

Last-Iterate Stationarity of Muon with Finitely Many Newton–Schulz Iterations

Ping Li and Vincent Y. F. Tan*

Abstract

Muon has achieved strong empirical performance in large-scale language-model training, motivating a better theoretical understanding of its practical implementation. Unlike the idealized polar-factor update, practical Muon uses a fixed number of quintic Newton–Schulz iterations. Existing analyses mainly establish average- or best-iterate stationarity guarantees, leaving last-iterate convergence less understood. We study last-iterate gradient convergence of practical finite-step Muon on smooth, lower-bounded nonconvex objectives.

For deterministic gradients, we show that without input stabilization, Muon can cycle even on a smooth convex quadratic. With positive stabilization, we establish last-iterate gradient convergence for any fixed momentum coefficient below one and a sufficiently small constant learning rate, together with square-summability of gradients. For stochastic gradients, we first show that persistent bounded, unbiased noise can prevent convergence with fixed learning rates and momentum, even with positive stabilization. We then establish almost-sure and mean-square last-iterate gradient convergence by combining decreasing learning rates with increasing momentum under bounded-variance stochastic gradients. Finally, we construct a smooth counterexample showing that neither convergence theorem guarantees a pointwise polynomial rate. We further establish density-one convergence rates, guaranteeing polynomial gradient decay for all but a vanishing fraction of iterations.

Keywords: nonconvex optimization; Muon; Newton–Schulz iteration; momentum; full-sequence stationarity; density-one rates.

1 Introduction

Muon has emerged as a successful alternative to AdamW for large-scale language-model training. Scaling experiments on Moonlight report roughly twice the training-compute efficiency of AdamW, and the Muon-derived MuonClip optimizer was used to pretrain the trillion-parameter Kimi K2 model [17, 20]. These empirical successes have motivated growing interest in understanding Muon’s optimization dynamics. Muon exploits the matrix structure of neural-network parameters by applying a spectral transformation to momentum-based updates. In its idealized formulation, Muon uses the polar factor of the momentum matrix as a steepest-descent direction under a spectral-norm constraint [1, 32]. Practical implementations instead use a small, fixed number of quintic Newton–Schulz (NS) iterations, typically with a positive input-normalization stabilizer [14, 15, 27]. Understanding the convergence behavior of this finite-step update is therefore an important theoretical question. Recent work has established convergence guarantees for several formulations of Practical Muon.

In particular, existing analyses of Muon and related variants have established average- or best-iterate stationarity guarantees for smooth nonconvex objectives [5, 12, 16, 18, 23, 26, 30, 32, 33, 35]. Such guarantees ensure that a nearly stationary iterate can be found, but they do not rule out

*The authors are with the Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore (NUS). V. Y. F. Tan is also with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, NUS.

large gradients at individual iterations, even late in training. This motivates studying *last-iterate stationarity*, which requires the gradient at the current iterate to vanish as training progresses:

$$\|\nabla F(W_t)\| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

where F denotes the original objective function and W_t the matrix-valued parameters at iteration t . Related last-iterate guarantees have been established for bounded-preconditioner momentum methods and Soft Muon [7], as well as objective-value convergence for Muon variants under additional structural assumptions [3, 8].

A second important distinction concerns how gradients are obtained. In deterministic optimization, each update uses the exact gradient of the objective, whereas stochastic optimization relies on mini-batch gradient estimates, whose noise may persist when the batch size remains fixed [6, 21]. This distinction has important implications for last-iterate stationarity. Even with exact gradients, normalized updates with a constant learning rate can exhibit persistent oscillations near stationary points, as illustrated by quadratic analyses of Muon [10]. With stochastic gradients, persistent noise introduces an additional source of instability, and nonconvergence has been demonstrated for finite-NS Muon under certain noise distributions [9]. Momentum averaging provides a mechanism for reducing stochastic fluctuations [6, 24, 25].

These observations highlight two distinct challenges for last-iterate stationarity of finite-step Muon: instability arising from normalized updates and persistent fluctuations introduced by stochastic gradients. The deterministic setting allows us to isolate the first challenge, while the stochastic setting requires controlling both effects. We investigate how these challenges can be addressed to establish last-iterate stationarity, and further examine what convergence rates can be guaranteed for individual iterates.

Contributions. Our main contributions are summarized below.

- **Last-iterate convergence with deterministic gradients.** We first show that without input stabilization ($\varepsilon = 0$), finite-NS Muon can cycle even on a smooth convex quadratic (Proposition 3.1). With positive stabilization, as used in practice [14, 27], we establish last-iterate gradient convergence for any fixed momentum coefficient $\beta < 1$ and a sufficiently small constant learning rate (Theorem 3.2). The result also guarantees square-summable gradients and extends to square-summable perturbations (Appendix C.3).
- **Last-iterate convergence with stochastic gradients.** We show that even with positive stabilization, fixed learning rates and momentum can fail to converge under persistent bounded, unbiased stochastic noise (Proposition 4.1). To address this, we combine decreasing learning rates with increasing momentum and establish almost-sure and mean-square last-iterate gradient convergence under conditionally unbiased, bounded-variance stochastic gradients (Theorem 4.2), building on stochastic momentum and tracking techniques.
- **Density-one convergence rates.** We construct a smooth objective under the settings of both convergence theorems for which no pointwise polynomial gradient rate holds (Proposition 5.1). We then establish *density-one rates*, guaranteeing polynomial gradient decay outside a set of iterations whose long-run proportion vanishes (Theorem 5.3). These rates describe almost all late iterations along an individual run, providing a useful quantitative view of training progress.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to establish last-iterate gradient convergence for practical finite-step Muon under general smooth, lower-bounded nonconvex objectives, without additional structural assumptions such as the Polyak–Łojasiewicz condition or star-convexity. Table 1 compares our deterministic and stochastic settings with existing results in terms of the

Muon variants considered, assumptions on the objective function, and convergence guarantees. The first block summarizes average- or best-iterate gradient bounds, while the second focuses on last-iterate guarantees (including objective-value results) and a related training-loss hitting-time bound. The final two rows present our deterministic and stochastic results. This grouping separates guarantees for averages or selected iterates from those that characterize later iterations. Appendix A gives a more detailed comparison with the related literature.

Table 1: Convergence guarantees for Muon and related methods.

Work	Type	Method	Nonconvex	Convergence
Li–Hong [18]	Stoch.	Polar	✓	Avg.
Kim–Oh [16]	Stoch.	Finite-NS (Taylor)	✓	Avg.
Sato et al. [30]	Stoch.	Polar (Nest., WD)	✓	Avg.
Nagashima–Iiduka [23]	Stoch.	Polar (Nest.)	✓	Best
Shulgin et al. [33]	Det./Stoch.	Inexact polar (LMO)	✓	Avg./Best
Choudhury et al. [5]	Stoch.	Inexact polar (Nest.)	✓	Best
Huang et al. [12]	Stoch.	LiMuon (VR, NS)	✓	Avg.
Peng et al. [26]	Stoch.	Practical (Nest.)	✓	Avg.
Wang et al. [35]	Stoch.	Practical (WD)	✓	Avg.
De Oliveira et al. [7]	Det.	Soft Muon	PL	Last / linear obj.
Chang et al. [3]	Stoch.	Muon–MVR	✓(avg.)/PL(last)	Avg. / last obj.
Demidovich et al. [8]	Det.	Scale-Calibrated	Star-convex	Last obj. gap
Roy–Chakraborty [29]	Det.	Practical	Squared loss	Loss hitting time
This work	Det.	Practical	✓	Last
This work	Stoch.	Practical	✓	Last

Note. *Type*: Det. = deterministic gradients; Stoch. = stochastic gradients. *Method*: NS = Newton–Schulz; WD = weight decay; VR = variance reduction; PL = Polyak–Łojasiewicz; LMO = linear minimization oracle; a.s. = almost surely; M.S. = mean-square. Polar Muon uses the exact polar factor; Practical Muon uses tuned quintic finite-NS. Nest. = Nesterov-style momentum; parentheses identify variants. *Nonconvex*: ✓ indicates no additional structural loss assumption beyond smoothness and lower boundedness. *Convergence*: Avg., Best, and Last refer to gradient stationarity unless objective gap or loss is specified.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the practical finite-NS update and its spectral properties. Section 3 studies last-iterate convergence with deterministic gradients, focusing on the role of input stabilization. Section 4 extends the analysis to persistent stochastic noise through time-varying learning rates and momentum. Section 5 examines the limitations of pointwise polynomial rates and establishes density-one convergence rates. Section 6 concludes the paper, while detailed proofs and related-work comparisons are provided in the appendices.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Problem Setup and Muon Update

We consider a single matrix parameter $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and a continuously differentiable loss $F : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Throughout, $\|X\| := \|X\|_F$ and $\langle X, Y \rangle := \text{tr}(X^\top Y)$ denote the Frobenius norm and inner product, and $\mathbb{E}$ denotes expectation. Our only standing assumption on the objective is the following.

Assumption 2.1 (Global smoothness and lower boundedness). There exist $L > 0$ and $F_{\inf} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for all $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$,

$$F(X) \geq F_{\inf}, \quad \|\nabla F(X) - \nabla F(Y)\| \leq L\|X - Y\|.$$

Let $g_t = \nabla F(W_t)$ and let $G_t = g_t + \zeta_t$ be a possibly perturbed gradient. Given deterministic sequences $\eta_t > 0$, $\beta_t \in [0, 1]$, and $\theta_t \in [0, 1]$, the finite-step Muon update is

$$M_t = \beta_t M_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_t) G_t, \quad (2.1)$$

$$N_t = \theta_t M_t + (1 - \theta_t) G_t, \quad (2.2)$$

$$D_t = \Phi_\varepsilon(N_t),$$

$$W_{t+1} = W_t - \eta_t D_t. \quad (2.3)$$

Here W_1 and M_0 are deterministic and finite. The matrix M_t is an exponential moving average, while N_t is the input to the Newton–Schulz transformation. The choices $\theta_t = 1$ and $\theta_t = \beta_t$ give, respectively, EMA input and the Nesterov-style mixture of the current gradient and momentum before the NS transformation used in the reference Muon implementation [14].

For fixed $J \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$, let $\Phi_\varepsilon(N)$ be the output Z_J of the following Newton–Schulz iteration:

$$Z_0 = \frac{N}{\|N\|_F + \varepsilon}, \quad Z_{j+1} = aZ_j + bZ_j Z_j^\top Z_j + c(Z_j Z_j^\top)^2 Z_j, \quad j = 0, \dots, J-1, \quad (2.4)$$

We use the practical quintic coefficients

$$(a, b, c) = (3.4445, -4.7750, 2.0315). \quad (2.5)$$

We set $\Phi_0(0) = 0$. The coefficients, the common choice $J = 5$, and the input normalization with a small positive ε are motivated by practical Muon implementations [14, 15, 26, 27, 35]. We analyze this core update for one matrix in exact arithmetic, without weight decay; any fixed shape-dependent output scale can be absorbed into η_t . A clamp-type normalization is discussed in Appendix B.3. Section 3 analyzes exact gradients; its square-summable perturbation extension appears in Appendix C.3. Section 4 analyzes persistent stochastic noise with varying learning rates and momentum.

2.2 Properties of the Finite Newton–Schulz Map

Our analysis works directly with spectral alignment properties of the *finite* quintic polynomial; the argument is independent of polar-approximation accuracy. Define its scalar singular-value transformation by

$$P(s) = as + bs^3 + cs^5, \quad \varphi_J = P^{\circ J}, \quad q_J(s) = \begin{cases} \varphi_J(s)/s, & s > 0, \\ a^J, & s = 0, \end{cases}$$

and set

$$\ell_J = \min_{0 \leq s \leq 1} q_J(s), \quad u_J = \max_{0 \leq s \leq 1} q_J(s).$$

These constants depend only on the polynomial and J .

