

Primal-dual splitting for structured composite monotone inclusions with or without cocoercivity

Minh N. Dao*, Hung M. Phan†, Matthew K. Tam‡ and Thang D. Truong§

December 11, 2025

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a primal-dual splitting algorithm for a broad class of structured composite monotone inclusions that involve finitely many set-valued operators, compositions of set-valued operators with bounded linear operators, and single-valued operators possibly without cocoercivity. The proposed algorithm is not only a unification for several contemporary algorithms but also a blueprint to generate new algorithms with graph-based structures. Our approach reduces dimensionality compared with the standard product space technique, which typically reformulates the original problem as the sum of two maximally monotone operators in order to apply splitting methods. It accommodates different cocoercive or Lipschitz constants as well as different resolvent parameters, and yields a larger allowable step-size range than in product space reformulations. We demonstrate the practicality of the approach by a numerical experiment on the decentralized fused lasso problem.

Keywords: Distributed optimization, composite monotone inclusions, splitting algorithms, primal-dual algorithms, fused lasso problem.

Mathematics Subject Classification (MSC 2020): 47H05, 47H10, 65K10, 90C30.

1. Introduction

Many interesting problems such as composite optimization problems, structured saddle-point problems, and variational inequalities can be formulated as monotone inclusion problems [14, 27, 28]. Among the most widely used methods for solving such problems are *splitting algorithms*, in which computations are performed separately on each operator instead of their compositions, see, e.g., [7, 19, 22, 24, 29, 32]. When an optimization problem involves compositions of set-valued operators with bounded linear operators, common mathematical tools such as resolvents can be computed for such compositions, however, it is generally very difficult, thus, not desirable. Instead, *primal-dual splitting algorithms* [2, 11, 12, 16, 21, 33] are usually used to process the set-valued operators separately using backward steps via their resolvents, while the bounded linear operators are evaluated

*School of Science, RMIT University, Melbourne, VIC 3000, Australia. E-mail: minh.dao@rmit.edu.au.

†Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Kennedy College of Sciences, University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, MA 01854, USA. E-mail: hung_phan@uml.edu.

‡School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia. E-mail: matthew.tam@unimelb.edu.au.

§School of Science, RMIT University, Melbourne, VIC 3000, Australia. E-mail: thang.tdk64@gmail.com.

directly using forward steps on their own or on their adjoints. Considering the primal inclusion and the dual inclusion simultaneously provides us a better understanding of the problem.

Let \mathcal{H} and $(\mathcal{G}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq r}$ be real Hilbert spaces. We consider the primal inclusion

$$\text{find } x \in \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } 0 \in \sum_{i=1}^n A_i x + \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* B_k L_k x + \sum_{j=1}^p C_j x, \quad (1)$$

where, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $A_i: \mathcal{H} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{H}$ is a maximally monotone operator, for each $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $B_k: \mathcal{G}_k \rightrightarrows \mathcal{G}_k$ is a maximally monotone operator and $L_k: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_k$ is a bounded linear operator with adjoint operator L_k^* , and for each $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, $C_j: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is either a cocoercive operator, or a monotone and Lipschitz continuous operator. Problem (1) arises in a wide range of applications, including location problems [9], image reconstruction [12], and signal processing [14]. The associated dual inclusion in the sense of Attouch–Théra [5] is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{find } (s_1, \dots, s_r) \in \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k \text{ such that} \\ & 0 \in -L_k \left(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i + \sum_{j=1}^p C_j \right)^{-1} \left(-\sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* s_k \right) + B_k^{-1} s_k, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, r\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

When $n \neq 0$, $r = 0$, and $p = 0$, problem (1) reduces to finding a zero in the sum of finitely many maximally monotone operators that are potentially set-valued. The most well-known algorithm for the classical case $n = 2$ is the *Douglas–Rachford algorithm* [19]. Recently, a splitting algorithm was proposed for $n = 3$ by Ryu [29], while a different resolvent splitting for the general case $n \geq 2$ was introduced by Malitsky and Tam [24]. The latter work was then extended into a framework [30] that covers these algorithms. In the setting when $n \neq 0$, $r = 0$, and $p \neq 0$, the problems involve not only maximally monotone operators but also single-valued operator which can be used directly by forward evaluations. When $n = 1$ and $p = 1$, the *forward-backward algorithm* [22] and the *forward-backward-forward algorithm* [32] are usually applied if C is cocoercive or C is monotone and Lipschitz continuous, respectively. Moreover, the authors of [4] developed a *distributed forward-backward algorithm* for the case where $n \geq 2$, $p = n - 1$, and each C_j is cocoercive, as well as a second algorithm for $n \geq 3$, $p = n - 2$, and each C_j monotone and Lipschitz continuous. Recently, the *forward-backward algorithms devised by graphs* in [3] and a class of algorithms in [1] effectively characterized methods that use only individual resolvent evaluations and direct evaluations of cocoercive operators, while a general approach to distributed operator splitting [18] addresses the situations where the single-valued operators may not be cocoercive.

In the setting when $r \neq 0$, there are many primal-dual algorithms are proposed, but only for some special cases of problem (1). For example, in the case $n = 1$, $r = 1$, and $p = 0$, popular algorithms include the *Chambolle–Pock algorithm* [12] and an algorithm proposed by Briceño-Arias and Combettes [11]. When $n = 0$, $r = 1$, and $p = 1$, one can use *primal-dual fixed-point algorithm based on the proximity operator* (PDFP²O) or *proximal alternating predictor-corrector* (PAPC) [13, 20]. For the case where $n = 1$, $r = 1$, and $p = 1$, we refer interested readers to [15, 16, 21, 23, 33]. When $r \geq 2$, one can adapt some of the above algorithms and use product space reformulations, even though it may not utilize different structures of algorithm design. Recently, Aragón-Artacho et al. [2] studied the case with $n \geq 2$, $r = 1$, and $p = 0$ in the reduced dimension $n - 1$. Then, to incorporate multiple bounded linear operators with $r \geq 2$, the proposed algorithm, however, still relies on a product space reformulation.

Most of the aforementioned algorithms reformulate the original problem as the sum of a maximally monotone operator and a skew-symmetric or cocoercive operator, then apply the forward-backward [16, 33] or forward-backward-forward approach [11, 15]. In this work, we introduce a primal-dual splitting algorithm for structured composite monotone inclusions. Our approach has the advantage of asking for only the resolvents of the operators but not of the compositions with bounded linear operators which is generally more difficult. Moreover, it does not require any matrix inversion or inner loops, but only the application of L and its adjoint. This is particularly beneficial for large-scale problems where computing the inverse of L is expensive. Our algorithm provides a different perspective using reduced dimension $n - 1$ compared to dimension n using product space reformulations which potentially contribute to the theory and applications of primal-dual algorithms. Further, we handle the linear operators L_1, \dots, L_r directly, not through product space, which can give alternative designs with step sizes that can possibly be r -times larger than that of [2, Corollary 1] when $L_1 = \dots = L_r$. Therefore, this approach is expected to facilitate distributed computation without central coordination which helps prevent central-coordination bottlenecks in practice. In addition, different cocoercive or Lipschitz constants, as well as resolvent parameters are also allowed for distributed implementation without requiring the knowledge of a global cocoercive or Lipschitz constant.

In this work, our main contributions are as follows.

- (i) We develop a primal-dual algorithm for structured composite monotone inclusions involving finitely many set-valued operators, composition of set-valued operators with bounded linear operators, and single-valued operators that may not be cocoercive. Our algorithm does not rely on reformulating the original problem as the sum of a maximally monotone operator and a skew-symmetric or cocoercive operator using product space reformulations but rather exploit structure of the algorithm to derive different designs with possibly larger step-size range. For our convergence analysis, we introduce the concept of *quasimonotonicity* in Definition 2.1(ii) and its natural connection to quasiaveragedness [18, Definition 2.1].
- (ii) The proposed algorithm not only unifies several contemporary algorithms but also provides a blueprint for generating new algorithms with graph-based structures. It only imposes mild assumptions on the coefficient matrices and allows different cocoercive or Lipschitz constants as well as different resolvent parameters that suitable for distributed implementation, hence improves certain existing methods. We further explore various choices of the coefficient matrices of the algorithm and examine the effect of step sizes on the algorithm's performance in a numerical experiment on the decentralized fused lasso problem.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some notations and background materials on set-valued, single-valued operators, Kronecker product, and solution sets of the primal and dual problem. In Section 3, we present our primal-dual splitting algorithm in Algorithm 1 with main convergence results in Theorem 3.10 and Theorem 3.12. We discuss about the relation to existing algorithms and new algorithms in Section 4. Section 5 provides a numerical experiment on the decentralized fused lasso problem to examine the performance of the algorithm under different settings of the coefficient matrices and parameters.

2. Preliminaries

In this paper, the sets of nonnegative integers and real numbers are denoted by \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{R} , respectively. We assume that \mathcal{H} and $(\mathcal{G}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq r}$ are real Hilbert spaces equipped with their respective inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and induced norm $\| \cdot \|$. Unless otherwise stated, we use the standard inner product in the product space \mathcal{H}^n , i.e., for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{H}^n$ and $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = (\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n) \in \mathcal{H}^n$,

$$\langle \mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle x_i, \bar{x}_i \rangle.$$

With this inner product, we say that a linear operator $\Psi : \mathcal{H}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^n$ is *positive semidefinite*, denoted by $\Psi \succeq 0$ if, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H}^n$, $\langle \mathbf{x}, \Psi \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq 0$. Strong and weak convergence of sequences are denoted by \rightarrow and \rightharpoonup , respectively.

For an operator A on \mathcal{H} , we write $A : \mathcal{H} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{H}$ when A is set-valued, and $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ when A is single-valued. For such an operator A , the *domain*, *graph*, *fixed-point set*, and *zero set* are defined by $\text{dom } A := \{x \in \mathcal{H} : Ax \neq \emptyset\}$, $\text{gra } A := \{(x, u) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} : u \in Ax\}$, $\text{Fix } A := \{x \in \mathcal{H} : x \in Ax\}$, and $\text{zer } A := \{x \in \mathcal{H} : 0 \in Ax\}$, respectively. The *resolvent* of A is defined by $J_A := (\text{Id} + A)^{-1}$, where Id denotes the identity operator. We say that A is *monotone* if, for all $(x, u), (y, v) \in \text{gra } A$,

$$\langle x - y, u - v \rangle \geq 0$$

and *maximally monotone* if it is monotone and there exists no monotone operator whose graph properly contains $\text{gra } A$.

An operator $C : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is ℓ -*Lipschitz continuous* for $\ell \in [0, +\infty)$ if, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, $\|Cx - Cy\| \leq \ell \|x - y\|$ and $\frac{1}{\ell}$ -*cocoercive* for $\ell \in (0, +\infty)$ if, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, $\langle Cx - Cy, x - y \rangle \geq \frac{1}{\ell} \|Cx - Cy\|^2$. By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, every $\frac{1}{\ell}$ -cocoercive operator is monotone and ℓ -Lipschitz continuous, which, in turn, means that it is also maximally monotone [7, Corollary 20.28].

For our convergence analysis, we will recall several related concepts.

Definition 2.1. We say that

- (i) $\Gamma : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is α -*comonotone* [8, Definition 2.4] with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ if, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\langle \Gamma x - \Gamma y, x - y \rangle \geq \alpha \|\Gamma x - \Gamma y\|^2.$$

- (ii) Γ is α -*quasicomonotone* (with respect to the set $\text{zer } \Gamma$) if, for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $y \in \text{zer } \Gamma$,

$$\langle \Gamma x, x - y \rangle \geq \alpha \|\Gamma x\|^2.$$

Unless stated otherwise, we will simply say Γ is α -quasicomonotone and drop the reference set $\text{zer } \Gamma$.

- (iii) $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is *conically ρ -averaged* [6, Definition 2.1] with $\rho \in (0, +\infty)$ if, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\|Tx - Ty\|^2 + \frac{1 - \rho}{\rho} \|(\text{Id} - T)x - (\text{Id} - T)y\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2,$$

- (iv) T is *conically ρ -quasiaveraged* (with respect to the set $\text{Fix } T$) [18, Definition 2.1] if, $\rho \in (0, +\infty)$ and for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and all $y \in \text{Fix } T$,

$$\|Tx - y\|^2 + \frac{1 - \rho}{\rho} \|(\text{Id} - T)x\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2.$$

Unless stated otherwise, we will simply say T is conically ρ -quasiaveraged and drop the reference set $\text{Fix } T$.

Clearly, every conically ρ -averaged operator is conically ρ -quasiaveraged. It is known from [6, Proposition 3.3] that, for $\alpha, \theta \in (0, +\infty)$, Γ is α -comonotone if and only if $\text{Id} - \theta\Gamma$ is conically $\frac{\theta}{2\alpha}$ -averaged. Naturally, we will derive a similar connection between conical quasiaveragedness and quasicomonotonicity.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\Gamma: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ and $\alpha, \theta \in (0, +\infty)$. Then Γ is α -quasicomonotone if and only if $T := \text{Id} - \theta\Gamma$ is conically $\frac{\theta}{2\alpha}$ -quasiaveraged.*

Proof. Take $\bar{x} \in \text{Fix } T = \text{zer } \Gamma$ and take any $x \in \mathcal{H}$. Then T is conically $\frac{\theta}{2\alpha}$ -quasiaveraged

$$\begin{aligned} \iff & \|Tx - \bar{x}\|^2 + \frac{1 - \theta/(2\alpha)}{\theta/(2\alpha)} \|(\text{Id} - T)x\|^2 \leq \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ \iff & \|x - \theta\Gamma x - \bar{x}\|^2 + \frac{2\alpha - \theta}{\theta} \|\theta\Gamma x\|^2 \leq \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ \iff & -2\langle \theta\Gamma x, x - \bar{x} \rangle + \|\theta\Gamma x\|^2 + (2\alpha - \theta)\theta\|\Gamma x\|^2 \leq 0 \\ \iff & \alpha\|\Gamma x\|^2 \leq \langle \Gamma x, x - \bar{x} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which means Γ is α -quasicomonotone. ■

2.1. Kronecker product, the vector $\mathbb{1}$, and the diagonal set Σ

For a matrix M , we denote its *range* and *kernel* by $\text{ran } M$ and $\text{ker } M$, respectively, its *transpose* by M^\top , and its *pseudo-inverse* by M^\dagger . For a positive diagonal matrix $E = \text{diag}(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ where $\eta_i \in (0, +\infty)$, we denote its square root matrix by $\sqrt{E} = \text{diag}(\sqrt{\eta_1}, \dots, \sqrt{\eta_n})$. Clearly, $\sqrt{E}\sqrt{E} = E$.

