

Variable metric extrapolation proximal iterative hard thresholding method for ℓ_0 minimization problem

Xue Zhang^a, Xiaoqun Zhang^{b,c}

^a*School of mathematics and computer science, Shanxi Normal Univeristy, Shanxi 041001, CHINA*

^b*Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, CHINA*

^c*Institute of Natural Sciences, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, CHINA*

Abstract

In this paper, we consider the ℓ_0 minimization problem whose objective function is the sum of ℓ_0 -norm and convex differentiable function. A variable metric type method which combines the PIHT method and the skill in quasi-newton method, named variable metric extrapolation proximal iterative hard thresholding (VMEPIHT) method, is proposed. Then we analyze its convergence, linear convergence rate and superlinear convergence rate under appropriate assumptions. Finally, we conduct numerical experiments on compressive sensing problem and CT image reconstruction problem to confirm VMEPIHT method's efficiency, compared with other state-of-art methods.

Keywords: ℓ_0 regularization; variable metric; linear convergence rate; superlinear convergence rate; iterative hard thresholding.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following ℓ_0 minimization problem proposed in compressed sensing (CS)

$$\min_x H(x) := f(x) + \lambda \|x\|_0 \quad (1)$$

where $f(x)$ is convex, $\nabla f(x)$ is L -Lipschitz continuous and $\|x\|_0$ is the number of nonzero components of x . Over the last decade, the sparse model with ℓ_0 -norm has been pursued in signal processing and many other fields, such as image processing[? ?], machine learning[?], CT image reconstruction[?], computer vision[?], signal recovery[?], and electrical capacitance tomography[?].

Despite problem (1) is NP-hard, there exist some methods to approximately solve the problem. To the best of our knowledge, there are three main schemes. The first scheme is the forward-backward(FB) method[? ?] which originally proposed for solving the the sum of two monotone operators. For the following general problem

$$\min_x f(x) + g(x) \quad (2)$$

whose special case is the problem (1) we consider, [?] provides a new convergence results for inexact forward-backward splitting method using Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz inequality under nonconvex assumption. The proximal iterative hard thresholding(PIHT) method proposed by [?] is to solve the problem (1),

Email addresses: zhangxue2100@sjtu.edu.cn (Xue Zhang), xqzhang@sjtu.edu.cn (Xiaoqun Zhang)

whose recursive formula is

$$x_{k+1} \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \lambda \|x\|_0 + \frac{L}{2} \|x - x_k + \nabla f(x_k)/L\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - x_k\|^2. \quad (3)$$

For any starting point, $\{x_k\}$ generated by PIHT method converges to a local minimizer under the assumption that $f(x)$ is convex and $\nabla f(x)$ is L -Lipschitz continuous. In fact, PIHT method is a direct application of forward-backward splitting method on problem (1).

The second scheme is extrapolation type methods. The inertial forward-backward (IFB) method [?] for solving problem ((2)) uses Bregman distance to replace Euclidean distance. If using Euclidean distance, the iterative scheme of IFB method is

$$\begin{aligned} y_{k+1} &= x_k + 2\beta_k(x_k - x_{k-1}) \\ x_{k+1} &\in \arg \min_{x \in X} g(x) + \frac{1}{4\alpha_k} \|x - x_k + 2\alpha_k \nabla f(x_k)\|^2 + \frac{1}{4\alpha_k} \|x - y_{k+1}\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha_k, \beta_k > 0$ satisfy

$$0 < \underline{\alpha} \leq \alpha_k \leq \bar{\alpha}, 0 < \beta_k \leq \beta, \quad 1 > \bar{\alpha}L + 2\beta\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\underline{\alpha}} \quad (4)$$

for some $\bar{\alpha}, \underline{\alpha}, \beta > 0$. Inequalities (4) imply that one cannot have both of large α_k and β_k . [?] proposed a multi-step IFB method which has two extrapolation step. And the parameters need to satisfy similar conditions. Monotone accelerated proximal gradient (mAPG) method [?] for solving nonconvex problem (2) has the iterative scheme as follows

$$\begin{aligned} y_k &= x_k + \frac{t_{k-1}}{t_k}(z_k - x_k) + \frac{t_{k-1}-1}{t_k}(x_k - x_{k-1}), \quad t_{k+1} = \frac{\sqrt{1+4t_k^2} + 1}{2} \\ z_{k+1} &= \arg \min_z g(z) + \frac{1}{2\alpha_y} \|z - y_k + \alpha_y \nabla f(y_k)\|^2 \\ v_{k+1} &= \arg \min_v g(v) + \frac{1}{2\alpha_x} \|v - x_k + \alpha_x \nabla f(x_k)\|^2 \\ x_{k+1} &= \begin{cases} z_{k+1}, & \text{if } f(z_{k+1}) + g(z_{k+1}) \leq f(v_{k+1}) + g(v_{k+1}) \\ v_{k+1}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

mAPG has $O(1/k^2)$ convergence rate if $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are convex. [?] also proposed a non-monotone APG(nmAPG) for saving the computation cost in each step. nmAPG method gets the next iteration point by $x^{k+1} = z^{k+1}$ when $f(z^{k+1}) + g(z^{k+1}) \leq c_k - \delta \|z^{k+1} - y^k\|^2$ where

$$q_1 = 1, c_1 = f(x_1) + g(x_1); q_{k+1} = \eta q_k + 1, c_{k+1} = \frac{\eta q_k c_k + f(x^{k+1}) + g(x^{k+1})}{q_{k+1}}; \quad (6)$$

otherwise, it gets the next iteration point same with mAPG. Nonconvex inexact accelerated proximal gradient (niAPG) method provided by [?] requires only one proximal step (may be inexact) in each iteration, thus less expensive than mAPG. It's iterative scheme is

$$\begin{aligned} y_k &= x_k + \frac{k-1}{k}(x_k - x_{k-1}), \quad \Delta_k = \max_{t=\max\{1, k-q\}, \dots, k} f(x_t) + g(x_t) \\ v_k &= \begin{cases} y_k, & \text{if } f(y_k) + g(y_k) \leq \Delta_k \\ x_k, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ x_{k+1} &= \arg \min_v g(v) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|v - v_k + \eta \nabla f(v_k)\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Method	Assumption	Convergence
IFB	nonconvex differentiable f , nonconvex g , KL	globally
mAPG	nonconvex differentiable f , nonconvex g	subsequence
niAPG	nonconvex differentiable f , nonconvex g	subsequence
nPIHT	convex differentiable f , $g(x) = \lambda\ x\ _0 + \delta_X(x)$	globally

Table 1: Comparisons of extrapolation type methods.

