

Optimizing the Efficiency of First-order Methods for Decreasing the Gradient of Smooth Convex Functions

Donghwan Kim · Jeffrey A. Fessler

Date of current version: March 22, 2018

Abstract This paper optimizes the step coefficients of first-order methods for smooth convex minimization in terms of the worst-case convergence bound (*i.e.*, efficiency) of the decrease of the gradient norm. This work is based on the performance estimation problem approach [5]. The corresponding worst-case gradient bound of the optimized method is optimal up to a constant for large-dimensional smooth convex minimization problems [13]. This paper then illustrates that the resulting method, named OGM-G, has a computationally efficient form that is similar to the optimized gradient method (OGM) [9].

Keywords First-order methods · Gradient methods · Smooth convex minimization · Worst-case performance analysis

1 Introduction

Large-dimensional optimization problems arise in various modern applications of signal processing, machine learning, control, communication, and many other areas. First-order methods are widely used for solving such large-scale problems as their iterations involve only function/gradient calculations and simple vector operations. However, they can require many iterations to achieve the given accuracy level. Therefore, developing efficient first-order methods has received great interest, which is the main motivation of this paper that targets the decrease of the gradient for smooth convex minimization. This paper uses the performance estimation problem (PEP) in [5], and leads to a new method called OGM-G.

Among the first-order methods for smooth convex minimization, Nesterov's fast gradient method (FGM) [14, 15] has been used widely because its worst-case cost function bound (*i.e.*, the cost function efficiency) is optimal up to a constant [13, 15]. Recently, the optimized gradient method (OGM) [9] (that was numerically first identified in [5] using PEP) was found to exactly achieve the optimal worst-case rate of decreasing the smooth convex functions [4], leaving no room for improvement in the worst-case. On the other hand, first-order methods that decrease the gradient at an optimal rate are yet unknown, even up to a constant, yet such gradient rate analysis is useful both in theory (*e.g.*, for a dual approach [16] and a matrix scaling problem [1]) and in practice (*e.g.*, can be used as a stopping criterion); there is a recent interest in developing accelerated methods for decreasing the gradient (in convex minimization) [1, 2, 8, 11, 16]. The best known worst-case gradient rate is achieved by FGM with a regularization technique in [16] that is optimal up to a logarithmic factor, but that method requires knowledge of a practically unavailable value such as the distance between the initial and optimal points. In [8] we used PEP to derive efficient first-order methods that do not need knowledge of such unavailable values. However, the methods in [8] are far from achieving the optimal rate (not even up to a logarithmic factor), due to strict relaxations introduced to PEP in [8], while a similar rate (but with larger constant) was also studied in [6, 11, 12, 16]. In a nutshell, there is still room to improve the worst-case gradient convergence bound of the first-order methods for smooth convex minimization.

This research was supported in part by NIH grant U01 EB018753.

Donghwan Kim · Jeffrey A. Fessler

Dept. of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 USA

E-mail: kimdongh@umich.edu, fessler@umich.edu

This paper optimizes the step coefficients of first-order methods in terms of the worst-case gradient decrease using PEP [5], leading to a new method called OGM-G, by avoiding strict relaxations on PEP in [8]. This paper then shows that OGM-G has an equivalent form that is similar to OGM, and thus has an inexpensive per-iteration computational complexity. In [13], the optimal worst-case rate was studied for the gradient decrease of convex *quadratic* minimization problems, which is naturally a lower bound on the optimal worst-case gradient bound for smooth convex minimization problems. OGM-G attains this $O(1/N^2)$ optimal bound of the worst-case gradient norm squared up to a constant under the initial bounded function condition, improving upon the papers [6, 8, 11, 12, 16] that do not attain the optimal rate (under either the initial bounded function or distance conditions). On the way, this paper provides an exact worst-case gradient bound for the gradient method (GM).

Sec. 2 reviews a smooth convex problem and first-order methods. Sec. 3 reviews the efficiency and its limit of the first-order methods in [4, 13]. Sec. 4 studies the PEP approach [5] and its relaxations for the worst-case gradient decrease analysis. Sec. 5 uses the relaxed PEP to provide the exact worst-case gradient bound for GM. Sec. 6 optimizes the step coefficients of the first-order methods using the relaxed PEP, and develops an efficient first-order method named OGM-G. Sec. 7 concludes the paper.

2 Problems and Methods

2.1 Smooth Convex Problems

We are interested in efficiently solving the following smooth and convex minimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}), \quad (\text{M})$$

where we assume that

- the function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function of the type $C_L^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, *i.e.*, its gradient $\nabla f(\mathbf{x})$ is Lipschitz continuous:

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{y})\| \leq L\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (2.1)$$

with a Lipschitz constant $L > 0$, and

- the optimal set $X_*(f) := \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x})$ is nonempty.

We denote the class of functions satisfying the two above conditions as $\mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We further assume that an initial point \mathbf{x}_0 satisfies the following condition for some $\mathbf{x}_* \in X_*(f)$:

- the function values between initial and optimal points are bounded as

$$f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \leq \frac{1}{2}LR^2 \quad \text{for a constant } R > 0. \quad (\text{ICF})$$

2.2 First-order Methods

To solve a large-dimensional problem (M), we consider first-order methods that iteratively gain first-order information, *i.e.*, values of the cost function f and its gradient ∇f at any given point in \mathbb{R}^d . The computational effort for acquiring those values depends mildly on the problem dimension. We are interested in developing a first-order method that efficiently generates a point \mathbf{x}_N after N iterations (starting from an initial point \mathbf{x}_0) that minimizes the worst-case absolute gradient inaccuracy:

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_N)\|^2. \quad (2.2)$$

For simplicity in sections 4, 5 and 6 that use the PEP approach (as in [5]), we consider the following *fixed-step* first-order methods (FSFOM):

$$\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_i - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k=0}^i h_{i+1,k} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k) \quad i = 0, \dots, N-1, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\mathbf{h} := \{h_{i+1,k}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{N(N+1)/2}$ is a tuple of fixed step coefficients that do not depend on f and \mathbf{x}_0 . This FSFOM class includes (fixed-step) GM, (fixed-step) FGM, OGM, and the proposed OGM-G, but excludes line-search approaches.

3 Efficiency of First-order Methods

This paper seeks to improve the *efficiency* of first-order methods, where the efficiency consists of the following two parts; the computational effort for selecting a search point (*e.g.*, line search), and the number of evaluations of the cost function value and gradient at each given search point to reach a given accuracy. This paper considers both parts of the efficiency, while particularly focusing on the latter part, as also detailed in this section. Regarding the former aspect of the efficiency, we later show that the proposed OGM-G has an efficient form, similar to (fixed-step) FGM and OGM, requiring computational effort comparable to that of a (fixed-step) GM.