In an abuse of notation, we identify matrices $M = (M_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ with the Kronecker product $(M \otimes \text{Id}): \mathcal{H}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^n$. Therefore, for any $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_m) \in \mathcal{H}^m$, we have

$$M\mathbf{z} := (M \otimes \text{Id})\mathbf{z} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^m M_{1j}z_j, \sum_{j=1}^m M_{2j}z_j, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^m M_{nj}z_j \right) \in \mathcal{H}^n.$$

Let $A_1, \dots, A_n: \mathcal{H} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{H}$ be maximally monotone operators. Given $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{H}^n$, we define the operator $\mathbf{A}: \mathcal{H}^n \rightrightarrows \mathcal{H}^n$ by $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} := A_1x_1 \times \dots \times A_nx_n$. It follows that \mathbf{A} is also a maximally monotone operator. As a consequence, its resolvent $J_{\mathbf{A}}: \mathcal{H}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^n$ is given by $J_{\mathbf{A}} = (J_{A_1}, \dots, J_{A_n})$. Note that we can write \mathbf{A} and $J_{\mathbf{A}}$ as diagonal operators

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & A_n \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } J_{\mathbf{A}} = \begin{bmatrix} J_{A_1} & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & J_{A_n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Similarly, we define the diagonal operators

$$\mathbf{B} := \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & B_r \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{L} := \begin{bmatrix} L_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & L_r \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C} := \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & C_p \end{bmatrix},$$

where the operators B_k , L_k , and C_j are from the setup of problem (1).

We denote $\mathbb{1}_n = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. When the context is clear, we will drop the subscript and simply write $\mathbb{1}$, for example, if $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, then $\mathbb{1}^\top M \mathbb{1} = (\mathbb{1}_m)^\top M (\mathbb{1}_n)$. Using this notation, we can define the *diagonal set*

$$\Sigma_n := \{\mathbf{x} = (x, \dots, x) \in \mathcal{H}^n\} = \{(\mathbb{1}_n)x : x \in \mathcal{H}\},$$

and thus its the orthogonal set is $\Sigma_n^\perp = \{\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{H}^n : \mathbb{1}^\top \hat{\mathbf{x}} = 0\}$. Again, we will drop the subscript and denote $\mathbb{1}x$ when the dimension is clear. In particular, for $x \in \mathcal{H}$, $\mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x) = (A_1x, \dots, A_nx)$, $\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x) = (L_1x, \dots, L_rx)$, and $\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x) = (C_1x, \dots, C_px)$.

2.2. Solution sets of the primal and dual problems

The sets of solutions to (1) and (2) are denoted by \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{D} , respectively. Let \mathbf{Z} be a subset of $\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z} &= \left\{ (x, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{H} \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k : \mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_r) \in \prod_{k=1}^r B_k L_k x \text{ and } 0 \in \sum_{i=1}^n A_i x + \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* s_k + \sum_{j=1}^p C_j x \right\} \\ &= \left\{ (x, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{H} \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k : \mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{BL}(\mathbb{1}x) \text{ and } 0 \in \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x) + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^* \mathbf{s} + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

An element of \mathbf{Z} is referred to as a *primal-dual solution* to (1) and (2) due to the following statement.

$$\mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset \iff \mathbf{Z} \neq \emptyset \iff \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset. \quad (4)$$

To prove (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \exists x \in \mathcal{P} &\iff \exists x \in \mathcal{H}, \quad 0 \in \sum_{i=1}^n A_i x + \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* B_k L_k x + \sum_{j=1}^p C_j x \\ &\iff \exists x \in \mathcal{H}, \quad 0 \in \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x) + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^* \mathbf{BL}(\mathbb{1}x) + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x) \\ &\iff \exists (x, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{H} \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k, \quad \begin{cases} -\mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^* \mathbf{s} &\in \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x) + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x), \\ \mathbf{s} &\in \mathbf{BL}(\mathbb{1}x) \end{cases} \\ &\iff \exists (x, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{H} \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k, \quad \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}x &\in \left(\mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x) + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x) \right)^{-1} \left(-\mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^* \mathbf{s} \right) \\ \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x) &\in \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{s} \end{cases} \\ &\iff \exists \mathbf{s} \in \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k, \quad 0 \in -\mathbf{L} \left(\mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x) + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x) \right)^{-1} \left(-\mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^* \mathbf{s} \right) + \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{s} \\ &\iff \exists \mathbf{s} \in \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k, \quad 0 \in -L_k \left(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i + \sum_{j=1}^p C_j \right)^{-1} \left(-\sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* s_k \right) + B_k^{-1} s_k, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, r\} \\ &\iff \exists \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{D}. \end{aligned}$$

3. A primal-dual splitting algorithm

Throughout this section, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, each $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, and each $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, A_i and B_k are maximally monotone operators, L_k is a bounded linear operator with adjoint operator

L_k^* , and C_j is a monotone and ℓ_j -Lipschitz continuous operator. Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$. Define an auxiliary operator $\Phi : \mathcal{H}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^n$ by

$$\Phi := (P - Q)CR + QCP^\top. \quad (5)$$

Let $D = \text{diag}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $E = \text{diag}(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_r) \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ be positive diagonal matrices. Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$, and $K \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$. Given $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{H}^m$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$, and $\theta \in (0, +\infty)$, we define the operator $T : \mathcal{H}^m \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^m \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$ as

$$T(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) := \begin{bmatrix} T_1(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) \\ T_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z} \\ \mathbf{w} \end{bmatrix} - \theta \begin{bmatrix} M^\top \mathbf{x} \\ E(\mathbf{L}H^\top \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} are defined via the solution operator $S : \mathcal{H}^m \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^n \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$ with $\gamma \in (0, +\infty)$

$$(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := S(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) := \begin{bmatrix} J_{\gamma D^{-1}A} \left[D^{-1} \left(M\mathbf{z} + N\mathbf{x} - \gamma\Phi\mathbf{x} - \gamma H\mathbf{L}^*(E\mathbf{L}K\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}) \right) \right] \\ J_{E^{-1}B} (\mathbf{L}K\mathbf{x} - E^{-1}\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{L}H^\top \mathbf{x}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

We propose the following primal-dual algorithm.

Algorithm 1. Let $\mathbf{z}^0 \in \mathcal{H}^m$, $\mathbf{w}^0 \in \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$, and $(\lambda_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, +\infty)$. For each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, compute

$$(\mathbf{z}^{t+1}, \mathbf{w}^{t+1}) := \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_t}{\theta}\right)(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) + \frac{\lambda_t}{\theta}T(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t),$$

where $\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t$ in $T(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)$ are determined by

$$(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t) := S(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)$$

with T, S defined by (6) and (7), respectively.

Remark 3.1 (Conditions for explicitness). Algorithm 1 can be written in the form

$$\begin{cases} x_i^t = J_{\frac{\gamma}{\delta_i}A_i} \left(\frac{1}{\delta_i} \sum_{j=1}^m M_{ij}z_j^t + \frac{1}{\delta_i} \sum_{j=1}^n N_{ij}x_j^t - \frac{\gamma}{\delta_i} \sum_{j=1}^p (P_{ij} - Q_{ij})C_j \left(\sum_{k=1}^n R_{jk}x_k^t \right) \right. \\ \quad \left. - \frac{\gamma}{\delta_i} \sum_{j=1}^p Q_{ij}C_j \left(\sum_{k=1}^n P_{kj}x_k^t \right) - \frac{\gamma}{\delta_i} \sum_{j=1}^r H_{ij}L_j^* \left(\eta_j L_j \left(\sum_{k=1}^n K_{jk}x_k^t \right) - w_j^t \right) \right), \\ \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \\ y_k^t = J_{\frac{1}{\eta_k}B_k} \left(L_k \left(\sum_{j=1}^n K_{kj}x_j^t \right) - \frac{1}{\eta_k}w_k^t + L_k \left(\sum_{j=1}^n H_{jk}x_j^t \right) \right), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \\ z_i^{t+1} = z_i^t - \lambda_t \sum_{j=1}^n M_{ji}x_j^t, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \\ w_k^{t+1} = w_k^t - \lambda_t \eta_k \left(L_k \left(\sum_{j=1}^n H_{jk}x_j^t \right) - y_k^t \right), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, r\}. \end{cases}$$

In general, the algorithm is implicit in the sense that the calculation of \mathbf{x}^t requires the value of \mathbf{x}^t itself. When the first rows of N, P, Q , and H are zeros, x_1^k is explicitly expressed as

$$x_1^t = J_{\frac{\gamma}{\delta_1}A_1} \left(\frac{1}{\delta_1} \sum_{j=1}^m M_{1j}z_j^t \right), \quad (8)$$

but the remaining components x_i^t may still be implicit. Although our convergence analysis of Algorithm 1 holds in this implicit setting, for practical implementation, we are interested in explicit

versions, in which x_1^t depends only on \mathbf{z}^t and, for each $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$, the update of x_i^t depends only on \mathbf{z}^t and components x_j^t with $j < i$ that have already been computed. This property is guaranteed as soon as N , Φ , and $H\mathbf{L}^*E\mathbf{L}K$ are strictly lower triangular, equivalently, for all $k \geq i$,

$$\begin{cases} N_{ij} = 0, & i \leq j \\ (P_{ij} - Q_{ij})R_{jk} = 0, & j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \\ Q_{ij}P_{kj} = 0, & j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \\ H_{ij}K_{jk} = 0, & j \in \{1, \dots, r\}. \end{cases} \quad \begin{array}{l} (9a) \\ (9b) \\ (9c) \\ (9d) \end{array}$$

Equations (9b) and (9c) mean that, for each $(i, j) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, p\}$, exactly one of the following happens:

- $R_{ji} \neq 0$, $P_{1j} = \dots = P_{ij} = 0$, $Q_{1j} = \dots = Q_{ij} = 0$;
- $R_{ji} = 0$, $P_{ij} \neq 0$, $Q_{1j} = \dots = Q_{ij} = 0$;
- $R_{ji} = 0$, $P_{ij} = 0$, $Q_{ij} \neq 0$.

These conditions, in fact, can be visualized nicely using a block structure in which they complement one another as in Figure 1a. The possible nonzero parts of R , P , and Q are in blue, green, and red colors, respectively. Similarly, the conditions on H and K are illustrated in Figure 1b.




Figure 1: Coefficient matrix structure

It is worthwhile mentioning that condition (9) is weaker and easier to verify than the condition in [18, Remark 3.1(i)]. Moreover, based on Figure 1, the coefficient matrices can be easily customized to meet specific computational requirements.

Now, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &:= 2D - N - N^\top - MM^\top - \gamma(H - K^\top)\mathbf{L}^*E\mathbf{L}(H^\top - K), \\ \Upsilon_1 &:= (P - Q)\text{diag}(\ell)(P^\top - Q^\top) + (P - R^\top)\text{diag}(\ell)(P^\top - R), \\ \Upsilon_2 &:= (P - R^\top)\text{diag}(\ell)(P^\top - R) \end{aligned}$$

and consider the following assumptions on the coefficient matrices.

Assumption 3.2 (Standing assumptions).

- (i) $\ker M^\top = \text{span}\{\mathbb{1}\}$.
- (ii) $\sum_{i,j=1}^n N_{ij} = \mathbb{1}^\top N \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}^\top D \mathbb{1} = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i$.
- (iii) $P^\top \mathbb{1} = R \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}$ if $\mathbf{C} \neq 0$, and $P^\top = R = 0$ if $\mathbf{C} = 0$.
- (iv) $H^\top \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}$ if $\mathbf{B} \neq 0$, and $H^\top = K = 0$ if $\mathbf{B} = 0$.

Assumption 3.3 (Positive semidefiniteness).

- (i) $\Omega \succeq 0$.
- (ii) $\Omega - \gamma \Upsilon_1 \succeq 0$.
- (iii) $\Omega - \frac{\gamma}{2} \Upsilon_2 \succeq 0$.

Remark 3.4. We make the following observations regarding Assumptions 3.2 and 3.3.

- (i) Assumption 3.2(i) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank } M &= \text{rank } M^\top = n - \dim(\ker M^\top) = n - 1, \\ \text{ran } M &= (\ker M^\top)^\perp = \left\{ (c_1, \dots, c_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{1}^\top c = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i = 0 \right\}, \\ \ker(M^\top \otimes \text{Id}) &= \ker M^\top \otimes \mathcal{H} = \Sigma, \\ \text{ran}(M \otimes \text{Id}) &= (\ker(M \otimes \text{Id}))^\perp = (\ker(M^\top \otimes \text{Id}))^\perp = \Sigma^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) In view of Assumption 3.2(iii), if $\mathbf{C} \neq 0$, then we have for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$ that $P^\top(\mathbb{1}x) = R(\mathbb{1}x) = \mathbb{1}x$, and so

$$\Phi(\mathbb{1}x) = (P - Q)\mathbf{C}R(\mathbb{1}x) + Q\mathbf{C}P^\top(\mathbb{1}x) = (P - Q)\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x) + Q\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x) = P\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x),$$

leading to $\mathbb{1}^\top \Phi(\mathbb{1}x) = \mathbb{1}^\top P\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x) = \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x)$, which also holds when $\mathbf{C} = 0$.

