

# A Second-Order Method for Strongly Convex $\ell_1$ -Regularization Problems

Kimon Fountoulakis and Jacek Gondzio

the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later

**Abstract** In this paper a robust second-order method is developed for the solution of strongly convex  $\ell_1$ -regularized problems. The main aim is to make the proposed method as inexpensive as possible, while even difficult problems can be efficiently solved. The proposed method is a primal-dual Newton Conjugate Gradients (pdNCG) method. Convergence properties of pdNCG are studied and worst-case iteration complexity is established. Numerical results are presented on a synthetic sparse least-squares problem and two real world machine learning problems.

**Keywords**  $\ell_1$ -regularization · Strongly convex optimization · Second-order methods · Iteration Complexity · Newton Conjugate-Gradients method

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2000)** 68W40, 65K05, 90C06, 90C25, 90C30, 90C51

## 1 Introduction

We are concerned with the solution of the following optimization problem

$$\text{minimize } f_\tau(x) := \tau\|x\|_1 + \varphi(x), \quad (1)$$

---

J. Gondzio is supported by EPSRC Grant EP/I017127/1

Kimon Fountoulakis  
School of Mathematics and Maxwell Institute, The University of Edinburgh, Mayfield Road,  
Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom.  
E-mail: K.Fountoulakis@sms.ed.ac.uk  
Tel.: +44 131 650 5083

Jacek Gondzio  
School of Mathematics and Maxwell Institute, The University of Edinburgh, Mayfield Road,  
Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom.  
E-mail: J.Gondzio@ed.ac.uk  
Tel.: +44 131 650 8574, Fax: +44 131 650 6553

where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\tau > 0$  and  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is the  $\ell_1$ -norm. The following three assumptions are made.

- The function  $\varphi(x)$  is twice differentiable, and
- strongly convex everywhere, which implies that at any  $x$  its second derivative  $\nabla^2\varphi(x)$  is uniformly bounded

$$\lambda_m I \preceq \nabla^2\varphi(x) \preceq \lambda_1 I, \quad (2)$$

with  $0 < \lambda_m \leq \lambda_1$ , where  $I_m$  is the  $m \times m$  identity matrix.

- The second derivative of  $\varphi(x)$  is Lipschitz continuous

$$\|\nabla^2\varphi(y) - \nabla^2\varphi(x)\| \leq L_\varphi \|y - x\|, \quad (3)$$

for any  $x, y$ , where  $L_\varphi \geq 0$  is the Lipschitz constant,  $\|\cdot\|$  is the  $\ell_2$ -norm.

A variety of problems originating from the “new” economy including Big-Data [20], Machine Learning [24] and Regression [25] problems to mention a few can be cast in the form of (1). Such problems usually consist of large-scale data, which frequently impose restrictions on methods that have been so far employed. For instance, the new methods have to be memory efficient and ideally, within seconds they should offer noticeable progress in reducing the objective function. First-order methods meet some of these requirements. They avoid matrix factorizations which implies low memory requirements, additionally, they sometimes offer fast progress in the initial stages of optimization. Unfortunately, *first-order methods may not always converge, or they might experience slow practical convergence*. The reason that first-order methods exhibit such performance is that they miss essential information about the conditioning of the problem. The main *advantage* of first-order methods, which is to rely only on simple and inexpensive operations such as matrix-vector products or merely coordinate updates, becomes their essential *weakness*. First-order methods do not estimate sufficient higher order information. Therefore, if the problem is trivial, i.e. very well conditioned, as the instances used in tests performed in [20], they are efficient; if the problem is not so well-conditioned they start to struggle; if the problem gets complicated, they stall forever and fail to converge.

We do not think this inherent weakness of first-order methods can be remedied. For this reason, in this paper, a second-order method is used instead, i.e. a primal-dual Newton Conjugate Gradients. The optimization community seems to consider the second-order methods to be rather expensive. The main aim in this paper is to make the proposed method as *inexpensive* as possible, while even complicated problems can be efficiently solved. To accomplish this, pdNCG is used in a matrix-free environment i.e. Conjugate Gradients is used to compute inexact Newton directions. No matrix factorization is performed and no excessive memory requirements are needed. Consequently, the main drawbacks of Newton method are removed, while at the same time their fast convergence properties are provably retained. In order to meet this goal, the

$\ell_1$ -norm is approximated by a smooth function which has derivatives of all degrees. Hence, problem (1) is replaced by

$$\text{minimize } f_\tau^\mu(x) := \tau\psi_\mu(x) + \varphi(x).$$

where  $\psi_\mu(x)$  denotes the smooth function which substitutes the  $\ell_1$ -norm and  $\mu$  is a parameter which controls the quality of approximation. Smoothing will allow access to second-order information and essential curvature information will be exploited.

In the theoretical front we show that the analysis of pdNCG can be performed in a variable metric using an important property of CG. The variable metric is the standard Euclidean norm scaled by an approximation of the second-order derivative at every iteration of pdNCG. Based on the variable metric we give a complete analysis of pdNCG, i.e. proof of global convergence, global and local convergence rates, local region of fast convergence rate and worst-case iteration complexity.

In what follows in this section we give a brief introduction of the smoothing technique. In Section 2, necessary basic results are given which will be used to support theoretical results in Section 4. In Section 3, the proposed pdNCG method is described in details. In Section 4, the convergence analysis and worst-case iteration complexity of pdNCG is studied. In Section 5, numerical results are presented.

### 1.1 Pseudo-Huber regularization


The non-smoothness of the  $\ell_1$ -norm prevents a straightforward application of the second-order method to problem (1). In this subsection, we focus on approximating the non-smooth  $\ell_1$ -norm by a smooth function. To meet such a goal, the first-order methods community replaces the  $\ell_1$ -norm with the so-called Huber penalty function  $\sum_{i=1}^m \phi_\mu(x_i)$  [2], where

$$\phi_\mu(x_i) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \frac{x_i^2}{\mu}, & \text{if } |x_i| \leq \mu \\ |x_i| - \frac{1}{2}\mu, & \text{if } |x_i| \geq \mu \end{cases} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m$$

and  $\mu > 0$ . The smaller the parameter  $\mu$  of the Huber function is, the better the function approximates the  $\ell_1$ -norm. Observe that the Huber function is only first-order differentiable, therefore, this approximation trick is not applicable to second-order methods. Fortunately, there is a smooth version of the Huber function, the pseudo-Huber function which has derivatives of all degrees [10]. The pseudo-Huber function parameterized with  $\mu > 0$  is

$$\psi_\mu(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \sqrt{\mu^2 + x_i^2} - \mu \right). \quad (4)$$

A comparison of the three functions  $\ell_1$ -norm, Huber and Pseudo-Huber function can be seen in Figure 1.



**Fig. 1** Comparison of the approximation functions, Huber and pseudo-Huber, with the  $\ell_1$ -norm in one dimensional space. **Fig.1a** shows the quality of approximation for the Huber and pseudo-Huber functions. **Fig.1b** shows how pseudo-Huber function converges to the  $\ell_1$ -norm as  $\mu \rightarrow 0$

The pseudo-Huber function is employed in design of an efficient second-order method in this paper. In particular, the  $\ell_1$ -regularization problem in (1) is replaced with the following approximation

$$\text{minimize } f_{\tau}^{\mu}(x) := \tau\psi_{\mu}(x) + \varphi(x). \quad (5)$$

The advantages of such an approach are listed below.

- Availability of second-order information owed to the differentiability of the pseudo-Huber function.
- Opening the door to using iterative methods to compute descent directions which take into account the curvature of the problem, such as CG.

There is an obvious cost which comes along with the above benefits, and that is the approximate nature of the pseudo-Huber function. There is a concern that in case that a very accurate solution is required, the pseudo-Huber function may be unable to deliver it. In theory, since the quality of the approximation is controlled by parameter  $\mu$  in (4), see Figure 1, the pseudo-Huber function can recover any level of accuracy under the condition that sufficiently small  $\mu$  is chosen. The reader is referred to [1] for a perturbation analysis when the  $\ell_1$ -norm is replaced with the Pseudo-Huber function. In practise a very small parameter  $\mu$  might worsen the conditioning of the linear algebra of the solver. However, we shall provide numerical evidence that even when  $\mu$  is set to small values, i.e. 1.0e-6, the proposed method behaves well and remains very efficient.

## 2 Preliminaries

The  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  denotes the infinity norm. The operator  $diag(\cdot)$  takes as input a vector and creates a diagonal matrix with the input vector on the diagonal. The operator  $[\cdot]_{ij}$  returns the element at row  $i$  and column  $j$  of the input matrix.

### 2.1 Properties of pseudo-Huber function

The gradient of the pseudo-Huber function  $\psi_\mu(x)$  in (4) is given by

$$\nabla\psi_\mu(x) = \left[ x_1 \left( \mu^2 + x_1^2 \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \dots, x_m \left( \mu^2 + x_m^2 \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right], \quad (6)$$

and the Hessian is given by

$$\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x) = \mu^2 \text{diag} \left( \left[ \left( \mu^2 + x_1^2 \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \dots, \left( \mu^2 + x_m^2 \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \right] \right). \quad (7)$$

The next lemma guarantees that the Hessian of the pseudo-Huber function  $\psi_\mu(x)$  is bounded.

