

Finitely Convergent Deterministic and Stochastic Iterative Methods for Solving Convex Feasibility Problems

Victor I. Kolobov*

Simeon Reich†

Rafał Zalas‡

March 18, 2022

Abstract

We propose finitely convergent methods for solving convex feasibility problems defined over a possibly infinite pool of constraints. Following other works in this area, we assume that the interior of the solution set is nonempty and that certain overrelaxation parameters form a divergent series. We combine our methods with a very general class of deterministic control sequences where, roughly speaking, we require that sooner or later we encounter a violated constraint if one exists. This requirement is satisfied, in particular, by the cyclic, repetitive and remotest set controls. Moreover, it is almost surely satisfied for random controls.

Keywords: Metric projection, random control, repetitive control, subgradient projection.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 47J25, 47N10, 90C25.

1 Introduction

The *convex feasibility problem* (CFP) is one of the fundamental problems in optimization. It is mainly used for (but not limited to) modeling problems in which finding a solution satisfying a given list of constraints is satisfactory, whereas obtaining the optimal solution is not necessary. In this paper we consider the following variant of the CFP defined in a real Hilbert space \mathcal{H} : Find $x \in C \cap Q$ with $C := \bigcap_{i \in I} C_i$. We assume that each one of the sets C_i , $i \in I$, as well as Q , is closed and convex and $I := \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$.

Oftentimes it is convenient to represent the constraint set C_i as the fixed point set of an operator $T_i: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, which satisfies certain conditions – a variation of firm nonexpansivity. In particular, one can use the metric projection P_{C_i} , the proximal operator Prox_{f_i} (when C_i is the set of minimizers of a proper, l.s.c. and convex function f_i) or the subgradient projection P_{f_i} (when C_i is the sublevel set of a real-valued, l.s.c. and convex function f_i). Note, however, that in some cases P_{f_i} may happen to be discontinuous (see [3, Example 29.47]). For this reason, in this paper we consider a class of operators called *cutters*, which, by some authors, are also called *finitely quasi-nonexpansive*; see [3, Definition 4.1]. A comprehensive overview of this class, citing many relevant references, can be found in [10]. Here we only note that in view of [10, Theorem 2.2.5], a cutter can be considered a generalization of a firmly nonexpansive mapping, provided it has a fixed point.

There is a great number of deterministic and stochastic Fejér monotone algorithms designed for solving the CFP, which are governed by cutter operators; see, for example, [1, 2, 6, 8, 10,

*Department of Computer Science, The Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, 32000 Haifa, Israel, kolobov.victor@gmail.com

†Department of Mathematics, The Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, 32000 Haifa, Israel, sreich@technion.ac.il

‡Department of Mathematics, The Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, 32000 Haifa, Israel, rzalas@campus.technion.ac.il

11, 12, 15, 16, 23, 27] to name but a few. A typical result ensures the asymptotic convergence of the generated iterates. For example, this can be weak, norm or linear convergence, but also their stochastic versions. A potential drawback, when using these algorithms, is that the produced iterates may never be feasible, unlike the limit point to which they converge. An example of such a situation has recently been given in [26, Theorem 7].

The purpose of this paper is to propose a modification of the iterative method discussed in [1], so that the sequence of the generated iterates reaches the solution set $C \cap Q$ within a finite number of steps in the presence of the following constraint qualification: $\text{int}(C) \cap Q \neq \emptyset$. We emphasize here that our approach is not the only way of achieving finite convergence. Other results that discuss this topic can be found, for instance, in [4, 5, 14, 20, 22, 25, 28].

To be more precise, we focus on a projected version of the framework considered in [1], which can be formulated as follows:

$$x_0 \in Q, \quad x_{k+1} := P_Q \left(x_k + \alpha_k \sum_{i \in I_k(x_k)} \lambda_{i,k}(x_k) (T_i(x_k) - x_k) \right), \quad (1.1)$$

where $\alpha_k \in (0, 2]$ is the *relaxation parameter*, the weights $\lambda_{i,k}(x_k) \in [0, 1]$ satisfy $\sum_{i \in I_k} \lambda_{i,k}(x_k) = 1$ and $I_k(x_k) \subset I$ is a nonempty and finite set of indices. The idea of the above-mentioned modification is to extend each nonzero vector $(T_i(x_k) - x_k)$ from (1.1) by a scalar $r_{[k]}/\varphi_i(x_k)$, where $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^\infty \subset (0, \infty)$ is a sequence of small *overrelaxation* parameters, $[k] \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ counts all the correction steps up to the k -th iterate and $\varphi_i(x_k) \in (0, \infty)$ satisfies a certain boundedness condition; see Theorem 4.7.

We observed, that after such a modification, whenever we do a correction step ($x_{k+1} \neq x_k$), we move towards an interior point $z \in \text{int}(C) \cap Q$ under the assumption that the overrelaxation parameter $r_{[k]}$ is small enough. In particular, we show that

$$\|x_{k+1} - z\|^2 \leq \|x_k - z\|^2 - 2MRr_{[k]}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $M > 0$ is some constant and $B(z, 2R) \subseteq C$. It is not difficult to see that by repeatedly applying the above inequality one could arrive at a contradiction knowing that correction steps happen a considerable number of times and $\sum_{k=0}^\infty r_k = \infty$. This simple argument suggests that eventually we should encounter an iterate $x_k \in C \cap Q$ for some k .

Special cases of our framework can be found in the literature; see, for example, [13, 18, 24], where $\varphi_i(x_k) := \|g_i(x_k)\|$ ($g_i(x_k)$ is a subgradient of a convex function f_i describing the sublevel set C_i) and [7, 17, 29], where $\varphi_i(x_k) := 1$. For a more detailed description of the above-mentioned works, see Table 1.1. Here we only note that the convergence analysis in [13, 18, 24] differs significantly from the one presented in [7, 17, 29]. In this paper we follow the path set in [7, 17, 29], where one can find weaker forms of inequality (1.2). Moreover, in our approach, by introducing general functionals φ_i , we show that this path can also be used for $\varphi_i(x) = \|g_i(x)\|$, as is the case in [13, 18, 24]. In particular, we establish inequality (1.2) for subgradient projection methods from [13, 18, 24], a property which was not known before.

Various strategies defining the control sequence $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ are known in the literature, ranging from deterministic, where $I_k: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^I \setminus \emptyset$, to random, where $I_k: \Omega \rightarrow 2^I \setminus \emptyset$ are i.i.d. defined in some probability space. In the former case, the most recognizable are almost cyclic, intermittent and repetitive (chaotic) control sequences; see [1] but also Table 1.1. The common feature of all

the above-mentioned deterministic control sequences is that

$$\#(\{k \geq 0: I_k(x) \cap I_+(x) \neq \emptyset\}) = \infty \quad (1.3)$$

for all $x \notin C$, where $I_+(x) := \{i \in I: x \notin C_i\}$. Moreover, one can show that the random controls almost surely satisfy condition (1.3) provided that the probability of performing a correction step is positive whenever the iterate is outside the set C . We note that the latter condition, which we formally write in (5.5), was proposed by Polyak in [29, Assumption 2], see also [9, Assumption 1]. What we show in this paper is that condition (1.3) is actually a sufficient one for obtaining the finite convergence of the modified method (1.1) discussed above.

The use of the counter $[k]$ instead of k was originally suggested in [29, Section 4.2] for a particular variant of our general framework (compare with Table 1.1). Note that there are certain situations, where $[k] = k$ or when $[k]$ can simply be omitted; see Remark 4.11. However, it is important to notice that in some cases, not using the counter $[k]$ may lead to lack of finite convergence. To illustrate this, we provide two counterexamples. In the relatively simple Example 5.6, we show that finite convergence does not occur for the alternating projection method with relaxation applied to two halfspaces in the plane. In Example 5.7, which is more important, but also more technical, we assume that the control sequence is repetitive, $r_k \downarrow 0$ (monotonically) and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} r_k = \infty$. In particular, this answers a question raised in [13] related to the use of repetitive controls (called expanding therein), showing that in general [13, Theorem 20] cannot hold without a certain technical assumption [11, Condition 19]. On the other hand, in view of our result, [11, Condition 19] is no longer necessary for repetitive controls, when combined with $[k]$.

