
Generalized Scaling for the Constrained Maximum-Entropy Sampling Problem*

Zhongzhu Chen · Marcia Fampa · Jon Lee

February 19, 2024

Abstract The best practical techniques for exact solution of instances of the constrained maximum-entropy sampling problem, a discrete-optimization problem arising in the design of experiments, are via a branch-and-bound framework, working with a variety of concave continuous relaxations of the objective function. A standard and computationally-important bound-enhancement technique in this context is (*ordinary*) *scaling*, via a single positive parameter. Scaling adjusts the shape of continuous relaxations to reduce the gaps between the upper bounds and the optimal value. We extend this technique to *generalized scaling*, employing a positive vector of parameters, which allows much more flexibility and thus potentially reduces the gaps further. We give mathematical results aimed at supporting algorithmic methods for computing optimal generalized scalings, and we give computational results demonstrating the performance of generalized scaling on benchmark problem instances.

Keywords ordinary scaling · generalized scaling · maximum-entropy sampling problem · convex optimization

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000) 90C25 · 90C27 · 90C51 · 62K99 · 62H11

* A short preliminary version of this paper appeared in ACDA 2023, [CFL23a].

Z. Chen
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA
E-mail: zhongzhc@umich.edu

M. Fampa
Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
E-mail: fampa@cos.ufrj.br

J. Lee
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA
E-mail: jonxlee@umich.edu

1 Introduction

Let C be a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix with rows/columns indexed from $N := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, with $n > 1$. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. For $0 < s < n$, we define the *constrained maximum-entropy sampling problem*

$$z(C, s, A, b) := \max \{ \text{l det } C[S(x), S(x)] : \mathbf{e}^\top x = s, x \in \{0, 1\}^n, Ax \leq b \} \quad (\text{CMESP})$$

where $S(x)$ is the support of $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, $C[S(x), S(x)]$ is the principal submatrix of C indexed by $S(x)$, and $\text{l det}(\cdot)$ is the natural logarithm of the determinant. See [FL22] for an extensive and recent compilation of research on CMESP.

When there are no constraints $Ax \leq b$ present, we refer to CMESP as MESP, which was introduced in the “design of experiments” literature by [SW87], and was first approached for global optimization by [KLQ95]. MESP corresponds to the fundamental problem of choosing an s -subvector of a Gaussian random n -vector, so as to maximize the “differential entropy”, which is a measure of information (see [Sha48]). We assume that $r := \text{rank}(C) \geq s$, so that MESP always has a feasible solution with finite objective value. MESP has been applied extensively in the field of environmental monitoring; see [FL22, Chapter 4], and the many references therein. Important for applications, the constraints $Ax \leq b$ of CMESP can model budget limitations that take into account the differing cost of observing random variables, geographical considerations (such as having lower and upper bounds on the number of observation in a region), and logical dependencies (such as not observing both of a given pair of random variables, due to technology constraints), for example. More broadly, MESP sits within the field of “optimal design of experiments”, where the handling of side constraints is a central topic (see [CF95, DCMT02, BH90], for example).

CMESP was first algorithmically approached by [Lee98] and then by [Fam96, Wil98, AFLW96, AFLW99]. It is implicitly considered in all of the mathematical-programming approaches to MESP, and it is explicitly mentioned in [Ans18, Ans20], for example. CMESP serves as a nice example of a “non-factorable” mixed-integer nonlinear program. When C is a diagonal matrix, CMESP reduces to a general cardinality-constrained binary linear program. [ATL21, ATL23] established that when C is tridiagonal (or even when the support graph of C is a spider with a bounded number of legs), MESP is then polynomially solvable by dynamic programming.

[KLQ95] established that MESP is NP-hard and introduced a novel B&B (branch-and-bound) approach based on a “spectral bound.” [Lee98] extended the spectral approach to CMESP. [AFLW96] and [AFLW99] developed a bound, the so-called “NLP bound”, employing a novel convex relaxation. [Ans18] developed the “BQP bound”, using an extended formulation based on the Boolean quadric polytope. [Ans20] introduced the “linx bound”, based on a clever convex relaxation. [Nik15] gave a novel “factorization bound” based on a subtle convex relaxation. This was further developed by [LX23]

and then [CFL23b] (who coined the term “factorization bound”). [CFLL21] gave a methodology for combining multiple convex-optimization bounds to give improved bounds. All of these convex-optimization based bounds admit variable-fixing methodology based on convex duality (see [FL22], for example). In computational practice, the best bounds appear to be the linx bound, the factorization bound, and the NLP bound. For MESP, the spectral bound is dominated by the factorization bound (see [CFL23b]), and the BQP bound is generally too time-consuming to compute, at present. In what follows, we concentrate on the linx, BQP and factorization bounds; these are all within the state-of-the-art, and for all we could obtain substantial and relevant results.

An important general technique for potentially improving some of the entropy upper bounds is “scaling”, based on the simple observation that for a positive constant γ , and S with $|S| = s$, we have that

$$\det(\gamma C)[S, S] = \gamma^s \det C[S, S] .$$

With this identity, we can easily see that

$$z(C, s, A, b) = z(\gamma C, s, A, b) - s \log \gamma ,$$

so upper bounds for $z(\gamma C, s, A, b)$ yield upper bounds for $z(C, s, A, b)$, shifting by $-s \log \gamma$. It is important to note that many bounding methods are *not* invariant under scaling; that is the scaled bound does *not* generally shift by $-s \log \gamma$ (notable exceptions being the spectral and factorization bounds for MESP). Scaling was first introduced in [AFLW96, AFLW99], and then exploited in [Ans18, Ans20, ATL20, CFLL21, CFL22, CFL23b]. Scaling can be seen as a technique aimed at adjusting the shape of concave continuous relaxations of the objective of CMESP in order to decrease the gap between the upper bounds and $z(C, s, A, b)$; see [CFL22] for an exploration of this in the context of the linx bound.

In this work, we generalize the idea of scaling to the vector case and apply it to three different upper bounds: the BQP bound, as well as the state-of-the-art linx and factorization bounds. Throughout, we let $\mathcal{Y} := (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$ be a “scaling vector.” We refer to our technique as *g-scaling* (i.e., *general scaling*) and the corresponding bounds as *g-scaled* (i.e., *generalized scaled*), and when all elements of \mathcal{Y} are equal, we say *o-scaling* (i.e., *ordinary scaling*) and *o-scaled* (i.e., *ordinary scaled*). If all elements of \mathcal{Y} are equal to 1, we say *unscaled*. In general, setting all of the elements of \mathcal{Y} to be equal, g-scaling reduces to o-scaling. This means that g-scaling can provide an upper bound that is at least as good as o-scaling. Moreover, as we will see later, g-scaling can sometimes provide significantly improved upper bounds compared to o-scaling.

Additionally in this work, we also leverage another key technique for obtaining bounds, namely “complementation”, first utilized by [AFLW96, AFLW99]. If C is invertible, we have

$$z(C, s, A, b) = z(C^{-1}, n - s, -A, b - Ae) + \text{l}det C,$$

where $z(C^{-1}, n - s, -A, b - A\mathbf{e})$ denotes the optimal value of **CMESP** with C, s, A, b replaced by $C^{-1}, n - s, -A, b - A\mathbf{e}$, respectively. So we have a *complementary CMESP* problem and *complementary* bounds (i.e., bounds for the complementary problem plus $\text{l det } C$) immediately give us bounds on z . Some upper bounds on z also shift by $\text{l det } C$ under complementing (notably, the spectral and linx bounds), in which case there is no additional value in computing the complementary bound. But the NLP, BQP and factorization bounds are generally not invariant under complementation. Details on all of this can be found in [FL22].

1.1 Organization and contributions.

In §2, we introduce the g-scaled BQP bound via symmetric scaling of C , and our substantial new result is its convexity in the log of the scaling vector, generalizing an important and practically-useful result for o-scaling (see [CFLL21, Theorem 11]). In §3, we introduce the g-scaled linx bound via symmetric scaling of $C \text{Diag}(x)C$, and our substantial new result is its convexity in the log of the scaling vector, generalizing another very important and practically-useful result for o-scaling (see [CFLL21, Theorem 18]). We wish to emphasize that the construction of the g-scaling versions of the BQP and linx bounds are different (unlike in the case of o-scaling) because this is what is needed to gain the convexity results. These convexity results are key for the tractability of globally optimizing the scaling, something that we do not have for general bound “masking”¹ (see [AL04, BL07] for this, in the context of the spectral bound). In §4, we introduce the “g-scaled factorization bound.” We note that there is no o-scaling for the factorization bound, as that bound is invariant under such a scaling (see [CFL23b, Theorem 2.1]), so scaling in this context is completely novel. In this section, which is one of our major contributions, we establish “generalized differentiability” results for the factorization bound (for the first time, even without the context of scaling), which are essential for the fast and stable calculation of the factorization bound and for globally optimizing the scaling vector, *even using general-purpose nonlinear-optimization software*. The prior literature on this type of bound focused on characterizing subdifferentials (see [Nik15, LX23]), so our generalized differentiability results were completely unanticipated. In fact, [CFL23b] empirically observed that general-purpose nonlinear-optimization software works remarkably well, and we can see our generalized differentiability results as an explanation. We are also able to establish that for **MESP**, the all-ones vector is a stationary point for the factorization bound as a function of the scaling vector. Therefore, in contrast to the BQP bound and the linx bound, g-scaling is unlikely to help the factorization bound for **MESP**. Despite this, through numerical experiments, we observe that g-scaling can significantly improve the factorization bound for **CMESP**, while o-scaling cannot help it (as we mentioned above). In

¹ This is a related bound-improvement technique where we preprocess C by taking its Hadamard product with a correlation matrix.

§6, we present results of computational experiments, demonstrating the improvements on upper bounds and on the number of variables that can be fixed (using convex duality) due to g-scaling. Further, we conducted experiments to demonstrate the relevance of our generalized differentiability results for the factorization bound. In §7, we make some brief concluding remarks.

1.2 Notation.

$\text{Diag}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ makes a diagonal matrix from $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\text{diag}(X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ extracts the diagonal of $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ as an n -vector. We let \mathbb{R}_+^n (resp., \mathbb{R}_{++}^n) be the points in \mathbb{R}^n having nonnegative (resp., positive) components. We let \mathbb{S}_+^n (resp., \mathbb{S}_{++}^n) be the set of positive semidefinite (resp., definite) symmetric matrices of order n . We let $\lambda_\ell(M)$ be the ℓ -th greatest eigenvalue of $M \in \mathbb{S}_+^n$. We denote by \mathbf{e}^n an all-ones vector in \mathbb{R}^n , e_i^n the i^{th} standard unit vector in \mathbb{R}^n , and I_n the order- n identity matrix. For matrices A and B with the same shape, $A \circ B$ is the Hadamard (i.e., element-wise) product, and $A \bullet B := \text{tr}(A^\top B)$ is the matrix dot-product. For a matrix A , we denote row i by A_i and column j by $A_{.j}$. We let A^\dagger be the Moore-Penrose (generalized) inverse of A . We denote natural logarithm by $\log(\cdot)$, and we apply it component-wise to vectors. We let E_{ij}^n denote the order- n square matrix with the only nonzero component being a one in the (i, j) position. We frequently drop the n (for all of these) when it is clear from the context. We use $\|\cdot\|$ for the vector 2-norm when applied to a vector and the 2-norm induced by the vector 2-norm when applied to a matrix. Given a convex function f , we use $\partial f(\cdot)$ for the subdifferential of f . Given a function f and a direction d , we write $\partial f(\cdot; d)$ for the directional derivative of f in the direction d .

The notations associated with each [CMESP](#) upper bound will be introduced in the corresponding section. For simplicity, we will exclude (C, s, A, b) from notations whenever it is clear from the context.

2 BQP bound

The Boolean-Quadratic-Polytope ([BQP](#)) bound was first suggested in 1995 by Christoph Helmberg (in private communication to K. Anstreicher and J.Lee), but no one developed it at that time. Finally, it was analyzed and developed in [\[Ans18\]](#) (see [\[FL22, Section 3.6, p. 110\]](#) for more details). We lift to matrix space, by defining the convex set

$$P(n, s) := \{(x, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^n : X - xx^\top \succeq 0, \text{diag}(X) = x, \mathbf{e}^\top x = s, X\mathbf{e} = sx\}.$$

For $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$ and $(x, X) \in P(n, s)$, we now define

$$f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y}) := \text{ldet} \left((\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})C \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})) \circ X + \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x) \right) - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \log \gamma_i,$$

with domain

$$\text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y}) := \{(x, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^n : \\ (\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})C \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})) \circ X + \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x) \succ 0\}.$$

The g -scaled BQP bound is defined as

$$z_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \max \{f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y}) : (x, X) \in P(n, s), Ax \leq b\}. \quad (\text{BQP})$$

We say x is feasible to BQP if x satisfies all the constraints in BQP.

Note that we can interpret BQP as applying the unscaled BQP bound to the symmetrically-scaled matrix $\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})C \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})$, and then correcting by $-2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \log \gamma_i$.

Theorem 1 For all $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$, the following holds:

- 1.i. $z_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is a valid upper bound for the optimal value of CMESP, i.e., $z(C, s, A, b) \leq z_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})$;
- 1.ii. the function $f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ is concave in (x, X) on $\text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y})$ and continuously differentiable in (x, X, \mathcal{Y}) on $\text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$;
- 1.iii. for fixed $(x, X) \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y})$, $f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ is convex in $\log \mathcal{Y}$, and thus $z_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is convex in $\log \mathcal{Y}$.

