

Heuristic Parameter Choice Rules for Tikhonov Regularisation with Weakly Bounded Noise

Stefan Kindermann*, Kemal Raik*

April 5, 2021

Abstract

We study the choice of the regularisation parameter for linear ill-posed problems in the presence of noise that is possibly unbounded but only finite in a weaker norm, and when the noise-level is unknown. For this task, we analyse several heuristic parameter choice rules, such as the quasi-optimality, heuristic discrepancy, and Hanke-Raus rules and adapt the latter two to the weakly bounded noise case. We prove convergence and convergence rates under certain noise conditions. Moreover, we analyse and provide conditions for the convergence of the parameter choice by the generalised cross-validation and predictive mean-square error rules.

1 Introduction

Let X and Y be Hilbert spaces and $T : X \rightarrow Y$ be a compact linear operator. We consider the ill-posed problem

$$Tx = y, \quad (1)$$

in which T may have a nontrivial kernel and where we do not know y exactly, but only noisy data $y^\delta = y + e$ are available. In contrast to the standard setting, the main focus of this paper concerns the case of possibly unbounded noise, i.e., $\delta := \|e\|$ is possibly infinite. The latter may occur, for instance, in the case where we have *white noise* and Y is the space of square summable sequences. It may be, however, that the noise is *weakly bounded* (cf. [3, 4, 12, 14, 15]), which we define as being whenever

$$\eta := \|(TT^*)^p(y^\delta - y)\| < \infty, \quad \text{for some } p \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]. \quad (2)$$

The aforementioned references, besides [4], are restricted to the particular case in which $p = \frac{1}{2}$. Since T is compact and $\dim \mathcal{R}(T) = \infty$, it follows that $\mathcal{R}(T)$ is non-closed, which implies that the generalised inverse (see, e.g., [16]) T^\dagger is an unbounded operator. We therefore introduce regularisation. We opt to employ *Tikhonov regularisation* (cf. [18]) in which the regularised solution is given by

$$x_\alpha^\delta := (T^*T + \alpha I)^{-1}T^*y^\delta.$$

We also denote x_α as the regularised solution with exact data. Note that by (2) and $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$, x_α^δ is well-defined. Furthermore, we shall assume henceforth that $y \in \mathcal{D}(T^\dagger)$. Then, in the case that y

*Industrial Mathematics Institute, Johannes Kepler University Linz, Altenbergerstraße 69, 4040, Linz, Austria. (kindermann@indmath.uni-linz.ac.at & kemal.raik@indmath.uni-linz.ac.at). This work was supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) project P 30157-N31.

is non-attainable, i.e. $y \notin \mathcal{R}(T)$, we may reduce to the attainable case by considering $Tx = Qy$ where $Q : Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}$ is an orthogonal projection (cf. [5]).

Our central aim is to approximate the *best approximate solution* $x^\dagger = T^\dagger y$, such that $x_{\alpha_*}^\delta$ converges to x^\dagger in the weakly bounded noise case, i.e., as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ for an appropriately selected α_* .

In the current setting, (cf. [3, 4, 14]) the balancing principle or modified discrepancy rules were suggested for the parameter choice. Note that these are a-posteriori rules which require knowledge of the noise level. In practical situations, such information is not normally available and this motivates the need for so-called *heuristic parameter choice rules* in which the parameter is selected as the minimiser of a functional $\psi : (0, \|T\|^2) \times Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, i.e.,

$$\alpha_* := \operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)} \psi(\alpha, y^\delta),$$

which requires no knowledge of η . The main objective of this paper is the analysis of heuristic parameter choice rules in the weakly bounded noise (aka large noise) case.

The functionals ψ in this article may also be represented in terms of spectral theory:

$$\psi^2(\alpha, y^\delta) = \int_0^{\|T\|^2} \Psi_\alpha(\lambda) d\|F_\lambda y^\delta\|^2,$$

where $\Psi_\alpha : (0, \|T\|^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a spectral filter function and $\{F_\lambda\}_\lambda$ denotes the spectral family of TT^* . For later reference we also define $\{E_\lambda\}_\lambda$ to be the spectral family of T^*T .

Note that in the following, C will denote an arbitrary positive constant which need not be universally equal.

The paper is organised as follows: in the proceeding section, we study and extend the classical heuristic parameter choice rules, namely, the quasi-optimality, heuristic discrepancy, and Hanke-Raus rules. We establish convergence rates under noise conditions similar to the strongly bounded noise case [9, 10]. In Section 3, we investigate known statistical rules in a deterministic framework, in particular, the generalised cross-validation rule. Since this is only defined in a discrete setting, we first analyse an infinite-dimensional variant, i.e., the predictive mean-square error method.

2 Heuristic Parameter Choice Rules

The standard method of approach to prove convergence rates for heuristic parameter choice rules is to estimate the data error from above by $\psi(\alpha, y - y^\delta)$ for which we also attain an estimate from above. One also estimates $\psi(\alpha, y)$ from above. If α_* is the minimiser of $\psi(\alpha, y^\delta)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| &\leq \|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x_{\alpha_*}\| + \|x_{\alpha_*} - x^\dagger\| = \mathcal{O}(\psi(\alpha_*, y - y^\delta) + \|x_{\alpha_*} - x^\dagger\|) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\psi(\alpha, y^\delta) + \psi(\alpha_*, y) + \|x_{\alpha_*} - x^\dagger\|), \end{aligned}$$

from which the derivation of the rates is quite standard.

Specifically, in this paper, we consider heuristic rules based on the following ψ -functionals:

- The quasi-optimality functional (cf. [18])

$$\psi_{\text{QO}}(\alpha, y^\delta) := \alpha \left\| \frac{d}{d\alpha} x_\alpha^\delta \right\|, \tag{3}$$

with

$$\Psi_{\alpha, \text{QO}}(\lambda) = \frac{\alpha^2 \lambda}{(\lambda + \alpha)^4}.$$

- The modified heuristic discrepancy functional (cf. [7])

$$\psi_{\text{HD}}(\alpha, y^\delta) := \frac{1}{\alpha^{q+\frac{1}{2}}} \|(TT^*)^q(Tx_\alpha^\delta - y^\delta)\|, \quad \text{where } q \geq p,$$

with

$$\Psi_{\alpha, \text{HD}}(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^{2q}\alpha}{\alpha^{2q}(\lambda + \alpha)^2}.$$

- The modified Hanke-Raus functional (cf. [7])

$$\psi_{\text{HR}}(\alpha, y^\delta) := \frac{1}{\alpha^{q+\frac{1}{2}}} \left\langle (TT^*)^q(Tx_{\alpha,2}^\delta - y^\delta), (TT^*)^q(Tx_\alpha^\delta - y^\delta) \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \text{where } q \geq p.$$

where $x_{\alpha,2}^\delta := (T^*T + \alpha I)^{-1}(T^*y^\delta + \alpha x_\alpha^\delta)$ is the second iterated Tikhonov solution, with

$$\Psi_{\alpha, \text{HR}}(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^{2q}\alpha^2}{\alpha^{2q}(\lambda + \alpha)^3}.$$

Note that our definitions of the heuristic discrepancy and Hanke-Raus functionals are generalisations of the usual ones. The usual functionals are obtained for the special case $q = 0$. The reason for this modification is that in the setting of weakly bounded noise, the discrepancy is possibly unbounded, and hence, the standard functionals need not be bounded either. Therefore, by introducing the operator $(TT^*)^q$, the functionals become finite if q is chosen larger than p . This is a simple exercise to prove. Note that the quasi-optimality functional does not require any modification.

