

Linearly-Convergent FISTA Variant for Composite Optimization with Duality

Casey Garner* Shuzhong Zhang†

December 13, 2021

Abstract

Many large-scale optimization problems can be expressed as composite optimization models. Accelerated first-order methods such as the fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm (FISTA) have proven effective for numerous large composite models. In this paper, we present a new variation of FISTA, to be called C-FISTA, which obtains global linear convergence for a broader class of composite models than many of the latest FISTA variants. We demonstrate the versatility and effectiveness of C-FISTA by showing C-FISTA outperforms current first-order solvers on both group Lasso and group logistic regression models. Furthermore, we utilize Fenchel duality to prove C-FISTA provides global linear convergence for a large class of convex models without the loss of global linear convergence.

Keywords: composite optimization, accelerated first-order algorithm, Fenchel duality, group Lasso.

1 Introduction

The following composite optimization model,

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & H(B(x)) + R(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where \mathcal{X} is a closed, convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n , $H, R : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are convex functions and $B : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a smooth mapping, has received ample attention in the literature [4, 5, 12, 13, 26, 35]. A special

*School of Mathematics, University of Minnesota, garne214@umn.edu

†Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, zhangs@umn.edu

case of (1) of immense importance is the additive composite optimization model,

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & H(x) + R(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

which envelopes a plethora of models including: compressive sensing [8], Lasso [34], and group Lasso and group logistic regression models [28, 36] as well as several machine learning constructs such as support vector machines. Due to their dimensionality, many large-scale optimization models have rendered second-order methods computationally impractical; thus, efficient and accelerated first-order algorithms have become essential for tackling numerous problems. With the advent of Nesterov’s seminal work [25] much effort has been expended toward the development of accelerated first-order methods. For a comprehensive overview of this line of research see the monograph of d’Aspremont *et al.* and the references therein [1]. As an example, utilizing Nesterov acceleration, Beck and Teboulle developed the influential fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm (FISTA) [4] which obtained the optimal sublinear convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ for (2) with H and R convex and R possibly nonsmooth. In recent years, under the assumption H and potentially R are strongly convex, many accelerated versions of FISTA for (2) have been developed which obtain the optimal linear convergence rate proved by Nesterov [7, 8, 15, 16, 31].

Furthermore, recent work has been done to determine conditions which lighten the assumption of strong convexity while maintaining accelerated and at times linear convergence [3, 12, 24]. In [12] the authors demonstrate local linear convergence to a first-order stationary point for (1) without assuming any strong convexity on H . The authors extended the work in [40] by utilizing a specific error bound condition (Definition 3.1 in [12]) in tandem with an assumption on the quadratic growth of the objective function.

In this paper we develop an accelerated composite version of FISTA, C-FISTA, similar to the recent FISTA variants which extends to solving model (1) as well as model (2). Also, in line with the recent works [12, 13], we forgo any assumption guaranteeing strong convexity of the objective function in (1) and prove C-FISTA obtains global linear convergence under certain error bound conditions.

1.1 Main Contributions

This paper presents three main contributions. The first contribution of this paper is the development of an accelerated version of FISTA which obtains global linear convergence for (1) under specific error bound conditions. Our algorithm, C-FISTA, differs from the aforementioned FISTA variants because they were either exclusively designed for the additive composite model (2) or only obtained local instead of global linear convergence for the more generalized model (1). We demonstrate that C-FISTA is a generalization of the FISTA variant GFISTA [7, 8] when $B(x) = x$ proving

C-FISTA is an extension of recent algorithmic developments. Further, we present an alternative convergence analysis than those presented for the other accelerated FISTA variants and exclude any reference to the strong convexity parameter of R as done in [7, 15, 16].

The second contribution of this paper is our utilization of Fenchel duality to develop dual models which can be solved via C-FISTA, and our leveraging of Fenchel duality theory [19, 32, 33] to enable efficient computation of the subproblems of C-FISTA. Additionally, we outline a dual algorithmic approach for a general convex model, which can be solved by C-FISTA which generalizes the approaches of Han and Lou [19] and Auslender [2] among others [17, 18]. Sections 4 and 5 provide the relevant background on Fenchel duality and provide an example on how we utilize the theory in the implementation of C-FISTA.

The third contribution of this paper is the presentation of globally linearly convergent algorithms for solving various Lasso and logistic regression models with C-FISTA. In our numerical experiments we demonstrate C-FISTA outperforms the state-of-the-art SLEP software package [22] for solving group, sparse-group and overlapping sparse-group Lasso models and sparse-group logistic regression models. We also compare C-FISTA with ADMM on the Lasso models, which has proven linear convergence for various Lasso formulations [20], and demonstrate superior convergence after tuning ADMM in our numerical experiments.

1.2 Organization of the Paper

In Section 2 we present C-FISTA and prove the global linear convergence of the algorithm under certain error bound conditions. Section 3 motivates C-FISTA by describing the Lasso and logistic regression models which are solvable with C-FISTA in the special case $B(x) = x$ in (1). In Section 4 we present the necessary background on Fenchel duality and make connections to our accelerated FISTA algorithm, and Section 5 provides an example of how Fenchel duality informs our application of C-FISTA to solve the crucial proximal mapping step. Section 6 contains the algorithms for solving the Lasso and sparse-group logistic regression models with C-FISTA, and our numerical experiments comparing C-FISTA to other efficient first-order algorithms. The paper concludes in Section 7 with some final remarks and potential avenues of future investigation.

2 A Generalized Composite Optimization Algorithm

In this paper, our primary focus revolves around the composite optimization model,

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & H(B(x)) + R(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{X} is a closed, convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n , $H : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is strongly convex with parameter $\mu > 0$ and has Lipschitz gradient with parameter $L > 0$, $R : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex but potentially non-smooth, and $B : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is of the form $B(x) = (B_1(x), \dots, B_m(x))^\top$ with Jacobian, $J_B(x)$, at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For convenience in our analysis we denote $F(x) := H(B(x)) + R(x)$. A key assumption for feasible implementation is that the following proximal mapping with respect to R is efficiently computable:

$$\text{Prox}_{tR}(u) := \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{2} \|x - u\|^2 + tR(x),$$

where $t > 0$. We now state our main assumptions and error bound conditions for our analysis:

(A1) $B_i \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is convex, Lipschitz continuous with parameter $\bar{L}_i \geq 0$, and has Lipschitz gradient constant $L_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$.

(A2) There exists $\tau > 0$ such that $\tau \|x - y\|^2 \leq \|B(x) - B(y)\|^2$ for all $x, y \in \text{span}(\mathcal{X})$.

(A3) There exists $\xi \geq 0$ such that $\forall x', x'' \in \text{span}(\mathcal{X})$ with $\bar{y} = B(x')$,

$$\left| \nabla_{\bar{y}} H(\bar{y})^\top (J_B(x'') - J_B(x')) (x'' - x') \right| \leq \xi \|x'' - x'\|^2.$$

We note that under assumptions (A1) - (A3) it is possible $H(B(x))$ is not strongly convex in x . Letting $\bar{x} := B(x)$, we do see, however, that the descent inequality and the strongly convex inequality still hold for H with respect to \bar{x} and \bar{y} , i.e. for all $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\bar{y}) &\leq H(\bar{x}) + \nabla_{\bar{x}} H(\bar{x})^\top (\bar{y} - \bar{x}) + \frac{L}{2} \|\bar{y} - \bar{x}\|^2, \\ H(\bar{y}) &\geq H(\bar{x}) + \nabla_{\bar{x}} H(\bar{x})^\top (\bar{y} - \bar{x}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\bar{y} - \bar{x}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla_{\bar{x}} H(\bar{x}) := \nabla H(y)|_{y=B(x)}$ and $\nabla_x H(\bar{x}) = \nabla_x H(B(x)) = J_B(x)^\top \nabla_{\bar{x}} H(\bar{x})$.