Remark 1 [Ans18] established Theorem 1.i for $\mathcal{Y} := \gamma \mathbf{e}$, with $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. We generalize this result to $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$. The concavity in Theorem 1.ii is a result of [Ans18], with details filled in by [FL22, Section 3.6.1]. Theorem 1.iii significantly generalizes a result of [CFL21], where it is established only for o-scaling: i.e., on $\{\mathcal{Y} := \gamma \mathbf{e} : \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}\}$. The proof of Theorem 1.iii requires new techniques (see the proof below). Additionally, the result is quite important as it enables the use of readily available quasi-Newton methods (like BFGS) for finding the globally-optimal g -scaling vector for the BQP bound.

Proof (Theorem 1)

- 1.i: It is enough to prove that there is a feasible solution to BQP with objective value equal to the optimal value of CMESP. In fact, let $x^* \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be an optimal solution to CMESP with support $S(x^*)$, and define $X^* := x^* (x^*)^\top$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $S(x^*) = \{1, \dots, s\}$, i.e., $x^* = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}^s \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $X^* = \begin{pmatrix} I_s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Clearly, $(x^*, X^*) \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y})$ and is feasible to BQP. Let $\mathcal{Y}_{S(x^*)}$ be the sub-vector of \mathcal{Y} indexed by $S(x^*)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & f_{\text{BQP}}(x^*, X^*; \mathcal{Y}) \\ &= \text{ldet} \left((\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})C \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})) \circ X^* + \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x^*) \right) - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^* \log \gamma_i \\ &= \text{ldet} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{Y}_{S(x^*)} C (S(x^*), S(x^*)) \mathcal{Y}_{S(x^*)} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n-s} \end{pmatrix} - 2 \sum_{i \in S(x^*)} x_i^* \log \gamma_i \\ &= \text{ldet} C(S(x^*), S(x^*)). \end{aligned}$$

- 1.ii: The concavity is essentially a result of [Ans18], with details filled in by [FL22, Section 3.6.1]. The continuous differentiability comes from the analyticity of $f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ in $(x, X, \mathcal{Y}) \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$.
- 1.iii: We sketch the proof first:
1. for fixed $(x, X) \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y})$, we derive the Hessian of $f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ with respect to $\log \mathcal{Y}$ and show that it is positive-semidefinite, which implies the convexity of $f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ in $\log \mathcal{Y}$;
 2. The convexity of $z_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})$ in $\log \mathcal{Y}$ then follows because $z_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is the point-wise maximum of $f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ over feasible (x, X) for **BQP** in domain $\text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y})$.

The detailed proof is as follows. For convenience, let

$$F_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y}) := (\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})C \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})) \circ X + \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x), \text{ and}$$

$$A_{\text{BQP}}(X; \mathcal{Y}) := (\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})C \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})) \circ X.$$

In the following derivation, we will consider $(x, X) \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y})$ fixed, and regard \mathcal{Y} as a variable. Thus, for simplicity, we write $F_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ and $A_{\text{BQP}}(X; \mathcal{Y})$ as $F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})$ and $A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})$, respectively.

Let $\tilde{x} := x - \mathbf{e}$, and we use the identities

$$F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) = I + F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x}), \quad (1)$$

$$A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} = I + \text{Diag}(\tilde{x}) F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

We first derive the gradient of $f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ with respect to \mathcal{Y} .

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \gamma_i} &= F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \bullet \frac{\partial A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})}{\partial \gamma_i} - 2 \frac{x_i}{\gamma_i} \\ &= F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \bullet \frac{1}{\gamma_i} (E_{ii} A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) + A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) E_{ii}) - 2 \frac{x_i}{\gamma_i} \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma_i} (A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\cdot i} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\cdot i}^{-1} + F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\cdot i}^{-1} A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\cdot i} - 2x_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma_i} (2F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\cdot i}^{-1} A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\cdot i} - 2x_i), \end{aligned}$$

where the last identity follows from the symmetry of $F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})$ and $A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})$. Then, applying (1), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \mathcal{Y}} = 2 \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} (\text{diag}(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) - \tilde{x}).$$

Next, we derive the Hessian of $f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ with respect to \mathcal{Y} . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \mathcal{Y} \partial \gamma_i} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \left(\frac{\partial f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \mathcal{Y}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\partial \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}}{\partial \gamma_i} (\text{diag}(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) - \tilde{x}) \\ &\quad + \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \frac{\partial (\text{diag}(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) - \tilde{x})}{\partial \gamma_i} \\ &= \frac{\partial \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}}{\partial \gamma_i} (\text{diag}(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) - \tilde{x}) \\ &\quad - \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \frac{\partial F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})}{\partial \gamma_i} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\frac{1}{\gamma_i^2} E_{ii} \left(\text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \right) - \check{x} \right) \\
&\quad - \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \frac{(E_{ii} A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) + A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) E_{ii})}{\gamma_i} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The first term in this last expression can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{1}{\gamma_i^2} E_{ii} \left(\text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \right) - \check{x} \right) \\
&= -\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag} \left(\text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \right) - \check{x} \right) \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i,
\end{aligned}$$

while for the second term, we use (1) and (2), and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} (E_{ii} A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) + A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) E_{ii}) F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \right) \\
&= \text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} E_{ii} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \right) + \text{diag} \left(E_{ii} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \right) \\
&\quad + \text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} E_{ii} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \right) \\
&\quad + \text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) E_{ii} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \right) \\
&= 2(x_i - 1) \left((F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1})_{ii} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \\
&\quad + 2(x_i - 1) \left(\text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} E_{ii} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \right) \right) \\
&= 2 \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \text{Diag} \left(\text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \right) \right) \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad + 2 \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \circ F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \right) \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \mathbf{e}_i,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \frac{(E_{ii} A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) + A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) E_{ii})}{\gamma_i} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \right) \\
&= -2 \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \text{Diag} \left(\text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \right) \right) \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad - 2 \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \circ F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \right) \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \mathcal{Y}^2} \\
&= -2 \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag} \left(\text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \right) - \check{x} \right) \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \\
&\quad - 4 \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \text{Diag} \left(\text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \right) \right) \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \\
&\quad - 4 \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \circ F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \right) \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2} = \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y}) \frac{\partial f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \mathcal{Y}} + \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y}) \frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \mathcal{Y}^2} \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y}) \\
&= -4 \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \text{Diag} \left(\text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \right) \right) \\
&\quad - 4 \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \circ F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \right) \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \\
&= 4 \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x) \text{Diag} \left(\text{diag} \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \right) \right) \\
&\quad - 4 \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x) \left(F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \circ F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \right) \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we will show the positive semidefiniteness of $\frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2}$ for all

$0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{e}, X \succeq 0$ such that $(x, X) \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y})$. Note that we will not require (x, X) to be feasible for **BQP**. We analyse two cases.

Case 1: when $0 \leq x < \mathbf{e}$ and $X \succeq 0$, let $D_{\text{BQP}}(x) := (\text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x))^{1/2} \succ 0$, and let $H_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y}) := (D_{\text{BQP}}(x))^{-1} A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) (D_{\text{BQP}}(x))^{-1} \succeq 0$. Again, for simplicity, we write $D_{\text{BQP}}(x)$ and $H_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ as D_{BQP} and $H_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})$, respectively. First, we note that

$$D_{\text{BQP}} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{BQP}} = (D_{\text{BQP}}^{-1} A_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) D_{\text{BQP}}^{-1} + I)^{-1}.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2} \\ &= \text{Diag}(\text{diag}(D_{\text{BQP}} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{BQP}})) \\ & \quad - \text{Diag}(D_{\text{BQP}} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{BQP}}) \circ \text{Diag}(D_{\text{BQP}} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{BQP}}) \\ &= (D_{\text{BQP}} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{BQP}}) \circ I \\ & \quad - \text{Diag}(D_{\text{BQP}} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{BQP}}) \circ \text{Diag}(D_{\text{BQP}} F_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{BQP}}) \\ &= (H_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) + I)^{-1} \circ I - (H_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) + I)^{-1} \circ (H_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) + I)^{-1} \\ &= (H_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) + I)^{-1} \circ (I - (H_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) + I)^{-1}) \succeq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds because $H_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) + I \succ 0$ and the Schur Product Theorem ([Sch11, p. 15, Theorem VII]).

Case 2: now, we discuss the general case $0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{e}, X \succeq 0$. Note that for $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$, $\frac{\partial f_{\text{BQP}}^2(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2}$ is analytic in $0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{e}, X \succeq 0$ such that $(x, X) \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y})$. Therefore, given $0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{e}, X \succeq 0$, assume that $\frac{\partial f_{\text{BQP}}^2(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2} \not\geq 0$. Then by the analyticity (continuity) of $\frac{\partial f_{\text{BQP}}^2(x, X; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2}$, there exists small enough $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any $0 \leq x' \leq \mathbf{e}, X' \succeq 0$ in the intersection of the neighbourhood

$$\mathcal{N}_\epsilon(x, X) := \{(x', X') : \|x - x'\|_\infty + \|X - X'\|_F \leq \epsilon\},$$

(where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is the vector infinity-norm, and $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm) and $\{(x', X') : 0 \leq x' \leq \mathbf{e}, X' \succeq 0, (x', X') \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y})\}$, we have $\frac{\partial f_{\text{BQP}}^2(x', X'; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2} \not\geq 0$. On the other hand, this intersection contains some (x', X') such that $0 \leq x' < \mathbf{e}, X' \succeq 0$, e.g. $(x', X') = (x - \sum_{i: x_i=1} \epsilon e_i, X)$. This is a contradiction to Case 1.

In conclusion, for each fixed $(x, X) \in \{(x, X) : 0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{e}, X \succeq 0, (x, X) \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y})\}$, we have that $f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ is convex in $\log \mathcal{Y}$. In particular, for $(x, X) \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{BQP}}; \mathcal{Y})$ and feasible to **BQP**, $f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ is convex in $\log \mathcal{Y}$. Finally, as $z_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is the point-wise maximum of $f_{\text{BQP}}(x, X; \mathcal{Y})$ over all such (x, X) , then $z_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is convex in $\log \mathcal{Y}$. \square

3 linx bound

The linx bound was first analyzed and developed in [Ans20] (see [FL22, Section 3.3] for more details). For $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$ and $x \in [0, 1]^n$, we now define

$$f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) := \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{l-det}(\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})C \text{Diag}(x)C \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y}) + \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x)) \right) - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \log \gamma_i$$

with

$$\text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y}) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})C \text{Diag}(x)C \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y}) + \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x) \succ 0\}.$$

We then define the *g-scaled linx bound*

$$z_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \max \{f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) : \mathbf{e}^\top x = s, 0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{e}, Ax \leq b\}. \quad (\text{linx})$$

We say that x is feasible to **linx** if x satisfies all the constraints in **linx**.

It is very important to note, in contrast to g-scaling for the **BQP** bound, that we are *not* applying the ordinary **linx** bound to a symmetric scaling of C . In this way, g-scaling for the **linx** bound is more subtle. Rather, we are symmetrically scaling $\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})C \text{Diag}(x)C \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})$. This point would not apply to o-scaling, as scalars commute through matrix multiplication.

Theorem 2 For all $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$ in **linx**, the following hold:

- 2.i. $z_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is a valid upper bound for the optimal value of **CMESP**, i.e., $z(C, s, A, b) \leq z_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})$;
- 2.ii. the function $f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is concave in x on $\text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y})$ and continuously differentiable in (x, \mathcal{Y}) on $\text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$;
- 2.iii. for fixed $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y})$, $f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is convex in $\log \mathcal{Y}$, and thus $z_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is convex in $\log \mathcal{Y}$.

Remark 2 [Ans20] established Theorem 2.i for $\mathcal{Y} := \gamma \mathbf{e}$, with $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. We generalize this result to $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$. The concavity in Theorem 2.ii is a result of [Ans20], with details filled in by [FL22]. Theorem 2.iii generalizes a result of [CFLL21], where it is established only for o-scaling: i.e., on $\{\mathcal{Y} = \gamma \mathbf{e} : \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}\}$. The proof of Theorem 2.iii requires new techniques (see the below). As in the case of the **BQP** bound, the result is quite important as it enables the use of readily available quasi-Newton methods (like BFGS) for finding the globally optimal g-scaling for the **linx** bound.

A small example of how g-scaling can improve upon o-scaling for the **linx** bound can be found in the Appendix.

Proof (Theorem 2)

- 2.i: It is enough to prove that there is a feasible solution to **linx** with objective value equal to the optimal value of **CMESP**. In fact, let $x^* \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be one optimal solution to **CMESP** with support $S(x^*)$, and define $X^* :=$

$x^* (x^*)^\top$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $S(x^*) = \{1, \dots, s\}$, i.e., $x^* = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}_s \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Let $T(x^*) := N \setminus S(x^*)$ be the complementary set of $S(x^*)$.