The contribution of our paper can be summarized as follows: We develop a unified analysis for a large class of finitely convergent iterative methods, which employ certain overrelaxation parameters. We also introduce a very broad class of control sequences, which covers a wide range of deterministic iterative methods and further allows us to consider stochastic iterative methods. As a byproduct, we improve all the results from [7, 13, 17, 18, 24, 29]; see the last row in Table 1.1.

Our paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we provide basic facts related to cutters. In section 3 we establish two auxiliary lemmata which are the key tools in our analysis. In particular, Lemma 3.2 laid the foundation for establishing inequality (1.2). In section 4 we discuss in detail condition (1.3) together with several examples. We present there our main result, namely Theorem 4.7. In section 5 we formulate a stochastic counterpart of Theorem 4.7 (Theorem 5.4). In the Appendix we provide two counterexamples showing that omitting the counter $[k]$ may cause lack of finite convergence.

2 Preliminaries

Let \mathcal{H} be a real Hilbert space with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and induced norm $\|\cdot\|$.

Definition 2.1. Let $T: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be an operator with $\text{Fix } T := \{z \in \mathcal{H}: T(z) = z\} \neq \emptyset$. We say that T is a *cutter* if $\langle x - T(x), z - T(x) \rangle \leq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $z \in \text{Fix } T$.

Example 2.2 (Metric Projection). Let $C \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ be nonempty, closed and convex. The *metric projection* $P_C(x) := \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in C} \|z - x\|$ is a cutter and $\text{Fix } P_C = C$; see, for example, [10, Theorem 1.2.4].

Result	Constraints and Operators	Constraints Qualification	$\varphi_i(x)$	Overrelaxation and Relaxation	Control Sequence
Iusem, Moledo [24, Theorem 1]	$C_i = S(f_i, 0)$ $T_i = P_{f_i}$ $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$ $Q = \mathbb{R}^n$	$\max_{i \in I} f_i(x) < 0$	$\varphi_i(x) = \ g_i(x)\ $ $g_i(x) \in \partial f_i(x)$ for $x \notin C_i$	$r_k \downarrow 0, \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r_k = \infty$ $\alpha_k \in [\varepsilon, 2 - \varepsilon]$	$I_k = I$
De Pierro, Iusem [18, Theorem 1]	as in [24]	as in [24]	as in [24]	as in [24]	almost cyclic
Censor, Chen, Pajoohesh [13, Theorem 20]	as in [24]	as in [24]	as in [24]	as in [24]	repetitive (single valued) + [13, Condition 19]
Polyak [29, Theorem 1] + [29, Section 4.2]	$C_i = S(f_i, 0)$ $T_i = P_{f_i}$ $m \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$	$\text{int}(C) \cap Q \neq \emptyset$	$\varphi_i(x) = 1$	$r_k = r$ or $r_k \rightarrow 0, \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r_k^2 = \infty$ (combined with [k]) $\alpha_k = 1$	random (single valued)
Crombez [17, Theorem 2.7]	$C_i = \text{Fix } T_i$ T_i - cutter $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$ $Q = \mathbb{R}^n$	$\text{int}(C) \neq \emptyset$	$\varphi_i(x) = 1$	$r_k = r$ $\alpha_k = 1$	$I_k(x) \subset I_+(x)$
Bauschke, Wang Wang, Xu [7, Theorem 3.1]	$C = \text{Fix } T$ T - cutter $m = 1$ $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$	$\text{int}(C \cap Q) \neq \emptyset$	$\varphi_i(x) = 1$	$r_k \rightarrow 0$ $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k r_k = \infty$ $\alpha_k \in (0, 2]$	x
Bauschke, Wang Wang, Xu [7, Theorem 3.2]	as above	$\text{int}(C) \cap Q \neq \emptyset$	as above	$r_k \rightarrow 0$ $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k (2 - \alpha_k) r_k^2 = \infty$ $\alpha_k \in (0, 2]$	x
Current Paper Theorems 4.7 and 5.4 (see also Ex. 4.9)	$C_i = \text{Fix } T_i$ T_i - cutter $m \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ $Q \subset \mathcal{H}$	$\text{int}(C) \cap Q \neq \emptyset$	$\delta \leq \varphi_i(x) \leq \Delta$ on bounded sets $\delta, \Delta \in (0, \infty)$ (all above)	$r_k = r$ or $r_k \rightarrow 0, \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k r_k = \infty$ (combined with [k]) $\alpha_k \in (0, 2]$	well matched or random

Table 1.1: The symbols P_{f_i} and $S(f_i, 0)$ refer to the subgradient projection and the sublevel set, respectively; see Example 2.4. A constant overrelaxation parameter $r \leq R$ is chosen so that $B(z, 2R) \subset C$ for some $z \in Q$ and applies only to $\varphi_i(x) = 1$. The result of Crombez featuring string averaging is reduced to singleton strings ([17, $n(t) = 1$]).

Example 2.3 (Proximal Operator). Let $f: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a lower semicontinuous and convex function. The *proximal operator* $\text{Prox}_f(x) := \arg\min_{y \in \mathcal{H}} (f(y) + \frac{1}{2}\|y - x\|^2)$ is firmly nonexpansive and $\text{Fix}(\text{Prox}_f) = \text{Argmin}_{x \in \mathcal{H}} f(x)$; see [3, Propositions 12.28 and 12.29]. Thus if f has at least one minimizer, then Prox_f is a cutter; see [10, Theorem 2.2.5].

Example 2.4 (Subgradient Projection). Let $f: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a lower semicontinuous and convex function with nonempty sublevel set $S(f, 0) := \{x \in \mathcal{H}: f(x) \leq 0\} \neq \emptyset$. For each $x \in \mathcal{H}$, let $g(x)$ be a chosen subgradient from the subdifferential set $\partial f(x) := \{g \in \mathcal{H}: f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle g, y - x \rangle, \text{ for all } y \in \mathcal{H}\}$, which, by [3, Proposition 16.27], is nonempty. Note here that we apply [3, Proposition 16.27] to a real-valued functional f . The *subgradient projection*

$$P_f(x) := \begin{cases} x - \frac{f(x)}{\|g(x)\|^2} g(x), & \text{if } f(x) > 0 \\ x, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

is a cutter and $\text{Fix } P_f = S(f, 0)$; see, for example, [10, Corollary 4.2.6].

Note that both the proximal operator and the subgradient projection extend the notion of the metric projection; see [3, Examples 12.25 and 29.44]. However, as we mentioned earlier in the introduction, the subgradient projection need not be even continuous; see [3, Example 29.47]. A comprehensive overview of cutters can be found in [10, Chapter 2]. Below we only recall [10, Remark 2.1.31], which will be used in the sequel.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $T: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be an operator with $\text{Fix } T \neq \emptyset$. Then T is a cutter if and only if $\langle T(x) - x, z - x \rangle \geq \|T(x) - x\|^2$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $z \in \text{Fix } T$.*

3 Auxiliary Results

Lemma 3.1. *Let $T: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be a cutter, let $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ and let $\rho: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. Define the operator $U: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ by $U(x) := x + \alpha\beta(x)(T(x) - x)$, where*

$$\beta(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{\rho(x) + \|T(x) - x\|}{\|T(x) - x\|}, & \text{if } T(x) \neq x \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Assume that $x \notin \text{Fix } T$ and $B(y, \rho(x)) \subseteq \text{Fix } T$. Then we have

$$\|U(x) - y\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2 - \frac{2 - \alpha}{\alpha} \|U(x) - x\|^2. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. The argument follows the proof of [7, Corollary 2.1(v)], which is only presented for a constant overrelaxation ρ . Define

$$w := y - \rho(x) \frac{T(x) - x}{\|T(x) - x\|} \quad (3.3)$$

and observe that $w \in B(y, \rho(x)) \subseteq \text{Fix } T$. Since T is a cutter, we have

$$\rho(x)\|T(x) - x\| + \|T(x) - x\|^2 - \langle y - x, T(x) - x \rangle = \langle w - T(x), x - T(x) \rangle \leq 0. \quad (3.4)$$

