

A convex combination based primal-dual algorithm with linesearch for general convex-concave saddle point problems

Xiaokai Chang¹ · Junfeng Yang² · Hongchao Zhang³

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract Using convex combination and linesearch techniques, we introduce a novel primal-dual algorithm for solving structured convex-concave saddle point problems with a generic smooth non-bilinear coupling term. Our adaptive linesearch strategy works under specific local smoothness conditions, allowing for potentially larger stepsizes. For an important class of structured convex optimization problems, the proposed algorithm reduces to a fully adaptive proximal gradient algorithm without linesearch, thereby representing an advancement over the golden ratio algorithm delineated in [Y. Malitsky, Math. Program. 2020]. We establish global pointwise and ergodic sub-linear convergence rate of the algorithm measured by the primal-dual gap function in the general case. When the coupling term is linear in the dual variable, we measure the convergence rate by function value residual and constraint violation of an equivalent constrained optimization problem. Furthermore, an accelerated algorithm achieving the faster $\mathcal{O}(1/N^2)$ ergodic convergence rate is presented for the strongly convex case, where N denotes the iteration number. Our numerical experiments on quadratically constrained quadratic programming and sparse logistic regression problems indicate the new algorithm is significantly faster than the comparison algorithms.

Keywords Convex-concave saddle point problems · non-bilinear coupling term · convex combination · primal-dual algorithm · linesearch

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000) 49M29 · 65K10 · 65Y20 · 90C25

1 Introduction

Let \mathbb{R}^p and \mathbb{R}^q be finite-dimensional Euclidean spaces, each endowed with an inner product and the induced norm denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\|\cdot\| = \sqrt{\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}$, respectively. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ be extended real-valued proper closed and convex functions, $\Phi : \mathbf{dom}(g) \times \mathbf{dom}(f^*) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function with certain differentiability properties, convex in x and concave in y , where $\mathbf{dom}(g)$ denotes the effective domain of g defined by $\mathbf{dom}(g) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : g(x) < +\infty\}$. Denote the Legendre-Fenchel conjugate of f by f^* , i.e., $f^*(y) = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^p} \{\langle y, u \rangle - f(u)\}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

1 School of Science, Lanzhou University of Technology, Lanzhou, Gansu, P. R. China. Research supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC-12161053) and the Natural Science Foundation for Distinguished Young Scholars of Gansu Province (22JR5RA223). Email: xkchang@lut.edu.cn.

2 Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, #22 Hankou Road, Nanjing, P. R. China. Research supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC-12371301). Corresponding author (jfyang@nju.edu.cn, <http://maths.nju.edu.cn/~jfyang/>)

3 Department of Mathematics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-4918. Phone (225) 578-1982. Fax (225) 578-4276. Research supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of U.S.A (DMS-2110722 and DMS-2309549). Email: hozhang@math.lsu.edu. <http://www.math.lsu.edu/~hozhang/>

In this paper, we focus on the following structured convex-concave saddle point problem with a generic non-bilinear coupling term

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^q} \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^p} \mathcal{L}(x, y) := g(x) + \Phi(x, y) - f^*(y). \quad (1)$$

This generic model encompasses several important special cases studied in the literature. For instance, if Φ is bilinear, i.e., $\Phi(x, y) = \langle Kx, y \rangle$ for some matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, then (1) reduces to the structured bilinear saddle point problem, which arises naturally from abundant interesting applications, including signal and image processing, machine learning, statistics, mechanics and economics, and so on, see, e.g., [3–5, 15, 32] and the references therein. If, in addition, g and f^* are indicator functions of the unit simplex in \mathbb{R}^q and \mathbb{R}^p , respectively, then (1) reduces to the zero-sum matrix game problem. If both g and f^* vanish, then (1) reduces to the unconstrained saddle point problem [10, 21], which has recently found abundant new applications in machine learning [1, 12]. In general, (1) covers a broad class of optimization problems, e.g., convex optimization with nonlinear conic constraints, which itself includes linear programming, quadratic programming, quadratically constrained quadratic programming, second-order cone programming and semidefinite programming as its subclasses, see [14] for details.

To solve (1), popular choices include various first-order methods. By reformulating (1) as a mixed variational inequality (MVI) problem and/or monotone operator inclusion problem, various methods have been developed in the literature, e.g., the extra-gradient method [18, 30] and the optimistic gradient descent ascent method [10, 21]. In this paper, motivated from the convex combination technique introduced in [19], we propose a new primal-dual algorithm (PDA) with adaptive linesearch. Primal-dual type algorithms were first introduced by Arrow and Hurwicz [31] and were recently further developed extensively, see [5, 9, 14, 17, 35] and the references therein.

1.1 Notation

Let h be an extended real-valued proper closed and convex function defined on a finite dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^m . The gradient operator and the subdifferential of h at $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, if exist, are, respectively, denoted by ∇h and $\partial h(x) := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m : h(y) \geq h(x) + \langle \xi, y - x \rangle, \forall y \in \text{dom}(h)\}$. For $\lambda > 0$, the proximal operator of λh is given by $\text{Prox}_{\lambda h}(x) := \arg \min_y \{h(y) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|y - x\|^2\}$, which is uniquely well defined for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$. If h is differentiable on $\text{int}(\text{dom}(h))$, the interior of $\text{dom}(h)$, and ∇h is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_h \geq 0$, i.e., $\|\nabla h(x) - \nabla h(y)\| \leq L_h \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in \text{int}(\text{dom}(h))$, then we say that h is L_h -smooth. ∇h is said to be locally Lipschitz continuous if it is Lipschitz continuous over any bounded subset of $\text{int}(\text{dom}(h))$. Given an index set \mathcal{I} , $|\mathcal{I}|$ denotes its cardinality. By convention, we define $1/0 = \infty$, in case it happens.

1.2 Related Work

Next, we review some closely related work. The Arrow-Hurwicz method [31] was initially proposed to treat (1) with bilinear coupling term, i.e., $\Phi(x, y) = \langle Kx, y \rangle$. A natural extension to the generic saddle point problem (1) iterates for $n \geq 1$ as

$$\begin{cases} x_n = \text{Prox}_{\tau_n g}(x_{n-1} - \tau_n \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1})), \\ y_n = \text{Prox}_{\sigma_n f^*}(y_{n-1} + \sigma_n \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1})), \end{cases}$$

where $x_0 \in \text{dom}(g)$ and $y_0 \in \text{dom}(f^*)$ are initial points, and $\tau_n, \sigma_n > 0$ are stepsizes. The heuristics of the Arrow-Hurwicz method is to solve the minimax problem (1) by alternately minimizing with x , maximizing with y and meanwhile incorporating the proximity technique by taking into account the latest information. Convergence of the Arrow-Hurwicz method for the bilinear case was studied with small stepsizes in [11], and sublinear convergence rate results were

obtained in [5, 22] when $\mathbf{dom}(f^*)$ is bounded. However, the Arrow-Hurwicz method does not converge in general, see [16, 17] for counterexamples. To remedy this issue, Korplevich [18] and Popov [25] proposed two different modifications by introducing extrapolation and optimism into the Arrow-Hurwicz method, respectively. For smooth and strongly-convex-strongly-concave objective functions, it was shown to converge linearly [21, 29]. The mirror-prox method [23] generalizes the extragradient method and works with a general Bregman distance.

Based on the PDA popularized by Chambolle and Pock [5, 6], which is merely applicable to the bilinear case too, Zhu et.al [34] considered a special case of (1), i.e., $\Phi(x, y) = \langle H(x), y \rangle$, where $H : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is nonlinear and smooth such that $f \circ H$ is convex, and studied a PDA with convergence rate analysis. Recently, Hamedani and Aybat [14] focused on the generic problem (1) and proposed the following scheme

$$\begin{cases} x_n = \text{Prox}_{\tau_n g}(x_{n-1} - \tau_n \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1})), \\ z_n = (1 + \delta) \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}) - \delta \nabla_y \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-2}), \\ y_n = \text{Prox}_{\sigma_n f^*}(y_{n-1} + \sigma_n z_n), \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $\delta \in (0, 1]$. Apparently, (2) can be viewed as an extension of Chambolle and Pock's PDA [5, 6] from the bilinear case to the generic nonlinear case. A linesearch strategy was also considered in [14] to choose the primal and dual stepsizes.

Recently, Malitsky [19] proposed a golden ratio algorithm (GRA) with fully adaptive stepsize for solving MVI problem. Since the optimality condition of (1) can be represented by MVI problem, GRA can thereby be applied. The iterate scheme of GRA applied to (1) takes a Jacobian form

$$\begin{cases} (z_n^x, z_n^y) = \frac{\psi-1}{\psi}(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}) + \frac{1}{\psi}(z_{n-1}^x, z_{n-1}^y), \\ x_n = \text{Prox}_{\tau_n g}(z_n^x - \tau_n \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1})), \\ y_n = \text{Prox}_{\tau_n f^*}(z_n^y + \tau_n \nabla_y \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1})), \end{cases}$$

where $\psi \in (1, (1 + \sqrt{5})/2]$ is a parameter to determine the convex combination z_n , and the stepsize $\tau_n > 0$ can be estimated adaptively. Unfortunately, numerical experiments show that straightforward application to the MVI representation of (1) is much less efficient than primal-dual type methods, e.g., the PDA scheme (2), which are able to take advantage of problem structures thoroughly and can take different stepsizes in the primal and dual subproblems. Motivated by [19], a golden ratio PDA (GRPDA) was presented in [8, 9], with constant or adaptive stepsize determined by linesearch for solving the bilinear cases of (1). Based on experimental evidence in [8], it has been observed that the additional linesearch trial steps taken by GRPDAs are much less than those required by Chambolle-Pock's PDA with linesearch [20]. In [7], by carrying out a refined analysis, the region of convex combination parameter was expanded further from $(1, (1 + \sqrt{5})/2]$ to $(1, 1 + \sqrt{3})$, which increased the weight of x_{n-1} in the convex combination, leading to improved numerical performance.

Considering the aforementioned advantageous properties, our study in this paper is an extension of GRPDA for convex-concave saddle point problem (1) with coupling term from the bilinear case to the generic non-bilinear case. Roughly speaking, given $z_0 = x_0 \in \mathbf{dom}(g)$ and $y_0 \in \mathbf{dom}(f^*)$, for $n \geq 1$, our new algorithm takes the following iterations

$$\text{PDAC: } \begin{cases} z_n = \frac{\psi-1}{\psi} x_{n-1} + \frac{1}{\psi} z_{n-1}, \\ x_n = \text{Prox}_{\tau_n g}(z_n - \tau_n \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1})), \\ y_n = \text{Prox}_{\sigma_n f^*}(y_{n-1} + \sigma_n \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1})), \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where ψ lies in the broader region $(1, 1 + \sqrt{3})$ as obtained in [7] for the bilinear case, and $\tau_n, \sigma_n > 0$ are stepsizes to be determined by newly designed adaptive linesearch.

1.3 Contributions

To solve (1), existing algorithms require knowledge of the global Lipschitz constants of $\nabla_x \Phi$ and $\nabla_y \Phi$ with respect to x , y , and (x, y) , which can be challenging to obtain in practice and poor estimates of these constants can significantly deteriorate the practical performance. Moreover, even with known Lipschitz constants, the stepsizes derived from these global Lipschitz constants are usually much overconservative since they fail to utilize local geometry, resulting slow practical convergence. Although the backtracking linesearch scheme proposed in [14] estimates stepsizes adaptively, it requires to update both variables x and y in every trial linesearch step, leading to expensive computational cost and potentially lower efficiency.

Our first contribution is to propose an algorithm with adaptive linesearch that addresses all the above mentioned limitations. In particular, the new algorithm is in the convex combination based PDA framework (3), and applies a novel linesearch to estimate stepsizes adaptively. Unlike previous approaches, our algorithm only updates the dual variable y for each linesearch trial step, rather than updating both variables. More importantly, our algorithm does not require any prior knowledge of the global Lipschitz constants and instead utilizes local geometry in the linesearch to improve the overall performance, making the algorithm much more efficient across various applications.

Another contribution of this paper is a fully adaptive algorithm for solving the structural convex optimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^q} g(x) + h(x) \quad \text{with} \quad h(x) := \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p h_i(x), \quad (4)$$

where, for each $i = 1, \dots, p$, $h_i : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex and differentiable with locally Lipschitz continuous gradient ∇h_i . Let $H(x) := (h_1(x), \dots, h_p(x))^\top$, $\mathbf{1} := (1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and $\iota_{\mathbf{1}/p}$ be the indicator function of the singleton $\{\mathbf{1}/p\}$. Then, (4) can be reformulated as

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^q} \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^p} g(x) + \langle y, H(x) \rangle - \iota_{\mathbf{1}/p}(y), \quad (5)$$

which is apparently a special case of (1). By applying our proposed algorithm in the paper (Algorithm 3.1) to this special case, we obtain a fully adaptive proximal gradient method with convex combination, which gives explicit stepsizes based on the available information computed through the iterations, without the need of a linesearch procedure and any prior knowledge of Lipschitz constants, see Section 5 for details.

Moreover, we establish the iterative global convergence and sublinear ergodic convergence rate of the proposed algorithm under local Lipschitz continuity assumptions of $\nabla_x \Phi$ and $\nabla_y \Phi$, while many algorithms (e.g. [14, 23]) require global Lipschitz continuity properties for ensuring convergence. Specifically, for the general nonbilinear case (1), the primal-dual gap $\mathcal{L}(x_n, y^*) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, y_n)$ is adopted to quantify the convergence rate, where (x^*, y^*) is any saddle point of $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$. When the coupling term $\Phi(x, y)$ is linear in one of the variables, we first reformulate (1) as a constrained optimization problem and then establish convergence rate results using function value residual and constraint violation as in [8, 26, 27]. Furthermore, we propose an accelerated algorithm achieving faster convergence rate for the strongly convex case. Our numerical experiments on quadratically constrained quadratic programming (QCQP) and sparse logistic regression (SLR) problems show that the proposed algorithms are significantly faster (or even on the order of faster for solving QCQP problems) than the comparison algorithms.

1.4 Organization

The organization of the remaining paper is outlined as follows. Section 2 provides basic assumptions, necessary facts, and notation. The main algorithm, a variant of PDAc with linesearch to determine stepsizes, is introduced in Section 3. Convergence results and sublinear convergence rate

results are also established in this section. In Section 4, we focus on the nonlinear compositional convex optimization problem, provide a different analysis based on function value residual and constraint violation and introduce an accelerated algorithm for the strongly convex case. In Section 5, we demonstrate that the proposed approach reduces to a fully adaptive proximal gradient method when applied to (4). Section 6 presents numerical results on QCQP and SRL problems. Comparisons with state-of-the-art algorithms are included as well. Finally, Section 7 provides some concluding remarks.

