. Panels (b)–(d) show the corresponding partitions on a representative ring. The stopping criterion is $\|X^\nu - \mathbf{1}(x^*)^\top\| < 10^{-4}$.

6.2 Performance comparison

In this part, we compare the algorithms in terms of iteration count and cumulative communication on tree-dominant barbell networks and a multi-cycle network. Communication is measured by the total number of scalars transmitted over directed links, normalized by d .

Tree-dominant barbell networks. We consider barbell graphs formed by two four-node cliques connected by a path of $L \in \{10, 100\}$ edges. The partition contains one dominant tree cluster formed by the path and a three-edge star centered at the

path endpoint in each clique, while each of the six remaining clique edges forms a singleton-edge cluster.

For the quadratic problems, we set $d = 100$ and use dense H_i generated from Gaussian Gram matrices with a diagonal correction, yielding $\kappa(H_i) \approx 100$. GATE uses exact quadratic messages, while GATE-S1 and GATE-S2 (cache Hessian) use a fixed diagonal metric and a slice-wise Hessian cache, respectively. Figure 8 shows that GATE is markedly faster than all other methods, reaching the target in only 31 and 114 iterations for $L = 10$ and $L = 100$, respectively. Although GATE initially transmits dense message Hessians, these matrices stabilize after finitely many rounds and only the message vectors are sent thereafter; consequently, GATE also has the lowest cumulative communication. GATE-S2 (cache Hessian) sends only message vectors and d -vector Hessian slices. Once its cache has recovered the stabilized message Hessians, its tail follows essentially the same linear rate as GATE, consistent with the finite cache-recovery property in Section 5.2.2. GATE-S1 is comparable to EXTRA, the fastest consensus baseline on these instances. CTA and ATC do not reach 10^{-6} within 10^5 iterations.




Fig. 8: Performance comparison for quadratic problems on two barbell graphs. Panels (a)–(c) use $L = 10$, while panels (d)–(f) use $L = 100$. Panels (a) and (d) report the primal error versus iteration count, while panels (b) and (e) report it versus cumulative communication. Panels (c) and (f) show the corresponding graphs and partitions; red edges form the dominant tree cluster and blue edges form singleton-edge clusters. The stopping criterion is $\|X^\nu - \mathbf{1}(x^*)^\top\| \leq 10^{-6}$.

We next test logistic-regression problems on the same graphs and partitions, with $d = 100$ and $N_i = 80$. GATE-S2 (exact Hessian), GATE-S1, and GATE-S2

(cache Hessian) use the full center-dependent Hessian, its diagonal, and a slice-wise Hessian cache, respectively. The exact-Hessian variant is included only in the iteration plots because it transmits dense Hessian matrices at every iteration. Figure 9 shows that the cache variant is second only to GATE-S2 (exact Hessian) in iteration count and requires the least communication among all other methods that reach the target. For $L = 100$, GATE-S2 (cache Hessian) requires about one third as much communication as either GATE-S1 or EXTRA.




Fig. 9: Logistic-regression comparison on two barbell graphs. Panels (a)–(c) use $L = 10$, while panels (d)–(f) use $L = 100$. Panels (a) and (d) report the error versus iteration count, while panels (b) and (e) report it versus cumulative communication; GATE-S2 (exact Hessian) is omitted from the communication panels. Panels (c) and (f) show the corresponding graphs and partitions; red edges form the dominant tree cluster and blue edges form singleton-edge clusters. The stopping criterion is $\|X^\nu - \mathbf{1}(x^*)^\top\| \leq 10^{-6}$.

A multi-cycle network. We next test whether the gains persist on the network in Figure 10, which contains several cycles but no pronounced long-tree structure. We consider partitions beyond Assumption 3 to assess the empirical robustness of GATE to the choice of partition. The quadratic problem uses $d = 200$ and dense local Hessians with condition number eight, while the logistic-regression problem uses $d = 50$ and $N_i = 80$. For the quadratic problem, we compare exact GATE, two GATE-S1 variants, and GATE-S2 (cache Hessian) against the consensus baselines. For logistic regression, we replace exact GATE with GATE-S2 (exact Hessian) and retain the remaining methods.

Figure 10(a) shows that exact GATE converges fastest for the quadratic problem. GATE-S2 (cache Hessian) follows essentially the same tail rate, and Figure 10(b) shows that it requires the least communication. The scalar and diagonal GATE-S1 variants also outperform all consensus baselines in both iteration count and communication. For logistic regression, Figure 10(d) shows that GATE-S2 (exact Hessian) is fastest, followed by the cache variant; Figure 10(e) shows that the cache variant again requires the least communication among the displayed methods. The diagonal GATE-S1 variant remains faster than all consensus baselines in both measures, whereas the scalar GATE-S1 variant is less competitive on this instance. EXTRA is the strongest consensus baseline in both problems; DIGing and SONATA require more communication, while CTA and ATC do not reach the target. Thus, the practical gains observed on the barbell graphs persist on this multi-cycle network.




Fig. 10: Performance comparison for quadratic and logistic-regression problems on a multi-cycle network. Panels (a)–(c) show the quadratic results with $d = 200$, while panels (d)–(f) show the logistic-regression (LR) results with $d = 50$. Panels (a) and (d) report the error versus iteration count, while panels (b) and (e) report it versus cumulative communication; GATE-S2 (exact Hessian) is omitted from panel (e). Panels (c) and (f) show the common graph and partition; red edges form the message-passing cluster and the blue edge forms the singleton-edge cluster. The stopping criterion is $\|X^\nu - \mathbf{1}(x^*)^\top\| \leq 10^{-6}$.

7 Conclusion

In this work, we developed a graph-decomposition framework for the joint design of the representation, block cover, and carriers in decentralized optimization. Specializing this framework to the incidence representation and tree-structured edge blocks, we proposed *GATE*: a single-loop decentralized message-passing algorithm derived from the block fixed-point decomposition. For strongly convex and smooth local objectives, we established linear convergence rates with explicit dependence on the network topology and the chosen partition. For the tree-dominant graph families, the contraction factor satisfies $(1 - \rho)^{-1} = O(D)$. To reduce per-iteration computational and communication costs, we develop *GATE-S*, a surrogate variant using tractable local models and lightweight message parametrizations, and established analogous linear convergence guarantees. Numerical experiments on quadratic and logistic-regression problems corroborate the theoretical scaling, demonstrate improved iteration and communication efficiency over consensus-based baselines. Future directions include extending the framework to non-strongly convex objectives and stochastic settings.

A Proofs for Section 4

A.1 Proof of Proposition 5

Fix a block r , an edge $e \in \mathcal{E}_r$, and an iteration $\nu \geq \max_{r \in [p]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_r)$. Since $e \in \mathcal{E}_r$ is a vertex of the factor graph $\mathcal{F}_r$, root $\mathcal{F}_r$ at e . For every vertex $v \neq e$, let $\text{pa}(v)$ be its parent. For $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$, let $\mathcal{T}_i$ be the component of $\mathcal{F}_r \setminus \{(i, \text{pa}(i))\}$ containing i , and denote by $\mathcal{V}_i$ and $\mathcal{E}_i$ its vertices in $\mathcal{V}_r$ and $\mathcal{E}_r$, respectively. Thus $\text{pa}(i) \notin \mathcal{E}_i$, where $\mathcal{E}_i$ consists exactly of the active edge variables strictly below i . For $\ell \in \mathcal{V}_r$, define the rooted local factor

$$\Psi_{\ell}^{\nu, e}(Y_{\mathcal{A}_{\ell}^{\circ}}) := f_{\ell}^* \left(B_{\ell, \mathcal{A}_{\ell}^{\circ}} Y_{\mathcal{A}_{\ell}^{\circ}} + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{A}_{\ell}^{\partial}} B_{\ell, h} Y_h^{\nu - \delta_{e, \ell}} \right),$$

where the second term is absent when $\ell \in \mathcal{V}_r^{\circ}$.

Step 1: Subtree message identity. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$, set $q_i := (\text{dist}_{\mathcal{F}_r}(e, i) - 1)/2$. Thus $q_i = \delta_{e, i}$ for boundary nodes. Since $q_i + 1 \leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_r) \leq \nu$, every message in the expansion has index $\nu - q_i \geq 1$ and satisfies (18); no initial message function remains. We prove that

$$\mu_{i \rightarrow \text{pa}(i)}^{\nu - q_i}(Y_{\text{pa}(i)}) = \min_{Y_{\mathcal{E}_i}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{V}_i} \Psi_{\ell}^{\nu, e}(Y_{\mathcal{A}_{\ell}^{\circ}}). \quad (59)$$

We prove (59) by induction on the height of $\mathcal{T}_i$.

Base case. If $\mathcal{V}_i = \{i\}$, then $\mathcal{E}_i = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{A}_i^{\circ} = \{\text{pa}(i)\}$. Evaluating (18) with $\nu + 1$ replaced by $\nu - q_i$ gives

$$\mu_{i \rightarrow \text{pa}(i)}^{\nu - q_i}(Y_{\text{pa}(i)}) = \Psi_i^{\nu, e}(Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^{\circ}}),$$

which is (59) for the base case.

