

A GLOBALLY CONVERGENT ALGORITHM FOR NONCONVEX OPTIMIZATION BASED ON BLOCK COORDINATE UPDATE*

YANGYANG XU[†] AND WOTAO YIN[‡]

Abstract. Nonconvex optimization problems arise in many areas of computational science and engineering and are (approximately) solved by a variety of algorithms. Existing algorithms usually only have local convergence or subsequence convergence of their iterates. We propose an algorithm for a generic nonconvex optimization formulation, establish the convergence of its whole iterate sequence to a critical point along with a rate of convergence, and numerically demonstrate its efficiency.

Specially, we consider the problem of minimizing a nonconvex objective function. Its variables can be treated as one block or be partitioned into multiple disjoint blocks. It is assumed that each non-differentiable component of the objective function or each constraint applies to one block of variables. The differentiable components of the objective function, however, can apply to one or multiple blocks of variables together.

Our algorithm updates one block of variables at time by minimizing a certain prox-linear surrogate. The order of update can be either deterministic or randomly shuffled in each round. In fact, our convergence analysis only needs that each block be updated at least once every fixed number of iterations. We obtain the convergence of the whole iterate sequence to a critical point under fairly loose conditions including, in particular, the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz (KL) condition, which is satisfied by a broad class of nonconvex/nonsmooth applications. Of course, these results apply to convex optimization as well.

We apply our convergence result to the coordinate descent method for non-convex regularized linear regression and also a modified rank-one residue iteration method for nonnegative matrix factorization. We show that both the methods have global convergence. Numerically, we test our algorithm on nonnegative matrix and tensor factorization problems, with random shuffling enable to avoid local solutions.

Key words. nonconvex optimization, nonsmooth optimization, block coordinate descent, Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz inequality, prox-linear, global convergence

1. Introduction. In this paper, we consider (nonconvex) optimization problems in the form of

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s) \equiv f(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s) + \sum_{i=1}^s r_i(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad \text{subject to } \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, s, \quad (1.1)$$

where variable $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ has s blocks, $s \geq 1$, function f is continuously differentiable, functions r_i , $i = 1, \dots, s$, are not necessarily differentiable. It is standard to assume that both f and r_i are closed and proper and sets \mathcal{X}_i are closed and nonempty. No convexity is assumed for f , r_i , or \mathcal{X}_i . In addition, by allowing r_i to take the ∞ -value, $r_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$ can incorporate the constraint $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ since enforcing the constraint is equivalent to minimizing the indicator function of \mathcal{X}_i , and r_i can remain proper and closed. Therefore, we no longer deal with the constraint $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ explicitly. In addition, functions r_i often incorporate regularization functions, which are used to enforce certain properties or structures in \mathbf{x}_i . A nonconvex example is the ℓ_p semi-norm, $0 \leq p < 1$, which promotes solution sparsity.

Let us mention some nonconvex problems in the form of (1.1). In addition to ℓ_p -seminorm ($0 \leq p < 1$) regularized sparse regression problems [9, 28, 36], sparse dictionary learning [1, 34, 50] are bi-convex (and thus nonconvex) problems, and some of them are equipped with ℓ_p -seminorm ($0 \leq p < 1$) and ℓ_1 -norm regularizers. Matrix rank minimization [41], matrix factorization with nonnegativity/sparsity/orthogonality regularizations [23, 29, 39], (nonnegative) tensor decomposition [25, 47], and (sparse) higher-order principal component analysis [2] all fit into the model (1.1).

Due to the lack of convexity, standard analysis tools such as convex inequalities and Fejér-monotonicity can hardly help establish the convergence of the iterate sequence. The case becomes more difficult with

*The work is supported in part by NSF DMS-1317602 and ARO MURI W911NF-09-1-0383.

[†]yangyang.xu@uwaterloo.ca. Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada.

[‡]wotaoyin@math.ucla.edu. Department of Mathematics, UCLA, Los Angeles, California, USA.

additional nonsmoothness in the problem. In these cases, convergence analysis of existing algorithms is typically limited to objective convergence (to some, possibly non-minimal, value) or the convergence of a certain subsequence of iterates to a critical point. (Some exceptions will be reviewed below.) Although whole-sequence convergence is almost always observed, it is rarely proved. This deficiency abates some widely used algorithms. For example, KSVD [1] only has nonincreasing monotonicity of its objective sequence, and iterative reweighted algorithms for sparse and low-rank recovery in [15, 28, 35] only has subsequence convergence. Some other methods establish global convergence by assuming stronger conditions that may be difficult to satisfy or verify, such as local convexity (on at least a part of the objective) and unique or isolated limit points. In this paper, we aim to establish whole sequence convergence with conditions that are easier to satisfy by a wide class of functions.

Problem (1.1) is set up with multiple blocks of variables since block coordinate descent (BCD) (more precisely, block coordinate update) is very general and widely used in both convex and nonconvex computation. Since only one block is updated at a time, it has a low per-iteration cost, which can lead to low overall cost. In recent works (e.g., [7, 22, 31, 37, 42, 44]), BCD methods have become very popular towards solving “big data” problems.

1.1. Proposed algorithm. In order to solve (1.1), we propose a block prox-linear (BPL) method, which updates a block of variables at each iteration by minimizing a prox-linear surrogate function. Specifically, at iteration k , a block $b_k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ is selected, in a deterministic or random manner, and $\mathbf{x}^k = (\mathbf{x}_1^k, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s^k)$ is computed accordingly to: $i = 1, \dots, s$,

$$\mathbf{x}_i^k = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}, & \text{if } i \neq b_k, \\ \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}_i} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}^{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k), \mathbf{x}_i - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2\alpha_k} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\|^2 + r_i(\mathbf{x}_i), & \text{if } i = b_k \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where α_k is a stepsize and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k$ is an extrapolated point computed from the previous value(s) of the i th block (the formula will be given in (1.6) below). The framework of our method is given in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: Randomized/deterministic block prox-linear (BPL) method for problem (1.1)

Initialization: $\mathbf{x}^{-1} = \mathbf{x}^0$, $T \geq s$.

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

 Pick $b_k \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ in a way, random or not, that each one is picked at least once every T iterations

 Set α_k and let $\mathbf{x}^k \leftarrow$ (1.2).

if *stopping criterion is satisfied* **then**

 Return \mathbf{x}^k .

At each iteration k , only block b_k is updated. In Algorithm 1, we impose an essential cyclic assumption — each block is selected for update at least once within every T consecutive iterations — otherwise in arbitrary orders. If the blocks are selected cyclically from 1 through s , then (1.2) reduces to the cyclic block proximal gradient (Cyc-BPG) method in [49]. If the s blocks are randomly shuffled at the beginning of each cycle, each block is updated at least once every $2s - 1$ iterations. We demonstrate in section 3 that random shuffling has better numerical performance.

1.2. Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property. To have global convergence of Algorithm 1, one key assumption we will make is the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property of the objective function F , which is defined below.

A lot of functions are known to satisfy the KL property. Recent works [4, section 4] and [49, section 2.2] give a lot of specific examples that satisfy the property including ℓ_p -(semi)norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_p$ with $p \in [0, +\infty]$, any

piecewise polynomial functions, indicator functions of polyhedral set, orthogonal matrix set, and positive semidefinite cone, matrix rank function, and so on.

DEFINITION 1.1 (Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz property). *A function $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies the KL property at point $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(\partial\psi)$ if there exists $\theta \in [0, 1)$ such that*

$$\frac{|\psi(\mathbf{x}) - \psi(\bar{\mathbf{x}})|^\theta}{\text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial\psi(\mathbf{x}))} \quad (1.3)$$

is bounded around $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ under the notational conventions: $0^0 = 1, \infty/\infty = 0/0 = 0$. In other words, in a neighborhood $\mathcal{B}_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} : \|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| < \rho\}$, there exists $\phi(a) = c \cdot a^{1-\theta}$ for some $c > 0$ and $\theta \in [0, 1)$ such that the KL inequality holds

$$\phi'(|\psi(\mathbf{x}) - \psi(\bar{\mathbf{x}})|)\text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial\psi(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1, \text{ for any } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \cap \text{dom}(\partial\psi) \text{ and } \psi(\mathbf{x}) \neq \psi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \quad (1.4)$$

where $\text{dom}(\partial\psi) = \{\mathbf{x} : \partial\psi(\mathbf{x}) \neq \emptyset\}$ and $\text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial\psi(\mathbf{x})) = \min\{\|\mathbf{y}\| : \mathbf{y} \in \partial\psi(\mathbf{x})\}$.

The KL property was introduced by Lojasiewicz [30] on real analytic functions, for which the term with $\theta \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ in (1.3) is bounded around any critical point $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$. Kurdyka extended this property to functions on the σ -minimal structure in [27]. Recently, the KL inequality (1.4) was extended to nonsmooth sub-analytic functions [10]. The work [11] characterizes the geometric meaning of the KL inequality.

1.3. Related literature. There are many methods that solve general nonconvex problems. Methods such as those in [6, 14, 16, 18] and the references therein and also books [8, 38] do not break variables into blocks. They usually only have local convergence, or subsequence convergence of the iterates to a critical point, or global convergence that the violation of optimality conditions approaches to *zero*. Next, we review BCD methods.

BCD has been extensively used in many applications. Its original form, block coordinate minimization (BCM), which updates a block by minimizing the original objective with respect to that block, dates back to the 1950's [20] and is closely related to the Gauss-Seidel and SOR methods for linear equation systems. Its convergence was studied under a variety of settings (cf. [19, 40, 45] and the references therein). The convergence rate of BCM was established under the strong convexity assumption [33] for the multi-block case and under the general convexity assumption [7] for the two-block case. To have even cheaper updates, one can update a block approximately, for example, by minimizing an approximate objective like was done in (1.2), instead of sticking to the original objective. The work [46] is a block coordinate gradient descent (BCGD) method, where taking a block gradient step is equivalent to minimizing a certain prox-linear approximation of the objective. Its global convergence was established under the assumptions of a so-called *local Lipschitzian error bound* and the convexity of the objective's nondifferentiable part. The randomized block coordinate descent (RBCD) method in [32, 37] randomly chooses the block to update with positive probability at each iteration and is not essentially cyclic. Objective convergence was established [37, 42], and the violation of the first-order optimization condition was shown to converge to *zero* [32]. There is no iterate convergence result for RBCD.

Some special cases of Algorithm 1 have appeared in the literature. The work [49] uses cyclic updates of a fixed order and assumes block-wise convexity; [12] studies two blocks without extrapolation, namely, $s = 2$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k = \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}, \forall k$ in (1.2). A more general result is [5, Lemma 2.6], where three conditions for global convergence are given and are met by methods including averaged projection, proximal point, and forward-backward splitting. Algorithm 1, however, does not satisfy the three conditions in [5].

