

DISTRIBUTED ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY VIA ONLINE CONVEX OPTIMIZATION

Bowen Wang^{✉,✉}, Matteo Zecchin[✉] and Osvaldo Simeone[✉]

^{✉✉}KCLIP, CIIPS, Department of Engineering, King’s College London, London WC2R 2LS, UK.

[✉]Communication Systems Department, EURECOM, 06904 Sophia Antipolis, France.

[✉]Intelligent Networked Systems Institute, Northeastern University London, London E1 8PH, UK.

E-mail: bowen.wang@kcl.ac.uk, zecchin@eurecom.fr, o.simeone@northeastern.edu

ABSTRACT

An associative memory (AM) enables cue–response recall, and associative memorization has recently been noted to underlie the operation of modern neural architectures such as Transformers. This work addresses a distributed setting where agents maintain a local AM to recall their own associations as well as selective information from others. Specifically, we introduce a distributed online gradient descent method that optimizes local AMs at different agents through communication over routing trees. Our theoretical analysis establishes sublinear regret guarantees, and experiments demonstrate that the proposed protocol consistently outperforms existing online optimization baselines.

Index Terms— Associative Memory, Distributed Optimization, Online Convex Optimization

1. INTRODUCTION

An *associative memory* (AM), a classical concept in cognitive science, stores cue–response associations, recalling the response when the corresponding cue is presented [1]. This principle, fundamental to human cognition, provides a natural abstraction for modeling how information can be efficiently retained, updated, and retrieved.

Recent advances in machine learning [2, 3, 4, 5] have demonstrated that Transformers [6] and related sequence models [7, 8, 9, 10] can be reinterpreted as realizations of AMs [5]. From this viewpoint, inference in such models can be seen as solving an online optimization problem for the storage and retrieval of information [11, 12]. A summary of representative models and their corresponding AM-based optimization objectives is provided in Table 1.

Existing research has largely focused on the design of *centralized* AMs [2, 3, 4, 5], where all information is processed by a single agent. However, many contemporary applications operate in *distributed* environments, where multiple agents have access only to local data, yet may still benefit from recalling associations across the network [13, 14]. This motivates the study of *distributed associative memory* (DAM), which is the focus of this work.

Specifically, the main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We formalize the DAM problem, in which each agent optimizes its local AM mechanism online, aiming not only to recall its own associations, but also to retain information from other agents of interest (Sec. 2).
- We propose a novel algorithm, termed *DAM via tree-based online gradient descent* (DAM-TOGD), which optimizes each agent’s AM via *online gradient descent* (OGD) while enabling information exchange along tree topology.
- We rigorously establish that DAM-TOGD achieves sublinear regret. Furthermore, we validate the effectiveness of DAM-TOGD through numerical experiments, which demonstrate its robustness and superior performance compared to existing online optimization baselines [15].

2. PROBLEM SETTING

We study distributed test-time memorization by generalizing the setting in [3, 4, 5] to N agents, where each agent n processes a stream of *keys* $\mathbf{k}_{n,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k}$ (*cues*) and *values* $\mathbf{v}_{n,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_v}$ (*responses*). The goal is to optimize the AM mechanism at each n -th agent in an online fashion, ensuring that at each time t , agent n not only recalls its past data $\{\mathbf{k}_{n,t'}, \mathbf{v}_{n,t'}\}_{t'=1}^t$ but also data $\{\mathbf{k}_{m,t'}, \mathbf{v}_{m,t'}\}_{t'=1}^t$ that is processed by a subset of other agents $m \neq n$.

Denote as $\mathbf{X}_{n,t} \in \mathcal{X}$ the parameters of AM mechanism maintained at agent n at time t , where \mathcal{X} is the design domain for parameter $\mathbf{X}_{n,t}$. For example, for a *linear AM*, the parameters $\mathbf{X}_{n,t}$ correspond to a matrix, returning the estimated value $\mathbf{X}_{n,t}\mathbf{k}_{n,t}$ for the input key $\mathbf{k}_{n,t}$. More generally, the AM mechanism may return $\mathbf{X}_{n,t}\phi(\mathbf{k}_{n,t})$, where $\phi(\cdot)$ is a non-linear feature-extraction function.

Given an AM mechanism at agent n with parameters $\mathbf{X}_{m,t}$, we denote as $f_{m,t}(\mathbf{X}_{n,t})$ the loss accrued on the data $(\mathbf{k}_{m,t}, \mathbf{v}_{m,t})$ processed at time t by agent m . Commonly used memory retrieval loss functions for linear AM are summarized in Table 1.

The overall retrieval loss for agent n weights the local loss $f_{m,t}(\mathbf{X}_{n,t})$ with respect to the information from agent m through the parameter $0 \leq w_{n,m} \leq 1$, with $\sum_{m=1}^N w_{n,m} = 1$. Accordingly, the cumulative loss function at time T for agent

Table 1: Memory retrieval loss functions $f(\mathbf{X})$ for different variants of Linear Attention [7], where \mathbf{X} represents the memory matrix, \mathbf{k} is the key vector, and \mathbf{v} is the corresponding value vector. (ψ is a gating vector with binary entries; and $\phi(\cdot)$ denotes a feature-extraction function.)