The drawback of heuristic parameter choice rules comes in the form of the so-called Bakushinskii veto, which states that choosing the parameter heuristically cannot lead to a convergent regularisation method in the worst case (cf. [1]). In spite of this, heuristic rules are still very often used with great success in practice. Motivated by this, it was shown that if one does not consider the worst case, heuristic rules may lead to convergent regularisation methods. In particular, in [9, 10], additional noise conditions were postulated in order to estimate the data error as

$$\|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\| \leq C\psi(\alpha, y - y^\delta), \quad (4)$$

from which we can prove convergence of the method. As we will show in the subsequent sections (and as was proven for the bounded noise case in [9, 10]), the estimate (4) is obtained for the mentioned rules whenever we impose a noise condition $y - y^\delta \in \mathcal{N}_\nu$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{N}_\nu := \left\{ e \in Y : \alpha^{\nu+1} \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \lambda^{-1} d\|F_\lambda e\|^2 \leq C \int_0^\alpha \lambda^\nu d\|F_\lambda e\|^2 \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where $\nu = 1$ for $\psi = \psi_{\text{QO}}$ and $\nu = 2q$ for $\psi \in \{\psi_{\text{HD}}, \psi_{\text{HR}}\}$.

Let us state some simple examples, where a noise condition (5) holds, and, in particular, convince the reader that the assumption of weakly bounded noise is compatible with condition (5). Note that in the classical situation of (strongly) bounded noise, it has been verified that (5) is satisfied in typical situations [10]. Moreover, for coloured Gaussian noise, (5) holds almost surely [11].

Suppose that TT^* has eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i\}$ with polynomial decay, and we assume a certain polynomial decay or growth of the noise $e = y^\delta - y$ with respect to the eigenfunctions of TT^* , denoted by $\{u_i\}$:

$$\lambda_i = \frac{1}{i^\gamma}, \quad \gamma > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad |\langle y^\delta - y, u_i \rangle|^2 = \tau \frac{1}{i^\beta} \quad \beta \in \mathbb{R}, \tau > 0. \quad (6)$$

Then

$$\|y^\delta - y\|^2 = \tau \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^\beta}, \quad \eta^2 = \|(TT^*)^p y^\delta - y\|^2 = \tau \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^{\beta+2p\gamma}}.$$

If we consider the case of unbounded, but weakly bounded noise, i.e., $\|y^\delta - y\|^2 = \infty$ but $\eta < \infty$, the exponents β, p should thus satisfy

$$\beta \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta + 2p\gamma > 1, \quad \text{thus,} \quad \beta \in (1 - 2p\gamma, 1].$$

The inequality in (5) can then be written as

$$\tau \alpha^{\nu+1} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}} i^{\gamma-\beta} = \alpha^{\nu+1} \sum_{\lambda_i \geq \alpha} \frac{1}{\lambda_i} |\langle y^\delta - y, u_i \rangle|^2 \leq C \sum_{\lambda_i \leq \alpha} \lambda_i^\nu |\langle y^\delta - y, u_i \rangle|^2 = C\tau \sum_{i \geq \alpha^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}} \frac{1}{i^{\gamma\nu+\beta}}.$$

Defining $N_* = \alpha^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}$, we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}} i^{\gamma-\beta} \leq \int_1^{N_*} x^{\gamma-\beta} dx \leq C \begin{cases} N_*^{\gamma-\beta+1} & \text{if } \gamma - \beta > -1, \\ 1 & \text{if } \gamma - \beta < -1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sum_{i \geq \alpha^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}} \frac{1}{i^{\gamma\nu+\beta}} \sim \int_{N_*}^{\infty} \frac{1}{x^{\gamma\nu+\beta}} dx \sim \begin{cases} \frac{C}{N_*^{\gamma\nu+\beta-1}} & \text{if } \gamma\nu + \beta > 1, \\ \infty & \text{if } \gamma\nu + \beta \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Since $\alpha = N_*^{-\gamma}$, we arrive at the sufficient inequality

$$N_*^{-\gamma(\nu+1)+1+\gamma-\beta} \leq CN_*^{1-\gamma\nu-\beta},$$

in the case that $\gamma - \beta > -1$ and $\gamma\nu + \beta > 1$. Since the exponents match, the noise condition is then satisfied. If $\gamma\nu + \beta \leq 1$, then the inequality is clearly satisfied because of the divergent right-hand side. Thus, the noise condition holds for

$$\beta < \gamma + 1.$$

Roughly speaking, this means that the noise should not be too regular (relative to the smoothing of the operator). In particular, the deterministic model of white noise, where $\beta = 0$ (no decay) satisfies a noise condition if the operator is smoothing. Most importantly, the assumption of a noise condition (5) is compatible with a weakly bounded noise situation.

In the latter sections, we also consider the predictive mean-square error (PMS) functional [13, 19]

$$\psi_{\text{PMS}}(\alpha, y^\delta) := \|Tx_\alpha^\delta - y\|.$$

This is not an implementable parameter choice rule per se as it involves the (unknown) exact data y . The reason for opting to study this functional is its relation to the generalised cross-validation functional, which is one of our main aims. For ill-conditioned problems $T_n x = y_n$, where $T_n : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, the generalised cross-validation (GCV) functional [19] is given by

$$\psi_{\text{GCV}}(\alpha, y_n^\delta) := \frac{1}{\rho(\alpha)} \|T_n x_\alpha^\delta - y_n^\delta\|,$$

with $\rho(\alpha) := \frac{\alpha}{n} \text{tr} \{(T_n T_n^* + \alpha I_n)^{-1}\}$. Its relation to ψ_{PMS} is that for i.i.d. noise, the expected value of $\psi_{\text{GCV}}^2(\alpha, y_n^\delta) - \|e\|^2$ is an estimator for the expected value of the predictive mean-square error functional squared, as has been shown by Wahba [19]. For numerical treatment of the GCV method, see, e.g., [6].

Convergence analysis The convergence analysis of regularisation methods with standard (non-heuristic) parameter choice rules in the weakly bounded noise setting is well established: for instance, in the present setting, one can easily show, as in [3], that

$$\|x_\alpha^\delta - x^\dagger\| \rightarrow 0,$$

if one chooses α_* such that $\alpha_* \rightarrow 0$ and $\eta^{2+p}/\alpha_* \rightarrow 0$ as $\eta \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, even in the presence of large noise, one may obtain a convergent regularisation method.

We are also interested in deriving rates of convergence. To this end, we assume throughout that the best approximate solution $x^\dagger \in X$ satisfies the source condition:

$$x^\dagger \in \mathcal{R}((T^*T)^\mu) \iff x^\dagger = (T^*T)^\mu \omega, \quad \|\omega\| < \infty, \quad 0 \leq \mu \leq 1, \quad (7)$$

which one can think of as a kind of *smoothness* condition on the solution.

The following error estimates are courtesy of [4] (cf. also [3, 14]):

Proposition 1. *Let x^\dagger satisfy (7). Then*

$$\|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\| \leq C \frac{\eta}{\alpha^{p+\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \|x_\alpha - x^\dagger\| \leq C \alpha^\mu, \quad \mu \leq 1, \quad (8)$$

$$\|T(x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha)\| \leq C \frac{\eta}{\alpha^p}, \quad \|Tx_\alpha - y\| \leq C \alpha^{\mu+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \mu \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (9)$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$.

