

FAST MULTIPLE SPLITTING ALGORITHMS FOR CONVEX OPTIMIZATION

DONALD GOLDFARB[†] AND SHIQIAN MA[†]

December 18, 2009. Revised March 16, 2011

Abstract. We present in this paper two different classes of general K -splitting algorithms for solving finite-dimensional convex optimization problems. Under the assumption that the function being minimized has a Lipschitz continuous gradient, we prove that the number of iterations needed by the first class of algorithms to obtain an ϵ -optimal solution is $O(1/\epsilon)$. The algorithms in the second class are accelerated versions of those in the first class, where the complexity result is improved to $O(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$ while the computational effort required at each iteration is almost unchanged. To the best of our knowledge, the complexity results presented in this paper are the first ones of this type that have been given for splitting and alternating direction type methods. Moreover, all algorithms proposed in this paper are parallelizable, which makes them particularly attractive for solving certain large-scale problems.

Key words. Convex Optimization, Variable Splitting, Alternating Direction Augmented Lagrangian Method, Alternating Linearization Method, Complexity Theory, Decomposition, Smoothing Techniques, Parallel Computing, Proximal Point Algorithm, Optimal Gradient Method

AMS subject classifications. Primary, 65K05; Secondary, 68Q25, 90C25, 49M27

1. Introduction. Many convex optimization problems that arise in practice take the form of a sum of convex functions. Often one function is an energy that one wants to minimize and the other functions are regularization terms to make the solution have certain properties. For example, Tikhonov regularization [28] is usually applied to ill-conditioned inverse problems to make them well-posed, compressed sensing [4, 8] uses ℓ_1 regularization to obtain sparse solutions, and problems arising from medical imaging adopt both ℓ_1 and total variation (TV) as regularization terms [20]. In this paper, we propose and analyze splitting/alternating direction algorithms for solving the following convex optimization problem:

$$(1.1) \quad \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} F(x) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^K f_i(x),$$

where $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \dots, K$, are convex functions. When the functions f_i 's are well-structured, a well established way to solve problem (1.1) is to split the variable x into K variables by introducing $K - 1$ new variables and then apply an augmented Lagrangian method to solve the resulting problem. Decomposition of the augmented Lagrangian function can then be accomplished by applying an alternating direction method (ADM) to minimize it.

Problem (1.1) is closely related to the following inclusion problem:

$$(1.2) \quad 0 \in T_1(x) + \dots + T_K(x),$$

where T_1, \dots, T_K are set-valued maximal monotone operators. The goal of problem (1.2) is to find a zero of the sum of K maximal monotone operators. Note that the optimality conditions for (1.1) are

$$0 \in \sum_{i=1}^K \partial f_i(x);$$

[†]Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA. Email: {goldfarb, sm2756}@columbia.edu. Research supported in part by NSF Grants DMS 06-06712 and DMS 10-16571, ONR Grant N00014-08-1-1118 and DOE Grant DE-FG02-08ER25856.

hence, these conditions can be satisfied by solving a problem of the form (1.2).

In the extensive literature on splitting and ADM algorithms, the case $K = 2$ predominates. The algorithms for solving (1.2) when $K = 2$ are usually based on operator splitting techniques. Important operator splitting algorithms include the Douglas-Rachford [9, 10, 7], Peaceman-Rachford [26], double-backward [6] and forward-backward class [13, 29] of algorithms. Alternating direction methods (ADM) within an augmented Lagrangian framework for solving (1.1) are optimization analogs/variants of the Douglas-Rachford and Peaceman-Rachford splitting methods. These algorithms have been studied extensively for the case of $K = 2$, and were first proposed in the 1970s for solving optimization problems arising from numerical PDE problems [14, 15]. We refer to [16] and the references therein for more information on splitting and ADM algorithms for the case of $K = 2$.

Although there is an extensive literature on operator splitting methods, very few convergence results have been published on methods for finding a zero of a sum of more than two maximal monotone operators. The principal exceptions, are the Jacobi-like method of Spingarn [27] and more recently, the general projective splitting methods of Eckstein and Svaiter [11]. The algorithm addressed in [27] first reduces problem (1.2) to the sum of two maximal monotone operators by defining new subspaces and operators, and then applies a Douglas-Rachford splitting algorithm to solve the new problem. The projective splitting methods in [11] do not reduce problem (1.2) to the case $K = 2$. Instead, by using the concept of an extended solution set, it is shown in [11] that solving (1.2) is equivalent to finding a point in the extended solution set, and a separator-projection algorithm is given to do this.

Global convergence results for variable splitting ADMs and operator splitting algorithms for the case of $K = 2$ have been proved under various assumptions. However, except for the fairly recently proposed gradient methods in [25] and related iterative shrinkage/thresholding algorithms in [2] and the alternating linearization methods in [16], complexity bounds for these methods had not been established. These complexity results are extensions of the seminal results of Nesterov [22, 23], who first showed that certain first-order methods that he proposed could obtain an ϵ -optimal solution of a smooth convex programming problem in $O(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$ iterations. Moreover, he showed that his methods were optimal in the sense that this iteration complexity was the best that could be obtained using only first-order information. Nesterov's optimal gradient methods are accelerated gradient methods that use a combination of previous points to compute the new point at each iteration. By combining these methods with smoothing techniques, optimal complexity results were obtained for solving nonsmooth problems in [24, 30].

In this paper, we propose two classes of multiple variable-splitting algorithms based on alternating direction and alternating linearization techniques that can solve problem (1.1) for general $K (K \geq 2)$ and we present complexity results for them. (Note that the complexity results in [25, 2, 16] are only for problem (1.1) when $K = 2$). The algorithms in the first class can be viewed as alternating linearization methods in the sense that at each iteration these algorithms perform K minimizations of an approximation to the original objective function F by keeping one of the functions $f_i(x)$ unchanged and linearizing the other $K - 1$ functions. An alternating linearization method for minimizing the sum of two convex functions was studied by Kiwiel et al. [18]. However, our algorithms differ greatly from the one in [18] in the way that the proximal terms are chosen. Moreover, our algorithms are more general as they can solve general problems with $K (K \geq 2)$ functions. Furthermore, we prove that the iteration complexity of this class of splitting algorithms is $O(1/\epsilon)$ for an ϵ -optimal solution. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first complexity result of this type for splitting/alternating direction type algorithms. The algorithms in our second class are accelerated versions of the algorithms in our first class and have $O(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$ iteration complexities. This class

of splitting algorithms is also new as are the complexity results.

Our new algorithms have, in addition, several practical advantages. First, they are all parallelizable. Thus, although at each iteration we solve K subproblems, the CPU time required should be approximately equal to the time required to solve the most difficult of the subproblems if we have K processors that can work in parallel. Second, since every function f_i is minimized once at each iteration, it is likely that our algorithms will need fewer iterations to converge than operator splitting algorithms such as FPC [17, 19], TVCMRI [20], ISTA and FISTA [2]. The numerical results in [1] for the case of $K = 2$ support this conclusion.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we propose a class of splitting algorithms based on alternating direction and alternating linearization methods for solving (1.1) and prove that they require $O(1/\epsilon)$ iterations to obtain an ϵ -optimal solution. In Section 3 we propose accelerated splitting algorithms for solving (1.1) and prove they have $O(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$ complexities. We discuss how to apply our algorithms for solving nonsmooth problems by using smoothing techniques in Section 4. Numerical results are presented in Section 5. Finally, we summarize our results in Section 6.

2. A class of multiple splitting algorithms. By introducing new variables, i.e., splitting variable x into K different variables, problem (1.1) can be rewritten as:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i=1}^K f_i(x^i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x^i = x^{i+1}, i = 1, \dots, K-1. \end{aligned}$$

In Sections 2 and 3, we focus on splitting and ADM algorithms for solving (2.1) and their complexity results.

We make the following assumptions throughout Sections 2 and 3.

ASSUMPTION 2.1.

- $f_i(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \dots, K$ is a smooth convex function of the type $C^{1,1}$, i.e. continuously differentiable with Lipschitz continuous gradient:

$$\|\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f_i(y)\| \leq L(f_i)\|x - y\|, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $L(f_i)$ is the Lipschitz constant.

- Problem (1.1) is solvable, i.e., $X_* := \arg \min F \neq \emptyset$.

We define the term ϵ -optimal as follows.

DEFINITION 2.2. Suppose x^* is an optimal solution to the following problem

$$(2.2) \quad \min\{f(x) : x \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

$x \in \mathcal{C}$ is called an ϵ -optimal solution to (2.2) if $f(x) - f(x^*) \leq \epsilon$ holds.

The following notation is adopted throughout Sections 2 and 3.

