

FOUR OPERATOR SPLITTING VIA A FORWARD-BACKWARD-HALF-FORWARD ALGORITHM WITH LINE SEARCH

LUIS M. BRICEÑO-ARIAS & FERNANDO ROLDÁN

ABSTRACT. In this article we provide a splitting method for solving monotone inclusions in real Hilbert space involving four operators: a maximally monotone, a monotone-Lipschitzian, a cocoercive, and a monotone-continuous operator. The proposed method takes advantage of the intrinsic properties of each operator, generalizing the forward-back-half forward splitting and the Tseng's algorithm with line-search. At each iteration, our algorithm defines the step-size by using a line search in which the monotone-Lipschitzian and the cocoercive operators need only one activation. We also derive a method for solving non-linearly constrained composite convex optimization problems in real Hilbert spaces. Finally, we implement our algorithm in a non-linearly constrained least-square problem and we compare its performance with available methods in the literature.

Keywords. *convex optimization, cocoercive operator, Lipschitzian operator, monotone operator theory, splitting algorithms.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we aim at finding a point in a closed convex set X , which is a zero of the sum of a maximally monotone, a cocoercive, a monotone-Lipschitzian, and a monotone-continuous operators in a Hilbertian setting. This inclusion encompasses several problems in partial differential equations coming from mechanical models [24, 25, 26], differential inclusions [1, 36], game theory [11], among other disciplines. When X is the whole Hilbert space, the algorithms proposed in [4, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34, 39] can solve this kind of problems under additional assumptions or without exploiting the intrinsic properties of the involved operators. Indeed, the algorithms in [5, 6, 7, 10, 16, 23] need to compute the resolvents of all the monotone operators, which are not explicit in general or they can be numerically expensive. The schemes proposed in [3, 17, 22, 27] take advantage of the properties of the monotone-Lipschitzian operator, but the cocoercivity and the continuity of the others are not leveraged. In fact, the algorithms in [3, 17, 22, 27] need to activate the continuous operator via its resolvent and to explicitly implement the cocoercive and the monotone-Lipschitzian operators twice by iteration. In contrast, the algorithms in [14, 19, 30, 32, 34] activate the cocoercive operator and the monotone-Lipschitzian operators only once by iteration, but they need to store in the memory the two past iterations and the step-size is reduced significantly. Furthermore, methods in [14, 19, 30] consider only one maximally monotone operator and, hence, it needs to compute the resolvent of the sum of the maximally monotone and the monotone-continuous operator. On the other hand, methods in [32, 34] need to calculate the resolvent of the monotone-continuous operator, which is not simple in general. In addition, methods proposed in [4, 18, 20, 21, 28, 31, 39] take advantage of the cocoercive operator by activating it once by iteration, but they do not exploit continuity or the monotone-Lipschitzian property of the operators and they need to compute their resolvents.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47H05, 47H10, 65K05, 65K15, 90C25, 49M29.

The method in [13] exploits the properties of the cocoercive and the monotone-Lipschitzian operators, but it does not take into advantage the monotonicity and continuity of one of the operators and need to compute its resolvent. Other methods solving this kind of problems including a normal cone to a closed vector subspace, when the continuous operator is zero and either the cocoercive or the monotone-Lipschitzian operator is zero, are discussed in [8, 9, 37].

In the case when X is a subset of the domain of the maximally monotone operator, methods exploiting the monotonicity and continuity property of one of the operators involved in our problem are proposed in [12, 38]. In particular, the algorithm in [38] solves our problem by using a line search procedure involving the sum of the the cocoercive, the monotone-Lipschitzian, and the monotone-continuous operators. On the other hand, the *forward-backward-half forward splitting* (FBHF) method, proposed in [12], solves our problem via a line search which activates the sum of the the monotone-Lipschitzian and the monotone-continuous operators. As perceived in [12], to reduce the activation of monotone operators in the line search procedure can reduce the number of iterations significantly (see, e.g., [12, Table 3] in which this reduction is around a 20%). Moreover, when the explicit implementation of these operators are expensive (e.g., high dimensional problems), the computational time can be much larger because line search procedures need to activate those operators several times by iteration.

In this paper, we propose a fully split method for solving our monotone inclusion, which take advantage of the intrinsic properties of each operator involved in the inclusion. More precisely, the proposed method activates the cocoercive operator once, the monotone-Lipschitzian operator twice by iteration, and uses a line search only implementing the monotone-continuous operator. We also relax the hypotheses on the set X by providing conditions independent of the domain of the maximally monotone operator ensuring the weak convergence of our algorithm. In particular, our method generalizes the algorithms in [12, 38]. We explore an interesting example in optimization, involving non-linear constraints governed by convex Gâteaux differentiable functions. We provide conditions on this function in order to guarantee that the saddle operator obtained from the Lagrangian of the problem is monotone and continuous and satisfies the hypotheses of our main convergence theorem. Finally, we provide a numerical experiment which illustrate the efficiency of our algorithm.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we set our notation. In Section 3 we provide some technical lemmas, our splitting method for solving Problem 3.1, and our convergence result. In Section 4 we derive an algorithm for solving a non-linearly constrained composite convex optimization problem. Finally, in Section 5 we provide a numerical experiment illustrating the efficiency of the proposed method in Section 4.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{G} are real Hilbert spaces. We denote the scalar product by $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ and the associated norm by $\| \cdot \|$. The symbols \rightharpoonup and \rightarrow denote the weak and strong convergence, respectively. Given a linear bounded operator $M : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$, we denote its adjoint by $M^* : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. Id denotes the identity operator on \mathcal{H} . Let $D \subset \mathcal{H}$ be non-empty, let $T : D \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, and let $\beta \in]0, +\infty[$. The operator T is β -cocoercive if

$$(\forall x \in D)(\forall y \in D) \quad \langle x - y | Tx - Ty \rangle \geq \beta \|Tx - Ty\|^2 \quad (2.1)$$

and it is β -Lipschitzian if

$$(\forall x \in D)(\forall y \in D) \quad \|Tx - Ty\| \leq \beta \|x - y\|. \quad (2.2)$$

Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be a set-valued operator. The domain, range, graph, and the zeros of A are, respectively, $\text{dom } A = \{x \in \mathcal{H} \mid Ax \neq \emptyset\}$, $\text{ran } A = \{u \in \mathcal{H} \mid (\exists x \in \mathcal{H}) u \in Ax\}$, $\text{gra } A = \{(x, u) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \mid u \in Ax\}$, and $\text{zer } A = \{x \in \mathcal{H} \mid 0 \in Ax\}$. The inverse of A is

$A^{-1}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}: u \mapsto \{x \in \mathcal{H} \mid u \in Ax\}$, and the resolvent of A is $J_A = (\text{Id} + A)^{-1}$. The operator A is monotone if

$$(\forall(x, u) \in \text{gra } A)(\forall(y, v) \in \text{gra } A) \quad \langle x - y \mid u - v \rangle \geq 0 \quad (2.3)$$

and it is maximally monotone if it is monotone and there exists no monotone operator $B: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ such that $\text{gra } B$ properly contains $\text{gra } A$, i.e., for every $(x, u) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$,

$$(x, u) \in \text{gra } A \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (\forall(y, v) \in \text{gra } A) \quad \langle x - y \mid u - v \rangle \geq 0. \quad (2.4)$$

A is locally bounded at $x \in \mathcal{H}$, if there exists $\delta \in]0, +\infty[$ such that $A(\mathcal{B}(x; \delta))$ is bounded, and A is locally bounded in $\emptyset \neq D \subset \mathcal{H}$ if, for every $x \in D$, A is locally bounded at x .

We denote by $\Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ the class of proper lower semicontinuous convex functions $f: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$. Let $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$. The Fenchel conjugate of f is defined by $f^*: u \mapsto \sup_{x \in \mathcal{H}} (\langle x \mid u \rangle - f(x))$, which is a function in $\Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$. The subdifferential of f is the maximally monotone operator

$$\partial f: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}: x \mapsto \{u \in \mathcal{H} \mid (\forall y \in \mathcal{H}) \ f(x) + \langle y - x \mid u \rangle \leq f(y)\}.$$

It turns out that $(\partial f)^{-1} = \partial f^*$ and that $\text{zer } \partial f$ is the set of minimizers of f , which is denoted by $\arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{H}} f(x)$. We denote the proximity operator of f by

$$\text{prox}_f: x \mapsto \arg \min_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \left(f(y) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - y\|^2 \right). \quad (2.5)$$

We have $\text{prox}_f = J_{\partial f}$. Moreover, it follows from [2, Theorem 14.3] that

$$\text{prox}_{\gamma f} + \gamma \text{prox}_{f^*/\gamma} \circ \text{Id} / \gamma = \text{Id}. \quad (2.6)$$

Given a non-empty closed convex set $C \subset \mathcal{H}$, we denote by P_C the projection onto C and by $\iota_C \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$ the indicator function of C , which takes the value 0 in C and $+\infty$ otherwise. For further properties of monotone operators, nonexpansive mappings, and convex analysis, the reader is referred to [2].