This proposition also illustrates the fact that convergence rates for Tikhonov regularisation do not improve for $\mu \geq 1$, which is the well-known saturation effect (cf. [5]). This is also the reason why we do not assume a source condition in (7) with $\mu > 1$.

We now consider an a-priori parameter choice yielding a so-called optimal (order) rate. Thereafter, we will utilise this a-priori parameter choice strategy to deduce convergence rates with respect to the heuristic parameter choice rules. In particular, if x^\dagger satisfies the source condition (7), then using the estimates of the previous proposition, one can estimate the total error as

$$\|x_\alpha^\delta - x^\dagger\| \leq C \alpha^\mu + C \frac{\eta}{\alpha^{p+\frac{1}{2}}} = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1}}), \quad (10)$$

which follows by taking the infimum over all α . In particular, one obtains that

$$\alpha_{\text{opt}} \sim \eta^{\frac{2}{2\mu+2p+1}},$$

is the so-called optimal (order) parameter choice.

For the following analysis, we state a standard estimate for spectral filter functions: for $t \geq 0$, there is a constant C such that for all nonnegative α, λ

$$\frac{\lambda^t}{(\alpha + \lambda)} \leq C \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha^{1-t}} & 0 \leq t \leq 1 \\ 1 & t \geq 1 \end{cases} = \frac{C}{\alpha^{\max\{1-t, 0\}}}. \quad (11)$$

2.1 The Quasi-Optimality Rule

Following [10], we show some upper and lower bounds for the quasi-optimality functional, which subsequently allow us to derive convergence rates.

Proposition 2. *For all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$, one has*

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{QO}(\alpha, y - y^\delta) &\leq \|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\|, \\ \psi_{QO}(\alpha, y) &\leq \|x_\alpha - x^\dagger\|.\end{aligned}$$

We omit the proof, but one may find it in [10].

Next, by assuming a noise condition, we verify the essential lower bound for the data-error part of the quasi-optimality functional:

Lemma 1. *Let $y - y^\delta \in \mathcal{N}_1$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\psi_{QO}(\alpha, y - y^\delta) \geq C \|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\|,$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$.

Proof. For all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{QO}^2(\alpha, y - y^\delta) &= \int_0^{\|T\|^2} \frac{\lambda \alpha^2}{(\lambda + \alpha)^4} d\|F_\lambda(y - y^\delta)\|^2 \geq C \int_0^\alpha \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda + \alpha)^2} d\|F_\lambda(y - y^\delta)\|^2 \\ &\geq C \int_0^\alpha \frac{\lambda}{\alpha^2} d\|F_\lambda(y - y^\delta)\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{\alpha^2} C \int_0^\alpha \lambda d\|F_\lambda(y - y^\delta)\|^2 \geq \alpha^2 \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \lambda^{-1} d\|F_\lambda(y - y^\delta)\|^2,\end{aligned}$$

where we introduced the noise condition (5) for $\nu = 1$ in the penultimate inequality. From this,

$$\frac{\lambda}{(\lambda + \alpha)^2} \leq C \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\lambda} & \text{if } \lambda \geq \alpha, \\ \frac{\alpha^2 \lambda}{(\lambda + \alpha)^4} & \text{if } \lambda \leq \alpha, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\|^2 = \int_0^\alpha \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda + \alpha)^2} d\|F_\lambda(y - y^\delta)\|^2 + \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda + \alpha)^2} d\|F_\lambda(y - y^\delta)\|^2,$$

the result follows. \square

Thus, with the above estimates, we may now state the convergence rate of the total error with respect to the regularised solution and the parameter chosen according to the quasi-optimality rule:

Theorem 1. *Let $y - y^\delta \in \mathcal{N}_1$, $T^*y \neq 0$, x^\dagger satisfy (7), and let α_* be the parameter selected according to the quasi-optimality rule. Then we obtain*

$$\|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1}\mu}),$$

for η sufficiently small.

Proof. From Proposition 2, the definition of α_* and the triangle inequality, it follows, with $\alpha = \frac{2}{\eta^{2\mu+2p+1}}$, that

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{\text{QO}}^2(\alpha_*, y^\delta) &\leq \psi_{\text{QO}}^2(\alpha, y^\delta) \leq \left(\psi_{\text{QO}}(\alpha, y^\delta - y) + \psi_{\text{QO}}(\alpha, y) \right)^2 \\ &\leq 2\|x_\alpha - x^\dagger\|^2 + 2\|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\|^2 \leq C\alpha^{2\mu} + C\frac{\eta^2}{\alpha^{2p+1}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\left[\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1}}\right]^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

By the triangle inequality and Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| &\leq \|x_{\alpha_*} - x^\dagger\| + \|x_{\alpha_*} - x_{\alpha_*}^\delta\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\|x_{\alpha_*} - x^\dagger\| + \psi_{\text{QO}}(\alpha_*, y - y^\delta)\right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(\|x_{\alpha_*} - x^\dagger\| + \psi_{\text{QO}}(\alpha_*, y^\delta) + \psi_{\text{QO}}(\alpha_*, y)\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_*^\mu + \left[\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1}}\right]^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{\text{QO}}^2(\alpha, y^\delta) &\geq \alpha^2 \int_0^{\|T\|^2} \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda + \|T\|^2)^4} d\|F_\lambda y^\delta\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{(2\|T\|^2)^4} \int_0^{\|T\|^2} \lambda d\|F_\lambda y^\delta\|^2 \\ &\geq \alpha^2 \frac{1}{(2\|T\|^2)^4} \left(\|T^*y\| - \|TT^*\|^{\frac{1}{2}-p}\eta\right)^2 \geq C\alpha^2,\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$ and η sufficiently small. Hence for $\alpha = \alpha_*$, it follows that $\alpha_* \leq C\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1}}$. Therefore, we may deduce that

$$\|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1}\mu}\right),$$

for η sufficiently small, which is what we wanted to show. \square

One may notice that the above convergence rates are optimal for the saturation case $\mu = 1$, but they are only suboptimal for $\mu < 1$ (similarly as in [9]). We may, however, impose an additional condition in order to achieve an optimal convergence rate. More specifically, we impose the following *regularity condition* on the best approximate solution, $x^\dagger \in X$:

$$\alpha^2 \int_\alpha^\infty \lambda^{-2} d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2 \geq C \int_0^\alpha d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2.\tag{13}$$

This condition was also used in [9, 10] where it was shown that it is often satisfied.

Theorem 2. *In addition to the assumptions of Theorem 1, let the regularity condition (13) hold. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| \leq C \inf_{\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)} \left(\|x_\alpha - x^\dagger\| + \|x_\alpha - x_\alpha^\delta\| \right),$$

which yields the optimal convergence rate.

Proof. Recall that $C\|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\| \leq \psi_{\text{QO}}(\alpha, y - y^\delta) \leq \|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\|$ and the regularity condition (13) imply cf. [9] that $C\|x_\alpha - x^\dagger\| \leq \psi_{\text{QO}}(\alpha, y) \leq C\|x_\alpha - x^\dagger\|$, from which the theorem follows similar to [9]. \square

In essence, the stated theorems are completely analogous to the bounded noise case [9]. Thus, all the known results for the quasi-optimality principle extend to the weakly-bounded noise case. For advanced numerical implementations of this method, see [17].