DEFINITION 2.3. We define $\tilde{f}_i(u, v)$ as the linear approximation to $f_i(u)$ at a point v plus a proximal term:

$$\tilde{f}_i(u, v) := f_i(v) + \langle \nabla f_i(v), u - v \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|u - v\|^2,$$

where μ is a penalty parameter. We use $Q_i(v^1, \dots, v^{i-1}, u, v^{i+1}, \dots, v^K)$ to denote the following approxima-

tion to the function $F(u)$:

$$Q_i(v^1, \dots, v^{i-1}, u, v^{i+1}, \dots, v^K) := f_i(u) + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \tilde{f}_j(u, v^j),$$

i.e., Q_i is an approximation to the function F , where the i -th function f_i is unchanged but the other functions are approximated by a linear term plus a proximal term. We use $p_i(v^1, \dots, v^{i-1}, v^{i+1}, \dots, v^K)$ to denote the minimizer of $Q_i(v^1, \dots, v^{i-1}, u, v^{i+1}, \dots, v^K)$ with respect to u , i.e.,

$$(2.3) \quad p_i(v^1, \dots, v^{i-1}, v^{i+1}, \dots, v^K) := \arg \min_u Q_i(v^1, \dots, v^{i-1}, u, v^{i+1}, \dots, v^K).$$

With the above notation, we have the following lemma which follows from a fundamental property of a smooth function in the class $C^{1,1}$; see e.g., [3].

LEMMA 2.4. For \tilde{f}_i defined as in Definition 2.3 and $\mu \leq 1/\max_{1 \leq i \leq K} L(f_i)$, we have for $i = 1, \dots, K$,

$$f_i(x) \leq f_i(y) + \langle \nabla f_i(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{L(f_i)}{2} \|x - y\|^2 \leq \tilde{f}_i(x, y), \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The following key lemma is crucial for the proofs of our complexity results. Our proofs of this lemma and most of the results that follow in this and the remaining sections of the paper closely follow proofs given in [2] for related lemmas and theorems.

LEMMA 2.5. For any $i = 1, \dots, K$, $u, v^1, \dots, v^{i-1}, v^{i+1}, \dots, v^K \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mu \leq 1/\max_{1 \leq i \leq K} L(f_i)$, we have,

$$(2.4) \quad 2\mu(F(u) - F(p)) \geq \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K (\|p - u\|^2 - \|v^j - u\|^2),$$

where $p := p_i(v^1, \dots, v^{i-1}, v^{i+1}, \dots, v^K)$.

Proof. From Lemma 2.4 we know that $F(p) \leq Q_i(v^1, \dots, v^{i-1}, p, v^{i+1}, \dots, v^K)$ holds for all i and $v^1, \dots, v^{i-1}, v^{i+1}, \dots, v^K \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have,

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} F(u) - F(p) &\geq F(u) - Q_i(v^1, \dots, v^{i-1}, p, v^{i+1}, \dots, v^K) \\ &= f_i(u) - f_i(p) + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \left(f_j(u) - f_j(v^j) - \langle \nabla f_j(v^j), p - v^j \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|p - v^j\|^2 \right) \\ &\geq \langle \nabla f_i(p), u - p \rangle + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \left(\langle \nabla f_j(v^j), u - v^j \rangle - \langle \nabla f_j(v^j), p - v^j \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|p - v^j\|^2 \right) \\ &= \langle \nabla f_i(p), u - p \rangle + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \left(\langle \nabla f_j(v^j), u - p \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|p - v^j\|^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \left(\left\langle -\frac{1}{\mu} (p - v^j), u - p \right\rangle - \frac{1}{2\mu} \|p - v^j\|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to the convexity of the functions $f_j, j = 1, \dots, K$ and the last equality is

from the first-order optimality conditions for problem (2.3), i.e.,

$$(2.6) \quad \nabla f_i(p) + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \left(\nabla f_j(v^j) + \frac{1}{\mu}(p - v^j) \right) = 0.$$

Then using the identity

$$(2.7) \quad \|a - c\|^2 - \|b - c\|^2 = \|a - b\|^2 + 2\langle a - b, b - c \rangle,$$

we get the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mu(F(u) - F(p)) &\geq \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K (\langle -2(p - v^j), u - p \rangle - \|p - v^j\|^2) \\ &= \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K (\|p - u\|^2 - \|v^j - u\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Our multiple splitting algorithms (MSA) for solving (2.1) are outlined in Algorithm 1, where $D^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ is a doubly stochastic matrix, i.e.,

$$D_{ij}^{(k)} \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^K D_{ij}^{(k)} = 1, \sum_{i=1}^K D_{ij}^{(k)} = 1, \forall i, j = 1, \dots, K.$$

One natural choice of $D^{(k)}$ is to take all of its components equal to $1/K$. In this case, all $w_{(k)}^i, i = 1, \dots, K$

Algorithm 1: A Class of Multiple Splitting Algorithms (MSA)

Set $x_0 = x_{(0)}^1 = \dots = x_{(0)}^K = w_{(0)}^1 = \dots = w_{(0)}^K$ and $\mu \leq 1/\max_{1 \leq i \leq K} L(f_i)$.

for $k = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**

- for each $i = 1, \dots, K$, compute $x_{(k+1)}^i := p_i(w_{(k)}^1, \dots, w_{(k)}^i)$,
- compute

$$\left(w_{(k+1)}^1, \dots, w_{(k+1)}^K \right) := \left(x_{(k+1)}^1, \dots, x_{(k+1)}^K \right) D^{(k+1)}.$$

are equal to $\sum_{i=1}^K x_{(k)}^i / K$, i.e., the average of the current K iterates.

At iteration k , Algorithm 1 computes K points $x_{(k)}^i, i = 1, \dots, K$ by solving K subproblems. For many problems in practice, these K subproblems are expected to be very easy to solve. Another advantage of the algorithm is that it is parallelizable since given $w_{(k)}^i, i = 1, \dots, K$, the K subproblems in Algorithm 1 can be solved simultaneously. Algorithm (1) can be viewed as an alternating linearization method since at each iteration, K subproblems are solved, and each subproblem corresponds to minimizing a function involving linear approximations to some of the functions. Although Algorithm 1 assumes the Lipschitz constants are known, and hence that μ is known, this assumption can be relaxed by using the backtracking technique in [2] to estimate μ at each iteration.

We prove in the following that the number of iterations needed by Algorithm 1 to obtain an ϵ -optimal

solution is $O(1/\epsilon)$.

THEOREM 2.6. *Suppose x^* is an optimal solution to problem (2.1). For any choice of $\mu \leq 1/\max_{1 \leq i \leq K} L(f_i)$, the sequence $\{x_{(k)}^i, w_{(k)}^i\}_{i=1}^K$ generated by Algorithm 1 satisfies:*

$$(2.8) \quad \min_{i=1, \dots, K} F(x_{(k)}^i) - F(x^*) \leq \frac{(K-1)\|x_0 - x^*\|^2}{2\mu k}.$$

Thus, the sequence $\{\min_{i=1, \dots, K} F(x_{(k)}^i)\}$ produced by Algorithm 1 converges to $F(x^)$. Moreover, if $\mu \geq \beta/\max_i\{L(f_i)\}$ where $0 < \beta \leq 1$, the number of iterations needed to obtain an ϵ -optimal solution is at most $\lceil C/\epsilon \rceil$, where $C = \frac{(K-1)\max_i\{L(f_i)\}\|x_0 - x^*\|^2}{2\beta}$.*

Proof. In (2.4), by letting $u = x^*$, $v^j = w_{(n)}^i$, $j = 1, \dots, K, j \neq i$, we have $p = x_{(n+1)}^i$ and

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} 2\mu(F(x^*) - F(x_{(n+1)}^i)) &\geq \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \left(\|x_{(n+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 - \|w_{(n)}^i - x^*\|^2 \right) \\ &= (K-1) \left(\|x_{(n+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 - \|w_{(n)}^i - x^*\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of $w_{(n)}^i$ in Algorithm 1, we have

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^K \|w_{(n+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^K \left\| \sum_{j=1}^K D_{ji}^{(n+1)} x_{(n+1)}^j - x^* \right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K \left\| \sum_{j=1}^K D_{ji}^{(n+1)} (x_{(n+1)}^j - x^*) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^K D_{ji}^{(n+1)} \|x_{(n+1)}^j - x^*\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^K \|x_{(n+1)}^j - x^*\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second and the last equalities are due to the fact that $D^{(n+1)}$ is a doubly stochastic matrix and the inequality is due to the convexity of the function $\|\cdot\|^2$.

Thus by summing (2.9) over $i = 1, \dots, K$ we obtain

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} 2\mu \left(KF(x^*) - \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(n+1)}^i) \right) &\geq (K-1) \left(\sum_{i=1}^K \|x_{(n+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^K \|w_{(n)}^i - x^*\|^2 \right) \\ &\geq (K-1) \left(\sum_{i=1}^K \|w_{(n+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^K \|w_{(n)}^i - x^*\|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (2.10).

