

Block Alternating Bregman Majorization Minimization with Extrapolation

Duy Nhat Phan · Le Thi Khanh Hien ·

Nicolas Gillis

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract TBC

Keywords i

nertial block coordinate method, majorization minimization, proximal algorithm with extrapolation

Duy Nhat Phan

Department of Mathematics and Informatics, HCMC University of Education, Vietnam
nhatpd@hcmue.edu.vn

Le Thi Khanh Hien and Nicolas Gillis

Department of Mathematics and Operations Research, University of Mons, Belgium
thikhanhhien.le@umons.ac.be, nicolas.gillis@umons.ac.be

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following non-smooth non-convex optimization problem

$$\min_x F(x) := f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m g_i(x_i) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{such that } x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m,$$

where $\mathcal{X}_i \subseteq \mathbb{E}_i$ is a closed convex set of a finite dimensional real linear space \mathbb{E}_i , x can be decomposed into m blocks $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ with $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$, f is a continuously differentiable function, and g_i is a proper and lower semi-continuous function (possibly with extended values). We use $\mathcal{X} := \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{X}_i$ to denote the feasible set of (1). We assume F is bounded from below throughout the paper.

1.1 Related work

The composite separable optimization problem (CSOP) (1) has recently been widely studied. It covers many applications including compressed sensing [4], sparse dictionary learning [1, 25], non-negative tensor factorization [24, 13] and regularized sparse regression problems [7, 18]. When f has the block Lipschitz smooth property (that is, for $i \in [m]$, where $[m] := \{1, \dots, m\}$, and fixing the values of x_j , $j \neq i$, the block function $x_i \mapsto f(x)$ admits a L_i -Lipschitz continuous gradient), then the nonconvex CSOP can be efficiently solved by block proximal gradient (BPG) methods [6, 10, 21, 23] that update each block i while fixing the value of block x_j , $j \neq i$, by minimizing over $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ the block

Lipschitz gradient surrogate function (see [14, Section 4]) as follows

$$\min_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i} \langle \nabla f_i^k(x_i^k), x_i - x_i^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2\gamma_i^k} \|x_i - x_i^k\|^2 + g_i(x_i), \quad (2)$$

where $f_i^k(x_i^k)$ denotes the value of the block function $x_i \rightarrow f(x_1^{k+1}, \dots, x_{i-1}^{k+1}, x_i, x_{i+1}^k, \dots, x_m^k)$

at the current iterate x_i^k , and γ_i^k is a step-size. To accelerate the BPG meth-

ods, several inertial versions have been proposed including (i) the heavy ball

type acceleration methods in [19] that calculates an extrapolation point $\bar{x}_i^k =$

$x_i^k + \beta_i^k(x_i^k - x_i^{prev})$, where x_i^{prev} is the previous value of x_i^k , then solving (2)

with replacing the proximal term $\frac{1}{2\gamma_i^k} \|x_i - x_i^k\|^2$ by $\frac{1}{2\gamma_i^k} \|x_i - \bar{x}_i^k\|^2$, (ii) the

Nesterov type acceleration methods in [24, 26] that takes the same step as

the heavy ball acceleration but also replace $\nabla f_i^k(x_i^k)$ in (2) by $\nabla f_i^k(\bar{x}_i^k)$, and

(iii) the acceleration methods using two extrapolation points in [13, 20] that

evaluate the gradient ∇f_i^k in (2) at an additional extrapolation point other

than \bar{x}_i^k . These methods, under some additional assumptions, were proved to

have convergence guarantees when solving the nonconvex CSOP. The analy-

sis of BPG methods has been extended to Bregman BPG methods [2, 12, 22]

that replace the proximal term $\frac{1}{2} \|x_i - x_i^k\|^2$ in (2) by a Bregman divergence

$D_{\varphi_i}(x_i, x_i^k)$ associated with a kernel function φ_i (see Definition 2.2) as follows

$$\min_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i} \langle \nabla f_i^k(x_i^k), x_i - x_i^k \rangle + \frac{1}{\gamma_i^k} D_{\varphi_i}(x_i, x_i^k) + g_i(x_i). \quad (3)$$

The Bregman BPG methods can deal with a larger class of nonconvex CSOP

in which the block function $x_i \mapsto f(x)$ (the values of other blocks x_j , $j \neq i$

are fixed) may not have a L_i -Lipschitz continuous gradient but it is a rela-

tive smooth function (also known as a smooth adaptable function) [5, 16, 11].

