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1 Introduction

Consider the following unconstrained optimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x),$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.1)

where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable and its gradient is denoted by $g$.

The gradient method takes the following form

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \alpha_k g_k, \hspace{1cm} (1.2)$$

where $\alpha_k$ is the stepsize and $g_k$ is the gradient of $f$ at $x_k$.

Throughout this paper, $g_k = g(x_k)$, $f_k = f(x_k)$, $s_{k-1} = x_k - x_{k-1}$, $y_{k-1} = g_k - g_{k-1}$ and $\|\cdot\|$ stands for the Euclidean norm.

It is widely accepted that the stepsize is of great importance to the numerical performance of gradient method [3]. In 1847, Cauchy [1] presented the steepest descent method, where the stepsize is determined by

$$\alpha_{SD}^k = \arg \min_{\alpha > 0} f(x_k - \alpha g_k).$$

The steepest descent method usually converges slowly. In 1988, Barzilai and Borwein [2] presented a new gradient method (BB method), where the stepsize is given by

$$\alpha_{BB}^{1k} = \frac{\|s_{k-1}\|^2}{s_k^T y_{k-1}} \hspace{1cm} \text{or} \hspace{1cm} \alpha_{BB}^{2k} = \frac{s_k^T y_{k-1}}{\|y_{k-1}\|^2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.3)

Clearly, the BB method is in essence a gradient method, but the choice of the stepsize is different from $\alpha_{SD}^k$.

Due to the simplicity and numerical efficiency, the BB method has enjoyed great developments during these years. The BB method has been proved to be globally [4] and linearly convergent [5] for any dimensional strictly convex quadratic functions. In 1997, Raydan [6] presented a global BB method for general nonlinear unconstrained optimization by incorporating the nonmonotone line search (GLL line search) [7], and the numerical results in [6] suggested that the BB method is superior to some classical conjugate gradient methods. From then on, a number of modified BB stepsizes have been exploited for gradient methods. Dai et al. [11] presented the cyclic BB method for unconstrained optimization. Using the interpolation scheme, Dai et al. [9] presented two modified BB stepsizes for gradient methods. Based on some modified secant equations, Xiao et al. [12] designed four modified BB stepsizes for gradient methods. According to a fourth order model and some modified secant equations, Biglari and Solimanpur [8] presented some modified gradient methods with modified BB stepsizes, and the numerical results in [8] indicated that these modified BB methods are efficient. Miladinović et
al. [13] proposed a new stepsize based on the usage of both the quasi-Newton property and the Hessian inverse approximation by an appropriate scalar matrix for gradient method.

Different from the above modified BB methods, Liu and Liu [30] introduced a new type of stepsize for gradient method in 2018, which is called approximately optimal stepsize and is quite efficient for gradient method.

**Definition 1.1** Suppose that $f$ is continuously differentiable, and let $\phi_k(\alpha)$ be an approximation model of $f(x_k - \alpha g_k)$, where $g_k = \nabla f(x_k)$. A positive number $\alpha_k^{AOS}$ is called the **approximately optimal stepsize** associated to $\phi_k(\alpha)$ for gradient method, if $\alpha_k^{AOS}$ satisfies

$$\alpha_k^{AOS} = \arg \min_{\alpha > 0} \phi_k(\alpha).$$

The approximately optimal stepsize is generally calculated easily and can be applied to unconstrained optimization. In any gradient method for strictly convex quadratic minimization problems, the stepsize $\alpha_k$ can also be generated by minimizing the following quadratic approximation model:

$$\phi_k(\alpha) = f_k - \alpha \|g_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 g_k^T \left( \frac{1}{\alpha_k} I \right) g_k,$$

where $\frac{1}{\alpha_k} I$ is an approximation to the Hessian matrix of $f$ at $x_k$. Then, the stepsize $\alpha_k$ is the approximately optimal stepsizes associated to the above-mentioned $\phi_k(\alpha)$ for gradient method. As a result, all gradient methods can be regarded as gradient methods with approximately optimal stepsize in this sense.

We see from the definition of approximately optimal stepsize that the numerical performance of gradient method with approximately optimal stepsize depends heavily on approximation model $\phi_k(\alpha)$. Some gradient methods with approximately optimal stepsizes [31–34] were later proposed for unconstrained optimization, and the numerical results in [31–34] suggested that these gradient methods with approximately optimal stepsizes are surprisingly efficient.

In those gradient methods with approximately optimal stepsizes [31–34], the gradient method with approximately optimal stepsizes based on conic model [31] has enjoyed some attentions [35] due to its good nice numerical performance. In this paper, we present an improved gradient method with approximately optimal optimal stepsize based on conic model for unconstrained optimization. In the proposed method, when the objective function $f$ is not close to a quadratic function on the line segment between $x_{k-1}$ and $x_k$, a conic model is exploited to generate approximately optimal stepsize if the conic model can be used. Otherwise, some quadratic models are constructed to derive approximately optimal stepsizes. We analyze the convergence of the proposed method under mild conditions. Two collect sets denoted by 80pAdr and 144pCUTEr, which are
from [27] and [28], respectively, are used to examine the effectiveness of the test methods. Some numerical experiments indicate that the proposed method is superior to the limited memory conjugate gradient software package CG_DESCENT (6.0) [29] for 80pAdr and is comparable to CG_DESCENT (5.0) [15] for 144pCUTEr, and performs better than CGOPT [26] for 80pAdr and is comparable to CGOPT for 144pCUTEr.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we exploit some approximation models including a conic model and quadratic models to derive efficient approximately optimal stepsizes for gradient method. In Section 3, we present an improved gradient method with approximately optimal stepsize based on conic model, and analyze the global convergence of the proposed method under some suitable conditions. In Section 4, some numerical experiments are done to examine the effectiveness of the proposed method. Conclusions and discussions are given in the last section.

2 Derivation of the Approximately Optimal Stepsize

In the section, based on the properties of the objective function \( f \), some approximation models including a conic model and quadratic models are exploited to generate approximately optimal stepsizes for gradient method.

According to the definition of approximately optimal stepsize in Section 1, we know that the effectiveness of approximately optimal stepsize will rely on the approximation model. We determine the approximation models based on the following observations.

