

Extragradient method with feasible inexact projection to variational inequality problem

R. Díaz Millán O.P. Ferreira J. Ugon

Abstract

The variational inequality problem in finite-dimensional Euclidean space is addressed in this paper, and two inexact variants of the extragradient method are proposed to solve it. Instead of computing exact projections on the constraint set, as in previous versions extragradient method, the proposed methods compute feasible inexact projections on the constraint set using a relative error criterion. The first version of the proposed method provided is a counterpart to the classic form of the extragradient method with constant steps. In order to establish its convergence we need to assume that the operator is pseudo-monotone and Lipschitz continuous, as in the standard approach. For the second version, instead of a fixed step size, the method presented finds a suitable step size in each iteration by performing a line search. Like the classical extragradient method, the proposed method does just two projections into the feasible set in each iteration. A full convergence analysis is provided, with no Lipschitz continuity assumption of the operator defining the variational inequality problem.

Keywords: Variational inequality problem, Extragradient method, Frank-Wolfe algorithm, conditional gradient method, feasible inexact projection.

MSC Classification: 65K05, 90C30, 90C25

1 Introduction

This paper addresses the variational inequality problem in finite-dimensional Euclidean spaces. This problem is formally stated as follows: Let $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be an operator and $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty and closed convex set, the variational inequality problem associated with F and \mathcal{C} ($\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$) consists in finding a $x^* \in \mathcal{C}$ such that

$$\langle F(x^*), x - x^* \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (1)$$

We denote by \mathcal{C}^* the *solution set* of problem 1, which we will assume to be nonempty. The variational inequality problem has captured the attention of the mathematics programming community, not only due to its intrinsic interest but also because it serves as an abstract model for several families of problems in nonlinear analysis and their applications. For instance, if $F = \nabla f$, where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a differentiable function,

then the $\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$ corresponds to the problem of minimizing the function f constrained to the set \mathcal{C} . When \mathcal{C} is a cone $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, the $\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$ is a complementary problem, which is stated in the following form: Compute $x^* \in \mathcal{K}$ such that, $F(x^*) \in \mathcal{K}^*$ and $\langle F(x^*), x^* \rangle = 0$, where \mathcal{K}^* denotes the dual of \mathcal{K} . For a comprehensive study of theory and applications of variational inequality, see [20, 19].

The extragradient method, one of the most popular algorithms to solve the $\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$, was proposed in [28] in the 1970s and continues to attract the interest of variational inequality experts, see [13, 29, 38, 5], and the references therein. This method is attractive due to the fact that it requires only two operator evaluations for each iteration, making it numerically stable and hence potentially suited for addressing large-scale problems. Apart from the projection required in its definition, which is responsible for nearly all of the computational demands when the constraint set projection is challenging to compute, it is a relatively simple method. Additionally, the method converges with mild assumptions. All these features motivate the study of it, resulting in many different versions of the method throughout the years culminating in a large body of literature on the subject, including [19, 20, 15, 41, 9, 11], and the references therein.

Another subject that has motivated the development of numerical methods for addressing constrained problems is dealing with the computation of the projection, which is the step that accounts for practically all of the computing demands of methods that utilize projections, like the Extragradient method. In general, computing the projection requires solving a quadratic problem constrained to the feasible set at each iteration, which can significantly raise the cost per iteration if the number of unknowns is large. In light of this, it may not be reasonable to do exact projections when the iterates of the method are distant from the solution of the problem under consideration. Over the years, various inexact procedures, which become increasingly accurate as the solution of the problem under consideration is approached, have been proposed in an effort to reduce the computational cost required for projections, thus leading to more effective projection-based methods; see for example [7, 8, 23, 24, 35, 40, 34, 18, 17].

The purpose of this paper is to present two variants of the extragradient method that utilize feasible inexact projections. In the proposed variants of the extragradient method, we will adopt a version of the scheme proposed in [40, Example 1], where the inexact projection over the feasible set is computed with an appropriate relative error tolerance. Firstly, we present a variation of the extragradient method with constant stepsize and show that it preserves the same convergence result as the classic method, see [20, 28]. We show that if F is a pseudo monotone operator on \mathcal{C} with respect to \mathcal{C}^* and Lipschitz continuous, the sequence generated converges to a solution of the $\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$. It is important to note in this version that the Lipschitz constant is required to compute the stepsize. Considering that the Lipschitz constant is not accessible or difficult to compute in almost every application, we propose and analyse a feasible inexact projection version of the extragradient method using an Armiljo-type line search. It is worth noting that, like the classical extragradient method, the method does just two projections into the feasible set in each iteration. The full convergence of the sequence to a solution is shown,

with F being a pseudo monotone operator on \mathcal{C} with respect to \mathcal{C}^* and no Lipschitz continuity assumption, which is the same results as the version with exact projection, see [5, 10, 42, 27, 36].

The organization of the paper is as follows. In section 2, we present some notation and basic results used throughout the paper. In Section 3 we will revisit the concept of feasible inexact projection onto a closed and convex set and describe some new properties of the feasible inexact projection. Section 4 describe and analyze the extragradient method with a feasible inexact projection for solving problem (1). In Section 5 is introduced and analyzed an inexact variant of the extragradient method with line search for solve $\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$. Finally, some concluding remarks are made in Section 7.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we present some preliminary results used throughout the paper. We denote: $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the usual inner product and $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm. Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be closed, convex and nonempty set, the *projection* is the map $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}(v) := \arg \min_{y \in \mathcal{C}} \|v - y\|.$$

In the next lemma, we present some important properties of the projection mapping.

Lemma 1. *Given a convex and closed set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the following properties hold:*

- (i) $\langle v - \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}(v), z - \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}(v) \rangle \leq 0$, for all $z \in \mathcal{C}$;
- (ii) $\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}(v) - z\|^2 \leq \|v - z\|^2 - \|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}(v) - v\|^2$, for all $z \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proof. The item (i) is proved in [2, Theorem 3.14]. For item (ii), combine $\|v - z\|^2 = \|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}(v) - v\|^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}(v) - z\|^2 - 2\langle \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}(v) - v, \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}(v) - z \rangle$ with item (i). \square

For the formula in the next proposition see, for example, [2, Example 3.21].

Proposition 2. *Let $a, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $H = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle v, x - a \rangle \leq 0\}$. If $\bar{x} \notin H$, then*

$$\mathcal{P}_H(\bar{x}) = \bar{x} - \frac{1}{\|v\|^2} \langle v, \bar{x} - a \rangle v.$$

Let $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be an operator, $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty and closed convex set. The operator F is said to be *pseudo-monotone on \mathcal{C} with respect to the solution set \mathcal{C}^** of problem (1) if the set \mathcal{C}^* is nonempty and, for every $x^* \in \mathcal{C}^*$, there holds:

$$\langle F(x), x - x^* \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{C}.$$

It is worth noting that the concept described above represents a relaxation of the pseudo-monotonicity of F on \mathcal{C} . The concept of *pseudo-monotonicity of F on \mathcal{C}* is defined as follows: for all $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$, one has that $\langle F(y), x - y \rangle \geq 0$ implies $\langle F(x), x - y \rangle \geq 0$.

Definition 1. Let S be a nonempty subset of \mathbb{R}^n . A sequence $(v_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be quasi-Fejér convergent to S , if and only if, for all $v \in S$ there exists $\bar{k} \geq 0$ and a summable sequence $(\epsilon_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that $\|v_{k+1} - v\|^2 \leq \|v_k - v\|^2 + \epsilon_k$ for all $k \geq \bar{k}$.

In the following lemma, we state the main properties of quasi-Fejér sequences that we will need; a comprehensive study on this topic can be found in [14].

Lemma 3. Let S be a nonempty subset of \mathbb{R}^n and $(v_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a quasi-Fejér sequence convergent to S . Then, the following conditions hold:

- (i) the sequence $(v_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded;
- (ii) if a cluster point \bar{v} of $(v_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ belongs to S , then $(v_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to \bar{v} .

3 Feasible inexact projection

In this section, we will revisit the concept of feasible inexact projection onto a closed and convex set. This concept has already been utilized in [1, 16, 17, 18]. We also describe some new properties of the feasible inexact projection, which is employed throughout the work. The definition of feasible inexact projection is as follows.

Definition 2. Let $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed convex set and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a given error tolerance. The feasible inexact projection mapping relative to $u \in C$ with error tolerance γ , denoted by $\mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(u, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows C$, is the set-valued mapping defined as follows

$$\mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(u, v) := \{w \in C : \langle v - w, y - w \rangle \leq \gamma \|w - u\|^2, \forall y \in C\}. \quad (2)$$

Each point $w \in \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(u, v)$ is called a feasible inexact projection of v onto C relative to u with error tolerance γ .

