

Eckstein-Ferris-Pennanen-Robinson duality revisited: paramonotonicity, total Fenchel-Rockafellar duality, and the Chambolle-Pock operator

Heinz H. Bauschke*, Walaa M. Moursi†, and Shambhavi Singh‡

December 12, 2024

Abstract

Finding zeros of the sum of two maximally monotone operators involving a continuous linear operator is a central problem in optimization and monotone operator theory. We revisit the duality framework proposed by Eckstein, Ferris, Pennanen, and Robinson from a quarter of a century ago. Paramonotonicity is identified as a broad condition ensuring that saddle points coincide with the closed convex rectangle formed by the primal and dual solutions. Additionally, we characterize total duality in the subdifferential setting and derive projection formulas for sets that arise in the analysis of the Chambolle-Pock algorithm within the recent framework developed by Bredies, Chenchene, Lorenz, and Naldi.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 49N15, 90C46, 47H05; Secondary 47H09; 47N10, 49M27, 49M29, 65K05, 90C25.

Keywords: Attouch-Théra duality, Chambolle-Pock operator, Eckstein-Ferris-Pennanen-Robinson duality, Fenchel-Rockafellar duality, maximally monotone operator, paramonotone operator, Primal-Dual Hybrid Gradient (PDHG) operator, saddle point, sum problem, subdifferential operator, total duality.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, we assume that

$$X \text{ and } Y \text{ are real Hilbert spaces, and } L: X \rightarrow Y \text{ is continuous and linear.} \quad (1)$$

We also assume that

$$A \text{ and } B \text{ are maximally monotone on } X \text{ and } Y, \text{ respectively.} \quad (2)$$

(See, e.g., [3] for more on maximally monotone operators.) A central problem in optimization and variational analysis is to

$$\text{Find } x \in X \text{ such that } 0 \in Ax + L^*BLx. \quad (3)$$

We emphasize that we do not assume that $A + L^*BL$ or L^*BL is maximally monotone. Following Eckstein and Ferris [14], we encode the (*primal*) problem (3) by the triple

$$(A, L, B). \quad (4)$$

*Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Kelowna, B.C. V1V 1V7, Canada. E-mail: heinz.bauschke@ubc.ca.

†Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1, Canada. and Mansoura University, Faculty of Science, Mathematics Department, Mansoura 35516, Egypt. E-mail: walaa.moursi@uwaterloo.ca.

‡Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1, Canada. shambhavi.singh@uwaterloo.ca.

The *dual problem* is given by

$$\text{Find } y \in Y \text{ such that } 0 \in B^{-1}y - LA^{-1}(-L^*y), \quad (5)$$

which is now represented by the triple $(B^{-1}, -L^*, A^{-1})$. This gives rise to the *duality* operation

$$(A, L, B)^* := (B^{-1}, -L^*, A^{-1}) \quad (6)$$

which features the pleasant *biduality* (see [14, Section 2.1])

$$(A, L, B)^{**} = (B^{-1}, -L^*, A^{-1})^* = ((A^{-1})^{-1}, -(-L^*)^*, (B^{-1})^{-1}) = (A, L, B). \quad (7)$$

The set of solutions to the primal problem is given by

$$\text{sol}(A, L, B) := \{x \in X \mid x \text{ solves the problem given by } (A, L, B)\} \quad (8a)$$

$$= \{x \in X \mid 0 \in Ax + L^*BLx\}. \quad (8b)$$

For ease of notation, we abbreviate the set of the primal and the dual solutions by

$$Z := \text{sol}(A, L, B) = \{x \in X \mid 0 \in Ax + L^*BLx\} \quad (9)$$

and

$$K := \text{sol}(A, L, B)^* = \{y \in Y \mid 0 \in B^{-1}y - LA^{-1}(-L^*y)\}, \quad (10)$$

respectively. Closely related to these notions is the set of *saddle points* for (A, L, B) , given by

$$\mathbf{S} := \{(x, y) \in X \times Y \mid -L^*y \in Ax \wedge Lx \in B^{-1}y\}. \quad (11)$$

The inclusion

$$\mathbf{S} \subseteq Z \times K \quad (12)$$

is always true (see [Corollary 3.3](#) below). However, equality in (12) may fail as Eckstein and Ferris ([14, page 69]) observed:

Example 1.1. Suppose that $X = Y = \mathbb{R}^2$, $L = \text{Id}$,

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

Then $A^{-1} = B = -A$, $B^{-1} = A = -B$, and we have the strict inclusion

$$\mathbf{S} = \text{gra}(-A) \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 = Z \times K. \quad (14)$$

Our goal in this paper is to carefully study the relationship between the primal problem (3), the dual problem (5), the corresponding solution sets (9), (10), and the set of saddle points (11). Our main results can be summarized as follows:

- We show that paramonotonicity of A and B is a quite general sufficient condition to guarantee that $\mathbf{S} = Z \times K$ ([Corollary 5.3](#)).
- We observe that — in the subdifferential case — the nonemptiness of Z characterizes total Fenchel-Rockafellar duality ([Theorem 6.5](#)).
- We obtain formulas for projections onto sets arising in the Bredies-Chenchene-Lorenz-Naldi framework for studying the Chambolle-Pock algorithm ([Section 8](#)).

Our work is complementary to that by Eckstein and Ferris [14] who focused on complementarity problems, by Pennanen [17] who considered an even more general framework and derived criteria for maximal monotonicity as did Robinson [19]. We mention that our work extends previous work on *Attouch-Théra duality*, i.e., when $Y = X$ and $L = \text{Id}$ (see [1] and [2]).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we lay the foundation by analyzing the mappings which traverse between Z and K , the sets of primal and dual solutions. The graph of these mappings is intimately connected to the set of saddle points as is observed in Section 3. The case when we have common zeros is characterized in Section 4. In Section 5, we reveal the set of saddle points \mathbf{S} to be the convex “rectangle” $Z \times K$ whenever A and B are paramonotone. In Section 6, we show that the nonemptiness of Z is equivalent to total Fenchel-Rockafellar duality. The Chambolle-Pock operator is revisited in the Bredies-Chenchene-Lorenz-Naldi framework in Section 7; moreover, projection formula on associated sets are presented in Section 8. In Section 9, we focus on the case when A and B are normal cone operators which is useful for studying feasibility problem. In the final Section 10, we discuss a product space set up to deal with certain problems that may feature more than two operators.

The notation we employ is fairly standard and largely follows [3].

2 Traversing between primal and dual solutions

The following notation, which induces a way to traverse between primal and dual solutions, will be used extensively throughout the paper: Set

$$(\forall x \in X) \quad K_x := (-L^{-*}Ax) \cap (BLx) \subseteq Y \quad (15)$$

and

$$(\forall y \in Y) \quad Z_y := (L^{-1}B^{-1}y) \cap A^{-1}(-L^*y) \subseteq X. \quad (16)$$

Proposition 2.1. *Let $(x, y) \in X \times Y$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) $y \in K_x \Leftrightarrow x \in Z_y$.
- (ii) $L^*(K_x) = (-Ax) \cap L^*BLx$ and $L(Z_y) = (B^{-1}y) \cap LA^{-1}(-L^*y)$.
- (iii) $K_x \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow x \in Z$, and $Z_y \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow y \in K$.
- (iv) $K_x \subseteq K$ and $Z_y \subseteq Z$.
- (v) K_x and Z_y are closed and convex.

Proof. We have the equivalences

$$y \in K_x \Leftrightarrow y \in -L^{-*}Ax \wedge y \in BLx \quad (17a)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow -L^*y \in Ax \wedge Lx \in B^{-1}y \quad (17b)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow x \in A^{-1}(-L^*y) \wedge x \in L^{-1}B^{-1}y \quad (17c)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow x \in Z_y, \quad (17d)$$

and this proves (i).

We now prove (ii): First, suppose that $v \in K_x$, i.e., $v \in -L^{-*}Ax$ and $v \in BLx$. It follows that $L^*v \in -Ax$ and $L^*v \in L^*BLx$, i.e., $L^*v \in (-Ax) \cap L^*BLx$. We’ve verified that $L^*(K_x) \subseteq (-Ax) \cap L^*BLx$. Conversely, suppose that $u \in (-Ax) \cap L^*BLx$. Then there exists $v \in BLx$ such that $u = L^*v$. Hence $-L^*v \in Ax$ and so $v \in -L^{-*}x$. Thus $v \in K_x$ and so $u = L^*v \in L^*(K_x)$. Altogether, we have shown that $L^*(K_x) = (-Ax) \cap L^*BLx$. The proof of the identity $L(Z_y) = (B^{-1}y) \cap LA^{-1}(-L^*y)$ is similar.