2 Assumptions and Preliminaries

The assumption of global Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla_x \Phi$ and $\nabla_y \Phi$, which is commonly used in many existing results [14, 23], may not hold in practice for many functions. In this paper, we show that local Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla_x \Phi$ and $\nabla_y \Phi$ is sufficient for establishing convergence of the adaptive PDA algorithm with linesearch proposed in this paper. A pair $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathbf{dom}(g) \times \mathbf{dom}(f^*)$ is said to be a saddle point of $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ or (1) if it satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}(x^*, y) \leq \mathcal{L}(x^*, y^*) \leq \mathcal{L}(x, y^*) \quad \text{for all } (x, y) \in \mathbf{dom}(g) \times \mathbf{dom}(f^*).$$

We denote the set of all saddle points of $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ by Ω , i.e.,

$$\Omega = \{(x^*, y^*) \in \mathbf{dom}(g) \times \mathbf{dom}(f^*) \mid -\nabla_x \Phi(x^*, y^*) \in \partial g(x^*), \nabla_y \Phi(x^*, y^*) \in \partial f^*(y^*)\}. \quad (6)$$

Throughout the paper, we make the following blanket assumptions.

Assumption 2.1 *Assume that problem (1) has at least one saddle point, i.e., $\Omega \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, $\mathbf{dom}(g) \times \mathbf{dom}(f^*) \subseteq \mathbf{dom}(\Phi)$ and $\mathcal{L}(x^*, y^*)$ is finite.*

Assumption 2.2 *Assume that $\Phi : \mathbf{dom}(g) \times \mathbf{dom}(f^*) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous such that*

- (i) (**convexity and concavity**) *for any $y \in \mathbf{dom}(f^*)$, $\Phi(\cdot, y)$ is convex and differentiable w.r.t. the first component, and for any $x \in \mathbf{dom}(g)$, $\Phi(x, \cdot)$ is concave and differentiable w.r.t. the second component;*
- (ii) (**local Lipschitz continuity**) *for any bounded subsets $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, there exist $L_{yy} \geq 0, L_{xx} \geq 0, L_{xy} > 0$ such that for any $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathbf{dom}(g)$ and $y, \tilde{y} \in \mathcal{Y} \cap \mathbf{dom}(f^*)$ there hold*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_y \Phi(x, y) - \nabla_y \Phi(x, \tilde{y})\| &\leq L_{yy} \|y - \tilde{y}\|, \\ \|\nabla_x \Phi(x, y) - \nabla_x \Phi(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\| &\leq L_{xx} \|x - \tilde{x}\| + L_{xy} \|y - \tilde{y}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.1 *We emphasize that the local Lipschitz continuity in Assumption 2.2 (ii) is only for theoretical analysis purpose. Our main algorithm, Algorithm 3.1, is parameter-free in the sense that it does not depend on the local Lipschitz constants L_{yy}, L_{xx} , or L_{xy} in Assumption 2.2 (ii), nor on any other parameters associated with the saddle point problem. While the local Lipschitz constants L_{yy}, L_{xx} , and L_{xy} should rely on the bounded subsets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , for simplifying the analysis and notation, we omit its explicit dependence on particular bounded subsets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} . Under the assumption of local Lipschitz continuity, we will prove that the sequence generated by our algorithm is bounded (see Lemma 3.3 (ii)) and, in fact, converges (see Theorem 3.1). Therefore, in the analysis, it is sufficient to choose L_{yy}, L_{xx} , and L_{xy} to be sufficiently large, ensuring that Assumption 2.2 (ii) holds for bounded sets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , which guarantees that the entire sequences generated by the algorithm are located within $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$.*

In addition, we make the following assumptions on f and g , which are widely satisfied in many practical applications, see, e.g., [2, Chapter 6].

Assumption 2.3 *Assume that the proximal operators of the component functions f and g either have closed form formulas or can be evaluated efficiently.*

The following simple facts and identities are useful in our analysis.

Fact 2.1 Let $h : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ be an extended real-valued closed proper and strongly convex function with modulus $\gamma \geq 0$. Then for any $\tau > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, it holds that $z = \text{Prox}_{\tau h}(x)$ if and only if $h(y) \geq h(z) + \frac{1}{\tau}\langle x - z, y - z \rangle + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|y - z\|^2$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

Fact 2.2 Let $\{u_n\}$ and $\{v_n\}$ be two real and nonnegative sequences. If, for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $u_{n+1} \leq \varepsilon u_n + v_n$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} v_n < \infty$, then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n < \infty$.

Fact 2.3 For any $u, v, a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u + v > 0$, there holds $\frac{uv}{u+v}(a+b)^2 \leq ua^2 + vb^2$.

For any $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, there hold

$$2\langle x - y, x - z \rangle = \|x - y\|^2 + \|x - z\|^2 - \|y - z\|^2, \quad (7)$$

$$\|\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y\|^2 = \alpha\|x\|^2 + (1 - \alpha)\|y\|^2 - \alpha(1 - \alpha)\|x - y\|^2. \quad (8)$$

3 PDAc with Linesearch

In this section, we introduce our PDA with convex combination for solving (1), where adaptive stepsizes is adopted by linesearch. Define

$$\theta_n := \nabla_x \Phi(x_n, y_n) - \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}), \quad (9)$$

$$\Phi_n^y := \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}) + \langle \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}), y_n - y_{n-1} \rangle - \Phi(x_n, y_n), \quad (10)$$

$$\omega := \omega(\xi, \varphi) := 2\psi - \xi - \frac{\psi^3 \varphi}{1 + \psi}, \quad \forall \psi \in (1, 1 + \sqrt{3}), \quad (11)$$

$$\Theta_\psi := \{(\xi, \varphi) \mid \xi > 0, \varphi > 1 \text{ and } \omega(\xi, \varphi) > 0\}. \quad (12)$$

It can be verified that with $\psi \in (1, 1 + \sqrt{3})$, the set Θ_ψ is nonempty. Using the notation defined in (9)-(12), the basic scheme is summarized in Algorithm 3.1.

Algorithm 3.1 (PDAc with Linesearch (PDAc-L))

Step 0. Choose $\psi \in (1, 1 + \sqrt{3})$, $(\xi, \varphi) \in \Theta_\psi$, $\tau_{\max} > 0$, $\nu \in (0, 1)$, $\mu \in (0, 1)$, $\eta \in [0, 1)$ and integer $M \geq 1$. Choose $x_0 \in \mathbf{dom}(g)$, $y_0 \in \mathbf{dom}(f^*)$, $\beta > 0$ and $\tau_0 \in (0, \tau_{\max}]$. Set $z_0 = x_0$, $\omega := \omega(\xi, \varphi)$, $\delta_0 = 1$ and $n = 1$.

Step 1. Compute

$$z_n = \frac{\psi - 1}{\psi} x_{n-1} + \frac{1}{\psi} z_{n-1}, \quad x_n = \text{Prox}_{\tau_{n-1} g}(z_n - \tau_{n-1} \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1})). \quad (13)$$

Step 2. Set $\tau = \min\{\varphi \tau_{n-1}, \tau_{\max}\}$ and compute

$$y_n = \text{Prox}_{\beta \tau_n f^*}(y_{n-1} + \beta \tau_n \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1})), \quad (14)$$

where $\tau_n = \tau \mu^i$ and i is the smallest nonnegative integer such that

$$\frac{\tau_n \tau_{n-1}}{\xi} \|\theta_n\|^2 + 2\tau_n \Phi_n^y \leq \nu r_n + (1 - \nu)c_n \quad (15)$$

with $r_n = \omega \delta_{n-1} \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2$, $c_n = (\eta/|\mathcal{I}_n|) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n} r_i$ and

$$\mathcal{I}_n = \{n - 1, n - 2, \dots, \max\{n - M, 1\}\}.$$

Step 3. Set $\delta_n = \tau_n / \tau_{n-1}$, $n \leftarrow n + 1$ and go to Step 1.

Remark 3.1 We give the following remarks on Algorithm 3.1.

1. The constant τ_{\max} in Algorithm 3.1 is to ensure that $\{\tau_n : n \geq 1\}$ is bounded, and thus it can be chosen to be a very large value in practice, see [19, Algorithm 1] for similar remarks.
2. It's worth emphasizing that in Algorithm 3.1, only the variable y needs to be updated within each linesearch step. In contrast, both x and y need to be updated within each linesearch step in [14, Algorithm 2.3]. Note that in many applications the objective function can be written as $\Phi(x, y) = \langle M(x), y \rangle + h(x)$, where $M : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$. In this case, $\nabla_x \Phi(x, y) = M'(x)^\top y + \nabla h(x)$, and $\Phi_n^y \equiv 0$ for our algorithm. Therefore, our algorithm has a very cheap cost in checking the condition (15). In contrast, validating the linesearch condition in [14, Algorithm 2.3] is much more expensive since it requires computing $\nabla_x \Phi$ at each intermediate trial point.
3. For any $\psi \in (1, 1 + \sqrt{3})$, ξ and φ can be flexibly selected in the region Θ_ψ defined in (12). For instance, ξ and φ can be chosen in $\{(\xi, \varphi) \mid \xi > 0, \varphi > 1, 20\xi + 27\varphi < 60\}$ for $\psi = 3/2$.

Without mentioning repeatedly, below we let (x^*, y^*) be an arbitrarily point in Ω (see definition in (6)) and $\{(z_n, x_n, y_n)\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 3.1. Recall that $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ is defined in (1). For any $(x, y) \in \mathbf{dom}(g) \times \mathbf{dom}(f^*)$, we further define the primal-dual gap function by

$$J(x, y) := \mathcal{L}(x, y^*) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, y), \quad (16)$$

which was used in [9, 14, 21] to measure convergence rate. Apparently, $J(x, y)$ is jointly convex in (x, y) and $J(x, y) \geq 0$ for any (x, y) . In the following, we present some basic properties of the sequence $\{(z_n, x_n, y_n)\}$ and explore the properties of τ_n , based upon which convergence of the algorithm will be established.

3.1 Basic Properties of PDAc-L

For any bounded subset $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, $x \in \mathbf{dom}(g)$ and $y, \tilde{y} \in \mathcal{Y} \cap \mathbf{dom}(f^*)$, it follows from Assumption 2.2 that

$$-\frac{L_{yy}}{2} \|y - \tilde{y}\|^2 \leq \Phi(x, y) - \Phi(x, \tilde{y}) - \langle \nabla_y \Phi(x, \tilde{y}), y - \tilde{y} \rangle \leq 0. \quad (17)$$

Next, we present two lemmas, which play critical roles in the convergence analysis.

Lemma 3.1 For θ_n , Φ_n^y and $J(\cdot)$ defined in (9), (10) and (16), respectively, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_n J(x_n, y_n) &\leq \langle x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}, x^* - x_{n+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{\beta} \langle y_n - y_{n-1}, y^* - y_n \rangle \\ &\quad + \psi \delta_n \langle x_n - z_{n+1}, x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle + \tau_n \langle \theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1} \rangle + \tau_n \Phi_n^y. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Proof It follows from (13), (14) and Fact 2.1 that

$$\tau_n (g(x_{n+1}) - g(x^*)) \leq \langle x_{n+1} - z_{n+1} + \tau_n \nabla_x \Phi(x_n, y_n), x^* - x_{n+1} \rangle, \quad (19)$$

$$\tau_{n-1} (g(x_n) - g(x_{n+1})) \leq \langle x_n - z_n + \tau_{n-1} \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle, \quad (20)$$

$$\tau_n (f^*(y_n) - f^*(y^*)) \leq \langle \frac{1}{\beta} (y_n - y_{n-1}) - \tau_n \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}), y^* - y_n \rangle. \quad (21)$$

Multiplying (20) by $\delta_n = \tau_n / \tau_{n-1}$ and using $x_n - z_n = \psi(x_n - z_{n+1})$, which follows from the definition of z_n in (13), we obtain

$$\tau_n (g(x_n) - g(x_{n+1})) \leq \langle \psi \delta_n (x_n - z_{n+1}) + \tau_n \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle. \quad (22)$$

It follows from the right-hand-side of (17) that

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}), y^* - y_n \rangle &= \langle \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}), y_n - y_{n-1} \rangle + \langle \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}), y_{n-1} - y^* \rangle \\ &\leq \langle \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}), y_n - y_{n-1} \rangle + \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}) - \Phi(x_n, y^*). \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of $J(\cdot)$ in (16), taking the sum of (19), (21)-(22), and using the above inequality, we obtain from elementary calculations that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_n J(x_n, y_n) &\leq \langle x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}, x^* - x_{n+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{\beta} \langle y_n - y_{n-1}, y^* - y_n \rangle \\ &\quad + \psi \delta_n \langle x_n - z_{n+1}, x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle + \tau_n \mathcal{G}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_n &:= \langle \nabla_x \Phi(x_n, y_n), x^* - x_{n+1} \rangle + \langle \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}), y_n - y_{n-1} \rangle + \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}) - \Phi(x^*, y_n). \end{aligned}$$

We can easily show, using (9)-(10) and the convexity of Φ in x , that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_n &= \langle \theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1} \rangle + \Phi_n^y + (\Phi(x_n, y_n) + \langle \nabla_x \Phi(x_n, y_n), x^* - x_n \rangle - \Phi(x^*, y_n)) \\ &\leq \langle \theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1} \rangle + \Phi_n^y. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (23) implies (18) immediately. \square

For any $(x^*, y^*) \in \Omega$, we define

$$\begin{cases} a_n := \frac{\psi}{\psi-1} \|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_{n-1} - y^*\|^2 + \omega \delta_{n-1} \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2, \\ b_n := -\frac{\tau_n \tau_{n-1}}{\xi} \|\theta_n\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2 + \omega \delta_{n-1} \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 - 2\tau_n \Phi_n^y. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Lemma 3.2 *For all $n \geq 1$, there holds $a_{n+1} + 2\tau_n J(x_n, y_n) \leq a_n - b_n$, where a_n and b_n are defined in (24).*