The feasible inexact projection generalizes the concept of usual projection. In the following, we present some remarks about this concept.

Remark 1. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be error tolerance, $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $u \in C$ and γ be as in Definition 2. For all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, it follows from (2) that $\mathcal{P}_C^0(u, v)$ is the exact projection of v onto C ; see [6, Proposition 2.1.3, p. 201]. Moreover, $\mathcal{P}_C^0(u, v) \subset \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(u, v)$ which implies that $\mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(u, v) \neq \emptyset$, for all $u \in C$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In general, if $\gamma \leq \bar{\gamma}$ then $\mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(u, v) \subset \mathcal{P}_C^{\bar{\gamma}}(u, v)$.

Below we present a particular counterpart of the firm non-expansiveness of the projection operator to a feasible inexact projection operator, its proof follows the same idea of [17].

Proposition 4. Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\gamma \geq 0$. If $w \in \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(u, v)$ and $\bar{w} = \mathcal{P}_C(\bar{v})$, then

$$\|w - \bar{w}\|^2 \leq \|v - \bar{v}\|^2 - \|(v - \bar{v}) - (w - \bar{w})\|^2 + 2\gamma \|w - u\|^2.$$

Proof. Since $w \in \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(u, v)$ and $\bar{w} = \mathcal{P}_C(\bar{v})$, it follows from (2) and Lemma 1 that

$$\langle v - w, \bar{w} - w \rangle \leq \gamma \|w - u\|^2, \quad \langle \bar{v} - \bar{w}, w - \bar{w} \rangle \leq 0$$

By adding the last two inequalities, some algebraic manipulations yield

$$-\langle \bar{v} - v, \bar{w} - w \rangle + \|w - \bar{w}\|^2 \leq \gamma \|w - u\|^2.$$

Since $\|(\bar{v} - v) - (\bar{w} - w)\|^2 = \|\bar{v} - v\|^2 - 2\langle \bar{v} - v, \bar{w} - w \rangle + \|\bar{w} - w\|^2$, the desired inequality follows by combination with the last inequality. \square

The forthcoming lemma delineates essential properties of the feasible inexact projection operator, specifically crafted for examining the extragradient method. These properties will play a crucial role in deriving features associated with the progress of this algorithm, as well as in verifying optimality.

Lemma 5. *Let $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be an operator, $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty, closed, and convex set, $x \in \mathcal{C}$ and $0 \leq \gamma < 1$. Take $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any inexact projection*

$$w(\alpha) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma}(x, x - \alpha F(z)), \quad \alpha \in (0, +\infty).$$

Then, there hold:

$$(i) \quad \langle F(z), w(\alpha) - x \rangle \leq \frac{\gamma - 1}{\alpha} \|w(\alpha) - x\|^2;$$

$$(ii) \quad \|w(\alpha) - x\| \leq \frac{\alpha}{1 - \gamma} \|F(z)\|.$$

Proof. Since $w(\alpha) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma}(x, x - \alpha F(z))$ we obtain $\langle x - \alpha F(z) - w(\alpha), x - w(\alpha) \rangle \leq \gamma \|w(\alpha) - x\|^2$, which after some algebraic manipulations yields

$$\|w(\alpha) - x\|^2 - \alpha \langle F(z), x - w(\alpha) \rangle \leq \gamma \|w(\alpha) - x\|^2.$$

Thus, item (i) follows from the last inequality. We proceed to prove the tem (ii). For that, first note that the item (i) is equivalent to

$$0 \leq \frac{1 - \gamma}{\alpha} \|w(\alpha) - x\|^2 \leq \langle F(z), x - w(\alpha) \rangle. \quad (3)$$

If $w(\alpha) = x$, then the inequality holds trivially. Assume that $w(\alpha) \neq x$. Thus, the inequality in item (ii) follows by combining the inequality (3) with $\langle F(z), x - w(\alpha) \rangle \leq \|F(z)\| \|x - w(\alpha)\|$. \square

The subsequent corollary, derived from the preceding lemma, plays a significant role in verifying the optimality of points generated by the extragradient method.

Corollary 6. *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) x is a solution of the VIP(F, \mathcal{C});
- (ii) $x \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma}(x, x - \alpha F(x))$, for all $\alpha \in (0, +\infty)$;
- (iii) there exists $\bar{\alpha} > 0$ such that $\langle F(x), w(\bar{\alpha}) - x \rangle \geq 0$ for $w(\bar{\alpha}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma}(x, x - \bar{\alpha} F(x))$.

Proof. Proof of equivalence between item (i) and item (ii): We first assume that item (i) holds, i.e., x is a solution for problem (1). In this case, by taking $w(\alpha) \in \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(x, x - \alpha F(x))$, we find that $w(\alpha) \in \mathcal{C}$. Consequently, we have $\langle F(x), w(\alpha) - x \rangle \geq 0$. Considering that $\alpha > 0$ and $0 \leq \gamma < 1$, the last inequality, along with item (i) of Lemma 5 for $z = x$, implies that $w(\alpha) = x$. Hence, $x \in \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(x, x - \alpha F(x))$, and item (ii) also holds. Reciprocally, assuming that item (ii) holds, if $x \in \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(x, x - \alpha F(x))$, then applying (2) with $w = x$, $v = x - \alpha F(x)$, and $u = x$ yields $\langle x - \alpha F(x) - x, y - x \rangle \leq 0$, for all $y \in \mathcal{C}$. Given that $\alpha > 0$, the last inequality is equivalent to $\langle F(x), y - x \rangle \geq 0$, for all $y \in \mathcal{C}$. Thus, x is a solution for problem (1), and item (i) holds as well.

Proof of equivalence between item (ii) and item (iii): Let us assume that item (ii) holds. Thus, item (i) also holds, and x is a solution for problem (1), which implies that $\langle F(x), y - x \rangle \geq 0$ for all $y \in \mathcal{C}$. Considering that for any $w(\bar{\alpha}) \in \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(x, x - \bar{\alpha} F(x))$, we have $w(\bar{\alpha}) \in \mathcal{C}$, it follows that $\langle F(x), w(\bar{\alpha}) - x \rangle \geq 0$, and item (iii) holds. Conversely, we assume, for contradiction, that item (ii) does not hold. Therefore, $x \notin \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(x, x - \alpha F(x))$, and considering that $w(\alpha) \in \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(x, x - \alpha F(x))$, we conclude that $x \neq w(\alpha)$. As a result, because $\alpha > 0$ and $0 < \gamma \leq \bar{\gamma}$, it follows from item (i) of Lemma 5 that $\langle F(x), w(\alpha) - x \rangle < 0$, for all $\alpha \in (0, +\infty)$. Thus, item (iii) does not hold, which leads to a contradiction. Therefore, (iii) implies (ii). \square

This section concludes with the presentation of a consequence derived from Lemma 5, providing a valuable tool for verifying the progress of the extragradient method.

Corollary 7. *Let $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a operator, $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty, closed, and convex set, $x \in \mathcal{C}$, $0 \leq \gamma < 1$ and $\alpha > 0$. If $y \in \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(x, x - \alpha F(x))$ and $x^+ \in \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(x, x - \alpha F(y))$, then the following inequalities hold:*

$$(i) \quad \|y - x\| \leq \frac{\alpha}{1 - \gamma} \|F(x)\|;$$

$$(ii) \quad \|x^+ - x\| \leq \frac{\alpha}{1 - \gamma} \|F(y)\|.$$

As a consequence, if F is Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{C} with constant $L > 0$, then it holds:

$$\|x^+ - x\| \leq \frac{\alpha(1 - \gamma + \alpha L)}{(1 - \gamma)^2} \|F(x)\|. \quad (4)$$

Proof. Applying item (ii) of Lemma 5 with $w(\alpha) = y$ and $z = x$ we obtain item (i) and with $w(\alpha) = x^+$ and $z = y$ we obtain item (ii). We proceed to prove (4). For that, we first note that due to F be Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{C} with constant $L > 0$, we obtain that

$$\|F(y)\| \leq \|F(y) - F(x)\| + \|F(x)\| \leq L\|y - x\| + \|F(x)\|.$$

Thus, considering that $y \in \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(x, x - \alpha F(x))$, we can apply the item (i) to obtain

$$\|F(y)\| \leq \frac{\alpha L}{1 - \gamma} \|F(x)\| + \|F(x)\| = \frac{1 - \gamma + \alpha L}{1 - \gamma} \|F(x)\|.$$

By combing the last inequality with item (ii), the desired inequality follows. \square

4 Extragradient inexact method with constant step size

In this section, we describe the extragradient method with a feasible inexact projection for solving problem (1). It should be noted that the proposed method uses appropriate relative error criteria to compute inexact projections on the constraint set, in contrast to the extragradient method, which employs exact projections on the constraint set. The inexact version of the classical extragradient method is stated as follows:

Algorithm 1 Extragradient inexact projection method-EInexPM

1: Take $\alpha > 0$, $0 < \bar{\gamma} < 1/2$ and $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} a_k < +\infty$. Let $x^1 \in \mathcal{C}$ and set $k = 1$.

