

Conjugate gradient methods without line search for multiobjective optimization

Wang Chen^{a,b}, Yong Zhao^c, Liping Tang^a, Xinmin Yang^a

^aNational Center for Applied Mathematics in Chongqing, Chongqing Normal University, Chongqing, 401331, China

^bSchool of Mathematical Sciences, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, 611731, China

^cCollege of Mathematics and Statistics, Chongqing Jiaotong University, Chongqing, China

Abstract

This paper addresses unconstrained multiobjective optimization problems where two or more continuously differentiable functions have to be minimized. We delve into the conjugate gradient methods proposed by Lucambio Pérez and Prudente (SIAM J Optim, 28(3): 2690–2720, 2018) for such problems. Instead of the Wolfe-type line search procedure used in their work, we employ a fixed stepsize formula (or no-line-search scheme), which can mitigate the pressure of choosing stepsize caused by multiple inequalities and avoid the computational cost associated with function evaluations in specific applications. The no-line-search scheme is utilized to derive the condition of Zoutendijk’s type. Global convergence encompasses the vector extensions of Fletcher–Reeves, conjugate descent, Dai–Yuan, Polak–Ribière–Polyak and Hestenes–Stiefel parameters, subject to certain mild assumptions. Additionally, numerical experiments are conducted to demonstrate the practical performance of the proposed stepsize rule, and comparative analyses are made with the multiobjective steepest descent methods using the Armijo line search and the multiobjective conjugate gradient methods using the Wolfe-type line search.

Keywords: Multiobjective optimization, Conjugate gradient method, Line search, Pareto critical, Global convergence

2010 MSC: 90C29, 90B50, 90C30, 65K05

1. Introduction

In various fields such as engineering [1], finance [2], environmental analysis [3], management science [4] and machine learning [5], one is faced with the problem that multiple objective have to be minimized concurrently, leading to a multiobjective optimization problem. These objective functions often conflict with each other, making it impossible to find a unique solution that optimizes all the objectives simultaneously. Instead, there exists a set of solutions known as the Pareto optimal solutions, which are characterized by the fact that an improvement in one objective will result in a deterioration in at least one of the other objectives.

One of the earliest and most widely used techniques for dealing with multiobjective optimization problems is the so-called scalarization method (see, e.g., [6, 7]), which transforms the original problem into a single objective optimization problem. The main drawback of scalarization methods is the necessity of defining appropriate parameters to obtain a “good” scalarizing function. This requires a deep understanding of the problem’s structure, which may not always be readily accessible. A class of parameter-free multiobjective optimization algorithms, known as descent algorithms, has garnered significant attention for not relying on prior information about the objective functions. This class of algorithms includes the steepest descent

* Email addresses: chenwangff@163.com (Wang Chen), zhaoyongty@126.com (Yong Zhao), tanglipings@163.com (Liping Tang), xmyang@cqnu.edu.cn (Xinmin Yang)

method [8, 9], the Newton method [10, 11], the quasi-Newton method [12, 13, 14, 15, 16], the trust-region method [17, 18], the Barzilai-Borwein method [19], the conjugate gradient method [20, 21, 22], the conditional gradient method [23, 24], the proximal gradient method [25, 26], and others.

In this paper, we are concerned with the following multiobjective optimization problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} F(x) = (f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_m(x))^\top, \quad (1.1)$$

where $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a continuously differentiable vector-valued function. As mentioned in [27], a class of interval-valued multiobjective optimization problems can also be reformulated as the problem (1.1). In the present work, we focus on the conjugate gradient (CG) methods for solving (1.1). It is noteworthy that the CG methods for multiobjective optimization, initially proposed by Lucambio Pérez and Prudente [20], generates a sequence of iterates according to the following form:

$$x^{k+1} = x^k + t_k d^k, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \quad (1.2)$$

where $d^k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the search direction, and $t_k > 0$ is the stepsize. The direction in [20] is defined by

$$d^k = \begin{cases} v(x^k), & \text{if } k = 0, \\ v(x^k) + \beta_k d^{k-1}, & \text{if } k \geq 1, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where $v(x^k)$ is the multiobjective steepest descent direction (see [8] or (2.4)), and β_k is a scalar algorithmic parameter determined by different formulas, each corresponding to a specific CG method. Lucambio Pérez and Prudente [20] introduced the vector extensions of Fletcher–Reeves (FR), Conjugate descent (CD), Dai–Yuan (DY), Polak–Ribière–Polyak (PRP) and Hestenes–Stiefel (HS), which take the forms respectively defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_k^{\text{FR}} &= \frac{\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1}))}, \\ \beta_k^{\text{CD}} &= \frac{\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})}, \\ \beta_k^{\text{DY}} &= \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^k, d^{k-1}) - \psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})}, \\ \beta_k^{\text{PRP}} &= \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1}))}{-\psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1}))}, \\ \beta_k^{\text{HS}} &= \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1}))}{\psi(x^k, d^{k-1}) - \psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi(\cdot, \cdot)$ is defined in the next section. As reported in [20], in all cases, the vector extensions retrieve the classical parameters in the scalar minimization case. For the ways of selecting the parameter β_k , there are also some interesting works, such as the vector extension of Hager–Zhang (see [22]), the vector extension of Liu–Storey (see [21]), the variants of FR, CD and PRP (see [28]), the alternative extension of HZ (see [29]) and the vector extension of Dai–Liao (see [30]). Very recently, the authors in [31, 32] have presented the CG methods for multiobjective optimization on Riemannian manifolds.

The global convergence of CG methods in multiobjective optimization crucially depends on the selection of the stepsize t_k . In [20, 21, 22, 28, 29, 30], it is usually required that the stepsize t_k satisfies the standard

Wolfe conditions

$$\begin{aligned} F(x^k + t_k d^k) &\preceq F(x^k) + \rho_1 t_k \psi(x^k, d^k), \\ \psi(x^k + t_k d^k, d^k) &\geq \rho_2 \psi(x^k, d^k), \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where “ \preceq ” is a partial order relation defined in the next section and $0 < \rho_1 < \rho_2 < 1$, or the strong Wolfe conditions, i.e., (1.4) and

$$|\psi(x^k + t_k d^k, d^k)| \leq \rho_2 |\psi(x^k, d^k)|. \tag{1.5}$$

However, the implementation of such Wolfe-type stepsize strategies gives rise to certain potential concerns. Firstly, it is noteworthy that, in (1.4), m inequalities must be satisfied simultaneously, which becomes stricter as the number of objective functions increases (see [19, 33]). Secondly, these types of line searches may involve extensive computations in evaluating the value of objective functions, which can pose a substantial burden in certain problem scenarios. Additionally, the converging line search strategies are usually not easy to implement in practice. Recognizing these issues, it is advisable to steer clear of the line search procedures in the design of descent algorithms for multiobjective optimization.

In this paper, we introduce a novel stepsize strategy for multiobjective optimization, which encompasses the stepsize rule from our previous work [34]. The newly proposed stepsize scheme replaces the line search procedure with a fixed stepsize formula, motivated by the quadratic approximations of the objective functions, incorporating a sequence of positive definite matrices B^k . Here and below, the statement “fixed stepsize” indicates “without line search”. We establish the Zoutendijk-type condition for multiobjective optimization when using the proposed fixed stepsize formula. This condition is a crucial component in deriving convergence results. We apply the proposed stepsize strategy to the CG methods [20] with FR, CD, DY, PRP and HS parameters, and then establish the global convergence of these CG methods under certain assumptions. Finally, we present numerical results for these CG methods without line search and compare them with their counterparts employing stepsizes that satisfy the Wolfe-type conditions. It is noteworthy that, in the numerical experiments, we consider B^k as a matrix with a simple structure that encapsulates some approximated second-order information about the objective functions.

The remainder of this paper is as follows. In the next section, we present some basic definitions, notations and auxiliary results in multiobjective optimization. Section 3 gives the stepsize formula and its properties. Section 4 includes the main convergence results of the CG methods with the proposed stepsize strategy. Section 5 contains numerical experiments illustrating the performance of the proposed stepsize. Finally, in section 6, some conclusions and remarks are given.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, we denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\|\cdot\|$, respectively, the usual inner product and the Euclidean norm in \mathbb{R}^n . For any positive integer m , let $\langle m \rangle = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. For any $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$, define $\|d\|_A = \sqrt{d^\top A d}$, where A is a positive definite matrix. Given a matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, the norm of B (see [8, 29]) is computed as

$$\|B\|_{2,\infty} = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|Bx\|_\infty}{\|x\|} = \max_{i \in \langle m \rangle} \|B_{i,\cdot}\| = \max_{i \in \langle m \rangle} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n B_{i,j}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Let \mathbb{R}_+^m and \mathbb{R}_{++}^m denote the non-negative orthant and positive orthant of \mathbb{R}^m , respectively. As usual, for $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we use “ \preceq ” to denote the classical partial order defined by

$$u \preceq v \Leftrightarrow v - u \in \mathbb{R}_+^m.$$

Definition 2.1. [6] A point $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be *Pareto optimal* of (1.1) if there exists no $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $F(x) \preceq F(\bar{x})$ and $F(x) \neq F(\bar{x})$.

A first-order necessary condition introduced in [8] for the Pareto optimality of a point $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is

$$JF(\bar{x})(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap (-\mathbb{R}_{++}^m) = \emptyset, \quad (2.1)$$

where $JF(\bar{x})$ is the Jacobian (or the first-order derivative) of F at \bar{x} , $JF(\bar{x})(\mathbb{R}^n) = \{JF(\bar{x})d : d \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ and $JF(\bar{x})d = (\langle \nabla f_1(\bar{x}), d \rangle, \langle \nabla f_2(\bar{x}), d \rangle, \dots, \langle \nabla f_m(\bar{x}), d \rangle)^\top$.