Model	$f(\mathbf{X})$
Linear Attention [7]	$-\langle \mathbf{X}\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{v} \rangle$
Gated Linear Attention [8]	$-\langle \mathbf{X}\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{v} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \ \text{diag}(\sqrt{1 - \psi})\mathbf{X}\ _F^2$
DeltaNet [9]	$\frac{1}{2} \ \mathbf{X}\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{v}\ ^2$
Softmax Attention w/o Norm	$-\langle \mathbf{X}\phi(\mathbf{k}), \mathbf{v} \rangle$
Softmax Attention w/ Norm [6]	$-\langle \mathbf{X}\phi(\mathbf{k}), \mathbf{v} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \ \mathbf{X}\ _F^2$
Gated Softmax Attention [10]	$-\langle \mathbf{X}\phi(\mathbf{k}), \mathbf{v} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \ \text{diag}(\sqrt{1 - \psi})\mathbf{X}\ _F^2$

n is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_n^T(\mathbf{X}_n^T) = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} f_{m,t}(\mathbf{X}_{n,t}), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{X}_n^T = \{\mathbf{X}_{n,t}\}_{t=1}^T$, and $\mathcal{W}_n = \{m \in \mathcal{N} | w_{n,m} > 0\}$ denotes the set of agents m whose data is relevant to agent n , i.e., those with nonzero weights $w_{n,m}$. The logical weights defining the loss (1) are collected into the row stochastic matrix \mathbf{W} with $[\mathbf{W}]_{n,m} = w_{n,m}$, which is assumed to be known at all agents.

Since the data $(\mathbf{k}_{m,t}, \mathbf{v}_{m,t})$ is only available at agent m , the loss function $f_{m,t}(\cdot)$ can only be evaluated by agent m . Therefore, in order to optimize the loss function (1), agent n must generally communicate with other agents (unless the weights $w_{n,m}$ equal zero for all $m \notin \mathcal{N}$). To enable inter-agent communication, agents interact over an *undirected graph* $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ is the set of agent indices, and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ is a collection of inter-agent links (m, n) , indicating that agents n and m can communicate. We let $\mathcal{N}_n = \{m \in \mathcal{N} : (m, n) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ denote the set of neighbors of agent n . Note that the set of edges \mathcal{E} represents the physical connectivity of the agents, while the weight matrix \mathbf{W} reflects the logical relationships among the performance requirements of different agents.

We aim at minimizing the regret with respect to the *best solutions* $\{\mathbf{U}_n^*\}_{n \in \mathcal{N}}$ in hindsight, where $\mathbf{U}_n^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{U}_n \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}_n^T(\mathbf{U}_n^*)$ denotes the optimal solution for agent n , which generally differs across agents. Summing over the N agents, the regret is defined as

$$\text{Reg}(T) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \left(\mathcal{L}_n^T(\mathbf{X}_n^T) - \mathcal{L}_n^T(\mathbf{U}_n^*) \right). \quad (2)$$

We adopt an *online convex optimization* (OCO) framework, making the assumptions that (i) The objective functions $f_{m,t}(\cdot)$ are convex for all agent $m \in \mathcal{N}$; (ii) The feasible set \mathcal{X} is closed, convex, and bounded with diameter B ; and (iii) The gradients satisfy the inequality $\|\nabla f_{m,t}(\mathbf{X})\|_F \leq L_m$ for some finite $L_m > 0$ for all $m \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{X}$. The objective functions listed in Table 1 can be verified to satisfy the above assumptions.

3. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we revisit some conventional methods to solve (2).

3.1. Full-Information DAM

In the ideal full-information setting in which all agents have access to the complete set of loss functions $\{f_{m,t}(\cdot)\}_{m \in \mathcal{N}}$ at each time t , the problem can be solved without inter-agent communication via OGD. Specifically, OGD yields the update [12, 11]

$$\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{X}} \left[\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \eta_{n,t} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \nabla f_{m,t}(\mathbf{X}_{n,t}) \right], \quad (3)$$

where $\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}[\cdot]$ denotes the projection onto set \mathcal{X} , and $\eta_{n,t}$ is the learning rate. The regret properties of OGD follow directly from [11, Theorem 2.13].

Theorem 1. *With learning rate $\eta_{n,t} = 1/\sqrt{t}$, and defining $\bar{L}_n = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} L_m$, OGD satisfies the regret bound*

$$\text{Reg}(T) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \left(\frac{B^2}{2} + \bar{L}_n^2 \right) \sqrt{T}. \quad (4)$$

3.2. Consensus DAM

For the weight matrix $\mathbf{W} = \mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^T/N$, the objectives in (1) become equal for all agent $n \in \mathcal{N}$. Therefore, their common minimizer can be evaluated via *consensus-based decentralized OGD* (C-DOGD) [15]. In fact, with C-DOGD, all agents asymptotically agree on a common solution \mathbf{X} , i.e., $\mathbf{X}_{n,t} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. C-DOGD is specified by a doubly stochastic matrix \mathbf{A} with entries $[\mathbf{A}]_{n,m} = a_{n,m}$. In particular, C-DOGD performs local gradient steps followed by consensus averaging as

$$\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{X}} \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_n} a_{n,m} \mathbf{X}_{m,t} - \eta_{n,t} \nabla f_{n,t}(\mathbf{X}_{n,t}) \right], \quad (5)$$

where $\eta_{n,t}$ is the learning rate. The regret properties of C-DOGD follow directly from [15, Theorem 1].