Remark 2.1. From assumption (A1) we obtain a few important inequalities. First, utilizing the fact each B_i is Lipschitz continuous, it follows from the limit definition of the directional derivative that $\|\nabla B_i(x)\|^2 \leq \bar{L}_i^2$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Therefore, letting $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be fixed we see that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|J_B(x)\| &= \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \|J_B(x)v\| \mid \|v\| = 1 \right\} \\ &= \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m (\nabla B_i(x)^\top v)^2} \mid \|v\| = 1 \right\} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\bar{L}_1^2 + \dots + \bar{L}_m^2}. \end{aligned}$$

So, defining $r := \bar{L}_1^2 + \dots + \bar{L}_m^2$ we have,

$$\|J_B(x)\|^2 \leq r, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (3)$$

Remark 2.2. As a result of (3) we obtain a second important inequality for our analysis. Letting $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, by the differentiability of B ,

$$B(y) - B(x) = \int_0^1 J_B(x + t(y-x))(y-x) dt,$$

which by the triangle inequality and (3) implies,

$$\|B(y) - B(x)\| \leq \int_0^1 \|J_B(x + t(y-x))\| \cdot \|y-x\| dt \leq \sqrt{r}\|y-x\|,$$

and so,

$$\|\bar{y} - \bar{x}\|^2 = \|B(y) - B(x)\|^2 \leq r\|y-x\|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (4)$$

In order to maintain the well-posedness of (1) it behooves us to maintain the convexity of $H(B(x))$. This along with assumption (A3) leads us to make a distinction between two separate cases.

Case 1. $B(x)$ is affine linear, i.e. $B(x) = Ax + b$ for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

In this case, the convexity of $H(B(x))$ follows readily without the need for any additional assumptions on H . Furthermore, (A1) and (A3) are satisfied trivially with $\xi = 0$ since $J_B(x) = A$ for all x , and (A2) will hold provided $\text{null}(A) \cap \text{span}(\mathcal{X}) = \{0\}$. In this case, r in (4) is the largest eigenvalue of $A^\top A$.

Case 2. $B(x)$ is not affine linear.

To maintain the convexity of the objective in (1) in this situation, we make the added assumption H is component-wise non-decreasing so that $H \circ B$ is convex.

We now present our accelerated composite FISTA algorithm, C-FISTA, for solving (1).

Algorithm 1: C-FISTA

Step 0 Choose any $(x^0, z^0) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$. Let $k := 0$.

Step 1 Let

$$y^k := \frac{1}{1+\theta} x^k + \frac{\theta}{1+\theta} z^k, \quad (5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k+1} &:= \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} H(\bar{y}^k) + \nabla_y H(\bar{y}^k)^\top (x - y^k) + \frac{rL}{2} \|x - y^k\|^2 + R(x) \\ &= \text{Prox}_{R/(rL)} \left(y^k - \frac{1}{rL} \nabla_y H(\bar{y}^k) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

and

$$z^{k+1} := (1-\theta)z^k + \theta y^k + \alpha(x^{k+1} - y^k). \quad (7)$$

Step 2 Let $k := k + 1$ and return to **Step 1** until convergence.

Theorem 1. *Assuming assumptions (A1) - (A3) hold with $\tau\mu - \xi > 0$ and $H \circ B$ convex, then C-FISTA has an accelerated global linear rate of convergence for (1); that is, for each iteration, we have,*

$$F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^*) + \left(\frac{\tau\mu - \xi}{2}\right) \|z^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{(\tau\mu - \xi)(rL - \xi)}}{rL}\right) \left(F(x^k) - F(x^*) + \left(\frac{\tau\mu - \xi}{2}\right) \|z^k - x^*\|^2\right).$$

In particular, if we perform C-FISTA for k iterations, then it holds that,

$$F(x^k) - F(x^*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{(\tau\mu - \xi)(rL - \xi)}}{rL}\right)^k \left(F(x^0) - F(x^*) + \left(\frac{\tau\mu - \xi}{2}\right) \|z^0 - x^*\|^2\right).$$

Proof. By the Lipschitz inequality for H ,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\bar{x}^{k+1}) &\leq H(\bar{y}^k) + \nabla_{\bar{y}} H(\bar{y}^k)^\top (\bar{x}^{k+1} - \bar{y}^k) + \frac{L}{2} \|\bar{x}^{k+1} - \bar{y}^k\|^2, \\ &\leq H(\bar{y}^k) + \nabla_{\bar{y}} H(\bar{y}^k)^\top (B(x^{k+1}) - B(y^k)) + \frac{rL}{2} \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2, \\ &= H(\bar{y}^k) + \nabla_{\bar{y}} H(\bar{y}^k)^\top \int_0^1 J_B(y^k + t(x^{k+1} - y^k)) (x^{k+1} - y^k) dt + \frac{rL}{2} \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2, \\ &= H(\bar{y}^k) + \nabla_{\bar{y}} H(\bar{y}^k)^\top \int_0^1 [J_B(y^k + t(x^{k+1} - y^k)) - J_B(y^k)] (x^{k+1} - y^k) dt \\ &\quad + \nabla_{\bar{y}} H(\bar{y}^k)^\top J_B(y^k) (x^{k+1} - y^k) + \frac{rL}{2} \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows from (4) and the last lines are a result of the Newton-Leibniz formula. Applying assumption (A3) we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\bar{x}^{k+1}) &\leq H(\bar{y}^k) + \int_0^1 \xi t \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 dt + \nabla_y H(\bar{y}^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - y^k) + \frac{rL}{2} \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2, \\ &= H(\bar{y}^k) + \nabla_y H(\bar{y}^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - y^k) + \frac{rL + \xi}{2} \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Utilizing the strong convexity of H , for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\bar{x}^{k+1}) &\leq H(\bar{x}) - \nabla_{\bar{y}} H(\bar{y}^k)^\top (\bar{x} - \bar{y}^k) - \frac{\mu}{2} \|\bar{x} - \bar{y}^k\|^2 + \nabla_y H(\bar{y}^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - y^k) + \frac{rL + \xi}{2} \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2, \\ &\leq H(\bar{x}) - \nabla_{\bar{y}} H(\bar{y}^k)^\top (\bar{x} - \bar{y}^k) + \nabla_y H(\bar{y}^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - y^k) + \frac{rL + \xi}{2} \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 - \frac{\tau\mu}{2} \|x - y^k\|^2, \\ &\leq H(\bar{x}) + \frac{\xi}{2} \|x - y^k\|^2 - \nabla_y H(\bar{y}^k)^\top (x - y^k) + \nabla_y H(\bar{y}^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - y^k) \\ &\quad + \frac{rL + \xi}{2} \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 - \frac{\tau\mu}{2} \|x - y^k\|^2 \\ &= H(\bar{x}) + \nabla_y H(\bar{y}^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - x) + \frac{rL + \xi}{2} \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 - \frac{\tau\mu - \xi}{2} \|x - y^k\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the second inequality follows from (A2) and the last results from (A3) as before. By the first order optimality conditions of (6) we have,

