

Improved convergence rates for the multiobjective Frank-Wolfe method

Douglas S. Gonçalves ^{*} Max L. N. Gonçalves [†] Jefferson G. Melo[†]

June 11, 2024

Abstract

This paper analyzes the convergence rates of the *Frank-Wolfe* method for solving convex constrained multiobjective optimization. We establish improved convergence rates under different assumptions on the objective function, the feasible set, and the localization of the limit point of the sequence generated by the method. In terms of the objective function values, we firstly show that if the objective function is strongly convex and the limit point of the sequence generated by the method lies in the relative interior of the feasible set, then the algorithm achieves a linear convergence rate. Next, we focus on a special class of problems where the feasible constraint set is (α, q) -uniformly convex for some $\alpha > 0$ and $q \geq 2$, including, in particular, ℓ_p -balls for all $p > 1$. In this context, we prove that the method attains: (i) a rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/k^{\frac{q}{q-1}})$ when the objective function is strongly convex; and (ii) a linear rate (if $q = 2$) or a rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/k^{\frac{q}{q-2}})$ (if $q > 2$) under an additional assumption, which always holds if the feasible set does not contain an unconstrained weak Pareto point. We also discuss enhanced convergence rates for the algorithm in terms of an optimality measure. Finally, we provide some simple examples to illustrate the convergence rates and the set of assumptions.

keywords: Frank-Wolfe method; conditional gradient method; convergence rate; Pareto optimality; constrained multiobjective problem.

AMS subject classifications: 49M05, 58E17, 65K05, 90C29

1 Introduction

In this paper, we are interested in the constrained convex multiobjective optimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} F(x) = (F_1(x), \dots, F_m(x)), \quad (1)$$

where the constraint set \mathcal{X} is a nonempty, convex, and compact subset of a finite dimensional vector space \mathcal{Y} equipped with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and a norm $\| \cdot \|$.

^{*}Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, SC 88040-900, Brazil. (E-mail: douglas.goncalves@ufsc.br). The work of this author was supported in part by CNPq (Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico) Grant 305213/2021-0.

[†]IME, Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia, GO 74001-970, Brazil. (E-mails: maxlmg@ufg.br and jefferson@ufg.br). The work of these authors was supported in part by CNPq (Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico) Grants 405349/2021-1, 304133/2021-3 and 312223/2022-6.

Many interesting problems in applications of engineering, economics, management science, and medicine can be formulated as (1); see, for example, [15, 28]. This motivates many researches in the last decades to develop algorithms for solving general multiobjective and vector optimization problems, many of them by extending algorithms from scalar ($m = 1$) optimization. Specifically, [23] proposed and analyzed a projected gradient method for solving constrained vector optimization problems which are more general than (1). The convergence of this method was further explored in [4, 17]. This method extends its unconstrained version proposed in [16]. By adding the indicator function of the constraint set \mathcal{X} to the objective function F , one can also apply multiobjective/vector proximal point methods such as the one introduced in [12] and further developed in [3, 9, 11, 18, 19, 25]. Newton-like methods [5] and other methods on manifolds [6–8, 10] were also proposed for multicriteria and vector optimization.

Recently, [1] introduced a Frank-Wolfe (conditional gradient) method for solving constrained multiobjective optimization problems. The study delved into various convergence properties of the method and showcased its numerical performance. Furthermore, [2, 21] explored extensions of the multiobjective Frank-Wolfe (M-FW) method for solving composite multiobjective optimization problems, while [14] addressed its application to vector optimization problems. A multiobjective version of the away-step Frank-Wolfe method was also recently proposed and analyzed in [22] for solving an instance of (1), where the constraint set \mathcal{X} is a polyhedron.

In this study our focus is on improved convergence rates that can be achieved by M-FW for solving convex constrained multiobjective optimization problems with special structure. We assume that the multiobjective function F satisfies the following conditions:

(A1) For every $j \in \mathcal{J} := \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, the component $F_j: V \subset \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is convex, continuously differentiable, and L_j -smooth over \mathcal{X} , i.e.,

$$F_j(x) + \langle \nabla F_j(x), y - x \rangle \leq F_j(y) \leq F_j(x) + \langle \nabla F_j(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L_j}{2} \|y - x\|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (2)$$

where V is an open set containing \mathcal{X} .

As is well-known, the convergence rate of the scalar (i.e., $m = 1$) Frank-Wolfe (FW) method is $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$, in terms of the sequence of functional values. Generally, this rate cannot be improved, even with the sole additional assumption that the objective function is strongly convex; see, for example, [26] and [22, Section 4.1] for further details. However, an enhanced convergence rate for the Frank-Wolfe algorithm in the scalar context has been established under one of the following assumptions, in addition to **(A1)**:

- (i) The function F is strongly convex on \mathcal{X} , and the optimal solution x^* of (1) is in the relative interior of \mathcal{X} ; see, for example, [13, 24];
- (ii) The set \mathcal{X} is (α, q) -uniformly convex for some $\alpha > 0$ and $q \geq 2$, and $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|\nabla F(x)\|_* > 0$ (this is equivalent to requiring that \mathcal{X} does not contain any unconstrained minimum point of F); see, for example, [13, 20, 27];
- (iii) The set \mathcal{X} is a (α, q) -uniformly convex for some $\alpha > 0$ and $q \geq 2$, and F is strongly convex on \mathcal{X} ; see, for example, [13, 20, 27].

As noted in [1, Remark 3], the M-FW algorithm maintains, under **(A1)**, a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$. The same order of convergence rate was also obtained in [2, 21].

The main goal of this paper is to explore, in the multiobjective setting, whether a faster convergence rate can be achieved for the Frank-Wolfe algorithm under natural generalizations of assumptions (i), (ii), and (iii) above. In terms of the objective function values, we initially show that the algorithm achieves a linear convergence rate when the objective function is strongly convex and the limit point of the sequence generated by the method lies in the relative interior

of the feasible set. Next, we turn our attention to a specific class of problems characterized by a feasible constraint set that is (α, q) -uniformly convex for some $\alpha > 0$ and $q \geq 2$, notably including ℓ_p -balls for all $p > 1$. In this scenario, we prove that the method attains: (i) a rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/k^{\frac{q}{q-1}})$ when the objective function is strongly convex; and (ii) a linear rate (if $q = 2$) or a rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/k^{\frac{q}{q-2}})$ (if $q > 2$) under an additional assumption, which always holds if the feasible set does not contain an unconstrained weak Pareto point; see Remark 5. The assumptions and convergence rate results are summarized in Table 1. We also discuss enhanced convergence rates for M-FW in terms of an optimality measure and present some illustrative examples to showcase our theoretical findings.

