

Asymptotic Analysis of Stochastic Splitting Methods for Multivariate Monotone Inclusions*

PATRICK L. COMBETTES¹ AND JAVIER I. MADARIAGA²

¹North Carolina State University
Department of Mathematics
Raleigh, NC 27695, USA
plc@math.ncsu.edu

²North Carolina State University
Department of Mathematics
Raleigh, NC 27695, USA
jimadari@ncsu.edu

Abstract We propose an abstract framework to establish the convergence of the iterates of stochastic versions of a broad range of monotone operator splitting methods in Hilbert spaces. This framework allows for the introduction of stochasticity at several levels: approximation of operators, selection of coordinates and operators in block-iterative implementations, and relaxation parameters. The proposed analysis involves a reduced inclusion model with two operators. At each iteration, stochastic approximations to points in the graphs of these two operators are used to form the update. The results are applied to derive the almost sure and L^2 convergence of stochastic versions of the proximal point algorithm, as well as of randomized block-iterative projective splitting methods for solving systems of coupled inclusions involving a mix of set-valued, cocoercive, and Lipschitzian monotone operators combined via various monotonicity-preserving operations.

Keywords. monotone inclusion, proximal point algorithm, projective splitting, randomized block-iterative splitting, stochastic algorithm.

*Contact author: P. L. Combettes. Email: plc@math.ncsu.edu. Phone: +1 919 515 2671. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-2513409.

§1. Introduction

The object of the present paper is to establish the convergence of a broad class of stochastic operator splitting methods for solving multivariate composite monotone inclusions in Hilbert spaces. As in the deterministic methods unified in [17], our analysis is articulated around the following two-operator abstract model.

Problem 1.1. Let H be a separable real Hilbert space, let $W: H \rightarrow 2^H$ be maximally monotone, let $\alpha \in]0, +\infty[$, and let $C: H \rightarrow H$ be α -cocoercive and such that $Z = \text{zer}(W + C) \neq \emptyset$. The task is to

$$\text{find } x \in H \text{ such that } 0 \in Wx + Cx. \quad (1.1)$$

If the resolvent of W were numerically tractable, Problem 1.1 could be solved via the classical forward-backward algorithm [24, 35, 43]. However, in the general inclusion models to be considered, W is typically a composite operator defined on a product space, which makes such an assumption unrealistic. Instead, we merely assume the ability to pick points in the graph of W . This leads us to the following deterministic algorithmic template from [17, Section 4.4], which was first considered in [12, Proposition 3] in the context of saddle projective splitting methods.

Algorithm 1.2. In the setting of Problem 1.1, let $x_0 \in H$ and iterate

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{for } n = 0, 1, \dots \\ \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{take } (w_n, w_n^*) \in \text{gra } W \text{ and } q_n \in H \\ t_n^* = w_n^* + Cq_n \\ \Delta_n = \langle x_n - w_n \mid t_n^* \rangle - (4\alpha)^{-1} \|w_n - q_n\|^2 \\ \theta_n = \begin{cases} \frac{\Delta_n}{\|t_n^*\|^2}, & \text{if } \Delta_n > 0; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ d_n = \theta_n t_n^* \\ \text{take } \lambda_n \in]0, 2[\\ x_{n+1} = x_n - \lambda_n d_n. \end{array} \right. \end{array} \quad (1.2)$$

As shown in [17], Algorithm 1.2 is at the core of a broad range of classical and block-iterative deterministic splitting methods, in particular those of [7, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 23, 25, 26, 30, 38, 42, 43, 44, 45]. Stochasticity can be introduced in various components of these deterministic algorithms: stochastic approximation of operators, random selection of coordinates and operators in block-iterative implementations, and random relaxation parameters. To design and analyze such stochastic variants of existing models, we propose to modify Algorithm 1.2 as follows.

Algorithm 1.3. In the setting of Problem 1.1, let $\rho \in [2, +\infty[$, let $x_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$, and iterate

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{for } n = 0, 1, \dots \\ \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{X}_n = \sigma(x_0, \dots, x_n) \\ \text{take } \{w_n, w_n^*, e_n, e_n^*\} \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H) \text{ such that } (w_n + e_n, w_n^* + e_n^*) \in \text{gra } W \text{ P-a.s.} \\ \text{take } \{q_n, c_n^*, f_n^*\} \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H) \text{ such that } c_n^* + f_n^* = Cq_n \text{ P-a.s.} \\ t_n^* = w_n^* + c_n^* \\ \Delta_n = \langle x_n - w_n \mid t_n^* \rangle - (4\alpha)^{-1} \|w_n - q_n\|^2 \\ \theta_n = \frac{1_{[t_n^* \neq 0]} 1_{[\Delta_n > 0]} \Delta_n}{\|t_n^*\|^2 + 1_{[t_n^* = 0]}} \\ d_n = \theta_n t_n^* \\ \text{take } \lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P;]0, \rho]) \\ x_{n+1} = x_n - \lambda_n d_n. \end{array} \right. \end{array} \quad (1.3)$$

At iteration n of Algorithm 1.3, the variables e_n , e_n^* , and f_n^* model stochastic errors allowed in the activation of the operators W and C . Thus, the algorithm does not require an exact point in the graph of W but merely a stochastic approximation (w_n, w_n^*) of such a point. Likewise, it does not require the exact evaluation of Cq_n but merely a stochastic approximation c_n^* of it. The broad reach of this algorithmic template stems from the flexibility it offers in choosing the triple (w_n, w_n^*, q_n) . Another notable new feature of (1.3) is the use of a random relaxation parameter λ_n which, furthermore, is not restricted to the usual interval $]0, 2[$.

Notation and preliminary results are presented in Section 2. The asymptotic behavior of Algorithm 1.3 is analyzed in Section 3, where we prove in particular weak almost sure convergence to a solution to Problem 1.1 under suitable assumptions. Just as the convergence analysis of Algorithm 1.2 provided a unifying framework to establish that of a wide array of classical and block-iterative methods in [17], those of Section 3 can be used to derive stochastic versions of these methods. Thus, in Section 4, we obtain stochastic versions of the basic proximal point algorithm, which involves a single monotone operator in its basic form. To illustrate the versatility of our framework, we consider in Section 5 a drastically different model, namely, a highly structured multivariate monotone inclusion problem involving a mix of set-valued, cocoercive, and Lipschitzian monotone operators, as well as linear operators, and various monotonicity-preserving operations among them. We design a stochastic version of the deterministic saddle projective splitting algorithm of [12] in which the blocks of variables and operators are now selected randomly over the course of the iterations, together with random relaxations. Theorem 5.9 establishes for the first time the almost sure convergence of such a block-iterative algorithm. Finally, Section 6 focuses on a randomized version of the Kuhn–Tucker projective splitting method of [18].

§2. Notation and preliminary results

2.1. General notation

We use sans-serif letters to denote deterministic variables and italicized serif letters to denote random variables. H is a separable real Hilbert space, with identity operator Id , power set 2^H , scalar product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$, and associated norm $\| \cdot \|$. The strong and weak convergence in H are denoted by the symbols \rightarrow and \rightharpoonup , respectively. The sets of strong and weak sequential cluster points of a sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in H are denoted by $\mathfrak{S}(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathfrak{M}(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, respectively. The reader is referred to [4] for background on convex analysis and fixed point theory, and to [32] for background on probability theory.

2.2. Operators

Let $M: H \rightarrow 2^H$. The graph of M is $\text{gra } M = \{(x, x^*) \in H \times H \mid x^* \in Mx\}$ and the set of zeros of M is $\text{zer } M = \{x \in H \mid 0 \in Mx\}$. The inverse of M is the operator $M^{-1}: H \rightarrow 2^H$ with graph $\text{gra } M^{-1} = \{(x^*, x) \in H \times H \mid x^* \in Mx\}$ and the resolvent of M is $J_M = (\text{Id} + M)^{-1}$. We say that M is monotone if

$$(\forall (x, x^*) \in \text{gra } M)(\forall (y, y^*) \in \text{gra } M) \quad \langle x - y | x^* - y^* \rangle \geq 0, \quad (2.1)$$

and that it is maximally monotone if

$$(\forall (x, x^*) \in H \times H) \quad [(x, x^*) \in \text{gra } M \Leftrightarrow (\forall (y, y^*) \in \text{gra } M) \quad \langle x - y | x^* - y^* \rangle \geq 0]. \quad (2.2)$$

If M is maximally monotone, then J_M is a single-valued operator defined on H and which satisfies

$$\text{Fix } J_M = \text{zer } M \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall x \in H)(\forall y \in H) \quad \|J_M x - J_M y\|^2 + \|(\text{Id} - J_M)x - (\text{Id} - J_M)y\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2. \quad (2.3)$$

Let $\beta \in]0, +\infty[$. Then M is β -strongly monotone if $M - \beta \text{Id}$ is monotone, i.e.,

$$(\forall (x, x^*) \in \text{gra } M)(\forall (y, y^*) \in \text{gra } M) \quad \langle x - y | x^* - y^* \rangle \geq \beta \|x - y\|^2. \quad (2.4)$$

The parallel sum of $B: H \rightarrow 2^H$ and $D: H \rightarrow 2^H$ is $B \square D = (B^{-1} + D^{-1})^{-1}$. An operator $C: H \rightarrow H$ is cocoercive with constant $\alpha \in]0, +\infty[$ if

$$(\forall x \in H)(\forall y \in H) \quad \langle x - y | Cx - Cy \rangle \geq \alpha \|Cx - Cy\|^2. \quad (2.5)$$

We denote by $\Gamma_0(H)$ the class of lower semicontinuous convex functions $f: H \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$ such that $\text{dom } f = \{x \in H \mid f(x) < +\infty\} \neq \emptyset$. The subdifferential of $f \in \Gamma_0(H)$ is the maximally monotone operator $\partial f: H \rightarrow 2^H: x \mapsto \{x^* \in H \mid (\forall y \in H) \langle y - x \mid x^* \rangle + f(x) \leq f(y)\}$ and the proximity operator of f is

$$\text{prox}_f = J_{\partial f}: H \rightarrow H: x \mapsto \underset{z \in H}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left(f(z) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - z\|^2 \right). \quad (2.6)$$

The infimal convolution of f and $h \in \Gamma_0(H)$ is $f \square h: H \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]: x \mapsto \inf_{y \in H} (f(y) + h(x - y))$.

2.3. Probabilistic setting

The underlying probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) is complete. Let (Ξ, \mathcal{G}) be a measurable space. A Ξ -valued random variable (random variable for short) is a measurable mapping $x: (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P) \rightarrow (\Xi, \mathcal{G})$. In particular, an H -valued random variable is a measurable mapping $x: (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P) \rightarrow (H, \mathcal{B}_H)$, where \mathcal{B}_H denotes the Borel σ -algebra of H . Given $x: \Omega \rightarrow \Xi$ and $S \in \mathcal{G}$, we set $[x \in S] = \{\omega \in \Omega \mid x(\omega) \in S\}$. Let $p \in [1, +\infty[$ and let \mathcal{X} be a sub σ -algebra of \mathcal{F} . Then $L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{X}, P; H)$ denotes the space of equivalence classes of P -a.s. equal H -valued random variables $x: (\Omega, \mathcal{X}, P) \rightarrow (H, \mathcal{B}_H)$ such that $E\|x\|^p < +\infty$. Endowed with the norm

$$\|\cdot\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{X}, P; H)}: x \mapsto E^{1/p} \|x\|^p = \left(\int_{\Omega} \|x(\omega)\|^p P(d\omega) \right)^{1/p}, \quad (2.7)$$

$L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{X}, P; H)$ is a real Banach space. Further,

$$(\forall S \in \mathcal{B}_H) \quad L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{X}, P; S) = \{x \in L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{X}, P; H) \mid x \in S \text{ } P\text{-a.s.}\}. \quad (2.8)$$

The σ -algebra generated by a family Φ of random variables is denoted by $\sigma(\Phi)$. Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and x be H -valued random variables. We say that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in probability to x , denoted by $x_n \xrightarrow{P} x$, if $\|x_n - x\|$ converges in probability to 0, i.e.,

$$(\forall \varepsilon \in]0, +\infty[) \quad P\left(\|x_n - x\| > \varepsilon\right) \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.9)$$

We say $\varphi: \Omega \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Carathéodory integrand if

$$\begin{cases} \text{for } P\text{-almost every } \omega \in \Omega, \varphi(\omega, \cdot) \text{ is continuous;} \\ \text{for every } x \in H, \varphi(\cdot, x) \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-measurable.} \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

We denote by $\mathfrak{C}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ the class of Carathéodory integrands $\varphi: \Omega \times H \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ such that

$$(\forall x \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)) \quad \int_{\Omega} \varphi(\omega, x(\omega)) P(d\omega) < +\infty. \quad (2.11)$$

Given $\varphi \in \mathfrak{C}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ and $x \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$, we set $\varphi(\cdot, x): \omega \mapsto \varphi(\omega, x(\omega))$.

2.4. Preliminary results

Our main results rest on several technical facts, which are presented below. The first two lemmas are direct consequences of the corresponding statements for \mathbb{R} -valued random variables; see [41, Section 2.10].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and x be H -valued random variables and let $p \in [1, +\infty[$ be such that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly in $L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ to x . Then $x_n \xrightarrow{P} x$.*

Lemma 2.2. Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and x be H -valued random variables such that $x_n \xrightarrow{P} x$. Then there exists a strictly increasing sequence $(j_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} such that $(x_{j_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly P -a.s. to x .