An efficiency estimate of an optimization method is defined by the worst-case absolute inaccuracy. One popular choice of the worst-case absolute inaccuracy is the worst-case absolute cost function inaccuracy:

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} f(\mathbf{x}_N) - f(\mathbf{x}_*), \quad (3.1)$$

with the following initial condition (different from (ICF)):

- the distance between initial and optimal points are bounded as

$$\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}_*\| \leq \bar{R} \quad \text{for a constant } \bar{R} > 0, \quad (\text{ICD})$$

GM has an $O(1/N)$ cost function efficiency (3.1) [15], and this was improved to $O(1/N^2)$ rate by FGM [14, 15]. This efficiency was further optimized by OGM [5, 9], which was shown to exactly achieve the optimal efficiency in [4].

Compared to the worst-case cost function efficiency (3.1), the worst-case absolute gradient inaccuracy (2.2) has received less attention [13, 16, 17, 18]; this paper optimizes this gradient efficiency (2.2). For the condition (ICD), GM has an $O(1/N^2)$ gradient efficiency [16], while FGM with a regularization technique [16] that requires the knowledge of (practically unavailable) \bar{R} achieves $O(1/N^4)$ up to a logarithmic factor, which is the best known rate. The rate $O(1/N^4)$ is an optimal gradient efficiency with given (ICD) [13]. On the other hand, the papers [6, 8, 11, 12, 16] studied first-order methods that do not require knowing \bar{R} and that have $O(1/N^3)$ gradient efficiency, but apparently none of them (including [16]) have optimal efficiency (even up to a constant).

On the other hand, gradient efficiency with the condition (ICF) has received even less attention [13, 17], but is known to have $O(1/N^2)$ optimal efficiency [13]. Sec. 5 provides the exact $O(1/N)$ rate of GM. The paper [2] discusses that FGM with a regularization technique [16] with (ICF) also achieves the optimal worst-case gradient rate $O(1/N^2)$ up to a logarithmic factor, which is the best previously known rate; this paper provides a better rate. In a nutshell, none of the existing first-order methods achieve the optimal rate even up to a constant, and thus this paper focuses on fully optimizing the gradient efficiency of first-order methods for smooth convex minimization with condition (ICF), while leaving a similar investigation under the condition (ICD) to future work. Table 1 summarizes the efficiency of first-order methods, and illustrates that the proposed OGM-G attains the optimal worst-case gradient rate $O(1/N^2)$ under the condition (ICF).

Efficiency	Initial cond.	GM rate	Best known rate		OGM-G rate	Optimal rate
			w/o R or \bar{R}	w/ R or \bar{R}		
Cost func. (3.1)	(ICD)	$O(1/N)$	$O(1/N^2)$.	$O(1/N^2)$
Gradient (2.2)	(ICD)	$O(1/N^2)$	$O(1/N^3)$	$\tilde{O}(1/N^4)$.	$O(1/N^4)$
	(ICF)	$O(1/N)$	$O(1/N)$	$\tilde{O}(1/N^2)$	$O(1/N^2)$	$O(1/N^2)$

Table 1 Summary of the efficiency of first-order methods discussed in Sec. 3 [2, 13, 15, 16]. $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ is a big- O notation that ignores a logarithmic factor.

4 Performance Estimation Problem (PEP) for the Worst-case Gradient Decrease

This section studies PEP [5] and its relaxations for the worst-case gradient analysis under the condition (ICF).

4.1 Exact PEP

The papers [5, 18] suggest that for any given step coefficients $\mathbf{h} := \{h_{i,k}\}$ of a FSFOM, total number of iterations N , problem dimension d , and constants L, R , the exact worst-case gradient bound is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_P(\mathbf{h}, N, d, L, R) := & \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} \max_{\substack{\mathbf{x}_0, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \mathbf{x}_* \in \mathcal{X}_*(f)}} \frac{1}{L^2 R^2} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_N)\|^2 \\ \text{s.t. } & \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_i - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k=0}^i h_{i+1,k} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k), & i = 0, \dots, N-1, \\ f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \leq \frac{1}{2} L R^2. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{P})$$

However, as noted in [5], it is intractable to solve (P) due to its infinite dimensional function constraint. Thus the next section employs relaxations introduced in [5].

4.2 Relaxing PEP

As suggested by [5, 18], to convert (P) into an equivalent finite dimensional problem, we replace the constraint $f \in \mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by a finite set of inequalities satisfied by $f \in \mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$ [15, Theorem 2.1.5]:

$$\frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_j)\|^2 \leq f(\mathbf{x}_i) - f(\mathbf{x}_j) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_j), \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j \rangle \quad (4.1)$$

on each pair $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$ for $i, j = 0, \dots, N, *. We further narrow down the set¹ of inequalities (4.1), specifically the pairs $\{(\mathbf{x}_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_i) : i = 1, \dots, N\}$, $\{(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{x}_i) : i = 0, \dots, N-1\}$ and $\{(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{x}_*)\}$. This relaxation leads to$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{P1}(\mathbf{h}, N, d) := & \max_{\substack{\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1) \times d}, \\ \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}}} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{u}_N \mathbf{u}_N^\top \mathbf{G} \right\} \\ \text{s.t. } & \begin{cases} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{A}_{i-1,i}(\mathbf{h}) \mathbf{G} \right\} \leq \delta_{i-1} - \delta_i, & i = 1, \dots, N, \\ \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{B}_{N,i}(\mathbf{h}) \mathbf{G} \right\} \leq \delta_N - \delta_i, & i = 0, \dots, N-1, \\ \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{C}_N \mathbf{G} \right\} \leq \delta_N, \\ \delta_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{P1})$$

where we define

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{g}_i := \frac{1}{LR} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i), & i = 0, \dots, N, \\ \mathbf{G} := [\mathbf{g}_0, \dots, \mathbf{g}_N]^\top, \\ \delta_i := \frac{1}{LR^2} (f(\mathbf{x}_i) - f(\mathbf{x}_*)), & i = 0, \dots, N, \\ \boldsymbol{\delta} := [\delta_0, \dots, \delta_N]^\top, \\ \mathbf{u}_i := [0, \dots, 0, \underbrace{1}_{(i+1)\text{th entry}}, 0, \dots, 0]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}, & i = 0, \dots, N, \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{A}_{i-1,i}(\mathbf{h}) := \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{u}_{i-1} - \mathbf{u}_i) (\mathbf{u}_{i-1} - \mathbf{u}_i)^\top + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} h_{i,k} (\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_k^\top + \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{u}_i^\top), & i = 1, \dots, N, \\ \mathbf{B}_{N,i}(\mathbf{h}) := \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{u}_N - \mathbf{u}_i) (\mathbf{u}_N - \mathbf{u}_i)^\top - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=i+1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} h_{l,k} (\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_k^\top + \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{u}_i^\top), & i = 0, \dots, N-1, \\ \mathbf{C}_N := \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}_N \mathbf{u}_N^\top. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