Define

\[
\mu_k = \left| \frac{2(f_k - f_{k-1} + g_k^T s_{k-1})}{s_{k-1}^T y_k - 1} \right|.
\]

According to [9, 10], \( \mu_k \) is a quantity showing how \( f(x) \) is close to a quadratic on the line segment between \( x_{k-1} \) and \( x_k \). If the following condition [31, 33] holds, namely,

\[
\mu_k \leq c_1 \quad \text{or} \quad \max \{\mu_k, \mu_{k-1}\} \leq c_2,
\]

where \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) are small positives and \( c_1 < c_2 \), then \( f \) might be close to a quadratic on the line segment between \( x_{k-1} \) and \( x_k \). General iterative methods, which are often based on quadratic model, have been quite successful in solving practical optimization problems [16], since quadratic model can approximates the objective function \( f \) well at a small neighbourhood of \( x_k \) in many cases. Consequently, if \( f \) is close to a quadratic on the line segment between \( x_{k-1} \) and \( x_k \), quadratic model is preferable. However, when \( x_k \) is far from the minimizer, quadratic model might not work very well if the objective function \( f \) possesses high non-linearity [17, 19]. To address the drawback, some conic models [17, 20, 21] have been exploited to approximate the objective function.
The conic functions, which interpolate both function values and gradients at the latest two iterates, can fit exponential functions, penalty functions or other functions which share with conics the property of increasing rapidly near some $n - 1$ dimensional hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^n$ [20]. All of these indicate that, when $f$ is not close to a quadratic function on the line segment between $x_{k-1}$ and $x_k$, conic models may serve better than quadratic model [21].

Based on the above observations, we determine approximately optimal stepsize for gradient method in the following cases.

**Case I: Conic Model**

When $f$ is not close to a quadratic on the line segment between $x_{k-1}$ and $x_k$, we consider the following conic model:

$$
\phi_k (d) = f_k + \frac{g_k^T d}{1 + b_k^T d} + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \frac{d^T B_k d}{(1 + b_k^T d)^2},
$$

where

$$
b_k = \frac{1 - \gamma_k}{\gamma_k g_{k-1}^T s_{k-1}} g_{k-1}, \quad \gamma_k = \frac{-g_k^T s_{k-1}}{\rho_k + f_{k-1} - f_k}, \quad \rho_k = \sqrt{\Delta_k}, \quad \Delta_k = (f_{k-1} - f_k)^2 - (g_k^T s_{k-1}) (g_{k-1}^T s_{k-1})
$$

and $B_k$ is generated by imposing generalized BFGS update formula [17] on a positive scalar matrix $D_k$:

$$
B_k = D_k - \frac{D_k v_{k-1} v_{k-1}^T D_k}{v_{k-1}^T D_k v_{k-1}} + \frac{r_{k-1} r_{k-1}^T}{v_{k-1}^T r_{k-1}}
$$

where $r_{k-1} = \bar{g}_{k-1}/\gamma_k, v_{k-1} = \gamma_k s_{k-1}$ and $\bar{g}_{k-1} = \gamma_k g_k - \frac{1}{\gamma_k} g_{k-1}$. Here we take the scalar matrix $D_k$ as $D_k = \xi_1 \frac{v_{k-1} v_{k-1}^T}{v_{k-1}^T r_{k-1}} I$, where $\xi_1 \geq 1$. It is easy to verify that, if $v_{k-1}^T r_{k-1} > 0$, then $D_k$ is symmetric positive definite and thus $B_k$ is symmetric positive definite. In order to improve the numerical performance, we restrict $\gamma_k = \max \{ \min \{ \gamma_k, 2\}, 0.01 \}$ and the coefficient $\frac{1 - \gamma_k}{\gamma_k g_{k-1}^T s_{k-1}}$ of $b_k$ as $\max \{ \min \{ \frac{1 - \gamma_k}{\gamma_k g_{k-1}^T s_{k-1}}, 5000 \}, -5000 \}$.

By substituting $d = -\alpha g_k$ into the above conic model $\phi_k (d)$, we obtain that

$$
\phi^1_k (\alpha) = f (x_k) - \frac{\alpha g_k^T g_k}{1 - \alpha b_k^T g_k} + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \frac{g_k^T B_k g_k}{(1 - \alpha b_k^T g_k)^2}.
$$

It is clear that $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{b_k^T g_k}$ is the singular point of $\phi^1_k (\alpha)$, $\phi^{1'}_k (\alpha) = \frac{\alpha (g_k^T B_k g_k + g_k^T g_k b_k^T g_k) - g_k^T g_k}{(1 - \alpha b_k^T g_k)^2}$ and $\phi^1_k (\alpha)$ is continuous differentiable in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{ 1/b_k^T g_k \}$.

If $\Delta_k > 0$, $v_{k-1}^T r_{k-1} > 0$ and $g_k^T B_k g_k + (g_k^T g_k) (b_k^T g_k) \neq 0$, by imposing $\frac{d\phi^1_k}{d\alpha} = 0$ we obtain the unique stationary point of $\phi^1_k (\alpha)$:

$$
\alpha^S_k = \frac{g_k^T g_k}{g_k^T B_k g_k + (g_k^T g_k) (b_k^T g_k)}, \quad \text{(2.2)}
$$

We analyze the properties of the stationary point $\alpha^S_k$ in the following two cases.
(1) The singular point $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{b_k^T g_k} < 0$. If $g_k^T B_k g_k + (g_k^T g_k) (b_k^T g_k) < 0$, then we know $\alpha_k^S < \frac{1}{b_k^T g_k}$. By $\phi_k^1(\alpha)$, it is not difficult to obtain that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1/b_k^T g_k} \phi_1(\alpha) = +\infty$$

and

$$\phi_k^1(\alpha) < 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \alpha > \frac{1}{b_k^T g_k}.$$ 

