

An over-relaxed ADMM for separable convex programming and its applications to statistical learning

Renyuan Ni

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract The alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) has been applied successfully in a broad spectrum of areas. Moreover, it was shown in the literature that ADMM is closely related to the Douglas-Rachford operator-splitting method, and can be viewed as a special case of the proximal point algorithm (PPA). As is well known, the relaxed version of PPA not only maintains the convergence properties of PPA in theory, but also numerically outperforms the original PPA. Therefore, it is interesting to ask whether ADMM can be accelerated by using the over-relaxation technique. In this paper, we answer this question affirmatively by developing an over-relaxed ADMM integrated with a criterion to decide whether a relaxation step is implemented in the iteration. The global convergence and $O(1/t)$ convergence rate of the over-relaxed ADMM are established. We also implement our proposed algorithm to solve Lasso and sparse inverse covariance selection problems, and compare its performance with the relaxed customized ADMM in [2] and the classical ADMM. The results show that our algorithm substantially outperforms the other two methods.

Keywords Convex separable programming · Alternating direction method of multipliers · Over relaxation · Convergence and convergence rate

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000) 90C25 · 90C90 · 65K05

1 Introduction

This paper considers the following structured convex programming problem

$$\min\{\theta_1(x) + \theta_2(y) \mid Ax + By = b, x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}\}, \quad (1)$$

Renyuan Ni
Department of Mathematics, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong, 999077, China
E-mail: 19481535@life.hkbu.edu.hk

where $\theta_1 : \mathfrak{R}^{n_1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$, $\theta_2 : \mathfrak{R}^{n_2} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ are convex functions (but not necessarily smooth), $A \in \mathfrak{R}^{m \times n_1}$, $B \in \mathfrak{R}^{m \times n_2}$ and $b \in \mathfrak{R}^m$, $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathfrak{R}^{n_1}$, $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathfrak{R}^{n_2}$ are given closed convex sets. Throughout this paper, the matrices A and B are assumed to have full column-rank. Problem (1) has recently found many applications in a variety of domains such as image processing [16,19], statistical learning [1] and communication networking [17,18].

The augmented Lagrangian function of Problem (1) is

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta(x, y, \lambda) = \theta_1(x) + \theta_2(y) - \lambda^T(Ax + By - b) + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax + By - b\|^2, \quad (2)$$

where λ is the Lagrange multiplier and $\beta > 0$ is a penalty parameter. Notice that Problem (1) has a separable structure and it is favorable to take this advantage in the algorithmic design. The alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM), which can be seen as a splitting version of augmented Lagrangian method, originally introduced in [5,6] is particularly suitable for solving (1). In fact, the ADMM decomposes the augmented Lagrangian separately with respect to the variables x and y , and then the resulted subproblems can be solved individually. At each iteration, the ADMM runs as follows:

$$\begin{cases} x^{k+1} = \arg \min \{ \mathcal{L}_\beta(x, y^k, \lambda^k) \mid x \in \mathcal{X} \}, & (3a) \\ y^{k+1} = \arg \min \{ \mathcal{L}_\beta(x^{k+1}, y, \lambda^k) \mid y \in \mathcal{Y} \}, & (3b) \\ \lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k - \beta(Ax^{k+1} + By^{k+1} - b). & (3c) \end{cases}$$

Since the ADMM enjoys wide applications, it has been studied extensively in the literature. For example, the ADMM is known to be convergent under mild conditions; see [1]. Under same conditions, it was shown the ADMM converges with an $O(1/n)$ rate (where n is the number of iterations)[10,11]. Furthermore, with some additional assumptions, the works [7,8,9,13] establish local linear convergence rate results for the ADMM.

Another important issue for the ADMM is to design its accelerated version by slightly modifying the original ADMM with a simple relaxation scheme. Notice that the ADMM was shown to be closely related to the proximal point algorithms(PPA). In fact, ADMM is recovered when a special splitting form of PPA is applied to the dual problem of (1). For proximal type algorithms, their convergence rates can be improved when an additional over-relaxation step is incorporated on the essential variables; see

Tao proposed a relaxed variant of PPA and proved its linear convergence results[23]. Gu and Yang further proved the optimal linear convergence rate of relaxed PPA under a regularity condition[20].

As been demonstrated by Boyd et al. in [1], the execution of ADMM is based on the input of (y^k, λ^k) , and x^k is not required at all. Thus x plays the role of intermediary variable and (y, λ) are essential variables in the scheme (3). It is therefore natural to ask whether it is possible to obtain a faster ADMM type method by equipping the ADMM scheme (3) with a relaxation

step on the essential variable (y^k, λ^k) . This idea leads to the method

$$\begin{cases} x^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{\theta_1(x) - x^T A^T \lambda^k + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax + By^k - b\|^2\}, & (4a) \\ \hat{y}^k = \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \{\theta_2(y) - y^T B^T \lambda^k + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax^{k+1} + By - b\|^2\}, & (4b) \\ \hat{\lambda}^k = \lambda^k - \beta(Ax^{k+1} + B\hat{y}^k - b). & (4c) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} y^{k+1} \\ \lambda^{k+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y^k \\ \lambda^k \end{pmatrix} - \gamma \begin{pmatrix} y^k - \hat{y}^k \\ \lambda^k - \hat{\lambda}^k \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

where the relaxation factor $\gamma \in (0, 2)$. Under certain conditions, researchers have established some results. Some scholars only introduced the relaxation scheme on the essential variable λ^k . For example, Xu [21] has proved that proximal ADMM can achieve the similar convergence result like the original ADMM when using the relaxation factor $\gamma \in (0, \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2})$. Moreover, Ma [22] has derived the feasible region for the relaxation parameter γ and proximal parameter and proved the global convergence rate of proximal ADMM. On the other hand, Ye [14] proposed a method that modified by using a self-adaptive step size in (5), and the performance is observed to be much improved. Cai [2] proved that if the order of the \hat{y}^k and $\hat{\lambda}^k$ update is swapped in (4), the algorithm is convergent. However, it is still not clear whether the method is convergent when we apply the relaxation scheme on the essential variable (y^k, λ^k) and γ is a constant in $(1, 2)$. In this paper, we affirmatively address this question by introducing a simple criterion at each iteration. When the criterion is satisfied, we can over-relax the variables of ADMM with the constant stepsize γ . Thus a new relaxed ADMM is proposed and will show that efficiency of the proposed algorithm on optimization problems from statistical learning.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give a formal statement of the over-relaxed ADMM and provide some preliminaries. Convergence and convergence rate are proved in Section 3. In Section 4, we summarize the experimental results. Finally, some conclusions are made in Section 5.

