

# Coordinate projected gradient descent minimization and its application to orthogonal nonnegative matrix factorization

Flavia Chorobura<sup>1</sup>, Daniela Lupu<sup>1</sup>, Ion Necoara<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract**—In this paper we consider large-scale composite nonconvex optimization problems having the objective function formed as a sum of three terms, first has block coordinate-wise Lipschitz continuous gradient, second is twice differentiable but nonseparable and third is the indicator function of some separable closed convex set. Under these general settings we derive and analyze a new cyclic coordinate descent method, which uses the partial gradient of the differentiable part of the objective, yielding a coordinate gradient descent scheme with a novel adaptive stepsize rule. We prove that this stepsize rule makes the coordinate gradient scheme a descent method, provided that additional assumptions hold for the second term in the objective function. We also present a worst-case complexity analysis for this new method in the nonconvex settings. Numerical results on orthogonal nonnegative matrix factorization problem also confirm the efficiency of our algorithm.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study a cyclic (block) coordinate gradient descent method for solving the large-scale composite optimization problem:

$$F^* = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} F(x) := f(x) + \psi(x) + \phi(x), \quad (1)$$

where  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has block coordinate-wise Lipschitz gradient,  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is twice differentiable (both functions possibly nonseparable and nonconvex), and  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the indicator function of a convex closed separable set  $Q = \prod_{i=1}^n Q_i$ . Optimization problems having this composite structure arise in many applications such as orthogonal nonnegative matrix factorization [2] and distributed control [9]. When the dimension of these problems is large, the usual methods based on full gradient and Hessian perform poorly. Hence, it is reasonable to solve such large-scale problems using (block) coordinate descent methods.

*Previous work.* There exist few studies on coordinate descent methods when the second term in the objective function is nonseparable. For example, [11], [12], [15] considers the composite optimization problem (1) with  $\psi$  convex and separable (possibly nonsmooth) and  $\phi$  the indicator function of the set  $\{x : Ax = b\}$ . Hence, nonseparability comes from the linear constraints. In these settings, [11], [12], [15] proposed coordinate proximal gradient descent methods that require solving at each iteration a subproblem over a subspace using a part of the gradient of  $f$  at the current feasible point. For these algorithms sublinear rates are derived in the (non)convex case and linear convergence is obtained for

strongly convex objective. Further, for optimization problem (1) with  $\psi$  convex, nonseparable and nonsmooth, [8] considered a proximal coordinate descent type method, where, however, at each iteration one needs to evaluate to full prox of  $\psi$ . Note that since  $\psi$  is nonsmooth, we can consider  $\phi \equiv 0$ . Linear convergence results were derived in [8] when the objective function satisfies the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz (KL) property. Recently, [1] considers the optimization problem (1), with  $f$  quadratic convex function and  $\psi$  convex function (possibly nonseparable and nonsmooth). Hence,  $\phi$  can be included in  $\psi$ . In these settings, [1] used the forward-backward envelope to smooth the original problem and then solved the smooth approximation with an accelerated coordinate gradient descent method. Sublinear rates were derived for this scheme, provided that the second function  $\psi$  is Lipschitz continuous. However, in this method it is also necessary to compute the full prox of function  $\psi$ . In [10], a stochastic coordinate proximal gradient method is proposed, where at each iteration one needs to sketch the gradient  $\nabla f$  and compute the prox of  $\psi$  along some subspace generated by a random matrix. Finally, in [10] we consider  $\phi \equiv 0$ . Assuming that  $\psi$  is twice differentiable, (sub)linear convergence rates are derived for both convex and nonconvex settings. However, [10] requires the computation of a prox along some subspace, which still can be prohibitive in some applications (including nonnegative matrix factorization).

*Contributions.* This paper deals with large-scale composite nonconvex optimization problems having the objective function formed as a sum of three terms, see (1). Under these general settings, we present a cyclic coordinate gradient descent method and derive convergence rates in function values. More precisely, our main contributions are:

- (i) We design a cyclic coordinate projected gradient method, which requires at each iteration the computation of a block of components of the gradient of the differentiable part of the objective function. We propose a new stepsize strategy for this method, which guarantees descent and convergence under certain boundedness assumptions on hessian of  $\psi$ . In particular, our stepsize rule is *adaptive* and requires the computation of a positive root of a given polynomial.
- (ii) We prove that our algorithm is descent method and derive convergence rates in function values. More precisely, under Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz (KL) property, we derive sublinear, linear or superlinear rates depending on the KL parameter.
- (iii) We show that the orthogonal nonnegative matrix factorization problem, see [5], fits into our settings and thus we can solve it using our algorithm. Preliminary numerical results

<sup>1</sup>Automatic Control and System Engineering Department, University Politehnica Bucharest, Spl. Independentei, 060042 Bucharest, Romania, Emails: flavia.chorobura@stud.acs.upb.ro, daniela.lupu@upb.ro, ion.necoara@upb.ro.

confirm the efficiency of our method on this application.