A point $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying the above relation (2.1) is said to be *Pareto critical* (see [8]). Equivalently, for any $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists $i^* \in \langle m \rangle$ such that $(JF(\bar{x})d)_{i^*} = \langle \nabla f_{i^*}(\bar{x}), d \rangle \geq 0$, which implies $\max_{i \in \langle m \rangle} \langle \nabla f_i(\bar{x}), d \rangle \geq 0$ for any $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Clearly, if $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is not a Pareto critical point, then there exists a vector $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $JF(x)d \in -\mathbb{R}_{++}^m$. We call the vector d a *descent direction* for F at x .

Now define the function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\psi(x, d) = \max_{i \in \langle m \rangle} \langle \nabla f_i(x), d \rangle. \quad (2.2)$$

Clearly, the function ψ gives the following characterizations:

- $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is descent direction for F at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if $\psi(x, d) < 0$,
- $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is Pareto critical if and only if $\psi(x, d) \geq 0$ for all $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Let us now consider the following scalar optimization problem:

$$\min_{d \in \mathbb{R}^n} \psi(x, d) + \frac{1}{2} \|d\|^2. \quad (2.3)$$

Obviously, the objective function in (2.3) is proper, closed and strongly convex. Therefore, (2.3) admits a unique optimal solution, referred to as the *steepest descent direction* (see [8]). Denote the optimal solution of (2.3) by $v(x)$, i.e.,

$$v(x) = \operatorname{argmin}_{d \in \mathbb{R}^n} \psi(x, d) + \frac{1}{2} \|d\|^2, \quad (2.4)$$

and let the optimal value of (2.3) be defined as $\theta(x)$, i.e.,

$$\theta(x) = \psi(x, v(x)) + \frac{1}{2} \|v(x)\|^2. \quad (2.5)$$

Let us now give a characterization of Pareto critical points of (1.1), which will be used in our subsequent analysis.

Proposition 2.1. [8] *Let $v(\cdot)$ and $\theta(\cdot)$ be as in (2.4) and (2.5), respectively. The following statements hold:*

- (i) *if x is a Pareto critical point of (1.1), then $v(x) = 0$ and $\theta(x) = 0$;*
- (ii) *if x is not a Pareto critical point of (1.1), then $v(x) \neq 0$, $\theta(x) < 0$ and $\psi(x, v(x)) < -\|v(x)\|^2/2 < 0$;*
- (iii) *$v(\cdot)$ is continuous.*

We finish the section with the following properties.

Lemma 2.1. [35] *For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\rho > 0$ and $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we obtain*

- (i) $\psi(x, \rho b_1) = \rho \psi(x, b_1)$;
- (ii) $\psi(x, b_1 + b_2) \leq \psi(x, b_1) + \psi(x, b_2)$ and $\psi(x, b_1) - \psi(x, b_2) \leq \psi(x, b_1 - b_2)$;

Lemma 2.2. [20] *For any scalars a, b and $\alpha \neq 0$, we have*

- (i) $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$;
- (ii) $(a + b)^2 \leq (1 + 2\alpha^2)a^2 + (1 + 1/(2\alpha^2))b^2$.

3. New stepsize and its properties

This section first presents a novel stepsize formula and then lists some relations, all of which are independent of the choice of the parameter β_k . Before describing these works, we make use of the following assumptions:

Assumption 3.1. The level set $\mathcal{L} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : F(x) \preceq F(x^0)\}$ is bounded, where $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a given starting point.

Assumption 3.2. The Jacobian JF is L -Lipschitz continuous on an open set \mathcal{B} containing \mathcal{L} , i.e., $\|JF(x) - JF(y)\|_{2,\infty} \leq L\|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{B}$.

Assumption 3.3. Each function f_i is strongly convex with constant $\mu_i > 0$, i.e., $(\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f_i(y))^\top (x - y) \geq \mu_i \|x - y\|^2$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in \langle m \rangle$.

Remark 3.1. The considered Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2 are natural extensions of those made for the scalar case, which are used in [8, 13, 20, 21, 22, 28, 29, 34]. Moreover, Assumption 3.2 implies $\|\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f_i(y)\| \leq L\|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in \langle m \rangle$. Indeed,

$$\|JF(x) - JF(y)\|_{2,\infty} = \max_{i \in \langle m \rangle} \|(JF(x) - JF(y))_{i,\cdot}\| = \max_{i \in \langle m \rangle} \|\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f_i(y)\|.$$

Assumption 3.3 is also a commonly used tool for obtaining convergence analysis in the multiobjective optimization literature (see [10, 35, 36, 37, 38]). Clearly, Assumption 3.3 implies Assumption 3.1.

According to Assumption 3.3, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mu = \min_{i \in \langle m \rangle} \mu_i$. Then, Assumption 3.3 implies the following relation:*

$$\psi(x^{k+1}, x^{k+1} - x^k) - \psi(x^k, x^{k+1} - x^k) \geq \mu \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. Let $x = x^{k+1}$ and $y = x^k$ in Assumption 3.3. For each $i \in \langle m \rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f_i(x^{k+1})^\top (x^{k+1} - x^k) &\geq \nabla f_i(x^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - x^k) + \mu_i \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\ &\geq \nabla f_i(x^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - x^k) + \mu \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the max operator for all $i \in \langle m \rangle$ in the above inequality, and observing the definition of ψ , we obtain

$$\psi(x^{k+1}, x^{k+1} - x^k) \geq \psi(x^k, x^{k+1} - x^k) + \mu \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Now, we introduce the fixed stepsize strategy for multiobjective optimization. For each $i \in \langle m \rangle$, we consider the following quadratic model:

$$f_i(x^k + td^k) - f_i(x^k) \approx t \nabla f_i(x^k)^\top d^k + \frac{t^2}{2} \|d^k\|_{B^k}^2, \quad (3.2)$$

where B^k is an $n \times n$ positive definite symmetric matrix. From the definition of ψ in (2.2), the right side of (3.2) is less than or equal to $t\psi(x^k, d^k) + t^2\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2/2$, which is a convex quadratic function that has the optimal solution $t = -\psi(x^k, d^k)/\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2$. Upon recognizing this issue, we determine the stepsize in this work by using the following formula rather than the line search procedure:

$$t_k = -\frac{\delta\psi(x^k, d^k)}{\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\delta > 0$ is a scalar. Clearly, if d^k is a descent direction, then $\psi(x^k, d^k) < 0$, and thus $t_k > 0$.

Remark 3.2. If $B^k = I$ (the identity matrix) for all k and $\delta = 1/L$, then (3.3) reduces to the stepsize-II strategy provided in [34]. If $m = 1$, we fall back to single objective optimization, and then (3.3) retrieves to the stepsize strategy proposed by Sun and Zhang [39], which has been further investigated in [40, 41, 42, 43].

If the stepsize is given by formula (3.3), then the following conclusions hold.

Lemma 3.1. *Consider an iteration of the form (1.2), where d^k is a descent direction for F at x^k and t_k satisfies (3.3). For all $k \geq 0$, we have*

$$\psi(x^{k+1}, d^k) = \rho_k \psi(x^k, d^k), \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$\rho_k = 1 - \frac{\delta\eta_k\|d^k\|^2}{\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2} \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$\eta_k = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } t_k = 0, \\ \frac{\psi(x^{k+1}, x^{k+1} - x^k) - \psi(x^k, x^{k+1} - x^k)}{\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2}, & \text{if } t_k \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. It is evident that (3.4) holds when $t_k = 0$. Now consider the case of $t_k \neq 0$. By (1.2), Proposition 2.1(i) and the definition of t_k in (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x^{k+1}, d^k) &= \psi(x^k, d^k) + \psi(x^{k+1}, d^k) - \psi(x^k, d^k) \\ &= \psi(x^k, d^k) + \frac{1}{t_k} (\psi(x^{k+1}, x^{k+1} - x^k) - \psi(x^k, x^{k+1} - x^k)) \\ &= \psi(x^k, d^k) + \frac{\eta_k}{t_k} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\ &= \psi(x^k, d^k) + \eta_k t_k \|d^k\|^2 \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\delta\eta_k\|d^k\|^2}{\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2}\right) \psi(x^k, d^k). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore, if we set $\rho_k = 1 - \delta\eta_k\|d^k\|^2/\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2$ in (3.6), then (3.4) is satisfied and the proof is complete. \square

Assumption 3.4. There exist positive constants a_{\min} and a_{\max} such that

$$a_{\min}\|d\|^2 \leq d^\top B^k d \leq a_{\max}\|d\|^2 \quad (3.7)$$

for all $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $k \geq 0$.

In the subsequent analysis, the parameter $\delta > 0$ is selected such that

$$\delta \in \left(0, \frac{a_{\min}}{L}\right). \quad (3.8)$$

In this case, it can be seen that

$$\frac{L\delta}{a_{\min}} < 1. \quad (3.9)$$

Corollary 3.1. Let ρ_k be as in (3.5). Then, the following statements hold:

(i) if Assumption 3.2 holds, then

$$\rho_k \in \left[1 - \frac{L\delta}{a_{\min}}, 1 + \frac{L\delta}{a_{\min}}\right];$$

(ii) if Assumption 3.3 holds, then

$$\rho_k \in \left(0, 1 - \frac{\mu\delta}{a_{\max}}\right].$$

Proof. From the definition of ρ_k in (3.5), it follows that

$$\rho_k = 1 - \frac{\delta(\psi(x^{k+1}, x^{k+1} - x^k) - \psi(x^k, x^{k+1} - x^k))}{\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2} \frac{\|d^k\|^2}{\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2}. \quad (3.10)$$

By [29, Lemma 4.1] and Assumption 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(x^{k+1}, x^{k+1} - x^k) - \psi(x^k, x^{k+1} - x^k)| &\leq \|JF(x^{k+1}) - JF(x^k)\|_{2,\infty} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \\ &\leq L\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\psi(x^{k+1}, x^{k+1} - x^k) - \psi(x^k, x^{k+1} - x^k)}{\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2} \in [-L, L].$$

This together with (3.10) and (3.7) gives us the bounds for ρ_k in item (i).