**Lemma 1** *The Hessian matrix  $\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x)$  satisfies*

$$0I \prec \nabla^2\psi_\mu(x) \preceq \frac{1}{\mu}I$$

where  $I$  is the identity matrix in appropriate dimension.

*Proof* The result follows easily by observing that  $0 < (\mu^2 + x_i^2)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \leq 1/\mu^3$  for any  $x_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ . The proof is complete.

The next lemma shows that the Hessian matrix of the pseudo-Huber function is Lipschitz continuous.

**Lemma 2** *The Hessian matrix  $\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x)$  is Lipschitz continuous*

$$\|\nabla^2\psi_\mu(y) - \nabla^2\psi_\mu(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{\mu^2}\|y - x\|.$$

*Proof*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2\psi_\mu(y) - \nabla^2\psi_\mu(x)\| &= \left\| \int_0^1 \frac{d\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x + s(y-x))}{ds} ds \right\| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \left\| \frac{d\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x + s(y-x))}{ds} \right\| ds \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\frac{d\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x+s(y-x))}{ds}$  is a diagonal matrix with each diagonal component,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , given by

$$\left[ \frac{d\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x + s(y-x))}{ds} \right]_{ii} = \frac{-3\mu^2(x_i + s(y_i - x_i))(y_i - x_i)}{(\mu^2 + (x_i + s(y_i - x_i))^2)^{\frac{5}{2}}}.$$

Using the previous observation we have that

$$\left\| \frac{d\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x + s(y-x))}{ds} \right\| = \max_{i=1,2,\dots,m} \left| \left[ \frac{d\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x + s(y-x))}{ds} \right]_{ii} \right| \quad (9)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left[ \frac{d\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x + s(y-x))}{ds} \right]_{ii} \right| &= \left| \frac{-3\mu^2(x_i + s(y_i - x_i))(y_i - x_i)}{(\mu^2 + (x_i + s(y_i - x_i))^2)^{\frac{5}{2}}} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{-3\mu^2(x_i + s(y_i - x_i))}{(\mu^2 + (x_i + s(y_i - x_i))^2)^{\frac{5}{2}}} \right| |y_i - x_i| \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the first absolute value in (10) has a maximum at  $\frac{\mu - 2x_i}{2(y_i - x_i)}$ , which gives

$$\left| \frac{-3\mu^2(x_i + s(y_i - x_i))}{(\mu^2 + (x_i + s(y_i - x_i))^2)^{\frac{5}{2}}} \right| \leq \frac{48}{25\sqrt{5}\mu^2} < \frac{1}{\mu^2}. \quad (11)$$

Combining (10) and (11) we get

$$\left| \left[ \frac{d\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x + s(y-x))}{ds} \right]_{ii} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\mu^2} |y_i - x_i|. \quad (12)$$

Replacing (12) in (9) and using the fact that  $\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq \|\cdot\|$  we get

$$\left\| \frac{d\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x + s(y-x))}{ds} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\mu^2} \|y - x\|.$$

Replacing the above expression in (8) and calculating the integral we arrive at the desired result. The proof is complete.

The next lemma shows that the gradient of the pseudo-Huber function is Lipschitz continuous.

**Lemma 3** *The gradient  $\nabla\psi_\mu(x)$  is Lipschitz continuous*

$$\|\nabla\psi_\mu(y) - \nabla\psi_\mu(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{\mu} \|y - x\|.$$

*Proof* Using the fundamental theorem of calculus, like in proof of Lemma 2, and Lemma 1 it is easy to show the result. The proof is complete.

## 2.2 Properties of function $f_\tau^\mu(x)$

The gradient of  $f_\tau^\mu(x)$  is given by

$$\nabla f_\tau^\mu(x) = \tau \nabla\psi_\mu(x) + \nabla\varphi(x)$$

where  $\nabla\psi_\mu(x)$  has been defined in (6). The Hessian matrix of  $f_\tau^\mu(x)$  is

$$\nabla^2 f_\tau^\mu(x) = \tau \nabla^2\psi_\mu(x) + \nabla^2\varphi(x).$$

where  $\nabla^2\psi_\mu(x)$  has been defined in (7). Using (2) and Lemma 1 we get the following bounds on the Hessian matrix of  $f_\tau^\mu(x)$

$$\lambda_m I \prec \nabla^2 f_\tau^\mu(x) \preceq \left(\frac{\tau}{\mu} + \lambda_1\right) I, \quad (13)$$

where  $I$  is the identity matrix in appropriate dimension.

**Lemma 4** *For any  $x$  and  $x^*$ , the minimizer of  $f_\tau^\mu(x)$ , the following holds*

$$\frac{1}{2\left(\frac{\tau}{\mu} + \lambda_1\right)} \|\nabla f_\tau^\mu(x)\|^2 \leq f_\tau^\mu(x) - f_\tau^\mu(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda_m} \|\nabla f_\tau^\mu(x)\|^2$$

and

$$\|x - x^*\| \leq \frac{2}{\lambda_m} \|\nabla f_\tau^\mu(x)\|.$$

*Proof* The right hand side of the first inequality is proved on page 460 of [3]. The left hand side of the first inequality is proved by using strong convexity of  $f_\tau^\mu(x)$ ,

$$f_\tau^\mu(y) \leq f_\tau^\mu(x) + \nabla f_\tau^\mu(x)^\top (y - x) + \frac{\tau}{2} \|y - x\|^2$$

and defining  $\tilde{y} = x - \frac{1}{\frac{\tau}{\mu} + \lambda_1} \nabla f_\tau^\mu(x)$ . We get

$$f_\tau^\mu(x) - f_\tau^\mu(x^*) \geq f_\tau^\mu(x) - f_\tau^\mu(\tilde{y}) \geq \frac{1}{2\left(\frac{\tau}{\mu} + \lambda_1\right)} \|\nabla f_\tau^\mu(x)\|^2.$$

The last inequality is proved on page 460 of [3]. The proof is complete.

The following lemma guarantees that the Hessian matrix  $\nabla^2 f_\tau^\mu(x)$  is Lipschitz continuous. In this lemma,  $L_\varphi$  is defined in (3).

**Lemma 5** *The function  $\nabla^2 f_\tau^\mu(x)$  is Lipschitz continuous*

$$\|\nabla^2 f_\tau^\mu(y) - \nabla^2 f_\tau^\mu(x)\| \leq L_{f_\tau^\mu} \|y - x\|,$$

where  $L_{f_\tau^\mu} := \frac{\tau}{\mu^2} + L_\varphi$ .

*Proof* Using Lemma 2 and (3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2 f_\tau^\mu(y) - \nabla^2 f_\tau^\mu(x)\| &\leq \tau \|\nabla^2 \psi_\mu(y) - \nabla^2 \psi_\mu(x)\| + \|\nabla^2 \varphi(y) - \nabla^2 \varphi(x)\| \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\tau}{\mu^2} + L_\varphi\right) \|y - x\|. \end{aligned}$$

The Lipschitz constant of  $\nabla^2 f_\tau^\mu(x)$  is therefore  $L_{f_\tau^\mu} := \frac{\tau}{\mu^2} + L_\varphi$ .

The next lemma shows how well the second-order Taylor expansion of  $f_\tau^\mu(x)$  approximates the function  $f_\tau^\mu(x)$ .

**Lemma 6** *If  $q_\tau^\mu(y)$  is a quadratic approximation of the function  $f_\tau^\mu(x)$  at  $x$*

$$q_\tau^\mu(y) := f_\tau^\mu(x) + \nabla f_\tau^\mu(x)^\top (y - x) + \frac{1}{2}(y - x)^\top \nabla^2 f_\tau^\mu(x)(y - x),$$

then

$$|f_\tau^\mu(y) - q_\tau^\mu(y)| \leq \frac{1}{6} L_{f_\tau^\mu} \|y - x\|^3.$$

*Proof* Using corollary 1.5.3 in [18] and Lemma 5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f_\tau^\mu(y) - q_\tau^\mu(y)| &\leq \|y - x\|^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^t \|\nabla^2 f_\tau^\mu(x + s(y - x)) - \nabla^2 f_\tau^\mu(x)\| ds dt \\ &\leq \|y - x\|^2 \int_0^1 \int_0^t s L_{f_\tau^\mu} \|y - x\| ds dt \\ &= \frac{1}{6} L_{f_\tau^\mu} \|y - x\|^3. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete.