Lemma 2.3. Let $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(\Delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $(\chi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be sequences of \mathbb{R} -valued random variables such that

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\lim} \Delta_n \leq 0 \text{ P-a.s.}; \\ \chi_n \xrightarrow{P} 0; \\ (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \xi_n \geq 0 \text{ P-a.s. and } \xi_n + \chi_n \leq \Delta_n \text{ P-a.s.} \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

Then $\xi_n \xrightarrow{P} 0$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \in]0, +\infty[$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\omega \in \Omega$ and suppose that $\xi_n(\omega) > \varepsilon$. Then there are two cases:

- $\chi_n(\omega) < -\varepsilon/2$.
- $\chi_n(\omega) \geq -\varepsilon/2$, in which case $\varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon - \varepsilon/2 < \xi_n(\omega) + \chi_n(\omega) \leq \Delta_n(\omega)$. Therefore,

$$[\xi_n > \varepsilon] \subset [\chi_n < -\varepsilon/2] \cup [\Delta_n > \varepsilon/2]. \quad (2.13)$$

Note that $P([\chi_n < -\varepsilon/2]) \rightarrow 0$ since $\chi_n \xrightarrow{P} 0$. On the other hand, since $\overline{\lim} \Delta_n \leq 0$ P-a.s., we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim} P([\Delta_n > \varepsilon/2]) &\leq P\left(\overline{\lim} [\Delta_n > \varepsilon/2]\right) \\ &= P\left(\left\{\omega \in \Omega \mid (\forall n \in \mathbb{N})(\exists k \in \{n, n+1, \dots\}) \Delta_k(\omega) > \varepsilon/2\right\}\right) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Altogether, $P([\xi_n] > \varepsilon) = P([\xi_n > \varepsilon]) \leq P([\chi_n < -\varepsilon/2]) + P([\Delta_n > \varepsilon/2]) \rightarrow 0$ and we conclude that $\xi_n \xrightarrow{P} 0$. \square

Lemma 2.4. Let $x \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ and let $T: H \rightarrow H$ be Lipschitzian. Then $Tx \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$.

Proof. Let $\beta \in]0, +\infty[$ be the Lipschitz constant of T . Since T is continuous, the mapping $\omega \mapsto (T \circ x)(\omega) = Tx(\omega)$ is measurable. Furthermore,

$$\frac{1}{2}E\|Tx\|^2 \leq E\|Tx - T0\|^2 + E\|T0\|^2 \leq \beta E\|x - 0\|^2 + E\|T0\|^2 = \beta E\|x\|^2 + \|T0\|^2 < +\infty, \quad (2.15)$$

which confirms that $Tx \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$. \square

Lemma 2.5. Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$, let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\vartheta(m)$ be a $\{0, \dots, m\}$ -valued random variable. Then the function $x_{\vartheta(m)}: \omega \mapsto x_{\vartheta(m)(\omega)}(\omega)$ is in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$.

Proof. We note that

$$x_{\vartheta(m)} = \sum_{j=0}^m 1_{[\vartheta(m)=j]} x_j \text{ P-a.s.}, \quad (2.16)$$

which shows that $x_{\vartheta(m)}$ is measurable, as $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ is complete, and that

$$E\|x_{\vartheta(m)}\|^2 \leq m \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} E\|x_j\|^2 < +\infty. \quad (2.17)$$

Thus, $x_{\vartheta(m)} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$. \square

The following theorem is a straightforward consequence of [20, Theorems 3.2 and 3.6].

Theorem 2.6. *Let Z be a nonempty closed convex subset of H , let $x_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$, and let $\rho \in [2, +\infty[$. Iterate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{for } n = 0, 1, \dots \\ & \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{X}_n = \sigma(x_0, \dots, x_n) \\ t_n^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H) \text{ and } \eta_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R}) \text{ satisfy} \\ \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1_{[t_n^* \neq 0]} 1_{[\langle x_n | t_n^* \rangle > \eta_n]} \eta_n}{\|t_n^*\| + 1_{[t_n^* = 0]}} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R}); \\ \theta_n = \frac{1_{[t_n^* \neq 0]} 1_{[\langle x_n | t_n^* \rangle > \eta_n]} (\langle x_n | t_n^* \rangle - \eta_n)}{\|t_n^*\|^2 + 1_{[t_n^* = 0]}}; \\ (\forall z \in Z) \quad \langle z | E(\theta_n t_n^* | \mathcal{X}_n) \rangle \leq E(\theta_n \eta_n | \mathcal{X}_n) + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \text{ P-a.s.,} \\ \text{where } \varepsilon_n \in \mathfrak{C}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H) \end{array} \right. \\ d_n = \theta_n t_n^* \\ \lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P;]0, \rho]) \\ x_{n+1} = x_n - \lambda_n d_n. \end{array} \right. \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

Suppose that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\{x_0, \dots, x_n, d_n\})$, and $E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) \geq 0$. Then the following hold:

- (i) $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a well-defined sequence in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$.
- (ii) Suppose that, for every $z \in Z$, $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) E \lambda_n < +\infty$. Then the following are satisfied:
 - (a) $(\|x_n\|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded P-a.s. and $(E\|x_n\|^2)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded.
 - (b) $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) E\|d_n\|^2 < +\infty$.
 - (c) Suppose that $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) > 0$. Then $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 < +\infty$.
 - (d) Suppose that $\mathfrak{B}(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset Z$ P-a.s. Then $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly P-a.s. and weakly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ to a random variable $x \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$.
 - (e) Suppose that $\mathfrak{S}(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ P-a.s. Then $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly P-a.s. and strongly in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ to a random variable $x \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; Z)$. Additionally, $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ to x .

Lemma 2.7 ([12, Lemma A.2]). *Let $\alpha \in [0, +\infty[$, let $A: H \rightarrow H$ be α -Lipschitzian, let $\sigma \in]0, +\infty[$, and let $\gamma \in]0, 1/(\alpha + \sigma)]$. Then $\gamma^{-1} \text{Id} - A$ is σ -strongly monotone.*

§3. Convergence analysis

This section is dedicated to establishing the weak convergence to solutions to Problem 1.1, in the almost sure and $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ modes, of sequences generated the stochastic Algorithm 1.3.

Theorem 3.1. *In the context of Problem 1.1, let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1.3. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $z \in Z$, set*

$$\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) = \max \left\{ 0, E \left(\theta_n \left(\langle w_n - z | e_n^* + f_n^* \rangle \right) + \langle e_n | w_n^* + Cz \rangle + \langle e_n | e_n^* \rangle \middle| \mathcal{X}_n \right) \right\}, \quad (3.1)$$

and suppose that λ_n is independent of $\sigma(\{x_0, \dots, x_n, d_n\})$ and that $E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) \geq 0$. Then the following hold:

- (i) Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in Z$. Then

$$\langle z | E(\theta_n t_n^* | \mathcal{X}_n) \rangle \leq E \left(\theta_n \langle w_n | t_n^* \rangle \middle| \mathcal{X}_n \right) + \frac{1}{4\alpha} E(\theta_n \|w_n - q_n\|^2 | \mathcal{X}_n) + \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) \text{ P-a.s.} \quad (3.2)$$

(ii) $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ lies in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$.

(iii) Suppose that, for every $z \in Z$, $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E \varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) E \lambda_n < +\infty$. Then the following are satisfied:

- (a) $(\|x_n\|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded P-a.s. and $(E\|x_n\|^2)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded.
- (b) $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) E\|d_n\|^2 < +\infty$.
- (c) Suppose that $\inf E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) > 0$. Then $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 < +\infty$.
- (d) Suppose that $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_n > 0$ P-a.s. and that $(t_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded P-a.s. Then $\lim \overline{\Delta_n} \leq 0$ P-a.s.
- (e) Suppose that $x_n - w_n - e_n \rightarrow 0$ P-a.s., $w_n + e_n - q_n \rightarrow 0$ P-a.s., and $w_n^* + e_n^* + Cq_n \rightarrow 0$ P-a.s. Then $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly P-a.s. and weakly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ to a Z -valued random variable.
- (f) Suppose that $\dim H < +\infty$, $x_n - w_n - e_n \xrightarrow{P} 0$, $w_n + e_n - q_n \xrightarrow{P} 0$, and $w_n^* + e_n^* + Cq_n \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Then $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges P-a.s. and in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ to a Z -valued random variable.

Proof. (i): Note that $(z, -Cz) \in \text{gra } W$. Hence, (1.3) and the monotonicity of W yield

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle z - w_n - e_n \mid w_n^* + e_n^* + c_n^* \rangle \\
&= \langle z - w_n - e_n \mid w_n^* + e_n^* + Cq_n \rangle - \langle z - w_n - e_n \mid f_n^* \rangle \\
&= \langle z - w_n - e_n \mid w_n^* + e_n^* + Cz \rangle + \langle z - w_n - e_n \mid Cq_n - Cz \rangle - \langle z - w_n - e_n \mid f_n^* \rangle \\
&\leq \langle z - w_n - e_n \mid Cq_n - Cz \rangle - \langle z - w_n - e_n \mid f_n^* \rangle \\
&= -\langle z - q_n \mid Cz - Cq_n \rangle + \langle w_n - q_n \mid Cz - Cq_n \rangle + \langle e_n \mid Cz - Cq_n \rangle - \langle z - w_n - e_n \mid f_n^* \rangle \\
&\leq -\alpha \|Cz - Cq_n\|^2 + \|w_n - q_n\| \|Cz - Cq_n\| + \langle e_n \mid Cz - Cq_n \rangle - \langle z - w_n - e_n \mid f_n^* \rangle \\
&= \frac{\|w_n - q_n\|^2}{4\alpha} - \left| (2\sqrt{\alpha})^{-1} \|w_n - q_n\| - \sqrt{\alpha} \|Cz - Cq_n\| \right|^2 \\
&\quad + \langle e_n \mid Cz - Cq_n \rangle - \langle z - w_n - e_n \mid f_n^* \rangle \\
&\leq \frac{\|w_n - q_n\|^2}{4\alpha} + \langle w_n - z \mid f_n^* \rangle + \langle e_n \mid Cz - Cq_n \rangle + \langle e_n \mid f_n^* \rangle \text{ P-a.s.}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Therefore, since $t_n^* = w_n^* + c_n^*$,

$$\langle z \mid t_n^* \rangle \leq \langle w_n \mid t_n^* \rangle + \frac{\|w_n - q_n\|^2}{4\alpha} + \langle w_n - z \mid e_n^* + f_n^* \rangle + \langle e_n \mid w_n^* + Cz \rangle + \langle e_n \mid e_n^* \rangle \text{ P-a.s.} \tag{3.4}$$

On the other hand, because $\theta_n \geq 0$ P-a.s., it follows from scaling by θ_n and taking the conditional expectation with respect to \mathcal{X}_n in (3.4) that (3.2) holds.

(ii): Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $\eta_n = \langle w_n \mid t_n^* \rangle + (4\alpha)^{-1} \|w_n - q_n\|^2$. Then $\eta_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R})$ and $\varepsilon_n \in \mathfrak{C}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$. Furthermore, by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} E \left| \frac{1_{[t_n^* \neq 0]} 1_{[\langle x_n \mid t_n^* \rangle > \eta_n]} \eta_n}{\|t_n^*\| + 1_{[t_n^* = 0]}} \right|^2 &\leq E \left| \frac{1_{[t_n^* \neq 0]} 1_{[\langle x_n \mid t_n^* \rangle > \eta_n]} (\langle x_n \mid t_n^* \rangle - \eta_n)}{\|t_n^*\| + 1_{[t_n^* = 0]}} \right|^2 + E \left| \frac{1_{[t_n^* \neq 0]} 1_{[\langle x_n \mid t_n^* \rangle > \eta_n]} \langle x_n \mid t_n^* \rangle}{\|t_n^*\| + 1_{[t_n^* = 0]}} \right|^2 \\
&\leq E \left| \frac{1_{[t_n^* \neq 0]} 1_{[\langle x_n \mid t_n^* \rangle > \eta_n]} \langle x_n \mid t_n^* \rangle - \eta_n}{\|t_n^*\| + 1_{[t_n^* = 0]}} \right|^2 + E \|x_n\|^2 \\
&= E \left| \frac{1_{[t_n^* \neq 0]} 1_{[\langle x_n \mid t_n^* \rangle > \eta_n]} (\langle x_n - w_n \mid t_n^* \rangle - (4\alpha)^{-1} \|w_n - q_n\|^2)}{\|t_n^*\| + 1_{[t_n^* = 0]}} \right|^2 + E \|x_n\|^2 \\
&\leq E \left| \frac{1_{[t_n^* \neq 0]} 1_{[\langle x_n \mid t_n^* \rangle > \eta_n]} \langle x_n - w_n \mid t_n^* \rangle}{\|t_n^*\| + 1_{[t_n^* = 0]}} \right|^2 + E \|x_n\|^2 \\
&\leq E \|x_n - w_n\|^2 + E \|x_n\|^2 \\
&< +\infty.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Altogether, in view of (i), we deduce that (1.3) is a realization of (2.18). Hence, the claim follows from Theorem 2.6(i).

(iii)(a)–(iii)(c): These follow from Theorem 2.6(ii)(a)–(ii)(c).

(iii)(d): Since $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_n > 0$ P-a.s., we proceed, for P-almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, as in the proof of [12, Proposition 3(iii)] to get the result using (iii)(c).

