

# SET INTERSECTION PROBLEMS: INTEGRATING PROJECTION AND QUADRATIC PROGRAMMING ALGORITHMS

C.H. JEFFREY PANG

**ABSTRACT.** The Set Intersection Problem (SIP) is the problem of finding a point in the intersection of convex sets. This problem is typically solved by the method of alternating projections. To accelerate the convergence, the idea of using Quadratic Programming (QP) to project a point onto the intersection of halfspaces generated by the projection process was discussed in earlier papers. This paper looks at how one can integrate projection algorithms together with an active set QP algorithm. As a byproduct of our analysis, we show how to accelerate an SIP algorithm involving box constraints, and how to extend a version of the Algebraic Reconstruction Technique (ART) while preserving finite convergence. Lastly, the warmstart property of active set QP algorithms is a valuable property for the problem of projecting onto the intersection of convex sets.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries: Dual active set QP algorithm of [GI83]	5
3. Active set QP method for the BAP and SIP	8
4. A simple example	13
5. One box constraint	14
6. Finite convergence of a modified ART	16
7. More on the degenerate inner GI step	20
8. Conclusion	24
References	24

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For finitely many closed convex sets  $K_1, \dots, K_r$  in a Hilbert space  $X$ , the *Set Intersection Problem* (SIP) is stated as:

$$(SIP): \quad \text{Find } x \in K := \bigcap_{i=1}^r K_i, \text{ where } K \neq \emptyset. \quad (1.1)$$

One assumption on the sets  $K_i$  is that projecting a point in  $X$  onto each  $K_i$  is a relatively easy problem.

A popular method of solving the SIP is the *Method of Alternating Projections* (MAP), where one iteratively projects a point through the sets  $K_i$  to find a point

---

*Date:* February 17, 2015.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 90C25, 90C20, 47J25, 52A20.

*Key words and phrases.* quadratic programming, projection algorithms, feasibility problems, algebraic reconstruction technique.

in  $K$ . Such methods fall under the broad class of *projection algorithms*. The rate of convergence of the MAP is linear, and is known to be slow when certain angles are small. Acceleration techniques include [GPR67, GK89, BDHP03]. For more on the background and recent developments of the MAP and its variants, we refer the reader to [BB96, BR09, ER11], as well as [Deu01b, Chapter 9], [BZ05, Subsubsection 4.5.4], and [Deu01a, Deu95]. Superlinear convergence can be achieved if the smoothness of the sets  $K_i$  are exploited [GP98, GP01]. Another acceleration method is the Dos Santos method [San87, Pie81], which is based on Cimmino's method for linear equations [Cim38].

Another problem related to the SIP is the *Best Approximation Problem* (BAP): Find the closest point to  $x_0$  in  $K$ , that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(BAP):} \quad & \min_{x \in X} \|x - x_0\| & (1.2) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in K := \bigcap_{i=1}^r K_i. \end{aligned}$$

The projection of a point onto a closed convex set generates a supporting halfspace. One can then project an iterate onto the intersection of these halfspaces using quadratic programming (QP). This gives us the *supporting halfspace and quadratic programming* (SHQP) strategy, which is illustrated in Figure 1.1. In our earlier paper on this topic, we mentioned the Dykstra's algorithm [Dyk83, BD85] and the related paper [Han88]. An alternative to Dykstra's algorithm is the approach of [Hau68], which has been tried in [Com03] for example. See also [BC11].

In [Pan15b], we proved that for the SIP, can, provided that the point of convergence satisfies a linear regularity property, converge to a point in the intersection of the sets *multiple-term superlinearly*. We say that a sequence  $\{x_i\}$  converges to  $\bar{x}$  *multiple-term superlinearly* if

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_i = \bar{x}, \text{ and } \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|x_{i+p} - \bar{x}\|}{\|x_i - \bar{x}\|} = 0 \text{ for some finite } p > 0.$$

In a follow-up [Pan14], we prove that this convergence can actually be multiple-term quadratic if the sets satisfy a second order regularity at the point of convergence, and how one can take fewer halfspaces and still achieve fast convergence. These results generalize those of [GP98, GP01], and give an indication that the SHQP strategy is a good idea to accelerate the convergence of projection algorithms, even though one may have to solve smaller QPs formed from fewer halfspaces than what can be proved to achieve the fast convergence. Particular cases of the SHQP strategy had been studied before. In [Pie84], Pierra suggested an extrapolation using this idea when one of the sets is an affine space. This idea was further studied in [BCK06] as the EAPM.

For the case when the sets  $K_i$  are affine spaces, the early papers [vN50, Hal62] show that the MAP converges strongly to the solution of the BAP. We discuss more about how to handle an SIP with affine constraints in Remark 5.4.

It appears that prevailing algorithms for the SIP (see for example the algorithms in [CCC+12, ER11]) do not exploit smoothness of the sets and fall back to a Newton-like method and achieve superlinear convergence in the manner of [GP98, GP01] and the algorithms of this paper.

**1.1. Finite convergence of the ART.** The ART (Algebraic Reconstruction Technique) was originally designed in [GBH70] to find a solution to  $Ax = b$  arising in




FIGURE 1.1. The method of alternating projections on two convex sets  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with starting iterate  $x_0$  arrives at  $x_3$  in three iterations. The point  $x_4$  is the projection of  $x_1$  onto the intersection of halfspaces generated by projecting onto  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  earlier. One can see that  $d(x_4, K_1 \cap K_2) < d(x_3, K_1 \cap K_2)$ , illustrating the potential of the SHQP (supporting halfspace and quadratic programming) strategy elaborated in [Pan15b, Pan14].

computerized tomography, where the rows of  $A$  are formed during the reconstruction process. This method is also known as the Kaczmarz method [Kac37] in numerical linear algebra. The ART and Kaczmarz method are updated by a projection method.

A variant of the ART [Her75], referred to as ART3, finds an  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  that satisfies the linear inequality  $L \leq Ax \leq U$ . If the set of points feasible in this system has nonempty interior in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then ART3 finds such an  $x$  in finitely many iterations. The ART3 was designed to solve a reconstruction problem from noisy x-rays.

**1.2. Algorithms for Quadratic Programs.** Algorithms for QPs have analogous counterparts to algorithms for linear programs (LPs). Ellipsoid and Interior point methods for QPs and LPs achieve polynomial time convergence. Another algorithm for LP is the simplex method, which has exponential worst case behavior but is known to perform well in practice. The simplex method has another advantage over interior point methods in that it can make use of warmstart solutions to solve the new problems created when constraints are added or deleted.

The dual active set QP algorithm of [GI83] can make use of warmstart solutions to solve QPs when new linear inequality constraints are added. We shall refer to their algorithm as the *GI algorithm*. This property of the GI algorithm makes it desirable to solve the QPs arising from the BAP, since the projection process continually adds new halfspaces bounding the intersection of the sets. Though active set methods for QPs are not as extensively tested as that for LPs, it is believed that, just like the simplex method for LPs, active set methods can achieve good performance in practice, but have bad worst case behavior.

**1.3. Contributions of this paper.** The theoretical analysis and possible implementation of the SHQP strategy for the BAP and SIP have contrasting requirements. The multiple-term fast convergence of the SHQP strategy for the SIP requires that a huge number of recently produced halfspaces be used to form the QP. On the other hand, practical concerns of solving a QP require that the number of halfspaces used to form the QP cannot be too large.

This paper looks at how one can integrate parts of the GI algorithm into projection algorithms for the SIP and BAP. The GI algorithm is chosen because it, being an active set algorithm, makes good use of warmstart solutions when new inequality constraints are added (by the projection process or by revisiting old constraints). The GI algorithm chooses to keep active halfspaces, which appears to be the best choice of halfspaces to keep, and updates the QR factorization of their normals for an effective solution of the QP.

To design our algorithms for the BAP and SIP, we isolate a step in the algorithm in the dual active set QP algorithm of [GI83], calling it the inner GI step (Algorithm 2.3). The additional work of the inner GI step is to update the KKT multipliers and QR factorization of the normals of the active set. This additional work is not too much more expensive than a projection if the number of normals involved in the QR factorization is small (See Remark 2.5), and can be worth the effort when it accelerates convergence. For example, multiple-term superlinear/ quadratic convergence is possible under added conditions as proved in [Pan14], and such convergence is also observed in our simple example in Section 4. In the case of the SIP, an inner GI step tries to move from one iterate to the next by sliding along the halfspaces of some (possibly suboptimal) choice of active constraints as far as possible. This is illustrated in Figures 1.2 and 7.1.




FIGURE 1.2. In the diagram on the left, the projection of  $x$  onto some convex set produces a halfspace through  $y$  with normal  $-c_2$ . If we have prior information that  $x$  lies on the boundary of a halfspace with normal  $-c_1$ , then it is better to slide in the direction  $d_2$  along the boundary of the halfspace with normal  $-c_1$  and reach  $z$ . The point  $z$  is also the projection of  $x$  onto the intersection of the two halfspaces, so this is one reason why  $z$  is a better iterate than  $y$ . Another reason why  $z$  is better than  $y$  is that there are more halfspaces active at  $z$  than at  $y$ , and one might be able to exploit this to improve convergence. The diagram on the right shows that the constraint with normal  $-c_1$  needs to be dropped in the next iteration. By integrating a QP algorithm to a projection algorithm, one can take advantage of the situations when the case on the left occurs.

The property of active set QP methods being able to effectively use warmstart solutions to resolve a problem when new inequality constraints are added is a useful feature for solving the BAP. See the description of Algorithm 3.1. The GI algorithm is recommended over other QP algorithms because even if the QPs were not solved fully,

the intermediate solutions of the GI algorithm improve as the number of inner GI steps increases. See Remark 2.7 and Figure 2.2.

Noticing that the key to projecting onto a polyhedron using the inner GI steps is to have a QR factorization of the normals of the active constraints, we show an effective procedure for the SIP when one of the sets is a box in Section 5. Box constraints received particular attention in [CCC<sup>+</sup>12]. We also point out how previous work [BCK06, Pie84], [HRER11] and [Pan15a] can be applied to handle affine constraints.

In Section 6, we extend the version of the ART in [Her75], showing when one can use the SHQP ideas while maintaining finite convergence.

To summarize, this paper appears to be the first paper that studies how one can integrate a QP algorithm and a projection algorithm for solving the BAP and SIP. These techniques store the largest number of the most useful halfspaces efficiently in order to obtain better algorithms for the BAP and SIP. In particular, the new algorithms can then fall back to a Newton-like method and achieve better than linear convergence when the boundaries of the sets are sufficiently smooth and satisfy a linear regularity property.