2.2 The Modified Heuristic Discrepancy Rule

Now we prove convergence rates for the modified heuristic discrepancy rule in a similar way by proving estimates for the functional acting on the noise and exact data. Note that this method is sometimes confusingly also referred to as the Hanke-Raus rule (as both rules agree for Landweber iteration). For clarity, it is preferable to name this method as the heuristic analogue of the classical discrepancy rule.

The upper bounds for the functional are straightforward to derive:

Proposition 3. *For $p \leq q \leq 1 + p$, we have*

$$\psi_{HD}(\alpha, y^\delta - y) \leq C \frac{\eta}{\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}+p}}, \quad (14)$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$. Let x^\dagger satisfy (7) and suppose $q \leq \frac{1}{2} - \mu$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\psi_{HD}(\alpha, y) \leq C\alpha^\mu. \quad (15)$$

Proof. This follows easily from the spectral representation and the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda^{2q}}{\alpha^{1+2q}} \frac{\alpha^2}{(\lambda + \alpha)^2} &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha^{2q-1}} \frac{\lambda^{2(q-q)}}{(\lambda + \alpha)^2} \lambda^{2p} \leq C \frac{1}{\alpha^{2q-1+2 \max\{1-(q-p), 0\}}} \lambda^{2p} \\ &= C \frac{1}{\alpha^{\max\{2p+1, 2q-1\}}} \lambda^{2p}. \end{aligned}$$

The second result follows from

$$\frac{\lambda^{2q}}{\alpha^{1+2q}} \frac{\alpha^2}{(\lambda + \alpha)^2} \lambda^{1+2\mu} \leq C \frac{1}{\alpha^{2q-1}} \frac{1}{\alpha^{2 \max\{1-\frac{1}{2}-\mu-q, 0\}}} = C \frac{1}{\alpha^{\max\{-2\mu, 2q-1\}}} = C\alpha^{\min\{2\mu, 1-2q\}}.$$

□

Proposition 4. *Let $q \leq \frac{1}{2}$. If $Q(y - y^\delta) \in \mathcal{N}_{2q}$, then*

$$\psi_{HD}(\alpha, y - y^\delta) \geq \|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\|, \quad (16)$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$.

Proof. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{HD}^2(\alpha, y - y^\delta) &= \frac{1}{\alpha^{2q+1}} \int_0^{\|T\|^2} \lambda^{2q} \frac{\alpha^2}{(\lambda + \alpha)^2} d\|F_\lambda Q(y - y^\delta)\|^2 \\ &\geq C \frac{1}{\alpha^{2q+1}} \int_0^\alpha \lambda^{2q} d\|F_\lambda Q(y - y^\delta)\|^2 + C \frac{1}{\alpha^{2q-1}} \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \lambda^{2q-2} d\|F_\lambda Q(y - y^\delta)\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$.

Conversely,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\|^2 &= \int_0^\alpha \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda + \alpha)^2} d\|F_\lambda Q(y - y^\delta)\|^2 \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^\alpha \frac{\lambda}{\alpha} d\|F_\lambda Q(y - y^\delta)\|^2 + C \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \lambda^{-1} d\|F_\lambda Q(y - y^\delta)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Since $2q - 1 \leq 0$, we observe that the term with \int_0^α in the above inequality is bounded by the corresponding term in (17). Thus, using the noise condition, the second term can be bounded by the first one of (17). □

Theorem 3. Let $p \leq q \leq p + 1$, $q \leq \frac{1}{2} - \mu$ and suppose the noise condition $Q(y - y^\delta) \in \mathcal{N}_{2q}$. Moreover, suppose that $(TT^*)^q Qy \neq 0$ and let x^\dagger satisfy (7). Let α_* be selected according to the modified heuristic discrepancy rule. Then for η sufficiently small,

$$\|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1} \frac{2\mu}{1-2q}}\right).$$

Proof. Note that from $(TT^*)^q Qy \neq 0$, we may conclude, as in (12), that

$$\alpha_* \leq C \left(\psi_{\text{HD}}(\alpha, y^\delta)^{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}-q}} \right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1} \frac{2}{1-2q}}\right).$$

Then it follows, as above, from (16), (14), and (15), that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| &\leq \|x_{\alpha_*} - x^\dagger\| + \|x_{\alpha_*} - x_{\alpha_*}^\delta\| = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_*^\mu + \psi(\alpha_*, y - y^\delta)) = \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_*^\mu + \alpha_*^\mu + \frac{\eta}{\alpha_*^{\frac{1}{2}+p}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1} \frac{2\mu}{1-2q}} + \eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

for η sufficiently small. This proves the theorem. \square

Let us discuss the assumptions in this theorem: the first condition on q is not particularly restrictive. However, the requirement $q \leq \frac{1}{2} - \mu$ implies that $\mu \leq \frac{1}{2} - q$, which means that we obtain a saturation at $\mu = \frac{1}{2} - q$. This is akin to the bounded noise case ($q = 0$), where this method saturates at $\mu = \frac{1}{2}$. It is well known that a similar phenomenon occurs for the non-heuristic analogue of this method, namely the discrepancy principle.

Similarly as for the quasi-optimality method, we again only obtain suboptimal rates except for the saturation case $\mu = \frac{1}{2} - q$. However, using again a regularity condition, we can even prove optimal order convergence rates for the modified heuristic discrepancy rule.

Theorem 4. Let $p \leq q \leq p + 1$ and $q \leq \frac{1}{2} - \mu$. Assume the noise condition $Q(y - y^\delta) \in \mathcal{N}_{2q}$, source condition (7), and regularity condition (13) hold. Furthermore, let α_* be selected according to the modified heuristic discrepancy rule. Then

$$\|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1}}\right).$$

Proof. We show that a regularity condition implies that $\psi_{\text{HD}}(\alpha, y) \geq C\|x_\alpha - x^\dagger\|$. Recall that

$$\|x_\alpha - x^\dagger\|^2 = \int_0^{\|T\|^2} \frac{\alpha^2}{(\alpha + \lambda)^2} d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2 \leq C \int_0^\alpha d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2 + C\alpha^2 \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2. \quad (19)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\text{HD}}^2(\alpha, y) &\geq \int_0^{\|T\|^2} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\alpha}\right)^{2q} \frac{\lambda\alpha}{(\lambda + \alpha)^2} d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2 \geq \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\alpha}\right)^{2q} \frac{\lambda\alpha}{(\lambda + \alpha)^2} d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2 \\ &\geq C \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \frac{\alpha}{\lambda} d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2 \geq C \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \frac{\alpha^2}{\lambda^2} d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the regularity condition, the first integral in the upper bound in (19) can be estimated by the second part which agrees up to a constant with the lower bound for $\psi_{\text{HD}}^2(\alpha, y)$. In the proof of Theorem 3, the estimate $\|x_{\alpha_*} - x^\dagger\| \leq C\alpha_*^\mu$ can then be replaced by $\|x_{\alpha_*} - x^\dagger\| \leq C\psi(\alpha_*, y)$, which leads, as in [10], to the optimal rate. \square

2.3 The Modified Hanke-Raus Rule

As for the other parameter choice rules, we prove estimates for the modified Hanke-Raus functional with the aim of deriving convergence rates.