Theorem	Feasible set \mathcal{X}	Function F	limit point x^*	Conv. rate
[1, Remark 3]	convex	convex	–	$\mathcal{O}(1/k)$
Theorem 6	convex	strongly convex	lies in $\text{relint}(\mathcal{X})$	linear
Theorem 8	(α, q) -uniformly convex	strongly convex	–	$\mathcal{O}\left(1/k^{\frac{q}{q-1}}\right)$
Theorem 9	(α, q) -uniformly convex	$0 < \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \tilde{\theta}(x) $	–	$\begin{cases} \text{linear} & \text{if } q = 2, \\ \mathcal{O}\left(1/k^{\frac{q}{q-2}}\right) & \text{if } q > 2 \end{cases}$

Convergence rates for the multiobjective Frank-Wolfe algorithm under different assumptions. In this table, x^* is the limit point of the sequence generated by the algorithm, $\text{relint}(\mathcal{X})$ denotes the relative interior of \mathcal{X} , and $\tilde{\theta}(x) := \min_{\|z\| \leq 1} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x), z \rangle$. Since **(A1)** is a common assumption across all results, it is not included in the third column for brevity.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 contains some notations, definitions and basic results. Section 3 formally describes the M-FW algorithm to solve (1) and presents some basic properties about its generated sequence. Section 4 establishes faster convergence rates for the M-FW algorithm under different assumptions. Section 5 contains some illustrative examples. Final remarks are given in Section 6.

2 Preliminary material

In this section, we introduce some notations and definitions which will be used throughout this paper. Some basic properties on the multiobjective Frank-Wolfe direction are also discussed.

Let $\mathcal{J} := \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $L := \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} L_j$. Denote by $B(x, \epsilon) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x - y\| \leq \epsilon\}$ the ball centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with radius $\epsilon > 0$. The diameter of \mathcal{X} , the affine hull of \mathcal{X} , and the relative interior of \mathcal{X} are denoted, respectively, by

$$D_{\mathcal{X}} := \max\{\|x - y\| : x, y \in \mathcal{X}\}, \quad \text{aff}(\mathcal{X}) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i : x_i \in \mathcal{X}, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}, \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1 \right\}$$

and

$$\text{relint}(\mathcal{X}) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : \text{there exists } \epsilon > 0 \text{ such that } B(x, \epsilon) \cap \text{aff}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{X}\}.$$

Given a pair $(\alpha, q) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\alpha > 0$ and $q \geq 2$, the set \mathcal{X} is (α, q) -uniformly convex if and only if for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, and $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|z\| \leq 1$, the following inclusion holds

$$x + \gamma(y - x) + \gamma(1 - \gamma) \frac{\alpha}{2} \|y - x\|^q z \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (3)$$

Uniformly convex sets encompass ℓ_p -balls, which are $(p - 1, 2)$ -uniformly convex for $1 < p \leq 2$ and $(2/p, p)$ -uniformly convex for $p > 2$, in the context of the $\|\cdot\|_p$ norm. An $(\alpha, 2)$ -uniformly

convex set is also called α -strongly convex set. Notably, for $1 < p \leq 2$, the ℓ_p -ball is $2(p - 1)$ -strongly convex with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_p$ norm. We refer the reader to [13, 27] for more details about the concept of (α, q) -uniformly convex.

In the multiobjective optimization setting, the concept of optimality is replaced by the concept of *Pareto-optimality* or *efficiency*. A point $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ is called *Pareto optimal* or *efficient* if and only if there is no $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $F(x) \leq F(x^*)$ and $F(x) \neq F(x^*)$, where the partial order \leq in \mathbb{R}^m is defined componentwise, i.e., $z \leq y$ if and only if $z_j \leq y_j$, for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$. Similarly, we have $z < y$ if and only if $z_j < y_j$, for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$. A point $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ is called *weak Pareto optimal* or *weakly efficient* if and only if there is no $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $F(x) < F(x^*)$. When the objectives and the feasible set are convex, a necessary and sufficient condition for a point $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ be weak Pareto optimal for (1) is that x^* is *Pareto critical* (*stationary*), i.e.,

$$\max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^*), y - x^* \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (4)$$

In the following, we recall a key result that will be used to establish the convergence rate of the M-FW algorithm when the constraint set \mathcal{X} is (α, q) -uniformly convex.

Lemma 1 (Lemma 2.21 of [13]). *Let $(\hat{h}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of positive numbers and c_0, c_1, c_2, β be positive numbers with $c_1 < 1$ such that $\hat{h}_1 \leq c_0$ and $\hat{h}_{k+1} \leq [1 - \min\{c_1, c_2 \hat{h}_k^\beta\}] \hat{h}_k$ for $k \geq 1$, then*

$$\hat{h}_k \leq \begin{cases} c_0(1 - c_1)^{k-1} & \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq k_0, \\ \left(\frac{c_1/c_2}{1 + c_1^\beta(k - k_0)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} = \mathcal{O}(1/k^{1/\beta}) & \text{for } k \geq k_0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$k_0 := \max \left\{ \left\lceil \log_{1-c_1} \left(\frac{(c_1/c_2)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}}{c_0} \right) \right\rceil + 2, 1 \right\}.$$

3 Multiobjective Frank-Wolfe algorithm and basic properties

In this section, we state the multiobjective Frank-Wolfe algorithm and present some of its basic properties, which will be useful to analyze its convergence rates.

We begin by stating the algorithm and recalling some properties regarding the optimal value of its subproblem.

Multiobjective Frank-Wolfe (M-FW) algorithm.

(0) Let $x^0 \in \mathcal{X}$ be given, and set $L := \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} L_j$ and $k \leftarrow 0$.

(1) Compute

$$p^{FW}(x^k) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), y - x^k \rangle \quad (5)$$

and let $d^{FW}(x^k) := p^{FW}(x^k) - x^k$ and $\theta^{FW}(x^k) := \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), d^{FW}(x^k) \rangle$.

(2) If $\theta^{FW}(x^k) = 0$, then stop and return x^k .

(3) Compute the stepsize $\gamma_k \in (0, 1]$ defined as

$$\gamma_k := \min \left\{ 1, \frac{-\theta^{FW}(x^k)}{L \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2} \right\}, \quad (6)$$

and set $x^{k+1} := x^k + \gamma_k d^{FW}(x^k)$ and $k \leftarrow k + 1$, and go to step (1).

end

Remark 1. (i) Since \mathcal{X} is a compact set, it follows that (5) has always a solution. Note that problem (5) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & t \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & \langle \nabla F_j(x), y - x \rangle \leq t, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, m, \\ & t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad y \in \mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

which is a constrained convex optimization problem. When \mathcal{X} is a polytope, it becomes a linear programming problem. (ii) The optimum value function $\theta^{FW}(\cdot)$ has interesting properties and, in particular, it can characterize stationary points of (1). Indeed, the following properties hold, see [1] for their proofs: (a) $\theta^{FW}(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$; (b) $\theta^{FW}(\cdot)$ is a continuous function on \mathcal{X} ; (c) $\theta^{FW}(x) = 0$ iff $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is a stationary point. (iii) It is immediate to see that if the M-FW algorithm does not stop in step (2), then $\theta^{FW}(x^k) < 0$ and, in particular, $d^{FW}(x^k) \neq 0$. Therefore, γ_k is well-defined and belongs to $(0, 1]$. Moreover, as $x^0 \in \mathcal{X}$, it follows from the definitions of $d^{FW}(x^k)$ and x^{k+1} , and the convexity of \mathcal{X} , that the whole sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is contained in \mathcal{X} .

In the following, we present some results that will be useful to establish the convergence rates of the M-FW algorithm. The first result shows the progress, in terms of objective value, between two consecutive iterates generated by the algorithm.

