



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
DI PADOVA

Università degli Studi di Padova

Padua Research Archive - Institutional Repository

A class of derivative-free nonmonotone optimization
algorithms employing coordinate rotations and gradient

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available at: 11577/3147000 since: 2017-03-16T17:12:27Z

Publisher:

Published version:

DOI: 10.1007/s10589-014-9665-9

Terms of use:

Open Access

This article is made available under terms and conditions applicable to Open Access Guidelines, as described at <http://www.unipd.it/download/file/fid/55401> (Italian only)

(Article begins on next page)

A class of derivative-free nonmonotone optimization algorithms employing coordinate rotations and gradient approximations

L. Grippo*, F. Rinaldi†

February 20, 2013

Abstract

In this paper we study a class of derivative-free unconstrained minimization algorithms employing nonmonotone inexact linesearch techniques along a set of suitable search directions. In particular, we define globally convergent nonmonotone versions of some well-known derivative-free methods and we propose a new algorithm combining coordinate rotations with approximate simplex gradients. Through extensive numerical experimentation, we show that the proposed algorithm is highly competitive in comparison with some of the most efficient direct search methods and model based methods on a large set of test problems.

Keywords. Derivative-free Methods, Nonmonotone Techniques, Unconstrained Optimization.

*Dipartimento di Ingegneria Informatica Automatica e Gestionale, "Sapienza" Università di Roma – mail: grippo@dis.uniroma1.it

†Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Padova – mail: rinaldi@math.unipd.it

1 Introduction

We consider unconstrained minimization problems of the form $\min_{x \in R^n} f(x)$, where (in the theoretical analysis) the function $f : R^n \rightarrow R$ is assumed to be continuously differentiable on R^n . However, we suppose that the derivatives of f are not available and that cannot be easily approximated by finite difference methods. As remarked in [3], this situation frequently arises when f must be evaluated through black-box simulation packages, typically proprietary, and each function evaluation may be costly and noisy. Thus the development of derivative-free optimization techniques is currently an area of increasing interest, both from a theoretical and a practical point of view.

A recent comprehensive study on methods for derivative-free optimization is the book cited above [3], where several approaches, such as pattern search methods, model-based methods, linesearch methods employing approximate gradients are described and analyzed. It would seem that there is still the need of improving the current approaches and of developing new ideas, especially when the problem dimensions are relatively large or the function f is noisy.

The objective of the present paper is actually that of contributing to this active field, by proposing new efficient derivative-free algorithms based on nonmonotone inexact linesearches along a set of search directions satisfying appropriate conditions. The derivative-free inexact linesearches used here are based on the techniques introduced in [6] and employed in [13], [21] for defining globally convergent unconstrained algorithms.

We note that the definition of appropriate ‘inexact’ algorithms can be important, in the general case, even from a theoretical point of view. In fact, for a wide class of derivative-free algorithms, ‘exact’ linesearches (at least in the sense that a stationary point along the search direction is approximated with good accuracy) may not guarantee global convergence, unless rather restrictive assumptions are imposed on f .

We consider also modifications of these algorithms based on nonmonotone acceptance rules, which relax the descent requirements, while preserving the convergence properties of the monotone methods. The modified algorithms used here can be viewed as derivative-free extensions of nonmonotone linesearch algorithms employing first order derivatives (see, e.g. [14], [15], [16]) and have been also considered in connection with Jacobian-free techniques for solving nonlinear equations [17]. Somewhat different derivative-free inexact and nonmonotone linesearch algorithms have been proposed in [9], [27], in the context of methods for the solution of nonlinear equations and in [7], [10], [11] with reference to optimization problems.

The introduction of nonmonotone acceptance rules can improve considerably both robustness and efficiency, especially in the case of noisy problems and in the case of objective function (possibly also non differentiable), whose contours exhibit steep sided valleys.

On the basis of the results mentioned above, in this paper we construct a class of algorithms that combines different strategies for choosing the search directions and for performing the line searches. The general algorithm scheme, illustrated in the next section, allows us to unify the description and the convergence analysis of various new linesearch-based algorithms. In particular, first we construct new nonmonotone globally convergent versions of known methods, such as the coordinate method, the Hooke-Jeeves method [18] and the Rosenbrock method [28]. Then, in the same framework, we define a new algorithm in which Rosenbrock rotation of the coordinate axes is combined with an approximate gradient constructed using previous information on function values. In particular, we use a form of (generalized) ‘simplex gradient’ [2], [4], [5], [19]. Approximations of the gradient of this form have been used in various works, in order to improve the performance of derivative-free methods and error bounds have been established. In our algorithm the acceleration step along the negative simplex gradient has also the effect of defining the subsequent rotation of the coordinate axes.

The algorithms introduced here are compared on a large set of difficult test problems [12],[22] with some of the best derivative-free methods currently available. The numerical results, evaluated through the performance and data profiles introduced in [23], show that the proposed technique is competitive with the other approaches.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe the general scheme of the class of algorithms considered in the sequel. In Section 3, we recall the basic features and the convergence properties of the linesearch algorithms, on the basis of the previous papers mentioned above. In Section 4, we specialize and extend some of the convergence results given for derivative-free methods [3], [13], [21]. In Section 5, we describe a new globally convergent implementation of the Hooke-Jeeves method, employing nonmonotone inexact linesearches. In Section 6, we describe a linesearch-based nonmonotone version of Rosenbrock’s method and we prove global convergence. In Section 7, we describe and analyze the new nonmonotone linesearch-based algorithm that makes use of simplex gradients and of Rosenbrock rotations for defining the search directions. In Section 8, we report and discuss the results of our computational experimentation. Finally, Section 9 contains some concluding remarks and indications on future work.

2 A conceptual scheme of the algorithms

In this section, we give an informal outline of the class of methods proposed in the present paper; more precise descriptions of the specific methods will be reported in the sequel. All the algorithms we will consider generate an infinite sequence of iterations of the form

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k, \quad (1)$$

where $d_k \in R^n$ is a search direction, $\alpha_k \in R$ is a stepsize along d_k and $x_0 \in R^n$ is a given point. We denote by

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \{x \in R^n : f(x) \leq f(x_0)\},$$

the level set of f corresponding to the initial value $f(x_0)$.

The algorithmic scheme we consider in the paper can be described as an infinite sequence of major steps, indexed by $\ell = 0, 1, \dots$. Each major step ℓ consists of a finite number of iterations of the form (1), organized into three different phases, as indicated below.

- (a) *Basic search.* Starting from the current point x_k , indicated by y^0 , we consider a finite set of r search directions

$$D = \{d^i \in R^n, i = 1, \dots, r\}, \quad (2)$$

where typically $r \geq n$. For $i = 1, \dots, r$ we use, in sequence, the search directions $d_k = d^i$ in D and we compute α_k by means of a derivative-free nonmonotone line search along d_k . Then, for each i , we generate a new point using the iteration (1) and we update k .

During this phase, when needed, we can further store a set of tentative points $y^j \in R^n$ computed along the directions d^i and the corresponding function values $f(y^j)$, for $j = 0, 1, \dots, q$.

After r line searches, we obtain a new updated point x_k .

- (b) *Acceleration step.* Given the available information gathered during phase (a), that is $y^j, f(y^j)$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, q$, we determine a new search direction d_k on the basis of some local model of f . Using again a derivative-free nonmonotone line search technique along d_k we perform the iteration

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k.$$

The attempt is that of improving substantially the results of phase (a) by computing, for instance, an approximation to the steepest descent direction or by determining a suitable pattern on the basis of the previous steps.

- (c) *Rotation of the search directions.* We perform a rotation (according to some given criterion) of the directions in D , thus obtaining a new set

$$\bar{D} = \{\bar{d}^i \in R^n, i = 1, \dots, r\}.$$

In the sequel, we will refer, in particular, to the Rosenbrock rotation [28] or to suitable modifications of this technique. Once that \bar{D} has been determined, we set $D = \bar{D}$, we update k and a new major step can be started.

