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1 Introduction

The primal-dual first-order method presents as a powerful tool to tackle many structured convex optimization models in image/signal processing, stochastic, machine learning, and
engineering applications, see, e.g. [10,14,15,23,26,30,46]. It is extremely flexible to handle composition and decomposition structures between convex functions and linear operators, as well as simple constraints by means of proximal operators, projections, and matrix-vector multiplications. This paper deals with a new class of convex optimization algorithms, called non-stationary first-order primal-dual methods with dynamic step-sizes. The term “non-stationary” is adopted from non-stationary Douglas-Rachford methods [34] to reflect the use of dynamic step-sizes but having rigorous convergence guarantees.

**Problem statement:** In this paper, we consider the following composite convex minimization problem:

$$F^* := \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ F(x) := f(x) + g(Kx) \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ are two proper, closed, and convex functions, and $K : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a given general linear operator.

Associated with the primal problem (1), we also consider its dual form as

$$G^* := \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ G(y) := f^*(-K^\top y) + g^*(y) \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where $f^*$ and $g^*$ are the Fenchel conjugates of $f$ and $g$, respectively. We can write both the primal and dual problems (1) and (2) into the following min-max setting:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \tilde{L}(x,y) := f(x) + \langle Kx, y \rangle - g^*(y) \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where $\tilde{L}(x,y)$ can be referred to as the Lagrange function of (1) and (2), see [2].

**A brief overview on primal-dual methods:** The primal-dual method for solving (1) and (2) is well-studied in the literature and becomes extremely active research area, ranging from algorithmic development and convergence theory to applications, see, e.g. [2,10,26,28] for more details. This method also has close connection to other fields such as monotone inclusions, variational inequalities, and game theory [2,27]. Among different primal-dual variants for convex optimization, the general primal-dual hybrid gradient (PDHG) method presented in [47] appears to be the most general scheme that covers many existing variants. PDHG was proposed in [63] and extensively studied in [25,30]. The original PDHG can be considered as a special case of Chambolle-Pock’s methods in [9] at which the relaxation parameter is one. Furthermore, as discussed in [9], Chambolle-Pock’s method has close connection to classical methods including Arrow-Hurwicz, extra-gradient method, and alternating direction methods of multipliers (ADMM) and its preconditioned variants. Note that Chambolle-Pock’s method can be cast into the general PDHG scheme as shown in [47]. However, by using an appropriate reformulation of (1), [47] also showed that general PDHG scheme is in fact equivalent to Douglas-Rachford method [2,24,35], and, therefore, to ADMM in the dual setting.

In our view, the study of first-order primal-dual methods for convex optimization can be divided into three main streams. The first one is algorithmic development with numerous variants using different frameworks such as fixed-point theory, projective methods, monotone operator splitting, Fenchel duality and augmented Lagrangian frameworks, and variational inequality, see, e.g. [7,12,13,29,31,36,59,60,62,63]. Extensions to three operators and three objective functions are also studied in several works including [3,17,21,57]. Other extensions to Bregman distances and multi-objective terms are also considered in [2,41].
The second stream is convergence analysis of primal-dual methods. Existing works often use a gap function to measure the optimality of given approximate solutions. This approach usually combines both primal and dual variables in one and uses, e.g., variational inequality frameworks to prove convergence, see, e.g., [24,31,37,38]. An algorithmic-independent framework to characterize primal-dual gap certificates can be found in [23]. Together with asymptotic convergence and linear convergence rates, many researchers have recently focussed on sublinear convergence rates under weaker assumptions than strongly convex or strongly monotone-type conditions, see [4,5,11,18,19,31,32,37,38,53] for more intensive analysis. We emphasize that in general convex setting, such convergence rates are often achieved via averaging sequences on both primal and dual variables, which are much faster than the sequence of last iterates. The third stream is applications of first-order primal-dual methods. Perhaps, applications in image and signal processing are mostly suitable for primal-dual methods [9,10,14,15,26,46]. Recently, many primal-dual methods have been also applied to solve applications in machine learning, statistics, and engineering see, e.g., [8,28,52].

**Motivation:** First-order primal-dual methods have huge impact on image and signal processing and machine learning. These problems often have special structures promoted by regularizers, constraints, or penalty functions. The solutions of the underlying optimization models often possess certain desired structures which unfortunately can be destroyed by optimization algorithms that are using averaging sequences as outputs. For instance, sharp-edgedness in images, sparsity in signal processing and model selection, and low-rankness in matrix approximation are such kinds of structures. This is perhaps a reason why many primal-dual methods eventually take the last iterate sequence as output and ignore the fact that their convergence rate guarantee is proved based on an averaging sequence. This mismatch between theory and practice motivates us to develop new primal-dual optimization algorithms that return the last iterates as outputs with rigorous convergence rate guarantees. While nonergodic convergence rates (i.e., convergence rates on the last iterate sequence) have recently been discussed in [18,19], to the best of our knowledge, nonergodic optimal convergence rate guarantees are still missing in primal-dual methods. This paper develops two new non-stationary first-order primal-dual schemes to fill in this gap. Instead of using constant step-sizes as in existing methods, we use adaptive step-sizes which leads to non-stationary methods as in the non-stationary Douglas-Rachford methods [34].

Whereas $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$-convergence rate appears to be optimal under only convexity and strong duality in certain regimes, i.e. $k \leq O\left(p\right)$, faster convergence rate for $k > O\left(p\right)$ in primal-dual methods seems to not be known yet, especially in nonergodic sense. Recently, [1] shows that Nesterov’s accelerated method can exhibit up to $o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ convergence rate when $k$ is sufficient large compared to the problem dimension $p$. This rate can only be achieved if $g$ is smooth and its gradient is Lipschitz continuous [1]. Both $o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$ and $o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$ rates have also been investigated in [13,19,22] for several optimization schemes. Under additional assumptions imposed on [1], this rate can be boosted up to $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$. This motivates us to consider such an acceleration in first-order primal-dual methods by adopting the approach in [1,22]. We show $o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$-convergence rate on $\min_{0 \leq i \leq k}(F(x^i) - F^\star)$ without any smoothness or strong convexity-type assumption. Such a rate is also considered in [19,20], where $o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$-rate is proved under additional assumption of strong convexity or smoothness.

**Our contribution:** Our contribution in this paper can be summarized as follows:

(a) **(Nonstrongly convex case)** We develop a non-stationary first-order primal-dual optimization algorithm for solving composite convex minimization primal and dual problems
that has essentially the same per-iteration complexity as existing primal-dual methods. We prove three $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$-convergence rate criteria for this algorithm: primal-dual gap convergence, primal objective residual, and dual objective residual convergence, where $k$ is the iteration counter. The primal-dual gap convergence rate is achieved in semi-nonergodic sense, i.e., nonergodic in primal variable and ergodic in dual variable. The primal objective residual convergence rate is nonergodic. We also show that our convergence rate is optimal in the sense of first-order black-box oracle theory \cite{12,13,58} when the number of iterations is relatively small compared to the problem dimension. For sufficiently large iteration counter $k$, we show that our algorithm can achieve up to $o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$ convergence rate on the primal objective residuals $\{\min_{1\leq i\leq k} F(x^i) - F^*\}$.

(b) \textbf{(Strongly convex case)} If the primal problem is strongly convex, then we can develop a new primal-dual algorithm to solve both primal and dual problems that can achieve $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$-convergence rate on the same three criteria as in the first algorithm. This rate is ergodic if we use only one proximal operator of $f$, and becomes semi-nonergodic as in the first algorithm, if we require two proximal operators of $f$. Our convergence rate is proven to be optimal in the sense of first-order black-box oracle theory \cite{12,13,58} when $k$ is relatively small compared to the problem dimension. When $k$ is sufficiently large, we can also achieve $o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$-convergence rate on $\{\min_{0\leq i\leq k} F(x^i) - F^*\}$.

(c) \textbf{(Extensions and special cases)} We extend our algorithms to handle the sum of three objective functions. Our algorithm has the same flavor as existing state-of-the-arts in \cite{17,21,57}. However, as a consequence of our approach, we achieve semi-nonergodic convergence rates compared to these works. We also specify our algorithms to handle the constrained convex problems, which leads to rigorous nonergodic convergence rate guarantees on both the primal objective residual and feasibility gap. We also provide a convergence rate guarantee on the dual problem for the nonstrongly convex case. When the constrained problem is semi-strongly convex, i.e., one objective term is strongly convex, but the whole problem is non-strongly convex, we propose a new algorithmic variant that can achieve both $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$-nonergodic convergence rate and $o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$-convergence rate on the primal objective residual and feasibility gap. This algorithm has several advantages compared to ADMM. To increase the performance of our algorithms, we propose restarting variants to reset the parameters.

In addition to the above contribution, we also emphasize the following points. First, due to the symmetry of the primal and dual problems, we can switch the algorithm to achieve a nonergodic convergence rate in the dual objective residual sequence. Second, note that under strong convexity of $F$ in \cite{1}, accelerated dual gradient method can be used to solve the dual problem. But to reconstruct a primal approximate solution, one needs to use an averaging scheme, which leads to ergodic convergence rate on the primal problem.

\textit{Comparison:} We now attempt to highlight some differences between our algorithms and existing methods in terms of algorithmic appearance and theoretical guarantees. First, our algorithm for solving general convex problems has some similarity to Chambolle-Pock’s method \cite{9,11,47}, but it possesses an extra momentum step that depends on two historical iterates $k - 1$ and $k - 2$. Moreover, its update rule must be adaptive to achieve the desired convergence rate guarantee, which we call it a non-stationary method. The second algorithm uses two proximal operators of the primal objective to obtain a nonergodic convergence rate. If we use one proximal operator, then our algorithm will have an ergodic convergence rate as in existing primal-dual methods \cite{29,30}. Second, most existing work only achieve ergodic convergence rates on both primal and dual variables in terms of a primal-dual gap
function, see, e.g. \cite{11,15,19,31,32,37,38}. However, in practice, their averaging sequence is not often used as an output of the algorithm. They instead use the last iterate sequence, which does not have convergence rate guarantee or has a suboptimal convergence rate \cite{18}. Moreover, as mentioned, this sequence breaks desired structures of the approximate solution. Regarding the $O(\frac{1}{k})$ rate, it is not new, and have been proved in many papers for different methods. However, it has been shown that this rate is optimal under only convexity. The main difference of our work compared to existing methods is that we achieve this rate on three criteria, and the rate is nonergodic on the primal objective residuals. A similar non-ergodic rate for primal-dual methods was recently studied in \cite{50}, but only on the primal-dual gap.

For $o(\frac{1}{k})$ and $o(\frac{1}{k^2})$ convergence rates, our first algorithm achieves $o(\frac{1}{k})$ convergence rate for the primal problem \cite{1}. Note that our algorithm is different from forward-backward splitting, Douglas-Rachford, and ADMM schemes as investigated in \cite{19,22}. Therefore, the analysis in \cite{22} is not applicable to our methods. \cite{18} provides an intensive analysis of splitting, Douglas-Rachford, and ADMM schemes as investigated in \cite{19,22}. Therefore, the rate for the primal problem (1). Note that our algorithm is different from forward-backward splitting, Douglas-Rachford, and ADMM schemes as investigated in \cite{19,22}. Therefore, the analysis in \cite{22} is not applicable to our methods. \cite{18} does not provide new algorithms, and their convergence rates if applied to (1) become $o(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}})$ as oppose to $o(\frac{1}{k})$ in our method. We believe that $o(\frac{1}{k})$ and $o(\frac{1}{k^2})$ are the first best-known convergence rate results obtained for direct primal-dual first-order-type methods for solving (1) without using reformulation. In constrained settings, our new method can achieve $o(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}})$-convergence rate without strong convexity or smoothness, and $o(\frac{1}{k^2})$-convergence rate under only semi-strong convexity.

**Paper organization:** The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews some preliminary tools used in the sequel. Section 3 develops a new algorithm for general convex case and its convergence guarantees. Section 4 studies the strongly convex case with a new algorithm and its convergence guarantees. Section 5 discusses extensions and special cases of our algorithms. Section 6 provides some illustrative numerical examples. All technical proofs of the results in the main text are deferred to the appendix.

### 2 Basic Assumption and Optimality Conditions

In this section, we state our basic assumption imposed on (1)-(2), discuss their optimality condition, and define a merit function.

#### 2.1 Basic notation

We work with standard Euclidean spaces $\mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$ equipped with standard inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and norm $\| \cdot \|$. For any nonempty, closed, and convex set $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathbb{R}^p$, we denote by $\text{ri} (\mathcal{X})$ the relative interior of $\mathcal{X}$ and $\delta_\mathcal{X} (\cdot)$ the indicator of $\mathcal{X}$. For any proper, closed, and convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, we use $\text{dom}(f) := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^p \mid f(x) < +\infty \}$ to denote its (effective) domain, $f^*(y) := \sup_x \{ \langle x, y \rangle - f(x) \}$ to denote the Fenchel conjugate of $f$, $\partial f(x) := \{ w \in \mathbb{R}^p \mid f(y) - f(x) \geq \langle w, y - x \rangle, \forall y \in \text{dom}(f) \}$ to denote the subdifferential of $f$ at $x$, and $\nabla f$ to denote the gradient or subgradient of $f$.

A function $f$ is called $M_f$-Lipschitz continuous on $\text{dom}(f)$ with a Lipschitz constant $M_f \in [0, +\infty)$ if $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq M_f \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in \text{dom}(f)$. If $f$ is differentiable on $\text{dom}(f)$ and $\nabla f$ is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_f \in [0, +\infty)$, i.e. $\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \leq L_f \|x - y\|$ for $x, y \in \text{dom}(f)$, then we say that $f$ is $L_f$-smooth. If $f(\cdot) - \frac{\mu_f}{2} \| \cdot \|^2$ is still convex for some $\mu_f > 0$, then we say that $f$ is $\mu_f$-strongly convex with a strong convexity parameter $\mu_f$. We also denote $\text{prox}_f(x) := \arg\min_{y} \{ f(y) + \frac{1}{2} \| y - x \|^2 \}$ the proximal operator of $f$. For any $\gamma > 0$, we have the following Moreau’s identity \cite{2}:

$$\text{prox}_{\gamma f}(x) + \gamma \text{prox}_{f^*/\gamma}(x/\gamma) = x. \quad (4)$$
We use $O(\cdot)$, $o(\cdot)$, and $\Omega(\cdot)$ to denote the order of complexity bounds as usual.

### 2.2 Basic assumptions and optimality condition

Our algorithms rely on the following assumption imposed on (1) and (2):

**Assumption 1** The functions $f$ and $g$ in (1) are proper, closed, and convex. The solution set $\mathcal{X}^*$ of (1) is nonempty, and $0 \in \text{ri}(\text{dom}(g) - K\text{dom}(f))$.

Assumption 1 is fundamental and required in any primal-dual method. Moreover, in a finite dimensional space, $K$ is an $n \times p$ matrix, and it is automatically bounded. Since $\mathcal{X}^*$ is nonempty, under Assumption 1 the strong duality holds, and we have $F^* + G^* = 0$. Moreover, the solution set $\mathcal{Y}^*$ of the dual problem (2) is also nonempty.

**Optimality conditions:** We can write the optimality conditions of (1) and (2) as:

- primal: $0 \in \partial f(x^*) + K^\top \partial g(Kx^*)$ or dual: $0 \in -K\partial f^*(-K^\top y^*) + \partial g^*(y^*)$. (5)

These two conditions can be written into the following primal-dual optimality condition, which can also be derived from the minmax form (3):

- primal-dual: $\begin{align*}
0 &\in K^\top y^* + \partial f(x^*) \\
0 &\in -Kx^* + \partial g^*(y^*).
\end{align*}$ (6)

**Gap function:** Let $\tilde{L}(x,y) := f(x) + \langle Kx, y \rangle - g^*(y)$ be defined by (3) and $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be given nonempty, closed, and convex sets such that $\mathcal{X}^* \cap \mathcal{X} \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{Y}^* \cap \mathcal{Y} \neq \emptyset$. We define a gap function $G_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(\cdot)$ as follows:

$$
G_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(x,y) := \min_{\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \left\{ \tilde{L}(x,\hat{y}) - \tilde{L}(\hat{x},y) \right\} = \min_{\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ f(\hat{x}) - f(x) + \langle K\hat{x}, \hat{y} \rangle - \langle Kx, \hat{y} \rangle + g^*(\hat{y}) - g^*(y) \right\}.
$$

The following lemma shows the relation between $G_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(\cdot)$ and $(\mathcal{X}^*, \mathcal{Y}^*)$. This result is obvious and we state it without proof.

**Lemma 1** For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $G_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(x,y) \geq 0$. A point $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{X}^* \times \mathcal{Y}^*$ is a primal-dual solution of (1) and (2) if and only if $G_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(x^*, y^*) = 0$.

If we choose $\mathcal{X} := \{x^*\}$ and $\mathcal{Y} := \{y^*\}$ for a given $x^* \in \mathcal{X}^*$ and $y^* \in \mathcal{Y}^*$, then we have $G_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(x,y) = G_{\{x^*\} \times \{y^*\}}(x,y) = \tilde{L}(x, y^*) - \tilde{L}(x^*, y)$. Therefore, we simply denote $G(x,y) := G_{\{x^*\} \times \{y^*\}}(x,y)$ for the sake of notation.

**Constrained reformulation and merit function:** The primal problem (1) can also be reformulated equivalently to the following constrained setting:

$$
F^* := \min_{z = (x,r)} \left\{ F(z) := f(x) + g(r) \text{ s.t. } Kx - r = 0 \right\}.
$$

Let $\mathcal{L}(x,r,y) := f(x) + g(r) + \langle Kx - r, y \rangle$ be the Lagrange function associated with (8), where $y$ is a Lagrange multiplier, and $\tilde{L}(x,y) := f(x) + \langle Kx, y \rangle - g^*(y)$ be defined by (3). Since $g^*(y) := \sup_{r \in \mathbb{R}^p} \{ \langle y,r \rangle - g^*(r) \}$, we can show that

$$
\tilde{L}(x,y) \leq f(x) + g(r) + \langle Kx - r, y \rangle = \mathcal{L}(x,r,y).
$$

(9)
Moreover, $\mathcal{L}(x, y) = \mathcal{L}(x, r, y)$ iff $y \in \partial g(r)$ or equivalently, $r \in \partial g^*(y)$.