(iii)(e): In view of (iii)(a), we fix $\Omega' \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$P(\Omega') = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall \omega \in \Omega') \quad \begin{cases} x_n(\omega) - w_n(\omega) - e_n(\omega) \rightarrow 0; \\ w_n(\omega) + e_n(\omega) - q_n(\omega) \rightarrow 0; \\ w_n^*(\omega) + e_n^*(\omega) + Cq_n(\omega) \rightarrow 0; \\ (\|x_n(\omega)\|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is bounded.} \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

Now let $\omega \in \Omega'$ and $x \in \mathfrak{B}(x_n(\omega))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then there exists a strictly increasing sequence in \mathbb{N} , say $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that $x_{k_n}(\omega) \rightarrow x$. Furthermore,

$$w_{k_n}(\omega) + e_{k_n}(\omega) = x_{k_n}(\omega) - (x_{k_n}(\omega) - w_{k_n}(\omega) - e_{k_n}(\omega)) \rightarrow x \quad (3.7)$$

and, since C is α^{-1} -Lipschitzian,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|w_{k_n}^*(\omega) + e_{k_n}^*(\omega) + C(w_{k_n}(\omega) + e_{k_n}(\omega))\| \\ & \leq \|w_{k_n}^*(\omega) + e_{k_n}^*(\omega) + Cq_{k_n}(\omega)\| + \|C(w_{k_n}(\omega) + e_{k_n}(\omega)) - Cq_{k_n}(\omega)\| \\ & \leq \|w_{k_n}^*(\omega) + e_{k_n}^*(\omega) + Cq_{k_n}(\omega)\| + \frac{\|w_{k_n}(\omega) + e_{k_n}(\omega) - q_{k_n}(\omega)\|}{\alpha} \\ & \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

On the other hand, (1.3) yields

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \left(w_{k_n}(\omega) + e_{k_n}(\omega), w_{k_n}^*(\omega) + e_{k_n}^*(\omega) + C(w_{k_n}(\omega) + e_{k_n}(\omega)) \right) \in \text{gra}(W + C). \quad (3.9)$$

Since, by [4, Corollary 25.5(i)], $W + C$ is maximally monotone, (3.7), (3.8), (3.9), and [4, Proposition 20.38(ii)] imply that $x \in Z$. Since x is arbitrarily chosen in $\mathfrak{B}(x_n(\omega))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, we deduce that $\mathfrak{B}(x_n(\omega))_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset Z$ and, since $P(\Omega') = 1$, that $\mathfrak{B}(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset Z$ P-a.s. Therefore, it follows from Theorems 2.6(ii)(d) that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly P-a.s. and weakly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ to a Z -valued random variable.

(iii)(f): Lemma 2.2 guarantees the existence of a strictly increasing sequence in \mathbb{N} , say $(l_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that $x_{l_n} - w_{l_n} - e_{l_n} \rightarrow 0$ P-a.s., $w_{l_n} + e_{l_n} - q_{l_n} \rightarrow 0$ P-a.s., and $w_{l_n}^* + e_{l_n}^* + Cq_{l_n} \rightarrow 0$ P-a.s. Additionally, it follows from (iii)(a) that $(\|x_{l_n}\|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded P-a.s. Let $\Omega' \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that

$$P(\Omega') = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall \omega \in \Omega') \quad \begin{cases} x_{l_n}(\omega) - w_{l_n}(\omega) - e_{l_n}(\omega) \rightarrow 0; \\ w_{l_n}(\omega) + e_{l_n}(\omega) - q_{l_n}(\omega) \rightarrow 0; \\ w_{l_n}^*(\omega) + e_{l_n}^*(\omega) + Cq_{l_n}(\omega) \rightarrow 0; \\ (\|x_{l_n}(\omega)\|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is bounded.} \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

Let $\omega \in \Omega'$. We derive from (3.10) and the fact that H is finite-dimensional that there exists $x \in H$ and a further subsequence $(k_{l_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $x_{k_{l_n}}(\omega) \rightarrow x$,

$$w_{k_{l_n}}(\omega) + e_{k_{l_n}}(\omega) = x_{k_{l_n}}(\omega) - (x_{k_{l_n}}(\omega) - w_{k_{l_n}}(\omega) - e_{k_{l_n}}(\omega)) \rightarrow x, \quad (3.11)$$

and, as in (3.8),

$$w_{k_{l_n}}^*(\omega) + e_{k_{l_n}}^*(\omega) + C(w_{k_{l_n}}(\omega) + e_{k_{l_n}}(\omega)) \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.12)$$

However, as in (3.9),

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \left(w_{k_n}(\omega) + e_{k_n}(\omega), w_{k_n}^*(\omega) + e_{k_n}^*(\omega) + C(w_{k_n}(\omega) + e_{k_n}(\omega)) \right) \in \text{gra}(W + C), \quad (3.13)$$

and the maximal monotonicity of $W + C$ yields $x \in Z$. Thus, $(x_n(\omega))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a cluster point in Z and we conclude that $\mathfrak{S}(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ P-a.s. Therefore, it follows from Theorem 2.6(ii)(e) that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges P-a.s. and in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ to a Z -valued random variable. \square

Remark 3.2. The random relaxations parameters $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfy $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) \geq 0$. When the relaxation parameters are deterministic, this condition imposes that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_n \in]0, 2[$, which is the standard range found in deterministic methods in the literature [12, 17, 28, 31]. However, Theorem 3.1 allows for the use of so-called super relaxation parameters [20] which may exceed 2 by satisfying

$$\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} P([\lambda_n > 2]) > 0. \quad (3.14)$$

Note that the use of super relaxation parameters leads to novel results and faster convergence; see [20, Section 6] for examples of super relaxation strategies.

§4. Stochastic proximal point algorithm

The proximal point algorithm is a classical method for finding a zero of a maximal monotone operator $A: H \rightarrow 2^H$ [5, 33, 34, 39]. In this section, we propose a stochastic version of it which involves stochastic approximations of the resolvents together with random relaxations.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $A: H \rightarrow 2^H$ be a maximally monotone operator such that $\text{zer } A \neq \emptyset$, let $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $]0, +\infty[$, and let $x_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$. Iterate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{for } n = 0, 1, \dots \\ & \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{take } e_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H) \text{ and } \lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P;]0, 2[) \\ x_{n+1} = x_n + \lambda_n (J_{\gamma_n A} x_n - e_n - x_n). \end{array} \right. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Suppose that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, λ_n is independent of $\sigma(x_0, \dots, x_n, e_n)$, and that one of the following holds:

- (i) $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) = +\infty$, $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{E|\lambda_n|^2 E\|e_n\|^2} < +\infty$, $(E\|e_n\|^2)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, and $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \gamma_n = 1$.
- (ii) $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) > 0$, $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_n > 0$, and $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{E\|e_n\|^2} < +\infty$.
- (iii) $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_n^2 = +\infty$, $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{E\|e_n\|^2} < +\infty$, and $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \lambda_n = 1$ P-a.s.

Then $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly P-a.s. and weakly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ to a $(\text{zer } A)$ -valued random variable.

Proof. We apply Theorem 3.1 with $W = A$, $C = 0$ (hence $Z = \text{zer } A$) and

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} w_n = J_{\gamma_n A} x_n - e_n; \\ w_n^* = \gamma_n^{-1} (x_n - w_n); \\ q_n = w_n; \\ c_n^* = f_n^* = 0; \\ e_n^* = -\gamma_n^{-1} e_n. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

In this setting, it follows from [4, Proposition 23.22] that

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad (w_n + e_n, w_n^* + e_n^*) = (J_{\gamma_n A} x_n, \gamma_n^{-1} (x_n - J_{\gamma_n A} x_n)) \in \text{gra } A \quad \text{P-a.s.} \quad (4.3)$$

and that algorithm (4.1) is an instantiation of Algorithm 1.3 with

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad t_n^* = \gamma_n^{-1}(x_n - w_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_n = \gamma_n. \quad (4.4)$$

We therefore deduce from Theorem 3.1(ii) that the sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ lies in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$. Next, let us define a family of auxiliary sequences as follows. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$y_{0,k} = x_k \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad y_{n+1,k} = y_{n,k} + \lambda_{n+k}(J_{Y_{n+k}A}y_{n,k} - y_{n,k}). \quad (4.5)$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, as above, $(y_{n,k})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence generated by an instantiation of Algorithm 1.3 now initialized at x_k with, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $e_n = 0$ and $q_n = J_{Y_{n+k}A}y_{n,k}$. Consequently, Theorem 3.1(iii)(a) asserts that $(\|y_{n,k}\|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded P-a.s. and that $(E\|y_{n,k}\|^2)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. Additionally, we deduce from Theorem 3.1(iii)(b) that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n))E\|y_{n,k} - J_{Y_{n+k}A}y_{n,k}\|^2 < +\infty. \quad (4.6)$$

Next, let us show that, under any of scenarios (i)–(iii),

$$\|y_{n,k} - J_{Y_{n+k}A}y_{n,k}\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ P-a.s. as } n \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (4.7)$$

- Suppose that (i) holds. Then we deduce from (4.6) that $\liminf E\|y_{n,k} - J_A y_{n,k}\|^2 = 0$. In turn, Fatou's lemma yields $\liminf \|y_{n,k} - J_A y_{n,k}\| = 0$ P-a.s. Now set $T = 2J_A - \text{Id}$ and recall that it is nonexpansive [4, Corollary 23.11(ii)]. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad 2\|y_{n+1,k} - J_A y_{n+1,k}\| &= \|Ty_{n+1,k} - y_{n+1,k}\| \\ &= \|Ty_{n+1,k} - Ty_{n,k} + (1 - \lambda_n/2)(Ty_{n,k} - y_{n,k})\| \\ &\leq \|y_{n+1,k} - y_{n,k}\| + (1 - \lambda_n/2)\|Ty_{n,k} - y_{n,k}\| \\ &= (\lambda_n/2)\|Ty_{n,k} - y_{n,k}\| + (1 - \lambda_n/2)\|Ty_{n,k} - y_{n,k}\| \\ &= 2\|y_{n,k} - J_A y_{n,k}\| \text{ P-a.s.,} \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

which shows that $(\|y_{n,k} - J_A y_{n,k}\|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ decreases P-a.s. Hence, $\|y_{n,k} - J_A y_{n,k}\| \rightarrow 0$ P-a.s. as $n \rightarrow +\infty$.

- Suppose that (ii) or (iii) holds. Then it follows from (4.6) that

$$E \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|y_{n,k} - J_{Y_{n+k}A}y_{n,k}\|^2 = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E\|y_{n,k} - J_{Y_{n+k}A}y_{n,k}\|^2 < +\infty. \quad (4.9)$$

Thus $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|y_{n,k} - J_{Y_{n+k}A}y_{n,k}\|^2 < +\infty$ P-a.s. and hence $\|y_{n,k} - J_{Y_{n+k}A}y_{n,k}\| \rightarrow 0$ P-a.s. as $n \rightarrow +\infty$.

This establishes (4.7). On the other hand, let us note that, under any of scenarios (i)–(iii),

$$E \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n| \|e_n\| = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(|\lambda_n| \|e_n\|) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E|\lambda_n| E\|e_n\| \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{E|\lambda_n|^2 E\|e_n\|^2} < +\infty. \quad (4.10)$$

Hence $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n| \|e_n\| < +\infty$ P-a.s. Consequently, taking into account (4.1), (4.5), and (2.3), we infer that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\|x_{n+k} - y_{n,k}\| \leq \sum_{j=k}^{n+k-1} \|\lambda_j e_j\| \leq \sum_{j=k}^{+\infty} |\lambda_j| \|e_j\| < +\infty \text{ P-a.s.} \quad (4.11)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{n+k} - y_{n,k}\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)} &\leq \sum_{j=k}^{n+k-1} \|\lambda_j e_j\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)} \\
&= \sum_{j=k}^{n+k-1} \sqrt{E|\lambda_j| \|e_j\|^2} \\
&= \sum_{j=k}^{n+k-1} \sqrt{E|\lambda_j|^2 E\|e_j\|^2} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=k}^{+\infty} \sqrt{E|\lambda_j|^2 E\|e_j\|^2} \\
&< +\infty
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

In turn, since $(E\|y_{n,k}\|^2)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, so is $(E\|x_n\|^2)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Next, fix $z \in \text{zer } A$. We derive from (3.1), (4.2), (4.4), the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and (2.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E\varepsilon_n(\cdot, z) E\lambda_n &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E \max \left\{ 0, E \left(\langle z - J_{Y_n A} x_n | e_n \rangle + \langle e_n | x_n - J_{Y_n A} x_n \rangle + \|e_n\|^2 \mid \mathcal{X}_n \right) \right\} E\lambda_n \\
&\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\sqrt{E\|z - J_{Y_n A} x_n\|^2} + \sqrt{E\|x_n - J_{Y_n A} x_n\|^2} + \sqrt{E\|e_n\|^2} \right) \sqrt{E\|e_n\|^2} E\lambda_n \\
&\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\sqrt{E\|z - x_n\|^2} + \sqrt{E\|(\text{Id} - J_{Y_n A})x_n - (\text{Id} - J_{Y_n A})z\|^2} + \sqrt{E\|e_n\|^2} \right) \sqrt{E|\lambda_n|^2 E\|e_n\|^2} \\
&\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(2\sqrt{E\|x_n - z\|^2} + \sqrt{E\|e_n\|^2} \right) \sqrt{E|\lambda_n|^2 E\|e_n\|^2} \\
&< +\infty.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

We conclude the proof using Theorem 3.1(iii)(e).

- Convergence under assumption (i) or (ii): In view of (4.2), let us show that

$$\begin{cases} x_n - w_n - e_n = x_n - J_{Y_n A} x_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ P-a.s.}; \\ w_n + e_n - q_n = J_{Y_n A} x_n - x_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ P-a.s.}; \\ w_n^* + e_n^* + Cq_n = Y_n^{-1}(x_n - J_{Y_n A} x_n) \rightarrow 0 \text{ P-a.s.} \end{cases} \tag{4.14}$$

By invoking (2.3), (4.11), and (4.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \|x_m - J_{Y_m A} x_m\| &= \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|x_{n+k} - J_{Y_{n+k} A} x_{n+k}\| \\
&\leq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\|x_{n+k} - y_{n,k}\| + \|J_{Y_{n+k} A} x_{n+k} - J_{Y_{n+k} A} y_{n,k}\| + \|y_{n,k} - J_{Y_{n+k} A} y_{n,k}\| \right) \\
&\leq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left(2\|x_{n+k} - y_{n,k}\| + \|y_{n,k} - J_{Y_{n+k} A} y_{n,k}\| \right) \\
&\leq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left(2 \sum_{j=k}^{+\infty} \|\lambda_j e_j\| + \|y_{n,k} - J_{Y_{n+k} A} y_{n,k}\| \right) \\
&= 2 \sum_{j=k}^{+\infty} |\lambda_j| \|e_j\| + \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|y_{n,k} - J_{Y_{n+k} A} y_{n,k}\| \\
&= 2 \sum_{j=k}^{+\infty} |\lambda_j| \|e_j\| \text{ P-a.s.}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Thus, upon taking the limit as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ in (4.15), we obtain $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \|x_m - J_{\gamma_m A} x_m\| = 0$ P-a.s. Hence, since $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded away from 0, (4.14) holds.

