

Theoretical smoothing frameworks for general nonsmooth bilevel problems

Jan Harold Alcantara* Akiko Takeda†

February 1, 2024

Abstract

Bilevel programming has recently received a great deal of attention due to its abundant applications in many areas. The optimal value function approach provides a useful reformulation of the bilevel problem, but its utility is often limited due to the nonsmoothness of the value function even in cases when the associated lower-level function is smooth. In this paper, we present two smoothing strategies for the value function associated with lower-level functions that are not necessarily smooth but are Lipschitz continuous. The first method employs quadratic regularization for partially convex lower-level functions, while the second utilizes entropic regularization for general lower-level objective functions. Meanwhile, the property known as gradient consistency is crucial in ensuring that a designed smoothing algorithm is globally subsequentially convergent to stationary points of the value function reformulation. With this motivation, we prove that the proposed smooth approximations satisfy the gradient consistent property under certain conditions on the lower-level function.

Keywords. bilevel optimization; value function; smooth approximation; gradient consistency; quadratic regularization; entropic regularization

1 Introduction

Consider the bilevel optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(x,y) \in X \times Y} & f(x,y) \\ \text{s.t.} & y \in \arg \min_{\bar{y} \in Y} g(x, \bar{y}) \end{aligned} \tag{BP}$$

where $f, g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are Lipschitz continuous but possibly nonsmooth functions, and X, Y are closed and convex subsets of \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^m , respectively. The minimization of $g(x, \cdot)$ over Y is known as the *lower-level problem*, while the minimization of f is called the *upper-level problem*. The bilevel optimization problem (BP) has recently gained significant attention due to its numerous applications, including hyperparameter optimization [Franceschi et al., 2018, Okuno et al., 2021], meta-learning [Franceschi et al., 2018], and Stackelberg games [von Stackelberg, 2010], among

*janharold.alcantara@riken.jp. Center for Advanced Intelligence Project, RIKEN, Tokyo, Japan.

†takeda@mist.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp. Department of Mathematical Informatics, Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan Center for Advanced Intelligence Project, RIKEN, Tokyo, Japan

others. We refer the reader to [Dempe et al., 2015, Dempe and Zemkoho, 2020] and the references therein for more applications of bilevel optimization.

Traditional methods for solving the bilevel problem (BP) involve reformulation or relaxation of (BP) as a one-level problem, thereby permitting the use of solution methods from nonlinear programming [Dempe et al., 2015]. A widely used approach is to replace the lower-level minimization problem by its optimality conditions. This yields an equivalent problem if $g(x, \cdot)$ is convex for each $x \in X$. Among the recent trends that gained considerable attention is the case when f is continuously differentiable, g is a twice continuously differentiable, $g(x, \cdot)$ is strongly convex for all $x \in X$, and $Y = \mathbb{R}^m$. In this case, the lower-level problem of (BP) defines a smooth map $x \mapsto y(x)$ that corresponds to the unique minimizer of $g(x, \cdot)$. In turn, (BP) simplifies to the minimization of a smooth function $f(x, y(x))$ over $x \in X$, which can be handled by typical smooth optimization methods such as the projected gradient descent algorithm. Indeed, this framework has been the basis of some recent works in the literature [Ghadimi and Wang, 2018, Ji et al., 2021, Pedregosa, 2016], but the main drawback is that this approach is heavily dependent on the smoothness of f and g , as well as the strong convexity of $g(x, \cdot)$. In many applications, such smoothness requirements are not met [Okuno et al., 2021]. Moreover, we note that when $g(x, \cdot)$ is nonconvex, a local optimal solution of (BP) may not even correspond to a stationary point of its reformulation via optimality conditions of the lower-level problem [Mirrlees, 1999].

An alternative stream of research, which is the direction pursued in this paper, employs the value function reformulation approach. The *value function* associated with the lower-level problem of (BP) is defined as

$$v(x) := \min_{y \in Y} g(x, y). \quad (1.1)$$

With this, the bilevel problem (BP) is equivalent to the nonlinear programming problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(x,y) \in X \times Y} & f(x, y) \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, y) - v(x) \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{VFP})$$

which was first proposed by Outrata [1990]. Note that the reformulation (VFP) is independent of any smoothness and convexity assumptions on g , so that this framework is theoretically applicable to any bilevel optimization problem. However, one difficulty that comes with this flexible reformulation is determining under what conditions local solutions of (VFP) correspond to its stationary points. In nonlinear programming, these conditions pertain to constraint qualifications (CQs), and unfortunately, usual CQs such as the Mangasarian-Fromovitz constraint qualification (MFCQ) are violated by feasible points of (VFP) [Ye and Daoli, 1995]. One promising alternative is to consider an approximate bilevel program

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(x,y) \in X \times Y} & f(x, y) \\ \text{s.t.} & g(x, y) - v(x) \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{VFP}_\epsilon)$$

where $\epsilon > 0$. The above perturbed problem is a reasonable approximation of (VFP) as its local and global solutions are arbitrarily close to the solution set of (VFP) [Lin et al., 2014, Ye et al., 2023]. Moreover, unlike (VFP), (nonsmooth) MFCQ is automatically satisfied by feasible points of (VFP_ϵ) , which is a sufficient constraint qualification for local solutions of (VFP_ϵ) to be stationary [Lampariello and Sagratella, 2020, Lin et al., 2014, Ye et al., 2023].

While the approximate bilevel problem (VFP_ϵ) addresses the CQ issue, another hurdle is the need for an algorithmic framework that is capable of obtaining stationary points. Solution methods for solving nonlinear programming problems often hinge on the assumption that both the objective and constraint functions involved are smooth. Unfortunately, the value function reformulation

(VFP) of the bilevel problem introduces a challenge, since the value function v defined by (1.1), in general, is nonsmooth even when g is a smooth function (see Theorem 2.1). In the absence of smoothness, a popular adopted strategy involves employing smooth approximations, which have been extensively utilized in many nonsmooth optimization problems, complementarity problems and variational inequalities; see Chen [2012] and the references therein. As a consequence, it is natural to expect that smooth approximations for the functions f and g in the bilevel problem (BP) may be readily available, since these often correspond to loss functions with a nonsmooth regularizer in many applications; for instance, see Chen [2012]. However, as previously mentioned, the smoothness of g is in general not adequate to ensure the smoothness of v . Consequently, employing traditional methods for the nonlinear programming reformulation (VFP) or (VFP $_{\epsilon}$) necessitates smoothing techniques for the value function. Unfortunately, to date, smooth approximations of the value functions have not been thoroughly investigated yet in the literature. One work that pursued this direction in the context of bilevel optimization is studied by Lin et al. [2014]. The authors adopted the entropic regularization approach originally formulated in [Fang and Wu, 1996], which yields an approximation (in the sense of Definition 2.5) that is valid for a smooth function g and a compact set Y . *Gradient consistency* (see Definition 2.6) of the proposed smoothing family is also proved, which is an essential property to guarantee convergence to stationary points. Apart from this work, there has been no other existing works on smoothing methods for bilevel problems, to the best of our knowledge.

In this paper, we present theoretical frameworks of smoothing strategies for solving the bilevel problem that do not require smoothness assumptions on g . In particular, we focus on the value function reformulation, and propose smooth approximations of the value function for Lipschitz continuous functions g . We propose two different techniques: First, we present a simple quadratic regularization approach for nonsmooth lower-level function g that is convex in y . The other technique is a more general approach that has no partial convexity requirement on g . More specifically, we extend the framework of Fang and Wu [1996], Lin et al. [2014] to obtain a smooth approximation of the value function for a nonsmooth function g and a compact set Y . In addition, we also present a possible extension to unbounded closed sets Y . Meanwhile, as mentioned above, gradient consistency is a very important property to guarantee that a smoothing algorithm is globally (subsequentially) convergent to stationary points (see Proposition 2.13). Motivated by this, we prove that under certain conditions on g , all the proposed smooth approximations possess gradient consistency. Instrumental to this goal are Danskin-type theorems for arbitrary closed sets Y , which are also derived in this paper.

2 Mathematical Preliminaries

Throughout the paper, $B_{\delta}(x)$ denotes an open ball centered at x with radius $\delta > 0$. The *interior*, *closure* and *convex hull* of a set X are denoted by $\text{int}(X)$, $\text{cl}(X)$ and $\text{co}(X)$, respectively. The *projection* onto X and the *distance function* on X are given respectively by

$$\Pi_X(z) := \arg \min\{\|x - z\| : x \in X\}$$

and

$$\text{dist}(z, X) := \min\{\|x - z\| : x \in X\}.$$

We will always use O_X and O_Y to denote an open set containing the closed sets X and Y , respectively. For a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$, we define

$$\pi_x(S) := \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^n : \exists y' \in \mathbb{R}^m \text{ s.t. } (x', y') \in S\}. \quad (2.1)$$

2.1 Nonsmooth and variational analysis

We recall some important concepts and results from nonsmooth and variational analysis. Most of these materials can be found in [Clarke, 1983, Chapter 2] and Rockafellar and Wets [1998].

Let ϕ be a Lipschitz continuous function on an open set $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. The *Clarke generalized directional derivative* of ϕ at $\bar{x} \in O$ in the direction d , denoted by $\phi^\circ(\bar{x}; d)$, is defined as

$$\phi^\circ(\bar{x}; d) = \limsup_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}, t \searrow 0} \frac{\phi(x + td) - \phi(x)}{t},$$

and the (usual) *directional derivative* of ϕ at \bar{x} in the direction d is

$$\phi'(\bar{x}; d) = \lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{\phi(\bar{x} + td) - \phi(\bar{x})}{t}.$$

We say that ϕ is at \bar{x} *Clarke regular* if for all $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\phi'(\bar{x}; d)$ exists and $\phi'(\bar{x}; d) = \phi^\circ(\bar{x}; d)$. For instance, if ϕ is differentiable at \bar{x} or if ϕ is convex, then it is Clarke regular at \bar{x} .

The *Clarke generalized gradient* of ϕ at \bar{x} , denoted by $\partial\phi(\bar{x})$, is given by

$$\partial\phi(\bar{x}) := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : \phi^\circ(\bar{x}; d) \geq \langle \xi, d \rangle \forall d \in \mathbb{R}^n\},$$

which is a compact and convex set. When ϕ is convex, this coincides with the subdifferential in the sense of convex analysis:

$$\partial^c\phi(\bar{x}) := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : \phi(x) \geq \phi(\bar{x}) + \langle \xi, x - \bar{x} \rangle \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

The Clarke generalized directional derivative $\phi^\circ(\bar{x}; \cdot)$ can be expressed as the support function of $\partial\phi(\bar{x})$, that is,

$$\phi^\circ(\bar{x}; d) = \sigma_{\partial\phi(\bar{x})}(d) := \max\{\langle d, \xi \rangle : \xi \in \partial\phi(\bar{x})\}, \quad (2.2)$$

and so when ϕ is convex, $\phi'(\bar{x}; d) = \sigma_{\partial^c\phi(\bar{x})}(d)$.

As a set-valued mapping, $\partial\phi(\cdot)$ is upper semicontinuous at any $\bar{x} \in O$. That is, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\partial\phi(x) \subseteq \partial\phi(\bar{x}) + \varepsilon B_1(0) \quad \forall x \in B_\delta(\bar{x}).$$

By a standard argument using Heine-Borel theorem and noting the boundedness of $\partial\phi(x)$ for any $x \in O$, note that $\bigcup_{x \in \Omega} \partial\phi(x)$ is a bounded set for any compact subset Ω of O .

For the Clarke subdifferential of the value function, we have the following celebrated result due to Danskin (see Danskin [1967] and [Clarke et al., 1998, Ex. 9.13]).

Theorem 2.1 (Danskin's Theorem). *Let $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given, where Y is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^m . Suppose that for a neighborhood Ω of $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the derivative $\nabla_x g(x, y)$ exists and is continuous (jointly) as a function of $(x, y) \in \Omega \times Y$. Then, the value function v given by (1.1) is Lipschitz and Clarke regular near \bar{x} , and*

$$\partial v(\bar{x}) = \text{co}\{\nabla_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) : \bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})\},$$

where $S : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows Y$ is given by

$$S(x) := \arg \min_{y \in Y} g(x, y).$$

An extension of the above result to the nonsmooth case was also provided in Bertsekas [1971] under additional structural assumption on g .

Theorem 2.2 (Extended Danskin's Theorem). *Let $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given, where Y is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^m . Suppose that for a neighborhood Ω of $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, g is continuous on $\Omega \times Y$, and for every $y \in Y$, the function $g(\cdot, y)$ is a concave function on \mathbb{R}^n . Then v given by (1.1) is concave on \mathbb{R}^n and*

$$\partial v(\bar{x}) = P(\bar{x}) := \text{co}\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : \xi \in \partial_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \text{ and } \bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. The original result is stated for the maximum value function. Denoting $V(x) := \max_{y \in Y} (-g(x, y))$, which is a convex function, we have from [Bertsekas, 1971, Proposition A.22] that

$$\partial^c V(\bar{x}) = \text{co}\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : \xi \in \partial_x^c (-g(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \text{ and } \bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})\}.$$

Noting that $\partial v = \partial(-V) = -\partial V = -\partial^c V$, we get the desired result. \square

In Theorem 3.8, we further extend the above theorem to non-compact sets Y under the assumption that g is a uniform level-bounded function, in the sense defined below; see Rockafellar and Wets [1998].

Definition 2.3. *A function $h : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ with values $h(y, z)$ is level-bounded in y locally uniform in z if for each $z' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists an open ball B around z' such that $\{(y, z) : z \in B, h(y, z) \leq M\}$ is bounded. We also say that h is a uniformly level-bounded function.*

We recall the following important result on uniform level-bounded functions; see [Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Theorem 1.17].