2 The Over-relaxed ADMM

In this section, we describe our over-relaxation ADMM method for solving problem (1).

2.1 Algorithm

Algorithm: Over-relaxed ADMM method for solving (1).

$$\begin{cases} x^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{ \theta_1(x) - x^T A^T \lambda^k + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax + By^k - b\|^2 \}, & (6a) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \hat{y}^k = \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \{ \theta_2(y) - y^T B^T \lambda^k + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax^{k+1} + By - b\|^2 \}, & (6b) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\lambda}^k = \lambda^k - \beta(Ax^{k+1} + B\hat{y}^k - b). & (6c) \end{cases}$$

Criterion: if $(\lambda^k - \hat{\lambda}^k)^T B(y^k - \hat{y}^k) \geq 0$, choose $\gamma \in (1, 2)$.

$$\begin{cases} y^{k+1} = y^k - \gamma(y^k - \hat{y}^k), & (7a) \\ \lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k - \gamma(\lambda^k - \hat{\lambda}^k), & (7b) \end{cases}$$

else

$$y^{k+1} = \hat{y}^k, \quad \lambda^{k+1} = \hat{\lambda}^k. \quad (7c)$$

2.2 Variational characterization of (1)

In the following, we characterize the optimality condition of the problem (1) as a variational inequality (VI). The VI reformulation plays a key role in our convergence analysis.

Let the Lagrangian function of (1) be

$$L(x, y, \lambda) = \theta_1(x) + \theta_2(y) - \lambda^T (Ax + By - b). \quad (8)$$

Finding primal and dual optimal variables for (1) is equivalent to finding a saddle point for the Lagrangian. Let (x^*, y^*, λ^*) be a saddle point of (8). Then we have

$$L_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}^m}(x^*, y^*, \lambda) \leq L(x^*, y^*, \lambda^*) \leq L_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}}(x, y, \lambda^*).$$

This saddle point problem can be combined into a system

$$\begin{cases} x^* \in \mathcal{X}, & \theta_1(x) - \theta_1(x^*) + (x - x^*)^T (-A^T \lambda^*) \geq 0, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \\ y^* \in \mathcal{Y}, & \theta_2(y) - \theta_2(y^*) + (y - y^*)^T (-B^T \lambda^*) \geq 0, \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}, \\ \lambda^* \in \mathfrak{R}^m, & (\lambda - \lambda^*)^T (Ax^* + By^* - b) \geq 0, \forall \lambda \in \mathfrak{R}^m. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Compactly, (9) can be written as

$$\text{VI}(\Omega, F, \theta) \quad w^* \in \Omega, \quad \theta(w) - \theta(w^*) + (w - w^*)^T F(w^*) \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in \Omega, \quad (10a)$$

where

$$w = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix}, \quad u = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}, \quad F(w) = \begin{pmatrix} -A^T \lambda \\ -B^T \lambda \\ Ax + By - b \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10b)$$

$$\theta(u) = \theta_1(x) + \theta_2(y), \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathfrak{R}^m.$$

In this way, problem (1) is reformulated as a variational inequality (10). We denote by Ω^* the solution set of $\text{VI}(\Omega, F, \theta)$. Note that Ω^* is nonempty under the nonempty assumption of the solution set of (1).

2.3 Preliminaries

Before proceeding with our analysis, we introduce some notations which will be frequently used. First, for the iterate $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})$ generated by the relaxed ADMM (2.1), we define an auxiliary vector $\tilde{w}^k = (\tilde{x}^k, \tilde{y}^k, \tilde{\lambda}^k)$ as

$$\tilde{x}^k = x^{k+1}, \quad \tilde{y}^k = \hat{y}^k, \quad (11a)$$

and

$$\tilde{\lambda}^k = \lambda^k - \beta(Ax^{k+1} + By^k - b). \quad (11b)$$

Note that x^k is an intermediate variable and (y, λ) are essential variables in (2.1), respectively. Accordingly, for $w = (x, y, \lambda)$ and $w^k = (x^k, y^k, \lambda^k)$ generated by (2.1), we use the notations

$$v = \begin{pmatrix} y \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad v^k = \begin{pmatrix} y^k \\ \lambda^k \end{pmatrix}$$

to denote the essential parts of w and w^k , respectively. We denote the essential part of w^* in Ω^* by use $v^* = (y^*, \lambda^*)$ and let \mathcal{V}^* denote all the collection of v^* .

Now we establish the relationship between the iterates v^k and v^{k+1} generated by the relaxed ADMM (2.1) and the auxiliary variable defined by (11).

Lemma 2.1 *For given $v^k = (y^k, \lambda^k)$, let w^{k+1} be generated by the relaxed ADMM (2.1) and \tilde{w}^k be defined by (11). Then, we have*

$$v^{k+1} = v^k - M(v^k - \tilde{v}^k), \quad (12a)$$

where

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma I & 0 \\ -\gamma \beta B & \gamma I_m \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12b)$$

Proof. It follows from (7b) and (11) that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{k+1} &= \lambda^k - \gamma\beta(Ax^{k+1} + By^k - b) \\ &= \lambda^k - \gamma[\beta(A\tilde{x}^k + By^k - b) - \beta B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)] \\ &= \lambda^k - \gamma(\lambda^k - \tilde{\lambda}^k) + \gamma\beta B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k).\end{aligned}$$

Together with (7a), we have the following relationship

$$\begin{pmatrix} y^{k+1} \\ \lambda^{k+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y^k \\ \lambda^k \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \gamma I & 0 \\ -\gamma\beta B & \gamma I_m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y^k - \tilde{y}^k \\ \lambda^k - \tilde{\lambda}^k \end{pmatrix}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

3 Convergence analysis

The following lemma shows the discrepancy of the auxiliary vector \tilde{w}^k from a solution point of VI(Ω, F, θ).

