

# Monotone Lipschitz-Gradient Denoiser: Explainability of Operator Regularization Approaches and Convergence to Optimal Point

Masahiro YUKAWA, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Isao YAMADA, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—This paper addresses explainability of the operator-regularization approach under the use of *monotone Lipschitz-gradient (MoL-Grad) denoiser* — an operator that can be expressed as the Lipschitz continuous gradient of a differentiable convex function. We prove that an operator is a MoL-Grad denoiser if and only if it is the “single-valued” proximity operator of a weakly convex function. An extension of Moreau’s decomposition is also shown with respect to a weakly convex function and the conjugate of its convexified function. Under these arguments, two specific algorithms, the forward-backward splitting algorithm and the primal-dual splitting algorithm, are considered, both employing MoL-Grad denoisers. These algorithms generate a sequence of vectors converging weakly, under conditions, to a minimizer of a certain cost function which involves an “implicit regularizer” induced by the denoiser. The theoretical findings are supported by simulations.

**Index Terms**—weakly convex function, proximity operator, nonexpansive operator, convex optimization

## I. INTRODUCTION

Operator splitting algorithm [1] is a standard technique nowadays for nonsmooth convex optimization. It allows to take into account prior knowledge such as sparsity and low-rankness both of which are quite relevant to signal processing as well as machine learning. Indeed, the naive discrete-valued measures (the  $\ell_0$  pseudo-norm and the matrix rank) of such prior information are discontinuous, and one often resorts to their convex relaxations (the  $\ell_1$  and nuclear norms) which are typically nonsmooth. Moreau’s proximity operator resides at the core of operator splitting algorithm, and it has many examples ranging from the soft-shrinkage and the convex projection to activation functions including rectified linear unit (ReLU), sigmoid, and softmax [2], to name a few. An advantage of the operator splitting algorithm is its computational efficiency as long as the nonsmooth function(s) involved is(are) prox friendly. The celebrated examples of the operator splitting algorithm include the proximal forward-backward splitting method (the proximal gradient method) [3, 4], the Douglas-Rachford splitting method [3], the alternating

direction methods of multipliers [5,6], and the primal-dual splitting methods [7–9]. See [10,11], for instance, for more about the history of the operator splitting methods.

Designing an objective function involving nonsmooth function(s) is the first step in typical signal processing approaches based on operator splitting. Then, an algorithm to optimize it is either constructed or selected from the available ones, followed by a derivation of Moreau’s proximity operator(s), as well as other operators such as the gradient in most cases. As the nonsmooth functions, the convex relaxations mentioned in the previous paragraph are usually chosen as a first choice. Their proximity operators, however, tend to cause nonnegligible estimation biases [12] due to the convexity. One might therefore return to the first step to devise a better objective function. Indeed, nonconvex regularizers have been studied widely [13–25], motivated by the fact that those regularizers are better approximations of the ideal  $\ell_0$  pseudo-norm and therefore reduce the estimation bias significantly.

Some promising approaches combining convex and nonconvex functions have been studied [26–28]. In these approaches, a weakly convex penalty is coupled with a strongly convex fidelity so that convexity of the whole objective function is preserved. A generalized penalty function has been proposed in [29] so that overall convexity can be preserved when applied to inverse problems of underdetermined linear systems (where the fidelity function is not strongly convex). In [30], the penalty has further been generalized to permit a composition with a bounded linear operator, and the generalized penalty has been shown to improve the performance of the  $\ell_1$ -based total variation as a particular instance. In [31], a general framework has been presented to apply the convex-nonconvex strategy to outlier-robust signal recovery, and it clarifies in what situations the sufficient condition of overall convexity is also a necessary condition; i.e., it clarifies when the bound for the regularization parameter is tight (see also for its extension [32]).

There are several other related approaches. One is to devise a better “operator” directly that accommodates prior information without causing serious estimation biases (see [33] and the references therein). Another popular one is an *operator-regularization* approach called plug-and-play [34], where the proximity operator is replaced by another denoiser such as deep neural networks. “Explainability” of the plug-and-play method has been studied actively in recent years (see, e.g., [35] and the references therein). Most of the previous works in this line of research impose the strong assumption of (averaged) nonexpansiveness on the neural network, which

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible. This work was partially supported by JSPS Grants-in-Aid (22H01492).

M. Yukawa is with the Department of Electronics and Electrical Engineering, Keio University, Yokohama, Kanagawa 223-8522, Japan (e-mail: yukawa@elec.keio.ac.jp).

Isao Yamada is with the Department of Information and Communications Engineering, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152-8550, Japan (e-mail: isao@sp.ce.titech.ac.jp).

often requires additional costs [36, 37]. There are some works considering a weaker assumption of Lipschitz continuity with Lipschitz constant allowed to exceed one [38, 39]. Although all those works concern convergence of the iterates, studies on optimality of the limit point are rather limited. In the present work, the following question is addressed for operators which are not necessarily nonexpansive: *when do the above approaches optimize an objective function, and how can such a function be characterized?*

In our approach, we suppose that an operator is firstly designed, or it could be learned by machine. The designed/learned operator replaces the proximity operator appearing in an operator splitting algorithm, and the optimization problem associated with the resultant algorithm is “derived” subsequently. As such, the processes of “design” and “derivation” are in the reverse order compared to the typical approaches. We mention for clarification that the desirable ‘estimate’ is not explicitly characterized as a *minimizer* (nor a *stationary/critical point*) of a function, but instead — it can be characterized as a *minimizer* of a convex function involving an “implicit regularizer”. (It can also be characterized as a fixed point of some averaged nonexpansive operator.) A practical advantage of the proposed approach is that the operator can be designed in a way that it can be computed simply whereas its corresponding cost function could be complicated, or even impossible to express in a closed form.

To present a more concrete picture, let us consider the simple iterate:

$$x_{k+1} := T(x_k - \mu \nabla f(x_k)), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1)$$

where  $T$  is a nonlinear mapping (denoiser) from a real Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a smooth convex function, and  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$  is the step size. Here, the term *smooth* (or  $\kappa$ -*smooth* more specifically) is used in this paper to mean that the function is differentiable with its gradient Lipschitz continuous with constant  $\kappa > 0$  (see (3)) over  $\mathcal{H}$ . If in particular  $T$  is Moreau’s proximity operator of a proper lower semicontinuous convex function  $g$ , (1) is the classical forward-backward splitting algorithm to minimize  $\mu f + g$ . It will turn out that  $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges weakly to a minimizer (if exists) of a certain cost function under the following condition (in addition to other technical assumptions).<sup>1</sup>

**Condition ♣ (Monotone Lipschitz-Gradient (MoL-Grad) Denoiser)** Denoiser  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is a  $\beta^{-1}$ -Lipschitz continuous operator for  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  such that  $T = \nabla \psi$  for a Fréchet differentiable convex function  $\psi$ . In other words,  $T$  can be expressed as the gradient of a  $\beta^{-1}$ -smooth convex function.

The name “MoL-Grad” of our denoiser stems from the fact that convexity of  $\psi$  can be characterized by monotonicity of the gradient  $\nabla \psi$  (see Section II-D). The convergence argument for the algorithm in (1) can be extended to other operator

<sup>1</sup>One may consider such a condition that  $T$  is a selection of the subdifferential of a (not necessarily differentiable) proper lower-semicontinuous convex function  $\psi$ . However, this seemingly weaker condition together with Lipschitz continuity implies Fréchet differentiability of  $\psi$  [40, Proposition 17.41]. To the best of authors’ knowledge, the subdifferentiability is often used in convex analysis to relate an operator to optimization. The case of  $\beta \geq 1$  corresponds to Moreau’s proximity operator of convex function [41], thus excluded in the present study.

splitting algorithms, as elaborated later on. It should be mentioned that (i) the Lipschitz continuity imposed on MoL-Grad denoiser is weaker than (averaged) nonexpansiveness which requires the Lipschitz constant to be one (or smaller), (ii) condition ♣ implies cocoercivity of  $T$ , i.e.,  $\beta T$  is firmly nonexpansive for some positive constant  $\beta$ , and (iii) the present study includes nonseparable operators in scope.<sup>2</sup>

### A. Contributions

In the first main part (Section III), we link the operator  $T$  to a generalized notion of Moreau’s proximity operator for possibly nonconvex functions to facilitate the analysis. The following proposition suggests that, although the proximity operator of a nonconvex function is set-valued in general, we can solely consider the *single-valued* case in the present study.

**Proposition 1** *Given a proper function  $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ , let  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  be a continuous operator such that  $T(x) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{H}} [f(y) + (1/2) \|x - y\|^2] \neq \emptyset$  for every  $x \in \mathcal{H}$ . Then, the penalized function  $f + (1/2) \|x - \cdot\|^2$  has a unique minimizer for every  $x \in \mathcal{H}$ .*

*Proof:* See Appendix A. ■

Indeed, every MoL-Grad denoiser is continuous owing directly to its Lipschitz continuity. (If  $T$  is discontinuous, the convergence analysis of the algorithm in (1) would be intractable in general.) Proposition 1 states that, if  $f + (1/2) \|x - \cdot\|^2$  has multiple minimizers, it is impossible to define a continuous operator  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  in the form of  $T(x) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{H}} [f(y) + (1/2) \|x - y\|^2]$ . We therefore define our generalized proximity operator as a unique minimizer of the penalized function only when the minimizer exists uniquely. Now, a natural question is what is a sufficient condition for  $T$  to be continuous. It is clear that  $f + (1/2) \|x - \cdot\|^2$  has a unique minimizer (i.e., the necessary condition in the proposition holds true) if  $f + (1/2) \|\cdot\|^2$  is strongly convex ( $f$  is weakly convex at least in this case). This condition actually implies that  $T$  is the Lipschitz continuous gradient (of a convex function), which again implies continuity of  $T$ . Our findings of the first part are summarized below.

- 1) An operator  $T$  is a MoL-Grad denoiser if and only if  $T$  is the (generalized) proximity operator of a  $(1 - \beta)$ -weakly convex function  $\varphi = \psi^* - (1/2) \|\cdot\|^2$  (Theorem 1). This actually motivates condition ♣.
- 2) Moreau’s decomposition is extended to weakly convex functions (Propositions 2 and 3).

In the second part (Sections IV–VI), we consider the modified operator splitting algorithms with the proximity operator replaced by a MoL-Grad denoiser, analyzing the convergence based on the results established in the first part. As a case study, we highlight two specific algorithms: (i) the forward-backward splitting type algorithm given in (1), and (ii) the primal-dual splitting type algorithm which is basically the

<sup>2</sup>For instance, when used as a penalty function for the linear inverse problem with underdetermined systems, a nonconvex function must be nonseparable to preserve overall convexity; i.e., there exists no separable nonconvex function that makes the overall cost function convex [42].

Condat–Vũ algorithm [8, 9] but with a certain modification. The specific contributions are listed below.

- 3) The iterate (1) with a MoL-Grad denoiser  $T$  converges weakly to a minimizer of  $\mu f + \varphi$  under conditions (Theorem 2). The monotonicity of our denoiser  $T$  allows its associated regularizer  $\varphi$  to be (weakly) convex.
- 4) The primal-dual splitting type algorithm employing a MoL-Grad denoiser converges weakly to a minimizer of a certain function under conditions (Theorem 3).
- 5) A systematic way of building operator-regularization algorithms using MoL-Grad denoisers with convergence guarantee is presented (Section IV-C).
- 6) Simulation results support the theoretical findings as well as showing potential advantages of the proposed approach (Section VI).

A part of Sections III, IV-A, and V-A has been presented in [43] without proofs. The present work contains many new results/discussions (such as Theorem 3 and Propositions 1 and 3) from a wider scope as well as proofs and simulations.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

Let  $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$  be a real Hilbert space with the induced norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . Let  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_{++}$ , and  $\mathbb{N}$  denote the sets of real numbers, nonnegative real numbers, strictly positive real numbers, and nonnegative integers, respectively.

