

# Primal-dual path following method for nonlinear semi-infinite programs with semi-definite constraints

Takayuki Okuno · Masao Fukushima

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** In this paper, we propose two algorithms for nonlinear semi-infinite semi-definite programs with infinitely many convex inequality constraints, called SISDP for short. A straightforward approach to the SISDP is to use classical methods for semi-infinite programs such as discretization and exchange methods and solve a sequence of (nonlinear) semi-definite programs (SDPs). However, it is often too demanding to find exact solutions of SDPs.

Our first approach does not rely on solving SDPs but on approximately following a path leading to a solution, which is formed on the intersection of the semi-infinite region and the interior of the semi-definite region. We show weak\* convergence of this method to a Karush-Kuhn-Tucker point of the SISDP under some mild assumptions and further provide with sufficient conditions for strong convergence. Moreover, as the second method, to achieve fast local convergence, we integrate a two-step sequential quadratic programming method equipped with Monteiro-Zhang scaling technique into the first method. We particularly prove two-step superlinear convergence of the second method using Alizadeh-Hareberly-Overton-like, Nesterov-Todd, and Helmberg-Rendle-Vanderbei-Wolkowicz/Kojima-Shindoh-Hara/Monteiro scaling directions. Finally, we conduct some numerical experiments to demonstrate the efficiency of the proposed method through comparison with a discretization method that solves SDPs obtained by finite relaxation of the SISDP.

**Keywords** semi-infinite program · nonlinear semi-definite program · path-following method · superlinear convergence · global convergence

---

The work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number [15K15943].

T. Okuno

RIKEN, The Center for Advanced Intelligence Project (AIP), Nihonbashi 1-chome Mitsui Building, 15th floor, 1-4-1 Nihonbashi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo 103-0027, Japan  
E-mail: takayuki.okuno.ks@riken.jp

M. Fukushima

Nanzan University, Faculty of Science and Engineering, 18 Yamazato-cho, Showa-ku, Nagoya 466-8673, Japan E-mail: fuku@nanzan-u.ac.jp

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2010)** 90C22 · 90C26 · 90C34

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following nonlinear semi-infinite semi-definite program with an infinite number of convex inequality constraints and one linear matrix inequality constraint, SISDP for short:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize } f(x) \\ & \text{subject to } g(x, \tau) \leq 0 \text{ for all } \tau \in T, \\ & \quad F(x) \in S_+^m, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where  $f : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  is a continuously differentiable function and  $T$  is a compact metric space. In addition,  $g : \mathcal{R}^n \times T \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  is a continuous function, and  $g(\cdot, \tau)$  is supposed to be convex and continuously differentiable. Moreover,  $S^m$  and  $S_{++}^m$  ( $S_+^m$ ) denote the sets of  $m \times m$  symmetric matrices and symmetric positive (semi-)definite matrices, respectively, and  $F(\cdot) : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow S^m$  is an affine function, i.e.,

$$F(x) := F_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i F_i$$

with  $F_i \in S^m$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$  and  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^\top$ . We assume that the SISDP (1.1) has a nonempty solution set. We may let the SISDP (1.1) include linear equality constraints, to which the algorithms and theories given in the subsequent sections can be extended straightforwardly. But, for simplicity of expression, we omit them.

When  $T$  comprises a finite number of elements, the SISDP reduces to a nonlinear semi-definite program (nonlinear SDP or NSDP). Particularly when all the functions are affine with respect to  $x$ , it further reduces to the linear SDP (LSDP). As is known broadly, studies on the LSDP have been crucially promoted in the aspects of theory, algorithms, and applications [30]. Compared with the LSDP, studies on the NSDP are still scarce, although important applications are found in various areas [3, 8, 9]. Shapiro [22] expanded an elaborate theory on the first and second order optimality conditions of the NSDP. See [1] for a comprehensive description of the optimality conditions and duality theory of the NSDP. Yamashita et al. [35] proposed a primal-dual interior point-type method using the Monteiro-Zhang (MZ) directions family and showed its global convergence property. They further made local convergence analysis in [33]. The SQP method for nonlinear programs was also extended to the NSDP by Freund et al. [3]. See the survey article [34] for more algorithms designed to solve the NSDP.

In the absence of the semi-definite constraint, (1.1) becomes a nonlinear semi-infinite program (SIP) with an infinite number of convex constraints. For solving nonlinear SIPs, many researchers proposed various kinds of algorithms, for example discretization based methods [20, 25], local reduction

based methods [5, 17, 18, 26], Newton-type methods [10, 19], smoothing projection methods [32], convexification based methods [2, 23, 24, 29], and so on. For an overview of the SIP, see [4, 7, 21] and the references therein.

Most closely related to the SISDP (1.1) are SIPs involving (possibly infinitely many) conic constraints. Li et al. [13] considered a linear SIP with semi-definite constraints and proposed a discretization based method. Subsequently, Li et al. [12] tackled the same problem and developed a relaxed cutting plane method. Hayashi and Wu [6] focused on a linear SIP involving second-order cone (SOC) constraints and proposed an exchange-type method. It is worth mentioning that the SISDP (1.1) can be viewed as a generalization of those problems. More recently, Okuno et al. [16] considered a convex SIP with an infinite number of conic constraints, and proposed an exchange-type method combined with Tikhonov's regularization technique. Okuno and Fukushima [14] restricted themselves to a nonlinear SIP with infinitely many SOC constraints, and constructed a quadratically convergent sequential quadratic programming (SQP)-type method based on the local reduction method. One of common features of the algorithms mentioned above is to solve a sequence of certain conic constrained problems.

We can find some important applications of the SISDP. For example, semi-infinite eigenvalue optimization problems [13], finite impulse response (FIR) filter design problems [31], and robust envelop-constrained filter design with orthonormal bases [11] can be formulated as the SISDP whose functions are all affine with respect to  $x$ . Moreover, robust beam forming problems [36] can be formulated as the SISDP with infinitely many nonlinear inequality constraints. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no existing work that deals with the SISDP (1.1) itself.

In this paper, we propose two algorithms tailored to the SISDP. In the first method, we generate a sequence approaching a Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) point of the SISDP by approximately following a central path formed by barrier KKT (BKKT) points of the SISDP. The BKKT points, whose definition will be provided in Section 2, can be computed efficiently using the interior-point SQP-type method proposed in the authors' recent work [15]. Although it is possible to design a convergent algorithm that solves NSDPs iteratively like the existing algorithms mentioned in the previous paragraph, it is often too demanding to get an accurate solution of an NSDP at each iteration. In contrast, the proposed path-following algorithm will only require solving quadratic programs if it is combined with the interior point SQP-type method. In the second method, to accelerate the local convergence speed, we further integrate a two-step SQP method into the first method. Specifically, we derive the scaled barrier KKT system of the SISDP by means of the local reduction method [5, 17, 18, 26] and the Monteiro-Zhang scaling technique [30, Chapter 10]. We then perform a two-step SQP method to generate iteration points, while decreasing a barrier parameter to zero superlinearly. In each step of the two-step SQP, to produce a search direction, we solve a mixed linear complementarity system approximating the aforementioned scaled barrier KKT system, which can be solved via a certain quadratic program. We then adjust a step-size along the

obtained search direction so that the next iteration point remains to lie in the interior of the semi-definite region. We will show that, under some regularity conditions at a KKT point of the SISDP, a step-size of the unity is eventually adopted and two-step superlinear convergence is achieved.

The proposed methods may be viewed as an extension of the primal-dual interior point method [35] for the NSDPs. Nonetheless, the theoretical and algorithmic extensions are not straightforward because of the presence of infinitely many inequality constraints. Furthermore, the results obtained in the paper have novelty not only in the field of the SIP but also the NSDP.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we propose a primal-dual path-following method for the SISDP. We prove that any weak\*-accumulation point of the generated sequence is a KKT point of the SISDP under some mild assumptions. We also give a sufficient condition for strong convergence of the sequence. In Section 3, we further combine the local-reduction based SQP method with the prototype method and prove that it converges to a KKT point of the SISDP two-step superlinearly. In Section 4, we conduct some numerical experiments to exhibit the efficiency of the proposed method. Finally, we conclude this paper with some remarks.

## Notations

Throughout this paper, we use the following notations: The identity matrix is denoted by  $I$ . For any  $P \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$ ,  $\text{Tr}(P)$  denotes the trace of  $P$ . For any symmetric matrices  $X, Y \in S^m$ , we denote the Jordan product of  $X$  and  $Y$  by  $X \circ Y := (XY + YX)/2$  and the inner product of  $X$  and  $Y$  by  $X \bullet Y = \text{Tr}(XY)$ . Also, we denote the Frobenius norm  $\|X\|_F := \sqrt{X \bullet X}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{svec}(X) := & (X_{11}, \sqrt{2}X_{21}, \dots, \sqrt{2}X_{m1}, X_{22}, \\ & \sqrt{2}X_{32}, \dots, \sqrt{2}X_{m2}, X_{33}, \dots, X_{mm})^\top \in \mathcal{R}^{\frac{m(m+1)}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

for  $X \in S^m$ . We write  $(F_i \bullet V)_{i=1}^n := (F_1 \bullet V, F_2 \bullet V, \dots, F_n \bullet V)^\top \in \mathcal{R}^n$  for  $V, F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n \in S^m$ . For any  $X \in S^m$ , we define the linear operator  $\mathcal{L}_X : S^m \rightarrow S^m$  by  $\mathcal{L}_X(Z) := X \circ Z$ . We also denote  $(\zeta)_+ := \max(\zeta, 0)$  for any  $\zeta \in \mathcal{R}$ . For sequences  $\{y^k\}$  and  $\{z^k\}$ , if  $\|y^k\| \leq M\|z^k\|$  for any  $k$  with some  $M > 0$ , we write  $\|y^k\| = O(\|z^k\|)$ . If  $M_1\|z^k\| \leq \|y^k\| \leq M_2\|z^k\|$  for any  $k$  with some  $M_1, M_2 > 0$ , we represent  $\|y^k\| = \Theta(\|z^k\|)$ . Moreover, if there exists a sequence  $\{\alpha_k\}$  with  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k = 0$  and  $\|y^k\| \leq \alpha_k\|z^k\|$  for any  $k$ , we write  $\|y^k\| = o(\|z^k\|)$ . Finally, we let  $\perp$  denote the perpendicularity.

## Terminologies from functional analysis

Let us review some terminologies from functional analysis briefly. For more details, refer to the basic material [1, Section 2] or suitable textbooks of functional analysis.

Let  $\mathcal{C}(T)$  be the set of real-valued continuous functions defined on  $T$  endowed with the supremum norm  $\|h\| := \max_{\tau \in T} |h(\tau)|$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}(T)$  be the dual space of  $\mathcal{C}(T)$ , which can be identified with the space of (finite signed) regular Borel measures with the Borel sigma algebra  $\mathcal{B}$  on  $T$  equipped with the total variation norm, i.e.,  $\|y\| := \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}} y(A) - \inf_{A \in \mathcal{B}} y(A)$  for  $y \in \mathcal{M}(T)$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{M}_+(T)$  the set of all the nonnegative Borel measures of  $\mathcal{M}(T)$ . Especially if  $y \in \mathcal{M}_+(T)$ ,  $\|y\| = y(T)$  since  $\inf_{A \in \mathcal{B}} y(A) = y(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $\sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}} y(A) = y(T)$ . We say that  $y \in \mathcal{M}(T)$  is a finite discrete measure if there exist a finite number of indices  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_q \in T$  and scalars  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_q \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $y(A) = \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i \delta_A(\tau_i)$  for any Borel set  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ , where  $\delta_S : T \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  is the indicator function satisfying  $\delta_S(\tau) = 1$  if  $\tau \in S$  and  $\delta_S(\tau) = 0$  otherwise.

Let  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathcal{M}(T) \times \mathcal{C}(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  be the bilinear form defined by  $\langle y, h \rangle := \int_T h(\tau) dy(\tau)$  for  $y \in \mathcal{M}(T)$  and  $h \in \mathcal{C}(T)$ . We then endow  $\mathcal{M}(T)$  with the weak\*-topology, which is the minimum topology such that any seminorm  $p_{\mathcal{A}}$  on  $\mathcal{M}(T)$  is continuous for any finite subset  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(T)$ , where  $p_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{M}(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  is defined by  $p_{\mathcal{A}}(y) := \max_{h \in \mathcal{A}} |\langle y, h \rangle|$ .

Let us here specify the concept of accumulation points and limit points in the sense of the weak\*-topology. Let  $\{y^k\}$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{M}(T)$  and  $y^* \in \mathcal{M}(T)$ .

1. We call  $y^*$  the weak\* limit point of  $\{y^k\}$  if for any neighborhood  $\mathcal{N}(y^*)$  of  $y^*$  with respect to the weak\*-topology there exists an integer  $K \geq 0$  such that  $y^k \in \mathcal{N}(y^*)$  for any  $k \geq K$ . We then say  $\{y^k\}$  weakly\* converges to  $y^*$  and often write it as  $w^*-\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y^k = y^*$ .
2. We call  $y^*$  a weak\* accumulation point of  $\{y^k\}$  if for any integer  $K \geq 0$  and neighborhood  $\mathcal{N}(y^*)$  of  $y^*$  with respect to the weak\*-topology there exists an integer  $k \geq K$  such that  $y^k \in \mathcal{N}(y^*)$ .

## 2 Primal-dual path-following method

### 2.1 KKT conditions for the SISDP

In this section, we present the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions for the SISDP together with Slater's constraint qualification, abbreviated as SCQ. Here, SCQ for the SISDP is defined precisely as below:

**Definition 1** We say that the Slater constraint qualification (SCQ) holds for the SISDP if there exists some  $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{R}^n$  such that  $F(\bar{x}) \in S_{++}^m$  and  $g(\bar{x}, \tau) < 0$  ( $\tau \in T$ ).

**Theorem 1** *Let  $x^* \in \mathcal{R}^n$  be a local optimal solution of the SISDP (1.1). Then, under the SCQ, there exists some finite Borel-measure  $y \in \mathcal{M}(T)$  such that*

$$\nabla f(x^*) + \int_T \nabla_x g(x^*, \tau) dy(\tau) - (F_i \bullet V)_{i=1}^n = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

$$F(x^*) \circ V = O, \quad F(x^*) \in S_+^m, \quad V \in S_+^m, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\int_T g(x^*, \tau) dy(\tau) = 0, \quad g(x^*, \tau) \leq 0 \quad (\tau \in T), \quad y \in \mathcal{M}_+(T), \quad (2.3)$$

where  $V \in S^m$  is a Lagrange multiplier matrix associated with the constraint  $F(x) \in S_+^m$ . In particular, there exists some discrete measure  $y \in \mathcal{M}_+(T)$  satisfying the above conditions and  $|\text{supp}(y)| \leq n$ , where  $\text{supp}(y) := \{\tau \in T \mid y(\{\tau\}) \neq 0\}$ . Conversely, when  $f$  is convex, if the above conditions (2.1)–(2.3) hold, then  $x^*$  is an optimum of the SISDP (1.1).

*Proof* Note that  $F(x^*) \bullet V = 0$ ,  $F(x^*) \in S_+^m$  and  $V \in S_+^m$  hold if and only if  $F(x^*) \circ V = O$ ,  $F(x^*) \in S_+^m$ , and  $V \in S_+^m$ . Then, the claim is proved in a manner similar to [16, Theorem 2.4].  $\square$

The system (2.1)–(2.3) is called the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions for the SISDP (1.1). We call  $(x, y, V)$  satisfying the KKT conditions (2.1)–(2.3) a KKT point of the SISDP (1.1) in particular.

## 2.2 Description of the algorithm

In this section, we propose an algorithm for solving the SISDP (1.1), whose fundamental framework is analogous to the primal-dual interior point method developed for solving the nonlinear SDP in [35]. It aims to find a KKT point of the SISDP (1.1), i.e., a point satisfying the optimality conditions (2.1)–(2.3) for the SISDP (1.1).