The item (ii) follows from (3.1), (3.7) and (3.10). \square

Next, we establish that the iterative form satisfies a condition of Zoutendijk's type, which is subsequently used to prove the global convergence of the CG methods with our stepsize strategy.

Lemma 3.2. Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.4 hold. Consider an iteration of the form (1.2), where d^k is a descent direction for F at x^k and t_k satisfies (3.3). Then

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\psi^2(x^k, d^k)}{\|d^k\|^2} < \infty. \quad (3.11)$$

Proof. It follows from the mean-value theorem that

$$f_i(x^{k+1}) - f_i(x^k) = \nabla f_i(\xi_i^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - x^k) \quad (3.12)$$

for each $i \in \langle m \rangle$, where $\xi_i^k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ lies in the line segment connecting x^k and x^{k+1} . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Assumption 3.2, the definition of ψ , Lemma 2.1(i), (3.3) and (3.7), for each $i \in \langle m \rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla f_i(\xi_i^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - x^k) &= \nabla f_i(x^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - x^k) + (\nabla f_i(\xi_i^k) - \nabla f_i(x^k))^\top (x^{k+1} - x^k) \\
&\leq \nabla f_i(x^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - x^k) + \|\nabla f_i(\xi_i^k) - \nabla f_i(x^k)\| \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \\
&\leq \nabla f_i(x^k)^\top (x^{k+1} - x^k) + L \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\
&\leq t_k \psi(x^k, d^k) + Lt_k^2 \|d^k\|^2 \\
&= -t_k \psi(x^k, d^k) \left(\frac{L\delta \|d^k\|^2}{\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2} - 1 \right) \\
&= \frac{\delta \psi^2(x^k, d^k)}{\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2} \left(\frac{L\delta \|d^k\|^2}{\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2} - 1 \right) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{L\delta^2}{a_{\min}} - \delta \right) \frac{\psi^2(x^k, d^k)}{\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2},
\end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (3.12), yields

$$f_i(x^{k+1}) - f_i(x^k) \leq \delta \left(\frac{L\delta}{a_{\min}} - 1 \right) \frac{\psi^2(x^k, d^k)}{\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2}, \quad (3.13)$$

for each $i \in \langle m \rangle$. This implies that $\{F(x^k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ is monotone decreasing because $L\delta/a_{\min} < 1$ in (3.9) and that

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \frac{\psi^2(x^j, d^j)}{\|d^j\|_{B^j}^2} \leq \frac{a_{\min}}{a_{\min}\delta - L\delta^2} (f_i(x^0) - f_i(x^{k+1}))$$

for each $i \in \langle m \rangle$ and all $k \geq 0$. Then, by Assumption 3.1 and the continuity arguments, since $\{x^k\} \subset \mathcal{L}$, there exists $\bar{F} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\bar{F} \preceq F(x^k)$ for all $k \geq 0$ and

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \frac{\psi^2(x^j, d^j)}{\|d^j\|_{B^j}^2} \leq \frac{a_{\min}}{a_{\min}\delta - L\delta^2} (f_i(x^0) - \bar{F}_i) \quad (3.14)$$

for each $i \in \langle m \rangle$ and all $k \geq 0$. Thus, by (3.7) and (3.14), we obtain

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\psi^2(x^k, d^k)}{\|d^k\|^2} \leq a_{\max} \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\psi^2(x^k, d^k)}{\|d^k\|_{B^k}^2} < \infty,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.3. In [20, Proposition 3.3], the condition of Zoutendijk's type was established using the standard Wolfe conditions. In contrast, our result does not require these conditions. If we replace Assumption 3.1 with Assumption 3.3 in the above lemma, the corresponding conclusion still hold, because Assumption 3.3 implies Assumption 3.1.

Remark 3.4. The multiobjective steepest descent method¹ proposed by Fliege and Svaiter [8] converges in the sense that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v(x^k)\| = 0$, provided that it employs the stepsize rule (3.3) instead of the Armijo

¹In this method, the Armijo line search [8] is proposed to ensure the convergence of the sequence of iterates generated by the method. Specifically, the stepsize t_k is chosen as the largest value from $\{(1/2)^0, (1/2)^1, \dots\}$ such that $F(x^k + t_k d^k) \preceq F(x^k) + \beta t_k JF(x^k) d^k$.

line search. Indeed, consider the iteration (1.2) with $d^k = v(x^k)$ and assume that t_k satisfies (3.3) for all $k \geq 0$. According to the relation $-\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) \geq \|v(x^k)\|^2/2$ in Proposition 2.1(ii), we have

$$\frac{\psi^2(x^k, d^k)}{\|d^k\|^2} = \frac{\psi^2(x^k, v(x^k))}{\|v(x^k)\|^2} \geq \frac{\|v(x^k)\|^2}{4}.$$

Summing the above inequality over all k , and combining it with (3.11), we have $\sum_{k \geq 0} \|v(x^k)\|^2 < \infty$, and thus $\|v(x^k)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

4. Convergence analysis

In this section, we analyze the convergence properties of the CG methods with the vector extensions of FR, CD, DY, PRP and HS parameters and the proposed stepsize rule. We now present the CG algorithm for the multiobjective optimization problem (1.1).

Algorithm 1 CG Algorithm to solve (1.1)

```

1: Input:  $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .
2: for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  do
3:   Compute  $v(x^k)$ ;
4:   if  $v(x^k) = 0$  then
5:     Return Pareto critical point  $x^k$ ;
6:   end if
7:   Select a parameter  $\beta_k$ ;
8:   Compute  $d^k$  using (1.3);
9:   Compute  $t_k$  using (3.3);
10:  Update  $x^{k+1} = x^k + t_k d^k$ ;
11: end for

```

Lemma 4.1. *Consider Algorithm 1 and let Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.4 hold. If $\beta_k \geq 0$, d^k is a descent direction of F at x^k , and $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v(x^k)\| \neq 0$, then*

$$\sum_{d^k \neq 0} \frac{\psi^2(x^k, v(x^k))}{\|d^k\|^2} < \infty. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. It follows from $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v(x^k)\| \neq 0$ that there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\|v(x^k)\| \geq \gamma \quad (4.2)$$

for all $k \geq 0$. Set $\tau_k = |\psi(x^k, d^k)|/\|d^k\|$. From Lemma 3.2, we have $\tau_k \leq \gamma/8$ for all large k and

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \tau_k^2 < \infty. \quad (4.3)$$

From (3.4), Corollary 3.1(i) and (3.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(x^k, d^{k-1})| &= |\rho_{k-1} \psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})| \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{L\delta}{a_{\min}}\right) |\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})| \\ &< 2|\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

By the definition of d^k and Lemma 2.1(i)–(ii), one has

$$\psi(x^k, d^k) = \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \beta_k d^{k-1} \leq \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \beta_k \psi(x^k, d^{k-1}),$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\|d^k\|} &\leq \frac{-\psi(x^k, d^k) + \beta_k \psi(x^k, d^{k-1})}{\|d^k\|} \\ &\leq \frac{|\psi(x^k, d^k)|}{\|d^k\|} + \frac{\beta_k |\psi(x^k, d^{k-1})|}{\|d^k\|} \\ &\leq \tau_k + \frac{2\beta_k |\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})|}{\|d^k\|} \\ &= \tau_k + 2\tau_{k-1} \frac{\|\beta_k d^{k-1}\|}{\|d^k\|} \\ &\leq \tau_k + 2\tau_{k-1} \frac{\|d^k\| + \|v(x^k)\|}{\|d^k\|} \tag{4.5} \\ &= \tau_k + 2\tau_{k-1} + 2\tau_{k-1} \frac{\|v(x^k)\|^2}{\|d^k\| \|v(x^k)\|} \\ &\leq \tau_k + 2\tau_{k-1} + 2\tau_{k-1} \frac{\|v(x^k)\|^2}{\gamma \|d^k\|} \\ &\leq \tau_k + 2\tau_{k-1} + 2 \left(\frac{\gamma}{8} \right) \frac{-2\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\gamma \|d^k\|} \\ &= \tau_k + 2\tau_{k-1} + \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{2\|d^k\|}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows from (4.4), the first equality is due to the definition of τ_k , the fifth inequality follows from (4.2) and the sixth inequality holds in view of the relation $-\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) \geq \|v(x^k)\|^2/2$ and the fact that $\tau_k \leq \gamma/8$. With a rearrangement of (4.5), we can obtain

$$0 \leq \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\|d^k\|} \leq 2\tau_k + 4\tau_{k-1} \leq 4(\tau_k + \tau_{k-1}).$$

This, combined with Lemma 2.2(ii) and (4.3), yields

$$\sum_{d^k \neq 0} \frac{\psi^2(x^k, v(x^k))}{\|d^k\|^2} \leq \sum_{d^k \neq 0} 16(\tau_k + \tau_{k-1})^2 \leq \sum_{d^k \neq 0} 32(\tau_k^2 + \tau_{k-1}^2) < \infty,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Remark 4.1. If we substitute Assumption 3.1 with Assumption 3.3 in the lemma above, the conclusion remains valid since Assumption 3.3 implies Assumption 3.1.

The following three theorems respectively discuss the convergence results of Algorithm 1 with the fixed stepsize formula (3.3) under the FR, CD and DY parameters.

