First Order Nonsmooth Optimization: Algorithm Design, Variational analysis, and Applications

Hongda Li

Department of Mathematics
University of British Columbia,
Okanagan Campus.

December 29, 2024

Contents

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbb{R}^n$ be the ambient space. We consider

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ F(x) : f(x) + g(x) \right\}. \tag{1.1}$$

Unless specified, assume $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is L-Lipscthiz smooth $\mu \geq 0$ strongly convex and $g : Q \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is convex. This type of problem is referred to as additive composite problems in the literature.

Our ongoing research concerns accelerated proximal gradient type method for solving (1). In the expository writing by Walkington [3], a variant for of accelerated gradient method for strongly convex function f is discussed. We had two lingering questions after reading it.

(i) Do there exist a unified description for the convergence for both variants of the algorithms?

(ii) Is it possible to attain faster convergence rate without knowledge about the strong convexity of function f?

(iii) Is it possible to describe the convergence of function value for momentum sequences that are much weaker than the Nesterov's rule?

The good news is we have definitive answers for all questions by our own efforts of research. Section 3, 4 are our ongoing research which present the answers to the questions.

In Section 3, we proposed the method of "Relaxed Weak Accelerated Proximal Gradient (R-WAPG)" as the foundation to describe several variants of Accelerated proximal gradient method in the literatures. The convergence theories of R-WAPG allows us to model convergence of accelerated proximal gradient method where the momentum sequence doesn't strictly follow the conditions presented in the literatures. The descriptive power of R-WAPG allows convergence analysis for all the variants using one single theorem.

In Section 4 we propose a practical algorithm that exploits a specific term in the proof of R-WAPG to achieve faster convergence for solving (1) without knowing parameter L, μ in prior. Results of numerical experiments are presented.

Section 5 are results of literatures review in MATH 590. It's based on a series of papers in the topic of Catalyst Meta Acceleration method for First Order Variance Reduced Methods. We will point out potential future direction of research of Catalyst acceleration.

■ Add Lin's papers and Paquette's papers.

Section 6, 7, 8 preview literatures in nonsmooth optimization frontier research where progress and impacts can be made.

1.1 Theme of the research

This section specifies a theme of the research in this proposal. Out first objective is to explore the Goldilocks zones between these topics: theories of variational analysis, design of continuous optimization algorithm and applications in sciences, engineering, and statistics. Our second objective is to identify the "chemistry" occurring between properties of functions and the designs of continuous optimizations algorithm and how it impacts the convergence and behaviors of the algorithms.

2 Preliminaries

Clarify: Notations, Organizations.

This section contains the basics of contents from convex optimization, and variational analysis.

Notations.

(i) $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty, -\infty\}$

2.1 Fundamentals in non-convex analysis

We are in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and the weakest assumption we are making for the objective function is Local Lipschitz continuity. Definitions:

- ■ Local Lipschitz continuity.
- ☐ Regular subgradient. Remember to cite.
- ☐ Limiting subgradient. Remember to cite.
- ■ Weakly convex function.
- ■ The Bregman Divergence of function.

Take Limiting, Regular subgradient definitions from Cui, Pong's book, Definition 4.3.1.

Let the ambient space be $\mathbb{R}^n$ equipped with inner product and 2-norm. Let O be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, the weakest assumption we are making for the objective function $F : O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ for optimization problem is Local Lipschitz Continuity. The assumption of local Lipschitz continuity is weak enough to describe most problems in applications, and strong enough to avoid most pathologies in analysis.

4

Definition 2.1 (Local Lipschitz continuity) *Let $F : O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be Locally Lipschitz and O is an open set. Then for all $\bar{x} \in O$, there exists a Neighborhood: $\mathcal{N}(\bar{x})$ and $K \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{x})$: $|F(x) - F(y)| \leq K\|x - y\|$.*

Definition 2.2 (Regular subgradient) *Let $F : O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be locally Lipschitz and $\bar{x} \in O$. The regular subdifferential at $\bar{x}$ is defined as*

$$\widehat{\partial}F(\bar{x}) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n \;\middle|\; \liminf_{\bar{x} \neq x \to \bar{x}} \frac{F(x) - F(\bar{x}) - \langle v, x - \bar{x} \rangle}{\|x - \bar{x}\|} \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Remark 2.3 Definition taken from Definition 4.3.1 from <mark>Pang, Cui's book</mark>

Definition 2.4 (Limiting subgradient) *Let $F : O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be locally Lipschitz and $\bar{x} \in O$. The limiting subdifferential at $\bar{x}$ is defined as*

$$\partial F(\bar{x}) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n \;\middle|\; \exists x_k \to \bar{x}, v_k \to v : v_k \in \widehat{\partial}F(x_k) \; \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Remark 2.5 Definition taken from Definition 4.3.1 from <mark>Pang, Cui's book</mark>

Definition 2.6 (Weakly convex function) *$F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is μ weakly convex if and only if $F + \frac{\mu}{2}\|\cdot\|^2$ is convex.*

Definition 2.7 (Bregman divergence) *Let $F : O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a differentiable function. Then the Bregman divergence of F is defined as:*

$$D_F(x, y) : O \times \mathrm{dom}(\partial F) \to \mathbb{R} := F(x) - F(y) - \langle \nabla F(y), x - y \rangle.$$

2.2 Fundamentals in convex analysis

This section introduces the classics and basics of convex analysis. Define F to be closed, proper and convex in this section. When F is convex, the limiting subgradient and the regular subgradient reduced to the following definition:

$$\partial F(x) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n \ : F(y) - F(x) \geq \langle v, y - x \rangle\}.$$

A convex function is locally Lipschitz in the relative interior of its domain, denoted as $\mathrm{ri}(\mathrm{dom}(F))$. So it has $\mathrm{ri}(\mathrm{dom}\, F) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(\partial F) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}\, F$.