Turning to (iii) and (iv), suppose that $K_x \neq \emptyset$, and let $k \in K_x$. It follows that

$$k \in -L^{-*}Ax \wedge k \in BLx. \quad (18)$$

First, this implies that $-L^*k \in Ax \wedge L^*k \in L^*BLx$, which upon adding, yields $x \in Z$. Second, this also implies $x \in A^{-1}(-L^*k) \wedge Lx \in B^{-1}k$. Hence $-Lx \in -LA^{-1}(-L^*k) \wedge Lx \in B^{-1}k$. Upon adding, we learn that $k \in K$. We have shown that $K_x \subseteq K$ and this is also trivially true if $K_x = \emptyset$.

Now assume $x \in Z$. Then there exists $y \in BLx$ such that $-L^*y \in Ax$, i.e., $y \in -L^{-*}Ax$. It follows that $y \in K_x$ and so $K_x \neq \emptyset$.

The remaining statements in (iii) and (iv) are proved similarly.

Because A and B are maximally monotone, the sets Ax and $B(Lx)$ are convex and closed. The linearity and continuity of $-L^*$ then yields the convexity and closedness of $-L^{-*}Ax$. Upon intersecting, we obtain convexity and closedness K_x . The set Z_k is treated similarly. ■

We now associate with (15) and (16) the following set-valued operators:

$$\mathbf{K}: X \rightrightarrows Y: x \mapsto K_x \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Z}: Y \rightrightarrows X: y \mapsto Z_y. \quad (19)$$

Corollary 2.2. *We have*

$$\text{dom } \mathbf{K} = Z \text{ and } \text{ran } \mathbf{K} = K = \bigcup_{z \in Z} K_z \quad (20)$$

as well as

$$\text{dom } \mathbf{Z} = K \text{ and } \text{ran } \mathbf{Z} = Z = \bigcup_{k \in K} Z_k. \quad (21)$$

Proof. The domain statements follow from Proposition 2.1(iii). This and Proposition 2.1(iv) imply $\text{ran } \mathbf{K} = \bigcup_{z \in Z} K_z \subseteq K$ and $\text{ran } \mathbf{Z} = \bigcup_{k \in K} Z_k \subseteq Z$. Now let $k \in K = \text{dom } \mathbf{Z}$. Then $Z_k \neq \emptyset$. Let $z \in Z_k$. By Proposition 2.1(i), $k \in K_z \subseteq \text{ran } \mathbf{K}$. Hence $K \subseteq \text{ran } \mathbf{K}$. Altogether, we deduce that $\text{ran } \mathbf{K} = K$. The range of \mathbf{Z} is treated similarly. ■

The next result states that the operators $L\mathbf{Z}$ and $L^*\mathbf{K}$ are skew.

Proposition 2.3. *Suppose that $z_i \in Z$, and $k_i \in K_{z_i}$, for each $i \in \{0, 1\}$. Then*

$$\langle Lz_0 - Lz_1, k_0 - k_1 \rangle = \langle z_0 - z_1, L^*k_0 - L^*k_1 \rangle = 0. \quad (22)$$

Proof. The left equality in (22) is trivial. Now, the assumption implies that each $k_i \in (-L^{-*}Az_i) \cap (BLz_i)$. Thus each $-L^*k_i \in Az_i$ and $L^*k_i \in L^*BLz_i$. Because A and L^*BL are monotone, we deduce that $0 \leq \langle z_0 - z_1, (-L^*k_0) - (-L^*k_1) \rangle$ and $0 \leq \langle z_0 - z_1, L^*k_0 - L^*k_1 \rangle$. Altogether, $0 = \langle z_0 - z_1, L^*k_0 - L^*k_1 \rangle$ which is the right equality in (22). ■

3 Saddle points

Fact 3.1. *The set of saddle points \mathbf{S} is convex and closed.*

Remark 3.2. *Fact 3.1 can be proved by observing that the \mathbf{S} are actually the zeros of the the maximally monotone operator on $X \times Y$, given by $(x, y) \mapsto (Ax \times B^{-1}y) + (L^*y, -Lx)$; see [14, Proposition 2] (and also [3, Proposition 26.33]). When $A = \partial f$ and $B = \partial g$, for proper lower semicontinuous convex functions f and g on X and Y , respectively, then the \mathbf{S} is precisely the set of saddle point of the function*

$$(x, y) \mapsto f(x) - g^*(y) + \langle x, L^*y \rangle, \quad (23)$$

which is convex in x and concave in y . This motivates the term ‘‘saddle points’’ for (11). One may also find the terminology ‘‘Kuhn-Tucker vectors’’ for \mathbf{S} in the literature (see, e.g., [18]).

Corollary 3.3. *The set*

$$\mathbf{S} = \text{gra } \mathbf{K} = \text{gra } \mathbf{Z}^{-1} \text{ is a closed convex subset of } Z \times K. \quad (24)$$

Moreover, the sets of primal and dual solutions

$$Z \text{ and } K \text{ are convex.} \quad (25)$$

Proof. Taking $(x, y) \in X \times Y$, we get the equivalences

$$(x, y) \in \mathbf{S} \Leftrightarrow y \in -L^{-*}Ax \wedge y \in B(Lx) \quad (26a)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow y \in K_x \quad (26b)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (x, y) \in \text{gra } \mathbf{K}, \quad (26c)$$

which yields $\mathbf{S} = \text{gra } \mathbf{K}$. On the other hand, [Proposition 2.1\(i\)](#) yields $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{Z}^{-1}$. Combining with [Fact 3.1](#), we obtain [\(24\)](#).

Because \mathbf{S} is convex, so are the restrictions to the first and second components, i.e., $Z = \text{dom } \mathbf{K}$ and $K = \text{ran } \mathbf{K}$. This proves [\(25\)](#) and we are done. ■

Remark 3.4. *The fact that Z and K are convex is somewhere surprising because the operator sums occurring in their definition are not assumed to be maximally monotone.*

4 Common zeros

The next result characterizes when we have common zeroes for the problem [\(3\)](#):

Proposition 4.1 (common zeros). $\text{zer } A \cap \text{zer } L^*BL \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow K \cap \ker L^* \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. “ \Rightarrow ”: Indeed, using [Proposition 2.1\(iv\)](#),

$$\text{zer } A \cap \text{zer } L^*BL \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow (\exists z \in X) \ z \in \text{zer } A \cap \text{zer } L^*BL \quad (27a)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\exists z \in X) \ 0 \in Az \wedge 0 \in L^*BLz \quad (27b)$$

$$\Rightarrow (\exists z \in X) \ L^{-*}(0) \subseteq L^{-*}Az \wedge (\exists y \in BLz) \ L^*y = 0 \quad (27c)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\exists z \in X) \ \pm \ker L^* \subseteq L^{-*}Az \wedge (\exists y \in Y) \ y \in BLz \cap \ker L^* \quad (27d)$$

$$\Rightarrow (\exists y \in Y) \ y \in \ker L^* \cap BLz \cap (-L^{-*}Az) \quad (27e)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\exists y \in Y) \ y \in \ker L^* \cap K_z \subseteq \ker L^* \cap K. \quad (27f)$$

“ \Leftarrow ”: Conversely, assume that $K \cap \ker L^* \neq \emptyset$. Let $k \in K \cap \ker L^*$. By [Corollary 2.2](#), $K = \bigcup_{z \in Z} K_z$. Hence there exists $z \in Z$ such that $k \in K_z \cap \ker L^*$. Thus

$$k \in (-L^{-*}Az) \cap (BLz) \cap \ker L^*. \quad (28)$$

Hence $-L^*k \in Az \wedge k \in BLz \wedge L^*k = 0$. This implies $0 = -0 = -L^*k \in Az \wedge 0 = L^*k \in L^*BLz$, i.e., $z \in \text{zer } A \cap \text{zer } L^*BL$. ■

Proposition 4.2 (0 as a dual solution). *We have: $\text{zer } L^{-*}A \cap \text{zer } BL \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow 0 \in K$.*

Proof. Indeed, using [Corollary 2.2](#), we have

$$\text{zer } L^{-*}A \cap \text{zer } BL \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow (\exists z \in X) \ 0 \in (-L^{-*}Az) \cap (BLz) \quad (29a)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\exists z \in X) \ 0 \in K_z \quad (29b)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow 0 \in K = \bigcup_{z \in Z} K_z, \quad (29c)$$

as claimed. ■

The previous two results generalize [\[2, Proposition 2.10\]](#); moreover, these generalization are different from each other as we now show:

Example 4.3. Suppose that $Y = X$ and that U is a proper closed linear subspace of X . Further suppose that $A = P_U$ and $L = P_U = L^*$, let $u^\perp \in U^\perp \setminus \{0\}$, and suppose that $B: y \mapsto u^\perp$. Because $\ker L^* = U^\perp$, we have $(\forall x \in X) x \in Z \Leftrightarrow 0 \in Ax + L^*BLx = P_Ux \Leftrightarrow x \in U^\perp$; thus,

$$Z = U^\perp. \quad (30)$$

It thus follows with [Corollary 2.2](#) that

$$K = \bigcup_{z \in Z} K_z = \bigcup_{z \in U^\perp} (-L^{-*}Az) \cap (BLz) = \bigcup_{z \in U^\perp} (-U^\perp \cap \{u^\perp\}) = \{u^\perp\}. \quad (31)$$

Hence $0 \notin K$, and, as predicted by [Proposition 4.2](#), $\text{zer } L^{-*} \cap \text{zer } BL = \emptyset$. On the other hand, $K \cap \ker L^* = \{u^\perp\} \cap U^\perp = \{u^\perp\} \neq \emptyset$ and so [Proposition 4.1](#) guarantees that $\text{zer } A \cap \text{zer } L^*BL \neq \emptyset$. Indeed, $\text{zer } A \cap \text{zer } L^*BL = \text{zer } P_U \cap \text{zer } P_Uu^\perp = U^\perp$.