1.4. Contributions. We summarize the main contributions of this paper as follows.

- A block prox-linear (BPL) method for nonconvex optimization with optional nonsmooth components is proposed. When there are more than one block of variables, essentially cyclic but otherwise arbitrary (deterministic or random) update order is applied. Extrapolation is used to accelerate it.
- We obtain the global convergence of BPL to a critical point with rate estimates, by first establishing subsequence convergence and then applying the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property assumed for the function. The established convergence results are then tailored to several existing algorithms for convergence results improved over the literature, including the coordinate descent method for non-convex regularized linear regression and rank-one residue iteration for nonnegative matrix factorization.
- We numerically tested BPL on nonnegative matrix and tensor factorization problems. At each cycle of updates, the blocks were randomly shuffled. BPL was very efficient on solving the problems, but also as a result of random shuffling, it avoided local solutions more often than it did with a deterministic cyclic order.

1.5. Notation and preliminaries. We restrict our discussion in \mathbb{R}^n equipped with the Euclidean norm, denoted by $\|\cdot\|$. However, all our results extend to general of primal and dual norm pairs. The lower-case letter s is reserved for the number of blocks and ℓ, L, L_k, \dots for various Lipschitz constants. $\mathbf{x}_{<i}$ is short for $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i-1})$, $\mathbf{x}_{>i}$ for $(\mathbf{x}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s)$, and $\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}$ for $(\mathbf{x}_{<i}, \mathbf{x}_{>i})$. We simplify $f(\mathbf{x}_{<i}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i, \mathbf{x}_{>i})$ to $f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i)$. The distance of a point \mathbf{x} to a set \mathcal{Y} is denoted by $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{Y}) = \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$.

Since the update may be aperiodic, extra notation is used for when and how many times a block is updated. Let $\mathcal{K}[i, k]$ denote the set of iterations in which the i -th block has been selected to update till the k th iteration:

$$\mathcal{K}[i, k] \triangleq \{\kappa : b_\kappa = i, 1 \leq \kappa \leq k\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}, \quad (1.5)$$

and let

$$d_i^k \triangleq |\mathcal{K}[i, k]|,$$

which is the number of times the i -th block has been updated till iteration k . For $k = 1, \dots$, we have $\cup_{i=1}^s \mathcal{K}[i, k] = [k] \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^s d_i^k = k$.

Let \mathbf{x}^k be the value of \mathbf{x} after the k th iteration, and for each block i , $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j$ be the value of \mathbf{x}_i after its j th update. By letting $j = d_i^k$, we have $\mathbf{x}_i^k = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j$.

The extrapolated point in (1.2) (for $i = b_k$) is computed from the last two updates of the same block:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} + \omega_k(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-2}), \text{ where } j = d_i^k, \quad (1.6)$$

for some weight $0 \leq \omega_k \leq 1$. We partition the set of Lipschitz constants and the extrapolation weights into s disjoint subsets as

$$\{L_\kappa : 1 \leq \kappa \leq k\} = \cup_{i=1}^s \{L_\kappa : \kappa \in \mathcal{K}[i, k]\} \triangleq \cup_{i=1}^s \{\tilde{L}_i^j : 1 \leq j \leq d_i^k\}, \quad (1.7a)$$

$$\{\omega_\kappa : 1 \leq \kappa \leq k\} = \cup_{i=1}^s \{\omega_\kappa : \kappa \in \mathcal{K}[i, k]\} \triangleq \cup_{i=1}^s \{\tilde{\omega}_i^j : 1 \leq j \leq d_i^k\}. \quad (1.7b)$$

Hence, for each block i , we have three sequences:

$$\text{value of } \mathbf{x}_i : \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^1, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^2, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^k}, \dots; \quad (1.8a)$$

$$\text{Lipschitz constant} : \tilde{L}_i^1, \tilde{L}_i^2, \dots, \tilde{L}_i^{d_i^k}, \dots; \quad (1.8b)$$

$$\text{extrapolation weight} : \tilde{\omega}_i^1, \tilde{\omega}_i^2, \dots, \tilde{\omega}_i^{d_i^k}, \dots \quad (1.8c)$$

TABLE 1.1
Summary of notation

Notion	Definition
s	the number of blocks of variables
b_k	the block selected at the k -th iteration to update
$\mathcal{K}[i, k]$	the set of iterations up to k in which the i -th block is selected; see (1.5)
d_i^k	$ \mathcal{K}[i, k] $: the number of times \mathbf{x}_i has been updated in the first k iterations
\mathbf{x}^k	the value of \mathbf{x} after the k -th iteration
$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j$	the value of \mathbf{x}_i after its j -th update; see (1.8a)
L_k	the gradient Lipschitz constant of the updated block at the k -th iteration; see (2.1)
\tilde{L}_i^j	the gradient Lipschitz constant of block i at its j -th update; see (1.7a) and (1.8b)
ω_k	the extrapolation weight used at the k -th iteration
$\tilde{\omega}_i^j$	the extrapolation weight used at the j -th update of block i ; see (1.7b) and (1.8c)

Table 1.1 summarizes the notation. In addition, we initialize $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{-1} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^0 = \mathbf{x}_i^0, \forall i$.

We make the following definitions, which can be found in [43].

DEFINITION 1.2 (Limiting Fréchet subdifferential [26]). *A vector \mathbf{g} is a Fréchet subgradient of a lower semicontinuous function F at $\mathbf{x} \in \text{dom}(F)$ if*

$$\liminf_{\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{x}} \frac{F(\mathbf{y}) - F(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|} \geq 0.$$

The set of Fréchet subgradient of F at \mathbf{x} is called Fréchet subdifferential and denoted as $\hat{\partial}F(\mathbf{x})$. If $\mathbf{x} \notin \text{dom}(F)$, then $\hat{\partial}F(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$.

The limiting Fréchet subdifferential is denoted by $\partial F(\mathbf{x})$ and defined as

$$\partial F(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{g} : \text{there is } \mathbf{x}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{x} \text{ and } \mathbf{g}_n \in \hat{\partial}F(\mathbf{x}_n) \text{ such that } \mathbf{g}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{g}\}.$$

If F is differentiable at \mathbf{x} , then $\partial F(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{\partial}F(\mathbf{x}) = \{\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\}$. For problem (1.1), it holds that (see [4, Lemma 2.1] or [43, Prop. 10.6, pp. 426])

$$\partial F(\mathbf{x}) = \{\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_1} f(\mathbf{x}) + \partial r_1(\mathbf{x}_1)\} \times \cdots \times \{\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_s} f(\mathbf{x}) + \partial r_s(\mathbf{x}_s)\}, \quad (1.9)$$

where $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ denotes the Cartesian product of \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 .

DEFINITION 1.3 (Critical point). *A point \mathbf{x}^* is called a critical point of F if $\mathbf{0} \in \partial F(\mathbf{x}^*)$.*

1.6. Organization. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 establishes convergence results. Some examples and applications are given in section 3, and finally section 4 concludes this paper.

2. Convergence analysis. In this section, we analyze the convergence of Algorithm 1. Throughout our analysis, we make the following assumptions.

ASSUMPTION 1. *F is proper and lower bounded in $\text{dom}(F) \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x}) < +\infty\}$, i.e., $\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{dom}(F)} F(\mathbf{x}) > -\infty$, f is continuously differentiable, and r_i is proper lower semicontinuous for all i . Problem (1.1) has a critical point \mathbf{x}^* , i.e., $\mathbf{0} \in \partial F(\mathbf{x}^*)$.*

ASSUMPTION 2. *$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_{b_k}} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq b_k}^{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_{b_k})$ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to \mathbf{x}_{b_k} with constant L_k , i.e.,*

$$\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_{b_k}} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq b_k}^{k-1}, \mathbf{u}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_{b_k}} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq b_k}^{k-1}, \mathbf{v})\| \leq L_k \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \quad (2.1)$$

and there exist constants $0 < \ell \leq L < \infty$, such that $\ell \leq L_k \leq L$ for all k .

ASSUMPTION 3. *Within any T consecutive iterations, every block is updated at least one time.*

Our analysis proceeds with several steps. We first estimate the objective decrease after every iteration (see Lemma 2.1) and then establish a square summable result of the iterate differences (see Proposition 2.2). Through the square summable result, we show a subsequence convergence result that every limit point of the iterates is a critical point (see Theorem 2.3). Assuming the KL property (see Definition 1.1) on the objective function, we establish global convergence of our algorithm and also give estimate of convergence rate (see Theorems 2.6 and 2.8).

We begin our analysis with the following lemma. For the convenience of readers, we give proofs of all lemmas and propositions in Appendix A.

LEMMA 2.1. *Let $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{2L_k}, \forall k$ in (1.2). After each iteration k , it holds*

$$F(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) - F(\mathbf{x}^k) \geq \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{k-1}+1}^{d_i^k} \left(c_1 \tilde{L}_i^j \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|^2 - c_2 \tilde{L}_i^j (\tilde{\omega}_i^j)^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-2} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1}\|^2 \right), \quad (2.2)$$

where $c_1 = \frac{1}{4}, c_2 = 9$, and we have adopted the convention that if $q < p$, then the summation $\sum_{j=p}^q a_j = 0$. If $\tilde{\omega}_i^j \leq \frac{\delta}{6} \sqrt{\tilde{L}_i^{j-1}/\tilde{L}_i^j}, \forall i, j$ for some $\delta < 1$,

$$F(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) - F(\mathbf{x}^k) \geq \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{k-1}+1}^{d_i^k} \left(\frac{\tilde{L}_i^j}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|^2 - \frac{\tilde{L}_i^{j-1} \delta^2}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-2} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1}\|^2 \right). \quad (2.3)$$

REMARK 2.1. *In (2.2) and (2.3), under the summation over i , all terms are zero except one. Assume that the i -th block is updated at the k -th iteration, i.e., $b_k = i$. Then $d_i^k = d_i^{k-1} + 1$ and $d_j^k = d_j^{k-1}, \forall j \neq i$, and (2.2) is exactly*

$$F(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) - F(\mathbf{x}^k) \geq \frac{\tilde{L}_i^{d_i^k}}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^k-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^k}\|^2 - 9 \tilde{L}_i^{d_i^k} (\tilde{\omega}_i^{d_i^k})^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^k-2} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^k-1}\|^2. \quad (2.4)$$

We write the form of (2.2) for convenience of our convergence analysis.

REMARK 2.2. *The choice of $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{2L_k}$ is for simplicity of our analysis. Generally, one can take $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{\gamma L_k}$ for any $\gamma > 1$. In this case, through the same arguments as those in the proof of Lemma 2.1, we have (2.2) with $c_1 = \frac{\gamma-1}{4}, c_2 = \frac{(\gamma+1)^2}{\gamma-1}$.*

It is not difficult to check from our proofs that if $0 < \inf_k \alpha_k \leq \sup_k \alpha_k < \infty$ (not necessary $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{\gamma L_k}$), (2.2) holds with positive c_1 and c_2 , and the extrapolation weights satisfy $\tilde{\omega}_i^j \leq \delta \sqrt{(c_1 \tilde{L}_i^{j-1}) / (c_2 \tilde{L}_i^j)}, \forall i, j$ for some $\delta < 1$, then all our convergence results can be obtained when all the other assumptions are satisfied.