- (iii) By Assumption 3.2(i)&(iii), if $\mathbf{C} \neq 0$, then it follows from [18, Remark 3.3(iv)] that $U = (P^\top - R)(M^\top)^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ solves $UM^\top = P^\top - R$ with minimal norm; moreover, if additional $Q^\top \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}$, then $W = (P^\top - Q^\top)(M^\top)^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ solves $WM^\top = P^\top - Q^\top$ with minimal norm. When $\mathbf{C} = 0$, we have $P = 0$ and $R = 0$, in which case the associated matrix U is simply 0.
- (iv) It is clear that $\Upsilon_1 \succeq \Upsilon_2 \succeq 0$. Therefore, Assumption 3.3(ii) \implies Assumption 3.3(iii) \implies Assumption 3.3(i).

3.1. Fixed-point encoding and preliminary results

Lemma 3.5 (Fixed points and Kuhn–Tucker points). *Suppose Assumption 3.2 holds. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *If $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) \in \text{Fix } T$ and $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})$, then $\mathbf{x} = \mathbb{1}x \in \Sigma$, $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x)$, and $(x, \text{ELK}(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbf{Z}$.*

- (ii) If $(x, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathbf{Z}$, then there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{H}^m$ such that $(\mathbf{z}, ELK(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbf{s}) \in \text{Fix } T$ and $(\mathbb{1}x, \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x)) = S(\mathbf{z}, ELK(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbf{s})$.

Consequently, $\text{Fix } T \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\mathbf{Z} \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. (i): Assume that $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) \in \text{Fix } T$ and $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})$. Then

$$(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) - T(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) = (\theta M^\top \mathbf{x}, \theta E(\mathbf{L}H^\top \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})) = (0, 0),$$

and so $\mathbf{x} \in \ker(M^\top \otimes \text{Id}) = \Sigma$ due to Remark 3.4(i). Thus, $\mathbf{x} = \mathbb{1}x$ for some $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{L}H^\top \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{L}H^\top(\mathbb{1}x) = \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x)$.

Since $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbb{1}x, \mathbf{y}) = S(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} D^{-1}\left(M\mathbf{z} - N(\mathbb{1}x) - \gamma\Phi(\mathbb{1}x) - \gamma H\mathbf{L}^*(ELK(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbf{w})\right) &\in \mathbb{1}x + \gamma D^{-1}\mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x), \\ LK(\mathbb{1}x) - E^{-1}\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{L}H^\top(\mathbb{1}x) &\in \mathbf{y} + E^{-1}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} M\mathbf{z} + N(\mathbb{1}x) - D(\mathbb{1}x) &\in \gamma\mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x) + \gamma\Phi(\mathbb{1}x) + \gamma H\mathbf{L}^*(ELK(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbf{w}), \\ ELK(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbf{w} &\in \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $M\mathbf{z} + N(\mathbb{1}x) - D(\mathbb{1}x) \in \gamma\mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x) + \gamma\Phi(\mathbb{1}x) + \gamma H\mathbf{L}^*\mathbf{B}\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x)$. This together with Remark 3.4(ii) and Assumption 3.2(i)(ii)(iv) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma\left(\mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x) + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^*\mathbf{B}\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x) + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x)\right) &= \gamma\left(\mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x) + \mathbb{1}^\top H\mathbf{L}^*\mathbf{B}\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x) + \mathbb{1}^\top \Phi(\mathbb{1}x)\right) \\ &\ni \mathbb{1}^\top M\mathbf{z} + \mathbb{1}^\top N(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbb{1}^\top D(\mathbb{1}x) = \mathbb{1}^\top M\mathbf{z} = 0^\top \mathbf{z} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(x, ELK(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbf{Z}$ as claimed.

(ii): Assume that $(x, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathbf{Z}$. Then $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{B}\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x)$ and $0 \in \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x) + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^*\mathbf{s} + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x)$. So, there exists $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x)$ such that

$$0 = \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{a} + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^*\mathbf{s} + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}x). \quad (10)$$

Define $\mathbf{u} := \mathbb{1}x + \gamma D^{-1}\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{1}x + \gamma D^{-1}\mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}x)$ and $\mathbf{v} := \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x) + E^{-1}\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x) + E^{-1}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x)$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{1}x = J_{\gamma D^{-1}\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{y} := \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x) = J_{E^{-1}\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{v}). \quad (11)$$

Define $\mathbf{w} := ELK(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbf{s}$, we have

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x) + E^{-1}\mathbf{s} = LK(\mathbb{1}x) - E^{-1}\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x) \quad (12)$$

Next, we will find $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{H}^m$ such that

$$\mathbf{u} = D^{-1}\left(M\mathbf{z} + N(\mathbb{1}x) - \gamma\Phi(\mathbb{1}x) - \gamma H\mathbf{L}^*(ELK(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbf{w})\right), \quad (13)$$

i.e., $M\mathbf{z} = D\mathbf{u} - N(\mathbb{1}x) + \gamma\Phi(\mathbb{1}x) + \gamma H\mathbf{L}^*(ELK(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbf{w})$. Thus, to establish the existence of \mathbf{z} , it suffices to prove that

$$D\mathbf{u} - N(\mathbb{1}x) + \gamma\Phi(\mathbb{1}x) + \gamma H\mathbf{L}^*(ELK(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbf{w}) \in \text{ran}(M \otimes \text{Id}) = \Sigma^\perp = \{\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{H}^n : \mathbb{1}^\top \hat{\mathbf{x}} = 0\}.$$

Indeed, we check that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{1}^\top \left(D\mathbf{u} - N(\mathbb{1}x) + \gamma\Phi\mathbf{x} + \gamma H\mathbf{L}^*(ELK(\mathbb{1}x) - \mathbf{w}) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{1}^\top D(\mathbb{1}x) + \gamma\mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{a} - \mathbb{1}^\top N(\mathbb{1}x) + \gamma\mathbb{1}^\top \Phi(\mathbb{1}x) + \gamma\mathbb{1}^\top H\mathbf{L}^*\mathbf{s} \\
&= \gamma \left(\mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{a} + \mathbb{1}^\top C(\mathbb{1}x) + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^*\mathbf{s} \right) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

due to $\mathbb{1}^\top D(\mathbb{1}x) = \mathbb{1}^\top N(\mathbb{1}x)$ by Assumption 3.2(ii), $\mathbb{1}^\top \Phi(\mathbb{1}x) = \mathbb{1}^\top C(\mathbb{1}x)$ by Remark 3.4(ii), and (10). Therefore, we have proved the existence of \mathbf{z} satisfying (13).

Now, combining (11), (12), and (13), we have that $(\mathbb{1}x, \mathbf{y}) = S(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})$. Finally, we check that $T(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) = (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) - \theta(M^\top(\mathbb{1}x), ELH^\top(\mathbb{1}x) - E\mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})$, i.e., $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) \in \text{Fix } T$. \blacksquare

The following lemma characterizes the cluster points of the sequence generated by Algorithm 1.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose Assumption 3.2 holds. Let $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequences generated by Algorithm 1 and suppose $(\text{Id} - T)(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *For all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $x_i^t - x_j^t \rightarrow 0$ and $y_k^t - L_k x_j^t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.*
- (ii) *For every weak cluster point $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ of $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, it holds that $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \text{Fix } T$, $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{1}\bar{x}$, and $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}\bar{x})$ with $(\bar{x}, ELK\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \mathbf{Z}$; moreover, if the first rows of N , P , Q , and H are zeros, then $\bar{x} = J_{\frac{\gamma}{\delta_1} A_1}(\frac{1}{\delta_1} \sum_{j=1}^m M_{1j} \bar{z}_j)$.*

Proof. (i): Let any $c := (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i = 0$. By Remark 3.4(i), $c \in \text{ran } M$, and so $c = Md$ for some $d \in \mathbb{R}^m$. As $t \rightarrow +\infty$, since $\mathbf{z}^t - T_1(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightarrow 0$, one has

$$c^\top \mathbf{x}^t = d^\top M^\top \mathbf{x}^t = \frac{1}{\theta} d^\top (\mathbf{z}^k - T_1(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)) \rightarrow 0.$$

For all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $i \neq j$, choosing $c_i = 1, c_j = -1$, and all other entries equal to zeros, we derive

$$x_i^t - x_j^t = c^\top \mathbf{x}^t \rightarrow 0. \tag{14}$$

Next, since $\mathbf{y}^t - \mathbf{L}H^\top \mathbf{x}^t = -\frac{1}{\theta} E^{-1}(\mathbf{w}^t - T_2(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)) \rightarrow 0$, using Assumption 3.2(iv) and (14), we have that, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$\mathbf{y}^t - \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}x_j^t) = \mathbf{y}^t - \mathbf{L}H^\top \mathbf{x}^t + \mathbf{L}H^\top (\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbb{1}x_j^t) \rightarrow 0,$$

which completes the proof of (i).

(ii): For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{H}^n$ and $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we set

$$\Phi\mathbf{x} := (\Phi_1\mathbf{x}, \dots, \Phi_n\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_i x := \Phi_i(\mathbb{1}x),$$

where Φ is given by (5), which means

$$\Phi_i\mathbf{x} = \sum_{j=1}^p \left((P_{ij} - Q_{ij})C_j \left(\sum_{k=1}^n R_{jk}x_k \right) + Q_{ij}C_j \left(\sum_{k=1}^n P_{kj}x_k \right) \right),$$

and, by Remark 3.4(ii),

$$\phi_i x = (PC(\mathbb{1}x))_i. \tag{15}$$

For each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, set $\mathbf{u}^t := D^{-1}(M\mathbf{z}^t + N\mathbf{x}^t - \gamma H L^*(E L K \mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{w}^t))$ and $\mathbf{v}^t := L K \mathbf{x}^t - E^{-1} \mathbf{w}^t + L H^\top \mathbf{x}^t$. Then $\mathbf{x}^t = J_{\gamma D^{-1} A}(\mathbf{u}^t - \gamma D^{-1} \Phi \mathbf{x}^t)$ and $\mathbf{y}^t = J_{E^{-1} B}(\mathbf{v}^t)$, which are equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta_i}{\gamma}(u_i^t - x_i^t) - \Phi_i \mathbf{x}^t &\in A_i x_i^t, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \\ \text{and } \eta_k(v_k^t - y_k^t) &\in B_k y_k^t, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, r\}. \end{aligned}$$

This can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} x_i^t - x_n^t &\in (A_i + \phi_i)^{-1} \left(\frac{\delta_i}{\gamma}(u_i^t - x_i^t) - \Phi_i \mathbf{x}^t + \phi_i x_i^t \right) - x_n^t, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \\ s^t &\in (A_n + \phi_n)(x_n^t) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{\delta_i}{\gamma}(u_i^t - x_i^t) - \Phi_i \mathbf{x}^t + \phi_i x_i^t \right) + \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^*(\eta_k(v_k^t - y_k^t)), \\ y_k^t - L_k x_n^t &\in B_k^{-1}(\eta_k(v_k^t - y_k^t)) - L_k x_n^t, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$s^t := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\gamma}(u_i^t - x_i^t) - \sum_{i=1}^n (\Phi_i \mathbf{x}^t - \phi_i x_i^t) + \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^*(\eta_k(v_k^t - y_k^t)). \quad (16)$$

Letting $\mathcal{S}: \mathcal{H}^{n+r} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{H}^{n+r}$ be given by

$$\mathcal{S} := \text{diag} \left(\begin{bmatrix} (A_1 + \phi_1)^{-1} \\ \vdots \\ (A_{n-1} + \phi_{n-1})^{-1} \\ (A_n + \phi_n) \\ B_1^{-1} \\ \vdots \\ B_r^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \right) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dots & 0 & -\text{Id} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & -\text{Id} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \text{Id} & \dots & \text{Id} & 0 & L_1^* & \dots & L_r^* \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & -L_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & -L_r & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

we derive that

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1^t - x_n^t \\ \vdots \\ x_{n-1}^t - x_n^t \\ s^t \\ y_1^t - L_1 x_n^t \\ \vdots \\ y_r^t - L_r x_n^t \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{S} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\delta_1}{\gamma}(u_1^t - x_1^t) - \Phi_1 \mathbf{x}^t + \phi_1 x_1^t \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\delta_{n-1}}{\gamma}(u_{n-1}^t - x_{n-1}^t) - \Phi_{n-1} \mathbf{x}^t + \phi_{n-1} x_{n-1}^t \\ x_n^t \\ \eta_1(v_1^t - y_1^t) \\ \vdots \\ \eta_r(v_r^t - y_r^t) \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (17)$$

As $C_1, \dots, C_p: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ are monotone and Lipschitz continuous, they are maximally monotone operators with full domain. By (15), ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n are also maximally monotone operators. Using [7, Corollary 25.5(i), Example 20.35], \mathcal{S} is a maximally monotone operator as the sum of a maximally monotone operator and a skew symmetric linear operator.

