

# FAST CONVERGENCE OF GENERALIZED FORWARD-BACKWARD ALGORITHMS FOR STRUCTURED MONOTONE INCLUSIONS

PAUL-EMILE MAINGÉ\*

**Abstract.** In this paper, we develop rapidly convergent forward-backward algorithms for computing zeroes of the sum of finitely many maximally monotone operators. A modification of the classical forward-backward method for two general operators is first considered, by incorporating an inertial term (closed to the acceleration techniques introduced by Nesterov), a constant relaxation factor and a correction term. In a Hilbert space setting, we prove the weak convergence to equilibria of the iterates  $(x_n)$ , with worst-case rates of  $o(n^{-2})$  in terms of both the discrete velocity and the fixed point residual, instead of the classical rates of  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$  established so far for related algorithms. Our procedure is then adapted to more general monotone inclusions and a fast primal-dual algorithm is proposed for solving convex-concave saddle point problems.

**Key words.** Nesterov-type algorithm, inertial-type algorithm, global rate of convergence, fast first-order method, relaxation factors, correction term, accelerated proximal algorithm.

**AMS subject classifications.** 90C25, 90C30, 90C60, 68Q25, 49M25

**1 Introduction.** Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a real Hilbert space endowed with inner product and induced norm denoted by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and  $\| \cdot \|$ , respectively. For any given linear self-adjoint and positive definite mapping  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ , and any bounded linear operator  $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ , we set  $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{M}} = \sqrt{\langle \mathcal{M}(\cdot), \cdot \rangle}$  (as an auxiliary metric on  $\mathcal{H}$ ) and  $\|\mathcal{L}\| = \sup_{\|x\|=1} \|\mathcal{L}x\|$ . Our goal is to propose and study rapidly converging forward-backward methods for solving a wide class of structured monotone inclusions, but it can be applied to a much larger class of problems.

**1.1 A new way to speed up forward-backward methods.** The simplest case of the considered problems consists of finding a zero of the sum of two operators, especially the following monotone inclusion

$$(1.1) \quad \text{find } \bar{x} \in \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } 0 \in A(\bar{x}) + B(\bar{x}),$$

under the assumptions that  $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  is maximally monotone and that  $B : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is co-coercive (see, e.g., [6, 15]). This framework finds many important applications in scientific fields such as image processing, computer vision, machine learning, signal processing, optimization, equilibrium theory, economics and game theory, partial differential equations, statistics, among other subjects (see, e.g., [5, 6, 13, 28, 30, 41, 46, 50]). In particular, we recall that the above setting encompasses the non-smooth structured convex minimization problem

$$(1.2) \quad \min_{\mathcal{H}} \{\Theta := f + g\},$$

where  $g : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  is proper, convex and lower semi-continuous and  $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty)$  is convex differentiable with Lipschitz continuous gradient. Indeed, the gradient of a convex and Frechet differentiable function is well-known to be co-coercive provided that it is Lipschitz continuous (see [6]). Thus, (1.2) is nothing but the special instance of (1.1) when  $A = \partial f$  ( $\partial f$  being the Fenchel sub-differential of  $f$ ) and  $B = \nabla g$  ( $\nabla g$  being the gradient of  $g$ ).

A typical method for solving (1.1), with a  $\beta$ -co-coercive operator  $B$  (for some  $\beta > 0$ ), is the forward-backward algorithm (FBA, for short), which operates according to the routine (see, e.g., Lions-Mercier [31], Passty [37])

$$(1.3) \quad x_{n+1} = J_{\lambda_n A}(x_n - \lambda_n B(x_n)),$$

where  $(\lambda_n) \subset (0, 2\beta)$  and  $J_{\lambda_n A} := (I + \lambda_n A)^{-1}$  is the resolvent operator of  $A$  with index  $\lambda_n$  (see Section 1.2.1 for more details on the resolvent operators).

---

\*Université des Antilles, D.S.I., Campus de Schoelcher, 97233 Cedex, Martinique, F.W.I., MEMIAD (Paul-Emile.Mainge@univ-antilles.fr)

When applied to the minimization problem (1.2), FBA was shown to generate weakly convergent sequences  $(x_n)$ , with worst-case rates  $\Theta(x_n) - \inf_{\mathcal{H}} \Theta = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$  (for the function values) and  $\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$  (for the discrete velocity). These rates have been considerably enhanced through an accelerated forward-backward algorithm (AFBA, for short, which will be described in Section 1.2.2), by means of an inertial-type extrapolation process. The latter AFBA generates convergent sequences  $(x_n)$  with the improved worst-case rates  $\Theta(x_n) - \inf_{\mathcal{H}} \Theta = o(n^{-2})$  and  $\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 = o(n^{-2})$ . Afterwards, general variants of AFBA, with arbitrary monotone operators  $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  and  $B : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ , have been extensively studied and many attempts to get convergence rates similar to that reached for the convex minimization case can be found in the literature (see, e.g., [1,30,33]). However, most of these works are only concerned with empirical results.

Our purpose here is twofold with regard to the previous observations:

First, we aim at extending, in terms of discrete velocity and fixed point residual, the above convergence properties (obtained for structured convex minimization) to some new variant of (1.3). This process will be investigated with an additional preconditioning strategy, as suggested by Lorenz-Pock [30], under the following general conditions:

(1.4a)  $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  is maximally monotone on  $\mathcal{H}$ ;

(1.4b)  $B : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is co-coercive w.r.t a linear, self-adjoint and positive definite map  $L$ ,

(1.4c)  $S := (A + B)^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset$ .

An operator  $B : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  is said to be co-coercive w.r.t a linear and positive definite map  $L : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  if it satisfies

$$(1.5) \quad \langle Bx - By, x - y \rangle \geq \|Bx - By\|_{L^{-1}}^2, \quad \text{for } (x, y) \in \mathcal{H}^2.$$

Note that in the simple case when  $L = \beta^{-1}I$  (for some  $\beta > 0$ ), any operator  $B$  verifying (1.5) is  $\beta$ -co-coercive. It can also turn out useful to consider more general map  $L$  as discussed in [30].

Specifically, for solving (1.1)-(1.4), we introduce CRIFBA (corrected relaxed inertial forward-backward algorithm) which consists of sequences  $\{z_n, x_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$  generated by the following process:

**(CRIFBA):**

▷ **Step 1** (initialization):

Let  $M : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  be a linear self-adjoint and positive definite map,  
let  $\{z_{-1}, x_{-1}, x_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\{s_1, s_0, \nu_0\} \subset [0, \infty)$ ,  $\{e, \lambda, w\} \subset (0, \infty)$ ,  
and set

$$(1.6) \quad \nu_n = s_1 n + \nu_0, \quad \theta_n = 1 - \frac{e+s_1}{e+\nu_{n+1}}, \quad \gamma_n = 1 - \frac{s_0}{e+\nu_{n+1}}.$$

▷ **Step 2** (main step):

Given  $\{z_{n-1}, x_{n-1}, x_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$  (with  $n \geq 0$ ), we compute the updates by

$$(1.7a) \quad v_n = z_{n-1} - x_n,$$

$$(1.7b) \quad z_n = x_n + \theta_n(x_n - x_{n-1}) + \gamma_n v_n,$$

$$(1.7c) \quad x_{n+1} = (1 - w)z_n + wJ_{\lambda M^{-1}A}(z_n - \lambda M^{-1}B(z_n)).$$

where  $J_{\lambda M^{-1}A} := (I + \lambda M^{-1}A)^{-1}$  denotes the resolvent of  $M^{-1}A$  (also referred to as a generalized resolvent of  $A$ ).

The algorithm under consideration can be regarded as a preconditioned and relaxed variant of the classical forward-backward in which we further incorporate the momentum term " $\theta_n(x_n - x_{n-1})$ "

(inspired by Guler's acceleration techniques for convex minimization) and the correction term " $\gamma_n(z_{n-1} - x_n)$ " (similar to that suggested by Kim [26] in proximal point iterations). Note that (1.7c) can be reformulated as

$$(1.8) \quad x_{n+1} = (1 - w)z_n + w(M + \lambda A)^{-1}(Mz_n - \lambda B(z_n)).$$

Then, as illustrated in [30] in the context of convex-concave saddle-point problems, the introduction of the map  $M$  can be helpful in some situations to make the iteration feasible, but it can be also interpreted as a left pre-conditioner to the monotone inclusion (1.1). Furthermore, this procedure allows us to investigate our algorithm with respect to the auxiliary metric  $\|\cdot\|_M$ , which can be also used as a speeding up process.

The simple form of CRIFBA allows us to extend the fast convergence rates obtained for AFBA (in the context of potential operators) to the wide framework of the structured monotone inclusion (1.1)-(1.4), especially in terms of the discrete velocity and the fixed point residual  $\|G_\lambda^M(x_n)\|_M^2$ , where

$$(1.9) \quad G_\lambda^M = \frac{1}{\lambda} (I - J_{\lambda M^{-1}A} \circ (I - \lambda M^{-1}B)),$$

hence  $\|G_\lambda^M(x_n)\|_M = (\lambda w)^{-2} \|x_n - z_{n-1}\|_M^2$ . The term  $G_\lambda^M(z)$  (for  $z \in \mathcal{H}$ ) can be regarded as a tool to measure the accuracy of some point  $z$  to the solution set  $S$  since  $G_\lambda(z) = 0$  is equivalent to  $z \in S$ . In particular, using appropriate parameters  $\{\theta_n, \gamma_n, \lambda, w\}$ , we establish, among others (see, Theorem 2.1), the weak convergence of  $(x_n)$  towards equilibria belonging to  $S$ , with the worst-case rates  $\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|_M^2 = o(n^{-2})$  (for the discrete velocity) and  $\|G_\lambda^M(x_n)\|_M^2 = o(n^{-2})$  (for the fixed point residual).

Secondly, by following the methodology developed by Raguet-Fadili-Peyré [40], we aim at adapting the proposed acceleration techniques to the more general inclusion problem :

$$(1.10) \quad \text{find } \bar{x} \in \mathcal{H} \text{ s.t. } 0 \in B(\bar{x}) + \sum_{k=1}^p A_k(\bar{x}),$$

where  $B : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is  $\beta$ -co-coercive and  $(A_i)_{i=1}^p : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  is a family of  $p$  maximally monotone operators. This gives rise to G-CRIFBA (generalized corrected and regularized forward-backward algorithm), whose structure bears similarities with FBA. Indeed, G-CRIFBA consists of an explicit forward step, followed by an implicit step in which the resolvent operators of each  $A_i$  are computed in parallel. Let us underline that G-CRIFBA provides yet another way for computing the resolvent of the sum of maximally monotone operators at a point  $y \in \text{rang}(I + \sum_{i=1}^p A_i)$ . This can be seen when taking  $B$  as the particular operator defined for  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  by  $B(x) = x - y$  (hence  $B$  is 1-co-coercive). A particular attention will also be paid to the case of potential operators.

## 1.2 Motivations and reminders on proximal splitting algorithms.

**1.2.1 Some splitting variants of the basic proximal algorithm.** A classical method for computing zeroes of a maximally monotone operator  $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  is the so-called PPA (proximal point algorithm) (see Martinet [32], Rockafellar [43, 44]), which consists of iteration

$$(1.11) \quad x_{n+1} = J_{\lambda A}(x_n),$$

where  $J_{\lambda A} := (I + \lambda A)^{-1}$  (for some positive parameter  $\lambda$ ) is the resolvent operator of  $A$ , which is well-known to be everywhere defined and single-valued (see, e.g., [9, 24, 27] for more details). In particular, when  $A = \partial g$  is the Fenchel sub-differential of a proper convex and lower-semi-continuous function  $g : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ , the resolvent operator of  $A$  reduces to the proximal mapping of  $g$  given by

$$(1.12) \quad \text{prox}_{\lambda g}(x) := J_{\lambda \partial g} = \underset{y \in \mathcal{H}}{\text{argmin}} (g(y) + (2\lambda)^{-1} \|x - y\|^2).$$

It is well-known that PPA generates weakly convergent sequences  $(x_n)$  with a discrete velocity that vanishes at the rate  $\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$  (or equivalently,  $\|x_n - J_{\lambda A}(x_n)\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$  for the fixed point residual).

In many situations, however, evaluating the resolvent of the sum of two maximally monotone operators  $A$  and  $B$  turns out to be more complicated than evaluating separately the proximal operators of  $A$  and  $B$ . This observation gave rise to two main categories of splitting methods of practical interest (for instance, in the context of sparse signal recovery [16, 19], machine learning [21] and image processing [40]):

**(c1)** The first category of splitting algorithms is composed of those that essentially include backward steps, namely, no evaluations of  $A$  and  $B$ , but only evaluations of both the resolvent operators of  $A$  and  $B$ . This kind of methods originates from the Peaceman-Rachford and the Douglas-Rachford splitting algorithms (see [20, 29, 38]). As an example, we mention the following iteration (see Corman-Yuan [18], Eckstein-Bertsekas [23])

$$(1.13) \quad x_{n+1} = H(x_n), \quad \text{where } H = J_{\lambda A}(2J_{\lambda B} - I) + I - J_{\lambda B} \quad (\text{for some } \lambda > 0).$$

The operator defined by  $D := H^{-1} - I$  was shown to verify the remarkable properties (see [23])

$$(1.14) \quad D \text{ is maximally monotone}, \quad H = J_D, \quad D^{-1}(0) = S := (A + B)^{-1}(0).$$

Thus, (1.13) is nothing but the fixed point iteration for the resolvent operator  $J_D$ . It is a classical matter to see that the iterates  $(x_n)$  produced by (1.13) converge weakly to some element of  $S$ .

**(c2)** The splitting methods in the second category combine both backward steps (evaluations of resolvent operators) and forward steps (evaluations of one of the two operators).

- A popular example of such methods, for a single-valued mapping  $B$ , is given by so-called forward-backward algorithm (1.3). In specific, when  $B$  is  $\beta$ -co-coercive, (1.3) was shown to be a convergent method, provided that  $(\lambda_n) \subset (0, 2\beta)$ . Note indeed that this latter algorithm can be reformulated as the fixed point iteration  $x_{n+1} = T_{\lambda_n} x_n$ , where  $T_{\lambda_n} = J_{\lambda_n A} \circ (I - \lambda_n B)$ , with a fixed point set  $\text{Fix}(T_{\lambda_n}) = S := (A + B)^{-1}(0)$ . One can easily check that this assumption ensures that  $T_{\lambda_n}$  is non-expansive (since  $J_{\lambda_n A}$  and  $I - \lambda_n B$  are non-expansive). This classically leads to the weak convergence of the iterates  $(x_n)$  generated by (1.3) towards some element of  $S$ .

- Another example, for a single-valued mapping  $B$ , is given by the following forward-backward-forward algorithm proposed by Tseng [47] (see also [8])

$$(1.15) \quad y_n = J_{\lambda_n A}(x_n - \lambda_n B(x_n)), \quad x_{n+1} = y_n - \lambda_n (B(y_n) - B(x_n)).$$

This method was shown to generate (weakly) convergent sequences, even when  $B$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz continuous (which is a weaker condition than co-coerciveness), provided that  $(\lambda_n) \subset (0, L^{-1})$ .