Theorem 2. *In the special case $\mathbf{W} = \mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^T/N$, with learning rate $\eta_{n,t} = 1/2\sqrt{t}$, and defining $L_{\max} = \max_{n \in \mathcal{N}} L_n$, C-DOGD satisfies the regret bound*

$$\text{Reg}(T) \leq N \left(B + \frac{5 - \alpha}{1 - \alpha} L_{\max}^2 \right) \sqrt{T}, \quad (6)$$

where α is the spectral gap of the doubly stochastic matrix \mathbf{A} .

Although C-DOGD circumvents the need for global loss information, its sublinear regret (6) guarantee holds only in the special case where all agents wish to memorize the same information.

4. PROPOSED METHOD

In this section, we study the practical setting in which local agent n has access only to its local loss $f_{n,t}(\cdot)$ and the logical weight matrix \mathbf{W} is not consistent with a consensus solution.

4.1. Protocol

We introduce DAM-TOGD, a novel DAM protocol that addresses the problem of minimizing the regret (2) for an arbitrary matrix \mathbf{W} of memorization requirements. DAM-TOGD applies OGD updates at each agent n based on delayed information received from the other agents in the subset $\mathcal{W}_n \setminus \{n\}$, whose data is of interest for agent n . As explained next, communication takes place over trees connecting each agent n to all relevant agents in $\mathcal{W}_n \setminus \{n\}$ on the graph \mathcal{G} .

To elaborate, given the physical communication graph \mathcal{G} and the logical weight matrix \mathbf{W} , we first construct Steiner trees $\{\mathcal{T}_n\}_{n \in \mathcal{N}}$, with each Steiner tree \mathcal{T}_n being rooted at agent n and containing paths, i.e., sequences of contiguous edges, from agent n to all agents in subset \mathcal{W}_n [16, 17].

At each time step t , agent n sends its current iterate $\mathbf{X}_{n,t-1}$ along tree \mathcal{T}_n toward all agents $m \in \mathcal{W}_n \setminus \{n\}$. This information requires $\tilde{\tau}_{n,m}$ time steps to arrive at agent m , where $\tilde{\tau}_{n,m}$ is the number of the edges on the path from agent n to agent m . Upon receiving the query at time $t + \tilde{\tau}_{n,m}$, agent m evaluates the gradient $\nabla f_{m,t-1}(\mathbf{X}_{n,t-1})$, and sends it back along the reverse path. We denote as $\tau_{n,m} = 2\tilde{\tau}_{n,m}$ the total communication delay incurred in the round-trip exchange between agent n and agent m .

Accordingly, the agent n receives the gradient $f_{m,t}(\mathbf{X}_{n,t})$ at time $t + \tau_{n,m}$. Using the most recent gradient information available from the agents in the subset $m \in \mathcal{W}_n \setminus \{n\}$, at time step $t + 1$, each agent applies the update

$$\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{X}} \left[\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \eta_{n,t} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \nabla f_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}(\mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}}) \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}} \right], \quad (7)$$

where $\eta_{n,t}$ is the learning rate. In (7), the gradient corresponding to agent m is multiplied by the weight $w_{n,m}$, reflecting the structure of the cumulative regret loss function (1).

The overall DAM-TOGD is summarized in Algorithm 1.

4.2. Regret Analysis

In this subsection, we derive a regret bound for DAM-TOGD.

Theorem 3. *Under the assumption that the learning rate $\eta_{n,t}$ is non-increasing, the regret of DAM-TOGD protocol is upper bounded as*

$$\text{Reg}(T) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathcal{W}_n} \left(Q_n \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \eta_{n,t} + P_n \eta_{n,\tau_{n,\min}+1} + H_n + C_n \right), \quad (8)$$

where

$$Q_n = \frac{K_n}{2} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} L_m + |\mathcal{W}_n| K_n^2 \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \tau_{n,m}, \quad (9)$$

Algorithm 1 DAM-TOGD (at agent n)

Input: $\{\eta_{n,t}\}_{t \geq 1}$, $\{w_{n,m}\}_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n}$, and tree \mathcal{T}_n