3. MAIN RESULTS

We aim at solving the following monotone inclusion problem.

Problem 3.1. *Let X be a nonempty closed convex subset of a real Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , let $A: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be a maximally monotone operator, let $B_1: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be a β -cocoercive operator for some $\beta > 0$, let $B_2: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be a monotone and L -Lipschitzian operator for some $L > 0$, and let $B_3: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ be a maximally monotone operator such that B_3 is single valued and continuous in $\text{dom } A \cup X \subset \text{dom } B_3$. Moreover assume that $A + B_3$ is maximally monotone. The problem is to*

$$\text{find } x \in X \quad \text{such that} \quad 0 \in Ax + B_1x + B_2x + B_3x, \quad (3.1)$$

under the assumption that the set of solutions to (3.1) is nonempty.

We first study some properties of the monotone operators involved in Problem 3.1, which ensure the finite termination of the backtracking procedure in our method.

Lemma 3.2. *In the context of Problem 3.1, let z and y in \mathcal{H} , and define*

$$(\forall \gamma > 0) \quad x_{z,y}(\gamma) = J_{\gamma A}(z - \gamma y) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma) = \frac{\|z - x_{z,y}(\gamma)\|}{\gamma}. \quad (3.2)$$

Then, the following statements holds:

- (1) $\varphi_{z,y}$ is nonincreasing.
- (2) $(\forall z \in \text{dom } A) \quad \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma) = \|(A + y)^0 z\| = \min_{w \in Az+y} \|w\|.$

(3) Set

$$\mathcal{C} = \{z \in \mathcal{H} \mid \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma) < +\infty\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Then, $\text{dom } A \subset \mathcal{C} \subset \overline{\text{dom } A}$.

(4) Suppose that one of the following holds:

(a) $z \in \mathcal{C}$.

(b) $z \in \text{dom } B_3 \setminus \mathcal{C}$, $y = (B_1 + B_2 + B_3)z$ and $\overline{B_3}$ is locally bounded at $P_{\overline{\text{dom } A}}z$.

(c) $z \in \text{dom } B_3 \setminus \mathcal{C}$, $y = (B_1 + B_2 + B_3)z$, and $\text{dom } A \subset \text{int dom } B_3$.

Then, for every $\theta \in]0, 1[$, there exists $\gamma(z) > 0$ such that, for every $\gamma \in]0, \gamma(z)[$,

$$\gamma \|B_3 z - B_3 x_{z,y}(\gamma)\| \leq \theta \|z - x_{z,y}(\gamma)\|. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. Let $z \in \mathcal{H}$. Note that, if $z \in \text{zer}(A + y)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\forall \gamma > 0) \quad 0 \in Az + y &\Leftrightarrow z - \gamma y \in \gamma Az + z \\ &\Leftrightarrow z = x_{z,y}(\gamma) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

In this case, 1, 2, and 4 are clear. Henceforth, assume $z \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \text{zer}(A + y)$. It follows from (3.2) that

$$\frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma)}{\gamma} - y \in Ax_{z,y}(\gamma). \quad (3.6)$$

1: For every γ_1 and γ_2 in $]0, +\infty[$, (3.6) and the monotonicity of A yield

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \left\langle \frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_1)}{\gamma_1} - \frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_2)}{\gamma_2} \mid x_{z,y}(\gamma_1) - x_{z,y}(\gamma_2) \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_1)}{\gamma_1} - \frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_2)}{\gamma_2} \mid x_{z,y}(\gamma_1) - z - (x_{z,y}(\gamma_2) - z) \right\rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{\gamma_1} \|z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_1)\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \right) \langle z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_1) \mid z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_2) \rangle - \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \|z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_2)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma_1)^2 + \gamma_2 \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma_2)^2 &\leq (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \left\langle \frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_1)}{\gamma_1} \mid \frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_2)}{\gamma_2} \right\rangle \\ &\leq \frac{(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)}{2} (\varphi_{z,y}(\gamma_1)^2 + \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma_2)^2), \end{aligned}$$

which yields $(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(\varphi_{z,y}(\gamma_1)^2 - \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma_2)^2) \leq 0$ and 1 follows.

2: It follows from the monotonicity of A and (3.6) that, for every $w \in Az + y$ and $\gamma \in]0, +\infty[$,

$$0 \leq \left\langle \frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma)}{\gamma} - w \mid x_{z,y}(\gamma) - z \right\rangle,$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\gamma} \|z - x_{z,y}(\gamma)\|^2 &\leq \langle w \mid z - x_{z,y}(\gamma) \rangle \\ &\leq \|w\| \|z - x_{z,y}(\gamma)\| \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

and, thus, $\varphi_{z,y}(\gamma) \leq \|w\|$. Therefore, since [2, Proposition 20.36] implies that, for every $z \in \text{dom } A$, $Az + y$ is nonempty, closed, and convex, [2, Theorem 11.10] yields

$$(\forall \gamma \in]0, +\infty[) \quad \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma) \leq \min_{w \in Az+y} \|w\|. \quad (3.8)$$

Hence, since $\varphi_{z,y} \geq 0$, 1 implies that $\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma)$ exists. Hence, from (3.8), $z \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \text{zer}(A+y)$, and (3.5) we deduce

$$0 < \varphi_{z,y}(1) \leq \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma) \leq \min_{w \in Az+y} \|w\|, \quad (3.9)$$

which implies

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} x_{z,y}(\gamma) = z. \quad (3.10)$$

Since $(\varphi_{z,y}(\gamma))_{(\gamma>0)}$ is bounded, by [2, Lemma 2.45], there exists a sequence $(\gamma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset]0, +\infty[$ and $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\gamma_k \downarrow 0$ and $\frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_k)}{\gamma_k} \rightharpoonup \bar{w}$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore, (3.6), (3.10), and [2, Proposition 20.38(i)], imply $\bar{w} \in Az + y$. Hence, noting that

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_{z,y}(\gamma_k))^2 &= \left\| \frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_k)}{\gamma_k} - \bar{w} \right\|^2 + \|\bar{w}\|^2 + 2 \left\langle \frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_k)}{\gamma_k} - \bar{w} \mid \bar{w} \right\rangle \\ &\geq \|\bar{w}\|^2 + 2 \left\langle \frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma_k)}{\gamma_k} - \bar{w} \mid \bar{w} \right\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

we deduce

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} (\varphi_{z,y}(\gamma_k))^2 = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} (\varphi_{z,y}(\gamma_k))^2 \geq \|\bar{w}\|^2 \geq \min_{w \in Az+y} \|w\|^2.$$

Hence, we obtain from (3.9) that

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma) = \min_{w \in Az+y} \|w\|, \quad (3.12)$$

and 2 follows.

3: It follows from (3.3) and 2 that $\text{dom } A \subset C$. Let $z \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \overline{\text{dom } A}$. The firmly nonexpansiveness of $J_{\gamma A}$ [2, Proposition 23.8(ii)] implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{z,y}(\gamma) - P_{\overline{\text{dom } A}} z\| &= \|J_{\gamma A}(z - \gamma y) - J_{\gamma A} z + J_{\gamma A} z - P_{\overline{\text{dom } A}} z\| \\ &\leq \|J_{\gamma A}(z - \gamma y) - J_{\gamma A} z\| + \|J_{\gamma A} z - P_{\overline{\text{dom } A}} z\| \\ &\leq \gamma \|y\| + \|J_{\gamma A} z - P_{\overline{\text{dom } A}} z\|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Hence, by taking $\gamma \downarrow 0$ in (3.13) we conclude from [2, Theorem 23.48] that $x_{z,y}(\gamma) \rightarrow P_{\overline{\text{dom } A}} z$ as $\gamma \downarrow 0$. Then, by the continuity of the norm and $z \notin \overline{\text{dom } A}$, we deduce

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \|z - x_{z,y}(\gamma)\| = \|z - P_{\overline{\text{dom } A}} z\| > 0.$$

Therefore, $\varphi_{z,y}(\gamma) = \|z - x_{z,y}(\gamma)\|/\gamma \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\gamma \downarrow 0$ and, hence, $z \in \mathcal{H} \setminus C$.