### 2.3 Alternative optimality conditions

The first-order optimality conditions of problem (5) are  $\nabla f_\tau^\mu(x) = \tau \nabla \psi_\mu(x) + \nabla \phi(x) = 0$ . Therefore, one could simply apply a Newton-CG method in order to find a root of this equation. However, in a series of papers [5,6] it has been noted that the linearization of  $\nabla \psi_\mu(x)$  for Newton-CG method might be a poor approximation of  $\nabla \psi_\mu(x)$  close to the optimal solution, hence, the method is misbehaving. This argument is supported with numerical experiments in [6], it is also worth mentioning that our empirical experience confirms the results of the previous paper. To deal with this problem the authors in [6] suggested to solve a reformulation of the optimality conditions which for the problems of our interest is

$$\begin{aligned} \tau y + \nabla \phi(x) &= 0 \\ D^{-1} y - x &= 0 \\ \|y\|_\infty &\leq 1, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where  $D$  is a diagonal matrix with components

$$[D]_{ii} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu^2 + x_i^2}} \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, m. \tag{15}$$

The basic idea behind this reformulation is that the linearization of the second equation in (14) is of much better quality than the linearization of  $\nabla \psi_\mu(x)$ , examples are given in [6]. Moreover, notice that the optimality conditions (14) correspond to the primal-dual optimality conditions of problem (5).

In this paper, we follow the same reasoning and solve (14) instead, this also explains the primal-dual suffix in the name of the proposed method.



## 2.4 A property of Conjugate Gradients algorithm

The following property of CG is used in the convergence analysis of pdNCG.

**Lemma 7** *Let  $Ax = b$ , where  $A$  is a symmetric and positive definite matrix. Furthermore, let us assume that this system is solved using CG approximately; CG is terminated prematurely at the  $i^{\text{th}}$  iteration. Then if CG is initialized with the zero solution the approximate solution  $x_i$  satisfies*

$$x_i^\top Ax_i = x_i^\top b.$$

*The same result holds when Preconditioned CG (PCG) is used.*

*Proof* The following property is shown in proof of Lemma 2.4.1 in [13]. If CG algorithm is initialised with the zero solution  $p_0 = 0$ , then it returns a solution  $x_i$  which satisfies

$$x_i := \arg \min_p \left\{ \frac{1}{2} p^\top A p - b^\top p \mid p \in \mathcal{E}_i \right\},$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_i := \text{span}(b, Ab, \dots, A^{i-1}b).$$

Therefore for every  $p \in \mathcal{E}_i$ , at  $t = 0$ , we get

$$\frac{d\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_i + tp)^\top A(x_i + tp) - (x_i + tp)^\top b\right)}{dt} = (Ax_i - b)^\top p = 0.$$

Since,  $x_i \in \mathcal{E}_i$ , then

$$(Ax_i - b)^\top x_i = 0 \iff x_i^\top Ax_i = x_i^\top b.$$

This completes the first part. In case that PCG is employed with symmetric positive definite preconditioner  $P = EE^\top$ , then PCG is equivalent to solving approximately the system  $E^{-1}AE^{-\top}\xi = E^{-1}b$  using CG and then calculating  $x_i = E^{-\top}\xi_i$ . Therefore, by applying the previous we get that  $\xi_i^\top E^{-1}AE^{-\top}\xi_i = \xi_i^\top E^{-1}b$  and by substituting  $\xi_i = E^\top x_i$  we prove the second part. The proof is complete.

## 3 Primal-Dual Newton Conjugate Gradients

In this section we describe a variation of Newton-CG, which we name primal-dual Newton-CG (pdNCG), for the solution of the primal-dual optimality conditions (14). The method is similar to the one in [6] for signal reconstruction problems, although, the two approaches differ in step 3 of pdNCG. Additionally, we make a step further and give complete convergence analysis and worst-case iteration complexity results in Section 4. A detailed pseudo-code of the method is given below.

---

**Algorithm pdNCG**


---

1: **Loop:** For  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , until  $\|d^k\|_{x^k} \leq \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon > 0$ .

2: Obtain  $d^k$  by solving approximately the system

$$H(x^k, y^k)d = -\nabla f_\tau^\mu(x^k) \quad (16)$$

using CG or PCG, where

$$H(x, y) = \tau D(I - D \text{diag}(x) \text{diag}(y)) + \nabla^2 \phi(x) \quad (17)$$

and matrix  $D$  is defined in (15). Obtain  $\Delta y^k$  by calculating

$$\Delta y^k = D(I - D \text{diag}(x) \text{diag}(y))d - (y^k - Dx^k). \quad (18)$$

3: Set  $\tilde{y}^{k+1} = y^k + \Delta y^k$  and calculate

$$y^{k+1} := P_{\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq 1}(\tilde{y}^{k+1}),$$

where  $P_{\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq 1}(\cdot)$  is the orthogonal projection in the  $\ell_\infty$  ball.

4: Find the least integer  $j \geq 0$  such that the function  $f_\tau^\mu(x)$  is sufficiently decreased along  $d^k$

$$f_\tau^\mu(x^k + c_3^j d^k) \leq f_\tau^\mu(x^k) - c_2 c_3^j \|d^k\|_{x^k},$$

where  $0 < c_2 < 1/2$ ,  $0 < c_3 < 1$ , and set  $\alpha = c_3^j$ .

5: Set  $x^{k+1} = x^k + \alpha d^k$ .

---

In algorithm pdNCG we make use of the local norm

$$\|\cdot\|_{x^k} := \sqrt{\langle \cdot, H(x^k, y^k) \cdot \rangle}, \quad (19)$$

where  $H(x^k, y^k)$  is a positive definite matrix under the condition that  $\|y^k\|_\infty \leq 1$  (Lemma 8). Step 2 of pdNCG is the approximate solution of the linearization of the first two equations in (14). The matrix  $H(x, y)$  is obtained by simply eliminating the variables  $\Delta y^k$  in the linearized system. Step 2 is performed by CG or PCG which is always initialized with the zero solution and it is terminated when

$$\|r_\tau^\mu(x, y)\| \leq \eta \|\nabla f_\tau^\mu(x)\|, \quad (20)$$

where  $r_\tau^\mu(x, y) = H(x, y)d + \nabla f_\tau^\mu(x)$  is the residual and  $0 \leq \eta < 1$  is a user-defined constant. In practice we have observed that setting  $\eta^k = 1.0e-1$  results in very fast convergence, however, the method will be analyzed for  $\eta^k$  set as in

$$\eta^k = \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \|\nabla f_\tau^\mu(x^k)\|^{c_0}\right\}, \quad (21)$$

with  $c_0 = 1$ .

Step 3 is a projection of  $\tilde{y}^{k+1}$  to the set  $\|y\|_\infty \leq 1$  such that feasibility of the third condition in (14) is always maintained. The projection operator is

$$v := P_{\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq 1}(u) = \text{sign}(u) \min(u, 1)$$

and it is applied component-wise. Step 4 is a backtracking line-search technique in order to guarantee that the sequence  $\{x^k\}$  generated by pdNCG monotonically decreases the objective function  $f_\tau^\mu(x)$ .

#### 4 Convergence analysis and worst-case iteration complexity

In this section we analyze the pdNCG method. In particular, we prove global convergence, we study the global and local convergence rates and we explicitly define a region in which pdNCG has fast convergence rate. Additionally, worst-case iteration complexity result of pdNCG is presented. The reader will notice that the results in this section are established when CG is used in step 2 of pdNCG. However, based on Lemma 7 it is trivial to show that the same results hold if PCG is used.

Before we introduce notational conventions for this section, it is necessary to find uniform bounds for matrix  $H(x, y)$  in (17). This is shown in the following lemma.

**Lemma 8** *If  $\|y\|_\infty \leq 1$ , then matrix  $H(x, y)$  is uniformly bounded by*

$$\lambda_m I \prec H(x, y) \preceq \left( \frac{\tau}{\mu} + \lambda_1 \right) I,$$

where  $I$  is the identity matrix in appropriate dimension.

*Proof* This result easily follows by using the definition of  $H(x, y)$  in (17) and (2). A similar argument, but for signal reconstruction problems, is also claimed in [6], page 1970. The proof is complete.

The equivalence of the Euclidean and the local norm (19) if  $\|y\|_\infty \leq 1$ , is given by the following inequality

$$\lambda_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \|d\| \leq \|d\|_x \leq \left( \frac{\tau}{\mu} + \lambda_1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|d\|. \quad (22)$$

The upper bound of the largest eigenvalue of  $H(x, y)$  if  $\|y\|_\infty \leq 1$ , will be denoted by  $\tilde{\lambda}_1 = (\tau/\mu + \lambda_1)$ . An upper bound of the condition number of matrix  $H(x, y)$  will be denoted by  $\kappa = \tilde{\lambda}_1/\lambda_m$ . The Lipschitz constant  $L_{f_\tau^\mu}$  defined in Lemma 5, will be denoted by  $L$ . Finally, the indexes  $\tau$  and  $\mu$  from function  $f_\tau^\mu(x)$  are dropped.

##### 4.1 Global convergence

First, the minimum decrease of the objective function at every iteration of pdNCG is calculated.