When we say $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is L Lipschitz smooth function, it means that there exists L such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, it has:

$$\|\nabla F(x) - \nabla F(y)\| \leq L \|x - y\|.$$

This condition is stronger than differentiability. When F convex, it has descent lemma:

$$(\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n)(\forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n) : 0 \leq F(x) - F(y) - \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle \leq \frac{L}{2} \|x - y\|^2.$$

When F is convex, the converse holds. The definitions that follow narrow things further for future discussions.

Definition 2.8 (Strong convexity) *A function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is $\mu \geq 0$ strongly convex if and only if for any fixed $y \in \mathrm{dom}(\partial F)$, we have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$:*

$$(\forall v \in \partial F(x)) \quad F(x) - F(y) \geq \langle v, x - y \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - y\|^2.$$

Lemma 2.9 (Quadratic growth from strong convexity) *If F is $\mu \geq 0$ strongly convex, $\bar{x}$ is a minimizer of F. Then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$*

$$F(x) - F(\bar{x}) \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2.$$

Remark 2.10 The minimizer is unique whenever $\mu > 0$. For contradiction, assume x is another minimizer, then $F(x) \neq F(\bar{x})$, which is a direct contradiction. The quadratic growth condition over a set of minimizer is much weaker than convexity.

2.2.1 Smooth, nonsmooth additive composite

Introduce notations for the proximal gradient model function. Lemmas:

- ■ Proximal gradient envelope.

- ■ A property of gradient mapping.

Theorems:

- ■ The proximal gradient inequality.

In this section, we zoom in further. Suppose that $F := f + g$ where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is convex, L Lipschitz smooth and $\mu \geq 0$ strongly convex and $g : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is convex. To make the discussion simpler, fix any $\beta \geq 0$ we define the following model functions as a $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$:

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\beta^{-1}}(x; y) := g(x) + f(y) + \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2}\|x - y\|^2,$$

$$\mathcal{M}^{\beta^{-1}}(x; y) := F(x) + \frac{\beta}{2}\|x - y\|^2.$$

Under convexity assumption in this section, both $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot; y), \mathcal{M}(\cdot; y)$ is at least $\beta \geq 0$ strongly convex.

Definition 2.11 (Proximal gradient operator) *Take $F := f + g$ where $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ as defined in this section. Define the proximal gradient operator T_L on all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$:*

$$T_L y := \underset{x \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ g(x) + f(y) + \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{L}{2}\|x - y\|^2 \right\}.$$

Remark 2.12 Under the assumption of this section, the mapping T_L is a single-valued mapping, it has domain on the entire $\mathbb{R}^n$, and it's a $3/2$ averaged operator.

Definition 2.13 (Gradient mapping operator) *Take $F := f + g$ as defined in this section. Define the gradient mapping operator $\mathcal{G}_L$ on all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$:*

$$\mathcal{G}_L y := L(y - T_L y).$$

Lemma 2.14 (Proximal gradient model function)
Take $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{L^{-1}}, \mathcal{M}^{L^{-1}}$ as defined in this section, we will have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that:

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{L^{-1}}(x; y) = \mathcal{M}^{L^{-1}}(x; y) - D_f(x, y).$$

Lemma 2.15 (A favorable property of gradient mapping) *Take $F := f + g$ as defined in this section. Fix any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists $v \in \partial g(T_L x)$ such that $\mathcal{G}_L(x) = v + \nabla f(x)$.*

Remark 2.16 This lemma still holds for non-convex f under prox-boundedness and weak convexity and differentiability of f.

Lemma 2.17 (The proximal gradient inequality) *Take $F := f + g$ as defined in this section. Fix any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then for all x, the proximal gradient inequality is true:*

$$(\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n) \quad h(x) - h(Ty) - \langle L(y - Ty), x - y \rangle - \frac{\mu}{2}\|x - y\|^2 - \frac{L}{2}\|y - Ty\|^2 \geq 0.$$

Remark 2.18 This lemma is proved in our draft paper.

2.3 Nesterov's estimating sequence technique

The method of Nesterov's estimating sequence for accelerated gradient method, and their nonsmooth counterparts assumes a convex function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. The estimating sequence is a technique searching for candidate algorithm with extrapolated momentum, and proving their convergence rate if possible.

The method is widespread in the literatures, and the ideas behind it are tremendously useful. Güler used the method to design an accelerated proximal point method, which inspired and served as the foundation of Catalyst Acceleration for variance reduced method in machine learning. Nesterov also used the technique to design an accelerated cubic regularized Newton's method. In (6.1.19) of Nesterov's book [2], it's also used to derive a method of accelerated mirror descent. And finally, Geovani N. et al used the technique to derive a accelerated Newton's method for convex composite objective function.

The definition of the estimating sequence that follows is based on our own understanding of the estimating sequence.

Definition 2.19 (Nesterov's estimating sequence) *Let $\phi_k : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ for all $k \geq 0$ be a sequence of functions. We call this sequence of function a Nesterov's estimating sequence when it satisfies the conditions:*

(i) *There exists another sequence $(x_k)_{k\geq 0}$ such that for all $k \geq 0$ it has $F(x_k) \leq \phi_k^* := \min_x \phi_k(x)$.*

(ii) *There exists a sequence of $(\alpha_k)_{k\geq 0}$ where $\alpha_k \in (0,1)$ $\forall k \geq 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ it has $\phi_{k+1}(x) - \phi_k(x) \leq -\alpha_k(\phi_k(x) - F(x))$.*

Observation 2.20 *In general, identifying the sequence $(x_k)_{k\geq 0}$ is non-trivial. But in case it can be found, the method of estimating sequence gives us the convergence rate described by the sequence $(\alpha_k)_{k\geq 0}$, and a candidate algorithm that generates the sequence $(x_k)_{k\geq 0}$. It's two birds with one stone.*