- 1: **Initialize** \mathbf{X}_1
 - 2: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: # *Receive memory parameters and send losses*
 - 4: Receive $\mathbf{X}_{m,t-\tilde{\tau}_{m,n}}$ from agent m
 - 5: Send $\nabla f_{n,t-\tilde{\tau}_{n,m}}(\mathbf{X}_{m,t-\tilde{\tau}_{m,n}})$ to agent m
 - 6: # *Send memory parameter and receive losses*
 - 7: Broadcast $\mathbf{X}_{n,t}$ to all agents $m \in \mathcal{W}_n \setminus \{n\}$
 - 8: Receive $\nabla f_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}(\mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}})$ from all agents $m \in \mathcal{W}_n \setminus \{n\}$
 - 9: # *Gradient Descent*
 - 10: Update local memory parameter using (7)
 - 11: **end for**
-

$$P_n = |\mathcal{W}_n|^2 K_n^2 \tau_{n,\max}^2, \quad (10)$$

$$H_n = \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2}{2\eta_{n,t}}, \quad (11)$$

$$C_n = \frac{\Delta\tau_n}{2} \left(\left(K_n \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} L_m \right) + |\mathcal{W}_n| B^2 \right), \quad (12)$$

with $K_n = \max_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} L_m$, $\tau_{n,\min} = \min_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \tau_{n,m}$, $\tau_{n,\max} = \max_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \tau_{n,m}$, $\Delta\tau_n = \tau_{n,\max} - \tau_{n,\min}$ and $|\mathcal{W}_n|$ being the cardinality of \mathcal{W}_n .

Proof. Please see online supplementary materials [18]. \square

Building on the above theorem, we now show that the proposed DAM-TOGD protocol achieves sublinear regret.

Corollary 1. *With learning rate $\eta_{n,t} = c/\sqrt{t - \tau_{n,\min}}$ for any $c > 0$, DAM-TOGD satisfies the regret bound*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}(T) &\leq \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \left(2cQ_n \sqrt{T + \Delta\tau_n} + \frac{B^2}{2c} \sqrt{T} + P_n c + C_n \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{T + \Delta\tau_n} + \sqrt{T} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

As established in Corollary 1, DAM-TOGD attains sublinear regret, like the ideal full-information protocol (Sec. 3.1). Relative to this benchmark, its regret additionally depends on the aggregate communication delay $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \tau_{n,m}$ and delay heterogeneity $\Delta\tau_n$, which depend on both the logical matrix \mathbf{W} and the connectivity graph \mathcal{G} .

5. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we present numerical experiments to illustrate and validate the performance of distributed DAM protocols.

5.1. Setting

We consider memorization under the DeltaNet model [9], where memory retrieval is linear and the loss function for agent n at time t is given by the third entry in Table 1. The key vectors $\mathbf{k}_{n,t}$ are generated independently for each agent n and time t , by drawing each entry from a uniform distribution




Fig. 1: (a) Physical topology considered in the experiments; (b) Regret versus time horizon T ($\rho = 0.75$, $y_0 = 2$, and $y_1 = 10$); (c) Regret at $T = 2500$ versus memory correlation parameter ρ ($y_0 = 6$, and $y_1 = 10$); (d) Regret at $T = 2500$ versus Dirichlet parameter y_0 ($\rho = 0.75$, and $y_1 = 10$).

over the interval $[-1, 1]$. The corresponding value vectors $\mathbf{v}_{n,t}$ are generated as

$$\mathbf{v}_{n,t} = ((1 - \rho)\mathbf{M}_n^* + \rho\mathbf{M}_{\text{com}}^*)\mathbf{k}_{n,t} + \mathbf{n}_{n,t}, \quad (14)$$

where $\mathbf{n}_{n,t} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_n^2)$ denotes additive Gaussian noise, with $\sigma_n^2 = 1$. The data-generation model (14) indicates that, apart from the presence of noise, the ground-truth optimal linear mechanism for agent n is given by $(1 - \rho)\mathbf{M}_n^* + \rho\mathbf{M}_{\text{com}}^*$, combining a personalized component \mathbf{M}_n^* and a common component $\mathbf{M}_{\text{com}}^*$ shared across all agents. The correlation parameter $\rho \in [0, 1]$ controls the trade-off between personalized and common memory contributions. Matrix $\mathbf{M}_{\text{com}}^*$ is generated by sampling each entry independently from a chi-squared distribution with 2 degrees of freedom, while the matrices \mathbf{M}_n^* are generated independently with Gaussian entries $\mathbf{M}_n^* \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2)$, where the mean μ_n and variance σ_n^2 are independently and uniformly sampled from the intervals $[-5, 5]$ and $[0, 50]$, respectively.

The logical weight matrix \mathbf{W} is constructed such each n -th row is sampled independently from a Dirichlet distribution. Specifically, the n -th row is determined as the random vector

$$\mathbf{W}[n, :] \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\underbrace{y_0, \dots, y_0}_{1:n-1}, y_1, \underbrace{y_0, \dots, y_0}_{n+1:N}), \quad (15)$$

for some $y_1 \geq y_0 \geq 0$. This way, the weight in (15) assigned to the local data at agent n is, on average, more relevant than the data from other agents by a factor y_1/y_0 . The number of agents is set to $N = 20$, and the connecting graph is shown in Fig. 1a.