Although the convergence analysis of BPG methods has been successfully extended to Bregman BPG methods, the convergence guarantee of their inertial versions for solving the nonconvex CSOP is still not sufficiently studied. To the best of our knowledge, there are only two papers addressing the convergence guarantee of inertial versions of Bregman BPG methods [3, 14] for solving (1). In [3], the authors consider an inertial Bregman BPG method that adds to $\nabla f_i^k(x_i^k)$ in (3) a *weak inertial force* $\alpha_i^k(x_i^k - x_i^{prev})$, where α_i^k is some extrapolation parameter. In [14, Section 4.3], the authors introduce a heavy ball type acceleration with back-tracking. The analysis of the latter method can be extended to a Nesterov type acceleration with back-tracking; however, the back-tracking procedure in [14, Section 4.3] for the Nesterov type acceleration would be quite expensive since the computation of $f_i^k(\bar{x}_i^k)$ and $\nabla f_i^k(\bar{x}_i^k)$ would involve in the back-tracking process. Furthermore, there are no experiments in [3] and [14] to justify the efficacy of the inertial versions.

BPG and Bregman BPG methods belong to the block majorization minimization framework [14, 21] that updates one block i of x by minimizing a block surrogate function of the objective function. In [14], a matrix completion problem (MCP), which also has the form of Problem (1), was experimented to illustrate the advantage of using suitable block surrogate functions and the efficacy of TITAN - the inertial block majorization minimization framework proposed in [14], see [14, Section 6.2]. Specifically, compared to the BPG method, each subproblem that minimizes the block surrogate function used in TITAN has a closed-form solution while each proximal gradient step does

not. Furthermore, TITAN outperforms BPG in the experiments of MCP. This inspires us to design our algorithm that allows using surrogate functions of g_i in contrast to the Bregman BPG methods which do not change g_i in the sub-problems (c.f. (3)).

1.2 Contribution

In this paper, we propose a block alternating **B**regman **M**ajorization **M**inimization framework with **E**xtrapolation (BMME) that uses Nesterov type acceleration (that is, the gradient and the Bregman divergence in (3) will be $\nabla f_i^k(\bar{x}_i^k)$ and $D_\varphi(x_i, \bar{x}_i^k)$) to solve Problem (1) in which f is assumed to be block relative smooth function (see Definition 2.4). We use a backtracking strategy proposed in [17] to determine the extrapolation point \bar{x}_i^k . We prove subsequential convergence of the sequence generated by BMME to a first-order stationary point of (1) under mild assumption, and prove the global convergence under stronger conditions. We remark that the inertial Bregman BPG method proposed in [17] is for solving the CSOP with $m = 1$ while BMME is for solving (1) with multiple blocks. Furthermore, the analysis in [17] does not consider the subsequential convergence but only proves the global convergence for the class of functions F satisfying Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property [15, ?] and under the assumption that the domain of the kernel function is full space. In our convergence analysis, we assume that every limit point of the generated sequence by BMME lies in the interior of the domain of the kernel generating function. This assumption is naturally satisfied when φ_i has a full space domain

or $\mathcal{X}_i \subset \text{int dom } \varphi_i$. We then prove the subsequential convergence without the requirement of the KL property for F , and prove global convergence using this requirement.

1.3 Organization of the paper

In the next section, we present some preliminaries on the Bregman framework. We introduce BMME in Section 3 and present its convergence analysis in Section 4. We provide numerical results in Section 5 and conclude the paper in Section 6.

2 Bregman framework

We adopt [11, Definition 2.1] to define a kernel generating distance, for which, for simplicity, we call “kernel function”.

Definition 2.1 (Kernel generating distance) Let C be a nonempty, convex and open subset of \mathbb{E}_i . A convex function $\varphi : \mathbb{E}_i \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ associated with C is called a kernel generating distance if it satisfies the following:

- (i) φ is proper and lower semicontinuous with $\text{dom } \varphi \subset \bar{C}$ and $\text{dom } \partial h = C$.
- (ii) h is C^1 on $\text{int dom } \varphi \equiv C$.