Later on, generalized variants of the forward-backward and forward-backward-forward algorithms (see, e.g., [14, 40]) have been adapted more general inclusion problems such as (1.10).

**1.2.2 Proximal splitting algorithms and acceleration processes.** It is suitable to accelerate the proximal point method and its splitting variants, in view of their various applications.

Note that, in the context of the convex minimization (1.2), the forward-backward method (1.3) reduces to

$$(1.16) \quad x_{n+1} = \text{prox}_{\lambda_n g}(x_n - \lambda_n \nabla f(x_n)).$$

For values  $(\lambda_n) \subset (0, L^{-1})$ , when  $\nabla f$  is assumed to be  $L$ -Lipschitz continuous, (1.16) generates (weakly) convergent sequences  $(x_n)$  that satisfy the (sub-linear) rate  $\Theta(x_n) - \inf_{\mathcal{H}} \Theta = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ .

( [10]).

Afterwards, (1.16) was enhanced through the *Fast Iterative Soft Thresholding Algorithm* (FISTA) proposed by Beck-Teboule [7] (also see [48]), based upon the acceleration techniques of Guler [25] and Nesterov [34–36]). FISTA was shown to produce iterates  $(x_n)$  that guarantee a rate of convergence  $\Theta(x_n) - \inf_{\mathcal{H}} \Theta = \mathcal{O}(n^{-2})$ . However, the convergence of these iterates has not been established.

This drawback was overcome by the following variant of FISTA recently introduced by Chambolle-Dossal (see [12]) (also see Attouch-Peypouquet [3]) given by

$$(1.17) \quad \begin{aligned} z_n &= x_n + \frac{n-1}{n+\alpha-1}(x_n - x_{n-1}), \\ x_{n+1} &= \text{prox}_{\lambda g}(z_n - \lambda \nabla f(z_n)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda \in (0, L^{-1})$  and  $\alpha > 0$ . It was proved for  $\alpha > 3$  (see [3]) that (1.17) generates (weakly) convergent sequences  $(x_n)$  that minimize the function values  $\Theta(x_n)$  with a complexity result of  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-2})$ , instead of the rates  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-2})$  obtained for (1.16) and FISTA, respectively.

It is worthwhile noticing in the case of an arbitrary maximally monotone operator  $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  that accelerated variants of PPA have been proposed and investigated through RIPA (Regularized Inertial Proximal Algorithm) by Attouch-Peypouquet [4], PRINAM (Proximal Regularized Inertial Newton Algorithm) by Attouch-Laslo [2]. These algorithms, despite their interesting asymptotic features, require unbounded proximal indexes for convergence and so cannot be extended to the forward-backward framework. In the same context, an accelerated proximal point method involving constant proximal indexes was proposed by Kim [26], based on the performance estimation problem (PEP) approach of Drori-Teboulle [22]. This yields the worst-case convergence rate of  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-2})$  in terms of fixed point residuals. Once again, no convergence of the iterates was established. To the best of our knowledge, regarding the existing algorithmic solutions to (1.1)-(1.4) with general operators, there are no analogous theoretical convergence results to that obtained for (1.17). Only somewhat empirical accelerations have been proposed, except for the work of Attouch-Cabot [1], via relaxation and inertial extrapolation techniques. Some of these processes are recalled below:

**(e1)** Inertial variants of (1.3), with a co-coercive operator  $B$ , have been discussed by Moudafi-Oliny [33]:

$$(1.18) \quad z_n = x_n + \alpha_n(x_n - x_{n-1}), \quad x_{n+1} = J_{\lambda_n A}(z_n - \lambda_n B(x_n)),$$

and by Lorenz-Pock [30]:

$$(1.19) \quad z_n = x_n + \alpha_n(x_n - x_{n-1}), \quad x_{n+1} = J_{\lambda_n A}(z_n - \lambda_n B(z_n)),$$

where  $(\alpha_n)$  and  $(\lambda_n)$  are positive sequences. Note that this second method involves the evaluation of  $B$  at  $z_n$  instead of  $x_n$  (as done in (1.18)).

**(e2)** A reflected variant of (1.3), with a Lipschitz continuous operator  $B$ , was investigated by Cevher-Vu [11]:

$$(1.20) \quad y_n = 2x_n - x_{n-1}, \quad x_{n+1} = J_{\lambda A}(x_n - \lambda B y_n).$$

**(e3)** An inertial and relaxed variant of (1.3), with a  $\beta$ -co-coercive operator  $B$ , has been discussed by Attouch-Cabot [1]:

$$(1.21) \quad z_n = x_n + \alpha_n(x_n - x_{n-1}), \quad x_{n+1} = (1 - w_n)z_n + w_n J_{\lambda_n A}(z_n - \lambda_n B z_n),$$

where  $\{\alpha_n, w_n, \lambda_n\}$  are positive and bounded sequences. Under various conditions on the parameters, the authors have established the weak convergence to equilibria of the iterates  $(x_n)$ , with additional convergence rates in terms of the discrete velocity and the fixed point residual

$\|G_\lambda^I(x_n)\|^2$  (where  $G_\lambda^I$  was introduced in (1.9)). In particular, this work meets the setting of Nesterov's accelerated methods through the choice  $\alpha_n = 1 - \alpha n^{-1}$  with  $\alpha > 2$  (for the momentum coefficient), along with  $\lambda_n = \lambda \in (0, 2\beta)$  (for the proximal indexes), and  $w_n = 1 - \rho n^{-2}$  and with  $0 < \rho < \alpha(\alpha - 2)(1 - \frac{\lambda}{4\beta})$  (for the relaxation factors). In this framework (see [1, corollary 4.9], they have reached the estimates  $\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$  and  $\sum_n n \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 < \infty$  (for the discrete velocity), along with  $\sum_n n^{-1} \|G_\lambda^I(x_n)\|^2 < \infty$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|G_\lambda^I(x_n)\| = 0$  (for the fixed point residuals).

Thanks to the correction term in CRIFBA we improve these last rates from  $\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$  and  $\|G_\lambda^I(x_n)\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$  to  $\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 = o(n^{-2})$  and  $\|G_\lambda^I(x_n)\|^2 = o(n^{-2})$ .

**1.3 Organization of the paper.** An outline of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we present CRIFBA (with full details on the parameters) and its main convergence results. A proof of the main results is then proposed. In section 4, we specialize CRIFBA to the setting of the more general monotone inclusion (1.10). An application of CRIFBA is given in section 5 relative to convex-concave saddle point problems.

**REMARK 1.1.** *From now on, so as to simplify the notations, we (often) use the following notation: given any sequence  $(u_n)$ , we denote  $\dot{u}_n = u_n - u_{n-1}$ .*

## 2 Main results and preliminary estimations.

**2.1 Main convergence results.** The following result states the convergence of CRIFBA, with an accuracy measured through the operator  $G_\lambda^M$  (introduced in (1.9)).

**THEOREM 2.1.** *Let  $L, M : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  be linear self-adjoint and positive definite maps, and let  $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  and  $B : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  verify (1.4), with  $S := (A + B)^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset$ . Suppose that  $\{x_n, v_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$  are generated by CRIFBA with  $\{s_1, s_0, v_0\} \subset [0, \infty)$  and  $\{e, \lambda, w\} \subset (0, \infty)$  verifying*

$$(2.1) \quad 2s_1 < s_0 < e, \quad 0 < w < 1.$$

*Suppose furthermore that one of the following conditions (2.2a) and (2.2b) holds :*

$$(2.2a) \quad \exists \delta > 0 \text{ s.t. } \lambda \|L\| \leq 4\delta \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{M}_1 := M - \frac{\delta}{w(1-w)} I \text{ is positive definite,}$$

$$(2.2b) \quad \bar{M}_2 := M - \frac{\lambda}{w(1-w)} L \text{ is positive definite.}$$

*Then the following properties are reached:*

$$(2.3a) \quad \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2 = o(n^{-2}), \quad \sum_n n \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2 < \infty, \quad \sum_n n^2 \|\dot{x}_{n+1} - \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 < \infty,$$

$$(2.3b) \quad \|v_n\|_M^2 = o(n^{-2}), \quad \sum_n n \|v_n\|_M^2 < \infty, \quad \sum_n n^2 \|\dot{v}_{n+1}\|_M^2 < \infty,$$

$$(2.3c) \quad \|G_\lambda^M(x_n)\|_M^2 = o(n^{-2}), \quad \sum_n n \|G_\lambda^M(x_n)\|_M^2 < \infty.$$

*Moreover, denoting  $y_n = x_n + (1 - \frac{1}{w})v_n$ , we have:*

$$(2.3d) \quad \|\dot{y}_{n+1}\|_M^2 = o(n^{-2}), \quad \sum_n n \|\dot{y}_{n+1}\|_M^2 < \infty,$$

$$(2.3e) \quad \|G_\lambda^M(y_n)\|_M^2 = o(n^{-2}), \quad \sum_n n \|G_\lambda^M(y_n)\|_M^2 < \infty.$$

*If, in addition,  $M$  and  $L$  are bounded, then:*

$$(2.3f) \quad \exists \bar{x} \in S, \text{ s.t. } (x_n, y_n) \rightharpoonup (\bar{x}, \bar{x}) \text{ weakly in } (\mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|_M)^2,$$

$$(2.3g) \quad \exists y_n^* \in (A + B)(y_n), \text{ s.t. } \|y_n^*\|_M = o(n^{-2}) \text{ and } \sum_n n \|y_n^*\|_M^2 < \infty.$$

Theorem 2.1 will be proved in Section 3.3.

Let us give some comments on the above theorem.

**REMARK 2.1.** Recall that a linear self-adjoint operator  $M : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is called positive definite if it satisfies  $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{\langle Mx, x \rangle}{\|x\|^2} > 0$ . So, we emphasize, for a bounded operator  $L$ , that the two conditions (2.2a) and (2.2b) are always feasible for  $\delta$  and  $\lambda$  small enough. In specific, regarding the classical setting of (1.1)-(1.4) when  $L = \beta^{-1}I$  (with  $\beta > 0$ ) and  $M = I$  (as used for instance in [1, 33, 40]), (2.2a) reduces to  $0 < \lambda \leq 4\beta\delta$  and  $0 < \delta < w(1-w)$ , for some  $\delta > 0$ , which is equivalent to  $0 < \lambda < 4\beta w(1-w)$ , while (2.2b) becomes the more stringent condition  $0 < \lambda < w(1-w)\beta$ . Nonetheless, condition (2.2b) (in general) does not require  $L$  to be bounded.

**2.2 Preliminary estimations on CRIFBA.** In order to prove Theorem 2.1, we exhibit a Lyapunov sequence in connection with the proposed algorithm. This allows us to obtain a series of preliminary estimates. Next, we derive additional estimates from a suitable reformulation of CRIFBA in terms of the quantities  $\dot{x}_n$  and  $v_n$ . Finally we combine the two series of results so as to reach the desired estimates. A preliminary observation regarding this section is given by the following remark.

**REMARK 2.2.** It is importance to notice that (1.7c) can be reformulated as

$$(2.4) \quad x_{n+1} = z_n - w\lambda G_\lambda^M(z_n),$$

where  $G_\lambda^M$  was introduced in (1.9).

**2.2.1 A useful reformulation of the algorithm.** We begin with providing a useful reformulation of CRIFBA. As standing assumptions we assume that  $L : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  and  $M : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  are linear self-adjoint and positive definite maps, and that  $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  and  $B : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  verify condition (1.4). A key result in our analysis is given by the following proposition.

**PROPOSITION 2.2.** The iterates  $(x_n)$  and  $(v_n)$  generated by CRIFBA satisfy (for  $n \geq 0$ )

$$(2.5a) \quad v_{n+1} = (\lambda w)G_\lambda^M(z_n),$$

$$(2.5b) \quad \dot{x}_{n+1} + v_{n+1} = \theta_n \dot{x}_n + \gamma_n v_n.$$

*Proof.* For  $n \geq 0$ , we have  $v_{n+1} = z_n - x_{n+1}$  (by definition of  $v_n$ ) together with  $z_n = x_{n+1} + (\lambda w)G_\lambda^M(z_n)$  (from (2.4)), hence, we obviously infer that  $v_{n+1} = (\lambda w)G_\lambda^M(z_n)$ , which yields (2.5a). Furthermore, by  $z_n = x_n + \theta_n \dot{x}_n + \gamma_n v_n$  (from (1.7b)), we immediately obtain  $v_{n+1} := z_n - x_{n+1} = \theta_n \dot{x}_n + \gamma_n v_n - \dot{x}_{n+1}$ , which entails (2.5b).  $\square$

**2.2.2 Co-coerciveness of  $G_\lambda^M$  and basic properties on  $(x_n)$  and  $(v_n)$ .** The following result establishes a co-coerciveness property for  $G_\lambda^M$ , which plays a central role in our methodology.

**PROPOSITION 2.3.** For any  $\lambda > 0$  and for any  $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{H}^2$ , we have

$$(2.6) \quad \langle \Delta G_\lambda^M(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M \geq \|\Delta B(x_1, x_2)\|_{L^{-1}}^2 + \lambda \|B(x_1) - B(x_2)\|_M^2 - \lambda \langle B(x_1) - B(x_2), \Delta B(x_1, x_2) \rangle,$$

where  $\Delta G_\lambda^M(x_1, x_2) = G_\lambda^M(x_1) - G_\lambda^M(x_2)$  and  $\Delta B(x_1, x_2) = B(x_1) - B(x_2)$ . So, for  $i = 1, 2$ , the following inequalities hold:

$$(2.7) \quad \langle \Delta G_\lambda^M(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M \geq \alpha_i \|\Delta B(x_1, x_2)\|_{L^{-1}}^2 + \lambda \langle H_i \Delta G_\lambda^M(x_1, x_2), \Delta G_\lambda^M(x_1, x_2) \rangle,$$

with parameters  $\alpha_i$  and  $H_i$  defined by

$$(2.8a) \quad \alpha_1 = 1 - \frac{\lambda}{4\delta} \|L\| \quad \text{and} \quad H_1 = M - \delta I \quad (\text{for some given } \delta > 0),$$

$$(2.8b) \quad \alpha_2 = \frac{3}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad H_2 = M - \lambda L.$$

The proof of Proposition 2.3 is given in Appendix A - 1 and it makes use of the following observation.

REMARK 2.3. Recall that for any linear self-adjoint and positive definite operator  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ , there exists a linear self-adjoint and positive definite, map denoted  $\mathcal{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  such that  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  (see [45]). The operator  $\mathcal{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  is called of roof of  $\mathcal{M}$  and it also satisfies  $\|\mathcal{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 = \|\mathcal{M}\|$ .

As an immediate consequence of the previous proposition, we provide basic properties concerning the sequences  $(x_n)$  and  $(v_n)$ .