Together with $\mathcal{L}$, we define an augmented Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_\rho$ as

$$
\mathcal{L}_\rho(x, r, y) := \mathcal{L}(x, r, y) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|Kx - r\|^2 = f(x) + g(r) + \phi_\rho(x, r, y),
$$

where $\phi_\rho(x, r, y) := \langle Kx - r, y \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|Kx - r\|^2$ and $\rho > 0$ is a penalty parameter. This function will serve as a merit function to develop algorithms in the sequel.

### 3 A New Primal-Dual Algorithm for General Convex Case

Our goal in this section is to develop a novel primal-dual algorithm to solve (1) and its dual form (2) that has fast convergence rate guarantees.

#### 3.1 The derivation of our primal-dual scheme

Our main idea is to combine the following techniques:

- Using $\mathcal{L}_\rho$ from (10) as a merit function. However, since $\mathcal{L}_\rho$ is nonseparable in $x$ and $r$, we apply an alternative strategy to decouple them into two subproblems.
- We linearize $\phi_\rho$ in (10) w.r.t. $x$ to use the proximal operators of $f$ and $g$.
- We incorporate Nesterov’s accelerated step on the primal variable and an averaging step on the dual variable to achieve acceleration.

Applying these techniques simultaneously to (1) and (2), we can describe the core steps of our algorithm as follows: Given $x^k$, $\hat{x}^k$, $r^k$, and $y^k$, we update

$$
\begin{align*}
\hat{x}^k &:= (1 - \tau_k)x^k + \tau_k\hat{x}^k \\
\tau_k &:= \text{prox}_{\rho_k}(\gamma_k/K\hat{x}^k) \\
x^k &:= \text{prox}_{\rho_k}f(\hat{x}^k - \beta_k\nabla\phi_{\rho_k}(\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k)) \\
\tilde{x}^{k+1} &:= \hat{x}^k + \frac{1}{\tau_k}(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k) \\
\hat{y}^{k+1} &:= \hat{y}^k + \eta_k(Kx^{k+1} - r^{k+1} - (1 - \tau_k)(Kx^k - r^k)).
\end{align*}
$$

Here, $\tau_k \in [0, 1]$, $\rho_k$, $\beta_k$, and $\eta_k$ are given parameters which will be specified later.

Now, by using Moreau’s identity (4) with $\gamma = 1/\rho_k$, we can write $r^{k+1}$ as follows:

$$
r^{k+1} = \frac{1}{\rho_k} (\hat{y}^k + \rho_k K\hat{x}^k - y^{k+1}) \quad \text{where} \quad y^{k+1} := \text{prox}_{\rho_k g^*}(\hat{y}^k + \rho_k K\hat{x}^k).
$$

We can also combine the first and the fourth lines of (11) to obtain $\hat{x}^{k+1} = x^{k+1} + \frac{\tau_k}{1 - \tau_k}(x^{k+1} - x^k)$.

If we use $r^k$ from (12) into the last line of (11), then

$$
\begin{align*}
\hat{y}^{k+1} &:= \hat{y}^k + \eta_k K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k - (1 - \tau_k)(x^k - \hat{x}^{k-1})) \\
&- \frac{\eta_k}{\rho_k} (\hat{y}^k - \hat{y}^{k-1}) + \frac{\eta_k}{\rho_k}(1 - \tau_k)(\hat{y}^{k-1} - y^k).
\end{align*}
$$

To obtain an approximate solution of (2), by our analysis, we define

$$
\underline{y}^{k+1} := (1 - \tau_k)y^k + \tau_ky^{k+1},
$$

where $\underline{y}^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an arbitrary initial point.
In summary, we can write our primal-dual scheme as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{y}^{k+1} := & \text{prox}_{\rho_k g} \left( \hat{y}^k + \rho_k K \hat{x}^k \right) \\
x^{k+1} := & \text{prox}_{\beta_k f} \left( \hat{x}^k - \beta_k K^T \hat{y}^{k+1} \right) \\
\hat{x}^{k+1} := & x^{k+1} + \theta_k(x^{k+1} - x^k), \\
\hat{y}^{k+1} := & \hat{y}^k + \eta_k K(\hat{x}^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k - (1 - \tau_k)(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^{k+1})) \\
& - \frac{\eta_k}{\rho_k} (\hat{y}^k - y^{k+1}) + \frac{\eta_k(1-\tau_k)}{\rho_k-1} (\hat{y}^{k-1} - y^k) \\
\hat{y}^{k+1} := & (1 - \tau_k)\hat{y}^k + \tau_k y^{k+1},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \theta_k := \frac{\tau_k+1}{\tau_k} \), and other parameters will be specified in the sequel.

### 3.2 One-iteration analysis

We first define the difference \( \tilde{G}_k \) of \( \mathcal{L}_p \) and \( \mathcal{L} \) as follows:

\[
\tilde{G}_k(x, y, r) := \mathcal{L}_{p_{k-1}}(x^k, r^k, y) - \mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^k).
\]

Next, we prove a key estimate on \( \tilde{G}_k \) in Lemma 2, whose proof is in Appendix A.1.

**Lemma 2** Let \( \tilde{G}_k \) be defined by (16) and \( (x^k, \hat{x}^k, \hat{x}^k, \hat{y}^k) \) be generated by (11), where \( \rho_k > \eta_k \). Then, for any \( (x, r, y) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \), it holds that

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{G}_{k+1}(x, y, r) &\leq (1 - \tau_k)\tilde{G}_k(x, y, r) + \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\rho_k} \left[ \| \hat{x}^k - x \|^2 - \| \hat{x}^{k+1} - x \|^2 \right] \\
&+ \frac{1}{2\rho_k} \left[ \| y - \hat{y}^k \|^2 - \| y - \hat{y}^{k+1} \|^2 \right] - \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{\beta_k} - \frac{\eta_k^2}{\rho_k - \eta_k} \right] \| x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k \|^2 \\
&- \frac{(1 - \tau_k)^2}{2} \left[ \rho_{k-1} - (1 - \tau_k) \rho_k \right] \| K x^k - r^k \|^2.
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, Lemma 3 provides conditions for choosing the parameters in (15) to obtain a bound on the difference \( \tilde{G}_k(\cdot) \).

**Lemma 3** Let \( \tau_k, \rho_k, \beta_k, \) and \( \eta_k \) in (15) be chosen such that \( \tau_0 := 1, \rho_k > \eta_k \), and

\[
1 - \frac{\rho_k^2 \| K \|^2}{\beta_k \rho_k - \eta_k} \geq 0, \quad \rho_{k-1} \geq (1 - \tau_k)\rho_k, \quad \eta_{k-1} \leq (1 - \tau_k)\eta_k, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\tau_k^2}{\beta_k (1 - \tau_k)} \leq \frac{\tau_{k-1}^2}{\beta_{k-1} (1 - \tau_{k-1})}.
\]

Then, for any \( (x, r, y) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \), we have

\[
\tilde{G}_k(x, r, y) \leq \frac{\omega_{k-1}}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{\beta_0} \| x^0 - x \|^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_0} \| y^0 - y \|^2 \right],
\]

where \( \omega_{k-1} := \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - \tau_i) \) and \( \tilde{G}_k \) is defined by (16).

**Proof** Let \( A_k := \mathcal{L}_{p_{k-1}}(x^k, r^k, y) - \mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^k) + \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\rho_k} \| \hat{x}^k - x \|^2 + \frac{1}{2\rho_k} \| \hat{y}^k - y \|^2 \). Using (18), we can simplify (17) as \( A_{k+1} \leq (1 - \tau_k)A_k \). By induction, the last inequality implies \( A_k \leq \omega_{k-1}A_1 \), where \( \omega_{k-1} := \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - \tau_i) \). Combining this and (17) with \( k = 0 \), we get

\[
A_k \leq \omega_{k-1}\left[ (1 - \tau_0)(\mathcal{L}_{p_0}(x^0, r^0, y) - \mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^0)) + \frac{\tau_0^2}{2\rho_0} \| x^0 - x \|^2 + \frac{1}{2\rho_0} \| y^0 - y \|^2 \right].
\]

Since \( \tau_0 := 1, x^0 := x^0 \), and \( \hat{y}^0 := y^0 \), this inequality implies (19). \( \square \)
3.3 Parameter update and complete algorithm

The condition \( [18] \) allows us to flexibly choose different update rules for parameters. We propose one simple rule to update them as follows:

\[
\tau_k := \frac{c}{k+c}, \quad \rho_k := \frac{\rho_0 c}{\tau_k}, \quad \beta_k := \frac{\gamma}{\|K\|^2 \rho_k}, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k := (1 - \gamma) \rho_k,
\]

where \( c \geq 1, \gamma \in (0, 1), \) and \( \rho_0 > 0 \) are given.

Clearly, it is easy to check that \( \tau_0 = 1 \) and \( \rho_k > \eta_k \). Moreover, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\eta_k (1 - \tau_k) - \eta_{k-1} &= (1 - \gamma) \rho_0 (1 - c). \\
\rho_{k-1} - \rho_k (1 - \tau_k) &= \rho_0 (c - 1). \\
\frac{1}{\rho_k} - \frac{\rho_k^2}{\rho_k - \eta_k} &= 0.
\end{align*}
\]

If \( c = 1 \), then it is obvious that all conditions of Lemma \( [3] \) are satisfied. However, if \( c > 1 \), then \( [21] \) violates the third condition of \( [18] \). In this case, we need to modify Lemma \( [3] \) to still guarantee convergence as in Theorem \( [2] \) below.

Now, using the update rule \( [20] \), we can describe our first primal-dual scheme \( [15] \) algorithmically as in Algorithm \( [1] \) for the case \( c \geq 1 \).

**Algorithm 1** (Non-Stationary First-Order Primal-Dual Algorithm: Nonstrong convexity)

1. **Initialization:** Choose \( y^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^p, \ \rho_0 > 0, \ c \geq 1, \) and \( \gamma \in (0, 1) \).
2. Set \( \tau_0 := 1, \ \hat{x}^0 := x^0, \ \hat{y}^0 := y^0, \) and \( \bar{y}^0 := y^0 \). Define \( x^{-1} := x^0 \) and \( \bar{y}^{-1} := y^0 \).
3. **For** \( k := 0, 1, \cdots, k_{\text{max}} \) **do**
   4. Update \( \rho_k := \frac{c \rho_0}{\tau_k}, \ \beta_k := \frac{\gamma}{\|K\|^2 \rho_k}, \ \eta_k := (1 - \gamma) \rho_k, \) and \( \tau_{k+1} := \frac{c \tau_k}{c + \tau_k} \).
   5. Update the primal-dual step:
      \[
      \begin{align*}
      y^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{\rho_k g} \left( \hat{y}^k + \rho_k K \hat{x}^k \right) \\
      x^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{\beta_k f} \left( \hat{x}^k - \beta_k K^\top y^{k+1} \right) \\
      \hat{x}^{k+1} &:= x^{k+1} + \theta_k (x^{k+1} - x^k) \quad \text{with} \quad \theta_k := \frac{\tau_k+1(1-\tau_k)}{\tau_k}.
      \end{align*}
      \]
   6. Update the momentum step:
      \[
      \hat{y}^{k+1} := \hat{y}^k + \eta_k K (x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k - (1 - \tau_k) (x^k - \hat{x}^{k-1})) - (1 - \gamma) \left( (\hat{y}^k - \hat{y}^{k+1}) - (\hat{y}^{k-1} - \hat{y}^k) \right).
      \]
   7. Update the dual averaging step:
      \[
      \bar{y}^{k+1} := (1 - \tau_k) \bar{y}^k + \tau_k y^{k+1}.
      \]
8. **EndFor**

Let us make the following remarks on Algorithm \( [1] \):

(a) Algorithm \( [1] \) is different from other primal-dual methods at the parameter update rules at Step 4 and the correction rule at Step 6. Here, \( \hat{y}^{k+1} \) is updated using three consecutive iterates at \( k + 1, k, \) and \( k - 1 \). All the parameters are updated dynamically at Step 4 which leads to a so-called “non-stationary” primal-dual method.

(b) We use two parameters \( \gamma \in (0, 1) \) and \( \rho_0 > 0 \) to trade-off between the primal and dual term \( \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \) and \( \|y^0 - y^*\|^2 \) in the bound \( [22] \) of Theorem \( [1] \) below.
The per-iteration complexity of Algorithm 1 is essentially the same as in other existing primal-dual methods. It requires one prox$_{p_kg^*}$, one prox$_{p_k}$, one $Kx$, and one $K^Ty$. The matrix-vector multiplication at Step 6 can be eliminated by combining $K\hat{x}^k$ and the last line of Step 3.

### 3.4 Convergence analysis

The convergence of Algorithm 1 is stated in the following theorem, whose proof is given in Appendix A.2. We emphasize that our results only require mild assumptions stated in Assumption 1 without smoothness and strong convexity.

**Theorem 1** ($O(1/k)$-Semi-Nonergodic Convergence Rates) Let $\{(x^k, y^k, \tilde{y}^k)\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 using $c := 1$, and $\tilde{E}$ be defined by (7). Then, under Assumption 1, the following bound is valid for any given $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $y^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\tilde{E}(x^k, y) - \tilde{E}(x, \tilde{y}^k) \leq \frac{1}{2k} \left[ \frac{\rho_0 \|K\|^2}{\gamma} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{(1 - \gamma)\rho_0} \|y^0 - y^\star\|^2 \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Consequently, we have the following statements:

(a) **(Semi-Nonergodic convergence rate on the primal-dual gap)** The gap function $G := G(x^\star, y^\star)$ defined by (7) satisfies:

$$G(x^k, \tilde{y}^k) \leq \frac{1}{2k} \left[ \frac{\rho_0 \|K\|^2}{\gamma} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{(1 - \gamma)\rho_0} \|y^0 - y^\star\|^2 \right], \quad \forall k \geq 1,$$

where $(x^\star, y^\star)$ is a given primal-dual solution of (1) and (2). Therefore, $\{G(x^k, \tilde{y}^k)\}$ converges to zero at $O(1/k)$-sublinear rate in semi-nonergodic sense, i.e. nonergodic in $x^k$ and ergodic in $\tilde{y}^k$.

(b) **(Nonergodic convergence rate on the primal objective residuals)** If $g$ is $M_g$-Lipschitz continuous on $\text{dom}(g)$ with $M_g \in [0, +\infty)$, then the primal last iterate sequence $\{x^k\}$ satisfies

$$F(x^k) - F^\star \leq \frac{1}{2k} \left[ \frac{\rho_0 \|K\|^2}{\gamma} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{D_g^2}{(1 - \gamma)\rho_0} \right],$$

where $D_g^2 := \sup \{\|y^0 - y\|^2 \mid \|y\| \leq M_g\}$. Consequently, $\{F(x^k)\}$ converges to the optimal value $F^\star$ of (1) at the optimal rate of $O(1/k)$ in nonergodic sense.

(c) **(Ergodic convergence rate on the dual objective residuals)** If $f^\star$ is $M_f^\star$-Lipschitz continuous on $\text{dom}(f^\star)$ with $M_f^\star \in [0, +\infty)$, then the dual sequence $\{\tilde{y}^k\}$ satisfies

$$G(\tilde{y}^k) - G^\star \leq \frac{1}{2k} \left[ \frac{\rho_0 \|K\|^2}{\gamma} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{\|y^0 - y^\star\|^2}{(1 - \gamma)\rho_0} \right],$$

where $D_g^2 := \sup \{\|x^0 - x\|^2 \mid \|x\| \leq M_f^\star\}$. Consequently, $\{G(\tilde{y}^k)\}$ converges to the dual optimal value $G^\star$ of (2) at $O(1/k)$-optimal rate in ergodic sense.

**Remark 1** (Symmetry) Since the primal-dual problems (1) and (2) are symmetric, to obtain a nonergodic convergence rate on the dual problem (2), we can switch Algorithm 1 by exchanging the primal-dual setting to the dual-primal pair.
Next, we show that by choosing \( c > 1 \), we can achieve \( o \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \)-convergence rate on the primal objective residuals as stated in the following theorem, whose proof is given in Appendix A.3.

**Theorem 2 (\( O \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \)-Nonergodic and \( o \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \)-Convergence rate)** Let \( \{(x^k, y^k)\} \) be the sequence generated by Algorithm [1] with \( c > 1 \). Then, under Assumption [1], we have the following conclusions:

(a) (Convergence rate of the Lagrange residuals) Let \( \mathcal{L} \) be the Lagrange function of (1) defined in [3]. Then

\[
\mathcal{L}(x^k, y^*) - F^* \leq \frac{(c-1)(F(x^0) - F^*) + R_0^2}{k + c - 1},
\]

where \( R_0^2 := \frac{\gamma^2 p_0 \| K \|^2}{2} \| x^0 - x^* \|^2 + \frac{1}{2(1 - \gamma)p_0} \| y^0 - y^* \|^2 \), and

\[
\min_{0 \leq i \leq k} \left[ \mathcal{L}(x^i, y^*) - F^* \right] \leq o \left( \frac{1}{k} \right).
\]

(b) (Convergence rate of the primal residuals) If \( g \) is \( M_g \)-Lipschitz continuous on \( \text{dom}(g) \) with \( M_g \in [0, +\infty) \), then the primal sequence \( \{x^k\} \) satisfies

\[
0 \leq F(x^k) - F^* \leq O \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{0 \leq i \leq k} \left[ F(x^i) - F^* \right] \leq o \left( \frac{1}{k} \right).
\]

Therefore, the sequence \( \{F^k\} \) converges to the optimal value \( F^* \) of (1) at \( o \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \)-rate, where \( F^k := \min_{0 \leq i \leq k} F(x^i) \).