Summing (2.11) over $n = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, and using the fact that $w_{(0)}^i = x_0, i = 1, \dots, K$, yields

$$(2.12) \quad 2\mu \left(kKF(x^*) - \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(n+1)}^i) \right) \geq (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \left(\|w_{(k)}^i - x^*\|^2 - \|w_{(0)}^i - x^*\|^2 \right) \\ \geq -K(K-1)\|x_0 - x^*\|^2.$$

In (2.4), by letting $u = v^j = w_{(n)}^i, j = 1, \dots, K, j \neq i$, we get $p = x_{(n+1)}^i$ and

$$(2.13) \quad 2\mu \left(F(w_{(n)}^i) - F(x_{(n+1)}^i) \right) \geq \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \|x_{(n+1)}^i - w_{(n)}^j\|^2 \geq 0.$$

From the way we compute $w_{(n)}^i, i = 1, \dots, K$, and the facts that F is convex and $D^{(n)}$ is a doubly stochastic matrix, we get

$$(2.14) \quad \sum_{i=1}^K F(w_{(n)}^i) = \sum_{i=1}^K F \left(\sum_{j=1}^K D_{ji}^{(n)} x_{(n)}^j \right) \\ \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^K D_{ji}^{(n)} F(x_{(n)}^j) \\ = \sum_{j=1}^K F(x_{(n)}^j).$$

Now summing (2.13) over $i = 1, \dots, K$ and using (2.14), we obtain

$$(2.15) \quad 2\mu \left(\sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(n)}^i) - \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(n+1)}^i) \right) \geq 0.$$

This shows that the sums $\sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(n)}^i)$ are non-increasing as n increases. Hence,

$$(2.16) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(n+1)}^i) \geq k \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(k)}^i).$$

Finally, combining (2.12) and (2.16) yields

$$2\mu \left(kKF(x^*) - k \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(k)}^i) \right) \geq -K(K-1)\|x_0 - x^*\|^2.$$

Hence,

$$\min_{1, \dots, K} F(x_{(k)}^i) - F(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(k)}^i) - F(x^*) \leq \frac{(K-1)\|x_0 - x^*\|^2}{2\mu k}.$$

It then follows that $\min_{i=1, \dots, K} F(x_{(k)}^i) - F(x^*) \leq \epsilon$, if $k \geq \lceil C/\epsilon \rceil$, where $C = \frac{(K-1) \max_i \{L(f_i)\} \|x_0 - x^*\|^2}{2\beta}$, and hence that for any $k \geq \lceil C/\epsilon \rceil$, $x_{(k)} := \arg \min \{F(x_{(k)}^i), i = 1, \dots, K\}$ is an ϵ -optimal solution. \square

REMARK 2.7. If in the original problem (1.1), x is subject to a convex constraint $x \in \mathcal{C}$, where \mathcal{C} is

a convex set, we can impose this constraint in every subproblem in MSA and obtain the same complexity result. The only changes in the proof are in Lemma 2.5. If there is a constraint $x \in \mathcal{C}$, then (2.4) and (2.5) hold for any $u \in \mathcal{C}$ and the last equality in (2.5) becomes a “ \geq ” inequality due to the fact that the optimality conditions (2.6) become

$$\left\langle \nabla f_i(p) + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \left(\nabla f_j(v^j) + \frac{1}{\mu}(p - v^j) \right), u - p \right\rangle \geq 0, \forall u \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Unfortunately, this extension is not very practical, since for it to be useful, adding the constraint in every subproblem would most likely make most of these subproblems difficult to solve.

3. A class of fast multiple splitting algorithms. In this section, we give a class of fast multiple splitting algorithms (FaMSA) for solving problem (2.1) that require at most $O(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$ iterations to obtain an ϵ -optimal solution while requiring a computational effort at each iteration that is roughly the same as Algorithm 1. Our fast multiple splitting algorithms are outlined in Algorithm 2, where $D^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ is a doubly stochastic matrix.

Algorithm 2: A Class of Fast Multiple Splitting Algorithms (FaMSA)

Set $x_0 = x_{(0)}^i = \hat{w}_{(0)}^i = w_{(1)}^i, i = 1, \dots, K, t_1 = 1$, and choose $\mu \leq 1/\max_{1 \leq i \leq K} L(f_i)$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

- for $i = 1, \dots, K$, compute $x_{(k)}^i = p_i(w_{(k)}^1, \dots, w_{(k)}^i)$
 - compute $(\hat{w}_{(k)}^1, \dots, \hat{w}_{(k)}^K) := (x_{(k)}^1, \dots, x_{(k)}^K) D^{(k)}$
 - compute $t_{k+1} = (1 + \sqrt{1 + 4t_k^2})/2$
 - for $i = 1, \dots, K$, compute $w_{(k+1)}^i := \hat{w}_{(k)}^i + \frac{1}{t_{k+1}} \left(t_k(x_{(k)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k-1)}^i) - (\hat{w}_{(k)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k-1)}^i) \right)$.
-

To establish the $O(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$ iteration complexity of FaMSA, we need the following lemma.

LEMMA 3.1. *Suppose x^* is an optimal solution to problem (2.1). For any choice of $\mu \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq K} L(f_i)$, the sequence $\{x_{(k)}^i, w_{(k)}^i, \hat{w}_{(k)}^i\}_{i=1}^K$ generated by Algorithm 2 satisfies:*

$$(3.1) \quad 2\mu(t_k^2 v_k - t_{k+1}^2 v_{k+1}) \geq (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K (\|u_{k+1}^i\|^2 - \|u_k^i\|^2),$$

where $v_k := \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(k)}^i) - KF(x^*)$ and $u_k^i := t_k x_{(k)}^i - (t_k - 1)\hat{w}_{(k-1)}^i - x^*, i = 1, \dots, K$.

Proof. In (2.4), by letting $u = \hat{w}_{(k)}^i, v^j = w_{(k+1)}^j, j = 1, \dots, K, j \neq i$, we get $p = x_{(k+1)}^i$ and

$$(3.2) \quad 2\mu \left(F(\hat{w}_{(k)}^i) - F(x_{(k+1)}^i) \right) \geq \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \left(\|x_{(k+1)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k)}^i\|^2 - \|w_{(k+1)}^j - \hat{w}_{(k)}^i\|^2 \right) \\ = (K-1) \left(\|x_{(k+1)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k)}^i\|^2 - \|w_{(k+1)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k)}^i\|^2 \right).$$

Summing (3.2) over $i = 1, \dots, K$, and using the facts that F is convex and $D^{(k)}$ is a doubly stochastic

matrix, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mu \left(\sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(k)}^i) - \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(k+1)}^i) \right) &\geq 2\mu \left(\sum_{i=1}^K F(\hat{w}_{(k)}^i) - \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(k+1)}^i) \right) \\ &\geq (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \left(\|x_{(k+1)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k)}^i\|^2 - \|w_{(k+1)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k)}^i\|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$(3.3) \quad 2\mu(v_k - v_{k+1}) \geq (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \left(\|x_{(k+1)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k)}^i\|^2 - \|w_{(k+1)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k)}^i\|^2 \right).$$

In (2.4), by letting $u = x^*$, $v^j = w_{(k+1)}^i$, we get $p = x_{(k+1)}^i$ and

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} 2\mu \left(F(x^*) - F(x_{(k+1)}^i) \right) &\geq \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \left(\|x_{(k+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 - \|w_{(k+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 \right) \\ &= (K-1) \left(\|x_{(k+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 - \|w_{(k+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Summing (3.4) over $i = 1, \dots, K$ we obtain

$$(3.5) \quad -2\mu v_{k+1} \geq (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \left(\|x_{(k+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 - \|w_{(k+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 \right).$$

Now multiplying (3.3) by t_k^2 and (3.5) by t_{k+1} , adding the resulting two inequalities, using the relation $t_k^2 = t_{k+1}(t_{k+1} - 1)$, and the identity (2.7), we get

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} &2\mu(t_k^2 v_k - t_{k+1}^2 v_{k+1}) \\ &\geq (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K t_{k+1}(t_{k+1} - 1) \left(\|x_{(k+1)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k)}^i\|^2 - \|w_{(k+1)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k)}^i\|^2 \right) \\ &\quad + (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K t_{k+1} \left(\|x_{(k+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 - \|w_{(k+1)}^i - x^*\|^2 \right) \\ &= (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K t_{k+1}(t_{k+1} - 1) \left(\|x_{(k+1)}^i - w_{(k+1)}^i\|^2 + 2 \langle x_{(k+1)}^i - w_{(k+1)}^i, w_{(k+1)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k)}^i \rangle \right) \\ &\quad + (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K t_{k+1} \left(\|x_{(k+1)}^i - w_{(k+1)}^i\|^2 + 2 \langle x_{(k+1)}^i - w_{(k+1)}^i, w_{(k+1)}^i - x^* \rangle \right) \\ &= (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \left(t_{k+1}^2 \|x_{(k+1)}^i - w_{(k+1)}^i\|^2 + 2t_{k+1} \langle x_{(k+1)}^i - w_{(k+1)}^i, t_{k+1} w_{(k+1)}^i - (t_{k+1} - 1) \hat{w}_{(k)}^i - x^* \rangle \right) \\ &= (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \left(\|t_{k+1} x_{(k+1)}^i - (t_{k+1} - 1) \hat{w}_{(k)}^i - x^*\|^2 - \|t_{k+1} w_{(k+1)}^i - (t_{k+1} - 1) \hat{w}_{(k)}^i - x^*\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