In our formulation the fundamental requirements for establishing global convergence are the conditions to be imposed on the line searches and the assumptions on the search directions in D . Thus, the basic search of step (a) is essential, while both the acceleration step and the rotation of the directions in D can be omitted. Therefore various algorithms can be derived from the scheme defined above. We mention here some of the most significant choices that will be studied in the sequel in more detail.

The simplest choice can be that of defining a (nonmonotone) linesearch-based version of the *coordinate method*. In this case the set D is defined by $D = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, where e_j is the j -th column of the identity $n \times n$ and the algorithm will consist only of the basic search step (a).

A second scheme can be defined by combining step (a) with step (b). An example could be a linesearch-based version of the *Hooke-Jeeves method*. In this case the set D is again the set of coordinate directions, no coordinate rotation is introduced and D remains constant during the iterations. The acceleration step (b) consists in defining the search direction

$$d_k = x_k - y^0$$

and in performing a (possibly nonmonotone) linesearch along d_k . A second example with a similar structure could be a nonmonotone extension of the algorithm defined in [21], where step (b) is defined by selecting a point and a search direction on the basis of the points and the function values produced at step (a).

A different algorithm consists in executing only step (a) and (c), by performing a coordinate rotation at step (c), starting from the vector

$$\bar{d}^1 = x_k - y^0$$

and employing Rosenbrock rotations. In this way we get a (nonmonotone) linesearch-based version of the *Rosenbrock method*.

Finally, new algorithms can be constructed where the acceleration step (b) and the Rosenbrock rotation at step (c) are combined. In the scheme proposed in this paper each iteration starts with set D and the basic search (a) is executed as in the other cases. The acceleration step (b) is defined by first computing the *gradient approximation* g_k at the last point x_k of step (a) and then performing a (nonmonotone) derivative-free line search along $-g_k$. The gradient approximation is constructed by employing the data collected during the linesearches of step (a). Once that the point $x_{k+1} = x_k - \alpha_k g_k$ has been obtained, the set D is updated by employing Rosenbrock rotation. However, now the first element of \bar{D} is given by

$$\bar{d}^1 = x_{k+1} - y^0$$

and hence the step along $-g_k$ has effect also on the rotation carried out within the Rosenbrock technique.

In order to perform a convergence analysis of the algorithms outlined above, we must first specify the line search algorithms employed, we must impose suitable conditions on the search directions that belong to D and then we must define exactly the different steps. This will be the object of the next sections.

3 Derivative-free line searches

We consider the derivative-free line search algorithms that will be used within the minimization method described in the preceding section, where it is assumed that, given x_k , the next point x_{k+1} is obtained through the iteration

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k,$$

where $d_k \in R^n$ is a search direction and $\alpha_k \in R$ is a step size.

The algorithms defined in this section are essentially based on the techniques described in [17] and can be viewed as nonmonotone versions of derivative-free line search algorithms enforcing to zero the distance $\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|$. A sufficient reduction of the objective function is imposed with respect to a reference value W_k that satisfies the condition

$$f(x_k) \leq W_k \leq \max_{0 \leq j \leq \min(k, M)} [f(x_{k-j})], \quad (3)$$

for a given integer $M \geq 0$. In order to simplify notation, in the sequel we set $f_k = f(x_k)$ whenever convenient.

We consider two different types of line search, depending on the fact that the search is bidirectional, that is α_k can have any sign, or that only a nonnegative value for α_k is permitted.

The first scheme reported below is the bidirectional search.

Nonmonotone Derivative Free Line Search (NDFLS) Algorithm

$d_k \in R^n, d_k \neq 0, W_k$ satisfying (3) and parameters:

$$0 < \theta_l < \theta_u < 1, \quad 1 < \mu_l < \mu_u, \quad \gamma_l > \gamma > 0, \quad \rho_k > 0, \quad \Delta_k > 0.$$

Step 1. Set $\alpha = \Delta_k$.

Step 2. While $f(x_k \pm \alpha d_k) > W_k - \gamma \alpha^2 \|d_k\|^2$ do:

If $\alpha \|d_k\| < \rho_k$ then

set $\alpha_k = 0, \eta_k = \alpha$ and terminate,

else

choose $\theta \in [\theta_l, \theta_u]$ and set $\alpha = \theta \alpha$.

End if

End while

Step 3. Let $t \in \{-1, 1\}$ be such that

$$f(x_k + t \alpha d_k) \leq W_k - \gamma \alpha^2 \|d_k\|^2$$

and set $\alpha = t \alpha$.

Step 4. If $|\alpha| < \Delta_k$, then set $\alpha_k = \alpha$ and terminate.

Step 5. Choose $\mu \in [\mu_l, \mu_u]$.

Step 6. While

$$f(x_k + \alpha d_k) < f_k - \gamma_1 \alpha^2 \|d_k\|^2$$

and

$$f(x_k + \mu \alpha d_k) < \min\{f(x_k + \alpha d_k), f_k - \gamma (\mu \alpha)^2 \|d_k\|^2\}$$

set $\alpha = \mu \alpha$ and choose $\mu \in [\mu_l, \mu_u]$.

End while

Step 7. Set $\alpha_k = \alpha$ and terminate.

In the preceding scheme, starting from an arbitrary given initial tentative value $\alpha = \Delta_k > 0$, we search both along d_k and $-d_k$ and the stepsize α is computed in order to satisfy the condition of sufficient decrease expressed by

$$f(x_k + \alpha_k d_k) \leq W_k - \gamma \alpha_k^2 \|d_k\|^2, \quad \gamma > 0, \quad (4)$$

with a sufficiently large stepsize. We note that, in this phase, when the initial tentative stepsize Δ_k or $-\Delta_k$ does not satisfy the condition (4), then at least three function values are available, and hence a safeguarded quadratic interpolation can be employed. The stepsize is reduced until either the condition of sufficient decrease is satisfied, and hence the sign of α_k is fixed, or the length of the tentative step $\alpha \|d_k\|$ becomes smaller than an adjustable bound ρ_k .

In the latter case, the value α_k determined by the algorithm is set equal to zero and the last value of α (required only in the proof) is indicated by $\eta_k > 0$. This failure of the search along d_k may be due, in particular, to the fact that the directional derivative of f along d_k at x_k is near zero.

When the initial tentative stepsize Δ_k or $-\Delta_k$ satisfies the condition of sufficient decrease, then an expansion step is performed and $|\alpha|$ is increased, until suitable conditions are satisfied. Several different acceptability conditions can be combined for guaranteeing that a sufficient displacement from x_k has been effected. In particular, an extension of Goldstein conditions can be based on the request that α_k satisfies both the condition of sufficient decrease and the condition

$$f(x_k + \alpha_k d_k) \geq f_k - \gamma_1 \alpha_k^2 \|d_k\|^2,$$

where $\gamma_1 > \gamma$.

Note that, in the nonmonotone case, an expansion step is not required if the initial tentative stepsize $\alpha \in \{-\Delta_k, \Delta_k\}$ satisfies the condition of sufficient decrease, but $f(x_k + \alpha d_k) > f_k$.

In the sequel, whenever convenient, we will recall the preceding algorithm by evidentiating some of the inputs; in this case we will use the notation $NDFLS(d_k, \Delta_k, \rho_k)$.

The properties of Algorithm NDFLS are stated in the next proposition, whose proof follows with minor modifications from the results given in Propositions 3 and 4 of [17].

Proposition 1 *Let $f : R^n \rightarrow R$ be continuously differentiable and assume that the level set \mathcal{L}_0 is compact.*

(i) *Algorithm NDFLS determines, in a finite number of steps, a scalar α_k such that*

$$f(x_k + \alpha_k d_k) \leq W_k - \gamma (\alpha_k)^2 \|d_k\|^2. \quad (5)$$

(ii) *Let $\{x_k\}$ be a the sequence of points in R^n and let K be an infinite index set such that*

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k, \quad \text{for all } k \in K$$

where $d_k \in R^n$, $d_k \neq 0$ and $\alpha_k \in R$ is determined by means of Algorithm NDFLS. Assume that $\rho_k \rightarrow 0$ for every infinite subsequence of $\{x_k\}_K$ such that $\alpha_k = 0$. Then, we have:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, k \in K} \frac{\nabla f(x_k)^T d_k}{\|d_k\|} = 0. \quad \square$$

Now we can define the linesearch algorithm where the searches are performed only for positive values of α , which can easily be obtained from the scheme of NDFLS algorithm by simple modifications.