On the other hand, by [3, Corollary 2.14] applied to

$$u := T(x) - y + \rho(x) \frac{T(x) - x}{\|T(x) - x\|} \quad \text{and} \quad v := x - y, \quad (3.5)$$

we obtain

$$\|U(x) - y\|^2 = \|\alpha u + (1 - \alpha)v\|^2 = \alpha\|u\|^2 + (1 - \alpha)\|v\|^2 - \alpha(1 - \alpha)\|u - v\|^2. \quad (3.6)$$

By (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|^2 &= \|T(x) - y\|^2 + \rho^2(x) + \frac{2\rho(x)}{\|T(x) - x\|} \langle (T(x) - x) + (x - y), T(x) - x \rangle \\ &= \|T(x) - y\|^2 + \rho^2(x) + 2\rho(x)\|T(x) - x\| - \frac{2\rho(x)}{\|T(x) - x\|} \langle y - x, T(x) - x \rangle \\ &\leq \|T(x) - y\|^2 - \rho^2(x) \\ &= \|(x - y) + (T(x) - x)\|^2 - \rho^2(x) \\ &= \|x - y\|^2 - \|T(x) - x\|^2 + 2(\|T(x) - x\|^2 - \langle y - x, T(x) - x \rangle) - \rho^2(x) \\ &\leq \|x - y\|^2 - \|T(x) - x\|^2 - 2\rho(x)\|T(x) - x\| - \rho^2(x) \\ &= \|x - y\|^2 - (\rho(x) + \|T(x) - x\|)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Consequently,

$$\alpha\|u\|^2 \leq \alpha\|x - y\|^2 - \frac{1}{\alpha}\|U(x) - x\|^2. \quad (3.8)$$

Moreover,

$$\alpha(1 - \alpha)\|u - v\|^2 = \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha}\|U(x) - x\|^2. \quad (3.9)$$

Combining this with (3.6), we arrive at (3.2), which completes the proof. ■

The following lemma is a key tool in our analysis. We use it, in particular, to derive estimate (1.2). Before proceeding, recall that $I_+(x) := \{i \in I : x \notin C_i\}$, $x \in \mathcal{H}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $C_i = \text{Fix } T_i$ for given cutter operators $T_i : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, $i \in I$. Moreover, let $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, let $\rho_i : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, $i \in I$, and let $J : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^I \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ satisfy $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{H}} \#(J(x)) < \infty$. Furthermore, let $\lambda_j : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be such that $\sum_{j \in J(x)} \lambda_j(x) = 1$. Define the operator $V : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ by*

$$V(x) := x + \alpha \sum_{j \in J(x)} \lambda_j(x) \beta_j(x) (T_j(x) - x), \quad (3.10)$$

where

$$\beta_j(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{\rho_j(x) + \|T_j(x) - x\|}{\|T_j(x) - x\|}, & \text{if } T_j(x) \neq x \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

Assume that $C \cap Q \neq \emptyset$ and that the weights λ_j satisfy the inequality $\lambda_j(x) \geq \lambda > 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $j \in J_+(x) := J(x) \cap I_+(x)$. Then

$$\text{Fix}(P_Q V) = Q \cap \text{Fix } V \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Fix } V = \left\{ x : x \in \bigcap_{j \in J(x)} \text{Fix } T_j \right\}. \quad (3.12)$$

Moreover, assume that there are $z \in Q$ and $R > 0$ such that $B(z, 2R) \subseteq C$. Then for all $x \notin C$ with $\rho(x) := \max_{j \in J_+(x)} \rho_j(x) \leq R$, we have

$$\|P_Q(V(x)) - z\|^2 \leq \|x - z\|^2 - 2\alpha\lambda R\rho(x). \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. We first show (3.12). To this end, assume that $Q \cap C \neq \emptyset$ and define $F := \{x : x \in \bigcap_{j \in J(x)} \text{Fix } T_j\}$. Observe that $C \subseteq F$ and thus $F \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, it is not difficult to see that the inclusion $Q \cap F \subseteq \text{Fix } P_Q V$ follows from the definition of V . It suffices to show that $\text{Fix } P_Q V \subseteq Q \cap F$. Clearly, by the definition of the metric projection, $P_Q V \subseteq Q$ and consequently, $\text{Fix } P_Q V \subseteq Q$. Let $x \in \text{Fix } P_Q V$ and suppose to the contrary that $x \notin F$, that is, $J_+(x) \neq \emptyset$. Since P_Q is a cutter, we have

$$\langle Vx - P_Q(V(x)), z - P_Q(V(x)) \rangle \leq 0 \quad (3.14)$$

for all $z \in Q$. On the other hand, since each T_j is a cutter, for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $z \in \text{Fix } T_j$, we have, by Proposition 2.5,

$$\langle T_j(x) - x, z - x \rangle \geq \|T_j(x) - x\|^2. \quad (3.15)$$

Since $x = P_Q(V(x))$, for any $z \in Q \cap C$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \langle V(x) - P_Q(V(x)), z - P_Q(V(x)) \rangle &= \langle V(x) - x, z - x \rangle \\ &= \alpha \sum_{j \in J_+(x)} \lambda_j(x) \beta_j(x) \langle T_j(x) - x, z - x \rangle \\ &\geq \alpha \sum_{j \in J_+(x)} \lambda_j(x) \beta_j(x) \|T_j(x) - x\|^2 > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

which is in contradiction with (3.14). Consequently $J_+(x) = \emptyset$ and $Q \cap F = \text{Fix } P_Q V$, as claimed.

Next we show that (3.13) holds for all $x \notin C$ with $\rho(x) \leq R$. To this end, for each $i \in I$, we define an auxiliary operator U_i by $U_i(x) := x + \alpha\beta_i(x)(T_i(x) - x)$. Thus $V(x) = \sum_{j \in J(x)} \lambda_j(x)U_j(x)$. Let $x \notin C$ be such that $\rho(x) \leq R$ and let $j \in J_+(x)$. Observe that for any $y \in B(z, R)$, we have $B(y, \rho(x)) \subseteq B(z, 2R) \subseteq \text{Fix } T_j$. Consequently, by Lemma 3.1 applied to U_j , we have

$$\|U_j(x) - y\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2 - \frac{2 - \alpha}{\alpha} \|U_j(x) - x\|^2. \quad (3.17)$$

In particular, the above inequality holds for

$$y := z - R \frac{U_j(x) - x}{\|U_j(x) - x\|}, \quad (3.18)$$

which by the choice of $j \in J_+(x)$ is well defined. By expanding the left-hand side of the inequality (3.17) with y defined as above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_j(x) - y\|^2 &= \left\| U_j(x) - z + R \frac{U_j(x) - x}{\|U_j(x) - x\|} \right\|^2 \\ &= \|U_j(x) - z\|^2 + \frac{2R}{\|U_j(x) - x\|} \langle U_j(x) - z, U_j(x) - x \rangle + R^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - y\|^2 &= \left\| x - z + R \frac{U_j(x) - x}{\|U_j(x) - x\|} \right\|^2 \\ &= \|x - z\|^2 - \frac{2R}{\|U_j(x) - x\|} \langle z - x, U_j(x) - x \rangle + R^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

and

$$\|U_j(x) - x\| = \alpha(\rho_j(x) + \|T_j(x) - x\|) \geq \alpha\rho_j(x). \quad (3.21)$$

By combining (3.17) with (3.18), (3.19) and (3.20), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_j(x) - z\|^2 &\leq \|x - z\|^2 - 2R\|U_j(x) - x\| - \frac{2 - \alpha}{\alpha} \|U_j(x) - x\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x - z\|^2 - \alpha\rho_j(x)(2R + (2 - \alpha)\rho_j(x)) \\ &\leq \|x - z\|^2 - 2\alpha R\rho_j(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Observe that (3.22) holds for all $j \in J_+(x)$. Moreover, for all $j \in J(x) \setminus J_+(x)$, we have

$$\|U_j(x) - z\| = \|x - z\|. \quad (3.23)$$

Hence, by the nonexpansivity of the metric projection P_Q and the convexity of the squared norm $\|\cdot\|^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_Q(V(x)) - z\|^2 &= \|P_Q(V(x)) - P_Q(z)\|^2 \leq \|V(x) - z\|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in J(x) \setminus J_+(x)} \lambda_j(x) \|x - z\|^2 + \sum_{j \in J_+(x)} \lambda_j(x) \|U_j(x) - z\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x - z\|^2 - 2\alpha R \sum_{j \in J_+(x)} \lambda_j(x) \rho_j(x) \\ &\leq \|x - z\|^2 - 2\alpha \lambda R \rho(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

The above inequality completes the proof. ■

The following lemma extends [7, Lemma 2.2].

