

Randomly Activated Proximal Methods for Nonsmooth Convex Minimization*

PATRICK L. COMBETTES¹ AND JAVIER I. MADARIAGA²

¹North Carolina State University
Department of Mathematics
Raleigh, NC 27695, USA
plc@math.ncsu.edu

²North Carolina State University
Department of Mathematics
Raleigh, NC 27695, USA
jimadari@ncsu.edu

Abstract We propose stochastic algorithms for solving large scale nonsmooth convex composite minimization problems. They activate at each iteration blocks of randomly selected proximity operators and achieve almost sure convergence of the iterates to a solution without any regularity assumptions. Numerical applications to data analysis problems are provided.

Keywords. Convex optimization, data analysis, proximal splitting, stochastic algorithm.

*Contact author: P. L. Combettes. Email: plc@math.ncsu.edu. Phone: +1 919 515 2671. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant CCF-2211123.

§1. Introduction

The objective of this paper is to propose stochastic algorithms with convergence guarantees on the sequence of iterates for solving the following general nonsmooth composite minimization problem, which is ubiquitous in signal processing, inverse problems, and machine learning applications (see Section 2.1 for notation).

Problem 1.1. H is a separable real Hilbert space and $f \in \Gamma_0(H)$. For every $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, G_k is a separable real Hilbert space, $g_k \in \Gamma_0(G_k)$, and $L_k: H \rightarrow G_k$ is linear and bounded. It is assumed that $Z = \text{Argmin}(f + \sum_{k=1}^p g_k \circ L_k) \neq \emptyset$. The task is to

$$\underset{x \in H}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x) + \sum_{k=1}^p g_k(L_k x). \quad (1.1)$$

Various deterministic proximal splitting methods are available to solve Problem 1.1, most of which require the activation of the proximity operators of the $p + 1$ functions f and $(g_k)_{1 \leq k \leq p}$ at each iteration [3, 5]. Our specific focus is on solving Problem 1.1 in instances when p is large, which makes it necessary to activate only a small number of proximity operators at each iteration. In this context, we aim at designing efficient stochastic proximal splitting algorithms with the following features:

- At each iteration, they activate only a block of randomly selected proximity operators of (f, g_1, \dots, g_p) .
- They guarantee the convergence of the sequence of iterates to a solution to Problem 1.1 (not just objective function convergence or ergodic convergence) without any additional assumptions on the functions or the operators.
- Knowledge of the norms of the linear operators is not required.

There is a vast literature on random activation algorithms in the special case of minimizing a sum of smooth functions $\sum_{k=1}^p g_k$ in $H = \mathbb{R}^N$ via so-called stochastic gradient descent [7]. The minimization of $\sum_{k=1}^p g_k$ when the functions are Lipschitzian is considered in [6], mostly in the presence of common minimizers. On the other hand, [10] addresses the constrained minimization of a smooth function under regularity conditions in $H = \mathbb{R}^N$. The work of [11], which employs the stochastic quasi-Fejér framework of [4], considers special cases of (1.1) and does not guarantee convergence of the (primal) iterates. On the other hand, the method of [9] does not handle linear operators and requires smoothness of f , while that of [2] does not guarantee iterate convergence. The only random activation framework that addresses Problem 1.1 in its generality and guarantees iterate convergence seems to be that of [12], which is based on [4, Remark 5.10(iv)]. This primal-dual renorming approach is however quite involved numerically and it requires knowledge of the norms of the linear operators. We propose three frameworks based on results of [4] which lead to simple and efficient algorithms for solving Problem 1.1 that satisfy all the requirements itemized above. These novel frameworks are presented in Section 2 and applied to support vector machine and classification problems in Section 3.