Inductive step. Assume now that (59) holds for all strict descendants of i . The same substitution in (18) gives

$$\mu_{i \rightarrow \text{pa}(i)}^{\nu - q_i}(Y_{\text{pa}(i)}) = \min_{Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^{\circ} \setminus \{\text{pa}(i)\}}} \left\{ \Psi_i^{\nu, e}(Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^{\circ}}) + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{A}_i^{\circ} \setminus \{\text{pa}(i)\}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_h \setminus \{i\}} \mu_{j \rightarrow h}^{\nu - q_i - 1}(Y_h) \right\}. \quad (60)$$

For each pair (h, j) in the double sum, $\text{pa}(h) = i$, $\text{pa}(j) = h$, and $q_j = q_i + 1$. The induction hypothesis therefore gives

$$\mu_{j \rightarrow h}^{\nu - q_i - 1}(Y_h) = \mu_{j \rightarrow \text{pa}(j)}^{\nu - q_j}(Y_{\text{pa}(j)}) = \min_{Y_{\mathcal{E}_j}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{V}_j} \Psi_{\ell}^{\nu, e}(Y_{\mathcal{A}_{\ell}^{\circ}}).$$

Since $h = \text{pa}(j)$, the pairs (h, j) correspond one-to-one to $j \in \mathcal{V}_i \setminus \{i\}$ with $\text{pa}(\text{pa}(j)) = i$. The sets $\mathcal{A}_i^{\circ} \setminus \{\text{pa}(i)\}$ and these $\mathcal{E}_j$ partition $\mathcal{E}_i$; hence substituting into (60), reindexing by j , and merging the minimizations gives

$$\mu_{i \rightarrow \text{pa}(i)}^{\nu - q_i}(Y_{\text{pa}(i)}) = \min_{Y_{\mathcal{E}_i}} \left\{ \Psi_i^{\nu, e}(Y_{\mathcal{A}_i^{\circ}}) + \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{V}_i \setminus \{i\} \\ \text{pa}(\text{pa}(j)) = i}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{V}_j} \Psi_{\ell}^{\nu, e}(Y_{\mathcal{A}_{\ell}^{\circ}}) \right\}.$$

Using $\mathcal{V}_i = \{i\} \sqcup \bigsqcup_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{V}_i \setminus \{i\} \\ \text{pa}(\text{pa}(j)) = i}} \mathcal{V}_j$, we obtain

$$\mu_{i \rightarrow \text{pa}(i)}^{\nu - q_i}(Y_{\text{pa}(i)}) = \min_{Y_{\mathcal{E}_i}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{V}_i} \Psi_{\ell}^{\nu, e}(Y_{\mathcal{A}_{\ell}^{\circ}}).$$

Step 2: Sum of messages at the root. Applying the identity to (17a), we can write

$$\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{Y_e} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_e} \mu_{i \rightarrow e}^{\nu}(Y_e) \right\}.$$

For $i \in \mathcal{I}_e$, one has $q_i = 0$, so (59) applies with $\text{pa}(i) = e$. The sets $\mathcal{V}_i$, $i \in \mathcal{I}_e$, partition $\mathcal{V}_r$, and the corresponding sets $\mathcal{E}_i$ partition $\mathcal{E}_r \setminus \{e\}$. Therefore

$$\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{Y_e} \min_{Y_{\mathcal{E}_r \setminus \{e\}}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{V}_r} \Psi_{\ell}^{\nu, e}(Y_{\mathcal{A}_{\ell}^{\circ}}).$$

This is exactly (21b). $\square$

A.2 Proof of Lemma 3

The next two lemmas isolate the two ingredients for Lemma 3: for each fixed boundary vector, the minimization over $Y_{\mathcal{E}_r}$ generates a common primal variable on $\mathcal{T}_r$, and the linear system $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_{\mathcal{E}_r} = q$ admits an explicit graph-compliant solution. For the block r and $b \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{\mathcal{J}}_r \times d}$ with rows indexed by $(i, h) \in \hat{\partial}_r$, define

$$c_i(b) := \sum_{h \in \mathcal{A}_i^{\partial}} \mathbf{B}_{i, h} b_{i, h}, \quad \eta_r(b) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} c_i(b) = \sum_{(i, h) \in \hat{\partial}_r} \mathbf{B}_{i, h} b_{i, h}.$$

Also write, for a minimizer $Y_r(b)$ in (27),

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_r(Y_{\mathcal{E}_r}; b) &:= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} f_i^*((\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_{\mathcal{E}_r})_i + c_i(b)), \\ \bar{x}_i(b) &:= \nabla f_i^*((\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_r(b))_i + c_i(b)), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}_r. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7 *Under Assumptions 1 and 3, the vectors $\bar{x}_i(b)$, $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$, have a common value, which depends on b only through $\eta_r(b)$; write it as $\chi_r(\eta_r(b))$. Hence*

$$\bar{x}_i(b) = \chi_r(\eta_r(b)), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}_r, \quad (61a)$$

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \nabla f_i(\chi_r(\eta_r(b))) = \eta_r(b), \quad (61b)$$

$$(\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_r(b))_i = \nabla f_i(\chi_r(\eta_r(b))) - c_i(b), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}_r. \quad (61c)$$

Proof Fix b and a minimizer $Y_r(b)$. For $e = (u, v) \in \mathcal{E}_r$, the optimality condition gives

$$0 = \nabla_{Y_e} \Psi_r(Y_r(b); b) = \mathbf{B}_{u,e} \bar{x}_u(b) + \mathbf{B}_{v,e} \bar{x}_v(b) = \mathbf{B}_{u,e} (\bar{x}_u(b) - \bar{x}_v(b)).$$

Thus $\bar{x}_u(b) = \bar{x}_v(b)$ for every $e = (u, v) \in \mathcal{E}_r$. Since $\mathcal{T}_r$ is connected, all $\bar{x}_i(b)$ are equal. Because ∇f_i and ∇f_i^* are inverse maps, $\nabla f_i(\bar{x}_i(b)) = (\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_r(b))_i + c_i(b)$ for $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$. Summing over $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$ and using the zero column sums of $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r}$ gives $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \nabla f_i(\bar{x}_i(b)) = \eta_r(b)$. Since all $\bar{x}_i(b)$ are equal, this equation identifies their common value as $\chi_r(\eta_r(b))$. Thus the common value depends on b only through $\eta_r(b)$, and (61a)–(61b) hold. Rearranging the first identity before summation gives (61c). $\square$

Lemma 8 For any $q = (q_i)_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r}$ with $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} q_i = 0$, the equation $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_{\mathcal{E}_r} = q$ has a unique solution. If $e \in \mathcal{E}_r$ and $\mathcal{S}$ is one of the two connected components of $\mathcal{T}_r \setminus \{e\}$, then $Y_e = \varepsilon_{e, \mathcal{S}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} q_i$ for some $\text{sign } \varepsilon_{e, \mathcal{S}} \in \{\pm 1\}$.

Proof Each column of $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r}$ sums to zero. Since $\mathcal{T}_r$ is a tree, $\text{rank}(\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r}) = |\mathcal{E}_r| = |\mathcal{V}_r| - 1$, hence $\text{Range}(\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r}) = \{q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}_r| \times d} : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} q_i = 0\}$. Thus $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_{\mathcal{E}_r} = q$ has a unique solution. Fix one component $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{T}_r \setminus \{e\}$. Summing the rows indexed by $\mathcal{S}$ gives

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} q_i = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{E}_r} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{B}_{i,a} \right) Y_a = \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{B}_{i,e} \right) Y_e, \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{B}_{i,e} \in \{\pm 1\},$$

where the terms with $a \neq e$ vanish because those edges do not cross from $\mathcal{S}$ to $\mathcal{V}_r \setminus \mathcal{S}$. This gives the formula. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 3. For $b \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{\mathcal{T}}_r \times d}$ with rows indexed by $(i, h) \in \hat{\partial}_r$, set $q_i(b) := \nabla f_i(\chi_r(\eta_r(b))) - c_i(b)$. Lemma 7 gives $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_r(b) = q(b)$, and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} q_i(b) = 0$. Lemma 8 gives a unique solution of $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_{\mathcal{E}_r} = q(b)$. Hence $Y_r(b)$ is single-valued. It also gives, for a boundary incidence $(i, h) \in \hat{\partial}_r$ and the component $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)$ not containing i ,

$$Y_{r,e}(b) = \varepsilon_{e,i} \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)} (\nabla f_j(\chi_r(\eta_r(b))) - c_j(b)), \quad \varepsilon_{e,i} \in \{\pm 1\}. \quad (62)$$

Let b, b' differ only in coordinate (i, h) . Since $i \notin \bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)$, the boundary terms $c_j(\cdot)$ in (62) are unchanged for all $j \in \bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)$. Also $\eta_r(b') - \eta_r(b) = \mathbf{B}_{i,h}(b'_{i,h} - b_{i,h})$. Hence

$$Y_{r,e}(b') - Y_{r,e}(b) = \varepsilon_{e,i} (\mathcal{L}_{r, \bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)}(\eta_r(b')) - \mathcal{L}_{r, \bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)}(\eta_r(b))),$$

and (30a) follows from the definition of $\kappa_{\partial, r}$.

For $v \neq i$, the coordinate (i, h) does not enter c_v , so $c_v(b') = c_v(b)$. By (61c) and the definition of $Z_{r,v}$, $Z_{r,v}(b) = \nabla f_v(\chi_r(\eta_r(b))) - c_v(b)$. Since $\mathcal{L}_{r, \{v\}}(\eta) = \nabla f_v(\chi_r(\eta))$, we obtain

$$Z_{r,v}(b') - Z_{r,v}(b) = \mathcal{L}_{r, \{v\}}(\eta_r(b')) - \mathcal{L}_{r, \{v\}}(\eta_r(b)).$$

Then, (30b) follows from the definition of $\kappa_{\partial, r}$. $\square$

A.3 Proof of Lemma 4

The next three results isolate the ingredients for Lemma 4: the first gives the rooted counting bounds used to sum edge sensitivities over active nodes, the second applies Lemma 3 to the specialized boundary values that generate $\hat{Y}_{\mathcal{E}_r}^{\nu+1}$ and $\bar{Y}_{\mathcal{E}_r}^{\nu+1}$, and the third converts Y -increments into image-variable Z -increments.

