# RELAXED AND INERTIAL NONLINEAR FORWARD-BACKWARD WITH MOMENTUM

FERNANDO ROLDÁN<sup>†</sup> AND CRISTIAN VEGA<sup>‡</sup>

ABSTRACT. In this article, we study inertial algorithms for numerically solving monotone inclusions involving the sum of a maximally monotone and a cocoercive operator. In particular, we analyze the convergence of inertial and relaxed versions of the nonlinear forwardbackward with momentum (NFBM). We propose an inertial version including a relaxation step, and a second version considering a double-inertial step with additional momentum. By applying NFBM to specific monotone inclusions, we derive inertial and relaxed versions of algorithms such as forward-backward, forward-half-reflect-backward (FHRB), Chambolle– Pock, Condat–Vũ, among others, thereby recovering and extending previous results from the literature for solving monotone inclusions involving maximally monotone, cocoercive, monotone and Lipschitz, and linear bounded operators. We also present numerical experiments on image restoration, comparing the proposed inertial and relaxation algorithms. In particular, we compare the inertial FHRB with its non-inertial and momentum versions. Additionally, we compare the numerical convergence for larger step-sizes versus relaxation parameters and introduce a *restart* strategy that incorporates larger step-sizes and inertial steps to further enhance numerical convergence.

**Keywords:** Operator splitting  $\cdot$  monotone operators  $\cdot$  monotone inclusion  $\cdot$  inertial methods  $\cdot$  convex optimization

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020):  $47H05 \cdot 65K05 \cdot 65K15 \cdot 90C25$ 

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Several applications are modeled through monotone inclusions, such as mechanical problems [37, 40, 41], differential inclusions [7, 54], convex programming [27], game theory [19, 22], data science [28], image processing [13,20], traffic theory [15,36,38], among other disciplines. For this reason, numerical algorithms for solving monotone inclusions have been extensively studied over the years [16–18,21,25,26,29,31,35,44,46,51,55,56]. In particular, the nonlinear forwardbackward with momentum (NFBM) was proposed in [48] for solving monotone inclusions involving maximally monotone and cocoercive operators. At each iteration, NFBM involves one evaluation of the cocoercive operator and one evaluation of the *warped resolvent*, which is induced by a Lipschitz operator (see also [23, 39]), generalizing the classic forward-backward (FB) algorithm [44,51]. Additionally, NFBM allows for variable metrics induced by self-adjoint strongly monotone linear operators. Consequently, by appropriately selecting the Lipschitz operator and the metric, several methods from the literature, such as forward-half-reflectedbackward (FHRB) [46], Douglas-Rachford [34,35,44], Chambolle-Pock (CP) [25], Condat-Vũ (CV) [29,56], among others, are recovered from NFBM. However, the inertial/relaxed versions of these algorithms are not deduced from NFBM. Inertial and relaxation steps are incorporated into numerical algorithms for solving monotone inclusions in order to accelerate convergence.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>DEPARTAMENTO DE INGENIERÍA MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN, CONCEPCIÓN, CHILE. *E-mail address:* fernandoroldan@udec.cl.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup> INSTITUTO DE ALTA INVESTIGACIÓN (IAI), UNIVERSIDAD DE TARAPACÁ, ARICA, CHILE. *E-mail address:* cristianvegacereno6@gmail.com.

The inertial step involves calculating the next iterate using the previous two iterates, while the relaxation step consists of a convex combination of the current and next iterate. For instance, it has been shown in [3,4,43] that incorporating inertial and/or relaxation steps improves algorithm performance. In this article, we study the convergence of an inertial and relaxed version of NFBM.

Many articles studied inertial/relaxed versions of algorithms for solving monotone inclusions. For instance, inertial and relaxation extensions of the gradient descent algorithm have been proposed in [50, 52]. Inertial proximal algorithms were studied in [2, 5, 6, 49]. Similarly, the Krasnosel'skiĭ–Mann has been extended with inertial and relaxation steps in [30, 32, 33, 47]. Inertial versions of FB have been studied in [1, 5, 9, 10, 45]. In addition, inertial and relaxed versions of FBF, DR, and CP have been studied in [10, 11, 14], [3, 12], and [42, 57], respectively.

The main contribution of this work is to incorporate inertial steps in NFBM. In particular, we propose an inertial version of NFBM including a relaxation step, and a second version considering a double-inertial step with additional momentum. For both methods, we prove the weak convergence of its iterates to a solution point of the monotone inclusion. We extend relaxed and inertial versions of algorithms such as FB, FHRB, CP, and CV. Moreover, we recover the existing conditions on the step-sizes that guarantee the weak convergence of the inertial and non-inertial versions of these methods that are available in the literature. Finally, we present numerical experiments in image restoration for testing the proposed inertial and relaxation algorithms; in particular, we compare the inertial FHRB with its non-inertial and momentum versions. We show that for a fix step-size, the proposed algorithms speed up the convergence in terms of iterations. In the case where the step-size approach to its admissible limit, we introduce a *restart* strategy that incorporates both larger step-sizes and inertial steps, obtaining better results than the non-inertial version in iterations and CPU time.

This article is organized as follows: In Section 3, we introduce the notation and mathematical background. Section 4 provides the convergence analysis of both inertial algorithms. In Section 5 we present inertial/relaxed algorithms deduced from our main result. Section 6 is dedicated to numerical experiments in image restoration. Finally, the conclusions are presented in Section 7.

### 2. Problem Statement and Proposed Algorithm

In this article we aim to solve numerically the following problem.

**Problem 2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a real Hilbert space, let  $A : \mathcal{H} \to 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  be a maximally monotone operator and let  $C : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$  be a  $\mu$ -cocoercive operator for  $\mu \in [0, +\infty[$ . The problem is to

nd 
$$x \in \mathcal{H}$$
 such that  $0 \in (A+C)x$ 

under the hypothesis that its solution set, denoted by  $\mathbf{Z}$ , is not empty.

fi

This problem can be solved by the NFBM, which for starting points  $(x_0, u_0) \in \mathcal{H}^2$ , iterates as follows:

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} x_{n+1} = (M_n + A)^{-1} (M_n x_n - C x_n + u_n / \gamma_n), \\ u_{n+1} = (\gamma_n M_n - S) x_{n+1} - (\gamma_n M_n - S) x_n. \end{cases}$$
(2.1)

where, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\gamma_n \in ]0, +\infty[$ ,  $M_n \colon \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$  is such that  $\gamma_n M_n - S$  is  $\zeta_n$ -Lipschitz and  $S \colon \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$  is a self-adjoint strongly monotone linear operator. In the case when, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\gamma_n = \gamma$ ,  $\gamma_n M_n = \mathrm{Id}$  and  $S = \mathrm{Id}$ , the recurrence in (2.1) corresponds to FB. Moreover, if we set  $M_n = \mathrm{Id}/\gamma - B$ ,  $S = \mathrm{Id}$ , and  $A = \tilde{A} + B$ , where  $\gamma \in ]0, +\infty[$ ,  $\tilde{A} \colon \mathcal{H} \to 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  is a set valued operator,  $B \colon \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$  is a  $\zeta$ -Lipschitzian operator for  $\zeta \in ]0, +\infty[$  and A is maximally monotone, (2.1) reduces to

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \lfloor x_{n+1} = J_{\gamma A} \left( x_n - \gamma (2Bx_n - Bx_{n-1} + Cx_n) \right). \tag{2.2}$$

Note that the recurrence in (2.2) corresponds to FHRB and  $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  converges weakly to a zero of  $(\tilde{A} + B + C)$  if  $\gamma \in ]0, 2\mu/(4\zeta\mu + 1)[$ . On the other hand, primal-dual methods generalizing CP and CV are deduced from the recurrence in (2.1) by an adequate choice of  $M_n$  and S (see [48, Section 6]). Therefore, despite our main problem consisting in an inclusion that involves only two operators, the recurrence in (2.2) can be adapted for finding zeros of monotone inclusions involving the sum of several operators, as in [48, Section 6].

In this article, we study the convergence of the following inertial and relaxed version of (2.1).

**Algorithm 2.2.** In the context of Problem 2.1, let  $(\gamma_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $]0, +\infty[$ , let  $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in [0,1], let  $\lambda \in ]0,2[$ , let  $(x_0, x_{-1}, u_0) \in \mathcal{H}^3$ , and consider the sequence defined recursively by

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \qquad \begin{cases} y_n = x_n + \alpha_n (x_n - x_{n-1}), \\ p_{n+1} = (M_n + A)^{-1} (M_n y_n - C y_n + u_n / \gamma_n), \\ u_{n+1} = (\gamma_n M_n - S) p_{n+1} - (\gamma_n M_n - S) y_n, \\ x_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda) y_n + \lambda p_{n+1}. \end{cases}$$
(2.3)

Note that, in the case where  $\alpha_n \equiv 0$  and  $\lambda = 1$ , (2.3) reduces to (2.1). Furthermore, in the same setting mentioned above, from (2.3), we deduce an inertial and relaxed version of FHRB (see (5.4)). Versions of NFBM and FHRB with additional momentum have been proposed in [48] and [46,58], respectively. However, these extensions are not completely inertial and do not cover the recurrences in (2.3) and (5.4). In order to recover these extensions, we provide the following algorithm that additionally incorporates momentum and a second relaxation step. The second inertial step allows for more flexibility in the choice of inertial parameters. For simplicity, we do not consider the relaxation step in this recurrence.

**Algorithm 2.3.** In the context of Problem 2.1, let  $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $(\beta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and  $(\theta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  sequences in [0,1], let  $(x_0, x_{-1}, u_0) \in \mathcal{H}^3$ , and consider the sequence defined recursively by

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \begin{vmatrix} y_n = x_n + \alpha_n (x_n - x_{n-1}), \\ z_n = x_n + \beta_n (x_n - x_{n-1}), \\ x_{n+1} = (M_n + A)^{-1} (M_n y_n - C z_n + u_n / \gamma_n + \theta_n S(x_n - x_{n-1}) / \gamma_n), \\ u_{n+1} = (\gamma_n M_n - S) x_{n+1} - (\gamma_n M_n - S) y_n. \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.4)$$

## 3. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

In this paper,  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  are real Hilbert spaces with scalar product  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$  and norm  $|| \cdot ||$ . We denoted by  $\rightarrow$  the strong convergence and  $\rightarrow$  the weak convergence. The identity operator is denoted by Id. Given a linear operator  $L : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ , we denote its adjoint by  $L^* : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  and its norm by ||L||. L is a self-adjoint operator if  $L^* = L$  and is strongly monotone if there exists  $\alpha \in ]0, +\infty[$  such that, for every  $x \in \mathcal{H}, \langle Lx | x \rangle \geq \alpha ||x||^2$ . Henceforth,  $S : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is a self-adjoint strongly monotone linear operator. The inner product and norm induced by S are denoted by  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_S := \langle S \cdot | \cdot \rangle$  and  $|| \cdot ||_S$ , respectively. Hence, for every  $(x, y, z) \in \mathcal{H}^3$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ 

$$2\langle x - y \mid y - z \rangle_S = \|x - z\|_S^2 - \|x - y\|_S^2 - \|y - z\|_S^2,$$
(3.1)

$$\|\alpha x + (1-\alpha)y\|_{S}^{2} = \alpha \|x\|_{S}^{2} + (1-\alpha)\|y\|_{S}^{2} - \alpha(1-\alpha)\|x-y\|_{S}^{2}.$$
(3.2)