4a: If $z \in C$, it follows from 1 that

$$0 < \varphi_{z,y}(1) \leq \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \varphi_{z,y}(\gamma) < +\infty. \quad (3.14)$$

Therefore $\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} x_{z,y} = z$ and the continuity of B_3 implies

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} B_3 x_{z,y} = B_3 z. \quad (3.15)$$

The result follows from (3.14) and (3.15).

4b: Set $B = B_1 + B_2 + B_3$ and let $p = P_{\overline{\text{dom } A}} z$. Since B_3 is locally bounded at p , there exists $\delta_p \in]0, +\infty[$ such that $B_3(\mathcal{B}(p; \delta_p))$ is bounded. Now since

$$\frac{z - J_{\gamma A} z}{\gamma} \in A J_{\gamma A} z, \quad (3.16)$$

(3.6), $y = Bz$, and the monotonicity of A yield

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \left\langle \frac{z - x_{z,y}(\gamma)}{\gamma} - Bz - \frac{z - J_{\gamma A}z}{\gamma} \mid x_{z,y}(\gamma) - J_{\gamma A}z \right\rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{\gamma} \|x_{z,y}(\gamma) - J_{\gamma A}z\|^2 + \langle Bz \mid J_{\gamma A} - x_{z,y}(\gamma) \rangle \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{\gamma} \|x_{z,y}(\gamma) - J_{\gamma A}z\|^2 + \|Bz\| \|J_{\gamma A} - x_{z,y}(\gamma)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\|x_{z,y}(\gamma) - J_{\gamma A}z\| \leq \gamma \|Bz\|. \quad (3.17)$$

Additionally, by [2, Theorem 23.48], there exists γ_1 such that, for every $\gamma < \gamma_1$, $\|J_{\gamma A}z - p\| \leq \delta_p/2$. Hence, from (3.17) we deduce that, for every $\gamma < \bar{\gamma} := \min\{\delta_p/(2\|Bz\|), \gamma_1\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{z,y}(\gamma) - p\| &\leq \|x_{z,y}(\gamma) - J_{\gamma A}z\| + \|J_{\gamma A}z - p\| \\ &\leq \gamma \|Bz\| + \frac{\delta_p}{2} \\ &< \delta_p, \end{aligned}$$

which yields $(x_{z,y}(\gamma))_{0 < \gamma \leq \bar{\gamma}} \subset B(p, \delta_p)$. Therefore, since $z \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{C}$ implies $\varphi_{z,\gamma}(\gamma) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\gamma \downarrow 0$ and $(\|B_3z - B_3x_{z,y}(\gamma)\|)_{0 < \gamma \leq \bar{\gamma}}$ is bounded, the result follows.

4c: Since $p = P_{\overline{\text{dom } A}}z \notin \text{bdry dom } B_3$, B_3 is locally bounded in p [2, Theorem 21.18], and the result follows from 4b. \square

Remark 3.3. (1) In the case $B_2 = 0$, by setting $y = (B_1 + B_3)z$ in Lemma 3.2(1) \mathcal{E} (2), we recover [12, Lemma 2.2(1)].

(2) Realizing that [12, Lemma 2.2(2)] is valid for every $z \in \text{dom } A$, it is a particular case of Lemma 3.2(3) \mathcal{E} (4a).

Now we state our main result.

Theorem 3.4. In the context of Problem 3.1, suppose that one of the following holds:

- (1) $\overline{X} \subset \text{dom } A$.
- (2) $\overline{\text{dom } A} \subset \text{dom } B_3$ and B_3 is locally bounded in $\text{dom } B_3$.
- (3) $\overline{\text{dom } A} \subset \text{int dom } B_3$.

Let $\varepsilon \in]0, 1[$, set $\rho = \min\{2\beta\varepsilon, \sqrt{1-\varepsilon}/L\}$, let $\sigma \in]0, 1[$, let $\theta \in]0, \sqrt{1-\varepsilon} - L\rho\sigma[$, let $z_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, and consider the sequence $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by the recurrence

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} x_n = J_{\gamma_n A}(z_n - \gamma_n(B_1 + B_2 + B_3)z_n) \\ z_{n+1} = P_X(x_n + \gamma_n(B_2 + B_3)z_n - \gamma_n(B_2 + B_3)x_n), \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

where, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, γ_n is the largest $\gamma \in \{\rho\sigma, \rho\sigma^2, \rho\sigma^3, \dots\}$ satisfying

$$\gamma \|B_3z_n - B_3J_{\gamma A}(z_n - \gamma(B_1 + B_2 + B_3)z_n)\| \leq \theta \|z_n - J_{\gamma A}(z_n - \gamma(B_1 + B_2 + B_3)z_n)\|. \quad (3.19)$$

Moreover, assume that at least one of the following additional statements hold:

- (i) $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n = \delta > 0$.
- (ii) B_3 is uniformly continuous in any weakly compact subset of $\overline{\text{conv}}(\text{dom } A \cup X)$.

Then, $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to a solution to Problem 3.1.

Proof. Set $B = B_1 + B_2 + B_3$ and fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $z_n \in \mathcal{C}$, where \mathcal{C} is defined in (3.3), then γ_n is well defined in view of Lemma 3.2(4a). In particular, if 1 holds, γ_n is well defined in view of Lemma 3.2(3). Now suppose that $z_n \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{C}$. Since $X \subset \text{dom } B_3$, then $z_n \in \text{dom } B_3 \setminus \mathcal{C}$. Now,

if we assume 2, then B_3 is locally bounded in $P_{\overline{\text{dom} A} z_n} \in \overline{\text{dom} A}$ and γ_n is well defined from Lemma 3.2(4b). Similarly, if we assume 3, γ_n is well defined from Lemma 3.2(4c).

Now, let $z^* \in \text{zer}(A + B) \cap X$. Note that, by the maximal monotonicity of $A + B_3$, the full domain of B_1 and B_2 , and [2, Corollary 25.5(i)], it follows that $A + B_2 + B_3$ and $A + B$ are maximally monotone. Then, since $B_2 + B_3$ is continuous and single valued in $\text{dom}(B_2 + B_3) = \text{dom} B_3 \supset \text{dom} A \cup X$ and B_1 is β -cocoercive, it follows from [12, Proposition 2.1(1)&(2)] that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_{n+1} - z^*\|^2 &\leq \|z_n - z^*\|^2 - (1 - \varepsilon)\|z_n - x_n\|^2 + \gamma_n^2 \|(B_2 + B_3)z_n - (B_2 + B_3)x_n\|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\gamma_n}{\varepsilon}(2\beta\varepsilon - \gamma_n)\|B_1 z_n - B_1 z^*\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Note that, the Lipschitz property of B_2 and (3.19) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_n^2 \|(B_2 + B_3)z_n - (B_2 + B_3)x_n\|^2 &\leq (L\gamma_n\|z_n - x_n\| + \gamma_n\|B_3 z_n - B_3 x_n\|)^2 \\ &\leq (L\gamma_n + \theta)^2 \|z_n - x_n\|^2 \\ &\leq (L\rho\sigma + \theta)^2 \|z_n - x_n\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Hence, it follows from (3.20) and (3.21) that

$$\begin{aligned} (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|z_{n+1} - z^*\|^2 &\leq \|z_n - z^*\|^2 - ((1 - \varepsilon) - (L\rho\sigma + \theta)^2)\|z_n - x_n\|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\gamma_n}{\varepsilon}(2\beta\varepsilon - \gamma_n)\|B_1 z_n - B_1 z^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $(1 - \varepsilon - (L\rho\sigma + \theta)^2) \geq 2\beta\varepsilon(1 - \sigma) > 0$ and $(2\beta\varepsilon - \gamma_n) > 0$, [15, Lemma 3.1(i)] implies that $(\|z_n - z^*\|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a convergent sequence and

$$z_n - x_n \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.22)$$

Let $z \in \mathcal{H}$ be a weak limit point of the subsequence $(z_n)_{n \in K}$, for some $K \subset \mathbb{N}$. Then z is also a weak limit point of $(x_n)_{n \in K}$ in view of (3.22). Since X is closed and $(z_n)_{n \in K}$ is a sequence in X we conclude that $z \in X$. Let us prove that $z \in \text{zer}(A + B)$.