Lemma 9 Fix $(i, h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r$ and root the active tree $\mathcal{T}_r$ at the boundary node i . For $v \in \mathcal{V}_r$, set

$$\delta_{r,i}(v) := \max\{\text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}_r}(i, v) - 1, 0\}. \quad (63)$$

For $v \neq i$, let $\text{Ch}_{r,i}(v)$ be the set of active edges from v to its children in this rooted tree; set $\text{Ch}_{r,i}(i) := \emptyset$. Let $p(v)$ be the active edge from $v \neq i$ to its parent, and set

$$n_{r,i}(i) := N_r, \quad n_{r,i}(v) := |\overline{\mathcal{V}}_{p(v)}(i)|, \quad v \neq i.$$

Then

$$\sum_{e \in \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v)} |\overline{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)| \leq n_{r,i}(v) - 1, \quad \sum_{\text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}_r}(i,v)=t} \frac{(n_{r,i}(v) - 1)^2}{N_r^2} \leq 1, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (64)$$

Proof For the first bound in (64), take $v \neq i$ and put $p = p(v)$. The components $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)$ with $e \in \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v)$ are pairwise disjoint, and their union is $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_p(i) \setminus \{v\}$. Hence equality holds in the first bound of (64) for $v \neq i$. If $v = i$, then $\text{Ch}_{r,i}(v) = \emptyset$, and the displayed inequality is immediate.

Fix $t \geq 1$. If two distinct nodes v, w have $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}_r}(i, v) = \text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}_r}(i, w) = t$, then $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_{p(v)}(i) \cap \overline{\mathcal{V}}_{p(w)}(i) = \emptyset$: otherwise some node u would have both v and w on the unique path from i to u , and the two vertices at depth t on this path would have to coincide. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}_r}(i,v)=t} n_{r,i}(v) &\leq N_r. \\ \sum_{\text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}_r}(i,v)=t} (n_{r,i}(v) - 1)^2 &\leq \left(\sum_{\text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}_r}(i,v)=t} (n_{r,i}(v) - 1) \right)^2 \leq N_r^2, \end{aligned}$$

The same conclusion is immediate for $t = 0$, since $n_{r,i}(i) = N_r$. This proves the second bound in (64). $\square$

Lemma 10 Under Assumptions 1 and 3, for every block r and all $\nu \geq \max_{s \in [p]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_s)$,

$$\|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2 \leq 4\kappa_{\partial,r}^2 \hat{J}_r \sum_{\ell=\nu-D_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{(i,h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r} \|Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell\|^2.$$

Proof Note that $\hat{Y}_{\mathcal{E}_r}^{\nu+1} = Y_r(b_r^\nu)$ with $(b_r^\nu)_{(i,h)} = Y_h^\nu$, and $\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} = Y_{r,e}(\hat{b}_{r,e}^\nu)$ with $(\hat{b}_{r,e}^\nu)_{(i,h)} = Y_h^{\nu-\delta_{e,i}}$ for $(i, h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r$. For $v \in \mathcal{V}_r$, define the node mismatch

$$m_v := (\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1})_v.$$

The vector $\hat{b}_{r,e}^\nu$ depends on the incident edge e , whereas m_v fixes the node v . To estimate m_v , insert the auxiliary node-aligned boundary vector

$$(b_{r,v}^\nu)_{(i,h)} := Y_h^{\nu-\delta_{r,i}(v)}, \quad (i, h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r.$$

For $e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ$, the definition of $\delta_{e,i}$ gives $\delta_{e,i} = \delta_{r,i}(v)$ unless $e \in \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v)$, in which case $\delta_{e,i} = \delta_{r,i}(v) + 1$. At $v = i$, both delays are zero for every incident edge. Thus $b_{r,v}^\nu$ uses, in each boundary coordinate (i, h) , the freshest value seen by any active edge incident to v . Since $(\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1})_v = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ} B_{v,e} Y_{r,e}(\hat{b}_{r,e}^\nu)$ and $(\bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1})_v = Z_{r,v}(b_r^\nu)$, inserting and subtracting $Z_{r,v}(b_{r,v}^\nu)$ gives

$$m_v = \underbrace{\sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ} B_{v,e} \left(Y_{r,e}(\hat{b}_{r,e}^\nu) - Y_{r,e}(b_{r,v}^\nu) \right)}_{=: p_v} + \underbrace{Z_{r,v}(b_{r,v}^\nu) - Z_{r,v}(b_r^\nu)}_{=: q_v}.$$

Write $\Delta Y_h^\ell := Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell$.

Estimate of p_v . Fix an ordering of the boundary coordinates $(i, h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r$. For each incident edge $e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ$, telescope the difference from $b_{r,v}^\nu$ to $\widehat{b}_{r,e}^\nu$ by changing one boundary coordinate at a time. In the step that changes coordinate (i, h) , let $b_{e,(i,h)}^-$ and $b_{e,(i,h)}^+$ denote the two consecutive boundary vectors. Then

$$Y_{r,e}(\widehat{b}_{r,e}^\nu) - Y_{r,e}(b_{r,v}^\nu) = \sum_{(i,h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r} (Y_{r,e}(b_{e,(i,h)}^+) - Y_{r,e}(b_{e,(i,h)}^-)),$$

where the (i, h) -summand is zero if $(\widehat{b}_{r,e}^\nu)_{(i,h)} = (b_{r,v}^\nu)_{(i,h)}$. The preceding observation shows that this coordinate difference is zero unless $e \in \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v)$. If $e \in \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v)$, then

$$(\widehat{b}_{r,e}^\nu)_{(i,h)} - (b_{r,v}^\nu)_{(i,h)} = -\Delta Y_h^{\nu - (\delta_{r,i}(v) + 1)}.$$

Therefore

$$p_v = \sum_{(i,h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r} \underbrace{\sum_{e \in \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v)} B_{v,e} (Y_{r,e}(b_{e,(i,h)}^+) - Y_{r,e}(b_{e,(i,h)}^-))}_{=: p_{v,(i,h)}}.$$

If $\text{Ch}_{r,i}(v) = \emptyset$, then $p_{v,(i,h)} = 0$. Otherwise, using the sensitivity bound (30a) and the first bound in (64),

$$\|p_{v,(i,h)}\| \leq \kappa_{\partial,r} \frac{n_{r,i}(v) - 1}{N_r} \|\Delta Y_h^{\nu - (\delta_{r,i}(v) + 1)}\|.$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz over the $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_r$ boundary coordinates,

$$\|p_v\|^2 \leq \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_r \kappa_{\partial,r}^2 \sum_{\substack{(i,h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r \\ \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v) \neq \emptyset}} \frac{(n_{r,i}(v) - 1)^2}{N_r^2} \|\Delta Y_h^{\nu - (\delta_{r,i}(v) + 1)}\|^2. \quad (65)$$

Summing (65) over v and exchanging the v - and (i, h) -sums gives

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|p_v\|^2 \leq \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_r \kappa_{\partial,r}^2 \sum_{(i,h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r} \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathcal{V}_r \\ \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v) \neq \emptyset}} \frac{(n_{r,i}(v) - 1)^2}{N_r^2} \|\Delta Y_h^{\nu - (\delta_{r,i}(v) + 1)}\|^2.$$

For fixed (i, h) , group the inner sum by rooted depth $t = \text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}_r}(i, v)$. On the nodes with $\text{Ch}_{r,i}(v) \neq \emptyset$, one has $v \neq i$ and $1 \leq \delta_{r,i}(v) + 1 = t \leq D_r$. Thus all nodes in the same depth shell use the same increment $\Delta Y_h^{\nu - t}$, and the second bound in (64) gives

$$\sum_{\substack{v \in \mathcal{V}_r \\ \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v) \neq \emptyset}} \frac{(n_{r,i}(v) - 1)^2}{N_r^2} \|\Delta Y_h^{\nu - (\delta_{r,i}(v) + 1)}\|^2 \leq \sum_{t=1}^{D_r} \|\Delta Y_h^{\nu - t}\|^2.$$

Summing over (i, h) gives

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|p_v\|^2 \leq \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_r \kappa_{\partial,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-D_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{(i,h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r} \|\Delta Y_h^\ell\|^2. \quad (66)$$

Estimate of q_v . Telescope the difference from b_r^ν to $b_{r,v}^\nu$ by changing one boundary coordinate at a time. If $v = i$, then $\delta_{r,i}(v) = 0$, so the corresponding coordinate difference is zero. Hence only coordinates (i, h) with $v \neq i$ remain, and the sensitivity bound (30b) applies:

$$\|q_v\|^2 \leq \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_r \kappa_{\partial,r}^2 \sum_{(i,h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r: i \neq v} \frac{1}{N_r^2} \|Y_h^{\nu - \delta_{r,i}(v)} - Y_h^\nu\|^2. \quad (67)$$

For every integer $t \geq 0$,

$$\|Y_h^{\nu-t} - Y_h^\nu\|^2 \leq t \sum_{m=1}^t \|\Delta Y_h^{\nu-m}\|^2.$$

Substituting this into (67) and summing over v , the bound $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \delta_{r,i}(v) \leq N_r D_r$, which follows from $0 \leq \delta_{r,i}(v) \leq D_r$, together with $D_r/N_r \leq 1$, yields

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|q_v\|^2 \leq \hat{J}_r \kappa_{\partial,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-D_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{(i,h) \in \partial_r} \|\Delta Y_h^\ell\|^2. \quad (68)$$

Finally,

$$\|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2 = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|m_v\|^2 \leq 2 \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|p_v\|^2 + 2 \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|q_v\|^2.$$