For convenience, we denote $\tilde{C} := \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})C$, $\tilde{C}_{ST} := \tilde{C}(S(x^*), T(x^*))$, and so on. Note that \tilde{C} is not symmetric. Also, note that \tilde{C} depends on \mathcal{Y} , and \tilde{C}_{ST} depends on $\mathcal{Y}, x^*, S(x^*)$, and $T(x^*)$. We can write

$$\tilde{C} \text{Diag}(x) \tilde{C}^\top = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{C}_{SS} & \tilde{C}_{ST} \\ \tilde{C}_{TS} & \tilde{C}_{TT} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{C}_{SS}^\top & \tilde{C}_{TS}^\top \\ \tilde{C}_{ST}^\top & \tilde{C}_{TT}^\top \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{C}_{SS} \tilde{C}_{SS}^\top & \tilde{C}_{SS} \tilde{C}_{TS}^\top \\ \tilde{C}_{TS} \tilde{C}_{SS}^\top & \tilde{C}_{TS} \tilde{C}_{TS}^\top \end{pmatrix},$$

and therefore

$$\tilde{C} \text{Diag}(x) \tilde{C}^\top + \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{C}_{SS} \tilde{C}_{SS}^\top & \tilde{C}_{SS} \tilde{C}_{TS}^\top \\ \tilde{C}_{TS} \tilde{C}_{SS}^\top & \tilde{C}_{TS} \tilde{C}_{TS}^\top + I_{n-s} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Applying the well-known Schur-complement determinant formula, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ldet} \left(\tilde{C} \text{Diag}(x) \tilde{C}^\top + \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x) \right) \\ &= 2 \text{ldet} \tilde{C}_{SS} + \text{ldet} \left(\tilde{C}_{TS}^\top \tilde{C}_{TS} + I_{n-s} - \tilde{C}_{TS}^\top \tilde{C}_{SS}^\top \tilde{C}_{SS}^{-1} \tilde{C}_{SS} \tilde{C}_{TS} \right) \\ &= 2 \text{ldet} \tilde{C}_{SS}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{Y}_{S(x^*)}$ be the sub-vector of \mathcal{Y} indexed by $S(x^*)$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\text{linx}}(x^*; \mathcal{Y}) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{ldet} \left(\tilde{C} \text{Diag}(x) \tilde{C}^\top + \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x) \right) - \sum_{i \in N} x_i^* \log \gamma_i \\ &= \text{ldet} \tilde{C}_{SS} - \sum_{i \in S(x^*)} \log \gamma_i \\ &= \text{ldet} \left(\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y}_{S(x^*)}) C(S(x^*), S(x^*)) \right) - \sum_{i \in S(x^*)} \log \gamma_i \\ &= \text{ldet} C(S(x^*), S(x^*)). \end{aligned}$$

2.ii: The concavity is essentially a result of [Ans20], with details filled in by [FL22, Section 3.3.1]. The continuous differentiability comes from the analyticity of $f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ in $(x, \mathcal{Y}) \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$.

2.iii: We sketch the proof first:

1. for fixed $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y})$, we derive the Hessian of $f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ with respect to $\log \mathcal{Y}$ and show that it is positive-semidefinite, which implies the convexity of $f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ in $\log \mathcal{Y}$;
2. The convexity of $z_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})$ in $\log \mathcal{Y}$ then follows because $z_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is the point-wise maximum of $f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ over feasible x for linx in domain $\text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y})$.

The detailed proof is as follows: for convenience, let

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) &:= \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})C \text{Diag}(x)C \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y}) + \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x), \text{ and} \\ A_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) &:= \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})C \text{Diag}(x)C \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y}). \end{aligned}$$

In the following derivation, we will fix x and regard \mathcal{Y} as a variable. Thus, for simplicity, we will write $F_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ and $A_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ as $F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})$ and $A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})$, respectively. Let $\tilde{x} := x - \mathbf{e}$, and we note that

$$F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) = I + F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x}), \quad (3)$$

$$A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} = I + \text{Diag}(\tilde{x}) F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}. \quad (4)$$

Given $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y})$, we first derive the gradient of $f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ with respect to \mathcal{Y} . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \gamma_i} &= \frac{1}{2} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \bullet \frac{\partial A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})}{\partial \gamma_i} - \frac{x_i}{\gamma_i} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \bullet \frac{1}{\gamma_i} (E_{ii} A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) + A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) E_{ii}) - \frac{x_i}{\gamma_i} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\gamma_i} ((A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\cdot i} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\cdot i}^{-1} + F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\cdot i}^{-1} A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\cdot i}) - 2x_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma_i} (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\cdot i}^{-1} A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\cdot i} - x_i), \end{aligned}$$

where the last identity follows from the symmetry of $F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})$ and $A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})$. Then, applying (3), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \mathcal{Y}} = \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} (\text{diag}(F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) - \tilde{x}).$$

Next, we derive the Hessian of $f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ with respect to \mathcal{Y} . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \mathcal{Y} \partial \gamma_i} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} \left(\frac{\partial f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \mathcal{Y}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\partial \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}}{\partial \gamma_i} (\text{diag}(F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) - \tilde{x}) \\ &\quad + \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \frac{\partial (\text{diag}(F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) - \tilde{x})}{\partial \gamma_i} \\ &= \frac{\partial \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}}{\partial \gamma_i} (\text{diag}(F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) - \tilde{x}) \\ &\quad - \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{diag} \left(F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \frac{\partial F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})}{\partial \gamma_i} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x}) \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\gamma_i^2} E_{ii} (\text{diag}(F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) - \tilde{x}) \\ &\quad - \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{diag} \left(F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \frac{(E_{ii} A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) + A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) E_{ii})}{\gamma_i} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we can reformulate

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{1}{\gamma_i^2} E_{ii} (\text{diag}(F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) - \tilde{x}) \\ &= -\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\text{diag}(F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) - \tilde{x}) \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i, \end{aligned}$$

while for the second term, we can reformulate

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{diag}(F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} (E_{ii} A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) + A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) E_{ii}) F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) \\ &= \text{diag}(F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} E_{ii} (I + \text{Diag}(\tilde{x}) F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}) \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) \\ &\quad + \text{diag}((I + F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) E_{ii} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\tilde{x})) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{diag} (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} E_{ii} \text{Diag}(\check{x})) + \text{diag} (E_{ii} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x})) \\
&\quad + \text{diag} (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} E_{ii} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x})) \\
&\quad + \text{diag} (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) E_{ii} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x})) \\
&= 2(x_i - 1) ((F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1})_{ii} \mathbf{e}_i) \\
&\quad + 2(x_i - 1) (\text{diag} (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} E_{ii} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}))) \\
&= 2 \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \text{Diag}(\text{diag} (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}) \mathbf{e}_i) \\
&\quad + 2 \text{Diag}(\check{x}) (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \circ F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}) \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \mathbf{e}_i,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\gamma_i} \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{diag} (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} (E_{ii} A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) + A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) E_{ii}) F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x})) \\
&= 2 \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \text{Diag}(\text{diag} (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1})) \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad + 2 \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \circ F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}) \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \mathcal{Y}^2} &= - \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\text{diag} (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x})) - \check{x}) \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \\
&\quad - 2 \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \text{Diag}(\text{diag} (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1})) \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \\
&\quad - 2 \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \text{Diag}(\check{x}) (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \circ F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}) \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2} &= \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y}) \frac{\partial f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \mathcal{Y}} + \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y}) \frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial \mathcal{Y}^2} \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y}) \\
&= -2 \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \text{Diag}(\text{diag} (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1})) \\
&\quad - 2 \text{Diag}(\check{x}) (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \circ F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}) \text{Diag}(\check{x}) \\
&= 2 \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x) \text{Diag}(\text{diag} (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1})) \\
&\quad - 2 \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x) (F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} \circ F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}) \text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we are going to show the positive semidefiniteness of $\frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2}$ for all $0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{e}$ such that $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y})$. Note that we will not require x to be feasible to **linx**. We divide the discussion into two cases.

Case 1: when $0 \leq x < \mathbf{e}$, let $D_{\text{linx}}(x) := (\text{Diag}(\mathbf{e} - x))^{1/2} \succ 0$, and $H_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) := (D_{\text{linx}}(x))^{-1} A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) (D_{\text{linx}}(x))^{-1} \succeq 0$. Again for simplicity, we write $D_{\text{linx}}(x)$ and $H_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ as D_{linx} and $H_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})$. First, we note

$$D_{\text{linx}} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{linx}} = (D_{\text{linx}}^{-1} A_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) D_{\text{linx}}^{-1} + I)^{-1}.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2} \\
&= \text{Diag}(\text{diag} (D_{\text{linx}} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{linx}}))
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \text{Diag} (D_{\text{linx}} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{linx}}) \circ \text{Diag} (D_{\text{linx}} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{linx}}) \\
&= (D_{\text{linx}} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{linx}}) \circ I \\
&\quad - \text{Diag} (D_{\text{linx}} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{linx}}) \circ \text{Diag} (D_{\text{linx}} F_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} D_{\text{linx}}) \\
&= (H_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) + I)^{-1} \circ I - (H_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) + I)^{-1} \circ (H_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) + I)^{-1} \\
&= (H_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) + I)^{-1} \circ (I - (H_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y}) + I)^{-1}) \succeq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds because $H_{\text{BQP}}(\mathcal{Y}) + I \succ 0$ and the Schur Product Theorem.

Case 2: We now discuss general $0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{e}$. Note that given $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$, $\frac{\partial f_{\text{linx}}^2(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2}$ is analytical in $0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{e}$ such that $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y})$. Therefore, given $0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{e}$, assume that $\frac{\partial f_{\text{linx}}^2(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2} \not\equiv 0$. Then by the analyticity (continuity) of $\frac{\partial f_{\text{linx}}^2(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2}$, there exists small enough $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any $0 \leq x' \leq \mathbf{e}$ in the intersection of neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon(x) := \{x' : \|x - x'\|_\infty \leq \epsilon\}$ (where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is the vector infinity norm) and $\{x' : 0 \leq x' \leq \mathbf{e}, x' \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y})\}$, we have $\frac{\partial f_{\text{linx}}^2(x; \mathcal{Y})}{\partial (\log \mathcal{Y})^2} \not\equiv 0$. On the other hand, this intersection contains some x' such that $0 \leq x' < \mathbf{e}$, e.g. $x' = x - \sum_{i: x_i=1} \epsilon e_i$. This contradicts Case 1.

In conclusion, for each fixed $x \in \{(x, X) : 0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{e}, x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y})\}$, $f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is convex in $\log \mathcal{Y}$. In particular, for $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{linx}}; \mathcal{Y})$ and feasible to **linx**, $f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is convex in $\log \mathcal{Y}$. Finally, as $z_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is the point-wise maximum of $f_{\text{linx}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ over all such x , we have that $z_{\text{linx}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is convex in $\log \mathcal{Y}$. \square

4 Factorization bound

The factorization bound was first analyzed in [Nik15], and then developed further in [LX23] and in [CFL23b] (see [FL22, Section 3.4] for more details). The definition of the factorization bound is based on the following key lemma.

Lemma 3 (see [Nik15, Lemma 14]) *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_k$, and let $0 < s \leq k$. There exists a unique integer ι , with $0 \leq \iota < s$, such that $\lambda_\iota > \frac{1}{s-\iota} \sum_{\ell=\iota+1}^k \lambda_\ell \geq \lambda_{\iota+1}$, with the convention $\lambda_0 := +\infty$.*

Now, suppose that $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_k$. Given an integer s with $0 < s \leq k$, let ι be the unique integer defined by Lemma 3. We define

$$\phi_s(\lambda) := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\iota} \log \lambda_\ell + (s - \iota) \log \left(\frac{1}{s-\iota} \sum_{\ell=\iota+1}^k \lambda_\ell \right).$$

Next, for $X \in \mathbb{S}_+^k$, we define $\Gamma_s(X) := \phi_s(\lambda_1(X), \dots, \lambda_k(X))$ where $\lambda_1(X) \geq \lambda_2(X) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_k(X)$ are the eigenvalues of X .

Suppose that the rank of C is $r \geq s$. Then we factorize $C = FF^\top$, with $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, for some k satisfying $r \leq k \leq n$. It has been established [CFL23b,

Theorem 2.2] that the value of the factorization bound is independent of the choice of F . Consequently, for the sake of simplicity, while certain terms may feature F in their defining equations, it will not be included as a parameter for such terms.

Now, for $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$ and $x \in [0, 1]^n$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) &:= \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x_i F_i^\top F_i, \text{ and} \\ f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) &:= \Gamma_s(F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})) - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \log \gamma_i. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we define the *g-scaled factorization bound*

$$z_{\text{DDFact}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \max \{ f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) : \mathbf{e}^\top x = s, 0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{e}, Ax \leq b \}. \quad (\text{DDFact})$$

The reason for the nomenclature **DDFact** is because it is obtained from the Lagrangian dual of the Lagrangian dual of a nonconvex continuous relaxation of **CMESP** (see [CFL23b]). Note that

$$F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) = F^\top \text{Diag}(\sqrt{\mathcal{Y}}) \text{Diag}(x) \text{Diag}(\sqrt{\mathcal{Y}}) F.$$

So, we can interpret **DDFact** as applying the unscaled **DDFact** bound to the symmetrically-scaled matrix $\text{Diag}(\sqrt{\mathcal{Y}}) F \text{Diag}(\sqrt{\mathcal{Y}}) F^\top \text{Diag}(\sqrt{\mathcal{Y}}) = C \text{Diag}(\sqrt{\mathcal{Y}})$, and then correcting by $-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \log \gamma_i$.

In what follows, the following notations will be employed:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(\Gamma_s) &:= \{X : X \succeq 0, \text{rank}(X) \geq s\}, \text{ and} \\ \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y}) &:= \{x : F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) \in \text{dom}(\Gamma_s)\} \end{aligned}$$

being the domains of $\Gamma_s(X)$ and $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$, respectively. Moreover, we denote

$$\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+ := \{x : x \geq 0, F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) \in \text{dom}(\Gamma_s)\}$$

as the intersection of $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})$ and \mathbb{R}_+^n . Because the feasible solutions of **DDFact** with finite objective values are evidently confined in $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$, it is enough to concentrate on $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$ instead of $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})$. We wish to highlight the following important point.