If we define ϕ_k, $\Delta_k(x) := \phi_k(x) - F(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and assume that F has minimizer x^*. Then observe that $\forall k \geq 0$:

$$\Delta_k(x) = \phi_k(x) - F(x) \geq \phi_k^* - F(x)$$
$$x = x_k \implies \Delta_k(x_k) \geq \phi_k^* - F(x_k) \geq 0;$$
$$x = x_* \implies \Delta_k(x_*) \geq \phi_k^* - F_* \geq F(x_k) - F_* \geq 0.$$

The function $\Delta_k(x)$ is non-negative at points: x_*, x_k. We can derive the convergence rate of $\Delta_k(x^*)$ because $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\phi_{k+1}(x) - \phi_k(x) \leq -\alpha_k(\phi_k(x) - F(x))$$
$$\iff \phi_{k+1}(x) - F(x) - (\phi_k(x) - F(x)) \leq -\alpha_k(\phi_k(x) - F(x))$$
$$\iff \Delta_{k+1}(x) - \Delta_k(x) \leq -\alpha_k \Delta_k(x)$$
$$\iff \Delta_{k+1}(x) \leq (1 - \alpha_k)\Delta_k(x).$$

Unrolling the above recursion it yields:

$$\Delta_{k+1}(x) \leq (1 - \alpha_k)\Delta_k(x) \leq \cdots \leq \left(\prod_{i=0}^{k}(1 - \alpha_i) \right) \Delta_0(x).$$

Finally, by setting $x = x^*$, $\Delta_k(x^*)$ is non-negative and using the property of Nesterov's estimating sequence it gives:

$$F(x_k) - F(x^*) \leq \phi_k^* - F(x^*) \leq \Delta_k(x^*) = \phi_k(x^*) - F(x^*) \leq \left(\prod_{i=0}^{k}(1 - \alpha_i) \right) \Delta_0(x^*).$$

3 Unifying NAG, and weakening the sequence assumption for convergences

This section is really about stating the results of the draft paper and no proofs will be done here. Along with the content of the draft paper, we will also explain the origin and inspirations of the ideas.

This section is based on the theoretical aspects of our draft paper. It will introduce major results and claims achieved during our research in each of the subsections. All theorems and claims stated in this section have proofs in the draft paper. The proofs haven't been carefully verified by authoritative people other than the author yet. We will start introducing the context and ideas for our research next.

Assume we want to solve a convex optimization problem: $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n}\{F(x)\}$ and $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a L Lipschitz smooth function. We made this assumption for now for a faster exposition.

One of the prime candidate for solving the optimization problem is the Nesterov's Accelerated Gradient methods (NAG) finds extensions for nonsmooth function through the proximal gradient operator. Proposed back in 1983 the original Nesterov's acceleration method which uses the previous iterates to extrapolate the next iterate to evaluate the gradient. It's well known that if minimizer x^* exists for F, the method achieves a $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ convergence rate on the objective value $F(x_k)$. This convergence rate is considered optimal for all class of L Lipschitz smooth convex function [2]. The convergence rate guarantee is faster than $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ exhibited by gradient descent.

> ■ Add Nesterov's original paper.
> □ Cite it.

> ■ Add Nesterov's new book.
> ■ Cite it.

We cover the algorithm briefly. Initialize $x_1 = y_1$ and $t_0 = 1$, the algorithm finds $(x_k)_{k \geq 1}$ for all $k \geq 1$ by:

$$x_{k+1} = y_k - L^{-1}\nabla F(y_k), \tag{3.1}$$

$$t_{k+1} = 1/2\left(1 + \sqrt{1 + 4t_k^2}\right), \tag{3.2}$$

$$\theta_{k+1} = (t_k - 1)/t_{k+1}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$y_{k+1} = x_{k+1} + \theta_{k+1}(x_{k+1} - x_k). \tag{3.4}$$

Unfortunately, the algorithm sped up the convergence rate for all convex function, it becomes slower for the subset of $\mu > 0$ strongly convex function. This drawback inspired a vast amount of literatures aims at improving, extending, and analyzing NAG. Restarting is a popular solution to address the issue of obtaining faster convergence rate when the objective function is strongly convex. Beck and Toubelle mitigated the issue by restarting and showed that it still has a $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ convergence rate, and it performs better empirically. See (5.2.2) Necoara et al. and Aujol et al. and references within for recent advancements in restarting accelerated proximal gradient algorithm.

> ■ Add Beck 2009 FISTA original paper. □ Cite it.

> ■ Add Necoara linear convergence
> ■ Add Aujol 2024 Parameter free FISTA restart.
> □ Cite Section 5.2.2 for the former, cite the entirety for the later.

Restarting the algorithm is not the entire picture. Let $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a L Lipschitz smooth and $\mu > 0$ function. As introduced previously, in Walkington's writing, he showed that there exists a variant of the Nesterov's accelerated gradient method that achieved a linear convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}((1 - \sqrt{\kappa})^k)$ where $\kappa = \mu/L$. This convergence rate is strictly better than $\mathcal{O}((1 - \mu/L)^k)$ for the method of gradient descent. However, this variant has a fixed momentum parameter $\theta_{k+1} = (\sqrt{\kappa} - 1)(\sqrt{\kappa} + 1)^{-1}$ back in Equation 3.1. The same variant also appears in Beck's book as V-FISTA, and Nesterov's book as (2.2.22).

> ■ Add Neol J. Walkington's "Nesterov's Method for Convex Optimization".
> □ Cite it.

> ■ Add Beck's first order textbook
> □ Cite 10.7.7.
> ■ Add Nesterov's textbook.
> □ Cite it.

One final Mystery of the algorithm is the convergence of the iterates which also has much to do with the momentum sequence $(\theta_k)_{k \geq 0}$ displayed in Equation 3.1. Chambolle, Dossal showed that by choosing sequence $(t_k)_{k \geq 1}$ to be $t_k = (n + a - 1)/a$ where $a > 2$ instead would give $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ weak convergence in Hilbert space. It's put as an open question on what happens to the iterates when $a = 2$.

> ■ Add paper: "On the convergence of the iterates of the..."
> □ Cite them.