Lemma 2.2 (Finite-NS bounds and alignment). *For each fixed finite $J \geq 1$, $0 < \ell_J \leq u_J < \infty$. For any matrix N , write $R = \|N\|_F$. Then*

$$\ell_J \frac{R}{R + \varepsilon} \leq \|\Phi_\varepsilon(N)\|_F \leq u_J \frac{R}{R + \varepsilon} \leq u_J, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\langle N, \Phi_\varepsilon(N) \rangle_F \geq \ell_J \frac{R^2}{R + \varepsilon}. \quad (2.7)$$

If $\varepsilon > 0$, additionally

$$\langle N, \Phi_\varepsilon(N) \rangle_F \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{u_J} \|\Phi_\varepsilon(N)\|_F^2. \quad (2.8)$$

When $R = \varepsilon = 0$, fractions are interpreted as zero.

The first inequality bounds the update direction, while the second ensures alignment with its input. Positive input stabilization yields the sector inequality (2.8) that drives the fixed-step Lyapunov analysis. The $\varepsilon = 0$ regime admits a distinct gradient-energy inequality, used in the diminishing-step analysis. The proof is in Appendix B.1. For later use, define

$$B := u_J, \quad r_t := N_t - g_t, \quad \psi_\varepsilon(x) := \begin{cases} x^2/(x + \varepsilon), & x + \varepsilon > 0, \\ 0, & x = \varepsilon = 0. \end{cases}$$

Thus $\|D_t\| \leq B$, r_t is the input-tracking error, and $\psi_0(x) = x$ for $x \geq 0$.

3 Stabilization Enables Fixed-Step Convergence

We begin with the deterministic setting to isolate instability caused by input normalization from the effects of stochastic noise. The analysis proceeds in two stages. First, a quadratic counterexample shows that without input stabilization, finite-step Muon can cycle indefinitely even with exact gradients and fixed momentum. We then show that positive stabilization provides the finite-NS alignment needed to combine objective descent with momentum tracking in a Lyapunov argument. This yields square-summability of gradients, and hence last-iterate stationarity, for a sufficiently small constant learning rate and every fixed $\beta < 1$.

In one dimension, the underlying failure mechanism is particularly transparent: at $\varepsilon = 0$, scalar input normalization removes the magnitude of every nonzero input. The resulting finite-NS direction may therefore retain a nonvanishing step length near a stationary point. The following quadratic example makes the effect explicit; its proof is given in Appendix C.1.

Proposition 3.1 (A parameter two-cycle when $\varepsilon = 0$). *Take $F(w) = 0.01w^2$, exact gradients, $\varepsilon = 0$, fixed $\eta > 0$, $\beta \in [0, 1)$, and $\theta \in [0, 1]$. Let $c_J = \varphi_J(1) > 0$ and $\delta = \eta c_J$. With $w_1 = \delta/2$ and $M_0 = 0$, the iterates satisfy*

$$w_t = (-1)^{t-1} \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad |\nabla F(w_t)| = 0.01\delta > 0 \quad (t \geq 1).$$

The two-cycle occurs for every fixed $\beta < 1$, independently of the Nesterov-style mixing parameter. Positive input stabilization changes the small-input geometry: Lemma 2.2 supplies the sector inequality (2.8), which connects the update direction to its input energy. This leads to our first full-sequence guarantee with *exact gradients*, a constant learning rate, and arbitrary fixed momentum below one. The extension to square-summable gradient perturbations, including growing-batch sampling, is given separately in Appendix C.3.

Fix $\beta_t \equiv \beta \in [0, 1)$, $\theta_t \equiv \theta \in [0, 1]$, and $\eta_t \equiv \eta > 0$. Define

$$\alpha := 1 - \beta, \quad \kappa := \frac{\varepsilon}{u_J}, \quad e_t := M_t - g_t, \quad N_t - g_t = \theta e_t \quad (G_t = g_t). \quad (3.1)$$

Our explicit constant-step condition is

$$0 < \eta \leq \frac{\varepsilon(1 - \beta)}{4Lu_J} = \frac{\kappa\alpha}{4L}. \quad (3.2)$$

Theorem 3.2 treats exact gradients for every fixed $\beta \in [0, 1)$.

Theorem 3.2 (Fixed-step full-sequence stationarity: exact gradients). *Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds. In the deterministic setting where $G_t = g_t$, fix finite $J \geq 1$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $\beta \in [0, 1]$, and $\theta \in [0, 1]$, and let the constant step size satisfy (3.2). Then*

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \|D_t\|^2 < \infty, \quad \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \|M_t - g_t\|^2 < \infty, \quad \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \|g_t\|^2 < \infty. \quad (3.3)$$

In particular, $\|\nabla F(W_t)\| \rightarrow 0$.

Note that the step-size restriction in Theorem 3.2 is a conservative global sufficient condition. For specific objectives, substantially larger steps can be stable, especially when β is close to one. The exact local calculation is given in Appendix C.4. We further extended the setting in Theorem 3.2 to finite total squared error energy in Appendix C.3.

3.1 Proof Sketch: Coupled Descent–Tracking Lyapunov Analysis

The proof uses two complementary properties. Finite-NS alignment controls descent along the momentum input N_t , while a momentum tracking recursion controls the difference $e_t = M_t - g_t$. Changes in the gradient introduce a tracking cost proportional to $\eta^2 \|D_t\|^2$; the sector inequality and the explicit step-size condition absorb this cost through the joint potential. The first lemma quantifies objective descent; its proof appears in Appendix C.2.1.

Lemma 3.3 (Objective descent). *Under the fixed-step setting above,*

$$F(W_{t+1}) - F(W_t) \leq -\left(\frac{\eta\kappa}{2} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2}\right) \|D_t\|^2 + \frac{\eta}{2\kappa} \|e_t\|^2. \quad (3.4)$$

The descent estimate identifies the update energy controlled by spectral alignment and the tracking energy to be absorbed. The EMA recursion supplies the complementary contraction, proved in Appendix C.2.2.

Lemma 3.4 (Momentum tracking). *Under the same conditions,*

$$\|e_{t+1}\|^2 \leq \frac{1+\beta}{2} \|e_t\|^2 + \frac{\beta(1+\beta)L^2\eta^2}{1-\beta} \|D_t\|^2. \quad (3.5)$$

Since $(1+\beta)/2 < 1$, the first term gives a strict contraction for any fixed $\beta < 1$. The remaining update-size term measures how much the moving target g_t disrupts tracking. Thus the two bounds are complementary: tracking contraction offsets the error in the descent bound, while objective descent absorbs the gradient-drift cost.

Combining these estimates yields a single objective–tracking Lyapunov function. Set

$$V_t := F(W_t) + \lambda \|e_t\|^2, \quad \lambda := \frac{2\eta}{\kappa(1-\beta)}.$$

Indeed, the coefficient of $\|e_t\|^2$ after addition is $\eta/(2\kappa) - \lambda(1-\beta)/2 = -\eta/(2\kappa)$; condition (3.2) also absorbs the $\|D_t\|^2$ cost in Lemma 3.4. Hence

$$V_{t+1} - V_t \leq -\frac{\eta\kappa}{4} \|D_t\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{2\kappa} \|e_t\|^2. \quad (3.6)$$

Thus the joint potential dissipates both update and tracking energy. The coefficient calculation appears in Appendix C.2.3.

Since F is bounded below, telescoping (3.6) controls both $\sum_t \|D_t\|^2$ and $\sum_t \|e_t\|^2$. The objective lower bound and smoothness bound the gradients, so N_t stays bounded. The radial estimate (2.6) then transfers update summability to N_t , and $g_t = N_t - \theta e_t$ yields $\sum_t \|g_t\|^2 < \infty$. This proves the full-sequence stationarity and gradient-energy claims of Theorem 3.2. Section 5 turns this square-summability into a density-one convergence rate. The complete exact-gradient proof appears in Appendix C.2.4; its perturbation extension appears in Appendix C.3.

4 Last-Iterate Convergence under Stochastic Noise

The deterministic result in Section 3 does not directly address the persistent noise of fixed-batch stochastic gradients. We therefore first show that positive input stabilization alone cannot prevent a nonvanishing gradient error when both the learning rate and momentum are fixed. Motivated by this obstruction, we next coordinate decreasing learning rates with increasing momentum: longer averaging filters the noise, while smaller updates limit the lag between momentum and the current gradient. By making the learning-rate-weighted tracking error summable and exploiting temporal regularity of the gradient sequence, we establish almost-sure and mean-square last-iterate stationarity despite persistent bounded-variance noise.

We start with a quadratic counterexample in which even symmetric, unbiased noise maintains a nonzero gradient error under fixed hyperparameters; its proof appears in Appendix D.1.

Proposition 4.1 (Persistent symmetric noise at a fixed step). *Let $F(w) = 0.01w^2$ and $G_t = 0.02w_t + \zeta_t$, where ζ_t are independent equiprobable variables in $\{+\sigma, -\sigma\}$, with $\sigma > 0$. Fix $\eta > 0$, $\beta \in [0, 1)$, $\theta \in [0, 1]$, and $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Put*

$$a_0 = (1 - \theta\beta)\sigma > 0, \quad d_0 = \ell_J \frac{a_0}{a_0 + \varepsilon} > 0.$$

Then

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|\nabla F(w_t)| \geq \frac{0.02\eta d_0}{4} > 0. \quad (4.1)$$

Moreover,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(|\nabla F(w_t)| \geq 0.01\eta d_0) \geq \frac{1}{4}. \quad (4.2)$$

In particular, the gradient does not converge to zero in probability.

The obstruction identifies the need to control how noise accumulates through the optimizer, rather than relying on positive stabilization alone. We do so with *decreasing learning rates* and *increasing momentum*. The latter averages perturbations over progressively longer windows, while the former limits gradient drift within that memory.

Let $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a filtration with W_t, M_{t-1} measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, and assume

$$\mathbb{E}[\zeta_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq \sigma^2 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (4.3)$$

The noise can be asymmetric and persists at bounded variance. Choose the explicit, horizon-free schedule

$$\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-p}, \quad \beta_t = 1 - \alpha_0 t^{-q}, \quad \eta_0 > 0, \quad 0 < \alpha_0 \leq 1, \quad (4.4)$$

with exponents in the admissible region

$$\frac{3}{4} < p \leq 1, \quad 2(1 - p) < q < 2p - 1. \quad (4.5)$$

Theorem 4.2 (Full-sequence stationarity under persistent noise). *Suppose Assumption 2.1 and (4.3) hold. Fix finite $J \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$; use the schedules (4.4)–(4.5), with either $\theta_t = 1$ or $\theta_t = \beta_t$ for every t . Then*

$$\|g_t\| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad \mathbb{E}\|g_t\|^2 \longrightarrow 0. \quad (4.6)$$

In addition,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t \psi_{\varepsilon}(\|g_t\|) < \infty, \quad \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t \|g_t\|^2 < \infty \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (4.7)$$

The convergence and energy guarantees hold for the entire admissible range $3/4 < p \leq 1$.

Theorem 4.2 shows that, despite persistent bounded-variance gradient noise, decreasing learning rates and increasing momentum yield *full-sequence* stationarity, both almost surely and in mean square, together with the weighted summability guarantees in (4.7). The mixing coefficient θ_t determines the input to the finite NS map. For $\theta_t = 1$, we have $N_t = M_t$, so the direction is computed from the exponential moving average alone (ordinary momentum). For $\theta_t = \beta_t$, we instead have $N_t = \beta_t M_t + (1 - \beta_t)G_t = \beta_t^2 M_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_t^2)G_t$, the Nesterov-style mixture used in practical Muon. Relative to $\theta_t = 1$, this gives the current stochastic gradient more weight while retaining the noise-filtering effect of momentum. Both choices satisfy the stated convergence guarantees without requiring the realized gradient noise to vanish or be square-summable.

