

On the Stability of Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann Iterations

Hui Ouyang*

March 25, 2022

Abstract

Firstly, we invoke the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of translated basic methods involving nonexpansive operators to establish the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of the associated method with both perturbation and approximation. Then we employ the technique obtaining the result above to extend convergence results from the classic Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations to their relaxation variants for finding a common fixed point of associated nonexpansive operators. At last, we show applications on generalized proximal point algorithms for solving monotone inclusion problems.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 65J15, 47J25, 47H05; Secondary 47H09, 47H10, 90C25.

Keywords: Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann Iterations, stability, generalized proximal point algorithms, maximally monotone operators, firmly nonexpansiveness, weak convergence, strong convergence

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper,

\mathcal{H} is a real Hilbert space,

with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and induced norm $\|\cdot\|$. We denote the set of all nonnegative integers by $\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$.

Let $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be a nonexpansive operator and let $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$. A generalization of the *Banach-Picard iteration*, $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) x_{k+1} = Tx_k$, is the *Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations*:

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = x_k + \lambda_k (Tx_k - x_k),$$

where $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in [0, 1]$. Let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) T_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be nonexpansive operators with $\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } T_k \neq \emptyset$, let $(\eta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in \mathbb{R}_+ , and let $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of *error terms* in \mathcal{H} . In this work, we mainly investigate the following relaxation variants of the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations.

(i) The *inexact Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations* follows the iteration scheme:

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = x_k + \lambda_k (Tx_k - x_k) + \eta_k e_k.$$

(ii) The (*exact*) *non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations* is the iteration scheme:

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = x_k + \lambda_k (T_k x_k - x_k).$$

*Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Kelowna, B.C. V1V 1V7, Canada. E-mail: hui.ouyang@alumni.ubc.ca.

(iii) The *inexact non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations* is the iteration scheme:

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = x_k + \lambda_k (T_k x_k - x_k) + \eta_k e_k. \quad (1.1)$$

In particular, if $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \eta_k = \lambda_k$, then the iteration scheme (1.1) is always written as

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = x_k + \lambda_k (T_k x_k + e_k - x_k).$$

Notice that Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations can be specified as the generalized proximal point algorithm [9], the forward-backward splitting algorithm [15], the Douglas-Rachford splitting algorithm [8, 13], the Peaceman-Rachford splitting algorithm [17], the alternating direction method of multipliers [10], the three-operator splitting schemes [4] and so on (see, e.g., [12, 14] for details). By studying relaxation variants of the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations, we are able to produce convergence results on generalized versions of optimization algorithms mentioned above if we specify the associated non-expansive operators accordingly.

The goal of this work is to investigate the stability of Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations. In particular, we shall deduce the weak and strong convergence of relaxation variants of the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations from the corresponding convergence results on the classic Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations for finding a common fixed point of associated nonexpansive operators. Moreover, we will also apply our convergence results to generalized proximal point algorithms for finding a zero of the related maximally monotone operator.

We summarize main results of this work as follows.

- R1:** Applying [Theorem 3.2](#), we can deduce the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of the iteration method (involving nonexpansive operators) with both approximation and perturbation from the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of associated translated basic methods.
- R2:** One R -linear convergence result on the exact version of non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations is shown in [Theorem 4.9](#). In addition, the weak and strong convergence of the inexact non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations are given in [Theorems 4.7](#) and [4.11](#).
- R3:** [Theorem 5.6](#) establishes a R -linear convergence result on the exact version of generalized proximal point algorithms. Moreover, [Theorems 5.7](#) to [5.8](#) and [5.10](#) provide sufficient conditions for the weak and strong convergence of generalized proximal point algorithms.

This work is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), except for some fundamental definitions and facts, we also show some auxiliary results to facilitate proofs in subsequent sections. In [Section 3](#), we specify [[11](#), Lemma 2.1] (that originates from [[3](#), Remark 14]) to weak and norm topologies in Hilbert spaces and deduce the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of the perturbed and approximate iteration method involving nonexpansive operators from the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of associated translated basic methods. This technique on the proof of convergence is invoked in [Section 4](#) where we extend some weak and strong convergence results from the classic Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations to their relaxation variants. In [Section 5](#), we apply main results in [Sections 3](#) and [4](#) to generalized proximal point algorithms for solving monotone inclusion problems. At last, we summarize this work and provide some directions on future work in [Section 6](#).

We now turn to the notation used in this work. Id stands for the *identity mapping*. Denote by $\mathbb{R}_+ := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \lambda \geq 0\}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{++} := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \lambda > 0\}$. Let \bar{x} be in \mathcal{H} and let $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$. $B[\bar{x}; r] := \{y \in \mathcal{H} : \|y - \bar{x}\| \leq r\}$ is the *closed ball centered at \bar{x} with radius r* . Let C be a nonempty set of \mathcal{H} . Then $(\forall x \in \mathcal{H}) \text{d}(x, C) = \inf_{y \in C} \|x - y\|$. If C is nonempty closed and convex, then the *projector* (or *projection operator*) onto C is the operator, denoted by P_C , that maps every point in \mathcal{H} to its unique projection onto C . C is *affine* if $C \neq \emptyset$ and $(\forall x \in C) (\forall y \in C) (\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}) \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in C$. Let \mathcal{D} be a nonempty subset of \mathcal{H} and let $T : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. $\text{Fix } T := \{x \in \mathcal{D} : x = T(x)\}$ is the *set of fixed points of T* . Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be a set-valued operator. Then A is characterized by its *graph*

$\text{gra } A := \{(x, u) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} : u \in A(x)\}$. The *inverse* of A , denoted by A^{-1} , is defined through its graph $\text{gra } A^{-1} := \{(u, x) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} : (x, u) \in \text{gra } A\}$. The *domain*, *range*, and *set of zeros* of A are defined by $\text{dom } A := \{x \in \mathcal{H} : Ax \neq \emptyset\}$, $\text{ran } A := \{y \in \mathcal{H} : \exists x \in \mathcal{H} \text{ s.t. } y \in Ax\}$, and $\text{zer } A := \{x \in \mathcal{H} : 0 \in Ax\}$, respectively. Let $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in \mathcal{H} . $\Omega((y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}})$ stands for the *set of all weak sequential clusters of the sequence* $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. If $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ *converges strongly* to \bar{y} , then we denote by $y_k \rightarrow \bar{y}$. $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ *converges weakly* to \bar{y} if, for every $u \in \mathcal{H}$, $\langle y_k, u \rangle \rightarrow \langle \bar{y}, u \rangle$; in symbols, $y_k \rightharpoonup \bar{y}$. Suppose that $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a point $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{H}$. $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is *R-linearly convergent* (or *converges R-linearly*) to \bar{y} if $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\|y_k - \bar{y}\|)^{\frac{1}{k}} < 1$. For other notation not explicitly defined here, we refer the reader to [1].

2 Auxiliary Results

In this section, we collect some definitions and facts mainly from the book [1], which are fundamental to our analysis later. Moreover, we also show some auxiliary results to simplify our proofs in subsequent sections.

The following result plays an essential role to prove multiple results in the next sections.

Fact 2.1. [1, Lemma 5.31] *Let $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(\beta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(\gamma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $(\varepsilon_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be sequences in \mathbb{R}_+ such that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_k < \infty$, $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \varepsilon_k < \infty$, and*

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \alpha_{k+1} \leq (1 + \gamma_k)\alpha_k - \beta_k + \varepsilon_k.$$

Then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k$ exists in \mathbb{R}_+ and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \beta_k < \infty$.

2.1 Nonexpansive operators

All algorithms studied in this work are based on nonexpansive operators. In fact, a lot of iteration mappings in optimization algorithms are nonexpansive.

Definition 2.2. [1, Definition 4.1] *Let D be a nonempty subset of \mathcal{H} and let $T : D \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. Then T is*

- (i) *quasinonexpansive* if $(\forall x \in D) (\forall y \in \text{Fix } T) \|Tx - y\| \leq \|x - y\|$;
- (ii) *nonexpansive* if it is Lipschitz continuous with constant 1, i.e., $(\forall x \in D) (\forall y \in D) \|Tx - Ty\| \leq \|x - y\|$;
- (iii) *firmly nonexpansive* if $(\forall x \in D) (\forall y \in D) \|Tx - Ty\|^2 + \|(\text{Id} - T)x - (\text{Id} - T)y\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2$.

The following [Fact 2.3](#) is basic for the analysis of many results later.

Fact 2.3. [1, Proposition 4.23(ii)] *Let D be a nonempty closed and convex subset of \mathcal{H} and let $T : D \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be quasinonexpansive. Then $\text{Fix } T$ is closed and convex.*

Although [1, Definition 4.33] considers only the case $\alpha \in]0, 1[$, we extend the definition to $\alpha \in]0, 1]$. Clearly, by [Definition 2.4](#), T is 1-averaged if and only if T is nonexpansive. This extension will facilitate our statements in the following sections.

Definition 2.4. [1, Definition 4.33] *Let D be a nonempty subset of \mathcal{H} , let $T : D \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be nonexpansive, and let $\alpha \in]0, 1]$. Then T is *averaged with constant α* , or *α -averaged*, if there exists a nonexpansive operator $R : D \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that $T = (1 - \alpha)\text{Id} + \alpha R$.*

Clearly, by [Definitions 2.2](#) and [2.4](#), firmly nonexpansive operators and averaged operators must be nonexpansive operators.

Fact 2.5. [1, Remark 4.34(iii)] *Let D be a nonempty subset of \mathcal{H} and let $T : D \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. Then T is firmly nonexpansive if and only if it is $\frac{1}{2}$ -averaged.*

In fact, [Fact 2.6](#) extends [[1](#), Proposition 4.40] from $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ and $\lambda \in]0, \frac{1}{\alpha}[$ to $\alpha \in]0, 1]$ and $\lambda \in]0, \frac{1}{\alpha}]$, but it is not difficult to see that the extension is trivial by [Definition 2.4](#).

Fact 2.6. [[1](#), Proposition 4.40] *Let D be a nonempty subset of \mathcal{H} , let $T : D \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, let $\alpha \in]0, 1]$, and let $\lambda \in]0, \frac{1}{\alpha}]$. Then T is α -averaged if and only if $(1 - \lambda) \text{Id} + \lambda T$ is $\lambda\alpha$ -averaged.*

[Proposition 2.7\(ii\)&\(iii\)](#) are inspired by [[1](#), Theorem 5.15 and Proposition 5.34] which work on the weak convergence of the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann Iterations. Specifically, the idea of [Proposition 2.7\(ii\)&\(iii\)](#) is used in the proofs [[1](#), Theorem 5.15 and Proposition 5.34].

Proposition 2.7. *Let $\alpha \in]0, 1]$ and let $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be an α -averaged operator with $\text{Fix } T \neq \emptyset$. Let x and e be in \mathcal{H} and let λ and η be in \mathbb{R}_+ . Define*

$$y_x := (1 - \lambda)x + \lambda Tx \quad \text{and} \quad z_x := (1 - \lambda)x + \lambda Tx + \eta e = y_x + \eta e. \quad (2.1)$$

Then the following statements hold.