Let us denote the class of kernel generating distances by $\mathcal{G}(C)$.

Definition 2.2 Given $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}(C)$, we define the *Bregman divergence* $D_\varphi : \text{dom } \varphi \times \text{int dom } \varphi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ associated with the kernel function φ as follows

$$D_\varphi(x_i, y_i) := \varphi(x_i) - \varphi(y_i) - \langle \nabla \varphi(y_i), x_i - y_i \rangle.$$

Definition 2.3 (((L, l) -relative smooth function) Given $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}(C)$. Let $\phi : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a differentiable function, where Q is a closed convex set such that $\text{int } Q \subseteq C$. We call $\phi(\cdot)$ a (L, l) -relative smooth to $\varphi(\cdot)$ on Q if there exist $L > 0$ and $l \geq 0$ such that for any $x_i, y_i \in \text{int } Q$ we have

$$\phi(x_i) - \phi(y_i) - \langle \nabla \phi(y_i), x_i - y_i \rangle \leq LD_\varphi(x_i, y_i) \quad (4)$$

and

$$-lD_\varphi(x_i, y_i) \leq \phi(x_i) - \phi(y_i) - \langle \nabla \phi(y_i), x_i - y_i \rangle \quad (5)$$

When ϕ is a convex function then we take $l = 0$ and Definition 2.3 recovers [16, Definition 1.1]. When $\text{int } Q = C$ and $l = L$ then Definition 2.3 recovers [11, Definition 2.2].

Definition 2.4 (Block relative smooth function) We say $f : \mathcal{X}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a block relative smooth function if for each $i \in [m]$ we have for any $y_j \in \mathcal{X}_j, j \neq i$, the block function

$$x_i \mapsto f(x_i, y_{\neq i}) := f(y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, x_i, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_m)$$

is a $(L_i^{y_{\neq i}}, l_i^{y_{\neq i}})$ -relative smooth to some kernel function $\varphi^{y_{\neq i}}(\cdot)$ on \mathcal{X}_i .

Throughout this paper we assume the following assumption.

Assumption 1 *The function f in (1) is a block relative smooth function and the corresponding kernel functions are strongly convex.*

3 Block Alternating Majorization Minimization with Extrapolation

We recall the definition of a block surrogate function in [14] as follows.

Definition 3.1 A function $u_i : \mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a block i surrogate function of r if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (a) $u_i(y_i, y) = r(y)$ for all $y \in \mathcal{X}$,
- (b) $u_i(x_i, y) \geq r(x_i, y_{\neq i})$ for all $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ and $y \in \mathcal{X}$. The block approximation error is defined as $h_i(x_i, y) := r_i(x_i, y) - r(x_i, y_{\neq i})$.

Denote

$$x^{k,i} = (x_1^{k+1}, \dots, x_i^{k+1}, x_{i+1}^k, \dots, x_m^k).$$

We summarize the BMME algorithm in Algorithm 1.

4 Convergence analysis

In this section, we study sub-sequential convergence as well as global convergence of BMME. For our upcoming analysis, we need the following first-order optimality condition of (1):

$$\langle p(x^*), x - x^* \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X}, \text{ for some } p(x^*) \in \partial F(x^*). \quad (8)$$

As f is continuously differentiable, $\partial F(x^*) = \{\partial_{x_1} F(x^*)\} \times \dots \times \{\partial_{x_m} F(x^*)\}$.

Therefore, (8) is equivalent to

$$\langle p_i(x^*), x_i - x_i^* \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i, \text{ for some } p_i(x^*) \in \partial_{x_i} F(x^*) \text{ for } i \in [m]. \quad (9)$$

If x^* is in the interior of \mathcal{X} or $\mathcal{X}_i = \mathbb{E}_i$ then (8) reduces to the condition $0 \in \partial F(x^*)$, that is, x^* is a critical point of F .