Nonmonotone Derivative Free Line Search Algorithm 2 (NDFLS2)

Data. $d_k \in R^n, d_k \neq 0, W_k$ satisfying (3) and parameters:

$$0 < \theta_l < \theta_u < 1, \quad 1 < \mu_l < \mu_u, \quad \gamma_l > \gamma > 0, \quad \rho_k > 0, \quad \Delta_k > 0.$$

Step 1. Set $\alpha = \Delta_k$.

Step 2. While $f(x_k + \alpha d_k) > W_k - \gamma \alpha^2 \|d_k\|^2$ do:

If $\alpha \|d_k\| < \rho_k$ then

set $\alpha_k = 0, \eta_k = \alpha$ and terminate,

else

choose $\theta \in [\theta_l, \theta_u]$ and set $\alpha = \theta \alpha$.

End if

End while

Step 3. If $\alpha < \Delta_k$, then set $\alpha_k = \alpha$ and terminate.

Step 4. Choose $\mu \in [\mu_l, \mu_u]$.

Step 5. While

$$f(x_k + \alpha d_k) < f_k - \gamma_1 \alpha^2 \|d_k\|^2$$

and

$$f(x_k + \mu \alpha d_k) < \min\{f(x_k + \alpha d_k), f_k - \gamma (\mu \alpha)^2 \|d_k\|^2\}$$

set $\alpha = \mu \alpha$ and choose $\mu \in [\mu_l, \mu_u]$.

End while

Step 6. Set $\alpha_k = \alpha$ and terminate.

The next proposition gives the convergence properties of the algorithm, that we may recall as $NDFLS2(d_k, \Delta_k, \rho_k)$.

The proof can be established along the lines that can be followed for proving Proposition 1.

Proposition 2 *Let $f : R^n \rightarrow R$ be continuously differentiable and assume that the level set \mathcal{L}_0 is compact.*

(i) *Algorithm NDFLS2 determines, in a finite number of steps, a scalar $\alpha_k \geq 0$ such that*

$$f(x_k + \alpha_k d_k) \leq W_k - \gamma (\alpha_k)^2 \|d_k\|^2. \quad (6)$$

(ii) *Let $\{x_k\}$ be a the sequence of points in R^n and let K be an infinite index set such that*

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k, \quad \text{for all } k \in K$$

where $d_k \in R^n, d_k \neq 0$ and $\alpha_k \in R$ is determined by means of Algorithm NDFLS2. Assume that $\rho_k \rightarrow 0$ for every infinite subsequence of $\{x_k\}_K$ such that $\alpha_k = 0$. Then, we have:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, k \in K} \frac{\nabla f(x_k)^T d_k}{\|d_k\|} \geq 0. \quad \square$$

4 Global convergence conditions

In this section we state convergence conditions that impose restrictions on the directions employed during the basic search defined at phase (a) of the scheme of Section 2. More specifically, we extend to nonmonotone methods some of the global convergence conditions already established for derivative-free line search-based methods [3], [13], [21]. In particular, we state conditions under which every limit point of the sequence generated by an unconstrained derivative-free algorithm, employing a nonmonotone line search at each step, is a stationary point of f . These conditions will be specialized in the sequel to the model algorithm introduced in Section 2 for proving global convergence.

Suppose first that the sequence of search directions $\{d_k\}$ satisfies the following assumption, which requires, in essence, that ultimately a set of n uniformly linearly independent search directions is employed cyclically.

Assumption 3 *Let $\{d_k\}$ be the sequence of search directions used in the algorithm. There exists a value $N > 0$ and n integers $j(k, i)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, such that*

$$k \leq j(k, 1) \leq j(k, 2) \leq \dots \leq j(k, n) \leq k + N$$

and the n sequences $\{p_k^i\}$, defined by

$$p_k^i = \frac{d_{j(k,i)}}{\|d_{j(k,i)}\|}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

have the property that every limit point $(\bar{p}^1, \bar{p}^2, \dots, \bar{p}^n)$ of $\{(p_k^1, p_k^2, \dots, p_k^n)\}$ is constituted by n linearly independent vectors $\bar{p}^i \in R^n, i = 1, \dots, n$. \square

It is easily seen that the assumption given above, for a sufficiently large N , is satisfied in a scheme where the coordinate directions are employed cyclically. Other examples will be considered later.

We recall from [24] that a function $\sigma : R^+ \rightarrow R^+$ is called a *forcing function* if, for every sequence of numbers $t_k \in R^+$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(t_k) = 0$, we have that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k = 0.$$

The convergence results given in the sequel depend on the following lemma, proved in [16], which follows essentially from the results established in [14], [15].

Lemma 4 *Let $\{x_k\}$ be a sequence of points such that*

$$f(x_{k+1}) \leq W_k - \sigma(\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|), \quad (7)$$

where $\sigma : R^+ \rightarrow R^+$ is a forcing function and W_k is a reference value that satisfies (3) for a given integer $M \geq 0$. Suppose that f is bounded below, and that it is Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{L}_0 , that is, that there exists a constant L such that

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq L\|x - y\|, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathcal{L}_0.$$

Then:

- (i) $x_k \in \mathcal{L}_0$ for all k ;
- (ii) the sequence $\{f(x_k)\}$ is convergent;
- (iii) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| = 0$. \square

Using this lemma, we can establish the following result.

Proposition 5 Let $f : R^n \rightarrow R$ be a continuously differentiable function and assume that the level set \mathcal{L}_0 is compact. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence of points produced by an algorithm of the form

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k,$$

where $d_k \neq 0$ for all k and $\alpha_k \in R$. Suppose that:

- (a) the sequence of search directions $\{d_k\}$ satisfies Assumption 3;
- (b) for every k we have

$$f(x_{k+1}) \leq W_k - \sigma(\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|), \quad (8)$$

where $\sigma : R^+ \rightarrow R^+$ is a forcing function and W_k is a reference value that satisfies (3) for a given integer $M \geq 0$.

- (c) in correspondence to all the sequences of search directions $d_{j(k,i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ considered in Assumption 3, the stepsize $\alpha_{j(k,i)}$ is computed using Algorithm NDFLS, where $\rho_k \rightarrow 0$ for every infinite subsequence such that $\alpha_{j(k,i)} = 0$.

Then the algorithm produces an infinite sequence that admits limit points and every limit point \bar{x} of $\{x_k\}$ is in \mathcal{L}_0 and satisfies $\nabla f(\bar{x}) = 0$.

Proof. Taking into account the assumptions on f and \mathcal{L}_0 and assumption (b), preliminarily we observe that all the hypotheses of Lemma 4 are satisfied and hence the assertions of Lemma 4 must hold. This implies, in particular, that $x_k \in \mathcal{L}_0$ for all k , that $\{x_k\}$ has limit points and that every limit point of the sequence is in \mathcal{L}_0 . We must show that every limit point of $\{x_k\}$ is a stationary point of f .

