

PROJECTION METHOD WITH RESIDUAL SELECTION FOR LINEAR FEASIBILITY PROBLEMS

ROBERT DYLEWSKI

Faculty of Mathematics, Computer Science and Econometrics

University of Zielona Góra, Poland

Szafrana 4a, 65-516 Zielona Góra, Poland

e-mail: r.dylewski@wmie.uz.zgora.pl

Abstract

We propose a new projection method for linear feasibility problems. The method is based on the so called residual selection model. We present numerical results for some test problems.

Keywords: projection method, linear feasibility, residual selection.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 65K05, 90C25.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider the linear feasibility problem:

Given a system of linear inequalities

$$(1) \quad G^\top x \leq b,$$

where G is a matrix of size $n \times m$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

Find a solution $x^* \in M_0 = \{x : G^\top x \leq b\}$ or detect that $M_0 = \emptyset$.

We use the following notation:

- x_k – k th element of a sequence (x_k) ,
- $x^\top y$ – the standard scalar product of vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,
- $\|x\|$ – the Euclidean norm of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,
- $P_D x$ – the metric projection of a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ onto a closed and convex subset $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

$A^+ = (A^\top A)^{-1} A^\top$ – the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of a full column rank matrix A .

We study the projection method for the problem (1) of the form

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} x_1 &\in \mathbb{R}^n - \text{arbitrary} \\ x_{k+1} &= x_k + \lambda_k t_k, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$t_k = P_{\{x: G_{L_k}^\top x \leq b_{L_k}\}} x_k - x_k,$$

and $\lambda_k \in (0, 2)$.

We denote by G_{L_k} the submatrix of G which consists of the columns $L_k \subset J = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and by b_{L_k} the subvector of b which consists of the coordinates $L_k \subset J$.

In the method (2) we have a problem: how to choose $L_k \subset J$ such that $x_k^+ = P_{\{x: G_{L_k}^\top x \leq b_{L_k}\}} x_k$ approximates a solution $x^* \in M_0$ essentially better than x_k and such that x_k^+ can easily be evaluated.

Suppose that G_{L_k} has a full column rank. Then, the equation system $G_{L_k}^\top x = b_{L_k}$ has a solution and

$$(3) \quad x'_k = P_{\{x: G_{L_k}^\top x = b_{L_k}\}} x_k = x_k - G_{L_k} \left(G_{L_k}^\top G_{L_k} \right)^{-1} \left(G_{L_k}^\top x_k - b_{L_k} \right).$$

Of course, x'_k is not necessarily equal to x_k^+ . Nevertheless, it can be shown that

$$(4) \quad x'_k = x_k^+ \iff y := \left(G_{L_k}^\top G_{L_k} \right)^{-1} \left(G_{L_k}^\top x_k - b_{L_k} \right) \geq 0.$$

If $G_{L_k}^\top x_k \geq b_{L_k}$ and $\left(G_{L_k}^\top G_{L_k} \right)^{-1} \geq 0$, then $y \geq 0$. Selections of $L_k \subset J$ with such properties were employed for convex feasibility problems or for convex minimization problems in [1, 2, 3, 4]. We call such a selection an *obtuse cone selection* since the columns of a full column rank matrix A generate an obtuse cone if and only if $(A^\top A)^{-1} \geq 0$. In this paper, we study selections of $L_k \subset J$ such that $y \geq 0$ without assuming that $G_{L_k}^\top x_k \geq b_{L_k}$, for the linear feasibility problems. Such selections were employed for convex minimization problems in [5, 6].

2. RESIDUAL SELECTION MODEL

Let be given a system of linear inequalities (1) and an approximation $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of a solution of this system. We construct sequentially a subset $L \subset J = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and, consequently, the matrix G_L which has the properties: G_L has a full column rank and $y := (G_L^\top G_L)^{-1} (G_L^\top x_k - b_L) \geq 0$. To simplify the notation, we denote $\underbrace{A}_{n \times l} := G_L$, $\underbrace{d}_{l \times 1} := b_L$, where $l = |L|$.

Let $A = [\underbrace{A_1}_{n \times (l-1)}, \underbrace{a}_{n \times 1}]$. Denote by r the residual vector, i.e.,

$$(5) \quad r = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 \\ \rho \end{bmatrix} = A^\top \bar{x} - d = \begin{bmatrix} A_1^\top \\ a^\top \end{bmatrix} \bar{x} - \begin{bmatrix} d_1 \\ \delta_l \end{bmatrix},$$

where $r_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{l-1}$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$.

