

The Connection Between Nesterov’s Accelerated Methods and Halpern Fixed-Point Iterations

Quoc Tran-Dinh

Department of Statistics and Operations Research
 The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
 318 Hanes Hall, UNC-Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3260.
Email: quoctd@email.unc.edu.

Abstract

We derive a direct connection between Nesterov’s accelerated first-order algorithm and the Halpern fixed-point iteration scheme for approximating a solution of a co-coercive equation. We show that one method is equivalent to another via a simple transformation, leading to a simple convergence proof for Nesterov’s accelerated scheme. Alternatively, we directly establish convergence rates of Nesterov’s accelerated variant, and as a consequence, we obtain a new convergence rate of the Halpern fixed-point iteration. Next, we apply our results to different methods such as proximal-point, forward-backward splitting, and three-operator splitting methods for solving monotone inclusions, where our convergence guarantees are applicable. Since the forward scheme requires the co-coerciveness of the underlying operator, we derive new Nesterov’s accelerated variants for both recent extra-anchored gradient and past-extra anchored gradient methods which can avoid the co-coerciveness assumption. For the extra-anchored gradient method, we consider two variants studied in [43] for the monotone case and in [21] for the co-monotone case. The latter covers the former as a special case and has a tighter convergence rate. For the past-extra anchored gradient method (an accelerated variant of the optimistic gradient method) [41], we obtain a new Nesterov’s accelerated variant with two past-iterate correction terms that may help to develop new Nesterov’s accelerated methods for minimax problems and their continuous views. We test our theoretical results on two numerical examples, where the actual convergence rates match well the theoretical rates up to a constant factor.

1 Introduction

Approximating a solution of a maximally monotone inclusion is a fundamental problem in optimization, nonlinear analysis, mechanics, and machine learning, among many other areas, see, e.g., [5, 9, 15, 33, 36, 37, 38]. This problem lies at the heart of monotone operator theory, and has been intensively studied in the literature for several decades, see, e.g., [5, 23, 37, 38] as a few examples. Various numerical methods, including gradient/forward, extragradient, past-extragradient, proximal-point, and their variants have been proposed to solve this problem, its extensions, and its special cases [5, 15]. When the underlying operator is the sum of two or multiple maximally monotone operators, forward-backward splitting, forward-backward-forward

splitting, Douglas-Rachford splitting, projective splitting methods, and their variants have been extensively developed for approximating its solutions under different assumptions and context, see, e.g., [5, 11, 12, 23, 26, 35, 42].

Motivation and related work. In the last decades, accelerated first-order methods have become an extremely popular and attractive research topic in optimization and related fields due to their applications to large-scale optimization problems in machine learning and signal and image processing [7, 28, 29, 30]. Among this research theme, Nesterov’s accelerated approach [28] presents as a leading research topic for many years, and remains emerging in optimization community. This well-known technique has been extended to different directions, including minimax problems, variational inequalities, and monotone inclusions [1, 18, 25]. Convergence rates of these methods have been intensively studied, which show significant improvements from $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ to $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ rates, where k is the iteration counters. The latter rate matches the lower bound rates in different settings using different criteria, see, e.g., [19, 29, 31]. In recent years, many researchers, including [1, 18, 25], have focused on developing Nesterov’s accelerated schemes for maximally monotone inclusions in different settings. They have proved $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ -convergence rates, and also $o(1/k^2)$ convergence rates on the operator residual mapping associated with the problem, while obtaining asymptotic convergence on iterate sequences, see, also [3, 10, 19]. Note that the problem of approximating a solution of a maximally monotone inclusion can be reformulated equivalently to approximating a fixed-point of a non-expansive operator [5]. Therefore, theory and solution methods from one field can be applied to the other and vice versa.

Alternatively, the Halpern fixed-point iteration is a classical method in fixed-point theory rooted from [16] to approximate a fixed-point of a nonexpansive operator. This method has recently attracted a great attention due to its ability to accelerate convergence rate in terms of operator residual norm. F. Lieder appears to be the first who proved an $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ rate on the square norm of the operator residual for the Halpern fixed-point iteration [22]. Unlike Nesterov’s accelerated method which was originally developed for solving convex optimization problems and its convergence rate is given in terms of the objective residual in general convex case, the Halpern fixed-point iteration was proposed to approximate a fixed-point of a nonexpansive operator, which is much more general than convex optimization, and hence, very convenient to extend to maximally monotone inclusions, and, in particular, game theory, robust optimization, and minimax problems [13, 21, 43].

A natural question is therefore arising: *What is the connection between the two accelerated techniques?* Such a type of questions was mentioned in [43]. Since both schemes come from different roots, at first glance, it is unclear to see a clear connection between Nesterov’s accelerated and the Halpern fixed-point schemes. Nesterov’s accelerated method is perhaps rooted from the gradient descent scheme in convex optimization with an additional momentum term.¹ Its acceleration behavior has been explained through different view points, including geometric interpretation [8] and continuous view point via differential equations [2, 4, 39, 40]. While the Halpern fixed-point method was proposed since 1967, existing convergence guarantees

¹In fact, an early work of B. Polyak [34] already showed local accelerated convergence rate of a Heavy-ball method for strongly convex and smooth functions. He also obtained global accelerated rates for the quadratic case. Such a convergence rate was later shown to be globally and optimally achieved in [27].

are essentially asymptotic or slow convergence rates. Its accelerated rate has just recently been established in [22] and followed up by a number of works, including [13, 21, 43]. Interestingly, the analysis of both schemes are quite different, but still relies on appropriate Lyapunov or potential functions, and varying parameters (e.g., stepsizes and momentum parameters).

Contribution. In this paper, we show that the Halpern fixed-point method can be transformed into Nesterov’s accelerated scheme and vice versa. We first present our results on approximating a solution of a co-coercive equation, and then we extend them to other schemes. In the first case, we establish that the iterate sequences generated by both schemes are identical, but the choice of parameters in these schemes could be different, leading to different convergence guarantees. We show that one can obtain the convergence of one scheme from another and vice versa. Then, by utilizing our analysis, we prove that a number of methods, including proximal-point, forward-backward splitting, Douglas-Rachford splitting, and three-operator splitting schemes can be easily accelerated and achieve fast convergence rates compared to their classical schemes.

Our next contribution is to show that the recent extra-anchored gradient (EAG) proposed in [21, 43] can be transformed into Nesterov’s accelerated interpretation. We provide an alternative analysis using a slightly different Lyapunov function and still obtain the same convergence rate on the operator norm as in [21, 43]. One important fact is that this accelerated method works with monotone and Lipschitz continuous operator instead of a co-coercive one as in [1, 18, 25]. This may provide some initial steps toward understanding Nesterov’s accelerated behavior on non-co-coercive operators, and possibly their continuous views.

Finally, we derive Nesterov’s accelerated variant of the past-extra anchored gradient method in [41] and provide a different convergence rate analysis than that of [41] by using two different stepsizes for the extra-gradient step. Interestingly, such a new scheme is very different from existing ones, e.g., [1, 18, 25], due to the use of two consecutive past iterates in the momentum/correction terms. This algorithm illustrates that one can build Nesterov’s accelerated scheme for monotone equations without co-coerciveness.

As a caveat, while our analysis in the co-coercive case hints a different choice of parameters for Halpern fixed-point iteration schemes and leads to different convergence guarantees, the analysis in the extra anchored gradient-type schemes does not provide such an opportunity to achieve $o(1/k^2)$ -rates, and therefore, we plan to investigate it in our future work. In addition, we have not tried to optimize the choice of parameters in order to close the gap between the upper and lower bound rates. While we are working on this paper, a recent manuscript [32] comes to our attention, which closely relates to Subsection 3.2 of this paper. However, [32] mainly focuses on establishing exact optimal rates of accelerated schemes for maximally monotone inclusions, whereas we study the connection between the two accelerated approaches and their convergence guarantees for different methods, including extra-anchored gradient.

Paper organization. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides some necessary background and preliminary results, which will be used in the sequel. Section 3 presents the equivalence between the Halpern fixed-point iteration and Nesterov’s accelerated scheme for solving a co-coercive equation. Next, we discuss its application to other methods such as proximal-point, forward-backward splitting, three-operator splitting, and Douglas-Rachford splitting schemes in Section 4. Then, section 5 investigates the connection between extra-

anchored gradient method and its variants and the corresponding Nesterov's interpretations. Section 6 provides two numerical examples to illustrate our theoretical results. Finally, missing technical proofs in the main text are deferred to the appendix.

2 Background and Preliminary Results

This section recalls some necessary notation and concepts which will be used in the sequel. It also presents some preliminary results for Section 4.

2.1 Basic concepts

We work with finite dimensional spaces \mathbb{R}^p and \mathbb{R}^n equipped with the standard inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and Euclidean norm $\| \cdot \|$. For a set-valued mapping $G : \mathbb{R}^p \rightrightarrows 2^{\mathbb{R}^p}$, $\text{dom}(G) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : Gx \neq \emptyset\}$ denotes its domain, $\text{graph}(G) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^p : y \in Gx\}$ denotes its graph, where $2^{\mathbb{R}^p}$ is the set of all subsets of \mathbb{R}^p . The inverse of G is defined as $G^{-1}y := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : y \in Gx\}$. Throughout this paper, we work with finite dimensional spaces; however, we believe that our result can be easily extended to Hilbert spaces.

Monotonicity. For a set-valued mapping $G : \mathbb{R}^p \rightrightarrows 2^{\mathbb{R}^p}$, we say that G is monotone if $\langle u - v, x - y \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x, y \in \text{dom}(G)$, $u \in Gx$, and $v \in Gy$. G is said to be μ_G -strongly monotone (or sometimes called coercive) if $\langle u - v, x - y \rangle \geq \mu_G \|x - y\|^2$ for all $x, y \in \text{dom}(G)$, $u \in Gx$, and $v \in Gy$, where $\mu_G > 0$ is called a strong monotonicity parameter. If $\mu_G < 0$, then we say that G is weakly monotone (also known as $-\mu_G$ -hypomonotone). If G is single-valued, then these conditions reduce to $\langle Gx - Gy, x - y \rangle \geq 0$ and $\langle Gx - Gy, x - y \rangle \geq \mu_G \|x - y\|^2$ for all $x, y \in \text{dom}(G)$, respectively. We say that G is maximally monotone if $\text{graph}(G)$ is not properly contained in the graph of any other monotone operator. Note that G is maximally monotone, then αG is also maximally monotone for any $\alpha > 0$, and if G and H are maximally monotone, and $\text{dom}(F) \cap \text{int}(\text{dom}(H)) \neq \emptyset$, then $G + H$ is maximally monotone.

Lipschitz continuity and co-coerciveness. A single-valued operator G is said to be L -Lipschitz continuous if $\|Gx - Gy\| \leq L\|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in \text{dom}(G)$, where $L \geq 0$ is a Lipschitz constant. If $L = 1$, then we say that G is nonexpansive, while if $L \in [0, 1)$, then we say that G is L -contractive, and L is its contraction factor. We say that G is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive if $\langle Gx - Gy, x - y \rangle \geq \frac{1}{L} \|Gx - Gy\|^2$ for all $x, y \in \text{dom}(G)$. If $L = 1$, then we say that G is firmly nonexpansive. Note that if G is $\frac{1}{L}$ -cocoercive, then it is also monotone and L -Lipschitz continuous (by using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality), but the reverse statement is not true in general. If $L < 0$, then we say that G is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-monotone [6] (also known as $-\frac{1}{L}$ -cohypomonotone).

Resolvent operator. The operator $J_G x := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^p : x \in y + Gy\}$ is called the resolvent of G , often denoted by $J_G x = (\mathbb{I} + G)^{-1}x$, where \mathbb{I} is the identity mapping. Clearly, evaluating J_G requires solving a strongly monotone inclusion $0 \in y - x + Gy$. If G is monotone, then J_G is single-valued, and if G is maximally monotone then J_G is single-valued and $\text{dom}(J_G) = \mathbb{R}^p$. If G is monotone, then J_G is firmly nonexpansive [5, Proposition 23.10].

2.2 Monotone inclusions and solution characterization

In this paper, we are interested in the following monotone inclusion and its special cases:

$$0 \in Ay^* + By^* + Cy^*, \tag{1}$$

where $A, B : \mathbb{R}^p \rightrightarrows 2^{\mathbb{R}^p}$ are multivalued and maximally monotone operators, and $C : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is a $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive operator. Let $Q := A + B + C$ and we assume that $\text{zer}(Q) := \{y^* \in \mathbb{R}^p : 0 \in Ay^* + By^* + Cy^*\} = Q^{-1}(0)$ is nonempty. We will consider the following cases in this paper:

- **Case 1:** If $A = 0$ and $B = 0$, then (1) reduces to a co-coercive equation of the form $Cy^* = 0$. In this paper, we will study convergence rates of accelerated forward schemes and the relation between the Halpern iteration and Nesterov's accelerated variant (Section 3).
- **Case 2:** If $B = 0$ and $C = 0$, then (1) reduces to $0 \in Ay^*$. Then, we will investigate the convergence of an accelerated proximal-point algorithm and the interplay between the Halpern iteration and Nesterov's accelerated interpretations in Subsection 4.1.
- **Case 3:** If $C = 0$, then (1) reduces to $0 \in Ay^* + By^*$. In this case, we will investigate the convergence of an accelerated forward-backward splitting scheme in Subsection 4.2 using our results in Section 3. Clearly, this case covers variational inequality problems (VIP) as special cases when $B = \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$, the normal cone of a closed and convex set \mathcal{X} .
- **Case 4:** Finally, we will also investigate the convergence of an accelerated three-operator splitting scheme for solving (1), and its special case: the accelerated Douglas-Rachford splitting scheme in Subsection 4.3, by employing the results in Section 3.

In order to characterize solutions of (1), we recall the following two operators. The first operator is the forward-backward residual mapping associated with **Case 2** of (1) (i.e. $0 \in Ay^* + By^*$):

$$G_{\lambda Q}y := \frac{1}{\lambda}(y - J_{\lambda A}(y - \lambda By)), \quad (2)$$

where B is single-valued, $Q := A + B$, and $J_{\lambda A}$ is the resolvent of λA for any $\lambda > 0$. Notice that if $0 < \lambda < \frac{4}{L}$, then $G_{\lambda Q}$ is $\frac{\lambda(4-\lambda L)}{4}$ -cocoercive, see, e.g., [5, Proposition 26.1] or a short proof in Lemma 2.1 below. It is obvious that y^* is a solution of (1) if and only if $G_{\lambda Q}y^* = 0$. Hence, solving (1) is equivalent to solving the co-coercive equation $G_{\lambda Q}y^* = 0$ as in (6).

Lemma 2.1. *Let A and B in (1) be maximally monotone, B be single-valued, and $C = 0$. Let $G_{\lambda Q}$ be the forward-backward residual mapping defined by (2). Then, we have*

$$\langle G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y, x - y + \lambda(Bx - By) \rangle \geq \lambda \|G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y\|^2 + \langle Bx - By, x - y \rangle. \quad (3)$$

Moreover, $G_{\lambda Q}y^* = 0$ iff $y^* \in \text{zer}(A + B)$. If, additionally, B is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive, then $G_{\lambda Q}$ is $\frac{\lambda(4-\lambda L)}{4}$ -co-coercive provided that $0 < \lambda < \frac{4}{L}$.