[?] proposed a new proximal iterative hard thresholding method (nPIHT) for problem (1) with a convex constraint set X whose iterative scheme is

$$\begin{aligned}
y_{k+1} &= x_k + |\text{sign}(x_k)|\omega_k(x_k - x_{k-1}) \\
\text{if } \langle y_{k+1} - x_k, \nabla f(y_{k+1}) \rangle > 0 \text{ or } y_{k+1} \notin X &\text{ reset } y_{k+1} = x_k \\
x_{k+1} &\in \arg \min_{x \in X} \lambda\|x\|_0 + \frac{L}{2}\|x - y_{k+1} + \frac{1}{L}\nabla f(y_{k+1})\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x - y_{k+1}\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The nPIHT method has better numerical results than mAPG for ℓ_0 minimization problem in [?]. Table (1) summarizes some differences of the above mentioned algorithms.

The third scheme is variable metric type methods usually using the following operator

$$\text{prox}_g^A(x) := \arg \min_y g(y) + \frac{1}{2}\|y - x\|_A^2$$

where A is a symmetric positive definite matrix. Variable metric technique is usually used for accelerating the convergence of the FB method. The general iteration of a variable metric FB method [?] can be stated as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
y_k &= \text{prox}_g^{\gamma_k^{-1}A_k}(x_k - \gamma_k A_k^{-1} \nabla f(x_k)) \\
x_{k+1} &= x_k + \lambda_k(y_k - x_k).
\end{aligned}$$

Different choices of A_k and γ_k lead to different convergence properties and practical performances. Usually, a good metric matrix selection rule should be able to preserve the theoretical convergence of the iterates to a solution, spend less effort in the computation of $\text{prox}_g^{\gamma_k^{-1}A_k}$ and have good numerical effect. Under suitable strategies for A_k , [?] have numerically shown that variable metric type methods can reach performance comparable with algorithms who have superlinear convergence rate. Several authors have analyzed the convergence of variable metric FB method when $f(x)$ is differentiable and $g(x)$ is nonconvex [?]. The convergence can be proved when $\{A_k\}$ is any sequence of symmetric positive definite matrices and satisfies one of the following conditions

- $\gamma_k A_k \geq aI > LI$;
- $0 \prec mI \preceq A_k \preceq MI$, and $f(x) \leq f(x_k) + \langle x - x_k, \nabla f(x_k) \rangle + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k}\|x - x_k\|_{A_k}^2$.

For some specific issues, [?] explained how to select metric matrix $\{A_k\}$ in detail. But in general, the strategy of selecting metric matrix $\{A_k\}$ to ensure the theoretical convergence and improves the effectiveness of the whole method need further study.

For nonconvex and nonsmooth problem (2), it is very difficult to propose a convergent method due to the reduction of convex properties. But $\|x\|_0$ has its own characteristics which is helpful to construct fast convergent method. So we focus on the special case, namely problem (1). And we aim to design fast

method using $\|x\|_0$'s characteristics. In fact, if k is sufficiently large, the non-zero index set of iteration point x_k remains unchanged [? ?]. Then the methods[? ?] find the solution of $\min_{x \in C} f(x)$ where C is a linear subspace instead of problem (1). On the other side, variable metric type method can reach fast performance in practice. Encouraged by these, we proposed a variable metric extrapolation PIHT method which use PIHT method to get a reliable linear subspace C , then use variable metric method to minimization $f(x)$ fastly in subspace C . Our method is described in Section 2. Its convergence behavior is shown in Section 3. For a general convex differentiable function $f(x)$, any cluster point of iterative sequence is a local minimizer of $H(x)$. In particular, linear convergence rate and superlinear convergence rate are studied for quadratic function $f(x)$ which often happens in signal and image processing. If $f(x)$ is furthermore twice differentiable, sequence convergence is studied. The numerical assessment of the proposed method is described in Section 4, which confirm our method's efficiency compared with other state-of-art methods.

2. Algorithm

2.1. Preliminaries

We first introduce some notations, concepts and results that will be used in this paper. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, x_i represents x 's i -th component and $\|x\|_0$ denotes the number of x 's nonzero elements. We define the zero element index set of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as $I(x) := \{i : x_i = 0\}$. And for any index set $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$,

$$C_I := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_i = 0 \text{ for all } i \in I\}.$$

The projection operator defined on a set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by

$$P_C(x) = \arg \min_{z \in C} \frac{1}{2} \|z - x\|^2.$$

$P_C(\cdot)$ is continuous, namely, for any convergent sequence $\{x^k\}$, it holds $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} P_C(x^k) = P_C(\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} x^k)$. For any symmetric A and B , $A \preceq B$ implies $B - A$ is a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix.

Definition 2.1. A mapping $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be L_T -Lipschitz continuous on the set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ if there exists $L_T > 0$ such that

$$\|T(x) - T(y)\| \leq L_T \|x - y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

Lemma 2.2. [?] For $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if $\nabla f(x)$ is L -Lipschitz continuous, the following inequality holds

$$f(x) - f(y) \leq \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|x - y\|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Lemma 2.3. Let $D \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ be a symmetric positive semidefinite matrices. Then $a^T D^2 a \geq \lambda_t a^T D a$ for any vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$, where ρ is the smallest eigenvalue except 0.