Let us define the function  $R_\mu : \mathcal{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}(T) \times S_+^m \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  with a parameter  $\mu \geq 0$  by

$$R_\mu(x, y, V) := \sqrt{\theta(x)^2 + \|\varphi_1(x, y, V)\|^2 + \varphi_2(x, y)^2 + \|\varphi_3(x, V, \mu)\|^2},$$

where

$$\theta(x) := \max_{\tau \in T} (g(x, \tau))_+,$$

$$\varphi_1(x, y, V) := \nabla f(x) + \int_T \nabla_x g(x, \tau) dy(\tau) - (F_i \bullet V)_{i=1}^n,$$

$$\varphi_2(x, y) := \int_T g(x, \tau) dy(\tau),$$

$$\varphi_3(x, V, \mu) := \text{svec}(F(x) \circ V - \mu I).$$

Notice that a point satisfying  $R_0(x, y, V) = 0$  with  $F(x) \in S_+^m$  and  $V \in S_+^m$  is nothing but a KKT point of the SISDP (1.1). In terms of the function  $R_\mu$ , we define a barrier KKT(BKKT) point by perturbing the semi-definite complementarity condition in the KKT conditions (2.1)–(2.3).

**Definition 2** Let  $\mu > 0$ . We call  $(x, y, V) \in \mathcal{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}(T) \times S^m$  a barrier Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (BKKT) point of the SISDP (1.1) if  $R_\mu(x, y, V) = 0$ ,  $y \in \mathcal{M}_+(T)$ ,  $F(x) \in S_{++}^m$ ,  $V \in S_{++}^m$ .

Additionally, given a positive parameter  $\varepsilon$ , we define a neighborhood of the BKKT points with barrier parameter  $\mu$ :

$$\mathcal{N}_\mu^\varepsilon := \{w := (x, y, V) \in \mathcal{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}_+(T) \times S_{++}^m \mid R_\mu(w) \leq \varepsilon, F(x) \in S_{++}^m\}.$$

The algorithm generates a sequence of approximate BKKT points  $\{w^k\}$  for the SISDP (1.1) such that  $w^k \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\varepsilon_k}$  for each  $k$  while driving the values of both parameters  $\mu_k$  and  $\varepsilon_k$  to 0 as  $k$  tends to  $\infty$ .

**Algorithm 1** (Primal-dual path following method)

Step 0 (Initial setting): Choose an initial iteration point  $w^0 := (x^0, y^0, V_0) \in \mathcal{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}_+(T) \times S^m$  such that  $F(x^0) \in S_{++}^m$  and  $V_0 \in S_{++}^m$ . Choose the initial parameters  $\mu_0 > 0$ ,  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $k := 0$ .

Step 1 (Stopping rule): Stop if

$$R_0(w^k) = 0, F(x^k) \in S_+^m, V_k \in S_+^m, y^k \in \mathcal{M}_+(T). \quad (2.4)$$

Otherwise, go to Step 2.

Step 2 (Computing an approximate BKKT point): Find an approximate BKKT point  $w^{k+1}$  such that

$$w^{k+1} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\varepsilon_k}. \quad (2.5)$$

Step 3 (Update): Set  $\mu_{k+1} := \beta\mu_k$  and  $\varepsilon_{k+1} := \beta\varepsilon_k$ . Let  $k := k + 1$ . Return to Step 1.

In the recent work [15], the authors propose the interior-point SQP method for computing a BKKT point and show its global convergence property. If we use the interior-point SQP method as a subroutine to find an approximate BKKT point satisfying condition (2.5), Step 2 of Algorithm 1 is well-defined, i.e., such an approximate BKKT point can be found in finitely many steps.

### 2.3 Convergence analysis

In this section, we suppose the well-definedness of Step 3 in Algorithm 1 and establish its weak\* convergence to KKT points of SISDP (1.1). Furthermore, we will characterize weak\* accumulation points of the generated sequence more precisely for some special cases. For the sake of analysis, we assume that Algorithm 1 produces an infinite sequence and further make the following assumptions:

#### Assumption A

1. The feasible set of SISDP (1.1) is nonempty and compact.
2. Slater's constraint qualification holds for SISDP (1.1).

Let  $S^* \subseteq \mathcal{R}^n$  be the optimal solution set of SISDP (1.1) and  $\bar{v} \in \mathcal{R}$  be a constant larger than the optimal value of the SISDP. If  $f$  is convex, Assumption A-1 can be replaced with the milder assumption that  $S^*$  is compact by adding a convex constraint  $f(x) \leq \bar{v}$  to the SISDP without changing the shape of  $S^*$ . Under the above assumptions, we first show that the generated sequences  $\{x^k\}$  and  $\{(y^k, V_k)\}$  are bounded.

**Proposition 1** *Suppose that Assumption A-1 holds. Then, any sequence  $\{x^k\}$  produced by Algorithm 1 is bounded.*

*Proof* Denote the feasible set of SISDP (1.1) by  $\mathcal{F}$  and define a proper closed convex function  $\varphi : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  by

$$\varphi(x) := \max\left(-\lambda_{\min}(F(x)), \max_{\tau \in T} g(x, \tau)\right).$$

Since the level set  $\{x \in \mathcal{R}^n \mid \varphi(x) \leq 0\} (= \mathcal{F})$  is compact, any level set  $\{x \in \mathcal{R}^n \mid \varphi(x) \leq \eta\}$  with  $\eta > 0$  is also compact. From (2.5) and  $\varepsilon_k \leq \varepsilon_0$  for all  $k$  sufficiently large, it is not difficult to show that  $\{x^k\} \subseteq \{x \in \mathcal{R}^n \mid \varphi(x) \leq \varepsilon_0\}$ , where  $\varepsilon_0$  is an algorithmic parameter given in Step 0, and thus  $\{x^k\}$  is bounded.  $\square$

**Proposition 2** *Suppose that Assumption A holds. Then, the generated Lagrange multiplier sequences  $\{V_k\} \subseteq S_{++}^m$  and  $\{y^k\} \subseteq M_+(T)$  are bounded.*

*Proof* For simplicity of expression, denote  $\tilde{w}^k := (V_k, y^k) \in S^m \times \mathcal{M}_+(T)$  and

$$W_k := \frac{V_k}{\|\tilde{w}^k\|}, \quad p^k := \frac{y^k}{\|\tilde{w}^k\|}$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  is a suitable norm such that  $\|\tilde{w}^k\|^2 = \|V_k\|^2 + \|y^k\|^2$  on  $S^m \times \mathcal{M}(T)$ . For contradiction, suppose that there exists a subsequence  $\{\tilde{w}^k\}_{k \in K} \subseteq \{\tilde{w}^k\}$  such that  $\|\tilde{w}^k\| \rightarrow \infty$  ( $k \in K \rightarrow \infty$ ). Note that  $\{(W_k, p^k)\}$  is bounded. Notice also that the corresponding sequence  $\{x^k\}_{k \in K}$  is bounded from Proposition 1. Recall that any bounded sequence in  $\mathcal{M}(T)$  has at least one weak\* accumulation point and one can extract a subsequence weakly\* converging to that point. Thanks to this property, without loss of generality we can assume that there exists a point  $(x^*, W_*, p^*) \in \mathcal{R}^n \times S_+^m \times \mathcal{M}_+(T)$  such that

$$\lim_{k \in K \rightarrow \infty} (x^k, W_k) = (x^*, W_*), \quad \text{w}^* \text{-} \lim_{k \in K \rightarrow \infty} p^k = p^*.$$

Note, in particular, that  $\|(W_*, p^*)\| = 1$ , since  $\text{w}^* \text{-} \lim_{k \in K \rightarrow \infty} p^k = p^*$  entails the relation that

$$\lim_{k \in K \rightarrow \infty} \|p^k\| = \lim_{k \in K \rightarrow \infty} \int_T dp^k(\tau) = \int_T dp^*(\tau) = \|p^*\|$$



and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\|(W_*, p^*)\|^2 &= \|W_*\|^2 + \|p^*\|^2 \\ &= \lim_{k \in K \rightarrow \infty} (\|W_k\|^2 + \|p^k\|^2) \\ &= 1.\end{aligned}$$

From (2.5), for each  $k \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \frac{\nabla f(x^k)}{\|\tilde{w}^k\|} - (F_i \bullet W_k)_{i=1}^n + \int_T \nabla_x g(x^k, \tau) dp^k(\tau) \right\| &\leq \frac{\varepsilon_{k-1}}{\|\tilde{w}^k\|}, \\ \left| \int_T g(x^k, \tau) dp^k(\tau) \right| &\leq \frac{\varepsilon_{k-1}}{\|\tilde{w}^k\|}, \quad p^k \in \mathcal{M}_+(T), \\ \left\| F(x^k) \circ W_k - \frac{\mu_{k-1}}{\|\tilde{w}^k\|} I \right\| &\leq \frac{\varepsilon_{k-1}}{\|\tilde{w}^k\|}, \quad F(x^k) \in S_{++}^m, \quad W_k \in S_{++}^m.\end{aligned}$$

By letting  $k \in K \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain

$$(F_i \bullet W_*)_{i=1}^n - \int_T \nabla_x g(x^*, \tau) dp^*(\tau) = 0, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\int_T g(x^*, \tau) dp^*(\tau) = 0, \quad p^* \in \mathcal{M}_+(T), \quad (2.7)$$

$$F(x^*) \circ W_* = O, \quad F(x^*) \in S_+^m, \quad W_* \in S_+^m. \quad (2.8)$$

Now, choose a Slater point  $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{R}^n$  arbitrarily and let  $\tilde{d} := \tilde{x} - x^*$ . Notice here that

$$F(\tilde{x}) \bullet W_* \geq 0, \quad \int_T g(\tilde{x}, \tau) dp^*(\tau) \leq 0, \quad (2.9)$$

since

$$F(\tilde{x}) \in S_{++}^m, \quad W_* \in S_+^m, \quad \max_{\tau \in T} g(\tilde{x}, \tau) < 0, \quad p^* \in \mathcal{M}_+(T). \quad (2.10)$$

Then, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}& F(\tilde{x}) \bullet W_* - \int_T g(\tilde{x}, \tau) dp^*(\tau) \\ &= F(x^* + \tilde{d}) \bullet W_* - \int_T g(x^* + \tilde{d}, \tau) dp^*(\tau) \\ &\leq F(x^* + \tilde{d}) \bullet W_* - \int_T \left( g(x^*, \tau) + \nabla_x g(x^*, \tau)^\top \tilde{d} \right) dp^*(\tau) \\ &= \tilde{d}^\top (F_i \bullet W_*)_{i=1}^n - \int_T \left( \nabla_x g(x^*, \tau)^\top \tilde{d} \right) dp^*(\tau) \\ &= \tilde{d}^\top \left( (F_i \bullet W_*)_{i=1}^n - \int_T \nabla_x g(x^*, \tau) dp^*(\tau) \right) \\ &= 0,\end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where the first inequality holds because  $g(x^*, \tau) + \nabla_x g(x^*, \tau)^\top \tilde{d} \leq g(x^* + \tilde{d}, \tau)$  ( $\tau \in T$ ) by the convexity of  $g(\cdot, \tau)$ . Moreover, the third equality is obtained from (2.7) and the fact that  $F(x^*) \bullet W_* = 0$  by (2.8). The last equality is due to (2.6). Combining (2.9) and (2.11) implies that  $F(\tilde{x}) \bullet W_* = 0$  and  $\int_T g(\tilde{x}) dp^*(\tau) = 0$ , from which we can conclude  $W_* = O$  and  $p^* = 0$  by using (2.10) again. However, this contradicts  $\|(W_*, p^*)\| = 1$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

Now, we are ready to establish the global convergence property of Algorithm 1.

**Theorem 2** *Suppose that Assumption A holds. Then, the sequence  $\{(x^k, y^k, V_k)\}$  produced by Algorithm 1 is bounded. Let  $(x^*, y^*, V_*) \in \mathcal{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}_+(T) \times S^m$  be a weak\*-accumulation point of  $\{(x^k, y^k, V_k)\}$ . Then,  $(x^*, y^*, V_*)$  is a KKT point of SISDP(1.1). In particular, if  $f$  is convex,  $x^*$  is an optimum.*

*Proof* The boundedness of  $\{(x^k, y^k, V_k)\}$  follows from Propositions 1 and 2. It remains to show the second half of the theorem. We can assume  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (x^k, V_k) = (x^*, V_*)$  and  $w^*\text{-}\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y^k = y^*$  without loss of generality. Then, by letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  in (2.5), we see that the KKT conditions (2.1)–(2.3) hold with  $V = V_*$  and  $y = y^*$ . By the second half of Theorem 1,  $x^*$  is an optimum of SISDP (1.1) when  $f$  is convex.  $\square$

Subsequently, let us consider the situation where the number of elements of  $\text{supp}(y^k)$  is bounded from above through execution of the algorithm. In this case, we can find a more precise form of the weak\* accumulation points of  $\{y^k\}$ . To see this, we begin with assuming  $|\text{supp}(y^k)| \leq M$  for any  $k \geq 0$

with some  $M > 0$ , and consider a sequence  $\{t^k\} \subseteq T^M := \overbrace{T \times \dots \times T}^{M \text{ times}}$  with  $t^k := (\tau_1^k, \tau_2^k, \dots, \tau_M^k)$  such that  $t^k$  has all elements of  $\text{supp}(y^k)$  as a sub-vector and  $y^k(\tau_i^k) = 0$  if  $\tau_i^k \notin \text{supp}(y^k)$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$ . Denote  $\zeta^k := (y^k(\tau_1^k), y^k(\tau_2^k), \dots, y^k(\tau_M^k))^\top \in \mathcal{R}_+^M$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ . In a manner similar to Proposition 2, we can show that  $\{t^k\}$  and the accompanying sequence  $\{(x^k, V_k)\}$  are bounded and have accumulation points with regard to the norm topology. Without loss of generality, we suppose that there exist  $(x^*, V_*) \in \mathcal{R}^n \times S_+^m$ ,  $t^* = (\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*, \dots, \tau_M^*) \in T^M$ , and  $\zeta^* = (\zeta_1^*, \zeta_2^*, \dots, \zeta_M^*) \in \mathcal{R}_+^M$  such that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (x^k, V_k, \zeta^k, t^k) = (x^*, V_*, \zeta^*, t^*)$ . Then we can establish the following theorem concerning the explicit form of the weak\*-accumulation point of  $\{(x^k, y^k, V_k)\}$ . In the remainder of the section, we use the notations and symbols introduced in this paragraph.

**Theorem 3** *Denote the distinct elements of  $\{\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*, \dots, \tau_M^*\}$  by  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_p \in T$ , where  $p \leq M$ , and define a finite discrete measure  $y^* : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_+$  by*

$$y^*(A) := \sum_{j=1}^p \xi_j^* \delta_A(s_j) \quad (A \in \mathcal{B}), \quad (2.12)$$

where  $\xi_j^* := \sum_{i: \tau_i^* = s_j} \zeta_i^*$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$ . Then,  $w^*\text{-}\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y^k = y^*$  holds and  $(x^*, y^*, V_*)$  is a KKT point of SISDP(1.1).

*Proof* Since the proof is straightforward, we omit it.  $\square$

Let us end the section with the most concise but practical version for Theorem 3. Let  $y^*$  be the measure defined by (2.12) and consider the case where  $|\text{supp}(y^*)| = M$ . Then, we readily obtain the following corollary from Theorem 3:

**Corollary 1** *Suppose that  $\text{supp}(y^*) = \{\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*, \dots, \tau_M^*\}$  and  $\tau_i^* \neq \tau_j^*$  for any  $i \neq j$ . Then,  $\{y^k\}$  converges to  $y^*$  strongly on  $\mathcal{M}(T)$  and  $(x^*, y^*, V_*)$  is a KKT point for SISDP(1.1).*

### 3 Two-step superlinearly convergent algorithm

In the section, for the sake of rapid local convergence, we propose to integrate the local reduction method [7, 18, 14, 26], which is a classical semi-infinite optimization method, with Algorithm 1. Throughout this section, we assume that the compact metric space  $T$  is a bounded closed set in  $\mathcal{R}^q$  formed by finitely many sufficiently smooth inequality constraints. Also, we often identify  $X \in S^m$  with  $\text{svec}(X) \in \mathcal{R}^{\frac{m(m+1)}{2}}$ .

