

Fast Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann algorithm with a convergence rate of the fixed point iteration of $o(1/k)$

Radu Ioan Bot^{*} Dang-Khoa Nguyen[†]

June 22, 2022

Abstract

The Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann (KM) algorithm is the most fundamental iterative scheme designed to find a fixed point of an averaged operator in the framework of a real Hilbert space, since it lies at the heart of various numerical algorithms for solving monotone inclusions and convex optimization problems. We enhance the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann algorithm with Nesterov's momentum updates and show that the resulting numerical method exhibits a convergence rate for the fixed point residual of $o(\frac{1}{k})$ while preserving the weak convergence of the iterates to a fixed point of the operator. Numerical experiments illustrate the superiority of the resulting so-called Fast KM algorithm over various fixed point iterative schemes, and also its oscillatory behavior, which is a specific of Nesterov's momentum optimization algorithms.

Key Words. nonexpansive operator, averaged operator, Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iteration, Nesterov's momentum, Lyapunov analysis, convergence rates, convergence of iterates

AMS subject classification. 47J20, 47H05, 65K15, 65Y20

1 Introduction

Let \mathcal{H} be a real Hilbert space with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and induced norm $\|\cdot\|$. In this paper we are interested in formulating a fast numerical method for solving the fixed point problem

$$\text{Find } x \in \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } x = T(x), \quad (1)$$

where $T: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a θ -averaged operator with $\theta \in (0, 1]$. Recall that an operator $R: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is *nonexpansive* if it is 1-Lipschitz continuous, that is

$$\|R(x) - R(y)\| \leq \|x - y\| \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Then T is said to be *averaged with constant θ* or *θ -averaged* if there exists a nonexpansive operator $R: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$T = (1 - \theta) \text{Id} + \theta R,$$

where $\text{Id}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ denotes the identity mapping on \mathcal{H} . Obviously, an operator T is nonexpansive if it is at least 1-averaged. We denote the set of all *fixed points* of T by $\text{Fix}T := \{x \in \mathcal{H} \mid x = T(x)\}$.

The most naive approach when looking for a fixed point of T is the following process, also called *Banach-Picard iteration*,

$$x_{k+1} := T(x_k) \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (2)$$

where $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ is a starting point.

^{*}Faculty of Mathematics, University of Vienna, Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria, email: radu.bot@univie.ac.at. Research partially supported by FWF (Austrian Science Fund), projects W 1260 and P 34922-N.

[†]Faculty of Mathematics, University of Vienna, Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria, email: dang-khoa.nguyen@univie.ac.at. Research supported by FWF (Austrian Science Fund), project P 34922-N.

According to the Banach-Picard fixed point theorem, if T is a *contraction*, namely, T is Lipschitz continuous with modulus $\delta \in [0, 1)$, then the sequence $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ generated by (2) converges strongly to the unique fixed point of T with linear convergence rate. If T is just nonexpansive, then this statement is no longer true. To illustrate this, it is enough to choose $T = -\text{Id}$ and $x_0 \neq 0$, in which case the Banach-Picard iteration not only fails approach a fixed point of T , but also generates a sequence that does not satisfy the *asymptotic regularity property*. We say that the sequence $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ satisfies the asymptotic regularity property if the difference $x_k - T(x_k)$ converges strongly to 0 as k tends to $+\infty$. This property is crucial for guaranteeing the convergence of the iterates, as we will see later.

In order to overcome the restrictive contraction assumption on T , Krasnosel'skiĭ proposed in [23] to apply the Banach-Picard iteration (2) to the operator $\frac{1}{2}\text{Id} + \frac{1}{2}T$ instead of T . Following on the idea of using convex combinations the so-called *Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann (KM) iteration*

$$x_{k+1} := (1 - s_k)x_k + s_kT(x_k) \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (3)$$

where $(s_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is a sequence in $(0, 1]$, emerged. It turned out that a fundamental step in proving the convergence of the iterates of (3) is to show that $x_k - T(x_k) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, as it was done by Browder and Petryshyn in [9] in the constant case $s_k \equiv s \in (0, 1)$. The extension to nonconstant sequences was achieved by Groetsch in [16] who proved that, if $\sum_{k \geq 0} s_k(1 - s_k) = +\infty$, then the asymptotic regularity property is satisfied. The weak convergence of the iterates was then studied in various settings in [16, 21, 34, 4, 3]. Tikhonov regularization based techniques to improve the convergence of the iterates from weak to strong have been recently studied in [5, 7].

By considering convex combinations with a fixed so-called *anchor point* $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ one obtains the *Halpern iteration* [18]

$$x_{k+1} := (1 - s_k)x_0 + s_kT(x_k) \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad (4)$$

a method that has recently attracted a lot of interest [26, 40, 33, 32]. The asymptotic regularity property of this iterative scheme has been studied in [38, 39].

Despite having ubiquitous applications in various fields applied field, the study of the computational complexity of fixed point iteration schemes is still limited. One natural measure to quantify this is by means of the rate of convergence of the *fixed point residual* $\|x_k - T(x_k)\|$. Notice that the asymptotic regularity property does not automatically provide an explicit convergence rate.

Sabach and Shtern proved in [35] for a general form of the Halpern iteration that the rate of convergence of the fixed point residual is of $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$. Lieder tightened this results in [26] by a constant factor, for the Halpern iteration with $s_k := \frac{1}{k+2}$ for every $k \geq 0$, whereas Park and Ryu proved in [32] that the convergence rate of $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$ is optimal for this iterative scheme, which means that it can not be improved in general. On the other hand, the convergence of the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iteration expressed in terms of the fixed point residual was in the ninties proved to be of $o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$ in [2] in the case of a constant sequence $(s_k)_{k \geq 0}$. Later on, in the case of a nonconstant sequence, it was proved to be of $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$ in [10, 25], and of $o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$ in [8, 13, 29]. Noticeably, Contreras and Cominetti showed in [11] that in the *Banach space setting* the lower bound of the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iteration is $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$, which does not say anything about the lower bound in the Hilbert space setting.

In this paper we introduce an iterative method for solving the fixed point problem (1) which exhibits a rate of convergence for the fixed point residual of $o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$ and guarantees the weak convergence of the iterates to a fixed point of T . The method is obtained by enhancing the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iteration with Nesterov's momentum updates and follows via the temporal discretization of the second order dynamical system with vanishing damping term proposed in [6] for solving monotone equations. The iterative scheme exploits the coercivity of the operator $\text{Id} - T$ and has consequently a much more simple formulation than the Fast OGD algorithm introduced in [6] for solving monotone equations, which requires the construction of auxiliary sequences. Numerical experiments show that the resulting so-called Fast KM algorithm outperforms various fixed point iterative schemes including recently introduced ones using anchoring. The numerical experiments also illustrate the oscillatory behavior of the method, which is a specific of algorithms with Nesterov's momentum updates.

As a by-product of our proposed approach we obtain several fast splitting methods for solving monotone inclusions. It is well-known that some of the most prominent splitting schemes result as

particular instances of the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iteration, since they can be reduced to the solving of a fixed point problem governed by an average operator. This is the case for the Douglas-Rachford splitting [15, 27], the forward-backward splitting [27], and the three operator splitting [14, 12]. For a comprehensive study of operator splitting schemes we refer to [3]. Recent contributions to the acceleration of the convergence of splitting methods have been made in [22, 40, 24, 37, 32].

2 A fast Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iteration

In our approach, we rely on the simple observation that

$$x_* \in \text{Fix}T \Leftrightarrow (\text{Id} - T)(x_*) = 0,$$

which allows us to benefit from the recent development on a continuous fast method for solving monotone equations in [6]. To be more specific, we have that T is θ -averaged if and only if $\text{Id} - T$ is $\frac{1}{2\theta}$ -cocoercive [3, Proposition 4.39], that is

$$\langle x - y, (\text{Id} - T)(x) - (\text{Id} - T)(y) \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2\theta} \|(\text{Id} - T)(x) - (\text{Id} - T)(y)\|^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (5)$$

From here one can immediately see that it follows immediately that $\text{Id} - T$ is monotone. Furthermore, from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we can see that $\text{Id} - T$ is at most 2θ -Lipschitz continuous.