Therefore, there no exists $\alpha^* > 0$ such that $\alpha^* = \min_{\alpha > 0} \phi_k^1(\alpha)$. Consequently, if $g_k^T B_k g_k + (g_k^T g_k) (b_k^T g_k) \leq 0$, then we will switch to Case II. Here we only consider the case of $g_k^T B_k g_k + (g_k^T g_k) (b_k^T g_k) > 0$. In the case we know that $\alpha_k^S > 0$. If $\alpha > \alpha_k^S$, then $\alpha (g_k^T B_k g_k + g_k^T g_k b_k^T g_k) - g_k^T g_k > 0$, which together with $1 - \alpha b_k^T g_k > 0$ implies that

$$\phi_1'(\alpha) > 0$$

for $\alpha > \alpha_k^S$. By $\phi_1'(0) = -\|g_k\|^2 < 0$, the continuous differentiability of $\phi_k^1(\alpha)$ in $R \setminus \{1/b_k^T g_k\}$, the uniqueness of the stationary point and $\phi_1'(\alpha_k^S) = 0$, we know that $\phi_1'(\alpha) < 0$ holds for $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_k^S)$. Therefore, the stationary point $\alpha_k^S$ satisfies

$$\alpha_k^S = \min_{\alpha > 0} \phi_1(\alpha),$$

which means that the stationary point $\alpha_k^S$ is the approximately optimal stepsize associated to $\phi_k^1(\alpha)$.

(2) The singular point $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{b_k^T g_k} > 0$. It is obvious that the stationary point $\alpha_k^S$ satisfies $0 < \alpha_k^S < \frac{1}{b_k^T g_k}$. If $\alpha_k^S < \alpha < \frac{1}{b_k^T g_k}$, we obtain that $1 - \alpha b_k^T g_k > 0$ and $\alpha (g_k^T B_k g_k + g_k^T g_k b_k^T g_k) - g_k^T g_k > 0$, which imply that

$$\phi_1'(\alpha) > 0$$

for $\alpha \in (\alpha_k^S, \frac{1}{b_k^T g_k})$. By $\phi_1'(0) = -\|g_k\|^2 < 0$, $\phi_1'(\alpha_k^S) = 0$, the continuous differentiability of $\phi_k^1(\alpha)$ in $R \setminus \{1/b_k^T g_k\}$ and the uniqueness of the stationary point, we know that $\phi_1'(\alpha) < 0$ holds for $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_k^S)$. Therefore, the stationary point $\alpha_k^S$ is a local minimizer of $\phi_k^1(\alpha)$ and

$$\phi_1(\alpha_k^S) = f_k - \frac{(g_k^T g_k)^2}{2g_k^T B_k g_k}.$$ 

If $\alpha > \frac{1}{b_k^T g_k}$, then we have $1 - \alpha b_k^T g_k < 0$,

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1/b_k^T g_k} \phi_1(\alpha) = +\infty$$

and

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_1(\alpha) = f_k + \frac{g_k^T g_k}{b_k^T g_k} + \frac{g_k^T B_k g_k}{2(b_k^T g_k)^2},$$

which together with the fact that $\phi_1'(\alpha) < 0$ holds for $\alpha > \frac{1}{b_k^T g_k}$ implies that

$$\phi_1(\alpha_k^S) - \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_1(\alpha) = \phi_1(\alpha_k^S) - f_k - \frac{g_k^T g_k}{b_k^T g_k} - \frac{g_k^T B_k g_k}{2(b_k^T g_k)^2} - \frac{(g_k^T g_k)^2}{2g_k^T B_k g_k} - \frac{g_k^T g_k}{b_k^T g_k} - \frac{g_k^T B_k g_k}{2(b_k^T g_k)^2} < 0$$

holds for $\alpha > \frac{1}{b_k^T g_k}$. Therefore, the stationary point $\alpha_k^S$ satisfies

$$\alpha_k^S = \arg \min_{\alpha > 0} \phi_k^1(\alpha),$$
which implies that the stationary point $\alpha_k^S$ is the approximately optimal stepsized associated to $\phi_k^1(\alpha)$.

It is observed by numerical experiments that the bound $[\alpha_k^{BB_2}, \alpha_k^{BB_1}]$ for $\alpha_k^S$ is very preferable for the case of $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} > 0$. Therefore, if the condition (2.1) does not hold and the conditions

$$\Delta_k > 0, \quad v_{k-1}^T r_{k-1} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad g_k^T B_k g_k + (g_k^T g_k) (b_k^T g_k) > 0$$

hold, the approximately optimal stepsized is taken as follows:

$$\alpha_k^{AOS} (1) = \begin{cases} 
\max \left\{ \min \left\{ \alpha_k^S, \alpha_k^{BB_1} \right\}, \alpha_k^{BB_2} \right\}, & \text{if } s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} > 0, \\
\alpha_k^S, & \text{if } s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} \leq 0. 
\end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

**Case II: Quadratic Models**

(i) $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} > 0$

It is generally accepted that quadratic model will serve well if $f$ is close to a quadratic function on the segment between $x_{k-1}$ and $x_k$. So we do not wish to abandon quadratic model because of the large amount of practical experience and theoretical work indicating its suitability. If the condition (2.1) holds and $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} > 0$, or the conditions (2.2) do not hold and $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} > 0$, we consider the following quadratic approximation model:

$$\phi_k^2(\alpha) = f(x_k) - \alpha \| g_k \|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 g_k^T B_k g_k,$$

where $B_k$ is a symmetric and positive definite approximation to the Hessian matrix. Taking into account the storage cost and computational cost, $B_k$ is generated by imposing the quasi-Newton update formula on a scalar matrix. Taking the scalar matrix as $D_k = \xi^2 \frac{y_{k-1}^T y_{k-1}}{y_{k-1}^T y_{k-1}} I$, where $\xi^2 \geq 1$, and imposing the modified BFGS update formula [22] on the scalar matrix $D_k$, we obtain

$$B_k = D_k - \frac{D_k s_{k-1} s_{k-1}^T D_k}{s_{k-1}^T D_k s_{k-1}} + \frac{\tilde{y}_{k-1} \tilde{y}_{k-1}^T}{\tilde{y}_{k-1}^T y_{k-1}},$$

where $\tilde{y}_{k-1} = y_{k-1} + \frac{r_k}{\| r_k \|^2} s_{k-1}$ and $\tilde{r}_k = 3 (g_k + g_{k-1})^T s_{k-1} + 6 (f_{k-1} - f_k)$.