All of these seemingly raises a crucial question: "Is it possible to describe something about the NAG algorithm for a set of sequence that is non-traditional?"; rephrasing it int a more

technical manner: "What is the weakest description of the momentum sequence (θ_k) such that we can still claim something of value about the NAG algorithm?"

3.1 Our Contributions, organizations

Our contributions are two folds, theoretical and practical. The results are based the assumption $F = f + g$ where $g : R^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is convex, and f is an L-Lipschitz smooth and $\mu \geq 0$ strongly convex function. We relax the traditional choice of the sequence θ_k in Equation 3.1 and showed an upper bound of the optimal gap. Let $(\alpha_k)_{k\geq0}, (\rho_k)_{k\geq0}$ be two sequences that satisfy

$$\alpha_0 \in (0, 1],$$
$$\alpha_k \in (\mu/L, 1) \quad (\forall k \geq 1),$$
$$\rho_k := \frac{\alpha_{k+1}^2 - (\mu/L)\alpha_{k+1}}{(1 - \alpha_{k+1})\alpha_k^2} \quad \forall (k \geq 0).$$

Our first main result shows that if $\theta_{k+1} = (\rho_k\alpha_k(1 - \alpha_k)/(\rho_k\alpha_k^2 + \alpha_{k+1}))$, using the R-WAPG we proposed in Definition 3.5 with Proposition 3.6, 3.15, we can show that the gap $F(x_k) - F(x^*)$ is bounded by:

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \max(1, \rho_k) \right) \prod_{i=1}^{k} (1 - \alpha_i) \right).$$

Our second main result shows that there exists $\rho_k > 1$ such that our R-WAPG reduces to a variant of FISTA proposed in Chambolle, Dossal, and we are able to show the same convergence rate in Theorem 3.18. When $\rho_k = 1, \mu = 0$, R-WAPG reduces perfectly to FISTA by in Beck. If $\mu > 0, \rho_k = 1$, it reduces to the V-FISTA by Beck [1]. In Theorem 3.19, it demonstrates that R-WAPG frameworks gives a linear convergence claim for all fixed momentum method where $\alpha_k := \alpha \in (\mu/L, 1)$ and F is $\mu > 0$ strongly convex.

■ Add "On the convergence of the iterates of..."
□ Cite them.

■ Add beck's original FISTA Paper.
□ Cite it.

Our practical contribution is an algorithm inspired by a detail in our convergence proof which we call it "Parameter Free R-WAPG" (See Algorithm 1). The algorithm is parameter free, meaning that it doesn't require knowing L, μ in advance, and it determines the value of θ_t by estimating the local concavity using iterates y_k, y_{k+1} with minimal computational cost. We conducted ample amount of numerical experiments to show that it has a favorable convergence rate in practice and behaves similarly to the FISTA with monotone restart.

Notations, and assumptions now follows. For all the subsection that follows, we let $F := f + g$ to take the same assumptions as in Section 2.2.1. Recall $T_L, \mathcal{G}_L$ denotes the proximal gradient operator and the gradient mapping operator. Additional notations are defined in the assumption below:

Assumption 3.1 Choose any integer $k \geq 0$. Given x_k, y_k, v_k, we define the following quantities

$$g_k := L(y_k - T_L y_k), \tag{3.5}$$

$$l_F(x; y_k) := F(T_L y_k) + \langle g_k, x - y_k \rangle + \frac{1}{2L}\|g_k\|^2, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\epsilon_k := F(x_k) - l_F(x_k; y_k), \tag{3.7}$$

Observe that by convexity of F, $\epsilon_k \geq 0$ for all $x_k, L > 0$. To see, use Theorem 2.17 and let $y = y_k, x = x_k$ which gives:

$$F(x_k) - F(T_L y_k) - \langle L(y_k - T_L y_k), x_k - y_k \rangle - \frac{L}{2}\|y_k - T_L y_k\|^2 - \frac{\mu}{2}\|x_k - y_k\|^2 \geq 0$$

$$\iff F(x_k) - F(T_L y_k) - \langle g_k, x_k - y_k \rangle - \frac{1}{2L}\|g_k\|^2 \geq 0.$$

■ Finish the organizations here after this section is finished.

Organization now follows. Section 3.2 provides a stepwise description of the R-WAPG iterative algorithm along with an inequality crucial to proving the convergence rate later. Section 3.3 introduce the definition of an R-WAPG sequence, which constraints all possible parameters used permitted by the algorithm. The section also states the full R-WAPG algorithm and an upper bound on $F(x_k) - F(x^*)$. Here, x_k is generated by the R-WAPG algorithm and x^* is the minimizer. Section 3.4 bring forward three equivalent forms of the R-WAPG algorithm making it more comparable with other Accelerated Proximal Gradient method appeared in the literatures. Section 3.5 gives characterizations of specific R-WAPG sequence that leads to convergence of the R-WAPG algorithm in terms of the optimality gap. The section also identifies specific instance of permissible R-WAPG sequences where it fits with the FISTA, V-FISTA, and the algorithm proposed by Chambolle Dossal.

□ Cite the Chambolle, Dossal 2015 paper here again.

3.2 Building Blocks of R-WAPG

Definitions:

   ■ R-WAPG stepwise definition.

   ■ R-WAPG stepwise convergence claim.

To do:

   ■ Explain what is what.

Definition3.2 describes the procedures of generating the iterates (v_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) given any

12

(v_k, x_k) and parameter $\alpha_k \in (0, 1), \gamma_k > 0$. Proposition 3.3 gives an inequality instrumental to the convergence rate analysis, with the same assumption as the definition.

