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Abstract—Regularized regression problems are ubiquitous in statistical modeling, signal processing, and machine learning. Sparse regression in particular has been instrumental in scientific model discovery, including compressed sensing applications, variable selection, and high-dimensional analysis. We propose a broad framework for sparse relaxed regularized regression, called SR3. The key idea is to solve a relaxation of the regularized problem, which has three advantages over the state-of-the-art: (1) solutions of the relaxed problem are superior with respect to errors, false positives, and conditioning, (2) relaxation allows extremely fast algorithms for both convex and nonconvex formulations, and (3) the methods apply to composite regularizers such as total variation (TV) and its nonconvex variants. We demonstrate the advantages of SR3 (computational efficiency, higher accuracy, faster convergence rates, greater flexibility) across a range of regularized regression problems with synthetic and real data, including applications in compressed sensing, LASSO, matrix completion, TV regularization, and group sparsity. To promote reproducible research, we also provide a companion MATLAB package that implements these examples.

I. INTRODUCTION

Regression is a cornerstone of data science. In the age of big data, optimization algorithms are largely focused on regression problems in machine learning and AI. As data volumes increase, algorithms must be fast, scalable, and robust to low-fidelity measurements (missing data, outliers, etc.). Regularization, which includes priors and constraints, is essential for the recovery of interpretable solutions in high-dimensional and ill-posed settings. Sparsity-promoting regression is one such fundamental technique, that enforces solution parsimony by balancing model error with complexity. Despite tremendous methodological progress over the last 80 years, many difficulties remain, including (i) restrictive theoretical conditions for practical performance, (ii) the lack of fast solvers for large scale and ill-conditioned problems, (iii) practical difficulties with nonconvex implementations, and (iv) high-fidelity requirements on data. To overcome these difficulties, we propose a broadly applicable method, sparse relaxed regularized regression (SR3), based on a relaxation reformulation of any regularized regression problem. We demonstrate that SR3 is fast, scalable, robust to noisy and missing data, and flexible enough to apply broadly to regularized regression problems, ranging from the ubiquitous LASSO and compressed sensing (CS), to composite regularizers such as the total variation (TV) regularization, and even to nonconvex regularizers, including $\ell_0$ and rank. SR3 improves on the state-of-the-art on all of these applications, both in terms of computational speed and performance. Moreover, SR3 is flexible and simple to implement. A companion open source package implements a range of examples using SR3.

The origins of regression extend back more than two centuries to the pioneering mathematical contributions of Legendre [28] and Gauss [23], [24], who were interested in determining the orbits of celestial bodies. The invention of the digital electronic computer in the mid 20th century greatly increased interest in regression methods, as computations became faster and larger problems from a variety of fields became tractable. It was recognized early on that many regression problems are ill-posed in nature, either being under-determined, resulting in an infinite set of candidate solutions, or otherwise sensitive to perturbations in the observations, often due to some reducency in the set of possible models. Andrey Tikhonov [40] was the first to systematically study the use of regularizers to achieve stable and unique numerical solutions of such ill-posed problems. The regularized linear least squares problem is given by

$$\min_x \frac{1}{2} \| A x - b \|^2 + \lambda R(C x),$$

(1)

where $R(\cdot)$ is the regularizer, $C$ is a linear map, and $\lambda$ parametrizes the strength of the regularization. Tikhonov proposed a simple $\ell_2$ penalty, i.e. $R(x) = \| x \|^2 = \sum x_i^2$, which eventually led to the formal introduction of the ridge regression strategy by Hoerl and Kennard 30 years later [27]. Other important regularizers include the $\ell_0$ penalty, $R(x) = \| x \|_0$, and the sparsity-promoting convex $\ell_1$ relaxation $R(x) = \| x \|_1$, introduced by Chen and Donoho in 1994 [36] as basis pursuit, and by Tibshirani in 1996 [39] as the least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO). More generally, the $\ell_1$ norm was introduced much earlier: as a penalty in 1969 [32], with specialized algorithms in 1973 [19], and as a robust loss in geophysics in 1973 [17]. In modern optimization, nonsmooth regularizers are widely used across a diverse set of applications, including in the training of neural network architectures [29]. Figure 1(a) illustrates the classic sparse regression iteration procedure for LASSO. Given the 1-norm of the solution, i.e. $\| \tilde{x} \|_1 = \tau$, the solution can be found by ‘inflating’ the level set of the data misfit until it intersects the ball $B_1 \leq \tau$. The geometry of the level sets influences both
the robustness of the procedure with respect to noise, and the convergence rate of iterative algorithms used to find \( \hat{x} \).

II. SR3 METHOD

Our goal is to improve the robustness, computational efficiency, and accuracy of sparse and nonsmooth formulations. We relax (1) using an auxiliary variable \( w \) that is forced to be close to \( Cx \). The general SR3 formulation modifies (1) to the following

\[
\min_{x, w} \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \lambda R(w) + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|Cx - w\|^2, \tag{2}
\]

where \( \kappa \) is a relaxation parameter that controls the gap between \( Cx \) and \( w \). Importantly, \( \kappa \) controls both the strength of the improvements to the geometry/regularity of the relaxed problem relative to the original and the fidelity of the relaxed problem to the original. To recover a relaxed version of the improvements to the geometry/regularity of the relaxed approach is in using (2) to extract information of the SR3 approach is in using (2) to extract information from the \( w \) variable. We also allow nonconvex regularizers \( R(\cdot) \), using the structure of (2) to simplify the analysis.

The success of SR3 stems from two key ideas. First, sparsity and accuracy requirements are split between \( w \) and \( x \) in the formulation (2), relieving the pressure these competing goals put on \( x \) in (1). Second, we can partially minimize (2) in \( x \) to obtain a function in \( w \) alone, with nearly spherical level sets, in contrast to the elongated ellipsoidal level sets of \( \|Ax - b\|^2 \). In \( w \) coordinates, it is much easier to find the correct support. Figure 1(b) illustrates this advantage of SR3 on the LASSO problem.

A. SR3 and Value Function Optimization

Associated with (2) is a value function formulation that allows us to precisely characterize the relaxed framework. Minimizing (2) in \( x \), we obtain the value function

\[
v(w) := \min_{x} \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|Cx - w\|^2. \tag{3}
\]

Assume that \( H_\kappa := A^\top A + \kappa C^\top C \) is invertible, so the minimizer \( x(w) = H_\kappa^{-1} (A^\top b + \kappa C^\top w) \) is unique. Define

\[
F_\kappa = \left[ \frac{\kappa A C^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \right]^\top, \quad G_\kappa = \left[ \frac{\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} C A^\top}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \right], \quad \sigma_i(\kappa) := \frac{\sigma_i(A)}{\sqrt{1 + \sigma_i(A)^2/\kappa}}.
\]

The ellipsoid in Fig. 1(a) shows the level sets of \( \|Ax - b\|^2 \), while the sphere in Fig. 1(b) shows the level sets of \( \|F_\kappa w - g_\kappa\|^2 \). Partial minimization improves the conditioning of the problem, as seen in Figure 1 and can be characterized by a simple theorem. Let \( \sigma_i(A) \) denote the vector of reduced singular values of an \( m \times n \) matrix \( A \), i.e. the first \( I = \min(m, n) \) singular values. Then we have the following (see Appendix for proof):

**Theorem 1.** When \( \lambda = 0 \), (5) and (1) have the same solution. Moreover, when \( C = I \), we have that

\[
\sigma_i(F_\kappa) = \frac{\sigma_i(A)}{\sqrt{1 + \sigma_i(A)^2/\kappa}}. \tag{6}
\]

Theorem 1 lets us interpret (5) as a re-weighted version of the original problem (1). Further, the re-weighted matrix \( F_\kappa \) has nicer properties than \( A \) when \( C = I \). Partial minimization of (3) shrinks the singular values of \( F_\kappa \) relative to \( A \), with less shrinkage for the smaller singular values. In particular, \( F_\kappa \) has a lower global quadratic upper bound and ratio of largest to smallest (nonzero) singular values than \( A \), as seen in Fig. 1. Denote the condition number of matrix \( A \) by \( \cond(A) := \sigma_{\max}(A)/\sigma_{\min}(A) \). We have the following result (see Appendix for proof):

**Corollary 1.** When \( C = I \), the condition numbers of \( F_\kappa \) and \( A \) are related by

\[
\cond(F_\kappa) = \cond(A) \sqrt{\frac{\kappa + \sigma_{\max}(A)^2}{\kappa + \sigma_{\min}(A)^2}}. \tag{7}
\]

Corollary 1 implies that for \( \cond(A) > 1 \), we have \( \cond(F_\kappa) < \cond(A) \), with

\[
\lim_{\kappa \downarrow 0} \cond(F_\kappa) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\kappa \uparrow \infty} \cond(F_\kappa) = \cond(A).
\]

For ill-conditioned \( A \), an iterative method for (5) converges much faster than the same method applied to (1). In the case of sparse regularization, the geometry of the level sets of (5) encourages the discovery of sparse solutions, see Figure 1.