(i): Assume that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma_n = \delta > 0$. Then, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\inf_{n \geq n_0} \gamma_n \geq \delta$. Hence, (3.19), (3.18), the Lipschitz continuity of B_2 , and the cocoercivity of B_1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} (\forall n \geq n_0) \quad \|Bz_n - Bx_n\| &\leq \|B_1 z_n - B_1 x_n\| + \|B_2 z_n - B_2 x_n\| + \|B_3 z_n - B_3 x_n\| \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\beta} + L + \frac{\theta}{\delta} \right) \|z_n - x_n\|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

which implies $Bz_n - Bx_n \rightarrow 0$ in view of (3.22). Hence, it follows from (3.18) that

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad u_n := \frac{z_n - x_n}{\gamma_n} - Bz_n + Bx_n \in (A + B)x_n, \quad (3.24)$$

and (3.22) and $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma_n = \delta > 0$ imply $u_n \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, since $x_n \rightharpoonup z$, $n \in K$, the weak-strong closure of the graph of the maximally monotone operator $A + B$ and (3.24) yield $z \in \text{zer}(A + B)$. The convergence follows from [2, Lemma 2.47].

(ii): Assume that B_3 is uniformly continuous in any weakly compact subset of $\overline{\text{conv}}(\text{dom} A \cup X)$ and, without loss of generality, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty, n \in K} \gamma_n = 0$. Our choice of γ_n guarantee that for $\tilde{\gamma}_n := \frac{\gamma_n}{\sigma} > \gamma_n$, for every $n \in K$, we have,

$$\tilde{\gamma}_n \|B_3 z_n - B_3 J_{\tilde{\gamma}_n A}(z_n - \tilde{\gamma}_n B z_n)\| > \theta \|z_n - J_{\tilde{\gamma}_n A}(z_n - \tilde{\gamma}_n B z_n)\|. \quad (3.25)$$

Now, by the nonincreasing property of $\gamma \mapsto \frac{1}{\gamma} \|z - J_{\gamma A}(z - \gamma Bz)\|$ provided by Proposition 3.2(1) with to $y = Bz$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{\gamma}_n} \|z_n - J_{\tilde{\gamma}_n A}(z_n - \tilde{\gamma}_n Bz_n)\| \leq \frac{1}{\gamma_n} \|z_n - J_{\gamma_n A}(z_n - \gamma_n Bz_n)\|, \quad (3.26)$$

which is equivalent to

$$\|z_n - J_{\tilde{\gamma}_n A}(z_n - \tilde{\gamma}_n Bz_n)\| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \|z_n - x_n\|. \quad (3.27)$$

Then $z_n - x_n \rightarrow 0$ implies that $z_n - J_{\tilde{\gamma}_n A}(z_n - \tilde{\gamma}_n Bz_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $n \in K$. Therefore, since $z_n \rightarrow z$, $n \in K$, the sequence $(\tilde{x}_n)_{n \in K}$ defined by

$$(\forall n \in K) \quad \tilde{x}_n = J_{\tilde{\gamma}_n A}(z_n - \tilde{\gamma}_n Bz_n) \quad (3.28)$$

satisfies $\tilde{x}_n \rightarrow z$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $n \in K$. Furthermore, (3.28) yields

$$\frac{z_n - \tilde{x}_n}{\tilde{\gamma}_n} + B\tilde{x}_n - Bz_n \in (A + B)\tilde{x}_n. \quad (3.29)$$

Since $\{z\} \cup \bigcup_{n \in K} [\tilde{x}_n, z_n]$ is a weakly compact subset of $\overline{\text{conv}}(\text{dom } A \cup X)$ [35, Lemma 3.2], it follows from the uniform continuity of B_3 that

$$B_3 z_n - B_3 \tilde{x}_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, n \in K. \quad (3.30)$$

Hence, by (3.25), we obtain $\frac{z_n - \tilde{x}_n}{\tilde{\gamma}_n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $n \in K$. Since $B_1 + B_2$ is Lipschitz continuous, (3.30) implies that

$$B\tilde{x}_n - Bz_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, n \in K. \quad (3.31)$$

Altogether, the convergence follows, as in the case (i), from (3.29), the weak-strong closure of the graph for the maximally monotone operator $A + B$, and [2, Lemma 2.47]. \square

Remark 3.5. (1) In Theorem 3.4, if $B_3 = 0$, we have $\text{dom } B_3 = \mathcal{H}$ and, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma_n = \sigma\rho = \sigma \min\{2\beta\varepsilon, \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon/L}\}$. Since, in this case $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is constant, the largest step-size is obtained by taking $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(L, \beta) = 2/(1 + \sqrt{1 + 16\beta^2 L^2})$, which satisfies $2\beta\varepsilon = \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon/L} = \chi(L, \beta)$, where

$$\chi(L, \beta) = \frac{4\beta}{1 + \sqrt{1 + 16\beta^2 L^2}}, \quad (3.32)$$

and $\gamma_n \equiv \gamma = \sigma\chi(L, \beta) \in]0, \chi(L, \beta)[$. Hence, we recover the result in [12, Theorem 2.3(1)] for constant stepsizes. Additionally, if $B_2 = 0$ and $X = \mathcal{H}$, we have $\varepsilon(L, \beta) \rightarrow 1$ and $\chi(L, \beta) \rightarrow 2\beta$ as $L \rightarrow 0$ and $\gamma_n \equiv 2\beta\sigma \in]0, 2\beta[$, recovering the forward backward algorithm [29]. On the other hand, if $B_1 = 0$, we have $\chi(L, \beta) \rightarrow 1/L$ as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ and $\gamma_n \equiv \sigma/L \in]0, 1/L[$, recovering the result in [38] for constant step-sizes.

(2) Suppose that $B_2 = 0$ and $X \subset \text{dom } A$. Then by taking $L \rightarrow 0$, we have $\rho \rightarrow 2\beta\varepsilon$ and $\theta \in]0, \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon}[$. Hence, Theorem 3.4 recovers [12, Theorem 2.3(2)] noting that the uniform continuity in weakly compact subsets of $\overline{\text{conv}}(\text{dom } A \cup X) = \overline{\text{dom } A}$ is needed. We hence generalize [12, Theorem 2.3(1)&(2)] to the case when $X \not\subset \text{dom } A$.

4. APPLICATION TO CONVEX OPTIMIZATION WITH NONLINEAR CONSTRAINTS

In this section we consider the following optimization problem.

Problem 4.1. Let $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H})$, let $g \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{G})$, let $h : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex Gâteaux differentiable function such that ∇h is β^{-1} -Lipschitzian for some $\beta \in]0, +\infty[$, let $M : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ be a bounded linear operator, and let $e : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p : x \mapsto (e_i(x))_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ be such that, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$,

e_i is convex and Gâteaux differentiable in $\text{int dom } e_i$, $\text{dom } e_i$ is closed, $\bigcap_{i=1}^p \text{int dom } e_i \neq \emptyset$, and $\text{dom } \partial f \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^p \text{int dom } e_i$. The problem is to

$$\min_{e(x) \in]-\infty, 0]^p} f(x) + g(Mx) + h(x), \quad (4.1)$$

and we assume that solutions exist.