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_t \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m$ be D 's eigenvalue where $\lambda_{t+1} = \dots = \lambda_m = 0$. $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_t, \dots, v_m$ are eigenvectors correspondingly which are orthogonal. Assume that $a = c_1 v_1 + \dots + c_m v_m$. Then

$$a^T D^2 a = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^2 c_i^2 \|v_i\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i^2 c_i^2 \|v_i\|^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_t \lambda_i c_i^2 \|v_i\|^2 = \lambda_t a^T D a.$$

□

2.2. VMEPIHT method

Emphasizing again, we focus on the problem (1), namely

$$\min_x H(x) := f(x) + \lambda \|x\|_0.$$

Throughout this paper, unless otherwise specified, our assumptions on problem (1) are

Assumption A:

1. f is convex differentiable and bounded from below;
2. ∇f is L -Lipschitz continuous.

We propose the following *variable metric extrapolation PIHT method*, called VMEPIHT.

VMEPIHT method

Choose parameters $\mu > 0, \lambda > 0$; choose starting point y^0 ; let $k = 0$.

while the stopping criterion does not hold

Let

$$x_k \in \arg \min_x \lambda \|x\|_0 + \frac{L}{2} \|x - y_k\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\nabla f(y_k)\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x - y_k\|^2 \quad (9)$$

compute positive definite matrix H_k by some method, then

$$y_{k+1} = P_{C_{I(x_k)}}(x_k - \alpha_k H_k \nabla f(x_k))$$

where step length α_k can guarantee the function value of f to decrease.

$k = k + 1$

end(while)

During the iteration, we use PIHT method to get a reliable linear subspace $C_{I(x^k)}$, then minimization $f(x)$ in linear subspace to get fast decrease of function value. That means $\|y_{k+1}\|_0 \leq \|x_k\|_0$ and $f(y_{k+1}) \leq f(x_k)$. Different choices of H_k lead to different convergence properties and practical performances. The practical suitable strategies for selecting metric matrix H_k and step length α_k will be declared in next section.

Remark 1. The solution of the equation (9) is given by

$$x_k \in \mathcal{H}_{\sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{L+\mu}}}(y_k - \frac{1}{L+\mu} \nabla f(y_k)),$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{\sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{L+\mu}}}(\cdot)$ is the hard thresholding operator defined as

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma(c))_i = \begin{cases} \{c_i\}, & \text{if } |c_i| > \gamma \\ \{0, c_i\} & \text{if } |c_i| = \gamma \\ \{0\}, & \text{if } |c_i| < \gamma. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

3. convergence

In this section, under suitable assumptions, we analyze the convergence behavior of VMEPIHT method. For simplicity, denote $C_* = C_{I(x^*)}$ and $C_k = C_{I(x^k)}$. To simplify proof of our main results, we first give the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. [?] (*Continuity of $\mathcal{H}_\gamma(\cdot)$*) If $\gamma_k \rightarrow \gamma$, $x_k \rightarrow x$, $y_k \rightarrow y$ and $x_k \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_k}(y_k)$, then $x \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma(y)$ holds.

Lemma 3.2. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by VMEPIHT method. Then

1. $\{H(x_k)\}$ is non-increasing;
2. $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|x_k - y_k\|^2 < \infty$, $\|x_k - y_k\|^2 \rightarrow 0$;
3. $I(x_k)$ changes only finitely often.

Proof. 1. Since $\nabla f(x)$ is L -Lipschitz continuous, from Lemma (2.2), we have

$$f(x_k) - f(y_k) \leq \langle \nabla f(y_k), x_k - y_k \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|x_k - y_k\|^2. \quad (11)$$

Meanwhile, it follows from VMEPIHT method that

$$\lambda \|x_k\|_0 + \frac{L}{2} \|x_k - y_k + \frac{\nabla f(y_k)}{L}\|_2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x_k - y_k\|^2 \leq \lambda \|y_k\|_0 + \frac{L}{2} \left\| \frac{\nabla f(y_k)}{L} \right\|^2$$

$$\|y_k\|_0 \leq \|x_{k-1}\|_0, \quad f(y_k) \leq f(x_{k-1})$$

Summing up the above four inequalities yields

$$H(x_k) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x_k - y_k\|_2 \leq H(x_{k-1}). \quad (12)$$

It's obvious that $\{H(x_k)\}$ is non-increasing.

2. Summing up the inequality (12) over $k = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$H(x^n) + \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n \|x^k - y^k\|^2 \leq H(x^0).$$

So $\{\sum_{k=1}^n \|x^k - y^k\|^2\}$ has upper bound since H has lower bound. Then we can conclude

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|x^k - y^k\|^2 < \infty, \quad \|x^k - y^k\| \rightarrow 0.$$

3. From the subproblem ((9)) and the hard thresholding operator (10), we have $|(x_k)_i| \geq \sqrt{2\lambda/(L + \mu)}$ for any $i \notin I(x_k)$. Hence, we have $\|x_k - y_k\| \geq \sqrt{2\lambda/(L + \mu)} > 0$ if $I(x_k)^C \not\subseteq I(y_k)^C$ where $I(x_k)^C$ denotes supplementary set of $I(x_k)$ in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Combining $\|x_k - y_k\| \rightarrow 0$ and $I(y_k)^C \subseteq I(x_{k-1})^C$, it is easy to see that $I(x_k)^C \subseteq I(x_{k-1})^C$ always hold if k is sufficiently large. Then $I(x_k)$ must change only finitely often. \square

Theorem 3.3. Let $H(x)$ be the objective function, and $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by VMEPIHT method, then

1. any cluster point of $\{x_k\}$ is a local minimizer of $H(x)$;
2. $H(x_k) \rightarrow H(x^*)$ where x^* is a cluster point of $\{x_k\}$.