Algorithm 1: BMME

Require: Choose x^{-1}, x^0 and set $k = 0$.**Ensure:** x^k 1: **repeat**2: Set $x^{k,0} = x^k$ 3: **for** $i = 1, \dots, m$ **do**4: Compute a convex surrogate function u^{g_i} of g_i at x_i^k and an extrapolation parameter β_i^k such that

$$D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^k, \bar{x}_i^k) \leq \frac{\delta_i L_i^{k-1}}{L_i^k + l_i^k} D_{\varphi_i^{k-1}}(x_i^{k-1}, x_i^k), \quad (6)$$

where $\bar{x}_i^k = x_i^k + \beta_i^k(x_i^k - x_i^{k-1})$.5: Update $x^{k,i}$ by

$$x_i^{k,i} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i} \left\{ L_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i, \bar{x}_i^k) + \left\langle \nabla_i f(\bar{x}_i^k, x_{\neq i}^{k,i-1}), x_i \right\rangle + u^{g_i}(x_i) \right\}, \quad (7)$$

and $x_j^{k,i} = x_j^{k,i-1}$ for all $j \neq i$.6: **end for**7: Set $x^{k+1} = x^{k,m}$.8: $k \leftarrow k + 1$.9: **until** Stopping criterion.

4.1 Sub-sequential convergence

The following theorem presents the sub-sequential sequence of the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 under an additional assumption on the surrogate function of g_i .

Assumption 2(A) For $i \in [m]$, where $[m] := \{1, \dots, m\}$, the convex surrogate function $u^{g_i}(x_i, y_i)$ is continuous in y_i and lower semi-continuous in x_i .

(B) For $i \in [m]$, given $y_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$, there exists a function $x_i \mapsto \bar{h}_i(x_i, y_i)$ such that $\bar{h}_i(\cdot, y_i)$ is continuously differentiable at y_i and $\nabla_{x_i} \bar{h}_i(y_i, y_i) = 0$, and the block approximation error $x_i \mapsto h_i(x_i, y_i) := u^{g_i}(x_i, y_i) - g_i(x_i)$ satisfies

$$h_i(x_i, y_i) \leq \bar{h}_i(x_i, y_i) \text{ for all } x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i. \quad (10)$$

Theorem 4.1 Let $\{x^k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. The following statements hold.

A) For $k = 0, 1, \dots$ we have

$$F(x^{k,i}) \leq F(x^{k,i-1}) - L_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^k, x_i^{k+1}) + \delta_i L_i^{k-1} D_{\varphi_i^{k-1}}(x_i^{k-1}, x_i^k). \quad (11)$$

B) If there exists a positive number \underline{L} such that $\min_{k,i} L_i^k \geq \underline{L}$, we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{i=1}^m D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^k, x_i^{k+1}) < +\infty.$$

C) Assume that $\{x^k\}$ is bounded. If there exist positive numbers \underline{L} , \bar{L} and ρ such that $\underline{L} \leq \min_{k,i} L_i^k \leq \max_{k,i} L_i^k \leq \bar{L}$ and $\min_{k,i} \rho_i^k \geq \rho$, every limit point of $\{x^k\}$ satisfies the first-order optimality condition (8).

Proof A) It follows from (7) that for every $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle L_i^k (\nabla \varphi_i^k(x_i^{k,i}) - \nabla \varphi_i^k(\bar{x}_i^k)) + \nabla f(\bar{x}_i^k, x_{\neq i}^{k,i-1}), x_i - x_i^{k,i} \right\rangle + u^{g_i}(x_i, x_i^k) \\ & \geq u^{g_i}(x_i^{k,i}, x_i^k). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

By choosing $x_i = x_i^{k,i-1}$, we achieve

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle L_i^k (\nabla \varphi_i^k(x_i^{k,i}) - \nabla \varphi_i^k(\bar{x}_i^k)) + \nabla f(\bar{x}_i^k, x_{\neq i}^{k,i-1}), x_i^{k,i-1} - x_i^{k,i} \right\rangle + u^{g_i}(x_i^{k,i-1}, x_i^k) \\ & \geq u^{g_i}(x_i^{k,i}, x_i^k). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Substituting $u^{g_i}(x_i^{k,i}, x_i^k) \geq g_i(x_i^{k+1})$ and $u^{g_i}(x_i^{k,i-1}, x_i^k) = g_i(x_i^k)$ into this inequality gives us that

$$\left\langle L_i^k(\nabla\varphi_i^k(x_i^{k,i}) - \nabla\varphi_i^k(\bar{x}_i^k)) + \nabla f(\bar{x}_i^k, x_{\neq i}^{k,i-1}), x_i^{k,i-1} - x_i^{k,i} \right\rangle + g_i(x_i^k) \geq g_i(x_i^{k+1}).$$