(i) *There exists a nonexpansive operator $R : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that $\text{Fix } T = \text{Fix } R$, $T - \text{Id} = \alpha(R - \text{Id})$, and $y_x = (1 - \alpha\lambda)x + \alpha\lambda Rx$.*

(ii) *Let $\bar{x} \in \text{Fix } T$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_x - \bar{x}\|^2 &\leq \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \lambda \right) \|x - Tx\|^2; \\ \|z_x - \bar{x}\|^2 &\leq \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \lambda \right) \|x - Tx\|^2 + \eta \|e\| (2 \|y_x - \bar{x}\| + \eta \|e\|). \end{aligned}$$

(iii) *Let $\bar{x} \in \text{Fix } T$ and $\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{\alpha}]$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_x - \bar{x}\| &\leq \|x - \bar{x}\|; \\ \|z_x - \bar{x}\| &\leq \|y_x - \bar{x}\| + \eta \|e\| \leq \|x - \bar{x}\| + \eta \|e\|; \\ \|Ty_x - y_x\| &\leq \|Tx - x\|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (i): Because T is α -averaged, by [Definition 2.4](#), there exists a nonexpansive operator $R : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$T = (1 - \alpha) \text{Id} + \alpha R \Leftrightarrow T - \text{Id} = \alpha(R - \text{Id}).$$

Because $\alpha \neq 0$, we observe that for every $u \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$u \in \text{Fix } T \Leftrightarrow u = Tu = (1 - \alpha)u + \alpha Ru \Leftrightarrow u = Ru \Leftrightarrow u \in \text{Fix } R,$$

which leads to $\text{Fix } T = \text{Fix } R$. Moreover, it is clear that

$$y_x = x + \lambda(Tx - x) = x + \alpha\lambda(Rx - x) = (1 - \alpha\lambda)x + \alpha\lambda Rx.$$

(ii): Apply (i) in the first equality and the inequality below, and employ [[1](#), Corollary 2.15] in the third equality below to ensure that

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_x - \bar{x}\|^2 &= \|(1 - \alpha\lambda)x + \alpha\lambda Rx - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ &= \|(1 - \alpha\lambda)(x - \bar{x}) + \alpha\lambda(Rx - \bar{x})\|^2 \\ &= (1 - \alpha\lambda) \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 + \alpha\lambda \|Rx - \bar{x}\|^2 - \alpha\lambda(1 - \alpha\lambda) \|x - Rx\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 - \alpha\lambda) \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 + \alpha\lambda \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 - \alpha\lambda(1 - \alpha\lambda) \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \|x - Tx\|^2 \\ &= \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \lambda \right) \|x - Tx\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Based on (2.1) and the inequality proved above, we establish that

$$\begin{aligned}\|z_x - \bar{x}\|^2 &= \|y_x - \bar{x} + \eta e\|^2 \\ &\leq \|y_x - \bar{x}\|^2 + \eta \|e\| (2 \|y_x - \bar{x}\| + \eta \|e\|) \\ &\leq \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \lambda \right) \|x - Tx\|^2 + \eta \|e\| (2 \|y_x - \bar{x}\| + \eta \|e\|),\end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality above we use the fact

$$(\forall u \in \mathcal{H})(\forall v \in \mathcal{H}) \quad \|u + v\|^2 \leq \|u\|^2 + \|v\| (2 \|u\| + \|v\|).$$

(iii): Note that (ii) necessitates

$$\|y_x - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x - \bar{x}\|,$$

which, connected with (2.1), guarantees that

$$\|z_x - \bar{x}\| \leq \|y_x - \bar{x}\| + \eta \|e\| \leq \|x - \bar{x}\| + \eta \|e\|.$$

In addition, applying Δ -inequality and $\alpha\lambda \in [0, 1]$ in the first inequality and utilizing (i) and the nonexpansiveness of R in the second inequality below, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\|Ty_x - y_x\| &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \alpha \|Ry_x - y_x\| \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \alpha \|Ry_x - Rx + Rx - (1 - \alpha\lambda)x - \alpha\lambda Rx\| \\ &= \alpha \|Ry_x - Rx + (1 - \alpha\lambda)(Rx - x)\| \\ &\leq \alpha (\|Ry_x - Rx\| + (1 - \alpha\lambda) \|Rx - x\|) \\ &\leq \alpha \left(\|y_x - x\| + \frac{1}{\alpha} (1 - \alpha\lambda) \|Tx - x\| \right) \\ &\stackrel{(2.1)}{=} \alpha\lambda \|Tx - x\| + (1 - \alpha\lambda) \|Tx - x\| \\ &= \|Tx - x\|.\end{aligned}$$

Altogether, the proof is complete. ■

2.2 Resolvent of monotone operators

Definition 2.8. [1, Definitions 20.1 and 20.20] Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be a set-valued operator. Then A is *monotone* if $(\forall (x, u) \in \text{gra } A)(\forall (y, v) \in \text{gra } A) \langle x - y, u - v \rangle \geq 0$. We say a monotone operator A is *maximally monotone* (or *maximal monotone*) if there exists no monotone operator $B : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ such that $\text{gra } B$ properly contains $\text{gra } A$, i.e., for every $(x, u) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$,

$$(x, u) \in \text{gra } A \Leftrightarrow (\forall (y, v) \in \text{gra } A) \langle x - y, u - v \rangle \geq 0.$$

Definition 2.9. [1, Definition 23.1] Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ and let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. The *resolvent* of A is

$$J_A = (\text{Id} + A)^{-1}.$$

The following [Fact 2.10](#) demonstrates that the resolvent of a maximally monotone operator is single-valued, full domain, and firmly nonexpansive, which is fundamental for our study on generalized proximal point algorithms in this work.

Fact 2.10. [1, Proposition 23.10] Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be such that $\text{dom } A \neq \emptyset$, set $D := \text{ran}(\text{Id} + A)$, and set $T = J_A|_D$. Then A is maximally monotone if and only if T is firmly nonexpansive and $D = \mathcal{H}$.

Fact 2.11 will be used frequently in our proofs later.

Fact 2.11. [1, Proposition 23.38] Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be monotone and let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Then $\text{Fix } J_{\gamma A} = \text{zer } A$.

Lemma 2.12. Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be maximally monotone with $\text{zer } A \neq \emptyset$, let x and e be in \mathcal{H} , let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, and let λ and η be in \mathbb{R}_+ . Define

$$y_x := (1 - \lambda)x + \lambda J_{\gamma A} x \quad \text{and} \quad z_x := (1 - \lambda)x + \lambda J_{\gamma A} x + \eta e = y_x + \eta e.$$

Then for every $\bar{x} \in \text{zer } A$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_x - \bar{x}\|^2 &\leq \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 - \lambda(2 - \lambda) \|x - J_{\gamma A} x\|^2; \\ \|z_x - \bar{x}\|^2 &\leq \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 - \lambda(2 - \lambda) \|x - J_{\gamma A} x\|^2 + \eta \|e\| (2 \|y_x - \bar{x}\| + \eta \|e\|). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Because A is maximally monotone and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, applying [1, Proposition 20.22] with $u = 0$ and $z = 0$, we know that γA is maximally monotone. Then, via [Facts 2.5](#) and [2.10](#), we know that $J_{\gamma A} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ -averaged. Moreover, due to [Fact 2.11](#), $\text{Fix } J_{\gamma A} = \text{zer } A$. Hence, the desired results follow immediately from [Proposition 2.7\(ii\)](#). \blacksquare

[Fact 2.13](#) below is fundamental to our analysis in some results below.

Fact 2.13. [1, Proposition 23.39] Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be maximally monotone. Then $\text{zer } A$ is closed and convex.

Corollary 2.14. Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be maximally monotone, let $x \in \mathcal{H}$, and let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Then the following hold.

- (i) $(J_{\gamma A} x, \frac{1}{\gamma}(x - J_{\gamma A} x)) \in \text{gra } A$.
- (ii) $(\forall \mu \in \mathbb{R}_{++}) J_{\gamma A}(x) = J_{\mu A} \left(\frac{\mu}{\gamma} x + \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\gamma}\right) J_{\gamma A} x \right)$.

Proof. (i): According to [Fact 2.10](#), we know that $J_{\gamma A} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is full domain. Hence, The desired result follows immediately from [1, Proposition 23.2(ii)].

(ii): Apply [1, Proposition 23.31(i)] with $\lambda = \frac{\mu}{\gamma}$ to deduce the required result. \blacksquare

Lemma 2.15. Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be maximally monotone with $\text{zer } A \neq \emptyset$ and let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Then

$$(\forall x \in \mathcal{H})(\forall z \in \text{zer } A) \quad \|J_{\gamma A} x - z\|^2 + \|(\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A}) x\|^2 \leq \|x - z\|^2.$$

Proof. As a consequence of [Fact 2.10](#), $J_{\gamma A}$ is firmly nonexpansive and full domain. Moreover, due to [Fact 2.11](#), $\text{Fix } J_{\gamma A} = \text{zer } A$. Therefore, the desired inequality follows easily from [Definition 2.2\(iii\)](#). \blacksquare

The following result complements [16, Proposition 2.16] which also provides sufficient conditions for the inclusion given in [Lemma 2.16](#). Notice that the assumption $\inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k > 0$ is critical in [16, Proposition 2.16].

Lemma 2.16. Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be maximally monotone with $\text{zer } A \neq \emptyset$. Let $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in \mathcal{H} and let $(c_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in \mathbb{R}_{++} . Denote the set of all weak sequential clusters of the sequence $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ by $\Omega((y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}})$. Suppose that $\frac{1}{c_k}(y_k - J_{c_k A} y_k) \rightarrow 0$ and that one of the following assumptions hold.

(A1) $\bar{c} := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k < \infty$.

(A2) $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) y_{k+1} = J_{c_k A} y_k$.

Then $\Omega((y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}) \subseteq \text{zer } A$.

Proof. If $\Omega((y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}) = \emptyset$, then the required result is trivial. Suppose that $\Omega((y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\bar{y} \in \Omega((y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}})$. Then there exists a subsequence $(y_{k_i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$y_{k_i} \rightarrow \bar{y}. \quad (2.2)$$

Case 1: Suppose that the assumption (A1) holds. As a consequence of $\frac{1}{c_k}(y_k - J_{c_k A} y_k) \rightarrow 0$, we know that

$$\|y_k - J_{c_k A} y_k\| = c_k \left\| \frac{1}{c_k} (y_k - J_{c_k A} y_k) \right\| \leq \bar{c} \left\| \frac{1}{c_k} (y_k - J_{c_k A} y_k) \right\| \rightarrow 0.$$

Combine this with (2.2) to establish that

$$J_{c_{k_i} A} y_{k_i} = (J_{c_{k_i} A} y_{k_i} - y_{k_i}) + y_{k_i} \rightarrow \bar{y} \quad (2.3)$$

Because A is monotone and, via Corollary 2.14(i),

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \left(J_{c_{k_i} A} y_{k_i}, \frac{1}{c_{k_i}} (y_{k_i} - J_{c_{k_i} A} y_{k_i}) \right) \in \text{gra } A,$$

we observe that

$$(\forall (x, u) \in \text{gra } A) \quad \left\langle J_{c_{k_i} A} y_{k_i} - x, \frac{1}{c_{k_i}} (y_{k_i} - J_{c_{k_i} A} y_{k_i}) - u \right\rangle \geq 0,$$

which, connected with (2.3) and the assumption $\frac{1}{c_k}(y_k - J_{c_k A} y_k) \rightarrow 0$, ensures that

$$(\forall (x, u) \in \text{gra } A) \quad \langle \bar{y} - x, 0 - u \rangle \geq 0.$$

This, due to Definition 2.8, guarantees that $(\bar{y}, 0) \in \text{gra } A$, that is, $\bar{y} \in \text{zer } A$.

Case 2: Suppose that (A2) holds. Then

$$J_{c_{k_i-1} A} y_{k_i-1} = y_{k_i} \rightarrow \bar{y}.$$

Corollary 2.14(i) leads to $(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) \left(J_{c_{k_i-1} A} y_{k_i-1}, \frac{1}{c_{k_i-1}} (y_{k_i-1} - J_{c_{k_i-1} A} y_{k_i-1}) \right) \in \text{gra } A$. Combine this with the monotonicity of A to deduce that

$$(\forall (x, u) \in \text{gra } A) \quad \left\langle J_{c_{k_i-1} A} y_{k_i-1} - x, \frac{1}{c_{k_i-1}} (y_{k_i-1} - J_{c_{k_i-1} A} y_{k_i-1}) - u \right\rangle \geq 0,$$

which, connected with

$$J_{c_{k_i-1} A} y_{k_i-1} \rightarrow \bar{y} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{c_k} (y_k - J_{c_k A} y_k) \rightarrow 0,$$

necessitates that

$$(\forall (x, u) \in \text{gra } A) \quad \langle \bar{y} - x, 0 - u \rangle \geq 0.$$

As we pointed out in the proof of Case 1 above, this entails $\bar{y} \in \text{zer } A$.

Altogether, the proof is complete. ■

2.3 Metrical subregularity

Definition 2.17. [7, Pages 183 and 184] Let $F : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be a set-valued operator. F is called *metrically subregular at \bar{x} for \bar{y}* if $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gra } F$ and there exists $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+$ along with a neighborhood U of \bar{x} such that

$$(\forall x \in U) \quad d\left(x, F^{-1}(\bar{y})\right) \leq \kappa d(\bar{y}, F(x)).$$

The constant κ is called *constant of metric subregularity*. The infimum of all κ for which the inequality above holds is the *modulus of metric subregularity*, denoted by $\text{subreg}(F; \bar{x}|\bar{y})$. The absence of metric subregularity is signaled by $\text{subreg}(F; \bar{x}|\bar{y}) = \infty$.