Note that, there exists a self-adjoint strongly monotone linear operator  $S^{1/2}: \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$  such that  $S = S^{1/2} \circ S^{1/2}$ . Therefore, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality can be extended to the norm induced by S and  $S^{-1}$  in the following sense, for every  $(x, u) \in \mathcal{H}^2$ 

$$|\langle x \mid u \rangle| = \left| \left\langle S^{-1/2} x \mid S^{1/2} u \right\rangle \right| \le ||S^{-1/2} x|| ||S^{1/2} u|| = ||x||_{S^{-1}} ||u||_S.$$

Let  $T: \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$  and  $\beta \in [0, +\infty)$ . The operator T is  $\beta$ -cocoercive with respect to S if for every  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{H}^2$ ,  $\langle x - y | Tx - Ty \rangle \geq \beta ||Tx - Ty||_{S^{-1}}^2$ . The operator T is  $\beta$ -Lipschitzian with respect to S if  $|Tx - Ty||_{S^{-1}} \leq \beta ||x - y||_S$ . Let  $A: \mathcal{H} \to 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  be a set-valued operator. The graph of A is defined by  $\operatorname{gra} A = \{(x, u) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \mid u \in Ax\}$  and the set of of zeros of A is given by  $\operatorname{zer} A = \{x \in \mathcal{H} \mid 0 \in Ax\}$ . The inverse of the operator A is defined by  $A^{-1}: u \mapsto$  $\{x \in \mathcal{H} \mid u \in Ax\}$ . The operator A is called monotone if for all  $((x, u), (y, v)) \in (\operatorname{gra} A)^2$ ,  $\langle x-y \mid u-v \rangle \geq 0$ . Moreover, A is maximally monotone if it is monotone and its graph is maximal in the sense of inclusions among the graphs of monotone operators. The resolvent of a maximally monotone operator A is defined by  $J_A := (\mathrm{Id} + A)^{-1}$ . Note that  $J_A$  is single valued. If A is maximally monotone, then its inverse  $A^{-1}$  is also a maximally monotone operator. We denote by  $\Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  the class of proper lower semicontinuous convex functions  $f: \mathcal{H} \to ]-\infty, +\infty]$ . Let  $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ . The Fenchel conjugate of f is defined by  $f^* \colon u \mapsto \sup_{x \in \mathcal{H}} (\langle x \mid u \rangle - f(x))$  and we have  $f^* \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ . The subdifferential of f is the maximally monotone operator  $\partial f: x \mapsto$  $\{u \in \mathcal{H} \mid (\forall y \in \mathcal{H}) \mid f(x) + \langle y - x \mid u \rangle \leq f(y)\},$  we have that  $(\partial f)^{-1} = \partial f^*$  and that  $\operatorname{zer} \partial f$  is the set of minimizers of f, which is denoted by  $\arg\min_{x\in\mathcal{H}} f$ . We denote the proximity operator of f by prox  $f = J_{\partial f}$ . For further background on monotone operators and convex analysis, the reader is referred to [8].

### 4. INERTIAL NONLINEAR FORWARD-BACKWARD WITH MOMENTUM CORRECTION

This section is divided in two parts. First, we present the convergence analysis of Algorithm 2.2. Next, we derive the convergence of Algorithm 2.3.

4.1. Convergence of Algorithm 2.2. The following assumption allows us to guarantee the convergence of the proposed algorithm, it was introduced [48, Assumption 2.2 & Proposition 2.1].

**Assumption 4.1.** In the context of Problem 2.1, let  $(\underline{\gamma}, \overline{\gamma}) \in [0, +\infty[^2, let (\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}]$  be a sequence in  $[\underline{\gamma}, \overline{\gamma}]$ , let  $S: \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$  be a strongly monotone self-adjoint linear bounded operator, and, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $M_n : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$  be such that  $\gamma_n M_n - S$  is  $\zeta_n$ -Lipschitz with respect to S for  $\zeta_n \in [0, 1 - \varepsilon]$  and  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1[$ .

The following proposition is a previous result that will be used to prove the convergence of the proposed method.

**Proposition 4.2.** In the context of Problem 2.1 and Assumption 4.1, consider the sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  defined recursively by Algorithm 2.2 with initialization points  $(x_0, x_{-1}, u_0) \in \mathcal{H}^3$ . Let  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$  and, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$T_n = \gamma_n M_n - S,\tag{4.1}$$

$$\nu_n = \begin{cases} \zeta_{n-1}, & \text{if } -T_n \text{ is monotone and } \lambda \ge 1, \\ 2\zeta_n + \zeta_{n-1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(4.2)

$$\rho_n = \left(2 - \lambda - |1 - \lambda|\nu_n - \frac{\gamma_n}{2\mu} - (1 + |1 - \lambda|)\zeta_n\right),\tag{4.3}$$

$$\eta_n = (1 - \alpha_n) \frac{\rho_n}{\lambda} - \lambda \zeta_{n-1}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\xi_n = \alpha_n \left(1 + \alpha_n\right) + \alpha_n (1 - \alpha_n) \frac{\rho_n}{\lambda},\tag{4.5}$$

$$C_{n+1}(x) = \|x_{n+1} - x\|_{S}^{2} - \alpha_{n} \|x_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} + 2\lambda \langle u_{n+1} | x_{n+1} - x \rangle + \lambda (1 + |1 - \lambda|) \zeta_{n} \|p_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2} + \xi_{n+1} \|x_{n+1} - x_{n}\|^{2}.$$
(4.6)

Suppose that there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $(\alpha_n)_{n \geq N_0}$  is non-decreasing, and that

$$(\forall n \ge N_0) \quad \rho_n \ge 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Then, the following hold:

- (1) For every  $n \ge N_0$ ,  $\xi_n$  is a non-negative.
- (2) For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$C_{n+1}(x) \le C_n(x) - (\eta_n - \xi_{n+1}) \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2.$$
(4.8)

Moreover, suppose that there exists  $\epsilon \in [0, +\infty)$  such that

$$(\forall n \ge N_0) \quad \eta_n - \xi_{n+1} \ge \epsilon \tag{4.9}$$

and either  $\lambda \in [1, 2[ \text{ or } \lambda \in ]0, 1[ \text{ and } (\xi_n)_{n \geq N_0} \text{ is non-decreasing. Then,}$ 

- (3) For every  $n_0 \ge N_0$ ,  $-\alpha_{n-1} \ge -\left(1 \frac{\lambda\zeta_{n-1}}{1+|1-\lambda|}\right)$ . (4)  $(C_n(x))_{n\ge N_0}$  is a non-negative convergent sequence. (5)  $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|x_{n+1} x_n\|^2 < +\infty$ .

Proof. Fix  $n \geq N_0$ .

- (1) Since  $\alpha_n \in [0, 1]$  and  $\rho_n \ge 0$ , the result follows from (4.5).
- (2) It follows from (2.3) that

$$\begin{split} \gamma_n M_n y_n &- \gamma_n C y_n + u_n - \gamma_n M_n p_{n+1} \in \gamma_n A p_{n+1} \\ \Leftrightarrow S y_n + u_n - (S p_{n+1} + u_{n+1}) - \gamma_n C y_n \in \gamma_n A p_{n+1}. \end{split}$$

Let  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ , thus,  $-\gamma_n C x \in \gamma_n A x$ . Then, by monotonicity of A, we have

$$2\langle Sy_n + u_n - (Sp_{n+1} + u_{n+1}) - \gamma_n Cy_n + \gamma_n Cx \mid p_{n+1} - x \rangle \ge 0.$$
(4.10)

Let us bound the terms in (4.10). First, (3.1) and (3.2) yield

$$2\langle y_n - p_{n+1} | p_{n+1} - x \rangle_S = ||y_n - x||_S^2 - ||y_n - p_{n+1}||_S^2 - ||p_{n+1} - x||_S^2$$
  
=  $(1 + \alpha_n) ||x_n - x||_S^2 + \alpha_n (1 + \alpha_n) ||x_n - x_{n-1}||_S^2$   
-  $\alpha_n ||x_{n-1} - x||_S^2 - ||y_n - p_{n+1}||_S^2$   
-  $||p_{n+1} - x||_S^2.$  (4.11)

Now, it follows from (2.2) that

$$2\langle u_n - u_{n+1} | p_{n+1} - x \rangle$$
  
= 2\langle u\_n - u\_{n+1} | x\_{n+1} - x \rangle + 2\langle u\_n - u\_{n+1} | p\_{n+1} - x\_{n+1} \rangle  
= 2\langle u\_n - u\_{n+1} | x\_{n+1} - x \rangle + 2(1 - \lambda) \langle u\_n - u\_{n+1} | p\_{n+1} - y\_n \rangle (4.12)

Since  $T_n$  is  $\zeta_n$ -Lipschitz, decomposing the first term, we have that

$$2\langle u_{n} | x_{n+1} - x \rangle$$
  
=  $2\langle u_{n} | x_{n} - x \rangle + 2\langle u_{n} | x_{n+1} - x_{n} \rangle$   
 $\leq 2\langle u_{n} | x_{n} - x \rangle + 2(||u_{n}||_{S^{-1}}||x_{n+1} - x_{n}||_{S})$   
 $\leq 2\langle u_{n} | x_{n} - x \rangle + \zeta_{n-1}(||p_{n} - y_{n-1}||_{S}^{2} + ||x_{n+1} - x_{n}||_{S}^{2}).$  (4.13)

Developing the second term in (4.12), by (4.2), we obtain

$$2(1-\lambda)\langle u_n - u_{n+1} | p_{n+1} - y_n \rangle$$
  
=2(1-\lambda)(\lambda u\_n | p\_{n+1} - y\_n \rangle - \lambda u\_{n+1} | p\_{n+1} - y\_n \rangle)  
\le= |1-\lambda|(\nu\_n || p\_{n+1} - y\_n ||\_S^2 + \zeta\_{n-1} || p\_n - y\_{n-1} ||\_S^2). (4.14)

Moreover, by the  $\mu$ -cocoercivity of C we have

$$2\gamma_{n} \langle Cy_{n} - Cx \mid x - p_{n+1} \rangle = 2\gamma_{n} \langle Cy_{n} - Cx \mid x - y_{n} \rangle + 2\gamma_{n} \langle Cy_{n} - Cx \mid y_{n} - p_{n+1} \rangle \leq -2\gamma_{n} \mu \|Cy_{n} - Cx\|_{S^{-1}}^{2} + 2\gamma_{n} \mu \|Cy_{n} - Cx\|_{S^{-1}}^{2} + \frac{\gamma_{n}}{2\mu} \|p_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2} = \frac{\gamma_{n}}{2\mu} \|p_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2}.$$

$$(4.15)$$

Hence, it follows from (4.10)-(4.15) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_{n+1} - x\|_{S}^{2} + 2\langle u_{n+1} | x_{n+1} - x \rangle \\ &\leq (1 + \alpha_{n}) \|x_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} - \alpha_{n} \|x_{n-1} - x\|_{S}^{2} + 2\langle u_{n} | x_{n} - x \rangle + \zeta_{n-1} \|p_{n} - y_{n-1}\|_{S}^{2} \\ &+ \alpha_{n} (1 + \alpha_{n}) \|x_{n} - x_{n-1}\|_{S}^{2} - \|p_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2} + \frac{\gamma_{n}}{2\mu} \|p_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2} \\ &+ \zeta_{n-1} \|x_{n+1} - x_{n}\|_{S}^{2} + \nu_{n} |1 - \lambda| \|p_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2} + |1 - \lambda| \zeta_{n-1} \|p_{n} - y_{n-1}\|_{S}^{2} \end{aligned}$$
(4.16)