**Lemma 9** Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be the current iteration of pdNCG,  $d \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be the pdNCG direction for the primal variables, which is calculated using CG. The parameter  $\eta$  of the termination criterion (20) of CG is set to  $0 \leq \eta < 1$ . If  $x$  is not the minimizer of problem (5), i.e.  $\nabla f(x) \neq 0$ , then the backtracking line-search algorithm in step 4 of pdNCG will calculate a step-size  $\bar{\alpha}$  such that

$$\bar{\alpha} \geq c_3 \frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_1}.$$

For this step-size  $\bar{\alpha}$  the following holds

$$f(x) - f(x(\bar{\alpha})) > c_4 \|d\|_x^2,$$

where  $c_4 = c_2 c_3 \frac{1}{\kappa}$  and  $x(\bar{\alpha}) = x + \bar{\alpha}d$ .

*Proof* For  $x(\alpha) = x + \alpha d$  and from strong convexity of  $f(x)$  we have

$$f(x(\alpha)) \leq f(x) + \alpha \nabla f(x)^\top d + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \tilde{\lambda}_1 \|d\|^2.$$

From Lemma 8 we have that  $H(x, y)$  is positive definite if  $\|y\|_\infty \leq 1$ , which is the condition that always satisfied by step 3 of pdNCG. Then, if  $\nabla f(x) \neq 0$  the CG algorithm terminated at the  $i^{\text{th}}$  iteration returns the vector  $d_i \neq 0$  which according to Lemma 7 satisfies

$$d_i^\top H(x, y) d_i = -d_i^\top \nabla f(x).$$

Therefore, by setting  $d := d_i$  we get

$$f(x(\alpha)) \leq f(x) - \alpha \|d\|_x^2 + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \tilde{\lambda}_1 \|d\|^2.$$

Using (22) we get

$$f(x(\alpha)) \leq f(x) - \alpha \|d\|_x^2 + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_m} \|d\|_x^2.$$

The right hand side of the above inequality is minimized for  $\bar{\alpha} = \frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_1}$ , which gives

$$f(x(\bar{\alpha})) \leq f(x) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_1} \|d\|_x^2.$$

Observe that for this step-size the exit condition of the backtracking line-search algorithm is satisfied, since

$$f(x(\bar{\alpha})) \leq f(x) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_1} \|d\|_x^2 < f(x) - c_2 \frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_1} \|d\|_x^2.$$

Therefore the step-size  $\bar{\alpha}$  returned by the backtracking line-search algorithm is in worst-case bounded by

$$\bar{\alpha} \geq c_3 \frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_1},$$

which results in the following decrease of the objective function

$$f(x) - f(x(\bar{\alpha})) > c_2 c_3 \frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_1} \|d\|_x^2 = c_2 c_3 \frac{1}{\kappa} \|d\|_x^2.$$

The proof is complete.

Global convergence of pdNCG for the primal variables is proved in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1** *Let  $\{x^k\}$  be a sequence generated by pdNCG. The parameter  $\eta$  of the termination criterion (20) of the CG algorithm is set to  $0 \leq \eta < 1$ . Then the sequence  $\{x^k\}$  converges to  $x^*$ , which is the minimizer of  $f(x)$  in problem (5).*

*Proof* From Lemma 8 and step 3 of pdNCG we have that matrix  $H(x, y)$  is symmetric and positive definite at any  $x^k, y^k$ . Moreover, if  $0 \leq \eta < 1$  in (20), then CG returns  $d^k = 0$  at a point  $x^k$  if and only if  $\nabla f(x^k) = 0$ . Hence, only at optimality CG will return a zero direction. Moreover, from Lemma 9 we get that if  $\nabla f(x^k) \neq 0$ , then  $\bar{\alpha}^k$  is bounded away from zero and the function  $f(x)$  is monotonically decreasing when the step  $\bar{\alpha}^k d^k$  is applied. The monotonic decrease of the objective function implies that  $\{f(x^k)\}$  converges to a limit, thus,  $\{f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1})\} \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $f(x^0) < \infty$  and  $f(x)$  is monotonically decreased, where  $x^0$  is a finite first guess given as an input to pdNCG, then the sequence  $\{x^k\}$  belongs in a closed, bounded and therefore, compact sublevel set. Hence, the sequence  $\{x^k\}$  must have a subsequence which converges to a point  $x^*$  and this implies that  $\{x^k\}$  also converges to  $x^*$ . Using Lemma 9 and  $\{f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1})\} \rightarrow 0$  we get that  $\|d^k\|_x \rightarrow 0$ , hence, due to positive definiteness of  $H(x, y)$ ,  $\|d^k\| \rightarrow 0$ , which implies that  $\|\nabla f(x^k)\| \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore,  $x^*$  is a stationary point of function  $f(x)$ . Strong convexity of  $f(x)$  guarantees that a stationary point must be a minimizer. The proof is complete.

Convergence of the dual variables is shown in the following theorem.

**Theorem 2** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold. Then we have that the sequences of dual variables produced by pdNCG satisfy  $\{y^k\} \rightarrow Dx^*$ , where  $x^*$  is the optimal solution of problem (5). Furthermore, the previous implies that the primal-dual iterates of pdNCG converge to the solution of system (14).*

*Proof* From Theorem 1 we have that  $d^k \rightarrow 0$  and  $x^k \rightarrow x^*$ . Hence, from (14) we get that  $\Delta y^k \rightarrow -y^k + Dx^*$ . Moreover, we have that the iterates at step 3 of pdNCG  $\tilde{y}^k \rightarrow Dx^*$  and consequently

$$y^k = P_{\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq 1}(\tilde{y}) \rightarrow P_{\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq 1}(Dx^*) = Dx^*.$$

It is easy to check that these values of  $y^*$  with the optimal variable  $x^*$  satisfy the system (14). The proof is complete.

## 4.2 Region of fast convergence rate

In this subsection we define a region based on  $\|d\|_x$ , in which by setting parameter  $\eta$  as in (21) with  $c_0 = 1$ , pdNCG converges with fast rate. The lemma below shows the behaviour of the function  $f(x)$  when a step along the primal pdNCG direction is made.

**Lemma 10** *Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be the current iteration of pdNCG,  $d \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be the pdNCG direction for primal variables calculated by CG, which is terminated according to criterion (20) with  $0 \leq \eta < 1$ . Then*

$$f(x) - f(x(\alpha)) \geq \alpha \|d\|_x^2 - \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \|d\|_x^2 - \frac{\alpha^3}{6} \frac{L}{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|d\|_x^3,$$

where  $x(\alpha) = x + \alpha d$  and  $\alpha > 0$ .

*Proof* Using Lemma 6 and setting  $y = x(\alpha) = x + \alpha d$  we get

$$f(x(\alpha)) \leq f(x) + \alpha \nabla f(x)^\top d + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} d^\top \nabla^2 f(x) d + \frac{\alpha^3}{6} L \|d\|_x^3.$$

From Lemma 8 and step 3 of pdNCG we have that (22) holds. Hence, using (22) and Lemma 7 we get

$$f(x(\alpha)) \leq f(x) - \alpha \|d\|_x^2 + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \|d\|_x^2 + \frac{\alpha^3}{6} \frac{L}{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|d\|_x^3.$$

The result is obtained by rearrangement of terms. The proof is complete.

The next lemma determines bounds on the norm of the primal direction  $d^k$  as a function of  $\|\nabla f_\tau^\mu(x^k)\|$ .

**Lemma 11** *Let  $d \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be the pdNCG primal direction calculated by CG which is terminated according to criterion (20) with  $0 \leq \eta < 1$ . Then the following holds*

$$\frac{1 - \eta^2}{2\tilde{\lambda}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\nabla f(x)\| \leq \|d\|_x \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_m^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\nabla f(x)\|$$

*Proof* By squaring (20) and making simple rearrangements of it we get

$$d^\top H(x, y)^2 d + 2\nabla f(x)^\top H(x, y) d + (1 - \eta^2) \|\nabla f(x)\|^2 \leq 0. \quad (23)$$

From step 3 of pdNCG we have that the condition of Lemma 8 is satisfied. Therefore by using Lemma 8 and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in (23) we get

$$\lambda_m^2 \|d\|^2 - 2\tilde{\lambda}_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla f(x)\| \|d\|_x + (1 - \eta^2) \|\nabla f(x)\|^2 \leq 0.$$

By dropping the quadratic term  $\lambda_m^2 \|d\|^2$  from the previous inequality and dividing by  $\|\nabla f(x)\|$ , after making appropriate rearrangements we get

$$\|d\|_x \geq \frac{1 - \eta^2}{2\tilde{\lambda}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\nabla f(x)\|.$$

This proves the left hand side of the result. For the right hand side, we simply use Lemma 7 and (22)

$$d^\top H(x, y)d = \|d\|_x^2 = -d^\top \nabla f(x) \leq \|d\| \|\nabla f(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_m^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|d\|_x \|\nabla f(x)\|.$$

By dividing with  $\|d\|_x$  we obtain the right hand side of our claim. The proof is complete.

The following lemma will be used to prove local fast convergence rate of pdNCG for the primal variables.