Theorem 4.1. *Consider Algorithm 1 and let $0 < \xi < 1$. Assume that Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.4 hold. If $|\beta_k| \leq \xi \beta_k^{\text{FR}}$ and d^k is a descent direction of F at x^k , then $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v(x^k)\| = 0$.*

Proof. Assume on the contrary that there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\|v(x^k)\| \geq \gamma$$

for all $k \geq 0$. By the definition of d^k , and Lemma 2.2(ii) with $a = \|v(x^k)\|$, $b = |\beta_k| \|d^{k-1}\|$ and $\alpha = \xi/\sqrt{2(1-\xi^2)}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|d^k\|^2 &= \|v(x^k) + \beta_k d^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\leq (\|v(x^k)\| + |\beta_k| \|d^{k-1}\|)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\xi^2} \|v(x^k)\|^2 + \frac{1}{\xi^2} \beta_k^2 \|d^{k-1}\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by $\psi^2(x^k, v(x^k))$ in the above relation, and observing that

$$|\beta_k| \leq \xi \beta_k^{\text{FR}} = \frac{\xi \psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1}))},$$

we have

$$\frac{\|d^k\|^2}{\psi^2(x^k, v(x^k))} \leq \frac{1}{1-\xi^2} \frac{\|v(x^k)\|^2}{\psi^2(x^k, v(x^k))} + \frac{\|d^{k-1}\|^2}{\psi^2(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1}))}.$$

This together with $\gamma^2 \leq \|v(x^k)\|^2 \leq -2\psi(x^k, v(x^k))$ gives us

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\|d^k\|^2}{\psi^2(x^k, v(x^k))} &\leq \frac{\|d^{k-1}\|^2}{\psi^2(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1}))} + \frac{4}{\gamma^2(1-\xi^2)} \\ &\leq \frac{\|d^{k-2}\|^2}{\psi^2(x^{k-2}, v(x^{k-2}))} + \frac{8}{\gamma^2(1-\xi^2)} \\ &\leq \dots \\ &\leq \frac{\|d^0\|^2}{\psi^2(x^0, v(x^0))} + \frac{4k}{\gamma^2(1-\xi^2)} \\ &\leq \frac{4}{\gamma^2} + \frac{4k}{\gamma^2(1-\xi^2)}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\sum_{d^k \neq 0} \frac{\psi^2(x^k, v(x^k))}{\|d^k\|^2} \geq \sum_{d^k \neq 0} \frac{\gamma^2(1-\xi^2)}{4} \frac{1}{k+1} = \infty,$$

contradicting the relation (4.1) and concluding the proof. \square

Theorem 4.2. Consider Algorithm 1 with $\beta_k = \beta_k^{\text{CD}} \geq 0$. If Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.4 hold, then $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v(x^k)\| = 0$.

Proof. According to the definitions of d^k and β_k^{CD} , Lemma 2.1(i)–(ii), (3.4) and Corollary 3.1, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(x^k, d^k) &= \psi\left(x^k, v(x^k) + \frac{\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})} d^{k-1}\right) \\ &\leq \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \frac{\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})} \psi(x^k, d^{k-1}) \\ &= \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \frac{\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})} (\rho_{k-1} \psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})) \\ &= (1 + \rho_{k-1}) \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) < 0,\end{aligned}\tag{4.6}$$

where $\rho_{k-1} > 0$, this means that d^k is a descent direction. From (4.6) and Corollary 3.1, and observing

$\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) < 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_k^{\text{CD}} &= \frac{\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})} \\ &\leq \frac{\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{(1 + \rho_{k-2})\psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1}))} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + \rho_{k-2}}\beta_k^{\text{FR}} \\ &\leq \frac{a_{\min}}{2a_{\min} - L\delta}\beta_k^{\text{FR}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta \in (0, a_{\min}/L)$, we have $a_{\min}/(2a_{\min} - L\delta) \in (0, 1)$. The rest of the proof follows from Theorem 4.1. \square

Theorem 4.3. Consider Algorithm 1 with $\beta_k = \beta_k^{\text{DY}} \geq 0$. Let Assumptions 3.2–3.4 hold and $c = 1 - \mu\delta/a_{\max}$. Then, d^k is a descent direction. Furthermore, if

$$\beta_k = \eta\beta_k^{\text{DY}}, \quad \text{where } 0 < \eta < \frac{1-c}{1+c},$$

then $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v(x^k)\| = 0$.

Proof. It follows from the definition of β_k^{DY} and (3.4) that

$$\beta_k^{\text{DY}} = \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^k, d^{k-1}) - \psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})} = \frac{\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{(1 - \rho_{k-1})\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})}. \quad (4.7)$$

This, combined with the definition of d^k , Lemma 2.1(i)–(ii) and (3.4), gives

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(x^k, d^k) &= \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \beta_k^{\text{DY}} d^{k-1} \\ &\leq \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \beta_k^{\text{DY}} \psi(x^k, d^{k-1}) \\ &= \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \frac{\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{(1 - \rho_{k-1})\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})} (\rho_{k-1} \psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})) \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - \rho_{k-1}} \psi(x^k, v(x^k)).\end{aligned}$$

Using Corollary 3.1(ii), we have $\rho_k \in (-c, c]$ with $0 < c \leq 1$. Therefore, one has

$$\psi(x^k, d^k) \leq \frac{1}{1+c} \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) < 0. \quad (4.8)$$

This implies that d^k is a descent direction.

On the other hand, from (3.4) and (4.8), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(x^k, d^{k-1}) - \psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1}) &= (\rho_{k-1} - 1)\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1}) \\ &\geq (c - 1)\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1}) \\ &\geq \frac{c-1}{1+c} \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1})) > 0.\end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Let $\xi = \eta(1+c)/(1-c)$. Then $\xi \in (0, 1)$. By the definition of β_k and (4.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_k &= \eta\beta_k^{\text{DY}} \\
&= \frac{\xi(1-c)}{1+c} \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^k, d^{k-1}) - \psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})} \\
&= \frac{\xi(1-c)}{1+c} \left(\frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{-\psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1}))} \right) \left(\frac{-\psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1}))}{\psi(x^k, d^{k-1}) - \psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})} \right) \\
&\leq \xi \frac{\psi(x^k, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1}))} \\
&= \xi\beta_k^{\text{FR}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The remainder of the proof follows the same steps as those in the proof of Theorem 4.1. \square

Now, we analyze the convergence of the CG algorithm with the proposed stepsize rule (3.3) under the PRP and HS parameters.

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.4 hold. Consider Algorithm 1 with $\beta_k = \max\{\beta_k^{\text{PRP}}, 0\}$. If d^k is a descent direction, then $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v(x^k)\| = 0$.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that there exists a positive constant γ such that

$$\|v(x^k)\| \geq \gamma$$

for all $k \geq 0$. From the definition of β_k^{PRP} and (3.4), and observing that $\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) \leq -\|v(x^k)\|^2/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\beta_k^{\text{PRP}}| &= \left| \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^k))}{-\psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^{k-1}))} \right| \\
&\leq 2 \frac{|-\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^k))|}{\|v(x^{k-1})\|^2} \\
&\leq \frac{2}{\gamma^2} |-\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^k))|.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the iteration (1.2), the definition of t_k in (3.3) and (3.7), we have

$$\sum_{d^k \neq 0} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 = \sum_{d^k \neq 0} \|t_k d^k\|^2 = \sum_{d^k \neq 0} \frac{\delta^2 \psi^2(x^k, d^k) \|d^k\|^2}{\|d^k\|_{B^k}^4} \leq \frac{\delta^2}{a_{\min}^2} \sum_{d^k \neq 0} \frac{\psi^2(x^k, d^k)}{\|d^k\|^2},$$

which together with Lemma 3.2 gives us $\sum_{d^k \neq 0} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 < \infty$. This implies that $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \rightarrow 0$, and thus $|\beta_k^{\text{PRP}}| \rightarrow 0$ and $\beta_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By the definition of d^k , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|d^k\| &= \|v(x^k) + \beta_k d^{k-1}\| \\
&\leq \|v(x^k)\| + \beta_k \|d^{k-1}\| \\
&\leq \|v(x^k)\| + \beta_k \|v(x^{k-1})\| + \beta_k \beta_{k-1} \|d^{k-2}\| \\
&\leq \dots \\
&\leq \|v(x^k)\| + \beta_k \|v(x^{k-1})\| + \dots + \beta_k \beta_{k-1} \dots \beta_1 \|v(x^0)\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

From Assumption 3.1, it follows that \mathcal{L} is bounded, and thus $\{x^k\} \subset \mathcal{L}$ and $\{\|v(x^k)\|\}$ is bounded using Proposition 2.1(iii). Furthermore, we can obtain $\{\|d^k\|\}$ is bounded, and $\{\|JF(x^k)\|_{2,\infty}\}$ is bounded above because the continuity argument for JF .