- Convergence under assumption (iii): Note that (4.6) yields $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{n+k}^2 \mathbb{E} \| \gamma_{n+k}^{-1} (y_{n,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+k} A} y_{n,k}) \|^2 < +\infty$, which forces $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \| \gamma_{n+k}^{-1} (y_{n,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+k} A} y_{n,k}) \| = 0$ P-a.s. Upon invoking [4, Proposition 23.22] and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{1}{\gamma_{n+1+k}} \left\langle J_{\gamma_{n+k} A} y_{n,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+1+k} A} y_{n+1,k} \left| \frac{y_{n,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+k} A} y_{n,k}}{\gamma_{n+k}} - \frac{y_{n+1,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+1+k} A} y_{n+1,k}}{\gamma_{n+1+k}} \right. \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \frac{J_{\gamma_{n+k} A} y_{n,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+1+k} A} y_{n+1,k}}{\gamma_{n+1+k}} \left| \frac{y_{n,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+k} A} y_{n,k}}{\gamma_{n+k}} \right. \right\rangle - \left\| \frac{y_{n+1,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+1+k} A} y_{n+1,k}}{\gamma_{n+1+k}} \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{y_{n+1,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+1+k} A} y_{n+1,k}}{\gamma_{n+1+k}} \right\| \left(\left\| \frac{y_{n,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+k} A} y_{n,k}}{\gamma_{n+k}} \right\| - \left\| \frac{y_{n+1,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+1+k} A} y_{n+1,k}}{\gamma_{n+1+k}} \right\| \right) \text{ P-a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

Hence, $(\| \gamma_{n+k}^{-1} (y_{n,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+k} A} y_{n,k}) \|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ decreases P-a.s., which implies that $\gamma_{n+k}^{-1} (y_{n,k} - J_{\gamma_{n+k} A} y_{n,k}) \rightarrow 0$ P-a.s. as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Consequently, we deduce then from Theorem (iii)(e) that, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(y_{n,k})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly P-a.s. and weakly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ to some (zer A)-valued random variable which we denote by y_k . In addition, we deduce from (4.1), (4.5), and (2.3) that

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N})(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} \|y_{n,k+1} - y_{n+1,k}\| \leq \|e_k\| \text{ P-a.s.}; \\ \|y_{n,k+1} - y_{n+1,k}\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)} \leq \|e_k\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)}. \end{cases} \quad (4.17)$$

In turn, the weak lower semicontinuity of the norm and Fatou's lemma imply that

$$(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} \|y_{k+1} - y_k\| \leq \liminf \|y_{n,k+1} - y_{n+1,k}\| \leq \|e_k\| \text{ P-a.s.}; \\ \mathbb{E} \|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2 \leq \liminf \mathbb{E} \|y_{n,k+1} - y_{n+1,k}\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E} \|e_k\|^2. \end{cases} \quad (4.18)$$

Since $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|e_n\| < +\infty$ P-a.s. and $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \|e_n\|^2} < +\infty$, (4.18) shows that $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence both P-a.s. and in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$. Hence, we deduce from (4.11), (4.12), and (4.18) that there exists a (zer A)-valued random variable y such that

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+k} - y_{n,k} \rightarrow 0 \text{ P-a.s. and in } L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty \text{ and } k \rightarrow +\infty; \\ \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N}, y_{n,k} - y_k \rightarrow 0 \text{ P-a.s. and in } L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty; \\ y_k - y \rightarrow 0 \text{ P-a.s. and in } L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H) \text{ as } k \rightarrow +\infty. \end{cases} \quad (4.19)$$

Thus, $x_{n+k} - y = x_{n+k} - y_{n,k} + y_{n,k} - y_k + y_k - y \rightarrow 0$ P-a.s. and in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and $k \rightarrow +\infty$. This confirms that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly P-a.s. and weakly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ to y .

□

Remark 4.2. Here are a few commentaries on Theorem 4.1.

- In the deterministic setting with $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $]0, 2[$, Theorem 4.1(i) follows from [15, Theorem 2.1(i)(a)], Theorem 4.1(ii) was established in [28, Theorem 3], and Theorem 4.1(iii) was established in [5, Remarque 14(a)].
- In the case of deterministic relaxations $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $]0, 2[$ and constant proximal parameters $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, the almost sure weak convergence result in Theorem 4.1(ii) follows from [21, Proposition 5.1].
- As discussed in [17, Section 5], the deterministic proximal point algorithm can be employed to solve equilibrium problems beyond the simple inclusion $0 \in Ax$. It captures in particular the method of partial inverses to split multi-operator inclusions, problems involving resolvent compositions, and the Chambolle–Pock algorithm. Stochasticity can be introduced in these methods via Theorem 4.1.

§5. Stochastic block-iterative saddle projective splitting

5.1. Problem setting

We consider a highly structured composite multivariate primal-dual inclusion problem introduced in [12] and further studied in [17, Section 10]. This model includes a mix of set-valued, cocoercive, and Lipschitzian monotone operators, as well as linear operators and various monotonicity-preserving operations among them. Its multivariate structure captures problems in areas such as domain decomposition methods [1, 2], game theory [11, 36], mean field games [8], machine learning [3, 6], network flow problems [9, 40], neural networks [22], and stochastic programming [29].

Problem 5.1. Let $(H_i)_{i \in I}$ and $(G_k)_{k \in K}$ be finite families of Euclidean spaces with respective direct sums $\mathbf{H} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} H_i$ and $\mathbf{G} = \bigoplus_{k \in K} G_k$. Denote by $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in I}$ a generic element in \mathbf{H} . For every $i \in I$ and every $k \in K$, let $s_i^* \in H_i$, let $r_k \in G_k$, and suppose that the following are satisfied:

- [a] $A_i: H_i \rightarrow 2^{H_i}$ is maximally monotone, $C_i: H_i \rightarrow H_i$ is cocoercive with constant $\alpha_i^c \in]0, +\infty[$, $Q_i: H_i \rightarrow H_i$ is monotone and Lipschitzian with constant $\alpha_i^\ell \in [0, +\infty[$, and $R_i: \mathbf{H} \rightarrow H_i$.
- [b] $B_k^m: G_k \rightarrow 2^{G_k}$ is maximally monotone, $B_k^c: G_k \rightarrow G_k$ is cocoercive with constant $\beta_k^c \in]0, +\infty[$, and $B_k^\ell: G_k \rightarrow G_k$ is monotone and Lipschitzian with constant $\beta_k^\ell \in [0, +\infty[$.
- [c] $D_k^m: G_k \rightarrow 2^{G_k}$ is maximally monotone, $D_k^c: G_k \rightarrow G_k$ is cocoercive with constant $\delta_k^c \in]0, +\infty[$, and $D_k^\ell: G_k \rightarrow G_k$ is monotone and Lipschitzian with constant $\delta_k^\ell \in [0, +\infty[$.
- [d] $L_{ki}: H_i \rightarrow G_k$ is linear.

In addition, it is assumed that

- [e] $\mathbf{R}: \mathbf{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}: \mathbf{x} \mapsto (R_i \mathbf{x})_{i \in I}$ is monotone and Lipschitzian with constant $\chi \in [0, +\infty[$.

The objective is to solve the primal problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{find } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbf{H} \text{ such that } (\forall i \in I) \quad & s_i^* \in A_i \bar{x}_i + C_i \bar{x}_i + Q_i \bar{x}_i + R_i \bar{\mathbf{x}} \\ & + \sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* \left(\left((B_k^m + B_k^c + B_k^\ell) \square (D_k^m + D_k^c + D_k^\ell) \right) \left(\sum_{j \in I} L_{kj} \bar{x}_j - r_k \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

and the associated dual problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{find } \bar{\mathbf{v}}^* \in \mathbf{G} \text{ such that } (\exists \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{H}) (\forall i \in I) (\forall k \in K) \\ \begin{cases} s_i^* - \sum_{j \in K} L_{ji}^* \bar{v}_j^* \in A_i x_i + C_i x_i + Q_i x_i + R_i \mathbf{x}; \\ \bar{v}_k^* \in \left((B_k^m + B_k^c + B_k^\ell) \square (D_k^m + D_k^c + D_k^\ell) \right) \left(\sum_{j \in I} L_{kj} x_j - r_k \right). \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Finally, \mathcal{P} denotes the set of solutions to (5.1), \mathcal{D} denotes the set of solutions to (5.2), and we set $\underline{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{H} \oplus \mathbf{G} \oplus \mathbf{G} \oplus \mathbf{G}$.

To deal with large size problems in which I and/or K is sizable, the deterministic block-iterative algorithm proposed in [12] has the ability to activate only subgroups of coordinates and operators at each iteration instead of all of them as in classical methods. We propose a stochastic version of this block-iterative algorithm with almost sure convergence to a solution of Problem 5.1. The convergence analysis will rely on an application of Theorem 3.1 in $\underline{\mathbf{X}}$ using the following saddle formalism.

Definition 5.2 ([12, Definition 1]). The *saddle operator* associated with Problem 5.1 is

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathcal{S}}: \underline{\mathbf{X}} \rightarrow 2^{\underline{\mathbf{X}}}: (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}^*) \mapsto \\ \left(\bigtimes_{i \in I} \left(-s_i^* + A_i x_i + C_i x_i + Q_i x_i + R_i \mathbf{x} + \sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* v_k^* \right), \bigtimes_{k \in K} (B_k^m y_k + B_k^c y_k + B_k^\ell y_k - v_k^*), \right. \\ \left. \bigtimes_{k \in K} (D_k^m z_k + D_k^c z_k + D_k^\ell z_k - v_k^*), \bigtimes_{k \in K} \left\{ r_k + y_k + z_k - \sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} x_i \right\} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

and the *saddle form* of Problem 5.1 is to

$$\text{find } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \underline{\mathbf{X}} \text{ such that } \mathbf{0} \in \underline{\mathcal{S}} \bar{\mathbf{x}}. \quad (5.4)$$

Item (ii) below asserts that finding a saddle point, i.e., solving (5.4), provides a solution to Problem 5.1.

Proposition 5.3 ([12, Proposition 1]). Consider the setting of Problem 5.1 and Definition 5.2. Then the following hold:

- (i) $\underline{\mathcal{S}}$ is maximally monotone.
- (ii) Suppose that $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{v}}^*) \in \text{zer } \underline{\mathcal{S}}$. Then $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{v}}^*) \in \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{D}$.
- (iii) $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow \text{zer } \underline{\mathcal{S}} \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset$.

To use Theorem 3.1, we decompose the saddle operator $\underline{\mathcal{S}}$ of (5.3) as the sum of

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbf{W}}: \underline{\mathbf{X}} \rightarrow 2^{\underline{\mathbf{X}}}: (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}^*) \mapsto \\ \left(\bigtimes_{i \in I} \left(-s_i^* + A_i x_i + Q_i x_i + R_i \mathbf{x} + \sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* v_k^* \right), \bigtimes_{k \in K} (B_k^m y_k + B_k^c y_k - v_k^*), \right. \\ \left. \bigtimes_{k \in K} (D_k^m z_k + D_k^c z_k - v_k^*), \bigtimes_{k \in K} \left\{ r_k + y_k + z_k - \sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} x_i \right\} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

and

$$\underline{\mathbf{C}}: \underline{\mathbf{X}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{X}}: (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}^*) \mapsto \left((C_i x_i)_{i \in I}, (B_k^c y_k)_{k \in K}, (D_k^c z_k)_{k \in K}, \mathbf{0} \right). \quad (5.6)$$

As seen in [12, Proposition 2(ii)–(iii)], $\underline{\mathbf{W}}$ is maximally monotone and $\underline{\mathbf{C}}$ is α -cocoercive with $\alpha = \min\{\alpha_i^c, \beta_k^c, \delta_k^c\}_{i \in I, k \in K}$. This confirms that (5.4) fits the framework described in Problem 1.1.

5.2. Algorithm and convergence

The following assumptions regulate the way in which the coordinates and the sets are randomly activated over the course of the iterations.

Assumption 5.4. I and K are nonempty finite sets, $(\pi_i)_{i \in I}$ and $(\zeta_k)_{k \in K}$ are in $]0, 1]$, and $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. $(I_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are nonempty sets with elements randomly taken in I , and $(K_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are nonempty sets with elements randomly taken in K satisfying, for every finite collection of positive integers n_1, \dots, n_m ,

$$\begin{cases} (\forall i \in I) & P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^m [i \in I_{n_j}]\right) = \prod_{j=1}^m P([i \in I_{n_j}]); \\ (\forall k \in K) & P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^m [k \in K_{n_j}]\right) = \prod_{j=1}^m P([k \in K_{n_j}]). \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

Moreover, $I_0 = I$, $K_0 = K$, and

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \begin{cases} (\forall i \in I) \ P\left(\left[i \in \bigcup_{j=n}^{n+N-1} I_j\right]\right) \geq \pi_i; \\ (\forall k \in K) \ P\left(\left[k \in \bigcup_{j=n}^{n+N-1} K_j\right]\right) \geq \zeta_k. \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

Example 5.5.