5 Paramonotonicity helps!

Recall that $A : X \rightrightarrows X$ is *paramonotone* if it is monotone and

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} (x_0, u_0) \in \text{gra } A \\ (x_1, u_1) \in \text{gra } A \\ \langle x_0 - x_1, u_0 - u_1 \rangle = 0 \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow (x_0, u_1) \in \text{gra } A \text{ and } (x_1, u_0) \in \text{gra } A.$$

The term ‘‘paramonotone’’ was introduced in [\[10\]](#) for functions on \mathbb{R}^n , and thoroughly studied in [\[15\]](#). The class of paramonotone operators is large: it includes subdifferential operators, strictly monotone operators, displacement mappings, and others (see also [\[3\]](#) and [\[7\]](#)).

Theorem 5.1. Suppose that A and B are paramonotone. Then $(\forall z \in Z) K_z = K$ and $(\forall k \in K) Z_k = Z$.

Proof. Take z_0, z_1 in Z , and let each $k_i \in K_{z_i}$. By [Proposition 2.3](#),

$$\langle Lz_0 - Lz_1, k_0 - k_1 \rangle = 0 = \langle z_0 - z_1, (-L^*k_0) - (-L^*k_1) \rangle. \quad (32)$$

On the other hand, the definition of K_{z_i} yields $(z_i, -L^*k_i) \in \text{gra } A$ and $(Lz_i, k_i) \in \text{gra } B$. Altogether, in view of the paramonotonicity of A and B , we deduce that $(z_0, -L^*k_1) \in \text{gra } A$, $(z_1, -L^*k_0) \in \text{gra } A$, $(Lz_0, k_1) \in \text{gra } B$, and $(Lz_1, k_0) \in \text{gra } B$. Hence $k_1 \in K_{z_0}$ and $k_0 \in K_{z_1}$. It follows that $K_{z_0} = K_{z_1}$ and thus $(\forall z \in Z) K_z = K$.

The remaining assertion is proved similarly, after noting that an operator is paramonotone if and only if its inverse is likewise. ■

Remark 5.2. Suppose that A and B are paramonotone, and that $k \in K$ is an arbitrary dual solution. Then [Theorem 5.1](#) guarantees that the entire set of primal solutions is recovered via

$$Z = Z_k = (L^{-1}B^{-1}k) \cap (A^{-1}(-L^*k)). \quad (33)$$

Similarly, a single primal solution $z \in Z$ recovers all dual solutions via $K = K_z = (-L^{-*}Az) \cap (BLz)$. Without paramonotonicity, this fails even when $Y = X$ and $L = \text{Id}$ — combine [Example 1.1](#) with [Corollary 3.3](#).

Corollary 5.3. Suppose that A and B are paramonotone. Then the following hold:

- (i) The sets of primal and dual solutions, Z and K , are convex and closed.
- (ii) $\text{gra } \mathbf{K} = \mathbf{S}$ and $\text{gra } \mathbf{Z}$ are the rectangles $Z \times K$ and $K \times Z$, respectively.
- (iii) $\langle \overline{\text{span}}(Z - Z), \overline{\text{span}}(L^*K - L^*K) \rangle = 0 = \langle \overline{\text{span}}(LZ - LZ), \overline{\text{span}}(K - K) \rangle$.

Proof. (i): Combine [Theorem 5.1](#) with [Proposition 2.1](#). (ii): Combine [Theorem 5.1](#) with [Corollary 3.3](#). (iii): Combining [Theorem 5.1](#) with [Proposition 2.3](#), we see that $\langle Z - Z, L^*K - L^*K \rangle = 0 = \langle LZ - LZ, K - K \rangle$ which yields the result. ■

Remark 5.4. As in [Remark 3.4](#), it is surprising that paramonotonicity guarantees that Z and K are closed and convex even though the operator sums occurring in their definition are not required to be maximally monotone.

We learn more about the solution sets under additional assumptions:

Proposition 5.5. Suppose that A and B are paramonotone. Then the following hold:

- (i) If $\overline{\text{span}}(L^*K - L^*K) = X$, then Z is a singleton.
- (ii) If $\overline{\text{span}}(LZ - LZ) = Y$, then K is a singleton.
- (iii) If $\overline{\text{span}}(K - K) = Y$, then $Z - Z \subseteq \ker L$.
- (iv) If $\overline{\text{span}}(Z - Z) = X$, then $K - K \subseteq \ker L^*$.

Proof. (i): If $\overline{\text{span}}(L^*K - L^*K) = X$, then [Corollary 5.3\(iii\)](#) yields $\overline{\text{span}}(Z - Z) = \{0\}$; equivalently, Z is a singleton. (ii): The proof is similar to that of (i). (iii): Suppose that $\overline{\text{span}}(K - K) = Y$. Then [Corollary 5.3\(iii\)](#) yields $\{0\} = \overline{\text{span}}(LZ - LZ)$. It follows that $\{0\} = LZ - LZ = L(Z - Z)$; hence, $Z - Z \subseteq \ker L$. (iv): The proof is similar to that of (iii). ■

Example 5.6. Suppose that $Y = X \neq \{0\}$, $A = 0$, and $B = \text{Id}$. Clearly, A and B are paramonotone. Because $\ker(L^*L) = \ker L$, we have

$$Z = \ker L = Z - Z. \quad (34)$$

And because $(\text{ran } L)^\perp = \ker L^*$ we deduce that

$$K = \{0\} = K - K. \quad (35)$$

We note the following:

- (i) If L is injective, then $Z = \{0\}$, $\overline{\text{span}}(L^*K - L^*K) = \{0\} \neq X$, and $\overline{\text{span}}(LZ - LZ) = \{0\} \neq Y$; therefore, the converse implications of [Proposition 5.5\(i\)&\(ii\)](#) fail.
- (ii) The converse of [Proposition 5.5\(iii\)](#) fails.
- (iii) If $L \neq 0$, then $Z - Z = \ker L \subsetneq X$ and so the converse of [Proposition 5.5\(iv\)](#) fails.

In the presence of a common-zero assumption, we can make further deductions:

Theorem 5.7. Suppose that A and B are paramonotone, and that $\text{zer } L^{-*}A \cap \text{zer } BL \neq \emptyset$. Then the following hold:

- (i) $Z = (\text{zer } A) \cap (L^{-1} \text{zer } B) = (\text{zer } A) \cap (\text{zer}(BL))$ and $0 \in K$.
- (ii) $\overline{\text{span}} L^*K \perp \overline{\text{span}}(Z - Z)$.
- (iii) If A is single-valued, then $K \subseteq \ker L^*$.
- (iv) If B is single-valued, then $K = \{0\}$.
- (v) If $\text{int } Z \neq \emptyset$, then $K \subseteq \ker L^*$.

Proof. The common-zero assumption is equivalent to

$$0 \in K \quad (36)$$

by [Proposition 4.2](#).

(i): In view of (36), we deduce from [Remark 5.2](#) that $Z = (L^{-1}B^{-1}0) \cap (A^{-1}(-L^*0)) = \text{zer } A \cap L^{-1}(\text{zer } B) = \text{zer } A \cap \text{zer}(BL)$.

(ii): By (36), $K = K - 0 \subseteq K - K$. Hence [Corollary 5.3\(iii\)](#) yields the result.