[Proposition 2.18\(ii\)](#) is inspired by [2, Lemma 3.8]. In fact, [Proposition 2.18\(ii\)](#) improves [2, Lemma 3.8] from the following three aspects: it replaces the α -averaged operator T in [2, Lemma 3.8] by the affine combination $F_\lambda = (1 - \lambda) \text{Id} + \lambda T$ below; it generalizes [2, Lemma 3.8] from boundedly linearly regularity (see [2, Definition 2.1] for a detailed definition) to metrical subregularity; and the upper bound in [Proposition 2.18\(ii\)\(b\)](#) is better than the corresponding one in the inequality (21) of [2, Lemma 3.8].

[Proposition 2.18](#) will play a critical role to prove [Theorem 4.9](#) below.

Proposition 2.18. Let $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be α -averaged with $\alpha \in]0, 1]$ and $\text{Fix } T \neq \emptyset$. Let $\lambda \in]0, \frac{1}{\alpha}[$. Define

$$F_\lambda := (1 - \lambda) \text{Id} + \lambda T.$$

Then the following statements hold.

(i) For every $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and every $z \in \text{Fix } T$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_\lambda x - z\|^2 + \frac{\lambda(1 - \lambda\alpha)}{\alpha} \|(\text{Id} - T)x\|^2 &\leq \|x - z\|^2; \\ \frac{\lambda(1 - \lambda\alpha)}{\alpha} \|(\text{Id} - T)x\|^2 &\leq d^2(x, \text{Fix } T) - d^2(F_\lambda x, \text{Fix } T). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $(\forall x \in \mathcal{H}) \quad d(F_\lambda x, \text{Fix } T) \leq d(x, \text{Fix } T)$.

(ii) Suppose that $\text{Id} - T$ is metrically subregular at $\bar{x} \in \text{Fix } T$ for $0 \in (\text{Id} - T)\bar{x}$, i.e.,

$$(\exists \kappa > 0)(\exists \delta > 0)(\forall x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]) \quad d(x, \text{Fix } T) \leq \kappa \|x - Tx\|. \quad (2.4)$$

Define $\rho := \left(1 - \frac{\lambda(1 - \lambda\alpha)}{\alpha\kappa^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then the following hold.

$$(a) \quad \rho \in \left[0, \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{\lambda(1 - \lambda\alpha)}{\alpha\kappa^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right] \subseteq [0, 1[.$$

$$(b) \quad (\forall x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]) \quad d(F_\lambda x, \text{Fix } T) \leq \rho d(x, \text{Fix } T).$$

Proof. (i): Because $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is α -averaged, due to [Fact 2.6](#), we know that F_λ is $\lambda\alpha$ -averaged with $\lambda\alpha \in]0, 1[$. As a consequence of $\lambda \neq 0$ and [Fact 2.3](#), we have that $\text{Fix } F_\lambda = \text{Fix } T$ is nonempty closed and convex. In view of the definition of F_λ , we get that

$$\text{Id} - F_\lambda = \lambda(\text{Id} - T). \quad (2.5)$$

Let $x \in \mathcal{H}$. Based on [1, Proposition 4.35] and $\text{Fix } F_\lambda = \text{Fix } T$, we observe that for every $z \in \text{Fix } T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_\lambda x - z\|^2 + \frac{1 - \lambda\alpha}{\lambda\alpha} \|(\text{Id} - F_\lambda)x\|^2 &\leq \|x - z\|^2 \\ \Leftrightarrow \|F_\lambda x - z\|^2 + \frac{\lambda(1 - \lambda\alpha)}{\alpha} \|(\text{Id} - T)x\|^2 &\leq \|x - z\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

which, noticing that $P_{\text{Fix } T} x \in \text{Fix } T$, implies that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda(1-\lambda\alpha)}{\alpha} \|(\text{Id} - T)x\|^2 \leq \|x - P_{\text{Fix } T} x\|^2 - \|F_\lambda x - P_{\text{Fix } T} x\|^2 \\ \Rightarrow & \frac{\lambda(1-\lambda\alpha)}{\alpha} \|(\text{Id} - T)x\|^2 \leq \|x - P_{\text{Fix } T} x\|^2 - \|F_\lambda x - P_{\text{Fix } T}(F_\lambda x)\|^2 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \frac{\lambda(1-\lambda\alpha)}{\alpha} \|(\text{Id} - T)x\|^2 \leq d^2(x, \text{Fix } T) - d^2(F_\lambda x, \text{Fix } T). \end{aligned}$$

(ii): Let $x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]$. Set $\eta := \frac{\lambda(1-\lambda\alpha)}{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. According to (2.4), we have that

$$d^2(x, \text{Fix } T) \leq \kappa^2 \|x - Tx\|^2 \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{\kappa^2}{\eta} \left(d^2(x, \text{Fix } T) - d^2(F_\lambda x, \text{Fix } T) \right).$$

This necessitates that

$$d^2(F_\lambda x, \text{Fix } T) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\kappa^2}\right) d^2(x, \text{Fix } T), \quad (2.6)$$

which forces that $1 - \frac{\eta}{\kappa^2} \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Notice that $1 - \frac{\eta}{\kappa^2} < \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\eta}{\kappa^2}} \Leftrightarrow 1 - \frac{\eta^2}{\kappa^4} < 1$. So, we establish that $0 \leq 1 - \frac{\lambda(1-\lambda\alpha)}{\alpha\kappa^2} < \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\lambda(1-\lambda\alpha)}{\alpha\kappa^2}} < 1$, that leads to (ii)(a).

In addition, (2.6) clearly ensures the required inequality in (ii)(b). \blacksquare

The following Lemma 2.19(iii) can also be obtained by substituting $\mathcal{B} = 0$ in [19, Lemma 3.3]. The idea of the following proof is almost the same as that of [19, Lemma 3.3]. For completeness and convenience of later references, we attach detailed results and proofs below.

Lemma 2.19. *Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be maximally monotone with $\text{zer } A \neq \emptyset$, let $\bar{x} \in \text{zer } A$, and let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Then the following hold.*

(i) *Suppose that A is metrically subregular at \bar{x} for $0 \in A\bar{x}$, i.e.,*

$$(\exists \kappa > 0)(\exists \delta > 0)(\forall x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]) \quad d(x, A^{-1}0) \leq \kappa d(0, Ax). \quad (2.7)$$

Then $\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A}$ is metrically subregular at \bar{x} for $0 = (\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A})\bar{x}$; more precisely,

$$(\forall x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]) \quad d\left(x, (\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A})^{-1}0\right) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{\gamma}\right) d(0, (\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A})x).$$

(ii) *Suppose that $\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A}$ is metrically subregular at \bar{x} for $0 = (\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A})\bar{x}$, i.e.,*

$$(\exists \kappa' > 0)(\exists \delta' > 0)(\forall x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta']) \quad d\left(x, (\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A})^{-1}0\right) \leq \kappa' d(0, (\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A})x). \quad (2.8)$$

Then A is metrically subregular at \bar{x} for $0 \in A\bar{x}$; more precisely,

$$(\forall x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta']) \quad d(x, A^{-1}0) \leq \kappa' \gamma d(0, Ax).$$

(iii) *A is metrically subregular at \bar{x} for $0 \in A\bar{x}$ if and only if $\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A}$ is metrically subregular at \bar{x} for $0 = (\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A})\bar{x}$.*

Proof. As a consequence of [Fact 2.11](#), $\text{zer}(\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A}) = \text{Fix} J_{\gamma A} = \text{zer} A$, which necessitates that

$$(\forall x \in \mathcal{H}) \quad \text{d}\left(x, (\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A})^{-1} 0\right) = \text{d}\left(x, A^{-1} 0\right). \quad (2.9)$$

(i): Let $x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]$. Employing $\bar{x} \in \text{zer} A$ and [Lemma 2.15](#), we get that $J_{\gamma A} x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]$. Then applying [\(2.7\)](#) with x replaced by $J_{\gamma A} x$ in the following first inequality and employing [Corollary 2.14\(i\)](#) in the second one, we establish that

$$\text{d}\left(J_{\gamma A} x, A^{-1} 0\right) \leq \kappa \text{d}\left(0, A(J_{\gamma A} x)\right) \leq \frac{\kappa}{\gamma} \|x - J_{\gamma A} x\|. \quad (2.10)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{d}\left(x, (\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A})^{-1} 0\right) &\stackrel{(2.9)}{=} \text{d}\left(x, A^{-1} 0\right) \\ &\leq \|x - J_{\gamma A} x\| + \text{d}\left(J_{\gamma A} x, A^{-1} 0\right) \\ &\stackrel{(2.10)}{\leq} \|x - J_{\gamma A} x\| + \frac{\kappa}{\gamma} \|x - J_{\gamma A} x\| \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{\gamma}\right) \text{d}\left(0, (\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A}) x\right). \end{aligned}$$

(ii): Let $x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta']$. Utilize [Corollary 2.14\(i\)](#) in the last inequality to obtain that

$$\text{d}\left(x, A^{-1} 0\right) \stackrel{(2.9)}{=} \text{d}\left(x, (\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A})^{-1} 0\right) \stackrel{(2.8)}{\leq} \kappa' \text{d}\left(0, (\text{Id} - J_{\gamma A}) x\right) = \kappa' \|x - J_{\gamma A} x\| \leq \kappa' \gamma \text{d}\left(0, Ax\right).$$

(iii): This follows immediately from (i) and (ii) above. ■

3 Convergence of the Perturbed or Approximate Method

In this section, we borrow the terminology used in [\[11\]](#). Consider some problems with data D . Let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be the iteration mapping that is defined from the data D . The *basic method* is generated by conforming to the iteration scheme:

$$x_0 = x \in \mathcal{H} \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) x_{k+1} = G_k x_k.$$

With such a basic method, we have the following associated methods.

(i) The *perturbed method* is given by the iteration scheme:

$$x_0 = x \in \mathcal{H} \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) x_{k+1} = F_k x_k,$$

where for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the iteration mapping $F_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is closely related to G_k and depends on the perturbed (or approximate) data of D .

(ii) The *translated basic method* is defined by the iteration scheme:

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \zeta_0(i) = x_i \in \mathcal{H} \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \zeta_{k+1}(i) = G_{k+i} \zeta_k(i).$$

(iii) The *approximate method* is defined by the iteration scheme

$$x_0 = x \in \mathcal{H} \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) x_{k+1} = G_k x_k + e_k,$$

where $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the sequence of *error terms*.

Note that, as stated in [11, Remark 2.1], if $\zeta_0(i) = x$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k \equiv G$, that is, the iterations mappings are independent on the iteration numbers k , then the translated basic method coincides with the basic one.

Lemma 3.1 is essentially a special case of [11, Lemma 2.1]. As stated in [11], [11, Lemma 2.1] is “substantially proved in [3, Remark 14]”. Notice that [11, Lemma 2.1] is on a general topology weaker than the norm topology in Banach spaces. In **Lemma 3.1**, we simplify the context and add some details on the proof of the weak and norm topologies in Hilbert spaces to make the proof easier to understand, but the idea of the proof is almost the same as that of [11, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be nonexpansive and let $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in \mathcal{H} . Define*

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad y_{k+1} = G_k y_k + e_k \text{ and } y_0 \in \mathcal{H}; \quad (3.1a)$$

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N})(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \zeta_{k+1}(i) = G_{k+i} \zeta_k(i) \text{ and } \zeta_0(i) = y_i. \quad (3.1b)$$

Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|e_k\| < \infty$ and that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to a point $\zeta(i) \in \mathcal{H}$. Then the following statements hold.

- (i) There exists a point $\bar{\zeta} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $(\zeta(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ strongly converges to $\bar{\zeta}$.
- (ii) $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to $\bar{\zeta} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(i)$.
- (iii) Suppose that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ strongly converges to a point $\zeta(i) \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to $\bar{\zeta} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(i)$.

Proof. First, we claim that

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}) \quad \|\zeta_k(i) - \zeta_{k+1}(i-1)\| \leq \|e_{i-1}\|. \quad (3.2)$$

In fact, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, if $k = 0$, then

$$\|\zeta_0(i) - \zeta_1(i-1)\| \stackrel{(3.1b)}{=} \|y_i - G_{0+i-1} \zeta_0(i-1)\| \quad (3.3a)$$

$$\stackrel{(3.1b)}{=} \|y_i - G_{i-1} y_{i-1}\| \quad (3.3b)$$

$$\stackrel{(3.1a)}{=} \|e_{i-1}\|; \quad (3.3c)$$

otherwise, by virtue of the nonexpansiveness of G_{k+i-1} in the first inequality below, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\zeta_k(i) - \zeta_{k+1}(i-1)\| &\stackrel{(3.1b)}{=} \|G_{k-1+i} \zeta_{k-1}(i) - G_{k+i-1} \zeta_k(i-1)\| \\ &\leq \|\zeta_{k-1}(i) - \zeta_k(i-1)\| \\ &\leq \|\zeta_0(i) - \zeta_1(i-1)\| \quad (\text{by induction}) \\ &\stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \|e_{i-1}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we establish (3.2).