From the way we compute $w_{(k+1)}^i$ in Algorithm 2, i.e.,

$$w_{(k+1)}^i := \hat{w}_{(k)}^i + \frac{1}{t_{k+1}} \left(t_k(x_{(k)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k-1)}^i) - (\hat{w}_{(k)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k-1)}^i) \right),$$

it follows that

$$t_{k+1}w_{(k+1)}^i - (t_{k+1} - 1)\hat{w}_{(k)}^i - x^* = t_kx_{(k)}^i - (t_k - 1)\hat{w}_{(k-1)}^i - x^*.$$

Thus, from (3.6) and the definition of u_k^i it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\mu(t_k^2v_k - t_{k+1}^2v_{k+1}) \\ & \geq (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \left(\|t_{k+1}x_{(k+1)}^i - (t_{k+1} - 1)\hat{w}_{(k)}^i - x^*\|^2 - \|t_kx_{(k)}^i - (t_k - 1)\hat{w}_{(k-1)}^i - x^*\|^2 \right) \\ & = (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K (\|u_{k+1}^i\|^2 - \|u_k^i\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Before proving our main complexity theorem to Algorithm 2, we note that the sequence $\{t_k\}$ generated by Algorithm 2 clearly satisfies $t_{k+1} \geq t_k + \frac{1}{2}$, and hence $t_k \geq (k+1)/2$ for all $k \geq 1$ since $t_1 = 1$.

THEOREM 3.2. *Suppose x^* is an optimal solution to problem (2.1). For any choice of $\mu \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq K} L(f_i)$, the sequence $\{x_{(k)}^i, w_{(k)}^i, \hat{w}_{(k)}^i\}_{i=1}^K$ generated by Algorithm 2 satisfies:*

$$(3.7) \quad \min_{i=1, \dots, K} F(x_{(k)}^i) - F(x^*) \leq \frac{2(K-1)\|x_0 - x^*\|^2}{\mu(k+1)^2}.$$

Thus, the sequence $\{\min_{i=1, \dots, K} F(x_{(k)}^i)\}$ produced by Algorithm 2 converges to $F(x^)$. Moreover, if $\mu \geq \beta / \max_i \{L(f_i)\}$ where $0 < \beta \leq 1$, the number of iterations needed to obtain an ϵ -optimal solution is at most $\lfloor \sqrt{C/\epsilon} \rfloor$, where $C = 2(K-1) \max_i \{L(f_i)\} \|x_0 - x^*\|^2 / \beta$.*

Proof. By rewriting (3.1) as

$$2\mu t_{k+1}^2 v_{k+1} + (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \|u_{k+1}^i\|^2 \leq 2\mu t_k^2 v_k + (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \|u_k^i\|^2,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
2\mu \left(\frac{k+1}{2}\right)^2 v_k &\leq 2\mu t_k^2 v_k + (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \|u_k^i\|^2 \\
&\leq 2\mu t_1^2 v_1 + (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \|u_1^i\|^2 \\
&= 2\mu v_1 + (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \|x_{(1)}^i - x^*\|^2 \\
&\leq (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K \|w_{(1)}^i - x^*\|^2 \\
&= K(K-1) \|x_0 - x^*\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to $t_k \geq (k+1)/2$, the first equality is from the facts that $t_1 = 1$ and $u_1^i = x_{(1)}^i - x^*$, the third inequality is from letting $k = 0$ in (3.5) and the last equality is due to $w_{(1)}^i = x_0, i = 1, \dots, K$.

Thus, from $v_k = \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(k)}^i) - KF(x^*)$ we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(k)}^i) - KF(x^*) \leq \frac{2K(K-1) \|x_0 - x^*\|^2}{\mu(k+1)^2},$$

which implies that

$$\min_{i=1, \dots, K} F(x_{(k)}^i) - F(x^*) \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(k)}^i) - F(x^*) \leq \frac{2(K-1) \|x_0 - x^*\|^2}{\mu(k+1)^2},$$

i.e., (3.7) holds.

Moreover, it follows that if $C/(k+1)^2 \leq \epsilon$, i.e., $k \geq \lfloor \sqrt{C/\epsilon} \rfloor$, then $\min_{i=1, \dots, K} F(x_{(k)}^i) - F(x^*) \leq \epsilon$, where $C = 2(K-1) \max_i \{L(f_i)\} \|x_0 - x^*\|^2 / \beta$. This implies that for any $k \geq \lfloor \sqrt{C/\epsilon} \rfloor$, $x_{(k)} := \arg \min \{x_{(k)}^i | F(x_{(k)}^i), i = 1, \dots, K\}$ is an ϵ -optimal solution. \square

REMARK 3.3. *Although we have assumed that the Lipschitz constants $L(f_i)$ are known, and hence that μ is chosen in Algorithm 2 to be smaller than $1/\max_{1 \leq i \leq K} \{L(f_i)\}$, this can be relaxed by using the backtracking technique in [2] that chooses a μ at each iteration that is smaller than the μ used at the previous iteration and for which $F(p) \leq Q_i(w_{(k)}^1, \dots, w_{(k)}^i, p, w_{(k)}^i, \dots, w_{(k)}^K)$ for all i .*

3.1. A variant of the fast multiple splitting algorithm. In this section, we present a variant of the fast multiple splitting algorithm (Algorithm 2) that is much more efficient and requires much less memory than Algorithm 2 for problems in which K is large. This variant uses $D^{(k)} := 1/Ke e^\top$, where e is the n -dimensional vector with all ones, and replaces $x_{(k)}^i$ in the last line of Algorithm 2 by $\hat{w}_{(k)}^i$; i.e., in the last line of Algorithm 2, we compute $w_{(k+1)}^i$ for $i = 1, \dots, K$ by the formula:

$$w_{(k+1)}^i := \hat{w}_{(k)}^i + \frac{t_k - 1}{t_{k+1}} (\hat{w}_{(k)}^i - \hat{w}_{(k-1)}^i).$$

It is easy to see that in this variant, the $\hat{w}_{(k)}^i, i = 1, \dots, K$ are all the same and the $w_{(k+1)}^i, i = 1, \dots, K$ are all the same. We call this variant FaMSA-s, where s refers to the fact that this variant computes a ‘‘single’’

vector \hat{w}^k and a single vector $w_{(k+1)}$ at the k -th iteration. It is given below as Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3: A variant of FaMSA (FaMSA-s)

Set $x_0 = x_{(0)}^i = \hat{w}_{(0)} = w_{(1)}$, $i = 1, \dots, K$, $t_1 = 1$, and choose $\mu \leq 1/\max_{1 \leq i \leq K} L(f_i)$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

- for $i = 1, \dots, K$, compute $x_{(k)}^i = p_i(w_{(k)}, \dots, w_{(k)})$
 - compute $\hat{w}_{(k)} := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K x_{(k)}^i$
 - compute $t_{k+1} = (1 + \sqrt{1 + 4t_k^2})/2$
 - for $i = 1, \dots, K$, compute $w_{(k+1)} := \hat{w}_{(k)} + \frac{t_k - 1}{t_{k+1}}(\hat{w}_{(k)} - \hat{w}_{(k-1)})$.
-

It is easy to verify that the following analog of Lemma 3.1 applies to Algorithm FaMSA-s.

LEMMA 3.4. *Suppose x^* is an optimal solution to problem (2.1). The sequence $\{w_{(k)}, \hat{w}_{(k)}\}$ generated by Algorithm FaMSA-s satisfies:*

$$2\mu(t_k^2 v_k - t_{k+1}^2 v_{k+1}) \geq (K-1) \sum_{i=1}^K (\|u_{k+1}\|^2 - \|u_k\|^2),$$

where $v_k := K(F(\hat{w}_{(k)}) - F(x^*))$ and $u_k := t_k \hat{w}_{(k)} - (t_k - 1)\hat{w}_{(k-1)} - x^*$.

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of Lemma 3.1; hence, we leave it to the reader. The main difference is that instead of using the inequality $\sum_{i=1}^K F(\hat{w}_{(k)}^i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(k)}^i)$ to replace the sum involving $\hat{w}_{(k)}^i$, we use the fact that $KF(\hat{w}_{k+1}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^K F(x_{(k+1)}^i)$ to replace the sum involving $x_{(k+1)}^i$ in the proof. \square

From Lemma 3.4, Theorem 3.2 with $\hat{w}_{(k)}^i$ and $w_{(k)}^i$, respectively, for $i = 1, \dots, K$ replaced by $\hat{w}_{(k)}$ and $w_{(k)}$ follows immediately for FaMSA-s.