Proof Fix $n \geq 1$ arbitrarily. By applying identity (7) to the first three inner products in (18) and reorganizing the terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_n - y^*\|^2 + 2\tau_n J(x_n, y_n) \\ &\leq \|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_{n-1} - y^*\|^2 + 2\tau_n \langle \theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1} \rangle + 2\tau_n \Phi_n^y \\ &\quad - \psi \delta_n \|z_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 - (1 - \psi \delta_n) \|x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}\|^2 - \psi \delta_n \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 - \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Since $x_{n+1} = \frac{\psi}{\psi-1} z_{n+2} - \frac{1}{\psi-1} z_{n+1}$, which follows from (13), we deduce from (8) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 &= \frac{\psi}{\psi-1} \|z_{n+2} - x^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{\psi-1} \|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{\psi}{(\psi-1)^2} \|z_{n+2} - z_{n+1}\|^2 \\ &= \frac{\psi}{\psi-1} \|z_{n+2} - x^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{\psi-1} \|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\psi} \|x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where the second equality is due to $z_{n+2} - z_{n+1} = \frac{\psi-1}{\psi}(x_{n+1} - z_{n+1})$. By plugging (26) into (25), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\psi}{\psi-1} \|z_{n+2} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_n - y^*\|^2 + 2\tau_n J(x_n, y_n) \\ &\leq \frac{\psi}{\psi-1} \|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_{n-1} - y^*\|^2 + 2\tau_n \langle \theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1} \rangle + 2\tau_n \Phi_n^y - \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad - \psi \delta_n \|z_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\psi} - \psi \delta_n\right) \|x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}\|^2 - \psi \delta_n \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

By using Fact 2.3 with $u = \psi\delta_n > 0$ and $v = 1 + \frac{1}{\psi} - \psi\delta_n$ so that $u+v = 1 + \frac{1}{\psi} > 0$, $a = \|z_{n+1} - x_n\|$, $b = \|x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}\|$ and noting $\|x_{n+1} - x_n\| \leq a + b$, we can easily obtain

$$\psi\delta_n \|z_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{\psi} - \psi\delta_n) \|x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}\|^2 \geq \psi\delta_n (1 - \frac{\psi^2\delta_n}{1+\psi}) \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2.$$

This together with (27) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\psi}{\psi-1} \|z_{n+2} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_n - y^*\|^2 + 2\tau_n J(x_n, y_n) \\ & \leq \frac{\psi}{\psi-1} \|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_{n-1} - y^*\|^2 + 2\tau_n \langle \theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1} \rangle + 2\tau_n \Phi_n^y \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2 - \psi\delta_n (2 - \frac{\psi^2\delta_n}{1+\psi}) \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Recall that $\delta_n = \tau_n/\tau_{n-1}$. Plug the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality $2\langle \theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1} \rangle \leq \frac{\xi}{\tau_{n-1}} \|x_n - x_{n+1}\|^2 + \frac{\tau_{n-1}}{\xi} \|\theta_n\|^2$, which holds for any $\xi > 0$, into (28) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\psi}{\psi-1} \|z_{n+2} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_n - y^*\|^2 + \delta_n (2\psi - \xi - \frac{\psi^3\delta_n}{1+\psi}) \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 + 2\tau_n J(x_n, y_n) \\ & \leq \frac{\psi}{\psi-1} \|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_{n-1} - y^*\|^2 + \frac{\tau_n\tau_{n-1}}{\xi} \|\theta_n\|^2 + 2\tau_n \Phi_n^y - \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

It follows from $\delta_n \leq \varphi$ (see Step 2 of Algorithm 3.1) and (11) that $2\psi - \xi - \frac{\psi^3\delta_n}{1+\psi} \geq \omega$. By reorganizing the terms in (29) and taking into account a_n and b_n defined in (24), we obtain the desired result $a_{n+1} + 2\tau_n J(x_n, y_n) \leq a_n - b_n$. \square

Based on Lemma 3.2, we next establish some properties of the sequences generated by Algorithm 3.1. Recall that θ_n and Φ_n^y are defined in (9) and (10), respectively. Next, we show that the linesearch step in Step 2 of Algorithm 3.1 is well-defined and establish some important properties for the sequences $\{(x_n, y_n, z_n)\}$, $\{\tau_n\}$ and $\{\delta_n\}$, which are essential for proving the convergence results. For convenience we define

$$\underline{\tau} := \min \left\{ \frac{\nu\xi}{\beta(2L_{xy}^2\tau_{\max} + L_{yy}\xi)}, \frac{\nu\omega\xi}{2L_{xx}^2\tau_{\max}} \right\}. \quad (30)$$

Lemma 3.3 *The following claims hold. (i) The linesearch step of Algorithm 3.1 always terminates, i.e., $\{\tau_n\}$ is well defined; (ii) The sequence $\{(x_n, y_n, z_n)\}$ generated by Algorithm 3.1 is bounded; (iii) If $\tau_n \leq \underline{\tau}$, then the linesearch condition (15) is satisfied; and (iv) Assuming that $\tau_0 \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$ and $\tau_{\max} \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$, then the sequences $\{\tau_n\}$ and $\{\delta_n\}$ generated by Algorithm 3.1 are strictly separated from 0. In fact, there hold $\tau_n \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$ and $\delta_n \geq \mu\underline{\tau}/\tau_{\max}$ for all $n \geq 1$.*

Proof (i) Fix n arbitrarily and recall that $\tau = \min\{\varphi\tau_{n-1}, \tau_{\max}\}$ at the n -th iteration. For convenience, we define

$$\left. \begin{aligned} y_n(\lambda) & := \text{Prox}_{\beta\lambda f^*}(y_{n-1} + \beta\lambda\nabla_y\Phi(x_n, y_{n-1})) \text{ for } \lambda > 0, \\ \theta_n(\lambda) & := \nabla_x\Phi(x_n, y_n(\lambda)) - \nabla_x\Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}), \\ \Phi_n^y(\lambda) & := \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}) + \langle \nabla_y\Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}), y_n(\lambda) - y_{n-1} \rangle - \Phi(x_n, y_n(\lambda)). \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (31)$$

It follows from [2, Theorem 10.9] that $\|y_n(\lambda) - y_{n-1}\| \leq r := \|y_n(\tau) - y_{n-1}\| < +\infty$ for any $\lambda \in (0, \tau]$. This implies that the curve $\{y_n(\lambda) : \lambda \in (0, \tau]\}$ lies in the closed ball $B[y_{n-1}; r]$. Assume,

by contradiction, that the linesearch procedure defined in Algorithm 3.1 fails to terminate at the n -th iteration. Then, for all $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and $\lambda = \tau\mu^i$, we have

$$\frac{\lambda\tau_{n-1}}{\xi}\|\theta_n(\lambda)\|^2 + 2\lambda\Phi_n^y(\lambda) > \nu r_n + (1-\nu)c_n \geq \nu r_n, \quad (32)$$

where r_n and c_n are given in (15). Since $y_n(\lambda) \in B[y_{n-1}; r]$ for all $\lambda = \tau\mu^i$ with $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, it follows from Assumption 2.2 (ii) and the inequality on the left-hand-side of (17) that

$$\|\theta_n(\lambda)\|^2 \leq 2L_{xx}^2\|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 + 2L_{xy}^2\|y_n(\lambda) - y_{n-1}\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_n^y(\lambda) \leq \frac{L_{yy}}{2}\|y_n(\lambda) - y_{n-1}\|^2. \quad (33)$$

Combining the above two inequalities with (32) and $\lambda = \tau\mu^i$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau\mu^i}{\xi} \left(2\tau_{n-1}L_{xx}^2\|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 + (2\tau_{n-1}L_{xy}^2 + \xi L_{yy})\|y_n(\lambda) - y_{n-1}\|^2 \right) \\ & > \nu r_n = \nu \left(\omega\delta_{n-1}\|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta}\|y_n(\lambda) - y_{n-1}\|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies $2\mu^i\tau\tau_{n-1}L_{xx}^2/\xi > \nu\omega\delta_{n-1}$ or $\mu^i(2\tau\tau_{n-1}L_{xy}^2 + \xi L_{yy})/\xi > \nu/\beta$. This is impossible since $\mu^i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, which indicates that the linesearch procedure must terminate.

(ii) By (15), which, from part (i) of this Lemma, is always satisfied, and the definition of b_n in (24), for all $n \geq 1$ we have

$$b_n \geq (1-\nu)(r_n - c_n) = (1-\nu) \left(r_n - \frac{\eta}{|\mathcal{I}_n|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n} r_i \right),$$

where $\mathcal{I}_n = \{n-1, n-2, \dots, \max\{n-M, 1\}\}$ and $M \geq 1$ is an integer. Hence, for all $k \geq M+1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=M+1}^k b_n & \geq (1-\nu) \left(\sum_{n=M+1}^k r_n - \frac{\eta}{M} \sum_{n=M+1}^k \sum_{i=n-M}^{n-1} r_i \right) \\ & = (1-\nu)(1-\eta) \sum_{n=M+1}^k r_n + (1-\nu)\eta \left(\sum_{n=M+1}^k r_n - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{n=M+1}^k \sum_{i=n-M}^{n-1} r_i \right) \\ & \geq (1-\nu)(1-\eta) \sum_{n=M+1}^k r_n - (1-\nu)\eta \sum_{n=1}^M r_n. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Since $J(x_n, y_n) \geq 0$ (see the definition of $J(\cdot)$ in (16)), it follows from Lemma 3.2 that $a_{n+1} \leq a_n - b_n$ for all $n \geq 1$. So, it follows from $r_n \geq 0$ for all n , $\nu \in (0, 1)$, $\eta \in [0, 1)$ and (34) that

$$a_{k+1} \leq a_{M+1} - \sum_{n=M+1}^k b_n \leq a_{M+1} + (1-\nu)\eta \sum_{n=1}^M r_n$$

for all $k \geq M+1$. Hence, the sequence $\{a_n\}$ is bounded. Using the definition of a_n in (24), we have

$$\frac{\psi}{\psi-1}\|z_{n+2} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta}\|y_n - y^*\|^2 \leq a_{n+1}. \quad (35)$$

Hence, the boundedness of $\{a_n\}$ implies that both sequences $\{z_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ are bounded. Since $x_n = \frac{\psi}{\psi-1}z_{n+1} - \frac{1}{\psi-1}z_n$, which follows from the first relation in (13), the sequence $\{(x_n, y_n, z_n)\}$ is bounded.

(iii) First, from part (ii) of this lemma, the sequence $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ is bounded. It then follows from Assumption 2.2 (ii) and the inequality on the left-hand-side of (17) that

$$\|\theta_n\|^2 \leq 2L_{xx}^2 \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 + 2L_{xy}^2 \|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_n^y \leq \frac{L_{yy}}{2} \|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2. \quad (36)$$

Using (36), we see that the linesearch condition (15) is satisfied provided that

$$\nu\omega\delta_{n-1} - 2\tau_n\tau_{n-1}L_{xx}^2/\xi \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nu/\beta - 2\tau_n\tau_{n-1}L_{xy}^2/\xi - \tau_nL_{yy} \geq 0. \quad (37)$$

Recall that $\delta_{n-1} = \tau_{n-1}/\tau_{n-2}$ and $\tau_j \leq \tau_{\max}$ for all $j \geq 0$. It is easy to show from the definition of $\underline{\tau}$ in (30) that the conditions in (37) are indeed satisfied when $\tau_n \leq \underline{\tau}$.

(iv) Let $\underline{\tau} > 0$ be defined in (30) and note that $\tau_0 \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$ and $\tau_{\max} \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$. Assume that $\tau_{n-1} \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$. To show that the sequence $\{\tau_n\}$ is strictly separated from 0, we only need to show that $\tau_n \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$ as well. Recall that $\tau = \min\{\varphi\tau_{n-1}, \tau_{\max}\}$. Since $\varphi > 1$, we have $\tau \geq \min\{\tau_{n-1}, \tau_{\max}\} \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$. Recall that $\tau_n = \tau\mu^i$ for some nonnegative integer i . If $i = 0$, then $\tau_n = \tau \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$. If $i > 0$, then $\hat{\tau}_n := \tau\mu^{i-1}$ must violate (15). It then follows from part (iii) of this lemma that $\hat{\tau}_n > \underline{\tau}$ must hold. Hence, $\tau_n = \mu\hat{\tau}_n > \mu\underline{\tau}$. As such, we have proved that $\tau_n \geq \mu\underline{\tau} > 0$ for all n . Finally, it is obvious that $\delta_n = \tau_n/\tau_{n-1} \geq \mu\underline{\tau}/\tau_{\max} > 0$ for all n . This completes the proof of this lemma. \square

Remark 3.2 (1.) By the definitions of a_n and b_n in (24), we have that a_n is nonnegative. However, the linesearch rule (15) in Algorithm 3.1 not necessarily ensures the nonnegativity of b_n unless setting the parameter $\eta = 0$ and therefore, it does not ensure the sequence $\{a_n\}$ is the monotonely decreasing. Hence, we may regard (15) as a “nonmonotone” line search procedure, which is often used in nonlinear optimization algorithms to improve both robustness and efficiency [13, 33]. (2.) The conditions $\tau_0 \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$ and $\tau_{\max} \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$ in Lemma 3.3 (iv) can be easily ensured. First, choose $y_{-1} \in \text{dom}(f^*)$ arbitrarily in a small neighborhood of the starting point y_0 such that $\nabla_x \Phi(x_0, y_{-1}) \neq \nabla_x \Phi(x_0, y_0)$ and then compute $\varpi = \|y_{-1} - y_0\|^2 / \|\nabla_x \Phi(x_0, y_{-1}) - \nabla_x \Phi(x_0, y_0)\|^2 \geq 1/L_{xy}^2$. Set $\tau_0 = \mu\xi\varpi/(2\beta)$ and $\tau_{\max} = \max(\chi, \tau_0)$ with $\chi > 1$. Then, we have $\tau_{\max} \geq \tau_0 \geq \frac{\mu\nu\xi}{2\beta L_{xy}^2} \geq \frac{\mu\nu\xi}{2\beta L_{xy}^2 \tau_{\max}} \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$ due to the definition of $\underline{\tau}$ in (30), $\nu \in (0, 1)$ and $\tau_{\max} > 1$. Hence, without loss of generality, in the following we assume τ_0 and τ_{\max} are chosen such that $\tau_0 \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$ and $\tau_{\max} \geq \mu\underline{\tau}$.

3.2 Convergence

Based on Lemma 3.3, we now establish global pointwise convergence and $\mathcal{O}(1/N)$ ergodic sublinear convergence rate of Algorithm 3.1.