Lemma 3.3 (Slater Condition). *For each $i \in I$, let $f_i: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex and lower semicontinuous function, and assume that $f(z) := \sup_{i \in I} f_i(z) < 0$ for some $z \in \mathcal{H}$. Then for all $r > 0$, we have*

$$\inf \left\{ \|g_i(x)\| : x \in B(z, r), f_i(x) > 0, g_i(x) \in \partial f_i(x) \right\} \geq \frac{-f(z)}{r} =: \delta > 0. \quad (3.25)$$

Proof. Let $x \in B(z, r)$ and $i \in I_+(x)$. By the subgradient inequality, we have $f_i(z) \geq f_i(x) + \langle g_i(x), z - x \rangle$, where $g_i(x) \in \partial f_i(x)$. Since $i \in I_+(x)$, we have $f_i(x) > 0$ and consequently,

$$-f(z) \leq -f_i(z) \leq -f_i(x) + \langle g_i(x), x - z \rangle < \langle g_i(x), x - z \rangle \leq \|g_i(x)\| \|x - z\| \leq \|g_i(x)\| r, \quad (3.26)$$

from which (3.25) follows. ■

4 Deterministic Methods

In this section we return to the CFP defined in the introduction.

Definition 4.1. We call the sequence $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ a *control sequence in I* if each $I_k: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^I \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ is a set-valued mapping with $M := \sup_{x,k} \#(I_k(x)) < \infty$. If each I_k is single-valued, say $I_k(x) = \{i_k(x)\}$, where $i_k: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow I$, then we also call the sequence $\{i_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ a *control sequence in I* . We say that the control sequence in I is *nonadaptive* if each set-valued mapping I_k (single-valued mapping i_k) is constant, that is, when $I_k(x) = I_k(y)$ ($i_k(x) = i_k(y)$) for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$. In this case we omit the argument.

Definition 4.2. We say that the control sequence $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ in I is *well matched* with the set C if

$$\#(x, \{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty) := \#(\{k \geq 0 : I_k(x) \cap I_+(x) \neq \emptyset\}) = \infty \quad (4.1)$$

for all $x \notin C$. In particular, a single-valued control sequence $\{i_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ in I is *well matched* with C if

$$\#(x, \{i_k\}_{k=0}^\infty) := \#(\{k \geq 0 : i_k(x) \in I_+(x)\}) = \infty \quad (4.2)$$

for all $x \notin C$.

Example 4.3. In the literature (see [1, 10]) one can find the following examples of a nonadaptive control sequences $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ in I which are well matched with C : (a) *cyclic control* defined in a finite I which satisfies $I_k = I_{(k \bmod s)}$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where $s \geq 2$; (b) *intermittent control* defined in a finite I which satisfies $I = \bigcup_{k=n}^{n+s-1} I_k$ for all $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and some integer $s \geq 2$; and the more general (c) *repetitive control* defined in both finite and infinite I , which satisfies $I = \bigcup_{k=n}^\infty I_k$ for all $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. All three definitions simplify when reduced to a single-valued control sequences $\{i_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be a nonadaptive control sequence in I and consider the following statements:*

- (i) $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is well matched with C .
- (ii) $F_n := \bigcap_{k=n}^\infty \bigcap_{i \in I_k} C_i = C$ for all $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$
- (iii) $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is repetitive in I' for some $\emptyset \neq I' \subseteq I$ (that is, $I' \subseteq \bigcup_{k=n}^\infty I_k$ for all $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) and $C = \bigcap_{i \in I'} C_i$.

Then (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) \Leftarrow (iii). Moreover, if I is finite, then (ii) \Rightarrow (iii).

Proof. We first show that (i) implies (ii). Suppose to the contrary that the control sequence $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is well matched with C and that for some $n \geq 0$, there exists a point $x \in F_n \setminus C$. Then $x \in C_i$ for all $i \in I_k$ and $k \geq n$, that is, $\#(x, \{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty) \leq n$. On the other hand, since $x \notin C$, by condition (4.1), $\#(x, \{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty) = \infty$, which is a contradiction.

To show that (ii) implies (i), assume that the equality $F_n = C$ holds for all $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and let $x \notin C$. Then for each $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, consider the smallest $k_n \geq n$ such that $x \notin F_{k_n}$. By the definition of the set F_n and by eventually passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $x \notin \bigcap_{i \in I_{k_n}} C_i$ in view of which, $\#(x, \{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty) = \infty$.

It is not difficult to see that (iii) implies (i). Indeed, if $x \notin C$, then, by (iii), x violates at least one constraint C_i for some $i \in I'$. Since the control is repetitive in I' , we see that $i \in I_k$ for infinitely many k 's and thus $\#(x, \{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty) = \infty$.

Assume now that I is finite. We show that (iii) follows from (ii). To this end, define $I' := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} I_k = \bigcap_{n=0}^\infty \bigcup_{k=n}^\infty I_k$ and observe that $i \in I'$ if and only if $i \in I_k$ for infinitely many k 's. Since I is finite, we see that $I' \neq \emptyset$. Assume that I' is a proper subset of I . For each $i \in I \setminus I'$, there is $n_i \geq 0$ such that $i \notin \bigcup_{k=n_i}^\infty I_k$ and since I is finite, we have $n := \max_{i \in I \setminus I'} n_i < \infty$. Consequently, $I' = \bigcup_{k=n}^\infty I_k$ and, by (ii), we arrive at $C = F_n = \bigcap_{i \in I'} C_i$. This completes the proof. ■

Remark 4.5. The implication (i) \Rightarrow (iii) may not be true when I is infinite. To see this, consider a decreasing sequence of sets $C_{k+1} \subseteq C_k$ with nonempty intersection C and define $i_k := k$. The control $\{i_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is well matched with C , but clearly it is not repetitive in any subset $I' \subseteq I$.

Example 4.6. Observe that in view of Definition 4.2, if for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and all $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, the set $I_k(x)$ contains at least one index from the set of violated constraints $I_+(x)$, then the control sequence $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is well matched with C . In particular, when I is finite, one could use maximal control sequences such as: (a) the *remotest set control* $i_k(x) := \arg\max_{i \in I} d(x, C_i)$; (b) the *maximal displacement control* $i_k(x) := \arg\max_{i \in I} \|T_i(x) - x\|$, when $C_i = \text{Fix } T_i$; or (c) the *maximal violation control* $i_k(x) := \arg\max_{i \in I} f_i^+(x)$, when $C_i = S(f_i, 0)$.

Theorem 4.7. Assume that $C_i = \text{Fix } T_i$ for given cutter operators $T_i: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, $i \in I$. Let $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be a given control sequence in I and let the weights $\lambda_{i,k}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be such that $\sum_{i \in I_k(x)} \lambda_{i,k}(x) = 1$. Moreover, let $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=0}^\infty \subset (0, 2]$ be a sequence of relaxations and let $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^\infty \subset (0, \infty)$ be a sequence of overrelaxations. Finally, let $\varphi_i: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. Define the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ by

$$x_0 \in Q, \quad x_{k+1} := P_Q \left(x_k + \alpha_{[k]} \sum_{i \in I_k(x_k)} \lambda_{i,k}(x_k) \beta_{i,k}(x_k) (T_i(x_k) - x_k) \right), \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$[0] := 0, \quad [k] := \#(\{0 \leq n \leq k-1 : x_n \neq x_{n+1}\}), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$\beta_{i,k}(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{\frac{r_{[k]}}{\varphi_i(x)} + \|T_i(x) - x\|}{\|T_i(x) - x\|}, & \text{if } T_i(x) \neq x, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad x \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (4.5)$$

Assume that

(i) $\text{int}(C) \cap Q \neq \emptyset$.

(ii) $r_k \rightarrow 0$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k r_k = \infty$.