#### 3.1 The overall structure of the proposed algorithm

The proposed method is designed to converge to a KKT point of SISDP (1.1) at least two-step superlinearly while satisfying the interior point constraints. More precisely, it generates a sequence  $\{w^k\} := \{(x^k, y^k, V_k)\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}_+(T) \times S_{++}^m$  together with two kinds of search directions

$$\left\{ \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k \right\} := \left\{ (\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x^k, \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} y^k, \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_k) \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ \Delta_1 w^k \right\} := \left\{ (\Delta_1 x^k, \Delta_1 y^k, \Delta_1 V_k) \right\}$$

such that

$$\left\| w^k + s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k + s_1^k \Delta_1 w^k - w^* \right\| = o(\|w^k - w^*\|),$$

$$F(x^k + s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x^k) \in S_{++}^m, \quad F(x^k + s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x^k + s_1^k \Delta_1 x^k) \in S_{++}^m, \quad (3.1)$$

$$V_k + s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_k \in S_{++}^m, \quad V_k + s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_k + s_1^k \Delta_1 V_k \in S_{++}^m \quad (3.2)$$

for any  $k$  sufficiently large, where  $w^*$  is a KKT point satisfying a certain regularity condition and  $s_j^k$  ( $j = \frac{1}{2}, 1$ ) are step-sizes determined by<sup>1</sup>

$$s_j^k = \min(t_j^k, u_j^k), \quad (3.3)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> For  $X \in S_{++}^m, Y \in S^m$ , the eigenvalues of  $X^{-1}Y$  are real numbers, and hence  $\lambda_{\min}(X^{-1}Y) \in \mathcal{R}$ .

where

$$t_j^k := \begin{cases} -\frac{\delta}{\lambda_{\min}(F(x^{k+j-\frac{1}{2}})^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_j x_i^k F_i)} \leq \delta & \text{if } \lambda_{\min}(F(x^{k+j-\frac{1}{2}})^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_j x_i^k F_i) \leq -1 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$u_j^k := \begin{cases} -\frac{\delta}{\lambda_{\min}(V_{k+j-\frac{1}{2}}^{-1} \Delta_j V_{k+j-\frac{1}{2}})} \leq \delta & \text{if } \lambda_{\min}(V_{k+j-\frac{1}{2}}^{-1} \Delta_j V_{k+j-\frac{1}{2}}) \leq -1 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for  $j = \frac{1}{2}, 1$ , where  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  is a prescribed algorithmic constant. Here,  $(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}, V_{k+\frac{1}{2}})$  is defined as

$$(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}, V_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) := (x^k + s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x^k, V_k + s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_k).$$

By the above choice of the step-sizes,  $s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k, s_1^k \in (0, 1]$  holds and the interior point constraints (3.1) and (3.2) are valid since

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{s} &:= \sup \{s \mid \lambda_{\min}(X + s\Delta X) \geq 0, s \geq 0\} \\ &= \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(X^{-1}\Delta X)} & \text{if } \lambda_{\min}(X^{-1}\Delta X) < 0 \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

for given  $X \in S_{++}^m$  and  $\Delta X \in S^m$ . We remark that if  $X + \Delta X \in S_{++}^m$ , then  $\bar{s} > 1$  and hence the step-size rule along with (3.4) yields

$$\lambda_{\min}(X^{-1}\Delta X) > -1. \quad (3.5)$$

So as to attain fast convergence speed as above, we try to follow the central path closely by updating the barrier parameter  $\mu_k$  so that  $\mu_{k+1} = o(\mu_k)$  and solving certain nonlinear systems to have the search directions  $\Delta_1 w^k$  and  $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k$ . When those directions turn out to be unsuccessful, a point near the central path is computed by the interior-point SQP method developed in the recent paper [15]. Before describing the details, we first show the overall structure of the proposed algorithm:

**Algorithm 2** (Superlinearly convergent primal-dual path following method)

Step 0 (Initial setting): Choose parameters

$$0 < \alpha < 1, \quad 0 < \beta < 1, \quad \gamma_1, \gamma_2 > 0, \quad \delta \in (0, 1), \quad \mu_0 > 0, \quad 0 < c \leq \frac{1}{\alpha + 2}.$$

Set  $\varepsilon_0 := \gamma_1 \mu_0^{1+\alpha}$ . Choose the initial iteration point  $w^0 := (x^0, y^0, V_0) \in \mathcal{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}_+(T) \times S^m$  such that  $F(x^0) \in S_{++}^m$  and  $V_0 \in S_{++}^m$ . Let  $k := 0$ .

Step 1 (Stopping rule): Stop if

$$R_0(w^k) = 0, \quad F(x^k) \in S_+^m, \quad V_k \in S_+^m, \quad y^k \in \mathcal{M}_+(T).$$

Otherwise, go to Step 2.

Step 2 (Computing an approximate BKKT point): Find an approximate BKKT point  $w^{k+1} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\varepsilon_k}$  by the following procedure:

Step 2-1: Choose a scaling matrix  $P_k$  and obtain  $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k$  by solving the mixed linear complementarity system (3.10), (3.12), and (3.13), which amounts to solving the QP (3.14) (see Section 3.3) with  $\mu = \mu_k$ ,  $P = P_k$  and  $\bar{w} = w^k$ . Compute  $s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k$  by (3.3) with  $j = \frac{1}{2}$  and set  $w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} := w^k + s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k$ .

Step 2-2: Choose a scaling matrix  $P_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$ . If the linear equations (3.17)–(3.20) (see Section 3.3) with  $\mu = \mu_k$ ,  $P = P_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\bar{w} = w^{k+\frac{1}{2}}$  are solvable, then set a solution as  $\Delta_1 w^k$  and compute  $s_1^k$  by (3.3) with  $j = 1$ . Otherwise, go to Step 2-4.

Step 2-3: If  $w_+^k := w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + s_1^k \Delta_1 w^k \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\varepsilon_k}$ , set  $w^{k+1} := w_+^k$  and go to Step 3. Otherwise, go to Step 2-4.

Step 2-4: Find  $w^{k+1} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\varepsilon_k}$  using the interior-point SQP method.

Step 3 (Update): Update the parameters as

$$\mu_{k+1} := \min(\beta\mu_k, \gamma_2\mu_k^{1+c\alpha}), \varepsilon_{k+1} := \gamma_1\mu_{k+1}^{1+\alpha}. \quad (3.6)$$

Set  $k := k + 1$  and return to Step 1.

We will discuss the structure of the mixed linear complementarity system (3.10)–(3.12) and the equations (3.17)–(3.20) in Steps 2-1 and 2-2 later in Section 3.3. As is confirmed easily, Algorithm 2 is a variant of Algorithm 1. Hence, by Theorem 2, we ensure its global convergence to a KKT point. In the subsequent convergence analysis, we will focus on the local convergence rate of Algorithm 2.

### 3.2 Local reduction technique

We explain the local reduction method to the SISDP (1.1) briefly. For more details, we refer the readers to [7, 18, 14, 26]. Suppose that we are standing at a point  $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{R}^n$ . The local reduction method represents the semi-infinite region  $D := \{x \in \mathcal{R}^n \mid g(x, \tau) \leq 0 \ (\tau \in T)\}$  with finitely many inequality constraints locally around  $\bar{x}$ . Specifically, in some open neighborhood of  $\bar{x}$ , say  $U(\bar{x})$ , it expresses the region  $D \cap U(\bar{x})$  as

$$D \cap U(\bar{x}) = \{x \in U(\bar{x}) \mid g(x, \tau_{\bar{x}}^i(x)) \leq 0 \ (i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x}))\}$$

using smooth implicit functions  $\tau_{\bar{x}}^i : U(\bar{x}) \rightarrow T$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})$ ) with some nonnegative integer  $p(\bar{x})$ . Then, SISDP (1.1) is locally equivalent to the problem with finitely many inequality constraints in  $U(\bar{x})$ , namely,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize } f(x) \\ & \text{subject to } \hat{g}_i(x) := g(x, \tau_{\bar{x}}^i(x)) \leq 0 \ (i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})), \\ & \quad \quad \quad F(x) \in S_+^m, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

to which standard nonlinear optimization algorithms such as the SQP-type method are conceptually applicable. In what follows, we clarify the condition under which the functions  $\tau_{\bar{x}}^i(\cdot)$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})$ ) and the open neighborhood  $U(\bar{x})$  exist. Let us denote by  $S(x)$  the set of all local maximizers of  $\max_{\tau \in T} g(x, \tau)$  and let

$$S_\delta(x) := \{\tau \in S(x) \mid g(x, \tau) > \max_{\tau \in T} g(x, \tau) - \delta\} \quad (3.8)$$

for a given constant  $\delta > 0$ . Moreover, define the nondegeneracy of  $\bar{x}$  as follows:

**Definition 3** We say that  $\bar{x}$  is nondegenerate for  $\max_{\tau \in T} g(\bar{x}, \tau)$  and  $\delta > 0$  if  $|S_\delta(\bar{x})| < \infty$  and the linear independence constraint qualification, the second-order sufficient conditions, and the strict complementarity condition regarding  $\max_{\tau \in T} g(\bar{x}, \tau)$  hold at any  $\tau \in S_\delta(\bar{x})$ .

If  $\bar{x}$  is nondegenerate, there exist an open neighborhood  $U(\bar{x}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}^n$ , a non-negative integer  $p(\bar{x}) := |S_\delta(\bar{x})|$ , and twice continuously differentiable implicit functions  $\tau_{\bar{x}}^i(\cdot) : U(\bar{x}) \rightarrow T$  such that  $S_\delta(x) = \{\tau_{\bar{x}}^i(x)\}_{i=1}^{p(\bar{x})}$  and  $\{\tau_{\bar{x}}^i(x)\}_{i=1}^{p(\bar{x})}$  are strict local maximizers in  $\max_{\tau \in T} g(x, \tau)$  for any  $x \in U(\bar{x})$ . With those implicit functions, it holds that  $\max_{\tau \in T} g(x, \tau) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq p(\bar{x})} \hat{g}_i(x)$  in  $U(\bar{x})$  and thus SISDP (1.1) and nonlinear SDP (3.7) are equivalent locally.

The functions  $\hat{g}_i(\cdot)$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})$ ) are convex in  $U(\bar{x})$  when the functions  $g(\cdot, \tau)$  ( $\tau \in T$ ) are convex. Indeed, for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})$ , there exists some neighborhood  $T_i \subseteq T$  of  $\tau_{\bar{x}}^i(\bar{x})$  such that  $\max_{\tau \in T_i} g(x, \tau) = \hat{g}_i(x)$  holds for any  $x \in U(\bar{x})$ . By noting that  $\max_{\tau \in T_i} g(\cdot, \tau)$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})$ ) are convex, we then ensure the convexity of  $\hat{g}_i(\cdot)$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})$ ) in  $U(\bar{x})$ .

We can compute the values of  $\nabla \tau_{\bar{x}}^i(\bar{x})$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})$  by solving a certain linear system derived from the implicit function theorem, from which we further obtain the values of  $\nabla \hat{g}_i(\bar{x})$  and  $\nabla^2 \hat{g}_i(\bar{x})$  for each  $i$ . Thanks to this result, we acquire the concrete forms of the quadratic programs (QPs) that arise in the SQP iterations for (3.7), although it is difficult in general to have explicit forms of the functions  $\tau_{\bar{x}}^i(\cdot)$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})$ ).

### 3.3 Computing the directions $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w$ and $\Delta_1 w$

#### 3.3.1 First direction $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w$

Let  $\bar{w} = (\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{V}) \in \mathcal{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}_+(T) \times S_{++}^m$  be the current point such that  $F(\bar{x}) \in S_{++}^m$  and  $\bar{x}$  is nondegenerate in the sense of Definition 3. We show that a first search direction  $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w = (\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x, \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} y, \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V) \in \mathcal{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}(T) \times S^m$  can be computed through the local reduction method in a manner similar to the interior-point SQP method proposed in the recent work [15].

To start with, we apply the Monteiro-Zhang scaling to  $F(x)$  and  $V$ , in which we select a nonsingular matrix  $P \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$  and scale the matrices  $F(x)$

and  $V$  as

$$F_P(x) := PF(x)P^\top = F_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i F_P^i, \quad V_P := P^{-\top}VP^{-1}, \quad (3.9)$$

where  $F_P^i := PF_iP^\top$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Let us consider the reduced NSDP (3.7) with  $F(x) \in S_+^m$  replaced by  $F_P(x) \in S_+^m$ , called the scaled NSDP (3.7). Since  $F(x) \circ V = \mu I$ ,  $F(x) \in S_{++}^m, V \in S_{++}^m$  if and only if  $F_P(x) \circ V_P = \mu I$ ,  $F_P(x) \in S_{++}^m, V_P \in S_{++}^m$  for any  $\mu \geq 0$ , the KKT (BKKT) conditions of the reduced NSDP (3.7) are equivalent to those of the scaled NSDP (3.7). Therefore, to produce a search direction, it is natural to solve the following mixed linear complementarity system approximating the BKKT system of the scaled NSDP:

$$\nabla f(\bar{x}) + \nabla_{xx}^2 L(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x + \nabla \hat{g}(\bar{x})(\bar{y} + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} y) - \left( F_P^i \bullet \left( \bar{V}_P + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_P \right) \right)_{i=1}^n = 0, \quad (3.10)$$

$$F_P(\bar{x}) \circ \left( \bar{V}_P + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_P \right) + \mathcal{L}_{\bar{V}_P} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x_i F_P^i = \mu I, \quad (3.11)$$

$$0 \leq y + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} y \perp \hat{g}(\bar{x}) + \nabla \hat{g}(\bar{x})^\top \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x \leq 0. \quad (3.12)$$

In our method, we make a slight modification to the above system. Specifically, we replace the second equation (3.11) with the following equation:

$$F_P(\bar{x}) \circ \left( \bar{V}_P + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_P \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \mathcal{L}_{\bar{V}_P} + \mathcal{L}_{F_P(\bar{x})} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{V}_P} \mathcal{L}_{F_P(\bar{x})}^{-1} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x_i F_P^i = \mu I. \quad (3.13)$$

The second term of the left hand side approximates  $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{V}_P} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta x_i F_P^i$  around a BKKT point. Actually, at any BKKT point, those two expressions are identical to each other since  $\mathcal{L}_{F_P(\bar{x})}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{V}_P}$  commute there. Particularly when choosing a scaling matrix  $P$  so that  $F_P(\bar{x})$  and  $\bar{V}_P$  commute, (3.11) and (3.13) become identical to each other.

The reason for using the system (3.10), (3.12), and (3.13) is that it can be solved via a KKT system of the following quadratic program (QP):

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\Delta x}{\text{Minimize}} \quad \nabla f(\bar{x})^\top \Delta x + \frac{1}{2} \Delta x^\top B_P(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{V}) \Delta x - \mu \xi_P(\bar{x})^\top \Delta x \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \hat{g}(\bar{x}) + \nabla \hat{g}(\bar{x})^\top \Delta x \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where  $\xi_P(\cdot) := \nabla \log \det F_P(\cdot) = (F_P^i \bullet F_P(\cdot)^{-1})_{i=1}^n$ ,  $\hat{g}(\cdot) := (\hat{g}_1(\cdot), \hat{g}_2(\cdot), \dots, \hat{g}_p(\bar{x})(\cdot))^\top$ , and

$$B_P(x, y, V) := \nabla_{xx}^2 L(x, y) + H_P(x, V) \quad (3.15)$$

with  $L(x, y)$  being the Lagrangian  $f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{g}_i(x) y(\tau_{\bar{x}}^i(x)) - F(x) \bullet V$  and  $H_P(x, V)$  being the symmetric matrix whose elements are defined by

$$(H_P(x, V))_{i,j} := \frac{1}{2} F_P^i \bullet \left( \mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{V_P} + \mathcal{L}_{V_P} \mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)}^{-1} \right) F_P^j \quad (3.16)$$

for  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Note that the linear operator  $\mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)}$  is invertible when  $F(x) \in S_{++}^m$ . Denote a KKT pair of the QP (3.14) by  $(\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}x, y + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}y)$  and define

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}V &:= \mu F(\bar{x})^{-1} - \bar{V} - \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}x_i P^\top \frac{1}{2} \left( \mathcal{L}_{F_P(\bar{x})}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{V}_P} + \mathcal{L}_{\bar{V}_P} \mathcal{L}_{F_P(\bar{x})}^{-1} \right) F_P^i P, \\ \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}V_P &:= P^{-\top} \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}V P^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, we can see that the triple  $(\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}x, \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}y, \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}V)$  solves the system (3.10), (3.12), and (3.13).

The QP (3.14) is necessarily feasible if the original problem (1.1) is feasible, since the functions  $\hat{g}_i(\cdot)$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})$ ) are convex as mentioned above. Furthermore, we have the following property concerning the strong convexity of the objective function of the QP (3.14)

**Proposition 3** *Suppose that  $F_P(x) \in S_{++}^m$ ,  $V_P \in S_{++}^m$ , and  $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n$  are linearly independent in  $S^m$ . Also, suppose that either of the following is true:*

- (i)  $\|F_P(x) \circ V_P - \mu I\| \leq \theta \mu$  with  $0 \leq \theta < 1$ ;
- (ii)  $F_P(x)$  and  $V_P$  commute.