*Content.* The paper is organized as follows. In Section II we present some definitions and preliminary results. In Section III we introduce our coordinate projected gradient algorithm and derive convergence rates in function values. Finally, in Section IV we provide detailed numerical simulations on the orthogonal nonnegative matrix factorization problem.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we present our basic assumptions for composite problem (1), some definitions and preliminary results. We consider the following problem setting. Let  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be a column permutation of the  $n \times n$  identity matrix and further let  $U = [U_1, \dots, U_N]$  be a decomposition of  $U$  into  $N$  submatrices, with  $U_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_i}$ , where  $\sum_{i=0}^N n_i = n$ . Any vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  can be written uniquely as  $x = \sum_{i=0}^N U_i x^{(i)}$ , where  $x^{(i)} = U_i^T x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ . Throughout the paper the following assumptions will be valid:

*Assumption 1:* For composite optimization problem (1) the following assumptions hold:

A.1: Gradient of  $f$  is coordinate-wise Lipschitz continuous:

$$\|U_i^T (\nabla f(x + U_i h) - \nabla f(x))\| \leq L_i (x^{\neq i}) \|h\| \quad (2)$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n, h \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$  and  $i = 1 : N$ .

A.2: Function  $\psi$  is twice continuously differentiable (possibly nonseparable and nonconvex). Moreover, we assume that there exist integer  $p \geq 1$  and constants  $H_{\psi_i} > 0$  such that

$$\|U_i^T \nabla^2 \psi(y) U_i\| \leq H_{\psi_i} \|y\|^p \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \quad i = 1 : N.$$

A.3: Function  $\phi$  is the indicator function of a nonempty closed convex separable set  $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , i.e.,

$$Q = \Pi_{i=1}^N Q_i, \quad \text{with } Q_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}, \quad i = 1 : N.$$

A.4: A solution exists for (1) (hence,  $F^* > -\infty$ ).

In Assumption 1.[A1] Lipschitz constants  $L_i (x^{\neq i})$  may depend on  $x^{(j)}$  for  $j \neq i$ . Further, let us define:

$$S_F(x) = \text{dist}(0, \partial F(x)) \left( := \inf_{F_x \in \partial F(x)} \|F_x\| \right). \quad (3)$$

Let us define next Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz (KL) property [3].

*Definition 1:* A proper and lower semicontinuous function  $F$  satisfies Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz (KL) property if for every compact set  $\Omega \subseteq \text{dom } F$  on which  $F$  takes a constant value  $F_*$  there exist  $q, \sigma_q, \delta, \epsilon > 0$  such that one has:

$$F(x) - F_* \leq \sigma_q S_F(x)^q, \quad (4)$$

for all  $x$  such that  $\text{dist}(x, \Omega) \leq \delta, F_* < F(x) < F_* + \epsilon$ .

The basic idea of our algorithm consists of updating  $i$ th component of  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  in a cyclic manner as  $x^+ = x + U_i d$ , for some appropriate direction  $d$ . Let us fix some notations first. We denote  $x_{k,0} = x_k$  and then  $x_{k,i_k} = (x_{k+1}^{(1)}, \dots, x_{k+1}^{(i_k)}, x_k^{(i_k+1)}, \dots, x_k^{(N)})$ . Further, let us define the differentiable function  $h(x) = f(x) + \psi(x)$ . For simplicity of the exposition let us denote  $L_{i_k}^k = L_{i_k} (x_{k,i_k-1}^{\neq i_k})$ . Also, let  $\phi_i$  denote the indicator function of the individual set  $Q_i$  and thus  $\phi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i(x^{(i)})$ .

## III. COORDINATE PROJECTED GRADIENT ALGORITHM

In this section, we present a cyclic coordinate projected gradient descent algorithm for solving problem (1), with  $f$  and  $\psi$  possibly nonseparable and nonconvex and  $\phi$  the indicator function of a separable convex set. Contrary to the usual approach from literature, the algorithm disregards the composite form of the objective function and makes an update based on the partial gradient of the differentiable term  $\nabla h$  (recall that in the literature, the convergence of coordinate gradient descent methods is guaranteed only when  $f$  is smooth and  $\psi$  is separable or  $\psi \equiv 0$ ). Hence, our cyclic Coordinate Projected Gradient Descent (CPGD) algorithm is:

---

### Algorithm 1 CPGD

---

Given a starting point  $x_0 \in Q$

**for**  $k \geq 0$  **do**

**for**  $i_k = 1 : N$  **do**

1. Choose  $H_{f,U_{i_k}} > \frac{L_{i_k}^k}{2}$  and compute the positive root  $\alpha_{i_k} \geq 0$  of the following polynomial:

$$2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \alpha^{p+1} + (2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \|x_{k,i_k-1}\|^p + H_{f,U_{i_k}}) \alpha = \|U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_{k,i_k-1})\|. \quad (5)$$

2. Update the stepsize in an adaptive fashion:

$$H_{F_{i_k}^k} = 2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \|x_{k,i_k-1}\|^p + 2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \alpha_{i_k}^p + H_{f,U_{i_k}}.$$

3. Solve the subproblem (projection):

$$d_k^{(i_k)} = \arg \min_{d \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}} \langle U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_{k,i_k-1}), d \rangle + \frac{H_{F_{i_k}^k}}{2} \|d\|^2 + \phi_{i_k}(x_k^{(i_k)} + d). \quad (6)$$