REMARK 2.3. *If f is block multi-convex, i.e., it is convex with respect to each block of variables while keeping the remaining variables fixed, and r_i is convex for all i , then taking $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{L_k}$, we have (2.2) holds with $c_1 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $c_2 = \frac{1}{2}$. In this case, we can take $\tilde{\omega}_i^j \leq \delta \sqrt{\tilde{L}_i^{j-1}/\tilde{L}_i^j}, \forall i, j$ for some $\delta < 1$, and all our convergence results can be shown through the same arguments if all the other assumptions are satisfied.*

In the remaining part of this section, we take stepsizes and extrapolation weights as follows

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1}{2L_k}, \forall k, \quad \tilde{\omega}_i^j \leq \frac{\delta}{6} \sqrt{\tilde{L}_i^{j-1}/\tilde{L}_i^j}, \forall i, j, \text{ for some } \delta < 1.$$

Using Lemma 2.1, we can have the following result, through which we show subsequence convergence of Algorithm 1.

PROPOSITION 2.2 (Square summable). *Let $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ be generated from Algorithm 1. We have*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{x}^{k-1} - \mathbf{x}^k\|^2 < \infty. \quad (2.5)$$

THEOREM 2.3 (Subsequence convergence). *Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.2, any limit point of $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ is a critical point of (1.1).*

REMARK 2.4. *The existence of finite limit point is guaranteed if $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ is bounded, and for some applications, the boundedness of $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ can be satisfied by setting appropriate parameters in Algorithm 1; see examples in section 3.*

Proof. Assume $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ is a limit point of $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$. Then there exists an index set \mathcal{K} so that the subsequence $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ converging to $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$. From (2.5), we have $\|\mathbf{x}^{k-1} - \mathbf{x}^k\| \rightarrow 0$ and thus $\{\mathbf{x}^{k+\kappa}\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}$ for any $\kappa \geq 0$. Define

$$\mathcal{K}_i = \{k \in \cup_{\kappa=0}^{T-1} (\mathcal{K} + \kappa) : b_k = i\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, s.$$

Take an arbitrary $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Note \mathcal{K}_i is an infinite set according to Assumption 3. Taking another subsequence if necessary, L_k converges to some \bar{L}_i as $\mathcal{K}_i \ni k \rightarrow \infty$. Note that since $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{2L_k}, \forall k$, for any $k \in \mathcal{K}_i$,

$$\mathbf{x}_i^k = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}_i} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}^{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k), \mathbf{x}_i - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k \rangle + L_k \|\mathbf{x}_i - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\|^2 + r_i(\mathbf{x}_i). \quad (2.6)$$

Note from (2.5) and (1.6) that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i$ as $\mathcal{K}_i \ni k \rightarrow \infty$. Since f is continuously differentiable and r_i is lower semicontinuous, letting $\mathcal{K}_i \ni k \rightarrow \infty$ in (2.6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} r_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) &\leq \liminf_{\mathcal{K}_i \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}^{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k), \mathbf{x}_i^k - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k \right) + L_k \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\|^2 + r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^k) \\ &\leq \liminf_{\mathcal{K}_i \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}^{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k), \mathbf{x}_i - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k \right) + L_k \|\mathbf{x}_i - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\|^2 + r_i(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad \forall \text{ fixed } \mathbf{x}_i \in \text{dom}(F) \\ &= \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i \rangle + \bar{L}_i \|\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i\|^2 + r_i(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad \forall \text{ fixed } \mathbf{x}_i \in \text{dom}(F). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}_i} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i \rangle + \bar{L}_i \|\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i\|^2 + r_i(\mathbf{x}_i),$$

and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i$ satisfies the first-order optimality condition:

$$\mathbf{0} \in \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \partial r_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i). \quad (2.7)$$

Since (2.7) holds for arbitrary $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ is a critical point of (1.1). \square

Assuming F satisfies the KL property (see Definition 1.1), we show that the entire sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ converges if it has a finite limit point. We first establish the following lemma. This lemma has its own importance and together with the KL property implies Lemma 2.6 of [5].

LEMMA 2.4. *For nonnegative sequences $\{A_{i,j}\}_{j=0}^\infty, \{\alpha_{i,j}\}_{j=0}^\infty, i = 1, \dots, s$, and $\{B_m\}_{m=0}^\infty$, if*

$$0 < \inf_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j} \leq \sup_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j} < \infty,$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m}+1}^{n_{i,m+1}} (\alpha_{i,j} A_{i,j}^2 - \alpha_{i,j-1} \beta^2 A_{i,j-1}^2) \leq B_m \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m-1}+1}^{n_{i,m}} A_{i,j}, \quad 0 \leq m \leq M, \quad (2.8)$$

where $0 \leq \beta < 1$, and $\{n_{i,m}\}_{m=0}^\infty, \forall i$ are nonnegative integer sequences satisfying: $n_{i,m} \leq n_{i,m+1} \leq n_{i,m} + N, \forall i, m$, for some integer $N > 0$. Then there is a constant $C > 0$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,M_1}+1}^{n_{i,M_2}+1} A_{i,j} \leq C \left(\sum_{m=1}^{M_2} B_m + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,M_1-1}+1}^{n_{i,M_1}} A_{i,j} \right), \quad \text{for } 0 \leq M_1 < M_2 \leq M. \quad (2.9)$$

In addition, if $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} B_m < \infty$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} n_{i,m} = \infty, \forall i$, and (2.8) holds for all m , then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_{i,j} < \infty, \forall i. \quad (2.10)$$

REMARK 2.5. We assume the general form in (2.8) due to the generality of Algorithm 1. In particular, we will use $A_{i,j}$ for $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|$ and relate $\alpha_{i,j}$ to Lipschitz constant \tilde{L}_i^j . The second term in the bracket of the left hand side of (2.8) is used to handle the extrapolation used in Algorithm 1, and we require $\beta < 1$ such that the first term can dominate the second one after summation.

For simplicity of the readers' understanding, let us mention some specific cases, for which one can specify values of the parameters. If no extrapolation is applied in Algorithm 1, one can take $\beta = 0$ in (2.8). Furthermore if cyclic update is performed, then one can take $n_{i,m+1} = n_{i,m} + 1 = m$, and (2.8) reduces to $\sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_{i,m} A_{i,m}^2 \leq B_m \sum_{i=1}^s A_{i,m-1}$, which together with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies

$$\left(\inf_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j}\right) \sum_{i=1}^s A_{i,m} \leq 4\tau B_m + \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^s A_{i,m-1}, \quad (2.11)$$

where τ is a sufficiently large constant such that $\frac{1}{\tau} < \inf_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j}$. If $\{B_m\}$ is summable, one can easily have (2.10) from (2.11).

We also need the following result.

PROPOSITION 2.5. Let $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ be generated from Algorithm 1. For a specific iteration $k \geq 3T$, assume $\mathbf{x}^k \in \mathcal{B}_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$, $\kappa = k - 3T, k - 3T + 1, \dots, k$ for some $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\rho > 0$. If for each i , $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x})$ is Lipschitz continuous with constant L_G within $B_{4\rho}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ with respect to \mathbf{x} , i.e.,

$$\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{y}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{z})\| \leq L_G \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in B_{4\rho}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}),$$

then

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial F(\mathbf{x}^k)) \leq (2(L_G + 2L) + s) \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{k-3T}+1}^{d_i^k} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|. \quad (2.12)$$

We are now ready to present and show the global convergence of Algorithm 1.

THEOREM 2.6 (Global convergence). Let $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ be generated from Algorithm 1. Assume

1. $F(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) \geq F(\mathbf{x}^k)$ for all k ;
2. $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ has a finite limit point $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$;
3. F satisfies the KL property (1.4) around $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ with parameters ρ and θ .
4. For each i , $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x})$ is Lipschitz continuous within $B_{4\rho}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ with respect to \mathbf{x} ;

then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}^k = \bar{\mathbf{x}}.$$

REMARK 2.6. Before proving the theorem, let us remark on the conditions we assume. The nonincreasing monotonicity of $\{F(\mathbf{x}^k)\}$ can be guaranteed if $\tilde{\omega}_i^j = 0, \forall i, j$ from (2.2) or one can redo the k -th iteration by setting $\omega_k = 0$ whenever $F(\mathbf{x}^k) > F(\mathbf{x}^{k-1})$ happens. The assumption in item 3 is significant and satisfied for a broad class of applications as we mentioned in section 1.2. Item 4 is a weak assumption since it requires the Lipschitz continuity only in a bounded set.

Proof. Since $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ is a limit point of $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ and according to (2.5), one can choose a sufficiently large k_0 such that the points $\mathbf{x}^{k_0+\kappa}$, $\kappa = 0, 1, \dots, 3T$ are all sufficiently close to $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ and in $\mathcal{B}_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$, and also the differences $\|\mathbf{x}^{k_0+\kappa} - \mathbf{x}^{k_0+\kappa+1}\|$, $\kappa = 0, 1, \dots, 3T$ are sufficiently close to zero such that¹ the right hand side of (2.17) is smaller than ρ . Since $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ converges if and only if $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}_{k=k_0}^\infty$ converges, without loss of generality, we assume $k_0 = 0$, which is equivalent to setting \mathbf{x}^{k_0} as a new starting point.

Assume \mathbf{x}^{3mT} , $m = 0, \dots, M$ to be in $\mathcal{B}_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ for some $M \geq 1$. Note that from the above discussion, such M exists. Letting $k = 3mT$ in (2.12) and using KL inequality (1.4), we have

$$\phi'(F(\mathbf{x}^{3mT}) - F(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) \geq \left((2(L_G + 2L) + s) \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{3(m-1)T}+1}^{d_i^{3mT}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\| \right)^{-1}, \quad (2.13)$$

where L_G is a uniform Lipschitz constant of $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x})$, $\forall i$ within $\mathcal{B}_{4\rho}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$. In addition, it follows from (2.3) that

$$F(\mathbf{x}^{3mT}) - F(\mathbf{x}^{3(m+1)T}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{3mT}+1}^{d_i^{3(m+1)T}} \left(\frac{\tilde{L}_i^j}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|^2 - \frac{\tilde{L}_i^{j-1} \delta^2}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-2} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1}\|^2 \right). \quad (2.14)$$

Let $\phi_m = \phi(F(\mathbf{x}^{3mT}) - F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))$. Note that

$$\phi_m - \phi_{m+1} \geq \phi'(F(\mathbf{x}^{3mT}) - F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))[F(\mathbf{x}^{3mT}) - F(\mathbf{x}^{3(m+1)T})].$$

Plugging (2.13) and (2.14) into the above inequality and letting $C = 2(L_G + 2L) + s$ give

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{3mT}+1}^{d_i^{3(m+1)T}} \left(\frac{\tilde{L}_i^j}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|^2 - \frac{\tilde{L}_i^{j-1} \delta^2}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-2} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1}\|^2 \right) \leq C(\phi_m - \phi_{m+1}) \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{3(m-1)T}+1}^{d_i^{3mT}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|. \quad (2.15)$$