The Lagrangian associated to (4.1) is

$$\mathcal{L}: \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R}^p: (x, v) \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty] \mapsto f(x) + g(Mx) + h(x) + e(x) \cdot v - \iota_{[0, +\infty[^p}(v). \quad (4.2)$$

In view of [2, Corollary 19.30], if $(\hat{x}, \hat{v}) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ is a saddle point of (4.2), \hat{x} is a solution to (4.1) and by [2, Corollary 19.30(v), Theorem 16.3, Theorem 16.47, Example 16.13, & Example 6.42(i)] we deduce

$$\begin{cases} 0 \in \partial(f + g \circ M + h)(\hat{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{v}_i \nabla e_i(\hat{x}) \\ 0 \in N_{[0, +\infty[^p}(\hat{v}) - e(\hat{x}). \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

Under standard qualification conditions, as $0 \in \text{sri}(\text{dom } g - M(\text{dom } f))$, there exists $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{G}$, such that (4.3) reduces to

$$\begin{cases} 0 \in \partial f(\hat{x}) + M^* \hat{u} + \nabla h(\hat{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{v}_i \nabla e_i(\hat{x}) \\ 0 \in \partial g^*(\hat{u}) - M \hat{x} \\ 0 \in N_{[0, +\infty[^p}(\hat{v}) - e(\hat{x}), \end{cases}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \begin{pmatrix} \partial f(\hat{x}) \\ \partial g^*(\hat{u}) \\ N_{[0, +\infty[^p}(\hat{v}) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \nabla h(\hat{x}) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} M^* \hat{u} \\ -M \hat{x} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{v}_i \nabla e_i(\hat{x}) \\ 0 \\ -e(\hat{x}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.4)$$

Proposition 4.2. *In the context of Problem 4.1 let $X = X_1 \times X_2 \times X_3 \subset \text{dom } \partial f \times \text{dom } \partial g^* \times [0, +\infty[^p$ be nonempty, closed, and convex, and define the operator*

$$B_3: \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathbb{R}}$$

$$(x, u, v) \mapsto \begin{cases} \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^p v_i \nabla e_i(x), 0, -e(x) \right) \right\}, & \text{if } v \in [0, +\infty[^p \text{ and } x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^p \text{int dom } e_i; \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

Then, the following hold:

- (1) B_3 is maximally monotone.
- (2) Suppose that one of the following holds:
 - (a) $(\nabla e_i)_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ are bounded and uniformly continuous in every weakly compact subset of $\overline{\text{dom } \partial f}$.
 - (b) \mathcal{H} is finite dimensional and $(\nabla e_i)_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ are continuous in every compact subset of $\overline{\text{dom } \partial f}$.

Then, B_3 is uniformly continuous in every compact subset of $\overline{\text{dom } \partial f} \times \overline{\text{dom } \partial g^*} \times [0, +\infty[^p$.

Proof. 1: Consider the saddle-function

$$\ell: \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$$

$$(x, u, v) \mapsto \begin{cases} e(x) \cdot v, & \text{if } v \in [0, +\infty[^p \text{ and } x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^p \text{dom } e_i; \\ +\infty, & \text{if } v \in [0, +\infty[^p \text{ and } x \notin \bigcap_{i=1}^p \text{dom } e_i; \\ -\infty, & \text{if } v \notin [0, +\infty[^p. \end{cases}$$

Note that, if $v \in [0, +\infty]^p$,

$$\ell: (x, u, v) \mapsto \begin{cases} e(x) \cdot v, & \text{if } x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^p \text{dom } e_i; \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

and, if $v \notin [0, +\infty]^p$, $\ell(\cdot, \cdot, v) \equiv -\infty$, hence, for every $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\ell(\cdot, \cdot, v)$ is lower-semicontinuous. Additionally, if $x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^p \text{dom } e_i$, we have

$$-\ell: (x, u, v) \mapsto \begin{cases} -e(x) \cdot v, & \text{if } v \in [0, +\infty]^p; \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

and, if $x \notin \bigcap_{i=1}^p \text{dom } e_i$

$$-\ell: (x, u, v) \mapsto \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } v \in [0, +\infty]^p; \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

hence, for every $(x, u) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G}$, $-\ell(x, u, \cdot)$ is lower-semicontinuous. Furthermore,

$$(\forall (x, u) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G})(\forall v \in \mathbb{R}^p) \quad B_3(x, u, v) = \partial \ell(\cdot, \cdot, v)(x, u) \times \partial(-\ell(x, u, \cdot))(v). \quad (4.9)$$

Hence, the maximal monotonicity of B_3 follows from [33, Corollary 1].

2: First, assume 2a. Let $Y = Y_1 \times Y_2 \times Y_3 \subset \overline{\text{dom } \partial f} \times \overline{\text{dom } \partial g^*} \times [0, +\infty]^p$ be a weakly compact set. Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, u_1, v_1)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (x_2, u_2, v_2)$ in Y , fix $i \in \{1 \dots, p\}$, define $\rho_i(t): [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}: t \mapsto e_i(x_1 + t(x_2 - x_1))$ which is differentiable in $]0, 1[$. Since Y_1 is weakly compact, by [2, Theorem 3.37], $\text{conv } Y_1$ is also weakly compact and, since ∇e_i is bounded in $\text{conv } Y_1 \subset \overline{\text{dom } \partial f}$, there exists $K_i > 0$ such that $\sup_{x \in \text{conv } Y_1} \|\nabla e_i(x)\| \leq K_i$. Note that $\dot{\rho}_i: t \mapsto \langle \nabla e_i(x_1 + t(x_2 - x_1)) | x_2 - x_1 \rangle$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} |e_i(x_2) - e_i(x_1)| &= |\rho_i(1) - \rho_i(0)| \\ &= \left| \int_0^1 \dot{\rho}_i(t) dt \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^1 \langle \nabla e_i(x_1 + t(x_2 - x_1)) | x_2 - x_1 \rangle dt \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \|\nabla e_i(x_1 + t(x_2 - x_1))\| \|x_2 - x_1\| dt \\ &\leq K_i \|x_2 - x_1\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude $|e_i(x_1) - e_i(x_2)| \leq K_i \|x_2 - x_1\|$ and therefore

$$\|e(x_2) - e(x_1)\| \leq K \|x_2 - x_1\| \quad (4.10)$$

for $K = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p K_i^2}$. Since Y is weakly compact, it is bounded [2, Lemma 2.36] and there exists $V > 0$ such that $\|v\| \leq V$ for all $v \in Y_3$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. The uniform continuity of $(\nabla e_i)_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ implies the existence of $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(\forall i \in \{1, \dots, p\})(\forall (z_1, z_2) \in Y_2^2) \quad \|z_1 - z_2\| < \delta \Rightarrow \|\nabla e_i(z_1) - \nabla e_i(z_2)\|^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4pV^2}. \quad (4.11)$$

Now suppose that

$$\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4pK^2}, \delta^2 \right\}.$$

Then, (4.10), the convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$, and (4.11) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\|B_3\mathbf{x} - B_3\mathbf{y}\|^2 &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^p v_{1,i} \nabla e_i(x_1) - v_{2,i} \nabla e_i(x_2) \right\|^2 + \|e(x_1) - e(x_2)\|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^p (v_{1,i} - v_{2,i}) \nabla e_i(x_1) \right\|^2 + 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^p v_{2,i} (\nabla e_i(x_1) - \nabla e_i(x_2)) \right\|^2 + K^2 \|x_1 - x_2\|^2 \\
&\leq 2p \sum_{i=1}^p |v_{1,i} - v_{2,i}|^2 \|\nabla e_i(x_1)\|^2 + 2p \sum_{i=1}^p |v_{2,i}|^2 \|\nabla e_i(x_1) - \nabla e_i(x_2)\|^2 + K^2 \|x_1 - x_2\|^2 \\
&\leq 2pK^2 \|v_1 - v_2\|^2 + 2pV^2 \sum_{i=1}^p \|\nabla e_i(x_1) - \nabla e_i(x_2)\|^2 + K^2 \|x_1 - x_2\|^2 \\
&\leq 2pK^2 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \\
&\leq \varepsilon^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore B_3 is uniformly continuous in Y .

Now, assume 2b. Since \mathcal{H} is finite dimensional the weak and strong topologies coincide [2, Fact 2.33]. Hence, since ∇e_i is continuous, it is bounded and uniformly continuous in every compact subset of X . The result follows from 2a. \square

Remark 4.3. Note that if, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, ∇e_i is bounded and uniformly continuous in every weakly compact subset of $\text{dom } f$, since $\text{dom } \partial f \subset \text{dom } f$, B_3 is uniformly continuous in every compact subset of $\text{dom } \partial f \times \text{dom } \partial g^* \times [0, +\infty]^p$ in view of Proposition 4.2.