4. Update  $x_{k+1}^{(i_k)} = x_k^{(i_k)} + d_k^{(i_k)}$ .

**end for**

**end for**

---

The main difficulty with the algorithm CPGD is that we need to find an appropriate stepsize  $H_{F_{i_k}^k}$  which ensures descent, although the differentiable part  $h$  of the objective function does not have a coordinate-wise Lipschitz gradient. In the sequel we prove that the stepsize choice for  $H_{F_{i_k}^k}$  from the algorithm CPGD combined with additional properties on  $\psi$  yields descent. Note that (6) can be written as:

$$\bar{x}_k^{(i_k)} = x_k^{(i_k)} - \frac{1}{H_{F_{i_k}^k}} U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_{k,i_k-1}) \quad (7)$$

and

$$x_{k+1}^{(i_k)} = \text{proj}_{Q_{i_k}}(\bar{x}_k^{(i_k)}). \quad (8)$$

Moreover, from (5), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( 2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \alpha_{i_k}^p + 2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \|x_{k,i_k-1}\|^p + H_{f,U_{i_k}} \right) \alpha_{i_k} \\ & = \|U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_{k,i_k-1})\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (7), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \bar{x}_k^{(i_k)} - x_k^{(i_k)} \right\| &= \frac{1}{H_{F_{i_k}^k}} \|U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_{k,i_k-1})\| \\ &= \frac{\|U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_{k,i_k-1})\|}{2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \alpha_{i_k}^p + 2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \|x_{k,i_k-1}\|^p + H_{f,U_{i_k}}} = \alpha_{i_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Note that it is easy to show that the polynomial equation has a nonnegative root  $\alpha_k$ . Let us define the following parameters:

$$H_{f,U_{i_k}} = \frac{L_{i_k}^k + \eta_{i_k}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_{\min} = \min_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_{i_k}. \quad (10)$$

*Lemma 1:* If Assumption 1 holds, then the iterates of algorithm CPGD satisfy the following descent:

$$F(x_{k+1}) \leq F(x_k) - \frac{\eta_{\min}}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2.$$

*Proof:* See appendix for a proof. ■

Next, we introduce some additional assumptions:

*Assumption 2:* Consider the following assumptions:

A.5: Sequence  $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$  generated by CPGD is bounded and there exists  $L_{\max}$  such that  $L_{i_k}^k \leq L_{\max}$  for all  $k \geq 0$ .

A.6: Assume that the full gradient  $\nabla f$  is Lipschitz continuous on any bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Let us define the following constant:

$$H_{F,\max} = \max_{k \geq 0, i_k = 1:N} H_{F_{i_k}^k}. \quad (11)$$

Note that if Assumption 2.[A.5] holds, then  $H_{F,\max}$  is finite. If  $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$  is bounded, from Assumption 1.[A.2] there exists  $L_{\psi,\max} > 0$  such that  $L_{\psi,\max} = \max_{i=1:N, x \in \text{conv}\{(x_k)_{k \geq 0}\}} \|U_i^T \nabla^2 \psi(x)\| < \infty$ . Moreover, in the next lemma we consider  $L > 0$  to be the Lipschitz constant for the full gradient  $\nabla f$  over  $\text{conv}\{(x_k)_{k \geq 0}\}$ . Then, we have the following result.

*Lemma 2:* Let  $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$  be generated by algorithm CPGD and  $C = 4NL^2 + 4NL_{\psi,\max}^2 + 2H_{F,\max}$ . If Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, then:

$$[S_F(x_{k+1})]^2 \leq C \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2. \quad (12)$$

*Proof:* See appendix for a proof. ■

Let us denote the set of limit points of the sequence  $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$  by  $\Omega(x_0)$ . Next lemma derives some properties for  $\Omega(x_0)$ .

*Lemma 3:* Let  $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$  be generated by algorithm CPGD. If Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, then  $\Omega(x_0)$  is compact set,  $F$  is constant on  $\Omega(x_0)$  and  $0 \in \partial F(\Omega(x_0))$ .

*Proof:* See appendix for a proof. ■

*Lemma 4:* Let  $\{\Delta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  be a sequence of positive numbers satisfying the following recurrence:

$$\Delta_k - \Delta_{k+1} \geq c \Delta_{k+1}^{\alpha+1} \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (13)$$

Then, we have:

(i) For  $c = 1$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  the sequence  $\Delta_k$  converges to 0 with sublinear rate:

$$\Delta_k \leq \frac{\Delta_0}{\left(1 + \frac{\alpha k}{1 + \alpha} \ln(1 + \Delta_0^\alpha)\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}. \quad (14)$$

(ii) For  $c > 0$  and  $\alpha = 0$  the sequence  $\Delta_k$  converges to 0 with linear rate:

$$\Delta_k \leq \left(\frac{1}{1+c}\right)^k \Delta_0. \quad (15)$$

(iii) For  $c > 0$  and  $\alpha < 0$  the sequence  $\Delta_k$  converges to 0 with superlinear rate:

$$\Delta_{k+1} \leq \left(\frac{1}{1+c\Delta_{k+1}^\alpha}\right) \Delta_k. \quad (16)$$

*Proof:* See appendix for a proof. ■

In the next theorem we derive convergence rates for CPGD algorithm when the objective function  $F$  satisfies the KL condition. From simplicity of exposition, let us define:

$$D = \frac{\eta_{\min}}{2 \left(4NL^2 + 4NL_{\psi,\max}^2 + 2H_{F,\max}\right)}.$$