Replacing $\max_{\mathbf{G}, \boldsymbol{\delta}} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{u}_N \mathbf{u}_N^\top \mathbf{G} \right\}$ of (P1) by $\min_{\mathbf{G}, \boldsymbol{\delta}} \text{Tr} \left\{ -\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{u}_N \mathbf{u}_N^\top \mathbf{G} \right\}$ for convenience, the Lagrangian function becomes

$$L(\mathbf{G}, \boldsymbol{\delta}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e; \mathbf{h}) := L_1(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e) + L_2(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c; \mathbf{h}) \quad (4.4)$$

¹ We found that the set of constraints in (P1) is sufficient for the exact worst-case gradient analysis of GM and OGM-G for (ICF), as illustrated in later sections. This choice for relaxing (P) differs from the choice in [5].

with four dual variables $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, \dots, a_N]^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $\mathbf{b} = [b_0, \dots, b_{N-1}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and $e \in \mathbb{R}_+$ corresponding to each constraint of (P1) in order, where

$$\begin{cases} L_1(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e) := \sum_{i=1}^N a_i(\delta_i - \delta_{i-1}) + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} b_i(\delta_i - \delta_N) - c\delta_N + e(\delta_0 - \frac{1}{2}), \\ L_2(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c; \mathbf{h}) := \text{Tr}\{\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c) \mathbf{G}\}, \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c) \\ & := \sum_{i=1}^N a_i \mathbf{A}_{i-1,i}(\mathbf{h}) + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} b_i \mathbf{B}_{N,i}(\mathbf{h}) + c \mathbf{C}_N(\mathbf{h}) - \mathbf{u}_N \mathbf{u}_N^\top \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N a_i (\mathbf{u}_{i-1} - \mathbf{u}_i)(\mathbf{u}_{i-1} - \mathbf{u}_i)^\top + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} b_i (\mathbf{u}_N - \mathbf{u}_i)(\mathbf{u}_N - \mathbf{u}_i)^\top + \frac{1}{2} (c - 2) \mathbf{u}_N \mathbf{u}_N^\top \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} a_i h_{i,k} (\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_k^\top + \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{u}_i^\top) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(b_i \sum_{l=\max\{i+1, k+1\}}^N h_{l,k} \right) (\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_k^\top + \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{u}_i^\top). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

The corresponding dual function is defined as

$$H(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e) := \min_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}} L_1(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e) + \min_{\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1) \times d}} L_2(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c; \mathbf{h}). \quad (4.7)$$

Since $L_1(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e)$ is linear in $\boldsymbol{\delta}$, we have $\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} L_1(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e) = 0$ whenever $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e) \in \Lambda$ for

$$\Lambda := \left\{ (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2N+2} : \begin{array}{l} -a_1 + b_0 + e = 0, \\ a_i - a_{i+1} + b_i = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1, \\ a_N - \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} b_i - c = 0. \end{array} \right\}, \quad (4.8)$$

and $\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} L_1(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e) = -\infty$ otherwise. Using [5, Lemma 1], the dual function can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} H(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e) & = \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}} \left\{ \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c) \mathbf{w} - \frac{1}{2} e \right\} \\ & = \max_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \gamma : \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \frac{1}{2}(\gamma - e) \end{pmatrix} \succeq \mathbf{0} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

for any $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e) \in \Lambda$, and we have the following dual problem of (P1):

$$\mathcal{B}_D(\mathbf{h}, N) := \min_{\substack{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e) \in \Lambda, \\ \gamma \in \mathbb{R}}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \gamma : \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \frac{1}{2}(\gamma - e) \end{pmatrix} \succeq \mathbf{0} \right\}, \quad (\text{D})$$

recalling that we replaced $\max_{\mathbf{G}, \boldsymbol{\delta}} \text{Tr}\{\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{u}_N \mathbf{u}_N^\top \mathbf{G}\}$ of (P1) by $\min_{\mathbf{G}, \boldsymbol{\delta}} \text{Tr}\{-\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{u}_N \mathbf{u}_N^\top \mathbf{G}\}$. For given \mathbf{h} and N , a semidefinite programming (SDP) problem (D) could be solved numerically using an SDP solver (e.g., [3, 7]). The next two sections analytically specify feasible points of (D) for GM and OGM-G, which were numerically first identified to be solutions of (D) for each method by the authors. These feasible points provide the exact worst-case analytical gradient bounds for GM and OGM-G.

5 Applying the Relaxed PEP to GM

Inspired by the numerical solutions of (D) for GM using an SDP solver [3, 7], we next specify a feasible point of (D) for GM.

Lemma 1 For GM, i.e. the FSFOM with $h_{i+1,k}$ having 1 for $k = i$ and 0 otherwise, the following set of dual variables:

$$\begin{cases} a_i = \frac{2(N+i)}{(N-i+1)(2N+1)} = \frac{N+i}{N-i+1} \gamma, & i = 1, \dots, N, \\ b_i = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{N(2N+1)} = \frac{1}{N} \gamma, & i = 0, \\ \frac{2}{(N-i)(N-i+1)}, & i = 1, \dots, N-1, \end{cases} \\ c = e = \gamma = \frac{2}{2N+1}, \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

is a feasible point of (D).

Proof It is obvious that (5.1) is in Λ (4.8), and the rest of proof shows the positive semidefinite condition of (D).

For any \mathbf{h} and $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e) \in \Lambda$, the (i, j) th entry of the symmetric matrix (4.6) can be rewritten as

$$[2\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c)]_{ij} \quad (5.2)$$

$$= \begin{cases} a_1 + b_0 (1 - 2 \sum_{l=1}^N h_{l,0}), & i = 0, j = i, \\ a_i + a_{i+1} + b_i (1 - 2 \sum_{l=i+1}^N h_{l,i}), & i = 1, \dots, N-1, j = i, \\ a_N + \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} b_l + c - 2 = 2(a_N - 1), & i = N, j = i, \\ a_i(h_{i,i-1} - 1) - b_i \sum_{l=i+1}^N h_{l,i-1} - b_{i-1} \sum_{l=i+1}^N h_{l,i}, & i = 1, \dots, N-1, j = i-1, \\ a_N(h_{N,N-1} - 1) - b_{N-1}, & i = N, j = i-1, \\ a_i h_{i,j} - b_i \sum_{l=i+1}^N h_{l,j} - b_j \sum_{l=i+1}^N h_{l,i}, & i = 2, \dots, N-1, j = 0, \dots, i-2, \\ a_N h_{N,j} - b_j, & i = N, j = 0, \dots, i-2. \end{cases}$$

Substituting the step coefficients \mathbf{h} for GM and the dual variables (5.1) in (5.2) yields

$$[2\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c)]_{ij} = \begin{cases} a_1 - b_0 = \gamma, & i = 0, j = i, \\ a_i + a_{i+1} - b_i = 2a_i, & i = 1, \dots, N-1, j = i, \\ 2(a_N - 1), & i = N, j = i, \\ -b_j, & i = 1, \dots, N, j = 0, \dots, i-1. \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

The matrix (5.3) has non-negative diagonal entries, and thus showing the diagonal dominance of the matrix (5.3) implies its positive semidefiniteness, which then proves the positive semidefinite condition of (D) with $\gamma = e$ in (5.1).