### A. Properness, Subdifferentiability, and Lower Semicontinuity

We consider a function  $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty] := \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ . A function  $f$  is *proper* if the domain is nonempty; i.e.,  $\text{dom } f := \{x \in \mathcal{H} \mid f(x) < +\infty\} \neq \emptyset$ . Given a proper function  $f$ , the set

$$\partial f(x) := \{z \in \mathcal{H} \mid \langle y-x, z \rangle + f(x) \leq f(y), \forall y \in \mathcal{H}\} \quad (2)$$

is the subdifferential of  $f$  at  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  [40]; each element  $f'(x) \in \partial f(x)$  is a subgradient of  $f$  at  $x$ . A function  $f$  is *lower semicontinuous* (or *closed*) on  $\mathcal{H}$  if the level set  $\text{lev}_{\leq a} f := \{x \in \mathcal{H} \mid f(x) \leq a\}$  is closed for every  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Every continuous function is lower semicontinuous.

### B. Convexity and Conjugation

A function  $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is convex on  $\mathcal{H}$  if  $f(\alpha x + (1-\alpha)y) \leq \alpha f(x) + (1-\alpha)f(y)$  for every  $(x, y, \alpha) \in \text{dom } f \times \text{dom } f \times [0, 1]$ . If the inequality of convex function holds with strict inequality whenever  $x \neq y$ ,  $f$  is strictly convex. For a positive constant  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ ,  $f$  is  $\rho$ -strongly convex if  $f - (\rho/2)\|\cdot\|^2$  is convex, while  $f$  is  $\rho$ -weakly convex if  $f + (\rho/2)\|\cdot\|^2$  is convex.

Let  $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be a proper convex function. Then, we have (i)  $\partial f(x) \neq \emptyset$  if  $f$  is continuous at  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  [40, Proposition 16.17], and (ii)  $\partial f(x) = \{\nabla f(x)\}$  if  $f$  is

Gâteaux differentiable with its Gâteaux derivative  $\nabla f$ .<sup>3</sup>

The set of all proper lower-semicontinuous convex functions  $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is denoted by  $\Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ . Given a function  $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ , the *Fenchel conjugate* of  $f$  is  $f^* : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty] : x \mapsto \sup_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \langle x, y \rangle - f(y)$ , satisfying (i)  $f^* \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  and (ii)  $u \in \partial f(x) \Leftrightarrow x \in \partial f^*(u)$ .

### C. Nonexpansiveness, Coccoercivity, and Fixed Point

Let  $\text{Id} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} : x \mapsto x$  denote the identity operator on  $\mathcal{H}$ . An operator  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is Lipschitz continuous with constant  $\kappa > 0$  (or  $\kappa$ -Lipschitz continuous for short) if for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\|T(x) - T(y)\| \leq \kappa \|x - y\|. \quad (3)$$

A 1-Lipschitz continuous operator is called *nonexpansive*. Given a nonexpansive operator  $N : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ , the operator  $T := (1 - \alpha)\text{Id} + \alpha N$  for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  is  $\alpha$ -averaged nonexpansive. In particular, (1/2)-averaged operator is called *firmly nonexpansive*. For  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ , an operator  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is  $\beta$ -cocoercive if  $\beta T$  is firmly nonexpansive. A point  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  is a *fixed point* of  $T$  if  $T(x) = x$ . The set  $\text{Fix}(T) := \{x \in \mathcal{H} \mid T(x) = x\}$  of all fixed points is called *the fixed point set* of  $T$ .

The following theorem is a part of [40, Theorem 5.15] with simplification regarding the domain of the operator.

**Fact 1** *Let  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  be a nonexpansive operator such that  $\text{Fix}(T) \neq \emptyset$ . Define  $T_{\alpha_k} := (1 - \alpha_k)\text{Id} + \alpha_k T$  for a real-number sequence  $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, 1]$  such that  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_k (1 - \alpha_k) = +\infty$ .<sup>4</sup> Then, given an initial point  $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ , the sequence  $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  generated by*

$$x_{k+1} := T_{\alpha_k}(x_k), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (4)$$

*converges weakly to a point  $\hat{x} \in \text{Fix}(T)$ ; i.e.,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle x_k - \hat{x}, y \rangle = 0$  for every  $y \in \mathcal{H}$ .*

The update rule in (4) is called *the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterate*. In particular, letting  $\alpha_k := \alpha$  ( $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$ ) for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  in Fact 1 implies that, given any averaged nonexpansive mapping  $T_\alpha$  with  $\text{Fix}(T_\alpha) \neq \emptyset$ , it holds that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_\alpha^k(x_0) \rightarrow \hat{x} \in \text{Fix}(T_\alpha)$ .

### D. Monotonicity

The subdifferential operator  $\partial f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  defined in (2) maps a vector  $x$  to the set (of subgradients). In general,  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  is called a set-valued operator, where  $2^{\mathcal{H}}$  is the power

<sup>3</sup>(Gâteaux and derivatives of function) Let  $U$  be an open subset of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then, a function  $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Gâteaux differentiable at a point  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  if there exists a vector  $\nabla f(x) \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+\delta h) - f(x)}{\delta} = \langle \nabla f(x), h \rangle$  for every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ . On the other hand, a function  $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Fréchet differentiable at a point  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  if there exists a vector  $\nabla f(x) \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x) - \langle \nabla f(x), h \rangle}{\|h\|} = 0$ . In each case, the operator  $\nabla f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is called the Gâteaux (or Fréchet) derivative of  $f$ , and the vector  $\nabla f(x)$  is the Gâteaux (or Fréchet) gradient of  $f$  at  $x$ . If  $f$  is Fréchet differentiable over  $U$ , it is also Gâteaux differentiable over  $U$ , and the two derivatives (i.e., Gâteaux and Fréchet) coincide.

<sup>4</sup>It suffices that  $\alpha_k \in [\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon]$  ( $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$ ) for some small  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ .

set of  $\mathcal{H}$ ; i.e., the family of all subsets of  $\mathcal{H}$ . An operator  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  is *monotone* if

$$\langle x-y, u-v \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall (x, u) \in \text{gra } T, \quad \forall (y, v) \in \text{gra } T, \quad (5)$$

where  $\text{gra } T := \{(x, u) \in \mathcal{H}^2 \mid u \in T(x)\}$  is the graph of  $T$ . A monotone operator  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  is *maximally monotone* if no other monotone operator has its graph containing  $\text{gra } T$  properly. For instance, the subdifferential operator  $\partial f$  of a proper function  $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is monotone, and it is maximally monotone if  $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ . Suppose that a proper function  $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is Gâteaux differentiable on  $\text{dom } f$  which is open and convex. Then,  $f$  is convex if and only if  $\nabla f$  is monotone [40, Proposition 17.7].

### E. Proximity Operator and Moreau Envelope

Motivated by Proposition 1, we define the single-valued proximity operator (the s-prox operator for short) of a proper function  $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  of index  $\gamma > 0$  as<sup>5</sup>

$$\text{s-Prox}_{\gamma f} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} : x \mapsto \underset{y \in \mathcal{H}}{\text{argmin}} \left( f(y) + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|x-y\|^2 \right) \quad (6)$$

whenever  $f + (1/2\gamma) \|x - \cdot\|^2$  has a unique minimizer for every fixed  $x \in \mathcal{H}$ . In the particular case of  $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ , existence and uniqueness of minimizer is automatically ensured owing to the strict convexity of  $\|\cdot\|^2$  and the coercivity of  $\|\cdot\|^2$  (i.e.,  $\|y\|^2 \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $\|y\| \rightarrow +\infty$ ). In this convex case,  $\text{s-Prox}_{\gamma f}$  is nothing but the classical Moreau's proximity operator [41, 46, 47], for which Moreau's decomposition holds:

$$\text{Id} = \text{s-Prox}_{\gamma f} + \gamma \text{s-Prox}_{\gamma^{-1} f^*} \circ (\gamma^{-1} \text{Id}). \quad (7)$$

Given a function  $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ , its Moreau envelope [41, 46, 47] of index  $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$  is defined as follows:

$$\gamma f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : x \mapsto \min_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \left( f(y) + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|x-y\|^2 \right). \quad (8)$$

The Moreau envelope  $\gamma f$  is convex and Fréchet differentiable with gradient given by

$$\nabla \gamma f(x) = \gamma^{-1} (x - \text{s-Prox}_{\gamma f}(x)), \quad (9)$$

which is  $\gamma^{-1}$ -Lipschitz continuous [41, 46–48]. This means that the Moreau envelope is a smooth approximation of a potentially nondifferentiable convex function  $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ . See [48] for more details.

## III. FUNDAMENTAL RESULTS

Letting  $\varphi := \gamma f$  in (6), it can readily be seen that  $\text{s-Prox}_{\varphi}$  is well-defined if  $\varphi$  is  $\rho$ -weakly convex for  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  so that  $\varphi + (1/2) \|x - \cdot\|^2$  is strongly (and thus strictly) convex and coercive. This simple observation is thoroughly investigated, followed by an extension of Moreau's decomposition.

<sup>5</sup>For proper (not necessarily convex) functions, the proximity operator is often defined as a set-valued operator because the  $f + (1/2\gamma) \|x - \cdot\|^2$  may have multiple minimizers [44, 45] (see also <https://proximity-operator.net/proximityoperator.html>). In the present work, we restrict our attention to the case that a unique minimizer exists over the entire space. Although the multi-valued proximity operator coincides with our s-prox operator when a unique minimizer exists, we give the specific name to our operator and we use the different notation  $\text{s-Prox}_{\gamma f}$  to convey our message that there are remarkable advantages from the viewpoints of explainability and optimization if we restrict ourselves to the unique-minimizer case.

### A. Weakly Convex Function and Gradient Operator of Smooth Convex Function

We show that a given nonlinear operator  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is the proximity operator of some weakly convex function if and only if it is the gradient operator of a smooth convex function, i.e., a MoL-Grad denoiser (see condition ♣). The proof relies on the following lemma.

**Lemma 1** *For a proper function  $h : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  and a vector  $x \in \mathcal{H}$ , let  $J_x(y) := h(y) + (1/2) \|y - x\|^2$ ,  $y \in \mathcal{H}$ . Then, the following equalities hold:*

$$\partial J_x(y) = \partial \left( h + \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \right)(y) - x, \quad (10)$$

$$\underset{y \in \mathcal{H}}{\text{argmin}} J_x(y) = \left[ \partial \left( h + \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \right) \right]^{-1}(x) \\ := \left\{ p \in \mathcal{H} \mid x \in \partial \left( h + \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \right)(p) \right\}. \quad (11)$$

*In particular, if  $h + (1/2) \|\cdot\|^2$  is coercive and strictly convex,  $J_x$  has a unique minimizer, which is*

$$\text{s-Prox}_h(x) = \left[ \partial \left( h + \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \right) \right]^{-1}(x) \quad (12)$$

(in the sense of (6)).

*Proof:* Fix  $y \in \mathcal{H}$  arbitrarily. For  $s \in \mathcal{H}$ , the following equivalence holds:

$$s \in \partial J_x(y) \\ \Leftrightarrow \langle z - y, s \rangle + J_x(y) \leq J_x(z), \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{H} \\ \Leftrightarrow \langle z - y, s \rangle + h(y) + \frac{1}{2} \|y\|^2 - \langle y, x \rangle \\ \leq h(z) + \frac{1}{2} \|z\|^2 - \langle z, x \rangle, \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{H} \\ \Leftrightarrow \langle z - y, s + x \rangle + h(y) + \frac{1}{2} \|y\|^2 \leq h(z) + \frac{1}{2} \|z\|^2, \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{H} \\ \Leftrightarrow s \in \partial \left( h + \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \right)(y) - x,$$

which verifies (10). Now, let  $p \in \mathcal{H}$ . Then, from (10), the following equivalence holds:

$$p \in \underset{y \in \mathcal{H}}{\text{argmin}} J_x(y) \Leftrightarrow 0 \in \partial J_x(p) = \partial \left( h + \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \right)(p) - x \\ \Leftrightarrow x \in \partial \left( h + \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \right)(p) \Leftrightarrow p \in \left[ \partial \left( h + \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \right) \right]^{-1}(x),$$

which verifies (11).

