

Research on the descent direction of prediction correction algorithms for pseudo-convex/convex optimization problems^{*}

Ting Li^a, Deren Han^a, Tanxing Wang^b and Xingju Cai^{b,*}

^a*School of Mathematical Sciences, LMIB, Beihang University, Beijing, 100191, China*

^b*School of Mathematical Sciences, Key Laboratory for NSLSCS, Ministry of Education, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, 210023 China*

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Prediction correction algorithm
Judiciously adjustment coefficient
Adaptive stepsize
Discrete differential equations
Trapezoidal formula

ABSTRACT

Prediction-correction algorithms are a highly effective class of methods for solving pseudo-convex optimization problems. The descent direction of these algorithms can be viewed as an adjustment to the gradient direction based on the prediction step. This paper investigates the adjustment coefficients of these descent directions and offers explanations from the perspective of differential equations. Unlike existing algorithms where the adjustment coefficient is always set to 1, we establish that the range of the adjustment coefficient lies within $(1/2, 1]$ for pseudo-convex optimization problems, and $[0, 1]$ for convex optimization problems. We also provide rigorous convergence proofs for these proposed algorithms. Numerical experiment results show that the algorithms perform best when the value of the adjustment coefficient makes the algorithm approach or equal to those in differential equations with higher-order global discrete error.

1. Introduction

This paper first focuses on the study of pseudo-convex optimization problems, which are more general than convex optimization problems. For instance, fractional programming problems, commonly encountered in fields such as wireless communications, economics, management, information theory, optics, graph theory, and computer science [1, 2, 3, 4, 5], are often pseudo-convex rather than convex optimization problems [6]. Directly developing numerical algorithms for pseudo-convex optimization problems can circumvent the complexities and potential errors associated with transforming the model into a convex problem [7].

Prediction-correction algorithms are a highly effective class of methods for solving pseudo-convex optimization problems [8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. In this paper, we express the descent direction of prediction-correction algorithms as an adjustment of the gradient direction using information from the prediction step. We investigate the range and the optimal value of the adjustment coefficient. In many existing well-performing algorithms, the adjustment coefficient is typically fixed at 1, such as the extra-gradient algorithm [13, 14], the improved extra-gradient algorithm [15], the projection contraction algorithm [11], and the forward-backward algorithm [16]. This paper addresses the question: if this coefficient changes, what would be the range of the coefficient and which one is the most efficient? We provide an answer and offer the convergence analysis. We highlight that changing the adjustment coefficient effectively rotates the descent direction and provide an illustrative figure for better understanding. Additionally, considering that adaptive step sizes can significantly improve the convergence speed of the algorithm [15, 17, 18], we also employ the line search strategies for the step sizes in the proposed algorithms.

In recent years, there has been growing interest in the relationship between differential equations and optimization problems. Scholars have already mapped many optimization algorithms to different discrete forms of differential equations [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24]. To provide a deeper theoretical understanding of the proposed algorithms, we explain several specific adjustment coefficients from the perspective of discrete differential equations.

Some pseudo-convex models can be conveniently and efficiently transformed into convex models using techniques such as the Charnes-Cooper transform and Dinkelbachs transform in fractional programming problems [7]. For the resulting convex optimization problems, we design a new prediction-correction algorithm where the correction step

^{*}This research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos.12131004, 12471290, 12126603), Grant 2021YFA1003600, Scientific and Technological Innovation Project of China Academy of Chinese Medical Sciences, Grant No.CI2023C064YLL.

^{*}Corresponding author

✉ liting_math@buaa.edu.cn (T. Li); handr@buaa.edu.cn (D. Han); wangtanxing2021@163.com (T. Wang);
caixingju@njnu.edu.cn (X. Cai)
ORCID(s): 0009-0009-4142-3492 (T. Li)

can have a different step size from the prediction step, provided that the adjustment coefficient can also be modified. We explain that several specific adjustment coefficients in this algorithm are also closely related to methods in discrete differential equations.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- By considering the descent direction of the prediction-correction algorithm as an adjustment to the gradient direction, we propose new prediction-correction algorithms that allow for altering the adjustment coefficient. We illustrate through a figure that modifying the adjustment coefficient essentially rotates the descent direction. From the perspective of discrete differential equations, we explain that when the adjustment coefficient is $\frac{1}{2}$, the algorithm corresponds to the trapezoidal formula, which has a higher-order global discrete error. This also provides an explanation for the optimal adjustment coefficient.
- We establish that the range of the adjustment coefficient lies within $(1/2, 1]$ for pseudo-convex optimization problems, and $[0, 1]$ for convex optimization problems. We also provide rigorous convergence proofs for these proposed algorithms.
- The numerical experiment demonstrates the effectiveness of our algorithms and shows that it is better to make the adjustment coefficient close to $\frac{1}{2}$ while ensuring convergence. This is also consistent with the explanation from the perspective of differential equations.

The rest of this article is arranged as follows. Section 2 is divided into two subsections. The first subsection is some basic notations and properties. The second subsection provides the motivation for the proposed algorithms and offers an explanation from the perspective of discrete differential equations for some specific adjustment coefficients. Section 3 is divided into three subsections. Subsections 3.1 and 3.2 respectively introduce the improved prediction-correction algorithms for solving pseudo-convex and convex optimization problems, along with their convergence analyses. Subsection 3.3 explains that, under certain conditions, the algorithm presented in subsection 3.2 can be fully aligned with the algorithm derived from the perspective of discrete differential equations. The numerical experiments are given to show the superiority of the algorithms proposed in this paper in Section 4. Section 5 is the conclusion.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Basic notions and properties

The optimization problem considered in this paper is

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x), \quad (1)$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth pseudo-convex or convex function.

We next give some basic notions, definitions, and properties that are useful in the subsequent paper.

For vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\langle x, y \rangle$ is the standard inner product. $\|x\| = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}$ is the Euclidean norm. We use $\mathbf{P}_{[a,b]}(x)$ to denote the projection of x on the interval $[a, b]$. A differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be convex, if it satisfies

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

An operator $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be monotone, if for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\langle T(y) - T(x), y - x \rangle \geq 0$. An operator $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be pseudo-monotone, if for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\langle T(x), y - x \rangle \geq 0$ implies $\langle T(y), y - x \rangle \geq 0$. A differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be pseudo-convex if its gradient is pseudo-monotone. An operator $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be L -Lipschitz continuous, if

$$\|T(y) - T(x)\| \leq L\|y - x\|, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let x^* be a stationary point of the unconstrained differentiable optimization problem (1), i.e., $\|\nabla f(x^*)\| = 0$, and define the stationary point set $X^* = \{x^* : \|\nabla f(x^*)\| = 0\}$. The following lemma gives the property of the gradient of a differentiable convex function.