Lemma 3.1 *For given $v^k = (y^k, \lambda^k)$, let w^{k+1} be generated by the relaxed ADMM (2.1) and \tilde{w}^k be defined by (11). Then, we have*

$$\tilde{w}^k \in \Omega, \quad \theta(w) - \theta(\tilde{w}^k) + (w - \tilde{w}^k)^T F(\tilde{w}^k) \geq (v - \tilde{v}^k)^T Q(v^k - \tilde{v}^k), \quad \forall w \in \Omega, \quad (13a)$$

where

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} \beta B^T B & 0 \\ -B & \frac{1}{\beta} I_m \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13b)$$

Proof. The optimality condition of the x -subproblem in (6a) is

$$x^{k+1} \in \mathcal{X}, \quad \theta_1(x) - \theta_1(x^{k+1}) + (x - x^{k+1})^T \{-A^T \lambda^k + \beta A^T (Ax^{k+1} + By^k - b)\} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Using the auxiliary vector \tilde{w}^k defined in (11), it can be further written as

$$\tilde{x}^k \in \mathcal{X}, \quad \theta_1(x) - \theta_1(\tilde{x}^k) + (x - \tilde{x}^k)^T (-A^T \tilde{\lambda}^k) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (14a)$$

Similarly, the optimality condition of the y -subproblem can be written as

$$y^{k+1} \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad \theta_2(y) - \theta_2(y^{k+1}) + (y - y^{k+1})^T \{-B^T \lambda^k + \beta B^T (Ax^{k+1} + By^{k+1} - b)\} \geq 0, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}. \quad (14b)$$

Now, consider the $\{\cdot\}$ term in the last inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}y^{k+1} \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad \theta_2(y) - \theta_2(y^{k+1}) + (y - y^{k+1})^T \{-B^T (\lambda^k - (Ax^{k+1} + By^k - b)) \\ + \beta B^T B(y^{k+1} - y^k)\} \geq 0, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}.\end{aligned}$$

Using the notations defined in (11), we obtain

$$\tilde{y}^k \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad \theta_2(y) - \theta_2(\tilde{y}^k) + (y - \tilde{y}^k)^T \{-B^T \tilde{\lambda}^k + \beta B^T B(\tilde{y}^k - y^k)\} \geq 0, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}. \quad (14c)$$

For the definition of $\tilde{\lambda}^k$ given by (11), we have

$$(A\tilde{x}^k + B\tilde{y}^k - b) - B(\tilde{y}^k - y^k) + (1/\beta)(\tilde{\lambda}^k - \lambda^k) = 0,$$

and it can be written as

$$\tilde{\lambda}^k \in \mathfrak{R}^m, \quad (\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}^k)^T \{(A\tilde{x}^k + B\tilde{y}^k - b) - B(\tilde{y}^k - y^k) + (1/\beta)(\tilde{\lambda}^k - \lambda^k)\} \geq 0, \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathfrak{R}^m. \quad (14d)$$

Combining (14a), (14c) and (14d), and using the notations of (10), the assertion of this lemma is proved.

□

Recall the matrix M defined in (12b) and the matrix Q defined in (13b), let us define a new matrix H as

$$H = QM^{-1}. \quad (15)$$

The following properties of H will be useful in our analysis.

Proposition 3.1 *The matrix H defined in (15) is symmetric and it can be written as*

$$H = \frac{1}{\gamma} \begin{pmatrix} \beta B^T B & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\beta} I \end{pmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

Moreover, when B is full column rank and $\gamma \in (0, 2)$ and $\mu \geq \alpha$, H is positive definite.

Proof The proof is simple, so we omit it here.

Lemma 3.1 shows that the accuracy of the generated iterate to the solution point of $\text{VI}(\Omega, F, \theta)$ is measured by the term $(v - \tilde{v}^k)^T Q(v^k - \tilde{v}^k)$. Therefore, we need to further investigate the term $(v - \tilde{v}^k)^T Q(v^k - \tilde{v}^k)$. Our purpose is to write it in terms of $\|v - v^k\|_H$ and $\|v - v^{k+1}\|_H$. This is given in the next lemma.

Lemma 3.2 *For given $v^k = (y^k, \lambda^k)$, let w^{k+1} be generated by the relaxed ADMM (2.1) and \tilde{w}^k be defined by (11). Then, we have*

$$(v - \tilde{v}^k)^T H(v^k - v^{k+1}) = \frac{1}{2}(\|v - v^{k+1}\|_H^2 - \|v - w^{k+1}\|_H^2) + \frac{1}{2}\|v^k - \tilde{v}^k\|_G^2, \quad \forall v \in \Omega, \quad (17)$$

where the matrix $G = Q^T + Q - M^T H M$.

Proof Applying the identity

$$(a - b)^T H(c - d) = \frac{1}{2}(\|a - d\|_H^2 - \|a - c\|_H^2) + \frac{1}{2}(\|c - b\|_H^2 - \|d - b\|_H^2), \quad (18)$$

to the right term of (13a) with $a = v, b = \tilde{v}^k, c = v^k, d = v^{k+1}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (v - \tilde{v}^k)^T H(v^k - v^{k+1}) &= \frac{1}{2}(\|v - v^{k+1}\|_H^2 - \|v - v^k\|_H^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(\|v^k - \tilde{v}^k\|_H^2 - \|v^{k+1} - \tilde{v}^k\|_H^2). \end{aligned}$$

For the last term of (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|v^k - \tilde{v}^k\|_H^2 - \|v^{k+1} - \tilde{v}^k\|_H^2 \\
&= \|v^k - \tilde{v}^k\|_H^2 - \|(v^k - \tilde{v}^k) - (v^k - v^{k+1})\|_H^2 \\
&\stackrel{(12)}{=} \|v^k - \tilde{v}^k\|_H^2 - \|(v^k - \tilde{v}^k) - M(v^k - \tilde{v}^k)\|_H^2 \\
&= 2(v^k - \tilde{v}^k)^T H M (v^k - \tilde{v}^k) - (v^k - \tilde{v}^k)^T M^T H M (v^k - \tilde{v}^k) \\
&\stackrel{(16)}{=} (v^k - \tilde{v}^k)^T (Q^T + Q - M^T H M) (v^k - \tilde{v}^k).
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

the assertion is proved.