Note that the \( o \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \) rate does not conflict the lower bound complexity in Subsection 3.5 below, which holds only when \( p \geq 6k + 2 \), but the convergence rate \( o \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \) holds when \( p \) is fixed and \( k \) is sufficiently large. The \( o(\cdot) \) has been studied for Nesterov’s accelerated methods in, e.g., [1], and for many other splitting methods in [18,22] but under different assumptions. The convergence rate shown in [19,20] is \( o \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \) but only under the assumption of strong convexity or smoothness.

### 3.5 Lower bound complexity

Our goal is to show that Algorithm [1] attains an optimal convergence rate under only Assumption 1 and the Lipschitz continuity.

We follow [33,58] to construct an example as follows. In order to show that the convergence rate of Algorithm [1] is optimal, we consider the following example:

\[
F^* := \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ F(x) := f(x) + g(x) \right\},
\]

where \( f \) and \( g \) are proper, closed, and convex, and Lipschitz continuous. Algorithm [1] for solving (29) can be cast as a special case of the following generic scheme:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\hat{x}^{k+1} & \text{ is a linear combination of } (x^j, y^j, \hat{x}^j, \hat{y}^j) \text{ for } 0 \leq j \leq k \\
x^{k+1} & := \text{prox}_{p_x f} (\hat{x}^{k+1}) \\
\hat{y}^{k+1} & \text{ is a linear combination of } (x^j, y^j, \hat{x}^j, \hat{y}^j) \text{ for } 0 \leq j \leq k \text{ and } (x^{k+1}, \hat{x}^{k+1}) \\
y^{k+1} & := \text{prox}_{p_y g} (\hat{y}^{k+1})
\end{aligned}
\]
Then, there exist \( f \) and \( g \) defined on \( \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+2} \mid \| x \| \leq B \} \) which are convex and \( L_f \)-Lipschitz continuous such that the general primal-dual scheme \([30]\) exhibits a lower bound:

\[
F(\bar{x}^k) - F^* \geq \frac{L_f B}{8(k+1)},
\]

where \( \bar{x}^k := \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j x^j + \sum_{l=1}^k \gamma_l y^l \) for any \( \alpha_j \) and \( \gamma_l \) with \( j, l = 1, \cdots, k \). This example can be found in \([33]\) Proposition 5. Since Algorithm \([1]\) can be considered as a variant of \([30]\) when solving \([29]\), which exhibits a lower bound convergence rate of \( \Omega \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \). The \( \Omega \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \) convergence rate stated in Theorem \([1]\) is optimal within a constant factor as long as the problem dimension \( p \) is sufficiently large, i.e., \( p \geq 6k + 2 \).

4 A New Primal-Dual Method for Strongly Convex Case

In this section, we consider the case where \( f \) is strongly convex with a strong convexity parameter \( \mu_f > 0 \), but \( g \) is not necessarily strongly convex as stated in the following assumption.

**Assumption 2** The function \( f \) of \([1]\) is \( \mu_f \)-strongly convex with \( \mu_f > 0 \) but not necessarily smooth. The function \( g \) is not necessarily strongly convex and smooth.

Note that the strong convexity of \( f \) implies the \( \frac{1}{\mu_f} \)-smoothness of \( f^* \). Due to the symmetry between \([1]\) and \([2]\), if \( g^* \) is \( \mu_g^* \)-strongly convex with \( \mu_g^* > 0 \), then we can switch our algorithm below to solve the dual-primal pair \([2]\) instead of the primal-dual pair.

4.1 Derivation of our primal-dual scheme

We follow the same diagram as in Section 3. However, we replace Nesterov’s accelerated step from \([3]\) by Tseng’s scheme \([55]\). This allows us to achieve an \( \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \) convergence rate. With this modification, the main steps of our primal-dual scheme for solving \([1]\) and \([2]\) can be described as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{x}^k &:= (1 - \tau_k) x^k + \tau_k \tilde{x}^k \\
r^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{g/\rho_k} \left( \frac{1}{\rho_k} \tilde{y}^k + K \tilde{x}^k \right) \\
\tilde{x}^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{(\beta_k/\tau_k)f} \left( \tilde{x}^k - \frac{2\rho_k}{\tau_k} \nabla f x \phi_{\rho_k}(\tilde{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \tilde{y}^k) \right), \\
x^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{f/(\rho_k \|K\|^2)} \left( \tilde{x}^k - \frac{1}{\rho_k \|K\|^2} \nabla f x \phi_{\rho_k}(\tilde{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \tilde{y}^k) \right), \\
\tilde{y}^{k+1} &:= \tilde{y}^k + \eta_k (K x^{k+1} - r^{k+1} - (1 - \tau_k)(K x^k - r^k)).
\end{align*}
\]

Here, \( \tau_k, \rho_k, \beta_k, \) and \( \eta_k \) as well as the dual averaging step will be specified later.

Next, we simplify this scheme to get a primal-dual representation. By using \([12]\) and eliminating \( r^{k+1} \) from \([31]\), then switching \( \tilde{x}^k \) step, we eventually get

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{y}^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{\rho_k g^*} \left( g^k + \rho_k K \tilde{x}^k \right), \\
\tilde{x}^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{(\beta_k/\tau_k)f} \left( \tilde{x}^k - \frac{\beta_k}{\tau_k} K^T y^{k+1} \right), \\
x^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{f/(\rho_k \|K\|^2)} \left( \tilde{x}^k - \frac{1}{\rho_k \|K\|^2} \nabla f x y^{k+1} \right), \\
\tilde{x}^{k+1} &:= (1 - \tau_{k+1}) x^{k+1} + \tau_{k+1} \tilde{x}^{k+1}, \\
\tilde{y}^{k+1} &:= \tilde{y}^k + \eta_k (K x^{k+1} - \tilde{x}^k - (1 - \tau_k)(x^k - \tilde{x}^{k-1})) \\
&= \tilde{y}^k + \frac{\eta_k}{\rho_k} (\tilde{y}^k - y^{k+1}) + \frac{\eta_k(1 - \tau_k)}{\rho_k \eta^2} (\tilde{y}^k - y^{k+1}), \\
\tilde{y}^{k+1} &:= (1 - \tau_k) \tilde{y}^k + \tau_k y^{k+1}.
\end{align*}
\]
Since we aim at obtaining nonergodic convergence rate on $x^k$, \ref{32} requires one additional prox, compared to Algorithm \ref{1}. We can avoid this prox by using $x^{k+1} := (1 - \tau_k)x^k + \tau_k \hat{x}^{k+1}$, but the convergence rate is no longer nonergodic.

### 4.2 One-iteration analysis

We analyze one iteration of the primal-dual scheme \ref{32} to obtain a recursive estimate and update rules for parameters. The following lemma provides a key estimate for our analysis, whose proof can be found in Appendix B.1.

**Lemma 4** Let $x^k, \hat{x}^k, \tilde{x}^k$, and $\hat{y}^k$ be generated by \ref{32} and $\tilde{G}_k$ be defined by \ref{16}. Assume that $\rho_k > \eta_k$ and $\rho_k \beta_k \|K\|^2 < 1$. Then, for any $(x, r, y) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, it holds that

\[
\tilde{G}_{k+1}(x, r, y) \leq (1 - \tau_k)\tilde{G}_k(x, r, y) + \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\beta_k} \|\tilde{x}^k - x\|^2 - \frac{\tau_k^2 + \gamma_k \beta_k \mu_f}{2\beta_k} \|\hat{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2 \\
+ \frac{1}{2\beta_k} \left(\|\hat{y}^k - \hat{y}^{k+1}\|^2 - \|y - \hat{y}^{k+1}\|^2\right) - \frac{\rho_k}{2} \left[1 - \rho_k \beta_k \|K\|^2 - \frac{\eta_k}{\rho_k - \eta_k}\right] \|K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)\|^2 \tag{33}
\]

\[ - \left(1 - \tau_k\right) \rho_k - (1 - \tau_k) \rho_k \|Kx^k - \hat{x}^k\|^2 \]

Our next lemma provides conditions for updating the parameters in \ref{31} to obtain an upper bound on the difference $\tilde{G}_k(x, r, y) := L_{\rho_k - 1}(x^k, r^k, y) - L(x, r, \tilde{y})$.

**Lemma 5** Assume that the parameters $\tau_k, \rho_k, \beta_k$, and $\eta_k$ are chosen such that $\tau_0 := 1, \rho_0 > \eta_0, \rho_k \beta_k \|K\|^2 < 1$, and

\[
1 - \rho_k \beta_k \|K\|^2 - \frac{\eta_k}{\rho_k - \eta_k} \geq 0, \quad \rho_k - 1 \geq (1 - \tau_k) \rho_k, \quad \eta_k - 1 \leq (1 - \tau_k) \eta_k, \tag{34}
\]

and

\[
\frac{\tau_k^2}{\beta_k(1 - \tau_k)} < \frac{\tau_k^2}{\beta_k - 1} + \tau_k \mu_f.
\]

Then, for any $(x, r, y) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

\[
\tilde{G}_k(x, r, y) \leq \frac{\omega_k - 1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{\rho_k \beta_k} \|x^0 - x\|^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_k \mu_f} \|y^0 - y\|^2\right], \tag{35}
\]

where $\omega_k := \prod_{i=1}^{k-1}(1 - \tau_i)$ and $\tilde{G}_k$ is defined by \ref{16}.

**Proof** Let $A_k := L_{\rho_k - 1}(x^k, r^k, y) - L(x, r, \hat{y}^k) + \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\beta_k - 1} \|\tilde{x}^k - x\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\beta_k - 1} \|\hat{y}^k - y\|^2$. By \ref{34}, we can simplify \ref{33} as $A_{k+1} \leq (1 - \tau_k)A_k$. Letting $\omega_k := \prod_{i=1}^{k-1}(1 - \tau_i)$. Then, by induction, the last estimate implies $A_k \leq \omega_k - 1$. Combining this and \ref{33} with $k = 0$, we finally get

\[
A_k \leq \omega_k - 1 \left[(1 - \tau_0) \left(L_{\rho_0 - 1}(x^0, r^0, y) - L(x, r, \hat{y}^0)\right) + \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\beta_k} \|\tilde{x}^0 - x\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\beta_k} \|\hat{y}^0 - y\|^2\right].
\]

Since $\tau_0 = 1$, $\hat{x}^0 := x^0$, and $\hat{y}^0 := y^0$, the last estimate implies \ref{35}. \hfill $\square$

### 4.3 Parameter update and complete algorithm

Clearly, condition \ref{34} allows us to flexibly select different update rules for parameters. We again consider one possibility as follows. Given $\gamma \in (0.5, 1)$, we define $\Gamma := \frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma} \in (0, 1)$.

Then, choose $0 < \rho_0 \leq \frac{\Gamma \mu_f}{2\|K\|^2}$ and $\tau_0 := 1$. Next, we update

\[
\left\{
\begin{array}{l}
\tau_{k+1} := \frac{\tau_k}{2} \left(\sqrt{\tau_k^2 + 4} - \tau_k\right), \\
\rho_k := \frac{\rho_0}{\tau_k}, \quad \beta_k := \frac{\Gamma}{\|K\|^2 \rho_k}, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k := (1 - \gamma) \rho_k.
\end{array}
\right.
\]

(36)
It is easy to check that the update (36) satisfies all three first conditions in (34). We only need to check the last condition of (34), as

\[ \frac{\tau_k^2}{\beta_k(1 - \tau_k)} \leq \frac{\tau_{k-1}^2}{\beta_{k-1}} + \tau_{k-1}\mu_f. \]  

(37)

Assume that the first three conditions of (37) are tight. Then, we can easily show that (36) is equivalent to \( 1 - \tau_k = \frac{\tau_0}{\tau_0} \). Using this equality and \( \rho_k = \frac{\rho_0}{\tau_k} \), and \( \beta_k := \frac{\Gamma}{\|K\|^2\mu_k} \), the last condition of (34) becomes

\[ \rho_0 \leq \frac{\tau_{k-1}(1 - \tau_k)\Gamma\mu_f}{\tau_k\|K\|^2} = \frac{\tau_{k-1}\Gamma\mu_f}{\tau_k\|K\|^2}. \]  

(38)

Since \( \tau_0 = 1 \), by (36), we have \( \frac{1}{k+1} \leq \tau_k \leq \frac{2}{k+2} \). Therefore, \( \frac{\tau_{k-1}}{\tau_k} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{k} \geq \frac{1}{2} \). If we impose \( \rho_0 \leq \frac{\Gamma\mu_f}{2\|K\|^2} \), then the condition (38) holds.

Now, we can describe our schemes (32)-(36) in detail as Algorithm 2.

**Algorithm 2 (New Non-stationary Primal-Dual Algorithm - Strong convexity)**

1. **Initialization**: Choose \( y^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \), \( x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^p \), and \( \gamma \in (0, 1) \).
2. Set \( \Gamma := \frac{2\gamma - 1}{\gamma} \) and choose \( \rho_0 \in \left(0, \frac{\Gamma\mu_f}{2\|K\|^2}\right) \).
3. Set \( \tau_0 := 1 \), \( \bar{x}^0 := x^0 \), \( \hat{y}^0 := y^0 \), and \( \tilde{y}^0 := y^0 \). Define \( x^{-1} := x^0 \) and \( y^{-1} := y^0 \).
4. For \( k := 0, 1, \cdots, k_{\text{max}} \) do
5. \( \tau_{k+1} := \frac{\tau_k}{2} \left( \left( \tau_k^2 + 4 \right) \frac{1}{2} - \tau_k \right) \), \( \rho_k := \frac{\rho_0}{\tau_k} \), \( \beta_k := \frac{\Gamma}{\|K\|^2\mu_k} \), and \( \eta_k := (1 - \gamma)\rho_k \).
6. Update the primal-dual step:
   \[
   \begin{align*}
   y^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{\rho_k g^*}(\hat{y}^k + \rho_k K \hat{x}^k), \\
   \hat{x}^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{(\beta_k/\tau_k)}(\tilde{x}^k - \frac{\beta_k}{\tau_k} K^\top y^{k+1}), \\
   x^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{f/(\rho_k K^2)} \left( \hat{x}^k - \frac{1}{\rho_k K^2} K^\top y^{k+1} \right), \\
   \hat{x}^{k+1} &:= (1 - \tau_{k+1})x^{k+1} + \tau_{k+1} \hat{x}^{k+1},
   \end{align*}
   \]
7. Update the momentum step:
   \[ \hat{y}^{k+1} := \hat{y}^k + \eta_k K (x^{k+1} - \tilde{x}^k - (1 - \tau_k)(x^k - \tilde{x}^{k-1})) - (1 - \gamma)(\hat{y}^k - \hat{y}^{k+1}) - (\tilde{y}^{k-1} - y^k). \]
8. Update the dual averaging step: \( \hat{y}^{k+1} := (1 - \tau_k)\hat{y}^k + \tau_k \hat{y}^{k+1} \).
9. EndFor

For per-iteration complexity, Algorithm 2 only requires one more additional prox \( f/(\rho_k K^2) \) compared to other existing primal dual methods. Each iteration needs one \( \text{prox}_{\rho_k g^*} \), two \( \text{prox}_{\beta_k f} \), one \( Kx \), and one \( K^\top y \). The matrix-vector multiplication at Step 7 can be eliminated using \( K \hat{x}^k \) and the last line of Step 6. Again, we can replace the \( \text{prox}_{f/(\rho_k K^2)} \) step for computing \( x^{k+1} \) at the third line of Step 6 by the averaging step \( x^{k+1} := (1 - \tau_k)x^k + \tau_k \hat{x}^{k+1} \).
4.4 Convergence analysis

We state the convergence of Algorithm 2 in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3** *(O (1/k^ε))-Semi-nonergodic Convergence Rates* Let \{\(x^k, y^k\)\} be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2. Then, under Assumption 1 and Assumption 2, for any \(\rho_0 \in \left(0, \frac{\mu}{2\sqrt{K}}\right]\) and given \(x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^p\) and \(y^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n\), we have

\[
\bar{L}(x^k, y) - \bar{L}(x, y^k) \leq \frac{2}{(k+1)^2} \left[\rho_0 \frac{K}{\gamma} \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)\rho_0} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)\rho_0} \|y^0 - y^*\|^2\right],
\]

for any \(x \in \mathbb{R}^p\) and \(y \in \mathbb{R}^n\). Consequently, we have the following statements:

(a) **(Semi-nonergodic convergence rate of the primal-dual gap)** The gap function \(G := G_{\{x^k\} \times \{y^k\}}\) satisfies:

\[
G(x^k, y^k) \leq \frac{2}{(k+1)^2} \left[\rho_0 \frac{K}{\gamma} \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)\rho_0} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)\rho_0} \|y^0 - y^*\|^2\right],
\]

where \((x^*, y^*)\) is a given primal-dual solution of (1) and (2). Hence, \(\{G(x^k, y^k)\}\) converges to zero at the rate of \(O\left(\frac{1}{k^\varepsilon}\right)\) in semi-nonergodic sense, i.e. nonergodic in \(x^k\) and ergodic in \(y^k\).

(b) **(Nonergodic convergence rate of the primal objective residuals)** If \(g\) is \(M_g\)-Lipschitz continuous with \(M_g \in [0, +\infty)\), then the primal sequence \{\(x^k\)\} satisfies

\[
F(x^k) - F^* \leq \frac{2}{(k+1)^2} \left[\rho_0 \frac{K}{\gamma} \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)\rho_0} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 + \frac{D_2^g}{(1-\gamma)\rho_0}\right],
\]

where \(D_2^g := \sup \{\|y^0 - y\| \leq M_g\}\). Consequently, \(\{F(x^k)\}\) converges to the primal optimal value \(F^*\) of (1) at the \(O\left(\frac{1}{k^\varepsilon}\right)\)-optimal rate in nonergodic sense.

(c) **(Ergodic convergence rate of the dual objective residuals)** If \(f^*\) is \(M_{f^*}\)-Lipschitz continuous with \(M_{f^*} \in [0, +\infty)\), then the dual sequence \{\(y^k\)\} satisfies

\[
G(y^k) - G^* \leq \frac{2}{(k+1)^2} \left[\rho_0 \frac{K}{\gamma} \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)\rho_0} \|y^0 - y^*\|^2 + \frac{D_2^g}{(1-\gamma)\rho_0}\right],
\]

where \(D_2^g := \sup \{\|x^0 - x\| \leq M_{f^*}\}\). Consequently, \(\{G(y^k)\}\) converges to the dual optimal value \(G^*\) of (2) at the \(O\left(\frac{1}{k^\varepsilon}\right)\)-optimal rate in ergodic sense.