- (i) The (deterministic) rule of [12, Assumption 2] satisfies Assumption 5.4 by setting, for every $i \in I$ and every $k \in K$, $\pi_i = 1$ and $\zeta_k = 1$.
- (ii) Set, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $I_n = \{i_n\}$ and $K_n = \{k_n\}$, where $(i_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d random variables uniformly distributed on I and $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d random variables uniformly distributed on K . This rule satisfies Assumption 5.4 for $N = 1$, $\pi_i \equiv 1/\text{card } I$, and $\zeta_k \equiv 1/\text{card } K$.

Proposition 5.6. *Let I be a nonempty finite set, and let $(I_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be randomly selected nonempty subsets of I . Suppose that $I_0 = I$, and that $i \in I$ is such that $([i \in I_n])_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an independent sequence in \mathcal{F} that satisfies*

$$(\exists N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})(\exists \pi_i \in]0, 1])(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \ P\left(\left[i \in \bigcup_{j=n}^{n+N-1} I_j\right]\right) \geq \pi_i. \quad (5.9)$$

Set, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\vartheta_1(n) = \max\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid j \leq n \text{ and } i \in I_j\}$. Further, let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$ such that $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E\|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 < +\infty$ P-a.s. Then $x_{\vartheta_1(n)} - x_n \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$.

Proof. Note that $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \ \vartheta_1(n) \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ P-a.s. Hence, Lemma 2.5 ensures that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_{\vartheta_1(n)} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$. On the other hand, it follows from the independence condition and (5.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad P\left(\left[i \notin \bigcup_{j=n}^{+\infty} I_j\right]\right) &= P\left(\bigcap_{j=n}^{+\infty} [i \in \mathbb{C} I_j]\right) \\ &= P\left(\lim_{0 < m \rightarrow +\infty} \bigcap_{j=n}^{n+mN-1} [i \in \mathbb{C} I_j]\right) \\ &= \lim_{0 < m \rightarrow +\infty} P\left(\bigcap_{j=n}^{n+mN-1} [i \in \mathbb{C} I_j]\right) \\ &= \lim_{0 < m \rightarrow +\infty} \prod_{k=0}^{m-1} P\left(\bigcap_{j=n+kN}^{n+(k+1)N-1} [i \in \mathbb{C} I_j]\right) \\ &= \lim_{0 < m \rightarrow +\infty} \prod_{k=0}^{m-1} P\left(\mathbb{C} \left[i \in \bigcup_{j=n+kN}^{(n+kN)+N-1} I_j\right]\right) \\ &\leq \lim_{0 < m \rightarrow +\infty} (1 - \pi_i)^m \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

Therefore $\vartheta_1(n) \rightarrow +\infty$ P-a.s. as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and, since $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 < +\infty$ P-a.s., we have $\sum_{j \geq \vartheta_1(n)} \|x_{j+1} - x_j\|^2 \downarrow 0$ P-a.s. as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Thus,

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad 0 \leq \sum_{j \geq \vartheta_1(n)} \|x_{j+1} - x_j\|^2 \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_{j+1} - x_j\|^2 \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R}), \quad (5.11)$$

from which we deduce via [41, Theorem 2.6.1(b)] that $E \sum_{j \geq \vartheta_i(n)} \|x_{j+1} - x_j\|^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. On the other hand, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $mN \leq n < (m+1)N$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& E(n - \vartheta_i(n)) \\
&= \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} (n-l) P([i \in I_l]) P\left([i \notin \bigcup_{j=l+1}^n I_j]\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} (n-l) P\left([i \notin \bigcup_{j=l+1}^n I_j]\right) \\
&\leq N(n - mN) + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \sum_{l=kN}^{(k+1)N-1} (n-l) P\left([i \notin \bigcup_{j=l+1}^n I_j]\right) \\
&\leq N^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \sum_{l=kN}^{(k+1)N-1} (n-l) P\left([i \notin \bigcup_{j=(k+1)N}^{mN-1} I_j]\right) \\
&\leq N^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (n - kN) \sum_{l=kN}^{(k+1)N-1} (1 - \pi_i)^{m-k-1} \\
&= N^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (n - kN) N (1 - \pi_i)^{m-k-1} \\
&\leq N^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} ((m+1)N - kN) N (1 - \pi_i)^{m-k-1} \\
&= N^2 \left(1 + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (m+1-k) (1 - \pi_i)^{m-k-1}\right) \\
&= N^2 \left(1 + \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} (l+2) (1 - \pi_i)^l\right) \\
&= N^2 \left(1 + \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} l (1 - \pi_i)^l + \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} 2 (1 - \pi_i)^l\right) \\
&= N^2 \left(1 + (1 - \pi_i) \frac{1 - m(1 - \pi_i)^{m-1} + (m-1)(1 - \pi_i)^m}{\pi_i^2} + 2 \frac{1 - (1 - \pi_i)^m}{\pi_i}\right) \\
&= N^2 \left(1 + \frac{1 - \pi_i - m(1 - \pi_i)^m + (m-1)(1 - \pi_i)^{m+1}}{\pi_i^2} + \frac{2\pi_i + 2(1 - \pi_i)^{m+1} - 2(1 - \pi_i)^m}{\pi_i^2}\right) \\
&= N^2 \left(1 + \frac{(m+1)(1 - \pi_i)^{m+1} - (m+2)(1 - \pi_i)^m + 1 + \pi_i}{\pi_i^2}\right), \tag{5.12}
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\overline{\lim} E(n - \vartheta_i(n)) \leq N^2(1 + (1 + \pi_i)/\pi_i^2) < +\infty$. Thus, $E\|x_n - x_{\vartheta_i(n)}\| \leq E \sum_{j=\vartheta_i(n)}^n \|x_{j+1} - x_j\| \leq E(\sqrt{n+1 - \vartheta_i(n)} \sqrt{\sum_{j=\vartheta_i(n)}^n \|x_{j+1} - x_j\|^2}) \leq \sqrt{1 + E(n - \vartheta_i(n))} \sqrt{E \sum_{j=\vartheta_i(n)}^{+\infty} \|x_{j+1} - x_j\|^2} \rightarrow 0$. This confirms that $x_{\vartheta_i(n)} - x_n \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H)$. \square

Assumption 5.7. In the setting of Problem 5.1, set $\alpha = \min\{\alpha_i^e, \beta_k^e, \delta_k^e\}_{i \in I, k \in K}$, and let $\sigma \in]0, +\infty[$ and $\varepsilon \in]0, 1[$ be such that $\sigma > 1/(4\alpha)$ and $1/\varepsilon > \max\{\alpha_i^e + \chi + \sigma, \beta_k^e + \sigma, \delta_k^e + \sigma\}_{i \in I, k \in K}$, and suppose that the following are satisfied:

- [a] For every $i \in I$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma_{i,n} \in [\varepsilon, 1/(\alpha_i^e + \chi + \sigma)]$.

- [b] For every $k \in K$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu_{k,n} \in [\varepsilon, 1/(\beta_k^\ell + \sigma)]$, $v_{k,n} \in [\varepsilon, 1/(\delta_k^\ell + \sigma)]$, and $\sigma_{k,n} \in [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]$.
[c] For every $i \in I$, $x_{i,0} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H_i)$ and, for every $k \in K$, $\{y_{k,0}, z_{k,0}, v_{k,0}^*\} \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; G_k)$.

We now introduce our stochastic block-iterative algorithm. It differs from that of [12] in that the selection of the blocks of variables and operators to be activated at each iteration is random, and so is the relaxation strategy. In addition, the relaxation parameters need not be bounded by 2.

Algorithm 5.8. Consider the setting of Problem 5.1 and suppose that Assumptions 5.4 and 5.7 are in force. Let $\rho \in [2, +\infty[$ and iterate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{for } n = 0, 1, \dots \\
& \quad \text{for every } i \in I_n \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & l_{i,n}^* = Q_i x_{i,n} + R_i x_n + \sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* v_{k,n}^*; \\ & a_{i,n} = J_{Y_{i,n} A_i} (x_{i,n} + Y_{i,n} (s_i^* - l_{i,n}^* - C_i x_{i,n})); \\ & a_{i,n}^* = Y_{i,n}^{-1} (x_{i,n} - a_{i,n}) - l_{i,n}^* + Q_i a_{i,n}; \\ & \xi_{i,n} = \|a_{i,n} - x_{i,n}\|^2; \end{aligned} \right. \\
& \quad \text{for every } i \in I \setminus I_n \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & a_{i,n} = a_{i,n-1}; \quad a_{i,n}^* = a_{i,n-1}^*; \quad \xi_{i,n} = \xi_{i,n-1}; \end{aligned} \right. \\
& \quad \text{for every } k \in K_n \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & u_{k,n}^* = v_{k,n}^* - B_k^\ell y_{k,n}; \\ & w_{k,n}^* = v_{k,n}^* - D_k^\ell z_{k,n}; \\ & b_{k,n} = J_{\mu_{k,n} B_k^\ell} (y_{k,n} + \mu_{k,n} (u_{k,n}^* - B_k^\ell y_{k,n})); \\ & d_{k,n} = J_{v_{k,n} D_k^\ell} (z_{k,n} + v_{k,n} (w_{k,n}^* - D_k^\ell z_{k,n})); \\ & e_{k,n}^* = \sigma_{k,n} (\sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} x_{i,n} - y_{k,n} - z_{k,n} - r_k) + v_{k,n}^*; \\ & q_{k,n}^* = \mu_{k,n}^{-1} (y_{k,n} - b_{k,n}) + u_{k,n}^* + B_k^\ell b_{k,n} - e_{k,n}^*; \\ & t_{k,n}^* = v_{k,n}^{-1} (z_{k,n} - d_{k,n}) + w_{k,n}^* + D_k^\ell d_{k,n} - e_{k,n}^*; \\ & \eta_{k,n} = \|b_{k,n} - y_{k,n}\|^2 + \|d_{k,n} - z_{k,n}\|^2; \\ & e_{k,n} = r_k + b_{k,n} + d_{k,n} - \sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} a_{i,n}; \end{aligned} \right. \tag{5.13} \\
& \quad \text{for every } k \in K \setminus K_n \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & b_{k,n} = b_{k,n-1}; \quad d_{k,n} = d_{k,n-1}; \quad e_{k,n}^* = e_{k,n-1}^*; \quad q_{k,n}^* = q_{k,n-1}^*; \quad t_{k,n}^* = t_{k,n-1}^*; \\ & \eta_{k,n} = \eta_{k,n-1}; \quad e_{k,n} = r_k + b_{k,n} + d_{k,n} - \sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} a_{i,n}; \end{aligned} \right. \\
& \quad \text{for every } i \in I \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & p_{i,n}^* = a_{i,n}^* + R_i a_n + \sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* e_{k,n}^*; \\ & \Delta_n = -(4\alpha)^{-1} (\sum_{i \in I} \xi_{i,n} + \sum_{k \in K} \eta_{k,n}) + \sum_{i \in I} \langle x_{i,n} - a_{i,n} | p_{i,n}^* \rangle \\ & \quad + \sum_{k \in K} (\langle y_{k,n} - b_{k,n} | q_{k,n}^* \rangle + \langle z_{k,n} - d_{k,n} | t_{k,n}^* \rangle + \langle e_{k,n} | v_{k,n}^* - e_{k,n}^* \rangle); \\ & \theta_n = \frac{1_{[\Delta_n > 0]} \Delta_n}{\sum_{i \in I} \|p_{i,n}^*\|^2 + \sum_{k \in K} (\|q_{k,n}^*\|^2 + \|t_{k,n}^*\|^2 + \|e_{k,n}\|^2) + 1_{[\Delta_n \leq 0]}}; \\ & \text{take } \lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; [\varepsilon, \rho]) \\ & \text{for every } i \in I \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & x_{i,n+1} = x_{i,n} - \lambda_n \theta_n p_{i,n}^*; \end{aligned} \right. \\
& \quad \text{for every } k \in K \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & y_{k,n+1} = y_{k,n} - \lambda_n \theta_n q_{k,n}^*; \quad z_{k,n+1} = z_{k,n} - \lambda_n \theta_n t_{k,n}^*; \quad v_{k,n+1}^* = v_{k,n}^* - \lambda_n \theta_n e_{k,n}; \end{aligned} \right.
\end{aligned}$$

The convergence properties of Algorithm 5.8 are established in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.9. Consider the setting of Algorithm 5.8. Suppose that $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) > 0$ and that $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$. Then the following hold:

- (i) Let $i \in I$. Then $(x_{i,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ lies in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H_i)$ and $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E\|x_{i,n+1} - x_{i,n}\|^2 < +\infty$.

- (ii) Let $k \in K$. Then $(y_{k,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(z_{k,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $(v_{k,n}^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are sequences in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; G_k)$. Further, $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E \|y_{k,n+1} - y_{k,n}\|^2 < +\infty$, $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E \|z_{k,n+1} - z_{k,n}\|^2 < +\infty$, and $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E \|v_{k,n+1}^* - v_{k,n}^*\|^2 < +\infty$.
- (iii) Let $i \in I$ and $k \in K$. Then $x_{i,n} - a_{i,n} \xrightarrow{P} 0$, $y_{k,n} - b_{k,n} \xrightarrow{P} 0$, $z_{k,n} - d_{k,n} \xrightarrow{P} 0$, and $v_{k,n}^* - e_{k,n}^* \xrightarrow{P} 0$.
- (iv) There exist a \mathcal{P} -valued random variable \bar{x} and a \mathcal{D} -valued random variable \bar{v}^* such that, for every $i \in I$ and every $k \in K$, $x_{i,n} \rightarrow \bar{x}_i$ P-a.s., $a_{i,n} \rightarrow \bar{x}_i$ P-a.s., and $v_{k,n}^* \rightarrow \bar{v}_k^*$ P-a.s.