5.2. Experiments

Convergence: In Fig. 1b, we study the evolution of the regret (2) over time for OGD, C-DOGD, and the proposed DAM-TOGD. As evidenced by the consistent decline in regret with increasing time horizon T seen in Fig. 1b, both OGD and the proposed DAM-TOGD exhibit a clear sublinear regret trend, conforming to Theorem 3 and Corollary 1. In contrast, the regret of C-DOGD initially decreases but quickly plateaus, demonstrating a regret behavior that fails to improve with time. This is because C-DOGD forces the agents to use

the same memory mechanism as time t increases, while the model (14) enables that different memorization mechanisms are preferred at distinct agents.

Impact of Memory Correlation: Fig. 1c shows the effect of the memory correlation parameter ρ in (14) on the regret. For large ρ , memory heterogeneity is minimal and all methods perform similarly. As ρ decreases, personalization increases, consensus becomes restrictive, and C-DOGD suffers a rapidly growing regret. In contrast, DAM-TOGD mitigates heterogeneity and maintains low regret, demonstrating robustness to personalization.

Impact of the Logical Weight Matrix: In Fig. 1d, we report the effect of the logical weight matrix in (15) by varying the Dirichlet parameter y_0 (with $y_1 = 10$), which controls how each agent’s memory incorporates data from others. When the parameter y_0 is small, the weight matrix \mathbf{W} becomes highly imbalanced, emphasizing personalized weights. In this regime, achieving consensus does not result in the optimal solution and C-DOGD incurs a large regret. In contrast, the results show that OGD and the proposed DAM-TOGD methods are largely unaffected by variations in parameter y_0 , demonstrating their robustness to changes in the network logical weight structure.

6. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have introduced the DAM problem and proposed DAM-TOGD, a tree-based OGD framework for optimizing associative memorization in distributed settings. By leveraging tree-structured communication, DAM-TOGD enables agents to recall both local and cross-agent associations while ensuring sublinear regret. Numerical experiments confirm its robustness and demonstrate consistent improvements over existing online optimization baselines, establishing DAM-TOGD as a scalable solution for DAM. Future work may consider time-varying connectivity conditions, robustness to link failures and noisy communications, and experiments with non-linear memory mechanisms.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The work of B. Wang was supported by the NMES Faculty Studentship and the Research Training and Support Grant (RTSG) from King’s College London. The work of O. Simeone was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon Europe Programme (Grant agreement No. 101198347), by an Open Fellowship of the EPSRC (EP/W024101/1), and by the EPSRC project (EP/X011852/1).

8. REFERENCES

- [1] Dmitry Krotov, Benjamin Hoover, Parikshit Ram, and Bao Pham, “Modern methods in associative memory,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.06211*, 2025.
- [2] Dmitry Krotov and John J Hopfield, “Dense associative memory for pattern recognition,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [3] Ali Behrouz, Meisam Razaviyayn, Peilin Zhong, and Vahab Mirrokni, “It’s all connected: A journey through test-time memorization, attentional bias, retention, and online optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.13173*, 2025.
- [4] Ke Alexander Wang, Jiaxin Shi, and Emily B Fox, “Test-time regression: a unifying framework for designing sequence models with associative memory,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12352*, 2025.
- [5] Shu Zhong, Mingyu Xu, Tenglong Ao, and Guang Shi, “Understanding transformer from the perspective of associative memory,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.19488*, 2025.
- [6] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [7] Angelos Katharopoulos, Apoorv Vyas, Nikolaos Pappas, and François Fleuret, “Transformers are RNNs: Fast autoregressive transformers with linear attention,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 5156–5165.
- [8] Songlin Yang, Bailin Wang, Yikang Shen, Rameswar Panda, and Yoon Kim, “Gated linear attention transformers with hardware-efficient training,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06635*, 2023.
- [9] Imanol Schlag, Kazuki Irie, and Jürgen Schmidhuber, “Linear transformers are secretly fast weight programmers,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 9355–9366.
- [10] Zhixuan Lin, Evgenii Nikishin, Xu Owen He, and Aaron Courville, “Forgetting transformer: Softmax attention with a forget gate,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.02130*, 2025.
- [11] Francesco Orabona, “A modern introduction to online learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.13213*, 2019.
- [12] Shai Shalev-Shwartz et al., “Online learning and online convex optimization,” *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 107–194, 2012.
- [13] Osvaldo Simeone, “A very brief introduction to machine learning with applications to communication systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 648–664, 2018.
- [14] Roula Nassif, Stefan Vlaski, Cédric Richard, Jie Chen, and Ali H Sayed, “Multitask learning over graphs: An approach for distributed, streaming machine learning,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 14–25, 2020.
- [15] Feng Yan, Shreyas Sundaram, S.V.N. Vishwanathan, and Yuan Qi, “Distributed autonomous online learning: Regrets and intrinsic privacy-preserving properties,” *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 2483–2493, 2013.
- [16] Frank K Hwang and Dana S Richards, “Steiner tree problems,” *Networks*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 55–89, 1992.
- [17] Lawrence Kou, George Markowsky, and Leonard Berman, “A fast algorithm for steiner trees,” *Acta informatica*, vol. 15, pp. 141–145, 1981.
- [18] Bowen Wang, Matteo Zecchin, and Osvaldo Simeone, “Distributed associative memory via online convex optimization (online supplementary materials),” <https://github.com/BW-Wang/DAM-TOGD>, 2025, [Online; accessed 10-Sep-2025].

A. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

For notational simplicity, we define

$$\mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n = \nabla f_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}(\mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}}), \quad (\text{A-1})$$

$$K_n = \max_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} L_m, \quad (\text{A-2})$$

$$\tau_{n,\min} = \min_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \tau_{n,m}, \quad (\text{A-3})$$

$$\tau_{n,\max} = \max_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \tau_{n,m}, \quad (\text{A-4})$$

$$\Delta\tau_n = \tau_{n,\max} - \tau_{n,\min}, \quad (\text{A-5})$$

and denote by $|\mathcal{W}_n|$ the cardinality of \mathcal{W}_n .

Recall that the network regret can be written as the sum of local regrets,

$$\text{Reg}(T) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \underbrace{\left(\mathcal{L}_n^T(\mathbf{X}_n^T) - \mathcal{L}_n^T(\mathbf{U}_n^*) \right)}_{\text{Reg}_n(T)} = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \text{Reg}_n(T). \quad (\text{A-6})$$

We now turn to analyze the regret at agent n . Aggregating the results across all agents then yields the regret bound $\text{Reg}(T)$. For agent n , by applying the convexity property [12, Lemma 2.5], the regret at agent n can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_n(T) &= \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} f_{m,t}(\mathbf{X}_{n,t}) - \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} f_{m,t}(\mathbf{U}_n^*) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \langle w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t}^n, \mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^* \rangle \right) \\ &\leq \underbrace{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \langle w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t>\tau_{n,m}\}}, \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} - \mathbf{U}_n^* \rangle}_{\text{Reg}_n^*(T)} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=T+\tau_{n,m}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \langle w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n, \mathbf{U}_n^* - \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} \rangle}_{\text{Drift}_n(T)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-7})$$

Next, we analyze the terms $\text{Reg}_n^*(T)$ and $\text{Drift}_n(T)$ separately.

A.1. Bounding $\text{Reg}_n^*(T)$

To analyze $\text{Reg}_n^*(T)$, we first present following inequity

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\| \Pi_{\mathcal{X}} \left[\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \eta_{n,t} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t>\tau_{n,m}\}} \right] - \mathbf{U}_n^* \right\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \eta_{n,t} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t>\tau_{n,m}\}} - \mathbf{U}_n^* \right\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 \\ &= \frac{\eta_{n,t}^2}{2} \left\| \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t>\tau_{n,m}\}} \right\|^2 - \eta_{n,t} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \langle w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t>\tau_{n,m}\}}, \mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^* \rangle \\ &= \frac{\eta_{n,t}^2}{2} \left\| \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t>\tau_{n,m}\}} \right\|^2 - \eta_{n,t} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \langle w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t>\tau_{n,m}\}}, \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} - \mathbf{U}_n^* \rangle \\ &\quad - \eta_{n,t} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \langle w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t>\tau_{n,m}\}}, \mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-8})$$

where (a) holds since $\|\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}[\mathbf{X}] - \mathbf{Y}\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Y}\|^2$ for $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{X}$ [11, Proposition 2.11].

Dividing both sides by $\eta_{n,t}$ and rearranging the terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \left\langle w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}}, \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} - \mathbf{U}_n^* \right\rangle \\ & \leq \frac{\eta_{n,t}}{2} \left\| \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}} \right\|^2 + \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2}{2\eta_{n,t}} \\ & \quad - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \left\langle w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}}, \mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-9})$$

Using Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to upper-bound the last inner product in (A-9), we further have

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \left\langle w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}}, \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} - \mathbf{U}_n^* \right\rangle \quad (\text{A-10a})$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \frac{\eta_{n,t}}{2} \left\| \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}} \right\|^2 + \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2}{2\eta_{n,t}} \\ & \quad + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \left\| \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \right\| \left\| \mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} \right\| \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-10b})$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\eta_{n,t}}{2} \left\| \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}} \right\|^2 + \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2}{2\eta_{n,t}} \\ & \quad + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} L_m \left\| \mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} \right\| \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-10c})$$

where (a) follows from the bounded gradient assumption.

Unrolling the difference $\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}}$ for $t > \tau_{n,m}$ and from the update rule (7), it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} \right\| &= \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_{n,m}} (\mathbf{X}_{n,t-j+1} - \mathbf{X}_{n,t-j}) \right\| \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_{n,m}} \left\| \mathbf{X}_{n,t-j+1} - \mathbf{X}_{n,t-j} \right\| \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_{n,m}} \eta_{n,t-j} \left\| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,s} \mathbf{G}_{s,t-j-\tau_{n,s}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t-j \geq \tau_{n,s}\}} \right\| \\ & \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_{n,m}} \eta_{n,t-j} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,s} \left\| \mathbf{G}_{s,t-j-\tau_{n,s}}^n \right\| \mathbb{1}_{\{t-j \geq \tau_{n,s}\}} \\ & \stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{j=1}^{\min\{\tau_{n,m}, t-\tau_{n,s}-1\}} \eta_{n,t-j} w_{n,s} L_s. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-11})$$

where (a) and (c) hold by the triangle inequality, (b) follows from $\|\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}[\mathbf{X}] - \mathbf{Y}\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Y}\|^2$ for $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{X}$ [11, Proposition 2.11], and (d) holds by the bounded gradient assumption.