(iii) For each bounded subset $S \subset \mathcal{H}$, there are $\delta, \Delta \in (0, \infty)$ s.t. $\delta \leq \varphi_i(x) \leq \Delta$ for all $x \in S$.

(iv) There is $\lambda > 0$ such that $\lambda_{i,k}(x) \geq \lambda > 0$ for all x, k and $i \in I_k(x) \cap I_+(x)$.

(v) $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is well matched with the set C .

If the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is bounded (see Examples 4.8 and 4.9), then $x_k \in C \cap Q$ for some k .

Proof. Since $x_k \in Q$, it suffices to show that $x_k \in C$ for some k . For each $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, define the operator $V_k: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ by

$$V_k(x) := x + \alpha_{[k]} \sum_{i \in I_k^+(x)} \lambda_{i,k}(x) \beta_{i,k}(x) (T_i(x) - x), \quad (4.6)$$

where $I_k^+(x) := I_k(x) \cap I_+(x)$. Clearly, we can write $x_{k+1} = P_Q(V_k(x_k))$. We divide the rest of the proof into two cases.

Case 1. Assume that $n := \sup_{k \geq 0} [k] < \infty$, in which case $x_n = x_k$ for all $k \geq n$. We show that $x_n \in C$. By Lemma 3.2, the equality $x_{k+1} = x_k$ implies that $x_k \in \text{Fix } V_k$, that is, $x_k \in \bigcap_{i \in I_k(x_k)} C_i$. Consequently $\#(x_n, \{I_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}) \leq n$ and thus $x_n \in C$. Otherwise, since the control $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is well matched with C , we would get $\#(x_n, \{I_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}) = \infty$, a contradiction.

Case 2. Assume now that $\sup_{k \geq 0} [k] = \infty$, that is, the set $\mathcal{N} := \{n \geq 0: x_n \neq x_{n+1}\}$ is infinite. There is a point $z \in \text{int}(C) \cap Q$ and a radius $R > 0$ such that the ball $B(z, 2R) \subseteq C$. Since the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is assumed to be bounded, there are $0 < \delta \leq \Delta < \infty$ such that $\delta \leq \varphi_i(x_k) \leq \Delta$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Consequently, the fraction $r_{[k]}/\varphi_i(x_k)$ can be made arbitrarily small because of the estimate $r_{[k]}/\varphi_i(x_k) \leq r_{[k]}/\delta$. In particular, we may assume that $r_{[k]}/\varphi_i(x_k) \leq R$ for all large enough k , say $k \geq K$ and $K \in \mathcal{N}$. Thus, by Lemma 3.2 applied to $V := V_k$ and $\rho_i(x) := r_{[k]}/\varphi_i(x)$, we get

$$\|x_{k+1} - z\|^2 \leq \|x_k - z\|^2 - 2\lambda R \alpha_{[k]} \max_{i \in I_k^+(x_k)} \frac{r_{[k]}}{\varphi_i(x_k)} \leq \|x_k - z\|^2 - 2\lambda R \alpha_{[k]} \frac{r_{[k]}}{\Delta} \quad (4.7)$$

for all $k \in \mathcal{N}$, $k \geq K$ (compare with (1.2)). On the other hand,

$$\|x_{k+1} - z\|^2 = \|x_k - z\|^2 \quad (4.8)$$

for all $k \notin \mathcal{N}$. Consequently, by inductively applying (4.7) and (4.8) to large enough k ($k \geq K$), we obtain

$$\|x_{k+1} - z\|^2 \leq \|x_K - z\|^2 - \frac{2\lambda R}{\Delta} \sum_{\substack{n=K \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}}^k \alpha_{[n]} r_{[n]} \quad (4.9)$$

and therefore, since $K \in \mathcal{N}$, we arrive at

$$\frac{2\lambda R}{\Delta} \sum_{n=[K]}^{[k+1]-1} \alpha_n r_n = \frac{2\lambda R}{\Delta} \sum_{\substack{n=K \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}}^k \alpha_{[n]} r_{[n]} \leq \|x_K - z\|^2. \quad (4.10)$$

Since, by assumption, $\sup_{k \geq 0} [k] = \infty$, we see that the left-hand side in (4.10) tends to infinity as $k \rightarrow \infty$, which is a contradiction. Consequently, we must have $n = \sup_{k \geq 0} [k] < \infty$, in which case we have already shown that $x_n \in C \cap Q$. ■

There are at least two known situations, where we can ensure that the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is indeed bounded.

Example 4.8. In the setting of Theorem 4.7, for each $x \in \mathcal{H}$, define

$$\varphi_i(x) := 1. \quad (4.11)$$

Obviously, $\varphi_i(x)$ satisfies (iii). Furthermore, by applying Lemma 3.2, it is not difficult to see that the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is bounded. Consequently, $x_k \in C \cap Q$ for some k .

Example 4.9. In the setting of Theorem 4.7, assume that $C_i = \{x: f_i(x) \leq 0\}$ for some convex and lower semicontinuous functions $f_i: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i \in I$. Let $T_i := P_{f_i}$ and let $g_i: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be the associated subgradient mapping (see Example 2.4). For each $x \in \mathcal{H}$, define

$$\varphi_i(x) := \begin{cases} \|g_i(x)\|, & \text{if } f_i(x) > 0 \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

Using (2.1) and the convention that the summation over the empty set is zero, method (4.3) becomes

$$x_0 \in Q, \quad x_{k+1} = P_Q \left(x_k - \alpha_{[k]} \sum_{i \in I_k^+(x_k)} \lambda_{i,k}(x_k) \frac{r_{[k]} + f_i(x_k)}{\|g_i(x_k)\|^2} g_i(x_k) \right). \quad (4.13)$$

Assume that (i') $f(z) := \sup_{i \in I} f_i(z) < 0$ for some $z \in Q$; (ii') = (ii); and (iii') $\bigcup_{i \in I} \partial f_i(S)$ is bounded for bounded subsets $S \subset \mathcal{H}$. Then the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is bounded and assumptions (i')–(iii') imply conditions (i)–(iii). Consequently, $x_k \in C \cap Q$ for some k .

Proof. We first demonstrate that the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is bounded. Obviously, the statement is trivial when $n := \sup_{k \geq 0} [k] < \infty$. Assume now that $\sup_{k \geq 0} [k] = \infty$. It suffices to show that $\|x_{k+1} - z\| \leq \|x_k - z\|$ for all k large enough.

If $I_k^+(x_k) = \emptyset$, then $x_{k+1} = x_k$ and thus $\|x_{k+1} - z\| = \|x_k - z\|$. On the other hand, if $I_k^+(x_k) \neq \emptyset$, then, by using the nonexpansivity of the metric projection P_Q and the convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{k+1} - z\|^2 &\leq \left\| (x_k - z) - \alpha_{[k]} \sum_{i \in I_k^+(x_k)} \lambda_{i,k}(x_k) \frac{f_i(x_k) + r_{[k]}}{\|g_i(x_k)\|^2} g_i(x_k) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x_k - z\|^2 + \alpha_{[k]} \sum_{i \in I_k^+(x_k)} \lambda_{i,k}(x_k) \theta_{k,i}(x_k) \frac{f_i(x_k) + r_{[k]}}{\|g_i(x_k)\|^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

where

$$\theta_{k,i}(x_k) := \alpha_{[k]}(f_i(x_k) + r_{[k]}) - 2 \langle x_k - z, g_i(x_k) \rangle, \quad i \in I_k^+(x_k). \quad (4.15)$$

Moreover, by combining the subgradient inequality with the inequality $r_{[k]} \leq -f(z)$, which holds for all k large enough (since $r_{[k]} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$), we get

$$\langle x_k - z, g_i(x_k) \rangle \geq f_i(x_k) - f_i(z) \geq f_i(x_k) - f(z) \geq f_i(x_k) + r_{[k]}. \quad (4.16)$$

Consequently, $\theta_{k,i}(x_k) \leq -(2 - \alpha_{[k]})(f_i(x_k) + r_{[k]}) \leq 0$, which leads to $\|x_{k+1} - x\| \leq \|x_k - z\|$, as asserted.