B. Algorithms for the SR3 Problem

Problem (5) can be solved using a variety of algorithms, including the prox-gradient method detailed in Algorithm 1. In the convex case, Algorithm 1 is equivalent to the alternating method of [4]. The \( w \) update is given by

\[
w^{k+1} = \prox_{\frac{1}{\kappa} R} \left( w^k - \frac{1}{\kappa} F_\kappa^\top (w^k - \kappa) \right), \tag{8}
\]

where \( \prox_{\frac{1}{\kappa} R} \) is the proximity operator (prox) for \( R \) (see e.g. (13)) evaluated at \( Cw \). The prox in Algorithm 1 is easy to evaluate for many important convex and nonconvex functions, often taking the form of a separable atomic operator, i.e. the prox requires a simple computation for each individual
In contrast, Algorithm 1 only needs the prox of the original problem (1), detailed in Algorithm 2. First, Algorithm 2 may be difficult to implement when C ≠ I, as the prox operator may no longer be separable or atomic. An iterative algorithm is required to evaluate

$$\text{prox}_{\lambda\|2\|1}(x) = \text{sign}(x_i) \max(|x_i| - \lambda, 0).$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

Algorithm 1 is the proximal gradient algorithm applied to (5). It is useful to contrast it with the proximal gradient algorithm for the original problem (1), detailed in Algorithm 2. When C = I, we see better convergence rates for Algorithm 1 than for Algorithm 2. In particular, the rates of Algorithm 1 are independent of A when A does not have full rank, and depend only weakly on A when A has full rank, as detailed in Theorem 2.

**Theorem 2.** Suppose that C = I. Let A and Fκ be as above and assume that R is closed and convex. Let x* and w* denote the minimum values of p_x(x) := \(\frac{1}{2}\|Ax - b\|^2 + R(x)\) and p_w(w) := \(\frac{1}{2}\|F_\kappa w - g_\kappa\|^2 + R(w)\), respectively. Let x^k denote the iterates of Algorithm 1 applied to p_x, and w^k denote the iterates of Algorithm 2 applied to p_w, with step sizes \(\eta_x = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\max}(A)^2}\) and \(\eta_w = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\max}(F^{\kappa})^2}\). We then have the following bounds:

- When A does not have full rank,

$$\frac{p_x(x^k) - p_x(x^*)}{\|x^0 - x^*\|^2} \leq \frac{\sigma_{\max}(A)^2}{2(k+1)} \leq \kappa$$

- When A has full rank,

$$\frac{\|x^k - x^*\|^2}{\|x^0 - x^*\|^2} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_{\min}(A)^2}{\sigma_{\max}(A)^2}\right)^k$$
$$\frac{\|w^k - w^*\|^2}{\|w^0 - w^*\|^2} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_{\min}(A)^2}{\sigma_{\max}(A)^2}\right)^k \frac{\sigma_{\max}(A)^2 + \kappa}{\sigma_{\max}(A)^2 + \kappa}$$

Algorithm 1 can be used with both convex and nonconvex regularizers, as long as the prox operator of the regularizer is available. A convergence result in the nonconvex case requires further preliminaries and is presented in Theorem 6 and Corollary 2 in the Appendix. Some popular prox operators are explained below and many others can be found in the Appendix as well as [18].

In all experiments, we simply use \(\eta = \frac{1}{n}\).
1) Nonconvex Regularizers: $\ell_0$. The 1-norm is often used as a convex alternative to $\ell_0$, defined by $||x||_0 = |\{i : x_i \neq 0\}|$. The nonconvex $\ell_0$ has a simple prox — hard thresholding (HT). The SR3 formulation with the $\ell_0$ regularizer uses HT instead of the ST operator in line 5 of Algorithm 1.

2) Constraints as Infinite-Valued Regularizers. The term $R(\cdot)$ does not need to be finite valued. In particular, for any set $C$ that has a projection, we can take $R(\cdot)$ to be the convex indicator function of $C$, given by

$$R_C(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in C \\ \infty & x \notin C, \end{cases}$$

with $\text{prox}_{R}(x) = \text{proj}_C(x)$. Simple examples of such regularizers include convex non-negativity constraints ($x \geq 0$) and nonconvex spherical constraints ($||x||_2 = \tau$).

3) Composite Regularization: Total Variation (TV). TV regularization can be written as $TV(x) = R(Cx) = ||Cx||_1$, with $C$ a (sparse) difference matrix (see [13]). The SR3 formulation is solved by Algorithm 1 a prox-gradient (primal) method. In contrast, most TV algorithms use primal-dual methods because of the composition $||Cx||_1$ [14].

C. Optimality of SR3 Solutions

We now consider the relationship between the optimal solution $\hat{w}$ to problem [5], and the original problem [1].

**Theorem 3 (Optimal Ratio).** Assume $C = I$, and let $\lambda_1$ for [1] and $\lambda_2$ for [5] be related by the ratio $\tau = \lambda_2/\lambda_1$, and let $w^k$ be the optimal solution for [5] with parameter $\lambda_2$. If $\lambda_2$ is set to be $\tau \lambda_1$ where

$$\hat{\tau} = \arg\min_{\tau > 0} \|\tau I - \kappa H^{-1}_\kappa\|_2 = \frac{\kappa}{2}(\sigma_{\max}(H^{-1}_\kappa) + \sigma_{\min}(H^{-1}_\kappa)), \tag{6}$$

then have that the distance to optimality of $\hat{w}$ for [1] is bounded above by

$$\frac{\sigma_{\max}(A) - \sigma_{\min}(A)}{\sigma_{\max}(A) + \sigma_{\min}(A) + 2\kappa} \|A^T \hat{w} - A^T b\|. \tag{7}$$

Theorem 3 gives a way to choose $\lambda_2$ given $\lambda_1$ so that $\hat{w}$ is as close as possible to the stationary point of [1], and characterizes the distance of $\hat{w}$ to optimality of the original problem. The proof and related lemmas and corollaries are presented in the Appendix.

Theorem 3 shows that as $\kappa$ increases, the solution $\hat{w}$ moves closer to being optimal for the original problem [1]. On the other hand, Theorem 2 suggests that lower $\kappa$ values regularize the problem, making it easier to solve. In practice, we find that $\hat{w}$ is useful and informative in a range of applications with moderate values of $\kappa$, see Section III.

III. RESULTS

The formulation [1] covers many standard problems, including variable selection (LASSO), compressed sensing, TV-based image de-noising, and matrix completion, shown in Fig. 2. In this section, we demonstrate the general flexibility of the SR3 formulation and its advantages over other state-of-the-art techniques. In particular, SR3 is faster than competing algorithms, and $w$ is far more useful in identifying the support of sparse signals, particularly when data are noisy and $A$ is ill-conditioned.

A. SR3 vs. LASSO and Compressed Sensing

Using Eqs. (1) and (2), the LASSO and associated SR3 problems are

$$\min_x \frac{1}{2} ||Ax - b||^2 + \lambda ||x||_1 \tag{11}$$
$$\min_{x,w} \frac{1}{2} ||Ax - b||^2 + \lambda ||w||_1 + \frac{\kappa}{2} ||x - w||^2 \tag{12}$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $m \geq n$. LASSO is often used for variable selection, i.e. finding a sparse set of coefficients $x$ that correspond to variables (columns of $A$) most useful for predicting the observation $b$. We compare the quality and numerical efficiency of Eqs. (11) and (12). The formulation in (12) is related to an earlier sequentially thresholded least square algorithm that was used for variable selection to identify nonlinear dynamical systems from data [9].