Now, we show that the left-hand side of (17) converges strongly to 0. In view of (i), it suffices to show that $s^t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. We note that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$\Phi_i \mathbf{x}^t - \phi_i x_i^t = \Phi_i \mathbf{x}^t - \Phi_i(\mathbb{1} x_i^t) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow +\infty \quad (18)$$

due to $\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbb{1}x_i^t \rightarrow 0$ by (i) and Φ_i is Lipschitz continuous by the Lipschitz continuity of C_1, \dots, C_p . By the definitions of \mathbf{u}^t and \mathbf{v}^t , and Remark 3.4(i),

$$D\mathbf{u}^t - N\mathbf{x}^t + \gamma H\mathbf{L}^*E(\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{L}H^\top \mathbf{x}^t) = M\mathbf{z}^t \in \text{ran}(M \otimes \text{Id}).$$

Noting from Assumption 3.2(iv) that $\mathbb{1}^\top H = \mathbb{1}^\top$, we have $\mathbb{1}^\top (D\mathbf{u}^t - N\mathbf{x}^t) + \gamma \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^*E(\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{L}H^\top \mathbf{x}^t) = 0$, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\gamma} (u_i^t - x_i^t) + \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* (\eta_k (v_k^t - y_k^t)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathbb{1}^\top D(\mathbf{u}^t - \mathbf{x}^t) + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^*E(\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{y}^t) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathbb{1}^\top (N\mathbf{x}^t - D\mathbf{x}^t) - \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^*E(\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{L}H^\top \mathbf{x}^t) + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^*E(\mathbf{v}^t - \mathbf{y}^t) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathbb{1}^\top (N - D)\mathbf{x}^t + \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^*E(\mathbf{L}H^\top \mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{y}^t) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathbb{1}^\top (N - D)(\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbb{1}x_n^t) + \frac{1}{\theta} \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^*(\mathbf{w}^t - T_2(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow +\infty, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where we use $\mathbb{1}^\top (N - D)(\mathbb{1}x_n^t) = 0$ (by Assumption 3.2(ii)) and $\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbb{1}x_i^t \rightarrow 0$ (by (i)). Combining (18) and (19) with (16), we deduce that $s^t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

Since $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ is a weak cluster point of $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, there exists a subsequence, denoted by $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ without relabeling, such that $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t) \rightharpoonup (\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. It follows from (i) that $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{1}\bar{x}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}\bar{x})$ for some $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{H}$. We also have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}^t &\rightharpoonup \bar{\mathbf{u}} = D^{-1}(M\bar{\mathbf{z}} + N\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \gamma H\mathbf{L}^*(E\mathbf{L}K\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}})) \\ \text{and } \mathbf{v}^t &\rightharpoonup \bar{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{L}K\bar{\mathbf{x}} - E^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{L}H^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{L}K\bar{\mathbf{x}} - E^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}\bar{x}). \end{aligned}$$

By combining with (19),

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{\gamma} (\bar{u}_i - \bar{x}) + \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* \eta_k (\bar{v}_k - \bar{y}_k) = 0. \quad (20)$$

Since the graph of a maximally monotone operator is sequentially closed in the weak-strong topology [7, Proposition 20.38(ii)], passing to the limit in (17) and using (i) and (18), we obtain that

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{S} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\delta_1}{\gamma} (\bar{u}_1 - \bar{x}) \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\delta_{n-1}}{\gamma} (\bar{u}_{n-1} - \bar{x}) \\ \bar{x} \\ \eta_1 (\bar{v}_1 - \bar{y}_1) \\ \vdots \\ \eta_r (\bar{v}_r - \bar{y}_r) \end{bmatrix} \right),$$

which together with (20) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\delta_i}{\gamma} (\bar{u}_i - \bar{x}) - \phi_i \bar{x} \in A_i \bar{x}, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \\ & \frac{\delta_n}{\gamma} (\bar{u}_n - \bar{x}) - \phi_n \bar{x} = - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\delta_i}{\gamma} (\bar{u}_i - \bar{x}) - \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* \eta_k (\bar{v}_k - \bar{y}_k) - \phi_n \bar{x} \in A_n \bar{x}, \\ & \eta_k (\bar{v}_k - \bar{y}_k) \in B_k L_k \bar{x}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{x} &= J_{\frac{\gamma}{\delta_i} A_i} \left(\bar{u}_i - \frac{\gamma}{\delta_i} \phi_i \bar{x} \right) = J_{\frac{\gamma}{\delta_i} A_i} \left(\bar{u}_i - \frac{\gamma}{\delta_i} \Phi_i \bar{\mathbf{x}} \right), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\ \bar{y}_k &= L_k \bar{x} = J_{\frac{1}{\eta_k} B_k} (\bar{v}_k), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, r\},\end{aligned}\tag{22}$$

which implies that $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) = S(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$, and thus $T(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) = (\bar{\mathbf{z}} - \theta M^\top(\mathbb{1}\bar{x}), \bar{\mathbf{w}} - \theta E(\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}\bar{x}) - \bar{\mathbf{y}})) = (\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$. As a result, $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \text{Fix } T$.

Next, we have from (15) and Assumption 3.2(iii) that $\sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i \bar{x} = \sum_{j=1}^p C_j \bar{x}$. By summing up the relations in (21), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}-\mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{L}^* E(\bar{\mathbf{v}} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}) - \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{1}\bar{x}) &\in \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbb{1}\bar{x}), \\ E(\bar{\mathbf{v}} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}) &\in \mathbf{B}\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}\bar{x}).\end{aligned}$$

Since $E(\bar{\mathbf{v}} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}) = E\mathbf{L}\mathbf{K}\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}} + E(\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}\bar{x}) - \bar{\mathbf{y}}) = E\mathbf{L}\mathbf{K}\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}$, it follows that $(\bar{x}, E\mathbf{L}\mathbf{K}\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \mathbf{Z}$. Finally, by (22), if the first rows of N , P , Q , and H are all zeros, then $\bar{x} = J_{\frac{\gamma}{\delta_1} A_1} (\bar{u}_1 - \frac{\gamma}{\delta_1} \phi_1 \bar{x}) = J_{\frac{\gamma}{\delta_1} A_1} (\frac{1}{\delta_1} \sum_{j=1}^m M_{1j} \bar{z}_j)$. \blacksquare

Next, we establish the convergence of Algorithm 1 in the presence of Fejér monotonicity.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose Assumption 3.2 holds and the first rows of N , P , Q , and H are entirely zeros. Let $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequences generated by Algorithm 1 and suppose that $(\text{Id} - T)(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *If $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, then so is $(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$.*
- (ii) *If $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Fejér monotone with respect to $\text{Fix } T$, then $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightharpoonup (\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \text{Fix } T$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.*
- (iii) *As $t \rightarrow +\infty$, if $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightharpoonup (\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$, then $(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t) \rightharpoonup (\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ and $(E\mathbf{L}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{w}^t) \rightharpoonup (E\mathbf{L}\mathbf{K}\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}})$ with $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{1}\bar{x}$, $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}\bar{x})$, and $(\bar{x}, E\mathbf{L}\mathbf{K}\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \mathbf{Z}$.*

Proof. (i): Since the first rows of N , P , Q , and H are all zeros, we have from (8) that $x_1^t = J_{\frac{\gamma}{\delta_1} A_1} (\frac{1}{\delta_1} \sum_{j=1}^m M_{1j} z_j^t)$ and $x_1^0 = J_{\frac{\gamma}{\delta_1} A_1} (\frac{1}{\delta_1} \sum_{j=1}^m M_{1j} z_j^0)$. By the nonexpansiveness of $J_{\frac{\gamma}{\delta_1} A_1}$,

$$\|x_1^t - x_1^0\| \leq \left\| \frac{1}{\delta_1} \sum_{j=1}^m M_{1j} z_j^t - \frac{1}{\delta_1} \sum_{j=1}^m M_{1j} z_j^0 \right\|.$$

Since, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $(z_j^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, so is $(x_1^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, which together with Lemma 3.6(i) implies the boundedness of $(\mathbf{x}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. The boundedness of $(\mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ then follows from the nonexpansiveness of $J_{E^{-1}\mathbf{B}}$ along with the boundedness of $(\mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(\mathbf{x}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, and \mathbf{L} .

(ii): As $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Fejér monotone, it is bounded due to [7, Proposition 5.4(i)]. By (i), $(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded.

Now, let $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) = (\bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_m, \bar{w}_1, \dots, \bar{w}_r) \in \mathcal{H}^m \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$ be an arbitrary weak cluster point of $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. By passing to another subsequences if necessary, there exist $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{H}^n$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$ such that $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ is a weak cluster point of $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. According to Lemma 3.6(ii), $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \text{Fix } T$. By [7, Theorem 5.5], $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \text{Fix } T$.

(iii): Since $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$, it is bounded, so $(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is also bounded due to (i). Let $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \mathcal{H}^n \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$ be an arbitrary weak cluster point of $(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ is a weak cluster point of $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t, \mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. By Lemma 3.6(ii), $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{1}\bar{x}$, $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}\bar{x})$, $(\bar{x}, ELK\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \mathbf{Z}$, and $\bar{x} = J_{\frac{\gamma}{\delta_1}A_1}(\frac{1}{\delta_1} \sum_{j=1}^m M_{1j}\bar{z}_j)$. Thus, $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$ do not depend on the choice of cluster points, and we must have $(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t) \rightharpoonup (\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. Together with the weak convergence of $(\mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, we obtain that $(ELK\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{w}^t) \rightharpoonup (ELK\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}})$, which completes the proof. \blacksquare

We observe that $T = \text{Id} - \theta\Gamma$ with $\Gamma : \mathcal{H}^m \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^m \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$:

$$(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} M^\top & 0 \\ ELH^\top & -E \end{bmatrix} S(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) = \begin{bmatrix} M^\top & 0 \\ ELH^\top & -E \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

where $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})$. Thus, the algorithm can be written as

$$(\mathbf{z}^{t+1}, \mathbf{w}^{t+1}) = (\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) - \lambda_t \Gamma(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t).$$

Our aim is to prove that T is conically quasiaveraged in the space $\mathcal{H}^m \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$ with the (scaled) inner product

$$\langle (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}), (\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \rangle_\star := \langle \mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \rangle + \gamma \langle E^{-1} \mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{w}} \rangle \quad (24)$$

for $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}), (\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \mathcal{H}^m \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$ and the corresponding induced \star -norm

$$\|(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})\|_\star = \sqrt{\langle (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}), (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) \rangle_\star}.$$

In view of Proposition 2.2, we will show that Γ is quasicomonotone. Thus, the next technical lemma is a key ingredient in our analysis.

Lemma 3.8 (A metric identity and inequality for Γ). *Let $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}), (\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \mathcal{H}^m \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$, $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})$, and $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) = S(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) - \Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})\|_\star^2 &= \|M^\top(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 + \gamma \|\sqrt{E}LH^\top(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \sqrt{E}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}})\|^2, \quad (25) \\ \langle \Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) - \Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}), (\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \rangle_\star &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) - \Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})\|_\star^2 + \gamma \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \Phi\mathbf{x} - \Phi\bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \Omega(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E}LK(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \sqrt{E}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}})\|^2. \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The identity follows directly from the definition of Γ and \star -norm. We now focus on the inequality. Set $\Delta\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}$, $\Delta\mathbf{y} := \mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}$, $\Delta\mathbf{z} := \mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}$, and $\Delta\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}$. Then

$$\langle \Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) - \Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}), (\Delta\mathbf{z}, \Delta\mathbf{w}) \rangle_\star = \langle M^\top \Delta\mathbf{x}, \Delta\mathbf{z} \rangle + \gamma \langle (LH^\top \Delta\mathbf{x} - \Delta\mathbf{y}), \Delta\mathbf{w} \rangle. \quad (27)$$

By definition of S in (7), we have $\mathbf{x} = J_{\gamma D^{-1}\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = J_{\gamma D^{-1}\mathbf{A}}(\bar{\mathbf{u}})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u} &:= D^{-1} \left(M\mathbf{z} + N\mathbf{x} - \gamma\Phi\mathbf{x} - \gamma HL^*(ELK\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}) \right), \\ \bar{\mathbf{u}} &:= D^{-1} \left(M\bar{\mathbf{z}} + N\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \gamma\Phi\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \gamma HL^*(ELK\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

So, $D\mathbf{u} - D\mathbf{x} \in \gamma\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ and $D\bar{\mathbf{u}} - D\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \gamma\mathbf{A}\bar{\mathbf{x}}$. Set $\Delta\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u} - \bar{\mathbf{u}}$. Since $\gamma\mathbf{A}$ is monotone,

$$0 \leq \langle \Delta\mathbf{x}, D\Delta\mathbf{u} - D\Delta\mathbf{x} \rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \langle \Delta \mathbf{x}, M\Delta \mathbf{z} + N\Delta \mathbf{x} - \gamma \Phi \Delta \mathbf{x} - \gamma H \mathbf{L}^* (E \mathbf{L} K \Delta \mathbf{x} - \Delta \mathbf{w}) - D\Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle \\
&= \langle M^\top \Delta \mathbf{x}, \Delta \mathbf{z} \rangle + \langle \Delta \mathbf{x}, (N - D)\Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle - \gamma \langle \Delta \mathbf{x}, \Phi \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle \\
&\quad - \gamma \langle \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x}, E \mathbf{L} K \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle + \gamma \langle \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x}, \Delta \mathbf{w} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms and using (27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) - \Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}), (\Delta \mathbf{z}, \Delta \mathbf{w}) \rangle_\star &\geq \langle \Delta \mathbf{x}, (D - N)\Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle + \gamma \langle \Delta \mathbf{x}, \Phi \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle \\
&\quad + \gamma \langle \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x}, E \mathbf{L} K \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle - \gamma \langle \Delta \mathbf{y}, \Delta \mathbf{w} \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

The first term on the right-hand side of (28) is

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Delta \mathbf{x}, (D - N)\Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \langle \Delta \mathbf{x}, [2D - 2N - M M^\top] \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|M^\top \Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \langle \Delta \mathbf{x}, [2D - N - N^\top - M M^\top] \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|M^\top \Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Since E and \mathbf{L} are diagonal, thus commutative, the third term on the right-hand side of (28) is