(iii): Assume that A is single-valued. By (i), $Z \subseteq \text{zer } A$. Now let $z \in Z$. Then $Az = 0$ and [Theorem 5.1](#) yields

$$K = K_z = (-L^{-*}Az) \cap (BLz) = (-L^{-*}0) \cap (BLz) = \ker L^* \cap (BLz) \subseteq \ker L^*. \quad (37)$$

(iv): Assume that B is single-valued. From (i), we have $Z \subseteq L^{-1} \text{zer } B$, i.e., $LZ \subseteq \text{zer } B$. Combining this with (36) and Theorem 5.1, we deduce that $(\forall z \in Z)$

$$\{0\} \subseteq K = K_z = (-L^{-*}Az) \cap (BLz) \subseteq (-L^{-*}Az) \cap (B \text{zer } B) = (-L^{-*}Az) \cap \{0\} \subseteq \{0\}. \quad (38)$$

(v): Assume that $\text{int } Z \neq \emptyset$. Then $\text{span}(Z - Z) = X$. Thus Proposition 5.5(iv) yields $K - K \subseteq \ker L^*$. On the other hand, $K = K - 0 \subseteq K - K$ by (36). Altogether, $K \subseteq \ker L^*$. ■

6 The subdifferential case and Fenchel-Rockafellar duality

Throughout this section, we assume that

$$f: X \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty] \quad \text{and} \quad g: Y \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty] \quad \text{are convex, lower semicontinuous, and proper,} \quad (39)$$

and that

$$A = \partial f \quad \text{and} \quad B = \partial g. \quad (40)$$

The Fenchel-Rockafellar primal problem asks to minimize $f + g \circ L$. Standard subdifferential calculus and Fermat's rule yields the following result:

Proposition 6.1. *We have*

$$Z = \text{zer}(\partial f + L^* \circ \partial g \circ L) \subseteq \text{zer}(\partial f + \partial(g \circ L)) \subseteq \text{zer} \partial(f + g \circ L) = \text{argmin}(f + g \circ L). \quad (41)$$

Theorem 6.2. *Suppose that $z \in Z$ and let $x \in \text{argmin}(f + g \circ L)$. Then $L^*(K_z) \subseteq L^*(K_x)$.*

Proof. Because of Proposition 6.1, we have $f(z) + g(Lz) = f(x) + g(Lx) \in \mathbb{R}$; hence,

$$f(z) - f(x) = g(Lx) - g(Lz). \quad (42)$$

We also have $K_z \neq \emptyset$ and $\emptyset \neq L^*(K_z) = (-Az) \cap L^*BLz = (-\partial f(z)) \cap L^*\partial g(Lz)$ by Proposition 2.1(iii)&(ii). Let $u \in (-\partial f(z)) \cap L^*\partial g(Lz)$. Then there exists $v \in K_z$ such that $u = L^*v$. On the one hand, because $-u \in \partial f(z)$, we have $f(z) + \langle x - z, -u \rangle \leq f(x)$ or

$$f(z) - f(x) \leq \langle x - z, u \rangle. \quad (43)$$

On the other hand, because $v \in K_z \subseteq \partial g(Lz)$, we have $g(Lz) + \langle Lx - Lz, v \rangle \leq g(Lx) \Leftrightarrow g(Lz) - g(Lx) \leq -\langle Lx - Lz, v \rangle = -\langle x - z, L^*v \rangle = -\langle x - z, u \rangle \Leftrightarrow$

$$\langle x - z, u \rangle \leq g(Lx) - g(Lz). \quad (44)$$

Combining (42), (43), and (44), we deduce that

$$f(z) - f(x) = \langle x - z, u \rangle = \langle Lx - Lz, v \rangle = g(Lx) - g(Lz). \quad (45)$$

Because $-u \in \partial f(z)$; equivalently, $\langle z, -u \rangle = f(z) + f^*(-u)$, we learn from (45) that $\langle z, -u \rangle = (f(x) + \langle x - z, u \rangle) + f^*(-u)$. Thus $\langle x, -u \rangle = f(x) + f^*(-u)$, i.e.,

$$-u \in \partial f(x). \quad (46)$$

And because $v \in \partial g(Lz)$, we have $\langle Lz, v \rangle = g(Lz) + g^*(v)$ and we learn from (45) that $\langle Lz, v \rangle = (g(Lx) + \langle Lz - Lx, v \rangle) + g^*(v)$. Thus $\langle Lx, v \rangle = g(Lx) + g^*(v)$ and so $v \in \partial g(Lx)$ which further yields

$$u = L^*v \in L^*\partial g(Lx). \quad (47)$$

Combining (46), (47), with Proposition 2.1(ii), we deduce that $u = L^*v \in L^*(K_x)$. ■

Corollary 6.3. *If $\text{zer}(\partial f + L^* \circ \partial g \circ L) \neq \emptyset$, then*

$$Z = \text{zer}(\partial f + L^* \circ \partial g \circ L) = \text{zer}(\partial f + \partial(g \circ L)) = \text{zer} \partial(f + g \circ L) = \text{argmin}(f + g \circ L). \quad (48)$$

Proof. Let $z \in \text{zer}(\partial f + L^* \circ \partial g \circ L) = Z$ and let $x \in \text{argmin}(f + g \circ L)$. Because $z \in Z$, [Proposition 2.1\(iii\)](#) yields $K_z \neq \emptyset$. In view of [Theorem 6.2](#), $L^*(K_x) \neq \emptyset$. Hence $K_x \neq \emptyset$ and so $x \in Z$. Therefore,

$$\text{argmin}(f + g \circ L) \subseteq Z. \quad (49)$$

Finally, the conclusion now follows from [Proposition 6.1](#). ■

Remark 6.4. *Consider [Corollary 6.3](#). If $Z = \emptyset$, then (48) may fail even when $Y = X$ and $L = \text{Id}$; for more on this, see [5, Chapter 13].*

We now involve the *Fenchel-Rockafellar dual problem* which asks to minimize $g^* + f^* \circ (-\text{Id})$. The corresponding *optimal values* of the primal and dual problems are

$$\mu := \inf_{x \in X} (f(x) + g(Lx)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^* := \inf_{y \in Y} (g^*(y) + f^*(-L^*y)), \quad (50)$$

respectively. The Fenchel-Young inequality quickly yields

$$\mu \geq -\mu^*. \quad (51)$$

Theorem 6.5 (total duality). *We have the equivalence*

$$Z \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow \mu^* = -\mu \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and both infima defining } \mu, \mu^* \text{ are attained}, \quad (52)$$

in which case $Z = \text{argmin}(f + g \circ L)$.

Proof. Either side of (52) implies that $\text{dom } g \cap L(\text{dom } f) \neq \emptyset$.

“ \Rightarrow ”: Suppose that $z \in Z$. Let $k \in K_z$. Then $(z, k) \in \mathbf{S}$ by [Corollary 3.3](#) and so $-L^*k \in \partial f(z)$ and $Lz \in \partial g^*(k)$. It thus follows from [3, Theorem 19.1] that z solves the primal problem, k solves the dual problem, and $\mu^* = -\mu \in \mathbb{R}$.

“ \Leftarrow ”: Suppose $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ satisfies $f(x) + g(Lx) = \mu = -\mu^* = -g^*(y) - f^*(-L^*y)$. By [3, Theorem 19.1], $(x, y) \in \mathbf{S}$. Hence [Corollary 3.3](#) and [Corollary 2.2](#) yield $x \in Z$ (and $y \in K$).

Finally, the “in which case” statement is a consequence of [Corollary 6.3](#). ■

Remark 6.6. *[Theorem 6.5](#) can be viewed as a variant of [16, Corollary 5.3] which states that if x is a primal solution and $\partial(f + g \circ L)(x) = \partial f(x) + L^* \partial g(Lx)$, then total duality holds, i.e., $\mu^* = -\mu$ and both the primal and the dual Fenchel-Rockafellar problems have solutions. We refer the reader to the paper [16] by Li, Fang, López, and López for a comprehensive study of total duality.*

In contrast, it is possible that there is no duality gap ($\mu^* = -\mu$) but neither the primal nor the dual Fenchel-Rockafellar problem has a solution:

Example 6.7. *Suppose that $X = Y = \mathbb{R}^2$, $L = \text{Id}$, and f and g are given by*

$$f(x_1, x_2) = \exp(x_1) + \exp^*(x_2) \quad \text{and} \quad g(x_1, x_2) = \exp(x_1) + \exp^*(-x_2). \quad (53)$$

Then $\mu^ = -\mu = 0$ but neither Fenchel-Rockafellar problem has a solution.*

Proof. Recall that

$$\exp^*(\xi) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } \xi < 0; \\ 0, & \text{if } \xi = 0; \\ \xi \ln(\xi) - \xi, & \text{if } \xi > 0. \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

It follows that

$$\mu = \inf_{x_1 \in \mathbb{R}} (\exp(x_1) + \exp(x_1)) + 0 = 0, \quad (55)$$

but μ is not attained. Because $f^*(y_1, y_2) = \exp^*(y_1) + \exp(y_2) = f(y_2, y_1)$ and $g^*(y_1, y_2) = \exp^*(y_1) + \exp(-y_2) = g(-y_2, -y_1)$, it follows that The Fenchel-Rockafellar dual problem thus asks to minimize $(y_1, y_2) \mapsto g(-y_2, -y_1) + f(-y_2, -y_1)$; however, again this problem has optimal value $\mu^* = 0$ yet no solution. ■

We conclude this section with an excursion to the unconstrained LASSO problem.