Let $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{L}_0$ be a limit point of $\{x_k\}$ and let $\{x_k\}_K$ be a subsequence converging to \bar{x} . Consider the search directions $d_{j(k,i)}$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, introduced in Assumption 3 and let

$$p_k^i = \frac{d_{j(k,i)}}{\|d_{j(k,i)}\|}, \quad j(k,i) \in \{k, k+1, \dots, k+N\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

be the elements of the n sequences defined there. As all the sequences $\{p_k^i\}$ are bounded there exists a subsequence $\{x_k\}_{K_1}$, with $K_1 \subseteq K$ such that

$$\lim_{k \in K_1, k \rightarrow \infty} p_k^i = \bar{p}^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (9)$$

By Assumption 3, we have that the vectors \bar{p}^i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ are linearly independent. By Lemma 4(iii), we have that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| = 0$$

and hence, as $j(k,i) \leq k+N$, it can be easily established, by induction, that all the points $x_{j(k,i)}$ converge to \bar{x} for $k \in K_1, k \rightarrow \infty$ and for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

As α_k is computed through Algorithm NDFLS it follows from (ii) of Proposition 1 that:

$$\lim_{k \in K_1, k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nabla f(x_{j(k,i)})^T d_{j(k,i)}}{\|d_{j(k,i)}\|} = \nabla f(\bar{x})^T \bar{p}^i = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (10)$$

Since vectors \bar{p}^i are linearly independent, we obtain $\nabla f(\bar{x}) = 0$. □

The convergence results given above can be easily extended to algorithms employing other types of search directions. To illustrate one of the most significant extensions, first we recall from [29] that the *positive span* of a set of vectors $\{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ is the cone

$$\{y \in R^n : y = \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i v_i, \gamma_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, r\}.$$

A *positive spanning set* in R^n is a set of vectors whose positive span is R^n . The set $\{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ is said to be *positively dependent* if one of its vectors is a positive combination of the others; otherwise, the set is *positively independent*. A *positive basis* in R^n is a positively independent set whose positive span is R^n . Two examples of positive basis for R^n are:

- the coordinate directions and their negative counterparts, that is

$$\{s_1, \dots, s_{2n}\} = \{e_1, \dots, e_n, -e_1, \dots, -e_n\};$$

- the coordinate directions and the negative of their sum, that is

$$\{s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}\} = \{e_1, \dots, e_n, -\sum_{i=1}^n e_i\}.$$

Now, let $\{x_k\}$ be a sequence of points produced by an algorithm of the form

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k,$$

where $d_k \neq 0$ for all k and $\alpha_k \geq 0$. We suppose that the sequence $\{d_k\}$ satisfies the following assumption, which can be related to the definition of ‘class (a) of search directions’ introduced in [21].

Assumption 6 *Let $\{d_k\}$ be the sequence of search directions used in the algorithm. There exists a value $N > 0$ and n integers $j(k, i)$, for $i = 1, \dots, r$, such that*

$$k \leq j(k, 1) \leq j(k, 2) \leq \dots \leq j(k, r) \leq k + N$$

and the r sequences $\{p_k^i\}$, defined by

$$p_k^i = \frac{d_{j(k,i)}}{\|d_{j(k,i)}\|}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r,$$

have the property that every limit point $(\bar{p}^1, \bar{p}^2, \dots, \bar{p}^r)$ of $\{(p_k^1, p_k^2, \dots, p_k^r)\}$ positively span R^n .

□

In this case, we suppose that the line search is carried out only for $\alpha \geq 0$ along each direction, and hence we refer to the line search algorithm NDFLS2. Then we can state a convergence result similar to that given in Proposition 5.

Proposition 7 *Let $f : R^n \rightarrow R$ be a continuously differentiable function and assume that the level set \mathcal{L}_0 is compact. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence of points produced by an algorithm of the form*

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k,$$

where $d_k \neq 0$ for all k and $\alpha_k \in R$. Suppose that:

- (a) the sequence of search directions $\{d_k\}$ satisfies Assumption 6;
- (b) for every k we have

$$f(x_{k+1}) \leq W_k - \sigma(\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|), \quad (11)$$

where $\sigma : R^+ \rightarrow R^+$ is a forcing function and W_k is a reference value that satisfies (3) for a given integer $M \geq 0$.

- (c) in correspondence to all the sequences of search directions $d_{j(k,i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, r$ considered in Assumption 6, the stepsize $\alpha_{j(k,i)} \geq 0$ is computed using Algorithm NDFLS2, where $\rho_k \rightarrow 0$ for every infinite subsequence such that $\alpha_{j(k,i)} = 0$.

Then the algorithm produces an infinite sequence that admits limit points and every limit point \bar{x} of $\{x_k\}$ is in \mathcal{L}_0 and satisfies $\nabla f(\bar{x}) = 0$.

Proof. Reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 5, we can establish that Lemma 4 holds. Let \bar{x} be a limit point of $\{x_k\}$ and let $\{x_k\}_K$ be a subsequence converging to $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{L}_0$. Consider the search directions

$$d_{j(k,i)}, \quad j(k,i) \in \{k, k+1, \dots, k+N\} \quad i = 1, \dots, r,$$

introduced in Assumption 6 and let p_k^i be the elements of the r sequences defined there. As all the sequences $\{p_k^i\}$ are bounded there exists a subsequence $\{x_k\}_{K_1}$, with $K_1 \subseteq K$ such that

$$\lim_{k \in K_1, k \rightarrow \infty} p_k^i = \bar{p}^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r. \quad (12)$$

By Assumption 6, we have that \bar{p}^i , $i = 1, \dots, r$ represent a positive basis in R^n . Using Lemma 4(iii), we have that points $x_{j(k,i)}$ converge to \bar{x} for $k \in K_1, k \rightarrow \infty$ and for all $i = 1, \dots, r$. As α_k is computed through Algorithm NDFLS2 it follows from (ii) of Proposition 2 that:

$$\lim_{k \in K_1, k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nabla f(x_{j(k,i)})^T d_{j(k,i)}}{\|d_{j(k,i)}\|} = \nabla f(\bar{x})^T \bar{p}^i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, r. \quad (13)$$

Since vectors \bar{p}^i represent a positive basis in R^n , we can write

$$-\nabla f(\bar{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \bar{p}^i, \quad \gamma_i \geq 0,$$

so that, by (13), we have

$$-\|\nabla f(\bar{x})\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \nabla f(\bar{x})^T \bar{p}^i \geq 0.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\nabla f(\bar{x}) = 0.$$

□

5 Hooke-Jeeves method with nonmonotone line searches

With reference to the scheme of Section 2 we consider here the case where the set D is not changed during the iterations and consists in the set defined by

$$D = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\},$$

where $e_j \in R^n$ is the j -th column of the identity $n \times n$.

We can describe, by means of a single scheme, the nonmonotone versions of the coordinate method and of the Hooke-Jeeves method; in particular in the following scheme the coordinate method can be obtained by terminating each major iteration at the end of Step 1.

NonMonotone Hooke-Jeeves (NMHJ) method

Data. Starting point $x_0 \in R^n$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $\rho_0 > 0$, $D = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$.

Set $k = 0$.

For $\ell = 0, 1, \dots$

Set $y^0 = x_k$ and $f(y^0) = f(x_k)$.

Step 1. *Coordinate search*

For $i = 1, \dots, n$

set $d_k = e_i$;

choose an initial stepsize $\Delta_k > 0$ and calculate step α_k along d_k

using Algorithm *NDFLS*(d_k, Δ_k, ρ_k);

set $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k$;

if $\alpha_k = 0$, set $\rho_{k+1} = \theta \rho_k$;

set $k = k + 1$.

End For

Step 2. *Pattern search*

Set $d_k = x_k - y^0$.

Choose an initial stepsize $\Delta_k > 0$ and calculate step α_k along d_k

using Algorithm *NDFLS*(d_k, Δ_k, ρ_k);

set $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k$;

if $\alpha_k = 0$ set $\rho_{k+1} = \theta \rho_k$;

set $k = k + 1$.

End For

The convergence of the algorithm is established in the next proposition.