In all LASSO experiments, $A$ is a random Gaussian matrix with entries independently drawn from a standard Gaussian distribution. Observations are generated by $b = Ax_i + \sigma e$, where $x_i$ is the true signal, and $e$ is independent Gaussian noise.

1) LASSO Path. The LASSO path refers to the set of solutions obtained by sweeping over $\lambda$ in (11) from a maximum $\lambda$, which gives $x = 0$, down to $\lambda = 0$, which gives the least squares solution. In [38], it was shown that (11) makes mistakes early along this path. As in [38], the measurement matrix $A$ is $1010 \times 1000$, with entries drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The first 200 elements of the true solution $x$ are set to be 4 and the rest to be 0; $\sigma = 1$ is used to generate $b$. Performing a $\lambda$ sweep, we track the fraction of incorrect nonzero elements in the last 800 entries vs. the fraction of nonzero elements in the first 200 entries of each solution, i.e. the false discovery proportion (FDP) and true positive proportion (TPP). The results are shown in the top-right panel of Fig. 3. LASSO makes mistakes in the early stage along the path [38]. In contrast, SR3 recovers the support without introducing any false positives along the entire path until overfitting sets in with the 201st nonzero entry.

2) Robustness to Noise. Observation noise makes signal recovery more difficult. We consider a range of noise levels $\sigma \in \{0.05i : i = 0, 1, \ldots, 20\}$, solving (11) and (12) for 200 different Gaussian random matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{600 \times 2500}$ at each level. We use the $F_1$-score, $F_1 = 2 (\text{precision \cdot recall}) / (\text{precision + recall})$, to compare reconstruction quality. For each experiment, we perform a $\lambda$-sweep for both (11) and (12), and record the best $F_1$-score. We plot the average normalized $F_1$-score for different noise levels in the bottom panel of Fig. 3. SR3 has a uniformly higher $F_1$-score across all noise levels.

3) Computational Efficiency. We compare the computational efficiency of the Alternating Directions Method of Multipliers (ADMM) (see e.g. [8], [25]) and proximal gradient algorithms (see e.g. [18]) on (11) with Algorithm 1. We generate the observations with $\sigma = 0.1$. We choose $\lambda$ in (11) to be $||A^T b||_\infty/5$ and $||F_k g_v||_\infty/5$ for (12). The dimension of $A$ is $600 \times 500$, and we vary the condition number of $\text{cond}(A)$ from 1 to 100. For each condition number, we solve the problem 10 times and record the average number of iterations required to reach a specified tolerance.
Sparse Relaxed Regularized Regression (SR3) \[ \min_{x, \omega} \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \lambda \|\omega\|_1 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|x - \omega\|^2 \]

(a) **Sparse regression** \[ \min_{x, \omega} \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \lambda \|\omega\|_1 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|x - \omega\|^2 \]

(b) **Matrix Completion** \[ \min_{X, W} \frac{1}{2} \|AX - D\|^2 + \lambda \|W\|_1 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|X - W\|^2 \]

- Corrupted image
- Low rank
- Sparse outliers

(c) **Compressed Sensing** \[ \min_{x, \omega} \frac{1}{2} \|A \circ f(x) - b\|^2 + \lambda \|\omega\|_1 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|x - \omega\|^2 \]

(d) **Total variation regularized derivative** \[ \min_{x, \omega} \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \lambda \|\omega\|_1 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|Dx - \omega\|^2 \]

Fig. 2: Common optimization applications where the SR3 method improves performance. For each method, the specific implementation of our general architecture (2) is given.

The results are shown in the top left panel of Fig. 5. SR3 requires far fewer iterations than ADMM and the proximal gradient method, especially as \( \text{cond}(A) \) increases. The ADMM updates look similar to those of SR3, but ADMM requires far more iterations for large \( \text{cond}(A) \). A key difference is that ADMM requires dual variables, while SR3 is fundamentally a primal-only method. When \( \text{cond}(A) = 100 \), ADMM needs almost \( 10^5 \) iterations to solve (11); proximal gradient descent requires \( 10^2 \) iterations; and SR3 requires 10 to solve (12).

4) **SR3 for Compressed Sensing.** When \( m \ll n \), the variable selection problem targeted by (11) is often called compressed sensing (CS). Sparsity is required to make the problem well-posed, as (11) has infinitely many solutions with \( \lambda = 0 \). In CS, columns of \( A \) are basis functions, e.g. the Fourier modes \( A_{ij} = \exp(\imath \omega_j t_i) \), and \( b \) may be corrupted by noise (11). In this case, compression occurs when \( m \) is smaller than the number of samples required by the Shannon sampling theorem.

Finding the optimal sparse solution is inherently combinatorial, and brute force solutions are only feasible for small-scale problems. In recent years, a series of powerful theoretical tools have been developed in [11, 13], [20, 21] to analyze and understand the behavior of (11) with \( R(\cdot) = \|\cdot\|_1 \) as a sparsity-promoting penalty. The main theme of these works is that if there is sufficient incoherence between the measurements and the basis, then exact recovery is possible. One weakness of the approach is that the incoherence requirement — for instance, having a small restricted isometry constant (RIC) [13] — may not be satisfied by the given samples, leading to sub-optimal recovery.

Here, we consider two synthetic CS problems. The sparse signal has dimension \( n = 500 \) and \( k = 20 \) nonzero coefficients with uniformly distributed positions and values randomly chosen as \(-2\) or \(2\). In the first experiment, the entries of \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \) are drawn independently from a normal distribution, which will generally have a small RIC [13] for sufficiently large \( m \). In the second experiment, entries of \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \) are drawn from a uniform distribution on the interval \([0, 1]\), which are generally more coherent than using Gaussian entries.

In the classic CS context, recovering the support of the signal (indices of non-zero coefficients) is the main goal, as the optimal coefficients can be computed in a post-processing step. To test the effect of the number of samples \( m \) on recovery, we take measurements with additive Gaussian noise of the form \((0.1)\mathcal{N}(0, 1)\), and choose \( m \) ranging from \( k \) to \( 20k \). For each choice of \( m \) we solve (11) and (2) 200 times with \( R \) taken
to be \( \ell_1 \) and \( \ell_0 \). For each instance, we perform a grid search on \( \lambda \) to identify the correct non-zero support, if possible. The fraction of runs with successful support recovery is recorded. For all experiments we fix \( \kappa = 5 \).

The results are shown in Figure 4. For the relatively incoherent random Gaussian measurements, the standard formulation (1) succeeds, but SR3 obtains a better recovery rate for every \( m \). For more coherent uniform measurements, SR3 obtains a recovery rate which is only slightly degraded from that of the Gaussian problem, while the results using (1) degrade drastically. Moreover, (1) with \( \ell_0 \) never succeeds in recovering the true support, getting stuck in a sub-optimal local minimum, while (2) with \( \ell_0 \) obtains the highest recovery rate of all methods. SR3 is more robust to both coherent measurements and to initialization for non-convex formulations.

### B. SR3 for Total Variation Regularization

Natural images are effectively modeled as large, smooth features separated by a few sparse edges. It is common to regularize ill-posed inverse problems in imaging by adding the so-called total variation (TV) regularization \([6], [14], [15], [30], [35], [37], [44]\). Let \( X_{ij} \) denote the \( i, j \) pixel of an \( m \times n \) image. For convenience, we treat the indices as doubly periodic, i.e. \( X_{i+p,m+j+q} = X_{ij} \) for \( p, q \in \mathbb{Z} \). Discrete \( x \) and \( y \) derivatives are defined by \( [D_x X]_{ij} = X_{i+1,j} - X_{ij} \) and \( [D_y X]_{ij} = X_{i,j+1} - X_{ij} \), respectively. The (isotropic) total variation of the image is then given by the sum of the length of the discrete gradient at each pixel, i.e.

\[
R_{TV} \left( \frac{D_x X}{D_y X} \right) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sqrt{[D_x X]_{ij}^2 + [D_y X]_{ij}^2}. \tag{13}
\]

Adding the TV regularizer (13) to a regression problem corresponds to imposing a sparsity prior on the discrete gradient.