Moreover, it follows from (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{n+1} - x\|_{S}^{2} &= (1-\lambda) \|y_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} + \lambda \|p_{n+1} - x\|_{S}^{2} - \lambda(1-\lambda) \|p_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2} \\ &= (1-\lambda)(1+\alpha_{n}) \|x_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} - (1-\lambda)\alpha_{n} \|x_{n-1} - x\|_{S}^{2} \\ &+ (1-\lambda)\alpha_{n}(1+\alpha_{n}) \|x_{n} - x_{n-1}\|_{S}^{2} + \lambda \|p_{n+1} - x\|_{S}^{2} \\ &- \lambda(1-\lambda) \|p_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2}. \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.17)$$

Then, combining (4.16) and (4.17), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{n+1} - x\|_{S}^{2} - \alpha_{n} \|x_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} + 2\lambda \langle u_{n+1} | x_{n+1} - x \rangle \\ &\leq \|x_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} - \alpha_{n} \|x_{n-1} - x\|_{S}^{2} + 2\lambda \langle u_{n} | x_{n} - x \rangle + \lambda \zeta_{n-1} \|x_{n+1} - x_{n} \|_{S}^{2} \\ &+ \lambda (1 + |1 - \lambda|) (\zeta_{n-1} \|p_{n} - y_{n-1}\|_{S}^{2} - \zeta_{n} \|p_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2}) \\ &+ \alpha_{n} (1 + \alpha_{n}) \|x_{n} - x_{n-1}\|_{S}^{2} - \lambda \rho_{n} \|p_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2}. \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.18)$$

Observe that  $p_{n+1} - y_n = \lambda^{-1}(x_{n+1} - y_n)$ . Then, in view of (3.2) and (4.7), the last term in (4.18) can be bound as follows:

$$-\lambda \rho_n \|p_{n+1} - y_n\|_S^2 = -\frac{\rho_n}{\lambda} \|(1 - \alpha_n)(x_{n+1} - x_n) + \alpha_n(x_{n+1} - 2x_n + x_{n-1})\|^2$$
  
$$= -\frac{\rho_n}{\lambda} \Big( (1 - \alpha_n) \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 - \alpha_n (1 - \alpha_n) \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2$$
  
$$+ \alpha_n \|x_{n+1} - 2x_n + x_{n-1}\|^2 \Big)$$
  
$$\leq -\frac{(1 - \alpha_n)\rho_n}{\lambda} (\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 - \alpha_n \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2).$$
(4.19)

Combining (4.18) and (4.19) and rearranging terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{n+1} - x\|_{S}^{2} - \alpha_{n} \|x_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} + 2\lambda \langle u_{n+1} | x_{n+1} - x \rangle \\ &\leq \|x_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} - \alpha_{n-1} \|x_{n-1} - x\|_{S}^{2} + 2\lambda \langle u_{n} | x_{n} - x \rangle + \xi_{n} \|x_{n} - x_{n-1}\|_{S}^{2} \\ &+ \lambda (1 + |1 - \lambda|) (\zeta_{n-1} \|p_{n} - y_{n-1}\|_{S}^{2} - \zeta_{n} \|p_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2}) - \eta_{n} \|x_{n+1} - x_{n}\|_{S}^{2}, \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to (4.8).

6

(3) First, suppose that  $\lambda \in [1, 2[$ , we have  $\lambda^2 + \lambda - 2 \ge 0$ , thus  $\lambda^2 \ge 2 - \lambda \ge \rho_n$ , in view of (4.3). It follows from (4.9) that

$$0 \le \eta_n \le \xi_{n+1} = (1 - \alpha_n)\lambda - \lambda\zeta_{n-1} \Rightarrow \alpha_n \le 1 - \zeta_{n-1}.$$

Then, the non-decreasing property of  $(\alpha_n)_{n\geq N_0}$  yields

$$-\alpha_{n-1} \ge -\alpha_n \ge -(1-\zeta_{n-1}) = -\left(1-\frac{\lambda\zeta_{n-1}}{1+|1-\lambda|}\right).$$

Now, suppose that  $\lambda \in [0, 1[$  and that  $(\xi_n)_{n \ge N_0}$  is non-decreasing. Thus,  $\lambda \eta_n \ge \lambda \xi_{n+1} \ge \lambda \xi_n \ge \alpha_n (1 - \alpha_n) \rho_n$ . Hence, in view of (4.4) and (4.3)

$$\lambda^2 \zeta_{n-1} \le (1 - \alpha_n)^2 \rho_n \le (1 - \alpha_n)^2 (2 - \lambda) \le (1 - \alpha_n)^2 (2 - \lambda)^2.$$
(4.20)

Moreover, since  $\zeta_{n-1} < 1$ , we have that  $\zeta_{n-1} < \sqrt{\zeta_{n-1}}$ . Then, by taking square root in (4.20) and by the non-decreasing property of  $(\alpha_n)_{n>N_0}$  we deduce

$$-\alpha_{n-1} \ge -\alpha_n \ge -\left(1 - \frac{\lambda\zeta_{n-1}}{2 - \lambda}\right) = -\left(1 - \frac{\lambda\zeta_{n-1}}{1 + |1 - \lambda|}\right)$$

(4) Since, for every  $n \ge N_0$ ,  $\eta_n - \xi_{n+1} \ge \epsilon$ , in view of (4.8) we conclude that  $(C_n(x))_{n\ge N_0}$ is non-increasing. To show that it is non-negative, suppose that  $C_{n_1}(x) < 0$  for some  $n_1 \ge N_0$ . Since  $(C_n(x))_{n\ge N_0}$  is non-increasing, for every  $n \ge n_1$ , we have  $0 > C_{n_1}(x) \ge C_n(x)$ . Moreover, for every  $n \ge n_1$ ,

$$C_{n}(x) \geq \|x_{n} - x\|^{2} - \alpha_{n-1} \|x_{n-1} - x\|^{2} + \lambda(1 + |1 - \lambda|)\zeta_{n-1} \|x_{n} - y_{n-1}\|^{2} - \lambda(1 + |1 - \lambda|)\zeta_{n-1} \|x_{n} - y_{n-1}\|^{2} - \frac{\lambda\zeta_{n-1}}{1 + |1 - \lambda|} \|x_{n} - x\|^{2} = \left(1 - \frac{\lambda\zeta_{n-1}}{1 + |1 - \lambda|}\right) \|x_{n} - x\|^{2} - \alpha_{n-1} \|x_{n-1} - x\|^{2} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda\zeta_{n-1}}{1 + |1 - \lambda|}\right) (\|x_{n} - x\|^{2} - \|x_{n-1} - x\|^{2}),$$

$$(4.21)$$

where the last inequality follows from 3. Hence, for every  $n \ge n_1$ ,

$$||x_n - x||^2 \le ||x_{n-1} - x||^2 + \frac{C_{n_1}(x)}{1 - \frac{\lambda\zeta_{n-1}}{1 + |1 - \lambda|}} \le ||x_{n-1} - x||^2 + C_{n_1}(x).$$

Therefore, for every  $n \ge n_1$ ,

$$0 \le \|x_n - x\|^2 \le \|x_{n-1} - x\|^2 + C_{n_1}(x) \le \dots \le \|x_{n_1} - x\|^2 + (n - n_1)C_{n_1}(x),$$
  
which leads to a contradiction. Consequently,  $(C_n(x)) \ge x_n$  is non-negative an

which leads to a contradiction. Consequently,  $(C_n(x))_{n\geq N_0}$  is non-negative and convergent.

- (5) Since, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\eta_n \xi_{n+1} \ge \epsilon$ , the result follows from (4.8) and [8, Lemma 5.31].
- **Remark 4.3.** (1) The non-decreasing assumption on  $(\xi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  is satisfied when  $\alpha_n \equiv \alpha$ and  $\zeta_n \equiv \zeta$ . Furthermore, this assumption is required only when  $\lambda \in ]0,1[$ . In general, the best convergence results for relaxed algorithms are achieved when  $\lambda > 1$  (see, for instance, [47, Section 5]).
  - (2) In the case where  $\lambda \geq 1$  and  $-T_n$  is monotone for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $\nu_n = \zeta_{n-1}$ , which provides more flexibility in the choice of  $\alpha_n$  and  $\lambda$  to satisfy (4.7) and (4.9). It is worth noting that in all the examples presented in Section 5,  $-T_n$  is monotone.

The following theorem establishes the weak convergence of Algorithm 2.2 to a solution to Problem 2.1.

**Theorem 4.4.** In the context of Problem 2.1 and Assumption 4.1, consider the sequence  $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  defined recursively by Algorithm 2.2 with initialization points  $(x_0, x_{-1}, u_0) \in \mathcal{H}^3$ . Let  $(\rho_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, (\eta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ , and  $(\xi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ , be the sequences defined in (4.3), (4.4), and (4.5), respectively. Suppose that there exist  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $(\alpha_n)_{n\geq N_0}$  is non-decreasing and  $\epsilon \in [0, +\infty[$  such that

$$(\forall n \ge N_0) \qquad \rho_n \ge 0 \text{ and } \eta_n - \xi_{n+1} \ge \epsilon.$$
(4.22)

Moreover, suppose that either  $\lambda \in [1, 2[ \text{ or } \lambda \in ]0, 1[ \text{ and } (\xi_n)_{n \geq N_0} \text{ is non-decreasing. Then,} (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges weakly to a point in  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

Proof. Let  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ . By Proposition 4.2 we conclude that  $(C_n(x))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is non-negative and convergent, and  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} ||x_{n+1} - x_n||^2 < +\infty$ . Since, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $y_n = x_n + \alpha_n(x_n - x_{n-1})$ ,  $x_{n+1} - y_n = \lambda(p_{n+1} - y_n)$ ,  $u_{n+1} = T_n p_{n+1} - T_n y_n$ ,  $T_n = \gamma_n M_n - S$  is  $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -Lipschitz, and C is  $(1/\mu)$ -Lipschitz, we obtain that

$$||x_{n+1} - y_n|| \to 0, \quad ||p_{n+1} - y_n|| \to 0, \quad ||u_{n+1}|| \to 0, \text{ and } ||Cp_{n+1} - Cy_n|| \to 0.$$
 (4.23)

Now, let  $\delta \in [\tau + \inf \alpha_{n-1}, \sup(1 - \zeta_n) - \tau]$  for  $\tau \in ]0, +\infty[$  small enough, thus, by applying the Young's Inequality with parameter  $(\delta - \alpha_{n-1})/\alpha_{n-1}$ 

$$\alpha_{n-1} \|x_{n-1} - x\|^2 = \alpha_{n-1} (\|x_n - x\|^2 - 2\langle x_n - x | x_n - x_{n-1} \rangle + \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2)$$
  
$$\leq \delta \|x_n - x\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_{n-1}\delta}{\delta - \alpha_{n-1}} \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2.$$
(4.24)