Proposition 4.4. In the context of Problem 4.1, assume that $0 \in \text{sri}(\text{dom } g - M(\text{dom } f))$, let $X = X_1 \times X_2 \times X_3 \subset \text{dom } \partial f \times \text{dom } \partial g^* \times [0, +\infty]^p$ be nonempty, closed, and convex, let $\varepsilon \in]0, 1[$, set $\rho = \min\{2\beta\varepsilon, \sqrt{1-\varepsilon}/\|M\|\}$, let $\sigma \in]0, 1[$, let $\theta \in]0, \sqrt{1-\varepsilon} - \|M\|\rho\sigma[$. For every $\mathbf{z} = (z^1, z^2, z^3) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ define $\Phi_{\mathbf{z}}: \gamma \mapsto (\Phi_{\mathbf{z}}^1(\gamma), \Phi_{\mathbf{z}}^2(\gamma), \Phi_{\mathbf{z}}^3(\gamma))$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{\mathbf{z}}^1: \gamma &\mapsto \text{prox}_{\gamma f} \left(z^1 - \gamma \left(\nabla h(z^1) + M^* z^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p z_i^3 \nabla e_i(z^1) \right) \right) \\
\Phi_{\mathbf{z}}^2: \gamma &\mapsto \text{prox}_{\gamma g^*} (z^2 + \gamma M z^1) \\
\Phi_{\mathbf{z}}^3: \gamma &\mapsto P_{[0, +\infty]^p} (z^3 + \gamma e(z^1)).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Let $\mathbf{z}_0 = (z_0^1, z_0^2, z_0^3) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ and consider the recurrence, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{cases}
x_n^1 = \Phi_{\mathbf{z}_n}^1(\gamma_n) \\
x_n^2 = \Phi_{\mathbf{z}_n}^2(\gamma_n) \\
x_n^3 = \Phi_{\mathbf{z}_n}^3(\gamma_n) \\
z_{n+1}^1 = P_{X_1} (x_n^1 + \gamma_n (M^* z_n^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p z_{n,i}^3 \nabla e_i(z_n^1)) - \gamma_n (M^* x_n^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p x_{n,i}^3 \nabla e_i(x_n^1))) \\
z_{n+1}^2 = P_{X_2} (x_n^2 - \gamma_n M z_n^1 + \gamma_n M x_n^1) \\
z_{n+1}^3 = P_{X_3} (x_n^3 - \gamma_n e(z_n^1) + \gamma_n e(x_n^1)) \\
\mathbf{z}_{n+1} = (z_{n+1}^1, z_{n+1}^2, z_{n+1}^3),
\end{cases} \tag{4.13}$$

where γ_n is the largest $\gamma \in \{\rho\sigma, \rho\sigma^2, \rho\sigma^3, \dots\}$ satisfying

$$\gamma^2 \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^p z_{n,i}^3 \nabla e_i(z_n^1) - \Phi_{z_n,i}^3(\gamma) \nabla e(\Phi_{z_n}^1(\gamma)) \right\|^2 + \|e(z_n^1) - e(\Phi_{z_n}^1(\gamma))\|^2 \right) \leq \theta^2 \|z_n - \Phi_{z_n}(\gamma)\|^2. \quad (4.14)$$

Moreover, assume that at least one of the following additional statements hold:

- (i) $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n = \delta > 0$.
- (ii) For every $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, ∇e_i is bounded and uniformly continuous in every weakly compact subset of $\overline{\text{dom } \partial f}$.

Then, $(z_n^1)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to a solution to Problem 4.1.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathbb{R}^p$, define

$$\begin{cases} A: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}: (x, u, v) \mapsto \partial f(x) \times \partial g^*(u) \times N_{[0, +\infty]^p}(v), \\ B_1: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}: (x, u, v) \mapsto (\nabla h(x), 0, 0), \\ B_2: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}: (x, u, v) \mapsto (M^*u, -Mx, 0), \end{cases} \quad (4.15)$$

and consider the operator B_3 defined in (4.5). Note that A is maximally monotone [2, Proposition 20.23 & Proposition 20.25], B_1 is β -cocoercive [2, Corollary 18.17], B_2 is $\|M\|$ -Lipschitzian [10, Proposition 2.7(ii)] & [2, Fact 2.20], and the operator B_3 is maximally monotone by Proposition 4.2. Furthermore, note that $\text{dom } A = \text{dom } (\partial f) \times \text{dom } (\partial g^*) \times [0, +\infty]^p$ and $\text{dom } B_3 = (\cap_{i=1}^n \text{int dom } e_i) \times \mathcal{G} \times [0, +\infty]^p$. Hence, it follows from $\text{dom } (\partial f) \subset \cap_{i=1}^n \text{int dom } e_i$ that $\text{dom } A \cup X \subset \text{dom } B_3$ and $0 \in \text{int}(\text{dom } A - \text{dom } B_3)$. Therefore, $A + B_3$ is maximally monotone [2, Corollary 25.5(ii)]. Altogether, the inclusion in (4.4) is a particular instance of Problem 3.1. Define, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{x}_n = (x_n^1, x_n^2, x_n^3)$. Hence, (4.12), (4.5), and (4.15) yield

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_n = J_{\gamma_n A}(\mathbf{z}_n - \gamma_n(B_1 + B_2 + B_3)\mathbf{z}_n) \\ \mathbf{z}_{n+1} = P_X(\mathbf{x}_n + \gamma_n(B_2 + B_3)\mathbf{z}_n - \gamma_n(B_2 + B_3)\mathbf{x}_n), \end{cases} \quad (4.16)$$

where γ_n , by (4.14) and (4.15), satisfies

$$\gamma \|B_3 \mathbf{z}_n - B_3 J_{\gamma A}(\mathbf{z}_n - \gamma(B_1 + B_2 + B_3)\mathbf{z}_n)\| \leq \theta \|\mathbf{z}_n - J_{\gamma A}(\mathbf{z}_n - \gamma(B_1 + B_2 + B_3)\mathbf{z}_n)\|. \quad (4.17)$$

Note that, if we assume (ii), by Proposition 4.2, B_3 is uniformly continuous in every weak compact subset of $\overline{\text{dom } \partial f} \times \overline{\text{dom } \partial g^*} \times [0, +\infty]^p = \overline{\text{conv}(\text{dom } A)} = \overline{\text{conv}(\text{dom } A \cup X)}$ [2, Corollary 21.14 & Exercise 3.2]. Altogether, assuming (i) or (ii), since $X \subset \text{dom } A$, by Theorem 3.4, there exists $\mathbf{z} = (z, u, v) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ solution to (4.4) such that $\mathbf{z}_n \rightharpoonup \mathbf{z}$. Since $0 \in \text{sri}(\text{dom } g - M(\text{dom } f))$, by (4.3), (4.4), and [2, Theorem 16.47] \mathbf{z} is a saddle-point of \mathcal{L} in (4.2). By [2, Corollary 19.30(v)], \mathbf{z} is a solution to Problem 4.1 and the result follows. \square

5. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section we consider the following optimization problem

$$\min_{\substack{y^0 \leq x \leq y^1 \\ x_i (\ln(x_i/a_i) - 1) - r_i \leq 0, \\ i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}} \alpha \|Mx\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - z\|^2, \quad (5.1)$$

where $M \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $y^0 = (\eta_i^0)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $y^1 = (\eta_i^1)_{1 \leq i \leq N} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $r_1, \dots, r_n \in]-1, +\infty[$, and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in]0, +\infty[$. Set

$$\begin{cases} C = \times_{i=1}^n [\eta_i^0, \eta_i^1], \\ f = \iota_C, \\ g = \alpha \|\cdot\|_1, \\ h = \|A \cdot -z\|^2/2, \\ e = (e_i(\cdot))_{i=1}^n, \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

where

$$(\forall i = 1, \dots, n) \quad e_i: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}: x \mapsto \begin{cases} x_i(\ln(x_i/a_i) - 1) - r_i, & \text{if } x_i > 0; \\ -r_i, & \text{if } x_i = 0; \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, we have $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $g \in \Gamma_0(\mathbb{R}^r)$, and that ∇h is $\|A\|^2$ -Lipschitzian. Additionally, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, e_i is Gâteaux differentiable in $]0, +\infty[^n$,

$$(\nabla e_i(x))_k = \begin{cases} \ln x_k, & \text{if } k = i, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

$\text{dom } e_i$ is closed, $\cap_{i=1}^n \text{dom } e_i = [0, +\infty[^n$, and

$$0 \in \text{int}(\text{dom}(\partial f) - \cap_{i=1}^n \text{dom } e_i) = \times_{i=1}^n]-\infty, \eta_i^1[.$$

Hence, the optimization problem in (5.1) is a particular instance of Problem 4.1. In this setting, since $g^* = \iota_{[-\alpha, \alpha]^r}$ [2, Example 13.32(v) & Proposition 13.23(i)], we consider $X_1 \times X_2 \times X_3 = C \times [-\alpha, \alpha]^r \times [0, +\infty[^p$ in order to write the recurrence in (4.13) as Algorithm 1 below.