§2. Proposed algorithms

2.1. Notation

Throughout, H is a separable real Hilbert space with identity operator Id , scalar product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$, and associated norm $\| \cdot \|$. $\Gamma_0(H)$ denotes the class of lower semicontinuous convex functions $f: H \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$ such that $\text{dom } f = \{x \in H \mid f(x) < +\infty\} \neq \emptyset$. Let C be a nonempty closed convex subset of H . Then ι_C denotes the indicator function of C and proj_C the projection operator onto C . Let $f \in \Gamma_0(H)$. The subdifferential of f at $x \in H$ is the set $\partial f(x) = \{u \in H \mid (\forall z \in H) \langle z - x | u \rangle + f(x) \leq f(z)\}$ and the proximity operator of f is

$$\text{prox}_f: H \rightarrow H: x \mapsto \underset{z \in H}{\text{argmin}} \left(f(z) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - z\|^2 \right). \quad (2.1)$$

We refer to [1] for background on convex analysis and optimization. The underlying probability space is (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) and \mathcal{B}_H denotes the Borel σ -algebra of H . An H -valued random variable is a measurable mapping $x: (\Omega, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (H, \mathcal{B}_H)$. The σ -algebra generated by a family Φ of random variables is denoted by $\sigma(\Phi)$. Given $x: \Omega \rightarrow H$ and $A \subset H$, we set $[x \in A] = \{\omega \in \Omega \mid x(\omega) \in A\}$.

2.2. General framework

Problem 1.1 has a single variable. Our approach consists in embedding it into multivariate problems that will have the following general form studied in [4].

Problem 2.1. Let $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$ and $(Y_k)_{1 \leq k \leq r}$ be families of separable real Hilbert spaces with direct Hilbert sums $\mathbf{X} = X_1 \oplus \dots \oplus X_m$ and $\mathbf{Y} = Y_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Y_r$. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, let $f_i \in \Gamma_0(X_i)$ and, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, let $h_k \in \Gamma_0(Y_k)$, and let $L_{ki}: X_i \rightarrow Y_k$ be linear and bounded. It is assumed that there exists $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{X}$ such that

$$(\forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}) 0 \in \partial f_i(u_i) + \sum_{k=1}^r L_{ki}^* \left(\partial h_k \left(\sum_{j=1}^m L_{kj} u_j \right) \right). \quad (2.2)$$

The task is to

$$\underset{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}}{\text{minimize}} \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x_i) + \sum_{k=1}^r h_k \left(\sum_{i=1}^m L_{ki} x_i \right) \quad (2.3)$$

and \mathbf{Z} denotes the set of solutions. Further, the projection operator onto the subspace

$$\mathbf{V} = \left\{ (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbf{X} \oplus \mathbf{Y} \mid (\forall k \in \{1, \dots, r\}) y_k = \sum_{i=1}^m L_{ki} x_i \right\} \quad (2.4)$$

is decomposed as $\text{proj}_{\mathbf{V}}: \mathbf{x} \mapsto (Q_i \mathbf{x})_{1 \leq i \leq m+r}$, where for every $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $Q_i: \mathbf{X} \oplus \mathbf{Y} \rightarrow X_i$ and, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $Q_{m+k}: \mathbf{X} \oplus \mathbf{Y} \rightarrow Y_k$.

Theorem 2.2 ([4, Corollary 5.5]). Consider the setting of Problem 2.1. Set $D = \{0, 1\}^{m+r} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, let $\gamma \in]0, +\infty[$, let $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $]0, 2[$ such that $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n > 0$ and $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n < 2$, let \mathbf{x}_0

and z_0 be \mathbf{X} -valued random variables, let \mathbf{y}_0 and \mathbf{w}_0 be \mathbf{Y} -valued random variables, and let $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be identically distributed \mathbf{D} -valued random variables. Iterate