$$\left(\nabla_y H(\bar{y}^k) + rL(x^{k+1} - y^k) + R'(x^{k+1}) \right)^\top (x - x^{k+1}) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{X},$$

where $R'(x^{k+1})$ is an element of the subgradient of R at x^{k+1} . The optimality conditions above along with the convexity of R and (8) give us,

$$\begin{aligned} F(x^{k+1}) &\leq F(x) + rL(x^{k+1} - y^k)^\top (x - x^{k+1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{rL + \xi}{2} \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 - \frac{\tau\mu - \xi}{2} \|x - y^k\|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Let $\theta \in (0, 1)$, whose exact value is to be determined later. Take $x = x^k$ in (9) and multiply by $1 - \theta$ on both sides of the expression. Then, let $x = x^*$ in (9) and multiply by θ on both sides. Finally, adding up these two resultant inequalities and applying the assumption $\tau\mu - \xi > 0$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^*) &\leq (1 - \theta) \left(F(x^k) - F(x^*) \right) - \theta \left(\frac{\tau\mu - \xi}{2} \right) \|x^* - y^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + rL(x^{k+1} - y^k)^\top \left[(1 - \theta)x^k + \theta x^* - x^{k+1} \right] + \left(\frac{rL + \xi}{2} \right) \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Recall from (7) that,

$$z^{k+1} = (1 - \theta)z^k + \theta y^k + \alpha(x^{k+1} - y^k),$$

where the value of the parameter α will be determined later. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|z^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 &\leq (1 - \theta)\|z^k - x^*\|^2 + \theta\|y^k - x^*\|^2 + \alpha^2\|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\alpha(x^{k+1} - y^k)^\top ((1 - \theta)z^k + \theta y^k - x^*). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Take $C > 0$, whose value will be determined in a moment. Multiplying by C on both sides of (11), and adding the resulting inequality to (10) we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} &F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^*) + C\|z^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 - \theta) \left(F(x^k) - F(x^*) + C\|z^k - x^*\|^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\theta C - \frac{(\tau\mu - \xi)\theta}{2} \right) \|x^* - y^k\|^2 + \left(\frac{rL + \xi}{2} + \alpha^2 C \right) \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + rL(x^{k+1} - y^k)^\top \left[(1 - \theta)x^k + \theta x^* - x^{k+1} + \frac{2\alpha C}{rL} \left((1 - \theta)z^k + \theta y^k - x^* \right) \right], \\ &= (1 - \theta) \left(F(x^k) - F(x^*) + C\|z^k - x^*\|^2 \right) + rL\|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + rL(x^{k+1} - y^k)^\top \left[(1 - \theta)x^k - x^{k+1} + \theta \left((1 - \theta)z^k + \theta y^k \right) \right], \\ &= (1 - \theta) \left(F(x^k) - F(x^*) + C\|z^k - x^*\|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

if we choose the parameters to take the values

$$C := \frac{\tau\mu - \xi}{2}, \quad \alpha := \sqrt{\frac{rL - \xi}{\tau\mu - \xi}}, \quad \theta := \frac{\sqrt{(\tau\mu - \xi)(rL - \xi)}}{rL}.$$

Observe $\theta \in (0, 1)$. Since $\tau \leq r$, $\mu \leq L$ and $\tau\mu - \xi > 0$, it follows $0 < \tau\mu - \xi \leq rL - \xi < rL$. Note in the last step above, we used (5),

$$y^k = \frac{1}{1 + \theta} x^k + \frac{\theta}{1 + \theta} z^k.$$

Therefore, $(1 - \theta)x^k + \theta((1 - \theta)z^k + \theta y^k) = y^k$, and so

$$rL(x^{k+1} - y^k)^\top \left[(1 - \theta)x^k - x^{k+1} + \theta((1 - \theta)z^k + \theta y^k) \right] = -rL\|x^{k+1} - y^k\|^2.$$

Hence, we have for all $k \geq 0$,

$$F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^*) + \left(\frac{\tau\mu - \xi}{2} \right) \|z^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{(\tau\mu - \xi)(rL - \xi)}}{rL} \right) \left(F(x^k) - F(x^*) + \left(\frac{\tau\mu - \xi}{2} \right) \|z^k - x^*\|^2 \right),$$

and so by induction starting from the k -th iteration we obtain the result. \square

Remark 2.3. If we have $B(x) = x$, then assumptions (A1) - (A3) hold trivially. Also, we have $\xi = 0$, $r = 1$ and $\tau = 1$ ensuring $\tau\mu - \xi > 0$ which gives us the convergence result,

$$F(x^k) - F(x^*) \leq \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{L}} \right)^k \left(F(x^0) - F(x^*) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|z^0 - x^*\|^2 \right).$$

If $z^0 = x^0$, then this is the same convergence result produced by GFISTA [7, 8] which is an accelerated variant of FISTA for (2). Therefore, C-FISTA generalizes GFISTA into the broader problem class given by the composite optimization model (1).

Remark 2.4. The condition $\tau\mu - \xi > 0$ essentially requires that the product of the first-order derivatives of H and the second-order derivative of B should not exceed the product of their curvatures. In some cases, this condition is easy to satisfy by variable-transformation, or scaling. For example, when $B(x)$ is homogeneous of degree $d_1 > 0$, i.e. $B(\lambda x) = \lambda^{d_1} B(x)$ for any x and $\lambda > 0$, and $R(x)$ is homogeneous with degree $d_2 > 0$, i.e. $R(\lambda x) = \lambda^{d_2} R(x)$. Then for any $\lambda > 0$ one can scale the variable as $x' := \lambda^{\frac{1}{d_1}} x$, and the problem is turned equivalently into minimizing $H(B(x')) + R(x') = H(\lambda B(x)) + \lambda^{\frac{d_2}{d_1}} R(x)$. After the above change of variables, the new objective has the modified parameters $\tau := \lambda^2 \tau$, $\mu := \mu$, and $\xi := \lambda \xi$. Therefore, in this situation by appropriately choosing $\lambda > 0$ one can always satisfy the condition $\tau\mu - \xi > 0$.

