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#### Abstract

We propose a non-monotone line search combination rule for unconstrained optimization problems, the corresponding non-monotone search algorithm is established and its global convergence can be proved. Finally, we use some numerical experiments to illustrate the new combination of non-monotone search algorithm's effectiveness.
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## 1. IN TRODUCTION

Unconstrained optimization problems

$$
\min _{x \in R^{n}} f(x)
$$

Has wide application background. Many authors have devoted a lot of time and effort to the algorithm research of unconstrained optimization problems [1]. The algorithm is generally solved by iterative method. At the current iteration point $x_{k}, g_{k}=\nabla f\left(x_{k}\right) \neq 0$, then step length $\alpha_{k}$ is determined along the search direction $d_{k}$, the next iteration point obtained by (1.1).

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{k+1}=x_{k}+\alpha_{k} d_{k} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In (1.1), there are many algorithms for $d_{k}$, Since the BFGS is currently the best quasi-newton method, and gives a convenient algorithm program. In this paper we use BFGS algorithm :

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{k}=-H_{k} g_{k}, \text { and if } g_{k}^{T} d_{k} \geq 0, \text { let } d_{k}=-g_{k} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where, $g_{k}=\nabla f\left(x_{k}\right) \neq 0, H_{k}$ are generated by the BFGS correction formula.

In (1.1), $\alpha_{k}$ can be produced by the Arimijo rule, Goldstein rule and Wolfe rule [1] that are all classic monotone line search rules. Recent research [2-4] indicates that the monotone line search method may considerably reduce the rate of convergence when the iteration point $x_{k}$ is trapped near a narrow curved valley, so the non-monotone line search method was proposed by Grippo et al. [4]. As a result, it is helpful to overcome this drawback. Some numerical experiments also show that the non-monotone line search method is effective. From non-monotone line search rule [210], the inequality $f\left(x_{k+1}\right)>f\left(x_{k}\right)$ may hold for any k , which play the non-monotone search role. However, the above non-monotone line search rules required conditions are $f\left(x_{k}\right) \leq f\left(x_{0}\right)$. Under this condition, if $x_{0}$ is near

[^0]bottom of the valley, $x_{k}$ is difficult to get out of this valley and search for a better point. Therefore, we improve nonmonotone line search methods, and prove the global convergence property by virtue of $[2,3,11]$. With the help of numerical experiments it is shown that the proposed method is very effective.

## 2. NONMONOTONE COMBINATION RULE FOR LINE SEARCHES

In this section we establish a non-monotone combination rules. First of all, we give the assumption and definition as follows.

Assumption 1. The function $f: R^{n} \rightarrow R$ is bounded and differentiable on the level set

$$
\Omega=\left\{x \mid f(x) \leq c f\left(x_{0}\right), \text { constant } c \geq 1\right\}
$$

And $f(x)>0$.
If $\min f_{1}(x)=-\infty$, it is meaningless to solve the problem $\min f_{1}(x)$. So we assume $\inf f_{1}(x)=w$. If $f_{1}(x) \leq 0$, take fixed constant $\beta>|w|$, such that $f_{1}(x)+\beta=f(x)>0$. Obviously, $f(x)$ and $f_{1}(x)+\beta$ have the same extreme value point, derivative and continuous roundedness. Therefore, it is feasible to set $f(x)>0$.

Definition 1. The function $\sigma:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow[0,+\infty)$ is a forcing function ( F - function), if for any sequence $\left\{t_{i}\right\} \subset[0,+\infty)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{i \rightarrow \infty} \sigma\left(t_{i}\right)=0 \text { implies } \lim _{i \rightarrow \infty} t_{i}=0 \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we give the non-monotone combination rule for line searches as follows. Let $\alpha_{k} \geq 0$ be bounded and satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
f\left(x_{k+1}\right)=f\left(x_{k}+\alpha_{k} d_{k}\right) \leq \sum_{r=o}^{m(k)} \lambda_{k r} f\left(x_{k-r}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{k}\right) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $m(k)=\min [k, M-1]$, with $M \geq 1$, a positive integer,

$$
\sum_{r=o}^{m(k)} \lambda_{k r}=\mu_{k} \geq 1, \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu_{k}=c(c \text { is a limited constant })
$$

$\lambda_{k r} \geq \lambda, \lambda \in(0,1), \sigma c t_{k}$ is a forcing function [2], with $t_{k}=-g_{k}^{T} d_{k} /\left\|d_{k}\right\| \geq 0$.