2: Choose an error tolerance γ_k such that

$$0 \leq \gamma_k \|F(x^k)\|^2 \leq a_k, \quad 0 \leq \gamma_k < \bar{\gamma}, \quad (5)$$

and compute the following feasible inexact projections:

$$y^k \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \alpha F(x^k)); \quad (6)$$

$$x^{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \alpha F(y^k)). \quad (7)$$

3: If $x^k = y^k$ or $y^k = x^{k+1}$, **stop**, else set $k \leftarrow k + 1$, and go to step 2.

Let us examine the main features of the EInexPM. To begin, we select a constant step size $\alpha > 0$, an upper bound for error tolerances $\bar{\gamma}$ such that $0 < \bar{\gamma} < 1/2$ and select an exogenous summable sequence $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ to control the error tolerance. The stopping criterion $F(x^k) = 0$ is then evaluated in the current iteration x^k . If this criterion is not satisfied, a non-negative error tolerance γ_k that fulfils the requirements (5) is selected. By using an inner procedure compute y^k as any feasible inexact projection $x^k - \alpha F(x^k)$ onto the feasible set \mathcal{C} relative to x^k , i.e. $y^k \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \alpha F(x^k))$. Finally, using again an inner procedure, the next iterate x^{k+1} is computed as any feasible inexact projection of $x^k - \alpha F(y^k)$ onto the feasible set \mathcal{C} relative to x^k , i.e., $x^{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \alpha F(y^k))$.

It is worth noting that if $\gamma_k \equiv 0$, then Remark 1 implies that inexact projections are the exact ones. Hence, EInexPM corresponds to the classical extragradient method introduced in [28]. It is important to note that γ_k in (5) can be selected as any nonnegative real number fulfilling $0 \leq \gamma_k \|F(x^k)\|^2 \leq a_k$, for a prefixed sequence $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. In this case, we have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (\gamma_k \|F(x^k)\|^2) < +\infty. \quad (8)$$

Since $x^1 \in \mathcal{C}$ and, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, x^{k+1} is a feasible inexact projection onto \mathcal{C} , we conclude $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{C}$. As a consequence of \mathcal{C} being a closed set, any cluster point of $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, if any exists, belongs to \mathcal{C} .

Next we present two examples of sequences $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} a_k < +\infty$.

Example 1. Sequences $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} a_k < +\infty$ are obtained

by taking $a_k := b_{k-1} - b_k$ and $\bar{b} > 0$ satisfying one the following conditions:
(i) $b_0 = 2\bar{b}$, $b_k = \bar{b}/k$, for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$; (ii) $b_0 = 2\bar{b}$, $b_k = \bar{b}/\ln(k+1)$,
for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$.

The convergence analysis of the sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ produced by EInxPM will be discussed in the following sections.

4.1 Convergence analysis

We will show in this section that the sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ generated by EInxPM converges to a solution of $\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$ for Lipschitz continuous pseudo-monotone operator F with Lipschitz constant $L \geq 0$. To state our first result, let us recall that the solution set of $\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$ is denoted by \mathcal{C}^* and define the following constants:

$$\bar{\eta} := 1 - \alpha^2 L^2 - 2\bar{\gamma}, \quad \bar{\nu} := \frac{\alpha^2(1 - \bar{\gamma} + \alpha L)^2}{(1 - \bar{\gamma})^4}. \quad (9)$$

The convergence of the sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, generated by Algorithm 1, relies on the following lemma. As we will demonstrate, under the condition (5), this lemma implies that $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is quasi-Fej'er convergent to the set \mathcal{C}^* .

Lemma 8. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty and closed convex set and $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Assume that $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a pseudo monotone operator on \mathcal{C} with respect to \mathcal{C}^* and Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{C} with constant $L > 0$. Then, for any $x^* \in \mathcal{C}^*$, there holds:*

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \bar{\eta}\|x^k - y^k\|^2 + \bar{\nu}\gamma_k\|F(x^k)\|^2, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Proof. First note that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x^k - \alpha F(y^k) - y^k, x^{k+1} - y^k \rangle &= \langle x^k - \alpha F(x^k) - y^k, x^{k+1} - y^k \rangle \\ &\quad + \alpha \langle F(x^k) - F(y^k), x^{k+1} - y^k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since (6) implies that $y^k \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \alpha F(x^k))$, we conclude that

$$\langle x^k - \alpha F(y^k) - y^k, x^{k+1} - y^k \rangle \leq \gamma_k \|y^k - x^k\|^2 + \alpha \langle F(x^k) - F(y^k), x^{k+1} - y^k \rangle. \quad (10)$$

For simplicity set $z^k := x^k - \alpha F(y^k)$. As nothing more than a result of some algebraic manipulations, we arrive to the conclusion that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 &= \|x^{k+1} - z^k\|^2 + \|z^k - x^*\|^2 - 2\langle x^{k+1} - z^k, x^* - z^k \rangle \\ &= -\|x^{k+1} - z^k\|^2 + \|z^k - x^*\|^2 + 2\langle z^k - x^{k+1}, x^* - x^{k+1} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $x^{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, z^k)$ we conclude that $\langle z^k - x^{k+1}, x^* - x^{k+1} \rangle \leq \gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2$, which combined with the previous equality give us

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|z^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - z^k\|^2 + 2\gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \quad (11)$$

Taking into account that $z^k = x^k - \alpha F(y^k)$, some calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|z^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - z^k\|^2 &= \|x^k - x^* - \alpha F(y^k)\|^2 - \|x^k - x^{k+1} - \alpha F(y^k)\|^2 \\ &= \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 + 2\alpha \langle F(y^k), x^* - x^{k+1} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, considering that $x^* \in \mathcal{C}^*$, $y^k \in \mathcal{C}$ and F is pseudo monotone operator on \mathcal{C} with respect to \mathcal{C}^* we have $\langle F(y^k), y^k - x^* \rangle \geq 0$. Thus, we conclude that

$$\langle F(y^k), x^* - x^{k+1} \rangle \leq \langle F(y^k), y^k - x^{k+1} \rangle.$$

The last inequality, when combined with the previous equality, implies that

$$\|z^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - z^k\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 + 2\alpha \langle F(y^k), y^k - x^{k+1} \rangle.$$

The previous inequality is now combined with (11) to provide the following inequality

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 + \gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + 2\alpha \langle F(y^k), y^k - x^{k+1} \rangle.$$

Since $\|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 = \|x^k - y^k\|^2 + \|y^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 + 2\langle x^k - y^k, y^k - x^{k+1} \rangle$, the last inequality is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^k - y^k\|^2 - \|y^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 + \gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + \\ &\quad 2\langle x^k - \alpha F(y^k) - y^k, x^{k+1} - y^k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality together with (10) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^k - y^k\|^2 - \|y^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 + \gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\gamma_k \|y^k - x^k\|^2 + 2\alpha \langle F(x^k) - F(y^k), x^{k+1} - y^k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Considering that F is Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{C} with constant $L > 0$, we have

$$\langle F(x^k) - F(y^k), x^{k+1} - y^k \rangle \leq L \|x^k - y^k\| \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|,$$

which combined with the last inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^k - y^k\|^2 - \|y^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 + \gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\gamma_k \|y^k - x^k\|^2 + 2\alpha L \|x^k - y^k\| \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|. \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - (1 - \alpha^2 L^2 - 2\gamma_k) \|x^k - y^k\|^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 - (\alpha L \|x^k - y^k\| - \|x^{k+1} - y^k\|)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - (1 - \alpha^2 L^2 - 2\gamma_k) \|x^k - y^k\|^2 + \gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2.$$

Thus, taking into account that $x^{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \alpha F(y^k))$, by applying Corollary 7 with $x^+ = x^{k+1}$, $x = x^k$ and $\gamma = \gamma_k$ we obtain that

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - (1 - \alpha^2 L^2 - 2\gamma_k) \|x^k - y^k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha^2 (1 - \gamma_k + \alpha L)^2}{(1 - \gamma_k)^4} \gamma_k \|F(x^k)\|^2.$$

Therefore, using (9) and considering that $0 \leq \gamma_k < \bar{\gamma}$, the desired inequality follows. \square

The following theorem represents the central outcome concerning Algorithm 1. It establishes the convergence of the sequence towards a solution of $\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$.