3 Motivation: Lasso & Logistic Regression Models

A class of motivating composite optimization models for which C-FISTA is applicable, in the special case $B(x) = x$, are the various Lasso formulations. The standard Lasso model originating from Tibshirani [34],

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \gamma \|x\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned}$$

is solvable via C-FISTA whenever A is of full-column rank. The results from Section 2 further guarantee global linear convergence to the optimal solution even when there exists a constraint on x . For example, the following constrained Lasso model is solvable with Algorithm 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \gamma \|x\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & l_i \leq x_i \leq u_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

The utility of the Lasso model is detailed extensively in the literature; see [21, 28, 36, 37, 38]. The success of the basic model spawned the development of several Lasso variants including: the group Lasso (GL) model [28, 37],

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \gamma \sum_{j \in \mathcal{G}} \|x(j)\| \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \end{aligned}$$

where $x(j)$ is a subvector of x corresponding to the indices in $j \in \mathcal{G}$ where \mathcal{G} disjointly partitions $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, the sparse-group Lasso (SGL) model [30, 38],

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|^2 + \gamma_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{G}} \|x(j)\| + \gamma_2 \|x\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned}$$

and the overlapping group and overlapping sparse-group Lasso (OSGL) models [21, 36, 38] which are of identical form to the group Lasso and sparse-group Lasso models respectively expect \mathcal{G} no longer is a disjoint partition of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. As we will see in Section 5, the subproblems required in C-FISTA for the Lasso models are solvable in closed form or by an efficient subroutine in the case of the overlapping group/sparse-group Lasso models with global linear convergence achieved in each variant.

Another model where C-FISTA provides global linear convergence is the sparse-group logistic regression (SGLR) model [22, 23],

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \ln(1 + \exp(-y_i (a_i^\top x + b))) + \gamma_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{G}} \|x(j)\| + \gamma_2 \|x\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, b \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

where $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector containing only entries of ± 1 . The sparse-group logistic regression model has applications in various machine learning models especially in the area of classification, and the

subproblems for the logistic regression model are in the same format as the sparse-group Lasso model detailed extensively in Section 5. Before discussing how to compute subproblems for the Lasso models, we first discuss Fenchel duality in Section 4 and describe how C-FISTA can be utilized via a dual approach to solve a general constrained composite model.

4 A Dual Formulation and Algorithmic Approach

In this section, we outline the construction of a dual algorithm using Fenchel duality which generates an approximate primal solution from the dual solution at every iterate. To elucidate this approach we first provide a brief overview of standard convex analysis results regarding conjugate functions and Fenchel duality [32, 33]. Unless otherwise stated, we use the standard notation of Rockafellar [32]. For generality, we will consider the following constrained composite model:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & h_0(x) + h_1(x) + \cdots + h_\ell(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathcal{C}_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, r, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where the h_i 's are proper convex functions on \mathbb{R}^n and the \mathcal{C}_j 's are closed convex subsets of \mathbb{R}^n . To begin, let us introduce some basic notions in convex analysis.

Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed convex set. The *support function* of S is defined as,

$$f_S(y) := \max_{x \in S} y^\top x,$$

and the *polar set* of S is,

$$S^\circ := \{y \mid y^\top x \leq 1, \forall x \in S\}.$$

Thus, we can succinctly write, $S^\circ = \{y \mid f_S(y) \leq 1\}$. Let g be a convex function whose domain is contained in S . The *conjugate of g* is defined as,

$$g^*(y) := \sup_{x \in S} [y^\top x - g(x)],$$

where the function is assumed to take value $+\infty$ anywhere outside its domain. In deriving the Fenchel dual of (12) we need some standard results from convex analysis.

Lemma 2. *Suppose f is a proper convex function, then*

$$-f^*(0) = \inf_x f(x). \tag{13}$$

Lemma 3. *(Theorem 16.4 [32]) Suppose g_1, \dots, g_r are proper convex functions on \mathbb{R}^n and the intersection of the relative interiors of the domains of the g_i 's are non-empty, then*

$$(g_1 + \cdots + g_r)^*(x) = \inf_{y_1 + \cdots + y_r = x} \sum_{j=1}^r g_j^*(y_j). \tag{14}$$

Lemma 4. For a convex set S , suppose its indicator function is defined as,

$$I_S(x) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \in S; \\ +\infty, & \text{if } x \notin S. \end{cases}$$

Then, the conjugate of the indicator function is simply the support function of S ; that is,

$$I_S^* = f_S.$$

The proofs of Lemmas 2 and 4 follow directly from the definitions of conjugate and support functions. Thus, rewriting (12) in the equivalent form,

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & h_0(x) + h_1(x) + \cdots + h_\ell(x) + I_{\mathcal{C}_1}(x) + \cdots + I_{\mathcal{C}_r}(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned}$$

and utilizing Lemmas 2, 3, and 4, the Fenchel dual of (12) is:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & h_0^*(-y_1 - \cdots - y_\ell - y_{\ell+1} - \cdots - y_{\ell+r}) \\ & + h_1^*(y_1) + \cdots + h_\ell^*(y_\ell) + f_{\mathcal{C}_1}(y_{\ell+1}) + \cdots + f_{\mathcal{C}_r}(y_{\ell+r}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y_j \in \mathbb{R}^n, j = 1, 2, \dots, \ell + r. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Note, for the sake of presentation we have written the dual problem (15) in such a manner that the optimal solutions of (12) and (15) differ by a negative sign. To better understand the link between the primal and dual models, we demonstrate how the optimality conditions of (12) and (15) are linked. Assuming the conjugate functions of the h_i 's ($i = 0, 1, \dots, \ell$) are differentiable and denoting y_j^* for $j = 1, \dots, \ell + r$ to be optimal for (15), we have the first-order optimality conditions,

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla h_0^*(-\sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} y_j^*) + \nabla h_i^*(y_i^*) = 0, & i = 1, \dots, \ell \\ \nabla h_0^*(-\sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} y_j^*) \in \partial f_{\mathcal{C}_j}(y_{\ell+j}^*), & j = 1, \dots, r. \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

Denoting $x^* := \nabla h_0^*(-\sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} y_j^*)$, the optimality conditions imply $x^* = \nabla h_i^*(y_i^*)$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, and so by Lemma 5 of [39], $\nabla h_i(x^*) = y_i^*$, for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. Similarly, because $f_{\mathcal{C}_j}^* = I_{\mathcal{C}_j}$, if $x^* \in \partial f_{\mathcal{C}_j}(y_{\ell+j}^*)$, then $y_{\ell+j}^* \in \partial I_{\mathcal{C}_j}(x^*)$, which means that $y_{\ell+j}^*$ is a normal direction at x^* :

$$(y_{\ell+j}^*)^\top (x - x^*) \leq 0, \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{C}_j.$$

Furthermore, by (16)

$$\nabla h_0(x^*) = -\sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} y_j^* = -\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \nabla h_i(x^*) - \sum_{j=1}^r y_{\ell+j}^*. \tag{17}$$

Thus, the first-order optimality conditions for the dual problem implies (17), which is the optimality condition for the primal problem (12). To see this, note that

$$\nabla h_0(x^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \nabla h_i(x^*) = - \sum_{j=1}^r y_{\ell+j}^*,$$

and so,

$$\left(\nabla h_0(x^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \nabla h_i(x^*) \right)^\top (x - x^*) = - \sum_{j=1}^r (y_{\ell+j}^*)^\top (x - x^*) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \cap_{j=1}^r \mathcal{C}_j.$$

We now present an important relationship between the primal solution induced by the dual iterations which outlines a dual approach to solving (12).