Consider image deblurring (Fig. 5). The two-dimensional convolution \( Y = A \ast X \) is given by the sum \( Y_{ij} = \sum_{p=1}^{m} \sum_{q=1}^{n} A_{pq} X_{i-p,j-q} \). Such convolutions are often used to model photographic effects, like distortion or motion blur. Even when the kernel \( A \) is known, the problem of recovering \( X \) given the blurred measurement is unstable because measurement noise is sharpened by ‘inverting’ the blur. Suppose that \( B = A \ast X + \nu G \), where \( G \) is a matrix with entries given by independent entries from a standard normal distribution and \( \nu \) is the noise level. To regularize the problem of recovering \( X \) from the corrupted signal \( B \), we add the TV regularization:

\[
\hat{X} = \arg\min_{X} \frac{1}{2} \| A \ast X - B \|_F^2 + \lambda R_{TV} \left( \frac{D_x X}{D_y X} \right). \tag{14}
\]
The natural SR3 reformulation is given by

\[
\min_{X, \hat{w}, \hat{y}} \frac{1}{2} \|A \ast X - B\|_F^2 + \lambda R_{TV} \left( \frac{\kappa}{2} \|w_x - D_x X\|_{\|\cdot\|_F^2} \right) + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|w_y - D_y X\|_{\|\cdot\|_F^2} \tag{15}
\]

Consider the standard Gaussian blur kernel of size $k$ and standard deviation $\sigma$, given by $A_{ij} = \exp \left(-\frac{(i^2 + j^2)}{2\sigma^2}\right)$, when $|i| < k$ and $|j| < k$, with the rest of the entries of $A$ determined by periodicity or equal to zero. In Figure 5 we demonstrate the stabilizing effect of TV regularization. Panels (a) and (b) show the classic “cameraman” image, i.e., $X$, and the corrupted image, i.e. $\mathbf{B}$, using $\sigma = 2$, $k = 4$, and $\nu = 2$. In panel (c), we see that simply inverting the effect of the blur results in a meaningless image. Adding TV regularization (with $\lambda = 0.075$) gives a more reasonable result in panel (d).

In the top plot of Fig. 5 we compare SR3 (with $\kappa = 0.5/\nu = 25$) and a primal-dual algorithm [14] on the objectives (15) and (14), respectively. Algorithm [14] converges as fast as the state-of-the-art method of [14], it is not significantly faster because for TV regularization, the equivalent of the map $\mathbf{C}$ is not the identity and the equivalent of $\mathbf{F}_\kappa$, see [4], is still ill-conditioned. Nonetheless, since SR3 gives a primal-only method, it is straightforward to accelerate using FISTA [7], giving a significantly better algorithm for TV deblurring. The FISTA algorithm for SR3 TV is detailed in Algorithm 3.

We can further analyze SR3 for the $\mathbf{C}$ in the TV denoising problem in order to understand the mediocre performance of unaccelerated SR3. Setting $x = \text{vec}(X)$, we have

\[
\mathbf{A} \ast X = \mathbf{F}^{-1} \text{Diag}(\hat{c}) \mathbf{F} x, \quad D_x X = \mathbf{F}^{-1} \text{Diag}(\hat{d}_x) \mathbf{F} x, \quad D_y X = \mathbf{F}^{-1} \text{Diag}(\hat{d}_y) \mathbf{F} x
\]

where $\mathbf{F} x$ corresponds to taking a 2D Fourier transform, i.e. of $\mathbf{F} x = \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(2d) X)$. Then, $\mathbf{F}_\kappa$ can be written as

\[
\mathbf{F}_\kappa = \mathbf{F}^{-1} \text{Diag}(\hat{c} \circ \hat{c} + \kappa \hat{d}_x \circ \hat{d}_x + \kappa \hat{d}_y \circ \hat{d}_y) \mathbf{F}
\]

and $\circ$ is element-wise multiplication. The SR3 formulation (15) reduces to

\[
\min_{\mathbf{w}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{F}_\kappa \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{g}_\kappa\|^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|_1,
\]

with $\mathbf{F}_\kappa$ and $\mathbf{g}_\kappa$ as above, and $\mathbf{w} = \text{vec} \left( \sqrt{\mathbf{A} \ast \mathbf{W}_x^{2d} \ast \mathbf{W}_y^{2d}} \right)$, where $\sqrt{\mathbf{A}}$ and $A^{2d}$ denote element-wise square root and squaring operations, respectively.

Setting $\mathbf{h} = \hat{c} \circ \hat{c} + \kappa \hat{d}_x \circ \hat{d}_x + \kappa \hat{d}_y \circ \hat{d}_y$, we have

\[
\mathbf{F}_\kappa^\top \mathbf{F}_\kappa = \mathbf{F}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_\kappa \mathbf{F},
\]

with $\mathbf{A}_\kappa$ given by

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\mathbf{I} - \kappa^2 \text{Diag}(\hat{d}_x \circ \hat{h}_x^{-1} \circ \hat{d}_x) & -\kappa^2 \text{Diag}(\hat{d}_y \circ \hat{h}_y^{-1} \circ \hat{d}_y)
\end{pmatrix},
\]

$\mathbf{F}_\kappa^\top \mathbf{F}_\kappa$ is a $2 \times 2$ block system of diagonal matrices, so we can efficiently compute its eigenvalues, thereby obtaining the singular values of $\mathbf{F}_\kappa$. In Figure 6 we plot the spectrum of $\mathbf{F}_\kappa$. Half of the singular values are exactly $\sqrt{\kappa}$, and the other half drop rapidly to 0. This spectral property is responsible for the slow sublinear convergence rate of SR3. Because of the special structure of the $\mathbf{C}$ matrix, $\mathbf{F}_\kappa$ does not improve conditioning as in the LASSO example, where $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{I}$. The SR3 formulation still makes it simple to apply the FISTA algorithm to the reduced problem (5), improving the convergence rates.

Algorithm 3 FISTA for SR3 TV

1. **Input:** $w^0$
2. **Initialize:** $k = 0$, $a_0 = 1$, $v_0 = w^0$, $\eta \leq \frac{1}{\kappa}$
3. **while** not converged **do**
   4. $k \leftarrow k + 1$
   5. $v_k \leftarrow \text{prox}_{\eta R}(w^{k-1} - \eta(F_k^\top (F_k w^{k-1} - g_k)))$
   6. $a_k \leftarrow (1 + \sqrt{1 + 4a_k^2 - 1})/2$
   7. $w^k \leftarrow v_k + (a_{k-1} - 1)/a_k(v_k - v_{k-1})$
8. **Output:** $w^k$
C. SR3 for Exact Derivatives

TV regularizers are often used in physical settings, where the position and the magnitude of the non-zero values for the derivative matters. In this numerical example, we use synthetic data to illustrate the efficacy of SR3 for such problems. In particular, we demonstrate that the use of nonconvex regularizers can improve performance.

Consider a piecewise constant step function with dimension \( x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{500} \) and values from \(-2\) to \(2\), see the first row of Figure 7 for a sample plot. We take 100 random measurements \( b = Ax_t + \sigma \epsilon \) of the signal, where the elements of \( A \) and \( \epsilon \) are i.i.d. standard Gaussian, and we choose a noise level of \( \sigma = 1 \).
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Fig. 7: SR3 TV regularization result on synthetic data. The first row plots the averaging recovery signal (dashed red line), integrating recovery signal (dot dashed green line) and the true signal (solid blue line). Second row plots the discretized derivative (solid red line) and true magnitude (dashed blue line). First column contain the results come from \( \ell_0 \) regularization, second column is from \( \ell_1 \).

To recover the signal, we solve the SR3 formulation

\[
\min_{x,w} \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \lambda R(w) + \frac{1}{2} \|w - Cx\|^2,
\]

where \( R \) is chosen to be \( \|\cdot\|_0 \) or \( \|\cdot\|_1 \), and \( C \) is the appropriate forward difference matrix. We want to both recover the signal \( x_t \) and obtain an estimate of the discrete derivative using \( w \). Results are shown in Figure 7 with the first row showing the recovered signals (red dash and green dot dash) vs. true signal (blue solid) and the second row showing the estimated signal derivative \( w \).

If we explicitly use the fact that our signal is a step function, it is easy to recover an accurate approximation of the signal using both \( x \) and \( w \). We define groups of indices corresponding to contiguous sequences for which \( w_i = 0 \). For such contiguous groups, we set the value of the recovered signal to be the mean of the \( x_i \) values. Ideally, there should be five such groups. In order to recover the signal, we need good group identification (positions of nonzeros in \( w \)) and an unbiased estimation for signal \( x \). From the red dash line in the first row of Figure 7 we can see that both \( \ell_0 \) and \( \ell_1 \) reasonably achieve this goal using the grouping procedure.