A sum of absolute values of non-diagonal elements for each row is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \neq i}}^N |[2\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c)]_{ij}| &= \begin{cases} Nb_0, & i = 0, \\ b_0 + (N-1)b_1 & i = 1, \\ \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} b_j + (N-i)b_i & i = 2, \dots, N-1, \\ \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} b_j & i = N, \end{cases} \quad (5.4) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{2}{2N+1}, & i = 0, \\ \frac{2}{N(2N+1)} + \frac{2}{N} = \frac{4(N+1)}{N(2N+1)}, & i = 1, \\ \frac{2}{N(2N+1)} + \frac{2}{N-i+1} - \frac{2}{N} + \frac{2}{N-i+1} = \frac{4(N+i)}{(N-i+1)(2N+1)}, & i = 2, \dots, N-1, \\ \frac{2}{N(2N+1)} + 2 - \frac{2}{N} = \frac{2(2N-1)}{2N+1}, & i = N, \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \gamma, & i = 0, \\ \frac{2(N+i)}{(N-i+1)} \gamma, & i = 1, \dots, N-1, \\ 2(2N\gamma - 1), & i = N, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and this satisfies $[2\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c)]_i = \sum_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \neq i}}^N |[2\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c)]_{ij}|$ for all i , i.e., the matrix (5.3) is diagonally dominant, and this concludes the proof.

The next theorem provides the worst-case convergence gradient bound of GM.

Theorem 1 For $f \in \mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let $\mathbf{x}_0, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be generated by GM, i.e., the FSFOM with $h_{i+1,k}$ having 1 for $k = i$ and 0 otherwise. Then, for any $N \geq 1$,

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_N)\|^2 \leq \frac{2L(f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}_*))}{2N+1} \quad (5.5)$$

Proof Using Lemma 1 for the step coefficients \mathbf{h} of GM, we have $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_N)\|^2 \leq L^2 R^2 \mathcal{B}_D(\mathbf{h}, N) = L^2 R^2 \frac{1}{2N+1}$. Now apply (ICF), i.e., let $f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}_*) = \frac{1}{2}LR^2$.

We next show that the bound (5.5) is exact by specifying a certain worst-case function. This implies that the feasible point in (5.1) is an optimal point of (D) for GM.

Lemma 2 For the following Huber function in $\mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $d \geq 1$:

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \frac{LR}{\sqrt{2N+1}}\|\mathbf{x}\| - \frac{LR^2}{2(2N+1)}, & \|\mathbf{x}\| \geq \frac{R}{\sqrt{2N+1}}, \\ \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}\|^2, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

GM exactly achieves the bound (5.5).

Proof Starting from $\mathbf{x}_0 = \frac{N+1}{\sqrt{2N+1}}R\mathbf{v}$ that satisfies $\phi(\mathbf{x}_0) - \phi(\mathbf{x}_*) = \frac{1}{2}LR^2$ (ICF) for any unit-norm vector \mathbf{v} , the iterates of GM are as follows

$$\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_0 - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \nabla \phi(\mathbf{x}_k) = \left(\frac{N+1}{\sqrt{2N+1}} - \frac{i}{\sqrt{2N+1}} \right) R\mathbf{v}, \quad i = 0, \dots, N,$$

where all the iterates stay in the affine region of the function $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ with the same gradient $\nabla \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{LR}{\sqrt{2N+1}}\mathbf{v}$, $i = 0, \dots, N$. Therefore, after N iterations of GM, we have $\|\nabla \phi(\mathbf{x}_N)\|^2 = \frac{L^2 R^2}{2N+1}$, which concludes the proof.

Remark 1 The N th iterate \mathbf{x}_N of GM has the following exact worst-case cost function bound [5, Theorems 1 and 2]:

$$f(\mathbf{x}_N) - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \leq \frac{L\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}_*\|^2}{2(2N+1)}, \quad (5.7)$$

where this exact upper bound is equivalent to the exact worst-case gradient bound (5.5) of GM up to a constant $\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}_*\|^2}{4(f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}_*))}$. Similar relationship also appears in [17, Table 3] for the composite convex minimization.

6 Optimizing FSFOM Using the Relaxed PEP

This section optimizes the step coefficients of FSFOM using the relaxed PEP (D) to develop an efficient first-order method for decreasing gradient of smooth convex functions.

6.1 Numerically Optimizing FSFOM Using the Relaxed PEP

To optimize the step coefficients of \mathbf{h} of FSFOM for each given N , we are interested in solving

$$\tilde{\mathbf{h}} := \arg \min_{\mathbf{h}} \mathcal{B}_D(\mathbf{h}, N), \quad (\text{HD})$$

which is non-convex. However, the problem (HD) is bi-convex over \mathbf{h} and $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c, e, \gamma)$, so for each given N we numerically solved (HD) by an alternating minimization approach using an SDP solver [3, 7]. Inspired by those numerical solutions, the next section specifies a feasible point of (HD).

6.2 A Feasible Point of the Relaxed PEP

The following lemma specifies a feasible point of (HD).

Lemma 3 *The following step coefficients of FSFOM:*

$$\tilde{h}_{i+1,k} = \begin{cases} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{k+1}-1}{\tilde{\theta}_k} \tilde{h}_{i+1,k+1}, & k = 0, \dots, i-2, \\ \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{k+1}-1}{\tilde{\theta}_k} (\tilde{h}_{i+1,i} - 1), & k = i-1, \\ 1 + \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}-1}{\tilde{\theta}_i}, & k = i, \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

and the following set of dual variables:

$$\begin{cases} a_i = \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_i^2}, & i = 1, \dots, N, \\ b_i = \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_i \tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2}, & i = 0, \dots, N-1, \\ c = e = \gamma = \frac{2}{\tilde{\theta}_0^2}, \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

constitute a feasible point of (HD) for the parameters:

$$\tilde{\theta}_i = \begin{cases} \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 8\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2}}{2}, & i = 0, \\ \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2}}{2}, & i = 1, \dots, N-1, \\ 1, & i = N. \end{cases} \quad (6.3)$$

Proof Appendix A first derives properties of the step coefficients $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \{\tilde{h}_{i,k}\}$ (6.1) that are used in the proof:

$$\tilde{h}_{i,j} = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_i^2 (2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_j \tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2}, \quad i = 2, \dots, N, \quad j = 0, \dots, i-2, \quad (6.4)$$

$$\sum_{l=i+1}^N \tilde{h}_{l,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\theta}_0 + 1), & i = 0, \quad j = i, \\ \tilde{\theta}_i, & i = 1, \dots, N-1, \quad j = i, \\ \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^4}{\tilde{\theta}_j \tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2}, & i = 1, \dots, N-1, \quad j = 0, \dots, i-1. \end{cases} \quad (6.5)$$

By definition of $\tilde{\theta}_i$ (6.3), we also have

$$\tilde{\theta}_i^2 = \begin{cases} \tilde{\theta}_i + 2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2, & i = 0, \\ \tilde{\theta}_i + \tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2, & i = 1, \dots, N-1. \end{cases} \quad (6.6)$$