In (2.2), when $M=1$ and $\lambda_{k 0}=1$, we have
$f\left(x_{k}+\alpha_{k} d_{k}\right) \leq f\left(x_{k}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{k}\right)$,
Where $\left.\sigma c t_{k}\right) \leq \alpha_{k} \rho-g_{k}^{T} d_{k}$, combination rule become Arimijo rule.

If $f\left(x_{k-l}\right)=\max _{0 \leq r \leq m(k)}\left\{f\left(x_{k-r}\right)\right\}$, take $\lambda_{k l}=1, \lambda_{k r}=0(r \neq l)$, then from (2.2) were:
$f\left(x_{k}+\alpha_{k} d_{k}\right) \leq \max _{0 \leq j \leq m(k)}\left\{f\left(x_{k-j}\right)\right\}-\sigma\left(t_{k}\right)$,
Which was the search rule proposed by Grippo et al. [4]. It is visible that combination rule is more universal and meanwhile it has the global convergence.

## 3. THE GLOBAL CONVERGENCE

In this section, we investigate the global convergence of the non-monotone combination search BFGS algorithm.

Lemma 1. If $\mu_{k} \geq 1$ and $\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu_{k}=c$ then $s(n)=\prod_{k=0}^{n} \mu_{k}$ is a monotonically non-decreasing function about ${ }^{k=0} \mathrm{n}$, and $s(n) \leq c$.

Theorem 1. If $\alpha_{k}$ satisfies combination rule (2.2),
$f(x)>0, \mu_{k} \geq 1$ and $\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu_{k}=c$, then
$f\left(x_{k+1}\right) \leq f\left(x_{0}\right) \prod_{n=0}^{k} \mu_{n}-\lambda \sum_{r=o}^{k-1} \sigma\left(t_{r}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{k}\right)$.
Proof. We will use mathematical induction to prove this theorem. In fact, for the case of $k=1$, we have