Remark 3 Generally, we must choose a factorization with k being at least the rank of C , but it is natural to choose one with k equal to the rank of C ; for example, via a spectral decomposition of C . In this case, $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is full-rank if and only if $x \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$. In light of this, we can fully understand where on the boundary of the feasible region of **DDFact**, we can encounter solutions not in the interior of $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$.

It is commonly assumed in the literature that the function $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ may exhibit non-smooth behavior in x , and toward this end, the supdifferential is characterized. In their work, [LX23] utilized a Frank-Wolfe algorithm to evaluate **DDFact** for the **MESP** case. Subsequently, [CFL23b] employed a BFGS-based algorithm of **Knitro** for **DDFact**, to handle both **MESP** and

CMESP, wherein they utilized supgradient information to update the Hessian approximation. This algorithm achieved superior performance in terms of both speed and accuracy, in the spirit of [LO13] which investigated the excellent performance of BFGS on non-smooth problems. In the following section, we will establish that $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is actually *in a certain generalized sense* “differentiable” in $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$. These findings serve as a theoretical foundation for the efficiency of algorithms (e.g., those employed by [CFL23b]) that rely on smoothness for their convergence. We will introduce two necessary definitions to facilitate the establishment of our generalized differentiability results.

Definition 4 For $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$, let the eigenvalues of $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ be $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r > \lambda_{r+1} = \dots = \lambda_k = 0$, and $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) = Q \text{Diag}(\lambda) Q$ with an orthonormal matrix Q . Define $\beta := (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_k)^\top$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i &:= \frac{1}{\lambda_i}, \quad \forall i \in [1, \iota], \\ \beta_i &:= \frac{s-\iota}{\sum_{i \in [\iota+1, k]} \lambda_i}, \quad \forall i \in [\iota+1, k], \end{aligned}$$

where ι is the unique integer defined in Lemma 3.

In cases where an explicit analytic formula is unavailable for a function, such as the objective of **DDFact**, the conventional definition of (Fréchet) differentiability only applies to points that exist within the interior of the function domain. This restriction presents challenges when attempting to analyze the properties of a function for points where the conventional definition of (Fréchet) differentiability is not defined, e.g., points at the boundary of the function domain, which is important for understanding the behavior of algorithms having iterates at such points. For our particular function, when we choose a factorization with k equal to the rank of C , such points are precisely the ones with zero components (see Remark 3), and might well be visited by active-set methods.² To overcome this difficulty, we will extend the definition of (Fréchet) differentiability, in a natural way, to include points at the boundary of a (convex) set.

Definition 5 We define a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be *generalized differentiable with respect to a set* $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \text{dom}(f)$ if a linear operator $g(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ exists for all $x \in \mathcal{A}$, such that for all d with $x+d \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $f(x+d) - f(x) - g(x)^\top d = o(\|d\|)$. We refer to $g(x)$ as the *generalized gradient with respect to* \mathcal{A} . We will omit “with respect to \mathcal{A} ” when it is clear from the context.

Remark 4 We would like to highlight that our concept of generalized differentiability is almost as potent as differentiability on \mathcal{A} . Specifically, it possesses identical capabilities as differentiability if we use feasible-point optimization algorithms. The reasons are as follows:

² In fact we will see in our computational results (Table 4) that they are frequently visited by active-set methods.

1. if x lies in the interior of \mathcal{A} , then the generalized differentiability and generalized gradient are exactly differentiability and gradient, respectively;
2. if x lies on the boundary of \mathcal{A} , then the Whitney Extension Theorem ([Whi34, Theorem 1]) guarantees the existence of a compact neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_c(x) \subset \mathcal{A}$ such that the restriction of f on $\mathcal{N}_c(x)$ has a continuously differentiable extension \hat{f} on \mathbb{R}^n , with prescribed derivative information on $\mathcal{N}_c(x)$. In other words, $\hat{f}(x) = f(x)$, $\frac{\partial \hat{f}(x)}{\partial x} = g(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{N}_c(x)$. Consequently, the generalized differentiability of f is equivalent to its differentiability at the boundary point x , as long as we examine a larger open set that contains a local neighborhood of the boundary point;
3. The equation $f(x+d) - f(x) - g(x)^\top d = o(\|d\|)$ implies that as d approaches the zero vector, the expression $f(x+d) - f(x) - g(x)^\top d$ approaches zero, regardless of the *path* taken by d . This statement is essentially the definition of differentiability, except that $x+d \in \mathcal{A}$. Consequently, if an optimization algorithm that always confines its iterates within \mathcal{A} is utilized, the capabilities of generalized differentiability are identical to those of differentiability. Specifically, if this optimization algorithm converges under differentiability, it should also converge under generalized differentiability.

In the subsequent analysis, we aim to establish the continuous generalized differentiability of the objective of **DDFact** concerning its dependence on $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$. This will give some theoretical understanding of the good performance of algorithms that empirically have many iterates at the boundary of the feasible region, where smoothness was in question. Such algorithms were observed to outperform interior-point algorithms, which will be shown in the experiments.

Theorem 6 *For all $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$ in **DDFact**, the following hold:*

- 6.i. $z_{\text{DDFact}}(\mathcal{Y})$ yields a valid upper bound for the optimal value of **CMESP**, i.e., $z(C, s, A, b) \leq z_{\text{DDFact}}(\mathcal{Y})$;
- 6.ii. the function $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is concave in x on $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$;
- 6.iii. the function $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is generalized differentiable with respect to $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$, with generalized gradient

$$g_x(x; \mathcal{Y}) := \mathcal{Y} \circ \text{diag}(FQ \text{Diag}(\beta) Q^\top F^\top) - \log \mathcal{Y},$$

where $C = FF^\top$ is a factorization of C and Q, β are defined in Definition 4. In particular, $g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is invariant to different choices of F, Q as long as we change β accordingly;

- 6.iv. given $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$, the function $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is differentiable in \mathcal{Y} with gradient

$$g_{\mathcal{Y}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) := x \circ \text{diag}(FQ \text{Diag}(\beta) Q^\top F^\top) - \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1}x,$$

where $C = FF^\top$ is a factorization of C and Q, β are defined in Definition 4. In particular, $g_{\mathcal{Y}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is invariant to different choices of F, Q , as long

as we change β accordingly. Additionally, for **MESP**, let x^* be an optimal solution to **DDFact**; then we have

$$g_{\mathcal{Y}}(x^*; \mathcal{Y})|_{\mathcal{Y}=\mathbf{e}} = 0$$

(which does not generally hold for **CMESP**, as we will see in §6).

- 6.v. the function $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is continuously generalized differentiable in x and continuously differentiable in \mathcal{Y} on $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+ \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$, i.e., $g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})$ and $g_{\mathcal{Y}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ are continuous on $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+ \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$.

Remark 5 [Nik15] established Theorem 6.i for $\mathcal{Y} := \mathbf{e}$, and hence only regarded as a function of x , which was developed further in [LX23]. We generalize this result to the situation where $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$ and is varying. We note that the o-scaled factorization bound for **CMESP** is invariant under the scale factor (see [CFL23b]), so the use of any type of scaling in the context of the **DDFact** bound is completely new. Theorem 6.ii is a result of [Nik15], with details filled in by [FL22, Section 3.4.2]. Theorem 6.iii is the first differentiability result of any type for the **DDFact** bound. These results illuminate the success of BFGS-based methods for calculating the **DDFact** bound, not fully anticipated by previous works which exposed only supgradients connected to **DDFact**. Theorem 6.iv provides the potential for fast algorithms leveraging BFGS-based methods to improve the **DDFact** bound by g-scaling, as we will see in experiments §6. These observations and Theorem 6.iv leave open the interesting question of whether g-scaling can help the **DDFact** bound for **MESP**; we can interpret Theorem 6.iv as a partial result toward a negative answer. Theorem 6.v is a consequence of Theorems 6.iii,iv.

Proof (Theorem 6.i,ii)

These are essentially results of [Nik15]; see also [FL22, Section 3.4]. Intuitively, **DDFact** is the Lagrangian dual of the Lagrangian dual of a nonconvex continuous relaxation of **CMESP** (see [CFL23b]). Therefore, **DDFact** has a concave objective function, and the optimal value $z_{\text{DDFact}}(\mathcal{Y})$ serves as valid upper bound for the optimal value of **CMESP**. \square

Toward establishing the generalized differentiability of $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$, we begin by characterizing the directional derivatives. Toward this end, our first step is to derive the supdifferential of the objective of $\Gamma_s(X)$ with respect to $X \in \text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$.

Proposition 7 [LX23, Proposition 2] *Given $X \in \text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$ with rank $r \in [s, k]$, suppose that its eigenvalues are $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r > \lambda_{r+1} = \dots = \lambda_k = 0$ and $X = Q \text{Diag}(\lambda) Q^{\top}$ with an orthonormal matrix Q . Then the supdifferential of the function $\Gamma_s(X)$ at X denoted by $\partial\Gamma_s(X)$ is*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\Gamma_s(X) &= \left\{ Q \text{Diag}(\beta) Q^{\top} : X = Q \text{Diag}(\lambda) Q^{\top}, Q \text{ is orthonormal,} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r > \lambda_{r+1} = \dots = \lambda_k = 0, \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$\beta \in \text{conv} \left\{ \beta : \beta_i = \frac{1}{\lambda_i}, \forall i \in [\iota], \beta_i = \frac{s-\iota}{\sum_{i \in [\iota+1, k]} \lambda_i}, \forall i \in [\iota+1, r], \right. \\ \left. \beta_i \geq \beta_r, \forall i \in [r+1, k] \right\},$$

where ι is the unique integer defined in Lemma 3.

Remark 6 If $X \succ 0$, then β is uniquely determined, resulting in a singleton supdifferential $\partial\Gamma_s(X)$ and differentiability of $\Gamma_s(X)$ at X . This further implies the differentiability of $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ in x by the chain rule when $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) \succ 0$. However, the supdifferential $\partial\Gamma_s(X)$ is not a singleton when X is located on the boundary of the positive-semidefinite cone. This indicates that $\Gamma_s(X)$ is *not* differentiable at such points. However, as we will show later, such non-differentiability does not really transfer to x . In fact, $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is generalized differentiable at every $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$. In other words, even if $\Gamma_s(F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}))$ is non-differentiable in $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$, $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) = \Gamma_s(F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})) - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \log \gamma_i$ is still generalized differentiable in x .

The subsequent step involves computing the directional derivative of $\Gamma_s(X)$ at X , using the supdifferential characterized in Proposition 7. It is a well-known fact that if X is located in the interior of $\text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$, then

$$\Gamma'_s(X; D) = \inf_{G \in \partial\Gamma_s(X)} \text{tr}(G^T D),$$

where D is a feasible direction at X in $\text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$; see e.g. [Roc97, Theorem 23.4]. However, in our current context, X might lie on the boundary of $\text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$. Fortunately, [Mor66, p. 65] provides a result that ensures that the same formula holds if $\Gamma_s(X)$ is continuous at X . Thus, our first step is to establish the continuity of $\Gamma_s(X)$ at $X \in \text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$.

Lemma 8 $\Gamma_s(X)$ is continuous on its domain.

Proof Consider $X \in \text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$ with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_k \geq 0$ and ι defined in Lemma 3. Let $P \in \mathbb{S}^n$ be such that $X + P \in \text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$ and $\hat{\lambda}_1 \geq \hat{\lambda}_2 \geq \dots \geq \hat{\lambda}_k$ be the eigenvalues of $X + P$ with $\hat{\iota}$ again defined in Lemma 3. We will use the continuity of eigenvalues (with respect to entries of the matrix) to prove the result.

We discuss two sub-cases:

1. $\lambda_\iota > \frac{1}{s-\iota} \sum_{\ell=\iota+1}^k \lambda_\ell > \lambda_{\iota+1}$. Then for $\|P\|$ small enough, by the continuity of eigenvalues, we have $\hat{\lambda}_\iota > \frac{1}{s-\iota} \sum_{\ell=\iota+1}^k \hat{\lambda}_\ell > \hat{\lambda}_{\iota+1}$, which implies $\hat{\iota} = \iota$. Again by the continuity of eigenvalues and $\log(\cdot)$, $\Gamma_s(X)$ is continuous at X on $\text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$.
2. $\lambda_\iota > \frac{1}{s-\iota} \sum_{\ell=\iota+1}^k \lambda_\ell = \lambda_{\iota+1}$. We have to be more careful in this case as any small $\|P\|$ can make $\hat{\iota}$ different from ι . We first characterize a range where $\hat{\iota}$ should lie within. Let $\iota_e := \max\{i : \lambda_i = \lambda_{\iota+1}, s > i \geq \iota + 1\}$. We claim that $\hat{\iota} \in [\iota + 1, \iota_e]$. Before proving this claim, we demonstrate three preliminary results:

- (a) For any $i \leq \iota$, $\lambda_i > \frac{1}{s-i} \sum_{\ell=i+1}^k \lambda_\ell$;
 (b) For any $i \leq \iota - 1$, $\frac{1}{s-i} \sum_{\ell=i+1}^k \lambda_\ell < \lambda_{i+1}$;
 (c) For any $s > i > \iota_e$, $\lambda_i < \frac{1}{s-i} \sum_{\ell=i+1}^k \lambda_\ell$.