Let S be nonempty and bounded subset of \mathcal{H} and choose $r > 0$ so that $S \subset B(z, r)$. The assumed boundedness of the subdifferential and Lemma 3.3 imply that there are $\Delta \geq \delta > 0$ such

that $\delta \leq \|g_i(x)\| \leq \Delta$, where the first inequality holds for all $x \in S$ and all $i \in I_+(x)$, whereas the second one holds for all $x \in S$ and all $i \in I$. This, when combined with (4.12), implies condition (iii). ■

Remark 4.10 (Constant overrelaxations). A careful analysis of the proof of Theorem 4.7 shows that when $\varphi_i(x) = 1$, $i \in I$, we can use constant overrelaxations $r_k := r \leq R$. This, however, requires the explicit knowledge of the radius R , which is not always possible.

Remark 4.11 (Using k instead of $[k]$). Observe that if $I_k^+(x) \neq \emptyset$ for all $x \notin C$, then $[k] = k$ as long as $x_k \notin C$. This condition is trivially satisfied if, for example, the number of constraints $m = 1$ or when $I_k = I$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Furthermore, the square brackets can be partially omitted if $\alpha_k \geq \alpha > 0$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r_k = \infty$. In this case we may replace “ $\alpha_{[k]}$ ” by “ α_k ” in (4.3) without losing the finite convergence property. If, in addition, we assume that the sequence $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is decreasing and the control is s -intermittent for some $s \geq 1$, then we may fully drop the square brackets notation and write “ r_k ” instead of “ $r_{[k]}$ ” in (4.5). This, however, requires a more detailed discussion, which we present below. We note that if r_k is not monotone, then by using r_k instead of $r_{[k]}$, we may indeed lose the finite convergence property; see Example 5.6.

Proof. For each $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, define V_k in the same way as in (4.6) with “ $[k]$ ” replaced by “ k ” and assume that \mathcal{N} is infinite. Since the control is s -intermittent, we have $\{k, k+1, \dots, k+s-1\} \cap \mathcal{N} \neq \emptyset$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Since $r_{k+l} \geq r_{k+s}$ for all $l \in \{0, \dots, s-1\}$, inequality (4.10) becomes

$$\frac{2\alpha\lambda R}{\Delta} \sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor (k-K)/s \rfloor + 1} r_{K+ns} \leq \frac{2\lambda R}{\Delta} \sum_{\substack{n=K \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}}^k \alpha_n r_n \leq \|x_0 - z\|^2 \quad (4.17)$$

for all $k \geq K$. Observe that due to monotonicity of the r_k ’s, the left-hand side tends to infinity as $k \rightarrow \infty$, which leads to a contradiction. Thus \mathcal{N} has to be finite and by using the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 4.7, we see that $x_k \in C \cap Q$ for some k . ■

Remark 4.12. The uniform boundedness of the subdifferential on bounded sets, which corresponds to condition (iii’) of Example 4.9, is a rather standard assumption; see [1, Proposition 7.8]. Note that condition (iii’) is not mentioned explicitly in [18, 24], but only in [13, Remark 16]. Nevertheless, it is satisfied therein because the set I is finite and $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus Example 4.9 (in view of Remark 4.11) improves upon the results established in [13, 18, 24].

Remark 4.13 (Comparison with [7]). Assume that $C = \text{Fix} T$, where $T: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a cutter ($m = 1$) and $\varphi(x) := 1$. Then (4.3) becomes the iterative method proposed in [7, equation (3)]. Furthermore, Theorem 4.7 guarantees finite convergence if one only assumes that $r_k \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k r_k = \infty$ and $C \cap \text{int}(Q) \neq \emptyset$. This extends both [7, Theorems 3.1 and Theorem 3.2]; compare with Table 1.1.

5 Stochastic Methods

In this section we consider a stochastic version of Theorem 4.7. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \text{Pr})$ be a given probability space.

Definition 5.1. We call the sequence $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ a *random control sequence in I* if $I_k: \Omega \rightarrow 2^I \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ are independent and identically distributed (set-valued) random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \text{Pr})$ with $M :=$

$\sup_{\omega,k} \#(I_k(\omega)) < \infty$. If each $I_k(\omega)$ is single-valued, say $I_k(\omega) = \{i_k(\omega)\}$ for $i_k: \Omega \rightarrow I$, then we also call the sequence $\{i_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ a *random control* in I .

Remark 5.2. The phrase “identically distributed” means that $\Pr(\{\omega \in \Omega: I_k(\omega) = J\}) = \Pr(\{\omega \in \Omega: I_n(\omega) = J\})$ for all k, n and all nonempty $J \subseteq I$ with $\#(J) \leq M$. The phrase “independent” means that $\Pr(\bigcap_{k \in K} \{\omega \in \Omega: I_k(\omega) = J_k\}) = \prod_{k \in K} \Pr(\{\omega \in \Omega: I_k(\omega) = J_k\})$ for all finite K and all nonempty $J_k \subseteq I$ with $\#(J_k) \leq M$.

Before formulating our next result, we establish a very intuitive lemma in view of which a random control is repetitive almost surely. We recall that $\{I_k(\omega)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is repetitive in I' if $I' \subseteq \bigcup_{k=n}^\infty I_k(\omega)$ for all $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be a random control in I and assume that $\Pr(\{\omega \in \Omega: i \in I_k(\omega)\}) > 0$ for all $i \in I' \subseteq I$. Then $\Pr(\{\omega \in \Omega: \{I_k(\omega)\}_{k=0}^\infty \text{ is repetitive in } I'\}) = 1$.*

Proof. Define the events $A_i^k := \{\omega \in \Omega: i \in I_k(\omega)\}$ and the family $\mathcal{J} := \{J \subseteq I: i \in J \text{ and } \#(J) \leq M\}$, where $M := \sup_{\omega,k} \#(I_k(\omega))$. Since the events $A_J^k := \{\omega \in \Omega: I_k(\omega) = J\}$ are disjoint for different values of $J \in \mathcal{J}$, we have

$$\Pr(A_i^k) = \Pr\left(\bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}} A_J^k\right) = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \Pr(A_J^k). \quad (5.1)$$

By assumption, the variables I_k are identically distributed. Consequently, we see that $\Pr(A_i^k) = \Pr(A_i^n)$ for all $i \in I$ and all $k, n = 1, 2, \dots$. Hence the probability $p_i := \Pr(A_i^k)$ does not depend on k and, by assumption, $p_i > 0$ for all $i \in I'$.

Moreover, the events A_i^k are independent over k . For simplicity, we only show this for a pair $K = \{k, n\}$, $k \neq n$, although the argument holds for any finite set of indices K . Indeed, by disjointness (over J) and independence (over k) of the events A_J^k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(A_i^k \cap A_i^n) &= \Pr\left(\bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}} A_J^k \cap \bigcup_{J' \in \mathcal{J}} A_{J'}^n\right) = \Pr\left(\bigcup_{J, J' \in \mathcal{J}} (A_J^k \cap A_{J'}^n)\right) \\ &= \sum_{J, J' \in \mathcal{J}} \Pr(A_J^k) \Pr(A_{J'}^n) = \Pr(A_i^k) \Pr(A_i^n). \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Consequently, for all $i \in I'$, we obtain $\sum_{k=0}^\infty \Pr(A_i^k) = \sum_{k=0}^\infty p_i = \infty$ and, by applying the Borel-Cantelli lemma (see [19, Theorem 8.3.4]) to $A_i := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_i^k$, we have $\Pr(A_i) = 1$.

Consider a decreasing sequence of sets $E_k := \bigcap_{t=1}^k A_{i_t}$ where $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ for finite $I' = \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$, whereas $k = 1, 2, \dots$ for infinite $I' = \{i_1, i_2, \dots\}$. Clearly, the set A_i consists of all $\omega \in \Omega$ for which the membership $i \in I_k(\omega)$ happens infinitely many times in the sequence $\{I_k(\omega)\}_{k=0}^\infty$. Bearing this in mind, we get

$$E := \bigcap_{k=1}^{\#(I')} E_k = \bigcap_{i \in I'} A_i = \{\omega \in \Omega: \{I_k(\omega)\}_{k=0}^\infty \text{ is repetitive in } I'\}. \quad (5.3)$$

We now show, by induction, that $\Pr(E_k) = 1$ for all k . Indeed, by definition, $\Pr(E_1) = \Pr(A_{i_1}) = 1$, as we have already observed above. Moreover,

$$\Pr(E_{k+1}) = \Pr(E_k \cap A_{i_{k+1}}) = \Pr(E_k) + \Pr(A_{i_{k+1}}) - \Pr(E_k \cup A_{i_{k+1}}). \quad (5.4)$$

By induction, $\Pr(E_k) = 1$ and, since $\Pr(A_{i_{k+1}}) = 1$, we conclude that $\Pr(E_k \cup A_{i_{k+1}}) = 1$. Otherwise $\Pr(E_{k+1})$ would be greater than one. Hence $\Pr(E_{k+1}) = 1$, as asserted.