**1.4. Notation.** For a subset  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , we define  $\text{span}(S)$  to be the *span* of  $S$  and  $\text{cone}(S)$  to be the *conical hull* of  $S$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{span}(S) &:= \left\{ x : x = \sum \lambda_i s_i, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}, s_i \in S \right\} \\ \text{and } \text{cone}(S) &:= \left\{ x : x = \sum \lambda_i s_i, \lambda_i \geq 0, s_i \in S \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $S$  is a matrix,  $\text{span}(S)$  and  $\text{cone}(S)$  are understood to be the lineality space and conical hull generated by the columns of  $S$ . Denote the projection of a point  $x$  onto a closed convex set  $S$  to be  $P_S(x)$ . The QR factorization will always mean the economy QR factorization. In other words, if  $N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ , then  $N = QR$  for  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$  and  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ .

## 2. PRELIMINARIES: DUAL ACTIVE SET QP ALGORITHM OF [GI83]

In this section, we recall the dual active set QP algorithm of [GI83], which will be the basis of the algorithms we discuss later. We also refer to their algorithm as the GI algorithm. Their paper actually treats the general case of a positive definite Hessian in the objective function, but we shall just restrict to the case when the Hessian is an identity matrix.

For  $x_* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , consider the QP problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad v(x) &:= \frac{1}{2} \|x - x_*\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & C^T x \geq b. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

We recall the GI algorithm and identify a step which we call the inner GI step.

**Definition 2.1.** (S-tuple) For the QP (2.1), we say that  $(x, J, u, N, Q, R, q)$  is an *s-tuple* if

- (1)  $J$  is an ordered subset of  $\{1, \dots, m\}$  of size  $q$  (and  $q$  is an integer).
- (2)  $N \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times n}$  is such that the  $i$ th column of  $N$  is the  $J(i)$ th column of  $C$ .
- (3)  $(Q, R)$  is an economy QR factorization of  $N$ , where  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$  and  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ .
- (4) [GI83]  $(x, J)$  is an *s-pair*, i.e.,




FIGURE 2.1. This diagram illustrates the GI algorithm [G183] to solve a quadratic program. The projection of  $x$  onto the halfspace with normal  $-c_1$  is  $y$ . When the halfspace that does not contain  $y$  is introduced, the GI algorithm finds a direction  $d$  to move from  $y$  to  $z$  (the projection of  $x$  onto the intersection of these two halfspaces) through what we call the inner GI step (Algorithm 2.3). This direction  $d$  is found by updating the KKT multipliers. In Section 2, we recall the full details of the GI algorithm, but omit derivations of its theoretical properties. For more details, refer to [G183], or even [Idn80].

- (a)  $x$  is the projection of  $x_*$  onto  $\{\tilde{x} : C_J^T \tilde{x} \geq b_J\}$ , and
- (b)  $C_J^T x = b_J$ . (i.e.,  $J$  is a subset of the constraints active at  $x$ .)
- (5)  $u \in \mathbb{R}^q$  is the KKT multipliers certifying the optimality of  $x$ , i.e.,
  - (a)  $u \geq 0$ , and
  - (b)  $x_* - x = -Nu$ .

The notion of the an s-pair in Definition 2.1(4) was used in [G183]. We feel that it is useful to highlight the other variables so that the computational costs of the dual active set QP algorithm can be more easily calculated.

**Algorithm 2.2.** [G183] (*GI algorithm*) This algorithm finds the solution to the projection problem (2.1).

- 01 Set  $J = \emptyset$ ,  $x = x_*$ ,  $q = 0$ , and set  $u$ ,  $N$ ,  $Q$  and  $R$  to be empty vectors/ matrices
- 02 so that  $(x, J, u, N, Q, R, q)$  is an s-tuple.
- 03 While  $x$  is not feasible
- 04 Find  $p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $c_p^T x - b_p < 0$
- 05 Use the inner GI step to find an s-tuple  $(x', J', u', N', Q', R', q')$
- 06 such that  $v(x') > v(x)$  or to determine  $\{\tilde{x} : C^T \tilde{x} \geq b\} = \emptyset$
- 07 Let  $(x, J, u, N, Q, R, q) \leftarrow (x', J', u', N', Q', R', q')$
- 08 end While.
- 09 Return  $(x, J, u)$ .

We go into more detail on the inner GI step.

**Algorithm 2.3.** [G183] (*Inner GI step*) The Inner GI step, which is required in step 5 of Algorithm 2.2, has the following inputs and outputs. We also list its full pseudocode from [G183].

**Inputs:** An s-tuple  $(x, J, u, N, Q, R, q)$  and  $p \notin J$  such that  $c_p^T x - b_p < 0$ .

**Outputs:** Either

- (1) An s-tuple  $(x', J', u', N', Q', R', q')$  s.t.  $J' \subset J \cup \{p\}$  and  $v(x') > v(x)$ , or
- (2) A certificate of  $\{\tilde{x} : C^T \tilde{x} \geq b\}$  being empty.

Set  $u^+ = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$  to be a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^{q+1}$ .

**(a) Determine step direction**

Compute  $z = [I - QQ^T]c_p$

If  $q > 0$ , compute  $r = R^{-1}Q^T c_p$

**(b) Compute step length**

**(i) Partial step length  $t_1$  (maximum step in dual space without violating dual feasibility)**

If  $r \leq 0$  or  $q = 0$ , set  $t_1 \leftarrow \infty$

Otherwise, set

$$t_1 \leftarrow \min_{\substack{r_j > 0 \\ j=1, \dots, q}} \left\{ \frac{u_j^+}{r_j} \right\} = \frac{u_l^+}{r_l} \quad (2.2)$$

**(ii) Full step length  $t_2$  (minimum step in primal space such that the  $p$ th constraint becomes feasible.)**

If  $|z| = 0$ , set  $t_2 \leftarrow \infty$ .

Otherwise, set  $t_2 \leftarrow \frac{b_p - c_p^T x}{z^T c_p}$

**(iii) Step length  $t$**

Set  $t \leftarrow \min(t_1, t_2)$ .

**(c) Determine new s-pair and take step**

**(i) No step in primal or dual space:**

If  $t = \infty$ , problem infeasible. Set  $J' \leftarrow J \cup \{p\}$ . We have  $C_{J'} \begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = 0$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$ .

**(ii) Step in dual space:**

If  $t_2 = \infty$ , then set  $u^+ \leftarrow u^+ + t \begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , and drop constraint  $l$ ; i.e. set  $J \leftarrow J \setminus \{J(l)\}$ ,  $q \leftarrow q - 1$ , update  $Q$ ,  $R$  and  $N$  and go to step 2(a).

**(iii) Step in primal and dual space:**

Set  $x \leftarrow x + tz$ ,

$u^+ \leftarrow u^+ + t \begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ .

If  $t = t_2$ , (full step), set  $x' \leftarrow x$ ,  $u' \leftarrow u^+$  and add constraint  $p$ ; i.e. set  $J' \leftarrow J \cup \{p\}$ ,  $q' \leftarrow q + 1$ , update  $Q$ ,  $R$  and  $N$  to get  $Q'$ ,  $R'$  and  $N'$ , and inner GI step ends.

If  $t = t_1$  (partial step), drop constraint  $l$ ; i.e. set  $J \leftarrow J \setminus \{J(l)\}$ ,  $q \leftarrow q - 1$ , update  $Q$ ,  $R$  and  $N$  and go to step 2(a).

**Remark 2.4.** (Certificate of  $\{\tilde{x} : C^T \tilde{x} \geq b\} = \emptyset$ ) We elaborate on why a certificate of infeasibility is obtained at step (c)(i). At this step, we found an  $r \leq 0$  and a  $J'$  such that  $C_{J'} \begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = 0$ . At this iterate  $x$ , we have  $c_j^T x = b_j$  for all  $j \in J'$  and  $c_p^T x < b_p$ , so

$$\begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}^T b_{J'} > \begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}^T C_{J'}^T x = 0.$$

For any  $\tilde{x}$  such that  $C_J^T \tilde{x} \geq b_J$ , we have  $\begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}^T C_J^T \tilde{x} \geq \begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}^T b_J > 0$ . But this is impossible since  $C_{J'} \begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = 0$  leads to a contradiction.

Suppose  $(x, J, u, N, Q, R, q)$  is an s-tuple. It is worth pointing out again that the columns of  $N$  form a subset of vectors which are negative of the normals of halfspaces active at  $x$ . Furthermore,  $(Q, R)$  is the  $QR$  factorization of  $N$ . The inner GI step maintains the  $QR$  factorization of the normals active at  $x$ .

*Remark 2.5.* (Cost of inner GI step) A quick check on the inner GI step shows that it involves the multiplication by  $Q$ ,  $Q^T$  and  $R^{-1}$  and the updating of the QR factorization of  $N$ . (Since  $R$  is upper triangular, the operation  $r = R^{-1}Q^T c_p$  in step (a) is easy.) The most expensive operation in the inner GI step is the updating of the QR factorization of  $N$ . This can be performed with a series of at most  $q$  Givens rotations when a single column of  $N$  is deleted, or by performing a Householder reflection when a column is added to  $N$ . Such operations are standard in numerical linear algebra, and are much cheaper than computing the QR factorization of  $N$  from scratch.

We recall the finite convergence of using the GI algorithm to solve (1.1).

**Theorem 2.6.** [Gl83] (*Finite convergence of GI algorithm*) Consider Algorithm 2.2, which solves (2.1).

(a) If  $(x^i, J^i, u^i, N^i, Q^i, R^i, q^i)$  and  $(x^{i+1}, J^{i+1}, u^{i+1}, N^{i+1}, Q^{i+1}, R^{i+1}, q^{i+1})$  are successive  $s$ -tuples of Algorithm 2.2 to solve (2.1), then  $v(x^{i+1}) > v(x^i)$ . Moreover, each  $x^i$  is the projection of  $x_*$  onto the inequality constraints indexed by  $J^i$ , i.e.,  $x^i = P_{\{x: C_{J^i}^T x \geq b_{J^i}\}}(x_*)$ .

(b) The GI algorithm converges to the optimal solution of (2.1) in finitely many inner GI steps.

Polynomial time algorithms for QPs include the ellipsoid method and interior point methods. However, these methods are not as effective in using warmstart solutions like active set methods. Though the performance of QP algorithms are not as well tested as that for LPs (linear programs), it is believed that active set methods behave like the simplex method: Good in the average case, and possibly bad in the worst case.