On the other hand, by the convexity of $L_i^k\varphi_i^k - f(\cdot, x_{\neq i}^{k,i-1})$ and $l_i^k\varphi_i^k + f(\cdot, x_{\neq i}^{k,i-1})$, we have

$$f(x_i^{k,i}) \leq f(\bar{x}_i^k, x_{\neq i}^{k,i-1}) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}_i^k, x_{\neq i}^{k,i-1}), x_i^{k,i} - \bar{x}_i^k \rangle + L_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^{k,i}, \bar{x}_i^k),$$

and

$$f(\bar{x}_i^k, x_{\neq i}^{k,i-1}) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}_i^k, x_{\neq i}^{k,i-1}), x_i^{k,i-1} - \bar{x}_i^k \rangle \leq g(x_i^{k,i-1}) + l_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^{k,i-1}, \bar{x}_i^k),$$

By summing the three inequalities above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_i^{k,i}) &\leq F(x_i^{k,i-1}) + \left\langle L_i^k(\nabla\varphi_i^k(x_i^{k,i}) - \nabla\varphi_i^k(\bar{x}_i^k)), x_i^{k,i-1} - x_i^{k,i} \right\rangle \\ &\quad + L_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^{k,i}, \bar{x}_i^k) + l_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^{k,i-1}, \bar{x}_i^k). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle L_i^k(\nabla\varphi_i^k(x_i^{k,i}) - \nabla\varphi_i^k(\bar{x}_i^k)), x_i^{k,i-1} - x_i^{k,i} \right\rangle + L_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^{k,i}, \bar{x}_i^k) \\ &= -L_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^{k,i-1}, x_i^{k,i}) + L_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^{k,i-1}, \bar{x}_i^k), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_i^{k,i}) &\leq F(x_i^{k,i-1}) - L_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^{k,i-1}, x_i^{k,i}) + \left(L_i^k + L_i^k \right) D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^{k,i-1}, \bar{x}_i^k) \\ &\leq F(x_i^{k,i-1}) - L_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^k, x_i^{k+1}) + \delta_i L_i^{k-1} D_{\varphi_i^{k-1}}(x_i^{k-1}, x_i^k), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the second inequality holds by (6).

B) Summing (11) over $i = 1, \dots, m$ gives us that

$$F(x^{k+1}) \leq F(x^k) - \sum_{i=1}^m L_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^k, x_i^{k+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_i L_i^{k-1} D_{\varphi_i^{k-1}}(x_i^{k-1}, x_i^k). \quad (17)$$

By summing up this inequality from $k = 0$ to $K - 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(x^K) + \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_i L_i^{K-1} D_{\varphi_i^{K-1}}(x_i^{K-1}, x_i^K) + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{i=1}^m (1 - \delta_i) L_i^k D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^k, x_i^{k+1}) \\ \leq F(x^0) + \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_i L_i^{-1} D_{\varphi_i^{-1}}(x_i^{-1}, x_i^0), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

which implies the result.

C) Let x^* be a limit point of $\{x^k\}$. There exists a sub-sequence $\{x^{k_n}\}$ of $\{x^k\}$ converging to x^* . Substituting $x_i = x_i^*$ and $k = k_n$ into (12) gives us that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle L_i^{k_n} (\nabla \varphi_i^{k_n}(x_i^{k_n, i}) - \nabla \varphi_i^{k_n}(\bar{x}_i^{k_n})) + \nabla f(\bar{x}_i^{k_n}, x_{\neq i}^{k_n, i-1}), x_i^* - x_i^{k_n, i} \right\rangle + u^{g_i}(x_i^*, x_i^{k_n}) \\ \geq u^{g_i}(x_i^{k, i}, x_i^{k_n}). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

By taking $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} u^{g_i}(x_i^{k, i}, x_i^{k_n}) \leq g_i(x_i^*), \quad (20)$$

where we have used the boundedness of $L_i^{k_n}$, the continuity of $u^{g_i}(x_i, y_i)$ in y_i , $\nabla \varphi_i^k$, and ∇f , and the fact that $x^{k_n, i-1} \rightarrow x^*$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. From this and the lower semi-continuity of $u^{g_i}(x_i, y_i)$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} u^{g_i}(x_i^{k, i}, x_i^{k_n}) = g_i(x_i^*). \quad (21)$$