Proof. 1. Assume that x^* is a cluster point of $\{x_k\}$ and the subsequence $\{x_{k_j}\}$ converging to x^* . It follows from Lemma (3.2) that $\|x_k - y_k\| \rightarrow 0$ and then $y_{k_j} \rightarrow x^*$ right now. The iterative formula (9) of VMEPIHT method is equivalent to

$$x_k \in \mathcal{H}_{\sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{L+\mu}}}(y_k - \frac{1}{L+\mu} \nabla f(y_k)).$$

Letting k be equal to k_j and j tends to infity, together with the Lemma (3.1), we obtain

$$x^* = \mathcal{H}_{\sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{L+\mu}}}(x^* - \frac{\nabla f(x^*)}{L+\mu}).$$

In particular $x_i^* = x_i^* - \frac{(\nabla f(x^*))_i}{L+\mu}$, $i \notin I(x^*)$, namely $(\nabla f(x^*))_i = 0$, $i \notin I(x^*)$.

Denote

$$U := \{\Delta x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\Delta x\|_\infty < \frac{1}{2} \min_{i \in I(x^*)} \left\{ \frac{\lambda}{|(\nabla f(x^*))_i|}, 1 \right\}; |\Delta x_i| < |x_i^*|, \forall i \notin I(x^*)\},$$

It is clear that $x^* + U$ is a neighborhood of x^* . For any $\Delta x \in U$, we have

- $\lambda\|x_i^* + \Delta x_i\|_0 = \lambda\|x_i^*\|_0$, $\forall i \notin I(x^*)$ since $|\Delta x_i| < |x_i^*|$;
- $\Delta x_i(\nabla f(x^*))_i = 0$, $\forall i \notin I(x^*)$;
- $\lambda\|\Delta x_i\|_0 + (\nabla f(x^*))_i \Delta x_i \geq 0$, $i \in I(x^*)$ since $\|\Delta x\|_\infty < \frac{1}{2} \min_{i \in I(x^*)} \left\{ \frac{\lambda}{|(\nabla f(x^*))_i|}, 1 \right\}$.

Using the above conclusions, for any $\Delta x \in U$, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H(x^* + \Delta x) - H(x^*) &= \lambda\|x^* + \Delta x\|_0 - \lambda\|x^*\|_0 + f(x^* + \Delta x) - f(x^*) \\ &\geq \sum_{i \in I(x^*)} \lambda\|\Delta x_i\|_0 + \langle \nabla f(x^*), \Delta x \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i \in I(x^*)} (\lambda\|\Delta x_i\|_0 + (\nabla f(x^*))_i \Delta x_i) + \sum_{i \notin I(x^*)} \Delta x_i (\nabla f(x^*))_i \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

So x^* is a local minimizer of objective function $H(x)$.

2. By inequality ((12)), $H(x_k)$ is non-increasing. Together with the assumption that $f(x)$ is bounded from below, we can conclude $H(x_k)$ is convergent. Furthermore, $H(x_k) \rightarrow H(x^*)$ since $I(x_k) = I(x^*)$ when $k \geq k_0$ and $f(x_{k_j}) \rightarrow f(x^*)$. \square

Note that, by the proof of Lemma (3.2) and Theorem (3.3), we have the following conclusions which are useful in subsection 3.1 and 3.2.

- There exists some k_0 such that $I(y_k) = I(x_k) = I(x^*)$; so we can assume that $x_k = [x_k^*, 0]$, $k \geq k_0$ and $x^* = [x_*^*, 0]$ without loss of generality.
- When $k \geq k_0$, $\mathcal{H}_{\sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{L+\mu}}}(y_k - \frac{1}{L+\mu} \nabla f(y_k)) = P_{C_*}(y_k - \frac{1}{L+\mu} \nabla f(y_k))$.
- If $x_k = \mathcal{H}_{\sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{L+\mu}}}(x_k - \frac{\nabla f(x_k)}{L+\mu})$ for some k , x_k is a local minimizer of $H(x)$. And then VMEPIHT method stops;
- $\nabla_* f(x^*) = 0$ where $\nabla_* f(x^*)$ denotes the elements of $\nabla f(x^*)$ in linear subspace C_* .

3.1. convergence behavior of iterative sequence when $f(x) = \|Ax - b\|^2/2$

In this subsection, we analyze the convergence behavior of iterative sequence generated by VMEPIHT method when $f(x) = \|Ax - b\|^2/2$.

Firstly, we explain how to select H_k and step length α_k . The strategy we used is very practical. For simplicity, we use the following notations. For a vector x , $(x)^k$ denotes the elements of x in linear subspace C_k . Correspondingly, x_k consists of x_k^k and 0 and y_{k+1} also consists of y_{k+1}^k and 0. In linear subspace C_k , let $\nabla_k f(x_k) = Q^k x_k^k + c^k$, where $c^k = -(A^T b)^k$ and the symmetric positive semidefinite matrix Q^k is the elements of $A^T A$ corresponding to x_k^k . Clearly, $\nabla_k f(x_k) = (\nabla f(x_k))^k$.

When $f(x) = \|Ax - b\|^2/2$, we obtained H_k and step length α_k through the following ways.

1. Symmetric positive definite matrix \tilde{H}_k is obtained by BFGS or limited-memory BFGS[?]. For simplicity, there is no harm in denoting $x_k = \begin{pmatrix} x_k^k \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and

$$\tilde{H}_k = \begin{pmatrix} H_k^k & * \\ * & * \end{pmatrix}$$

where H_k^k is corresponding to x_k^k and then let

$$H_k = \begin{pmatrix} H_k^k & 0 \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}$$

where $*$ represent any positive definite matrix which does not work during the iteration. Then

$$y_{k+1} = P_{C_k}(x_k - \alpha_k H_k \nabla f(x_k)) = \begin{pmatrix} x_k^k + \alpha_k d_k^k \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where } d_k^k = -H_k^k \nabla_k f(x_k).$$

In practice, we can construct the definite matrix \tilde{H}_k firstly. Secondly, compute $P_{C_k}(\nabla f(x_k))$ to get $\begin{pmatrix} \nabla_k f(x_k) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then naturally

$$y_{k+1} = P_{C_k}(x_k - \alpha_k \tilde{H}_k \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_k f(x_k) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}) = \begin{pmatrix} x_k^k + \alpha_k d_k^k \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

2. If $Q^k d_k^k = 0$, let $\alpha_k = 0$. Otherwise, it is clear that d_k^k is a descent direction of function $f|_{C_k}$ at point x_k^k . Let α_k be the optimal steplength, namely

$$\alpha_k = \frac{-\nabla_k f(x_k)^T d_k^k}{d_k^k Q^k d_k^k} = \frac{\nabla_k f(x_k)^T H_k^k \nabla_k f(x_k)}{\nabla_k f(x_k)^T H_k^k Q^k H_k^k \nabla_k f(x_k)}.$$

In practice, the step length

$$\alpha_k = \frac{-\nabla_k f(x_k)^T d_k^k}{d_k^k Q^k d_k^k} = \frac{-\nabla f(x_k)^T d_k}{\|Ad_k\|^2}$$

where $d_k = \begin{pmatrix} d_k^k \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and hence $\|Ad_k\|^2 = ((d_k^k)^T, 0)A^T A \begin{pmatrix} d_k^k \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = d_k^k Q^k d_k^k$.