Moreover, by (4.24) and (4.21) we have that

$$(1 - \zeta_{n-1} - \delta) \|x_n - x\|^2 \le (1 - \zeta_{n-1}) \|x_n - x\|^2 - \alpha_{n-1} \|x_{n-1} - x\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_{n-1}\delta}{\delta - \alpha_{n-1}} \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 \le C_n(x) + \frac{\alpha_{n-1}\delta}{\delta - \alpha_{n-1}} \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2.$$

Since  $(C_n(x))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  and  $(\|x_n - x_{n-1}\|)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  are convergent and  $\left(\frac{\alpha_{n-1}\delta}{\delta - \alpha_{n-1}}\right)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  is bounded,  $(\|x_n - x\|)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  is also bounded. Set  $M = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|x_n - x\|$ . Therefore, in view of (4.23) we conclude that

$$|||x_{n} - x||^{2} - ||x_{n-1} - x||^{2}| = |||x_{n} - x|| - ||x_{n-1} - x|| (||x_{n} - x|| + ||x_{n-1} - x||)$$
  

$$\leq 2M |||x_{n} - x_{n-1}|| - x_{n-1} - x||$$
  

$$\leq 2M |||x_{n} - x_{n-1}|| \to 0.$$
(4.25)

Since  $(\alpha_n)_{n \ge N_0}$  is non-decreasing and bounded, it converges. Moreover, by (4.9) and (4.4) we conclude that  $(1 - \alpha_{n-1}) \ge \lambda \epsilon/2 > 0$ . Then, for every  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the convergence of  $(||x_n - x||)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , is deduced by (4.23) and (4.25) noticing that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} (1 - \alpha_{n-1}) \|x_n - x\|^2 = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left( C_n(x) - 2\langle u_n | x - x_n \rangle - \xi_n \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2 - \alpha_{n-1} \left( \|x_n - x\|^2 - \|x_{n-1} - x\|^2 \right) - \lambda (1 + |1 - \lambda|) \zeta_{n-1} \|p_n - y_{n-1}\|_S^2 \right).$$

Note that, by (2.3), we have

$$M_n y_n + u_n / \gamma_n - C y_n - M_n p_{n+1} \in A p_{n+1} \Leftrightarrow v_n \in (A+C) p_{n+1}, \tag{4.26}$$

where

$$v_n = S(p_{n+1} - y_n) + (u_n - u_{n+1})/\gamma_n - (Cy_n - Cp_{n+1}).$$

It follows from (4.23) that,  $v_n \to 0$ . Therefore, since C is cocoercive, the operator A + C is maximally monotone [8, Corollary 25.5] and we deduce from the weak-strong closeness of its graph [8, Proposition 20.38] and (4.26) that every weak cluster point of  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  belongs to Z. The result follows by applying Opial's lemma (see [8, Lemma 2.47]). 

**Remark 4.5.** In the case when  $\lambda = 1$ ,  $\rho_n$ ,  $\eta_n$ , and  $\xi_n$  defined in (4.3), (4.4), and (4.5), reduce to  $\rho_n = 1 - \frac{\gamma_n}{2\mu} - \zeta_n$ ,  $\eta_n = (1 - \alpha_n)\rho_n - \zeta_{n-1}$ , and  $\xi_n = \alpha_n (1 + \alpha_n) + \alpha_n (1 - \alpha_n)\rho_n$ . Therefore, in this case, the conditions in (4.22) correspond to, for every  $n \ge N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\gamma_n}{2\mu} - \zeta_n \ge 0, \\ (1 - \alpha_n)\rho_n - \zeta_{n-1} - \alpha_{n+1}((1 + \alpha_{n+1}) + (1 - \alpha_{n+1})\rho_{n+1}) \ge \epsilon. \end{cases}$$
(4.27)

In the non-inertial case ( $\alpha_n \equiv 0$ ), (4.27) reduces to, for every  $n \ge N_0$ ,  $1 - \gamma_n/(2\mu) - \zeta_n - \zeta_{n-1} \ge 1$  $\epsilon$ , which is the condition in [48, Theorem 3.1] for guaranteeing the convergence of NFBM.

4.2. NFBM with double inertia and additional momentum. In this subsection, we study the convergence of Algorithm 2.3. The following proposition is a preliminary step before addressing the convergence.

**Proposition 4.6.** In the context of Problem 2.1 and Assumption 4.1, consider the sequence  $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  defined recursively by Algorithm 2.3 with initialization points  $(x_0, x_{-1}, u_0) \in \mathcal{H}^3$ . Let  $x \in \mathbf{Z}$  and, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$\tilde{\alpha}_n = \alpha_n + \theta_n, \tag{4.28}$$

$$\eta_n = \left(1 - \tilde{\alpha}_n - \frac{\gamma_n(1 - \beta_n)}{2\mu} - \zeta_n(1 - \alpha_n) - \zeta_{n-1}\right),\tag{4.29}$$

$$\xi_n = \left(2\tilde{\alpha}_n - \frac{\gamma_n\beta_n(1-\beta_n)}{2\mu} - \zeta_n\alpha_n(1-\alpha_n)\right),\tag{4.30}$$

$$C_{n+1}(x) = \|x_{n+1} - x\|_{S}^{2} - \tilde{\alpha}_{n} \|x_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} + 2\langle u_{n+1} | x_{n+1} - x \rangle + \zeta_{n} \|x_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2} + \xi_{n+1} \|x_{n+1} - x_{n}\|^{2}.$$
(4.31)

Suppose that there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $(\tilde{\alpha}_n)_{n \geq N_0}$  is non-decreasing and that

$$(\forall n \ge N_0) \quad \left(\tilde{\alpha}_n - \frac{\gamma_n \beta_n}{2\mu} - \zeta_n \alpha_n\right) \ge 0.$$
 (4.32)

Then, the following hold.

- (1) For every  $n \ge N_0$ ,  $\xi_n$  is a non-negative.
- (2) For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$C_{n+1}(x) \le C_n(x) - (\eta_n - \xi_{n+1}) \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2.$$
(4.33)

Moreover, suppose that there exists  $\epsilon \in [0, +\infty)$  such that

$$(\forall n \ge N_0) \quad \eta_n - \xi_{n+1} \ge \epsilon. \tag{4.34}$$

- (3)  $(C_n(x))_{n \ge N_0}$  is a non-negative convergent sequence. (4)  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_{n+1} x_n\|^2 < +\infty.$

Proof. (1) It follows directly from (4.32) by noticing that

$$(\forall n \ge N_0) \quad \xi_n \ge \left(\tilde{\alpha}_n - \frac{\gamma_n \beta_n}{2\mu} - \zeta_n \alpha_n\right).$$

(2) Fix  $n \ge N_0$  and define  $\tilde{y}_n = y_n + \theta_n(x_n - x_{n-1}) = x_n + \tilde{\alpha}_n(x_n - x_{n-1})$ . It follows from (2.4) that

$$\gamma_n M_n y_n - \gamma_n C z_n + u_n + \theta_n S(x_n - x_{n-1}) - \gamma_n M_n x_{n+1} \in \gamma_n A x_{n+1}$$
$$\Leftrightarrow S \tilde{y}_n + u_n - (S x_{n+1} + u_{n+1}) - \gamma_n C z_n \in \gamma_n A x_{n+1}.$$

Let  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ , thus,  $-\gamma_n C x \in \gamma_n A x$ . Therefore, by the monotonicity of A, we have

$$\langle S\tilde{y}_n + u_n - (Sx_{n+1} + u_{n+1}) - \gamma_n Cz_n + \gamma_n Cx \mid x_{n+1} - x \rangle \ge 0.$$
(4.35)

Let us bound the terms in (4.35). First, note that, (3.1) and (3.2) yield

$$2\langle \tilde{y}_{n} - x_{n+1} | x_{n+1} - x \rangle_{S} = \|\tilde{y}_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} - \|\tilde{y}_{n} - x_{n+1}\|_{S}^{2} - \|x_{n+1} - x\|_{S}^{2}$$
  
$$= (1 + \tilde{\alpha}_{n})\|x_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} + \tilde{\alpha}_{n}(1 + \tilde{\alpha}_{n})\|x_{n} - x_{n-1}\|_{S}^{2}$$
  
$$- \tilde{\alpha}_{n}\|x_{n-1} - x\|^{2} - \|x_{n+1} - \tilde{y}_{n}\|_{S}^{2}$$
  
$$- \|x_{n+1} - x\|_{S}^{2}.$$
(4.36)

Now, since  $\gamma_n M_n - S$  is  $\zeta_n$ -Lipschitz, by (2.3) we have that

$$2\langle u_{n} - u_{n+1} | x_{n+1} - x \rangle$$

$$= 2\langle u_{n} | x_{n} - x \rangle - 2\langle u_{n+1} | x_{n+1} - x \rangle + 2\langle u_{n} | x_{n+1} - x_{n} \rangle$$

$$\leq 2\langle u_{n} | x_{n} - x \rangle - 2\langle u_{n+1} | x_{n+1} - x \rangle + 2(||u_{n}||_{S^{-1}}||x_{n+1} - x_{n}||_{S})$$

$$\leq 2\langle u_{n} | x_{n} - x \rangle - 2\langle u_{n+1} | x_{n+1} - x \rangle$$

$$+ \zeta_{n-1}(||x_{n} - y_{n-1}||_{S}^{2} + ||x_{n+1} - x_{n}||_{S}^{2})$$

$$(4.37)$$

Moreover, by the  $\mu$ -cocoercivity of C we have

$$2\gamma_{n}\langle Cz_{n} - Cx \mid x - x_{n+1} \rangle = 2\gamma_{n}\langle Cz_{n} - Cx \mid x - z_{n} \rangle + 2\gamma_{n}\langle Cz_{n} - Cx \mid z_{n} - x_{n+1} \rangle \leq -2\gamma_{n}\mu \|Cz_{n} - Cx\|_{S^{-1}}^{2} + 2\gamma_{n}\mu \|Cz_{n} - Cx\|_{S^{-1}}^{2} + \frac{\gamma_{n}}{2\mu} \|x_{n+1} - z_{n}\|_{S}^{2} = \frac{\gamma_{n}}{2\mu} \|x_{n+1} - z_{n}\|_{S}^{2}.$$

$$(4.38)$$

Now, from (4.35)-(4.38) and the non-decreasing property of  $(\tilde{\alpha}_n)_{n\geq N_0}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{n+1} - x\|_{S}^{2} &- \tilde{\alpha}_{n} \|x_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} + 2\langle u_{n+1} | x_{n+1} - x \rangle + \zeta_{n} \|x_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2} \\ &\leq \|x_{n} - x\|_{S}^{2} - \tilde{\alpha}_{n-1} \|x_{n-1} - x\|_{S}^{2} + 2\langle u_{n} | x_{n} - x \rangle + \zeta_{n-1} \|x_{n} - y_{n-1}\|_{S}^{2} \\ &+ \tilde{\alpha}_{n} (1 + \tilde{\alpha}_{n}) \|x_{n} - x_{n-1} \|_{S}^{2} - \|x_{n+1} - \tilde{y}_{n}\|_{S}^{2} + \frac{\gamma_{n}}{2\mu} \|x_{n+1} - z_{n}\|_{S}^{2} \\ &+ \zeta_{n} \|x_{n+1} - y_{n}\|_{S}^{2} + \zeta_{n-1} \|x_{n+1} - x_{n}\|_{S}^{2}. \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.39)$$