4.1 Proof sketch: Momentum Filtering and Convergence Analysis

The proof of Theorem 4.2 hinges on controlling the *mixed-input tracking error* $r_t = N_t - g_t$. Although the stochastic gradient noise need not decay, the increasing momentum coefficient makes the EMA average perturbations over an effective memory of order t^q . This reduces the noise contribution to the expected tracking error to order $t^{-q/2}$. At the same time, the parameters continue to move, so the momentum estimate must track a changing gradient. With steps of order t^{-p} , this drift introduces an additional lag of order t^{q-p} . For both ordinary momentum ($\theta_t = 1$) and Nesterov-style mixing ($\theta_t = \beta_t$), the tracking analysis in Appendix D.3.2 gives

$$\mathbb{E}\|r_t\| = O(t^{-q/2} + t^{q-p}), \quad \eta_t \mathbb{E}\|r_t\| = O(t^{-p-q/2} + t^{q-2p}). \quad (4.8)$$

The two terms in (4.8) determine how the learning rate and momentum should be coordinated. In particular, their learning-rate-weighted sum is finite when $p + q/2 > 1$ and $2p - q > 1$, exactly the inequalities defining the admissible region (4.5). The same estimate also identifies a natural balanced schedule: equating the noise-averaging and gradient-drift exponents gives

$$\frac{q}{2} = p - q \iff q = \frac{2p}{3}, \quad \mathbb{E}\|r_t\| = O(t^{-p/3}). \quad (4.9)$$

Thus $\eta_t \mathbb{E}\|r_t\| = O(t^{-4p/3})$, which is summable for $p > 3/4$. This balance explains how growing momentum filters persistent noise without allowing its tracking lag to accumulate.

We now connect the tracking estimate to descent of the objective. The finite-NS alignment inequality and smoothness imply the inexact-input descent bound (proved in Appendix D.2.1)

$$F(W_{t+1}) - F(W_t) \leq -\ell_J \eta_t \psi_\varepsilon(\|g_t\|) + (\ell_J + B) \eta_t \|r_t\| + \frac{LB^2}{2} \eta_t^2.$$

By the exponent conditions, $\sum_t \eta_t \mathbb{E}\|r_t\| < \infty$; Tonelli's theorem therefore gives $\sum_t \eta_t \|r_t\| < \infty$ almost surely. Combining this with $\sum_t \eta_t^2 < \infty$ and the lower bound on F , we can sum the descent inequality to obtain

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t \psi_\varepsilon(\|g_t\|) < \infty \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (4.10)$$

The remaining step converts this accumulated gradient control into convergence of the entire sequence. Because the finite-NS directions are bounded, smoothness yields $\|g_{t+1}\| - \|g_t\| \leq LB \eta_t$. Together with $\sum_t \eta_t = \infty$, this temporal regularity upgrades (4.10) to $\|g_t\| \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. Finally, an integrable objective-gap bound gives $\mathbb{E}\|g_t\|^2 \rightarrow 0$. The full argument appears in Appendix D.4.

5 Density-One Rates Beyond Pointwise Guarantees

The preceding two sections establish full-sequence stationarity, but convergence alone does not specify a polynomial decay rate at every iteration. We first construct a smooth objective exhibiting arbitrarily late, sparse gradient peaks under the settings of both convergence theorems, showing why a general pointwise polynomial rate is unavailable. We then ask what quantitative guarantee survives without excluding such exceptional iterations. The answer comes from the gradient-energy estimates already established: square-summability in the fixed-step regime and weighted summability in the stochastic regime. A counting argument converts these estimates into density-one rates, giving polynomial gradient decay outside a set of iterations whose asymptotic proportion vanishes.

5.1 Sparse Peaks and Pointwise-Rate Barriers

Theorems 3.2 and 4.2 guarantee convergence of the sequence of gradients, yet neither implies a polynomial rate at every iteration. We show this using one objective with fixed, widely separated gradient peaks. Fix $\eta_0 > 0$ and let $c_J := \varphi_J(1) > 0$. Define an auxiliary sequence and indices by

$$x_t := -c_J \eta_0 \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} s^{-4/5}, \quad t_k := \lceil e^{k^2} \rceil.$$

Choose $k_0 \geq 2$ large enough that the points x_{t_k} are separated by more than 2. Let $\rho \in C_c^\infty((-1, 1))$ satisfy $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$ and $\rho = 1$ on $[-1/2, 1/2]$, and define

$$\begin{aligned} H(x) &:= \frac{1}{1+x^2} + \sum_{k \geq k_0} \frac{1}{k} \rho(k(x - x_{t_k})), \\ F(x) &:= \int_{-\infty}^x H(u) du. \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

These functions are sketched in Fig. 1. The x_{t_k} are prescribed peak locations from the auxiliary sequence, not necessarily the actual iterates w_{t_k} . For each trajectory (w_t) , define its first crossing time

$$s_k := \min\{t \geq 2 : w_t \leq x_{t_k} + \frac{1}{2k}\}.$$

The proof shows that s_k is finite for all sufficiently large k ; these times may differ across the two regimes.

Proposition 5.1 (No polynomial pointwise rate in either regime). *The objective F in (5.1) is smooth and lower bounded. Let $L \geq 1$ be a Lipschitz constant of $H = F'$. Initialize $w_1 = M_0 = 0$ and use exact gradients. Consider either*

- (i) Fixed-step regime (Theorem 3.2): *any $\varepsilon > 0$, fixed $\beta \in [0, 1]$ and $\theta \in [0, 1]$, with $0 < \eta \leq \varepsilon(1 - \beta)/(4Lu_J)$;*
- (ii) Diminishing-step regime (Theorem 4.2): *any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-4/5}$, $\beta_t = 1 - \frac{1}{2}t^{-1/2}$, and $\theta_t \in \{1, \beta_t\}$, with $\zeta_t = 0$.*

In both regimes all assumptions of the respective theorem hold and $|F'(w_t)| \rightarrow 0$. Nevertheless, for each trajectory there are actual visit times $s_k \geq Ce^{k^2/5}$ ($C > 0$) such that

$$|w_{s_k} - x_{t_k}| \leq \frac{1}{2k}, \quad |F'(w_{s_k})| \geq \frac{1}{k}.$$

Consequently,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\nu |F'(w_t)| = +\infty \quad \text{for every } \nu > 0.$$

Both regimes can use the same positive ε .

Appendix E.1 proves that neither update jumps across these narrow peaks at late times.




Figure 1: Schematic illustration of an objective with sparse gradient peaks; horizontal distances are not to scale.

5.2 Density-One Rate Guarantees

The sparse peaks in Section 5.1 motivate a rate notion that captures the behavior of the overwhelming majority of iterations while remaining compatible with exceptional, very sparse peaks. We use the natural density of the iterations where a specified rate is exceeded.

Definition 5.2 (Density-one rate). For a nonnegative sequence h_t and a positive reference rate ρ_t , write $h_t = o_{\text{dens}}(\rho_t)$ if

$$\forall c > 0, \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \# \{1 \leq t \leq T : h_t > c \rho_t\} = 0.$$

For stochastic trajectories the condition is understood almost surely, path by path. Unlike a pointwise $o(\rho_t)$ rate, this definition allows exceptional iterations whose asymptotic proportion vanishes.

The gradient-energy bounds in Theorems 3.2 and 4.2 give explicit rates in this sense.

Theorem 5.3 (Density-one gradient rates for finite-step Muon). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, the gradient sequence satisfies, pathwise,*

$$\|g_t\| = o_{\text{dens}}(t^{-1/2}). \quad (5.2)$$

Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.2 with $p < 1$, the following rates hold almost surely:

$$\|g_t\| = \begin{cases} o_{\text{dens}}(t^{-(1-p)/2}), & \varepsilon > 0, \\ o_{\text{dens}}(t^{-(1-p)}), & \varepsilon = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

To see the mechanism, the constant-step theorem yields $\sum_t \|g_t\|^2 < \infty$. Thus for any $c > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{T} \# \left\{ T \leq t < 2T : \|g_t\| > \frac{c}{\sqrt{T}} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{c^2} \sum_{t=T}^{2T-1} \|g_t\|^2 \rightarrow 0.$$

The same counting principle applies to the stochastic energy estimate (4.7) when $\eta_t \asymp t^{-p}$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, it yields the quadratic weighted summability $\sum_t \eta_t \|g_t\|^2 < \infty$; for $\varepsilon = 0$, the identity $\psi_0(x) = x$ gives the stronger linear bound $\sum_t \eta_t \|g_t\| < \infty$. These two forms of energy control

produce the different exponents in (5.3). The general summability-to-density argument and the full proof of Theorem 5.3 appear in Appendix E.3.

The admissible schedules also yield explicit limiting exponents. As $p \downarrow 3/4$, for any sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ one can choose parameters so that

$$\|g_t\| = o_{\text{dens}}(t^{-1/8+\delta}) \quad (\varepsilon > 0), \quad \|g_t\| = o_{\text{dens}}(t^{-1/4+\delta}) \quad (\varepsilon = 0), \quad \text{a.s..}$$

For example, the balanced schedule $q = 2p/3$ from (4.9) realizes these bounds by taking $p = 3/4 + 2\delta$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ or $p = 3/4 + \delta$ for $\varepsilon = 0$.

Density-one rates quantify gradient decay at asymptotically almost all late iterations of a single run, rather than identifying only a best-performing iterate or bounding an average. This gives a useful trajectory-level interpretation when optimization is inspected over many training steps: the exceptional iterations occupy a vanishing fraction of the run.

6 Conclusion

The analysis identifies two distinct convergence obstructions for finite-step Muon: constant-step cycling without input stabilization and a persistent-noise floor under fixed learning rates and momentum. These phenomena motivate two complementary full-sequence convergence mechanisms. Positive stabilization and a coupled descent-tracking Lyapunov principle yield convergence with exact gradients, fixed steps, and arbitrary fixed momentum below one. The square-summable perturbation extension is treated in the appendix. Coordinated diminishing steps and increasing momentum extend full-sequence stationarity to persistent unbiased bounded-variance stochastic noise.

The same convergence regimes provide gradient-energy bounds that support density-one convergence rates. Sparse-peak constructions explain the distinction from pointwise polynomial bounds, while the density-one results quantify the behavior of almost all late iterations along an individual trajectory. Together, stabilization, momentum-based noise filtering, and density-one rates give a unified account of convergence and quantitative progress for finite-step Muon.