Theorem 9. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty and closed convex set and $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Assume that $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a pseudo monotone operator on \mathcal{C} with respect to \mathcal{C}^* and Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{C} with constant $L > 0$. If*

$$0 < \alpha < \frac{\sqrt{1 - 2\bar{\gamma}}}{L}, \quad (12)$$

then the sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a solution of the $\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$.

Proof. Let $x^* \in \mathcal{C}^*$ be an arbitrary solution of the $\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$. The condition (12) and $0 < \bar{\gamma} < 1/2$ imply that $\bar{\eta} > 0$ and $\bar{\nu} > 0$. Thus, it follows from Lemma 8 that

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \bar{\nu}\gamma_k \|F(x^k)\|^2, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

The last inequality together with (8) implies that $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is quasi-Fejér convergent to \mathcal{C}^* . Considering that \mathcal{C}^* is nonempty, the item (i) of Lemma 3 implies that $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. Let \bar{x} be a cluster point of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(x_{k_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ a subsequence of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} x_{k_j} = \bar{x}$. To continue the proof, keep in mind that Lemma 8 also implies that

$$\bar{\eta} \|x^k - y^k\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 + \bar{\nu}\gamma_k \|F(x^k)\|^2, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

By adding both sides of the previous inequality and using (8), we arrive at the conclusion that

$$\bar{\eta} \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \|x^k - y^k\|^2 \leq \|x^1 - x^*\|^2 + \bar{\nu} \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \gamma_k \|F(x^k)\|^2 < +\infty.$$

Hence, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \|x^k - y^k\| = 0$. Thus, taking into account that $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} x_{k_j} = \bar{x}$, we conclude that $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} y_{k_j} = \bar{x}$. It follows from (6) that

$$y^{k_j} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_{k_j}}(x^{k_j}, x^{k_j} - \alpha F(x^{k_j})).$$

Considering that $\gamma_{k_j} < \bar{\gamma}$, the last inclusion and Definition 2 imply that

$$\langle x^{k_j} - \alpha F(x^{k_j}) - y^{k_j}, y - y^{k_j} \rangle \leq \gamma \|y^{k_j} - x^{k_j}\|^2, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Since $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} x_{k_j} = \bar{x}$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} y_{k_j} = \bar{x}$, taking the limit in the previous inequality as j tending to infinity yields

$$\langle \bar{x} - \alpha F(\bar{x}) - \bar{x}, y - \bar{x} \rangle \leq \bar{\gamma} \|\bar{x} - \bar{x}\|, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{C}.$$

which, by using that $\alpha > 0$, is equivalent to $\langle F(\bar{x}), y - \bar{x} \rangle \geq 0$, for all $y \in \mathcal{C}$. Hence, $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{C}^*$. Given that \bar{x} is a cluster point of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, item (ii) of Lemma 3 implies that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} x_k = \bar{x}$, and the proof is complete. \square

5 Extragradient inexact method with line search

In this section, we introduce an inexact variant of the extragradient method for $\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$ with F pseudo monotone operator on \mathcal{C} with respect to the solution set \mathcal{C}^* of problem (1), see for example [25, 5, 27]. Instead of a fixed step size, the method presented finds a suitable step size in each iteration by performing an Armijo type line search. It is worth noting that, like the classical extragradient method, the method does just two projections into the feasible set in each iteration. A full convergence analysis is provided, with no Lipschitz continuity assumption of the operator defining the variational inequality problem.

The inexact version of the proposed version of the extragradient method is stated as follows:

Algorithm 2 Extragradient inexact projection method with line search-EInexPMLS

- 1: Take $0 < \hat{\beta} \leq \bar{\beta}$ and $(\beta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $0 < \hat{\beta} \leq \beta_k \leq \bar{\beta}$. Take also σ, ρ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and

$$0 < \bar{\gamma} < \min \{1 - \rho, 2 - \sqrt{3}\}. \quad (13)$$

Let $x^1 \in \mathcal{C}$ and set $k = 1$.

- 2: Choose a error tolerance γ_k such that $0 \leq \gamma_k < \bar{\gamma}$ and compute the following feasible inexact projection:

$$y^k \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \beta_k F(x^k)). \quad (14)$$

- 3: If $y^k = x^k$, then **stop**; otherwise, compute

$$i_k := \min \left\{ i \in \mathbb{N} : \langle F(x^k + \sigma \alpha^i (y^k - x^k)), y^k - x^k \rangle \leq \rho \langle F(x^k), y^k - x^k \rangle \right\}, \quad (15)$$

and set

$$z^k := x^k + \sigma \alpha^{i_k} (y^k - x^k). \quad (16)$$

- 4: Compute the next iteration as a feasible inexact projection:

$$x^{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \lambda_k F(z^k)), \quad \lambda_k := -\frac{1}{\|F(z^k)\|^2} \langle F(z^k), z^k - x^k \rangle. \quad (17)$$

- 5: Update $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to Step 2.
-

Let us go through the main features of the EInexPMLS. First, we must select some parameters that will control the behaviour of the algorithm and will be essential in your convergence analysis. The most important of these parameters is the upper bound $\bar{\gamma}$ for error tolerance γ_k , which is connected to the line search parameter ρ . In step 2 of the algorithm, by using an inner procedure compute y^k as any feasible inexact projection of $x^k - \beta_k F(x^k)$ onto the feasible set \mathcal{C} relative to x^k , i.e. (14). Then, in step 3, the conceptual stopping criterion $y^k = x^k$ is then evaluated in the current iteration. If this stopping criterion is not satisfied, a line search in the segment between the points x^k and y^k is done in order to decrease the mapping

$$(0, 1) \ni t \mapsto \langle F(x^k + t(y^k - x^k)), y^k - x^k \rangle.$$

In step 4, the line search resultant point z^k is utilized to define the following half space

$$H_k := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle F(z^k), x - z^k \rangle \leq 0 \right\}, \quad (18)$$

whose boundary separates the current iterate x_k of the solution set \mathcal{C}^* . Then, by applying Proposition 2, is computed the projection of x^k onto the hyperplane H_k as follows

$$\mathcal{P}_{H_k}(x^k) = x^k - \lambda_k F(z^k), \quad \lambda_k := -\frac{1}{\|F(z^k)\|^2} \langle F(z^k), z^k - x^k \rangle. \quad (19)$$

Finally, using again an inner procedure, the next iterate x^{k+1} is computed as any feasible inexact projection of $\mathcal{P}_{H_k}(x^k)$ onto the feasible set \mathcal{C} relative to x^k . Thus, by using (19), we conclude that (17) is equivalently stated as follows

$$x^{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, \mathcal{P}_{H_k}(x^k)), \quad (20)$$

It is noteworthy that if $\gamma_k \equiv 0$, then Remark 1 implies that inexact projection is the exact one. Consequently, EInexPMLS corresponds to a version of the extragradient method addressed in [25], see also [5, 10].

Remark 2. *The stopping criteria is well defined, i.e., if $x^k = y^k$, then x^k is a solution of the Problem 1. In fact, $y^k = x^k$ and (14) implies that $x^k \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \alpha_k F(x^k))$. Thus, it follows from Corollary 6 that $x^k \in \mathcal{C}^*$.*

Next, we show that the Algorithm 2 is well defined, namely that there exists i_k fulfilling (15).

Proposition 10. *Step 3 is well-defined, i.e., there exists i_k satisfying 15.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that $\langle F(x^k + \sigma \alpha^i (y^k - x^k)), y^k - x^k \rangle > \langle F(x^k), y^k - x^k \rangle$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y^k \neq x^k$. Since F is continuous and $0 < \alpha < 1$, taking the limit in the last inequality as i tends to infinity, we conclude that $\langle F(x^k), y^k - x^k \rangle \geq \rho \langle F(x^k), y^k - x^k \rangle$. Thus, taking into account that $0 < \rho < 1$, the last inequality that

$$\langle F(x^k), y^k - x^k \rangle \geq 0. \quad (21)$$

Considering that $y^k \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \beta_k F(x^k))$ and $x^k \in \mathcal{C}$, it follows from Definition 2 that

$$\langle x^k - \beta_k F(x^k) - y^k, x^k - y^k \rangle \leq \gamma_k \|y^k - x^k\|^2.$$

Since $0 < \hat{\beta} \leq \beta_k$ and $0 < \bar{\gamma} < 1$, we can deduce from some algebraic manipulations in the preceding inequality that

$$0 \leq \langle F(x^k), y^k - x^k \rangle \leq \frac{\gamma_k - 1}{\beta_k} \|y^k - x^k\|^2 < 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, there exists i_k satisfying (15). \square

Let $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2. Since $x^1 \in \mathcal{C}$ and, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, (17) implies that x^{k+1} is a feasible inexact projection onto \mathcal{C} , we conclude that $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{C}$. Consequently, due to \mathcal{C} be a closed set, each clustering point of $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ that exists belongs to \mathcal{C} .