Lemma 2. Let $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by M-FW algorithm. Then, for every $j \in \mathcal{J}$, it holds:

$$F_j(x^{k+1}) \leq F_j(x^k) + \frac{\theta^{FW}(x^k)}{2} \gamma_k, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (8)$$

Proof. Since F_j is L_j -smooth on \mathcal{X} and $L = \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} L_j$, it follows from the second inequality in

(2) that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
F_j(x^{k+1}) &= F_j(x^k + \gamma_k d^{FW}(x^k)) \leq F_j(x^k) + \gamma_k \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), d^{FW}(x^k) \rangle + \frac{L_j}{2} \gamma_k^2 \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2 \\
&\leq F_j(x^k) + \gamma_k \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), d^{FW}(x^k) \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \gamma_k^2 \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2 \\
&= F_j(x^k) + \gamma_k \theta^{FW}(x^k) + \frac{L}{2} \gamma_k^2 \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2, \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to the definition of $\theta^{FW}(x^k)$ in step 1 of the M-FW algorithm. If $\gamma_k = -\theta^{FW}(x^k)/(L\|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2)$, it follows from the last inequality that

$$F_j(x^{k+1}) \leq F_j(x^k) - \frac{\theta^{FW}(x^k)^2}{2L\|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, j \in \mathcal{J}. \tag{10}$$

Now, if $\gamma_k = 1$, then $L\|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2 \leq -\theta^{FW}(x^k)$. Hence, from (9), we obtain

$$F_j(x^{k+1}) \leq F_j(x^k) + \frac{\theta^{FW}(x^k)}{2}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, j \in \mathcal{J}.$$

Therefore, (8) follows from the last inequality, (10) and the definition of γ_k in (6). \square

It follows from step (2) of the M-FW algorithm and statement (c) in Remark 1(ii) that the algorithm stops at some iteration k if and only if x^k is a weak Pareto point for problem (1). Hence, from now on, we will assume that the M-FW algorithm generates an infinite sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Since F is a convex function, we have that every limit point x^* of $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a weak Pareto point of (1); see [1, Remark 2]. Moreover, since $\theta^{FW}(x^k) < 0$, it follows from (8) that the sequence $(F_j(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is monotonically decreasing for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$ and bounded, because F_j is continuous and \mathcal{X} is compact, hence, it converges to some F_j^* . Thus, for every $j \in \mathcal{J}$, we have $F_j(x^*) = F_j^*$ for all limit point x^* of $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Furthermore, under the additional assumption that F_j is μ_j -strongly convex for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$, the whole sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to x^* , see the proof of this fact immediately after assumption **(A2)**. Therefore, henceforth we fix a limit point x^* of $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and define the following elements:

$$e^k := \frac{x^* - x^k}{\|x^* - x^k\|}, \quad h_j(x^k) := F_j(x^k) - F_j(x^*), \quad \hat{h}(x^k) := \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} h_j(x^k). \tag{11}$$

It is easy to see that the sequence $(\hat{h}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to zero. Our goal will be to measure how fast this convergence is, under different set of assumptions on the objective function F and the constraint set \mathcal{X} . To this end, it will be interesting to give an upper bound on the quantity $\hat{h}(x^1)$. The next result shows that, in fact, an upper bound can be universally established for the whole sequence $(\hat{h}(x^{k+1}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in terms of the constant of smoothness of F , $L = \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} L_j$, and the diameter of the constraint set \mathcal{X} .

Lemma 3. *Let $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by the M-FW algorithm. The following inequality holds:*

$$\hat{h}(x^{k+1}) \leq \frac{LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2}{2}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{12}$$

where $L := \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} L_j$ and $D_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the diameter of the constraint set \mathcal{X} .

Proof. It follows from (9) and (11), for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{h}(x^{k+1}) &\leq \hat{h}(x^k) + \gamma_k \theta^{FW}(x^k) + \frac{L}{2} \gamma_k^2 \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2 \\ &\leq \hat{h}(x^k) + \theta^{FW}(x^k) + \frac{L}{2} \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2,\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that the stepsize γ_k given in (6) is the minimizer of the quadratic function $q(\gamma) := \gamma \theta^{FW}(x^k) + \frac{L}{2} \gamma^2 \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2$ over the interval $[0, 1]$. On the other hand, it follows from the definitions of $\theta^{FW}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{h}(x^k)$ in step (1) of the M-FW algorithm and (11), respectively, and the gradient inequality of the convex function F_j (see the first inequality in (2)) that

$$\theta^{FW}(x^k) \leq \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), x^* - x^k \rangle \leq \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} (F_j(x^*) - F_j(x^k)) = -\min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} h_j(x^k) = -\hat{h}(x^k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Therefore, (12) follows by combining the last inequality, (13), and the fact that $\|d^{FW}(x^k)\| \leq D_{\mathcal{X}}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

The next two results assume that the objective function of problem (1) is strongly convex. For convenience, this will be stated in the following assumption.

(A2) the function F is strongly convex, i.e., the component $F_j: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of F , for every $j \in \mathcal{J}$, satisfies

$$F_j(y) \geq F_j(x) + \langle \nabla F_j(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu_j}{2} \|y - x\|^2, \quad x, y \in \mathcal{X},\tag{14}$$

for some $\mu_j > 0$. For simplicity, we denote $\mu := \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mu_j$.

It is worth noting that, under assumption **(A2)**, the whole sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to the limit point x^* . Indeed, since $F(x^*) \leq F(x^k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows from **(A2)** and the definition of $\theta^{FW}(x^k)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}0 &\geq \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} (F_j(x^*) - F_j(x^k)) \geq \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), x^* - x^k \rangle + \frac{\min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mu_j}{2} \|x^k - x^*\|^2 \\ &\geq \theta^{FW}(x^k) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^k - x^*\|^2,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$|\theta^{FW}(x^k)| \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \|x^k - x^*\|^2, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.\tag{15}$$

Since $(\theta^{FW}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to zero (see [1, Corollary 14]), we conclude from (15) that the whole sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to x^* .

In the following, we show that the decreasing of the sequence $(h_j(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be, at iteration k , controlled by the angle between $\nabla F_j(x^k)$ and the direction e^k defined in (11). The proof of this property is similar to the one in [22, Lemma 5], established for a special variant of the M-FW algorithm, we have included it here for completeness.