As a direct consequence of (5) we have that for every $x_* \in \text{Fix}T$ it holds

$$\langle x - x_*, x - T(x) \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2\theta} \|x - T(x)\|^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{H}.$$

The dynamical system studied in [6], formulated for the monotone equation $(\text{Id} - T)(x) = 0$ and for constant time scaling term $\beta(t) \equiv 1$, reads

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{x}(t) + \frac{\alpha}{t}\dot{x}(t) + \frac{d}{dt}(\text{Id} - T)(x(t)) + \frac{\alpha}{2t}(\text{Id} - T)(x(t)) = 0 \\ x(t_0) = x_0 \text{ and } \dot{x}(t_0) = \dot{x}_0, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $\alpha \geq 2$, $(x_0, \dot{x}_0) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$. We set the time scaling term equal to one since our aim is to derive via temporal discretization an explicit iterative fixed point scheme, whereas nonconstant time scaling terms are known to positively impact the convergence rates of implicit numerical algorithms; see [6, Remark 2] for a detailed discussion on this issue.

Consider the first-order formulation of the first equation in (6)

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}(t) &= (2 - \alpha)(\text{Id} - T)(x(t)) \\ u(t) &= 2(\alpha - 1)x(t) + 2t\dot{x}(t) + 2t(\text{Id} - T)(x(t)). \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

We fix a time step $s > 0$, set $s_k := s(k + 1)$ for every $k \geq 1$, and approximate $x(s_k) \approx x_{k+1}$, and $u(s_k) \approx u_{k+1}$. The explicit finite-difference scheme for (7) at time $t := s_k$ gives for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{u_{k+1} - u_k}{s} &= (2 - \alpha)(\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \\ u_{k+1} &= 2(\alpha - 1)x_{k+1} + 2(k + 1)(x_{k+1} - x_k) + 2s(k + 1)(\text{Id} - T)(x_k), \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

with the initialization $u_0 := x_0 - s\dot{x}_0$ and $u_1 := x_0$. Different to [6], where for the discretization of the argument of $\text{Id} - T$ we used an auxiliary sequence, this time we can use $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$. This is thanks to the stronger property of cocoercivity the operator $\text{Id} - T$ is enhanced with and which will be reflected in the convergence analysis. We will see that this allows us not only to design a simpler algorithm, but also to consider larger step sizes than for the one proposed in [6].

Next we will simplify the sequence $(u_k)_{k \geq 0}$. The second equation in (8) gives for every $k \geq 1$

$$u_k = 2(\alpha - 1)x_k + 2k(x_k - x_{k-1}) + 2sk(\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}).$$

Taking the difference we obtain for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} u_{k+1} - u_k &= 2(k + \alpha)(x_{k+1} - x_k) - 2k(x_k - x_{k-1}) + 2s(\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \\ &\quad + 2sk((\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1})) \\ &= (2 - \alpha)s(\text{Id} - T)(x_k), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the last relation comes from the first equation in (8). After rearranging (9), we obtain for every $k \geq 1$

$$2(k + \alpha)(x_{k+1} - x_k) = 2k(x_k - x_{k-1}) - \alpha s(\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - 2sk((\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1})). \quad (10)$$

From here, we deduce that for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= x_k + \frac{k}{k + \alpha}(x_k - x_{k-1}) - \frac{s\alpha}{2(k + \alpha)}(\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - \frac{sk}{k + \alpha}((\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1})) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{s\alpha}{2(k + \alpha)}\right)x_k + \frac{(1 - s)k}{k + \alpha}(x_k - x_{k-1}) + \frac{s\alpha}{2(k + \alpha)}T(x_k) + \frac{sk}{k + \alpha}(T(x_k) - T(x_{k-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Summing up, the algorithm we propose in this paper for solving (1) has the following formulation.

Algorithm 1. (Fast KM algorithm) Let $\alpha > 2, x_0, x_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $0 < s \leq \frac{1}{\theta}$. For every $k \geq 1$ we set

$$x_{k+1} := \left(1 - \frac{s\alpha}{2(k + \alpha)}\right)x_k + \frac{(1 - s)k}{k + \alpha}(x_k - x_{k-1}) + \frac{s\alpha}{2(k + \alpha)}T(x_k) + \frac{sk}{k + \alpha}(T(x_k) - T(x_{k-1})). \quad (11)$$

Remark 1. For the step size choice $s := 1$ which is allowed for every θ -averaged operator T with $\theta \in (0, 1]$, our iterative schemes becomes

$$x_{k+1} := \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2(k + \alpha)}\right)x_k + \frac{\alpha}{2(k + \alpha)}T(x_k) + \frac{k}{k + \alpha}(T(x_k) - T(x_{k-1})) \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (12)$$

Notice that for a *nonexpansive* operator T , which corresponds to the case $\theta = 1$, the value $s := 1$ is the largest the step size can take.

The numerical algorithm (12) can be interpreted as a Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iteration enhanced with the extrapolation term $\frac{k}{k + \alpha}(T(x_k) - T(x_{k-1}))$ which proves to have an accelerating effect on the convergence of the fixed point residual. We learn from here that, in order to improve the convergence rate while preserving the convergence of the iterates, one must address iterative schemes that go beyond the classical *Mann iteration* [28]. The latter allows in the update rule only nonnegative coefficients for both the previous iterates and the operator evaluations at the previous iterates.

Remark 2. A direct application of the explicit Fast OGD method in [6] to the solving of the monotone equation $(\text{Id} - T)(x) = 0$ leads for given $\alpha > 2, x_0, x_1, y_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, $0 < s < \max\{\frac{1}{4\theta}, \frac{1 - \theta}{2\theta}\}$ to the following iterative scheme: for every $k \geq 1$ set

$$y_k := x_k + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{k + \alpha}\right)(x_k - x_{k-1}) - \frac{\alpha s}{2(k + \alpha)}(\text{Id} - T)(y_{k-1}) \quad (13a)$$

$$x_{k+1} := y_k - \frac{s}{2}\left(1 + \frac{k}{k + \alpha}\right)((\text{Id} - T)(y_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(y_{k-1})). \quad (13b)$$

If T is θ -averaged, then $\text{Id} - T$ is L -Lipschitz with $L := \min\left\{2\theta, \frac{\theta}{1 - \theta}\right\}$ (here we make the convention $\frac{1}{0} := +\infty$), thus the upper bound of the step size is $\frac{1}{2L} = \max\left\{\frac{1}{4\theta}, \frac{1 - \theta}{2\theta}\right\}$. Indeed, we already noticed

that, since $\text{Id} - T$ is $\frac{1}{2\theta}$ -cocoercive, it is at most 2θ -Lipschitz continuous. On the other hand, T is θ -averaged if and only if (cf. [3, Proposition 4.35])

$$\|T(x) - T(y)\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2 - \frac{1 - \theta}{\theta} \|(\text{Id} - T)(x) - (\text{Id} - T)(y)\|^2 \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{H},$$

which implies that $\text{Id} - T$ is Lipschitz continuous with modulus at most $\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}$.

Noticeably, the step size upper bound for algorithm (13) is more restrictive compared to the one in the Fast KM iteration (11). In addition, (11) has an obviously simpler formulation than (13). Even if one rewrites (13) in terms of a single sequence $(y_k)_{k \geq 0}$, it would require y_k, y_{k-1} and y_{k-2} to compute y_{k+1} . In comparison, (11) requires x_k and x_{k-1} to compute x_{k+1} .