Since there exists $u_1 \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$\tilde{r}_k = 3 \left( s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} - s_{k-1}^T \nabla^2 f(x_{k-1} + u_1 s_{k-1}) s_{k-1} \right),$$

in order to improve the numerical performance we restrict $\tilde{r}_k$ as

$$\tilde{r}_k = \min \left\{ \max \left\{ \tilde{r}_k, -\tilde{\eta} s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} \right\}, \tilde{\eta} s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} \right\}, \quad (2.5)$$

where $0 < \tilde{\eta} < 0.1$.

It follows from (2.5) that $s_{k-1}^T \tilde{y}_{k-1} = s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} + \tilde{r}_k \geq (1-\eta) s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1}$ when $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} > 0$, which implies the following lemma.
Lemma 2.1 Suppose that $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} > 0$. Then $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} > 0$ and $B_k$ is symmetric and positive definite.

Imposing $\frac{ds_2^2}{d\alpha} = 0$, we obtain

$$\hat{\alpha}_k^{AOS(2)} = \frac{g_k^T g_k}{g_k^T B_k g_k} = \frac{g_k^T g_k}{s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} - \frac{||g_k||^2}{s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1}} + \frac{g_k^T g_{k-1}}{s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1}} + \frac{\tau_k g_k^T y_{k-1}}{s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1}} + \frac{\eta_k^g y_{k-1}}{s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1}} ||s_{k-1}||^2}.$$

(2.6)

By $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} > 0$ and Lemma 2.1, we know that $\hat{\alpha}_k^{AOS(2)}$ is the approximately optimal stepsizes associated to $\phi_k^g(\alpha)$.

It is also observed by numerical experiments that the bound $\left[\alpha_k^{BB_{2}}, \alpha_k^{BB_{1}}\right]$ for $\alpha_k$ in (2.6) is very preferable. Therefore, if the condition (2.1) holds and $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} > 0$, or the conditions (2.3) do not hold and $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} > 0$, the approximately optimal stepsizes is taken as the truncation form of $\hat{\alpha}_k^{AOS(2)}$:

$$\alpha_k^{AOS(2)} = \max\left\{\min\left\{\hat{\alpha}_k^{AOS(2)}, \alpha_k^{BB_{2}}\right\}, \alpha_k^{BB_{1}}\right\}.$$

(2.7)

(ii) $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} \leq 0$

It is a challenging task to determine a suitable stepsizes for gradient method when $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} \leq 0$. In some modified BB methods [9, 12], the stepsizes is set simply to $\alpha_k = 10^{30}$ for the case of $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} \leq 0$. It is too simple to consume expensive computational cost for searching a suitable stepsizes for gradient method.

In [34], Liu et al. proposed a simple and efficient strategy for choosing the stepsizes for the case of $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} \leq 0$: $\alpha_k = \delta \alpha_{k-1}$, where $\delta > 0$. Liu and Liu [32] designed an approximation model to generate approximately optimal stepsizes. Liu and Liu [31] designed two approximation models to generate two approximately optimal stepsizes, and the numerical results in [31] showed that these approximately optimal stepsizes are efficient. We take the stepsizes [31] for gradient method, which is described here for completeness.

If the condition (2.1) holds and $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} \leq 0$, or the conditions (2.3) do not hold and $s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} \leq 0$, we design other approximation models to derive approximately optimal stepsizes. Suppose for the moment that $f$ is twice continuously differentiable, the second order Taylor expansion is

$$f(x_k - \alpha g_k) = f(x_k) - \alpha g_k^T g_k + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 g_k^T \nabla^2 f(x_k) g_k + o(\alpha^2).$$

For a very small $\tau_k > 0$, we have that

$$\nabla^2 f(x_k) g_k \approx \frac{g(x_k - \tau_k g_k) - g(x_k)}{\tau_k},$$

which gives a new approximation model

$$\phi_k^g(\alpha) = f(x_k) - \alpha g_k^T g_k + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 g_k^T (g(x_k - \tau_k g_k) - g(x_k))/\tau_k].$$
If \( g_k^T (g(x_k - \tau_k g_k) - g(x_k))/\tau_k \neq 0 \), then by imposing \( \frac{d \phi_k^3}{d \alpha} = 0 \) and the coefficient of \( \alpha^2 \) in \( \phi_k^3 (\alpha) \), we obtain the approximately optimal stepsize associated to \( \phi_k^3 (\alpha) \):

\[
\alpha_k^{AOS(3)} = \frac{g_k^T g_k}{g_k^T (g(x_k - \tau_k g_k) - g(x_k))/\tau_k}. \tag{2.8}
\]

When \( g_k^T (g(x_k - \tau_k g_k) - g(x_k))/\tau_k = 0 \), similar to \([34]\), the stepsize \( \alpha_k \) is computed by

\[
\alpha_k = \delta \alpha_{k-1}, \tag{2.9}
\]

where \( \delta > 0 \).

To obtain the stepsize \( \alpha_k \) in (2.8), it has the cost of an extra gradient evaluation, which may result in great computational cost if the gradient evaluation is evoked frequently. To reduce the computational cost, we turn to consider \( g_{k-1} \). Since

\[
s_{k-1}^T g_{k-1} = -\alpha_{k-1} g_{k-1}^T (g_k - g_{k-1}) = \alpha_{k-1} (\|g_{k-1}\|^2 - g_{k-1}^T g_k) \leq 0,
\]

we have that

\[
\|g_{k-1}\|^2 \leq g_{k-1}^T g_k,
\]

which implies

\[
\frac{\|g_{k-1}\|}{\|g_k\|} \leq 1.
\]