Choosing $k = k_n$ in (12) and letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$ gives us that for all $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$

$$g_i(x_i^*) \leq u_i^{g_i}(x_i, x_i^*) + \left\langle \nabla f(x_i^*, x_{\neq i}^*), x_i - x_i^* \right\rangle. \quad (22)$$

Therefore, we have for all $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$

$$\begin{aligned} F(x^*) &\leq F(x_i, x_{\neq i}^*) + L_i^* D_{\varphi_i^*}(x_i^*, x_i) + h_i(x_i, x_i^*) \\ &\leq F(x_i, x_{\neq i}^*) + L_i^* D_{\varphi_i^*}(x_i^*, x_i) + \bar{h}_i(x_i, x_i^*), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where $h_i(x_i, x_i^*) = u_i^{g_i}(x_i, x_i^*) - \phi(x_i, x_{\neq i}^*)$ and \bar{h}_i satisfies Assumption B (2).

This implies that x_i^* is a minimizer of the following problem

$$\min_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i} F(x_i, x_{\neq i}^*) + L_i^* D_{\varphi_i^*}(x_i^*, x_i) + \bar{h}_i(x_i, x_i^*). \quad (24)$$

The results follows the optimality condition of (24) and $\nabla \bar{h}(x_i^*, x^*) = 0$.

4.2 Global convergence

In order to prove the global convergence of Algorithm 1, we need to make an additional assumption.

Assumption 3 A) *There exists a positive integer number N such that $\underline{L}_i \leq$*

$$\min_{k \geq N} L_i^k \leq \max_{k \geq N} L_i^k \leq \bar{L}_i \text{ and } \delta_i < \underline{L}_i / \bar{L}_i \text{ for some } \underline{L}_i, \bar{L}_i > 0, \text{ and } \varphi_i^k = \varphi_i \text{ for all } k \geq N.$$

B) ∇f and $\nabla \varphi_i$ are Lipschitz continuous on any bounded subsets of \mathbb{E} and \mathcal{X}_i , respectively.

The global convergence of Algorithm 1 now can be stated in the theorem below.

Theorem 4.2 *Let $\{x^k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Assume that $\{x^k\}$ is bounded, for any x_i, y_i in a bounded subset of \mathcal{X}_i if $s_i \in \partial \left(g_i(x_i) - u_i^{g_i}(x_i, y_i) \right)$, then $\|s_i\| \leq A_i \|x_i - y_i\|$ for some constant A_i , and F satisfies the*

KL property at any point $x^ \in \text{dom} \partial F$. The whole sequence $\{x^k\}$ converges to a critical point $\Phi(x) = F(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m I_{\mathcal{X}_i}(x_i)$, where $I_{\mathcal{X}_i}$ is the indicator function of \mathcal{X}_i .*

Proof Consider an auxiliary function

$$\Phi^\gamma(x, y) = F(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i D_{\varphi_i}(y_i, x_i), \quad (25)$$

where $\gamma_i = (\underline{L}_i + \delta_i \bar{L}_i)/2$. We need to verify three conditions **H1**, **H2**, and **H3** in \square .

(**H1**) *Sufficient decrease condition.* It follows from (17) that for all $k \geq N+1$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \underline{L}_i D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^k, x_i^{k+1}) + F(x^{k+1}) \leq F(x^k) + \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_i \bar{L}_i D_{\varphi_i^k}(x_i^{k-1}, x_i^k). \quad (26)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^\gamma(x^k, x^{k-1}) - \Phi^\gamma(x^{k+1}, x^k) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\underline{L}_i - \delta_i \bar{L}_i}{2} \left(D_{\varphi_i}(x_i^{k-1}, x_i^k) + D_{\varphi_i}(x_i^k, x_i^{k+1}) \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{(\underline{L}_i - \delta_i \bar{L}_i) \rho_i}{4} \left(\|x_i^{k-1} - x_i^k\|^2 + \|x_i^k - x_i^{k+1}\|^2 \right) \\ &\geq \tau \left(\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 + \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau = \min_i (\underline{L}_i - \delta_i \bar{L}_i) \rho_i / 4$.