Combining (66) and (68) proves the lemma. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 4. For $s \in \mathcal{M}_r$, set $\Delta Y_s^\ell := Y_{\mathcal{E}_s}^{\ell+1} - Y_{\mathcal{E}_s}^\ell$ and $\Delta Z_s^\ell := Z_s^{\ell+1} - Z_s^\ell = \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E}_s} \Delta Y_s^\ell$. Let $\mathbf{R}_{r,s}$ be the row selector satisfying $\mathbf{R}_{r,s} Y_{\mathcal{E}_s} = Y_{\mathcal{B}_{r,s}}$. Full column rank gives $\Delta Y_s^\ell = \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E}_s}^\dagger \Delta Z_s^\ell$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{(i,h) \in \partial_r \\ h \in \mathcal{E}_s}} \|\Delta Y_h^\ell\|^2 &= \sum_{h \in \mathcal{B}_{r,s}} |\mathcal{I}_h \cap \mathcal{V}_r| \|\Delta Y_h^\ell\|^2 = \|(\Lambda_{r,s})^{1/2} \mathbf{R}_{r,s} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E}_s}^\dagger \Delta Z_s^\ell\|^2 \\ &\leq \gamma_{r,s} \|\Delta Z_s^\ell\|^2 \leq \Gamma_r \|\Delta Z_s^\ell\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{\mathcal{B}_{r,s} : s \in \mathcal{M}_r\}$ is a disjoint partition of ∂_r , summing the displayed estimate over s and over the delay window, and then applying Lemma 10, proves (31). $\square$

A.4 Proof of Proposition 6

Fix m , relabel the tree block as block 1, and suppress the subscript m : write $\mathcal{T}_0 = (\mathcal{V}_0, \mathcal{E}_0)$, $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_0, \mathcal{I}_\partial, \mathcal{P}$, and $(\underline{\alpha}_\partial, \bar{\alpha}_\partial, R_\partial)$ for the corresponding objects. For $Z \in \mathcal{S}$, put $x_i := \nabla f_i^*(Z_i)$. We first express the block progress terms in (19). Let $h = \{i, j\} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}_0$ be a singleton edge block, and write Δ_h for the progress of this block. Changing only Y_h by s changes the image coordinates to $Z_i + \mathbf{B}_{i,h}s$ and $Z_j + \mathbf{B}_{j,h}s$. Since $\mathbf{B}_{i,h} + \mathbf{B}_{j,h} = 0$ and $|\mathbf{B}_{i,h}| = 1$, the singleton block minimization in (19) reduces to

$$\min_{u_i + u_j = Z_i + Z_j} f_i^*(u_i) + f_j^*(u_j).$$

Let (u_i^h, u_j^h) be its minimizer. The first-order condition gives $\nabla f_i^*(u_i^h) = \nabla f_j^*(u_j^h) = p_h$. Thus $u_i^h = \nabla f_i(p_h)$ and $u_j^h = \nabla f_j(p_h)$, where p_h is the unique solution of $\nabla f_i(p_h) + \nabla f_j(p_h) = Z_i + Z_j$. By the definition of the block progress and this identity,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_h(Z) &= f_i^*(Z_i) + f_j^*(Z_j) - f_i^*(u_i^h) - f_j^*(u_j^h) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \{i,j\}} [f_k^*(Z_k) - f_k^*(\nabla f_k(p_h)) - \langle p_h, Z_k - \nabla f_k(p_h) \rangle]. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of x_k , $\nabla f_k(x_k) = Z_k$. Fenchel's identity gives

$$f_k(x_k) + f_k^*(Z_k) = \langle Z_k, x_k \rangle, \quad f_k(p_h) + f_k^*(\nabla f_k(p_h)) = \langle \nabla f_k(p_h), p_h \rangle.$$

Substituting these identities yields, for $k \in \{i, j\}$,

$$f_k^*(Z_k) - f_k^*(\nabla f_k(p_h)) - \langle p_h, Z_k - \nabla f_k(p_h) \rangle = f_k(p_h) - f_k(x_k) - \langle \nabla f_k(x_k), p_h - x_k \rangle.$$

Define the Bregman divergence $D_{f_i}(u, v) := f_i(u) - f_i(v) - \langle \nabla f_i(v), u - v \rangle$. Then

$$\Delta_h(Z) = D_{f_i}(p_h, x_i) + D_{f_j}(p_h, x_j).$$

The lower Hessian bound in Proposition 6 yields

$$\Delta_h(Z) \geq \frac{\alpha_\partial}{2} (\|p_h - x_i\|_{R_\partial}^2 + \|p_h - x_j\|_{R_\partial}^2) \geq \frac{\alpha_\partial}{4} \|x_i - x_j\|_{R_\partial}^2. \quad (69)$$

The same argument applied to (19) for the tree block yields $u_i = \nabla f_i(p_0)$, $i \in \mathcal{V}_0$, where p_0 is the unique solution of $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_0} \nabla f_i(p_0) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_0} Z_i$. The corresponding progress Δ_1 satisfies

$$\Delta_1(Z) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_0} D_{f_i}(p_0, x_i) \geq \frac{\alpha_\partial}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\partial \cap \mathcal{V}_0} \|x_i - p_0\|_{R_\partial}^2. \quad (70)$$

We next compare the global gap with the block progress. By Fenchel's identity,

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} D_{f_i}(p, x_i) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} (f_i(p) - f_i(x_i) - \langle Z_i, p - x_i \rangle) = G(Z) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} f_i(p) - \left\langle \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} Z_i, p \right\rangle.$$

Since $Z \in \mathcal{S} = \text{Range}(\mathbf{B})$, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} Z_i = 0$. Taking $p = p_0$, using $\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{I}_\partial$, and applying weak duality for (P) and (D), which gives $-G^* \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} f_i(p_0)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G(Z) - G^* &\leq G(Z) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} f_i(p_0) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} D_{f_i}(p_0, x_i) = \Delta_1(Z) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}_0} D_{f_i}(p_0, x_i) \\ &\leq \Delta_1(Z) + \frac{\bar{\alpha}_\partial}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\partial} \|x_i - p_0\|_{R_\partial}^2. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to bound the finite boundary term by block progress. Extending $\mathcal{T}_0$ to a spanning tree of $\mathcal{G}$ gives $|\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}_0| \leq |\bar{\mathcal{E}}_0| \leq q$. Each vertex outside $\mathcal{V}_0$ has a path to $\mathcal{V}_0$ with at most q edges in $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_0$, ending at a vertex of $\mathcal{I}_\partial \cap \mathcal{V}_0$. Applying Cauchy's inequality along these paths and summing gives, with $C_q := 1 + q(q+1)$,

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\partial} \|x_i - p_0\|_{R_\partial}^2 \leq C_q \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\partial \cap \mathcal{V}_0} \|x_i - p_0\|_{R_\partial}^2 + \sum_{\{i, j\} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}_0} \|x_i - x_j\|_{R_\partial}^2 \right).$$

Combining the last two bounds with (70) and (69) gives

$$G(Z) - G^* \leq \left(1 + 2C_q \frac{\bar{\alpha}_\partial}{\alpha_\partial}\right) \left(\Delta_1(Z) + \sum_{h \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}_0} \Delta_h(Z)\right),$$

which is exactly the block error bound for the partition $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{E}_0\} \cup \{\{h\} : h \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}_0\}$. Since q is fixed and $\bar{\alpha}_\partial/\alpha_\partial = O(1)$, this proves $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} = O(1)$.

Finally we bound the constants in Theorem 1. The partition has $p = 1 + |\bar{\mathcal{E}}_0| \leq q + 1$. Singleton blocks have no interior propagation, so $D_r = 0$ for them; only block 1 can contribute to A . For block 1, $\hat{I}_1 \leq 2|\bar{\mathcal{E}}_0| \leq 2q$. Every neighboring block is a singleton edge $\mathcal{E}_s = \{h\}$, and its incidence column has norm $\sqrt{2}$, so $\gamma_{1,s} = |\mathcal{I}_h \cap \mathcal{V}_1|/2 \leq 1$ and $\Gamma_1 \leq 1$. Moreover, for $S \subseteq \mathcal{V}_1$, the map $\sum_{i \in S} \nabla f_i$ is $|S|L$ -Lipschitz, while $(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_1} \nabla f_i)^{-1}$ is $(N_1\mu_1)^{-1}$ -Lipschitz. Hence $\kappa_{\partial,1} \leq L/\mu_1 = O(1)$. Together with the uniform bounds on μ_1^{-1} and L , the definition of A gives $A = O(1)$. Finally, $D \leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_0) - 1$; substituting $\omega_{\mathcal{P}} \leq p = O(1)$, $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} = O(1)$, and $A = O(1)$ into (36) gives $(1 - \rho)^{-1} = O(\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_0))$. $\square$

A.5 Proof of Proposition 7

Fix m and abbreviate $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}_m$, $R := R_m$, $\underline{\alpha} := \underline{\alpha}_m$, and $\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\alpha}_m$. For $Z \in \mathcal{S}$, set $G_0(Z) := \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(ZR^{-1}Z^\top)$. Let $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}^{(0)}$ be its block error-bound constant and set $W := ZR^{-1/2}$. This bijection maps $\mathcal{S}$ and each $\mathcal{U}_r$ onto themselves, so block error-bound constants are invariant under the corresponding change of objective. Moreover, $G_0(WR^{1/2}) = \frac{1}{2}\|W\|^2$. Below, we write Z for W and work with $G_0(Z) = \frac{1}{2}\|Z\|^2$. We first prove

$$\frac{D+2}{4\sin^2(\pi/p)} \leq \kappa_{\mathcal{P}}^{(0)} \leq 1 + \frac{3(D+1)}{2\sin^2(\pi/p)}, \quad \kappa_{\mathcal{P}}^{(0)} = \Theta\left(\frac{m^2}{D}\right), \quad (71)$$

For a path block $\mathcal{E}_r$, the incidence matrix has rank $|\mathcal{V}_r| - 1$, and hence

$$\mathcal{U}_r = \left\{ U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} : \text{supp}(U) \subseteq \mathcal{V}_r, \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} U_i = 0 \right\}.$$