Definition 3.2 (Stepwise weak accelerated proximal gradient)
Assume $0 \leq \mu < L$. Fix any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. For any $(v_k, x_k), \alpha_k \in (0, 1), \gamma_k > 0$, let $\hat{\gamma}_{k+1}$, and vectors y_k, v_{k+1}, x_{k+1} be given by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{\gamma}_{k+1} &= (1 - \alpha_k)\gamma_k + \mu\alpha_k, \\
y_k &= (\gamma_k + \alpha_k\mu)^{-1}(\alpha_k\gamma_k v_k + \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} x_k), \\
g_k &= \mathcal{G}_L y_k, \\
v_{k+1} &= \hat{\gamma}_{k+1}^{-1}(\gamma_k(1 - \alpha_k)v_k - \alpha_k g_k + \mu\alpha_k y_k), \\
x_{k+1} &= T_L y_k.
\end{aligned}
$$

Proposition 3.3 (Stepwise Lyapunov)
Fix any integer $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Given any v_k, x_k and $\gamma_k > 0$, invoke Definition 3.2 to obtain $v_{k+1}, x_{k+1}, y_k, \hat{\gamma}_{k+1}$. Fix any arbitrary $R_k \in \mathbb{R}$. Define:

$$
R_{k+1} := \frac{1}{2}\left(L^{-1} - \frac{\alpha_k^2}{\hat{\gamma}_{k+1}}\right)\|g_k\|^2 + (1 - \alpha_k)\left(\epsilon_k + R_k + \frac{\mu\alpha_k\gamma_k}{2\hat{\gamma}_{k+1}}\|v_k - y_k\|^2\right).
$$

Then it has for all $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where $F^* = F(x^*)$, the inequality:

$$
F(x_{k+1}) - F^* + R_{k+1} + \frac{\hat{\gamma}_{k+1}}{2}\|v_{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq (1 - \alpha_k)\left(F(x_k) - F^* + R_k + \frac{\gamma_k}{2}\|v_k - x^*\|^2\right).
$$

3.3 R-WAPG Sequence and R-WAPG algorithm

> The R-WAPG Algorithm and convergence claim. Definitions:
> - ■ R-WAPG Sequence.
> - ■ R-WAPG algorithm
> - ■ Convergence of the R-WAPG algorithm.
>
> Todo:
> - ■ Explain what is what.

The Definition 3.5 gives the definition of an iterative algorithm we called: Relaxed Weak Accelerated Proximal Gradient (R-WAPG) algorithm which generates sequence $(x_k, v_k)_{k \geq 1}$ using the R-WAPG sequences $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 0}, (\rho_k)_{k \geq 0}$ given in Defintion 3.4. Proposition 3.6 shows the upper bound of the optimality gap $F(x_k) - F(x^*)$ with (x_k) generated by the R-WAPG algorithm.

Definition 3.4 (R-WAPG sequences)

Assume $0 \leq \mu < L$. The sequences $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 0}, (\rho_k)_{k \geq 1}$ are sequences parameterized by μ, L. They are valid for R-WAPG if all the following holds:

$$\alpha_0 \in (0, 1],$$
$$\alpha_k \in (\mu/L, 1) \quad (\forall k \geq 1),$$
$$\rho_k := \frac{\alpha_{k+1}^2 - (\mu/L)\alpha_{k+1}}{(1 - \alpha_{k+1})\alpha_k^2} \quad \forall (k \geq 0).$$

*We call $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 0}, (\rho_k)_{k \geq 0}$ the **R-WAPG Sequences**.*

Definition 3.5 (Relaxed weak accelerated proximal gradient (R-WAPG))

Choose any $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n, v_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 0}, (\rho_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be given by Definition 3.4. The algorithm generates a sequence of vector $(y_k, x_{k+1}, v_{k+1})_{k \geq 1}$ for $k \geq 1$ by the procedures:

For $k = 1, 2, 3, \cdots$

$$\gamma_k := \rho_{k-1} L \alpha_{k-1}^2,$$
$$\hat{\gamma}_{k+1} := (1 - \alpha_k)\gamma_k + \mu\alpha_k = L\alpha_k^2,$$
$$y_k = (\gamma_k + \alpha_k\mu)^{-1}(\alpha_k\gamma_k v_k + \hat{\gamma}_{k+1}x_k),$$
$$g_k = \mathcal{G}_L y_k,$$
$$v_{k+1} = \hat{\gamma}_{k+1}^{-1}(\gamma_k(1 - \alpha_k)v_k - \alpha_k g_k + \mu\alpha_k y_k),$$
$$x_{k+1} = T_L y_k.$$

Proposition 3.6 (R-WAPG convergence claim)

Fix any arbitrary $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n, N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let vector sequence $(y_k, v_k, x_k)_{k \geq 1}$ and R-WAPG sequences α_k, ρ_k be given by Definition 3.5. Define $R_1 = 0$ and suppose that for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, we have R_k recursively given by:

$$R_{k+1} := \frac{1}{2}\left(L^{-1} - \frac{\alpha_k^2}{\hat{\gamma}_{k+1}}\right)\|g_k\|^2 + (1 - \alpha_k)\left(\epsilon_k + R_k + \frac{\mu\alpha_k\gamma_k}{2\hat{\gamma}_{k+1}}\|v_k - y_k\|^2\right).$$

Then for all $k = 1, 2, \cdots, N$:

$$F(x_{k+1}) - F(x^*) + \frac{L\alpha_k^2}{2}\|v_{k+1} - x^*\|^2$$
$$\leq \left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\max(1, \rho_k)\right)\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k}(1 - \alpha_i)\right)\left(F(x_1) - F(x^*) + \frac{L\alpha_0^2}{2}\|v_1 - x^*\|^2\right).$$

14

3.4 Equivalent forms of R-WAPG algorithm

Definitions:
- ■ R-WAPG Intermediate form.
- ■ R-WAPG Similar triangle form.
- ■ R-WAPG Momentum form.

Theorems:
- ■ R-WAPG First equivalent form.
- ■ R-WAPG Second equivalent form.
- ■ R-WAPG Third equivalent form.

Lemmas Todo:
- (i) Explain what is what.

Definitions 3.7, 3.9 and 3.11 are three equivalent representations of the R-WAPG algorithms. Propositions 3.13, 3.14 and 3.15 states the equivalences between the forms and the sufficient conditions for initial conditions of x_1, v_1 such equivalence holds. The remarks of the definitions identifies specific instances in the literatures where the Accelerated Proximal Gradient method were presented under this specific form.