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{for } n = 0, 1, \dots \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{for } i = 1, \dots, m \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} x_{i,n+1} = x_{i,n} + \varepsilon_{i,n} (Q_i(z_n, \mathbf{w}_n) - x_{i,n}) \\ z_{i,n+1} = z_{i,n} + \varepsilon_{i,n} \mu_n (\text{prox}_{\gamma f_i}(2x_{i,n+1} - z_{i,n}) - x_{i,n+1}) \end{array} \right. \\ \text{for } k = 1, \dots, r \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} y_{k,n+1} = y_{k,n} + \varepsilon_{m+k,n} (Q_{m+k}(z_n, \mathbf{w}_n) - y_{k,n}) \\ \mathbf{w}_{k,n+1} = \mathbf{w}_{k,n} + \varepsilon_{m+k,n} \mu_n (\text{prox}_{\gamma h_k}(2y_{k,n+1} - \mathbf{w}_{k,n}) - y_{k,n+1}). \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

In addition, assume that the following are satisfied:

- (i) For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma(\varepsilon_n)$ and $\sigma(z_j, \mathbf{w}_j)_{0 \leq j \leq n}$ are independent.
- (ii) For every $j \in \{1, \dots, m+r\}$, $P[\varepsilon_{j,0} = 1] > 0$.

Then $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly P-a.s. to a \mathbf{Z} -valued random variable.

Remark 2.3. The random variables $\varepsilon_{i,n}$ and $\varepsilon_{k,n}$ control which components are updated.

We now present three frameworks for solving Problem 1.1 which are based on specializations of Theorem 2.2. We define $\mathbf{G} = G_1 \oplus \dots \oplus G_p$ and

$$\mathbf{W} = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in H \oplus \mathbf{G} \mid (\forall k \in \{1, \dots, p\}) x_{k+1} = L_k x_1 \right\}. \quad (2.5)$$

2.3. Framework 1

We start with the following reformulation of Problem 1.1.

Problem 2.4. Consider the setting of Problem 1.1. Set $f_1 = f$ and, for every $i \in \{2, \dots, p+1\}$, $f_i = g_{i-1}$. Denote by $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{p+1})$ a generic element in $H \oplus \mathbf{G}$. The task is to

$$\underset{\mathbf{x} \in H \oplus \mathbf{G}}{\text{minimize}} \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} f_i(x_i) + \iota_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (2.6)$$

We observe that Problem 2.4 is a special case of Problem 2.1 in which $m = p+1$, $r = 1$, $X_1 = H$, $(X_i)_{2 \leq i \leq m} = (G_{i-1})_{2 \leq i \leq m}$, $Y_1 = \mathbf{X}$, $h_1 = \iota_{\mathbf{W}}$, and, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $L_{1i}: x_i \mapsto (y_1, \dots, y_m)$, where $y_j = 0$ if $j \neq i$, and $y_j = x_i$ if $j = i$. Altogether, Problem 1.1 is an instance of Problem 2.1 and we apply Theorem 2.2 to solve it as follows.

Proposition 2.5. Consider the setting of Problem 1.1. Set $D = \{0, 1\}^{p+2} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, let $\gamma \in]0, +\infty[$, let $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $]0, 2[$ such that $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n > 0$ and $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n < 2$, let $\mathbf{x}_0, z_0, \mathbf{y}_0$, and \mathbf{w}_0 be $H \oplus \mathbf{G}$ -valued random variables, and let $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be identically distributed \mathbf{D} -valued random variables.