By definition, $\Delta_r^{(0)}(Z) = \frac{1}{2}\|Z\|^2 - \min_{U \in \mathcal{U}_r} \frac{1}{2}\|Z + U\|^2$. The minimum is attained when $Z_i + U_i = \bar{Z}_{\mathcal{V}_r} := |\mathcal{V}_r|^{-1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_r} Z_j$ for $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$. Hence

$$\Delta_r^{(0)}(Z) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|Z_i - \bar{Z}_{\mathcal{V}_r}\|^2.$$

Relabel the blocks by $r = 0, \dots, p-1$ and index the ring nodes cyclically as $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$. Let

$$Q_r := \{v_{r(D+1)+j} : 0 \leq j \leq D\}, \quad b_r := v_{(r+1)(D+1)},$$

where indices are taken modulo m . The sets Q_r form a disjoint partition of $\mathcal{V}$, with $|Q_r| = D+1$. Since b_r is the first node of Q_{r+1} , the nodes incident to block r are $\mathcal{V}_r = Q_r \cup \{b_r\}$. With $\xi_r := (D+1)^{-1} \sum_{i \in Q_r} Z_i$, then

$$2\Delta_r^{(0)}(Z) = \sum_{i \in Q_r} \|Z_i - \xi_r\|^2 + \frac{D+1}{D+2} \|Z_{b_r} - \xi_r\|^2.$$

Thus

$$\sum_{i \in Q_r} \|Z_i - \xi_r\|^2 \leq 2\Delta_r^{(0)}(Z), \quad \|Z_{b_r} - \xi_r\|^2 \leq 4\Delta_r^{(0)}(Z). \quad (72)$$

Since $b_r \in Q_{r+1}$, (72) gives

$$\|\xi_{r+1} - \xi_r\|^2 \leq 2\|\xi_r - Z_{b_r}\|^2 + 2\|Z_{b_r} - \xi_{r+1}\|^2 \leq 8\Delta_r^{(0)}(Z) + 4\Delta_{r+1}^{(0)}(Z).$$

Summing cyclically yields

$$\sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \|\xi_{r+1} - \xi_r\|^2 \leq 12 \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \Delta_r^{(0)}(Z). \quad (73)$$

Since $Z \in \mathcal{S}$ and the sets Q_r form a partition of $\mathcal{V}$, $\sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \xi_r = (D+1)^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} Z_i = 0$. Set $\Xi := (\xi_0^\top, \dots, \xi_{p-1}^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d}$ and

$$C_p := \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & & & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The cycle spectrum satisfies $\lambda_{\min}^+(C_p^\top C_p) = 4\sin^2(\pi/p)$; see, e.g., [3]. Therefore,

$$\sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \|\xi_{r+1} - \xi_r\|^2 = \|C_p \Xi\|_F^2 \geq 4\sin^2(\pi/p) \|\Xi\|_F^2 = 4\sin^2(\pi/p) \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \|\xi_r\|^2. \quad (74)$$

Combining (72), (73), and (74) yields

$$\|Z\|^2 = \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \left[\sum_{i \in Q_r} \|Z_i - \xi_r\|^2 + (D+1)\|\xi_r\|^2 \right] \leq 2 \left(1 + \frac{3(D+1)}{2 \sin^2(\pi/p)} \right) \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \Delta_r^{(0)}(Z).$$

This proves the upper bound in (71).

For the lower bound, choose a nonzero $\Xi \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d}$ whose columns lie in the eigenspace of $C_p^\top C_p$ associated with $4 \sin^2(\pi/p)$, and denote its rows by ξ_r . Then

$$\sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \xi_r = 0, \quad \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \|\xi_{r+1} - \xi_r\|^2 = 4 \sin^2(\pi/p) \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \|\xi_r\|^2.$$

Set $Z_i = \xi_r$ for $i \in Q_r$, $r = 0, \dots, p-1$. Then $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} Z_i = (D+1) \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \xi_r = 0$ and

$$G_0(Z) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \sum_{i \in Q_r} \|Z_i\|^2 = \frac{D+1}{2} \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \|\xi_r\|^2.$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{V}_r = Q_r \cup \{b_r\}$, with $Z_i = \xi_r$ for $i \in Q_r$ and $Z_{b_r} = \xi_{r+1}$, so $\bar{Z}_{\mathcal{V}_r} = ((D+1)\xi_r + \xi_{r+1})/(D+2)$. Substitution into the definition of $\Delta_r^{(0)}$ yields

$$\Delta_r^{(0)}(Z) = \frac{1}{2} [(D+1)\|\xi_r - \bar{Z}_{\mathcal{V}_r}\|^2 + \|\xi_{r+1} - \bar{Z}_{\mathcal{V}_r}\|^2] = \frac{D+1}{2(D+2)} \|\xi_{r+1} - \xi_r\|^2.$$

Hence $G_0(Z)/\sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \Delta_r^{(0)}(Z) = (D+2)/(4 \sin^2(\pi/p))$ and (71) follows.

It remains to transfer the bound to G . Define $\hat{G}(W) := G(WR^{1/2})$ for $W \in \mathcal{S}$. The Hessian bounds in Proposition 7 give $\bar{\alpha}^{-1}I \preceq \nabla^2[f_i^*(R^{1/2} \cdot)](W_i) \preceq \underline{\alpha}^{-1}I$. Let $P_{\mathcal{S}}$ and P_r be the Euclidean projectors onto $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{U}_r$, respectively, and define $\hat{\Delta}_r(W) := \hat{G}(W) - \min_{U \in W + \mathcal{U}_r} \hat{G}(U)$. For $G_0(V) = \frac{1}{2}\|V\|^2$, the minimizer over $V + \mathcal{U}_r$ is $V - P_r V$; hence $\Delta_r^{(0)}(V) = \frac{1}{2}\|V\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|V - P_r V\|^2 = \frac{1}{2}\|P_r V\|^2$. The quadratic block error bound therefore gives $\sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \|P_r V\|^2 \geq (\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}^{(0)})^{-1} \|V\|^2$ for $V \in \mathcal{S}$. Since $\mathcal{U}_r \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, $P_r P_{\mathcal{S}} = P_r$. The smoothness and strong convexity bounds above then yield

$$\sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \hat{\Delta}_r(W) \geq \frac{\underline{\alpha}}{2} \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \|P_r \nabla \hat{G}(W)^\top\|^2 \geq \frac{\underline{\alpha}}{2\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}^{(0)}} \|P_{\mathcal{S}} \nabla \hat{G}(W)^\top\|^2 \geq \frac{\underline{\alpha}}{\bar{\alpha}\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}^{(0)}} (\hat{G}(W) - G^*).$$

Therefore $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} \leq (\bar{\alpha}/\underline{\alpha})\kappa_{\mathcal{P}}^{(0)}$, and (71) proves $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}} = O(m^2/D)$. $\square$

B Proofs for Section 5

For the proof notation, fix a block r . For $b \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{\mathcal{J}}_r \times d}$ with rows indexed by $(i, h) \in \hat{\partial}_r$, use the boundary contribution $c_i(b) = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{A}_i^{\partial}} B_{i,h} b_{i,h}$ from Appendix A.2, and write $c_r(b) := (c_i(b))_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r}$. For $U, \vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_r \times d}$, the exact and surrogate block slices are

$$G_r(U) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} f_i^*(U_i), \quad \tilde{G}_r(U; \vartheta) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \tilde{f}_i^*(U_i; \vartheta_i).$$

Only nodes in $\mathcal{V}_r$ appear in these slices; the remaining terms are constant under a block- r update.

B.1 Proof of Lemma 5

Proof of (52a)–(52c). Fix a block r . For $b \in \mathbb{R}^{\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_r \times d}$ with rows indexed by $(i, h) \in \widehat{\partial}_r$, set $\eta_r(b) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} c_i(b)$. Suppose $\vartheta, \widehat{\vartheta} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_r \times d}$ differ only in coordinate i . Define

$$u_j^0 := \widetilde{Z}_{r,j}(b, \vartheta) + c_j(b), \quad u_j^1 := \widetilde{Z}_{r,j}(b, \widehat{\vartheta}) + c_j(b).$$

Applying the same optimality condition for each active edge variable as in the proof of Lemma 7 to the two minimizers $\widetilde{Y}_r(b, \vartheta)$ and $\widetilde{Y}_r(b, \widehat{\vartheta})$, with f_j^* replaced by $\widetilde{f}_j^*(\cdot; \vartheta_j)$ and $\widetilde{f}_j^*(\cdot; \widehat{\vartheta}_j)$, respectively, gives common values $x^0, x^1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_j^0 &= (\nabla_u \widetilde{f}_j^*(\cdot; \vartheta_j))^{-1}(x^0), \quad u_j^1 = (\nabla_u \widetilde{f}_j^*(\cdot; \widehat{\vartheta}_j))^{-1}(x^1), \quad j \in \mathcal{V}_r, \\ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_r} u_j^0 &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_r} u_j^1 = \eta_r(b). \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,S}$ in (48),

$$u_j^0 = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,\{j\}}(\eta_r(b); \vartheta), \quad u_j^1 = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,\{j\}}(\eta_r(b); \widehat{\vartheta}).$$

Using (50) at the fixed input $\eta_r(b)$ gives,

$$\|\widetilde{Z}_{r,i}(b, \widehat{\vartheta}) - \widetilde{Z}_{r,i}(b, \vartheta)\| = \|\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,\{i\}}(\eta_r(b); \widehat{\vartheta}) - \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,\{i\}}(\eta_r(b); \vartheta)\| \leq \widetilde{\kappa}_{c,r} \|\widehat{\vartheta}_i - \vartheta_i\|.$$