(**H2**) *Relative error condition.* We have

$$\partial_i \Phi^\gamma(x^{k+1}, x^k) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_i} F(x^{k+1}) + \gamma_i \langle \nabla^2 \varphi_i(x_i^{k+1}), x_i^{k+1} - x_i^k \rangle \\ \gamma \left(\varphi_i(x_i^k) - \varphi_i(x_i^{k+1}) \right) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

Therefore, we can deduce the relative error condition by using boundedness of $\{x^k\}$ and the local lipschitz continuity of $\nabla \varphi_i$ and ∇f .

(**H3**) *Continuity condition.* Let x^* be a limit point of $\{x^k\}$. There exists a sub-sequence $\{x^{k_n}\}$ of $\{x^k\}$ converging to x^* . Similarly to the proof of Theorem

4.1 (B), we can derive that $u_i^{g_i}(x_i^{k_n}, x_i^{k_n-1}) \rightarrow g_i(x_i^*)$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} F(x^{k_n}) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} f(x^{k_n}) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i^{g_i}(x_i^{k_n}, x_i^{k_n-1}) \\ &= f(x^*) + \sum_{i=1}^m g_i(x_i^*). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

On the other hand, since $\{\Phi^\gamma(x^k, x^{k-1})\}$ is non-increasing and bounded below, there exists $F^* = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi^\gamma(x^k, x^{k-1})$. Moreover, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} D_{\varphi_i}(x_i^{k-1}, x_i^k) = 0$. This implies that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} F(x^k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi^\gamma(x^k, x^{k-1}) = F^*$. By the uniqueness of limit, we have $F^* = F(x^*)$.

5 Numerical experiment

6 Conclusion

7 Preliminaries of non-convex non-smooth optimization

Let $g : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a proper lower semicontinuous function.

Definition 7.1 (i) For each $x \in \text{dom } g$, we denote $\hat{\partial}g(x)$ as the Frechet sub-differential of g at x which contains vectors $v \in \mathbb{E}$ satisfying

$$\liminf_{y \neq x, y \rightarrow x} \frac{1}{\|y - x\|} (g(y) - g(x) - \langle v, y - x \rangle) \geq 0.$$

If $x \notin \text{dom } g$, then we set $\hat{\partial}g(x) = \emptyset$.

(ii) The limiting-subdifferential $\partial g(x)$ of g at $x \in \text{dom } g$ is defined as follows.

$$\partial g(x) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{E} : \exists x^k \rightarrow x, g(x^k) \rightarrow g(x), v^k \in \hat{\partial}g(x^k), v^k \rightarrow v \right\}.$$

Definition 7.2 We call $x^* \in \text{dom } F$ a critical point of F if $0 \in \partial F(x^*)$.

We note that if x^* is a local minimizer of F then x^* is a critical point of F .

Definition 7.3 A function $\phi(x)$ is said to have the KL property at $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } \partial\phi$ if there exists $\eta \in (0, +\infty]$, a neighborhood U of \bar{x} and a concave function $\xi : [0, \eta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ that is continuously differentiable on $(0, \eta)$, continuous at 0, $\xi(0) = 0$, and $\xi'(s) > 0$ for all $s \in (0, \eta)$, such that for all $x \in U \cap [\phi(\bar{x}) < \phi(x) < \phi(\bar{x}) + \eta]$, we have

$$\xi'(\phi(x) - \phi(\bar{x})) \text{dist}(0, \partial\phi(x)) \geq 1. \quad (29)$$

$\text{dist}(0, \partial\phi(x)) = \min \{\|y\| : y \in \partial\phi(x)\}$. If $\phi(x)$ has the KL property at each point of $\text{dom } \partial\phi$ then ϕ is a KL function.

Many non-convex non-smooth functions in practical applications belong to the class of KL functions, for examples, real analytic functions, semi-algebraic functions, and locally strongly convex functions [8, 10].