*Then,  $H_P(x, V)$  is positive definite. Especially, if  $f$  is convex and  $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{R}_+^{p(\bar{x})}$ , the objective function of the QP (3.14) is strongly convex. Therefore, it has a unique optimum.*

*Proof* Note that  $F_P(x) \circ V_P \in S_{++}^m$  holds if either of the assumptions (i) and (ii) holds. Then, the operators  $\mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)} \mathcal{L}_{V_P}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{V_P} \mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)}$  are positive definite. Actually, for any  $D \in S^m \setminus \{O\}$ ,  $D \bullet \mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)} \mathcal{L}_{V_P} D = D \bullet \mathcal{L}_{V_P} \mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)} D = \text{Tr}(D(F_P(x) \circ V_P)D) > 0$ . Then, letting  $\Delta F := \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta x_i F_P^i$  and noting the linear independence of  $F_1, F_2, \dots$ , and  $F_n$  in  $S^m$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}2\Delta x^\top H_P(x, V)\Delta x &= \Delta F \bullet \left( \mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{V_P} + \mathcal{L}_{V_P} \mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)}^{-1} \right) \Delta F \\ &= \mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)}^{-1}(\Delta F) \bullet \left( \mathcal{L}_{V_P} \mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)} + \mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)} \mathcal{L}_{V_P} \right) \mathcal{L}_{F_P(x)}^{-1}(\Delta F) > 0\end{aligned}$$

for any  $\Delta x \neq 0$ . We omit the proof for the latter claim.

Below, we list some particular choices for the scaling matrix  $P$  and the corresponding directions  $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}V$ :

- (i)  $P = I$ : In this case,  $F_P(\bar{x}) = F(\bar{x})$  and

$$\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}V = \mu F(\bar{x})^{-1} - \bar{V} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \mathcal{L}_{F(\bar{x})}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{V}} + \mathcal{L}_{\bar{V}} \mathcal{L}_{F(\bar{x})}^{-1} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}x_i F_i.$$

- (ii)  $P = F(\bar{x})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ : In this case,  $F_P(\bar{x}) = I$  and

$$\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}V = \mu F(\bar{x})^{-1} - \bar{V} - \frac{1}{2} F(\bar{x})^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}x_i F_i \right) \bar{V} + \bar{V} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}x_i F_i \right) F(\bar{x})^{-1}.$$



- (iii)  $P = W^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ ,  $W := F(\bar{x})^{\frac{1}{2}}(F(\bar{x})^{\frac{1}{2}}\bar{V}F(\bar{x})^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-\frac{1}{2}}F(\bar{x})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ : In this case,  $F_P(\bar{x}) = \bar{V}_P$  and

$$\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}V = \mu F(\bar{x})^{-1} - \bar{V} - W^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}x_i F_i \right) W^{-1}.$$

The direction  $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}V$  obtained as above can be related to the family of Monteiro-Zhang (MZ) directions [30]. Actually, as for (i), if  $F_P(\bar{x})$  and  $\bar{V}_P$  commute, the generated direction can be cast as the Alizadeh-Hareberly-Overton (AHO) direction. On the other hand, the generated directions in (ii) and (iii) are nothing but the Helmberg-Rendle-Vanderbei-Wolkowicz/Kojima-Shindoh-Hara/Monteiro (HRVW/KSH/M) and Nesterov-Todd (NT) directions, respectively, by themselves.

### 3.3.2 Second direction $\Delta_1 w$

We next show how to compute the second direction  $\Delta_1 w$  at  $\bar{w} + s\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}w$ . In a manner similar to  $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}w$ , we may compute the second direction  $\Delta_1 w$  by solving the QP (3.14) with  $\bar{w}$  and  $P$  replaced by  $\bar{w} + s\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}w$  and another scaling matrix  $\hat{P} \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$ , respectively. However, by exploiting information associated to  $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}x$ , we can replace the QP with certain linear equations as follows:

Let  $J_a(\bar{x}) := \{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})\} \mid \hat{g}_i(\bar{x}) + \nabla \hat{g}_i(\bar{x})^\top \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}x = 0\}$ . If the current point  $\bar{x}$  is sufficiently close to a KKT point, we can expect that the inequality constraints  $\hat{g}_i(x) \leq 0$  ( $i \in J_a(\bar{x})$ ) are also active at the KKT point. Motivated by this observation, we propose to solve the following linear equations for  $\Delta_1 w_{\hat{P}} := (\Delta_1 x, \Delta_1 y, \Delta_1 V_{\hat{P}})$ :

$$\nabla f(\hat{x}) + \nabla_{xx}^2 L(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \Delta_1 x + \nabla \hat{g}(\hat{x})(\hat{y} + \Delta_1 y) - \left( F_{\hat{P}}^i \bullet \left( \hat{V}_{\hat{P}} + \Delta_1 V_{\hat{P}} \right) \right)_{i=1}^n = 0, \quad (3.17)$$

$$F_{\hat{P}}(\hat{x}) \circ \left( \hat{V}_{\hat{P}} + \Delta_1 V_{\hat{P}} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \mathcal{L}_{\hat{V}_{\hat{P}}} + \mathcal{L}_{F_{\hat{P}}(\hat{x})} \mathcal{L}_{\hat{V}_{\hat{P}}} \mathcal{L}_{F_{\hat{P}}(\hat{x})}^{-1} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_1 x_i F_{\hat{P}}^i = \mu I, \quad (3.18)$$

$$\hat{g}_i(\hat{x}) + \nabla \hat{g}_i(\hat{x})^\top \Delta_1 x = 0 \quad (i \in J_a(\bar{x})), \quad (3.19)$$

$$\hat{y}_i + \Delta_1 y_i = 0 \quad (i \notin J_a(\bar{x})), \quad (3.20)$$

where  $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{V}_{\hat{P}}) := \bar{w}_{\hat{P}} + s\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}w_{\hat{P}}$ . We then set  $\Delta_1 w := (\Delta_1 x, \Delta_1 y, \Delta_1 V)$  with  $\Delta_1 V := \hat{P}^\top \Delta_1 V_{\hat{P}} \hat{P}$ . If the above linear equations are not solvable or not well-defined because  $\{\tau_{\bar{x}}^i(\cdot)\}_{i \in J_a(\bar{x})} \subseteq \{\tau_{\hat{x}}^i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{p(\hat{x})}$  does not hold, i.e., the family of functions  $\hat{g}_i(\cdot)$  ( $i \in J_a(\bar{x})$ ) defined at  $\bar{x}$  is not valid at  $\hat{x}$ , then we skip the above procedure and proceed to the next step.

### 3.4 Local convergence analysis

In this section, we focus on the case where the identity matrix is selected as a scaling matrix, i.e.,  $P = I$ . Accordingly,  $F_P(x) = F(x)$  and  $V_P = V$  hold throughout the section. For the other cases where scaling matrices corresponding to HRVW/KSH/M and NT directions are used (recall (ii) and (iii) in Section 3.3.1), we can also show results similar to the ones given below in a manner analogous to [33, Theorems 3,4].

Let  $w^* = (x^*, y^*, V_*)$  be an arbitrary weak\*-accumulation point of the generated sequence  $\{w^k\}$ . Recall that  $w^*$  is a KKT point of SISDP (1.1) by Theorem 2. Our aim in the section is to examine the convergence rate under the assumption that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} w^k = w^*$ .

In what follows, we will make two sets of assumptions. Firstly, we assume the following hypotheses concerning the NSDP (3.7) obtained through the local reduction around  $x^*$ .

#### Assumption B:

1.  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} w^k = w^*$ .
2. The point  $x^*$  is nondegenerate in the sense of Definition 3. Hence, we have NSDP (3.7) with  $\bar{x} = x^*$  together with the implicit functions  $\tau_{x^*}^i(\cdot) : U(x^*) \rightarrow T$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)$ ).
3. For sufficiently large  $k$ ,

$$\{\tau_{x^k}^i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{p(x^k)} = \{\tau_{x^*}^i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{p(x^*)} \text{ and } \text{supp}(y^k) \subseteq \{\tau_{x^*}^1(x^k), \tau_{x^*}^2(x^k), \dots, \tau_{x^*}^{p(x^*)}(x^k)\}.$$

Hereafter, according to Assumption B-3, we identify Borel measures  $y^k, y^* \in \mathcal{M}(T)$  with some vectors in  $\mathcal{R}^{p(x^*)}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} y^k &= (y_1^k, y_2^k, \dots, y_{p(x^*)}^k)^\top \in \mathcal{R}^{p(x^*)}, \quad y_i^k := y^k(\tau_{x^*}^i(x^k)) \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)), \\ y^* &= (y_1^*, y_2^*, \dots, y_{p(x^*)}^*)^\top \in \mathcal{R}^{p(x^*)}, \quad y_i^* := y^*(\tau_{x^*}^i(x^*)) \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)). \end{aligned}$$

Let us define some functions and notations. Denote by  $I_a(x^*)$  the set of indices corresponding to the active inequality constraints at  $x^*$  among  $\hat{g}_1(x) \leq 0, \dots, \hat{g}_p(x) \leq 0$ , i.e.,  $I_a(x^*) := \{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)\} \mid \hat{g}_i(x^*) = 0\}$ . For a fixed barrier parameter  $\mu > 0$ , we consider the function  $\Phi_\mu : \mathcal{R}^n \times \mathcal{R}^{|I_a(x^*)|} \times \mathcal{R}^{m(m+1)/2} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^d$  with  $d := n + |I_a(x^*)| + m(m+1)/2$  defined by

$$\Phi_\mu(\tilde{w}) := \begin{pmatrix} \nabla f(x) + \sum_{i \in I_a(x^*)} y_i \nabla \hat{g}_i(x) - (F_i \bullet V)_{i=1}^n \\ (\hat{g}_i(x))_{i \in I_a(x^*)} \\ \text{svec}(F(x) \circ V - \mu I) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.21)$$

where we write  $\tilde{w} := (x, \tilde{y}, \text{svec}(V)) \in \mathcal{R}^n \times \mathcal{R}^{|I_a(x^*)|} \times \mathcal{R}^{m(m+1)/2}$  with  $\tilde{y} = (y_i)_{i \in I_a(x^*)}$ . Denote the Jacobian of  $\Phi_\mu(\cdot)$  by  $\mathcal{J}\Phi_\mu(\cdot)$ , that is,

$$\mathcal{J}\Phi_\mu(\tilde{w}) := \begin{pmatrix} \nabla^2 f(x) + \sum_{i \in I_a(x^*)} y_i \nabla^2 \hat{g}_i(x) & (\nabla \hat{g}_i(x))_{i \in I_a(x^*)} & - \begin{pmatrix} \text{svec}(F_1)^\top \\ \vdots \\ \text{svec}(F_n)^\top \end{pmatrix} \\ (\nabla \hat{g}_i(x))_{i \in I_a(x^*)}^\top & 0 & 0 \\ \text{svec}(\mathcal{L}_V(F_1)) \cdots \text{svec}(\mathcal{L}_V(F_n)) & 0 & \mathcal{T}_{F(x)} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\mathcal{T}_X \in \mathcal{R}^{m(m+1)/2 \times m(m+1)/2}$  is defined as the matrix such that  $\mathcal{T}_X \text{svec}(Y) := \text{svec}(\mathcal{L}_X(Y))$  for any  $X, Y \in S^m$ . It is worth mentioning that  $\mathcal{J}\Phi_\mu = \mathcal{J}\Phi_0$  holds for any  $\mu \geq 0$ . Then,  $\tilde{w}^* := (x^*, \tilde{y}^*, \text{svec}(V_*))$  solves  $\Phi_0(\tilde{w}) = 0$ . Correspondingly, let us define the function  $Q : \mathcal{R}^n \times \mathcal{R}^{|I_a(x^*)|} \times \mathcal{R}^{m(m+1)/2} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{d \times d}$  by replacing the block consisting of  $\text{svec}(\mathcal{L}_V(F_i))$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  in  $\mathcal{J}\Phi_\mu(\tilde{w})$  with the matrix with columns  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$ , where

$$v_i := \frac{1}{2} \text{svec} \left( \mathcal{L}_V F_i + \mathcal{L}_{F(x)} \mathcal{L}_V \mathcal{L}_{F(x)}^{-1} F_i \right) \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, n).$$

Next, for convenience, we also define the following index set for each  $k$ :

$$J_a^k := \left\{ i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)\} \mid \hat{g}_i(x^k) + \nabla \hat{g}_i(x^k)^\top \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x^k = 0 \right\}. \quad (3.22)$$

We additionally make the second set of assumptions:

**Assumption C:**

1. The functions  $f$  and  $g(\cdot, \tau)$  ( $\tau \in T$ ) are three times continuously differentiable.
2. The active inequality constraints at  $x^*$  are eventually identified in the sense that  $J_a^k = I_a(x^*)$  holds for any  $k$  sufficiently large.
3. The strict complementarity condition holds for the semi-definite constraint and the inequality constraints, i.e.,

$$F(x^*) + V_* \in S_{++}^m, \quad -\hat{g}_i(x^*) + y_i^* > 0 \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)).$$

4. The Jacobian  $\mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^*)$  is nonsingular.

We can show that Assumption C-2 holds true when the objective function  $f$  is convex, although we omit the proof here. Also, in a manner analogous to the proof of [33, Theorem 1], it is not difficult to verify Assumption C-4 under suitable regularity conditions.

In view of the implicit function theorem, we can ensure the existence of the central path converging to  $w^*$  under Assumption C-4. Specifically, there exist some  $\bar{\mu} > 0$  and a smooth curve  $\tilde{w}(\cdot) : (0, \bar{\mu}] \rightarrow U(x^*) \times \mathcal{R}^{|I_a(x^*)|} \times \mathcal{R}^{m(m+1)/2}$  such that  $\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{w}(\mu) = \tilde{w}^*$  and  $\tilde{w}(\mu)$  represents the BKKT point with the barrier parameter  $\mu \in (0, \bar{\mu}]$ .

Recall the definition (3.22) of  $J_a^k$ . Then, Assumption C-2 along with the complementarity condition (3.12) with  $\bar{w} = w^k$  yields that, for all  $k$  sufficiently

large,  $\hat{g}_i(x^k) + \nabla \hat{g}_i(x^k)^\top \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x^k < 0$  and  $y_i^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} y_i^k = 0$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)\} \setminus I_a(x^*)$ . Similarly, by (3.20) with  $\bar{x} = x^k$  and  $J_a(\bar{x})$  replaced by  $J_a^k$ , i.e.,  $I_a(x^*)$  under Assumption C-2, we have  $y_i^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 y_i^k = 0$  ( $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)\} \setminus I_a(x^*)$ ). Therefore, we can reduce the system (3.10), (3.12), and (3.13) with  $P = I$  and  $(\mu, \bar{w}) = (\mu_k, w^k)$  and the equations (3.17)–(3.20) with  $\bar{P} = I$  and  $(\mu, \hat{w}) = (\mu_k, w^{k+\frac{1}{2}})$  to the following equations for  $j = 0$  and  $j = \frac{1}{2}$ , respectively:

$$\Phi_{\mu_k}(\tilde{w}^{k+j}) + Q(\tilde{w}^{k+j}) \Delta_{j+\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{w} = 0, \quad (3.23)$$

where  $\Delta_{j+\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{w} := \left( \Delta_{j+\frac{1}{2}} x, \Delta_{j+\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{y}, \text{svec} \left( \Delta_{j+\frac{1}{2}} V \right) \right)^\top$ .

### 3.4.1 Technical results

In this section, we provide two useful propositions before entering the essential part of the convergence analysis. See the Appendix for the proofs. The first proposition is associated with the limiting behavior of the operator  $\mathcal{L}_{F(x^k)} \mathcal{L}_{V_k} \mathcal{L}_{F(x^k)}^{-1}$  as  $k$  tends to  $\infty$ .