3 Convergence analysis

The fundamental tool of the convergence analysis is the following discrete energy sequence, which, for fixed $x_* \in \text{Fix}T$ and $0 \leq \lambda \leq \alpha - 1$, is defined for every $k \geq 1$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k} := & \frac{1}{2} \left\| 2\lambda(x_k - x_*) + 2k(x_k - x_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)}(3\alpha-2)sk(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1}) \right\|^2 \\ & + 2\lambda(\alpha-1-\lambda)\|x_k - x_*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha-1}(\alpha-2)\lambda sk \langle x_k - x_*, (\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)^2}(\alpha-2)(3\alpha-2)s^2k^2\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3. *Let $x_* \in \text{Fix}T$ and $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then the following statements are true:*

(i) *for $0 \leq \lambda \leq \alpha - 1$ and every $k \geq 1$ it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k+1} - \mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k} \leq & 2(2-\alpha)\lambda s \langle x_k - x_*, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k) \rangle + \omega_1 k \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\ & + s(\omega_2 k + \omega_3) \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k) \rangle + \omega_4 s^2 k \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)}(\alpha-2) \left(s - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) s k^2 \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k) - (\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where

$$\omega_1 := 4(\lambda + 1 - \alpha) \leq 0, \quad (15a)$$

$$\omega_2 := \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \left(4(\alpha-1)(\lambda+1-\alpha) + \alpha(2-\alpha) \right) \leq 0, \quad (15b)$$

$$\omega_3 := \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \left(2\alpha(\alpha-1)(\lambda+1-\alpha) + \alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 + 2(2-\alpha)(\alpha-1) \right), \quad (15c)$$

$$\omega_4 := \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)}(2-\alpha)(3\alpha-2) \leq 0; \quad (15d)$$

(ii) *for $0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{3\alpha}{4} - \frac{1}{2}$ the energy sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k})_{k \geq 1}$ is nonnegative.*

Proof. (i) Let $0 \leq \lambda \leq \alpha - 1$. First we will show that for every $k \geq 1$ the following identity holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda, k+1} + \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)} (\alpha-2) \alpha s^2 (k+1) \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k)\|^2 \right) \\
& \quad - \left(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda, k} + \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)} (\alpha-2) \alpha s^2 k \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 \right) \\
& = 2(2-\alpha) \lambda s \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle + 2(\lambda+1-\alpha)(2k+\alpha+1) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)} (2-\alpha) s^2 (2(3\alpha-2)k + 2\alpha^2 + \alpha - 2) \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k)\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \left(4(\alpha-1)(\lambda+1-\alpha) + \alpha(2-\alpha) \right) s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \left(2\alpha(\alpha-1)(\lambda+1-\alpha) + \alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 \right) s \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} (2-\alpha) s (k+\alpha) k \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)} (2-\alpha) s^2 k (2k+\alpha) \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1})\|^2. \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

For brevity we denote for every $k \geq 0$

$$u_{\lambda, k+1} := 2\lambda(x_{k+1} - x_*) + 2(k+1)(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)} (3\alpha-2) s (k+1) (\text{Id} - T)(x_k), \tag{17}$$

which means that for every $k \geq 1$ it holds

$$u_{\lambda, k} = 2\lambda(x_k - x_*) + 2k(x_k - x_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)} (3\alpha-2) s k (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}). \tag{18}$$

Subtracting (18) from (17) and then using (10) we obtain for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
& u_{\lambda, k+1} - u_{\lambda, k} \\
& = 2(\lambda+1-\alpha)(x_{k+1} - x_k) + 2(k+\alpha)(x_{k+1} - x_k) - 2k(x_k - x_{k-1}) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)} (3\alpha-2) s (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)} (3\alpha-2) s k \left((\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \right) \\
& = 2(\lambda+1-\alpha)(x_{k+1} - x_k) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)} \left(\alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 \right) s (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)} (2-\alpha) s k \left((\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \right). \tag{19}
\end{aligned}$$

In the following we want to use the identity

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\|u_{\lambda, k+1}\|^2 - \|u_{\lambda, k}\|^2 \right) = \langle u_{\lambda, k+1}, u_{\lambda, k+1} - u_{\lambda, k} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \|u_{\lambda, k+1} - u_{\lambda, k}\|^2 \quad \forall k \geq 1. \tag{20}$$

Thanks to the relations (17) and (19), we derive for every $k \geq 1$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle u_{\lambda,k+1}, u_{\lambda,k+1} - u_{\lambda,k} \rangle \\
= & 4\lambda(\lambda+1-\alpha) \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \left(\alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 \right) \lambda s \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} (2-\alpha) \lambda s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& + 4(\lambda+1-\alpha)(k+1) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \left(\alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 + (3\alpha-2)(\lambda+1-\alpha) \right) s(k+1) \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} (2-\alpha) s(k+1) k \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)^2} (3\alpha-2) \left(\alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 \right) s^2(k+1) \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k)\|^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)^2} (3\alpha-2)(2-\alpha) s^2(k+1) k \langle (\text{Id} - T)(x_k), (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle, \quad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \frac{1}{2} \|u_{\lambda,k+1} - u_{\lambda,k}\|^2 \\
= & -2(\lambda+1-\alpha)^2 \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 - \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)^2} \left(\alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 \right)^2 s^2 \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k)\|^2 \\
& - \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)^2} (2-\alpha)^2 s^2 k^2 \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 \\
& - \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \left(\alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 \right) (\lambda+1-\alpha) s \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle \\
& - \frac{1}{\alpha-1} (2-\alpha) (\lambda+1-\alpha) s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& - \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)^2} \left(\alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 \right) (2-\alpha) s^2 k \langle (\text{Id} - T)(x_k), (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle. \quad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

A direct computation shows that for every $k \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left((3\alpha-2)(\lambda+1-\alpha) + \alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 \right) (k+1) - (\lambda+1-\alpha) \left(\alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 \right) \\
= & \left((3\alpha-2)(\lambda+1-\alpha) + \alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 \right) k + 2\alpha(\alpha-1)(\lambda+1-\alpha) + \alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 \\
= & \left((3\alpha-2)(\lambda+1-\alpha) + \alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 - (2-\alpha)\lambda \right) k + (2-\alpha)\lambda k \\
& + 2\alpha(\alpha-1)(\lambda+1-\alpha) + \alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 \\
= & \left(4(\alpha-1)(\lambda+1-\alpha) + \alpha(2-\alpha) \right) k + (2-\alpha)\lambda k + 2\alpha(\alpha-1)(\lambda+1-\alpha) + \alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by plugging (21) and (22) into (20), we get for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \left(\|u_{\lambda, k+1}\|^2 - \|u_{\lambda, k}\|^2 \right) \\
= & 4\lambda(\lambda + 1 - \alpha) \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \left(\alpha - 2(\alpha - 1)^2 \right) \lambda s \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} (2 - \alpha) \lambda s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& + 2(\lambda + 1 - \alpha) (2k + \alpha + 1 - \lambda) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)^2} \left(\alpha - 2(\alpha - 1)^2 \right) s^2 (2(3\alpha - 2)k + 2\alpha^2 + \alpha - 2) \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k)\|^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \left(4(\alpha - 1)(\lambda + 1 - \alpha) + \alpha(2 - \alpha) + (2 - \alpha)\lambda \right) s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \left(2\alpha(\alpha - 1)(\lambda + 1 - \alpha) + \alpha - 2(\alpha - 1)^2 \right) s \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} (2 - \alpha) s (k + \alpha - \lambda) k \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{4(\alpha - 1)^2} (2 - \alpha) s^2 ((3\alpha - 2)k + 2(\alpha - 1)\alpha) k \langle (\text{Id} - T)(x_k), (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& - \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)^2} (2 - \alpha)^2 s^2 k^2 \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1})\|^2. \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that by the definition of the discrete energy we have for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{E}_{\lambda, k} + \frac{1}{4(\alpha - 1)} (\alpha - 2) \alpha s^2 k \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 \\
= & \frac{1}{2} \|u_{\lambda, k}\|^2 + 2\lambda(\alpha - 1 - \lambda) \|x_k - x_*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} (\alpha - 2) \lambda s k \langle x_k - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)^2} (\alpha - 2) s^2 k ((3\alpha - 2)k + 2(\alpha - 1)\alpha) \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1})\|^2. \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