PROPOSITION 2.4. Suppose that  $\{x_n, v_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$  are generated by CRIFBA with parameters  $\{s_0, s_1\} \subset [0, \infty)$ ,  $\{e, \nu_0, \lambda\} \subset (0, \infty)$  and  $w \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose furthermore, for some integer  $i_c \in \{1, 2\}$ , that  $M_{i_c}$  is positive definite, where  $\bar{M}_1$  and  $\bar{M}_2$  are defined by

$$(2.9) \quad \bar{M}_1 := M - \frac{\delta}{w(1-w)}I \text{ is (for some given } \delta > 0), \quad \bar{M}_2 := M - \frac{\lambda}{w(1-w)}L.$$

Then, for  $n \geq 1$  and for any  $q \in S$  we have the following inequalities:

$$(2.10a) \quad \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M \geq (\lambda w) \alpha_{i_c} \|B(z_{n-1}) - B(q)\|_{L^{-1}}^2 + \frac{(1-w)^2}{w} \|v_n\|_M^2,$$

$$(2.10b) \quad \langle \dot{v}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M \geq (\lambda w) \alpha_{i_c} \|B(z_n) - B(z_{n-1})\|_{L^{-1}}^2 + \frac{(1-w)^2}{w} \|\dot{v}_{n+1}\|_M^2,$$

where  $\alpha_{i_c}$  is given by (2.8).

*Proof.* For convenience of the reader we set  $\zeta_n = G_\lambda^M(z_n)$ . Clearly, for  $n \geq 1$ , by Remark 2.2 we have  $x_n = z_{n-1} - \lambda w \zeta_{n-1}$ . It follows immediately for  $q \in S$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M &= (\lambda w) \langle \zeta_{n-1}, x_n - q \rangle_M \\ &= (\lambda w) \langle \zeta_{n-1}, z_{n-1} - q \rangle_M - (\lambda w)^2 \|\zeta_{n-1}\|_M^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Proposition 2.3 and recalling that  $G_\lambda^M(q) = 0$  we have (for  $i = 1, 2$ )

$$\langle \zeta_{n-1}, z_{n-1} - q \rangle_M \geq \alpha_i \|B(z_{n-1}) - B(q)\|_{L^{-1}}^2 + \lambda \langle H_i \zeta_{n-1}, \zeta_{n-1} \rangle.$$

Consequently, by the previous statements, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M &- (\lambda w) \alpha_i \|B(z_{n-1}) - B(q)\|_{L^{-1}}^2 \\ &\geq \langle (\lambda^2 w H_i - (\lambda w)^2 M) \zeta_{n-1}, \zeta_{n-1} \rangle \\ &= \lambda^2 w \langle (H_i - wM) \zeta_{n-1}, \zeta_{n-1} \rangle = \lambda^2 w (1-w) \langle \bar{J}_i \zeta_{n-1}, \zeta_{n-1} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{J}_1 &= (1-w)^{-1} (H_1 - wM) = (1-w)^{-1} (M - \delta I - wM) \\ &= M - \delta (1-w)^{-1} I = (1-w)M + w\bar{M}_1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{J}_2 &= (1-w)^{-1} (H_2 - wM) = (1-w)^{-1} (M - \lambda L - wM) \\ &= M - \lambda (1-w)^{-1} L = (1-w)M + w\bar{M}_2. \end{aligned}$$

This leads immediately to (2.10a). Next, for  $n \geq 1$ , by (2.5a) we obviously have  $\dot{v}_{n+1} = \lambda w (\zeta_n - \zeta_{n-1})$ , while Remark 2.2 yields  $\dot{x}_{n+1} = \dot{z}_n - \lambda w (\zeta_n - \zeta_{n-1})$ . Then we immediately see that

$$\langle \dot{v}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M = \lambda w \langle \zeta_n - \zeta_{n-1}, \dot{z}_n \rangle_M - (\lambda w)^2 \|\zeta_n - \zeta_{n-1}\|_M^2.$$

In addition, by Proposition 2.3, we have (for  $i = 1, 2$ )

$$\langle \dot{\zeta}_n, \dot{z}_n \rangle_M \geq \alpha_i \|B(z_n) - B(z_{n-1})\|_{L^{-1}}^2 + \lambda \langle H_i \dot{\zeta}_n, \dot{\zeta}_n \rangle.$$

Then by the previous two results we are led to

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \dot{v}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M &- (\lambda w) \alpha_i \|B(z_n) - B(z_{n-1})\|_{L^{-1}}^2 \\ &\geq \langle (\lambda^2 w H_i - (\lambda w)^2 M) \dot{\zeta}_n, \dot{\zeta}_n \rangle = \lambda^2 w \langle (H_i - wM) \dot{\zeta}_n, \dot{\zeta}_n \rangle \\ &= \lambda^2 w (1-w) \langle \bar{J}_i \dot{\zeta}_n, \dot{\zeta}_n \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{J}_i$  was previously introduced. This readily amounts to (2.10b).  $\square$

**2.2.3 Links between the iterates and the graph of  $(A+B)$ .** Consider the elements  $y_n$  and  $y_n^*$  defined by

$$(2.11) \quad y_n = -\frac{1}{w} v_n + z_{n-1} \text{ and } y_n^* = (\lambda w)^{-1} M v_n + B(y_n) - B(z_{n-1}).$$



REMARK 2.4. Note that, for  $n \geq 1$  we have  $z_{n-1} = v_n + x_n$  (from definition of  $v_n$ ), so  $y_n = x_n + (1 - \frac{1}{w})v_n$ , which is nothing but the formulation of  $y_n$  used in Theorem 2.1.

The following result makes the connection between  $y_n^*$  and  $(A + B)(y_n)$ .

PROPOSITION 2.5. Let  $\{x_{n+1}, v_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  be sequences produced by CRIFBA. Then, for  $n \geq 0$ , the elements  $y_{n+1}$  and  $v_{n+1}$  given by (2.11) satisfy

$$(2.12a) \quad (\lambda w)^{-1} M v_{n+1} \in B(z_n) + A(y_{n+1}),$$

$$(2.12b) \quad y_{n+1}^* \in B(y_{n+1}) + A(y_{n+1}).$$

If, in addition,  $M$  and  $L$  are bounded and such that  $M - \rho L$  or  $M - \rho I$  is positive definite (for some  $\rho > 0$ ), then

$$(2.13) \quad \|y_{n+1}^*\|_M \leq \frac{1}{w} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda} \|M\| + \frac{1}{\rho^{1/2}} (\|M\| \cdot \|L\|)^{\frac{1}{2}} (1 + \|L\|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right) \|v_{n+1}\|_M.$$

The proof of Proposition 2.5 is given in Appendix A - 2.

**3 Convergence analysis of CRIFBA.** A series of estimates are obtained here by means of a Lyapunov analysis (based upon Proposition 3.2) and using the reformulation of CRIFBA. The main results of Theorem 2.1 will be derived as a combination of the previous series of estimates. As standing assumptions we assume that  $L : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  and  $M : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  are linear self-adjoint and positive definite maps and that  $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$  and  $B : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  are maximally monotone operators.

**3.1 Estimates from an energy-like sequence.** With the iterates  $\{x_n, v_n\}$  produced by CRIFBA, we associate the sequence  $(\mathcal{E}_n(s, q))$  defined for  $(s, q) \in (0, \infty) \times S$  and for  $n \geq 0$  by

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{E}_n(s, q) = \frac{1}{2} \|s(q - x_n) - \nu_n \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 + \frac{1}{2} s(e - s) \|x_n - q\|_M^2 + s(e + \nu_n) \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M.$$

Our Luapunov analysis we be based upon the following lemma.

LEMMA 3.1. Suppose that (1.4) holds and that  $\{x_n, v_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$  are generated by CRIFBA with parameters  $\{s_0, s_1\} \subset [0, \infty)$  and  $\{e, \nu_0, w, \lambda\} \subset (0, \infty)$  such that

$$(3.2) \quad 0 \leq s_1 < s_0 < e, \quad 0 < w < 1.$$

Suppose furthermore that there exists  $i_c \in \{1, 2\}$  such that the following condition holds:

$$(3.3) \quad \alpha_{i_c} \text{ is non-negative and } \bar{M}_{i_c} \text{ is positive definite,}$$

where  $\alpha_{i_c}$  and  $\bar{M}_{i_c}$  are given by (2.8) and (2.9), respectively. Then, for any  $(s, q) \in (0, e] \times \mathcal{H}$  and for  $n \geq 1$ , we have

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \dot{\mathcal{E}}_{n+1}(s, q) + s(s_0 - s_1) \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M \\ & + \frac{(1-w)}{w} (e + \nu_{n+1}) (e - s + \nu_{n+1}) \|\dot{v}_{n+1}\|_M^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2} (e + \nu_{n+1}) \|\dot{x}_{n+1} - \theta_n \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 \\ & + (s_0 - s) (e + \nu_{n+1}) \langle v_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M + \frac{1}{2} (e - s) (e + 2\nu_{n+1}) \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2 \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for  $q \in S$ , the sequence  $(\mathcal{E}_n(s_0, q))_{n \geq 1}$  is non-increasing and convergent, and the following estimates are reached:

$$(3.5a) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \|x_n - q\|_M^2 \leq \frac{2\mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q)}{s_0(e - s_0)},$$

$$(3.5b) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \nu_n \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q)}{s_0},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.5c) \quad & \sup_n n \|\dot{x}_n\|_M < \infty, \\
(3.5d) \quad & \sum_{n \geq 1} \nu_{n+1}^2 \|\dot{v}_{n+1}\|_M^2 \leq \frac{w \mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q)}{(1-w)^2}, \\
(3.5e) \quad & \sum_{n \geq 1} \nu_{n+1} \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2 \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q)}{e-s_0}, \\
(3.5f) \quad & \sum_{n \geq 1} \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q)}{s_0(s_0 - s_1)}, \\
(3.5g) \quad & \sum_n n^2 \|\dot{x}_{n+1} - \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

### 3.1.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1.

#### 3.1.1.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1 - Part I : a useful equality for a Lyapunov analysis.

An important equality of independent interest is proposed here relative to our method through the wider framework of sequences  $\{x_n, d_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$  and  $\{e, \nu_n, \theta_n\} \subset (0, \infty)$  verifying (for  $n \geq 0$ )

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.6a) \quad & \dot{x}_{n+1} - \theta_n \dot{x}_n + d_n = 0, \\
(3.6b) \quad & (e + \nu_{n+1})\theta_n = \nu_n.
\end{aligned}$$

As a key element of our methodology we associate with (3.6) the quantity  $F_n(s, q)$  given for any  $(s, q) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{H}$  by

$$(3.7) \quad F_n(s, q) = \frac{1}{2} \|s(q - x_n) - \nu_n \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 + \frac{1}{2} s(e - s) \|x_n - q\|_M^2.$$

Basic properties regarding the sequence  $(F_n(s, q))$  are established through the following proposition.

**PROPOSITION 3.2.** *Let  $\{x_n, d_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$  and  $\{\theta_n, \nu_n, e\} \subset (0, \infty)$  verify (3.6), and suppose that  $M : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is a linear self-adjoint and positive definite map. Then for  $(s, q) \in (0, e] \times \mathcal{H}$  and for  $n \geq 0$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.8) \quad & \dot{F}_{n+1}(s, q) + \frac{1}{2}(e + \nu_{n+1})^2 \|\dot{x}_{n+1} - \theta_n \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 \\
& + s(e + \nu_{n+1}) \langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle_M \\
& + (e + \nu_{n+1})(e - s + \nu_{n+1}) \langle d_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M = -\frac{1}{2}(e - s)(e + 2\nu_{n+1}) \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Proposition 3.2 is given in Appendix A - 3.

#### 3.1.1.2 Proof of Lemma 3.1 - Part II.

Let us begin with proving (3.4). It can be observed (from (2.5b)) that the iterates  $\{x_n, v_n\}$  generated by CRIFBA enter the special case of the general iterative process (3.6) when taking  $d_n = v_{n+1} - \gamma_n v_n$ . Hence, for  $n \geq 0$ , by Proposition 3.2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.9) \quad & \dot{F}_{n+1}(s, q) + \frac{1}{2} \tau_n^2 \|W_n\|_M^2 \\
& + (s\tau_n) \langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle_M + (\tau_n^2 \vartheta_n) \langle d_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M = -\frac{1}{2}(e - s)(e + 2\nu_{n+1}) \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2.
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tau_n = e + \nu_{n+1}$ ,  $\vartheta_n = 1 - s\tau_n^{-1}$  and  $W_n = \dot{x}_{n+1} - \theta_n \dot{x}_n$ . Let us evaluate the quantity  $(s\tau_n) \langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle_M + (\tau_n^2 \vartheta_n) \langle d_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M$ . Setting  $U_n = \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M$ , by  $d_n = v_{n+1} - \gamma_n v_n$  we have

$$(3.10) \quad \langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle_M = U_{n+1} + \langle -\gamma_n v_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M - \gamma_n U_n,$$

$$(3.11) \quad \langle d_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M = \langle v_{n+1}, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M + \langle -\gamma_n v_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M.$$

This, noticing that  $s\tau_n + \tau_n^2\vartheta_n = \tau_n^2$ , amounts to

$$\begin{aligned} (s\tau_n)\langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle_M + (\tau_n^2\vartheta_n)\langle d_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M \\ = (s\tau_n)U_{n+1} - (s\tau_n)\gamma_n U_n + (\tau_n^2\vartheta_n)\langle v_{n+1}, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M + \tau_n^2\langle -\gamma_n v_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we obviously have

$$\langle v_{n+1}, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M = \langle \dot{v}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M + \langle v_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M.$$

Then, by the previous arguments we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (s\tau_n)\langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle_M + (\tau_n^2\vartheta_n)\langle d_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M \\ = (s\tau_n)U_{n+1} - \gamma_n(s\tau_n)U_n + (\tau_n^2\vartheta_n)\langle v_{n+1}, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M - \gamma_n\tau_n^2\langle v_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M \\ = (s\tau_n)U_{n+1} - \gamma_n(s\tau_n)U_n + (\tau_n^2\vartheta_n)\langle \dot{v}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M + \tau_n^2(\vartheta_n - \gamma_n)\langle v_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, observing that  $\gamma_n = 1 - s_0\tau_n^{-1}$  and that  $\dot{\tau}_n := \tau_n - \tau_{n-1} = s_1$ , an easy computation gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_n\tau_n &= \tau_n - s_0 = \tau_{n-1} - (s_0 - s_1), \\ \tau_n(\vartheta_n - \gamma_n) &= (s_0 - s). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, for  $n \geq 1$ , by Proposition 2.4 and setting  $\eta = \frac{(1-w)^2}{w}$ , we have

$$\langle \dot{v}_{n+1}, x_{n+1} \rangle_M \geq \eta \|\dot{v}_{n+1}\|_M^2.$$

Therefore combining the previous results amounts to

$$\begin{aligned} (3.12) \quad & (s\tau_n)\langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle_M + (\tau_n^2\vartheta_n)\langle d_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M \\ & \geq (s\tau_n)U_{n+1} - (s\tau_{n-1})U_n + s(s_0 - s_1)U_n \\ & \quad + \eta(\tau_n^2\vartheta_n)\|\dot{v}_{n+1}\|_M^2 + \tau_n(s_0 - s)\langle v_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, in light of (3.9), we deduce for  $n \geq 1$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{F}_{n+1}(s, q) + (s\tau_n)U_{n+1} - (s\tau_{n-1})U_n + s(s_0 - s_1)U_n \\ + \eta\tau_n^2\vartheta_n\|\dot{v}_{n+1}\|_M^2 + \tau_n(s_0 - s)\langle v_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M \leq -\frac{1}{2}(e - s)(e + 2\nu_{n+1})\|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2. \end{aligned}$$

This, from  $\mathcal{E}_n(s, q) = F_n(s, q) + (s\tau_{n-1})U_n$  (in light of (3.1)), can be rewritten as (3.4).