*Theorem 3:* Let  $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$  be generated by algorithm CPGD. Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and additionally, assume that  $F$  satisfy the KL property (4) on  $\Omega(x_0)$ . Then: (i) If  $q \in (1, 2)$ , we have the following sublinear rate:

$$F(x_k) - F_* \leq \frac{F(x_0) - F_*}{\left(1 + \frac{2-q}{2} k \ln\left(1 + D\sigma_q^{-\frac{2}{q}} (F(x_0) - F_*)^{\frac{2-q}{q}}\right)\right)^{\frac{q}{2-q}}}$$

(ii) If  $q = 2$ , we have the following linear rate:

$$F(x_k) - F_* \leq \left(\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_2 + D}\right)^k (F(x_0) - F_*).$$

(ii) If  $q > 2$ , we have the following superlinear rate:

$$F(x_k) - F_* \leq \frac{F(x_{k-1}) - F_*}{1 + D\sigma_q^{-\frac{2}{q}} (F(x_k) - F_*)^{\frac{2-q}{q}}}.$$

*Proof:* Proof follows from Lemmas 1, 2 and (4). ■

#### IV. ORTHOGONAL NONNEGATIVE MATRIX FACTORIZATION

We consider a penalized formulation of the orthogonal nonnegative matrix factorization problem, used e.g., in dimensionality reduction of big data [2], [5]:

$$\min_{W \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times r}, V \in \mathbb{R}_+^{r \times n}} \frac{1}{2} \|X - WV\|_F^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|I - VV^T\|_F^2. \quad (17)$$

Let us define the following functions:

$$\begin{aligned} f(W, V) &= \frac{1}{2} \|X - WV\|_F^2, \quad \psi(W, V) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \|I - VV^T\|_F^2, \\ \phi(W, V) &= \phi_1(W) + \phi_2(V), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\phi_1(W) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } W \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times r}, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad \phi_2(V) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } V \in \mathbb{R}_+^{r \times n}, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For optimization problem (17) one can notice that the functions  $f(W, V)$  and  $\psi(W, V)$  are polynomial and  $\phi_1(W)$  and  $\phi_2(V)$  are indicator functions of semialgebraic (polyhedral) sets, thus they are semialgebraic functions. Therefore, it follows from Theorem 3.1 in [3] that the objective function  $F(W, V) = f(W, V) + \psi(W, V) + \phi(W, V)$  satisfies the KL condition for some exponent  $q > 1$  (see (4)).

Note that we have the following expressions for the gradient and the hessian of  $f$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_W f(W, V) &= WV V^T - XV^T, \\ \nabla_V f(W, V) &= W^T W V - W^T X, \\ \nabla_{WW}^2 f(W, V) Z &= Z V V^T, \quad \nabla_{VV}^2 f(W, V) Z = W^T W Z.\end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\nabla f$  is Lipschitz continuous w.r.t.  $W$ , with constant Lipschitz  $L_1(V) = \|V V^T\|_F$ . Similarly,  $\nabla f$  is Lipschitz continuous w.r.t.  $V$ , with constant Lipschitz  $L_2(W) = \|W^T W\|_F$ . This implies that  $\nabla f$  satisfies Assumption 1.[A.1]. Moreover,  $\nabla_V \psi(W, V) = 2\lambda(V V^T V - V)$  and the hessian is:

$$\nabla_{VV}^2 \psi(W, V) Z = 2\lambda(Z V^T V + V Z^T V + V V^T Z - Z).$$

Thus, we get the following bound on the hessian of  $\psi$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\langle Z, \nabla_V^2 \psi(W, V) Z \rangle &= \langle Z, 2\lambda(Z V^T V + V Z^T V + V V^T Z - Z) \rangle \\ &\leq 6\lambda \|Z\|_F^2 \|V\|_F^2.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $\nabla_V^2 \psi(\cdot)$  satisfies Assumption 1.[A.2], with  $p = 2$  and  $H_{\psi_2} = 6\lambda$ . Moreover, note that  $H_{\psi_1} = 0$ . Therefore, we can solve problem (17) using algorithm CPGD, having the following updates:

$$\begin{aligned}W_{k+1} &= \max \left( W_k - \frac{1}{H_{f,W}(V_k)} (W_k V_k V_k^T - X V_k^T), 0 \right), \\ \bar{V}_k &= V_k - \frac{1}{H_{F_{i_k}^k}} (W_{k+1}^T W_{k+1} V_k - W_{k+1}^T X) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{H_{F_{i_k}^k}} (2\lambda(V_k V_k^T V_k - V_k)), \quad V_{k+1} = \max(\bar{V}_k, 0).\end{aligned}$$