Theorem 3.1 (Global pointwise convergence) *The sequence $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ generated by Algorithm 3.1 converges to a solution of the saddle point problem (1).*

Proof Again, it follows from $J(x_n, y_n) \geq 0$ and Lemma 3.2 that $a_{n+1} \leq a_n - b_n$ for all $n \geq 1$. So, by (34) and $a_n \geq 0$ for all n , we have

$$(1 - \nu)(1 - \eta) \sum_{n=M+1}^{\infty} r_n \leq a_{M+1} + (1 - \nu)\eta \sum_{n=1}^M r_n. \quad (38)$$

From the proof of Lemma 3.3 (iv), we have $\delta_n \geq \underline{\delta} := \mu\underline{\tau}/\tau_{\max} > 0$ for all $n \geq 1$. Then, by the definition of r_n in (15), we have $r_n = \omega\delta_{n-1}\|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta}\|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2 \geq \omega\underline{\delta}\|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta}\|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2$. Hence, we have from $\nu \in (0, 1)$, $\eta \in [0, 1)$ and (38) that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_n < \infty, \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2 < \infty,$$

which also implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - x_{n-1}\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|y_n - y_{n-1}\| = 0$. Let $u_n := z_n - x_n$. It is easy to verify from $z_{n+1} = (1 - 1/\psi)x_n + z_n/\psi$ that $\psi u_{n+1} - u_n = \psi(x_n - x_{n+1})$. Dividing both sides of this equality by $\psi - 1$ and using (8) gives

$$\frac{\psi}{\psi - 1} \|u_{n+1}\|^2 - \frac{1}{\psi - 1} \|u_n\|^2 + \frac{\psi}{(\psi - 1)^2} \|u_{n+1} - u_n\|^2 = \frac{\psi^2}{(\psi - 1)^2} \|x_n - x_{n+1}\|^2.$$

This implies that $\|u_{n+1}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\psi} \|u_n\|^2 + \frac{\psi}{\psi - 1} \|x_n - x_{n+1}\|^2$. It then follows from $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|x_n - x_{n+1}\|^2 < \infty$ and Fact 2.2 (ii) that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|u_n\|^2 < \infty$, and thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (z_n - x_n) = 0$. Since the sequence $\{(x_n, y_n, z_n)\}$ is bounded from Lemma 3.3 (ii), there exist (x^*, y^*) and a subsequence of $\{n_k : k \geq 1\} \subseteq \{n : n \geq 1\}$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_{n_k} = x^*$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_{n_k} = y^*$, which implies that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_{n_k+1} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_{n_k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} z_{n_k} = x^*$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_{n_k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_{n_k-1} = y^*$. Since $z_{n+1} = (1 - 1/\psi)x_n + z_n/\psi$ for all $n \geq 1$, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} z_{n_k+1} = x^*$ as well.

Similar to (19) and (21), for any $(x, y) \in \mathbf{dom}(g) \times \mathbf{dom}(f^*)$, there hold

$$\begin{cases} \tau_{n_k} (g(x_{n_k+1}) - g(x)) \leq \langle x_{n_k+1} - z_{n_k+1} + \tau_{n_k} \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n_k}, y_{n_k}), x - x_{n_k+1} \rangle, \\ \tau_{n_k} (f^*(y_{n_k}) - f^*(y)) \leq \langle \frac{1}{\beta} (y_{n_k} - y_{n_k-1}) - \tau_{n_k} \nabla_y \Phi(x_{n_k}, y_{n_k-1}), y - y_{n_k} \rangle. \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

Then, dividing τ_{n_k} from both sides of (39), taking into account that both g and f are closed (and thus lower semicontinuous) and letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$g(x^*) - g(x) \leq \langle \nabla_x \Phi(x^*, y^*), x - x^* \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad f^*(y^*) - f^*(y) \leq -\langle \nabla_y \Phi(x^*, y^*), y - y^* \rangle. \quad (40)$$

Since (40) holds for any $(x, y) \in \mathbf{dom}(g) \times \mathbf{dom}(f^*)$, we have $-\nabla_x \Phi(x^*, y^*) \in \partial g(x^*)$ and $\nabla_y \Phi(x^*, y^*) \in \partial f^*(y^*)$, which implies that (x^*, y^*) is a solution of the saddle point problem (1).

Recall that $J(\cdot)$ and a_n are defined in (16) and (24), respectively, which depend on an arbitrarily fixed solution pair (x^*, y^*) . Since (x^*, y^*) is also solution of the saddle point problem (1), we can replace (x^*, y^*) by (x^*, y^*) in the first place. As such, there holds $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} = 0$ since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} z_{n_k+1} = x^*$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_{n_k-1} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_{n_k} = y^*$. Exactly same as (34), for all $\ell \geq n_k \geq M + 1$ we can obtain

$$\sum_{i=n_k}^{\ell} b_i \geq (1 - \nu)(1 - \eta) \sum_{i=n_k}^k r_i - (1 - \nu)\eta \sum_{i=n_k-M}^{n_k-1} r_i.$$

Hence, we can derive from $0 \leq a_{n+1} \leq a_n - b_n$ and $r_n \geq 0$ for all $n \geq 1$ that

$$0 \leq a_{\ell+1} \leq a_{n_k} + (1 - \nu)\eta \sum_{i=n_k-M}^{n_k-1} r_i, \quad \forall \ell \geq n_k \geq M + 1.$$

Then, we have from $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = 0$ that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$ as well. As a result, due to the definition of a_n in (24), there holds $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (z_n, y_n) = (x^*, y^*)$. Again, by the first relation in (13), we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x^*$. This completes the proof. \square

We next establish ergodic sublinear convergence rate of Algorithm 3.1 using the primal-dual gap function $J(\cdot)$ defined in (16).

Theorem 3.2 (Sublinear convergence rate) *There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that for any $N \geq 1$ there holds $J(\hat{x}_N, \hat{y}_N) \leq C_1/N$, where \hat{x}_N and \hat{y}_N are defined as*

$$\hat{x}_N = \frac{1}{s_N} \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n x_n \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{y}_N = \frac{1}{s_N} \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n y_n \quad \text{with} \quad s_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n.$$

Proof Recall from Lemma 3.2 that $2\tau_n J(x_n, y_n) \leq a_n - a_{n+1} - b_n$ for all $n \geq 1$, a sum of which over $n = 1, \dots, N$ yields $2 \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n J(x_n, y_n) \leq a_1 - a_{N+1} - \sum_{n=1}^N b_n$. Then, it follows from (34) that $2 \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n J(x_n, y_n) \leq a_1 + \tilde{C}$, where $\tilde{C} = \sum_{n=1}^M |b_n| + (1 - \nu)\eta \sum_{n=1}^M r_n$. Since $J(x, y)$ is jointly convex in (x, y) , it follows from the definitions of \hat{x}_N, \hat{y}_N and Jensen's inequality that $J(\hat{x}_N, \hat{y}_N) \leq \frac{1}{s_N} \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n J(x_n, y_n)$. Combining the two inequalities just derived, we obtain $J(\hat{x}_N, \hat{y}_N) \leq (a_1 + \tilde{C})/(2s_N)$. By Lemma 3.3 (iv), it holds $\tau_n \geq \mu_{\underline{\tau}} > 0$ and then $s_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n \geq \mu_{\underline{\tau}} N$. By defining $C_1 = (a_1 + \tilde{C})/(2\mu_{\underline{\tau}}) > 0$, the proof is completed. \square

Even though the primal-dual gap function $J(\cdot)$ is frequently adopted in the literature to measure sublinear convergence rate, see, e.g., [5, 6, 14], it has a flaw that it could vanish at nonstationary points. Next, we consider a special yet important case, where the coupling term is linear in one of the variables. We reformulate the problem as a constrained optimization problem and establish convergence rate results for Algorithm 3.1 in terms of the conventional measure of function value residual and constraint violation of the reformulated problem. Moreover, when g is strongly convex, we propose an accelerated algorithm and establish the faster $\mathcal{O}(1/N^2)$ ergodic convergence rate.

4 Nonlinear Compositional Convex Optimization Problem

Let g and f be the same functions as in (1), $H : \mathbf{dom}(g) \rightarrow \mathbf{dom}(f)$ be nonlinear and continuously differentiable, and $h : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex and L_h -smooth with some constant $L_h > 0$.

In this section, we consider the following nonlinear compositional convex optimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^q} \{P(x) := g(x) + h(x) + f(H(x))\}. \quad (41)$$

Using the fact that $f^{**} = f$, (41) can be represented as

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^q} \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^p} \{\mathcal{L}(x, y) := g(x) + \Phi(x, y) - f^*(y)\} \quad \text{with} \quad \Phi(x, y) := h(x) + \langle H(x), y \rangle, \quad (42)$$

which is obviously a special case of (1). Assume that Assumptions 2.1-2.3 hold for (42). Moreover, we assume that, for any $y \in \mathbf{dom}(f^*)$, $\langle H(x), y \rangle$ is convex in x . Under this assumption, it follows that $f(H(x)) = \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^p} \{\langle H(x), y \rangle - f^*(y)\}$ is convex in x as well.

Since $\Phi(x, y)$ is linear in y , the Lipschitz constant L_{yy} defined in Assumption 2.2 (ii) can set to be 0. Note that problem (42) is an extension of the case studied in [34], where $h \equiv 0$ was considered. Define $l(y) := \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^q} \{\langle H(x), y \rangle - g(x) - h(x)\}$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Then, the dual problem of (41) is given by

$$\max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^p} \{D(y) := -l(-y) - f^*(y)\}. \quad (43)$$

On the other hand, by introducing an auxiliary variable $w \in \mathbb{R}^p$, the primal problem (41) can be equivalently represented as the following nonlinear equality constrained problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^q, w \in \mathbb{R}^p} \{F(x, w) := g(x) + h(x) + f(w) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad H(x) - w = 0\}. \quad (44)$$

Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be the Lagrange multiplier and denote the Lagrange function of (44) by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x, w, y) := F(x, w) + \langle y, H(x) - w \rangle, \quad (x, w, y) \in \mathbf{dom}(g) \times \mathbf{dom}(f) \times \mathbb{R}^p. \quad (45)$$

Similar to Assumption 2.1 for (1), we make the following assumption.

Assumption 4.1 Assume that problem (42) has at least one saddle point.

Under Assumption 4.1, strong duality holds between (41) and (43), and there exists $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathbf{dom}(g) \times \mathbf{dom}(f^*)$ such that $P(x^*) = D(y^*) = \mathcal{L}(x^*, y^*)$. As such, x^* and y^* are optimal for the primal and dual problems, respectively, and (x^*, y^*) is a solution of the primal-dual problem (42). Let $w^* = H(x^*)$. Then, (x^*, w^*) is a solution of (44) and (x^*, w^*, y^*) is a saddle point of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\cdot)$, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x^*, w^*, y) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x^*, w^*, y^*) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x, w, y^*) \quad \text{for all } (x, w, y) \in \mathbf{dom}(g) \times \mathbf{dom}(f) \times \mathbb{R}^p.$$

Denote the set of saddle points of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\cdot)$ by $\tilde{\Omega}$, which is nonempty under Assumption 4.1, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (x^*, w^*, y^*) \in \mathbf{dom}(g) \times \\ \mathbf{dom}(f) \times \mathbf{dom}(f^*) \end{array} \mid \begin{array}{l} -H'(x^*)^\top y^* - \nabla h(x^*) \in \partial g(x^*) \\ y^* \in \partial f(w^*), H(x^*) = w^* \end{array} \right\} \neq \emptyset. \quad (46)$$

By using the Moreau's decomposition $y = \text{Prox}_{f/\sigma}(y) + \frac{1}{\sigma}\text{Prox}_{\sigma f^*}(\sigma y)$, which holds for any $\sigma > 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$, y_n defined in (14) can be split as

$$y_n = y_{n-1} + \beta\tau_n(H(x_n) - w_n) \quad \text{with } w_n := \text{Prox}_{f/(\beta\tau_n)}(y_{n-1}/(\beta\tau_n) + H(x_n)). \quad (47)$$

Moreover, recall that in this case $L_{yy} = 0$ and $\Phi_n^y = 0$. Hence, the linesearch procedure using condition (15) can be much simplified. In the rest of this section, without mentioning repeatedly, we always fix arbitrary a primal-dual solution triplet $(x^*, w^*, y^*) \in \tilde{\Omega}$, let $\{(z_n, x_n, y_n)\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 3.1 when applied to the special case (42), and $\{w_n\}$ be given by (47). Furthermore, we define

$$\tilde{J}(x, w, y) := \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x, w, y) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x^*, w^*, y) = F(x, w) + \langle y, H(x) - w \rangle - F(x^*, w^*), \quad (48)$$

where $F(x, w)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x, w, y)$ are given in (44) and (45), respectively.

4.1 Convergence Rate Analysis of PDAC-L for (42)

In this section, we establish convergence rate results of PDAC-L (i.e., Algorithm 3.1) when applied to the particular case (42). These convergence rate results are measured in terms of function value residual and constraint violation of the equivalent problem (44).

Lemma 4.1 *Let θ_n be defined in (9). Then, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_n \tilde{J}(x_n, w_n, y) &\leq \langle x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}, x^* - x_{n+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{\beta} \langle y_n - y_{n-1}, y - y_n \rangle \\ &\quad + \psi \delta_n \langle x_n - z_{n+1}, x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle + \tau_n \langle \theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Proof It follows from (19), (22), (47) and Fact 2.1 that

$$\begin{cases} \tau_n (g(x_{n+1}) - g(x^*)) \leq \langle x_{n+1} - z_{n+1} + \tau_n \nabla_x \Phi(x_n, y_n), x^* - x_{n+1} \rangle, \\ \tau_n (g(x_n) - g(x_{n+1})) \leq \langle \psi \delta_n (x_n - z_{n+1}) + \tau_n \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle, \\ \tau_n (f(w_n) - f(w^*)) \leq -\tau_n \langle y_{n-1} + \beta\tau_n (H(x_n) - w_n), w^* - w_n \rangle. \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

By taking a sum to (50), followed by adding $\tau_n (h(x_n) + \langle y, H(x_n) - w_n \rangle - h(x^*))$ to both sides, using the notation $\Phi(\cdot)$, $F(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{J}(\cdot)$ defined in (42), (44) and (48), respectively, and taking into account the relations $y_n = y_{n-1} + \beta\tau_n (H(x_n) - w_n)$ and $H(x^*) = w^*$, we obtain after elementary calculations that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_n \tilde{J}(x_n, w_n, y) &= \tau_n (F(x_n, w_n) + \langle y, H(x_n) - w_n \rangle - F(x^*, w^*)) \\ &\leq \langle x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}, x^* - x_{n+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{\beta} \langle y_n - y_{n-1}, y - y_n \rangle + \psi \delta_n \langle x_n - z_{n+1}, x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle + \tau_n \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n &:= \langle \nabla_x \Phi(x_n, y_n), x^* - x_{n+1} \rangle + \langle \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle + \Phi(x_n, y_n) - \Phi(x^*, y_n) \\ &= \langle \theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1} \rangle + \langle \nabla_x \Phi(x_n, y_n), x^* - x_n \rangle + \Phi(x_n, y_n) - \Phi(x^*, y_n) \\ &\leq \langle \theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1} \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the definition of θ_n in (9) and inequality is due to the convexity of $\Phi(\cdot)$ in x . This together with (51) implies (49) immediately. \square

Recall that b_n and $\omega := \omega(\xi, \varphi)$ are defined in (24) and (11), respectively. Similar to Lemma 3.2, we have the following result.