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma \langle \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x}, E \mathbf{L} K \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle &= \gamma \langle \sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x}, \sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} K \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle \\
&= \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} K \Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} (H^\top - K) \Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2 \\
&= \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} K \Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\gamma}{2} \langle \Delta \mathbf{x}, (H - K^\top) \mathbf{L}^* E \mathbf{L} (H^\top - K) \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Next, set $\mathbf{v} := \mathbf{L} K \mathbf{x} - E^{-1} \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{L} H^\top \mathbf{x}$, $\bar{\mathbf{v}} := \mathbf{L} K \bar{\mathbf{x}} - E^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{w}} + \mathbf{L} H^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}}$, and $\Delta \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}$. Then $\mathbf{y} = J_{E^{-1} \mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{v})$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = J_{E^{-1} \mathbf{B}}(\bar{\mathbf{v}})$, or equivalently, $E(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbf{B} \mathbf{y}$ and $E(\bar{\mathbf{v}} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \mathbf{B} \bar{\mathbf{y}}$. Since $\gamma > 0$ and \mathbf{B} is monotone,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \gamma \langle \Delta \mathbf{y}, E \Delta \mathbf{v} - E \Delta \mathbf{y} \rangle \\
&= \gamma \langle \Delta \mathbf{y}, E \mathbf{L} K \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle + \gamma \langle \Delta \mathbf{y}, E \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle - \gamma \|\sqrt{E} \Delta \mathbf{y}\|^2 - \gamma \langle \Delta \mathbf{y}, \Delta \mathbf{w} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the fourth term in the right-hand side of (28) can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
-\gamma \langle \Delta \mathbf{y}, \Delta \mathbf{w} \rangle &\geq -\gamma \langle \Delta \mathbf{y}, E \mathbf{L} K \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle - \gamma \langle \Delta \mathbf{y}, E \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle + \gamma \|\sqrt{E} \Delta \mathbf{y}\|^2 \\
&= -\gamma \langle \sqrt{E} \Delta \mathbf{y}, \sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} K \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle - \gamma \langle \sqrt{E} \Delta \mathbf{y}, \sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle + \gamma \|\sqrt{E} \Delta \mathbf{y}\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Summing up (30) and (31) and using the identity $\|a - b\|^2 = \|a\|^2 - 2 \langle a, b \rangle + \|b\|^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma \langle \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x}, E \mathbf{L} K \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle - \gamma \langle \Delta \mathbf{y}, \Delta \mathbf{w} \rangle \\
&\geq \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x} - \sqrt{E} \Delta \mathbf{y}\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} K \Delta \mathbf{x} - \sqrt{E} \Delta \mathbf{y}\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\gamma}{2} \langle \Delta \mathbf{x}, (H - K^\top) \mathbf{L}^* E \mathbf{L} (H^\top - K) \Delta \mathbf{x} \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Finally, substituting (29) and (32) into (28), and noting from (25) that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|M^\top \Delta \mathbf{x}\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} H^\top \Delta \mathbf{x} - \sqrt{E} \Delta \mathbf{y}\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) - \Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})\|_\star^2,$$

we complete the proof. ■

3.2. Convergence without cocoercivity

We recall that Assumption 3.2(i)(iii) together with $Q^\top \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}$ ensures the existence of matrices $U, W \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ such that

$$P^\top - R = UM^\top \quad \text{and} \quad P^\top - Q^\top = WM^\top.$$

Remark 3.4(iii) provides one possible choice for U, W , though simpler alternatives can be used.

Lemma 3.9 (Conical quasiaveragedness of T). *Suppose Assumption 3.2 holds and $Q^\top \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}$. Let $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathcal{H}^m \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$, $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \text{zer } \Gamma = \text{Fix } T$, $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})$, and $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) = S(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$. Let $U, W \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ be such that $P^\top - R = UM^\top$ and $P^\top - Q^\top = WM^\top$. Set $\tau := \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})U\|^2 + \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})W\|^2$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the matrix 2-norm. Then the following hold:*

(i) (Metric inequalities for Φ)

$$\langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \Phi \mathbf{x} - \Phi \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \geq -\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \Upsilon_1(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle \quad (33)$$

$$\geq -\frac{\tau}{2} \|\Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})\|_*^2 + \frac{\gamma\tau}{2} \|\sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} H^\top (\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \sqrt{E}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}})\|^2. \quad (34)$$

(ii) (Metric inequalities for Γ)

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}), (\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \rangle_* \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})\|_*^2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, (\Omega - \gamma \Upsilon_1)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} K(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \sqrt{E}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}})\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \geq \frac{1}{2} (1 - \gamma\tau) \|\Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})\|_*^2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \Omega(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} K(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \sqrt{E}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}})\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{\gamma^2\tau}{2} \|\sqrt{E} \mathbf{L} H^\top (\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \sqrt{E}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}})\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

(iii) *If Assumption 3.3(i) holds and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{\tau})$, then Γ is $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \gamma\tau)$ -quasimonotone and T is conically ρ -quasiaveraged with $\rho = \frac{\theta}{1 - \gamma\tau} > 0$; if Assumption 3.3(ii) holds, then Γ is $\frac{1}{2}$ -quasimonotone and T is conically θ -quasiaveraged.*

Proof. (i): By Lemma 3.5(i), $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{1}\bar{x}$ for some $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{H}$. It then follows from Remark 3.4(ii) that $P^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}} = R\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \Phi \mathbf{x} - \Phi \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \\ & = \langle P^\top (\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}), C R \mathbf{x} - C R \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + \langle Q^\top (\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}), [C P^\top \mathbf{x} - C P^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}}] - [C R \mathbf{x} - C R \bar{\mathbf{x}}] \rangle \\ & = \langle P^\top (\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}), C R \mathbf{x} - C P^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + \langle Q^\top (\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}), C P^\top \mathbf{x} - C R \mathbf{x} \rangle \\ & = \langle P^\top (\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}), C P^\top \mathbf{x} - C P^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + \langle (Q^\top - P^\top)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}), C P^\top \mathbf{x} - C R \mathbf{x} \rangle \\ & \geq \langle (Q^\top - P^\top)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}), C P^\top \mathbf{x} - C R \mathbf{x} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

using the monotonicity of C .

Let P_j^\top , Q_j^\top , and R_j denote the j -th rows of the matrices P^\top , Q^\top , and R , respectively. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the Lipschitz continuity of the C_j , and the AM-GM inequality, we derive that

$$\langle (Q^\top - P^\top)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}), C P^\top \mathbf{x} - C R \mathbf{x} \rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{j=1}^p \left\langle (Q_j^\top - P_j^\top)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}), C_j P_j^\top \mathbf{x} - C_j R_j \mathbf{x} \right\rangle \\
&\geq - \sum_{j=1}^p \|(P_j^\top - Q_j^\top)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\| \cdot \|C_j P_j^\top \mathbf{x} - C_j R_j \mathbf{x}\| \\
&\geq - \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_j \|(P_j^\top - Q_j^\top)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\| \cdot \|(P_j^\top - R_j) \mathbf{x}\| \\
&\geq - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_j \left(\|(P_j^\top - Q_j^\top) \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 + \|(P_j^\top - R_j) \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right) \\
&= - \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})(P^\top - Q^\top)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 + \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})(P^\top - R)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 \right) \tag{38} \\
&= - \frac{1}{2} \left(\langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, (P - Q) \text{diag}(\ell)(P^\top - Q^\top)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, (P - R) \text{diag}(\ell)(P^\top - R)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle \right), \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality uses $(P^\top - R)\bar{\mathbf{x}} = 0$. Hence, (33) follows from (37) and (39).

On the other hand, since $P^\top - R = UM^\top$, and $P^\top - Q^\top = WM^\top$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&- \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})(P^\top - Q^\top)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 + \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})(P^\top - R)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 \right) \\
&= - \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})WM^\top(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 + \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})UM^\top(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 \right) \\
&\geq - \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})U\|^2 + \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})W\|^2 \right) \|M^\top(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (37), (38), the identity in Lemma 3.8, and the fact that $\Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) = 0$, implies (34).

(ii): Substituting (33) and (34) into (26) in Lemma 3.8 yields (35) and (36), respectively.

(iii): The quasicomonotonicity of Γ follows from (ii), and the conical quasiaveragedness of $T = \text{Id} - \theta\Gamma$ then follows from Proposition 2.2. \blacksquare

We now arrive at convergence properties of Algorithm 1.

Theorem 3.10 (Convergence without cocoercivity). *Suppose $\text{zer}(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i + \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* B_k L_k + \sum_{j=1}^p C_j) \neq \emptyset$, Assumption 3.2 holds, $Q^\top \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$, and the first rows N , P , Q , and H are entirely zeros. Let $U, W \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ be such that $P^\top - R = UM^\top$ and $P^\top - Q^\top = WM^\top$, and suppose either*

- (a) *Assumption 3.3(i) holds, $\tau = \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})U\|^2 + \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})W\|^2$, and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{\tau})$; or*
- (b) *Assumption 3.3(ii) holds, $\tau = 0$, and $\gamma \in (0, +\infty)$.*

Let $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequences generated by Algorithm 1 with $(\lambda_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, 1 - \gamma\tau]$ satisfying $\liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_t(1 - \frac{\lambda_t}{1 - \gamma\tau}) > 0$. Then, as $t \rightarrow +\infty$,

- (i) $(\text{Id} - T)(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightarrow 0$ with $\|\frac{1}{t+1} \sum_{i=0}^t (\text{Id} - T)(\mathbf{z}^i, \mathbf{w}^i)\|_* = O(1/\sqrt{t})$.
- (ii) $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightharpoonup (\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \text{Fix } T$, $(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t) \rightharpoonup (\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$, and $(ELK\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{w}^t) \rightharpoonup (ELK\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}})$ with $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{1}\bar{x}$, $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{1}\bar{x})$, and $(\bar{x}, ELK\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \mathbf{Z}$.

Proof. (i): Since $\text{zer}(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i + \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* B_k L_k + \sum_{j=1}^p C_j) \neq \emptyset$, we first have $\text{Fix } T \neq \emptyset$ by (4) and Lemma 3.5. Then Lemma 3.9(iii) implies that T is conically ρ -quasiaveraged with $\rho = \frac{\theta}{1-\gamma\tau}$. By [18, Proposition 2.2], $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Fejér monotone with respect to $\text{Fix } T$, $(\text{Id} - T)(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightarrow 0$, and $\|\frac{1}{t+1} \sum_{i=0}^t (\text{Id} - T)(\mathbf{z}^i, \mathbf{w}^i)\|_* = O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}})$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

(ii): In view of Lemma 3.7(ii)–(iii), this follows from (i) and the Fejér monotonicity of $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ with respect to $\text{Fix } T$. \blacksquare

3.3. Convergence with cocoercivity

In this section, we focus on the case where each C_j is cocoercive. This assumption allows us to simply set $Q = 0$, which in turn yields $\Phi = PCR$.

Lemma 3.11 (Conical averagedness of T). *Suppose, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, C_j is $\frac{1}{\ell_j}$ -cocoercive, Assumption 3.2 holds, and $Q = 0$. Let $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}), (\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \mathcal{H}^m \times \prod_{k=1}^r \mathcal{G}_k$, $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})$, and $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) = S(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$. Let $U \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ be such that $P^\top - R = UM^\top$. Set $\tau := \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})U\|^2$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the matrix 2-norm. Then the following hold:*

(i) (Metric inequalities for Φ)

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \Phi \mathbf{x} - \Phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle \\ & \geq -\frac{1}{4} \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \Upsilon_2(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \left\| (P^\top - R)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) + 2 \text{diag}(\ell)^{-1} (C R \mathbf{x} - C R \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right\|_{\text{diag}(\ell)}^2 \quad (40) \\ & \geq -\frac{\tau}{4} \|\Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) - \Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})\|_*^2 + \frac{\gamma\tau}{4} \|\sqrt{E} L H^\top (\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \sqrt{E}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}})\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{4\theta^2} \left\| U(\mathbf{z} - T_1(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})) - U(\bar{\mathbf{z}} - T_1(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})) + 2\theta \text{diag}(\ell)^{-1} (C R \mathbf{x} - C R \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right\|_{\text{diag}(\ell)}^2. \quad (41) \end{aligned}$$

(ii) (Metric inequalities for Γ)

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) - \Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}), (\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \rangle_* \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) - \Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})\|_*^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, (\Omega - \frac{\gamma}{2} \Upsilon_2)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right\rangle \\ & \quad + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E} L K (\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \sqrt{E}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}})\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{\gamma}{4} \left\| (P^\top - R)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) + 2 \text{diag}(\ell)^{-1} (C R \mathbf{x} - C R \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right\|_{\text{diag}(\ell)}^2 \quad (42) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{4} (2 - \gamma\tau) \|\Gamma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) - \Gamma(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})\|_*^2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \Omega(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle \\ & \quad + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\sqrt{E} L K (\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \sqrt{E}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}})\|^2 + \frac{\gamma^2\tau}{4} \|\sqrt{E} L H^\top (\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \sqrt{E}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}})\|^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{\gamma}{4\theta^2} \left\| U(\mathbf{z} - T_1(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w})) - U(\bar{\mathbf{z}} - T_1(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})) + 2\theta \text{diag}(\ell)^{-1} (C R \mathbf{x} - C R \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right\|_{\text{diag}(\ell)}^2. \quad (43) \end{aligned}$$

(iii) If Assumption 3.3(i) holds and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{\tau})$, then Γ is $\frac{1}{4}(2 - \gamma\tau)$ -comonotone and T is conically ρ -averaged with $\rho = \frac{2\theta}{2 - \gamma\tau} > 0$; if Assumption 3.3(iii) holds, then Γ is $\frac{1}{2}$ -comonotone and T is conically θ -averaged.

