

Revisiting Theoretical Guarantees of Direct-Search Methods

K. J. Dzahini*

F. Rinaldi†

C. W. Royer‡

D. Zeffiro§

Monday 11th March, 2024

Abstract

Optimizing a function without using derivatives is a challenging paradigm, that precludes from using classical algorithms from nonlinear optimization and may thus seem intractable other than by using heuristics. However, the field of derivative-free optimization has succeeded in producing algorithms that do not rely on derivatives and yet are endowed with convergence guarantees. One class of such methods, called direct search, is particularly popular thanks to its simplicity of implementation, even though its theoretical underpinnings are not always easy to grasp.

In this work, we survey contemporary direct-search algorithms from a theoretical viewpoint, with the aim of highlighting the key theoretical features of these methods. Our study goes beyond the classical, textbook cases and tackles the presence of nonsmoothness, noise, and constraints in the problem at hand. In addition to reviewing classical results in the field, we provide new perspectives on existing results, as well as novel proofs that illustrate the versatility of direct-search schemes.

1 Introduction

Direct-search methods, whose name was coined by Hooke and Jeeves [54], form one of the main classes of derivative-free optimization (DFO) algorithms. Those methods work in a very easy and intuitive way: they sample the objective function at a finite number of points at each iteration and decide which actions to take next solely based on those function values, either by function value comparison through ranking or based on numerical values, and without any explicit or implicit derivative approximation or model building. This simple principle partly explains why direct-search approaches were highly popular in the early days of numerical optimization. Despite the existence of tools that allow us to easily use first- or second-order derivative information in an algorithm (i.e., tools that compute derivatives automatically), there is still need for methods that only use function values in their implementation. In the context of, e.g., simulation-based optimization, derivative information can hardly be obtained. There also exist real-world applications where the objective function is not numerical in nature (see, e.g., [58] for further details). In all those contexts, direct-search methods still play a fundamental role and have been adopted by practitioners. Although classical direct-search techniques such as Nelder–Mead’s simplex method [75] or evolutionary algorithms [11] are not built on strong theoretical foundations, modern direct-search algorithms are typically equipped with convergence

*Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 S. Cass Avenue, Lemont, IL 60439, USA (kdzahini@anl.gov). Funding of this author was supported by the CAMPA and ComPASS-4, projects of the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research and Office of High Energy Physics, Scientific Discovery through Advanced Computing (SciDAC) program under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357.

†Dipartimento di Matematica “Tullio Levi-Civita”, Università di Padova, Padua, Italy (rinaldi@math.unipd.it).

‡LAMSADE, CNRS, Université Paris Dauphine-PSL, Place du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny, 75016 Paris, France (clement.royer@lamsade.dauphine.fr). Funding for this author’s research was partially provided by Agence Nationale de la Recherche through program ANR-19-P3IA-0001 (PRAIRIE 3IA Institute).

§Dipartimento di Matematica “Tullio Levi-Civita”, Università di Padova, Padua, Italy (zeffiro@math.unipd.it).

guarantees, that certify their ability to converge to a (possibly approximate) solution of the problem at hand. Still, those guarantees are somewhat scattered in the literature, in research papers as well as surveys and books on derivative-free optimization.

Indeed, direct-search methods have been the subject of several dedicated surveys [3, 58, 68, 84]. The 1996 survey of Wright [84] was arguably the first on direct-search schemes, with an emphasis on simplicial methods that may lack convergence guarantees. The later survey of Lewis et al. [68] discussed in particular pattern search methods along with the convergence results that relied on simple decrease. The landmark survey of Kolda et al. [58] followed and provided a thorough investigation of convergence results on direct search based on simple and sufficient decrease, highlighting developments in the (linearly) constrained setting but focusing mainly on smooth objectives. To the best of our knowledge, the most recent survey article is due to Audet [3], who described the developments of direct search with an emphasis on mesh adaptive direct search (MADS) and its use in applications. More broadly, direct-search methods have been featured in textbooks and reviews on derivative-free optimization. Conn et al. [27] covered the basics of direct-search methods with convergence results. Audet and Hare [8] focused on direct-search schemes based on simple decrease, and provided a thorough introduction to pattern search and MADS. Finally, in the recent overview of derivative-free algorithms, Larson et al. [64] provided a general direct-search scheme, along with recent references, notably on the development of complexity results for direct-search methods, but focused more on the final results than the actual proof techniques.

In this survey, we provide an overview of the various direct-search algorithms that have been proposed, with a focus on those endowed with theoretical guarantees. In particular, we would like to put more emphasis on some derivative-free techniques that have been somewhat overlooked in previous surveys (like e.g., line-search methods and randomized direct-search methods), despite attracting growing interest in recent years. To this end, the first section of the present survey will consist of a generic algorithmic framework, that we will instantiate into the key families of direct-search methods.

The basic direct-search methodology is relatively straightforward to describe in the context of smooth, unconstrained optimization, yet its adaptation to more difficult optimization formulations poses a number of challenges, and therefore several surveys only mention those extensions, albeit with suitable references. In here, we intend to provide the reader with more details on topics that have received less attention in previous surveys and textbooks. Although numerous topics could have been addressed, we elected to focus on nonsmoothness, constraints, and noise in the objective function. We believe that a reader interested in direct-search methods on a specific problem will likely be faced with one or several of these aspects. As a result, we dedicated a section of our survey to each of those categories, where we extend our basic algorithmic scheme to handle these new challenges.

2 Main algorithms and definitions

Notations Throughout, vectors will be written in lowercase boldface (e.g., $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n, n \geq 2$) while matrices will be written in uppercase boldface (e.g., $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$). The set of column vectors of a matrix \mathbf{D} will be denoted by \mathbb{D} , and more generally sets such as $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}$ will be denoted by blackboard letters. The set of nonnegative real numbers will be denoted by $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Given two integers a, b , we write $[a : b]$ for the set of all integer values $a \leq z \leq b$. Sequences indexed by \mathbb{N} will be denoted by $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ or $\{a_k\}$ in absence of ambiguity. Random quantities will be denoted using underlined letters (e.g., $\underline{z}, \underline{\mathbf{v}}, \underline{\mathbf{S}}$). The expected value operator will be denoted by $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$. When necessary, we will specify the variables on which the expected value is computed (e.g. $\mathbb{E}_{\zeta}[\cdot]$ for the expected value over ζ). Given a point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we use the notations $B_{\delta}(\mathbf{x}), \text{diam}(\Omega), T_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x})$ and $N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x})$ to denote the open ball with radius δ around \mathbf{x} , the diameter of Ω , the tangent cone to Ω in \mathbf{x} , and the normal cone to Ω in \mathbf{x} , respectively. We use $\pi(\Omega, \cdot)$ for the projection operator on Ω . Given a quantity A , the notation $\mathcal{O}(A)$ means a constant times A , where the constant does not

depend on A .

2.1 The direct-search framework

In this section, we introduce the main ideas behind direct search by considering an unconstrained minimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}), \quad (1)$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is the objective function of our problem. We will describe typical requirements on f in Section 2.2.2, but we emphasize that a direct-search method only requires access to values of f to proceed.

Algorithm 1 describes a generic direct-search framework, that will be used as a baseline for developing more involved variants in the subsequent sections. The method initially selects a point in the variable space (also called the *incumbent solution* in the direct-search literature), as well as an initial value for the so-called *stepsize*. At every iteration, the function is evaluated at trial points, obtained from the current point by a displacement along certain directions, called *poll directions*, of the current stepsize. If one of those points provides a decrease with respect to the current function value as measured by a *forcing function*, this point can be accepted as the new point, and the stepsize can be increased (or kept constant). Otherwise, the next point is set to be the current point, and the stepsize is decreased.

Algorithm 1: Basic direct-search method

- 1: **Inputs:** Starting point/incumbent solution $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, initial stepsize $\alpha_0 > 0$, stepsize update parameters $0 < \theta < 1 \leq \gamma$, forcing function $\rho : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: Select a set \mathbb{D}_k of poll directions.
 - 4: **if** $f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}) < f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \rho(\alpha_k)$ holds for some $\mathbf{s} \in \{\alpha_k \mathbf{d} : \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k\}$ **then**
 - 5: Declare the iteration as successful, set $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}$ and $\alpha_{k+1} = \gamma \alpha_k$.
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: Declare the iteration as unsuccessful, set $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k$ and $\alpha_{k+1} = \theta \alpha_k$.
 - 8: **end if**
 - 9: **end for**
-

Each step of Algorithm 1 highlights the key ingredients that define a given direct-search method. First, the choice of poll directions \mathbb{D}_k is instrumental to deriving convergence results. These directions can be chosen in a deterministic or randomized fashion, fixed throughout the iterations or varying at every iteration. In the rest of Section 2, we will review the most classical polling strategies.

Secondly, the condition for success

$$f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}) < f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \rho(\alpha_k), \quad (2)$$

characterizes a major divide between direct-search methods, depending on whether or not any possible improvement in the objective function is accepted. Definition 2.1 gives the associated terminology from the direct-search literature.

Definition 2.1. *Algorithm 1 (or an instance thereof) is said to be based on a sufficient decrease condition if $\rho(\alpha_k) > 0$ for all k . Otherwise, the algorithm is said to be based on simple decrease.*

Thirdly, in order to check the decrease condition (2), Algorithm 1 requires access to the function value at both $\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}$ and \mathbf{x}_k . When exact values of f are available, one only needs to evaluate f once at a given point,

hence values can be saved between iterations to avoid extra calculations. On the contrary, repeated evaluations (also termed replications in the literature) are particularly useful in the context of *stochastic* optimization, where only noisy evaluations of the objective are available. Such algorithms are an important part of this survey and are reviewed in Section 3.

Fourthly, the set of points that are considered at every iteration may be broader than those obtained through the polling directions and the current stepsize. In particular, line-search variants on direct search, which are discussed in Section 2.6, evaluate additional points beyond those considered in polling in order to perform extrapolation.

Finally, the decision made at every iteration of Algorithm 1 may not require all points in $\{\alpha_k \mathbf{d} : \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k\}$ to be checked in case of success (although this remains necessary to declare an iteration as unsuccessful). This observation leads to the following divide between algorithms.

Definition 2.2. *Algorithm 1 (or an instance thereof) is said to use opportunistic polling if step 2 stops as soon as it finds a vector \mathbf{s} satisfying (2). Otherwise, the algorithm is said to use complete polling.*

2.2 Main mathematical concepts

In this section, we gather key algebraic definitions associated with the choice of directions in a direct-search method, for future reference in the rest of the survey. We also provide standard analytical definitions associated with the objective function (and the constraint functions when applicable).

2.2.1 Geometry of polling sets

One of the main features of a direct-search method is its strategy to choose the poll directions. Those directions play a key role in guaranteeing convergence, provided they possess favorable geometric properties. The first property below is an intrinsic property of a direction set.

Definition 2.3. *For a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and a set of directions \mathbb{D} , the cosine measure of \mathbb{D} with respect to \mathbf{v} is defined as*

$$\text{cm}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{v}) := \max_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}} \frac{\langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{v} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{d}\| \|\mathbf{v}\|}. \quad (3)$$

The cosine measure of \mathbb{D} is then

$$\text{cm}(\mathbb{D}) = \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}} \text{cm}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{v}). \quad (4)$$

The cosine measure of a set \mathbb{D} captures how much of the space is covered by the cone spanned using the vectors in \mathbb{D} . The best scenario corresponds to spanning the entire space, and corresponds to the following notion.

Definition 2.4. *A set \mathbb{D} of vectors in \mathbb{R}^n is called a positive spanning set if its cosine measure is positive, or equivalently, if every vector in \mathbb{R}^n can be written as a nonnegative linear combination of vectors in \mathbb{D} .*

Positive spanning sets are the typical choice of poll directions for direct-search methods. In addition to relying on positive spanning sets, certain direct-search methods ensure that the points considered for evaluation lie on carefully designed grids. We adopt here the terminology of meshes and frames [8], and provide the definitions independently of any algorithm.

Definition 2.5. *Consider a positive spanning set \mathbb{D} , and let $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_D}$ be a matrix representation of \mathbb{D} . For any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any $\alpha > 0$, the mesh of coarseness α corresponding to \mathbf{D} and centered at \mathbf{x} , is defined by*

$$\mathcal{M} = \{\mathbf{x} + \alpha \mathbf{D} \mathbf{z} : \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{N}^{n_D}\}. \quad (5)$$

For any $\delta > 0$, the frame of coarseness δ associated to \mathcal{M} is then defined by

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M} : \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq \delta\}. \quad (6)$$

One interesting feature of meshes and frames is that they lead to asymptotic density, a concept that has proven fundamental in analyzing direct-search methods, especially in the nonsmooth setting [6, 8].

Definition 2.6. A sequence $\{\mathbb{D}_k\}_k$ of vector sets defines an asymptotically dense set of directions if the set

$$\{\mathbf{d}/\|\mathbf{d}\|_\infty : \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$$

is dense in the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n .

2.2.2 Function classes and stationary points

By design, a direct-search method can be applied to any function for which the objective value (or approximations thereof, see Section 3) can be queried. Still, in order to establish convergence, one typically assumes a certain level of regularity in the objective function. For this reason, we will assume continuity of the objective function, though we note that direct search has been applied to extended-value and discontinuous problems [4, 19, 30].

Definition 2.7. A function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is said to be L -Lipschitz continuous if

$$\forall(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \|F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{y})\| \leq L\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|.$$

In this survey, we will consider both Lipschitz continuous functions or functions with Lipschitz continuous derivative, in the following sense.

Definition 2.8. A function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be L -smooth for $L > 0$ if f is continuously differentiable and $\nabla f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is L -Lipschitz continuous.

When optimizing a smooth function without constraints, direct-search methods generally aim at converging towards a point with zero gradient, called a *stationary point*. We will present results of that form in the upcoming sections. Existing analyzes of direct-search methods also provide guarantees on nonsmooth functions using generalized derivatives. The next two definitions [26] correspond to the most classical notion used in the direct-search literature.