If $M=1$, then $m(k)=0$. From (2.2), we have
$f\left(x_{2}\right) \leq \lambda_{10} f\left(x_{1}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{1}\right)$
$=\mu_{1} f\left(x_{1}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{1}\right)$,
Which combined with
$f\left(x_{1}\right) \leq \lambda_{00} f\left(x_{0}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{0}\right)$
$=\mu_{0} f\left(x_{0}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{0}\right)$,
Gives $f\left(x_{2}\right) \leq \mu_{1}\left\{\mu_{0} f\left(x_{0}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{0}\right)\right\}-\sigma\left(t_{1}\right)$
$=\mu_{1} \mu_{0} f\left(x_{0}\right)-\mu_{1} \sigma\left(t_{0}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{1}\right)$
$\leq \mu_{1} \mu_{0} f\left(x_{0}\right)-\lambda \sigma\left(t_{0}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{1}\right)$.
If $M>1$, it is concluded from (2.2) that
$f\left(x_{2}\right) \leq \lambda_{10} f\left(x_{1}\right)+\lambda_{11} f\left(x_{0}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{1}\right)$
$\leq \lambda_{10}\left\{\mu_{0} f\left(x_{0}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{0}\right)\right\}+\lambda_{11} f\left(x_{0}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{1}\right)$
$=\left(\lambda_{10} \mu_{0}+\lambda_{11}\right) f\left(x_{0}\right)-\lambda_{10} \sigma\left(t_{0}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{1}\right)$
$\leq \mu_{0}\left(\lambda_{10}+\lambda_{11}\right) f\left(x_{0}\right)-\lambda_{10} \sigma\left(t_{0}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{1}\right)$
$\leq \mu_{0} \mu_{1} f\left(x_{0}\right)-\lambda \sigma\left(t_{0}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{1}\right)$;
That is (3.1) holds for $k=1$. Let us now assume
$f\left(x_{k}\right) \leq f\left(x_{0}\right) \prod_{n=0}^{k-1} \mu_{n}-\lambda \sum_{r=o}^{k-2} \sigma\left(t_{r}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{k-1}\right)$.
It follows that
$f\left(x_{k+1}\right) \leq \sum_{r=o}^{m(k)} \lambda_{k r} f\left(x_{k-r}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{k}\right)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \leq \sum_{r=o}^{m(k)} \lambda_{k r}\left\{f\left(x_{0}\right) \prod_{n=0}^{k-r-1} \mu_{n}-\lambda \sum_{i=o}^{k-r-2} \sigma\left(t_{i}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{k-r-1}\right)\right\}-\sigma\left(t_{k}\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{r=o}^{m(k)} \lambda_{k r}\left\{f\left(x_{0}\right) \prod_{n=0}^{k-1} \mu_{n}-\lambda \sum_{i=o}^{k-m(k)-2} \sigma\left(t_{i}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{k-r-1}\right)\right\}-\sigma\left(t_{k}\right) \\
& =f\left(x_{0}\right)\left(\sum_{r=o}^{m(k)} \lambda_{k r}\right) \prod_{n=0}^{k-1} \mu_{n}-\lambda\left(\sum_{r=o}^{m(k)} \lambda_{k r}\right) \sum_{i=o}^{k-m(k)-2} \sigma\left(t_{i}\right) \\
& -\sum_{r=o}^{m(k)} \lambda_{k r} \sigma\left(t_{k-r-1}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{k}\right) \sum_{i=0}{ }^{=} f\left(x_{0}\right) \mu_{k} \prod_{n=0}^{k-1} \mu_{n}-\lambda \mu_{k} \sum_{i=o}^{k-m(k)-2} \sigma\left(t_{i}\right)-\sum_{r=o}^{m(k)} \lambda_{k r} \sigma\left(t_{k-r-1}\right) \\
& -\sigma\left(t_{k}\right) \\
& \leq f\left(x_{0}\right) \prod_{n=0}^{k} \mu_{n}-\lambda \sum_{i=o}^{k-m(k)-2} \sigma\left(t_{i}\right)-\lambda \sum_{i=k-m(k)-1}^{k-1} \sigma\left(t_{i}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{k}\right) \\
& \leq f\left(x_{0}\right) \prod_{n=0}^{k} \mu_{n}-\lambda \sum_{r=o}^{k-1} \sigma\left(t_{r}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{k}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

This means that (3.1) holds for any $k \in Z, k \geq 1$.
The proof is completed.
Next, we will prove the global convergence of the nonmonotone combination search algorithm.

Theorem 2. Assume Assumption 1 hold, the search direction $d_{k}$ satisfies BFGS algorithm, line search length $\alpha_{k}$ satisfies rule (2.2), $\left\{x_{k}\right\}$ is generated sequence, then $\left\{x_{k}\right\} \in \Omega$, and $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|g_{k}\right\|=0$.

Proof. From Theorem 1 we have

$$
f\left(x_{k+1}\right) \leq f\left(x_{0}\right) \prod_{n=0}^{k} \mu_{n}-\lambda \sum_{r=o}^{k-1} \sigma\left(t_{r}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{k}\right) \leq c f\left(x_{0}\right)
$$

According to the definition of $\Omega$, we know that $\left\{x_{k}\right\} \in \Omega$.
From (3.1) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f\left(x_{k+1}\right) \leq f\left(x_{0}\right) \prod_{n=0}^{k} \mu_{n}-\lambda \sum_{r=o}^{k-1} \sigma\left(t_{r}\right)-\sigma\left(t_{k}\right) \\
& \leq f\left(x_{0}\right) \prod_{n=0}^{k} \mu_{n}-\lambda \sum_{r=o}^{k} \sigma\left(t_{r}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

That is

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq \lambda \sum_{r=0}^{k} \sigma\left(t_{r}\right) \leq c f\left(x_{0}\right)-f\left(x_{k+1}\right) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Assumption 1 we know that $f\left(x_{k+1}\right)$ are bounded in the $\Omega$, so according to (3.2), when $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have
$\lambda \sum_{r=o}^{\infty} \sigma\left(t_{r}\right)<\infty$, or equivalently $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma\left(t_{k}\right)=0$.
From Definition 1, we have
$\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} t_{k}=\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left(-g_{k}^{T} d_{k} /\left\|d_{k}\right\|\right)=0$,
That is
$\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|g_{k}\right\| \cos \left(-g_{k}, d_{k}\right)=0$,

From (1.2), we have $\cos \left(-g_{k}, d_{k}\right)>0$, so $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left\|g_{k}\right\|=0$.
This completes the proof of Theorem 2.
Theorem 2 illustrates the global convergence of the nonmonotone combination search algorithm. To test the effectiveness of the non-monotone combination rule, we give some numerical experiments.