Proposition 5. *Suppose that h_0 is a strongly convex function with strong convexity parameter μ and gradient Lipschitz constant L . Let $\{y^k\}$ be a sequence converging to the dual solution y^* . For each y^k in the dual sequence, we recover a primal solution $x^k := \nabla h_0^*(-\sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} y_j^k)$ such that,*

$$\frac{1}{L} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} (y_j^k - y_j^*) \right\| \leq \|x^k - x^*\| \leq \frac{1}{\mu} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} (y_j^k - y_j^*) \right\|.$$

Proof. By the Fenchel duality relation, we know that h_0^* is also a strongly convex function with strong convexity parameter $1/L$ and gradient Lipschitz constant $1/\mu$ (Theorem 1 [39]). Further, by the definition of x^k and previously stated results, $\nabla h_0(x^k) = -\sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} y_j^k$. Therefore, $\nabla h_0(x^k) - \nabla h_0(x^*) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} (y_j^* - y_j^k)$, and so the gradient Lipschitz condition on h yields,

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} (y_j^k - y_j^*) \right\| = \|\nabla h_0(x^k) - \nabla h_0(x^*)\| \leq L \|x^k - x^*\|.$$

On the other hand, the gradient Lipschitz condition on h^* states,

$$\|x^k - x^*\| = \left\| \nabla h_0^* \left(-\sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} y_j^k \right) - \nabla h_0^* \left(-\sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} y_j^* \right) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\mu} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\ell+r} (y_j^k - y_j^*) \right\|.$$

□

Therefore, the above result gives us the framework to develop a general dual approach to solving (12). Applying any algorithm to solve the dual problem (15) we can recover a primal solution at each iteration; furthermore, the rate of convergence on the primal side for any algorithm will only differ by a fixed constant, $1/\mu$, in-comparison to the rate of convergence on the dual side.

The presented dual formulation is not novel; Han and Lou [19] and Fukushima *et al.* [17] have very similar derivations of the dual and many algorithms such as Dykstra's projection algorithm [18] utilize Fenchel duality. The clarity provided by the previous result is that, under the assumption h_0 is strongly convex with gradient Lipschitz, any algorithm which generates a converging dual solution will generate a primal solution with the same rate of convergence up to a constant factor. Connecting this result back to C-FISTA in the special case $B(x) = x$, we can solve the dual problem (15) and obtain a primal solution from Proposition 5. Therefore, any primal problem (12) can be solved with C-FISTA assuming the required proximal mappings are computable and the necessary assumptions for Theorem 1 are maintained.

Besides using Fenchel duality in a direct fashion as detailed in this section, one can also utilize Fenchel duality theory to solve intermediate subproblems for the primal. In the next section we describe this process using the sparse-group Lasso model as an example.

5 Solving Subproblems with Fenchel Duality

One example of how duality can be leveraged to apply C-FISTA can be seen in how we solve the subproblems for the group and sparse-group Lasso models. In the sparse-group Lasso model, the main subproblem which needs to be solved to apply C-FISTA is of the form,

$$(S) \quad \min \quad \frac{1}{2} \|x - d\|^2 + \gamma_1 \|x\| + \gamma_2 \|x\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

with $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \geq 0$. Utilizing Lemmas 2 and 3 and standard conjugate functions [33], we see the Fenchel dual of (S) is,

$$(DS) \quad \min \quad \frac{1}{2} \|d + y_1 + y_2\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \|y_1\| \leq \gamma_1, \\ \|y_2\|_\infty \leq \gamma_2.$$

When y_2 is fixed, consider the simple projection problem $\min_{\|y_1\| \leq \gamma_1} \|d + y_2 + y_1\|$, whose solution is explicit:

$$y_1^* = \begin{cases} -d - y_2, & \text{if } \|d + y_2\| \leq \gamma_1; \\ -\gamma_1(d + y_2)/\|d + y_2\|, & \text{if } \|d + y_2\| > \gamma_1. \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$\|d + y_2 + y_1^*\| = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \|d + y_2\| \leq \gamma_1; \\ \|d + y_2\| - \gamma_1, & \text{if } \|d + y_2\| > \gamma_1. \end{cases}$$

Thus, the dual problem (DS) is equivalent to $\min_{\|y_2\|_\infty \leq \gamma_2} (\|d + y_2\| - \gamma_1)_+$, which can be solved through the associated model,

$$(DS)' \quad \min \quad \frac{1}{2} \|d + y_2\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \|y_2\|_\infty \leq \gamma_2.$$

Since the individual components of y_2 are decoupled in $(DS)'$, the above problem can be reduced to solving n 1-dimensional problems,

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & (d_i + t)^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & |t| \leq \gamma_2, \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Observe that the solutions for the above 1-dimensional models can be found using the following thresholding operator:

$$\text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(t) := \begin{cases} -\gamma_2, & \text{if } t < -\gamma_2; \\ t, & \text{if } -\gamma_2 \leq t \leq \gamma_2; \\ \gamma_2, & \text{if } t > \gamma_2. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, a solution for (DS) is $y_2^* = \text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(-d)$, where $(\text{Th}_{\gamma_2})_i = \text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(-d_i)$ for all i , and,

$$y_1^* = \begin{cases} -d - \text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(-d), & \text{if } \|d + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(-d)\| \leq \gamma_1; \\ -\gamma_1(d + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(-d))/\|d + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(-d)\|, & \text{if } \|d + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(-d)\| > \gamma_1. \end{cases}$$

After solving (DS) with the optimal solution (y_1^*, y_2^*) , one recovers the optimal solution to (S) as $x^* = d + y_1^* + y_2^*$ using the results from Section 4. In particular,

$$x^* = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \|d + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(-d)\| \leq \gamma_1; \\ (\|d + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(-d)\| - \gamma_1)/\|d + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(-d)\| (d + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(-d)), & \text{if } \|d + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2}(-d)\| > \gamma_1. \end{cases}$$

Hence, by Fenchel duality we obtain a closed form solution to (S) yielding an exact solution to the required subproblems to apply C-FISTA to the sparse-group Lasso model. Similar approaches can be taken to solve other potential subproblems which arise when applying C-FISTA. In the next section, we present the algorithms and numerical experiments for solving the models discussed in Section 3.

6 Numerical Experiments

To demonstrate the practicality and efficiency of C-FISTA, we conducted numerous experimental tests on group Lasso, sparse-group Lasso, overlapping sparse-group Lasso and sparse-group logistic regression models. Subsection 6.1 details how to apply C-FISTA to solve the Lasso models; Subsection 6.2 presents the solution procedure for the sparse-group logistic regression model, and Subsection 6.3 displays the results of the numerical experiments comparing C-FISTA, the state-of-the-art software package SLEP [22], and ADMM on the Lasso and logistic regression models.

6.1 Lasso Models

In this section we state how to apply C-FISTA to solve the various Lasso models described in Section 3 beginning with the group Lasso model.

6.1.1 C-FISTA for Group Lasso

Applying C-FISTA to solve any model hinges on computing the proximal mapping in (6). This key subproblem in the group Lasso model is of the form,

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{2}\|x - d\|^2 + \gamma\|x\| \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

which by the first-order optimality conditions has the simple closed-form solution,

$$x^* = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \|d\| \leq \gamma; \\ \left(\frac{\|d\| - \gamma}{\|d\|} \right) d, & \text{if } \|d\| > \gamma. \end{cases}$$

With the solution to the group Lasso subproblems (18), we write down how to solve the group Lasso model with C-FISTA in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: C-FISTA for (GL)

Step 0. Choose any $(x^0, z^0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $k := 0$.