Lemma 4.2 *For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $n \geq 1$, there holds*

$$\tilde{a}_{n+1}(y) + 2\tau_n \tilde{J}(x_n, w_n, y) \leq \tilde{a}_n(y) - b_n, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^p,$$

where $\tilde{a}_n(y) := \frac{\psi}{\psi-1} \|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta} \|y_{n-1} - y\|^2 + \omega \delta_{n-1} \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2$.

Proof The proof is completely analogous to that of Lemma 3.2 and is therefore omitted. \square

Theorem 4.1 (Sublinear convergence rate) *There exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that for any $N \geq 1$ there hold $|F(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N) - F(x^*, w^*)| \leq C_2/N$ and $\|H(\hat{x}_N) - \hat{w}_N\| \leq (2C_2/c)/N$, where $c > 0$ is a constant satisfying $c \geq 2\|y^*\|$, and \hat{x}_N and \hat{w}_N are defined as*

$$\hat{x}_N = \frac{1}{s_N} \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n x_n \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{w}_N = \frac{1}{s_N} \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n w_n \quad \text{with} \quad s_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n.$$

Proof Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be arbitrarily fixed. Recall that b_n and $\tilde{a}_n(y)$ are defined in (24) and Lemma 4.2, respectively. By definition, the sequence $\{\tilde{a}_n(y)\}$ is nonnegative. Lemma 4.2 implies that $2\tau_n \tilde{J}(x_n, w_n, y) \leq \tilde{a}_n(y) - \tilde{a}_{n+1}(y) - b_n$, a sum of which over $n = 1, \dots, N$ yields

$$2 \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n \tilde{J}(x_n, w_n, y) \leq \tilde{a}_1(y) - \tilde{a}_{N+1}(y) - \sum_{n=1}^N b_n \leq \tilde{a}_1(y) - \sum_{n=1}^N b_n \leq \tilde{a}_1(y) + \tilde{C}, \quad (52)$$

where the last inequality follows from (34) and $\tilde{C} = \sum_{n=1}^M |b_n| + (1-\nu)\eta \sum_{n=1}^M r_n$. Since $\tilde{J}(x, w, y)$ is convex in (x, w) , it follows from the definitions of \hat{x}_N and \hat{w}_N and Jensen's inequality that

$$\tilde{J}(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N, y) \leq \frac{1}{s_N} \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n \tilde{J}(x_n, w_n, y). \quad (53)$$

Combining (52), (53) and the definition of $\tilde{J}(\cdot)$ in (48), we obtain

$$F(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N) + \langle y, H(\hat{x}_N) - \hat{w}_N \rangle - F(x^*, w^*) \leq (\tilde{a}_1(y) + \tilde{C})/(2s_N).$$

By Lemma 3.3 (iv), we have $s_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n \geq \mu \underline{\tau} N$. By taking the maximum on both sides of the above inequality over $\|y\| \leq c$ and defining $\bar{C} = \sup_y \{\tilde{a}_1(y) : \|y\| \leq c\}/(2\mu \underline{\tau}) > 0$ and $C_2 = \bar{C} + \tilde{C}$, we obtain

$$F(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N) + c\|H(\hat{x}_N) - \hat{w}_N\| - F(x^*, w^*) \leq C_2/N, \quad (54)$$

which implies $F(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N) - F(x^*, w^*) \leq C_2/N$. Recall that $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\cdot)$ is defined in (45). It follows from $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x^*, w^*, y^*) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N, y^*)$, $H(x^*) = w^*$ and $\|y^*\| \leq c/2$ that

$$F(x^*, w^*) - F(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N) \leq \langle y^*, H(\hat{x}_N) - \hat{w}_N \rangle \leq (c/2)\|H(\hat{x}_N) - \hat{w}_N\|, \quad (55)$$

which together with (54) implies

$$c\|H(\hat{x}_N) - \hat{w}_N\| \leq F(x^*, w^*) - F(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N) + C_2/N \leq (c/2)\|H(\hat{x}_N) - \hat{w}_N\| + C_2/N.$$

As a result, we derive $\|H(\hat{x}_N) - \hat{w}_N\| \leq (2C_2/c)/N$. It then follows from (55) that $F(x^*, w^*) - F(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N) \leq C_2/N$, and thus $|F(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N) - F(x^*, w^*)| \leq C_2/N$. The proof is completed. \square

4.2 Acceleration When g is Strongly Convex

In this section, we assume that g is strongly convex with modulus $\gamma > 0$, i.e.,

$$g(x) \geq g(\tilde{x}) + \langle \zeta, x - \tilde{x} \rangle + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^2, \quad \forall x, \tilde{x} \in \mathbf{dom}(g), \zeta \in \partial g(\tilde{x}).$$

Under this assumption, we are able to present an accelerated algorithm by adaptively tuning the parameter β in Algorithm 3.1. Recall that $\psi \in (1, 1 + \sqrt{3})$ and $\omega := \omega(\xi, \varphi)$ is defined in (11). For convenience, we define

$$\Theta_{sc} := \{(\psi, \xi, \varphi) \mid \xi > 0, \psi > \varphi > 1 \text{ and } \omega(\xi, \varphi) > 0\}. \quad (56)$$

Recall that for problem (42) we have $\Phi(x, y) = h(x) + \langle H(x), y \rangle$ and θ_n is defined in (9). The proposed accelerated algorithm is summarized below.

Algorithm 4.1 (Accelerated PDAc-L (aPDAc-L) when g is γ -strongly convex)

Step 0. Choose $\psi \in (1, 1 + \sqrt{3})$ and $(\psi, \xi, \varphi) \in \Theta_{sc}$, $\tau_{\max} > 0$ and $\mu \in (0, 1)$. Choose $x_0 \in \mathbf{dom}(g)$, $y_0 \in \mathbf{dom}(f^*)$, $\beta_0 > 0$ and $\tau_0 \in (0, \tau_{\max}]$. Set $z_0 = x_0$, $\omega := \omega(\xi, \varphi)$, $\delta_0 = 1$ and $n = 1$.

Step 1. Compute z_n and x_n according to (13) and define

$$\rho_n := \frac{\psi - \varphi}{\psi + \varphi\tau_{n-1}}, \quad \beta_n := (1 + \gamma\rho_n\tau_{n-1})\beta_{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_{n-1} := \omega\delta_{n-1} + \gamma\tau_{n-1}. \quad (57)$$

Step 2. Set $\tau = \min\{\varphi\tau_{n-1}, \tau_{\max}\}$ and compute

$$w_n = \text{Prox}_{f/(\beta_n\tau_n)}(y_{n-1}/(\beta_n\tau_n) + H(x_n)) \quad \text{and} \quad y_n = y_{n-1} + \beta_n\tau_n(H(x_n) - w_n),$$

where $\tau_n = \tau\mu^i$ and i is the smallest nonnegative integer such that

$$\frac{\tau_n\tau_{n-1}}{\xi} \|\theta_n\|^2 \leq \frac{\kappa_{n-1}\beta_{n-1}}{\beta_n} \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta_n} \|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2. \quad (58)$$

Step 3. Set $\delta_n = \tau_n/\tau_{n-1}$, $n \leftarrow n + 1$ and go to Step 1.

Recall that $\tilde{J}(\cdot)$ is defined in (48). Similarly to Lemma 4.1, we can derive the following stronger result due to the strong convexity of g .

Lemma 4.3 *For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_n \tilde{J}(x_n, w_n, y) &\leq \langle x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}, x^* - x_{n+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{\beta_n} \langle y_n - y_{n-1}, y - y_n \rangle + \tau_n \langle \theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1} \rangle \\ &\quad + \psi\delta_n \langle x_n - z_{n+1}, x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle - \frac{\gamma\tau_n}{2} (\|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Proof As g is γ strongly convex, we can strengthen the first two inequalities in (50) by

$$\begin{cases} \tau_n (g(x_{n+1}) - g(x^*)) \leq \langle x_{n+1} - z_{n+1} + \tau_n \nabla_x \Phi(x_n, y_n), x^* - x_{n+1} \rangle - \frac{\gamma\tau_n}{2} \|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2, \\ \tau_n (g(x_n) - g(x_{n+1})) \leq \langle \psi\delta_n (x_n - z_{n+1}) + \tau_n \nabla_x \Phi(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle - \frac{\gamma\tau_n}{2} \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2. \end{cases}$$

The remaining proof is entirely analogous to Lemma 4.1 and is thus omitted for simplicity. \square

Similar to Lemma 4.2, we can establish the following result.

Lemma 4.4 For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $n \geq 1$, there holds

$$\beta_{n+1}A_{n+1}(y) + \beta_n\tau_n\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(x_n, w_n, y) \leq \beta_nA_n(y) - \beta_nB_n, \quad (60)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} A_n(y) := \frac{\psi + \gamma\tau_n}{2(\psi - 1)}\|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\beta_n}\|y_{n-1} - y\|^2 + \frac{\kappa_{n-1}\beta_{n-1}}{\beta_n}\|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2, \\ B_n := \frac{1}{\beta_n}\|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2 + \frac{\kappa_{n-1}\beta_{n-1}}{\beta_n}\|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 - \frac{\tau_n\tau_{n-1}}{\xi}\|\theta_n\|^2. \end{cases} \quad (61)$$

Proof By applying (7) to the first, second, and fourth inner products in (59), and then reorganizing the terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + \gamma\tau_n)\|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta_n}\|y_n - y\|^2 + 2\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(x_n, w_n, y) \\ & \leq \|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta_n}\|y_{n-1} - y\|^2 - \frac{1}{\beta_n}\|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2 + 2\tau_n\langle\theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1}\rangle \\ & \quad - \psi\delta_n\|z_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 - (1 - \psi\delta_n)\|x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}\|^2 - (\psi\delta_n + \gamma\tau_n)\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by plugging (26) into the above inequality and combining the terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\psi(1 + \gamma\tau_n)}{\psi - 1}\|z_{n+2} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta_n}\|y_n - y\|^2 + 2\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(x_n, w_n, y) \\ & \leq \frac{\psi + \gamma\tau_n}{\psi - 1}\|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta_n}\|y_{n-1} - y\|^2 - \frac{1}{\beta_n}\|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2 + 2\tau_n\langle\theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1}\rangle \\ & \quad - \psi\delta_n\|z_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 - \left(1 + \frac{1 + \gamma\tau_n}{\psi} - \psi\delta_n\right)\|x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}\|^2 - (\psi\delta_n + \gamma\tau_n)\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

On the other hand, Fact 2.3 with $u = \psi\delta_n$, $v = 1 + \frac{1 + \gamma\tau_n}{\psi} - \psi\delta_n$, $a = \|z_{n+1} - x_n\|$, $b = \|x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}\|$ and $\|x_{n+1} - x_n\| \leq a + b$ imply

$$\psi\delta_n\left(1 - \frac{\psi^2\delta_n}{1 + \psi + \gamma\tau_n}\right)\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 \leq \psi\delta_n\|z_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1 + \gamma\tau_n}{\psi} - \psi\delta_n\right)\|x_{n+1} - z_{n+1}\|^2.$$

Moreover, since we have $2\langle\theta_n, x_n - x_{n+1}\rangle \leq \frac{\xi}{\tau_{n-1}}\|x_n - x_{n+1}\|^2 + \frac{\tau_{n-1}}{\xi}\|\theta_n\|^2$, substituting this into (62) and utilizing the above inequality, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\psi(1 + \gamma\tau_n)}{\psi - 1}\|z_{n+2} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta_n}\|y_n - y\|^2 + 2\tau_n\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(x_n, w_n, y) \\ & \leq \frac{\psi + \gamma\tau_n}{\psi - 1}\|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta_n}\|y_{n-1} - y\|^2 + \frac{\tau_n\tau_{n-1}}{\xi}\|\theta_n\|^2 \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{\beta_n}\|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2 - \left(\delta_n\left(2\psi - \xi - \frac{\psi^3\delta_n}{1 + \psi + \gamma\tau_n}\right) + \gamma\tau_n\right)\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\psi + \gamma\tau_n}{\psi - 1}\|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta_n}\|y_{n-1} - y\|^2 + \frac{\tau_n\tau_{n-1}}{\xi}\|\theta_n\|^2 \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{\beta_n}\|y_n - y_{n-1}\|^2 - \kappa_n\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where the second inequality follows from $\kappa_n = \omega\delta_n + \gamma\tau_n$ (see (57)), $(\psi, \xi, \varphi) \in \Theta_{sc}$ (see (56) and (11)) and $\delta_n \leq \varphi$. It follows from $\tau_{n+1} \leq \varphi\tau_n$ and the definition of ρ_n in (57) that

$$\frac{\psi(1 + \gamma\tau_n)}{\psi + \gamma\tau_{n+1}} \geq \frac{\psi(1 + \gamma\tau_n)}{\psi + \gamma\varphi\tau_n} = 1 + \frac{(\psi - \varphi)\gamma\tau_n}{\psi + \gamma\varphi\tau_n} = 1 + \rho_{n+1}\gamma\tau_n. \quad (64)$$

Consequently, we have

$$\frac{\psi(1 + \gamma\tau_n)}{\psi - 1} = \frac{\psi(1 + \gamma\tau_n)}{\psi + \gamma\tau_{n+1}} \frac{\psi + \gamma\tau_{n+1}}{\psi - 1} \stackrel{(64)}{\geq} (1 + \rho_{n+1}\gamma\tau_n) \frac{\psi + \gamma\tau_{n+1}}{\psi - 1} \stackrel{(57)}{=} \frac{\beta_{n+1}}{\beta_n} \frac{\psi + \gamma\tau_{n+1}}{\psi - 1}.$$

By plugging the above inequality into (63) and using the definitions of $A_n(y)$ and B_n in (61), we obtain the desired result (60). \square

The subsequent lemma plays a crucial role in proving convergence rate results for Algorithm 4.1. Its proof shares similarity to that of Lemma 3.3 and is deferred to Appendix A.