In the previous updates, we choose  $H_{f,W}(V_k) > \frac{L_1(V_k)}{2}$ ,  $H_{f,V}(W_{k+1}) > \frac{L_2(W_{k+1})}{2}$ ,  $H_{F_{i_k}^k} = 12\lambda \|V_k\|_F^2 + 12\lambda \alpha_{i_k}^2 + H_{f,V}(W_{k+1})$  and  $\alpha_{i_k}$  as the solution of equation:

$$\begin{aligned}12\lambda \alpha^3 + (12\lambda \|V_k\|_F^2 + H_{f,V}(W_{k+1})) \alpha \\ - \|\nabla_V f(W_{k+1}, V_k) + \nabla_V \psi(W_{k+1}, V_k)\|_F = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Note that one can find explicitly the positive root of this third order equation. Moreover, our algorithm is very simple to implement as it requires only basic matrix operations. In our experiments, we take  $H_{f,W}(V_k) = 0.51 \cdot L_1(V_k)$  and  $H_{f,V}(W_{k+1}) = 0.51 \cdot L_2(W_{k+1})$ . We compare our CPGD algorithm with the algorithm BMM proposed in [7]. For problem (17), BMM is a Bregman gradient descent method having computational cost per iteration comparable to CPGD. For numerical tests, we consider Salinas data set from [16], which has the dimensions  $111104 \times 204$ . Each row of matrix  $X$  is a vectorized image at a given band of the data set and we aim to reduce the number of bands using formulation (17), i.e. to reduce  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{111104 \times 204}$  to  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{111104 \times r}$ , with  $r \ll 204$ . We have 16 classes for this image. The matrices  $W_0$  and  $V_0$  are initialized random, but positive. Moreover, we take  $\lambda = 1000$  and the dimension  $r = 15$ . We run the two algorithms for 50s. The results are displayed in Figures 1, where we plot the




Fig. 1. Salinas dataset for  $r = 15$ : evolution of objective function values (top figure) and orthogonal error (bottom figure) with respect to time of BMM and CPGD

evolution of function values (top) and the orthogonality error  $O_{\text{error}} = \|I - V_k V_k^T\|_F$  (bottom) along time. From the plots, we observe that algorithm CPGD is better than BMM in terms of both, function values and orthogonality error.

We further test the quality of the reduced data  $W$  for different ranks  $r$  on a classification task. We choose the nonlinear Support Vector Machine (SVM) [4] with the Radial Basis Function(RBF) for the kernel. We set the regularization parameter of the classifier to 10 and the kernel coefficient to  $1/(r \cdot \text{Var}(W))$ , where  $\text{Var}(W)$  is the variation of  $W$ . Further, we divide randomly our data set in 80% samples from each class for the training and the remaining 20% for testing. Additionally, to reduce the influence of samples random selection, the classifier runs 10 times and we display the average results in Table I. The performance is quantified via the overall accuracy (OA) expressed in percentage, the Cohen's kappa coefficient ( $\kappa$ ) [6] and the training time. Observe that for the reduced matrix data  $W$  given by CPGD, we obtain better performances for the classifier than for the BMM reduced matrix data, in all the criteria (OA,  $\kappa$  and time). Additionally, one can observe that for  $r = 80$ , we obtain for the classifier based on the CPGD reduced data matrix even better overall accuracy than on the original data.

TABLE I  
CLASSIFICATION RESULTS FOR SALINAS DATA SET OBTAINED BY APPLYING RBF SVM FOR DIFFERENT CPGD VRS. BMM (REDUCED) DATA MATRICES OF RANK  $r$ .

Alg.	r	5	15	50	80	204
CPGD	OA(%)	90.52	91.17	91.63	92.26	92.05
	$\kappa$	0.8942	0.9014	0.9064	0.9136	0.9112
	time(s)	7.02	8.19	12.97	22.04	31.3
BMM	OA(%)	90.43	91.16	91.42	91.83	92.05
	$\kappa$	0.8931	0.9013	0.9041	0.9088	0.9112
	time(s)	7.37	13.5	15.70	26.66	31.3

## V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have considered composite problems having the objective function formed as a sum of three terms, first has block coordinate-wise Lipschitz continuous gradient,



second is twice differentiable but nonseparable and third is the indicator function of some separable closed convex set. We have proposed a new cyclic coordinate projected gradient descent method for solving this problem. Moreover, we have designed a new adaptive stepsize strategy. Further, we derived convergence bounds in the nonconvex settings. Numerical results confirmed the efficiency of our algorithm on the orthogonal nonnegative matrix factorization problem.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The research leading to these results has received funding from: ITN-ETN project TraDE-OPT funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 861137; NO Grants 2014-2021, under project ELO-Hyp, no. 24/2020; UEFISCDI PN-III-P4-PCE-2021-0720, under project L2O-MOC, nr. 70/2022.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Aberdam and A. Beck *An Accelerated Coordinate Gradient Descent Algorithm for Non-separable Composite Optimization*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, doi: 10.1007/s10957-021-01957-1, 2021.
- [2] M. Ahookhosh, L.T. K. Hien, N. Gillis and P. Patrinos, *Multi-block Bregman proximal alternating linearized minimization and its application to orthogonal nonnegative matrix factorization*, Computational Optimization and Application, 79: 681–715, 2021.
- [3] J. Bolte, A. Daniilidis and A. Lewis, *The Łojasiewicz inequality for nonsmooth subanalytic functions with applications to subgradient dynamical systems*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 17: 1205–1223, 2007.
- [4] B.E. Boser, I.M. Guyon and V.N. Vapnik, *A training algorithm for optimal margin classifiers*, Proceedings of the fifth annual workshop on Computational learning theory, pp. 144–152, 1992.
- [5] Y. Chi, Y.M. Lu and Y. Chen, *Nonconvex optimization meets low-rank matrix factorization: an overview*, arXiv preprint: 1809.09573, 2019.
- [6] M. Grandini, E. Bagli and G. Visani, *Metrics for multi-class classification: an overview*, arXiv preprint: 2008.05756, 2020.
- [7] L.T.K. Hien, D.N. Phan, N. Gillis, M. Ahookhosh and P. Patrinos *Block bregman majorization minimization with extrapolation*, arXiv preprint: 2107.04395, 2021.
- [8] P. Latafat, A. Themelis and P. Patrinos *Block-coordinate and incremental aggregated proximal gradient methods for nonsmooth nonconvex problems*, Mathematical Programming, 2021.
- [9] I. Necoara and D. Clipici, *Efficient parallel coordinate descent algorithm for convex optimization problems with separable constraints: Application to distributed MPC*, Journal of Process Control 23(3): 243–253, 2013.
- [10] I. Necoara and F. Chorobura, *Efficiency of stochastic coordinate proximal gradient methods on nonseparable composite optimization*, arXiv preprint:2104.13370, 2021.
- [11] I. Necoara, *Random coordinate descent algorithms for multi-agent convex optimization over networks*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 58(8): 2001–2012, 2013.
- [12] I. Necoara and M. Takac, *Randomized sketch descent methods for non-separable linearly constrained optimization*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, doi: 10.1093/imanum/draa018, 2020.
- [13] Yu. Nesterov, *Inexact basic tensor methods*, Core Discussion Paper 23, 2019.
- [14] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J-B Wets, *Variational Analysis*, Springer, 1998.
- [15] P. Tseng and S. Yun, *Block-coordinate gradient descent method for linearly constrained nonsmooth separable optimization*, Journal Optimization Theory and Applications, 140, 2009.
- [16] [http://www.ehu.es/ccwintco/index.php/Hyperspectral\\_Remote\\_Sensing\\_Scenes](http://www.ehu.es/ccwintco/index.php/Hyperspectral_Remote_Sensing_Scenes).