4. Multiple splitting algorithms for nonsmooth problems. Although for the above results we required all functions to be in the class of $C^{1,1}$, our algorithms can still be applied to solve nonsmooth problems by first smoothing all nonsmooth functions. One of the most important smoothing techniques is the one proposed by Nesterov [24]. We use the ℓ_1 -norm function as an example to show how Nesterov's smoothing technique works. Note that the ℓ_1 function $f(x) := \|x\|_1$ can be rewritten as $\|x\|_1 = \max\{\langle x, u \rangle : u \in U\}$, where $U := \{u : \|u\|_\infty \leq 1\}$. Since U is a bounded convex set, we can define a prox-function $d(u)$ for the set U , where $d(u)$ is continuous and strongly convex on U with convexity parameter $\sigma > 0$. For U defined as above, a natural choice for $d(u)$ is $d(u) := \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_2^2$ and thus $\sigma = 1$. Hence, we have the following smooth approximation for $f(x) = \|x\|_1$:

$$f_\rho(x) := \max\{\langle x, u \rangle - \rho d(u) : u \in U\},$$

where ρ is a positive smoothness parameter. It can be shown that $f_\rho(x)$ is well defined and is in the class of $C^{1,1}$ and its gradient is Lipschitz continuous with constant $L_\rho = \frac{1}{\rho\sigma}$ (see Theorem 1 in [24]). Also, it is easy to show that the following relations hold for $f(x)$ and $f_\rho(x)$:

$$f_\rho(x) \leq f(x) \leq f_\rho(x) + \rho D,$$

where $D := \max_u \{d(u) : u \in U\}$. Therefore, to get an ϵ -optimal solution to a problem involving the ℓ_1 -norm function $f(x)$, we can replace $f(x)$ with $f_{\frac{\epsilon}{2D}}(x)$ to get a smooth problem, and then apply our splitting algorithms to the new problem to get an $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ -optimal solution, which will be ϵ -optimal to the original nonsmooth

problem. Since $L_{\frac{\epsilon}{2D}}$ is $O(1/\epsilon)$, our fast $O(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$ algorithms require $O(1/\epsilon)$ iterations to compute an ϵ -optimal solution.

For nonsmooth problems in imaging, data analysis, and machine learning, etc. with regularization terms that involve total variation and the nuclear norm, we can use similar smoothing techniques to smooth these nonsmooth functions, and then apply our multiple splitting algorithms to solve them.

5. Numerical experiments. We present some preliminary numerical experiments in this section. Specifically, we apply our MSA and FaMSA algorithms to solve the Fermat-Weber problem and a total variation and wavelet based image deblurring problem. All numerical experiments were run in MATLAB 7.3.0 on a Dell Precision 670 workstation with an Intel Xeon(TM) 3.4GHZ CPU and 6GB of RAM.

5.1. The Fermat-Weber problem. The Fermat-Weber (F-W) problem can be cast as:

$$(5.1) \quad \min F(x) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^K \|x - c^i\|,$$

where $c^i \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, \dots, K$ are K given points. Problem (5.1) can be reformulated as a second-order cone programming (SOCP) problem and thus solved in polynomial time by an interior-point method. Since there are K cones, the size of a standard form SOCP formulation for this problem is quite large for large K and n . Since $f_i(x) = \|x - c^i\|, i = 1, \dots, K$ are not smooth, to apply our MSA and FaMSA algorithms, we need to smooth them first. Here we adopt the smoothing technique discussed in section 4; we approximate $f_i(x)$ by the smooth function

$$(5.2) \quad f_i^\rho(x) := \max\{\langle x - c^i, y \rangle - \frac{\rho}{2}\|y\|^2 : \|y\| \leq 1\},$$

where $\rho > 0$ is a smoothness parameter. The gradient of $f_i^\rho, \nabla f_i^\rho(x) = y_i^*$, where y_i^* is the optimal solution to the optimization problem in (5.2). It is easy to show that $y_i^* = \frac{x - c^i}{\max\{\rho, \|x - c^i\|\}}$. Moreover, $\nabla f_i^\rho(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous with constant $L(f_i^\rho) = 1/\rho$. Now we can apply MSA, FaMSA and FaMSA-s to solve

$$(5.3) \quad \min \sum_{i=1}^K f_i^\rho(x).$$

The i -th subproblem in all of these algorithms corresponds to solving the following problem:

$$(5.4) p_i(w_{(k)}^i, \dots, w_{(k)}^i) := \arg \min_u f_i^\rho(u) + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \left(f_j^\rho(w_{(k)}^j) + \langle \nabla f_j^\rho(w_{(k)}^j), u - w_{(k)}^j \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|u - w_{(k)}^j\|^2 \right).$$

It is easy to check that the optimal solution to problem (5.4) is given by

$$u^* := \begin{cases} c^i + \frac{\rho(K-1)}{\mu + \rho(K-1)}(z_{(k)}^i - c^i), & \text{if } \|z_{(k)}^i - c^i\| \leq \rho + \frac{\mu}{K-1} \\ c^i + \frac{(K-1)\|z_{(k)}^i - c^i\| - \mu}{(K-1)\|z_{(k)}^i - c^i\|}(z_{(k)}^i - c^i), & \text{if } \|z_{(k)}^i - c^i\| > \rho + \frac{\mu}{K-1}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$z_{(k)}^i := w_{(k)}^i - \frac{\mu}{K-1} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \frac{w_{(k)}^i - c^j}{\max\{\rho, \|w_{(k)}^i - c^j\|\}}.$$

If we choose the doubly stochastic matrix $D^{(k)}$ to be $D^{(k)} := 1/K ee^\top$ in MSA as we do in FaMSA-s, all $w_{(k)}^i$'s are the same in MSA as they are in FaMSA-s. Hence, computing $x_{(k)}^i$, for $i = 1, \dots, K$ in both algorithms can be done efficiently as follows.

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{cases} \hat{z}_{(k)} &= \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{w_{(k)} - c^j}{\max\{\rho, \|w_{(k)} - c^j\|\}} \\ z_{(k)}^i &= w_{(k)} - \frac{\mu}{K-1} \left(\hat{z}_{(k)} - \frac{w_{(k)} - c^i}{\max\{\rho, \|w_{(k)} - c^i\|\}} \right), \forall i = 1, \dots, K \\ x_{(k)}^i &= c^i + \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\max\{(K-1)\|z_{(k)}^i - c^i\|, \mu + \rho(K-1)\}} \right) (z_{(k)}^i - c^i), \forall i = 1, \dots, K \end{cases}$$

We compared the performance of MSA and FaMSA-s with the classical gradient method (Grad) and Nesterov's accelerated gradient method (Nest) for solving (5.3). The classical gradient method for solving (5.3) with step size $\tau > 0$ is:

$$x^{k+1} = x^k - \tau \sum_{j=1}^K \nabla f_j^\rho(x^k).$$

The variant of Nesterov's accelerated gradient method that we used is the following:

$$\begin{cases} x^k &= y^{k-1} - \tau \sum_{j=1}^K \nabla f_j^\rho(y^{k-1}) \\ y^k &= x^k - \frac{k-1}{k+2} (x^k - x^{k-1}). \end{cases}$$

We created random problems to test the performance of MSA, FaMSA-s, Grad and Nest as follows. Vectors $c^i \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, \dots, K$ were created with i.i.d. Gaussian entries from $\mathcal{N}(0, n)$. The seed for generating random numbers in MATLAB was set to 0. We set the smoothness parameter ρ equal to 10^{-3} . The initial points $x^i, i = 1, \dots, K$ were set to the average of all of the c^i 's, i.e., $x_{(0)}^i = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K c^i$. We chose $D_{ij}^{(k)} = 1/K, i, j = 1, \dots, K$ for all k in MSA. To compare the number of iterations needed by MSA and FaMSA-s, we first solved (5.1) by Mosek [21] after converting it into an SOCP problem to get the optimal solution x^* , and then terminated MSA, FaMSA-s, Grad and Nest when the relative error of the objective function value at the k -th iterate,

$$relerr := \frac{|\min_{i=1, \dots, K} F(x_{(k)}^i) - F(x^*)|}{F(x^*)},$$

was less than 10^{-6} . We tested the performance of these four solvers for different choices of τ , which is the step size for Grad and Nest. Note that since the w^i 's are the same in MSA with $D^{(k)} = \frac{1}{K} ee^\top$ for all k and in FaMSA-s, these two methods can be viewed as linearization methods in which the single function $\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K f_j(x)$ is linearized at the point w with only one proximal term $\frac{K-1}{2\mu} \|x - w\|$ in the i -th subproblem. So the step size for MSA and FaMSA-s is $\mu/(K-1)$. Hence, the parameter μ for MSA and FaMSA-s was set to $\mu = \tau(K-1)$ in our numerical tests.

Our results are presented in Table 5.1. The CPU times reported are in seconds. These results show that for the F-W problem, our implementations of MSA and FaMSA-s take roughly between two and three

times as much time to solve each problem as taken by Grad and Nest, respectively. This is not surprising since it is clear that the computation of each set of K vectors $z_{(k)}^i$ and $x_{(k)}^i$ for $i = 1, \dots, K$ in (5.5) is roughly comparable to a single computation of the gradient, i.e., the K gradients of $f_i^p(x)$, for $i = 1, \dots, K$. Moreover, for the simple F-W objective function, not much is gained by minimizing only one out of the K individual functions $f_i^p(x)$, $i = 1, \dots, K$, when K is large as it is in our tests. Note that the number of iterations required by MSA and Grad were exactly the same on our set of test problems. When K is of a moderate size and the individual functions are more complicated, MSA should require fewer iterations than Grad.