Theorem 2.4. *Let $h : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a proper lower-semicontinuous function that is level-bounded in $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ locally uniform in $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Define for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the functions*

$$v(z) := \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} h(y, z) \quad \text{and} \quad S(z) := \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} h(y, z)$$

and let $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

- (a) *If there exists $\bar{y} \in S(\bar{z})$ such that $h(\bar{y}, \cdot)$ is continuous on a set U containing \bar{z} , then v is continuous on U ; and*
- (b) *If v is continuous on a set U containing \bar{z} , $\{z^k\} \subseteq U$ such that $z^k \rightarrow \bar{z}$ and $\{y^k\}$ is a sequence such that $y^k \in S(z^k)$ for all k , then $\{y^k\}$ is bounded and its accumulation points lie on $S(\bar{z})$.*

2.2 Smooth approximations

We formally recall some concepts related to smooth approximations. The definitions herein are adopted from Chen et al. [2011].

Definition 2.5. *Let $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set. We say that $\{\phi_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smooth approximations for a continuous function $\phi : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ over the set O if $\phi_\mu : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable and if for all $\bar{z} \in O$, we have $\lim_{z \rightarrow \bar{z}, \mu \rightarrow 0} \phi_\mu(z) = \phi(\bar{z})$.*

With the availability of a smooth approximation, a traditional smoothing method is as follows: Given a nonsmooth optimization problem (P) involving a nonsmooth function g , we consider a smooth approximate problem (P_μ) obtained by replacing g with g_μ . This is a convenient approach as there are many powerful algorithms for dealing with smooth optimization problems, which may then be used for solving (P_μ) .

Intuitively, we expect that a sequence of solutions (or stationary points) of (P_μ) with μ decreasing to zero will converge to a solution (or stationary point) of the original problem (P). Theoretically, this is achieved through the notion of gradient consistency defined as follows. Note that this property is very important in characterizing stationary points of any smoothing method.

Definition 2.6. Let $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set and $\{g_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ be a family of smoothing functions for a continuous function $g : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ over the set O . This family is said to satisfy the gradient consistent property at $\bar{z} \in O$ if

$$\emptyset \neq \limsup_{z \rightarrow \bar{z}, \mu \searrow 0} \nabla g_\mu(z) \subseteq \partial g(\bar{z}),$$

where

$$\limsup_{z \rightarrow \bar{z}, \mu \searrow 0} \nabla g_\mu(z) := \left\{ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists \{z^k\}, \exists \{\mu_k\} \text{ such that } z^k \rightarrow \bar{z}, \mu_k \searrow 0 \text{ and } \nabla g_{\mu_k}(z^k) \rightarrow \xi \right\}.$$

We now provide some examples of smooth approximations that satisfy gradient consistency. We also highlight the uniform convergence of these smoothing families, to illustrate the satisfiability of the hypotheses of some results in Sections 3 and 4.

Example 2.7. Chen and Mangasarian [1995] proposed a smooth approximation of the plus function $\phi(z) = z_+ = \max\{z, 0\}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}$, using symmetric density functions ρ with $\kappa := \int_{\mathbb{R}} |s| \rho(s) ds < +\infty$. In particular, they defined

$$\phi_\mu(z) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - \mu s)_+ \rho(s) ds,$$

which satisfies the inequality $0 \leq \phi_\mu(z) - \phi(z) \leq \kappa \mu$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$. With this, it is straightforward to see that $\{\phi_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smooth approximations of ϕ in the sense of Definition 2.5, and in addition, $\phi_\mu \rightarrow \phi$ uniformly on \mathbb{R} . Moreover, it also holds that

$$\limsup_{z \rightarrow \bar{z}, \mu \searrow 0} \phi'_\mu(z) \begin{cases} = \text{sgn}(\bar{z}) & \text{if } \bar{z} \neq 0 \\ \subseteq [0, 1] & \text{if } \bar{z} = 0 \end{cases},$$

and thus gradient consistency is satisfied. This smoothing is particularly useful since many other loss functions and structure-promoting regularizers are expressible in terms of the plus function (see Alcantara et al. [2021], Chen [2012]).

Example 2.8. The Moreau envelope of a closed proper function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is given by

$$e_\mu \phi(z) := \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} \phi(u) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|z - u\|^2.$$

When ϕ is a convex function, $e_\mu \phi$ is (μ^{-1}) -smooth with $\nabla e_\mu \phi(z) = \frac{1}{\mu}(z - p_\mu(z))$ where $p_\mu(z) := \arg \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} \phi(u) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|z - u\|^2$ [Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Theorem 2.26(b)]. Moreover, for any open subset $\Omega \subseteq \text{int}(\text{dom}(\phi))$, we have $0 \leq \phi(z) - e_\mu \phi(z) \leq \frac{L_{\phi, \Omega}^2}{2} \mu$ for all $z \in \Omega$, where $L_{\phi, \Omega}$ is the Lipschitz constant of ϕ on Ω (see [Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Example 9.14] and [Beck, 2017,

Theorem 10.51]). Hence, $\{e_\mu\phi : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smooth approximations of ϕ , and we also note that $e_\mu\phi$ converges to ϕ uniformly on Ω . Using [Liu et al., 2019, Lemma 1] and noting that $\nabla e_\mu\phi(z) \in \partial\phi(p_\mu(z))$ and $\partial\phi$ is upper semicontinuous, it is not difficult to check that the gradient consistent property is satisfied.

Example 2.9. Let $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function (that is, convex in (x, y)) and level-bounded in y locally uniform in x . Then the value function v given by (1.1) is convex [Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Theorem 10.13] and by Example 2.8, $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ where

$$v_\mu(x) := e_\mu(v(x)) = \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \min_{y \in Y} g(z, y) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|z - x\|^2$$

is a family of smooth approximations of the value function satisfying gradient consistency.

Example 2.10. Let $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that $g(\cdot, y)$ is a concave function for all $y \in Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$. Then $-v$ is a convex function and we may consider

$$v_\mu(x) := -e_\mu(-v(x)) = \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \min_{y \in Y} g(z, y) - \frac{1}{2\mu} \|z - x\|^2$$

as a family of smooth approximations of the value function satisfying gradient consistency.

Aside from the restrictive structural assumptions on g , another main drawback of the smoothing functions in the preceding two examples is that function and gradient evaluations at a single point would require solving a min-min or max-min optimization problems.

2.3 Necessary Optimality Conditions

We recall the definition of stationary point for the value function reformulation (VFP $_\epsilon$) with $\epsilon \geq 0$.

Definition 2.11 (Stationary point[Ye et al., 2023, Definition 4]). *Let (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) be a feasible point of (VFP $_\epsilon$) with $\epsilon \geq 0$. We say that (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) is a stationary point of (VFP $_\epsilon$) if there exists $\lambda \geq 0$ such that*

$$\begin{cases} 0 \in \partial f(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + \lambda \partial g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) - \lambda \partial v(\bar{x}) \times \{0\} + N_{X \times Y}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \\ \lambda(g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) - v(\bar{x}) - \epsilon) = 0 \end{cases}$$

The following result indicates that local minima of (VFP $_\epsilon$) are stationary points in the sense of Definition 2.11. Note that since the nonsmooth MFCQ automatically holds when $\epsilon > 0$ (see [Ye et al., 2023, Proposition 8]), the theorem below does not require any CQs, which are typically essential in proving necessary optimality conditions. As mentioned above, lack of a CQ for $\epsilon = 0$ is the main hurdle when directly dealing with the reformulation (VFP). Nevertheless, an analogous result as below can be obtained by imposing so-called ‘‘partial calmness condition’’. Since this is not the main focus of the present manuscript, we refer the reader to Ye and Daoli [1995], Ye et al. [2023] for further discussions.

Theorem 2.12 ([Ye et al., 2023, Theorem 4]). *If (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) is a local optimal solution to (VFP $_\epsilon$) with $\epsilon > 0$, then (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) is a stationary point of (VFP $_\epsilon$).*

We now highlight the importance of gradient consistency when employing smoothing techniques.

Proposition 2.13. *Let $\epsilon > 0$. For each $\mu > 0$, consider the smooth problem*

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(x,y) \in X \times Y} \quad & f_\mu(x, y) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & g_\mu(x, y) - v_\mu(x) \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{VFP}_\epsilon^\mu$$

where $\{f_\mu : \mu > 0\}$, $\{g_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ and $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ are families of smooth approximations of f , g and v , respectively, that all satisfy the gradient consistent property. Let $\{\mu_k\}$ be a sequence of positive numbers with $\mu_k \searrow 0$, and let (x^k, y^k) be a stationary point of $(\text{VFP}_\epsilon^\mu)$ with $\mu = \mu_k$, and denote by λ_k the corresponding Lagrange multiplier. If $\{(x^k, y^k, \lambda_k)\}$ is bounded, then its accumulation points are stationary points of (VFP_ϵ) .

Proof. From the KKT conditions of $(\text{VFP}_\epsilon^\mu)$ with $\mu = \mu_k$, we have that (x^k, y^k) belongs to $X \times Y$ and satisfies the conditions

$$\begin{cases} 0 \in \nabla f_{\mu_k}(x^k, y^k) + \lambda_k \nabla g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y^k) - \lambda_k \nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) \times \{0\} + N_{X \times Y}(x^k, y^k), \\ \lambda_k \geq 0, \quad g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y^k) - v_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \epsilon \leq 0, \quad \lambda_k (g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y^k) - v_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \epsilon) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

for all k . We immediately get the desired result by noting the closedness of $X \times Y$, invoking gradient consistency, and letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ in (2.4), taking subsequences if necessary. \square

Motivated by the above proposition, we propose smoothing techniques for the value function that satisfy gradient consistency.

3 Quadratic Regularization

In this section, we consider the case when $g(x, \cdot)$ is a convex function for each $x \in O_X$, which will be our standing assumption. We also assume that we have a family $\{g_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ of smooth approximations of g . In this case, note that $\{\tilde{g}_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ where

$$\tilde{g}_\mu(x, y) := g_\mu(x, y) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|y\|^2, \tag{3.1}$$

is likewise a family of smoothing functions for g .

3.1 Smooth approximation of the value function

Intuitively, we see that we may approximate the value function v by replacing the corresponding objective function g by its smooth approximation \tilde{g}_μ (or g_μ). Here, we consider the functions $v_\mu : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $S_\mu : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$ given by

$$v_\mu(x) := \min_{y \in Y} \tilde{g}_\mu(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad S_\mu(x) := \arg \min_{y \in Y} \tilde{g}_\mu(x, y) \tag{3.2}$$

where \tilde{g}_μ is given by (3.1). In the following discussion, we show that $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is indeed a family of smoothing functions for v .

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that for any open set Ω with $\text{cl}(\Omega) \subseteq O_X$, $g_\mu(x, y)$ is uniformly bounded below over $\text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y$ for any $\mu > 0$. If $g_\mu(x, \cdot)$ is convex for any $x \in O_X$ and $\mu > 0$, then S_μ given in (3.2) is a (single-valued) continuous function on O_X for any $\mu > 0$.*

Proof. Note that S_μ is single-valued on O_X by the strong convexity of $\tilde{g}_\mu(x, \cdot)$ and the convexity of Y . To show continuity of S_μ on O_X , let $\bar{x} \in O_X$ and $\Omega \subseteq O_X$ be a neighborhood of \bar{x} with closure in O_X . Given $\mu > 0$, define $h_\mu : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ by

$$h_\mu(y; x) := \tilde{g}_\mu(x, y) + \delta_{\text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y}(x, y) = g_\mu(x, y) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|y\|^2 + \delta_{\text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y}(x, y). \quad (3.3)$$

Observe that

$$v_\mu(x) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} h_\mu(y; x) \quad \text{and} \quad S_\mu(x) = \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} h_\mu(y; x) \quad (3.4)$$

for any $x \in \text{cl}(\Omega)$. Now, consider the level set $L_\mu(x; M) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : h_\mu(y; x) \leq M\}$ where M is any real number. Since $g_\mu(x, y) \geq m$ for all $(x, y) \in \text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y$ for some constant m , it is not difficult to see that $L_\mu(x, M) \subseteq B_\delta(0)$ for any $x \in \text{cl}(\Omega)$, where $\delta := \max\{2(M - m)/\mu, 0\}$. It follows that h_μ is level-bounded in y locally uniform in x , which permits the use of Theorem 2.4. In particular, noting that $S_\mu(\bar{x}) \neq \emptyset$, h_μ is a continuous function on its closed domain, and using (3.4), we see from Theorem 2.4(a) that v_μ is continuous at \bar{x} . Consequently, given any sequence $\{x^k\} \subseteq \Omega$ such that $x^k \rightarrow \bar{x}$, the sequence $\{S_\mu(x^k)\}$ is bounded and any accumulation point belongs to $S_\mu(\bar{x})$ by Theorem 2.4(b). Since $S_\mu(\bar{x})$ is a singleton, it follows that $S_\mu(x^k) \rightarrow S_\mu(\bar{x})$. Hence, S_μ is continuous at \bar{x} , as desired. \square

Remark 3.2. We make some comments about the uniform boundedness assumption in Lemma 3.1.

1. If Y is compact, this assumption automatically holds by the continuity of g_μ .
2. Note that the uniform boundedness assumption holds for a wide class of bilevel problems with unbounded Y . For instance, consider the class of hyperparameter problems in Alcantara et al. [2021], where the lower-level function takes the form

$$g(x, y) = \ell(y) + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i p_i(y), \quad (3.5)$$

where ℓ corresponds to a nonnegative loss function, x is a hyperparameter, and p_i are (possibly nonsmooth) regularizers which are nonnegative. The function g along with the family of smoothing functions derived in Alcantara et al. [2021] are uniformly bounded below by 0 over $\mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$. Hence, uniform boundedness holds when $Y = \mathbb{R}^m$ and $X = [\varepsilon_1, \infty) \times \cdots \times [\varepsilon_n, \infty)$, where $\varepsilon_i > 0$ for all i .

Remark 3.3. If $g(x, \cdot)$ is convex for each $x \in O_X$, then its Moreau envelope $e_\mu g(x, y)$ is convex in y for any $x \in O_X$, which satisfies the convexity requirement of the smoothing function g_μ in Lemma 3.1.