Now, we investigate the properties of the matrix G . Using (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
G &= (Q^T + Q) - M^T Q \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} 2\beta B^T B - B^T & \\ -B & \frac{2}{\beta} I_m \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \gamma I - \gamma\beta B^T & \\ 0 & \gamma I_m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta B^T B & 0 \\ -B & \frac{1}{\beta} I_m \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} 2\beta B^T B - B^T & \\ -B & \frac{2}{\beta} I_m \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 2\gamma\beta B^T B - \gamma B^T & \\ -\gamma B & \frac{\gamma}{\beta} I_m \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} (2 - 2\gamma)\beta B^T B & (\gamma - 1)B^T \\ (\gamma - 1)B & \frac{2-\gamma}{\beta} I \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Lemma 3.3 *Let v^k be the sequence generated by a method for the problem (1) and \tilde{w}^k is obtained in the k -th iteration. If H defined in the Theorem ?? is positive definite, then we have*

$$\|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_H^2 \leq \|v^k - v^*\|_H^2 - \|v^k - \tilde{v}^k\|_G^2, \quad \forall v^* \in V^*. \tag{21}$$

In the following, we further investigate the term $\|v^k - \tilde{v}^k\|_G^2$ and show how to bound it.

Because $G = \begin{pmatrix} (2-2r)\beta B^T B (r-1)B^T \\ (r-1)B \quad \frac{2-r}{\beta}I \end{pmatrix}$ and $v = \begin{pmatrix} y \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v^k - \tilde{v}^k\|_G^2 &= (2-2r)\beta \|B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)\|^2 + \frac{2-r}{\beta} \|\lambda^k - \tilde{\lambda}^k\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2(r-1)(\lambda^k - \tilde{\lambda}^k)^T B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k) \\
&= (2-2r)\beta \|B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)\|^2 + \frac{2-r}{\beta} \|\beta(A\tilde{x}^k + By^k - b)\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2(r-1)\beta(A\tilde{x}^k + By^k - b)^T B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k) \\
&= (2-2r)\beta \|B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)\|^2 + \frac{2-r}{\beta} \|\beta(A\tilde{x}^k + B\tilde{y}^k - b) + \beta B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2(r-1)\{\beta(A\tilde{x}^k + B\tilde{y}^k - b) + \beta B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)\}^T B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k) \\
&= (2-2r)\beta \|B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)\|^2 + (2-r)\beta \|B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{2-r}{\beta} \|\beta(A\tilde{x}^k + B\tilde{y}^k - b)\|^2 + (4-2r)\beta(A\tilde{x}^k + B\tilde{y}^k - b)^T B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k) \\
&\quad + 2(r-1)\beta(A\tilde{x}^k + B\tilde{y}^k - b)^T B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k) + 2(r-1)\beta \|B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)\|^2 \\
&= (2-r)\beta \|B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)\|^2 + \frac{2-r}{\beta} \|\beta(A\tilde{x}^k + B\tilde{y}^k - b)\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\beta(A\tilde{x}^k + B\tilde{y}^k - b)^T B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Notice that

$$\hat{\lambda}^k = \lambda^k - \beta(A\tilde{x}^k + B\tilde{y}^k - b)$$

and

$$y^k - \tilde{y}^k = \frac{1}{r}(y^k - y^{k+1})$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v^k - \tilde{v}^k\|_G^2 &= \frac{2-r}{r^2}\beta \|B(y^k - y^{k+1})\|^2 + \frac{2-r}{\beta} \|\lambda^k - \hat{\lambda}^k\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2(\lambda^k - \hat{\lambda}^k)^T B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Meanwhile, we have

$$\lambda^k - \hat{\lambda}^k = \frac{1}{r}(\lambda^k - \lambda^{k+1})$$

Substituting it in (23), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v^k - \tilde{v}^k\|_G^2 &= \frac{2-r}{r^2}\beta \|B(y^k - y^{k+1})\|^2 + \frac{2-r}{r^2\beta} \|\lambda^k - \lambda^{k+1}\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2(\lambda^k - \hat{\lambda}^k)^T B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k)
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Combining (22) and (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_H^2 &\leq \|v^k - v^*\|_H^2 - \frac{2-r}{r^2}\beta \|B(y^k - y^{k+1})\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{2-r}{r^2\beta} \|\lambda^k - \lambda^{k+1}\|^2 - 2(\lambda^k - \hat{\lambda}^k)^T B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we give the following theorem to establish the global convergence of our algorithm for $1 < r < 2$.

Theorem 3.1 *For the sequence generated w^k by the over relaxation ADMM, if $(\lambda^k - \hat{\lambda}^k)^T B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k) \geq 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\|B(y^k - y^{k+1})\|^2 + \|\lambda^k - \lambda^{k+1}\|^2) = 0. \quad (25)$$

and the sequence v^k converges to a solution point $v^\infty \in \mathcal{V}^*$.

Proof Let (y^0, λ^0) be the initial iterate. For $1 < r < 2$, according to (25), there are constants $C_1 = \frac{2-r}{r^2} \beta > 0$, and $C_2 = \frac{2-r}{r^2 \beta} > 0$ such that

$$C_1 \|B(y^k - y^{k+1})\|^2 + C_2 \|\lambda^k - \lambda^{k+1}\|^2 \leq \|v^k - v^*\|_H^2 - \|v^{k+1} - v^*\|_H^2 \quad \forall v^* \in \mathcal{V}^* \quad (26)$$

Summing the above inequality from $k = 0$ to ∞ , we obtain

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (C_1 \|B(y^k - y^{k+1})\|^2 + C_2 \|\lambda^k - \lambda^{k+1}\|^2) \leq \|v^0 - v^*\|_H^2$$

and thus we obtain the assertion (25).