Proposition 8 *Let $f : R^n \rightarrow R$ be a continuously differentiable function and assume that the level set \mathcal{L}_0 is compact. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence of points produced by Algorithm NMHJ. Then the algorithm produces an infinite sequence of points in \mathcal{L}_0 , such that there exist limit points and every limit point \bar{x} of $\{x_k\}$ satisfies $\nabla f(\bar{x}) = 0$.*

Proof. In order to prove the assertion, we need to show that the sequence generated by the algorithm satisfies conditions (a), (b) and (c) of Proposition 5. Let x_k be one of the points generated at the major step ℓ . Then, it is easily seen that, after at most n searches, at Step 1 of the next major step $\ell + 1$, we assume as search directions the coordinate directions and hence the sequence $\{d_k\}$ satisfies Assumption 3 with $p_k^i = e_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ for all k . Thus condition (a) of Proposition 5 holds. As for every k the condition of sufficient reduction used in Algorithm NDFLS must be met, in correspondence to the forcing function $\sigma(t) = \gamma t^2$, also assumption (b) of Proposition 5 is satisfied. Finally, the instructions of the algorithm guarantee that condition (c) of Proposition 5 holds. \square

6 Rosenbrock method with nonmonotone line searches

We introduce, in this section, a linesearch-based version of the Rosenbrock method. First we illustrate the procedure used for constructing periodically a basic set of search directions. Then we describe two different algorithms:

- 1) a nonmonotone linesearch-based Rosenbrock method employing bidirectional searches along n directions;
- 2) a nonmonotone linesearch-based Rosenbrock method employing non negative searches along $n + 1$ directions.

In the Rosenbrock approach, a set of orthogonal directions is rotated at each major step, so that at least one of the new directions is more closely conformed to the local behavior of the function. We consider:

- an orthonormal set of vectors $D = \{d^i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ given initially or determined during a cycle of previous iterations;
- a set of values $\sigma^i \in R, i = 1, \dots, n$ representing the movements performed along the vectors d^i in a cycle of previous iterations.

The new set of directions

$$\bar{D} = \{\bar{d}^i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$$

is obtained by using the following scheme:

Search Directions Generation(SDG)

For $i = 1, \dots, n$

Step 1. Set

$$a^i = \begin{cases} d^i & \text{if } \sigma^i = 0 \\ \sum_{j=i}^n \sigma^j d^j & \text{if } \sigma^i \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

Step 2. Set

$$b^i = \begin{cases} a^i & \text{if } i = 1 \\ a^i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} ((a^i)^\top \bar{d}^j) \bar{d}^j & \text{if } i \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

with $\bar{d}^i = \frac{b^i}{\|b^i\|}$

End For

At Step 1, a vector a^i is calculated, which represents the sum of all the movements made in the directions d^j for $j = i, \dots, n$. At Step 2, the new orthogonal vector \bar{d}^i is obtained by a Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure.

In practice, \bar{d}^1 represents the direction of farthest advance, \bar{d}^2 is the best direction which can be found normal to \bar{d}^1 , and so on. In other words, \bar{d}^1 connects the point x from which we start our search and the point

$$\bar{x} = x + \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma^j d^j$$

obtained at the end of the search.

It has been proved (see [1]) that the new directions generated by the SDG Algorithm are linearly independent and orthogonal. More precisely, the following result can be established.

Proposition 9 *Let us assume that d^i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ are linearly independent and mutually orthogonal. Then the directions \bar{d}^i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ generated by the SDG Algorithm are also linearly independent and mutually orthogonal for any set σ^i , $i = 1, \dots, n$. Furthermore, if $\sigma^i = 0$, then $\bar{d}^i = d^i$. \square*

Let us denote by $\sigma = (\sigma^1, \sigma^2, \dots, \sigma^n)^T$ the n -vector of the movements along the directions d^i , for $i = 1, \dots, n$, starting from x . Then, the computation performed with the preceding scheme will be indicated by

$$\bar{D} = \text{SDG}(D, \sigma).$$

At each step, the method of Rosenbrock originally proposed in [28] takes discrete steps along the search directions. In [1], a version of the method that utilizes exact line searches is presented and convergence results are reported, under rather restrictive assumptions on the objective functions.

Now we describe the two new versions of the Rosenbrock method, based on the use of nonmonotone, inexact derivative-free line search techniques, and we prove convergence towards stationary points under usual assumptions. We first consider the version which uses n bidirectional searches carried out by means of Algorithm NDFLS. We report here the algorithm scheme.

NonMonotone LineSearch-based Rosenbrock (NMLSR) Algorithm 1

Data. Starting point $x_0 \in R^n$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $\rho_0 > 0$, $D = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$, $k = 0$.

For $\ell = 0, 1, \dots$

Step 1. *Coordinate search*

For $i = 1, \dots, n$

set $d_k = d^i$;

choose an initial stepsize $\Delta_k > 0$ and calculate step α_k along d_k

using Algorithm *NDFLS*(d_k, Δ_k, ρ_k).

set $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k$, $\sigma^i = \alpha_k$ and set $\rho_{k+1} = \theta \rho_k$ if $\alpha_k = 0$;

set $k = k + 1$.

End For

Step 2. *Coordinate rotation*

Compute the new set of search directions through Rosenbrock rotation, that is

$\bar{D} = \text{SDG}(D, \sigma)$;

set $D = \bar{D}$.

End For

In the following proposition, we report the main result about the convergence of the algorithm.

Proposition 10 *Let $f : R^n \rightarrow R$ be a continuously differentiable function and assume that the level set \mathcal{L}_0 is compact. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence of points produced by Algorithm NMLSR. Then the algorithm produces an infinite sequence of points in \mathcal{L}_0 , such that there exist limit points and every limit point \bar{x} of $\{x_k\}$ satisfies $\nabla f(\bar{x}) = 0$.*

Proof. In order to prove the assertion, we need to show that the sequence generated by the algorithm satisfies assumptions (a), (b) and (c) of Proposition 5. By Proposition 9, we have that, every time Step 2 is performed in the algorithm, a new orthonormal set of n search directions is generated.

Therefore, for each k it is possible to find an index $\bar{k} \geq k$, with $\bar{k} \leq k + n - 1$, where Step 2 is performed, and a finite positive value $N \leq 2n - 1$ such that the n indices

$$k \leq j(k, 1) \leq j(k, 2) \leq \dots \leq j(k, n) \leq k + N$$

are related to the set of mutually orthogonal directions $d_{j(k,i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ previously generated at Step 2. As the sequences $\{p_k^i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are defined by

$$p_k^i = \frac{d_{j(k,i)}}{\|d_{j(k,i)}\|}, \quad j(k, i) \in \{k, k + 1, \dots, k + N\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

the vectors p_k^i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ are mutually orthogonal too. Then we have, by continuity, that every limit point $(\bar{p}^1, \bar{p}^2, \dots, \bar{p}^n)$ of $\{(p_k^1, p_k^2, \dots, p_k^n)\}$ is constituted by n orthonormal vectors $\bar{p}^i \in R^n$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Thus, assumption (a) of Proposition 5 is satisfied. Since at every iteration the acceptability condition of sufficient reduction used in Algorithm NDFLS must hold, also assumption (b) of Proposition 5 is satisfied in correspondence to the forcing function $\sigma(t) = \gamma t^2$. Finally, the instructions at Step 1 of the algorithm guarantee that the assumptions on ρ_k are satisfied and also (c) of Proposition 5 holds. \square

As we have already said at the beginning of the section, we can define, in alternative to Algorithm 1, a version of the Rosenbrock algorithm with (nonmonotone) derivative-free line searches and $n+1$ search directions. In Section 4, we have seen that a positive basis can be obtained by the coordinate directions and the negative of their sums. In general, if we have a set of linearly independent mutually orthogonal vectors $D_a = \{d^1, \dots, d^n\}$, we can always build a positive basis by adding to the set D_a the negative of their sums, that is

$$D = \left\{ d^1, \dots, d^n, - \sum_{j=1}^n d^j \right\}.$$

Then we can define a modified version of the Rosenbrock algorithm that uses $n+1$ line searches for non negative values of the stepsize and hence makes use of Algorithm *NDFLS2*.