*Remark 2.7.* (More on inner GI steps) While Theorem 2.6(b) says that the number of inner GI steps needed to solve (1.1) to optimality is finite, it may take too many steps to solve the QP to optimality if the number of constraints is large. Thankfully, the QPs in the SHQP strategy need not be solved fully. Theorem 2.6(a) states that the next iterate obtained by the inner GI step is a projection onto a polyhedron defined by another set of inequalities that increases the distance  $v(\cdot)$ , which makes the next iterate a better iterate than the last. Refer to Figure 2.2.

### 3. ACTIVE SET QP METHOD FOR THE BAP AND SIP

In this section, we describe our algorithms for the BAP and SIP using the inner GI step. We can then adapt the GI algorithm for the BAP.

**Algorithm 3.1.** (*Algorithm for the BAP*) For a point  $x_0$  and closed convex sets  $K_l$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots, r$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , find the projection of  $x_0$  onto  $K := \cap_{l=1}^r K_l$ .

- 01 Set  $J = \emptyset$ ,  $x = x_0$ ,  $q = 0$ , and set  $u$ ,  $N$ ,  $Q$  and  $R$  to be empty vectors/ matrices
- 02 so that  $(x, J, u, N, Q, R, q)$  is an  $s$ -tuple.
- 03 While  $x \notin K$
- 04 Find a halfspace  $\{\tilde{x} : c_p^T \tilde{x} - b_p \leq 0\}$  containing  $K$  but not  $x$ .
- 05 Find an  $s$ -tuple  $(x', J', u', N', Q', R', q')$
- 06 such that  $\|x' - x_0\| > \|x - x_0\|$  or to determine  $K = \emptyset$
- 07 Let  $(x, J, u, N, Q, R, q) \leftarrow (x', J', u', N', Q', R', q')$
- 08 end While.
- 09 Return  $x$ .

We now explain the differences of Algorithm 3.1 from Algorithm 2.2.






FIGURE 2.2. Suppose at some point of an SHQP algorithm that one arrives at the point  $x$  that is on the boundary of some halfspace  $H_2$ . The halfspace  $H_1$  is a halfspace generated by a previous projection, while  $H_3$  is the newest halfspace generated. An inner GI step from  $x$  with  $H_3$  as the violated constraint leads to the point  $y = P_{H_2 \cap H_3}(x)$ , and another inner GI step from  $y$  with  $H_1$  as the violated constraint leads to the point  $z = P_{H_1 \cap H_3}(x) = P_{H_1 \cap H_2 \cap H_3}(x)$ . Remark 2.7 says that even if one does not land on the point  $z = P_{H_1 \cap H_2 \cap H_3}(x)$  (i.e., the exact solution of the QP subproblem), the point  $y$  in the intermediate calculation of the active set QP algorithm [GI83] is still a good point to continue calculations since  $y$  is the projection of  $x$  onto the intersection of some of the halfspaces generated so far.

*Remark 3.2.* (Line 4 of Algorithm 3.1) In line 4 of Algorithm 3.1, a halfspace containing  $\bigcap_{l=1}^r K_l$  but not  $x$  is found by projecting  $x$  onto a set  $K_l$  such that  $x \notin K_l$ . One can also revisit old constraints that were dropped by earlier inner GI steps. Since  $K$  is contained in the intersection of the halfspaces obtained so far, a certificate of the intersection of the halfspaces being empty also gives a certificate of  $K$  being empty in line 6.

*Remark 3.3.* (Line 5 of Algorithm 3.1) In line 5, we no longer explicitly mention that one uses a single inner GI step to find the next  $s$ -tuple. One can use more than one inner GI step. As we have pointed out in Theorem 2.6, it takes finitely many inner GI steps to solve a QP with a set of linear inequality constraints. As elaborated in Remark 2.7 it may be worthwhile to solve a QP with a small number of constraints to optimality, but once the number of constraints becomes too large, it may be better off to find a new halfspace separating  $K$  from the current iterate  $x$  to continue Algorithm 3.1 instead.

We now propose our algorithm for the SIP using the inner GI step.

**Algorithm 3.4.** (Algorithm for the SIP) For a point  $x_0$  and closed convex sets  $K_l$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots, r$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , find a point in  $K := \bigcap_{l=1}^r K_l$ . The algorithm here is almost exactly the same as that of Algorithm 3.1, except that we change line 7 to:

- 05 Find an  $s$ -tuple  $(x', J', u', N', Q', R', q')$
- 06 such that  $\|x' - x\| > 0$  or to determine  $K = \emptyset$
- 07 Let  $(x, J, u, N, Q, R, q) \leftarrow (x', J', 0, N', Q', R', q')$

Remarks 3.2 and 3.3 still apply to Algorithm 3.4. In view of Definition 2.1(5)(b), the point that we project from in Algorithm 3.4 at the end of line 7 is now changed to the current value of  $x$  since  $u$  is set to be the zero vector. This is reflected in Figure 1.2 for two cases: When the inner GI step does not have to drop constraints, and when the inner GI step has to drop a constraint. Since the point we now project from is  $x$ , line 6 is changed accordingly.

Next, we explain why we need to use a different algorithm in line 5 of Algorithm 3.4. The inner GI step as written in Algorithm 2.3 requires  $u > 0$  in order to calculate the ratio  $t_1$  in (2.2) properly, but in Algorithm 3.4, the multipliers  $u$  are often zero due to line 7 of Algorithm 3.4. We write down an easy result that leads to our design of the degenerate inner GI step (Algorithm 3.6) to handle the case when  $u = 0$  at the start of the inner GI step.

**Proposition 3.5.** *(A particular QP) Consider the QP*

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|x - x_*\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \tilde{C}^T x \geq \tilde{b} \\ & \tilde{c}_p^T x \geq \hat{b}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where  $\tilde{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ ,  $\tilde{b} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ ,  $\tilde{c}_p \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\hat{b} \in \mathbb{R}$  are such that  $\tilde{C}^T x_* = \tilde{b}$  and  $\tilde{c}_p^T x_* < \hat{b}$ . Let  $J$  be a subset of  $\{1, \dots, q\}$ , and let  $N = \tilde{C}_J$  (i.e., the columns of  $N$  are the columns of  $\tilde{C}$  indexed by  $J$ ), with QR factorization  $N = QR$ . Let  $z = (I - QQ^T)\tilde{c}_p$ ,  $r = R^{-1}Q^T\tilde{c}_p$  and  $t_2 = \frac{\hat{b} - \tilde{c}_p^T x_*}{z^T \tilde{c}_p}$ . If  $r \leq 0$ , then  $x_* + t_2 z$  is the optimal solution of the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|x - x_*\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \tilde{C}_J^T x \geq \tilde{b}_J \\ & \tilde{c}_p^T x \geq \hat{b}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

and all constraints listed in (3.2) are tight.

*Proof.* Before we continue with the proof, we remark that a result similar to this is the foundation of why the inner GI step fits properly in the GI algorithm.

Let  $x_+ = x_* + t_2 z$ . Then

$$\tilde{C}_J^T x_+ = \tilde{C}_J^T x_* + t_2 \tilde{C}_J^T z = \tilde{b}_J + t_2 N^T (I - QQ^T) \tilde{c}_p.$$

But  $N^T (I - QQ^T) = R^T Q^T (I - QQ^T) = 0$ , so  $\tilde{C}_J^T x_+ = \tilde{b}_J$  as needed. Also,

$$\tilde{c}_p^T x_+ = \tilde{c}_p^T x_* + \frac{\hat{b} - \tilde{c}_p^T x_*}{z^T \tilde{c}_p} \tilde{c}_p^T z = \hat{b}.$$

Thus the constraints listed in (3.2) are tight. Lastly,

$$\begin{aligned}
x_* - x_+ &= t_2 z \\
&= t_2(I - QQ^T)\tilde{c}_p \\
&= t_2[\tilde{c}_p - QQ^T\tilde{c}_p] \\
&= t_2[\tilde{c}_p - QRr] \\
&= t_2[\tilde{c}_p - Nr] \\
&= t_2 \begin{bmatrix} N & \tilde{c}_p \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

All these show that the KKT conditions hold at  $x_+$ , and thus  $x_+$  is optimal.  $\square$

Such a  $J$  found in Proposition 3.5 need not be the active set that solves (3.1). To find this active set, one would have to start from the solution in (3.2) and invoke inner GI steps using the constraints violated in  $\tilde{C}^T x \geq \tilde{b}$  (that are certainly not in the index set  $J$ ). Theorem 2.6 and Remark 2.7 still apply.

We now write down the degenerate inner GI step in Algorithm 3.6 below, which plays the role of the inner GI step (Algorithm 2.3) when  $u = 0$ . Algorithm 3.6 is written so that the similarities to the inner GI step are preserved.

**Algorithm 3.6.** (*Degenerate inner GI step*) In step 5 of Algorithm 3.4, one has to solve a QP of the form (3.1). The inner GI step (Algorithm 2.3) cannot handle the case when  $u = 0$ , so we present this alternative algorithm. This algorithm has the following inputs and outputs. We also list its full pseudocode.

**Inputs:** An  $s$ -tuple  $(x, J, u, N, Q, R, q)$  and  $p \notin J$  s.t.  $c_p^T x - b_p < 0$  and  $u = 0$ .

**Outputs:** Either

- (1) An  $s$ -tuple  $(x', J', u', N', Q', R', q')$  s.t.  $J' \subset J \cup \{p\}$  and  $v(x') > v(x)$ , or
- (2) A certificate of  $\{\tilde{x} : C^T \tilde{x} \geq b\}$  being empty.

**(a) Determine step direction**

Loop

  Compute  $z = [I - QQ^T]c_p$   
  If  $q > 0$ , compute  $r = R^{-1}Q^T c_p$ ,  
  otherwise  $r = -1$ .

  If  $r \leq 0$ , break.

  Find index  $l$  such that  $r_l > 0$ .

  Update  $J \leftarrow J \setminus \{J(l)\}$ ,  $q \leftarrow q - 1$ .

  Remove  $l$ th column from  $N$  and update  $(Q, R)$ .

end Loop

**(b) Compute full step length  $t_2$  (minimum step in primal space such that the  $p$ th constraint becomes feasible.)**

If  $|z| = 0$ , then problem is infeasible. Set  $J' \leftarrow J \cup \{p\}$ . We have  $C_{J'} \begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = 0$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$ . End.