In view of (3.2), for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i - k - 1 \geq 0$,

$$\|y_i - \zeta_{k+1}(i-k-1)\| \stackrel{(3.1b)}{=} \|\zeta_0(i) - \zeta_{k+1}(i-k-1)\| \quad (3.4a)$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{t=0}^k (\zeta_t(i-t) - \zeta_{t+1}(i-t-1)) \right\| \quad (3.4b)$$

$$\leq \sum_{t=0}^k \|\zeta_t(i-t) - \zeta_{t+1}(i-t-1)\| \quad (3.4c)$$

$$\stackrel{(3.2)}{\leq} \sum_{t=0}^k \|e_{i-t-1}\| = \sum_{j=i-k-1}^{i-1} \|e_j\|. \quad (3.4d)$$

For every $i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, substitute i in (3.4) by $i+k$ to derive that

$$\|y_{i+k} - \zeta_{k+1}(i-1)\| \leq \sum_{j=i-1}^{i+k-1} \|e_j\|. \quad (3.5)$$

(i): As a consequence of (3.2), for all i, p , and k in \mathbb{N} with $k \geq p$,

$$\|\zeta_{k-p}(i+p) - \zeta_k(i)\| = \left\| \sum_{t=1}^p (\zeta_{k-t}(i+t) - \zeta_{k-t+1}(i+t-1)) \right\| \quad (3.6a)$$

$$\leq \sum_{t=1}^p \|\zeta_{k-t}(i+t) - \zeta_{k-t+1}(i+t-1)\| \quad (3.6b)$$

$$\stackrel{(3.2)}{\leq} \sum_{t=1}^p \|e_{i+t-1}\| = \sum_{j=i}^{i+p-1} \|e_j\|. \quad (3.6c)$$

According to the assumption that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to a point $\zeta(i) \in \mathcal{H}$, we observe that

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N})(\forall p \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \zeta_{k-p}(i+p) - \zeta_k(i) \rightharpoonup \zeta(i+p) - \zeta(i) \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.7)$$

Combine [1, Lemma 2.42] with (3.7) and (3.6) to deduce that

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N})(\forall p \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|\zeta(i+p) - \zeta(i)\| \stackrel{(3.7)}{\leq} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\zeta_{k-p}(i+p) - \zeta_k(i)\| \stackrel{(3.6)}{\leq} \sum_{j=i}^{i+p-1} \|e_j\|. \quad (3.8)$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Because $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \|e_i\| < \infty$, we know that there exists $I_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{i \geq I_0} \|e_i\| < \epsilon. \quad (3.9)$$

Combine (3.8) and (3.9) to obtain that

$$(\forall i \geq I_0)(\forall p \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|\zeta(i+p) - \zeta(i)\| \leq \sum_{j=i}^{i+p-1} \|e_j\| \leq \sum_{i \geq I_0} \|e_i\| < \epsilon,$$

which implies that $(\zeta(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Hence, there exists a point $\bar{\zeta} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $(\zeta(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ strongly converges to $\bar{\zeta}$.

(ii): Let $u \in \mathcal{H}$. Notice that for every $i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\langle y_{i+k} - \bar{\zeta}, u \rangle = \langle y_{i+k} - \zeta_{k+1}(i-1), u \rangle + \langle \zeta_{k+1}(i-1) - \zeta(i-1), u \rangle + \langle \zeta(i-1) - \bar{\zeta}, u \rangle. \quad (3.10)$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Assume that $u \neq 0$. Due to (i) above, there exists $I_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(\forall i \geq I_1) \quad \langle \zeta(i-1) - \bar{\zeta}, u \rangle < \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \quad (3.11)$$

Since $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|e_k\| < \infty$, we see that there exists $I_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{j \geq I_2-1} \|e_j\| < \frac{\epsilon}{3\|u\|}$. Combine this with (3.5) to get that every all $i \geq I_2$ and for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\langle y_{i+k} - \zeta_{k+1}(i-1), u \rangle \leq \|y_{i+k} - \zeta_{k+1}(i-1)\| \|u\| \leq \sum_{j=i-1}^{i+k-1} \|e_j\| \|u\| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \quad (3.12)$$

Set $I := \max\{I_1, I_2\}$. Inasmuch as for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to a point $\zeta(i) \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(\forall k \geq K) \quad \langle \zeta_{k+1}(I-1) - \zeta(I-1), u \rangle < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (3.13)$$

Taking (3.10), (3.11), (3.12), and (3.13) into account, we conclude that for every $n \geq I + K$,

$$\langle y_n - \bar{\zeta}, u \rangle = \langle y_{I+(n-I)} - \bar{\zeta}, u \rangle < \varepsilon. \quad (3.14)$$

If $u = 0$, then (3.14) holds trivially. Altogether, $y_n \rightharpoonup \bar{\zeta}$.

(iii): Let $i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Clearly, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$y_{i+k} - \bar{\zeta} = (y_{i+k} - \zeta_{k+1}(i-1)) + (\zeta_{k+1}(i-1) - \zeta(i-1)) + (\zeta(i-1) - \bar{\zeta}). \quad (3.15)$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Due to (i), there exists $J_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(\forall i \geq J_1) \quad \|\zeta(i-1) - \bar{\zeta}\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (3.16)$$

Based on (3.5) and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|e_k\| < \infty$, there exists $J_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(\forall i \geq J_2)(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|y_{i+k} - \zeta_{k+1}(i-1)\| \leq \sum_{j=i-1}^{i+k-1} \|e_j\| \leq \sum_{j \geq J_2-1} \|e_j\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (3.17)$$

Denote by $J := \max\{J_1, J_2\}$. Inasmuch as for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ strongly converges to $\zeta(i)$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(\forall k \geq N) \quad \|\zeta_{k+1}(J-1) - \zeta(J-1)\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (3.18)$$

Bearing (3.15), (3.16), (3.17), and (3.18) in mind, we obtain that

$$(\forall n \geq J + N) \quad \|y_n - \bar{\zeta}\| = \|y_{J+(n-J)} - \bar{\zeta}\| < \varepsilon,$$

which means that $y_n \rightarrow \bar{\zeta}$. ■

Theorem 3.2. Let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be nonexpansive and let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) F_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. Let $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in \mathcal{H} such that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|e_k\| < \infty$. Define

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = F_k x_k + e_k \text{ and } x_0 \in \mathcal{H}; \quad (3.19a)$$

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \zeta_{k+1}(i) = G_{k+i} \zeta_k(i) \text{ and } \zeta_0(i) = x_i. \quad (3.19b)$$

Then the following statements hold.

- (i) Suppose that $\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } G_k \neq \emptyset$. Let $\bar{x} \in \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } G_k$ and let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \gamma_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_k < \infty$. Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|F_k \bar{x} - G_k \bar{x}\| < \infty$ and that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) F_k$ is $(1 + \gamma_k)$ -Lipschitz continuous, i.e.,

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall x \in \mathcal{H})(\forall y \in \mathcal{H}) \quad \|F_k x - F_k y\| \leq (1 + \gamma_k) \|x - y\|. \quad (3.20)$$

Then $(\|x_k - \bar{x}\|)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a point in \mathbb{R}_+ and $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded.

- (ii) Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|F_k x_k - G_k x_k\| < \infty$ and that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to a point $\zeta(i) \in \mathcal{H}$. Then the following hold.

- (a) There exists a point $\bar{\zeta} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $(\zeta(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ strongly converges to $\bar{\zeta}$.

(b) $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to $\bar{\zeta} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(i)$.

(c) Suppose further that $(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) (\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to a point $\zeta(i) \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to $\bar{\zeta} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(i)$.

Proof. (i): Employing $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \bar{x} = G_k \bar{x}$ in the first inequality below, we observe that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|x_{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \stackrel{(3.19a)}{=} \|F_k x_k + e_k - \bar{x}\| \quad (3.21a)$$

$$\leq \|F_k x_k - F_k \bar{x}\| + \|F_k \bar{x} - G_k \bar{x}\| + \|e_k\| \quad (3.21b)$$

$$\stackrel{(3.20)}{\leq} (1 + \gamma_k) \|x_k - \bar{x}\| + \|F_k \bar{x} - G_k \bar{x}\| + \|e_k\|. \quad (3.21c)$$

Combine the assumptions, $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_k < \infty$ and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (\|F_k \bar{x} - G_k \bar{x}\| + \|e_k\|) < \infty$, with [Fact 2.1](#) and [\(3.21\)](#) to obtain the convergence of $(\|x_k - \bar{x}\|)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, which forces the boundedness of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

(ii): Set $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \tilde{e}_k := F_k x_k - G_k x_k + e_k$. Then [\(3.19a\)](#) becomes $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = G_k x_k + F_k x_k - G_k x_k + e_k = G_k x_k + \tilde{e}_k. \quad (3.22)$$

By assumptions,

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|\tilde{e}_k\| = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|F_k x_k - G_k x_k + e_k\| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|F_k x_k - G_k x_k\| + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|e_k\| < \infty. \quad (3.23)$$

Hence, bearing [\(3.22\)](#) and [\(3.23\)](#) in mind and applying [Lemma 3.1](#) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) y_k = x_k$ and $e_k = \tilde{e}_k$, we obtain all required results in (ii). \blacksquare

Remark 3.3. (i) [[11](#), Proposition 2.1] proved that under a topology weaker than the norm topology in Banach spaces, the convergence of translated basic methods ensures the convergence of the perturbed method.

[Theorem 3.2](#) specifies the context of [[11](#), Proposition 2.1] to the weak and norm topologies in Hilbert spaces and affirm that the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of translated basic methods necessitates the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of the associated method with both approximation and perturbation. In addition, in [Theorem 3.2\(ii\)](#), we get rid of extra assumptions in [[11](#), Proposition 2.1] and keep only necessary ones for deducing the required convergence, which will facilitate future applications.

(ii) The main idea of the proof of [Theorem 3.2\(ii\)](#) is essentially from the proof of [[11](#), Proposition 2.1]. Note that this idea is also used in the proof of [[12](#), Theorem 4] to prove the weak convergence of non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann Iterations.

In fact, if we consider [[11](#), Proposition 2.1] only for weak and norm topologies in Hilbert spaces, then it reduces to [Corollary 3.4](#) below.

Corollary 3.4. Let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \gamma_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_k < \infty$. Let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be nonexpansive and let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) F_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be $(1 + \gamma_k)$ -Lipschitz continuous. Define

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = F_k x_k \text{ and } x_0 \in \mathcal{H}; \quad (3.24a)$$

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N})(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \zeta_{k+1}(i) = G_{k+i} \zeta_k(i) \text{ and } \zeta_0(i) = x_i. \quad (3.24b)$$

Suppose that $\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } G_k \neq \emptyset$, that

$$(\forall \rho > 0) \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\|x\| \leq \rho} \|F_k x - G_k x\| < \infty, \quad (3.25)$$

and that $(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) (\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly (resp. strongly) to a point $\zeta(i) \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly (resp. strongly).

Proof. Let $\bar{x} \in \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } G_k$. It is clear that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|F_k \bar{x} - G_k \bar{x}\| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\|x\| \leq \|\bar{x}\|} \|F_k x - G_k x\| < \infty. \quad (3.25)$$

Hence, combine assumptions above with [Theorem 3.2\(i\)](#) to deduce that there exists $\bar{\rho} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \|x_k\| \leq \bar{\rho}$. Furthermore, we observe that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|F_k x_k - G_k x_k\| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\|x\| \leq \bar{\rho}} \|F_k x - G_k x\| < \infty. \quad (3.25)$$

Therefore, due to [Theorem 3.2\(ii\)](#), we obtain the required convergence of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. \blacksquare

To end this section, we show the following easy but powerful result. In particular, [Corollary 3.5](#) illustrates that the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of the translated basic methods implies the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of the associated approximate method.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be nonexpansive and let $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in \mathcal{H} such that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|e_k\| < \infty$. Define*

$$\begin{aligned} (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} &= G_k x_k + e_k \text{ and } x_0 \in \mathcal{H}; \\ (\forall k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \zeta_{k+1}(i) &= G_{k+i} \zeta_k(i) \text{ and } \zeta_0(i) = x_i. \end{aligned}$$

Let C be a nonempty closed subset of \mathcal{H} . Suppose that $(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) (\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly (resp. converges strongly) to a point in C . Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly (resp. converges strongly) to a point in C .