## 4. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section we use the non-monotone combination line search rule and BFGS algorithm to test a few standard test problems, where line search steps meet non-monotone search combination rule, the following are the basic steps of algorithms:

Step 1: A given initial value $x_{0} \in R^{n}, \alpha_{0}=1, \varepsilon \geq 0$, integer $M \geq 1, \rho \in(0,0.5), H_{0} \in R^{n \times n}$ (symmetric positive), let $k=0$;

Step 2: Testing the termination condition, we calculate $g_{k}=\nabla f\left(x_{k}\right)$, if $\left\|g_{k}\right\| \leq \varepsilon, x^{*}=x_{k}$, then stop;

Step 3: Calculating the search direction, $d_{k}=-H_{k} g_{k}$; if $g_{k}^{T} d_{k}>0$, then $d_{k}=-g_{k}$;

Step 4: Determine the line search step length $\alpha_{k}$. Order $m(k)=\min \{k, M-1\}, \lambda_{k r}$ meet $\sum_{r=o}^{m(k)} \lambda_{k r}=\mu_{k} \geq 1$ and $\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu_{k}=c$. If $\alpha$ eligible

$$
f\left(x_{k}+\alpha d_{k}\right) \leq \sum_{r=o}^{m(k)} \lambda_{k r} f\left(x_{r}\right)+\rho \alpha g_{k}^{T} d_{k}
$$

Then $\alpha_{k}=\alpha$, otherwise, using two points two times interpolation shorten $\alpha$;

Step 5: Calculating new points. Order $s_{k}=\alpha_{k} d_{k}$, $x_{k+1}=x_{k}+s_{k}$, calculating $f\left(x_{k+1}\right), g_{k+1}=\nabla f\left(x_{k+1}\right)$;

Step 6: Calculating $y_{k}=g_{k+1}-g_{k}$,

$$
v_{k}=\left(y_{k}^{T} H_{k} y_{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left[\frac{s_{k}}{s_{k}^{T} y_{k}}-\frac{H_{k} y_{k}}{y_{k}^{T} H_{k} y_{k}}\right]
$$

$$
H_{k+1}=H_{k}+\frac{s_{k} s_{k}^{T}}{s_{k}^{T} y_{k}}-\frac{H_{k} y_{k} y_{k}^{T} H_{k}}{y_{k}^{T} H_{k} y_{k}}+v_{k} v_{k}^{T},
$$

$k=\mathrm{k}+1$, go to step 2 .
We choose the following tests.
Question 1. GROSEN function

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(x)=\sum_{i=2}^{n}\left[100\left(x_{i}-x_{i-1}^{2}\right)^{2}+\left(1-x_{i-1}\right)^{2}\right], \\
& x_{0}=(-1.2,1,-1.2,1, \cdots, 1)^{T} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Question 2. Wood function

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(x)= & 100\left(x_{1}^{2}-x_{2}\right)^{2}+\left(x_{1}-1\right)^{2}+\left(x_{3}-1\right)^{2}+90\left(x_{3}^{2}-x_{4}\right)^{2} \\
& +10.1\left[\left(x_{2}-1\right)^{2}+\left(x_{4}-1\right)^{2}\right]+19.8\left(x_{2}-1\right)\left(x_{4}-1\right), \\
x_{0}= & {[-3,-1,-3,-1]^{T} . }
\end{aligned}
$$