By plugging (A-11) into the last term of (A-10c), and summing over $t = \tau_{n,\min} + 1$ to $T + \tau_{n,\max}$, we obtain the following upper bound on $\text{Reg}_n^*(T)$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_n^*(T) & \leq \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \left\langle w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}}, \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} - \mathbf{U}_n^* \right\rangle \\ & \leq \underbrace{\sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \frac{\eta_{n,t}}{2} \left\| \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \right\|^2}_{\text{Part 1}} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{j=1}^{\min\{\tau_{n,m}, t-\tau_{n,s}-1\}} \eta_{n,t-j} w_{n,m} w_{n,s} L_m L_s \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}}}_{\text{Part 2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2}{2\eta_{n,t}}. \quad (\text{A-12})$$

Next, we bound Part 1 and Part 2. Specifically, for Part 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \frac{\eta_{n,t}}{2} \left\| \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \right\|^2 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \frac{\eta_{n,t}}{2} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} \left\| \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \right\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} L_m^2 \right) \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \frac{\eta_{n,t}}{2} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} K_n \left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} L_m \right) \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \frac{\eta_{n,t}}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-13})$$

where (a) follows from Jensen's inequality, (b) from the bounded gradient assumption, and (c) from the definition of $K_n = \max_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} L_m$.

For the Part 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{j=1}^{\min\{\tau_{n,m}, t-\tau_{n,s}-1\}} \eta_{n,t-j} w_{n,m} w_{n,s} L_m L_s \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \eta_{n,t-1} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} w_{n,s} L_m L_s \min\{\tau_{n,m}, t - \tau_{n,s} - 1\} \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} K_n^2 \eta_{n,t-1} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \min\{\tau_{n,m}, t - \tau_{n,s} - 1\} \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-14})$$

where (a) follows from $\sum_{j=1}^{\min\{a,b\}} c = \min\{a,b\} \times c$, with c being a constant independent of j , and (b) from the definition of $K_n = \max_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} w_{n,m} L_m$.

Under the non-increasing learning rate assumption, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} K_n^2 \eta_{n,t-1} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \min\{\tau_{n,m}, t - \tau_{n,s} - 1\} \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}} \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{\tau_{n,s}+\tau_{n,m}} K_n^2 \eta_{n,t-1} (t - \tau_{n,s} - 1) \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau_{n,m}\}} + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,s}+\tau_{n,m}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} K_n^2 \eta_{n,t-1} \tau_{n,m} \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,m}+1}^{\tau_{n,s}+\tau_{n,m}} K_n^2 \eta_{n,t-1} (t - \tau_{n,s} - 1) + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,s}+\tau_{n,m}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} K_n^2 \eta_{n,t-1} \tau_{n,m} \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \eta_{n,\tau_{n,m}} K_n^2 \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,m}+1}^{\tau_{n,s}+\tau_{n,m}} (t - \tau_{n,s} - 1) + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \tau_{n,m} K_n^2 \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,s}+\tau_{n,m}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \eta_{n,t-1} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} |\mathcal{W}_n|^2 K_n^2 \tau_{n,\max}^2 \eta_{n,\tau_{n,\min}+1} + |\mathcal{W}_n| K_n^2 \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \tau_{n,m} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \eta_{n,t} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-15})$$

where (a) follows from

$$\sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,m}+1}^{\tau_{n,s}+\tau_{n,m}} (t - \tau_{n,s} - 1) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \frac{2\tau_{n,m} - \tau_{n,s} - 1}{2} \tau_{n,s} \leq |\mathcal{W}_n| \tau_{n,\max}^2, \quad (\text{A-16})$$

and

$$\sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,s}+\tau_{n,m}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \eta_{n,t-1} = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=\tau_{n,m}+\tau_{n,s}}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}-1} \eta_{n,t} \leq |\mathcal{W}_n| \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \eta_{n,t}. \quad (\text{A-17})$$

Combining the above equations, the term $\text{Reg}_n^*(T)$ can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_n^*(T) &\leq \left(\frac{K_n}{2} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} L_m + |\mathcal{W}_n| K_n^2 \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \tau_{n,m} \right) \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \eta_{n,t} \\ &\quad + |\mathcal{W}_n|^2 K_n^2 \tau_{n,\max}^2 \eta_{n,\tau_{n,\min}+1} + \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2}{2\eta_{n,t}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-18})$$