Example 6.8 (LASSO). Let $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\lambda > 0$, and suppose that $X = \mathbb{R}^n$, $Y = \mathbb{R}^m$, and $L \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Furthermore, we suppose that $f(x) = \lambda \|x\|_1 - \langle x, L^*b \rangle$ and $g(y) = \frac{1}{2} \|y\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|b\|^2$. Thus our maximally monotone operators are given by

$$Ax = \partial f(x) = \lambda \partial \|x\|_1 - L^*b \text{ and } By = \partial g(y) = \nabla g(y) = \text{Id}. \quad (56)$$

The value of the primal Fenchel-Rockafellar problem is

$$\mu = \min_{x \in X} (f(x) + g(Lx)) = \min_{x \in X} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|Lx - b\|^2 + \lambda \|x\|_1 \right), \quad (57)$$

which is the famous unconstrained LASSO problem [21]. Note that we wrote “min”, not “inf”, which we justify now: indeed, the primal objective function $x \mapsto f(x) + g(Lx)$ is the sum of the nonnegative function $x \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \|Lx - b\|^2$ and the coercive continuous function $x \mapsto \lambda \|x\|_1$, which guarantees that minimizers exist. Next, $f^*(x) = \iota_C((x + L^*b)/\lambda)$ and $g^*(y) = \frac{1}{2} \|y\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|b\|^2$, where $C = [-1, 1]^n$ is the unit ball with respect to the max norm. It follows analogously that the dual objective function $y \mapsto g^*(y) + f^*(-L^*y)$ has a minimizer; moreover, it is unique due to the strong convexity of g^* . Combining with the fact that $\text{dom } g = \text{dom } g^* = Y$, we have total duality and so $Z \neq \emptyset$ and $K \neq \emptyset$. Denote the unique dual solution by k :

$$K = \{k\}. \quad (58)$$

The inverses of A and B are given by $A^{-1}: x \mapsto N_C((x + L^*b)/\lambda)$ and $B^{-1} = \text{Id}$. If $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, then

$$N_C(x) = N_{[-1,1]}(x_1) \times \dots \times N_{[-1,1]}(x_n), \quad \text{where } N_{[-1,1]}(\xi) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{R}_-, & \text{if } \xi = -1; \\ \{0\}, & \text{if } |\xi| < 1; \\ \mathbb{R}_+, & \text{if } \xi = 1; \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (59)$$

Now $Z = Z_k = L^{-1}B^{-1}(k) \cap A^{-1}(-L^*k)$, which turns in our current setting into

$$Z = L^{-1}(k) \cap N_C\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}L^*(b - k)\right). \quad (60)$$

We note that (60) immediately yields the following:

- (i) If L is injective ($\Leftrightarrow \text{rank}(L) = n \leq m$), then $L^{-1}(k) = Z$ is a singleton.
- (ii) If each $(L^*(b - k))_i \in]-\lambda, \lambda[$, i.e., $\frac{1}{\lambda}L^*(b - k) \in \text{int } C$, then $N_C\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}L^*(b - k)\right) = \{0\}$ and so $Z = \{0\}$ is a singleton.

More general conditions ensuring that Z is a singleton can be found in Tibshirani’s [22]; see also the recent paper by Berk, Brugiapaglia, and Hoheisel [8].

7 The Chambolle-Pock operator within the Bredies-Chenchene-Lorenz-Naldi framework

From now on we assume that

$$\sigma > 0, \tau > 0, \text{ and } \sigma\tau \|L\|^2 \leq 1. \quad (61)$$

Recall that the *Chambolle-Pock* (a.k.a. *Primal-Dual Hybrid Gradient*) operator for the problem (3) is defined by (see [11] and also [12])

$$\mathbf{T}: X \times Y \rightarrow X \times Y: \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} x^+ \\ y^+ \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} J_{\sigma A}(x - \sigma L^* y) \\ J_{\tau B^{-1}}(y + \tau L(2x^+ - x)) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (62)$$

Proposition 7.1. *Fix $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{S}$ is convex and closed.*

Proof. Let $(x, y) \in X \times Y$. Then

$$(x, y) \in \text{Fix } \mathbf{T} \Leftrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{T} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \quad (63a)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow x = J_{\sigma A}(x - \sigma L^*(y)) \wedge y = J_{\tau B^{-1}}(y + \tau Lx) \quad (63b)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow x - \sigma L^* y \in x + \sigma Ax \wedge y + \tau Lx \in y + \tau B^{-1}y \quad (63c)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow -L^* y \in Ax \wedge Lx \in B^{-1}y \quad (63d)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (x, y) \in \mathbf{S}, \quad (63e)$$

and so $\text{Fix } \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{S}$. Now invoke [Corollary 3.3](#). ■

Following the recent framework proposed by Bredies, Chenchene, Lorenz, and Naldi [9], we define block operators on $X \times Y$ via

$$\mathbf{M} := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sigma} \text{Id}_X & -L^* \\ -L & \frac{1}{\tau} \text{Id}_Y \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{A} := \begin{bmatrix} A & L^* \\ -L & B^{-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (64)$$

Then \mathbf{A} is maximally monotone with $\text{zer } \mathbf{A} = \text{Fix } \mathbf{T}$ while \mathbf{M} is a positive semidefinite preconditioner and

$$(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{M})^{-1}: \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} J_{\sigma A}(\sigma x) \\ J_{\tau B^{-1}}(2\tau J_{\sigma A}(\sigma x) + \tau y) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (65)$$

Moreover,

$$\mathbf{T} = (\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{M})^{-1} \mathbf{M}. \quad (66)$$

The preconditioner \mathbf{M} induces a seminorm on $X \times Y$ via $\|(x, y)\|_{\mathbf{M}}^2 = \langle (x, y), \mathbf{M}(x, y) \rangle$; it is a norm if and only if $\sigma\tau\|L\|^2 < 1$, in which case \mathbf{T} is firmly nonexpansive with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{M}}$. We also assume that there exist another real Hilbert space Z and a continuous linear operator $C: Z \rightarrow X \times Y$ such that

$$CC^* = \mathbf{M}. \quad (67)$$

The associated reduced operator

$$\tilde{T} := C^*(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{M})^{-1}C, \quad (68)$$

which operates in Z , is (classically) firmly nonexpansive and

$$\text{Fix } \tilde{T} = C^*(\text{Fix } \mathbf{T}) \text{ is convex and closed.} \quad (69)$$

We now discuss various cases.

7.1 The general case

One way to find C is by first constructing another operator R in the following manner: Suppose that $Z = X \times Y$ and $R: Y \rightarrow Y$ satisfies

$$RR^* = \text{Id}_Y - \sigma\tau LL^* \quad \text{and set} \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma}} \text{Id}_X & 0 \\ -\sqrt{\sigma}L & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}}R \end{bmatrix}. \quad (70)$$

For instance, R can be chosen as the principal square root of $\text{Id}_Y - \sigma\tau LL^*$ for which we even have $R = R^*$. Another possibility is to use a Cholesky factorization of $\text{Id}_Y - \sigma\tau LL^*$ in the finite-dimensional case.

7.2 The case when $K \subseteq \ker L^*$

For simplicity, we shall assume that Y is finite-dimensional, R is chosen as the principal square root of $\text{Id}_Y - \sigma\tau LL^*$, and $K \subseteq \ker L^*$. Then $(\forall k \in K) R^2k = k$. If $k \in K \setminus \{0\}$, then k is an eigenvector of R^2 with eigenvalue 1; thus, k is also an eigenvector of R with eigenvalue $\sqrt{1} = 1$. Hence

$$(\forall k \in K) \quad Rk = k, \quad (71)$$

and this hold obviously when $k = 0$.

Now assume furthermore that A and B are paramonotone. Combining [Proposition 7.1](#) with [Corollary 5.3\(i\)](#) yields $\text{Fix } \mathbf{T} = Z \times K$. Thus (69) yields

$$\text{Fix } \tilde{T} = \{C^*(z, k) \mid (z, k) \in Z \times K\} \quad (72a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma}} \{(z - \sigma L^*k, \sqrt{\sigma/\tau}k) \mid (z, k) \in Z \times K\} \quad (72b)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma}}Z \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}}K. \quad (72c)$$

7.3 The scaled isometry case: $\sigma\tau LL^* = \text{Id}_Y$

In this subsection, we assume that

$$\sigma\tau LL^* = \text{Id}_Y. \quad (73)$$

(Note that this corresponds to $R = 0$ in (70).) In this case, we can pick $Z = X$ and

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma}} \text{Id}_X \\ -\sqrt{\sigma}L \end{bmatrix}. \quad (74)$$