Proof. The results will be derived from Theorem 3.1 applied to $\underline{Z} = \text{zer } \underline{\mathcal{S}}$ in \mathbf{X} , following the general pattern of the deterministic proof of [12, Theorem 1]. We use the notation of Definition 5.2, as well as (5.5) and (5.6). Note that, since $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$, Proposition 5.3(iii) asserts that $\text{zer } \underline{\mathcal{S}} \neq \emptyset$. Let us show that (5.13) is a special case of (1.3). We define the random indices

$$(\forall i \in I)(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \vartheta_i(n) = \max\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid j \leq n \text{ and } i \in I_j\} \quad (5.14)$$

and

$$(\forall k \in K)(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \varrho_k(n) = \max\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid j \leq n \text{ and } k \in K_j\}. \quad (5.15)$$

It then follows from (5.13) that

$$(\forall i \in I)(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad a_{i,n} = a_{i,\vartheta_i(n)} \text{ P-a.s.}, \quad a_{i,n}^* = a_{i,\vartheta_i(n)}^* \text{ P-a.s.}, \quad \xi_{i,n} = \xi_{i,\vartheta_i(n)} \text{ P-a.s.}, \quad (5.16)$$

and

$$(\forall k \in K)(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} b_{k,n} = b_{k,\varrho_k(n)} \text{ P-a.s.}; & d_{k,n} = d_{k,\varrho_k(n)} \text{ P-a.s.}; & \eta_{k,n} = \eta_{k,\varrho_k(n)} \text{ P-a.s.}; \\ e_{k,n}^* = e_{k,\varrho_k(n)}^* \text{ P-a.s.}; & q_{k,n}^* = q_{k,\varrho_k(n)}^* \text{ P-a.s.}; & t_{k,n}^* = t_{k,\varrho_k(n)}^* \text{ P-a.s.} \end{cases} \quad (5.17)$$

To match the notation of Theorem 3.1, set

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} \underline{x}_n = (\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n, \mathbf{z}_n, \mathbf{v}_n^*); \\ \underline{\tilde{q}}_n = (\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n, \mathbf{z}_n, \mathbf{e}_n^*); \\ \underline{w}_n = (\mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{b}_n, \mathbf{d}_n, \mathbf{e}_n^*); \\ \underline{w}_n^* = (\mathbf{p}_n^* - (C_i x_{i,\vartheta_i(n)})_{i \in I}, \mathbf{q}_n^* - (B_k^c y_{k,\varrho_k(n)})_{k \in K}, \mathbf{t}_n^* - (D_k^c z_{k,\varrho_k(n)})_{k \in K}, \mathbf{e}_n); \\ \underline{q}_n = ((x_{i,\vartheta_i(n)})_{i \in I}, (y_{k,\varrho_k(n)})_{k \in K}, (z_{k,\varrho_k(n)})_{k \in K}, (e_{k,n}^*)_{k \in K}); \\ \underline{t}_n^* = (\mathbf{p}_n^*, \mathbf{q}_n^*, \mathbf{t}_n^*, \mathbf{e}_n); \\ (\underline{e}_n, \underline{e}_n^*, \underline{f}_n^*) = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}). \end{cases} \quad (5.18)$$

Then it follows from (3.1) that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $\underline{z} \in \text{zer } \underline{\mathcal{S}}$, $\varepsilon_n(\cdot, \underline{z}) = 0$ P-a.s. Next, we observe that, for every $i \in I$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (5.16), (5.14), (5.13), and [4, Proposition 23.2(ii)] imply that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{i,n}^* - C_i x_{i,\vartheta_i(n)} &= a_{i,\vartheta_i(n)}^* - C_i x_{i,\vartheta_i(n)} \\ &= Y_{i,\vartheta_i(n)}^{-1} (x_{i,\vartheta_i(n)} - a_{i,\vartheta_i(n)}) - l_{i,\vartheta_i(n)}^* - C_i x_{i,\vartheta_i(n)} + Q_i a_{i,\vartheta_i(n)} \\ &\in -S_i^* + A_i a_{i,\vartheta_i(n)} + Q_i a_{i,\vartheta_i(n)} \\ &= -S_i^* + A_i a_{i,n} + Q_i a_{i,n} \text{ P-a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

and, therefore, that

$$\begin{aligned} p_{i,n}^* - C_i x_{i,\vartheta_i(n)} &= a_{i,n}^* - C_i x_{i,\vartheta_i(n)} + R_i \mathbf{a}_n + \sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* e_{k,n}^* \\ &\in -S_i^* + A_i a_{i,n} + Q_i a_{i,n} + R_i \mathbf{a}_n + \sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* e_{k,n}^* \text{ P-a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

Likewise, we derive from (5.17), (5.15), (5.13), and [4, Proposition 23.2(ii)] that

$$(\forall k \in K)(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} q_{k,n}^* - B_k^\ell y_{k,\varrho_k(n)} \in B_k^m b_{k,n} + B_k^\ell b_{k,n} - e_{k,n}^* & \text{P-a.s.}; \\ t_{k,n}^* - D_k^\ell z_{k,\varrho_k(n)} \in D_k^m d_{k,n} + D_k^\ell d_{k,n} - e_{k,n}^* & \text{P-a.s.}; \\ e_{k,n} = r_k + b_{k,n} + d_{k,n} - \sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} a_{i,n} & \text{P-a.s.} \end{cases} \quad (5.21)$$

In turn, we derive from (5.18) and (5.5) that the sequence $(\underline{w}_n, \underline{w}_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ lies in $\text{gra } \underline{W}$ P-a.s. Next, using (5.18) and (5.6), we obtain, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_n^* = \underline{w}_n^* + \underline{C} \underline{q}_n$ P-a.s. Additionally, (5.13) and (5.16)–(5.18) yield

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \sum_{i \in I} \xi_{i,n} + \sum_{k \in K} \eta_{k,n} = \|\underline{w}_n - \underline{q}_n\|^2 \quad \text{P-a.s.} \quad (5.22)$$

Hence, in view of (5.13),

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \Delta_n = \langle \underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n \mid t_n^* \rangle - (4\alpha)^{-1} \|\underline{w}_n - \underline{q}_n\|^2 \quad \text{P-a.s.} \quad (5.23)$$

On the other hand,

$$(\forall i \in I)(\forall k \in K)(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \begin{cases} R_i, Q_i, B_k^\ell, D_k^\ell \text{ and } L_{ki} \text{ are Lipschitzian;} \\ C_i, B_k^\ell, \text{ and } D_k^\ell \text{ are cocoercive, hence Lipschitzian;} \\ J_{Y_i, n} A_i, J_{\mu_{k,n}} B_k^m, \text{ and } J_{\nu_{k,n}} D_k^m \text{ are 1-Lipschitzian.} \end{cases} \quad (5.24)$$

It therefore follows from Assumption 5.7[c], Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, and an inductive argument that the variables defined in (5.18) belong to $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \underline{X})$. Altogether, taking into account the assumptions, we have shown that (5.13) is a realization of (1.3). In turn, Theorem 3.1(iii)(c) asserts that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E \|\underline{x}_{n+1} - \underline{x}_n\|^2 < +\infty. \quad (5.25)$$

(i)–(ii): These follow from Theorem 3.1(ii), (5.25), and (5.18).

(iii)–(iv): Theorem 3.1(iii)(a) implies that $(\underline{x}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded P-a.s. Therefore, arguing as in the proof of [12, Theorem 1],

$$\left(\tilde{\underline{q}}_n \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \quad (\underline{w}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \quad \text{and} \quad (t_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \quad \text{are bounded P-a.s.} \quad (5.26)$$

As a result, (5.23) and Theorem 3.1(iii)(d) yield

$$\overline{\lim} \left(\langle \underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n \mid t_n^* \rangle - (4\alpha)^{-1} \|\underline{w}_n - \underline{q}_n\|^2 \right) = \overline{\lim} \Delta_n \leq 0 \quad \text{P-a.s.} \quad (5.27)$$

Now define

$$\underline{L}: \underline{H} \rightarrow \underline{G}: \underline{x} \mapsto \left(\sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} x_i \right)_{k \in K}, \quad \text{with adjoint } \underline{L}^*: \underline{G} \rightarrow \underline{H}: \underline{v}^* \mapsto \left(\sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* v_k^* \right)_{i \in I}, \quad (5.28)$$

and

$$\underline{U}: \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{X}: (\underline{x}, \underline{y}, \underline{z}, \underline{v}^*) \mapsto (\underline{L}^* \underline{v}^*, -\underline{v}^*, -\underline{v}^*, -\underline{L} \underline{x} + \underline{y} + \underline{z}). \quad (5.29)$$

Further, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$\begin{cases} (\forall i \in I) \quad F_{i,n} = Y_{i,\varrho_i(n)}^{-1} \text{Id} - Q_i; \\ (\forall k \in K) \quad S_{k,n} = \mu_{k,\varrho_k(n)}^{-1} \text{Id} - B_k^\ell; \quad T_{k,n} = \nu_{k,\varrho_k(n)}^{-1} \text{Id} - D_k^\ell; \\ \underline{F}_n: \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{X}: (\underline{x}, \underline{y}, \underline{z}, \underline{v}^*) \mapsto ((F_{i,n} x_i)_{i \in I}, (S_{k,n} y_k)_{k \in K}, (T_{k,n} z_k)_{k \in K}, (\sigma_{k,\varrho_k(n)}^{-1} v_k^*)_{k \in K}) \end{cases} \quad (5.30)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n = \left((x_{i,\vartheta_i(n)})_{i \in I}, (y_{k,\varrho_k(n)})_{k \in K}, (z_{k,\varrho_k(n)})_{k \in K}, (v_{k,\varrho_k(n)}^*)_{k \in K} \right); \\ \underline{\mathbf{v}}_n^* = \underline{\mathbf{F}}_n \mathbf{x}_n - \underline{\mathbf{F}}_n \mathbf{w}_n; \quad \underline{\mathbf{u}}_n^* = \underline{\mathbf{U}} \mathbf{w}_n - \underline{\mathbf{U}} \mathbf{x}_n; \\ \underline{\mathbf{r}}_n^* = ((R_i \mathbf{a}_n - R_i \mathbf{x}_n)_{i \in I}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}); \quad \tilde{\mathbf{r}}_n^* = ((R_i \mathbf{a}_n - R_i \mathbf{x}_{\vartheta_i(n)})_{i \in I}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}); \\ \underline{\mathbf{l}}_n^* = \left((-\sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* v_{k,\vartheta_i(n)}^*)_{i \in I}, (v_{k,\varrho_k(n)}^*)_{k \in K}, (v_{k,\varrho_k(n)}^*)_{k \in K}, (\sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} x_{i,\varrho_k(n)} - y_{k,\varrho_k(n)} - z_{k,\varrho_k(n)})_{k \in K} \right). \end{cases} \quad (5.31)$$

Assumptions [a]–[c] in Problem 5.1 and 5.7[a]&[b], together with Lemma 2.7, imply that

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \text{the operators} \quad \begin{cases} (F_{i,n})_{i \in I} \text{ are } (\chi + \sigma)\text{-strongly monotone;} \\ (S_{k,n})_{k \in K} \text{ and } (T_{k,n})_{k \in K} \text{ are } \sigma\text{-strongly monotone.} \end{cases} \quad (5.32)$$

Consequently, in view of (5.30), that there exists $\kappa \in]0, +\infty[$ such that

$$\text{the operators } (\underline{\mathbf{F}}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ are } \kappa\text{-Lipschitzian.} \quad (5.33)$$

Next, using the same arguments as in the proof of [12, Theorem 1], we obtain

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \mathbf{t}_n^* = \underline{\mathbf{F}}_n \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n - \underline{\mathbf{F}}_n \mathbf{w}_n + \tilde{\mathbf{r}}_n^* + \underline{\mathbf{l}}_n^* + \underline{\mathbf{U}} \mathbf{w}_n \text{ P-a.s.} \quad (5.34)$$

We also observe that, in view of (5.25), (5.14), (5.15), and Assumption 5.4, Proposition 5.6 and Lemma 2.1 imply that

$$(\forall i \in I)(\forall k \in K) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_{\vartheta_i(n)} - \mathbf{x}_n \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{0}; \quad \mathbf{x}_{\varrho_k(n)} - \mathbf{x}_n \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{0}; \\ \mathbf{v}_{\vartheta_i(n)}^* - \mathbf{v}_n^* \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{0}; \quad \mathbf{y}_{\varrho_k(n)} - \mathbf{y}_n \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{0}; \\ \mathbf{z}_{\varrho_k(n)} - \mathbf{z}_n \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{0}; \quad \mathbf{v}_{\varrho_k(n)}^* - \mathbf{v}_n^* \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{0}. \end{cases} \quad (5.35)$$

Thus, (5.31), (5.28), and (5.29) yield

$$\underline{\mathbf{l}}_n^* + \underline{\mathbf{U}} \mathbf{x}_n \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{0}, \quad (5.36)$$

while assumption [e] in Problem 5.1 gives

$$(\forall i \in I) \quad \|R_i \mathbf{x}_{\vartheta_i(n)} - R_i \mathbf{x}_n\| \leq \chi \|\mathbf{x}_{\vartheta_i(n)} - \mathbf{x}_n\| \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (5.37)$$

On the other hand, (5.33), (5.31), and (5.35) yield

$$\|\underline{\mathbf{F}}_n \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n - \underline{\mathbf{F}}_n \mathbf{x}_n\| \leq \kappa \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n - \mathbf{x}_n\| \xrightarrow{P} 0 \quad (5.38)$$

which, combined with (5.34), (5.31), (5.36), and (5.37) leads to

$$\mathbf{t}_n^* - (\underline{\mathbf{v}}_n^* + \underline{\mathbf{r}}_n^* + \underline{\mathbf{u}}_n^*) = \underline{\mathbf{l}}_n^* + \underline{\mathbf{U}} \mathbf{x}_n + \underline{\mathbf{F}}_n \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n - \underline{\mathbf{F}}_n \mathbf{x}_n + \tilde{\mathbf{r}}_n^* - \underline{\mathbf{r}}_n^* \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{0}. \quad (5.39)$$