If \( \|g_{k-1}\|^2 \geq \xi_3 \), where \( \xi_3 > 0 \) is close to 1, we know that \( g_k \) and \( g_{k-1} \) will incline to be collinear and \( \|g_k\| \) and \( \|g_{k-1}\| \) are approximately equal. In the case, we use \( g_{k-1}^T \nabla^2 f(x_k) g_{k-1} \) to approximate \( g_k^T \nabla^2 f(x_k) g_k \), and then use

\[
\left\| \left( \frac{(g_k + \alpha_{k-1} g_{k-1}) - g(x_k)}{\alpha_{k-1}} \right)^T g_{k-1} \right\| = \left\| \frac{s_{k-1}^T g_{k-1}}{\alpha_{k-1}} \right\|
\]

to estimate \( g_{k-1}^T \nabla^2 f(x_k) g_{k-1} \), which imply a new approximation model:

\[
\phi_k^4 (\alpha) = f(x_k) - \alpha \|g_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 \left| \frac{s_{k-1}^T g_{k-1}}{\alpha_{k-1}^2} \right|.
\]

If \( s_{k-1}^T g_{k-1} \neq 0 \), by imposing \( \frac{d \phi_k^4}{d \alpha} = 0 \) and the coefficient of \( \alpha^2 \) in \( \phi_k^4 (\alpha) \), we also obtain the approximately optimal stepsize associated to \( \phi_k^4 (\alpha) \):

\[
\alpha_k^{AOS(4)} = \frac{\|g_k\|^2}{s_{k-1}^T g_{k-1} \alpha_{k-1}^2}. \tag{2.10}
\]

As for the case of \( s_{k-1}^T g_{k-1} = 0 \), the stepsize is also computed by (2.9).
Therefore, if the condition (2.1) holds and \( s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} \leq 0 \), or the conditions (2.3) do not hold and \( s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} \leq 0 \), the stepsize is determined by

\[
\alpha_k = \begin{cases} 
\frac{g_k^T y_k}{\|g_k\|^2} & \text{if } \|g_k\|^2 < \xi_3 \text{ and } g_k^T (g(x_k - \tau_k g_k) - g(x_k)) / \tau_k \neq 0, \\
\delta \alpha_{k-1} & \text{if } \|g_k\|^2 \geq \xi_3 \text{ and } s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} \neq 0, \\
0 & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \delta > 0 \).

3 Gradient Method with Approximately Optimal Stepsize Based on Conic Model

In the section, we present an improved gradient method with approximately optimal stepsize based on conic model (we call it GM\_AOS (cone) for short) for unconstrained optimization. Though GLL line search [7] was firstly incorporated into the BB method [6], it is observed by numerical experiments that for modified BB methods the nonmonotone line search (Zhang-Hager line search) proposed by Zhang and Hager [24] is preferable. Usually, the strategy (3.2) for a nonmonotone line search [25] is used to accelerate the convergence rate. Therefore, we adopt Zhang-Hager line search with the strategy (3.2) in GM\_AOS (cone). Motivated by SMCG\_BB [36], at the first iteration we choose the initial stepsize \( \alpha_0^0 \) as

\[
\alpha_0^0 = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } |f| \leq 10^{-30} \text{ and } \|x_0\|_\infty \leq 10^{-30}, \\
2 |f| / \|g_0\|, & \text{if } |f| > 10^{-30} \text{ and } \|x_0\|_\infty \leq 10^{-30}, \\
\min \{1, \|x_0\|_\infty / \|g_0\|_\infty\}, & \text{if } \|g_0\|_\infty < 10^7 \text{ and } \|x_0\|_\infty > 10^{-30}, \\
\min \{1, \max \{1, \|x_0\|_\infty / \|g_0\|_\infty\}\}, & \text{if } \|g_0\|_\infty \geq 10^7 \text{ and } \|x_0\|_\infty > 10^{-30}.
\end{cases}
\]

Now we describe GM\_AOS (cone) in detail.

**Algorithm 1 GM\_AOS (cone)**

**Step 0** Initialization. Given a starting point \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \), constants \( \varepsilon > 0 \), \( \lambda_{\min}, \lambda_{\max}, \eta_{\min}, \eta_{\max}, \sigma, \delta, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \eta, c_1 \) and \( c_2 \). Set \( Q_0 = 1, C_0 = f_0 \) and \( k := 0 \).

**Step 1** If \( \|g_k\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon \), then stop.

**Step 2** Compute the initial stepsize for Zhang-Hager line search.

**Step 2.1** If \( k = 0 \), then compute \( \alpha_0^0 \) by (3.1) and set \( \alpha = \alpha_0^0 \), go to Step 3.

**Step 2.2** If the condition (2.1) does not hold and the conditions (2.3) hold, then compute \( \alpha_k \) by (2.4). Set \( \alpha_k^0 = \max \{ \min \{ \alpha_k, \lambda_{\max} \}, \lambda_{\min} \} \) and \( \alpha = \alpha_k^0 \), and go to Step 3.

**Step 2.3** If \( s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1} > 0 \), then compute \( \alpha_k \) by (2.7); otherwise compute \( \alpha_k \) by (2.11). Set
\( \alpha_k^0 = \max \{ \min \{ \alpha_k, \lambda_{\text{max}} \}, \lambda_{\text{min}} \} \) and \( \alpha = \alpha_k^0 \), and go to Step 3.

**Step 3** Zhang-Hager line search. If

\[
f(x_k - \alpha g_k) \leq C_k - \sigma \alpha \| g_k \|^2,
\]

then go to Step 4. Otherwise, update \( \alpha \) by [25]

\[
\alpha = \begin{cases} 
\bar{\alpha}, & \text{if } \alpha > 0.1 \alpha_k^0 \text{ and } \bar{\alpha} \in [0.1 \alpha_k^0, 0.9], \\
0.5 \alpha, & \text{otherwise}, 
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \bar{\alpha} \) is the trial stepsize obtained by a quadratic interpolation at \( x_k \) and \( x_k - \alpha g_k \), go to Step 3.

**Step 4** Choose \( \eta_k \in [\eta_{\text{min}}, \eta_{\text{max}}] \) and update \( Q_{k+1}, C_{k+1} \) by the following ways:

\[
Q_{k+1} = \eta_k Q_k + 1, C_{k+1} = (\eta_k Q_k C_k + f(x_{k+1}))/Q_{k+1}.
\]

**Step 5** Set \( \alpha_k = \alpha, x_{k+1} = x_k - \alpha_k g_k, k := k + 1 \) and go to Step 1.

In what follows, we analyze the convergence and the convergence rate of GM_AOS (cone). Our convergence result utilizes the following assumptions:

A1. \( f \) is continuously differentiable on \( \mathbb{R}^n \).