**Lemma 12** *Let the iterates  $x^k$  and  $y^k$  be produced by pdNCG, then the following holds*

$$\|\nabla^2 f(x^k) - H(x^k, y^k)\| \leq \gamma \|d^k\|_{x^k},$$

where

$$\gamma = \left( \frac{8\tilde{\lambda}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\lambda_m} (L + M + \frac{M}{\mu}) + \frac{M}{\lambda_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu} \right),$$

$M$  is a positive constant.

*Proof* Let  $x^*$  be the optimal solution of problem (5). We rewrite

$$\nabla^2 f(x^k) - H(x^k, y^k) = \nabla^2 f(x^k) - \nabla^2 f(x^*) + \nabla^2 f(x^*) - H(x^k, y^k).$$

Moreover, let  $y^*$  be the optimal dual variable, which according to Theorem 2 satisfies  $y^* = D(x^*)x^*$ . Notice that matrix  $D$  in (15) is dependent on variable  $x$ ; for the purposes of this proof we will explicitly denote this dependence. From the definition of  $H(x, y)$  in (17) we have that  $H(x^*, y^*) = \nabla^2 f(x^*)$ . The following holds

$$\|\nabla^2 f(x^k) - H(x^k, y^k)\| \leq \|\nabla^2 f(x^k) - \nabla^2 f(x^*)\| + \|H(x^*, y^*) - H(x^k, y^k)\|.$$

By Lipschitz continuity of  $\nabla^2 f(x)$  in Lemma 5 we get that

$$\|\nabla^2 f(x^k) - H(x^k, y^k)\| \leq L\|x^* - x^k\| + \|H(x^*, y^*) - H(x^k, y^k)\|. \quad (24)$$

We now focus on bounding  $\|H(x^*, y^*) - H(x^k, y^k)\|$ . Using the fundamental theorem of calculus we have

$$H(x^*, y^*) - H(x^k, y^k) = \int_0^1 \frac{dH(x^*(s), y^*(s))}{d(x^*(s), y^*(s))} [x^* - x^k; y^* - y^k] ds,$$

where  $x^*(s) = x^* + s(x^* - x^k)$  and  $y^*(s) = y^* + s(y^* - y^k)$ . Hence,

$$\|H(x^*, y^*) - H(x^k, y^k)\| \leq (\|x^* - x^k\| + \|y^* - y^k\|) \int_0^1 \left\| \frac{dH(x^*(s), y^*(s))}{d(x^*(s), y^*(s))} \right\| ds.$$

We now prove that  $dH(x^*(s), y^*(s))/d(x^*(s), y^*(s))$  is bounded in the set  $\mathbb{R}^m \times \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|y\|_\infty \leq 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2m}$ . Observe that the partial derivatives  $H(x, y)$  with respect to  $x$  or  $y$  are continuous. Therefore,  $dH(x^*(s), y^*(s))/d(x^*(s), y^*(s))$

is a continuous tensor. In this case, the only candidates of unboundedness are the limits  $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$ . It is easy to show that at the limits all partial derivatives are finite and this implies that every component of the tensor is bounded in  $\mathbb{R}^m \times \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|y\|_\infty \leq 1\}$ . We will denote the bound by a positive constant  $M$ , hence,

$$\|H(x^*, y^*) - H(x^k, y^k)\| \leq M(\|x^* - x^k\| + \|y^* - y^k\|). \quad (25)$$

It remains to find a bound for  $\|y^* - y^k\|$ . From step 3 of pdNCG we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|y^* - y^k\| &\leq \|P_{\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq 1}(y^*) - P_{\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq 1}(\tilde{y}^k)\| \leq \|y^* - \tilde{y}^k\| \\ &\leq \|D(x^*)x^* - D(x^k)x^k\| \\ &\quad + \|D(x^k)(I - D(x^k)\text{diag}(x^k)\text{diag}(y^k))\|\|d^k\| \\ &= \|\nabla\psi_\mu(x^*) + \nabla\psi_\mu(x^k)\| \\ &\quad + \|D(x^k)(I - D(x^k)\text{diag}(x^k)\text{diag}(y^k))\|\|d^k\|. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 3 and

$$D(x^k)(I - D(x^k)\text{diag}(x^k)\text{diag}(y^k)) \preceq D(x^k) \preceq \frac{1}{\mu}I,$$

which holds for  $\|y\|_\infty \leq 1$ , we have that

$$\|y^* - y^k\| \leq \frac{1}{\mu}\|x^* - x^k\| + \frac{1}{\mu}\|d^k\|. \quad (26)$$

By combining inequalities (25) and (26) in (24) we get

$$\|\nabla^2 f(x^k) - H(x^k, y^k)\| \leq (L + M + \frac{M}{\mu})\|x^* - x^k\| + \frac{M}{\mu}\|d^k\|.$$

Combining Lemmas 4, 11 and (21) for a bound on  $\|x^* - x^k\|$  we get

$$\|\nabla^2 f(x^k) - H(x^k, y^k)\| \leq \frac{8\tilde{\lambda}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\lambda_m}(L + M + \frac{M}{\mu})\|d^k\|_{x^k} + \frac{M}{\mu}\|d^k\|.$$

Using (22) we get the result. The proof is complete.

Based on Lemmas 10, 11 and 12, a region is defined in the following lemma, in which unit-step sizes are calculated by the backtracking line-search algorithm. Additionally, for this region,  $\|d^{k+1}\|_{x^{k+1}}$  is bounded as a function of  $\|d^k\|_{x^k}$ . In this lemma the constants  $c_2$  and  $c_3$  have been defined in step 4 of pdNCG, moreover,  $x^{k+1} = x^k + d^k$ .

**Lemma 13** *If  $\|d^k\|_{x^k} \leq 3(1 - 2c_2)\frac{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}}{L}$ , then the backtracking line-search algorithm in step 4 of pdNCG calculates unit step-sizes. Moreover, if the parameter  $\eta^k$  of the termination criterion (20) of CG is set as in (21) with  $c_0 = 1$ , then for two consequent primal directions  $d^k$ ,  $d^{k+1}$  and points  $x^k$ ,  $x^{k+1}$ , the following holds*

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{16\tilde{\lambda}_1\lambda_m + 2\gamma\lambda_m^{\frac{1}{2}} + L}{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|d^{k+1}\|_{x^{k+1}} \leq \left( \frac{1}{2} \frac{16\tilde{\lambda}_1\lambda_m + 2\gamma\lambda_m^{\frac{1}{2}} + L}{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|d^k\|_{x^k} \right)^2.$$



*Proof* By setting  $\bar{\alpha} = 1$  in Lemma 10 we get

$$f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|d^k\|_{x^k}^2 - \frac{1}{6} \frac{L}{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|d^k\|_{x^k}^3 = \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6} \frac{L}{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|d^k\|_{x^k} \right) \|d^k\|_{x^k}^2.$$

if  $\|d^k\|_{x^k} \leq 3(1 - 2c_2) \frac{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}}{L}$  we get

$$f(x^k) - f(x^{k+1}) \geq c_2 \|d^k\|_{x^k}^2,$$

which implies that  $\bar{\alpha} = 1$  satisfies the exit condition of the backtracking line-search algorithm. Let us define the quantities  $\nabla f(x(t))^\top h$ , where  $h \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $x(t) = x^k + td^k$  and  $x(\delta) = x^k + \delta d^k$  then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f(x(t))^\top h &= \nabla f(x^k)^\top h + t(d^k)^\top \nabla^2 f(x^k) h \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^u \nabla^3 f(x(\delta)) [d^k, d^k, h] d\delta du \\ &\leq \nabla f(x^k)^\top h + t(d^k)^\top \nabla^2 f(x^k) h \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^u \left| \nabla^3 f(x(\delta)) [d^k, d^k, h] \right| d\delta du \\ &= \nabla f(x^k)^\top h + t(d^k)^\top \nabla^2 f(x^k) h \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^u \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left| \frac{(d^k)^\top (\nabla^2 f(x(\delta)) - \nabla^2 f(x^k)) h}{\delta} \right| d\delta du \\ &\leq \nabla f(x^k)^\top h + t(d^k)^\top \nabla^2 f(x^k) h \\ &\quad + \|d^k\| \|h\| \int_0^t \int_0^u \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left\| \frac{1}{\delta} (\nabla^2 f(x(\delta)) - \nabla^2 f(x^k)) \right\| d\delta du \\ &\leq \nabla f(x^k)^\top h + t(d^k)^\top \nabla^2 f(x^k) h + \|d^k\| \|h\| \int_0^t \int_0^u L \|d^k\| d\delta du \\ &= \nabla f(x^k)^\top h + t(d^k)^\top \nabla^2 f(x^k) h + \frac{t^2}{2} L \|d^k\|^2 \|h\|. \end{aligned}$$

By taking absolute values and setting  $t = 1$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla f(x^{k+1})^\top h| &\leq |\nabla f(x^k)^\top h + (d^k)^\top \nabla^2 f(x^k) h| + \frac{1}{2} L \|d^k\|^2 \|h\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(x^k) + \nabla^2 f(x^k) d^k\| \|h\| + \frac{1}{2} L \|d^k\|^2 \|h\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(x^k) + H(x^k, y^k) d^k\| \|h\| \\ &\quad + \|\nabla^2 f(x^k) - H(x^k, y^k)\| \|d^k\| \|h\| + \frac{1}{2} L \|d^k\|^2 \|h\| \quad (27) \end{aligned}$$