For $v \neq i$,

$$\|\widetilde{Z}_{r,v}(b, \widehat{\vartheta}) - \widetilde{Z}_{r,v}(b, \vartheta)\| = \|\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,\{v\}}(\eta_r(b); \widehat{\vartheta}) - \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,\{v\}}(\eta_r(b); \vartheta)\| \leq \frac{\widetilde{\kappa}_{c,r}}{N_r} \|\widehat{\vartheta}_i - \vartheta_i\|.$$

By Lemma 8, for some sign $\varepsilon_{e,i} \in \{\pm 1\}$,

$$\widetilde{Y}_{r,e}(b, \widehat{\vartheta}) - \widetilde{Y}_{r,e}(b, \vartheta) = \varepsilon_{e,i} \sum_{v \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)} (u_v^1 - u_v^0).$$

The choice $i \notin \overline{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)$ matches the edge term in (50): the center perturbation is in coordinate i , while the aggregate is over the opposite component $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)$. By (48),

$$\sum_{v \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)} (u_v^1 - u_v^0) = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,\overline{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)}(\eta_r(b); \widehat{\vartheta}) - \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,\overline{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)}(\eta_r(b); \vartheta).$$

Therefore

$$\|\widetilde{Y}_{r,e}(b, \widehat{\vartheta}) - \widetilde{Y}_{r,e}(b, \vartheta)\| \leq \widetilde{\kappa}_{c,r} \frac{|\overline{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)|}{N_r} \|\widehat{\vartheta}_i - \vartheta_i\|.$$

This proves (52a)–(52c).

Proof of (51a)–(51b). Fix a center tuple $\vartheta = (\vartheta_i)_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r}$, and suppose b, b' differ only in boundary coordinate (i, h) . With ϑ fixed, (48) is the surrogate counterpart of the aggregate map used in Lemma 3. Repeating the proof of Lemma 3 with $\mathcal{L}_{r,S}$ replaced by $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,S}(\cdot; \vartheta)$ gives

$$\|\widetilde{Y}_{r,e}(b', \vartheta) - \widetilde{Y}_{r,e}(b, \vartheta)\| \leq \widetilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r} \frac{|\overline{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)|}{N_r} \|b'_{i,h} - b_{i,h}\|$$

and

$$\|\widetilde{Z}_{r,v}(b', \vartheta) - \widetilde{Z}_{r,v}(b, \vartheta)\| \leq \widetilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r} \frac{1}{N_r} \|b'_{i,h} - b_{i,h}\|, \quad v \neq i.$$

This proves (51a)–(51b). $\square$

Remark on $\widetilde{\kappa}_{c,r}$. The constant $\widetilde{\kappa}_{c,r}$ in (50) measures the center sensitivity of the frozen aggregate maps and can reflect the associated surrogate approximation quality. When $\widetilde{f}_j^* \in C^2$

in (u, θ) for $j \in \mathcal{V}_r$, fix $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$, $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and a center tuple $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_r \times d}$. To identify the local derivative entering Lip_{ϑ_i} in (50), vary only the i -th center, denoted by θ . By (48), along this one-coordinate variation, for any nonempty $S \subseteq \mathcal{V}_r$,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{r,S}(\eta; \vartheta) \Big|_{\vartheta_i = \theta} = \sum_{j \in S} u_j(\theta),$$

where $u_j(\theta)$, $j \in \mathcal{V}_r$, are determined by

$$\nabla_u \tilde{f}_j^*(u_j(\theta); \vartheta_j) = x(\theta) \quad (j \neq i), \quad \nabla_u \tilde{f}_i^*(u_i(\theta); \theta) = x(\theta), \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_r} u_j(\theta) = \eta.$$

Applying the implicit function theorem at $\theta = \vartheta_i$, write

$$H_j := \left(\nabla_{uu}^2 \tilde{f}_j^*(u_j(\vartheta_i); \vartheta_j) \right)^{-1} \quad (j \neq i),$$

$$H_i := \left(\nabla_{uu}^2 \tilde{f}_i^*(u_i(\vartheta_i); \vartheta_i) \right)^{-1}, \quad C_i := \nabla_{\theta}^{\top} \nabla_u \tilde{f}_i^*(u_i(\vartheta_i); \theta) \Big|_{\theta = \vartheta_i}, \quad H_{\Sigma} := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_r} H_j.$$

Differentiating the defining equations gives

$$\nabla_{\theta} u_j(\vartheta_i)^{\top} = H_j \nabla_{\theta} x(\vartheta_i)^{\top} \quad (j \neq i), \quad \nabla_{\theta} u_i(\vartheta_i)^{\top} = H_i \nabla_{\theta} x(\vartheta_i)^{\top} - H_i C_i.$$

Differentiating $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_r} u_j(\theta) = \eta$ then yields

$$0 = H_{\Sigma} \nabla_{\theta} x(\vartheta_i)^{\top} - H_i C_i, \quad \nabla_{\theta} x(\vartheta_i)^{\top} = H_{\Sigma}^{-1} H_i C_i.$$

Therefore, for every component $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)$ not containing i ,

$$\nabla_{\theta} \left(\sum_{v \in \bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)} u_v \right) (\vartheta_i)^{\top} = \left(\sum_{v \in \bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)} H_v \right) H_{\Sigma}^{-1} H_i C_i,$$

$$\nabla_{\theta} u_i(\vartheta_i)^{\top} = H_i (H_{\Sigma}^{-1} H_i - I) C_i, \quad \nabla_{\theta} u_v(\vartheta_i)^{\top} = H_v H_{\Sigma}^{-1} H_i C_i \quad (v \neq i).$$

Thus $\tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}$ is certified by any upper bound on

$$\sup_{\eta, \vartheta} \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \left\{ \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}_r} \frac{N_r}{|\bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)|} \left\| \left(\sum_{v \in \bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)} H_v \right) H_{\Sigma}^{-1} H_i C_i \right\|, \right.$$

$$\left. \left\| H_i (H_{\Sigma}^{-1} H_i - I) C_i \right\|, \quad \max_{v \neq i} N_r \left\| H_v H_{\Sigma}^{-1} H_i C_i \right\| \right\}.$$

For the quadratic surrogates in Examples 2–3, let $Q_i(Z_i)$ denote the quadratic metric, so $Q_i \equiv M_i$ in Example 2 and $Q_i = H_i$ in Example 3. The local derivative above is $C_i(u_i(\vartheta_i), \vartheta_i)$, where

$$C_i(U_i, Z_i)h = (\nabla^2 f_i^*(Z_i) - Q_i(Z_i))h + (\nabla_{Z_i} Q_i(Z_i)[h])(U_i - Z_i).$$

In Example 2, $\|C_i(U_i, Z_i)\| \leq \mu_{f_i}^{-1} + \|M_i\|$ and the uniform curvature bounds imply $\tilde{\kappa}_{c,r} < \infty$.

B.2 Proof of Lemma 6

Fix a block r and an iteration $\nu \geq \max_{s \in [p]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_s)$. For $i, v \in \mathcal{V}_r$, set $d_i(v) := 0$ if $i = v$, and $d_i(v) := \min_{e \in \mathcal{A}_v^0} \delta_{e,i}$ otherwise. Use the node-aligned boundary vector $b_{r,v}^{\nu}$ from the proof of Lemma 10, and set $Z_{r,v}^{\nu} := (Z_i^{\nu - d_i(v)})_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r}$ for the center coordinates. In particular, $[Z_{r,v}^{\nu}]_v = Z_v^{\nu}$.

Mismatch decomposition. For $v \in \mathcal{V}_r$, define the node mismatch

$$m_v := (\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1})_v.$$

The pair $(b_{r,e}^\nu, Z_{r,e}^\nu)$ depends on the incident edge e , whereas m_v fixes the node v . To estimate m_v , insert the node-aligned pair $(b_{r,v}^\nu, Z_{r,v}^\nu)$. Since

$$(\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1})_v = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ} \mathbf{B}_{v,e} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{r,e}(b_{r,e}^\nu, Z_{r,e}^\nu)$$

and $(\bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1})_v = \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{r,v}(b_r^\nu, Z_{\mathcal{V}_r}^\nu)$, adding and subtracting

$$\sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ} \mathbf{B}_{v,e} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{r,e}(b_{r,v}^\nu, Z_{r,v}^\nu) = \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{r,v}(b_{r,v}^\nu, Z_{r,v}^\nu)$$

gives the exact decomposition

$$m_v = p_v + q_v,$$

where

$$p_v := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ} \mathbf{B}_{v,e} \left[\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{r,e}(b_{r,e}^\nu, Z_{r,e}^\nu) - \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{r,e}(b_{r,v}^\nu, Z_{r,v}^\nu) \right], \quad (75)$$

$$q_v := \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{r,v}(b_{r,v}^\nu, Z_{r,v}^\nu) - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{r,v}(b_r^\nu, Z_{\mathcal{V}_r}^\nu). \quad (76)$$

Estimate of p_v . Insert $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{r,e}(b_{r,v}^\nu, Z_{r,v}^\nu)$ in each summand of (75). This gives

$$p_v = p_v^\partial + p_v^c,$$

where

$$p_v^\partial := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ} \mathbf{B}_{v,e} \left[\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{r,e}(b_{r,e}^\nu, Z_{r,e}^\nu) - \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{r,e}(b_{r,v}^\nu, Z_{r,v}^\nu) \right],$$

$$p_v^c := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ} \mathbf{B}_{v,e} \left[\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{r,e}(b_{r,v}^\nu, Z_{r,e}^\nu) - \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{r,e}(b_{r,v}^\nu, Z_{r,v}^\nu) \right].$$

The term p_v^∂ changes only the boundary vector. For $e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ$ and $(i, h) \in \hat{\partial}_r$, the delay definition and (63) give $\delta_{e,i} \in \{\delta_{r,i}(v), \delta_{r,i}(v) + 1\}$. Hence the same argument in (66) gives