Lemma 4. *Let $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the generated by the M-FW algorithm and consider $(h_j(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(e^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ as in (11). If **(A2)** holds, then, for every $j \in \mathcal{J}$, we have*

$$0 < h_j(x^k) \leq \frac{\langle \nabla F_j(x^k), e^k \rangle^2}{2\mu}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.\tag{16}$$

Proof. The first inequality in (16) follows from the definition of $h_j(x^k)$ in (11), the fact that $F_j(x^k) \geq F_j(x^*)$, and the assumption that x^k is not a weak Pareto point for (1). Now, since F_j is μ_j -strongly convex and $\mu = \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mu_j$, we have, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \in \mathcal{J}$ and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, that

$$F_j(x^k + \gamma(x^* - x^k)) \geq F_j(x^k) + \gamma \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), x^* - x^k \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \gamma^2 \|x^* - x^k\|^2 =: q(\gamma).$$

Using that the unconstrained minimizer of $q(\gamma)$ is $\gamma^* = -\langle \nabla F_j(x^k), x^* - x^k \rangle / (\mu \|x^* - x^k\|^2)$, we obtain, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \in \mathcal{J}$, and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, that

$$F_j(x^k + \gamma(x^* - x^k)) \geq F_j(x^k) - \frac{\langle \nabla F_j(x^k), x^* - x^k \rangle^2}{2\mu \|x^* - x^k\|^2}.$$

Taking $\gamma = 1$ in the last inequality and using the definition of e^k in (11), we have, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$F_j(x^*) \geq F_j(x^k) - \frac{\langle \nabla F_j(x^k), e^k \rangle^2}{2\mu},$$

which, combined with the definition of $h_j(\cdot)$ in (11), proves the second inequality in (16). \square

We now prove a recursive inequality for the sequence $(\hat{h}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ that will be essential to establish the convergence rate of the M-FW algorithm under strongly convexity assumption on the objective function F .

Lemma 5. *Let $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by the M-FW algorithm, and let $\hat{h}(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(e^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be as defined in (11). Assume that **(A2)** holds. Then,*

$$\hat{h}(x^{k+1}) \leq \left[1 + \frac{\mu \gamma_k \theta^{FW}(x^k)}{\min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), e^k \rangle^2} \right] \hat{h}(x^k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (17)$$

Proof. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows from Lemma 4 and the definition of \hat{h} in (11) that

$$0 < \hat{h}(x^k) \leq \frac{\min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), e^k \rangle^2}{2\mu},$$

which yields

$$\frac{1}{2\hat{h}(x^k)} \geq \frac{\mu}{\min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), e^k \rangle^2}.$$

On the other hand, it follows from (8) and the definition of \hat{h} in (11) that

$$\hat{h}(x^{k+1}) \leq \left[1 + \frac{\gamma_k \theta^{FW}(x^k)}{2\hat{h}(x^k)} \right] \hat{h}(x^k).$$

Therefore, (17) follows by combining the last two inequalities and the facts that $\theta^{FW}(x^k) < 0$ and $\hat{h}(x^k) > 0$. \square

The next section is devoted to the main results of this paper. Specifically, under different set of assumptions on the objective function F and the feasible set \mathcal{X} , we establish improved convergence rates for the sequences $(\hat{h}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\theta(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

4 Improved convergence rates for the M-FW algorithm

We start this section by establishing the linear convergence of the M-FW algorithm under the assumptions, besides of **(A1)**, that (i) F is strongly convex on \mathcal{X} and (ii) the limit point x^* of $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is in the relative interior of \mathcal{X} .

Theorem 6. *Assume that **(A2)** holds and $x^* \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $r > 0$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $B(x^*, 2r) \cap \text{aff}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathcal{X}$ and $x_k \in B(x^*, r)$ for all $k \geq k_0$. Then, the following inequalities hold*

$$\hat{h}(x^{k+1}) \leq \left[1 - \frac{\mu r^2}{LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2} \right] \hat{h}(x^k), \quad \forall k \geq k_0, \quad (18)$$

and

$$\sum_{i=m}^k |\theta^{FW}(x^i)|^2 \leq 2LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \hat{h}(x^m), \quad \forall k \geq m \geq 1. \quad (19)$$

Proof. First note that the existence of $r > 0$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ follows from the fact that the sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $x^* \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{X})$. Hence, for all $k \geq k_0$, we trivially have $y^k := x^k + re^k \in \mathcal{X}$, where $e^k = (x^* - x^k)/\|x^* - x^k\|$. Therefore, it follows from (5) that

$$\theta^{FW}(x^k) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), y - x^k \rangle \leq r \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), e^k \rangle < 0,$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that, for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$, F_j is convex and $F_j(x^*) - F_j(x^k) = -h_j(x^k) < 0$ (see (16)). Thus,

$$-\left(\theta^{FW}(x^k)\right)^2 \leq -r^2 \left(\max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), e^k \rangle \right)^2 = -r^2 \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), e^k \rangle^2. \quad (20)$$

On the other hand, we have that $\gamma_k < 1$ for all $k \geq k_0$. Indeed, if $\gamma_k = 1$, then $p^{FW}(x^k) = x^{k+1} \in B(x^*, r)$, which implies that $p^{FW}(x^k) \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{X})$. Hence, $z^k := x^k + t(p^{FW}(x^k) - x^k) \in \mathcal{X}$ for some $t > 1$. Thus, we have

$$\theta^{FW}(x^k) = \min_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), z - x^k \rangle \leq \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), t(p^{FW}(x^k) - x^k) \rangle = t\theta^{FW}(x^k),$$

which is a contradiction with the fact that $t > 1$ and $\theta^{FW}(x^k) < 0$. Hence, it follows from (6) that $\gamma_k = -\theta^{FW}(x^k)/(L\|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2)$, which combined with (17) yields

$$\hat{h}(x^{k+1}) \leq \left[1 - \frac{\mu(\theta^{FW}(x^k))^2}{L\|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2 \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), e^k \rangle^2} \right] \hat{h}(x^k).$$

Therefore, (18) follows from the latter inequality, (20) and the fact that $\|d^{FW}(x^k)\| \leq D_{\mathcal{X}}$. Now, to prove (19), note that (8) and the fact that $\gamma_k = -\theta^{FW}(x^k)/(L\|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2)$, imply that

$$\frac{|\theta^{FW}(x^k)|^2}{2L\|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2} \leq F_j(x^k) - F_j(x^{k+1}), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J},$$

which, combined with the fact that $\|d^{FW}(x^k)\| \leq D_{\mathcal{X}}$, yields, for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$ and $k \geq m \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{i=m}^k |\theta^{FW}(x^i)|^2 \leq 2LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \sum_{i=m}^k (F_j(x^i) - F_j(x^{i+1})) = 2LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2 (F_j(x^m) - F_j(x^{k+1})).$$

Therefore, (19) follows from the last inequality, the fact that $F(x^{k+1}) \geq F(x^*)$ and the definition of $\hat{h}(x^m)$ in (11). \square

Remark 2. It follows from (15) and (19) with $m = k$ that

$$\frac{\mu}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq |\theta^{FW}(x^k)| \leq \sqrt{2LD\mathcal{X}} \sqrt{\hat{h}(x^k)}, \quad k \geq 1.$$

On the other hand, by recursively using (18), we find that

$$\hat{h}(x^k) \leq \left[1 - \frac{\mu r^2}{LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2}\right]^{k-k_0} \hat{h}(x^{k_0}), \quad \forall k \geq k_0, \quad (21)$$

where k_0 is as in Theorem 6. From (12), we immediately have

$$\sqrt{\hat{h}(x^{k_0})} \leq \sqrt{LD\mathcal{X}}/\sqrt{2}. \quad (22)$$

Thus, combining the last three inequalities, we get

$$\frac{\mu}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq |\theta^{FW}(x^k)| \leq LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \left[\sqrt{1 - \frac{\mu r^2}{LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2}} \right]^{k-k_0}, \quad \forall k \geq k_0.$$