Observe that if I' is finite, then $E = E_n$ and consequently, $\Pr(E) = \Pr(E_n) = 1$. On the other hand, if I' is infinite, then $\{E_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is a decreasing sequence of events, where $E_{k+1} \subseteq E_k$ and, by the continuity of \Pr (see [21, Chapter II.9, Theorem E]), we have $\Pr(E) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(E_k) = 1$. This completes the proof. ■

Theorem 5.4. *Let the sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be defined as in Theorem 4.7 using a random control $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ in I (that is, for each $\omega \in \Omega$ we define a sequence $\{x_k(\omega)\}_{k=0}^\infty$, where at each step k the iterate $x_{k+1}(\omega)$ is obtained by using the realization $I_k(\omega)$ instead of $I_k(x_k)$, and where $x_0(\omega) = x_0 \in Q$). Assume that conditions (i)–(iv) of Theorem 4.7 hold and that for all $x \notin C$, we have*

$$\Pr(\{\omega \in \Omega: I_k(\omega) \cap I_+(x) \neq \emptyset\}) > 0. \quad (5.5)$$

Then, by (5.5), almost surely, the control sequence $\{I_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is well matched with C (condition (v)). Furthermore, almost surely, $x_k \in C \cap Q$ for some k given that $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is bounded (with some positive probability).

Proof. Define the following events: $E_0 := \{\omega \in \Omega: \{x_k(\omega)\}_{k=0}^\infty \text{ is bounded}\}$, $E_1 := \{\omega \in \Omega: \{I_k(\omega)\}_{k=0}^\infty \text{ is repetitive in } I'\}$, $E_2 := \{\omega \in \Omega: \{I_k(\omega)\}_{k=0}^\infty \text{ is well matched with } C\}$ and $E_3 := \{\omega \in \Omega: x_k(\omega) \in C \cap Q \text{ for some } k\}$, where, as in Lemma 5.3, $I' := \{i \in I: \Pr(A_i^k) > 0\}$ and $A_i^k := \{\omega \in \Omega: i \in I_k(\omega)\}$. It suffices to show that $\Pr(E_3 | E_0) = 1$.

We first demonstrate that $C = \bigcap_{i \in I'} C_i$. Suppose to the contrary that $x \in \bigcap_{i \in I'} C_i \setminus C$. Clearly, $I_+(x) \subseteq I \setminus I'$ and thus $\Pr(A_i^k) = 0$ for all $i \in I_+(x)$. By (5.5), we obtain

$$0 < \Pr(\{\omega \in \Omega: I_k(\omega) \cap I_+(x) \neq \emptyset\}) = \Pr\left(\bigcup_{i \in I_+(x)} A_i^k\right) \leq \sum_{i \in I_+(x)} \Pr(A_i^k) = 0, \quad (5.6)$$

a contradiction.

Consequently, by Proposition 4.4, we get $E_1 \subseteq E_2$. Moreover, by Lemma 5.3, we get $\Pr(E_1) = 1$. Thus $\Pr(E_2) = 1$, but also $\Pr(E_0 \cup E_2) = 1$. On the other hand, by Theorem 4.7, we have $E_0 \cap E_2 \subseteq E_3 = E_0 \cap E_3$, where, by assumption, $\Pr(E_0) > 0$. Hence,

$$\Pr(E_0 \cap E_3) \geq \Pr(E_0 \cap E_2) = \Pr(E_0) + \Pr(E_2) - \Pr(E_0 \cup E_2) = \Pr(E_0) \quad (5.7)$$

and we arrive at $\Pr(E_3 | E_0) = \Pr(E_0 \cap E_3) / \Pr(E_0) \geq \Pr(E_0) / \Pr(E_0) = 1$. ■

Remark 5.5 (Comparison with [29]). If $\{i_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is a single-valued random control in I . Then condition (5.5) recovers [29, Assumption 2], that is, $\Pr(\{\omega \in \Omega: i_k(\omega) \in I_+(x)\}) > 0$ for all $x \notin C$. In particular, Theorem 5.4 recovers [29, Theorem 1] reduced to at most countably infinite number of constraints.

Acknowledgements. We thank two anonymous referees for their useful comments and helpful suggestions. This work was partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation (Grants 389/12 and 820/17), the Fund for the Promotion of Research at the Technion and by the Technion General Research Fund.

References

- [1] H. H. BAUSCHKE AND J. M. BORWEIN, *On projection algorithms for solving convex feasibility problems*, SIAM Rev., 38 (1996), pp. 367–426.
- [2] H. H. BAUSCHKE AND P. L. COMBETTES, *A weak-to-strong convergence principle for Fejér-monotone methods in Hilbert spaces*, Math. Oper. Res., 26 (2001), pp. 248–264.

- [3] ———, *Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces*, CMS Books in Mathematics/Ouvrages de Mathématiques de la SMC, Springer, Cham, second ed., 2017. With a foreword by Hedy Attouch.
- [4] H. H. BAUSCHKE AND M. N. DAO, *On the finite convergence of the Douglas-Rachford algorithm for solving (not necessarily convex) feasibility problems in Euclidean spaces*, SIAM J. Optim., 27 (2017), pp. 507–537.
- [5] H. H. BAUSCHKE, M. N. DAO, D. NOLL, AND H. M. PHAN, *On Slater’s condition and finite convergence of the Douglas-Rachford algorithm for solving convex feasibility problems in Euclidean spaces*, J. Global Optim., 65 (2016), pp. 329–349.
- [6] H. H. BAUSCHKE, D. NOLL, AND H. M. PHAN, *Linear and strong convergence of algorithms involving averaged nonexpansive operators*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 421 (2015), pp. 1–20.
- [7] H. H. BAUSCHKE, C. WANG, X. WANG, AND J. XU, *On the finite convergence of a projected cutter method*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 165 (2015), pp. 901–916.
- [8] J. M. BORWEIN, G. LI, AND M. K. TAM, *Convergence rate analysis for averaged fixed point iterations in common fixed point problems*, SIAM J. Optim., 27 (2017), pp. 1–33.
- [9] G. CALAFIORE AND B. T. POLYAK, *Stochastic algorithms for exact and approximate feasibility of robust lmis*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 46 (2001), pp. 1755–1759.
- [10] A. CEGIELSKI, *Iterative methods for fixed point problems in Hilbert spaces*, vol. 2057 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.
- [11] A. CEGIELSKI AND Y. CENSOR, *Opial-type theorems and the common fixed point problem*, in Fixed-point algorithms for inverse problems in science and engineering, vol. 49 of Springer Optim. Appl., Springer, New York, 2011, pp. 155–183.
- [12] A. CEGIELSKI, S. REICH, AND R. ZALAS, *Regular sequences of quasi-nonexpansive operators and their applications*, SIAM J. Optim., 28 (2018), pp. 1508–1532.
- [13] Y. CENSOR, W. CHEN, AND H. PAJOOHESH, *Finite convergence of a subgradient projections method with expanding controls*, Appl. Math. Optim., 64 (2011), pp. 273–285.
- [14] W. CHEN AND G. T. HERMAN, *Efficient controls for finitely convergent sequential algorithms*, ACM Trans. Math. Software, 37 (2010), pp. 1–23.
- [15] P. L. COMBETTES, *The convex feasibility problem in image recovery*, Advances in Imaging and Electron Physics, 95 (1996), pp. 155–270.
- [16] P. L. COMBETTES, *Quasi-Fejérian analysis of some optimization algorithms*, in Inherently parallel algorithms in feasibility and optimization and their applications (Haifa, 2000), vol. 8 of Stud. Comput. Math., North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2001, pp. 115–152.
- [17] G. CROMBEZ, *Finding common fixed points of a class of paracontractions*, Acta Math. Hungar., 103 (2004), pp. 233–241.
- [18] A. R. DE PIERRO AND A. N. IUSEM, *A finitely convergent “row-action” method for the convex feasibility problem*, Appl. Math. Optim., 17 (1988), pp. 225–235.
- [19] R. M. DUDLEY, *Real analysis and probability*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [20] M. FUKUSHIMA, *A finitely convergent algorithm for convex inequalities*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 27 (1982), pp. 1126–1127.
- [21] P. R. HALMOS, *Measure theory*, D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., New York, 1950.
- [22] G. T. HERMAN AND W. CHEN, *A fast algorithm for solving a linear feasibility problem with application to intensity-modulated radiation therapy*, Linear Algebra Appl., 428 (2008), pp. 1207–1217.
- [23] N. HERMER, D. R. LUKE, AND A. STURM, *Random function iterations for consistent stochastic feasibility*, Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim., 40 (2019), pp. 386–420.
- [24] A. N. IUSEM AND L. MOLEDO, *A finitely convergent method of simultaneous subgradient projections for the convex feasibility problem*, Mat. Appl. Comput., 5 (1986), pp. 169–184.
- [25] ———, *On finitely convergent iterative methods for the convex feasibility problem*, Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat., 18 (1987), pp. 11–18.
- [26] D. R. LUKE, M. TEBoulLE, AND N. H. THAO, *Necessary conditions for linear convergence of iterated expansive, set-valued mappings*, Math. Program., 180 (2020), pp. 1–31.