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|p_v^\partial\|^2 \leq \hat{J}_r \tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-\bar{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{(i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r} \|Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell\|^2. \quad (77)$$

For the center part, write $\Delta Z_i^\ell := Z_i^{\ell+1} - Z_i^\ell$. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$, root the tree at i , and let $\text{Ch}_{r,i}(v) := \{e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ : \delta_{e,i} = d_i(v) + 1\}$, which are among the child edges of v in this rooted tree. For $v \neq i$, let $p_i(v)$ be the active edge from v to its parent, and set

$$n_{r,i}(i) := N_r, \quad n_{r,i}(v) := |\bar{\mathcal{V}}_{p_i(v)}(i)|, \quad v \neq i.$$

Since $\delta_{e,i} = 0$ for every $e \in \mathcal{A}_i^\circ$, $\text{Ch}_{r,i}(i) = \emptyset$. For each $e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ$, telescope differences from $Z_{r,v}^\nu$ to $Z_{r,e}^\nu$ by changing center coordinates one at a time. In the coordinate- i step, let $\vartheta_{e,i}^-$ and $\vartheta_{e,i}^+$ denote the consecutive center tuples, and define

$$p_{v,i}^c := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ} \mathbf{B}_{v,e} \left[\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{r,e}(b_{r,v}^\nu, \vartheta_{e,i}^+) - \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{r,e}(b_{r,v}^\nu, \vartheta_{e,i}^-) \right].$$

Then $p_v^c = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} p_{v,i}^c$. Since $\delta_{e,i} \in \{d_i(v), d_i(v) + 1\}$ for every $e \in \mathcal{A}_v^\circ$, the i -coordinate difference is zero unless $e \in \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v)$. If $e \in \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v)$, then

$$(\vartheta_{e,i}^+ - \vartheta_{e,i}^-)_i = [Z_{r,e}^\nu]_i - [Z_{r,v}^\nu]_i = Z_i^{\nu-\delta_{e,i}} - Z_i^{\nu-d_i(v)} = -\Delta Z_i^{\nu-d_i(v)-1}.$$

If $\text{Ch}_{r,i}(v) = \emptyset$, then $p_{v,i}^c = 0$. Otherwise $d_i(v) + 1 \leq \tilde{D}_r$, and the sensitivity bound (52a) together with the counting argument for $v \neq i$ in (64) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_{v,i}^c\|^2 &\leq \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \frac{\left(\sum_{e \in \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v)} |\bar{\mathcal{V}}_e(i)|\right)^2}{N_r^2} \|\Delta Z_i^{\nu-d_i(v)-1}\|^2 \\ &\leq \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \frac{(n_{r,i}(v) - 1)^2}{N_r^2} \|\Delta Z_i^{\nu-d_i(v)-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\|p_v^c\|^2 \leq N_r \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r, \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v) \neq \emptyset} \frac{(n_{r,i}(v) - 1)^2}{N_r^2} \|\Delta Z_i^{\nu-d_i(v)-1}\|^2.$$

Summing over v and rearranging terms gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|p_v^c\|^2 &\leq N_r \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r: \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v) \neq \emptyset} \frac{(n_{r,i}(v) - 1)^2}{N_r^2} \|\Delta Z_i^{\nu-d_i(v)-1}\|^2 \\ &= N_r \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \sum_{t=1}^{\tilde{D}_r} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r: \text{Ch}_{r,i}(v) \neq \emptyset, d_i(v)+1=t} \frac{(n_{r,i}(v) - 1)^2}{N_r^2} \right) \|\Delta Z_i^{\nu-t}\|^2 \\ &\leq N_r \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \sum_{t=1}^{\tilde{D}_r} \|\Delta Z_i^{\nu-t}\|^2 = N_r \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|Z_i^{\ell+1} - Z_i^\ell\|^2, \quad (78) \end{aligned}$$

Here $d_i(v) = \max\{\text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}_r}(i, v) - 1, 0\}$, so each inner sum is over vertices at depth t and is at most one by (64). Combining (77) and (78) yields

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|p_v\|^2 \leq 2\hat{J}_r \tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{(i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r} \|Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell\|^2 + 2N_r \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|Z_i^{\ell+1} - Z_i^\ell\|^2. \quad (79)$$

Estimate of q_v . Split $q_v = q_v^\partial + q_v^c$, where

$$q_v^\partial := \tilde{Z}_{r,v}(b_{r,v}^\nu, Z_{r,v}^\nu) - \tilde{Z}_{r,v}(b_r^\nu, Z_{r,v}^\nu), \quad q_v^c := \tilde{Z}_{r,v}(b_r^\nu, Z_{r,v}^\nu) - \tilde{Z}_{r,v}(b_r^\nu, Z_{\mathcal{V}_r}^\nu).$$

With $Z_{r,v}^\nu$ fixed, Lemma 10 gives the same q_v -estimate with $\tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r}$ in place of $\kappa_{\partial,r}$:

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|q_v^\partial\|^2 \leq \hat{J}_r \tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{(i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r} \|Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell\|^2. \quad (80)$$

For the center part, keep the boundary vector fixed at b_r^ν and change $Z_{\mathcal{V}_r}^\nu$ to $Z_{r,v}^\nu$ one center coordinate at a time. Let $q_{v,i}^c$ be the change in $\tilde{Z}_{r,v}$ during the i -coordinate replacement. Since $d_v(v) = 0$, we have $q_{v,v}^c = 0$. Thus $q_v^c = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r \setminus \{v\}} q_{v,i}^c$, and (52c) gives $\|q_{v,i}^c\| \leq \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}}{N_r} \|Z_i^{\nu-d_i(v)} - Z_i^\nu\|$ for $i \neq v$. Hence, using Cauchy-Schwarz and $(N_r - 1)/N_r^2 \leq 1/N_r$,

$$\|q_v^c\|^2 \leq \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2}{N_r} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|Z_i^{\nu-d_i(v)} - Z_i^\nu\|^2. \quad (81)$$

For every i , telescoping gives

$$\|Z_i^{\nu-d_i(v)} - Z_i^\nu\|^2 \leq d_i(v) \sum_{m=1}^{d_i(v)} \|Z_i^{\nu-m+1} - Z_i^{\nu-m}\|^2, \quad 0 \leq d_i(v) \leq \tilde{D}_r.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|Z_i^{\nu-d_i(v)} - Z_i^\nu\|^2 \leq \tilde{D}_r \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|Z_i^{\ell+1} - Z_i^\ell\|^2, \quad (82)$$

where we used $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} d_i(v) \leq N_r \tilde{D}_r$. Combining (81) and (82) yields

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|q_v^c\|^2 \leq \tilde{D}_r \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|Z_i^{\ell+1} - Z_i^\ell\|^2.$$

Together with (80),

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|q_v\|^2 \leq 2\hat{J}_r \tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{(i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r} \|Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell\|^2 + 2\tilde{D}_r \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|Z_i^{\ell+1} - Z_i^\ell\|^2. \quad (83)$$

Since

$$\|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2 = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|m_v\|^2 \leq 2 \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|p_v\|^2 + 2 \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|q_v\|^2,$$

combining (79) and (83) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2 &\leq 8\hat{J}_r \tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{(i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r} \|Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell\|^2 \\ &\quad + 4(N_r + \tilde{D}_r) \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|Z_i^{\ell+1} - Z_i^\ell\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Reduction to block increments. It remains to replace the coordinate increments by block and boundary increments. Since $Z^\ell = \mathbf{B}Y^\ell$, $Z_r^\ell = \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E}_r} Y_{\mathcal{E}_r}^\ell$, and $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_i^\circ \sqcup \mathcal{A}_i^\partial$, for $i \in \mathcal{V}_r$,

$$Z_i^{\ell+1} - Z_i^\ell = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{A}_i} \mathbf{B}_{i,h} (Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell) = (Z_r^{\ell+1} - Z_r^\ell)_i + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{A}_i^\partial} \mathbf{B}_{i,h} (Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell).$$

Cauchy's inequality, $J_{r,i} := |\mathcal{A}_i^\partial| \leq J_r$, and $\hat{\partial}_r = \bigsqcup_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} (\{i\} \times \mathcal{A}_i^\partial)$ give

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_r} \|Z_i^{\ell+1} - Z_i^\ell\|^2 \leq 2\|Z_r^{\ell+1} - Z_r^\ell\|^2 + 2J_r \sum_{(i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r} \|Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell\|^2.$$

Summing over $\ell = \nu - \tilde{D}_r, \dots, \nu - 1$ and substituting into (84) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2 &\leq \left(8\tilde{\kappa}_{\partial,r}^2 \hat{J}_r + 8J_r(N_r + \tilde{D}_r) \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2\right) \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{(i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r} \|Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell\|^2 \\ &\quad + 8(N_r + \tilde{D}_r) \tilde{\kappa}_{c,r}^2 \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \|Z_r^{\ell+1} - Z_r^\ell\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

By the proof of Lemma 4,

$$\sum_{\substack{(i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r \\ h \in \mathcal{E}_s}} \|Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell\|^2 \leq \gamma_{r,s} \|Z_s^{\ell+1} - Z_s^\ell\|^2 \leq \Gamma_r \|Z_s^{\ell+1} - Z_s^\ell\|^2, \quad s \in \mathcal{M}_r.$$

Since $\hat{\partial}_r = \bigsqcup_{s \in \mathcal{M}_r} \{(i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r : h \in \mathcal{E}_s\}$, summing this estimate over s and $\ell = \nu - \tilde{D}_r, \dots, \nu - 1$ yields

$$\sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{(i,h) \in \hat{\partial}_r} \|Y_h^{\ell+1} - Y_h^\ell\|^2 \leq \Gamma_r \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}_r}^{\nu-1} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{M}_r} \|Z_s^{\ell+1} - Z_s^\ell\|^2.$$

Substitution into (85), together with the definitions of $\tilde{M}_{r,\partial}$ and $\tilde{M}_{r,c}$, proves (53). $\square$

B.3 Proof of Theorem 2

As in the proof of Theorem 1, we first rewrite Algorithm 2 as a delayed block update and then combine a one-step surrogate recursion with the delayed mismatch estimate. Similar to the proof of Proposition 5, applying the same message expansion to (39) gives the following delayed block representation; we omit the proof.