Otherwise, set  $t_2 \leftarrow \frac{b_p - c_p^T x}{z^T c_p}$

**(c) Determine new  $s$ -pair and take step in primal and dual space**

Set  $x' \leftarrow x + t_2 z$ ,

$u' \leftarrow t_2 \begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ .

Add constraint  $p$ ; i.e. set  $J' \leftarrow J \cup \{p\}$ ,  $q' \leftarrow q + 1$ , update  $Q, R$  and  $N$  to get  $Q', R'$  and  $N'$ , and degenerate inner GI step ends.

We give a more detailed discussion of Algorithm 3.6 in Section 7.

We present an elementary result that shows the dimension reduction property of the QR factorization that is applicable to both Algorithms 3.1 and 3.4.

**Proposition 3.7.** (*Problem size reduction*) Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $QR = C$  be the economy QR factorization of  $C$ . Suppose  $z = P_{\{\tilde{x}: R^T \tilde{x} \geq b\}}(Q^T x)$ . Then  $P_{\{\tilde{x}: C^T \tilde{x} \geq b\}}(x) = Qz + (I - QQ^T)x$ .

*Proof.* Let  $y$  be any point in  $\{\tilde{x} : C^T \tilde{x} \geq b\}$ . Then  $C^T y \geq b$  implies that  $R^T(Q^T y) \geq b$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} y - [Qz + (I - QQ^T)x] &= (I - QQ^T)(y - x) + QQ^T y - Qz. \\ \text{and } x - [Qz + (I - QQ^T)x] &= QQ^T x - Qz. \end{aligned}$$

From  $Q^T Q = I$ , we have

$$[QQ^T y - Qz]^T [QQ^T x - Qz] = [Q^T y - z]^T [Q^T x - z]. \quad (3.3)$$

Since  $z = P_{\{\tilde{x}: R^T \tilde{x} \geq b\}}(Q^T x)$ , the term in (3.3) is less than equal to zero. Furthermore, from  $Q^T Q = I$ , we have  $(I - QQ^T)Q = 0$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} [(I - QQ^T)(y - x)]^T [QQ^T x - Qz] &= (y - x)^T (I - QQ^T)Q [Q^T x - z] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the displayed formulas so far gives

$$[y - [Qz + (I - QQ^T)x]]^T [x - [Qz + (I - QQ^T)x]] \leq 0.$$

Since this holds for all  $y \in \{\tilde{x} : C^T \tilde{x} \geq b\}$ , our conclusion follows.  $\square$

Proposition 3.7 shows that the QR factorization of the constraints can be used to simplify the QP associated with projecting a point  $x$  onto the set of constraints generated so far. This is a better strategy than following the descriptions of Algorithms 3.1 and 3.4 to the letter. It appears that the kind of problems where projection methods are the most effective (for example, those in [HC08, CCC<sup>+</sup>12]) involve a huge number of variables, so this dimensional reduction allows us to find a better next iterate by solving a much smaller QP.

We remark on the dropping and aggregation of constraints.

*Remark 3.8.* (*Aggregation of constraints for the BAP*) In Algorithm 3.1 (BAP), one stores the s-tuple  $(x, J, u, N, Q, R, q)$ . It may be necessary to store a smaller matrix  $N$  (and correspondingly, for all other variables except for  $x$  and  $q$ ) to reduce storage requirements. We highlight Definition 2.1(5)(b) as the condition requiring more attention. In the case where  $N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2}$  and  $u \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , we can easily see how to perform the aggregation. This same method of aggregation can be used to aggregate any two chosen columns of  $N$  when  $N$  is of a much larger size. When  $N$  is maintained to be of size  $n \times 1$ , Algorithm 3.1 reduces to Algorithm 3.10 later. Just like in Remark 2.5, we can make use of Givens rotations to update the QR factorizations of the normals when columns are removed.

*Remark 3.9.* (*Dropping of constraints for the SIP*) The aggregation strategy in Remark 3.8 can be done for Algorithm 3.4 as well. The s-tuple  $(x, J, 0, N, Q, R, q)$  has zeros for its  $u$  component, so the aggregation strategy can be much more flexible. Another strategy to reduce storage requirements is to drop constraints. One can easily see that

when no normals of active constraints are stored, Algorithm 3.4 reduces to the method of alternating projections.

We recall another algorithm for the BAP. This method was tried in [Com03], but it goes back to [Hau68] as far as we are aware. See [BC11].

**Algorithm 3.10.** *(An algorithm for the BAP) This algorithm solves the BAP (1.2), i.e., the problem of projecting a point  $x^0$  onto the intersection  $K = \cap_{l=1}^r K_l$  of convex sets  $K_l$ .*

Set  $i = 0$

Loop

Project  $x^i$  onto a set  $K_l$  and obtain a halfspace  $H_i$ .

Project  $x^0$  onto the intersection of  $H_i$  and the halfspace with normal  $x^0 - x^i$  and  $x^i$  onto its boundary to get  $x^{i+1}$ .

Set  $i \leftarrow i + 1$

until  $x^i$  sufficiently close to  $P_K(x^0)$ .

#### 4. A SIMPLE EXAMPLE

In this section, we make use of a simple example to show that Algorithms 3.1 (BAP) and 3.4 (SIP) reduce to a Newton-like method and achieve fast convergence. Methods that do not involve quadratic programming (the method of alternating projections, Dykstra's algorithm) or involve QPs that are too small (Algorithm 3.10) cannot reduce to a Newton-like method and achieve such fast convergence.

Consider two circles with centers  $(\pm 2.9, 0)$ , radii 3, and the starting iterate of  $(0, 10)$ . We apply Algorithms 3.1 (BAP) and 3.4 (SIP). For both cases, the halfspaces in step 4 are found by projecting onto the sets in a cyclic manner, and we do not revisit old halfspaces. We only perform a single inner GI step or degenerate inner GI step in step 5. It can be seen that both sets of iterates converge to  $\bar{x} = (0, \sqrt{0.59})$ . Table 4.1 shows the iterates of Algorithms 3.1 (BAP) and 3.4 (SIP), with  $x^i$  being the value of  $x$  in the  $i$ th iteration. The theory implies that multiple-term superlinear convergence occurs, and this is observed in our experiment.

We now compare our algorithms to the method of alternating projections. With the same starting conditions, the method of alternating projections takes 200 iterations to find a point distance  $2.35 \times 10^{-13}$  from  $\bar{x}$ . The theory of alternating projections suggests that the rate of linear convergence once close to  $\bar{x}$  is

$$\cos\left(2 \cos^{-1}\left(\frac{2.9}{3}\right)\right) = 2\left(\frac{2.9}{3}\right)^2 - 1 \approx 0.8689.$$

The corresponding values for measure 2 defined in Table 4.1 would eventually be  $\ln(0.8689) \approx -0.1405$ , which was observed in our numerical experiments.

We now look at algorithms for the BAP. Algorithm 3.10 takes 90,000 iterations to find a point distance  $7.51 \times 10^{-4}$  from  $\bar{x}$ . Dykstra's algorithm takes 2000 iterations to find a point distance  $3.97 \times 10^{-10}$  from  $\bar{x}$ , but we caution that Dykstra's algorithm works differently in that the KKT conditions are only approximately satisfied at each iterate.

*Remark 4.1.* (Insufficient halfspaces stored to get superlinear convergence) It may appear from our example that collecting one halfspace from each set in the SIP (1.1) is sufficient to give multiple-term superlinear convergence. But this is not true in general.

Iter	(a) $d(x^i, \bar{x})$		(b) Measure 1		(c) Measure 2	
	BAP	SIP	BAP	SIP	BAP	SIP
0	$9.23 \times 10^0$	$9.23 \times 10^0$				
1	$2.95 \times 10^0$	$2.95 \times 10^0$	-1.14	-1.14	-1.14	-1.14
2	$1.48 \times 10^0$	$7.98 \times 10^{-1}$	-0.917	-1.22	-0.694	-1.31
3	$2.16 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.70 \times 10^{-1}$	-1.25	-1.33	-1.92	-1.55
4	$1.54 \times 10^{-1}$	$7.57 \times 10^{-2}$	-1.02	-1.20	-0.338	-0.809
5	$1.60 \times 10^{-2}$	$8.04 \times 10^{-3}$	-1.27	-1.41	-2.26	-2.24
6	$5.22 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.38 \times 10^{-3}$	-1.25	-1.47	-1.12	-1.76
7	$7.91 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.79 \times 10^{-5}$	-1.67	-1.88	-4.19	-4.34
8	$6.91 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.84 \times 10^{-7}$	-1.76	-2.10	-2.44	-3.61
9	$1.67 \times 10^{-9}$	$8.28 \times 10^{-11}$	-2.49	-2.83	-8.33	-8.67
10	$1.21 \times 10^{-11}$	$5.93 \times 10^{-14}$	-2.74	-3.27	-4.93	-7.24
11	$9.44 \times 10^{-16}$	$7.86 \times 10^{-16}$	-3.35	-3.36	-9.46	-4.32

TABLE 4.1. This table plots the values for the experiments in Section 4. To check the speed of convergence, we calculate  $\frac{\ln(d(x^i, \bar{x})) - \ln(d(x^0, \bar{x}))}{i}$  for Measure 1 and  $\ln(d(x^i, \bar{x})) - \ln(d(x^{i-1}, \bar{x}))$  for Measure 2. In the case of linear convergence (of a geometric sequence), these numbers will be constant. The measures decrease over iterations, which is evidence for multiple-term superlinear convergence.

An example involving the intersection of a plane and a line in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  where only linear and not superlinear convergence is obtained is given in [Pan15b, Example 4.7].

An advantage of Algorithms 3.1 and 3.4 is that they store and make use of previously generated halfspaces as far as possible to accelerate convergence. Algorithm 3.10 and Dykstra's algorithm do not keep such information. One can perform a single inner GI step in line 5 of Algorithm 3.1 for a low cost method of finding an iterate  $x$ . Alternatively, one can revisit old constraints and perform as many inner GI steps as necessary to solve the intermediate subproblems to optimality so that fewer projections are carried out. Further discussions of Algorithm 3.4 are given in Section 7.

Even if multiple-term superlinear convergence is not achieved, we believe our algorithms would be better for most, if not all, problems. When the problems are well structured, the number of halfspaces that need to be stored to achieve multiple-term superlinear convergence can be quite small.