Later we will subtract the above identity at consecutive indices and to this end we will make use of the following identities which hold for every $k \geq 1$:

$$\|x_{k+1} - x_*\|^2 - \|x_k - x_*\|^2 = 2 \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle - \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2, \tag{25}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\lambda s (k + 1) \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle - 2\lambda s k \langle x_k - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
= & 2\lambda s \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle + 2\lambda s k \left(\langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle - \langle x_k - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \right) \\
= & 2\lambda s \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle + 2\lambda s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& + 2\lambda s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
= & 2\lambda s \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle + 2\lambda s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& - 2\lambda s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle + 2\lambda s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle, \tag{26}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)} s^2 (k+1) ((3\alpha-2)(k+1) + 2(\alpha-1)\alpha) \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2 \\
& - \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)} s^2 k ((3\alpha-2)k + 2(\alpha-1)\alpha) \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 \\
= & \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)} s^2 (2(3\alpha-2)k + 2\alpha^2 + \alpha - 2) \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)} s^2 k ((3\alpha-2)k + 2(\alpha-1)\alpha) \left(\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2 - \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 \right) \\
= & \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)} s^2 (2(3\alpha-2)k + 2\alpha^2 + \alpha - 2) \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)} s^2 k ((3\alpha-2)k + 2(\alpha-1)\alpha) \langle (\text{Id}-T)(x_k), (\text{Id}-T)(x_k) - (\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& - \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)} s^2 k ((3\alpha-2)k + 2(\alpha-1)\alpha) \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k) - (\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2. \tag{27}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by multiplying (26) and (27) by $\frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)}(\alpha-2)$, relation (24) gives for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda, k+1} + \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)} (\alpha-2) \alpha s^2 (k+1) \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2 \right) \\
& - \left(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda, k} + \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)} (\alpha-2) \alpha s^2 k \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 \right) \\
= & \frac{1}{2} \left(\|u_{\lambda, k+1}\|^2 - \|u_{\lambda, k}\|^2 \right) + 2\lambda(\alpha-1-\lambda) \left(\|x_{k+1} - x_*\|^2 - \|x_k - x_*\|^2 \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} (\alpha-2) \lambda s \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k) \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} (\alpha-2) \lambda s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_*, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k) - (\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& - \frac{1}{\alpha-1} (\alpha-2) \lambda s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k) - (\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} (\alpha-2) \lambda s k \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k) \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)^2} (\alpha-2) s^2 (2(3\alpha-2)k + 2\alpha^2 + \alpha - 2) \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)^2} (\alpha-2) s^2 k ((3\alpha-2)k + 2(\alpha-1)\alpha) \langle (\text{Id}-T)(x_k), (\text{Id}-T)(x_k) - (\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\
& - \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)^2} (\alpha-2) s^2 k ((3\alpha-2)k + 2(\alpha-1)\alpha) \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k) - (\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

By multiplying (25) by $2\lambda(\alpha-1-\lambda)$ and by taking into consideration (23) and that

$$\alpha - 2(\alpha-1)^2 + \alpha - 2 = 2(\alpha-1)(2-\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad -(\alpha-2)^2 - (\alpha-2)(3\alpha-2) = -4(\alpha-2)(\alpha-1),$$

we immediately obtain from here identity (16).

Next we will focus on the term $\langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k) - (\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle$ for which we will provide an upper bound by exploiting the cocoercivity of $\text{Id}-T$. Precisely, the relations (5) and (10)

guarantee that for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2sk(k+\alpha)\langle x_{k+1}-x_k, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k)-(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\rangle \\
&= -2sk^2\langle x_k-x_{k-1}, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k)-(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\rangle + 2s^2k^2\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)-(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 \\
&\quad + \alpha s^2k\langle (\text{Id}-T)(x_k), (\text{Id}-T)(x_k)-(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\rangle \\
&\leq \left(2s-\frac{1}{\theta}\right)sk^2\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)-(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha s^2k\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\alpha s^2k\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)-(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha s^2k\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 \\
&\leq \left(\left(2s-\frac{1}{\theta}\right)sk^2 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha s^2k\right)\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)-(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\alpha s^2(k+1)\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha s^2k\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

After multiplying this inequality by $\frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)}(\alpha-2) > 0$, adding it to (16), and using that

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2(2-\alpha)\lambda s\langle x_{k+1}-x_*, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\rangle \\
&= 2(2-\alpha)\lambda s\langle x_{k+1}-x_k, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\rangle + 2(2-\alpha)\lambda s\langle x_k-x_*, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

we deduce the desired inequality (14). In order to obtain the coefficients of $\|x_{k+1}-x_k\|^2$ and $\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2$ as given in (15), one also has to take into consideration that $\lambda+1-\alpha \leq 0$ and $2\alpha^2+\alpha-2 > 0$, as $\alpha > 2$. The assumptions we made on α and λ immediately imply that ω_1, ω_2 and ω_4 are nonpositive numbers.

(ii) Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\alpha-1}(\alpha-2)\lambda sk\langle x_k-x_*, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\rangle + \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)^2}(\alpha-2)(3\alpha-2)s^2k^2\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{3\alpha-2}(\alpha-2)\left(\frac{1}{\alpha-1}(3\alpha-2)\lambda sk\langle x_k-x_*, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\rangle\right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)^2}(3\alpha-2)^2s^2k^2\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{3\alpha-2}(\alpha-2)\left(\frac{1}{2}\left\|2\lambda(x_k-x_*) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)}(3\alpha-2)sk(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\right\|^2 - 2\lambda^2\|x_k-x_*\|^2\right),
\end{aligned}$$

we deduce that for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k} &= \frac{1}{2}\left\|2\lambda(x_k-x_*) + 2k(x_k-x_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)}(3\alpha-2)sk(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\right\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\lambda(\alpha-1-\lambda)\|x_k-x_*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha-1}(\alpha-2)\lambda sk\langle x_k-x_*, (\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)^2}(\alpha-2)(3\alpha-2)s^2k^2\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left\|2\lambda(x_k-x_*) + 2k(x_k-x_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)}(3\alpha-2)sk(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\right\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2(3\alpha-2)}(\alpha-2)\left\|2\lambda(x_k-x_*) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)}(3\alpha-2)sk(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\right\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\lambda(\alpha-1)\left(1-\frac{4\lambda}{3\alpha-2}\right)\|x_k-x_*\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the identity

$$\|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2 = \frac{1}{2}\left(\|x+y\|^2 + \|x-y\|^2\right) \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{H},$$

we obtain for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k} &= \frac{\alpha}{3\alpha-2} \left\| 2\lambda(x_k - x_*) + 2k(x_k - x_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)}(3\alpha-2)sk(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1}) \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4(3\alpha-2)}(\alpha-2) \left\| 4\lambda(x_k - x_*) + 2k(x_k - x_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{\alpha-1}(3\alpha-2)sk(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1}) \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{3\alpha-2}(\alpha-2)k^2 \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|^2 + 2\lambda(\alpha-1) \left(1 - \frac{4\lambda}{3\alpha-2}\right) \|x_k - x_*\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

This shows that for $0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{3\alpha}{4} - \frac{1}{2}$ all terms in the expression (28) are nonnegative, thus the discrete energy sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k})_{k \geq 1}$ is nonnegative, too. \square

The following lemma will play a fundamental role in the subsequent analysis.

Lemma 4. *Let*

$$\underline{\lambda}(\alpha) := \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)}\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha-1) - \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)}(\alpha-2)\sqrt{(\alpha-2)(5\alpha-2)} > 0, \quad (29a)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}(\alpha) := \min \left\{ \frac{3\alpha}{4} - \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)}\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha-1) + \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)}(\alpha-2)\sqrt{(\alpha-2)(5\alpha-2)} \right\}. \quad (29b)$$

Then for every λ satisfying $\underline{\lambda}(\alpha) < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}(\alpha)$ one can find an integer $k(\lambda) \geq 1$ with the property that the following inequality holds for every $k \geq k(\lambda)$

$$\begin{aligned} R_k &:= \sqrt{\frac{5\alpha-2}{2(3\alpha-2)}}\omega_1 k \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + s(\omega_2 k + \omega_3) \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id}-T)(x_k) \rangle \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{5\alpha-2}{2(3\alpha-2)}}\omega_4 s^2 k \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_k)\|^2 \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$ and ω_4 are the constants defined in (15).

Proof. For the quadratic expression in R_k we calculate

$$\frac{\Delta_k}{s^2} := (\omega_2 k + \omega_3)^2 - \frac{2(5\alpha-2)}{3\alpha-2}\omega_1\omega_4 k^2 = \left(\omega_2^2 - \frac{2(5\alpha-2)}{3\alpha-2}\omega_1\omega_4 \right) k^2 + 2\omega_2\omega_3 k + \omega_3^2.$$

It suffices to guarantee that $\omega_2^2 - \frac{2(5\alpha-2)}{3\alpha-2}\omega_1\omega_4 < 0$ in order to be sure that there exists some integer $k(\lambda) \geq 1$ such that $\Delta_k \leq 0$ for every $k \geq k(\lambda)$ and to obtain from here, due to Lemma 12, that $R_k \leq 0$ for every $k \geq k(\lambda)$.