**Proposition 4** *Let  $(X_*, Y_*) \in S_+^m \times S_+^m$  satisfy the strict complementarity condition that  $X_* \circ Y_* = O$  and  $X_* + Y_* \in S_{++}^m$ . Let  $\{\mu_r\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{++}$  and  $\{(X_r, Y_r)\} \subseteq S_{++}^m \times S_{++}^m$  be sequences such that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mu_r = 0$ ,  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (X_r, Y_r) = (X_*, Y_*)$  and  $\|X_r \circ Y_r - \mu_r I\|_F = O(\mu_r^{1+\zeta})$  with  $\zeta > 0$ . Then,  $\|\mathcal{L}_{X_r} \mathcal{L}_{Y_r} \mathcal{L}_{X_r}^{-1} - \mathcal{L}_{Y_r}\|_2 = O(\mu_r^\zeta)$  and thus  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_{X_r} \mathcal{L}_{Y_r} \mathcal{L}_{X_r}^{-1} = \mathcal{L}_{Y_*}$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_2$  denotes the operator norm, namely, for any linear operator  $\mathcal{T} : S^m \rightarrow S^m$ ,  $\|\mathcal{T}\|_2 := \sup_{\|X\|_F=1} \|\mathcal{T}(X)\|_F$ .*

The next proposition will be useful in proving that the interior point constraints  $F(x^{k+j-\frac{1}{2}} + s_k^j \Delta_j x^k) \in S_{++}^m$  and  $V_{k+j-\frac{1}{2}} + s_k^j \Delta_j V_k \in S_{++}^m$  eventually hold true with  $s_k^j = 1$  for  $j = \frac{1}{2}, 1$ .

**Proposition 5** *Let  $0 < \zeta < 1$  and  $\{(X_r, Y_r)\} \subseteq S_{++}^m \times S_{++}^m$ ,  $\{(\Delta X_r, \Delta Y_r)\} \subseteq S^m \times S^m$ , and  $\{\mu_r\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{++}$  be sequences such that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mu_r = 0$ ,*

$$\|\Delta X_r \circ \Delta Y_r\|_F = O(\mu_r^2), \quad (3.24)$$

$$\|X_r \circ Y_r - \mu_r I\|_F = O(\mu_r^{1+\zeta}). \quad (3.25)$$

*Moreover, let  $0 < \hat{\zeta} < 1$  and  $\{\hat{\mu}_r\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{++}$  be a sequence such that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mu}_r = 0$ ,*

$$\|Z_r - \hat{\mu}_r I\|_F = O(\hat{\mu}_r^{1+\hat{\zeta}}), \quad (3.26)$$

$$\mu_r^2 = o(\hat{\mu}_r), \quad (3.27)$$

*where  $Z_r := X_r \circ Y_r + X_r \circ \Delta Y_r + Y_r \circ \Delta X_r$ . Then, we have  $X_r + \Delta X_r \in S_{++}^m$  and  $Y_r + \Delta Y_r \in S_{++}^m$  for any sufficiently large  $r$ .*

### 3.4.2 Main convergence results

In this section, we provide the main convergence results for the proposed algorithm. For the sake of analysis, we choose a parameter  $\tilde{c}$  such that

$$\frac{1}{2} < \tilde{c} < \frac{1-c}{1+c\alpha} < 1, \quad (3.28)$$

where  $c$  and  $\alpha$  are algorithmic parameters selected in Step 0. We can ensure that such  $\tilde{c}$  exists if the parameter  $c$  is selected as in Step 0 of Algorithm 2. In terms of  $\tilde{c}$ , let us define the parameter sequence  $\{\tilde{\varepsilon}_k\}$  by

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_k := \gamma_1 \mu_k^{1+\tilde{c}\alpha} \quad (3.29)$$

for each  $k$ . Note that the second inequality in (3.28) implies  $(1+c\alpha)(1+\tilde{c}\alpha) < 1+\alpha$ . Then, from (3.6), we have

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_k > \varepsilon_k \quad (3.30)$$

for all  $k$  large enough. Furthermore, the update rule (3.6) of  $\{\mu_k\}$  and  $\{\varepsilon_k\}$  yields

$$\mu_k = \gamma_2 \mu_{k-1}^{1+c\alpha}, \quad \varepsilon_k = \gamma_1 \gamma_2^{1+\alpha} \mu_{k-1}^{(1+c\alpha)(1+\alpha)} \quad (3.31)$$

for all  $k$  sufficiently large. Hereafter, we assume that the iteration number  $k$  is so large that (3.30) and (3.31) hold.

To show the final theorem concerning two-step superlinear convergence (see Theorem 4), we prove the following two propositions:

**Proposition 6** *Suppose that Assumptions B and C hold. We have*

1. the full step-size  $s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k = 1$  is eventually adopted in Step 2-1,
2.  $w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_k}$ , i.e.,  $R_{\mu_k}(w^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_k$ ,  $F(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \in S_{++}^m$ , and  $V_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \in S_{++}^m$  for all  $k$  sufficiently large, and
3.  $\|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - w^*\| = O(\|w^k - w^*\|^{1+c\alpha})$ .

**Proposition 7** *Suppose that Assumptions B and C hold. We have*

1. the full step-size  $s_1^k = 1$  is eventually adopted in Step 2-2,
2.  $w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 w^k \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\varepsilon_k}$ , i.e.,  $R_{\mu_k}(w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 w^k) \leq \varepsilon_k = \gamma_1 \mu_k^{1+\alpha}$ ,  $F(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 x^k) \in S_{++}^m$ , and  $V_{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 V_k \in S_{++}^m$  for all  $k$  sufficiently large and
3.  $\|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 w^k - w^*\| = O(\|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - w^*\|)$ .

Items 1 and 2 of Proposition 6 mean that  $w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} = w^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k$  eventually holds and it is accommodated by  $\mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_k}$ , which is larger than  $\mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\varepsilon_k}$  since  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_k > \varepsilon_k = \gamma_1 \mu_k^{1+\alpha}$  for  $k$  sufficiently large by (3.30). On the other hand, items 1 and 2 of Proposition 7 indicate that  $w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 w^k$  is necessarily accepted by the targeted neighborhood  $\mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\varepsilon_k}$  for all  $k$  sufficiently large. Hence, the condition in Step 2-3 is eventually satisfied with  $s_1^k = 1$ .

In what follows, we devote ourselves to prove the above two propositions. To begin with, we give some lemmas that help to show Proposition 6. The following lemma is concerned with the convergence speed of  $\mu_{k-1}$ ,  $\|\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^k)\|$ , and  $\|w^k - w^*\|$ .

**Lemma 1** *Suppose that Assumptions B and C hold. Then, we have  $\|w^k - w^*\| = \|\tilde{w}^k - \tilde{w}^*\|$  for sufficiently large  $k$  and  $\mu_{k-1} = \Theta(\|\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^k)\|) = \Theta(\|\tilde{w}^k - \tilde{w}^*\|) = \Theta(\|w^k - w^*\|)$ .*

*Proof* See Appendix.  $\square$

**Lemma 2** *Suppose that Assumptions B and C hold. Then,*

1. *we have*

$$\|\mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^k) - Q(\tilde{w}^k)\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{1}{2} \left( \mathcal{L}_{F(x^k)} \mathcal{L}_{V_k} \mathcal{L}_{F(x^k)}^{-1} - \mathcal{L}_{V_k} \right) F_i \right\|_F^2} = O(\mu_{k-1}^\alpha)$$

and hence  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Q(\tilde{w}^k) = \mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^*)$ ;

2.  $Q(\tilde{w}^k)$  is nonsingular for sufficiently large  $k$  and  $\{Q(\tilde{w}^k)^{-1}\}$  is bounded.

*Proof* Notice that  $\|F(x^k) \circ V_k - \mu_{k-1} I\| \leq \varepsilon_{k-1} = \gamma_1 \mu_{k-1}^{1+\alpha}$  by  $w^k \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_{k-1}}^{\varepsilon_{k-1}}$  and (3.6). In addition, note that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (F(x^k), V_k) = (F(x^*), V_*) \in S_+^m \times S_+^m$  and  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(x^k) + V_k = F(x^*) + V_* \in S_{++}^m$  by Assumptions B-1 and C-3. Then, Proposition 4 with  $\{X_r\}$ ,  $\{Y_r\}$ ,  $\{\mu_r\}$ , and  $\zeta$  replaced by  $\{F(x^k)\}$ ,  $\{V_k\}$ ,  $\{\mu_{k-1}\}$ , and  $\alpha$ , respectively, yields

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{F(x^k)} \mathcal{L}_{V_k} \mathcal{L}_{F(x^k)}^{-1} - \mathcal{L}_{V_k}\|_2 = O(\mu_{k-1}^\alpha),$$

which further implies

$$\|\mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^k) - Q(\tilde{w}^k)\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{1}{2} \left( \mathcal{L}_{F(x^k)} \mathcal{L}_{V_k} \mathcal{L}_{F(x^k)}^{-1} - \mathcal{L}_{V_k} \right) F_i \right\|_F^2} = O(\mu_{k-1}^\alpha),$$

where the first equality is a direct consequence of the fact  $\|\text{svec}(X)\|^2 = \|X\|_F^2$  ( $X \in S^m$ ) and the forms of  $\mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^k)$  and  $Q(\tilde{w}^k)$ . To prove item 2, recall that  $\mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^*)$  is nonsingular from Assumption C-4. Then, since  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Q(\tilde{w}^k) = \mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^*)$  from item 1,  $Q(\tilde{w}^k)$  is nonsingular for all  $k$  sufficiently large. In addition, we obtain the boundedness of  $\{Q(\tilde{w}^k)^{-1}\}$  as  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Q(\tilde{w}^k)^{-1} = \mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^*)^{-1}$  holds. The proof is complete.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Proposition 6 using Lemmas 1 and 2.

**Proof of Proposition 6:**

Recall that  $\tilde{w}^k = (x^k, \tilde{y}^k, \text{svec}(V_k))$  with  $\tilde{y}^k = (y_i^k)_{i \in I_a(x^*)}$  and  $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{w}^k = (\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x^k, \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{y}^k, \text{svec}(\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_k))$ . For simplicity of expression, we suppose  $I_a(x^*) = \{1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)\}$ , which implies  $\tilde{w}^k = w^k$  and  $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{w}^k = \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k$  for sufficiently large  $k$  and  $\tilde{w}^* = w^*$ . It is not difficult to extend the subsequent analysis to the more general case of  $I_a(x^*) \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)\}$ . Hereafter, we write

$$Q_k := Q(w^k), \quad \mathcal{J}_k := \mathcal{J}\Phi_0(w^k) \quad (3.32)$$

for each  $k$ .

From item 2 of Lemma 2 together with (3.23), we readily see that there exists some  $M > 0$  such that

$$\|Q_k^{-1}\|_F \leq M \quad (3.33)$$

and

$$\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k = -Q_k^{-1} \Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k), \quad (3.34)$$

$$\|\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k\| \leq \|Q_k^{-1}\|_F \|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k)\| = O(\|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k)\|), \quad (3.35)$$

where the equality in (3.35) follows from (3.33). Especially, combining the above with Lemma 1 implies that

$$\max\left(\|\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x^k\|, \|\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_k\|\right) \leq \|\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k\| = O(\mu_{k-1}). \quad (3.36)$$

Notice that  $\|\Phi_{\mu}(w^*)\| = \|\mu I\|_F = \mu\sqrt{m}$  for any  $\mu \geq 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k)\| &\leq \|\Phi_0(w^k)\| + \mu_k\sqrt{m} \\ &= \|\Phi_0(w^k)\| + o(\mu_{k-1}) \\ &= O(\|w^k - w^*\|) \end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

$$= O(\mu_{k-1}), \quad (3.38)$$

where the first equality follow from (3.31) and the last two equalities are derived from Lemma 1. Additionally, by item 1 of Lemma 2, we have

$$\|\mathcal{J}_k - Q_k\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{1}{2} \left( \mathcal{L}_{F(x^k)} \mathcal{L}_{V_k} \mathcal{L}_{F(x^k)}^{-1} - \mathcal{L}_{V_k} \right) F_i \right\|_F^2} = O(\mu_{k-1}^\alpha). \quad (3.39)$$

1. It suffices to show that

$$F(x^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x^k) = F(x^k) + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} F_k \in S_{++}^m, \quad V_k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_k \in S_{++}^m \quad (3.40)$$

for any  $k$  sufficiently large, where  $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} F_k := \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x_i^k F_i$ . In fact, if these conditions hold, by (3.5) with  $(X, \Delta X) = (F(x^k), \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} F_k)$  and  $(X, \Delta X) = (V_k, \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_k)$ , we see that  $t_{\frac{1}{2}}^k = u_{\frac{1}{2}}^k = 1$  and thus  $s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k = 1$  from (3.3). From  $w^k \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_{k-1}}^{\varepsilon_{k-1}}$  and  $\varepsilon_{k-1} = \gamma_1 \mu_{k-1}^{1+\alpha}$ , we have

$$\|F(x^k) \circ V_k - \mu_{k-1} I\|_F = O(\mu_{k-1}^{1+\alpha}). \quad (3.41)$$

Denote

$$\Gamma_k := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x_i^k \left( \mathcal{L}_{F(x^k)} \mathcal{L}_{V_k} \mathcal{L}_{F(x^k)}^{-1} - \mathcal{L}_{V_k} \right) F_i. \quad (3.42)$$

In view of (3.36) and (3.39), we have

$$\|\Gamma_k\|_F \leq \|\mathcal{J}_k - Q_k\|_F \|\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x^k\| = O(\mu_{k-1}^{1+\alpha}), \quad (3.43)$$

$$\|\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} F_k \circ \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_k\|_F = O(\|\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k\|^2) = O(\mu_{k-1}^2). \quad (3.44)$$

By rearranging (3.13) with  $\bar{w} = w^k$ ,  $\mu = \mu_k$ , and  $P = I$  in terms of  $\Gamma_k$ , we obtain

$$F(x^k) \circ V_k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} F_k \circ V_k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_k \circ F(x^k) - \mu_k I = -\Gamma_k,$$

which together with (3.43) and (3.31) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(x^k) \circ V_k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} F_k \circ V_k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_k \circ F(x^k) - \mu_k I\|_F &= O(\mu_{k-1}^{1+\alpha}) \\ &= O(\mu_k^{1+\frac{(1-c)\alpha}{1+c\alpha}}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

Since  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $c \in (0, 1)$ , using (3.31) again, we obtain

$$\mu_{k-1}^2 = o(\mu_k). \quad (3.46)$$

In Proposition 5, replace  $\{X_r\}$ ,  $\{Y_r\}$ ,  $\{\Delta X_r\}$ ,  $\{\Delta Y_r\}$ ,  $\{(\mu_r, \hat{\mu}_r)\}$ , and  $(\zeta, \hat{\zeta})$  by  $\{F(x^k)\}$ ,  $\{V_k\}$ ,  $\{\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} F_k\}$ ,  $\{\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} V_k\}$ ,  $\{(\mu_{k-1}, \mu_k)\}$ , and  $(\alpha, \frac{(1-c)\alpha}{1+c\alpha})$ , respectively. Then, the relations (3.41), (3.44), (3.45), and (3.46) correspond to conditions (3.24)–(3.27). We thus have (3.40) by Proposition 5.

2. We have only to show  $R_{\mu_k}(w^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_k$ . To start with, we note that from item 1,  $s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k = 1$  for all  $k$  sufficiently large. Then, the value of  $\|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k + s_{\frac{1}{2}}^k \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k)\|$  is evaluated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k)\| &\leq \|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k) + \mathcal{J}_k \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k\| + O(\|\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k\|^2) \\ &= \|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k) - \mathcal{J}_k Q_k^{-1} \Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k)\| + O(\mu_{k-1}^2) \\ &= \|(Q_k - \mathcal{J}_k) Q_k^{-1} \Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k)\| + O(\mu_{k-1}^2) \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{J}_k - Q_k\|_F \|Q_k^{-1}\|_F \|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k)\| + O(\mu_{k-1}^2) \\ &= O(\mu_{k-1}^{1+\alpha}) + O(\mu_{k-1}^2) \\ &= O(\mu_{k-1}^{1+\alpha}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

where the first inequality follows from (3.32) and  $\mathcal{J}_k = \mathcal{J} \Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k)$ , the first equality comes from (3.34) and (3.36), and the third equality is derived from (3.38), (3.39), and (3.33). From (3.47), we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{p(x^*)} (y_i^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} y_i^k) \hat{g}_i(x^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} x^k) \right| &\leq p(x^*) \|w^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k\| \|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k)\| \\ &= O(\|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k)\|) \\ &= O(\mu_{k-1}^{1+\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$



and

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq i \leq p(x^*)} (\hat{g}_i(x^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}x^k))_+ &= \max_{i \in I_a(x^*)} (\hat{g}_i(x^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}x^k))_+ \\ &= O(\|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}w^k)\|) \\ &= O(\mu_{k-1}^{1+\alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining these facts, we get  $R_{\mu_k}(w^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}w^k) = O(\mu_{k-1}^{1+\alpha})$ . Since (3.29) and (3.28) together yield  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_k = \gamma_1 \gamma_2^{1+\tilde{c}\alpha} \mu_{k-1}^{(1+c\alpha)(1+\tilde{c}\alpha)}$  and  $(1+c\alpha)(1+\tilde{c}\alpha) < 1+\alpha$ , we conclude  $R_{\mu_k}(w^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}w^k) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_k$  for any  $k$  sufficiently large.