Note that (a) holds for $i = 0$. Assume that there exists some $i \leq \iota$ such that $\lambda_i \leq \frac{1}{s-i} \sum_{\ell=i+1}^k \lambda_\ell$. Without loss of generality, let i be the minimum integer satisfying this condition. Obviously $i \geq 1$. Furthermore,

$$\frac{1}{s-i+1} \sum_{\ell=i}^k \lambda_\ell = \frac{(\sum_{\ell=i+1}^k \lambda_\ell) + \lambda_i}{s-i+1} \geq \frac{1}{s-i+1} ((s-i)\lambda_i + \lambda_i) = \lambda_i.$$

By assumption, we also have that $\lambda_{i-1} > \frac{1}{s-i+1} \sum_{\ell=i}^k \lambda_\ell$, which together with the above deduction, implies that $\iota = i - 1 \leq \iota - 1$, a contradiction. For (b), if there exists $i \leq \iota - 1$ with $\frac{1}{s-i} \sum_{\ell=i+1}^k \lambda_\ell \geq \lambda_{i+1}$, together with (a), we have $\iota = i \leq \iota - 1$, a contradiction. Finally, (c) comes from

$$\begin{aligned} (s-i)\lambda_i &< (s-i)\lambda_{\iota+1} = (s-\iota)\lambda_{\iota+1} - (i-\iota)\lambda_{\iota+1} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=\iota+1}^k \lambda_\ell - (i-\iota)\lambda_{\iota+1} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=\iota+1}^i (\lambda_i - \lambda_{\iota+1}) + \sum_{\ell=i+1}^k \lambda_\ell \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=i+1}^k \lambda_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

With (a–c), and the continuity of eigenvalues with respect to the entries of a matrix, for $\|P\|$ small enough, we have:

- (\hat{a}) For any $i \leq \iota$, $\hat{\lambda}_i > \frac{1}{s-i} \sum_{\ell=i+1}^k \hat{\lambda}_\ell$;
 (\hat{b}) For any $i \leq \iota - 1$, $\frac{1}{s-i} \sum_{\ell=i+1}^k \hat{\lambda}_\ell < \hat{\lambda}_{i+1}$;
 (\hat{c}) For any $s > i > \iota_e$, $\hat{\lambda}_i < \frac{1}{s-i} \sum_{\ell=i+1}^k \hat{\lambda}_\ell$.
 (\hat{a} – \hat{c}) suggest that $\hat{i} \in [\iota+1, \iota_e]$, otherwise the condition $\hat{\lambda}_{\hat{i}} > \frac{1}{s-\hat{i}} \sum_{\ell=\hat{i}+1}^k \hat{\lambda}_\ell \geq \hat{\lambda}_{\hat{i}+1}$ in Lemma 3 will be violated.

From $\frac{1}{s-\iota} \sum_{\ell=\iota+1}^k \lambda_\ell = \lambda_{\iota+1}$ and the definition of ι_e , we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\iota+1} &= \frac{1}{s-\iota-1} \sum_{\ell=\iota+2}^k \lambda_\ell = \lambda_{\iota+2} = \frac{1}{s-\iota-2} \sum_{\ell=\iota+3}^k \lambda_\ell \\ &= \dots \\ &= \lambda_{\iota_e} = \frac{1}{s-\iota_e} \sum_{\ell=\iota_e+1}^k \lambda_\ell. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We are now ready to prove the continuity results. Because $\hat{i} \in [\iota + 1, \iota_e]$ and (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\ell=1}^{\iota} \log(\lambda_\ell) + (s-\iota) \log\left(\frac{1}{s-\iota} \sum_{\ell=\iota+1}^k \lambda_\ell\right) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{\iota} \log(\lambda_\ell) + (\hat{i}-\iota) \log\left(\frac{1}{s-\iota} \sum_{\ell=\iota+1}^k \lambda_\ell\right) + (s-\hat{i}) \log\left(\frac{1}{s-\iota} \sum_{\ell=\iota+1}^k \lambda_\ell\right) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{\iota} \log(\lambda_\ell) + \sum_{\ell=\iota+1}^{\hat{i}} \log(\lambda_\ell) + (s-\hat{i}) \log\left(\frac{1}{s-\hat{i}} \sum_{\ell=\hat{i}+1}^k \lambda_\ell\right) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{\hat{i}} \log(\lambda_\ell) + (s-\hat{i}) \log\left(\frac{1}{s-\hat{i}} \sum_{\ell=\hat{i}+1}^k \lambda_\ell\right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the above equation holds for any $\|P\|$ small enough, and with its corresponding \hat{i} and at $X + P$, we have

$$\Gamma_s(X + P) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\hat{i}} \log(\hat{\lambda}_\ell) + (s - \hat{i}) \log\left(\frac{1}{s - \hat{i}} \sum_{\ell=\hat{i}+1}^k \hat{\lambda}_\ell\right).$$

Then by the continuity of eigenvalues (with respect to elements of the matrix) and $\log(\cdot)$ function, we conclude that $\Gamma_s(X)$ is continuous on $\text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$. \square

The continuity of $\Gamma_s(X)$ in X together with the continuity of eigenvalues in matrix elements also implies the following.

Corollary 9 $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon)$ is continuous in (x, Υ) on $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \Upsilon)_+$.

Utilizing the above results, we can characterize the directional derivative of $\Gamma_s(X)$ and further characterize the directional derivative of $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon)$.

Proposition 10 For $X \in \text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$, let $D \in \mathbb{S}^n$ be such that $X + D \in \text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$; then the directional derivative of $\Gamma_s(X)$ at X in the direction D , denoted $\Gamma'_s(X; D)$, exists and

$$\Gamma'_s(X; D) = \inf_{G \in \partial \Gamma_s(X)} \text{tr}(G^\top D).$$

Proof By definition, [LX23, Lemma 3] and Lemma 8, $\Gamma_s(X)$ is convex, finite, and continuous in X over $\text{dom}(\Gamma_s)$. Then the conclusion follows by [Mor66, p. 65]. \square

Proposition 11 For $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \Upsilon)_+$, let $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $x + d \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \Upsilon)_+$; then the directional derivative of $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon)$ at x in the direction d exists, and

$$f'_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon; d) = (\Upsilon \circ \text{diag}(FQ \text{Diag}(\beta) QF^\top))^\top d - \log(\Upsilon)^\top d,$$

where $C = FF^\top$ is a factorization of C , and Q, β are defined in Definition 4. In particular, $FQ \text{Diag}(\beta) QF^\top$ and thus $f'_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon; d)$ is invariant to the choice of F, Q , as long as we change β accordingly.

Proof By Theorem 6.ii, we have that $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon)$ is concave. Then by [Roc97, Theorem 23.1], the directional derivative $f'_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon; d)$ exists and

$$\begin{aligned} f'_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon; d) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f_{\text{DDFact}}(x + td; \Upsilon) - f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon)}{t} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\Gamma_s(F_{\text{DDFact}}(x + td; \Upsilon)) - \Gamma_s(F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon)) + t \log(\Upsilon)^\top d}{t} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\Gamma_s(F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon) + t F_{\text{DDFact}}(d; \Upsilon)) - \Gamma_s(F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon)) + t \log(\Upsilon)^\top d}{t} \\ &= \Gamma'_s(F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon); F_{\text{DDFact}}(d; \Upsilon)) + \log(\Upsilon)^\top d \\ &= \inf_{G \in \partial \Gamma_s(F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \Upsilon))} \text{tr}(G^\top F_{\text{DDFact}}(d; \Upsilon)) + \log(\Upsilon)^\top d, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation is due to Proposition 10. Let $\Theta(x, \mathcal{Y})$ denote the set of (Q, β) in the characterization of $\partial \Gamma_s(F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}))$, as described in Proposition 7. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(x, \mathcal{Y}) = & \left\{ (Q, \beta) : F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) = Q \text{Diag}(\lambda) Q^\top, Q \text{ is orthonormal,} \right. \\ & \lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r > \lambda_{r+1} = \dots = \lambda_k = 0, \\ & \beta \in \text{conv} \left\{ \beta : \beta_i = \frac{1}{\lambda_i}, \forall i \in [\ell], \beta_i = \frac{s-\ell}{\sum_{i \in [\ell+1, k]} \lambda_i}, \forall i \in [\ell+1, r], \right. \\ & \left. \left. \beta_i \geq \beta_r, \forall i \in [r+1, k] \right\} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where ℓ is the unique integer defined in Lemma 3. According to the former derivation,

$$\begin{aligned} f'_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}; d) &= \inf_{G \in \partial \Gamma_s(F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}))} \text{tr}(G^\top F_{\text{DDFact}}(d; \mathcal{Y})) + \log(\mathcal{Y})^\top d \\ &= \inf_{(Q, \beta) \in \Theta(x; \mathcal{Y})} \text{tr}(FQ \text{Diag}(\beta) Q^\top F^\top \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y} \circ d)) + \log(\mathcal{Y})^\top d \\ &= \inf_{(Q, \beta) \in \Theta(x; \mathcal{Y})} (\mathcal{Y} \circ \text{diag}(FQ \text{Diag}(\beta) Q^\top F^\top))^\top d + \log(\mathcal{Y})^\top d. \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

We now show that the infimum of (6) is obtained by (Q, β) characterized in Definition 4. For simplicity, we let

$$\begin{aligned} g(Q, \beta; \mathcal{Y}) &:= \mathcal{Y} \circ \text{diag}(FQ \text{Diag}(\beta) Q^\top F^\top); \\ g_j(Q, \beta; \mathcal{Y}) &:= \gamma_i F_i \cdot Q \text{Diag}(\beta) Q^\top F_i^\top, && \text{the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ element of } g(Q, \beta; \mathcal{Y}); \\ q_j &:= Q \cdot j, && \text{the } j^{\text{th}} \text{ column of } Q \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

(where $F_i \cdot$ denotes the i^{th} row of F). By the definition of $\Theta(x, \mathcal{Y})$, we also have that if $j_1 > j_2$, the eigenvalues $\lambda_{j_1}, \lambda_{j_2}$ associated with q_{j_1}, q_{j_2} satisfy $\lambda_{j_1} \leq \lambda_{j_2}$.

We claim that for any $1 \leq i \leq n, r < j \leq k$ where $x_i > 0, F_i \cdot q_j = 0$. First by the characterization of Q in $\Theta(x, \mathcal{Y})$, we have that $q_{j_1}^\top q_{j_2} = 0$ for all $1 \leq j_1 \leq r < j_2 \leq k$, because q_{j_1}, q_{j_2} lie in eigenspaces corresponding to different eigenvalues. Therefore, it is enough to prove that $F_i \cdot$ lies in the space spanned by $\{q_j : 1 \leq j \leq r\}$. Notice that $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x_i F_i^\top F_i = F^\top \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y} \circ x) F$. Therefore, the column space of $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is equal to the row space of $\text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y} \circ x)^{\frac{1}{2}} F$, which is in turn equal to the space spanned by $\{F_i^\top : 1 \leq i \leq n, x_i > 0\}$. On the other hand, $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) = Q \text{Diag}(\lambda) Q^\top$, and thus the column space of $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is equal to the row space of $\text{Diag}(\lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}} Q^\top$, which is in turn equal to the space spanned by $\{q_j : 1 \leq j \leq r\}$. Therefore, we have proved that

$$\text{span}\{F_i^\top : 1 \leq i \leq n, x_i > 0\} = \text{span}\{q_j : 1 \leq j \leq r\},$$

which implies that for all $1 \leq i \leq n, r < j \leq k$ where $x_i > 0, F_i \cdot q_j = 0$. With this result, we have when $x_i > 0$,

$$g_i(Q, \beta; \mathcal{Y}) = \gamma_i F_i \cdot Q \text{Diag}(\beta) Q^\top F_i^\top = \gamma_i \sum_{j=1}^r \beta_j \|F_i \cdot q_j\|^2,$$

which is invariant to $(Q, \beta) \in \Theta(x; \mathcal{Y})$ because $\beta_j, 1 \leq j \leq r$ are fixed and Q is not contained in the right-hand side formula.

We choose some $(\hat{Q}, \hat{\beta})$ defined in Definition 4. Note that the choice of $(\hat{Q}, \hat{\beta})$ is not unique. Then we can write the directional derivative as

$$\begin{aligned} f'_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}; d) &= \inf_{(Q, \beta) \in \Theta(x; \mathcal{Y})} \sum_{x_i > 0} g_i(Q, \beta; \mathcal{Y}) d_i + \sum_{x_i = 0} g_i(Q, \beta; \mathcal{Y}) d_i + \log(\mathcal{Y})^\top d \\ &= \sum_{x_i > 0} g_i(\hat{Q}, \hat{\beta}; \mathcal{Y}) d_i + \inf_{(Q, \beta) \in \Theta(x; \mathcal{Y})} \sum_{x_i = 0} \gamma_i \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j \|F_i \cdot q_j\|^2 d_i + \log(\mathcal{Y})^\top d \\ &= \sum_{x_i > 0} g_i(\hat{Q}, \hat{\beta}; \mathcal{Y}) d_i + \inf_{(Q, \beta) \in \Theta(x; \mathcal{Y})} \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j \sum_{x_i = 0} \gamma_i \|F_i \cdot q_j\|^2 d_i + \log(\mathcal{Y})^\top d. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if $x_i = 0$, we must have $d_i \geq 0$ to make $x + d \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$. Therefore, for each $r < j \leq k, \sum_{i: x_i = 0} \gamma_i \|F_i \cdot q_j\| d_i \geq 0$, and the infimum is achieved if and only if each $\beta_j, r < j \leq k$ takes the minimum value in $\Theta(x; \mathcal{Y})$, which is easy to see that is just the value in Definition 4. In particular, $(\hat{Q}, \hat{\beta})$ is such a choice. Specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f'_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}; d) &= \sum_{x_i > 0} g_i(\hat{Q}, \hat{\beta}; \mathcal{Y}) d_i + \gamma_i \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{\beta}_j \sum_{x_i = 0} \|F_i \cdot \hat{q}_j\|^2 d_i + \log(\mathcal{Y})^\top d \\ &= \sum_{x_i > 0} g_i(\hat{Q}, \hat{\beta}; \mathcal{Y}) d_i + \gamma_i \sum_{x_i = 0} g_i(\hat{Q}, \hat{\beta}; \mathcal{Y}) d_i + \log(\mathcal{Y})^\top d \\ &= g_i(\hat{Q}, \hat{\beta}; \mathcal{Y})^\top d + \log(\mathcal{Y})^\top d. \end{aligned}$$

Note that \hat{Q} can be any Q defined in Definition 4, and the value of $g(Q, \beta; \mathcal{Y})$ is invariant as long as we change $\hat{\beta}$ accordingly. The invariance relative to F is due to the invariance of $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ relative to F (see [CFL23b, Theorem 2.2]). \square

With the characterization of directional derivative in Proposition 11, we can prove the general differentiability with respect to $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$ as defined in Definition 5.