Step 1. Let,

$$y^k := \frac{1}{1 + \theta} x^k + \frac{\theta}{1 + \theta} z^k.$$

Step 2. For $j = 1, \dots, J$:

$$x(j)^{k+1} := \begin{cases} 0, & \|d(j)\| \leq \gamma/L; \\ \left(\frac{\|d(j)\| - \gamma/L}{\|d(j)\|} \right) d(j), & \|d(j)\| > \gamma/L; \end{cases}$$

with $d := y^k - \frac{1}{L} A^\top (A y^k - b)$ and corresponding subvectors $d(j)$.

Step 3.

$$z^{k+1} := (1 - \theta) z^k + \theta y^k + \alpha (x^{k+1} - y^k).$$

Step 4. Let $k := k + 1$; return to Step 1 until convergence.

Practical application of Algorithm 2 requires the user to determine bounds for the Lipschitz constant and strong convexity constants, L and μ , for $H(x)$. For the group Lasso models $H(x) := \frac{1}{2}\|Ax - b\|^2$

making such bounds readily available. By the definition of strong convexity we see $\mu = \lambda_{\min}(A^\top A)$. Similarly, using the definition of the Lipschitz constant, we see that $L \leq \lambda_{\max}(A^\top A)$ where $\lambda_{\min}(A^\top A)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A^\top A)$ are the smallest and largest eigenvalues of $A^\top A$ respectively. For other strongly convex functions $H(x)$ on which C-FISTA is applicable, tight bounds for L and μ might be unavailable. In these situations conservative estimates for these bounds or a backtracking scheme such as in [4] to estimate these parameters would be required. In this paper we do not focus on subroutines to estimate these bounds in our algorithms; however, the backtracking strategies applied in [4, 7, 15] could similarly be implemented in many instances of C-FISTA.

6.1.2 C-FISTA for Sparse-Group Lasso

The key subproblem in applying C-FISTA to solve the sparse-group Lasso model was determined in Section 5; thus, we can write Algorithm 3 to solve the sparse-group Lasso model with C-FISTA.

Algorithm 3: C-FISTA for (SGL)

Step 0. Choose any $(x^0, z^0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $k := 0$.

Step 1. Let

$$y^k := \frac{1}{1+\theta}x^k + \frac{\theta}{1+\theta}z^k.$$

Step 2. For $j = 1, \dots, J$:

$$x^{(j)k+1} := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \|d(j) + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2/L}(-d(j))\| \leq \gamma_1/L; \\ \left(\frac{\|d(j) + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2/L}(-d(j))\| - \gamma_1/L}{\|d(j) + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2/L}(-d(j))\|} \right) (d(j) + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2/L}(-d(j))), & \text{if } \|d(j) + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2/L}(-d(j))\| > \gamma_1/L; \end{cases}$$

with $d := y^k - \frac{1}{L}\nabla H(y^k) = y^k - \frac{1}{L}A^\top(Ay^k - b)$ and $d(j)$ the corresponding subvectors.

Step 3.

$$z^{k+1} := (1 - \theta)z^k + \theta y^k + \alpha (x^{k+1} - y^k).$$

Step 4. Let $k := k + 1$; return to Step 1 until convergence.

Since $H(x)$ is identical in all of the Lasso models, the same bounds for the Lipschitz and strong convexity constants in Algorithm 2 apply for each of the Lasso models. Comparing Algorithms 2 and 3 we note only Step 2 has been updated because the y and z -updates are independent of the objective function. The alteration in Step 2 is solely due to the difference in the regularization term in the group and sparse-group Lasso models which alters the proximal mapping (6). Changes in the smooth part of the objective function, H , appear as changes in $d := y^k - \frac{1}{L}\nabla H(y^k)$, recall from Remark 2.3 that $r = 1$ in the special case $B(x) = x$; therefore, altering H presents few challenges to implementing C-FISTA; the key computational hurdle lies in computing efficient proximal mappings which depend on R .

6.1.3 C-FISTA for Overlapping Sparse-Group Lasso

The key difference between the overlapping sparse-group Lasso model and those previously discussed is the removal of the prohibition that the groups of variables cannot intersect. Allowing overlapping groups of variables removes the ability to decouple the minimization in (6) into subproblems over the individual subvectors. In the sparse-group Lasso model, since the groups of variables do not overlap, we were able to show in Section 5 there was a closed form solution to the proximal mappings; however, with overlapping groups the key subproblem for implementing C-FISTA,

$$\min \frac{1}{2} \|x - d\|^2 + \frac{\gamma_1}{L} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{G}} \|x(j)\| + \frac{\gamma_2}{L} \|x\|_1, \quad (19)$$

is no longer decomposable and a simple closed form solution is unobtainable; therefore, we must solve this subproblem numerically at each iteration in-order to apply C-FISTA to the overlapping sparse-group Lasso model. In [36] the authors apply a variation of FISTA to solve the (OSGL) model. Our approach is distinct from their approach because we accelerate FISTA through the use of two sequences, $\{y^k\}$ and $\{z^k\}$, while they use a single sequence performing a Nesterov-like acceleration. In order to apply their algorithm, the authors of [36] developed an efficient subroutine, *overlapping.c*, to numerically solve (19). Their subroutine is provided in the SLEP software package [22]. In our solving of the (OSGL) model with C-FISTA, we apply Algorithm 3 exactly in the same fashion as for the sparse-group Lasso model except when computing x^{k+1} in Step 2 we solve (19) with *overlapping.c* from the SLEP software package.

6.2 C-FISTA for Sparse-Group Logistic Regression

In this section we describe how to apply C-FISTA to solve the sparse-group logistic regression model,

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \ln(1 + \exp(-y_i (a_i^\top x + b))) + \gamma_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{G}} \|x(j)\| + \gamma_2 \|x\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, b \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

The sparse-group Lasso and sparse-group logistic regression models only differ with respect to their strongly convex term, so the procedure for solving the sparse-group logistic regression model with C-FISTA is very similar to Algorithm 3. Only two alterations to Algorithm 3 are required to solve the sparse-group logistic regression model. One, we must update d in Algorithm 3 to be,

$$d = y^k - \frac{1}{L} \nabla H(y^k) = y^k + \frac{1}{mL} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{y_i \exp(-y_i (a_i^\top y^k + b))}{1 + \exp(-y_i (a_i^\top y^k + b))} \begin{pmatrix} a_i \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (20)$$

and second we require new estimates for the bounds of the Lipschitz and strong convexity constants L and μ . Updating d is straightforward, but obtaining tight upper and lower bounds on

the Lipschitz and strong convexity constants can become a challenging task as mentioned previously. Algorithm 4 presents C-FISTA for solving the sparse-group logistic regression model. In our implementation of Algorithm 4, we fixed the Lipschitz and strong convexity parameters though backtracking procedures could be utilized.

Algorithm 4: C-FISTA for (SGLR)

Step 0. Choose any $(x^0, b^0, z^0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Let $k := 0$.