Lemma 4.5 (i) *The linesearch step of Algorithm 4.1, i.e., Step 2, always terminates.* (ii) *The sequence $\{(x_n, y_n, z_n) : n \geq 1\}$ generated by Algorithm 4.1 is bounded;* (iii) *There exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that $\sqrt{\beta_n}\tau_n \geq c_1$ and $\beta_n \geq c_2n^2$ for all $n \geq 1$.*

Now, we are ready to present the pointwise convergence and ergodic $\mathcal{O}(1/N^2)$ convergence rate results of Algorithm 4.1. Note that, since g is strongly convex, x^* is unique.

Theorem 4.2 (Convergence results) *Let $\{(z_n, x_n, w_n, y_n, \beta_n, \tau_n) : n \geq 1\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 4.1. Then, we have (i) there exist constants $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that $\|z_{n+1} - x^*\| \leq C_1/n$ and $\|x_{n+1} - x^*\| \leq C_2/n$ for any $n \geq 1$; and (ii) there exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ such that $|F(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N) - F(x^*, w^*)| \leq C_3/N^2$ and $\|H(\hat{x}_N) - \hat{w}_N\| \leq (2C_3/c)/N^2$ for any $N \geq 1$, where $c > 0$ is a constant satisfying $c \geq 2\|y^*\|$, and \hat{x}_N and \hat{w}_N are defined as*

$$\hat{x}_N = \frac{1}{s_N} \sum_{n=1}^N \beta_n \tau_n x_n \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{w}_N = \frac{1}{s_N} \sum_{n=1}^N \beta_n \tau_n w_n \quad \text{with} \quad s_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \beta_n \tau_n. \quad (65)$$

Proof It follows from (58) and (61) that $B_n \geq 0$ for any $n \geq 1$. Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be arbitrarily fixed. By dropping B_n on the right-hand-side of (60) and taking a sum over $n = 1, \dots, N$, we obtain

$$\beta_{N+1} A_{N+1}(y) + \sum_{n=1}^N \beta_n \tau_n \tilde{J}(x_n, w_n, y) \leq \beta_1 A_1(y). \quad (66)$$

Recall that $\tilde{J}(x, w, y)$ is defined in (48) and $\tilde{J}(x_n, w_n, y^*)$ is always nonnegative. Then, we can infer from (66) and the definition of $A_n(y)$ in (61) that

$$\|z_{N+2} - x^*\|^2 \leq \frac{2(\psi - 1)}{\psi + \gamma\tau_{N+1}} \frac{\beta_1 A_1(y^*)}{\beta_{N+1}} \leq \frac{2\beta_1 A_1(y^*)}{\beta_{N+1}}. \quad (67)$$

Consequently, it follows from (67) and item (iii) of Lemma 4.5 that $\|z_{N+2} - x^*\| \leq C_1/(N+1)$ with $C_1 := \sqrt{2\beta_1 A_1(y^*)}/c_2 > 0$. Since $z_{N+2} = \frac{\psi-1}{\psi} x_{N+1} + \frac{1}{\psi} z_{N+1}$, we derive $\|x_{N+1} - x^*\| \leq C_2/N$ for some $C_2 > 0$. Hence, property (i) holds.

On the other hand, $\tilde{J}(x, w, y)$ is convex with respect to (x, w) for any y . After discarding the nonnegative term $\beta_{N+1} A_{N+1}(y)$ from (66), we can utilize (65) and Jensen's inequality to obtain

$$\tilde{J}(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N, y) \leq \frac{1}{s_N} \sum_{n=1}^N \beta_n \tau_n \tilde{J}(x_n, w_n, y) \leq \frac{\beta_1 A_1(y)}{s_N}. \quad (68)$$

Furthermore, it follows from (57) that $\beta_n \tau_n = (\beta_{n+1} - \beta_n)/(\rho_{n+1}\gamma) \geq (\beta_{n+1} - \beta_n)/\gamma$. Hence, we have $s_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \beta_n \tau_n \geq (\beta_{N+1} - \beta_1)/\gamma \geq c_3 N^2$ for some $c_3 > 0$, since $\beta_{N+1} \geq c_2(N+1)^2$ by item (iii) of Lemma 4.5. Consequently, it follows from (68) that

$$\tilde{J}(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N, y) = F(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N) + \langle y, H(\hat{x}_N) - \hat{w}_N \rangle - F(x^*, w^*) \leq (\beta_1/c_3) A_1(y)/N^2.$$

By taking supremum on both sides of the above inequality over $\|y\| \leq c$, we obtain

$$F(\hat{x}_N, \hat{w}_N) + c\|H(\hat{x}_N) - \hat{w}_N\| - F(x^*, w^*) \leq C_3/N^2,$$

where $C_3 = \sup_y \{(\beta_1/c_3) A_1(y) : \|y\| \leq c\} > 0$. Since we have $c \geq 2\|y^*\|$, we can use similar reasoning as in Theorem 4.1 to establish the validity of property (ii). \square

5 A Fully Adaptive Proximal Gradient Method

This section is devoted to the special case (5), which fits in (1) with $\Phi(x, y) = \langle H(x), y \rangle$ and $f^*(y) = \iota_{\mathbb{1}/p}(y)$. In this case, we have $\nabla_x \Phi(x, y) = H'(x)^\top y$ with $H'(x) = [\nabla h_1(x), \dots, \nabla h_p(x)]^\top$, $\nabla_y \Phi(x, y) = H(x)$ and $L_{yy} = 0$. Recall that $h := \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p h_i$ as defined in (5). Applying Algorithm 3.1 to problem (5), we have $y_n \equiv \mathbb{1}/p \in \mathbb{R}^p$ for all $n \geq 1$. As a result, we have $\nabla_x \Phi(x_n, y_n) = \nabla h(x_n)$ for any $n \geq 1$, $\theta_n = \nabla h(x_n) - \nabla h(x_{n-1})$ and $\Phi_n^y \equiv 0$ for all n (see definitions of θ_n and Φ_n^y in (9) and (10)). Recall that $\delta_{n-1} = \tau_{n-1}/\tau_{n-2}$. Therefore, the linesearch condition (15) can be equivalently rewritten as

$$\tau_n \leq \frac{\xi(\nu r_n + (1 - \nu)c_n)}{\tau_{n-1}},$$

where r_n and c_n are defined in (15). Setting $\eta = 0$, we have $c_n = 0$ for all n and the above condition will reduce to

$$\tau_n \leq \frac{\nu \xi \omega}{\tau_{n-2}} \cdot \frac{\|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2}{\|\nabla h(x_n) - \nabla h(x_{n-1})\|^2}.$$

As a result, by setting parameter $\eta = 0$, Algorithm 3.1 reduces to the following fully adaptive proximal gradient method with convex combination (aPGMc) given below.

Algorithm 5.1 (A fully adaptive PGM with convex combination (aPGMc) for (5))

Step 0. Choose $\psi \in (1, 1 + \sqrt{3})$, $\nu \in (0, 1)$, $(\xi, \varphi) \in \Theta_\psi$, $\tau_{\max} > 0$ and $\mu \in (0, 1)$. Choose $x_0 \in \text{dom}(g)$ and $\tau_0 \in (0, \tau_{\max}]$. Set $z_0 = x_0$, $\omega := \omega(\xi, \varphi)$, $\tau_{-1} = \tau_0$ and $n = 1$.

Step 1. Compute

$$z_n = \frac{\psi - 1}{\psi} x_{n-1} + \frac{1}{\psi} z_{n-1}, \quad x_n = \text{Prox}_{\tau_{n-1}g}(z_n - \tau_{n-1} \nabla h(x_{n-1})).$$

Step 2. Set $\tau_n = \min \left\{ \varphi \tau_{n-1}, \frac{\nu \xi \omega}{\tau_{n-2}} \cdot \frac{\|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2}{\|\nabla h(x_n) - \nabla h(x_{n-1})\|^2}, \tau_{\max} \right\}$, $n \leftarrow n + 1$ and go to Step 1.

Define $\bar{\omega} := \bar{\omega}(\xi, \varphi) := \xi \omega = \xi \omega(\xi, \varphi) = \xi(2\psi - \xi - \frac{\psi^3 \varphi}{1+\psi})$ and recall that the interested parameters are restricted by $\psi \in (1, 1 + \sqrt{3})$, $\varphi > 1$ and $\xi > 0$. From Step 2 of Algorithm 5.1, aside from the value of φ , larger $\bar{\omega}$ likely results to larger stepsize τ_n . Apparently, $\bar{\omega}(\xi, \varphi)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to φ . On the other hand, $\bar{\omega}(\xi, \varphi)$ attains its maximum value at $\xi = \psi - \frac{\psi^3 \varphi}{2(1+\psi)}$ for any ψ and φ . Practically, it is not desirable to choose φ very close to 1 since that will hinder the increase of stepsize. For any given $\psi \in (1, 1 + \sqrt{3})$, our strategy is to choose φ first, followed by setting $\xi = \psi - \frac{\psi^3 \varphi}{2(1+\psi)}$. The relation between ψ and φ determined by $\xi = \psi - \frac{\psi^3 \varphi}{2(1+\psi)}$ with a sample of different choices of ξ are drawn in Figure 1.

In fact, our adaptive rule of choosing algorithmic parameters, i.e., the formula for τ_n in Step 2 of Algorithm 5.1, generalizes that in [19]. In particular, aside from the parameter $\nu \in (0, 1)$, the adaptive rule adopted in [19, Algorithm 1] essentially corresponds to setting $\xi = \psi/2$ in the relation $\xi = \psi - \frac{\psi^3 \varphi}{2(1+\psi)}$, which gives $\bar{\omega} = \psi^2/4$, see [19, Eq. (21)]. Moreover, the algorithm presented in [19, Page 3] corresponds to $(\psi, \varphi) = (3/2, 10/9)$ and $\xi = \psi/2 = 3/4$, which gives $\bar{\omega} = 9/16$.

In our numerical experiments, we first set $(\psi, \varphi) = (2, 6/5)$ and then compute $\xi = \psi - \frac{\psi^3 \varphi}{2(1+\psi)} = 2/5$, which gives $\bar{\omega}(\xi, \varphi) = 4/25$. The resulting algorithm appears as

$$\begin{cases} \tau_n = \min \left\{ \frac{6}{5} \tau_{n-1}, \frac{4\nu}{25\tau_{n-2}} \frac{\|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2}{\|\nabla h(x_n) - \nabla h(x_{n-1})\|^2}, \tau_{\max} \right\}, \\ z_{n+1} = (x_n + z_n)/2, \\ x_{n+1} = \text{Prox}_{\tau_n g}(z_{n+1} - \tau_n \nabla h(x_n)), \end{cases}$$




Fig. 1 The relation between ψ and φ determined by $\xi = \psi - \frac{\psi^3 \varphi}{2(1+\psi)}$ with different values of ξ .

Compared with the algorithm in [19, Page 3], our choice of $\psi = 2$ results to larger weight for the latest iterate x_{n-1} in the convex combination. Furthermore, the choice of $\varphi = 6/5$ allows the stepsize to increase at a faster rate, compared to the algorithm in [19, Page 3], which sets the increasing factor to be $10/9$. Experimental results show that our algorithm is more efficient, see Section 6.

6 Numerical Results

In this section, we provide numerical results from two examples to demonstrate the performance of the proposed Algorithms 3.1 and 4.1, which we will refer to as PDAc-L and aPDAc-L. The first example is a quadratic constrained quadratic programming (QCQP) problem, and the second is a sparse logistic regression (SLR) problem. We implemented our experiments in Matlab R2013b on a 64-bit Windows PC with an Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-4590 CPU@3.30 GHz and 8GB of RAM. The codes used in the experiments are available at <https://github.com/xkchang-opt/PDac-Linesearch>.

6.1 Implementation Details

As noted in [24], rounding errors can occur when the objective function's value is used in linesearch, which may cause the termination criterion to fail when generating iterates with very close function values. Note that, in the linesearch step of Algorithm 3.1, computing the difference $\Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}) - \Phi(x_n, y_n)$ is necessary to evaluate Φ_n^y . To enhance stability and eliminate the use of function values, we have incorporated an alternative termination criterion into the linesearch procedure by replacing Φ_n^y with $\tilde{\Phi}_n^y := \langle \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_{n-1}) - \nabla_y \Phi(x_n, y_n), y_n - y_{n-1} \rangle$, as suggested in [14]. Due to the concavity property of $\Phi(x, y)$ in y , we can derive $\Phi_n^y \leq \tilde{\Phi}_n^y$ and $\Phi_n^y = \tilde{\Phi}_n^y$ when function $\Phi(x, \cdot)$ is quadratic for fixed x , which results in a more robust and reliable termination condition. From our observations, this modification makes the algorithm numerically more stable.

The performance of primal-dual algorithms is widely recognized to depend not only on the primal and dual step-sizes but also on their ratio, as has been established in previous studies like [7, 28]. If we define the dual stepsize as $\sigma_n := \beta \tau_n$, then the ratio $\beta = \sigma_n / \tau_n$ can greatly affect the performance of the algorithm. It is important to note that a fixed ratio may not always produce the best numerical results, even though the convergence is assured for any $\beta > 0$. Choosing the optimal ratio β is crucial for achieving good numerical performance in practice, and an adaptive

approach that balances primal and dual feasibility violations can help achieve this. Our adaptive approach involves evaluating inexpensive distances and can be easily applied in various scenarios.