In the above two questions, the parameters involved are taken as $\quad \lambda_{k r}=\frac{1}{1+m(k)} \beta^{\frac{1+k)^{12}}{2}} \quad(r=0,1, \cdots, m(k)), \quad \varepsilon=10^{-6}$, $\rho=10^{-3}, H_{0}=I_{n \times n}, \quad \beta \geq 1$ and $M \geq 1$ are controlled constants for $\beta \in R$ and $M \in Z$. Note that the rule reduces to the monotone line search method when $M=1$ and $\beta=1$, while the rule is similar to the non-monotone line search of F-rule when $M>1$ and $\beta=1$ In the following three tables, $n_{g}$ denotes the outside loop iterations, $n_{f}$ denotes the function evaluations, while $f\left(x^{*}\right)$ stands for the function value of the approximate solution $x^{*}$.

From the results of above three questions, we can see that it is effective for the non-monotone combination line search algorithm.

For question 1, see Table 1, the iterations of nonmonotone line search algorithm are less than monotone line search algorithm, while the iterations of combination line search algorithm are much less and the accuracy is higher. From Table 2, we can see that non-monotone line search

Table 1. The calculation results of question $1(n=2)$.

| $M$ | $\beta$ | $n_{g}$ | $n_{f}$ | $f\left(x^{*}\right)$ | $M$ | $\beta$ | $n_{g}$ | $n_{f}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 39 | 96 | $1.5647 \mathrm{e}-017$ | 1 | $5\left(x^{*}\right)$ |  |  |
| 2 | 1 | 38 | 92 | $3.5514 \mathrm{e}-023$ | 2 | 5 | 37 | 91 |
| 3 | 1 | 38 | 92 | $3.5514 \mathrm{e}-023$ | 3 | $7.3465 \mathrm{e}-019$ |  |  |
| 4 | 1 | 38 | 90 | $1.2758 \mathrm{e}-017$ | 4 | 5 | 5 | 31 |
| 5 | 1 | 38 | 90 | $1.2758 \mathrm{e}-017$ | 5 | 75 | 75 | $7.8019 \mathrm{e}-020$ |

Table 2. The calculation results of question $1,(n=100)$.

| $M$ | $\beta$ | $n_{g}$ | $n_{f}$ | $f\left(x^{*}\right)$ | $M$ | $\beta$ | $n_{g}$ | $n_{f}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1001 | 14781 | $2.0205 \mathrm{e}-012$ | 1 | $5\left(x^{*}\right)$ |  |  |
| 2 | 1 | 1001 | 14314 | $5.2899 \mathrm{e}-014$ | 2 | 5 | 1001 | 14040 |
| 3 | 1 | 1001 | 13083 | $1.2005 \mathrm{e}-015$ | 3 | $6.6312 \mathrm{e}-012$ |  |  |
| 4 | 1 | 655 | 1807 | $4.5093 \mathrm{e}-016$ | 4 | 5 | 1001 | 13689 |
| 5 | 1 | 659 | 1814 | $5.2653 \mathrm{e}-016$ | 5 | 1001 | 12950 | $1.7840 \mathrm{e}-013$ |
|  | 1 |  |  | 5 | 1001 | 12286 | $1.6415 \mathrm{e}-015$ |  |
| $5.2825 \mathrm{e}-016$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3. The calculation results of question 2.

| $M$ | $\beta$ | $n_{g}$ | $n_{f}$ | $f\left(x^{*}\right)$ | $M$ | $\beta$ | $n_{g}$ | $n_{f}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 101 | 2579 | $6.0152 \mathrm{e}-013$ | 1 | $5\left(x^{*}\right)$ |  |  |
| 2 | 1 | 101 | 2577 | $1.3019 \mathrm{e}-014$ | 2 | 5 | 101 | 2579 |
| 3 | 1 | 35 | 97 | $1.1446 \mathrm{e}-017$ | 3 | $6.0152 \mathrm{e}-013$ |  |  |
| 4 | 1 | 42 | 111 | $5.2348 \mathrm{e}-020$ | 4 | 5 | 58 | 103 |
| 3 | 1 | 64 | 161 | $6.3740 \mathrm{e}-018$ | 5 | $5.5936 \mathrm{e}-016$ |  |  |

algorithm is better than monotone line search algorithm, and the results of non-monotone combination line search algorithm are basically the same as ordinary non-monotone line search algorithm, which indicates the efficiency of nonmonotone combination line search algorithm.