Step 1. Let

$$y^k := \frac{1}{1 + \theta} \begin{pmatrix} x^k \\ b^k \end{pmatrix} + \frac{\theta}{1 + \theta} z^k.$$

Step 2. For $j \in J$:

$$x(j)^{k+1} := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \|d(j) + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2/L}(-d(j))\| \leq \gamma_1/L; \\ \left(\frac{\|d(j) + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2/L}(-d(j))\| - \gamma_1/L}{\|d(j) + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2/L}(-d(j))\|} \right) (d(j) + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2/L}(-d(j))), & \text{if } \|d(j) + \text{Th}_{\gamma_2/L}(-d(j))\| > \gamma_1/L; \end{cases}$$

where d is as defined in (20) and $d(j)$ is the subvector of d corresponding to the subvector $x(j)$.

Step 3.

$$b^{k+1} = y_{n+1}^{k+1} + \frac{1}{mL} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{y_i \exp(-y_i(a_i^\top y^k + b))}{1 + \exp(-y_i(a_i^\top y^k + b))}.$$

Step 4.

$$z^{k+1} := (1 - \theta)z^k + \theta y^k + \alpha \left[\begin{pmatrix} x^{k+1} \\ b^{k+1} \end{pmatrix} - y^k \right].$$

Step 5. Let $k := k + 1$; return to Step 1 until convergence.

Note, computing b^{k+1} at each iteration is simple relative to x^{k+1} because the subproblem (6) is decomposable into a minimization over x and b respectively. Since the minimization over b contains no regularization terms, the first-order optimality conditions provide a simple update for b .

6.3 Experimental Set-Up and Results

6.3.1 Experimental Set-Up for the Lasso Models

In this section we present our experimental set-up for comparing C-FISTA, SLEP and ADMM on the Lasso models. We constructed synthetic data sets for testing in a manner similar to the process utilized in [38]. For our tests of the group and sparse-group Lasso models, we randomly generated a $m \times n$ data matrix A from the standard normal distribution, and we formed three

different subvector groups, $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2$, and \mathcal{G}_3 , where the subvectors in \mathcal{G}_i were of sizes 10, 100, and 200 respectively. Thus, in our experiments we let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{8000 \times 5000}$ and had,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_1 &= \{(1, \dots, 10), (11, \dots, 20), \dots, (4991, \dots, 5000)\}, \\ \mathcal{G}_2 &= \{(1, \dots, 100), (101, \dots, 200), \dots, (4901, \dots, 5000)\}, \\ \mathcal{G}_3 &= \{(1, \dots, 200), (201, \dots, 400), \dots, (4801, \dots, 5000)\}.\end{aligned}$$

The response vectors b^i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ were formed as,

$$b^i = Ax + \delta \cdot \epsilon,$$

where each component of ϵ was drawn from the standard norm distribution, $\delta > 0$ provided a scaling factor for the noise, and $x(j) = (1, 2, \dots, 10, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, 10$ with $x(j) = \mathbf{0}$ for the remaining subvector groups $j = 11, \dots, |\mathcal{G}_i|$. We set the positive penalty parameters γ_1 and γ_2 to be equal and of a magnitude to ensure sparse but non-trivial solutions.

For the overlapping sparse-group Lasso model we constructed the data matrix A in the same manner, and let the subvector groups be,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_1 &= \{(1, \dots, 10), (6, \dots, 15), \dots, (4986, \dots, 4995), (4991, \dots, 5000)\}, \\ \mathcal{G}_2 &= \{(1, \dots, 100), (51, \dots, 150), \dots, (4851, \dots, 4950), (4901, \dots, 5000)\}, \\ \mathcal{G}_3 &= \{(1, \dots, 200), (101, \dots, 300), \dots, (4701, \dots, 4900), (4801, \dots, 5000)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, each of the adjacent subvectors in \mathcal{G}_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ overlapped with another subvector. The response vectors were constructed as done for the group and sparse-group Lasso models.

6.3.2 Experimental Set-Up for the Logistic Regression Model

The set-up for the numerical experiments on the sparse-group logistic regression model were similar to the set-up for the Lasso models. We generated the data matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{500 \times 5000}$ from the standard normal distribution letting a_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 500$ be the rows of A , and set $y = (-\mathbf{e}^\top, \mathbf{e}^\top)^\top$ where $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{250}$ is the vector of all ones. We conducted three experiments from the generated data using the same subvector groups, $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2$ and \mathcal{G}_3 , utilized in the group and sparse-group Lasso tests. We set $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0.01$ in our tests to ensure a non-trivial solution with substantial sparsity.

6.4 Experimental Results

All of the numerical experiments were conducted in MATLAB R2021a. We implemented C-FISTA for the Lasso models as detailed in Section 6.1. From the state-of-the-art SLEP software package [22]

we utilized *glLeastR.m*, *sgLeastR.m*, *overlapping_LeastR.m* and *sgLogisticR.m* to solve the group, sparse-group and overlapping sparse-group Lasso models and sparse-group logistic regression model respectively. All iterative sequences in the algorithms were initialized at zero. For comparison, all of the Lasso models were tested with the same data matrix A and response vectors b^i . Figure 1 displays the convergence results for C-FISTA, SLEP and ADMM on the three Lasso models and the sparse-group logistic regression model. In Figure 1, the y-axis measures the absolute difference from the optimal objective value at each iteration of the individual algorithms. We took the final value of the objective function of C-FISTA as the exact optimal solution which agreed, as can be seen in Figure 1, to within machine tolerance of the final iterates produced by ADMM and SLEP. Note, we fine-tuned the augmented Lagrangian parameter ρ in the ADMM algorithm to achieve the optimal performance for the method.

The computational results displayed in Figure 1 clearly demonstrate the proven global linear convergence of C-FISTA for all of the models. While ADMM and SLEP both display linear convergence properties, C-FISTA significantly outperformed both ADMM and SLEP in all the numerical tests. Furthermore, C-FISTA maintained a robustness between the various Lasso models. While SLEP’s convergence rate suffered as the subvector group sizes increased in the group Lasso model, the convergence rate of C-FISTA did not suffer in the group or sparse-group Lasso models as the group sizes increased. The results for the overlapping sparse-group Lasso tests are of particular interest because SLEP is considered the state-of-the-art first order approach for this model, and C-FISTA was about two times quicker than SLEP in our tests. Lastly, the numerical results from the sparse-group logistic regression tests clearly show the vast improvement of C-FISTA over SLEP; C-FISTA demonstrated clear linear convergence while SLEP required substantially more iterations to obtain a solution accurate to within $\pm 1.0 \times 10^{-10}$.

7 Conclusions

In this paper we developed an accelerated composite version of FISTA, C-FISTA, which handles the composite optimization model (1) and is a generalization of GFISTA [7, 8]. We proved global linear convergence for C-FISTA without having a strongly convex objective function, and demonstrated through Fenchel duality the breadth of convex models which are solvable via C-FISTA in Section 4. Lastly, we demonstrated C-FISTA outperforms both ADMM and the state-of-the-art software package SLEP on various Lasso and logistic regression models.

The following lines of directions could be of interest as future research topics. First, the conditions underlying our global linear convergence results may be weakened. Second, one may further study possible *adaptive* schemes to implement the accelerated FISTA without requiring the exact knowledge of the problem parameters. Finally, it is interesting to study how the new algorithm behaves beyond the scope of convex optimization.