Proof. The inequality (3) and the statement: $G_{\lambda Q}y^* = 0$ iff $y^* \in \text{zer}(A + B)$ were proved in [41]. From the definition of $G_{\lambda Q}$, we have $J_{\lambda A}(y - \lambda By) = y - \lambda G_{\lambda Q}y$. By the firm non-expansiveness of $J_{\lambda A}$, we have $\langle J_{\lambda A}(x - \lambda Bx) - J_{\lambda A}(y - \lambda By), x - y - \lambda(Bx - By) \rangle \geq \|J_{\lambda A}(x - \lambda Bx) - J_{\lambda A}(y - \lambda By)\|^2$, leading to

$$\langle x - y - \lambda(G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y), x - y - \lambda(Bx - By) \rangle \geq \|x - y - \lambda(G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y)\|^2.$$

Expanding this inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - y\|^2 - \lambda \langle x - y, Bx - By \rangle - \lambda \langle x - y, G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y \rangle + \lambda^2 \langle Bx - By, G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y \rangle \\ \geq \|x - y\|^2 - 2\lambda \langle x - y, G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y \rangle + \lambda^2 \|G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying this expression and utilizing the $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coerciveness of C , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle x - y, G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y \rangle &\geq \lambda \|G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y\|^2 + \langle x - y, Bx - By \rangle - \lambda \langle Bx - By, G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y \rangle \\
&\geq \lambda \|G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y\|^2 + \frac{1}{L} \|Bx - By\|^2 - \lambda \|Bx - By\| \|G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y\| \\
&\geq \lambda \|G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y\|^2 + \frac{1}{L} \|Bx - By\|^2 - \frac{1}{L} \|Bx - By\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\lambda^2 L}{4} \|G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y\|^2 \\
&= \lambda \left(1 - \frac{\lambda L}{4}\right) \|G_{\lambda Q}x - G_{\lambda Q}y\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $G_{\lambda Q}$ is $\frac{\lambda(4-\lambda L)}{4}$ -co-coercive provided that $0 < \lambda < \frac{4}{L}$. \square

The second operator is the following residual mapping of a three-operator splitting scheme:

$$E_{\lambda Q}y := \frac{1}{\lambda}(J_{\lambda B}y - J_{\lambda A}(2J_{\lambda B}y - y - \lambda C \circ J_{\lambda B}y)), \quad (4)$$

where $J_{\lambda A}$ and $J_{\lambda B}$ are the resolvents of λA and λB , respectively, and \circ is a composition operator. As proved in Lemma 2.2 below (see also [5, 12, 17]) that y^* is a solution of (1) if and only if $E_{\lambda Q}y^* = 0$. Moreover, if $0 < \lambda < \frac{4}{L}$, then $E_{\lambda Q}$ is $\frac{\lambda(4-L\lambda)}{4}$ -co-coercive. Hence, solving (1) is equivalent to solving the co-coercive equation $E_{\lambda Q}y^* = 0$ as stated in (6) below.

Lemma 2.2. *Let A and B in (1) be maximally monotone, and C be $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive. Let $E_{\lambda Q}$ be the residual mapping defined by (4). Then, $E_{\lambda Q}u^* = 0$ iff $y^* \in \text{zer}(A + B + C)$, where $y^* = J_{\lambda B}u^*$. Moreover, we have $E_{\lambda Q}$ satisfies the following property for all u and v :*

$$\langle E_{\lambda Q}u - E_{\lambda Q}v, u - v \rangle \geq \frac{\lambda(4-L\lambda)}{4} \|E_{\lambda Q}u - E_{\lambda Q}v\|^2. \quad (5)$$

If B is single-valued and $C = 0$, and $G_{\lambda Q}$ is defined by (2), then we have $E_{\lambda Q}u = G_{\gamma Q}y$, where $y = J_{\lambda B}u$ or equivalently, $u = y + \lambda B y$.

Proof. The property $E_{\lambda Q}u^* = 0$ iff $y^* \in \text{zer}(A + B + C)$ is well-known [5, 12]. The property (5) has been proved in [17], but we give a short proof here for completeness. Let us introduce $z_u := J_{\lambda B}u$ and $w_u := J_{\lambda A}(2z_u - u - \lambda C z_u)$. Then, by the 1-co-coerciveness of $J_{\lambda A}$ and $J_{\lambda B}$, we first have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle z_u - z_v, u - v \rangle &\geq \|z_u - z_v\|^2, \\
\langle 2(z_u - z_v) - (u - v) - \lambda(Cz_u - Cz_v), w_u - w_v \rangle &\geq \|w_u - w_v\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, using these inequalities and noting that $z_u - w_u = \lambda E_{\lambda Q}u$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda \langle E_{\lambda Q}u - E_{\lambda Q}v, u - v \rangle &= \langle z_u - z_v, u - v \rangle - \langle w_u - w_v, u - v \rangle \\
&\geq \|z_u - z_v\|^2 + \|w_u - w_v\|^2 - 2\langle z_u - z_v, w_u - w_v \rangle \\
&\quad + \lambda \langle Cz_u - Cz_v, w_u - w_v \rangle \\
&= \lambda^2 \|E_{\lambda Q}u - E_{\lambda Q}v\|^2 + \lambda \langle Cz_u - Cz_v, w_u - w_v \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by the $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coerciveness of C , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle Cz_u - Cz_v, w_u - w_v \rangle &= \langle Cz_u - Cz_v, z_u - z_v \rangle - \lambda \langle Cz_u - Cz_v, E_{\lambda Q}u - E_{\lambda Q}v \rangle \\
&\geq \frac{1}{L} \|Cz_u - Cz_v\|^2 - \frac{1}{L} \|Cz_u - Cz_v\|^2 - \frac{L\lambda^2}{4} \|E_{\lambda Q}u - E_{\lambda Q}v\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining both inequalities, we obtain (5).

Finally, assume that $C = 0$. Since $y = J_{\gamma B}u$ and B is single-valued, we have $u = y + \lambda B y$. By the definition of $E_{\lambda Q}$ from (4) and $G_{\lambda Q}$ from (2), we can derive

$$\lambda E_{\lambda Q}u = J_{\lambda B}u - J_{\lambda A}(2J_{\lambda B}u - u) = y - J_{\lambda A}(2y - u) = y - J_{\lambda A}(y - \lambda B y) = \lambda G_{\lambda Q}y,$$

which proves the last statement of Lemma 2.2. \square

By means of Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, one can transform (1) and its special cases equivalently to a co-coercive equation (6) in Section 3 so that the results of Section 3 can be applied to (1).

3 Equivalence Between Halpern and Nesterov Acceleration

Both Nesterov's accelerated and Halpern iteration schemes show significant improvement on convergence rates over classical methods for solving (1). However, they are derived from different perspectives, and it is unclear if they are closely related to each other. In this section, we show that these schemes are actually equivalent, though they may use different sets of parameters.

To present our analysis framework, we consider the following co-coercive equation:

$$\text{Find } y^* \in \mathbb{R}^p \text{ such that: } G y^* = 0, \quad (6)$$

where $G : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is a single-valued and $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive operator. We denote by $\text{zer}(G) := G^{-1}(0) = \{y^* \in \mathbb{R}^p : G y^* = 0\}$ the solution set of (6), and assume that $\text{zer}(G)$ is nonempty. Equation (6) is a special case, **Case 3**, of (1). However, we study it separately to provide a generic framework for developing new variants to solve the remaining cases of (1).

3.1 The Halpern Fixed-Point Scheme and Its Convergence

The Halpern fixed-point scheme for solving (6) can be written as follows (see [13, 16, 22]):

$$y_{k+1} := \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k) y_k - \eta_k G y_k, \quad (7)$$

where $\beta_k \in (0, 1)$ and $\eta_k > 0$ are appropriately chosen.

The convergence rate of (7) has been established in [13, 22] using different tools. While [22] provides a direct proof and uses a performance estimation problem approach to establish convergence of (7), [13] exploits a Lyapunov technique to analyze convergence rate. Let us summarize the result in [13] in our context.

The standard Lyapunov function to study (7) is

$$\mathcal{L}_k := \frac{p_k}{L} \|G y_k\|^2 + q_k \langle G y_k, y_k - y_0 \rangle, \quad (8)$$

where $p_k := q_0 k(k+1)$ and $q_k := q_0(k+1)$ (for some $q_0 > 0$) are given parameters. The following theorem states the convergence of (7).

Theorem 3.1 ([13, 22]). *Assume that G in (6) is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive with $L \in (0, +\infty)$, and $y^* \in \text{zer}(G)$. Let $\{y_k\}$ be generated by (7) using $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$ and $\eta_k := \frac{2(1-\beta_k)}{L} = \frac{2(k+1)}{(k+2)L}$. Then*

$$\|G y_k\| \leq \frac{L \|y_0 - y^*\|}{k+1}. \quad (9)$$

If we choose $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$ and $\eta_k := \frac{(1-\beta_k)}{L}$, then we have $\|Gy_k\|^2 \leq \frac{4L^2\|y_0 - y^*\|^2}{(k+1)(k+3)}$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)(k+2)\|Gy_{k+1} - Gy_k\|^2 \leq 2L^2\|y_0 - y^*\|^2$.

The last statement of Theorem 3.1 was not proved in [13, 22], but requires a few elementary justification, and hence we omit it here. Note that if $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$, then we can rewrite (7) into the Halpern fixed-point iteration as in [22]:

$$y_{k+1} := \frac{1}{(k+2)}y_0 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{(k+2)}\right)Ty_k, \quad \text{where } Ty_k := y_k - \frac{2}{L}Gy_k. \quad (10)$$

Since G is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive, $T = \mathbb{I} - \frac{2}{L}G$ is nonexpansive, see [5, Proposition 4.11]. Therefore, (7) is equivalent to the scheme studied in [22], and Theorem 3.1 can be obtained from the results in [22]. The choice of β_k and η_k are tight and the bound (9) is unimprovable since there exists an example that achieves this rate as the lower bound, see, e.g., [22] for such an example.

3.2 The Relation Between Halpern's and Nesterov's Accelerations

Our next step is to show that the Halpern fixed-point iteration (7) can be transformed into a Nesterov's accelerated interpretation and vice versa.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\{x_k\}$ and $\{y_k\}$ be generated by the following scheme starting from $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $x_0 = x_{-1} = y_{-1} := y_0$ and $\beta_{-1} = \eta_{-1} = 0$:*

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} & := y_k - \gamma_k Gy_k, \\ y_{k+1} & := x_{k+1} + \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \nu_k(y_k - x_{k+1}) + \kappa_k(y_{k-1} - x_k), \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where $\theta_k := \frac{\beta_k(1-\beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}}$, $\nu_k := \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} + 1 - \beta_k - \frac{\eta_k}{\gamma_k}$, and $\kappa_k := \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} \left(\frac{\eta_{k-1}}{\gamma_{k-1}} - 1 + \beta_{k-1} \right)$. Then, the sequence $\{y_k\}$ is identical to the one generated by (7) for solving (6).

In particular, if we choose $\gamma_k := \frac{\eta_k}{1-\beta_k}$, then $\nu_k = \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}}$, $\kappa_k = 0$, and (11) reduces to

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} & := y_k - \gamma_k Gy_k, \\ y_{k+1} & := x_{k+1} + \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \nu_k(y_k - x_{k+1}). \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Before proving Theorem 3.2, let us make the following remarks. Both (11) and (12) can be viewed as Nesterov's accelerated variants with correction terms. While (11) has two correction terms $\nu_k(y_k - x_{k+1})$ and $\kappa_k(y_{k-1} - x_k)$, (12) has only one term $\nu_k(y_k - x_{k+1})$. In fact, (12) covers the proximal-point scheme in [24] as a special case. As discussed in [2], (12) can be viewed as Ravine's method if convergence is given in y_k instead of x_k .

Proof. [(11) \Rightarrow (7)] Substituting θ_k , ν_k , and κ_k into (11), and simplifying the result, we get

$$\begin{aligned} y_{k+1} &= \left(\frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} - \beta_k + 1 \right) x_{k+1} - \frac{\beta_k(1-\beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}} x_k + \left(\frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} + 1 - \beta_k - \frac{\eta_k}{\gamma_k} \right) (y_k - x_{k+1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} \left(\frac{\eta_{k-1}}{\gamma_{k-1}} - 1 + \beta_{k-1} \right) (y_{k-1} - x_k). \end{aligned}$$

Now, using the first line of (11) into this expression, we get

$$\begin{aligned} y_{k+1} &= \left(\frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} - \beta_k + 1 \right) (y_k - \gamma_k Gy_k) - \frac{\beta_k(1-\beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}} (y_{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1} Gy_{k-1}) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} + 1 - \beta_k - \frac{\eta_k}{\gamma_k} \right) \gamma_k Gy_k + \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} \left(\frac{\eta_{k-1}}{\gamma_{k-1}} - 1 + \beta_{k-1} \right) \gamma_{k-1} Gy_{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging this expression, we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{\beta_k} y_{k+1} - \left(\frac{1}{\beta_k} - 1 \right) y_k + \frac{\eta_k}{\beta_k} G y_k = \frac{1}{\beta_{k-1}} y_k - \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{k-1}} - 1 \right) y_{k-1} - \frac{\eta_{k-1}}{\beta_{k-1}} G y_{k-1}.$$

By induction, and noticing that $y_{-1} = y_0$, and $\eta_{-1} = 0$, this expression leads to

$$\frac{1}{\beta_k} y_{k+1} - \left(\frac{1}{\beta_k} - 1 \right) y_k + \frac{\eta_k}{\beta_k} G y_k = y_0.$$

This is indeed equivalent to (7).

[(7) \Rightarrow (11)] Firstly, shifting the index from k to $k-1$ in (7), we have $y_k = \beta_{k-1} y_0 + (1 - \beta_{k-1}) y_{k-1} - \eta_{k-1} G y_{k-1}$. Here, we assume that $y_{-1} = y_0$. Multiplying this expression by β_k and (7) by $-\beta_{k-1}$ and adding the results, we obtain

$$\beta_{k-1} y_{k+1} - \beta_k y_k = \beta_{k-1} (1 - \beta_k) y_k - \beta_k (1 - \beta_{k-1}) y_{k-1} - \beta_{k-1} \eta_k G y_k + \beta_k \eta_{k-1} G y_{k-1}.$$

This expression leads to

$$y_{k+1} = \left(\frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} + 1 - \beta_k \right) y_k - \eta_k G y_k - \frac{\beta_k (1 - \beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}} y_{k-1} + \frac{\beta_k \eta_{k-1}}{\beta_{k-1}} G y_{k-1}. \quad (13)$$

Next, let us introduce $x_{k+1} := y_k - \gamma_k G y_k$ for some $\gamma_k > 0$. Then, we have $G y_k = \frac{1}{\gamma_k} (y_k - x_{k+1})$. Substituting this relation into (13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} y_{k+1} &= \left(\frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} + 1 - \beta_k \right) y_k - \frac{\eta_k}{\gamma_k} (y_k - x_{k+1}) - \frac{\beta_k (1 - \beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}} y_{k-1} + \frac{\beta_k \eta_{k-1}}{\beta_{k-1} \gamma_{k-1}} (y_{k-1} - x_k) \\ &= x_{k+1} + \frac{\beta_k (1 - \beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}} (x_{k+1} - x_k) + \left(\frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} + 1 - \beta_k - \frac{\eta_k}{\gamma_k} \right) (y_k - x_{k+1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} \left(\frac{\eta_{k-1}}{\gamma_{k-1}} - 1 + \beta_{k-1} \right) (y_{k-1} - x_k). \end{aligned}$$

If we define $\theta_k := \frac{\beta_k (1 - \beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}}$, $\nu_k := \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} + 1 - \beta_k - \frac{\eta_k}{\gamma_k}$ and $\kappa_k := \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} \left(\frac{\eta_{k-1}}{\gamma_{k-1}} - 1 + \beta_{k-1} \right)$, then this expression can be rewritten as

$$y_{k+1} = x_{k+1} + \theta_k (x_{k+1} - x_k) + \nu_k (y_k - x_{k+1}) + \kappa_k (y_{k-1} - x_k).$$

Combining this line and $x_{k+1} = y_k - \gamma_k G y_k$, we get (11).

Finally, if we choose $\gamma_k := \frac{\eta_k}{1 - \beta_k}$, then it is obvious that $\kappa_k = 0$, and $\nu_k = \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}}$. Hence, (11) reduces to (12). \square

In particular, if we choose $\gamma_k := \frac{1}{L}$, $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$, and $\eta_k := \frac{(1 - \beta_k)}{L} = \frac{(k+1)}{L(k+2)}$, then (11) reduces to the following one:

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} := y_k - \frac{1}{L} G y_k, \\ y_{k+1} := x_{k+1} + \frac{k}{k+2} (x_{k+1} - x_k) + \frac{k+1}{k+2} (y_k - x_{k+1}). \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Alternatively, if we choose $\gamma_k := \frac{1}{L}$, $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$, and $\eta_k := \frac{2(1 - \beta_k)}{L}$, then (11) reduces to

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} := y_k - \frac{1}{L} G y_k, \\ y_{k+1} := x_{k+1} + \frac{k}{k+2} (x_{k+1} - x_k) + \frac{k}{k+2} (y_{k-1} - x_k). \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

The convergence on $\|Gy_k\|$ of both (14) and (15) is guaranteed by Theorem 3.1. The scheme (15) covers [18] as a special case when $Gy = J_{\lambda A}y$, the resolvent of a maximally monotone operator λA . We state this result in the following corollary. However, it is not clear how to derive convergence of $\|Gx_k\|$ as well as $o(1/k^2)$ -rates as in Theorem 3.1. We summarize this result in the following lemma.