Set $x_0 = x_{1,0}$ and iterate

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{for } n = 0, 1, \dots \\
\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{n+1} = x_n + \varepsilon_{1,n} \left(\frac{1}{2} z_{1,n} + \frac{1}{2} w_{1,n} - x_n \right) \\
z_{1,n+1} = z_{1,n} + \varepsilon_{1,n} \mu_n \left(\text{prox}_{\gamma f} (2x_{n+1} - z_{1,n}) - x_{n+1} \right) \\
\text{for } k = 1, \dots, p \\
\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{k+1,n+1} = x_{k+1,n} + \varepsilon_{k+1,n} \left(\frac{1}{2} z_{k+1,n} + \frac{1}{2} w_{k+1,n} - x_{k+1,n} \right) \\
z_{k+1,n+1} = z_{k+1,n} + \varepsilon_{k+1,n} \mu_n \left(\text{prox}_{\gamma g_k} (2x_{k+1,n+1} - z_{k+1,n}) - x_{k+1,n+1} \right) \\
\mathbf{y}_{n+1} = \mathbf{y}_n + \varepsilon_{p+2,n} \left(\frac{1}{2} z_n + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{w}_n - \mathbf{y}_n \right) \\
q_n = (\text{Id} + \sum_{k=1}^p L_k^* \circ L_k)^{-1} (2y_{1,n+1} - w_{1,n+1} + \sum_{k=1}^p L_k^* (2y_{k+1,n+1} - w_{k+1,n+1})) \\
w_{1,n+1} = w_{1,n} + \varepsilon_{p+2,n} \mu_n (q_n - y_{1,n+1}) \\
\text{for } k = 1, \dots, p \\
\left[\begin{array}{l}
w_{k+1,n+1} = w_{k+1,n} + \varepsilon_{p+2,n} \mu_n (L_k q_n - y_{k+1,n+1}).
\end{array} \right.
\end{array} \right.
\end{array}$$

In addition, assume that the following are satisfied:

- (i) $(\exists u \in H) 0 \in \partial f(u) + \sum_{k=1}^p L_k^* (\partial g_k(L_k u))$.
- (ii) For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma(\varepsilon_n)$ and $\sigma(z_j, \mathbf{w}_j)_{0 \leq j \leq n}$ are independent.
- (iii) For every $j \in \{1, \dots, p+2\}$, $P[\varepsilon_{j,0} = 1] > 0$.

Then $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly P-a.s. to a Z-valued random variable.

2.4. Framework 2

Here is an alternative reformulation of Problem 1.1.

Problem 2.6. Consider the setting of Problem 1.1 and let $(f_i)_{1 \leq i \leq p+1}$ be as in Problem 2.4. Let $(K_k)_{1 \leq k \leq r}$ be separable real Hilbert spaces, set $\mathbf{K} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^r K_k$, and let

$$\mathbf{C}: H \oplus \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{K}: \mathbf{x} \mapsto \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p+1} C_{ki} x_i \right)_{1 \leq k \leq r} \quad (2.7)$$

be linear, bounded, and such that $\ker \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{W}$. The task is to

$$\underset{\mathbf{x} \in H \oplus \mathbf{G}}{\text{minimize}} \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} f_i(x_i) + \sum_{k=1}^r \iota_{\{0\}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p+1} C_{ki} x_i \right). \quad (2.8)$$

We observe that Problem 2.6 is the special case of Problem 2.1 in which $m = p+1$, $X_1 = H$, $(X_i)_{2 \leq i \leq m} = (G_{i-1})_{2 \leq i \leq m}$, $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{K}$, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $h_k = \iota_{\{0\}}$, and, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $L_{ki} = C_{ki}$. Thus, the subspace \mathbf{V} of (2.4) becomes

$$\mathbf{V} = \left\{ (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbf{X} \oplus \mathbf{Y} \mid (\forall k \in \{1, \dots, r\}) y_k = \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} C_{ki} x_i \right\}, \quad (2.9)$$

This confirms that Problem 1.1 is an instance of Problem 2.6. In turn, we apply Theorem 2.2 to solve it as follows.