Proof. It is trivial that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|G_k x_k - G_k x_k\| = 0 < \infty$. Therefore, it is not difficult to derive the required results by applying [Theorem 3.2\(ii\)](#) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) F_k = G_k$.

Alternatively, we can also get the required result directly from [Lemma 3.1](#). \blacksquare

4 Convergence of Relaxation Variants of Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann Iterations

[Fact 4.1](#) shows the weak convergence of the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations. Note that although in [\[1, Proposition 5.16\]](#), α is in $]0, 1[$, based on [\[1, Theorem 5.15\]](#) and the proof of [\[1, Proposition 5.16\]](#), there is little difficulty to extend the range of α to $]0, 1]$.

Fact 4.1. [\[1, Proposition 5.16\]](#) *Let $\alpha \in]0, 1]$, let $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be an α -averaged operator such that $\text{Fix } T \neq \emptyset$, let $(\lambda_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $[0, \frac{1}{\alpha}]$ such that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (1 - \alpha \lambda_k) = \infty$, and let $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$. Set*

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = x_k + \lambda_k (Tx_k - x_k).$$

Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to a point in $\text{Fix } T$.

Denote by $\ell_+^1 := \{(\alpha_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} : \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_k < \infty \text{ and } (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \alpha_k \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$.

Definition 4.2. [\[1, Definitions 5.1 and 5.32\]](#) *Let C be a nonempty subset of \mathcal{H} and let $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in \mathcal{H} . Then*

(i) $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Fejér monotone with respect to C if

$$(\forall x \in C)(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|x_{k+1} - x\| \leq \|x_k - x\|.$$

(ii) $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is quasi-Fejér monotone with respect to C if

$$(\forall x \in C) \left(\exists (\varepsilon_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_+^1 \right) (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|x_{k+1} - x\|^2 \leq \|x_k - x\|^2 + \varepsilon_k.$$

4.1 Inexact non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations

In this subsection, we provide some properties of the inexact non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations.

Theorem 4.3 is inspired by [1, Theorem 5.15 and Proposition 5.34]. In particular, **Theorem 4.3(ii)(a)** generalizes [1, Proposition 5.34(i)] by replacing the nonexpansive operator T therein with a sequence of averaged operators $(T_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$; moreover, **Theorem 4.3(ii)(c)** extends [1, Theorem 5.15(ii)] from the exact Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations to inexact non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in $]0, 1]$, let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in \left[0, \frac{1}{\alpha_k}\right]$, and let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) T_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be α_k -averaged. Let x_0 be in \mathcal{H} . Define*

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = (1 - \lambda_k)x_k + \lambda_k T_k x_k + \eta_k e_k.$$

Suppose that $\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } T_k \neq \emptyset$. Then the following statements hold.

(i) $(\forall \bar{x} \in \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } T_k) (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \|x_{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x_0 - \bar{x}\| + \sum_{i=0}^k \eta_i \|e_i\|.$

(ii) Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$. Then the following hold.

(a) $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is quasi-Fejér monotone with respect to $\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } T_k$.

(b) $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_k} - \lambda_k\right) \|x_k - T_k x_k\|^2 < \infty.$

(c) Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_k} - \lambda_k\right) = \infty$. Then $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_k - T_k x_k\| = 0$.

(d) Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_k} - \lambda_k\right) = \infty$ and that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_k - T_k x_k\|$ exists (e.g., $(\|x_k - T_k x_k\|)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is decreasing). Then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_k - T_k x_k\| = 0$.

(e) Suppose that $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_k} - \lambda_k\right) > 0$ (e.g., $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k > 0$ and $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k < \frac{1}{\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k} < \infty$). Then $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_k - T_k x_k\|^2 < \infty$. Consequently, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_k - T_k x_k\| = 0$.

Proof. Let $\bar{x} \in \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } T_k$. Set

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad y_k := (1 - \lambda_k)x_k + \lambda_k T_k x_k \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_k := \eta_k \|e_k\| (2 \|y_k - \bar{x}\| + \eta_k \|e_k\|). \quad (4.1)$$

For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, apply **Proposition 2.7(ii)&(iii)** with $x = x_k$, $y_x = y_k$, $z_x = x_{k+1}$, $T = T_k$, $\alpha = \alpha_k$, $\lambda = \lambda_k$, $\eta = \eta_k$, and $e = e_k$ to derive that

$$\|y_k - \bar{x}\|^2 \leq \|x_k - \bar{x}\|^2 - \lambda_k \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_k} - \lambda_k\right) \|x_k - T_k x_k\|^2; \quad (4.2a)$$

$$\|x_{k+1} - \bar{x}\|^2 \leq \|x_k - \bar{x}\|^2 - \lambda_k \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_k} - \lambda_k\right) \|x_k - T_k x_k\|^2 + \varepsilon_k; \quad (4.2b)$$

$$\|x_{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \leq \|y_k - \bar{x}\| + \eta_k \|e_k\| \leq \|x_k - \bar{x}\| + \eta_k \|e_k\|. \quad (4.2c)$$

(i): This is clear from (4.2c) by induction.

(ii): Bearing (4.2c) and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$ in mind and applying **Fact 2.1** with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \alpha_k = \|x_k - \bar{x}\|$, $\beta_k = \gamma_k \equiv 0$, and $\varepsilon_k = \eta_k \|e_k\|$, we know that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_k - \bar{x}\|$ exists in \mathbb{R}_+ . This together with the assumption that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$ entails that

$$M_1 := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_k - \bar{x}\| < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty. \quad (4.3)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \varepsilon_k &\stackrel{(4.1)}{=} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| (2 \|y_k - \bar{x}\| + \eta_k \|e_k\|) \\
&\stackrel{(4.2a)}{\leq} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| (2 \|x_k - \bar{x}\| + \eta_k \|e_k\|) \\
&\stackrel{(4.3)}{\leq} (2M_1 + M_2) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

which, combining with (4.2b), Definition 4.2(ii), and Fact 2.1, guarantees the results in (ii)(a) and (ii)(b) hold.

(ii)(c) and (ii)(e) are immediate from (ii)(b) above. Moreover, (ii)(d) is clear from (ii)(c) above.

Altogether, the proof is complete. \blacksquare

Corollary 4.4. *Let $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in $]0, 1]$, let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in [0, \frac{1}{\alpha_k}]$, and let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) T_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be α_k -averaged. Let x_0 be in \mathcal{H} . Define*

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = (1 - \lambda_k)x_k + \lambda_k T_k x_k + \eta_k e_k.$$

Suppose that $C := \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } T_k \neq \emptyset$ and that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$. Then the following statements hold.

- (i) For every $\bar{x} \in C$, $(\|x_k - \bar{x}\|)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges.
- (ii) $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded.
- (iii) $(d(x_k, C))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges.
- (iv) $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to a point in C if and only if $\Omega((x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}) \subseteq C$.

Proof. The required results follow directly from [1, Theorem 5.33] and Theorem 4.3(ii)(a). \blacksquare

4.2 Convergence of inexact Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations

In Proposition 4.5 below, we invoke Corollary 3.5 and extend the weak convergence of the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations from its exact version to its inexact version.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\alpha \in]0, 1]$, let $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be an α -averaged operator such that $\text{Fix } T \neq \emptyset$, and let $(\lambda_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $]0, \frac{1}{\alpha}]$ such that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (1 - \alpha \lambda_k) = \infty$. Let $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in \mathcal{H} and let $(\eta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in \mathbb{R}_+ with $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$. Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$. Set*

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = x_k + \lambda_k (Tx_k - x_k) + \eta_k e_k. \tag{4.4}$$

Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to a point in $\text{Fix } T$.

Proof. Define

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad G_k := (1 - \lambda_k) \text{Id} + \lambda_k T.$$

Then (4.4) becomes

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = G_k x_k + \eta_k e_k. \tag{4.5}$$

Because $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is α -averaged and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in]0, \frac{1}{\alpha}]$, we know, by Fact 2.6, that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k$ is $\lambda_k \alpha$ -averaged, which implies that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k$ is nonexpansive. Because $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \neq 0$, it is easy

to see that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \text{Fix } G_k = \text{Fix } T$, which, combined with [Fact 2.3](#), entails that $\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } G_k = \text{Fix } T$ is nonempty and closed.

Notice that

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (1 - \alpha \lambda_k) = \infty \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_{k+i} (1 - \alpha \lambda_{k+i}) = \infty.$$

Set

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N})(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \zeta_{k+1}(i) = G_{k+i} \zeta_k(i) \text{ and } \zeta_0(i) = x_i. \quad (4.6)$$

Hence, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, applying [Fact 4.1](#) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) x_k = \zeta_k(i)$ and $\lambda_k = \lambda_{k+i}$, we have that

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \zeta_k(i) \rightharpoonup \zeta(i) \in \text{Fix } T. \quad (4.7)$$

Therefore, bearing [\(4.5\)](#), [\(4.6\)](#), and [\(4.7\)](#) in mind and applying [Corollary 3.5](#) with $C = \text{Fix } T$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) e_k = \eta_k e_k$, we obtain the required weak convergence of the sequence $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. \blacksquare

Remark 4.6. [Proposition 4.5](#) reduces to [[1](#), Proposition 5.34(iii)] if $\alpha = 1$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \eta_k \equiv \lambda_k$ although the proof of [Proposition 4.5](#) has nothing to do with that of [[1](#), Proposition 5.34].

4.3 Convergence of inexact non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations

In this subsection, we show the weak and strong convergence of the inexact version of the non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations.

In the following result, we deduce the weak convergence of the inexact non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations from the weak convergence of the exact Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\alpha \in]0, 1]$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in]0, \frac{1}{\alpha}]$, let $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be α -averaged with $\text{Fix } T \neq \emptyset$, and let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) T_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. Let $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in \mathcal{H} and let $(\eta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in \mathbb{R}_+ such that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$. Let x_0 be in \mathcal{H} . Define*

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = (1 - \lambda_k)x_k + \lambda_k T_k x_k + \eta_k e_k. \quad (4.8)$$

Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k \|T_k x_k - T x_k\| < \infty$. Then the following statements hold.

(i) Define

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N})(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \zeta_{k+1}(i) = (1 - \lambda_{k+i})\zeta_k(i) + \lambda_{k+i} T \zeta_k(i) \text{ and } \zeta_0(i) = x_i. \quad (4.9)$$

Suppose that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to a point $\zeta(i) \in \mathcal{H}$. Then the following hold.

(a) There exists a point $\bar{\zeta} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $(\zeta(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ strongly converges to $\bar{\zeta}$.

(b) $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to $\bar{\zeta} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(i)$.

(c) Suppose further that $(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) (\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to a point $\zeta(i) \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to $\bar{\zeta} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(i)$.

(ii) Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (\frac{1}{\alpha} - \lambda_k) = \infty$. Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to a point \bar{x} in $\text{Fix } T$.

Proof. (i): Define

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad F_k := (1 - \lambda_k) \text{Id} + \lambda_k T_k \text{ and } G_k := (1 - \lambda_k) \text{Id} + \lambda_k T. \quad (4.10)$$

Inasmuch as $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is α -averaged and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in]0, \frac{1}{\alpha}]$, via [Fact 2.6](#), we know that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k$ is nonexpansive. According to the construction of the operators $(G_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(F_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in [\(4.10\)](#), we observe that [\(4.8\)](#) and [\(4.9\)](#) become, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} &= F_k x_k + \eta_k e_k; \\ (\forall i \in \mathbb{N})(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \zeta_{k+1}(i) &= G_{k+i} \zeta_k(i) \text{ and } \zeta_0(i) = x_i. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, applying [\(4.10\)](#) again, we see that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|F_k x_k - G_k x_k\| < \infty \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k \|T_k x_k - T x_k\| < \infty.$$

Hence, [\(i\)](#) is clear from [Theorem 3.2\(ii\)](#).

[\(ii\)](#): Note that

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \lambda_k \right) = \infty \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_{k+i} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \lambda_{k+i} \right) = \infty.$$

For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, applying [Fact 4.1](#) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) x_k = \zeta_k(i)$ and $\lambda_k = \lambda_{k+i}$, we establish that $(\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to a point $\zeta(i) \in \text{Fix } T$.

Furthermore, bearing [Fact 2.3](#) and [\(i\)\(a\)](#) in mind, we know that the limit $\bar{\zeta}$ of $(\zeta(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ must be in $\text{Fix } T$ as well. Therefore, we obtain the required weak convergence of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ by [\(i\)\(b\)](#) above. \blacksquare

Remark 4.8. [Theorem 4.7\(ii\)](#) generalizes [[12](#), Theorem 4] from the following aspects.