We will now outline our strategy for dynamically adjusting the ratio β . While we do not have a complete theory for this strategy, we have observed its effectiveness in various applications, as shown in Figure 2. Many applications allow for the easy computation of the subdifferential of g and f^* . Using this information, we can define the primal and dual infeasibilities (denoted respectively by pinf_n and dinf_n) using $\partial f^*(y_n)$, $\partial g(x_n)$, $\nabla \Phi_y(x_n, y_n)$, and $-\nabla \Phi_x(x_n, y_n)$, see (71) for their definitions in the case of QCQP problems. With this approach, we can dynamically adjust the value of β to ensure that pinf_n and dinf_n are balanced. In particular, we have adopted the following adaptive rule to determine the value of β :

$$\beta = \begin{cases} \max\{0.8\beta, \underline{\beta}\}, & \text{if } r_n \leq 0.8, \\ \beta & \text{if } r_n \in (0.8, 1.25), \\ \min\{1.25\beta, \bar{\beta}\} & \text{if } r_n \geq 1.25, \end{cases} \quad \text{with } r_n := \text{pinf}_n / \text{dinf}_n, \quad (69)$$

where $\underline{\beta}$ and $\bar{\beta}$ are lower and upper bounds on β . In our experiments, we have initialized $\beta = 1$, and set the bounds as $\underline{\beta} = 0.01$ and $\bar{\beta} = 100$.

The parameters of Algorithms 3.1 and 4.1 are specified as: $\psi = 2$, $\varphi = 6/5$, $\nu = 0.9$, $\mu = 0.7$, $\xi = 2/5$, $M = 5$ and $\eta = 0.9$. Parameters τ_0 and τ_{\max} are generated as in Remark 3.2 with $\chi = 10^6$ to meet the requirement of Lemma 3.3 (iv).

6.2 Experiments on QCQP Problems

In this subsection, we provide a comparison of PDAc-L (Algorithm 3.1) against two other algorithms, namely PDA with backtracking (denoted by PDB) [14] and the fully adaptive golden ratio algorithm (denoted by aGRAAL) [19] on a set of convex QCQP problems, for which data is randomly generated, as tested in [14]. In particular, the tested problem is given by

$$\begin{cases} h_{\text{opt}} := \min_{x \in X} h(x) := \frac{1}{2}x^\top A_0 x + b_0^\top x \\ \text{s.t. } h_j(x) := \frac{1}{2}x^\top A_j x + b_j^\top x - c_j \leq 0, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \end{cases} \quad (70)$$

where $X := [-10, 10]^n$, and the problem data is generated randomly as follows: $\{b_j\}_{j=0}^m \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with elements drawn from the standard Gaussian distribution, $\{c_j\}_{j=1}^m \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with elements drawn from a uniform distribution over $[0, 1]$, and $A_j = \Lambda_j^\top S_j \Lambda_j$ for $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$. Here, $\Lambda_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a random orthonormal matrix, and $S_j \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$ is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are generated uniformly and randomly from the interval $[0, 100]$, with 0 allowed as the diagonal element of S_j . Define $H(x) := (h_1(x), \dots, h_m(x))^\top$ and $\Phi(x, y) := h(x) + \langle y, H(x) \rangle$ for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$. Then, (70) can be represented as $\min_x \max_y g(x) + \Phi(x, y) - f^*(y)$, where $g(x) = \iota_X(x)$, the indicator function of X , and $f^*(y) = \iota_+(y)$, the indicator function of the nonnegative orthant. Note that $\Phi(x, y)$ is linear with respect to y . Let $H'(x)$ be the Jacobian matrix of $H(x)$. It is easy to derive that $\nabla_x \Phi(x, y) = H'(x)^\top y + A_0 x + b_0$ and $\nabla_y \Phi(x, y) = H(x)$. As pointed out in the second point of Remark 3.1, for PDAc-L applied to this problem, we have $\Phi_n^y \equiv 0$ and therefore checking the linesearch condition (15) is computationally inexpensive.

It is easy to derive from (47) and **Fact 2.1** that $y_n \in \partial f(w_n)$ for any $n \geq 1$, which implies that $w_n \in \partial f^*(y_n)$. Recall that $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\Omega}$ are defined in (45) and (46), respectively, for problem (42). It is thus reasonable to define the primal and dual feasibility violations at the n th iteration respectively by

$$\text{pinf}_n := \|H(x_n) - w_n\|_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dinf}_n := \frac{\text{dist}(-H'(x_n)^\top y_n - \nabla h(x_n), \partial g(x_n))}{1 + \|x_n\|_1}, \quad (71)$$

where $\text{dist}(v, S)$ represents the distance from the vector v to the set S measured by the ℓ_1 -norm. Then, the ratio β was tuned adaptively according to (69). We terminated PDB and aGRAAL via $\max\{e_{\text{obj}}(x_n), e_{\text{con}}(x_n)\} \leq \epsilon$, where

$$e_{\text{obj}}(x) := |h(x) - h_{\text{opt}}|/|h_{\text{opt}}| \quad \text{and} \quad e_{\text{con}}(x) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \max\{h_j(x), 0\}, \quad (72)$$

with h_{opt} being computed using MOSEK via CVX¹. To terminate PDac-L, in addition to the condition $\max\{e_{\text{obj}}(x_n), e_{\text{con}}(x_n)\} \leq \epsilon$, we also require $\max\{\text{pinf}_n, \text{dinf}_n\} < \epsilon_{pd}$. Furthermore, all the tested algorithms were terminated as well if a maximum number of iterations, named n_{max} , was reached. In this set of experiments, we set $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$, $\epsilon_{pd} = 10^{-6}$ and $n_{\text{max}} = 5 \times 10^4$.

To examine the effectiveness of PDac-L with β being fixed or adaptively tuned via (69), we first ran experiments with $n = 100$ and $m = 10$. The performance comparison results are presented in Figure 2. As shown in Figure 2(a), the number of iterations used by PDac-L initially decreases with increasing values of β . However, it then exhibits an overall increasing trend, with some fluctuations that may be attributed to the random nature of the test data. In contrast, when β was adaptively tuned using (69), PDac-L terminated after only 254 iterations, as shown in Figure 2(b). This is faster than PDac-L using any fixed values of β .




Fig. 2 Performance comparison of PDac-L with β being constant or adaptively determined by (69).




Fig. 3 Performance comparison of PDac-L with $\eta = 0$ and $\eta = 0.9$.

¹ Downloaded from <http://cvxr.com/cvx/>

Additionally, we evaluated the impact of η on the numerical performance of PDAc-L for 10 QCQP problems randomly generated with $n = 500$ and $m = 10$. Specifically, we considered fixed $\beta = 30$ and adaptive β tuning. The results are depicted in Figure 3, in which each solid line represents the median performance over the 10 random instances, and the shaded area surrounding each line indicates the varying range of the corresponding values across the 10 random instances. We observe that setting $\eta = 0.9$ enhances the method's performance in comparison to the case where η equals 0. This is why we adopted $\eta = 0.9$ for our experiments.




Fig. 4 Details of linesearch for the problem (70) with $n = 500$ and $m = 10$. (a) Comparison results of extra linesearch trial steps taken by PDB and PDAc-L. (b) Cumulative results for both algorithms.

To further investigate the linesearch step of PDB and PDAc-L, we solved (70) with $n = 500$ and $m = 10$. The details of the linesearch are illustrated in Figure 4. As shown in Figure 4(a), PDB takes between 1 and 2 extra linesearch trials per iteration, while PDAc-L takes between 1 and 23 extra linesearch trials per iteration. However, as the majority of iterations in PDAc-L succeeded in the linesearch on the very first trial (i.e., no extra trial steps were needed), on average, PDAc-L requires much fewer extra linesearch steps than PDB, as shown by the cumulative results presented in Figure 4(b). Note that the results shown in Figure 4 are only for the first 300 iterations, but similar trends can be observed for more iterations.

Table 1 displays a comparative evaluation of aGRAAL, PDB, and PDAc-L, testing their performance on QCQP problems of varying dimensions. The table reports the number of iterations (**Iter**), total CPU time (**Time**, in seconds), and the number of extra linesearch trial steps (**#LS**) required by PDAc-L and PDB algorithms. Note that aGRAAL does not require any linesearch.

Table 1 Comparison results of aGRAAL, PDB and PDAc-L on the QCQP problems with different values of (n, m) .

n	m	aGRAAL		PDB			PDAc-L		
		Iter	Time	Iter	Time	#LS	Iter	Time	#LS
100	10	5092	4.8	2777	4.2	2704	227	0.1	105
100	30	9504	26.4	6471	28.1	6312	1102	1.0	552
100	50	13760	66.1	10646	81.7	10388	1958	3.1	989
500	10	6189	36.5	2465	34.8	2402	391	1.8	193
500	30	12834	228.5	4543	190.5	4433	644	8.6	318
500	50	19267	483.2	5210	317.9	5081	1315	23.6	657
1000	10	8478	158.6	2488	140.3	2425	524	7.9	264
1000	30	23750	1362.9	5877	976.3	5736	1141	51.3	580
1000	50	45604	4097.2	7909	2108.0	7643	1824	141.9	914

The results in Table 1 indicate that aGRAAL runs the slowest among the three algorithms, whereas PDB performs better than aGRAAL, and PDAc-L records the fastest performance. Additionally, in an average sense, PDB requires around one additional linesearch trial step per iteration,




Fig. 5 Comparison results in terms of function value residual (left) and feasibility violations (right) on 10 random QCQPs with $n = 500$ and $m = 10$. First row: convergence as the iterations proceeded. Second row: convergence as CPU time proceeded.

while PDAC-L needs roughly one extra linesearch trial step per two iterations. Furthermore, PDAC-L requires significantly fewer iterations than PDB, resulting in much less CPU time consumption for PDAC-L with an adaptive parameter β than for PDB.

We now proceed to implement aGRAAL, PDB, and PDAC-L on 10 QCQP instances randomly generated with $n = 500$ and $m = 10$. The values of $e_{\text{obj}}(x_n)$ and $e_{\text{con}}(x_n)$ as defined in (72) against the number of iterations and CPU time were plotted in Figure 5. The same as in Figure 3, each solid line represents the median values, while the shaded area surrounding the lines denotes the variation range observed across the random runs. The plots shown in Figure 5 confirmed our earlier conclusion derived from the results in Table 1. Furthermore, the results in Figure 5 also indicate that PDAC-L presents a smaller variance than the other two algorithms, which suggests that PDAC-L is more stable.

In order to assess the performance of the accelerated algorithm aPDAC-L (Algorithm 4.1) in solving problem (70) with a strongly convex h , we conducted a test using data generated in a manner similar to that used for the convex case, with the only difference being that, for $j = 0$, we set the diagonal elements of S_0 to be randomly generated from the range of $[1, 101]$. We can rewrite S_0 as the sum of a positive semidefinite matrix \tilde{S}_0 and the identity matrix I : $S_0 = \tilde{S}_0 + I$. This enables us to express A_0 as $A_0^\top (\tilde{S}_0 + I) A_0 = \tilde{A}_0 + I$. Moreover, we can represent $h(x)$ as $\tilde{h}(x) + \frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2$, where $\tilde{h}(x) := \frac{1}{2}x^\top \tilde{A}_0 x + b_0^\top x$. By doing so, we can apply aPDAC-L to solve $\min_x \max_y g(x) + \Phi(x, y) - \iota_+(y)$, where $g(x)$ is strongly convex and defined as $g(x) = \iota_X(x) + \frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2$, $\Phi(x, y) = \tilde{h}(x) + \langle H(x), y \rangle$, and $f^*(y) = \iota_+(y)$.

We tested three optimization algorithms: PDAC-L with $\beta = 1$, accelerated PDB (aPDB) [14, Algorithm 2.2] and aPDAC-L, both with $\beta_0 = 1$. We applied these algorithms to a set of 10

randomly generated strongly convex QCQP instances, with $n = 500$ and $m = 10$, as described earlier.

The results displayed in Figure 6, which show the evolution of the objective and constraint violation using $e_{\text{obj}}(x_n)$ and $e_{\text{con}}(x_n)$, demonstrate that aPDAC-L and PDAC-L outperform aPDB in CPU time (as shown in the bottom row of the figure). This is likely due to the fact that aPDAC-L and PDAC-L only require dual variable updates, while aPDB needs to update both primal and dual variables during each linesearch step. In addition, the superior performance of aPDAC-L and PDAC-L in terms of CPU time can be partially attributed to the fact that these algorithms require fewer additional linesearch trials on average. Furthermore, aPDAC-L outperforms PDAC-L due to its capacity to leverage the strong convexity of the problem.




Fig. 6 Comparison results in terms of function value residual (left) and feasibility violations (right) on 10 random strongly convex QCQPs with $n = 500$ and $m = 10$. First row: convergence as the iterations proceeded. Second row: convergence as CPU time proceeded.

6.3 Experiments on SLR Problems

The second problem under investigation is the SLR problem for binary classification. The training set is represented as $\{(a_i, b_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \{\pm 1\} : i = 1, \dots, m\}$, where a_i denotes the feature vector for each sample and b_i is the corresponding binary label. The SLR problem is formulated as

$$F_{\text{opt}} := \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ F(x) := t\|x\|_1 + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \log(1 + \exp(-b_i a_i^\top x)) \right\}, \quad (73)$$

where $t > 0$ is a regularization parameter. By letting $h(x) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \log(1 + \exp(-b_i a_i^\top x))$ and $g(x) := t\|x\|_1$, (73) reduces to (4) and thus can be solved by Algorithm 5.1. In our experiments,

we set $t = 0.005 \|A^\top b\|_\infty$ as in [19] with $A^\top = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m]$ and $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m)^\top$. We next compare the proposed Algorithm 5.1 (aPGMc) with aGRAAL proposed in [19]. We used $\psi = 3/2$ and $\varphi = 10/9$ for aGRAAL, and $\psi = 2$ (which is larger than that for aGRAAL) and either $\varphi = 10/9$ or $\varphi = 6/5$ for aPGMc. In our experiments, we took two popular datasets from LIBSVM²: *a9a* with $(m, n) = (32561, 123)$ and *rcv1* with $(m, n) = (20242, 47236)$.

Following [19], we executed aPGMc and aGRAAL for a sufficient number of iterations until the condition $\|x_n - \text{Prox}_{\tau_n g}(x_n - \tau_n \nabla f(x_n))\| \leq 10^{-6}$ was satisfied. Next, we defined F_{opt} as the smallest function value $F(x_n)$ observed during the execution. Figure 7 shows a comparison of the decreasing behavior of $F(x_n) - F_{\text{opt}}$ with respect to CPU time. The results indicate that aPGMc with either $\varphi = 10/9$ or $\varphi = 6/5$ converges faster than aGRAAL for both datasets. One plausible reason for this faster convergence is that aPGMc uses $\psi = 2$, which is larger than the value of $\psi = 3/2$ used in aGRAAL, and increasing ψ brings z_n closer to the current iterate x_{n-1} . For aPGMc, on the other hand, the use of the larger value $\varphi = 6/5$ results in slightly faster convergence compared to $\varphi = 10/9$. This may be because increasing φ leads to a possibly faster increase in the stepsize τ_{n-1} , as defined in Algorithm 5.1.