We will show that there exists a nonempty open interval contained in $[0, \alpha-1]$ with the property that $\omega_2^2 - \frac{2(5\alpha-2)}{3\alpha-2}\omega_1\omega_4 < 0$ holds when λ is chosen within this open interval. To this end we set $\xi := \lambda + 1 - \alpha \leq 0$ and get

$$\omega_2 = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \left(4(\alpha-1)\xi - \alpha(\alpha-2) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_1\omega_4 = -\frac{2}{\alpha-1}(\alpha-2)(3\alpha-2)\xi.$$

Written in terms of ξ , we have first to guarantee that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_2^2 - \frac{2(5\alpha-2)}{3\alpha-2}\omega_1\omega_4 &= \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)^2} \left((4(\alpha-1)\xi - \alpha(\alpha-2))^2 + 4(5\alpha-2)(\alpha-1)(\alpha-2)\xi \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)^2} \left(16(\alpha-1)^2\xi^2 + 4(\alpha-1)(\alpha-2)(3\alpha-2)\xi + \alpha^2(\alpha-2)^2 \right) < 0. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

A direct computation shows that

$$\Delta_\xi = 16(\alpha - 1)^2(2 - \alpha)^2 \left((3\alpha - 2)^2 - 4\alpha^2 \right) = 16(\alpha - 1)^2(\alpha - 2)^3(5\alpha - 2) > 0.$$

Hence, in order to get (31), we have to choose ξ between the two roots of the quadratic function arising in this formula, in other words

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_1(\alpha) &:= \frac{1}{32(\alpha - 1)^2} \left(-4(\alpha - 1)(\alpha - 2)(3\alpha - 2) - \sqrt{\Delta_\xi} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)} (\alpha - 2) \left(3\alpha - 2 + \sqrt{(\alpha - 2)(5\alpha - 2)} \right) \\ &< \xi = \lambda + 1 - \alpha < \xi_2(\alpha) := \frac{1}{32(\alpha - 1)^2} \left(-4(\alpha - 1)(\alpha - 2)(3\alpha - 2) + \sqrt{\Delta_\xi} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)} (\alpha - 2) \left(3\alpha - 2 - \sqrt{(\alpha - 2)(5\alpha - 2)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously $\xi_1(\alpha) < 0$ and from Viète's formula $\xi_1(\alpha) \cdot \xi_2(\alpha) = \frac{\alpha^2(\alpha - 2)^2}{16(\alpha - 1)^2}$, it follows that we must have $\xi_2(\alpha) < 0$ as well.

Therefore, going back to λ , in order to be sure that $\omega_2^2 - \frac{2(5\alpha - 2)}{3\alpha - 2}\omega_1\omega_4 < 0$ this must be chosen such that

$$\alpha - 1 + \xi_1(\alpha) < \lambda < \alpha - 1 + \xi_2(\alpha).$$

Next we will show that

$$0 < \alpha - 1 - \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)} (\alpha - 2)(3\alpha - 2) < \frac{3\alpha}{4} - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (32)$$

Indeed, the inequality on the left-hand side follows immediately, since

$$\alpha - 1 - \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)} (\alpha - 2)(3\alpha - 2) = \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)} (5\alpha^2 - 8\alpha + 4) = \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)} \left(\alpha^2 + 4(\alpha - 1)^2 \right) > 0.$$

Using this relation, one can notice that the inequality on the right-hand side of (32) can be equivalently written as

$$5\alpha^2 - 8\alpha + 4 < 2(\alpha - 1)(3\alpha - 2) \Leftrightarrow 0 < \alpha^2 - 2\alpha = \alpha(\alpha - 2),$$

which is true as $\alpha > 2$.

From (32) we immediately deduce that

$$0 < \alpha - 1 + \xi_2(\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha - 1 + \xi_1(\alpha) < \frac{3\alpha}{4} - \frac{1}{2}.$$

This allows us to choose

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\lambda}(\alpha) &:= \alpha - 1 + \xi_1(\alpha) = \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)}\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 1) - \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)}(\alpha - 2)\sqrt{(\alpha - 2)(5\alpha - 2)} \\ &< \bar{\lambda}(\alpha) &:= \min \left\{ \frac{3\alpha}{4} - \frac{1}{2}, \alpha - 1 + \xi_2(\alpha) \right\} \\ &:= \min \left\{ \frac{3\alpha}{4} - \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)}\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 1) + \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)}(\alpha - 2)\sqrt{(\alpha - 2)(5\alpha - 2)} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)}\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 1) - \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)}(\alpha - 2)\sqrt{(\alpha - 2)(5\alpha - 2)} > 0.$$

Indeed, as $(\alpha - 1)\sqrt{\alpha - 1} > (\alpha - 2)\sqrt{\alpha - 2}$ and $4\sqrt{\alpha - 1} > \sqrt{5\alpha - 2}$ we can easily deduce that

$$\alpha^2 + 4(\alpha - 1)^2 > 4(\alpha - 1)^2 > (\alpha - 2)\sqrt{(\alpha - 2)(5\alpha - 2)}$$

and the claim follows.

In conclusion, choosing λ to satisfy $\underline{\lambda}(\alpha) < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}(\alpha)$, we have $\omega_2^2 - \frac{2(5\alpha - 2)}{3\alpha - 2}\omega_1\omega_4 < 0$ and therefore there exists some integer $k(\lambda) \geq 1$ such that $R_k \leq 0$ for every $k \geq k(\lambda)$. \square

The following result is a direct consequence of Lemma 4 and Lemma 11.

Proposition 5. *Let $x_* \in \text{Fix}T$ and $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then it holds*

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} \langle x_k - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle < +\infty, \quad (33a)$$

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} k \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 < +\infty, \quad (33b)$$

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} k \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k)\|^2 < +\infty, \quad (33c)$$

$$\left(\frac{1}{\theta} - s\right) \sum_{k \geq 1} k^2 \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 < +\infty. \quad (33d)$$

In addition, the sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k})_{k \geq 1}$ converges for every $\underline{\lambda}(\alpha) < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}(\alpha)$, where the pair $(\underline{\lambda}(\alpha), \bar{\lambda}(\alpha))$ is defined in (29). Consequently, the sequence $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is bounded.

Proof. Let $(\underline{\lambda}(\alpha), \bar{\lambda}(\alpha))$ be the pair defined in (29) and $\underline{\lambda}(\alpha) < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}(\alpha)$. By Lemma 4, there exists an integer $k(\lambda) \geq 1$ such that for every $k \geq k(\lambda)$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} & s(\omega_2 k + \omega_3) \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle \\ & \leq -\sqrt{\frac{5\alpha - 2}{2(3\alpha - 2)}} \omega_1 k \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 - \sqrt{\frac{5\alpha - 2}{2(3\alpha - 2)}} \omega_4 s^2 k \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By plugging this inequality into (14) it follows that for every $k \geq k(\lambda)$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k+1} - \mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k} & \leq 2(2 - \alpha) \lambda s \langle x_k - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle + \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{5\alpha - 2}{2(3\alpha - 2)}}\right) \omega_1 k \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \\ & \quad + \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{5\alpha - 2}{2(3\alpha - 2)}}\right) \omega_4 s^2 k \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k)\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{(\alpha - 1)} (\alpha - 2) \left(s - \frac{1}{\theta}\right) s k^2 \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_k) - (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1})\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that $\omega_1, \omega_4 \leq 0$ (see (15)), and $\frac{5\alpha - 2}{2(3\alpha - 2)} < 1$, we can apply Lemma 11 to obtain the summability results in (33) as well as the fact that the sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k})_{k \geq 1}$ is convergent. Since $0 < \underline{\lambda}(\alpha) < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}(\alpha) < \alpha - 1$, the boundedness of $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ will then follow from the definition of the discrete energy sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k})_{k \geq 1}$. \square

Next we will show the convergence of the sequence of iterates. The proof relies on the Opial Lemma (see Lemma 9) and the *demiclosedness principle* for nonexpansive operators. According to this principle, if $(z_k)_{k \geq 0} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ is a sequence which converges weakly to $z \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $z_k - T(z_k)$ converges strongly to 0 as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, then $z \in \text{Fix}T$ (see [3, Corollary 4.28]).