3. Recall that  $\{\|Q_k^{-1}\|\}$  is bounded by (3.33) and  $\mu_{k-1} = \Theta(\|w^k - w^*\|)$  from Lemma 1. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|w^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}w^k - w^*\| \\ &= \|w^k - Q_k^{-1}\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k) - w^*\| \\ &\leq \|w^k - Q_k^{-1}\Phi_0(w^k) - w^*\| + \mu_k \|Q_k^{-1}\|_F \sqrt{m} \\ &\leq \|Q_k^{-1}\|_F \|Q_k(w^k - w^*) - \Phi_0(w^k) + \Phi_0(w^*)\| + \gamma_2 \mu_{k-1}^{1+c\alpha} \|Q_k^{-1}\|_F \sqrt{m} \\ &= \|Q_k^{-1}\|_F \|\mathcal{J}_k(w^k - w^*) + (Q_k - \mathcal{J}_k)(w^k - w^*) - \Phi_0(w^k) + \Phi_0(w^*)\| + O(\mu_{k-1}^{1+c\alpha}) \\ &\leq \|Q_k^{-1}\|_F \|\mathcal{J}_k(w^k - w^*) - \Phi_0(w^k) + \Phi_0(w^*)\| \\ &\quad + \|Q_k^{-1}\|_F \|\mathcal{J}_k - Q_k\|_F \|w^k - w^*\| + O(\|w^k - w^*\|^{1+c\alpha}) \\ &= O(\|w^k - w^*\|^2) + O(\|w^k - w^*\|^{1+c\alpha}) + O(\|w^k - w^*\|^{1+c\alpha}) \\ &= O(\|w^k - w^*\|^{1+c\alpha}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (3.34), the first inequality comes from  $\Phi_0(w^k) - \Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k) = (0, 0, \text{svec}(\mu_k I))$  (see (3.21)), the second inequality is derived from  $\Phi_0(w^*) = 0$  and (3.31), and the third equality is due to (3.39) and Lemma 1. Thus, the desired conclusion is obtained.  $\square$

We next enter the phase of proving Proposition 7. First, let us observe several properties obtained from Proposition 6. Note that item 3 of Proposition 6 implies  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} = w^*$ , and thus

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \tilde{w}^*. \quad (3.48)$$

By (3.48),  $x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}$  is sufficiently close to  $x^*$  for all  $k$  large enough. Then, from the implicit function theorem we have  $\{\tau_{x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}^i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{p(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}})} = \{\tau_{x^*}^i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{p(x^*)}$ , while  $\{\tau_{x^k}^i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{p(x^k)} = \{\tau_{x^*}^i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{p(x^*)}$  also holds for all  $k$  sufficiently large because of Assumption B-1. Thus, the sets of implicit functions defined at  $x^k$  and  $x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}$  are identical, that is to say,  $\{\tau_{x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}^i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{p(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}})} = \{\tau_{x^k}^i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{p(x^k)}$  holds. Furthermore, noting  $w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_k}$ , we can show that  $\|\mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - Q(\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}})\|_F = O(\mu_k^{\tilde{c}\alpha})$  in a manner similar to item 1 of Lemma 2. Thus, it holds that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Q(\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) =$

$\mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^*)$  from (3.48), which together with Assumption C-4 implies the non-singularity of  $Q(\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}})$  for all  $k$  sufficiently large and the boundedness of  $\{Q(\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}\}$ .

The above observations are summarized in the following lemma:

**Lemma 3** *Suppose that Assumptions B and C hold. Then, we have*

1. *the functions  $\hat{g}_i(\cdot)$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(x^k)$ ) defined at  $x^k$  are also valid at  $x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}$  and hence the linear equations (3.17)–(3.20) are well-defined, and  $Q(\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}})$  is nonsingular for all  $k$  sufficiently large. In addition,*
2.  *$\|\mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) - Q(\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}})\|_F = O(\mu_k^{\tilde{c}\alpha})$ , and*
3.  *$\{Q(\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}\}$  is bounded.*

Furthermore, in a manner similar to Lemma 1, we can derive the following result in view of  $w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\tilde{c}\alpha}$ :

**Lemma 4** *Suppose that Assumptions B and C hold. Then, we have  $\|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - w^*\| = \|\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \tilde{w}^*\|$  for sufficiently large  $k$  and  $\mu_k = \Theta(\|\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}})\|) = \Theta(\|\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \tilde{w}^*\|) = \Theta(\|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - w^*\|)$ .*

*Proof* The proof is obtained in a manner analogous to Lemma 1. □

We are now ready to prove Proposition 7. Its proof seems quite similar to Propositions 6. However, we do not omit it since there are some significant differences. For example, the proof of item 2 of Proposition 7 relies on the condition  $\tilde{c} > \frac{1}{2}$  in (3.28).

### Proof of Proposition 7:

Like the proof of Proposition 6, for simplicity of expression, we suppose  $I_a(x^*) = \{1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)\}$ , which implies  $\tilde{w}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} = w^{k+\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\Delta_1 w^k = \Delta_1 \tilde{w}^k$  for sufficiently large  $k$  and  $\tilde{w}^* = w^*$ . We also write

$$Q_{k+\frac{1}{2}} := Q(w^{k+\frac{1}{2}}), \quad \mathcal{J}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} := \mathcal{J}\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k) = \mathcal{J}\Phi_0(w^k + \Delta_{\frac{1}{2}} w^k).$$

By item 2 of Proposition 6, we have, for any  $k$  sufficiently large,

$$\|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^k)\| = O(\mu_k^{1+\tilde{c}\alpha}) \quad (3.49)$$

By (3.23) with  $j = \frac{1}{2}$  and item 1 of Lemma 3, we have

$$\Delta_1 w^k = -Q_{k+\frac{1}{2}}^{-1} \Phi_{\mu_k}(w^{k+\frac{1}{2}}), \quad (3.50)$$

which together with (3.49), item 3 of Lemma 3, and Lemma 4 implies

$$\|\Delta_1 w^k\| = O(\|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^{k+\frac{1}{2}})\|) = O(\mu_k^{1+\tilde{c}\alpha}). \quad (3.51)$$

Combining this with Lemma 4 yields

$$\|\Delta_1 w^k\| = O(\|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - w^*\|^{1+\tilde{c}\alpha}). \quad (3.52)$$

Note that, from Lemma 3, we have

$$\|\mathcal{J}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - Q_{k+\frac{1}{2}}\| = O(\mu_k^{\tilde{c}\alpha}). \quad (3.53)$$

1. As in the proof of item 1 of Proposition 6, it suffices to show that

$$F(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 x^k) = F(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \Delta_1 F_k \in S_{++}^m, \quad V_{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 V_k \in S_{++}^m \quad (3.54)$$

for all  $k$  sufficiently large, where  $\Delta_1 F_k := \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_1 x_i^k F_i$ . Since  $w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_k}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_k}$  by Proposition 6 and  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_k = \gamma_1 \mu_k^{1+\tilde{c}\alpha}$ , we obtain

$$\|F(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \circ V_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \mu_k I\|_F = O(\mu_k^{1+\tilde{c}\alpha}). \quad (3.55)$$

The expression (3.51) implies

$$\|\Delta_1 F_k \circ \Delta_1 V_k\|_F = O(\|\Delta_1 w^k\|^2) = O(\mu_k^2). \quad (3.56)$$

Moreover, by (3.18) with  $\hat{P} = I$ ,  $\hat{w} = w^{k+\frac{1}{2}}$ , and  $\mu = \mu_k$ , it holds that

$$\|F(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \circ V_{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 F_k \circ V_{k+\frac{1}{2}} + F(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \circ \Delta_1 V_k - \mu_k I\|_F = 0. \quad (3.57)$$

In Proposition 5, replace  $\{X_r\}$ ,  $\{Y_r\}$ ,  $\{\Delta X_r\}$ ,  $\{\Delta Y_r\}$ ,  $\{(\mu_r, \hat{\mu}_r)\}$ , and  $(\zeta, \hat{\zeta})$  by  $\{F(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}})\}$ ,  $\{V_{k+\frac{1}{2}}\}$ ,  $\{\Delta_1 F_k\}$ ,  $\{\Delta_1 V_k\}$ ,  $\{(\mu_k, \mu_k)\}$ , and  $(\tilde{c}\alpha, \alpha)$ , respectively. Then, in view of (3.55), (3.56), and (3.57), we can verify the conditions (3.24)–(3.27). We thus obtain (3.54) and conclude the desired result.

2. We show only  $R_{\mu_k}(w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 w^k) \leq \varepsilon_k = \gamma_1 \mu_k^{1+\alpha}$  for  $k$  sufficiently large. The remaining part is obvious from (3.54). We first note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 w^k)\| &\leq \|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \mathcal{J}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_1 w^k\| + O(\|\Delta_1 w^k\|^2) \\ &\leq \|\Phi_{\mu_k}(w^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + Q_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_1 w^k\| \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{J}_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - Q_{k+\frac{1}{2}}\| \|\Delta_1 w^k\| + O(\|\Delta_1 w^k\|^2) \\ &= O(\mu_k^{\tilde{c}\alpha} \|\Delta_1 w^k\|) + O(\|\Delta_1 w^k\|^2) \\ &= O(\mu_k^{1+2\tilde{c}\alpha}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (3.23), (3.50), and (3.53) and the second equality is obtained from (3.51). Then, in a manner similar to Proposition 6, we can show  $R_{\mu_k}(w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 w^k) = O(\mu_k^{1+2\tilde{c}\alpha})$ , which together with  $\tilde{c} > \frac{1}{2}$  from (3.28) implies  $R_{\mu_k}(w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 w^k) \leq \varepsilon_k = \gamma_1 \mu_k^{1+\alpha}$  for all  $k$  sufficiently large.

3. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 w^k - w^*\| &\leq \|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - w^*\| + \|\Delta_1 w^k\| \\ &= \|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - w^*\| + O(\|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - w^*\|^{1+\tilde{c}\alpha}) \\ &= O(\|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - w^*\|), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (3.52).  $\square$

Combining Propositions 6 and 7, we get the following two-step superlinear convergence result.

**Theorem 4** *Suppose that Assumptions B and C hold. Then, the update in Step 2-3 is eventually adopted and we have*

$$\|w^{k+1} - w^*\| = O(\|w^k - w^*\|^{1+c\alpha}). \quad (3.58)$$

Hence,  $\{w^k\}$  converges to  $w^*$  two-step superlinearly with the order of  $1 + c\alpha \in (1, \frac{4}{3})$ .

*Proof* From item 2 of Proposition 7,  $w^{k+1} = w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 w^k$  holds for any  $k$  sufficiently large, that is to say, the update in Step 2-3 is eventually accepted. Using Propositions 6 and 7 again yields

$$\|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} + \Delta_1 w^k - w^*\| = O(\|w^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - w^*\|) = O(\|w^k - w^*\|^{1+c\alpha}).$$

We thus confirm (3.58). Finally, since the parameter  $c$  is chosen so that  $0 < c \leq \frac{1}{\alpha+2}$ , we have

$$1 < 1 + c\alpha \leq 1 + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2} = 2 - \frac{2}{\alpha+2} < \frac{4}{3}.$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

## 4 Numerical experiments

In this section, we conduct some numerical experiments to demonstrate the efficiency of the primal-dual path following method (Algorithm 2) by solving two kinds of SISDPs with a one-dimensional index set of the form  $T = [T_{\min}, T_{\max}]$ : The first one is a linear SISDP where all functions are affine with respect to  $x$ ; the second one is an SISDP with a nonlinear objective function. Throughout the section, we identify a symmetric matrix variable  $X \in S^m$  with a vector variable  $x := (x_{11}, x_{12}, \dots, x_{1m}, x_{12}, x_{22}, \dots, x_{mm})^\top \in \mathcal{R}^{\frac{m(m+1)}{2}}$  through

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & \dots & x_{1m} \\ x_{12} & x_{22} & \dots & x_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{1m} & x_{2m} & \dots & x_{mm} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The program was coded in MATLAB R2012a and run on a machine with Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-1620 v3@3.50GHz and 10.24GB RAM. We compute the scaling matrices for the NT direction according to [27, Section 4.1]. As for SISDPs with a nonlinear objective function, the matrix  $B_P$  in the quadratic program (3.14) is not necessarily positive-definite. So as to assure its positive definiteness, we modified  $B_P$  by lifting its negative eigenvalues to 1. Let  $\bar{x}$

be a current point and  $\{\tau_{\bar{x}}^i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{p(\bar{x})}$  be the set of implicit functions defined in (3.7). As for the set  $S_\delta(\bar{x})$  defined by (3.8), we set  $\delta := 10^{-1}$  and put  $N + 1$  grids  $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{N+1}\}$  on  $T$  uniformly with  $N := 100$ . To specify the set  $S_\delta(\bar{x})$ , we apply Newton's method combined with the projection onto  $T$  for the problem  $\max_{\tau \in T} g(\bar{x}, \tau)$  starting from each of the local maximizers  $\bar{s}$  of  $\max\{g(\bar{x}, s) \mid s = s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{N+1}\}$  such that  $g(\bar{x}, \bar{s}) > \max_{1 \leq i \leq N+1} g(\bar{x}, s_i) - \delta$ . Let  $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{R}_+^{p(\bar{x})}$  be a current estimate of Lagrange multiplier vector associated with the inequality constraints  $g(x, \tau_{\bar{x}}^i(x)) \leq 0$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})$ ). As  $\bar{x}$  moves to  $\bar{x} + \Delta\bar{x}$ , we trace the value of the implicit function  $\tau_{\bar{x}}^i$  for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})$ , namely, we identify  $\tau_{\bar{x}}^i(\bar{x} + \Delta\bar{x})$  with an element in  $S_\delta(\bar{x} + \Delta\bar{x})$  to examine the correspondence between  $\bar{y}_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})$ ) and the inequality constraints  $g(x, \tau_{\bar{x}+\Delta\bar{x}}^j(x)) \leq 0$  ( $1 \leq j \leq p(\bar{x} + \Delta\bar{x})$ ). For this purpose, for each element  $\tau_{\bar{x}+\Delta\bar{x}}^j(\bar{x}_+) \in S_\delta(\bar{x}_+)$  with  $\bar{x}_+ := \bar{x} + \Delta\bar{x}$ , we search  $S_\delta(\bar{x}) = \{\tau_{\bar{x}}^1(\bar{x}), \tau_{\bar{x}}^2(\bar{x}), \dots, \tau_{\bar{x}}^{p(\bar{x})}(\bar{x})\}$  for an index  $\tilde{i} \in \{1, 2, \dots, p(\bar{x})\}$  such that  $\|\tau_{\bar{x}+\Delta\bar{x}}^j(\bar{x}_+) - \tau_{\bar{x}}^{\tilde{i}}(\bar{x}) - \nabla \tau_{\bar{x}}^{\tilde{i}}(\bar{x})^\top \Delta\bar{x}\| (\approx \|\tau_{\bar{x}+\Delta\bar{x}}^j(\bar{x}_+) - \tau_{\bar{x}}^{\tilde{i}}(\bar{x}_+)\|) \leq 10^{-1}$ . If it is found, we regard  $\tau_{\bar{x}+\Delta\bar{x}}^j(\bar{x}_+)$  as  $\tau_{\bar{x}}^{\tilde{i}}(\bar{x}_+)$ . Otherwise, we treat  $\tau_{\bar{x}+\Delta\bar{x}}^j(\cdot)$  as the implicit function that newly appears at  $\bar{x}_+$ , and set zero to be the Lagrange multiplier for the inequality constraint  $g(x, \tau_{\bar{x}+\Delta\bar{x}}^j(x)) \leq 0$ .