**Proof** Similar to the proof of Theorem 1 by using (35), we can show that

\[
\bar{L}(x^k, y) - \bar{L}(x, y^k) \leq \omega_{k-1} \left[\frac{1}{\rho_0} \|x^0 - x\|^2 + \frac{1}{\rho_0} \|y^0 - y\|^2\right],
\]

for any \(x \in \mathbb{R}^p\), \(y \in \mathbb{R}^n\), and \(r \in \partial g^*(y^k)\). On the other hand, by the update rule of \(\tau_k\), we have \(1 - \tau_k = \frac{2}{\rho_0 \bar{L}(x^k, y^k)}\). Hence, \(\omega_{k-1} = \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - \tau_i) = \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\tau_i}{\tau_{i-1}} = \tau_{k-1} \leq \frac{4}{(k+1)^2}\). Using this into the last inequality, we obtain

\[
\bar{L}(x^k, y) - \bar{L}(x, y^k) \leq \frac{2}{(k+1)^2} \left[\frac{1}{\rho_0} \|x^0 - x\|^2 + \frac{1}{\rho_0} \|y^0 - y\|^2\right].
\]

The remaining conclusions of this theorem are proved similarly to the proof of Theorem 1 but using the last inequality. We do not repeat this proof here. \(\square\)
We can modify the update rule of $\tau_k$ to obtain $o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$-convergence rate for the primal objective residual $\{\min_{0 \leq i \leq k} F(x^i) - F^*\}$. To achieve this goal, we design new update rules for parameters as in $[20]$. Given $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we define $\Gamma := \frac{2\gamma - 1}{\gamma}$. Next, we choose $c > 2$ and $\rho_0 \in \left(0, \frac{\Gamma \mu(c-1)}{c(2c-1)\|K\|^2}\right]$, and then update

$$
\tau_k := c \frac{k+c}{c^k}, \quad \rho_k := \frac{\rho_0 c^2}{\tau_k^2}, \quad \beta_k := \frac{\Gamma}{\|K\|^2 \rho_k}, \text{ and } \eta_k := (1-\gamma)\rho_k. \tag{43}
$$

We state the convergence of Algorithm 2 using (43) in the following theorem, whose proof is given in Appendix A.2.

**Theorem 4** ($O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$-Nonergodic and $o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$-Convergence Rate) Let $\{(x^k, y^k)\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2 using the update rule (43) with $c > 2$ and $\rho_0 \in \left(0, \frac{\Gamma \mu(c-1)}{c(2c-1)\|K\|^2}\right]$. Then, under Assumptions 1 and 2, we have the following conclusions:

(a) **Convergence rate of the Lagrange residuals** Let $\tilde{L}$ be the Lagrange function of (1) defined in (3). Then

$$0 \leq \tilde{L}(x^k, y^*) - F^* \leq O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{0 \leq i \leq k} \left[\tilde{L}(x^i, y^*) - F^*\right] \leq o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right). \tag{44}
$$

(b) **Convergence rate of the primal residuals** If $g$ is $M_g$-Lipschitz continuity on $\text{dom}(g)$ with $M_g \in [0, +\infty)$, then the primal sequence $\{x^k\}$ satisfies

$$0 \leq F(x^k) - F^* \leq O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{0 \leq i \leq k} [F(x^i) - F^*] \leq o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right). \tag{45}
$$

Hence, the sequence $\{F^k\}$ converges to the optimal value $F^*$ of (1) at an $o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$-convergence rate, where $F^k := \min_{0 \leq i \leq k} F(x^i)$.

We note that under Assumptions 1 and 2, the convergence rate shown in $[19,20]$ is $o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$, which was the best rate available up until this paper. Again, the $o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$-convergence rate stated in Theorem 4 is only attained for sufficiently large $k$. This does not conflict with the optimal upper bound stated in Theorem 3 which is just for $6k+2 \leq p$ as shown in Subsection 4.5 below.

### 4.5 Lower bound complexity for the strongly convex case

Similar to Algorithm 1, we show that Algorithm 2 also achieves an optimal rate. We consider again example (29), where we assume that $g$ is $\mu_g$-strongly convex. Algorithm 2 for solving (29) is a special case of (30) if $g$ is strongly convex. Then, by $[58]$ Theorem 2], the lower bound complexity of (30) to produce $\bar{x}^k$ is $F(\bar{x}^k) - F^* \geq \Omega\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ for $p \geq 6k+2$. Consequently, the convergence rate of Algorithm 2 stated in Theorem 3 matches this lower bound, and hence, is optimal.

### 5 Extension and special case

In this section, we discuss one extension to the sum of three objective terms and one special case of Algorithms 1 and 2.
5.1 Extension to the sum of three objective terms

We can extend our algorithms to handle the sum of three objective functions as follows:

\[
F^* := \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ F(x) := f(x) + \psi(x) + g(Kx) \right\},
\]

where \( f, \psi : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}, \ g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \) are proper, closed, and convex, and \( K : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^n \) is a given linear operator. Associated with the primal problem (46), we consider its dual form as

\[
G^* := \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ G(y) := (f^* \boxdot \psi^*)(-K^T y) + g^*(y) \right\},
\]

where \( f^*, g^*, \) and \( \psi^* \) are Fenchel conjugate of \( f, g, \) and \( \psi, \) respectively, and

\[
(f^* \boxdot \psi^*)(u) := \min_{v \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ f^*(v) + \psi^*(u - v) \right\},
\]

is the exact infimal convolution of \( f^* \) and \( \psi^*. \)

To apply a splitting method to (46), apart from Assumption 1 applied to (46) to guarantee strong duality, we require additionally the following assumption:

**Assumption 3** Both \( f \) and \( g \) are convex but not necessarily strongly convex and smooth. The function \( \psi \) is convex and \( L_\psi \)-smooth with \( L_\psi \in [0, +\infty) \).

Under Assumption 3, \( \nabla \psi \) is coercive, and we can apply three-operator splitting schemes to solve (46). We modify Algorithm 1 to solve (46). Its main steps are presented as

\[
\begin{align*}
    y^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{\rho y}(\hat{y}^{k} + \rho_k K\hat{x}^{k}) \\
    x^{k+1} &:= \text{prox}_{\beta_k f}(\hat{x}^{k} - \beta_k (K^T y^{k+1} + \nabla \psi(\hat{x}^{k}))) \\
    \hat{x}^{k+1} &:= x^{k+1} + \theta_k (x^{k+1} - x^{k}) \\
    \hat{y}^{k+1} &:= \hat{y}^{k} + \eta_k K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^{k} - (1 - \tau_k)(x^{k} - \hat{x}^{k-1})) \\
    y^{k+1} &:= (1 - \tau_k)\hat{y}^{k} + \tau_k y^{k+1},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \theta_k := \tau \frac{(1-\tau_k)}{\tau} \).

We can modify Algorithm 1 to solve (49) by using the scheme (49). Moreover, for given \( \gamma \in (0, 1), \ c \geq 1, \) and \( \rho_0 > 0, \) the parameters are updated as

\[
\tau_k := \frac{c}{k + c}, \quad \rho_k := \frac{\rho_0 c}{k + c}, \quad \beta_k := \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{\|K\|^2 \rho_k + \gamma L_\psi}, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k := (1 - \gamma) \rho_k.
\]

The following theorem states the convergence of this algorithmic variant under Assumption 3, whose proof can be found in Appendix C.1.

**Theorem 5** Let \( \{x^k, \hat{x}^k, y^k, \hat{y}^k\} \) be the sequence generated by (49) to solve (46) and (47) using the update rule (50) with \( c = 1 \). Then, under Assumptions 1 and 3, the conclusions of Theorem 2 remain valid, but \( \rho_0 \|K\|^2 \) is replaced by \( \rho_0 \|K\|^2 + \gamma L_\psi \) in all the bounds.

If we use \( c > 1 \) in (50), then the conclusions of Theorem 3 remain valid for (46).

We can also extend Algorithm 2 to solve (46)-(47) by assuming that \( f \) and/or \( \psi \) is strongly convex, i.e., \( \mu_f + \mu_\psi > 0 \). Similar to Algorithm 1, we can obtain \( O\left(\frac{1}{K}\right) \) in a semi-nonergodic sense as in Theorem 3. However, we skip the details of this variant to avoid overloading the paper.
5.2 Constrained nonsmooth convex optimization

In this section, we modify both Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 to solve nonsmooth constrained convex problems. We divide this section into two cases.

5.2.1 Nonstrongly convex case

We consider the following constrained nonsmooth convex optimization problem:

\[
F^* := \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ F(x) := f(x) + \psi(x) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad Kx = b \right\},
\]

where \( f, \psi \) and \( K \) are defined in (46) and \( b \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

The corresponding dual problem of (51) can be written as

\[
G^* := \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ G(y) := (f^* \square \psi^*)(-K^\top y) + \langle b, y \rangle \right\}.
\]

This primal-dual pair is a special case of (1)-(2) by setting \( g(u) := \delta_b(u) \), the indicator of \( \{b\} \), where \( b \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is a given vector. In this case, \( g^*(y) = \langle b, y \rangle \). The last condition of Assumption 1 reduces to \( \text{ri}(\text{dom}(f) \cap \text{dom}(\psi)) \cap \{x \mid Kx = b\} \neq \emptyset \).

Now, we can specify Algorithm 1 to solve (51)-(52). Since \( g^*(y) = \langle b, y \rangle \), we have

\[\text{prox}_{\gamma g}(y) = \arg\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \gamma \langle b, u \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|u - y\|^2 \right\} = y - \gamma b.\]

The first row of (15) reduces to \( y^{k+1} := \hat{y}^k + \rho_k (K \hat{x}^k - b) \). As a result, we can simplify the last row of (15) as \( y^{k+1} := \hat{y}^k + \eta_k (K (x^{k+1} - (1 - \tau_k)x^k) - \tau_k b) \).

In summary, we can specify Algorithm 1 to solve (51)-(52) as follows:

\[
\text{Algorithm 1(b)}:
\begin{aligned}
\begin{cases}
y^{k+1} := \hat{y}^k + \rho_k (K \hat{x}^k - b), \\
x^{k+1} := \text{prox}_{\beta_k f}(\hat{x}^k - \beta_k (K^\top y^{k+1} + \nabla \psi(\hat{x}^k))) \\
\hat{x}^{k+1} := x^{k+1} + \frac{\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k}{\tau_k} (x^{k+1} - x^k), \\
\hat{y}^{k+1} := \hat{y}^k + \eta_k (K (x^{k+1} - (1 - \tau_k)x^k) - \tau_k b) \\
y^{k+1} := (1 - \tau_k) \hat{y}^{k+1} + \tau_k y^{k+1}.
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
\]

The parameters \( \tau_k \in (0, 1), \rho_k, \beta_k, \) and \( \eta_k \) are updated as in Algorithm 1. The following theorem proves the convergence of (53) for both the primal and dual problems, whose proof is given in Appendix C.2.

**Theorem 6** Let \( \overline{R}_0^2 := \frac{\rho_0 \|K\|^2}{\rho_0 + (\gamma L_\psi)\|x_0 - x^*\|^2} + \frac{2\|y^0\| \|y^0\|}{\rho_0 (1 - \gamma)} \) for any \((x^*, y^*) \in X^* \times Y^*\) and \( y^* \neq 0 \), the primal-dual solution of (51)-(52), and \( c_1 \) be generated by Algorithm 1 using (53) and \( c = 1 \) to solve (51)-(52). Then, under Assumption 1 we have

\[
\text{(Primal convergence)} : \quad |F(x^k) - F^*| \leq \overline{R}_0^2 \frac{2}{k} \text{ and } \|Kx^k - b\| \leq \overline{R}_0^2 \frac{2}{k\|y^*\|}. \tag{54}
\]

If, in addition, \( \text{dom}(F) \) is bounded, then

\[
\text{(Dual convergence)} : \quad G(\hat{y}^k) - G^* \leq \frac{1}{2k} \left[ \frac{\rho_0 \|K\|^2 + \gamma L_\psi \overline{R}_0^2}{\gamma} + \frac{\|y^0 - y^*\|^2}{\rho_0 (1 - \gamma)} \right], \tag{55}
\]

where \( D_X := \sup \{\|x - x_0\| \mid x \in \text{dom}(F)\} \) < +\infty.

If we apply Algorithm 1 using (53) and \( c > 1 \) to solve (51), then

\[
\liminf_{k \to \infty} (k + c - 1)|F(x^k) - F^*| = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{k \to \infty} (k + c - 1)\|Kx^k - b\| = 0. \tag{56}
\]
Note that the $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$-convergence rate results of Theorem 6 are similar to [50,51]. However, [53] studied only primal methods using quadratic penalty framework and alternating minimization techniques. Therefore, it does not have a dual step to update multipliers, and does not have convergence guarantee on the dual problem. Another related work for solving (51) is [54], which relies on a different approach called smoothing techniques and excessive gap framework in [44]. The result on $o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$-convergence rate is new.

5.2.2 Semi-strongly convex case

We consider another nonsmooth constrained convex optimization setting:

\[ F^* := \min_{x,w} \left\{ F(x,w) := f(x) + \psi(w) \mid Ax + Bw = b \right\}, \]  

(57)

where $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $\psi : \mathbb{R}^l \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ are proper, closed, and convex, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times l}$, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Different from (51), we impose the following assumption.

**Assumption 4** The function $f$ of (57) is $\mu_f$-strongly convex with $\mu_f > 0$ but not necessarily smooth. The function $\psi$ is not necessarily strongly convex and smooth, and $B$ is not necessarily invertible.

Note that if $B$ is invertible, then (57) reduces to (1) with $g(Kx) := \psi(-B^{-1}(Ax - b))$. In this case, we can apply accelerated proximal methods in [113] to the dual problem (2) and using the strategy in [32, 40] to recover a primal approximate solution.

In this paper, we consider the case where $B$ is not invertible. Hence, (57) is non-strongly convex, and we cannot directly apply Algorithm 2 as well as the accelerated proximal methods in [113] to solve (57). However, exploiting the idea in [49, 50], we can still develop a new variant of Algorithm 2 to solve (57). This variant combines Algorithm 2 and an alternating strategy to alternate between $w$ and $x$, and can be described as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
  w^{k+1} &:= \arg\min_w \left\{ \psi(w) + \langle B^\top \hat{y}^k, w \rangle + \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|Ax^k + Bw - b\|^2 + \frac{\nu_0}{2} \|w - \hat{w}^k\|^2 \right\}, \\
  y^k &:= \hat{y}^k + \rho_k (Ax^k + Bw^k + b), \\
  \hat{x}^k &:= \prox_{(\beta_k/\tau_k)} f (x^k - \frac{\beta_k}{\tau_k} A^\top y^k + 1), \\
  x^{k+1} &:= \prox_{f/(\rho_k \|A\|^2)} (x^{k} - \frac{1}{\rho_k \|A\|^2} A^\top y^{k+1}), \\
  \hat{x}^{k+1} &:= (1 - \tau_{k+1}) x^{k+1} + \tau_{k+1} \hat{x}^{k+1}, \\
  \hat{w}^{k+1} &:= w^{k+1} + \theta_k (w^{k+1} - w^k), \quad \text{with } \theta_k := \frac{\tau_{k+1}(1 - \tau_k)}{\tau_k}, \\
  \hat{y}^{k+1} &:= \hat{y}^k + \eta_k (A(x^{k+1} - (1 - \tau_k)x^k) + B(w^{k+1} - (1 - \tau_k)w^k) - \tau_k b), \\
  \tilde{y}^{k+1} &:= (1 - \tau_k) \hat{y}^{k+1} + \tau_k \hat{y}^{k+1}.
\end{align*}
\]  

(58)

Again, the parameters $\tau_k \in (0, 1]$, $\rho_k$, $\beta_k$, and $\eta_k$ are updated as in Algorithm 2 and $\nu_0 \geq 0$. Note that we can avoid the proximal step $\prox_{f/(\rho_k \|K\|^2)}$ for computing $x^{k+1}$ by using an averaging step $x^{k+1} := (1 - \tau_k)x^k + \tau_k \hat{x}^{k+1}$. However, this step will lead to a semi-ergodic convergence rate guarantee on $\{(x^k, w^k)\}$ (i.e., nonergodic in $w^k$ and ergodic in $x^k$). We can choose $\nu_0 = 0$ if the subproblem in $w^{k+1}$ at the first line of (58) is well-defined.

The scheme (58) is fundamentally different from ADMM at several points. First, it linearizes the augmented term in the second subproblem $\hat{x}^{k+1}$ to use the proximal operator of $f$. Second, it has two proximal steps on $f$. Third, it has additional intermediate steps in $\hat{x}^k$, $\hat{w}^k$, and $\hat{y}^k$. Fourth, it has two dual steps in $\hat{y}^{k+1}$ and $\tilde{y}^{k+1}$. Finally, the parameters in the
dual steps and the augmented term are not the same. Clearly, if $A$ is not orthogonal, then the per-iteration complexity of (58) with the averaging step $x^{k+1} := (1 - \tau_k)x^k + \tau_k\tilde{x}^{k+1}$ is better than ADMM since it already linearized the second subproblem in $\tilde{x}^{k+1}$.

Finally, we can state the convergence of (53) and (58) as in the following theorem, whose proof is given in Appendix C.3.

**Theorem 7** Let $\bar{R}_0 := \frac{\rho_0\|A\|^2}{\gamma}w^0 - x^* - \nu_0\|w^0 - w^*\|^2 + \nu_0\||w^0 - w^*\|^2 + \frac{\nu_0\|w^0 - w^*\|^2}{\gamma}$ for any $(x^*, w^*, y^*) \in X^* \times W^* \times Y^*$, the primal-dual solution of (51)–(52), and $y^* \neq 0$. Assume that Assumption 1 and Assumption 4 hold. Let $\{(x^k, w^k, \tilde{y}^k)\}$ be generated by (58) to solve (51)–(52). Then

$$|F(x^k, w^k) - F^*| \leq \frac{2\bar{R}_0^2}{(k+1)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|Ax^k + Bw^k - b\| \leq \frac{2\bar{R}_0^2}{\|y^*\|(k+1)^2}. \quad (59)$$

Consequently, $\|x^k - x^*\| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{\bar{R}_0^2}}{\sqrt{\gamma}(k+1)}$, and therefore $\{x^k\}$ converges to $x^*$ at $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$-rate.