Now we prove the second part of Lemma 3.1. For  $q \in S$  and  $s = s_0$ , inequality (3.4) becomes (for  $n \geq 1$ )

$$(3.13) \quad \dot{\mathcal{E}}_{n+1}(s_0, q) + s_0(s_0 - s_1)\langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M \\ + \eta\tau_n^2\vartheta_n\|\dot{v}_{n+1}\|_M^2 + \frac{1}{2}\tau_n^2\|W_n\|_M^2 + \frac{1}{2}(e - s_0)(e + 2\nu_{n+1})\|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2 \leq 0.$$

Clearly, we know that  $U_n$  is non-negative (from Proposition 2.4). It follows immediately that the non-negative sequence  $(\mathcal{E}_n(s_0, q))_{n \geq 1}$  is non-increasing, since the constants  $s_0 - s_1$  and  $e - s_0$  are non-negative (in light of condition (3.2)). Whence it is convergent and bounded. Also recall from (3.1) that

$$(3.14) \quad \mathcal{E}_n(s_0, q) = \frac{1}{2}\|s_0(q - x_n) - \nu_n\dot{x}_n\|_M^2 + \frac{1}{2}s_0(e - s_0)\|x_n - q\|_M^2 + s_0(e + 2\nu_n)\langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M.$$

Then, for  $n \geq 1$ , by the inequality  $\mathcal{E}_n(s_0, q) \leq \mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q)$  we get

$$(3.15) \quad \frac{1}{2}s_0(e - s_0)\|x_n - q\|_M^2 \leq \mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q),$$

$$(3.16) \quad s_0(e + 2\nu_n)\langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M \leq \mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q),$$

$$(3.17) \quad \|\nu_n\dot{x}_n\|_M - \|s_0(q - x_n)\|_M \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q)}.$$

Estimates (3.5a), (3.5b) and (3.5c) are direct consequences of these last three inequalities. Moreover, given some integer  $N \geq 1$ , by adding (3.13) from  $n = 1$  to  $n = N$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (3.18) \quad & \mathcal{E}_{N+1}(s_0, q) + s_0(s_0 - s_1)\sum_{n=1}^N \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M \\ & + \eta\sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n^2\vartheta_n\|\dot{v}_{n+1}\|_M^2 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n^2\|\dot{x}_{n+1} - \theta_n\dot{x}_n\|_M^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2}(e - s_0)\sum_{n=1}^N (e + 2\nu_{n+1})\|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2 \leq \mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q). \end{aligned}$$

It follows immediately that

$$(3.19a) \quad \eta \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n^2 \gamma_n \|\dot{v}_{n+1}\|_M^2 \leq \mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q),$$

$$(3.19b) \quad \frac{1}{2} (e - s_0) \sum_{n=1}^N (e + 2\nu_{n+1}) \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2 \leq \mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q),$$

$$(3.19c) \quad s_0(s_0 - s_1) \sum_{n=1}^N \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M \leq \mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q),$$

$$(3.19d) \quad \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n^2 \|\dot{x}_{n+1} - \theta_n \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 \leq \mathcal{E}_1(s_0, q).$$

This straightforwardly yields (3.5d), (3.5e) and (3.5f). The last estimate (3.5g) is simply deduced from (3.19d) and (3.5e) (in light of the definition of  $\theta_n$ ).  $\square$

**3.2 Estimates from the reformulation of the method.** Additional estimates are established regarding CRIFBA, especially on the sequence  $(v_n + \dot{x}_n)$ .

**LEMMA 3.3.** *Let  $\{x_n, v_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$  be given by CRIFBA with  $\{s_1, s_0\} \subset [0, \infty)$  and  $\{e, \nu_0, w, \lambda\} \subset (0, \infty)$  verifying  $0 < s_0 < e$ . Then, for any  $(s, q) \in (0, e] \times \mathcal{H}$  and for  $n \geq 1$ , we have*

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & (e + \nu_{n+1})^2 \|v_{n+1} + \dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2 - (e + \nu_n)^2 \|v_n + \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 \\ & + (s_0 - 2s_1)(e + \nu_{n+1}) \|v_n + \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 \leq s_0^{-1} (e - s_0 + s_1)^2 (e + \nu_{n+1}) \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose, in addition, that condition (3.3) holds and that the parameters verify

$$(3.21) \quad 0 \leq s_1 < (1/2)s_0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < w < 1.$$

Then the following estimates are reached

$$(3.22a) \quad \sum_n n \|\dot{x}_n + v_n\|_M^2 < \infty,$$

$$(3.22b) \quad \|\dot{x}_n + v_n\|_M = o(n^{-1}).$$

*Proof.* For  $n \geq 1$ , according to Lemma 2.2 and denoting  $\tau_n = e + \nu_{n+1}$  we have  $v_{n+1} + \dot{x}_{n+1} = \theta_n \dot{x}_n + \gamma_n v_n$ , together with  $\gamma_n = 1 - s_0 \tau_n^{-1}$  and  $\theta_n = \nu_n \tau_n^{-1} = 1 - (e + s_1) \tau_n^{-1}$ , which yields

$$v_{n+1} + \dot{x}_{n+1} = \gamma_n (v_n + \dot{x}_n) + (\theta_n - \gamma_n) \dot{x}_n.$$

Then, setting  $H_n = v_n + \dot{x}_n$ , we equivalently have

$$H_{n+1} = \gamma_n H_n + (\theta_n - \gamma_n) \dot{x}_n,$$

along with  $\theta_n - \gamma_n = -(e - s_0 + s_1) \tau_n^{-1}$ , which amounts to

$$H_{n+1} = \gamma_n H_n + (1 - \gamma_n) \frac{\theta_n - \gamma_n}{1 - \gamma_n} \dot{x}_n.$$

Hence, by convexity of the squared norm we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_{n+1}\|_M^2 & \leq \gamma_n \|H_n\|_M^2 + (1 - \gamma_n) \left( \frac{\gamma_n - \theta_n}{1 - \gamma_n} \right)^2 \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2 \\ & = \gamma_n \|H_n\|_M^2 + \frac{(e - s_0 + s_1)^2}{1 - \gamma_n} \tau_n^{-2} \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain

$$\|H_{n+1}\|_M^2 = (1 - s_0 \tau_n^{-1}) \|H_n\|_M^2 + s_0^{-1} (e - s_0 + s_1)^2 \tau_n^{-1} \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2.$$

Then multiplying this last inequality by  $\tau_n^2$  amounts to

$$\tau_n^2 \|H_{n+1}\|_M^2 \leq (\tau_n^2 - s_0 \tau_n) \|H_n\|_M^2 + s_0^{-1} (e - s_0 + s_1)^2 \tau_n \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2,$$

while by  $\tau_n = s_1$  (from the definitions of  $\tau_n$  and  $\nu_n$ ) we simply have

$$\tau_n^2 - \tau_{n-1}^2 \leq s_1 (\tau_n + \tau_{n-1}) \leq 2s_1 \tau_n.$$

Combining these last two results amounts to

$$\tau_n^2 \|H_{n+1}\|_M^2 \leq \tau_n^2 \|H_n\|_M^2 - (s_0 \tau_n - 2s_1 \tau_n) \|H_n\|_M^2 + s_0^{-1} (e - s_0 + s_1)^2 \tau_n \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2,$$

which leads to the desired inequality.

Next we prove the second part of the lemma. Clearly, the assumptions of Lemma 3.3 guarantee that  $\sum_n \tau_n \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2 < \infty$  (according to Lemma 3.1). Consequently, by (3.20) under the condition  $0 \leq s_1 < (1/2)s_0$ , we classically deduce that  $\sum_n \tau_n \|v_n + \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 < \infty$  (namely (3.22a)) and that the sequence  $(\tau_n^2 \|v_{n-1} + \dot{x}_{n-1}\|_M^2)$  is convergent. Thus, there exists  $l_1 \geq 0$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_n^2 \|v_{n-1} + \dot{x}_{n-1}\|_M^2 = l_1$ , hence, we also have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_n^2 \|v_n + \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 = l_1$  (since  $\frac{\tau_{n-1}}{\tau_n} \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ). So, noticing that  $\sum_n \tau_n^{-1} = \infty$ , we are led to  $l_1 = 0$ , which proves (3.22b).  $\square$

**3.3 Proof of Theorem 2.1.** Let us begin with observing that the conditions (2.2a) and (2.2b) correspond to condition (3.3) with  $i_c = 1$  and  $i_c = 2$ , respectively. The rest of the proof will be divided into the following two steps **(B1)**, **(B2)** and **(B3)**:

**(B1)** In order to reach (2.3a), (2.3b) and (2.3d), we prove the following estimates:

$$(3.23) \quad \sum_n n \|v_n\|_M^2 < \infty,$$

$$(3.24) \quad \sum_n n \|\langle v_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle\|_M < \infty,$$

$$(3.25) \quad \|\dot{x}_n\|_M = o(n^{-1}),$$

$$(3.26) \quad \|v_n\|_M = o(n^{-1}).$$

Indeed, from a quick computation, we have

$$(3.27) \quad n \|v_n\|_M^2 \leq 2n \|v_n + \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 + 2n \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2.$$

So, by  $\sum_n n \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2 < \infty$  (from (3.5e)) and  $\sum_n n \|v_n + \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 < \infty$  (from (3.22a)), we immediately obtain (3.23). The estimate (3.24) is an immediate consequence of  $\sum_n n \|\dot{x}_n\|^2 < \infty$  (from (3.5e)) and  $\sum_n n \|v_n\|_M^2 < \infty$  (from (3.23)). Next, passing to the limit as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  in (3.4) amounts to

$$(3.28) \quad \nu_{n+1}^2 \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2 - \nu_n^2 \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2 + s_0(e + \nu_{n+1}) \langle v_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle_M + \frac{1}{2}e(e + 2\nu_{n+1}) \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|_M^2 \leq 0.$$

Then, in light of  $\sum_n n \|\langle v_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle\|_M < \infty$  (from (3.24)) and  $\sum_n n \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2 < \infty$  (from (3.5e)), we derive, from (3.28), that  $(\nu_n^2 \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2)$  is convergent, namely, there exists some  $l_2 \geq 0$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n^2 \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2 = l_2$ . Moreover, by  $\sum_n \nu_n \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2 < \infty$ , and recalling that  $\sum_n \nu_n^{-1} = \infty$ , we get  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n^2 \|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2 = 0$ . It follows that  $l_2 = 0$ , that is (3.25). Next combining this last result with  $\|\dot{x}_n + v_n\|_M = o(n^{-1})$  (from (3.22b)) gives us  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \|v_n\|_M = 0$ , that is (3.26). It can be seen that the estimations in (2.3a) are given by (3.25), (3.5e) and (3.5g), respectively. The estimates in (2.3b) follow from (3.26) and (3.23). Furthermore, by  $y_n = x_n + (1 - \frac{1}{w})v_n$ , we obviously have  $\dot{y}_n = \dot{x}_n + (1 - \frac{1}{w})\dot{v}_n$ , which implies that

$$(3.29) \quad \|\dot{y}_n\|_M^2 \leq 2\|\dot{x}_n\|_M^2 + 2\left(1 - \frac{1}{w}\right)^2 \|\dot{v}_n\|_M^2.$$

Therefore, by (3.29) in light of  $\|\dot{x}_n\|^2 = o(n^{-2})$  (from (3.25)) and  $\sum_n n^2 \|\dot{v}_n\|_M^2 < \infty$  (from (3.5d)), we obtain  $\|\dot{y}_n\|^2 = o(n^{-2})$ , that is the first result in (2.3d). In addition, by (3.29), along with  $\sum_n n \|\dot{x}_n\|^2 < \infty$  (from (3.24)) and  $\sum_n n^2 \|\dot{v}_n\|_M^2 < \infty$  (from (3.5d)), we are led to  $\sum_n n \|\dot{y}_n\|^2 < \infty$ , that is the second result in (2.3d).

**(B2)** Let us prove (2.3c) and (2.3e). From (2.3b) and  $G_\lambda^M(z_n) = (\lambda w)v_{n+1}$ , we readily have

$$(3.30) \quad \|G_\lambda^M(z_n)\|_M^2 = \mathcal{O}(n^{-2}) \text{ and } \sum_n n \|G_\lambda^M(z_n)\|_M^2 < \infty.$$

In addition, given  $\{x, z\} \subset \mathcal{H}$  and setting  $\Delta G_\lambda^M(x, z) = G_\lambda^M(x) - G_\lambda^M(z)$ , by the simple decomposition  $G_\lambda^M(x) = \Delta G_\lambda^M(x, z) + G_\lambda^M(z)$ , we readily get

$$(3.31) \quad \|G_\lambda^M(x)\|_M^2 \leq 2\|\Delta G_\lambda^M(x, z)\|_M^2 + 2\|G_\lambda^M(z)\|_M^2.$$

Moreover, from condition (3.3) and (2.7) we have

$$(3.32) \quad \lambda \langle H_{i_c} \Delta G_\lambda^M(x, z), \Delta G_\lambda^M(x, z) \rangle \leq \langle \Delta G_\lambda^M(x, z), x - z \rangle_M,$$

where  $H_{i_c} = M - K_{i_c}I$  (with  $K_{i_c} = \delta I$  if  $i_c = 1$  and  $K_{i_c} = \lambda L$  otherwise), hence, by applying Peter-Paul's inequality, we obtain

$$\lambda \langle H_{i_c} \Delta G_\lambda^M(x, z), \Delta G_\lambda^M(x, z) \rangle \leq (1/2)(\lambda w^2) \|\Delta G_\lambda^M(x, z)\|_M^2 + (1/2)(\lambda w^2)^{-1} \|x - z\|_M^2,$$

or equivalently

$$(3.33) \quad \lambda \langle (H_{i_c} - (1/2)w^2 M) \Delta G_\lambda^M(x, z), \Delta G_\lambda^M(x, z) \rangle \leq (1/2)(\lambda w^2)^{-1} \|x - z\|_M^2.$$

Furthermore, we simply have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{i_c} - (1/2)w^2M &= (1-w)M + (w-w^2)M - K_{i_c}I + (1/2)w^2M \\ &= (1-w)M + w(1-w)\bar{M}_{i_c} + (1/2)w^2M \\ &= (1/2)(1+(1-w)^2)M + w(1-w)\bar{M}_{i_c}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, as  $\bar{M}_{i_c}$  is positive definite (from condition (3.3)), combining the previous two results yields

$$(3.34) \quad \lambda \|\Delta G_\lambda^M(x, z)\|_M^2 \leq (\lambda w)^{-1} \|x - z\|_M^2,$$

which by (3.31) entails that

$$(3.35) \quad \|G_\lambda^M(x)\|_M^2 \leq 2\lambda^{-2}w^{-1} \|x - z\|_M^2 + 2\|G_\lambda^M(z)\|_M^2.$$

In particular, using (3.35), by  $x_{n+1} - z_n = -\lambda w G_\lambda^M(z_n)$  we obtain

$$(3.36) \quad \|G_\lambda^M(x_{n+1})\|_M^2 \leq 2(w+1)\|G_\lambda^M(z_n)\|_M^2,$$

which in light of (3.30) amounts to (2.3c). Again using (3.35), by  $y_{n+1} = x_{n+1} + (1 - \frac{1}{w})v_{n+1}$ , we obtain

$$\|G_\lambda^M(y_{n+1})\|_M^2 \leq 2\lambda^{-2}w^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{w}\right)^2 \|v_{n+1}\|_M^2 + 2\|G_\lambda^M(x_{n+1})\|_M^2,$$

which in light of (2.3b) and (2.3c) implies (2.3e).