☐ Add and explain this part.

Definition 3.7 (R-WAPG intermediate form)

Assume $\mu < L$ and let $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 0}, (\rho_k)_{k \geq 0}$ given by Definition 3.4. Initialize any x_1, v_1 in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For $k \geq 1$, the algorithm generates sequence of vector iterates $(y_k, v_{k+1}, x_{k+1})_{k \geq 1}$ by the procedures:

For $k = 1, 2, \cdots$

$$y_k = \left(1 + \frac{L - L\alpha_k}{L\alpha_k - \mu}\right)^{-1} \left(v_{k+1} + \left(\frac{L - L\alpha_k}{L\alpha_k - \mu}\right) x_k\right),$$

$$x_{k+1} = y_k - L^{-1} \mathcal{G}_L y_k,$$

$$v_{k+1} = \left(1 + \frac{\mu}{L\alpha_k - \mu}\right)^{-1} \left(v_k + \left(\frac{\mu}{L\alpha_k - \mu}\right) y_k\right) - \frac{1}{L\alpha_k} \mathcal{G}_L y_k.$$

Remark 3.8 This form of APG is rarely identified in the literatures. The closest algorithm that fits the form but with $\mu = 0$ is Chapter 12 of in Ryu and Yin's Book [4], right after Theorem 17. We created this form which makes the math that follows simpler. The inspiration of using this as an intermediate representation was inspired by solving Exercise 12.1 in the same Ryu and Yin's Book.

■ Add them
☐ Cite them.

Definition 3.9 (R-WAPG similar triangle form)
Given any (x_1, v_1) in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Assume $\mu < L$. Let the sequence $(\alpha_k)_{k\geq 0}, (\rho_k)_{k\geq 0}$ be given by Definition 3.4. For $k \geq 1$, the algorithm generates sequences of vector iterates $(y_k, v_{k+1}, x_{k+1})_{k\geq 1}$ by the procedures:

$$y_k = \left(1 + \frac{L - L\alpha_k}{L\alpha_k - \mu}\right)^{-1} \left(v_k + \left(\frac{L - L\alpha_k}{L\alpha_k - \mu}\right) x_k\right),$$
$$x_{k+1} = y_k - L^{-1}\mathcal{G}_L y_k,$$
$$v_{k+1} = x_{k+1} + (\alpha_k^{-1} - 1)(x_{k+1} - x_k).$$

For $k = 1, 2, \cdots$

Remark 3.10 The word similar triangle form can be traced back to several literatures. The term "Method of Similar Triangle" was used for Algorithm (6.1.19) in Nesterov's book [2], but without the necessary graphical illustrations to clarify it. Finally, a similar triangle for formulation of FISTA can be found in Equation (2), (3), (4) in [**?**]. To see graphical visualization on why such term is used to describe the APG algorithm in the literatures, see (3.1, 4.1) in Lee et al. [**?**] and Ahn and Sra [**?**].

□ Cite Chambolle Dossal 2015 again.

■ Add these. □ Cite these.

The term "Method of Similar Triangle" specific to this particular representation of AGM. For more information, see:

(i) 3.1, 4.1 in Jongmin Lee et al., "A geometric structure of Acceleration and its role in making gradients small"

(ii) The entirety of Ahn and Sra's paper "PPM interpretation of Nesterov's accelerated gradient. ".

Definition 3.11 (R-WAPG momentum form) *Given any $y_1 = x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and sequences $(\rho_k)_{k\geq 0}, (\alpha_k)_{k\geq 0}$ Definition 3.4. The algorithm generates iterates x_{k+1}, y_{k+1} For $k = 1, 2, \cdots$ by the procedures:*

For $k = 1, 2, \cdots$

$$x_{k+1} = y_k - L^{-1}\mathcal{G}_L y_k,$$
$$y_{k+1} = x_{k+1} + \frac{\rho_k \alpha_k (1 - \alpha_k)}{\rho_k \alpha_k^2 + \alpha_{k+1}}(x_{k+1} - x_k).$$

In the special case where $\mu = 0$, the momentum term can be represented without relaxation parameter ρ_k:

$$(\forall k \geq 1) \quad \frac{\rho_k \alpha_k (1 - \alpha_k)}{\rho_k \alpha_k^2 + \alpha_{k+1}} = \alpha_{k+1}(\alpha_k^{-1} - 1).$$

Remark 3.12 This format fits with (2.2.19) in Nesterov's book [2], however, the sequence $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 0}$ would be given by a different rule. See Theorem 3.18 and Lemma 3.16 to see a specific choice of $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 0}, (\rho_k)_{k \geq 0}$ such this equivalent form of R-WAPG is in fact two possible variants of the FISTA algorithm.

Proposition 3.13 (First equivalent representation of R-WAPG)
If the sequence $(y_k, v_k, x_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is produced by R-WAPG (Definition 3.5), then the iterates can be expressed without $(\gamma_k)_{k \geq 1}, (\hat{\gamma}_k)_{k \geq 2}$, and for all $k \geq 1$ they are algebraically equivalent to

$$y_k = \left(1 + \frac{L - L\alpha_k}{L\alpha_k - \mu}\right)^{-1} \left(v_k + \left(\frac{L - L\alpha_k}{L\alpha_k - \mu}\right) x_k\right),$$

$$x_{k+1} = y_k - L^{-1}\mathcal{G}_L y_k,$$

$$v_{k+1} = \left(1 + \frac{\mu}{L\alpha_k - \mu}\right)^{-1} \left(v_k + \left(\frac{\mu}{L\alpha_k - \mu}\right) y_k\right) - \frac{1}{L\alpha_k}\mathcal{G}_L y_k.$$