Proof (Theorem 6.iii, iv, v)

- 6.iii: By Proposition 11, let $g_x(x; \mathcal{Y}) := \mathcal{Y} \circ \text{diag}(FQ \text{Diag}(\beta) QF^\top) + \log(\mathcal{Y})$ for any (Q, β) defined in Definition 4. Proposition 11 shows that $(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is invariant to the choice of (Q, β) and F . Then the directional derivative of $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ with respect to $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$ and feasible direction $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $x + d \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$ is $g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})^\top d$.

We first demonstrate two preliminary results:

- (a) Given $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$, we define the neighbourhood of x with radius r with respect to $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$ as

$$\mathcal{N}_r(x) := \{y : \|y - x\| \leq r, y \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+\}.$$

We claim that for r small enough, $\mathcal{N}_r(x)$ is a compact set. Recall that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(\Gamma_s) &:= \{X : X \succeq 0, \text{rank}(X) \geq s\}, \text{ and} \\ \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+ &:= \{x : x \geq 0, F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) \in \text{dom}(\Gamma_s)\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the continuity of eigenvalues, there is some small enough $\tilde{r} > 0$ such that when $r \leq \tilde{r}$, $F_{\text{DDFact}}(y; \mathcal{Y})$ has at least the same number of nonzero eigenvalues as $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$, and so $\text{rank}(F_{\text{DDFact}}(y; \mathcal{Y})) \geq s$. Moreover, note that the set $\{x : F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) \succeq 0\}$ and the non-negative cone $\mathbb{R}_+^n = \{x : x \geq 0\}$ are closed. So $\mathcal{N}_r(x)$ can be seen as the intersection of $\{x : F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) \succeq 0\}$, \mathbb{R}_+^n , and the sphere $\{y : \|y - x\| \leq r\}$, thus is closed and bounded, and thus compact. Furthermore, we have shown in Corollary 9 that $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is continuous over $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$, thus uniform continuous over $\mathcal{N}_r(x)$ for $r \leq \tilde{r}$.

- (b) Given $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$, we define the circle of x with radius r with respect to $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$ as

$$\mathcal{C}_r(x) := \{y : \|y - x\| = r, y \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+\}.$$

With similar logic to the above, when $r \leq \tilde{r}$, $\mathcal{C}_r(x)$ is closed and bounded. Then by Heine-Borel Theorem, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a finite set $F \subset \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{r}}(x)$ such that for any $y \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{r}}(x)$, there exists $u \in F$ such that $\|y - u\| < \epsilon$.

Now we are ready to establish generalized differentiability of $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ with respect to $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$. In particular, we want to demonstrate that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that whenever $y \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$ and $\|y - x\| < \delta$, we have

$$|f_{\text{DDFact}}(y; \mathcal{Y}) - f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) - g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})^\top(y - x)| < \epsilon.$$

We will assume that $g_x(x; \mathcal{Y}) \neq 0$, because the case where $g_x(x; \mathcal{Y}) = 0$ is implied by the continuity of $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ (see Corollary 9). We have the following four facts:

- (1) from (a), $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is uniformly continuous on $\mathcal{N}_{\tilde{r}}(x)$. Then given $\epsilon > 0$, there is some $\delta_1 > 0$ such that for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{r}}(x)$ such that $\|x_1 - x_2\| < \frac{\delta_1}{\|g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})\|}$, we have $|f_{\text{DDFact}}(x_1; \mathcal{Y}) - f_{\text{DDFact}}(x_2; \mathcal{Y})| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$.
- (2) given $\delta_1 > 0$, by (b), there is some finite set $F \subset \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{r}}(x)$ such that for every $y \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{r}}(x)$, there exists $u \in F$ such that $\|y - u\| < \frac{\min\{\epsilon, \delta_1\}}{3 \cdot \|g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})\|}$.
- (3) because of the finiteness of F and the existence of the directional derivative in direction $u - x$, $\forall u \in F$, given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $\delta_2 \leq 1$ such that for any $u \in F$, when $t < \delta_2$, we have

$$|f_{\text{DDFact}}(x + t(u - x); \mathcal{Y}) - f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) - tg_x(x; \mathcal{Y})^\top(u - x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}.$$

Note that $t < \delta_2$ is equivalent to that $t \cdot \|u - x\| < \delta_3 := \delta_2 \cdot \tilde{r}$.

(4) for every $y \in \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{r}}(x)$, we have that $x + \frac{y-x}{\|y-x\|} \cdot \tilde{r} \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{r}}(x)$. By (2), there is some $u \in F$ such that

$$\left\| x + \frac{y-x}{\|y-x\|} \cdot \tilde{r} - u \right\| < \frac{\min\{\epsilon, \delta_1\}}{3 \cdot \|g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})\|},$$

and thus

$$\|y - (x + \frac{y-x}{\tilde{r}} \cdot \|y-x\|)\| = \frac{\|y-x\|}{\tilde{r}} \cdot \left\| x + \frac{y-x}{\|y-x\|} \cdot \tilde{r} - u \right\| < \frac{\min\{\epsilon, \delta_1\}}{3 \cdot \|g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})\|}.$$

From (1-4), given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta_3 > 0$ and a finite set $F \subset \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{r}}(x)$ such that for any $y \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$ and $\|y-x\| < \delta_3$, there exists some $u \in F$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & |f_{\text{DDFact}}(y; \mathcal{Y}) - f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) - g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})^\top (y-x)| \\ & \leq |f_{\text{DDFact}}(y; \mathcal{Y}) - f_{\text{DDFact}}(\hat{y}; \mathcal{Y})| \\ & \quad + |f_{\text{DDFact}}(\hat{y}; \mathcal{Y}) - f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) - g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})^\top (\hat{y}-x)| \\ & \quad + |g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})^\top (y-\hat{y})| \\ & < \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \|g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})\| \frac{\min\{\epsilon, \delta_1\}}{3 \|g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})\|} < \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{y} = x + \frac{y-x}{\tilde{r}} \|y-x\|$. Finally, the invariance of $g_x(x; \mathcal{Y})$ to F, Q as long as we change β accordingly follows from Proposition 11.

6.iv: For the first part, note that $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x_i F_i^\top F_i$, and for every $x \in \text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$ and $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$, $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) \in \text{dom}(f_s)$, and is thus well defined. On the other hand, by switching the value of x and \mathcal{Y} , we find that $F_{\text{DDFact}}(\mathcal{Y}; x) = F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$. We can use the same method which we used to derive the generalized gradient with respect to x to derive the generalized gradient with respect to \mathcal{Y} . This means that $f_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is generalized differentiable at \mathcal{Y} with generalized gradient

$$g_{\mathcal{Y}}(x; \mathcal{Y}) = x \circ \text{diag}(FQ \text{Diag}(\beta) Q^\top F^\top) - \text{Diag}(\mathcal{Y})^{-1} x,$$

where $C = FF^\top$ is a factorization of C and (Q, β) are defined in Definition 4. In particular, $g_{\mathcal{Y}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ is invariant to different choices of F, Q and thus well defined. Moreover, because $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$ lies in the interior of \mathbb{R}_{++}^n , the generalized differentiability reduces to differentiability. Moreover, the invariance of $g_{\mathcal{Y}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ to F, Q as long as we change β accordingly follows the same logic as Theorem 6.iii.

For the second part, note that $g_{\mathcal{Y}}(x^*; \mathcal{Y})|_{\mathcal{Y}=\mathbf{e}} = 0$ is equivalent to $x^* \circ (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}) - \mathbf{e}) = 0$, where $g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}) = \text{diag}(FQ \text{Diag}(\beta) Q^\top F^\top)$ as defined in (7), specifically for x^* . This is further equivalent to

$$g_i^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}) = 1, \quad \forall x_i^* > 0.$$

In the following proof, we will leverage the KKT conditions of **DDFact** which we present here: for any optimal solution x^* to **DDFact**, there is some $v^* \in \mathbb{R}^n, \nu^* \in \mathbb{R}^n, \pi^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}^\top x^* &= s, Ax^* \leq b, 0 \leq x^* \leq \mathbf{e}, \\ v^* &\geq 0, \nu^* \geq 0, \pi^* \geq 0, \\ g^*(Q, \beta; \mathcal{Y}) + v^* - \nu^* - A^\top \pi^* - \tau^* \mathbf{e} &= 0, \\ \pi^* \circ (b - Ax^*) &= 0, v^* \circ x^* = 0, \nu^* \circ (\mathbf{e} - x^*) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{DDFact-KKT})$$

where $g^*(Q, \beta; \mathcal{Y}) = \mathcal{Y} \circ \text{diag}(FQ \text{Diag}(\beta) Q^\top F^\top)$ as defined in (7), specifically for x^* . The existence of $v^* \in \mathbb{R}^n, \nu^* \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tau^* \in \mathbb{R}, \pi^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is due to that: (1) **DDFact** is a generalized differentiable convex-optimization problem; (2) Slater's condition holds because of the affine constraints describing the feasible region of **DDFact**.

By [LX23, Section 3.1], when $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbf{e}$ and there are not linear constraints $Ax \leq b$, then there is a closed-form solution (v^*, ν^*, τ^*) to **DDFact-KKT** given x^* . Suppose that σ is a permutation of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$(g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(1)} \geq (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(2)} \geq \dots \geq (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(n)},$$

where $(g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_i$ denotes the i^{th} element of $g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^* &= (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(s)}, \\ \nu_{\sigma(i)}^* &= \begin{cases} (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(i)} - \tau^*, & \forall 1 \leq i \leq s; \\ 0, & \forall s+1 \leq i \leq n, \end{cases} \\ v^* &= \nu^* + \tau^* \mathbf{e} - g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$\sum_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} x_{\sigma(i)}^* (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(i)} = \sum_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}} (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(i)} = s.$$

In fact, by **DDFact-KKT**, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= x^* \circ (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}) + v^* - \nu^* - \tau^* \mathbf{e}) \\ &= x^* \circ g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}) + x^* \circ v^* - x^* \circ \nu^* - \tau^* x^* \\ &= x^* \circ g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}) - x^* \circ \nu^* - \tau^* x^* \\ &= x^* \circ g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}) - \nu^* - \tau^* x^*, \end{aligned}$$

and further

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathbf{e}^\top (x^* \circ g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}) - \nu^* - \tau^* x^*) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} x_{\sigma(i)}^* (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(i)} + \sum_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}} \nu_{\sigma(i)}^* + \tau^* s \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} x_{\sigma(i)}^* (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(i)} - \sum_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}} (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by [CFL23b], the duality gap of **DDFact** is $\mathbf{e}^\top \nu^* + \tau^* s - s = 0$ and thus

$$\sum_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} x_{\sigma(i)}^* (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(i)} = \sum_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}} (g^*(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(i)} = s. \quad (8)$$

Furthermore, we claim that if $x_{\sigma(i)}^* = 1$, then $g_{\sigma(i)}(x^*) \leq 1$. Note that by the proof of Proposition 11, letting q_j be the j^{th} column of Q , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (g(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(i)} &= F_{\sigma(i)} \cdot Q \text{Diag}(\beta) Q^\top F_{\sigma(i)}^\top \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^r \beta_j F_{\sigma(i)} \cdot q_j q_j^\top F_{\sigma(i)} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^r \frac{1}{\lambda_j} F_{\sigma(i)} \cdot q_j q_j^\top F_{\sigma(i)} \\ &= F_{\sigma(i)} \cdot (F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathbf{e}))^\dagger F_{\sigma(i)}^\top \\ &= F_{\sigma(i)} \cdot \left(F_{\sigma(i)}^\top \cdot F_{\sigma(i)} + \sum_{j \neq \sigma(i)} x_j^* F_j^\top F_j \right)^\dagger F_{\sigma(i)}^\top \\ &\leq F_{\sigma(i)} \cdot \left(F_{\sigma(i)}^\top \cdot F_{\sigma(i)} \right)^\dagger F_{\sigma(i)}^\top = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the first inequality is due to Lemma 3 and Definition 4, and the second inequality is due to the Sherman–Morrison formula for the Moore–Penrose inverse. (8) and (9) together imply that

$$(g(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(1)} = \dots = (g(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(s)} = 1.$$

Moreover, for $i > s$ such that $x_{\sigma(i)}^* > 0$, we must have $(g(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(i)} = (g(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(s)}$, otherwise we contradict (8), due to the non-increasingness of $(g(Q; \beta; \mathbf{e}))_{\sigma(i)}$ in i .