Next, we explain how each step of the algorithm is implemented. In Step 0, we set

$$\gamma_1 = \sqrt{\frac{m(m+1)}{2}}, \quad \gamma_2 = 5, \quad c = \frac{1}{2.99}, \quad \alpha = 0.99, \quad \beta = 0.8.$$

As for starting points, we set  $y^0 = (1, 1)^\top$ ,  $V_0 = mI$ , and  $\mu_0 = 1$ , while  $x^0$  is chosen so that  $X^0 = m^{-1}I$  for linear SISDPs, and  $x^0 = 0$  is chosen for SISDPs with a nonlinear objective function. In Step 1, we terminate the algorithm if  $\mu_{k+1} < 10^{-10}$  or the value of the function  $R_0$  is less than  $10^{-8}$ , where  $R_0$  is the function  $R_\mu$  with  $\mu = 0$  defined in Section 2.2. In Step 2.4, we implement the interior-point SQP-type method proposed in [15] by using the implementation details described therein. In Step 3, for the sake of numerical stability, we set  $\varepsilon_{k+1} := \max(10^{-7}, \gamma_1 \mu_{k+1}^{1+\alpha})$ . For  $X \in S_{++}^m$  and  $Y \in S^m$ , we compute  $\mathcal{L}_X^{-1}Y$  by solving the linear equation  $\mathcal{L}_X Z = Y$  for  $Z \in S^m$  with the Matlab built-in solver `lyap2`. We moreover use `quadprog` to solve quadratic programs in Step 2-1.

For the sake of comparison, we also implement a discretization method that solves finitely relaxed SISDPs sequentially until an approximate feasible solution is obtained. More precisely, for solving the SISDP (1.1), we use the following discretization algorithm:

- Step 0: Choose an initial index set  $T_0 \subseteq T$  with  $|T_0| < +\infty$ . Choose  $\theta > 0$ .  
Set  $r := 0$ .
- Step 1: Get a KKT point  $x^r$  of the finitely relaxed SISDP with  $T$  replaced by  $T_r$ .
- Step 2: Find  $\bar{\tau} \in T$  such that  $g(x^r, \bar{\tau}) > \theta$  and set  $T_{r+1} := T_r \cup \{\bar{\tau}\}$ . If such a point does not exist in  $T$ , terminate the algorithm.

Step 3: Increment  $r$  by one and return to Step 1.

In Step 0, we choose  $T_0 = \{T_{\min}, T_{\max}\}$ . In Step 2, to find such a  $\bar{\tau} \in T$  we solve  $\max_{\tau \in T} g(x^r, \tau)$  by applying Newton's method with a starting point  $s \in \operatorname{argmax}\{g(x^k, s) \mid s = s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{N+1}\}$ , where  $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{N+1}\}$  is the set of grids defined earlier in this section.<sup>2</sup> We set  $\theta := 10^{-6}$ .

#### 4.1 Linear SISDPs

In this section, we consider the linear SISDP (1.1), called LSISDP for short. Specifically, we solve the following problem taken from [13, Section 4.2]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize } A_0 \bullet X \\ & \text{subject to } A(\tau) \bullet X \geq 0 \ (\tau \in T) \\ & \quad I \bullet X = 1 \\ & \quad X \in S_+^m, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where  $A_0 \in S^m$  and  $A : T \rightarrow S^m$  is a symmetric matrix valued function whose elements are  $q$ -th order polynomials in  $\tau$ , i.e.,  $(A(\tau))_{i,j} = \sum_{l=0}^q a_{i,j,l} \tau^l$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ .

In this experiment, we deal with the cases where  $q = 9$ ,  $m = 10, 20$ , and  $T = [0, 1]$ , i.e.,  $T_{\min} = 0$  and  $T_{\max} = 1$ . We generate 10 test problems for each of  $m = 10, 20$  as follows: We choose all entries of  $A_0$  and the coefficients  $a_{i,j,l}$  in  $A(\tau)$  from the interval  $[-1, 1]$  randomly. Among those generated data sets, we use only data such that the semi-infinite constraint includes at least one active constraint at an optimum of (4.1). Specifically, for each generated data, we compute an optimum, say  $\tilde{X}$ , of the SDP obtained by removing the semi-infinite constraints. If  $\min_{1 \leq i \leq 21} A \left( T_{\min} + \frac{(i-1)(T_{\max}-T_{\min})}{20} \right) \bullet \tilde{X} \leq -10^{-3}$ , which implies that  $\tilde{X}$  does not satisfy the semi-infinite constraints, we adopt it as a valid data set.

We examine the performance of Algorithm 2 by comparing it with the discretization method that uses SDPT3 [28] with the default setting to solve linear SDPs sequentially. The obtained results are shown in Tables 1 and 2, in which ‘‘ave.time(s)’’ and ‘‘ $\Phi_0^*$ ’’ stand for the average running time in seconds and the average value of  $\Phi_0$  at the solution output by the algorithm ‘‘Disc.’’ stands for the discretization method. Moreover, ‘‘AHO-like’’, ‘‘NT’’, and ‘‘H.K.M’’ stand for Algorithm 2 combined with the scaling matrices  $P = I$ ,  $F(x^k)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , and  $W^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , respectively.

From the tables, we observe that computational time for ‘‘AHO-like’’ is largest among all. Actually, it spends around 3 seconds for  $m = 10$  and 40 seconds for  $m = 20$ , while the others spend less than 1 second in all cases. This is mainly due to high computational costs for calculating the matrix  $H_P$  defined by (3.16), in which  $\mathcal{L}_{F(x)}^{-1}$  must be dealt with. However, in the

<sup>2</sup> There is no theoretical guarantee for global optimality of  $\tau$  thus found. In practice, however, we may expect to have a global optimum by setting  $N$  large enough.

cases of “NT” and “H.K.M”,  $H_P$  can be handed more efficiently. Second, we observe that “Disc.” solves problems faster than Algorithm 2. This is because an SDP is solved very quickly with SDPT3 at each iteration of “Disc.”, and the number of SDPs solved is very small. In fact, only three or four SDPs are solved on average per run. However, we can see that our methods gain KKT points with higher accuracy than the discretization method. More specifically, the values of  $\Phi_0^*$  for Algorithm 2 lie between  $1.0 \times 10^{-9}$  and  $2.0 \times 10^{-9}$ , while those for the discretization method are around  $10^{-6}$ . We also observed that Algorithm 2 skips Step 2.4 in most iterations, namely,  $w^{k+1}$  is determined by the directions  $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}}w^{k+1}$  and  $\Delta_1w^{k+1}$ . Actually, Step 2.4 was skipped in more than 90% of iterations. Skipping Step 2.4 is desirable since the interior point SQP method performed in Step 2.4 is likely to solve multiple QPs and result in more computational cost than Steps 2.1 and 2.2. Also, in most cases, the full step was accepted eventually and the value of  $\Phi_{\mu_{k-1}}$  converged to 0 superlinearly.

	ave.time(s)	$\Phi_0^*$
AHO-like	2.63	$1.39 \cdot 10^{-9}$
NT	0.44	$1.39 \cdot 10^{-9}$
H.K.M.	0.45	$1.39 \cdot 10^{-9}$
Disc.	0.54	$2.06 \cdot 10^{-6}$

**Table 1** Results for linear SISDPs with  $m = 10$

	ave.time(s)	$\Phi_0^*$
AHO-like	46.3	$1.97 \cdot 10^{-9}$
NT	0.90	$1.97 \cdot 10^{-9}$
H.K.M.	0.90	$1.97 \cdot 10^{-9}$
Disc.	0.40	$1.34 \cdot 10^{-6}$

**Table 2** Results for linear SISDPs with  $m = 20$

## 4.2 Nonlinear SISDPs

Next, we solve the following SISDP whose objective function is nonlinear:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Minimize} && \frac{1}{2}x^\top Mx + c^\top x + \omega\|x\|^4 \\
 & x \in \mathcal{R}^{\frac{m(m+1)}{2}} \\
 & \text{subject to} && \sum_{i=1}^n \tau^{i-1}x_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \tau^{2i} + \sin(9\pi\tau) + 2 \quad (\tau \in T) \\
 & && X + \kappa I \in S_+^m
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

with  $\omega > 0$ ,  $\kappa > 0$ , and  $n := m(m+1)/2$ . The objective function is not convex in general but coercive in the sense that  $f(x) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\|x\| \rightarrow \infty$ , and thus the considered problem is guaranteed to have at least one global optimum. We deal with the cases of  $m = 10, 20$ . For each of  $m = 10, 20$ , all the elements of  $M \in S^m$  and  $c \in \mathcal{R}^n$  are randomly generated from the interval  $[-1, 1]$ . We set  $T = [0, 1]$  and  $\kappa = \omega = 0.01$ . In Step 2 of the discretization method, we use the primal-dual interior point method [35] to solve finitely relaxed SISDPs.

We show the results in Tables 3 and 4, where each column and row has the same meaning as in Tables 1 and 2. From the tables, “AHO-like” spends the largest CPU-time like in linear SISDPs. We observe that Algorithm 2 (AHO-like, NT, H.K.M.) successfully obtains KKT points with higher accuracy than

the discretization method. Actually, the values of  $\Phi_0^*$  obtained by Algorithm 2 lie between  $10^{-9}$  and  $2 \times 10^{-9}$ , while those for the discretization method are around  $10^{-6}$ . Compared with the case of linear SISDPs, we observed that the rate of skipping Step 2-4 was less. Actually, Step 2-4 was used at about 15% of iterations when  $m = 10$  and about 24% when  $m = 20$ , while it was used only in a few early iterations for linear SISDPs. This might be caused by the nonlinearity of the objective function.

	ave.time(s)	$\Phi_0^*$
AHO-like	3.16	$1.39 \cdot 10^{-9}$
NT	0.86	$1.39 \cdot 10^{-9}$
H.K.M.	0.85	$1.39 \cdot 10^{-9}$
Disc.	1.27	$9.62 \cdot 10^{-7}$

**Table 3** Results for the nonlinear SISDP with  $m = 10$

	ave.time(s)	$\Phi_0^*$
AHO-like	50.3	$1.97 \cdot 10^{-9}$
NT	4.06	$2.32 \cdot 10^{-9}$
H.K.M.	4.00	$2.32 \cdot 10^{-9}$
Disc.	8.08	$8.06 \cdot 10^{-7}$

**Table 4** Results for the nonlinear SISDP with  $m = 20$

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed two algorithms for solving the SISDP (1.1): The first one (Algorithm 1) is a primal-dual path following method designed to find a KKT point of the SISDP by following a path formed by BKKT points. We showed that a sequence generated by the algorithm weakly\* converges to a KKT point under some mild assumptions. To accelerate local convergence speed, the second algorithm (Algorithm 2) integrates a two-step SQP method into Algorithm 1. Algorithm 2 solves a sequence of quadratic programs and Newton equations obtained by the local reduction method and Monteiro-Zhang scaling technique, while decreasing the value of the barrier parameter.

We established two-step superlinear convergence of Algorithm 2 for the particular case where the AHO-like directions is used. As for the cases of the NT and H.K.M directions, we can show a two-step superlinear convergence in a manner analogous to [33, Theorems 3,4]. Finally, we conducted some numerical experiments to investigate the efficiency of Algorithm 2 by comparing it with the discretization method which solves (nonlinear) SDPs obtained by finite relaxation of the SISDP (1.1). In the experiments, we confirmed that the sequences generated by Algorithm 2 actually converged to a KKT point two-step superlinearly. We also observed that it exhibited the numerical efficiency comparable to the discretization method. In particular, it worked better in finding highly accurate solutions than the discretization method.

## References

1. Bonnans, J. F. and Shapiro, A.: Perturbation Analysis of Optimization Problems, Springer-Verlag, New York (2000)



2. Floudas, C. A. and Stein, O.: The adaptive convexification algorithm: A feasible point method for semi-infinite programming, *SIAM J. Optim.* **18**, 1187–1208 (2007)
3. Freund, R. W. , Jarre, F., and Vogelbusch, C. H.: Nonlinear semidefinite programming: Sensitivity, convergence, and an application in passive reduced-order modeling, *Math. Program.* **109**, 581–611 (2007)
4. Goberna, M. A. and López, M. A. : *Semi-Infinite Programming: Recent Advances*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht (2001)
5. Gramlich, G., Hettich, R., and Sachs, E. W. : Local convergence of SQP methods in semi-infinite programming, *SIAM J. Optim.* **5**, 641–658 (1995)
6. Hayashi, S. and S.-Y. Wu, S.-Y.: An explicit exchange algorithm for linear semi-infinite programming problems with second-order cone constraint, *SIAM J. Optim.* **20**, 1527–1546 (2009)
7. Hettich, R. and Kortanek, K. O.: *Semi-infinite programming: Theory, methods, and applications*, *SIAM Rev.* **35**, 380–429 (1993)
8. Konno, H., Kawada, N., and Tuy, H.: Cutting plane algorithms for nonlinear semi-definite programming problems with applications, *J. Global Optim.* **25**, 141–155 (2003)
9. Leibfritz, F. and Maruhn, J. H.: A successive SDP-NSDP approach to a robust optimization problem in finance, *Comput. Optim. and Appl.* **44**, 443–466 (2009)
10. Li, D., Qi, L., Tam, J., and Wu, S.-Y.: A smoothing Newton method for semi-infinite programming, *J. Global Optim.* **30**, 169–194 (2004)
11. Li, S., Teo, K. L., Yang, X., and Wu, S.-Y.: Robust envelope-constrained filter with orthonormal bases and semi-definite and semi-infinite programming, *Optim. Eng.* **8**, 299–319 (2007)
12. Li, S., Wu, S.-Y., Yang, X., and Teo, K.-L.: A relaxed cutting plane method for semi-infinite semi-definite programming, *Comput. Optim. and Appl.* **196**, 459–473 (2006)
13. Li, S., Yang, X., Teo, K. L., and Wu, S.-Y.: A solution method for combined semi-infinite and semi-definite programming, *ANZIAM J.* **45**, 477–494 (2004)
14. Okuno, T. and Fukushima, M.: Local reduction based SQP-type method for semi-infinite programs with an infinite number of second-order cone constraints, *J. Global Optim.* **60**, 25–48 (2014)
15. Okuno, T. and Fukushima, M.: An interior point sequential quadratic programming-type method for log-determinant semi-infinite programs, arXiv preprint; arXiv:1809.08838
16. Okuno, T., Hayashi, S., and Fukushima, M.: A regularized explicit exchange method for semi-infinite programs with an infinite number of conic constraints, *SIAM J. Optim.* **22**, 1009–1028 (2012)
17. Pereira, A., Costa, M., and Fernandes, E.: Interior point filter method for semi-infinite programming problems, *Optimization* **60**, 1309–1338 (2011)
18. Pereira, A. and Fernandes, E.: A reduction method for semi-infinite programming by means of a global stochastic approach, *Optimization* **58**, 713–726 (2009)
19. Qi, L., Wu, S.-Y., and Zhou, G.: Semismooth Newton methods for solving semi-infinite programming problems, *J. Global Optim.* **27**, 215–232 (2003)
20. Reemtsen, R., Discretization methods for the solution of semi-infinite programming problems, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **71**, 85–103 (1991)
21. Reemtsen, R. and Rückmann, J.: *Semi-infinite Programming*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston (1998)
22. Shapiro, A.: First and second order analysis of nonlinear semidefinite programs, *Math. Program.* **77**, 301–320 (1997)
23. Shiu, T. and Wu, S.-Y.: Relaxed cutting plane method with convexification for solving nonlinear semi-infinite programming problems, *Comput. Optim. and Appl.* **53**, 1–23 (2012)
24. Stein, O. and Steuermann, P.: The adaptive convexification algorithm for semi-infinite programming with arbitrary index sets, *Math. Program.* **18**, 1–25 (2012)
25. Still, G.: Discretization in semi-infinite programming: The rate of convergence, *Math. Program.* **91**, 53–69 (2001)
26. Tanaka, Y., Fukushima, M., and Ibaraki, T.: A globally convergent SQP method for semi-infinite nonlinear optimization, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **23**, 141–153 (1988)
27. Todd, M. J., Toh, K. C., and Tütüncü, R. H.: On the Nesterov–Todd direction in semidefinite programming, *SIAM J. Optim.* **8**, 769–796 (1998)

28. Toh, K. C., Todd, M. J., and Tütüncü, R. H., SDPT3—a MATLAB software package for semidefinite programming, version 2.1, *Optim. Methods Softw.* **11**, 545–581 (1999)
29. Wang, S. and Yuan, Y.: Feasible method for semi-infinite programs, *SIAM J. Optim.* **25**, 2537–2560 (2015)
30. Wolkowicz, H., Saigal, R., and Vandenberghe, L.: *Handbook of Semidefinite Programming: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications*, Springer Science & Business Media (2012)
31. Wu, S.-P., Boyd, S., and Vandenberghe, L.: FIR filter design via semidefinite programming and spectral factorization, In *Proc. IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, 271–276 (1996)
32. Xu, M., Wu, S.-Y., and Ye, J. J.: Solving semi-infinite programs by smoothing projected gradient method, *Comput. Optim. and Appl.* **59**, 591–616 (2014)
33. Yamashita, H. and Yabe, H.: Local and superlinear convergence of a primal-dual interior point method for nonlinear semidefinite programming, *Math. Program.* **132**, 1–30 (2012)
34. Yamashita, H. and Yabe, H.: A survey of numerical methods for nonlinear semidefinite programming, *J. Oper. Res. Soc. Japan.* **58**, 24–60 (2015)
35. Yamashita, H., Yabe, H., and Harada, K.: A primal-dual interior point method for nonlinear semidefinite programming, *Math. Program.* **135**, 89–121 (2012)
36. Yu, Z. L., Er, M. H., and Ser, W.: A novel adaptive beamformer based on semidefinite programming (SDP) with magnitude response constraints, *IEEE Trans. Antennas and Propag.* **5**, 1297–1307 (2008)

## Appendix

In the appendix, we prove Propositions 4, 5, and Lemma 1. We begin with giving some lemmas that help to show Proposition 4.