Theorem 6. *Let $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ converges weakly to an element in $\text{Fix}T$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$.*

Proof. Let $x_* \in \text{Fix}T$, $(\underline{\lambda}(\alpha), \bar{\lambda}(\alpha))$ be the pair defined in (29) and $\underline{\lambda}(\alpha) < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}(\alpha)$. By the definition we have for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k} & = 2\lambda \left\langle x_k - x_*, 2k(x_k - x_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha - 1)} (3\alpha - 2) s k (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \right\rangle \\ & \quad + 2\lambda(\alpha - 1) \|x_k - x_*\|^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} (\alpha - 2) \lambda s k \langle x_k - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle \\ & \quad + \frac{k^2}{2} \left\| 2(x_k - x_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha - 1)} (3\alpha - 2) s (\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \right\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{8(\alpha - 1)^2} (\alpha - 2) (3\alpha - 2) s^2 k^2 \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1})\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

which implies for every $\underline{\lambda}(\alpha) < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \bar{\lambda}(\alpha)$ and every $k \geq 1$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda_2, k} - \mathcal{E}_{\lambda_1, k} = 4(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \left(k \langle x_k - x_*, x_k - x_{k-1} + s(\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 1) \|x_k - x_*\|^2 \right). \quad (35)$$

For every $k \geq 1$ we set

$$p_k := \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 1) \|x_k - x_*\|^2 + k \langle x_k - x_*, x_k - x_{k-1} + s(\text{Id} - T)(x_{k-1}) \rangle, \quad (36)$$

$$q_k := \frac{1}{2} \|x_k - x_*\|^2 + s \sum_{i=1}^k \langle x_i - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{i-1}) \rangle. \quad (37)$$

We notice that for every $k \geq 2$

$$q_k - q_{k-1} = \langle x_k - x_*, x_k - x_{k-1} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|^2 + s \langle x_k - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_k) \rangle,$$

and thus

$$(\alpha - 1)q_k + k(q_k - q_{k-1}) = p_k + (\alpha - 1)s \sum_{i=1}^k \langle x_i - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{i-1}) \rangle - \frac{k}{2} \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|^2.$$

Since the discrete energy sequence converges for every $\underline{\lambda}(\alpha) < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \bar{\lambda}(\alpha)$, we obtain that the limit $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} (\mathcal{E}_{\lambda_2, k} - \mathcal{E}_{\lambda_1, k}) \in \mathbb{R}$ exists. This implies in view of (35) and (36) that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} p_k \in \mathbb{R} \text{ exists.} \quad (38)$$

Moreover, thanks to the triangle inequality and the statements (33a) - (33c) in Proposition 5, we have for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^k |\langle x_i - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{i-1}) \rangle| \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |\langle x_i - x_{i-1}, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{i-1}) \rangle| + \sum_{i=1}^k \langle x_{i-1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{i-1}) \rangle \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_i - x_{i-1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_{i-1})\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^k \langle x_{i-1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{i-1}) \rangle \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \geq 1} \|x_i - x_{i-1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \geq 1} \|(\text{Id} - T)(x_{i-1})\|^2 + \sum_{i \geq 1} \langle x_{i-1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{i-1}) \rangle < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This means the series $\sum_{i=1}^k \langle x_i - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{i-1}) \rangle$ is absolutely convergent, thus convergent. In addition, due to (33b),

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} k \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|^2 = 0,$$

which implies that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} ((\alpha - 1)q_k + k(q_k - q_{k-1})) \in \mathbb{R} \text{ exists.}$$

From Proposition 5, we have that $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is bounded, hence $(q_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is also bounded. This allows us to apply Lemma 10 to conclude that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} q_k \in \mathbb{R}$ also exists. Once again, by the definition of q_k in (37) and the fact that the sequence $\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \langle x_{i-1} - x_*, (\text{Id} - T)(x_{i-1}) \rangle \right)_{k \geq 1}$ converges, it follows that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \|x_k - x_*\| \in \mathbb{R}$ exists. In other words, the hypothesis (i) in Opial Lemma (see Lemma 9) is fulfilled.

Now let \bar{x} be a weak sequential cluster point of $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$, meaning that there exists a subsequence $(x_{k_n})_{n \geq 0}$ such that

$$x_{k_n} \text{ converges weakly to } \bar{x} \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

On the other hand,

$$(\text{Id} - T)(x_{k_n}) \text{ converges weakly to } 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Due to the demiclosedness principle we conclude from here that $\bar{x} \in \text{Fix}T$. This shows that the hypothesis (ii) in Opial Lemma is also fulfilled, and completes the proof. \square

The following results proves the convergence rate of the Fast KM algorithm in terms of the discrete velocity and fixed point residual.

Theorem 7. *Let $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then it holds*

$$\|x_k - x_{k-1}\| = o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \|x_{k-1} - T(x_{k-1})\| = o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) \text{ as } k \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Proof. Let $x_* \in \text{Fix}T$, $(\underline{\lambda}(\alpha), \bar{\lambda}(\alpha))$ be the pair defined in (29) and $\underline{\lambda}(\alpha) < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}(\alpha)$. According to Proposition 5, the sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k})_{k \geq 1}$ converges.

From (34) and (36) we have that for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k} &= 4\lambda p_k + \frac{k^2}{2} \left\| 2(x_k - x_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)}(3\alpha-2)s(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1}) \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)^2}(\alpha-2)(3\alpha-2)s^2k^2\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We set for every $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} h_k := \frac{k^2}{2} &\left(\left\| 2(x_k - x_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)}(3\alpha-2)s(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1}) \right\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{4(\alpha-1)^2}(\alpha-2)(3\alpha-2)s^2\|(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

so that $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k} = 4\lambda p_k + h_k$. Furthermore, since $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{E}_{\lambda,k} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} p_k \in \mathbb{R}$ (see also (38)), it holds

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} h_k \in \mathbb{R} \text{ exists.}$$

On the other hand, in view of (33b) and (33c) in Proposition 5 we have

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k} h_k \leq 4 \sum_{k \geq 1} k \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{8(\alpha-1)^2} (3\alpha-2)(7\alpha-6)s^2 \sum_{k \geq 1} k \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\|^2 < +\infty.$$

Consequently, $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} h_k = 0$, which yields

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} k \left\| 2(x_k - x_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)}(3\alpha-2)s(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1}) \right\| = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} k \|(\text{Id}-T)(x_{k-1})\| = 0.$$

This immediately implies $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} k \|x_k - x_{k-1}\| = 0$. \square

4 Application to several splitting algorithms

In the light of the fact that fixed point methods lie at the heart of important splitting iterative schemes for monotone inclusions, we will discuss in this section how the fast KM algorithm impacts the latter. In addition, we will review some recent acceleration approaches of splitting algorithms from the literature.

Consider the following monotone inclusion problem

$$\text{Find } x \in \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } 0 \in A(x) + B(x) + C(x), \quad (39)$$

where $A, B: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ are set-valued maximally monotone operators and $C: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a β -cocoercive operator with $\beta > 0$.

Davis and Yin introduced in [14] the following operator

$$T_{DY}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}, \quad T_{DY} := J_{\gamma A} \circ (2J_{\gamma B} - \text{Id} - \gamma C \circ J_{\gamma B}) + \text{Id} - J_{\gamma B}, \quad (40)$$

where $0 < \gamma \leq 2\beta$ and $J_{\gamma A} := (\text{Id} + \gamma A)^{-1}$ denotes the *resolvent operator* of γA with constant γ . The set zeros of $A + B + C$, denoted by $\text{Zer}(A + B + C)$, can be characterized in terms of T_{DY} by (see [14, Lemma 2.2])

$$\text{Zer}(A + B + C) = J_{\gamma B}(\text{Fix}T_{DY}).$$

The Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iteration applied to T_{DY} gives rise to the *three-operator splitting method*

$$x_{k+1} := (1 - s_k)x_k + s_k T_{DY}(x_k) \quad \forall k \geq 0,$$

where $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $(s_k)_{k \geq 0} \subseteq (0, 1]$. The operator T_{DY} is $\frac{2\beta}{4\beta - \gamma}$ -averaged, here we use the convention $\beta := +\infty$ whenever $C \equiv 0$, in which case the operator is $\frac{1}{2}$ -averaged. According to [20], this constant is tight. It has been shown in [12] that the convergence rate of three-operator splitting method is, as expected, of $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$.

The theoretical statements of the previous section applied to this particular setting lead to the following result.