- The nonexpansive operator T in [[12](#), Theorem 4] is extended to the α -averaged operator T with $\alpha \in]0, 1]$ in [Theorem 4.7\(ii\)](#) (notice that 1-averaged operator is nonexpansive).
- The assumption $\inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (1 - \lambda_k) > 0$ in [[12](#), Theorem 4] is replaced by a more general assumption $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \lambda_k \right) = \infty$.
- The corresponding assumptions that

$$(\forall \rho \in \mathbb{R}_+) \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\|x\| \leq \rho} \lambda_k \|T_k x - T x\| < \infty$$

and that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) F_k$ is $(1 + \gamma_k)$ -Lipschitz continuous, where $(\gamma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is in \mathbb{R}_+ such that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_k < \infty$, in [[12](#), Theorem 4] are simplified as $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_{k+1} \|T_{k+1} x_k - T x_k\| < \infty$ in [Theorem 4.7\(ii\)](#).

To show a strong convergence of the inexact non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations in [Theorem 4.11](#) below, we first deduce the following result on the exact non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) T_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be α_k -averaged with $\alpha_k \in]0, 1]$ and $C := \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } T_k \neq \emptyset$. Let $\bar{x} \in \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } T_k$, let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in]0, \frac{1}{\alpha_k}]$, and let x_0 be in \mathcal{H} . Define*

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = (1 - \lambda_k) x_k + \lambda_k T_k x_k.$$

Then the following statements hold.

[\(i\)](#) $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Fejér monotone with respect to C .

[\(ii\)](#) Suppose that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \text{Id} - T_k$ is metrically subregular at \bar{x} for $0 = (\text{Id} - T_k) \bar{x}$, i.e., for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(\exists \gamma_k > 0) (\exists \delta_k > 0) (\forall x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta_k]) \quad d \left(x, (\text{Id} - T_k)^{-1} 0 \right) \leq \gamma_k \|x - T_k x\|.$$

Suppose that $\delta := \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_k > 0$ and $x_0 \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]$. Define $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \rho_k := \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_k (1 - \lambda_k \alpha_k)}{\alpha_k \gamma_k^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then the following hold.

- (a) $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) x_k \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]$ and $d(x_{k+1}, \text{Fix } T_k) \leq \rho_k d(x_k, \text{Fix } T_k)$.
- (b) Suppose that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \text{Fix } T_k = C$ and that $0 < \underline{\lambda} := \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k \leq \bar{\lambda} := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k < \frac{1}{\alpha}$ where $\alpha := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k > 0$ and $\gamma := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_k < \infty$. Define $\rho := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho_k$. Then the following hold.

$$i. 0 \leq \rho \leq \left(1 - \frac{\underline{\lambda}(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \bar{\lambda})}{\gamma^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{\underline{\lambda}(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \bar{\lambda})}{\gamma^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} < 1.$$

- ii. There exist $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu \in]\rho, 1[$ such that for every $k \geq K$, $d(x_{k+1}, C) \leq \mu d(x_k, C)$.
- iii. There exist $\hat{x} \in C$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mu \in]\rho, 1[$ such that for every $k \geq K$,

$$(\forall k \geq K) \quad \|x_k - \hat{x}\| \leq 2\mu^{k-K} d(x_K, C). \quad (4.11)$$

Consequently, $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges R -linearly to a point $\hat{x} \in C$. In particular, if C is affine, then $\hat{x} = P_C x_0$.

Proof. (i): According to [Definition 4.2\(i\)](#), applying [Theorem 4.3\(i\)](#) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) e_k \equiv 0$ and $\eta_k \equiv 0$, we obtain the required Fejér monotonicity.

(ii)(a): Using (i) above and invoking the assumption, $x_0 \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]$, we establish by induction that

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|x_{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x_k - \bar{x}\| \leq \dots \leq \|x_0 - \bar{x}\| \leq \delta.$$

Hence, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the inequality $d(x_{k+1}, \text{Fix } T_k) \leq \rho_k d(x_k, \text{Fix } T_k)$ follows directly from [Proposition 2.18\(ii\)\(b\)](#) with replacing $x = x_k$, $\alpha = \alpha_k$, $\lambda = \lambda_k$, $T = T_k$, $\text{Fix } T = \text{Fix } T_k$, and $F_\lambda x = x_{k+1}$.

(ii)(b): It is easy to deduce (ii)(b)i. by our assumptions and [Proposition 2.18\(ii\)\(a\)](#).

The result in (ii)(b)ii. is immediate from (ii)(a) above.

As a consequence of [Fact 2.3](#), we know that C is nonempty closed and convex. Taking (i), (ii)(b)ii., and [\[1, Theorem 5.12\]](#) into account, we easily obtain (4.11) which implies the desired R -linear convergence of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

In addition, if C is affine, then, via the convergence of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ proved above and [\[1, Proposition 5.9\(ii\)\]](#), we obtain $\hat{x} = P_C x_0$.

Altogether, the proof is complete. ■

Remark 4.10. [Theorem 4.9](#) generalizes [\[2, Corollary 5.4\]](#) from the following two aspects.

- We extend [\[2, Corollary 5.4\]](#) from boundedly linearly regularity to metrically subregularity.
- The operator T in [\[2, Corollary 5.4\]](#) is replaced by the affine combination $(1 - \lambda_k) \text{Id} + \lambda_k T_k$ in [Theorem 4.9](#) which reduces to T when $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1$ and $T_k \equiv T$.

Applying [Corollary 3.5](#) and the convergence of the exact version of the non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations presented in [Theorem 4.9](#), we obtain the strong convergence of the inexact version of the non-stationary Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations in [Theorem 4.11](#) below.

Theorem 4.11. Let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) T_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be α_k -averaged with $\alpha_k \in]0, 1]$ and $C := \text{Fix } T_k \neq \emptyset$. Let $\bar{x} \in C$ and let $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in \left]0, \frac{1}{\alpha_k}\right[$. Suppose that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \text{Id} - T_k$ is metrically subregular at \bar{x} for $0 = (\text{Id} - T_k) \bar{x}$, i.e., for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(\exists \gamma_k > 0) (\exists \delta_k > 0) (\forall x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta_k]) \quad d\left(x, (\text{Id} - T_k)^{-1} 0\right) \leq \gamma_k \|x - T_k x\|.$$

Suppose that $\delta := \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_k > 0$ and that $\epsilon := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \delta$. Suppose that $0 < \underline{\lambda} := \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k \leq \bar{\lambda} := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k < \frac{1}{\alpha}$ where $\alpha := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k > 0$ and $\gamma := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_k < \infty$.

Let $\hat{\delta} \in]0, \delta - \epsilon]$ and let $x_0 \in B[\bar{x}; \hat{\delta}]$. Define

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = (1 - \lambda_k) x_k + \lambda_k T_k x_k + \eta_k e_k. \quad (4.12)$$

Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to a point in C . In particular, if C is affine, then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to $P_C x_0$.

Proof. Define

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad G_k := (1 - \lambda_k) \text{Id} + \lambda_k T_k. \quad (4.13)$$

Then (4.12) becomes

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = G_k x_k + \eta_k e_k. \quad (4.14)$$

Inasmuch as $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) T_k : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is α_k -averaged and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in]0, \frac{1}{\alpha_k}]$, we know, by [Fact 2.6](#), that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k$ is $\lambda_k \alpha_k$ -averaged, which implies that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k$ is nonexpansive.

Because $x_0 \in B[\bar{x}; \hat{\delta}]$ and $\bar{x} \in C = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } T_k$, due to [Theorem 4.3\(i\)](#), we observe that

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|x_{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x_0 - \bar{x}\| + \sum_{i=0}^k \eta_i \|e_i\| \leq \hat{\delta} + \epsilon \leq \delta. \quad (4.15)$$

Define

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N})(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \xi_{k+1}(i) = G_{k+i} \xi_k(i) \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_0(i) = x_i. \quad (4.16)$$

In view of (4.15), we know that $(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) \xi_0(i) \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]$. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, applying [Theorem 4.9\(ii\)\(b\)](#) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) x_k = \xi_k(i)$, $T_k = T_{k+i}$, and $\lambda_k = \lambda_{k+i}$, we obtain that the sequence $(\xi_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to a point in C . In addition, as a result of [Fact 2.3](#) and (4.13), $C = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } G_k$ is nonempty and closed.

Therefore, invoking the strong convergence of $(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) (\xi_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, taking (4.14) and (4.16) into account, and employing [Corollary 3.5](#), we obtained that $x_k \rightarrow \hat{x} \in C$. If C is affine, then, the convergence of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and [\[1, Proposition 5.9\(ii\)\]](#) lead to $\hat{x} = P_C x_0$. \blacksquare

5 Convergence of Generalized Proximal Point Algorithms

Throughout this section, $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ is maximally monotone with $\text{zer } A \neq \emptyset$ and

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = (1 - \lambda_k) x_k + \lambda_k J_{c_k A} x_k + \eta_k e_k, \quad (5.1)$$

where $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ is the *initial point* and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in [0, 2]$ and $\eta_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ are the *relaxation coefficients*, $c_k \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is the *regularization coefficient*, and $e_k \in \mathcal{H}$ is the *error term*.

Generalized proximal point algorithms generate the iteration sequence by conforming to the scheme (5.1). The classic proximal point algorithm generates the iteration sequence by following (5.1) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1$, $e_k \equiv 0$, and $\eta_k \equiv 0$. In this section, we investigate the weak and strong convergence of generalized proximal point algorithms for solving the monotone inclusion problem, i.e., finding a point in $\text{zer } A$.

5.1 Iteration sequences generated by generalized proximal point algorithms

In this subsection, we provide some properties of the iteration sequences generalized by (5.1).

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\bar{x} \in \text{zer } A$. Set*

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad y_k = (1 - \lambda_k) x_k + \lambda_k J_{c_k A} x_k \text{ and } \varepsilon_k = \eta_k \|e_k\| (2 \|y_k - \bar{x}\| + \eta_k \|e_k\|).$$

Then the following hold.

- (i) $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|y_k - \bar{x}\|^2 \leq \|x_k - \bar{x}\|^2 - \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) \|x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k\|^2.$
- (ii) $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|x_{k+1} - \bar{x}\|^2 \leq \|x_k - \bar{x}\|^2 - \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) \|x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k\|^2 + \varepsilon_k.$
- (iii) *Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$. Then the following hold.*
 - (a) $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \varepsilon_k = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| (2 \|y_k - \bar{x}\| + \eta_k \|e_k\|) < \infty$
 - (b) $(\forall \bar{x} \in \text{zer } A) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_k - \bar{x}\|$ exists.
 - (c) $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) \|x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k\|^2 < \infty.$
- (iv) *Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) = \infty$. Suppose that $c := \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k > 0$ or that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1$. Then $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) = \infty$.*
- (v) *Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$ and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) = \infty$. Suppose that $\inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k > 0$ or that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1$. Then $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{c_k} (x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k) \right\| = 0$.*

Proof. (i)&(ii): For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, applying Lemma 2.12 with $x = x_k, y_x = y_k, z_x = x_{k+1}, \lambda = \lambda_k, \gamma = c_k, \eta = \eta_k$, and $e = e_k$, we deduce the required inequalities in (i) and (ii).

(iii): Because $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$, due to [16, Proposition 3.3(ii)], we know that $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. This connected with $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$ and (i) above implies that $(2 \|y_k - \bar{x}\| + \eta_k \|e_k\|)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. Hence, it is easy to see that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \varepsilon_k = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| (2 \|y_k - \bar{x}\| + \eta_k \|e_k\|) < \infty$, which, combined with Fact 2.1 and (ii) above, entails that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_k - \bar{x}\|$ exists and that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) \|x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k\|^2 < \infty$.

(iv): If $c = \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k > 0$, then $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) \geq c^2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) = \infty$. If $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1$, then $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty$.

(v): Because $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$, via (iii)(c) above, we observe that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) c_k^2 \left\| \frac{1}{c_k} (x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k) \right\|^2 < \infty,$$

which, connected with (iv), yields that $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{c_k} (x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k) \right\| = 0$. ■

Note that the assumption $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) c_{k+1} \geq c_k$ in Lemma 5.2 below also appears in the seminal work [18, Theorem 2] although a weaker requirement works therein.