The above inequalities imply that the sequences $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\theta^{FW}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converge R -linearly under the assumptions of Theorem 6. Moreover, it follows from (19) with $m = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$, (21) and (22) that

$$\theta_{\text{best}}^k \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2}{\sqrt{k}} \left[\sqrt{1 - \frac{\mu r^2}{LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2}} \right]^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor - k_0}, \quad \forall k > 2k_0,$$

where $\theta_{\text{best}}^k := \min_{i \in \{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor, \dots, k\}} |\theta^{FW}(x^i)|$. Roughly speaking, for k sufficiently large, the above bound is of $\mathcal{O}(\beta^k/\sqrt{k})$ for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Recall that [1, Theorem 16] established, under **(A1)**, a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ for the sequence $(\theta_{\text{best}}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Therefore, under the additional hypothesis of Theorem 6, we have shown an improved convergence rate for $(\theta_{\text{best}}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ as well as new convergence rates for $(\theta^{FW}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

The next two theorems are devoted to the analysis of the convergence rate of the M-FW algorithm under the additional assumption that the feasible set \mathcal{X} is uniformly convex. Both results use the fundamental recursive inequality on the sequence $(\hat{h}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ presented in the following lemma. It is interesting to note that this lemma does not require the objective function F to be strongly convex.

Lemma 7. Assume that the constraint set \mathcal{X} is (α, q) -uniformly convex for some $\alpha > 0$ and $q \geq 2$. Let $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by the M-FW algorithm. Then, the following inequalities hold

$$|\theta^{FW}(x^k)| \geq \frac{\alpha}{4} \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^q |\tilde{\theta}(x^k)|, \quad \hat{h}(x^{k+1}) \leq \left[1 - \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}, r_k\right\}\right] \hat{h}(x^k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (23)$$

where

$$r_k := \frac{[\hat{h}(x^k)]^{(q-2)/q} [\alpha \|\tilde{\theta}(x^k)\|]^{2/q}}{2^{(4+q)/q} L}, \quad \tilde{\theta}(x) := \min_{\|z\| \leq 1} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x), z \rangle. \quad (24)$$

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows from step 1 of the M-FW algorithm, the first inequality in (2) and (11) that

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^{FW}(x^k) &= \min_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), y - x^k \rangle \leq \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), x^* - x^k \rangle \\ &\leq \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} F_j(x^*) - F_j(x^k) \\ &= -\min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} h_j(x^k) = -\hat{h}(x^k).\end{aligned}\quad (25)$$

Now, let z^k and \tilde{x}^k be defined as

$$z^k := \arg \min_{\|z\| \leq 1} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), z \rangle, \quad \tilde{x}^k := x^k + \frac{1}{2} d^{FW}(x^k) + \frac{\alpha}{8} \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^q z^k.$$

Since $d^{FW}(x^k) = p^{FW}(x^k) - x^k$, we have $\tilde{x}^k \in \mathcal{X}$ in view of (3) with $x = x^k, y = p^{FW}(x^k), z = z^k$ and $\gamma = 1/2$. Hence, it follows from the definitions of $\theta^{FW}(x^k)$ and $\tilde{\theta}(x^k)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^{FW}(x^k) &= \min_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), y - x^k \rangle \leq \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), \tilde{x}^k - x^k \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), d^{FW}(x^k) \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{8} \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^q \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), z^k \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \theta^{FW}(x^k) + \frac{\alpha}{8} \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^q \tilde{\theta}(x^k),\end{aligned}$$

which, combined with the fact that $\max\{\theta^{FW}(x^k), \tilde{\theta}(x^k)\} < 0$, implies the first inequality in (23). Now, using (8) and (25) and the definition of \hat{h} in (11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{h}(x^{k+1}) &\leq \hat{h}(x^k) + \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \theta^{FW}(x^k) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}\right) \hat{h}(x^k).\end{aligned}\quad (26)$$

It follows from the definition of γ_k in (6), (25), the first inequality in (23), and the fact that $\max\{\theta^{FW}(x^k), \tilde{\theta}(x^k)\} < 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_k &= \min \left\{ 1, \frac{|\theta^{FW}(x^k)|}{L \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2} \right\} = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{|\theta^{FW}(x^k)|^{1-2/q} |\theta^{FW}(x^k)|^{2/q}}{L \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2} \right\} \\ &\geq \min \left\{ 1, \frac{[\hat{h}(x^k)]^{1-2/q} [\frac{\alpha}{4} \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^q |\tilde{\theta}(x^k)|]^{2/q}}{L \|d^{FW}(x^k)\|^2} \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ 1, \frac{[\hat{h}(x^k)]^{1-2/q} [\alpha |\tilde{\theta}(x^k)|]^{2/q}}{2^{4/q} L} \right\}\end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (26) and the definition of r_k in (24), proves the second inequality in (23). \square

We next establish a faster convergence rate for the M-FW algorithm by assuming, besides **(A1)**, that **(A2)** holds and the set \mathcal{X} is (α, q) -uniformly convex. Roughly speaking, we show that $\hat{h}(x^k) = \mathcal{O}(1/k^{q/(q-1)})$. In particular, if \mathcal{X} is strongly convex, i.e., $(\alpha, 2)$ -uniformly convex, then $\hat{h}(x^k) = \mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$, which improves the sublinear convergence rate $\hat{h}(x^k) = \mathcal{O}(1/k)$ proved in [1] under the assumption of convexity of F .

Theorem 8. Let $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by the M-FW algorithm. Assume that the constraint set \mathcal{X} is (α, q) -uniformly convex for some $\alpha > 0$ and $q \geq 2$, and that **(A2)** holds. Then, the following inequalities hold

$$\hat{h}(x^k) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2}{2^k}, & \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq k_0, \\ \left(\frac{8}{\alpha^2 \mu}\right)^{1/(q-1)} \left(\frac{2qL}{2q+(q-1)(k-k_0)}\right)^{\frac{q}{q-1}} = \mathcal{O}\left(1/k^{\frac{q}{q-1}}\right), & \text{for } k > k_0, \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

and

$$\sum_{i=m}^k \min \left\{ |\theta^{FW}(x^i)|, \frac{|\theta^{FW}(x^i)|^2}{L \|\theta^{FW}(x^i)\|^2} \right\} \leq 2\hat{h}(x^m), \quad \forall k \geq m \geq 1, \quad (28)$$

where

$$k_0 := \max \left\{ \left\lceil \log_2 \left(\frac{D_{\mathcal{X}}^2}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha^2 \mu}{8L} \right)^{1/(q-1)} \right) \right\rceil + 2, 1 \right\}.$$

Proof. Let e^k and $\tilde{\theta}(x^k)$ as in (11) and (24), respectively. Using the first inequality in (2), we have

$$\tilde{\theta}(x^k) \leq \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), e^k \rangle \leq \frac{\max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} F_j(x^*) - F_j(x^k)}{\|x^k - x^*\|} < 0.$$