Proposition 2.7. Consider the setting of Problem 1.1. Let \mathbf{K} and \mathbf{C} be as in Problem 2.6, set \mathbf{V} be as in (2.9), and decompose its projection operator as $\text{proj}_{\mathbf{V}}: \mathbf{x} \mapsto (R_j \mathbf{x})_{1 \leq j \leq p+1+r}$, where $R_1: \mathbf{H} \oplus \mathbf{G} \oplus \mathbf{K} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$, $(\forall i \in \{1, \dots, p\}) R_{1+i}: \mathbf{H} \oplus \mathbf{G} \oplus \mathbf{K} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_i$, and $(\forall k \in \{1, \dots, r\}) R_{p+1+k}: \mathbf{H} \oplus \mathbf{G} \oplus \mathbf{K} \rightarrow \mathbf{K}_k$. Set $D = \{0, 1\}^{p+1+r} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, let $\gamma \in]0, +\infty[$, let $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $]0, 2[$ such that $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n > 0$ and $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n < 2$, let x_0 and z_0 be $\mathbf{H} \oplus \mathbf{G}$ -valued random variables, let y_0 and w_0 be \mathbf{K} -valued random variable, and let $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be identically distributed D -valued random variables. Set $x_0 = x_{1,0}$ and iterate

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{for } n = 0, 1, \dots \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} x_{n+1} = x_n + \varepsilon_{1,n} (R_1(z_n, w_n) - x_n) \\ z_{1,n+1} = z_{1,n} + \varepsilon_{1,n} \mu_n (\text{prox}_{\gamma f} (2x_{n+1} - z_{1,n}) - x_{n+1}) \\ \text{for } k = 1, \dots, p \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} x_{k+1,n+1} = x_{k+1,n} + \varepsilon_{k+1,n} (R_{k+1}(z_n, w_n) - x_{k+1,n}) \\ z_{k+1,n+1} = z_{k+1,n} + \varepsilon_{k+1,n} \mu_n (\text{prox}_{\gamma g_k} (2x_{k+1,n+1} - z_{k,n}) - x_{k+1,n+1}) \end{array} \right. \\ \text{for } k = 1, \dots, r \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} y_{k,n+1} = y_{k,n} + \varepsilon_{p+1+k,n} (R_{p+1+k}(z_n, w_n) - y_{k,n}) \\ w_{k,n+1} = w_{k,n} - \varepsilon_{p+1+k,n} \mu_n y_{k,n+1}. \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

In addition, assume that the following are satisfied:

- (i) There exists $\mathbf{u} \in \ker \mathbf{C}$ such that $0 \in \partial f(\mathbf{u}_1) + \sum_{k=1}^r \text{range } C_{k1}^*$ and $(\forall j \in \{1, \dots, p\}) 0 \in \partial g_j(\mathbf{u}_{j+1}) + \sum_{k=1}^r \text{range } C_{kj}^*$.
- (ii) For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma(\varepsilon_n)$ and $\sigma(z_j, w_j)_{0 \leq j \leq n}$ are independent.
- (iii) For every $j \in \{1, \dots, p+1+r\}$, $P[\varepsilon_{j,0} = 1] > 0$.

Then $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly P-a.s. to a Z -valued random variable.

2.5. Framework 3

The third approach stems from the observation that Problem 1.1 coincides with (2.3) for $m = 1$, $r = p$, $X_1 = \mathbf{H}$, $f_1 = f$, and $(\forall k \in \{1, \dots, p\}) Y_k = \mathbf{G}_k$, $L_{k,1} = L_k$, and $h_k = g_k$. We therefore derive from Theorem 2.2 the following convergence result.

Proposition 2.8. Consider the setting of Problem 1.1. Set $D = \{0, 1\}^{1+p} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, let $\gamma \in]0, +\infty[$, let $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $]0, 2[$ such that $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n > 0$ and $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n < 2$, let x_0 and z_0 be \mathbf{H} -valued random variables, let y_0 and w_0 be \mathbf{G} -valued random variables, and let $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be identically distributed D -valued random variables. Iterate

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{for } n = 0, 1, \dots \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} q_n = (\text{Id} + \sum_{k=1}^p L_k^* \circ L_k)^{-1} (z_n + \sum_{k=1}^p L_k^* w_{k,n}) \\ x_{n+1} = x_n + \varepsilon_{1,n} (q_n - x_n) \\ z_{n+1} = z_n + \varepsilon_{1,n} \mu_n (\text{prox}_{\gamma f} (2x_{n+1} - z_n) - x_{n+1}) \\ \text{for } k = 1, \dots, p \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} y_{k,n+1} = y_{k,n} + \varepsilon_{1+k,n} (L_k q_n - y_{k,n}) \\ w_{k,n+1} = w_{k,n} + \varepsilon_{1+k,n} \mu_n (\text{prox}_{\gamma g_k} (2y_{k,n+1} - w_{k,n}) - y_{k,n+1}). \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