When  $h + (1/2) \|\cdot\|^2$  is coercive and strictly convex, the coercivity and strict convexity of  $J_x$  ensures the existence and uniqueness of its minimizer, respectively, and thus (11), together with the definition of the proximity operator in (6), implies (12). ■

**Theorem 1** *Let  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ . Then, for every  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , the following two conditions are equivalent.*

- (C1)  $T = \text{s-Prox}_{\varphi}$  for some  $\varphi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  such that  $\varphi + ((1-\beta)/2) \|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ .
- (C2)  $T$  satisfies condition ♣, i.e., the following hold jointly.
  - 1)  $T = \nabla \psi$  for some Fréchet differentiable convex function  $\psi \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ .

2)  $T$  is  $\beta$ -cocoercive, or equivalently  $\beta^{-1}$ -Lipschitz continuous (by the Baillon Haddad theorem [49]).

In particular, the following statements hold.

(a) Assume that (C1) is satisfied. Define  $\check{\varphi} := \varphi + ((1 - \beta)/2) \|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ . Then, it holds that

$$T = \text{s-Prox}_{\varphi} = \nabla \underbrace{\left( \varphi + \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \right)^*}_{=\psi} = \nabla^{\beta}(\check{\varphi}^*), \quad (13)$$

which is  $\beta$ -cocoercive (thus  $\beta^{-1}$ -Lipschitz continuous and maximally monotone).

(b) Assume that (C2) is satisfied. Then, it holds that

$$T = \nabla\psi = \text{s-Prox}_{\psi^* - (1/2)\|\cdot\|^2}, \quad (14)$$

where

$$\varphi = \psi^* - \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \quad (15)$$

is  $(1 - \beta)$ -weakly convex.

*Proof:* C1  $\Rightarrow$  C2: For the sake of readability, we present a proof which the reader may follow directly with a minimal use of the known results in convex analysis.<sup>6</sup> Due to the convexity of  $\check{\varphi} := \varphi + ((1 - \beta)/2) \|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ , we have  $T^{-1} = \text{s-Prox}_{\check{\varphi}^{-1}} = \partial(\varphi + (1/2) \|\cdot\|^2) = \partial(\check{\varphi} + (\beta/2) \|\cdot\|^2) = \partial\check{\varphi} + \beta\text{Id}$  by Lemma 1. Given any fixed  $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ , let  $u \in T^{-1}(x)$  and  $v \in T^{-1}(y)$  ( $\Leftrightarrow x = T(u)$ ,  $y = T(v)$ ). Then, since  $T^{-1} - \beta\text{Id} = \partial\check{\varphi}$  is a monotone operator, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x - y, (u - \beta x) - (v - \beta y) \rangle &\geq 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow \langle x - y, u - v \rangle &\geq \beta \|x - y\|^2 \\ \Leftrightarrow \langle T(u) - T(v), u - v \rangle &\geq \beta \|T(u) - T(v)\|^2 \\ \Leftrightarrow \langle \beta T(u) - \beta T(v), u - v \rangle &\geq \|\beta T(u) - \beta T(v)\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the last inequality implies that  $T$  is  $\beta$ -cocoercive. On the other hand, for every  $y \in \mathcal{H}$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} [\beta(\check{\varphi}^*)]^*(y) &= \sup_{x \in \mathcal{H}} \left[ \langle x, y \rangle - \inf_{z \in \mathcal{H}} \left( \check{\varphi}^*(z) + \frac{1}{2\beta} \|z - x\|^2 \right) \right] \\ &= \sup_{x \in \mathcal{H}} \left[ \langle x, y \rangle + \sup_{z \in \mathcal{H}} \left( -\check{\varphi}^*(z) - \frac{1}{2\beta} \|z - x\|^2 \right) \right] \\ &= \sup_{z \in \mathcal{H}} \left[ -\check{\varphi}^*(z) + \sup_{x \in \mathcal{H}} \left( \langle x, y \rangle - \frac{1}{2\beta} \|z - x\|^2 \right) \right] \\ &= \sup_{z \in \mathcal{H}} \left[ -\check{\varphi}^*(z) + \langle z, y \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|y\|^2 \right] \\ &= \check{\varphi}^{**}(y) + \frac{\beta}{2} \|y\|^2 = \check{\varphi}(y) + \frac{\beta}{2} \|y\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where  $\check{\varphi}^{**} = \check{\varphi}$  because  $\check{\varphi} \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  by virtue of the Fenchel-Moreau theorem [40, Theorem 13.37]. From (17), it follows that

$$\left( \check{\varphi} + \frac{\beta}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \right)^* = [\beta(\check{\varphi}^*)]^{**} = \beta(\check{\varphi}^*) =: \psi, \quad (18)$$

where  $\beta(\check{\varphi}^*)$ , and thus  $\psi$ , is a Fréchet differentiable function with  $\beta^{-1}$ -Lipschitz continuous gradient (see Section II-E):

$$\nabla\psi = \nabla \left( \check{\varphi} + \frac{\beta}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \right)^* = \left[ \partial \left( \check{\varphi} + \frac{\beta}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 \right) \right]^{-1} = T. \quad (19)$$

<sup>6</sup>The proof can be shortened by using [40, Example 22.7] and [40, Example 14.1] to verify (16) and (18).




Fig. 1. A weakly convex function  $\varphi$ , a smooth function  $\psi$ , and the intermediate “neutrally” convex function  $\check{\varphi}$  between  $\varphi$  and the strongly convex function  $\psi^*$ .

The proof in this part also verifies Theorem 1(a).

C2  $\Rightarrow$  C1: We observe that  $T^{-1} = (\nabla\psi)^{-1} = \partial\psi^* = \partial(\varphi + (1/2) \|\cdot\|^2)$ , where  $\varphi := \psi^* - (1/2) \|\cdot\|^2$ . This leads to  $T = [\partial(\varphi + (1/2) \|\cdot\|^2)]^{-1} = \text{s-Prox}_{\varphi}$ . Here, the Fréchet differentiability of  $\psi$  and the  $\beta^{-1}$ -Lipschitz continuity of  $\nabla\psi$  imply  $\beta$ -strong convexity of the conjugate  $\psi^*$  [40, Theorem 18.15], and we thus obtain  $\varphi + ((1 - \beta)/2) \|\cdot\|^2 = \psi^* - (\beta/2) \|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ . The proof in this part also verifies Theorem 1(b). ■

The relations among  $\varphi$ ,  $\psi$ , and  $\check{\varphi}$  are depicted in Fig. 1. An application of Theorem 1(b) has been shown in [50], where an external division of two Moreau’s proximity operators is shown to be the proximity operator of a weakly convex function under a certain condition (see Example 4).

**Remark 1 (Alternative proof of Theorem 1(b))** *Theorem 1(b) could be proved using known results as follows. By [40, Theorem 18.15], there exists some  $\check{\varphi} \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\psi = \beta(\check{\varphi}^*)$ , and thus  $\psi^* = \check{\varphi} + (\beta/2) \|\cdot\|^2$  is  $\beta$ -strongly convex by [40, Proposition 13.24]. Hence, by Moreau’s decomposition, it follows that  $\nabla\psi = \beta^{-1}(\text{Id} - \text{s-Prox}_{\beta\check{\varphi}^*}) = \text{s-Prox}_{\beta^{-1}\check{\varphi}} \circ (\beta^{-1}\text{Id}) = \text{s-Prox}_{\beta^{-1}\psi^* - (1/2)\|\cdot\|^2} \circ (\beta^{-1}\text{Id}) = \text{s-Prox}_{\psi^* - (1/2)\|\cdot\|^2}$ , where the last inequality can be verified by the definition of proximity operator with some manipulations.*

## B. Extension of Moreau’s Decomposition

We show that Moreau’s decomposition (see Section II-E) can be extended to weakly convex functions.

**Proposition 2** *Let  $\varphi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be a proper function such that  $\check{\varphi} := \varphi + ((1 - \beta)/2) \|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  for  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ . Then, the following equalities hold:*

$$\text{s-Prox}_{\varphi} = \text{s-Prox}_{\check{\varphi}/\beta} \circ \beta^{-1}\text{Id}, \quad (20)$$

$$\text{Id} = \beta\text{s-Prox}_{\varphi} + \text{s-Prox}_{\beta\check{\varphi}^*}. \quad (21)$$

*Proof:* By using Moreau’s decomposition, it can be

verified that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \beta^{-1} (\text{Id} - \text{s-Prox}_{\beta\check{\varphi}^*}) (x) = \text{s-Prox}_{\beta^{-1}\check{\varphi}} (\beta^{-1}x) \\
& = \underset{y \in \mathcal{H}}{\text{argmin}} \left( \beta^{-1}\check{\varphi}(y) + \frac{1}{2} \|y - \beta^{-1}x\|^2 \right) \\
& = \underset{y \in \mathcal{H}}{\text{argmin}} \left( \varphi(y) + \frac{1-\beta}{2} \|y\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \|y - \beta^{-1}x\|^2 \right) \\
& = \underset{y \in \mathcal{H}}{\text{argmin}} \left( \varphi(y) + \frac{1}{2} \|y - x\|^2 + K_x \right) = \text{s-Prox}_{\varphi}(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $K_x := ((\beta^{-1} - 1)/2) \|x\|^2$  is constant in  $y$ . ■

The identity in (20) can be written equivalently as follows:

$$\underbrace{\text{s-Prox}_{\check{\varphi}/\beta}}_{\text{firmly nonexpansive}} = \underbrace{\text{s-Prox}_{\varphi}}_{\beta\text{-cocoercive}} \circ \beta \text{Id}. \quad (22)$$

The relation in (22) is consistent with Theorem 1 which shows  $\beta$ -cocoercivity of  $\text{s-Prox}_{\varphi}$  (see Lemma B.1 in Appendix B).

**Remark 2 (On Proposition 2)** *As opposed to the case of  $\text{s-Prox}_{\varphi}$  for the weakly convex function  $\varphi$ ,  $\text{s-Prox}_{\beta^{-1}\check{\varphi}}$  and  $\text{s-Prox}_{\beta\check{\varphi}^*}$  are the proximity operators in the sense of Moreau, because  $\beta^{-1}\check{\varphi}$  and  $\beta\check{\varphi}^*$  are convex. The identity in (20) gives an expression of the  $s$ -prox operator of the weakly convex function in terms of the “classical” proximity operator of the convex function  $\beta^{-1}\check{\varphi}$ . The identity in (21) resembles Moreau’s decomposition, but the essential difference is that  $\varphi$  is weakly convex. More specifically, (21) gives a way of decomposing a vector using the proximity operators of the weakly convex function  $\varphi$  and the convex function  $\check{\varphi}^*$ .*

Proposition 2 can be given in a general form as below.

**Proposition 3** *Let  $\phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  such that  $\check{\phi} := \phi + (\rho/2) \|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  for a positive constant  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ . Then, for any positive constant  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ , it holds that*

$$\text{s-Prox}_{\check{\phi}/\sigma} = \text{s-Prox}_{\phi/(\sigma+\rho)} \circ \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma+\rho} \text{Id} \right), \quad (23)$$

$$\text{Id} = \text{s-Prox}_{\sigma\check{\phi}^*} + \sigma \text{s-Prox}_{\phi/(\sigma+\rho)} \circ (\sigma + \rho)^{-1} \text{Id}. \quad (24)$$

*Proof:* Let  $\varphi := \phi/(\sigma + \rho)$  in (22). Then,  $\varphi$  is  $(1 - \beta)$ -weakly convex for  $\beta := \sigma/(\sigma + \rho) \in (0, 1)$ , and we thus obtain (23). Using Moreau’s decomposition (7) and then applying (23) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Id} &= \text{s-Prox}_{\sigma\check{\phi}^*} + \sigma \text{s-Prox}_{\check{\phi}/\sigma} \circ (\sigma^{-1} \text{Id}) \\
&= \text{s-Prox}_{\sigma\check{\phi}^*} + \sigma \text{s-Prox}_{\phi/(\sigma+\rho)} \circ (\sigma + \rho)^{-1} \text{Id}. \quad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

#### IV. OPERATOR-REGULARIZATION APPROACHES — CHARACTERIZATION OF IMPLICIT REGULARIZER AND CONVERGENCE TO OPTIMAL POINT

We have seen that a MoL-Grad denoiser satisfying condition ♣ can always be expressed as  $T = \text{s-Prox}_{\varphi}$  for the  $(1 - \beta)$ -weakly convex function  $\varphi = \psi^* - (1/2) \|\cdot\|^2$  (Theorem 1). We use this fundamental result to make the plug-and-play methods

“transparent”. More specifically, we consider operator splitting algorithms with the proximity operator(s) replaced by our MoL-Grad denoiser  $T$ , which accommodates prior information (often implicitly) such as the data distribution.