5.1 Convergence analysis

In the previous section, we show that EInexPMLs generates a $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ belonging to the set \mathcal{C} . In this section we will show that $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a solution of $\text{VIP}(F, \mathcal{C})$. To this purpose, we will begin by establishing a few initial results. First, we show that the boundary of the half space H_k defined as in (18) separates the current iterates x_k of the solution set \mathcal{C}^* .

Proposition 11. *Let H_k be defined as in (18). Then, $x^k \in H_k$ if and only if $x^k \in \mathcal{C}^*$.*

Proof. First, we assume that $x^k \in H(z^k)$. Thus, taking into account (16) we conclude that

$$0 \geq \langle F(z^k), x^k - z^k \rangle = \sigma \alpha^{i_k} \langle F(z^k), x^k - y^k \rangle,$$

which implies that $\langle F(z^k), y^k - x^k \rangle \geq 0$. Hence, by using (15) and (16), we conclude that $\langle F(x^k), y^k - x^k \rangle \geq 0$. Therefore, using (14) together with Corollary 6 we conclude that $x^k \in \mathcal{C}^*$.

Conversely, we assume that $x^k \in \mathcal{C}^*$. Since x^k and y^k belong to \mathcal{C} , it follows from (16) that $z^k \in \mathcal{C}$ by convexity of \mathcal{C} , for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, due to $x^k \in \mathcal{C}^*$, we have $\langle F(x^k), z^k - x^k \rangle \geq 0$. Since F is a pseudo-monotone operator, $\langle F(x^k), z^k - x^k \rangle \geq 0$ implies $\langle F(z^k), z^k - x^k \rangle \geq 0$, which means that $x^k \in H_k$. \square

Proposition 12. *The following inequality holds:*

$$\langle F(x^k), x^k - y^k \rangle \geq \frac{\max\{\rho, \sqrt{3} - 1\}}{\bar{\beta}} \|y^k - x^k\|^2, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (22)$$

Proof. Keeping in mind that $y^k \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}^*}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \beta_k F(x^k))$ and $x^k \in \mathcal{C}$, from Definition 2 we have

$$\langle x^k - \beta_k F(x^k) - y^k, x^k - y^k \rangle \leq \gamma_k \|y^k - x^k\|^2,$$

which, after some algebraic manipulation, is rewritten as follows

$$\langle F(x^k), x^k - y^k \rangle \geq \frac{1 - \gamma_k}{\beta_k} \|y^k - x^k\|^2. \quad (23)$$

Considering that $0 < \beta_k \leq \bar{\beta}$ and $0 \leq \gamma_k < \bar{\gamma} < \min\{1 - \rho, 2 - \sqrt{3}\}$, we conclude that

$$\frac{1 - \gamma_k}{\beta_k} \geq \frac{\max\{\rho, \sqrt{3} - 1\}}{\bar{\beta}}.$$

The combination of (23) with the previous inequality yields the desired inequality. \square

Next, we are going to establish two important inequalities to show the convergence of Algorithm 2.

Lemma 13. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty and closed convex set and $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ the sequence generated by Algorithm 2. Assume that $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a pseudo monotone operator on \mathcal{C} with respect to the solution set \mathcal{C}^* of problem (1) and $x^k \notin \mathcal{C}^*$, for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Then, for any $x^* \in \mathcal{C}^*$, there holds:*

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{(1 - \bar{\gamma})^2} (\bar{\gamma}^2 - 4\bar{\gamma} + 1) \lambda_k^2 \|F(z^k)\|^2, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (24)$$

As a consequence, $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Fejér convergent to \mathcal{C}^* , i.e., for any $x^* \in \mathcal{C}^*$ there holds

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\| \leq \|x^k - x^*\|, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (25)$$

Proof. Take $x^* \in \mathcal{C}^*$. Denotes the boundary of H_k by L_k , which is given by

$$L_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle F(z^k), x - z^k \rangle = 0\}. \quad (26)$$

Since x^k and y^k belong to the convex set \mathcal{C} , we obtain from (16) that $z^k \in \mathcal{C}$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, due to F be pseudo monotone on \mathcal{C} with respect to the solution set \mathcal{C}^* of problem (1), we have

$$\langle F(z^k), x^k - x^* \rangle \geq 0.$$

The last inequality and the definition of H_k in (18) imply that $x^* \in H_k$. Thus, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{P}_{H_k}(x^*) = x^*. \quad (27)$$

We know as well that applying Proposition 4 with $v = x^k - \lambda_k F(z^k)$, $u = x^k$, $\gamma = \gamma_k$, $w = x^{k+1}$ and $\bar{w} = \bar{v} = x^*$ we obtain that

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - \lambda_k F(z^k) - x^*\|^2 - \|(x^k - \lambda_k F(z^k) - x^*) - (x^{k+1} - x^*)\|^2 + 2\gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2,$$

which implies that

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - \lambda_k F(z^k) - x^*\|^2 + 2\gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2. \quad (28)$$

Using (27) and the item (ii) of Lemma 1 we have

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{H_k}(x^k) - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|\mathcal{P}_{H_k}(x^k) - x^k\|^2.$$

Since $x^k \notin \mathcal{C}^*$, Proposition 11 implies that $x^k \notin H_k$. Hence, the last inequality together with the first equality in (19) yield

$$\|x^k - \lambda_k F(z^k) - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \lambda_k^2 \|F(z^k)\|^2.$$

As a result of combining the last inequality with (28), we arrive at the conclusion that

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \lambda_k^2 \|F(z^k)\|^2 + 2\gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2. \quad (29)$$

Since $x^{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \lambda_k F(z^k))$, applying item (ii) of Lemma 5 with $\gamma = \gamma_k$, $x = x^k$, $z = z^k$, $\alpha = \lambda_k$ and $w(\alpha) = x^{k+1}$ we obtain that

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \leq \frac{\lambda_k}{1 - \gamma_k} \|F(z^k)\|,$$

which combined with (29) yields

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \lambda_k^2 \|F(z^k)\|^2 + 2\gamma_k \frac{\lambda_k^2}{(1 - \gamma_k)^2} \|F(z^k)\|^2,$$

or equivalently,

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \frac{1}{(1 - \gamma_k)^2} (\gamma_k^2 - 4\gamma_k + 1) \lambda_k^2 \|F(z^k)\|^2. \quad (30)$$

Since $0 < \bar{\gamma} < 2 - \sqrt{3}$, the function $(0, \bar{\gamma}] \mapsto (\gamma_k^2 - 4\gamma_k + 1) / (1 - \gamma_k)^2$ is increasing and positive, the inequality (24) follows (30). As a consequence, (25) follows from (24) and the proof is complete. \square

The following theorem shows the most important finding about Algorithm 2. It establishes the convergence of the sequence towards a solution of VIP(F,C).

Theorem 14. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty and closed convex set and $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Assume that $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a pseudo monotone operator on \mathcal{C} with respect to the solution set \mathcal{C}^* of problem (1). If $\mathcal{C}^* \neq \emptyset$, then Algorithm 1 either ends at iteration k , in which case $x^k \in \mathcal{C}^*$, or generates an infinite sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ that converges to a point belonging to \mathcal{C}^* .*

Proof. First, we assume that Algorithm 1 ends at iteration k . In this case, we have $y^k = x^k$ and Remark 2 implies that $x^k \in \mathcal{C}^*$. Now, we assume that the sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is infinite. Hence, we have $x^k \notin \mathcal{C}^*$, for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$

Since $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies (25) in Lemma 13, it also satisfies Definition 1. Thus, due to $\mathcal{C}^* \neq \emptyset$, it follows from item (ii) of Lemma 3 that $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. Using (24) of Lemma 13 we have

$$0 < \frac{1}{(1 - \bar{\gamma})^2} (\bar{\gamma}^2 - 4\bar{\gamma} + 1) \lambda_k^2 \|F(z^k)\|^2 \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (31)$$

On the other hand, (25) implies that the sequence $(\|x^k - x^*\|)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is monotone non-increasing and bounded from below. Thus, $(\|x^k - x^*\|)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges. Hence, taking the limit in (31) as k tends to infinity, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_k \|F(z^k)\| = 0$. And, in view of (17) we conclude that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_k \|F(z^k)\| = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\|F(z^k)\|} \langle F(z^k), z^k - x^k \rangle = 0. \quad (32)$$

Since $y^k \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \beta_k F(x^k))$, applying item (i) of Corollary 7 with $\gamma = \gamma_k$, $x = x^k$, $\alpha = \beta_k$ and $y = y^k$ we obtain that

$$\|y^k - x^k\| \leq \frac{\beta_k}{1 - \beta_k} \|F(x^k)\|.$$

Because $0 < \hat{\beta} < \beta_k < \bar{\beta}$, $0 \leq \gamma_k < \bar{\gamma}$ and $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, the latter inequality implies that $(y^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. Hence, it follows from (16) that $(z^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is also bounded. In addition, due to F be continuous, we conclude that $(F(z^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. Thus, from (32) we have