## 5. ONE BOX CONSTRAINT

The problem of interest in this section is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|x - x_*\|^2 \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & L_i \leq x_i \leq U_i \\
 & c_p^T x \geq \hat{b},
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where  $c_p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\hat{b} \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $x_*$  satisfies  $L_i \leq (x_*)_i \leq U_i$  for all indices  $i$ , but  $c_p^T x_* < \hat{b}$ . The constraints  $L_i \leq x_i \leq U_i$  are also known as the *box constraints*. Problems with box constraints received particular attention in [CCC<sup>+</sup>12]. The  $L_i$  and  $U_i$  can be  $\pm\infty$  rather than real numbers. Such a problem arises when one of the sets involved in an




FIGURE 5.1. This figure shows how one can make use of the orthogonal normals in a box constraint to accelerate the SHQP procedure. The rectangle represents a box constraint, while the ellipse represents a set that is not easy to project onto. The first projection from  $x_1$  to  $x_2$  generates a halfspace that must contain the intersection. Subsequently, one tries to find a point in the box and the halfspace. The first three iterations from  $x_1$  to  $x_3$  follow the standard alternating projections. A tight constraint in the box is identified at  $x_3$ , and one makes use of the procedure in Section 5 (motivated by the idea in Figure 1.2) to show that there is an empty intersection.

SIP is a box constraint, and the constraint  $c_p^T x \geq \hat{b}$  is generated by the projection of  $x_*$  onto some set  $K_l$  such that  $x_* \notin K_l$ . The problem (5.1) is a particular case of (3.1). For (3.1), we can only find an active set  $J$  that solves (3.1) partially in (3.2) through a degenerate inner GI step. But since the constraints corresponding to the box constraints are orthogonal, we shall see in the rest of this section that problem (5.1) can be solved to optimality quite effectively. This allows us to make maximum use of the constraint  $c_p^T x \geq \hat{b}$ , especially when this constraint is expensive to calculate.

To simplify notation, we let  $B$  be the box

$$B = \{x : L_i \leq x_i \leq U_i \text{ for all } i\}. \quad (5.2)$$

We now present our algorithm and result for (5.1).

**Algorithm 5.1.** (Algorithm for box constraints) This algorithm solves (5.1). Let  $B$  be as defined in (5.2).

01 Set  $j = 0$  and  $\tilde{x}^0 = x_*$ .

02 While  $c_p^T \tilde{x}^j < \hat{b}$

03 **(Determine step direction)** Let the direction  $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be defined to be

$$d_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } [(c_p)_i > 0 \text{ and } \tilde{x}_i^j = U_i] \text{ or } [(c_p)_i < 0 \text{ and } \tilde{x}_i^j = L_i] \\ (c_p)_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

04 **(Determine step length)**

05 If  $\|d\| = 0$ , then problem is infeasible. Stop.

06 Otherwise, let  $t_2 = \frac{\hat{b} - c_p^T \tilde{x}^j}{c_p^T d}$ , and let  $y^j \leftarrow \tilde{x}^j + t_2 d$ .

07 Let  $\tilde{x}^{j+1} \leftarrow P_B(y^j)$  and  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ .

08 end while

We now show that the iterates  $\{\tilde{x}^j\}$  of Algorithm 5.1 terminates to the solution of (5.1).

**Proposition 5.2.** (Convergence of Algorithm 5.1) *Algorithm 5.1 either converges to the solution of (5.1) or declares the infeasibility of its constraints in finitely many steps.*

*Proof.* By multiplying components of  $c_p$  by  $-1$  and making the appropriate adjustments to (5.1) if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that  $c_p \geq 0$ . Hence  $d \geq 0$ .

We first prove that the algorithm cannot loop indefinitely. From the formula  $\tilde{x}^{j+1} = P_B(\tilde{x}^j + t_2 d)$  and  $d \geq 0$ , we can infer that  $c_p^T \tilde{x}^{j+1} > c_p^T \tilde{x}^j$ . It is also clear that  $c_p^T \tilde{x}^{j+1} \leq c_p^T y^j = \hat{b}$ . By the design of  $d$ , an index active  $i$  in  $\tilde{x}^j$  (i.e., any index  $i$  such that  $\tilde{x}_i^j = U_i$ ) would result in  $d_i = 0$ , which in turn results in  $i$  being an active index in  $\tilde{x}^{j+1}$ . Furthermore, if  $\tilde{x}^{j+1} \neq y^j$ , this means that there is an index active in  $\tilde{x}^{j+1}$  that is not active in  $\tilde{x}^j$ . There are only finitely many indices, and so the algorithm cannot loop indefinitely.

To see that  $\|d\| = 0$  implies that the problem (5.1) is infeasible, note that  $c_p$  would be a normal cone to  $B$  at  $\tilde{x}^j$ , signifying that the maximum value of  $c_p^T x$  over all  $x \in B$  equals  $c_p^T \tilde{x}^j$ , which is in turn strictly less than  $\hat{b}$ . Thus the problem (5.1) is infeasible.

Lastly, we show that the final iterate of  $\tilde{x}$  is the solution of (5.1). Let the set  $T_j$  be

$$T_j := \text{conical hull of } [\{c_p\} \cup \{-e_i : i \text{ is an active index of } \tilde{x}^j\}].$$

Note that by our earlier discussions,  $T_{j+1} \supsetneq T_j$ . It is clear that  $\tilde{x}^j - y^j \in T_j$  and  $y^j - \tilde{x}^{j+1} \in T_{j+1}$ . Let  $j^*$  be the final iteration of Algorithm 5.1. We have  $\tilde{x}^0 - \tilde{x}^{j^*} \in T_{j^*}$ , which gives the the KKT conditions certifying the optimality of  $\tilde{x}^{j^*}$  for (5.1).  $\square$

In practice, one may stop at any of the  $\tilde{x}^j$  or the  $y^j$ , though it is sensible to perform all iterations of Algorithm 5.1 and solve (5.1) fully if the constraint  $c_p^T x \geq \hat{b}$  was difficult to obtain.

*Remark 5.3.* (Comparison to Algorithm 3.4) Algorithm 5.1 is actually Algorithm 3.4 simplified for the case of box constraints. Lines 3 to 6 correspond to the degenerate inner GI step (Algorithm 3.6). Specifically, line 3 of Algorithm 5.1 finds the optimal step direction, and corresponds to step (a) of Algorithm 3.6, while lines 5 and 6 correspond to steps (b) and (c) of Algorithm 3.6. Line 7 corresponds to a projection back onto the box. Besides Algorithm 5.1 being much simpler than Algorithm 3.4 for the case of box constraints, the inner GI steps only require one iteration to find the optimal step direction, and (5.1) can be solved fully after the appropriate number of steps.

*Remark 5.4.* (Affine constraints) When some of the sets in the SIP are affine constraints, the techniques of [Pan15a] can be applied in a straightforward manner. Another approach for handling affine spaces is [HRER11]. Even though the approach in [HRER11] does not appear to preserve Fejér monotonicity, it uses a novel conjugate gradient approach that gives some very good numerical results. Idnani's thesis [Idn80] also elaborated on how to handle equality constraints in the GI algorithm.

## 6. FINITE CONVERGENCE OF A MODIFIED ART

In this section, we look at finite convergence of a modified ART (Algebraic Reconstruction Technique) algorithm. A version of the ART given in [Her75] solves the problem of finding a point in the intersection of finitely many hyperslabs in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , provided that the intersection has nonempty interior. We look at how we can modify the algorithm in [Her75] so that one has the option of solving QPs to accelerate performance, and still maintain finite convergence.



Consider the set

$$S := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : L \leq Ax \leq U\}, \quad (6.1)$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and each component of  $L_j$  and  $U_j$  lies in  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . We also let  $S_j$  be the  $j$ th hyperslab defined by

$$S_j := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : L_j \leq a_j^T x \leq U_j\},$$

where  $a_j^T$  is the  $j$ th row of  $A$ . The version of ART in [Her75], referred in there as ART3, can be stated as follows:

**Algorithm 6.1.** [Her75] (ART3) *This algorithm finds a point in  $S$  defined in (6.1) in finitely many iterations provided that  $S$  has nonempty interior. Let  $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a starting iterate, and let  $a_j^T$  be the  $j$ th row of  $A$ .*

01 Set  $i = 0, j = 1, k = m$

02 Loop

03 if  $j = k$ , then  $x \in S$  and STOP. Otherwise, set  $x^{i+1}$  by

$$x^{i+1} = \begin{cases} x^i & \text{if } a_j^T x^i \in [L_j, U_j] \\ x^i + \frac{2(L_j - a_j^T x^i)}{a_j^T a_j} a_j & \text{if } a_j^T x^i \in [L_j - \frac{1}{2}(U_j - L_j), L_j] \\ x^i + \frac{2(U_j - a_j^T x^i)}{a_j^T a_j} a_j & \text{if } a_j^T x^i \in [U_j, U_j + \frac{1}{2}(U_j - L_j)] \\ x^i + \frac{\frac{1}{2}(L_j + U_j) - a_j^T x^i}{a_j^T a_j} a_j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

04 if  $x^{i+1} \neq x^i$ , then  $k \leftarrow j$ .

05  $i \leftarrow i + 1$

06  $j \leftarrow \text{mod}(j + 1, m)$ . (i.e.,  $j \leftarrow j + 1$  if  $j < m$ , and  $j \leftarrow 1$  if  $j = m$ .)

07 end Loop

We elaborate on the formula (6.2). The point  $x^{i+1}$  is obtained from  $x^i$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} t &:= \max \{t' : P_{S_j}(x^i) + t'(P_{S_j}(x^i) - x^i) \in S_j\} \\ \bar{t} &:= \min\{t/2, 1\} \\ x^{i+1} &= P_{S_j}(x^i) + \bar{t}(P_{S_j}(x^i) - x^i). \end{aligned}$$

The idea is to reflect  $x^i$  about  $P_{S_j}(x^i)$  while staying as far inside the hyperslab  $S_j$  as possible.

The ART3 is proven to converge in finitely many iterations to a point in  $S$  as defined in (6.1).

**Theorem 6.2.** [Her75] (Finite convergence of ART3) *If  $S$  in (6.1) has nonempty interior, then Algorithm 6.1 converges to a point in  $S$  in finitely many iterations.*

We now extend Algorithm 6.1 so that one can perform QP steps in an attempt to improve its convergence. To simplify notation, define  $\tilde{L}_j$  and  $\tilde{U}_j$  as follows.

$$\tilde{L}_j := L_j - \frac{1}{2}(U_j - L_j), \quad \tilde{U}_j := U_j + \frac{1}{2}(U_j - L_j). \quad (6.3)$$

In Algorithm 6.4 below, we shall keep a record of three points  $x_\circ^i$ ,  $x_\times^i$  and  $x_+^i$  at each iteration  $i$ . The point  $x_\times^i$  is the projection of  $x_\circ^i$  onto a polyhedron defined by a few halfspaces that had been identified earlier. The point  $x_+^i$  is the extrapolation of this projection. This is explained in Figure 6.1.