Corollary 3.1. *Assume that G in (6) is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive and $\text{zer}(G) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\{(x_k, y_k)\}$ be generated by (11) using $\gamma_k := \frac{1}{L}$, $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$, and $\eta_k := \frac{(1-\beta_k)}{L}$. Then, we obtain $\theta_k := \frac{k}{k+2}$, $\nu_k := \frac{k+1}{k+2}$, and $\kappa_k := 0$. Moreover, (11) reduces to (12) (or equivalently (14)), and the following guarantee holds:*

$$\|Gy_k\|^2 \leq \frac{4L^2\|y_0 - y^*\|^2}{(k+1)(k+3)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)(k+2)\|Gy_{k+1} - Gy_k\|^2 \leq 2L^2\|y_0 - y^*\|^2. \quad (16)$$

If we use $\gamma_k := \frac{1}{L}$, $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$, and $\eta_k := \frac{2(1-\beta_k)}{L}$, then we obtain $\theta_k := \frac{k}{k+2}$, $\nu_k := 0$, and $\kappa_k := \frac{k}{k+2}$, and (11) reduces to (15). Moreover, the following guarantee holds: $\|Gy_k\| \leq \frac{L\|y_0 - y^\|}{(k+1)}$.*

The constant factor in the bound (16) is slightly worse than the one in $\|Gy_k\| \leq \frac{L\|y_0 - y^*\|}{(k+1)}$. In fact, the latter one is exactly optimal since there exists an example showing it matches the lower bound complexity, see, e.g. [13, 22].

3.3 Convergence Analysis of Nesterov's Accelerated Scheme (12)

In this subsection, we provide a direct convergence analysis of (12) without using Theorem 3.1. For simplicity, we will analyze the convergence of (12) with only one correction term. However, our analysis can be easily extended to (11) when $\kappa_k \neq 0$ with some simple modifications.

Our analysis relies on the following Lyapunov function:

$$\mathcal{V}_k := a_k\|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 + b_k\langle Gy_{k-1}, x_k - y_k \rangle + \|x_k + t_k(y_k - x_k) - y^*\|^2 + \mu\|x_k - y^*\|^2, \quad (17)$$

where a_k , b_k , and $t_k > 0$ are given parameters, which will be determined later, and $\mu \geq 0$ is an optimal parameter. This Lyapunov is slightly different from \mathcal{L}_k defined by (8), but it is closely related to standard Nesterov's potential function (see, e.g., [3]). To see the connection between \mathcal{V}_k and \mathcal{L}_k , we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let \mathcal{L}_k be defined by (8) and \mathcal{V}_k be defined by (17). Assume that $a_{k+1} := \frac{4p_k^2}{Lq_k^2} + \frac{4p_k\eta_k}{Lq_k(1-\beta_k)}$, $b_{k+1} := \frac{4p_k}{Lq_k\beta_k}$, $t_{k+1} := \frac{1}{\beta_k}$, and $\gamma_k := \frac{\eta_k}{1-\beta_k}$. Then, we have*

$$\mathcal{V}_{k+1} = \frac{4p_k}{Lq_k^2}\mathcal{L}_k + \|y_0 - y^*\|^2 + \mu\|x_{k+1} - y^*\|^2. \quad (18)$$

Before proving this lemma, we make the following remarks.

- For $p_k = q_0k(k+1)$ and $q_k = q_0(k+1)$, we have $\frac{4p_k}{Lq_k^2} = \frac{4k}{Lq_0(k+1)} \approx \frac{4}{Lq_0}$. Hence, we have $\mathcal{V}_{k+1} = \frac{4k}{Lq_0(k+1)}\mathcal{L}_k + \|y_0 - y^*\|^2 + \mu\|x_{k+1} - y^*\|^2$.
- If we choose $p_k = cq_k^2$ for some $c > 0$, then $\mathcal{V}_{k+1} = \frac{4c}{L}\mathcal{L}_k + \|y_0 - y^*\|^2 + \mu\|x_{k+1} - y^*\|^2$. Clearly, if $\mu = 0$, then $\mathcal{V}_{k+1} = \frac{4c}{L}\mathcal{L}_k + \|y_0 - y^*\|^2$.

- The term $\mu\|x_k - y^*\|^2$ allows us to get the tail $\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2$ in (27) of Lemma 3.3, which is a key to prove convergence in Theorem 3.3, especially $o(1/k^2)$ -convergence rates. It remains unclear to us how to prove such a convergence rate without the term $\mu\|x_k - y^*\|^2$.

Proof. From $\mathcal{L}_k = \frac{p_k}{L}\|Gy_k\|^2 + q_k\langle Gy_k, y_k - y_0 \rangle$ in (8), we can write it as

$$\mathcal{L}_k = \frac{p_k}{L}\|Gy_k - \frac{q_k}{2p_k}(y_0 - y^*)\|^2 + q_k\langle Gy_k, y_k - y^* \rangle - \frac{q_k^2}{4p_k}\|y_0 - y^*\|^2.$$

From (7), we have $y_0 - y^* = \frac{1}{\beta_k}(y_{k+1} + \eta_k Gy_k - (1 - \beta_k)y_k) - y^* = y_k - y^* + \frac{1}{\beta_k}(y_{k+1} - y_k) + \frac{\eta_k}{\beta_k}Gy_k$. Using $x_{k+1} = y_k - \frac{\eta_k}{1 - \beta_k}Gy_k$, we have $y_k = x_{k+1} + \frac{\eta_k}{1 - \beta_k}Gy_k$. Combining these lines, we get

$$Gy_k - \frac{Lq_k}{2p_k}(y_0 - y^*) = Gy_k - \frac{Lq_k}{2p_k}\left[x_{k+1} + \frac{1}{\beta_k}(y_{k+1} - x_{k+1}) - y^*\right].$$

Let $z_{k+1} := x_{k+1} + \frac{1}{\beta_k}(y_{k+1} - x_{k+1})$. Then, taking again $y_k = x_{k+1} + \frac{\eta_k}{1 - \beta_k}Gy_k$, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_k &= \frac{p_k}{L}\|Gy_k - \frac{Lq_k}{2p_k}(z_{k+1} - y^*)\|^2 + q_k\langle Gy_k, y_k - y^* \rangle - \frac{Lq_k^2}{4p_k}\|y_0 - y^*\|^2 \\ &= \frac{p_k}{L}\|Gy_k\|^2 - q_k\langle Gy_k, z_{k+1} - y_k \rangle + \frac{Lq_k^2}{4p_k}\|z_{k+1} - y^*\|^2 - \frac{Lq_k^2}{4p_k}\|y_0 - y^*\|^2 \\ &= \left(\frac{p_k}{L} + \frac{q_k\eta_k}{(1 - \beta_k)}\right)\|Gy_k\|^2 + q_k\langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - z_{k+1} \rangle + \frac{Lq_k^2}{4p_k}\|z_{k+1} - y^*\|^2 - \frac{Lq_k^2}{4p_k}\|y_0 - y^*\|^2 \\ &= \frac{Lq_k^2}{4p_k}\left[\left(\frac{4p_k^2}{L^2q_k^2} + \frac{4p_k\eta_k}{Lq_k(1 - \beta_k)}\right)\|Gy_k\|^2 + \frac{4p_k}{Lq_k\beta_k}\langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - y_{k+1} \rangle + \|z_{k+1} - y^*\|^2 - \|y_0 - y^*\|^2\right], \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $x_{k+1} - z_{k+1} = \frac{1}{\beta_k}(x_{k+1} - y_{k+1})$ in the last line. This expression together with (17) imply (18). \square

Now, we prove the following key lemma for our convergence analysis.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\{(x_k, y_k)\}$ be generated by (12) using $\gamma_k := \gamma > 0$, and \mathcal{V}_k be defined by (17). Then, if $b_{k+1}\theta_k + 2\gamma t_k(t_k - 1) - 2\gamma\nu_k\theta_k t_{k+1}^2 \geq 0$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_k - \mathcal{V}_{k+1} &\geq \left(\gamma b_{k+1}\nu_k + \gamma^2 t_k^2 - \gamma^2 t_{k+1}^2 \nu_k^2 - a_{k+1} - \frac{\gamma^2 b_k^2}{4a_k}\right)\|Gy_k\|^2 \\ &\quad + [b_{k+1}\theta_k + 2\gamma t_k(t_k - 1) - 2\gamma\nu_k\theta_k t_{k+1}^2 - b_k]\langle Gy_{k-1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \\ &\quad + (t_k^2 - 2t_k + 1 + \mu - t_{k+1}^2\theta_k^2)\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + a_k\left\|Gy_{k-1} - \frac{\gamma b_k}{2a_k}Gy_k\right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{L} - \gamma\right)[b_{k+1}\theta_k + 2\gamma t_k(t_k - 1) - 2\gamma\nu_k\theta_k t_{k+1}^2]\|Gy_k - Gy_{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2(t_k - t_{k+1}\theta_{k+1} - 1 - \mu)\langle x_{k+1} - x_k, x_{k+1} - y^* \rangle \\ &\quad + \gamma(t_k - t_{k+1}\nu_k)\langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - y^* \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Proof. Our goal is to lower bound the difference $\mathcal{V}_k - \mathcal{V}_{k+1}$. Firstly, from (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_k - \mathcal{V}_{k+1} &= a_k\|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 - a_{k+1}\|Gy_k\|^2 + b_k\langle Gy_{k-1}, x_k - y_k \rangle - b_{k+1}\langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - y_{k+1} \rangle \\ &\quad + \|x_k - y^*\|^2 - \|x_{k+1} - y^*\|^2 + \|x_k - y^* + t_k(y_k - x_k)\|^2 \\ &\quad - \|x_{k+1} - y^* + t_{k+1}(y_{k+1} - x_{k+1})\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Next, since $y_k = x_{k+1} + \gamma Gy_k$ from (12), it is easy to show that

$$\langle Gy_{k-1}, x_k - y_k \rangle = -\langle Gy_{k-1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle - \gamma \langle Gy_{k-1}, Gy_k \rangle. \quad (21)$$

Alternatively, from (12), we have $x_{k+1} - y_{k+1} = -\theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) - \gamma\nu_k Gy_k$. Therefore, we get

$$\langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - y_{k+1} \rangle = -\theta_k \langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle - \gamma\nu_k \|Gy_k\|^2. \quad (22)$$

Then, using again $y_k = x_{k+1} + \gamma Gy_k$ from (12), we can derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_k - y^* + t_k(y_k - x_k)\|^2 &= \|x_{k+1} - y^* + (t_k - 1)(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \gamma t_k Gy_k\|^2 \\ &= \|x_{k+1} - y^*\|^2 + (t_k - 1)^2 \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \gamma^2 t_k^2 \|Gy_k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2(t_k - 1) \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, x_{k+1} - y^* \rangle + 2\gamma t_k \langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - y^* \rangle \\ &\quad + 2\gamma t_k (t_k - 1) \langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Similarly, using $y_{k+1} - x_{k+1} = \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \gamma\nu_k Gy_k$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{k+1} - y^* + t_{k+1}(y_{k+1} - x_{k+1})\|^2 &= \|x_{k+1} - y^* + t_{k+1}\theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \gamma t_{k+1}\nu_k Gy_k\|^2 \\ &= \|x_{k+1} - y^*\|^2 + t_{k+1}^2 \theta_k^2 \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \gamma^2 t_{k+1}^2 \nu_k^2 \|Gy_k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\gamma\nu_k \theta_k t_{k+1}^2 \langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \\ &\quad + 2\gamma t_{k+1} \nu_k \langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - y^* \rangle \\ &\quad + 2t_{k+1} \theta_k \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, x_{k+1} - y^* \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Substituting (21), (22), (23), and (24) into (20), and using the identity $\mu\|x_k - y^*\|^2 - \mu\|x_{k+1} - y^*\|^2 = \mu\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 - 2\mu\langle x_{k+1} - x_k, x_{k+1} - y^* \rangle$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_k - \mathcal{V}_{k+1} &= a_k \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 + [\gamma b_{k+1} \nu_k + \gamma^2 t_k^2 - \gamma^2 t_{k+1}^2 \nu_k^2 - a_{k+1}] \|Gy_k\|^2 \\ &\quad - \gamma b_k \langle Gy_{k-1}, Gy_k \rangle - b_k \langle Gy_{k-1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \\ &\quad + [b_{k+1} \theta_k + 2\gamma t_k (t_k - 1) - 2\gamma \nu_k \theta_k t_{k+1}^2] \langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \\ &\quad + [\mu + (t_k - 1)^2 - t_{k+1}^2 \theta_k^2] \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2(t_k - t_{k+1} \theta_k - 1 - \mu) \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, x_{k+1} - y^* \rangle \\ &\quad + 2\gamma(t_k - t_{k+1} \nu_k) \langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - y^* \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

By the $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coerciveness of G and $x_{k+1} = y_k - \gamma Gy_k$ from (12), we can derive

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Gy_k - Gy_{k-1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle &= \langle Gy_k - Gy_{k-1}, y_k - y_{k-1} \rangle - \gamma \|Gy_k - Gy_{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{L} - \gamma\right) \|Gy_k - Gy_{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality implies that $\langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \geq \langle Gy_{k-1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle + \left(\frac{1}{L} - \gamma\right) \|Gy_k - Gy_{k-1}\|^2$. Finally, if we assume that $b_{k+1} \theta_k + 2\gamma t_k (t_k - 1) - 2\gamma \nu_k \theta_k t_{k+1}^2 \geq 0$, then by substituting the last inequality into (25) and noting that $a_k \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 - \gamma b_k \langle Gy_k, Gy_{k-1} \rangle = a_k \|Gy_{k-1} - \frac{\gamma b_k}{2a_k} Gy_k\|^2 - \frac{\gamma^2 b_k^2}{4a_k} \|Gy_k\|^2$, we obtain (19). \square

Our next lemma is to provide a particular choice of parameters such that $\mathcal{V}_k - \mathcal{V}_{k+1} \geq 0$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $0 < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{L}$, $\mu \geq 0$, and $\omega \geq 1$ be given. Let $\{(x_k, y_k)\}$ be generated by (12) and \mathcal{V}_k be defined by (17). Assume that $t_k, \theta_k, \nu_k, a_k$, and b_k in (12) and (17) are chosen as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} t_k &:= \frac{k+2\omega+1}{\omega}, \quad \theta_k := \frac{t_k-1-\mu}{t_{k+1}}, \quad \nu_k := 1 - \frac{1}{t_{k+1}}, \\ b_k &:= 2\gamma t_k(t_k - 1), \quad \text{and} \quad a_k := \gamma^2 t_k(t_k - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Then, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_k - \mathcal{V}_{k+1} &\geq \mu(2t_k - 1 - \mu)\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \gamma^2 t_k(t_k - 1)\|Gy_k - \nu_{k-1}Gy_{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\gamma\left(\frac{1}{L} - \gamma\right)t_k(t_k - 1)\|Gy_k - Gy_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{\gamma(\omega-1)}{L\omega}\|Gy_k\|^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Moreover, we have $\mathcal{V}_k \geq \mu\|x_k - y^*\|^2 + \frac{b_k}{t_k}\left(\frac{1}{L} - \gamma\right)\|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 \geq 0$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu(2t_k - 1 - \mu)\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 & \leq \mathcal{V}_0, \\ \frac{\gamma(\omega-1)}{L\omega} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|Gy_k\|^2 & \leq \mathcal{V}_0, \\ \frac{2\gamma(1-L\gamma)}{L} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} t_k(t_k - 1)\|Gy_k - Gy_{k-1}\|^2 & \leq \mathcal{V}_0, \\ \gamma^2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} t_k(t_k - 1)\|x_{k+1} - x_k - \theta_{k-1}(x_k - x_{k-1})\|^2 & \leq \mathcal{V}_0. \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

Proof. Let us show that t_k, θ_k, ν_k , and b_k chosen by (26) satisfy

$$t_k - t_{k+1}\theta_k - 1 - \mu = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_{k+1}\theta_k + 2\gamma t_k(t_k - 1) - 2\gamma\nu_k\theta_k t_{k+1}^2 - b_k = 0. \quad (29)$$

First, since $\theta_k = \frac{t_k-1-\mu}{t_{k+1}}$, the first condition of (29) automatically holds. Next, using $b_k = 2\gamma t_k(t_k - \mu)$ and $\nu_k = 1 - \frac{1}{t_{k+1}}$, one can easily verify the second condition of (29).