$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \langle F(z^k), z^k - x^k \rangle = 0$. Therefore, it follows from the last equality and (16) that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \sigma \alpha^{i_k} \langle F(z^k), y^k - x^k \rangle = 0. \quad (33)$$

Since the sequences $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{C}$, $(y^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{C}$ and $(z^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{C}$ are bounded, we can take subsequences $(x^{k_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(y^{k_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(z^{k_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of them, respectively, and $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{C}$, $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} x^{k_j} = \bar{x}$, $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} y^{k_j} = \bar{y}$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} z^{k_j} = \bar{z}$. Furthermore, due to $0 < \alpha < 1$, $0 \leq \gamma_k < \bar{\gamma}$ and $0 < \hat{\beta} < \beta_k < \bar{\beta}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we can also assume without loss of generality that $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha^{i_{k_j}} = \bar{\alpha} \in [0, 1]$, $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma_{k_j} = \hat{\gamma} \leq \bar{\gamma}$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \beta_{k_j} = \tilde{\beta} \geq \hat{\beta}$. We have two possibilities for $\bar{\alpha}$: $\bar{\alpha} > 0$ or $\bar{\alpha} = 0$.

First we assume that $\bar{\alpha} > 0$. In this case, it follows from (33) that

$$0 = \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \sigma \alpha^{i_{k_j}} \langle F(z^{k_j}), y^{k_j} - x^{k_j} \rangle = \sigma \bar{\alpha} \langle F(\bar{z}), \bar{y} - \bar{x} \rangle.$$

Because we are assuming that $\bar{\alpha} > 0$, we conclude that $\langle F(\bar{z}), \bar{y} - \bar{x} \rangle = 0$. Using, (15) and (16) together with Proposition 12 we conclude that

$$\langle F(z^{k_j}), y^{k_j} - x^{k_j} \rangle \leq \rho \langle F(x^{k_j}), y^{k_j} - x^{k_j} \rangle \leq -\rho \frac{\max\{\rho, \sqrt{3} - 1\}}{\bar{\beta}} \|y^{k_j} - x^{k_j}\|^2.$$

Taking the limit in the previous inequality as j tending to infinity and taking into account $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} x^{k_j} = \bar{x}$, $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} y^{k_j} = \bar{y}$ and $\langle F(\bar{z}), \bar{y} - \bar{x} \rangle = 0$, we conclude that $\bar{y} = \bar{x}$. Considering that $y^k \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\gamma_k}(x^k, x^k - \beta_k F(x^k))$, it follows from Definition 2 that

$$\langle x^{k_j} - \beta_{k_j} F(x^{k_j}) - y^{k_j}, y - y^{k_j} \rangle \leq \gamma_{k_j} \|y^{k_j} - x^{k_j}\|^2, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Thus, taking the limit in the previous inequality as j tending to infinity, using that $\bar{y} = \bar{x}$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \beta_{k_j} = \tilde{\beta} > 0$, we obtain that

$$\langle F(\bar{x}), y - \bar{x} \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{C},$$

which implies that $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{C}^*$. Since \bar{x} is a cluster point of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the sequence $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Fejér convergent to \mathcal{C}^* , item (ii) of Lemma 3 implies that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} x_k = \bar{x}$.

Now, let us assume that $\bar{\alpha} = 0$. We proceed to prove that in this case, $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ likewise converges to some point belonging to the set \mathcal{C}^* . For that, we consider the auxiliary sequence $(\hat{z}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by

$$\hat{z}^k := x^k + \sigma \frac{\alpha^{i_k}}{\alpha} (y^k - x^k), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (34)$$

where i_k is defined in (15). Since $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} x^{k_j} = \bar{x}$, $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} y^{k_j} = \bar{y}$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha_{k_j} = \bar{\alpha} = 0$, it follows from (34) that $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \hat{z}^{k_j} = \bar{x}$. The definition of i_{k_j} in (15) implies that

$$\langle F(\hat{z}^{k_j}), y^{k_j} - x^{k_j} \rangle > \rho \langle F(x^{k_j}), y^{k_j} - x^{k_j} \rangle. \quad (35)$$

Thus, (35) implies that $\langle F(\bar{x}), \bar{y} - \bar{x} \rangle \geq \rho \langle F(\bar{x}), \bar{y} - \bar{x} \rangle$, and since $\rho < 1$ we conclude that

$$\langle F(\bar{x}), \bar{y} - \bar{x} \rangle \geq 0. \quad (36)$$

Given that $y^k \in \mathcal{P}_C^{\gamma k}(x^k, x^k - \alpha_k F(x^k))$, it follows from Definition 2 that

$$\langle x^{k_j} - \beta_{k_j} F(x^{k_j}) - y^{k_j}, y - y^{k_j} \rangle \leq \gamma_{k_j} \|y^{k_j} - x^{k_j}\|^2, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Taking the limit in the previous inequality as j going to infinity, and using that $\hat{\gamma} \leq \bar{\gamma}$, we have

$$\langle \bar{x} - \bar{y}, y - \bar{y} \rangle - \tilde{\beta} \langle F(\bar{x}), y - \bar{y} \rangle \leq \bar{\gamma} \|\bar{y} - \bar{x}\|^2, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (37)$$

Substituting $y \in \mathcal{C}$ for $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{C}$ in the last inequality, after some algebraic manipulations yields

$$\tilde{\beta} \langle F(\bar{x}), \bar{y} - \bar{x} \rangle \leq (\bar{\gamma} - 1) \|\bar{y} - \bar{x}\|^2. \quad (38)$$

Combining (36) with the latter inequality we obtain that $(1 - \bar{\gamma}) \|\bar{y} - \bar{x}\|^2 \leq 0$. Hence, because (13) implies that $1 - \bar{\gamma} > 0$, we conclude that $\bar{y} = \bar{x}$. Therefore, due to $\tilde{\beta} > 0$ and $\bar{y} = \bar{x}$, it follows from (37) that

$$\langle F(\bar{x}), y - \bar{x} \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{C},$$

which also implies that $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{C}^*$. Again, because \bar{x} is a cluster point of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the sequence $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Fejér convergent to \mathcal{C}^* , item (ii) of Lemma 3 implies that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} x_k = \bar{x}$ and the proof is concluded. \square

6 Numerical Results

To demonstrate the behavior of the proposed algorithms, we present the results of numerical experiments. We implemented Algorithms 1 and 2 and applied them to test problems adapted from [10]. For that, we slightly modified the feasible set \mathcal{C} to be the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d with the p -norm, defined as

$$B_p^d := \left\{ x := (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\|_p := \left(\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^p \right)^{1/p} \leq 1 \right\}. \quad (39)$$

Projections onto this set are more challenging than those on the original problems' feasible sets. The algorithms were implemented in the Julia language. The code can be obtained from <https://github.com/ugonj/extragradient>.

Given the necessity to compute an inexact projection, we now introduce an algorithm designed precisely for this purpose—the well-established classical Frank-Wolfe algorithm (FW algorithm) detailed, for instance, in [3]. Notably, the FW algorithm we present exhibits versatility, enabling the computation of both inexact and exact projections. To achieve the latter, one simply needs to set a tolerance for the exact projection, ensuring it is significantly smaller than the tolerance employed for the inexact projection. For a more thorough guide on computing inexact projections, please consult [21]. To present the FW algorithm, we assume the existence of a linear optimization oracle (referred to as LO oracle) capable of minimizing linear functions over the constraint set \mathcal{C} . The FW algorithm is formally defined to compute a feasible inexact projection $w \in \mathcal{C}$ of a point $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ onto a compact convex set \mathcal{C} with respect to a reference point $u \in \mathcal{C}$ and a forcing parameter $\gamma \geq 0$ as follows:

Algorithm 3 FW algorithm $w \in \mathcal{P}_C^\gamma(u, v)$

- 1: Take $\gamma > 0$, $v, u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $w_0 \in \mathcal{C}$. Set $\ell = 0$.
- 2: Use a LO oracle to compute an optimal solution z_ℓ and the optimal value s_ℓ^* as

$$z_\ell := \arg \min_{y \in \mathcal{C}} \langle w_\ell - v, y - w_\ell \rangle, \quad s_\ell^* := \langle w_\ell - v, z_\ell - w_\ell \rangle. \quad (40)$$

- 3: If $-s_\ell^* \leq \gamma \|w_\ell - u\|^2$, then **stop**, and set $w := w_\ell$. Otherwise, set

$$w_{\ell+1} := w_\ell + \alpha_\ell (z_\ell - w_\ell), \quad \alpha_\ell := \min \left\{ 1, \frac{-s_\ell^*}{\|z_\ell - w_\ell\|^2} \right\}. \quad (41)$$