Definition 2.9. For $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the Clarke directional derivative of f at \mathbf{x} in the direction \mathbf{v} is

$$f^\circ(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}) = \limsup_{\substack{\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{x} \\ t \searrow 0}} \frac{f(\mathbf{y} + t\mathbf{v}) - f(\mathbf{y})}{t}. \quad (7)$$

The Clarke subdifferential of f at \mathbf{x} is then defined as

$$\partial f(\mathbf{x}) = \left\{ \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{g}^\top \mathbf{v} \leq f^\circ(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}. \quad (8)$$

Definition 2.10. The point \mathbf{x}^* is Clarke stationary for f if $f^\circ(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}) \geq 0$ for every $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ or, equivalently, if $\mathbf{0} \in \partial f(\mathbf{x})$.

The notion of Clarke stationarity is weaker than many others used in variational analysis, yet it exists under relatively low requirements, which lead to its extensive use in deriving guarantees for direct-search schemes [4]. Still, we provide another notion of stationarity due to Goldstein [48] that has recently been used to provide complexity results in direct-search methods.

Definition 2.11. Given $\delta > 0$, the point \mathbf{x}^* is called δ -Goldstein stationary for f if

$$\inf \{ \|\mathbf{g}\| \mid \mathbf{g} \in \text{conv} \left(\bigcup_{\mathbf{y} \in B_\delta(\mathbf{x})} \partial f(\mathbf{y}) \right) \} = 0,$$

where $\text{conv}(\mathcal{S})$ denotes the set of convex combinations of vectors in \mathcal{S} .

Note that this survey will also consider approximate definitions of stationary points in order to derive complexity results. For instance, in the smooth setting, rather than a point with zero gradient, we might be interested in converging towards a point with small enough gradient norm. In the nonsmooth setting, the notion of an approximate stationary point is more intricate, and we provide the definition below.

Definition 2.12. Given $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called a (δ, ε) -Goldstein stationary point for a function f if

$$\inf \{ \|\mathbf{g}\| \mid \mathbf{g} \in \text{conv} \bigcup_{\mathbf{y} \in B_\delta(\mathbf{x})} \partial f(\mathbf{y}) \} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (9)$$

The concept of approximate stationary points will also be discussed in Section 2.4.

2.3 Basic convergence ingredients

In this section, we provide the main assumptions and technical lemmas that are used while analyzing a direct-search method. As in the rest of Section 2, we focus on the unconstrained, deterministic setting, and provide results for both smooth and nonsmooth objectives.

2.3.1 Main assumptions

We begin by listing the key assumptions that are made on the objective function.

Assumption 2.1. The objective f is lower bounded, i.e., there exists $f^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq f^* \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Assumption 2.1 is typically used together with a guarantee of decrease at every iteration of the algorithm to establish convergence.

Assumption 2.2. The sublevel set $L_0 := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(\mathbf{x}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_0)\}$ is bounded, where $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the initial point of Algorithm 1.

Assumption 2.2 certifies that the iterates of Algorithm 1 remain in a bounded set, which is particularly helpful to guarantee convergence of a subsequence of the iterates.

In addition to assumptions on the objective function, an analysis of Algorithm 1 typically requires conditions on the polling directions, that are stated below.

Assumption 2.3. For $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have $\|\mathbf{d}\| \in [d_{\min}, d_{\max}]$ where d_{\min} and d_{\max} are positive constants.

The upper bound ensures that the information obtained in unsuccessful steps is relevant for the directional derivative, while the lower bound ensures that the sufficient decrease condition can indeed be satisfied for good descent directions.

The last classical assumption concerns the forcing function.

Assumption 2.4. The forcing function $\rho : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, is continuous, non decreasing and such that $\rho(\alpha) = o(\alpha)$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$.

Note that using simple decrease (i.e., $\rho \equiv 0$) leads to immediate satisfaction of Assumption 2.4. Popular choices for ρ in direct search based on sufficient decrease include $\rho(\alpha) = c\alpha^q$ with $c > 0$ and $q > 1$, that also satisfy this condition.

2.3.2 Key lemmas

A remarkable feature of direct-search schemes is that their analysis relies upon *unsuccessful iterations*, at which the iterate does not change. On those iterations, one can relate a stationarity criterion of interest to the stepsize parameter. In a smooth setting, the following lemma is the first step towards establishing convergence results.

Lemma 2.1. *Let f be an L -smooth function, and consider that Algorithm 1 is applied to the minimization of f . Suppose that the k th iteration of Algorithm 1 is unsuccessful. Then,*

$$-\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{d} \rangle \leq \alpha_k \frac{L \|\mathbf{d}\|^2}{2} + \frac{\rho(\alpha_k)}{\alpha_k}. \quad (10)$$

Lemma 2.1 highlights the importance of choosing a good set of polling directions, so as to relate the left-hand side of (10) with a convergence criterion. The use of positive spanning sets is particularly suited in that regard, as it leads to the following result.

Proposition 2.1. *Let the assumptions of Lemma 2.1 hold. Suppose further that Assumption 2.3 holds, and that \mathbb{D}_k is a positive spanning set with cosine measure $\tau > 0$. Then,*

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \leq \frac{1}{\tau} \left[\alpha_k \frac{L d_{\max}}{2} + \frac{\rho(\alpha_k)}{\alpha_k d_{\min}} \right]. \quad (11)$$

The result of Proposition 2.1 can be used to guarantee convergence of the gradient norm to zero for a subsequence of unsuccessful iterates. We will illustrate such a result in Section 2.4.

In absence of smoothness, the result of Lemma 2.1 no longer holds, and one reverts to the more general statement below.

Lemma 2.2. *Consider that Algorithm 1 is applied to the minimization of f . Suppose that the k th iteration of Algorithm 1 is unsuccessful. Then, for any $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k$, we have*

$$\frac{f(\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_k \mathbf{d}) - f(\mathbf{x}_k)}{\alpha_k} \geq \frac{\rho(\alpha_k)}{\alpha_k}. \quad (12)$$

The left-hand side of (12) resembles the formula of the Clarke derivative, and is used together with the notion of refining subsequence to yield asymptotic guarantees on the Clarke directional derivatives. We define the former concept below.

Definition 2.13. *Consider a sequence of iterates $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, a sequence of stepsize parameters $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a sequence of polling sets $\{\mathbb{D}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ associated with a direct-search algorithm. Let $\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be an index subsequence such that the k th iteration is unsuccessful for every $k \in \mathbb{K}$ and the subsequence $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ converges towards $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

- *The subsequence $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ is called a refining subsequence if $\lim_{k \in \mathbb{K}} \alpha_k = 0$, in which case $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ is called a refined point.*
- *If $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ is a refining subsequence, a direction $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called a refining direction if there exists an infinite subset $\mathbb{L} \subset \mathbb{K}$ and a sequence $\{\mathbf{d}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{L}}$ such that $\mathbf{d}_k \in \mathbb{D}_k$ for any $k \in \mathbb{L}$ and $\lim_{k \in \mathbb{L}} \frac{\mathbf{d}_k}{\|\mathbf{d}_k\|} = \frac{\mathbf{d}}{\|\mathbf{d}\|}$.*

By reasoning on refining subsequences, one can directly establish asymptotic results on (Clarke) directional derivatives. This property is crucial in analyzing algorithms based on simple decrease such as those described in Section 2.5.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that f is Lipschitz continuous, and consider that Algorithm 1 is applied to the minimization of f with a forcing function that satisfies Assumption 2.4. Let $\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be an index subsequence such that $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ is a refining subsequence with refined point \mathbf{x}^* . Then, for any refining direction \mathbf{d} , it holds that*

$$f^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{d}) \geq 0. \quad (13)$$

This lemma will be used in the subsequent analyzes of direct search in the nonsmooth setting.

2.4 Directional algorithms

In their basic form, directional direct-search methods follow exactly the generic template of Algorithm 1, and we thus use them to present a detailed convergence analysis. Those schemes vary in their choice of polling directions, as well as their use of opportunistic or complete polling. However, to guarantee convergence, those methods all rely on sufficient decrease, that is on using a forcing function ρ that satisfies Assumption 2.4 as well as $\rho(\alpha) > 0$ when $\alpha > 0$. In the survey [58], this assumption is referred to as a possible “globalization strategy”, since it can be used in combination with other assumptions to prove convergence of the whole sequence generated by the direct-search algorithm.

Following the template of Section 2.3.2, we focus on the smooth setting and describe the key, deterministic results that are typically obtained for directional methods in Section 2.4.1. We then review probabilistic variants of these results in Section 2.4.2, with additions to the literature. Finally, we cover deterministic, nonsmooth results in Section 2.4.3.

2.4.1 Deterministic convergence results in the smooth case

We begin the analysis of Algorithm 1 by focusing on the smooth setting. In that context, the polling sets are typically required to be positive spanning sets with positive cosine measure. We formalize this requirement through the following assumption.

Assumption 2.5. *The polling sets $\{\mathbb{D}_k\}$ used in Algorithm 1 satisfy $\text{cm}(\mathbb{D}_k) \geq \tau$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\tau > 0$.*

A direct application of Proposition 2.1 under this assumption yields the following convergence result.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that Algorithm 1 is applied to an L -smooth function f under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.4. Let \mathbb{K} be a sequence of unsuccessful steps such that $\lim_{k \in \mathbb{K}} \alpha_k \rightarrow 0$. If $\text{cm}(\mathbb{D}_k) \geq \tau$ for every $k \in \mathbb{K}$, and $\{\mathbb{D}_k\}$ satisfies Assumptions 2.3 and 2.5, then*

$$\lim_{k \in \mathbb{K}} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\| = 0. \quad (14)$$

Theorem 2.1 is a weak convergence result, in that it only guarantees that a subsequence of gradient norms is going to zero provided there exists a subsequence of stepsizes that converges to 0. Note that neither this result nor that of Lemma 2.1 do leverage the use of sufficient decrease. A first step towards improving the results of Theorem 2.1 consists in exploiting sufficient decrease to guarantee that the entire sequence of stepsizes converges to 0.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that Algorithm 1 is applied to an L -smooth function f under Assumptions 2.1, 2.4 and 2.3. Suppose further that the algorithm uses sufficient decrease. Then, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k = 0$.*

Combining Lemma 2.4 with Theorem 2.1 does not guarantee that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\| = 0$, since the result of Theorem 2.1 only concerns subsequences of unsuccessful iterations. In fact, the result of Lemma 2.4 alone is not sufficient to improve the result of Theorem 14 and guarantee that the entire sequence of gradient

norms is converging towards zero. A popular approach requires complete polling to be performed (recall Definition 2.2) [27, 58]. Dedicated results can also be obtained in the context of locally strongly convex objectives [37, 58]. In the next theorem, we depart from standard references and show that expanding the stepsize parameter on successful iterations is a sufficient condition for the result to hold. This result was recently established in the context of direct search applied to manifold optimization problems [62], and relies on the following argument.

Lemma 2.5. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.4, for any subsequence of iterates $\{\mathbf{x}_{j(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ generated by Algorithm 1, there exists a subsequence of iterates $\{\mathbf{x}_{h(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ corresponding to unsuccessful iterations such that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{x}_{j(k)} - \mathbf{x}_{h(k)}\| = 0. \quad (15)$$

This property allows to relate the behavior of iterates on unsuccessful iterations to that of the entire iterate sequence, leading to the following global convergence result.

Theorem 2.2. *Let the assumptions of Lemma 2.4 hold. In addition, suppose that Algorithm 1 is applied using an expansion factor $\gamma > 1$ and a sequence of polling sets satisfying Assumption 2.5. Then,*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\| = 0. \quad (16)$$

The observation that global convergence follows from Lemma 2.5 was already made in [73], but applied in the context of line-search methods, to be discussed in Section 2.6.

Complexity guarantees In addition to global convergence results, the sufficient decrease condition also endows direct-search schemes with complexity bounds, or non-asymptotic results, that quantify how many iterations or function evaluations are needed in the worst case to reach an approximate optimality criterion, such as $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \leq \epsilon$ (for nonconvex objectives) or $f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \epsilon$ (for convex and strongly convex objectives). In the context of direct search, the first bounds of this nature were established by Vicente [83] in the nonconvex setting, and later extended to the convex and strongly convex setting by Dodangeh and Vicente [35]. A unified and simplified argument was presented in [61], assuming however no expansion in successful steps and a suitable initialization of the algorithm.

A common feature of these results is that they exhibit additional dependencies on the problem dimension compared to those for derivative-based algorithms, a common trait among derivative-free algorithms [23]. We present these results in a single theorem without a full proof, and refer to the aforementioned references for details. Rather than highlighting the technicalities of the proof, we focus on the connections between the results for direct search and those available for gradient descent techniques.

Theorem 2.3. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 2.2 hold. Suppose further that $\rho(\alpha) = c\alpha^2$ for some $c > 0$, and that $|\mathbb{D}_k| \leq m$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, the following results hold.*

1. *If f is nonconvex, Algorithm 1 reaches an iterate \mathbf{x}_k such that $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \leq \epsilon$ in at most $\mathcal{O}(\tau^{-2}\epsilon^{-2})$ iterations and $\mathcal{O}(m\tau^{-2}\epsilon^{-2})$ function evaluations, where τ is the bound on the cosine measures given by Assumption 2.5.*
2. *If f is convex and the distance between x_0 and the optimal set is bounded, Algorithm 1 reaches an iterate \mathbf{x}_k such that $f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \epsilon$ in at most $\mathcal{O}(\tau^{-2}\epsilon^{-1})$ iterations and $\mathcal{O}(m\tau^{-2}\epsilon^{-1})$ function evaluations.*
3. *If f is strongly convex, Algorithm 1 reaches an iterate \mathbf{x}_k such that $f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \epsilon$ in at most $\mathcal{O}(\tau^{-2} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$ iterations and $\mathcal{O}(m\tau^{-2} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$ function evaluations.*

Proof sketch. We refer in this proof as constant any quantity depending on the algorithmic parameters but not on ϵ , τ and m . First, standard theory of gradient descent (see, e.g. [85]) ensures that for any vector \mathbf{x}_k , we have

$$f\left(\mathbf{x}_k - \frac{1}{L}\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\right) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \frac{2}{L}\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|^2 \leq f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \frac{2}{L}\mathbf{g}_k^2, \quad (17)$$

for $\mathbf{g}_k \leq \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|$ a suitable stationarity measure non increasing in k and depending on the regularity of the objective. More precisely, this measure is the constant ϵ , $(f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^*)/\text{diam}(L_0)$ and $\sqrt{2\mu(f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^*)}$ for non convex, convex and strongly convex objectives. We distinguish three types of steps.