In the following, we will analyze the convergence behavior of $\{x_k\}_{k \geq k_0}$ generated by VMEPIHT method. Similarly, denote the elements of H_k corresponding to x_k^* by H_k^* . Hence H_k^* is a symmetric positive definite matrix. And

$$f_*(x_k) = f\left(\begin{pmatrix} x_k^* \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \|A \begin{pmatrix} x_k^* \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} - b\|^2/2, \quad \nabla_* f(x_k) = (\nabla f(x_k))^* = Qx_k^* + c$$

$$d_k^* = -H_k^* \nabla_* f(x_k), \quad d_k = \begin{pmatrix} d_k^* \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $c = -(A^T b)^*$ and the symmetric positive semidefinite matrix Q is the elements of $A^T A$ corresponding to x_k^* .

If there exists some $k \geq k_0$ such that $\alpha_k = 0$, namely $Qd_k^* = 0$ and $y_{k+1} = x_k$, combining with the fact $\nabla_* f(x^*) = 0$ yields

$$\langle \nabla_* f(x_k), H_k^* \nabla_* f(x_k) \rangle = \langle 0 - \nabla_* f(x_k), d_k^* \rangle = \langle \nabla_* f(x^*) - \nabla_* f(x_k), d_k^* \rangle = \langle Q(x^* - x_k), d_k^* \rangle = 0.$$

Then $\nabla_* f(x_k) = \nabla_* f(y_{k+1}) = 0$ right now. Hence

$$\mathcal{H}_{\sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{L+\mu}}}(y_{k+1} - \frac{1}{L+\mu} \nabla f(y_{k+1})) = P_{C_*}(x_k - \frac{1}{L+\mu} \nabla f(x_k)) = x_k = y_{k+1}.$$

and so x_k is a local minimizer according to the proof of Theorem (3.3). In the following, we assume that VMEPIHT method gets a infinite set $\{x^k\}$, namely $\alpha_k > 0$ for any $k \geq k_0$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $f(x) = \|Ax - b\|^2/2$ and $\{x_k\}_{k \geq k_0}$ be the sequence generated by VMEPIHT. x^* is any cluster point of $\{x_k\}$ and hence is a local minimizer of $H(x)$. Then*

1. $\|x_k - x^*\|_{A^T A}^2$ and $\|y_k - x^*\|_{A^T A}^2$ tend to 0 decreasingly; if there exists $k \geq k_0$ such that $\|y_k - x^*\|_{A^T A}^2 = 0$, y_k is a local minimizer;
2. if there exist positive constants m and M such that $\prec mI \preceq H_k \prec MI$, then $\|x_k - x^*\|_{A^T A}^2$ converges to 0 linearly;
3. if Q is furthermore a positive definite matrix and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|((H_k^*)^{-1} - Q)d_k^*\|}{\|d_k^*\|} = 0$, then $\|x_k - x^*\|$ converges to 0 at a superlinear rate.

Proof. For any $k \geq k_0$, the iterative process of VMEPIHT turns to

$$x_k^* = y_k^* - \frac{\nabla_* f(y_k)}{L + \mu}$$

$$y_{k+1}^* = x_k^* - \alpha_k H_k^* \nabla_* f(x_k)$$

$$\alpha_k = \frac{-\nabla_* f(x_k)^T d_k^*}{d_k^* Q d_k^*} = \frac{\nabla_* f(x_k)^T H_k^* \nabla_* f(x_k)}{\nabla_* f(x_k)^T H_k^* Q H_k^* \nabla_* f(x_k)} = \frac{(x_k^* - x_*^*)^T Q H_k^* Q (x_k^* - x_*^*)}{(x_k^* - x_*^*)^T Q H_k^* Q H_k^* Q (x_k^* - x_*^*)}.$$

The third equation about α_k holds owing to the fact $\nabla_* f(x^*) = 0$.

1. Form the iterative formula above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|y_{k+1}^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2 \\ = & \|x_k^* - \alpha_k H_k^* \nabla_* f(x_k) - x_*^*\|_Q^2 = \|x_k^* - x_*^* - \alpha_k H_k^* (\nabla_* f(x_k) - \nabla_* f(x_*^*))\|_Q^2 \\ = & \|x_k^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2 - 2\alpha_k \langle x_k^* - x_*^*, Q H_k^* (\nabla_* f(x_k) - \nabla_* f(x_*^*)) \rangle + \alpha_k^2 \|H_k^* (\nabla_* f(x_k) - \nabla_* f(x_*^*))\|_Q^2 \\ = & \|x_k^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2 - \frac{\langle x_k^* - x_*^*, Q H_k^* Q (x_k^* - x_*^*) \rangle^2}{(x_k^* - x_*^*)^T Q H_k^* Q H_k^* Q (x_k^* - x_*^*)} \\ \leq & \|x_k^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_k^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2 &= \|y_k^* - \nabla_* f(y_k)/(L + \mu) - x_*^*\|_Q^2 \\
&= \|y_k^* - \nabla_* f(y_k)/(L + \mu) - x_*^* + \nabla_* f(x^*)/(L + \mu)\|_Q^2 \\
&= \|(I - \frac{Q}{L + \mu})(y_k^* - x_*^*)\|_Q^2 \\
&\leq \|y_k^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Combining with the fact that x^* is a cluster point of $\{x_k\}$ $x_k - y_k \rightarrow 0$ from Lemma (3.2) and $\|y_k - x^*\|_{A^T A}^2 = \|y_k^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2$, we can conclude $\|y_k - x^*\|_{A^T A}^2$ and $\|x_k - x^*\|_{A^T A}^2$ tend to 0 decreasingly.