Letting $A_{i,j} = \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|$, $\alpha_{i,j} = \tilde{L}_i^j/4$, $n_{i,m} = d_i^{3mT}$, $B_m = C(\phi_m - \phi_{m+1})$, and $\beta = \delta$ in Lemma 2.4, we have from (2.9) that there is a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{3(N-1)T}+1}^{d_i^{3(M+1)T}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\| \leq C_1 \phi_N + C_1 \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{3(N-1)T}+1}^{d_i^{3NT}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|. \quad (2.16)$$

Letting $N = 1$ in the above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^{3(M+1)T} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^s \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^{3(M+1)T}} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^s \left(\sum_{j=d_i^{3T}+1}^{d_i^{3(M+1)T}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\| + \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^{3T}} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i\| \right) \\ &\leq C_1 \phi_1 + C_1 \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{d_i^{3T}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\| + \sum_{i=1}^s \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^{3T}} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i\|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

As discussed in the beginning of the proof, the right hand side of (2.17) is smaller than ρ . Hence, $\mathbf{x}^{3(M+1)T} \in \mathcal{B}_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$. By induction, $\mathbf{x}^{3mT} \in \mathcal{B}_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$, $\forall m$, and (2.16) holds for all M . Using Lemma 2.4 again,

¹Note that $F(\mathbf{x}^k) \rightarrow F(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ from (2.13), and thus ϕ_1 can be sufficiently small in (2.17).

we have that $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\}$ is a Cauchy sequence for all i and thus converges, and $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$ also converges. Since $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ is a limit point of $\{\mathbf{x}^k\}$, we have $\mathbf{x}^k \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$. \square

In addition, we can show convergence rate of Algorithm 1 through the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.7. *For nonnegative sequence $\{A_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, if $A_k \leq A_{k-1} \leq 1, \forall k \geq K$ for some integer K , and there are positive constants α, β and γ such that*

$$A_k \leq \alpha(A_{k-1} - A_k)^\gamma + \beta(A_{k-1} - A_k), \forall k, \quad (2.18)$$

we have

1. If $\gamma \geq 1$, then $A_k \leq \left(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{1+\alpha+\beta}\right)^{k-K} A_K, \forall k \geq K$;
2. If $0 < \gamma < 1$, then $A_k \leq \nu(k-K)^{-\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}}, \forall k \geq K$, for some positive constant ν .

THEOREM 2.8 (Convergence rate). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.6, we have:*

1. If $\theta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $\|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \leq C\alpha^k, \forall k$, for a certain $C > 0, \alpha \in [0, 1)$;
2. If $\theta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $\|\mathbf{x}^k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \leq Ck^{-(1-\theta)/(2\theta-1)}, \forall k$, for a certain $C > 0$.

Proof. When $\theta = 0$, then $\phi'(a) = c, \forall a$, and there must be a sufficiently large integer k_0 such that $F(\mathbf{x}^k) = F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \forall k \geq k_0$. Otherwise $F(\mathbf{x}^k) > F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \forall k$, by noting that $F(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) \geq F(\mathbf{x}^k)$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(\mathbf{x}^k) = F(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$. Then from the KL inequality (1.4), it holds that $c \cdot \text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial F(\mathbf{x}^k)) \geq 1$, for all $\mathbf{x}^k \in \mathcal{B}_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$, which is impossible since $\text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial F(\mathbf{x}^{3mT})) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ from (2.12).

For $k > k_0$, since $F(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) = F(\mathbf{x}^k)$, and noting that in (2.3) all terms but one are zero under the summation over i , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{k-1}+1}^{d_i^k} \sqrt{\tilde{L}_i^{j-1} \delta} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-2} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1}\| \geq \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{k-1}+1}^{d_i^k} \sqrt{\tilde{L}_i^j} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|.$$

Summing the above inequality over k from $m > k_0$ to ∞ and using $\ell \leq \tilde{L}_i^j \leq L, \forall i, j$, we have

$$\sqrt{L} \delta \sum_{i=1}^s \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^{m-1}-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^{m-1}}\| \geq \sqrt{\ell} (1 - \delta) \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{m-1}+1}^{\infty} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|, \forall m > k_0. \quad (2.19)$$

Let

$$B_m = \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{m-1}+1}^{\infty} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|.$$

Then from Assumption 3, we have

$$B_{m-T} - B_m = \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{m-T-1}+1}^{d_i^{m-1}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\| \geq \sum_{i=1}^s \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^{m-1}-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^{m-1}}\|.$$

which together with (2.19) gives $B_m \leq \frac{\sqrt{L}\delta}{\sqrt{\ell}(1-\delta)} (B_{m-T} - B_m)$. Hence,

$$B_{mT} \leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{L}\delta}{\sqrt{L}\delta + \sqrt{\ell}(1-\delta)} \right) B_{(m-1)T} \leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{L}\delta}{\sqrt{L}\delta + \sqrt{\ell}(1-\delta)} \right)^{m-\ell_0} B_{\ell_0 T},$$

where $\ell_0 = \min\{\ell : \ell T \geq k_0\}$. Letting $\alpha = \left(\frac{\sqrt{L}\delta}{\sqrt{L}\delta + \sqrt{\ell}(1-\delta)}\right)^{1/T}$, we have

$$B_{mT} \leq \alpha^{mT} (\alpha^{-\ell_0 T} B_{\ell_0 T}).$$

Note $\|\mathbf{x}^{m-1} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \leq B_m$. Hence, choosing a sufficiently large $C > 0$ gives the result in item 1 for $\theta = 0$.

When $0 < \theta < 1$, we let

$$A_m = \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{3mT}+1}^{\infty} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|,$$

and thus

$$A_{m-1} - A_m = \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{3(m-1)T}+1}^{d_i^{3mT}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|.$$

From (2.13), it holds that

$$c(1 - \theta)(F(\mathbf{x}^{3mT}) - F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))^{-\theta} \geq ((2(L_G + 2L) + s)(A_{m-1} - A_m))^{-1},$$

which implies

$$\phi_m = c(F(\mathbf{x}^{3mT}) - F(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))^{1-\theta} \leq c(c(1 - \theta)(2(L_G + 2L) + s)(A_{m-1} - A_m))^{\frac{1-\theta}{\theta}}. \quad (2.20)$$

In addition, letting $N = m$ in (2.16), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{3(M+1)T}+1}^{d_i^{3(M+1)T}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\| \leq C_1 \phi_m + C_1 \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=d_i^{3(m-1)T}+1}^{d_i^{3mT}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|.$$

Letting $M \rightarrow \infty$ in the above inequality, we have

$$A_m \leq C_1 \phi_m + C_1 (A_{m-1} - A_m) \leq C_1 c (c(1 - \theta)(2(L_G + 2L) + s)(A_{m-1} - A_m))^{\frac{1-\theta}{\theta}} + C_1 (A_{m-1} - A_m),$$

where the second inequality is from (2.20). Since $A_{m-1} - A_m \leq 1$ as m is sufficiently large and $\|\mathbf{x}^m - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \leq A_{\lfloor \frac{m}{3T} \rfloor}$, the results in item 2 for $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and item 3 now immediately follow from Lemma 2.7. \square

3. Applications and numerical results. In this section, we give some specific examples of (1.1) and show the global convergence of some existing algorithms. In addition, we demonstrate that updating variables in a random order can improve the performance of Algorithm 1 over that in the cyclic order.

3.1. Coordinate descent method for nonconvex regression. As the number of predictors is larger than sample size, variable selection becomes important to keep more important predictors and obtain a more interpretable model, and penalized regression methods are popularly used to achieve variable selection. The work [13] considers the linear regression with nonconvex penalties: the minimax concave penalty (MCP) and the smoothly clipped absolute deviation (SCAD) penalty. Specifically, the following model is considered

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p r_{\lambda, \gamma}(\beta_j), \quad (3.1)$$

where $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ are standardized such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n y_i = 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^n x_{ij} = 0, \quad \forall j, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{ij}^2 = 1, \quad \forall j, \quad (3.2)$$

and MCP is defined as

$$r_{\lambda, \gamma}(\theta) = \begin{cases} \lambda|\theta| - \frac{\theta^2}{2\gamma}, & \text{if } |\theta| \leq \gamma\lambda, \\ \frac{1}{2}\gamma\lambda^2, & \text{if } |\theta| > \gamma\lambda, \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

and SCAD penalty is defined as

$$r_{\lambda,\gamma}(\theta) = \begin{cases} \lambda|\theta|, & \text{if } |\theta| \leq \lambda, \\ \frac{2\gamma\lambda|\theta| - (\theta^2 + \lambda^2)}{2(\gamma-1)}, & \text{if } \lambda < |\theta| \leq \gamma\lambda, \\ \frac{\gamma^2(\gamma^2-1)}{2(\gamma-1)}, & \text{if } |\theta| > \gamma\lambda. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

The cyclic coordinate descent method used in [13] performs the update from $j = 1$ through p

$$\beta_j^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\beta_j} \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{X}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{<j}^{k+1}, \beta_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{>j}^k) - \mathbf{y}\|^2 + r_{\lambda,\gamma}(\beta_j),$$

which can be equivalently written into the form of (1.2) by

$$\beta_j^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\beta_j} \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{x}_j\|^2 (\beta_j - \beta_j^k)^2 + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{x}_j^\top (\mathbf{X}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{<j}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\geq j}^k) - \mathbf{y}) \beta_j + r_{\lambda,\gamma}(\beta_j). \quad (3.5)$$

Note that the data has been standardized such that $\|\mathbf{x}_j\|^2 = n$. Hence, if $\gamma > 1$ in (3.3) and $\gamma > 2$ in (3.4), it is easy to verify that the objective in (3.5) is strongly convex, and there is a unique minimizer. From the convergence results of [45], it is concluded in [13] that any limit point² of the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{\beta}^k\}$ generated by (3.5) is a coordinate-wise minimizer of (3.1). Since $r_{\lambda,\gamma}$ in both (3.3) and (3.4) is piecewise polynomial and thus semialgebraic, it satisfies the KL property (see Definition 1.1). In addition, let $f(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ be the objective of (3.1). Then

$$f(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{<j}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\geq j}^k) - f(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\leq j}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{>j}^k) \geq \frac{\mu}{2} (\beta_j^{k+1} - \beta_j^k)^2,$$

where μ is the strong convexity constant of the objective in (3.5). Hence, according to Theorem 2.6 and Remark 2.2, we have the following global convergence result.

THEOREM 3.1. *Assume \mathbf{X} is standardized as in (3.2). Let $\{\boldsymbol{\beta}^k\}$ be the sequence generated from (3.5) or by the following update with random shuffling of coordinates*

$$\beta_{\pi_j^k}^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\beta_{\pi_j^k}} \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{x}_{\pi_j^k}\|^2 (\beta_{\pi_j^k} - \beta_{\pi_j^k}^k)^2 + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{x}_{\pi_j^k}^\top (\mathbf{X}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\pi_{<j}^k}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\pi_{\geq j}^k}^k) - \mathbf{y}) \beta_{\pi_j^k} + r_{\lambda,\gamma}(\beta_{\pi_j^k}),$$

where $(\pi_1^k, \dots, \pi_p^k)$ is any permutation of $(1, \dots, p)$, and $r_{\lambda,\gamma}$ is given by either (3.3) with $\gamma > 1$ or (3.4) with $\gamma > 2$. If $\{\boldsymbol{\beta}^k\}$ has a finite limit point, then $\boldsymbol{\beta}^k$ converges to a coordinate-wise minimizer of (3.1).