Observe that

$$|\psi(x^k, d^{k-1})| = \left| \max_{i \in \langle m \rangle} \langle \nabla f_i(x^k), d^{k-1} \rangle \right| \leq \max_{i \in \langle m \rangle} \|\nabla f_i(x^k)\| \|d^{k-1}\| = \|JF(x^k)\|_{2,\infty} \|d^{k-1}\|.$$

By the definition of d^k , the non-negativeness of β_k and Lemma 2.1(i)–(ii), one has

$$\psi(x^k, d^k) \leq \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \beta_k \psi(x^k, d^{k-1}) \leq \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \beta_k |\psi(x^k, d^{k-1})|,$$

which, together with the relation $\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) \leq -\|v(x^k)\|^2/2$, yields

$$\begin{aligned} -\psi(x^k, d^k) &\geq -\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) - \beta_k |\psi(x^k, d^{k-1})| \\ &\geq \frac{\|v(x^k)\|^2}{2} - \beta_k \|JF(x^k)\|_{2,\infty} \|d^{k-1}\| \\ &\geq \frac{\|v(x^k)\|^2}{4} \\ &\geq \frac{\gamma^2}{4} > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

for large k , where the third inequality holds in view of

$$\beta_k \|d^{k-1}\| \leq \frac{\|v(x^k)\|^2}{4 \|JF(x^k)\|_{2,\infty}}$$

for large k , as $\beta_k \rightarrow 0$ for large k and $\{\|d^{k-1}\|\}$ has a bound. By (4.11) and the upper boundedness of $\|d^k\|$, we conclude that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{d^k \neq 0} \frac{\psi^2(x^k, d^k)}{\|d^k\|^2} \geq \sum_{d^k \neq 0} \frac{\gamma^2}{4} \frac{1}{\|d^k\|^2} \geq \sum_{d^k \neq 0} \frac{\gamma^2}{4c_1} = \infty.$$

This contradicts Lemma 3.2. Therefore, the proof is complete. \square

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.2–3.4 hold. Consider Algorithm 1 with $\beta_k = \max\{\beta_k^{\text{HS}}, 0\}$. If d^k is a descent direction, then $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v(x^k)\| = 0$.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that there exists a positive constant γ such that

$$\|v(x^k)\| \geq \gamma$$

for all $k \geq 0$. By (1.2), the definition of t_k and (3.7), we have

$$\sum_{d^k \neq 0} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 = \sum_{d^k \neq 0} \|t_k d^k\|^2 = \sum_{d^k \neq 0} \frac{\delta^2 \psi^2(x^k, d^k) \|d^k\|^2}{\|d^k\|_{B^k}^4} \leq \frac{\delta^2}{a_{\min}^2} \sum_{d^k \neq 0} \frac{\psi^2(x^k, d^k)}{\|d^k\|^2},$$

which implies that $\sum_{d^k \neq 0} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 < \infty$ because Lemma 3.2. Hence

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \rightarrow 0 \tag{4.12}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By the definition of β_k^{HS} and (3.4), we have

$$\beta_k^{\text{HS}} = \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^k, d^{k-1}) - \psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})} = \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^k))}{(\rho_{k-1} - 1)\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})}. \tag{4.13}$$

Combining it with the definition of d^k and Proposition 2.1(i)–(ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(x^k, d^k) &= \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \beta_k d^{k-1} \\
&\leq \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \beta_k \psi(x^k, d^{k-1}) \\
&= \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \beta_k \rho_{k-1} \psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1}) \\
&= \psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \frac{\rho_{k-1}}{\rho_{k-1} - 1} (-\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^k))).
\end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides of the above inequality by $\psi(x^k, v(x^k))$, and observing that $\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) < 0$ and (4.12), we obtain

$$\frac{\psi(x^k, d^k)}{\psi(x^k, v(x^k))} \geq 1 + \frac{\rho_{k-1}}{\rho_{k-1} - 1} \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^k))}{\psi(x^k, v(x^k))} \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

for large k . Then, remembering that $\|v(x^k)\|^2 \leq -2\psi(x^k, v(x^k))$, we have

$$\frac{4\psi^2(x^k, d^k)}{\|v(x^k)\|^4} \geq \frac{\psi^2(x^k, d^k)}{\psi^2(x^k, v(x^k))} \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

for large k , i.e., $|\psi(x^k, d^k)| \geq \|v(x^k)\|^2/4$ for large k . This, together with (4.13) and Corollary 3.1(ii), yields

$$\begin{aligned}
|\beta_k^{\text{HS}}| &= \left| \frac{-\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^k))}{(1 - \rho_{k-1})\psi(x^{k-1}, d^{k-1})} \right| \\
&\leq \frac{4}{1 - \rho_{k-1}} \frac{|\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^k))|}{\|v(x^{k-1})\|^2} \\
&\leq \frac{4a_{\max}}{\mu\delta} \frac{|\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^k))|}{\|v(x^{k-1})\|^2} \\
&\leq \frac{4a_{\max}}{\mu\delta\gamma^2} |\psi(x^k, v(x^k)) + \psi(x^{k-1}, v(x^k))|,
\end{aligned}$$

which combined with (4.12) yields $|\beta_k^{\text{HS}}| \rightarrow 0$ and $\beta_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. From (4.10), we have that $\{\|d^k\|\}$ is bounded. Then, the remaining proof is the same as that of Theorem 4.4. \square

5. Numerical experiments

This section presents numerical experiments to demonstrate the performance of the proposed stepsize strategy. Our experiments are conducted using MATLAB R2020b on a computer with the following characteristics: 11th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-11390H processor (3.40 GHz) and 16 GB of RAM.

It is noteworthy that the proposed stepsize rule is governed by δ and B^k . In the following, we will begin by discussing how to update these two parameters during the iterations.

5.1. The update techniques of δ and B^k

In our numerical experiments, the case of $B^k = I$ for all $k \geq 0$ shows unsatisfactory convergence behavior. Therefore, we consider another update way for B^k , i.e., $B^0 = I$, and the rest iterations use the modified BFGS update formula:

$$B^{k+1} = \begin{cases} B^k + \frac{y^k (y^k)^\top}{(s^k)^\top y^k} - \frac{B^k s^k (s^k)^\top B^k}{(s^k)^\top B^k s^k}, & (s^k)^\top y^k > 0, \\ B^k, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where

$$s^k = x^{k+1} - x^k,$$

$$y^k = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^k (\nabla f_i(x^{k+1}) - \nabla f_i(x^k)).$$

It is noteworthy that λ_i^k ($i \in \langle m \rangle$) is the optimal solution of (5.2), which slightly differs from the setting of [16, 13, 44].

Since δ in (3.8) depends on the unknown parameters a_{\min} and L , determining its precise value in practice can be quite challenging. If the value of δ is artificially set too large in the test, the CG methods with our stepsize rule may occasionally produce an x^{k+1} such that $F(x^{k+1}) \not\leq F(x^k)$. In theory, as shown in (3.13), this issue can be avoided if δ is sufficiently small. When the case of $F(x^{k+1}) \not\leq F(x^k)$ is detected in practice, we reduce δ by half². Thus, the method will generate a satisfactory iterate after finite steps and finally converge. The technique for setting δ is similar to the approach used in [40] for solving single objective optimization problems.

5.2. Experiments settings

In the following subsections, we present a detailed description of the experimental settings.

5.2.1. Algorithms

In the classical multiobjective steepest descent (SD) method [8], the stepsize was obtained by the Armijo line search. According to Remark 3.4, the SD_no³ method converges. Therefore, we first compare the SD_no method with the SD method. Additionally, we also compare the CG methods using the stepsize (3.3) with the CG methods using the Wolfe-type line search [20]. For brevity, we use “FR_no” to denote the CG method with β_k^{FR} and the proposed stepsize formula. By doing this, we have five distinct algorithms, i.e., FR_no, CD_no, DY_no, PRP_no and HS_no.

All the compared algorithms require solving the optimization problem (2.3) to determine $v(x^k)$. In the test, we consider the corresponding dual problem of (2.3) (see [8]):

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \nabla f_i(x^k) \right\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \lambda \in \Lambda^m, \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where $\Lambda^m = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m : \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i = 1, \lambda_i \geq 0, \forall i \in \langle m \rangle\}$ stands for the simplex. Then, $v(x^k)$ can also be represented as

$$v(x^k) = - \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^k \nabla f_i(x^k),$$

where $\lambda_i^k = (\lambda_1^k, \lambda_2^k, \dots, \lambda_m^k) \in \Lambda^m$ is optimal solution of (5.2). The standard MATLAB subroutine quadprog is adopted to solve the dual problem (5.2).

All runs are stopped whenever $|\theta(x^k)|$ is less than or equal 10^{-6} . Since Proposition 2.1 implies that $v(x) = 0$ if and only if $\theta(x) = 0$, this stopping criterion makes sense. The maximum number of allowed outer iterations is set to 10000. In the Armijo line search [8], we set the parameter $\beta = 10^{-4}$, and in the strong Wolfe line search [20], we set the parameters $\rho_1 = 10^{-4}$ and $\rho_2 = 10^{-1}$.

²The initial value of δ is set to 1.

³We use “SD_no” to denote the SD method [8] with the proposed stepsize formula (3.3).

Table 1. Test problems.

Problem	n	m	x_L	x_U	Source
BK1	2	2	(-5, -5)	(10, 10)	[45]
DD1a ¹	5	2	(-1, ..., -1)	(1, ..., 1)	[46]
DD1b ¹	5	2	(-10, ..., -10)	(10, ..., 10)	[46]
DD1c ¹	5	2	(-20, ..., -20)	(20, ..., 20)	[46]
DGO1	1	2	-10	13	[45]
Far1	2	2	(-1, -1)	(1, 1)	[45]
FDSa	10	3	(-2, ..., -2)	(2, ..., 2)	[10]
FDSb	200	3	(-2, ..., -2)	(2, ..., 2)	[10]
FDSc	500	3	(-2, ..., -2)	(2, ..., 2)	[10]
FDSd	1000	3	(-2, ..., -2)	(2, ..., 2)	[10]
FF1	2	2	(-1, -1)	(1, 1)	[45]
Hil1	2	2	(0, 0)	(1, 1)	[47]
IKK1	2	3	(-50, -50)	(50, 50)	[47]
IM1	2	2	(1, 1)	(4, 2)	[47]
JOS1a	50	2	(-100, ..., -100)	(100, ..., 100)	[48]
JOS1b	500	2	(-100, ..., -100)	(100, ..., 100)	[48]
JOS1c	1000	2	(-100, ..., -100)	(100, ..., 100)	[48]
KW2	2	2	(-3, -3)	(3, 3)	[49]
Lov1	2	2	(-10, -10)	(10, 10)	[50]
Lov3	2	2	(-100, -100)	(100, 100)	[50]
Lov4	2	2	(-20, -20)	(20, 20)	[50]
Lov5	3	2	(-2, -2, -2)	(2, 2, 2)	[50]
MGH16 ²	4	5	(-25, -5, -5, -1)	(25, 5, 5, 1)	[51]
MGH26 ²	4	4	(-1, -1, -1, -1)	(1, 1, 1, 1)	[51]
MOP2	2	2	(-4, -4)	(4, 4)	[45]
MOP3	2	2	(- π , - π)	(π , π)	[45]
MOP5	2	3	(-30, -30)	(30, 30)	[45]
PNR	2	2	(-2, -2)	(2, 2)	[52]
MMR5a	50	2	(-5, ..., -5)	(5, ..., 5)	[53]
MMR5b	200	2	(-5, ..., -5)	(5, ..., 5)	[53]
MMR5c	500	2	(-5, ..., -5)	(5, ..., 5)	[53]
SLCDT2	10	3	(-1, ..., -1)	(1, ..., 1)	[54]
SP1	2	2	(-100, -100)	(100, 100)	[45]
SSFYY2	1	2	-100	100	[45]
Toi9 ²	4	4	(-1, -1, -1, -1)	(1, 1, 1, 1)	[55]
Toi10 ²	4	3	(-2, -2, -2, -2)	(2, 2, 2, 2)	[55]
VU1	2	2	(-3, -3)	(3, 3)	[45]

¹This is a modified version of DD1 (see [33] for more details).