Assume first that $Y \neq \{0\}$. Then

$$1 = \|\text{Id}_Y\| = \sigma\tau \|LL^*\| = \sigma\tau \|L\|^2 = \sigma\tau \|L^*\|^2 \quad (75)$$

and $\|y\|^2 = \langle y, \sigma\tau LL^*y \rangle = \sigma\tau \langle L^*y, L^*y \rangle = \sigma\tau \|L^*y\|^2 = \|L^*y\|^2 / \|L^*\|^2$. Hence

$$L^* \text{ is a constant-multiple of an isometry from } Y \text{ to } X, \quad (76)$$

a statement that trivially holds when $Y = \{0\}$. If L is a nonzero matrix, this means that rows of L are pairwise orthogonal, and each row vector has the same length $1/\sqrt{\sigma\tau}$. In any case, L^* preserves the topology of Y . Let $x \in X$ and let V be a nonempty closed convex subset of Y . Then L^*V is a nonempty closed convex subset of X and

$$P_{L^*V}(x) = L^*(P_V Lx). \quad (77)$$

More generally, if $\rho \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, then

$$P_{\rho L^*V}(x) = P_{L^*(\rho V)}(x) = L^*P_{\rho V}(Lx) = L^*(\rho P_V(Lx/\rho)) = \rho L^*P_V(Lx/\rho). \quad (78)$$

Now assume that A and B are paramonotone. Combining [Proposition 7.1](#) with [Corollary 5.3\(i\)](#) yields

$$\text{Fix } \mathbf{T} = Z \times K. \quad (79)$$

Hence (69) and (74) result in

$$\text{Fix } \tilde{T} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma}}(Z - \sigma L^*K). \quad (80)$$

Hence $Z - \sigma L^*K = \sqrt{\sigma} \text{Fix } \tilde{T}$ and so

$$P_{Z - \sigma L^*K} = \sqrt{\sigma} P_{\text{Fix } \tilde{T}} \circ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma}} \text{Id}_X; \quad (81)$$

or, equivalently,

$$P_{\text{Fix } \tilde{T}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma}} P_{Z - \sigma L^*K} \circ \sqrt{\sigma} \text{Id}_X. \quad (82)$$

Corollary 7.2. *Suppose that $\sigma\tau LL^* = \text{Id}_Y$, and A and B are paramonotone. Then $(\forall \rho > 0)$ $Z - \rho L^*K$ is closed and convex.*

Proof. It follows from (80) that $Z - \sigma L^*K$ is closed and convex. But $\sigma > 0$ has been chosen arbitrarily and Z and K do not depend on σ ; consequently, the result follows. ■

7.4 The Douglas-Rachford case: $Y = X$, $L = \text{Id}_X$, and $\sigma = \tau = 1$

We specialize the scaled-isometry case (Section 7.3) further to $Y = X$ and $\sigma = \tau = 1$. Then

$$C: x \mapsto (x, -x) \quad \text{and} \quad C^*: (x, y) \mapsto x - y. \quad (83)$$

The reduced operator \tilde{T} from (68) turns into the Douglas-Rachford operator

$$x \mapsto x - J_A x + J_B R_A x, \quad (84)$$

where $R_A := 2J_A - \text{Id}$ is the reflectant of A . In the paramonotone case, (80) turns into

$$\text{Fix } \tilde{T} = Z - K. \quad (85)$$

8 Projections involving the solution sets

Motivated by the descriptions of $\text{Fix } \tilde{T}$ in (80) and (85), we study projections related to the solution sets Z and K . In this section we will assume that

$$A \text{ and } B \text{ are paramonotone.} \quad (86)$$

8.1 The general paramonotone case

Theorem 8.1. *Suppose that A and B are paramonotone, let $(z_0, k_0) \in Z \times K$, $x \in X$, and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) $Z - \rho \overline{L^*K}$ is convex and closed.
- (ii) $P_{Z - \rho \overline{L^*K}}(x) = P_Z(x + \rho L^*k_0) + P_{-\rho \overline{L^*K}}(x - z_0)$.
- (iii) If $(Z - z_0) \perp \rho L^*K$, then $P_{Z - \rho \overline{L^*K}}(x) = P_Z(x) + P_{-\rho \overline{L^*K}}(x - z_0)$.
- (iv) If $Z \perp \rho(L^*K - L^*k_0)$, then $P_{Z - \rho \overline{L^*K}}(x) = P_Z(x + \rho L^*k_0) + P_{-\rho \overline{L^*K}}(x)$.

Proof. Recall from Corollary 5.3(i) that Z and K are convex and closed. By Corollary 5.3(iii), $(Z - Z) \perp (\rho L^*K - \rho L^*K)$. It follows that

$$(Z - z_0) \perp (-\rho \overline{L^*K} + \rho L^*k_0). \quad (87)$$

By [3, Proposition 29.6], the set $Z - z_0 - \rho \overline{L^*K} + \rho L^*k_0$ is closed and convex — equivalently, $Z - \rho \overline{L^*K}$ is closed and convex which yields (i) — and

$$P_{Z - z_0 - \rho \overline{L^*K} + \rho L^*k_0} = P_{Z - z_0} + P_{-\rho \overline{L^*K} + \rho L^*k_0}. \quad (88)$$

This implies (ii) via

$$P_{Z - \rho \overline{L^*K}}(x) = P_{(z_0 - \rho L^*k_0) + Z - \rho \overline{L^*K} - (z_0 - \rho L^*k_0)}(x) \quad (89a)$$

$$= (z_0 - \rho L^*k_0) + P_{Z - \rho \overline{L^*K} - (z_0 - \rho L^*k_0)}(x - (z_0 - \rho L^*k_0)) \quad (89b)$$

$$= (z_0 - \rho L^* k_0) + P_{Z-z_0}(x - (z_0 - \rho L^* k_0)) + P_{-\rho \overline{L^* K} + \rho L^* k_0}(x - (z_0 - \rho L^* k_0)) \quad (89c)$$

$$= P_Z(x + \rho L^* k_0) + P_{-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x - z_0). \quad (89d)$$

Similarly, we deduce that (iii) via

$$P_{Z-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x) = P_{z_0+(Z-z_0)-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x) \quad (90a)$$

$$= z_0 + P_{Z-z_0-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x - z_0) \quad (90b)$$

$$= z_0 + P_{Z-z_0}(x - z_0) + P_{-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x - z_0) \quad (90c)$$

$$= P_Z(x) + P_{-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x - z_0). \quad (90d)$$

Finally, (iv) follows from

$$P_{Z-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x) = P_{-\rho L^* k_0 + Z - \rho \overline{L^* K} + \rho L^* k_0}(x) \quad (91a)$$

$$= -\rho L^* k_0 + P_{Z-\rho \overline{L^* K} + \rho L^* k_0}(x + \rho L^* k_0) \quad (91b)$$

$$= -\rho L^* k_0 + P_Z(x + \rho L^* k_0) + P_{-\rho \overline{L^* K} + \rho L^* k_0}(x + \rho L^* k_0) \quad (91c)$$

$$= P_Z(x + \rho L^* k_0) + P_{-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x). \quad (91d)$$

The proof is complete. ■

Theorem 8.2. *Suppose that A and B are paramonotone, let $\rho > 0$, and let $x \in X$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *If $k_0 \in K$, then $J_{\rho A} P_{Z-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x) = P_Z(x + \rho L^* k_0)$.*
- (ii) *If $z_0 \in Z$ and $(Z - z_0) \perp \rho L^* K$, then $J_{\rho A} P_{Z-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x) = P_Z(x)$.*
- (iii) *If $K \cap \ker L^* \neq \emptyset$, then $J_{\rho A} P_{Z-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x) = P_Z(x)$.*

Proof. Let $z_0 \in Z$. (i): Let $k_0 \in K$, and set $z := P_Z(x + \rho L^* k_0)$. Using [Theorem 8.1\(ii\)](#) and [Theorem 5.1](#), we deduce that

$$P_{Z-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x) - z = P_{-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x - z_0) \in -\rho \overline{L^* K} = -\rho \overline{L^* K_z} \subseteq \rho \overline{Az} = \rho Az. \quad (92)$$

Hence $P_{Z-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x) \in (\text{Id} + \rho A)z$; equivalently, $z = J_{\rho A} P_{Z-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x)$.

(ii): Assume that $(Z - z_0) \perp L^* K$, and set $z := P_Z(x)$. Using [Theorem 8.1\(iii\)](#) and [Theorem 5.1](#),

$$P_{Z-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x) - z = P_{-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x - z_0) \in -\rho \overline{L^* K} = -\rho \overline{L^* K_z} \subseteq \rho \overline{Az} = \rho Az. \quad (93)$$

Hence $P_{Z-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x) \in (\text{Id} + \rho A)z$; equivalently, $z = J_{\rho A} P_{Z-\rho \overline{L^* K}}(x)$.

(iii): Assume that $k_0 \in K \cap \ker L^*$. Then [Corollary 5.3\(iii\)](#) yields $0 = \langle Z - z_0, L^* K - L^* k_0 \rangle = \langle Z - z_0, L^* K \rangle$. Now apply (ii). ■

Remark 8.3. *Specializing the results in this section to the Douglas-Rachford setting (see [Section 7.4](#)), we recover the results of [\[2, Section 6\]](#).*

8.2 Revisiting the scaled isometry case

In addition to the paramonotonicity assumption of this section, we assume in this subsection the scaled isometry case, i.e.,

$$\sigma \tau L L^* = \text{Id}_Y. \quad (94)$$

We have seen in [Section 7.3](#) that $L^* K$ is already closed; therefore, we can remove all closure bars in [Theorem 8.1](#) and [Theorem 8.2](#) in this case and obtain the following two results.