Note that, by (3.2) we have, for every  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ , that

$$||x_{n+1} - (x_n + \sigma(x_n - x_{n-1}))||^2$$
  
=  $(1 - \sigma)||x_{n+1} - x_n||^2 - \sigma(1 - \sigma)||x_n - x_{n-1}||^2 + \sigma||x_{n+1} - 2x_n + x_{n-1}||^2$ 

10

Therefore,

$$-\|x_{n+1} - \tilde{y}_n\|_S^2 + \frac{\gamma_n}{2\mu} \|x_{n+1} - z_n\|_S^2 + \zeta_n \|x_{n+1} - y_n\|_S^2$$
  
=  $-\left(1 - \tilde{\alpha}_n - \frac{\gamma_n(1 - \beta_n)}{2\mu} - \zeta_n(1 - \alpha_n)\right) \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2$   
+  $\left((1 - \tilde{\alpha}_n)\tilde{\alpha}_n - \frac{\gamma_n(1 - \beta_n)\beta_n}{2\mu} - \zeta_n(1 - \alpha_n)\alpha_n\right) \|x_n - x_{n-1}\|^2$   
-  $\left(\tilde{\alpha}_n - \frac{\gamma_n\beta_n}{2\mu} - \zeta_n\alpha_n\right) \|x_{n+1} - 2x_n + x_{n-1}\|^2.$  (4.40)

11

Then, by replacing (4.39) in (4.40) and in view of (4.32) we obtain (4.33). Finally, since  $\eta_n \ge \xi_{n+1} \ge 0$ , we conclude that  $-\tilde{\alpha}_{n-1} \ge -\tilde{\alpha}_n \ge -(1-\zeta_{n-1})$ . Then, the proof of 3 and 4 are analogous to the proof of Proposition 4.2.

The following result establishes the convergence of Algorithm 2.3 and its proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 4.4.

**Theorem 4.7.** In the context of Problem 2.1 and Assumption 4.1, consider the sequence  $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  defined recursively by Algorithm 2.3 with initialization points  $(x_0, x_{-1}, u_0) \in \mathcal{H}^3$ . Let  $(\xi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ ,  $(\eta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ , and  $(\tilde{\alpha}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  be the sequences defined in (4.30), (4.29), and (4.28), respectively. Suppose that there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $(\tilde{\alpha}_n)_{n\geq N_0}$  is non-decreasing and that

$$(\forall n \ge N_0) \qquad \left(\tilde{\alpha}_n - \frac{\gamma_n \beta_n}{2\mu} - \zeta_n \alpha_n\right) \ge 0 \text{ and } \eta_n - \xi_{n+1} \ge \epsilon.$$
(4.41)

Then,  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges weakly to a point in  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ . In view of (2.4), we have

$$M_n y_n - M_n x_{n+1} + u_n / \gamma_n + \theta_n S(x_n - x_{n-1}) / \gamma_n - C z_n \in A x_{n+1}$$
  

$$\Leftrightarrow S(\tilde{y}_n - x_{n+1}) + (u_n - u_{n+1}) / \gamma_n - (C z_n - C x_{n+1}) \in (A+C) x_{n+1}.$$
(4.42)

By Proposition 4.6.4, we have  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} ||x_{n+1} - x_n||^2 < +\infty$ . Then, since, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\tilde{y}_n = x_n + \tilde{\alpha}_n(x_n - x_{n-1}), z_n = x_n + \beta_n(x_n - x_{n-1}), \gamma_n M_n - S$  is  $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -Lipschitz, and C is  $(1/\mu)$ -Lipschitz, we conclude that

$$\|\tilde{y}_n - x_{n+1}\| \to 0, \quad \|x_{n+1} - y_n\| \to 0, \quad \|u_n\| \to 0, \text{ and } \|Cx_{n+1} - Cz_n\| \to 0.$$
 (4.43)

Therefore, by (4.42) and (4.43), we deduce that every weak cluster point of  $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  belongs to  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Moreover, by Proposition 4.6.3 we conclude that  $(C_n(x))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  is non-negative and convergent. Consequently, by proceeding similarly to the proof of Theorem 4.4, we deduce that  $(||x_n-x||)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  is convergent and the weak convergence follows from Opial's lemma.

**Remark 4.8.** In the case when, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\alpha_n = \beta_n = 0$ , (2.4) reduces to

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \begin{vmatrix} x_{n+1} = (M_n + A)^{-1} (M_n x_n - C x_n + u_n / \gamma_n + \theta_n S(x_n - x_{n-1}) / \gamma_n), \\ u_{n+1} = (\gamma_n M_n - S) x_{n+1} - (\gamma_n M_n - S) x_n, \end{vmatrix}$$

which is the momentum version of NFBM proposed in [48, Algorithm 2]. In this case, (4.41) reduces to,

$$(\forall n \ge N_0) \quad 1 - \theta_n - 2\theta_{n+1} - \frac{\gamma_n}{2\mu} - \zeta_n - \zeta_{n-1} \ge \varepsilon,$$

which corresponds with the condition in [48, Corollary 4.1].

### 5. Particular Cases of the Inertial NFBM

In this section, we describe particular instances of Algorithm 2.2 and Algorithm 2.3 obtaining inertial versions of existing methods in the literature. This section is developed in the context of Problem 2.1 and Assumption 4.1.

5.1. Forward-Backward. In the particular case when S = Id and, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\gamma_n = \gamma \in ]0, +\infty[$  and  $\gamma M_n = \text{Id}$ , Algorithm 2.2 can be written as

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} y_n = x_n + \alpha_n (x_n - x_{n-1}), \\ p_{n+1} = J_{\gamma A} (y_n - \gamma C y_n), \\ x_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda) y_n + \lambda p_{n+1}, \end{cases}$$

which corresponds to FB with inertia and relaxation step. In this case, since  $\zeta_n \equiv 0$  and assuming  $\alpha_n \nearrow \alpha$ , in view of Theorem 4.4, the convergence of  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  to a  $x \in \operatorname{zer}(A + C)$  is guaranteed if

$$\frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{\lambda}\left(2-\lambda-\frac{\gamma}{2\mu}\right)-\alpha(1+\alpha)>0$$

which corresponds with the condition in [5, Corollary 3.12]. Furthermore, if  $\lambda = 1$ , it reduces to

$$1 - 3\alpha - \frac{\gamma(1 - \alpha)^2}{2\mu} > 0, \tag{5.1}$$

which is the condition proposed in [45]. In this same setting Algorithm 2.3 iterates

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} y_n = x_n + \alpha_n (x_n - x_{n-1}), \\ z_n = x_n + \beta_n (x_n - x_{n-1}), \\ x_{n+1} = J_{\gamma A} (y_n - \gamma C z_n). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if we assume that  $\alpha_n \nearrow \alpha$  and  $\beta_n \rightarrow \beta$ , in view of (4.41), the convergence of this algorithm is guaranteed if

$$\alpha - \frac{\gamma\beta}{2\mu} \ge 0 \text{ and } 1 - 3\alpha - \frac{\gamma}{2\mu} (1 - \beta)^2 > 0.$$
(5.2)

Note that (5.2) restricts  $\alpha$  to the interval ]0, 1/3[, just as (5.1) does; however,  $\beta$  is not constrained to this range, thus, (5.2) allows more flexibility in the choice of  $(\alpha, \beta)$  than (5.1).

5.2. Forward-Half-Reflected-Backward. Let  $B: \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$  be a  $\zeta$ -Lipschitz operator for  $\zeta \in ]0, +\infty[$  and  $\tilde{A}: \mathcal{H} \to 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  be a set-valued operator such that  $\tilde{A} + B$  is maximally monotone. The problem is to,

find 
$$x \in \mathcal{H}$$
 such that  $0 \in (A + B + C)x$ . (5.3)

We assume that the solution set is not empty. This problem can be solved, for example, by the methods proposed in [21,46]. Set  $A = \tilde{A} + B$ , S = Id, and, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\gamma_n M_n = \text{Id} - \gamma B$ , for  $\gamma \in [0, +\infty[$ . In this setting, (2.3) is written as follows.

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} y_n = x_n + \alpha_n (x_n - x_{n-1}), \\ p_{n+1} = J_{\gamma \tilde{A}} (y_n - \gamma (Bx_n + Cy_n) - \gamma (By_n - By_{n-1})), \\ x_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda)y_n + \lambda p_{n+1}. \end{cases}$$
(5.4)

Note that, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\gamma_n M_n - S$  is  $(\zeta \gamma)$ -Lipschitz. Then, if  $\alpha_n \nearrow \alpha \in ]0, +\infty[$ , according to Theorem 4.4, if

$$(1-\alpha)^2 \left(2-\lambda-(1+2|1-\lambda|)\zeta\gamma-\frac{\gamma}{2\mu}\right) - \lambda^2 \zeta\gamma - \lambda\alpha(1+\alpha) > 0, \tag{5.5}$$

 $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , generated by (5.4), converges weakly to some solution to (5.3). The recurrence in (5.4) differs from the algorithm proposed in [46, Theorem 4.3] which is limited to  $\lambda < 1$ .

**Remark 5.1.** In the case when  $\lambda = 1$ , by defining  $\kappa = \zeta + 1/2\mu$  and  $\varphi: \alpha \to (1 - 3\alpha)/(\zeta + \kappa(1 - \alpha)^2)$ , (5.5) reduces to

$$1 - \zeta \gamma - \widetilde{\gamma} - (3 - 2\widetilde{\gamma})\alpha - \widetilde{\gamma}\alpha^2 > 0 \Leftrightarrow \varphi(\alpha) > \gamma$$

By noticing that  $\varphi$  is decreasing in [0,1], we conclude that while  $\alpha$  increases,  $\gamma$  decreases, and conversely.

In the same setting, Algorithm 2.3 iterates as follows.

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \begin{cases} y_n = x_n + \alpha_n (x_n - x_{n-1}), \\ z_n = x_n + \beta_n (x_n - x_{n-1}), \\ x_{n+1} = J_{\gamma \tilde{A}} (y_n - \gamma (Bx_n + Cz_n + By_n - By_{n-1}) + \theta_n (x_n - x_{n-1})). \end{cases}$$
(5.6)

In view of Theorem 4.7, if  $\alpha_n \nearrow \alpha \in [0, +\infty[, \beta_n \rightarrow \beta \in ]0, +\infty[, \theta_n \nearrow \theta \in ]0, +\infty[, (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}},$ generated by (5.6), converges weakly to a solution to (5.3) if

$$1 - 3(\alpha + \theta) - \frac{\gamma(1 - \beta)^2}{2\mu} - \gamma\zeta - \gamma\zeta(1 - \alpha)^2 > 0 \text{ and } \alpha + \theta - \frac{\gamma\beta}{2\mu} - \zeta\gamma\alpha > 0.$$
 (5.7)

Note that, if  $\alpha = \beta = 0$ , (5.7) reduces to  $1 - 3\theta - \gamma/(2\mu) - 2\zeta\gamma > 0$  which corresponds with the condition proposed in [46, Theorem 4.3] and in [58, Theorem 3.4]. Note that the inertial versions of FRB and FHRB proposed in [46,58] considers only the momentum term  $\theta(x_n - x_{n-1})$ on its iterations. On the other hand, the algorithm in (5.4) includes two inertial steps which are evaluated in the terms  $Cz_n$  and  $y_n - \gamma_{n-1}(By_n - By_{n-1})$ , giving more flexibility in the method implementation.