For question 2, see Table 3, the results of non-monotone combination line search algorithm are basically the same as ordinary non-monotone line search algorithm, that are all better than monotone line search algorithm.

## CONCLUSION

From (3.2), we can obtain $c f\left(x_{0}\right)-f\left(x_{k}\right) \geq 0$, that is $f\left(x_{k}\right) \leq c f\left(x_{0}\right)$. From $\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu_{k}=c$ and $\mu_{k} \geq 1$, we have $c \geq 1$, so $f\left(x_{k}\right)>f\left(x_{0}\right)$ can be achieved, which is our biggest breakthroughs to make $x_{k}$ out a nearby valley of $x_{0}$ to search a better solution.

Rule (2.2) we proposed is easy to implement and emulated a lot of $\mu_{k}$, example $\mu_{k}=\beta^{\frac{1}{(k+1)^{p}}}$, constant $\beta \geq 1, p>1$, now $p$-series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k+1)^{p}}$ converge on a limited number s , then

$$
\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu_{k} \leq \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \beta^{\frac{1}{(1+k)^{p}}}=\beta^{\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+k)^{p}}}=\beta^{s}=c .
$$

In order to prove easily, we assume $f(x)>0$ in rule (2.2). If $f(x) \leq 0, \mu_{k}$ should satisfy $0<\mu_{k} \leq 1$, now theoretical proof is more troublesome, therefore we need further research.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors confirm that this article content has no conflict of interest.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Research supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province (BK20141409) and the Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.: 61074188).

## REFERENCES

[1] Q. Ni, Optimization Method and Program Design, Beijing: Science Press, 2009.
[2] W. Y. Sun, J. Y. Han, and J. Sun, "Global convergence of nonmonotone descent methods for unconstrained optimization problems," J. Computat. Appl. Math., vol. 146, pp. 89-98, 2002.
[3] Z. S. Yu, and D. G. Pu, "A new non-monotone line search technique for unconstrained optimization," J. Computat. Appl. Math., vol. 219, pp. 134-144, 2008.
[4] L. Grippo, F. Lampariello, and S. Lucidi, "A non-monotone line search technique for Newton 's Methods," SIAM J. Numer. Anal., vol. 23, pp.707-716, 1986.
[5] P. P. Liu, and L. P. Chen, "A Quasi-Newton non-monotonic trust Region algorithm and its convergence," Adv. in Math., vol. 37, pp.92-100, 2008.
[6] Y. H. Xiao, H. J. Sun, and Z. G. Wang, "A globally convergent BFGS method non-monotone line search for non-convex minimization," J. Computat. Appl. Math., vol. 230, pp. 95-106, 2009.
[7] W. Y. Sun, and Q. Y. Zhou, "An unconstrained optimization method using non-monotone second order Goldstein's line search," Sci. China Ser. A Math., vol. 50, pp. 1389-1400, 2007.
[8] Q. Y. Zhou, and W. Y. Sun, "Adaptive non-monotone line search method for unconstrained optimization," Front. Math. China, vol. 3, pp. 133-148, 2008.
[9] M. A. Diniz-Ehrhardt, J. M. Martinez, and M. Raydan, "Aderiva-tive-free non-monotone line search technique for unconstrained optimization," J. Computat. Appl. Math., vol. 219, pp. 383-397, 2008.
[10] L. P. Chen, J. J. Yu, and B. C. Jiao, "A class of hybrid conjugate gradient methods with non-monotone line search," Math. Pract. Theory, vol. 38, pp.101-107, 2008.
[11] P. Hu, X. Q. Liu, "A nonmonotone line search slackness technique for unconstrained optimization," J. Optim. Theory Appl., vol. $158 \mathrm{pp} .773-786,2013$.

[^1]This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (http://creativecommons.org/-licenses/by-nc/3.0/) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.


[^0]:    *Address correspondence to this author at the MeiCheng east road no. 1, Huaian, P.R.China. Postcard: 223003; Tel: +86-517-83559093;
    Fax: +86-517-83559053; E-mail: hyhuping@163.com

[^1]:    © Hu and Wang; Licensee Bentham Open.