Furthermore, it follows from (26) that the sequence v^k is in a compact set and it has a subsequence v^{k_j} converging to a cluster point, say, v^∞ . Let \tilde{x}^∞ be generated by $(y^\infty, \lambda^\infty)$. Because B assumed to be full column rank and equation (25), we have

$$B(y^\infty - \tilde{y}^\infty) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^\infty - \tilde{\lambda}^\infty = 0$$

Then, according to (13a), we get

$$\theta(u) - \theta(\tilde{u}^\infty) + (w - \tilde{w}^\infty)^T F(\tilde{w}^\infty) \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in \Omega,$$

So $\tilde{w}^\infty = w^\infty$ is a solution point of (10a). Also, (26) is true for any solution point of (10a), we have

$$\|v^{k+1} - v^\infty\|_H^2 \leq \|v^k - v^\infty\|_H^2$$

the sequence v^k cannot have another cluster point and thus it converges to a solution point $v^* = v^\infty \in \mathcal{V}^*$.

Because y^k is the corrector of \tilde{y}^{k-1} , λ^k is the corrector of $\hat{\lambda}^{k-1}$. In most cases, $(\lambda^k - \hat{\lambda}^k)^T B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k) \geq 0$ is true in practical computation, while only a very small part of cases do not hold. The frequency of not being true depends on whether r is close to 2. Therefore, we can first judge whether $(\lambda^k - \hat{\lambda}^k)^T B(y^k - \tilde{y}^k) \geq 0$ is true or not. If it is true, we can use over relaxation method to set r from 0 to 2; otherwise we let $r = 1$, which is the original ADMM method.

4 Numerical Experiment

In this paper, we report the numerical performance of our over-relax ADMM by solving the Lasso problem and the Sparse inverse covariance selection. We compare our over-relax ADMM with the relaxed customized PPA proposed in [2]. All the simulations are performed on a Laptop with 8GB RAM memory, using Matlab R2015b.

4.1 Lasso Problem

The least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (Lasso) was first proposed by Tibshirani in his famous work [12], and has been used as a very popular and attractive method for regularization and variable selection for high-dimensional data in statistics and machine learning. Lasso can be mathematically formulated as

$$\min \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + \rho \|x\|_1, \quad (27)$$

where $\rho > 0$ is a regularization parameter. The $m \times n$ dimensional matrix A contains the m -dimensional independent observations of x , and the vector b contains the m -dimensional independent observations of the response variable. The main reason for the popularity of Lasso is that it can handle the case where predictor variables are larger than samples and produce sparse models which are easy to interpret.

Now, we show how to use the ADMM for solving Lasso (27). First, we rewrite the original problem (27) into the canonical form in form of (1) that consists of two separable variables. Introducing a new variable $y = x$, the problem can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + \rho \|y\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x - y = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Then apply ADMM to (28), we get

$$\begin{cases} x^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmin} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \|x - y^k - \frac{1}{\beta} z^k\|_2^2 \right\}, & (29a) \\ y^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmin} \left\{ \rho \|y\|_1 + \frac{\beta}{2} \|x^{k+1} - y - \frac{1}{\beta} z^k\|_2^2 \right\}. & (29b) \\ z^{k+1} = z^k - \beta (x^{k+1} - y^{k+1}), & (29c) \end{cases}$$

The first subproblem is an unconstrained convex quadratic minimization. Its unique solution can be given by

$$x^{k+1} := (A^T A + \beta I)^{-1} (A^T b + \beta y^k + z^k). \quad (30)$$

Applying the Sherman–Morrison formula to (30), we can obtain

$$x^{k+1} := \left[\frac{1}{\beta} I - \frac{1}{\beta^3} A^T (\beta I + A A^T)^{-1} A \right] (A^T b + \beta y^k + z^k). \quad (31)$$

The second subproblem is a $l_1 + l_2$ minimization, and it can be solved via using the soft thresholding operator

$$\tilde{y}^k := \mathcal{S}_{\frac{\rho}{\beta}}(x^{k+1} + \tilde{z}^k), \quad (32)$$

where the operator is defined by

$$\mathcal{S}_{\kappa}(a) = (a - \kappa)_+ - (-a - \kappa)_+. \quad (33)$$

We refer the reader to [1] for more details.

The data was generated similarly with [1], and as follows. For different size of m and n , we generate the matrix A with independent standard Gaussian values, then we standardize the columns of A to have unit l_2 norm. A ‘true’ value $x_{\text{true}} \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ is generated with around 100 nonzero entries, each sampled from an $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ distribution. The labels b are then computed as $b = Ax_{\text{true}} \in \mathfrak{R}^m + v$, where $v \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 10^{-3}I)$, which corresponds to a signal-to-noise ratio $\|Ax_{\text{true}}\|_2^2/\|v\|_2^2$ of around 200.

The regularization parameter was determined by $\rho = 0.1\rho_{\text{max}}$, where $\rho_{\text{max}} = \|A^T b\|_{\infty}$ is the critical value of ρ above which the solution of the lasso problem is $x = 0$. The proximal parameter for the ADMM and relaxed ADMM is set to be $\beta = \frac{1}{\delta}$. The termination tolerance is defined as similarly with [1], that is,

$$\|r^k\|_2 = \|x^k - y^k\|_2 \leq \varepsilon^{\text{pri}}, \quad \|s^k\|_2 = \|y^k - y^{k-1}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon^{\text{dual}}. \quad (34)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{\text{pri}} &= \sqrt{p}\varepsilon^{\text{abs}} + \varepsilon^{\text{rel}} \max\{\|x^k\|_2, \|y^k\|_2\} \\ \varepsilon^{\text{dual}} &= \sqrt{n}\varepsilon^{\text{abs}} + \varepsilon^{\text{rel}}\|y^k\|_2 \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

and we set $\varepsilon^{\text{abs}} = 10^{-5}$, $\varepsilon^{\text{rel}} = 10^{-3}$ for both methods. All variables were initially set to be zero. Since $(m < n)$ in matrix A , we use the ShermanMorrison formula to $(A^T A + \beta I)^{-1}$ and instead factor the smaller matrix $I + \beta A A^T$, which is then cached for subsequent x -updates.

Table 1-3 gives the iterations required and the total computational time for ADMM, relaxed customized ADMM and our relaxed ADMM with $\gamma = 1.8$. From the table, we can see that, the relaxed ADMM is always faster than the other two algorithms and it requires less iteration steps and less time to reach the termination tolerance. Thus, relaxed ADMM is more efficient than the original ADMM and the relaxed customized ADMM. The numerical results of three methods for the case with $m = 1000, n = 1500$ are plotted in Fig 1. The left part in Fig 1 presents the relationship of primal residual r^k and the number of iteration while the right part shows the relationship of dual residual s^k and the number of iteration. The green curve plots our relaxed ADMM and the other two curves belongs to ADMM and relaxed customized ADMM respectively. We can observe our method converges linearly and is considerably faster than other two methods, which supports our convergence analysis.