Lemma 11 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2, for all $\nu \geq \max_{r \in [p]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_r)$, Algorithm 2 is equivalent to the block update: for any $e \in \mathcal{E}_r$ and $r \in [p]$,*

$$\begin{cases} \hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} \in \underset{Y_e}{\text{argmin}} \min_{Y_{\mathcal{E}_r \setminus \{e\}}} \tilde{G}_r(\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{V}_r, \mathcal{E}_r} Y_{\mathcal{E}_r} + c_r(b_{r,e}^\nu; Z_{r,e}^\nu), \\ Y_e^{\nu+1} = Y_e^\nu + \tau_r^\nu (\hat{Y}_e^{\nu+1} - Y_e^\nu). \end{cases} \quad (86)$$

Lemma 12 *Under Assumption 5, if $0 \leq \tau_r^\nu \leq 1/\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$ for every $r \in [p]$, then*

$$G(Z^{\nu+1}) \leq G(Z^\nu) - \sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^\nu \tilde{\delta}_r(Y^\nu) + \sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^\nu \frac{\tilde{L}_r^*}{2} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2. \quad (87)$$

Proof Since $\tau_r^\nu \leq 1/\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$, applying Jensen's inequality to each f_i^* and summing over the nodes yields

$$G(Z^{\nu+1}) - G(Z^\nu) \leq \sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^\nu \left[G(Z^\nu - Z_r^\nu + \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1}) - G(Z^\nu) \right].$$

For fixed r , all outside coordinates are unchanged. Majorization and touching give

$$G(Z^\nu - Z_r^\nu + \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1}) - G(Z^\nu) \leq \tilde{G}(Z^\nu - Z_r^\nu + \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1}; Z^\nu) - \tilde{G}(Z^\nu; Z^\nu).$$

Since $Z^\nu - Z_r^\nu + \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}$ minimizes $\tilde{G}(\cdot; Z^\nu)$ over $Z^\nu + \mathcal{U}_r$ and $\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1} \in \mathcal{U}_r$, first-order optimality gives

$$\left\langle \nabla_U \tilde{G}(Z^\nu - Z_r^\nu + \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}; Z^\nu)^\top, \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1} \right\rangle = 0.$$

The $\tilde{L}_r^*$ -smoothness on this slice then yields

$$\tilde{G}(Z^\nu - Z_r^\nu + \hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1}; Z^\nu) \leq \tilde{G}(Z^\nu - Z_r^\nu + \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}; Z^\nu) + \frac{\tilde{L}_r^*}{2} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2.$$

Combining these bounds with the definition of $\tilde{\delta}_r(Y^\nu)$ proves (87). $\square$

Lemma 13 *Under Assumptions 5 and 6, assume that $0 < \tau_r^\nu \leq 1/\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$ for every $r \in [p]$, and let $\underline{\tau}^\nu := \min_{r \in [p]} \tau_r^\nu$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} G(Z^{\nu+1}) - G^* &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\underline{\tau}^\nu}{2\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}}}\right) (G(Z^\nu) - G^*) - \sum_{r=1}^p \frac{\tilde{\mu}_r^*}{8\tau_r^\nu} \|Z_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu\|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^\nu \frac{2\tilde{L}_r^* + \tilde{\mu}_r^*}{4} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Proof Split $\sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^\nu \tilde{\delta}_r(Y^\nu)$ in (87) into two halves. The surrogate block error bound gives

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=1}^p \tau_r^\nu \tilde{\delta}_r(Y^\nu) \geq \frac{\underline{\tau}^\nu}{2\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathcal{P}}} (G(Z^\nu) - G^*).$$

For the second half, touching and strong convexity of the nondelayed surrogate slice give

$$\tilde{\delta}_r(Y^\nu) \geq \frac{\tilde{\mu}_r^*}{2} \|\bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu\|^2.$$

Using

$$\|\bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu\|^2 - \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2$$

and $Z_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu = \tau_r^\nu (\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu)$, the second half of the progress satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2} \tau_r^\nu \tilde{\delta}_r(Y^\nu) \geq \frac{\tilde{\mu}_r^*}{8\tau_r^\nu} \|Z_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu\|^2 - \tau_r^\nu \frac{\tilde{\mu}_r^*}{4} \|\hat{Z}_r^{\nu+1} - \bar{Z}_r^{\nu+1}\|^2.$$

Substituting these bounds into Lemma 12 gives (88). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2. Substituting (53) into (88) and using (54) gives for all $\nu \geq \max_{r \in [p]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_r)$

$$\begin{aligned} G(Z^{\nu+1}) - G^* &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{2\tilde{\kappa}_P}\right) (G(Z^\nu) - G^*) - \frac{\tilde{\mu}^*}{8\tau} \sum_{r=1}^p \|Z_r^{\nu+1} - Z_r^\nu\|^2 \\ &\quad + \tau \tilde{A} \sum_{\ell=\nu-\tilde{D}}^{\nu-1} \sum_{r=1}^p \|Z_r^{\ell+1} - Z_r^\ell\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking the standard delay-window inequality under (55) from this starting index and then using the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1 gives (56). $\square$

References

1. Albert Berahas, Raghu Bollapragada, Nitish Shirish Keskar, and Ermin Wei. Balancing Communication and Computation in Distributed Optimization. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, to appear, 2019.
2. S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein. Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 3(1):1–122, 2011.
3. Fan R. K. Chung. *Spectral Graph Theory*, volume 92 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.
4. P. Di Lorenzo and G. Scutari. NEXT: In-network nonconvex optimization. *IEEE Trans. Signal Inf. Process. Netw.*, 2(2):120–136, June 2016.
5. Hamid Reza Feyzmahdavian and Mikael Johansson. Asynchronous iterations in optimization: New sequence results and sharper algorithmic guarantees. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(158):1–75, 2023.
6. Hadrien Hendrikx, Francis Bach, and Laurent Massoulié. An optimal algorithm for decentralized finite-sum optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(4):2753–2783, 2021.
7. D. Jakovetic, J. M. F. Moura, and J. Xavier. Linear convergence rate of a class of distributed augmented lagrangian algorithms. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 60(4):922–936, April 2015.
8. Dusan Jakovetic. A Unification and Generalization of Exact Distributed First-Order Methods. *IEEE Trans. Signal Inf. Process. Netw.*, 5(1):31–46, 2019.
9. Cassio G Lopes and Ali H Sayed. Diffusion Least-Mean Squares Over Adaptive Networks: Formulation and Performance Analysis. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 56(7):3122–3136, 2008.
10. A. Nedić and A. Ozdaglar. Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 54(1):48–61, January 2009.
11. Angelia Nedić, Alex Olshevsky, and Michael G. Rabbat. Network topology and communication-computation tradeoffs in decentralized optimization. *Proc. IEEE*, 106(5):953–976, 2018.
12. Angelia Nedic, Alex Olshevsky, and Wei Shi. Achieving geometric convergence for distributed optimization over time-varying graphs. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 27(4):2597–2633, 2017.
13. A. Olshevsky and J. Tsitsiklis. Convergence speed in distributed consensus and averaging. *SIAM REVIEW*, 53(4):747–772, 2011.

14. Guannan Qu and Na Li. Harnessing Smoothness to Accelerate Distributed Optimization. *IEEE Control Netw. Syst.*, 5(3):1245–1260, 2018.
15. Ali H. Sayed. Adaptation, learning, and optimization over networks. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 7(4-5):311–801, 2014.
16. Kevin Scaman, Francis Bach, Sébastien Bubeck, Yin Tat Lee, and Laurent Massoulié. Optimal algorithms for smooth and strongly convex distributed optimization in networks. In Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh, editors, *Proc. of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proc. of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3027–3036, International Convention Centre, Sydney, Australia, 06–11 Aug 2017. PMLR.
17. Gesualdo Scutari and Ying Sun. Distributed nonconvex constrained optimization over time-varying digraphs. *Mathematical Programming*, 176(1-2):497–544, 2019.
18. Wei Shi, Qing Ling, Gang Wu, and Wotao Yin. On the linear convergence of the ADMM in decentralized consensus optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 62(7):1750–1761, 2014.
19. Wei Shi, Qing Ling, Gang Wu, and Wotao Yin. EXTRA: An exact first-order algorithm for decentralized consensus optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(2):944–966, 2015.
20. Ying Sun, Gesualdo Scutari, and Amir Daneshmand. Distributed optimization based on gradient tracking revisited: Enhancing convergence rate via surrogation. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 32(2):354–385, 2022.
21. R. Xin, S. Pu, A. Nedic, and U. Khan. A general framework for decentralized optimization with first-order methods. *Proc. IEEE*, 108(11):1869–1889, 2020.
22. J. Xu, S. Zhu, Y. C. Soh, and L. Xie. Augmented distributed gradient methods for multi-agent optimization under uncoordinated constant stepsizes. In *Proc. of the 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC 2015)*, pages 2055–2060, Osaka, Japan, Dec. 2015.
23. Kun Yuan, Qing Ling, and WOTAO Yin. On the Convergence of Decentralized Gradient Descent. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 26(3):1835–1854, January 2016.
24. Kun Yuan, Qing Ling, and Wotao Yin. On the convergence of decentralized gradient descent. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 26(3):1835–1854, 2016.