²This is an adaptation of a single objective optimization problem to the multiobjective setting (see [33] for more details).

5.2.2. Test problems

We select 37 test problems, consisting of both convex and nonconvex multiobjective optimization problems, as shown in Table 1. The first column identifies the problem name. The second and third columns, labeled as “ n ” and “ m ”, respectively, inform the number of variables and the number of objective functions of the problem. The initial points are generated within a box defined by the lower and upper bounds, denoted as x_L and x_U , respectively. The last column indicates the corresponding reference. It is important to emphasize that the boxes presented in Table 1 are exclusively used for specifying the initial points and are not considered by the algorithms during their execution.

Taking into account of numerical reasons, we use a scaled version of (1.1), which was proposed in [22, 56], i.e.,

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (r_1 f_1(x), r_2 f_2(x), \dots, r_m f_m(x))^\top, \quad (5.3)$$

where the scaling factors are computed as $r_i = 1/\max\{1, \|\nabla f_i(x^0)\|_\infty\}$, $i \in \langle m \rangle$, x^0 is the given initial point. As illustrated in [22, 29, 56], (1.1) is equivalent to (5.3), since they have the same Pareto critical points.

5.2.3. Metrics

All problems are solved 100 times using initial points from a uniform random distribution inside a box specified in Table 1. The numerical results are reported by the median number of iterations (Iter), the median number of function evaluations (Feval), the median number of gradient evaluations (Geval) and the percentage of runs that have reached a critical point (%).

To compare the ability of the algorithms to properly generate Pareto front approximations, we use the well-known *Purity* and (Γ and Δ) *Spread* metrics [57]. Roughly speaking, the Purity metric measures the ability of the algorithm to find points on the Pareto front of the problem, and the Spread metric measures the ability of the algorithm to obtain well-distributed points along the Pareto front.

In order to compare the performance of the tested algorithms more clearly, we use the performance profiles⁴ proposed by Dolan and Moré [58].

5.3. Results analysis

In this section, we begin by comparing the performance of the SD method with that of the SD_no method. Table 2 lists the performance results of the two algorithms on the benchmark instances. It can be seen that the SD method does not outperform the SD_no method in terms of the number of iterations and gradient evaluations for all test problems. However, for function evaluations, the SD_no method performs worse than the SD method on FDSa–FDSd and MOP2. For IM1 and MMR5c, the SD method struggles to converge within the maximum number of iterations, whereas the SD_no method converges with fewer iterations. To offer a more intuitive representation of the numerical results, Fig. 1 presents the performance profiles for the number of iterations, function evaluations and gradient evaluations. As observed, the SD_no method outperforms the SD method in finding stationary points on all test problems. Fig. 2 shows the Purity and (Δ and Γ) Spread performance profiles for the SD method and the SD_no method. It can be observed that the SD_no method outperforms the SD method in terms of the Purity and Γ metrics, while the SD method shows better performance than the SD_no method with respect to the Δ metric when $\tau > 1.2$. Overall, the stepsize strategy we proposed performs better than the multiobjective Armijo line search strategy in the experimental setting of this paper.




Fig. 1. Performance profiles using the number of iterations, the number of function evaluations and the number of gradient evaluations as the performance measurements for the SD and SD_no methods.

⁴The performance profiles in this paper are generated using the MATLAB code `perfprof.m`, which is freely available on the website <https://github.com/higham/matlab-guide-3ed/blob/master/perfprof.m>.

Table 2. Numerical results of SD and SD_no on the chosen set of test problems.

Problem	SD				SD_no			
	Iter	Feval	Geval	%	Iter	Feval	Geval	%
BK1	29	60	60	100	2	6	6	100
DD1a	34	70	70	100	6	16	14	100
DD1b	30	62	62	100	5	15	12	100
DD1c	31	64	64	100	5	14	12	100
DGO1	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	100
Far1	18.5	67	39	100	13	63	28	100
FDSa	31	96	96	100	11	60	36	100
FDSb	106.5	322.5	322.5	100	44	483	135	100
FDSc	124.5	376.5	376.5	100	49	546	150	100
FDSd	135	408	408	100	52	582	159	100
FF1	21	44	44	100	9	30	20	100
Hil1	6	32	14	100	6	24	14	100
IKK1	59.5	181.5	181.5	100	2	9	9	100
IM1	10000	20002	20002	0	21	112	44	100
JOS1a	173	348	348	100	2	6	6	100
JOS1b	1472.5	2947	2947	100	2	6	6	100
JOS1c	2775	5552	5552	100	2	6	6	100
KW2	10.5	41	23	100	7	23	16	100
Lov1	35.5	73	73	100	4	10	10	100
Lov3	80	162	162	100	3	8	8	100
Lov4	81	164	164	100	2	6	6	100
Lov5	71	150	144	100	8	20	18	100
MGH16	59.5	310	302.5	100	2	15	15	100
MGH26	11	48	48	100	5	24	24	100
MOP2	6	14	14	100	5	16	12	100
MOP3	15.5	35	33	100	6	20	14	100
MOP5	16	51	51	100	4	15	15	100
PNR	5	14	12	100	3	8	8	100
MMR5a	2220.5	4443	4443	100	45.5	440	93	100
MMR5b	6534	13070	13070	100	9.5	47	21	100
MMR5c	10000	20002	20002	0	6	18	14	100
SLCDT2	18	57	57	100	7	25.5	24	100
SP1	945.5	1893	1893	100	7	17	16	100
SSFYY2	128	258	258	100	4	10	10	100
Toi9	9	50	40	100	6	36	28	100
Toi10	52	208.5	159	100	11.5	42	37.5	100
VU1	151	304	304	100	69.5	584	141	100

Next, we compare the FR_no, CD_no, DY_no, PRP_no and HS_no methods to determine which parameter, β_k , is most effective under the proposed stepsize strategy. The numerical results of these five methods on the chosen set of test problems are listed in Table 3. From this table, we can see that all five methods are able to reach critical points within the given maximum number of iterations. Fig. 3 shows the results comparing the algorithms using as the performance measurement: the number of iterations, the number of function evaluations and the number of gradient evaluations. Considering the number of iterations, the HS_no method is the most effective (82.9%), followed by the PRP_no method (78.0%), the DY_no method (39.0%), the CD_no method (36.6%) method and the FR_no method (31.7%). In terms of function and gradient evaluations, the HS_no and the PRP_no method clearly exhibit comparable performance, outperforming the rest three methods. Figs. 4 and 5 show the Purity and (Δ and Γ) spread performance profiles for these algorithms. As recommended in [57], for the Purity metric, we compare the algorithms in pairs. For the Purity metric, it can be seen that HS_no exhibits the best performance, followed closely by PRP_no. For the Δ metric, there is no significant difference between FR_no and HS_no, both of which perform slightly better than the other methods. For the Γ metric, no significant differences are observed among the considered algorithms.




Fig. 2. Performance profiles using the Purity and (Δ and Γ) spread as the performance measurements for the SD and SD_no methods.




Fig. 3. Performance profiles using the number of iterations, the number of function evaluations and the number of gradient evaluations as the performance measurements for the FR_no, CD_no, DY_no, PRP_no and HS_no methods.




Fig. 4. Purity performance profiles of the FR_no, CD_no, DY_no, PRP_no and HS_no methods.

Table 3. Numerical results of the FR_no, CD_no, DY_no, PRP_no and HS_no methods on the chosen set of test problems.