Table 1 Performance comparison of ADMM, Relaxed ADMM and Relaxed customized ADMM ($\epsilon^{\text{abs}} = 10^{-5}$, $\epsilon^{\text{rel}} = 10^{-3}$)

$m \times n$ matrix		ADMM				Relaxed ADMM				Relaxed customized ADMM			
m	n	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time
1000	1500	18	5.54e-03	1.45e-03	0.10	14	5.94e-03	3.54e-03	0.09	28	2.04e-03	3.43e-03	0.14
1500	1500	16	5.16e-03	2.26e-03	0.16	22	6.09e-03	1.06e-03	0.17	30	1.47e-03	3.26e-03	0.19
1500	3000	20	9.23e-03	2.42e-03	0.38	20	9.23e-03	2.42e-03	0.38	27	4.01e-03	5.71e-03	0.41
2000	3000	18	7.70e-03	3.63e-03	0.55	15	5.30e-03	4.33e-03	0.50	29	2.83e-03	4.72e-03	0.72
3000	3000	16	6.97e-03	2.88e-03	0.59	13	6.81e-03	2.43e-03	0.52	28	2.29e-03	5.05e-03	0.79
3000	5000	18	1.26e-02	4.17e-03	1.48	17	8.59e-03	6.06e-03	1.39	27	4.78e-03	7.30e-03	1.75
4000	5000	17	9.99e-03	3.53e-03	2.23	14	1.05e-02	6.76e-03	2.14	28	3.04e-03	5.67e-03	2.97
5000	5000	16	1.00e-02	4.69e-03	1.76	15	9.99e-03	4.53e-03	1.64	28	2.99e-03	6.64e-03	2.25
5000	10000	20	1.70e-02	6.59e-03	5.40	20	1.70e-02	6.59e-03	5.29	26	7.72e-03	1.06e-02	6.03
7000	10000	18	1.57e-02	3.78e-03	9.37	16	1.02e-02	5.64e-03	8.98	23	6.85e-03	1.11e-02	10.53
10000	10000	16	1.19e-02	6.15e-03	7.76	12	1.71e-02	9.33e-03	7.31	29	4.07e-03	8.96e-03	10.14

Table 2 Performance comparison of ADMM, Relaxed ADMM and Relaxed customized ADMM ($\epsilon^{\text{abs}} = 10^{-6}$, $\epsilon^{\text{rel}} = 10^{-4}$)

$m \times n$ matrix		ADMM				Relaxed ADMM				Relaxed customized ADMM			
m	n	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time
1000	1500	27	7.04e-04	7.19e-05	0.17	24	7.09e-04	8.16e-05	0.15	36	2.10e-04	3.43e-04	0.19
1500	1500	23	6.28e-04	5.94e-05	0.18	19	4.46e-04	5.93e-05	0.16	38	1.66e-04	3.69e-04	0.26
1500	3000	31	9.51e-04	1.13e-04	0.47	25	8.32e-04	1.84e-04	0.43	36	4.36e-04	5.97e-04	0.55
2000	3000	28	9.04e-04	9.02e-05	0.66	22	7.37e-04	1.17e-04	0.58	38	3.39e-04	5.59e-04	0.84
3000	3000	24	8.12e-04	7.15e-05	0.72	22	6.03e-04	5.62e-05	0.69	38	2.12e-04	4.72e-04	0.95
3000	5000	30	8.85e-04	8.12e-05	1.81	24	9.09e-04	1.28e-04	1.63	34	5.00e-04	7.34e-04	1.98
4000	5000	26	9.85e-04	1.28e-04	2.77	21	9.77e-04	2.61e-04	2.49	36	3.26e-04	6.00e-04	3.29
5000	5000	24	1.02e-03	1.07e-04	2.07	18	9.55e-04	1.40e-04	1.74	38	2.80e-04	6.23e-04	2.70
5000	10000	32	1.67e-03	1.81e-04	6.62	26	1.75e-03	3.09e-04	5.96	35	7.84e-04	1.06e-03	6.94
7000	10000	28	1.42e-03	1.50e-04	11.35	25	1.14e-03	1.34e-04	10.58	34	6.78e-04	1.11e-03	11.99
10000	10000	23	1.73e-03	1.81e-04	9.03	19	1.65e-03	4.37e-04	8.76	38	4.24e-04	9.34e-04	11.84


**Fig. 1** The primal and dual residual for ADMM, relaxed ADMM and relaxed customized ADMM.

Table 3 Performance comparison of ADMM, Relaxed ADMM and Relaxed customized ADMM ($\epsilon^{\text{abs}} = 10^{-7}$, $\epsilon^{\text{rel}} = 10^{-5}$)

$m \times n$ matrix		ADMM				Relaxed ADMM				Relaxed customized ADMM			
m	n	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time
1000	1500	38	6.51e-05	5.42e-06	0.20	31	6.63e-05	5.20e-06	0.17	49	2.16e-05	3.62e-05	0.25
1500	1500	33	6.37e-05	5.48e-06	0.22	24	5.94e-05	8.77e-06	0.18	48	1.82e-05	4.04e-05	0.28
1500	3000	43	9.60e-05	7.08e-06	0.62	35	1.03e-04	1.55e-05	0.50	50	3.34e-05	4.88e-05	0.66
2000	3000	40	7.96e-05	4.83e-06	0.90	31	8.21e-05	4.87e-06	0.75	44	3.69e-05	5.81e-05	0.93
3000	3000	33	8.98e-05	7.18e-06	0.88	27	8.56e-05	6.74e-06	0.75	49	2.15e-05	4.76e-05	1.13
3000	5000	40	1.09e-04	9.12e-06	2.32	32	9.37e-05	8.12e-06	1.96	46	4.85e-05	7.38e-05	2.53
4000	5000	34	1.27e-04	1.18e-05	3.27	27	1.24e-04	1.19e-05	2.84	51	2.98e-05	5.76e-05	4.13
5000	5000	33	1.07e-04	8.72e-06	2.62	26	1.01e-04	7.79e-06	2.21	49	2.91e-05	6.43e-05	3.39
5000	10000	46	1.35e-04	8.40e-06	8.48	36	1.23e-04	1.43e-05	7.20	41	1.03e-04	1.37e-04	7.69
7000	10000	38	1.61e-04	1.14e-05	13.16	31	1.62e-04	1.13e-05	12.30	45	6.61e-05	1.08e-04	14.54
10000	10000	34	1.22e-04	9.52e-06	11.99	25	1.12e-04	8.56e-06	10.32	46	4.47e-05	9.98e-05	14.33