Hence, since F_j is μ -strongly convex for every $j \in \mathcal{J}$, it follows from (16) and the definition of $\hat{h}(x^k)$ in (11) that

$$0 < \hat{h}(x^k) \leq \frac{\min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), e^k \rangle^2}{2\mu} = \frac{(\max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), e^k \rangle)^2}{2\mu} \leq \frac{\tilde{\theta}(x^k)^2}{2\mu},$$

which yields

$$\tilde{\theta}(x^k)^2 \geq 2\mu \hat{h}(x^k).$$

It follows by combining the latter inequality and the definition of r_k in (24) that

$$r_k = \frac{[\hat{h}(x^k)]^{(q-2)/q}}{2L} \left(\frac{\alpha^2 \tilde{\theta}(x^k)^2}{16} \right)^{1/q} \geq \frac{[\hat{h}(x^k)]^{(q-1)/q}}{2L} \left(\frac{\alpha^2 \mu}{8} \right)^{1/q}.$$

Hence, from the second inequality in (23), we have

$$\hat{h}(x^{k+1}) \leq \left[1 - \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{[\hat{h}(x^k)]^{(q-1)/q}}{2L} \left(\frac{\alpha^2 \mu}{8} \right)^{1/q} \right\} \right] \hat{h}(x^k), \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

Moreover, it follows from (12) that

$$\hat{h}(x^1) \leq \frac{LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2}{2}.$$

Therefore, (27) follows immediately from the last two inequalities and Lemma 1 with

$$c_0 = \frac{LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2}{2}, \quad c_1 = \frac{1}{2}, \quad c_2 = \frac{1}{2L} \left(\frac{\alpha^2 \mu}{8} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad \beta = \frac{q-1}{q},$$

and some algebraic manipulations. Now, to prove (28), note that (8) and the definition of γ_k in (6) imply that

$$\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ |\theta^{FW}(x^i)|, \frac{|\theta^{FW}(x^i)|^2}{L \|d^{FW}(x^i)\|^2} \right\} \leq F_j(x^i) - F_j(x^{i+1}), \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}, \forall j \in \mathcal{J}.$$

Hence, for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$ and $k \geq m \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=m}^k \min \left\{ |\theta^{FW}(x^i)|, \frac{|\theta^{FW}(x^i)|^2}{L \|d^{FW}(x^i)\|^2} \right\} &\leq 2 \sum_{i=m}^k (F_j(x^i) - F_j(x^{i+1})) \\ &= 2(F_j(x^m) - F_j(x^{k+1})). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (28) follows from the last inequality, the fact that $F(x^{k+1}) \geq F(x^*)$, and the definition of $\hat{h}(x^m)$ in (11). \square

Remark 3. It follows from (28) with $m := k$ and the fact that $\|d^{FW}(x^k)\| \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$ that

$$\min \left\{ |\theta^{FW}(x^k)|, \frac{|\theta^{FW}(x^k)|^2}{L \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}^2} \right\} \leq 2\hat{h}(x^k), \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (29)$$

In particular, the sequence $(\theta^{FW}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to zero and, for all k sufficiently large, we have $|\theta^{FW}(x^k)|^2 / [L \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}^2] \leq |(\theta^{FW}(x^k))|$. Hence, from (15), (27), and (29), we have, for all k sufficiently large,

$$\frac{\mu}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq |\theta^{FW}(x^k)| \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \sqrt{2L\hat{h}(x^k)} \approx \mathcal{O}\left(1/k^{\frac{q}{2(q-1)}}\right),$$

which implies that the sequences $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\theta^{FW}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converge at a rate $\mathcal{O}\left(1/k^{\frac{q}{4(q-1)}}\right)$ and $\mathcal{O}\left(1/k^{\frac{q}{2(q-1)}}\right)$, respectively, under the assumptions of Theorem 8. Again as $(\theta^{FW}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to zero, it follows (27), (28) with $m = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ and simple algebraic manipulations that, for all k sufficiently large,

$$\theta_{best}^k \approx \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{k^{\frac{2q-1}{2(q-1)}}}\right),$$

where θ_{best}^k is as in Remark 2. Since $q \geq 2$, the above bound improves the rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ for the sequence $(\theta_{best}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ established in [1, Theorem 16] under **(A1)**.

We are now ready to establish a convergence rate result for the M-FW algorithm when (i) the constraint set \mathcal{X} is (α, q) -uniformly convex and (ii) the sequence $(\tilde{\theta}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined in (24) stays away from zero. The next convergence rate bounds are better than those in Theorem 8, and, in particular, the linear convergence is achieved when the constraint set is strongly convex (i.e., $(\alpha, 2)$ -uniformly convex). Although the assumption on $(\tilde{\theta}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is considered on the sequence generated by the M-FW algorithm, we will show in Remark 5 that it holds under suitable conditions on problem (1).

Theorem 9. Let $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by the M-FW algorithm. Assume that the constraint set \mathcal{X} is (α, q) -uniformly convex for some $\alpha > 0$ and $q \geq 2$, and $c := \inf_k |\tilde{\theta}(x^k)| > 0$. Then,

$$\hat{h}(x^k) \leq \begin{cases} \left[\max \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, 1 - \frac{\zeta}{L} \right\} \right] \hat{h}(x^{k-1}) & \text{for } q = 2, k \geq 1, \\ \frac{LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2}{2^k} & \text{for } q > 2, 1 \leq k \leq k_0, \\ \left(\frac{qL}{\zeta[2q+(q-2)(k-k_0)]} \right)^{\frac{q}{q-2}} = \mathcal{O} \left(1/k^{\frac{q}{q-2}} \right) & \text{for } q > 2, k > k_0, \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

and

$$\sum_{i=m}^k \min \left\{ |\theta^{FW}(x^i)|, \frac{|\theta^{FW}(x^i)|^2}{L \|d^{FW}(x^i)\|^2} \right\} \leq 2\hat{h}(x^m), \quad \forall k \geq m \geq 1, \quad (31)$$

where

$$\zeta = \zeta(\alpha, q, c) := \frac{[\alpha c]^{2/q}}{2^{(4+q)/q}}, \quad k_0 := \max \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{2}{q-2} \log_2 \left(\frac{2D_{\mathcal{X}}^{q-2} \zeta^{q/2}}{L} \right) \right\rfloor + 2, 1 \right\}.$$

Proof. Since $c = \inf_k |\tilde{\theta}(x^k)| > 0$, it follows from the second inequality in (23) and the definition of ζ that

$$\hat{h}(x^{k+1}) \leq \left[1 - \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{\zeta}{L} [\hat{h}(x^k)]^{(q-2)/q} \right\} \right] \hat{h}(x^k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The first inequality in (30) follows immediately from the above inequality with $q = 2$. Now, note that (12) implies that

$$\hat{h}(x^1) \leq \frac{LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2}{2}.$$

Thus, if $q > 2$ the result follows immediately from the last two inequalities above, Lemma 1 with $c_0 = LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2/2$, $c_1 = 1/2$, $c_2 = \zeta/L$ and $\beta = (q-2)/q$, and some algebraic manipulations. Since the proof of (31) follows the same steps as those of (28), it is omitted. \square

We finish this section by presenting two remarks. The first one shows how convergence rate of the sequence $(\theta(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be obtained from Theorem 9, and compares it with the one obtained in [1]. The second remark discusses some conditions that imply the assumption on $(\tilde{\theta}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ considered in Theorem 9.