3.2. Rank-one residue iteration for nonnegative matrix factorization. The nonnegative matrix factorization can be modeled as

$$\min_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}} \|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{Y}^\top - \mathbf{M}\|_F^2, \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times p}, \quad \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times p}, \quad (3.6)$$

where $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$ is a given nonnegative matrix, $\mathbb{R}_+^{m \times p}$ denotes the set of $m \times p$ nonnegative matrices, and p is a user-specified rank. The problem in (3.6) can be written in the form of (1.1) by letting

$$f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{Y}^\top - \mathbf{M}\|_F^2, \quad r_1(\mathbf{X}) = \iota_{\mathbb{R}_+^{m \times p}}(\mathbf{X}), \quad r_2(\mathbf{Y}) = \iota_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n \times p}}(\mathbf{Y}).$$

In the literature, most existing algorithms for solving (3.6) update \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} alternately; see the review paper [24] and the references therein. The work [21] partitions the variables in a different way: $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{y}_p)$, where \mathbf{x}_j denotes the j -th column of \mathbf{X} , and proposes the rank-one residue iteration

²It is stated in [13] that the sequence generated by (3.5) converges to a coordinate-wise minimizer of (3.1). However, the result is obtained directly from [45], which only guarantees subsequence convergence.

(RRI) method. It updates the variables cyclically, one column at a time. Specifically, RRI performs the updates cyclically from $i = 1$ through p ,

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}_i \geq 0} \|\mathbf{x}_i(\mathbf{y}_i^k)^\top + \mathbf{X}_{<i}^{k+1}(\mathbf{Y}_{<i}^{k+1})^\top + \mathbf{X}_{>i}^k(\mathbf{Y}_{>i}^k)^\top - \mathbf{M}\|_F^2, \quad (3.7a)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_i^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}_i \geq 0} \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1}(\mathbf{y}_i)^\top + \mathbf{X}_{<i}^{k+1}(\mathbf{Y}_{<i}^{k+1})^\top + \mathbf{X}_{>i}^k(\mathbf{Y}_{>i}^k)^\top - \mathbf{M}\|_F^2, \quad (3.7b)$$

where $\mathbf{X}_{>i}^k = (\mathbf{x}_{i+1}^k, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p^k)$. The advantage of RRI is that each update in (3.7) has a closed form solution. Both updates in (3.7) can be written in the form of (1.2) by noting that they are equivalent to

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}_i \geq 0} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y}_i^k\|^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 + (\mathbf{y}_i^k)^\top (\mathbf{X}_{<i}^{k+1}(\mathbf{Y}_{<i}^{k+1})^\top + \mathbf{X}_{\geq i}^k(\mathbf{Y}_{\geq i}^k)^\top - \mathbf{M})^\top \mathbf{x}_i, \quad (3.8a)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_i^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}_i \geq 0} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1}\|^2 \|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_i^k\|^2 + \mathbf{y}_i^\top (\mathbf{X}_{<i}^{k+1}(\mathbf{Y}_{<i}^{k+1})^\top + \mathbf{x}_i^{k+1}(\mathbf{y}_i)^\top + \mathbf{X}_{>i}^k(\mathbf{Y}_{>i}^k)^\top - \mathbf{M})^\top \mathbf{x}_i^{k+1}. \quad (3.8b)$$

Since $f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) + r_1(\mathbf{X}) + r_2(\mathbf{Y})$ is semialgebraic and has the KL property, directly from Theorem 2.6, we have the following global convergence, which is stronger compared to the subsequence convergence in [21].

THEOREM 3.2 (Global convergence of RRI). *Let $\{(\mathbf{X}^k, \mathbf{Y}^k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be the sequence generated by (3.7) or (3.8) from any starting point $(\mathbf{X}^0, \mathbf{Y}^0)$. If $\{\mathbf{x}_i^k\}_{i,k}$ and $\{\mathbf{y}_i^k\}_{i,k}$ are uniformly bounded and away from zero, then $(\mathbf{X}^k, \mathbf{Y}^k)$ converges to a critical point of (3.6).*

However, during the iterations of RRI, it may happen that some columns of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} become or approach to zero vector, or some of them blow up, and these cases fail the assumption of Theorem 3.2. To tackle with the difficulties, we modify the updates in (3.7) and improve the RRI method as follows.

Our first modification is to require each column of \mathbf{X} to have unit Euclidean norm; the second modification is to take the Lipschitz constant of $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{X}_{<i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}_{>i}^k, \mathbf{Y}_{<i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{Y}_{\geq i}^k)$ to be $L_i^k = \max(L_{\min}, \|\mathbf{y}_i^k\|^2)$ for some $L_{\min} > 0$; the third modification is that at the beginning of the k -th cycle, we shuffle the blocks to a permutation $(\pi_1^k, \dots, \pi_p^k)$. Specifically, we perform the following updates from $i = 1$ through p ,

$$\mathbf{x}_{\pi_i^k}^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}_{\pi_i^k} \geq 0, \|\mathbf{x}_{\pi_i^k}\|=1} \frac{L_{\pi_i^k}^k}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_{\pi_i^k} - \mathbf{x}_{\pi_i^k}^k\|^2 + (\mathbf{y}_{\pi_i^k}^k)^\top (\mathbf{X}_{\pi_{<i}^k}^{k+1}(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi_{<i}^k}^{k+1})^\top + \mathbf{X}_{\pi_{\geq i}^k}^k(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi_{\geq i}^k}^k)^\top - \mathbf{M})^\top \mathbf{x}_{\pi_i^k}^k, \quad (3.9a)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_{\pi_i^k}^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}_{\pi_i^k} \geq 0} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y}_{\pi_i^k}\|^2 + \mathbf{y}_{\pi_i^k}^\top (\mathbf{X}_{\pi_{<i}^k}^{k+1}(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi_{<i}^k}^{k+1})^\top + \mathbf{X}_{\pi_{>i}^k}^k(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi_{>i}^k}^k)^\top - \mathbf{M})^\top \mathbf{x}_{\pi_i^k}^{k+1}. \quad (3.9b)$$

Note that if $\pi_i^k = i$ and $L_i^k = \|\mathbf{y}_i^k\|^2$, the objective in (3.9a) is the same as that in (3.8a). Both updates in (3.9) have closed form solutions; see Appendix B. Using Theorem 2.6, we have the following theorem, whose proof is given in Appendix C.1. Compared to the original RRI method, the modified one automatically has bounded sequence and always has the global convergence.

THEOREM 3.3 (Global convergence of modified RRI). *Let $\{(\mathbf{X}^k, \mathbf{Y}^k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be the sequence generated by (3.9) from any starting point $(\mathbf{X}^0, \mathbf{Y}^0)$. Then $\{\mathbf{Y}^k\}$ is bounded, and $(\mathbf{X}^k, \mathbf{Y}^k)$ converges to a critical point of (3.6).*

Numerical tests. We tested (3.8) and (3.9) on randomly generated data and also the Swimmer dataset [17]. We set $L_{\min} = 0.001$ in the tests and found that (3.9) with $\pi_i^k = i, \forall i, k$ produced the same final objective values as those by (3.8) on both random data and the Swimmer dataset. In addition, (3.9) with random shuffling performed almost the same as those with $\pi_i^k = i, \forall i$ on randomly generated data. However, random shuffling significantly improved the performance of (3.9) on the Swimmer dataset. There are 256 images of resolution 32×32 in the Swimmer dataset, and each image (vectorized to one column of \mathbf{M}) is composed of four limbs and the body. Each limb has four different positions, and all images have the body

FIG. 3.1. *Some images in the Swimmer Dataset*





FIG. 3.2. *Relative errors, defined as $\|\mathbf{C}^k \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1^k \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N^k - \mathcal{M}\|_F / \|\mathcal{M}\|_F$, given by (3.11) on Gaussian randomly generated $80 \times 80 \times 80$ tensor with core size of $5 \times 5 \times 5$. No extrapolation: $\hat{\mathbf{C}}^k = \mathbf{C}^k, \hat{\mathbf{A}}^k = \mathbf{A}^k, \forall k$; With extrapolation: $\hat{\mathbf{C}}^k, \hat{\mathbf{A}}^k$ set as in (1.6) with extrapolation weights taken as those in section 3.2 of [49].*



at the same position; see Figure 3.1. Hence, each of these images is a nonnegative combination of 17 images: one with the body and each one of another 16 images with one limb. We set $p = 17$ in our test and ran (3.8) and (3.9) with/without random shuffling to 100 cycles. If the relative error $\|\mathbf{X}^{out}(\mathbf{Y}^{out})^\top - \mathbf{M}\|_F / \|\mathbf{M}\|_F$ is below 10^{-3} , we regard the factorization to be successful, where $(\mathbf{X}^{out}, \mathbf{Y}^{out})$ is the output. We ran the three different updates for 50 times independently, and for each run, they were fed with the same randomly generated starting point. *Both (3.8) and (3.9) without random shuffling succeed 20 times, and (3.9) with random shuffling succeeds 41 times.*

3.3. Block prox-linear method for nonnegative Tucker decomposition. The nonnegative Tucker decomposition is to decompose a given nonnegative tensor (multi-dimensional array) into the product of a core nonnegative tensor and a few nonnegative factor matrices. It can be modeled as

$$\min_{\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}} \|\mathbf{C} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1 \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N - \mathcal{M}\|_F^2, \quad (3.10)$$

where $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N)$ and $\mathcal{X} \times_i \mathbf{Y}$ denotes tensor-matrix multiplication along the i -th mode (see [25] for example). The cyclic block proximal gradient method for solving (3.10) performs the following updates cyclically

$$\mathbf{C}^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{C} \geq 0} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{C}} f(\hat{\mathbf{C}}^k, \mathbf{A}^k), \mathbf{C} - \hat{\mathbf{C}}^k \rangle + \frac{L_c^k}{2} \|\mathbf{C} - \hat{\mathbf{C}}^k\|_F^2, \quad (3.11a)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_i^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{A}_i \geq 0} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{A}_i} f(\mathbf{C}^{k+1}, \mathbf{A}_{<i}^{k+1}, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_i^k, \mathbf{A}_{>i}^k), \mathbf{A}_i - \hat{\mathbf{A}}_i^k \rangle + \frac{L_i^k}{2} \|\mathbf{A}_i - \hat{\mathbf{A}}_i^k\|_F^2, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (3.11b)$$

where $f(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{C} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1 \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N - \mathcal{M}\|_F^2$, $\hat{\mathbf{C}}^k$ and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_i^k$ are extrapolated points, and L_c^k and L_i^k are gradient Lipschitz constants with respect to \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{A}_i respectively. Figure 3.2 shows that the extrapolation technique significantly accelerates the convergence speed of the method.