## APPENDIX

*Proof of Lemma 1:* Since  $\psi$  is differentiable, from mean value theorem, there exists  $y_k \in [x_{k,i_k-1}, x_{k,i_k}]$  such that  $\psi(x_{k,i_k}) - \psi(x_{k,i_k-1}) = \langle \nabla \psi(y_k), x_{k,i_k} - x_{k,i_k-1} \rangle = \langle \nabla \psi(y_k), U_{i_k} \left( x_{k+1}^{(i_k)} - x_k^{(i_k)} \right) \rangle$ . Combining the last equality with Assumption 1.[A.1] and Step 4 in Algorithm 1, we get:

$$f(x_{k,i_k}) + \psi(x_{k,i_k}) \leq f(x_{k,i_k-1}) + \psi(x_{k,i_k-1}) \quad (18)$$

$$+ \frac{L_{i_k}^k}{2} \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^2 + \langle U_{i_k}^T \nabla \psi(y_k) + U_{i_k}^T \nabla f(x_{k,i_k-1}), d_k^{(i_k)} \rangle$$

On the other hand, from the optimality condition for the problem (6), we have:

$$-U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_{k,i_k-1}) - H_{F_{i_k}^k} d_k^{(i_k)} \in \partial \phi_{i_k} \left( x_{k+1}^{(i_k)} \right).$$

Moreover, since  $\phi$  is convex function, we get:

$$\phi(x_{k,i_k}) \leq \phi(x_{k,i_k-1}) - \langle U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_{k,i_k-1}) + H_{F_{i_k}^k} d_k^{(i_k)}, d_k^{(i_k)} \rangle.$$

Since  $\nabla h(x) = \nabla f(x) + \nabla \psi(x)$ , combining the last inequality with (18), we obtain:

$$F(x_{k,i_k}) \leq F(x_{k,i_k-1}) + \frac{L_{i_k}^k}{2} \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^2 \quad (19)$$

$$+ \langle U_{i_k}^T (\nabla \psi(y_k) - \nabla \psi(x_{k,i_k-1})), d_k^{(i_k)} \rangle - H_{F_{i_k}^k} \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^2.$$

From mean value inequality there exists also some  $\bar{x}_k \in [x_{k,i_k-1}, y_k]$  such that  $U_{i_k}^T (\nabla \psi(y_k) - \nabla \psi(x_{k,i_k-1})) \leq \|U_{i_k}^T \nabla^2 \psi(\bar{x}_k) U_{i_k}\| \|y_k^{(i_k)} - x_{k,i_k-1}^{(i_k)}\|$ . Note that  $\bar{x}_k = (1 - \mu)x_{k,i_k-1} + \mu y_k$  for some  $\mu \in [0, 1]$ . From Assumption 1.[A.2] and last inequality we obtain:

$$\langle U_{i_k}^T (\nabla \psi(y_k) - \nabla \psi(x_{k,i_k-1})), d_k^{(i_k)} \rangle$$

$$\leq \|U_{i_k}^T \nabla^2 \psi(\bar{x}_k) U_{i_k}\| \|y_k^{(i_k)} - x_{k,i_k-1}^{(i_k)}\| \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|$$

$$\leq H_{\psi_{i_k}} \|x_{k,i_k-1} + \mu(y_k - x_{k,i_k-1})\|^p \|y_k - x_{k,i_k-1}\| \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|.$$