However, such an explicit assumption on the structure of the signal may not be appropriate in more complicated applications. A more generic approach would “invert” \( C \) (discrete integration in this example) to reconstruct the signal given \( w \). From the second row of Figure 7 we see that \( \ell_0 \)-TV obtains a better unbiased estimation of the magnitude of the derivative compared to \( \ell_1 \)-TV; accordingly, the signal reconstructed by integration is more faithful using the \( \ell_0 \)-style regularizaton.

D. SR3 for Matrix Completion

Analogous to sparsity in compressed sensing, low-rank structure has been used to solve a variety of matrix completion problems, including the famous Netflix Prize problem, as well as in control, system identification, signal processing, combinatorial optimization [10], [33], and seismic data interpolation/denoising [3], [29].

We compare classic rank penalty approaches using the nuclear norm (see e.g. [33]) to the SR3 approach on a seismic interpolation example. Seismic data interpolation is crucial for accurate inversion and imaging procedures such
as full-waveform inversion \cite{42}, reverse-time migration \cite{3} and multiple removal methods \cite{41}. Dense acquisition is prohibitively expensive in these applications, motivating reduction in seismic measurements. On the other hand, using subsampled sources and receivers without interpolation gives unwanted imaging artifacts. The main goal is to simultaneously sample and compress a signal using optimization to replace dense acquisition, thus enabling a range of applications in seismic data processing at a fraction of the cost. We use a real seismic line from the Gulf of Suez. The signal is stored in a $401 \times 401$ complex matrix, arranged as a matrix by source/receiver, see the left plot of Fig. 8. Fully sampled seismic data has a fast decay of singular values, while sub-sampling breaks this decay \cite{3}. A convex formulation for matrix completion with nuclear norm is hard to compare with the naked eye, so we plot the achievable misfit on the observed data against the parameters of the images is hard to compare with the naked eye, so we plot the achievable misfit on the observed data against the parameters of the images.

We compare the results from four formulations, SR3 $\ell_0$, SR3 $\ell_1$, classic $\ell_0$ and classic $\ell_1$, i.e. the equations

$$\min_{X} \frac{1}{2} \| A(X) - D \|_F^2 + \lambda R(\sigma(X)) \quad (16)$$

where $A$ maps $X$ to data $D$, and $R(\cdot) = \| \cdot \|_1$ penalizes rank.

The SR3 model relaxes \cite{18} to obtain the formulation

$$\min_{X,W} \frac{1}{2} \| A(X) - D \|_F^2 + \lambda R(\sigma(W)) + \frac{\kappa}{2} \| W - X \|_F^2. \quad (17)$$

To find $X(W)$, the minimizer of \cite{19} with respect to $X$, we solve a least squares problem. The $W$ update requires thresholding the singular values of $X(W)$. We compare the results from four formulations, SR3 $\ell_0$, SR3 $\ell_1$, classic $\ell_0$ and classic $\ell_1$, i.e. the equations

$$\min_{X} \frac{1}{2} \| A(X) - D \|_F^2 + \lambda R(\sigma(X)) \quad (18)$$

and

$$\min_{X,W} \frac{1}{2} \| A(X) - D \|_F^2 + \lambda R(\sigma(W)) + \frac{\kappa}{2} \| W - X \|_F^2, \quad (19)$$

where $R$ can be either $\ell_1$ or $\ell_0$. To generate figures from SR3 solutions, we look at the signal matrix $X$ rather than the auxiliary matrix $W$, since here we want in the interpolated result itself, rather than identifying support, as in compressive sensing examples.

In Figure 8, 85% of the data is missing. We arrange the frequency slice into a $401 \times 401$ matrix, and then transform the data into the midpoint-offset domain following \cite{3}, with $m = \frac{1}{2}(s+r)$ and $h = \frac{1}{2}(s-r)$, increasing the dimension to $401 \times 801$. We then solve \cite{19} to interpolate the slice, and compare with the original to get a signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of 9.7 (last panel in Fig. 8). The SNR obtained by solving \cite{18} is 9.2.

Results are shown in Figures 9 and 10. The relative quality of the images is hard to compare with the naked eye, so we compute the Signal to Noise Ratio (SNR) with respect to the original (fully sampled) data to present a comparison. SR3 fits original data better than the solution of \cite{18}, obtaining a maximum SNR of 12.6, see Figure 10.

We also generate Pareto curves for the four approaches, plotting achievable misfit on the observed data against the ranks of the solutions. Pareto curves for $\ell_0$ formulations lie below those of $\ell_1$ formulations, i.e. using the 0-norm allows better data fitting for a given rank, and equivalently a lower rank at a particular error level, see Figure 10. The Pareto curves obtained using the SR3 approach are lower still, through the relaxation.

E. SR3 for Group Sparsity

Group sparsity is a composite sparse regularizer used in multi-task learning to regularize under-determined learning tasks by introducing redundancy in the solution vectors. Consider a set of under-determined linear systems,

$$b_i = A_i x_i + \sigma \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, k,$$

where $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$ and $m_i < n$. If we assume a priori that some of these systems might share the same solution vector, we can formulate the problem of recovering the $x_i$ as

$$\min_{x_i} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \| A_i x_i - b_i \|_2^2 + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{k} \| x_i - x_j \|_2$$

where the $\ell_2$ norm promotes sparsity of the differences $x_i - x_j$ (or, equivalently, encourages redundancy in the $x_i$). To write the objective in a compact way, set

$$x = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ \vdots \\ b_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ \vdots \\ A_k \end{bmatrix}.$$ We can then re-write the optimization problem as

$$\min_x \frac{1}{2} \| A x - b \|_2^2 + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{k} \| D_{ij} x \|_2,$$

where $D_{ij} x$ gives the pairwise differences between $x_i$ and $x_j$. There is no simple primal algorithm for this objective, as $\| \cdot \|_2$ is not smooth and there is no efficient prox operation for the composition of $\| \cdot \|_2$ with the mapping $D$.

Applying SR3 approach, we introduce the variables $w_{ij}$ to approximate $D_{ij} x$ and obtain

$$\min_{x,w} \frac{1}{2} \| A x - b \|_2^2 + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{k} \| w_{ij} \|_2$$

$$+ \kappa \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{k} \| w_{ij} - D_{ij} x \|_2^2.$$

We set up a synthetic problem with $n = 200$, $m_i = 150$, and $k = 7$. The $A_i$ are random Gaussian matrices and we group the true underlying signal as follows:

$$x_1 = x_2, \quad x_3 = x_4, \quad x_5 = x_6 = x_7$$

where the generators are sampled form a Gaussian distribution. We set the noise level to $\sigma = 0.1$ and select the optimization parameters $\lambda = 10$ and $\kappa = 1$.

The pairwise distance of the result is shown in Figure 11. The groups have been successfully recovered. If we directly use the $x$ from the SR3 solution, we obtain 47% relative error. However, using the pattern discovered by $w$ to regroup the least square problems, namely combine $A_1, A_2$ and $b_1, b_2$ to solve for the first group of variables, $x_1 = x_2$, and so on, we improve the result significantly to 1% relative error (which is essentially optimal given the noise).
IV. DISCUSSION AND OUTLOOK

Sparsity promoting regularization of regression problems continues to play a critical role in obtaining actionable and interpretable models from data. Further, the robustness, computational efficiency, and generalizability of such algorithms is required for them to have the potential for broad applicability across the data sciences. The SR3 algorithm developed here satisfies all of these important criteria and provides a broadly applicable, simple architecture that is better than state-of-the-art methods for compressed sensing, matrix completion, LASSO, TV regularization, and group sparsity. Critical to its success is the relaxation that splits sparsity and accuracy requirements.

The success of the relaxed formulation suggests broader applicability of SR3. Specially, we can also consider the general optimization problem associated with nonlinear functions, such as the training of neural networks, optimizing over a set of supervised input-output responses that are given by a nonlinear function \( f(\cdot) \) with constraints. The relaxed formulation of (2) generalizes to

\[
\min_{x, w} f(A, x, b) + \lambda R(w) + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|Cx - w\|^2.
\]

(20)

Accurate and sparse solutions for such neural network architectures can be more readily generalizable, analogous with how SR3 helps to achieve robust variable selection in sparse
linear models. The application to neural networks is beyond the scope of this manuscript, but the architecture proposed has great potential for broader applicability.