References

- [1] Jeremy Bernstein and Laker Newhouse. Old Optimizer, New Norm: An Anthology. In *NeurIPS 2024 Workshops: OPT*, 2024.
- [2] David Carlson, Volkan Cevher, and Lawrence Carin. Stochastic Spectral Descent for Restricted Boltzmann Machines. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 38 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 111–119, 2015.
- [3] Da Chang, Yongxiang Liu, Huihui Zhou, and Ganzhao Yuan. On the Convergence of Muon and Beyond. arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.15816v6, 2026. First posted in 2025.
- [4] Lizhang Chen, Jonathan Li, and Qiang Liu. Muon Optimizes Under Spectral Norm Constraints. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2026.
- [5] Sayantan Choudhury, Xiaoran Cheng, Martin Takáč, Sen Na, and Mladen Kolar. Muon with Nesterov Momentum: Heavy-Tailed Noise and (Randomized) Inexact Polar Decomposition. arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.06884, 2026.
- [6] Ashok Cutkosky and Harsh Mehta. Momentum improves normalized SGD. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2260–2268, 2020.
- [7] Arthur C. B. de Oliveira, Dhruv D. Jatkar, Guilherme S. Vicinansa, and Eduardo D. Sontag. Convergence guarantees for Muon: New parameter regimes and generalizations. arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.30546v1, 2026.
- [8] Yury Demidovich, Abhishek Chakraborty, Grigory Malinovsky, Angelia Nedić, and Peter Richtárik. Distance-Aware Muon: Adaptive Step Scaling for Normalized Optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.18999v1, 2026.
- [9] Thang Do, Steffen Dereich, and Arnulf Jentzen. On MUON optimization: From non-convergence to an error analysis with Polar Express and the Newton–Schulz polynomial from implementations. arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.04607v1, 2026.
- [10] Antoine Gonon, Andreea-Alexandra Muşat, and Nicolas Boumal. Insights on Muon from Simple Quadratics. arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.11948v1, 2026.
- [11] Vineet Gupta, Tomer Koren, and Yoram Singer. Shampoo: Preconditioned Stochastic Tensor Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1842–1850, 2018.
- [12] Feihu Huang, Yuning Luo, and Songcan Chen. LiMuon: Light and fast muon optimizer for large models. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 306 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 47263–47305, 2026.
- [13] Hideaki Iiduka. Muon Converges under Heavy-Tailed Noise: Nonconvex Hölder-Smooth Empirical Risk Minimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.15059v2, 2026.
- [14] Keller Jordan et al. Muon reference implementation, `muon.py`. Source code repository on GitHub, 2026. Accessed October 17, 2026; mutable master branch.
- [15] Keller Jordan, Yuchen Jin, Vlado Boza, Jiacheng You, Franz Cesista, Laker Newhouse, and Jeremy Bernstein. Muon: An optimizer for hidden layers in neural networks. Technical design note (originally published December 8, 2024), 2024.

- [16] Gyu Yeol Kim and Min-hwan Oh. Convergence of Muon with Newton–Schulz. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2026.
- [17] Kimi Team. Kimi K2: Open Agentic Intelligence. arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.20534, 2025.
- [18] Jiaxiang Li and Mingyi Hong. A Note on the Convergence of Muon. arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.02900, 2025.
- [19] Mingyi Li and Taira Tsuchiya. Muon with Finite Newton–Schulz: The Smoothing Benefit in Nonsmooth Nonconvex Optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.26288, 2026.
- [20] Jingyuan Liu et al. Muon is Scalable for LLM Training. arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.16982, 2025.
- [21] Jun Liu and Ye Yuan. Almost Sure Convergence Rates Analysis and Saddle Avoidance of Stochastic Gradient Methods. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(271):1–40, 2024.
- [22] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019.
- [23] Shuntaro Nagashima and Hideaki Iiduka. Improved Convergence Rates of Muon Optimizer for Nonconvex Optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.19400v3, 2026.
- [24] Konstantinos Oikonomidis, Jan Quan, Kimon Antonakopoulos, Antonio Silveti-Falls, Volkan Cevher, and Panagiotis Patrinos. Constrained stochastic spectral preconditioning converges for nonconvex objectives. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2026. Accepted to NeurIPS 2026.
- [25] Konstantinos Oikonomidis, Jan Quan, and Panagiotis Patrinos. Nonlinearly Preconditioned Gradient Methods: Momentum and Stochastic Analysis. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 38, pages 43584–43615, 2025.
- [26] Hanyang Peng, Hui Wang, and Yue Yu. Convergence of Practical Muon with Finite Newton–Schulz Iterations and Nesterov Momentum. arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.39595v1, 2026.
- [27] PyTorch contributors. Muon optimizer documentation and reference implementation. PyTorch online documentation, 2026. Accessed October 18, 2026; mutable main documentation.
- [28] Xun Qian, Hussein Rammal, Dmitry Kovalev, and Peter Richtárik. Muon is Provably Faster with Momentum Variance Reduction. arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.16598, 2025.
- [29] Amartya Roy and Souvik Chakraborty. Training-Loss Guarantees for Muon with Finite-Step Newton–Schulz Orthogonalization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.03306, 2026.
- [30] Naoki Sato, Hiroki Naganuma, and Hideaki Iiduka. Convergence Bound and Critical Batch Size of Muon Optimizer. arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.01598, 2025. Revised in 2026.
- [31] Maria-Eleni Sfyraiki and Jun-Kun Wang. Lions and Muons: Optimization via Stochastic Frank–Wolfe under Heavy-Tailed Noise. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 306 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 109388–109428, 2026.
- [32] Wei Shen, Ruichuan Huang, Minhui Huang, Cong Shen, and Jiawei Zhang. On the Convergence Analysis of Muon. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2026.

- [33] Egor Shulgin, Sultan AlRashed, Peter Richtárik, and Francesco Orabona. Beyond the Ideal: Analyzing the Inexact Muon Update. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 300 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5167–5175, 2026.
- [34] Pierre Vernimmen and François Glineur. Can Acceleration in Gradient-Norm Minimization Be Anytime? Sharp Last-Iterate Limits in Smooth Convex Optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.05710v1, 2026.
- [35] Haonan Wang, Yu Wu, Minghui Liwang, Xinlei Yi, and Yiguang Hong. Convergence of Practical Muon. arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.33152v1, 2026.

A Related Work (Supplement to Section 1)

Table 1 summarizes convergence results for different Muon variants. A key distinction is between average- or best-iterate gradient bounds and convergence of the full gradient sequence; objective-gap and hitting-time guarantees are also different criteria.

Matrix geometry and practical updates. Muon builds on spectral steepest descent and matrix-aware optimization [1, 2, 11]. Practical implementations replace exact polar factors by a fixed number of quintic Newton–Schulz (NS) iterations [14, 15, 27], sometimes combined with scaling and weight decay [20]. The distinction between exact, inexact, and finite-NS spectral maps is important when comparing convergence results.

Average- and best-iterate stationarity. For exact-polar updates, Li and Hong [18] and Sato et al. [30] obtain stochastic average-gradient guarantees, whereas Nagashima and Iiduka [23] study a Nesterov-style variant with a best-iterate guarantee. For approximate updates, Kim and Oh [16] analyze finite-NS (Taylor-type) steps, Shulgin et al. [33] use an inexact linear minimization oracle, Choudhury et al. [5] consider possibly randomized inexact polar decomposition with momentum, and Huang et al. [12] combine variance reduction with NS computations in LiMuon. Their guarantees concern average or best iterates. Closer to the practical quintic implementation, Peng et al. [26] and Wang et al. [35] establish expected average-gradient bounds, the latter also accounting for weight decay and input normalization.

Last-iterate and related guarantees. De Oliveira et al. [7] establish full-gradient-sequence convergence for bounded-preconditioner momentum methods in a restricted momentum regime, with a Soft Muon specialization under additional assumptions. Chang et al. [3] give last-iterate objective-gap guarantees under a Polyak–Łojasiewicz condition, while Demidovich et al. [8] study a scale-calibrated variant under star-convexity. Roy and Chakraborty [29] obtain a training-loss hitting-time result for practical finite-NS updates in a squared-loss setting. These conclusions differ in both their assumptions and their convergence criteria.

Stochastic noise and other connections. Normalized-momentum and nonlinear-preconditioning analyses provide related tracking techniques [6, 21, 24, 25]. Do et al. [9] demonstrate stochastic nonconvergence phenomena for finite-NS Muon, while Iiduka [13] studies heavy-tailed noise. Other related directions include finite-NS smoothing [19], regularization and spectral constraints [4, 22, 31], and density-one optimization guarantees [34].

B Supporting Results for Section 2: Preliminaries

This appendix establishes the finite Newton–Schulz map estimates and the objective-gradient bound used throughout, then records the alternative input normalization.

B.1 Proof of Lemma 2.2

Proof. First consider the scalar polynomial. For every real $s \neq 0$,

$$\frac{P(s)}{s} = a + bs^2 + cs^4 = c \left(s^2 + \frac{b}{2c} \right)^2 + a - \frac{b^2}{4c} \geq a - \frac{b^2}{4c} > 0. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The final strict inequality follows by direct substitution of (2.5) (the difference is approximately 0.6386). In particular, $P(s) > 0$ whenever $s > 0$; iteration shows $\varphi_J(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$. Since $P(s) = as + O(s^3)$ as $s \downarrow 0$, the chain rule, or induction over J , gives $\varphi_J(s) = a^J s + O(s^3)$. Thus

q_J extends continuously and strictly positively to the compact interval $[0, 1]$, proving the claim concerning ℓ_J and u_J .

If $N = 0$, then $\Phi_\varepsilon(N) = 0$ and every assertion is immediate. Otherwise choose a thin singular-value decomposition $N = U \operatorname{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) V^\top$, with $\sigma_i \geq 0$ and $r = \min\{m, n\}$; zero singular values are allowed. Direct multiplication gives

$$\begin{aligned} Z_j &= U \operatorname{diag}(z_{1,j}, \dots, z_{r,j}) V^\top, \\ z_{i,0} &= \frac{\sigma_i}{R + \varepsilon}, \quad z_{i,j+1} = P(z_{i,j}). \end{aligned}$$

Because $\sigma_i \leq R$, all the inputs $z_{i,0}$ lie in $[0, 1]$. The coefficients in (B.1) ensure that $z_{i,j} \geq 0$ for all j . Writing $d_i = z_{i,J}$, we therefore have

$$\frac{\ell_J \sigma_i}{R + \varepsilon} \leq d_i \leq \frac{u_J \sigma_i}{R + \varepsilon} \quad (1 \leq i \leq r). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Squaring (B.2), summing over i , and using $\sum_i \sigma_i^2 = R^2$ proves (2.6); summing $\sigma_i d_i$ proves (2.7). Finally, $\sigma_i \geq (R + \varepsilon) d_i / u_J$, whence

$$\sigma_i d_i \geq \frac{R + \varepsilon}{u_J} d_i^2 \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{u_J} d_i^2.$$

Summing yields (2.8). □

B.2 Gradient self-bound

Lemma B.1 (Gradient self-bound). *Under Assumption 2.1, for all $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$,*

$$\|\nabla F(X)\|^2 \leq 2L(F(X) - F_{\inf}). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Proof. The descent lemma applied at $Y = X - L^{-1} \nabla F(X)$ gives $F(Y) \leq F(X) - \|\nabla F(X)\|^2 / (2L)$. Combining this with $F(Y) \geq F_{\inf}$ and rearranging proves the result. □

B.3 Maximum-Type Input Normalization

We record a normalization variant within the same exact-arithmetic analysis.

Proposition B.2 (Maximum-type input floor). *Replace (2.4)'s initial normalization by*

$$Z_0 = N / \max\{\|N\|_F, \varepsilon\}, \quad \varepsilon > 0,$$

and denote the corresponding finite-NS map by $\Phi_\varepsilon^{\max}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_\varepsilon^{\max}(N)\|_F &\leq u_J, \quad \|\Phi_\varepsilon^{\max}(N)\|_F \geq \ell_J \frac{\|N\|_F}{\|N\|_F + \varepsilon}, \\ \langle N, \Phi_\varepsilon^{\max}(N) \rangle_F &\geq \frac{\varepsilon}{u_J} \|\Phi_\varepsilon^{\max}(N)\|_F^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Accordingly Theorem 3.2 holds, with the same sufficient condition (3.2), for this modified normalization. The diminishing-step proofs carry over as well.