A2. \( f \) is bounded below on \( \mathbb{R}^n \).

A3. The gradient \( g \) is Lipschitz continuous on \( \mathbb{R}^n \), namely, there exists \( L > 0 \) such that

\[
\| g(x) - g(y) \| \leq L \| x - y \|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

Since \( d_k = -g_k \), we have \( \| d_k \| = \| g_k \| \) and \( g_k^T d_k = -\| g_k \|^2 \). Therefore, by Theorem 2.2 of [24] we can easily obtain the following theorem which shows that GM_AOS (cone) is globally convergent.

**Theorem 3.1** Suppose that assumption A1, A2 and A3 hold. Let \( \{ x_k \} \) be the sequence generated by GM_AOS (cone). Then

\[
\liminf_{k \to \infty} ||g_k|| = 0.
\]

Furthermore, if \( \eta_{\text{max}} < 1 \), then

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} ||g_k|| = 0.
\]

Hence, every convergent subsequence of the \( \{ x_k \} \) approaches a stationary point \( x^* \).

Similar to the above theorem, by Theorem 3.1 of [24], we also obtain the following theorem which implies the R-linear convergence of GM_AOS (cone).
Theorem 3.2 Suppose that A1 and A3 hold, $f$ is strongly convex with unique minimizer $x^*$ and $\eta_{\max} < 1$. Then there exists $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$f(x_k) - f(x^*) \leq \zeta^k (f(x_0) - f(x^*)),$$

for each $k \geq 0$.

4 Numerical Experiments

In the section, some numerical experiments are conducted to check the numerical performance of GM\_AOS (cone). Two groups of collect sets are used, and their names are described in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively. The first group of collect sets denoted by 80pAndr includes 80 test functions mainly from [27], and their expressions and Fortran codes can be found in Andrei’s website: http://camo.ici.ro/nercui/AHYBRIDM. The dimension of each test function in 80pro\_Andrei is set to 10000 and the initial points are default. The second group of collect sets denoted by 144pCUTEr includes 145 test functions from CUTEr library [28], which can be found in http://users.clas.ufl.edu/hager/papers/CG/results6.0.txt. It is noted that the 144 test functions from CUTEr library [28] are indeed used to test, as the default initial point is the optimal point in the test function “FLETCBV2”, so the second group of collect sets is denoted by 144pCUTEr. And the initial points and dimensions of the test functions from 144pCUTEr are default.

The BB method, the SBB4 method [8], CGOPT [26] and CG\_DESCENT [15] are chosen to be compared with GM\_AOS (cone). All test methods are implemented by C language. The C code of GM\_AOS (cone) and some numerical results can be downloaded from the website: http://web.xidian.edu.cn/xdliuhongwei/en/paper.html. The codes of CGOPT and CG\_DESCENT can be downloaded from http://coa.amss.ac.cn/wordpress/?page_id=21 and http://users.clas.ufl.edu/hager/papers/Software, respectively.

In the numerical experiments, GM\_AOS (cone) uses the following parameters: $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$, $\delta = 10$, $\sigma = 10^{-4}$, $\lambda_{\min} = 10^{-30}$, $\lambda_{\max} = 10^{30}$, $\eta_k = 1$, $\bar{\eta} = 5.0/3 \times 10^{-5}$, $\tau_k = \min\{0.1\alpha_k-1, 0.01\}$, $\xi_1 = 2.15$, $\xi_2 = 1.07$, $\xi_3 = 0.9$, $c_1 = 10^{-8}$ and $c_2 = 0.07$. The BB method and the SBB4 method adopt the same line search as GM\_AOS (cone). All the gradient methods are stopped if $\|g_k\|_{\infty} \leq 10^{-6}$ is satisfied, the number of iterations exceeds 140000, or the number of function evaluations exceeds 50000. CG\_DESCENT and CGOPT are terminated if $\|g_k\|_{\infty} \leq 10^{-6}$ is satisfied or the number of iterations exceeds 140000, and use all default parameter values in their codes but the above stopping conditions.
The numerical experiments with 80pro_Andrei are running on Microsoft Visual Studio 2012, which is installed in Windows 7 in a PC with 3.20 GHz CPU processor, 4 GB RAM memory, while the numerical experiments with 144pCUTEr are running on Ubuntu 10.04 LTS fixed in a VMware Workstation 10.0, which is installed in Windows 7 in the same PC. The performance profiles introduced by Dolan and Moré [37] are used to display the performance of these methods, respectively. In the following figures, $N_{iter}$, $N_f$, $N_g$ and $T_{CPU}$ represent the performance profiles in term of the number of iterations, the number of function evaluations, the number of gradient evaluations and CPU time (s), respectively.

The numerical experiments are divided into four groups.

In the first group of numerical experiments, we use the collect set 80pAndr to examine the effectiveness of the stepsize (2.11). In Figs. 1-4, “GM_AOS (cone) with $\alpha_k = 10^{30}$” stands for the variant of GM_AOS (cone), which is different from GM_AOS (cone) only in that (2.11) is replaced by $\alpha_k = 10^{30}$ in the Step 2.3
of GM\_AOS (cone). In numerical experiments, GM\_AOS (cone) successfully solves all 80 problems, while its
variant successfully solves 76 problems. As shown in Fig. 1, GM\_AOS (cone) performs slightly better than its
variant in term of the number of iterations. We can observe from Figs. 2-3 that GM\_AOS (cone) requires much
less function evaluations and less gradient evaluations than its variant since the stepsize (2.11) is used. In Fig. 4,
we see that GM\_AOS (cone) is much faster than its variant. It indicates that the stepsize (2.11) is very efficient.