4.2 Sparse inverse covariance selection

In this section, we consider to use the ADMM to solve the sparse inverse covariance selection problem (SCSP), which first proposed in [3]. This problem can be understood as a structure learning problem of estimating the topology of the undirected graphical model representation of the Gaussian, and is a popular method using in reverse engineering of genetic regulatory networks. Suppose the vector a_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$ is a sample from a zero mean Gaussian distribution in \mathfrak{R}^n . i.e.,

$$a_i \sim N(0, \Sigma), i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (36)$$

but the positive definite covariance matrix Σ is unknown. Our task is to estimate the covariance matrix Σ under the assumption that Σ^{-1} is sparse. Let $S = (1/m) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i a_i^T$ be the empirical covariance matrix of the sample, the convex formulation of SCSP is as follows.

$$\min\{\text{Tr}(SX) - \log \det X + \tau \|X\|_1 \mid X \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n\} \quad (37)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the l_1 norm, \mathbb{S}_{++}^n denotes the set of symmetric positive definite $n \times n$ matrices, and $\text{Tr}(SX)$ is the trace of SX . Now we show how to apply ADMM for SCSP. First, we rewrite the original problem (37) into the canonical form in form of (1) that consists of two sparable variables. Introducing a new variable $Y = X$, the problem can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \text{Tr}(SX) - \log \det X + \tau \|Y\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & X - Y = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Then using ADMM or (38), we get

$$\begin{cases} X^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmin}\{\operatorname{Tr}(SX) - \log \det X + \frac{\beta}{2}\|X - Y^k - \frac{1}{\beta}\Lambda^k\|_F^2\}, & (39a) \\ Y^{k+1} = \operatorname{argmin}\{\tau\|Y\|_1 + \frac{\beta}{2}\|X^{k+1} - Y - \frac{1}{\beta}\Lambda^k\|_F^2\}, & (39b) \\ \Lambda^{k+1} = \Lambda^k - \beta(X^{k+1} - Y^{k+1}). & (39c) \end{cases}$$

The X -minimization can be solved by the orthogonal eigenvalue decomposition. The X -minimization can be solved by the soft thresholding operator (33). Thus the subproblems can all have closed form solutions. We refer the reader to e.g., [15] for more details.

The implementation details are as follows: we take the initial iterate as $Y^0 = 0, \Lambda^0 = 0$. The relaxation factor is set to be $\gamma = 1.7$ and β is all set to be $\beta = 1$. the stopping criteria is set to be similar as (35). For different number of features n , we always set the number of samples be $0.01 * n^2$. We also randomly generated ten cases for each instance, and the results reported were averaged over ten runs. In Tables 4-6, we report the performance of the relaxed ADMM algorithm for different settings of the dimensions. It shows that the relaxed ADMM is significantly faster than the ADMM and the relaxed customized admm. For example, for $n = 300$ with $\epsilon^{\text{abs}} = 10^{-6}$, $\epsilon^{\text{rel}} = 10^{-4}$, ADMM and the relaxed customized ADMM solved it to the desired accuracy with 21 and 29 iterations respectively, while the relaxed ADMM took 14 iterations. The numerical results of three methods for the case with $n = 300$ are plotted in Fig 2. The left part in Fig 2 presents the relationship of primal residual r^k and the number of iteration while the right part shows the relationship of dual residual s^k and the number of iteration. The pink curve plots our relaxed ADMM and the other two curves belongs to ADMM and relaxed customized ADMM respectively. We can observe our method converges linearly and is considerably faster than other two methods, which supports our convergence analysis.

Table 4 Performance comparison of ADMM, Relaxed ADMM and Relaxed customized ADMM($\epsilon^{\text{abs}} = 10^{-4}$, $\epsilon^{\text{rel}} = 10^{-2}$)


matrix	ADMM				Relaxed ADMM				Relaxed customized ADMM			
	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time
200	11	1.25e-01	5.16e-03	0.20	9	1.09e-01	6.28e-03	0.15	16	1.00e-01	1.33e-01	0.28
300	9	1.55e-01	9.21e-03	0.37	7	1.20e-01	7.77e-03	0.28	16	1.25e-01	1.61e-01	0.64
500	7	2.06e-01	9.81e-02	0.88	6	2.06e-01	4.45e-02	0.78	16	1.65e-01	2.04e-01	2.19
700	6	2.40e-01	3.28e-01	1.71	6	1.43e-01	1.37e-02	1.77	16	1.98e-01	2.37e-01	5.09
900	6	2.53e-01	3.85e-01	3.26	7	8.36e-02	8.46e-03	4.11	15	3.24e-01	3.83e-01	9.14
1100	7	1.20e-01	1.95e-01	7.14	5	1.98e-01	3.47e-02	5.15	15	3.61e-01	4.19e-01	16.84

Table 5 Performance comparison of ADMM, Relaxed ADMM and Relaxed customized ADMM ($\varepsilon^{\text{abs}} = 10^{-5}$, $\varepsilon^{\text{rel}} = 10^{-3}$)

matrix	ADMM				Relaxed ADMM				Relaxed customized ADMM			
	n	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$
200	19	1.08e-02	6.67e-05	0.35	14	1.01e-02	9.29e-05	0.25	22	1.18e-02	1.56e-02	0.40
300	15	1.49e-02	1.10e-04	0.63	11	7.29e-03	3.31e-05	0.45	22	1.47e-02	1.90e-02	0.91
500	12	1.99e-02	1.05e-03	1.53	9	1.74e-02	1.76e-04	1.21	22	1.94e-02	2.40e-02	2.96
700	11	1.92e-02	4.19e-03	3.43	8	2.72e-02	3.43e-04	2.46	22	2.34e-02	2.79e-02	7.05
900	10	3.20e-02	1.23e-02	5.85	9	1.44e-02	1.22e-04	5.35	22	2.67e-02	3.15e-02	13.64
1100	10	2.30e-02	1.59e-02	10.65	8	1.83e-02	2.92e-04	8.70	22	2.97e-02	3.44e-02	25.49