- [27] A. NEDIĆ, *Random projection algorithms for convex set intersection problems*, in 49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 2010, pp. 7655–7660.
- [28] C. H. J. PANG, *Set intersection problems: supporting hyperplanes and quadratic programming*, Math. Program., 149 (2015), pp. 329–359.
- [29] B. T. POLYAK, *Random algorithms for solving convex inequalities*, in Inherently parallel algorithms in feasibility and optimization and their applications (Haifa, 2000), vol. 8 of Stud. Comput. Math., North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2001, pp. 409–422.

Appendix

Example 5.6. We show that the relaxed alternating projection method, where $\alpha = 1/2$, may fail to converge in finitely many steps if the sequence of overrelaxations $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is not monotone and when we use r_k instead of $r_{[k]}$; compare with Remark 4.11 (e). To this end, consider the CFP with $Q = \mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^2$, $C_1 := \{(x, y) : x \leq 0\}$ and $C_2 := \{(x, y) : y \leq 0\}$. Clearly, $C_1 \cap C_2 = (-\infty, 0] \times (-\infty, 0]$. Define

$$i_k := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \\ 2, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad r_k := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k+1}, & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \\ \frac{1}{2^k}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

Set $(x_0, y_0) := (1, 1)$ and

$$(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) := (x_k, y_k) + \frac{r_k + d((x_k, y_k), C_{i_k})}{2d((x_k, y_k), C_{i_k})} \left(P_{C_{i_k}}((x_k, y_k)) - (x_k, y_k) \right). \quad (5.9)$$

Then $r_k \rightarrow 0$ and $\sum_{k=0}^\infty r_k = \infty$, but $(x_k, y_k) \notin C_1 \cap C_2$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Indeed, observe that $x_k = 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Moreover, $y_0 = y_1 = 1$ and, by induction,

$$y_{2k-1} = y_{2k-2} \quad \text{and} \quad y_{2k} = y_{2k-1} + \frac{\frac{1}{2^{2k-1}} + y_{2k-1}}{2y_{2k-1}} (0 - y_{2k-1}) = \frac{1}{2^{2k}} > 0. \quad (5.10)$$

Example 5.7. We show that the subgradient projection method (4.13), when combined with a repetitive control (as in [13]), may fail to converge in finitely many steps if we choose to use “ r_k ” instead of “ $r_{[k]}$ ”, even though the sequence of overrelaxations $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is decreasing. Indeed, consider the CFP with $Q = \mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^2$, $C_1 := \{(x, y) : f_1(x, y) \leq 0\}$ and $C_2 := \{(x, y) : f_2(x, y) \leq 0\}$, where $f_1(x, y) := |y| - 1$ and $f_2(x, y) := x^2 - 1$. Thus $C_1 \cap C_2 = [-1, 1] \times [-1, 1]$ and the Slater condition is satisfied since $f_1(0, 0) = f_2(0, 0) = -1 < 0$. Define two auxiliary sequences $\{a_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ and $\{b_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ by

$$a_k := \frac{1}{k+1} \quad \text{and} \quad b_0 := \frac{1}{2}, \quad b_{k+1} := \frac{b_k}{\left(\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{b_k}} + 4\right)^2}, \quad (5.11)$$

and let the sequence of overrelaxations $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ consist of all the elements of $\{a_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ and $\{b_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ sorted in a decreasing order, that is,

$$\{r_k\}_{k=0}^\infty = \left\{ a_0 = 1, a_1 = \frac{1}{2}, b_0 = \frac{1}{2}, a_2 = \frac{1}{3}, \dots, \right. \\ \left. a_{127} = \frac{1}{128}, b_1 = \frac{1}{128}, a_{128} = \frac{1}{129}, \dots \right\}. \quad (5.12)$$

Observe that $r_k \rightarrow 0$ monotonically and $\sum_{k=0}^\infty r_k = \infty$, as required in [13]. Indeed, the former condition follows from the inequality $b_{k+1} \leq \frac{b_k}{16}$ and the latter one from the definition of a_k . Let m_k and n_k denote the position (we start counting from 0) of a_k and b_k in the sequence $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$,

respectively, and define the control sequence $\{i_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ by $i_{m_k} := 1$ and $i_{n_k} := 2$. It is not difficult to see that $\{i_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is repetitive. Following (4.13), we define

$$(x_0, y_0) := (2, 2), \quad (x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) := (x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) - \frac{r_k + f_{i_k}(x_k, y_k)}{\|g_{i_k}(x_k, y_k)\|^2} g_{i_k}(x_k, y_k) \quad (5.13)$$

whenever $f_{i_k}(x_k, y_k) > 0$ and $(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) := (x_k, y_k)$ otherwise, where $g_{i_k}(x_k, y_k) \in \partial f_{i_k}(x_k, y_k)$. Then $(x_k, y_k) \notin C_1 \cap C_2$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

Proof. Observe that by (5.13), we get

$$x_{m_k+1} = x_{m_k} \quad \text{and} \quad y_{m_k+1} = \begin{cases} 1 - r_{m_k}, & \text{if } y_{m_k} > 1 \\ r_{m_k} - 1, & \text{if } y_{m_k} < -1 \\ y_{m_k}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.14)$$

Moreover,

$$x_{n_k+1} = \frac{1}{2} \left(x_{n_k} + \frac{1 - r_{n_k}}{x_{n_k}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad y_{n_k+1} = y_{n_k}. \quad (5.15)$$

On the other hand, by the definition of m_k and n_k , we have $r_{m_k} = a_k$ and $r_{n_k} = b_k$. Consequently, by the choice of the starting point, we obtain $y_k = 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$

We claim that $x_{n_k} = 1 + \sqrt{2b_k}$. Indeed, by the equality $n_0 = 2$ and by (5.14), we have

$$1 + \sqrt{2b_0} = x_0 = x_1 = x_2 = x_{n_0}. \quad (5.16)$$

Observe that, by (5.14), we also obtain $x_{n_{k+1}} = x_{n_k+1}$. Consequently, by (5.15) and by induction,

$$x_{n_{k+1}} = \frac{x_{n_k}^2 + 1 - b_k}{2x_{n_k}} = \frac{(1 + \sqrt{2b_k})^2 + 1 - b_k}{2(1 + \sqrt{2b_k})} = 1 + \frac{b_k}{2 + 2\sqrt{2b_k}} = 1 + \sqrt{2b_{k+1}}. \quad (5.17)$$

Using the positivity of b_k , we see that $x_{n_k} > 1$ which, when combined with (5.14), yields that $x_k > 1$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. This implies that $(x_k, y_k) \notin C_1 \cap C_2$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, as claimed. \blacksquare