We mention that the differentiability of the value function associated with a quadratically regularized *smooth function* of (x, y) that is convex in y has already been noted in other works; for instance, see Liu et al. [2023]. Since this is precisely the structure of the function \tilde{g}_μ (i.e., it is the sum of g_μ , a smooth function convex in y , and the quadratic term $\mu\|y\|^2/2$), then v_μ given in (3.2) must be smooth. For the sake of completeness, we present a simple proof of this result in the following proposition. Moreover, we emphasize as well that in this paper, we prove that the obtained function v_μ is a smooth approximation of v in the sense of Definition 2.5, which has not been shown in the literature yet. Even more importantly, we establish the gradient consistency of this smoothing family, which is instrumental in developing smoothing algorithms that converge to stationary points of the bilevel problem (see Proposition 2.13).

Proposition 3.4. *Under the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1, v_μ is continuously differentiable on O_X with $\nabla v_\mu(x) = \nabla_x g_\mu(x, S_\mu(x))$.*

Proof. Fix $\bar{x} \in O_X$ and let $\bar{y} := S_\mu(\bar{x})$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we have from Lemma 3.1 that there exists sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ such that $B_\delta(\bar{x}) \subseteq O_X$ and for any $x \in B_\delta(\bar{x})$, $S_\mu(x) \in B_\varepsilon(\bar{y})$. Let $\hat{Y} := \text{cl}(B_\varepsilon(\bar{y})) \cap Y$. Moreover, define $\hat{v}_\mu : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\hat{S}_\mu : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ as

$$\hat{v}_\mu(x) := \min_{y \in \hat{Y}} \tilde{g}_\mu(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{S}_\mu(x) := \arg \min_{y \in \hat{Y}} \tilde{g}_\mu(x, y).$$

Observe that $v_\mu(x) \leq \hat{v}_\mu(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and \hat{S}_μ is single-valued on O_X . Moreover, we have from Theorem 2.1, Lemma 3.1 and [Clarke, 1983, Proposition 2.1.5(d)] that \hat{v}_μ is continuously differentiable on O_X with $\nabla \hat{v}_\mu(x) = \nabla_x g_\mu(x, \hat{S}_\mu(x))$ for all $x \in O_X$. In particular, these properties of \hat{S}_μ and \hat{v}_μ hold on the open subset $B_\delta(\bar{x})$. Meanwhile, by choice of δ , it follows that for any $x \in B_\delta(\bar{x})$, we have $S_\mu(x) \in B_\varepsilon(\bar{y}) \cap Y \subseteq \hat{Y}$. Hence, $\tilde{g}_\mu(x, \hat{S}_\mu(x)) \leq \tilde{g}_\mu(x, S_\mu(x))$; that is, $\hat{v}_\mu(x) \leq v_\mu(x)$ for all $x \in B_\delta(\bar{x})$. Consequently, noting the strong convexity of \tilde{g}_μ and the convexity of \hat{Y} , we have $v_\mu \equiv \hat{v}_\mu$ and $S_\mu \equiv \hat{S}_\mu$ on the open set $B_\delta(\bar{x})$. Hence, v_μ is also continuously differentiable on $B_\delta(\bar{x})$ with $\nabla v_\mu(x) = \nabla_x g_\mu(x, \hat{S}_\mu(x)) = \nabla_x g_\mu(x, S_\mu(x))$. This completes the proof. \square

When \tilde{g}_μ has a Lipschitz continuous gradient, the following proposition shows that S_μ is Lipschitz continuous and v_μ has Lipschitz continuous gradient over O_X .

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose that in addition to the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1, \tilde{g}_μ is L_μ -smooth. Then, S_μ is (L_μ/μ) -Lipschitz continuous and ∇v_μ is $(L_\mu\sqrt{1 + L_\mu^2/\mu^2})$ -Lipschitz continuous on O_X .*

Proof. Since $\tilde{g}_\mu(x, \cdot)$ is μ -strongly convex over Y , then $\nabla_y \tilde{g}_\mu(x, \cdot) + N_Y(\cdot)$ is μ -strongly monotone over Y , where N_Y denotes the normal cone to Y [Beck, 2017, Theorem 5.24]. That is, for all $x \in O_X$,

$$\langle \nabla_y \tilde{g}_\mu(x, y) + \eta_y - \nabla_y \tilde{g}_\mu(x, \bar{y}) - \eta_{\bar{y}}, y - \bar{y} \rangle \geq \mu \|y - \bar{y}\|^2, \quad (3.6)$$

for any $y, \bar{y} \in Y$, $\eta_y \in N_Y(y)$, and $\eta_{\bar{y}} \in N_Y(\bar{y})$. Set $\bar{y} = S_\mu(x)$ and choose $\eta_{\bar{y}} \in N_Y(\bar{y})$ so that $\nabla_y \tilde{g}_\mu(x, \bar{y}) + \eta_{\bar{y}} = 0$. With these choices, we have from (3.6) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$\|\nabla_y \tilde{g}_\mu(x, y) + \eta_y\| \geq \mu \|y - S_\mu(x)\| \quad \forall (x, y) \in O_X \times Y, \quad \forall \eta_y \in N_Y(y). \quad (3.7)$$

Now let $x_i \in O_X$ and set $y_i := S_\mu(x_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Choose $\eta_{y_2} \in N_Y(y_2)$ such that $\nabla_y \tilde{g}_\mu(x_2, y_2) + \eta_{y_2} = 0$. We have from (3.7) that

$$\|\nabla_y \tilde{g}_\mu(x_1, y_2) + \eta_{y_2}\| \geq \mu \|y_2 - S_\mu(x_1)\| = \mu \|S_\mu(x_2) - S_\mu(x_1)\|.$$

Meanwhile, since $\eta_{y_2} = -\nabla_y \tilde{g}_\mu(x_2, y_2)$ and $\nabla \tilde{g}_\mu$ is L_μ -Lipschitz continuous, we have

$$\|\nabla_y \tilde{g}_\mu(x_1, y_2) + \eta_{y_2}\| = \|\nabla_y \tilde{g}_\mu(x_1, y_1) - \nabla_y \tilde{g}_\mu(x_2, y_1)\| \leq L_\mu \|x_1 - x_2\|.$$

Combining the preceding two inequalities, we see that S_μ is (L_μ/μ) -Lipschitz continuous. The claim about ∇v_μ is immediate by using the formula given in Proposition 3.4. \square

Note that under a simple assumption that g_μ is uniformly lower-bounded, we were able to conclude that h_μ given by (3.3) is level bounded in y locally uniform in x for a fixed μ . With this, we obtained the continuous differentiability of v_μ in Proposition 3.4. On the other hand, our technique for proving that v_μ is a smoothing function for v requires that $h_\mu(y; x)$ is level bounded in y locally uniform jointly in (x, μ) , as shown in the following result.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that in addition to the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1, $g_\mu \rightarrow g$ uniformly on $\text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y$ and $g_\mu(x, y)$ is continuous as a function of $(x, y, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$. If g is level-bounded in y locally uniform in x , then $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smoothing functions over O_X for the value function v .*

Proof. Since v_μ is continuously differentiable on O_X by Proposition 3.4, it is enough to show that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}, \mu \rightarrow 0} v_\mu(x) = v(\bar{x})$ for any $\bar{x} \in O_X$. To this end, define $h : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ as

$$h(y; x, \mu) := h_{|\mu|}(y; x) = \begin{cases} g_{|\mu|}(x, y) + \frac{|\mu|}{2} \|y\|^2 + \delta_{\text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y}(x, y) & \text{if } \mu \neq 0 \\ g(x, y) + \delta_{\text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y}(x, y) & \text{if } \mu = 0 \end{cases}, \quad (3.8)$$

where Ω is an open set containing \bar{x} with $\text{cl}(\Omega) \subseteq O_X$. For all $(x, \mu) \in \text{cl}(O_X) \times \mathbb{R}$, define

$$v_\mu(x) := \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} h(y; x, \mu) \quad \text{and} \quad S_\mu(x) := \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} h(y; x, \mu), \quad (3.9)$$

which agree on the set $\text{cl}(\Omega)$ with the definitions of v_μ and S_μ given in (3.2) when $\mu > 0$. We now claim that $v_\mu(x)$ viewed as a function of $(x, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ is continuous on a neighborhood of $(\bar{x}, 0)$. To this end, Theorem 2.4 asserts that it is enough to show that (i) h given by (3.8) is a proper lower semicontinuous function; (ii) h is level-bounded in y locally uniform in (x, μ) ; and (iii) there exists $\bar{y} \in S_0(\bar{x}) = S(\bar{x})$ such that $h(\bar{y}; x, \mu)$ is a continuous function of (x, μ) in some neighborhood of $(\bar{x}, 0)$.

To prove (i), we use our hypothesis that $g_\mu(x, y)$ is continuous as a function of (x, y, μ) on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ to conclude that h is lower semicontinuous at any (y, x, μ) with $\mu \neq 0$. On the other hand, since g_μ is a smoothing function of g , it follows from Definition 2.5 that h is also lower semicontinuous at any point $(y, x, 0)$ with $(y, x) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$. In fact, we have that h is continuous on the set $Y \times \text{cl}(O_X) \times \mathbb{R}$. From this, we also obtain claim (iii) by noting that $S_0(\bar{x}) = S(\bar{x}) \neq \emptyset$ due to our uniform level-boundedness assumption on g . It remains to show that (ii) holds. We need to show that given any $M \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $L(M; \delta) := \{(y, x, \mu) : x \in B_\delta(\bar{x}), |\mu| < \delta, h(y; x, \mu) \leq M\}$ is bounded. By the uniform convergence hypothesis, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that $g_\mu(x, y) > g(x, y) - 1$ for all $(x, y) \in \text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y$ and $\mu \in (0, \delta_1)$. Then $h(y; x, \mu) \geq g(x, y) - 1$ for all $(x, y, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times (-\delta_1, \delta_1)$. Since g is level bounded in y locally uniform in x , there exists $\delta_2 > 0$ such that $\{(y, x) : x \in B_{\delta_2}(\bar{x}), g(x, y) \leq M+1\}$ is bounded. Choosing $\delta := \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$, the resulting set $L(M; \delta)$ is in turn bounded, and therefore h is level bounded in y locally uniform in (x, μ) . Hence, we have completed the proof that $v_\mu(x)$ is continuous at $(\bar{x}, 0)$ for any $\bar{x} \in O_X$. Consequently, by definition of continuity,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}, \mu \rightarrow 0} v_\mu(x) = v_0(\bar{x}) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} h(y; \bar{x}, 0) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} g(\bar{x}, y) + \delta_Y(y) = \min_{y \in Y} g(\bar{x}, y) = v(\bar{x}),$$

showing that v_μ is indeed a smoothing function for V . □

3.2 Danskin-type theorems and gradient consistency

We have shown above that regularized smoothing approximations $\{\tilde{g}_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ of g lead to smoothing functions $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ for the value function v . Unfortunately, the gradient consistent property is not necessarily inherited by the approximations for v ; that is, $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ does not necessarily possess gradient consistent property when $\{\tilde{g}_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ has this property. Fortunately, we can obtain gradient consistency for several classes of functions g .

Danskin-type theorems

To prove gradient consistency of $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$, it is important to determine what exactly the elements of the Clarke subdifferential¹ of v are. For compact sets Y , the subdifferential ∂v is characterized by Danskin's Theorem (Theorem 2.1) for smooth functions g , and its extension Theorem 2.2 for a nonsmooth g that is concave in x . We now establish extensions of these results for non-compact sets Y by assuming uniform level-boundedness of g .

We start with the following extension of the classical Danskin's Theorem (Theorem 2.1). This result should be well-known, and we provide a simple proof for self-containedness.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given, where Y is a closed subset of \mathbb{R}^m and g is level-bounded in y locally uniform in x . Suppose that for a neighborhood Ω of $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the derivative $\nabla_x g(x, y)$ exists and is continuous (jointly) as a function of $(x, y) \in \Omega \times Y$. Then the value function v given by (1.1) is Lipschitz and Clarke regular near \bar{x} , and*

$$\partial v(\bar{x}) = \text{co}\{\nabla_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) : \bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})\},$$

where $S(x) := \arg \min_{y \in Y} g(x, y)$.

Proof. Set $M := \max_{x \in \text{cl}(B_1(\bar{x}))} g(x, y')$ for some fixed and arbitrarily chosen $y' \in Y$. Note that by continuity of g , M is finite. By uniform level-boundedness of g , there exists some ball $B_\alpha(\bar{x})$ with $\alpha < 1$ such that $\{(x, y) : x \in \text{cl}(B_\alpha(\bar{x})), g(x, y) \leq M\}$ is bounded. Since $\alpha < 1$, then

$$\bigcup_{x \in \text{cl}(B_\alpha(\bar{x}))} S(x) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in \text{cl}(B_\alpha(\bar{x}))} \{y \in Y : g(x, y) \leq M\}.$$

It follows that $\hat{Y} := \bigcup_{x \in \text{cl}(B_\alpha(\bar{x}))} S(x)$ is a bounded set. If we have a sequence $\{y^k\} \subseteq \hat{Y}$ such that $y^k \rightarrow y^*$, then there exists $x^k \in \text{cl}(B_\alpha(\bar{x}))$ such that $g(x^k, y^k) \leq g(x^k, y)$ for all k and for all $y \in Y$. We may assume without loss of generality that $x^k \rightarrow x^*$ where $x^* \in \text{cl}(B_\alpha(\bar{x}))$. Noting the continuity of g , we have $g(x^*, y^*) \leq g(x^*, y)$ for all $y \in Y$ so that $y^* \in S(x^*)$. Hence, $y^* \in \hat{Y}$ and therefore \hat{Y} is in fact compact. Consider now the functions

$$\hat{v}(x) := \min_{y \in \hat{Y}} g(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{S}(x) := \arg \min_{y \in \hat{Y}} g(x, y).$$

Since the global minimizers of $g(x, \cdot)$ are contained in \hat{Y} for any $x \in \text{cl}(B_\alpha(\bar{x}))$, it follows that $\hat{S} \equiv S$ on $\text{cl}(B_\alpha(\bar{x}))$. In particular, $\hat{v} \equiv v$ on the open set $B_\alpha(\bar{x})$ so that their Clarke subdifferentials agree. Hence, together with Danskin's theorem, $\partial v(\bar{x}) = \partial \hat{v}(\bar{x}) = \text{co}\{\nabla_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) : \bar{y} \in \hat{S}(\bar{x})\} = \text{co}\{\nabla_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) : \bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})\}$. This completes the proof. \square

On the other hand, the following theorem is an extension of Theorem 2.2 that is applicable for unbounded closed sets Y provided that g is uniformly level-bounded. Moreover, we also relax the concavity assumption to weak concavity. Recall that given a convex set Ω , a function h is ρ -weakly convex on Ω if $h + \frac{\rho}{2} \|\cdot\|^2$ is convex on Ω , where $\rho > 0$. We say that h is ρ -weakly concave on Ω if $-h$ is a weakly convex function on Ω .