- unsuccessful steps. Using that the stepsize decreases by a constant factor together with Proposition 2.1 forcing successful iterations for α_k small enough, the number I_{ns} of these can be easily bounded as $I_{ns} \leq F_1 \ln \frac{1}{\tau\epsilon} + F_2 I_s$, for F_1, F_2 constants, and I_s number of successful steps.
- short successful steps, i.e., successful steps with $\mathbf{g}_k > \gamma \frac{\alpha}{\tau} (\frac{L}{2} + c)$. These can be bounded by a constant depending only on the algorithmic parameters but independent of ϵ (assuming ϵ small enough for nonconvex objectives).
- long successful steps, i.e., successful steps with $\mathbf{g}_k \leq \gamma \frac{\alpha}{\tau} (\frac{L}{2} + c)$. In this case then it is not difficult to prove

$$f(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \frac{K\tau^2}{2L}\mathbf{g}_k^2. \quad (18)$$

By comparing the improvement we get for this type of iterations given in (18) and the improvement we get for gradient descent in (17), we obtain that we need at most $\mathcal{O}(I_g(\epsilon)/\tau^2)$ long successful steps to converge, for $I_g(\epsilon)$ asymptotic bound on the number of gradient iterations needed to converge.

The result follows by adding the above bounds and multiplying by m to take into account that each iteration can cost up to m function evaluations. \square

As stated, the result of Theorem 2.3 does not exhibit explicit dependencies on the problem dimension. However, if one aims at minimizing the complexity bounds as functions of m and τ , it has been shown that the best choice consists in selecting \mathbb{D}_k as an orthonormal basis and its negative, in which case the results hold with $m = 2n$ and $\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ [36]. As a result, the iteration complexity bounds exhibit a dependency in n , while the evaluation complexity bounds have a dependency in n^2 . In the next section, we will describe variants of directional direct search that attempts to reduce that dependency through randomization.

2.4.2 Randomized directional direct search

An important subclass of directional direct search, that has grown in importance over the past decade, is that of *randomized direct-search* techniques. Rather than relying on deterministic properties of the polling sets, such as Assumption 2.5, those methods employ a small number of directions to effectively reduce the number of points considered at every iteration. Various zeroth-order algorithms, that attempt to build a gradient approximation, were indeed endowed with evaluation complexity bounds with a dependency in n rather than n^2 [14, 76]. In the context of directional direct search, Gratton et al [50] showed that such an improvement can be achieved thanks to randomization. The concept of *probabilistic descent* was introduced for that purpose, based on the idea of viewing the polling sets as random variables.

Assumption 2.6. *The random polling set sequence $\{\mathbb{D}_k\}$ is such that, for some $\tau > 0$ and some $\beta \in (0, 1)$*

$$\mathbf{P}(\text{cm}(\mathbb{D}_k, -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)) \geq \tau \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) \geq \beta, \quad (19)$$

where \mathcal{F}_{k-1} is the σ -algebra generated by $\mathbb{D}_0, \dots, \mathbb{D}_{k-1}$.

Note that Assumption 2.6 is clearly satisfied when Assumption 2.5 holds, i.e., when the polling sets are positive spanning sets.

Under Assumption 2.6, one can derive a high-probability function evaluation complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n\epsilon^{-2})$ for a proper choice of \mathbb{D}_k (more precisely, with probability $1 - e^{-\mathcal{O}(n\epsilon^{-2})}$). The simplest way to select \mathbb{D}_k in order to get this result is to consider a direction uniformly distributed in the unit sphere and its negative. Expected value results can also be obtained by that process. We provide a proof of that form that also encompasses the convex and strongly convex cases, left open in Gratton et al.[50].

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose that Algorithm 1 is applied to an L -smooth function f with $\rho(\alpha) = c\alpha^2$ for some $c > 0$ and $\gamma = \theta^{-1}$. Suppose that Assumption 2.3 holds for all realizations of $\{\mathbb{D}_k\}$, and that Assumption 2.6 holds with $\beta > 1/2$ and $|\mathbb{D}_k| \leq m$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, the following results hold.*

1. *If f is nonconvex, Algorithm 1 reaches an iterate \mathbf{x}_k such that $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \leq \epsilon$ in an average of at most $\mathcal{O}(\tau^{-2}\epsilon^{-2})$ iterations and $\mathcal{O}(m\tau^{-2}\epsilon^{-2})$ function evaluations, where τ is the bound on the cosine measures given by Assumption 2.6.*
2. *If f is convex and the distance between \mathbf{x}_0 and the optimal set is bounded, Algorithm 1 reaches an iterate \mathbf{x}_k such that $f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \epsilon$ in an average of at most $\mathcal{O}(\tau^{-2}\epsilon^{-1})$ iterations and $\mathcal{O}(m\tau^{-2}\epsilon^{-1})$ function evaluations.*
3. *If f is strongly convex, Algorithm 1 reaches an iterate \mathbf{x}_k such that $f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \epsilon$ in an average of at most $\mathcal{O}(\tau^{-2} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$ iterations and $\mathcal{O}(m\tau^{-2} \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$ function evaluations.*

Proof sketch. We focus on the case of a μ -strongly convex function., where the argument we use can be extended to the other cases as in the deterministic case described in Theorem 2.3. Let $f^* = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}_k)$ and $\underline{f}_k = f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^*$, so that $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \geq \sqrt{2\mu\underline{f}_k}$. If \mathbb{D}_k satisfies the event in (19), then it follows from Proposition 2.1 that

$$\alpha_k \geq \tau C \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|$$

for some constant $C > 0$, and thus

$$\alpha_k \geq \bar{\alpha}_k := \tau C \sqrt{2\mu\underline{f}_k}. \quad (20)$$

We assume now for simplicity $\alpha_0 > \bar{\alpha}_0$, where the case $\alpha_0 \leq \bar{\alpha}_0$ can be dealt with analogously. Let N_ϵ be the stopping time for the condition $f_k \leq \epsilon$, let j_ϵ be the number of times the stepsize sequence enters in $A_k = (0, \bar{\alpha}_k)$ before N_ϵ and let $\{I_j\}_{j \in [1:j_\epsilon]}$ the entry times. From the definition and the monotonicity of $\{\bar{\alpha}_k\}$ it follows that I_j is the j th unsuccessful step with $\alpha_k \in [\bar{\alpha}_k, \theta^{-1}\bar{\alpha}_k)$. Let then $\{E_j\}_{j \in [1:j_\epsilon]}$ be the sequence of the first j_ϵ exit times from A_k , where we set $E_{j_\epsilon} = N_\epsilon$ in case the stopping time is reached before the process leaves A_k for the j_ϵ th time. Then with this definition E_j coincides with the minimum between N_ϵ and the index of the j th successful iteration with $\alpha_k \in [\theta\bar{\alpha}_k, \bar{\alpha}_k)$. For the iterations between E_j and I_j we have $\alpha_k < \bar{\alpha}_k$, and therefore the probability of success is at least $\mathbf{P}(\text{cm}(\mathbb{D}_k) \geq \tau \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) \geq \beta$. We can conclude by property of the hitting times for random walks (see [15] and references therein) that

$$\mathbb{E}[I_j - E_j] \leq \frac{1}{2\beta - 1}. \quad (21)$$

We can now distinguish three kinds of steps.

- *Long successful steps.* These are successful steps with $\alpha_k \geq \theta\bar{\alpha}_k$. In this case, we have

$$\underline{f}_{k+1} \leq \underline{f}_k - c\alpha_k^2 \leq \underline{f}_k - c\theta^{-2}C^2\tau^2(2\mu\underline{f}_k) = \underline{f}_k(1 - \bar{C}\tau^2) \quad (22)$$

for some constant $\bar{C} > 0$, and where in the second inequality we used (20). Therefore there can be at most $N_{ls} = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\tau^2} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ steps of this kind.

- *Long unsuccessful steps.* These are unsuccessful steps with $\alpha_k \geq \bar{\alpha}_k$. From the assumption $\gamma = 1/\theta$, it follows that these can be at most

$$N_{lu} = \ln \gamma \ln \frac{\alpha_0}{\bar{\alpha}_0} + N_{ls}. \quad (23)$$

Therefore, $N_{lu} = O(\frac{1}{\tau^2} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ as well.

- *Short steps.* These are successful steps with $\alpha_k < \theta \bar{\alpha}_k$ or unsuccessful steps with $\alpha_k < \bar{\alpha}_k$. By definition the number of such steps is at most

$$N_s = \sum_{j=1}^{j_\epsilon} (I_j - E_j). \quad (24)$$

Now we can bound the expectation of the right-hand side of (24) as follows

$$\sum_{j=1}^{j_\epsilon} \mathbb{E}[I_j - E_j] \leq \frac{j_\epsilon}{2\beta - 1} \leq \frac{N_{ls}}{2\beta - 1} = O\left(\frac{1}{\tau^2} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right), \quad (25)$$

where the first inequality uses (21) while the second uses that E_j is a long unsuccessful step for $j \in [1 : j_\epsilon]$, and the last equality follows from the result on long successful steps. Thus $\mathbb{E}[N_s] = O(\frac{1}{\tau^2} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon})$.

We can now conclude

$$\mathbb{E}[N_\epsilon] = \mathbb{E}[N_s + N_{lu} + N_{ls}] = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\tau^2} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right). \quad (26)$$

The function evaluation complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\frac{m}{\tau^2} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ immediately follows since every iteration requires at most $|\mathbb{D}_k| \leq m$ function evaluations. \square

When every \mathbb{D}_k consists of a direction uniformly selected in the unit sphere together with its negative, then probabilistic descent (Assumption 2.6) is satisfied with $m = 2$ and $\tau^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/n)$ (see, e.g., [50]), implying a dependency of n in the complexity bounds of Theorem 2.4. Such results were also established for random search schemes in Bergou et al.[14], in which a stepsize dependent on the Lipschitz constant of the gradient is used. Direct-search methods employing a random direction and its negative at every iteration can be viewed as adaptive versions of those schemes, that maintain an estimate of the Lipschitz constant of the gradient through the stepsize parameter. The analysis of direct search using probabilistic descent directions was recently extended by Roberts and Royer [81] to allow for unbounded sets of descent directions, highlighting the connection with the theory of random matrices. In that work, each descent direction is defined through combinations of columns of a random matrix $\underline{P}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$, that represents a subspace of possible directions at iteration k . The complexity result from Gratton et al. [50] is retrieved up to an additional dependence on probabilistic bounds for the extreme singular values of \underline{P}_k . Such probabilistic bounds are non trivial to compute and have been the subject of recent studies [41].

2.4.3 Deterministic convergence results on nonsmooth objectives

We now turn to the nonsmooth setting, where we merely assume that f is Lipschitz continuous. Convergence results for methods based on sufficient decrease require asymptotic density of the set of directions.

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that Algorithm 1 is applied to a Lipschitz continuous function f . Let \mathbb{K} be a sequence of unsuccessful steps such that $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ is a refining subsequence converging to \mathbf{x}^* . If the corresponding set of refining directions is dense in the unit sphere, then \mathbf{x}^* is a Clarke stationary point.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, for any refining direction \mathbf{d} associated with $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$, we have $f^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{d}) \geq 0$. Since the set of refining directions is dense in the unit sphere, for any nonzero vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a sequence of refining directions $\{\mathbf{d}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mathbf{d}_i \rightarrow \frac{\mathbf{u}}{\|\mathbf{u}\|}$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. As a result, we obtain in the limit that $f^\circ\left(\mathbf{x}^*; \frac{\mathbf{u}}{\|\mathbf{u}\|}\right) \geq 0$. Since the Clarke directional derivative is positively homogeneous, we also have $f^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u}) \geq 0$, from which the desired conclusion follows. \square

Under additional assumptions, one can obtain a stronger result akin to Theorem 2.2 for nonsmooth objectives. While this result follows from well established techniques, we are not aware of any existing reference in the literature.

Theorem 2.6. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 2.5 hold. Suppose further that Assumptions 2.1, 2.4 and 2.3 hold. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\mathbb{D}_k = \{\mathbf{d}/\|\mathbf{d}\| \mid \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k\}$. If $\cup_{k \in \mathbb{K}} \mathbb{D}_k$ is dense in the unit sphere for every infinite subsequence \mathbb{K} , then every limit point of $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Clarke stationary.*

Unlike in the smooth setting, complexity bounds for direct search remain rather unexplored in the non-smooth setting. Garmanjani and Vicente [45] provided complexity results for a special class of nonsmooth problems for which a family of smoothed functions $\{\tilde{f}(\cdot, \mu)\}_{\mu > 0}$ of smooth functions (in the sense of Definition 2.8) is available such that $\tilde{f}(\cdot, \mu)$ gets increasingly close to f as μ decreases. Examples of such functions include Gaussian or uniform smoothing, for which one can show that $\tilde{f}(\cdot, \mu)$ is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\mu}\right)$ -smooth [76]. We present below a simplified version of the analysis in Garmanjani and Vicente [45] based on a fixed smoothing parameter.