Lemma 1. ([25], Theorem 2.1.3) *For a differentiable convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, its gradient operator ∇f is monotone, and thus pseudo-monotone.*

The following descent lemma is well-known and useful for our analysis of convergence later.

Lemma 2. ([25], Theorem 2.1.5) *If $\nabla f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is L -Lipschitz continuous, then for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$f(x) \leq f(y) + \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|x - y\|^2.$$

Under the convexity of f and the Lipschitz continuity of ∇f , an inequality can be derived in the following Lemma.

Lemma 3. ([25], Theorem 2.1.5) *If f is a convex function and $\nabla f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a L -Lipschitz continuous operator, then for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\langle \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle \geq \frac{1}{L} \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|^2.$$

2.2. Motivation

The prediction-correction algorithms is a highly effective method for solving pseudo-convex optimization problems. We analyse some typical prediction-correction algorithms which use the gradient step: $z^k = x^k - h_k \nabla f(x^k)$ as a prediction to illustrate the motivation behind the proposed algorithms.

For unconstrained optimization problem (1), the correction step of the extra-gradient algorithm [13, 14] and forward-backward-forward algorithm [16] can be both written as

$$x_{EG/FBF}^{k+1} = x^k - h_k (\nabla f(x^k) - (\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))). \quad (2)$$

The numerical performance of the improved extra-gradient algorithm [15] and the projection contraction algorithm [11] remains difficult to surpass. Their correction steps can be expressed as:

$$x_{IEG/PC}^{k+1} = x^k - \eta \alpha_k h_k (\nabla f(x^k) - (\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))). \quad (3)$$

We find that algorithms (2), (3) both use direction $\nabla f(x^k) - (\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))$ as the descent direction, where $\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k)$ is used to adjust the gradient direction $\nabla f(x^k)$, and the adjustment coefficient is 1. A natural question is what is the best adjustment coefficient? If we reset $\beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))$ as the adjustment direction, what is the range and the best choice of β ? Thus, this paper considers the following improved prediction correction algorithm whose correction step is

$$x_{IPC}^{k+1} = x^k - h_k (\nabla f(x^k) - \beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))). \quad (4)$$

We provide the range of β and give the convergence analysis. For the optimal value of β , we provide an explanation from the perspective of differential equations. Regarding the step size h_k , we give two selection ways: constant step size and adaptive step size. For the convex optimization problem, we propose the following form of the algorithm with correction step written as

$$x^{k+1} = x^k - \eta \alpha_k h_k (\nabla f(x^k) - \beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))). \quad (5)$$

The difference of iterating one step with different adjustment coefficient β in Algorithm (4) can be intuitively shown in Figure 1. In this figure, x_{GD}^1 corresponds to $\beta = 0$; x_{EG}^1 corresponds to $\beta = 1$; x_{IPC}^1 corresponds to $\beta \in (0, 1)$. As can be seen from this figure, changing the adjustment coefficient is equivalent to rotating the descent direction, and by rotating the descent direction to an appropriate angle, a more optimal descent direction can be obtained.

Next, we will explain that when the adjustment coefficient takes on the special values of 0, 1, and $\frac{1}{2}$, it corresponds to algorithms with different orders of discretization error in the differential equations.

Consider the first order ordinary differential equation (gradient flow):

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = -\nabla f(x(t)), t \geq 0, \\ x(0) = x^0. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The equilibrium points $x^* = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t)$ of (6) are the stationary points of unconstrained optimization problem (1), where $x(t)$ is the solution trajectory of (6) [19, 20, 23]. In general, the solution trajectory $x(t)$ is difficult to compute.

Thus, some discrete methods are proposed to approximate $x(t)$. The explicit Euler discrete method for problem (6) is related to the gradient descent algorithm [26, 27]

$$x^{k+1} = x^k - h \nabla f(x^k)$$

for problem (1), and this corresponds to $\beta = 0$ in Algorithm (4). The implicit Euler discrete method for problem (6) corresponds to the proximal point algorithm [22, 28, 29, 30]

$$x^{k+1} = x^k - h \nabla f(x^{k+1})$$

for problem (1). Both the explicit Euler discrete method and the implicit Euler discrete method bring $O(h)$ global discrete error in terms of $\|x^k - x(t_k)\|$ [31]. Generally speaking, the proximal point algorithm is more stable than the gradient descent algorithm, but the proximal point algorithm involves implicit updates. If take the point obtained by the gradient descent algorithm as the approximation of the point x^{k+1} , then the proximal point algorithm can be approximated by extra-gradient algorithm (2). Notice that extra-gradient algorithm corresponds to $\beta = 1$ in Algorithm (4).

The midpoint rectangle formula for (6) has higher global discrete error order of $O(h^2)$ [31], and the discrete scheme is

$$x^{k+1} = x^k - h \nabla f\left(\frac{x^{k+1} + x^k}{2}\right). \quad (7)$$

Setting $z^k = \frac{x^{k+1} + x^k}{2}$, the iteration (7) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} z^k &= x^k - \frac{h}{2} \nabla f(z^k), \\ x^{k+1} &= z^k + z^k - x^k, \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to the extended proximal point algorithm for (1) [22, 32, 33]. As we all know, extended proximal point algorithm usually brings better performance than proximal point algorithm. It is important to note that in differential equations, the step size h approaches zero to ensure that the iteration sequence $\{x^k\}$ approximate the solution trajectory $x(t)$, leading the limit of the iteration sequence to be the equilibrium point of the differential equation. However, in optimization problems, the primary concern is the final equilibrium point. To achieve faster convergence, a step size h that does not approach zero is often used. This prevents the extrapolation coefficient $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ in the extended proximal point algorithm: $x^{k+1} = z^k + \alpha(z^k - x^k)$ from reaching 1.

The trapezoidal formula for (6) also has global discrete error order of $O(h^2)$ [31], and its discrete format is

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k+1} &= x^k - \frac{h}{2} (\nabla f(x^{k+1}) + \nabla f(x^k)) \\ &= x^k - h \left(\nabla f(x^k) - \frac{1}{2} (\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^{k+1})) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

However, iteration (8) is an implicit update. If we also take the point obtained by the gradient descent algorithm as the approximation of the point x^{k+1} , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} z^k &= x^k - h \nabla f(x^k), \\ x^{k+1} &= x^k - h \left(\nabla f(x^k) - \frac{1}{2} (\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k)) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

(9) corresponds to Algorithm (4) with $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$. Since the trapezoidal formula has higher order of global discretization error than explicit and implicit Euler discretization, similar to the extended proximal point algorithm, Algorithm (4) may have better numerical performance when β approaches to $\frac{1}{2}$, compared with when β approaches to 0 or 1.