Proof. Set $\tau = \max\{\|N\|_F, \varepsilon\} \geq \varepsilon$. For singular values σ_i of N , one has $\sigma_i / \tau \in [0, 1]$ and the finite polynomial bounds give $\ell_J \sigma_i / \tau \leq d_i \leq u_J \sigma_i / \tau$. Thus $\|(d_i)\|_2 \leq u_J \|N\|_F / \tau \leq u_J$ and $\|(d_i)\|_2 \geq \ell_J \|N\|_F / \tau \geq \ell_J \|N\|_F / (\|N\|_F + \varepsilon)$. The inequality $\sigma_i d_i \geq \tau d_i^2 / u_J \geq \varepsilon d_i^2 / u_J$ proves (B.4). These reproduce all the estimates invoked in the fixed-step argument. The alignment inequality used for diminishing steps also follows from $\sum_i \sigma_i d_i \geq \ell_J \|N\|_F^2 / \tau \geq \ell_J \|N\|_F^2 / (\|N\|_F + \varepsilon)$. □

C Proofs for Section 3: Fixed-Step Stationarity

We first establish the unstabilized two-cycle, then give the descent-tracking Lyapunov proof of Theorem 3.2. We finish with the square-summable-error extension and scalar local stability.

C.1 Proof of the Unstabilized Two-Cycle

The quadratic two-cycle in Proposition 3.1 holds for all fixed momentum and pre-NS mixing coefficients in the stated ranges. Its explicit scalar recursion is as follows.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. For every nonzero scalar n , zero-stabilizer normalization gives $Z_0 = \text{sign}(n)$; the scalar recurrence is φ_J and hence

$$\Phi_0(n) = c_J \text{sign}(n). \quad (\text{C.1})$$

If $w_s = (-1)^{s-1} \delta/2$ for $1 \leq s \leq t$, then unrolling $M_t = \beta M_{t-1} + (1 - \beta) 0.02 w_t$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} M_t &= (1 - \beta) \frac{0.02\delta}{2} \sum_{s=1}^t \beta^{t-s} (-1)^{s-1} \\ &= (-1)^{t-1} \frac{0.02(1 - \beta)\delta}{2(1 + \beta)} [1 - (-\beta)^t]. \end{aligned}$$

For $\beta \in [0, 1)$ the bracket is strictly positive, so M_t and $g_t = 0.02 w_t$ have the same nonzero sign. Their convex mixture $N_t = \theta M_t + (1 - \theta) g_t$ has that sign as well. By (C.1), $w_{t+1} = w_t - \eta c_J \text{sign}(w_t) = -w_t$. This closes the induction beginning at $w_1 = \delta/2$. $\square$

C.2 Descent-Tracking Lyapunov Proof of Theorem 3.2

C.2.1 Proof of Lemma 3.3

Use the fixed parameters and constants from Section 3, under Assumption 2.1.

Proof. The smoothness inequality and update (2.3) give

$$F(W_{t+1}) - F(W_t) \leq -\eta \langle g_t, D_t \rangle + \frac{L\eta^2}{2} \|D_t\|^2.$$

Writing $g_t = N_t - \theta e_t$, applying (2.8), and using (3.1) yield

$$F(W_{t+1}) - F(W_t) \leq -\eta \kappa \|D_t\|^2 + \eta \langle \theta e_t, D_t \rangle + \frac{L\eta^2}{2} \|D_t\|^2. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Young's inequality gives $\langle r, d \rangle \leq \kappa \|d\|^2/2 + \|r\|^2/(2\kappa)$. Since $\|\theta e_t\|^2 \leq \|e_t\|^2$, substituting this estimate into (C.2) proves (3.4). $\square$

C.2.2 Proof of Lemma 3.4

Proof. The recursion (2.1), evaluated at time $t + 1$, gives

$$e_{t+1} = \beta(e_t + g_t - g_{t+1}). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Write $\Delta_t = g_t - g_{t+1}$. Since $0 \leq \beta < 1$,

$$\|e_{t+1}\|^2 = \beta^2 \|e_t + \Delta_t\|^2 \leq \beta \|e_t + \Delta_t\|^2. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

For $0 < \beta < 1$, Young's squared-norm inequality with $\rho = \alpha/(2\beta)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \|e_t + \Delta_t\|^2 &\leq \beta(1 + \rho) \|e_t\|^2 + \beta(1 + \rho^{-1}) \|\Delta_t\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1 + \beta}{2} \|e_t\|^2 + \frac{\beta(1 + \beta)}{\alpha} \|\Delta_t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 2.1 and (2.3), $\|\Delta_t\| \leq L\eta \|D_t\|$; substituting into (C.4) proves (3.5). For $\beta = 0$, (C.3) reduces to $e_{t+1} = 0$, and the same estimate holds. $\square$

C.2.3 Quantitative Lyapunov decrease

Lemma C.1 (Quantitative Lyapunov decrease). *Define*

$$V_t = F(W_t) + \frac{2\eta}{\kappa\alpha} \|e_t\|^2.$$

If (3.2) holds, then for all $t \geq 1$,

$$V_{t+1} - V_t \leq -\frac{\eta\kappa}{4} \|D_t\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{2\kappa} \|e_t\|^2. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Proof. Multiply (3.5) by $C = 2\eta/(\kappa\alpha)$ and add (3.4). The coefficient of $\|e_t\|^2$ is

$$\frac{\eta}{2\kappa} + C \left(\frac{1+\beta}{2} - 1 \right) = \frac{\eta}{2\kappa} - \frac{\eta}{\kappa} = -\frac{\eta}{2\kappa}.$$

The remaining negative coefficient of $\|D_t\|^2$ is

$$Q = \frac{\eta\kappa}{2} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2} - \frac{2\beta(1+\beta)L^2\eta^3}{\kappa\alpha^2}.$$

To verify that it is positive under the explicit step-size condition, put $x = L\eta/(\kappa\alpha)$, so $0 < x \leq 1/4$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Q}{\eta\kappa} &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha x}{2} - 2\beta(1+\beta)x^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{8} - \frac{\beta(1+\beta)}{8} = \frac{3-\beta^2}{8} \geq \frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

This lower bound holds also at $\beta = 0$. Substituting $Q \geq \eta\kappa/4$ into the combined inequality gives (C.5). $\square$

C.2.4 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof. Part I: Lyapunov summability. For exact gradients, (C.5) and the lower bound $V_{T+1} \geq F(W_{T+1}) \geq F_{\inf}$ give

$$\frac{\eta\kappa}{4} \sum_{t=1}^T \|D_t\|^2 + \frac{\eta}{2\kappa} \sum_{t=1}^T \|e_t\|^2 \leq V_1 - F_{\inf} =: H < \infty. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Thus the first two series in (3.3) converge. Moreover, (C.5) ensures $V_t \leq V_1$, hence

$$0 \leq F(W_t) - F_{\inf} \leq V_t - F_{\inf} \leq H \quad (t \geq 1). \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Part II: square-summability of gradients. Lemma B.1 and (C.7) give

$$\|g_t\| \leq \sqrt{2LH} \quad (t \geq 1).$$

By (C.6), also $\|e_t\| \leq \sqrt{2\kappa H/\eta}$ for every t . Since $N_t = g_t + \theta e_t$, the inputs are uniformly bounded:

$$H_N := \sqrt{2LH} + \sqrt{2\kappa H/\eta}, \quad \|N_t\| \leq H_N \quad (t \geq 1).$$

The radial estimate (2.6) therefore yields

$$\|N_t\|^2 \leq \frac{(H_N + \varepsilon)^2}{\ell_j^2} \|D_t\|^2. \quad (\text{C.8})$$

In particular, $\sum_t \|N_t\|^2 < \infty$. Since $g_t = N_t - \theta e_t$,

$$\|g_t\|^2 \leq 2\|N_t\|^2 + 2\|e_t\|^2.$$

The third summability assertion in (3.3) now follows. Every square-summable sequence converges to zero; thus $\|g_t\| \rightarrow 0$, as claimed. $\square$

C.3 Fixed-step extension to square-summable gradient perturbations

The exact-gradient restriction in Theorem 3.2 may be relaxed to perturbations of finite total squared energy. We keep this extension separate because the main theorem and its proof require no stochastic assumptions.

Theorem C.2 (Fixed-step stationarity with square-summable errors). *Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds. Use $G_t = g_t + \zeta_t$, fix finite $J \geq 1$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $\beta \in [0, 1)$, and $\theta \in [0, 1]$, and choose the constant step size according to (3.2). If the perturbations satisfy*

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \|\zeta_t\|^2 < \infty, \quad (\text{C.9})$$

then, pathwise,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \|D_t\|^2 < \infty, \quad \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \|M_t - g_t\|^2 < \infty, \quad \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \|g_t\|^2 < \infty. \quad (\text{C.10})$$

In particular, $\|g_t\| \rightarrow 0$. If the perturbations are random and satisfy

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \|\zeta_t\|^2 < \infty, \quad (\text{C.11})$$

then (C.10) holds almost surely and

$$\mathbb{E} \|\nabla F(W_t)\|^2 \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{C.12})$$

Neither conditional unbiasedness nor independence is required.

Proof. Set $\alpha = 1 - \beta$, $\kappa = \varepsilon/u_J$, and $e_t = M_t - g_t$. Now $N_t - g_t = \theta e_t + (1 - \theta)\zeta_t$. The sector inequality (2.8), smoothness, Young's inequality, and $\|\theta e_t + (1 - \theta)\zeta_t\|^2 \leq \|e_t\|^2 + \|\zeta_t\|^2$ give

$$F(W_{t+1}) - F(W_t) \leq - \left(\frac{\eta\kappa}{2} - \frac{L\eta^2}{2} \right) \|D_t\|^2 + \frac{\eta}{2\kappa} (\|e_t\|^2 + \|\zeta_t\|^2). \quad (\text{C.13})$$

The exact tracking recursion is

$$e_{t+1} = \beta(e_t + g_t - g_{t+1}) + \alpha\zeta_{t+1}.$$

By convexity of the squared norm and Young's inequality, for $0 < \beta < 1$,

$$\|e_{t+1}\|^2 \leq \frac{1+\beta}{2} \|e_t\|^2 + \frac{\beta(1+\beta)L^2\eta^2}{\alpha} \|D_t\|^2 + \alpha\|\zeta_{t+1}\|^2. \quad (\text{C.14})$$

For $\beta = 0$, this bound follows directly from $e_{t+1} = \zeta_{t+1}$.

With $V_t = F(W_t) + 2\eta\|e_t\|^2/(\kappa\alpha)$, the same coefficient calculation as in Appendix C.2.3 (which uses only the step-size restriction) combines (C.13) and (C.14) into

$$\begin{aligned} V_{t+1} - V_t &\leq - \frac{\eta\kappa}{4} \|D_t\|^2 - \frac{\eta}{2\kappa} \|e_t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\eta}{2\kappa} \|\zeta_t\|^2 + \frac{2\eta}{\kappa} \|\zeta_{t+1}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.15})$$

Fix any trajectory satisfying (C.9) and put $Z := \sum_{t \geq 1} \|\zeta_t\|^2$ and $H := V_1 - F_{\inf} + 5\eta Z/(2\kappa) < \infty$. Telescoping (C.15) and using $V_{T+1} \geq F_{\inf}$ show that

$$\frac{\eta\kappa}{4} \sum_{t=1}^T \|D_t\|^2 + \frac{\eta}{2\kappa} \sum_{t=1}^T \|e_t\|^2 \leq H \quad (T \geq 1).$$

The same inequality implies $0 \leq F(W_t) - F_{\inf} \leq H$ for all t . By Lemma B.1, $\|g_t\| \leq \sqrt{2LH}$. Also $\|e_t\| \leq \sqrt{2\kappa H/\eta}$ and $\|\zeta_t\| \leq \sqrt{Z}$. Consequently,

$$\|N_t\| \leq H_N := \sqrt{2LH} + \sqrt{2\kappa H/\eta} + \sqrt{Z} < \infty.$$

Using (2.6) as in (C.8) gives $\sum_t \|N_t\|^2 < \infty$. Finally,

$$\|g_t\|^2 \leq 3\|N_t\|^2 + 3\|e_t\|^2 + 3\|\zeta_t\|^2,$$

so the third series in (C.10) converges.