References

1. M. Aharon, M. Elad, A. Bruckstein, et al. K-svd: An algorithm for designing overcomplete dictionaries for sparse representation. *IEEE Transactions on signal processing*, 54(11):4311, 2006.
2. M. Ahookhosh, L. T. K. Hien, N. Gillis, and P. Patrinos. Multi-block Bregman proximal alternating linearized minimization and its application to sparse orthogonal nonnegative matrix factorization. *arXiv:1908.01402*, 2019.
3. M. Ahookhosh, L. T. K. Hien, N. Gillis, and P. Patrinos. A block inertial bregman proximal algorithm for nonsmooth nonconvex problems with application to symmetric nonnegative matrix tri-factorization. *arXiv:2003.03963*, 2020.

4. H. Attouch, J. Bolte, P. Redont, and A. Soubeyran. Proximal alternating minimization and projection methods for nonconvex problems: An approach based on the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz inequality. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 35(2):438–457, 2010.
5. H. H. Bauschke, J. Bolte, and M. Teboulle. A descent lemma beyond Lipschitz gradient continuity: First-order methods revisited and applications. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 42(2):330–348, 2017.
6. A. Beck and L. Tetruashvili. On the convergence of block coordinate descent type methods. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23:2037–2060, 2013.
7. T. Blumensath and M. E. Davies. Iterative hard thresholding for compressed sensing. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 27(3):265 – 274, 2009.
8. J. Bochnak, M. Coste, and M.-F. Roy. *Real Algebraic Geometry*. Springer, 1998.
9. J. Bolte, A. Daniilidis, and A. Lewis. The Lojasiewicz inequality for nonsmooth subanalytic functions with applications to subgradient dynamical systems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 17(4):1205–1223, 2007.
10. J. Bolte, S. Sabach, and M. Teboulle. Proximal alternating linearized minimization for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 146(1):459–494, Aug 2014.
11. J. Bolte, S. Sabach, M. Teboulle, and Y. Vaisbourd. First order methods beyond convexity and lipschitz gradient continuity with applications to quadratic inverse problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(3):2131–2151, 2018.
12. L. T. K. Hien and N. Gillis. Algorithms for nonnegative matrix factorization with the kullback-leibler divergence. , 2020.
13. L. T. K. Hien, N. Gillis, and P. Patrinos. Inertial block proximal method for non-convex non-smooth optimization. In *Thirty-seventh International Conference on Machine Learning ICML 2020*, 2020.
14. L. T. K. Hien, D. N. Phan, and N. Gillis. Inertial block majorization minimization framework for nonconvex nonsmooth optimization. arXiv:2010.12133, 2020.
15. K. Kurdyka. On gradients of functions definable in o-minimal structures. *Annales de l’Institut Fourier*, 48(3):769–783, 1998.

16. H. Lu, R. M. Freund, and Y. Nesterov. Relatively smooth convex optimization by first-order methods, and applications. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(1):333–354, 2018.
17. M. C. Mukkamala, P. Ochs, T. Pock, and S. Sabach. Convex-concave backtracking for inertial bregman proximal gradient algorithms in nonconvex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 2(3):658–682, 2020.
18. B. Natarajan. Sparse approximate solutions to linear systems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 24(2):227–234, 1995.
19. P. Ochs. Unifying abstract inexact convergence theorems and block coordinate variable metric ipiano. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(1):541–570, 2019.
20. T. Pock and S. Sabach. Inertial proximal alternating linearized minimization (iPALM) for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 9(4):1756–1787, 2016.
21. M. Razaviyayn, M. Hong, and Z. Luo. A unified convergence analysis of block successive minimization methods for nonsmooth optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(2):1126–1153, 2013.
22. M. Teboulle and Y. Vaisbourd. Novel proximal gradient methods for nonnegative matrix factorization with sparsity constraints. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 13(1):381–421, 2020.
23. P. Tseng and S. Yun. A coordinate gradient descent method for nonsmooth separable minimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 117(1):387–423, Mar 2009.
24. Y. Xu and W. Yin. A block coordinate descent method for regularized multiconvex optimization with applications to nonnegative tensor factorization and completion. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 6(3):1758–1789, 2013.
25. Y. Xu and W. Yin. A fast patch-dictionary method for whole image recovery. *Inverse Problems & Imaging*, 10:563, 2016.
26. Y. Xu and W. Yin. A globally convergent algorithm for nonconvex optimization based on block coordinate update. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 72(2):700–734, Aug 2017.