If we apply (58) and (43) to solve (51), then

$$\liminf_{k \to \infty} (k + c - 1)^2|F(x^k, w^k) - F^*| = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{k \to \infty} (k + c - 1)^2\|Ax^k + Bw^k - b\| = 0. \quad (60)$$

To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 7 presents the first $o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$-convergence result for general constrained convex problem (57) under the semi-strong convexity (i.e. $f$ is strongly convex, but $\psi$ is non-strongly convex).

### 5.3 Restarting variant

Since the parameters $\tau_k$, $\beta_k$ are decreasing and vanishing, while $\rho_k$ and $\eta_k$ are increasing, Algorithm 1 or Algorithm 2 performs as predicted by the theory and slows down when $k$ is increasing. To keep these parameters not too small and large, we can restart Algorithm 1 (or Algorithm 2) by simply resetting $\tau_k := 1$, $\rho_k := \rho_0$, $\tilde{x}^k = x^k$ and $\tilde{y}^k := \tilde{y}^k$. Let us describe this variant formally as in Algorithm 3. Here, we fix the number of stages $S_{\text{max}}$ and allow the number of inner iterations $k_s$ at each stage $s$ to vary. Note that by appropriately

**Algorithm 3** (Restarting Primal-Dual Variant)

1: **Initialization:** Choose an initial point $(x^0, y^0) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^n$.
2: **For** $s := 0, 1, \ldots, S_{\text{max}} - 1$ **do**
3: Run Algorithm 1 or Algorithm 2 starting from $(x^0, y^0)$ within $k_s$ iterations, and returns $(x^{k_s}, y^{k_s})$.
4: Reset $x^0 := x_{k_s}$, $y^0 := y^{k_s}$, $\tau_0$, and $\rho_0$, and repeat Step 3.
5: **EndFor**

selecting $k_s$, one can prove a global $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$ (or $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$) convergence rate of Algorithm 3 by exploiting the idea in [51, Theorem 3.1.]. However, to avoid overloading this paper, we leave this analysis for our future work.

### 6 Numerical illustrations

We inspect some theoretical statements in this paper through two well-known examples and compare our methods with some existing state-of-the-arts. Our code is implemented in Matlab (R2014b) and available at [https://github.com/qvuctd/PrimalDualCvxOpt](https://github.com/qvuctd/PrimalDualCvxOpt). The experiment is run on a MacBook Pro Laptop with 2.7 GHz Intel Core i5 and 16GB memory.
6.1 Ergodic vs. nonergodic convergence rates

We consider the following nonsmooth composite convex minimization problem:
\[ F^* := \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ F(x) := f(x) + \|Kx - b\|_1 \right\}, \tag{61} \]
where \( K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \) and \( b \in \mathbb{R}^n \) are given, and \( f(x) \) is a nonsmooth convex regularizer.

**Case 1: LAD with \( \ell_1 \)-regularizer:** We first verify the theoretical aspects of Algorithm 1 by considering the \( \ell_1 \)-regularized least absolute deviation problem (LAD) as an instance of (61) with \( f(x) := \lambda \|x\|_1 \) for a given regularization parameter \( \lambda > 0 \). This problem has the same form as (61) with \( f(x) := \lambda \|x\|_1 \) and \( g(u) := \|u - b\|_1 \). Moreover, it is nonsmooth and nonstrongly convex, and satisfies Assumption 1.

We compare two variants of Algorithm 1 with \( c = 1 \) and \( c = 2 \), and compare them with the well-established methods: Chambolle-Pock’s method (CP) \(^9\) and ADMM \(^6\). For CP and ADMM, we use three different values of \( \rho \) to make sure that the range of step-sizes and penalty parameter is chosen carefully. Since both CP and ADMM have \( O(\frac{1}{k}) \) convergence rate on the ergodic sequence of the (relative) objective residual \( \frac{F(x^k) - F^*}{\max\{1,|F^*|\}} \) with \( F^* \) being computed by Mosek up to the high precision, we compare this sequence with the last iterate sequence of Algorithm 1, where they all have the same convergence rate guarantee.

For Algorithm 1, we use \( \rho_0 := \left( \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \right)^{1/2} \frac{\|y^0 - y^*\|}{\|K\|_{2 \to p}} \) with \( \gamma := 0.99 \) as guided by Theorem 1. For CP method, we choose the step-size \( \rho := \frac{\|y^0 - y^*\|}{\|K\|_{2 \to p}} \) in \( \text{prox}_{\rho g}(\cdot) \) and \( \beta := 0.99 \) in \( \text{prox}_{\beta f}(\cdot) \). To be fair, we also try different values of \( \rho \) for CP method such as \( \rho = 10 \), \( \rho = 1 \), and \( \rho = 0.1 \). For ADMM, we reformulate (61) into the constrained problem (8) by introducing \( r = Kx - c \), and choose the penalty parameter \( \rho := 10, 1, \) and \( 0.1 \).

We test these algorithms on two instances of (61), where \( K \) is generated from the standard Gaussian distribution \( \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \), \( b := Kx^s + e \), where \( x^s \) is an \( s \)-sparse vector, and \( e \) is a sparse Gaussian noise with variance 0.01 and 10% nonzero entries. The size of the problem is \((n, p, s) = (2000, 640, 200)\) and \( \lambda := 0.05 \) that gives us a good sparse solution.

The relative objective residuals \( \{ \frac{F(x^k) - F^*}{\max\{1,|F^*|\}} \} \) of these algorithms are plotted in Figure 1 (left) for the last iterate of Algorithm 1 and for the averaging sequence of CP and ADMM methods. In Algorithm 1, we use two different values of \( c \) to update \( \tau_k: c = 1 \) and \( c = 2 \).

The left plot of Figure 1 shows that all the algorithms achieve \( O\left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \) rate. The case \( c = 2 \) in Algorithm 1 is slightly faster as predicted by Theorem 2. The ergodic sequences of CP and ADMM methods also reflect their \( O\left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \) rate, but they are slower than that of Algorithm 1 and sensitively depends on the choice of parameters.

Note that since both CP and ADMM use constant step-size \( \rho \) and \( \sigma \), their last iterate sequence has better practical convergence rate although its theoretical rate is \( O\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \right) \) \(^13\).

The right plot of Figure 1 reveals the convergence rate of the last iterate sequence of Algorithm 1. CP method with \( \rho := 1 \) and \( \rho := \frac{\|y^0 - y^*\|}{\|K\|_{2 \to p}} \), and ADMM with \( \rho := 10 \) and \( \rho := 1 \). Clearly, this sequence practically exhibits over \( O\left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \) rate, and much faster than the theoretical rate in this example. Since the parameters \( \beta_k \) and \( \tau_k \) in Algorithm 1 decay with \( O\left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \) rate, we simply restart the algorithm at \( 50 \times 2^{[k/50]} \)-th iteration as suggested in Algorithm 3 to reset these parameters. By doing this simple trick, we obtain similar convergence rate as in CP and ADMM methods with the well-chosen parameters.

**Case 2: LAD with elastic net regularizer - Strongly convex case:** Now, we test Algorithm 2 by replacing the \( \ell_1 \)-regularizer \( f(x) := \lambda \|x\|_1 \) in (61) by the elastic net one.
Fig. 1 The convergence behavior of 11 algorithmic variants on (61) after 3000 iterations: Left: nonergodic vs. Ergodic, Right: Simple restart vs. last iterates. Here, the problem size is \((n, p, s) = (2000, 740, 200)\).

\[ f(x) := \lambda \|x\| + \mu f_2 \|x\|^2, \]

where we choose \(\lambda := 0.05\) and \(\mu := 0.1\). In this case, the resulting problem is \(\mu_f\)-strongly convex. We use the same setting to generate problem instances as in Case 1 but with 50% correlated columns in \(K\). Here, we choose \(\rho_0 := \frac{\Gamma \mu_f}{\|K\|^2}\) in Algorithm 2 as suggested by Theorem 3. However, we believe that our analysis of Theorem 3 is still loose, so we also multiply this value \(\rho_0\) by 5 to observe any improvement of Algorithm 2. As suggested by Theorem 4, we also consider the variant of Algorithm 2 with \(c = 4\) in the update (43) and \(\rho_0 := \frac{(c-1) \Gamma \mu_f}{c(2c-1)\|K\|^2}\). We implement an accelerated Chambolle-Pock’s (scvx-CP) method in [9] using \(\rho_0 := \frac{\|y_0 - y^*\|}{\|K\|\|x_0 - x^*\|}\). We also consider two variants of this method by multiplying the step-size \(\rho_0\) by 10 to get 10\(\rho_0\) or dividing it by 5 to have \(\frac{\rho_0}{5}\).

Fig. 2 The convergence behavior of 8 algorithmic variants on (61) with the elastic-net regularizer. Left: last iterate vs. averaging sequence, Right: Simple restarting vs. last iterates. Here, \((n, p, s) = (2000, 740, 200)\).

The convergence behavior of this test is plotted in Figure 2. The left plot shows the convergence of the last iterate sequence of Algorithm 2 vs. the ergodic (i.e., weighted averaging) sequence of the accelerated CP (scvx-CP) method. Both scvx-CP and Algorithm 2 show...
Similarly \( O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \) convergence rate as predicted by the theory. Algorithm 2 with \( 5\rho_0 \) performs similar to scvx-CP and scvx-CP with \( 5\rho_0 \). Algorithm 2 with \( c = 4 \) is slightly better. The right plot shows the convergence of the last iterate sequence of 6 variants. Here, scvx-CP with \( \rho_0 = \frac{\|y^0 - y^\star\|}{\|K\parallel x^0 - x^\star\|} \) seems to be the best. If we increase \( \rho_0 \), scvx-CP does not significantly accelerates. However, with the same simple restarting trick as in Algorithm 3, Algorithm 2 outperforms the last iterate sequence of the scvx-CP method. The restarting variant with \( c = 4 \) performs really well in this example.

6.2 Primal-dual methods vs. smoothing techniques
Consider the following matrix min-max game problem studied in [45]:

\[
F^* := \min_{x \in \Delta_p} \{ F(x) := \max_{y \in \Delta_n} (Kx, y) \},
\]

where \( K \) is \( n \times p \) matrix, \( \Delta_p := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \mid \sum_{j=1}^p x_j = 1 \} \), and \( \Delta_n := \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \mid \sum_{i=1}^n y_i = 1 \} \) are two standard simplexes in \( \mathbb{R}^p \) and \( \mathbb{R}^n \), respectively. This problem can be cast into \( \phi \) with \( f(x) := \delta_{\Delta_p}(x) \), the indicator of \( \Delta_p \), and \( g^*(y) := \delta_{\Delta_n}(y) \), the indicator of \( \Delta_n \).

Our goal is to compare Algorithm 1 and the smoothing technique in [45]. Both methods theoretically achieve the same \( O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \) convergence rate, but the performance of smoothing techniques depends on the choice of accuracy. To compare these algorithms, we follow the same configuration in [45]. For Algorithm 1, we choose \( \gamma := 0.5 \), \( \rho_0 := \frac{1}{\|\alpha\|} \) to balance the right-hand side bound in Theorem 1. We also update \( \tau_k \) with \( c := 1 \) and \( c := 2 \) to obtain two variants, and add the third variant with a simple restarting technique as in Subsection 6.1.

The matrix \( K \) is generated using uniform random distribution between \([-1, 1] \) as in [45]. Then, it is normalized such that \( \|K\| = 1 \). Since \( \|K\| = 1 \), we only choose the Euclidean distance to smooth \( F(x) := \max_{y \in \Delta_n} (Kx, y) \) as

\[
F_\mu(x) := \max_{y \in \Delta_n} \{ (Kx, y) - \frac{\mu}{2} \|y - y_c\|^2 \},
\]

which gives us a better complexity bound than using entropy proximity functions [45, formula (4.11)], where \( \mu > 0 \) is the smoothness parameter and \( y_c := (1/n, \cdots, 1/n)^T \) is the center of \( \Delta_n \). As suggested in [45, formula (4.8)], we fix the accuracy \( \varepsilon > 0 \), and choose the number of iterations \( k := \frac{4\|K\|}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{(1 - \frac{1}{n})(1 - \frac{1}{p})} \) and the smoothness parameter \( \mu := \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{(1 - 1/n)}} \).

The Lipschitz constant of \( \nabla F_\mu \) is \( L_\mu := \frac{\|K\|^2}{\mu} \). To see how the smoothness parameter \( \mu \) affects the performance of the smoothing method, we also run this algorithm with two more cases. In the first case, we multiply \( \mu \) by 5 to get a larger smoothness parameter \( 5\mu \), and in the second case, we divide it by 5 to have 0.2\( \mu \). We test two cases with \( \varepsilon_1 = 10^{-3} \) and \( \varepsilon_2 = 10^{-4} \). With these choices of \( \varepsilon \), the corresponding number of iterations is \( k_1 := 3,997 \) and \( k_2 := 39,970 \), respectively. We run all algorithms up to these numbers of iterations.

We first choose a dense matrix \( K \) of the size \((n, p) = (1000, 2000) \). Then, the absolute duality gap \( G(x^k, y^k) \) of this test is plotted in Figure 3.

As we can observe from Figure 3, Nesterov’s smoothing method and Algorithm 1 with \( c = 1 \) follows the \( O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \) convergence rate. The performance of Nesterov’s smoothing method crucially depends on the choice of the smoothness \( \mu \). A large \( \mu \) converges fast in early iterations but becomes saturated in later iterations, while a small \( \mu \) reflects an opposite behavior. Algorithm 1 with \( c = 2 \) seems to outperform other methods in both cases: \( \varepsilon_1 = 10^{-3} \) and \( \varepsilon_1 = 10^{-4} \). With a simple restarting trick, it also improves the performance.

Figure 4 reveals the performance of 6 algorithmic variants on a sparse matrix \( K \) of size \((n = 5000, p = 2000) \) with 10% nonzero entries. In this test, we also observe that Algorithm 1
Absolute gap value: $F(x^k) + G(y^k)$ - in logscale

Fig. 3 The convergence behavior of 6 algorithmic variants on (62) with a dense matrix $K$ of size ($n = 1000, p = 2000$): Left: $\varepsilon_1 = 10^{-3}$ and Right: $\varepsilon_2 = 10^{-4}$.

Fig. 4 The convergence behavior of 6 algorithmic variants on (62) with a sparse matrix $K$ of size ($n = 5000, p = 2000$) and 10% nonzero entries: Left: $\varepsilon_1 = 10^{-3}$ and Right: $\varepsilon_2 = 10^{-4}$.

with $c = 2$ exhibits faster performance than $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$ convergence rate as predicted by our theory. Other variants remain reflecting the $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$ convergence rate.
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A Appendix: Technical proofs in Section 3: Nonstrongly convex case

This appendix provides the full proof of technical results in Section 3. Recall $\phi(x, r, y) := \frac{\rho}{2}\|Kx - r\|^2 + \langle y, Kx - r \rangle$ defined by (10). We have

$$\phi(x, r, y) = \phi(x, r, y) + \langle \nabla_x \phi(x, r, y), x - \hat{x} \rangle + \langle \nabla_r \phi(x, r, y), r - \hat{r} \rangle $$

$$+ \frac{\rho}{2}\|K(x - \hat{x}) - (r - \hat{r})\|^2;$$

(63)

for any $x, r, y, \hat{x}$, and $\hat{r}$. Here, $\nabla_x \phi(x, r, y) = K^T(y + \rho(K\hat{x} - \hat{r}))$ and $\nabla_r \phi(x, r, y) = \rho(\hat{r} - K\hat{x}) - y$ are partial gradients of $\phi$.  


A.1 The proof of Lemma 2

One-iteration analysis

We break the proof of Lemma 2 into two parts. First, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6 Let \((x^k, x^k, \hat{x}^k, r^k, \hat{g}^k)\) be computed by (11) and \(L_{\rho} \) be given in (10). Then

\[
L_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, r^{k+1}, \hat{g}^{k+1}) \leq (1 - \tau_k)L_{\rho_k}(x^k, r^k, \hat{g}^k) + \tau_k L_{\rho_k}(x, r, \hat{g}^k) + \frac{\tau_k^2}{2}\rho_k \left[ \|\hat{x}^k - x\|^2 - \|\hat{x}^k + x\|^2 \right] - \frac{\rho_k(1 - \tau_k)}{2} \|K(x^k - \hat{x}^k) - (r^k - r^{k+1})\|^2 + \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|K(x^k - \hat{x}^k)\|^2 - \frac{\rho_k \tau_k}{2} \|K\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1} - (Kx - r)\|^2.
\]

Proof First, the optimality conditions of \(x^{k+1}\) and \(r^{k+1}\) in (11) can be written as

\[
\begin{aligned}
0 &\in \partial g(r^{k+1}) + \rho_k (r^{k+1} - K\hat{x}^k) - \hat{g}^k \equiv \partial g(r^{k+1}) + \nabla_r \phi_{\rho_k}(\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{g}^k), \\
0 &\in \partial f(x^{k+1}) + \nabla_x \phi_{\rho_k}(\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{g}^k) + \frac{1}{\rho_k} (x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k).
\end{aligned}
\]

Second, by convexity of \(f\) and \(g\), and the above optimality conditions, we can derive

\[
\begin{aligned}
g(r^{k+1}) &\leq g(r) + \langle \nabla g(r^{k+1}), r^{k+1} - r \rangle + \frac{1}{2\rho_k} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2 \\
f(x^{k+1}) &\leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x^{k+1}), x^{k+1} - x \rangle + \frac{1}{2\rho_k} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k, x - x^{k+1}\| + \frac{1}{\rho_k} (x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k, x - x^{k+1}),
\end{aligned}
\]

where \(\nabla f(x^{k+1}) \in \partial f(x^{k+1})\) and \(\nabla g(r^{k+1}) \in \partial g(r^{k+1})\).