Additionally, (5.18) and (5.35) yield

$$\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_n - \mathbf{q}_n \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{0}. \quad (5.40)$$

Therefore, by Cauchy–Schwarz and (5.26),

$$|\langle \mathbf{w}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_n | \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_n - \mathbf{q}_n \rangle| \leq \left(\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \|\mathbf{w}_m\| + \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_m\| \right) \|\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_n - \mathbf{q}_n\| \xrightarrow{P} 0 \quad (5.41)$$

while, by (5.39),

$$|\langle \underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n | \underline{t}_n^* - (\underline{v}_n^* + \underline{r}_n^* + \underline{u}_n^*) \rangle| \leq \left(\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \|\underline{x}_m\| + \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \|\underline{w}_m\| \right) \|\underline{t}_n^* - (\underline{v}_n^* + \underline{r}_n^* + \underline{u}_n^*)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (5.42)$$

However, it follows from (5.29) and assumption [d] in Problem 5.1 that \underline{U} is linear and bounded, with $\underline{U}^* = -\underline{U}$. It then results from (5.31) that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\langle \underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n | \underline{u}_n^* \rangle = 0$ P-a.s. On the other hand, note that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n | \underline{t}_n^* \rangle - (4\alpha)^{-1} \|\underline{w}_n - \underline{q}_n\|^2 \\ &= \langle \underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n | \underline{v}_n^* + \underline{r}_n^* + \underline{u}_n^* \rangle + \langle \underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n | \underline{t}_n^* - (\underline{v}_n^* + \underline{r}_n^* + \underline{u}_n^*) \rangle - (4\alpha)^{-1} \|\underline{w}_n - \underline{q}_n\|^2 \\ &= \langle \underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n | \underline{v}_n^* + \underline{r}_n^* \rangle + \langle \underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n | \underline{t}_n^* - (\underline{v}_n^* + \underline{r}_n^* + \underline{u}_n^*) \rangle \\ &\quad - (4\alpha)^{-1} \left(\|\underline{w}_n - \underline{q}_n\|^2 + 2\langle \underline{w}_n - \underline{q}_n | \underline{q}_n - \underline{q}_n \rangle + \|\underline{q}_n - \underline{q}_n\|^2 \right) \text{ P-a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (5.43)$$

Moreover, as in [12, Equation (95)], it follows from (5.31), (5.18), (5.30), (5.32), Assumption 5.7[b], and assumption [e] in Problem 5.1 that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n | \underline{v}_n^* + \underline{r}_n^* \rangle - (4\alpha)^{-1} \|\underline{w}_n - \underline{q}_n\|^2 \\ & \geq (\sigma - (4\alpha)^{-1}) (\|\underline{x}_n - \underline{a}_n\|^2 + \|\underline{y}_n - \underline{b}_n\|^2 + \|\underline{z}_n - \underline{d}_n\|^2) + \varepsilon \|\underline{v}_n^* - \underline{e}_n^*\|^2 \text{ P-a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let us define

$$\begin{cases} \xi_n = (\sigma - (4\alpha)^{-1}) (\|\underline{x}_n - \underline{a}_n\|^2 + \|\underline{y}_n - \underline{b}_n\|^2 + \|\underline{z}_n - \underline{d}_n\|^2) + \varepsilon \|\underline{v}_n^* - \underline{e}_n^*\|^2; \\ \chi_n = \langle \underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n | \underline{t}_n^* - (\underline{v}_n^* + \underline{r}_n^* + \underline{u}_n^*) \rangle - (4\alpha)^{-1} (2\langle \underline{w}_n - \underline{q}_n | \underline{q}_n - \underline{q}_n \rangle + \|\underline{q}_n - \underline{q}_n\|^2). \end{cases} \quad (5.45)$$

Then $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \xi_n \geq 0$ P-a.s. Moreover, (5.43) and (5.44) imply that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\xi_n + \chi_n \leq \Delta_n$ P-a.s. In addition, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_n \leq 0$ P-a.s. by (5.27) and $\chi_n \xrightarrow{P} 0$ by (5.40)–(5.42). Therefore, in view of Lemma 2.3, $\xi_n \xrightarrow{P} 0$ and therefore

$$\underline{x}_n - \underline{a}_n \xrightarrow{P} \underline{0}, \quad \underline{y}_n - \underline{b}_n \xrightarrow{P} \underline{0}, \quad \underline{z}_n - \underline{d}_n \xrightarrow{P} \underline{0}, \quad \underline{v}_n^* - \underline{e}_n^* \xrightarrow{P} \underline{0}, \quad (5.46)$$

which establishes (iii). In turn, (5.18) and (5.33) force

$$\underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n \xrightarrow{P} \underline{0} \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|\underline{F}_n \underline{x}_n - \underline{F}_n \underline{w}_n\| \leq \kappa \|\underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n\|. \quad (5.47)$$

Hence,

$$\underline{F}_n \underline{x}_n - \underline{F}_n \underline{w}_n \xrightarrow{P} \underline{0}. \quad (5.48)$$

Likewise, (5.35) yields $\underline{w}_n - \underline{q}_n \xrightarrow{P} \underline{0}$. Further, we infer from (5.31), (5.46), and Problem 5.1[e] that

$$\|\underline{r}_n^*\|^2 = \|\underline{R} \underline{a}_n - \underline{R} \underline{x}_n\|^2 \leq \chi^2 \|\underline{a}_n - \underline{x}_n\|^2 \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (5.49)$$

As a result, it follows from (5.31), (5.39), (5.48), and (5.49) that

$$\underline{t}_n^* = \left(\underline{t}_n^* - (\underline{v}_n^* + \underline{r}_n^* + \underline{u}_n^*) \right) + (\underline{F}_n \underline{x}_n - \underline{F}_n \underline{w}_n) + \underline{U}(\underline{w}_n - \underline{x}_n) + \underline{r}_n^* \xrightarrow{P} \underline{0}. \quad (5.50)$$

Altogether,

$$\underline{x}_n - \underline{w}_n - \underline{e}_n \xrightarrow{P} \underline{0}, \quad \underline{w}_n + \underline{e}_n - \underline{q}_n \xrightarrow{P} \underline{0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{w}_n^* + \underline{e}_n^* + \underline{C} \underline{q}_n \xrightarrow{P} \underline{0} \quad (5.51)$$

and Theorem 3.1(iii)(f) therefore guarantees that there exists a zero \mathbb{S} -valued random variable $\bar{\underline{x}} = (\bar{\underline{x}}, \bar{\underline{y}}, \bar{\underline{z}}, \bar{\underline{v}}^*)$ such that $\underline{x}_n \rightarrow \bar{\underline{x}}$ P-a.s. This and (5.46) imply that, for every $i \in I$ and every $k \in K$, $\underline{x}_{i,n} \rightarrow \bar{\underline{x}}_i$ P-a.s., $\underline{a}_{i,n} \rightarrow \bar{\underline{x}}_i$ P-a.s., and $\underline{v}_{k,n}^* \rightarrow \bar{\underline{v}}_k^*$ P-a.s. Finally, Proposition 5.3(ii) asserts that $\bar{\underline{x}}$ solves (5.1) P-a.s. and that $\bar{\underline{v}}^*$ solves (5.2) P-a.s. \square

Remark 5.10. Here are some observations pertaining to Theorem 5.9.

- (i) There does not exist any result on stochastic algorithms for solving Problem 5.1 with random block selections or random relaxations. In the case of deterministic relaxations $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $]0, 2[$ and deterministic blocks selections (see Example 5.5(i)), Theorem 5.9 appears in [12, Theorem 1(iv)].
- (ii) For notational simplicity we have not introduced stochastic errors in the evaluations of the single-valued operators and the resolvents in Algorithm 5.8. As a result, we implemented Theorem 3.1 with $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})(\forall \underline{z} \in \text{zer } \underline{\mathcal{S}}) \varepsilon_n(\cdot, \underline{z}) = 0$ P-a.s. Such errors can be introduced under suitable summability conditions to guarantee that $(\forall \underline{z} \in \text{zer } \underline{\mathcal{S}}) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E \varepsilon_n(\cdot, \underline{z}) E \lambda_n < +\infty$.
- (iii) The convergence result invokes Theorem 3.1(iii)(f), which requires Euclidean spaces. Note that we cannot use Theorem 3.1(iii)(e), which would provide weak convergence in general Hilbert spaces, because the convergences in (5.51) are only in probability and not almost sure.

5.3. Application to multivariate minimization

We consider a multivariate composite minimization problem.

Problem 5.11. Let $(H_i)_{i \in I}$ and $(G_k)_{k \in K}$ be finite families of Euclidean spaces with respective direct sums $\mathbf{H} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} H_i$ and $\mathbf{G} = \bigoplus_{k \in K} G_k$. Denote by $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in I}$ a generic element in \mathbf{H} . For every $i \in I$ and every $k \in K$, let $f_i \in \Gamma_0(H_i)$, let $\alpha_i \in]0, +\infty[$, let $\varphi_i: H_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex and differentiable with a $(1/\alpha_i)$ -Lipschitzian gradient, let $g_k \in \Gamma_0(G_k)$, let $h_k \in \Gamma_0(G_k)$, let $\beta_k \in]0, +\infty[$, let $\psi_k: G_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex and differentiable with a $(1/\beta_k)$ -Lipschitzian gradient, and suppose that $L_{ki}: H_i \rightarrow G_k$ is linear. In addition, let $\chi \in [0, +\infty[$ and let $\Theta: \mathbf{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex and differentiable with a χ -Lipschitzian gradient. The objective is to

$$\underset{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{H}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \Theta(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i \in I} (f_i(x_i) + \varphi_i(x_i)) + \sum_{k \in K} ((g_k + \psi_k) \square h_k) \left(\sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} x_i \right). \quad (5.52)$$

We denote by \mathcal{P} the set of solutions to (5.52).

Algorithm 5.12. Consider the setting of Problem 5.11 and suppose that Assumptions 5.4 and 5.7 are in force with, for every $i \in I$ and every $k \in K$, $\alpha_i^e = \alpha_i$, $\beta_k^e = \beta_k$, $\alpha_i^e = \beta_k^e = \delta_k^e = \delta_k^e = 0$, and $\nabla_i \Theta$ denotes the partial derivative of Θ relative to H_i . Iterate as in (5.13), where the following adjustments are made

$$\begin{cases} J_{Y_i, n} A_i = \text{prox}_{Y_i, n f_i}; & C_i = \nabla \varphi_i; & Q_i = 0; & R_i = \nabla_i \Theta; & s_i^* = 0; \\ J_{\mu_{k, n} B_k^m} = \text{prox}_{\mu_{k, n} g_k}; & B_k^e = \nabla \psi_k; & J_{\nu_{k, n} D_k^m} = \text{prox}_{\nu_{k, n} h_k}; & B_k^e = D_k^e = D_k^e = 0; & r_k = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.53)$$

Corollary 5.13. Consider the setting of Algorithm 5.12. Suppose that $\inf E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) > 0$ and that a Kuhn–Tucker point $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{v}}^*) \in \mathbf{H} \times \mathbf{G}$ exists, that is,

$$(\forall i \in I)(\forall k \in K) \quad \begin{cases} - \sum_{j \in K} L_{ji} \bar{v}_j^* \in \partial f_i(\bar{x}_i) + \nabla \varphi_i(\bar{x}_i) + \nabla_i \Theta(\bar{\mathbf{x}}); \\ \sum_{j \in I} L_{kj} \bar{x}_j \in \partial(g_k^* \square \psi_k^*)(\bar{v}_k^*) + \partial h_k^*(\bar{v}_k^*). \end{cases} \quad (5.54)$$

Then there exists a \mathcal{P} -valued random variable $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ such that, for every $i \in I$, $x_{i, n} \rightarrow \bar{x}_i$ P-a.s.

§6. Stochastic block-iterative Kuhn–Tucker projective splitting

We revisit a multivariate primal-dual inclusion problem studied in [18] and randomize the algorithm proposed there to solve it. See also [17, Section 9] and [27] for further discussions on the deterministic setting.

Problem 6.1. Let $(H_i)_{i \in I}$ and $(G_k)_{k \in K}$ be finite families of Euclidean spaces with respective direct sums $\mathbf{H} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} H_i$ and $\mathbf{G} = \bigoplus_{k \in K} G_k$. Denote by $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in I}$ a generic element in \mathbf{H} . For every $i \in I$ and every $k \in K$, $A_i: H_i \rightarrow 2^{H_i}$ is maximally monotone, $B_k: G_k \rightarrow 2^{G_k}$ is maximally monotone, and $L_{ki}: H_i \rightarrow G_k$ is linear. The objective is to solve the primal problem

$$\text{find } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbf{H} \text{ such that } (\forall i \in I) \quad 0 \in A_i \bar{x}_i + \sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* \left(B_k \left(\sum_{j \in I} L_{kj} \bar{x}_j \right) \right) \quad (6.1)$$

and the associated dual problem

$$\text{find } \bar{\mathbf{v}}^* \in \mathbf{G} \text{ such that } (\exists \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{H}) \quad \begin{cases} (\forall i \in I) & x_i \in A_i^{-1} \left(- \sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* \bar{v}_k^* \right); \\ (\forall k \in K) & \sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} x_i \in B_k^{-1} \bar{v}_k^*. \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

Finally, \mathcal{P} denotes the set of solutions to (6.1) and \mathcal{D} the set of solutions to (6.2).