*Remark 6.3.* (Finding  $x_+^i$  given  $x_o^i$  and  $x_\times^i$ .) Refer to Figure 6.1. The point  $x_+^i$  is found by extrapolating  $x_\times^i$  along the direction  $x_\times^i - x_o^i$  so that  $x_+^i$  gets inside the interior of the intersection of the hyperslabs active at  $x_\times^i$  as far as possible. More precisely, let  $J^i$  be the set of indices of hyperslabs  $S_j$  active at  $x_\times^i$ . Then calculate

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \max\{t' : x_\times^i + t'(x_\times^i - x_o^i) \in S_j \text{ for all } j \in J^i\} \\ \bar{t} &= \min\{t/2, 1\} \\ x_+^i &= x_\times^i + \bar{t}(x_\times^i - x_o^i). \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 6.1. Consider the problem of finding a point in  $S_1 \cap S_2$ , where  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are both hyperslabs. This diagram shows how  $x_o^1$ ,  $x_\times^1$  and  $x_+^1$  line up:  $x_\times^1 = P_{S_1}(x_o^1)$ , and  $x_+^1$  is of the form  $x_\times^1 + t(x_\times^1 - x_o^1)$ , where  $t$  is the largest number so that  $x_\times^1 + 2t(x_\times^1 - x_o^1) \in S_1$ . When step  $(P_o)$  is performed, then  $(x_o^2, x_\times^2, x_+^2) = (x_o^1, A, B)$ . When step  $(P_\times)$  is performed, then  $(x_o^2, x_\times^2, x_+^2) = (x_\times^1, A, C)$ . When step  $(P_+)$  is performed, then  $(x_o^2, x_\times^2, x_+^2) = (x_+^1, D, E)$ . If both  $(P_o)$  and  $(P_\times)$  are both possible, then  $(P_\times)$  is likely to be better because  $x_o^{i+1}$ ,  $x_\times^{i+1}$  and  $x_+^{i+1}$  are likely to have more constraints active. (The exact situation depends on the inner GI steps.) If both  $(P_o)$  and  $(P_+)$  are possible, then  $(P_o)$  is likely to be better because  $x_\times^{i+1}$  and  $x_+^{i+1}$  are likely to satisfy more constraints.

**Algorithm 6.4.** (Extended ART) This algorithm finds a point in  $S$  defined in (6.1). Let  $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a starting iterate, and let  $a_j^T$  be the  $j$ th row of  $A$ . Let  $\tilde{L}_j$  and  $\tilde{U}_j$  be defined as in (6.3).

Set  $i = 0$ ,  $j = 1$ ,  $k = m$ ,  $x_o^0 = x^0$ ,  $x_\times^0 = x^0$  and  $x_+^0 = x^0$ .

Loop

Analyze cases:

**Case 1:**  $a_j^T x_+ \in [L_j, U_j]$

Do nothing:  $x_o^{i+1} \leftarrow x_o^i$ ,  $x_\times^{i+1} \leftarrow x_\times^i$  and  $x_+^{i+1} \leftarrow x_+^i$ .

**Case 2:**  $a_j^T x_+ \in [\tilde{L}_j, L_j) \cup (U_j, \tilde{U}_j]$  and  $a_j^T x_\times \notin [L_j, U_j]$

Perform step  $(P_o)$  (preferred) or  $(P_+)$ .

**Case 3:**  $a_j^T x_+ \in [\tilde{L}_j, L_j) \cup (U_j, \tilde{U}_j]$  and  $a_j^T x_\times \in [L_j, U_j]$

Perform step  $(P_+)$ .  
**Case 4:**  $a_j^T x_+ \notin [\tilde{L}_j, \tilde{U}_j]$  and  $a_j^T x_\times \notin [L_j, U_j]$   
 Perform step  $(P_\circ)$  or  $(P_\times)$  (preferred) or  $(P_+)$ .  
**Case 5:**  $a_j^T x_+ \notin [\tilde{L}_j, \tilde{U}_j]$  and  $a_j^T x_\times \in [L_j, U_j]$   
 Perform step  $(P_\times)$  (preferred) or  $(P_+)$ .  
 end analyze cases.  
 $i \leftarrow i + 1$   
 $j \leftarrow \text{mod}(j + 1, m)$ .  
 end Loop

**Step  $(P_\circ)$ : Update  $x_\circ^{i+1}$  from  $x_\circ^i$ .**

Feed the violated constraint (violated by  $x_\times^i$ ) into the inner GI step (Algorithm 2.3) to improve on the problem of projecting from  $x_\circ^i$ . This is done by setting  $x_\circ^{i+1} = x_\circ^i$  and updating  $x_\times^{i+1}$  by using inner GI steps from  $x_\times^i$ . Use Remark 6.3 to get  $x_+^{i+1}$ .

**Step  $(P_\times)$ : Update  $x_\times^{i+1}$  from  $x_\times^i$ . We can build active sets with this step.**

Feed the violated constraint (violated by  $x_\times^i$ ) into the degenerate inner GI step (Algorithm 3.6) from the starting point  $x_\times^i$  to get  $x_\circ^{i+1} = x_\times^i$  and the new points  $x_\times^{i+1}$  and  $x_+^{i+1}$ . Use Remark 6.3 to get  $x_+^{i+1}$ .

**Step  $(P_+)$ : Update  $x_+^{i+1}$  from  $x_+^i$ .**

Feed the violated constraint (violated by  $x_+^i$ ) into the degenerate inner GI step (Algorithm 3.6) from the starting point  $x_+^i$  to get  $x_\circ^{i+1} = x_+^i$  and the new points  $x_\times^{i+1}$  and  $x_+^{i+1}$ . Use Remark 6.3 to get  $x_+^{i+1}$ .

The paper [HC08] pointed out that a cyclic order in checking the constraints  $a_j^T x \in [L_j, U_j]$  is not necessarily the most effective order. The strategy of keeping active sets through the QP algorithm can be considered a way to improve on the cyclic order in checking the constraints.

**Remark 6.5.** (Preference of steps in Algorithm 6.4) We list down the reasons why we make certain choices about the steps performed for each of the cases highlighted in Algorithm 6.4.

- (1) (on  $(P_\times)$ ) The reason why we do not perform step  $(P_\times)$  for cases 2 and 3 (i.e., when  $a_j^T x_+ \in [\tilde{L}_j, L_j] \cup (U_j, \tilde{U}_j]$ ) is that performing  $(P_\times)$  disrupts the final part of the proof of Theorem 6.6. However, we still make performing the step  $(P_\times)$  the preferred choice for cases 4 and 5. The paper [Her75] cites [Gof71] in pointing out that “for rapid convergence, it is a good strategy to use projections when we are far away from the hyperslab and reflections when we are near it”. Another advantage of  $(P_\times)$  that we have seen throughout this paper is that we can build active sets using the inner GI steps that may accelerate the convergence of the problem at hand.
- (2) (on  $(P_\circ)$ ) This step requires that  $x_\times^i$  be outside the slab  $\{x : L_j \leq a_j^T x \leq U_j\}$  so that one can apply the inner GI step with the appropriate face of the hyperslab being used as a violated constraint. Therefore,  $(P_\circ)$  cannot be performed in cases 3 and 5 when  $a_j^T x_\times \in [L_j, U_j]$ . In case 2, we marked that this step is preferred, but we recall Theorem 2.6 and Remark 2.7. Furthermore, if  $x_\times$  is close to but not in the hyperslab, then it may be better to perform  $(P_+)$  instead.

We now prove that the finite convergence of Algorithm 6.4.

**Theorem 6.6.** *(Finite convergence of Algorithm 6.4) Suppose that the feasible region  $S$  defined in (6.1) has nonempty interior. Then there is an  $i$  such that  $x_+^i \in S$  in Algorithm 6.4.*

*Proof.* Seeking a contradiction, suppose that  $x_+^i \notin S$  for all  $i > 0$ . Rewrite the iterates  $\{x_+^i\}$  as a subsequence  $\{\tilde{x}^i\}$  where for each  $i$ , either we have a projection  $\tilde{x}^{i+1} = P_{S_i}(\tilde{x}^i)$  (when a step  $(P_\times)$  is performed) or a partial reflection  $\tilde{x}^{i+1} = P_{S_i}(\tilde{x}^i) + \bar{t}(P_{S_i}(\tilde{x}^i) - \tilde{x}^i)$  for some  $\bar{t} \in [0, 1]$  (when a step  $(P_+)$  is performed). Note that when a step  $(P_\circ)$  is performed at iteration  $j$ , we have  $x_+^{j+1} = x_+^j$ , so we do not add a new term for  $\tilde{x}^i$ .

The number of times the step  $(P_\circ)$  is performed consecutively cannot be infinite in view of Theorem 2.6. Therefore, the sequence  $\{\tilde{x}^i\}$  is infinite.

Since the sequence  $\{\tilde{x}^i\}$  is formed by projections and (partial) reflections about the convex sets containing  $S$ , it is a standard result that the sequence  $\{\tilde{x}^i\}$  is Fejér monotone with respect to  $S$ , i.e.,

$$\|\tilde{x}^{i+1} - s\| \leq \|\tilde{x}^i - s\| \text{ for all } s \in S.$$

Since  $S$  was assumed to have nonempty interior, [BZ05, Theorem 4.5.10(iii)] implies that the iterates  $\{\tilde{x}^i\}$  converges to some point, say  $\bar{x}$ . It is clear that this limit  $\bar{x}$  cannot lie outside any hyperslab  $\{x : L_j \leq a_j^T x \leq U_j\}$ , and hence cannot lie outside  $S$ . If this limit  $\bar{x}$  lies in the interior of  $S$ , then we would have gotten finite convergence. Thus this limit is on the boundary of  $S$ .