APPENDIX

We review necessary preliminaries from the optimization literature, and then present a series of theoretical results that explain some of the properties of SR3 solutions and characterize convergence of the proposed algorithms.

MATHEMATICAL PRELIMINARIES

Before analyzing SR3, we give some basic results from the non-smooth optimization literature.

Subdifferential and Optimality

In this paper, we work with nonsmooth functions, both convex and nonconvex. Given a convex nonsmooth function \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) and a point \( \bar{x} \) with \( f(\bar{x}) \) finite, the subdifferential of \( f \) at \( \bar{x} \), denoted \( \partial f(\bar{x}) \), is the set of all vectors \( v \) satisfying

\[
    f(x) \geq f(\bar{x}) + \langle v, x - \bar{x} \rangle \quad \forall x.
\]

The classic necessary stationarity condition \( 0 \in \partial f(\bar{x}) \) implies \( f(x) \geq f(\bar{x}) \) for all \( x \), i.e. global optimality. The definition of subdifferential must be amended for the general nonconvex case. Given an arbitrary function \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) and a point \( \bar{x} \) with \( f(\bar{x}) \) finite, the Fréchet subdifferential of \( f \) at \( \bar{x} \), denoted \( \hat{\partial} f(\bar{x}) \), is the set of all vectors \( v \) satisfying

\[
    f(x) \geq f(\bar{x}) + \langle v, x - \bar{x} \rangle + o(\|x - \bar{x}\|) \quad \text{as } x \to \bar{x}.
\]

Thus the inclusion \( v \in \hat{\partial} f(\bar{x}) \) holds precisely when the affine function \( x \mapsto f(\bar{x}) + \langle v, x - \bar{x} \rangle \) underestimates \( f \) up to first-order near \( \bar{x} \). In general, the limit of Fréchet subgradients \( v_i \in \hat{\partial} f(x_i) \), along a sequence \( x_i \to \bar{x} \), may not be a Fréchet subgradient at the limiting point \( \bar{x} \). Therefore, one formally enlarges the Fréchet subdifferential and defines the limiting subdifferential of \( f \) at \( \bar{x} \), denoted \( \partial f(\bar{x}) \), to consist of all vectors \( v \) for which there exist sequences \( x_i \) and \( v_i \), satisfying \( v_i \in \hat{\partial} f(x_i) \) and \( (x_i, f(x_i), v_i) \to (\bar{x}, f(\bar{x}), v) \). In this general setting, the condition \( 0 \in \partial f(\bar{x}) \) is necessary but not sufficient. However, stationary points are the best we can hope to find using iterative methods, and distance to stationarity serves as a way to detect convergence and analyze algorithms. In particular, we design and analyze algorithms that find the stationary points of (1) and (5), which are defined below, for both convex and nonconvex regularizers \( R(\cdot) \).

Definition 1 (Stationarity). We call \( \hat{x} \) the stationary point of (1) if

\[
    0 \in A^\top (A\hat{x} - b) + \lambda C^\top \partial R(\hat{x}).
\]

And \((\hat{x}, \hat{w})\) the stationary point of (5) if

\[
    0 = A^\top (A\hat{x} - b) + \kappa C^\top (C\hat{x} - \hat{w}),
\]

\[
    0 \in \lambda \partial R(\hat{w}) + \kappa (\hat{w} - C\hat{x}).
\]

Moreau Envelope and Prox Operators

For any function \( f \) and real \( \eta > 0 \), the Moreau envelope and the proximal mapping are defined by

\[
    f_\eta(x) := \inf_z \left\{ f(z) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \| z - x \|^2 \right\},
\]

\[
    \text{prox}_{\eta f}(x) := \arg\min_z \left\{ \eta f(z) + \frac{1}{2} \| z - x \|^2 \right\},
\]

respectively.

The Moreau envelope has a smoothing effect on convex functions, characterized by the following theorem. Note that a proper function \( f \) satisfies that \( f > -\infty \) and it takes on a value other than \(+\infty\) for some \( x \). A closed function satisfies that \( \{ x : f(x) \leq \alpha \} \) is a closed set for each \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \).

Theorem 4 (Regularization properties of the envelope). Let \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) be a proper closed convex function. Then \( f_\eta \) is convex and \( C^1 \)-smooth with

\[
    \nabla f_\eta(x) = \frac{1}{\eta}(x - \text{prox}_{\eta f}(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Lip}(\nabla f_\eta) \leq \frac{1}{\eta}.
\]

If in addition \( f \) is \( L \)-Lipschitz, then the envelope \( f_\eta(\cdot) \) is \( L \)-Lipschitz and satisfies

\[
    0 \leq f(x) - f_\eta(x) \leq \frac{L^2\eta}{2} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

Proof. See Theorem 2.26 of [34].

However, when \( f \) is not convex, \( f_\eta \) may no longer be smooth as we show in Figure 12 where we use \( \ell_0 \) as an example.
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For any function \( f \) and real \( \eta > 0 \), the Moreau envelope and the proximal mapping are defined by

\[
    f_\eta(x) := \inf_z \left\{ f(z) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \| z - x \|^2 \right\},
\]

\[
    \text{prox}_{\eta f}(x) := \arg\min_z \left\{ \eta f(z) + \frac{1}{2} \| z - x \|^2 \right\},
\]

respectively.

Fig. 12: Envelope functions indexed by the parameter \( \eta \), for \( f = \| \cdot \|_0 \). In contrast to the convex case, here all \( f_\eta \) are nonsmooth and nonconvex.

Common Prox Operators

The prox operator is useful when designing algorithms that handle non-smooth and non-convex functions. Its calculation is often straightforward when the function \( f \) decouples element-wise. To illustrate the idea, we derive proximal mappings for
\( \ell_1, \ell_0, \ell_2^2, \) and \( \ell_2. \) Many more operators can be found e.g. in \cite{18}.

- \( f(\cdot) = \| \cdot \|_1. \) The \( \ell_1 \) norm is a convex nonsmooth penalty often used to promote sparse solutions in regression problems. We include a derivation of the proximity operator for this problem and the remaining operators have similar derivations.

**Lemma 1 (\( \ell_1 \)).** The prox operator of \( \ell_1 \) is an element-wise soft-thresholding action on the given vector:

\[
\mathbf{x} = \text{prox}_{\eta f}(\mathbf{y}) = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \| \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \|^2 + \eta \| \mathbf{x} \|_1 \quad \Rightarrow \\
\mathbf{x}_i = \begin{cases} y_i - \eta, & y_i > \eta \\ 0, & |y_i| \leq \eta \\ y_i + \eta, & y_i < -\eta \end{cases} \quad (24)
\]

**Proof.** Note that the optimization problem may be written as

\[
\arg\min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \| \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \|^2 + \eta \| \mathbf{x} \|_1 \\
= \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - y_i)^2 + \eta |x_i| ,
\]

i.e. the problem decouples over the elements of \( \mathbf{y}. \) For each \( i, \) the optimization problem has the subdifferential

\[
\partial x_i \left( \frac{1}{2} (x_i - y_i)^2 + \eta |x_i| \right) \\
= \begin{cases} x_i - y_i + \eta, & x_i > 0 \\ x_i - y_i + \{ z : |z| \leq \eta \}, & x_i = 0 \\ x_i - y_i - \eta, & x_i < 0 \end{cases} \quad (26)
\]

After checking the possible stationary points given this formula for the subdifferential, it is simple to derive (24).

- \( f(\cdot) = \| \cdot \|_0. \) The \( \ell_0 \) penalty directly controls the number of non-zeros in the vector instead of penalizing the magnitude of elements as \( \ell_1 \) does. However, it is non-convex and in practice regression formulations with \( \ell_0 \) regularization can be trapped in local minima instead of finding the true support.