Observe that from (21) with  $c^0 = 1$  we have that  $\eta^k \leq \|\nabla f(x^k)\|$ . Hence, combining the previous with Lemma 11 and (20) in (27) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla f(x^{k+1})^\top h| &\leq 8\tilde{\lambda}_1 \|d^k\|_{x^k}^2 \|h\| + \|\nabla^2 f(x^k) - H(x^k, y^k)\| \|d^k\| \|h\| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} L \|d^k\|^2 \|h\|. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 12 we have

$$|\nabla f(x^{k+1})^\top h| \leq 8\tilde{\lambda}_1 \|d^k\|_{x^k}^2 \|h\| + \gamma \|d^k\|_{x^k} \|d^k\| \|h\| + \frac{1}{2} L \|d^k\|^2 \|h\|.$$

From the equivalence of norms (22) we get

$$|\nabla f(x^{k+1})^\top h| \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{16\tilde{\lambda}_1 \lambda_m + 2\gamma \lambda_m^{\frac{1}{2}} + L}{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|d^k\|_{x^k}^2 \|h\|_{x^{k+1}}.$$

The previous result holds for every  $h \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , hence, by setting  $h = d^{k+1}$  and by using Lemma 7 we prove the second part of this lemma. The proof is complete.

The following corollary states the region of fast convergence rate of Newton-CG. By fast rate it is meant that if pdNCG is initialized in this region, then the worst-case iteration complexity result for convergence to  $x^*$  is of the form  $\log_2 \log_2 \frac{\text{constant}}{\text{required accuracy}}$ . This statement is proved in Subsection 4.3 in Theorem 4.

**Corollary 1** *If the parameter  $\eta^k$  in the termination criterion (20) of CG is set as in (21) with  $c_0 = 1$  and  $\|d^k\|_{x^k} < \varpi$ ,  $0 < \varpi \leq c_5$ , where*

$$c_5 = \min \left\{ 3(1 - 2c_2) \frac{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}}{L}, \frac{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}}{16\tilde{\lambda}_1 \lambda_m + 2\gamma \lambda_m^{\frac{1}{2}} + L} \right\},$$

*then according to Lemma 13 pdNCG converges with fast rate.*

#### 4.3 Worst-case iteration complexity

The following theorem shows the worst-case iteration complexity of pdNCG in order to enter the region of fast convergence rate, i.e.  $\|d\|_x < \varpi$ , where  $0 < \varpi \leq c_5$  and  $c_5$  has been defined in Corollary 1. In this theorem the constant  $c_4$  has been defined in Lemma 9,  $c_2$  and  $c_3$  are constants of the backtracking line-search algorithm in step 4 of pdNCG. Moreover,  $x^*$  denotes the minimizer of problem (5).

**Theorem 3** *Starting from an initial point  $x^0$ , such that  $\|d^0\|_{x^0} \geq \varpi$  and setting  $0 \leq \eta < 1$  in the termination criterion (20) of CG, then pdNCG requires at most*

$$K_1 = c_6 \log \left( \frac{f(x^0) - f(x^*)}{c_7 \varpi^2} \right),$$

*iterations to obtain a solution  $x^k$ ,  $k > 0$ , such that  $\|d^k\|_{x^k} < \varpi$ , where*

$$c_6 = \frac{2\kappa^2}{(1 - \eta^2)^2 c_2 c_3} \quad \text{and} \quad c_7 = \frac{1}{2\kappa}.$$

*Proof* Let us assume an iteration index  $k > 0$ , then from Lemmas 4 and 11 we get

$$f(x^k) - f(x^*) \geq \frac{1}{2\kappa} \|d^k\|_{x^k}^2, \quad (28)$$

and

$$f(x^{k-1}) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{2\kappa}{(1-\eta^2)^2} \|d^{k-1}\|_{x^{k-1}}^2. \quad (29)$$

From Lemma 9 we have

$$f(x^k) < f(x^{k-1}) - c_4 \|d^{k-1}\|_{x^{k-1}}^2. \quad (30)$$

Combining (29), (30) and subtracting  $f(x^*)$  from both sides we get

$$\begin{aligned} f(x^k) - f(x^*) &< \left(1 - \frac{(1-\eta^2)^2 c_4}{2\kappa}\right) (f(x^{k-1}) - f(x^*)) \\ &< \left(1 - \frac{(1-\eta^2)^2 c_4}{2\kappa}\right)^k (f(x^0) - f(x^*)) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{(1-\eta^2)^2 c_2 c_3}{2\kappa^2}\right)^k (f(x^0) - f(x^*)) \end{aligned}$$

From the last inequality and (28) we get

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa} \|d^k\|_{x^k}^2 < \left(1 - \frac{(1-\eta^2)^2 c_2 c_3}{2\kappa^2}\right)^k (f(x^0) - f(x^*)).$$

Using the definitions of constants  $c_6$  and  $c_7$  we have

$$\|d^k\|_{x^k}^2 < \left(1 - \frac{1}{c_6}\right)^k \frac{1}{c_7} (f(x^0) - f(x^*)).$$

Hence, we conclude that after at most  $K_1$  iterations as defined in the preamble of this theorem, the algorithm produces  $\|d^k\|_{x^k} < \varpi$ . The proof is complete.

The following theorem presents the worst-case iteration complexity result of pdNCG to obtain a solution  $x^l$ , of accuracy  $f(x^l) - f(x^*) < \epsilon$ , when initialized at a point inside the region of fast convergence.

**Theorem 4** *Suppose that there is an iteration index  $k$  of pdNCG, such that  $\|d^k\|_{x^k} < \varpi$ . If  $\eta$  in (20) is set as in (21) with  $c_0 = 1$ , then pdNCG needs at most*

$$K_2 = \log_2 \log_2 \left( \frac{c_8}{\epsilon} \right)$$

*iterations to obtain a solution  $x^l$ ,  $l > k$ , such that  $f(x^l) - f(x^*) < \epsilon$ , where*

$$c_8 = \frac{16\kappa\lambda_m^3}{(16\tilde{\lambda}_1\lambda_m + 2\gamma\lambda_m^{\frac{1}{2}} + L)^2}.$$

*Proof* Suppose that there is an iteration index  $k$  such that  $\|d^k\|_{x^k} < \varpi$ , then for an index  $l > k$ , by applying Lemma 13 recursively we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{16\tilde{\lambda}_1\lambda_m + 2\gamma\lambda_m^{\frac{1}{2}} + L}{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|d^l\|_{x^l} &\leq \left( \frac{1}{2} \frac{16\tilde{\lambda}_1\lambda_m + 2\gamma\lambda_m^{\frac{1}{2}} + L}{\lambda_m^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|d^k\|_{x^k} \right)^{2^{l-k}} \\ &< \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2^{l-k}}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

From Lemmas 4, 11 and  $\eta^k$  in (21) we get

$$f(x^l) - f(x^*) \leq 4\kappa \|d^l\|_{x^l}^2,$$

By replacing (31) in the above inequality we get

$$f(x^l) - f(x^*) < \frac{16\kappa\lambda_m^3}{(16\tilde{\lambda}_1\lambda_m + 2\gamma\lambda_m^{\frac{1}{2}} + L)^2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2^{l-k+1}}.$$

Hence, in order to obtain a solution  $x^l$ , such that  $f(x^l) - f(x^*) < \epsilon$ , pdNCG requires at most as many iterations as in the preamble of this theorem. The proof is complete.

The following theorem summarizes the complexity result of pdNCG. The constants  $c_6$ ,  $c_7$  and  $c_8$  in this theorem are defined in Theorems 3 and 4, respectively.

**Theorem 5** *Starting from an initial point  $x^0$ , such that  $\|d^0\|_{x^0} \geq \varpi$ , pdNCG requires at most*

$$K_3 = c_6 \log \left( \frac{f(x^0) - f(x^*)}{c_7\varpi^2} \right) + \log_2 \log_2 \left( \frac{c_8}{\epsilon} \right)$$

*iterations to converge to a solution  $x^k$ ,  $k > 0$ , of accuracy*

$$f(x^k) - f(x^*) < \epsilon.$$

## 5 Numerical Experience

We illustrate the robustness and efficiency of pdNCG on a synthetic  $\ell_1$ -regularized Sparse Least-Squares (S-LS) problem and two real world  $\ell_1$ -regularized Logistic Regression (LR) problems.