5.3. **Primal-Dual with Block-Triangular Resolvent.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a real Hilbert space, let  $A_1: \mathcal{H} \to 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  and  $A_2: \mathcal{G} \to 2^{\mathcal{G}}$  be maximally monotone operators, let  $B: \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$  be a monotone and  $\zeta$ -Lipschitz operator for  $\zeta \in ]0, +\infty[$ , let  $\tilde{C}$  be a  $\mu$ -cocoercive operator for  $\mu \in ]0, +\infty[$ , and let  $L: \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{G}$  be a linear bounded operator. In this case, the problem is to

find 
$$(x, u) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G}$$
 such that 
$$\begin{cases} 0 \in (A_1 + B + \tilde{C})x + L^*u \\ 0 \in A_2^{-1}u - Lx. \end{cases}$$
(5.8)

under the hypothesis that its solution set is not empty. This problem and particular instances of it, have been studied, for example, in [21,25,29,48,53,56]. Let  $(\sigma, \tau) \in [0, +\infty)^2$ , set  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G}$ , and consider the following operators.

$$A: \mathcal{H} \to 2^{\mathcal{H}}: (x, u) \mapsto ((A_1 + B)x + L^*u) \times (A_2^{-1}u - Lx),$$
  

$$C: \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}: (x, u) \to (\tilde{C}x, 0),$$
  

$$S: \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}: (x, u) \to (x - \tau L^*u, \tau u/\sigma - \tau Lx),$$
  

$$M: \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}: (x, u) \to (x/\tau - Bx - L^*u, u/\sigma + Lx).$$

Additionally, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , set  $\alpha_n = \alpha \in [0, +\infty[$  and define  $\gamma_n = \tau$  and  $M_n = M$ . Hence, in this setting, by proceeding similar to [48, Section 6.1], for initialization points  $y_{-1} \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $(x_0, v_0) \in \mathcal{H}$ , and  $(x_{-1}, v_{-1}) \in \mathcal{H}$ , Algorithm 2.2 iterates as follows

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} (y_n, w_n) = (x_n, v_n) + \alpha (x_n - x_{n-1}, v_n - v_{n-1}), \\ p_{n+1} = J_{\tau A_1} \left( y_n - \tau L^* w_n - \tau (Bx_n + By_n - By_{n-1} + \tilde{C}y_n) \right), \\ q_{n+1} = J_{\sigma A_2^{-1}} (w_n + \sigma L(2x_{n+1} - y_n)), \\ (x_{n+1}, v_{n+1}) = (1 - \lambda) (x_n, v_n) + \lambda (p_{n+1}, q_{n+1}), \end{cases}$$
(5.9)

which corresponds to a relaxed and inertial version of the Primal-Dual with Block-Triangular Resolvent (PDBTR) algorithm proposed in [48, Section 6.1]. According to [48, Proof of Corollary 6.1], if  $\kappa := 1 - \sigma \tau ||L||^2 > 0$ , A is maximally monotone, S is linear self-adjoint and strongly monotone, C is  $(\mu \kappa)^{-1}$ -cocoercive with respect to S, and  $\tau M - S$  is  $(\tau \zeta/\kappa)$ -Lipschitz with respect to S. Therefore, the condition in (4.22) reduces to

$$(1-\alpha)^2 \left(2-\lambda - \frac{(1+2|1-\lambda|)\tau\zeta}{\kappa} - \frac{\tau}{2\mu\kappa}\right) - \frac{\lambda^2\tau\zeta}{\kappa} - \lambda\alpha(1+\alpha) > 0.$$
(5.10)

Then, if (5.10) holds,  $(x_n, v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges weakly to a solution to (5.8). When B = 0, (5.9) reduces to the inertial and relaxed version of CV and of CP if C = 0 [25,29,47,56]. In the case when  $\alpha = 0$  and  $\lambda = 1$ , (5.10) reduces to the condition in [48, Corollory 6.1] guaranteeing the convergence of PDBTR.

### 6. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we present a series of numerical experiments<sup>1</sup> on image restoration to evaluate the efficiency of the inertial variants of FHRB. In particular, we test the performance of our method under different inertia and momentum parameter settings. Additionally, we compare the results with the standard FHRB method (without inertia) and its momentum-based variant proposed in [46, 58]. The problem formulation is described first, followed by the presentation and discussion of the numerical results.

6.1. Numerical experiments on image restoration. Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x^* \in \mathcal{C} := [0, 255]^{N \times N}$  represent an image of  $N \times N$  pixels in the range [0, 1]. The goal is to recover the original image from a blurry and noisy observation  $b = Kx^* + \epsilon$ , where  $K : \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \to \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  is a linear, bounded operator modelling a blur process and  $\epsilon$  is a random additive noise. We assume that  $x^*$  can be well-approximated by solving the following optimization problem.

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{2} \|Kx - b\|^2 + \rho \|Dx\|_1,$$
(6.1)

where  $\rho > 0$  is a regularization parameter,  $\|\cdot\|_1$  denotes the  $\ell_1$  norm, and  $D: x \mapsto (D_1x, D_2x)$ is the discrete gradient with  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  representing the horizontal and vertical differences with Neumann boundary conditions, respectively. By setting  $f = \iota_{\mathcal{C}}$ ,  $h = \frac{1}{2} \|K \cdot -b\|^2$ , and  $g = \lambda \|\cdot\|_1$ , we can note that  $0 \in \operatorname{sri}(\operatorname{dom} g - D(\operatorname{dom} f))$ , thus, in view of [8, Theorem 16.3 & Theorem 16.47], the optimization problem (6.1) is equivalent to

find 
$$x^* \in \mathcal{H}$$
 such that  $0 \in \partial f(x^*) + D^* \partial g(Dx^*) + \nabla h(x^*)$ , (6.2)

which, together with its dual problem, is a particular instance of (5.3) and can be solved using the algorithms (5.4) and (5.6). Indeed, by taking  $u^* \in \partial g(Dx^*)$ , from (6.2), we have  $(0,0)^\top \in (\tilde{A} + B + C)(x^*, u^*)^\top$  where  $\tilde{A}: (x, u) \to \partial f(x) \times \partial g^*(u)$ ,  $B: (x, u) \to (D^*u, -Dx)$ , and  $C: (x, u) \to (\nabla h(x), 0)$ . Since  $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$  and  $g \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{G})$  by [8, Proposition 20.22 & Proposition 20.23], A is maximally monotone. Moreover, since B is skew, by [18, Proposition 2.7], B is  $\|D\|$ -Lipschitz and  $\tilde{A} + B$  is maximally monotone. Moreover, by [58, Theorem 5.1], Cis  $(1/|K||^2)$ -cocccercive. Therefore, we can apply (5.4) and (5.6) to solve the problem in (6.1). In this context, Algorithm 2.2 and Algorithm 2.3 are written in (6.3) in a general framework.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>All numerical experiments were implemented in MATLAB on a laptop equipped with an AMD Ryzen 5 3550Hz processor, Radeon Vega Mobile Gfx, and 32 GB of RAM. The code is available at this repository.

Algorithm	Case	α	β	θ	$\lambda$	
FHRB	1	0	0	0	1	-
	1	0	0	$\theta_1/3$	1	0.00
FHRBSI	2	0	0	$2\theta_1/3$	1	$\theta_1 = \frac{0.55}{2} \left(1 - \widetilde{\gamma} - \zeta \gamma\right)$
	3	0	0	$\theta_1$	1	პ
	1	$\alpha_1/3$	0	0	1	0.99
FHRBI	2	$2\alpha_1/3$	0	0	1	$\alpha_1 = \frac{0.05}{2\widetilde{\gamma}} (2\widetilde{\gamma} - 3 + \sqrt{(3 - 2\widetilde{\gamma})^2 + 4(1 - \zeta\gamma - \widetilde{\gamma})}\widetilde{\gamma})$
	3	$\alpha_1$	0	0	1	2: γ
	1	$\alpha_2/3$	1	0	1	
FHRBDI	2	$2\alpha_2/3$	1	0	1	$\alpha_2 = \frac{0.55}{2\zeta_2} \left( 2\zeta\gamma - 3 + \sqrt{(3 - 2\zeta\gamma)^2 + 4\zeta\gamma \left(1 - 2\zeta\gamma - \frac{(1 - \beta)^2\gamma}{2\mu}\right)} \right)$
	3	$\alpha_2$	1	0	1	$2\zeta\gamma$ ( V ( $2\mu$ ))
FHRBSDI	1	0	1	$\theta_2$	1	$\theta_2 = 0.99 \left( 1 - \gamma (1 - \beta)^2 / (2\mu) - 2\zeta \gamma \right) / 3$

TABLE 1. Inertial parameters for FRHB, FHRB semi inertial (FHRBSI) [58, Theorem 5.1], FHRB inertial (FHRBI), FHRB double inertial (FHRBDI), and FHRB semi double inertial (FHRBSDI).

Algorithm	Case	α	β	θ	λ	
FHRBRI	1	$3\alpha_1/4$	0	0	$\lambda_1$	
	2	$\alpha_1/2$	0	0	$\lambda_1$	$= 0.99 \left( \sqrt{(1+2(x+x(1+x))^2 + 4(x(2+(x-y)))^2} + 1 - 2(x-x(1+x)) \right)$
	3	$\alpha_1/4$	0	0	$\lambda_1$	$\lambda_{1} = \frac{1}{2\zeta\gamma} \left( \sqrt{(1+2\zeta\gamma+\alpha(1+\alpha))} + 4\zeta\gamma(2+\zeta\gamma-\frac{1}{2\mu}) - 1 - 2\zeta\gamma-\alpha(1+\alpha) \right)$
	4	0	0	0	$\lambda_1$	

TABLE 2. Relaxation and inertial parameters for FHRBRI.

We compare the algorithms proposed in Table 1 and Table 2 that are particular instances of the recurrence in (6.3).

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \begin{vmatrix} (y_n^1, y_n^2) = (x_n^1, x_n^2) + \alpha(x_n^1 - x_{n-1}^1, x_n^2 - x_{n-1}^2), \\ z_n^1 = x_n^1 + \beta(x_n^1 - x_{n-1}^1), \\ (w_n^1, w_n^2) = (x_n^1, x_n^2) + \theta(x_n^1 - x_{n-1}^1, x_n^2 - x_{n-1}^2), \\ p_{n+1}^1 = \operatorname{prox}_{\gamma f} \left( w_n^1 - \gamma(D^*(x_n^2 + y_n^2 - y_{n-1}^2) + \nabla h(z_n^1)) \right), \\ p_{n+1}^2 = \operatorname{prox}_{\gamma g^*} \left( w_n^2 - \gamma D(x_n^1 + y_n^1 - y_{n-1}^1) \right), \\ (x_{n+1}^1, x_{n+1}^2) = (1 - \lambda)(y_n^1, y_n^2) + \lambda(p_{n+1}^1, p_{n+1}^2). \end{aligned}$$
(6.3)

The explicit formula of  $\operatorname{prox}_{\gamma f}$  can be found in [8, Example 23.4 & Proposition 29.3]. While the explicit formula of  $\operatorname{prox}_{\gamma g^*}$  can be found in [8, Proposition 24.8 (ix) & Example 24.11].