Figure 1: The numerical results for the Lasso models (GL), (SGL) and ($OSGL$) and the sparse-group logistic regression model ($SGLR$) with three different subvector groupings. The y -axis is given in logarithmic scale and measures the absolute difference in the objective value and the optimal objective value at each iteration; $\gamma = 5$, $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 10$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0.1$ for the (GL), (SGL) and ($OSGL$) models respectively while $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0.01$ for the ($SGLR$) model.

References

- [1] A. d’Aspremont, D. Scieur, A. Taylor, *Acceleration Methods*, January 2021, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.09545v1>
- [2] A. Auslender, *Asymptotic properties of the Fenchel’s dual functional and their applications to decomposition problems*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 73 (1992), pp. 427-450.
- [3] A. Beck, S. Shtern, *Linearly convergent away-step conditional gradient for non-strongly convex functions*. Math. Program. 164, 1-27 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-016-1069-4>
- [4] A. Beck and M. Teboulle, *A Fast Iterative Shrinkage-Threshold Algorithm Linear Inverse Problems*, SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences, 2, pages 183-202, 2009.
- [5] J. V. Burke and M. C. Ferris. *A Gauss-Newton method for convex composite optimization*. Mathematical Programming, 71 (2, Ser. A): 179-194, 1995.
- [6] E.J. Candés, X.D. Li, Y. Ma, and J. Wright, *Robust Principal Component Analysis?* Journal of the ACM, 58 (3), 2011.
- [7] L. Calatroni and A. Chambolle, *Backtracking strategies for accelerated descent methods with smooth composite objectives*. SIAM Journal on Optimization, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 29 (3), pages 1772-1798, 2019.
- [8] A. Chambolle and T. Pock, *An introduction to continuous optimization for imaging*, Acta Numerica 25, pages 161-319, 2016.
- [9] V. Chandrasekaran, B. Recht, P.A. Parrilo, and A.S. Willsky, *The convex geometry of linear inverse problems*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics, 12 (6), pages 805-849, 2012.
- [10] P. L. Combettes and V. R. Wajs, *Signal recovery by proximal forward-backward splitting*, Multiscale Model. Simul., 4, pages 1168-1200, 2005.
- [11] I. Daubechies, M. Defrise, and C. D. Mol, *An iterative thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems with a sparsity constraint*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 57, pages 1413-1457, 2004.
- [12] D. Drusvyatskiy and A. S. Lewis, *Error Bounds, Quadratic Growth, and Linear Convergence of Proximal Methods*. Mathematics of Operations Research, 43, (3), pages 919-948, 2018.
- [13] D. Drusvyatskiy and C. Paquette, *Efficiency of minimizing compositions of convex functions and smooth maps*, Mathematical Programming, 178, pages 503-558, 2019.
- [14] M. A. T. Figueiredo and R. D. Nowak, *An EM algorithm for wavelet-based image restoration*, IEEE Trans. Image Process., 12, pages 906-916, 2003.

- [15] M. I. Florea and S. A. Vorobyov, *An Accelerated Composite Gradient Method for Large-scale Composite Objective Problems*. IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 67(2), pages 444 - 459, 2019.
- [16] M. I. Florea and S. A. Vorobyov, *A generalized accelerated composite gradient method: Uniting Nesterov's fast gradient method and FISTA*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 68, pages 3033-3048, 2020.
- [17] M. Fukushima, M. Haddou, H. Van Nguyen, et al. *A parallel descent algorithm for convex programming*. Comput Optim Applic 5, 5-37 (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00429749>
- [18] N. Gaffke and R. Mathar, *A cyclic projection algorithm via duality*. Metrika, 36, 29-54 (1989).
- [19] S. P. Han and G. Lou, *A Parallel Algorithm for a Class of Convex Programs*, SIAM J. Control and Opt. 26, (2), 1988.
- [20] M. Hong, Z.-Q. Luo, *On the linear convergence of the alternating direction method of multipliers*. Math. Program., 162, 165-199, 2017.
- [21] L. Jacob, G. Obozinski, and J. Vert, *Group lasso with overlap and graph lasso*. In ICML, 2009.
- [22] J. Liu and S. S. Ji and J. Ye *SLEP: Sparse Learning and Efficient Projections*, 2009. <http://yelabs.net/software/SLEP/>
- [23] L. Meier, S. Geer, and P. Bühlmann. *The group lasso for logistic regression*. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B, 70:53-71, 2008.
- [24] I. Necoara, Y. Nesterov & F. Glineur, *Linear convergence of first order methods for non-strongly convex optimization*. Mathematical Programming, 175, 69–107, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-018-1232-1>
- [25] Y. Nesterov, *A method for solving the convex programming problem with convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$* , Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 269 (1983), pp. 543-547 (in Russian).
- [26] Y. Nesterov. *Gradient methods for minimizing composite functions*. Mathematical Programming, 140(1, Ser. B):125-161, 2013.
- [27] M. Pham, A. Ninh, H. Le and Y. Liu, *An Efficient Algorithm for Minimizing Multi Non-Smooth Component Functions*. Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics, 30:1, 162-170, 2021. DOI: 10.1080/10618600.2020.1804390
- [28] Z.W. Qin, K. Scheinberg and D. Goldfarb, *Efficient Block-Coordinate Descent Algorithms for the Group Lasso*, Math. Prog. Comp. 5, pages 143-169, 2013.

- [29] N. Rao, P. Shah, and S. Wright, *Forward - Backward Greedy Algorithms for Atomic Norm Regularization*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 63 (21), pages 5798-5811, 2015.
- [30] N. Simon, J. Friedman, T. Hastie and R. Tibshirani, *A Sparse-Group Lasso*, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 22:2, 231-245, 2013, DOI: 10.1080/10618600.2012.681250.
- [31] S. Rebegoldi and L. Calatroni, *Scaled, inexact and adaptive generalized FISTA for strongly convex optimization*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.03915>, 2021.
- [32] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, second edition, 1970.
- [33] K. Roos, M. Balvert, B. Gorissen, D. Hertog, *A Universal and Structured Way to Derive Dual Optimization Problem Formulations*, INFORMS Journal on Optimization 2(4), pages 229-255, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1287/ijoo.2019.0034>
- [34] R. Tibshirani, *Regression shrinkage and selection via the Lasso*. J. R. Stat. Soc. B 58, pages 267-288, 1996.
- [35] S. J. Wright. *Convergence of an inexact algorithm for composite nonsmooth optimization*. IMA J. Numer. Anal., 10(3):299-321, 1990.
- [36] L. Yuan, J. Liu and L. Ye, *Efficient Methods for Overlapping Group Lasso*, IEEE Trans Pattern Anal Mach Intell. 2013 Sep;35(9):2104-16. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2013.17. PMID: 23868773
- [37] M. Yuan and Y. Lin, *Model Selection and Estimation in Regression With Grouped Variables*. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 68, 49-67, 2007.
- [38] Y. J. Zhang, N. Zhang, D. F. Sun and K. C. Toh. *An efficient Hessian based algorithm for solving large-scale sparse group Lasso problems*, Mathematical Programming, 179(1): 223-263, 2020.
- [39] X. Zhou, *On the Fenchel Duality between Strong Convexity and Lipschitz Continuous Gradient*, 2018, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.06573v1>.
- [40] Z. Zhou, A. MC. So, *A unified approach to error bounds for structured convex optimization problems*. Mathematical Programming, 165, 689-728 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-016-1100-9>