### 5.1 State-of-the-art first- and second-order methods

A number of efficient first-order methods [7, 11, 19, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30] have been developed for the solution of problem (1). Moreover, there has been a series of interesting papers which describe the adaptation of second-order methods to such problems [4, 31, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21]. The most efficient first-order methods rely on properties of the  $\ell_1$ -norm to obtain the new direction at each iteration. In particular, very often the direction is obtained by minimizing exactly an upper bound of the objective function in problem (1),

$$d := \arg \min_p \|x + p\|_1 + \varphi(x) + \nabla\varphi(x)^\top p + \frac{L_\varphi}{2} \|p\|^2, \quad (32)$$

where  $x$  is the current iteration and  $d$  is the direction. Other first-order methods use the decomposability of the former problem and solve it only for some chosen coordinates [20]. In this case, the Lipschitz constant is replaced by partial Lipschitz constants for each chosen coordinate. Some efficient second-order methods find the direction at every iteration by approximately solving

$$d := \arg \min_p \|x + p\|_1 + \varphi(x) + \nabla\varphi(x)^\top p + \frac{1}{2} d^\top \nabla^2 \varphi(x) d, \quad (33)$$

using a coordinate descent algorithm, see [31].

In this section we compare pdNCG with two such state-of-the-art first- and second-order methods.

- PCDM (Parallel Coordinate Descent Method) [20]. The published implementation performs parallel coordinate updates asynchronously based on (32), where the coordinates are chosen uniformly at random. This method is well-known for exploiting separability of the problems. This code can be downloaded at <http://code.google.com/p/ac-dc/>.
- newGLMNET [31] is a sequential Newton-type method which calculates the direction at every iteration by solving approximately (33) using a cyclic coordinate descent method. Moreover, newGLMNET performs an active set technique for reducing the dimensions of the problem close to the optimal solution. It has been shown in [31] that newGLMNET is one of the most efficient implementations for  $\ell_1$ -regularized LR when the required accuracy is not very high, which is the case for the problems of our interest. This solver can be found as part of the LIBLINEAR package at <http://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/liblinear/>. In this paper the version 1.93 of the LIBLINEAR package has been used.

### 5.2 Implementation details

Solvers PCDM and newGLMNET are *C* or *C++* implementations, while pdNCG is implemented in MATLAB. We expect that the programming language should not be an obstacle for pdNCG. This is because pdNCG relies

only on basic linear algebra operations, such as the dot product, which are implemented in C++ in MATLAB by default. All experiments are performed on a Dell PowerEdge C6220 running Redhat Enterprise Linux with Quad 8 Core Intel Xeon (Sandybridge) processors running in 64bit mode. PCDM as a parallel method exploits 24 cores. Whilst, pdNCG as a MATLAB implementation it exploits multicore systems by performing in parallel simple linear algebra tasks by default. Unfortunately newGLMNET does not have an implementation for parallel linear algebra. Therefore, for the comparison on the  $\ell_1$ -regularized LR problems, in which we compare pdNCG with newGLMNET, we force pdNCG to run on a single MATLAB thread. This of course favours PCDM against both pdNCG and newGLMNET, but it also makes certain that we do not favour the proposed pdNCG solver. Finally, for pdNCG a limited memory BFGS preconditioner with maximum six updates is used for all experiments.

### 5.3 Termination criteria and parameter tuning

Regarding the synthetic S-LS problem, first pdNCG is employed and an approximate optimal value of the objective function in (1) is found, denoted by  $f_\tau(x)$ . Then PCDM is employed till the objective function drops below  $f_\tau(x)$ . Since for PCDM making functions evaluations is prohibited, because it is considered as a very expensive operation, we do not include the CPU time of making such operations in the total CPU time.

Regarding the  $\ell_1$ -regularized LR problems we employ first newGLMNET with its termination criterion tolerance set to  $1.0e-1$  (default setting), see [31] for details about the criterion. Then pdNCG and PCDM are terminated when their objective function value and their classification accuracy are of similar magnitude as of newGLMNET.

For pdNCG, the smoothing parameter  $\mu$  is set to  $1.0e-6$  and the parameter  $\eta$  in (21) is set to  $1.0e-1$  for  $\ell_1$ -regularized LR and to  $1.0e-2$  for the synthetic S-LS problem. The maximum number of backtracking line-search iterations is fixed to 10. For PCDM, the parameter  $\sigma$  is set to  $1 + 23(\nu - 1)/(m - 1)$  like it is proposed in [20], where  $\nu$  is the partial separability degree of the problem which is solved; we will define  $\nu$  later in this section. For newGLMNET we use the default parameter setting. Finally, all solvers are initialized to the zero solution.

### 5.4 $\ell_1$ -Regularized Sparse Least-Squares

In this subsection we compare pdNCG with PCDM. The comparison is made on a problem for which

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2$$

in (1), where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  with  $n \geq m$ . We are interested in problems of this form which are sparse, with well- or misbehaved spectral

properties of  $A^\top A$ , but *partially* separable and not *very* separable. The definition of separability which is employed is the same as in [20], which for these problems is measured with the following constant

$$\beta_{LS} := \max_{j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \|A_j\|_0, \quad (34)$$

where  $A_j$  is the  $j^{\text{th}}$  row of matrix  $A$ . Obviously, the following holds  $1 \leq \beta_{LS} \leq m$ . Notice that the larger  $\beta_{LS}$  is the less separable the problem becomes. However, observe that  $\beta_{LS}$  captures separability based only on the most dense row of matrix  $A$ . This implies that there might exist matrix  $A$  which is very sparse but there is a single row of  $A$  that is relatively dense and this will result in large  $\beta_{LS}$ . In the examples that will be presented in this subsection  $\beta_{LS}$  is a small fraction of  $m$ .

#### 5.4.1 Benchmark Generator

A generator for non-trivial sparse and partially separable S-LS problems is given in the following simple process. First, matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  with  $n \geq m$  is generated. Second, the eigenvalue decomposition of  $A^\top A = Q\Lambda Q^\top$  is computed. Third, the optimal solution is generated by approximately solving


$$\begin{aligned} x^* := \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & \|Q^\top x - \Lambda e\|^2 \\ \text{subject to: } & \|x\|_0 \leq s, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where  $e$  is a vector of ones,  $\|\cdot\|_0$  is the zero norm which counts the number of nonzero components of the input argument and  $s$  is a positive integer. To solve the above problem one can use an Orthogonal Matching Pursuit (OMP) solver <http://www.mathworks.co.uk/matlabcentral/fileexchange/32402-cosamp-and-omp-for-sparse-recovery>. The aim of this approach is to find a sparse  $x^*$  which can be expressed as  $x^* = Qv$ , where the coefficients  $v$  of the linear combination are close to the eigenvalues of matrix  $A^\top A$ . It is well known that such an  $x^*$  makes the problem difficult to solve, see for example the analysis of Steepest Descent for LS in [23]. Finally,  $b$  can be generated such that the following holds

$$x^* := \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|x\|_1 + \|Ax - b\|^2.$$

This is achieved by substituting in the optimality conditions of the previous problem  $x^*$  and then choosing  $b$  such that the optimality conditions are satisfied.

An advantage of this generator is that one can choose the sparsity level of matrix  $A$ , the partial separability degree  $\beta_{LS}$  and the singular values of matrix  $A$ . It is easy to extend the generator to other values of  $\tau > 0$ , except of  $\tau = 1$ . The generator can be downloaded from <http://www.maths.ed.ac.uk/ERGO/pdNCG/>.



**Fig. 2** Comparison of pdNCG with PCDM on a synthetic sparse S-LS problem which is partially separable. The axis are in log-scale. In this figure  $f_\tau(x)$  denotes the objective value that was obtained by each solver and  $f_\tau^*$  is the optimal objective value. PCDM was terminated after 30 million iterations which corresponds to approximately  $10^5$  seconds, while pdNCG converged in 12 iterations in much less CPU time

#### 5.4.2 A partially separable sparse least-squares example

We generate an instance  $(A, b, x^*)$  where  $A$  has  $m = 2^{12}$  columns,  $n \approx 1.01m$  rows. Matrix  $A$  is sparse  $nnz(A)/(mn) \approx 9.00e-03$  and partially separable  $\beta_{LS}/m \approx 6.14e-02$ . The condition number of  $A^\top A$  is approximately  $9.00e+08$ . The optimal solution  $x^*$  has approximately  $s \approx 0.3m$  non-zero components. The code for regenerating this instance can be found in <http://www.maths.ed.ac.uk/ERGO/pdNCG/>.

The result of the comparison of pdNCG with PCDM is shown in Figure 2. In this figure the distance from optimality in terms of the objective function  $f_\tau(x)$  is presented against the CPU time. Observe the log-scale used for both axes. The CPU time of the solvers is shown after their first iteration takes place. Notice that despite the problem being sparse and partially separable PCDM did not converge in reasonable time; it was terminated after 30 million iterations, i.e. approximately  $10^5$  seconds. In fact, notice that the observed rate of convergence was becoming slower as the algorithm progressed. On the other hand, pdNCG converged to an approximate solution in 12 iterations which corresponds to few minutes of CPU time.