Theorem 2.7. *Let f be a Lipschitz continuous function satisfying Assumption 2.1. Given $\epsilon > 0$, suppose that we apply Algorithm 1 to the smoothed function $\tilde{f}(\cdot, \epsilon)$ with x_0 chosen so that the level set at x_0 is bounded (in the sense of Assumption 2.2). Suppose finally that Algorithm 1 uses $\rho(\alpha) = c\alpha^{3/2}$ and polling sets $\{\mathbb{D}_k\}$ chosen so that $\text{cm}(\mathbb{D}_k) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$.*

Then, the algorithm takes at most $\mathcal{O}(n^{3/2}\epsilon^{-3})$ iterations and $\mathcal{O}(n^{5/2}\epsilon^{-3})$ function evaluations to obtain a point such that $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}, \epsilon)\| < \epsilon$.

Very recently, Lin et al [69] obtained a function evaluation complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n^{3/2}\epsilon^{-5})$ was proved for zeroth-order, smoothing-based methods to achieve a similar outcome than that of Theorem 2.7. The former result has a lower dependence from n but a higher dependence from ϵ compared to the latter. Note however that the algorithm of Lin et al. [69] only uses true function values rather than values for smoothed approximations.

2.5 Mesh-based algorithms

In contrast with directional direct-search techniques, mesh-based algorithms rely on simple decrease, and enforce convergence thanks to a careful generation of search directions. Pioneer methods of that form include generalized pattern search (GPS) [18, 82] and frame-based methods [28]. We focus our presentation on the *mesh adaptive direct search* (MADS) [6], that is nowadays dominant in the landscape of mesh-based algorithms, thanks in part to the practical success of the NOMAD software [65].

Algorithm 2 describes a generic MADS instance. Importantly, algorithms of that class rely on two stepsize parameters called *mesh size parameter* and *poll size parameter*. The use of both parameters is essential to producing a rich set of trial points to be considered by the algorithm.

Let $\mathbf{D} := \mathbf{G}\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_D}$ where $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is invertible and the columns of $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n_D}$ form a positive spanning set. Let \mathbb{D} be the set of columns of \mathbf{D} . The mesh \mathcal{M}_k , and the frame \mathcal{F}_k centered at $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are

defined respectively as

$$\mathcal{M}_k := \bigcup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{V}_k} \{\mathbf{x} + \alpha_k^m \mathbf{D} \mathbf{z} : \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{N}^{n_D}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_k := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}_k : \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_k\|_\infty \leq \alpha_k^p d_{\max}\}, \quad (27)$$

where \mathcal{V}_k is the set containing all the points where the objective function has been evaluated by the start of iteration k , $\alpha_k^m \leq \alpha_k^p$ for all k , and $d_{\max} = \max\{\|\mathbf{d}'\|_\infty : \mathbf{d}' \in \mathbb{D}\}$, so that $\mathcal{F}_k \subseteq \mathcal{M}_k$. Note that the mesh is conceptual in the sense that it is actually never explicitly constructed nor stored. Rather, one simply makes sure in practice that the strategy used to generate trial points is such that the latter always belong to the mesh. Also recall that in the above definition, \mathcal{M}_k is defined as the union of sets over the *cache* \mathcal{V}_k , which ensures that all previously visited points trivially belong to the mesh, and that new trial points can be selected around any of them using the directions in \mathbb{D} . The goal of a MADS iteration is to locate an *improved mesh point* by evaluating the objective at a finite number of points lying on the frame \mathcal{F}_k . In practice, we point out that additional points on $\mathcal{M}_k \setminus \mathcal{F}_k$ are often considered in the context of a search step.

When iteration k of Algorithm 2 is unsuccessful, the frame \mathcal{F}_k is called a *minimal frame* and \mathbf{x}_k is called a *minimal frame center* [6, Section 2]. In that case, we have $\alpha_{k+1}^p = \theta \alpha_k^p < \alpha_k^p$ and $\alpha_{k+1}^m < \alpha_k^m$, but allowing the poll size parameter α_k^m to decrease more rapidly than α_k^p leads to strong guarantees on the trial points that are considered by the algorithm [8]. This observation is at the heart of the convergence analysis of mesh-based algorithms.

Algorithm 2: Mesh adaptive direct search (MADS)

- 1: **Inputs:** $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\alpha_0^p > 0$, $\alpha_0^m = \min\{\alpha_0^p, (\alpha_0^p)^2\}$, $\theta \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$.
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: Select a positive spanning set \mathbb{D}_k^p such that $\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_k^m \mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{F}_k \subseteq \mathcal{M}_k$ for all $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k^p$, where $\alpha_k^m = \min\{\alpha_k^p, (\alpha_k^p)^2\}$.
 - 4: **if** $f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}) < f(\mathbf{x}_k)$ holds for some $\mathbf{s} \in \{\alpha_k^m \mathbf{d} : \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k^p\}$ **then**
 - 5: Declare the iteration as successful, set $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}$ and $\alpha_{k+1}^p = \theta^{-1} \alpha_k^p$ and $\alpha_{k+1}^m = \min\{\alpha_{k+1}^p, (\alpha_{k+1}^p)^2\}$.
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: Declare the iteration as unsuccessful, set $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k$ and $\alpha_{k+1}^p = \theta \alpha_k^p$.
 - 8: **end if**
 - 9: **end for**
-

Algorithm 3: Creating the set \mathbb{D}_k^p of poll directions

- 1: **Inputs:** $\mathbf{v}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|\mathbf{v}_k\| = 1$ and $\alpha_k^p \geq \alpha_k^m > 0$.
 - 2: Use \mathbf{v}_k to create the Householder matrix $\mathbf{H}_k = \mathbf{I}_n - 2\mathbf{v}_k \mathbf{v}_k^\top = [\mathbf{h}_{1,k} \ \mathbf{h}_{2,k} \ \dots \ \mathbf{h}_{n,k}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$.
 - 3: Define $\mathbb{B}_k = \{\mathbf{b}_{1,k}, \mathbf{b}_{2,k}, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n,k}\}$ with $\mathbf{b}_{j,k} = \text{round}\left(\frac{\alpha_k^p}{\alpha_k^m} \frac{\mathbf{h}_{j,k}}{\|\mathbf{h}_{j,k}\|_\infty}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$.
 - 4: Set the poll set as $\mathbb{D}_k^p = \mathbb{B}_k \cup (-\mathbb{B}_k)$.
-

The weakest convergence result for MADS presented in the theorem below states that the mesh used by the algorithm gets infinitely fine.

Theorem 2.8. ([8, Theorem 8.1]) *Suppose that Algorithm 2 is applied to a function f satisfying Assumption 2.2. Then, the stepsize parameter sequences satisfy*

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k^m = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k^p = 0. \quad (28)$$

The proof of Theorem 2.8 relies on the properties of the meshes rather than sufficient decrease, as well as the use of a rational parameter to update the two stepsize parameters [8, Lemmas 7.1-7.3]. In particular, the structure of the matrix D used in Algorithm 2 guarantees that the distance between distinct mesh points is lower bounded by a function of the mesh size parameter α_k^m .

The second part of the MADS algorithm convergence analysis studies the Clarke generalized directional derivative of the objective function f at so-called refined points in refining directions. Crucially, those notions are defined according to Definition 2.13, using $\{\alpha_k^m\}$ as the stepsize parameter sequence and $\{\mathbb{D}_k^p\}$ as the polling set sequence. The existence of at least one refining subsequence along with its refined point is demonstrated in [8, Theorem 7.6] and easily follows from Theorem 2.8 along with the fact that the iterates produced by Algorithm 2 belong to a bounded level set per Assumption 2.2. On the other hand, as emphasized in [8, Section 8.3], the existence of a refining direction follows from the compactness of the closed unit ball along with Bolzano–Weierstrass’s theorem.

The basic convergence result of Algorithm 2 on refining directions (see, e.g., [6, Theorem 3.12] and [8, Theorem 8.3]) is stated next in the unconstrained case.

Theorem 2.9. *Suppose that Algorithm 2 is applied to a Lipschitz continuous function f satisfying Assumption 2.2. Let $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ be a refining subsequence for the algorithm with refined point $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a refining direction for $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$. Then $f^\circ(\hat{\mathbf{x}}; \mathbf{d}) \geq 0$.*

Theorem 2.9 is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.3, but was originally stated in a more general, constrained setting. A key to strengthening this result lies in the fact that the mesh size parameter α_k^m of MADS goes to zero faster than the frame size parameter α_k^p , thus allowing the possibility of a richer set of poll directions. In fact, dedicated approaches such as Algorithm 3 guarantee asymptotic density of the directions.

Theorem 2.10. *([8, Theorem 8.6]) The sequence of sets \mathbb{D}_k^p produced by Algorithm 3 forms an asymptotically dense set of directions if the directions \mathbf{v}_k used to construct the Householder matrices \mathbf{H}_k form a dense sequence $\{\mathbf{v}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{n-1} .*

Corollary 2.1. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 2.9 hold, and suppose that the set of refining directions for $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is dense in the unit sphere. Then $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is a Clarke stationary point.*

Remarkably, a simpler version of the result leads to convergence to a stationary point in the presence of smoothness. The proof of this result leverages sublinearity of the Clarke directional derivative.

Corollary 2.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.9, suppose further that f is smooth near a refined point $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, if the set of refining directions contains a positive spanning set, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is a stationary point for f .*

By design, a mesh-based algorithm aims at generating an asymptotically dense set of polling directions, and thus fulfills convergence conditions in both a nonsmooth and a smooth setting. In that sense, mesh-based algorithms enjoy asymptotic convergence guarantees for a large class of functions. Non-asymptotic results, such as complexity results or convergence rates, have not been derived for mesh-based methods that rely on simple decrease. Note that combining a mesh-based approach with sufficient decrease does lead to complexity guarantees, however this combination has only been adopted in the context of stochastic optimization (see Section 3.2), and remains nonstandard in the deterministic case.

2.6 Line-search algorithms

Line-search-based derivative-free methods combine a sufficient decrease condition (see Definition 2.1) with a thorough search-direction exploration procedure. Those line-search approaches date back almost 40 years. A first example of derivative-free line-search was indeed proposed in [31] by De Leone, Gaudioso and Grippo, and further analyzed in [53] by Grippo, Lampariello and Lucidi. The ideas in [31, 53] were then suitably

adapted by Lucidi and Sciandrone in [73] to define new globally convergent direct-search schemes that make use of an extrapolation step.

We report, in Algorithm 5, an example of exploration procedure that performs an extrapolation step once a given trial point satisfies the acceptance condition. In case the sufficient decrease condition is met, such a step ensures improved practical performances by accepting larger stepsizes than the ones obtained using a basic direct-search strategy like the one described in Algorithm 1. As it can be easily seen by observing the scheme, the extrapolation indeed enables us to further explore the direction \mathbf{d} by suitably increasing the stepsize β (see Steps 5-7) as long as the sufficient decrease is guaranteed in the new trial point $\mathbf{x} + \beta\mathbf{d}$ with respect to the starting point \mathbf{x} that is used to feed the procedure.

Algorithm 4: Line-search-based DS scheme

- 1: **Inputs:** $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{\alpha_0^j\}_{j \in [0:m]}$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma > 1$, a forcing function $\rho : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: Select a set of Poll directions $\mathbb{D}_k = \{\mathbf{d}_k^j\}_{j \in [0:m]}$.
 - 4: Set $j(k) = \text{mod}(k, m)$, $\alpha_{k+1}^i = \alpha_k^i$ for $i \in [0 : m] \setminus \{j(k)\}$.
 - 5: Compute $\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \alpha_{k+1}^{j(k)}$ with **Linesearch_extrapolation**($\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{d}_k^{j(k)}, \alpha_k^{j(k)}, \theta, \gamma, \rho$).
 - 6: **end for**
-

Algorithm 5: Linesearch_extrapolation($\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}, \alpha, \theta, \gamma, \rho$)

- 1: **Set** $\beta = \alpha$.
 - 2: **if** $f(\mathbf{x} + \beta\mathbf{d}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}) - \rho(\beta)$ **then**
 - 3: **Return** $\mathbf{x}, \theta\beta$
 - 4: **end if**
 - 5: **while** $f(\mathbf{x} + \beta\mathbf{d}) < f(\mathbf{x}) - \rho(\beta)$ **do**
 - 6: Set $\beta = \gamma\beta$
 - 7: **end while**
 - 8: **Return** $(\mathbf{x} + \frac{\beta}{\gamma}\mathbf{d}, \beta/\gamma)$
-

When using line-searches, it is necessary to keep a distinct sequence of stepsizes for each direction in the poll set \mathbb{D}_k , and to ensure some consistency in the choice of \mathbb{D}_k . More precisely, if $\mathbb{D}_k = \{\mathbf{d}_k^j\}_{j \in [0:m]}$ then $\{\mathbf{d}_k^j\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ must change in a continuous way with respect to $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$, and distinct sequences of stepsizes $\{\alpha_k^j\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ for $j \in [0 : m]$ must be defined. Furthermore, there is no distinction between successful and unsuccessful steps, since every iteration is guaranteed to produce some unsuccessful sufficient decrease test. This is quite evident when we examine the way the extrapolation procedure is defined. In order to ease the comprehension of the algorithmic details, we include the outline of the Line-search direct-search method in Algorithm 4. If we assume that the function is smooth (i.e., it is continuously differentiable), and the set of Poll directions is a positive spanning set we can easily prove convergence of the method using classic techniques from the literature (see, e.g., [73]). We highlight that in this case any limit point of the sequence generated by Algorithm 4 is a stationary point, a stronger result than the one reported in Theorem 2.1. The formal statement is reported below.

Theorem 2.11. *Suppose that we apply Algorithm 5 to an L -smooth function f , under Assumptions 2.2, 2.4, 2.3 and 2.5. Suppose further that sufficient decrease is used. Then,*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\| = 0. \quad (29)$$

Remark 2.1. *The result of Theorem 2.11 holds also if instead of \mathbb{D}_k constant we use more general the continuity condition*

$$\|\mathbf{d}_k^{(j)} - \mathbf{d}_{k+1}^{(j)}\| \leq L_D \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\| \quad \forall j \in [0 : m], \quad (30)$$

as it was proved in the more general setting of Riemannian optimization in [62].