Now, using (26), we can directly compute the following coefficients of (19):

$$\begin{cases} t_k^2 - 2t_k + 1 + \mu - t_{k+1}^2\theta_k^2 & = \mu(2t_k - 1 - \mu), \\ t_k - t_{k+1}\nu_k & = \frac{\omega-1}{\omega}, \\ b_{k+1}\theta_k + 2\gamma t_k(t_k - 1) - 2\gamma\nu_k\theta_k t_{k+1}^2 & = 2\gamma t_k(t_k - 1), \\ \gamma b_{k+1}\nu_k + \gamma^2 t_k^2 - \gamma^2 t_{k+1}^2\nu_k^2 - a_{k+1} - \frac{\gamma^2 b_k^2}{4a_k} & = \frac{\gamma^2(\omega-1)}{\omega}. \end{cases}$$

Substituting these coefficients and the two conditions (29) into (19), we get (27).

Finally, since $Gy^* = 0$, using the $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coerciveness of G , we get $\langle Gy_{k-1}, x_k - y^* \rangle = \langle Gy_{k-1} - Gy^*, y_{k-1} - y^* - \gamma(Gy_{k-1} - Gy^*) \rangle \geq \left(\frac{1}{L} - \gamma\right)\|Gy_{k-1}\|^2$. Therefore, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} b_k \langle Gy_{k-1}, x_k - y_k \rangle &= -\frac{b_k}{t_k} \langle Gy_{k-1}, x_k - y^* + t_k(y_k - x_k) \rangle + \frac{b_k}{t_k} \langle Gy_{k-1}, x_k - y^* \rangle \\ &\geq -\frac{b_k^2}{4t_k^2} \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 - \|x_k - y^* + t_k(y_k - x_k)\|^2 + \frac{b_k}{t_k} \left(\frac{1}{L} - \gamma\right) \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this bound into the definition (17) of \mathcal{V}_k and noticing that $a_k - \frac{b_k^2}{4t_k^2} = \gamma^2(t_k - 1)$, we get $\mathcal{V}_k \geq \left(a_k - \frac{b_k^2}{4t_k^2}\right)\|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{b_k}{t_k}\left(\frac{1}{L} - \gamma\right)\|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 + \mu\|x_k - y^*\|^2 = \frac{\gamma(2-\gamma L)(t_k-1)}{L}\|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 + \mu\|x_k - y^*\|^2$, which proves the nonnegativity of \mathcal{V}_k . Clearly, (28) is a direct consequence of (27) and the fact that $x_{k+1} - x_k - \theta_{k-1}(x_k - x_{k-1}) = \gamma(Gy_k - \nu_{k-1}Gy_{k-1})$. \square

The following theorem proves convergence of Nesterov's accelerated scheme (12), but using a different set of parameters compared to Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.3. *Assume that G in (6) is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive and $\text{zer}(G) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\{(x_k, y_k)\}$ be generated by (12) to solve (6) using $\gamma_k := \gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{L})$, $\theta_k := \frac{k+1}{k+2\omega+2}$, and $\nu_k := \frac{k+\omega+2}{k+2\omega+2} \in (0, 1)$ for a given constant $\omega > 2$. Then, the following estimates hold:*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + \omega + 1) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right), \\ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + 2\omega + 1) \|y_k - x_k\|^2 < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \|y_k - x_k\|^2 = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right), \\ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + \omega + 1) \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \|Gy_k\|^2 = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right), \\ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + \omega + 1) \|Gx_k\|^2 < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \|Gx_k\|^2 = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right), \\ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + \omega) \|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2 < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2 = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right). \end{array} \right. \quad (30)$$

Consequently, both $\{x_k\}$ and $\{y_k\}$ converge to $y^* \in \text{zer}(G)$.

Before proving Theorem 3.3, we make the following remarks. First, if we choose $\gamma = \frac{1}{L}$, then we only obtain the first result of (30) and $\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$. This rate is slightly better than the $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ rate in [18] when k is sufficiently large. Second, if $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{L})$, then we can prove $o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ convergence rates of $\|Gy_k\|^2$, $\|Gx_k\|^2$, $\|y_k - x_k\|^2$, and $\|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2$. Note that we can simply choose $\omega = 3$ to further simplify the results. In this case, we obtain $\theta_k = \frac{k+1}{k+8}$, which is different from $\theta_k = \frac{k}{k+2}$ in (14) obtained by Theorem 3.1. We emphasize that $o(\cdot)$ convergence rates have recently studied in a number of works such as [1, 3, 24, 25].

Proof. The first claim in the first line of (30) is directly from (28) by noticing that $t_k - 1 = \frac{k+\omega+1}{\omega}$. Now, we prove the second line of (30). We first choose $\mu = 1$ in (17). Then, from (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} y_{k+1} - x_{k+1} &= \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \gamma\nu_k Gy_k = \nu_k(x_{k+1} + \gamma Gy_k - x_k) + (\theta_k - \nu_k)(x_{k+1} - x_k) \\ &= \nu_k(y_k - x_k) + (\theta_k - \nu_k)(x_{k+1} - x_k). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Young's inequality, $\nu_k \in (0, 1)$, and this expression, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} t_{k+1}^2 \|y_{k+1} - x_{k+1}\|^2 &= t_{k+1}^2 \|\nu_k(y_k - x_k) + (\theta_k - \nu_k)(x_{k+1} - x_k)\|^2 \\ &\leq t_{k+1}^2 \nu_k \|y_k - x_k\|^2 + \frac{t_{k+1}^2 (\theta_k - \nu_k)^2}{1 - \nu_k} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Notice from (26) that $t_{k+1}^2 \nu_k = t_k^2 - \frac{\omega(\omega-2)t_k + \omega - 1}{\omega^2}$ and $\frac{t_{k+1}^2 (\theta_k - \nu_k)^2}{1 - \nu_k} = \frac{(\omega-1)^2 (k+2\omega+2)}{\omega^3}$. Utilizing these expressions into the last inequality, we obtain

$$\frac{\omega(\omega-2)t_k + \omega - 1}{\omega^2} \|y_k - x_k\|^2 \leq t_k^2 \|y_k - x_k\|^2 - t_{k+1}^2 \|y_{k+1} - x_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{(\omega-1)^2 t_{k+1}}{\omega^2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2. \quad (31)$$

Summing up this estimate from $k = 0$ to $k = K$, we get

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\omega(\omega-2)t_k + \omega - 1}{\omega^2} \|y_k - x_k\|^2 \leq t_0^2 \|y_0 - x_0\|^2 + \frac{(\omega-1)^2}{\omega^3} \sum_{k=0}^K (k + 2\omega + 2) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2.$$

Using the first line of (30) into this inequality and $\omega > 2$, we obtain $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [(\omega - 2)(k + 2\omega + 1) + \omega - 1] \|y_k - x_k\|^2 < +\infty$, which implies the first claim in the second line of

(30). Moreover, (31) also shows that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k^2 \|x_k - y_k\|^2$ exists. Combining this fact and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + 2\omega + 1) \|y_k - x_k\|^2 < +\infty$, we obtain $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k^2 \|x_k - y_k\|^2 = 0$, which shows that $\|x_k - y_k\|^2 = o(1/k^2)$.

To prove the third line of (30), we note that $\gamma \nu_k G y_k = (y_{k+1} - x_{k+1}) - \theta_k (x_{k+1} - x_k)$. Hence, $\gamma^2 \nu_k^2 (t_k - 1) \|G y_k\|^2 \leq 2(t_k - 1) \|y_{k+1} - x_{k+1}\|^2 + 2\theta_k^2 (t_k - 1) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2$. Exploiting the finite sum of the last two terms from (30), we obtain $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + \omega + 1) \|G y_k\|^2 < +\infty$.

To prove the second part in the first line of (30), utilizing (12), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_{[1]} &:= \theta_{k-1}^2 t_k^2 \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|^2 - \theta_k^2 t_{k+1}^2 \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\
&= t_k^2 \|y_k - x_k - \gamma \nu_{k-1} G y_{k-1}\|^2 - t_k^2 \|y_k - x_k - \gamma G y_k\|^2 + (t_k^2 - \theta_k^2 t_{k+1}^2) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\
&= \gamma^2 t_k^2 \|G y_k - \nu_{k-1} G y_{k-1}\|^2 + 2\gamma t_k^2 \langle G y_k - \nu_{k-1} G y_{k-1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \\
&\quad + (t_k^2 - \theta_k^2 t_{k+1}^2) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\
&= \gamma^2 t_k^2 \|G y_k - \nu_{k-1} G y_{k-1}\|^2 + 2\gamma t_k^2 \langle G y_k - G y_{k-1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \\
&\quad + 2\gamma t_k^2 (1 - \nu_k) \langle G y_{k-1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle + (t_k^2 - \theta_k^2 t_{k+1}^2) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\
&\geq \gamma^2 t_k^2 \|G y_k - \nu_{k-1} G y_{k-1}\|^2 + 2\gamma t_k^2 \left(\frac{1}{L} - \gamma\right) \|G y_k - G y_{k-1}\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\gamma t_k^2 (1 - \nu_k) \langle G y_{k-1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle + (t_k^2 - \theta_k^2 t_{k+1}^2) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Employing the update rule (26) and Young's inequality, this inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_{k-1}^2 t_k^2 \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|^2 - \theta_k^2 t_{k+1}^2 \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 &\geq 2\gamma t_k^2 (1 - \nu_k) \langle G y_{k-1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \\
&\geq -\frac{\gamma t_k^2}{t_{k+1}} [\|G y_{k-1}\|^2 + \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

Following the same argument as in the proof of $\|x_k - y_k\|^2$, we can show that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k^2 \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| = 0$, and hence, $\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 = o(1/k^2)$, which proves the second part in the first line of (30). Since $\gamma^2 \|G y_k\|^2 = \|x_{k+1} - y_k\|^2 \leq 2\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + 2\|y_k - x_k\|^2$, we also obtain $\|G y_k\|^2 = o(1/k^2)$.

Since $\|G x_k\|^2 \leq 2\|G x_k - G y_k\|^2 + 2\|G y_k\|^2 \leq 2L^2 \|x_k - y_k\|^2 + 2\|G y_k\|^2$, we obtain the fourth line of (30) from the previous lines.

Now, to prove the last line of (30). Since $y_{k+1} - y_k = x_{k+1} - x_k + \theta_k (x_{k+1} - x_k) - \theta_{k-1} (x_k - x_{k-1}) - \gamma (\nu_k G y_k - \nu_{k-1} G y_{k-1})$, we can bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2 &\leq 4(1 + \theta_k)^2 \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + 4\theta_{k-1}^2 \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|^2 \\
&\quad + 4\gamma^2 \nu_k^2 \|G y_k - G y_{k-1}\|^2 + 4\gamma (\nu_k - \nu_{k-1})^2 \|G y_{k-1}\|^2 \\
&\leq 16\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + 4\|x_k - x_{k-1}\|^2 + 4\gamma^2 \|G y_k - G y_{k-1}\|^2 + 4\gamma^2 \|G y_{k-1}\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the facts that $\theta_k, \theta_{k-1}, \nu_k, \nu_{k-1} \in (0, 1)$ and $(\nu_k - \nu_{k-1})^2 < 1$. Combining this estimate and the first and second lines of (30), we obtain the third line of (30).

Finally, to prove the convergence of $\{x_k\}$ and $\{y_k\}$, we note that $\|x_k - y^*\|^2 \leq \mathcal{V}_k \leq \mathcal{V}_0$. Hence $\{x_k\}$ is bounded, which has a limit point. Moreover, since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_k - x_{k-1}\| = 0$, $\{x_k\}$ is convergent to y^* . We have $\|G x_k\| \leq \|G y_k\| + \|G y_k - G x_k\| \leq \|G y_k\| + L\|x_k - y_k\| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since G is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-cocercive, it is L -Lipschitz continuous. Passing the limit through G and using the continuity of G , we obtain $G y^* = 0$. Since $\|x_k - y_k\| \rightarrow \infty$, we also have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y^k = y^*$. \square

From the result of Theorem 3.3, we can derive the convergence of the Halpern fixed-point iteration (7), but under different choice of parameters.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\{y_k\}$ be generated by the Halpern fixed-point iteration (7) using $\beta_k := \frac{\omega+1}{k+2\omega+2}$ and $\eta_k := \gamma(1 - \beta_k)$ for a fixed $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{L})$ and $\omega > 2$. Then, the following statements hold:*

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + \omega + 1) \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 < +\infty & \text{and} & \|Gy_k\|^2 = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right), \\ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + \omega) \|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2 < +\infty & \text{and} & \|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2 = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right). \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

Consequently, $\{y_k\}$ converges to $y^* \in \text{zer}(G)$.

Proof. As proved in Theorem 3.2, (7) is equivalent to (12) provided that $\theta_k = \frac{\beta_k(1-\beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}}$, $\nu_k = \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}}$, and $\gamma_k := \frac{\eta_k}{1-\beta_k}$. Using the choice of β_k , ν_k , and γ_k in Theorem 3.3, we can show that $\theta_k = \frac{\beta_k(1-\beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}} = \frac{k+1}{k+2\omega+2}$ and $\nu_k = \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} = \frac{k+\omega+2}{k+2\omega+2}$. These relations lead to $\beta_k = \frac{\omega+1}{k+2\omega+2}$. Moreover, since $\gamma_k = \frac{\eta_k}{1-\beta_k} = \gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{L})$, we have $\eta_k = \gamma(1 - \beta_k)$. Consequently, (32) follows from (30). \square

If we set $\omega = 0$, then we obtain $\beta_k = \frac{1}{k+2}$ as in Theorem 3.1. In this case, we have to set $\mu = 0$ in \mathcal{V}_k from (17), and hence only obtain $\|Gy_k\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ convergence rate. Note that other choices of parameters in Theorem 3.3 are possible, e.g., by changing μ and ω . Here, we have not tried to optimize the choice of these parameters. As shown in [5, Proposition 4.11] that T is a non-expansive mapping if and only if $G := \mathbb{I} - T$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ -co-coercive. Therefore, we can obtain new convergence results on the residual norm $\|y_k - Ty_k\|$ from Corollary 3.2 for a Halpern fixed-point iteration scheme to approximate a fixed-point y^* of T .

4 Application to Monotone Inclusions

In this section, we present some applications of the results in Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3 to proximal-point, forward-backward splitting, and three-operator splitting methods. The main idea is to transform (1) and its special cases to a co-coercive equation of the form (6), and then apply the results from Section 3 to this equation.

4.1 Application to Proximal-Point Method

We consider **Case 2** where (1) reduces to finding $y^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $0 \in Ay^*$. Let $J_{\lambda A}y := (\mathbb{I} + \lambda A)y$ be the resolvent of λA for any $\lambda > 0$ and $G_{\lambda A}y = \frac{1}{\lambda}(\mathbb{I} - J_{\lambda A})y = \frac{1}{\lambda}(y - J_{\lambda A}y)$ be the Yosida approximation of A with index $\lambda > 0$. Then, it is well-known that $G_{\lambda A}$ is λ -co-coercive [5, Corollary 23.11]. Moreover, y^* solves $0 \in Ay^*$ if and only if $G_{\lambda A}y^* = 0$. Hence, solving $0 \in Ay^*$ is equivalent to solving the co-coercive equation $G_{\lambda A}y^* = 0$ with λ -co-coercive $G_{\lambda A}$.