¹ Note that v is Lipschitz continuous so that its Clarke subdifferential is well-defined. This fact follows from the Lipschitz continuity of g . Indeed, given x and \bar{x} , denote $y \in S(x)$ and $\bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})$. Then $v(x) - v(\bar{x}) = g(x, y) - g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leq g(x, \bar{y}) - g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leq L\|x - \bar{x}\|$, where L is the Lipschitz constant of g . Reversing the roles of x and \bar{x} , we immediately get $|v(x) - v(\bar{x})| \leq L\|x - \bar{x}\|$.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be level-bounded in y locally uniform in x , where Y is a closed subset of \mathbb{R}^m . Suppose that for a convex neighborhood Ω of $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and an open set O_Y containing Y , g is Lipschitz continuous on $\Omega \times O_Y$ and $g(\cdot, y)$ is a ρ -weakly concave function on Ω for every $y \in O_Y$. Then v given by (1.1) is weakly concave on Ω and*

$$\partial v(\bar{x}) = P(\bar{x}) = \text{co}\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : \xi \in \partial_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \text{ and } \bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})\}. \quad (3.10)$$

Proof. Define $h := -g$, so that $V(x) := \max_{y \in Y} h(x, y) = -v(x)$ and $h(\cdot, y)$ is ρ -weakly convex on Ω for each $y \in O_Y$. It follows that $\hat{h}(\cdot, y) := h(\cdot, y) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|\cdot\|^2$ is a convex function on Ω , and therefore the maximum over all $y \in Y$ is convex on Ω . That is,

$$\max_{y \in Y} \hat{h}(x, y) = \max_{y \in Y} \left(h(x, y) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x\|^2 \right) = \left(\max_{y \in Y} h(x, y) \right) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x\|^2 = V(x) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x\|^2 =: \hat{V}(x)$$

is convex on Ω , which proves that V is ρ -weakly convex on Ω . Hence, v is ρ -weakly concave on Ω .

Let $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $t_k \searrow 0$, and denote $x^k := \bar{x} + t_k d$ and $y^k \in S(x^k)$. Note that given any $y \in S(\bar{x})$,

$$\frac{\hat{V}(\bar{x} + t_k d) - \hat{V}(\bar{x})}{t_k} = \frac{\hat{h}(\bar{x} + t_k d, y^k) - \hat{h}(\bar{x}, y)}{t_k} \geq \frac{\hat{h}(\bar{x} + t_k d, y) - \hat{h}(\bar{x}, y)}{t_k}$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\hat{V}'(\bar{x}; d) \geq \hat{h}'_y(\bar{x}; d), \quad \forall y \in S(\bar{x}), \quad (3.11)$$

where $\hat{h}'_y(\bar{x}; d)$ denotes the directional derivative of $h(\cdot, y)$ at \bar{x} in the direction d . Meanwhile, we also have

$$\frac{\hat{V}(\bar{x} + t_k d) - \hat{V}(\bar{x})}{t_k} = \frac{\hat{h}(\bar{x} + t_k d, y^k) - \hat{h}(\bar{x}, y)}{t_k} \leq \frac{\hat{h}(\bar{x} + t_k d, y^k) - \hat{h}(\bar{x}, y^k)}{t_k}. \quad (3.12)$$

Note that since g is level-bounded in y locally uniform in x , we have from Theorem 2.4 that $\{y^k\}$ is bounded with accumulation points lying in $S(\bar{x})$. Hence, we may assume without loss of generality that $y^k \rightarrow \bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})$. Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.12) and from the definition of the Clark generalized directional derivative, we see that

$$\hat{V}'(\bar{x}; d) \leq \hat{h}^\circ(\bar{x}, \bar{y}; d, 0). \quad (3.13)$$

From the max formula (2.2) for Clarke generalized directional derivative, we have

$$\hat{h}^\circ(\bar{x}, \bar{y}; d, 0) = \max\{\langle \zeta, (d, 0) \rangle : \zeta \in \partial \hat{h}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})\} = \max\{\langle \zeta_x, d \rangle : \zeta_x \in \pi_x(\partial \hat{h}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}))\}, \quad (3.14)$$

where π_x is defined as in (2.1). On the other hand, by the convexity of $\hat{h}(\cdot, y)$ for all y on some neighborhood of \bar{y} , we have from [Clarke, 1983, Proposition 2.5.3] that $\pi_x(\partial \hat{h}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \subseteq \partial_x \hat{h}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$. From (3.14), we conclude that

$$\hat{h}^\circ(\bar{x}, \bar{y}; d, 0) \leq \max\{\langle \zeta_x, d \rangle : \zeta_x \in \partial_x \hat{h}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})\} = \hat{h}'_{\bar{y}}(\bar{x}; d), \quad (3.15)$$

where the last equation holds by the max formula for the (usual) directional derivative for the convex function $\hat{h}_{\bar{y}}$. Combining (3.11), (3.13) and (3.15) while noting that $\bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}'(\bar{x}; d) &= \max_{y \in S(\bar{x})} \hat{h}'_y(\bar{x}; d) = \max_{y \in S(\bar{x})} \max_{\zeta \in \partial_x \hat{h}_y(\bar{x})} \langle \zeta, d \rangle \\ &= \max \left\{ \langle \zeta, d \rangle : \zeta \in \bigcup_{y \in S(\bar{x})} \partial_x \hat{h}(\bar{x}, y) \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ \langle \zeta, d \rangle : \zeta \in \text{cl} \left(\text{co} \left(\bigcup_{y \in S(\bar{x})} \partial_x \hat{h}(\bar{x}, y) \right) \right) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation holds by [Beck, 2017, Lemma 2.35]. Noting the upper semicontinuity of ∂h and compactness of $S(\bar{x})$, we obtain the compactness of $\bigcup_{y \in S(\bar{x})} \partial_x \hat{h}(\bar{x}, y)$, and therefore its convex hull is likewise compact [Rudin, 1991, Theorem 3.20]. Thus, we may equivalently write

$$\hat{V}'(\bar{x}; d) = \max \left\{ \langle \zeta, d \rangle : \zeta \in \text{co} \left(\bigcup_{y \in S(\bar{x})} \partial_x \hat{h}(\bar{x}, y) \right) \right\}.$$

Meanwhile, we have from the convexity of \hat{V} that $\hat{V}'(\bar{x}; d) = \max_{\xi \in \partial \hat{V}(\bar{x})} \langle \xi, d \rangle$. By the closedness and convexity of both $\partial \hat{V}(\bar{x})$ and $\text{co} \left(\bigcup_{y \in S(\bar{x})} \partial_x \hat{h}(\bar{x}, y) \right)$, we have from [Beck, 2017, Lemma 2.34] that

$$\partial \hat{V}(\bar{x}) = \text{co} \left(\bigcup_{y \in S(\bar{x})} \partial_x \hat{h}(\bar{x}, y) \right).$$

Subtracting $\rho \bar{x}$ from both sides of the above equation, we see that $\partial V(\bar{x}) = \text{co} \left(\bigcup_{y \in S(\bar{x})} \partial_x h(\bar{x}, y) \right)$. From here, we immediately obtain (3.10), thus completing the proof. \square

We also take note of the following special case which should also be well-known, but a proof is provided for completeness.

Theorem 3.9. *Let $g(x, y)$ be convex in (x, y) and level-bounded in y locally uniform in x . If the partial differentiation formula*

$$\partial g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \partial_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \times \partial_y g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \tag{3.16}$$

holds for all $\bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})$, then

$$\partial v(\bar{x}) = \partial_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}),$$

where \bar{y} can be arbitrarily chosen from $S(\bar{x})$.

Proof. Since g is convex in (x, y) , we have from [Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Theorem 10.13] that $\partial v(\bar{x}) = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : (\xi, 0) \in \partial(g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + \delta_Y(\bar{y}))\}$ where \bar{y} can be arbitrarily chosen from $S(\bar{x})$. Meanwhile, $\partial(g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + \delta_Y(\bar{y})) = \partial g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + (\{0\} \times N_Y(\bar{y}))$ by [Beck, 2017, Theorem 3.36(a)] and [Clarke, 1983, Corollary 1 of Theorem 2.9.8], noting that g is Lipschitz continuous. Further applying (3.16), we then obtain

$$\partial v(\bar{x}) = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : (\xi, 0) \in \partial_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \times (\partial_y g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + N_Y(\bar{y}))\} = \partial_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \quad \forall \bar{y} \in S(\bar{x}),$$

where the last equality holds by the optimality of \bar{y} , noting the convexity of g and Y . \square

We note that for a convex function g , we always have $\partial g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \subseteq \partial_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \times \partial_y g(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$. More generally, this inclusion holds when g is Clarke regular at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) by [Clarke, 1983, Proposition 2.3.15]. Conditions under which equality holds, as required by condition (3.16), are provided in [Ye et al., 2023, Proposition 1].

Gradient consistency

With the above characterizations of the Clarke subdifferential of the value function, we can now derive the gradient consistency of the proposed smoothing family $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ given in (3.2). Our main tool is the following simple lemma.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose that the hypotheses of Theorem 3.6 hold and that $\{g_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a smoothing family of functions that satisfies the gradient consistent property. Let $\bar{x} \in O_X$ and suppose that*

$$\pi_x(\partial g(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \subseteq \partial_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \quad \forall \bar{y} \in S(\bar{x}), \quad (3.17)$$

and $\{\nabla g_\mu(x, y) : (x, y, \mu) \in \Theta\}$ is bounded² for some neighborhood Θ of $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, 0)$ for $\bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})$. Then

$$\emptyset \neq \limsup_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}, \mu \rightarrow 0} \nabla v_\mu(x) \subseteq \bigcup_{\bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})} \partial_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}). \quad (3.18)$$

Proof. Consider any sequence $\mu_k \searrow 0$ and $x^k \rightarrow \bar{x}$. That $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}, \mu \rightarrow 0} \nabla v_\mu(x)$ is non-empty holds due to our boundedness assumption. Suppose that $\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) \rightarrow \xi$. By Proposition 3.4, $\nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y^k) \rightarrow \xi$ where $y^k = S_{\mu_k}(x^k)$. Using (3.9), the uniform level boundedness of h given by (3.8), and Theorem 2.4(b), we know that $\{y^k\}$ is bounded with accumulation points in $S(\bar{x})$, and so we may assume without loss of generality that $y^k \rightarrow \bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})$. Meanwhile, using again our boundedness assumption, note that $\nabla g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y^k)$ is bounded so that we may assume without loss of generality that it converges to a point (ξ, η) , which belongs to $\partial g(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ by gradient consistency of $\{g_\mu : \mu > 0\}$. With (3.17), we infer that $\xi \in \partial_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and therefore (3.18) holds. \square

In general, under some regularity conditions (see [Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Definition 7.25]) and the assumption that $g(x, \cdot)$ is convex for all $x \in O_X$, we can only obtain

$$\partial v(\bar{x}) \subseteq \bigcup_{\bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})} \partial_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \quad (3.19)$$

by using [Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Theorem 10.13], [Clarke, 1983, Proposition 2.3.15], and [Clarke, 1983, Corollary 1 of Theorem 2.9.8]. Hence, (3.18) is in general a weaker result as it only guarantees that $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}, \mu \rightarrow 0} \nabla v_\mu(x)$ is contained on the right hand side of (3.19). Nevertheless, with the above, we immediately obtain the gradient consistency of $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ for several special cases.

Theorem 3.11. *Suppose that the hypotheses of Theorem 3.6 hold and that $\{g_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a smoothing family of functions satisfying the gradient consistent property. Let $\bar{x} \in O_X$ and suppose that $\{\nabla g_\mu(x, y) : (x, y, \mu) \in \Theta\}$ is bounded for some neighborhood Θ of $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, 0)$ for $\bar{y} \in S(\bar{x})$. Then, under any of the following conditions, $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smooth approximations of v that satisfies the gradient consistent property at \bar{x} :*

- (a) $\nabla_x g(x, y)$ exists and is continuous on $\Omega \times Y$;
- (b) $g(\cdot, y)$ is ρ -weakly concave on Ω for all $y \in O_Y$; or
- (c) (3.16) holds and g is convex in (x, y) ,

where Ω is a neighborhood of \bar{x} .

Proof. We first show that condition (3.17) holds for each of the cases described. To this end, let $\xi \in \pi_x(\partial g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}))$ and let $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $(\xi, \eta) \in \partial g(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$. For (a), it is enough to show that $\xi = \nabla_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$. Let $\{(x^k, y^k)\}$ be a sequence converging to (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) such that g is differentiable at each (x^k, y^k) and $\{\nabla g(x^k, y^k)\}$ is convergent. By continuity of $\nabla_x g$, we conclude that $\nabla_x g(x^k, y^k) \rightarrow$

²This condition is easily satisfied by several smoothing functions; see Section 2.2 and Alcantara et al. [2021], Chen [2012].