We shall show that such plug-and-play methods (employing our denoiser  $T = \nabla\psi$ ) asymptotically optimize a certain cost function in the sense of generating a vector sequence convergent to its minimizer. Here, the cost function involves an *implicit “operator-inducing” regularizer* which depends on  $\varphi = \psi^* - (1/2) \|\cdot\|^2$ . In this way, the loss function is implicitly regularized by the denoiser  $T$ , as opposed to the case of the traditional *functional-regularization* approaches which explicitly regularize the loss by some penalty functions.

In the following, two specific *operator-regularization* algorithms are studied. A generic way of applying the same idea systematically to different algorithms is then presented.

##### A. Forward-Backward Splitting Type Algorithm

Based on the results given in Section III, we show that the algorithm in (1) with a MoL-Grad denoiser  $T$  converges to a solution of an optimization problem.

**Theorem 2** *Let  $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  be a  $\kappa$ -smooth  $\rho$ -strongly-convex function with  $\kappa > \rho > 0$ . Assume that  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  satisfies condition ♣ for  $\beta \in ((\kappa - \rho)/(\kappa + \rho), 1) \subsetneq (0, 1)$  so that the Lipschitz constant is bounded by  $\beta^{-1} < (\kappa + \rho)/(\kappa - \rho)$ . Set  $\mu \in [(1 - \beta)/\rho, (1 + \beta)/\kappa)$ . Then, the following hold.*

- 1) *Let  $\hat{f} := f - [(1 - \beta)/(2\mu)] \|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  and  $\check{\varphi} := \varphi + [(1 - \beta)/2] \|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  so that  $\mu\hat{f} + \check{\varphi} = \mu f + \varphi$ . Then, it holds that*

$$T \circ (\text{Id} - \mu\nabla f) = \text{s-Prox}_{\beta^{-1}\check{\varphi}} \circ (\text{Id} - \beta^{-1}\mu\nabla\hat{f}) \quad (26)$$

*with  $\beta^{-1} \in (1, 2/L_{\mu\nabla\hat{f}})$ , where  $L_{\mu\nabla\hat{f}} := \mu\kappa - (1 - \beta) > 0$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $\mu\nabla\hat{f}$ .*

- 2) *Suppose that  $\mu f + \varphi$  has a minimizer in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then, for an arbitrary  $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ , the sequence  $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}$  generated by (1) converges weakly to a minimizer  $\hat{x}$  of  $\mu f + \varphi$ . (In this case,  $\varphi$  is the implicit regularizer.)*

*Proof:* 1) Since  $\mu \geq (1 - \beta)/\rho \Leftrightarrow \rho \geq (1 - \beta)/\mu$ , the  $\rho$ -strong convexity of  $f$  immediately implies  $\hat{f} \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ . On the other hand, since  $\varphi$  is  $(1 - \beta)$ -weakly convex by Theorem 1,  $\check{\varphi} \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  follows. Now, using Theorem 1(b) and Proposition 2, we can verify that

$$\begin{aligned}
T \circ (\text{Id} - \mu\nabla f) &= \text{s-Prox}_{\varphi} \circ (\text{Id} - \mu\nabla f) \\
&= \text{s-Prox}_{\beta^{-1}\check{\varphi}} \circ (\beta^{-1} \text{Id} - \beta^{-1}\mu\nabla f) \\
&= \text{s-Prox}_{\beta^{-1}\check{\varphi}} \circ (\text{Id} - \beta^{-1}\mu\nabla\hat{f}).
\end{aligned}$$

It can be verified that  $L_{\mu\nabla\hat{f}} = \mu\kappa - (1 - \beta) > \mu\rho - (1 - \beta) \geq 0$ , where the assumption  $\mu \geq (1 - \beta)/\rho$  is used again to verify the last inequality. On the other hand, we observe that  $\mu < (1 + \beta)/\kappa \Leftrightarrow \mu\kappa - (1 - \beta) < 2\beta \Leftrightarrow \beta^{-1} < 2/(\mu\kappa - (1 - \beta)) = 2/L_{\mu\nabla\hat{f}}$ , and thus  $\beta^{-1} < 2/L_{\mu\nabla\hat{f}}$  is verified. Finally, since  $\nabla f$  is  $\kappa$ -Lipschitz continuous by the assumption, it is not difficult to see that  $\mu\nabla\hat{f} = \mu\nabla f - (1 - \beta)\text{Id}$  is  $(\mu\kappa - (1 - \beta))$ -Lipschitz continuous (see, e.g., [51, Lemma 8]).

2) By Theorem 2.1, (1) can be regarded as the forward-backward splitting iterate for the sum of the convex functions  $\mu\hat{f}$  and  $\tilde{\varphi}$  with the step size  $\beta^{-1} \in (1, 2/L_{\mu\hat{f}})$ . Hence, from the standard argument of the forward-backward splitting method (see, e.g., [48, Example 17.6]), the composition  $\text{s-Prox}_{\beta^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}} \circ (\text{Id} - \beta^{-1}\mu\nabla\hat{f})$  is an averaged nonexpansive operator with the fixed-point set  $\text{Fix}(\text{s-Prox}_{\beta^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}} \circ (\text{Id} - \beta^{-1}\mu\nabla\hat{f})) = \text{argmin}_{x \in \mathcal{H}}[\mu\hat{f}(x) + \tilde{\varphi}(x)] = \text{argmin}_{x \in \mathcal{H}}[\mu f(x) + \varphi(x)] \neq \emptyset$ , where the nonemptiness is due to the assumption. The classical Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterate (see Fact 1) thus ensures weak convergence of  $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  to a fixed point which is a minimizer of  $\mu f(x) + \varphi(x)$ .  $\blacksquare$

The existence (and uniqueness) of minimizer of  $\mu f + \varphi$  is ensured if  $\mu\rho > 1 - \beta$ . The case that  $f$  is not strongly convex has been addressed in [50].

**Remark 3 (On Theorem 2)** If  $\beta \approx 1$  (i.e.,  $T$  is nearly nonexpansive), the range of  $\mu$  is approximately identical to  $(0, 2/\kappa)$ . Meanwhile, if  $\kappa \approx \rho$ , the range of  $\beta$  is nearly  $(0, 1)$ , meaning that the Lipschitz constant  $\beta^{-1}$  of  $T$  could be an arbitrary real number virtually. However, focusing on the gap with respect to the range of  $\mu$ , we observe that  $(1 + \beta)/\kappa - (1 - \beta)/\rho = K_{\kappa, \rho}(\beta(\kappa + \rho)/(\kappa - \rho) - 1) > 0$  with  $K_{\kappa, \rho} := \rho^{-1} - \kappa^{-1} > 0$ , where the strict positivity of the gap is verified by  $\beta > (\kappa - \rho)/(\kappa + \rho)$ . This suggests that, in case that  $\beta^{-1}$  is significantly large so that  $\beta \approx (\kappa - \rho)/(\kappa + \rho)$ , the gap of  $\mu$  vanishes.

### B. Primal-Dual Splitting Type Algorithm

We now build a framework which could be applied to a wider class of problems involving total variation, for instance, where a bounded linear operator  $L : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  will be used in the algorithm. Here,  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  are real Hilbert spaces equipped with the inner products  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ ,  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$ , and the induced norms  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{U}}$ , respectively. We define the operator norm  $\|L\| := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{H}, \|x\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 1} \|Lx\|_{\mathcal{U}}$ . The adjoint operator of  $L$  is denoted by  $L^* : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ . With a nonlinear operator  $T : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ , we consider the following algorithm inspired by the Condat-Vũ algorithm [8, 9].

#### Algorithm 1

**Initialization:**  $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}$

**Requirements:**  $\sigma > 0$ ,  $\tau > 0$ ,  $\rho > 0$

$$\tilde{u}_{k+1} := u_k + \sigma Lx_k$$

$$u_{k+1} := \tilde{u}_{k+1} - \sigma T \left( \left( \sigma + \frac{\rho}{\|L\|^2} \right)^{-1} \tilde{u}_{k+1} \right)$$

$$x_{k+1} := \left( \text{Id} + \frac{\tau\rho}{\|L\|^2} L^*L \right) x_k - \tau \nabla f(x_k) - \tau L^*(2u_{k+1} - u_k)$$

**Theorem 3** Let  $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  be a smooth  $\rho$ -strongly convex function for  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$  so that the function

$$\Gamma_0(\mathcal{H}) \ni \hat{f} : x \mapsto f(x) - \frac{\rho}{2\|L\|^2} \|Lx\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2 \quad (27)$$

is  $\kappa$ -smooth for some  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ . Assume that  $T : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  satisfies condition  $\clubsuit$  for some  $\psi \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ . Set the step sizes  $\sigma, \tau > 0$  such that

- (i)  $\sigma \leq \frac{\rho\beta}{\|L\|^2(1-\beta)}$ ,
- (ii)  $\tau \left( \sigma \|L\|^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2} \right) < 1$ .

Then, for arbitrary  $(x_0, u_0) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{U}$ , the sequences  $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}$  and  $(u_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}$  generated by Algorithm 1 converge weakly to solutions  $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{U}$  of the following primal and dual problems, respectively:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{H}} f(x) + g(Lx), \quad (28)$$

$$\min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{f}^*(-L^*u) + \check{g}^*(u), \quad (29)$$

provided that such solutions exist. Here,

$$g := \left( \sigma + \frac{\rho}{\|L\|^2} \right) \varphi = \left( \sigma + \frac{\rho}{\|L\|^2} \right) \left( \psi^* - \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2 \right), \quad (30)$$

$$\check{g} := g + \frac{\rho}{2\|L\|^2} \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2 \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{U}) \quad (31)$$

satisfy  $f + g \circ L = \hat{f} + \check{g} \circ L \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ . (In this case,  $g \circ L$  is the implicit regularizer.)

*Proof:* First of all,  $\mathcal{H} \ni x \mapsto (\rho/2)\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - (\rho/(2\|L\|^2))\|Lx\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2$  is a convex function due to the positive semidefiniteness of  $\text{Id} - L^*L/\|L\|^2$ . This, together with the  $\rho$ -strong convexity of  $f$ , implies that  $\hat{f} = f - (\rho/(2\|L\|^2))\|L\cdot\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2$  is convex.

Since  $\varphi$  is  $(1 - \beta)$ -weakly convex by Theorem 1,  $g = (\sigma + \rho/\|L\|^2)\varphi$  is  $(\sigma + \rho/\|L\|^2)(1 - \beta)$ -weakly convex. On the other hand, condition (i) of the theorem implies that  $(\sigma + \rho/\|L\|^2)(1 - \beta) \leq \rho/\|L\|^2$ , and hence  $\check{g}$  is convex as well.