In this case, the Halpern-type fixed-point scheme (7) applying to $G_{\lambda A}y^* = 0$, or equivalently, to solving $0 \in Ay^*$, can be written as

$$y_{k+1} := \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \eta_k G_{\lambda A}y_k = \beta_k y_0 + \left(1 - \beta_k - \frac{\eta_k}{\lambda}\right)y_k + \frac{\eta_k}{\lambda} J_{\lambda A}y_k, \quad (33)$$

where β_k and η_k can be chosen either in Theorem 3.1 or Corollary 3.2 to guarantee convergence of (33). If $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$ and $\eta_k := 2\lambda(1 - \beta_k)$ as in Theorem 3.1, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} y_{k+1} &:= \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - 2(1 - \beta_k)(y_k - J_{\lambda A}y_k) \\ &= \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)(2J_{\lambda A}y_k - y_k) \\ &= \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)R_{\lambda A}y_k, \end{aligned}$$

where $R_{\lambda A} := 2J_{\lambda A} - \mathbb{I}$ is the reflected resolvent of λA . Moreover, under this choice of parameters, we have the following result from Theorem 3.1:

$$\|G_{\lambda A}y_k\| \leq \frac{\|y_0 - y^*\|}{\lambda(k+1)}.$$

If we choose $\beta_k := \frac{\omega+1}{k+2\omega+2}$ and $\eta_k := \gamma(1 - \beta_k)$ as in Corollary 3.2, then (33) becomes

$$y_{k+1} := \frac{\omega+1}{k+2\omega+2} \cdot y_0 + \frac{k+\omega+1}{k+2\omega+2} \cdot \left[\left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{\lambda}\right) y_k + \frac{\gamma}{\lambda} J_{\lambda A}y_k \right].$$

This expression can be viewed as a new variant of the Halpern fixed-point iteration applied to the averaged mapping $P_{\rho A}y = (1 - \rho)y + \rho J_{\lambda A}y$ with $\rho := \frac{\gamma}{\lambda}$ provided that $\gamma \in (0, \lambda]$. In this case, we obtain a convergence result as in (32).

Alternatively, if we apply (12) to solve $G_{\lambda A}y^* = 0$, then we obtain a Nesterov's accelerated interpretation of (33) as

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} := y_k - \gamma_k G_{\lambda A}y_k = (1 - \rho_k)y_k + \rho_k J_{\lambda A}y_k & \text{with } \rho_k := \frac{\gamma_k}{\lambda}, \\ y_{k+1} := x_{k+1} + \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \nu_k(y_k - x_{k+1}). \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

This method was studied in [24]. Nevertheless, our analysis in Theorem 3.3 is simpler than that of [24] when it applies to (34). In particular, if we choose $\gamma_k := \lambda$, then the first line of (34) reduces to $x_{k+1} = J_{\lambda A}y_k$. The convergence rate guarantees of (34) can be obtained as results of Corollary 3.1 and Theorem 3.3, respectively.

Finally, if we apply (11) to solve $G_{\lambda A}y^* = 0$ and choose $\gamma_k := \lambda$, $\eta_k := \lambda \left(\frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} + 1 - \beta_k \right)$ such that $\nu_k = 0$ and $\kappa_k = \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-2}}$, then (11) reduces to

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} := J_{\lambda A}y_k, \\ y_{k+1} := x_{k+1} + \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \kappa_k(y_{k-1} - x_k). \end{cases}$$

Clearly, if we choose $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$, then $\theta_k = \frac{k}{k+2}$ and $\kappa_k = \frac{k}{k+2}$. In this case, the last scheme reduces to the accelerated proximal-point algorithm studied in [18]. In addition, we have $\eta_k = \frac{2\lambda(k+1)}{k+2}$ as in Theorem 3.1. Hence, the result of Corollary 3.1 is still applicable to this scheme to obtain a convergence rate guarantee $\|G_{\lambda Q}y_k\| \leq \frac{\|y_0 - y^*\|}{\lambda(k+1)}$ as in [18, Theorem 4.1].

4.2 Application to Forward-Backward Splitting Method

Let us consider **Case 3** when (1) reduces to finding $y^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $0 \in Ay^* + By^*$. By Lemma 2.1, $y^* \in \text{zer}(A + B)$ if and only if $G_{\lambda Q}y^* = 0$, where $Q := A + B$ and $G_{\lambda Q}$ is defined by (2). Moreover, $G_{\lambda Q}$ is $\frac{\lambda(4-\lambda L)}{4}$ -co-coercive, provided that $0 < \lambda < \frac{4}{L}$.

If we apply (7) to solve $G_{\lambda Q}y^* = 0$, then its iterate can be written explicitly as

$$y_{k+1} := \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \eta_k G_{\lambda Q}y_k = \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)[(1 - \rho)y_k + \rho J_{\lambda A}(y_k - \lambda B y_k)], \quad (35)$$

where we have set $\rho := \frac{4 - \lambda L}{2}$. In particular, if we choose $\lambda := \frac{2}{L}$, then $\rho = 1$ and (35) reduces to $y_{k+1} := \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)J_{\lambda A}(y_k - \lambda B y_k)$, which can be viewed as the Halpern fixed-point iteration applied to approximate a fixed-point of $J_{\lambda A}(y_k - \lambda B y_k)$.

Depending on the choice of β_k and ρ as in Theorem 3.1 or Corollary 3.2, we obtain

$$\|G_{\lambda Q}y_k\| \leq \frac{4\|y_0 - y^*\|}{\lambda(4 - \lambda L)(k + 1)}, \quad \text{or} \quad \|G_{\lambda Q}y_k\| = o(1/k),$$

respectively, provided that $0 < \lambda < \frac{4}{L}$.

Now, we consider Nesterov's accelerated variant of (35) by applying (12) to $G_{\lambda Q}y^* = 0$:

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} := (1 - \rho_k)y_k + \rho_k J_{\lambda A}(y_k - \lambda B y_k), \\ y_{k+1} := x_{k+1} + \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \nu_k(y_k - x_{k+1}), \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

where $\rho_k := \frac{\gamma_k}{\lambda}$, $\theta_k := \frac{\beta_k(1 - \beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}}$, and $\nu_k := \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}}$. This scheme is similar to the one studied in [25]. Again, the convergence of (36) can be guaranteed by either Corollary 3.1 or Theorem 3.3 depending on the choice of γ_k , θ_k , and ν_k . However, we omit the details here.

4.3 Application to Three-Operator Splitting Method

Finally, we consider the general case, **Case 4**. As stated in Lemma 2.2, $y^* \in \text{zer}(A + B + C)$ if and only if $E_{\lambda Q}y^* = 0$, where $Q := A + B + C$ and $E_{\lambda Q}$ is defined by (4). Let us apply (7) to $E_{\lambda Q}y^* = 0$ and arrive at the following scheme:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{k+1} &:= \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \eta_k E_{\lambda Q}y_k \\ &= \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \frac{\eta_k}{\lambda}(J_{\lambda B}y_k - J_{\lambda A}(2J_{\lambda B}y_k - y_k - \lambda C \circ J_{\lambda B}y_k)). \end{aligned}$$

Unfolding this scheme by using intermediate variables z_k and w_k , we obtain

$$\begin{cases} z_k &:= J_{\lambda B}y_k, \\ w_k &:= J_{\lambda A}(2z_k - y_k - \lambda C z_k), \\ y_{k+1} &:= \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \frac{\eta_k}{\lambda}(z_k - w_k). \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

This is called a Halpern-type three-operator splitting scheme for solving (1). If $C = 0$, then it reduces to Halpern-type Douglas-Rachford splitting scheme for solving **Case 2** of (1) derived from (7). The latter case was proposed in [41] with a direct convergence proof for both dynamic and constant stepsizes, but the convergence is given on $G_{\lambda Q}$ instead of $E_{\lambda Q}$. Note that the convergence results of Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2 can be applied to (37) to obtain convergence rates on $\|E_{\lambda Q}y_k\|$. Such rates can be transformed to the ones on $\|G_{\lambda Q}z_k\|$ when $C = 0$ and B is single valued.

Next, we can also derive Nesterov's accelerated variant of (37) by applying (12) to solve $E_{\lambda Q}y^* = 0$. In this case, (12) becomes

$$\begin{cases} z_k & := J_{\lambda B}y_k, \\ w_k & := J_{\lambda A}(2z_k - y_k - \lambda C z_k), \\ x_{k+1} & := y_k + \frac{1}{\lambda}(w_k - z_k), \\ y_{k+1} & := x_{k+1} + \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \nu_k(y_k - x_{k+1}). \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

Here, the parameters θ_k and ν_k can be chosen as in either Corollary 3.1 or Theorem 3.3. This scheme essentially has the same per-iteration complexity as the standard three-operator splitting scheme in the literature [12]. However, its convergence rate is much faster than the standard one by applying either Corollary 3.1 or Theorem 3.3. If $C = 0$, then (38) reduces to accelerated Douglas-Rachford splitting scheme, where its fast convergence rate guarantee can be obtained as a special case of either Corollary 3.1 or Theorem 3.3.

5 Extra-Anchored Gradient Method and Its Variants

Motivation. While the gradient of a convex and L -smooth function is co-coercive, monotone and Lipschitz continuous operators are not co-coercive in general. As a simple example, one can take $Gx = (Av, -A^\top u)$ as the gradient of the saddle objective function in a bilinear game, where A in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is given and $x = (u, v)$. In order to solve (6) when G is only monotone and L -Lipschitz continuous, the extragradient method (EG) appears to be one of the most suitable candidates [20]. This method has recently been extended to weak Minty variational inequality, i.e. $\langle Gy, y - y^* \rangle \geq -\rho \|Gy\|^2$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $y^* \in \text{zer}(G)$ in our context, see, e.g. [14]. In [43], Yoon and Ryu have applied the Halpern fixed-point iteration to EG and obtained a new algorithm called extra-anchored gradient method (EAG). This algorithm achieves optimal convergence rate on $\|Gy_k\|$. Recently, [21] has extended EAG to a co-monotone setting of (6) and still achieved the same rate $\|Gy_k\| = \mathcal{O}(1/k)$ as in [43]. This is perhaps surprised since G is nonmonotone. An extension to Popov's scheme (also called past-extra-gradient, or reflected forward methods) can be found in [41]. Our goal in this section is to derive a corresponding Nesterov's accelerated interpretation of these schemes and possibly provide an alternative convergence rate analysis for existing results in [21, 41, 43].

5.1 The Extra-Anchored Gradient Method and Its Convergence

The extra-anchored gradient method (EAG) was proposed in [43] to solve (6) under the monotonicity and L -Lipschitz continuity of G , which can be written as

$$\begin{cases} z_{k+1} & := \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \eta_k G y_k, \\ y_{k+1} & := \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \hat{\eta}_k G z_{k+1}, \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

where $\beta_k \in (0, 1)$, y_0 is an initial point, and η_k and $\hat{\eta}_k$ are two given step-sizes. Here, we use two different step-sizes η_k and $\hat{\eta}_k$ compared to the original EAG in [43] by adopting the idea of EG+ from [14], see also [21].

As proved in [43], if we update $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$, $\eta_{k+1} := \left(1 - \frac{L^2\eta_k^2}{(1-L^2\eta_k^2)(k+1)(k+3)}\right)\eta_k$, and $\hat{\eta}_{k+1} := \eta_{k+1}$ with some $0 < \eta_0 < \frac{1}{L}$, then the following convergence rate guarantee is obtained:

$$\|Gy_k\|^2 \leq \frac{C_*\|y_0 - y^*\|^2}{(k+1)(k+2)}, \quad \text{where } \eta_* = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad C_* := \frac{4(1 + \eta_0\eta_*L^2)}{\eta_*^2}. \quad (40)$$

Alternatively, one can also fix the step-size $\hat{\eta}_k = \eta_k = \eta \in (0, \frac{1}{8L}]$, and the following convergence guarantee is established:

$$\|Gy_k\|^2 \leq \frac{C_*\|y_0 - y^*\|^2}{(k+1)^2}, \quad \text{where } C_* := \frac{4(1 + \eta L + \eta^2 L^2)}{\eta^2(1 + \eta L)}. \quad (41)$$

In particular, if $\eta := \frac{1}{8L}$, then $C_* = 260$. Both guarantees (40) and (41) were proven in [43].

5.2 Nesterov's Accelerated Interpretation of EAG

Now, let us derive Nesterov's accelerated interpretation of (39) by proving the following result.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}$ be generated by the following scheme:*

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} &:= y_k - \gamma_k Gy_k, \\ z_{k+1} &:= x_{k+1} + \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \nu_k(z_k - x_{k+1}), \\ y_{k+1} &:= z_{k+1} - \hat{\eta}_k Gz_{k+1} + \eta_k Gy_k, \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

starting from $z_0 = x_0 := y_0$, where $\gamma_k := \frac{\eta_k}{1-\beta_k}$, $\theta_k := \frac{\beta_k(1-\beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}}$, and $\nu_k := \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}}$. Then, $\{(y_k, z_k)\}$ is identical to the one generated by the EAG scheme (39).

Clearly, (42) does not look like any Nesterov's accelerated scheme in the literature. To see the relation, let us rewrite (42) equivalently to the following scheme:

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} &:= z_k - \hat{\eta}_{k-1} \hat{G}z_k, \\ z_{k+1} &:= x_{k+1} + \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \nu_k(z_k - x_{k+1}), \end{cases} \quad (43)$$

where $\begin{cases} \hat{G}z_k &:= Gz_k + \frac{\gamma_k}{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}} Gy_k - \frac{\eta_{k-1}}{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}} Gy_{k-1}, \\ y_{k+1} &:= z_{k+1} - \hat{\eta}_k Gz_{k+1} + \eta_k Gy_k. \end{cases}$

Clearly, the first two lines of (43) are similar to (12), but using an approximate operator $\hat{G}z_k$ instead of the exact evaluation Gz_k as in (12). Therefore, (43) can be viewed as an inexact variant of the Nesterov's accelerated method (12).

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We only prove that (39) leads to (42). The opposite direction from (42) to (39) is obtained by reverting back the derivations below, and hence omitted.

Firstly, multiplying the first line of (39) by β_{k-1} , we have $\beta_{k-1}z_{k+1} = \beta_k\beta_{k-1}y_0 + \beta_{k-1}(1 - \beta_k)y_k - \beta_{k-1}\eta_k Gy_k$. Shifting the index from k to $k-1$ of the first line of (39), and then multiplying the result by $-\beta_k$, we get $-\beta_k z_k = -\beta_k\beta_{k-1}y_0 - \beta_k(1 - \beta_{k-1})y_{k-1} + \beta_k\eta_{k-1}Gy_{k-1}$.

Summing up both expressions, we arrive at $\beta_{k-1}z_{k+1} - \beta_k z_k = \beta_{k-1}(1 - \beta_k)y_k - \beta_{k-1}\eta_k G y_k - \beta_k(1 - \beta_{k-1})y_{k-1} + \beta_k \eta_{k-1} G y_{k-1}$. The last expression leads to

$$z_{k+1} = \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} z_k + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \eta_k G y_k - \frac{\beta_k(1 - \beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}} y_{k-1} + \frac{\beta_k \eta_{k-1}}{\beta_{k-1}} G y_{k-1}.$$

Next, subtracting the first line from the second one of (39), we have $y_{k+1} - z_{k+1} = -\hat{\eta}_k G z_{k+1} + \eta_k G y_k$, leading to $y_{k+1} = z_{k+1} - \hat{\eta}_k G z_{k+1} + \eta_k G y_k$. Combining both expressions, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} z_{k+1} = \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} z_k + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \eta_k G y_k - \frac{\beta_k(1 - \beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}} y_{k-1} + \frac{\beta_k \eta_{k-1}}{\beta_{k-1}} G y_{k-1}, \\ y_{k+1} = z_{k+1} - \hat{\eta}_k G z_{k+1} + \eta_k G y_k. \end{cases} \quad (44)$$

Let us introduce $x_{k+1} := y_k - \gamma_k G y_k$. Then, we have $G y_k = \frac{1}{\gamma_k}(y_k - x_{k+1})$. Substituting these expressions into the first line of (44), we get

$$\begin{aligned} z_{k+1} &= \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} z_k + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \frac{\eta_k}{\gamma_k}(y_k - x_{k+1}) - \frac{\beta_k(1 - \beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}} y_{k-1} + \frac{\beta_k \eta_{k-1}}{\beta_{k-1} \gamma_{k-1}}(y_{k-1} - x_k) \\ &= \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} z_k + \left(1 - \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}}\right) x_{k+1} + \frac{\beta_k(1 - \beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}}(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \left(1 - \beta_k - \frac{\eta_k}{\gamma_k}\right)(y_k - x_{k+1}) \\ &\quad - \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}}(1 - \beta_{k-1} - \frac{\eta_{k-1}}{\gamma_{k-1}})(y_{k-1} - x_k). \end{aligned}$$

If we choose γ_k such that $1 - \beta_k - \frac{\eta_k}{\gamma_k} = 0$ (or equivalently, $\gamma_k = \frac{\eta_k}{1 - \beta_k}$), then we have

$$z_{k+1} = \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} z_k + \left(1 - \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}}\right) x_{k+1} + \frac{\beta_k(1 - \beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}}(x_{k+1} - x_k).$$

Finally, putting the above derivation together, we eventually get

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} := y_k - \frac{\eta_k}{1 - \beta_k} G y_k, \\ z_{k+1} := \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}} z_k + \left(1 - \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}}\right) x_{k+1} + \frac{\beta_k(1 - \beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}}(x_{k+1} - x_k), \\ y_{k+1} := z_{k+1} - \hat{\eta}_k G z_{k+1} + \eta_k G y_k, \end{cases}$$

which is exactly (42). \square

In order to analyze the convergence of (42), following the same approach as in Section 3, we consider the following Lyapunov function:

$$\mathcal{Q}_k := a_k \|G y_{k-1}\|^2 + b_k \langle G y_{k-1}, x_k - z_k \rangle + \|x_k + t_k(z_k - x_k) - y^*\|^2 + \mu \|x_k - y^*\|^2, \quad (45)$$

where $a_k > 0$, $b_k > 0$, and $t_k > 0$ are given parameters, which will be determined later, and $\mu \geq 0$.