For nonsmooth objectives the positive spanning set assumption is replaced by an asymptotic density assumption on the set of Poll directions. Furthermore, we have that the simplest choice for the set of Poll directions is $\mathbb{D}_k = \{\mathbf{g}_k\}$, with \mathbf{g}_k random direction in the unit sphere.

Theorem 2.12. *Suppose that we apply Algorithm 5 to a Lipschitz continuous function f , under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.4, with sufficient decrease being used. Let $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ be a refining subsequence for the algorithm with refined point \mathbf{x}^* such that $\mathbb{D}_k = \{\mathbf{g}_k\}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{K}$. Then, if any subsequence of $\{\mathbb{D}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ is dense in the unit sphere, then \mathbf{x}^* is a Clarke stationary point.*

The incorporation of non-monotone acceptance rules can significantly enhance both robustness and efficiency of line-search derivative-free methods, especially when dealing with objective functions featuring contours characterized by steep-sided valleys. In this case, the non-monotone sufficient decrease condition can be defined as follows (see, e.g., [52]).

Definition 2.14. *Let M be a positive integer. A non-monotone sufficient decrease condition for Algorithm 1 or Algorithm 5 consists in replacing (2) by*

$$f(\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_k \mathbf{d}_k) < f_k - \rho(\alpha_k), \quad f(\mathbf{x}_k) \leq f_k \leq \max_{j \in [0, \min(k, M)]} \{f(\mathbf{x}_{k-j})\}.$$

Grippo and Rinaldi [52] expand those non-monotone strategies to encompass a wide range of algorithms that make use of simplex gradients, thus promoting an extensive integration of direct search and model-based approaches. Standard direct-search have also been combined with the nonmonotone principle [46]. Other interesting examples of non-monotone line-search derivative-free algorithms are reported, e.g., in [33, 44]. Analysis of worst case complexity bounds for line-search derivative-free algorithms are reported in [21]. In particular, those bounds match the ones available in the literature for directional direct-search algorithms.

3 Handling noisy and stochastic values

This section focuses on direct-search methods for unconstrained optimization problems where the objective function cannot be evaluated exactly due to noise in the calculation. Standard direct-search methods such as those described in Section 3 have long been observed to be robust to noise up to a certain magnitude associated with the stepsize [58]. However, provably handling noise in the function evaluations requires to modify the basic direct-search framework in order to establish (probabilistic) convergence guarantees. Our goal in this section is to provide the reader with key approaches in this very active area of research.

In Section 3.1, we describe existing results in the case of bounded noise, and provide a simple complexity proof in that setting. Section 3.2 describes direct-search methods for more general noisy problems, and discusses in particular the number of noisy evaluations (also called samples) that are necessary to guarantee convergence of the algorithms.

3.1 Direct search with bounded noise

In this section, we consider problem (1) under a bounded noise model. At any point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, any query for the true function value $f(\mathbf{x})$ returns a noisy evaluation $\underline{f}(\mathbf{x})$ ¹ such that $|\underline{f}(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})|$ is bounded by a fixed

¹We recall from Section 2 that we underline quantities that depend on some form of noise, although that noise may be deterministic in nature.

value called the noise level. This noise level typically prevents the method from converging below a certain accuracy, yet it is often possible to guarantee convergence up to that threshold. We review such convergence results in Section 3.1.1, then provide a simple complexity result in the context of uniformly distributed noise in Section 3.1.2.

3.1.1 Existing results for bounded noise

The bounded noise model has been analyzed in various ways in the direct-search literature. Kelley’s implicit filtering method was equipped with global convergence guarantees that depend on the noise level [57]. The thesis of Pauwels follows a similar approach to derive complexity guarantees [78, Chapter 3]. Lucidi and Sciandrone [72] considered a line-search algorithm similar to those of Section 2.6, under the assumption that the noise level at every point considered at iteration k is bounded by a deterministic value $\Delta_k > 0$. Provided the sequence $\left\{ \frac{\Delta_k}{\min_{j \in \{0, k\}} \alpha_{k,j}} \right\}$ converges to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, convergence to stationarity points is established on smooth problems.

Another possible approach to deal with bounded noise is the use of a relaxed sufficient decrease condition with threshold $\rho(\alpha) - \gamma\epsilon$ for some $\gamma > 0$, which corresponds to the relaxed Armijo condition first proposed for line-search methods by Berahas et al. [12, 13] (note that these methods may use some derivative information). In the smooth setting, these methods can converge to an approximate stationary point with gradient norm of order $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon})$.

More recently, Diouane et al. [34] described a direct-search approach motivated by bilevel optimization to handle uniformly bounded noise, i.e., assuming $|\underline{f}(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})| \leq \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. The proposed method is a slight modification on Algorithm 1 where the stepsize α_k is updated so as to remain above a certain threshold $\alpha_{\min} \geq 0$, by selecting $\alpha_0 \geq \alpha_{\min}$ and updating $\alpha_{k+1} = \max\{\theta\alpha_k, \alpha_{\min}\}$ on unsuccessful iterations. Convergence results are then established for both mesh-based and directional variants of the method. In presence of smoothness, and assuming that the method stops at the first iteration for which $\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}$, the method with sufficient decrease reaches an iterate such that

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\alpha_{\min}} + \alpha_{\min}\right)$$

after at most $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_{\min}^{-2})$ iterations. Setting $\alpha_{\min} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{1/2})$ shows that one can expect a gradient accuracy in $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{1/2})$ in $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ iterations. For nonsmooth objectives, the method converges asymptotically to a $(\alpha_{\min}, \mathcal{O}(\epsilon/\alpha_{\min} + \alpha_{\min}))$ -Goldstein stationary point in the sense of Definition 2.12, and such a point is identified in a finite number of iterations when sufficient decrease is used. Setting again $\alpha_{\min} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{1/2})$ guarantees convergence to $(\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon}), \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon}))$ -Goldstein stationary points.

3.1.2 A simple convergence proof for uniform noise

In this section, we aim at illustrating how one obtains convergence results such as those from the previous section in the context of uniform noise in an interval $[-\sigma, \sigma]$ with $\sigma > 0$. Similarly to Berahas et al. [12], we replaced the decrease condition (2) by the *strong sufficient decrease* condition

$$\underline{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}) < \underline{f}(\mathbf{x}_k) - \rho(\alpha_k) + 2\sigma. \quad (31)$$

We also use a threshold on the stepsize, as in the approach of Diouane et al. [34]. Those changes are summarized in Algorithm 6, where we again emphasize quantities influenced by the noisy evaluations by underlining them.

To analyze this algorithm, we make the following assumption on the noisy estimates.

Assumption 3.1. *At every iteration k , the estimate $\underline{f}(\mathbf{x}_k)$ is obtained at a cost of m , while the estimates of $\underline{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s})$ are obtained at a cost of 1.*

Algorithm 6: Direct-search method for uniformly bounded noise problems

- 1: **Inputs:** Starting point/incumbent solution $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, initial stepsize $\alpha_0 > 0$, stepsize update parameters $0 < \theta < 1 \leq \gamma$, forcing function $\rho : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, threshold $\alpha_{\min} \geq 0$, noise level $\sigma > 0$
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: Select a set \mathbb{D}_k of poll directions.
 - 4: **if** $\underline{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}) < \underline{f}(\mathbf{x}_k) - \rho(\alpha_k) + 2\sigma$ holds for some $\mathbf{s} \in \{\alpha_k \mathbf{d} : \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k\}$ **then**
 - 5: Declare the iteration as successful, set $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}$ and $\alpha_{k+1} = \gamma \alpha_k$.
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: Declare the iteration as unsuccessful, set $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k$ and $\alpha_{k+1} = \max\{\theta \alpha_k, \alpha_{\min}\}$.
 - 8: **end if**
 - 9: **end for**
-

Assumption 3.1 holds when the function estimate at the incumbent \mathbf{x}_k is obtained as a maximum of m values, each of them being queried at the same time as an estimate for a given trial point $\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}$. This assumption allows us to bound the cost of every iteration in terms of (noisy) function queries, and thus to derive a sample complexity result from an iteration complexity result. Our main theorem presents both results, that are instantiated in Table 1 at the end of Section 3 for specific choices of polling sets.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that Algorithm 6 is applied to the minimization of an L -smooth function f . Suppose that any evaluation $f(\mathbf{x})$ performed by the algorithm returns a value $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})$ such that $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})$ is uniformly distributed in $[-\sigma, \sigma]$ and Assumption 3.1 holds. Suppose that the polling sets satisfy Assumption 2.3 with $d_{\min} = d_{\max} = 1$ and 2.5 with $|\mathbb{D}_k| \leq m$. Finally, suppose that the forcing function is defined by $\rho(\alpha) = c\alpha^2$ for some $c > 0$, and that $\alpha_{\min} = t \frac{\tau \varepsilon}{L/2 + 2c}$. Then for any $\varepsilon < C\sqrt{\sigma mn}$, the number of iterations required by Algorithm 6 to produce an iterate such that $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \leq \varepsilon$, denoted by N_ε , satisfies $\mathbb{E}[N_\varepsilon] = \mathcal{O}(1/(\tau^6 \varepsilon^6))$.*

In addition, the expected number of queries to noisy function values is $\mathcal{O}(m/(\tau^6 \varepsilon^6))$.

Proof. Let $k \leq N_\varepsilon$ be the index of a successful iteration, and let \mathbf{d}_k be the direction such that $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_k \mathbf{d}_k$. Define $\underline{f}_k = \underline{f}(\mathbf{x}_k)$ and $\underline{f}_k^+ = \underline{f}(\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_k \mathbf{d}_k)$. By definition of a successful iteration,

$$f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \geq \underline{f}_k - \underline{f}_k^+ - 2\sigma > \rho(\alpha_k) - 2\sigma \geq c\alpha_k^2. \quad (32)$$

Second, consider an index $k < N_\varepsilon$ corresponding to an unsuccessful iteration such that $\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}$. By Assumption 2.5, there exists $\mathbf{d}_k \in \mathbb{D}_k$ such that $\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{d}_k \rangle \leq -\tau \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k)\|$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f(\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_k \mathbf{d}_k) &\geq -\alpha_k \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{d}_k \rangle - \frac{L}{2} \alpha_k^2 = -\alpha_{\min} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{d}_k \rangle - \frac{L}{2} \alpha_{\min}^2 \\ &\geq \alpha_{\min} (\tau \varepsilon - L/2(\alpha_{\min})) = 2c\alpha_{\min}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Consider now the set of successful iterations prior to iteration N_ε such that $\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}$. Letting $\delta_k = \underline{f}_k - f(\mathbf{x}_k)$ and $\delta_k^+ = \underline{f}_k^+ - f(\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_k \mathbf{d}_k)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{k \in S\} &\supseteq \{\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}\} \cap \{\underline{f}_k - \underline{f}_k^+ \geq c\alpha_k^2 + 2\sigma\} \\ &\supseteq \{\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}\} \cap \{\delta_k - \delta_k^+ \geq 2\sigma - c\alpha_k^2\}, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where we used (33) in the second inclusion. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(1_S | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) &\geq 1_{\{\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}\}} \mathbf{P}(\delta_k - \delta_k^+ \geq 2\sigma - c\alpha_k^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) \geq \\ &1_{\{\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}\}} \mathbf{P}(\delta_k \geq \sigma - \frac{c}{2}\alpha_k^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) \mathbf{P}(\delta_k^+ \leq -\sigma + \frac{c}{2}\alpha_k^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) \geq \\ &1_{\{\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}\}} \frac{m c \alpha_k^2}{8\sigma} \frac{c \alpha_k^2}{4\sigma} = 1_{\{\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}\}} \frac{c^2 \alpha_{\min}^4}{32\sigma^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where we used (34) in the first inequality together with the measurability of $\{\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}\}$ with respect to \mathcal{F}_{k-1} , the conditional independence of $\underline{\delta}_k$ and $\underline{\delta}_k^+$ in the second inequality, and elementary properties of the uniform distribution in the third inequality, taking in particular C such that $\frac{c\alpha_{\min}^2}{4\sigma} < m/2$. We now distinguish three kinds of iterations:

- successful iterations. From (32) it follows that these can be at most $N_s = 1 + (f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) / (c\alpha_{\min}^2) = \mathcal{O}(1/(\tau^2\epsilon^2))$.
- unsuccessful iterations with $\alpha_k > \alpha_{\min}$. From well known arguments mentioned also in the deterministic case (see the proof of Theorem 2.3) it follows that these are at most $N_{lu} = \mathcal{O}(1/(\tau^2\epsilon^2))$ like the successful iterations.
- unsuccessful iterations with $\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}$. Let j_ϵ be the number of times the stepsize becomes α_{\min} before N_ϵ (possibly including the first iteration if $\alpha_0 = \alpha_{\min}$), and let $\{E_j\}_{j=[1:j_\epsilon]}$ be the indices of the iterations where this happens. Let also $\{I_j\}_{j=[1:j_\epsilon]}$ the indices of the iterations where the stepsize increases from α_{\min} , i.e., the indices of successful iterations with $\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}$. From the definition, if N_{us} is the number of unsuccessful iterations with $\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}$,

$$N_{us} = \sum_{j=1}^{j_\epsilon} I_j - E_j. \quad (36)$$

Since the probability of a successful step when $\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}$ is at least $p^* = \frac{mc^2\alpha_{\min}^4}{32\sigma^2}$ as proved in (35), we have, for $j \in [1 : j_\epsilon]$

$$\mathbb{E}[I_j - E_j] \leq 1/p^* - 1. \quad (37)$$

Therefore we can derive the following upper bound on the expectation for N_{us}

$$\mathbb{E}[N_{us}] = \sum_{j=1}^{j_\epsilon} \mathbb{E}[I_j - E_j] \leq \frac{j_\epsilon}{p^*} - j_\epsilon \leq \frac{N_s}{p^*}. \quad (38)$$

We finally get $\mathbb{E}[N_{us}] = \mathcal{O}(N_s/p^*) = \mathcal{O}(1/(m\tau^6\epsilon^6))$.