Under (C.11), Tonelli's theorem gives $Z < \infty$ almost surely, hence the pathwise conclusions hold almost surely. Deterministic finite initialization and $\mathbb{E}\|\zeta_1\|^2 < \infty$ ensure $\mathbb{E}V_1 < \infty$, so $\mathbb{E}H < \infty$. For every t , Lemma B.1 gives $0 \leq \|g_t\|^2 \leq 2LH$. Dominated convergence proves (C.12). $\square$

C.3.1 Growing Batches with Fixed Hyperparameters

Corollary C.3 (Growing batches with constant hyperparameters). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C.2, if $\mathbb{E}\|\zeta_t\|^2 \leq \sigma^2/b_t$ and $\sum_t b_t^{-1} < \infty$, then full-sequence stationarity holds almost surely and in mean square. A sufficient choice is $b_t = \lceil t^{1+\delta} \rceil$ for $\delta > 0$.*

Proof. The moment and batch conditions imply (C.11). Apply Theorem C.2. $\square$

C.4 Exact Local Stability Region on Quadratics

We characterize the precise Schur stability region of the scalar finite-NS dynamics. This criterion describes local behavior around the stationary point and complements the global Lyapunov condition for smooth lower-bounded objectives.

Proposition C.4 (Strict Schur stability of the scalar linearization). *Let $F(w) = \lambda w^2/2$ with $\lambda > 0$ and use exact gradients, fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, $\eta > 0$, $\beta \in [0, 1)$, and $\theta \in [0, 1]$. The linearized state dynamics at the origin are strictly Schur stable if and only if*

$$0 < s := \frac{\eta\lambda a^J}{\varepsilon} < \frac{2(1+\beta)}{1+\beta-2\theta\beta}. \quad (\text{C.16})$$

Within this open range the nonlinear origin is locally asymptotically stable; above the upper endpoint it is unstable. The equality case is not classified by this linearization.

For ordinary EMA momentum ($\theta = 1$), the upper bound is $2(1+\beta)/(1-\beta)$. For Nesterov-style mixing ($\theta = \beta$), it becomes $2(1+\beta)/((1-\beta)(1+2\beta))$.

Proof. Near $n = 0$, $n/(|n| + \varepsilon) = n/\varepsilon + o(|n|)$ and $\varphi_J(z) = a^J z + o(|z|)$. Thus

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(n) = kn + o(|n|), \quad k = \frac{a^J}{\varepsilon}. \quad (\text{C.17})$$

Take the state variable (w_t, M_{t-1}) . Eliminating the current momentum gives

$$M_t = \beta M_{t-1} + (1-\beta)\lambda w_t, \quad N_t = \theta\beta M_{t-1} + (1-\theta\beta)\lambda w_t.$$

Using (C.17), the Jacobian of the map $(w_t, M_{t-1}) \mapsto (w_{t+1}, M_t)$ at $(0, 0)$ is

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - s(1-\theta\beta) & -\eta k \theta \beta \\ (1-\beta)\lambda & \beta \end{pmatrix}.$$

Its trace and determinant are, by direct calculation,

$$\tau = 1 + \beta - s(1 - \theta\beta), \quad d = \beta[1 - (1 - \theta)s]. \quad (\text{C.18})$$

For the characteristic polynomial $z^2 - \tau z + d$, the strict real quadratic Schur (Jury) conditions are $1 - \tau + d > 0$, $1 + \tau + d > 0$, and $1 - d > 0$. Substituting (C.18) gives exactly

$$1 - \tau + d = s(1 - \beta), \quad (\text{C.19})$$

$$1 + \tau + d = 2(1 + \beta) - s(1 + \beta - 2\theta\beta), \quad (\text{C.20})$$

$$1 - d = 1 - \beta + \beta(1 - \theta)s. \quad (\text{C.21})$$

Because $s > 0$, $\beta < 1$, and $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, (C.19) and (C.21) are strictly positive. Furthermore $1 + \beta - 2\theta\beta = 1 - \beta + 2\beta(1 - \theta) > 0$. Consequently (C.20) is equivalent to the upper bound in (C.16). The state map is continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of the origin because $\varepsilon > 0$; the discrete-time linearization theorem gives local asymptotic stability when A is strictly Schur stable. If s is above the threshold, the characteristic polynomial satisfies $p(-1) = 1 + \tau + d < 0$ and $p(z) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $z \rightarrow -\infty$. Hence an eigenvalue is less than -1 , so the origin is unstable. At equality -1 is an eigenvalue, and linearization alone does not settle nonlinear stability. $\square$

Global and local stability certificates. The global Lyapunov condition and the exact scalar Schur criterion address complementary objectives. The former guarantees full-sequence stationarity from arbitrary initialization under the smoothness and exact-gradient assumptions; the latter gives a precise local threshold around a quadratic stationary point. For $F(w) = \lambda w^2/2$, $\lambda > 0$, exact gradients, and Nesterov-style mixing $\theta = \beta$, Proposition C.4 yields local asymptotic stability whenever

$$0 < \eta < \eta_{\text{loc}} := \frac{2(1 + \beta)\varepsilon}{\lambda a^J(1 - \beta)(1 + 2\beta)}.$$

The global sufficient condition from Theorem 3.2, specialized to $L = \lambda$, is $\eta \leq \eta_{\text{glob}} := \varepsilon(1 - \beta)/(4\lambda u_J)$. These distinct certificates satisfy

$$\frac{\eta_{\text{loc}}}{\eta_{\text{glob}}} = \frac{8u_J}{a^J} \frac{1 + \beta}{(1 - \beta)^2(1 + 2\beta)} \geq \frac{8(1 + \beta)}{(1 - \beta)^2(1 + 2\beta)},$$

because $u_J \geq q_J(0) = a^J$. Their dependence on β also differs: the global sufficient threshold scales as $1 - \beta$ while the scalar local threshold scales as $(1 - \beta)^{-1}$ as $\beta \uparrow 1$. These are separate, mathematically precise characterizations of global dissipation and local linear stability.

D Proofs for Section 4: Stochastic Stationarity

We prove the persistent-noise obstruction, develop the diminishing-step stationarity criterion, and then derive the noise-filtering estimates for Theorem 4.2. Additional fixed-momentum regimes are recorded at the end.

D.1 Proof of the Persistent-Noise Floor

We prove the probability and expectation lower bounds of Proposition 4.1 under bounded symmetric unbiased perturbations.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Using the current EMA update in the mixture yields

$$N_t = \theta\beta M_{t-1} + (1 - \theta\beta)(0.02w_t + \zeta_t).$$

Let $a_0 = (1 - \theta\beta)\sigma > 0$. Conditional on the past, the two possible values of N_t differ by $2a_0$. If two real numbers have distance $2a_0$, at least one has absolute value at least a_0 . Since the two possibilities are equiprobable,

$$\Pr(|N_t| \geq a_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

By (2.6), whenever $|N_t| \geq a_0$, $|D_t| \geq \ell_J a_0 / (a_0 + \varepsilon) =: d_0 > 0$. It follows that $\mathbb{E}|D_t| \geq d_0/2$ for every t . But $w_{t+1} - w_t = -\eta D_t$, so by the triangle inequality

$$\eta d_0/2 \leq \eta \mathbb{E}|D_t| \leq \mathbb{E}|w_{t+1}| + \mathbb{E}|w_t|. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

All finite-time expectations exist, because $|D_t| \leq u_J$ ensures $|w_t| \leq |w_1| + (t-1)\eta u_J$. Taking upper limits in (D.2), allowing an infinite upper limit, yields $\limsup_t \mathbb{E}|w_t| \geq \eta d_0/4$, and hence $\limsup_t \mathbb{E}|F'(w_t)| \geq 0.02\eta d_0/4$, which is exactly (4.1).

For the probability claim, (D.1) and the radial lower bound imply $\Pr(|w_{t+1} - w_t| \geq \eta d_0) \geq 1/2$. With $h_0 = \eta d_0/2$, the triangle inequality then gives

$$\Pr(|w_t| \geq h_0) + \Pr(|w_{t+1}| \geq h_0) \geq \frac{1}{2} \quad (t \geq 1).$$

Consequently, at least one member of every adjacent pair has probability at least $1/4$. Since $|F'(w_t)| = 0.02|w_t|$, this proves (4.2). $\square$

D.2 General Diminishing-Step Stationarity Criterion

For diminishing steps, use the standard summability conditions

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t = \infty, \quad \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t^2 < \infty. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Theorem D.1 (Diminishing-step stationarity criterion). *Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds and $\varepsilon \geq 0$ is fixed. Let the deterministic positive step sizes satisfy (D.3). If along a deterministic trajectory*

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t \|r_t\| < \infty, \quad (\text{D.4})$$

then $\|g_t\| \rightarrow 0$. For random iterates, if

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t \mathbb{E}\|r_t\| < \infty, \quad (\text{D.5})$$

then $\|g_t\| \rightarrow 0$ almost surely and $\mathbb{E}\|g_t\|^2 \rightarrow 0$.

D.2.1 Inexact-input descent bound

Lemma D.2 (Inexact-input descent). *Under Assumption 2.1, for any $\eta_t > 0$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$, the update (2.3) satisfies*

$$\langle g_t, D_t \rangle \geq \ell_J \psi_\varepsilon(\|g_t\|) - (\ell_J + B)\|r_t\|, \quad (\text{D.6})$$

$$F(W_{t+1}) \leq F(W_t) - \ell_J \eta_t \psi_\varepsilon(\|g_t\|) + (\ell_J + B)\eta_t \|r_t\| + \frac{LB^2}{2} \eta_t^2. \quad (\text{D.7})$$

Moreover, the gradient norm cannot change too quickly:

$$|\|g_{t+1}\| - \|g_t\|| \leq LB\eta_t. \quad (\text{D.8})$$

Proof. The derivative of ψ_ε on $(0, \infty)$ is

$$\psi'_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{x(x+2\varepsilon)}{(x+\varepsilon)^2} = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(x+\varepsilon)^2} \in [0, 1].$$

For $\varepsilon = 0$, $\psi_0(x) = x$. In either case the extension to $[0, \infty)$ is nonnegative, nondecreasing, and 1-Lipschitz. Applying (2.7) directly to the single matrix gives

$$\langle N_t, D_t \rangle \geq \ell_J \frac{\|N_t\|^2}{\|N_t\| + \varepsilon} = \ell_J \psi_\varepsilon(\|N_t\|).$$

The inequalities remain valid when $N_t = 0$, by the zero convention. As $g_t = N_t - r_t$,

$$\langle g_t, D_t \rangle = \langle N_t, D_t \rangle - \langle r_t, D_t \rangle \geq \ell_J \psi_\varepsilon(\|N_t\|) - B\|r_t\|.$$

The reverse triangle inequality and the Lipschitz property yield $\psi_\varepsilon(\|N_t\|) \geq \psi_\varepsilon(\|g_t\|) - \|r_t\|$, which proves (D.6). Applying the standard smoothness bound to $W_{t+1} = W_t - \eta_t D_t$ and then $\|D_t\| \leq B$ proves (D.7). Finally, the reverse triangle inequality, L -smoothness, and $\|D_t\| \leq B$ imply

$$|\|g_{t+1}\| - \|g_t\|| \leq \|g_{t+1} - g_t\| \leq L\eta_t \|D_t\| \leq LB\eta_t,$$

which proves (D.8). $\square$

D.2.2 Interpolation and full-sequence regularity

Lemma D.3 (Interpolation and full-sequence regularity). *Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $h_t \geq 0$, and let deterministic $\eta_t > 0$ satisfy (D.3). If there is a finite $C \geq 0$ such that*