Proof. (i): Since $Q = 0$, using the equality $\langle a, b \rangle = -\frac{\ell_j}{4}\|a\|^2 + \frac{\ell_j}{4}\left\|a + \frac{2}{\ell_j}b\right\|^2 - \frac{1}{\ell_j}\|b\|^2$ and the cocoercivity of the C_j , we have the estimation

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \Phi \mathbf{x} - \Phi \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, PCR\mathbf{x} - PCR\bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \\
&= \langle P^\top (\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}), CR\mathbf{x} - CR\bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \\
&= \langle (P^\top - R)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}), CR\mathbf{x} - CR\bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + \langle R\mathbf{x} - R\bar{\mathbf{x}}, CR\mathbf{x} - CR\bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^p \langle (P_j^\top - R_j)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}), C_j R_j \mathbf{x} - C_j R_j \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^p \langle R_j \mathbf{x} - R_j \bar{\mathbf{x}}, C_j R_j \mathbf{x} - C_j R_j \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \\
&\geq -\frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_j \|(P_j^\top - R_j)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_j \left\| (P_j^\top - R_j)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \frac{2}{\ell_j} (C_j R_j \mathbf{x} - C_j R_j \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right\|^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{\ell_j} \|C_j R_j \mathbf{x} - C_j R_j \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{\ell_j} \|C_j R_j \mathbf{x} - C_j R_j \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 \\
&= -\frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^p \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})(P^\top - R)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4} \left\| (P^\top - R)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) + 2 \text{diag}(\ell)^{-1} (CR\mathbf{x} - CR\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right\|_{\text{diag}(\ell)}^2, \tag{44}
\end{aligned}$$

where P_j^\top and R_j denote the j -th rows of the matrices P^\top and R , respectively. Noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})(P^\top - R)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 &= \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, (P - R^\top) \text{diag}(\ell)(P^\top - R)(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle \\
&= \langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \Upsilon_2(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain (40).

Now, since $P^\top - R = UM^\top$, we further estimate (44) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \Phi \mathbf{x} - \Phi \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle &\geq -\frac{1}{4} \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})U\|^2 \|M^\top(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \left\| UM^\top(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) + 2 \text{diag}(\ell)^{-1} (CR\mathbf{x} - CR\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right\|_{\text{diag}(\ell)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (41) due to (25) in Lemma 3.8 and the fact that $M^\top \mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{\theta}(\mathbf{z} - T_1(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}))$ and $M^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{\theta}(\bar{\mathbf{z}} - T_1(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}))$.

(ii): Substituting (40) and (41) into the inequality in Lemma 3.8 gives (42) and (43), respectively.

(iii): The comonotonicity of Γ follows from (ii). This together with [6, Proposition 3.3] implies the conical averagedness of $T = \text{Id} - \theta\Gamma$. \blacksquare

The convergence properties of Algorithm 1 with $Q = 0$ in the cocoercive setting for the operators C_j are established in the following theorem. We adopt a convention that $\frac{2}{\tau} = +\infty$ when $\tau = 0$.

Theorem 3.12 (Convergence with cocoercivity). *Suppose, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, C_j is $\frac{1}{\ell_j}$ -cocoercive, $\text{zer}(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i + \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* B_k L_k + \sum_{j=1}^p C_j) \neq \emptyset$, Assumption 3.2 holds, $Q = 0$. Let $U \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ be such that $P^\top - R = UM^\top$ and suppose either*

- (a) *Assumption 3.3(i) holds, $\tau = \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})U\|^2$, and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{\tau})$; or*
- (b) *Assumption 3.3(iii) holds, $\tau = 0$, and $\gamma \in (0, +\infty)$.*

Let $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequences generated by Algorithm 1 with $(\lambda_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, \frac{2-\gamma\tau}{2}]$ satisfying $\sum_{t=0}^{+\infty} \lambda_t(1 - \frac{2\lambda_t}{2-\gamma\tau}) = +\infty$. Then, as $t \rightarrow +\infty$,

(i) $(\text{Id} - T)(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightarrow 0$ and if $\liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_t(1 - \frac{2\lambda_t}{2-\gamma\tau}) > 0$, then $\|(\text{Id} - T)(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)\|_* = o(1/\sqrt{t})$.

(ii) $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightharpoonup (\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \text{Fix } T$.

(iii) $\mathbf{C}R\mathbf{x}^t \rightarrow \mathbf{C}R\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ with $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = J_{\gamma D^{-1}\mathbf{A}}\left(D^{-1}(M\bar{\mathbf{z}} + N\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \gamma\Phi\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \gamma H\mathbf{L}^*(ELK\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}))\right)$.

(iv) $(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t) \rightharpoonup (\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ and $(ELK\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{w}^t) \rightharpoonup (ELK\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}})$ with $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{1}\bar{x}$, $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{1}\bar{x})$, and $(\bar{x}, ELK\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \mathbf{Z}$, provided that the first rows of N , P , and H are entirely zeros.

Proof. (i) & (ii): As $\text{zer}(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i + \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* B_k L_k + \sum_{j=1}^p C_j) \neq \emptyset$, it follows from (4) and Lemma 3.5 that $\text{Fix } T \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 3.11(iii), T is conically ρ -averaged with $\rho = \frac{2\theta}{2-\gamma\tau}$. Applying [6, Proposition 2.9], we obtain that $(\text{Id} - T)(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightarrow 0$, $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightharpoonup (\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \text{Fix } T$, and if $\liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_t(1 - \frac{2\lambda_t}{2-\gamma\tau}) > 0$, then $\|(\text{Id} - T)(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)\|_* = o(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}})$.

(iii): Since $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \in \text{zer } \Gamma = \text{Fix } T$ and $\Omega \succeq 0$ (due to Assumption 3.3(i) or Assumption 3.3(iii)), it follows from Lemma 3.11(ii) that, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Gamma(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t), (\mathbf{z}^t - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^t, \mathbf{w}^t - \bar{\mathbf{w}}^t) \rangle_* &\geq \frac{1}{4}(2 - \gamma\tau) \|\Gamma(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)\|_*^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma}{4\theta^2} \left\| U(\mathbf{z}^t - T_1(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)) + 2\theta \text{diag}(\ell)^{-1}(\mathbf{C}R\mathbf{x}^t - \mathbf{C}R\bar{\mathbf{x}}^t) \right\|_{\text{diag}(\ell)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $t \rightarrow +\infty$ and recalling that $\theta\Gamma(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) = (\text{Id} - T)(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t) \rightarrow 0$ and $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, we obtain the convergence of $(\mathbf{C}R\mathbf{x}^t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ to $\mathbf{C}R\bar{\mathbf{x}}$.

(iv): As $Q = 0$, the conclusion follows directly from (ii) and Lemma 3.7(iii). \blacksquare

We note from Lemma 3.9(iii) (resp., Lemma 3.11(iii)) that the fixed-point operator T can admit better conical quasiaveraged (resp., averaged) constants, and thus allow a larger range of step sizes, when $\Omega - \gamma\Upsilon_1 \succeq 0$ (resp., $\Omega - \frac{\gamma}{2}\Upsilon_2 \succeq 0$). However, these assumptions are more restrictive than Assumption 3.3(i), which only requires $\Omega \succeq 0$.

4. Realizations of Algorithm 1

4.1. Existing algorithms

Example 4.1. Consider a special case of problem (1) with $n = 1$, $r = 1$, and $p = 0$, namely,

$$\text{find } x \in \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } 0 \in Ax + L^*BLx.$$

To solve this problem, we apply Algorithm 1 with $n = 2$ and $r = 1$, setting $A_1 = 0$ and $A_2 = A$. The coefficient matrices are then given by $P = 0$, $Q = 0$, $R = 0$,

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad N = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad D = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad E = [\eta], \quad H = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad K = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Algorithm 1 now reduces to

$$\begin{cases} x^t &= J_{\gamma A}(z^t - \gamma L^*(\eta L z^t - w^t)) \\ y^t &= J_{\frac{1}{\eta} B}\left(L z^t - \frac{1}{\eta} w^t + L x^t\right), \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

$$\begin{cases} z^{t+1} &= z^t - \lambda_t(z^t - x^t) \\ w^{t+1} &= w^t - \lambda_t \eta(L x^t - y^t). \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

Using Moreau decomposition [7, Theorem 14.3(ii)], y^t in (45) becomes

$$y^t = L z^t - \frac{1}{\eta} w^t + L x^t - \frac{1}{\eta} J_{\eta B^{-1}}(\eta L z^t - w^t + \eta L x^t).$$

Set $u^t := \eta L z^t - w^t$ and $v^t := u^t + \eta L x^t - \eta y^t = \eta L z^t - w^t + \eta L x^t - \eta y^t$. Then (45) becomes

$$x^t = J_{\gamma A}(z^t - \gamma L^* u^t) \quad \text{and} \quad v^t = J_{\eta B^{-1}}(u^t + \eta L x^t).$$

Since $w^t = \eta L z^t - u^t$ and $\eta(L x^t - y^t) = v^t - u^t$, the second equation in (46) becomes $\eta L z^{t+1} - u^{t+1} = \eta L z^t - u^t - \lambda_t(v^t - u^t)$, or equivalently,

$$u^{t+1} = u^t + \lambda_t(v^t - u^t) + \eta(L z^{t+1} - L z^t).$$

We obtain the algorithm

$$\begin{cases} x^t &= J_{\gamma A}(z^t - \gamma L^* u^t) \\ v^t &= J_{\eta B^{-1}}(u^t + \eta L x^t), \\ z^{t+1} &= z^t - \lambda_t(z^t - x^t) \\ u^{t+1} &= u^t + \lambda_t(v^t - u^t) + \eta(L z^{t+1} - L z^t). \end{cases}$$

In turn, when $\lambda_t = 1$, this algorithm simplifies to the algorithm proposed in [17, Eq. (37)]:

$$\begin{aligned} z^{t+1} &= J_{\gamma A}(z^t - \gamma L^* u^t) \\ u^{t+1} &= J_{\eta B^{-1}}(u^t + \eta L z^{t+1}) + \eta(L z^{t+1} - L z^t). \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward that Assumption 3.3(i) is satisfied under the condition that $\gamma \eta \|L\|^2 \leq 1$.

Example 4.2. We consider another special case of problem (1) when $r = 0$, that is,

$$\text{find } x \in \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } 0 \in \sum_{i=1}^n A_i x + \sum_{j=1}^p C_j x.$$

Choosing $H = 0$ and $K = 0$, Algorithm 1 becomes

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}^t &= J_{\gamma D^{-1} A} \left[D^{-1} \left(M \mathbf{z}^t + N \mathbf{x}^t - \gamma((P - Q) C R \mathbf{x}^t + Q C P^\top \mathbf{x}^t) \right) \right] \\ \mathbf{z}^{t+1} &= \mathbf{z}^t - \lambda_t M^\top \mathbf{x}^t, \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

which not only recovers [18, Algorithm 1] but also improves it by allowing different cocoercive or Lipschitz constants for the C_j . When $Q = 0$ and each C_j is cocoercive, (47) reduces to [1, Algorithm 1], where the authors require that $\Omega - \frac{\gamma}{2} \Upsilon_2 \succeq 0$. The scheme (47) extends many existing algorithms including the frugal and decentralized splittings [30], the *forward-backward algorithms devised by graphs* [3], the forward-backward and forward-reflected-backward algorithms for ring networks [4], the sequential and parallel forward-Douglas–Rachford algorithms [10], the *generalized forward-backward algorithm* [26]. Moreover, the scheme generates different product-space formulations of the Davis–Yin algorithm, including a reduced dimensional variant, and a generalization of Ryu splitting algorithm; see [18, Section 4].

4.2. New algorithms

In this section, we generate a class of algorithms with graph-based structures which easily satisfy Assumption 3.2. Moreover, we provide a simple choice for the coefficient matrices that achieves a large range for the step sizes in Assumption 3.3(i). Here, we briefly introduce the main idea of graph theory and refer readers to [18, Section 4] for more detail.

Let $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, $\mathcal{E} = \{e_1, \dots, e_q\} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$, be a weighted undirected connected graph with $|\mathcal{V}| = n \geq 2$, $|\mathcal{E}| = q \geq n - 1$, and weight matrix $W = (w_{ij}) \in [0, +\infty)^{n \times n}$. Let $G' = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}')$ be a weighted connected subgraph of G with $\mathcal{E}' \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, and weight matrix $W' = (w'_{ij}) \in [0, +\infty)^{n \times n}$ such that for all $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}'$,

$$w'_{ij} \leq w_{ij}.$$

i.e., the weight on each edge of G' is not greater than the weight on the corresponding edge of G .

Let $N = (N_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ where $N_{ij} = w_{ji}$ if $i > j$ and $N_{ij} = 0$ if $i \leq j$. Thus N is a strictly lower triangular matrix. Let $\text{Deg}(G) = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_n)$, where $d_i = \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij}$, is the *degree matrix* of G . Let $D = \text{diag}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n)$, where $\delta_i = \frac{1}{2}d_i$. Furthermore, let $M = (M_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-1)}$ be an *onto decomposition* of the *Laplacian matrix* $\text{Lap}(G') = \text{Deg}(G') - W$, i.e., $MM^\top = \text{Lap}(G')$. If G' is a tree, then M can be chosen as the *incidence matrix* $\text{Inc}(G'^\sigma)$ for some orientation σ of G' (see [3, Remark 2.17]).