TABLE 5.1
Comparison of MSA, FaMSA-v, Grad and Nest on solving Fermat-Weber problem (5.3)

Problem		Mosek	MSA			FaMSA-s			Grad			Nest		
n	K	time	iter	relerr	time	iter	relerr	time	iter	relerr	time	iter	relerr	time
$\tau = 0.001$														
50	50	0.85	500	4.1e-05	0.73	107	8.4e-07	0.17	500	4.1e-05	0.21	109	9.0e-07	0.05
50	100	3.40	500	5.6e-06	1.44	69	9.9e-07	0.21	500	5.6e-06	0.42	72	8.5e-07	0.07
50	200	0.96	427	9.9e-07	2.44	47	8.8e-07	0.28	427	9.9e-07	0.69	49	8.6e-07	0.09
100	100	1.78	500	8.9e-06	1.68	94	9.8e-07	0.33	500	8.9e-06	0.51	97	9.1e-07	0.10
100	200	4.48	500	1.6e-06	3.35	60	9.2e-07	0.42	500	1.6e-06	1.00	62	9.2e-07	0.13
100	400	9.40	198	1.0e-06	2.68	34	9.5e-07	0.47	198	1.0e-06	0.79	36	9.2e-07	0.15
200	200	22.22	500	2.3e-06	4.36	75	9.9e-07	0.67	500	2.3e-06	1.39	77	9.9e-07	0.22
200	400	45.55	275	1.0e-06	4.81	41	9.9e-07	0.73	275	1.0e-06	1.54	43	9.8e-07	0.25
200	800	100.15	41	1.0e-06	1.44	15	9.7e-07	0.54	41	1.0e-06	0.46	16	9.8e-07	0.18
300	300	102.64	419	1.0e-06	6.73	52	9.9e-07	0.85	419	1.0e-06	2.22	54	9.9e-07	0.29
300	600	194.99	24	1.0e-06	0.79	11	9.9e-07	0.37	24	1.0e-06	0.26	12	9.9e-07	0.14
300	1200	401.54	1	5.8e-07	0.08	1	5.8e-07	0.08	1	5.8e-07	0.03	1	5.8e-07	0.03
$\tau = 0.01$														
50	50	0.84	238	9.9e-07	0.36	32	8.3e-07	0.06	238	9.9e-07	0.11	34	7.5e-07	0.02
50	100	3.36	93	9.9e-07	0.29	20	9.6e-07	0.07	93	9.9e-07	0.08	22	7.6e-07	0.03
50	200	0.96	42	9.9e-07	0.26	13	9.2e-07	0.09	42	9.9e-07	0.07	15	5.9e-07	0.03
100	100	1.78	160	1.0e-06	0.55	28	9.0e-07	0.11	160	1.0e-06	0.17	30	8.1e-07	0.04
100	200	4.48	62	9.8e-07	0.43	17	9.2e-07	0.13	62	9.8e-07	0.13	19	7.5e-07	0.05
100	400	9.46	20	9.5e-07	0.28	9	9.1e-07	0.13	20	9.5e-07	0.09	10	9.2e-07	0.05
200	200	22.37	91	1.0e-06	0.81	22	9.2e-07	0.21	91	1.0e-06	0.26	23	1.0e-06	0.07
200	400	45.56	28	9.7e-07	0.50	11	9.9e-07	0.21	28	9.7e-07	0.16	13	8.4e-07	0.08
200	800	99.38	4	1.0e-06	0.16	4	8.6e-07	0.16	4	1.0e-06	0.05	4	9.4e-07	0.05
300	300	100.48	42	9.9e-07	0.69	15	9.3e-07	0.26	42	9.9e-07	0.23	16	9.5e-07	0.09
300	600	194.88	3	9.7e-07	0.11	3	9.4e-07	0.11	3	9.7e-07	0.04	3	9.6e-07	0.04
300	1200	402.16	1	5.4e-07	0.08	1	5.4e-07	0.08	1	5.4e-07	0.03	1	5.4e-07	0.03
$\tau = 0.1$														
50	50	0.84	23	9.5e-07	0.05	9	3.4e-07	0.03	23	9.4e-07	0.02	10	5.4e-07	0.01
50	100	3.41	9	7.7e-07	0.04	5	6.1e-07	0.03	9	7.7e-07	0.02	6	5.1e-07	0.01
50	200	0.95	4	5.3e-07	0.04	3	2.9e-07	0.03	4	5.2e-07	0.01	3	1.0e-06	0.01
100	100	1.80	16	8.6e-07	0.07	8	3.6e-07	0.04	16	8.6e-07	0.02	9	4.1e-07	0.02
100	200	4.48	6	8.3e-07	0.05	4	7.2e-07	0.04	6	8.3e-07	0.02	5	5.2e-07	0.02
100	400	9.40	2	6.4e-07	0.04	2	4.2e-07	0.04	2	6.4e-07	0.02	2	6.4e-07	0.02
200	200	22.25	9	9.4e-07	0.09	6	5.8e-07	0.07	9	9.3e-07	0.03	6	9.4e-07	0.02
200	400	45.61	3	7.9e-07	0.07	3	5.0e-07	0.07	3	7.9e-07	0.02	3	6.9e-07	0.03
200	800	99.77	1	5.0e-07	0.05	1	5.0e-07	0.05	1	5.0e-07	0.02	1	5.0e-07	0.02
300	300	100.37	4	9.9e-07	0.08	4	6.7e-07	0.08	4	9.9e-07	0.03	4	8.4e-07	0.03
300	600	197.72	1	7.0e-07	0.05	1	7.0e-07	0.05	1	7.0e-07	0.02	1	7.0e-07	0.02
300	1200	412.49	1	2.1e-07	0.08	1	2.1e-07	0.08	1	2.1e-07	0.03	1	2.1e-07	0.03

The purpose of this set of tests was not to demonstrate any advantage that our algorithms might have over gradient methods. Rather, they were performed to validate our algorithms and show that the accelerated variants like algorithm Nest can reduce the number of iterations required to solve problems of the form (1.1). This is quite clear from the results reported in Table 5.1. We further note that FaMSA-s often takes one to three fewer iterations than Nest. Note that for some problems, the multiple splitting algorithm took only one iteration to converge. The reason was that for these problems, the number of points was much larger than the dimension of the space. Therefore, the points were very compact and fairly uniformly distributed around the initial point; hence that point was quite likely to be very close to the optimal solution.

5.2. An image deblurring problem. In this section, we report the results of applying our multiple splitting algorithms to a benchmark total variation and wavelet-based image deblurring problem from [12]. In this problem, the original image is the well-known Cameraman image of size 256×256 and the observed image is obtained after imposing a uniform blur of size 9×9 (denoted by the operator A) and Gaussian noise (generated by the function *randn* in MATLAB with a seed of 0 and a standard deviation of 0.56). Since the vector of coefficients of the wavelet transform of the image is sparse in this problem and the total variation norm of the image is expected to be small, one can try to reconstruct the image x from the observed image b by solving the problem:

$$(5.6) \quad \min \quad \alpha \text{TV}(x) + \beta \|\Phi x\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2,$$

where $\text{TV}(x) := \sum_{ij} \sqrt{(x_{i+1,j} - x_{ij})^2 + (x_{ij} - x_{i,j+1})^2}$ is the total variation of x , Φ is the wavelet transform, A denotes the deblurring kernel and $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 0$ are weighting parameters. Problem (5.6) involves minimizing the sum of three convex functions with $f_1(x) = \alpha \text{TV}(x)$, $f_2(x) = \beta \|\Phi x\|_1$ and $f_3(x) = \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2$.