3. Improved prediction correction algorithms with adjustment coefficient

This section include three subsections. In subsection 3.1, we present two improved prediction-correction algorithms with adjustment coefficients for pseudo-convex objective functions under both constant and adaptive step sizes. In subsection 3.2, for convex objective functions, we introduce another improved prediction-correction algorithm with a wider range of adjustment coefficient. Additionally, the correction step can have a different step size from the prediction step. In subsection 3.3, we explain that when the objective function is convex and the adjustment coefficient is $\frac{1}{2}$, it can fully corresponds to the algorithm in (9).

3.1. Improved prediction correction algorithms: pseudo-convex case

In this subsection, we propose the improved prediction correction algorithms that use constant step size (IPC-C) and adaptive step size (IPC-A) for pseudo-convex optimization problem (1). To establish the convergence of the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm IPC-C and IPC-A, we make some required assumptions firstly in the following.

Assumption 1. (i) The stationary point set X^* of problem (1) is non-empty.

(ii) f is pseudo-convex and ∇f is L -Lipschitz continuous.

Algorithm 1 considers the iteration format (4) and uses a constant step size whose range related to the Lipschitz constant of ∇f .

Algorithm 1 (pseudo-convex-IPC-C):

Step 0: Initialize $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\epsilon > 0$, $k = 0$.

Step 1: If $\|\nabla f(x^k)\| < \epsilon$, stop. Else go to step 2.

Step 2: Generate new iteration point.

$$\begin{aligned} z^k &= x^k - h\nabla f(x^k), \\ x^{k+1} &= x^k - h(\nabla f(x^k) - \beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\text{where } 0 < h < \frac{1}{L}, \beta \in \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - h^2 L^2}}{h^2 L^2}, 1 \right].$$

$k = k + 1$. Go to Step 1.

The Fejér monotonicity of the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 1 with respect to the set X^* is given below.

Proposition 1. Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, then the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 1 satisfies

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \kappa_1 \|x^k - z^k\|^2,$$

where $\kappa_1 = 2\beta - 1 - \beta^2 h^2 L^2 > 0$.

Proof By the identity transformation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 &= \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + 2\langle x^{k+1} - x^k, x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &= \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + 2\langle -h\nabla f(x^k) + h\beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k)), x^k - x^* \rangle \\ &= \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 - 2\langle h\beta\nabla f(z^k), z^k - x^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\langle h\beta\nabla f(z^k), x^k - z^k \rangle + 2\langle h(\beta - 1)\nabla f(x^k), x^k - x^* \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since ∇f is pseudo-monotone, $\nabla f(x^*) = 0$ and $\beta \leq 1$, we have

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 - 2\langle h\beta\nabla f(z^k), x^k - z^k \rangle. \quad (11)$$

Combining (10) and (11), it gets that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \|z^k - x^k + h\beta\nabla f(x^k) - h\beta\nabla f(z^k)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\beta\langle z^k - x^k + h\beta\nabla f(x^k) - h\beta\nabla f(z^k), x^k - z^k \rangle \\ &= \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \|z^k - x^k\|^2 + \beta^2 h^2 \|\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\beta\langle h\nabla f(x^k) - h\nabla f(z^k), z^k - x^k \rangle + 2\beta\langle z^k - x^k + h\beta\nabla f(x^k) - h\beta\nabla f(z^k), x^k - z^k \rangle \\ &= \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \|z^k - x^k\|^2 + \beta^2 h^2 \|\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k)\|^2 - 2\beta\|x^k - z^k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

According to the L -Lipschitz continuity of ∇f , (12) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \|z^k - x^k\|^2 + \beta^2 h^2 L^2 \|x^k - z^k\|^2 - 2\beta\|x^k - z^k\|^2 \\ &= \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - (2\beta - 1 - \beta^2 h^2 L^2)\|z^k - x^k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $0 < h < \frac{1}{L}$, $\beta \in \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - h^2 L^2}}{h^2 L^2}, 1 \right]$, we have $2\beta - 1 - \beta^2 h^2 L^2 > 0$. Thus, the desired conclusion is proved. \square

Remark 1. When $h \rightarrow 0$, the lower bound of $\beta = \frac{1-\sqrt{1-h^2L^2}}{h^2L^2} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$. When $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$, Algorithm 1 becomes Algorithm (9). In the following numerical experiment, we find that, for a given h , the closer β is to $\frac{1}{2}$, the better the numerical performance.

The convergence of Algorithm 1 is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 1. Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, then the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 1 converges to a stationary point of problem (1).

Proof Under Assumption 1, the conclusion of Proposition 1 holds. Thus

$$h^2 \kappa_1 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\nabla f(x^k)\|^2 = \kappa_1 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|x^k - z^k\|^2 < \infty,$$

and $\{x^k\}$ is bounded. Consequently, $\|\nabla f(x^k)\| \rightarrow 0$, and there exists a subsequence $\{x^{k_j}\}$ converges to a cluster point x^∞ . By the continuity of the operator ∇f and $\|\cdot\|$, we have $\|\nabla f(x^{k_j})\| \rightarrow \|\nabla f(x^\infty)\|$. Combining with $\|\nabla f(x^k)\| \rightarrow 0$, we get $\|\nabla f(x^\infty)\| = 0$. Thus $x^\infty \in X^*$. We next show that $\{x^k\}$ has a unique cluster point.

Since the sequence $\{\|x^k - x^*\|^2\}$ is monotonically decreasing and bounded below, thus $\{\|x^k - x^*\|^2\}$ converges. Taking $x^* = x^\infty$, we obtain $\{\|x^k - x^\infty\|^2\}$ has a limit. Taking the subsequence $\{x^{k_j}\}$, we have $\{\|x^{k_j} - x^\infty\|\} \rightarrow 0$. Thus the whole sequence $\{\|x^k - x^\infty\|\} \rightarrow 0$, i.e., $\{x^k\} \rightarrow x^\infty \in X^*$. \square

The following theorem provides the convergence rate of $\|\nabla f(x^k)\|^2$ in the ergodic sense.

Theorem 2. Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, then the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 1 satisfies

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla f(x^k)\|^2 \leq \frac{\|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{K \kappa_1 h^2}.$$

Proof Under Assumption 1, the conclusion of Proposition 1 holds. Thus

$$\kappa_1 h^2 \|\nabla f(x^k)\|^2 = \kappa_1 \|x^k - z^k\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2.$$

Sum the above inequality from 0 to $K-1$ to get

$$\kappa_1 h^2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla f(x^k)\|^2 \leq \|x^0 - x^*\|^2.$$

This means

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla f(x^k)\|^2 \leq \frac{\|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{K \kappa_1 h^2}.$$

This proves the desired conclusion. \square

The range of the step size h and the adjustment coefficient β in Algorithm 1 are determined by the global Lipschitz constant L of ∇f . However, generally speaking, L is not easy to obtain or is difficult to estimate accurately. Even if L is estimated well, it is only the global Lipschitz constant, which is much larger than the local Lipschitz constant. This will result in a small step size and slow convergence. Therefore, we present the following Algorithm IPC-A that does not rely on the global Lipschitz constant.