If there exists some $k \geq k_0$ such that $\|y_k^* - x_*^*\|_{A^T A}^2 = 0$, namely $\nabla f(y_k) = \nabla f(x^*)$, then

$$\mathcal{H}_{\sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{L+\mu}}}(y_k - \frac{\nabla f(y_k)}{L + \mu}) = \mathcal{H}_{\sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{L+\mu}}}(y_k - \frac{\nabla f(x^*)}{L + \mu}) \ni y_k.$$

Hence y_k is a local minimizer according to the proof of Theorem (3.3) and algorithm stops.

2. If $0 \prec mI \prec H_k \prec MI$, similarly with the procedure (13) and (14), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{k+1}^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2 &= \|(I - \frac{Q}{L + \mu})(y_{k+1}^* - x_*^*)\|_Q^2 \\
&\leq \|y_{k+1}^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2 \\
&= \|x_k^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2 - \frac{\langle x_k^* - x_*^*, QH_k^*Q(x_k^* - x_*^*) \rangle}{(x_k^* - x_*^*)^T QH_k^*QH_k^*Q(x_k^* - x_*^*)} \langle x_k^* - x_*^*, QH_k^*Q(x_k^* - x_*^*) \rangle \\
&\leq \|x_k^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2 - \frac{m}{ML} \langle x_k^* - x_*^*, QQ(x_k^* - x_*^*) \rangle \\
&\leq (1 - \frac{m\lambda_t}{ML}) \|x_k^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where λ_t is Q 's minimum eigenvalue except 0 and the last inequality holds due to Lemma (2.3). Naturally $\|x_k - x^*\|_{A^T A}^2 = \|x_k^* - x_*^*\|_Q^2$ converges to 0 linearly.

3. If Q is a positive definite matrix and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|((H_k^*)^{-1} - Q)d_k^*\|}{\|d_k^*\|} = 0$, we have

$$\alpha_k - 1 = \frac{\langle (H_k^*)^{-1}d_k^*, d_k^* \rangle}{d_k^* Q d_k^*} - 1 = \frac{\langle d_k^*, ((H_k^*)^{-1} - Q)d_k^* \rangle}{\langle d_k^*, Qd_k^* \rangle} \rightarrow 0. \tag{16}$$

Combining $Q(y_{k+1}^* - x_k^*) = \nabla_* f(y_{k+1}^*) - \nabla_* f(x_k^*)$ with the iteration procedure $y_{k+1}^* = x_k^* - \alpha_k H_k^* \nabla_* f(x_k)$, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|\nabla_* f(y_{k+1}^*)\|}{\|y_{k+1}^* - x_k^*\|} &= \frac{\|(Q - \alpha_k^{-1}(H_k^*)^{-1})d_k^*\|}{\|d_k^*\|} \\
&= \frac{\|\alpha_k^{-1}(Q - (H_k^*)^{-1})d_k^* + (1 - \alpha_k^{-1})Qd_k^*\|}{\|d_k^*\|} \\
&\leq \frac{\|\alpha_k^{-1}(Q - (H_k^*)^{-1})d_k^*\| + \|(1 - \alpha_k^{-1})Qd_k^*\|}{\|d_k^*\|}
\end{aligned}$$

Let λ_{\min} is the minimum eigenvalue of Q . It follows from (16) and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|((H_k^*)^{-1} - Q)d_k^*\|}{\|d_k^*\|} = 0$ that

$$0 \leftarrow \frac{\|\nabla_* f(y_{k+1}^*)\|}{\|y_{k+1}^* - x_k^*\|} = \frac{\|\nabla_* f(y_{k+1}^*) - \nabla_* f(x_k^*)\|}{\|y_{k+1}^* - x_k^*\|} \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min} \|y_{k+1}^* - x_*^*\|}{\|y_{k+1}^* - x_*^*\| + \|x_k^* - x_*^*\|},$$

which, together with the conclusion $\|x_{k+1}^* - x_*^*\|_Q \leq \|y_{k+1}^* - x_*^*\|_Q$, imply

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|x_{k+1}^* - x_*^*\|}{\|x_k^* - x_*^*\|} = 0.$$

Thus $\|x_k - x^*\|$ converges to 0 at a superlinear rate. \square

Remark 2. If symmetric positive definite matrix \tilde{H}_k is obtained by limited-memory BFGS by the set of vector pairs $\{S_i, Y_i\}_{i=k-T}^{k-1}$ where $S_{k-1} = x_k - y_k$, $S_{k-2} = y_k - x_{k-1}$, \dots and $Y_i = A^T A S_i + tI$, $t > 0$. So it's clear that \tilde{H}_k have positive upper and lower bounds. And the same for H_k .

Remark 3. The Theorem (3.4) tells us a superlinear convergence rate can be attained if $(H_k^*)^{-1}$ become accurate approximation to Q along the direction d_k^* . Although we can't prove that it holds. It worth believing that the VMEPIHT method is fast.

3.2. convergence behavior of iterative sequence for general convex differentiable $f(x)$

In this subsection, we will analyze the convergence behavior of iterative sequence for general convex differentiable $f(x)$. Under attainable conditions, we prove the iterative sequence's convergence.

We assume that the sequence of symmetric positive definite matrix $\{H_k\}$ and steplength satisfy the following conditions.