We show that Algorithm 1 is obtained by applying the Condat-Vũ algorithm to the primal and dual problems, (28) and (29). By  $\nabla \hat{f}(x_k) = \nabla f(x_k) - (\rho/\|L\|^2)L^*Lx_k$ , the last recursion of Algorithm 1 can be rewritten as

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \tau \nabla \hat{f}(x_k) - \tau L^*(2u_{k+1} - u_k). \quad (32)$$

We shall now show that the first two recursions can be expressed as

$$u_{k+1} = \text{s-Prox}_{\sigma\check{g}^*}(u_k + \sigma Lx_k), \quad (33)$$

because the set of recursions (32) and (33) gives (a non-relaxation version of) the Condat-Vũ iteration (form II) [11]. Indeed, the formulation in [11] involves three functions  $f$ ,  $g$ , and  $h$ , each of which corresponds to the zero function,  $\check{g}$ , and  $\hat{f}$ , respectively, in our case. Once (33) is proved, the convergence follows immediately by [11, Theorem 7.1] under condition (ii).

Letting  $\phi := g$  in Proposition 3 yields

$$\text{s-Prox}_{\sigma\check{g}^*} = \text{Id} - \sigma \text{s-Prox}_{g/(\sigma + \rho/\|L\|^2)} \circ \left( \sigma + \frac{\rho}{\|L\|^2} \right)^{-1} \text{Id}, \quad (34)$$




Fig. 2. A schematic diagram of the derivation of Algorithm 1.

which, together with  $T = s\text{-Prox}_{\varphi} = s\text{-Prox}_{g/(\sigma+\rho/\|L\|^2)}$  by Theorem 1, verifies

$$s\text{-Prox}_{\sigma\tilde{g}^*} = \text{Id} - \sigma T \circ \left( \sigma + \frac{\rho}{\|L\|^2} \right)^{-1} \text{Id}. \quad (35)$$

The identity in (35) justifies the expression in (33), and this completes the proof. ■

**Remark 4 (Parameter design)** From (30), the optimization problem (28) which Algorithm 1 actually solves depends on the dual step-size  $\sigma$  as well as  $\varphi$  which is associated with  $T$ . Note here that  $\rho$  and  $L$  are assumed to be given. Specifically, the parameter  $\sigma$  governs the weight of the regularizer (prior)  $\varphi$  relative to  $f$ , and a tuning parameter  $\delta \in (0, 1]$  can be introduced to control the weight as  $\sigma := \delta\rho\beta/[\|L\|^2(1-\beta)]$ . It should be remarked that changing the tuning parameter(s) in  $T$  (if any) may scale  $\varphi$  as well as  $\beta$  which determines the upper bound of  $\sigma$  (see condition (i) of Theorem 3). The primal step size  $\tau$  only affects the convergence speed; it can simply be set to  $\tau := \gamma(\sigma\|L\|^2 + \kappa/2)^{-1}$ , where  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  (our recommended choice is  $\gamma := 0.9$ ).

### C. A Systematic Way of Building Operator-Regularization Algorithms using MoL-Grad with Convergence Guarantee

We have seen in Section IV-B that Algorithm 1 minimizes  $f + g \circ L$  (and  $\hat{f}^* \circ (-L^*) + \tilde{g}^*$  at the same time) under the conditions. But, *how can we derive such an algorithm?* The derivation process of Algorithm 1 is illustrated in Fig. 2, elaborated below in a step-by-step manner.

Suppose that we would like to plug a (well-performing) MoL-Grad denoiser  $T$  into the primal-dual splitting algorithm. Since such a  $T$  is the proximity operator of a weakly convex function (Theorem 1), we start with the convex objective  $f + g \circ L$  with  $g$  weakly convex. First, we define  $\hat{f}$  and  $\tilde{g}$  as in (27) and (31), respectively, which satisfy  $f + g \circ L = \hat{f} + \tilde{g} \circ L$ . Second, the primal-dual algorithm is applied to the sum  $\hat{f} + \tilde{g} \circ L$  of convex functions to obtain the set of recursions (32) and (33). Third, Proposition 3 is applied to  $s\text{-Prox}_{\sigma\hat{g}^*}$  to obtain (34), and then  $s\text{-Prox}_{g/(\sigma+\rho/\|L\|^2)}$  is replaced by  $T$  to obtain (35). Note here that the  $(1-\beta)$ -weak convexity of  $g/(\sigma+\rho/\|L\|^2)$  matches condition ♣ of MoL-Grad denoiser under Theorem 1. Finally, plugging (35) into (33) yields Algorithm 1.

The point is that the denoiser can be expressed as  $T = s\text{-Prox}_{g/(\sigma+\rho/\|L\|^2)}$  based on Theorem 1, which is further

linked to the (Moreau's) proximity operator by Proposition 3. Thanks to this link, Algorithm 1 has been shown to minimize  $f + g \circ L$  with the operator-inducing function  $g$  given in (30). In general, given an arbitrary operator splitting algorithm, the proximity operator(s) employed can be replaced systematically by any MoL-Grad denoiser(s) by the following steps.

**Step 0.** Suppose that we are given an operator splitting algorithm in which the proximity operator wants to be replaced by a MoL-Grad denoiser  $T$ . The associated optimization problem typically involves a smooth function  $f$  and a prox-friendly convex function  $g$  (or possibly multiple such functions) which is possibly composed with a bounded linear operator. As opposed to this standard setting, we suppose that  $g$  is weakly convex (and possibly other prox-friendly functions could also be so) while  $f$  is strongly convex so that the whole objective  $f + g \circ L$  is convex.

**Step 1.** Add a quadratic function to the weakly convex function, and subtract its corresponding quadratic function from the strongly convex function in such a way that (a) the sum remains the same, (b) the weakly convex function is convexified, and (c) the strongly convex function remains convex. By doing so, a convex optimization problem is obtained with the same objective.

**Step 2.** Apply the operator splitting algorithm to the convex optimization problem obtained in step 1.

**Step 3.** Apply Proposition 3 (or Proposition 2), and replace the proximity operator of  $g$  (of some index) by the  $T$  (and also replace those of the other functions by other MoL-Grad denoisers).

Through the above steps, the obtained algorithm involves no proximity operator anymore in an explicit form. By the same principle as stated above for Algorithm 1, however, it iteratively solves an optimization problem involving an implicit regularizer(s) which is induced by the denoiser  $T$ .

## V. EXAMPLES AND RELATION TO PRIOR WORK

We present examples of MoL-Grad denoiser, or equivalently the proximity operator of weakly convex function in the sense of (6), and we then discuss the relation to prior work. In the Euclidean space setting, we use the standard notation  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and  $\|\cdot\|_2$  for the  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$  norms of vector, respectively, and  $(\cdot)^T$  for matrix transposition.



### A. Shrinkage Operators for Scalar

Below are a selection of typical shrinkage operators.

1) *Soft shrinkage*: The soft shrinkage operator  $\text{soft}_\lambda : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for the threshold  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$  defined by

$$\text{soft}(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| \leq \lambda \\ x - \lambda & \text{if } x > \lambda \\ x + \lambda & \text{if } x < -\lambda \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

is the proximity operator of the convex function  $\lambda|\cdot|$ . The soft shrinkage operator is a MoL-Grad denoiser for an arbitrary  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  because it is (firmly) nonexpansive.

2) *Firm shrinkage*: The firm shrinkage operator  $\text{firm}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for the thresholds  $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$  and  $\lambda_2 \in (\lambda_1, +\infty)$  defined by [52]

$$\text{firm}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| \leq \lambda_1 \\ \text{sign}(x) \frac{\lambda_2(|x| - \lambda_1)}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1} & \text{if } \lambda_1 < |x| \leq \lambda_2 \\ x & \text{if } |x| > \lambda_2 \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

is the proximity operator  $\text{s-Prox}_\varphi$  of the following  $\lambda_1/\lambda_2$ -weakly convex function  $\varphi := \lambda_1 \varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}$ , where

$$\varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}(x) := \begin{cases} |x| - \frac{1}{2\lambda_2} x^2 & \text{if } |x| \leq \lambda_2 \\ \frac{1}{2}\lambda_2 & \text{if } |x| > \lambda_2 \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

is the minimax concave (MC) penalty [17, 29, 51].

3) *Garrote shrinkage*: The garrote shrinkage (nonnegative garrote thresholding) operator  $\text{garrote}_\lambda : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for the threshold  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$  defined by [53]

$$\text{garrote}_\lambda(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| \leq \lambda \\ x - \frac{\lambda^2}{x} & \text{if } |x| > \lambda \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

is the proximity operator  $\text{s-Prox}_\varphi$  of the following  $1/2$ -weakly convex function:

$$\varphi(x) := \frac{1}{4} \left( |x| \sqrt{x^2 + 4\lambda^2} - x^2 \right) + \lambda^2 \left[ \log(|x| + \sqrt{x^2 + 4\lambda^2}) - \log 2\lambda \right]. \quad (40)$$

Note that the hard shrinkage operator is *not* the proximity operator of any weakly convex function (in the sense of (6)) because of its discontinuity.

### B. Shrinkage Operators for Vector

**Definition 1 (Moreau enhanced model [29, 30])** Given a convex function  $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ , its Moreau enhanced model of index  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$  is defined by

$$f_\lambda : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty] : x \mapsto f(x) - \lambda f(x). \quad (41)$$

Using this notion, the MC function  $\varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}$  can be expressed as the Moreau enhanced model of the absolute-value function  $|\cdot|$  of index  $\lambda_2$ ; i.e.,  $\varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}(x) = (|\cdot|)_{\lambda_2}$  [29, Proposition 12].

**Example 1 (Firm-shrinkage for vector)** Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an arbitrary Hilbert space equipped with a norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . For positive constants  $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$  and  $\lambda_2 \in (\lambda_1, +\infty)$ , we define the vector firm-shrinkage operator:

$$T_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{\text{v-firm}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} : (0 \neq) x \mapsto \frac{x}{\|x\|} \text{firm}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(\|x\|) \quad (42)$$

with  $T_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{\text{v-firm}}(0) := 0$ . Then,  $T_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{\text{v-firm}}$  is the proximity operator of the  $(\lambda_1/\lambda_2)$ -weakly convex function  $\lambda_1(\|\cdot\|)_{\lambda_2}$ , where  $(\|\cdot\|)_{\lambda_2} := \|\cdot\| - \lambda_2 \|\cdot\| = \varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}} \circ \|\cdot\|$ .

*Proof*: See Appendix C. ■

**Example 2 (Group firm-shrinkage)** Let  $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \dots, \mathcal{H}_G$  be real Hilbert spaces equipped with the norms  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}, \dots, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_G}$ , respectively, and define the product space  $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}_G$  equipped with the norm  $\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}} := \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^G \|x_i\|_{\mathcal{H}_i}^2}$ ,  $x := (x_i)_{i=1}^G \in \mathcal{H}$ . Given constants  $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$  and  $\lambda_2 \in (\lambda_1, +\infty)$ , we define the group firm-shrinkage operator:

$$T_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{\text{g-firm}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} : (x_i)_{i=1}^G \mapsto (T_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{\text{v-firm}}(x_i))_{i=1}^G, \quad (43)$$

where  $T_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{\text{v-firm}}$  is defined by (42) in each space. Then,  $T_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{\text{g-firm}}$  is the proximity operator of the  $(\lambda_1/\lambda_2)$ -weakly convex function  $\lambda_1(\|\cdot\|_{\text{g},1})_{\lambda_2}$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{g},1} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ : (x_i)_{i=1}^G \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^G \|x_i\|_{\mathcal{H}_i}$ .

*Proof*: See Appendix D. ■

**Example 3 (Neural Network with Tied Weights)** Let  $\nabla\psi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  be a firmly-nonexpansive activation operator, such as ReLU, sigmoid, and softmax [2]. Let  $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  be a nonzero weight matrix. Then, a weight-tied neural network [54]  $T := \mathbf{W}^\top \circ \nabla\psi \circ \mathbf{W} = \nabla(\psi \circ \mathbf{W})$  can be expressed as  $T = \text{s-Prox}_\varphi$  with  $\varphi := (\psi \circ \mathbf{W})^* - (1/2)\|\cdot\|_2^2$ . Here, if  $\kappa := \|\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W}\| > 1$ ,  $T$  is a MoL-Grad denoiser, and  $\varphi$  is  $(1-\kappa^{-1})$ -weakly convex; if  $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ ,  $T$  is Moreau's proximity operator of the convex function  $\varphi$ .