Algorithm 2 (pseudo-convex-IPC-A):

Step 0: Initialize $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $0 < \mu < \nu < 1$, $\underline{h} < 1 \leq \gamma_0^0 \leq \bar{h}$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $\tau > 1$, $\epsilon > 0$, $k = 0$.

Step 1: If $\|\nabla f(x^k)\| < \epsilon$, stop. Else go to step 2.

Step 2: Line search for h_k .

$l = 0$;
 If $r_k(\gamma_l^k) := \gamma_l^k \|\nabla f(z^k(\gamma_l^k)) - \nabla f(x^k)\| / \|z^k(\gamma_l^k) - x^k\| > \nu$,
 where $z^k(\gamma_l^k) = x^k - \gamma_l^k \nabla f(x^k)$.
 $\gamma_{l+1}^k = \gamma_l^k \theta * \min\{1, 1/r_k(\gamma_l^k)\}$, $l = l + 1$.
 Else
 $h_k = \gamma_l^k$.

Step 3: Generate new iteration point.

$$\begin{aligned} z^k &= x^k - h_k \nabla f(x^k), \\ x^{k+1} &= x^k - h_k (\nabla f(x^k) - \beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$\text{where } \beta \in \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - \nu^2}}{\nu^2}, 1 \right].$$

Step 4: Adaptively select γ_0^{k+1} , the initial line search step size for iteration $k + 1$.

If $r_k(h_k) \leq \mu$, then $\gamma_0^{k+1} = \tau h_k$.
 Else $\gamma_0^{k+1} = h_k$.
 $\gamma_0^{k+1} = \mathbf{P}_{[\underline{h}, \bar{h}]}(\gamma_0^{k+1})$.
 $k = k + 1$. Go to Step 1.

We first illustrate by two lemmas that the line search in Algorithm 2 finitely terminates and the step size h_k has a consistent lower bound.

Lemma 4. Suppose that ∇f is L -Lipschitz continuous, then the line search for h_k in Algorithm 2 terminates in finite steps.

Proof If there exists k such that the line search can not finitely terminated, then for all $l > 0$,

$$\gamma_l^k \|\nabla f(z^k(\gamma_l^k)) - \nabla f(x^k)\| / \|z^k(\gamma_l^k) - x^k\| > \nu.$$

By the L -Lipschitz continuity of ∇f , we have

$$\gamma_l^k L \geq \gamma_l^k \|\nabla f(z^k(\gamma_l^k)) - \nabla f(x^k)\| / \|z^k(\gamma_l^k) - x^k\| > \nu.$$

Thus, $\gamma_l^k > \frac{\nu}{L}$, $\forall l > 0$. Letting $l \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $\frac{\nu}{L} \leq 0$. This contradicts with $0 < \nu < 1$. \square

Lemma 5. Suppose that ∇f is L -Lipschitz continuous, then the step size h_k in Algorithm 2 satisfies $h_k \geq h_{\min}$, where $h_{\min} = \min \left\{ \underline{h}, \frac{\nu\theta}{hL^2} \right\}$.

Proof If $h_k = \gamma_0^k$, then $h_k \geq \underline{h}$. If $h_k = \gamma_l^k$, $l \geq 1$, then

$$\gamma_{l-1}^k \|\nabla f(z^k(\gamma_{l-1}^k)) - \nabla f(x^k)\| / \|z^k(\gamma_{l-1}^k) - x^k\| > \nu.$$

By the L -Lipschitz continuity of ∇f , we get

$$\gamma_{l-1}^k L \geq \gamma_{l-1}^k \|\nabla f(z^k(\gamma_{l-1}^k)) - \nabla f(x^k)\| / \|z^k(\gamma_{l-1}^k) - x^k\| > \nu.$$

That is $\gamma_{l-1}^k > \frac{\nu}{L}$. Multiplying by $\theta * \min \{1, 1/r_k(\gamma_{l-1}^k)\}$ at both sides of this inequality, we have

$$h_k = \gamma_l^k > \frac{\nu\theta}{L} * \min \{1, 1/r_k(\gamma_{l-1}^k)\}. \quad (14)$$

Due to

$$r_k(\gamma_{l-1}^k) = \gamma_{l-1}^k \|\nabla f(z^k(\gamma_{l-1}^k)) - \nabla f(x^k)\| / \|z^k(\gamma_{l-1}^k) - x^k\|$$

$$\leq \frac{\gamma_{l-1}^k L \|z^k(\gamma_{l-1}^k) - x^k\|}{\|z^k(\gamma_{l-1}^k) - x^k\|} = \gamma_{l-1}^k L \leq \gamma_0^k L \leq \bar{h}L,$$

we obtain

$$\frac{1}{r_k(\gamma_{l-1}^k)} \geq \frac{1}{\bar{h}L}. \quad (15)$$

From (14) and (15), we have $h_k > \frac{\nu\theta}{L}$ or $h_k > \frac{\nu\theta}{L} \cdot \frac{1}{\bar{h}L}$. We can always make $L \geq 1$. Combining with $\bar{h} \geq 1$, we have $\frac{1}{\bar{h}L} \leq 1$. Thus, $h_k > \frac{\nu\theta}{L} \cdot \frac{1}{\bar{h}L} = \frac{\nu\theta}{\bar{h}L^2}$.

Combining the above two situations, we have $h_k \geq h_{\min} = \min \left\{ h, \nu\theta/\bar{h}L^2 \right\}$. \square

Similar to Proposition 1, The sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 2 is Fejér monotonicity with respect to the set X^* .

Proposition 2. Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, then the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 2 satisfy

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \kappa_2 \|x^k - z^k\|^2,$$

where $\kappa_2 = 2\beta - 1 - \beta^2\nu^2 > 0$.

Proof Consistent with the first half of the proof in Proposition 1, the inequality (12) is obtained. Combining (12) with the choice of h_k in Algorithm 2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \|z^k - x^k\|^2 + \beta^2\nu^2\|x^k - z^k\|^2 - 2\beta\|x^k - z^k\|^2 \\ &= \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - (2\beta - 1 - \beta^2\nu^2)\|z^k - x^k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $0 < \nu < 1$, $\beta \in \left(\frac{1-\sqrt{1-\nu^2}}{\nu^2}, 1 \right]$, we have $2\beta - 1 - \beta^2\nu^2 > 0$. Thus, the desired conclusion is obtained. \square

The convergence of Algorithm 2 is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 3. Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, then the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 2 converges to a stationary point of problem (1).