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t \psi_\varepsilon(h_t) < \infty, \quad |h_{t+1} - h_t| \leq C\eta_t \quad (t \geq 1), \quad (\text{D.9})$$

then $h_t \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Define $s_1 = 0$ and $s_{t+1} = s_t + \eta_t$. The first condition in (D.3) implies $s_t \rightarrow \infty$. On each interval $[s_t, s_{t+1}]$, define the linear interpolant

$$h(s) = h_t + \frac{s - s_t}{\eta_t} (h_{t+1} - h_t).$$

The bound in (D.9) implies that each piece has slope at most C in absolute value. Continuity across its breakpoints then implies that $h : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is globally C -Lipschitz. Since ψ_ε is 1-Lipschitz and nonnegative,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{s_t}^{s_{t+1}} \psi_\varepsilon(h(s)) ds &\leq \int_{s_t}^{s_{t+1}} [\psi_\varepsilon(h_t) + C(s - s_t)] ds \\ &= \eta_t \psi_\varepsilon(h_t) + \frac{C}{2} \eta_t^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summing and using (D.3) and (D.9) yields

$$\int_0^\infty \psi_\varepsilon(h(s)) ds < \infty. \quad (\text{D.10})$$

Set $f(s) = \psi_\varepsilon(h(s))$. It is a nonnegative globally C -Lipschitz function. We justify explicitly the implication $f(s) \rightarrow 0$: if $C = 0$, then f is constant and (D.10) forces that constant to be zero. If $C > 0$ and there exist $d > 0$ and arbitrarily large s with $f(s) \geq d$, then $f(u) \geq d/2$ for all $|u - s| \leq d/(2C)$. We may pick infinitely many such centers with pairwise disjoint intervals of this radius, producing an infinite integral in (D.10), a contradiction. Hence $f(s) \rightarrow 0$. In particular, $\psi_\varepsilon(h_t) \rightarrow 0$. Finally, $\psi_\varepsilon(x) \geq \psi_\varepsilon(d) > 0$ whenever $x \geq d > 0$, so $h_t \rightarrow 0$. $\square$

D.2.3 Proof of Theorem D.1

Proof. First consider any sample path on which (D.4) holds. Telescoping (D.7) from 1 through T , and using $F(W_{T+1}) \geq F_{\inf}$, gives

$$\ell_J \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \psi_\varepsilon(\|g_t\|) \leq F(W_1) - F_{\inf} + (\ell_J + B) \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \|r_t\| + \frac{LB^2}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2. \quad (\text{D.11})$$

The right side is bounded independently of T , proving $\sum_t \eta_t \psi_\varepsilon(\|g_t\|) < \infty$. Moreover the reverse triangle inequality, gradient Lipschitzness, (2.3), and $\|D_t\| \leq B$ give

$$|\|g_{t+1}\| - \|g_t\|| \leq \|g_{t+1} - g_t\| \leq LB\eta_t.$$

Lemma D.3 applied to $h_t = \|g_t\|$ proves $\|g_t\| \rightarrow 0$ along the chosen path.

For random iterates, (D.5) and Tonelli's theorem imply (D.4) almost surely, so we obtain the almost-sure conclusion. To prove the mean-square conclusion, note that the same descent inequality without its negative term implies for every t the pathwise estimate

$$0 \leq F(W_t) - F_{\inf} \leq R_A := F(W_1) - F_{\inf} + (\ell_J + B) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_j \|r_j\| + \frac{LB^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_j^2. \quad (\text{D.12})$$

Since W_1 is deterministic and (D.5) holds, $\mathbb{E}R_A < \infty$. Lemma B.1 gives $0 \leq \|g_t\|^2 \leq 2LR_A$ for all t . Dominated convergence now yields $\mathbb{E}\|g_t\|^2 \rightarrow 0$. $\square$

D.3 Polynomial-Schedule Memory and Noise Filtering

D.3.1 Polynomial-Schedule Convolution Estimates

Let $1 - \beta_t = \alpha_0 t^{-q}$, where $0 < \alpha_0 \leq 1$ and $0 < q < 1$. For $1 \leq s \leq t$, define

$$R_{s:t} = \prod_{j=s}^t \beta_j, \quad R_{t+1:t} = 1.$$

Lemma D.4 (Geometric-memory estimates). *If $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-p}$ with $p > 0$ and $\eta_0 > 0$, then as $t \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$R_{1:t} = O(e^{-ct^{1-q}}) \quad \text{for some } c > 0, \quad (\text{D.13})$$

$$\sum_{s=2}^t R_{s:t} \eta_{s-1} = O(t^{q-p}), \quad (\text{D.14})$$

$$\sum_{s=1}^t (1 - \beta_s)^2 R_{s+1:t}^2 = O(t^{-q}). \quad (\text{D.15})$$

The implied constants depend on α_0, η_0, p, q but not on t .

Proof. Since $1 - x \leq e^{-x}$ for $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$R_{s:t} \leq \exp \left(- \sum_{j=s}^t (1 - \beta_j) \right). \quad (\text{D.16})$$

For $s = 1$, the integral lower bound $\sum_{j=1}^t j^{-q} \geq \int_1^{t+1} x^{-q} dx = ((t+1)^{1-q} - 1)/(1-q)$ proves (D.13) (adjusting c for small t).

For the two sums, write $m = \lfloor t/2 \rfloor$ and first take $t \geq 4$. If $s \leq m$, both $R_{s:t}$ and $R_{s+1:t}$ contain the product over $j = m+1, \dots, t$; therefore

$$R_{s:t} \leq e^{-\alpha_0(t-m)t^{-q}}, \quad R_{s+1:t} \leq e^{-\alpha_0(t-m)t^{-q}} \leq e^{-(\alpha_0/2)t^{1-q}}.$$

Since $\eta_{s-1} \leq \eta_0$ and $(1 - \beta_s) \leq \alpha_0$, the contributions from $s \leq m$ to (D.14) and (D.15) are bounded by a constant times $te^{-ct^{1-q}}$, hence are smaller than any fixed negative power of t .

For $s > m$, one has $s - 1 \geq t/2 - 1 \geq t/4$, and therefore

$$\eta_{s-1} \leq 4^p \eta_0 t^{-p}, \quad (1 - \beta_s) \leq 2^q \alpha_0 t^{-q}. \quad (\text{D.17})$$

Furthermore, the sequence $(1 - \beta_j)_{j \geq 1}$ is nonincreasing, so $1 - \beta_j \geq 1 - \beta_t$ for $j \leq t$. Equation (D.16) gives

$$R_{s:t} \leq e^{-(1-\beta_t)(t-s+1)}, \quad R_{s+1:t} \leq e^{-(1-\beta_t)(t-s)}. \quad (\text{D.18})$$

For $0 < x \leq 1$, the inequality $1 - e^{-x} \geq x/(1+x)$ implies

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-xk} = \frac{1}{1 - e^{-x}} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{x}. \quad (\text{D.19})$$

Using (D.17)–(D.19) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=m+1}^t R_{s:t} \eta_{s-1} &\leq 4^p \eta_0 t^{-p} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-(1-\beta_t)k} = O(t^{-p}(1 - \beta_t)^{-1}) = O(t^{q-p}), \\ \sum_{s=m+1}^t (1 - \beta_s)^2 R_{s+1:t}^2 &\leq 2^{2q} \alpha_0^2 t^{-2q} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-2(1-\beta_t)k} = O(t^{-2q}(1 - \beta_t)^{-1}) = O(t^{-q}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the early and late estimates proves both assertions. The finitely many values $t < 4$ can be absorbed into the constants. $\square$

D.3.2 Noise filtering and momentum tracking

Lemma D.5 (Noise filtering and momentum tracking). *Under Assumption 2.1, (4.3), and the polynomial schedules (4.4) with $0 < q < 1$ and $p > q$, let $e_t = M_t - g_t$. For $\theta_t = 1$ or $\theta_t = \beta_t$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\|e_t\| = O(t^{-q/2} + t^{q-p}), \quad (\text{D.20})$$

$$\mathbb{E}\|r_t\| = O(t^{-q/2} + t^{q-p}). \quad (\text{D.21})$$

In particular, the exponent conditions (4.5) imply

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t \mathbb{E}\|r_t\| < \infty. \quad (\text{D.22})$$

Proof. Set $e_t = M_t - g_t$. The time-varying counterpart of (C.3) is

$$e_t = \beta_t(e_{t-1} + g_{t-1} - g_t) + (1 - \beta_t)\zeta_t, \quad t \geq 2,$$

while at $t = 1$, $e_1 = \beta_1(M_0 - g_1) + (1 - \beta_1)\zeta_1$. Iteration gives the *exact*, consistently indexed identity

$$e_t = R_{1:t}(M_0 - g_1) + \sum_{s=2}^t R_{s:t}(g_{s-1} - g_s) + \sum_{s=1}^t (1 - \beta_s) R_{s+1:t} \zeta_s. \quad (\text{D.23})$$

The initial term is $O(e^{-ct^{1-q}})$ by Lemma D.4. Since $\|D_{s-1}\| \leq B$,

$$\|g_{s-1} - g_s\| \leq L\|W_s - W_{s-1}\| \leq LB\eta_{s-1}. \quad (\text{D.24})$$

Consequently the norm of the middle sum in (D.23) is bounded *pathwise* by $LB \sum_{s=2}^t R_{s:t} \eta_{s-1} = O(t^{q-p})$.

For the final sum in (D.23), define the *deterministic* scalars $w_{s,t} = (1 - \beta_s)R_{s+1:t}$. Because ζ_s is $\mathcal{F}_s$ -measurable and $\mathbb{E}[\zeta_u | \mathcal{F}_{u-1}] = 0$, for $s < u$,

$$\mathbb{E}\langle \zeta_s, \zeta_u \rangle = \mathbb{E}\left[\langle \zeta_s, \mathbb{E}[\zeta_u | \mathcal{F}_{u-1}] \rangle\right] = 0.$$

The interchange is legitimate by Cauchy–Schwarz and the bounded second moments. Expanding the square and using (4.3) therefore gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left\|\sum_{s=1}^t w_{s,t} \zeta_s\right\|^2 &= \sum_{s=1}^t w_{s,t}^2 \mathbb{E}\|\zeta_s\|^2 \\ &\leq \sigma^2 \sum_{s=1}^t (1 - \beta_s)^2 R_{s+1:t}^2 = O(t^{-q}). \end{aligned}$$

Jensen’s inequality yields an expected norm of order $t^{-q/2}$. Applying the triangle inequality to the three terms of (D.23) proves (D.20).

If $\theta_t = 1$, then $r_t = e_t$. If $\theta_t = \beta_t$, the exact identity (2.2) gives

$$r_t = \beta_t e_t + (1 - \beta_t) \zeta_t.$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}\|r_t\| \leq \mathbb{E}\|e_t\| + (1 - \beta_t)\sigma$; $1 - \beta_t = O(t^{-q})$ is absorbed in $O(t^{-q/2})$. This proves (D.21). Under (4.5), multiplying the estimate by $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-p}$ gives

$$\eta_t \mathbb{E}\|r_t\| = O(t^{-p-q/2} + t^{q-2p}).$$

Both exponents are less than -1 because $p + q/2 > 1$ and $2p - q > 1$. Summation proves (D.22). $\square$

D.4 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Proof. The interval for q in (4.5) is nonempty exactly when $p > 3/4$. Because $p \leq 1$, it also implies $0 < q < 1$; because $q < 2p - 1 \leq p$ for $p \leq 1$, we have $q < p$. Lemma D.5 therefore applies and directly gives (D.22). Also $p > 3/4 > 1/2$ and $p \leq 1$ imply $\sum_t \eta_t^2 < \infty$ and $\sum_t \eta_t = \infty$. All hypotheses of Theorem D.1 are satisfied; applying it proves both statements in (4.6).