#### 5.5 $\ell_1$ -Regularized Logistic Regression

In this subsection we compare pdNCG with PCDM and newGLMNET on two real world  $\ell_1$ -regularized LR problems. For  $\ell_1$ -regularized LR the function



**Table 1** Properties of two  $\ell_1$ -regularized LR problems which are used as benchmarks in this paper. The second and third columns show the number of training samples and features, respectively. The fourth and fifth columns show the sparsity of matrix  $X$  and the degree of partial separability  $\beta_{LR}$  in (36), respectively. The sixth column is the largest eigenvalue of  $X^\top X$  and the last column is the  $\tau$  found using cross-validation

Problem	$n$	$m$	$\text{nnz}(X)/(mn)$	$\beta_{LR}$	$\lambda_{\max}(X^\top X)$	$\tau$
cod-rna	59,535	8	1.00e-00	8	1.53e+10	1.11e+01
covtype	581,012	54	2.20e-01	12	1.17e+13	4.58e-02

**Table 2** Results on  $\ell_1$ -regularized LR problems for PCDM and newGLMNET. Acc. denotes the classification accuracy and  $f_\tau(x)$  is the final objective value

Problem	PCDM			newGLMNET		
	Acc.	$f_\tau(x)$	CPU time	Acc.	$f_\tau(x)$	CPU time
cod-rna	93.38 %	2.16e+05	1.03e+02	93.40 %	2.16e+05	7.28e-01
covtype	75.59 %	7.35e+05	1.53e+03	75.60 %	7.31e+05	5.02e+01

$\varphi(x)$  in (1) is set to

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 + e^{-y_i w^\top x_i}),$$

where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^m \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  are the training samples and  $y_i \in \{-1, +1\}$  are the corresponding labels. Such problems are used for training a linear classifier  $w \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Although in Linear Support Vector Machine (LSVM) literature there are more alternatives for function  $\varphi(x)$ , in this section we choose LR because it is second-order differentiable. For more details about support vector machine problems we refer the reader to [32].

We present two  $\ell_1$ -regularized LR problems which are sparse and partially separable or dense and also  $X^\top X$  has a large eigenvalue, where  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  is a matrix which in its rows has the training samples. Exact information for these problems is given in Table 1. In this table, the fourth column shows the sparsity of the problem, where  $\text{nnz}(X)$  is the number of non-zero components in  $X$ . The fifth column shows the degree of partial separability which is defined as

$$\beta_{LR} := \max_{j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \|X_j\|_0, \quad (36)$$

where  $X_j$  is the  $j^{\text{th}}$  row of matrix  $X$ . The sixth column shows the largest eigenvalue of  $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$  of matrix  $X^\top X$ . The last column shows the  $\tau$  which gave the classification with the highest accuracy after performing a fivefold cross validation over various  $\tau$  values, as proposed in [12]. This problem can be downloaded from the collection of LSVM problems in <http://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvmtools/datasets/>.

The results of the comparison among the solvers pdNCG, PCDM and newGLMNET are shown in Tables 2 and 3. In these tables the classification accuracy results are obtained by using the training samples to measure the accuracy level of the obtained linear classifier.

**Table 3** Results on  $\ell_1$ -regularized LR problems for pdNCG. Acc. denotes the classification accuracy and  $f_\tau(x)$  is the final objective value

Problem	pdNCG		
	Acc.	$f_\tau(x)$	CPU time
cod-rna	93.33 %	2.27e+05	3.20e-01
covtype	75.51 %	7.20e+05	5.40e+00

## 6 Conclusion

Recently, the optimization community seems to focus on inexpensive methods, such as coordinate descent, for the solution of sparse and *very separable*  $\ell_1$ -regularized problems. However, there is a class of  $\ell_1$ -regularized problems which can be sparse and only *partially separable* or dense. Additionally, their second-order derivatives might misbehave; that is display noticeable differences of the magnitude of eigenvalues. For such problems it is crucial that the methods capture information from the second-order derivative. In this paper, we have proposed an inexpensive but still robust primal-dual Newton-CG (pdNCG) method that is aimed for such difficult problems. We have given a synthetic sparse least-squares example and two real world machine learning problems which satisfy the previous criteria and we have shown that on these problems the proposed method is efficient. Moreover, we have shown that by using the property of CG described in Lemma 7, the convergence analysis of pdNCG can be performed in a variable metric which is defined based on approximate second-order derivatives. The variable metric opens the door for a tight convergence analysis of pdNCG, which includes global and local convergence rates, explicit definition of fast local convergence region and worst-case iteration complexity.

## References

1. R. Acar and C. R. Vogel. Analysis of bounded variation penalty methods for ill-posed problems. *Inverse Problems*, 10:1217–1229, 1994.
2. S. R. Becker, J. Bobin, and E. J. Candés. NESTA: A fast and accurate first-order method for sparse recovery. *SIAM J. Imaging Sciences*, 4(1):1–39, 2011.
3. S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press New York, NY, USA, 2004.
4. R. H. Byrd, G. M. Chin, J. Nocedal, and F. Oztoprak. A family of second-order methods for convex  $\ell_1$ -regularized optimization. Unpublished: Optimization Center: Northwestern University, Tech Report, June 2012.
5. R. H. Chan, T. F. Chan, and H. M. Zhou. Advanced signal processing algorithms. in *Proceedings of the International Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers*, F. T. Luk, ed., SPIE, pages 314–325, 1995.
6. T. F. Chan, G. H. Golub, and P. Mulet. A nonlinear primal-dual method for total variation-based image restoration. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 20(6):1964–1977, 1999.
7. K.-W. Chang, C.-J. Hsieh, and C.-J. Lin. Coordinate descent method for large-scale  $\ell_2$ -loss linear support vector machines. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9:1369–1398, 2008.
8. A. Galen and J. Gao. Scalable training of  $\ell_1$ -regularization log-linear models. In *ICML*, 2007.

9. S. Hansen and J. Nocedal. Second-order methods for  $\ell_1$ -regularized problems in machine learning. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2012*, pages 5237–5240, march 2012.
10. R. I. Hartley and A. Zisserman. *Multiple View Geometry in Computer Vision*. Cambridge University Press, ISBN: 0521540518, second edition, 2004.
11. C.-J. Hsieh, K.-W. Chang, C.-J. Lin, S. S. Keerthi, and S. Sundararajan. A dual coordinate descent method for large-scale linear SVM. *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2008*, pages 408–415, 2008.
12. C.-W. Hsu, C.-C. Chang, and C.-J. Lin. A practical guide to support vector classification. Technical report, Department of Computer Science, National Taiwan University, 2010.
13. C. T. Kelly. *Iterative Methods for Linear and Nonlinear Equations*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA., 1995.
14. J. Kim and H. Park. Fast active-set-type algorithms for  $\ell_1$ -regularized linear regression. In *In Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2010.
15. S.-J. Kim, K. Koh, M. Lustig, S. Boyd, and D. Gorinevsky. An interior-point method for large-scale  $\ell_1$ -regularized least squares. *IEEE Journal on Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 1(4):606–617, 2007.
16. S.-I. Lee, H. Lee, P. Abbeel, and A. Y. Ng. Efficient  $\ell_1$ -regularized logistic regression. In *In AAAI*, 2006.
17. C.-J. Lin, R. C. Weng, and S. S. Keerthi. Trust region Newton method for large-scale logistic regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9:627–650, 2008.
18. J. Renegar. *A Mathematical View of Interior-Point Methods in Convex Optimization*. MOS-SIAM Series on Optimization, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 2001.
19. P. Richtárik and M. Takáč. Iteration complexity of randomized block-coordinate descent methods for minimizing a composite function. *Mathematical Programming*, 2012.
20. P. Richtárik and M. Takáč. Parallel coordinate descent methods for big data optimization. Technical report, School of Mathematics, Edinburgh University, 2012.
21. M. Schmidt, G. Fung, and R. Rosales. Fast optimization methods for  $\ell_1$ -regularization: A comparative study and two new approaches. In *In Proceedings of European Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 286–297, 2007.
22. S. Shalev-Shwartz and A. Tewari. Stochastic methods for  $\ell_1$ -regularized loss minimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(4):1865–1892, 2011.
23. J. R. Shewchuk. An introduction to the conjugate gradient method without the agonizing pain. Technical report, Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA, USA, 1994.
24. S. Sra, S. Nowozin, and S. J. Wright. *Optimization for Machine Learning*. MIT Press, 2011.
25. R. Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Roy. Statist. Soc.*, 58(1):267–288, 1996.
26. P. Tseng. Convergence of a block coordinate descent method for nondifferentiable minimization. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 109(3):475–494, 2001.
27. P. Tseng. Efficiency of coordinate descent methods on huge-scale optimization problems. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 22:341–362, 2012.
28. P. Tseng and S. Yun. A coordinate gradient descent method for nonsmooth separable minimization. *Math. Program., Ser. B*, 117:387–423, 2009.
29. S. J. Wright. Accelerated block-coordinate relaxation for regularized optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(1):159–186, 2012.
30. T. T. Wu and K. Lange. Coordinate descent algorithms for lasso penalized regression. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 2(1):224–244, 2008.
31. G-X Yuan, C-H Ho, and C-J Lin. An improved glmnet for  $\ell_1$ -regularized logistic regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13:1999–2030, 2012.
32. G. X. Yuan, C. H. Ho, and C. J. Lin. Recent advances of large-scale linear classification. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 100(9):2584–2603, 2012.