To apply our multiple splitting algorithms to solve (5.6), our theory requires all the functions to be smooth functions. So we needed to smooth the TV and the ℓ_1 functions first. We adopted the following way to smooth the TV function, widely used in the literature for doing this:

$$f_1^\delta(x) := \alpha \sum_{ij} \sqrt{(x_{i+1,j} - x_{ij})^2 + (x_{ij} - x_{i,j+1})^2} + \delta.$$

The ℓ_1 function was smoothed in the way described in Section 4:

$$f_2^\sigma(x) := \beta \max_u \{ \langle \Phi x, u \rangle - \frac{\sigma}{2} \|u\|^2 : \|u\|_\infty \leq 1 \}.$$

Thus, the smooth version of problem (5.6) was:

$$(5.7) \quad \min_x \quad f_1^\delta(x) + f_2^\sigma(x) + f_3(x).$$

However, when we applied our multiple splitting algorithms to (5.7), we actually performed the following computation on the k -th iteration:

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{cases} x^{k+1} & := \arg \min_x f_1(x) + \langle \nabla f_2^\sigma(w^k), x - w^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|x - w^k\|^2 + \langle \nabla f_3(w^k), x - w^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|x - w^k\|^2 \\ y^{k+1} & := \arg \min_y f_2^\sigma(y) + \langle \nabla f_1^\delta(w^k), y - w^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|y - w^k\|^2 + \langle \nabla f_3(w^k), y - w^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|y - w^k\|^2 \\ z^{k+1} & := \arg \min_z f_3(z) + \langle \nabla f_1^\delta(w^k), z - w^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|z - w^k\|^2 + \langle \nabla f_2^\sigma(w^k), z - w^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|z - w^k\|^2 \\ w^{k+1} & := (x^{k+1} + y^{k+1} + z^{k+1})/3. \end{cases}$$

Note that in (5.8), when we linearized the TV function, we used the smoothed TV function $f_1^\delta(\cdot)$, i.e., we computed the gradient of $f_1^\delta(\cdot)$. But when we solved the first subproblem, we used the nonsmooth TV function $f_1(\cdot)$, because there are efficient algorithms for solving this nonsmooth problem. Specifically, this subproblem can be reduced to:

$$x^{k+1} := \arg \min_x \frac{\alpha\mu}{2} \text{TV}(x) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - (w^k - \mu(\nabla f_2^\sigma(w^k) + \nabla f_3(w^k)) / 2)\|^2,$$

which is a standard TV-denoising problem. In our tests, we perform 10 iterations of the algorithm proposed by Chambolle in [5] to approximately solve this problem. The second subproblem in (5.8) can be reduced to:

$$(5.9) \quad y^{k+1} := \arg \min_y \frac{\mu}{2} f_2^\sigma(y) + \frac{1}{2} \|y - (w^k - \mu(\nabla f_1^\delta(w^k) + \nabla f_3(w^k)) / 2)\|^2.$$

It is easy to check that the solution of (5.9) is given by:

$$y^{k+1} := \Phi^\top \left(\Phi \bar{w}^k - \frac{\mu\beta}{2} \tilde{w}^k \right)$$

where $(\bar{w}^k)_j = \max\{-1, \min\{1, \frac{2(\Phi \bar{w}^k)_j}{2\sigma + \beta\mu}\}\}$ and $\bar{w}^k = w^k - \mu(\nabla f_1^\delta(w^k) + \nabla f_3(w^k)) / 2$. The third subproblem in (5.8) corresponds to solving the following linear system:

$$(A^\top A + 2/\mu I)z = A^\top b - \nabla f_1^\delta(w^k) + 2/\mu w^k - \nabla f_2^\delta(w^k).$$

Solving this linear system is easy since the operator A has a special structure and thus $(A^\top A + 2/\mu I)$ can be inverted efficiently.

In our tests, we set $\alpha = 0.001$, $\beta = 0.035$ and used smoothing parameters $\delta = \sigma = 10^{-4}$. The initial points were all set equal to 0. We compared the performance of MSA, FaMSA, FaMSA-s and Grad for different μ and step sizes τ . In these comparisons, we simply terminated the codes after 500 iterations. The objective function value and the improvement signal noise ratio (ISNR) at different iterations are reported in Table 5.2. The ISNR is defined as $ISNR := 10 \log_{10} \frac{\|x-b\|^2}{\|x-\bar{x}\|^2}$, where x is the reconstructed image and \bar{x} is the true image. As we did for F-W problem, we always used $\mu = \tau(K-1)$ and since there were three functions in this problem, we used $\mu = 2\tau$. For large μ , we did not report the results for all of the iterations since the comparisons are quite clear from the selected iterations. See Figure 5.1 for additional and more complete comparisons. We make the following observations from Table 5.2. For $\mu = 0.1$, FaMSA-s achieved the best objective function value in about 200 iterations and 152 CPU seconds. The best ISNR was also achieved by FaMSA-s, in about 300 iterations and 227 seconds. MSA and Grad were not able to obtain an acceptable solution in 500 iterations. In fact, they were only able to reduce the objective function to twice the near-optimal value of 3.86×10^4 achieved by FaMSA-s. For $\mu = 0.5$, FaMSA-s achieved the best objective function value and ISNR in 100 iterations and 76 seconds and 125 iterations and 94 seconds, respectively. Again, MSA and Grad did not achieve acceptable results even after 500 iterations. For $\mu = 1$, MSA achieved the best objective function value, 3.73×10^4 , after 500 iterations and 349 CPU seconds, while the best ISNR was achieved by FaMSA-s in 80 iterations and 61 seconds. Also, the best objective function value achieved by FaMSA-s was at the 60-th iteration after only 47 CPU seconds. We also note that for $\mu = 0.1, 0.5$ and 1, MSA was always better than Grad and FaMSA-s was always slightly better than FaMSA. Another observation was that MSA always decreased the objective function value for $\mu = 0.1, 0.5$ and 1,

while FaMSA and FaMSA-s always achieved near-optimal results in a relatively small number of iterations and then started getting worse. However, in practice, one would always terminate FaMSA and FaMSA-s once the objective function value started increasing. For $\mu = 5$, MSA gave very good results while the other three solvers diverged immediately. Specifically, the best objective function value 3.73×10^4 was achieved by MSA in 120 iterations and 80 CPU seconds, and the best ISNR was achieved by MSA in 200 iterations and 132 CPU seconds. Thus, based on these observations, we conclude that FaMSA-s attains a nearly optimal solution very quickly for small μ while MSA is more stable for large μ .

We also plotted some figures to graphically illustrate the performance of these solvers. Figures (a), (b) and (c) in Figure 5.1 plot the objective function value versus the iteration number for $\mu = 0.1, 0.5$ and 1, respectively. Figures (d), (e) and (f) in Figure 5.1 plot ISNR versus the iteration number for $\mu = 0.1, 0.5$ and 1. We did not plot graphs for $\mu = 5$, since FaMSA, FaMSA-s and Grad diverged from the very first iteration. From Figure 5.1 we can see the comparisons clearly. Basically, these figures show that FaMSA and FaMSA-s achieve a nearly optimal solution very quickly. We can also see from (b), (c), (e) and (f) that FaMSA-s is always slightly better than FaMSA and MSA is always better than Grad.

We also tested setting $D^{(k)}$ to the identity matrix in MSA and FaMSA, but this choice, as expected, did not give as good results.

To see how MSA performed for the deblurring problem (5.7), we show the original (a), blurred (b) and reconstructed (c) cameraman images in Figure 5.2. The reconstructed image (c) is the one that was obtained by applying MSA with $\mu = 5$ after 200 iterations. The ISNR of the reconstructed image is 5.3182. From Figure 5.2 we see that MSA was able to recover the blurred image very well.

6. Conclusions. In this paper, we proposed two classes of multiple splitting algorithms based on alternating directions and optimal gradient techniques for minimizing the sum of K convex functions. Complexity bounds on the number of iterations required to obtain an ϵ -optimal solution for these algorithms were derived. Our algorithms are all parallelizable, which is attractive for practical applications involving large-scale optimization problems.

Acknowledgement. We would like to thank the anonymous referee for making several very helpful suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. AFONSO, J. BIOUCAS-DIAS, AND M. FIGUEIREDO, *Fast image recovery using variable splitting and constrained optimization*, IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 19 (2010), pp. 2345–2356.
- [2] A. BECK AND M. TEOULLE, *A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems*, SIAM J. Imaging Sciences, 2 (2009), pp. 183–202.
- [3] D. P. BERTSEKAS, *Nonlinear Programming, 2nd Ed*, Athena Scientific, Belmont, Massachusetts, 1999.
- [4] E. J. CANDÈS, J. ROMBERG, AND T. TAO, *Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 52 (2006), pp. 489–509.
- [5] A. CHAMBOLLE, *An algorithm for total variation minimization and applications*, Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision, 20 (2004), pp. 89–97.
- [6] P. L. COMBETTES, *Solving monotone inclusions via compositions of nonexpansive averaged operators*, Optimization, 53 (2004), pp. 475–504.
- [7] P. L. COMBETTES AND JEAN-CHRISTOPHE PESQUET, *A Douglas-Rachford splitting approach to nonsmooth convex variational signal recovery*, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing, 1 (2007), pp. 564–574.
- [8] D. DONOHO, *Compressed sensing*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 52 (2006), pp. 1289–1306.
- [9] J. DOUGLAS AND H. H. RACHFORD, *On the numerical solution of the heat conduction problem in 2 and 3 space variables*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 82 (1956), pp. 421–439.




FIG. 5.1. Comparison of MSA, FaMSA-s and Grad for different μ .

- [10] J. ECKSTEIN AND D. P. BERTSEKAS, *On the Douglas-Rachford splitting method and the proximal point algorithm for maximal monotone operators*, Math. Program., 55 (1992), pp. 293–318.
- [11] J. ECKSTEIN AND B. F. SVAITER, *General projective splitting methods for sums of maximal monotone operators*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 48 (2009), pp. 787–811.
- [12] M. FIGUEIREDO AND R. NOWAK, *An EM algorithm for wavelet-based image restoration*, IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 12 (2003), pp. 906–916.
- [13] D. GABAY, *Applications of the method of multipliers to variational inequalities*, in Augmented Lagrangian Methods: Applications to the Solution of Boundary Value Problems, M. Fortin and R. Glowinski, eds., North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1983.