We can conclude that $\mathbb{E}[N_\epsilon] = \mathbb{E}[N_s] + \mathbb{E}[N_{lu}] + \mathbb{E}[N_{us}] = \mathcal{O}(1/(\tau^6\epsilon^6))$, and therefore, under Assumption 3.1, the sample complexity is $\mathcal{O}(m/(\tau^6\epsilon^6))$. \square

3.2 Direct search for general random noise

In this section, we consider a more general form of noise, viewed as a random variable that is not necessarily bounded. In that setting, a noisy estimate of $f(\mathbf{x})$ is represented as $f_{\underline{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x})$, where $\underline{\zeta}$ is a random variable modeling the noise. In this model, the true objective value corresponds to the expected value of the stochastic estimates, hence the optimization problem of interest is

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}_{\underline{\zeta}} \left[f_{\underline{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}) \right]. \quad (39)$$

The value $\underline{\zeta}$ represents a random variable (with unknown probability distribution in general), $\mathbb{E}_{\underline{\zeta}}$ denotes the expectation with respect to $\underline{\zeta}$, while $f_{\underline{\zeta}}$ is the noisy computable version of the numerically unavailable function f , that is the only function whose values $f_{\underline{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x})$ are accessible to optimization algorithms. Problem (39) has attracted significant attention from the derivative-free optimization community. Several line-search techniques that employ a stochastic estimation of the gradient $\nabla f(\mathbf{x})$ have been investigated [13, 16, 55, 77].

Interestingly, recent proposals of that form, termed “step search”, modify the search direction along with the stepsize, thus bringing them closer to direct-search methods in spirit [16]. Extensions of the direct-search schemes reviewed in Section 3 have also been proposed to tackle problem (39) [2, 10, 24, 40, 42, 80]. Audet et al. [10] introduced StoMADS, which can be viewed as a stochastic variant of Algorithm 2. At every iteration, this method uses estimates $\underline{f}_k^0 \approx f(\mathbf{x}_k)$ and $\underline{f}_k^s \approx f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s})$ that are computed using the evaluations of the noisy function f_{ζ} , e.g. by averaging over multiple samples evaluated at the same point. We present below a convergence theory for StoMADS seen as a variant of Algorithm 2 using random estimates.

One drawback of using such estimates is that the simple decrease condition $\underline{f}_k^s < \underline{f}_k^0$ does not necessarily imply $f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}) < f(\mathbf{x}_k)$. To circumvent this issue, Audet et al. [10] introduced so-called ε_f -accurate estimates, inspired by derivative-free trust-region algorithms [25] and proved that a *sufficient* decrease in such estimates guarantees an improvement in f . This notion, that can be found in various works ([25, Definition 3.3], [10, Definition 1],[40, Definition 1]) is recalled below.

Definition 3.1. *Consider a realization of Algorithm 2 applied to problem (39), and let \mathbf{x}_k be the incumbent at iteration k . Then, for any $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any $\varepsilon_f > 0$, a value f_k^s is called an ε_f -accurate estimate of $f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s})$ for α_k^p if*

$$|f_k^s - f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s})| \leq \varepsilon_f (\alpha_k^p)^2.$$

Note that Definition 3.1 is stated in a deterministic fashion. Similarly to the analysis in Section 2.4.2, probabilistic satisfaction of this property is usually considered in the analysis.

Let $\gamma > 2$ be a constant. By making use of ε_f -accurate estimates, [10, Proposition 1] demonstrated that

$$f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}) - f(\mathbf{x}_k) \leq -(\gamma - 2)\varepsilon_f (\alpha_k^p)^2 < 0 \quad \text{if} \quad f_k^s - f_k^0 \leq -\gamma\varepsilon_f (\alpha_k^p)^2 \quad (40)$$

(in which case the StoMADS iteration is called successful), while $f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}) - f(\mathbf{x}_k) \geq (\gamma + 2)\varepsilon_f (\alpha_k^p)^2 > 0$ whenever $f_k^s - f_k^0 \geq -\gamma\varepsilon_f (\alpha_k^p)^2$. In the latter case, the unsuccessful iteration is called *certain*, which differs from so-called *uncertain* unsuccessful ones where $f_k^s - f_k^0$ belongs to the so-called *uncertainty interval* $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma, \varepsilon_f}(\alpha_k^p) := (-\gamma\varepsilon_f (\alpha_k^p)^2, \gamma\varepsilon_f (\alpha_k^p)^2)$, whence $f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}) - f(\mathbf{x}_k) \in (-\gamma\varepsilon_f (\alpha_k^p)^2, \gamma\varepsilon_f (\alpha_k^p)^2) =: \mathcal{I}'_{\gamma, \varepsilon_f}(\alpha_k^p)$. Indeed, since $0 \in \mathcal{I}'_{\gamma, \varepsilon_f}(\alpha_k^p)$, it is impossible to know whether or not a decrease occurs in f . This distinction between the two types of unsuccessful iterations and the need to reduce the mesh and frame size parameters less aggressively during uncertain unsuccessful iterations motivated the update of the latter parameters using θ and θ^2 . Indeed, on successful iterations, the frame size parameter and the current solution are updated, respectively according to $\alpha_{k+1}^p = \min\{\theta^{-2}\alpha_k^p, \theta^{-\hat{z}}\}$, for some $\hat{z} \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}$. When the unsuccessful iteration is certain, α_k^p is decreased according to $\alpha_{k+1}^p = \theta^2\alpha_k^p$, and when it is uncertain, $\alpha_{k+1}^p = \theta\alpha_k^p$. In both latter cases, $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k$. A detailed presentation of StoMADS is given by [10, Algorithm 1].

The convergence analysis of StoMADS uses the theory of stochastic processes, which is motivated by the fact that the proposed method ends up making use of *probabilistic estimates* \underline{f}_k^0 and \underline{f}_k^s with realizations f_k^0 and f_k^s respectively, thus resulting in a stochastic process, as detailed in [10, Section 2.2]. For convergence needs, the probabilistic estimates are assumed to be accurate with a sufficiently large, but fixed, probability conditioned on the past history of the algorithm, where the latter is formalized using σ -algebras \mathcal{F}_{k-1} generated by the estimates \underline{f}_ℓ^0 and \underline{f}_ℓ^s , $\ell \in [0 : k - 1]$, as proposed in [25].

Definition 3.2. *A sequence $\{\underline{f}_k^0, \underline{f}_k^s\}$ of random estimates produced by the stochastic version of Algorithm 2 is called β -probabilistically ε_f -accurate with respect to the corresponding sequence $\{\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{s}_k, \alpha_k^p\}$, if*

$$\mathbb{P}(\{|f_k^0 - f(\mathbf{x}_k)| \leq \varepsilon_f (\alpha_k^p)^2\} \cap \{|f_k^s - f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}_k)| \leq \varepsilon_f (\alpha_k^p)^2\} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) \geq \beta. \quad (41)$$

The convergence analysis of StoMADS uses the following key assumptions on the nature of the stochastic information.

Assumption 3.2. The sequence $\{f_k^0, f_k^s\}$ of random estimates:

i- is β -probabilistically ε_f -accurate for some $\beta \in (1/2, 1)$.

ii- satisfies for all $k \geq 0$ and some $\kappa_f \geq 0$, the following κ_f -variance conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|f_k^s - f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}_k)|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] &\leq \kappa_f^2 (\alpha_k^p)^4 \text{ almost surely, and} \\ \mathbb{E} \left[|f_k^0 - f(\mathbf{x}_k)|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] &\leq \kappa_f^2 (\alpha_k^p)^4 \text{ almost surely.} \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Inspired by [25], Audet et al. [10] showed how random estimates satisfying Assumption 3.2 can be made available by considering a simple random noise framework where in addition to (39), it is assumed that $\mathbb{V}_{\zeta} [f_{\zeta}(\mathbf{x})] \leq V < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and some constant V . Then for a *sample size* p_k satisfying $p_k \geq \frac{\bar{V}}{\varepsilon_f^2(1-\sqrt{\beta})(\alpha_k^p)^4}$, and κ_f chosen according to $\kappa_f^2 \geq \varepsilon_f^2(1-\sqrt{\beta})$, Assumption 3.2 is shown to be satisfied for the random estimates

$$f_k^0 := \frac{1}{p_k} \sum_{i=1}^{p_k} f_{\zeta_i^0}(\mathbf{x}_k) \quad \text{and} \quad f_k^s := \frac{1}{p_k} \sum_{i=1}^{p_k} f_{\zeta_i^s}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}_k),$$

where $\zeta_i^0, i = 1, \dots, p_k$ and $\zeta_i^s, i = 1, \dots, p_k$ are independent random samples of independent copies ζ^0 and ζ^s , respectively, of ζ .

One would ideally like β to be equal to 1 in (41), which is very difficult or impossible in practice in a non degenerate noise framework. Thus, inspired by [15, 25, 77] the analysis of StoMADS showed that instead of the latter requirement, a well-chosen lower bound on β is enough for the convergence of the proposed method to be guaranteed. More precisely the following results [10, Theorem 1 and Corollary 1] are proved.

Theorem 3.2. Under Assumptions 2.1 and 3.2, for $\nu \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta \in (1/2, 1)$ satisfying

$$\frac{\nu}{1-\nu} \geq \frac{2(\theta^4 - 1)}{\varepsilon_f(\gamma - 2)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{1-\beta}} \geq \frac{4\nu\kappa_f}{(1-\nu)(1-\theta^2)}, \quad (43)$$

the sequence $\{\alpha_k^m\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of random mesh size parameters satisfies $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k^m < \infty$ almost surely. In particular, this means that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha_k^m = 0$ almost surely.

The last result of Theorem 3.2, so-called zeroth-order convergence result, shows that on an event of probability one, the meshes used by StoMADS become infinitely fine. It is worth noticing the convergence of the whole sequence of mesh size parameters to zero in the StoMADS framework, which is stronger than the \liminf -type result of MADS in Theorem 2.8. In fact, while using the same mesh and $\theta \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ as in MADS, the above \lim -type convergence result of StoMADS mesh size parameters is due to the fact that its analysis does not rely on Theorem 2.8 but rather takes advantage of the sufficient decrease in the objective function values implied by that in the acceptance condition (of new points) related to corresponding estimates as emphasized by (40). Indeed, it is this sufficient decrease in f , whenever the random estimates are probabilistically accurate, combined with the κ_f -variance condition in Assumption 3.2 when the estimates are inaccurate, that play a major role in showing that $\mathbb{E} [\phi_{k+1} - \phi_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq -\eta(\alpha_k^p)^2$ almost surely for all $k \geq 0$ and some constant $\eta > 0$, thus leading to the results of Theorem 3.2 as explained in the more general framework of [40, Theorem 3], where $\phi_k := \nu(f(\mathbf{x}_k) - f^*) + (1-\nu)(\alpha_k^p)^2 > 0$.

The proof of the existence of a convergent refining subsequence in StoMADS framework does not use the assumption that all the iterates generated by the algorithm belong to the level set $\mathcal{L}(f(\mathbf{x}_0))$ as in MADS. This is because due to inaccurate estimates, the algorithm can wrongly accept new points leading to possible

increases in f between successive iterations, resulting in iterates that lie outside the initial level set $\mathcal{L}(f(x_0))$. In other words, the algorithm can *venture outside* the initial level as was also the case and emphasized in [25]. Thus, the existence of a convergent refining subsequence is demonstrated in [10, Theorem 2] under the assumption that all the iterates generated by the method belong to a compact set. More precisely the following result is established.

Theorem 3.3. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, and suppose further that all the iterates generated by StoMADS lie in a compact set. Then under the additional assumptions of Theorem 3.2, there exists a refining subsequence $\{\underline{x}_k\}_{k \in K}$, for a random set K , which converges almost surely to a refined point $\hat{\underline{x}}$.*

In addition to the theory of stochastic processes, the main convergence result of StoMADS uses Clarke calculus [26]. It states that the Clarke generalized derivative of f at a refined point in a corresponding refining direction is nonnegative almost surely. More precisely the following result is derived.

Theorem 3.4. *Let all the assumptions made in Theorem 3.3 hold. Then there exists an almost sure event \mathcal{E} such that for all $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$, for any refined point $\hat{\underline{x}}(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and for any refining direction $\hat{\underline{d}}(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for $\hat{\underline{x}}(\omega)$, one has*

$$f^\circ(\hat{\underline{x}}(\omega); \hat{\underline{d}}(\omega)) \geq 0.$$

To analyze the complexity of stochastic direct-search methods, Dzahini [40] extended StoMADS to a more general framework by introducing so-called stochastic directional direct-search (SDDS) algorithms [40, Algorithm 1] which accept new points using the sufficient decrease condition $f_{-k}^s - f_{-k}^0 \leq -\gamma c \varepsilon_f (\alpha_k)^q$, where $c > 0$ and $q > 1$. The SDDS framework which, unlike StoMADS, does not require that trial points belong to a mesh, shows in [40, Section 2.1] how the parameter θ used to update the stepsize α_k can be chosen so that there is no need to distinguish *certain* and *uncertain* unsuccessful iterations. Under similar StoMADS assumptions related to β -probabilistically ε_f -accurate estimates, and by making use of an existing supermartingale-based framework proposed by Blanchet et al. [15], the expected number of iterations required by SDDS algorithms to drive $\|\nabla f(\underline{x}_k)\|_2$ below a given threshold $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ is proved in [40, Theorem 4] to be $\mathcal{O}\left(\epsilon^{-\frac{q}{\min(q-1, 1)}} / (2\beta - 1)\right)$. More recently, Rinaldi et al. [80] proved convergence of a minimalistic stochastic direct-search scheme for nonsmooth objectives, following Algorithm 1 with a single poll direction and with stochastic estimates replacing exact values. Their convergence analysis uses only a weak tail bound condition on the noise, bounding the probability that the error on the estimate of the improvement is greater than a fraction of the acceptance threshold. Some original sampling complexity results given in that work will be discussed in the next section.