In addition, assume that the following are satisfied:

- (i) $(\exists \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}) 0 \in \partial f(\mathbf{u}) + \sum_{k=1}^p L_k^* (\partial g_k(L_k \mathbf{u}))$.

- (ii) For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma(\varepsilon_n)$ and $\sigma(z_j, \mathbf{w}_j)_{0 \leq j \leq n}$ are independent.
- (iii) For every $j \in \{1, \dots, p+1\}$, $P[\varepsilon_{j,0} = 1] > 0$.

Then $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly P-a.s. to a Z -valued random variable.

2.6. Examples

We provide some examples of operators arising in Propositions 2.5, 2.7, and 2.8.

Example 2.9. In Proposition 2.7, set $r = p$, $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{G}$, and, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and every $i \in \{1, \dots, p+1\}$,

$$C_{ki} = \begin{cases} L_k, & \text{if } i = 1; \\ -\text{Id}, & \text{if } i = k + 1; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

Let $\mathbf{x} \in H \oplus \mathbf{G}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{G}$, and set $q = (2\text{Id} + \sum_{k=1}^p L_k^* \circ L_k)^{-1} (2x_1 + \sum_{k=1}^p L_k^*(x_{k+1} + y_k))$. Then, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, p+1\}$, $R_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is given by

$$\begin{cases} q, & \text{if } i = 1; \\ \frac{1}{2}(L_{i-1}q + x_i - y_{i-1}), & \text{if } 2 \leq i \leq p+1; \\ \frac{1}{2}(L_{i-p-1}q - x_{i-p} + y_{i-p-1}), & \text{if } p+2 \leq i \leq 2p+1. \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

The next examples focus on the special case of Problem 1.1 in which, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, $G_k = H$ and $L_k = \text{Id}$, that is,

$$\underset{x \in H}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x) + \sum_{k=1}^p g_k(x). \quad (2.12)$$

Example 2.10. In Example 2.9, for every $\mathbf{x} \in H^{p+1}$ and every $\mathbf{y} \in H^p$,

$$q = \frac{1}{p+2} \left(2x_1 + \sum_{k=1}^p (x_{k+1} + y_k) \right). \quad (2.13)$$

Example 2.11. In Proposition 2.7, set \mathbf{C} such that, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, p+1\}$ and every $i \in \{1, \dots, p+1\}$,

$$C_{ki} = \begin{cases} \frac{p}{p+1} \text{Id}, & \text{if } k = i; \\ -\frac{1}{p+1} \text{Id}, & \text{if } k \neq i. \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

Then $\ker \mathbf{C}$ is the subspace of all the vectors $\mathbf{x} \in H^{p+1}$ such that, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, p+1\}$, $x_i = \frac{1}{p+1} \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} x_j$. Hence, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, 2p+2\}$, $\mathbf{x} \in H^{p+1}$, and $\mathbf{y} \in H^{p+1}$, $R_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is given by

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(x_i + y_i) + \frac{1}{2(p+1)} \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} (x_j - y_j), & \text{if } i \leq p+1; \\ \frac{1}{2}(x_i + y_i) - \frac{1}{(p+1)} \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} (x_j + y_j), & \text{if } p+2 \leq i \leq 2p+2. \end{cases} \quad (2.15)$$

Example 2.12. In Propositions 2.5 and 2.8,

$$\left(\text{Id} + \sum_{k=1}^p L_k^* \circ L_k \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{p+1} \text{Id}. \quad (2.16)$$

Remark 2.13. On the one hand, the operator \mathbf{C} in Example 2.10 applied to $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{H}^{p+1}$ couples, for every $i \in \{2, \dots, p+1\}$, x_i with x_1 . On the other hand, in Example 2.11 the operator \mathbf{C} applied to $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{H}^{p+1}$ couples, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, p+1\}$, x_i with the average $\frac{1}{p+1} \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} x_j$. Various alternative coupling operators \mathbf{C} can be considered to enforce the condition $x_1 = \dots = x_{p+1}$.