Proposition 5. *Let $p \leq q \leq p + \frac{3}{2}$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\psi_{HR}(\alpha, y - y^\delta) \leq C \frac{\eta}{\alpha^{p+\frac{1}{2}}},$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$. Let $q \leq 1 - \mu$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\psi_{HR}(\alpha, y) \leq C\alpha^\mu,$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$.

Proof. In terms of filter functions, we have

$$\frac{\lambda^{2q}\alpha^{2-2q}}{(\lambda + \alpha)^3} = \frac{\lambda^{2(q-p)}\alpha^{2-2q}}{(\lambda + \alpha)^3}\lambda^{2p} \leq C \frac{\alpha^{2-2q}}{\alpha^{\max\{3-2(q-p), 0\}}}\lambda^{2p} \leq C \frac{1}{\alpha^{\max\{1+2p, 2q-2\}}}\lambda^{2p},$$

which leads to the first estimate. The second statement follows from

$$\frac{\lambda^{2q}\alpha^{2-2q}}{(\lambda + \alpha)^3}\lambda^{1+2\mu} \leq C \frac{\alpha^{2-2q}}{\alpha^{\max\{3-(1+2\mu+2q), 0\}}}\lambda \leq C \frac{1}{\alpha^{\max\{-2\mu, 2q-2\}}}.$$

□

The lower bound for the noise propagation again requires a noise condition.

Proposition 6. *Let $Q(y - y^\delta) \in \mathcal{N}_{2q}$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\psi_{HR}(\alpha, y - y^\delta) \geq C\|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\|,$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$.

Proof. We estimate

$$\frac{\lambda^{2q}}{\alpha^{2q}} \frac{\alpha^2}{(\lambda + \alpha)^3} \geq C \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda^{2q}}{\alpha^{2q+1}} & \text{if } \lambda \leq \alpha, \\ \frac{\lambda^{2q-3}}{\alpha^{2q-2}} & \text{if } \lambda \geq \alpha. \end{cases}$$

Now, using \mathcal{N}_{2q} and (18), we can estimate $\|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\|$ by the part of $\psi_{HR}(\alpha, y - y^\delta)$ restricted to $\lambda \leq \alpha$. The part for $\lambda \geq \alpha$ can then be estimated from below by 0. □

Theorem 5. *Let $p \leq q \leq p + \frac{3}{2}$ and $q \leq 1 - \mu$. Moreover, suppose $Q(y - y^\delta) \in \mathcal{N}_{2q}$, $(TT^*)^q Qy \neq 0$ and let x^\dagger satisfy (7). Let α_* be chosen according to the modified Hanke-Raus rule. Then*

$$\|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1} \frac{1}{1-q}}\right).$$

Proof. As in (12), we prove that if $\|(TT^*)^q Qy\| \geq C$, then

$$\alpha_* \leq C\psi_{\text{HR}}(\alpha_*, y^\delta)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| &\leq \|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x_{\alpha_*}\| + \|x_{\alpha_*} + x^\dagger\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_*^\mu + \psi_{\text{HR}}(\alpha, y) + \psi_{\text{HR}}(\alpha, y - y^\delta)\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\psi_{\text{HR}}(\alpha, y^\delta)^{\frac{\mu}{1-q}} + \eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1} \frac{\mu}{1-q}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

In contrast to the modified discrepancy rule, we observe that the saturation occurs at $\mu = 1 - q$. Hence, again analogous to the bounded noise case (and to the non-heuristic case), the modified Hanke-Raus method yields convergence rates for a wider range of smoothness classes. The observed suboptimal rates for the non-saturation case can again be handled by a regularity condition.

Theorem 6. *Suppose that, in addition to the assumptions in Theorem 5, the regularity condition (13) holds. Then,*

$$\|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1}}\right).$$

Proof. Similarly as for the modified discrepancy rule, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\text{HR}}^2(\alpha, y) &\geq \int_0^{\|T\|^2} \frac{\lambda^{2q+1} \alpha^{2-2q}}{(\lambda + \alpha)^3} d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2 \geq \alpha^2 \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\alpha}\right)^{2q} \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda + \alpha)^3} d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2 \\ &\geq \alpha^2 \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^3} d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2 \geq \alpha^2 \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} d\|E_\lambda x^\dagger\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

As before, combined with the regularity condition, this allows to conclude that $\psi_{\text{HR}}(\alpha, y) \geq C\|x_\alpha - x^\dagger\|$, and the rest of the proof follows similarly as for the modified heuristic discrepancy case. □

3 PMS and GCV

In this section we study the generalised cross-validation and its infinite-dimensional analogue, the predictive mean-square error method, in a deterministic framework.

3.1 The Predictive Mean-Square Error

The predictive mean-square error functional differs from the previous ones in the sense that it has different upper bounds. In fact, from (9), one immediately finds that

$$\psi_{\text{PMS}}^2(\alpha, y^\delta) \leq C \frac{\eta^2}{\alpha^{2p}} + C\alpha^{2\mu+1},$$

for $\mu \leq \frac{1}{2}$. The minimum of the upper bound is again obtained for $\alpha = \alpha_{\text{opt}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{2}{2p+2\mu+1}}\right)$, but the resulting rate is of the order

$$\psi_{\text{PMS}}^2(\alpha, y^\delta) \leq C \left[\eta^{\frac{(2\mu+1)}{2p+2\mu+1}} \right]^2,$$

which agrees with the optimal rate for the error in the T -norm, $\|x_\alpha^\delta - x^\dagger\|_T := \|T(x_\alpha^\delta - x^\dagger)\|$. Thus, for this method, it is not reasonable to bound the functional ψ_{PMS} by expressions involving $\|x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha\|$ or $\|x_\alpha - x^\dagger\|$. Rather, we try to directly relate the selected regularisation parameter α_* to the optimal choice α_{opt} .

To do so, we need some estimates from below, although in this case, we will need to introduce a noise condition of a different type and an additional condition on the exact solution.

Lemma 2. *Suppose that there exists a positive constant C such that $y^\delta - y \in Y$ satisfies*

$$\int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} d\|F_\lambda Q(y - y^\delta)\|^2 \geq C \frac{\eta^2}{\alpha^{2p-\varepsilon}}, \quad (20)$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ small. Then

$$\|T(x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha)\| \geq C \frac{\eta}{\alpha^{p-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}}.$$

Proof. From (20), one can estimate

$$\|T(x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha)\|^2 = \int_0^{\|T\|^2} \frac{\lambda^2}{(\alpha + \lambda)^2} d\|F_\lambda Q(y - y^\delta)\|^2 \geq \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} d\|F_\lambda Q(y - y^\delta)\|^2 \geq C \frac{\eta^2}{\alpha^{2p-\varepsilon}}.$$

□

Let us exemplify condition (20): for the case in (6), we have that

$$\int_{\lambda \geq \alpha} d\|F_\lambda Q(y - y^\delta)\|^2 = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N_*} \frac{1}{i^\beta} \sim \int_1^{N_*} \frac{1}{x^\beta} dx = \begin{cases} CN_*^{1-\beta} & \text{if } 1 - \beta > 0, \\ C & \text{if } 1 - \beta < 0, \end{cases}$$

with $N_* = \frac{1}{\alpha^\gamma}$. This gives that the left-hand side is of the order of $\alpha^{-\frac{1-\beta}{\gamma}}$. For (20) to hold true, we require that $\frac{1-\beta}{\gamma} \geq 2p - \varepsilon$, which means that

$$1 + \varepsilon\gamma \geq \beta + 2p\gamma.$$

If we now choose p close to the smallest admissible exponent for the weakly bounded noise condition, i.e. $2p\gamma = 1 - \beta + \varepsilon\gamma$, with ε small, then the condition holds. In other words, our interpretation of the stated noise condition means that $\|(TT^*)^p(y^\delta - y)\| < \infty$ and p is selected as the minimal exponent such that this holds. This noise condition automatically excludes the (strongly) bounded noise case. It can easily be seen that for strongly bounded noise $\|y^\delta - y\| < \infty$, the method fails as it selects $\alpha_* = 0$. The example also shows that the desired inequality with $\varepsilon = 0$ cannot be achieved.

