

Lecture 17

Last time

- ▷ Maximal monotone
- ▷ Douglas Rachford
- ▷ Augmented Lagrangian

Today

- ▷ Douglas-Rachford
- ▷ Consensus optimization

Douglas-Rachford

The method that we will see next dates back to the 1950's and came from ideas in differential equations and infinite dimensional problems.

Recall that given a monotone operator $A: E \rightrightarrows E$, we defined

$$R_A = (I + \alpha A)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad C_A = 2R_A - I.$$

Moreover, the fixed points of R_A and C_A correspond to the zeros of A , i.e.,

$$\{x \mid 0 \in Ax\}.$$

In turn, sometimes we are interested in finding a zero of a sum of operators maximal monotone operators, i.e., $x \in E$ s.t.

$$0 \in (A+B)x. \quad (i')$$

However, computing a resolvent of $A+B$ might be expensive.

Q: Is it possible to solve (i') using only R_A and R_B ?

To answer this question Douglas-Rachford asked themselves the marvelous question of what are fixed points of $C_A \circ C_B$:

$$y \in C_A \cap C_B \quad y \Leftrightarrow y = 2R_A(2R_By - y) - (2R_By - y)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (17) \quad x = R_By &\Leftrightarrow R_By = R_A(2R_By - y) \\ &\Leftrightarrow x = R_A(2x - y) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (2x - y) \in x + Ax \\ &\Leftrightarrow (x - y) \in Ax. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by definition

$$x = R_By \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad y - x \in Bx.$$

Proposition (M): Let $A, B: E \rightrightarrows E$ be maximal monotone operators. Then, the zeros of $A+B$ are exactly the images under R_B of fixed points $C_A \cap C_B$.

Proof: Note that

$$0 \in (A+B)x \Leftrightarrow \exists z \in Ax \text{ with } -z \in Bx$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \exists y \text{ s.t. } \begin{matrix} x-y \in Ax \\ y-x \in Bx. \end{matrix}$$

The rest of the argument follows by (13). $\square$

Thus, we have transformed the problem into that of looking for a fixed point of $C_A \circ C_B$.

We could aim to apply the fixed point iteration directly

$$y_{k+1} \leftarrow C_A C_B y_k.$$

This method is known as Peaceman-Rachford (PR). As we know this iteration might fail to converge since $C_A C_B$ is merely non expansive (see lecture 15).

Instead Douglas - Rachford proposed to use the averaged update

$$y_{k+1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{2} (I + C_A \circ C_B) y_k$$

which can be expanded as:

Douglas - Rachford Method (DRM)

Input: Initial y_0 and resolvents R_A, R_B .

Loop $k \geq 0$:

▷ $x_{k+1} \leftarrow R_B y_{k+1}$ Auxiliary state-
ments

▷ $y' \leftarrow 2x_{k+1} - y_k$ ←

▷ $\hat{x}_{k+1} \leftarrow R_A y'$

▷ $y'' \leftarrow 2\hat{x}_{k+1} - y' = 2\hat{x}_{k+1} - 2x_{k+1} + y_k$

▷ $y_{k+1} \leftarrow y_k + \hat{x}_{k+1} - x_{k+1} = \frac{1}{2}(y_k + y'')$

Remark: This algorithm does not "interact" with $A+B$ directly, instead it "splits" the computation into applications of R_A and R_B . $\rightarrow$

Theorem (b) Assume that A, B are maximal monotone operators and $A+B$ has a zero. Then, any sequence generated $\{y_k\}$ by DRM converges to some y^* and $x^* = R_B y^*$ satisfies $0 \in (A+B)x^*$.

Proof: This follows immediately from our KM iteration result and Proposition (11). $\square$

Consensus optimization

Let us see an important applica-

tion of DRM. Suppose we are interested in minimizing

$$\inf_{x \in E} \sum_{i=1}^k f_i(x) \quad (\diamond)$$

where each $f_i: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is close, convex, and proper. Think of each f_i as being relatively simple in that we can compute their prox operator efficiently.

To split this problem we consider the formulation

$$\inf_{x_i \in E \forall i} f(x_1, \dots, x_k) + \mathcal{L}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$$

where

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{i=1}^k f_i(x_i) \quad \text{and} \\ \mathcal{L} = \{ (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in E^k \mid x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_k \}.$$

Thus we want to solve

$$0 \in (\partial f + \partial z_L)(x_1, \dots, x_k).$$

Assuming $\bigcap_i \text{int dom } f_i \neq \emptyset$, we have that

$$\partial(\sum f_i)(x) = \sum \partial f_i(x).$$

Therefore,

$$x \text{ solves } (\diamond) \Leftrightarrow 0 \in \partial(\sum f_i)(x)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \forall i \in [k] \exists z_i \in \partial f_i(x) \\ \sum z_i = 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (z_1, \dots, z_k) \in \partial f(\underbrace{x, \dots, x}_{\in L}) \\ \sum z_i = 0$$

Exercise

Claim: $-(z_1, \dots, z_k) \in z_L(x, \dots, x) = L^\perp$
iff $\sum_{i=1}^k z_i = 0$. -1

$$\Leftrightarrow (z_1, \dots, z_k) \in \partial f(x, \dots, x) \\ \text{and} \\ -(z_1, \dots, z_k) \in \partial z_L(x, \dots, x)$$

Thus we could apply DDM with $A = \partial z_L$ and $B = \partial f$.

Notice that

$$R_B(y_1, \dots, y_k) = \begin{pmatrix} \text{prox}_{\alpha f_1}(y_1) \\ \vdots \\ \text{prox}_{\alpha f_k}(y_k) \end{pmatrix}$$

The beauty of splitting the variables.

$$R_A(y_1, \dots, y_k) = \text{proj}_L(y_1, \dots, y_k)$$

$$\text{Check!} \rightarrow = \frac{1}{k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k y_i, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^k y_i \right)$$

For simplicity let $\bar{y} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k y_i$.

Consensus Optimization via DR

Input: $y_0 \in E$ and maps $\text{prox}_{\alpha f_i}$.

Loop $k \geq 0$:

$$\triangleright x_{k+1}^{(i)} \leftarrow \text{prox}_{\alpha f_i}(y_k^{(i)}) \quad \forall i \in [k]$$

$$\triangleright y_{k+1}^{(i)} \leftarrow y_k^{(i)} + 2\bar{x}_{k+1} - \bar{y}_k - x_{k+1}^{(i)} \\ \forall i \in [K].$$

By Theorem (b) this algorithm generates a sequence $\bar{y}_k \rightarrow y^*$ s.t. $x^* = R_B y^*$ is a minimizer of (d).

Remark: We can apply the same ideas to solve for $0 \in \sum_{i=1}^K A_i(x)$.