Recall that the Lyapunov function used in [43] to establish convergence of (39) is $\mathcal{L}_k := p_k \|G y_k\| + q_k \langle G y_k, y_k - y_0 \rangle$, where p_k and q_k are given parameters. Similar to Lemma 3.1, we can show that if $\mu = 0$, $a_k := \frac{4p_k(p_k + \gamma_k q_k)}{q_k^2}$, and $b_k := \frac{4p_k}{\beta_k q_k}$, then $\mathcal{L}_k = \frac{q_k^2}{4p_k} [\mathcal{Q}_{k+1} - \|y_0 - y^*\|^2]$. This relation allows one to adopt the analysis in [43] to prove convergence of (42). However, the analysis using \mathcal{Q}_k remains different from [43] since $\mathcal{L}_{k-1} - \mathcal{L}_k$ is different from $\mathcal{Q}_k - \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ provided that $\frac{q_k^2}{4p_k}$ is not a constant. The following lemma proves a monotone property of \mathcal{Q}_k , which plays a key role for our analysis.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that G in (6) is monotone and L -Lipschitz continuous. Let $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}$ be generated by (42) and \mathcal{Q}_k be defined by (45) with $\mu := 0$. Assume that the parameters t_k , γ_k , $\hat{\eta}_k$, η_k , θ_k , ν_k , a_k , and b_k are updated by*

$$\begin{aligned} t_k &:= k + 1, & \gamma_k &:= \frac{1}{L}, & \hat{\eta}_k &:= \frac{1}{L}, & \eta_k &:= \frac{(k+1)}{L(k+2)}, & \theta_k &:= \frac{k}{k+2}, & \nu_k &:= \frac{k+1}{k+2}, \\ a_k &:= \frac{b_k(k+2)}{2(k+1)}, & \text{and } b_{k+1} &:= \frac{b_k(k+2)}{k}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Then, for $k \geq 0$, the following estimates hold:

$$\mathcal{Q}_k - \mathcal{Q}_{k+1} \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}_{k+1} \geq \frac{b_1(4 - Lb_1)(k+1)^2}{16L} \|Gy_k\|^2. \quad (47)$$

Moreover, we also have $b_k = \frac{b_1 k(k+1)}{2}$ and hence $a_k = \frac{b_1 k(k+2)}{4L}$.

Proof. Similar to the proof of (25) in Lemma 3.2, using (42) and (45), we can prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_k - \mathcal{Q}_{k+1} &= a_k \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 - a_{k+1} \|Gy_k\|^2 - b_k \langle Gy_{k-1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \\ &\quad + b_{k+1} \theta_k \langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle - b_k \langle Gy_{k-1}, z_k - x_{k+1} \rangle \\ &\quad + b_{k+1} \nu_k \langle Gy_k, z_k - x_{k+1} \rangle + (t_k^2 - \nu_k^2 t_{k+1}^2) \|z_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + [(t_k - 1)^2 - t_{k+1}^2 \theta_k^2 + \mu] \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2(t_k - 1 - t_{k+1} \theta_k - \mu) \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, x_{k+1} - y^* \rangle \\ &\quad + 2(t_k - t_{k+1} \nu_k) \langle z_k - x_{k+1}, x_{k+1} - y^* \rangle \\ &\quad + 2[t_k(t_k - 1) - \nu_k \theta_k t_{k+1}^2] \langle z_k - x_{k+1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Now, let us choose the parameters t_k , b_k , θ_k , and ν_k such that

$$t_k - t_{k+1} \nu_k = 0, \quad t_k(t_k - 1) - \nu_k \theta_k t_{k+1}^2 = 0, \quad t_k - 1 - t_{k+1} \theta_k - \mu = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad b_k = b_{k+1} \theta_k. \quad (49)$$

The third condition leads to $\theta_k := \frac{t_k - 1 - \mu}{t_{k+1}}$, while the first one gives us $\nu_k := \frac{t_k}{t_{k+1}}$. The second condition becomes $t_k(t_k - 1) = t_k(t_{k+1} - 1 - \mu)$, which is satisfied if $\mu = 0$. The last condition holds if we choose $b_{k+1} := \frac{b_k}{\theta_k}$. These updates are exactly given in (46).

Noticing from (42) that $z_k - x_{k+1} = \gamma_k Gy_k + \hat{\eta}_{k-1} Gz_k - \eta_{k-1} Gy_{k-1}$. Using this relation and our choice $b_{k+1} = \frac{b_k}{\theta_k}$, we can easily show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{[2]} &:= b_{k+1} \nu_k \langle Gy_k, z_k - x_{k+1} \rangle - b_k \langle Gy_{k-1}, z_k - x_{k+1} \rangle \\ &= b_k \langle \frac{\nu_k}{\theta_k} Gy_k - Gy_{k-1}, \gamma_k Gy_k + \hat{\eta}_{k-1} Gz_k - \eta_{k-1} Gy_{k-1} \rangle \\ &= \frac{b_k \gamma_k \nu_k}{\theta_k} \|Gy_k\|^2 - b_k \left(\gamma_k + \frac{\eta_{k-1} \nu_k}{\theta_k} \right) \langle Gy_k, Gy_{k-1} \rangle + \frac{b_k \hat{\eta}_{k-1} \nu_k}{\theta_k} \langle Gy_k, Gz_k \rangle \\ &\quad - b_k \hat{\eta}_{k-1} \langle Gy_{k-1}, Gz_k \rangle + b_k \eta_{k-1} \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, using the monotonicity of G , $b_k = b_{k+1} \theta_k$, and $x_{k+1} = y_k - \gamma_k Gy_k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{[3]} &:= b_{k+1} \theta_k \langle Gy_k, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle - b_k \langle Gy_{k-1}, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \\ &= b_k \langle Gy_k - Gy_{k-1}, y_k - y_{k-1} - (\gamma_k Gy_k - \gamma_{k-1} Gy_{k-1}) \rangle \\ &= b_k \langle Gy_k - Gy_{k-1}, y_k - y_{k-1} \rangle - b_k \gamma_k \|Gy_k\|^2 + b_k (\gamma_k + \gamma_{k-1}) \langle Gy_k, Gy_{k-1} \rangle - b_k \gamma_{k-1} \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\geq -b_k \gamma_k \|Gy_k\|^2 + b_k (\gamma_k + \gamma_{k-1}) \langle Gy_k, Gy_{k-1} \rangle - b_k \gamma_{k-1} \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting (49), $\mathcal{T}_{[2]}$, and $\mathcal{T}_{[3]}$ into (48), we can further lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_k - \mathcal{Q}_{k+1} &\geq [a_k + b_k(\eta_{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1})] \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 + \left[b_k \gamma_k \left(\frac{\nu_k}{\theta_k} - 1 \right) - a_{k+1} \right] \|Gy_k\|^2 \\ &\quad - b_k \left(\frac{\eta_{k-1}\nu_k}{\theta_k} - \gamma_{k-1} \right) \langle Gy_k, Gy_{k-1} \rangle + b_k \hat{\eta}_{k-1} \left(\frac{\nu_k}{\theta_k} - 1 \right) \langle Gy_k, Gz_k \rangle \\ &\quad + b_k \hat{\eta}_{k-1} \langle Gy_k - Gy_{k-1}, Gz_k \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Now, using the L -Lipschitz continuity of G , we have $\|Gz_k - Gy_k\|^2 \leq L^2 \|z_k - y_k\|^2 = L^2 \|\hat{\eta}_{k-1} Gz_k - \eta_{k-1} Gy_{k-1}\|^2$, which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\|Gy_k\|^2 + (1 - L^2 \hat{\eta}_{k-1}^2) \|Gz_k\|^2 - 2(1 - L^2 \eta_{k-1} \hat{\eta}_{k-1}) \langle Gy_k, Gz_k \rangle \\ &\quad - 2L^2 \eta_{k-1} \hat{\eta}_{k-1} \langle Gz_k, Gy_k - Gy_{k-1} \rangle - L^2 \eta_{k-1}^2 \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying this inequality by $\frac{b_k}{2L^2\eta_{k-1}}$ and adding the result to (50), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_k - \mathcal{Q}_{k+1} &\geq \left[a_k + \frac{b_k}{2} (\eta_{k-1} - 2\gamma_{k-1}) \right] \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{b_k(1-L^2\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^2)}{2L^2\eta_{k-1}} \|Gz_k\|^2 \\ &\quad + \left[b_k \gamma_k \left(\frac{\nu_k}{\theta_k} - 1 \right) + \frac{b_k}{2L^2\eta_{k-1}} - a_{k+1} \right] \|Gy_k\|^2 \\ &\quad + b_k \left(\frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}\nu_k}{\theta_k} - \frac{1}{L^2\eta_{k-1}} \right) \langle Gy_k, Gz_k \rangle - b_k \left(\frac{\eta_{k-1}\nu_k}{\theta_k} - \gamma_{k-1} \right) \langle Gy_k, Gy_{k-1} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Let us choose γ_{k-1} , $\hat{\eta}_{k-1}$, η_{k-1} , and a_k as follows:

$$\gamma_{k-1} = \hat{\eta}_{k-1} := \frac{1}{L}, \quad \eta_{k-1} := \frac{\theta_k}{L^2\nu_k\hat{\eta}_{k-1}} = \frac{(t_k-1)}{Lt_k}, \quad \text{and} \quad a_k := \frac{b_k(2\gamma_{k-1}-\eta_{k-1})}{2} = \frac{b_k(t_k+1)}{2Lt_k}. \quad (52)$$

Then, noting from (49) that $b_k = b_{k+1}\theta_k = \frac{b_{k+1}(t_k-1)}{t_{k+1}}$, we can easily check that

$$\begin{cases} a_k + \frac{b_k}{2} (\eta_{k-1} - 2\gamma_{k-1}) &= 0, \\ \frac{b_k(1-L^2\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^2)}{2L^2\eta_{k-1}} &= 0, \\ b_k \left(\frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}\nu_k}{\theta_k} - \frac{1}{L^2\eta_{k-1}} \right) &= 0, \\ b_k \left(\frac{\eta_{k-1}\nu_k}{\theta_k} - \gamma_{k-1} \right) &= 0, \\ b_k \gamma_k \left(\frac{\nu_k}{\theta_k} - 1 \right) + \frac{b_k}{2L^2\eta_{k-1}} - a_{k+1} &= \frac{b_{k+1}(t_k-t_{k+1}+1)}{2Lt_{k+1}}. \end{cases}$$

If we choose $t_k := k + 1$, then both (49) and (52) lead to the updates in (46). Moreover, the last term of the above expression becomes $b_k \gamma_k \left(\frac{\nu_k}{\theta_k} - 1 \right) + \frac{b_k}{2L^2\eta_{k-1}} - a_{k+1} = 0$. Hence, (51) leads to $\mathcal{Q}_k - \mathcal{Q}_{k+1} \geq 0$, which proves the first estimate of (47). Note that since $b_{k+1} = \frac{b_k(k+2)}{k}$, by induction, we get $b_{k+1} = \frac{b_1(k+1)(k+2)}{2}$, leading to $b_k = \frac{b_1 k(k+1)}{2}$, and hence $a_k = \frac{b_k(t_k+1)}{2Lt_k} = \frac{b_1 k(k+2)}{4L}$. Clearly, with $b_k = \frac{b_1 k(k+1)}{2}$, we have $b_0 = 0$ and $a_0 = 0$.

Finally, using the definition (45) of \mathcal{Q}_k , $x_k = y_{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1} Gy_{k-1}$, and the monotonicity of

G , we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_k &\stackrel{(45)}{=} a_k \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 - \frac{b_k}{t_k} \langle Gy_{k-1}, x_k + t_k(x_k - z_k) - y^* \rangle \\
&\quad + \|x_k + t_k(z_k - x_k) - y^*\|^2 + \frac{b_k}{t_k} \langle Gy_{k-1}, x_k - y^* \rangle \\
&= \|x_k + t_k(z_k - x_k) - y^* - \frac{b_k}{2t_k} Gy_{k-1}\|^2 + \left(a_k - \frac{b_k^2}{4t_k^2}\right) \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{b_k}{t_k} \langle Gy_{k-1}, x_k - y^* \rangle \\
&\geq \left(a_k - \frac{b_k^2}{4t_k^2} - \frac{b_k \gamma_{k-1}}{t_k}\right) \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Utilizing (46) and $b_k = \frac{b_1 k(k+1)}{2}$, we obtain $\mathcal{Q}_k \geq \frac{b_1 k^2(4-Lb_1)}{16L} \|Gy_{k-1}\|^2$, which proves the second estimate of (47). \square

Now, we can state the main convergence result of (42) in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.2. *Assume that G in (6) is monotone and L -Lipschitz continuous. Let $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}$ be generated by (42) using the update rules (46). Then, for all $k \geq 0$, we have*

$$\|Gy_k\|^2 \leq \frac{4L^2}{(k+1)^2} \|y_0 - y^*\|^2. \quad (53)$$

Proof. From (47), if we choose $b_1 := \frac{2}{L}$, then we have $\mathcal{Q}_k - \mathcal{Q}_{k+1} \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1} \geq \frac{(k+1)^2}{4L^2} \|Gy_k\|^2$. By induction, we get $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1} \leq \mathcal{Q}_0$. Noting that $a_0 = b_0 = 0$ and $z_0 = x_0$, we obtain $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \|y_0 - y^*\|^2$. Combining three last statements, we arrive at $\frac{(k+1)^2}{4L^2} \|Gy_k\|^2 \leq \mathcal{Q}_{k+1} \leq \mathcal{Q}_0 \leq \|y_0 - y^*\|^2$, which leads to the first line of (53). \square

Unfortunately, with the proof technique in Theorem 5.2, we were unable to achieve faster $o(1/k^2)$ -convergence rates as in Theorem 3.3. We believe that such rates require to choose $\mu > 0$ in the Lyapunov function \mathcal{Q}_k of (45). We leave this analysis as our future research.

5.3 EAG for Co-Monotone Case and Its Nesterov's Acceleration

We consider the variant of EAG in [21] for the co-monotone operator G . Recall that the operator G in (6) is said to be ρ -comonotone if $\langle Gx - Gy, x - y \rangle \geq \rho \|Gx - Gy\|^2$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^p$, where $\rho < 0$. In this subsection, we consider the case that G is also L -Lipschitz continuous and ρ is chosen such that $-\frac{1}{2L} < \rho \leq \frac{1}{L}$. Hence, it covers three cases: co-coerciveness when $\rho > 0$, monotonicity when $\rho = 0$, and co-monotonicity when $\rho < 0$. The second case has been studied in Subsection 5.2.

More specifically, [21] proposes a variant of (39) to solve (6), which can be written as

$$\begin{cases} z_{k+1} := \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k) y_k - (1 - \beta_k) (2\rho + \eta_k) Gy_k, \\ y_{k+1} := \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k) y_k - 2\rho(1 - \beta_k) Gy_k - \eta_k Gz_{k+1}, \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

where $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+1}$, $\eta_k := \frac{1}{L}$. If $\rho := 0$, then (54) reduces to (42).

As proved in [21], the following convergence guarantee is obtained for (54):

$$\|Gy_k\|^2 \leq \frac{4L^2 \|y_0 - y^*\|^2}{(1 + 2\rho L) k^2}, \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (55)$$

Here, the key condition is that $\rho > -\frac{1}{2L}$, which allows one to handle a non-monotone G in (6).