Theorem 7. *Let $\mu \leq \frac{1}{2}$, α_* be the minimiser of $\psi_{\text{PMS}}(\alpha, y^\delta)$, assume that the noise satisfies (20) and that $Tx^\dagger \neq 0$. Then*

$$\|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| \leq \begin{cases} C\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1}} \frac{2\mu+1}{2}, & \text{if } \alpha_* \geq \alpha_{\text{opt}}, \\ C\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1} - \varepsilon} \frac{2p+1}{(2p-\varepsilon)(2\mu+2p+1)}, & \text{if } \alpha_* \leq \alpha_{\text{opt}}. \end{cases}$$

If additionally for some $\varepsilon_2 > 0$,

$$\int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \lambda^{2\mu-1} d\|E_\lambda \omega\|^2 \geq C\alpha^{2\mu-1+\varepsilon_2}, \quad (21)$$

then for the first case we have

$$\|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| \leq C\eta^{\frac{2\mu}{2\mu+2p+1} \frac{2\mu+1}{2\mu+1+\epsilon_2}}, \quad \text{if } \alpha_* \geq \alpha_{\text{opt}},$$

Proof. If $\alpha_* \geq \alpha_{\text{opt}}$, it follows from $Tx^\dagger \neq 0$ that

$$\|Tx_\alpha - y\|^2 \geq C\alpha^2,$$

and if (21) holds, then one even has that

$$\|T(x_\alpha - x^\dagger)\|^2 \geq \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \frac{\lambda^{1+2\mu}\alpha^2}{(\alpha + \lambda)^2} d\|E_\lambda\omega\|^2 \geq \alpha^2 \int_\alpha^{\|T\|^2} \lambda^{2\mu-1} d\|E_\lambda\omega\|^2 \geq C\alpha^{2\mu+1+\epsilon_2}.$$

Since $\alpha \mapsto \|T(x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha)\|^2$ is a monotonically decreasing function and using Young's inequality, we may obtain that

$$C\alpha_*^t \leq \|T(x_{\alpha_{\text{opt}}}^\delta - x_{\alpha_{\text{opt}}})\|^2 + \|Tx_{\alpha_{\text{opt}}} - y\|^2 \leq C \left[\eta^{\frac{2\mu+1}{2\mu+2p+1}} \right]^2,$$

i.e.,

$$\alpha_* \leq C\eta^{\frac{2\mu+1}{2\mu+2p+1} \frac{2}{t}},$$

where $t = 2$ or $t = 2\mu + 1 + \epsilon_2$ if (21) holds.

If $\alpha_* \leq \alpha_{\text{opt}}$, then we may bound the functional from below as

$$\psi_{\text{PMS}}^2(\alpha, y^\delta) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|T(x_\alpha^\delta - x_\alpha)\|^2 - \|Tx_\alpha - y\|^2,$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \|T\|^2)$, which allows us to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \|T(x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x_{\alpha_*})\|^2 - \|Tx_{\alpha_*} - y\|^2 &\leq \psi_{\text{PMS}}^2(\alpha_*, y^\delta) \leq \psi_{\text{PMS}}^2(\alpha_{\text{opt}}, y^\delta) \\ &\leq 2\|T(x_{\alpha_{\text{opt}}}^\delta - x_{\alpha_{\text{opt}}})\|^2 + 2\|Tx_{\alpha_{\text{opt}}} - y\|^2 \leq C \left[\eta^{\frac{2\mu+1}{2\mu+2p+1}} \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

i.e., by Lemma 2,

$$C \frac{\eta^2}{\alpha_*^{2p-\epsilon}} - C\alpha_*^{2\mu+1} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|T(x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x_{\alpha_*})\|^2 - \|Tx_{\alpha_*} - y\|^2 \leq C \left[\eta^{\frac{2\mu+1}{2\mu+2p+1}} \right]^2.$$

Now, from $\alpha_* \leq \alpha_{\text{opt}}$, we get

$$C \frac{\eta^2}{\alpha_*^{2p-\epsilon}} \leq C \left[\eta^{\frac{2\mu+1}{2\mu+2p+1}} \right]^2 + C\alpha_*^{2\mu+1} \leq C \left[\eta^{\frac{2\mu+1}{2\mu+2p+1}} \right]^2 + C\alpha_{\text{opt}}^{2\mu+1} \leq C \left[\eta^{\frac{2\mu+1}{2\mu+2p+1}} \right]^2,$$

i.e.,

$$\alpha_*^{2p-\epsilon} \geq C \left[\eta^{\frac{2\mu+1}{2\mu+2p+1}} \right]^2 \iff \alpha_* \geq C\eta^{\frac{2}{2\mu+2p+1} \cdot \frac{2p}{2p-\epsilon}}.$$

Then inserting the respective bounds for α_* into (10) yields the desired rates. \square

Condition (21) can again be verified as we did for the noise condition for some canonical examples. The inequality with $\epsilon_2 = 0$ does not usually hold. The condition can be interpreted as the claim that x^\dagger satisfies a source condition with a certain μ but this exponent cannot be increased, i.e., $x^\dagger \notin \mathcal{R}((T^*T)^{\mu+\epsilon})$. A similar condition was used by Lukas in his analysis of the generalised cross-validation rule [13].

The theorem shows that we may obtain almost optimal convergence results but only under rather restrictive conditions. Moreover, the method shows a saturation effect at $\mu = \frac{1}{2}$ comparable to the discrepancy principles.

3.2 The Generalised Cross-Validation Rule

The generalised cross-validation rule was proposed and studied in particular by Wahba [19], and it is most popular in a statistical context but less so for deterministic inverse problems. It is derived from the cross-validation method by combining the associated estimates with certain weights. Most importantly, it was shown in [19] that the expected value of the generalised cross-validation functional converges to the expected value of the PMS-functional as the dimension tends to infinity. This is why, in the last section, we studied ψ_{PMS} in detail.

One can show that the weight $\rho(\alpha)$ in ψ_{GCV} is monotonically increasing with $\rho(0) = 0$ and bounded with $\rho(\alpha) \leq 1$. It can furthermore be shown that for $\alpha > 0$, $\rho(\alpha) \rightarrow 1$ as the dimension $n \rightarrow \infty$. This is also the reason why one has to study the GCV in terms of weakly bounded noise. The limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{\text{GCV}}$ tends pointwise to the residual $\|Tx_\alpha^\delta - y_\delta\|$, which in the bounded noise case does not yield a reasonable parameter choice as then $\alpha_* = 0$ is always chosen.