Lemma 5.2. *Define $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) R_k := 2J_{c_k A} - \text{Id}$. Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (i) $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \frac{1}{2} \|R_{k+1} x_k - R_k x_k\| \leq \left| 1 - \frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k} \right| \|x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k\|.$
- (ii) $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \left\| x_{k+1} - J_{c_{k+1} A} x_{k+1} \right\| \leq \left(1 + \left| 1 - \frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k} \right| \right) \|x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k\| + \eta_k \|e_k\|.$

(iii) Assume that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) c_{k+1} \geq c_k$. Then

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \frac{1}{c_{k+1}} \left\| x_{k+1} - J_{c_{k+1}A} x_{k+1} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{c_k} \left\| x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k \right\| + \frac{\eta_k}{c_{k+1}} \|e_k\|.$$

(iv) Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) = \infty$ and that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) c_{k+1} \geq c_k$. Then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{c_k} (x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k) = 0$.

Proof. Because A is maximally monotone, via [Fact 2.10](#) and [[1](#), Propositions 4.4 and 20.22], we know that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) R_k$ is nonexpansive. Clearly, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$R_k - \text{Id} = 2 (J_{c_k A} - \text{Id}) \Leftrightarrow J_{c_k A} - \text{Id} = \frac{1}{2} (R_k - \text{Id}); \quad (5.2a)$$

$$R_{k+1} - R_k = 2 (J_{c_{k+1} A} - J_{c_k A}). \quad (5.2b)$$

Combine [\(5.1\)](#) and [\(5.2a\)](#) to derive that

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = x_k + \lambda_k (J_{c_k A} x_k - x_k) + \eta_k e_k = x_k + \frac{\lambda_k}{2} (R_k x_k - x_k) + \eta_k e_k,$$

which follows immediately by

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} - R_k x_k = \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_k}{2}\right) (x_k - R_k x_k) + \eta_k e_k. \quad (5.3)$$

(i): For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, applying [Corollary 2.14\(ii\)](#) in the second equality and employing the nonexpansiveness of $J_{c_{k+1} A}$ in the inequality below, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \|R_{k+1} x_k - R_k x_k\| &\stackrel{(5.2b)}{=} \left\| J_{c_{k+1} A} x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k \right\| \\ &= \left\| J_{c_{k+1} A} x_k - J_{c_{k+1} A} \left(\frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k} x_k + \left(1 - \frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k}\right) J_{c_k A} x_k \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \left| 1 - \frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k} \right| \left\| x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

which follows directly by (i).

(ii): Now, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by virtue of the nonexpansiveness of R_k in the second inequality below,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| x_{k+1} - J_{c_{k+1} A} x_{k+1} \right\| &\stackrel{(5.2a)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \|R_{k+1} x_{k+1} - x_{k+1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|R_{k+1} x_{k+1} - R_{k+1} x_k\| + \frac{1}{2} \|R_{k+1} x_k - R_k x_k\| + \frac{1}{2} \|R_k x_k - x_{k+1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \frac{1}{2} \|R_{k+1} x_k - R_k x_k\| + \frac{1}{2} \|R_k x_k - x_{k+1}\| \\ &\stackrel{(5.3)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \frac{1}{2} \|R_{k+1} x_k - R_k x_k\| + \frac{1 - \frac{\lambda_k}{2}}{2} \|R_k x_k - x_k\| + \frac{1}{2} \eta_k \|e_k\| \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \left| 1 - \frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k} \right| \left\| x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k \right\| + \frac{1 - \frac{\lambda_k}{2}}{2} \|R_k x_k - x_k\| + \frac{1}{2} \eta_k \|e_k\| \\ &\stackrel{(5.2a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \left(\left| 1 - \frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k} \right| + 1 - \frac{\lambda_k}{2} \right) \left\| x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k \right\| + \frac{1}{2} \eta_k \|e_k\| \\ &\stackrel{(5.1)}{\leq} \frac{\lambda_k}{2} \left\| x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k \right\| + \left(\left| 1 - \frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k} \right| + 1 - \frac{\lambda_k}{2} \right) \left\| x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k \right\| + \eta_k \|e_k\| \\ &= \left(1 + \left| 1 - \frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k} \right| \right) \left\| x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k \right\| + \eta_k \|e_k\|, \end{aligned}$$

which follows immediately by the desired inequality in (ii).

(iii): In view of $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) c_{k+1} \geq c_k$, we establish that

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \left(1 + \left|1 - \frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k}\right|\right) = \frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k}.$$

Hence, the required inequality is immediate from (ii).

(iv): In view of $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) c_{k+1} \geq c_k \geq c_0 > 0$, we observe that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\eta_k}{c_{k+1}} \|e_k\| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\eta_k}{c_0} \|e_k\| < \infty.$$

Bearing (iii) in mind and applying Fact 2.1 with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \alpha_k = \frac{1}{c_k} \|x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k\|$, $\gamma_k = \beta_k \equiv 0$, and $\varepsilon_k = \frac{\eta_k}{c_{k+1}} \|e_k\|$, we know that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{c_k} \|x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k\|$ exists in \mathbb{R}_+ . Combine this with Lemma 5.1(v) to conclude that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{c_k} (x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k) = 0$. \blacksquare

5.2 Exact version of generalized proximal point algorithms

In this subsection, we consider the sequence generated by (5.1) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) e_k \equiv 0$ and $\eta_k \equiv 0$. In fact, we consider the convergence of the exact version of generalized proximal point algorithms.

Note that although in practice we normally can only get the inexact version of generalized proximal point algorithms, by invoking Corollary 3.5, the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of the translated exact version of generalized proximal point algorithms can be extended to the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of their inexact versions. We shall do this extension in the following subsection.

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) e_k \equiv 0$ and $\eta_k \equiv 0$ in (5.1). Then the following assertions hold.*

- (i) $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) d(0, A(J_{c_k A} x_k)) \leq \left\| \frac{1}{c_k} (J_{c_k A} x_k - x_k) \right\|.$
- (ii) *Suppose that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) c_{k+1} \geq c_k$ or that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1$. Then $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \frac{1}{c_{k+1}} \left\| J_{c_{k+1} A} x_{k+1} - x_{k+1} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{c_k} \left\| J_{c_k A} x_k - x_k \right\|.$*
- (iii) *Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) = \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) c_{k+1} \geq c_k$ or that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1$. Then $\frac{1}{c_k} (J_{c_k A} x_k - x_k) \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. (i): This follows directly from Corollary 2.14(i).

(ii): If $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) c_{k+1} \geq c_k$, applying Lemma 5.2(iii) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) e_k \equiv 0$ and $\eta_k \equiv 0$, we deduce $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \frac{1}{c_{k+1}} \left\| J_{c_{k+1} A} x_{k+1} - x_{k+1} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{c_k} \left\| J_{c_k A} x_k - x_k \right\|.$

If $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1$, then via [5, Lemma 2.1], we also obtain $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \frac{1}{c_{k+1}} \left\| J_{c_{k+1} A} x_{k+1} - x_{k+1} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{c_k} \left\| J_{c_k A} x_k - x_k \right\|.$

(iii): This is clear from (ii) above and Lemma 5.1(v). \blacksquare

Remark 5.4. Consider Proposition 5.3(iii) with the assumption that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1$. In view of (5.1), we observe that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) x_{k+1} = J_{c_k A} x_k$. Taking this and Proposition 5.3(i) into account, we conclude that Proposition 5.3(iii) with the assumption that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1$ implies [6, Proposition 2.1].

Note that it is possible that $c_k \rightarrow 0$ in Proposition 5.5 under the assumption of (A1) although $\inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k > 0$ is critical in many results on the convergence of generalized proximal point algorithms in the literature.

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) e_k \equiv 0$ and $\eta_k \equiv 0$ in (5.1) and that one of the following holds.*

(A1) $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1$.

(A2) $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) = \infty$, $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k < \infty$, and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) c_{k+1} \geq c_k$.

Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to a point in $\text{zer } A$.

Proof. Applying Lemma 5.1(iii)(b) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \eta_k \equiv 0$ and $e_k \equiv 0$, we deduce that

$$(\forall \bar{x} \in \text{zer } A) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_k - \bar{x}\| \text{ exists in } \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (5.4)$$

Combine Proposition 5.3(iii) with our assumption (A1) or (A2) to establish that $\frac{1}{c_k} (x_k - J_{c_k A} x_k) \rightarrow 0$, which, connected with Lemma 2.16, entails that

$$\Omega((x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}) \subseteq \text{zer } A. \quad (5.5)$$

Altogether, recall our assumption that $\text{zer } A \neq \emptyset$ and invoke (5.4), (5.5), and [1, Lemma 2.47] to reach the desired weak convergence of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. \blacksquare

The following result illustrates a R -linear convergence result of the exact version of generalized proximal point algorithms and will be used to prove the strong convergence of the inexact version of generalized proximal point algorithms in the next subsection.

Theorem 5.6. *Suppose that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) e_k \equiv 0$ and $\eta_k \equiv 0$ in (5.1). Suppose that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in]0, 2[$ and that $c := \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k > 0$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (i) $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Fejér monotone with respect to $\text{zer } A$.
- (ii) Let $\bar{x} \in \text{zer } A$. Suppose that A is metrically subregular at \bar{x} for $0 \in A\bar{x}$, i.e.,

$$(\exists \kappa > 0)(\exists \delta > 0)(\forall x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]) \quad d(x, A^{-1}0) \leq \kappa d(0, Ax). \quad (5.6)$$

Suppose that $x_0 \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]$. Define $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \gamma_k := 1 + \frac{\kappa}{c_k}$ and $\rho_k := \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_k(2-\lambda_k)}{\gamma_k^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then the following hold.

- (a) $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) x_k \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]$ and $d(x_{k+1}, \text{zer } A) \leq \rho_k d(x_k, \text{zer } A)$.
- (b) Suppose that $0 < \underline{\lambda} := \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k \leq \bar{\lambda} := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k < 2$. Define $\rho := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho_k$ and $\gamma := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_k$. Then the following hold.

$$i. \quad 0 \leq \rho \leq \left(1 - \frac{\underline{\lambda}(2-\bar{\lambda})}{\gamma^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{\underline{\lambda}(2-\bar{\lambda})}{\gamma^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} < 1.$$

- ii. There exist $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu \in]\rho, 1[$ such that $(\forall k \geq K) d(x_{k+1}, \text{zer } A) \leq \mu d(x_k, \text{zer } A)$.
- iii. There exist $\hat{x} \in \text{zer } A$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mu \in]\rho, 1[$ such that

$$(\forall k \geq K) \quad \|x_k - \hat{x}\| \leq 2\mu^{k-K} d(x_K, \text{zer } A).$$

Consequently, $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges R -linearly to a point $\hat{x} \in \text{zer } A$. In addition, if $\text{zer } A$ is affine, then $\hat{x} = P_{\text{zer } A} x_0$.

Proof. According to [Facts 2.10](#) and [2.11](#), $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) J_{c_k A}$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ -averaged operator and

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad (\text{Id} - J_{c_k A})^{-1} 0 = \text{Fix} J_{c_k A} = \text{zer } A.$$

(i): Apply [Theorem 4.9\(i\)](#) with $C = \text{zer } A$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) T_k = J_{c_k A}$ and $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{2}$ to deduce (i).

(ii): Invoking [\(5.6\)](#) and for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, applying [Lemma 2.19\(i\)](#) with $\gamma = c_k$, we know that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \text{Id} - J_{c_k A}$ is metrically subregular at \bar{x} for $0 = (\text{Id} - J_{c_k A}) \bar{x}$, that is,

$$(\forall x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]) \quad d\left(x, (\text{Id} - J_{c_k A})^{-1} 0\right) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{c_k}\right) \|x - J_{c_k A} x\|.$$

Notice that $\gamma = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_k \leq (1 + \frac{\kappa}{c}) < \infty$. Therefore, applying [Theorem 4.9\(ii\)](#) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) T_k = J_{c_k A}$, $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{2}$, $\text{Fix } T_k = \text{zer } A$, and $\delta_k = \delta$, we easily obtain the desired results in (ii). \blacksquare

5.3 Weak and strong convergence of generalized proximal point algorithms

Recall that $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ is maximally monotone with $\text{zer } A \neq \emptyset$ and that

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = (1 - \lambda_k) x_k + \lambda_k J_{c_k A} x_k + \eta_k e_k, \quad (5.7)$$

where $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in [0, 2]$, $c_k \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $\eta_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and $e_k \in \mathcal{H}$.

In this section, we consider the weak and strong convergence of the sequence generated by conforming to the iteration scheme [\(5.7\)](#) for solving monotone inclusion problems.