1. $H_k = \begin{pmatrix} H_k^* & 0 \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}$ when $k \geq k_0$ and there exists k_1 such that $(H_{k+1}^*)^{-1} \preceq (1 + \epsilon_k)(H_k^*)^{-1}$, where $\epsilon_k \geq 0$ and $\sum_{k=\max\{k_0, k_1\}}^{\infty} \epsilon_k < +\infty$.
2. If $\nabla_k f(x_k^k)^T d_k^k = 0$, let $\alpha_k = 0$; otherwise, $\alpha_k \in \{\frac{2\|\nabla_* f(x_k)\|^2}{L\|\nabla_* f(x_k)\|_{H_k^*}^2} \gamma^i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ satisfies Dong's step length rule[?] which can guarantee the function value of f to decrease, namely

$$\langle \nabla_k f\left(\begin{pmatrix} y_{k+1}^k \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right), d_k^k \rangle \geq \delta \langle \nabla_k f\left(\begin{pmatrix} x_k^k \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right), d_k^k \rangle$$

where $\gamma, \delta \in (0, 1)$.

Lemma 3.5. [?] Let $\{a_k\}$ and $\{\eta_k\}$ be nonnegative sequences of real nmubers such that

$$a_{k+1} \leq (1 + \eta_k)a_k, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \eta_k < +\infty.$$

Then $\{a_k\}$ converges.

Theorem 3.6. Assume that $f(x)$ satisfies Assumption A and is furthermore twice continuously differentiable. Let $\{x_k\}_{k \geq k_0}$ be the sequence generated by VMEPIHT. x^* is any cluster point of $\{x_k\}$ and hence is a local minimizer of $H(x)$. Then $\|x_k^* - x^*\|_{(H_{k-1}^*)^{-1}} \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. For any $k \geq \max\{k_0, k_1\}$, the iterative process of VMEPIHT turns to

$$\begin{aligned} x_k^* &= y_k^* - \frac{\nabla_* f(y_k)}{L + \mu} \\ y_{k+1}^* &= x_k^* - \alpha_k H_k^* \nabla_* f(x_k) \end{aligned}$$

Form the iterative formula above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|y_{k+1}^* - x_*^*\|_{(H_k^*)^{-1}}^2 &= \|x_k^* - \alpha_k H_k^* \nabla_* f(x_k) - x_*^*\|_{(H_k^*)^{-1}}^2 \\
&= \|x_k^* - x_*^*\|_{(H_k^*)^{-1}}^2 - 2\alpha_k \langle x_k^* - x_*^*, \nabla_* f(x_k) - \nabla_* f(x_*^*) \rangle + \alpha_k^2 \|\nabla_* f(x_k)\|_{H_k^*}^2 \\
&= \|x_k^* - x_*^*\|_{(H_k^*)^{-1}}^2 - \frac{2\alpha_k}{L} \|\nabla_* f(x_k) - \nabla_* f(x_*^*)\|^2 + \alpha_k^2 \|\nabla_* f(x_k)\|_{H_k^*}^2 \\
&= \|x_k^* - x_*^*\|_{(H_k^*)^{-1}}^2 - \frac{2\alpha_k}{L} \|\nabla_* f(x_k)\|^2 + \alpha_k^2 \|\nabla_* f(x_k)\|_{H_k^*}^2 \\
&\leq \|x_k^* - x_*^*\|_{(H_k^*)^{-1}}^2 \\
&= \|y_k^* - \nabla_* f(y_k)/(L + \mu) - x_*^*\|_{(H_k^*)^{-1}}^2 \\
&= \|y_k^* - \nabla_* f([y_k^*; 0])/(L + \mu) - x_*^* + \nabla_* f([x_*^*; 0])/(L + \mu)\|_{(H_k^*)^{-1}}^2 \\
&= \|(I - \frac{\nabla_*^2 f(\xi_k)}{L + \mu})(y_k^* - x_*^*)\|_{(H_k^*)^{-1}}^2 \\
&\leq (1 + \epsilon_{k-1}) \|y_k^* - x_*^*\|_{(H_{k-1}^*)^{-1}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\|y_k^* - x_*^*\|_{(H_{k-1}^*)^{-1}}^2$ converges according to Lemma (3.5). Then $\|y_k^* - x_*^*\|_{(H_{k-1}^*)^{-1}}^2 \rightarrow 0$. \square

Remark 4. In practice, we can obtain $\{H_k\}_{k \geq k_0}$ in the similar way as subsection 3.1. Firstly construct the definite matrix \tilde{H}_k by BFGS or limited-memory BFGS method. Secondly, compute $P_{C_k}(\nabla f(x_k))$. So get $\begin{pmatrix} \nabla_k f(x_k) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. and

$$y_{k+1} = P_{C_k}(x_k - \alpha_k \tilde{H}_k \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_k f(x_k) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}) = \begin{pmatrix} x_k^k + \alpha_k d_k^k \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Finally, for some k_1 , let $\tilde{H}_k = \tilde{H}_t$ for any $k \geq k_1$. Once $k \geq \max\{k_0, k_1\}$,

$$y_{k+1} = P_{C_*}(x_k - \alpha_k \tilde{H}_t \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_* f(x_k) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}) = \begin{pmatrix} x_k^k + \alpha_k \tilde{H}_t^* \nabla_* f(x_k) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence $H_k^* = \tilde{H}_{k_1}^*$ for any $k \geq \max\{k_0, k_1\}$. Naturally, the conditions $(H_{k+1}^*)^{-1} \preceq (1 + \epsilon_k)(H_k^*)^{-1}$, $k \geq k_1$ and $\sum_{k=k_1}^{\infty} \epsilon_k < +\infty$ hold.

4. Numerical results

In this section, we present the performance of VMEPIHT method for solving ℓ_0 minimization problems through some numerical tests on compressive sensing and MRI Imaging. The solvers, nmAP(6), niAPG(7) and nPIHT(8) are compared. We do not compare with the variable metric type method as we do not know the effective strategy of selecting metric matrix. All the experiments are conducted in MATLAB using a desktop computer equipped with a .0GHz 8-core i7 processor and 16GB memory.

4.1. Compressive sensing

For this experiment, we consider the following ℓ_0 regularization compressive sensing problem coming from [?]]