Problem	FR_no				CD_no				DY_no				PRP_no				HS_no			
	Iter	Feval	Geval	%	Iter	Feval	Geval	%	Iter	Feval	Geval	%	Iter	Feval	Geval	%	Iter	Feval	Geval	%
BK1	4	10	10	100	4	10	10	100	4	10	10	100	2	6	6	0	2	6	6	100
DD1a	151	448	304	100	83.5	497	169	100	26.5	97	55	100	6.5	16	15	0	6	16	14	100
DD1b	127	298	256	100	79	420	160	100	19	57	40	100	6	16	14	0	6	16	14	100
DD1c	126.5	269	255	100	79	516	160	100	15	41	32	100	6	16	14	0	6	16	14	100
DGO1	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	0	2	6	6	100
Far1	517	2068	1036	100	254	1102	510	100	42.5	196	87	100	24	117	50	0	20.5	114	43	100
FDSa	516	3091.5	1551	100	177	1125	534	100	41	246	126	100	11	60	36	0	11	60	36	100
FDSb	2574.5	29986.5	7726.5	100	1649.5	19188	4951.5	100	215	2475	648	100	44	483	135	0	44	483	135	100
FDSc	3042	35907	9129	100	1550.5	18483	4654.5	100	241	2797.5	726	100	49	546	150	0	49	546	150	100
FDSd	3390	40174.5	10173	100	1525.5	18646.5	4579.5	100	255	2973	768	100	52	582	159	0	52	582	159	100
FF1	114	310	230	100	122.5	640	247	100	21	71	44	100	10	32	22	0	10	33	22	100
Hil1	61	224	124	100	219	1241	440	100	13	49	28	100	7.5	29	17	0	7	27	16	100
IKK1	2	9	9	100	2	9	9	100	2	9	9	100	2	9	9	0	2	9	9	100
IM1	958.5	5764	1919	100	789.5	5336	1581	100	83.5	486	169	100	23	120	48	0	22	114	46	100
JOS1a	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	0	2	6	6	100
JOS1b	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	0	2	6	6	100
JOS1c	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	0	2	6	6	100
KW2	45.5	135	93	100	99	528	200	100	13	36	28	100	10	28	22	0	10	33	22	100
Lov1	4	10	10	100	4	10	10	100	4	10	10	100	4	10	10	0	4	10	10	100
Lov3	3	8	8	100	3.5	9	9	100	3	8	8	100	3	8	8	0	3	8	8	100
Lov4	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	100	2	6	6	0	2	6	6	100
Lov5	7	16	16	100	7	16	16	100	7	16	16	100	7	18	16	0	7	16	16	100
MGH16	2	15	15	100	2	15	15	100	2	15	15	100	2	15	15	0	2	15	15	100
MGH26	5	24	24	100	4	26	20	100	5	24	24	100	5	24	24	0	5	28	24	100
MHHM2	2	9	9	100	2	9	9	100	2	9	9	100	3	168	12	0	2.5	10.5	10.5	100
MOP2	34	74	70	100	65.5	235	133	100	11	28	24	100	6	18	14	0	6.5	20	15	100
MOP3	20	49	42	100	31.5	118	65	100	10	26	22	100	7	22	16	0	7	23	16	100
MOP5	4	18	15	100	4	16.5	15	100	4	16.5	15	100	4	15	15	0	4	15	15	100
MOP7	9	30	30	100	7	24	24	100	8	27	27	100	8	27	27	0	7	24	24	100
PNR	5	12	12	100	5	12	12	100	4	12	10	100	4	10	10	0	4	10	10	100
MMR5a	3302	43628	6606	100	837	11390	1676	100	234	3048	470	100	109	1198	220	0	116.5	1483	235	100
MMR5b	664	7051	1330	100	72	680	146	100	20.5	175	43	100	14.5	61	31	0	14.5	69	31	100
MMR5c	33.5	239	69	100	8	27	18	100	5	16	12	100	8	20	18	0	8	20	18	100
SLCDT2	73	255	222	100	135.5	1062	409.5	100	13	45	42	100	8	31.5	27	0	8	33	27	100
SP1	5.5	14	13	100	5	12	12	100	6	14	14	100	7	18	16	0	7	17	16	100
SSFYY2	4	10	10	100	4	10	10	100	4	10	10	100	4	10	10	0	4	10	10	100
Toi9	17.5	90	74	100	41	334	168	100	8	44	36	100	7	40	32	0	7	36	32	100
Toi10	8	27	27	100	7.5	25.5	25.5	100	7	24	24	100	10.5	36	34.5	0	9	36	30	100
VU1	4317.5	43007	8637	100	1112.5	11105	2227	100	355.5	2888	713	100	72	607	146	0	72.5	601	147	100




Fig. 5. Spread performance profiles of the FR_no, CD_no, DY_no, PRP_no and HS_no methods.

It has been observed in [20, pp. 2713] that the HS and PRP methods, when applied with the strong Wolfe line search (i.e., (1.4) and (1.5)), are equivalent and exhibit superior performance compared to the FR, CD and DY methods under the same line search. From Fig. 3, it can be seen that the PRP_no and HS_no methods exhibit similar performance and show a certain advantage over the other three methods, namely FR_no, CG_no and DY_no. Therefore, we next compare the proposed method, HS_no, with the HS method [20]. The numerical results obtained by the two algorithms for the selected instances are shown in Table 4. When considering the iterations as an evaluation metric, the HS_no method outperforms the HS method in the following 17 problem instances: BK1, DD1a–DD1c, FDSa–FDSd, Hil1, IM1, Lov4, MMR5a–MMR5c, Toi9, Toi10 and VU1. The HS_no method is identical to the HS method in 6 problem instances: DGO1, Lov3, MGH16, PNR, SLCDT2 and SP1. In terms of function and gradient evaluations, the HS method outperforms the HS_no method only on MOP5. The performance profiles obtained by the two algorithms are shown in Fig. 6. From the first figure of Fig. 6, it can be seen that when $\tau < 1.5$, the HS_no method show a significant advantage over the HS method. However, when $\tau \geq 1.5$, the HS_no method does not outperform the HS method. From the second and third figures of Fig. 6, it is easy to see that the HS_no method surpasses the HS method in function and gradient evaluations. The performance profiles of the Purity and Spread metrics are shown in Fig. 7. As can be seen, the HS_no method is better than the HS method for the Purity and Δ metrics, whereas no significant difference is noticed for the Γ metric.

In summary, our numerical results on the selected benchmark problems indicate that, without consuming the number of objective function evaluations, the proposed stepsize strategy outperforms the multiobjective Armijo line search [8] and is competitive with multiobjective Wolfe-type line searches [20].

6. Conclusion and remarks

In this paper, we proposed a new stepsize strategy defined by the formula (3.3) in multiobjective optimization, and successfully applied it to the CG methods proposed in [20]. The Zoutendijk-type condition for multiobjective optimization are established when using the proposed fixed stepsize formula. Our results reveal an interesting property of the CG methods for some choices of β_k , i.e., the global convergence can be guaranteed under mild assumptions by using the proposed stepsize rule rather than the Wolfe-type conditions. Numerical experiments on a set of test problems indicate that the proposed stepsize scheme outperforms the multiobjective Armijo line search and is competitive with the Wolfe-type conditions.

As part of our future research agenda, we would like to further construct alternative way for updating the matrix B^k and investigate the adaptive updating way for the parameter δ . Secondly, we aim to apply the proposed stepsize rule to other variants of multiobjective conjugate gradient methods [21, 22, 28]. Addi-

Table 4. Numerical results of the HS and HS_no methods on the chosen set of test problems.

Problem	HS				HS_no			
	Iter	Feval	Geval	%	Iter	Feval	Geval	%
BK1	4	39	34	100	2	6	6	100
DD1a	9	71	63	100	6	16	14	100
DD1b	9	71	62	100	6	16	14	100
DD1c	9	71	62	100	6	16	14	100
DGO1	2	13	11	100	2	6	6	100
Far1	15.5	131.5	113	100	20.5	114	43	100
FDSa	17	291	257	100	11	60	36	100
FDSb	55	1008	898	100	44	483	135	100
FDSc	64	1235	1107	100	49	546	150	100
FDSd	70	1362	1222	100	52	582	159	100
FF1	8.5	88	77	100	10	33	22	100
Hil1	7.5	83.5	72.5	100	7	27	16	100
IKK1	1	17	15	100	2	9	9	100
IM1	35	703	633	100	22	114	46	100
JOS1a	1	9	8	100	2	6	6	100
JOS1b	1	10	9	100	2	6	6	100
JOS1c	1	10	9	100	2	6	6	100
KW2	7	74	63	100	10	33	22	100
Lov1	3	30	26	100	4	10	10	100
Lov3	3	25	22	100	3	8	8	100
Lov4	3	27	24	100	2	6	6	100
Lov5	4	35	31	100	7	16	16	100
MGH16	2	85.5	76.5	100	2	15	15	100
MGH26	2	45	40	100	5	28	24	100
MOP2	6	71	61	100	6.5	20	15	100
MOP3	6	63	55.5	100	7	23	16	100
MOP5	1	12	11	100	4	15	15	100
PNR	4	33.5	28.5	100	4	10	10	100
MMR5a	125	2091	1889.5	100	116.5	1483	235	100
MMR5b	36.5	420	379.5	100	14.5	69	31	100
MMR5c	14	303.5	277	100	8	20	18	100
SLCDT2	8	104	91.5	100	8	33	27	100
SP1	7	88	77.5	100	7	17	16	100
SSFYY2	1	14	12	100	4	10	10	100
Toi9	8	228.5	203	100	7	36	32	100
Toi10	17	426.5	374	100	9	36	30	100
VU1	90.5	1675.5	1494.5	100	72.5	601	147	100




Fig. 6. Performance profiles using the number of iterations, the number of function evaluations and the number of gradient evaluations as the performance measurements for the HS and HS_no methods.




Fig. 7. Purity and Spread performance profiles of the HS and HS.no methods.

tionally, we hope that stepsize technique can also be useful for other multiobjective descent algorithms, such as multiobjective quasi-Newton algorithm [15, 16, 13]. In scalar optimization case, Dai [59] showed that the global convergence properties for some conjugate gradient methods with constant stepsize, which opens up an intriguing new avenue for theoretical research in multiobjective optimization.