Note that in a stochastic context, and using the expected value of ψ_{GCV} , a convergence analysis has been done by Lukas [13]. In contrast, we analyse the deterministic case.

We now consider the ill-conditioned problem

$$T_n x = y_n, \quad (22)$$

where we only have noisy data $y_n^\delta \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

We impose a discretisation independent source condition, that is,

$$x^\dagger = (T_n^* T_n)^\mu \omega, \quad \|\omega\| \leq C, \quad 0 < \mu \leq 1,$$

where C does not depend on the dimension n . Furthermore, let us restate some definitions for this discrete setting:

$$\delta_n := \|y_n^\delta - y_n\|, \quad \eta^2 := \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^{2p} |\langle y_n^\delta - y_n, u_i \rangle|^2.$$

Note that in an asymptotically weakly bounded noise case, we might assume that η is bounded independent of n while δ_n might be unbounded as n tends to infinity.

Moreover, we impose a noise condition of similar type as for the predictive mean-square error

$$\sum_{\lambda_i \geq \alpha} |\langle y_n^\delta - y, u_i \rangle|^2 \geq C \frac{\eta^2}{\alpha^{2p-\varepsilon}}, \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \text{I}, \quad (23)$$

where C does not depend on n . Note that in the discrete case, one must restrict the noise condition to an interval with $\text{I} = [\alpha_{\min}, \|T\|^2]$ with $\alpha_{\min} > 0$.

Similarly, we state a regularity condition

$$\sum_{\lambda_i \geq \alpha} \lambda^{2\mu-1} |\langle \omega, v_i \rangle|^2 \geq C \alpha^{2\mu-1+\varepsilon_2} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \text{I}, \quad (24)$$

where $\{v_i\}$ denote the eigenfunctions of T^*T .

In order to deduce convergence rates, we look to bound the functional from above as we did for the other functionals in the previous sections:

Lemma 3. For $y_n^\delta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exist positive constants such that

$$\psi_{GCV}(\alpha, y_n) \leq \frac{C}{\rho(\alpha)} C \alpha^{2\mu+1}, \quad \mu \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (25)$$

$$\psi_{GCV}(\alpha, y_n^\delta - y) \leq \frac{C}{\rho(\alpha)} \delta_n^2, \quad \mu \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{hence,} \quad (26)$$

$$\psi_{GCV}(\alpha, y_n^\delta) \leq \frac{1}{\rho(\alpha)} (C \alpha^{2\mu+1} + \delta_n^2), \quad \mu \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (27)$$

Proof. It is a standard result [5] that $\|T_n x_\alpha^\delta - y_n^\delta - (T_n x_\alpha - y_n)\| \leq \|y_n^\delta - y_n\| \leq \delta_n$. Similarly, by the usual source condition, we obtain $\|(T_n x_\alpha - y_n)\| \leq C \alpha^{2\mu+1}$ for $\mu \leq \frac{1}{2}$. The result follows from the triangle inequality. \square

The proceeding results generally follow from the infinite dimensional setting and we similarly obtain the following bounds from below:

Lemma 4. Suppose that $\alpha \in \mathbf{I}$ and also that (23) holds. Then

$$\psi_{GCV}(\alpha, y_n^\delta - y) \geq \frac{1}{\rho(\alpha)} \left(C \frac{\eta^2}{\alpha^{2p-\varepsilon}} \right).$$

Moreover, if $\|T_n x^\dagger\| \geq C_0$, with an n -independent constant, then there exists an n -independent constant C with

$$\psi_{GCV}(\alpha, y) \geq C \frac{1}{\rho(\alpha)} \alpha^2.$$

If (24) holds and $\alpha \in \mathbf{I}$, then

$$\psi_{GCV}(\alpha, y) \geq C \frac{1}{\rho(\alpha)} \alpha^{2\mu+1+\varepsilon_2}, \quad \mu \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Theorem 8. Let $\mu \leq \frac{1}{2}$, assume α_* is the minimiser of $\psi_{GCV}(\alpha, y_n^\delta)$ and suppose further that $\alpha_* \in \mathbf{I}$ such that (23) holds. Then

$$\alpha_* \geq \left[\inf_{\alpha \geq \alpha_*} (C \alpha^{2\mu+1} + C \delta_n^2) \right]^{-\frac{1}{2p-\varepsilon}} \eta^{\frac{2}{2p-\varepsilon}} \geq C \delta_n^{-\frac{2}{2p-\varepsilon}} \eta^{\frac{2}{2p-\varepsilon}}.$$

On the other hand

$$\alpha_* \leq \left[\inf_{\alpha \leq \alpha_*} \frac{1}{\rho(\alpha)} (C \alpha^{2\mu+1} + C \delta_n^2) \right]^{\frac{1}{t}},$$

with $t = 2$. If $\alpha_* \in \mathbf{I}$ and (24) hold, then $t = 2\mu + 1 + \varepsilon_2$.

Proof. Take an arbitrary $\bar{\alpha}$ and consider first the case $\alpha_* \leq \bar{\alpha}$. Following on from the previous lemmas and using (26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\rho(\alpha_*)} \left(C \frac{\eta^2}{\alpha_*^{2p-\varepsilon}} \right) &\leq \psi_{GCV}^2(\alpha_*, y_n^\delta - y) \leq C \psi_{GCV}^2(\alpha_*, y_n^\delta) + C \psi_{GCV}^2(\alpha_*, y_n) \\ &\leq \psi_{GCV}^2(\bar{\alpha}, y_n^\delta) + C \frac{1}{\rho(\alpha_*)} \alpha_*^{2\mu+1} \leq \frac{1}{\rho(\bar{\alpha})} (C \bar{\alpha}^{2\mu+1} + \delta_n^2) + C \frac{1}{\rho(\alpha_*)} \alpha_*^{2\mu+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the monotonicity of $\alpha \mapsto \alpha^{2\mu+1}$ and since ρ is monotonically increasing, we obtain that

$$\left(C \frac{\eta^2}{\alpha_*^{2p-\varepsilon}} \right) \leq \frac{\rho(\alpha_*)}{\rho(\bar{\alpha})} (C\bar{\alpha}^{2\mu+1} + \delta_n^2) + \alpha_*^{2\mu+1} \leq (C\bar{\alpha}^{2\mu+1} + \delta_n^2) + \alpha_*^{2\mu+1} \leq (C\bar{\alpha}^{2\mu+1} + \delta_n^2).$$

Hence,

$$\alpha_* \geq \left[\inf_{\alpha \geq \alpha_*} (C\alpha^{2\mu+1} + C\delta_n^2) \right]^{-\frac{1}{2p-\varepsilon}} \eta^{\frac{2}{2p-\varepsilon}} \geq C\delta_n^{-\frac{2}{2p-\varepsilon}} \eta^{\frac{2}{2p-\varepsilon}}.$$

Now, suppose $\alpha_* \geq \bar{\alpha}$. Then using that α_* is a minimiser

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C}{\rho(\alpha_*)} \alpha_*^t &\leq \psi_{\text{GCV}}^2(\alpha_*, y_n) \leq C\psi_{\text{GCV}}^2(\alpha_*, y_n^\delta) + \psi_{\text{GCV}}^2(\alpha_*, y_n^\delta - y_n) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\rho(\bar{\alpha})} (C\bar{\alpha}^{2\mu+1} + C\delta_n^2) + C \frac{1}{\rho(\alpha_*)} \delta_n^2 \leq \frac{1}{\rho(\bar{\alpha})} (C\bar{\alpha}^{2\mu+1} + C\delta_n^2) + C \frac{1}{\rho(\bar{\alpha})} \delta_n^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, as $\rho(\alpha_*)$ is bounded from above by 1, it follows that

$$\alpha_* \leq \left[\inf_{\alpha \leq \alpha_*} \frac{1}{\rho(\alpha)} (C\alpha^{2\mu+1} + C\delta_n^2) \right]^{\frac{1}{t}}.$$

□

Theorem 9. *Suppose that, in addition to the assumptions in the previous theorem, one has $\rho(\delta_n^{\frac{2}{2\mu+1}}) \geq C$. Then*

$$\|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| \leq \delta_n^{\frac{2\mu}{t}} + \delta_n \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta_n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2p-\varepsilon}},$$

with t as in Theorem 8.