$\nabla_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$. It now directly follows from [Clarke, 1983, Theorem 2.5.1] that $\xi = \nabla_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, proving that (3.17) holds. For (b), we have from [Clarke, 1983, Proposition 2.5.3] that $\pi_x \left(\partial \hat{h}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \right) \subseteq \partial_x \hat{h}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ where $\hat{h}(x, y) := h(x, y) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x\|^2$ and $h = -g$ as in the proof of Theorem 3.8. The inclusion (3.17) immediately follows. Lastly, in part (c), the hypothesis that (3.16) holds directly implies (3.17). Hence, we may use Lemma 3.10. By Theorem 3.7, Theorem 3.8 and Theorem 3.9, which can be applied for cases (a), (b) and (c), respectively, the right-hand side of (3.18) is either equal to or contained in $\partial v(\bar{x})$. Hence, gradient consistency holds at \bar{x} . \square

4 Entropic Regularization

Lin et al. [2014] proposed the function $x \mapsto -\mu \ln \left(\int_Y \exp(-\mu^{-1} g(x, y)) dy \right)$ as a smooth approximation³ of the value function when g is smooth and Y is a compact set. This is based on the earlier works of Fang and Wu [1996], Li and Fang [1997] on smoothing by entropic regularization for the maximum value function. A natural way to extend this to a nonsmooth function g is to replace g with a smooth approximation. That is, if $\{g_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smooth approximations of g , then we consider

$$v_\mu(x) := -\mu \ln \left(\int_Y \exp(-\mu^{-1} g_\mu(x, y)) dy \right) \quad (4.1)$$

as a smooth approximation of the value function.

We show that when Y is a compact set, the function (4.1) is indeed a smooth approximation of v which satisfies gradient consistency under certain conditions. In fact, we can further extend this result to the case when Y is non-compact by replacing Y in (4.1) with Y_μ , where $\{Y_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of compact subsets of Y such that $Y_\mu \nearrow Y$. These considerably extend the smoothing framework of Li and Fang [1997], Lin et al. [2014] to unbounded closed sets and nonsmooth functions. Such an extension is not trivial, necessitating subtle modifications to the proofs established for the compact case, as well as sufficient conditions required to obtain a smoothing family and gradient consistency. These intricacies are systematically discussed in this manuscript. To concentrate on the main ideas, we focus first on the compact case in Section 4.1, and then present analogous results for the noncompact case in Section 4.2.

4.1 Entropic regularization for bounded constraint set

We start by proving that v_μ given by (4.1) is continuously differentiable.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that Y is compact and $\{g_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smooth approximations of g over some open set $O_X \times O_Y$. Then for each $\mu > 0$, v_μ given by (4.1) is continuously differentiable on O_X .*

Proof. Let Ω be any bounded open set whose closure is contained in O_X . Note that by the continuity of g_μ , $\|\nabla_x \exp(-\mu^{-1} g_\mu(x, y))\|$ is uniformly bounded over $\text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y$ by any constant c such that

$$c \geq \max_{(x, y) \in \text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y} \mu^{-1} \exp(\mu^{-1} g_\mu(x, y)) \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y)\|,$$

By Leibniz rule, we obtain

$$\nabla v_\mu(x) = \int_Y \alpha_\mu(x, y) \nabla_x g_\mu(x, y) dy \quad \forall x \in \Omega, \quad (4.2)$$

³ For an intuitive interpretation of this smoothing function, recall that a usual approximation of $\max\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r\}$ is $\mu \ln \sum_{i=1}^r \exp(\mu^{-1} x_i)$. We may thus view the given smoothing function as a continuous extension of this approximation.

where

$$\alpha_\mu(x, y) := \frac{\exp(-\mu^{-1}g_\mu(x, y))}{\int_Y \exp(-\mu^{-1}g_\mu(x, z))dz}. \quad (4.3)$$

We now show that ∇v_μ is continuous on Ω . First, we claim that α_μ is a continuous function on $\Omega \times Y$. Note that $\exp(-\mu^{-1}g_\mu(x, z))$ is uniformly bounded above by some constant over the compact set $\text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y$. Hence, continuity of α_μ on $\Omega \times Y$ holds by the bounded convergence theorem. By continuity of α_μ and $\nabla_x g_\mu$, we can again apply the same argument to show that ∇v_μ is continuous on Ω . Since Ω is arbitrarily chosen, we have completed the proof. \square

We now show that $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smooth approximations in the sense of Definition 2.5. We need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let Y be a compact set, g be a Lipschitz continuous function on some open set $O_X \times O_Y$ containing $X \times Y$, and let Ω be any convex open set such that $\text{cl}(\Omega) \subseteq O_X$. For any $\tau \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $\mu \in (0, \delta)$,*

$$\tau(\mu \text{vol}(Y))^\mu \max_{y \in Y} \exp(-g(x, y)) \leq \left(\int_Y \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right)^\mu \quad \forall x \in \text{cl}(\Omega). \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. From the proof of [Fang and Wu, 1996, Theorem 1], the result follows if we can show that for any $\tau \in (0, 1)$, there exists a sufficiently large N such that

$$\max_{j=1,2,\dots,k} \min_{y \in Y_j} \exp(-g(x, y)) > \tau \cdot \max_{y \in Y} \exp(-g(x, y)) \quad \forall x \in \text{cl}(\Omega) \quad (4.5)$$

holds for all integers $k \geq N$ and any partition $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_k\}$ of Y with $\max_{j=1,2,\dots,k} \text{diam}(Y_j) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, where $\text{diam}(Y_j)$ is the diameter of Y_j . This is similar to [Fang and Wu, 1996, Lemma 2] where the inequality (4.5) holds on the set X but the function g should be such that $g(\cdot, y)$ is continuously differentiable for any $y \in Y$. We show that the result can be extended to the setting described in Lemma 4.2.

For the sake of contradiction, suppose that there exists $\tau \in (0, 1)$, a sequence $\{x^k\} \subseteq \text{cl}(\Omega)$, and integers i_k with $i_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\frac{\max_{j=1,2,\dots,i_k} \min_{y \in Y_j} \exp(-g(x, y))}{\tau \cdot \max_{y \in Y} \exp(-g(x, y))} \leq 1$$

for some partition $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_{i_k}\}$ with $\max_{j=1,2,\dots,i_k} \text{diam}(Y_j) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By the compactness of $\text{cl}(\Omega)$, we may assume that $x^k \rightarrow x^*$ for some $x^* \in \text{cl}(\Omega)$. Now, we use the mean-value theorem for Lipschitz continuous functions. Noting that $\text{cl}(\Omega) \subseteq O_X$, we have from [Clarke, 1983, Theorem 2.3.7] that there exists u^k in the relative interior of the line segment joining x^* and x^k such that

$$\exp(-g(x^k, y)) - \exp(-g(x^*, y)) \in \langle \partial h_y(u^k), x^k - x^* \rangle,$$

where $h_y(x) := \exp(-g(x, y))$. By Theorem 2.3.9(ii) and Proposition 2.3.1 of Clarke [1983], we have

$$\exp(-g(x^k, y)) - \exp(-g(x^*, y)) = -\langle \exp(-g(u^k, y))v^k, x^k - x^* \rangle, \quad (4.6)$$

where $v^k \in \partial_x g(u^k, y)$. Meanwhile, noting the convexity of $\text{cl}(\Omega)$, each u^k is in $\text{cl}(\Omega) \subseteq O_X$. On the other hand, $\partial g(u, y)$ is a compact set for any (u, y) by [Facchinei and Pang, 2003, Proposition 7.1.4(a)]. Hence, with the upper-semicontinuity of the Clarke subdifferential (see [Facchinei and Pang, 2003, Proposition 7.1.4(b)] or [Clarke, 1983, Proposition 2.1.5(d)]), we conclude that

$\bigcup_{(u,y) \in \text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y} \partial g(u, y)$ is bounded. (Note that here, the Lipschitz continuity of g over the open set $O_X \times O_Y$ containing the compact set $\text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y$ plays an important role; see also Section 2.1). Since $\partial_x g(u, y) \subseteq \pi_x(\partial g(u, y))$ by [Clarke, 1983, Proposition 2.3.16], we conclude that the set $\bigcup_{(u,y) \in \text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y} \partial_x g(u, y)$ is likewise bounded, which together with the continuity of g implies that $M := \sup \{ \exp(-g(u, y)) \|v\| : v \in \partial_x g(u, y) \text{ and } (u, y) \in \text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y \}$ is finite. Going back to (4.6) and using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\min_{y \in Y_j} (-g(x^*, y)) - M \|x^k - x^*\| \leq \min_{y \in Y_j} \exp(-g(x^k, y)) \leq \min_{y \in Y_j} \exp(-g(x^*, y)) + M \|x^k - x^*\|.$$

At this point, we follow arguments analogous to those in the proof of [Fang and Wu, 1996, Lemma 2] to obtain a contradiction, thus completing the proof. We note, however, that showing that equation (17) in Fang and Wu [1996] does not require the ‘‘super uniform continuity’’ assumption imposed by the authors, as it automatically follows from Theorem 2.4. \square

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that the hypotheses of Lemma 4.2 hold and $\{g_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smooth approximations of g over $O_X \times O_Y$ such that g_μ converges uniformly to g on $\text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y$ for any open subset Ω with $\text{cl}(\Omega) \subseteq O_X$. Then, $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smooth approximations for the value function over O_X .*

Proof. Proposition 4.1 already provides the continuous differentiability of each v_μ on O_X . We just need to show that for any $\bar{x} \in O_X$, $v_\mu(x) \rightarrow v(\bar{x})$ as $\mu \rightarrow 0$ and $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$. Take any $\bar{x} \in O_X$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given, and $\tau \in (\exp(-\varepsilon), 1)$. By Lemma 4.2 there exists $\delta > 0$ such that (4.4) holds for all $\mu \in (0, \delta)$. Together with [Fang and Wu, 1996, Theorem 1], we have

$$\tau (\mu \text{vol}(Y))^\mu \max_{y \in Y} \exp(-g(x, y)) \stackrel{(4.4)}{\leq} \left(\int_Y \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right)^\mu \leq \text{vol}(Y)^\mu \max_{y \in Y} \exp(-g(x, y))$$

for all $x \in \text{cl}(\Omega)$, where Ω is an open set containing \bar{x} whose closure is contained in O_X . Noting the monotonicity of the logarithmic function, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\mu \ln \text{vol}(Y) - \max_{y \in Y} (-g(x, y)) &\leq -\mu \ln \left(\int_Y \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right) \\ &\leq -\ln \tau - \mu \ln(\mu \text{vol}(Y)) - \max_{y \in Y} (-g(x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of τ and the definition of v , we have

$$v(x) - \mu \ln \text{vol}(Y) \leq -\mu \ln \left(\int_Y \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right) \leq v(x) - \mu \ln(\mu \text{vol}(Y)) + \varepsilon.$$

We may choose $\delta > 0$ to be sufficiently small enough so that for all $\mu \in (0, \delta)$, we have $\mu \ln \text{vol}(Y) < 2\varepsilon$ and $-\mu \ln(\mu \text{vol}(Y)) < \varepsilon$. Hence,

$$\left| -\mu \ln \left(\int_Y \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right) - v(x) \right| < 2\varepsilon, \quad (4.7)$$

valid for all $x \in \text{cl}(\Omega)$ and $\mu \in (0, \delta)$. On the other hand, invoking the uniform convergence of g_μ to g on $\text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y$, we may choose δ to be small enough so that (4.7) holds and $|g_\mu(x, y) - g(x, y)| < \varepsilon$ for all $\mu \in (0, \delta)$ and $(x, y) \in \text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y$. Consequently, we have

$$\left| -\mu \ln \left(\int_Y \exp(-\mu^{-1}g_\mu(x, y)) dy \right) + \mu \ln \left(\int_Y \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right) \right| < \varepsilon$$

for all $x \in \text{cl}(\Omega)$ and $\mu \in (0, \delta)$. Together with (4.7) and the definition of v_μ , we have

$$|v_\mu(x) - v(x)| < 3\varepsilon \quad \forall x \in \text{cl}(\Omega), \forall \mu \in (0, \delta). \quad (4.8)$$

By the continuity of the value function on $\text{cl}(\Omega)$ (see Theorem 2.4(a)), we may choose $\delta > 0$ so that $|v(x) - v(\bar{x})| < \varepsilon$ for all $x \in \text{cl}(\Omega)$ with $\|x - \bar{x}\| < \delta$. Together with (4.8), we have $|v_\mu(x) - v(\bar{x})| < 4\varepsilon$ for all $\mu \in (0, \delta)$ and $x \in \text{cl}(\Omega)$ with $\|x - \bar{x}\| < \delta$. This completes the proof. \square

We next show that v_μ satisfies the gradient consistent property. To this end, we need the following lemmas. Note that Lemma 4.4 is an extension of [Lin et al., 2014, Theorem 5.3], but we provide a simpler and shorter proof as shown below. Moreover, we also need another technical result shown in Lemma 4.5, which will be helpful in our proof of gradient consistency.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\bar{x} \in O_X$ and $y' \in Y \setminus S(\bar{x})$. Under the hypotheses of Theorem 4.3, we have $\alpha_\mu(x, y') \rightarrow 0$ as $(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$, where α_μ is given by (4.3).*

Proof. By Theorem 4.3, $-g_\mu(x, y') + v_\mu(x) \rightarrow -g(\bar{x}, y') + v(\bar{x})$ as $(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$. Meanwhile, observe that we can rewrite α_μ as $\alpha_\mu(x, y) = \exp(\mu^{-1}(-g_\mu(x, y) + v_\mu(x)))$. Hence, letting $(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$ and noting that $-g(\bar{x}, y') + v(\bar{x}) < 0$ since $y' \notin S(\bar{x})$, we see that $\alpha_\mu(x, y') \rightarrow 0$, as desired. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\bar{x} \in O_X$ and let Z be any closed subset of $Y \setminus S(\bar{x})$. Under the hypotheses of Theorem 4.3, $\int_Z \alpha_\mu(x, y) dy \rightarrow 0$ as $(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$.*

Proof. First, we claim that $g_\mu(x, \cdot) \rightarrow g(\bar{x}, \cdot)$ as $(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$ uniformly on Y . Note that by hypothesis, $g_\mu \rightarrow g$ as $\mu \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on $\text{cl}(B_{\delta_0}(\bar{x})) \times Y$, where δ_0 is any positive number such that $\text{cl}(B_{\delta_0}) \subseteq O_X$. Thus, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ such that

$$\mu \in (0, \delta) \implies |g_\mu(x, y) - g(x, y)| < \varepsilon/2 \quad \forall (x, y) \in \text{cl}(B_{\delta_0}(\bar{x})) \times Y. \quad (4.9)$$

Meanwhile, since g is uniformly continuous on the compact set $\text{cl}(B_{\delta_0}(\bar{x})) \times Y$, we may choose a smaller $\delta > 0$, if necessary, so that

$$|g(x, y) - g(x', y')| < \varepsilon/2 \quad \forall (x, y), (x', y') \text{ with } \|(x, y) - (x', y')\| < \delta. \quad (4.10)$$

Since $\delta < \delta_0$ and $\|(x, y) - (\bar{x}, y)\| = \|x - \bar{x}\|$, then for any (x, μ) such that $\|x - \bar{x}\| < \delta$ and $\mu \in (0, \delta)$, it follows from triangle inequality and (4.9)-(4.10) that $|g_\mu(x, y) - g(\bar{x}, y)| < \varepsilon$ for any $y \in Y$. This completes that $g_\mu(x, \cdot) \rightarrow g(\bar{x}, \cdot)$ as $(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$ uniformly on Y .