**Example 4 (Debiased OSCAR)** Given constants  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ , the octagonal shrinkage and clustering algorithm for regression (OSCAR) [55–57] is defined by

$$\Omega_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{\text{OSCAR}} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \lambda_1 \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 + \lambda_2 \sum_{i < j} \max\{|x_i|, |x_j|\}.$$

For  $\omega, \eta \in (1, +\infty)$ , the operator

$$T_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \omega, \eta}^{\text{DOSCAR}} := \omega \text{s-Prox}_{\Omega_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{\text{OSCAR}}} - (1-\omega) \text{s-Prox}_{\eta \Omega_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{\text{OSCAR}}} \quad (44)$$

is called the debiased OSCAR (DOSCAR) [50]. The operator  $T_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \omega, \eta}^{\text{DOSCAR}}$  is the proximity operator of a certain weakly convex function.

### C. Relation to Prior Work

**Gradient-step denoiser**: The so-called gradient-step denoiser has been studied in the literature [38, 58, 59]. Among those studies, the most relevant results would be the one in [38, Proposition 3.1], which are, however, based on a restrictive assumption. Specifically, [38, Proposition 3.1] assumes essentially that  $\text{Id} - \nabla\psi$  is contraction ( $\kappa$ -Lipschitz continuous for  $\kappa < 1$ ), and this assumption induces the positive definiteness of the Jacobian of  $T$  as well as the smoothness of  $\varphi$ . This excludes important operators, such as the firm/garrote shrinkage (Section V-A), and weight-tied neural networks (Example 3)

with saturating activation functions (such as ReLU) for which it holds that  $\nabla^2\psi(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{O}$  at some  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ .

**Characterization of the limit point for plug-and-play method:** In [36, Proposition 3.1], a characterization of the limit point of the vector sequence generated by the forward-backward splitting algorithm using the plug-and-play method has been presented through variational inequalities for a general family of maximally monotone operator. While the scope therein is wider in the sense that their analysis covers a general case rather than focusing solely on optimization, the operator considered therein is neural network denoisers. In addition, we explicitly showed in Section IV-B that, when the plug-and-play is applied to the primal-dual splitting algorithm, it is still possible to ensure the convergence to an optimal point with a slight modification. We repeat that the operator is not necessarily nonexpansive in our case, whereas it is supposed to be firmly nonexpansive in [36, Proposition 3.1].

**Characterization of implicit regularizer:** In [2], the softmax activation function is shown to be Moreau’s proximity operator of a certain convex function by using [40, Corollary 24.5], which is related to, but is different from, Theorem 1(b). Specifically, [40, Corollary 24.5] states that, given  $\varphi \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  and  $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\varphi = f - (1/2)\|\cdot\|^2$ , it holds that  $\text{s-Prox}_\varphi = \nabla f^*$ . Here,  $\varphi$  is implicitly assumed to be 1-strongly convex. Meanwhile, by changing  $\psi^*$  in Theorem 1(b) by  $f$ , it can essentially be stated as follows: given  $\varphi + ((1-\beta)/2)\|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  and  $f - (\beta/2)\|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  with  $\varphi = f - (1/2)\|\cdot\|^2$ , it holds that  $\text{s-Prox}_\varphi = \nabla f^*$ . Here,  $\varphi$  is  $(1-\beta)$ -weakly convex (while  $f$  is  $\beta$ -strongly convex) in contrast to the former case.

**Proximity operator of nonconvex function:** In [45], it has been shown that, given a proper lower semicontinuous function, it is weakly convex if and only if its proximity operator is cocoercive. The arguments therein are based on the notion of *abstract subgradient*, while our arguments are based solely on the standard subgradient (see Section II-A) adopted in convex analysis. In [44], on the other hand, the proximity operator of nonconvex (possibly nonseparable) function has been studied in a general Hilbert space from a different scope. In fact, Theorem 1 was inspired by [44, Proposition 2]. In [44], the proximity operator is defined as a set-valued operator, as in the most studies on the proximity operator of nonconvex function, and the optimization aspect has not been discussed. In sharp contrast to the studies in [44, 45], our s-prox operator is defined as a “unique” minimizer of the penalized function in (6). This is because our primal focus is on the explainability perspective of optimization algorithms, and because for this reason our denoiser is continuous (see Proposition 1). The single-valuedness of the s-prox operator brings the exact relation between  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$ , which clarifies what function is optimized by the modified operator splitting algorithm (see Section IV).

**Proximity operator of weakly convex function in a linear inverse problem:** In [51], the proximity operator (in the sense of (6) essentially) of weakly convex functions has been studied in a linear inverse problem, and the convergence of the forward-backward splitting algorithm with the s-prox operator has been analyzed. While the main results therein are related to

Theorem 2, the present study has a wider scope. Specifically, it includes Theorem 1, Propositions 2 and 3, and Theorem 3 as well as the discussions in Section IV-C to make the idea be applicable to other operator splitting algorithms. Moreover, the study in [51] considers the case that (i)  $\mathcal{H}$  is the Euclidean space, and (ii) the range of  $\varphi$  is  $\mathbb{R}$ , whereas the present study concerns the case that (i)  $\mathcal{H}$  is a general Hilbert space, and (ii)  $\varphi$  may take the value  $+\infty$ .

**Other related works:** There are some other related works. In [33], a class of “separable” shrinkage operators (i.e., one-dimensional shrinkage operators essentially) and their induced penalty functions have been studied. In [60], a study on one-dimensional monotone operators has been presented, showing that “a non-decreasing non-constant function with at most a countable number of discontinuities” can be expressed as a “selection” of the (set-valued) proximity operator of a weakly convex function. Although those studies are related to Theorem 1, the scope of the present study is different in the sense that it concerns the operator-regularization approaches explicitly based on the s-prox operator of nonseparable weakly-convex function defined on a Hilbert space.

## VI. SIMULATIONS

Simulations are conducted to show (i) how the theory works in practice and (ii) how the generalized proximity operator competes with Moreau’s one. For this purpose, the firm shrinkage operator will be adopted as the MoL-Grad denoiser  $T$  in Algorithm 1.

### A. Firm Shrinkage Plugged into Algorithm 1

We consider the linear system model  $\mathbf{y} := \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_\diamond + \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_\diamond \in \mathcal{H} := \mathbb{R}^n$  is the  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean vector to estimate,  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  is the sensing matrix, and  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the noise vector. We consider the overdetermined case  $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) > 0$ , where  $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$  denotes the smallest eigenvalue. (See [50] for the case of  $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) = 0$ .) We suppose that  $\mathbf{x}_\diamond$  is piecewise constant so that the difference vector  $\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x} = [x_1 - x_2, x_2 - x_3, \dots, x_{n-1} - x_n]^\top$  is sparse, where  $\mathbf{D} := [\mathbf{I} \ \mathbf{0}] - [\mathbf{0} \ \mathbf{I}] \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times n}$  with the identity matrix  $\mathbf{I}$  and the zero vector  $\mathbf{0}$  of length  $n-1$ . We therefore let  $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1} =: \mathcal{U} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}$ . The data fidelity term is set to  $f(\mathbf{x}) := (1/2)\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2$ . In this case, since the Hessian matrices of  $f$  and  $\hat{f}$  are given by  $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$  and  $\nabla^2 \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} - (\rho/\|\mathbf{D}\|^2)\mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{D}$ , respectively, at every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $f$  is  $\rho$ -strongly convex for  $\rho := \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})$ , and  $\hat{f}$  is  $\kappa$ -smooth for  $\kappa := \|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} - (\rho/\|\mathbf{D}\|^2)\mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{D}\|$ .

Recall that the firm shrinkage given in (37) has two parameters  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$ , and its corresponding weakly convex function is  $\varphi := \lambda_1 \varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}$  with  $\varphi + (\lambda_1/(2\lambda_2))\|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , which means that  $\beta = 1 - \lambda_1/\lambda_2$ . Hence, in view of Theorem 3, under an appropriate setting, the sequence  $(\mathbf{x}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  generated by Algorithm 1 converges to a solution of the following minimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) + [\sigma + \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})/\|\mathbf{D}\|^2]\lambda_1 \varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}). \quad (45)$$

From (45), the impact of the regularizer  $\varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}$  scales with  $\lambda_1$  as well as the dual step size  $\sigma$ .

As mentioned in Remark 4, the  $\sigma$  satisfying condition (i) in Theorem 3 can be parametrized by  $\delta \in (0, 1]$  as  $\sigma := \delta(\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) / \|\mathbf{D}\|^2)[(\lambda_2/\lambda_1) - 1] > 0$ , making (45) into

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) + \mu^{-1} \varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}), \quad (46)$$

where  $\mu := \|\mathbf{D}\|^2 / [\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})((1-\delta)\lambda_1 + \delta\lambda_2)] > 0$ . Here,  $\|\mathbf{D}\|^2$  and  $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})$  serve as a sort of normalizer, while  $(1-\delta)\lambda_1 + \delta\lambda_2 \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$  weights the regularizer  $\varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}$  relative to  $f$ ; increasing  $\delta$  shifts the weight from  $\lambda_1$  to  $\lambda_2$ .

Letting  $\delta := 1$ , or equivalently setting  $\sigma$  to its upper bound, reduces (45) to

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{\lambda_2 \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})}{\|\mathbf{D}\|^2} \varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}), \quad (47)$$

which is independent of  $\lambda_1$ . Note here that the dependence on  $\lambda_1$  is eliminated by condition (i) to guarantee convexity of the overall cost  $f + g \circ L$ . As such, the performance of Algorithm 1 in this case is governed solely by  $\lambda_2$ , given the matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$ . This might be advantageous in practice, because  $\lambda_2$  is the only parameter to tune, unless one cares the speed of convergence.

### B. Experimental Verification of Theorem 3

Since  $\varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}} = \|\cdot\|_1 - \lambda_2(\|\cdot\|_1)$ , (46) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \underbrace{\mu f(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda_2(\|\cdot\|_1)(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})}_{=\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})} + \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_1. \quad (48)$$

As  $\tilde{f} := \mu f - \lambda_2(\|\cdot\|_1) \circ \mathbf{D}$  is a smooth convex function with its gradient available in a closed form, the minimization problem in (48) can be solved by the operator splitting algorithm such as the primal-dual splitting method with convergence guarantee.<sup>7</sup> To demonstrate the validity of Theorem 3 by simulation, we apply the Condat–Vũ algorithm (form II) to (48) to see whether Algorithm 1 converges to the same point. We show, more specifically, that the discrepancy is vanishing between  $(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k)$  of Algorithm 1 and  $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k)$  of the Condat–Vũ algorithm applied to (48), where “discrepancy” is quantified as follows:

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_k - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_k - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_k\|_2^2}. \quad (49)$$

We let  $n := 256$ ,  $m = 1024$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_\diamond$  depicted in Fig. 3 is used. For Algorithm 1, we set  $\delta := 1$ ,  $\tau := 0.9(\sigma \|\mathbf{D}\|^2 + \kappa/2)^{-1}$ ,  $\lambda_1 := 2.5$ , and  $\lambda_2 := 5$ . We repeat that  $\lambda_1$  does not change the solution, see (47). For the approach based on (48), we set  $\sigma := 0.2$ , and all other parameters are the same as for Algorithm 1. Figure 2 plots the discrepancy given in (49) (which is labeled as ‘ $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}$ ’); the discrepancy in terms of the primal variables and that in terms of the dual variables are also plotted, labeled as ‘ $\mathbf{x}$ ’ and ‘ $\mathbf{u}$ ’, respectively. It can be seen that the discrepancy vanishes as time goes by.

<sup>7</sup>This is possible in this specific example, because the function  $\varphi$  corresponding to the firm shrinkage is available. In general,  $\varphi$  could be unavailable, and thus this kind of approach cannot be used in such a case.




Fig. 3. The vector  $\mathbf{x}_\diamond$  used in the simulation.




Fig. 4. Agreement of the learning curves in line with Theorem 3.