Since the core tensor \mathbf{C} interacts with all factor matrices, the work [48] proposes to update \mathbf{C} more frequently to improve the performance of the block proximal gradient method. Specifically, at each cycle, it

performs the following updates sequentially from $i = 1$ through N

$$\mathbf{C}^{k+1,i} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{C} \geq 0} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{C}} f(\hat{\mathbf{C}}^{k,i}, \mathbf{A}_{<i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{A}_{\geq i}^k), \mathbf{C} - \hat{\mathbf{C}}^{k,i} \rangle + \frac{L_c^{k,i}}{2} \|\mathbf{C} - \hat{\mathbf{C}}^{k,i}\|_F^2, \quad (3.12a)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_i^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{A}_i \geq 0} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{A}_i} f(\mathbf{C}^{k+1,i}, \mathbf{A}_{<i}^{k+1}, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_i^k, \mathbf{A}_{>i}^k), \mathbf{A} - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^k \rangle + \frac{L_i^k}{2} \|\mathbf{A} - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^k\|_F^2. \quad (3.12b)$$

It was demonstrated that (3.12) numerically performs better than (3.11). Note that both (3.11) and (3.12) are special cases of Algorithm 1 with $T = N + 1$ and $T = 2N + 2$ respectively, and the global convergence result in [48] is also a special case of Theorem 2.6.

Numerically, we observed that the performance of (3.12) could be improved if the blocks of variables were randomly shuffled as in (3.9), namely, we performed the updates sequentially from $i = 1$ through N

$$\mathbf{C}^{k+1,i} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{C} \geq 0} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{C}} f(\hat{\mathbf{C}}^{k,i}, \mathbf{A}_{\pi_{<i}^k}^{k+1}, \mathbf{A}_{\pi_{\geq i}^k}^k), \mathbf{C} - \hat{\mathbf{C}}^{k,i} \rangle + \frac{L_c^{k,i}}{2} \|\mathbf{C} - \hat{\mathbf{C}}^{k,i}\|_F^2, \quad (3.13a)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{\pi_i^k}^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{A}_{\pi_i^k} \geq 0} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{A}_{\pi_i^k}} f(\mathbf{C}^{k+1,i}, \mathbf{A}_{\pi_{<i}^k}^{k+1}, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{\pi_i^k}^k, \mathbf{A}_{\pi_{>i}^k}^k), \mathbf{A} - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^k \rangle + \frac{L_i^k}{2} \|\mathbf{A} - \hat{\mathbf{A}}^k\|_F^2, \quad (3.13b)$$

where $(\pi_1^k, \pi_2^k, \dots, \pi_N^k)$ is a random permutation of $(1, 2, \dots, N)$ at the k -th cycle. We tested (3.12) and (3.13) on the $32 \times 32 \times 256$ Swimmer dataset used above and set the core size to $24 \times 17 \times 16$. We ran them to 500 cycles from the same random starting point. If the relative error $\|\mathbf{C}^{out} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1^{out} \dots \times_N \mathbf{A}_N^{out} - \mathcal{M}\|_F / \|\mathcal{M}\|_F$ is below 10^{-3} , we regard the decomposition to be successful, where $(\mathbf{C}^{out}, \mathbf{A}^{out})$ is the output. *Among 50 independent runs, (3.13) with random shuffling succeeds 26 times while (3.12) succeeds only 18 times.*

4. Conclusions. We have presented a (randomized or deterministic) block prox-linear method for solving nonconvex optimization problems that may have block separable nonsmooth terms. The method has easy implementation since only one block coordinate is updated each time. It allows to update variables in both deterministic or random shuffled orders. Assuming that the differentiable parts have Lipschitz gradients, we obtained a subsequence convergence result that any limit point is a critical point. Further assuming the so-called Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz property, we showed that the entire sequence converges to a critical point and also estimated the convergence rate. Many problems in application have such a property, and thus global convergence of the iterates can be obtained by applying our method to these problems including ℓ_p -(semi)norm ($p \in [0, +\infty]$) regularized regression problems, matrix rank minimization, orthogonality constrained optimization, semidefinite programming, and so on.

Appendix A. Proofs of key lemmas. In this section, we give proofs of the lemmas and also propositions we used.

A.1. Proof of Lemma 2.1. Assume $b_k = i$. From the Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}^{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_i)$ about \mathbf{x}_i , it holds that (e.g., see Lemma 2.1 in [49])

$$f(\mathbf{x}^k) \leq f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) + \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}), \mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1} \rangle + \frac{L_k}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2. \quad (A.1)$$

Since \mathbf{x}_i^k is the minimizer of (1.2), then

$$\langle \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}^{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k), \mathbf{x}_i^k - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2\alpha_k} \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\|^2 + r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^k) \leq \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}^{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k), \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2\alpha_k} \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k-1} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\|^2 + r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}). \quad (A.2)$$

Summing (A.1) and (A.2) and noting that $\mathbf{x}_j^{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_j^k, \forall j \neq i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& F(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) - F(\mathbf{x}^k) \\
&= f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}) + r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}) - f(\mathbf{x}^k) - r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^k) \\
&\geq \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}^{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}), \mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1} \rangle + \frac{1}{2\alpha_k} \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\alpha_k} \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k-1} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\|^2 - \frac{L_k}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2 \\
&= \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}^{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1}), \mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1} \rangle + \frac{1}{\alpha_k} \langle \mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k \rangle + \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha_k} - \frac{L_k}{2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2 \\
&\geq - \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\| (\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}^{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}^{k-1})\| + \frac{1}{\alpha_k} \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k-1} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\|) + \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha_k} - \frac{L_k}{2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2 \\
&\geq - \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_k} + L_k \right) \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k-1} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\| + \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha_k} - \frac{L_k}{2} \right) \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_k} - L_k \right) \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2 - \frac{(1/\alpha_k + L_k)^2}{1/\alpha_k - L_k} \omega_k^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k-1} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^{k-1}-1}\|^2 \\
&= \frac{L_k}{4} \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2 - 9L_k \omega_k^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k-1} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^{d_i^{k-1}-1}\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the second inequality, Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}_{\neq i}^{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_i)$ in the third one, the Young's inequality and (1.6) in the fourth one, and $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{2L_k}$ to get the last equality.

Substituting $\tilde{\omega}_i^j \leq \frac{\delta}{6} \sqrt{\tilde{L}_i^{j-1}/\tilde{L}_i^j}$ and recalling (1.8) completes the proof.

A.2. Proof of Proposition 2.2. Summing (2.3) over k from 1 to K gives

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\mathbf{x}^0) - F(\mathbf{x}^K) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=d_i^{k-1}+1}^{d_i^k} \left(\frac{\tilde{L}_i^j}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|^2 - \frac{\tilde{L}_i^{j-1} \delta^2}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-2} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1}\|^2 \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{d_i^K} \left(\frac{\tilde{L}_i^j}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|^2 - \frac{\tilde{L}_i^{j-1} \delta^2}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-2} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1}\|^2 \right) \\
&\geq \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{d_i^K} \frac{\tilde{L}_i^j (1 - \delta^2)}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|^2 \\
&\geq \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{d_i^K} \frac{\ell (1 - \delta^2)}{4} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact $d_i^0 = 0, \forall i$ in the first equality, $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{-1} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^0, \forall i$ to have the second inequality, and $\tilde{L}_i^j \geq \ell, \forall i, j$ in the last inequality. Letting $K \rightarrow \infty$ and noting $d_i^K \rightarrow \infty$ for all i by Assumption 3, we conclude from the above inequality and the lower boundedness of F in Assumption 1 that

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{j-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^j\|^2 < \infty,$$

which implies (2.5).

A.3. Proof of Lemma 2.4. Let \mathbf{a}_m and \mathbf{u}_m be the vectors with their i -th entries

$$(\mathbf{a}_m)_i = \sqrt{\alpha_{i,n_i,m}}, \quad (\mathbf{u}_m)_i = A_{i,n_i,m}.$$

Then (2.8) can be written as

$$\|\mathbf{a}_{m+1} \odot \mathbf{u}_{m+1}\|^2 + (1 - \beta^2) \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m}+1}^{n_{i,m+1}-1} \alpha_{i,j} A_{i,j}^2 \leq \beta^2 \|\mathbf{a}_m \odot \mathbf{u}_m\|^2 + B_m \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m}-1+1}^{n_{i,m}} A_{i,j}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Let

$$\underline{\alpha} = \inf_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j}, \quad \bar{\alpha} = \sup_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j}.$$

Then it follows from (A.3) that

$$\|\mathbf{a}_{m+1} \odot \mathbf{u}_{m+1}\|^2 + \underline{\alpha}(1 - \beta^2) \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m}+1}^{n_{i,m+1}-1} A_{i,j}^2 \leq \beta^2 \|\mathbf{a}_m \odot \mathbf{u}_m\|^2 + B_m \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m-1}+1}^{n_{i,m}} A_{i,j}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and noting $n_{i,m+1} - n_{i,m} \leq N, \forall i, m$, we have that there exists a sufficiently small $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1 + \beta}{2} \|\mathbf{a}_{m+1} \odot \mathbf{u}_{m+1}\| + C_1 \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m}+1}^{n_{i,m+1}-1} A_{i,j} \leq \sqrt{\|\mathbf{a}_{m+1} \odot \mathbf{u}_{m+1}\|^2 + \underline{\alpha}(1 - \beta^2) \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m}+1}^{n_{i,m+1}-1} A_{i,j}^2}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and for any $C_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\beta^2 \|\mathbf{a}_m \odot \mathbf{u}_m\|^2 + B_m \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m-1}+1}^{n_{i,m}} A_{i,j}} \\ & \leq \beta \|\mathbf{a}_m \odot \mathbf{u}_m\| + \sqrt{B_m \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m-1}+1}^{n_{i,m}} A_{i,j}} \\ & \leq \beta \|\mathbf{a}_m \odot \mathbf{u}_m\| + C_2 B_m + \frac{1}{4C_2} \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m-1}+1}^{n_{i,m}} A_{i,j} \\ & \leq \beta \|\mathbf{a}_m \odot \mathbf{u}_m\| + C_2 B_m + \frac{1}{4C_2} \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m-1}+1}^{n_{i,m}-1} A_{i,j} + \frac{\sqrt{s}}{4C_2} \|\mathbf{u}_m\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Combining (A.4), (A.5), and (A.6), we have

$$\frac{1 + \beta}{2} \|\mathbf{a}_{m+1} \odot \mathbf{u}_{m+1}\| + C_1 \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m}+1}^{n_{i,m+1}-1} A_{i,j} \leq \beta \|\mathbf{a}_m \odot \mathbf{u}_m\| + C_2 B_m + \frac{1}{4C_2} \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m-1}+1}^{n_{i,m}-1} A_{i,j} + \frac{\sqrt{s}}{4C_2} \|\mathbf{u}_m\|. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Take C_2 in (A.5) such that

$$\frac{1}{4C_2} \leq \frac{C_1}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\sqrt{s}}{4C_2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\underline{\alpha}(1 - \beta)}}{4}.$$