We compare Algorithm 1 with the algorithm propose in [12] called FBHF and with the MATLAB's `fmincon` (interior point).

To solve problem in (4.1) with FBHF algorithm, we consider $X = X_1 \times X_2 \times X_3$ and the followings operators (see (4.4) and [12, Theorem 2.3])

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \partial f(\hat{x}) \\ \partial g^*(\hat{u}) \\ N_{[0, +\infty[^p}(\hat{v}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \nabla h(\hat{x}) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_2 + B_3 = \begin{pmatrix} M^* \hat{u} + \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{v}_i \nabla e_i(\hat{x}) \\ -M \hat{x} \\ -e(\hat{x}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.4)$$

In our numerical experiments, we generate 20 random realizations of A , M , z , and r_1, \dots, r_n for dimensions $n = m \in \{600, 900, 1200\}$ and $r \in \{n/3, n/2, 2n/3\}$. In each realization we define $a_i = 9$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\alpha = 0.05$, and $y^0 = \hat{y}_0$ and $y^1 = \hat{y}_1 + \text{rand}(n)$, where \hat{y}_1 and \hat{y}_2 satisfies $e(\hat{y}_0) = e(\hat{y}_1) = 0$. For Algorithm 1 we consider $\sigma = 0.99$. For FBHF we consider $\varepsilon = 0.8$, $\theta = \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon}/2$, $\sigma = 0.99$, the maximally monotone operator A , the cocoercive operator B_1 , and the continuous operator $B_1 + B_2$ on (5.4) (see [12, Theorem 2.3]).

In Table 1 we provide the average time and iterations to achieve a tolerance $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$ for the instances mentioned above. We can observe that, for each instance, Algorithm 1 is more efficient than the method FBHF and `fmincon`. Algorithm 1 and FBHF are similar in number of iterations, but each iteration of FBHF is more expensive in time than Algorithm 1. This is because FBHF needs, additionally, to activate the operators M^* and M in each line search. This difference is larger as the dimension of the problem increases. Although `fmincon` needs less iterations than Algorithm 1 and FBHF to reach the stop criterion, each iteration is very expensive in CPU time. Indeed, Algorithm 1 reaches the stop criterion in 20% of the time that `fmincon` takes.

Algorithm 1

```

1: Fix  $\mathbf{z}_0 = (z_0^1, z_0^2, z_0^3) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $\sigma \in ]0, 1[$ , let  $\varepsilon = \|A\|^4 \frac{\sqrt{1+16\|M\|^2/\|A\|^4}-1}{8\|M\|^2}$ , let
    $\theta = 2\varepsilon\|M\|(1-\sigma)/\|A\|^2$ , and let  $\epsilon > 0$ .
2: while  $r_n > \epsilon$  do
3:    $\gamma = 2\varepsilon\|M\|$ 
4:    $\mathbf{V} = 0$ 
5:   while  $\mathbf{V} = 0$  do
6:      $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma \cdot \sigma$ 
7:      $\Phi^1(\gamma) = P_{[\eta_1, \eta_2]^n} \left( z_n^1 - \gamma(A^*(Az_n^1 - z) + M^*z_n^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p z_{n,i}^3 \ln(z_{n,i}^1)) \right)$ 
8:      $\Phi^2(\gamma) = \gamma(\text{Id} - \text{prox}_{\alpha\|\cdot\|_1/\gamma})(z_n^2/\gamma + Mz_n^1)$ 
9:      $\Phi^3(\gamma) = P_{[0, +\infty[^n} (z_n^3 + \gamma e(z_n^1))$ 
10:     $\Phi(\gamma) = (\Phi^1(\gamma), \Phi^2(\gamma), \Phi^3(\gamma))$ 
11:    if  $\sum_{i=1}^p |z_{n,i}^3 \ln(z_{n,i}^1) - \Phi_i^3(\gamma) \ln(\Phi_i^1(\gamma))|^2 + \|e(z_n^1) - e(\Phi^1(\gamma))\|^2 \leq \frac{\theta^2}{\gamma^2} \|\mathbf{z}_n - \Phi(\gamma)\|^2$ 
      then
12:       $\mathbf{V} = 1$ 
13:    end if
14:  end while
15:   $\gamma_n = \gamma$ 
16:   $(x_n^1, x_n^2, x_n^3) = (\Phi^1(\gamma_n), \Phi^2(\gamma_n), \Phi^3(\gamma_n))$ 
17:   $z_{n+1}^1 = P_{[\eta_1, \eta_2]^n} (x_n^1 + \gamma_n(M^*z_n^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p z_{n,i}^3 \ln(z_{n,i}^1)) - \gamma_n(M^*x_n^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p x_{n,i}^3 \ln(x_{n,i}^1)))$ 
18:   $z_{n+1}^2 = P_{[-\alpha, \alpha]^r} (x_n^2 - \gamma_n M z_n^1 + \gamma_n M x_n^1)$ 
19:   $z_{n+1}^3 = P_{[0, +\infty[^p} (x_n^3 - \gamma_n e(z_n^1) + \gamma_n e(x_n^1))$ 
20:   $\mathbf{z}_{n+1} = (z_{n+1}^1, z_{n+1}^2, z_{n+1}^3)$ 
21:   $r_n = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{z}_{n+1}, \mathbf{z}_n)$ 
22:   $n \rightarrow n + 1$ 
23: end while
24: return  $\mathbf{z}_{n+1}$ 

```

TABLE 1. Average time and average number of iterations of 20 random realizations of problem in (5.1) for Algorithm 1, FBHF, and `fmincon`.

N_1	$\epsilon = 10^{-6}$	$N_2 = N_1/3$		$N_2 = N_1/2$		$N_2 = 2N_1/3$	
	Algorithm	Av. Time (s)	Av. Iter	Av. Time (s)	Av. Iter	A. Time (s)	A. Iter
600	Alg. 1	6.82	7845	9.61	10384	15.79	16136
	FBHF	10.47	8280	14.22	10885	23.28	16772
	<code>fmincon</code>	52.52	238	66.25	276	69.78	251
900	Alg. 1	19.26	8185	28.89	11932	52.69	20653
	FBHF	31.28	8568	46.06	12375	84.17	21757
	<code>fmincon</code>	256.71	350	309.33	408	292.21	368
1200	Alg. 1	36.01	8809	62.82	14490	110.76	24778
	FBHF	59.41	9231	98.60	14783	174.08	25633
	<code>fmincon</code>	694.86	457	839.06	528	790.66	462

6. CONCLUSIONS

We provide an algorithm for finding a zero of the sum of a maximally monotone, a cocoercive, a monotone-Lipschitzian, and a monotone-continuous operators in a Hilbertian setting which splits their influence in its implementation. The proposed method exploits the intrinsic properties of each operator activating implicitly the maximally monotone operator via its resolvent, explicitly the cocoercive and the monotone-Lipschitzian operator, and for the continuous operator activation a line search procedure is needed. This method generalizes previous results in [12, 29, 38] and it is more efficient than other algorithms in the literature when applied to non-linearly constrained convex optimization problems.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The first author thanks the support of Centro de Modelamiento Matemático (CMM), ACE210010 and FB210005, BASAL funds for centers of excellence and ANID under grant FONDECYT 1190871 from ANID-Chile. The second author thanks the support of ANID-Subdirección de Capital Humano/Doctorado Nacional/2018-21181024 and by the Dirección de Postgrado y Programas from UTFSM through Programa de Incentivos a la Iniciación Científica (PIIC).