- 6.v: By the generalized gradients characterized for x and gradients characterized for ψ in Theorem 6.iii,iv, we only need to prove the continuity of $g(Q; \beta; \mathcal{Y})$ as defined in (7) with respect to (x, \mathcal{Y}) . Because of the invariance of $g(Q; \beta; \mathcal{Y})$ to F, Q as long as we change β accordingly, we can fix F, Q ; then the conclusion follows from the continuity of eigenvalues in the matrix elements. \square

5 Algorithms

In this section, we discuss our algorithms for determining optimal g-scaling vectors for **BQP** and **linx**, as well as for the selection of *good* g-scaling vectors for **DDFact**. For **DDFact**, we can only aim for *good*, because of the lack of a convexity result concerning the g-scaling vector for **DDFact**; despite this, results presented in §6 demonstrate that, in many cases, the **DDFact** bounds computed with the best g-scaling vectors obtained are the strongest that we have, demonstrating the effectiveness of such algorithms.

For notational generality, we consider an upper-bound form for **CMESP**, which encompasses **BQP**, **linx**, and **DDFact** as particular instantiations. Specifically, we define a general upper bound for **CMESP** of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} z(\psi) := \max \quad & f(x; \psi) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & g_i(x) \leq 0, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, m_1; \\ & h_j(x) = 0, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, m_2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{CMESP-UB})$$

where $f : \text{dom}(f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $g_i : \text{dom}(g_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $h_j : \text{dom}(h_j) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (with the data C, s, A, b being absorbed into these functions). We assume that T , the set of possible values for the parameter vector ψ to be open. We also assume that $f(x; \psi)$ is convex in x for each ψ and *continuously generalized differentiable* in x and *continuous differentiable* in ψ on its domain. Finally, we assume that **CMESP-UB** is a convex program and that its maximum is attained on the feasible set. We let M denote the feasible set of **CMESP-UB**, we let $M^*(\psi) := \{x \in M : f(x; \psi) = z(\psi)\}$ (the optimal x given ψ), and we say that ψ^* is optimal if $z(\psi^*) = \min_{\psi \in T} z(\psi)$.

Remark 7 **linx** and **DDFact** can naturally be viewed as an instantiation of **CMESP-UB** with $\psi := \log \mathcal{Y}$. For **BQP**, we can view $X \in \mathbb{S}^n$ as a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{n(n+1)/2}$, therefore it can also be regarded as an instantiation of **CMESP-UB** with $\psi := \log \mathcal{Y}$. The continuous generalized differentiability and continuous differentiability of the objective functions is established in the proofs of Theorem 1, 2, and 6.

We first focus on the cases where $f(x; \psi)$ is convex in ψ , which encompasses **BQP** and **linx** as particular cases. For such cases, $z(\psi)$ becomes a convex function in ψ . Our algorithm relies on the following theorem, tailored from [Zal02, Theorem 2.4.18] to our specific context.

Theorem 12 [Zal02, Theorem 2.4.18] *Assume that $f(x; \psi)$ is convex in ψ for every $x \in M$, then the subdifferential of $z(\psi)$ at $\psi \in T$ is*

$$\partial z(\psi) = \overline{\text{conv}} \left\{ \frac{f(x; \psi)}{\partial \psi} : x \in M^*(\psi) \right\},$$

where $\overline{\text{conv}}$ denotes the convex closure. Furthermore, if $M^*(\psi)$ is a singleton, then the unique subgradient becomes the gradient of $z(\psi)$ at ψ .

Remark 8 [FL22, Propositions 3.3.7 and 3.6.9] provide sufficient conditions for $M^*(\psi)$ to be a singleton for **BQP** and **linx**, respectively.

Theorem 12 allows the calculation of the subgradient (or gradient) of $z(\psi)$ by solving **CMESP-UB**. Thus, a standard subgradient algorithm can achieve convergence to an optimal ψ^* . However, due to the well-known sluggishness of the subgradient algorithm, we employ a BFGS-type algorithm that utilizes the subgradient (or gradient) to update the Hessian approximation.

For cases where $f(x; \psi)$ is not necessarily convex in ψ , we cannot aim for verified global optimality. Nevertheless, we still use a BFGS-type algorithm,

where we use $\frac{\partial f(x;\psi)}{\partial \psi}$ for any $x \in M^*(\psi)$ to update the Hessian approximation. Under some smoothness assumption, $\frac{\partial f(x;\psi)}{\partial \psi}$ becomes the differential of $z(\psi)$, and this algorithm will converge to a stable point of $z(\psi)$. The following theorem provides a sufficient condition for the differentiability of $z(\psi)$, tailored from [OT18, Proposition 2.1] to our specific context.

Theorem 13 [OT18, Proposition 2.1] *We define a selection to be a function mapping from ψ to x selected from $M^*(\psi)$, denoted as $x^*(\psi)$. Given $\bar{\psi} \in T$, if there is a selection $x^*(\psi)$ continuous at $\bar{\psi}$, then $z(\psi)$ is differentiable at $\bar{\psi}$ with*

$$\frac{\partial z(\bar{\psi})}{\partial \psi} = \frac{\partial f(x^*(\bar{\psi}); \bar{\psi})}{\partial \psi}.$$

In particular, if $M^(\bar{\psi})$ is a singleton, then the unique selection $x^*(\psi)$ is always continuous at $\bar{\psi}$.*

Additionally, BFGS has been shown to possess good convergence properties under non-smooth settings, e.g., locally Lipschitz and directionally differentiable (see [LO13]). The following theorem guarantees this property for $z_{\text{DDFact}}(\mathcal{T})$, tailored from [FI90, Theorem 4.1] to our specific context.

Theorem 14 *For any $\psi \in T$, $z(\psi)$ is locally Lipschitz near ψ and directionally differentiable at ψ in any feasible direction v with formula*

$$\partial z(\psi; v) = \max_{x \in M^*(\psi)} \left(\frac{\partial f(x; \alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \right)^\top v.$$

Remark 9 Theorem 12, 13, and 14 hold based on the continuous differentiability of $f(x; \psi)$ in ψ and the continuity of $f(x; \psi)$ in x for CMESP-UB. The continuously generalized differentiability of $f(x; \psi)$ in x ensures good convergence behavior of algorithms for obtaining $x^* \in M^*(\psi)$.

6 Numerical results

We experimented on benchmark instances of MESP, using three covariance matrices that have been extensively used in the literature, with $n = 63, 90, 124$ (see, e.g., [KLQ95, Lee98, AFLW99, Ans18, Ans20]). For testing CMESP, we included five side constraints $a_i^\top x \leq b_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, 5$, in MESP. As there is no benchmark data for the side constraints, we have generated them randomly. For each n , the left-hand side of constraint i is given by a uniformly-distributed random vector a_i with integer components between -2 and 2 . The right-hand side of the constraints was selected so that, for every s considered in the experiment, the best known solution of the instance of MESP is violated by at least one constraint.

For each n (which refers always to a particular benchmark covariance matrix), we consider different values of s defining a set of test instances of MESP

and **CMESP**. We ran our experiments under Windows, on an Intel Xeon E5-2667 v4 @ 3.20 GHz processor equipped with 8 physical cores (16 virtual cores) and 128 GB of RAM. We implemented our code in **Matlab** using the solvers **SDPT3** v. 4.0 for **BQP**, and **Knitro** v. 12.4 for **linx** and **DDFact**. When instantiating the **DDFact** bound, the selection of F is made as $F := U\Lambda^{1/2}$, where $C = U\Lambda U^T$ represents a spectral decomposition of C omitting eigenvalues of zero, so that $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \text{rank}(C)}$ and diagonal matrix $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{\text{rank}(C) \times \text{rank}(C)}$. This choice gives the number of columns of F equal to the rank of C , so that Remark 3 applies.

In all of our experiments, we compare g-scaling only with *optimal* o-scaling for the **linx** and **BQP** bounds and no scaling for the factorization bound (which is invariant under o-scaling). We never work with unscaled **linx** and **BQP** bounds, as these bounds are not generally useful; in branch-and-bound approaches (see [Ans20], for example), a good scaling parameter is used on every subproblem.

We optimized scaling vectors Υ using a BFGS algorithm, and o-scaling parameters γ using Newton’s method. In all of our experiments we set **Knitro** parameters³ as follows: **convex** = 1 (true), **gradopt** = 1 (we provided exact gradients), **maxit** = 1000. We set **opttol** = 10^{-10} , aiming to satisfy the KKT optimality conditions to a very tight tolerance. We set **xtol** = 10^{-15} (relative tolerance for lack of progress in the solution point) and **feastol** = 10^{-10} (relative tolerance for the feasibility error), aiming for the best solutions that we could reasonably find, to be sure that we are seeing the best possible that can be achieved. These are not meant to be practical settings for performance, so we do not report running times. In our first set of experiments, we set the the **Knitro** parameter **algorithm** = 3 to use an active-set method. Besides solving the relaxations to get upper bounds for our test instances of **MESP** and **CMESP**, we compute lower bounds with a heuristic of [Lee98, Section 4] and then a local search (see [KLQ95, Section 4]).

In Figure 1, we show the impact of g-scaling on the **linx** bound for **MESP** on the three benchmark covariance matrices. For the $n = 63$ matrix, we also show the impact of g-scaling on the **BQP** and complementary **BQP** bounds (recall that the **linx** bound is invariant under complementation). The **DDFact** and complementary **DDFact** bounds are only considered in the experiments for **CMESP**, as the g-scaling methodology was only able to improve these bounds when side constraints were added to **MESP**. The plots on the left in Figure 1 present the “integrality gap decrease ratios”, given by the difference between the integrality gaps using o-scaling and the integrality gaps using g-scaling, divided by the integrality gaps using o-scaling. The integrality gaps are given by the difference between the upper bounds computed with the relaxations and lower bounds given by heuristic solutions. We see that larger n leads to larger maximum ratios. We also see that the g-scaling methodology is effective in reducing all bounds evaluated, especially the **linx** bound. Even for the most difficult instances, with intermediate values of s , we have some improvement

³ see https://www.artelys.com/docs/knitro/2_userGuide.html, for details

on the bounds, which can be effective in the branch-and-bound context where the bounds would ultimately be applied. The plots on the right in Figure 1 present the integrality gaps, and we see that even when the integrality gaps given by the o-scaling are less than 1, g-scaling can reduce them.

In Figures 2 and 3, we show for CMESP, similar results to the ones shown in Figure 1, except that now we also present the effect of g-scaling on the DDFact and the complementary DDFact bounds. We see from the integrality gap decrease ratios that when side constraints are added to MESP, the g-scaling is, in general, more effective in reducing the gaps given by o-scaling. We also see that, it is particularly effective in reducing the DDFact and complementary DDFact bounds that were not improved by o-scaling. Especially for the $n = 124$ matrix, we see a significant reduction on the gaps given by complementary DDFact and DDFact, for s smaller and greater than 50, respectively.

We also investigated how the improvement of g-scaling over o-scaling for the linx bound can increase the possibility of fixing variables in MESP and CMESP. The methodology for fixing variables is based on convex duality and has been applied since the first convex relaxation was proposed for these problems in [AFLW96]. When a lower bound for each instance is available, the dual solution of the relaxation can potentially be used to fix variables at 0/1 values (see [FL22], for example). This is an important feature in the B&B context. The methodology may be able to fix a number of variables when the relaxation generates a strong bound, and in doing so, it reduces the size of the successive subproblems and improves the bounds computed for them.

In Table 1, for MESP, we consider (unscaled) DDFact and (unscaled) complementary DDFact, and we show the impact of using g-scaled linx, compared to o-scaled linx, on an iterative procedure where we solve linx, DDFact, and complementary DDFact, fixing variables at 0/1 whenever possible. While for CMESP, we show the impact of using g-scaled linx, g-scaled DDFact, and g-scaled complementary DDFact, compared to o-scaled linx, (unscaled) DDFact, and (unscaled) complementary DDFact, on the same iterative procedure where we solve linx, DDFact, and complementary DDFact, fixing variables at 0/1 whenever possible. In both cases, we update the scaling parameters of the scaled bounds at every iteration. For o-scaling, we optimize the scalar γ by applying Newton steps until the absolute value of the derivative is less than 10^{-10} . For g-scaling, we were interested here in getting closer to a practical computational context. So, we optimize the vector \mathcal{T} by applying up to 10 BFGS steps, taking $\gamma\mathbf{e}$ as a starting point. In a practical computational context within B&B, we would have a better starting point (from the parent), and we could then probably get away with 2-3 perhaps BFGS steps.