**(B3)** Let us prove (2.3f) and (2.3g). From Proposition 2.5, we know that there exists a sequence  $(y_n^*) \subset \mathcal{H}$  (given by (2.5)) verifying

$$(3.37) \quad y_n^* \in (A+B)(y_n),$$

where  $y_n = x_n + (1 - \frac{1}{w})v_n$ . It can also be noticed from (2.13) that  $\|y_n^*\|_M = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ , since  $\|v_n\|_M = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$  (from (3.26)). This leads to (2.3f). At once, we prove (2.3g), by means of the well-known Opial lemma which guarantees that  $(x_n)$  converges to some element of  $S$ , provided that the following results hold:

- (h1) for any  $q \in S$ , the sequence  $(\|x_n - q\|_M)$  is convergent,
- (h2) any weak-cluster point of  $(x_n)$ , in  $(\mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|_M)$ , belongs to  $S$ .

Let us prove (h1). Take  $q \in S$ . Clearly, as a straightforward consequence of the bounded-ness of  $(x_n)$  (given by (3.5a)) along with (3.26) we have

$$(3.38) \quad \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M = o(n^{-1}).$$

Moreover, we know that  $(\mathcal{E}_n(s_0, q))$  is convergent (from Lemma 3.1) and that it writes

$$(3.39) \quad \mathcal{E}_n(s_0, q) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \|s_0(q - x_n) - \nu_n \dot{x}_n\|_M^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \beta_{s_0} \|x_n - q\|_M^2 + s_0(e + 2\nu_n) \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M,$$

where  $\beta_{s_0} = s_0(e - s_0)$ . Then, by  $\nu_n \|\dot{x}_n\|_M \rightarrow 0$  (from (3.25)) and  $(e + 2\nu_n) \langle v_n, x_n - q \rangle_M \rightarrow 0$  (according to (3.38)) as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we deduce that

$$(3.40) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n(s_0, q) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} s_0 e \|x_n - q\|_M^2.$$

This entails (h1). Now, we prove (h2). Let  $u$  be a weak cluster point of  $(x_n)$  in  $(\mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|_M)$ , namely there exists a subsequence  $(x_{n_k})$  that converges weakly to  $u$  in  $(\mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|_M)$ , as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Observe that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , by  $y_n = x_n + (1 - \frac{1}{w})v_n$  and  $\|v_n\|_M \rightarrow 0$  (from (3.26)) we have  $\|y_n - x_n\|_M \rightarrow 0$ , whence,  $(y_{n_k})$  converges weakly to  $u$  in  $(\mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|_M)$  (as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ). Moreover, by (2.3f) we know that  $\|y_n^*\|_M \rightarrow 0$  (as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ), while (3.37) gives us

$$(3.41) \quad y_{n_k}^* \in (A+B)(y_{n_k}).$$

Then passing to the limit as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  in (3.41) and recalling that the graph of the maximally monotone operator  $A+B$  is sequentially closed with respect to the weak-strong topology of the product space  $\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$  (see, for instance, [9]), we deduce that  $0 \in (A+B)(u)$ , namely  $u \in S$ . This proves (h2) and completes the proof.  $\square$

**4 From (CRIFBA) to a generalized variant (G-CRIFBA).** Our purpose here is to adapt CRIFBA to the general structured monotone inclusion problem

$$(4.1) \quad \text{find } \bar{x} \in S := (B + \sum_{k=1}^p A_k)^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset,$$

where  $B : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is  $\beta$ -co-coercive on  $\mathcal{H}$ , while  $(A_i)_{i=1}^p : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is a family of  $p$  maximally monotone operators whose resolvent operators can be easily evaluated. For the sake of clarity we do not include pre-conditioning in the proposed method. To deal with this problem, we follow the methodology of Raguet-Fadili-Peyre [40], as described below.

Let  $\{\rho_k\}_{k=1}^p \subset (0, 1)$  be such that  $\sum_{k=1}^p \rho_k = 1$  and consider the Hilbert space  $E = \mathcal{H}^p$  endowed with the scalar product  $(\cdot | \cdot)_{\mathcal{H}^p}$  defined, for elements  $x = (x_k)_{k=1}^p$  and  $y = (y_k)_{k=1}^p$  belonging to  $E$ , by  $(x | y)_{\mathcal{H}^p} = \sum_{k=1}^p \rho_k \langle x_k, y_k \rangle$ . The induced norm of  $(\cdot | \cdot)_{\mathcal{H}^p}$  will be denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^p}$ .

Consider also the auxiliary problem

$$(4.2) \quad \text{find } \bar{z} \in S_p := \{z \in \mathcal{H}^p ; \sum_{k=1}^p \rho_k z_k \in S\},$$

which was shown to have a nonempty solution set  $S_p$  (whenever  $S \neq \emptyset$ ). It can also be reformulated as a monotone inclusion that fits the structure (1.1) and (1.4) on  $E$ . Introduce indeed the mappings  $\bar{A}_G$  and  $\tilde{B}_G$  from  $E$  onto  $E$  defined for  $(x_i)_{i=1}^p \in E$  by

$$(4.3) \quad \bar{A}_G \left( (x_i)_{i=1}^p \right) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{\rho_i} A_i(x_i) \right)_{i=1}^p, \quad \tilde{B}_G \left( (x_i)_{i=1}^p \right) = \left( B(x_i) \right)_{i=1}^p,$$

and let  $N_\Gamma : \mathcal{H}^p \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}^p}$  be the normal cone to the (nonempty) closed convex set

$$\Gamma = \{(x_i)_{i=1}^p \in \mathcal{H}^p ; x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_p\}.$$

It can be checked that  $\bar{A}_G$  and  $\tilde{B}_G$  are maximally monotone operator on  $E$ . So the reflection operators  $R_{\bar{A}_G} = 2J_{\bar{A}_G} - I_{\mathcal{H}^p}$  and  $R_{N_\Gamma} = 2J_{N_\Gamma} - I_{\mathcal{H}^p}$  are well-defined, which allows us to consider the mappings  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$  and  $T$ , from  $E$  onto  $E$  and such that

$$(4.4) \quad T_1 = \frac{1}{2}(R_{\bar{A}_G} \circ R_{N_\Gamma} + I_{\mathcal{H}^p}), \quad T_2 = I_{\mathcal{H}^p} - \lambda \tilde{B}_G \circ J_{N_\Gamma} \quad \text{and} \quad T = T_1 \circ T_2.$$

It is established in [40] the results given in the next proposition.

**PROPOSITION 4.1.** *The following statements are obtained:*

- (See [40, Propositions 4.1, 4.2 and 4.6]) *There exists some maximally monotone operator  $\mathcal{A} : E \rightarrow 2^E$  such that*

$$(4.5) \quad S_p = \left( \mathcal{A} + \tilde{B}_G \circ J_{N_\Gamma} \right)^{-1}(0).$$

- (See the proof of [40, Proposition 4.1]) *The operator  $\tilde{B}_G \circ J_{N_\Gamma}$  is  $\beta$  co-coercive.*
- *$S_p$  is nothing but the fixed point set of the operator  $T$  which can be rewritten as*

$$(4.6) \quad T = J_{\mathcal{A}} \circ (I_{\mathcal{H}^p} - \lambda \tilde{B}_G \circ J_{N_\Gamma}).$$

Consequently, a strategy to solve (4.1) consists first of approaching an element of  $S_p$  (namely a fixed point of  $T$ ) by means of sequences  $(z_n) = \left( (z_{n,k})_{k=1}^p \right) \subset \mathcal{H}^p$  and  $(\zeta_n) = \left( (\zeta_{n,k})_{k=1}^p \right) \subset \mathcal{H}^p$  generated by CRIFBA, in the context of (4.5)-(4.6), as follows:

$$(4.7a) \quad z_n = \zeta_n + \theta_n(\zeta_n - \zeta_{n-1}) + \gamma_n(z_{n-1} - \zeta_n),$$

$$(4.7b) \quad \zeta_{n+1} = (1 - w)z_n + wT(z_n).$$

Next, we derive an element of  $S$  as the limit of  $(x_n) \subset \mathcal{H}$  given by  $x_n = \sum_{k=1}^p \rho_k \zeta_{n,k}$ . This leads us (see the proof of Theorem 4.2) to the algorithm (G-CRIFBA) given below :

**(G-CRIFBA):****▷ Step 1 (initialization):**

Let  $\{z_{-1}, \zeta_{-1}, \zeta_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}^p$ ,  $\{e, s_0, s_1, \nu_0, \lambda, w\} \subset [0, \infty)$ ,  $\{\rho_k\}_{k=1}^p \subset (0, 1)$ ,  
and set  $\nu_n = s_1 n + \nu_0$ ,  $\theta_n = 1 - \frac{e+s_1}{e+\nu_{n+1}}$  and  $\gamma_n = 1 - \frac{s_0}{e+\nu_{n+1}}$ .

**▷ Step 2 (main step):**

Given  $\{z_{n-1}, \zeta_{n-1}, \zeta_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}^p$  (with  $n \geq 0$ ), we compute

$$(4.8a) \quad z_n = \zeta_n + \theta_n(\zeta_n - \zeta_{n-1}) + \gamma_n(z_{n-1} - \zeta_n),$$

$$(4.8b) \quad u_n = \sum_{k=1}^p \rho_k z_{n,k},$$

$$(4.8c) \quad \zeta_{n+1} = \left( z_{n,k} + w \left( J_{\frac{\lambda}{\rho_k} A_k} (2u_n - \lambda B(u_n) - z_{n,k}) - u_n \right) \right)_{k=1}^p,$$

$$(4.8d) \quad x_{n+1} = \sum_{k=1}^p \rho_k \zeta_{n,k}.$$

The next theorem sets the convergence rates of the iterates  $(\zeta_n)$  generated by G-CRIFBA in terms of discrete velocity and fixed point residual to  $\|\dot{\zeta}_n\|_{\mathcal{H}^p} = o(n^{-1})$  and  $\|T(\zeta_n) - \zeta_n\|_{\mathcal{H}^p} = o(n^{-1})$ , respectively, instead of the rates  $\|\zeta_n\|_{\mathcal{H}^p} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$  and  $\|T(\zeta_n) - \zeta_n\|_{\mathcal{H}^p} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$  obtained for classical fixed point iterations of  $T$  as in [40] (that is (4.8) with  $w = 1$  and  $\theta_n = \gamma_n = 0$ ).

**THEOREM 4.2.** *Let  $\{x_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$  be generated by G-CRIFBA with  $\{\rho_k\}_{k=1}^p \subset (0, 1)$  verifying  $\sum_{k=1}^p \rho_k = 1$ , together with the other parameters such that*

$$(4.9) \quad 0 < \lambda < 4w(1-w)\beta, \quad 0 < w < 1, \quad 2s_1 < s_0 < e.$$

*Then the following results are reached:*

$$(4.10a) \quad \|\dot{\zeta}_n\|_{\mathcal{H}^p} = o(n^{-2}), \quad \sum_n n \|\dot{\zeta}_n\|_{\mathcal{H}^p}^2 < \infty, \quad \sum_n n^2 \|\dot{\zeta}_{n+1} - \dot{\zeta}_n\|_{\mathcal{H}^p}^2 < \infty,$$

$$(4.10b) \quad \|\zeta_{n+1} - z_n\|_{\mathcal{H}^p}^2 = o(n^{-2}), \quad \sum_n n \|\zeta_{n+1} - z_n\|_{\mathcal{H}^p}^2 < \infty,$$

$$(4.10c) \quad \|T(\zeta_n) - \zeta_n\|_{\mathcal{H}^p} = o(n^{-1}), \quad \sum_n n \|T(\zeta_n) - \zeta_n\|_{\mathcal{H}^p}^2 < \infty,$$

$$(4.10d) \quad \exists \bar{\zeta} \in S_p, \text{ s.t. (for } k = 1, \dots, p) \bar{\zeta}_{n,k} \rightharpoonup \bar{\zeta}_k \text{ weakly in } \mathcal{H}, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

$$(4.10e) \quad x_n \rightharpoonup \bar{x} = \sum_{k=1}^p \rho_k \bar{\zeta}_k \in S \text{ weakly in } \mathcal{H}.$$

*Proof.* Let us evaluate the operator  $T$  on  $E$  from its formulation given by (4.4), namely  $T = T_1 \circ T_2$ . It can be checked (see [40, Lemma 4.1]) that, for  $(x_k)_{k=1}^p \in E$ , we have

$$(4.11) \quad J_{N_\Gamma}(\{x_i\}_{i=1}^p) = \left( \sum_{j=1}^p \rho_j x_j \right)_{i=1}^p,$$

$$(4.12) \quad R_{N_\Gamma}(\{x_k\}_{k=1}^p) = \left( 2 \sum_{i=1}^p \rho_i x_i - x_k \right)_{k=1}^p,$$

$$(4.13) \quad R_{\bar{A}_G}(\{x_k\}_{k=1}^p) = \left( 2J_{\frac{\lambda}{\rho_k} A_k}(x_k) - x_k \right)_{k=1}^p.$$