The following theorem enables a sequential construction of a full column rank submatrix A of G for which $y := (A^\top A)^{-1} r \geq 0$, where the residual vector r is not necessarily nonnegative. Therefore, we call a model obtained by such a construction a *residual selection model*.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that there exists $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $A^\top z \leq d$. If*

- (i) A_1 has a full column rank,
- (ii) $(A_1^\top A_1)^{-1} r_1 \geq 0$,
- (iii) $A_1^+ a \leq 0$,
- (iv) $(A_1^+ a)^\top r_1 < \rho$,

then

- (I) A has a full column rank,
- (II) $(A^\top A)^{-1} r \geq 0$.

Proof. See [6, Theorem 1]. ■

Corollary 2. *Let $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary. Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 1 are satisfied and let*

$$(6) \quad t = -A (A^\top A)^{-1} (A^\top \bar{x} - d).$$

Then

$$(7) \quad x^+ = \bar{x} + t = P_{\{x: A^\top x \leq d\}} \bar{x}.$$

Proof. By (3) and by (6) we have $\bar{x} + t = P_{\{x: A^\top x = d\}} \bar{x}$. By Theorem 1 and by (4) we obtain equality (7). ■

3. PROJECTION METHOD WITH RESIDUAL SELECTION

In this section, we present a projection method with a residual selection for the linear feasibility problem presented in Section 1. We do not suppose that the system (1) is consistent.

Iterative scheme 3.

Choose:

$x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (*starting point*), $\varepsilon \geq 0$ (*optimality tolerance*).

For $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$:

1. (*stopping criterion*)

set $i_k = \arg \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{G_i^\top x_k - b_i\}$,

where G_i is the i th column of G ;

if $G_{i_k}^\top x_k - b_{i_k} \leq \varepsilon$, then terminate;

otherwise

2. (*residual selection*)

select $L_k \subset \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ such that:

$i_k \in L_k$, $G_{L_k} = [G_i : i \in L_k]$ has a full column rank and $(G_{L_k}^\top G_{L_k})^{-1} r_{L_k} \geq 0$,
where $r_{L_k} = G_{L_k}^\top x_k - b_{L_k}$,

3. make a Cholesky factorization $C_{L_k} C_{L_k}^\top$ of the matrix $G_{L_k}^\top G_{L_k}$;
if the Cholesky procedure breaks down, then terminate ($\{x : G^\top x \leq b\} = \emptyset$),

4. evaluate $t_k = -G_{L_k} (C_{L_k} C_{L_k}^\top)^{-1} r_{L_k}$,

5. set $x_{k+1} = x_k + \lambda_k t_k$,

where the *relaxation parameter* $\lambda_k \in [\alpha, 2 - \alpha]$, $0 < \alpha < 1$.

Remark 4. We apply sequentially Theorem 1 in order to construct the subset L_k and, consequently, the matrix G_{L_k} in Step 2.

If the Cholesky procedure detects a linear dependency of the columns of G_{L_k} in Step 3, then we obtain a contradiction, which proves by Theorem 1 the inconsistency of the system $G^\top x \leq b$. If the inconsistency is not detected, then the matrix G_{L_k} has a full column rank and, by Corollary 2, the vector t_k determined in Step 4 is the projection vector of x_k onto the subset $\{x : G_{L_k}^\top x \leq b_{L_k}\}$.

Now, we show that any sequence generated by Iterative scheme 3 converges to a solution $x^* \in M_0$.

Theorem 5. *Suppose that there exists $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $G^\top z \leq b$. If the sequence (x_k) is generated by Iterative scheme 3, then*

$$(8) \quad \max\{0, G_i^\top x_k - b_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, m\} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Proof. For all $z \in M_0$ and $k \geq 0$ we have

$$(z - x_k)^\top t_k \geq \|t_k\|^2$$

and, consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{k+1} - z\|^2 &= \|x_k + \lambda_k t_k - z\|^2 = \|x_k - z\|^2 - 2\lambda_k (z - x_k)^\top t_k + (\lambda_k)^2 \|t_k\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x_k - z\|^2 - 2\lambda_k \|t_k\|^2 + (\lambda_k)^2 \|t_k\|^2 = \|x_k - z\|^2 - \lambda_k (2 - \lambda_k) \|t_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|t_k\|^2 < \infty$$

since $\lambda_k \in [\alpha, 2 - \alpha]$, $0 < \alpha < 1$ and, consequently,

$$(9) \quad \|t_k\| \longrightarrow 0.$$

We denote $\beta = \max_{i=1,2,\dots,m} \|G_i\|$. If $L_k = \{i_k\}$, then

$$t_k = - \left(G_{i_k}^\top x_k - b_{i_k} \right) \left(G_{i_k} / \|G_{i_k}\|^2 \right).$$

Hence, if $i_k \in L_k$, then $\{x : G_{L_k}^\top x \leq b_{L_k}\} \subset \{x : G_{i_k}^\top x \leq b_{i_k}\}$ and

$$\|t_k\| \geq (G_{i_k}^\top x_k - b_{i_k}) / \|G_{i_k}\| \geq (G_{i_k}^\top x_k - b_{i_k}) / \beta.$$

Consequently,

$$(10) \quad \|t_k\| \geq (G_i^\top x_k - b_i) / \beta,$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Now, we obtain (8) from (9) and (10). ■

4. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we present the computation results of the projection method with a residual selection for linear feasibility problems.