**Lemma 5** *Let  $X \in S_+^m$ ,  $Y \in S^m$  and  $\mu \geq 0$ . Then,*

1.  $\|XY - YX\|_F \leq 2\|X \circ Y - \mu I\|_F$  and
2.  $\|\mathcal{L}_X \mathcal{L}_Y - \mathcal{L}_Y \mathcal{L}_X\|_2 \leq \|X \circ Y - \mu I\|_F$ .

*Proof* Using some orthogonal matrix  $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$ , we make an eigenvalue decomposition of  $X$ :  $\mathcal{O}^\top X \mathcal{O} = D$  with  $D \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$  being a diagonal matrix. Denote the  $i$ -th diagonal entry of  $D$  by  $d_i \geq 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ . Let  $\tilde{Y} := \mathcal{O}^\top Y \mathcal{O}$  with the  $(i, j)$ -th entry  $\tilde{y}_{ij}$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ .

1. We have the desired result from

$$\begin{aligned}
\|XY - YX\|_F^2 &= \|\mathcal{O}^\top X \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O}^\top Y \mathcal{O} - \mathcal{O}^\top Y \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O}^\top X \mathcal{O}\|_F^2 \\
&= \|D\tilde{Y} - \tilde{Y}D\|_F^2 \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} (d_i - d_j)^2 \tilde{y}_{ij}^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq m} (d_i + d_j)^2 \tilde{y}_{ij}^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq m} (d_i + d_j)^2 \tilde{y}_{ij}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^m (2d_i \tilde{y}_{ii} - 2\mu)^2 \\
&= \|D\tilde{Y} + \tilde{Y}D - 2\mu I\|_F^2 \\
&= \|XY + YX - 2\mu I\|_F^2 \\
&= 4\|X \circ Y - \mu I\|_F^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from  $d_i \geq 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ .

2. By direct calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}_X \mathcal{L}_Y - \mathcal{L}_Y \mathcal{L}_X\|_2 &= \max_{\|Z\|_F=1} \|\mathcal{L}_X \mathcal{L}_Y Z - \mathcal{L}_Y \mathcal{L}_X Z\|_F \\ &= \max_{\|Z\|_F=1} \frac{\|(XY - YX)Z - Z(XY - YX)\|_F}{4} \\ &\leq \frac{\|XY - YX\|_F}{2} \\ &\leq \|X \circ Y - \mu I\|_F, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from item 1.  $\square$

**Lemma 6** Let  $(X_*, Y_*) \in S_+^m \times S_+^m$  satisfy the strict complementarity condition that  $X_* \circ Y_* = O$  and  $X_* + Y_* \in S_{++}^m$ . Let  $\{\mu_r\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{++}$  and  $\{(X_r, Y_r)\} \subseteq S_{++}^m \times S_{++}^m$  be sequences such that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mu_r = 0$  and  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (X_r, Y_r) = (X_*, Y_*)$ . Let spectral decompositions of  $X_*$  and  $Y_*$  be

$$\mathcal{O}_*^\top X_* \mathcal{O}_* = \begin{pmatrix} D_{X_*} & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{O}_*^\top Y_* \mathcal{O}_* = \begin{pmatrix} O & O \\ O & D_{Y_*} \end{pmatrix}$$

using some orthogonal matrix  $\mathcal{O}_* \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$  and positive diagonal matrices  $D_{X_*} \in S_{++}^p$  and  $D_{Y_*} \in S_{++}^q$  with  $p + q = m$ . Furthermore, suppose  $p, q > 0$  and choose a sequence of orthogonal matrices  $\{\mathcal{O}_r\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$  such that

$$\mathcal{O}_r^\top X_r \mathcal{O}_r = \begin{pmatrix} D_{X_r} & O \\ O & E_{X_r} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{O}_r = \mathcal{O}_*$$

with  $D_{X_r} \in \mathcal{R}^{p \times p}$  and  $E_{X_r} \in \mathcal{R}^{q \times q}$  being positive diagonal matrices for  $r \geq 1$ . (Notice that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} E_{X_r} = O$ .) If  $\|X_r \circ Y_r - \mu_r I\| = o(\mu_r)$ , then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\mu_r} E_{X_r} = D_{Y_*}^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

*Proof* Let  $\tilde{Y}_r := \mathcal{O}_r^\top Y_r \mathcal{O}_r$  and  $\tilde{y}_{ii}^r$  and  $e_i^r$  be the  $i$ -th diagonal entry of  $\tilde{Y}_r$  and  $E_{X_r}$ , respectively for any  $i = p+1, p+2, \dots, m$ . Since  $\|X_r \circ Y_r - \mu_r I\|_F = o(\mu_r)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_r \circ Y_r - \mu_r I\|_F &= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} D_{X_r} & O \\ O & E_{X_r} \end{pmatrix} \circ \tilde{Y}_r - \mu_r I \right\|_F \\ &\geq \sqrt{\sum_{i=p+1}^m (e_i^r \tilde{y}_{ii}^r - \mu_r)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$0 = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=p+1}^m (e_i^r \tilde{y}_{ii}^r - \mu_r)^2}}{\mu_r} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\sum_{i=p+1}^m \left( \frac{e_i^r \tilde{y}_{ii}^r}{\mu_r} - 1 \right)^2},$$

which yields  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e_i^r}{\mu_r} \tilde{y}_{ii}^r = 1$  for any  $i = p+1, \dots, m$ . Notice that, for  $i \geq p+1$ ,  $\{\tilde{y}_{ii}^r\}$  converges to the  $i$ -th positive diagonal entry of  $D_{Y_*}$ . In view of these facts, we obtain (A.1).  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4*

For the case where  $X_* \in S_{++}^m$ , it is easy to prove the desired result. So, we consider the case of  $X_* \in S_+^m \setminus S_{++}^m$ . Let  $\lambda_r > 0$  be the smallest eigenvalue of  $X_r$ . Notice that  $\lambda_r \rightarrow 0$  ( $r \rightarrow \infty$ ) and, by Lemma 6,  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_r}{\mu_r}$  exists and is positive. Thus, we also have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_r}{\lambda_r} > 0. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Note that, for any  $X \in S^m$  having  $m$  eigenvalues  $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_m$ , the corresponding symmetric linear operator  $\mathcal{L}_X$  has  $m(m+1)/2$  eigenvalues  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m, \{(\alpha_i + \alpha_j)/2\}_{i \neq j}$ . This fact yields that the maximum eigenvalue of the operator  $\mathcal{L}_{X_r}^{-1}$  is  $\lambda_r^{-1}$ . Therefore, we have  $\|\mathcal{L}_{X_r}^{-1}\|_2 = \lambda_r^{-1}$  for any  $r \geq 0$ . It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}_{X_r} \mathcal{L}_{Y_r} \mathcal{L}_{X_r}^{-1} - \mathcal{L}_{Y_r}\|_2 &\leq \|\mathcal{L}_{Y_r} \mathcal{L}_{X_r} - \mathcal{L}_{X_r} \mathcal{L}_{Y_r}\|_2 \|\mathcal{L}_{X_r}^{-1}\|_2 \\ &\leq \mu_r \|\mathcal{L}_{X_r}^{-1}\|_2 \frac{\|X_r \circ Y_r - \mu_r I\|_F}{\mu_r} \\ &= \frac{\mu_r}{\lambda_r} \frac{\|X_r \circ Y_r - \mu_r I\|_F}{\mu_r}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 5. This relation together with (A.2) and  $\|X_r \circ Y_r - \mu_r I\|_F = O(\mu_r^{1+\zeta})$  implies  $\|\mathcal{L}_{X_r} \mathcal{L}_{Y_r} \mathcal{L}_{X_r}^{-1} - \mathcal{L}_{Y_r}\|_2 = O(\mu_r^\zeta)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 5*

Define  $\Phi_r(s) := (X_r + s\Delta X_r) \circ (Y_r + s\Delta Y_r)$  for  $s \in [0, 1]$  and each  $r$ . By using the fact that  $\|X\|_F \geq |\lambda_{\min}(X)|$  for any  $X \in S^m$ , the conditions (3.24)–(3.26) yield that there exists some  $\theta > 0$  such that

$$\lambda_{\min}(\Delta X_r \circ \Delta Y_r) \geq -\theta \mu_r^2, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\lambda_{\min}(X_r \circ Y_r) \geq \mu_r - \theta \mu_r^{1+\zeta}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\lambda_{\min}(Z_r - \hat{\mu}_r I) \geq -\theta \hat{\mu}_r^{1+\zeta}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Then, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{\min}(\Phi_r(s)) &= \lambda_{\min}(X_r \circ Y_r + sX_r \circ \Delta Y_r + sY_r \circ \Delta X_r + s^2\Delta X_r \circ \Delta Y_r) \\
&= \lambda_{\min}((1-s)X_r \circ Y_r + s(Z_r - \hat{\mu}_r I) + s\hat{\mu}_r I + s^2\Delta X_r \circ \Delta Y_r) \\
&\geq (1-s)\lambda_{\min}(X_r \circ Y_r) + s\lambda_{\min}(Z_r - \hat{\mu}_r I) \\
&\quad + s\lambda_{\min}(\hat{\mu}_r I) + s^2\lambda_{\min}(\Delta X_r \circ \Delta Y_r) \\
&\geq (1-s)(\mu_r - \theta\mu_r^{1+\zeta}) - s\theta\hat{\mu}_r^{1+\hat{\zeta}} + s\hat{\mu}_r - s^2\theta\mu_r^2 \\
&=: \varphi_r(s)
\end{aligned}$$

for any  $r$  sufficiently large and  $s \in [0, 1]$ , where the first inequality follows from the fact that  $\lambda_{\min}(A+B) \geq \lambda_{\min}(A) + \lambda_{\min}(B)$  for  $A, B \in S^m$  and the second inequality is due to (A.4)–(A.6) and  $s \in [0, 1]$ . Notice that  $\varphi_r(s)$  is concave and quadratic. Then, for any  $r$  sufficiently large, we have  $\varphi_r(s) > 0$  ( $s \in [0, 1]$ ) since  $0 < \zeta, \hat{\zeta} < 1$ ,  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty}(\mu_r, \hat{\mu}_r) = (0, 0)$ , and (3.27) imply that  $\varphi_r(0) = \mu_r - \theta\mu_r^{1+\zeta} > 0$  and  $\varphi_r(1) = \hat{\mu}_r - \theta\hat{\mu}_r^{1+\hat{\zeta}} - \theta\mu_r^2 > 0$  for sufficiently large  $r$ . This means that  $\lambda_{\min}(\Phi_r(s)) \geq \varphi_r(s) > 0$  ( $s \in [0, 1]$ ) and therefore

$$\Phi_r(s) \in S_{++}^m \quad (s \in [0, 1]), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

from which we can derive  $X_r + \Delta X_r \in S_{++}^m$  and  $Y_r + \Delta Y_r \in S_{++}^m$ . Actually, for contradiction, suppose that either one of these two conditions is not true. We can assume  $X_r + \Delta X_r \notin S_{++}^m$  without loss of generality. Recall that  $X_r \in S_{++}^m$ . Then, there exists some  $\bar{s} \in (0, 1]$  such that  $X_r + \bar{s}\Delta X_r \in S_+^m \setminus S_{++}^m$ . Therefore, we can find some nonzero vector  $d \in \mathcal{R}^n$  such that  $(X_r + \bar{s}\Delta X_r)d = 0$ . From this fact, we readily have

$$d^\top \Phi_r(\bar{s})d = \frac{d^\top (X_r + \bar{s}\Delta X_r)(Y_r + \bar{s}\Delta Y_r)d + d^\top (Y_r + \bar{s}\Delta Y_r)(X_r + \bar{s}\Delta X_r)d}{2} = 0,$$

which contradicts (A.7). Hence, we conclude that  $X_r + \Delta X_r \in S_{++}^m$  and  $Y_r + \Delta Y_r \in S_{++}^m$  for all  $r$  sufficiently large. The proof is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 1*

To begin with, by  $w^k \in \mathcal{N}_{\mu_{k-1}}^{\varepsilon_{k-1}}$  and  $\varepsilon_{k-1} = \gamma_1 \mu_{k-1}^{1+\alpha}$ , it follows that

$$\left\| \nabla f(x^k) + \sum_{i=1}^{p(x^*)} \nabla \hat{g}_i(x^k) y_i^k - (F_i \bullet V_k)_{i=1}^n \right\| = o(\mu_{k-1}), \quad \|F(x^k) \circ V_k\|_F = \Theta(\mu_{k-1}), \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^{p(x^*)} y_i^k \hat{g}_i(x^k) \right| = o(\mu_{k-1}), \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq p(x^*)} (\hat{g}_i(x^k))_+ = o(\mu_{k-1}) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

together with  $y_i^k \geq 0$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)$ ). Then, (A.9) implies  $|\hat{g}_i(x^k)| = o(\mu_{k-1})$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)$ ), which together with (A.8) and (A.9) yields  $\|\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^k)\| = \Theta(\mu_{k-1})$ . We then have  $\mu_{k-1} = \Theta(\|\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^k)\|)$ .

We next prove  $\mu_{k-1} = \Theta(\|w^k - w^*\|)$ . Notice that by Assumption B-3, for sufficiently large  $k$ ,  $y_i^k > 0$  ( $i \in I_a(x^*)$ ) and  $y_i^k = 0$  ( $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)\} \setminus I_a(x^*)$ ), which together with  $y_i^* = 0$  ( $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p(x^*)\} \setminus I_a(x^*)$ ) implies  $\|\tilde{w}^k - \tilde{w}^*\| = \|w^k - w^*\|$ . Thus, to show the desired result, we have only to prove  $\|\Phi_0(w^k)\| = \Theta(\|\tilde{w}^k - \tilde{w}^*\|)$ . In other words, it suffices to show that the sequence of positive numbers  $\{\zeta_k\}$  is bounded above and away from zero, where  $\zeta_k := \|\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^k)\|/\|\tilde{w}^k - \tilde{w}^*\|$ . Note that

$$\zeta_k = \frac{\|\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^k) - \Phi_0(\tilde{w}^*)\|}{\|\tilde{w}^k - \tilde{w}^*\|} = \left\| \mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^*) \frac{\tilde{w}^k - \tilde{w}^*}{\|\tilde{w}^k - \tilde{w}^*\|} + \frac{O(\|\tilde{w}^k - \tilde{w}^*\|^2)}{\|\tilde{w}^k - \tilde{w}^*\|} \right\|.$$

Obviously,  $\zeta_k$  is bounded from above. To show  $\zeta_k$  is bounded away from zero, suppose to the contrary. Then, without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_k = 0$ , and hence there exists some  $d^*$  with  $\|d^*\| = 1$  such that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{w}^k - \tilde{w}^*}{\|\tilde{w}^k - \tilde{w}^*\|} = d^*$  and  $\mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^*)d^* = 0$ . However, this contradicts the nonsingularity of  $\mathcal{J}\Phi_0(\tilde{w}^*)$  from Assumption C-4. We have the desired conclusion.  $\square$