FIG. 5.2. Using MSA to solve (5.7). (a): Original image; (b): Blurred image; (c): Reconstructed image by MSA

- [14] D. GABAY AND B. MERCIER, *A dual algorithm for the solution of nonlinear variational problems via finite-element approximations*, *Comp. Math. Appl.*, 2 (1976), pp. 17–40.
- [15] R. GLOWINSKI AND P. LE TALLEC, *Augmented Lagrangian and Operator-Splitting Methods in Nonlinear Mechanics*, SIAM, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1989.
- [16] D. GOLDFARB, S. MA, AND K. SCHEINBERG, *Fast alternating linearization methods for minimizing the sum of two convex functions*, tech. report, Department of IEOR, Columbia University. Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.4571>, 2010.
- [17] E. T. HALE, W. YIN, AND Y. ZHANG, *Fixed-point continuation for ℓ_1 -minimization: Methodology and convergence*, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19 (2008), pp. 1107–1130.
- [18] K. C. KIWIEL, C. H. ROSA, AND A. RUSZCZYNSKI, *Proximal decomposition via alternating linearization*, *SIAM J. Optimization*, 9 (1999), pp. 668–689.
- [19] S. MA, D. GOLDFARB, AND L. CHEN, *Fixed point and Bregman iterative methods for matrix rank minimization*, To appear in *Mathematical Programming Series A*, (2009).
- [20] S. MA, W. YIN, Y. ZHANG, AND A. CHAKRABORTY, *An efficient algorithm for compressed MR imaging using total variation and wavelets*, *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, (2008), pp. 1–8.
- [21] MOSEK APS INC., *The Mosek optimization tools, ver 6.*, 2009.
- [22] Y. E. NESTEROV, *A method for unconstrained convex minimization problem with the rate of convergence $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$* , *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 269 (1983), pp. 543–547.
- [23] ———, *Introductory lectures on convex optimization*, 87 (2004), pp. xviii+236. A basic course.
- [24] ———, *Smooth minimization for non-smooth functions*, *Math. Program. Ser. A*, 103 (2005), pp. 127–152.
- [25] ———, *Gradient methods for minimizing composite objective function*, *CORE Discussion Paper 2007/76*, (2007).
- [26] D. H. PEACEMAN AND H. H. RACHFORD, *The numerical solution of parabolic elliptic differential equations*, *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 3 (1955), pp. 28–41.
- [27] J. E. SPINGARN, *Partial inverse of a monotone operator*, *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 10 (1983), pp. 247–265.
- [28] A. N. TIKHONOV AND V. Y. ARSEININ, *Solutions of ill-posed problems*, Winston, New York, 1977.
- [29] P. TSENG, *A modified forward-backward splitting method for maximal monotone mappings*, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 38 (2000), pp. 431–446.
- [30] ———, *On accelerated proximal gradient methods for convex-concave optimization*, submitted to *SIAM J. Optim.*, (2008).

TABLE 5.2
Comparison of MSA, FaMSA, FaMSA-s and Grad on solving TV-deblurring problem

Iter	MSA		FaMSA		FaMSA-s		Grad	
	obj	ISNR	obj	ISNR	obj	ISNR	obj	ISNR
$\mu = 0.1, \tau = 0.05$								
100	3.42e+005	0.9311	4.67e+004	3.6310	4.66e+004	3.6332	3.36e+005	0.9344
200	1.55e+005	1.5340	3.89e+004	4.9693	3.86e+004	4.9821	1.55e+005	1.5341
300	1.13e+005	1.9057	3.98e+004	5.2695	3.94e+004	5.2989	1.13e+005	1.9043
400	9.25e+004	2.1905	4.30e+004	4.6587	4.26e+004	4.7075	9.28e+004	2.1871
500	7.97e+004	2.4235	4.76e+004	3.3881	4.70e+004	3.4500	8.02e+004	2.4175
$\mu = 0.5, \tau = 0.25$								
25	2.41e+005	1.1343	7.70e+004	2.4777	7.69e+004	2.4784	2.36e+005	1.1408
50	1.29e+005	1.7359	4.31e+004	3.9343	4.28e+004	3.9416	1.29e+005	1.7376
75	9.66e+004	2.1260	3.92e+004	4.7122	3.88e+004	4.7324	9.67e+004	2.1250
100	7.96e+004	2.4243	3.90e+004	5.1257	3.84e+004	5.1638	8.00e+004	2.4198
125	6.92e+004	2.6659	3.97e+004	5.2558	3.90e+004	5.3160	6.98e+004	2.6569
150	6.21e+004	2.8682	4.12e+004	5.0880	4.04e+004	5.1737	6.30e+004	2.8538
175	5.71e+004	3.0416	4.33e+004	4.6478	4.23e+004	4.7576	5.82e+004	3.0207
200	5.34e+004	3.1928	4.58e+004	3.9964	4.46e+004	4.1258	5.48e+004	3.1646
225	5.06e+004	3.3266	4.86e+004	3.2006	4.73e+004	3.3442	5.22e+004	3.2902
250	4.85e+004	3.4463	5.18e+004	2.3223	5.03e+004	2.4758	5.03e+004	3.4009
275	4.67e+004	3.5545	5.54e+004	1.4132	5.37e+004	1.5723	4.88e+004	3.4991
300	4.54e+004	3.6529	5.93e+004	0.5078	5.74e+004	0.6705	4.76e+004	3.5869
500	3.99e+004	4.2186	9.74e+004	-5.2730	9.43e+004	-5.1193	4.38e+004	4.0416
$\mu = 1, \tau = 0.5$								
20	1.53e+005	1.5382	6.35e+004	2.7991	6.33e+004	2.8006	1.51e+005	1.5443
40	9.23e+004	2.1927	4.10e+004	4.2214	4.05e+004	4.2361	9.22e+004	2.1932
60	7.09e+004	2.6220	3.91e+004	4.9205	3.84e+004	4.9591	7.13e+004	2.6158
80	5.99e+004	2.9413	3.96e+004	5.2175	3.86e+004	5.2890	6.08e+004	2.9258
100	5.34e+004	3.1933	4.10e+004	5.1371	3.98e+004	5.2488	5.47e+004	3.1664
120	4.93e+004	3.4003	4.33e+004	4.6922	4.19e+004	4.8439	5.10e+004	3.3597
140	4.64e+004	3.5751	4.62e+004	3.9649	4.45e+004	4.1489	4.85e+004	3.5186
160	4.44e+004	3.7258	4.94e+004	3.0524	4.75e+004	3.2595	4.68e+004	3.6515
180	4.29e+004	3.8578	5.32e+004	2.0449	5.10e+004	2.2668	4.57e+004	3.7637
200	4.18e+004	3.9748	5.74e+004	1.0116	5.50e+004	1.2419	4.49e+004	3.8592
220	4.09e+004	4.0795	6.20e+004	-0.0045	5.93e+004	0.2311	4.44e+004	3.9407
240	4.02e+004	4.1741	6.70e+004	-0.9780	6.41e+004	-0.7394	4.40e+004	4.0103
260	3.96e+004	4.2602	7.22e+004	-1.8951	6.90e+004	-1.6561	4.37e+004	4.0695
280	3.92e+004	4.3388	7.77e+004	-2.7506	7.43e+004	-2.5136	4.36e+004	4.1197
300	3.88e+004	4.4111	8.34e+004	-3.5436	7.97e+004	-3.3102	4.35e+004	4.1620
500	3.73e+004	4.9042	1.35e+005	-8.5246	1.29e+005	-8.3127	4.47e+004	4.2742
$\mu = 5, \tau = 2.5$								
20	2.54e+007	-2.7911	1.10e+023	-157.9048	8.53e+018	-116.7985	5.63e+015	-84.9895
40	4.91e+005	3.7130	1.37e+040	-328.8532	8.05e+031	-246.5444	6.03e+022	-155.2917
60	4.69e+004	4.4065	3.59e+057	-503.0389	1.68e+045	-379.7479	6.55e+029	-225.6465
80	3.80e+004	4.6991	1.29e+075	-678.5934	4.93e+058	-514.4122	7.15e+036	-296.0278
100	3.74e+004	4.9027	5.53e+092	-854.9100	1.74e+072	-649.8897	7.84e+043	-366.4253
120	3.73e+004	5.0513	2.65e+110	-1031.7135	6.92e+085	-785.8864	8.61e+050	-436.8334
140	3.73e+004	5.1600	1.37e+128	-1208.8552	2.99e+099	-922.2437	9.47e+057	-507.2490
160	3.74e+004	5.2373	7.52e+145	-1386.2455	1.37e+113	-1058.8660	1.04e+065	-577.6699
180	3.76e+004	5.2888	4.31e+163	-1563.8262	6.62e+126	-1195.6913	1.15e+072	-648.0947
200	3.78e+004	5.3182	2.55e+181	-1741.5574	3.31e+140	-1332.6769	1.27e+079	-718.5224
500	4.27e+004	4.4523	Inf	-Inf	Inf	-Inf	5.70e+184	-1775.0426