Since  $y_k \in [x_{k,i_k-1}, x_{k,i_k-1} + U_{i_k} d_k^{(i_k)}]$ , then  $\|y_k - x_{k,i_k-1}\| \leq \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|$ . Moreover, since  $\|a+b\|^p \leq 2^{p-1} \|a\|^p + 2^{p-1} \|b\|^p$  for any  $p \geq 1$ , we further get:

$$\langle U_{i_k}^T (\nabla \psi(y_k) - \nabla \psi(x_k)), d_k \rangle$$

$$\leq 2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} (\|x_{k,i_k-1}\|^p + \mu^p \|y_k - x_{k,i_k-1}\|^p) \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^2$$

$$\leq 2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \|x_{k,i_k-1}\|^p \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^2 + 2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^{p+2}.$$

From inequality above and the expression of  $H_{F_{i_k}^k}$ , we get:

$$F(x_{k,i_k})$$

$$\leq F(x_{k,i_k-1}) + 2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^{p+2} - H_{F_{i_k}^k} \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^2$$

$$+ 2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \|x_{k,i_k-1}\|^p \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^2 + \frac{L_{i_k}^k}{2} \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^2.$$

On the other hand, using (7) and (8), we have:

$$\|d_k^{(i_k)}\| = \|x_{k+1}^{(i_k)} - x_k^{(i_k)}\| \leq \|\bar{x}_k^{(i_k)} - x_k^{(i_k)}\|.$$

Hence,

$$F(x_{k,i_k}) \leq F(x_{k,i_k-1}) + \left( \frac{L_{i_k}^k}{2} - H_{F_{i_k}^k} \right) \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^2$$

$$+ \left( 2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \|x_{k,i_k-1}\|^p + 2^{p-1} H_{\psi_{i_k}} \|\bar{x}_k^{(i_k)} - x_k^{(i_k)}\|^p \right) \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^2$$

From (9), we have  $H_{F_{i_k}^k} = 2^{p-1}H_{\psi_{i_k}}\|x_k\|^p + 2^{p-1}H_{\psi_{i_k}}\|\bar{x}_k^{(i_k)} - x_k^{(i_k)}\|^p + H_{f,U_{i_k}}$ . Using (10), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_k, i_k) &\leq F(x_k, i_{k-1}) - \left( H_{f,U_{i_k}} - \frac{L_{i_k}^k}{2} \right) \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^2 \\ &\leq F(x_k, i_{k-1}) - \frac{\eta_{\min}}{2} \|x_{k+1}^{(i_k)} - x_k^{(i_k)}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summing this for  $i_k = 1 : N$ , the lemma is proved.

*Proof of Lemma 2:* Since  $h$  is assumed differentiable and  $\phi$  is convex, then from basic subdifferential calculus rules it follows that  $\nabla h(x) + \partial\phi(x) = \partial F(x)$  for any  $x \in Q$ , see [14]. Moreover, from the optimality condition of (6), there exists  $\phi_{x_{k+1}^{(i_k)}} \in \partial\phi_{i_k}(x_{k+1}^{(i_k)})$  such that:

$$U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_k, i_{k-1}) + H_{F_{i_k}^k} d_k^{(i_k)} + \phi_{x_{k+1}^{(i_k)}} = 0. \quad (20)$$

On the other hand,  $F_{x_{k+1}} := \nabla h(x_{k+1}) + \phi_{x_{k+1}} \in \partial F(x_{k+1})$ . Since  $\phi$  is block separable function, it follows that  $\phi_{x_{k+1}} = \sum_{i_k}^N U_{i_k} \phi_{x_{k+1}^{(i_k)}}$ . Using (20), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} [S_F(x_{k+1})]^2 &\leq \|F_{x_{k+1}}\|^2 = \|\nabla h(x_{k+1}) + \phi_{x_{k+1}}\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{i_k=1}^N \left\| U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_{k+1}) - U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_k, i_{k-1}) - H_{F_{i_k}^k} d_k^{(i_k)} \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i_k=1}^N 2 \|U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_{k+1}) - U_{i_k}^T \nabla h(x_k, i_{k-1})\|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{i_k=1}^N 2 H_{F_{i_k}^k} \|d_k^{(i_k)}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used  $\|a+b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$  in the last inequality. From  $\nabla h(x) = \nabla f(x) + \nabla\psi(x)$  and (11), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} [S_F(x_{k+1})]^2 &\leq \|F_{x_{k+1}}\|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i_k=1}^N 4 \|U_{i_k}^T \nabla f(x_{k+1}) - U_{i_k}^T \nabla f(x_k, i_{k-1})\|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{i_k=1}^N 4 \|U_{i_k}^T \nabla\psi(x_{k+1}) - U_{i_k}^T \nabla\psi(x_k, i_{k-1})\|^2 + 2H_{F,\max} \|d_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Since  $\nabla f$  is Lipschitz over  $\text{conv}\{(x_k)_{k \geq 0}\}$  (see Assumption 2.[A.6]), then there exists  $L > 0$  such that

$$\|U_{i_k}^T \nabla f(x_{k+1}) - U_{i_k}^T \nabla f(x_k, i_{k-1})\| \leq L \|x_{k+1} - x_k, i_{k-1}\|. \quad (22)$$