Proof Under Assumption 1, the conclusion of Proposition 2 holds. Thus

$$h_{\min}^2 \kappa_2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\nabla f(x^k)\|^2 \leq h_k^2 \kappa_2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\nabla f(x^k)\|^2 = \kappa_2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|x^k - z^k\|^2 < \infty,$$

and $\{x^k\}$ is bounded. Consequently, $\|\nabla f(x^k)\| \rightarrow 0$, and there exists a subsequence $\{x^{k_j}\}$ converges to a cluster point x^∞ . The latter proof is consistent with Theorem 1. \square

Consistent with the proof of Theorem 2 and combined with Lemma 5, we can conclude the following convergence rate result.

Theorem 4. Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, then the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 2 satisfies

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla f(x^k)\|^2 \leq \frac{\|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{K \kappa_2 h_{\min}^2}.$$

3.2. Improved prediction correction algorithm: convex case

In this subsection, we present another improved prediction-correction algorithm for the convex optimization problem (1), in which a wider range of adjustment coefficient can be used, and the correction step uses a different step size from the prediction step. Then, we show that if the step size in prediction step takes a special value, the optimal step size in the correction step of has a lower bound of $\frac{1}{2}$. Consequently, the algorithm can corresponds exactly to Algorithm (9).

Algorithm 3 (convex-IPC):

Step 0: Initialize $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $0 < \mu < \nu < 1$, $0 < \underline{h} < 1 \leq \gamma_0^0 \leq \bar{h} < \frac{4}{L}$, $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $\tau > 1$, $\eta \in (0, 2)$, $\epsilon > 0$, $k = 0$.

Step 1: If $\|\nabla f(x^k)\| < \epsilon$, stop. Else go to step 2.

Step 2: Line search for h_k .

$l = 0$;

If $r_k(\gamma_l^k) := \gamma_l^k \|\nabla f(z^k(\gamma_l^k)) - \nabla f(x^k)\| / \|z^k(\gamma_l^k) - x^k\| > \nu$,
where $z^k(\gamma_l^k) = x^k - \gamma_l^k \nabla f(x^k)$.

$\gamma_{l+1}^k = \gamma_l^k \theta * \min\{1, 1/r_k(\gamma_l^k)\}$, $l = l + 1$.

Else

$h_k = \gamma_l^k$.

Step 3: Generate new iteration point.

$$z^k = x^k - h_k \nabla f(x^k), \quad (16)$$

$$x^{k+1} = x^k - \eta \alpha_k h_k (\nabla f(x^k) - \beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))), \quad (17)$$

$$\text{where } \alpha_k = \frac{(1-\beta)\left(1 - \frac{Lh_k}{4}\right) \|x^k - z^k\|^2 + \beta \langle x^k - z^k, h_k \nabla f(z^k) \rangle}{h_k^2 \|\nabla f(x^k) - \beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))\|^2}.$$

Step 4: Adaptively select γ_0^{k+1} , the initial line search step size for iteration $k + 1$.

If $r_k(h_k) \leq \mu$, then $\gamma_0^{k+1} = \tau h_k$.

Else $\gamma_0^{k+1} = h_k$.

$\gamma_0^{k+1} = \mathbf{P}_{[\underline{h}, \bar{h}]}(\gamma_0^{k+1})$.

$k = k + 1$. Go to Step 1.

Remark 2. In Algorithm 3, the calculation of α_k requires the global Lipschitz constant L , but we still use adaptive line search in Step 2. This is because the line search seeks a smaller local Lipschitz constant, allowing for a larger step size h_k , and the algorithm usually converges faster.

We first give assumptions required by Algorithm 3.

Assumption 2. (i) The solution set X^* of problem (1) is non-empty.

(ii) f is convex and ∇f is L -Lipschitz continuous.

We next demonstrate below through a lemma that the direction in (17) is a descent direction for the distance function $\frac{1}{2} \|x^k - x^*\|^2$.

Lemma 6. Suppose Assumption 2 holds. Let $\{x^k\}, \{z^k\}$ are generated by Algorithm 3, and define

$$d_k := h_k (\nabla f(x^k) - \beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))),$$

where $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$. Then

$$\langle x^k - x^*, d^k \rangle \geq (1 - \beta) \left(1 - \frac{Lh_k}{4}\right) \|x^k - z^k\|^2 + \beta \langle x^k - z^k, h_k \nabla f(z^k) \rangle \quad (18)$$

$$\geq \kappa_3 \|x^k - z^k\|^2, \quad (19)$$

where $\kappa_3 = (1 - \beta) \left(1 - \frac{Lh_k}{4}\right) + \beta(1 - \nu) > 0$.

Proof According to the definition of d^k , we have

$$\langle x^k - x^*, d^k \rangle = \langle x^k - x^*, h_k \nabla f(x^k) - \beta h_k (\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k)) \rangle. \quad (20)$$

On the one hand, due to

$$x^k - z^k = h_k \nabla f(x^k) = h_k \nabla f(x^k) - h_k \nabla f(x^*),$$

we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x^k - x^*, x^k - z^k \rangle &= \|x^k - z^k\|^2 + h_k \langle z^k - x^*, \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^*) \rangle \\ &= \|x^k - z^k\|^2 + h_k \langle x^k - x^*, \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^*) \rangle - h_k \langle x^k - z^k, \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^*) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 3 and the inequality $2ab \leq a^2 + b^2$ with $a = \frac{\sqrt{Lh_k}}{2}(x^k - z^k)$, $b = \sqrt{\frac{h_k}{L}}(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^*))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x^k - x^*, x^k - z^k \rangle &\geq \|x^k - z^k\|^2 + h_k \frac{1}{L} \|\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^*)\|^2 - h_k \frac{1}{L} \|\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^*)\|^2 - \frac{Lh_k}{4} \|x^k - z^k\|^2 \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{Lh_k}{4}\right) \|x^k - z^k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This means

$$\langle x^k - x^*, h_k \nabla f(x^k) \rangle \geq \left(1 - \frac{Lh_k}{4}\right) \|x^k - z^k\|^2. \quad (21)$$

On the other hand,

$$\langle x^k - x^*, h_k \nabla f(z^k) \rangle = \langle z^k - x^*, h_k \nabla f(z^k) \rangle + \langle x^k - z^k, h_k \nabla f(z^k) \rangle. \quad (22)$$

Combining this with $\langle z^k - x^*, h_k \nabla f(x^*) \rangle = 0$ and the monotonicity of the operator ∇f , we obtain

$$\langle z^k - x^*, h_k \nabla f(z^k) \rangle \geq 0. \quad (23)$$

Combining (20), (21), (22), (23) and $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$, we obtain (18).