- 4: Set $\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1$, and go to Step 2.
-

Now, let us show that the FW algorithm described above is capable of computing the feasible inexact projection $w \in \mathcal{C}$ of a point $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ onto a compact convex set \mathcal{C} concerning a reference point $u \in \mathcal{C}$ and a forcing parameter $\gamma \geq 0$. To achieve this, consider $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\psi_v : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\psi_v(y) := \|y - v\|^2/2$, with $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ being a convex compact set. In this case, (40) is equivalent to $s_\ell^* := \min_{y \in \mathcal{C}} \langle \psi'_v(w_\ell), y - w_\ell \rangle$. Since ψ_v is convex, we have $\psi_v(y) \geq \psi_v(w_\ell) + \langle \psi'_v(w_\ell), y - w_\ell \rangle \geq \psi_v(w_\ell) + s_\ell^*$ for all $y \in \mathcal{C}$. Set $w_* := \arg \min_{y \in \mathcal{C}} \psi_v(y)$ and $\psi^* := \psi_v(w_*)$. Letting $y = w_*$ in the last inequality, we have $\psi_v(w_\ell) \geq \psi^* \geq \psi_v(w_\ell) + s_\ell^*$, implying that $s_\ell^* \leq 0$. Thus, $-s_\ell^* = \langle v - w_\ell, z_\ell - w_\ell \rangle \geq 0 \geq \langle v - w_*, y - w_* \rangle$, for all $y \in \mathcal{C}$. Therefore, we can set the stopping criterion to $-s_\ell^* \leq \gamma \|w_\ell - u\|^2$, ensuring that the FW algorithm will terminate after finitely many iterations. When the FW algorithm computes $w_\ell \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfying $-s_\ell^* \leq \gamma \|w_\ell - u\|^2$, the method terminates. Otherwise, it computes the stepsize $\alpha_\ell = \arg \min_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} \psi_v(w_\ell + \alpha(y_\ell - w_\ell))$ using exact line search. Since $z_\ell, w_\ell \in \mathcal{C}$ and \mathcal{C} is convex, we conclude from (41) that $w_{\ell+1} \in \mathcal{C}$; thus, the FW algorithm generates a sequence in \mathcal{C} . Finally, (40) implies that $\langle v - w_\ell, y - w_\ell \rangle \leq -s_\ell^*$ for all $y \in \mathcal{C}$. Hence, considering the stopping criterion $-s_\ell^* \leq \gamma \|w_\ell - u\|^2$, we conclude that any output of the FW algorithm $w \in \mathcal{C}$ is a feasible inexact projection onto \mathcal{C} of the point $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with respect to $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a relative error tolerance function $\gamma \|w_\ell - u\|^2$, i.e.,

$$\langle u - w, y - w \rangle \leq \gamma \|w_\ell - u\|^2 \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{C}.$$

In the subsequent sections, we present numerical experiments related to Algorithms 1 and 2. Consequently, it is imperative to provide nuanced considerations relevant to our numerical results. Firstly, it is crucial to acknowledge the prominent standing of the Extragradient Method in the Variational Inequality literature, characterized by numerous well-established and widely recognized variants known for their efficacy in solving such problems, as evidenced in [30, 32, 31, 37]. Our proposed method introduces an additional paradigm within this domain, explicitly tailored for a well-defined class of problems—specifically, instances where computing an inexact projection proves more efficient than obtaining an exact projection. Our study does not aim to claim universal superiority for our method but rather to offer a specialized solution for the addressed problem class. It intends to demonstrate that, within the

realm of projection methods for variational inequality problems utilizing exact projection, there may be advantages in employing inexact projections. Consequently, our research represents a preliminary step toward the development of inexact projection methods for variational inequality problems based on more sophisticated projection techniques, such as those discussed in [12, 4, 30, 33, 32, 31, 37, 39]. In light of these considerations, it is essential to emphasize that our presentation of numerical experiments serves as an illustrative analysis rather than an exhaustive comparison with all potential variants of the Extragradient Method. Therefore, our focus is solely on the classic Extragradient Method, serving as a benchmark reference.

6.1 Lipschitz operator

In this section, we demonstrate the convergence of Algorithm 1 for a Lipschitz continuous operator. To do this, we consider the constrained set $\mathcal{C} = B_{10}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, the unit ball in the 10-norm as in (39), and the operator

$$\hat{T}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 3/2 \\ 1/2 \end{bmatrix}$$

We applied Algorithm 1 on $\text{VIP}(\hat{T}, \mathcal{C})$. The iterates are depicted in Figure 1.

Results for exact and inexact projections for $\alpha=0.31$




Figure 1: Convergence of Algorithm 1 with exact and inexact projections. On this problem the number of steps is the same in both cases.

Table 1 shows how the Algorithm 1 performed for various values of α and $\bar{\gamma}$. The third columns represent the number of steps taken by the extragradient algorithm to reach the solution, and the last column represents the total number of linear searches applied by the Frank-Wolfe method. It is interesting to compare the case when $\bar{\gamma}$ is small (say, $\bar{\gamma} = 0.01$) to the cases when $\bar{\gamma}$ is larger: it can be seen that although the algorithm takes the same number of steps to reach the solution, when $\bar{\gamma} \approx 0$ (in the case when the projection is almost exact), significantly more Frank-Wolfe iterations were performed. In other words, since performing approximate projections does not increase the total number of steps in

the extragradient method, it is beneficial to use them, as each step of this method requires less work.

α	$\bar{\gamma}$	N. steps	N. linear searches
0.01	0.01	109	1.0317e7
0.01	0.106	109	6.62431e6
0.01	0.49	109	6.57129e6
0.11	0.01	16	12997
0.11	0.106	16	1085
0.11	0.394	16	966
0.21	0.01	11	2444
0.21	0.106	11	237
0.21	0.394	11	239
0.31	0.01	9	935
0.31	0.106	9	129
0.31	0.298	9	126
0.41	0.01	9	476
0.41	0.106	9	113

Table 1: Behaviour of the algorithm for various values of α and $\bar{\gamma}$.

6.2 Non-Lipschitz operator

In this section we consider the constrained set $\mathcal{C} = B_{10}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, the unit ball in the 10-norm as in (39), and the operator $\tilde{T}(x_1, x_2) = -\frac{t(x_1, x_2)}{1+t(x_1, x_2)}(1, 1)$, where $t(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 + \sqrt{x_1^2 + 4x_2})/2$. The operator \tilde{T} is quasimonotone, and it is pseudomonotone with respect to the solution set, as it has a unique solution $(1, 1)/\|(1, 1)\|_{10}$, see [10]. However it is not Lipschitz. We applied Algorithm 2 on $\text{VIP}(\tilde{T}, \mathcal{C})$, with initial point at $(0, 1)$. The iterates are depicted in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Convergence of Algorithm 2.

6.3 Higher dimensions

In this section, we apply Algorithm 1 to a problem in d -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d , which is a modified version of [10, Example 5.3]. Consider the unit norm ball in p -norm B_p^d , as defined in (39), and let $T_h(x) := (T_{h,1}(x), \dots, T_{h,d}(x))$ be an operators, where

$$T_{h,i}(x) := \frac{hx_i \sum_{j=1}^d x_j - \frac{1}{2}h \sum_{j=1}^d x_j^2 - 1}{(\sum_{i=1}^d x_i)^2},$$

and h is a value such that $0.1 \leq h \leq 1.6$. The operator T_h vanishes at the point $x = \alpha e$, where $\alpha = (2/(dh))^{0.5}$ and $e := (1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. When this point is in the set B_p^d , then it is a solution to the problem $VIP(T, B_p^d)$. Otherwise, when $h \geq 2d^{(\frac{2}{p}-1)}$, a solution is the Euclidean projection of $x = \alpha e$ onto B_p^d , i.e., $x^* = \mathcal{P}_{B_p^d}(\alpha e)$.

In all experiments we use the starting point $x^1 = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$.

6.3.1 In \mathbb{R}^5

We first consider the convergence when $d = 5$. In these experiments we set $h = 0.6$. The convergence of the sequence of iterates is shown on Figure 3. It can be seen that the sequence converges rapidly towards the solution of the problem, which is $e/\|e\|_p \in \mathbb{R}^5$.




Figure 3: Convergence of the iterates of the proposed method.