Proposition 3.14 (Second equivalent representation of R-WAPG)
Let iterates $(y_k, x_k, v_k)_{k \geq 1}$ and sequence $(\alpha_k, \rho_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be given by Definition 3.7. Then for all $k \geq 1$, iterate y_k, x_{k+1}, v_{k+1} satisfy:

$$y_k = \left(1 + \frac{L - L\alpha_k}{L\alpha_k - \mu}\right)^{-1} \left(v_k + \left(\frac{L - L\alpha_k}{L\alpha_k - \mu}\right) x_k\right),$$

$$x_{k+1} = y_k - L^{-1}\mathcal{G}_L y_k,$$

$$v_{k+1} = x_{k+1} + (\alpha_k^{-1} - 1)(x_{k+1} - x_k).$$

Proposition 3.15 (Third equivalent representation of R-WAPG)
Let sequence $(\alpha_k, \rho_k)_{k \geq 0}$ and iterates $(x_k, v_k, y_k)_{k \geq 1}$ given by R-WAPG intermediate form (Definition 3.9). Then for all $k \geq 1$, the iterates $(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1})_{k \geq 1}$ are algebraically equivalent to:

$$x_{k+1} = y_k - L^{-1}\mathcal{G}_L y_k,$$

$$y_{k+1} = x_{k+1} + \frac{\rho_k \alpha_k (1 - \alpha_k)}{\rho_k \alpha_k^2 + \alpha_{k+1}}(x_{k+1} - x_k).$$

If in addition, $v_1 = x_1$ then

$$y_1 = \left(1 + \frac{L - L\alpha_1}{L\alpha_1 - \mu}\right)^{-1} \left(v_1 + \left(\frac{L - L\alpha_1}{L\alpha_1 - \mu}\right) x_1\right) = x_1.$$

In the special case when $\mu = 0$, the momentum term admits simpler representation

$$(\forall k \geq 1) \quad \frac{\rho_k \alpha_k (1 - \alpha_k)}{\rho_k \alpha_k^2 + \alpha_{k+1}} = \alpha_{k+1}(\alpha_k^{-1} - 1).$$

17

3.5 The descriptive power of R-WAPG on existing variants

Lemma 3.16 indentifies a sequence $(\alpha_k)_{k\geq 0}$ such that $\alpha_k^{-2} \geq \alpha_{k+1}^{-2} - \alpha_{k+1}^{-1}$ as an specific instance of R-WAPG sequence. The lemma showed that sequence $(\alpha_k^{-1})_{k\geq 0}$ is the FISTA sequence which governs the momentum term and convergence claim in FISTA algorithms and variants alike. The lemma also provides a simplified convergence claim using the R-WAPG sequence on Proposition 3.6. Theorem 3.18 stated that the sequences given in Chambolle, Dossal's paper indeed is an instance of R-WAPG sequence, along with that, it indeed attains a convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$.

☐ Cite this paper again here.

Lemma 3.16 (R-WAPG sequences as inverted FISTA sequence) *Let R-WAPG sequence* $(\rho_k)_{k\geq 0}, (\alpha_k)_{k\geq 0}$ *given by Definition 3.4. If* $\mu = 0, \rho_k \geq 1 \ \forall k \geq 0$, *and* $\alpha_0 = 1$, *then:*

(i) $\alpha_k^{-2} \geq \alpha_{k+1}^{-2} - \alpha_{k+1}^{-1} \ \forall k \geq 0$

(ii) *Let* $t_k := \alpha_k^{-1}$, *then* $0 < t_{k+1} \leq (1/2)\left(1 + \sqrt{1 + 4t_k^2}\right) \ \forall k \geq 0$, *hence the name: "Inverted FISTA sequence".*

(iii) $\prod_{i=1}^{k} \max(1, \rho_{k-1})(1 - \alpha_k) = \alpha_k^2 \quad (\forall k \geq 1)$.

Lemma 3.17 (Constant R-WAPG sequences) *Suppose* $(\alpha_k)_{k\geq 0}, (\rho_k)_{k\geq 0}$ *are R-WAPG sequences given by Definition 3.4 and assume* $L > \mu > 0$. *Define* $q := \mu/L$. *Then* $\forall r \in \left(\sqrt{q}, \sqrt{q^{-1}}\right)$, *the constant sequence* $\alpha_k := r\sqrt{q}$ *has the following:*

(i) *Fix any* $r \in \left(\sqrt{q}, \sqrt{q^{-1}}\right)$ *then the constant sequence* $\alpha_k := \alpha \in (q, 1)$ *and*
$\rho_k := \rho = \left(1 - r^{-1}\sqrt{q}\right)\left(1 - r\sqrt{q}\right)^{-1} > 0$, *hence it's a pair of valid R-WAPG sequence.*

(ii) *The momentum term in Definition 3.11, which we denoted by* θ *has:*
$\theta = (1 - r^{-1}\sqrt{q})(1 - r\sqrt{q})(1 - q)^{-1}$.

18

(iii) *When $r = 1$, $\theta = (1 - \sqrt{q})(1 + \sqrt{q})^{-1}$.*

(iv) *For all $r \in \left(1, \sqrt{q^{-1}}\right)$, $\rho > 1$; for all $r \in \left(\sqrt{q}, 1\right]$ $\rho \leq 1$.*

(v) *For all $r \in \left(\sqrt{q}, \sqrt{q^{-1}}\right)$, $\max(\rho, 1)(1 - \alpha) = \max\left(1 - r\sqrt{q}, 1 - r^{-1}q\right)$.*

Theorem 3.18 (FISTA first variant Chambolle, Dossal 2015)
Fix arbitrary $a \geq 2$. Define $\forall k \geq 1$ the sequence $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 0}, (\rho_k)_{k \geq 0}$ by

$$\alpha_k = a/(k + a),$$
$$\rho_k = \frac{(k + a)^2}{(k + 1)(k + a + 1)}.$$

Consider the algorithm given by:

> *Initialize any $y_1 = x_1$.*
> *For $k = 1, 2, \cdots$, update:*
>
> $$x_{k+1} := y_k + L^{-1}\mathcal{G}_L(y_k),$$
> $$\theta_{t+1} := \alpha_{k+1}(\alpha_k^{-1} - 1),$$
> $$y_{k+1} := x_{k+1} + \theta_{k+1}(x_{k+1} - x_k).$$

If $\mu = 0$, then $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 0}, (\rho_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is a valid pair of R-WAPG sequence from Definition 3.4 and the above algorithm is a valid form of R-WAPG.