According to the iteration format (16), Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the line search condition in Algorithm 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x^k - z^k, h_k \nabla f(z^k) \rangle &= \langle x^k - z^k, x^k - z^k - h_k \nabla f(x^k) + h_k \nabla f(z^k) \rangle \\ &\geq \|x^k - z^k\|^2 - h_k \|x^k - z^k\| \|\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k)\| \\ &\geq (1 - \nu) \|x^k - z^k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Combining (22), (23), (24), we obtain

$$\langle x^k - x^*, h_k \nabla f(z^k) \rangle \geq (1 - \nu) \|x^k - z^k\|^2. \quad (25)$$

The inequality (19) can be obtained by combining the inequalities (20), (21), (25) and $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$. \square

We next show that α_k has a consistent lower bound.

Lemma 7. Under the assumption that the operator ∇f is L -Lipschitz continuous, the step size α_k in Algorithm 3 satisfies $\alpha_k \geq \alpha_{\min}$, where

$$\alpha_{\min} = \frac{\left((1 - \beta) \left(1 - \frac{L\bar{h}}{4} \right) + \beta(1 - \nu) \right)}{(2 + 2\beta^2\nu^2)}.$$

Proof According to (24) and the definition of α_k , we have

$$\alpha_k = \frac{(1 - \beta) \left(1 - \frac{Lh_k}{4} \right) \|x^k - z^k\|^2 + \beta \langle x^k - z^k, h_k \nabla f(z^k) \rangle}{h_k^2 \|\nabla f(x^k) - \beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))\|^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \geq \frac{\left((1-\beta) \left(1 - \frac{Lh_k}{4} \right) + \beta(1-\nu) \right) \|x^k - z^k\|^2}{\|x^k - z^k - \beta h_k (\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))\|^2} \\
 & \geq \frac{\left((1-\beta) \left(1 - \frac{Lh_k}{4} \right) + \beta(1-\nu) \right) \|x^k - z^k\|^2}{2\|x^k - z^k\|^2 + 2\|\beta h_k (\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))\|^2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Due to Step 2 in Algorithm 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \alpha_k & \geq \frac{\left((1-\beta) \left(1 - \frac{Lh_k}{4} \right) + \beta(1-\nu) \right) \|x^k - z^k\|^2}{(2 + 2\beta^2\nu^2)\|x^k - z^k\|^2} \\
 & = \frac{\left((1-\beta) \left(1 - \frac{Lh_k}{4} \right) + \beta(1-\nu) \right)}{(2 + 2\beta^2\nu^2)} \\
 & \geq \frac{\left((1-\beta) \left(1 - \frac{L\bar{h}}{4} \right) + \beta(1-\nu) \right)}{(2 + 2\beta^2\nu^2)} := \alpha_{\min}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

The following proposition states that the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 3 is Fejér monotone with respect to the solution set X^* .

Proposition 3. *Under Assumption 2, the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 3 satisfies*

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \kappa_4 \|x^k - z^k\|^2,$$

where $\kappa_4 = \eta(2 - \eta)\alpha_{\min} \left((1 - \beta) \left(1 - \frac{L\bar{h}}{4} \right) + \beta(1 - \nu) \right) > 0$.

Proof From the iteration format (17), we have

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 = \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - 2\eta\alpha_k \langle x^k - x^*, d^k \rangle + \eta^2\alpha_k^2 \|d^k\|^2.$$

Combining (18), the choice of α_k in Step 3, and the above equality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \\
 & \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \eta^2\alpha_k^2 \|d^k\|^2 - 2\eta\alpha_k \left((1 - \beta) \left(1 - \frac{Lh_k}{4} \right) \|x^k - z^k\|^2 + \beta \langle x^k - z^k, h_k \nabla f(z^k) \rangle \right) \\
 & = \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \eta(2 - \eta)\alpha_k \left((1 - \beta) \left(1 - \frac{Lh_k}{4} \right) \|x^k - z^k\|^2 + \beta \langle x^k - z^k, h_k \nabla f(z^k) \rangle \right) \\
 & \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \eta(2 - \eta)\alpha_{\min} \left((1 - \beta) \left(1 - \frac{L\bar{h}}{4} \right) + \beta(1 - \nu) \right) \|x^k - z^k\|^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

where the equality is according to the setting of α_k in Step 3 in Algorithm 3, and the last inequality is due to (19), $\alpha_k \geq \alpha_{\min}$ and $h_k \leq \bar{h}$. □

Similar to the proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 3, we can derive the following convergence theorem.

Theorem 5. *Under Assumption 2, the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 3 converges to a solution point of problem (1).*

Similar to the proof of Theorem 4, we can conclude the following convergence rate result.

Theorem 6. *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds, then the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by Algorithm 3 satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|\nabla f(x^k)\|^2 \leq \frac{\|x^0 - x^*\|^2}{K\kappa_4 h_{\min}^2}.$$

3.3. The relationship between Algorithm 3 and Algorithm (9)

If we take the step size $h_k \equiv \frac{0.9}{L}$, Algorithm 3 can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} z^k &= x^k - \frac{0.9}{L} \nabla f(x^k), \\ x^{k+1} &= x^k - \eta \alpha_k \frac{0.9}{L} (\nabla f(x^k) - \beta (\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))). \end{aligned}$$

Based on the expression of α_k in Algorithm 3, after transformation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_k &= \frac{\frac{3.1}{4}(1-\beta)\|x^k - z^k\|^2}{\left\|x^k - z^k - \frac{0.9}{L}\beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))\right\|^2} + \frac{\beta\langle x^k - z^k, x^k - z^k - \frac{0.9}{L}(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))\rangle}{\left\|x^k - z^k - \frac{0.9}{L}\beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))\right\|^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(\frac{3.1+0.9\beta}{2}\right)\|x^k - z^k\|^2 - \frac{1.8}{L}\beta\langle x^k - z^k, \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k)\rangle}{\left\|x^k - z^k - \frac{0.9}{L}\beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))\right\|^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\left(\frac{1.1+0.9\beta}{2}\right)\|x^k - z^k\|^2 - \frac{0.81}{L^2}\beta^2\|\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k)\|^2}{\left\|x^k - z^k - \frac{0.9}{L}\beta(\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))\right\|^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Due to the Assumption that the operator ∇f is L -Lipschitz continuous, we have under $\beta \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{1.1+0.9\beta}{2}\right)\|x^k - z^k\|^2 - \frac{0.81}{L^2}\beta^2\|\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k)\|^2 \\ &\geq \left(\left(\frac{1.1+0.9\beta}{2}\right) - 0.81\beta^2\right)\|x^k - z^k\|^2 > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Combining (26) and (27), we obtain $\alpha_k > \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, we can take $\eta = \frac{1}{\alpha_k} \in (0, 2)$. So that $\eta\alpha_k = 1$. At this point, Algorithm 3 can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} z^k &= x^k - \frac{0.9}{L} \nabla f(x^k), \\ x^{k+1} &= x^k - \frac{0.9}{L} (\nabla f(x^k) - \beta (\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(z^k))). \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta \in [0, 1]$, which is in the form of Algorithm (9). Notice that the range of β in Algorithm 3 is wider than Algorithm 1 and 2. If $\beta = 0$, Algorithm 3 is the gradient descent algorithm. If $\beta = 1$, Algorithm 3 is the extra-gradient algorithm. If $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$, Algorithm 3 becomes Algorithm (9) which is related to the trapezoidal formula.