NonMonotone LineSearch-based Rosenbrock (NMLSR) Algorithm 2

Data. Starting point $x_0 \in R^n$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $\rho_0 > 0$, $\ell = 0$, $k = 0$,
 $D_a = \{d^1, d^2, \dots, d^n\}$, $D = D_a \cup \{d^{n+1}\}$, where $d^i = e_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $d^{n+1} = -\sum_{i=1}^n d^i$.

For $\ell = 0, 1, \dots$

Step 1. Set $y^0 = x_k$;

Step 2. Search on a positive basis

For $i = 1, \dots, n + 1$

set $d_k = d^i$;

choose an initial stepsize $\Delta_k > 0$ and calculate step $\alpha_k \geq 0$ along d_k using Algorithm *NDFLS2*(d_k, Δ_k, ρ_k);

set $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k$, and set $\rho_{k+1} = \theta \rho_k$ if $\alpha_k = 0$;

set $k = k + 1$.

End For

Step 3. Set $\sigma_i = (x_k - y^0)^T d^i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Step 4. Coordinate rotation

Compute a new set of search directions by first employing Rosenbrock rotation of D_a ,

that is $\bar{D}_a = \text{SDG}(D_a, \sigma)$, and then setting $\bar{d}^{n+1} = -\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{d}^i$; $\bar{D} = \bar{D}_a \cup \{\bar{d}^{n+1}\}$;

set $D = \bar{D}$.

End For

In the following proposition, we establish the convergence of the algorithm.

Proposition 11 *Let $f : R^n \rightarrow R$ be a continuously differentiable function and assume that the level set \mathcal{L}_0 is compact. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence of points produced by Algorithm NMLSR2 and assume that $d_k \neq 0$ for all k . Then the algorithm produces an infinite sequence such that every limit point \bar{x} of $\{x_k\}$ satisfies $\nabla f(\bar{x}) = 0$.*

Proof. We show that the sequence generated by our algorithm satisfies assumptions (a), (b) and (c) of Proposition 7. By Proposition 9, every time Step 4 is performed in the algorithm, a new positive basis in R^n is obtained by adding the negative sum to the set of linearly independent and mutually orthogonal directions generated by means of Algorithm SDG. As Step 4 is performed after all $n + 1$ directions have been explored, for each k it is possible to find a step $\bar{k} \geq k$ and $\bar{k} \leq k + n$, where Step 4 is performed, and a finite positive value $N \leq 2(n + 1)$ such that the $n + 1$ indices

$$k \leq j(k, 1) \leq j(k, 2) \leq \dots \leq j(k, n + 1) \leq k + N$$

are related to the positive basis $d_{j(k,i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n + 1$ previously generated at Step 4. Then, as the sequences $\{p_k^i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n + 1$, are defined by

$$p_k^i = \frac{d_{j(k,i)}}{\|d_{j(k,i)}\|}, \quad j(k, i) \in \{k, k + 1, \dots, k + N\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n + 1,$$

the vectors $p_k^i, i = 1, \dots, n + 1$ have the property that every limit point $(\bar{p}^1, \bar{p}^2, \dots, \bar{p}^{n+1})$ of $\{(p_k^1, p_k^2, \dots, p_k^{n+1})\}$ is constituted by a positive basis of R^n . Thus, assumption (a) is satisfied. By the instructions at Step 2 of the algorithm, the stepsize α_k along d_k is calculated using Algorithm *NDFLS2* for every k and $\rho_{k+1} = \theta\rho_k$ if $\alpha_k = 0$. Then assumptions (b) and (c) are satisfied. \square

7 Linesearch-based algorithms employing gradient approximations and Rosenbrock rotations

In this section, we describe a new class of derivative-free algorithms, structured as indicated in the general scheme of Section 2, which makes use of *simplex gradients* and of Rosenbrock rotations for defining the search directions. Along these directions the stepsizes are computed through nonmonotone, inexact, derivative-free line searches.

In the scheme of Section 2, after a cycle of line searches at Step (a) is carried out along a set of given directions d^i , for $i = 1, \dots, n$, we introduce at Step (b) the computation of a simplex gradient g (in an extended sense). During the searches at Step (a) we further store (at least) n points $y^i \in R^n$ and the corresponding function values $f(y^i)$, for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$ and we compute the simplex gradient g using these data. Then, given the set of points $\{y^0, \dots, y^{n-1}\}$, we define the gradient approximation in x_k as the solution of the least squares problem

$$\min_g \|S^T g - \delta(f)\|^2,$$

where:

$$S = [y^0 - x_k, \dots, y^{n-1} - x_k] \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(f) = [f(y^0) - f(x_k), \dots, f(y^{n-1}) - f(x_k)]^T.$$

A schematic illustration of a major step of our algorithm is given in the figure reported below, where we have assumed, for simplicity, that all stepsizes are positive.




Figure 1: illustration of a major step of Alg. NMDFU

We now formally state the algorithm where we combine simplex gradients with Rosenbrock rotations.

NonMonotone Derivative-Free Unconstrained (NMDFU) Algorithm

Data. Starting point $x_0 \in R^n$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $\rho_0 > 0$, $k = 0$ and $D = \{d^1, d^2, \dots, d^n\}$, where $d^i = e_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

For $\ell = 0, 1, \dots$

Set $y^0 = x_k$ and $f(y^0) = f(x_k)$.

Step 1. *Coordinate search*

For $i = 1, \dots, n$

set $d_k = d^i$, choose an initial stepsize $\Delta_k > 0$ and calculate step α_k along d_k using Algorithm *NDFLS*(d_k, Δ_k, ρ_k);

if $\alpha_k = 0$ set $y^i = x_k + \Delta_k d^i$ else set $y^i = x_k + \alpha_k d^i$; store $y^i, f(y^i)$;

set $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k$, $\sigma^i = \alpha_k$ and set $\rho_{k+1} = \theta \rho_k$ if $\alpha_k = 0$;

set $k = k + 1$.

End For

Step 2. *Gradient approximation calculation*

Set $S = [y^0 - x_k, \dots, y^{n-1} - x_k]$, $\delta(f) = [f(y^0) - f(x_k), \dots, f(y^{n-1}) - f(x_k)]^T$;

calculate the gradient approximation g by solving the least squares problem

$$\min_g \|S^T g - \delta(f)\|^2,$$

and set $d_k = -g$.

Step 3. *Line search along the gradient approximation*

Choose an initial stepsize $\Delta_k > 0$, calculate step $\alpha_k \geq 0$ along $d_k = -g$ using Algorithm *NDFLS2*(d_k, Δ_k, ρ_k);

set $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k$ and set $\rho_{k+1} = \theta \rho_k$ if $\alpha_k = 0$;

if $\alpha_k \neq 0$ set $\sigma^i = (x_{k+1} - y^0)^T d^i$, with $i = 1, \dots, n$;

set $k = k + 1$.

Step 4. *Coordinate rotation*

Compute the new set of search directions through Rosenbrock rotation, that is

$$\bar{D} = \text{SDG}(D, \sigma).$$

Step 5. Set $D = \bar{D}$.

End For

The convergence of the algorithm is established in the next proposition.

Proposition 12 *Let $f : R^n \rightarrow R$ be a continuously differentiable function and assume that the level set \mathcal{L}_0 is compact. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence of points produced by Algorithm NMDFU. Then the algorithm produces an infinite sequence of points in \mathcal{L}_0 , such that there exist limit points and every limit point \bar{x} of $\{x_k\}$ satisfies $\nabla f(\bar{x}) = 0$.*

Proof. In order to prove the assertion, we need to show that the sequence generated by the algorithm satisfies assumptions (a), (b) and (c) of Proposition 5.