Fig. 7 Comparisons results of aGRAAL and aPGMc on SLR problem. The decreasing behavior of $F(x_n) - F_{\text{opt}}$ with respect to CPU time on problem (73) are presented. Left: dataset a9a. Right: dataset rcv1.

7 Conclusion

This paper proposes a convex combination based primal-dual algorithm with adaptive linesearch for solving structured convex-concave saddle point problems with generic nonlinear coupling term. The proposed linesearch strategy has the advantage of updating only one variable per linesearch iteration, which is computationally cheaper for many practical problems. Global pointwise convergence and $\mathcal{O}(1/N)$ ergodic convergence rates are also established. For optimization problems with nonlinear compositional structure, ergodic convergence rates are measured by both the function value residual and constraint violations. Furthermore, when one of the component functions is strongly convex, faster $\mathcal{O}(1/N^2)$ ergodic convergence rate results, quantified by the same measures, are established by adaptively choosing some algorithmic parameters. For composite convex optimization problems with finite sum structure, the proposed algorithm will reduce to a fully adaptive proximal gradient algorithm with convex combination, which gives explicit stepsize rules without requiring linesearch. The resulting algorithm allows for a wider choice of key parameters compared to the adaptive algorithm proposed by Malitsky [19]. Numerical experiments on QCQP and SLR problems demonstrate the benefits of the proposed algorithms.

² Website: <https://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvmtools/datasets/>

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express gratitude towards the authors of [14, 19] for sharing their codes, which were used for fair comparisons in this study.

A Proof of Lemma 4.5

Proof (i) Recall that for problem (42) we have $\Phi(x, y) = h(x) + \langle H(x), y \rangle$. Let $\theta_n(\lambda)$ and $\Phi_n^y(\lambda)$ be defined in (31) and define $y_n(\lambda) := \text{Prox}_{\beta_n \lambda f^*}(y_{n-1} + \beta_n \lambda H(x_n))$ for $\lambda > 0$. Assume, by contradiction, that the linesearch procedure defined in Algorithm 4.1 fails to terminate at the n th iteration. Then for all $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and $\lambda = \tau \mu^i$, where $\tau = \min\{\varphi \tau_{n-1}, \tau_{\max}\}$ as defined in Step 2 of the algorithm, we have

$$\frac{\lambda \tau_{n-1}}{\xi} \|\theta_n(\lambda)\|^2 > \frac{\kappa_{n-1} \beta_{n-1}}{\beta_n} \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta_n} \|y_n(\lambda) - y_{n-1}\|^2. \quad (74)$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.3, for all $\lambda = \tau \mu^i$ with $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, we have $y_n(\lambda) \in B[y_{n-1}; \tau]$. Then, by combining (33), (74) and $\lambda = \tau \mu^i$, we obtain

$$\frac{2\tau \mu^i \tau_{n-1}}{\xi} \left(L_{xx}^2 \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 + L_{xy}^2 \|y_n(\lambda) - y_{n-1}\|^2 \right) > \frac{\beta_{n-1} \kappa_{n-1}}{\beta_n} \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta_n} \|y_n(\lambda) - y_{n-1}\|^2,$$

which implies $2\tau \mu^i \tau_{n-1} L_{xx}^2 / \xi > \beta_{n-1} \kappa_{n-1} / \beta_n$ or $2\tau \mu^i \tau_{n-1} L_{xy}^2 / \xi > 1 / \beta_n$ for all $i \geq 0$. This is impossible since $\mu^i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, which indicates that the linesearch procedure must terminate.

(ii) We can observe that $\tilde{J}(x_n, w_n, y^*)$, $A_n(y^*)$, and B_n are all nonnegative and that $\beta_n \geq \beta_{n-1}$ for all $n \geq 1$, as defined in (57). Therefore, using (60), we can show that $\beta_1 A_n(y^*) \leq \beta_n A_n(y^*) \leq \beta_{n-1} A_{n-1}(y^*) \leq \dots \leq \beta_1 A_1(y^*)$. Hence, using the definition of $A_n(y^*)$ in (61), we can derive

$$\frac{\psi}{2(\psi-1)} \|z_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq A_n(y^*) \leq A_1(y^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2} \|y_{n-1} - y^*\|^2 \leq \beta_n A_n(y^*) \leq \beta_1 A_1(y^*),$$

which implies that $\{z_n : n \geq 1\}$ and $\{y_n : n \geq 1\}$ are bounded. Since $x_n = (\psi z_{n+1} - z_n) / (\psi - 1)$, which follows from the first relation in (13), the sequence $\{(x_n, y_n, z_n) : n \geq 1\}$ is bounded.

(iii) Let $h(\tau) := 1 + \frac{(\psi-\varphi)\gamma\tau}{\psi+\varphi\gamma\tau}$, which is an increasing function of $\tau > 0$. Since $\tau_n \leq \tau_{\max}$ for all $n \geq 0$, it follows that $\varsigma := h(\tau_{\max}) \geq h(\tau_n) = 1 + \gamma\rho_{n+1}\tau_n \geq 1$. From part (ii) of this lemma, the sequence $\{(x_n, y_n) : n \geq 1\}$ is bounded. Further considering the left-hand-side inequality in (36), we observe that the linesearch condition (58) is satisfied provided that

$$\beta_{n-1} \kappa_{n-1} / \beta_n - 2\tau_n \tau_{n-1} L_{xx}^2 / \xi \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 / \beta_n - 2\tau_n \tau_{n-1} L_{xy}^2 / \xi \geq 0. \quad (75)$$

Since $\kappa_{n-1} \geq \omega \delta_{n-1} = \omega \tau_{n-1} / \tau_{n-2}$, $\beta_n = (1 + \gamma\rho_n \tau_{n-1}) \beta_{n-1} \leq \varsigma \beta_{n-1}$ and $\tau_n \leq \tau_{\max}$ for all n , we have

$$\frac{\kappa_{n-1} \beta_{n-1}}{\tau_{n-1} \sqrt{\beta_n}} \geq \frac{\omega \beta_{n-1}}{\tau_{n-2} \sqrt{\beta_n}} \geq \frac{\omega \sqrt{\beta_0}}{\tau_{\max} \sqrt{\varsigma}}. \quad (76)$$

For convenience, we define $\Upsilon_1 := \frac{\xi}{2L_{xx}^2} \frac{\omega \sqrt{\beta_0}}{\tau_{\max} \sqrt{\varsigma}}$ and $\Upsilon_2 := \frac{\xi}{2L_{xy}^2}$. It follows from (76) that the left-hand-side inequality in (75) holds when $\sqrt{\beta_n} \tau_n \leq \Upsilon_1$, while the right-hand-side inequality is equivalent to $\beta_n \tau_n \tau_{n-1} \leq \Upsilon_2$.

Then, for any fixed $n \geq 1$, setting $\tau_n = \underline{\tau} := \min(\Upsilon_1 / \sqrt{\beta_n}, \Upsilon_2 / (\beta_n \tau_{n-1}))$ will make the two inequalities in (75) being satisfied, and so is the linesearch condition (58). Since $\tau_n = \tau \mu^i$, where i is the smallest nonnegative integer such that (58) is satisfied, there must hold $\tau_n > \mu \underline{\tau}$, which implies that either $\tau_n > \mu \Upsilon_1 / \sqrt{\beta_n}$ or $\tau_n > \mu \Upsilon_2 / (\beta_n \tau_{n-1})$ for all $n \geq 1$. In the former case, we have $\sqrt{\beta_n} \tau_n > \mu \Upsilon_1$. In the later case, with n replaced by $n+1$, we have $\beta_{n+1} \tau_n \tau_{n+1} > \mu \Upsilon_2$. Then, by $\tau_{n+1} \leq \varphi \tau_n$, we derive $\beta_{n+1} \tau_n^2 \geq \beta_{n+1} \tau_n \tau_{n+1} / \varphi > \mu \Upsilon_2 / \varphi$, and thus

$$\beta_n \tau_n^2 \stackrel{(57)}{=} \frac{\beta_{n+1} \tau_n^2}{1 + \gamma\rho_{n+1} \tau_n} > \frac{\mu \Upsilon_2 / \varphi}{1 + \gamma\rho_{n+1} \tau_n} \geq \frac{\mu \Upsilon_2}{\varphi \varsigma} > 0.$$

Hence, we always have $\sqrt{\beta_n} \tau_n > c_1 := \min(\mu \Upsilon_1, \sqrt{\mu \Upsilon_2 / (\varphi \varsigma)}) > 0$. Since $\tau_n \leq \tau_{\max}$, we have

$$\beta_{n+1} \stackrel{(57)}{=} \beta_n \left(1 + \frac{\gamma(\psi-\varphi)\tau_n}{\psi+\varphi\gamma\tau_n} \right) \geq \beta_n + \frac{\gamma(\psi-\varphi)\sqrt{\beta_n} \tau_n}{\psi+\varphi\gamma\tau_{\max}} \sqrt{\beta_n} \geq \beta_n + \varrho \sqrt{\beta_n}, \quad (77)$$

where $\varrho := \frac{\gamma(\psi-\varphi)c_1}{\psi+\varphi\gamma\tau_{\max}} > 0$. From (77), it is easy to show by induction that $\beta_n \geq c_2 n^2$ for all $n \geq 1$ with $c_2 := \min(\varrho^2/9, \beta_1) > 0$. This completes the proof. \square

References

1. M. Arjovsky, S. Chintala, and L. Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 214–22, 2017.
2. A. Beck. *First-Order Methods in Optimization*. MOS-SIAM Series on Optimization. SIAM-Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2017.
3. D. P. Bertsekas and E. M. Gafni. Projection methods for variational inequalities with application to the traffic assignment problem. *Mathematical Programming Study*, 17:139–159, 1982.
4. T. Bouwmans, N. S. Aybat, and E. H. Zahzah. *Handbook of “Robust low-rank and sparse matrix decomposition: applications in image and video processing”*, volume 45. 2016.
5. A. Chambolle and T. Pock. A first-order primal-dual algorithm for convex problems with applications to imaging. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 40(1):120–145, 2011.
6. A. Chambolle and T. Pock. On the ergodic convergence rates of a first-order primal-dual algorithm. *Mathematical Programming*, 159(1–2):253–287, SEP 2016.
7. X. Chang and J. Yang. Grpda revisited: relaxed condition and connection to chambolle-pock’s primal-dual algorithm. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 2022.
8. X. Chang, J. Yang, and H. Zhang. Golden ratio primal-dual algorithm with linesearch. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 32(3):1584–1613, 2022.
9. X. Chang and J. F. Yang. A golden ratio primal-dual algorithm for structured convex optimization. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 87, 2021.
10. V. S. Constantinou Daskalakis, Andrew Ilyas and H. Zeng. Training GANs with Optimism.
11. E. Esser, X. Zhang, and T. F. Chan. A general framework for a class of first order primal-dual algorithms for convex optimization in imaging science. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 3(4):1015–1046, 2010.
12. I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In Advances in neural information processing systems, pages 2672–2680, 2014.
13. L. Grippo, F. Lampariello, and S. Lucidi. A nonmonotone line search technique for Newton’s method. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 23(4):707–716, 1986.
14. E. Y. Hamedani and N. S. Aybat. A primal-dual algorithm with line search for general convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(2):1299–1329, 2021.
15. S. Hayden and O. Stanley. A low patch-rank interpretation of texture. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 6(1):226–262, 2013.
16. B. He, S. Xu, and X. Yuan. On convergence of the arrow-hurwicz method for saddle point problems. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 64:662–671, 2022.
17. B. He, Y. You, and X. Yuan. On the convergence of primal-dual hybrid gradient algorithm. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 7(4):2526–2537, 2014.
18. G. Korpelevich. The extragradient method for finding saddle points and other problems. *Matecon*, 12(1):747–756, 1976.
19. Y. Malitsky. Golden ratio algorithms for variational inequalities. *Mathematical Programming*, 184:383–410, 2020.
20. Y. Malitsky and T. Pock. A first-order primal-dual algorithm with linesearch. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(1):411–432, 2018.
21. A. Mokhtari, A. E. Ozdaglar, and S. Pattathil. Convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ for optimistic gradient and extragradient methods in smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 30(4):3230–3251, 2020.
22. A. Nedic and A. Ozdaglar. Subgradient methods for saddle-point problems. *Journal of Optimization Theory & Applications*, 142(1):205–228, JUL 2009.
23. A. Nemirovski. Prox-method with rate of convergence $o(1/t)$ for variational inequalities with lipschitz continuous monotone operators and smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 15(1):229–251, 2004.
24. Y. Nesterov. Gradient methods for minimizing composite functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 140(1):125–161, 2013.
25. L. D. Popov. A modification of the arrow-hurwicz method for search of saddle points. *Mathematical Notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR* 28.5, pages 845–848, 1980.
26. S. Sabach and M. Teboulle. Faster lagrangian-based methods in convex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 32(1):204–227, 2022.
27. R. Shefi and M. Teboulle. Rate of convergence analysis of decomposition methods based on the proximal method of multipliers for convex minimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(1):269–297, 2014.
28. D. Sun, K.-C. Toh, and L. Yang. A convergent 3-block semi-proximal alternating direction method of multipliers for conic programming with 4-type of constraints. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(2):882–915, 2015.
29. P. Tseng. On linear convergence of iterative methods for the variational inequality problem. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 60(1–2):237–252, 1995.
30. P. Tseng. A modified forward-backward splitting method for maximal monotone mappings. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 38(2):431–446, 2000.
31. H. Uzawa. *Iterative methods for concave programming*. Studies in Linear and Nonlinear Programming (K. J. Arrow, L. Hurwicz and H. Uzawa, eds). Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, 1958.

-
32. J. Yang and Y. Zhang. Alternating direction algorithms for ℓ_1 -problems in compressive sensing. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 33(1):250–278, 2011.
 33. H. Zhang and W. W. Hager. A nonmonotone line search technique and its application to unconstrained optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 14(4):1043–1056, 2004.
 34. Y. Zhu, D. Liu, and Q. Tran-Dinh. New primal-dual algorithms for a class of nonsmooth and nonlinear convex-concave minimax problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 32(4):2580–2611, 2022.
 35. Z. Zhu, F. Chen, J. Zhang, and Z. Wen. A unified primal-dual algorithm framework for inequality constrained problems. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 97(2), NOV 2023.