Summing (A.7) over m from M_1 through $M_2 \leq M$ and arranging terms yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{\underline{\alpha}(1 - \beta)}}{4} \sum_{m=M_1}^{M_2} \|\mathbf{u}_{m+1}\| + \frac{C_1}{2} \sum_{m=M_1}^{M_2} \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m}+1}^{n_{i,m+1}-1} A_{i,j} \\ & \leq \beta \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}} \|\mathbf{u}_{M_1}\| + C_2 \sum_{m=M_1}^{M_2} B_m + \frac{1}{4C_2} \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,M_1-1}+1}^{n_{i,M_1}-1} A_{i,j} + \frac{\sqrt{s}}{4C_2} \|\mathbf{u}_{M_1}\|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

which together with $\sum_{i=1}^s A_{i,n_i,m+1} \leq \sqrt{s} \|\mathbf{u}_{m+1}\|$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
C_3 \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,M_1}+1}^{n_{i,M_2}+1} A_{i,j} &= C_3 \sum_{m=M_1}^{M_2} \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,m}+1}^{n_{i,m+1}} A_{i,j} \\
&\leq \beta \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}} \|\mathbf{u}_N\| + C_2 \sum_{m=M_1}^{M_2} B_m + \frac{1}{4C_2} \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,M_1-1}+1}^{n_{i,M_1}-1} A_{i,j} + \frac{\sqrt{s}}{4C_2} \|\mathbf{u}_{M_1}\|, \\
&\leq C_2 \sum_{m=1}^{M_2} B_m + C_4 \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=n_{i,M_1-1}+1}^{n_{i,M_1}} A_{i,j}, \tag{A.9}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\|\mathbf{u}_{M_1}\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^s A_{i,n_i,M_1}$, and

$$C_3 = \min \left(\frac{\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}}(1-\beta)}{4\sqrt{s}}, \frac{C_1}{2} \right), \quad C_4 = \beta \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}} + \frac{\sqrt{s}}{4C_2}.$$

Obviously, (A.9) implies (2.9). If $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} n_{i,m} = \infty, \forall i$, $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} B_m < \infty$, and (2.8) holds for all m , letting $M_1 = 1$ and $M_2 \rightarrow \infty$, we have (2.10) from (A.9).

A.4. Proof of Proposition 2.5. For any i , assume that while updating the i -th block to \mathbf{x}_i^k , the value of the j -th block ($j \neq i$) is $\mathbf{y}_j^{(i)}$, the extrapolated point of the i -th block is \mathbf{z}_i , and the Lipschitz constant of $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{y}_{\neq i}^{(i)}, \mathbf{x}_i)$ with respect to \mathbf{x}_i is \tilde{L}_i , namely,

$$\mathbf{x}_i^k = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}_i} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{y}_{\neq i}^{(i)}, \mathbf{z}_i), \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{z}_i \rangle + \tilde{L}_i \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{z}_i\|^2 + r_i(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

Hence, $\mathbf{0} \in \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{y}_{\neq i}^{(i)}, \mathbf{z}_i) + 2\tilde{L}_i(\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{z}_i) + \partial r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^k)$, or equivalently,

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{y}_{\neq i}^{(i)}, \mathbf{z}_i) - 2\tilde{L}_i(\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{z}_i) \in \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}^k) + \partial r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^k). \tag{A.10}$$

Note that \mathbf{x}_i may be updated to \mathbf{x}_i^k not at the k -th iteration but at some earlier one, which must be between $k - T$ and k by Assumption 3. In addition, for each pair (i, j) , there must be some $\kappa_{i,j}$ between $k - 2T$ and k such that

$$\mathbf{y}_j^{(i)} = \mathbf{x}_j^{\kappa_{i,j}}, \tag{A.11}$$

and for each i , there are $k - 3T \leq \kappa_1^i < \kappa_2^i \leq k$ and extrapolation weight $\tilde{\omega}_i \leq 1$ such that

$$\mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{x}_i^{\kappa_2^i} + \tilde{\omega}_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{\kappa_2^i} - \mathbf{x}_i^{\kappa_1^i}). \tag{A.12}$$

By triangle inequality, $(\mathbf{y}_{\neq i}^{(i)}, \mathbf{z}_i) \in B_{4\rho}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ for all i . Therefore, it follows from (1.9) and (A.10) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial F(\mathbf{x}^k)) &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^s \|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{y}_{\neq i}^{(i)}, \mathbf{z}_i) - 2\tilde{L}_i(\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{z}_i)\|^2} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^s \|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{y}_{\neq i}^{(i)}, \mathbf{z}_i) - 2\tilde{L}_i(\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{z}_i)\| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^s \left(\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{y}_{\neq i}^{(i)}, \mathbf{z}_i)\| + 2\tilde{L}_i \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{z}_i\| \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^s \left(L_G \|\mathbf{x}^k - (\mathbf{y}_{\neq i}^{(i)}, \mathbf{z}_i)\| + 2\tilde{L}_i \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{z}_i\| \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^s \left((L_G + 2L) \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{z}_i\| + \sum_{j \neq i} \|\mathbf{x}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^{(i)}\| \right), \tag{A.13}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the fourth inequality, we have used the Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x})$ with respect to \mathbf{x} , and the last inequality uses $\tilde{L}_i \leq L$. Now use (A.13), (A.11), (A.12) and also the triangle inequality to have the desired result.

A.5. Proof of Lemma 2.7. The proof follows that of Theorem 2 of [3]. When $\gamma \geq 1$, since $0 \leq A_{k-1} - A_k \leq 1, \forall k \geq K$, we have $(A_{k-1} - A_k)^\gamma \leq A_{k-1} - A_k$, and thus (2.18) implies that for all $k \geq K$, it holds that $A_k \leq (\alpha + \beta)(A_{k-1} - A_k)$, from which item 1 immediately follows.

When $\gamma < 1$, we have $(A_{k-1} - A_k)^\gamma \geq A_{k-1} - A_k$, and thus (2.18) implies that for all $k \geq K$, it holds that $A_k \leq (\alpha + \beta)(A_{k-1} - A_k)^\gamma$. Letting $h(x) = x^{-1/\gamma}$, we have for $k \geq K$,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq (\alpha + \beta)^{1/\gamma} (A_{k-1} - A_k) A_k^{-1/\gamma} \\ &= (\alpha + \beta)^{1/\gamma} \left(\frac{A_{k-1}}{A_k} \right)^{1/\gamma} (A_{k-1} - A_k) A_{k-1}^{-1/\gamma} \\ &\leq (\alpha + \beta)^{1/\gamma} \left(\frac{A_{k-1}}{A_k} \right)^{1/\gamma} \int_{A_k}^{A_{k-1}} h(x) dx \\ &= \frac{(\alpha + \beta)^{1/\gamma}}{1 - 1/\gamma} \left(\frac{A_{k-1}}{A_k} \right)^{1/\gamma} \left(A_{k-1}^{1-1/\gamma} - A_k^{1-1/\gamma} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used nonincreasing monotonicity of h in the second inequality. Hence,

$$A_k^{1-1/\gamma} - A_{k-1}^{1-1/\gamma} \geq \frac{1/\gamma - 1}{(\alpha + \beta)^{1/\gamma}} \left(\frac{A_k}{A_{k-1}} \right)^{1/\gamma}. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Let μ be the positive constant such that

$$\frac{1/\gamma - 1}{(\alpha + \beta)^{1/\gamma}} \mu = \mu^{\gamma-1} - 1. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Note that the above equation has a unique solution $0 < \mu < 1$. We claim that

$$A_k^{1-1/\gamma} - A_{k-1}^{1-1/\gamma} \geq \mu^{\gamma-1} - 1, \quad \forall k \geq K. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

It obviously holds from (A.14) and (A.15) if $\left(\frac{A_k}{A_{k-1}} \right)^{1/\gamma} \geq \mu$. It also holds if $\left(\frac{A_k}{A_{k-1}} \right)^{1/\gamma} \leq \mu$ from the arguments

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{A_k}{A_{k-1}} \right)^{1/\gamma} \leq \mu &\Rightarrow A_k \leq \mu^\gamma A_{k-1} \Rightarrow A_k^{1-1/\gamma} \geq \mu^{\gamma-1} A_{k-1}^{1-1/\gamma} \\ &\Rightarrow A_k^{1-1/\gamma} - A_{k-1}^{1-1/\gamma} \geq (\mu^{\gamma-1} - 1) A_{k-1}^{1-1/\gamma} \geq \mu^{\gamma-1} - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is from $A_{k-1}^{1-1/\gamma} \geq 1$. Hence, (A.16) holds, and summing it over k gives

$$A_k^{1-1/\gamma} \geq A_k^{1-1/\gamma} - A_K^{1-1/\gamma} \geq (\mu^{\gamma-1} - 1)(k - K),$$

which immediately gives item 2 by letting $\nu = (\mu^{\gamma-1} - 1)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}$.

Appendix B. Solutions of (3.9). In this section, we give closed form solutions to both updates in (3.9). First, it is not difficult to have that the solution of (3.9b) is

$$\mathbf{y}_{\pi_i}^{k+1} = \max \left(0, \left(\mathbf{X}_{\pi_{<i}}^{k+1} (\mathbf{Y}_{\pi_{<i}}^{k+1})^\top + \mathbf{X}_{\pi_{>i}}^k (\mathbf{Y}_{\pi_{>i}}^k)^\top - \mathbf{M} \right)^\top \mathbf{x}_{\pi_i}^{k+1} \right).$$

Secondly, since $L_{\pi_i}^k > 0$, it is easy to write (3.9a) in the form of

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \geq 0, \|\mathbf{x}\|=1} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}\|^2 + \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{x} + C,$$

which is apparently equivalent to

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \geq 0, \|\mathbf{x}\|=1} \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

which $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}$. Next we give solution to (B.1) in three different cases.

Case 1: $\mathbf{c} < 0$. Let $i_0 = \arg \max_i c_i$ and $c_{\max} = c_{i_0} < 0$. If there are more than one components equal c_{\max} , one can choose an arbitrary one of them. Then the solution to (B.1) is given by $x_{i_0} = 1$ and $x_i = 0, \forall i \neq i_0$ because for any $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$, it holds that

$$\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} \leq c_{\max} \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq c_{\max} \|\mathbf{x}\| = c_{\max}.$$

Case 2: $\mathbf{c} \leq 0$ and $\mathbf{c} \not\leq 0$. Let $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{c}_{I_0}, \mathbf{c}_{I_-})$ where $\mathbf{c}_{I_0} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{c}_{I_-} < 0$. Then the solution to (B.1) is given by $\mathbf{x}_{I_-} = \mathbf{0}$ and \mathbf{x}_{I_0} being any vector that satisfies $\mathbf{x}_{I_0} \geq 0$ and $\|\mathbf{x}_{I_0}\| = 1$ because $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} \leq 0$ for any $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$.