Substituting the step coefficients $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ (6.1) and the dual variables (6.2) with their properties (6.4), (6.5) and (6.6) in (5.2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & [2\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c)]_{ij} \\ & \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_1^2} + \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_0 \tilde{\theta}_1^2} (1 - (\tilde{\theta}_0 + 1)), & i = 0, \quad j = i, \\ \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_i^2} + \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2} + \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_i \tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2} (1 - 2\tilde{\theta}_i) = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2 + \tilde{\theta}_i - \tilde{\theta}_i^2}{\tilde{\theta}_i^2 \tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2}, & i = 1, \dots, N-1, \quad j = i, \\ 2 \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_N^2} - 1 \right), & i = N, \quad j = i, \\ \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_i^2} \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}} - \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_i \tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^4}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1} \tilde{\theta}_i^2} - \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1} \tilde{\theta}_i^2} \tilde{\theta}_i = \frac{(2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)\tilde{\theta}_i - \tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2 - \tilde{\theta}_i^2}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1} \tilde{\theta}_i^3}, & i = 1, \dots, N-1, \quad j = i-1, \\ \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_N^2} \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_N - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{N-1}} - \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_{N-1} \tilde{\theta}_N^2}, & i = N, \quad j = i-1, \\ \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_i^2} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_i^2 (2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_j \tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2} - \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_i \tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^4}{\tilde{\theta}_j \tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2} - \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_j \tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2} \tilde{\theta}_i = \frac{(2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)\tilde{\theta}_i - (\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)^2 \tilde{\theta}_i^2 - \tilde{\theta}_i^2}{\tilde{\theta}_j \tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2 \tilde{\theta}_i}, & i = 2, \dots, N-1, \quad j = 0, \dots, i-2, \\ \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_N^2} \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_j \tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2} - \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_j \tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2}, & i = N, \quad j = 0, \dots, i-2, \end{cases} \\ & = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

This equality shows the positive semidefinite condition of (D) (and (HD)) using $\gamma = e$, which concludes the proof.

The next theorem provides the worst-case convergence gradient bound of FSFOM with step coefficients (6.1).

Theorem 2 For $f \in \mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let $\mathbf{x}_0, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be generated by FSFOM with step coefficients (6.1). Then, for any $N \geq 1$,

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_N)\|^2 \leq \frac{2L(f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}_*))}{\tilde{\theta}_0^2} \leq \frac{4L(f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}_*))}{(N+1)^2}. \quad (6.7)$$

Proof Using Lemma 3, we have $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_N)\|^2 \leq L^2 R^2 \mathcal{B}_D(\mathbf{h}, N) = L^2 R^2 \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_0^2}$. We can easily show that $\tilde{\theta}_i$ (6.3) satisfies $\tilde{\theta}_i \geq \frac{N-i+2}{2}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$ by induction, and this then yields $\tilde{\theta}_0 \geq \frac{N+1}{\sqrt{2}}$. Now apply (ICF), i.e., let $f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}_*) = \frac{1}{2}LR^2$, which concludes the proof.

The bound (6.7) of FSFOM with (6.1) is optimal up to a constant because Nemirovsky shows in [13] that the worst-case rate for the gradient decrease of large-dimensional convex quadratic function is $O(1/N^2)$ under (ICF). However, the per-iteration computational complexity of FSFOM with (6.1) would be expensive if implemented directly via (2.3), compared to GM, FGM and OGM, so the next section seeks its efficient form.

6.3 An Efficient Form of the Proposed Optimized Method: OGM-G

This section develops an efficient form of FSFOM with the step coefficients (6.1), named OGM-G.

OGM-G

Input: $f \in \mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{y}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $N \geq 1$.

$$\tilde{\theta}_i = \begin{cases} \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 8\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2}}{2}, & i = 0, \\ \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^2}}{2}, & i = 1, \dots, N-1, \\ 1, & i = N, \end{cases}$$

For $i = 0, \dots, N-1$,

$$\mathbf{y}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_i - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i),$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{y}_{i+1} + \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)(2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1} - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_i(2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)}(\mathbf{y}_{i+1} - \mathbf{y}_i) + \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1} - 1}{2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1}(\mathbf{y}_{i+1} - \mathbf{x}_i).$$

Proposition 1 The sequence $\{\mathbf{x}_0, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N\}$ generated by FSFOM with (6.1) is identical to the corresponding sequence generated by OGM-G.

Proof We first show that the step coefficients $\{\tilde{h}_{i+1,k}\}$ (6.1) are equivalent to

$$\tilde{h}'_{i+1,k} = \begin{cases} \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)(2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1} - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_i(2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)} \tilde{h}'_{i,k}, & k = 0, \dots, i-2, \\ \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)(2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1} - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_i(2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)} (\tilde{h}'_{i,i-1} - 1), & k = i-1, \\ 1 + \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1} - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_i}, & k = i. \end{cases} \quad (6.8)$$

It is obvious that $\tilde{h}_{i+1,i} = \tilde{h}'_{i+1,i}$, $i = 0, \dots, N-1$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}_{i+1,i-1} &= \frac{\tilde{\theta}_i - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}} (\tilde{h}_{i+1,i} - 1) = \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)(2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1} - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}\tilde{\theta}_i} = \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)(2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1} - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_i(2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)} \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}} \\ &= \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)(2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1} - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_i(2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)} (\tilde{h}'_{i,i-1} - 1) = \tilde{h}'_{i+1,i-1} \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N-1$. We next use induction by assuming $\tilde{h}_{i+1,k} = \tilde{h}'_{i+1,k}$ for $i = 0, \dots, n-1$, $k = 0, \dots, i$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{h}_{n+1,k} &= \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{k+1}-1}{\tilde{\theta}_k} \tilde{h}_{n+1,k+1} = \left(\prod_{j=k}^{n-1} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{j+1}-1}{\tilde{\theta}_j} \right) (\tilde{h}_{n+1,n}-1) \\ &= \left(\prod_{j=k}^{n-2} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{j+1}-1}{\tilde{\theta}_j} \right) (\tilde{h}_{n,n-1}-1) \frac{\tilde{\theta}_n-1}{\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}} \frac{\tilde{h}_{n+1,n}-1}{\tilde{h}_{n,n-1}-1} \\ &= \tilde{h}_{n,k} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_n-1}{\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}} \frac{(2\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}-1)\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}}{\tilde{\theta}_n(2\tilde{\theta}_n-1)} = \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_n-1)(2\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}-1)}{\tilde{\theta}_n(2\tilde{\theta}_n-1)} \tilde{h}'_{n,k} = \tilde{h}'_{n+1,k}\end{aligned}$$

for $k = 0, \dots, n-2$, where the fourth equality uses the definition of $\tilde{h}_{n,k}$. This proves the first claim that the step coefficients $\{\tilde{h}_{i+1,k}\}$ (6.1) and $\{\tilde{h}'_{i+1,k}\}$ (6.8) are equivalent.