There is a neighborhood  $V$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that for any  $y \in V$  and any constraint  $\{x : L_j \leq a_j^T x \leq U_j\}$  tight at  $\bar{x}$ , we have  $a_j^T y \in [\tilde{L}_j, \tilde{U}_j]$ , where  $\tilde{L}_j$  and  $\tilde{U}_j$  are defined in (6.3). Therefore once close enough to  $\bar{x}$ , step  $(P_\times)$  will not be performed. This will mean that all the steps that are performed are reflections. But these reflections would mean that  $\{\|\tilde{x}^i - \bar{x}\|\}$  remains constant after some point, contradicting the assumption that  $\{\tilde{x}^i\}$  converges to  $\bar{x}$ .  $\square$

## 7. MORE ON THE DEGENERATE INNER GI STEP

In this section, we introduce an additional step (Algorithm 7.2) after step (a) of Algorithm 3.6, and show its relationship with the inner GI step (Algorithm 2.3) and the degenerate inner GI step (Algorithm 3.6) in Theorem 7.4. We also show how to reduce the dimensions of the QP needed to be solved for Algorithm 3.4 (SIP). These observations can be built on to improve algorithms for the SIP.

**Proposition 7.1.** *(Step (a) of Algorithm 3.6) At the end of step (a) of Algorithm 3.6,  $c_p - z = P_{\text{cone}(-N)}(c_p)$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $c_p - z = QQ^T c_p$  and  $(Q, R)$  is the QR factorization of  $N$ . So  $c_p - z = P_{\text{span}(-N)}(c_p)$ . Next, note that by the time step (a) ends,  $r \leq 0$ . Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} r &= R^{-1}Q^T c_p \\ \Rightarrow Nr &= QQ^T c_p = c_p - z. \end{aligned}$$

In other words,  $c_p - z$  is also  $P_{\text{cone}(-N)}(c_p)$  as claimed.  $\square$

Proposition 7.1 states that the Algorithm 3.6 tries to find  $z$  and the active set  $J$  so that  $c_p - z = P_{\text{cone}(-N)}(c_p)$ . (Readers familiar with the Moreau Theorem and the (negative) polar cone will notice that an equivalent way to write this statement is  $z = P_{[\text{cone}(-N)]^-}(c_p)$ , where  $C^-$  refers to the polar cone of  $C$ .) In trying to find this  $z$




FIGURE 7.1. In the diagram on the left, the degenerate inner GI step (Algorithm 3.6) may not find the correct set of active constraints to slide along in solving (3.1). The degenerate inner GI step might find  $z$  by sliding along the constraints defined by the normal  $c_1$ , or find the point  $y$  after dropping all constraints active at  $x$  instead of finding the optimal point  $w$ . One approach to find  $w$  even if we didn't land in  $w$  in the first try is to introduce the violated constraints into the inner GI step (Algorithm 2.3). Another approach is to find a better direction to slide along by running as many steps of Algorithm 7.2 as needed between steps (a) and (b) of Algorithm 3.6. The second approach is equivalent to projecting  $c_3$  onto the conical hull of  $\{-c_1, -c_2\}$ , as elaborated in the rest of Section 7.

and  $J$ , Algorithm 3.6 may find a suboptimal active set  $J$  so that  $c_p - z = P_{\text{cone}(-N)}(c_p)$  holds.

Instead of running Algorithm 3.6 and then running Algorithm 2.3 till (3.1) is solved (fully or partially; refer to Theorem 2.6 and Remark 2.7), another approach is to try to solve  $P_{\text{cone}(-N)}(c_p)$  to optimality as far as possible using a primal active set QP algorithm before the conclusion of Algorithm 3.6. We now show how to do so.

**Algorithm 7.2.** (After step (a) of Algorithm 3.6) Let  $J_0$  and  $N_0$  be the values of  $J$  and  $N$  at the start of Algorithm 3.6, and let  $J_1$  and  $N_1$  be the values of  $J$  and  $N$  after step (a) of Algorithm 3.6 is performed. Note that  $J_1 \subset J_0$ . This algorithm tries to find the active set  $J$  and the corresponding  $N$  so that  $P_{\text{cone}(-N_0)}(c_p) = P_{\text{cone}(-N)}(c_p)$ . The direction  $z = c_p - P_{\text{cone}(-N)}(c_p)$  to be used at step (b) of Algorithm 3.6 would then be the best possible.

We label this algorithm as step  $(a^+)$ , which is to be performed in Algorithm 3.6 after step (a) and before step (b).

**$(a^+)$  Improve step direction**

00 Set  $J \leftarrow J_1$ , and set  $N, Q, R$  and  $r$  in a similar manner. Set  $y \leftarrow Nr$ .

01 Loop

**(Choose index to enter basis)**

02 Find an index  $j \in J_0 \setminus J$  such that  $[-c_j]^T [c_p - y] > 0$

03 If no such  $j$  exists, then  $y = P_{\text{cone}(-N_0)}(c_p)$ . Exit loop.

04 Let  $N_+ = [N \quad c_j]$ ,

05 Let  $(Q_+, R_+)$  be the economy QR factorization of  $N_+$ .

06 Let  $r^+ = R_+^{-1} Q_+ c_p$ .

**(Remove active indices till  $j$  enters basis)**07 While  $r^+ \not\leq 0$ 

08 Set

$$t_3 := \min_{\substack{r_i^+ > 0 \\ i \in \{1, \dots, q\}}} \left\{ \frac{-r_i}{r_i^+} \right\} = \frac{-r_l}{r_l^+}.$$

09 Let  $r = r + t_3 r^+$ .10 Remove  $J(l)$ th element from  $J$ , and11 update  $N$ ,  $N_+$ ,  $Q$ ,  $Q_+$ ,  $R$ ,  $R_+$ ,  $r$  and  $q$  accordingly.12 Let  $r^+ = R_+^{-1} Q_+ c_p$ 

13 end While

14 Let  $N \leftarrow N_+$ ,  $r \leftarrow r^+$ ,  $Q \leftarrow Q_+$ ,  $R \leftarrow R_+$ ,  $q \leftarrow q + 1$ ,  $y \leftarrow Nr$ .15 If  $y$  is deemed to be satisfactory, then break.

16 end loop

*Remark 7.3.* (On Algorithm 7.2) Algorithm 7.2 describes a primal active set QP strategy for solving (3.1), where we try to find  $y \in \text{cone}(-N_0)$  that minimizes the distance from  $c_p$  to  $\text{cone}(-N_0)$ . The standard theory of the active set method implies that the distance  $\|c_p - y\|$  is strictly decreasing and also that there are only finitely many combinations of active indices. Hence Algorithm 7.2 must terminate at the optimum  $y = P_{\text{cone}(-N_0)}(c_p)$  in finitely many iterations. But the analogue of Theorem 2.6 and Remark 2.7 also apply for the primal active set QP algorithm: It may be excessive to perform all the required iterations to solve (3.1) to optimality, but any intermediate solutions can still give good progress towards the original SIP.

A byproduct of this perspective for solving (3.1) is that the index  $j$  that maximizes  $[-c_j]^T [c_p - y]$  seems to be a good index to add in line 2 to accelerating convergence. A divide and conquer approach can be used to find an approximation to  $y = P_{\text{cone}(-N_0)}(c_p)$  when the number of columns of  $N_0$  is large. More details on the primal active set QP method can be found in [NW06] for example.

We now prove a connection between Algorithm 7.2 and the inner GI step.

**Theorem 7.4.** (Step  $(a^+)$  and inner GI step) Consider the first sequence of steps below

- Step (a) of Algorithm 3.6 (degenerate inner GI step), followed by an iteration of lines 2-15 of Algorithm 7.2 (step  $(a^+)$ ), followed by the remainder of Algorithm 3.6,

and the second sequence of steps below

- Algorithm 3.6 (degenerate inner GI step) followed by an inner GI step (Algorithm 2.3).

An index  $j$  gives a violated constraint to perform step  $(a^+)$  in the first sequence of steps if and only if this index gives a violated constraint to perform an inner GI step in the second sequence of steps. Furthermore, the two sequences of steps are equivalent provided that the same violated constraint is used in both sequences of steps.

*Proof.* We mark the variables  $N_0$ ,  $Q_0$ ,  $R_0$  and  $J_0$  be the corresponding parameters before step (a) of Algorithm 3.6 in both sequences of steps. Let the variables  $N_1$ ,  $Q_1$ ,  $R_1$ ,  $J_1$  be the corresponding parameters after step (a) and before the two sequences of steps diverges.

By the end of step (a) of Algorithm 3.6, we have found a direction  $z = c_p - P_{\text{cone}(-N_1)}(c_p)$ .

We look at a single iteration in the inner loop in step (a<sup>+</sup>). Step (a<sup>+</sup>) finds a  $j$  so that  $c_j^T(c_p - y) > 0$ .

Next, we consider the second sequence of steps. By the end of Algorithm 3.6, we have found an  $x$  such that  $x^+ = x + tz$ , where  $t = \frac{b - c_p^T x}{c_p^T z} > 0$ . Making use of the connection  $c_p - y = z$ , we have  $-c_j^T(c_p - y) > 0$  if and only if  $c_j^T z < 0$ . The condition  $-c_j^T(c_p - y) > 0$  is thus equivalent to

$$c_j^T x^+ = c_j^T x + t c_j^T z = b_j + t c_j^T z < b_j.$$

In other words, the first statement of our result holds.

To prove the second statement, we look at the first sequence of steps again. The inner loop of step (a<sup>+</sup>) contains yet another inner loop in lines 7-13. It suffices to compare this inner loop with the inner loop within the inner GI step.

In the second sequence of steps, consider the variables at the end of performing Algorithm 3.6. From  $x^+ = x + tz$  in Algorithm 3.6, we have  $z = \frac{1}{t}(x^+ - x)$ . From the definition of an  $s$ -tuple in Definition 2.1(5)(b), we have  $z = -Nu$ , where  $u = \begin{pmatrix} -r \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$ . The equivalences of the two sequences of steps can be observed by noting the similarities between the variables  $r$ ,  $r^+$  and  $t_3$  in step (a<sup>+</sup>) and the variables  $-u$  (the first  $q$  components only),  $r$  and  $t_1$  in the inner loop of the inner GI step.  $\square$

The elementary result below, which is quite similar to Proposition 3.7, makes a final point about reducing the problem size to speed up the algorithm.

**Proposition 7.5.** (Problem size reduction) *Let  $Q_0 R_0$  be a QR factorization of  $N_0$ . The columns of  $N_0$  are indexed by  $J_0$ . Let  $\tilde{y} = P_{\text{cone}(-R_0)}(Q_0^T c_p)$ . Then*

- (1) *There is an index set  $J$  and a vector  $r < 0$  such that  $\tilde{y} = (R_0)_J r$ , where  $(R_0)_J$  is the matrix formed by the columns of  $R_0$  indexed by  $J$ .*
- (2)  $Q_0 \tilde{y} = P_{\text{cone}(-N_0)}(c_p)$ .