For a comparison, we also test a straightforward approach (which has no theoretical guarantee): apply the Condat–Vũ algorithm (form II) directly to the nonconvex formulation (46), which is essentially the same as (48). Here,  $\text{s-Prox}_{\sigma g^*}$  appearing in the algorithm is replaced<sup>8</sup> by  $\text{Id} - \sigma \text{s-Prox}_{\varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}/(\mu\sigma)} \circ (\sigma^{-1} \text{Id})$ , where  $\text{s-Prox}_{\varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}/(\mu\sigma)}$  is the proximity operator in the sense of (6), which coincides with the firm shrinkage with  $\lambda_1 := 1/(\mu\sigma)$ . The  $\sigma$  here needs to be chosen so that  $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ . The results are plotted in Fig. 5. It can be seen that the discrepancy ( $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}$ ) does not vanish. Although the discrepancy in terms of ‘ $\mathbf{x}$ ’ vanishes, there is no theoretical guarantee for that, to the best of authors’ knowledge.

### C. Performance Comparisons

We compare the performance of the approach described in Section VI-A to that of the  $\ell_1$ -based total variation approach under the same setting basically as in Section VI-B. For the former approach, since  $\lambda_2$  is the only parameter that affects the solution, we change  $\lambda_2$  to see how the performance changes accordingly. The cost function of the latter approach is given by  $\mu f + \|\cdot\|_1 \circ \mathbf{D}$ , and we change  $\mu$  for this approach. The evaluation metric is system mismatch defined by  $\|\mathbf{x}_\diamond - \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 / \|\mathbf{x}_\diamond\|_2^2$ .

Figure 6 plots the results averaged over 300 independent trials. The approach described in Section VI-A outperforms the  $\ell_1$ -based approach. Note here that it is a fair comparison in the sense that both approaches have a single tuning parameter. To see the full potential of the firm shrinkage operator, one may also tune  $\lambda_1$  and  $\delta$ , and this will lead to further performance improvements at the cost of additional parameter tuning.

## VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper studied the operator-regularization approaches from the “optimality” perspective based on the “single-valued”

<sup>8</sup>This replacement is heuristic, and there is no theoretical support for that.




Fig. 5. Disagreement of the learning curves for the straightforward approach.




Fig. 6. Performance comparisons: convex (soft shrinkage) and weakly-convex (firm shrinkage).

proximity operator of nonconvex functions. The single-valuedness here was a necessary condition for the operator to be continuous. (Proposition 1). The fundamental result was presented, showing that a given operator is the “single-valued” proximity operator of a weakly convex function if and only if it is a MoL-Grad denoiser, i.e., the gradient of a  $\kappa$ -smooth convex function for  $\kappa > 1$  (Theorem 1). Extensions of Moreau’s decomposition were also presented, expressing a vector in terms of the proximity operators of a weakly convex function and the conjugate of its convexified one (Propositions 2 and 3). In addition to the forward-backward splitting algorithm, the primal-dual splitting algorithm employing a MoL-Grad denoiser (under the slight modification) was shown to generate a vector sequence convergent weakly to a minimizer of the cost function involving the implicit regularizer (Theorems 2 and 3). The simulation results matched our theoretical findings as well as demonstrating potential advantages of the proposed approach.

An important implication of our findings is the following: when the fidelity term is strongly convex and when such a modified operator splitting algorithm that has guarantee of convergence to an optimal point is desired, one can restrict attention to MoL-Grad denoisers, or, equivalently, (the proximity operator of) weakly convex functions. Applications of the presented theory in various problems are left as an exciting open issue.

## REFERENCES

- [1] H. H. Bauschke, R. S. Burachik, and D. R. Luke, Eds., *Splitting Algorithms, Modern Operator Theory, and Applications*. Cham: Switzerland: Springer, 2019.
- [2] P. L. Combettes and J. C. Pesquet, “Deep neural network structures solving variational inequalities,” *Set-Valued Var. Anal.*, vol. 28, pp. 491–518, 2020.
- [3] P. L. Lions and B. Mercier, “Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators,” *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 964–979, 1979.
- [4] P. L. Combettes and V. R. Wajs, “Signal recovery by proximal forward-backward splitting,” *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 1168–1200, 2005.
- [5] R. Glowinski and A. Marrocco, “Sur l’approximation par éléments finis d’ordre un, et la résolution par pénalisation-dualité d’une classe de problèmes de Dirichlet non linéaires,” *Rev. Française Automat. Informat. Recherche Opérationnelle*, vol. 9, pp. 41–76, 1975.
- [6] D. Gabay and B. Mercier, “A dual algorithm for the solution of nonlinear variational problems via finite element approximation,” *Comput. Math. Appl.*, vol. 2, pp. 17–40, 1976.
- [7] A. Chambolle and T. Pock, “A first-order primal-dual algorithm for convex problems with applications to imaging,” *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, vol. 40, pp. 120–145, 2011.
- [8] L. Condat, “A primal dual splitting method for convex optimization involving Lipschitzian, proximable and linear composite terms,” *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, vol. 158, pp. 460–479, 2013.
- [9] B. C. Vũ, “A splitting algorithm for dual monotone inclusions involving cocoercive operators,” *Adv. Comput. Math.*, vol. 38, pp. 667–681, 2013.
- [10] P. L. Combettes, “Monotone operator theory in convex optimization,” *Math. Program.*, vol. 170, pp. 177–206, 2018.
- [11] L. Condat, D. Kitahara, A. Contreras, and A. Hirabayashi, “Proximal splitting algorithms for convex optimization: A tour of recent advances, with new twists,” *SIAM Review*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 375–435, 2023.
- [12] A. Antoniadis, “Wavelet methods in statistics: Some recent developments and their applications,” *Statist. Surv.*, vol. 1, pp. 16–55, 12 2007.
- [13] J. Fan and R. Li, “Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties,” *J. American Statistical Association*, vol. 96, no. 456, pp. 1348–1360, Dec. 2001.
- [14] R. Chartrand and V. Staneva, “Restricted isometry properties and non-convex compressive sensing,” *Inverse Problems*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 1–14, 2008.
- [15] E. J. Candes, M. B. Wakin, and S. P. Boyd, “Enhancing sparsity by reweighted  $\ell_1$  minimization,” *J. Fourier Analysis and Applications*, vol. 14, no. 5–6, pp. 877–905, Oct. 2008.
- [16] T. Zhang, “Some sharp performance bounds for least squares regression with  $\ell_1$  regularization,” *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 37, no. 5A, pp. 2109–2144, Oct. 2009.
- [17] C. H. Zhang, “Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty,” *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 894–942, Apr. 2010.
- [18] G. Marjanovic and V. Solo, “On  $\ell_q$  optimization and matrix completion,” *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 60, no. 11, pp. 5714–5724, Nov. 2012.
- [19] X. Shen and Y. Gu, “Nonconvex sparse logistic regression with weakly convex regularization,” *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 66, no. 12, pp. 3199–3211, June 2018.
- [20] Q. Yao and J. T. Kwok, “Efficient learning with a family of nonconvex regularizers by redistributing nonconvexity,” *J. Machine Learn. Research*, vol. 18, no. 179, pp. 1–52, 2018.
- [21] B. Wen, X. Chen, and T. K. Pong, “A proximal difference-of-convex algorithm with extrapolation,” *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, vol. 69, no. 2, pp. 297–324, Oct. 2018.
- [22] R. Chartrand, “Exact reconstruction of sparse signals via nonconvex minimization,” *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 14, no. 10, pp. 707–710, Oct. 2007.
- [23] E. Soubies, L. Blanc-Féraud, and G. Aubert, “A continuous exact  $\ell_0$  penalty (CEL0) for least squares regularized problem,” *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 1607–1639, 2015.
- [24] M. Yukawa and S. Amari, “ $\ell_p$ -regularized least squares ( $0 < p < 1$ ) and critical path,” *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 488–502, Jan. 2016.
- [25] K. Jeong, M. Yukawa, and S. Amari, “Can critical-point paths under  $\ell_p$ -regularization ( $0 < p < 1$ ) reach the sparsest least squares solutions?” *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 2960–2968, May 2014.
- [26] T. P. Dinh and E. B. Souad, *Algorithms for solving a class of nonconvex optimization problems: Methods of subgradient*, ser. Fermat Days 85: Mathematics for Optimization. Elsevier, 1986, vol. 129, pp. 249–271.
- [27] A. Blake and A. Zisserman, *Visual Reconstruction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987.
- [28] M. Nikolova, “Markovian reconstruction using a GNC approach,” *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 8, no. 9, pp. 1204–1220, Sep. 1999.
- [29] I. Selesnick, “Sparse regularization via convex analysis,” *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 65, no. 17, pp. 4481–4494, Sep. 2017.

- [30] J. Abe, M. Yamagishi, and I. Yamada, "Linearly involved generalized Moreau enhanced models and their proximal splitting algorithm under overall convexity condition," *Inverse Problems*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 1–36, Feb. 2020.
- [31] M. Yukawa, H. Kaneko, K. Suzuki, and I. Yamada, "Linearly-involved Moreau-enhanced-over-subspace model: Debiased sparse modeling and stable outlier-robust regression," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 71, pp. 1232–1247, 2023.
- [32] K. Suzuki and M. Yukawa, "Sparse stable outlier-robust signal recovery under Gaussian noise," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 71, pp. 372–387, 2023.
- [33] R. Chartrand, "Shrinkage mappings and their induced penalty functions," in *IEEE ICASSP*, 2014, pp. 1026–1029.
- [34] S. V. Venkatakrishnan, C. A. Bouman, and B. Wohlberg, "Plug-and-play priors for model based reconstruction," in *Proc. IEEE Global Conf. Signal Inf. Process.*, 2013, pp. 945–948.
- [35] S. Mukherjee, A. Hauptmann, O. Öktem, M. Pereyra, and C.-B. Schönlieb, "Learned reconstruction methods with convergence guarantees: A survey of concepts and applications," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 164–182, 2023.
- [36] J.-C. Pesquet, A. Repetti, M. Terris, and Y. Wiaux, "Learning maximally monotone operators for image recovery," *SIAM J. Imag. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 1206–1237, 2021.
- [37] P. Nair and K. N. Chaudhury, "Averaged deep denoisers for image regularization," *J. Math. Imaging Vis.*, Mar. 2024.
- [38] S. Hurault, A. Leclaire, and N. Papadakis, "Proximal denoiser for convergent plug-and-play optimization with nonconvex regularization," in *Proc. ICML*, vol. 162, 2022, pp. 9483–9505.
- [39] A. Goujon, S. Neumayer, and M. Unser, "Learning weakly convex regularizers for convergent image-reconstruction algorithms," *SIAM J. Imag. Sci.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 91–115, 2024.
- [40] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, 2nd ed. New York: NY: Springer, 2017.
- [41] J. J. Moreau, "Proximité et dualité dans un espace hilbertien," *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, vol. 93, pp. 273–299, 1965.
- [42] I. W. Selesnick and I. Bayram, "Enhanced sparsity by non-separable regularization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 64, no. 9, pp. 2298–2313, 2016.
- [43] M. Yukawa and I. Yamada, "Cocoercive gradient operator of convex function and its associated weakly convex function: Generalized proximity operator for case of unique minimizer," in *Proc. IEICE Signal Processing Symposium*, Kyoto: Japan, Nov. 2023.
- [44] R. Gribonval and M. Nikolova, "A characterization of proximity operators," *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, vol. 62, pp. 773–789, 2020.
- [45] H. H. Bauschke, W. M. Moursi, and X. Wang, "Generalized monotone operators and their averaged resolvents," *Math. Program.*, vol. 189, no. 55–74, 2021.
- [46] J. J. Moreau, "Fonctions convexes duales et points proximaux dans un espace hilbertien," *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. A Math.*, vol. 255, pp. 2897–2899, 1962.
- [47] P. L. Combettes and V. R. Wajs, "Signal recovery by proximal forward-backward splitting," *SIAM Journal on Multiscale Modeling and Simulation*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 1168–1200, 2005.
- [48] I. Yamada, M. Yukawa, and M. Yamagishi, *Fixed-Point Algorithms for Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering*, ser. Optimization and Its Applications. New York: Springer, 2011, vol. 49, ch. 17, pp. 345–390.
- [49] J.-B. Baillon and G. Haddad, "Quelques propriétés des opérateurs angle-bornés et  $n$ -cycliquement monotones," *Israel J. Math.*, vol. 26, pp. 137–150, 1977.
- [50] K. Suzuki and M. Yukawa, "External division of two proximity operators: An application to signal recovery with structured sparsity," in *Proc. IEEE ICASSP*, 2024, pp. 9471–9475.
- [51] I. Bayram, "On the convergence of the iterative shrinkage/thresholding algorithm with a weakly convex penalty," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 1597–1608, 2016.
- [52] H.-Y. Gao and A. G. Bruce, "Waveshrink with firm shrinkage," *Statistica Sinica*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 855–874, 1997.
- [53] H.-Y. Gao, "Wavelet shrinkage denoising using the non-negative garrote," *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 469–488, 1998.
- [54] P. Vincent, H. Larochelle, I. Lajoie, Y. Bengio, and P.-A. Manzagol, "Stacked denoising autoencoders: Learning useful representations in a deep network with a local denoising criterion," *J. Machine Learn. Research*, vol. 11, no. 110, pp. 3371–3408, 2010.
- [55] H. D. Bondell and B. J. Reich, "Simultaneous regression shrinkage, variable selection, and supervised clustering of predictors with OSCAR," *Biometrics*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 115–123, 2008.
- [56] L. W. Zhong and J. T. Kwok, "Efficient sparse modeling with automatic feature grouping," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 1436–1447, 2012.
- [57] X. Zeng and M. A. T. Figueiredo, "The ordered weighted  $\ell_1$  norm: Atomic formulation, projections, and algorithms," *arXiv*, 2015, arXiv:1409.4271 [cs.DS].
- [58] R. Cohen, Y. Blau, D. Freedman, and E. Rivlin, "It has potential: Gradient-driven denoisers for convergent solutions to inverse problems," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, 2021, pp. 18 152–18 164.
- [59] S. Hurault, A. Leclaire, and N. Papadakis, "Gradient step denoiser for convergent plug-and-play," in *Proc. ICLR*, 2022.
- [60] I. Bayram, "Penalty functions derived from monotone mappings," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 265–269, 2015.