We finally use induction to show the equivalence between the generated sequences of FSFOM with (6.8) and OGM-G. For clarity, we use the notation $\mathbf{x}'_0, \dots, \mathbf{x}'_N$ and $\mathbf{y}'_0, \dots, \mathbf{y}'_N$ for OGM-G. It is obvious that $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}'_0$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}_1 &= \mathbf{x}_0 - \frac{1}{L} \tilde{h}'_{1,0} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0 - \frac{1}{L} \left(1 + \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_1-1}{\tilde{\theta}_0} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_0) \\ &= \mathbf{y}'_1 - \frac{1}{L} \frac{(2\tilde{\theta}_0-1)(2\tilde{\theta}_1-1)}{\tilde{\theta}_0(2\tilde{\theta}_0-1)} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}'_0) \\ &= \mathbf{y}'_1 - \frac{1}{L} \left(\frac{(\tilde{\theta}_0-1)(2\tilde{\theta}_1-1)}{\tilde{\theta}_0(2\tilde{\theta}_0-1)} + \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_1-1}{2\tilde{\theta}_0-1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{x}'_0) = \mathbf{x}'_1.\end{aligned}$$

Assuming $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}'_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}_{n+1} &= \mathbf{x}_n - \frac{1}{L} \tilde{h}'_{n+1,n} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_n) - \frac{1}{L} \tilde{h}'_{n+1,n-1} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_{n-1}) - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \tilde{h}'_{n+1,k} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k) \\ &= \mathbf{x}_n - \frac{1}{L} \left(1 + \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}-1}{\tilde{\theta}_n} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_n) - \frac{1}{L} \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_n-1)(2\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}-1)}{\tilde{\theta}_n(2\tilde{\theta}_n-1)} (\tilde{h}_{n,n-1}-1) \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_{n-1}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{L} \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_n-1)(2\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}-1)}{\tilde{\theta}_n(2\tilde{\theta}_n-1)} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \tilde{h}_{n,k} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k) \\ &= \mathbf{x}_n - \frac{1}{L} \left(1 + \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}-1}{2\tilde{\theta}_n-1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_n) \\ &\quad + \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_n-1)(2\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}-1)}{\tilde{\theta}_n(2\tilde{\theta}_n-1)} \left(-\frac{1}{L} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_n) + \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_{n-1}) - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \tilde{h}_{n,k} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k) \right) \\ &= \mathbf{y}'_{n+1} + \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_n-1)(2\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}-1)}{\tilde{\theta}_n(2\tilde{\theta}_n-1)} (\mathbf{y}'_{n+1} - \mathbf{y}'_n) + \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}-1}{2\tilde{\theta}_n-1} (\mathbf{y}'_{n+1} - \mathbf{x}'_n) = \mathbf{x}'_{n+1}.\end{aligned}$$

6.4 Two Worst-case Functions for OGM-G

This section specifies two worst-case functions for OGM-G, Huber and quadratic functions, that make the bound (6.7) exact. This implies that the feasible point in (6.2) is an optimal point of (D) for OGM-G.

Lemma 4 For the following Huber and quadratic functions in $\mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $d \geq 1$:

$$\phi_1(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \frac{LR}{\tilde{\theta}_0} \|\mathbf{x}\| - \frac{LR^2}{2\tilde{\theta}_0^2}, & \|\mathbf{x}\| \geq \frac{R}{\tilde{\theta}_0}, \\ \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|^2, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|^2, \quad (6.9)$$

OGM-G exactly achieves the bound (6.7).

Proof We first consider $\phi_1(\mathbf{x})$. Starting from $\mathbf{x}_0 = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_0^2 + 1}{2\tilde{\theta}_0} R\mathbf{v}$ that satisfies $\phi_1(\mathbf{x}_0) - \phi_1(\mathbf{x}_*) = \frac{1}{2}LR^2$ (ICF) for any unit-norm vector \mathbf{v} , we have

$$\mathbf{x}_N = \mathbf{x}_0 - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \tilde{h}_{j,k} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k) \left(\frac{\tilde{\theta}_0^2 + 1}{2\tilde{\theta}_0} - \frac{\tilde{\theta}_0^2 - 1}{2\tilde{\theta}_0} \right) R\mathbf{v},$$

since

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \tilde{h}_{j,k} = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\theta}_0 + 1) + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \tilde{\theta}_j = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\theta}_0 + 1 + 2\tilde{\theta}_1^2 - 2) = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\theta}_0^2 - 1)$$

that uses (6.5) and (6.6). Here, all the iterates stay in the affine region of the function $\phi_1(\mathbf{x})$ with the same gradient $\nabla\phi_1(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{LR}{\tilde{\theta}_0}\mathbf{v}$, $i = 0, \dots, N$. Therefore, after N iterations of OGM-G, we have $\|\nabla\phi_1(\mathbf{x}_N)\|^2 = \frac{L^2R^2}{\tilde{\theta}_0^2}$.

We next consider $\phi_2(\mathbf{x})$. Starting from $\mathbf{x}_0 = R\mathbf{v}$ that satisfies $\phi_2(\mathbf{x}_0) - \phi_2(\mathbf{x}_*) = \frac{1}{2}LR^2$ (ICF) for any unit-norm vector \mathbf{v} , we have

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = -\frac{1}{L} \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_1 - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_0} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_0) = -\frac{2\tilde{\theta}_1 - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_0} \mathbf{x}_0,$$

and we have

$$\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = -\frac{1}{L} \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1} - 1}{2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i) = -\frac{2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1} - 1}{2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1} \mathbf{x}_i = (-1)^i \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_{i+1} - 1}{2\tilde{\theta}_1 - 1} \mathbf{x}_1, \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1,$$

using $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{0}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. Therefore, after N iterations of OGM-G, we have $\|\nabla\phi_2(\mathbf{x}_N)\|^2 = L^2\|\mathbf{x}_N\|^2 = \frac{L^2R^2}{\tilde{\theta}_0^2}$.

In [10, 18], first-order methods that have the two types of worst-case functions in (6.9), Huber and quadratic functions, were found to have an optimal worst-case bound among a certain subset of first-order methods; a gradient method with the optimal constant step size and OGM have such two types of worst-case functions, and have an optimal worst-case bound among fixed-step gradient methods and all first-order methods (under a large-dimensional condition) respectively. This leads us to conjecture that the exact worst-case bound (6.7) of OGM-G may be optimal, but proving it remains an open problem.

6.5 Related Work: OGM

This section shows that the proposed OGM-G has a close relationship with the following OGM [9] (that was numerically first identified in [5]).

OGM [9]

Input: $f \in \mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{y}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $N \geq 1$, $\hat{\theta}_0 = 1$.