Assume minimizer x^* exists for function F. Then algorithm produces $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ such that $F(x) - F(x^*)$ convergences at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_k^2)$.

Theorem 3.19 (Fixed momentum APG) *Assume $L > \mu > 0$, let a pair of constant R-WAPG sequence: $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 0}, (\rho_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be given by Lemma 3.17. Define $q := \mu/L$ and for any fixed $r \in \left(\sqrt{q}, \sqrt{q^{-1}}\right)$, let $\alpha_k := \alpha = r\sqrt{q}$ be the constant R-WAPG sequence. Consider the algorithm with a constant momentum specified by the following:*

> *Define $\theta = \left(1 - r^{-1}\sqrt{q}\right)\left(1 - r\sqrt{q}\right)(1 - q)^{-1}$.*
> *Initialize $y_1 = x_1$; for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, update:*
>
> $$x_{k+1} = y_k + L^{-1}\mathcal{G}_L y_k,$$
> $$y_{k+1} = x_{k+1} + \theta(x_{k+1} - x_k).$$

Then the algorithm generates $(x_k)_{k \geq 1}$ such that $F(x) - F(x^*)$ convergences at a rate of $\mathcal{O}\left(\max(1 - r\sqrt{q}, 1 - r^{-1}\sqrt{q})^k\right)$.

4 Method Free R-WAPG

This section introduces an algorithm of our creation inspired by the remark of Proposition 3.3. Algorithm 1 estimates the μ constant as the algorithm executes and pools the information using the Bregman Divergence of the smooth part function f.

Algorithm 1 Free R-WAPG

1: **Input:** $f, g, x_0, L > \mu \geq 0, \in \mathbb{R}^n, N \in \mathbb{N}$
2: **Initialize:** $y_0 := x_0; L := 1; \mu := 1/2; \alpha_0 = 1;$
3: **Compute:** $f(y_k);$
4: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, N$ **do**
5:    **Compute:** $\nabla f(y_k); x^+ := [I + L^{-1}\partial g](y_k - L^{-1}\nabla f(y_k));$
6:    **while** $L/2\|x^+ - y\|^2 < D_f(x^+, y)$ **do**
7:      $L := 2L;$
8:      $x^+ = [I + L^{-1}\partial g](y_k - L^{-1}\nabla f(y_k));$
9:    **end while**
10:   $x_{k+1} := x^+;$
11:   $\alpha_{k+1} := (1/2)\left(\mu/L - \alpha_k^2 + \sqrt{(\mu/L - \alpha_k^2)^2 + 4\alpha_k^2}\right);$
12:   $\theta_{k+1} := \alpha_k(1 - \alpha_k)/(\alpha_k^2 + \alpha_{k+1});$
13:   $y_{k+1} := x_{k+1} + \theta_{k+1}(x_{k+1} - x_k);$
14:   **Compute:** $f(y_{k+1})$
15:   $\mu := (1/2)(2D_f(y_{k+1}, y_k)/\|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2) + (1/2)\mu;$
16: **end for**

Line 5-8 estimates upper bound for the Lipschitz constant and find x^+, the next iterates produced by proximal gradient descent on previous y_k. Line 9 updates x_{k+1} to be x^+, a successful iterate identified by the Lipschitz line search routine. Line 10 updates the R-WAPG sequence α_k for the iterates y_{k+1}. Line 13 updates μ using the Bregman Divergence of f from iterates y_{k+1}, y_k.

Assume L given is an upper bound of the Lipschitz smoothness constant of f, then the algorithm calls $f(\cdot)$ two times, and $\nabla f(\cdot)$ once per iteration. The algorithm computes $\nabla f(y_k)$ once for x^+, $f(y_{k+1})$ once for Bregman Divergence because $f(y_k)$ is evaluated from the previous iteration, and $f(x^+)$ once for Lipschitz constant line search condition. We note that $f(y_0)$ is computed before the start of the for loop. And finally, it evaluates proximal of g at $y_k - L^{-1}\nabla f(y_k)$ once.

5 Catalyst accelerations and future works

Literatures review of the topics in Catalyst acceleration method. Here is a list of topics:

(i) The original accelerated PPM.

(ii) The Catalyst with weakly convex objectives.

After the literature reviews of the core literatures, move on and state new research directions and open problems. There are several directions for open problem:

(i) APPM method for monotone operators instead of just subgradient, whether the same framework exists in a greater context.

(ii) Accelerated Proximal Bregman Method.

(iii) Removing smoothness assumption in Catalyst acceleration framework.

A list of relevant literatures:

(i) Güler's 1992 paper on Accelerated Proximal Point method.

(ii) Lin's, and Payquette's three triology paper on Catalyst acceleration for convex, non-convex Variance reduced algorithm.

6 Performance estimation problems

There are several foundational papers relevant.

7 Methods of inexact proximal point

8 Nestrov's acceleration in the non-convex case

9 Using PostGreSQL and big data analytic method for species classification on Sentinel-2 Satellite remote sensing imagery

References

[1] A. BECK, *First-order Methods in Optimization*, MOS-SIAM Series in Optimization, SIAM, israel, 2017.

[2] Y. NESTEROV, *Lectures on Convex Optimization*, vol. 137 of Springer Optimization and Its Applications, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018.

[3] W. NOEL, *Nesterov's method for convex optimization*, SIAM Review, 65, pp. 539–562.

[4] E. K. RYU AND W. YIN, *Large-scale Convex Optimization: Algorithms & Analyses via Monotone Operators*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2022.