Corollary 8.4. Suppose that A and B are paramonotone, and $\sigma\tau LL^* = \text{Id}_Y$. Let $(z_0, k_0) \in Z \times K$, $x \in X$, and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the following hold:

- (i) $Z - \rho L^*K$ is convex and closed.
- (ii) $P_{Z - \rho L^*K}(x) = P_Z(x + \rho L^*k_0) + P_{-\rho L^*K}(x - z_0)$.
- (iii) If $(Z - z_0) \perp \rho L^*K$, then $P_{Z - \rho L^*K}(x) = P_Z(x) + P_{-\rho L^*K}(x - z_0)$.
- (iv) If $Z \perp \rho(L^*K - L^*k_0)$, then $P_{Z - \rho L^*K}(x) = P_Z(x + \rho L^*k_0) + P_{-\rho L^*K}(x)$.

Corollary 8.5. Suppose that A and B are paramonotone, and $\sigma\tau LL^* = \text{Id}_Y$. Let $\rho > 0$ and $x \in X$. Then the following hold:

- (i) If $k_0 \in K$, then $J_{\rho A}P_{Z - \rho L^*K}(x) = P_Z(x + \rho L^*k_0)$.
- (ii) If $z_0 \in Z$ and $(Z - z_0) \perp \rho L^*K$, then $J_{\rho A}P_{Z - \rho L^*K}(x) = P_Z(x)$.
- (iii) If $K \cap \ker L^* \neq \emptyset$, then $J_{\rho A}P_{Z - \rho L^*K}(x) = P_Z(x)$.

Corollary 8.6. Suppose that A and B are paramonotone, $\sigma\tau LL^* = \text{Id}_Y$, and $K \cap \ker L^* \neq \emptyset$. Let $(x_0, y_0) \in X \times Y$. Set $w_0 := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma}}(x_0 - \sigma L^*y_0)$. Then

$$w := P_{\text{Fix } \tilde{T}} w_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma}} P_{Z - \sigma L^*K}(\sqrt{\sigma} w_0), \quad (95)$$

while the \mathbf{M} -projection of (x_0, y_0) onto $\text{Fix } \mathbf{T}$ is given by

$$\left(P_Z(x_0 - \sigma L^*y_0), J_{\tau B^{-1}}(2\tau L P_Z(x_0 - \sigma L^*y_0)) \right). \quad (96)$$

Proof. Setting $\mathbf{u}_0 := (x_0, y_0)$, we see that $w_0 = C^* \mathbf{u}_0$ using (74). Then (82) yields the right identity in (95). By [6, Theorem 3.1(i)] and (79), we have

$$\mathbf{u} := P_{\text{Fix } \mathbf{T}}^{\mathbf{M}} \mathbf{u}_0 = P_{Z \times K}^{\mathbf{M}} \mathbf{u}_0 = (\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{A})^{-1} C w; \quad (97)$$

here $P_{\text{Fix } \mathbf{T}}^{\mathbf{M}}$ denotes the (well-defined!) projection onto $\text{Fix } \mathbf{T}$ with respect to the \mathbf{M} -norm. Combining (97), (74), and (65) gives

$$\mathbf{u} = \begin{bmatrix} J_{\sigma A}(\sqrt{\sigma} w) \\ J_{\tau B^{-1}}(2\tau L J_{\sigma A}(\sqrt{\sigma} w)) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (98)$$

In view of (95), we have, using now Corollary 8.5(iii),

$$J_{\sigma A}(\sqrt{\sigma} w) = J_{\sigma A} P_{Z - \sigma L^*K}(\sqrt{\sigma} w_0) = P_Z(\sqrt{\sigma} w_0) = P_Z(x_0 - \sigma L^*y_0). \quad (99)$$

Substituting this into (98) yields (96). ■

Remark 8.7. Corollary 8.6 is interesting in certain algorithmic setting (see [6, Section 5]). The projection $P_Z(x_0 - \sigma L^*y_0)$ occurs also in [6, Lemma 5.1] where on the one hand (A, B) is more restrictive (normal cones of linear subspaces instead of paramonotone operators) and on the other hand L is less restrictive (general instead of a scaled isometry). Corollary 8.6 also generalizes the Douglas-Rachford case in [6, Section 5.1.2].

9 Examples involving normal cone operators

9.1 Two normal cone operators: feasibility

In this subsection, we assume, respectively, that

$$U \text{ and } V \text{ are nonempty closed convex subsets of } X \text{ and } Y, \text{ and that } U \cap L^{-1}(V) \neq \emptyset. \quad (100)$$

We also assume that

$$A = N_U \text{ and } B = N_V. \quad (101)$$

Note that $A = \partial_{\iota_U}$ and $B = \partial_{\iota_V}$, which shows that we can also think about this as the set up in Section 6.

Theorem 9.1. *The following hold under assumptions (100) and (101):*

- (i) $Z = U \cap L^{-1}(V)$.
- (ii) $K = N_{V-LU}(0) = N_{\overline{V-LU}}(0)$.
- (iii) *If U and V are cones, then $K = V^\ominus \cap L^{-*}(U^\oplus)$.*
- (iv) *If U and V are linear subspaces, then $K = V^\perp \cap L^{-*}(U^\perp)$.*
- (v) *If $V \cap \text{int } LU \neq \emptyset$ or $\text{int}(V) \cap LU \neq \emptyset$ or $0 \in \text{int } \overline{V-LU}$, then $K = \{0\}$.*

Proof. (i): Let $x \in X$. We have the equivalences $x \in Z \Leftrightarrow 0 \in Ax + L^*BLx \Leftrightarrow 0 \in N_U(x) + L^*N_V(Lx) \Leftrightarrow x \in U \wedge Lx \in V \Leftrightarrow x \in U \cap L^{-1}(V)$.

(ii): Let $z \in Z$. By (i), $z \in U \cap L^{-1}(V)$. Then

$$K_z = (-L^{-*}N_U(z)) \cap N_V(Lz) = (-N_{LU}(Lz)) \cap N_V(Lz) \quad (102a)$$

$$= N_{-LU}(-Lz) \cap N_V(Lz) = N_{V-LU}(0), \quad (102b)$$

where the last equality follows either from [3, Proposition 16.61(i)] or by direct verification. Now apply Corollary 2.2.

(iii): Using [3, Propositions 6.27 and 6.37], we obtain $N_{V-LU}(0) = (V-LU)^\ominus = (V+(-L)U)^\ominus = V^\ominus \cap ((-L)U)^\ominus = V^\ominus \cap ((-L)(U^\ominus)^\ominus)^\ominus = V^\ominus \cap ((-L)^*)^{-1}(U^\ominus) = V^\ominus \cap L^{-*}(U^\oplus)$.

(iv): This follows from (iii).

(v): The assumptions imply $T_{V-LU}(0) = Y$, hence $K = N_{V-LU}(0) = \{0\}$ by [3, Proposition 6.44(ii)]. ■

Remark 9.2. *Theorem 9.1(iv) appears also in [6, Section 5.2]. In the Douglas-Rachford case ($Y = X$ and $L = \text{Id}$), (ii) states that $K = N_{V-U}(0)$; see also [4, Corollary 3.9].*

9.2 Normal cone operator of an affine subspace

Proposition 9.3. *Let U be a closed affine subspace of X , suppose that $A = N_U$ and B is paramonotone. Then the following hold:*

- (i) $Z = U \cap (L^{-1}B^{-1}L^{-*}((U-U)^\perp)) = U \cap ((L^*BL)^{-1}((U-U)^\perp)) \subseteq U$.
- (ii) $(\forall z \in Z) \quad K = L^{-*}((U-U)^\perp) \cap (BLz) \subseteq L^{-*}((U-U)^\perp)$.
- (iii) $Z - Z \perp L^*K$.

Proof. For every $x \in X$, we have

$$Ax = \begin{cases} (U-U)^\perp, & \text{if } x \in U; \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } x \notin U, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad A^{-1}x = \begin{cases} U, & \text{if } x \in (U-U)^\perp; \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (103)$$

(i): Fix $x \in X$. From Corollary 5.3(ii), we have the equivalences

$$x \in Z \Leftrightarrow (\exists y \in Y) \quad Lx \in B^{-1}(y) \wedge -L^*y \in Ax \quad (104a)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\exists y \in Y) \quad x \in L^{-1}B^{-1}(y) \wedge x \in U \wedge y \in -L^{-*}((U-U)^\perp) \quad (104b)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\exists y \in Y) \quad x \in U \cap L^{-1}B^{-1}(y) \wedge y \in L^{-*}((U-U)^\perp) \quad (104c)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow x \in U \cap L^{-1}B^{-1}L^{-*}((U-U)^\perp), \quad (104d)$$

which yields the conclusion.