Let us rewrite (54) in a different form. First, we have $y_{k+1} - z_{k+1} = -\eta_k G z_{k+1} + \eta_k(1 - \beta_k)G y_k$. Hence, we get $2\rho(1 - \beta_k)G y_k = \frac{2\rho}{\eta_k}(y_{k+1} - z_{k+1}) + 2\rho G z_{k+1}$. Then, we have $y_{k+1} = \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \eta_k G z_{k+1} - \frac{2\rho}{\eta_k}(y_{k+1} - z_{k+1}) - 2\rho G z_{k+1}$. This expression implies that $(\eta_k + 2\rho)y_{k+1} = 2\rho z_{k+1} + \eta_k[\beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k] - \eta_k(\eta_k + 2\rho)G z_{k+1}$. Therefore, we eventually arrive at

$$y_{k+1} = (1 - \tau_k)x_{k+1} + \tau_k[\beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \frac{\eta_k^2}{\tau_k}G z_{k+1}], \quad \text{where} \quad \tau_k := \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_k + 2\rho} > 0.$$

Overall, the scheme (54) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} z_{k+1} & := \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \frac{(1 - \beta_k)\eta_k}{\tau_k}G y_k, \\ w_{k+1} & := \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \frac{\eta_k^2}{\tau_k}G z_{k+1}, \\ y_{k+1} & := (1 - \tau_k)z_{k+1} + \tau_k w_{k+1}. \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

The last line is a convex combination of the first two lines of the accelerated variant of EG+ from [14]. If $\tau_k = 1$ (i.e. $\rho = 0$ or G is monotone), then (56) reduces to EAG in (39).

Now, we derive Nesterov's accelerated interpretation of (54). Following the same derivation as of (42), we can show that (54) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} & := y_k - (\eta_k + 2\rho)G y_k, \\ z_{k+1} & := x_{k+1} + \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \nu_k(z_k - x_{k+1}), \\ y_{k+1} & := z_{k+1} - \eta_k(G z_{k+1} - (1 - \beta_k)G y_k). \end{cases} \quad (57)$$

This Nesterov's accelerated interpretation reduces to (42) when $\rho = 0$. Moreover, it still achieves $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ rate even when G is co-monotone (i.e. $-\frac{1}{2L} < \rho < 0$), which is non-monotone. The analysis in Theorem 5.2 can be applied to (57). However, we omit the details here.

5.4 Nesterov's Accelerated Interpretation of Halpern-Type PEG Method

Our final step is to consider the Halpern-type past-extragradient scheme for solving (6) studied in [41], which can be written as

$$\begin{cases} z_{k+1} & := \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \eta_k G z_k, \\ y_{k+1} & := \beta_k y_0 + (1 - \beta_k)y_k - \hat{\eta}_k G z_{k+1}. \end{cases} \quad (58)$$

Here, $z_0 := y_0$, $\beta_k \in (0, 1)$, and $\eta_k, \hat{\eta}_k > 0$ are given parameters, which will be determined in Theorem 5.3. The convergence of (58) has been proved in [41] for $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$, $\eta_{k+1} := \frac{(1 - \beta_k^2 - 2L^2\eta_k^2)\beta_{k+1}\eta_k}{(1 - 2L^2\eta_k^2)(1 - \beta_k)\beta_k}$, and $\hat{\eta}_k := \eta_k$ with some $0 < \eta_0 < \frac{1}{2L}$. However, we provide a slightly different variant in Theorem 5.3 with $\eta_k \neq \hat{\eta}_k$, whose proof is deferred to Appendix A.

Theorem 5.3. *Assume that G in (6) is monotone and L -Lipschitz continuous and $\text{zer}(G) \neq \emptyset$. For a given $\sigma > 0$, let $M := L^2(1 + \sigma)$. Let $\{(y_k, z_k)\}$ be generated by (58) to solve (6) using*

$\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$, $\eta_k := \frac{1-\beta_k}{\sqrt{2M}}$, and $\hat{\eta}_k := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2M}}$. Then, the following convergence guarantees hold:

$$\begin{cases} \|Gy_k\|^2 + 2L^2\|z_k - y_k\|^2 & \leq \frac{2(1+4M)\|y_0 - y^*\|^2}{(k+1)^2}, \\ \|Gz_k\|^2 & \leq \frac{3(1+4M)\|y_0 - y^*\|^2}{(k+1)^2}, \\ (\sigma-1)\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k(k+1)\|z_k - y_k\|^2 & \leq \frac{(1+4M)}{L^2}\|y_0 - y^*\|^2. \end{cases} \quad (59)$$

The last statement of (59) holds if $\sigma > 1$. In particular, if we choose $\sigma := \frac{19}{100}$, then $\hat{\eta}_k := \frac{0.9}{L}$. This stepsize is smaller than the one in (39). However, (58) only requires one evaluation of G per iteration compared to two evaluations as in (39).

By following the same way as (42), we can derive Nesterov's accelerated interpretation of (58). This result is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\beta_k \in (0, 1)$ and $\eta_k, \hat{\eta}_k > 0$ be given. Let $\{(\hat{x}_k, y_k, z_k)\}$ be generated by the following scheme:*

$$\begin{cases} \hat{x}_{k+1} := z_k - \hat{\gamma}_k Gz_k, \\ z_{k+1} := \hat{x}_{k+1} + \theta_k(\hat{x}_{k+1} - \hat{x}_k) + \nu_k(z_k - \hat{x}_{k+1}) + \kappa_k(z_{k-1} - \hat{x}_k) - \zeta_k(z_{k-2} - \hat{x}_{k-1}), \end{cases} \quad (60)$$

starting from $z_{-2} = z_{-1} = z_0 = \hat{x}_{-1} = \hat{x}_0 := y_0$, and using $\theta_k := \frac{\beta_k(1-\beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}}$, $\nu_k := \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}}$, $\hat{\gamma}_k := \hat{\eta}_{k-1} + \frac{\eta_k}{1-\beta_k}$, $\kappa_k := \frac{\eta_{k-1}(1-\beta_k)}{\hat{\gamma}_{k-1}}$ and $\zeta_k := \frac{\theta_k \eta_{k-2}}{\hat{\gamma}_{k-2}}$ provided that $\hat{\eta}_{-2} = \hat{\eta}_{-1} = \hat{\eta}_0 = \eta_{-2} = \eta_{-1} = \eta_0$. Then, $\{(y_k, z_k)\}$ is identical to the one generated by (58) starting from y_0 .

Proof. Similar to the derivation of (42), the following scheme is equivalent to (58):

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} := y_k - \gamma_k Gz_k, \\ z_{k+1} := x_{k+1} + \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \nu_k(z_k - x_{k+1}), \\ y_{k+1} := z_{k+1} - \hat{\eta}_k Gz_{k+1} + \eta_k Gz_k, \end{cases} \quad (61)$$

where $\gamma_k := \frac{\eta_k}{1-\beta_k}$, $\theta_k := \frac{\beta_k(1-\beta_{k-1})}{\beta_{k-1}}$, and $\nu_k := \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{k-1}}$.

Next, from the third line of (61), we have $y_k = z_k - \hat{\eta}_{k-1} Gz_k + \eta_{k-1} Gz_{k-1}$. Hence, we can eliminate y_k in (61) to get $x_{k+1} = z_k - (\hat{\eta}_{k-1} + \gamma_k) Gz_k + \eta_{k-1} Gz_{k-1}$. In this case, (61) can be written equivalently to

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} := z_k - (\hat{\eta}_{k-1} + \gamma_k) Gz_k + \eta_{k-1} Gz_{k-1}, \\ z_{k+1} := x_{k+1} + \theta_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \nu_k(z_k - x_{k+1}). \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

This scheme can be viewed as Nesterov's accelerated interpretation of (58). Unlike the standard one, (62) has one correction term in each line. However, if we denote $\hat{x}_{k+1} := z_k - (\hat{\eta}_{k-1} + \gamma_k) Gz_k$, then $x_{k+1} = \hat{x}_{k+1} + \eta_{k-1} Gz_{k-1}$. Substituting this expression into the second line of (62), we get $z_{k+1} = \hat{x}_{k+1} + \theta_k(\hat{x}_{k+1} - \hat{x}_k) + \nu_k(z_k - \hat{x}_{k+1}) + \eta_{k-1}(1 + \theta_k - \nu_k) Gz_{k-1} - \theta_k \eta_{k-2} Gz_{k-2}$. Since $Gz_{k-1} = \frac{1}{(\hat{\eta}_{k-2} + \gamma_{k-1})} (z_{k-1} - \hat{x}_k)$, we can further write (62) as

$$\begin{cases} \hat{x}_{k+1} := z_k - \hat{\gamma}_k Gz_k, \\ z_{k+1} := \hat{x}_{k+1} + \theta_k(\hat{x}_{k+1} - \hat{x}_k) + \nu_k(z_k - \hat{x}_{k+1}) + \kappa_k(z_{k-1} - \hat{x}_k) - \zeta_k(z_{k-2} - \hat{x}_{k-1}), \end{cases}$$

where $\hat{\gamma}_k := \hat{\eta}_{k-1} + \gamma_k$, $\kappa_k := \frac{\eta_{k-1}(1+\theta_k-\nu_k)}{\hat{\eta}_{k-2}+\gamma_{k-1}} = \frac{\eta_{k-1}(1-\beta_k)}{\hat{\gamma}_{k-1}}$ and $\zeta_k := \frac{\theta_k\eta_{k-2}}{\hat{\eta}_{k-3}+\gamma_{k-2}} = \frac{\theta_k\eta_{k-2}}{\hat{\gamma}_{k-2}}$. The last scheme is exactly (60). \square

Clearly, the new Nesterov's accelerated scheme (60) for solving (6) has three correction terms instead of two as in (11). Since our transformation is equivalent, the convergence of (60) is still guaranteed by Theorem 5.3. More specifically, if we choose β_k , $\hat{\eta}_k$, and η_k as in Theorem 5.3, then we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 5.1. *Assume that G in (6) is monotone and L -Lipschitz continuous and $\text{zer}(G) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\{(\hat{x}_k, z_k)\}$ be generated by (60) to solve (6) using $\hat{\gamma}_k := \frac{1}{L}$, $\theta_k := \frac{k}{k+2}$, $\nu_k := \frac{k+1}{k+2}$, $\kappa_k := \frac{k}{2(k+2)}$, and $\zeta_k := \frac{k-1}{2(k+2)}$ if $k \geq 1$ and $\zeta_k := 0$, otherwise. Then, we have*

$$\begin{cases} \|G\hat{x}_{k+1}\|^2 & \leq \frac{12(1+8L^2)\|\hat{x}_0 - y^*\|^2}{(k+1)^2}, \\ \|Gz_k\|^2 & \leq \frac{3(1+8L^2)\|\hat{x}_0 - y^*\|^2}{(k+1)^2}. \end{cases} \quad (63)$$

Unlike (11), (60) has convergence guarantee without the co-coerciveness of G . It only requires G to be monotone and L -Lipschitz continuous, and one evaluation of G per iteration.

Proof. For simplicity, let us first choose $\sigma := 1$ in Theorem 5.3. Then, by the choice of $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$, $\hat{\eta}_k := \frac{1}{2L}$, and $\eta_k := \frac{1-\beta_k}{2L}$ in Theorem 5.3, we can easily show that $\hat{\gamma}_k := \frac{1}{L}$, $\theta_k := \frac{k}{k+2}$, $\nu_k := \frac{k+1}{k+2}$, $\kappa_k := \frac{k}{2(k+2)}$, and $\zeta_k := \frac{k-1}{2(k+2)}$ if $k \geq 1$ and $\zeta_k := 0$, otherwise.

Next, since $\hat{x}^{k+1} = z_k - \hat{\gamma}_k Gz_k$ due to (60) and $\hat{\eta}_k = \frac{1}{L}$, we have $\|G\hat{x}_{k+1}\|^2 \leq 2\|G\hat{x}_{k+1} - Gz_k\|^2 + 2\|Gz_k\|^2 \leq 2L^2\|\hat{x}_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 + 2\|Gz_k\|^2 = 2L^2\hat{\eta}_k^2\|Gz_k\|^2 + 2\|Gz_k\|^2 = 4\|Gz_k\|^2$. Combining this inequality and the second line of (59), and noting that $\hat{x}_0 = y_0$, we obtain the first line of (63). The second line of (63) directly comes from the second line of (59). \square

6 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we illustrate our theoretical results through two numerical examples. The first one is to test Nesterov's accelerated variant (12) with two sets of parameters stated in Corollary 3.1 and Theorem 3.3, respectively. The second example is to test two Nesterov's accelerated schemes (42) and (60) of EAG and PEAG, respectively in Section 5.

6.1 The performance of Nesterov's accelerated variants of (7)

We consider a linear regression model $b = Py + \epsilon$, and its corresponding least-squares problem, where $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, y is a model parameter, and ϵ is a Gaussian noise of zero mean and variance σ^2 . We define the operator G from the normal equation of this least-squares problem, which is written as $Gy = P^\top(Py - b)$. It is obvious to show that Gy is $\frac{1}{L}$ -co-coercive with $L = \|P^\top P\|$.

We implement two variants of (12) with two sets of parameters stated in Corollary 3.1 and Theorem 3.3, respectively to solve $Gy^* = 0$ (i.e. $P^\top(Py^* - b) = 0$). The input data is generated as follows. We choose two cases: Case 1 with $(n, p) = (500, 1000)$ and Case 2 with $(n, p) = (1000, 1000)$. We generate P randomly using the standard Gaussian distribution and then normalize it to get unit columns. Next, we generate $b := Py^\natural + \mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$, where y^\natural is a

given vector generated from the standard Gaussian distribution, and $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$ is a Gaussian noise of zero mean and variance $\sigma^2 = 0.1$. This procedure makes sure that y^* exists.

We run both variants: **NesGD-v1** (corresponding to Corollary 3.1) and **NesGD-v2** (corresponding to Theorem 3.3) on these two instances up to 5000 iterations. The results of both variants are revealed in Figure 1, where the y -axis shows the relative error $\frac{\|Gx_k\|}{\|Gx_0\|}$ in log-scale.




Figure 1: The convergence behavior of the two Nesterov’s accelerated variants on two problem instances. Left: Case 1 with $(n, p) = (500, 1000)$, and Right: Case 2 with $(n, p) = (1000, 1000)$.

Figure 1 shows that **NesGD-v1** follows $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ -convergence rate in both cases, while **NesGD-v2** highly outperforms its $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ theoretical rate in Case 1. In Case 2, **NesGD-v2** still follows its $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ -convergence rate. Moreover, $\|Gx_k\|$ is decreasing smoothly without oscillation w.r.t. the iteration counter k in both variants.

6.2 The performance of Nesterov’s accelerated variants of EAG and PEAG

Our next experiment is to test Nesterov’s accelerated variants (42) of EAG and (60) of PEAG. For this purpose, we consider a minimax problem and the corresponding saddle operator G as

$$\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^m} \max_{v \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \mathcal{H}(u, v) := f(u) + \langle Ku, v \rangle - g(v) \right\}, \quad \text{and} \quad Gy := \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(u) + K^\top v \\ \nabla g(v) - Ku \end{bmatrix}, \quad (64)$$

where $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $\nabla f(\cdot)$ and $\nabla g(\cdot)$ are the gradients of L -smooth and convex functions $f(\cdot)$ and $g(\cdot)$, respectively. In this case, it is well-known that G is monotone and Lipschitz continuous with $L := \sqrt{2}[\max\{L_f^2, L_g^2\} + \|K\|^2]^{1/2}$, where L_f and L_g are the Lipschitz constants of f and g , respectively.

In our experiments below, we choose $f(u) := \lambda \sum_{i=1}^m \ell_\epsilon(u_i)$, and $g(v) := \rho \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_\epsilon(v_i)$, where $\ell_\epsilon(\tau)$ is the well-known Huber function (i.e. $\ell_\epsilon(\tau) = \epsilon|\tau| - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}$ if $|u| \geq \epsilon$, and $\ell_\epsilon(\tau) = \frac{\tau^2}{2}$, otherwise) and $\lambda > 0$ and $\rho > 0$ are given parameters. Clearly, one can easily show that $\nabla f(u) = \lambda(\ell'_\epsilon(u_1), \dots, \ell'_\epsilon(u_m))^\top$ and $\nabla g(v) = \rho(\ell'_\epsilon(v_1), \dots, \ell'_\epsilon(v_n))^\top$, where $\ell'_\epsilon(\tau) = \tau$ if $|\tau| < \epsilon$, $\ell'_\epsilon(\tau) = -\epsilon$ if $\tau \leq -\epsilon$, and $\ell'_\epsilon(\tau) = \epsilon$ if $\tau \geq \epsilon$. To obtain data for our experiments, we generate a random matrix K in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ from the standard Gaussian distribution and normalize its columns. Then, we compute $\|K\|$ and then choose $\lambda = \rho := \|K\|$ and $\epsilon := 0.05$.