Proof. Since

$$\|x_{\alpha_*}^\delta - x^\dagger\| \leq C\alpha^\mu + C \frac{\delta_n}{\sqrt{\alpha}},$$

we may take the balancing parameter $\bar{\alpha} = \delta_n^{\frac{2}{2\mu+1}}$. From the previous theorem, it follows that if $\alpha_* \leq \bar{\alpha}$, then

$$\alpha_* \geq \frac{\eta^{\frac{2}{2p-\varepsilon}}}{[\inf_{\alpha \geq \alpha_*} (C\alpha^{2\mu+1} + C\delta_n^2)]^{\frac{1}{2p-\varepsilon}}} \geq \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta_n} \right)^{\frac{2}{2p-\varepsilon}}.$$

On the other hand, if $\alpha_* \geq \bar{\alpha}$, and $\rho(\bar{\alpha}) \geq C$, then

$$\alpha_* \leq C\delta_n^{\frac{2}{t}}.$$

Thus, taking for α^μ and $\frac{\delta_n}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$ the worst of these estimates, we obtain the desired result. □

This result establishes convergence rates in the discrete case. However, the required conditions are somewhat restrictive as we need that the selected α_* has to be in a certain interval (although this is to be expected in a finite-dimensional setting). Note that the term δ_n^2 in Theorem 8 can be replaced by any reasonable monotonically decreasing upper bound for $\psi_{\text{GCV}}^2(\alpha, y_\delta - y)$. In particular, if we could conclude that α_* is in a region where $\psi_{\text{GCV}}^2(\alpha, y_\delta - y) \leq C \frac{\eta^2}{\alpha^{2p}}$, then we would obtain similar convergence results as for the predictive mean square error.

In general, however, the performance of the GCV-rule for the regularisation of deterministic inverse problems is subpar compared to other heuristic rules, e.g., those mentioned in the previous sections; cf., e.g., [2,8]. This is also illustrated by the fact that we had to impose stronger conditions for the convergence results compared to the aforementioned rules.

4 Conclusion

We analysed and provided conditions for the derivation of convergence rates for a number of well-known heuristic parameter choice rules in the weakly bounded noise setting and modified them when necessary. The theory was extended in a consistent and systematic way whereby one attains the standard results whenever the situation is as in the classical setting. In particular, we provided noise conditions which are very often satisfied for when one can prove suboptimal convergence rates for the quasi-optimality, modified heuristic discrepancy and Hanke-Raus rules, as well as optimal rates whenever certain regularity conditions are satisfied.

A further novel aspect of this paper was the examination of the generalised cross-validation rule and the predictive mean-square error in a deterministic framework. In the case of the former, it was in a finite-dimensional setting where we proved convergence rates.

In essence, it was demonstrated that heuristic rules remain viable methods for selecting the regularisation parameter, even in the case where the noise is only *weakly bounded*.

References

- [1] A. BAKUSHINSKIY, *Remarks on choosing a regularization parameter using quasi-optimality and ratio criterion*, USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, 24 (1985), pp. 181–182.
- [2] F. BAUER AND M. A. LUKAS, *Comparing parameter choice methods for regularization of ill-posed problems*, Mathematics and Computers in Simulation, 81 (2011), pp. 1795 – 1841.
- [3] H. EGGER, *Regularization of inverse problems with large noise*, Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 124 (2008), p. 012022.
- [4] P. P. B. EGGERMONT, V. N. LARICCIA, AND M. Z. NASHED, *On weakly bounded noise in ill-posed problems*, Inverse Problems, 25 (2009), p. 115018.
- [5] H. ENGL, M. HANKE, AND A. NEUBAUER, *Regularization of Inverse Problems*, Mathematics and Its Applications, Springer Netherlands, 1996.
- [6] C. FENU, L. REICHEL, G. RODRIGUEZ, AND H. SADOK, *GCV for Tikhonov regularization by partial SVD*, BIT, 57 (2017), pp. 1019–1039.
- [7] M. HANKE AND T. RAUS, *A general heuristic for choosing the regularization parameter in ill-posed problems*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 17 (1996), pp. 956–972.
- [8] U. HÁMARIK, R. PALM, AND T. RAUS, *Comparison of parameter choices in regularization algorithms in case of different information about noise level*, Calcolo, 48 (2011), pp. 47–59.
- [9] S. KINDERMANN, *Convergence analysis of minimization-based noise level-free parameter choice rules for linear ill-posed problems*, Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal., 38 (2011), pp. 233–257.
- [10] S. KINDERMANN AND A. NEUBAUER, *On the convergence of the quasioptimality criterion for (iterated) tikhonov regularization*, Inverse Problems and Imaging, 2 (2008), pp. 291–299.
- [11] S. KINDERMANN, S. PEREVERZYEV, JR., AND A. PILIPENKO, *The quasi-optimality criterion in the linear functional strategy*, Inverse Problems, 34 (2018), pp. 075001, 24.

- [12] KOKURIN AND M. YU, *Stable iteratively regularized gradient method for nonlinear irregular equations under large noise*, Inverse Problems, 22 (2006), p. 197.
- [13] M. A. LUKAS, *Asymptotic optimality of generalized cross-validation for choosing the regularization parameter*, Numer. Math., 66 (1993), pp. 41–66.
- [14] P. MATHÉ AND U. TAUTENHAHN, *Regularization under general noise assumptions*, Inverse Problems, 27 (2011), p. 035016.
- [15] V. MOROZOV, *Regulyarizatsiya pri bol'shih pomehah (russian) (regularization under large noise)*, Zh. Vychisl. Mat. Mat. Fiz., 36 (1996), p. 13.
- [16] M. NASHED, *Generalized inverses and applications: proceedings of an advanced seminar*, no. v. 1973 in Publication of the Mathematics Research Center, the University of Wisconsin–Madison, Academic Press, 1976.
- [17] T. RAUS AND U. HÁMARIK, *Heuristic parameter choice in Tikhonov method from minimizers of the quasi-optimality function*, in New trends in parameter identification for mathematical models, Trends Math., Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2018, pp. 227–244.
- [18] A. TIKHONOV AND V. GLASKO, *The approximate solution of fredholm integral equations of the first kind*, USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, 4 (1969), p. 236247.
- [19] G. WAHBA, *Spline models for observational data*, vol. 59 of CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1990.