(ii): Let $z \in Z \subseteq U$ and $y \in Y$. By Theorem 5.1, $K_z = K$. Thus

$$y \in K \Leftrightarrow y \in -L^{-*}Az \cap BLz \quad (105a)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow z \in U \wedge y \in L^{-*}((U - U)^\perp) \cap BLz \quad (105b)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow y \in L^{-*}((U - U)^\perp) \cap BLz, \quad (105c)$$

which yields the conclusion.

(iii): (i) and (ii) yield $Z \subseteq U$ and $K \subseteq L^{-*}((U - U)^\perp)$. Hence $Z - Z \subseteq U - U$ and $L^*(K) \subseteq (U - U)^\perp$, and we are done. ■

Remark 9.4. *Proposition 9.3(iii) was an assumption in various results considered earlier: Theorem 8.1(iii), Theorem 8.2(ii), Corollary 8.4(iii), and Corollary 8.5(ii).*

10 Dealing with more than two operators via the product space

In this last section, we illustrate how problems that are more general than (3) can be handled using a product space approach. To this end, we assume that

$$Y_1, \dots, Y_n \text{ are real Hilbert spaces, each } L_j: X \rightarrow Y_j \text{ is continuous and linear,} \quad (106)$$

and

$$B_1, \dots, B_n \text{ are maximally monotone on } Y_1, \dots, Y_n, \quad (107)$$

respectively. The problem of interest is to

$$\text{Find } x \in X \text{ such that } 0 \in Ax + \sum_{j=1}^n L_j^* B_j L_j x. \quad (108)$$

We utilize the usual product Hilbert space

$$Y = Y_1 \times \dots \times Y_n, \quad L: X \rightarrow Y: x \mapsto (L_j x)_{j=1}^n, \quad \text{and } B = B_1 \times \dots \times B_n. \quad (109)$$

Then

$$x \text{ solves } 0 \in Ax + L^* B L x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x \text{ solves (108),} \quad (110)$$

which allows us to tap into the theory developed above. We will not translate all results to this framework; rather, we focus on some highlights. The dual problem of (A, L, B) asks to find $y \in Y$ such that $0 \in B^{-1}y - LA^{-1}(-L^*y)$, i.e.,

$$\text{Find } (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in Y \text{ such that } (\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}) \quad 0 \in B_i^{-1}(y_i) - L_i A^{-1}(- (L_1^* y_1 + \dots + L_n^* y_n)). \quad (111)$$

Proposition 10.1. *Suppose that A, B_1, \dots, B_n are paramonotone and that $y \in Y$ solves (111). Then the entire set of primal solutions of (108) is given by*

$$Z = L^{-1} B^{-1} y \cap A^{-1}(-L^*y) = \bigcap_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} L_i^{-1} B_i^{-1} y_i \cap A^{-1}(- (L_1^* y_1 + \dots + L_n^* y_n)). \quad (112)$$

Proof. The assumption implies that B is paramonotone. Hence the result follows from Remark 5.2. ■

Next, we record a consequence of Theorem 9.1 in the current setting.

Corollary 10.2. *Let U, V_1, \dots, V_n be closed convex subsets of X, Y_1, \dots, Y_n , respectively. Assume that $U \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^n L^{-1}(V_j) \neq \emptyset$, that $A = N_U$, and that each $B_j = N_{V_j}$. Set $V := V_1 \times \dots \times V_n$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) $Z = U \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^n L^{-1}(V_j)$.
- (ii) $K = N_{V-LU}(0)$.
- (iii) If U and each V_j are cones, then $K = (V_1^\ominus \times \dots \times V_n^\ominus) \cap L^{-*}(U^\ominus)$.

- (iv) If U and each V_j are linear subspaces, then $K = (V_1^\perp \times \cdots \times V_n^\perp) \cap L^{-*}(U^\perp)$.
(v) If $U \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^n L_j^{-1}(\text{int } V_j) \neq \emptyset$, then $K = \{0\}$.

Finally, to find primal and dual solutions, one may iterate the Chambolle-Pock operator \mathbf{T} . In the present set up, it is given by the following formula:

$$\mathbf{T}: X \times (Y_1 \times \cdots \times Y_n) \rightarrow X \times (Y_1 \times \cdots \times Y_n) \quad (113a)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} x \\ y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} x^+ \\ y_1^+ \\ \vdots \\ y_n^+ \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} J_{\sigma A}(x - \sigma \sum_{j=1}^n L_j^* y_j) \\ J_{\tau B_1^{-1}}(y_1 + \tau L_1(2x^+ - x)) \\ \vdots \\ J_{\tau B_n^{-1}}(y_n + \tau L_n(2x^+ - x)) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (113b)$$

Of course, other splitting methods can be applied to solve (108). We refer the reader to the nice recent book by Ryu and Yin [20] and the nice recent survey by Condat, Kitahara, Contreras, and Hirabayashi [13].

Acknowledgments

The research of HHB and WMM was supported by Discovery Grants from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada. The research of SS was supported by a postdoctoral fellowship from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

References

- [1] H. Attouch, and M. Théra: A general duality principle for the sum of two operators, *Journal of Convex Analysis* 3 (1996): 1–24. <https://www.heldermann.de/JCA/jca03.htm>
- [2] H.H. Bauschke, R.I. Boţ, W.L. Hare, and W.M. Moursi: Attouch-Théra duality revisited: paramonotonicity and operator splitting, *Journal of Approximation Theory* 164 (2012), 1065–1084. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jat.2012.05.008>
- [3] H.H. Bauschke and P.L. Combettes: *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, 2nd edition, Springer, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48311-5>
- [4] H.H. Bauschke, P.L. Combettes, D.R. Luke: Finding best approximation pairs relative to two closed convex sets in Hilbert spaces, *Journal of Approximation Theory* 127 (2005), 178–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jat.2004.02.006>
- [5] H.H. Bauschke and W.M. Moursi: *An Introduction to Convexity, Optimization, and Algorithms*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611977806>
- [6] H.H. Bauschke and W.M. Moursi and S. Singh and X. Wang: On the Bredies-Chenchene-Lorenz-Naldi algorithm: linear relations and strong convergence: *arXiv*, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.09747>
- [7] H.H. Bauschke, X. Wang, and L. Yao: Rectangularity and paramonotonicity of maximally monotone operators, *Optimization* 63 (2014), 487–504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02331934.2012.707653>
- [8] A. Berk, S. Brugiapaglia, and T. Hoheisel: LASSO reloaded: a variational analysis perspective with applications to compressed sensing, *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science* 5 (2023), 829–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1498991>
- [9] K. Bredies, E. Chenchene, D.A. Lorenz, and E. Naldi: Degenerate preconditioned proximal point algorithms, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 32 (2022), 2376–2401. <https://doi.org/10.1137/21M1448112>

- [10] Y. Censor, A.N. Iusem, S.A. Zenios: An interior point method with Bregman functions for the variational inequality problem with paramonotone operators. *Mathematical Programming* 81 (1998), 373–400. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01580089>
- [11] A. Chambolle and T. Pock: A First-Order Primal-Dual Algorithm for Convex Problems with Applications to Imaging, *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision* 40 (2011), 120–145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10851-010-0251-1>
- [12] A. Chambolle and T. Pock: An introduction to continuous optimization in imaging, *Acta Numerica* 25 (2016), 161–319. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S096249291600009X>
- [13] L. Condat, D. Kitahara, A. Contreras, and A. Hirabayashi: Proximal splitting algorithms for convex optimization, *SIAM Review* 65 (2023), 375–435. <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1379344>
- [14] J. Eckstein and M. Ferris: Smooth methods of multipliers for complementarity problems. *Mathematical Programming* 86 (1999), 65–90. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s101079900076>
- [15] A.N. Iusem: On some properties of paramonotone operators, *Journal of Convex Analysis* 5 (1998), 269–278. <https://www.heldermann.de/JCA/jca05.htm#jca052>
- [16] C. Li, D. Fang, G. López, and M.A. López, Stable and total Fenchel duality for convex optimization problems in locally convex spaces, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 20(4) (2009), 1032–1051. <https://doi.org/10.1137/080734352>
- [17] T. Pennanen: Dualization of Generalized Equations of Maximal Monotone Type, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 10 (2000) 809–835. <https://doi.org/10.1137/S1052623498340448>
- [18] R.T. Rockafellar: *Convex Analysis*, Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [19] S.M. Robinson: Composition duality and maximal monotonicity, *Mathematical Programming* 85 (1999) 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s101070050043>
- [20] E.K. Ryu and W. Yin: *Large-Scale Convex Optimization*, Cambridge University Press, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009160865>
- [21] R.J. Tibshirani: Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B* 58 (1996), 267–288.
- [22] R.J. Tibshirani: The lasso problem and uniqueness, *Electronic Journal on Statistics* 7(2013), 1456–1490. <https://doi.org/10.1214/13-EJS815>