Now, let $\varepsilon := \max_{y \in Z} g(\bar{x}, y) - v(\bar{x})$. Note that since Z is compact and lies outside $S(\bar{x})$, then ε is a finite positive number. Since $\lim_{(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)} v_\mu(x) = v(\bar{x})$ by Theorem 4.3, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $v_\mu(x) - v(\bar{x}) < \varepsilon/2$ for all $(x, \mu) \in B_\delta(\bar{x}, 0)$. On the other hand, by the claim proved above, we may choose a smaller $\delta > 0$ if necessary so that $g(\bar{x}, y) - g_\mu(x, y) < \varepsilon/2$ for all $y \in Y$ and for all $(x, \mu) \in B_\delta(\bar{x}, 0)$. Consequently, $-g_\mu(x, y) + v_\mu(x) < -g(\bar{x}, y) + v(\bar{x}) + \varepsilon$ for all $y \in Y$ and for all $(x, \mu) \in B_\delta(\bar{x}, 0)$. On the other hand, by our choice of ε , we have $-g(\bar{x}, y) + v(\bar{x}) + \varepsilon \leq 0$ for all $y \in Z$, so that $-g_\mu(x, y) + v_\mu(x) < 0$ for all $(x, \mu) \in B_\delta(\bar{x}, 0)$ and $y \in Z$. In turn, $\alpha_\mu(x, \cdot) = \exp(\mu^{-1}(-g_\mu(x, \cdot) + v_\mu(x)))$ is uniformly bounded above by 1 on Z for all $(x, \mu) \in B_\delta(\bar{x}, 0)$. Finally, we obtain the desired limit $\int_Z \alpha_\mu(x, y) dy \rightarrow 0$ as a direct consequence of Lemma 4.4 and the bounded convergence theorem. \square

We now prove the following result which is instrumental in showing gradient consistency, as proved in Theorem 4.10. Note that unlike the smooth analogue [Lin et al., 2014, Theorem 5.5], we do not assume compactness of the set X . As mentioned above, we also need the additional result

Lemma 4.5 to prove the following lemma. We also point out that due to the nonsmoothness of g , the main challenge and difficulty lie in finding an element of $P(\bar{x})$ (refer to (2.3)) that is arbitrarily close to the set $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}, \mu \searrow 0} \nabla v_\mu(x)$. Moreover, the subsequent verification that the identified element is indeed close requires some subtle techniques.

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose that the hypotheses of Theorem 4.3 hold and that there exists a neighborhood Ω of $\bar{x} \in O_X$ such that $\partial_x g(\cdot, \cdot)$ is upper semicontinuous on $\Omega \times O_Y$. If $\text{dist}(\nabla_x g_\mu(x, \cdot), \partial_x g(x, \cdot))$ converges to 0 uniformly on Y as $(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$, then*

$$\emptyset \neq \limsup_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}, \mu \searrow 0} \nabla v_\mu(x) \subseteq P(\bar{x}),$$

where $P(\bar{x})$ is given in (2.3).

Proof. First, we show that $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}, \mu \searrow 0} \nabla v_\mu(x)$ is indeed nonempty. By the uniform convergence assumption, there exists $\delta' > 0$ such that $\text{dist}(\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y), \partial_x g(x, y)) < 1$ for all $\mu \in (0, \delta')$ and $(x, y) \in \text{cl}(B_{\delta'}(\bar{x})) \times Y$. It follows that

$$\|\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y)\| \leq 1 + M \quad \forall \mu \in (0, \delta'), \forall (x, y) \in B_{\delta'}(\bar{x}) \times Y \quad (4.11)$$

where

$$M := \sup\{\|\xi\| : \xi \in \partial_x g(x, y) \text{ and } (x, y) \in \text{cl}(B_{\delta'}(\bar{x})) \times Y\}. \quad (4.12)$$

We may choose $\delta' > 0$ to be sufficiently small so that $\text{cl}(B_{\delta'}(\bar{x})) \subseteq \Omega$. Thus, $M < +\infty$ by the upper semicontinuity of $\partial_x g(\cdot, \cdot)$ and compactness of $\text{cl}(B_{\delta'}(\bar{x})) \times Y$. From (4.2) and noting that $\int_Y \alpha_\mu(x, y) dy = 1$, we see that $\{\nabla v_\mu(x) : x \in B_{\delta'}(\bar{x}), \mu \in (0, \delta')\}$ is a bounded set, thus proving the first claim.

To prove the inclusion, suppose that $\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) \rightarrow \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for some sequences $x^k \rightarrow \bar{x}$ and $\mu_k \searrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We need to show that $\xi \in P(\bar{x})$. To this end, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. We will find an element ξ^k of $P(\bar{x})$ such that $\|\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \xi^k\| < \varepsilon$ for sufficiently large k . For any $y \in S(\bar{x})$, we have from upper semicontinuity that there exists $\delta_y > 0$ such that

$$\partial_x g(x', y') \subseteq \partial_x g(\bar{x}, y) + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} B_1(0) \quad \forall x' \in B_{\delta_y}(\bar{x}), y' \in B_{\delta_y}(y). \quad (4.13)$$

Meanwhile, since Y is compact and g is continuous, $S(\bar{x})$ is compact. Hence, there exist points $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_r \in S(\bar{x})$ and numbers $\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_r > 0$ such that $S(\bar{x}) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^r B_{\delta_i}(y_i)$. Denote $Y_1 := Y \cap B_{\delta_1}(y_1)$, $Y_i := Y \cap \left(B_{\delta_i}(y_i) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} B_{\delta_j}(y_j) \right)$ for $i = 2, \dots, r$, and $Y_{r+1} := Y \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^r B_{\delta_i}(y_i)$. Note that since $Y_{r+1} \subseteq Y \setminus S(\bar{x})$, it follows from Lemma 4.4 that $\int_{Y_{r+1}} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) dy \rightarrow 0$.

Now, let $\delta > 0$ be such that $\delta < \min\{\delta', \delta_1, \dots, \delta_r\}$ and

$$\text{dist}(\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y), \partial_x g(x, y)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \quad \forall \mu \in (0, \delta) \text{ and } \forall (x, y) \in \text{cl}(B_\delta(\bar{x})) \times Y. \quad (4.14)$$

Choose k large enough so that $x^k \in B_\delta(\bar{x})$, $\mu_k \in (0, \delta)$ and

$$\int_{Y_{r+1}} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) dy < \frac{\varepsilon}{3(2M+1)} \quad (4.15)$$

where M is given by (4.12). We now define ξ^k as

$$\xi^k := \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \int_{Y_i} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)} \left(\varphi_k^{(i)}(y) \right) dy,$$

where y_{r+1} is an arbitrarily chosen element of $S(\bar{x})$, $\Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)}$ denotes the projection operator onto the convex set $\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)$, and $\varphi_k^{(i)}$ is any single-valued mapping from Y_i to $\partial_x g(x^k, y)$. Note that since $\bigcup_{i=1}^{r+1} Y_i = Y$, $\int_Y \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) dy = 1$, and the range of $\Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)}$ is contained in $P(\bar{x})$, it follows that ξ^k is indeed in $P(\bar{x})$ by Jensen's inequality.

We now show that $\|\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \xi^k\| < \varepsilon$. For each $i = 1, \dots, r$, denote $E_i := \{y \in Y_i : g \text{ is not differentiable at } (x^k, y)\}$. By Rademacher's theorem, note that the Lebesgue measure of E_i is zero since g is Lipschitz continuous on $O_X \times O_Y$. Moreover, $\partial_x g(x^k, y) = \{\nabla_x g(x^k, y)\}$ and $\varphi_k^{(i)}(y) = \nabla_x g(x^k, y)$ for any $y \in Y_i \setminus E_i$ where $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Hence, for all $y \in Y_i \setminus E_i$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) - \nabla_x g(x^k, y) \right\| &= \left\| \nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) - \Pi_{\partial_x g(x^k, y)}(\nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y)) \right\| \\ &= \text{dist}(\nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y), \partial_x g(x^k, y)) \\ &< \frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where the last inequality holds by (4.14). By (4.13) and our choice of δ , we have for any $y \in Y_i \setminus E_i$ ($i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$) that there exists $\nu(y) \in \partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)$ such that $\|\nabla_x g(x^k, y) - \nu(y)\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$. It follows that $\|\nabla_x g(x^k, y) - \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)}(\nabla_x g(x^k, y))\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$. This, together with (4.16), implies that

$$\left\| \nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) - \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)}(\varphi_k^{(i)}(y)) \right\| < \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}, \quad \forall y \in Y_i \setminus E_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \quad (4.17)$$

by triangle inequality. Meanwhile, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \int_{Y_{r+1}} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \left(\nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) - \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_{r+1})}(\varphi_k^{(r+1)}(y)) \right) dy \right\| \\ &\leq \int_{Y_{r+1}} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \left(\left\| \nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \right\| + \left\| \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_{r+1})}(\varphi_k^{(r+1)}(y)) \right\| \right) dy \\ &\leq (2M + 1) \int_{Y_{r+1}} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) dy \\ &\stackrel{(4.15)}{<} \frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

where the second inequality holds by (4.11) and (4.12) since $\delta < \delta'$. Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \xi^k\| &= \left\| \int_Y \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) dy - \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \int_{Y_i} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)} \left(\varphi_k^{(i)}(y) \right) dy \right\| \\
&\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^r \int_{Y_i} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \left(\nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) - \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)} \left(\varphi_k^{(i)}(y) \right) \right) dy \right\| \\
&\quad + \left\| \int_{Y_{r+1}} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \left(\nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) - \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_{r+1})} \left(\varphi_k^{(r+1)}(y) \right) \right) dy \right\| \\
&\stackrel{(4.18)}{<} \sum_{i=1}^r \int_{Y_i} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \left\| \nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) - \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)} \left(\varphi_k^{(i)}(y) \right) \right\| dy + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^r \int_{Y_i \setminus E_i} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \left\| \nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) - \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)} \left(\varphi_k^{(i)}(y) \right) \right\| dy + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \\
&\stackrel{(4.17)}{<} \frac{2\varepsilon}{3} \sum_{i=1}^r \int_{Y_i} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) dy + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \\
&\leq \varepsilon. \tag{4.19}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, it follows that we can extract a subsequence $\{\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k)\}_{k \in K}$ where $K \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ together with $\{\xi^k\}_{k \in K} \subseteq P(\bar{x})$ such that $\|\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \xi^k\| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ with $k \in K$. Since $P(\bar{x})$ is closed (due to the compactness of $S(\bar{x})$), any accumulation point ξ^* of $\{\xi^k\}_{k \in K}$ belongs to $P(\bar{x})$. Since $\|\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \xi^*\| \leq \|\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \xi^k\| + \|\xi^k - \xi^*\|$ and $\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) \rightarrow \xi$, we conclude that $\xi = \xi^*$, so that $\xi \in P(\bar{x})$ as desired. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.7. We note that the uniform convergence assumption in the above lemma can be achieved in many situations. Suppose that g takes the form $g(x, y) = a(x, y) + b(p(x), q(y))$ where a and b are smooth, b has Lipschitz continuous derivative, p and q are Lipschitz continuous functions, and the chain rule applies for $b(p(\cdot), q(y))$ for each y ; for instance, under the conditions stipulated in [Clarke, 1983, Theorem 2.3.9] or simply when p is a smooth function. Let $\{p_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ and $\{q_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ be smooth approximations of p and q , respectively, such that $\text{dist}(\nabla p_\mu(\cdot), \partial p(\cdot)) \rightarrow 0$ pointwise (uniform convergence is not required), and $q_\mu \rightarrow q$ uniformly on Y . Note that these assumptions are satisfied by the Chen-Mangasarian smoothing and the Moreau envelope smoothing described in Example 2.7 and Example 2.8. Under these circumstances, we obtain the uniform convergence required in Lemma 4.6.

Remark 4.8. Upper semicontinuity of $\partial_x g$ can be attained under any condition that will guarantee that if $(\xi, \xi') \in \partial g(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, then $\xi \in \partial_x g(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ for any (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) . For instance, the latter condition can be satisfied under Clarke regularity of g (see [Clarke, 1983, Proposition 2.3.15]) or convexity/concavity of g with respect to x (see [Clarke, 1983, Proposition 2.5.3]). To see how the said condition implies upper semicontinuity of $\partial_x g$, note that given any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have from upper semicontinuity of ∂g that we can find $\delta > 0$ such that $\partial g(x, y) \subseteq \partial g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + \varepsilon B_1(0)$ for all $(x, y) \in B_\delta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$. From [Clarke, 1983, Proposition 2.3.16], we have $\partial_x g(x, y) \subset \pi_x \partial g(x, y)$. Finally, we get the desired result by noting that $\pi_x(\partial g(x, y)) \subset \pi_x(\partial g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + \varepsilon B_1(0))$.