![Fig. 5: N_{iter} (80pAndr)](image)

![Fig. 6: N_{f} (80pAndr)](image)

![Fig. 7: N_{g} (80pAndr)](image)

![Fig. 8: T_{CPU} (80pAndr)](image)

In the second group of numerical experiments, we also use the collect set 80pAndr to compare the per-
formances of GM\_AOS (cone) with that of the SBB4 method and the BB method. In numerical experiments,
GM\_AOS (cone) successfully solves all 80 problems, while the SBB4 method and the BB method successfully
solve 75 and 76 problems, respectively. As shown in Fig. 5, GM\_AOS (cone) outperforms the SBB4 method
and the BB method, since GM\_AOS (cone) successfully solves about 68% problems with the least ite-
rations, while the percentages of the SBB4 method and the BB method are about 28% and 15%, respectively. Similar
observation can be made in Fig. 7 for the number of gradient evaluations. We observe from Fig. 6 that GM_AOS (cone) has a very great advantage over the SBB4 method and the BB method in term of the number of function evaluations, since GM_AOS (cone) successfully solves about 77% problems with the least function evaluations, while the percentage of the SBB4 method and the BB method are 21% and 18%, respectively. Fig. 8 shows that GM_AOS (cone) is much faster than the SBB4 method and the BB method. It indicates that GM_AOS (cone) is superior to the SBB4 method and the BB method.

Fig. 9: $N_{iter}$ (80pAndr)  
Fig. 10: $N_f$ (80pAndr)  
Fig. 11: $N_g$ (80pAndr)  
Fig. 12: $T_{CPU}$ (80pAndr)

In the third group of numerical experiments, we use the collect sets 80pAndr and 144pCUTEr to compare the performance of GM_AOS with that of CGOPT. For 80pAndr, GM_AOS (cone) successfully solves all 80 problems, while CGOPT successfully solves 79 problems. Figs. 9-12 plot the performance profiles of GM_AOS (cone) and CGOPT for 80pAndr in term of $N_t$, $N_f$, $N_g$ and $T_{CPU}$. As shown in Figs. 9-12, we observe that GM_AOS (cone) is considerably superior to CGOPT for 80pAndr. For 144pCUTEr, GM_AOS (cone) successfully...
solves 134 problems, while CGOPT successfully solves 133 problems. Figs. 13-16 plot the performance profiles of GM\_AOS (cone) and CGOPT for 144pCUTEr in term of $N_f$, $N_g$, $N_f + 3N_g$ [38] and $T_{CPU}$. As shown in Fig. 13, GM\_AOS (cone) is much superior to CGOPT in term of $N_f$, since GM\_AOS (cone) solves about 78% problems with the least function evaluation, while the percentage of CGOPT is about 29% for 80pAndr. Fig. 14 indicates that GM\_AOS (cone) is inferior to CGOPT in term of $N_g$, while Fig. 15 shows that GM\_AOS (cone) performs a little better than CGOPT in term of $N_f + 3N_g$. We observe from Fig. 16 that GM\_AOS (cone) is as fast as CGOPT. It indicates GM\_AOS (cone) is much superior to CGOPT for 80pAdr and is comparable to CGOPT for 144pCUTEr.

In the fourth group of numerical experiments, we use the collect set 80pAndr to compare the performance of GM\_AOS with that of CG\_DESCENT (6.0), which is the limited memory conjugate gradient software package, and then use the collect set 144pCUTEr to compare the performance of GM\_AOS with that of CG\_DESCENT (5.0). For 80pAndr, GM\_AOS (cone) successfully solves all 80 problems, while CG\_DESCENT (6.0) successfully solves 75 problems. Figs. 17-20 plot the performance profiles of GM\_AOS (cone) and CG\_DESCENT (6.0) for
As shown in Figs. 17-18, we observe that GM\_AOS (cone) is considerably superior to CG\_DESCENT (6.0) in term of $N_f$ but is a little inferior to CG\_DESCENT (6.0) in term of $N_g$. Fig. 19 shows that GM\_AOS (cone) performs better than CG\_DESCENT (6.0) in term of $N_f + 3N_g$. We observe from Fig. 20 that GM\_AOS (cone) is faster than CG\_DESCENT (6.0). For 144pCUTEr, GM\_AOS (cone) successfully solves 134 problems, while CG\_DESCENT (5.0) successfully solves 142 problems.

Figs. 21-24 plot the performance profiles of GM\_AOS (cone) and CG\_DESCENT (5.0) for 144pCUTEr in terms of $N_f$, $N_g$, $N_f + 3N_g$ and $T_{CPU}$. As shown in Fig. 21, GM\_AOS (cone) is much superior to CGOPT in term of $N_f$, since GM\_AOS (cone) solves about 65% problems with the least function evaluations, while the percentage of CG\_DESCENT (5.0) is about 39%. Fig. 22 indicates that GM\_AOS (cone) is inferior to CG\_DESCENT (5.0) in term of $N_g$, while Fig. 23 shows that GM\_AOS (cone) is comparable to CG\_DESCENT (5.0) in term of $N_f + 3N_g$. We observe from Fig. 24 that GM\_AOS (cone) is as fast as CG\_DESCENT (5.0). It indicates GM\_AOS (cone) is superior to CG\_DESCENT (6.0) for 80pAdr and is comparable to CG\_DESCENT (5.0) for 144pCUTEr.
5 Conclusions and Discussions