3.2.1 Sample complexity

In addition to iteration complexity results such as those of the rest of Section 3, results that determine how many samples (i.e., evaluations of stochastic estimates) are required to reach a desired accuracy are of primary importance in a derivative-free setting. A first bound of that form was shown in the context of model-based methods [15], and was established for a direct-search scheme by Audet et al. [10]. This result shows that the number of samples at iteration k must be $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_k^{-4})$ in order to obtain convergence guarantees. An improvement to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_k^{-2q})$ samples per iteration was proved by Rinaldi et al. [80], where $q \in (1, 2]$ originates from the choice of forcing function $\rho(\alpha) = c\alpha^q$ with $c > 0$. In that work, an important distinction was also made for cases where the noisy objective is an expectation as in (39) and sampling can be done with a common random number generator (i.e., the same realization of ζ can be used to produce several estimates), that is the setting typically used in the analysis of smoothing based zeroth-order methods [47]. The following assumption summarizes this setup.

Assumption 3.3. *The objective is an expectation as in (39), the sampling can be done with common random number generator and $f_{\zeta}(\mathbf{x})$ is uniformly Lipschitz continuous, i.e., there exists L_F independent of ζ such that*

$$|f_{\zeta}(\mathbf{x}) - f_{\zeta}(\mathbf{y})| \leq L_F \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (44)$$

In [80] it was proved that Assumption 3.3 leads to an improvement by a factor of α_k^2 on the number of samples required per iteration, for adaptive sampling techniques. Another notable result is the $\mathcal{O}((\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}} T^{\frac{2}{3}})$ regret bound with respect to a sample budget T for stochastic direct-search applied to smooth strongly convex objectives proved by Achddou et al. [1]. The same authors introduce a novel technique called *sequential sampling*, that allows for fewer samples per iteration in cases where the sufficient decrease condition is satisfied or violated with a certain margin. This technique was shown to have the same theoretical worst case bounds and better practical performance than adaptive sampling, at least in the setting considered in that work.

Setting aside the bounds on the number of samples needed per iteration, to our knowledge there are no available bounds on the overall number of samples needed to achieve a certain accuracy for direct-search methods with adaptive sampling. Still, such complexity bounds can be easily obtained with well known techniques. We describe here two possible strategies. The simplest one is to impose a suitable lower bound α_{\min} on the stepsize, and prove an iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n/\varepsilon^2)$ by adapting the merit function technique mentioned in Section 3.2 in relation to Theorem 3.2. Then the sample complexity can be bounded as the iteration complexity times the number of samples required when $\alpha_k = \alpha_{\min}$. Another option not requiring lower bounds on the stepsize is using iteration complexity results within the general sample complexity framework for derivative free methods recently introduced in [56]. Under that framework however specific assumptions on the algorithmic parameters are required, and the sample complexities can only be proved with high but constant probability. The results that can be obtained applying these techniques, together with already known results and an original contribution of this survey are reported in Table 1. As an important example, the sample complexity result in line 3 of Table 1 for SDS-AS (stochastic direct-search with adaptive sampling) can be obtained combining the iteration complexity proved in [40] with the general framework in [56] (the dependence from n of the samples per iteration is however not discussed in [40]).

4 Handling constraints

In this section, we consider direct-search methods designed for *constrained* optimization problems of the form

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \quad (45)$$

where Ω is a proper subset of \mathbb{R}^n called the feasible set, that encodes the various constraints applicable to the problem variables. Those constraints are subject to a careful classification in derivative-free optimization, according to the information they provide regarding feasibility [66]. In the context of this survey, we will classify constraints as *relaxable* or *unrelaxable* depending on whether the objective function can be queried at points that do not satisfy this constraint. We will also distinguish between *quantifiable* and *non-quantifiable* constraints. The former type corresponds to constraints that produce a numerical value indicating how far a point is from being feasible, while the latter type can be viewed as a binary certificate of constraint satisfaction.

This section begins by a novel perspective on feasible direct-search methods, that aim at preserving feasibility during the optimization process. The survey of Kolda et al. [58] provides an excellent introduction to handling linear constraints through the choice of polling directions in the context of directional methods, and complexity results have been derived for such approaches [51, 64]. Therefore, we chose to cover additional techniques that were not present in other surveys, including a new result for Frank-Wolfe strategies, that we present in Section 4.1.1. In Section 4.2, we review infeasible direct-search methods, for which feasibility can only be guaranteed asymptotically.

Method	Noise	Objective	Samples per iteration	Iteration Complexity	Sample complexity	Relevant works
SDS-AS	$M_{r(q)} < +\infty$	Lipschitz	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha_k^{-2q})$	-	-	[80]
SDS-AS	Assumption 3.3	Lipschitz	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha_k^{2-2q})$	-	-	[80]
SDS-AS	$M_2 < \infty$	Lipschitz	$\mathcal{O}(n^2 \alpha_k^{-4})$	$\mathcal{O}(n/\varepsilon^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^5/\varepsilon^6)$	[40, 56]
SDS-SSD	$\mathcal{U}([- \sigma, \sigma])$	Smooth	$\mathcal{O}(n)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^2/\varepsilon^6)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3/\varepsilon^6)$	Theorem 3.1
SDS-AS	Assumption 3.3	Smooth	$\mathcal{O}(n^2 \alpha_k^{-2})$	$\mathcal{O}(n/\varepsilon^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3/\varepsilon^4)$	-
RSDS-AS	$M_2 < \infty$	Smooth	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha_k^{-4})$	$\mathcal{O}(n/\varepsilon^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3/\varepsilon^6)$	-
RSDS-SSD	$\mathcal{U}([- \sigma, \sigma])$	Smooth	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3/\varepsilon^6)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3/\varepsilon^6)$	Theorem 3.1
RSDS-AS	Assumption 3.3	Smooth	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha_k^{-2})$	$\mathcal{O}(n/\varepsilon^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^2/\varepsilon^4)$	-
ZOGD	Assumption 3.3	Smooth	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(n/\varepsilon^4)$	$\mathcal{O}(n/\varepsilon^4)$	[47]

Table 1: Complexity of stochastic direct-search methods and Zeroth-order gradient descent (ZOGD). SDS = stochastic direct search, AS = adaptive sampling, SSD = strong sufficient decrease, SRDS = stochastic direct search with probabilistic descent directions. For Lipschitz objectives, the poll set is chosen as a random direction in the unit sphere; for smooth objectives, the poll set is chosen as the canonical basis and its opposite in the deterministic base, and as a vector uniformly distributed in the unit sphere and its opposite in the randomized case. M_r is the r -th moment of the noise, $q \in (1, 2]$ is the exponent in the sufficient decrease condition, assumed to be 2 for smooth objectives, $r(q) = q/(q - 1)$ and \mathcal{U} denotes the uniform distribution.

4.1 Feasible methods

In this section, we consider feasible direct-search algorithms, that are particularly suited for unrelaxable constraints. Those methods obey a similar principle, that consists in starting from a feasible point and ensure feasibility through feasible directions. To this end, we modify Algorithm 1 to account for the use of feasible directions and feasible iterates. Algorithm 7 describes this modification.

Algorithm 7: Feasible direct-search scheme

- 1: **Inputs:** Feasible point $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega$, initial stepsize $\alpha_0 > 0$, stepsize update parameters $0 < \theta < 1 \leq \gamma$, forcing function $\rho : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: Select a set \mathbb{D}_k of poll directions, and define $\alpha_k^{\mathbf{d}} = \min\{\alpha_k, \alpha_{\max}^{\mathbf{d}}\}$ for every $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k$.
 - 4: **if** $f(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}) < f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \rho(\alpha_k^{\mathbf{d}})$ holds for some $\mathbf{s} \in \{\alpha_k^{\mathbf{d}} \mathbf{d} : \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k\}$ **then**
 - 5: Declare the iteration as successful, set $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}$ and $\alpha_{k+1} = \gamma \alpha_k$.
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: Declare the iteration as unsuccessful, set $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k$ and $\alpha_{k+1} = \theta \alpha_k$.
 - 8: **end if**
 - 9: **end for**
-

In order to preserve feasibility, note that the method uses a stepsize $\alpha_k^{\mathbf{d}}$ tailored to the direction at hand, akin to the line-search techniques of Section 2.6. This stepsize is always smaller than the maximal feasible stepsize for the particular direction. Algorithm 7 differs from first-order feasible direction methods as described e.g. in [79, Algorithm 1] through the use of poll directions instead of a derivative-based direction. This observation is crucial to Section 4.1.1, where we provide an analysis of Algorithm 7 based on

Frank–Wolfe methods. Sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 survey other feasible iterates strategies, based on Riemannian manifolds and extreme barrier, respectively.

4.1.1 Frank–Wolfe direct-search method

Previous surveys have focused on extending the theory from the unconstrained setting to the constrained case [58, 64, 83]. We depart from existing analyzes by interpreting feasible direct-search methods as *zeroth-order* Frank–Wolfe (FW) methods, with results mostly inspired by the recent works [29] and [79].

Suppose that the feasible set satisfies $\Omega = \text{conv}(A)$ with $|A| < +\infty$, i.e., we assume that Ω is a polytope given as a convex hull. The Frank–Wolfe or conditional gradient method [17] proceeds iteratively by selecting a direction \mathbf{d}_k^{FW} pointing towards the vertex of Ω minimizing the scalar product with the gradient:

$$\mathbf{d}_k^{FW} = \mathbf{v}_k - \mathbf{x}_k \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{v}_k \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \Omega} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{d}_k \rangle$$

Under our assumption on Ω , the direction can equivalently be defined as

$$\mathbf{d}_k^{FW} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{v} \in A} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle .$$

A zeroth-order version of the Frank-Wolfe algorithm can be obtained by considering Algorithm 7 with

$$\mathbb{D}_k = \mathbb{D}_k^{FW} := \{ \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}_k \}_{\mathbf{v} \in A} . \quad (46)$$

With the choice (46), observe that $\mathbf{d}_k^{FW} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k^{FW}} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{d} \rangle$, and thus Algorithm 7 is indeed approximating \mathbf{d}_k^{FW} (a gradient-based direction) with a finite set of directions.

Convergence results for Frank-Wolfe methods are typically obtained using a stationarity measure called the Frank–Wolfe gap, and defined by

$$G(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \Omega} \langle -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega .$$

It immediately follows from the definition that $G(\mathbf{x}_k) = \langle -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{d}_k \rangle$, and one can show that $G(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ with equality only in stationary points. Complexity results based on this measure seek to bound the cost of satisfying

$$\min_{k \in [0:T]} G(\mathbf{x}_k) \leq \varepsilon . \quad (47)$$

The result below provides such a complexity bound in the context of a zeroth-order Frank–Wolfe method.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that Algorithm 7 is applied to problem (45) for smooth objective f and $\Omega = \text{conv}(A)$ with $|A| < +\infty$. Suppose further that $\{\mathbb{D}_k\}$ is chosen following (46). Let $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$ be a sequence generated by Algorithm 7 with $\mathbb{D}_k = \mathbb{D}_k^{FW}$ and maximal stepsize equal to 1. Then $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$ converges to stationary points with a function evaluation complexity of $\mathcal{O}(|A|/\varepsilon^2)$ for the condition (47).*

Proof. For simplicity, we assume $\gamma = 1$, and give a proof that can be extended to the case where $\gamma \geq 1$ exactly as in the unconstrained setting. We have, for L_f affine invariant Lipschitz constant of f over Ω (see, e.g., [17])

$$f(\mathbf{x} + \alpha \mathbf{d}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}) + \alpha \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{d} \rangle + \frac{L_f \alpha^2}{2} . \quad (48)$$

Then, if the iteration k is unsuccessful, for $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k$ such that $G(\mathbf{x}_k) = \langle -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{d} \rangle$, and $\alpha = \alpha_k^d$

$$f(\mathbf{x}_k) - c\alpha^2 \leq f(\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha \mathbf{d}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_k) + \alpha \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{d} \rangle + \frac{L_f \alpha^2}{2} = f(\mathbf{x}_k) - \alpha G(\mathbf{x}_k) + \frac{L_f \alpha^2}{2} \quad (49)$$

and therefore

$$G(\mathbf{x}_k) \leq \alpha_k^d \left(\frac{L_f}{2} + c \right) \leq \alpha_k \left(\frac{L_f}{2} + c \right), \quad (50)$$

where the second inequality follows from $\alpha_k^d \leq \alpha_k$. Now, let \tilde{T}_ε be the index of the first unsuccessful iteration with $\alpha_k \leq \bar{\alpha}_\varepsilon = \varepsilon / (L_f/2 + c)$. Then necessarily $\tilde{T}_\varepsilon \geq T_\varepsilon$, since applying (50) with $k = T_\varepsilon$ we get $G(\mathbf{x}_{T_\varepsilon}) \leq \varepsilon$. Now, exploiting that the stepsize sequence is non increasing we get that for every successful iteration before T_ε the objective improves by at least $c\tilde{\alpha}_\varepsilon^2$, for

$$\tilde{\alpha}_\varepsilon = \min(\bar{\alpha}_\varepsilon, \alpha_0, 1) = \min(\bar{\alpha}_\varepsilon, \alpha_0) \quad (51)$$

where in the first equality we exploited that the maximal feasible stepsize is always 1 for the FW method. Thus, there can be at most $S(\tilde{T}_\varepsilon) = (f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) / (c\tilde{\alpha}_\varepsilon^2)$ successful steps before iteration \tilde{T}_ε . At the same time, clearly there can be at most $N(\tilde{T}_\varepsilon) = \ln_\theta(\tilde{\alpha}_\varepsilon/\alpha_0)$ unsuccessful steps before the iteration \tilde{T}_ε . Thus

$$T_\varepsilon \leq \tilde{T}_\varepsilon = 1 + S(\tilde{T}_\varepsilon) + N(\tilde{T}_\varepsilon) \leq 1 + \frac{f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)}{c\tilde{\alpha}_\varepsilon^2} + \ln_\theta(\tilde{\alpha}_\varepsilon/\alpha_0) = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\right). \quad (52)$$

Since every iteration costs at most $|A|$ function evaluations, the $O(|A|/\varepsilon^2)$ complexity result follows. \square

When Ω is the probability simplex in particular we get an $O(n/\varepsilon^2)$ function evaluation complexity. This apparent improvement with respect to the unconstrained case is possible thanks to the fact that the FW gap is a weak stationarity measure, as we will see later in this section.