References

References

- [1] G. P. Rangaiah, A. Bonilla-Petriciolet, Multi-Objective Optimization in Chemical Engineering, John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- [2] C. Zopounidis, E. Galariotis, M. Doumpos, S. Sarri, K. Andriopoulos, Multiple criteria decision aiding for finance: An updated bibliographic survey, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 247 (2) (2015) 339–348.
- [3] J. Fliege, OLAF—A general modeling system to evaluate and optimize the location of an air polluting facility, *OR Spektrum.* 23 (2001) 117–136.
- [4] M. Tavana, M. A. Sodenkamp, L. Suhl, A soft multi-criteria decision analysis model with application to the European Union enlargement, *Ann. Oper. Res.* 181 (2010) 393–421.
- [5] Y. Jin, Multi-Objective Machine Learning, Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [6] K. Miettinen, Nonlinear Multiobjective Optimization, Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- [7] E. Eichfelder, Adaptive Scalarization Methods in Multiobjective Optimization, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.
- [8] J. Fliege, B. F. Svaiter, Steepest descent methods for multicriteria optimization, *Math. Methods Oper. Res.* 51 (2000) 479–494.
- [9] L. M. Graña Drummond, B. F. Svaiter, A steepest descent method for vector optimization, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 175 (2) (2005) 395–414.
- [10] J. Fliege, L. M. Graña Drummond, B. F. Svaiter, Newton’s method for multiobjective optimization, *SIAM J. Optim.* 20 (2) (2009) 602–626.

- [11] J. Wang, Y. Hu, C. K. Wai Yu, C. Li, X. Yang, Extended Newton methods for multiobjective optimization: Majorizing function technique and convergence analysis, *SIAM J. Optim.* 29 (3) (2019) 2388–2421.
- [12] Ž. Povalej, Quasi-newton’s method for multiobjective optimization, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 255 (2014) 765–777.
- [13] M. Lapucci, P. Mansueto, A limited memory Quasi-Newton approach for multi-objective optimization, *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 85 (1) (2023) 33–73.
- [14] S. Qu, M. Goh, F. T. Chan, Quasi-Newton methods for solving multiobjective optimization, *Oper. Res. Lett.* 39 (5) (2011) 397–399.
- [15] L. Prudente, D. R. Souza, A quasi-Newton method with Wolfe line searches for multiobjective optimization, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 194 (3) (2022) 1107–1140.
- [16] M. A. T. Ansary, G. Panda, A modified quasi-Newton method for vector optimization problem, *Optimization.* 64 (11) (2015) 2289–2306.
- [17] G. A. Carrizo, P. A. Lotito, M. C. Maciel, Trust region globalization strategy for the nonconvex unconstrained multiobjective optimization problem, *Math. Program.* 159 (2016) 339–369.
- [18] V. A. Ramirez, G. N. Sottosanto, Nonmonotone trust region algorithm for solving the unconstrained multiobjective optimization problems, *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 81 (3) (2022) 769–788.
- [19] V. Morovati, L. Pourkarimi, H. Basirzadeh, Barzilai and Borwein’s method for multiobjective optimization problems, *Numer. Algor.* 72 (2016) 539–604.
- [20] L. R. Lucambio Pérez, L. F. Prudente, Nonlinear conjugate gradient methods for vector optimization, *SIAM J. Optim.* 28 (3) (2018) 2690–2720.
- [21] M. L. Gonçalves, L. Prudente, On the extension of the Hager–Zhang conjugate gradient method for vector optimization, *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 76 (3) (2020) 889–916.
- [22] M. L. Gonçalves, F. S. Lima, L. Prudente, A study of Liu-Storey conjugate gradient methods for vector optimization, *Appl. Math. Comput.* 425 (2022) 127099.
- [23] P. Assunção, O. P. Ferreira, L. Prudente, Conditional gradient method for multiobjective optimization, *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 78 (2021) 741–768.
- [24] W. Chen, X. Yang, Y. Zhao, Conditional gradient method for vector optimization, *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 85 (3) (2023) 857–896.
- [25] H. Tanabe, E. H. Fukuda, N. Yamashita, Proximal gradient methods for multiobjective optimization and their applications, *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 72 (2019) 339–361.
- [26] H. Tanabe, E. H. Fukuda, N. Yamashita, An accelerated proximal gradient method for multiobjective optimization, *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 86 (2) (2023) 421–455.
- [27] B. B. Upadhyay, R. K. Pandey, J. Pan, S. Zeng, Quasi-Newton algorithms for solving interval-valued multiobjective optimization problems by using their certain equivalence, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 438 (2024) 115550.
- [28] J. Yahaya, P. Kumam, Efficient hybrid conjugate gradient techniques for vector optimization, *Res. Control Optim.* 14 (2024) 100348.

- [29] Q. Hu, L. Zhu, Y. Chen, Alternative extension of the Hager–Zhang conjugate gradient method for vector optimization, *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 88 (2024) 217–250.
- [30] J. Yahaya, P. Kumam, A. Bello, K. Sitthithakerngkiet, On the dai–liao conjugate gradient method for vector optimization, *Optimization* (2024) 1–31.
- [31] S. Najafi, M. Hajarian, Multiobjective conjugate gradient methods on Riemannian manifolds, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 197 (3) (2023) 1229–1248.
- [32] K. Chen, E. H. Fukuda, H. Sato, Nonlinear conjugate gradient method for vector optimization on Riemannian manifolds with retraction and vector transport, *Appl. Math. Comput.* 486 (2025) 129001.
- [33] K. Mita, E. H. Fukuda, N. Yamashita, Nonmonotone line searches for unconstrained multiobjective optimization problems, *J. Global Optim.* 75 (1) (2019) 63–90.
- [34] W. Chen, X. Yang, Y. Zhao, Memory gradient method for multiobjective optimization, *Appl. Math. Comput.* 443 (2023) 127791.
- [35] E. H. Fukuda, L. M. Graña Drummond, A survey on multiobjective descent methods, *Pesq. Oper.* 34 (2014) 585–620.
- [36] L. Zeng, Y. Dai, Y. Huang, Convergence rate of gradient descent method for multi-objective optimization, *J. Comput. Math.* 37 (5) (2019) 689.
- [37] H. Tanabe, E. H. Fukuda, N. Yamashita, Convergence rates analysis of a multiobjective proximal gradient method, *Optim. Lett.* 17 (2) (2023) 333–350.
- [38] J. Fliege, A. I. F. Vaz, L. N. Vicente, Complexity of gradient descent for multiobjective optimization, *Optim. Methods Softw.* 34 (5) (2019) 949–959.
- [39] J. Sun, J. Zhang, Global convergence of conjugate gradient methods without line search, *Ann. Oper. Res.* 103 (2001) 161–173.
- [40] X. Chen, J. Sun, Global convergence of a two-parameter family of conjugate gradient methods without line search, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 146 (1) (2002) 37–45.
- [41] L. Zhang, A globally convergent BFGS method for nonconvex minimization without line searches, *Optim. Methods Softw.* 20 (6) (2005) 737–747.
- [42] H. Zhu, X. Chen, Global convergence of a special case of the Dai–Yuan family without line search, *Asia-Pacific J. Oper. Res.* 25 (03) (2008) 411–420.
- [43] S. Indrapriyadarsini, S. Mahboubi, H. Ninomiya, H. Asai, Implementation of a modified Nesterov’s accelerated quasi-Newton method on Tensorflow, in: 2018 17th IEEE International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications (ICMLA), IEEE, 2018, pp. 1147–1154.
- [44] J. Chen, G. Li, X. Yang, Variable metric method for unconstrained multiobjective optimization problems, *J. Oper. Res. Soc. China* 11 (3) (2023) 409–438.
- [45] S. Huband, P. Hingston, L. Barone, L. While, A review of multiobjective test problems and a scalable test problem toolkit, *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.* 10 (5) (2006) 477–506.
- [46] I. Das, J. E. Dennis, Normal-boundary intersection: A new method for generating the pareto surface in nonlinear multicriteria optimization problems, *SIAM J. Optim.* 8 (3) (1998) 631–657.

- [47] C. Hillermeier, Generalized homotopy approach to multiobjective optimization, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 110 (3) (2001) 557–583.
- [48] Y. Jin, M. Olhofer, B. Sendhoff, Dynamic weighted aggregation for evolutionary multi-objective optimization: Why does it work and how, in: *Proceedings of the genetic and evolutionary computation conference*, 2001, pp. 1042–1049.
- [49] I. Y. Kim, O. L. De Weck, Adaptive weighted-sum method for bi-objective optimization: Pareto front generation, *Struct. Multidiscip. Optim.* 29 (2005) 149–158.
- [50] A. Lovison, Singular continuation: Generating piecewise linear approximations to Pareto sets via global analysis, *SIAM J. Optim.* 21 (2) (2011) 463–490.
- [51] J. J. Moré, B. S. Garbow, K. E. Hillstom, Testing unconstrained optimization software, *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.* 7 (1) (1981) 17–41.
- [52] M. Preuss, B. Naujoks, G. Rudolph, Pareto set and EMOA behavior for simple multimodal multiobjective functions, in: *International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature*, Springer, 2006, pp. 513–522.
- [53] E. Miglierina, E. Molho, M. C. Recchioni, Box-constrained multi-objective optimization: a gradient-like method without “a priori” scalarization, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 188 (3) (2008) 662–682.
- [54] O. Schütze, M. Laumanns, C. A. Coello Coello, M. Dellnitz, E.-G. Talbi, Convergence of stochastic search algorithms to finite size Pareto set approximations, *J. Global Optim.* 41 (2008) 559–577.
- [55] P. L. Toint, Test problems for partially separable optimization and results for the routine PSPMIN, The University of Namur, Department of Mathematics, Belgium, Tech. Rep.
- [56] M. L. Gonçalves, F. S. Lima, L. Prudente, Globally convergent Newton-type methods for multiobjective optimization, *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 83 (2) (2022) 403–434.
- [57] A. L. Custódio, J. A. Madeira, A. I. F. Vaz, L. N. Vicente, Direct multisearch for multiobjective optimization, *SIAM J. Optim.* 21 (3) (2011) 1109–1140.
- [58] E. D. Dolan, J. J. Moré, Benchmarking optimization software with performance profiles, *Math. Program.* 91 (2002) 201–213.
- [59] Y. Dai, Convergence of conjugate gradient methods with constant stepsizes, *Optim. Methods Softw.* 26 (6) (2011) 895–909.