Corollary 8. *Let $\alpha > 2, x_0, x_1 \in \mathcal{H}, 0 < \gamma \leq 2\beta$ and $0 < s \leq 2 - \frac{\gamma}{2\beta}$. For every $k \geq 1$ we set*

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} := & \left(1 - \frac{s\alpha}{2(k+\alpha)}\right) x_k + \frac{(1-s)k}{k+\alpha} (x_k - x_{k-1}) \\ & + \frac{s\alpha}{2(k+\alpha)} T_{DY}(x_k) + \frac{sk}{k+\alpha} (T_{DY}(x_k) - T_{DY}(x_{k-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Then the following statements are true:

- (i) $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ converges weakly to an element x_* in $\text{Fix}T_{DY}$ such that $J_{\gamma B}(x_*)$ is a solution of (39);
- (ii) it holds

$$\|x_k - x_{k-1}\| = o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \|x_{k-1} - T(x_{k-1})\| = o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty.$$

In the following we will revisit some of the particular formulations of (39) and of the corresponding underlying operator T_{DY} also in order to emphasize the broad applicability of Corollary 8.

Resolvent operator. For $B \equiv C \equiv 0$, the problem (39) reduces to

$$\text{Find } x \in \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } 0 \in A(x),$$

and, for $\gamma > 0$,

$$T_{DY} = J_{\gamma A},$$

which is $\frac{1}{2}$ -averaged.

The fixed point residual of the classical proximal point algorithm

$$x_{k+1} = J_{\gamma A}(x_k) \quad \forall k \geq 0,$$

is known to be in general of $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$, whereas Gu and Yang have shown in [17] that, for $\mathcal{H} := \mathbb{R}^n$, it can be tightened to

$$\|J_{\gamma A}(x_k) - x_k\| = \begin{cases} O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right), & \text{if } n = 1, \\ O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{(1 + \frac{1}{k})^k k}}\right), & \text{if } n \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

In the same setting of finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, Kim proposed in [22] (see also [32]) the following *accelerated proximal point method*, which, given $y_0 = x_0 = x_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\gamma > 0$, reads: for every $k \geq 1$ set

$$\begin{aligned} y_{k+1} &:= J_{\gamma A}(x_k), \\ x_{k+1} &:= y_{k+1} + \frac{k}{k+2}(y_{k+1} - y_k) - \frac{k}{k+2}(y_k - x_{k-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Using the performance estimation approach, the the author proved that the method exhibits a convergence rate of the fixed point residual of $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$.

By comparison, the algorithm in Corollary 8 for $\gamma > 0$, $0 < s \leq 2$ and $T_{DY} = J_{\gamma A}$ exhibits a convergence rate of the fixed point residual of $o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$.

Forward-backward operator. For $B \equiv 0$, the problem (39) reduces to

$$\text{Find } x \in \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } 0 \in A(x) + C(x),$$

and, for $0 < \gamma \leq 2\beta$,

$$T_{DY} := T_{FB} = J_{\gamma A} \circ (\text{Id} - \gamma C),$$

which is $\frac{2\beta}{4\beta - \gamma}$ -averaged.

The Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iteration gives rise in this case to the classical *forward-backward* algorithm, which is known to exhibit a convergence rate of the fixed point residual of $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$. By comparison, the algorithm in Corollary 8 for $T_{DY} = T_{FB}$ exhibits a convergence rate of the fixed point residual of $o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$.

Douglas-Rachford operator. For $C \equiv 0$, the problem (39) reduces to

$$\text{Find } x \in \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } 0 \in A(x) + B(x),$$

and, for $\gamma > 0$,

$$T_{DY} := T_{DR} = J_{\gamma A} \circ (2J_{\gamma B} - \text{Id}) + \text{Id} - J_{\gamma B},$$

which is $\frac{1}{2}$ -averaged.

The Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iteration gives rise in this case to the classical *Douglas-Rachford* algorithm (see [15], [27]), which is known to exhibit a convergence rate of the fixed point residual of $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$ (see [19]). By comparison, the algorithm in Corollary 8 for $\gamma > 0$, $0 < s \leq 2$ and $T_{DY} = T_{DR}$ exhibits a convergence rate of the fixed point residual of $o\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$.

Recent contributions to acceleration approaches. The idea of the Halpern iteration of considering in the iterative schemes convex combinations with an anchor point has been recently extensively exploited as it led to convergence rate improvements of numerical methods. This has been first done for fixed point iterations ([35], [26]), then for algorithms for solving monotone equations and minimax problems ([40], [24]), and later on for variants of splitting algorithms like the forward-backward, the Douglas-Rachford and the three-operator splitting method ([33, 37, 36, 41]).

Our method, however, relies on the continuous time approach from [6] and uses the idea of Nesterov's momentum updates ([30]).

5 Numerical experiments

In order to illustrate the numerical performances of the Fast KM algorithm by comparison to other iterative schemes we consider, for $n \geq 1$, the fixed point problem

$$\text{Find } x \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \text{ such that } J_A(x) = x,$$

where $J_A : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is the resolvent of the maximally monotone operator given by the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbb{I} & \mathbb{O} \\ \mathbb{O} & \mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n},$$

where \mathbb{I} and \mathbb{O} denote the identity and the all-zeros matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, respectively. This operator has been used in the literature to illustrate the worse-case performance of the proximal point method and of the Banach-Picard iteration (see [17, 32]). Notice that $x = 0$ is the unique fixed point of J_A .




Figure 1: Comparison of the behaviour of the fixed point residual for different methods

We solve the fixed point problem with the Banach-Picard iteration, which corresponds to the proximal point algorithm, the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iteration (3), which corresponds to the relaxed proximal point algorithm, the Halpern iteration (4), the accelerated proximal point method (APPM) (41), and the Fast KM algorithm (11) with $\alpha = 3$.




Figure 2: The parameter α influences the convergence behaviour of the Fast KM algorithm

For all iterative methods we consider as starting $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_n \\ \mathbf{0}_n \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, where $\mathbf{1}_n$ and $\mathbf{0}_n$ denote then all ones and all zeros vector in \mathbb{R}^n , respectively.

In a first experiment, we run all these methods in case $n := 5000$. The values of the corresponding fixed point residuals are plotted in Figure 1 in logarithmic scale. It is obvious that the Fast KM algorithm outperforms all other numerical algorithms.

In a second experiment, we run the Fast KM algorithm for different values of α in $\{3, 5, 10, 20\}$. The values of the corresponding fixed point residuals are plotted in Figure 2 in logarithmic scale. As there is almost no difference between the methods in the first 100 iterations, one can notice that the speed of convergence of the fixed point residual increases with increasing α and it is consistently faster than $o(1/k)$. This phenomenon seems to be common for algorithms enhanced with Nesterov's momentum update (see also [6]). However, whereas in the case of Nesterov's acceleration algorithms for minimizing smooth and convex function the values of α are correlated with the speed of convergence of the objective function values, here this applies to the fixed point residual.

In addition, the plots of the fixed point residual exhibit a strong oscillatory behaviour, very similar to the behaviour of the objective function values of Nesterov's acceleration algorithms for convex minimization. This is another evidence that Nesterov's momentum improves the convergence behaviour of numerical algorithms beyond the optimization setting (see also [6]).




Figure 3: The trajectory of the Banach-Picard iteration/proximal point algorithm




Figure 4: The trajectory of the Krasnosel'skiĭ-Mann iteration/relaxed proximal point algorithm




Figure 5: The trajectory of Halpern iteration




Figure 6: The trajectory of the accelerated proximal point method

In the figures 3 - 10 we plot the trajectories generated by all methods considered in the numerical experiments in case $n := 1$. From the convergence analysis we know that they all converge to the unique fixed point of the operator, however, as the plots show, after spiralling around it. It is also obvious that the spiralling effect in case of the Fast KM algorithm is less pronounced than for the other algorithms.




Figure 7: The trajectory of the Fast KM algorithm for $\alpha = 3$




Figure 8: The trajectory of the Fast KM algorithm for $\alpha = 5$




Figure 9: The trajectory of the Fast KM algorithm for $\alpha = 10$




Figure 10: The trajectory of the Fast KM algorithm for $\alpha = 20$

A Auxiliary results

We collect in this section some auxiliary results which are used in the convergence analysis of the Fast KM algorithm.

We start with the Opial Lemma ([31]) which is used in the proof of the convergence of the iterates.

Lemma 9. *Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty subset of \mathcal{H} and $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be a sequence in \mathcal{H} . Assume that*

- (i) *for every $x_* \in \mathcal{S}$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \|x_k - x_*\|$ exists;*
- (ii) *every weak sequential cluster point of the sequence $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ belongs to \mathcal{S} .*

Then $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$ converges weakly to a point in \mathcal{S} as $k \rightarrow +\infty$.