## APPENDIX A

### PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

We first show the monotonicity of the "set-valued" operator  $\mathbf{Prox}_f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}} : x \mapsto \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{H}} J_x(y)$ , where  $J_x := f + (1/2) \|x - \cdot\|^2$ . By virtue of Fermat's rule together with Lemma 1 given in Section III-A, we have

$$p \in \mathbf{Prox}_f(x) \Leftrightarrow 0 \in \partial J_x(p) \Leftrightarrow x \in \partial J_0(p) \Leftrightarrow p \in (\partial J_0)^{-1}(x),$$

which implies that  $\mathbf{Prox}_f = (\partial J_0)^{-1}$ . As the subdifferential  $\partial J_0$  is monotone [40, Example 20.3], its inverse  $(\partial J_0)^{-1}$  is also monotone [40, Proposition 20.10].

For contradiction, suppose, for an arbitrarily fixed  $x \in \mathcal{H}$ , that  $\mathbf{Prox}_f(x)$  contains two distinct vectors  $T(x)$  and  $T(x) + \delta$  for some  $\delta \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$ . The monotonicity of  $\mathbf{Prox}_f$  suggests that, for every  $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T(x + \epsilon\delta) - (T(x) + \delta), (x + \epsilon\delta) - x \rangle &\geq 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow \langle T(x + \epsilon\delta) - T(x) - \delta, \epsilon\delta \rangle &\geq 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow \langle T(x + \epsilon\delta) - T(x), \delta \rangle &\geq \|\delta\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

By the continuity of  $T$  as well as that of the inner product, (A.1) reads

$$0 = \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \langle T(x + \epsilon\delta) - T(x), \delta \rangle \geq \|\delta\|^2 > 0, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

which gives contradiction. Hence,  $\mathbf{Prox}_f$  is a single-valued operator over  $\mathcal{H}$ , meaning that  $J_x$  has a unique minimizer for every  $x \in \mathcal{H}$ . ■

## APPENDIX B

### PRESERVATION OF AVERAGED NONEXPANSIVENESS

**Lemma B.1** *Let  $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ . Then, for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $\varrho \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ , the following hold.*

- 1)  $T$  is  $\alpha$ -averaged nonexpansive if and only if  $(c^{-1}T) \circ (c\text{Id})$  is  $\alpha$ -averaged nonexpansive for every  $c \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ .
- 2)  $\varrho T$  is  $\alpha$ -averaged nonexpansive if and only if  $T \circ (\varrho\text{Id})$  is  $\alpha$ -averaged nonexpansive. In particular,  $T$  is  $\varrho$ -cocoercive if and only if  $T \circ (\varrho\text{Id})$  is firmly  $((1/2)\text{-averaged})$  nonexpansive.

*Proof:* 1): It can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned} T &= (1 - \alpha)\text{Id} + \alpha N, \quad \exists N : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \text{ nonexpansive} \\ \Leftrightarrow c^{-1}T \circ (c\text{Id}) &= (1 - \alpha)\text{Id} + \alpha c^{-1}N \circ (c\text{Id}), \\ &\quad \exists N : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \text{ nonexpansive.} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Here,  $\tilde{N} := c^{-1}N \circ (c\text{Id})$  is nonexpansive if  $N$  is nonexpansive, because  $\|\tilde{N}(x) - \tilde{N}(y)\| = c^{-1}\|N(cx) - N(cy)\| \leq c^{-1}\|cx - cy\| = \|x - y\|$ . The converse can be verified in an analogous way. Hence, (B.3) implies the equivalence of the  $\alpha$ -averaged nonexpansiveness of  $T$  and  $c^{-1}T \circ (c\text{Id})$  for an arbitrary  $c > 0$ .

2): As the second claim can be immediately verified by letting  $\alpha := 1/2$  in the first one, we prove the first claim in the following. Assume that  $\varrho T$  is  $\alpha$ -averaged nonexpansive. Then, by Lemma B.1.1,  $c^{-1}\varrho T \circ (c\text{Id})$  is  $\alpha$ -averaged nonexpansive for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ . The specific choice of  $c := \varrho$  yields  $\alpha$ -averaged nonexpansiveness of  $T \circ (\varrho\text{Id})$ .

To verify the reverse implication, assume that  $T \circ (\varrho\text{Id})$  is  $\alpha$ -averaged nonexpansive. Then, by Lemma B.1.1 again,  $c^{-1}T \circ (c\varrho\text{Id})$  is  $\alpha$ -averaged nonexpansive for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ . The specific choice of  $c := \varrho^{-1}$  yields  $\alpha$ -averaged nonexpansiveness of  $\varrho T$ . ■

#### APPENDIX C PROOF OF EXAMPLE 1

We first prove the following lemma.

**Lemma C.1** *Let  $\|\cdot\|$  be a norm in a real Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a nonincreasing function; i.e.,  $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni a \leq b \in \mathbb{R}_+ \Rightarrow h(a) \leq h(b)$ . Assume that the s-prox operator of  $h$  is well-defined. Then, for every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$  and every  $x \in \mathcal{H}$ , it holds that  ${}^\lambda(h \circ \|\cdot\|)(x) = {}^\lambda(h \circ |\cdot|)(\|x\|)$  and*

$$\text{s-Prox}_{\lambda h \circ \|\cdot\|}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\text{s-Prox}_{\lambda h \circ |\cdot|}(\|x\|)}{\|x\|}x & \text{if } x \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0. \end{cases}$$

*Proof of Lemma C.1:* By definition, we have

$${}^\lambda(h \circ \|\cdot\|)(x) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \left( h(\|y\|) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|y - x\|^2 \right). \quad (\text{C.4})$$

If  $x = 0$ ,  ${}^\lambda(h \circ \|\cdot\|)(0) = {}^\lambda(h \circ |\cdot|)(\|0\|) = h(0)$ . We now assume that  $x \neq 0$ . Based on the orthogonal decomposition of  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp$  with  $\mathcal{M} := \text{span}\{x\}$  and its orthogonal complement  $\mathcal{M}^\perp$ , every  $y$  can be represented by  $y = \xi x + y_\perp$  with  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y_\perp \in \mathcal{M}^\perp$ . Thus, by the Pythagorean theorem, the Moreau envelope in (C.4) can be represented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} {}^\lambda(h \circ \|\cdot\|)(x) &= \min_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}, y_\perp \in \mathcal{M}^\perp} h\left(\sqrt{\|\xi x\|^2 + \|y_\perp\|^2}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \left( \|(\xi - 1)x\|^2 + \|y_\perp\|^2 \right) \\ &= \min_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}} h(\|\xi x\|) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|(\xi - 1)x\|^2 \\ &= \min_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}} h(|\xi \|x\||) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} (\xi \|x\| - \|x\|)^2 \\ &= \min_{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}} h(|\zeta|) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} (\zeta - \|x\|)^2 \\ &= {}^\lambda(h \circ |\cdot|)(\|x\|), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

which proves the first claim of the lemma. Here, the second equality of (C.5) holds because the minimum is achieved only when  $y_\perp = 0$  due to the nonincreasingness of  $h$ . The second claim of the lemma can be verified in an analogous way. ■

*Proof of Example 1:* Letting  $h : x \mapsto x$  and  $\lambda := \lambda_2$  in Lemma C.1 gives  ${}^{\lambda_2}\|\cdot\|(x) = \lambda_2 |\cdot|(\|x\|)$ . This, together with  $(|\cdot|)_{\lambda_2} = \varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}$ , verifies that  $(\|\cdot\|)_{\lambda_2} = \varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}} \circ \|\cdot\|$ . Recall now that the MC function given in (38) is a symmetric nondecreasing function. Hence, letting  $h = \varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}$  and  $\lambda := \lambda_1$  in Lemma C.1 yields  $\text{s-Prox}_{\lambda_1 \varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}} \circ \|\cdot\|}(x) = (x/\|x\|)\text{s-Prox}_{\lambda_1 \varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}} \circ |\cdot|}(\|x\|) = (x/\|x\|)\text{s-Prox}_{\lambda_1 \varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}}(\|x\|) = (x/\|x\|)\text{firm}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(\|x\|)$ , where the second equality is due to the symmetry of  $\varphi_{\lambda_2}^{\text{MC}}$ . See Section V-A and also [17, 29, 60] for the third equality. ■

#### APPENDIX D PROOF OF EXAMPLE 2

Due to the group-wise separability of the group  $\ell_1$  norm  $\|\cdot\|_{g,1}$ , the Moreau envelope can be expressed in the following separable form:  ${}^{\lambda_2}\|\cdot\|_{g,1}(x) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^G \|y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}_i} \right) + (1/(2\lambda_2)) \|x - y\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^G \min_{y_i \in \mathcal{H}_i} \left[ \|y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}_i} + (1/(2\lambda_2)) \|x_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}_i}^2 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^G {}^{\lambda_2}\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_i}(x_i)$ . Thus, the Moreau enhanced model can also be expressed in a separable form as follows:  $(\|\cdot\|_{g,1})_{\lambda_2}(x) := \sum_{i=1}^G (\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_i})_{\lambda_2}(x_i)$ . Hence, it follows that  $\text{s-Prox}_{\lambda_1(\|\cdot\|_{g,1})_{\lambda_2}}(x) = \text{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^G \left[ (\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_i})_{\lambda_2}(y_i) + (1/(2\lambda_1)) \|x_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}_i}^2 \right] = (\text{s-Prox}_{\lambda_1(\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_i})_{\lambda_2}}(x_i))_{i=1}^G$ , where  $\text{s-Prox}_{\lambda_1(\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_i})_{\lambda_2}} = T_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{\text{v-firm}}$  by Example 1. ■