Then, for  $(z_k)_{k=1}^p \in E$ , by  $T_2 = I_{\mathcal{H}^p} - \lambda \tilde{B}_G \circ J_{N_\Gamma}$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T_2((z_k)_{k=1}^p) &= (z_k)_{k=1}^p - \lambda(\tilde{B}_G \circ J_{N_\Gamma})((z_k)_{k=1}^p) \\ &= (z_k)_{k=1}^p - \lambda \tilde{B}_G \left( \left( \sum_{i=1}^p \rho_i z_i \right)_{k=1}^p \right) \\ &= \left( z_k - \lambda B \left( \sum_{i=1}^p \rho_i z_i \right) \right)_{k=1}^p. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, for  $(y_k)_{k=1}^p \in E$  and setting  $\bar{y} = \sum_{i=1}^p \rho_i y_i$ , by

$$T_1 = (1/2)(R_{\bar{A}_G} \circ R_{N_\Gamma} + I_{\mathcal{H}^p})$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} T_1((y_k)_{k=1}^p) &= \frac{1}{2} \left( R_{\bar{A}_G}((2\bar{y} - y_k)_{k=1}^p) + (y_k)_{k=1}^p \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \left( 2J_{\frac{\lambda}{\rho_k} A_k}(2\bar{y} - y_k) - 2\bar{y} + y_k \right)_{k=1}^p + (y_k)_{k=1}^p \right) \\ &= \left( J_{\frac{\lambda}{\rho_k} A_k}(2\bar{y} - y_k) - \bar{y} + y_k \right)_{k=1}^p. \end{aligned}$$



Hence, taking  $(y_k)_{k=1}^p := T_2((z_k)_{k=1}^p)$  and setting  $\bar{z} = \sum_{i=1}^p \rho_i z_i$ , we have

$$T((z_k)_{k=1}^p) = T_1((y_k)_{k=1}^p),$$

or equivalently

$$T((z_k)_{k=1}^p) = T_1\left((z_k - \lambda B(\bar{z}))_{k=1}^p\right) = \left(J_{\frac{\lambda}{\rho_k} A_k}(2\bar{z} - \lambda B(\bar{z}) - z_k) - \bar{z} + z_k\right)_{k=1}^p.$$

It follows that

$$(4.14) \quad (1-w)(z_k)_{k=1}^p + wT((z_k)_{k=1}^p) = \left(z_k + w\left(J_{\frac{\lambda}{\rho_k} A_k}(2\bar{z} - \lambda B(\bar{z}) - z_k) - \bar{z}\right)\right)_{k=1}^p.$$

This leads us to the formulation of G-CRIFBA and the results (4.10a) to (4.10d) follow straightforwardly from Theorem 2.1 (also see Remark 2.1), while (4.10e) is immediately deduced from (4.10d).  $\square$

**5 An application of (CRIFBA) to some convex-concave saddle-point problem.** In this section we apply CRIFBA to the problem below discussed by Lorenz-Pock [30].

Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be two Hilbert spaces endowed with scalar products  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y$ , respectively, and induced norms denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_X$  and  $\|\cdot\|_Y$ , and consider the following saddle-point problem

$$(5.1) \quad \min_{x \in X} \max_{y \in Y} G(x) + Q(x) + \langle Kx, y \rangle_Y - F^*(y) - P^*(y),$$

where  $K : X \rightarrow Y$  is linear and bounded,  $G : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  and  $F^* : Y \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  are convex functions, while  $Q : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  and  $P^* : Y \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  are convex differentiable functions with Lipschitz continuous gradient (whose respective Lipschitz constants are  $l_Q$  and  $l_{P^*}$ ).

The above problem covers several primal-dual formulation of nonlinear problems encountered for instance in image processing.

We denote by  $S$  the solution set of (5.1) and we assume that  $S \neq \emptyset$ .

Introduce the Hilbert space  $E = X \times Y$  endowed with the scalar product  $(\cdot | \cdot)$  defined for  $\zeta_1 = (x_1, y_1) \in E$  and  $\zeta_2 = (x_2, y_2) \in E$  by  $(\zeta_1 | \zeta_2) = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle_X + \langle y_1, y_2 \rangle_Y$ , and let us denote its induced norm by  $\|\cdot\|$ . So, (5.1) through its optimality condition can be re-formulated as

$$(5.2) \quad \text{find } (x, y) \in E \text{ such that } 0 \in (A + B) \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $A$  and  $B$  are the monotone operators on  $E$  defined by

$$(5.3) \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} \partial G & K^* \\ -K & \partial F^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} \nabla Q & 0 \\ 0 & \nabla P^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is established in [30] the following result.

**PROPOSITION 5.1.** (See [30, Proof of Theorem 5]) *The operator  $B$  is co-coercive w.r.t. to the mapping*

$$(5.4) \quad L = \begin{pmatrix} l_Q I_X & 0 \\ 0 & l_{P^*} I_Y \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $I_X$  and  $I_Y$  denote the identity mappings on  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively.

*Proof.* Given  $\{\zeta_1 = (x_1, y_1), \zeta_2 = (x_2, y_2)\} \subset E$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (B(\zeta_1) - B(\zeta_2) | \zeta_1 - \zeta_2) \\ &= \langle \nabla Q(x_1) - \nabla Q(x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_X + \langle \nabla P^*(y_1) - \nabla P^*(y_2), y_1 - y_2 \rangle_Y \\ &\geq l_Q^{-1} \|Q(x_1) - \nabla Q(x_2)\|_X + l_{P^*}^{-1} \|\nabla P^*(y_1) - \nabla P^*(y_2)\|_Y \\ &= (L^{-1}(B(\zeta_1) - B(\zeta_2)) | B(\zeta_1) - B(\zeta_2)) = \|B(\zeta_1) - B(\zeta_2)\|_{L^{-1}}^2. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, the above monotone inclusion (5.2) enters the setting of (1.1) and (1.4) and so it can be solved by means of the proposed method CRIFBA. In general, as explained in [30], evaluating the proximal mapping  $(I + \lambda A)^{-1}$  may be prohibitively expensive, which would make our algorithm impracticable in the standard case when  $M = I$ . Fortunately, this drawback can be overcome when choosing the pre-conditioner mapping  $M$  in order to cancel out the upper off-diagonal block in the sum  $M + A$ , as follows

$$(5.5) \quad M = \begin{pmatrix} \tau^{-1}I_X & -K^* \\ -K & \sigma^{-1}I_Y \end{pmatrix}, \quad M + A = \begin{pmatrix} \tau^{-1}I_X + \partial G & 0 \\ -2K & \sigma^{-1}I_Y + \partial F^* \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$  are positive real numbers. Furthermore, an easy computation gives us the following result.

PROPOSITION 5.2. *For any  $(\xi', \chi') \in X \times Y$ , we obtain*

$$(5.6) \quad (M + A)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \xi' \\ \chi' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{prox}_{\tau G}(\tau \xi') \\ \text{prox}_{\sigma F^*}(\sigma \chi' + 2\sigma K \text{prox}_{\tau G}(\tau \xi')) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly, a solution to (5.2) can be approximated by means of a sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n)\} \subset X \times Y$  generated by CRIFBA (with  $\lambda = 1$ ), in the context of (5.3) and (5.5), as follows

$$(5.7a) \quad (\xi_n, \chi_n) = (x_n, y_n) + \theta_n((x_n, y_n) - (x_{n-1}, y_{n-1})) + \gamma_n((\xi_{n-1}, \chi_{n-1}) - (x_n, y_n)),$$

$$(5.7b) \quad (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}) = (1 - w)(\xi_n, \chi_n) + wT(\xi_n, \chi_n),$$

where  $T = (M + A)^{-1}(M - B)$ . This in light of (5.6) leads us to the following corrected relaxed inertial primal dual algorithm:

**(CRIPDA):**

▷ **Step 1** (initialization):

Let  $\{(\xi_{-1}, \chi_{-1}), (x_{-1}, y_{-1}), (x_0, y_0)\} \subset X \times Y$ ,  $\{e, s_0, s_1, \nu_0, w, \sigma, \tau\} \subset [0, \infty)$ ,  
and set  $\nu_n = s_1 n + \nu_0$ ,  $\theta_n = 1 - \frac{e+s_1}{e+\nu_{n+1}}$  and  $\gamma_n = 1 - \frac{s_0}{e+\nu_{n+1}}$ .

▷ **Step 2** (main step):

Given  $\{(\xi_{n-1}, \chi_{n-1}), (x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}), (x_n, y_n)\} \subset X \times Y$  (with  $n \geq 0$ ), we compute

$$(5.8a) \quad \xi_n = x_n + \theta_n(x_n - x_{n-1}) + \gamma_n(\xi_{n-1} - x_n),$$

$$(5.8b) \quad \chi_n = y_n + \theta_n(y_n - y_{n-1}) + \gamma_n(\chi_{n-1} - y_n),$$

$$(5.8c) \quad x_{n+1} = (1 - w)\xi_n + (w)\text{prox}_{\tau G}\left(\xi_n - \tau(\nabla Q(\xi_n) + K^*\chi_n)\right),$$

$$(5.8d) \quad \bar{\xi}_n = 2w^{-1}(x_{n+1} - (1 - w)\xi_n),$$

$$(5.8e) \quad y_{n+1} = (1 - w)\chi_n + (w)\text{prox}_{\sigma F^*}\left(\chi_n - \sigma(\nabla P^*(\chi_n) - K\bar{\xi}_n)\right).$$

In the absence of any correction term and relaxation factor (that is  $\gamma_n = 0$  and  $w = 1$ ) we retrieve the primal-dual algorithm in [30], which was discussed with step-size rules regarding the momentum term  $\theta_n$ . In the absence of inertial and correction terms (that is  $\theta_n = \gamma_n = 0$ ) we retrieve the primal-dual algorithms, proposed by Condat [17] (for  $P^* = 0$ ) and Vu [49], which were also investigated with varying relaxation factors. Compared with these methods, a fast convergence rate is proved for CRIPDA.

The next result establishes the convergence of the above algorithm.

THEOREM 5.3. Let  $\{(x_n, y_n)\} \subset X \times Y$  be generated by CRIPDA with parameters verifying

$$(5.9) \quad 0 < w < 1, \quad 2s_1 < s_0 < e.$$

Suppose in addition that one of the two conditions (5.10) and (5.11) holds:

$$(5.10) \quad \delta > \frac{1}{4} \max\{l_Q, l_{P^*}\}, \quad \{\tau, \sigma\} \subset \left(0, \frac{w(1-w)}{\delta}\right), \quad \|K\|^2 < \left(\tau^{-1} - \frac{\delta}{w(1-w)}\right) \left(\sigma^{-1} - \frac{\delta}{w(1-w)}\right),$$

$$(5.11) \quad 0 < \tau < \frac{w(1-w)}{l_Q}, \quad 0 < \sigma < \frac{w(1-w)}{l_{P^*}}, \quad \|K\|^2 < \left(\tau^{-1} - \frac{l_Q}{w(1-w)}\right) \left(\sigma^{-1} - \frac{l_{P^*}}{w(1-w)}\right).$$

Then the following results are reached:

$$(5.12a) \quad \|(\dot{x}_n, \dot{y}_n)\|_M^2 = o(n^{-2}), \quad \sum_n n \|(\dot{x}_n, \dot{y}_n)\|_M^2 < \infty, \quad \sum_n n^2 \|(\dot{x}_{n+1} - \dot{x}_n, \dot{y}_{n+1} - \dot{y}_n)\|_M^2 < \infty,$$

$$(5.12b) \quad \|T(x_n, y_n) - (x_n, y_n)\|_M^2 = o(n^{-2}), \quad \sum_n n \|T(x_n, y_n) - (x_n, y_n)\|_M^2 < \infty,$$

$$(5.12c) \quad \exists(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in S, \text{ s.t. } (x_n, y_n) \rightharpoonup (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \text{ weakly in } X \times Y.$$

*Proof.* Clearly, we have  $\|L\| = \sup\{l_{P^*}, l_Q\}$ , while it can be checked that the operator  $M - \frac{\delta}{w(1-w)}I$  is positive definite if the last two conditions in (5.10) are fulfilled. Moreover, it can be verified that the operator  $M - \frac{1}{w(1-w)}L$  is positive definite if (5.11) is fulfilled. Therefore, conditions (2.2a) and (2.2b) of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied under conditions (5.10) and (5.11), respectively. The rest of the proof is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.1.  $\square$

## A APPENDIX.

**A - 1 Proof of Proposition 2.3.** For simplification reasons, we write  $G$  instead of  $G_\lambda^M$  and, given any mapping  $\Gamma : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  and any elements  $\{x_1, x_2\} \subset \mathcal{H}$ , we denote

$$\Delta\Gamma(x_1, x_2) = \Gamma(x_1) - \Gamma(x_2).$$

Let  $\bar{A} = M^{-1}A$ ,  $\bar{B} = M^{-1}B$  and  $C = I - \lambda\bar{B}$ . Clearly,  $\bar{A}$  is monotone in  $(\mathcal{H}, |\cdot|_M)$ . It is also obviously seen for  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  that  $G(x) = \lambda^{-1} \left( x - J_{\lambda\bar{A}}(C(x)) \right)$ , hence

$$G(x) = \lambda^{-1} (x - C(x)) + \lambda^{-1} \left( C(x) - J_{\lambda\bar{A}}(C(x)) \right),$$

or equivalently

$$(A.1) \quad G(x) = \bar{B}(x) + \bar{A}_\lambda(C(x)),$$

where  $\bar{A}_\lambda := \lambda^{-1} (I - J_{\lambda\bar{A}})$  is the Yosida regularization of  $\bar{A}$ . Now, given any  $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{H}^2$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M &= \langle \bar{B}(x_1) + \bar{A}_\lambda(C(x_1)) - \bar{B}(x_2) - \bar{A}_\lambda(C(x_2)), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M \\ &= \langle \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M + \langle \Delta(\bar{A}_\lambda \circ C)(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M \\ &= \langle \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M + \langle \Delta(\bar{A}_\lambda \circ C)(x_1, x_2), \Delta C(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M \\ &\quad + \langle \Delta(\bar{A}_\lambda \circ C)(x_1, x_2), \Delta(I - C)(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M, \end{aligned}$$

hence, by  $I - C = \lambda\bar{B}$ , we equivalently obtain

$$(A.2) \quad \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M \geq \langle \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M + \langle \Delta(\bar{A}_\lambda \circ C)(x_1, x_2), \Delta C(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M \\ + \lambda \langle \Delta(\bar{A}_\lambda \circ C)(x_1, x_2), \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M.$$

Let us estimate separately the last two terms in the right side of the previous inequality. As a classical result, by the  $\lambda$ -co-coerciveness of  $\bar{A}_\lambda$  in  $(\mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|_M)$ , we have

$$\langle \Delta(\bar{A}_\lambda \circ C)(x_1, x_2), \Delta C(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M \geq \lambda \|\Delta(\bar{A}_\lambda \circ C)(x_1, x_2)\|_M^2,$$

which by  $\bar{A}_\lambda \circ C = G - \bar{B}$  (from (A.1)) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Delta(\bar{A}_\lambda \circ C)(x_1, x_2), \Delta C(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M &\geq \lambda \|\Delta G(x_1, x_2) - \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2)\|_M^2 \\ &= \lambda \|\Delta G(x_1, x_2)\|_M^2 + \lambda \|\Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2)\|_M^2 - 2\lambda \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by  $\bar{A}_\lambda \circ C = G - \bar{B}$  (from (A.1)), we simply get

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda \langle \Delta(\bar{A}_\lambda \circ C)(x_1, x_2), \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M \\ &= \lambda \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2) - (\Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2)), \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M \\ &= \lambda \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M - \lambda \|\Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2)\|_M^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (A.2) and the previous arguments, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M \\ & \geq \langle \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M + \lambda \|\Delta G(x_1, x_2)\|_M^2 + \lambda \|\Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2)\|_M^2 \\ & \quad - 2\lambda \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M + \lambda \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M - \lambda \|\Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2)\|_M^2 \\ & = \langle \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M + \lambda \|\Delta G(x_1, x_2)\|_M^2 - \lambda \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2) \rangle_M. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, reminding that  $\bar{B} = M^{-1}B$ , we equivalently obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M \\ & \geq \langle \Delta \bar{B}(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle + \lambda \|\Delta G(x_1, x_2)\|_M^2 - \lambda \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), \Delta B(x_1, x_2) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the co-coercivity assumption on  $B$  we infer that

$$(A.3) \quad \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M \geq \|\Delta B(x_1, x_2)\|_{L^{-1}}^2 + \lambda \|\Delta G(x_1, x_2)\|_M^2 - \lambda \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), \Delta B(x_1, x_2) \rangle,$$

that is (2.6).