Remark 4. Similarly to Remark 3, we can show that the sequences $(\theta(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\theta_{best}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, for k sufficiently large, have the following convergence rates

$$|\theta^{FW}(x^k)| \approx \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{k^{\frac{q}{2(q-2)}}} \right), \quad \theta_{best}^k \approx \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{k^{\frac{q-1}{q-2}}} \right), \quad \text{for } q > 2.$$

For the particular case in which $q = 2$, these convergence are further improved. Indeed, from the first inequality in (23), (31) and the assumption $|\tilde{\theta}(x^k)| \geq c > 0$, we have

$$\min \left\{ 1, \frac{\alpha c}{4L} \right\} \sum_{i=m}^k |\theta^{FW}(x^i)| \leq 2\hat{h}(x^m), \quad \forall k \geq m \geq 1,$$

which, combined with (30) with $q = 2$ and the fact that $\hat{h}(x^1) \leq LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2/2$ (see (12)), implies that

$$\sum_{i=m}^k |\theta^{FW}(x^i)| \leq 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{4L}{\alpha c} \right\} \frac{LD_{\mathcal{X}}^2}{2} \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, 1 - \frac{\zeta}{L} \right\}^{m-1}, \quad \forall k \geq m \geq 1.$$

The above inequality with $m = k$ and $m = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ implies, respectively, the improved convergence rates

$$|\theta^{FW}(x^k)| \approx \mathcal{O}(\beta^k), \quad \theta_{best}^k \approx \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\beta^k}{k}\right), \quad (32)$$

where $\beta := \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, 1 - \frac{\zeta}{L} \right\} < 1$. The above convergence rates for $(\theta_{best}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are better than the rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ established in [1, Theorem 16] under assumption **(A1)**. It is worth mentioning that the latter reference does not contain convergence rate for $(\theta(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Next we discuss some properties about the quantity $(\tilde{\theta}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ computed in (24) and present some conditions under which the assumption considered on this sequence in Theorem 9 holds.

Remark 5. (i) Let $\|\cdot\|_2$ denote the norm induced by the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ in \mathcal{Y} . It is easy to see that in the scalar setting, i.e., $m = 1$, we have $\tilde{\theta}(x^k) = -\|\nabla f(x^k)\|_2$. Hence, in this case, the assumption on the quantity $\tilde{\theta}(x^k)$ considered in Theorem 9 coincides with the one in [13, 20, 27]. (ii) For a given point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the multiobjective steepest descent direction at x , see [16], is defined as

$$d^s(x) := \arg \min_{d \in \mathbb{R}^n} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x), d \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|d\|_2^2.$$

It can be shown, see [29, Corollary 2.3], that $\max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x), d^s(x) \rangle = -\|d^s(x)\|_2^2$. Now, since \mathcal{Y} is a finite dimensional space, there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that $\|x\|_2 \geq \kappa \|x\|$ for all $x \in \mathcal{Y}$. Hence, for every $k \geq 0$,

$$\tilde{\theta}(x^k) = \min_{\|z\| \leq 1} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \nabla F_j(x^k), z \rangle \leq \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \left\langle \nabla F_j(x^k), \frac{d^s(x^k)}{\|d^s(x^k)\|} \right\rangle = -\frac{\|d^s(x^k)\|_2^2}{\|d^s(x^k)\|} \leq -\kappa \|d^s(x^k)\|_2,$$

which implies that

$$|\tilde{\theta}(x^k)| \geq \kappa \|d^s(x^k)\|_2. \quad (33)$$

Thus, the assumption on $(\tilde{\theta}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in Theorem 9 holds if it is assumed that $\inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|d^s(x^k)\|_2 > 0$. Additionally, it is worth pointing out that the latter assumption can be ensured by requiring that the constraint set \mathcal{X} does not contain any unconstrained weak Pareto point of the objective function F . Indeed, this observation follows from the fact that $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{X}$, \mathcal{X} is compact, $d^s(\cdot)$ is a continuous function and $d^s(x) = 0$ if and only if x is an unconstrained weak Pareto point of F , see [16, Lemma 1].

5 Illustrative examples

In this section, we present some instances of (1) to illustrate the behavior of the M-FW algorithm under the scenarios described in Theorems 6, 8 and 9. These examples provide concrete situations to show how different set of assumptions considered in the paper can affect the performance of the method.




Figure 1: On the left we illustrate the unconstrained Pareto set (red line segment), the level curves of the two objectives, the constraint feasible set, and the trajectory of M-FW. On the right, the sublinear convergence rate is illustrated by plotting $\log \hat{h}(x^k)$ versus the number of iterations.

We begin by illustrating that assuming only the strong convexity of F is insufficient to improve the sublinear convergence rate of the M-FW algorithm.

Let

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\|x - b\|_2^2, \|x - c\|_2^2)^T, \quad (34)$$

and the feasible constraint set

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|x\|_1 \leq 1\}.$$

It is easy to see that, regardless the points $b, c \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have $\mu = L = 1$ and $D_{\mathcal{X}} = 2$.

Consider $b = (-0.6, -0.6)^T$ and $c = (-0.5, -0.5)^T$. It is not hard to see that the unconstrained Pareto set intersects the feasible set \mathcal{X} in a single boundary point $(-0.5, -0.5)^T$ (see Figure 1(left)). In this case, we observe the sublinear convergence rate of the sequence $(\hat{h}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ generated by the M-FW algorithm (Figure 1(right)).

Now, consider the same b as before, but $c = (-0.01, -0.01)^T$ instead. Since $(-0.01, -0.01)^T$ is a Pareto point in the relative interior of \mathcal{X} and the objectives are strongly convex, Theorem 6 applies and the linear convergence rate of $(\hat{h}(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is illustrated in Figure 2(right).

In order to illustrate Theorem 8, consider F as in (34), but the feasible region as

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_2 \leq 1\},$$

which is an $(1,2)$ -uniformly convex set. Take $b = (-1/\sqrt{2}, -1/\sqrt{2})^T$ and $c = (-3/4, -3/4)^T$. In this setting, since **(A2)** holds and $q = 2$, we should observe an $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ convergence rate as in Theorem 8. This is illustrated in Figure 3.

Finally, recall that Theorem 9 does not require the strong convexity of the objectives, only the (α, q) -uniform convexity of the feasible set. However, the extra condition is that $\tilde{\theta}(x)$ stays bounded away from zero, at least at the iterates generated by M-FW. Consider now

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\|Ax - b_1\|_2^2, \|Ax - b_2\|_2^2)^T,$$




Figure 2: On the left we illustrate the unconstrained Pareto set (red line segment), the level curves of the two objectives, the constraint feasible set, and the trajectory of M-FW. On the right, the linear convergence rate is illustrated by plotting $\log \hat{h}(x^k)$ versus the number of iterations.




Figure 3: On the left we illustrate the unconstrained Pareto set (red line segment), the level curves of the two objectives, the constraint feasible set, and the trajectory of M-FW. On the right, the $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ rate is illustrated by plotting $\log \hat{h}(x^k)$ versus the number of iterations.