6.3.2 Higher Dimensions

We also observe the number of iterations required by our algorithm to reach an approximate solution. We vary d of the d -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d and p of the p -norm. We set $h = 0.2$ so that in most problems that we solve the solution to the VIP problem is not a zero of the operator

T_h . The number of iterations, for various values of d and p is provided in Table 2.

d	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
p										
10	704	926	1083	1644	2045	2502	2783	3371	3578	3643
15	283	419	481	804	976	1227	1484	1564	1249	256

d	15	16	17	18	19	20	25	50	100
p									
10	3193	2291	863	308	316	325	364	519	736
15	281	290	299	308	317	325	365	518	735

Table 2: Number of iterations required to obtain an approximate solution (such that $\|x_k - x^*\| \leq 10^{-2}$).

7 Conclusions

We investigate the Extragradient method for solving variational inequality problems using inexact projections onto the feasible set in this paper. We expect that our study can contribute to further research on the subject, particularly in solving large-scale problems where the computing effort of each iteration is connected with projections into the feasible set. Indeed, the idea of employing inexactness in the projection rather than exactness is very attractive from a computational perspective. It is worth noting that the Frank-Wolfe approach has a low computing cost for each iteration, resulting in great computational performance in various types of compact sets, as cited in [22, 26]. Searching for new efficient methods, such as the Frank-Wolfe method which generates inexact projections, is a subject that calls for attention.

8 Acknowledgements

The first and last authors were supported by the Australian Research Council (ARC), Solving hard Chebyshev approximation problems through nonsmooth analysis (Discovery Project DP180100602). The second author was supported in part by CNPq grant 304666/2021-1.

9 Data availability and conflict of interest statement

We do not analyse or generate any datasets, because our work proceeds within a theoretical and mathematical approach. All code used to produce

the results of the numerical experiments is available at <https://github.com/ugonj/extragradient>. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] A. A. Aguiar, O. P. Ferreira, and L. F. Prudente. Subgradient method with feasible inexact projections for constrained convex optimization problems. *Optimization*, 71(12):3515–3537, 2022.
- [2] Heinz H. Bauschke and Patrick L. Combettes. *Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces*. CMS Books in Mathematics/Ouvrages de Mathématiques de la SMC. Springer, New York, 2011. With a foreword by Hedy Attouch.
- [3] Amir Beck and Marc Teboulle. A conditional gradient method with linear rate of convergence for solving convex linear systems. *Math. Methods Oper. Res.*, 59(2):235–247, 2004.
- [4] J. Y. Bello Cruz and A. N. Iusem. A strongly convergent direct method for monotone variational inequalities in Hilbert spaces. *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.*, 30(1-2):23–36, 2009.
- [5] J.Y. Bello-Cruz, R. Díaz Millán, and Hung M. Phan. Conditional extragradient algorithms for solving variational inequalities. *Pacific journal of optimization*, 15(3):331–357, 2019.
- [6] Dimitri P. Bertsekas. *Nonlinear programming*. Athena Scientific Optimization and Computation Series. Athena Scientific, Belmont, MA, second edition, 1999.
- [7] Ernesto G. Birgin, José Mario Martínez, and Marcos Raydan. Inexact spectral projected gradient methods on convex sets. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 23(4):539–559, 2003.
- [8] S. Bonettini, I. Loris, F. Porta, and M. Prato. Variable metric inexact line-search-based methods for nonsmooth optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 26(2):891–921, 2016.
- [9] Regina Burachik and Joydeep Dutta. Inexact proximal point methods for variational inequality problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(5):2653–2678, 2010.
- [10] Regina Burachik and R. Díaz Millán. A projection algorithm for non-monotone variational inequalities. *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, 28:149–166, 2020.
- [11] Regina Sandra Burachik and Susana Scheimberg. A proximal point method for the variational inequality problem in banach spaces. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 39(5):1633–1649, 2000.
- [12] Y. Censor, A. Gibali, and S. Reich. The subgradient extragradient method for solving variational inequalities in Hilbert space. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 148(2):318–335, 2011.
- [13] Yair Censor, Aviv Gibali, and Simeon Reich. Extensions of korpelevich’s extragradient method for the variational inequality problem in euclidean space. *Optimization*, 61(9):1119–1132, 2012.

- [14] Patrick L. Combettes. Quasi-Fejérian analysis of some optimization algorithms. In *Inherently parallel algorithms in feasibility and optimization and their applications (Haifa, 2000)*, volume 8 of *Stud. Comput. Math.*, pages 115–152. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2001.
- [15] J. Y. Bello Cruz and R. Díaz Millán. A relaxed-projection splitting algorithm for variational inequalities in hilbert spaces. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 65(3):597–614, 2016.
- [16] Fabiana R. de Oliveira, Orizon P. Ferreira, and Gilson N. Silva. Newton’s method with feasible inexact projections for solving constrained generalized equations. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 72(1):159–177, 2019.
- [17] R. Díaz Millán, O. P. Ferreira, and L. F. Prudente. Alternating conditional gradient method for convex feasibility problems. *Comput Optim Appl*, 80:245–269, 2021.
- [18] R. Díaz Millán, O. P. Ferreira, and J. Ugon. Approximate douglas–rachford algorithm for two-sets convex feasibility problems. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 86:621–636, 2023.
- [19] Francisco Facchinei and Jong-Shi Pang. *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems. Vol. I*. Springer Series in Operations Research. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [20] Francisco Facchinei and Jong-Shi Pang. *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems. Vol. II*. Springer Series in Operations Research. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [21] O. P. Ferreira, M. Lemes, and L. F. Prudente. On the inexact scaled gradient projection method. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 81(1):91–125, 2022.
- [22] Dan Garber and Elad Hazan. Faster rates for the frank-wolfe method over strongly-convex sets. *Proceedings of the 32Nd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 37*, pages 541–549, 2015.
- [23] M. Golbabaee and M. E. Davies. Inexact gradient projection and fast data driven compressed sensing. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 64(10):6707–6721, 2018.
- [24] Douglas S. Gonçalves, Max L. N. Gonçalves, and Tiago C. Menezes. Inexact variable metric method for convex-constrained optimization problems. *Optimization*, 0(0):1–19, 2021.
- [25] A. N. Iusem and B. F. Svaiter. A variant of Korpelevich’s method for variational inequalities with a new search strategy. *Optimization*, 42(4):309–321, 1997.
- [26] Martin Jaggi. Revisiting frank-wolfe: Projection-free sparse convex optimization. *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 28, ICML’13:I-427–I-435*, 2013.
- [27] I. V. Konnov. A Class of Combined Iterative Methods for Solving Variational Inequalities. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 94(3):677–693, September 1997.

- [28] G. M. Korpelevič. An extragradient method for finding saddle points and for other problems. *Ėkonom. i Mat. Metody*, 12(4):747–756, 1976.
- [29] Yu. Malitsky. Projected reflected gradient methods for monotone variational inequalities. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(1):502–520, 2015.
- [30] Yu. Malitsky. Proximal extrapolated gradient methods for variational inequalities. *Optim. Methods Softw.*, 33(1):140–164, 2018.
- [31] Yu. V. Malitsky and V. V. Semenov. An extragradient algorithm for monotone variational inequalities. *Cybernet. Systems Anal.*, 50(2):271–277, 2014. Translation of *Kibernet. Sistem. Anal.* **2014**, no. 2, 125–131.
- [32] Yu. V. Malitsky and V. V. Semenov. A hybrid method without extrapolation step for solving variational inequality problems. *J. Global Optim.*, 61(1):193–202, 2015.
- [33] Yura Malitsky. Golden ratio algorithms for variational inequalities. *Math. Program.*, 184(1-2):383–410, 2020.
- [34] Julian Rasch and Antonin Chambolle. Inexact first-order primal-dual algorithms. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 76(2):381–430, 2020.
- [35] Saverio Salzo and Silvia Villa. Inexact and accelerated proximal point algorithms. *J. Convex Anal.*, 19(4):1167–1192, 2012.
- [36] M. V. Solodov and B. F. Svaiter. A new projection method for variational inequality problems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 37(3):765–776, 1999.
- [37] Michael V. Solodov and Paul Tseng. Modified projection-type methods for monotone variational inequalities. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 34(5):1814–1830, 1996.
- [38] Duong Viet Thong and Dang Van Hieu. Modified subgradient extragradient algorithms for variational inequality problems and fixed point problems. *Optimization*, 67(1):83–102, 2018.
- [39] Paul Tseng. A modified forward-backward splitting method for maximal monotone mappings. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 38(2):431–446, 2000.
- [40] Silvia Villa, Saverio Salzo, Luca Baldassarre, and Alessandro Verri. Accelerated and inexact forward-backward algorithms. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 23(3):1607–1633, 2013.
- [41] Y. J. Wang, N. H. Xiu, and J. Z. Zhang. Modified extragradient method for variational inequalities and verification of solution existence. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 119(1):167–183, 2003.
- [42] Minglu Ye and Yiran He. A double projection method for solving variational inequalities without monotonicity. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 60(1):141–150, January 2015.