Third, using (63) twice with \(y := \hat{y}^k, r = \hat{r} := r^{k+1}\), and \((x, r) := (\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}), (\bar{x}, \bar{r}) := (x, r)\), respectively, we can derive

\[
\begin{aligned}
\phi_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, r^{k+1}, \hat{g}^k) = \phi_{\rho_k}(\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{g}^k) + \langle \nabla x \phi_{\rho_k}(\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{g}^k), x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k \rangle + \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)\|^2 \\
= \phi_{\rho_k}(x, r, \hat{g}^k) + \langle \nabla x \phi_{\rho_k}(\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{g}^k), x^{k+1} - x \rangle \\
+ \langle \nabla r \phi_{\rho_k}(\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{g}^k), r^{k+1} - r \rangle + \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)\|^2 \\
- \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|K(x - \hat{x}^k) - (r - r^{k+1})\|^2.
\end{aligned}
\]

Fourth, summing up (66) and (67), and using (10), we arrive at

\[
L_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, r^{k+1}, \hat{g}^k) \leq L_{\rho_k}(x, r, \hat{g}^k) + \frac{1}{\rho_k} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k, x - x^{k+1}\| - \frac{1}{\rho_k} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2 \\
+ \frac{1}{2\rho_k} \|K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)\|^2 - \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|K(x - \hat{x}^k) - (r - r^{k+1})\|^2.
\]

Fifth, substituting \((x, r) := (x^k, r^k)\) into (68), we obtain

\[
L_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, r^{k+1}, \hat{g}^k) \leq L_{\rho_k}(x^k, r^k, \hat{g}^k) + \frac{1}{\rho_k} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k, x - x^{k+1}\| - \frac{1}{\rho_k} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2 \\
+ \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)\|^2 - \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|K(x - \hat{x}^k) - (r^k - r^{k+1})\|^2.
\]

Next, multiplying (69) by \(1 - \tau_k\) and (68) by \(\tau_k\), and summing up the results, then utilizing \(\hat{x}^k = (1 - \tau_k)x^k + \tau_k x^k\), we get

\[
L_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, r^{k+1}, \hat{g}^k) \leq (1 - \tau_k)L_{\rho_k}(x^k, r^k, \hat{g}^k) + \tau_k L_{\rho_k}(x, r, \hat{g}^k) + \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\rho_k} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k, x - \hat{x}^k\| \\
- \frac{\tau_k}{2\rho_k} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2 + \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)\|^2 \\
- \frac{\rho_k \tau_k}{2} \|K\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1} - (Kx - r)\|^2 \\
- \frac{\rho_k (1 - \tau_k)}{2} \|K(x - \hat{x}^k) - (r^k - r^{k+1})\|^2.
\]

Now, by the update \( \hat{x}^{k+1} := \hat{x}^k + \frac{1}{\rho_k} (x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k) \) from (11), we can further derive

\[
T_1 := \frac{\tau_k}{2\beta_k} (x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k, x - \hat{x}^k) - \frac{1}{2\beta_k} ||x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k||^2 \\
= \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\beta_k} [||\hat{x}^k - x||^2 - ||\hat{x}^{k+1} - x||^2].
\]  
(71)

Finally, substituting this expression into (70), we obtain (64).

\[ \square \]

**The proof of Lemma 2**: First, from the first formula of (12), we have

\[
\hat{y}^{k+1} := (1 - \tau_k)\hat{y}^k + \tau_k (\hat{y}^k + \rho_k (K\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1})) = (1 - \tau_k)\hat{y}^k + \tau_k y^{k+1}.
\]

Using this expression and the definition of \( \mathcal{L} \), we can show that

\[
T_2 := \tau_k \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x,r,\hat{y}^k) - \frac{\rho_k \tau_k}{2} ||Kx^k - r^{k+1} - (Kx - r)||^2 \\
= \mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^{k+1}) - (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^k) - \frac{\rho_k \tau_k}{2} ||K\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1}||^2.
\]  
(72)

Next, substituting \( T_2 \) into (64) of Lemma 6, we can further estimate it as

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k) \leq (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x^k, r^k, \hat{y}^k) + \left[ \mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^{k+1}) - (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^k) \right] \\
+ \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\beta_k} [||\hat{x}^k - x||^2 - ||\hat{x}^{k+1} - x||^2] \\
- \frac{1}{2\beta_k} ||x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k||^2 + \frac{\rho_k \tau_k}{2} ||K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)||^2 \\
- \frac{\rho_k (1 - \tau_k)}{2} K(\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1})^2 - \frac{\rho_k \tau_k}{2} ||K\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1}||^2.
\]  
(73)

On the other hand, by the definition of \( \mathcal{L} \) and \( \hat{y}^{k+1} \) from (11), we have

\[
T_3 := \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, r^{k+1}, y) - (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x^k, r^k, y) \\
= \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k) - (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x^k, r^k, \hat{y}^k) \\
+ \frac{1}{2\beta_k} [||y - \hat{y}^k||^2 - ||y - \hat{y}^{k+1}||^2 + ||\hat{y}^{k+1} - \hat{y}^k||^2].
\]  
(74)

In addition, one can easily show that

\[
T_4 := \frac{\rho_k (1 - \tau_k)}{2 - 2\rho_k} ||K(x^k - \hat{x}^k) - (r^k - r^{k+1})||^2 + \frac{\rho_k \tau_k}{2} ||K\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1}||^2 \\
- \frac{(1 - \tau_k)(\rho_k - \rho_k - 1)}{2} ||Kx^k - r^k||^2 \\
= \frac{\rho_k}{2} ||(K\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1}) - (1 - \tau_k)(Kx^k - r^k)||^2 \\
+ \frac{(1 - \tau_k)}{2} [\rho_{k-1} - (1 - \tau_k)\rho_k] ||Kx^k - r^k||^2.
\]
(75)

Now, substituting (74) and (75) into (73), and using

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x^k, r^k, y) = \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x^k, r^k, y) + \frac{(\rho_k - \rho_{k-1})}{2} ||Kx^k - r^k||^2, \text{ for any } y \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\]

we arrive at

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, r^{k+1}, y) \leq (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x^k, r^k, y) + \left[ \mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^{k+1}) - (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^k) \right] \\
+ \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\beta_k} [||\hat{x}^k - x||^2 - ||\hat{x}^{k+1} - x||^2] - \frac{1}{2\beta_k} ||x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k||^2 \\
+ \frac{1}{2\beta_k} [||y - \hat{y}^k||^2 - ||y - \hat{y}^{k+1}||^2] + \frac{1}{2\beta_k} ||\hat{y}^{k+1} - \hat{y}^k||^2 \\
+ \frac{\rho_k}{2} ||K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)||^2 - \frac{\rho_k}{2} ||(K\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1}) - (1 - \tau_k)(Kx^k - r^k)||^2 \\
- \frac{(1 - \tau_k)}{2} [\rho_{k-1} - (1 - \tau_k)\rho_k] ||Kx^k - r^k||^2.
\]
(76)
Let \( \hat{a}_k := K\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1} \), \( b_k := (1 - \tau_k)(Kx^k - r^k) \), and \( a^{k+1} := Kx^{k+1} - r^{k+1} \). If \( \rho_k > \eta_k \), then we can easily check that
\[
\rho_k \| \hat{a}_k - b_k \|^2 - \eta_k \| a^{k+1} - b_k \|^2 \geq -\frac{\rho_k \eta_k}{\rho_k - \eta_k} \| a^{k+1} - \hat{a}_k \|^2.
\]
Applying this inequality, we can bound
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{T}_5 := \frac{\rho_k}{2} \| (Kx^k - r^{k+1}) - (1 - \tau_k)(Kx^k - r^k) \|^2 - \frac{1}{2\eta_k} \| \hat{y}^{k+1} - \hat{y}^k \|^2 \\
\geq -\frac{\rho_k \eta_k}{2(\rho_k - \eta_k)} \| K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k) \|^2.
\end{align*}
\]
Substituting the estimate of \( \mathcal{T}_5 \) into (76), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, r^{k+1}, y) &\leq (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x^k, r^k, y) + \left[ \mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^{k+1}) - (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^k) \right] \\
&+ \frac{\rho_k}{2\eta_k} \left[ \| \hat{x}^k - x \|^2 - \| x^{k+1} - x \|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2\eta_k} \left[ \| y - \hat{y}^k \|^2 - \| y - x^{k+1} \|^2 \right] \\
&- \mathcal{T}_6,
\end{align*}
\]
where \( \mathcal{T}_6 \) is defined as
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{T}_6 := \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho_{k-1} - (1 - \tau_k)\rho_k \right] \| Kx^k - r^k \|^2 + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \| x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k \|^2 - \frac{\rho_k^2}{2(\rho_k - \eta_k)} \| K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k) \|^2 \\
\geq \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho_{k-1} - (1 - \tau_k)\rho_k \right] \| Kx^k - r^k \|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{\beta_k} - \frac{\rho_k^2}{\rho_k - \eta_k} \right] \| x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k \|^2.
\end{align*}
\]
Using the lower bound of \( \mathcal{T}_6 \) into (78) we finally obtain (17). \( \square \)

A.2 The proof of Theorem 1. \( \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k}) \)-Semi-nonergodic convergence rate

By (20), we have \( \omega_{k-1} = \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - \tau_i) = \frac{1}{k} \). Moreover, \( \beta_0 = \frac{\gamma \| K \|^2}{\rho_0} \) and \( \eta_0 = (1 - \gamma)\rho_0 \). Using these expressions into (19) we get
\[
\mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x^k, r^k, y) - \mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^k) \leq \frac{\rho_0 \| K \|^2}{2\beta_0} \| x^0 - x \|^2 + \frac{1}{2(1 - \gamma)\rho_0} \| y^0 - y \|^2.
\]
Note that \( \mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^k) = f(x) + \langle Kx, \hat{y}^k \rangle + g(r) - \langle \hat{y}^k, r \rangle \) for any \( (x, r) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^n \). Hence, we can choose \( r \in \partial g^*(y^k) \) to obtain \( \mathcal{L}(x, r, \hat{y}^k) = \hat{L}(x, \hat{y}^k) \). On the other hand, by (40), we have
\( \hat{L}(x^k, y) \leq \mathcal{L}(x^k, r^k, y) \leq \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x^k, r^k, y) \) for any \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \). Using these relations into (79) and \( y^0 := y^0 \), we can easily derive (22).

(a) From (7), we have \( \hat{g}(x^k, \hat{y}^k) = \hat{L}(x^k, y^*) - \hat{L}(x^k, \hat{y}^k) \). Hence, we obtain (23). The remaining conclusion is a direct consequence of (23).

(b) By \( M_g \)-Lipschitz continuity of \( g \), we have
\[
F(x^k) - F^* \leq f(x^k) + g(r^k) + M_g \| Kx^k - r^k \| - F^* \\
\leq f(x^k) + g(r^k) + \langle \hat{y}^k, Kx^k - r^k \rangle - F^* \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{y}^k := \frac{M_g(Kx^k - r^k)}{\| Kx^k - r^k \|}
\]
\[
\leq \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x^k, r^k, \hat{y}^k) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, r^*, \hat{y}^k).
\]
Here, we use \( \mathcal{L}(x^k, r^k, \hat{y}^k) = f(x^k) + g(r^k) + \langle Kx^k - r^k, \hat{y}^k \rangle \leq \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(x^k, r^k, \hat{y}^k) \) and \( F^* = \mathcal{L}(x^*, r^*, \hat{y}^k) \) in the last inequality.

Substituting \( (x, r, y) = (x^*, r^*, \hat{y}^k) \) and \( y^0 := y^0 \) into (79) and combining the result and (80), we have
\[
F(x^k) - F^* \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[ \frac{\rho_0 \| K \|^2}{\beta_0} \| x^0 - x^* \|^2 + \frac{1}{(1 - \gamma)\rho_0} \| y^0 - \hat{y}^k \|^2 \right].
\]
Since \( \tilde{y}^k := \frac{M_g(Kx^k - r^k)}{\|Kx^k - r^k\|} \), we can show that \( \|y^0 - \tilde{y}^k\|^2 \leq \sup_y \{ \|y^0 - y\|^2 \mid \|y\| \leq M_g \} \). Using this bound into the last inequality, we obtain (25). The remaining statement is a direct consequence of (24). The optimal rate is shown through an example in Subsection 3.3.

(c) For any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^p \) and \( r \in \mathbb{R}^n \), we also have

\[
L(x, r, \tilde{y}^k) = f(x) - \langle -K^\top \tilde{y}^k, x \rangle + g(r) - \langle \tilde{y}^k, r \rangle
\geq -\sup_x \{ \langle -K^\top \tilde{y}^k, x \rangle - f(x) \} - \sup_r \{ \langle \tilde{y}^k, r \rangle - g(r) \}
= -f^*(-K^\top \tilde{y}^k) - g^*(\tilde{y}^k)
= -G(\tilde{y}^k).
\]

Let \( \tilde{x} := \nabla f^*(-K^\top \tilde{y}^k) \in \mathbb{R}^p \) and \( \tilde{r} := \nabla g^*(\tilde{y}^k) \). It is clear that

\[
L(\tilde{x}, \tilde{r}, \tilde{y}^k) = f(\tilde{x}) + g(\tilde{r}) + \langle \tilde{y}^k, K\tilde{x} - \tilde{r} \rangle = -f^*(-K^\top \tilde{y}^k) - g^*(\tilde{y}^k) = -G(\tilde{y}^k).
\]

The last relation together with \( F^* + G^* = 0 \) and \( F^* \leq L(x^k, r^k, y^*) \) imply

\[
G(\tilde{y}^k) - G^* = F^* - L(\tilde{x}, \tilde{r}, \tilde{y}^k) \leq L(x^k, r^k, y^*) - L(\tilde{x}, \tilde{r}, \tilde{y}^k).
\]

Combining this inequality and (79), we finally get

\[
G(\tilde{y}^k) - G^* \leq \frac{\alpha_0\|K\|^2}{2\gamma} \|x^0 - \tilde{x}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2(1 - \gamma)\rho_0 k} \|y^0 - y^*\|^2.
\]

Using the \( M_f \)-Lipschitz continuity of \( f^* \) and \( \tilde{x} := \nabla f^*(-K^\top \tilde{y}^k) \), we have \( \|\tilde{x} - x^0\|^2 \leq \sup_x \{ \|x^0 - x\|^2 \mid \|x\| \leq M_f \} \). Substituting this into the last estimate and \( \tilde{y}^k := y^0 \), we obtain (25). Again, the remaining statement is a direct consequence of (25), and the optimal rate is deferred to Subsection 3.3 due to the symmetry between (1) and (2).

A.3 The proof of Theorem 2: Primal-dual scheme with \( o(\frac{1}{k}) \)-convergence rate

Let us first abbreviate \( \tilde{G}_k := L(x^k, r^k, y^*) - L(x^*, r^*, \tilde{y}^k) \), \( a_k^2 := \frac{\alpha_0}{2\gamma} \|Kx^k - r^k\|^2 \), and \( b_k^2 := \frac{\alpha_0 \rho_0 \|K\|^2}{2\gamma} \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{2(1 - \gamma)\rho_0} \|y^* - \tilde{y}^k\|^2 \). Since \( (x^*, r^*, y^*) \) is a saddle point of the Lagrange function \( L \), it is clear that \( \tilde{G}_k \geq 0 \).

Now, using (20), \( L_p(x, r, y) := L(x, r, y) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|Kx - r\|^2 \), and \( \tilde{G}_k \geq 0 \), we can derive from (17) that

\[
\tilde{G}_{k+1} + (k + c)a^2_{k+1} \leq \frac{k}{k + c}[\tilde{G}_k + (k + c - 1)a_k^2] + \frac{1}{k + c} [b_k^2 - b_{k+1}^2] - \frac{(c - 1)k}{k + c} a_k^2.
\]

Rearranging this estimate, we obtain

\[
(c - 1)[\tilde{G}_k + (k + c - 1)a_k^2] \leq (c - 1)[\tilde{G}_k + (2k + c - 1)a_k^2] 
\leq (k + c - 1)\tilde{G}_k + (k + c - 1)^2a_k^2 + b_k^2
- [(k + c)\tilde{G}_{k+1} + (k + c)^2a^2_{k+1} + b^2_{k+1}].
\]

Clearly, (81) also implies

\[
(k + c)\tilde{G}_{k+1} + (k + c)^2a^2_{k+1} + b^2_{k+1} \leq (k + c - 1)\tilde{G}_k + (k + c - 1)^2a^2_k + b^2_k.
\]
By induction and the definition of $\tilde{G}_k$, we can easily show that

$$\tilde{L}(x^k, y^*) - F^* \leq \mathcal{L}(x^k, r^k, y^*) - F^* = \tilde{G}_k$$

$$= \frac{1}{k+e-1} \left( (c-1)\tilde{G}_0 + (c-1)^2 a_0^2 + b_0^2 \right)$$

(82)

which is exactly (26), where $R_0^2 := \frac{\gamma_0 K \|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{2\gamma} + \frac{1}{2(1-\gamma)\gamma_0} \|y^0 - y^*\|^2$.