For $i = 0, \dots, N-1$,

$$\mathbf{y}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_i - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i),$$

$$\hat{\theta}_{i+1} = \begin{cases} \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\hat{\theta}_i^2}}{2}, & i < N-1, \\ \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 8\hat{\theta}_i^2}}{2}, & i = N-1, \end{cases} \quad (6.10)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{y}_{i+1} + \frac{\hat{\theta}_i - 1}{\hat{\theta}_{i+1}} (\mathbf{y}_{i+1} - \mathbf{y}_i) + \frac{\hat{\theta}_i}{\hat{\theta}_{i+1}} (\mathbf{y}_{i+1} - \mathbf{x}_i).$$

We can easily notice the symmetric relationship of the parameters

$$\hat{\theta}_i = \tilde{\theta}_{N-i}, \quad i = 0, \dots, N, \quad (6.11)$$

and the fact that OGM and OGM-G have forms that differ in the coefficients of the terms $\mathbf{y}_{i+1} - \mathbf{y}_i$ and $\mathbf{y}_{i+1} - \mathbf{x}_i$.

The final N th iterate \mathbf{x}_N of OGM has the following exact worst-case cost function bound [9, Theorems 2 and 3]:

$$f(\mathbf{x}_N) - f(\mathbf{x}_*) \leq \frac{L\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}_*\|^2}{2\hat{\theta}_N^2} \leq \frac{L\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}_*\|^2}{(N+1)^2}, \quad (6.12)$$

where this exact upper bound is equivalent to the exact worst-case gradient bound (6.7) of OGM-G up to a constant $\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}_*\|^2}{4(f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}_*))}$. This is similar to the relationship between the exact worst-case bounds (5.5) and (5.7) of GM discussed in Remark 1. The worst-case rate (6.12) of OGM is exactly optimal for large-dimensional smooth convex minimization [4].

OGM is equivalent to FSFOM with the step coefficients [9, Proposition 4]:

$$\hat{h}_{i+1,k} = \begin{cases} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{i-1}}{\hat{\theta}_{i+1}} \hat{h}_{i,k}, & k = 0, \dots, i-2, \\ \frac{\hat{\theta}_{i-1}}{\hat{\theta}_{i+1}} (\hat{h}_{i,i-1} - 1), & k = i-1, \\ 1 + \frac{2\hat{\theta}_{i-1}}{\hat{\theta}_{i+1}}, & k = i. \end{cases} \quad (6.13)$$

for $i = 0, \dots, N-1$. The following proposition shows the symmetric relationship between the step coefficients $\{\hat{h}_{i+1,k}\}$ (6.13) and $\{\tilde{h}_{i+1,k}\}$ (6.1) of OGM and OGM-G respectively.

Proposition 2 *The step coefficients $\{\hat{h}_{i+1,k}\}$ (6.13) and $\{\tilde{h}_{i+1,k}\}$ (6.1) of OGM and OGM-G respectively have the following relationship*

$$\hat{h}_{i+1,k} = \tilde{h}_{N-k, N-i-1}, \quad i = 0, \dots, N-1, k = 0, \dots, i. \quad (6.14)$$

Proof We use induction. It is obvious that $\hat{h}_{1,0} = \tilde{h}_{N, N-1}$. Then, assuming $\hat{h}_{i+1,k} = \tilde{h}_{N-k, N-i-1}$ for $i = 0, \dots, n-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{h}_{n+1,k} &= \begin{cases} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{N-n-1}}{\hat{\theta}_{N-n-1}} \tilde{h}_{N-k, N-n}, & k = 0, \dots, n-2, \\ \frac{\hat{\theta}_{N-n-1}}{\hat{\theta}_{N-n-1}} (\tilde{h}_{N-n+1, N-n} - 1), & k = n-1, \\ 1 + \frac{2\hat{\theta}_{N-n-1}}{\hat{\theta}_{N-n-1}}, & k = n, \end{cases} \\ &= \tilde{h}_{N-k, N-n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Building upon the relationships (6.11) and (6.14) between OGM and OGM-G, we numerically study the momentum coefficient values β_i and γ_i of OGM and OGM-G in the following form that characterize the convergence behaviors of the methods.

Accelerated First-order Method

Input: $f \in \mathcal{F}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{y}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $N \geq 1$.

For $i = 0, \dots, N-1$,

$$\mathbf{y}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_i - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i),$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{y}_{i+1} + \beta_i (\mathbf{y}_{i+1} - \mathbf{y}_i) + \gamma_i (\mathbf{y}_{i+1} - \mathbf{x}_i).$$

Figure 1 compares the momentum coefficients (β_i , γ_i) of OGM and OGM-G for $N = 100$. It is interesting to notice that having increasing values of (β_i , γ_i) as i increases, except for the last iteration, yields the optimal (fast) worst-case rate for decreasing the cost function, whereas having decreasing values of (β_i , γ_i), except for the first iteration, yields the fast worst-case rate (that is optimal up to a constant) for decreasing the gradient. We leave further theoretical study on such choices of coefficients as future work.




Fig. 1 Comparison of momentum coefficients (β_i, γ_i) of OGM and OGM-G.

7 Conclusion

This paper developed a first-order method named OGM-G that has an inexpensive per-iteration computational complexity and achieves the optimal worst-case bound for decreasing the gradient of large-dimensional smooth convex functions up to a constant, under the initial bounded function condition. This OGM-G was derived by optimizing the step coefficients of first-order methods in terms of the worst-case gradient bound using the performance estimation problem (PEP) approach [5]. On the way, the exact worst-case gradient bound for a gradient method was studied.

A practical drawback of OGM-G is that one must choose the number of iterations N in advance. Finding a first-order method that achieves the optimal worst-case gradient bound (up to a constant), but that does not depend on selecting N in advance, remains an open problem. In addition, extending the approaches based on PEP in this paper to the initial bounded distance condition (ICD) will be interesting future work; this PEP approach with a strict relaxation (unlike this paper) has been studied in [8]. Further extensions of this paper to nonconvex problems and composite problems are also of interest.

A Proof of Equations (6.4) and (6.5)

This proof shows the properties (6.4) and (6.5) of the step coefficients $\{\tilde{h}_{i,j}\}$ (6.1).

We first show (6.4). We can easily derive

$$\tilde{h}_{i,i-2} = \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_{i-1} - 1)(2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-2}\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}} = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_i^2(2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-2}\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}^2}$$

for $i = 2, \dots, N$ using (6.6). Again using the definition of (6.1) and (6.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}_{i,j} &= \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{j+1} - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_j} \tilde{h}_{i,j+1} = \dots = \left(\prod_{l=j+1}^{i-2} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_l - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{l-1}} \right) \tilde{h}_{i,i-2} = \left(\prod_{l=j+1}^{i-1} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_l - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{l-1}} \right) \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_j} \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_{j+1}} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{j+1} - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{j+2}} \dots \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{i-3} - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-2}} (\tilde{\theta}_{i-2} - 1)(\tilde{\theta}_{i-1} - 1) \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_j} \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_{j+1}} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{j+2}}{\tilde{\theta}_{j+1}} \dots \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{i-2}}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-3}} (\tilde{\theta}_{i-2} - 1)(\tilde{\theta}_{i-1} - 1) \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}} \\ &= \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{i-2}(\tilde{\theta}_{i-2} - 1)(\tilde{\theta}_{i-1} - 1)(2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_j \tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2 \tilde{\theta}_{i-1}} = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_i^2(2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_j \tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2}, \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 2, \dots, N$, $j = 0, \dots, i-3$, which concludes the proof of (6.4).