§3. Numerical experiments

We present two experiments to compare the numerical behavior of the algorithms presented in Section 2. The qualification condition (2.2) is satisfied in all cases.

3.1. Experiment 1: Overlapping group lasso

We address the overlapping group lasso regression problem of [8]. Here $H = \mathbb{R}^N$ and, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, $\emptyset \neq l_k \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ and

$$L_k: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\text{card } l_k}: \mathbf{x} = (\xi_j)_{1 \leq j \leq N} \mapsto (\xi_j)_{j \in l_k}. \quad (3.1)$$

Further, $\bigcup_{k=1}^p l_k = \{1, \dots, N\}$. The goal is to

$$\underset{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}\|^2 + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{k=1}^p \|L_k \mathbf{x}\|, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^M$, and $\lambda \in]0, +\infty[$. In the experiment $M = 1000$, $N = 3610$, $p = 40$, and, as in [13], $\lambda = 5/p^2$. The entries of \mathbf{A} are i.i.d. samples from a $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ distribution, and the entries of \mathbf{b} are i.i.d. samples from a $\mathcal{N}(100, 100)$ distribution. Finally,

$$(\forall k \in \{1, \dots, p\}) \quad l_k = \{90k - 89, \dots, 90k + 10\}. \quad (3.3)$$

We employ the three frameworks of Sections 2.3–2.5 to solve (3.2), where Proposition 2.7 uses the operator \mathbf{C} defined in Example 2.9. In each case, $\gamma = p$, the initial points \mathbf{x}_0 , \mathbf{z}_0 , \mathbf{y}_0 , and \mathbf{w}_0 are set to $\mathbf{0}$, and, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu_n = 1.9$. The random variable ε_0 activates a single index in $\{1, \dots, p+2\}$, $\{1, \dots, 2p+1\}$, and $\{1, \dots, p+1\}$ respectively, and the distribution is uniform. We display in Fig. 1 the normalized error versus execution time.

3.2. Experiment 2: Classification using the hinge loss

We address a binary classification problem. The training data set $((u_k, \xi_k))_{1 \leq k \leq p}$ is in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \{-1, 1\}$ and the goal is to learn a linear classifier $\mathbf{x} \in H = \mathbb{R}^N$. For this purpose, we solve the support vector machine model

$$\underset{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{k=1}^p g_k(\mathbf{x}), \quad (3.4)$$




Figure 1: Normalized error $20 \log(\|x_n - x_\infty\|/\|x_0 - x_\infty\|)$ (dB) versus execution time (s). **Orange:** Framework 1. **Blue:** Framework 2 with Example 2.9. **Green:** Framework 3.

where $\lambda \in]0, +\infty[$ and, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$,

$$g_k: x \mapsto \max\{0, 1 - \xi_k \langle x | u_k \rangle\}. \quad (3.5)$$

In the experiment, $N = 5000$, $\lambda = 1$, $p = 500$, and, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, the entries of u_k are i.i.d. samples from a $\mathcal{N}(10, 100)$ distribution, and the entries of ξ_k are i.i.d. samples from a uniform distribution on $\{-1, 1\}$. We employ four methods to solve this problem: Framework 1, Framework 2 using the operators \mathbf{C} defined in Example 2.10 and Example 2.11, and Framework 3. In each case, $\gamma = p$, the initial points x_0 , z_0 , y_0 , and w_0 are set to $\mathbf{0}$ and, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu_n = 1.9$. We run three instances of the algorithms. In the first one, the random variable ε_n activates one index uniformly in $\{1, \dots, p + 2\}$, $\{1, \dots, 2p + 1\}$, $\{1, \dots, 2p + 2\}$, and $\{1, \dots, p + 1\}$ respectively. In the second, the number of activated indices is 8, and in the third it is 32. We display in Fig. 2 the normalized error versus execution time for each instances. The execution time is evaluated based on the assumption that the computation corresponding to each selected index is assigned a dedicated core and that all the cores are working in parallel.