Let $c \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. It is clear that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \frac{c_k}{c} - 1 \right| < \infty \Rightarrow c_k \rightarrow c \Rightarrow \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k > 0.$$

Therefore, assumptions in [Theorem 5.7](#) actually implies the popular assumption $\inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k > 0$ for the convergence of generalized proximal point algorithms.

Theorem 5.7. *Suppose that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in]0, 2]$ and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$. Suppose that there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \frac{c_k}{c} - 1 \right| < \infty$ (e.g., $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) c_k \equiv c \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$). Then the following statements hold.*

(i) *Define*

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \xi_{k+1}(i) = ((1 - \lambda_{k+i}) \text{Id} + \lambda_{k+i} J_{c A}) \xi_k(i) \text{ and } \xi_0(i) = x_i.$$

Suppose that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\xi_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to a point $\xi(i) \in \mathcal{H}$. Then the following hold.

(a) *There exists a point $\bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $(\xi(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ strongly converges to $\bar{\xi}$.*

(b) *$(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to $\bar{\xi} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \xi(i)$.*

(c) *Suppose that $(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) (\xi_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to a point $\xi(i) \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to $\bar{\xi} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \xi(i)$.*

(ii) *Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) = \infty$. Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to a point in $\text{zer } A$.*

Proof. Define

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad G_k := (1 - \lambda_k) \text{Id} + \lambda_k J_{c A} \text{ and } F_k := (1 - \lambda_k) \text{Id} + \lambda_k J_{c_k A}.$$

In view of [Facts 2.5](#), [2.10](#) and [2.11](#), we know that $J_{c A}$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) J_{c_k A}$ are $\frac{1}{2}$ -averaged and that

$$\text{Fix } J_{c A} = \text{zer } A \neq \emptyset. \quad (5.8)$$

Moreover, via [Fact 2.6](#), we know that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k$ is nonexpansive.

Employing [Corollary 2.14\(ii\)](#) in the first equality and utilizing the nonexpansiveness of $J_{c_k A}$ in the inequality below, we observe that for every $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|J_{c_k A} x - J_{c A} x\| = \left\| J_{c_k A} x - J_{c_k A} \left(\frac{c_k}{c} x + \left(1 - \frac{c_k}{c} \right) J_{c A} x \right) \right\| \quad (5.9a)$$

$$\leq \left\| x - \frac{c_k}{c} x - \left(1 - \frac{c_k}{c} \right) J_{c A} x \right\| \quad (5.9b)$$

$$= \left| 1 - \frac{c_k}{c} \right| \|x - J_{c A} x\|. \quad (5.9c)$$

For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, applying [\(5.9\)](#) with $x = x_k$ and invoking [Lemma 2.15](#) in the first and second inequalities below, respectively, we establish that

$$(\forall z \in \text{zer } A) (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|J_{c_k A} x_k - J_{c A} x_k\| \leq \left| 1 - \frac{c_k}{c} \right| \|x_k - J_{c A} x_k\| \leq \left| 1 - \frac{c_k}{c} \right| \|x_k - z\|,$$

which, connected with the assumptions that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \frac{c_k}{c} - 1 \right| < \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in]0, 2]$, yields that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k \|J_{c_k A} x_k - J_{c A} x_k\| < \infty, \quad (5.10)$$

since, via [\[16, Proposition 3.3\(ii\)\]](#), we know that $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded.

Taking [\(5.10\)](#) and [\(5.8\)](#) into account and applying [Theorem 4.7\(i\)](#) and [Theorem 4.7\(ii\)](#), respectively, with $T = J_{c A}$, $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) T_k = J_{c_k A}$, we obtain the required results in [\(i\)](#) and [\(ii\)](#). \blacksquare

In the following result, we deduce some weak convergence results on the inexact version of generalized proximal point algorithms from the corresponding results on the exact version of generalized proximal point algorithms.

Theorem 5.8. *Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$ and that one of the following assumptions hold.*

(A1) $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1$.

(A2) $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) = \infty$, $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k < \infty$, and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in]0, 2]$ and $c_{k+1} \geq c_k$.

Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to a point in $\text{zer } A$.

Proof. Define

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad G_k := (1 - \lambda_k) \text{Id} + \lambda_k J_{c_k A} \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \xi_{k+1}(i) = G_{k+i} \xi_k(i) \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_0(i) = x_i.$$

Then [\(5.7\)](#) becomes

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad x_{k+1} = (1 - \lambda_k) x_k + \lambda_k J_{c_k A} x_k + \eta_k e_k = G_k x_k + \eta_k e_k.$$

Taking [Facts 2.5, 2.6, 2.10](#) and [2.11](#) into account, we know that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k$ is nonexpansive and that

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \text{Fix } G_k = \text{Fix } J_{c_k A} = \text{zer } A \neq \emptyset,$$

which, combined with [Fact 2.13](#), entails that $\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } G_k = \text{zer } A$ is nonempty closed and convex.

In addition, notice that the sequence $(G_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of iteration mappings depends only on A , $(\lambda_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $(c_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, and that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_{k+i}^2 = \infty;$$

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \equiv 1 \Rightarrow (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_{k+i} \equiv 1;$$

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) = \infty \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_{k+i} (2 - \lambda_{k+i}) = \infty;$$

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k < \infty \Leftrightarrow \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_{k+i} < \infty;$$

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) c_{k+1} \geq c_k \Rightarrow (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) c_{k+1+i} \geq c_{k+i}.$$

Hence, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, applying [Proposition 5.5](#) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) x_k = \zeta_k(i)$, $c_k = c_{k+i}$, and $\lambda_k = \lambda_{k+i}$, we know that any one of the assumptions (A1) and (A2) ensures that $(\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to a point in $\text{zer } A$.

Therefore, due to [Corollary 3.5](#), we obtain that $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to a point in $\text{zer } A$. \blacksquare

The following [Corollary 5.9](#) demonstrates a weak convergence result on the inexact version of the proximal point algorithm. Notice that we don't require the popular assumption $\inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k > 0$ in [Corollary 5.9](#).

Corollary 5.9. *Let y_0 and $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in \mathcal{H} , let $(\eta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in \mathbb{R}_+ , and let $(c_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be in \mathbb{R}_{++} . Define $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) y_{k+1} = J_{c_k A} y_k + \eta_k e_k$. Suppose that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| < \infty$ and that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k^2 = \infty$. Then $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to a point in $\text{zer } A$.*

Proof. This is exactly [Theorem 5.8](#) under the assumption (A1). \blacksquare

To end this section, we provide some sufficient conditions for the strong convergence of generalized proximal point algorithms below.

Theorem 5.10. *Let \bar{x} be in $\text{zer } A$. Suppose that A is metrically subregular at \bar{x} for $0 \in A\bar{x}$, i.e.,*

$$(\exists \kappa > 0)(\exists \delta > 0)(\forall x \in B[\bar{x}; \delta]) \quad d(x, A^{-1}0) \leq \kappa d(0, Ax).$$

Let $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that $\tau + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| \leq \delta$ and let $x_0 \in B[\bar{x}; \tau]$. Suppose that $\inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k > 0$, that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k \in]0, 2[$, and that $0 < \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k < 2$. Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to a point in $\text{zer } A$.

Proof. Define

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad G_k := (1 - \lambda_k) \text{Id} + \lambda_k J_{c_k A} \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \zeta_{k+1}(i) = G_{k+i} \zeta_k(i) \text{ and } \zeta_0(i) = x_i.$$

Bearing [Facts 2.5, 2.6, 2.10](#) and [2.11](#) in mind, we deduce that $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) G_k$ is nonexpansive and that

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \text{Fix } G_k = \text{Fix } J_{c_k A} = \text{zer } A \neq \emptyset,$$

which, via [Fact 2.13](#), guarantees that $\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fix } G_k = \text{zer } A$ is nonempty closed and convex.

Moreover, applying [Theorem 4.3\(i\)](#) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) T_k = J_{c_k A}$ and $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{2}$, we observe that

$$(\forall i \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|\zeta_0(i) - \bar{x}\| = \|x_i - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x_0 - \bar{x}\| + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k \|e_k\| \leq \delta.$$

Hence, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, invoking our assumptions and applying [Theorem 5.6\(ii\)\(b\)iii.](#) with $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_k = \lambda_{k+i}$, $c_k = c_{k+i}$, and $x_k = \zeta_k(i)$, we deduce that $(\zeta_k(i))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges R -linearly (hence, converges strongly) to a point in $\text{zer } A$.

Furthermore, due to [Corollary 3.5](#), we deduce that $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to a point in $\text{zer } A$. \blacksquare

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, applying a specific instance of [[11](#), Lemma 2.1] which originates from [[3](#), Remark 14], we deduce the weak convergence (resp. strong convergence) of the iteration method (involving nonexpansive operators) with both approximation and perturbation from the weak convergence (resp. strong

convergence) of associated translated basic methods. Based on this result and some beautiful properties of averaged operators, by employing some convergence results on the classical Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations, we establish the weak and strong convergence of relaxation variants of Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations for finding a fixed point of the associated nonexpansive operators. In addition, bearing the powerful properties of the resolvent of maximally monotone operators in mind, we apply all previous convergence results and proof techniques to generalized proximal point algorithms and obtain some weak and strong convergence results on generalized proximal point algorithms for solving monotone inclusion problems.

Note that relaxation variants of Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations and generalized proximal point algorithms cover generalized versions of multiple popular optimization algorithms. In the future, by specifying the nonexpansive operators in relaxation variants of Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iterations or the maximally monotone operators in generalized proximal point algorithms accordingly, we shall elaborate applications of our convergence results for more particular algorithms such as the Douglas-Rachford splitting algorithm, the three-operator splitting schemes, the alternating direction method of multipliers, and so on.

References

- [1] H. H. BAUSCHKE AND P. L. COMBETTES: *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, second edition, Springer, 2017.
- [2] H. H. BAUSCHKE, D. NOLL, AND H. M. PHAN: Linear and strong convergence of algorithms involving averaged nonexpansive operators, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 421 (2015), pp. 1–20.
- [3] H. BRÉZIS AND P. L. LIONS: Produits infinis de résolvantes, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 29 (1978), pp. 329–345.
- [4] D. DAVIS AND W. YIN: A three-operator splitting scheme and its optimization applications, *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis. Theory and Applications* 25 (2017), pp. 829–858.
- [5] Y. DONG: The proximal point algorithm revisited, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 161 (2014), pp. 478–489.
- [6] Y. DONG: Comments on “The proximal point algorithm revisited”, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 166 (2015), pp. 343–349.
- [7] A. L. DONTCHEV AND R. T. ROCKAFELLAR: *Implicit Functions and Solution Mappings*, second edition, Springer, 2014.
- [8] J. DOUGLAS AND H. H. RACHFORD: On the numerical solution of heat conduction problems in two and three space variables, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 82 (1956), pp. 421–439.
- [9] J. ECKSTEIN AND D. P. BERTSEKAS: On the Douglas-Rachford splitting method and the proximal point algorithm for maximal monotone operators, *Mathematical Programming* 55 (1992), pp. 293–318.
- [10] D. GABAY AND B. MERCIER: A dual algorithm for the solution of nonlinear variational problems via finite element approximation, *Computers and Mathematics with Applications* 2 (1976), pp. 17–40.
- [11] B. LEMAIRE: Stability of the iteration method for nonexpansive mappings, *Serdica Mathematical Journal* 22 (1996), pp. 229–238.

- [12] J. LIANG, J. FADILI, AND G. PEYRÉ: Convergence rates with inexact non-expansive operators, *Mathematical Programming* 159 (2016), pp. 403–434.
- [13] P. L. LIONS AND B. MERCIER: Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 16 (1979), pp. 964–979.
- [14] S. Y. MATSUSHITA: On the convergence rate of the Krasnosel’skiĭ-Mann iteration, *Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society* 96 (2017), pp. 162–170.
- [15] B. MERCIER: *Lectures on Topics in Finite Element Solution of Elliptic Problems*, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, 1979.
- [16] H. OUYANG: Weak and strong convergence of generalized proximal point algorithms, *arXiv preprint: 2110.07015* (2021), pp. 1–30.
- [17] D. W. PEACEMAN AND H. H. RACHFORD: The numerical solution of parabolic and elliptic differential equations, *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics* 3 (1955), pp. 28–41.
- [18] T. R. ROCKAFELLAR: Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 14 (1976), pp. 877–898.
- [19] L. SHEN AND S. PAN: Linear convergence of the generalized PPA and several splitting methods for the composite inclusion problem, *arXiv preprint: 1508.05156* (2016), pp. 1–22.