Now, summing up (81) from $i = 0$ to $k$, we get

$$(c - 1) \sum_{i=0}^{k} \left[ \tilde{G}_i + (i + c - 1) a_i^2 \right] \leq (c - 1) \tilde{G}_0 + (c - 1)^2 a_0^2 + b_0^2$$

$$- [(k + c)\tilde{G}_{k+1} + (k + c)^2 a_{k+1}^2 + b_{k+1}^2]$$

(83)

If we define $u_k^2 := (k + c - 1)\tilde{G}_k + (k + c - 1)^2 a_k^2$, then (83) implies

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} u_i^2 \leq \frac{u_k^2}{k+c-1} < \infty.$$  

In addition, (83) also shows that $\{ u_k^2 \}$ is bounded. Consequently, $\liminf_{k \to \infty} u_k^2 = 0$. Indeed, assume by contradiction that $\liminf_{k \to \infty} u_k^2 = \bar{u}^2 > 0$ (noting that the lim inf of a bounded sequence always exists, and the non-negativity of $u_k$ ensures that $\liminf_{k \to \infty} u_k^2 \geq 0$). Then by definition, for a given $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\bar{u}^2 - \varepsilon > 0$, there exists $k_\varepsilon \geq 0$ such that for all $k \geq k_\varepsilon$ we have $u_k^2 \geq \bar{u}^2 - \varepsilon$. Hence, the following expression

$$+\infty > \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{u_k^2}{k+c-1} \geq \sum_{k=k_\varepsilon}^{\infty} \frac{u_k^2}{k+c-1} \geq \sum_{k=k_\varepsilon}^{\infty} \bar{u}^2 - \varepsilon = (\bar{u}^2 - \varepsilon) \sum_{k=k_\varepsilon}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k+c-1} = +\infty$$

shows a contradiction. Therefore, $\liminf_{k \to \infty} u_k^2 = 0$. Using the definition of $u_k^2$, $\tilde{G}_k$ and $a_k^2$, this limit leads to

$$\liminf_{k \to \infty} (k + c - 1) \left[ \mathcal{L}(x^k, r^k, y^*) - F^* + \frac{\rho_0 (k + c - 1)}{2} \|Kx^k - r^k\|^2 \right] = 0.$$  

(84)

However, since $0 \leq \tilde{L}(x^k, y^*) - F^* \leq \mathcal{L}(x^k, r^k, y^*) - F^*$, (84) leads to (27).

Finally, by the $M_g$-Lipschitz continuity of $g$, we can show that

$$0 \leq F(x^k) - F^* \leq f(x^k) + g(r^k) - F^* + |g(Kx^k) - g(r^k)|$$

$$\leq f(x^k) + g(r^k) - F^* + M_g \|Kx^k - r^k\|$$

$$\leq \mathcal{L}(x^k, r^k, y^*) - F^* + (\|y^*\| + M_g) \|Kx^k - r^k\|.$$  

(85)

Using the same way as the proof of (82), we can show that

$$\|Kx^k - r^k\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2/\rho_0}{\|y^*\| + M_g} ((c - 1)(F(x^0) - F^*) + R_0^2)^{1/2}}.$$  

Combining this estimate, (82) and (85) we obtain the first assertion of (28). Furthermore, using the limit (84) into (85), and noting that $\min_{0 \leq i \leq k} F(x^i)$ is nonincreasing in $k$, we obtain the second assertion of (28).  

□
B Appendix: Technical proofs in Section 4

Strongly convex case

Given $\hat{x}^k$, $r^{k+1}$, and $\hat{y}^k$, we define the following functions

$$
\hat{\ell}_\rho(x, r) := \phi_\rho(\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k) + \langle \nabla_x \phi_\rho(\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k), x - \hat{x}^k \rangle \\
+ \langle \nabla_r \phi_\rho(\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k), r - r^{k+1} \rangle,
$$

which is (86)

$$
\hat{Q}_\rho(x) := \hat{\ell}_\rho(x, r^{k+1}) + \|\rho \langle K \rangle \|^2 ||x - \hat{x}^k||^2.
$$

The following lemma provides a key step to prove the convergence of Algorithm 2

**Lemma 7** Let $\hat{\ell}_\rho$ and $\hat{Q}_\rho$ be defined by (86), and $\bar{x}^{k+1} := (1 - \tau_k) x^k + \tau_k \bar{x}^{k+1}$. Then

$$
f(\bar{x}^{k+1}) + g(r^{k+1}) + \hat{Q}_\rho_k (\bar{x}^{k+1}) \leq (1 - \tau_k) \left[ F(\hat{x}^k) + \hat{\ell}_\rho_k (x^k, r^k) \right] \\
+ \tau_k \left[ F(z) + \hat{\ell}_\rho_k(x, r) \right] + \frac{\tau_k^2}{2} \|\bar{x}^k - x\|^2 - \frac{\tau_k^2 + \tau_k \beta \kappa \mu}{2} \|\bar{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2
$$

(87)

The proof follows from (86), we can easily show that

$$
\hat{Q}_\rho_k (\bar{x}^{k+1}) = (1 - \tau_k) \hat{\ell}_\rho_k (x^k, r^k) + \tau_k \hat{\ell}_\rho_k (\bar{x}^{k+1}, r^{k+1}) + \frac{\mu \tau_k^2 \|\kappa\|^2}{2} \|\bar{x}^{k+1} - \bar{x}^k\|^2
$$

(88)

Utilizing again $\bar{x}^{k+1} := (1 - \tau_k) x^k + \tau_k \bar{x}^{k+1}$, the $\mu_f$-strong convexity of $f$, and the convexity of $g$, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we can derive

$$
f(\bar{x}^{k+1}) \leq (1 - \tau_k) f(x^k) + \tau_k f(x) + \tau_k \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}^{k+1}), \bar{x}^{k+1} - x \rangle \\
- \frac{\tau_k \mu}{2} \|\bar{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2 - \frac{\tau_k (1 - \tau_k) \mu}{2} \|\bar{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2,
$$

(89)

g(r^{k+1}) \leq (1 - \tau_k) g(r^k) + \tau_k g(r) + \langle \nabla g(r^{k+1}), r^{k+1} - (1 - \tau_k) r^k - \tau_k r \rangle,

where $\nabla f(\bar{x}^{k+1}) \in \partial f(\bar{x}^{k+1})$ and $\nabla g(r^{k+1}) \in \partial g(r^{k+1})$.

Moreover, from (86), we can also write $\hat{\ell}_\rho_k$ as

$$
\hat{\ell}_\rho_k (\bar{x}^{k+1}, r^{k+1}) = \hat{\ell}_\rho_k (x, r) + \langle \nabla_x \phi_\rho_k (\bar{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k), \bar{x}^{k+1} - x \rangle + \langle \nabla_r \phi_\rho_k (\bar{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k), r^{k+1} - r \rangle.
$$

Combining (88), (89), and the last expression, we obtain

$$
P_k (\bar{x}^{k+1}) := f(\bar{x}^{k+1}) + g(r^{k+1}) + \hat{Q}_\rho_k (\bar{x}^{k+1})
$$

$$
\leq (1 - \tau_k) \left[ f(x^k) + g(r^k) + \hat{\ell}_\rho_k (x^k, r^k) \right] + \tau_k \left[ f(x) + g(r) + \hat{\ell}_\rho_k (x, r) \right] \\
+ \tau_k \left[ \nabla f(\bar{x}^{k+1}) + \nabla_x \phi_\rho_k (\bar{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k), \bar{x}^{k+1} - x \right] - \frac{\tau_k \mu}{2} \|\bar{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2
$$

(90)

$$
+ \langle \nabla g(r^{k+1}) + \nabla_r \phi_\rho_k (\bar{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k), r^{k+1} - (1 - \tau_k) r^k - \tau_k r \rangle
$$

$$
+ \frac{\mu \tau_k^2 \|\kappa\|^2}{2} \|\bar{x}^{k+1} - \bar{x}^k\|^2 - \frac{\tau_k (1 - \tau_k) \mu}{2} \|\bar{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2.
$$

Now, by the optimality conditions of the two subproblems in (91), we can write

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nabla f(\bar{x}^{k+1}) + \nabla_x \phi_\rho_k (\bar{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k) &= \frac{\tau_k}{\rho_k} (\bar{x}^{k} - \bar{x}^{k+1}), \\
\nabla g(r^{k+1}) + \nabla_r \phi_\rho_k (\bar{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k) &= 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

\begin{aligned}
\nabla f(\bar{x}^{k+1}) \in \partial f(\bar{x}^{k+1}), \\
\nabla g(r^{k+1}) \in \partial g(r^{k+1}).
\end{aligned}
Substituting them into (90), and then using the following elementary identity

$$2(\tilde{x}^k - \tilde{x}^{k+1}, \tilde{x}^{k+1} - x) = \|\tilde{x}^k - x\|^2 - \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2 - \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - \tilde{x}^k\|^2,$$

and \(\tilde{x}^{k+1} - \tilde{x}^k = \tau_k(\tilde{x}^{k+1} - \tilde{x}^k)\), we can further estimate (90) as

\[
P_k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) := f(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) + g(r^{k+1}) + \hat{Q}_{\rho_k}(\tilde{x}^{k+1})
\leq (1 - \tau_k) \left[ f(x^k) + g(r^k) + \hat{\ell}_{\rho_k}(x^k, r^k) \right] + \tau_k \left[ f(x) + g(r) + \hat{\ell}_{\rho_k}(x, r) \right]
+ \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\beta_k} \|x^k - x\|^2 - \frac{\tau_k^2 + \tau_k \beta_k \mu L}{2\beta_k} \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2
- \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \beta_k \|K\|^2}{\mu L} \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - \tilde{x}^k\|^2,
\]

which is exactly (87).

\[\Box\]

**B.1 The proof of Lemma 4: One-iteration analysis**

Using \(\hat{Q}_\rho\) from (86), we can write the third line of (32) as

\[x^{k+1} = \arg\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ f(x) + \hat{Q}_{\rho_k}(x) \right\}.\]

Since \(f\) is \(\mu_f\)-strongly convex, this strongly convex minimization leads to

\[f(x^{k+1}) + \hat{Q}_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}) \leq f(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) + \hat{Q}_{\rho_k}(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) - \frac{\rho_k \|K\|^2 + \mu \mu L}{2} \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x^{k+1}\|^2.\]  

(91)

Moreover, we have \(\phi_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k) \leq \hat{Q}_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1})\) by (63). Substituting this inequality into (91), we can derive

\[L_{\rho_k}(z^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k) = f(x^{k+1}) + g(r^{k+1}) + \phi_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, x^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k)
\leq f(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) + g(r^{k+1}) + \hat{Q}_{\rho_k}(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) - \frac{\rho_k \|K\|^2 + \mu \mu L}{2} \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x^{k+1}\|^2.\]  

(92)

Next, using (86) and (63), we can show that

\[
\phi_{\rho_k}(x^k, r^k, \hat{y}^k) = \hat{\ell}_{\rho_k}(x^k, r^k) + \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|K(x^k - \hat{x}^k) - (r^k - r^{k+1})\|^2,
\phi_{\rho_k}(x, r, \hat{y}^k) = \hat{\ell}_{\rho_k}(x, r) + \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|K\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1} - (Kx - r)\|^2.
\]

Combining these equalities, (92), and (87) from Lemma 7, we can further estimate

\[L_{\rho_k}(z^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k) \leq (1 - \tau_k) L_{\rho_k}(z^k, \hat{y}^k) + \tau_k L_{\rho_k}(x, r, \hat{y}^k)
+ \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\beta_k} \|x^k - x\|^2 - \frac{\tau_k^2 + \tau_k \beta_k \mu L}{2\beta_k} \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2
- \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \beta_k \|K\|^2}{\mu L} \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - \tilde{x}^k\|^2
- \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \beta_k \|K\|^2}{\mu L} \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x^{k+1}\|^2.\]  

(93)

Now, by the definition of \(L_\rho\) and \(\hat{y}^{k+1} := \hat{y}^k + \eta_k(Kx^{k+1} - r^{k+1} - (1 - \tau_k)(Kx^k - r^k))\), from (31) we have

\[L_{\rho_k}(z^{k+1}, y) - (1 - \tau_k) L_{\rho_k}(z^k, y) = L_{\rho_k}(z^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k) - (1 - \tau_k) L_{\rho_k}(z^k, \hat{y}^k)
+ \frac{1}{2\beta_k} [\|y - \hat{y}^k\|^2 - \|y - \hat{y}^{k+1}\|^2 + \|\hat{y}^{k+1} - \hat{y}^k\|^2].\]  

(94)
Combining $\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(z^k, y) = \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k-1}(z^k, y) + \frac{(\rho_k - \rho_k-1)}{2} \|Kx^k - r^k\|^2$, (93), (94), and (72), and then using (75), we further derive

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(z^{k+1}, y) \leq (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k-1}(z^{k}, y) + \left[\mathcal{L}(z, \hat{y}^{k+1}) - (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}(z, \hat{y}^k)\right]$$

$$- \frac{\rho_k}{2} \left\| \left( K\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1} \right) - (1 - \tau_k) \left( Kx^k - r^k \right) \right\|^2$$

$$+ \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\eta_k} \|\hat{x}^k - x\|^2 - \left( \frac{\tau_k^2 + \tau_k \beta_k \mu_f}{2\eta_k} \right) \|\hat{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2$$

$$- \frac{(1 - \tau_k)}{2} \left[ \rho_k(1 - \tau_k)\rho_k \right] \|Kx^k - r^k\|^2 \left[ (1 - \rho_k)\beta_k K^2 \right] \|\hat{x}^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2\eta_k} \left[ \|y - \hat{y}^k\|^2 - \|y - \hat{y}^{k+1}\|^2 \right] + \|\hat{y}^{k+1} - \hat{y}^k\|^2.$$ (95)

Recalling the bound of $\mathcal{T}_5$ from (77) as

$$\mathcal{T}_5 := \frac{\rho_k}{2} \left\| \left( K\hat{x}^k - r^{k+1} \right) - (1 - \tau_k) \left( Kx^k - r^k \right) \right\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\eta_k} \|\hat{y}^{k+1} - \hat{y}^k\|^2$$

$$\geq - \frac{\rho_k \eta_k}{2(\rho_k - \eta_k)} K \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2.$$

Substituting the lower bound of $\mathcal{T}_5$ into (95) and noting that $\rho_k > \eta_k$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(z^{k+1}, y) \leq (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k-1}(z^{k}, y) + \left[\mathcal{L}(z, \hat{y}^{k+1}) - (1 - \tau_k)\mathcal{L}(z, \hat{y}^k)\right]$$

$$+ \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\eta_k} \|\hat{x}^k - x\|^2 - \left( \frac{\tau_k^2 + \tau_k \beta_k \mu_f}{2\eta_k} \right) \|\hat{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2\eta_k} \left[ \|y - \hat{y}^k\|^2 - \|y - \hat{y}^{k+1}\|^2 \right] - \hat{T}_1,$$ (96)

where $\hat{T}_1$ is defined as

$$\hat{T}_1 := \frac{(1 - \tau_k)}{2} \left[ \rho_k(1 - \tau_k)\rho_k \right] \|Kx^k - r^k\|^2 \left[ (1 - \rho_k)\beta_k K^2 \right] \|\hat{x}^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2$$

$$- \frac{\rho_k \eta_k}{2(\rho_k - \eta_k)} K \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2 + \frac{\tau_k(1 - \tau_k) \mu_f}{2\eta_k} \|\hat{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2 + \left( \frac{\rho_k \beta_k K^2 + \mu_f}{2\eta_k} \right) \|\hat{x}^{k+1} - x^k\|^2.$$

Since $\rho_k \beta_k K^2 < 1$, if we define $m_k := \frac{1 - \rho_k \beta_k K^2}{\beta_k} > 0$ and $n_k := \rho_k K^2 + \mu_f > 0$, then, by elementary calculation and $\frac{\rho_k K^2 + \mu_f}{\beta_k + \rho_k \mu_f} > \rho_k K^2$, we can show that

$$m_k \|\hat{x}^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2 + n_k \|\hat{x}^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \geq \frac{m_k \eta_k}{m_k + n_k} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2$$

$$\geq \frac{m_k \eta_k}{(m_k + n_k) K^2} \|K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)\|^2$$

$$\geq \rho_k (1 - \rho_k \beta_k K^2) \|K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)\|^2.$$

Therefore, we can bound $\hat{T}_1$ that

$$\hat{T}_1 \geq \frac{\rho_k}{2} \left( 1 - \rho_k \beta_k K^2 - \frac{\eta_k}{\rho_k - \eta_k} \right) \|K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)\|^2 + \frac{(1 - \tau_k)}{2} \left[ \rho_k(1 - \tau_k)\rho_k \right] \|Kx^k - r^k\|^2.$$

Substituting the lower bound of $\hat{T}_1$ into (96), we finally get (33). □
B.2 The proof of Theorem 4: $o(\frac{1}{k^2})$-Convergence Rate

Similar to the proof of Theorem 2, we define $\tilde{G}_k := \mathcal{L}(x^k, r^k, y^*) - \mathcal{L}(x^*, r^*, y^k)$, $\mathcal{R}_k := \frac{\mu}{2} \|Kx^k - r^k\|^2$, $a_k^2 := \frac{1}{4} \|x^k - x^*\|^2$, $b_k^2 := \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \|y^* - y^k\|^2$, and $\bar{L} := \frac{\mu}{2} \|K\|^2$. It is clear that $\tilde{G}_k \geq 0$ since $(x^*, r^*, y^*)$ is a saddle point of $\mathcal{L}$.