In this paper, we present an improved gradient method with approximately optimal stepsize based on conic model (GM_AOS (cone)). In GM_AOS (cone), some approximation models including the conic model and some quadratic models are exploited to generate approximately optimal stepsizes for gradient method. It is noted that the main difference between the proposed method and the gradient method with approximately optimal stepsize based on conic model [31] lies that the proposed method uses the stepsize (3.1) as the initial stepsize at the first iteration, while the gradient method [31] takes \(1/\|g_0\|_\infty\) as the initial stepsize. In addition, more numerical experiments with two group collect sets 80pAdr and 144pCUTEr are conducted to examine the effectiveness of the proposed method. Numerical results indicate that GM_AOS (cone) is superior to the SBB4 method and the BB method, performs better than CGOPT [26] for 80pAdr and is comparable to CGOPT for 144pCUTEr, and is superior to the limited memory conjugate gradient software package CG_DESCENT (6.0) [29] for 80pAdr.
Table 1: The test functions in collect set 80pAndr mainly from [27]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freudenstein and Roth FREUROTH (CUTE)</td>
<td>EG2 (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Trigonometric ET1</td>
<td>EDENSCH (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Rosenbrock SROSENBR (CUTE)</td>
<td>Broyden Pentadiagonal (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended White and Holst</td>
<td>Almost Perturbed Quadratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Beale BEALE (CUTE)</td>
<td>Almost Perturbed Quartic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Penalty</td>
<td>FLETCHCR (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perturbed Quadratic</td>
<td>ENGVAL1 (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raydan 1</td>
<td>DENSCHNA (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raydan 2</td>
<td>DENSCHNB (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-SUMM</td>
<td>DENSCHNC (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagonal 1</td>
<td>DENSCHNF (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagonal 2</td>
<td>SINQUAD (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hager</td>
<td>Himmelblau (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Tridiagonal 1</td>
<td>HIMMELBH (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Tridiagonal 1</td>
<td>DIXON3DQ (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Three Expo Terms</td>
<td>BIGGSB1 (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Tridiagonal 2</td>
<td>Perturbed Quadratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagonal 3 (1c1c)</td>
<td>GENROSNB (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagonal Full Bordered</td>
<td>QP1 Extended Quadratic Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Himmelblau HIMMELBC (CUTE)</td>
<td>QP2 Extended Quadratic Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Powell</td>
<td>Tridiagonal TS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridiagonal Double Bordered Arrow Up</td>
<td>Tridiagonal TS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended PSC1</td>
<td>Tridiagonal TS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Block-Diagonal BD1</td>
<td>Extended Trigonometric ET2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Maratos</td>
<td>QP3 Extended Quadratic Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Hessian FH1</td>
<td>EG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Cliff</td>
<td>GENROSEN-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic Diagonal Perturbed</td>
<td>PRODsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Hessian FH2</td>
<td>PROD1 (m=n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Hessian FH3</td>
<td>PRODcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridiagonal Double Bordered - NONDQUAR</td>
<td>PROD2 (m=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridiagonal White and Holst (c=4)</td>
<td>ARGLINB (m=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagonal Double Bordered Arrow Up</td>
<td>DIXMAANA (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIDIA (CUTE)</td>
<td>DIXMAANB (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARWHEAD (CUTE)</td>
<td>DIXMAANC (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONDIA (CUTE)</td>
<td>DIXMAAND (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended WOODS (CUTE)</td>
<td>DIXMAANL (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Hiebert</td>
<td>VARDIM (CUTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQRTIC (CUTE)</td>
<td>DIAG-AUP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQRTIC (CUTE)</td>
<td>ENGVAL8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and is comparable to CG_DESCENT (5.0) [15] for 144pCUTEr. As far as we know, GM_AOS (cone) is the most efficient gradient method for general unconstrained optimization so far.

Given that the search direction $-g_k$ has low storage and can be easily computed, the nonmonotone Armijo line search used can be easily implemented and the numerical effect is surprising, the gradient methods with
Table 2: The test functions in collect set 144pCUTEr from CUTEr library [28]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AKIVA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EDENSCH</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>NONDQUAR</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLINITU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EG2</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>OSBORNEA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGLINA</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>EIGENALS</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>OSBORNEB</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGLINB</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>EIGENBLS</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>OSCIPATH</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARWHEAD</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>EIGENCLS</td>
<td>2652</td>
<td>PALMER1C</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENGVAL1</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>PALMER1D</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDQRTIC</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>ENGVAL2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PALMER2C</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEALE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ERRINROS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>PALMER3C</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIGGS6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EXPFIT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PALMER4C</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOX3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EXTROSNB</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>PALMER5C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOX</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>FLETCBV2</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>PALMER6C</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRMCC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FLETCHCR</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>PALMER7C</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNAL</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>FMINSRF2</td>
<td>5625</td>
<td>PALMER8C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNBS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FMINSURF</td>
<td>5625</td>
<td>PARKCH</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNDEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FREUROTH</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>PENALTY1</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRODYND7D</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>GENHUMPS</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>PENALTY2</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYBND</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>GENROSE</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>PENALTY3</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAINWOO</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>GROWTHLS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>POWELLSG</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHNROSNB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GULF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIFF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HAIRY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>QUARTC</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSINE</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>HATFLDD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ROSENBR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAGGLVY</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>HATFLDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S308</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HATFLDFL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SCHMVETT</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURLY10</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>HEART6LS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SENSORS</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURLY20</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>HEART8LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SINEVAL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURLY30</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>HELIX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SINOQUAD</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECONVU</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>HIELOW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SISSE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSCHNA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HILBERTA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SNAIL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSCHNB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HILBERTB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SPARSINE</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSCHNC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIMMELBB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SPARSQUR</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSCHN3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HIMMELBF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SPMSTRTLS</td>
<td>4999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSCHNE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HIMMELBG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ROSENBR</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSCHNF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIMMELBH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>STRATEC</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXMAANA</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>HUMPS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TESTQUAD</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXMAANB</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>JENSMP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TOINTGOR</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXMAANC</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>JIMACK</td>
<td>3549</td>
<td>TOINTGSS</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXMAAND</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>KOWOSB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TOINTPSP</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXMAANE</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>LIARWHD</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>TOINTQOR</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXMAANF</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>LOGHAIRY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TQUARTIC</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXMAANG</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>MANCINO</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>TRIDIA</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXMAANH</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>MARATOSB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VARDIM</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXMAANI</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>MEXHAT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VAREIGVL</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXMAANJ</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>MOREBV</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>VIBRBEAM</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXMAANK</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>MSQRTALS</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>WATSON</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXMAANL</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>MSQRTBLS</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>WOODS</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXON3DQ</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>NCB20B</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>YFITU</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJTL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NCB20</td>
<td>5010</td>
<td>ZANGWIL2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQDRTIC</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>NONCXYU2</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQRTIC</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>NONDIA</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
approximately optimal stepsizes will be strong candidates for large scale unconstrained optimization. And the following problems are very interesting: (1) What is the best gradient method with approximately optimal stepsize (GM\(_{\text{AOS}}\))? (2) Can the gradient method with approximately optimal stepsize perform better than CG\(_{\text{DESCENT}}\) (5.3) for CUTEr library?
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