Case 3: $\mathbf{c} \not\leq 0$. Let $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{c}_{I_+}, \mathbf{c}_{I_+^c})$ where $\mathbf{c}_{I_+} > 0$ and $\mathbf{c}_{I_+^c} \leq 0$. Then (B.1) has a unique solution given by $\mathbf{x}_{I_+} = \frac{\mathbf{c}_{I_+}}{\|\mathbf{c}_{I_+}\|}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{I_+^c} = \mathbf{0}$ because for any $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$, it holds that

$$\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{c}_{I_+}^\top \mathbf{x}_{I_+} \leq \|\mathbf{c}_{I_+}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{x}_{I_+}\| \leq \|\mathbf{c}_{I_+}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{x}\| = \|\mathbf{c}_{I_+}\|,$$

where the second inequality holds with equality if and only if \mathbf{x}_{I_+} is collinear with \mathbf{c}_{I_+} , and the third inequality holds with equality if and only if $\mathbf{x}_{I_+^c} = \mathbf{0}$.

Appendix C. Proofs of convergence of some examples. In this section, we give the proofs of the theorems in section 3.

C.1. Proof of Theorem 3.3. Through checking the assumptions of Theorem 2.6, we only need to verify the boundedness of $\{\mathbf{Y}^k\}$ to show Theorem 3.3. Let $\mathbf{E}^k = \mathbf{X}^k (\mathbf{Y}^k)^\top - \mathbf{M}$. Since every iteration decreases the objective, it is easy to see that $\{\mathbf{E}^k\}$ is bounded. Hence, $\{\mathbf{E}^k + \mathbf{M}\}$ is bounded, and

$$a = \sup_k \max_{i,j} (\mathbf{E}^k + \mathbf{M})_{ij} < \infty.$$

Let \mathbf{y}_i^k be the i -th row of \mathbf{Y}^k . Thus the q -th column of $\mathbf{E}^k + \mathbf{M}$ is

$$a \geq \mathbf{e}_q^k + \mathbf{m}_q = \sum_{j=1}^p y_{ij}^k \mathbf{x}_j^k, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where \mathbf{x}_j^k is the j -th column of \mathbf{X}^k . Note that $\|\mathbf{x}_j^k\| = 1$. Thus $\|\mathbf{x}_j^k\|_\infty \geq 1/\sqrt{m}$, and by nonnegativity of \mathbf{Y}^k , we have from (C.1) that $y_{ij}^k \leq a\sqrt{m}$ for all i, j and k . This completes the proof.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. AHARON, M. ELAD, AND A. BRUCKSTEIN, *K-SVD: An algorithm for designing overcomplete dictionaries for sparse representation*, Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on, 54 (2006), pp. 4311–4322.
- [2] G. ALLEN, *Sparse higher-order principal components analysis*, in International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, 2012, pp. 27–36.
- [3] H. ATTOUCH AND J. BOLTE, *On the convergence of the proximal algorithm for nonsmooth functions involving analytic features*, Mathematical Programming, 116 (2009), pp. 5–16.
- [4] H. ATTOUCH, J. BOLTE, P. REDONT, AND A. SOUBEYRAN, *Proximal alternating minimization and projection methods for nonconvex problems: An approach based on the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz inequality*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 35 (2010), pp. 438–457.
- [5] H. ATTOUCH, J. BOLTE, AND B. F. SVAITER, *Convergence of descent methods for semi-algebraic and tame problems: proximal algorithms, forward-backward splitting, and regularized gauss-seidel methods*, Mathematical Programming, 137 (2013), pp. 91–129.

- [6] A. M. BAGIROV, L. JIN, N. KARIMITSA, A. AL NUAIMAT, AND N. SULTANOVA, *Subgradient method for nonconvex nonsmooth optimization*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 157 (2013), pp. 416–435.
- [7] A. BECK AND L. TETRUASHVILI, *On the convergence of block coordinate descent type methods*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 23 (2013), pp. 2037–2060.
- [8] D. P. BERTSEKAS, *Nonlinear Programming*, Athena Scientific, September 1999.
- [9] T. BLUMENSATH AND M. E. DAVIES, *Iterative hard thresholding for compressed sensing*, Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis, 27 (2009), pp. 265–274.
- [10] J. BOLTE, A. DANILIDIS, AND A. LEWIS, *The Lojasiewicz inequality for nonsmooth subanalytic functions with applications to subgradient dynamical systems*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 17 (2007), pp. 1205–1223.
- [11] J. BOLTE, A. DANILIDIS, O. LEY, AND L. MAZET, *Characterizations of lojasiewicz inequalities: subgradient flows, talweg, convexity*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 362 (2010), pp. 3319–3363.
- [12] J. BOLTE, S. SABACH, AND M. TEBoulLE, *Proximal alternating linearized minimization for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems*, Mathematical Programming, (2013), pp. 1–36.
- [13] P. BREHENY AND J. HUANG, *Coordinate descent algorithms for nonconvex penalized regression, with applications to biological feature selection*, The annals of applied statistics, 5 (2011), pp. 232–253.
- [14] J. V. BURKE, A. S. LEWIS, AND M. L. OVERTON, *A robust gradient sampling algorithm for nonsmooth, nonconvex optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 15 (2005), pp. 751–779.
- [15] R. CHARTRAND AND W. YIN, *Iteratively reweighted algorithms for compressive sensing*, in Acoustics, speech and signal processing, 2008. ICASSP 2008. IEEE international conference on, IEEE, 2008, pp. 3869–3872.
- [16] X. CHEN, *Smoothing methods for nonsmooth, nonconvex minimization*, Mathematical programming, 134 (2012), pp. 71–99.
- [17] D. DONOHO AND V. STODDEN, *When does non-negative matrix factorization give a correct decomposition into parts*, Advances in neural information processing systems, 16 (2003).
- [18] A. FUDULI, M. GAUDIOSO, AND G. GIALLOMBARDO, *Minimizing nonconvex nonsmooth functions via cutting planes and proximity control*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 14 (2004), pp. 743–756.
- [19] L. GRIPPO AND M. SCIANDRONE, *Globally convergent block-coordinate techniques for unconstrained optimization*, Optim. Methods Softw., 10 (1999), pp. 587–637.
- [20] C. HILDRETH, *A quadratic programming procedure*, Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, 4 (1957), pp. 79–85.
- [21] N. HO, P. VAN DOOREN, AND V. BLONDEL, *Descent methods for nonnegative matrix factorization*, Numerical Linear Algebra in Signals, Systems and Control, (2011), pp. 251–293.
- [22] M. HONG, X. WANG, M. RAZAVIYAYN, AND Z.-Q. LUO, *Iteration complexity analysis of block coordinate descent methods*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1310.6957, (2013).
- [23] P. HOYER, *Non-negative matrix factorization with sparseness constraints*, The Journal of Machine Learning Research, 5 (2004), pp. 1457–1469.
- [24] J. KIM, Y. HE, AND H. PARK, *Algorithms for nonnegative matrix and tensor factorizations: A unified view based on block coordinate descent framework*, Journal of Global Optimization, 58 (2014), pp. 285–319.
- [25] T. KOLDA AND B. BADER, *Tensor decompositions and applications*, SIAM review, 51 (2009), p. 455.
- [26] A. Y. KRUGER, *On fréchet subdifferentials*, Journal of Mathematical Sciences, 116 (2003), pp. 3325–3358.
- [27] K. KURDYKA, *On gradients of functions definable in o-minimal structures*, in Annales de l’institut Fourier, vol. 48, Chartres: L’Institut, 1950-, 1998, pp. 769–784.
- [28] M.-J. LAI, Y. XU, AND W. YIN, *Improved iteratively reweighted least squares for unconstrained smoothed ℓ_q minimization*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 51 (2013), pp. 927–957.
- [29] D. LEE AND H. SEUNG, *Learning the parts of objects by non-negative matrix factorization*, Nature, 401 (1999), pp. 788–791.
- [30] S. LOJASIEWICZ, *Sur la géométrie semi-et sous-analytique*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), 43 (1993), pp. 1575–1595.
- [31] Z. LU AND L. XIAO, *On the complexity analysis of randomized block-coordinate descent methods*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1305.4723, (2013).
- [32] ———, *Randomized block coordinate non-monotone gradient method for a class of nonlinear programming*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.5918, (2013).
- [33] Z. Q. LUO AND P. TSENG, *On the convergence of the coordinate descent method for convex differentiable minimization*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 72 (1992), pp. 7–35.
- [34] J. MAIRAL, F. BACH, J. PONCE, AND G. SAPIRO, *Online dictionary learning for sparse coding*, in Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning, ACM, 2009, pp. 689–696.
- [35] K. MOHAN AND M. FAZEL, *Iterative reweighted algorithms for matrix rank minimization*, The Journal of Machine Learning Research, 13 (2012), pp. 3441–3473.
- [36] B. K. NATARAJAN, *Sparse approximate solutions to linear systems*, SIAM journal on computing, 24 (1995), pp. 227–234.
- [37] Y. NESTEROV, *Efficiency of coordinate descent methods on huge-scale optimization problems*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 22 (2012), pp. 341–362.

- [38] J. NOCEDAL AND S. J. WRIGHT, *Numerical Optimization*, Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering, Springer, New York, second ed., 2006.
- [39] P. PAATERO AND U. TAPPER, *Positive matrix factorization: A non-negative factor model with optimal utilization of error estimates of data values*, *Environmetrics*, 5 (1994), pp. 111–126.
- [40] M. RAZAVIYAYN, M. HONG, AND Z.-Q. LUO, *A unified convergence analysis of block successive minimization methods for nonsmooth optimization*, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23 (2013), pp. 1126–1153.
- [41] B. RECHT, M. FAZEL, AND P. PARRILO, *Guaranteed minimum-rank solutions of linear matrix equations via nuclear norm minimization*, *SIAM review*, 52 (2010), pp. 471–501.
- [42] P. RICHTÁRIK AND M. TAKÁČ, *Iteration complexity of randomized block-coordinate descent methods for minimizing a composite function*, *Mathematical Programming*, (2012), pp. 1–38.
- [43] R. ROCKAFELLAR AND R. WETS, *Variational analysis*, vol. 317, Springer Verlag, 2009.
- [44] A. SAHA AND A. TEWARI, *On the nonasymptotic convergence of cyclic coordinate descent methods*, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23 (2013), pp. 576–601.
- [45] P. TSENG, *Convergence of a block coordinate descent method for nondifferentiable minimization*, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 109 (2001), pp. 475–494.
- [46] P. TSENG AND S. YUN, *A coordinate gradient descent method for nonsmooth separable minimization*, *Math. Program.*, 117 (2009), pp. 387–423.
- [47] M. WELLING AND M. WEBER, *Positive tensor factorization*, *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 22 (2001), pp. 1255–1261.
- [48] Y. XU, *Alternating proximal gradient method for sparse nonnegative tucker decomposition*, *Mathematical Programming Computation*, (2014), pp. 1–32.
- [49] Y. XU AND W. YIN, *A block coordinate descent method for regularized multiconvex optimization with applications to nonnegative tensor factorization and completion*, *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 6 (2013), pp. 1758–1789.
- [50] ———, *A fast patch-dictionary method for whole image recovery*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1408.3740, (2014).