Since  $\psi$  is twice differentiable, then from the mean value inequality there exists  $\bar{x}_{i_k} \in [x_k, i_{k-1}, x_{k+1}]$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|U_{i_k}^T (\nabla\psi(x_{k+1}) - \nabla\psi(x_k, i_{k-1}))\| \\ &\leq \|U_{i_k}^T \nabla^2\psi(\bar{x}_{i_k})\| \|x_{k+1} - x_k, i_{k-1}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Since  $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$  is assumed bounded, then  $\overline{\text{conv}}\{(x_k)_{k \geq 0}\}$  is also bounded. Using the fact that  $\psi$  is twice continuously differentiable, we have that there exist  $L_{\psi,\max} < \infty$  such that  $\|U_{i_k}^T \nabla^2\psi(x)\| \leq L_{\psi,\max}$  for all  $x \in \overline{\text{conv}}\{(x_k)_{k \geq 0}\}$

and  $i_k = 1 : N$ . Note  $[x_k, i_{k-1}, x_{k+1}] \subseteq [x_k, x_{k+1}]$ , hence  $\bar{x}_{i_k} \in \overline{\text{conv}}\{(x_k)_{k \geq 0}\}$ . From (21), (22) and (23), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} [S_F(x_{k+1})]^2 &\leq \|F_{x_{k+1}}\|^2 \\ &\leq (4NL^2 + 4NL_{\psi,\max}^2 + 2H_{F,\max}) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where we used that  $\|x_k, i_{k-1} - x_{k+1}\| \leq \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|$  and  $x_{k+1} = x_k + d_k$ . This proves our statement.

*Proof of Lemma 3:* Since the sequence  $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$  is bounded, this implies that the set  $\Omega(x_0)$  is also bounded. Closeness of  $\Omega(x_0)$  also follows observing that  $\Omega(x_0)$  can be viewed as an intersection of closed sets, i.e.,  $\Omega(x_0) = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} \bigcup_{\ell \geq j} \{x_k\}$ . Hence  $\Omega(x_0)$  is a compact set. Let us prove that  $F$  is constant on  $\Omega(x_0)$ . From Lemma 1, we have:

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \|x_{j+1} - x_j\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{\eta_{\min}} (F(x_0) - F^*) < \infty.$$

This implies that  $\|x_{j+1} - x_j\| \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, from (24), we have:

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|F_{x_{j+1}}\| = 0. \quad (25)$$

Moreover, from Lemma 1 we have that  $(F(x_k))_{k \geq 0}$  is monotonically decreasing and since  $F$  is assumed bounded from below by  $F^* > -\infty$ , it converges, let us say to  $F_* > -\infty$ , i.e.  $F(x_k) \rightarrow F_*$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $F_* \geq F^*$ . On the other hand, let  $x_*$  be a limit point of  $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ , i.e.  $x_* \in \Omega(x_0)$ . This means that there is a subsequence  $(x_{\bar{k}})_{\bar{k} \geq 0}$  of  $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$  such that  $x_{\bar{k}} \rightarrow x_*$  as  $\bar{k} \rightarrow \infty$ . From the lower semicontinuity of  $\phi$  we always have:  $\lim_{\bar{k} \rightarrow \infty} \inf \phi(x_{\bar{k}}) \geq \phi(x_*)$ . On the other hand, since  $\phi$  is convex, we have:

$$\phi(x_{\bar{k}}) \leq \phi(x_*) + \langle \phi_{x_{\bar{k}}}, x_{\bar{k}} - x_* \rangle \leq \phi(x_*) + \|\phi_{x_{\bar{k}}}\| \|x_{\bar{k}} - x_*\|.$$

Moreover, from (25) we have that  $(\phi_{x_{\bar{k}}})_{\bar{k} \geq 0}$  is bounded. Since  $x_{\bar{k}} \rightarrow x_*$ , we get:

$$\limsup_{\bar{k} \rightarrow \infty} \phi(x_{\bar{k}}) \leq \limsup_{\bar{k} \rightarrow \infty} \phi(x_*) + \|\phi_{x_{\bar{k}}}\| \|x_{\bar{k}} - x_*\| \leq \phi(x_*).$$

Therefore, we have  $\phi(x_{\bar{k}}) \rightarrow \phi(x_*)$  and since  $f$  and  $\psi$  are continuous functions, it also follows that  $F(x_{\bar{k}}) \rightarrow F(x_*)$ . This implies that  $F(x_*) = F_*$ . Finally, to prove that  $0 \in \partial F(\Omega(x_0))$ , one can note that when  $\bar{k} \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $x_{\bar{k}} \rightarrow x_*$  and  $F(x_{\bar{k}}) \rightarrow F(x_*)$ . Moreover, from (25),  $\|F_{x_{\bar{k}}}\| \rightarrow 0$ . Then, from the definition of the limiting subdifferential it follows that  $0 \in \partial F(x_*)$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4:* First, the inequality (14) has been derived in [13] (Lemma 11). If  $\alpha = 0$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_k - \Delta_{k+1} \geq c\Delta_{k+1} &\iff \Delta_k \geq (1+c)\Delta_{k+1} \\ &\iff \Delta_{k+1} \leq \left( \frac{1}{1+c} \right) \Delta_k. \end{aligned}$$

This yields (15). Finally, for the third case, we have:

$$\Delta_{k+1} (1 + c\Delta_{k+1}^\alpha) \leq \Delta_k \iff \Delta_{k+1} \leq \left( \frac{1}{1 + c\Delta_{k+1}^\alpha} \right) \Delta_k.$$

These prove our statements.