Now, let us prove (2.6) for  $i = 1$ . From an easy computation, we obtain

$$\|\Delta B(x_1, x_2)\|^2 \leq \|L^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \|\Delta B(x_1, x_2)\|_{L^{-1}}^2.$$

hence, for any  $\delta > 0$ , using successively Peter-Paul's inequality and the previous inequality gives us

$$(A.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), \Delta B(x_1, x_2) \rangle & \leq \delta \|\Delta G(x_1, x_2)\|^2 + \frac{1}{4\delta} \|\Delta B(x_1, x_2)\|^2, \\ & \leq \delta \|\Delta G(x_1, x_2)\|^2 + \frac{1}{4\delta} \|L^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \|\Delta B(x_1, x_2)\|_{L^{-1}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combining this last inequality with (A.3) entails

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M \\ & \geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{4\delta} \|L^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2\right) \|\Delta B(x_1, x_2)\|_{L^{-1}}^2 + \lambda (\|\Delta G(x_1, x_2)\|_M^2 - \delta \|\Delta G(x_1, x_2)\|^2) \\ & = \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{4\delta} \|L^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2\right) \|\Delta B(x_1, x_2)\|_{L^{-1}}^2 + \lambda \langle (M - \delta I) \Delta G(x_1, x_2), \Delta G(x_1, x_2) \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

that is (2.6) with  $i = 1$ .

Let us prove (2.6) for  $i = 2$ . Using again Peter-Paul's inequality, we readily have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), \Delta B(x_1, x_2) \rangle &= \langle \lambda \Delta G(x_1, x_2), L^{\frac{1}{2}} L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta B(x_1, x_2) \rangle \\ &= \langle \lambda L^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta G(x_1, x_2), L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta B(x_1, x_2) \rangle \\ &\leq \lambda^2 \|L^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta G(x_1, x_2)\|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \|L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta B(x_1, x_2)\|^2 \\ &= \lambda^2 \langle L \Delta G(x_1, x_2), \Delta G(x_1, x_2) \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \|\Delta B(x_1, x_2)\|_{L^{-1}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which, in light (A.3), gives us

$$\langle \Delta G(x_1, x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle_M \geq \frac{3}{4} \|\Delta B(x_1, x_2)\|_{L^{-1}}^2 + \lambda \langle (M - \lambda \delta L) \Delta G(x_1, x_2), \Delta G(x_1, x_2) \rangle,$$

that is (2.6) with  $i = 2$ .  $\square$

## A - 2 Proof of Proposition 2.5. According to (2.5a), we have

$$v_{n+1} = (\lambda w) G_\lambda^M(z_n) = w(z_n - J_{\lambda M^{-1}A}(z_n - \lambda M^{-1}B(z_n))),$$

namely

$$(I + \lambda M^{-1}A)^{-1}(z_n - \lambda M^{-1}B(z_n)) = z_n - \frac{1}{w}v_{n+1},$$

which is equivalent to the inclusion

$$Mz_n - \lambda B(z_n) \in (M + \lambda A)(z_n - \frac{1}{w}v_{n+1}).$$

This, by  $y_{n+1} = z_n - \frac{1}{w}v_{n+1}$  (according to (2.11)) can be reduced to

$$Mz_n - \lambda B(z_n) \in Mz_n - \frac{1}{w}Mv_{n+1} + \lambda A(y_{n+1}),$$

namely

$$(\lambda w)^{-1}Mv_{n+1} \in (B(z_n) + A(y_{n+1})),$$

that is (2.12a). Hence, by

$$y_{n+1}^* = (\lambda w)^{-1}Mv_{n+1} + B(y_{n+1}) - B(z_n) \text{ (according to (2.11))},$$

we get

$y_{n+1}^* \in B(y_{n+1}) + A(y_{n+1})$ , that is (2.12b).

Next, by definition of  $y_{n+1}^*$ , we simply have

$$(A.5) \quad \|y_{n+1}^*\|_M \leq (\lambda w)^{-1} \|Mv_{n+1}\|_M + \|B(y_{n+1}) - B(z_n)\|_M.$$

Let us estimate the two terms in the right side of the previous inequality. Concerning the first term, since  $M$  and  $L$  are assumed to be bounded, by Remark 2.3 we have

$$(A.6) \quad \|Mv_{n+1}\|_M^2 = \langle (M^{\frac{1}{2}})^6 v_{n+1}, v_{n+1} \rangle = \langle M^2 M^{1/2} v_{n+1}, M^{1/2} v_{n+1} \rangle \leq \|M\|^2 \|v_{n+1}\|_M^2.$$

Concerning the second term, we simply get

$$\|B(y_{n+1}) - B(z_n)\|_M \leq \|M^{\frac{1}{2}} L^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \times \|B(y_{n+1}) - B(z_n)\|_{L^{-1}},$$

while the co-coerciveness of  $B$  (given by condition (1.4)) yields

$$\|B(y_{n+1}) - B(z_n)\|_{L^{-1}} \leq \|L^{\frac{1}{2}}(y_{n+1} - z_n)\|,$$

whence it comes that

$$(A.7) \quad \|B(y_{n+1}) - B(z_n)\|_M \leq \|M^{\frac{1}{2}} L^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \times \|L^{\frac{1}{2}}(y_{n+1} - z_n)\|,$$

where  $y_{n+1} - z_n = -\frac{1}{w}v_{n+1}$  (from (2.11)). Then, by (A.5), (A.6) and (A.7), we obtain

$$(A.8) \quad \|y_{n+1}^*\| \leq (\lambda w)^{-1} \|M\| \times \|v_{n+1}\|_M + \frac{1}{w} \|M^{\frac{1}{2}} L^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \times \|L^{\frac{1}{2}} v_{n+1}\|.$$

On the one hand, if  $M - \rho L$  is positive definite, we have

$$\|v_{n+1}\|_M^2 - \rho \|L^{\frac{1}{2}} v_{n+1}\|^2 = \langle (M - \rho L) v_{n+1}, v_{n+1} \rangle \geq 0,$$

hence  $\|L^{\frac{1}{2}} v_{n+1}\| \leq \rho^{-1/2} \|v_{n+1}\|_M$ . On the other hand, if  $M - \rho I$  is positive definite, we get

$$\|M^{\frac{1}{2}} v_{n+1}\|^2 - \rho \|v_{n+1}\|^2 = \langle (M - \rho I) v_{n+1}, v_{n+1} \rangle \geq 0,$$

which yields  $\|v_{n+1}\| \leq \rho^{-1/2} \|v_{n+1}\|_M$ , hence

$$\|L^{\frac{1}{2}} v_{n+1}\| \leq \rho^{-1/2} \|L^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \times \|v_{n+1}\|_M.$$

Consequently, regarding the previous two situations, by (A.8) we are led to

$$\|y_{n+1}^*\|_M \leq (\lambda w)^{-1} \|M\| \times \|v_{n+1}\|_M + \frac{1}{w} \|M^{\frac{1}{2}} L^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \times \rho^{-1/2} (1 + \|L^{\frac{1}{2}}\|) \times \|v_{n+1}\|_M,$$

which amounts to (2.13).  $\square$

**A - 3 Proof of Proposition 3.2.** For the sake of simplicity, we write  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  instead of  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_M$ . Setting  $\tau_n := e + \nu_{n+1}$ , we observe that (3.6b) can be alternatively expressed as

$$(A.9) \quad \theta_n = \frac{\nu_n}{\tau_n}.$$

As another crucial parameter arising in our study, we consider the real sequence  $(\vartheta_n)$  (with  $s > 0$ ) defined by

$$(A.10) \quad \vartheta_n = 1 - \frac{s}{\tau_n}.$$

The following elementary observation will be particularly helpful for the sequel of our study.

REMARK A.1. For  $s \in (0, e]$ , we have  $(\vartheta_n) \subset (0, 1)$ .

It is readily noticed that  $\dot{F}_n(s, q)$  can be formulated as

$$(A.11) \quad \dot{F}_{n+1}(s, q) = s(\nu_{n+1}a_{n+1} - \nu_n a_n) + (se)\dot{b}_{n+1} + \nu_{n+1}^2 c_{n+1} - \nu_n^2 c_n,$$

where  $a_n := \langle x_n - q, \dot{x}_n \rangle$ ,  $b_n := (1/2)\|x_n - q\|^2$  and  $c_n := (1/2)\|\dot{x}_n\|^2$ .

Note also that for any bilinear symmetric form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_E$  on a real vector space  $E$  and for any sequences  $\{\phi_n, \varphi_n\} \subset E$  we have the discrete derivative rules:

$$(A.12a) \quad \langle \phi_{n+1}, \varphi_{n+1} \rangle_E - \langle \phi_n, \varphi_n \rangle_E = \langle \dot{\phi}_{n+1}, \varphi_{n+1} \rangle_E + \langle \phi_n, \dot{\varphi}_{n+1} \rangle_E,$$

$$(A.12b) \quad \langle \phi_{n+1}, \varphi_{n+1} \rangle_E - \langle \phi_n, \varphi_n \rangle_E = \langle \dot{\phi}_{n+1}, \varphi_n \rangle_E + \langle \phi_{n+1}, \dot{\varphi}_{n+1} \rangle_E.$$

The sequel of the proof can be divided into the following parts **(1)-(5)**:

**(1) Basic estimates.** Setting  $\tau_n = e + \nu_{n+1}$ ,  $P_n = \langle q - x_{n+1}, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle$  and  $R_n = \langle q - x_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle$ , we establish the elementary but useful facts below:

$$(A.13a) \quad \dot{a}_{n+1} = \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle - P_n + R_n,$$

$$(A.13b) \quad \dot{b}_{n+1} = -P_n - (1/2)\|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2,$$

$$(A.13c) \quad \nu_{n+1}a_{n+1} - \nu_n a_n = \nu_n \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle - \nu_{n+1}P_n + \tau_n (P_n - \langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle).$$

Let us prove (A.13a)- (A.13b). From  $a_n := \langle x_n - q, \dot{x}_n \rangle$ , by the rule (A.12b) we simply have

$$\dot{a}_{n+1} = \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle + \langle x_{n+1} - q, \dot{x}_{n+1} - \dot{x}_n \rangle,$$

which gives us (A.13a). From  $2b_{n+1} = \|x_{n+1} - q\|^2$ , by the derivative rule (A.12a) we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2\dot{b}_{n+1} &= \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, x_{n+1} - q \rangle + \langle x_n - q, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle \\ &= \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, x_{n+1} - q \rangle + \langle x_n - x_{n+1}, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle + \langle x_{n+1} - q, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

namely  $2\dot{b}_{n+1} = -2P_n - \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2$ , which leads to (A.13b).

Let us prove (A.13c). From  $a_n = \langle q - x_n, -\dot{x}_n \rangle$ , we simply get

$$a_n = \langle q - x_{n+1}, -\dot{x}_n \rangle + \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, -\dot{x}_n \rangle = -R_n - \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle,$$

while the derivative rule (A.12b) yields  $\nu_{n+1}a_{n+1} - \nu_n a_n = \dot{\nu}_{n+1}a_n + \nu_{n+1}\dot{a}_{n+1}$ .

This, in light of (A.13a), amounts to

$$(A.14) \quad \begin{aligned} a_{n+1}\nu_{n+1} - a_n\nu_n &= \dot{\nu}_{n+1}(-R_n - \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle) + \nu_{n+1}(\langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle - P_n + R_n) \\ &= \nu_n \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle - \nu_{n+1}P_n + \nu_n R_n. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, (3.6) gives us  $\dot{x}_{n+1} + d_n - \theta_n \dot{x}_n = 0$ . Taking the scalar product of each side of this equality by  $q - x_{n+1}$  yields

$$\theta_n R_n = P_n - \langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle.$$

So, noticing that  $\nu_n = \tau_n \theta_n$ , we get

$$\nu_n R_n = \tau_n (\theta_n R_n) = \tau_n (P_n - \langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle),$$

which, in light of (A.14), entails (A.13c).

**(2) An estimate from the inertial part.** Now, given  $(s, q) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{H}$ , we prove that the discrete derivative  $\dot{F}_{n+1}(s, q)$  satisfies

$$(A.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{F}_{n+1}(s, q) &+ s(e + \nu_{n+1})\langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle \\ &= s\nu_n \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle - \frac{1}{2}(se - \nu_{n+1}^2)\|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\nu_n^2\|\dot{x}_n\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, in light of (A.11) and (A.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{F}_{n+1} &= s(\nu_n \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle - \nu_{n+1}P_n + \tau_n(P_n - \nu_n)) \\ &\quad + (se)(-P_n - \frac{1}{2}\|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2) + \frac{1}{2}(\nu_{n+1}^2\|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2 - \nu_n^2\|\dot{x}_n\|^2) \\ &= s\nu_n \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle + s(-\nu_{n+1} + \tau_n - e)P_n + \frac{1}{2}(se - \nu_{n+1}^2)\|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2 \\ &\quad - s\tau_n \langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

hence, by rearranging the terms in the previous equality, we are led to

$$\dot{F}_{n+1} + s\tau_n \langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle = s\nu_n \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle + \frac{1}{2}(\nu_{n+1}^2 - se)\|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\nu_n^2\|\dot{x}_n\|^2.$$

This obviously leads to the desired equality.