**Lemma 2 (\( \ell_0 \)).** The prox operator of \( \ell_0 \) is simple, element-wise hard-thresholding:

\[
\mathbf{x} = \text{prox}_{\eta f}(\mathbf{y}) = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \| \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \|^2 + \eta \| \mathbf{x} \|_0 \quad \Rightarrow \\
\mathbf{x}_i = \begin{cases} y_i, & |y_i| > \sqrt{2\eta} \\ 0, & |y_i| \leq \sqrt{2\eta} \end{cases} \quad (27)
\]

**Proof.** Analogous to the \( \ell_1 \), the prox problem for \( \ell_0 \) can be decoupled across coordinates:

\[
\frac{1}{2} \| \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \|^2 + \eta \| \mathbf{x} \|_0 = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - y_i)^2 + \eta \mathbf{1}_{\{ x_i = 0 \}} .
\]

From this formula, it is clear that the only possible solutions for each coordinate are \( x_i = 0 \) or \( x_i = y_i. \)

The formula (27) follows from checking the conditions for these cases.

- \( f(\cdot) = \frac{1}{2} \| \cdot \|_2^2. \) The \( \ell_2 \) penalty can be used as a smooth and convex penalty which biases towards zero. When combined with linear regression, it is commonly known as ridge regression.

**Lemma 3 (\( \ell_2^2 \)).** The prox of \( \ell_2^2 \) is scaling.

\[
\mathbf{x} = \text{prox}_{\eta f}(\mathbf{y}) = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \| \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \|^2 + \eta \| \mathbf{x} \|_2^2 = \frac{1}{1 + \eta} \mathbf{y} .
\]

**Proof.** The proof follows directly from calculus.

- \( f(\cdot) = \| \cdot \|. \) The \( \ell_2 \) norm adds a group sparsity prior, i.e. the vector \( \mathbf{x} \) is biased toward being the zero vector. Often, this penalty is applied to each column of a matrix of variables. Unlike the prox operators above, \( \| \cdot \| \) (by design) does not decouple into scalar problems. Fortunately, a closed form solution is easy to obtain.

**Lemma 4.**

\[
\mathbf{x} = \text{prox}_{\eta f}(\mathbf{y}) = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \| \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \|^2 + \eta \| \mathbf{x} \| \\
= \begin{cases} \frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|-\eta}{\|\mathbf{y}\|}, & \|\mathbf{y}\| > \eta \\ 0, & \|\mathbf{y}\| \leq \eta \end{cases} .
\]

**Proof.** Observe that for any fixed value of \( \| \mathbf{x} \| \) the objective

\[
\frac{1}{2} \| \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \|^2 + \eta \| \mathbf{x} \|
\]

is minimized by taking \( \mathbf{x} \) in the direction of \( \mathbf{y}. \) This reduces the problem to finding the optimal value of \( \| \mathbf{x} \|, \) for which the same reasoning as the \( \ell_1 \) penalty applies.

**Proximal Gradient Descent**

**Algorithm 4** Proximal gradient descent

1: Input: \( x_0, \eta \)
2: Initialize: \( k = 0 \)
3: while not converged do
4: \( k \leftarrow k + 1 \)
5: \( x^k \leftarrow \text{prox}_{\eta g}(x^{k-1} - \eta \nabla f(x^{k-1})) \)
6: Output: \( x^k \)

Consider an objective of the form \( p(x) = f(x) + g(x) \). Given a step size \( t \), the proximal gradient descent algorithm as is defined in Algorithm \cite{18}. This algorithm has been studied extensively. Among other results, we have

**Theorem 5** (Proximal Gradient Descent). Assume \( p = f + g \) and both \( p \) and \( g \) are closed convex functions. Let \( p^* \) denote the optimal function value and \( x^* \) denote the optimal solution.

- If \( \nabla f \) is \( \beta \) Lipschitz continuous, then, setting the step size as \( 1/\beta \), the iterates generated by proximal gradient descent satisfy

\[
p(x^k) - p^* \leq \frac{\beta \| x^0 - x^* \|^2}{2(k+1)} .
\]
• Furthermore, if \( p \) is also \( \alpha \) strongly convex, we have,
\[
\|x^k - x^*\|^2 \leq \left( 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \right)^k \|x^0 - x^*\|^2.
\]

These results are well known; see e.g. [7], [18], [31] and the tutorial section 4.4 of [2].

**Theoretical Results and Properties**

In the main text, it is demonstrated that SR3 [5] outperforms the standard regression problem [1], achieving faster convergence and obtaining higher quality solutions. Here, we develop some theory to explain the performance of SR3 from the perspective of the relaxed coordinates, \( w \). We obtain an explicit formula for the SR3 problem in \( F \) and the SR3 relaxation.

**Spectral Properties of \( F \)**

1) **Proof of Theorem [7]** The first property can be verified by direct calculation. We have
\[
F^\top_k F_k w - F^\top_k g_k = (\kappa I - \kappa^2 CH_k^{-1} C^\top) w - \kappa CH_k^{-1} A^\top b
\]
\[
= \kappa H_k^{-1} [(H_k - \kappa I) w - A^\top b]
\]
so that \( F^\top_k F_k w - F^\top_k g_k = 0 \iff A^\top A w + A^\top b = 0 \).

For the second property, we assume that \( C = I \). By the definition of \( F_k \), we have that
\[
F^\top_k F_k = \kappa[I - \kappa(A^\top A + \kappa I)^{-1}]
\]
\[
= A^\top(I + \kappa A A^\top)^{-1} A
\]
Assume \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \) has the singular value decomposition (SVD) \( A = U \Sigma V^\top \), where \( U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \), \( \Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \), and \( V \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \). We have
\[
F^\top_k F_k = V \Sigma^\top (I + \Sigma^2 / \kappa)^{-1} \Sigma V^\top.
\]

Let \( \hat{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l} \) denote the reduced diagonal part of \( \Sigma \), i.e. the top-left \( l \times l \) submatrix of \( \Sigma \) with \( l = \min(m, n) \). When \( m \geq n \), we have
\[
\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Sigma} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad F^\top_k F_k = V \hat{\Sigma}^\top (I + \hat{\Sigma}^2 / \kappa)^{-1} \hat{\Sigma} V^\top
\]
And when \( m < n \),
\[
\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Sigma} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad F^\top_k F_k = V \left[ \hat{\Sigma}^\top (I + \hat{\Sigma}^2 / \kappa)^{-1} \hat{\Sigma} 0 0 \right] V^\top
\]

2) **Proof of Corollary [7]** Note that the function
\[
x \frac{x}{\sqrt{1 + x^2}}
\]
is an increasing function of \( x \) when \( x, a > 0 \). Therefore, by [6], we have
\[
\sigma_{\max}(F_k) = \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\Delta)}{\sqrt{1 + \sigma_{\max}(\Delta)^2 / \kappa}} \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
\sigma_{\min}(F_k) = \frac{\sigma_{\min}(\Delta)}{\sqrt{1 + \sigma_{\min}(\Delta)^2 / \kappa}}.
\]

[7] follows by the definition of the condition number.

3) **Proof of Theorem [2]** The result is immediate from combining Theorems [4] and [5].

4) **Convergence result for the general case.** In the general setting, where \( R \) can be nonconvex, all we can hope to prove is that the sequence generated by the algorithm will converge to one of the stationary points, as defined in Definition [1]. In [45], such a convergence result was established, which we will translate here to the specific case of regularized linear regression.

**Theorem 6 (Proximal Gradient Descent for General Linear Regression).** Consider linear regression objective,
\[
\min_x p(x) := \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \lambda R(x),
\]
where \( p \) is assumed to be bounded below (\( R \) may be non-smooth and nonconvex). Setting the time step \( t = 1/\|A\|^2 = 1/\sigma_{\max}(A)^2 \), the sequence generated by Algorithm [2] with \( f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 \) and \( g(x) = \lambda R(x) \) satisfies
\[
(\|A\|^2 I - A^\top A)(x_k - x^{k+1}) \in \partial p(x^{k+1})
\]
\[
= A^\top (Ax^{k+1} - b) + \lambda \partial R(x^{k+1}), \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots
\]
Moreover, we have the following convergence result
\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|v^{k+1}\|^2 \leq \frac{\|A\|^2}{N} (p(x^0) - p^*)
\]
where \( v^{k+1} = (\|A\|^2 I - A^\top A)(x_k - x^{k+1}) \), and \( p^* = \inf_x p(x) \); i.e., the proximal gradient algorithm converges sublinearly to the stationary point of the linear regression objective.