We implement both Nesterov’s accelerated variants (42) and (60) to solve problem (64). The parameters are updated exactly as in Theorems 5.2 and Corollary 5.1, respectively. We run these two algorithms on two cases: Case 1: $(m, n) = (1000, 750)$ and Case 2: $(m, n) = (1000, 1000)$.

We set the number of iterations k_{\max} at $k_{\max} := 5000$. The convergence behavior of both schemes in terms of $\frac{\|Gx_k\|}{\|Gx_0\|}$ is plotted in Figure 2.




Figure 2: The performance of Nesterov's accelerated variants of EAG and PEAG on (64). Left: Case 1, and Right: Case 2

Figure 2 shows that both schemes match very well the $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ -rate in terms of $\|Gx_k\|$ as proven by our theory. Here, (42) performs slightly better than (60) due to its bigger stepsize. However, (60) only requires one evaluation of G at each iteration as opposed to two in as (42).

A The proof of Theorem 5.3: Convergence Analysis of PEAG

The proof of Theorem 5.3. Let us consider the function $\mathcal{L}_k := a_k \|Gy_k\|^2 + b_k \langle Gy_k, y_k - y_0 \rangle$. Then, as proved in [43], we have $\mathcal{L}_k \geq \frac{a_k}{2} \|Gy_k\|^2 - \frac{b_k^2}{2a_k} \|y_0 - y^*\|^2$. Following the same proof as in [41], by choosing $b_{k+1} = \frac{b_k}{1-\beta_k}$ and using (58), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_k - \mathcal{L}_{k+1} &\geq a_k \|Gy_k\|^2 - a_{k+1} \|Gy_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{b_k \hat{\eta}_k}{\beta_k} \langle Gy_{k+1} - Gy_k, Gz_{k+1} \rangle \\ &\quad + b_{k+1} \hat{\eta}_k \langle Gy_{k+1}, Gz_{k+1} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Now, using again (58), we have $z_{k+1} - y_{k+1} = \hat{\eta}_k Gz_{k+1} - \eta_k Gz_k$. This expression leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\|^2 &\leq 2\|\hat{\eta}_k Gz_{k+1} - \eta_k Gy_k\|^2 + 2\eta_k^2 \|Gy_k - Gz_k\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\hat{\eta}_k^2 \|Gz_{k+1}\|^2 - 4\hat{\eta}_k \eta_k \langle Gz_{k+1}, Gy_k \rangle + 2\eta_k^2 \|Gy_k\|^2 + 2L^2 \eta_k^2 \|y_k - z_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the Lipschitz continuity of G , we have $\|Gz_{k+1}\|^2 - 2\langle Gz_{k+1}, Gy_{k+1} \rangle + \|Gy_{k+1}\|^2 = \|Gz_{k+1} - Gy_{k+1}\|^2 \leq L^2 \|z_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\|^2$. Combining the last two inequalities, for any $\sigma > 0$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{[4]} &:= \|Gz_{k+1}\|^2 - 2\langle Gz_{k+1}, Gy_{k+1} \rangle + \|Gy_{k+1}\|^2 + \sigma L^2 \|z_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq 2(1+\sigma)L^2 \hat{\eta}_k^2 \|Gz_{k+1}\|^2 - 4(1+\sigma)L^2 \hat{\eta}_k \eta_k \langle Gz_{k+1}, Gy_k \rangle + 2(1+\sigma)L^2 \eta_k^2 \|Gy_k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2(1+\sigma)L^4 \eta_k^2 \|z_k - y_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $M := (1+\sigma)L^2$. Then, the last inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{[4]} &:= \|Gy_{k+1}\|^2 + (1-2M\hat{\eta}_k^2)\|Gz_{k+1}\|^2 - 2M\eta_k^2 \|Gy_k\|^2 - 2(1-2M\hat{\eta}_k \eta_k) \langle Gz_{k+1}, Gy_{k+1} \rangle \\ &\quad - 4M\hat{\eta}_k \eta_k \langle Gy_{k+1} - Gy_k, Gz_{k+1} \rangle + \sigma L^2 \|z_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\|^2 - 2ML^2 \eta_k^2 \|z_k - y_k\|^2 \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying this inequality by $\frac{b_k}{4M\eta_k\beta_k}$ and adding the result to (65), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_k - \mathcal{L}_{k+1} &\geq \left(a_k - \frac{b_k\eta_k}{2\beta_k}\right) \|Gy_k\|^2 + \left(\frac{b_k}{4M\eta_k\beta_k} - a_{k+1}\right) \|Gy_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{b_k(1-2M\hat{\eta}_k^2)}{4M\eta_k\beta_k} \|Gz_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{b_k}{\beta_k} \left(\frac{\hat{\eta}_k}{1-\beta_k} - \frac{1}{2M\eta_k}\right) \langle Gy_{k+1}, Gz_{k+1} \rangle + \frac{\sigma L^2 b_k}{4M\eta_k\beta_k} \|z_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{L^2 b_k \eta_k}{2\beta_k} \|z_k - y_k\|^2.\end{aligned}\tag{66}$$

Here, we have used $b_{k+1}(1-\beta_k) = b_k$. Let us choose $\beta_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$, $a_k := \frac{b_k\eta_k}{2\beta_k}$, $\hat{\eta}_k := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2M}}$, and $\eta_k := \frac{(1-\beta_k)}{2M\hat{\eta}_k} = \frac{(1-\beta_k)}{\sqrt{2M}}$. Then, $b_{k+1} = \frac{b_k}{1-\beta_k} = \frac{b_k(k+2)}{k+1} = b_0(k+2)$ and $a_k = \frac{b_0(k+1)^2}{2\sqrt{2M}}$. Moreover, we have $\frac{b_k}{4M\eta_k\beta_k} - a_{k+1} = \frac{b_k}{4M\eta_k\beta_k} - \frac{b_{k+1}\eta_{k+1}}{2\beta_{k+1}} = \frac{b_k}{2\sqrt{2M}\beta_k(1-\beta_k)} - \frac{b_k(1-\beta_{k+1})}{2\sqrt{2M}\beta_{k+1}(1-\beta_k)} = \frac{b_k}{2\sqrt{2M}(1-\beta_k)} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_k} - \frac{1}{\beta_{k+1}} + 1\right) = 0$. Using the choice of these parameters, we obtain from (66) that

$$\mathcal{L}_k + \frac{L^2 b_k \eta_k}{2\beta_k} \|z_k - y_k\|^2 \geq \mathcal{L}_{k+1} + \frac{\sigma L^2 b_k}{4M\eta_k\beta_k} \|z_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\|^2.\tag{67}$$

Note that $\frac{\sigma b_k}{2M\eta_k\beta_k} - \frac{b_{k+1}\eta_{k+1}}{\beta_{k+1}} = \frac{\sigma b_k}{\sqrt{2M}\beta_k(1-\beta_k)} - \frac{b_k(1-\beta_{k+1})}{\sqrt{2M}(1-\beta_k)\beta_{k+1}} = \frac{b_k}{\sqrt{2M}(1-\beta_k)} \left(\frac{\sigma}{\beta_k} - \frac{1}{\beta_{k+1}} + 1\right) = \frac{(\sigma-1)b_k(k+1)}{\sqrt{2M}(1-\beta_k)} = \frac{(\sigma-1)b_k(k+2)}{\sqrt{2M}}$. If we define $\mathcal{E}_k := \mathcal{L}_k + \frac{L^2 b_k \eta_k}{2\beta_k} \|z_k - y_k\|^2 + b_0\sqrt{2M}\|y_0 - y^*\|^2$, then by using the last relation, (67) becomes

$$\mathcal{E}_k \geq \mathcal{E}_{k+1} + \frac{L^2(\sigma-1)b_k(k+2)}{2\sqrt{2M}} \|z_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\|^2.\tag{68}$$

Moreover, since $\mathcal{L}_k \geq \frac{a_k}{2} \|Gy_k\|^2 - \frac{b_k^2}{2a_k} \|y_0 - y^*\|^2$, we have $\mathcal{E}_k \geq \frac{a_k}{2} \|Gy_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2 b_k \eta_k}{2\beta_k} \|z_k - y_k\|^2 \geq 0$. For $\sigma \geq 1$ and noting that $b_k = b_0(k+1)$, summing up (68) from $k=0$ to K , and passing the limit as $K \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\frac{L^2(\sigma-1)b_0}{2\sqrt{2M}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)(k+2) \|z_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\|^2 \leq \mathcal{E}_0.\tag{69}$$

Moreover, (68) also implies that $\frac{a_k}{2} \|Gy_k\|^2 + \frac{L^2 b_k \eta_k}{2\beta_k} \|z_k - y_k\|^2 \leq \mathcal{E}_k \leq \mathcal{E}_0$, leading to

$$\|Gy_k\|^2 + 2L^2 \|z_k - y_k\|^2 \leq \frac{4\sqrt{2M}\mathcal{E}_0}{b_0(k+1)^2}.$$

Since $\mathcal{E}_0 = \frac{b_0}{2\sqrt{2M}} \|Gy_0\|^2 + b_0\sqrt{2M}\|y_0 - y^*\|^2 \leq b_0 \left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2M}} + \sqrt{2M}\right) \|y_0 - y^*\|^2$, we obtain the first line of (59) from the last inequality and this one.

Using the Lipschitz continuity of G , we have $\|Gz_k\|^2 \leq 3\|Gz_k - Gy_k\|^2 + \frac{3}{2}\|Gy_k\|^2 \leq \frac{3}{2} [2L^2\|z_k - y_k\|^2 + \|Gy_k\|^2]$. Combining this inequality and the first line of (59), we get the second line of (59). Finally, combining the upper bound of $\mathcal{E}_0 \leq \frac{b_0(1+4M)}{2\sqrt{2M}} \|y_0 - y^*\|^2$ and (69), and noting that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k(k+1) \|z_k - y_k\|^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)(k+2) \|z_{k+1} - y_{k+1}\|^2$, we obtain the third line of (59). \square

References

- [1] H. Attouch and A. Cabot. Convergence of a relaxed inertial proximal algorithm for maximally monotone operators. *Math. Program.*, 184(1):243–287, 2020.

- [2] H. Attouch and J. Fadili. From the Ravine method to the Nesterov method and vice versa: a dynamical system perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11643*, 2022.
- [3] H. Attouch and J. Peypouquet. The rate of convergence of Nesterov’s accelerated forward-backward method is actually faster than $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 26(3):1824–1834, 2016.
- [4] H. Attouch and J. Peypouquet. Convergence of inertial dynamics and proximal algorithms governed by maximally monotone operators. *Math. Program.*, 174(1-2):391–432, 2019.
- [5] H. H. Bauschke and P. Combettes. *Convex analysis and monotone operators theory in Hilbert spaces*. Springer-Verlag, 2nd edition, 2017.
- [6] H. H. Bauschke, W. M. Moursi, and X. Wang. Generalized monotone operators and their averaged resolvents. *Math. Program.*, pages 1–20, 2020.
- [7] A. Beck and M. Teboulle. A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 2(1):183–202, 2009.
- [8] S. Bubeck, Y. T. Lee, and M. Singh. A geometric alternative to Nesterov’s accelerated gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.08187*, 2015.
- [9] R. S. Burachik and A. Iusem. *Set-Valued Mappings and Enlargements of Monotone Operators*. New York: Springer, 2008.
- [10] A. Chambolle and C. Dossal. On the convergence of the iterates of the “Fast iterative shrinkage/thresholding algorithm”. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 166(3):968–982, 2015.
- [11] P. L. Combettes and V. R. Wajs. Signal recovery by proximal forward-backward splitting. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 4:1168–1200, 2005.
- [12] D. Davis and W. Yin. A three-operator splitting scheme and its optimization applications. *Set-valued and Variational Analysis*, 25(4):829–858, 2017.
- [13] J. Diakonikolas. Halpern iteration for near-optimal and parameter-free monotone inclusion and strong solutions to variational inequalities. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1428–1451. PMLR, 2020.
- [14] J. Diakonikolas, C. Daskalakis, and M. Jordan. Efficient methods for structured nonconvex-nonconcave min-max optimization. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2746–2754. PMLR, 2021.
- [15] F. Facchinei and J.-S. Pang. *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems*, volume 1-2. Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [16] B. Halpern. Fixed points of nonexpanding maps. *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.*, 73(6):957–961, 1967.
- [17] B. He and X. Yuan. On the convergence rate of Douglas–Rachford operator splitting method. *Math. Program.*, 153(2):715–722, 2015.

- [18] D. Kim. Accelerated proximal point method for maximally monotone operators. *Math. Program.*, pages 1–31, 2021.
- [19] D. Kim and J. A. Fessler. Optimized first-order methods for smooth convex minimization. *Math. Program.*, 159(1-2):81–107, 2016.
- [20] G. M. Korpelevic. An extragradient method for finding saddle-points and for other problems. *Èkonom. i Mat. Metody.*, 12(4):747–756, 1976.
- [21] S. Lee and D. Kim. Fast extra gradient methods for smooth structured nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems. *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS2021)*, 2021.
- [22] F. Lieder. On the convergence rate of the halpern-iteration. *Optimization Letters*, 15(2):405–418, 2021.
- [23] P. L. Lions and B. Mercier. Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators. *SIAM J. Num. Anal.*, 16:964–979, 1979.
- [24] P.-E. Maingé. Accelerated proximal algorithms with a correction term for monotone inclusions. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 84(2):2027–2061, 2021.
- [25] P. E. Maingé. Fast convergence of generalized forward-backward algorithms for structured monotone inclusions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.10107*, 2021.
- [26] Y. Malitsky. Projected reflected gradient methods for monotone variational inequalities. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 25(1):502–520, 2015.
- [27] A. Nemirovskii and D. Yudin. *Problem Complexity and Method Efficiency in Optimization*. Wiley Interscience, 1983.
- [28] Y. Nesterov. A method for unconstrained convex minimization problem with the rate of convergence $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$. *Doklady AN SSSR*, 269:543–547, 1983. Translated as Soviet Math. Dokl.
- [29] Y. Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87 of *Applied Optimization*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004.
- [30] Y. Nesterov. Smooth minimization of non-smooth functions. *Math. Program.*, 103(1):127–152, 2005.
- [31] Y. Ouyang and Y. Xu. Lower complexity bounds of first-order methods for convex-concave bilinear saddle-point problems. *Math. Program.*, online first:1–35, 2019.
- [32] J. Park and E. K. Ryu. Exact optimal accelerated complexity for fixed-point iterations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11413*, 2022.
- [33] R. R. Phelps. *Convex functions, monotone operators and differentiability*, volume 1364. Springer, 2009.

- [34] Boris T. Polyak. Some methods of speeding up the convergence of iteration methods. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 4(5):1–17, 1964.
- [35] L. D. Popov. A modification of the Arrow-Hurwicz method for search of saddle points. *Math. notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR*, 28(5):845–848, 1980.
- [36] R. Rockafellar and R. Wets. *Variational Analysis*, volume 317. Springer, 2004.
- [37] R.T. Rockafellar. Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 14:877–898, 1976.
- [38] E. K. Ryu and S. Boyd. Primer on monotone operator methods. *Appl. Comput. Math.*, 15(1):3–43, 2016.
- [39] B. Shi, S. S. Du, M. I. Jordan, and W. Su. Understanding the acceleration phenomenon via high-resolution differential equations. *Math. Program.*, pages 1–70, 2021.
- [40] W. Su, S. Boyd, and E. Candes. A differential equation for modeling Nesterov’s accelerated gradient method: Theory and insights. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 2510–2518, 2014.
- [41] Q. Tran-Dinh and Y. Luo. Halpern-type accelerated and splitting algorithms for monotone inclusions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08150*, 2021.
- [42] Paul Tseng. A modified forward-backward splitting method for maximal monotone mappings. *SIAM J. Control and Optim.*, 38(2):431–446, 2000.
- [43] T. Yoon and E. K. Ryu. Accelerated algorithms for smooth convex-concave minimax problems with $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ rate on squared gradient norm. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12098–12109. PMLR, 2021.