**(3) An estimate from the proximal part.** We prove that, for any  $\xi_n \neq 1$ , it holds that

$$(A.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \xi_n \langle d_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle &+ \frac{1}{2}\|\dot{x}_{n+1} - \theta_n \dot{x}_n\|^2 \\ &= -\theta_n(1 - \xi_n)\langle \dot{x}_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\theta_n^2\|\dot{x}_n\|^2 - (\xi_n - \frac{1}{2})\|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, we have  $\dot{x}_{n+1} = \theta_n \dot{x}_n - d_n$  (from (3.6)), hence, for any  $\xi_n \neq 1$ , and setting  $H_n = \dot{x}_{n+1} - (1 - \xi_n)^{-1} \theta_n \dot{x}_n$ , we get

$$(1 - \xi_n)H_n = (1 - \xi_n)\dot{x}_{n+1} - \theta_n \dot{x}_n = -d_n - \xi_n \dot{x}_{n+1},$$

or equivalently

$$(A.17) \quad \xi_n \dot{x}_{n+1} = -(1 - \xi_n)H_n - d_n.$$

Furthermore, by  $-d_n = \dot{x}_{n+1} - \theta_n \dot{x}_n$  (again using (3.6)), we simply obtain

$$(A.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle (-d_n), H_n \rangle &= \langle \dot{x}_{n+1} - \theta_n \dot{x}_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} - (1 - \xi_n)^{-1} \theta_n \dot{x}_n \rangle \\ &= \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2 + (1 - \xi_n)^{-1} \theta_n^2 \|\dot{x}_n\|^2 - \frac{2 - \xi_n}{(1 - \xi_n)} \theta_n \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, taking the scalar product of each side of (A.17) with  $d_n$ , and adding  $(1/2)\|d_n\|^2$  to the resulting equality, next using (A.18) and  $\|d_n\|^2 = \|\dot{x}_{n+1} - \theta_n \dot{x}_n\|^2$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_n \langle d_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|d_n\|^2 &= (1 - \xi_n) \langle (-d_n), H_n \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \|d_n\|^2 \\ &= (1 - \xi_n) \left( \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2 + \frac{\theta_n^2}{(1 - \xi_n)} \|\dot{x}_n\|^2 - \frac{2 - \xi_n}{(1 - \xi_n)} \theta_n \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} (\|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2 + \theta_n^2 \|\dot{x}_n\|^2 - 2\theta_n \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle) \\ &= -(1 - \xi_n) \theta_n \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \theta_n^2 \|\dot{x}_n\|^2 + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \xi_n \right) \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This yields (A.16).

**(4) Combining proximal and inertial effects.** At once we show for  $s \in (0, e]$  that the iterates verify (for  $n \geq 0$ )

$$(A.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{F}_{n+1}(s, q) + \frac{1}{2} \tau_n^2 \|W_n\|^2 \\ + (s\tau_n) \langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle + \vartheta_n \tau_n^2 \langle d_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle = -T_n(\dot{x}_{n+1}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tau_n = e + \nu_{n+1}$ ,  $\vartheta_n = 1 - s\tau_n^{-1}$ ,  $W_n = \dot{x}_{n+1} - \theta_n \dot{x}_n$ , while  $T_n(x)$  is defined for any  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  by

$$(A.20) \quad T_n(x) = \frac{1}{2} (se - \nu_{n+1}^2 + \tau_n^2 (2\vartheta_n - 1)) \|x\|^2.$$

Indeed, from (A.15) we know that

$$(A.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{F}_{n+1}(s, q) + (s\tau_n) \langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle \\ = - (s\nu_n \langle \dot{x}_{n+1}, \dot{x}_n \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \nu_n^2 \|\dot{x}_n\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} (se - \nu_{n+1}^2) \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by  $\vartheta_n = 1 - s\tau_n^{-1}$  and assuming that  $s \in (0, e]$ , we have  $(\vartheta_n) \subset (0, 1)$  (according to Remark A.1). So, from (A.16), we also have

$$(A.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \vartheta_n \langle d_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|W_n\|^2 \\ = - (\theta_n (1 - \vartheta_n) \langle \dot{x}_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \theta_n^2 \|\dot{x}_n\|^2 + (\vartheta_n - \frac{1}{2}) \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then multiplying equality (A.22) by  $\tau_n^2$  (while noticing that  $\tau_n^2 = (s\tau_n)(1 - \vartheta_n)^{-1}$ ), and adding the resulting equality to (A.21) gives us

$$(A.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \vartheta_n \tau_n^2 \langle d_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \tau_n^2 \|W_n\|^2 \\ + \dot{F}_{n+1}(s, q) + (s\tau_n) \langle d_n, x_{n+1} - q \rangle = - (w_n \langle \dot{x}_n, \dot{x}_{n+1} \rangle + \eta_n \|\dot{x}_n\|^2 + \sigma_n \|\dot{x}_{n+1}\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

together with the following parameters

$$w_n = -s\nu_n + \tau_n^2 \theta_n (1 - \vartheta_n), \quad \eta_n = \frac{1}{2} \nu_n^2 - \frac{1}{2} \tau_n^2 \theta_n^2, \quad \sigma_n = \frac{1}{2} (se - \nu_{n+1}^2) + \tau_n^2 (\vartheta_n - \frac{1}{2}).$$

Clearly, by  $\tau_n \theta_n = \nu_n$  (from (3.6b)), and noticing that  $(1 - \vartheta_n)^{-1} = \frac{\tau_n}{s}$ , we are led to

$$\begin{aligned} w_n &= -s\nu_n + s\nu_n = 0, \\ \eta_n &= \frac{1}{2} \nu_n^2 - \frac{\tau_n^2 \theta_n^2}{2} = \frac{1}{2} (\nu_n^2 - \nu_n^2) = 0, \\ \sigma_n &= \frac{1}{2} (se - \nu_{n+1}^2) + \tau_n^2 (\vartheta_n - \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2} (se - \nu_{n+1}^2 + \tau_n^2 (2\vartheta_n - 1)). \end{aligned}$$

This leads to (A.19)-(A.20).

(5) It remains to simplify the formulation given by (A.20). A simple computation yields

$$2\vartheta_n - 1 = 1 - \frac{2s}{(e+\nu_{n+1})} \quad (\text{as } \vartheta_n = 1 - \frac{s}{e+\nu_{n+1}}),$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (e + \nu_{n+1})^2(2\vartheta_n - 1) &= (e^2 + 2e\nu_{n+1} + (\nu_{n+1})^2) - 2s(e + \nu_{n+1}) \\ &= e(e - s) - se + 2\nu_{n+1}(e - s) + (\nu_{n+1})^2 \\ &= (e + 2\nu_{n+1})(e - s) - se + (\nu_{n+1})^2. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, by (A.20) we obtain

$$T_n(x) = \frac{(e-s)}{2} (e + 2\nu_{n+1}) \|x\|^2.$$

This ends the proof.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] H. Attouch, H., A. Cabot, *Convergence of a relaxed inertial forward-backward algorithm for structured monotone inclusions*, Appl. Math. Optim., 80, pp. 547–598 (2019).
- [2] H. Attouch, S.C. Laszlo, *Newton-like inertial dynamics and proximal algorithms governed by maximally monotone operators*, SIAM J. Optim., 30(4), (2020), pp. 3252–3283.
- [3] H. Attouch, J. Peypouquet, The rate of convergence of Nesterov’s accelerated forward-backward method is actually faster than  $1/k^2$ , *SIAM J. Optimization*, 26(3), pp. 1824–1834.
- [4] H. Attouch, J. Peypouquet, *Convergence of inertial dynamics and proximal algorithms governed by maximal monotone operators*, Math. Programming., vol. 174, (2019), pp. 391–432.
- [5] H. Attouch, M. Soueycatt, *Augmented Lagrangian and proximal alternating direction methods of multipliers in Hilbert spaces. Applications to games, PDE’s and control*, Pac. J. Optim. 5(1), (2009), pp. 17–37.
- [6] H.H. Bauschke and P.L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, Springer, New York, (2017).
- [7] A. Beck, M. Teboulle, *A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems*, SIAM J. Imaging Sci., 2 (2009), No. 1, pp. 183–202.
- [8] R.I. Bot, M. Sedlmayer, P.T. Vuong, *A relaxed inertial forward-backward-forward algorithm for solving monotone inclusions with application to GANs*, CoRR abs/2003.07886 (2020).
- [9] H. Brezis, *Opérateurs maximaux monotones*, Math. Stud. 5, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1973).
- [10] H. Brezis, P.L. Lions, *Produits infinis de résolvantes*, Isr. J. Math., 29, (1978), pp. 329–345.
- [11] V. Cevher and B.C. Vu: *A Reflected Forward-Backward Splitting Method for Monotone Inclusions Involving Lipschitzian Operators*, *Set-Valued Var. Anal.* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11228-020-00542-4>
- [12] A. Chambolle, C. Dossal, *On the convergence of the iterates of Fista*, J. Optim. Theory Applications, vol. 166, Issue 3, (2015), pp. 968–982.
- [13] P.L. Combettes, *Monotone operator theory in convex optimization*, Math. Programming, vol. B, 170, (2018), no. 1, pp. 177–206.
- [14] P.L. Combettes, J.-C. Pesquet, *Primal-dual splitting algorithm for solving inclusions with mixtures of composite, Lipschitzian, and parallel-sum type monotone operators*, Set-Valued and Variational Analysis 20(2), (2012), pp. 307–330.
- [15] P.L. Combettes and B.C. Vu, *Variable metric forward-backward splitting with applications to monotone inclusions in duality*, Optimization, Volume 63, Issue 9, (2014) , pp. 1289–1318.
- [16] P.L. Combettes and V. Wajs, *Signal recovery by proximal forwardbackward splitting. SIAM Multiscale Modeling and Simulation*, 4(4), (2005), pp. 1168–1200.
- [17] L. Condat, *A primal-dual splitting method for convex optimization involving lipschitzian, proximable and linear composite terms*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 158(2), (2013), pp. 460–479.
- [18] E. Corman, X. Yuan, *A generalized proximal point algorithm and its convergence rate*, SIAM J. Optimization, 24(4), (2014), pp. 1614–1638.
- [19] I. Daubechies, M. Defrise, and C. De Mol: *An iterative thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems with a sparsity constraint*. Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, 57, (2004), pp. 1413–1457, .
- [20] J. Douglas, H. H. Rachford, *On the numerical solution of heat conduction problems in two and three space variables*, Trans. Amer. Math. Society, 82, (1956), pp. 421–439.
- [21] . J. Duchi and Y. Singer, *Efficient online and batch learning using forward backward splitting. Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10, (2009), pp. 2899–2934.
- [22] Y. Drori, M. Teboulle, *Performance of first-order methods for smooth convex minimization: A novel approach*, Math. Programming, 145(1-2), (2014), pp. 451–482.
- [23] J. Eckstein, D.P. Bertsekas, *On the Douglas-Rachford splitting method and the proximal point algorithm for maximal monotone operators*, Math. Programming, 55(1-3), (1992), pp. 293–318.



- [24] O. Guler, *On the convergence of the proximal point algorithm for convex minimization*, SIAM J. Control Optimization, 29, (1991), pp. 403-419.
- [25] O. Guler, *New proximal point algorithms for convex minimization*, SIAM J. Optim., 2(4), (1992), pp. 649-664.
- [26] D. Kim, *Accelerated proximal point method for maximally monotone operators*, (2019), arXiv:1905.05149.
- [27] B. Lemaire, *The proximal algorithm*, in: New methods in optimization and their industrial uses, J.P. Penot (ed), Internat. Ser. Numer. Math. 87, Birkhauser, Basel, (1989), pp. 73-87.
- [28] H. Lin, J. Mairal, Z. Harchaoui, *Catalyst acceleration for first-order convex optimization: from theory to practice*, J. Mach. Learning Res. 18(212), (2018), pp. 1-54
- [29] P.L. Lions and B. Mercier, *Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators*. SIAM J. Numerical Analysis, 16(6), (1979), pp. 964-979.
- [30] D.A. Lorenz, T. Pock, *An inertial forward-backward algorithm for monotone inclusions*, J. Math. Imaging and Vision, 51, (2015), pp. 311-325.
- [31] P.L. Lions, B. Mercier, *Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 16, (1979), pp. 964-979.
- [32] B. Martinet, *Régularisation d'équations variationnelles par approximations successives*, Rev. Fr. Infor. Rech. Opération. 4, (1970), pp. 154-8.
- [33] A. Moudafi, M. Oliny, *Convergence of a splitting inertial proximal method for monotone operators*, J. Comput. Appl. Math., 155 (2003), No. 2, pp. 447-454.
- [34] Y. Nesterov, *A method of solving a convex programming problem with convergence rate  $O(1/k^2)$* , Soviet Math. Doklady, 27, (1983), pp. 372-376.
- [35] Y. Nesterov, *A method for unconstrained convex minimization problem with the rate of convergence  $O(1/k^2)$* , Dokl. Akad. Nauk. USSR 269(3), (1983), pp. 543-7.
- [36] Y. Nesterov, *Gradient methods for minimizing composite objective function*, Math. Programming, Ser. B 140, (2013), pp. 125-161.
- [37] G.B. Passty, *Ergodic convergence to a zero of the sum of monotone operators in Hilbert space*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 72 (1979), pp.383-390.
- [38] D. W. Peaceman and H. H. Rachford, *The numerical solution of parabolic and elliptic differential equations*, J. Soc. Indust. Appl. Math., 3(1), (1955), pp. 28-41.
- [39] M.J.D. Powell, *A method for nonlinear constraints in minimization problems*, In Optimization (R. Fletcher, ed.), pp. 283-98, Academic Press, New York, (1969).
- [40] H. Raguét, J. Fadili, G. Peyré: *A generalized forward-backward splitting*, SIAM J. Imaging Sci. 6, (2013), pp. 1199-1226.
- [41] R.T. Rockafellar, *Monotone operators associated with saddle functions and minimax problems*, Nonlinear Functional Analysis, Part 1, F. E. Browder, ed., Symposia in Pure Math., vol. 18, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI., (1970), pp. 397-407.
- [42] R.T. Rockafellar, *Augmented Lagrangians and applications of the proximal point algorithm in convex programming*, Math. of Operations Research, 1(2), (1976), pp. 97-116.
- [43] R.T. Rockafellar, *Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm*, SIAM J. Control. Opt., 14 (5), (1976), pp. 877-898.
- [44] R.T. Rockafellar, J.B. Wets, *Variational Analysis*, Springer-Verlag (1998).
- [45] Z. Sebestyen, Z. Tarcsay, *On the square root of a positive selfadjoint operator*, Periodica Mathematica Hungarica volume, 75 (2017), pp. 268-272.
- [46] W. Takahashi, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Yokohama Publishers, Yokohama, Japan, (2000).
- [47] P. Tseng: *A modified forward-backward splitting method for maximal monotone mappings*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 38(2), (2000), pp. 431-446.
- [48] S. Villa, S. Salzo, L. Baldassarre, and A. Verri. *Accelerated and inexact forward-backward algorithms*. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 23(3), (2013), pp. 1607-1633.
- [49] B. Vu. *A splitting algorithm for dual monotone inclusions involving cocoercive operators*, Advances in Computational Mathematics, 38(3), (2013), pp. 667-681.
- [50] X. Q. Zhang, M. Burger, X. Bresson and S. Osher, *Bregmanized nonlocal regularization for deconvolution and sparse reconstruction*, SIAM J. Imaging Sci., 3(3), (2010), pp. 253-276.