REFERENCES

- [1] J.-P. AUBIN AND H. FRANKOWSKA, *Set-valued analysis*, Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2009, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-8176-4848-0>.
- [2] H. H. BAUSCHKE AND P. L. COMBETTES, *Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces*, CMS Books in Mathematics/Ouvrages de Mathématiques de la SMC, Springer, Cham, second ed., 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48311-5>. With a foreword by Hedy Attouch.
- [3] R. I. BOŦ AND E. R. CSETNEK, *An inertial forward-backward-forward primal-dual splitting algorithm for solving monotone inclusion problems*, Numer. Algorithms, 71 (2016), pp. 519–540, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11075-015-0007-5>.
- [4] R. I. BOŦ AND E. R. CSETNEK, *ADMM for monotone operators: convergence analysis and rates*, Adv. Comput. Math., 45 (2019), pp. 327–359, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10444-018-9619-3>.
- [5] R. I. BOŦ, E. R. CSETNEK, AND A. HEINRICH, *A primal-dual splitting algorithm for finding zeros of sums of maximal monotone operators*, SIAM J. Optim., 23 (2013), pp. 2011–2036, <https://doi.org/10.1137/12088255X>.
- [6] R. I. BOŦ, E. R. CSETNEK, AND C. HENDRICH, *Inertial Douglas-Rachford splitting for monotone inclusion problems*, Appl. Math. Comput., 256 (2015), pp. 472–487, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2015.01.017>.
- [7] R. I. BOŦ AND C. HENDRICH, *A Douglas-Rachford type primal-dual method for solving inclusions with mixtures of composite and parallel-sum type monotone operators*, SIAM J. Optim., 23 (2013), pp. 2541–2565, <https://doi.org/10.1137/120901106>.
- [8] L. M. BRICEÑO-ARIAS, *Forward-Douglas-Rachford splitting and forward-partial inverse method for solving monotone inclusions*, Optimization, 64 (2015), pp. 1239–1261, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02331934.2013.855210>.
- [9] L. M. BRICEÑO-ARIAS, *Forward-partial inverse-forward splitting for solving monotone inclusions*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 166 (2015), pp. 391–413, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-015-0703-2>.
- [10] L. M. BRICEÑO-ARIAS AND P. L. COMBETTES, *A monotone + skew splitting model for composite monotone inclusions in duality*, SIAM J. Optim., 21 (2011), pp. 1230–1250, <https://doi.org/10.1137/10081602X>.
- [11] L. M. BRICEÑO-ARIAS AND P. L. COMBETTES, *Monotone operator methods for Nash equilibria in non-potential games*, in Computational and analytical mathematics, vol. 50 of Springer Proc. Math. Stat., Springer, New York, 2013, pp. 143–159, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7621-4_9.
- [12] L. M. BRICEÑO-ARIAS AND D. DAVIS, *Forward-backward-half forward algorithm for solving monotone inclusions*, SIAM J. Optim., 28 (2018), pp. 2839–2871, <https://doi.org/10.1137/17M1120099>.
- [13] M. N. BÙI AND P. L. COMBETTES, *Multivariate monotone inclusions in saddle form*, Mathematics of Operations Research, to appear (2022).
- [14] V. CEVHER AND B. VÛ, *A reflected forward-backward splitting method for monotone inclusions involving lipschitzian operators*, Set-Valued Var. Anal., (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11228-020-00542-4>.

- [15] P. L. COMBETTES, *Quasi-Fejérian analysis of some optimization algorithms*, in Inherently parallel algorithms in feasibility and optimization and their applications (Haifa, 2000), vol. 8 of Stud. Comput. Math., North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2001, pp. 115–152, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1570-579X\(01\)80010-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1570-579X(01)80010-0).
- [16] P. L. COMBETTES AND J. ECKSTEIN, *Asynchronous block-iterative primal-dual decomposition methods for monotone inclusions*, Math. Program., 168 (2018), pp. 645–672, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-016-1044-0>.
- [17] P. L. COMBETTES AND J.-C. PESQUET, *Primal-dual splitting algorithm for solving inclusions with mixtures of composite, Lipschitzian, and parallel-sum type monotone operators*, Set-Valued Var. Anal., 20 (2012), pp. 307–330, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11228-011-0191-y>.
- [18] P. L. COMBETTES AND B. C. VÛ, *Variable metric forward-backward splitting with applications to monotone inclusions in duality*, Optimization, 63 (2014), pp. 1289–1318, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02331934.2012.733883>.
- [19] E. CSETNEK, Y. MALITSKY, AND M. TAM, *Shadow Douglas-Rachford splitting for monotone inclusions*, Appl. Math. Optim., 80 (2019), pp. 665–678.
- [20] D. DAVIS AND W. YIN, *A three-operator splitting scheme and its optimization applications*, Set-Valued Var. Anal., 25 (2017), pp. 829–858, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11228-017-0421-z>.
- [21] Y. DONG, *Weak convergence of an extended splitting method for monotone inclusions*, J. Global Optim., 79 (2021), pp. 257–277, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10898-020-00940-w>.
- [22] D. DÛNG AND B. C. VÛ, *A splitting algorithm for system of composite monotone inclusions*, Vietnam J. Math., 43 (2015), pp. 323–341, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10013-015-0121-7>.
- [23] J. ECKSTEIN, *A simplified form of block-iterative operator splitting and an asynchronous algorithm resembling the multi-block alternating direction method of multipliers*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 173 (2017), pp. 155–182, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-017-1074-7>.
- [24] D. GABAY, *Chapter IX applications of the method of multipliers to variational inequalities*, in Augmented Lagrangian Methods: Applications to the Numerical Solution of Boundary-Value Problems, M. Fortin and R. Glowinski, eds., vol. 15 of Studies in Mathematics and Its Applications, Elsevier, New York, 1983, pp. 299 – 331, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-2024\(08\)70034-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-2024(08)70034-1).
- [25] R. GLOWINSKI AND A. MARROCO, *Sur l’approximation, par elements finis d’ordre un, et la resolution, par penalisation-dualite, d’une classe de problemes de dirichlet non lineares*, Revue Francaise d’Automatique, Informatique et Recherche Operationelle, 9 (1975), pp. 41–76, <https://doi.org/10.1051/M2AN/197509R200411>.
- [26] A. A. GOLDSTEIN, *Convex programming in Hilbert space*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, 70 (1964), pp. 709 – 710, <https://doi.org/bams/1183526263>, <https://doi.org/>.
- [27] P. R. JOHNSTONE AND J. ECKSTEIN, *Projective splitting with forward steps only requires continuity*, Optim. Lett., 14 (2020), pp. 229–247, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11590-019-01509-7>.
- [28] P. R. JOHNSTONE AND J. ECKSTEIN, *Single-forward-step projective splitting: exploiting cocoercivity*, Comput. Optim. Appl., 78 (2021), pp. 125–166, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-020-00238-3>.
- [29] P. LIONS AND B. MERCIER, *Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 16 (1979), pp. 964–979.
- [30] Y. MALITSKY AND M. K. TAM, *A forward-backward splitting method for monotone inclusions without cocoercivity*, SIAM J. Optim., 30 (2020), pp. 1451–1472, <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1207260>.
- [31] H. RAGUET, J. FADILI, AND G. PEYRÉ, *A generalized forward-backward splitting*, SIAM J. Imaging Sci., 6 (2013), pp. 1199–1226, <https://doi.org/10.1137/120872802>, <https://doi-org.usm.idm.oclc.org/10.1137/120872802>.
- [32] J. RIEGER AND M. K. TAM, *Backward-forward-reflected-backward splitting for three operator monotone inclusions*, Appl. Math. Comput., 381 (2020), pp. 125248, 10, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2020.125248>.
- [33] R. T. ROCKAFELLAR, *Monotone operators associated with saddle-functions and minimax problems*, in Nonlinear Functional Analysis (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. XVIII, Part 1, Chicago, Ill., 1968), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1970, pp. 241–250.
- [34] E. K. RYU AND B. C. VÛ, *Finding the forward-Douglas-Rachford-forward method*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 184 (2020), pp. 858–876, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-019-01601-z>.
- [35] S. SALZO, *The variable metric forward-backward splitting algorithm under mild differentiability assumptions*, SIAM J. Optim., 27 (2017), pp. 2153–2181, <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1073741>.
- [36] R. E. SHOWALTER, *Monotone Operators in Banach Space and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 49 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997, <https://doi.org/10.1090/surv/049>.
- [37] J. E. SPINGARN, *Partial inverse of a monotone operator*, Appl. Math. Optim., 10 (1983), pp. 247–265, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01448388>.

- [38] P. TSENG, *A modified forward-backward splitting method for maximal monotone mappings*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 38 (2000), pp. 431–446, <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0363012998338806>.
- [39] B. C. VŨ, *A splitting algorithm for dual monotone inclusions involving cocoercive operators*, Adv. Comput. Math., 38 (2013), pp. 667–681, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10444-011-9254-8>.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA FEDERICO SANTA MARÍA, AVENIDA ESPAÑA 1680,
VALPARAÍSO, CHILE
Email address: `luis.briceno@usm.cl`, `fernando.roldan@usm.cl`