The Kuhn–Tucker operator associated with Problem 6.1 is [17, Equation (9.18)]

$$\mathbf{W}: \mathbf{H} \oplus \mathbf{G} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbf{H} \oplus \mathbf{G}}: (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}^*) \mapsto \left(\bigtimes_{i \in I} \left(A_i x_i + \sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* v_k^* \right), \bigtimes_{k \in K} \left(B_k^{-1} v_k^* - \sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} x_i \right) \right) \quad (6.3)$$

As shown in [17, Lemma 9.7(ii)], $\text{zer } \mathbf{W} \subset \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{D}$. We can therefore approach Problem 6.1 as an instance of Problem 1.1 with $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{0}$ and then α can be selected arbitrarily large. By applying Theorem 3.1 in this context, we obtain a randomized version of the deterministic algorithm of [18], which relied on Algorithm 1.2. To this end, let us make the following assumption.

Assumption 6.2. In the setting of Problem 6.1, set $\varepsilon \in]0, 1[$ and suppose that for every $i \in I$, every $k \in K$, and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma_{i,n} \in [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]$, $\mu_{k,n} \in [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]$, $x_{i,0} \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; H_i)$, and $v_{k,0}^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; G_k)$.

Algorithm 6.3. Consider the setting of Problem 6.1 and suppose that Assumptions 5.4 and 6.2 are in force. Let $\rho \in [2, +\infty[$ and iterate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{for } n = 0, 1, \dots \\
& \quad \text{for every } i \in I_n \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & l_{i,n}^* = \sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* v_{k,n}^*; \\ & a_{i,n} = J_{Y_{i,n} A_i}(x_{i,n} - Y_{i,n} l_{i,n}^*); \quad a_{i,n}^* = Y_{i,n}^{-1}(x_{i,n} - a_{i,n}) - l_{i,n}^*; \end{aligned} \right. \\
& \quad \text{for every } i \in I \setminus I_n \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & a_{i,n} = a_{i,n-1}; \quad a_{i,n}^* = a_{i,n-1}^*; \end{aligned} \right. \\
& \quad \text{for every } k \in K_n \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & l_{k,n} = \sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} x_{i,n}; \\ & b_{k,n} = J_{\mu_{k,n} B_k}(l_{k,n} + \mu_{k,n} v_{k,n}^*); \quad b_{k,n}^* = v_{k,n}^* + \mu_{k,n}^{-1}(l_{k,n} - b_{k,n}); \end{aligned} \right. \\
& \quad \text{for every } k \in K \setminus K_n \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & b_{k,n} = b_{k,n-1}; \quad b_{k,n}^* = b_{k,n-1}^*; \end{aligned} \right. \\
& \quad \text{for every } i \in I \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & t_{i,n}^* = a_{i,n}^* + \sum_{k \in K} L_{ki}^* b_{k,n}^*; \end{aligned} \right. \tag{6.4} \\
& \quad \text{for every } k \in K \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & t_{k,n} = b_{k,n}^* + \sum_{i \in I} L_{ki} a_{i,n}^*; \end{aligned} \right. \\
& \quad \Delta_n = \sum_{i \in I} (\langle x_{i,n} | t_{i,n}^* \rangle - \langle a_{i,n} | a_{i,n}^* \rangle) + \sum_{k \in K} (\langle t_{k,n} | v_{k,n}^* \rangle + \langle b_{k,n} | b_{k,n}^* \rangle); \\
& \quad \theta_n = \frac{1_{[\Delta_n > 0]} \Delta_n}{\sum_{i \in I} \|t_{i,n}^*\|^2 + \sum_{k \in K} \|t_{k,n}\|^2 + 1_{[\Delta_n \leq 0]}}; \\
& \quad \text{take } \lambda_n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; [\varepsilon, \rho]) \\
& \quad \text{for every } i \in I \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & x_{i,n+1} = x_{i,n} - \lambda_n \theta_n t_{i,n}^*; \end{aligned} \right. \\
& \quad \text{for every } k \in K \\
& \quad \quad \left| \begin{aligned} & v_{k,n+1}^* = v_{k,n}^* - \lambda_n \theta_n t_{k,n}. \end{aligned} \right.
\end{aligned}$$

The convergence properties of Algorithm 6.3 are established in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.4. Consider the setting of Algorithm 6.3. Suppose that $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$ and $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(\lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)) > 0$. Then there exist a \mathcal{P} -valued random variable \bar{x} and a \mathcal{D} -valued random variable \bar{v}^* such that, for every $i \in I$ and every $k \in K$, $x_{i,n} \rightarrow \bar{x}_i$ P-a.s. and $v_{k,n}^* \rightarrow \bar{v}_k^*$ P-a.s.

Proof. (Sketch) We apply Theorem 3.1 to find a zero $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}^*)$ of \mathbf{W} following the deterministic pattern of the proof of [18, Theorem 13] and using probabilistic arguments made in the proof of Theorem 5.9, which shares the same Assumption 5.4 and involves a more sophisticated version of Assumption 6.2. \square

Remark 6.5. We complement Theorem 6.4 with the following observations.

- (i) In the case of deterministic relaxations $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $]0, 2[$ and deterministic blocks selection, Theorem 6.4 appears in [18, Theorem 13].
- (ii) A stochastic block-iterative algorithm for solving Problem 6.1 was proposed in [21, Corollary 5.3], with almost sure convergence of its iterates. This algorithm involves deterministic relaxations in $]0, 2[$ and necessitates inversions to handle the linear operators. In the case when I is a singleton, further algorithms with the same features were proposed in [19]. The algorithm of [37, Proposition 4.6] also guarantees almost sure convergence of the iterates but it requires knowledge of the norms of linear operators. The same comments apply to the algorithm of [13, Theorem 2.1 and Algorithm 3.1], which considers the minimization case with I as a singleton. Additionally, none of these prior works show convergence in L^2 , nor can they benefit from adaptive strategies as in Assumption 5.4 since their block-selection distributions remain constant throughout the iterations.

- (iii) As in Remark 5.10, stochastic errors can be introduced in the evaluations of the resolvents in Algorithm 6.3.

References

- [1] G. Alduncin, Multidomain optimal control of variational subpotential mixed evolution inclusions, *Appl. Math. Optim.*, vol. 88, art. 35, 2023.
- [2] H. Attouch, L. M. Briceño-Arias, and P. L. Combettes, A strongly convergent primal-dual method for nonoverlapping domain decomposition, *Numer. Math.*, vol. 133, pp. 433–470, 2016.
- [3] F. Bach, R. Jenatton, J. Mairal, and G. Obozinski, Optimization with sparsity-inducing penalties, *Found. Trends Machine Learn.*, vol. 4, pp. 1–106, 2012.
- [4] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, 2nd ed. Springer, New York, 2017.
- [5] H. Brézis and P. L. Lions, Produits infinis de résolvantes, *Israel J. Math.*, vol. 29, pp. 329–345, 1978.
- [6] L. M. Briceño-Arias, G. Chierchia, E. Chouzenoux, and J.-C. Pesquet, A random block-coordinate Douglas-Rachford splitting method with low computational complexity for binary logistic regression, *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, vol. 72, pp. 707–726, 2019.
- [7] L. M. Briceño-Arias and D. Davis, Forward-backward-half forward algorithm for solving monotone inclusions, *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 28, pp. 2839–2871, 2018.
- [8] L. M. Briceño-Arias, D. Kalise, and F. J. Silva, Proximal methods for stationary mean field games with local couplings, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 56, pp. 801–836, 2018.
- [9] M. N. Bui, A decomposition method for solving multicommodity network equilibria, *Oper. Res. Lett.*, vol. 50, pp. 40–44, 2022.
- [10] M. N. Bui and P. L. Combettes, Warped proximal iterations for monotone inclusions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, vol. 491, art. 124315, 2020.
- [11] M. N. Bui and P. L. Combettes, Analysis and numerical solution of a modular convex Nash equilibrium problem, *J. Convex Anal.*, vol. 29, pp. 1007–1021, 2022.
- [12] M. N. Bui and P. L. Combettes, Multivariate monotone inclusions in saddle form, *Math. Oper. Res.*, vol. 47, pp. 1082–1109, 2022.
- [13] A. Chambolle, C. Delplancke, M. J. Ehrhardt, C.-B. Schönlieb, and J. Tang, Stochastic primal-dual hybrid gradient algorithm with adaptive step sizes, *J. Math. Imaging Vision*, vol. 66, pp. 294–313, 2024.
- [14] A. Chambolle and T. Pock, A first-order primal-dual algorithm for convex problems with applications to imaging, *J. Math. Imaging Vision*, vol. 40, pp. 120–145, 2011.
- [15] P. L. Combettes, Iterative construction of the resolvent of a sum of maximal monotone operators, *J. Convex Anal.*, vol. 16, pp. 727–748, 2009.
- [16] P. L. Combettes, Systems of structured monotone inclusions: Duality, algorithms, and applications, *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 23, pp. 2420–2447, 2013.
- [17] P. L. Combettes, The geometry of monotone operator splitting methods, *Acta Numer.*, vol. 33, pp. 487–632, 2024.
- [18] P. L. Combettes and J. Eckstein, Asynchronous block-iterative primal-dual decomposition methods for monotone inclusions, *Math. Program.*, vol. B168, pp. 645–672, 2018.
- [19] P. L. Combettes and J. I. Madariaga, Almost-surely convergent randomly activated monotone operator splitting methods, *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, vol. 18, pp. 2177–2205, 2025.
- [20] P. L. Combettes and J. I. Madariaga, A geometric framework for stochastic iterations, arxiv, 2025.
<https://arxiv.org/pdf/2504.02761>
- [21] P. L. Combettes and J.-C. Pesquet, Stochastic quasi-Fejér block-coordinate fixed point iterations with random sweeping, *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 25, pp. 1221–1248, 2015.

- [22] P. L. Combettes and J.-C. Pesquet, Deep neural network structures solving variational inequalities, *Set-Valued Var. Anal.*, vol. 28, pp. 491–518, 2020.
- [23] P. L. Combettes and B. C. Vũ, Variable metric forward-backward splitting with applications to monotone inclusions in duality, *Optimization*, vol. 63, pp. 1289–1318, 2014.
- [24] P. L. Combettes and I. Yamada, Compositions and convex combinations of averaged nonexpansive operators, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, vol. 425, pp. 55–70, 2015.
- [25] L. Condat, A primal-dual splitting method for convex optimization involving Lipschitzian, proximable and linear composite terms, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, vol. 158, pp. 460–479, 2013.
- [26] D. Davis and W. Yin, A three-operator splitting scheme and its optimization applications, *Set-Valued Var. Anal.*, vol. 25, pp. 829–858, 2017.
- [27] J. Eckstein, A simplified form of block-iterative operator splitting and an asynchronous algorithm resembling the multi-block alternating direction method of multipliers, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, vol. 173, pp. 155–182, 2017.
- [28] J. Eckstein and D. P. Bertsekas, On the Douglas–Rachford splitting method and the proximal point algorithm for maximal monotone operators, *Math. Program.*, vol. 55, pp. 293–318, 1992.
- [29] J. Eckstein, J.-P. Watson, and D. L. Woodruff, Projective hedging algorithms for multistage stochastic programming, supporting distributed and asynchronous implementation, *Oper. Res.*, vol. 73, pp. 311–324, 2025.
- [30] P. Giselsson, Nonlinear forward-backward splitting with projection correction, *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 31, pp. 2199–2226, 2021.
- [31] E. G. Gol’shtein and N. V. Tret’yakov, Modified Lagrangians in convex programming and their generalizations, *Math. Program. Studies*, vol. 10, pp. 86–97, 1979.
- [32] M. Ledoux and M. Talagrand, *Probability in Banach Spaces: Isoperimetry and Processes*. Springer, New York, 1991.
- [33] J. Lieutaud, Approximations d’opérateurs monotones par des méthodes de splitting, in *Theory and Applications of Monotone Operators* (A. Ghizzetti, ed.), Edizioni Oderisi, pp. 259–264, 1969.
- [34] B. Martinet, Régularisation d’inéquations variationnelles par approximations successives, *Rev. Fr. Inform. Rech. Oper.*, vol. 4, pp. 154–158, 1970.
- [35] B. Mercier, *Topics in Finite Element Solution of Elliptic Problems* (Lectures on Mathematics, no. 63). Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay, 1979.
- [36] L. Pavel, On operator theory and applications in game theory, *Annu. Rev. Control Robot. Autonom. Syst.*, published online 2025-10-08.
- [37] J.-C. Pesquet and A. Repetti, A class of randomized primal-dual algorithms for distributed optimization, *J. Nonlinear Convex Anal.*, vol. 16, pp. 2453–2490, 2015.
- [38] H. Raguet, A note on the forward-Douglas-Rachford splitting for monotone inclusion and convex optimization, *Optim. Lett.*, vol. 13, pp. 717–740, 2019.
- [39] R. T. Rockafellar, Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 14, pp. 877–898, 1976.
- [40] R. T. Rockafellar, Monotone relations and network equilibrium, in: *Variational Inequalities and Network Equilibrium Problems*, (F. Giannessi and A. Maugeri, eds.), pp. 271–288. Plenum Press, New York, 1995.
- [41] A. N. Shiryaev, *Probability–1*, 3rd ed. Springer, New York, 2016.
- [42] J. E. Spingarn, Partial inverse of a monotone operator, *Appl. Math. Optim.*, vol. 10, pp. 247–265, 1983.
- [43] P. Tseng, Applications of a splitting algorithm to decomposition in convex programming and variational inequalities, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 29, pp. 119–138, 1991.
- [44] P. Tseng, A modified forward-backward splitting method for maximal monotone mappings, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 38, pp. 431–446, 2000.
- [45] B. C. Vũ, A splitting algorithm for dual monotone inclusions involving cocoercive operators, *Adv. Comput. Math.*, vol. 38, pp. 667–681, 2013.