Example 4.9. For the hyperparameter learning lower-level function g given by (3.5) where the p_i 's are not necessarily convex but may be nonsmooth, we may consider any smooth approximation

$$g_\mu(x, y) := \ell_\mu(y) + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i p_{i, \mu}(y),$$

where $p_{i,\mu} \rightarrow p_i$ uniformly on $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$. When p_i is convex, such uniform convergence required can be attained by using the Moreau envelope, or the Chen-Mangasarian smoothing. For nonconvex p_i such as the l_p -norm with $p \in (0, 1)$, uniform convergence holds for several examples as well (see Chen [2012]). For this example of g and g_μ , it is not difficult to verify that the assumptions required by Lemma 4.6 are all satisfied.

With Lemma 4.6, we immediately obtain gradient consistency as follows.

Theorem 4.10. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 4.3 and assuming that $\text{dist}(\nabla_x g_\mu(x, \cdot), \partial_x g(x, \cdot))$ converges to 0 uniformly on Y as $(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$, the family of smooth approximations $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ of v satisfies the gradient consistent property at $\bar{x} \in O_X$ under any of the following conditions:*

- (a) $\nabla_x g(x, y)$ exists and is continuous on $\Omega \times Y$;
- (b) $g(\cdot, y)$ is ρ -weakly concave function on Ω for any $y \in Y$; or
- (c) (3.16) holds and g is convex in (x, y) ,

where Ω is a neighborhood of \bar{x} .

Proof. Under any of the conditions in (a), (b), and (c), the set-valued mapping $\partial_x g$ is upper semicontinuous; see also Remark 4.8. Hence, this theorem directly follows from Lemma 4.6, Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 3.9. \square

4.2 Entropic regularization for unbounded constraint set

We show that when Y is a closed unbounded set, the family of functions given by

$$v_\mu(x) := -\mu \ln \left(\int_{Y_\mu} \exp(-\mu^{-1} g_\mu(x, y)) dy \right), \quad (4.20)$$

is a smoothing function for the value function $v(x) = \max_{y \in Y} g(x, y)$ for a suitably chosen family $\{Y_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ of subsets of Y .

Proposition 4.11. *Suppose that $\{Y_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of compact subsets of Y such that $Y_\mu \nearrow Y$, and $\{g_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smoothing functions of g over $O_X \times O_Y$. For each $\mu > 0$, v_μ given by (4.20) is continuously differentiable on O_X .*

Proof. The claim can be proved by replacing Y in the proof of Proposition 4.1 with Y_μ . We note that the gradient of v_μ is given by

$$\nabla v_\mu(x) = \int_{Y_\mu} \alpha_\mu(x, y) \nabla_x g_\mu(x, y) dy,$$

where

$$\alpha_\mu(x, y) := \frac{\exp(-\mu^{-1} g_\mu(x, y))}{\int_{Y_\mu} \exp(-\mu^{-1} g_\mu(x, z)) dz}. \quad (4.21)$$

\square

To prove an analogue of Lemma 4.2, we require the uniform level-boundedness assumption.

Lemma 4.12. *Suppose that the hypotheses of Proposition 4.11 hold, g is level-bounded in y , locally uniform in x , and g is Lipschitz continuous function on $O_X \times O_Y$, where O_X is convex. Given any $\bar{x} \in O_X$, there exist a neighborhood Ω of \bar{x} and a positive number $\mu_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\max_{y \in Y_{\mu_0}} \exp(-g(x, y)) = \max_{y \in Y} \exp(-g(x, y)) \quad \forall x \in \text{cl}(\Omega). \quad (4.22)$$

Moreover, for any $\tau \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\tau(\mu \text{vol}(Y_{\mu_0}))^\mu \max_{y \in Y} \exp(-g(x, y)) \leq \left(\int_{Y_\mu} \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right)^\mu \quad \forall x \in \text{cl}(\Omega), \forall \mu \in (0, \delta). \quad (4.23)$$

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 3.8, we know that $\bigcup_{x \in \text{cl}(B_\alpha(\bar{x}))} S(x)$ is a bounded set for some $\alpha < 1$. Therefore, we may choose μ_0 small enough so that Y_{μ_0} contains $\bigcup_{x \in \text{cl}(\Omega)} S(x)$ with $\Omega = B_\alpha(\bar{x})$. Hence, (4.22) holds. Now, let $\tau \in (0, 1)$. We have from the proof of Lemma 4.2 that there exists a sufficiently large N_0 such that

$$\max_{j=1,2,\dots,k} \min_{y \in (Y_{\mu_0})_j} \exp(-g(x, y)) > \tau \cdot \max_{y \in Y_{\mu_0}} \exp(-g(x, y)) \quad \forall x \in \text{cl}(\Omega) \quad (4.24)$$

holds for all integers $k \geq N_0$ and any partition $\{(Y_{\mu_0})_1, (Y_{\mu_0})_2, \dots, (Y_{\mu_0})_k\}$ of Y_{μ_0} with $\max_{j=1,2,\dots,k} \text{diam}(Y_{\mu_0})_j \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Choose $\delta < 1/N_0$ and partition Y_{μ_0} into N_0 equal parts. Then, for any $\mu \in (0, \delta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{Y_\mu} \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right)^\mu &\geq \left(\int_{Y_{\mu_0}} \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right)^\mu \\ &\geq \left(\frac{\text{vol}(Y_{\mu_0})}{N_0} \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} \min_{y \in (Y_{\mu_0})_j} \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) \right)^\mu \\ &= \left(\frac{\text{vol}(Y_{\mu_0})}{N_0} \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} \left(\min_{y \in (Y_{\mu_0})_j} \exp(-g(x, y)) \right)^{\mu^{-1}} \right)^\mu \\ &\geq \left(\frac{\text{vol}(Y_{\mu_0})}{N_0} \left(\max_{j=1,\dots,N_0} \min_{y \in (Y_{\mu_0})_j} \exp(-g(x, y)) \right)^{\mu^{-1}} \right)^\mu \\ &\geq \tau \left(\frac{\text{vol}(Y_{\mu_0})}{N_0} \right)^\mu \max_{y \in Y_{\mu_0}} \exp(-g(x, y)) \\ &\geq \tau \text{vol}(Y_{\mu_0})^\mu \mu^\mu \max_{y \in Y_{\mu_0}} \exp(-g(x, y)) \\ &= \tau \text{vol}(Y_{\mu_0})^\mu \mu^\mu \max_{y \in Y} \exp(-g(x, y)), \end{aligned}$$

where the fourth inequality holds by (4.24), and the last equality holds by (4.22). This completes the proof. \square

We now show that $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smooth approximations in the sense of Definition 2.5.

Theorem 4.13. *Suppose that the hypotheses of Lemma 4.12 hold and the family $\{Y_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is chosen so that $\mu \ln \text{vol}(Y_\mu) \rightarrow 0$ as $\mu \rightarrow 0^4$. If g_μ converges uniformly to g on $\text{cl}(\Omega) \times Y$ for any*

⁴ For instance, a simple choice would be to set $Y_\mu := Y \cap B_{r_\mu}(0)$ where r_μ is chosen so that $r_\mu \nearrow +\infty$ as $\mu \searrow 0$ and $\text{vol}(B_{r_\mu}(0)) \leq \mu^{-p}$ for any $p > 0$.

open subset Ω with $\text{cl}(\Omega) \subseteq O_X$, then $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ is a family of smooth approximations for the value function over O_X

Proof. We only need to show that for any $\bar{x} \in O_X$, $v_\mu(x) \rightarrow v(\bar{x})$ as $\mu \rightarrow 0$ and $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$. To this end, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given, and let $\tau \in (\exp(-\varepsilon), 1)$. By Lemma 4.12 there exist a neighborhood Ω of \bar{x} and positive numbers μ_0 and $\delta < \mu_0$ such that (4.22) and (4.23) hold for all $\mu \in (0, \delta)$. Meanwhile, arguing as in [Fang and Wu, 1996, Theorem 1], we have

$$\left(\int_{Y_\mu} \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right)^\mu \leq \text{vol}(Y_\mu)^\mu \max_{y \in Y_\mu} \exp(-g(x, y)), \quad \forall x \in O_X.$$

Together with (4.23) and noting that $Y_\mu \supseteq Y_{\mu_0}$, we have

$$\tau(\mu \text{vol}(Y_{\mu_0}))^\mu \max_{y \in Y} \exp(-g(x, y)) \leq \left(\int_{Y_\mu} \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right)^\mu \leq \text{vol}(Y_\mu)^\mu \max_{y \in Y} \exp(-g(x, y))$$

for all $x \in \text{cl}(\Omega)$. Since the logarithmic function is monotonic, then

$$\begin{aligned} -\mu \ln \text{vol}(Y_\mu) - \max_{y \in Y}(-g(x, y)) &\leq -\mu \ln \left(\int_{Y_\mu} \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right) \\ &\leq -\ln \tau - \mu \ln(\mu \text{vol}(Y_{\mu_0})) - \max_{y \in Y}(-g(x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$v(x) - \mu \ln \text{vol}(Y_\mu) \leq -\mu \ln \left(\int_{Y_\mu} \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right) \leq v(x) - \mu \ln(\mu \text{vol}(Y_{\mu_0})) + \varepsilon.$$

We may choose $\delta > 0$ to be sufficiently small enough so that for all $\mu \in (0, \delta)$, we have $\mu \ln \text{vol}(Y_\mu) < 2\varepsilon$ and $-\mu \ln(\mu \text{vol}(Y_{\mu_0})) < \varepsilon$. Hence,

$$\left| -\mu \ln \left(\int_{Y_\mu} \exp(-\mu^{-1}g(x, y)) dy \right) - v(x) \right| < 2\varepsilon,$$

valid for all $x \in \text{cl}(\Omega)$ and $\mu \in (0, \delta)$. The rest of the proof follows from the same arguments as in Theorem 4.3. □

As shown above, managing the unboundedness of the constraint set Y to obtain a smoothing function of the value function can be achieved by assuming uniform level-boundedness of g and restricting the region of integration to Y_μ . In particular, we need the Y_μ 's to be compact sets whose volumes increase in a controlled magnitude so that $\mu \ln(\text{vol}(Y_\mu)) \rightarrow 0$. However, these are not sufficient to prove gradient consistency of the smoothing family, and the main difficulty lies on the unbounded nature of Y . Integrable dominating functions would be required to handle limits of sequences of integrals as shown in the following results.

Lemma 4.14. *Let $\bar{x} \in O_X$ and $y' \in Y \setminus S(\bar{x})$. Under the hypotheses of Theorem 4.13, we have $\alpha_\mu(x, y') \rightarrow 0$ as $(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$, where α_μ is given by (4.21).*

Proof. The proof is exactly identical to that of Lemma 4.4. □

To prove a counterpart of Lemma 4.5 for the unbounded case, we need to assume the existence of an integrable dominating function h for $\alpha_\mu(x, y)$ over a neighborhood of (\bar{x}, μ) . Note that in the case of Lemma 4.5, we have shown in the proof that uniform convergence of $\{g_\mu\}$ and the compactness of Y lead us to obtain the constant function $h \equiv 1$ to be the desired dominating function, which is indeed integrable over the compact set Z .

Lemma 4.15. *Let $\bar{x} \in O_X$ and suppose that for any closed subset Z of $Y \setminus S(\bar{x})$, there exists an integrable function $h : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha_\mu(x, y) \leq h(y)$ for all $y \in Z$ and for all (x, μ) in some neighborhood of $(\bar{x}, 0)$. Under the hypotheses of Theorem 4.13, we have $\int_Z \alpha_\mu(x, y) dy \rightarrow 0$ as $(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem and Lemma 4.14. \square

The following is another technical lemma needed to prove the next theorem.

Lemma 4.16. *Suppose that the hypotheses of Lemma 4.15 hold, and that for any closed subset Z of $Y \setminus S(\bar{x})$, there exists an integrable function $H : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha_\mu(x, y) \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y)\| \leq H(y)$ for all $y \in Z$ and for all (x, μ) in some neighborhood of $(\bar{x}, 0)$. Further, suppose that there exists a neighborhood Ω of $\bar{x} \in O_X$ such that $\partial_x g(\cdot, \cdot)$ is upper semicontinuous on $\Omega \times O_Y$. If $\text{dist}(\nabla_x g_\mu(x, \cdot), \partial_x g(x, \cdot))$ converges to 0 uniformly on Y as $(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$, then there exists $\delta' > 0$ such that $\{\nabla v_\mu(x) : \mu \in (0, \delta'), x \in \text{cl}(B_{\delta'}(\bar{x}))\}$ is bounded.*

Proof. Let Θ be a bounded open set that properly contains the compact set $S(\bar{x})$, and let $Z := Y \setminus \Theta$, which is a closed set contained in $Y \setminus S(\bar{x})$. Meanwhile, we know from the uniform convergence of $\text{dist}(\nabla_x g_\mu(x, \cdot), \partial_x g(x, \cdot))$ on Y that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}(\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y), \partial_x g(x, y)) < 1 \quad \forall \mu \in (0, \delta), \quad \forall (x, y) \in \text{cl}(B_\delta(\bar{x})) \times Y. \quad (4.25)$$

We may argue as in the first part of the proof of Lemma 4.6 to conclude that the set

$$\left\{ \int_{\Theta \cap Y} \alpha_\mu(x, y) \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y)\| dy : x \in \text{cl}(B_\delta(\bar{x})), \mu \in (0, \delta) \right\} \quad (4.26)$$

is bounded, noting the set $\text{cl}(\Theta) \cap Y$ is compact. From the upper semicontinuity of $\partial_x g(\cdot, \cdot)$, we see that $\bigcup_{x \in \text{cl}(B_\delta(\bar{x}))} \partial_x g(x, y)$ is bounded for any given $y \in Z$. Together with (4.25) and triangle inequality, we know that $\{\|\nabla_x g(x, y)\| : x \in \text{cl}(B_\delta(\bar{x})), \mu \in (0, \delta)\}$ is bounded for a fixed y . Hence, using Lemma 4.15, we conclude that $\alpha_\mu(x, y) \|\nabla_x g(x, y)\|$ converges pointwise to 0 as $(x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$ for each $y \in Z$. Since an integrable dominating function exists by our hypothesis, we conclude by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem that

$$\int_Z \alpha_\mu(x, y) \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y)\| dy \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } (x, \mu) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0). \quad (4.27)$$

Finally, since

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla v_\mu(x)\| &\leq \int_{Y_\mu} \alpha_\mu(x, y) \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y)\| dy \\ &= \int_{\Theta \cap Y} \alpha_\mu(x, y) \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y)\| dy + \int_{Y_\mu \setminus (\Theta \cap Y)} \alpha_\mu(x, y) \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y)\| dy \\ &\leq \int_{\Theta \cap Y} \alpha_\mu(x, y) \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y)\| dy + \int_Z \alpha_\mu(x, y) \|\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y)\| dy, \end{aligned}$$

the boundedness of (4.26) and the limit (4.27) imply the boundedness of $\|\nabla v_\mu(x)\|$ on a neighborhood of $(\bar{x}, 0)$, thus completing the proof. \square

Lemma 4.17. *Suppose that the hypotheses of Lemma 4.15 hold. Then,*

$$\emptyset \neq \limsup_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}, \mu \searrow 0} \nabla v_\mu(x) \subseteq P(\bar{x}),$$

where $P(\bar{x})$ is given in (2.3).