It is easily seen that we can follow essentially the same arguments used in the proof of Proposition

10. In fact, every time Step 4 is performed in the algorithm, a new orthonormal set of n search directions is generated and used within $N \leq 2n$ iterations and assumption (a) of Proposition 5 can be established. Since at every iteration either the acceptability condition of sufficient reduction used in Algorithm NDFLS or in Algorithm NDFLS2 must hold, also assumption (b) of Proposition 9 is satisfied in correspondence to the forcing function $\sigma(t) = \gamma t^2$. Finally, the instructions at Step 1 guarantee that also condition (c) of Proposition 5 is satisfied. \square

8 Numerical Results

In this section we analyze the effects of using coordinate rotations and gradient approximations in a derivative-free context. Our numerical experience can be divided into three parts:

1. In the first part, we compare algorithms NMDFU and NMLSR (Alg. 1) with a nonmonotone version of the Coordinate Search algorithm (NMCS). The aim of this experiment is analyzing the effects of using coordinate rotations and gradient approximations;
2. In the second part, in order to analyze the impact of nonmonotone linesearches in the proposed framework, we compare two different version of our algorithm where we respectively use a nonmonotone and a monotone linesearch;
3. In the third part, we compare the NMDFU Algorithm with NEWUOA [26] and NOMAD [20] two well-known and widely used codes for derivative-free unconstrained optimization. The aim of this experiment is that of evaluating the efficiency of our approach when compared with other derivative-free solvers.

Consequently, we adopt the same procedure as that used in [23] to evaluate the behavior of the different solvers. We use the following convergence condition:

$$f(x_0) - f(x_k) \geq (1 - \tau)(f(x_0) - f_L) \quad (14)$$

where $0 \leq \tau \leq 1$ is a suitably chosen tolerance and f_L is the smallest function value obtained by any solver within the same maximum computational budget. We consider a set \mathcal{A} of n_a algorithms, a set \mathcal{P} of $|\mathcal{P}|$ problems and a performance measure $m_{p,a}$ (e.g. in our case, number of function evaluations). We compare the performance on problem p by algorithm a with the best performance by any algorithm on this problem using the following *performance ratio*

$$r_{p,a} = \frac{m_{p,a}}{\min\{m_{p,a} : a \in \mathcal{A}\}}.$$

Then, we obtain a first overall assessment of the performance of the algorithm a by defining the *performance profile*:

$$\rho_a(\alpha) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|} \text{size}\{p \in \mathcal{P} : r_{p,a} \leq \alpha\},$$

which represents the probability for algorithm $a \in \mathcal{A}$ that the performance ratio $r_{p,a}$ is within a factor $\alpha \in R$ of the best possible ratio. The function ρ_a represents the distribution function for the performance ratio. Thus $\rho_a(1)$ gives the fraction of problems for which the algorithm a was the most effective, $\rho_a(2)$ gives the fraction of problems for which the algorithm a is within a factor of 2 of the best algorithm, and so on. The convention $r_{p,a} = \infty$ is used when algorithm a fails to satisfy the convergence test (14) for problem p .

We further measure performances of the different solvers by the percentage of problems that can be solved (for a given tolerance τ) within a certain number of function evaluations. We define $t_{p,a}$ the number of function evaluations needed for algorithm a to satisfy (14) for a given tolerance τ , and we obtain the percentage of problems solved with ν function evaluations by means of the so called *data profile*:

$$d_a(\nu) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|} \text{size}\{p \in \mathcal{P} : \frac{t_{p,a}}{n_p + 1} \leq \nu\},$$

where n_p is the number of variables in $p \in P$. If the convergence test (14) cannot be satisfied within the assigned computational budget, we set $t_{p,a} = \infty$.

The test set \mathcal{P} we consider in the experiments consists of 38 problems from the CUTEr collection [12] and 49 nonsmooth problems from the collection of Lukšan and Vlček [22, 30]. Since the problems in \mathcal{P} have at most 50 variables, in our numerical experience we set the maximum computational budget to be 5000 and we investigate the behavior of the solvers within this computational budget. We use both performance and data profile with the test (14) where $\tau = 10^{-l}$ with $l \in \{3, 6\}$.

In NMDFU, NMLSR Algorithm 1 and NMCS we used the following reference value:

$$W_k = \max_{0 \leq j \leq \min(k, M)} [f(x_{k-j})],$$

with $M = 3$.

In Figure 2, we report performance and data profiles related to the first experiment. As we can see, looking at the performance profiles, NMDFU is the fastest solver in at least 55% of the problems, while NMLSR and NMCS are the fastest solvers respectively in less than 40% and 20% of the problems at most.




Figure 2: Performance and Data Profiles of NMDFU, NMLSR (Alg.1) and NMCS

Furthermore, NMDFU guarantees better results than NMLSR and NMCS in terms of robustness and the performance difference between NMLSR and the other two solvers increases as the tolerance decreases. The data profiles show that NMDFU is slightly better than NMLSR as it solves a higher percentage of problems when the number of simplex gradients is sufficiently large. We can also notice that both the algorithms are better than NMCS as they solve a larger percentage of problems for all sizes of computational budget and levels of accuracy τ .

What we can conclude from this first experiment is that, in a derivative-free context, using coordinate rotations and gradient approximations can be beneficial.

As the goal of the second experiment was analyzing the impact of nonmonotone linesearches in the proposed framework, in Figure 3 we show the performances of two different version of our algorithm that respectively use a nonmonotone and a monotone linesearch.




Figure 3: Monotone vs Nonmonotone - Performance and Data Profiles.

By looking at the performance profiles, we can easily see that nonmonotone linesearches guarantee better results both in terms of efficiency and robustness for any value of the tolerance τ . The good behavior of the nonmonotone version of the code is confirmed by the data profiles as they basically say that the nonmonotone version solves a larger percentage of problems for all sizes of computational budget and levels of accuracy τ . Furthermore, the performance difference between the two tends to be significantly large when the computational budget is large enough.

The results of the third experiment are reported in Figures 4-7. The performance profiles (Fig. 4) show that NMDFU is competitive with NEWUOA and that they are both better than NOMAD. Furthermore, NMDFU guarantees quite better results than both NEWUOA and NOMAD in terms of robustness.




Figure 4: Performance profiles of NMDFU, NEWUOA and NOMAD.

More specifically, both for $\tau = 10^{-3}$ and for $\tau = 10^{-6}$ NEWUOA and NMDFU show a similar behavior, in terms of efficiency, as they are the fastest in about 40% of the problems, while NOMAD is the fastest in about 20% of the problems. When the performance ratio is larger than 1.5 for $\tau = 10^{-3}$ or larger than 2 for $\tau = 10^{-6}$, NMDFU guarantees better results than both NEWUOA and NOMAD. We further have that, for any value of τ , the performance differences between NMDFU and the other two codes becomes significantly large as the ratio increases.

From the data profiles (Fig. 5), we can see that, when the computational budget is small, (say less than 70 simplex gradient evaluations for $\tau = 10^{-3}$ or 200 for $\tau = 10^{-6}$) NEWUOA guarantees better results than NMDFU, and that these two algorithms are both much better than NOMAD. As the computational budget increases NMDFU solves a larger number of problems than the other solvers and the difference is significantly large as the number of simplex gradients increases.




Figure 5: Data Profiles of NMDFU, NEWUOA and NOMAD.

We can note, in particular, that, from a certain point onward (that is when the number of simplex gradients is larger than 220 for $\tau = 10^{-3}$ or than 200 for $\tau = 10^{-6}$) NMDFU outperforms both NOMAD and NEWUOA. Once the number of simplex gradient evaluations becomes larger than 350, the performance difference between NMDFU and NEWUOA is about 20% and the difference between NMDFU and NOMAD is about 15% – 20%.

In order to better understand the behavior of the codes in difficult cases, we also separately report, in Figures 6 and 7, performance and data profiles related to the 49 nonsmooth problems taken from [22], extracted from our test set.




Figure 6: Performance Profiles of NMDFU, NEWUOA and NOMAD (Nonsmooth Problems).

As we can easily see by looking at the performance profiles, the NMDFU algorithm guarantees better results both in terms of efficiency and robustness for any value of the tolerance τ . The good behavior of our code is confirmed by the data profiles, as they basically say that NMDFU solves a larger percentage of problems for a computational budget respectively larger than 30 when $\tau = 10^{-3}$ and larger than 100 when $\tau = 10^{-6}$. Furthermore, the performance differences between NMDFU and the other two codes becomes significantly large as the ratio increases.