6.2. Numerical results. In a first instance, we consider N = 256 and the original image  $x^*$  shown in Figure 3a. The operator K corresponds to an average blur kernel of  $3 \times 3$  with symmetric boundary conditions, implemented in MATLAB using the imfilter function. We approximate  $\zeta = \|D\|$  as  $\sqrt{8}$  (see [24]). Additionally, we have  $\|K\| = 1$ , thus,  $\mu = 1/\|K\|^2 = 1$ . To test the inertial parameters, for a given step-size  $\gamma$ , we select  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\theta$  to satisfy either (5.5) or (5.7), depending on the chosen algorithm. In particular, we consider  $\gamma = 2\mu\kappa/(1+4\mu\zeta)$  for  $\kappa \in \{0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8\}$ . For FHRBSI, FHRBI, and FHRBDI, we analyze three distinct cases of  $\alpha$  and  $\theta$ . The specific values of  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\theta$  are summarized in Table 1, where we set  $\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma(\zeta + 1/(2\mu))$ .

We compare the aforementioned algorithms, step-sizes, and relaxation parameters across 20 random realizations of b. The stopping criterion is based on the relative error, with a tolerance of  $10^{-6}$ , and a maximum of  $10^4$  iterations. Table 3 reports the average iteration number (IN) and the average CPU Time (T) in seconds, obtained by applying all the algorithms to

16

solve the optimization problem in (6.1) for the 20 random observations. From the results in Table 3, we observe that larger inertial parameters improve the convergence of the inertial algorithms. Among these, FHRBDI achieves the best performance in terms of the average number of iterations. However, FHRBSDI exhibits the best performance in terms of average CPU time, even though it requires more iterations. This can be attributed to the additional inertial step performed at each iteration by FHRBDI, which increases its computational cost. Furthermore, we note that larger values of  $\kappa$ , corresponding to larger step-sizes  $\gamma$ , lead to better results in terms of both iterations and CPU time for all algorithms. This observation aligns with findings reported in [14, 58].

To test FHRB relaxed inertial (FHRBRI), we consider  $\kappa = 0.8$  and use the inertial and relaxation parameters specified in Table 2, where  $\alpha_1$  is defined in Table 1. The results are summarized in Table 4. From these results, we observe that FHRBRI achieves improved convergence compared to FHRB; however, it is outperformed by FHRBDI and FHRBSDI in terms of iteration number and CPU time, respectively. We conclude that to further accelerate the convergence of FHRBRI, prioritizing larger values of  $\alpha$  over larger values of  $\lambda$  is recommended.

As mentioned earlier, larger values of  $\gamma$  yield better results in terms of iterations and CPU time for all the algorithms. However, as  $\kappa$  approaches 1, the parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\theta$  satisfying (5.7) converge to 0, causing the inertial effect to diminish. To explore this behavior, we set  $\kappa = 0.99$  and consider two scenarios for the inertial parameters. First, we test the algorithms using constant step-sizes that violates (5.7). The results, presented in Table 5, show that FRHR outperforms all the results reported in Table 3. On the other hand, we observe that including an inertial parameter can accelerate the convergence but may also lead to divergence. In particular, FHRBSI, FHRBI, and FHRBDI exhibit accelerated convergence when  $\alpha = 0.1$  but diverge when  $\alpha = 0.25$ . Notably, FHRBI and FHRBDI also accelerate for  $\alpha = 0.2$ . Figure 1 illustrates the relative error as a function of the iteration number for the 10th random observation.

To leverage the acceleration provided by the inertial step even when  $\kappa = 0.99$ , while ensuring convergence, we propose a *restart* strategy for the inertial parameter. In particular, we define  $\alpha_n = \alpha \in [0, +\infty)$  for  $n \leq N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha_n = 0$  for  $n \geq N_0$ . This choice of  $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 4.4. Table 6 presents the convergence results for FHRB, FHRBSI, FHRBI, FHRBDI, and the restart strategy, called FHRBIR. The inertial parameters for FHRBSI, FHRBI, and FHRBDI were selected based on Table 1, specifically in their respective case 3. As these parameters are relatively small, Table 6 shows that the acceleration effect is negligible in these cases. On the other hand, the restart strategy improves convergence when  $\alpha = 0.1$  and  $\alpha = 0.2$  but slows down when  $\alpha = 0.25$ . Figure 2a illustrates the relative error as a function of the iteration number for the 10th random observation. Furthermore, Figure 3 displays the original, blurred and noisy, and recovered images for this observation.

To conclude this section, we modify the scenario by comparing FHRB with FHRBIR in cases where K is generated using a blur of kernel of size  $9 \times 9$  for N = 256 and N = 512. Additionally, we evaluate FHRBIR with restart points at 1000, 2000, and 3000 iterations. The results are summarized in Table 7. From these results, we observe that the acceleration effect is more pronounced in this scenario due to the increased computational cost per iteration. Among the restart strategies tested, the one with a restart at 3000 iterations achieves the best performance. The relative error as a function of the iteration number for the 10th random observation is shown in Figure 2b and Figure 2c. Additionally, the original, blurred and noisy, and recovered images for this observation are presented in Figure 4 and Figure 5.

		$\kappa = 0.5$		$\kappa = 0.6$		$\kappa = 0.7$		$\kappa = 0.8$	
Algorithm	Case	IN	Т	IN	Т	IN	Т	IN	Т
FHRB	1	1762	10.73	1588	9.51	1451	8.75	1343	8.12
	1	1704	10.71	1545	9.65	1421	8.88	1326	8.25
FHRBSI	2	1647	10.30	1501	9.33	1392	8.63	1309	8.12
	3	1588	9.87	1457	9.08	1362	8.46	1293	7.99
	1	1694	10.70	1535	9.67	1412	8.85	1320	8.37
FHRBI	2	1624	10.26	1480	9.32	1374	8.71	1296	8.17
	3	1555	9.82	1424	8.94	1336	8.44	1273	8.03
	1	1563	10.26	1430	9.28	1337	8.72	1269	8.32
FHRBDI	2	1558	10.25	1425	9.26	1333	8.67	1266	8.29
	3	1546	10.03	1411	9.19	1321	8.61	1256	8.18
FHRBSDI	1	1573	9.87	1441	8.88	1346	8.37	1276	7.89

TABLE 3. Numerical results for FHRB, FHRBSI, FHRBDI, FHRBDI, and FHRBSDI for  $\kappa \in \{0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8\}$ 

Algorithm

FHRB

FHRBSI

FHRBI

		$\kappa = 0.8$					
Algorithm	Case	IN	Т				
	1	1277	8.38				
FHDBDI	2	1281	8.40				
FIIIDIU	3	1286	8.38				
	4	1291	7.96				

for FHRBRI for  $\kappa = 0.8$ .

TABLE 5. Numerical results for FHRB, FHRBSI, FHRBI, FHRBDI, for  $\kappa = 0.99$  and inertial parameters that do not satisfy the hypothesis guaranteeing convergence.

β

0

0

0

0

0.1

0.2

0.25

1

1

1

 $\alpha$ 

0

0

0

0

0.1

0.2

0.25

0.1

0.2

0.25

 $\theta$ 

0

0.1

0.2 1

0.25 1

0

0

0

0

0

0

 $\lambda$ 

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1



FIGURE 1. Relative error along iteration number for the random observation 10. In this case, the inertial parameters do not satisfy the hypothesis guaranteeing convergence. See Table 5 for details on the parameters.

 $\kappa=0.99$ 

Т

7.32

7.22

7.26

6.73

\_

7.48

6.98

\_

IN

1194

1123

1124

1051

- 1123

1050

						$\kappa =$	0.99
Algorithm	α	$\beta$	$\theta$	$\lambda$	$N_0$	IN	Т
FHRB	0	0	0	1	-	1194	7.16
FHRBSI	0	0	$\theta_1$	1	-	1192	7.37
FHRBI	$\alpha_1$	0	0	1	-	1190	7.46
FHRBDI	$\alpha_2$	0.05	0	1	-	1188	7.54
	0.1	0.1	0	1	1000	1085	6.78
FHRBIR	0.2	0.2	0	1	1000	998	6.26
	0.25	0.25	0	1	1000	1689	10.34

TABLE 6. Numerical results for FHRB, FHRBSI, FHRBI, FHRBDI, and FHRBIR, for  $\kappa = 0.99$ .

						$\kappa = 0.99$						
						N =	= 256	N =	= 512			
Algorithm	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\theta$	$\lambda$	$N_0$	IN	Т	IN	Т			
FHRB	0	0	0	1	-	3593	24.13	4477	188.10			
	0.2	0.2	0	1	1000	3349	22.82	4230	178.86			
FHRBIR	0.2	0.2	0	1	2000	3108	21.47	3983	169.40			
	0.2	0.2	0	1	3000	3015	21.13	3738	160.23			

TABLE 7. Numerical results for FHRB and FHRBIR, for  $\kappa = 0.99$ , blur of kernel  $9 \times 9$ , and N = 256 and N = 512,



FIGURE 2. Relative error along iteration number for the random observation 10. See Table 6 for details on the parameters.

#### 7. Conclusions

In this article, we propose several inertial/relaxed versions of NFBM, extending and recovering the classic convergence result for NFBM. Moreover, by a specific choice of monotone operators and metrics in the inertial/relaxed version of NFBM, we recover and extend inertial and relaxed versions of FB, FHRB, CP, CV, among others. We compare the FHRB with its momentum, inertial, relaxed, and double-inertial versions in image restoration. For a fixed step-size, all the inertial/relaxed versions improve the convergence, with the double-inertial version exhibiting the best performance in terms of the number of iterations. However, since the inertial parameters converge to zero as the step-size approaches its admissible limit, the



(E) FHRBRI (33.42) (F) FHRBDI (33.42) (G) FHRBIR (33.42)

FIGURE 3. Original image, blur and noisy observation 10, and recovered images for FHRB, FHRBSI, FHRBI, FHRBDI, and FHRBIR ( $\alpha = 0.2$ ) with their respective PNSR (dB), blur of kernel  $3 \times 3$  and N = 256. See Table 6 for details on the parameters.



FIGURE 4. Original image, blur and noisy observation 10, and recovered images for FHRB and FHRBIR ( $N_0 = 3000$ ) with their respective PNSR (dB), blur of kernel 9 × 9 and N = 256. See Table 7 for details on the parameters.



FIGURE 5. Original image, blur and noisy observation 10, and recovered images for FHRB and FHRBIR ( $N_0 = 3000$ ) with their respective PNSR (dB), blur of kernel  $9 \times 9$  and N = 512. See Table 7 for details on the parameters.

### 20 RELAXED AND INERTIAL NONLINEAR FORWARD-BACKWARD WITH MOMENTUM

acceleration becomes negligible. To leverage the acceleration provided by the inertial step, we propose a restart strategy for the inertial parameter. Numerical experiments illustrate that this strategy improves convergence, although there is no theoretical framework to implement it to accelerate the process. These results motivate further investigation into incorporating larger step-sizes that do not limit the inertial parameter.