4. Numerical Experiment

In this section, we provide some examples of both pseudo-convex and convex optimization problems to demonstrate the effectiveness of the algorithms proposed in this paper. The experiments are operated with Matlab R2021b on a Windows 11 with a 3.30 Ghz processor and 32 GB of memory.

Experiment 1: Pseudo-convex fractional programming problem

Consider the fractional program problem of the form [1]:

$$\min f(x) = \frac{G(x)}{h(x)},$$

where $G(x)$ is a convex quadratic function and $h(x)$ is a positive linear function. Apparently, such a problem is pseudo-convex and its gradient is pseudo-monotone [6]. Specifically, $G(x) = \frac{1}{2}x'Qx + c'x + q$, $h(x) = r'x + t$. $Q = MM' + I$,

Table 1Comparison of the efficiency of Algorithm 2 under different β for Experiment 1

	$n = 1000$		$n = 2000$		$n = 5000$	
	Iter.	CPU	Iter.	CPU	Iter.	CPU
$\beta = 0.54$	2022	1.6364	3123	14.6207	4840	177.0001
$\beta = 0.6$	2170	1.7270	3244	14.9632	5008	186.8468
$\beta = 0.7$	2409	2.0179	3616	16.6457	5561	201.4298
$\beta = 0.8$	2638	2.0183	3964	18.5336	6065	210.1741
$\beta = 0.9$	2863	2.2903	4383	19.9577	6675	223.3490
$\beta = 1$	3085	2.4040	4723	21.7784	7101	237.7850

M is a $n \times n$ matrix and each element is selected from a uniform distribution on the interval (0,1) randomly. I is the $n \times n$ identity matrix. r and c are $n \times 1$ vectors drawn uniformly at random from (0, 2). q is a random number in (1,2) and $t = 1 + 4n$.

To avoid computing the Lipschitz constant of the gradient of the objective function in this experiment, we only provide the numerical results for Algorithm 2. The starting point x^0 is randomly chosen in $(1, 10)^n$. The parameters in our Algorithm 2 are set as: $\mu = 0.3, \nu = 0.5, \tau = 1.5, \theta = 0.67, \gamma_0^0 = 1, \bar{h} = 3, \underline{h} = 10^{-6}, \epsilon = 10^{-3}$. The stopping criterion is chosen as $\|\nabla f(x^k)\| \leq \epsilon$.

We carry out our experiments for $n \in \{1000, 2000, 5000\}$ under different β . Notice that $\beta = 0.54$ is the minimum value that can be attained in Algorithm 2 when $\nu = 0.5$. The number of iterations and CPU time under different dimensions and β of Algorithm 2 are given in Table 1. The residual $\log(\|\nabla f(x^k)\|)$ vs. number of iterations is given in Figure 2.

The comparison of numerical results of Algorithm 2 under different dimensions and β are shown in Table 1 and Figure 2. When $\beta = 1$, Algorithm 2 reduces to the extra-gradient algorithm. It can be seen from these tables and figures that at various dimensions, the numerical performance is best when $\beta = 0.54$ in Algorithm 2, and improves by approximately 32% compared to the extra-gradient algorithm. This optimal β is close to 0.5, which is consistent with our previous explanation from the perspective of differential equations.

Experiment 2: Smooth convex optimization problem

Consider the following differentiable convex optimization problem, in which we refer to the example in [15].

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) = x^T \arctan x - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln(1 + x_i^2) + \frac{1}{2} x^T M x + q^T x.$$

The matrix $M = A^T A + B$, where A is an $n \times n$ matrix whose entries are randomly generated in the interval (-5,5) and a skew-symmetric matrix B is generated in the same way. The vector q is generated from a uniform distribution in the interval (-500,500). The gradient of f is $\nabla f(x) = \arctan x + Mx + q$. The Lipschitz constant of ∇f is $L = \|M\| + 1$.

We carry out our experiments under dimension $n \in \{1000, 2000, 5000\}$, and compare the numerical performance of Algorithm 3 under different β . Each algorithm comes from the same initial point x^0 , whose entries are randomly generated in the interval (0,1). The parameters in our Algorithm 3 are set as: $\mu = 0.4, \nu = 0.9, \underline{h} = 10^{-6}, \gamma_0^0 = \bar{h} = 2/L, \theta = 0.7, \tau = 1.5, \eta = 1.9, \epsilon = 10^{-3}$. The stopping criterion is set as $\|\nabla f(x^k)\| < \epsilon$.

The comparisons of numerical results of Algorithm 3 under different dimensions and β are shown in Table 2 and Figure 3. We note that when $\beta = 0$, Algorithm 3 reduces to the gradient descent algorithm, and when $\beta = 1$, Algorithm 3 reduces to the extra-gradient algorithm. It can be seen from these tables and figures that at various dimensions, the numerical performance is best when $\beta = 0.5$, and improves by approximately 33% compared to the gradient descent algorithm. The numerical performance for other values of β is symmetrically distributed. This is consistent with our previous explanation from the perspective of differential equations, and demonstrates the advantage of incorporating a correction coefficient in the descent direction.