A.2. Bounding Drift $_n(T)$

For the term $\text{Drift}_n(T)$, we have

$$- \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=T+\tau_{n,m}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \left\langle w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n, \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} - \mathbf{U}_n^* \right\rangle \quad (\text{A-19a})$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=T+\tau_{n,m}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \left| \left\langle w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n, \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} - \mathbf{U}_n^* \right\rangle \right| \quad (\text{A-19b})$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \sum_{t=T+\tau_{n,m}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \left(\left\| w_{n,m} \mathbf{G}_{m,t-\tau_{n,m}}^n \right\|^2 + \left\| \mathbf{X}_{n,t-\tau_{n,m}} - \mathbf{U}_n^* \right\|^2 \right) \quad (\text{A-19c})$$

$$\leq \frac{\Delta\tau_n}{2} \left(K_n \left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} L_m \right) + |\mathcal{W}_n| B^2 \right) \quad (\text{A-19d})$$

where (a) follows from the inequality $-\langle a, b \rangle \leq |\langle a, b \rangle|$, and (b) from Young's inequality $2|\langle a, b \rangle| \leq |a|^2 + |b|^2$.

A.3. Regret Bound

Combining the above equations, the regret of user n can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_n^*(T) &\leq \left(\frac{K_n}{2} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} L_m + |\mathcal{W}_n| K_n^2 \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \tau_{n,m} \right) \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \eta_{n,t} \\ &\quad + |\mathcal{W}_n|^2 K_n^2 \tau_{n,\max}^2 \eta_{n,\tau_{n,\min}+1} + \frac{\Delta\tau_n}{2} \left(K_n \left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} L_m \right) + |\mathcal{W}_n| B^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2}{2\eta_{n,t}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-20})$$

Defining

$$Q_n = \frac{K_n}{2} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} L_m + |\mathcal{W}_n| K_n^2 \sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} \tau_{n,m}, \quad (\text{A-21})$$

$$P_n = |\mathcal{W}_n|^2 K_n^2 \tau_{n,\max}^2, \quad (\text{A-22})$$

$$H_n = \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2}{2\eta_{n,t}}, \quad (\text{A-23})$$

$$C_n = \frac{\Delta\tau_n}{2} \left(K_n \left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{W}_n} L_m \right) + |\mathcal{W}_n| B^2 \right), \quad (\text{A-24})$$

and summing over all agents, the network regret can be bounded as

$$\text{Reg}(T) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathcal{W}_n} \left(Q_n \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \eta_{n,t} + P_n \eta_{n,\tau_{n,\min}+1} + H_n + C_n \right). \quad (\text{A-25})$$

B. PROOF OF COROLLARY 1

We first assume that a learning rate of the form $\eta_{n,t} = c(t - \tau_{n,\min})^{-\beta}$ with $\beta \in (0, 1)$. For this choice, we will establish a bound on the regret, and then verify that a sublinear regret can be achieved only for $\beta = 0.5$.

For the first term in the regret bound (A-25), we have

$$Q_n \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \eta_{n,t} = Q_n c \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} (t - \tau_{n,\min})^{-\beta}. \quad (\text{B-1})$$

Substituting $s = t - \tau_{n,\min}$, we get

$$Q_n c \sum_{s=1}^{T+\Delta\tau_n} s^{-\beta} \leq Q_n c \int_1^{T+\Delta\tau_n} s^{-\beta} ds = \frac{Q_n c}{1-\beta} (T + \Delta\tau_n)^{1-\beta}. \quad (\text{B-2})$$

For the second term in the regret bound (A-25), we have

$$P_n \eta_{n,\tau_{n,\min}+1} = P_n c \times 1^{-\beta} = P_n c, \quad (\text{B-3})$$

which is constant with respect to T .

For the third term in the regret bound (A-25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_n &= \sum_{t=\tau_{n,\min}+1}^{T+\tau_{n,\max}} \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_{n,t} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{X}_{n,t+1} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2}{2\eta_{n,t}} \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_{n,\tau_{n,\min}+1} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2}{2\eta_{n,\tau_{n,\min}+1}} - \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_{n,T+\tau_{n,\max}+1} - \mathbf{U}_n^*\|^2}{2\eta_{n,T+\tau_{n,\max}+1}} \\ &\leq \frac{B^2}{2\eta_{n,\tau_{n,\min}+1}} = \frac{B^2}{2T^{-\beta}c} = \frac{B^2}{2c} T^\beta \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B-4})$$

Overall, combining the three terms, we obtain

$$\text{Reg}(T) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \left(\frac{c}{1-\beta} Q_n (T + \Delta\tau_n)^{1-\beta} + \frac{B^2}{2c} T^\beta + P_n c + C_n \right) = \mathcal{O}((T + \Delta\tau_n)^{1-\beta} + T^\beta). \quad (\text{B-5})$$

From (B-5), it follows that $\text{Reg}(T) = \mathcal{O}(T^{\max\{\beta, 1-\beta\}})$, hence the regret is sublinear for all $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Choosing $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ balances the two terms and yields

$$\text{Reg}(T) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \left(2cQ_n \sqrt{T + \Delta\tau_n} + \frac{B^2}{2c} \sqrt{T} + P_n c + C_n \right) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T + \Delta\tau_n} + \sqrt{T}). \quad (\text{B-6})$$