We present in the columns of Table 1, the following information from left to right: The problem considered, n , the range of s considered, the scaling, the number of instances solved (one for each s considered), the number of instances on which we could fix at least one variable (“inst fix”), the total number of variables fixed on all instances solved (“var fix”), the %-improvement of g-scaling over o-scaling for the two last statistics. Additionally, to better understand




Fig. 1: Comparison between g-scaling and o-scaling for MESP




Fig. 2: Comparison between g-scaling and o-scaling for CMESP




Fig. 3: Comparison between g-scaling and o-scaling for [CMESP](#)

how well our methods works for [MESP](#) as n grows, we also experimented with a covariance matrix of order $n = 300$, which is a principal submatrix of the covariance matrix of order $n = 2000$ used as a benchmark in the literature (see [[LX23](#), [CFL23b](#)]). First, we see that, except for the number of instances of [MESP](#) with $n = 124$ and $n = 300$ on which we could fix variables, there is always an improvement. The improvement becomes very significant when side constraints are considered. We note that the number of variables fixed, reported on [Table 1](#), refers only to the root nodes of the B&B algorithm and indicates a promising approach to reduce the B&B enumeration.

	n	s	scal	Number of			Improvement	
				s	inst fix	var fix	inst fix	var fix
MESP	63	[2,62]	o	61	41	1123		
			g	61	42	1140	2.44%	1.51%
	90	[2,89]	o	88	41	1741		
			g	88	42	1790	2.44%	2.81%
	124	[2,123]	o	122	35	3322		
			g	122	35	3353	0.00%	0.93%
	300	[80,120]	o	41	41	8382		
			g	41	41	10753	0.00%	28.3%
CMESP	63	[3,52]	o	50	22	371		
			g	50	28	537	27.27%	44.74%
	90	[4,87]	o	84	26	606		
			g	84	37	1048	42.31%	72.94%
	124	[11,110]	o	100	9	197		
			g	100	33	1120	266.67%	468.53%

Table 1: Impact of g-scaling on variable fixing

The experiments with the fixing methodology show that g-scaling can effectively lead to a positive impact on the solution of [MESP](#) and [CMESP](#), especially of the latter.

We carried out further experiments to investigate the relevance of our generalized differentiability for [DDFact](#). For these experiments, we only worked with [MESP](#), because we wanted to better expose the non-negativity constraints to the algorithms, and we chose (again) factorizations with k equal to the rank of C , taking advantage of [Remark 3](#). For these experiments, we employed all four of the [Knitro](#) algorithmic options: Interior/Direct, Interior/Conjugate-Gradient(CG), Active Set, Sequential Quadratic Programming (SQP), and chose all of the other [Knitro](#) parameters as described for our first experiments. The first two algorithms have all of their iterates in the interior of $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{T})_+$, while the latter two can have iterates at the boundary of $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{T})_+$. We collected average converging times of the four algorithms in [Table 2](#). In particular, the converging times are averaged over $5 \leq s \leq n - 5$ for the $n = 63, 90, 124$ benchmark covariance matrices and over $s = 20, 40, 60, 80, 100$ for the (full) $n = 2000$ benchmark covariance matrix. To mitigate the impact of some variance in the run time for each instance, we also

n	Interior	Interior(CG)	Active-set	SQP
63	0.09	0.42	0.11	0.18
90	0.19	0.83	0.20	0.29
124	0.40	1.63	0.37	0.44
2000	1292.2	2227.39	96.30	304.60

Table 2: Average converging time of each algorithm for solving **DDFact**.

n	Interior	Interior(CG)	Active-set	SQP
63	46.3	0	55.6	0
90	48.8	0	57.3	1.2
124	48.3	0	44.8	13.8
2000	0	0	100.0	0

Table 3: % of s on which the algorithm converges within no more than 105% converging time of the best algorithm (i.e., optimal under 5% tolerance).

included in Table 3 the percentage of instances s for each n where the convergence time of the algorithm is within 105% of the convergence time of the best-performing algorithm among the four. This criterion implies that the algorithm is considered the best within a tolerance of 5%. Additionally, in Table 4, we gathered the average iterates that lie on the boundary of $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$ for each algorithm to exhibit the relevance of generalized differentiability in Definition 5. We use the rank function of MATLAB to determine the boundary iterates by singularity of $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{Y})$ (equivalently, when x has any zero components; see Remark 3). In particular, MATLAB asserts a matrix to be singular if the matrix has some singular value smaller than the product of the maximum of dimension lengths and the exponential of the matrix 2-norm.

Table 2 exhibits that the active-set algorithm consistently achieves the minimum, or near-minimum, average converging time. Table 3 shows that the active-set algorithm has the greatest winning percentages except for $n = 124$, where the combined winning percentages of the active-set and SQP algorithms still exceed those of the other two algorithms. These outcomes indicate the superiority of algorithms that produce iterates lying on the boundary of $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$, thereby emphasizing the relevance of generalized differentiability in justifying their use. Table 4 reveals that for both the active-set and SQP algorithms, nearly all iterates are on the boundary of $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$. We note that even the interior-point methods display iterates on the boundary of $\text{dom}(f_{\text{DDFact}}; \mathcal{Y})_+$ within the tolerance. These findings underscore the relevance of generalized differentiability across all algorithms.

7 Concluding remarks

We have seen that g-scaling can lead to improvements in upper bounds and variable fixing for **MESP** and very good improvements for **CMESP**. In future work, we will implement this in an efficient manner, within a B&B algorithm. In that context, it is important to efficiently use parent scaling vectors to

n	Interior	Interior(CG)	Active-set	SQP
63	27.6	1.3	97.7	97.2
90	35.5	0.8	98.7	98.6
124	61.1	22.4	93.0	93.6
2000	69.2	29.5	100.0	100.0

Table 4: Average % of iterates with x having any zero components, which is equivalent to the singularity of $F_{\text{DDFact}}(x; \mathcal{T})$.

warm-start the optimization of scaling vectors for children (see [Ans20], where this was an important issue for o-scaling in the context of the `linx` bound). An open question that we wish to highlight is whether g-scaling can help the `DDFact` bound for `MESP`. Theorem 6.iv is a partial result toward a negative answer.

Finally, we remark that there is room to do g-scaling for other bounds for `CMESP`. We did not work with g-scaling for the NLP bound. Besides the fact that we do not have a convexity result for o-scaling of the NLP bound as a starting point for generalizing the theory, the o-scaling parameter is entangled with other parameters of the NLP bound which must be selected properly (even for the NLP bound to be a convex optimization problem). For these reasons, we have left exploration of g-scaling for the NLP bound for future research. Additionally, we did not attempt to merge the ideas of g -scaling with bound “mixing” (see [CFL21]); this looks like another promising area for investigation.

Acknowledgements

We are especially grateful to Kurt Anstreicher for suggesting the possibility of generalizing (ordinary) scaling for the `linx` bound. M. Fampa was supported in part by CNPq grants 305444/2019-0 and 434683/2018-3. J. Lee was supported in part by AFOSR grant FA9550-22-1-0172. This work is partially based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1929284 while the authors were in residence at the Institute for Computational and Experimental Research in Mathematics (ICERM) at Providence, RI, during the Discrete Optimization program.

References

- AFLW96. Kurt M. Anstreicher, Marcia Fampa, Jon Lee, and Joy Williams. Continuous relaxations for constrained maximum-entropy sampling. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization (Vancouver, BC, 1996)*, volume 1084 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 234–248. Springer, Berlin, 1996.
- AFLW99. Kurt M. Anstreicher, Marcia Fampa, Jon Lee, and Joy Williams. Using continuous nonlinear relaxations to solve constrained maximum-entropy sampling problems. *Mathematical Programming, Series A*, 85(2):221–240, 1999.

- AL04. Kurt M. Anstreicher and Jon Lee. A masked spectral bound for maximum-entropy sampling. In *mODa 7—Advances in Model-Oriented Design and Analysis*, Contrib. Statist., pages 1–12. Physica, Heidelberg, 2004.
- Ans18. Kurt M. Anstreicher. Maximum-entropy sampling and the Boolean quadric polytope. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 72(4):603–618, 2018.
- Ans20. Kurt M. Anstreicher. Efficient solution of maximum-entropy sampling problems. *Operations Research*, 68(6):1826–1835, 2020.
- ATL20. Hessa Al-Thani and Jon Lee. An R package for generating covariance matrices for maximum-entropy sampling from precipitation chemistry data. *SN Operations Research Forum*, Volume 1:Article 17 (21 pages), 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43069-020-0011-z>.
- ATL21. Hessa Al-Thani and Jon Lee. Tridiagonal maximum-entropy sampling and tridiagonal masks. *LAGOS 2021 proceedings, Procedia Computer Science*, 195:127–134, 2021.
- ATL23. Hessa Al-Thani and Jon Lee. Tridiagonal maximum-entropy sampling and tridiagonal masks. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 337:120–138, 2023.
- BH90. George Box and Ian Hau. Constrained experimental designs part i: Construction of projection designs, 1990. Technical report, <http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1793/69117>.
- BL07. Samuel Burer and Jon Lee. Solving maximum-entropy sampling problems using factored masks. *Mathematical Programming, Series B*, 109(2–3):263–281, 2007.
- CF95. R.D. Cook and V. Fedorov. Constrained optimization of experimental design (invited with discussion). *Statistics*, 26:129–178, 1995.
- CFL22. Zhongzhu Chen, Marcia Fampa, and Jon Lee. Masking Anstreicher’s linx bound for improved entropy bounds. *Operations Research*, 2022.
- CFL23a. Zhongzhu Chen, Marcia Fampa, and Jon Lee. Generalized scaling for the constrained maximum-entropy sampling problem. In *SIAM Conference on Applied and Computational Discrete Algorithms (ACDA23)*, pages 110–118. SIAM, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611977714.10>.
- CFL23b. Zhongzhu Chen, Marcia Fampa, and Jon Lee. On computing with some convex relaxations for the maximum-entropy sampling problem. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 35(2):368–385, 2023.
- CFL21. Zhongzhu Chen, Marcia Fampa, Amélie Lambert, and Jon Lee. Mixing convex-optimization bounds for maximum-entropy sampling. *Mathematical Programming, Series B*, 188:539–568, 2021.
- DCMT02. Duangporn Jearkpaporn Douglas C. Montgomery, Elvira N. Loredó and Murat Caner Testik. Experimental designs for constrained regions. *Quality Engineering*, 14(4):587–601, 2002.
- Fam96. Marcia Helena Costa Fampa. *Relaxações Contínuas para o Problema da Amostra de Máxima Entropia Restrito e um Algoritmo de Trajetória Central de Passos Longos para Problemas de Programação Semidefinida*. D.Sc., Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, November 1996. <https://www.cos.ufrj.br/uploadfile/1339609553.pdf>.
- FI90. Anthony V. Fiacco and Yo Ishizuka. Sensitivity and stability analysis for nonlinear programming. *Annals of Operations Research*, 27(1):215–235, 1990.
- FL22. Marcia Fampa and Jon Lee. *Maximum-Entropy Sampling: Algorithms and Application*. Springer International Publishing, 2022.
- KLQ95. Chun-Wa Ko, Jon Lee, and Maurice Queyranne. An exact algorithm for maximum-entropy sampling. *Operations Research*, 43(4):684–691, 1995.
- Lee98. Jon Lee. Constrained maximum-entropy sampling. *Operations Research*, 46(5):655–664, 1998.
- LO13. Adrian S. Lewis and Michael L. Overton. Nonsmooth optimization via quasi-Newton methods. *Mathematical Programming*, 141:135–163, 2013.
- LX23. Yongchun Li and Weijun Xie. Best principal submatrix selection for the maximum entropy sampling problem: Scalable algorithms and performance guarantees. *Operations Research*, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2023.2488>.
- Mor66. Jean-Jacques Moreau. Fonctionnelles convexes. *Séminaire Jean Leray*, 2:1–108, 1966.

- Nik15. Aleksandar Nikolov. Randomized rounding for the largest simplex problem. In *Proceedings of the 47th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 861–870, 2015.
- OT18. Daisuke Oyama and Tomoyuki Takenawa. On the (non-)differentiability of the optimal value function when the optimal solution is unique. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 76:21–32, 2018.
- Roc97. R. Tyrrell Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Princeton Mathematical Series. Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Sch11. J. Schur. Bemerkungen zur theorie der beschränkten bilinearformen mit unendlich vielen veränderlichen. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 1911(140):1–28, 1911.
- Sha48. Claude E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3):379–423, 1948.
- SW87. Michael C. Shewry and Henry P. Wynn. Maximum entropy sampling. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 46:165–170, 1987.
- Whi34. Hassler Whitney. Analytic extensions of differentiable functions defined in closed sets. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 36(1):63–89, 1934.
- Wil98. Joy Denise Williams. *Spectral Bounds for Entropy Models*. Ph.D., University of Kentucky, April 1998.
- Zal02. Constantin Zalinescu. *Convex Analysis in General Vector Spaces*. World Scientific, 2002.

Appendix

We give a small numerical example to demonstrate how a g-scaling bound can be better than the optimal o-scaling bound. Consider the (randomly generated) positive-definite matrix

$$C := \begin{pmatrix} 5.69 & -1.34 & -0.93 & -0.61 \\ -1.34 & 3.49 & 1.36 & 0.45 \\ -0.93 & 1.36 & 3.71 & 2.25 \\ -0.61 & 0.45 & 2.25 & 3.13 \end{pmatrix},$$

with $n = 4$. We work with the [linx](#) bound, as it is the easiest for an interested reader to check (using software like `CVX` or `YALMIP`, for example).

We took $s = 2$, and it easy to check that among the $\binom{4}{2} = 6$ feasible solutions, the optimal one is $\hat{x} = (1, 0, 1, 0)^\top$ with optimal value 3.0079. We calculated the optimal o-scaling parameter $\gamma^* = 0.0963$ (which can be verified by perturbation, because of convexity in the scaling parameter), with the corresponding optimal solution $x^* = (1.0000, 0.2423, 0.7577, 0.0000)^\top$. This gives an o-scaled [linx](#) bound of 3.0210 with an integrality gap of 0.0131. On the other hand, employing the g-scaling parameter $\Upsilon^* = (0.1215, 0.3306, 0.3358, 0.2839)^\top$, the (optimal) g-scaled [linx](#) solution is $x^* = (1.0000, 0.1850, 0.7319, 0.0831)^\top$, which results in a bound of 3.0146 and a reduced integrality gap of 0.0067. So, we can see that for this example, g-scaling reduces the gap by about 50%.