Table 6 Performance comparison of ADMM, Relaxed ADMM and Relaxed customized ADMM ($\varepsilon^{\text{abs}} = 10^{-6}$, $\varepsilon^{\text{rel}} = 10^{-4}$)

matrix	ADMM				Relaxed ADMM				Relaxed customized ADMM			
	n	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$	Time	Iter.	$\ r^k\ _2$	$\ s^k\ _2$
200	26	1.29e-03	1.13e-06	0.51	19	9.84e-04	4.96e-07	0.36	29	9.73e-04	1.29e-03	0.56
300	21	1.29e-03	1.11e-06	0.85	14	1.43e-03	1.96e-06	0.54	29	1.21e-03	1.56e-03	1.21
500	17	1.74e-03	1.23e-05	2.31	12	1.29e-03	9.19e-07	1.63	29	1.60e-03	1.98e-03	3.88
700	15	2.32e-03	1.33e-04	4.64	11	1.49e-03	1.25e-06	3.58	28	2.75e-03	3.28e-03	8.98
900	15	2.13e-03	1.76e-04	8.90	11	2.42e-03	4.37e-06	6.64	28	3.14e-03	3.70e-03	17.40
1100	14	2.43e-03	5.71e-04	15.61	10	2.81e-03	6.40e-06	11.15	28	3.50e-03	4.05e-03	32.00

**Fig. 2** The primal and dual residual for ADMM, relaxed ADMM and relaxed customized ADMM. ($n = 300$)

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we propose an over-relaxed ADMM method and introduce a simple criterion. We show that, when the criterion is satisfied at each iteration, we can over-relax the variables of ADMM. We prove the global convergence of the over-relaxed ADMM. Finally, we demonstrate the numerical performance improvement of this algorithm by solving Lasso and sparse inverse covariance selection problems. In the future, we will investigate the linear convergence rate

of our algorithm under some regularity conditions for error bounds and extend our over-relaxation scheme to the multi-block ADMM.

References

1. S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato and J. Eckstein, *Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers*, Found. Trends Mach. Learn., 3 (2010), pp. 1-122.
2. X. J. Cai, G. Y. Gu, B. S. He and X. M. Yuan, *A proximal point algorithm revisit on the alternating direction method of multipliers*, Sci. China Math., 56 (10), pp. 2179-2186.
3. Arthur P. Dempster. Covariance selection. Biometrics, 157-175 (1972)
4. J. Eckstein and W. Yao, *Understanding the convergence of the alternating direction method of multipliers: Theoretical and computational perspectives*, Pacific J. Optim., 11(2015), pp. 619-644.
5. D. Gabay and B. Mercier, *A dual algorithm for the solution of nonlinear variational problems via finite-element approximations*, Comput. Math. Appli., 2 (1976), pp. 17-40.
6. R. Glowinski, and A. Marrocco, *Sur l'approximation par éléments finis d'ordre un et la résolution par pénalisation-dualité d'une classe de problèmes de Dirichlet non linéaires*, Revue Fr. Autom. Inform. Rech. Opér., Anal. Numér. 2 (1975), pp. 41-76.
7. D. Boley, *Local linear convergence of the alternating direction method of multipliers on quadratic or linear programs*, SIAM J. Optim., 23 (2013), 2183-2207.
8. D. R. Han and X. M. Yuan, *Local linear convergence of the alternating direction method of multipliers for quadratic programs*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 51 (2013), pp. 3446-3457.
9. M. Hong and Z. Q. Luo, *On the linear convergence of the alternating direction method of multipliers*, Math. Program., 162 (2017), pp.165-199.
10. B. S. He and X. M. Yuan, *On the $O(1/t)$ convergence rate of the Douglas-Rachford alternating direction method*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 50 (2012), pp. 700-709.
11. B. S. He and X. M. Yuan, *On nonergodic convergence rate of the Douglas-Rachford alternating direction method*, Numer. Math., 130 (2015), pp. 567-577.
12. R. Tibshirani, *Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological), (1996), pp. 267-288.
13. W. H. Yang and D. R. Han, *Linear convergence of alternating direction method of multipliers for a class of convex optimization problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 54 (2016), pp. 625-640.
14. C. H. Ye and X. M. Yuan, *A descent method for structured monotone variational inequalities*, Optim. Methods Softw., 22 (2007), pp. 329-338.
15. X. M. Yuan, *Alternating direction method for covariance selection models*, J. Sci. Comp., 51(2012), pp. 261-273.
16. M. Tao and J. Yang, "Alternating direction algorithms for total variation deconvolution in image reconstruction," *TR0918*, 2009.
17. P. L. Combettes and J. C. Pesquet, "A douglas-Rachford splitting approach to nonsmooth convex variational signal recovery," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 564-574, 2007.
18. Combettes, Patrick L. and Pesquet, Jean Christophe, "Proximal splitting methods in signal processing," *Heinz H Bauschke*, vol. 49, pp. pgs. 185-212, 2009.
19. M. K. Ng, P. Weiss, and X. Yuan, "Solving constrained total-variation image restoration and reconstruction problems via alternating direction methods," vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 2710-2736, 2010.
20. G.Y.Gu and J.F.Yang. On the optimal linear convergence factor of the relaxed proximal point algorithm for monotone inclusion problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.04537*, 2019.
21. M.H.Xu. Proximal alternating directions method for structured variational inequalities. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 134(1):107-117, 2007.

-
22. F.Ma. Convergence study on the proximal alternating direction method with larger step size. *Numerical Algorithms*, 85(2):399–425, 2020.
 23. M. Tao and X. Yuan. On the optimal linear convergence rate of a generalized proximal point algorithm. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 74(2):826–850, 2018.