Almost-sure weighted square-summability. The argument leading to (D.12) yields an almost-surely finite random variable $R_A \geq 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t \geq 1} (F(W_t) - F_{\inf}) \leq R_A, \quad \ell_J \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t \psi_{\varepsilon}(\|g_t\|) \leq R_A \quad \text{a.s..}$$

(The latter inequality follows directly from (D.11), and $R_A < \infty$ follows from $\sum_t \eta_t \|r_t\| < \infty$ almost surely.) The gradient self-bound (B.3) implies $\|g_t\| \leq \sqrt{2LR_A}$ simultaneously for all t , almost surely. By the exact identity $x^2 = (x + \varepsilon)\psi_{\varepsilon}(x)$ for every $x \geq 0$, including $\varepsilon = x = 0$ under our convention, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t \|g_t\|^2 &= \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t (\|g_t\| + \varepsilon) \psi_{\varepsilon}(\|g_t\|) \\ &\leq \frac{(\sqrt{2LR_A} + \varepsilon) R_A}{\ell_J} < \infty \quad \text{a.s..} \end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.7) and completes Theorem 4.2. $\square$

D.5 Fixed Momentum with Summably Weighted Noise

Corollary D.6 (Fixed momentum with summably weighted noise). *Under Assumption 2.1, fix $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $J \geq 1$, $\beta \in [0, 1)$, and $\theta \in [0, 1]$. Let η_t be positive, nonincreasing, and satisfy (D.3). If deterministic $\sigma_t \geq 0$ satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\zeta_t\| \leq \sigma_t, \quad \sum_{t \geq 1} \eta_t \sigma_t < \infty, \quad (\text{D.25})$$

then $\|g_t\| \rightarrow 0$ almost surely and $\mathbb{E}\|g_t\|^2 \rightarrow 0$, without unbiasedness.

For example, $\eta_t \asymp t^{-4/5}$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\zeta_t\|^2 \lesssim t^{-1/2}$ satisfy this condition.

D.5.1 Proof of Corollary D.6

Proof. With $e_t = M_t - g_t$, expansion of the constant- β recursion shows that for all $t \geq 1$,

$$e_t = \beta^t(M_0 - g_1) + \sum_{s=2}^t \beta^{t-s+1}(g_{s-1} - g_s) + \alpha \sum_{s=1}^t \beta^{t-s} \zeta_s, \quad \alpha = 1 - \beta.$$

Take expected norms, multiply by η_t , and sum. For the initial condition, the monotonicity of η_t yields

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \eta_t \beta^t \|M_0 - g_1\| \leq \frac{\beta \eta_1}{1 - \beta} \|M_0 - g_1\|. \quad (\text{D.26})$$

For the drift part, use (D.24), exchange the order of nonnegative sums, and note that if $t \geq s$ then $\eta_t \leq \eta_{s-1}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t \geq 1} \eta_t \sum_{s=2}^t \beta^{t-s+1} \|g_{s-1} - g_s\| \\ & \leq LB \sum_{s=2}^{\infty} \eta_{s-1} \sum_{t=s}^{\infty} \eta_t \beta^{t-s+1} \\ & \leq \frac{LB\beta}{1 - \beta} \sum_{s=2}^{\infty} \eta_{s-1}^2 = \frac{LB\beta}{1 - \beta} \sum_{t \geq 1} \eta_t^2 < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.27})$$

Finally, by (D.25), nonincreasing steps, and $\alpha \sum_{k \geq 0} \beta^k = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha \sum_{t \geq 1} \eta_t \sum_{s=1}^t \beta^{t-s} \mathbb{E}\|\zeta_s\| \\ & \leq \alpha \sum_{s \geq 1} \sigma_s \sum_{t=s}^{\infty} \eta_t \beta^{t-s} \leq \sum_{s \geq 1} \eta_s \sigma_s < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.28})$$

Equations (D.26)–(D.28) show $\sum_t \eta_t \mathbb{E}\|e_t\| < \infty$. Since $r_t = \theta e_t + (1 - \theta)\zeta_t$, (D.25) implies $\sum_t \eta_t \mathbb{E}\|r_t\| < \infty$. Theorem D.1 proves the claim. For $\beta = 0$, the terms in (D.26)–(D.27) vanish and the same proof is valid with $r_t = \zeta_t$. $\square$

D.5.2 Fixed-Memory Stochastic Bias and Growing-Memory Filtering

Do, Dereich, and Jentzen [9, Theorem 1.3] identify a complementary stochastic regime for generalized finite-NS Muon: asymmetric data can induce a persistent bias with fixed memory. The following specialized statement records the update and noise conditions relevant to our comparison.

Lemma D.7 (Fixed momentum with decreasing steps: a nonconvergence example [9]). *There are bounded i.i.d. data X with nonzero third centered moment, a one-dimensional strongly convex quadratic objective $F(w) = \mathbb{E}[(w - X)^2]$, and fixed-batch instances of finite-NS Muon with the practical polynomial, positive input stabilization, EMA input ($\theta_t = 1$), fixed $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and decreasing steps $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-p}$ with $0 < p < 1$, for which*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\min\{1, |w_t - \mathbb{E}X|\}] > 0.$$

Consequently, the prescribed decreasing learning rates and fixed momentum need not yield last-iterate stationarity.

Our stochastic theorem uses $1 - \beta_t \downarrow 0$ to increase the noise-averaging window. The example therefore separates the fixed-memory and growing-memory noise-filtering regimes; variance reduction provides another approach to noise control [28].

E Proofs for Section 5: Density-One Rates

The proofs are organized in the order of Section 5: the sparse-peak counterexample, the general density-one counting argument, and the rate theorem. The perturbed fixed-step variant follows.

E.1 Proof of the Common Sparse-Peak Construction

Proof of Proposition 5.1. The bumps in (5.1) have disjoint supports, height $1/k$, and width $O(1/k)$. Because $|x_{t_k}| \asymp e^{k^2/5}$, their supports are disjoint for sufficiently large k . Thus $H > 0$ is smooth with $\sup |H'| < \infty$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} H = \pi + (\int \rho) \sum_{k \geq k_0} k^{-2} < \infty$. Consequently F is globally smooth and lower bounded, with $H(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow -\infty$.

In either regime, positive gradients give $M_t, N_t, D_t > 0$, so w_t decreases. If $w_t \rightarrow w_* > -\infty$, then $H(w_t) \rightarrow h_* = H(w_*) > 0$ and $M_t, N_t \rightarrow h_*$: for fixed momentum this follows from $\beta < 1$, and for increasing momentum from $\sum_t (1 - \beta_t) = \infty$. Hence $D_t \rightarrow \Phi_\varepsilon(h_*) > 0$, contradicting $\sum_t \eta_t = \infty$. Therefore $w_t \downarrow -\infty$.

The first-crossing time s_k defined in Section 5.1 is finite for all large k . Since $0 < D_t \leq u_J$ and the learning rates are bounded, reaching x_{t_k} requires $s_k \geq ce^{k^2/5}$ for some $c > 0$. If the crossing step is shorter than $1/k$, then

$$|w_{s_k} - x_{t_k}| \leq \frac{1}{2k}, \quad H(w_{s_k}) \geq \frac{1}{k}. \quad (\text{E.1})$$

We verify this step bound in both regimes.

Fixed steps. Define the first exit time from the $(k-1)$ st bump by $\tau_k := \min\{t \geq 2 : w_t \leq x_{t_{k-1}} - 1/(k-1)\}$. The uniform step bound and $|x_{t_k} - x_{t_{k-1}}| \asymp e^{k^2/5}$ imply $s_k - \tau_k \geq c_1 e^{k^2/5}$ for large k . Between τ_k and $s_k - 1$, the earlier bumps have been passed and $H(w_t) \leq 2/k$. Hence, with $H_{\max} = \sup H$,

$$M_{s_k-1} \leq H_{\max} \beta^{s_k - \tau_k} + \frac{2}{k} \leq \frac{3}{k}, \quad N_{s_k-1} \leq \frac{3}{k}.$$

The finite-NS bound and the admissible learning rate give

$$w_{s_k-1} - w_{s_k} \leq \frac{\eta u_J}{\varepsilon} N_{s_k-1} \leq \frac{3(1-\beta)}{4Lk} < \frac{1}{k}.$$

Thus (E.1) holds.

Diminishing steps. The bound on s_k and $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-4/5}$ yield

$$w_{s_k-1} - w_{s_k} \leq \eta_0 u_J (s_k - 1)^{-4/5} = o(k^{-1}),$$

so (E.1) again holds.

In either case, for every $\nu > 0$,

$$s_k^\nu |F'(w_{s_k})| \geq \frac{c^\nu e^{\nu k^2/5}}{k} \longrightarrow \infty.$$

The fixed-step parameters satisfy Theorem 3.2; the second regime satisfies Theorem 4.2 since $p = 4/5$, $q = 1/2$, and $\zeta_t = 0$. Both theorems give $|F'(w_t)| \rightarrow 0$, completing the proof. $\square$

E.2 A General Summability-to-Density Principle

Lemma E.1 (Summability implies a density-one rate). *Let $a_t \geq 0$, $0 \leq p < 1$, and $s > 0$. If*

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} t^{-p} a_t^s < \infty,$$

then

$$a_t = o_{\text{dens}}(t^{-(1-p)/s}). \quad (\text{E.2})$$

E.2.1 Proof of Lemma E.1

Proof. Set $b_t = t^{-p} a_t^s \geq 0$ and $B_* := \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} b_t < \infty$. For any $c > 0$, define the bad set $\mathcal{B}_c := \{t : a_t > c t^{-(1-p)/s}\}$. For $t \in \mathcal{B}_c$, $b_t > c^s/t$, so

$$\frac{\#(\mathcal{B}_c \cap [1, T])}{T} \leq \frac{1}{c^s T} \sum_{t=1}^T t b_t.$$

The right side tends to zero: given any integer $N < T$,

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T t b_t \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^N t b_t + \sum_{t>N} b_t.$$

First let $T \rightarrow \infty$, then $N \rightarrow \infty$. This proves (E.2). $\square$

E.3 Proof of Theorem 5.3

Proof. For the fixed-step exact-gradient regime, Theorem 3.2 gives $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \|g_t\|^2 < \infty$. Lemma E.1, applied with $p = 0$, $s = 2$, and $a_t = \|g_t\|$, yields (5.2). The square-summable-error extension is stated separately in Corollary E.2.

For the stochastic regime, Theorem 4.2 gives $\sum_t \eta_t \|g_t\|^2 < \infty$ almost surely. If $p < 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, substitute $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-p}$ and apply Lemma E.1 with $s = 2$. If $\varepsilon = 0$, then $\psi_0(x) = x$ and (4.7) yield $\sum_t t^{-p} \|g_t\| < \infty$ almost surely. The same lemma with $s = 1$ gives the second rate in (5.3). $\square$

E.4 Density-One Rates under Square-Summable Perturbations

Corollary E.2 (Perturbed fixed-step density-one rate). *Under the pathwise conditions of Theorem C.2, $\|g_t\| = o_{\text{dens}}(t^{-1/2})$. Under (C.11), the rate holds almost surely.*

Proof. Apply Lemma E.1 with $p = 0$, $s = 2$, and $a_t = \|g_t\|$, using (C.10). $\square$