3.3. Discussion

As discussed in Section 1, the only comparable existing algorithm is that of [12]. We do not plot its results because it is significantly slower: for example, in Experiment 2 using just one activation, it took 130 seconds to reach -50 dB.

In terms of storage, Framework 1 stores $p + 2$ variables, Framework 2 stores $p + r + 1$, and Framework 3 stores $p + 1$. An advantage of Framework 2 is that in the last r activations no proximal calculations are needed. In general, the execution time will depend on the computational load associated with the evaluation of the proximity operators and the inversions. For instance, these are cheaper in Experiment 2, which makes Framework 3 the fastest.




Figure 2: Normalized error $20 \log(\|x_n - x_\infty\|/\|x_0 - x_\infty\|)$ (dB) versus execution time (s). Top: Block size 1 with 1 core. Middle: Block size 8 with 8 cores. Bottom: Block size 32 with 32 cores. **Orange**: Framework 1. **Blue**: Framework 2 with Example 2.10. **Magenta**: Framework 2 with Example 2.11. **Green**: Framework 3.

References

- [1] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, 2nd ed. Springer, New York, 2017.
- [2] A. Chambolle, M. J. Ehrhardt, P. Richtárik, and C.-B. Schönlieb, Stochastic primal-dual hybrid gradient algorithm with arbitrary sampling and imaging applications, *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 28, pp. 2783–2808, 2018.
- [3] P. L. Combettes, The geometry of monotone operator splitting methods, *Acta Numer.*, to appear (<https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.08443>).
- [4] P. L. Combettes and J.-C. Pesquet, Stochastic quasi-Fejér block-coordinate fixed point iterations with random sweeping, *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 25, pp. 1221–1248, 2015.
- [5] L. Condat, D. Kitahara, A. Contreras, and A. Hirabayashi, Proximal splitting algorithms for convex optimization: A tour of recent advances, with new twists, *SIAM Rev.*, vol. 65, pp. 375–435, 2023.
- [6] D. Davis, Variance reduction for root-finding problems, *Math. Program.*, vol. A197, pp. 375–410, 2023.
- [7] A. Dieuleveut, G. Fort, E. Moulines, and H.-T. Wai, Stochastic approximation beyond gradient for signal processing and machine learning, *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 71, pp. 3117–3148, 2023.
- [8] L. Jacob, G. Obozinski, and J.-Ph. Vert, Group lasso with overlap and graph lasso, *Proc. Int. Conf. Machine Learn.*, pp. 433–440, 2009.
- [9] P. R. Johnstone, J. Eckstein, T. Flynn, and S. Yoo, Stochastic projective splitting, *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, vol. 87, pp. 397–437, 2024.
- [10] A. Nedić, Random algorithms for convex minimization problems, *Math. Program.*, vol. B129, pp. 225–253, 2011.
- [11] Z. Peng, Y. Xu, M. Yan, and W. Yin, ARock: An algorithmic framework for asynchronous parallel coordinate updates, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, vol. 38, pp. A2851–A2879, 2016.
- [12] J.-C. Pesquet and A. Repetti, A class of randomized primal-dual algorithms for distributed optimization, *J. Nonlinear Convex Anal.*, vol. 16, pp. 2453–2490, 2015.
- [13] Y.-L. Yu, Better approximation and faster algorithm using the proximal average, *Proc. Conf. Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, pp. 458–466, 2013.