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \lambda \|x\|_0. \quad (17)$$

Method	nmAP(6)	niAPG(7)	nPIHT(8)	VMEPINT
parameters	$\alpha_x = \alpha_y = 1/(L + 10^{-6})$ $\eta = 0.1$	$\eta = 1/(L + 10^{-6})$ $q = 2$	$\mu = 10^{-6}$ $\omega_k = 0.9999$	$\mu = 10^{-6}$ $T = 6$

Table 2: The parameters of methods for CS.

The data matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ($n \in \{10000, 18000\}$, $m = \lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor$) is a random Gaussian or random Bernoulli sensing matrix and the columns are normalized to have ℓ_2 norm of 1. The true signals x^* are chosen $\lfloor \frac{m}{32} \rfloor$ -sparse. The observed data $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is generated by

$$b = Ax^* + \eta,$$

where η is a white Gaussian noise of variance 0.02. Since the optimal regularization parameter λ^* depends on noise level $\|\eta\|$ which is unknown in practice, we predefine a path

$$\{\lambda = \|A^T b\|_\infty^2 \exp^t, t = \log 1 : \frac{\log(10^{-10}) - \log 1}{199} : \log(10^{-10})\}$$

and select the optimal λ^* .

For all methods, the initial guess is $x_0 = A^T b$. \tilde{x} is a local minimizer when $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{H}_{\sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{L+\mu}}}(\tilde{x} - \frac{1}{L+\mu} \nabla f(\tilde{x}))$. So we use the following stopping criteria

$$\frac{\|x_{k+1} - a_k\|}{\max\{1, \|x_k\|\}} < 1 \times 10^{-5}.$$

where a_k represents x_k or y_k for nmAPG method, v_k for niAPG method, y_{k+1} for nPIHT method and our VMEPIHT method. The parameters of methods are showed in Table (2) where metric matrix is updated by limited-memory BFGS by vector pairs with T members for our method.

For each algorithm and each choice of n , we conduct 50 experiments and record the CPU runtime, the relative error $\frac{\|x - x^*\|}{\|x^*\|}$ and the iteration number. Related results are shown in Figure (1) and Figure (2). In addition, for all the methods, $I(\tilde{x})$ is always equal to $I(x^*)$ and we do not list them. For all methods, the relative error is almost the same which means that the quality of approximate solution is comparability. Our method, VMEPIHT method have obvious runs significantly faster compared with other three method.

4.2. CT image reconstruction

In this subsection, we use the following ℓ_0 regularization problem to reconstructed CT images,

$$\min_x \frac{1}{2} \|AW^T x - b\|^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|(I - WW^T)x\|^2 + \lambda \|x\|_0, \quad (18)$$

For this experiment, the test image is Shepp-Logan phantom with size 128×128 generated by MATLAB built-in functions, degradation matrix A happens to be a projection matrix with 50 projections, the wavelet tight frame transform W is the $2D$ tensor-product piecewise linear spline wavelet tight frame system whose level of wavelet decomposition is set to be 4. After the construction of the projection matrix A , we then add some Gaussian noise with variance $\sigma = 0.01 \cdot \|Af\|_\infty$ to the projected data to obtain the observed data b where f represents the true image.




Figure 1: Numerical results(iterative number, CPU time and relative error) with random Gaussian sensing matrix A of size $n = 10000$ (left) and $n = 18000$ (right).




Figure 2: Numerical results(iterative number, CPU time and relative error) with random Bernoulli sensing matrix A of size $n = 10000$ (left) and $n = 18000$ (right).

Method	nmAP(6)	niAPG(7)	nPIHT(8)	VMEPIHT
parameters	$\alpha_x = \alpha_y = 1/(L + 10^{-6})$ $\eta = 0.4$	$\eta = 1/(L + 10^{-6})$ $q = 9$	$\mu = 10^{-6}$ $\omega_k = 0.9999$	$\mu = 10^{-6}$ $T = 2$

Table 3: The parameters of methods for CT.

Method tol	nmAP(6)	niAPG(7)	nPIHT(8)	VMEPIHT
5×10^{-5}	145.73/231/31.5533	201.80/247/31.4024	98.39 /262/31.2354	107.34/ 116 / 32.0719
1×10^{-5}	246.39/407/31.5682	229.95/288/31.3905	118.27/313/31.3362	115.16 / 129 / 32.1153
5×10^{-6}	278.67/464/31.5906	269.50/339/31.3605	150.55/404/31.3944	143.03 / 152 / 32.1409
1×10^{-6}	549.05/836/31.5799	305.22/386/31.3585	213.67/580/31.4364	178.39 / 198 / 32.1817

Table 4: Numerical results(CPU time/iterative number/PSNR) for CT.

For all methods, the stopping criteria is

$$\frac{\|x_{k+1} - a_k\|}{\max\{1, \|x_k\|\}} < \text{tol}.$$

where a_k represents x_k or y_k for nmAPG method, v_k for niAPG method, y_{k+1} for nPIHT method and our VMEPIHT method. The parameters of methods are showed in Table (3).

For different choice of tol, we conduct experiments and record the CPU runtime, the PSNR values and the iteration number. Related results are fully summarized in Table (4). VMEPIHT method always takes less processing iterative number and have high PSNR. However, it's CPU time don't have absolute advantages. The longer processing time of VMEPIHT when $\text{tol} = 5 \times 10^{-5}$ is largely due to the computation of $H_k \nabla f(x_k)$. On the whole, VMEPIHT method have an advantage over other three method.

5. Conclusions and perspectives

In this paper, we proposed a variable metric extrapolation proximal iterative hard thresholding (VMEPIHT) method which combines the PIHT method and the skill in quasi-newton method for solving ℓ_0 regularized minimization problem. We provide some convergence results for the proposed method, including the convergence of iterative sequence, linear convergence rate and superlinear convergence rate. Although nmAPG and niAPG is able to solve more general nonconvex problem compared with VMEPIHT method. VMEPIHT method which designed by using $\|x\|_0$'s characteristics, has better numerical performance on CS and CT reconstruction problems.

Acknowledgements

The work were partially supported by NSFC(11901368).

References