Proof. That $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}, \mu \searrow 0} \nabla v_\mu(x)$ is nonempty follows from Lemma 4.16. To prove the inclusion, suppose that $\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) \rightarrow \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for some sequences $x^k \rightarrow \bar{x}$ and $\mu_k \searrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We need to show that $\xi \in P(\bar{x})$. As in Lemma 4.6, it suffices to show that for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an element of $P(\bar{x})$ within ε unit away from $\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k)$, if k is chosen sufficiently large. That is, there exists $\xi^k \in P(\bar{x})$ such that $\|\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \xi^k\| < \varepsilon$. Following similar arguments in Lemma 4.6, we know that we can find points $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_r \in S(\bar{x})$ and numbers $\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_r > 0$ such that $S(\bar{x}) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^r B_{\delta_i}(y_i)$ and

$$\partial_x g(x', y') \subseteq \partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i) + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} B_1(0) \quad \forall x' \in B_{\delta_i}(\bar{x}), y' \in B_{\delta_i}(y_i),$$

for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Denote $Y_1 := Y \cap B_{\delta_1}(y_1)$, and $Y_i := Y \cap \left(B_{\delta_i}(y_i) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} B_{\delta_j}(y_j) \right)$ for $i = 2, \dots, r$. Moreover, we let y_{r+1} be an arbitrary element of $S(\bar{x})$, and we denote $Y_{r+1}^k := Y_{\mu_k} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^r B_{\delta_i}(y_i)$.

From the uniform convergence of $\text{dist}(\nabla_x g_\mu(x, \cdot), \partial_x g(x, \cdot))$ on Y , we can find a $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta < \min\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_r\}$ and

$$\text{dist}(\nabla_x g_\mu(x, y), \partial_x g(x, y)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \quad \forall \mu \in (0, \delta) \text{ and } \forall (x, y) \in \text{cl}(B_\delta(\bar{x})) \times Y. \quad (4.28)$$

Setting $\Theta := \bigcup_{i=1}^r B_{\delta_i}(y_i)$ and $Z := Y \setminus \Theta$, we know that (4.27) holds since Θ contains $S(\bar{x})$. Hence, we may choose a smaller δ if necessary so that (4.28) holds and at the same time,

$$\int_Z \alpha_\mu(x, y) \|\nabla_x g(x, y)\| dy < \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \quad \forall \mu \in (0, \delta), \forall x \in \text{cl}(B_\delta(\bar{x})). \quad (4.29)$$

Choosing a smaller δ if needed, we have from Lemma 4.15 that

$$\int_Z \alpha_\mu(x, y) < \frac{\varepsilon}{6M} \quad \forall \mu \in (0, \delta), \forall x \in \text{cl}(B_\delta(\bar{x})), \quad (4.30)$$

where $M := \max\{\|\xi\| : \xi \in \partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_{r+1})\}$, which is finite due to the boundedness of $\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_{r+1})$.

Now, let us choose k to be large enough so that $x^k \in B_\delta(\bar{x})$ and $\mu_k \in (0, \delta)$. Define ξ^k as

$$\xi^k := \sum_{i=1}^r \int_{Y_i} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)} \left(\varphi_k^{(i)}(y) \right) dy + \int_{Y_{r+1}^k} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_{r+1})} \left(\varphi_k^{(r+1)}(y) \right) dy,$$

where $\varphi_k^{(i)}$ ($i = 1, \dots, r$) is any single-valued mapping from Y_i to $\partial_x g(x^k, y)$, and $\varphi_k^{(r+1)}$ is a single-valued mapping from Y_{r+1}^k to $\partial_x g(x^k, y)$. Note that since $Y_{r+1}^k \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^r Y_i \right) = Y_{\mu_k}$, $\int_{Y_{\mu_k}} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) dy = 1$, and the range of $\Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)}$ is contained in $P(\bar{x})$, it follows that ξ^k is indeed in $P(\bar{x})$ by Jensen's inequality.

We show that $\|\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \xi^k\| < \varepsilon$. As before, we denote by E_i the set $E_i := \{y \in Y_i : g \text{ is not differentiable at } (x^k, y)\}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, r$, and we note that each E_i has zero Lebesgue measure. We can follow the same arguments in Lemma 4.6 to show that

$$\left\| \nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) - \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_i)} \left(\varphi_k^{(i)}(y) \right) \right\| < \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}, \quad \forall y \in Y_i \setminus E_i, i \in \{1, \dots, r\}. \quad (4.31)$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \int_{Y_{r+1}^k} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \left(\nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) - \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_{r+1})} \left(\varphi_k^{(r+1)}(y) \right) \right) dy \right\| \\
& \leq \int_{Y_{r+1}^k} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \left\| \nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \right\| dy + \int_{Y_{r+1}^k} \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \left\| \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_{r+1})} \left(\varphi_k^{(r+1)}(y) \right) \right\| dy \\
& \leq \int_Z \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \left\| \nabla_x g_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \right\| dy + \int_Z \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) \left\| \Pi_{\partial_x g(\bar{x}, y_{r+1})} \left(\varphi_k^{(r+1)}(y) \right) \right\| dy \\
& \stackrel{(4.29)}{<} \frac{\varepsilon}{6} + M \int_Z \alpha_{\mu_k}(x^k, y) dy \\
& \stackrel{(4.30)}{<} \frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \tag{4.32}
\end{aligned}$$

where second inequality holds since $Y_{r+1}^k \subseteq Z$ for any k . Finally, we can use (4.32) and (4.31) to show that $\|\nabla v_{\mu_k}(x^k) - \xi^k\| < \varepsilon$ by arguing as in (4.19). \square

We finally show that v_μ satisfies the gradient consistent property.

Theorem 4.18. *Under the hypotheses of Lemma 4.17, the family of smooth approximations $\{v_\mu : \mu > 0\}$ of v satisfies the gradient consistent property at \bar{x} under any of the following conditions:*

- (a) $\nabla_x g(x, y)$ exists and is continuous on $\Omega \times O_Y$; or
- (b) $g(\cdot, y)$ is ρ -weakly concave function on Ω for any $y \in Y$; or
- (c) (3.16) holds and g is convex in (x, y) ,

where Ω is a neighborhood of \bar{x}

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Lemma 4.17, Theorem 3.7, Theorem 3.8 and Theorem 3.9. \square

5 Concluding Remarks

We have presented two techniques for deriving smooth approximations of the value function corresponding to a nonsmooth function. One approach is through the use of quadratic regularization, which is applicable when the lower-level objective is convex in the decision variable of the lower-level problem. In the absence of this convexity structure, we also present another technique by entropic regularization, which does not require any other structural assumption other than Lipschitz continuity. While smoothing approaches are often employed for the practical purpose that optimization toolboxes usually require smoothness, it is equally important to theoretically investigate whether or not the smoothing algorithm will converge to a stationary point. In this work, we also proved the gradient consistent property for the proposed smoothing techniques, which serve as a primary tool for convergence analysis of a smoothing algorithm. This paper provides the theoretical framework for smoothing approaches for bilevel optimization problems. In our future work, we will further investigate if we can relax the Lipschitz continuity assumption on the lower-level objective function, which played a pivotal role in almost all of our analyses. Existence of dominating functions which were required in entropic regularization for unbounded constraint sets also deserve further investigation. Finally, it is a subject of our future work to look into practical implementations of gradient-based algorithms for solving the bilevel optimization problem using the proposed smoothing functions for the value function.

References

- Jan Harold Alcantara, Chieu Thanh Nguyen, Takayuki Okuno, Akiko Takeda, and Jein-Shan Chen. Unified smoothing approach for best hyperparameter selection problem using a bilevel optimization strategy, 2021. arXiv:2110.12630. 6, 9, 15
- Amir Beck. *First-Order Methods in Optimization*. SIAM - Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, United States, 2017. 6, 10, 14
- Dimitri P. Bertsekas. *Control of Uncertain Systems with a Set-Membership Description*. Phd thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, May 1971. Available at <https://web.mit.edu/dimitrib/www/phdthesis.pdf>. 4, 5
- Chunhui Chen and Olvi L. Mangasarian. A class of smoothing functions for nonlinear and mixed complementarity problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 71:51–70, 1995. 6
- Xiaojun Chen. Smoothing methods for nonsmooth, nonconvex minimization. *Mathematical Programming Series B*, 134:71–99, 2012. 3, 6, 15, 23
- Xiaojun Chen, Robert S. Womersley, and Jane J. Ye. Minimizing the condition number of a gram matrix. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21:127–148, 2011. 5
- Frank H. Clarke. *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis*. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1983. 4, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22
- Frank H. Clarke, Yu. S Ledyaev, Ron J. Stern, and Peter R. Wolenski. *Nonsmooth Analysis and Control Theory*. Springer, New York, 1998. 4
- John M. Danskin. *The Theory of Max-Min and its Applications to Weapons Allocation Problems*. Springer, New York, 1967. 4
- Stephan Dempe and Alain Zemkoho. *Bilevel Optimization: Advances and Next Challenges*. Springer Optimization and Its Applications. Springer International Publishing, 2020. ISBN 9783030521196. 2
- Stephan Dempe, Vyacheslav Kalashnikov, Gerardo A. Pérez-Valdés, and Nataliya Kalashnykova. *Bilevel Programming Problems: Theory, Algorithms and Applications to Energy Networks*. Energy Systems. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015. ISBN 9783662458273. 2
- Francisco Facchinei and Jong-Shi Pang. *Finite-Dimensional Variational Inequalities and Complementarity Problems*. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY, 2003. 17
- Shu-Cherng Fang and Soon-Yi Wu. Solving min-max problems and linear semi-infinite programs. *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, 32(6):87–93, 1996. 3, 16, 17, 18, 25
- Luca Franceschi, Paolo Frasconi, Saverio Salzo, Riccardo Grazi, and Massimiliano Pontil. Bilevel programming for hyperparameter optimization and meta-learning. In Jennifer Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1568–1577. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018. 1
- Saeed Ghadimi and Mengdi Wang. Approximation methods for bilevel programming, 2018. arXiv:1802.02246. 2

- Kaiyi Ji, Junjie Yang, and Yingbin Liang. Bilevel optimization: Convergence analysis and enhanced design. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4882–4892. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021. 2
- Lorenzo Lampariello and Simone Sagratella. Numerically tractable optimistic bilevel problems. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 76:277–303, 2020. 2
- Xing-Si Li and Shu-Cherng Fang. On the entropic regularization method for solving min-max problems with applications. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 46:119–130, 1997. 16
- Gui-Hua Lin, Mengwei Xu, and Jane J. Ye. On solving simple bilevel programs with a nonconvex lower level program. *Mathematical Programming Series A*, 144:277–305, 2014. 2, 3, 16, 19
- Risheng Liu, Xuan Liu, Shangzhi Zeng, Jin Zhang, and Yixuan Zhang. Value-function-based sequential minimization for bi-level optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45:15930 – 15948, 2023. 9
- Tianxiang Liu, Ting-Kei Pong, and Akiko Takeda. A successive difference-of-convex approximation method for a class of nonconvex nonsmooth optimization problems. *Mathematical Programming Series B*, 176:339–367, 2019. 7
- James Mirrlees. The theory of moral hazard and unobservable behaviour: Part i. *Review of Economic Studies*, 66(1):3–21, 1999. 2
- Takayuki Okuno, Akiko Takeda, Akihiro Kawana, and Motokazu Watanabe. On ℓ_p -hyperparameter learning via bilevel nonsmooth optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22:1–47, 2021. 1, 2
- Jiri Outrata. On the numerical solution of a class of stackelberg problems. *Zeitschrift für Operations Research*, 34:255–277, 1990. 2
- Fabian Pedregosa. Hyperparameter optimization with approximate gradient. In Maria Florina Balcan and Kilian Q. Weinberger, editors, *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 48 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 737–746, New York, New York, USA, 20–22 Jun 2016. PMLR. 2
- R. Tyrrell Rockafellar and Roger J-B Wets. *Variational Analysis*, volume 317 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer, Berlin, 1998. 4, 5, 6, 7, 14, 15
- Walter Rudin. *Functional Analysis*. International series in pure and applied mathematics. McGraw-Hill, 1991. 14
- H. von Stackelberg. *Market Structure and Equilibrium*. Springer Science and Business Media, Berlin, 2010. 1
- Jane J. Ye and Zhu Daoli. Optimality conditions for bilevel programming problems. *Optimization*, 33:9–27, 1995. 2, 7
- Jane J. Ye, Xiaoming Yuan, Shangzhi Zeng, and Jin Zhang. Difference of convex algorithms for bilevel programs with applications in hyperparameter selection. *Mathematical Programming*, 198:1583–1616, 2023. 2, 7, 14