We next prove the first two lines of (6.5) using the induction. For $N = 1$, we have $\tilde{\theta}_1 = 1$ and

$$\tilde{h}_{1,0} = 1 + \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_1 - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_0} = 1 + \frac{\tilde{\theta}_1^2}{\tilde{\theta}_0} = 1 + \frac{\frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\theta}_0^2 - \tilde{\theta}_0)}{\tilde{\theta}_0} = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\theta}_0 + 1),$$

where the third equality uses (6.6). For $N > 1$, we have

$$\tilde{h}_{N,N-1} = 1 + \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_N - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{N-1}} = 1 + \frac{\tilde{\theta}_N^2}{\tilde{\theta}_{N-1}} = 1 + \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{N-1}^2 - \tilde{\theta}_{N-1}}{\tilde{\theta}_{N-1}} = \tilde{\theta}_{N-1},$$

where the third equality uses (6.6). Assuming $\sum_{l=j+1}^N \tilde{h}_{l,j} = \tilde{\theta}_j$ for $j = n, \dots, N-1$ and $n \geq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=n}^N \tilde{h}_{l,n-1} &= 1 + \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_n - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}} + \frac{\tilde{\theta}_n - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}} (\tilde{h}_{n+1,n} - 1) + \frac{\tilde{\theta}_n - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}} \sum_{l=n+2}^N \tilde{h}_{l,n} \\ &= 1 + \frac{\tilde{\theta}_n}{\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}} + \frac{\tilde{\theta}_n - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}} \sum_{l=n+1}^N \tilde{h}_{l,n} = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{n-1} + \tilde{\theta}_n + (\tilde{\theta}_n - 1)\tilde{\theta}_n}{\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}} = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{n-1} + \tilde{\theta}_n^2}{\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\theta}_0 + 1), & n = 0, \\ \tilde{\theta}_n, & n = 1, \dots, N-1, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses (6.6), which concludes the proof of the first two lines of (6.5).

We finally prove the last line of (6.5) using the induction. For $i \geq 1$, we have

$$\sum_{l=i+1}^N \tilde{h}_{l,i-1} = \sum_{l=i}^N \tilde{h}_{l,i-1} - \tilde{h}_{i,i-1} = \tilde{\theta}_{i-1} - \left(1 + \frac{2\tilde{\theta}_i - 1}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}}\right) = \frac{(\tilde{\theta}_i - 1)^2}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}} = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}^4}{\tilde{\theta}_{i-1}\tilde{\theta}_i^2},$$

where the third and fourth equalities use (6.6). Then, assuming $\sum_{l=i+1}^N \tilde{h}_{l,j} = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_j^4}{\tilde{\theta}_j\tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2}$ for $i = n, \dots, N-1$, $j = 0, \dots, i-1$ with $n \geq 1$, we get:

$$\sum_{l=n}^N \tilde{h}_{l,j} = \sum_{l=n+1}^N \tilde{h}_{l,j} + \tilde{h}_{n,j} = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}^4}{\tilde{\theta}_j\tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2} + \frac{\tilde{\theta}_n^2(2\tilde{\theta}_n - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_j\tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2} = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_n^2(\tilde{\theta}_n - 1)^2 + \tilde{\theta}_n^2(2\tilde{\theta}_n - 1)}{\tilde{\theta}_j\tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2} = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_n^4}{\tilde{\theta}_j\tilde{\theta}_{j+1}^2},$$

where the second and third equalities use (6.4), which concludes the proof.

References

1. Z. ALLEN-ZHU, *How to make the gradients small stochastically*, 2018. arxiv 1801.02982.
2. Y. CARMON, J. C. DUCHI, O. HINDER, AND A. SIDFORD, *Lower bounds for finding stationary points II: First-order methods*, 2017. arxiv 1711.00841.
3. CVX RESEARCH INC., *CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.0*. <http://cvxr.com/cvx>, Aug. 2012.
4. Y. DRORI, *The exact information-based complexity of smooth convex minimization*, J. Complexity, 39 (2017), pp. 1–16.
5. Y. DRORI AND M. TEBoulLE, *Performance of first-order methods for smooth convex minimization: A novel approach*, Mathematical Programming, 145 (2014), pp. 451–82.
6. S. GHADIMI AND G. LAN, *Accelerated gradient methods for nonconvex nonlinear and stochastic programming*, Mathematical Programming, 156 (2016), pp. 59–99, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-015-0871-8>.
7. M. GRANT AND S. BOYD, *Graph implementations for nonsmooth convex programs*, in Recent Advances in Learning and Control, V. Blondel, S. Boyd, and H. Kimura, eds., Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences, Springer-Verlag Limited, 2008, pp. 95–110. http://stanford.edu/~boyd/graph_dcp.html.
8. D. KIM AND J. A. FESSLER, *Generalizing the optimized gradient method for smooth convex minimization*, 2016. arxiv 1607.06764.
9. D. KIM AND J. A. FESSLER, *Optimized first-order methods for smooth convex minimization*, Mathematical Programming, 159 (2016), pp. 81–107.
10. D. KIM AND J. A. FESSLER, *On the convergence analysis of the optimized gradient method*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 172 (2017), pp. 187–205.
11. D. KIM AND J. A. FESSLER, *Another look at the fast iterative shrinkage/thresholding algorithm (FISTA)*, SIAM J. Optim., 28 (2018), pp. 223–50, <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M108940X>.
12. R. D. C. MONTEIRO AND B. F. SVAITER, *An accelerated hybrid proximal extragradient method for convex optimization and its implications to second-order methods*, SIAM J. Optim., 23 (2013), pp. 1092–1125, <https://doi.org/10.1137/110833786>.
13. A. S. NEMIROVSKY, *Information-based complexity of linear operator equations*, J. of Complexity, 8 (1992), pp. 153–75, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0885-064X\(92\)90013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0885-064X(92)90013-2).
14. Y. NESTEROV, *A method for unconstrained convex minimization problem with the rate of convergence $O(1/k^2)$* , Dokl. Akad. Nauk. USSR, 269 (1983), pp. 543–7.
15. Y. NESTEROV, *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, Kluwer, 2004.
16. Y. NESTEROV, *How to make the gradients small*, 2012, http://www.mathopt.org/?nav=optima_newsletter. Optima 88.
17. A. B. TAYLOR, J. M. HENDRICKX, AND F. GLINEUR, *Exact worst-case convergence rates of the proximal gradient method for composite convex minimization*, 2017. arxiv 1705.04398.
18. A. B. TAYLOR, J. M. HENDRICKX, AND F. GLINEUR, *Smooth strongly convex interpolation and exact worst-case performance of first-order methods*, Mathematical Programming, 161 (2017), pp. 307–45, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-016-1009-3>.