Example 4.3. Let G be a ring graph and G' be a sequential graph, both with unit weights. Since G' is a tree, we take M as the incidence matrix. Then $D = \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1)$, $E = \eta \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1)$,

$$M_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, j = i \\ -1 & \text{if } i \in \{2, \dots, n\}, j = i-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad N_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in \{2, \dots, n\}, j = i-1 \\ 1 & \text{if } i = n, j = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{(n-1) \times r} \\ 1_{1 \times r} \end{bmatrix}, \quad K = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{r \times 1} & | & 0_{r \times (n-1)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Case 1: Each C_j is $\frac{1}{\ell_j}$ -cocoercive. In this case, we set $Q = 0$,

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{(n-1) \times p} \\ 1_{1 \times p} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad R = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{p \times 1} & | & 0_{p \times (n-1)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Letting $U = -1_{p \times (n-1)}$, we have $P^\top - R = UM^\top$ and $\tau = \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})U\|^2 = (n-1) \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_j$. Algorithm 1 becomes

$$\begin{cases} x_1^t &= J_{\gamma A_1}(z_1^t) \\ x_i^t &= J_{\gamma A_i}(z_i^t - z_{i-1}^t + x_{i-1}^t), \quad i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\} \\ x_n^t &= J_{\gamma A_n}(-z_{n-1}^t + x_1^t + x_{n-1}^t - \gamma \sum_{j=1}^p C_j x_1^t - \gamma \sum_{j=1}^r L_j^*(\eta L_j x_1^t - w_j^t)) \\ y_k^t &= J_{\frac{1}{\eta} B_k}(L_k x_1^t - \frac{1}{\eta} w_k^t + L_k x_n^t), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

$$\begin{cases} z_i^{t+1} &= z_i^t - \lambda_t(x_i^t - x_{i+1}^t), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \\ w_k^{t+1} &= w_k^t - \lambda_t \eta (L_k x_n^t - y_k^t), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \end{cases} \quad (49)$$

which reduces to [2, Algorithm 1] when $p = 0$ (no single-valued operator C_j) and $\gamma = 1$.

Now, we consider Assumption 3.3(i) since Assumption 3.2 can be seen easily from their definition. By definition, we have

$$\Omega = (\text{Id} - \gamma\eta \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* L_k) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It follows that if $\gamma\eta \sum_{k=1}^r \|L_k\|^2 \leq 1$, then $\Omega \succeq 0$, i.e., Assumption 3.3(i) is satisfied.

$$\Omega - \frac{\gamma}{2} \Upsilon_2 = \left(\text{Id} - \gamma\eta \sum_{k=1}^r L_k^* L_k - \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_j \text{Id} \right) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, if $\gamma\eta \sum_{k=1}^r \|L_k\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_j \leq 1$, then $\Omega - \frac{\gamma}{2} \Upsilon_2 \succeq 0$, i.e., Assumption 3.3(iii) is satisfied.

Case 2: Each C_j is monotone and ℓ_j -Lipschitz continuous. For this case, we choose

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{0_{(n-2) \times p}}{1_{1 \times p}} \\ 0_{1 \times p} \end{bmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{p \times 1} & | & 0_{p \times (n-1)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad Q = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{0_{(n-1) \times p}}{1_{1 \times p}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $P^\top - R = UM^\top$ and $P^\top - Q^\top = WM^\top$ with $U = [-1_{p \times (n-2)} \mid 0_{p \times 1}]$ and $W = [0_{p \times (n-2)} \mid 1_{p \times 1}]$. We see that

$$\tau = \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})U\|^2 + \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})W\|^2 = (n-2) \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_j + \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_j = (n-1) \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_j.$$

Algorithm 1 now takes the form

$$\begin{cases} x_1^t &= J_{\gamma A_1}(z_1^t) \\ x_i^t &= J_{\gamma A_i}(z_i^t - z_{i-1}^t + x_{i-1}^t), \quad i \in \{2, \dots, n-2\} \\ x_{n-1}^t &= J_{\gamma A_{n-1}}(z_{n-1}^t - z_{n-2}^t + x_{n-2}^t - \gamma \sum_{j=1}^p C_j x_1^t) \\ x_n^t &= J_{\gamma A_n}(-z_{n-1}^t + x_1^t + x_{n-1}^t + \gamma \sum_{j=1}^p C_j(x_1^t - x_{n-1}^t) - \gamma \sum_{j=1}^r L_j^*(\eta L_j x_1^t - w_j^t)) \\ y_k^t &= J_{\frac{1}{\eta} B_k}(L_k x_1^t - \frac{1}{\eta} w_k^t + L_k x_n^t), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

$$\begin{cases} z_i^{t+1} &= z_i^t - \lambda_t(x_i^t - x_{i+1}^t), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \\ w_k^{t+1} &= w_k^t - \lambda_t \eta (L_k x_n^t - y_k^t), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, r\}. \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

In this case, Assumption 3.3(i) still holds when $\gamma\eta \sum_{k=1}^r \|L_k\|^2 \leq 1$, whereas Assumption 3.3(ii) is not easy to verify.

From now on, we work in the setting where each C_j is $\frac{1}{\ell_j}$ -cocoercive, which allows us to take $Q = 0$. In the absence of cocoercivity, one may instead choose any $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ satisfying $Q^\top \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}$ together with conditions (9b)–(9c) (if an explicit form is desired). While Assumption 3.3(i) does not depend on Q , Assumption 3.3(ii) can be verified more readily under a suitable choice of Q .

Example 4.4. We consider the particular instance of problem (1) when $r = p = n - 1$. Let $\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E}$, meaning that G and G' have the same graph structure but may differ in their edge weights.

Case 1: G' is a tree. Then $|\mathcal{E}'| = n - 1$. We consider $w_{ij} = \kappa + 1$ if $\{v_i, v_j\} \in \mathcal{E}$, and $w'_{ij} = 1$ if $\{v_i, v_j\} \in \mathcal{E}'$. Let $E = \eta \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)}$. Let $M = \text{Inc}(G'^\sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-1)}$ is the incidence matrix of G' given by

$$\text{Inc}(G'^\sigma)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if edge } e_j \text{ leaves node } v_i \\ -1 & \text{if edge } e_j \text{ enters node } v_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $H = P = (P_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-1)}$ and $K = R = (R_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times n}$ are defined based on the incidence matrix of G' ,

$$P_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if edge } e_j \text{ enters node } v_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad R_{ji} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if edge } e_j \text{ leaves node } v_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It can be seen that $M = -(P - R^\top) = -(H - K^\top)$, or equivalently, $P^\top - R = -M^\top$. Taking $U = -\text{Id}_{n-1}$, we have $P^\top - R = UM^\top$ and $\tau = \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})U\|^2 = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n-1} \ell_k$.

Now, we consider Assumption 3.3(i) because Assumption 3.2 can be easily verified by definition. Since $G = G'$ and $w_{ij} = (\kappa + 1)w'_{ij}$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, it follows from [18, Example 4.1] that $2D - N - N^\top - MM^\top = \kappa MM^\top = \kappa(H - K^\top)E(H^\top - K)$ is positive semidefinite. Then $\Omega = M \text{diag}(\kappa \text{Id} - \gamma \eta L_1^* L_1, \dots, \kappa \text{Id} - \gamma \eta L_r^* L_r) M^\top$, and so

$$\Omega \succeq 0 \iff (\forall k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \quad \kappa \text{Id} - \gamma \eta L_k^* L_k \succeq 0) \iff \frac{\gamma}{\kappa} \eta \max_{1 \leq k \leq n-1} \|L_k\|^2 \leq 1. \quad (52)$$

For Assumption 3.3(iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega - \frac{\gamma}{2} \Upsilon_2 \succeq 0 &\iff \left(\forall k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \quad \text{Id} \left(\kappa - \frac{\gamma \ell_k}{2} \right) - \gamma \eta L_k^* L_k \succeq 0 \right) \\ &\iff \frac{\gamma}{\kappa} \eta \max_{1 \leq k \leq n-1} \|L_k\|^2 + \frac{\gamma \max_{1 \leq k \leq n-1} \ell_k}{2} \leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

We note that, since the actual resolvent parameter of \mathbf{A} is γD^{-1} (not γ), the conditions in (52) and (53) must be interpreted with the scaling $\frac{\gamma}{\delta_i} = \frac{2\gamma}{d_i} = \frac{2\gamma}{\sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij}} \sim \frac{\gamma}{n\kappa}$. Therefore, depending on each type of graph, we obtain different ranges for the step sizes. For simplicity, we set $\kappa = 1$ and focus on algorithms based on the sequential and star graphs, both of which are tree structures.

Sequential graph algorithm:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{ij} &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, j = i \\ -1 & \text{if } i \in \{2, \dots, n\}, j = i-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} & N_{ij} &= \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } i \in \{2, \dots, n\}, j = i-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ H = P &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{1 \times (n-1)} \\ \text{Id}_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}, & K = R &= \begin{bmatrix} \text{Id}_{n-1} & | & 0_{(n-1) \times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \\ D &= \text{diag}(1, 2, \dots, 2, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 1 then becomes

$$\begin{cases}
x_1^t &= J_{\gamma A_1}(z_1^t) \\
x_i^t &= J_{\frac{\gamma}{2} A_i} \left(\frac{1}{2} (z_i^t - z_{i-1}^t + 2x_{i-1}^t - \gamma C_{i-1} x_{i-1}^t - \gamma L_{i-1}^* (\eta L_{i-1} x_{i-1}^t - w_{i-1}^t)) \right), \\
&\quad i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\} \\
x_n^t &= J_{\gamma A_n} (-z_{n-1}^t + 2x_{n-1}^t - \gamma C_{n-1} x_{n-1}^t - \gamma L_{n-1}^* (\eta L_{n-1} x_{n-1}^t - w_{n-1}^t)) \\
y_k^t &= J_{\frac{1}{\eta} B_k} \left(L_k x_k^t - \frac{1}{\eta} w_k^t + L_k x_{k+1}^t \right), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \\
z_i^{t+1} &= z_i^t - \lambda_t (x_i^t - x_{i+1}^t), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \\
w_k^{t+1} &= w_k^t - \lambda_t \eta (L_k x_{k+1}^t - y_k^t), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}.
\end{cases} \quad (54)$$

Star graph algorithm:

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{ij} &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = 1, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \\ -1 & \text{if } i \in \{2, \dots, n\}, j = i-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} & N_{ij} &= \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } j = 1, i \in \{2, \dots, n\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\
H = P &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{1 \times (n-1)} \\ \text{Id}_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}, & K = R &= \begin{bmatrix} 1_{(n-1) \times 1} & | & 0_{(n-1) \times (n-1)} \end{bmatrix}, \\
D &= \text{diag}(n-1, 1, \dots, 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 1 now takes the form

$$\begin{cases}
x_1^t &= J_{\frac{\gamma}{n-1} A_1} \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} z_j^t \right) \\
x_i^t &= J_{\gamma A_i} \left(2x_1^t - z_{i-1}^t - \gamma C_{i-1} x_1^t - \gamma L_{i-1}^* (\eta L_{i-1} x_1^t - w_{i-1}^t) \right), \quad i \in \{2, \dots, n\} \\
y_k^t &= J_{\frac{1}{\eta} B_k} \left(L_k x_1^t - \frac{1}{\eta} w_k^t + L_k x_{k+1}^t \right), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \\
z_i^{t+1} &= z_i^t - \lambda_t (x_1^t - x_{i+1}^t), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \\
w_k^{t+1} &= w_k^t - \lambda_t \eta (L_k x_{k+1}^t - y_k^t), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}.
\end{cases} \quad (55)$$

Case 2: G' is a complete graph. In this case, we use another onto decomposition for $\text{Lap}(G')$. We derive an algorithm based on the structure of complete graphs.

Complete graph algorithm:

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{ij} &= \begin{cases} a_i := \sqrt{\frac{(n-i)n}{n-i+1}} & \text{if } i = j \\ t_j := -\sqrt{\frac{n}{(n-j)(n-j+1)}} & \text{if } i > j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} & N_{ij} &= \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } i > j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\
D &= (n-1) \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1), & E_{ij} = \eta E'_{ij} &= \begin{cases} \eta a_i^2 & \text{if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\
H_{ij} = P_{ij} &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n-j} & \text{if } i > j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} & K = R &= \begin{bmatrix} \text{Id}_{n-1} & | & 0_{(n-1) \times 1} \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

By [3, Proposition A.2], M is an onto decomposition. From the definition, Assumption 3.2 is satisfied and $M^\top = -\sqrt{E'}(P^\top - R)$. Then $P^\top - R = UM^\top$ with $U = -(\sqrt{E'})^{-1} = -\text{diag}(\frac{1}{a_j}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)}$. We have $\tau = \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})U\|^2 = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n-1} \frac{\ell_k}{a_k^2}$. Since $2D - N - N^\top - MM^\top = (H - K^\top)E'(H^\top - K)$, we obtain the same result as in (52), namely,

$$\Omega \succeq 0 \iff \gamma\eta \max_{1 \leq k \leq r} \|L_k\|^2 \leq 1.$$

Algorithm 1 reduces to

$$\begin{cases} x_1^t &= J_{\frac{\gamma}{n-1}A_1} \left(\frac{1}{n-1} a_1 z_1^t \right) \\ x_i^t &= J_{\frac{\gamma}{n-1}A_i} \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \left(a_i z_i^t + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_j z_j^t + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} 2x_j^t - \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{n-j} C_j x_j^t \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{n-j} L_j^* (\eta a_j^2 L_j x_j^t - w_j^t) \right) \right), \quad i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\} \\ x_n^t &= J_{\frac{\gamma}{n-1}A_n} \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} t_j z_j^t + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} 2x_j^t - \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{n-j} C_j x_j^t \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{n-j} L_j^* (\eta a_j^2 L_j x_j^t - w_j^t) \right) \right) \\ y_k^t &= J_{\frac{1}{\eta a_k^2} B_k} \left(L_k x_k^t - \frac{1}{\eta a_k^2} w_k^t + L_k \left(\sum_{j=k+1}^n \frac{1}{n-k} x_j^t \right) \right), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \\ z_i^{t+1} &= z_i^t - \lambda_t (a_i x_i^t + \sum_{j=i+1}^n t_i x_j^t), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \\ w_k^{t+1} &= w_k^t - \lambda_t \eta a_k^2 (L_k (\sum_{j=k+1}^n \frac{1}{n-k} x_j^t) - y_k^t), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}. \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

In this case, $2D - N - N^\top - MM^\top \neq (P - R^\top)(P^\top - R)$, so it is not straightforward to verify Assumption 3.3(iii), which requires $\Omega - \frac{\gamma}{2}\Upsilon_2 \succeq 0$.