*Lastly, if the QR factorization of  $(R_0)_J$  is obtained in the process of finding  $\tilde{y}$ , say  $(R_0)_J = \tilde{Q} \tilde{R}$ , then  $[Q_0 \tilde{Q}] \tilde{R}$  would be the QR factorization of  $Q_0 (R_0)_J$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\tilde{y} = P_{\text{cone}(-R_0)}(Q_0^T c_p)$ , we have  $\tilde{y} \in \text{cone}(-R_0)$ , so there is an index set  $J \subset J_0$  and a vector  $r < 0$  such that  $\tilde{y} = (R_0)_J r$ , giving us the first conclusion.

For the second conclusion, let  $y = Q_0 \tilde{y}$ . We want to check that  $y = P_{\text{cone}(-N_0)}(c_p)$ . Any element in  $\text{cone}(-N_0)$  can be written as  $Q_0 R_0 \tilde{v}$  for some  $\tilde{v} \leq 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} [c_p - y]^T [Q_0 R_0 \tilde{v} - y] &= [c_p - Q_0 Q_0^T c_p]^T Q_0 [R_0 \tilde{v} - \tilde{y}] \\ &\quad + [Q_0 Q_0^T c_p - y]^T Q_0 [R_0 \tilde{v} - \tilde{y}]. \end{aligned}$$

The expressions above can be simplified

$$\begin{aligned} [c_p - Q_0 Q_0^T c_p]^T Q_0 [R_0 \tilde{v} - \tilde{y}] &= c_p^T [I - Q_0 Q_0^T] Q_0 [R_0 \tilde{v} - \tilde{y}] = 0, \\ \text{and } [Q_0 Q_0^T c_p - y]^T Q_0 [R_0 \tilde{v} - \tilde{y}] &= [Q_0^T c_p - \tilde{y}]^T Q_0^T Q_0 [R_0 \tilde{v} - \tilde{y}] \\ &= [Q_0^T c_p - \tilde{y}]^T [R_0 \tilde{v} - \tilde{y}] \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality comes from the fact that  $\tilde{y} = P_{\text{cone}(-R_0)}(Q_0^T c_p)$ . Therefore  $[c_p - y]^T [v - y] \leq 0$  for all  $v \in \text{cone}(-N_0)$ , which shows that  $y = P_{\text{cone}(-N_0)}(c_p)$  as needed. The last statement is straightforward.  $\square$

The last result shows us that instead of following the description of Algorithm 7.2, a dimension reduction can reduce the size of the QP needed to be solved, which leads to a more efficient algorithm.

## 8. CONCLUSION

We show how the inner GI step, which is derived from the dual active set QP algorithm of [GI83], can allow us to keep a QR factorization of the normals of the active constraints. The cost of accumulating this QR factorization is actually quite cheap in view of Remark 2.5. Accumulating such information about the normals of the active constraints accelerate the convergence to a solution for the simple example in Section 4.

Since keeping a large number of recently generated halfspaces is useful for accelerating convergence, it is natural to look at how we can keep the largest number of the most useful halfspaces efficiently. This paper on integrating projection and QP algorithms appears to be the first effort in this direction. We shall defer more serious numerical calculations to a later paper.

## REFERENCES

- [BB96] H.H. Bauschke and J.M. Borwein, *On projection algorithms for solving convex feasibility problems*, SIAM Rev. **38** (1996), 367–426.
- [BC11] H.H. Bauschke and P.L. Combettes, *Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces*, Springer, 2011.
- [BCK06] H.H. Bauschke, P.L. Combettes, and S.G. Kruk, *Extrapolation algorithm for affine-convex feasibility problems*, Numer. Algorithms **41** (2006), 239–274.
- [BD85] J.P. Boyle and R.L. Dykstra, *A method for finding projections onto the intersection of convex sets in Hilbert spaces*, Advances in Order Restricted Statistical Inference, Lecture notes in Statistics, Springer, New York, 1985, pp. 28–47.
- [BDHP03] H.H. Bauschke, F. Deutsch, H.S. Hundal, and S.-H. Park, *Accelerating the convergence of the method of alternating projections*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **355** (2003), no. 9, 3433–3461.
- [BR09] E.G. Birgin and M. Raydan, *Dykstra’s algorithm and robust stopping criteria*, Encyclopedia of Optimization (C. A. Floudas and P. M. Pardalos, eds.), Springer, US, 2 ed., 2009, pp. 828–833.
- [BZ05] J.M. Borwein and Q.J. Zhu, *Techniques of variational analysis*, Springer, NY, 2005, CMS Books in Mathematics.
- [CCC<sup>+</sup>12] Y. Censor, W. Chen, P. L. Combettes, R. Davidi, and G.T. Herman, *On the effectiveness of projection methods for convex feasibility problems with linear inequality constraints*, Comput. Optim. Appl. **51** (2012), 1065–1088.
- [Cim38] G. Cimmino, *Calcolo approssimato per le soluzioni dei sistemi di equazioni lineari*, La Ricerca Scientifica XVI II (1938), no. 9, 326–333.
- [Com03] P.L. Combettes, *A block-iterative surrogate constraint splitting method for quadratic signal recovery*, IEEE Transactions in Signal Processing **51** (2003), no. 7, 1771–1782.
- [Deu95] F. Deutsch, *The angle between subspaces of a Hilbert space*, Approximation Theory, Spline Functions and Applications (S. P. Singh, ed.), Kluwer Academic Publ., The Netherlands, 1995, pp. 107–130.
- [Deu01a] ———, *Accelerating the convergence of the method of alternating projections via a line search: A brief survey*, Inherently Parallel Algorithms in Feasibility and Optimization and their Applications (D. Butnariu, Y. Censor, and S. Reich, eds.), Elsevier, 2001, pp. 203–217.
- [Deu01b] ———, *Best approximation in inner product spaces*, Springer, 2001, CMS Books in Mathematics.
- [Dyk83] R.L. Dykstra, *An algorithm for restricted least-squares regression*, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. **78** (1983), 837–842.
- [ER11] R. Escalante and M. Raydan, *Alternating projection methods*, SIAM, 2011.
- [GBH70] R. Gordon, R. Bender, and G.T. Herman, *Algebraic reconstruction techniques (ART) for three-dimensional electron microscopy and x-ray photography*, Journal of Theoretical Biology (1970), no. 29, 471–481.
- [GI83] D. Goldfarb and A. Idrani, *A numerically stable dual method for solving strictly convex quadratic programs*, Math. Programming **27** (1983), 1–33.



- [GK89] W.B. Gearhart and M. Koshy, *Acceleration schemes for the method of alternating projections*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **26** (1989), 235–249.
- [Gof71] J.L. Goffin, *On the finite convergence of the relaxation method for solving systems of inequalities*, Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1971.
- [GP98] U.M. García-Palomares, *A superlinearly convergent projection algorithm for solving the convex inequality problem*, Oper. Res. Lett. **22** (1998), 97–103.
- [GP01] ———, *Superlinear rate of convergence and optimal acceleration schemes in the solution of convex inequality problems*, Inherently Parallel Algorithms in Feasibility and Optimization and their Applications (D. Butnariu, Y. Censor, and S. Reich, eds.), Elsevier, 2001, pp. 297–305.
- [GPR67] L.G. Gubin, B.T. Polyak, and E.V. Raik, *The method of projections for finding the common point of convex sets*, USSR Comput. Math. Math. Phys. **7** (1967), no. 6, 1–24.
- [Hal62] I. Halperin, *The product of projection operators*, Acta. Sci. Math. (Szeged) **23** (1962), 96–99.
- [Han88] S.P. Han, *A successive projection method*, Math. Programming **40** (1988), 1–14.
- [Hau68] Y. Haugazeau, *Sur les inéquations variationnelles et la minimisation de fonctionnelles convexes*, Ph.D. thesis, Université de Paris, 1968.
- [HC08] G.T. Herman and W. Chen, *A fast algorithm for solving a linear feasibility problem with application to intensity-modulated radiation therapy*, Linear Algebra Appl. **428** (2008), 1207–1217.
- [Her75] G.T. Herman, *A relaxation method for reconstructing objects from noisy X-rays*, Math. Program. (1975), no. 8, 1–19.
- [HRER11] L. M. Hernández-Ramos, R. Escalante, and M. Raydan, *Unconstrained optimization techniques for the acceleration of alternating projection methods*, Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim. **32** (2011), no. 10, 1041–1066.
- [Idn80] A.U. Idnani, *Numerically stable dual projection methods for solving positive definite quadratic programs*, Ph.D. thesis, City University of New York, 1980.
- [Kac37] S. Kaczmarz, *Angenäherte auflösung von systemen linearer gleichungen*, Bull. Internat. Acad. Pol. Sci. Lett. Ser. A **35** (1937), 355–357.
- [NW06] J. Nocedal and S.J. Wright, *Numerical optimization*, 2 ed., Springer, 2006.
- [Pan14] C.H.J. Pang, *Improved analysis of algorithms based on supporting halfspaces and quadratic programming for the convex intersection and feasibility problems*, (preprint) (2014).
- [Pan15a] ———, *Accelerating the alternating projection algorithm for the case of affine subspaces using supporting hyperplanes*, Linear Algebra Appl. **469** (2015), 419–439.
- [Pan15b] ———, *Set intersection problems: Supporting hyperplanes and quadratic programming*, Math. Programming **149** (2015), 329–359.
- [Pie81] A.R. De Pierro, *Metodos de projeção para a resolução de sistemas gerais de equações algébricas lienaers*, Ph.D. thesis, Instituto de Matemática, Universidade a Federal do Rio de Janeiro (IM- UFRJ), 1981.
- [Pie84] G. Pierra, *Decomposition through formalization in a product space*, Math. Programming **28** (1984), 96–115.
- [San87] L. T. Dos Santos, *A parallel subgradient projections method for the convex feasibility problem*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **18** (1987), 307–320.
- [vN50] J. von Neumann, *Functional operators. II. The geometry of orthogonal spaces.*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, no. 22., Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1950, [This is a reprint of mimeographed lecture notes first distributed in 1933.].

*Current address:* Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore, Block S17 08-11, 10 Lower Kent Ridge Road, Singapore 119076

*E-mail address:* matpchj@nus.edu.sg