Figure 4: On the left we illustrate the unconstrained Pareto (red rectangle), the level curves of the two objectives, the constraint feasible set, and the trajectory of M-FW. On the right, the linear convergence rate is illustrated by plotting $\log \min_j \hat{h}_j(x^k)$ versus the number of iterations.

where $A = e_1 e_1^T$, $e_1 = (1, 0)^T$, $b_1 = (-1.1, 0)^T$ and $b_2 = (-1.3, 0)^T$, with

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|x\|_2 \leq 1\}$$

as feasible region. Since A is only positive semidefinite, the objectives are convex but not strongly convex. As in the previous example, \mathcal{X} is (1,2)-uniformly convex.

Thus, according to Theorem 9 we should expect a linear convergence rate (since $q = 2$) as long as $c := \inf_k |\hat{\theta}(x^k)| > 0$. In order to estimate c , we observe that $\langle \nabla F_j(x), z \rangle = (x_1 - b_{j1})z_1$, for $j = 1, 2$. Also, $x_1 - b_{j1} \geq -1 - b_{j1} = 0.1 > 0$, for $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence, the minimizer of $\max\{\langle \nabla F_1(x), z \rangle, \langle \nabla F_2(x), z \rangle\}$ for $z \in \mathcal{X}$ is $z = (-1, 0)^T$ with optimal value $\max\{b_{11} - x_1, b_{21} - x_1\} = b_{11} - x_1 = -1.1 - x_1 \geq 0.1$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$, so we obtain that $c \geq 0.1 > 0$. Figure 4 illustrates the linear convergence rate of the M-FW algorithm in this example.

6 Conclusion

This paper established convergence rates for the multiobjective Frank-Wolfe algorithm for solving constrained convex multiobjective optimization problems. It was shown that the algorithm achieves faster sublinear as well as linear convergence rates under different set of assumptions such as strong convexity of the multiobjective function and uniform convexity of the constraint set. Illustrative examples were presented to showcase the convergence rates obtained and the assumptions considered.

Data availability statement

Data sharing not applicable – no new data generated, or the article describes entirely theoretical research.

Conflict of interest

The authors have no Conflict of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

References

- [1] P. B. Assunção, O. P. Ferreira, and L. F. Prudente. Conditional gradient method for multi-objective optimization. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 78:741–768, 2021.
- [2] P. B. Assunção, O. P. Ferreira, and L. F. Prudente. A generalized conditional gradient method for multiobjective composite optimization problems. *Optimization*, 0(0):1–31, 2023.
- [3] Y. Bello-Cruz, J. Melo, and R. G. Serra. A proximal gradient splitting method for solving convex vector optimization problems. *Optimization*, 71(1):33–53, 2022.
- [4] Y. Bello-Cruz, L. L. Pérez, and J. Melo. Convergence of the projected gradient method for quasiconvex multiobjective optimization. *Nonlinear Anal. Theory Methods Appl.*, 74(16):5268 – 5273, 2011.
- [5] G. C. Bento, G. Bouza Allende, and Y. R. L. Pereira. A newton-like method for variable order vector optimization problems. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 177:201–221, 2018.
- [6] G. C. Bento and J. X. Cruz Neto. A subgradient method for multiobjective optimization on Riemannian manifolds. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 159:125–137, 2013.
- [7] G. C. Bento, J. X. Cruz Neto, and L. V. Meireles. Proximal point method for locally lipschitz functions in multiobjective optimization of Hadamard manifolds. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 179:37–52, 2018.
- [8] G. C. Bento, J. X. Cruz Neto, and P. S. M. Santos. An inexact steepest descent method for multicriteria optimization on Riemannian manifolds. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 159:108–124, 2013.
- [9] G. C. Bento, J. X. Cruz-Neto, and A. Soubeyran. A proximal point-type method for multicriteria optimization. *Set-Valued Var Anal.*, 22(3):557–573, 2014.
- [10] G. C. Bento, O. P. Ferreira, and P. R. Oliveira. Unconstrained steepest descent method for multicriteria optimization on Riemannian manifolds. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 154:88–107, 2012.
- [11] G. C. Bento, O. P. Ferreira, A. Soubeyran, and V. L. Sousa Júnior. Inexact multi-objective local search proximal algorithms: Application to group dynamic and distributive justice problems. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 177:181–200, 2018.
- [12] H. Bonnel, A. N. Iusem, and B. F. Svaiter. Proximal methods in vector optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 15(4):953–970, 2005.
- [13] G. Braun, A. Carderera, C. W. Combettes, H. Hassani, A. Karbasi, and A. Mokhtari. Conditional gradient methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.14103*, 2022.

- [14] W. Chen, X. Yang, and Y. Zhao. Conditional gradient method for vector optimization. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 85:857–896, 2023.
- [15] H. A. Eschenauer, J. Koski, and A. Osyczka. *Multicriteria Optimization — Fundamentals and Motivation*, pages 1–32. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1990.
- [16] J. Fliege and B. F. Svaiter. Steepest descent methods for multicriteria optimization. *Math. Method. Oper. Res.*, 51(3):479–494, 2000.
- [17] E. Fukuda and L. M. G. Drummond. On the convergence of the projected gradient method for vector optimization. *Optimization*, 60(8-9):1009–1021, 2011.
- [18] E. Fukuda, H. Tanabe, and N. Yamashita. Proximal gradient methods for multiobjective optimization and their applications. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 72(2):339–361, 2019.
- [19] E. Fukuda, H. Tanabe, and N. Yamashita. An accelerated proximal gradient method for multiobjective optimization. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 86(2):421–455, 2023.
- [20] D. Garber and E. Hazan. Faster rates for the Frank-Wolfe method over strongly-convex sets. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 541–549. PMLR, 2015.
- [21] A. G. Gebriel and E. H. Fukuda. Adaptive generalized conditional gradient method for multiobjective optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04174*, 2024.
- [22] D. Gonçalves, M. Gonçalves, and J. G. Melo. An away-step frank-wolfe algorithm for constrained multiobjective optimization. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 2024.
- [23] L. M. Graña Drummond and A. N. Iusem. A projected gradient method for vector optimization problems. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 28(1):5–29, 2004.
- [24] J. Guélat and P. Marcotte. Some comments on Wolfe’s ‘away step’. *Mathematical Programming*, 35(1):110–119, May 1986.
- [25] A. N. Iusem, J. G. Melo, and R. G. Serra. A strongly convergent proximal point method for vector optimization. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 190:183–200, 2021.
- [26] M. Jaggi. Revisiting Frank-Wolfe: Projection-free sparse convex optimization. In S. Dasgupta and D. McAllester, editors, *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 28 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 427–435, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, June 2013. PMLR.
- [27] T. Kerdreux, A. d’Aspremont, and S. Pokutta. Projection-free optimization on uniformly convex sets. In *Proceedings of The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, volume 130, pages 19–27. PMLR, 2021.
- [28] E. Schreibmann, M. Lahanas, L. Xing, and D. Baltas. Multiobjective evolutionary optimization of the number of beams, their orientations and weights for intensity-modulated radiation therapy. *Physics in medicine and biology*, 49:747–70, 04 2004.
- [29] B. F. Svaiter. The multiobjective steepest descent direction is not Lipschitz continuous, but is Hölder continuous. *Operations Research Letters*, 46(4):430–433, 2018.