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

### References

- Alvarez F (2004) Weak convergence of a relaxed and inertial hybrid projection-proximal point algorithm for maximal monotone operators in Hilbert space. SIAM J. Optim. 14:773-782. https://doi.org/10.1137/ S1052623403427859
- [2] Alvarez F, Attouch H (2001) An inertial proximal method for maximal monotone operators via discretization of a nonlinear oscillator with damping. Set-Valued Anal. 9:3-11 https://doi.org/10.1023/A: 1011253113155.
- [3] Alves MM, Eckstein J, Geremia M, Melo JG (2020) Relative-error inertial-relaxed inexact versions of Douglas-Rachford and ADMM splitting algorithms. Comput. Optim. Appl. 75:389–422. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s10589-019-00165-y.
- [4] Alves MM, Marcavillaca RT (2020) On inexact relative-error hybrid proximal extragradient, forward-backward and Tseng's modified forward-backward methods with inertial effects. Set-Valued Var. Anal. 28:301–325. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11228-019-00510-7.
- [5] Attouch H, Cabot A (2019) Convergence of a relaxed inertial forward-backward algorithm for structured monotone inclusions. Appl. Math. Optim. 80:547–598. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00245-019-09584-z
- [6] Attouch H, Peypouquet J (2019) Convergence of inertial dynamics and proximal algorithms governed by maximally monotone operators. Math. Program. 174:391–432. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10107-018-1252-x.
- [7] Aubin JP, Frankowska H (2009) Set-valued Analysis. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-8176-4848-0
- [8] Bauschke HH, Combettes PL (2017) Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces, second edn.CMS Books in Mathematics/Ouvrages de Mathématiques de la SMC. Springer, Cham. https: //doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48311-5
- Beck A, Teboulle M (2009) Fast gradient-based algorithms for constrained total variation image denoising and deblurring problems. IEEE Trans. Image Process. 18:2419–2434. https://doi.org/10.1109/TIP.2009. 2028250.
- [10] Boţ RI, Csetnek ER (2016) An inertial forward-backward-forward primal-dual splitting algorithm for solving monotone inclusion problems. Numer. Algorithms 71:519–540. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11075-015-0007-5
- [11] Boţ RI, Csetnek ER (2016) An inertial Tseng's type proximal algorithm for nonsmooth and nonconvex optimization problems. J. Optim. Theory Appl. 171(2), 600-616 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10957-015-0730-z.
- [12] Boţ RI, Csetnek ER, Hendrich C (2015) Inertial Douglas-Rachford splitting for monotone inclusion problems. Appl. Math. Comput. 256:472-487. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2015.01.017
- [13] Boţ RI, Hendrich C (2014) Convergence analysis for a primal-dual monotone + skew splitting algorithm with applications to total variation minimization. J. Math. Imaging Vis. 49:551–568. https://doi.org/10. 1007/s10851-013-0486-8.
- [14] Boţ RI, Sedlmayer M, Vuong PT (2023) A relaxed inertial forward-backward-forward algorithm for solving monotone inclusions with application to GANs. J. Mach. Learn. Res. 24:191-227.
- [15] Briceño L, Cominetti R, Cortés CE, Martínez F (2008) An integrated behavioral model of land use and transport system: a hyper-network equilibrium approach. Netw. Spat. Econ. 8:201-224. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s11067-007-9052-5
- [16] Briceño-Arias L, Deride J, López-Rivera S, Silva FJ (2023) A primal-dual partial inverse algorithm for constrained monotone inclusions: applications to stochastic programming and mean field games. Appl. Math. Optim. 87:21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00245-022-09921-9
- [17] Briceño-Arias L, Deride J, Vega C (2022) Random activations in primal-dual splittings for monotone inclusions with a priori information. J. Optim. Theory Appl. 192:56-81. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10957-021-01944-6

- [18] Briceño-Arias LM, Combettes P (2011) A monotone + skew splitting model for composite monotone inclusions in duality. SIAM J. Optim. 21:1230–1250. https://doi.org/10.1137/10081602X
- [19] Briceño-Arias LM, Combettes PL (2013) Monotone operator methods for Nash equilibria in non-potential games. In: Computational and analytical mathematics, Springer Proc. Math. Stat., vol. 50, Springer, New York, pp 143–159. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7621-4\_9
- [20] Briceño-Arias LM, Combettes PL, Pesquet JC, Pustelnik N (2011) Proximal algorithms for multicomponent image recovery problems. J. Math. Imaging Vis. 41:3–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10851-010-0243-1.
- [21] Briceño-Arias LM, Davis D (2018) Forward-backward-half forward algorithm for solving monotone inclusions. SIAM J. Optim. 28:2839–2871 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1137/17M1120099
- [22] Briceño-Arias L, López Rivera S (2019) A projected primal-dual method for solving constrained monotone inclusions. J. Optim. Theory Appl. 180:907–924. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-018-1430-2
- [23] Bùi MN, Combettes PL (2020) Warped proximal iterations for monotone inclusions. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 491:124,315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2020.124315
- [24] Chambolle A (2004) An algorithm for total variation minimization and applications. J. Math. Imaging Vis. 20:89–97. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JMIV.0000011320.81911.38.
- [25] Chambolle A, Pock T (2011) A first-order primal-dual algorithm for convex problems with applications to imaging. J. Math. Imaging Vis. 40:120–145. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10851-010-0251-1
- [26] Combettes PL (2004) Solving monotone inclusions via compositions of nonexpansive averaged operators. Optimization 53:475-504. https://doi.org/10.1080/02331930412331327157
- [27] Combettes PL (2018) Monotone operator theory in convex optimization. Math. Program. 170:177-206. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-018-1303-3
- [28] Combettes PL, Pesquet JC (2021) Fixed point strategies in data science. IEEE Trans. Signal Process. 69:3878-3905. https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2021.3069677
- [29] Condat L (2013) A primal-dual splitting method for convex optimization involving Lipschitzian, proximable and linear composite terms. J. Optim. Theory Appl. 158:460-479. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10957-012-0245-9
- [30] Cortild D, Peypouquet J (2024) Krasnoselskii-mann iterations: Inertia, perturbations and approximation. https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.16870
- [31] Davis D, Yin W (2017) A three-operator splitting scheme and its optimization applications. Set-Valued Var. Anal. 25:829–858. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11228-017-0421-z
- [32] Dong Q., Cho YJ, He S, Pardalos PM, Rassias TM (2021) The inertial krasnosel'skii-mann iteration. In: The Krasnosel'skii-Mann Iterative Method: Recent Progress and Applications, pp. 59–73. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-91654-1\_5
- [33] Dong Y, Sun M (2022) New acceleration factors of the krasnosel'skii-mann iteration. Results Math. 77:194. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00025-022-01729-x
- [34] Douglas J, Rachford HH (1956) On the numerical solution of heat conduction problems in two and three space variables. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 82:421–439. https://doi.org/10.2307/1993056
- [35] Eckstein J, Bertsekas D (1992) On the Douglas-Rachford splitting method and the proximal point algorithm for maximal monotone operators. Math. Program. 55:293–318. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01581204
- [36] Fukushima M (1996) The primal Douglas-Rachford splitting algorithm for a class of monotone mappings with application to the traffic equilibrium problem. Math. Program. 72:1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/ 0025-5610(95)00012-7
- [37] Gabay D (1983) Applications of the method of multipliers to variational inequalities. In: M. Fortin, R. Glowinski (eds.)Augmented Lagrangian Methods: Applications to the Solution of Boundary-Value Problems, Amsterdam, Netherlands pp.299-331. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-2024(08)70034-1
- [38] Gafni EM, Bertsekas DP (1984) Two-metric projection methods for constrained optimization. SIAM J. Control Optim. 22:936–964. https://doi.org/10.1137/0322061
- [39] Giselsson P (2021) Nonlinear forward-backward splitting with projection correction. SIAM J. Optim. 31:2199-2226. https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1345062
- [40] Glowinski R, Marrocco A (1975) 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 Sér. Rouge Anal. Numér. 9:41–76.
- [41] Goldstein AA (1964) Convex programming in Hilbert space. Bull. Am. Math. Soc. 70:709-710. https://doi.org/bams/1183526263
- [42] He X, Hu R, Fang YP (2022) Inertial accelerated primal-dual methods for linear equality constrained convex optimization problems. Numer. Algor. 90:1669–1690 . https://doi.org/10.1007/s11075-021-01246-y
- [43] Iutzeler F, Hendrickx JM (2019) A generic online acceleration scheme for optimization algorithms via relaxation and inertia. Optim. Methods Softw. 34:383–405. https://doi.org/10.1080/10556788.2017.1396601

#### 22 RELAXED AND INERTIAL NONLINEAR FORWARD-BACKWARD WITH MOMENTUM

- [44] Lions PL, Mercier B (1979) Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 16:964-979. https://doi.org/10.1137/0716071
- [45] Lorenz DA, Pock T (2015) An inertial forward-backward algorithm for monotone inclusions. J. Math. Imaging Vis. 51:311-325. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10851-014-0523-2
- [46] Malitsky Y, Tam MK (2020) A forward-backward splitting method for monotone inclusions without cocoercivity. SIAM J. Optim. 30:1451–1472. https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1207260
- [47] Maulén JJ, Fierro I, Peypouquet J (2024) Inertial Krasnoselskii-Mann Iterations. Set-Valued Var. Anal. 32. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11228-024-00713-7
- [48] Morin M, Banert S, Giselsson P (2023) Nonlinear Forward-Backward Splitting with Momentum Correction. Set-Valued Var. Anal. 31:37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11228-023-00700-4
- [49] Moudafi A, Oliny M (2003) Convergence of a splitting inertial proximal method for monotone operators.
   J. Comput. Appl. Math. 155:447–454. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-0427(02)00906-8
- [50] Nesterov Y (1983) A method for unconstrained convex minimizing problem with the rate of convergence  $o1/k^2$ ). In Doklady an ussr 269:543–547.
- [51] Passty G. (1979) Ergodic convergence to a zero of the sum of monotone operators in hilbert space. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 72:383–390. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X(79)90234-8
- [52] Polyak B (1964) Some methods of speeding up the convergence of iteration methods. U.S.S.R. Comput. Math. Math. Phys. 4:1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/0041-5553(64)90137-5
- [53] Roldán F (2024) Forward primal-dual half-forward algorithm for splitting four operators. https://arxiv. org/abs/2310.17265
- [54] Showalter RE (1997) Monotone Operators in Banach Space and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI. https://doi.org/10.1090/surv/049
- [55] Tseng P (2000) A modified forward-backward splitting method for maximal monotone mappings. SIAM J. Control Optim. 38:431–446. https://doi.org/10.1137/S0363012998338806
- [56] Vũ BC (2013) A splitting algorithm for dual monotone inclusions involving cocoercive operators. Adv. Comput. Math. 38:667–681 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10444-011-9254-8
- [57] Valkonen T (2020) Inertial, corrected, primal-dual proximal splitting. SIAM J. Optim. 30:1391–1420. https: //doi.org/10.1137/18M1182851
- [58] Zong CX, Tang YC, Zhang, GF (2022) An inertial semi-forward-reflected-backward splitting and its application. Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.) 38:443-464. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10114-022-0649-x