Figure 7: Data Profiles of NMDFU, NEWUOA and NOMAD (Nonsmooth Problems).

Finally, we analyze the performances of the algorithms when the number of variables of the problem to be solved is (relatively) large. We consider 4 problems from the CUTER collection (namely, arwhed, penalty1, penalty2 and extended woods) with a number of variables $n \in \{50, 75, 100\}$, thus obtaining a set of 12 problems. In Figure 8, we show performance and data profiles related to the comparison of NMDFU and NEWUOA on the 12 large dimensional problems. In this case, we set the computational budget to 10000.

By considering the performance profiles, we can see that NMDFU guarantees better results both in terms of efficiency and robustness for any value of the tolerance τ . The good results are

confirmed once again by the data profiles, as we have that our code solves a larger percentage of problems for almost all sizes of computational budget at any levels of accuracy τ .




Figure 8: Comparison of NMDFU and NEWUOA on Large Dimensional Problems.

9 Concluding remarks and future work

The results presented in this paper show that linesearch-based nonmonotone methods appear quite competitive and often superior to some of the best derivative-free techniques presently available. More specifically, on the basis of our preliminary computational experience, it would seem that linesearch-based methods can be much more efficient than mesh adaptive direct search methods. In comparison with good model-based methods (such as NEWUOA) the advantages of our algorithm can be significant in difficult problems and in (relatively) large dimensional problems. Additional work may be needed for improving our code, for evaluating the effect of some parameters and for experimenting other possible choices in the general framework considered here. Future research will include:

- the study of algorithms for large dimensional systems employing decomposition techniques and parallel searches;
- the definition of enhanced nonmonotone acceptance rules, such as, for instance, the combination of nonmonotone linesearches with nonmonotone *watchdog* techniques (see e.g. [17] in the case of nonlinear equations);
- extensions to constrained problems.

References

- [1] M. S. BAZARAA, H. D. SHERALI, C. M. SHETTY, *Nonlinear Programming: Theory and Algorithms*. 3rd edn. Wiley and Sons, USA , 2006.
- [2] D. M. BORTZ, C. T. KELLEY, *The simplex gradient and noisy optimization problems in Computational Methods in Optimal Design and Control*, Progress in Systems and Control Theory, edited by J. T. Borggaard, J. Burns, E. Cliff, and S. Schreck, vol. 24, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1998, pp. 77–90.
- [3] A. R. CONN, K. SCHEINBERG, L. N. VICENTE, *Introduction to Derivative-Free Optimization* MPS-SIAM Series on Optimization, Philadelphia, PA, 2008.
- [4] A. L. CUSTÓDIO, L. N. VICENTE, *Using sampling and simplex derivatives in pattern search methods*. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 18, (2007), pp. 537–555.
- [5] A. L. CUSTÓDIO, J. E. DENNIS, L. N. VICENTE, *Using simplex gradients of nonsmooth functions in direct search methods*. IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, 28, (2008), pp. 770–784.
- [6] R. DE LEONE, M. GAUDIOSO, L. GRIPPO, *Stopping criteria for linesearch methods without derivatives*. Mathematical Programming, 30, (1984) pp. 285–300.
- [7] M.A. DINIZ-EHRHARDT, J.M. MARTNEZ, M. RAYDAN, *A derivative-free nonmonotone line-search technique for unconstrained optimization*. Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, 219, (2008) pp.383–397.
- [8] L. FRIMANSLUND, T. STEIHAUG, *A generating set search method using curvature information*. Computational Optimization and Applications, 38, (2007), pp. 105–121.
- [9] D.H. LI AND M. FUKUSHIMA, *A derivative-free line search and global convergence of Broyden-like method for nonlinear equations*. Optimization Methods and Software, 13, (2000), pp. 181–201.
- [10] U. M. GARCÍA-PALOMARES, J. F. RODRÍGUEZ, *New sequential and parallel derivative free algorithms for unconstrained minimization*. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 13-1, (2002), pp. 79–96.
- [11] U. M. GARCÍA-PALOMARES, F. J. GONZÁLEZ-CASTANO, JUAN C. BURGUILLO-RIAL, *A combined global and local search approach to global optimization*. Journal of Global Optimization, 34, (2006), pp. 409–426
- [12] N. I. M. GOULD, D. ORBAN, P. L. TOINT, *CUTEr and SifDec: A constrained and unconstrained testing environment revisited*. ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software, 29, (2003) pp. 373–394.
- [13] L. GRIPPO, F. LAMPARIELLO, S. LUCIDI, *Global Convergence and stabilization of unconstrained minimization methods without derivatives*. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 56, (1988), pp. 385–406.
- [14] L. GRIPPO, F. LAMPARIELLO, S. LUCIDI, *A nonmonotone line search technique for Newton’s method*. SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 23, (1986), pp. 707–716.
- [15] L. GRIPPO, F. LAMPARIELLO AND S. LUCIDI, *A class of nonmonotone stabilization methods in unconstrained optimization*. Numerische Mathematik, 59, (1986), pp. 779–805.
- [16] L. GRIPPO, M. SCIANDRONE, *Nonmonotone globalization techniques for the Barzilai-Borwein gradient method*. Computational Optimization and Applications, 23, (2002), pp. 143–169.
- [17] L. GRIPPO AND M. SCIANDRONE, *Nonmonotone derivative-free methods for nonlinear equations*. Computational Optimization and Applications, 27, (2007), pp. 297–328.
- [18] R. HOOKE, T.A. JEEVES, “*Direct Search*” *Solution of Numerical and Statistical Problems*, Journal of the ACM, 8, (1961), pp. 212–229.

- [19] C.T. KELLEY, *Iterative Methods for Optimization*, SIAM Publications, Philadelphia, Penn., 1999.
- [20] S. LE DIGABEL, *Algorithm 909: NOMAD: Nonlinear optimization with the MADS algorithm*. ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software, vol 37(4), (2011) pp.44:1–44:15.
- [21] S. LUCIDI, M. SCIANDRONE, *On the Global Convergence of Derivative Free Methods for Unconstrained Optimization*. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 13,(2007), pp. 97–116.
- [22] V. LUKŠAN, J. VLČEK, *Test Problems for Nonsmooth Unconstrained and Linearly Constrained Optimization*. Technical report, Institute of Computer Science, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 2000.
- [23] J.J. MORÉ, S.M. WILD, Benchmarking derivative-free optimization algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20, (2009), pp. 17–191.
- [24] J.M. ORTEGA, W.C. RHEINBOLDT, *Iterative solution of nonlinear equations in several variables*. Academic Press, 1970.
- [25] M. J. D. POWELL, *An efficient method for finding the minimum of a function of several variables without calculating derivatives*. The Computer Journal, 7, (1964), pp. 155–162.
- [26] M. J. D. POWELL, *The NEWUOA software for unconstrained optimization without derivatives*, in Large Scale Nonlinear Optimization, G. Di Pillo and M. Roma, eds., Springer, Netherlands, pp. 255–297, 2006.
- [27] W. LA CRUZ, J.M. MARTINEZ AND M. RAYDAN, *Spectral residual method without gradient information for solving large-scale nonlinear systems of equations*. Mathematics of Computation, 75, (2006), pp. 1449–1466.
- [28] H. H. ROSENBRACK, *An Automatic Method for Finding the Greatest or Least Value of a Function*. The Computer Journal 3, (1960), pp. 175–184.
- [29] T.G. KOLDA AND R.M. LEWIS AND V. TORCZON, *Optimization by direct search: New perspective on some classical and modern methods*. ICASE SIAM Review, 45, (2003), pp. 385–482.
- [30] L. M.L RIOS N. V. SAHINIDIS, *Derivative-free optimization: a review of algorithms and comparison of software implementations*, Journal of Global Optimization, DOI 10.1007/s10898-012-9951-y, 2012.