For the proof of the following result, which is the discrete counterpart of [1, Lemma A.2], we refer to [6, Lemma 21].

Lemma 10. *Let $a \geq 1$ and $(q_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be a bounded sequence in \mathcal{H} such that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(q_{k+1} + \frac{k}{a} (q_{k+1} - q_k) \right) = l \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Then it holds $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} q_k = l$.

The following result is a particular instance of [3, Lemma 5.31].

Lemma 11. *Let $(a_k)_{k \geq 1}$, $(b_k)_{k \geq 1}$ and $(d_k)_{k \geq 1}$ be sequences of real numbers. Assume that $(a_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is bounded from below, and $(b_k)_{k \geq 1}$ and $(d_k)_{k \geq 1}$ are nonnegative sequences such that $\sum_{k \geq 1} d_k < +\infty$. If*

$$a_{k+1} \leq a_k - b_k + d_k \quad \forall k \geq 1,$$

then the following statements are true:

- (i) the sequence $(b_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is summable, namely $\sum_{k \geq 1} b_k < +\infty$;
- (ii) the sequence $(a_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is convergent.

The following elementary result is used several times in the paper.

Lemma 12. *Let $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $a < 0$ and $b^2 - ac \leq 0$. Then it holds*

$$a \|x\|^2 + 2b \langle x, y \rangle + c \|y\|^2 \leq 0 \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}.$$

References

- [1] **H. Attouch, J. Peypouquet, P. Redont.** *Fast convex optimization via inertial dynamics with Hessian driven damping.* Journal of Differential Equations 261(10), 5734–5783 (2016)
- [2] **J. B. Baillon, R. E. Bruck.** *The rate of asymptotic regularity is $o(1/n)$.* In: Theory and Applications of Nonlinear Operators of Accretive and Monotone Types, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics 178, 51–81. Dekker, New York (1996)
- [3] **H. H. Bauschke, P. L. Combettes.** *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces.* CMS Books in Mathematics, Springer, New York (2017)
- [4] **J. Borwein, S. Reich, I. Shafrir.** *Krasnoselski-Mann iterations in normed spaces.* Canadian Mathematical Bulletin 35(1), 21–28 (1992)
- [5] **R. I. Boţ, E.R. Csetnek, D. Meier.** *Inducing strong convergence into the asymptotic behaviour of proximal splitting algorithms in Hilbert spaces.* Optimization Methods and Software 34(3), 489–514 (2019)
- [6] **R. I. Boţ, E. R. Csetnek, D.-K. Nguyen.** *Fast OGDA in continuous and discrete time.* arXiv:2203.10947
- [7] **R. I. Boţ, D. Meier.** *A strongly convergent Krasnosel’skii-Mann-type algorithm for finding a common fixed point of a countably infinite family of nonexpansive operators in Hilbert spaces.* Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics 395, Article number: 113589 (2021)
- [8] **M. Bravo, R. Cominetti.** *Sharp convergence rates for averaged nonexpansive maps.* Israel Journal of Mathematics 227, 163–188 (2018)
- [9] **F. E. Browder, W. V. Petryshyn.** *The solution by iteration of nonlinear functional equations in Banach spaces.* Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society 72, 571–575 (1966)
- [10] **R. Cominetti, J. A. Soto, J. Vaisman.** *On the rate of convergence of Krasnosel’skii-Mann iterations and their connection with sums of Bernoullis.* Israel Journal of Mathematics 199(2), 757–772 (2014)
- [11] **J. P. Contreras, R. Cominetti.** *Optimal error bounds for nonexpansive fixed-point iterations in normed spaces.* arXiv:2108.10969
- [12] **D. Davis.** *Convergence rate analysis of the forward-Douglas-Rachford splitting scheme.* SIAM Journal on Optimization 25(3), 1760–1786 (2015)
- [13] **D. Davis, W. Yin.** *Convergence rate analysis of several splitting schemes.* In: **R. Glowinski, S. J. Osher, W. Yin,** Splitting Methods in Communication, Imaging, Science, and Engineering, 115–163. Springer (2016)
- [14] **D. Davis, W. Yin.** *A three-operator splitting scheme and its optimization applications.* Set-Valued and Variational Analysis 25 (4), 829–858 (2017)

- [15] **J. Douglas, H. H. Rachford.** *On the numerical solution of heat conduction problems in two and three space variables.* Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 82(2), 421–439 (1956)
- [16] **C. W. Groetsch.** *A note on segmenting Mann iterates.* Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 40, 369–372 (1972)
- [17] **G. Gu, J. Yang.** *Tight sublinear convergence rate of the proximal point algorithm for maximal monotone inclusion problems.* SIAM Journal on Optimization 30(3), 1905–1921 (2020)
- [18] **B. Halpern.** *Fixed points of nonexpanding maps.* Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society 73(6), 957–961 (1967)
- [19] **B. He, X. Yuan.** *On the convergence rate of Douglas–Rachford operator splitting method.* Mathematical Programming 153, 715–722 (2015)
- [20] **X. Huang, E. K. Ryu, W. Yin.** *Tight coefficients of averaged operators via scaled relative graph.* Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 490, 124211 (2020)
- [21] **S. Ishikawa.** *Fixed points and iteration of a nonexpansive mapping in a Banach space.* Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 59(1), 65–71 (1976)
- [22] **D. Kim.** *Accelerated proximal point method for maximally monotone operators.* Mathematical Programming 190, 57–87 (2021)
- [23] **M. A. Krasnosel’skiĭ.** *Two remarks on the method of successive approximations.* Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk 10, 123–127 (1955)
- [24] **S. Lee, D. Kim.** *Fast extra gradient methods for smooth structured nonconvex-nonconcave minimax problems.* NIPS 2021: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34 (2021)
- [25] **J. Liang, J. Fadili, G. Peyré.** *Convergence rates with inexact non-expansive operators.* Mathematical Programming 159(1–2), 403–434 (2016)
- [26] **F. Lieder.** *On the convergence rate of the Halpern-iteration.* Optimization Letters 15(2), 405–418 (2021)
- [27] **P.-L. Lions, B. Mercier.** *Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators.* SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis 16(6), 964–979 (1979)
- [28] **W. R. Mann.** *Mean value methods in iteration.* Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 4(3), 506–510 (1953)
- [29] **S.-Y. Matsushita.** *On the convergence rate of the Krasnosel’skiĭ-Mann iteration.* Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society 96(1), 162–170 (2017)
- [30] **Y. Nesterov.** *A method of solving a convex programming problem with convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$.* Soviet Mathematics Doklady 27, 372–376 (1983)
- [31] **Z. Opial.** *Weak convergence of the sequence of successive approximations for nonexpansive mappings.* Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society 73, 591–597 (1967)
- [32] **J. Park, E. K. Ryu.** *Exact optimal accelerated complexity for fixed-point iterations.* arXiv: 2201.11413
- [33] **H. Qi, H.-K. Xu.** *Convergence of Halpern’s iteration method with applications in optimization.* Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization 42:15, 1839–1854 (2021)
- [34] **S. Reich.** *Weak convergence theorems for nonexpansive mappings in Banach spaces.* Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 67, 274–276 (1979)

- [35] **S. Sabach, S. Shtern** *A first order method for solving convex bilevel optimization problems.* SIAM Journal on Optimization 27 (2), 640–660 (2017)
- [36] **Q. Tran-Dinh.** *The connection between Nesterov’s accelerated methods and Halpern fixed-point iterations.* arXiv:2203.04869
- [37] **Q. Tran-Dinh, Y. Luo.** *Halpern-type accelerated and splitting algorithms for monotone inclusions.* arXiv:2110.08150
- [38] **R. Wittmann.** *Approximation of fixed points of nonexpansive mappings.* Archiv der Mathematik 58(5), 486–491 (1992)
- [39] **H.-K. Xu.** *Iterative algorithms for nonlinear operators.* Journal of the London Mathematical Society 66(1), 240–256 (2002)
- [40] **T. H. Yoon, E. K. Ryu.** *Accelerated algorithms for smooth convex-concave minimax problems with $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ rate on squared gradient norm.* International Conference on Machine Learning, 12098–12109 (2021)
- [41] **T. H. Yoon, E. K. Ryu.** *Accelerated minimax algorithms flock together.* arXiv:2205.11093