In the numerical experiments we have tested the method for the randomly generated linear feasibility problems

$$G^\top x \leq b,$$

where G is a matrix of size $n \times m$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

In these problems, the coordinates of columns of matrix G are randomly generated in the interval $(-0.5, 0.5)$. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$ we admit $b_i = 0$ and for $i = l+1, \dots, m$ the coordinates of vector b are randomly generated in the interval $(0, 1)$. We have guaranteed that the system $G^\top x \leq b$ is consistent. The coordinates of the starting point are generated in the interval $(0, 1)$.

Ten examples were solved for each system of parameters n, m, l . In Tables 1 and 2 we present the average number of iterations $k_i, i = 1, 2, 3$ which are necessary to get an ε -optimal solution. We set the optimality tolerance $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$. The method was programmed in Fortran 90 (Lahey Fortran 90 v.3.5). All floating point calculations were performed with double precision, allowing the relative accuracy of $2.2 * 10^{-16}$.

In Table 1 we present the results of numerical tests for the method presented in Section 3 (Iterative scheme 3) with relaxation parameter $\lambda_k = 1$ and $\lambda_k = 1.5$. In the last column we present results where we use the so called largest residuum strategy (*l.r.s.*) in Step 2 of Iterative scheme 3, (see [5, Section 3]).

Table 1

		$\lambda_k = 1$	$\lambda_k = 1.5$	$\lambda_k = 1.5$ (<i>l.r.s.</i>)
$n \times m$	l	k_1	k_2	k_3
20×20	12	6	6	5
	20	7	6	5
20×40	12	8	7	7
	24	14	13	11
20×80	12	11	10	10
	24	18	14	12
50×50	30	19	12	10
	50	33	16	14
50×100	30	35	19	14
	60	145	37	28
50×200	30	69	28	21
	60	122	37	27
100×100	60	49	20	17
	100	77	25	19
200×200	120	97	34	25
	200	164	38	30

In Table 2 we present the results of numerical tests for the projection method with a residual selection (see [6]) for convex minimization problems of the form

$$\text{minimize} \quad f(x) = \max\{0, G_i^\top x - b_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$$

which is equivalent to the problem (1).

Table 2

		$\lambda_k = 1$	$\lambda_k = 1.5$	$\lambda_k = 1.5$ (<i>l.r.s.</i>)
$n \times m$	l	k_1	k_2	k_3
20×20	12	10	9	9
	20	11	10	10
50×50	30	29	24	24
	50	51	33	32
100×100	60	71	49	47
	100	99	57	54

We can see that for each system of parameters n, m, l the results for the projection method with a residual selection for the linear feasibility problem (Table 1) are better than for the projection method with a residual selection for the convex minimization problem (Table 2). The influence of the relaxation parameter λ_k on the convergence is essential for both methods. If the parameter l is greater then the solution set $M_0 = \{x : G^\top x \leq b\}$ is flatter and the number of iterations is greater.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Cegielski, *Relaxation Methods in Convex Optimization Problems*, Higher College of Engineering, Series Monographs, No. 67, Zielona Góra, 1993 (Polish).
- [2] A. Cegielski, *Projection onto an acute cone and convex feasibility problems*, J. Henry and J.-P. Yvon (eds.), *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Science* **197** (1994), 187–194.
- [3] K.C. Kiwiel, *Monotone Gram matrices and deepest surrogate inequalities in accelerated relaxation methods for convex feasibility problems*, *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* **252** (1997), 27–33.
- [4] A. Cegielski, *A method of projection onto an acute cone with level control in convex minimization*, *Mathematical Programming* **85** (1999), 469–490.
- [5] A. Cegielski and R. Dylewski, *Selection strategies in projection methods for convex minimization problems*, *Discuss. Math. Differential Inclusions, Control and Optimization* **22** (2002), 97–123.
- [6] A. Cegielski and R. Dylewski, *Residual selection in a projection method for convex minimization problems*, *Optimization* **52** (2003), 211–220.

Received 15 March 2006