Table 2Comparison of the efficiency of Algorithm 3 under different β for Experiment 2

	$n = 1000$		$n = 2000$		$n = 5000$	
	Iter.	CPU	Iter.	CPU	Iter.	CPU
$\beta = 0$	10534	2.3537	16004	21.2347	29406	325.5482
$\beta = 0.1$	9575	2.0596	14549	20.3756	26732	293.5786
$\beta = 0.2$	8776	1.8370	13336	17.7952	24504	271.1818
$\beta = 0.3$	8100	1.6974	12310	16.3450	22618	257.8097
$\beta = 0.4$	7520	1.6083	11429	15.2138	21002	233.4083
$\beta = 0.5$	7106	1.5463	10750	14.5367	20149	224.5374
$\beta = 0.6$	7704	1.8194	11688	16.9927	21414	254.4506
$\beta = 0.7$	8430	1.9288	12768	19.5998	23414	267.9760
$\beta = 0.8$	9159	2.0952	14011	19.3668	25432	301.5660
$\beta = 0.9$	9654	2.2999	14642	21.3543	26850	318.6725
$\beta = 1$	10583	2.4761	16037	22.9588	29497	339.8504

5. Conclusion

This paper explores prediction-correction algorithms for solving pseudo-convex and convex optimization problems. We express the descent direction of some typical prediction-correction algorithms as an adjustment to the gradient direction, and three improved prediction-correction algorithms are proposed by selecting suitable adjustment coefficients. These coefficients are intuitively explained as rotations of the descent direction, demonstrating that rotating by a suitable angle results in a more effective descent direction. Several specific adjustment coefficients are analyzed from the perspective of discrete differential equations. The ranges of these coefficients are provided for both pseudo-convex and convex objective functions, accompanied by a convergence analysis. The final numerical results indicate that the algorithm achieves optimal performance when the adjustment coefficient approximates the trapezoidal formula, which possesses higher-order global discrete error, underscoring the value and significance of this paper.

References

- [1] Boţ R.I. Mertikopoulos P. Staudigl M. Vuong P.T. On the convergence of stochastic forward-backward-forward algorithms with variance reduction in pseudo-monotone variational inequalities. In *NIPS 2018-Workshop on Smooth Games, Optimization and Machine Learning.*, pages 1–5, 2018.
- [2] Cheung K. Yang S. Hanzo L. Achieving maximum energy efficiency in multi-relay ofdma cellular networks: A fractional programming approach. *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, 61:2746–2757, 2013.
- [3] Malitsky Y. Tam M. A forward-backward splitting method for monotone inclusions without cocoercivity. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 30:1451–1472, 2020.
- [4] Stancu-Minasian I. M. Fractional programming: theory, methods and applications. In *Norwell, MA, USA: Kluwer.*, 1992.
- [5] Zappone A. and Jorswieck E. Energy efficiency in wireless networks via fractional programming theory. *Foundations Trends Commun. Inf. Theory.*, 11:185–396, 2015.
- [6] Mangasarian O.L. Convexity, pseudo-convexity and quasi-convexity of composite functions. In *Stochastic Optimization Models in Finance, Academic Press*, 1975.
- [7] Shen K. Yu W. Fractional programming for communication systems-part I: power control and beamforming. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 66:2616–2630, 2018.
- [8] Cai X. Han D. Xu L. An improved first-order primal-dual algorithm with a new correction step. *J. Global Optim.*, 57:1419–1428, 2013.
- [9] Chen Y. Lan G. Ouyang Y. Accelerated schemes for a class of variational inequalities. *Math. Program.*, 165:113–149, 2017.
- [10] Facchinei F. Pang J. Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems. vol. i. In *Springer, New York*, 2003.
- [11] He B. Yuan X. Zhang J. Comparison of two kinds of prediction-correction methods for monotone variational inequalities. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 27:247–267, 2004.
- [12] He B. Yuan X. Zhang W. A customized proximal point algorithm for convex minimization with linear constraints. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 56:559–572, 2013.
- [13] Jelena D. Lorenzo O. Accelerated extra-gradient descent: a novel accelerated first-order method. In *9th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference.*, pages 1–19, 2018.
- [14] Korpelevič G. An extragradient method for finding saddle points and for other problems. *Matecon.*, 12:747–756, 1976.
- [15] He B. Liao L. Improvements of some projection methods for monotone nonlinear variational inequalities. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 112:111–128, 2002.
- [16] Tseng P. A modified forward-backward splitting method for maximal monotone mappings. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 38:431–446, 2000.
- [17] Dong X. Cai X. Han D. Prediction-correction method with BB step sizes. *Front. Math. China*, 13:1325–1340, 2018.

- [18] Ogwo G.N. Alakoya T.O. Mewomo O.T. Inertial iterative method with self-adaptive step size for finite family of split monotone variational inclusion and fixed point problems in banach spaces. *Demonstr. Math.*, 55:193–216, 2022.
- [19] Attouch H. Csaba L. Newton-like inertial dynamics and proximal algorithms governed by maximally monotone operators. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 30:3252–3283, 2020.
- [20] Chen L. Luo H. A unified convergence analysis of first order convex optimization methods via strong lyapunov functions. *arXivpreprintarXiv:2108.00132v1*, 2021.
- [21] Diakonikolas J. Orecchia L. The approximate duality gap technique: a unified theory of first-order methods. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 29:660–689, 2019.
- [22] Parikh N. Boyd S. Proximal algorithms. *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization.*, 1:123–231, 2013.
- [23] Su W. Boyd S. Candès E. A differential equation for modeling nesterov’s accelerated gradient method: theory and insights. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 17:1–43, 2016.
- [24] Zhang G. Bao X. Lessard L. A unified analysis of first-order methods for smooth games via integral quadratic constraints. *arXivpreprintarXiv:2009.11359v4*, 2021.
- [25] Nesterov Y. Lectures on convex optimization. In *Springer Optimization and Its Applications.*, 2018.
- [26] Bertsekas D. Nonlinear programming. 3rd edition. In *Athena Scientific, Belmont, Massachusetts*, 2017.
- [27] Liu H. Hu J. Li Y. Wen Z. Optimization: modeling, algorithm and theory (in chinese). In *Higher Education Press.*, 2020.
- [28] Cai X. A proximal point algorithm with asymmetric linear term. *Optim. Lett.*, 13:777–793, 2019.
- [29] Cai X. Guo K. Jiang F. The developments of proximal point algorithms. *J. Oper. Res. Soc. China*, 10:197–239, 2022.
- [30] Jiang F. Cai X. Han D. The indefinite proximal point algorithms for maximal monotone operators. *Optimization*, 70:1759–1790, 2021.
- [31] Lin C. Numerical computation methods (in chinese). In *Science Press.*, 2005.
- [32] He B. Fu X. Jiang Z. Proximal-point algorithm using a linear proximal term. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 141:299–319, 2009.
- [33] Nemirovski A. Prox-method with rate of convergence $o(1/t)$ for variational inequality with lipschitz continuous monotone operators and smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 15:229–251, 2005.




Figure 1: Comparison of iterating one step with different adjustment coefficient in Algorithm (4)




Figure 2: Numerical performance of Algorithm 2 with different β for Experiment 1




Figure 3: Numerical performance of Algorithm 3 with different β for Experiment 2