Remark 4.5. Although the new algorithms in Example 4.4 are derived for solving problem (1) when $r = p = n - 1$, they can be readily adapted to the case $n = r = p$. Specifically, we apply the sequential graph, star graph, and complete graph algorithms to problem (1) with $(n+1)$ maximally monotone operators A_1, \dots, A_{n+1} , n compositions of B_1, \dots, B_n with bounded linear operator L_1, \dots, L_n , and n cocoercive or monotone Lipschitz operators C_1, \dots, C_n . Then using an artificial operator $A_0 = 0$ (or $A_{n+1} = 0$), we obtain the corresponding algorithms. This is useful in some cases, as shown in the next section.

5. Numerical experiments

In this section, we present a numerical experiment on the decentralized fused lasso problem to test different choices of the coefficient matrices, which correspond to different graph structures, in Algorithm 1. We also investigate the influence of step sizes and the relaxation parameter on the performance of the algorithm.

Fused lasso: The famous lasso problem (least absolute shrinkage and selection operator) is to find a sparse least square solution of a linear system via ℓ_1 -penalization. The fused lasso [31] extends the classical lasso in the sense that it encourages the sparsity of not only the solution but

also the differences between adjacent components of the solution, i.e., the flatness of the solution. Specifically, given $\mu, \nu \in (0, +\infty)$, the fused lasso can be written as

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{A}x - b\|^2 + \mu \|x\|_1 + \nu \|Lx\|_1 \right),$$

where $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d-1) \times d}. \quad (57)$$

The fused lasso is especially useful when the feature vector x have some kind of natural ordering and the number of features d is much greater than the number of sample size m .

Decentralized fused lasso: We are interested in the decentralized fused lasso problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{A}_{(i)}x - b_{(i)}\|^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_{(i)} \|x\|_1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{(i)} \|Lx\|_1 \right), \quad (58)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times d}$, $b_{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$, $\sum_{i=1}^n m_i = m$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and the same $L \in \mathbb{R}^{(d-1) \times d}$. Problem (58) can be rewritten in an equivalent form

$$\text{find } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ such that } 0 \in \sum_{i=1}^n A_i x + \sum_{i=1}^n L^* B_i L x + \sum_{i=1}^n C_i x, \quad (59)$$

where $A_i x = \partial(\mu_{(i)} \|x\|_1)$, $B_i L x = \partial(\nu_{(i)} \|Lx\|_1)$ and $C_i x = \nabla(\frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{A}_{(i)}x - b_{(i)}\|^2) = \mathcal{A}_{(i)}^\top (\mathcal{A}_{(i)}x - b_{(i)})$. It is easy to see that C_i is both $\frac{1}{\ell_i}$ -cocoercive and ℓ_i -Lipschitz continuous with $\ell_i = \|\mathcal{A}_{(i)}^\top \mathcal{A}_{(i)}\|_2 = \|\mathcal{A}_{(i)}\|_2^2$. In addition, it follows from [25] that $\|L\| = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(L^* L)}$ can be analytically computed as $\sqrt{2 - 2 \cos\left(\frac{d-1}{d}\pi\right)}$.

We address problem (59) by using the technique discussed in Remark 4.5 for three algorithms: sequential graph algorithm (54), star graph algorithm (55), and complete graph algorithm (56).

Parameter settings and results: We consider problem (58) with $n = 5$, $m = 100$, $d = 1000$. The true vector is generated with 10 nonzero elements. Matrix \mathcal{A} is a random matrix whose elements follow the standard Gaussian distribution and it is partitioned into n row blocks randomly. Then b is obtained by adding independent and identical distributed Gaussian noise with variance 10^{-3} onto $\mathcal{A}x$.

For the parameter, we set $\mu_{(i)} = 15$ and $\nu_{(i)} = 5$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. And for each algorithm, we compute $\tau = \|\text{diag}(\sqrt{\ell})U\|^2$, where explicit expressions of U are given for three algorithms considered. We then select $\gamma := \hat{\gamma}\gamma_{\max}$ where $\hat{\gamma} \in (0, 1)$ is a scaling factor and $\gamma_{\max} = \frac{2}{\tau}$. Next, we choose two other scaling factors $\hat{\eta}, \hat{\lambda} \in (0, 1)$ such that $\eta := \hat{\eta}\eta_{\max}$ and $\lambda_t := \lambda = \hat{\lambda}\lambda_{\max}$, where

$$\eta_{\max} = \frac{1}{\gamma \max_{1 \leq k \leq r} \|L_k\|^2}, \quad \lambda_{\max} = \frac{2 - \gamma\tau}{2}.$$

We measure the performance of the algorithms using the residuals $\frac{1}{\lambda} \|(\text{Id} - T)(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)\|^2$, where $(\mathbf{z}^t, \mathbf{w}^t)$ denotes the sequences generated by Algorithm 1. For simplicity, we examine the effect of varying parameter $\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\lambda}$. The behavior of the sequential and star graph algorithms are very similar, thus we only include the result for the sequential graph algorithm.

First, we examine the impact of γ on the performance by fixing $\hat{\eta} = 0.1$, $\hat{\lambda} = 0.9$, and varying $\hat{\gamma}$ between $(0, 1)$. The result for the sequential graph algorithm and the complete graph algorithm are provided in Figure 2a and Figure 2b, respectively. The result suggests that both three algorithms perform better when $\hat{\gamma} = 0.5$. Second, with $\hat{\gamma} = 0.5$ and $\hat{\lambda} = 0.9$ fixed, we analyze the effect of




Figure 2: Impact of varying $\hat{\gamma}$ on the performance of the sequential and complete graph algorithms.

changing $\hat{\eta}$. The corresponding results for the sequential graph algorithm and the complete graph algorithm are shown in Figure 3a and Figure 3b. The experiment indicates that they achieve the best performance when $\hat{\eta}$ is small. Next, we investigate how the algorithms behave as $\hat{\lambda}$ varies while




Figure 3: Impact of varying $\hat{\eta}$ on the performance of the sequential and complete graph algorithms.

$\hat{\gamma} = 0.5$, $\hat{\eta} = 0.1$ are set. Figure 4a and Figure 4b show the result for the sequential graph algorithm

and the complete graph algorithm. The plots suggests that both three algorithms converge faster when $\hat{\lambda}$ is larger.




Figure 4: Impact of varying $\hat{\lambda}$ on the performance of the sequential and complete graph algorithms.

Now, we compare the performance of three algorithms using $\hat{\gamma} = 0.5$, $\hat{\eta} = 0.1$, and $\hat{\lambda} = 0.9$. In Figure 5a, the vector x_{true} is represented by red color, followed by $x_{complete}$ in blue, $x_{sequential}$ in orange, and x_{star} in green. All three algorithms converge to the same solution which is resemble to the original vector. The residuals are shown in Figure 5b which indicates that the complete graph converges faster in terms of iteration counts compared to the others. However, this comes at the cost of significantly increased runtime. The sequential graph and star graph algorithms are slightly different at the beginning but nearly identical after that.




Figure 5: The performance of the sequential graph, star graph, and complete graph algorithms.

Acknowledgements. The research of MND, MKT and TDT was supported in part by Australian Research Council grant DP230101749.

References

- [1] A. Åkerman, E. Chenchene, P. Giselsson, and E. Naldi, Splitting the forward-backward algorithm: A full characterization, [arXiv:2504.10999](#).
- [2] F.J. Aragón-Artacho, R.I. Boş, and D. Torregrosa-Belén, A primal-dual splitting algorithm for composite monotone inclusions with minimal lifting, *Numer. Algorithms* **93**, 103–130 (2023).
- [3] F.J. Aragón-Artacho, R. Campoy, and C. López-Pastor, Forward-backward algorithms devised by graphs, *SIAM J. Optim.* **35**(4), 2423–2451 (2025).
- [4] F.J. Aragón-Artacho, Y. Malitsky, M.K. Tam, and D. Torregrosa-Belén, Distributed forward-backward methods for ring networks, *Comput Optim Appl.* **86**, 845–870 (2023).
- [5] H. Attouch and M. Théra, A general duality principle for the sum of two operators, *J. Convex Anal.* **3**, 1–24 (1996).
- [6] S. Bartz, M.N. Dao, and H.M. Phan, Conical averagedness and convergence analysis of fixed point algorithms, *J. Glob. Optim.* **82**(2), 351–373 (2022).
- [7] H.H. Bauschke and P.L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, 2nd ed., Springer, Cham (2017).
- [8] H.H. Bauschke, W.M. Moursi, and X. Wang, Generalized monotone operators and their averaged resolvents, *Math. Program. Ser. B* (2020).
- [9] R.I. Boş and C. Hendrich, Douglas–Rachford type primal-dual method for solving inclusions with mixtures of composite and parallel-sum type monotone operators, *SIAM J. Optim.* **23**(4), 2541–2565 (2013).
- [10] K. Bredies, E. Chenchene, D.A. Lorenz, and E. Naldi, Degenerate preconditioned proximal point algorithms, *SIAM J. Optim.* **32**(3), 2376–2401 (2022).
- [11] L.M. Briceño-Arias and P.L. Combettes, A monotone + skew splitting model for composite monotone inclusions in duality, *SIAM J. Optim.* **21**(4), 1230–1250 (2011).
- [12] A. Chambolle and T. Pock, A first-order primal-dual algorithm for convex problems with applications to imaging, *J. Math. Imaging Vis.* **40**(1), 120–145 (2011).
- [13] P. Chen, J. Huang, and X. Zhang, A primal–dual fixed point algorithm for convex separable minimization with applications to image restoration, *Inverse Probl.* **29**(2), 025011 (2013).
- [14] P.L. Combettes and J.C. Pesquet, Proximal Splitting Methods in Signal Processing. In: H.H. Bauschke, R.S. Burachik, P.L. Combettes, V. Elser, D.R. Luke, and H. Wolkowicz (eds), *Fixed-Point Algorithms for Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering*, Springer, New York, (2011).
- [15] P.L. Combettes and J.C. Pesquet, Primal–dual splitting algorithm for solving inclusions with mixtures of composite, lipschitzian, and parallel-sum type monotone operators, *Set Valued Var. Anal.* **20**(2), 307–330 (2012).
- [16] L. Condat, A primal–dual splitting method for convex optimization involving Lipschitzian, proximable and linear composite terms, *J. Optim. Theory. Appl.* **158**, 460–479 (2013).
- [17] E.R. Csetnek, Y. Malitsky, and M.K. Tam, Shadow Douglas–Rachford splitting for monotone inclusions, *Appl. Math. Optim.* **80**, 665–678 (2019).
- [18] M.N. Dao, M.K. Tam, and T.D. Truong, A general approach to distributed operator splitting, [arXiv:2504.14987](#).
- [19] J. Douglas and H.H. Rachford, On the numerical solution of heat conduction problems in two and three space variables, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **82**, 421–439 (1956).

- [20] Y. Drori, S. Sabach, and M. Teboulle, A simple algorithm for a class of nonsmooth convex-concave saddle-point problems, *Oper. Res. Lett.* **43**(2), 209–214 (2015).
- [21] P. Latafat and P. Patrinos, Asymmetric forward-backward-adjoint splitting for solving monotone inclusions involving three operators, *Comput. Optim. Appl.* **68**(1), 57–93 (2017).
- [22] P.L. Lions and B. Mercier, Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators, *SIAM J. Nume. Anal.* **16**(6), 964–979 (1979).
- [23] Y. Malitsky and M.K. Tam, A first-order algorithm for decentralised min-max problems, [arXiv:2308.11876](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.11876).
- [24] Y. Malitsky and M.K. Tam, Resolvent splitting for sums of monotone operators with minimal lifting, *Math. Program.* **201**, 231–262 (2023).
- [25] S. Noschese, L. Pasquini, and L. Reichel, Tridiagonal Toeplitz matrices: properties and novel applications, *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.* **20**, 302–326 (2013).
- [26] H. Raguet, J. Fadili, and G. Peyré, A generalized forward-backward splitting, *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.* **6**(3), 1199–1226 (2013).
- [27] R.T. Rockafellar, Monotone operators associated with saddle-functions and minimax problems, In: F.E. Browder (ed.) *Nonlinear functional analysis, Proc. Symp. Pure Math.* **18**, 241–250 (1970).
- [28] R.T. Rockafellar and R. Wets, *Variational Analysis*, vol. 317. Springer, Berlin (1998).
- [29] E.K. Ryu, Uniqueness of DRS as the 2 operator resolvent-splitting and impossibility of 3 operator resolvent-splitting, *SIAM J. Optim.* **182**(1), 233–273 (2020).
- [30] M.K. Tam, Frugal and decentralised resolvent splittings defined by nonexpansive operators, *Optim Lett.* **18**, 1541–1559 (2023).
- [31] R. Tibshirani, M. Saunders, S. Rosset, J. Zhu, and K. Knight, Sparsity and smoothness via the fused lasso, *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B (Stat. Methodol.)* **67**(1), 91–108 (2005).
- [32] P. Tseng, A modified forward-backward splitting method for maximal monotone mappings, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **38**(2), 431–446 (2000).
- [33] B.C. Vũ, A splitting algorithm for dual monotone inclusions involving cocoercive operators, *Adv. Comput. Math.* **38**, 667–681 (2013).