Proof. For the iterates of the proximal gradient method, we have
\[
x^{k+1} = \arg\min_x \frac{1}{2} \|x - (x^k - \eta \nabla f(x^k))\|^2 + \eta g(x)
\]
and from the first order optimality condition we have
\[
0 \in x^{k+1} - x^k + \eta \nabla f(x^k) + \eta \partial g(x^{k+1})
\]
\[
\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\eta} (x^k - x^{k+1}) + \nabla f(x^{k+1}) - \nabla f(x^k)
\]
\[
\in \nabla f(x^{k+1}) + \partial g(x^{k+1})
\]
\[
\Rightarrow (\|A\|^2 I - A^\top A)(x_k - x^{k+1}) \in \partial p(x^{k+1})
\]
which establishes the first statement. Next, consider the following inequality

\[
p(x^{k+1}) = \frac{1}{2} \|Ax^{k+1} - b\|^2 + \lambda R(x^{k+1})
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \|Ax_k - b + A(x^{k+1} - x^k)\|^2 + \lambda R(x^{k+1})
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \|Ax_k - b\|^2 + \lambda R(x^{k+1})
\]

\[
+ \langle A^T (Ax_k - b), x^{k+1} - x_k \rangle
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{2} \|A(x^{k+1} - x_k)\|^2
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \|Ax_k - b\|^2 + \lambda R(x^k) - \frac{\|A\|^2}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{2} \|A(x^{k+1} - x_k)\|^2 ,
\]

which implies the inequality

\[
\langle x^k - x^{k+1}, (\|A\|^2 I - A^TA) (x^k - x^{k+1}) \rangle 
\]

\[
\leq p(x^k) - p(x^{k+1}),
\]

Setting \(v^{k+1} = P(x^k - x^{k+1}) \in \partial p(x^{k+1}),\) where \(P = \|A\|^2 I - A^TA,\) we have,

\[
\|v^{k+1}\|^2 = \|P(x^k - x^{k+1})\|^2
\]

\[
= \|P^{1/2}P^{1/2}(x^k - x^{k+1})\|^2
\]

\[
\leq \|P^{1/2}\|^2 \|P^{1/2}(x^k - x^{k+1})\|^2
\]

\[
\leq \|P^{1/2}\|^2 \|p(x^k) - p(x^{k+1})\|^2
\]

\[
\leq \|A\|^2 \|p(x^k) - p(x^{k+1})\|
\]

After we add up and simplify, we obtain

\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|v^{k+1}\|^2 \leq \frac{\|A\|^2}{N} \left( p(x^0) - p(x^N) \right)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{\|A\|^2}{N} \left( p(x^0) - p^* \right),
\]

which is the desired convergence result. \(\square\)

From Theorem 3 we see that, in the general case, the convergence to stationarity of the proximal gradient algorithm still depends on \(\sigma_{\text{max}}(A).\) In this case, the \(p_w\) formulation holds the same advantage over \(p_x\) as in the (degenerate) convex case.

**Corollary 2.** Define \(p_x\) and \(p_w\) as in Theorem 2 but without the convexity assumption on \(R.\) Then the convergence of Algorithm 2 satisfies

\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|v^{k+1}\|^2 \leq \frac{\|A\|^2}{N} \left( p_x(x_0) - p^* \right)
\]

\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|w^{k+1}\|^2 \leq \frac{\|A\|^2}{N} \left( p_w(x_0) - p^* \right)
\]

where \(v^{k+1} = (\|A\|^2 I - A^TA) (x^k - x^{k+1}) \in \partial p_x(x^{k+1}),\)

\(v^{k+1}_w = (\kappa I - F^TF)(w^k - w^{k+1}) \in \partial p_w(w^{k+1}).\)

**Characterizing Optimal Solutions of SR3**

In this section, we quantify the relation between the solution of (1) and (5) when \(C = I.\) In this analysis, we fix \(\kappa\) as a constant and set \(C = I.\)

**Lemma 5** (Optimality conditions for (1) and (5)). Define the sets

\[
S_1(x, \lambda_1) = \{ A^TAx - A^Tb + \lambda_1 v_1 : v_1 \in \partial R(x) \}
\]

\[
S_2(w, \lambda_2) = \{ \kappa H_\kappa^{-1}(A^TAw - A^Tb) + \lambda_2 v_2 : v_2 \in \partial R(w) \},
\]

where \(H_\kappa = A^TA + \kappa I,\) as above. These sets contain the subgradients of (1) and (5). If we assume \(\hat{x}\) and \(\hat{w}\) are the (stationary) solutions of (1) and (5), namely

\[
0 \in S_1(\hat{x}, \lambda_1), \quad 0 \in S_2(\hat{w}, \lambda_2),
\]

then

\[
[ I - (\lambda_1/\lambda_2)\kappa H_\kappa^{-1}] (A^TA\hat{w} - A^Tb) \in S_1(\hat{w}, \lambda_1),
\]

\[
[\kappa H_\kappa^{-1} - (\lambda_2/\lambda_1)I] (A^TA\hat{x} - A^Tb) \in S_2(\hat{x}, \lambda_2).
\]

**Proof.** As \(\hat{x}\) and \(\hat{w}\) are the (stationary) solutions of (1) and (5), we have

\[
\exists v_1 \in \partial R(\hat{x}), \quad \lambda_1 v_1 = -(A^TA \hat{x} - A^Tb),
\]

\[
\exists v_2 \in \partial R(\hat{w}), \quad \lambda_2 v_2 = -\kappa H_\kappa^{-1}(A^TA\hat{w} - A^Tb).
\]

Then,

\[
A^TA\hat{w} - A^Tb + \lambda_1 v_2 \in S_1(\hat{w}, \lambda_1)
\]

\[
\Rightarrow [ I - (\lambda_1/\lambda_2)\kappa H_\kappa^{-1}] (A^TA\hat{w} - A^Tb) \in S_1(\hat{w}, \lambda_1),
\]

\[
[\kappa H_\kappa^{-1} - (\lambda_2/\lambda_1)I] (A^TA\hat{x} - A^Tb) \in S_2(\hat{x}, \lambda_2).
\]

\(\Box\)

5) **Proof of Theorem 3**  Using the definitions of Lemma 5 we have

\[
\text{dist}(0, S_1(\hat{w}, \lambda_1))
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{\tau} \| (\hat{r}I - \kappa H_\kappa^{-1}) (A^TA\hat{w} - A^Tb) \|
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\tau} \| (\hat{r}I - \kappa H_\kappa^{-1})_2 | A^TA\hat{w} - A^Tb |\|
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\tau} \| (\hat{r}I - \kappa \sigma(H_\kappa^{-1}))_\infty | A^TA\hat{w} - A^Tb |\|
\]

\[
= \| \sigma_{\text{max}}(H_\kappa) - \sigma_{\text{min}}(H_\kappa) \| | A^TA\hat{w} - A^Tb |\|
\]

\[
= \| \sigma_{\text{max}}(A^2) - \sigma_{\text{min}}(A^2) \| + 2\kappa \| A^TA\hat{w} - A^Tb |\|
\]

If \(\hat{x} = \hat{w},\) then \(r = A^TA\hat{w} - A^Tb = A^TAx - A^Tb\) is in the null space of \(\tau I - \kappa H_\kappa^{-1},\) where \(\tau = \lambda_2/\lambda_1.\) This establishes a connection between \(\lambda_1\) and \(\lambda_2.\) For instance, we have the following result. In the case that \(A\) has orthogonal rows or columns, theorem 3 provides some explicit bounds on the distance between these solutions.

**Corollary 3.** If \(A^TA = I,\) then \(\text{dist}(0, S_1(\hat{w}, \lambda_1)) = 0, i.e. \hat{w} is the stationary point of (1).\) If \(AA^T = I,\) then \(\text{dist}(0, S_1(\hat{w}, \lambda_1)) \leq 1/(1 + 2\kappa).\)
Proof. The formula for $H_\kappa$ simplifies under these assumptions. When $A^TA = I$, we have $H_\kappa = (1 + \kappa)I$ and $\sigma_{\max}(H_\kappa) = \sigma_{\min}(H_\kappa) = 1 + \kappa$. When $A^TA = I$, we have $\sigma_{\max}(H_\kappa) = 1 + \kappa$ and $\sigma_{\min}(H_\kappa) = \kappa$. Theorem 5 then implies the result.
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