Next, using these notations, and (43), we can rewrite (33) in Lemma 4 as follows:

$$
\tilde{G}_{k+1} + (k + c)^2 \mathcal{R}_{k+1} \leq \frac{k}{k+c} [\tilde{G}_k + (k + c - 1)^2 \mathcal{R}_k] + \frac{1}{(k+c)^2} [k^2 - b_{k+1}^2] + \bar{L}a_k^2 - \left(\bar{L} + \frac{\mu c}{k+c}\right) a_k^2 + \frac{k((c-2)k^2 + c^2) + 1}{k+c} \mathcal{R}_k.
$$

Multiplying both sides of this estimate by $(k + c)^2$ and rearranging the result, we get

$$(k + c)^2 \tilde{G}_{k+1} + (k + c)^4 \mathcal{R}_{k+1} + \left[\bar{L}(k + c)^2 + \mu f c(k + c)\right] a_k^2 + b_{k+1}^2 \leq (k + c) \tilde{G}_k + k^2(k + c)^2 \mathcal{R}_k + \bar{L}(k + c)^2 a_k^2 + b_k^2.
$$

Define $A_k := (k + c - 1)^2 \tilde{G}_k + (k + c - 1)^4 \mathcal{R}_k + \left[\bar{L}(k + c - 1)^2 + \mu f c(k + c - 1)\right] a_k^2 + b_k^2$. Then, if we choose $\rho_0 \leq \frac{\gamma \mu c}{c(2c-1) \|K\|^2}$, then we have $\bar{L}(k + c)^2 \leq \bar{L}(k + c - 1)^2 + \mu f c(k + c - 1)$. Overestimating and rearranging the last inequality, we can show that

$$
A_{k+1} \leq A_k - \left[(c - 2)k + (c - 1)^2\right] \tilde{G}_k - \varphi(k) \mathcal{R}_k,
$$

where

$$
\varphi(k) := 2(c - 2)k^2 (k + c) + 2(k - 1)^2 k^2 (k + c) + (c - 2)(k - 1)^2 k^2 + (c - 1)^4 \geq (c - 2)(k + c - 1)^3.
$$

Since $c > 2$, we can overestimate the above inequality as

$$
0 \leq [(c - 2)(k + c - 1) \tilde{G}_k + (k + c - 1)^3 \mathcal{R}_k] \leq A_k - A_{k+1}.
$$

This inequality shows that $\{A_k\}$ is non-increasing. By induction and the definitions of $A_k$ and $\tilde{G}$, we can show that

$$
\tilde{L}(x^k, y^*) - F^* - F^* - F^* - \tilde{G}_k \leq \frac{1}{(k+c-1)^2} A_k \leq \frac{1}{(k+c-1)^2} A_0,
$$

where $A_0 := (c - 1)^2 \tilde{G}_0 + (c - 1)^4 \mathcal{R}_0 + \left[\bar{L}(c - 1)^2 + c(c - 1)\mu f\right] a_0^2 + b_0^2$. This proves the first assertion of (44).

Let us define $u_k^2 := (k + c - 1)^2 \tilde{G}_k + (k + c - 1)^4 \mathcal{R}_k$. Then, summing up the inequality (32) from $i = 0$ to $k$ for any $k \geq 0$, we get

$$
\sum_{i=0}^{k} \frac{u_i^2}{k+c-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [(k + c - 1) \tilde{G}_k + (k + c - 1)^3 \mathcal{R}_k] = \frac{A_0 - A_k}{c - 2} < +\infty
$$

With the same proof as in Theorem 2, we can show that $\liminf_{k \to \infty} u_k^2 = 0$. That is

$$
\liminf_{k \to \infty} [(k + c - 1)^2 \tilde{G}_k + (k + c - 1)^4 \mathcal{R}_k] = 0
$$

By the definitions of $\tilde{G}_k$ and $\mathcal{R}_k$, the last limit leads to

$$
\liminf_{k \to \infty} \left[(k + c - 1)^2 [\mathcal{L}(x^k, r^k, y^*) - F^*] + \rho_0(k + c - 1)^4 \|Kx^k - r^k\|^2\right] = 0.
$$

With the same proof as in Theorem 2, we can prove the second assertion of (44). Moreover, using (98), we can also show that $F(x^k) - F^* \leq O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ and $\liminf_{k \to \infty} (k + c - 1)^2 [F(x^k) - F^*] = 0$, which exactly leads to (45).
C Appendix: Technical proofs in Section 5: The sum of three objectives

We provide the full proof of Theorem 5 and Theorem 6.

C.1 The proof of Theorem 5: The sum of three objective functions

Step 1: Key estimate: We first write down the optimality condition of \(x^{k+1} := \text{prox}_{\beta_k f}(\hat{x}^k - \beta_k (\nabla x \phi p_k(\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k) + \nabla \psi(\hat{x}^k)))\) from (19) as

\[
0 \in \partial f(x^{k+1}) + \nabla x \phi p_k(\hat{x}^k, r^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k) + \nabla \psi(\hat{x}^k) + \frac{1}{\beta_k} (x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k).
\]

(99)

By convexity and \(L_\psi\)-smoothness of \(\psi\), for any \(x \in \mathbb{R}^p\), we have

\[
\psi(x^{k+1}) \leq \psi(\hat{x}^k) + \langle \nabla \psi(\hat{x}^k), x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k \rangle + \frac{L_\psi}{2} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2
\]

\[
\leq \psi(x) + \langle \nabla \psi(\hat{x}^k), x^{k+1} - x \rangle + \frac{L_\psi}{2} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2.
\]

(100)

Combining (99), (100), (66), and (67), then using \(\mathcal{L}_\rho(z, y) := f(x) + \psi(x) + g(r) + \phi_\rho(x, r, y)\), we arrive at

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(z^{k+1}, \tilde{y}^k) \leq \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(z, \tilde{y}^k) + \frac{1}{\beta_k} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k \|^2 - \frac{1}{\beta_k} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k \|^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)\|^2 - \frac{\rho_k}{2} \|K(x - \hat{x}^k) - (r - r^{k+1})\|^2 + \frac{L_\psi}{2} \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2.
\]

(101)

With the same proof as (84) but using (101), we get

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(z^{k+1}, y) \leq (1 - \tau_k) \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(z^k, y) + \left[\mathcal{L}(z, \tilde{y}^{k+1}) - (1 - \tau_k) \mathcal{L}(z, \tilde{y}^k)\right]
\]

\[
+ \frac{\tau_k}{2 \beta_k} \|\tilde{x}^k - x\|^2 - \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2 + \frac{1}{2 \eta_k} \left\|y - \tilde{y}^k\|^2 - \|y - \tilde{y}^{k+1}\|^2\right\| - \mathcal{T}_1,
\]

(102)

where \(\mathcal{T}_1\) is defined as

\[
\mathcal{T}_1 := \frac{(1 - \tau_k)}{2} \left[\rho_{k-1} - (1 - \tau_k) \rho_k\right] \|Kx^k - r^k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{\beta_k} - L_\psi\right] \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2
\]

\[
- \frac{\rho_k^2}{2 (\rho_k - \eta_k)} \|K(x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k)\|^2
\]

\[
\geq \frac{(1 - \tau_k)}{2} \left[\rho_{k-1} - (1 - \tau_k) \rho_k\right] \|Kx^k - r^k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{\beta_k} - L_\psi - \frac{\rho_k^2 \|K\|^2}{\rho_k - \eta_k}\right] \|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}^k\|^2.
\]

Step 2: Parameter update: Define \(A_k := \mathcal{L}_{\rho_{k-1}}(z^k, y) - \mathcal{L}(z, \tilde{y}^k) + \frac{\tau_k^2}{2 \beta_k} \|x^k - x\|^2 + \frac{1}{2 \eta_k} \|\tilde{y}^k - y\|^2\). To obtain \(A_{k+1} \leq (1 - \tau_k) A_k\) from (102), we impose

\[
\begin{cases}
\frac{1}{\beta_k} - L_\psi - \frac{\rho_k^2 \|K\|^2}{\rho_k - \eta_k} \geq 0, \\
\frac{\tau_k^2}{\beta_k (1 - \tau_k)} \eta_k \leq \frac{\tau_k^2}{\beta_k (1 - \tau_k)}, \\
\rho_{k-1} \geq (1 - \tau_k) \rho_k, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_{k-1} \leq (1 - \tau_k) \eta_k.
\end{cases}
\]

For \(c \geq 1, \gamma \in (0, 1), \) and \(\rho_0 > 0\), if we update the parameters as

\[
\tau_k := \frac{c}{c + 1}, \quad \rho_k := \frac{\rho_0}{1 - \tau_k}, \quad \beta_k := \frac{\gamma}{\|K\|^2 \rho_k + L_\psi}, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k := (1 - \gamma) \rho_k,
\]

(103)

then they tightly satisfy all the above conditions as long as \(c = 1\).

Step 3: Convergence analysis: Using the update rule (103), with a similar proof as of Theorem 1, we have

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x^k, y) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x, \tilde{y}^k) \leq \frac{1}{2 k \beta_0} \|x^0 - x\|^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_0} \|y^0 - y\|^2.
\]
Now, since we choose \( \beta_0 := \frac{\gamma}{\rho_0} \) and \( \rho_0 \) as in Theorem 1, we get
\[
\tilde{L}(x^k,y) - \tilde{L}(x,\hat{y}^k) \leq \frac{1}{2k} \left[ \left( \frac{\rho_0 \| K \|_2^2 + \gamma L_{\psi} \right) \frac{\| x^0 - x \|^2 + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)} \| y^0 - y \|^2 }{\gamma} \right].
\]

The remaining conclusion of Theorem 5 is proved as in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 using the last estimate. We omit the details here.

C.2 The proof of Theorem 6

Nonstrongly convex constrained problem

Since (103) is a special case of (46) when \( g^*(y) := \langle b, y \rangle \) and \( r := b \), if we define \( L(x, y) := f(x) + \psi(x) + (Kx - b, y) \) and \( L_p(x, y) := f(x) + \psi(x) + (Kx - b, y) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \| Kx - b \|^2 \), then, by Theorem 5 and (103), we have
\[
L_{p_k-1}(x^k, y) - L(x, \hat{y}^k) \leq \frac{1}{2k} \left[ \left( \frac{\rho_0 \| K \|_2^2 + \gamma L_{\psi} \right) \frac{\| x^0 - x \|^2 + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)} \| y^0 - y \|^2 }{\gamma} \right] ,
\]
for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^p \), \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

Since \( L(x^*, \hat{y}^k) = F^* \), by letting \( \bar{R}_0(y) := \left( \frac{\rho_0 \| K \|_2^2 + \gamma L_{\psi} \right) \frac{\| x^0 - x \|^2 + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)} \| y^0 - y \|^2 }{\gamma} \) implies
\[
F(x^k) + \langle y, Kx^k - b \rangle + \frac{\rho_0}{2} \| Kx^k - b \|^2 - F^* \leq \frac{\bar{R}_0(y)}{2k}, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

Therefore, we can show that for any \( \Delta > 0 \), the last inequality leads to
\[
F(x^k) - F^* + \Delta \| Kx^k - b \| + \frac{\rho_0}{2\Delta} \| Kx^k - b \|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2k} \sup \left\{ \bar{R}_0(y) \mid \| y \| \leq \Delta \right\}.
\]

It is not hard to show that \( \bar{R}_0(y) := \sup \{ \bar{R}_0(y) \mid \| y \| \leq \Delta \} = \left( \frac{\rho_0 \| K \|_2^2 + \gamma L_{\psi} \right) \frac{\| x^0 - x \|^2 + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)} \| y^0 \|^2 }{\gamma} \). On the other hand, we have \( F(x^k) + \langle y^*, Kx^k - b \rangle \leq L(x^k, y^*) \geq F^* \), which implies that \( F(x^k) - F^* \geq -\| y^* \| \| Kx^k - b \| \). Combining these expressions, we obtain
\[
\begin{cases} 
(\Delta - \| y^* \|) \| Kx^k - b \| + \frac{\rho_0}{2} \| Kx^k - b \|^2 \leq \frac{\bar{R}_0}{2k} \\
-\| y^* \| \| Kx^k - b \| \leq F(x^k) - F^* \leq \frac{\bar{R}_0}{2k}.
\end{cases}
\]

Let us choose \( \Delta := 2 \| y^* \| \), we obtain (54).

Next, let \( \hat{x} := \nabla F^* \left( -K^\top \hat{y}^k \right) \in \partial F^* \left( -K^\top \hat{y}^k \right) \), we have
\[
G(\hat{y}^k) - G^* = \sup_x \left\{ \langle -K^\top \hat{y}^k, x \rangle - f(x) - \psi(x) \right\} + \langle b, \hat{y}^k \rangle + F^*
\leq L(x^k, y^*) - f(\hat{x}) - \psi(\hat{x}) - \langle K\hat{x} - b, \hat{y}^k \rangle
\leq L(x^k, y^*) - L(\hat{x}, \hat{y}^k).
\]

Since \( \text{dom}(F) \) is bounded, we have
\[
\| \hat{x} - x^0 \|^2 \leq \sup \left\{ \| x - x^0 \|^2 \mid x \in \text{dom}(F) \right\} \leq D^2_X.
\]

Combining these two last inequalities and (104), we finally obtain (55).

The proof of (56) is very similar to the proof of (54) but using the result of Theorem 2.

We omit the details.
C.3 The proof of Theorem 7: Semi-strongly convex constrained problems

Let \( \hat{\phi}_\rho(x, w, y) := \langle y, Ax + Bw - b \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|Ax + Bw - b\|^2 \). Given \( \hat{x}^k, w^{k+1}, \) and \( \hat{y}^k \), we define the following functions

\[
\tilde{\ell}_\rho(x, w) := \hat{\phi}_\rho(\hat{x}^k, w^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k) + (\nabla_A \hat{\phi}_\rho(\hat{x}^k, w^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k), x - \hat{x}^k) \\
+ (\nabla_w \hat{\phi}_\rho(\hat{x}^k, w^{k+1}, \hat{y}^k), w - w^{k+1}),
\]

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\rho(x) := \tilde{\ell}_\rho(x, w^{k+1}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - \hat{x}^k\|^2.
\]

Now, combining (107), (108), (109), and (110), for any \( x^k, w^{k+1}, \) and \( \hat{y}^k \), we have

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\rho(x) - \mathcal{Q}_\rho(x^k) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\hat{x}^k - x\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - \hat{x}^k\|^2.
\]

Next, note that

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\rho(x) = \tilde{\ell}_\rho(x) + \mathcal{Q}_\rho(x) + \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\rho(x) - \mathcal{Q}_\rho(x^k).
\]

Combining (107), (108), (109), and (110), for any \( z := (x, w) \in \text{dom}(F) \), we can derive

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\rho(x) - \mathcal{Q}_\rho(x^k) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\hat{x}^k - x\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - \hat{x}^k\|^2.
\]

Proof Since \( \hat{x}^k = (1 - \tau_k)w^{k+1} + \tau_k \hat{w}^{k+1} \), we have \( (1 - \tau_k)w^{k+1} + \tau_k \hat{w}^{k+1} = 0 \) and \( \hat{x}^{k+1} - \hat{x} = \tau_k (\hat{x}^{k+1} - \hat{x}) \). Using these expressions, \( x^{k+1} := (x, w), \) \( \tilde{\ell}_\rho \) and \( \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\rho \) in (105), we can derive

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\rho(x^{k+1}) = (1 - \tau_k)\tilde{\ell}_\rho(x^k) + \tau_k \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\rho(x^{k+1}) + \frac{\mu \tau_k^2}{2} \|\hat{x}^{k+1} - \hat{x}\|^2.
\]

By the convexity of \( \psi \) and \( w^{k+1} - (1 - \tau_k)w^k = \tau_k \hat{w}^{k+1} \), for any \( w \in \text{dom}(\psi) \) and \( \nabla \psi(w^{k+1}) \in \partial \psi(w^{k+1}) \), we can estimate that

\[
\psi(w^{k+1}) \leq (1 - \tau_k)\psi(w^k) + \tau_k \psi(w) + \tau_k \langle \nabla \psi(w^{k+1}), \hat{w}^{k+1} - w \rangle,
\]

Since \( \hat{x}^{k+1} := (1 - \tau_k)w^{k} + \tau_k \hat{w}^{k+1} \), by \( f \)-convexity of \( f \), for any \( x \in \text{dom}(f) \) and \( \nabla f(\hat{x}^{k+1}) \in \partial f(\hat{x}^{k+1}) \), we have

\[
f(\hat{x}^{k+1}) \leq (1 - \tau_k) f(x^k) + \tau_k f(x) + \tau_k \langle \nabla f(\hat{x}^{k+1}), \hat{x}^{k+1} - x \rangle - \frac{\tau_k \mu}{2} \|\hat{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2.
\]
Now, from the optimality condition of the $w^{k+1}$- and $\tilde{x}^{k+1}$-subproblems in (58), we can show that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{D}_\rho_k \left[ F(x^k, w^k) + \tilde{\ell}_\rho_k(x^k, w^k) \right] + \tau_k \left[ F(x, w) + \tilde{\ell}_\rho_k(x, w) \right] \\
&\quad + \nu_0 \frac{\tau_k^2}{2} \left( \|x^k - x\|^2 - \|x - \tilde{x}^{k+1} - w\|^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \nu_0 \frac{\tau_k^2}{2} \left( \|w - w^k\|^2 - \|w^k + 1 - \tilde{w}^k\|^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau_k^2 \beta_k}{2} \left( \|x^k - x\|^2 - \|x - \tilde{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2 \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{\tau_k (1 - \tau_k) \eta_k}{2} \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2,
\end{aligned}
$$

which is exactly (60). \hfill \blacksquare

**Proof (The proof of Theorem 7)** First, using (106) from Lemma 8 with the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4, we can show that

$$
\tilde{g}_{k+1}(x, w, y) \leq (1 - \tau_k) \tilde{g}_k(x, w, y) + \frac{\tau_k^2}{2\beta_k} \|\tilde{x}^k - x\|^2 + \frac{\tau_k^2 \beta_k \mu_k}{2} \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x\|^2 \\
+ \frac{1}{2 \beta_k} \left( \|y - \tilde{y}\|^2 - \|y - \tilde{y}^{k+1}\|^2 \right) - \frac{\eta_k}{2} \left[ 1 - \rho_k \beta_k \|A\|^2 - \frac{m}{m - \rho_k} \right] \|A(x^{k+1} - \tilde{x}^k)\|^2 \\
+ \frac{\nu_0 \tau_k^2}{2} \|\tilde{x}^k - w\|^2 - \frac{\nu_0 \tau_k^2}{2} \|\tilde{w}^{k+1} - w\|^2 \\
- \frac{(1 - \tau_k) \eta_k}{2} \|A_x x + B w - b\|^2,
$$

where $\tilde{g}_{k+1}(x, w, y) := \mathcal{L}_{\rho_k}(x^{k+1}, w^{k+1}, y) - \mathcal{L}(x, w, y)$.

If we update the parameter as in (36), then following the proof of (35), (114) leads to

$$
\tilde{g}_k(x, w, y) \leq \frac{\omega_k - 1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{\beta_0} \|x^0 - x\|^2 + \nu_0 \|w^0 - w\|^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_0} \|y^0 - y\|^2 \right],
$$

where $\omega_k := \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - \tau_i)$. With (115), the proof of (60) follows from (115) with the same argument as in Theorem 6.

The proof of (60) follows the same way as the proof of (111), and we omit the details. \hfill \blacksquare
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