The cosine measure can be generalized to the constrained setting of Algorithm 7 in the following way.

Definition 4.1. For a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathbf{y} \in C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and a set of feasible directions \mathbb{D} in \mathbf{y} the C -cosine measure of \mathbb{D} with respect to \mathbf{v} in \mathbf{y} is defined as

$$\text{cm}_C(\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v}) := \max_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}} \frac{\langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{v} \rangle}{\|\pi(T_C(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{v})\| \|\mathbf{d}\|}. \quad (53)$$

The C -cosine measure of \mathbb{D} in \mathbf{y} is then defined as

$$\text{cm}_C(\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{y}) = \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}} \text{cm}_C(\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v}). \quad (54)$$

We will show in the rest of this section how this extension was used in different ways in various direct-search method. While the direct-search literature focuses on the case where C is a suitably defined cone depending from k (see, e.g., [59] and references therein), here we consider the simpler case where $C = \Omega$ does not depend from k .

A first-order version of the cosine measure for constrained problems given in Definition 4.1 was introduced in the recent work [79]. There it was proved that on polytopes the directions of several Frank–Wolfe variants have uniform positive cosine measure, i.e., $\text{cm}_\Omega(\{\mathbf{d}^{FWV}\}, \mathbf{x}, -\nabla f(\mathbf{x})) > 0$ uniformly in \mathbf{x} for any direction \mathbf{d}^{FWV} selected by the variant. As an immediate corollary, a zeroth-order version of such variants can be given by considering \mathbb{D}_k as the set of all possible directions selected by the variant in \mathbf{x}_k .

Example 4.1. Assume that Ω is the probability simplex

$$\Delta^{n-1} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{x} \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1\} = \text{conv}(\{\mathbf{e}_i\}). \quad (55)$$

Then, the directions of the Away step Frank–Wolfe (AFW) method are

$$\mathbb{D}_k^{AFW} = \{\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{x}_k\}_{i \in [1:n]} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{e}_i\}_{i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_k)}. \quad (56)$$

It follows from the results in [79] that these directions have positive cosine measure with cosine measure $\Theta(1/\sqrt{n})$. In [29] instead a direct-search method with line search is defined using the following set of directions:

$$\mathbb{D}_k = \{\pm(\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_{j_k})\}_{i \in [1:n] \setminus \{j_k\}} \quad \text{with} \quad (\mathbf{x}_k)_{j_k} \geq \bar{\tau} \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty. \quad (57)$$

These directions are a subset of the pairwise Frank–Wolfe (PFW) directions $\{\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j\}_{i \neq j}$. By exploiting the fact that the PFW directions satisfy $\text{cm}_\Omega(\mathbb{D}_k, \mathbf{x}_k) \geq \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$, it is easy to see that the directions in (57) satisfy the condition with $\tau = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$ as well. This is an improvement from the results presented in [29] implying that the set of directions (57) has positive cosine measure $\frac{1}{\sqrt{8(n-1)}}$.

In the next theorem we give a complexity result for the condition

$$\min_{i \in [0:K]} \|\pi(T_\Omega(\mathbf{x}_k), -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_k))\| \leq \varepsilon, \quad (58)$$

where $\pi(C, \mathbf{v})$ denotes the projection of the vector \mathbf{v} onto the set C . Note that condition (58) is stronger than (47), in that

$$G(\mathbf{x}) \leq \text{diam}(\Omega) \text{dist}(N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}), -\nabla f(\mathbf{x})) = \|\pi(T_\Omega(\mathbf{x}), -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}))\|$$

for every $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ (see, e.g., [17, Equation (39)]). The result will require an upper bound on the number of maximal steps taken by the algorithm, i.e., successful iterations where $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_{\max}^k \mathbf{d}_k$. These are referred to as short steps in the context of Frank–Wolfe variants, and bounds can be found in [63, 79].

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that Algorithm 7 is applied to problem (45) where f is L -smooth and satisfies Assumption 2.1. Assume $\rho(\alpha) = c\alpha^2$, that \mathbb{D}_k satisfies Assumption 2.3 as well as the positive cosine measure condition with respect to Ω for some $\tau > 0$, that $|\mathbb{D}_k| \leq \bar{D}$ for every k , and that among the first k_s successful steps at least $(k_s - K_0)/F_s$ do not have maximal stepsize, for some positive constants \bar{D} , K_0 and F_s . Then the sequence converges to stationary points with function evaluation complexity $\mathcal{O}(F_s |\mathbb{D}| / (\tau^2 \varepsilon^2))$ with respect to condition (58).*

Proof. Let $p_k = \|\pi(T_\Omega(\mathbf{x}), -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}))\|$. We assume $\gamma = 1$ for simplicity like in the proof of Theorem 4.1. The result of Proposition 2.1 becomes in this constrained setting

$$p_k \leq \bar{c} \alpha_k, \quad (59)$$

for $\bar{c} = (Ld_{\max}/2 + c/d_{\min})/\tau$, as can be proved with the same argument. Then if \tilde{T}_ε is the index of the first unsuccessful iteration with $\alpha_k \leq \alpha_\varepsilon = \varepsilon/c$ and T_ε is the desired stopping time for condition (58) we have $\tilde{T}_\varepsilon \leq T_\varepsilon$. Let $S(\tilde{T}(\varepsilon))$ the number of successful steps before iteration $\tilde{T}(\varepsilon)$, $N(\tilde{T}(\varepsilon))$ the number of unsuccessful steps before iteration $\tilde{T}(\varepsilon)$, and $S_g(\tilde{T}(\varepsilon))$ the number of non maximal successful steps before iteration \tilde{T}_ε . Let $\tilde{\alpha}_\varepsilon = \min(\alpha_0, \alpha_\varepsilon)$. At every non maximal successful step before iteration \tilde{T}_ε the objective improves by at least $c\tilde{\alpha}_\varepsilon^2$, so that

$$S_g(\tilde{T}(\varepsilon)) \leq \frac{f(\mathbf{x}_0) - f^*}{c\tilde{\alpha}_\varepsilon^2}. \quad (60)$$

Then by the lower bound on the non maximal successful steps we get

$$S(\tilde{T}(\varepsilon)) \leq K_0 + F_s S_g(\tilde{T}(\varepsilon)). \quad (61)$$

Finally, from $\gamma = 1$ it follows

$$N(\tilde{T}(\varepsilon)) \leq \log_{\theta}(\tilde{\alpha}_{\varepsilon}/\alpha_0). \quad (62)$$

Thus we can conclude

$$T_{\varepsilon} \leq \tilde{T}_{\varepsilon} = N(\tilde{T}(\varepsilon)) + S(\tilde{T}(\varepsilon)) \leq \log_{\theta}(\tilde{\alpha}_{\varepsilon}/\alpha_0) + K_0 + F_s S_g(\tilde{T}(\varepsilon)) = O\left(\frac{F_s}{\tau^2 \varepsilon^2}\right). \quad (63)$$

The desired function evaluation complexity result follows from the observation that at most $|\mathbb{D}|$ function evaluations are performed at each iteration. \square

While Theorem 4.2 was not stated explicitly in previous works, in the recent work [29] convergence to stationary points was proved for a direct-search method using the directions in (57). These directions can be easily seen to satisfy all the conditions required by the theorem, beside the positive cosine measure condition as already discussed in Example 4.1. The direct-search method introduced in [29] was also used as a subroutine in the same work in a zeroth-order version of the fully corrective FW method, alternating FW steps with approximate minimizations in low dimensional faces.

The following is an example unrelated to FW variants where Theorem 4.2 applies.

Example 4.2. Let $\Omega = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \ell \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{u}\}$. We define the poll set as

$$\mathbb{D}_k = \{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{\{i:\mathbf{x}_i < u\}} \cup \{-\mathbf{e}_i\}_{\{i:\mathbf{x}_i > \ell\}} \quad (64)$$

Then it is not difficult to see that both the positive cosine measure condition and the maximal steps bound are satisfied, with constants $\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$, $K_0 = n$ and $F_s = 2$, as long as the stepsize is kept below $\min(\mathbf{u} - \ell)$.

We now show some connections between the above results and the standard theory of linearly constrained feasible directions direct-search methods. We refer the reader to the previous works [27, 58] for a more comprehensive treatment of these methods. The feasible set is assumed to be a general polyhedral set:

$$\Omega = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}\} \quad (65)$$

for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times n}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^l$. Without loss of generality we assume $\|\mathbf{a}_i\| = 1$ for $i \in [1 : l]$. The key tool used by direct-search methods in this setting is the ε -tangent cone $T_{\Omega}(\cdot, \varepsilon)$, defined as the dual of the cone $N_{\Omega}(\cdot, \varepsilon)$ spanned by the constraints satisfied with a margin at most ε :

$$T_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = (N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon))^{\circ} \quad \text{with} \quad N_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = \text{pspan}(\{\mathbf{a}_i : i \in S(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon)\}) \quad (66)$$

for $S(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = \{i : \langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle - b_i \geq -\varepsilon\}$. Importantly, a set of generators for this cone can be found using a QR decomposition for the matrix with columns equal to the generators of the normal cone. Furthermore, from $\|\mathbf{a}_i\| = 1$ it follows that a stepsize of at least ε can be done along any direction with unit norm feasible for $T_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon)$. A natural strategy that guarantees a positive cosine measure (in the sense of Definition 4.1) consists in choosing \mathbb{D}_k to contain a set of generators with unit norm of $T_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon)$ (see, e.g. [59, Proposition 2.1]). Before stating the next convergence result, we need to introduce the stationarity measure

$$\chi(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{\substack{\mathbf{y} \in \Omega \\ \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\| \leq 1}} \langle -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle, \quad (67)$$

first used in [58] to prove convergence of direct-search for linearly constrained problems. As it is evident comparing (4.1.1) and (67), the stationarity measure χ is a local version of the FW gap G . When Ω is bounded and convex, they are equivalent, up to a constant. Indeed

$$\chi(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{\substack{\mathbf{y} \in \Omega \\ \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\| \leq 1}} \langle -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \Omega} \langle -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle = G(\mathbf{x}) \quad (68)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
G(\mathbf{x}) &= \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \Omega} \langle -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle = \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \Omega} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\| \left\langle -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \frac{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|} \right\rangle \\
&\leq \text{diam}(\Omega) \max_{\substack{\mathbf{y} \in \Omega \\ \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\| \leq 1}} \langle -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle = \text{diam}(\Omega) \chi(\mathbf{x}).
\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

We have the following bound on $\chi(\mathbf{x})$, rephrased in our setting from [59, Proposition B.2].

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that Ω is a polyhedral set given as in (65). Then, for $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$*

$$\chi(\mathbf{x}) \leq \|\pi(T_\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon), -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}))\| + \varepsilon \frac{\|\pi(N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon), -\nabla f(\mathbf{x}))\|}{\text{cm}_{N_\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon)}(\{\mathbf{a}_i\}_{i \in S(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon)}, 0)}. \tag{70}$$

We finally can state the desired convergence result, measuring the complexity in the number of function evaluations it takes to get

$$\min_{k \in [0:K]} \chi(\mathbf{x}_k) \leq \varepsilon. \tag{71}$$

Theorem 4.3. *Let Ω be a polyhedral set given as in (65), and assume that $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|$ is uniformly upper bounded in Ω . Let $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$ be a sequence generated by Algorithm 7, with maximal stepsize given by maximal feasible stepsize and $\rho(\alpha) = c\alpha^2$. Assume also that \mathbb{D}_k is a set of positive generators with unit norm for $T_\Omega(\mathbf{x}_k, \alpha_k)$, depending only from $S(\mathbf{x}_k, \alpha_k)$, and that $|\mathbb{D}_k| \leq \bar{D}$ for some $\bar{D} > 0$. Let τ_{\min} be the minimal cosine measure of \mathbb{D}_k with respect to $T_\Omega(\mathbf{x}_k, \alpha_k)$. Then, $\tau_{\min} > 0$, and the function evaluation complexity with respect to condition (71) is $\mathcal{O}(\bar{D}/(\varepsilon^2 \tau_{\min}^2))$.*

The result of Theorem 4.3 is classical and was first presented in the survey [58] without complexity, while the complexity bound was proved in [51]. With respect to Theorem 4.2, we can see that on the one hand there is no longer dependence from the number of successful steps, while on the other hand the constant τ_{\min} is defined more implicitly than the constant τ . Bounds on the constant τ beside those presented in this survey are available for Frank–Wolfe variants directions on a variety of settings (see, e.g., [79] and references therein), while bounds for τ_{\min} are only known box and equality constrained problems [51], depending from generating sets of a larger number of possible tangent cones. Finally, Theorem 4.2 does not require any upper bound on the gradient norm.

An extension of Theorem 4.3 using random directions from the generating sets of $T(\mathbf{x}_k, \alpha_k)$ was presented in [51]. This extension using randomized directions does not lead to the same complexity improvement of randomization in the unconstrained setting, since it translates to choosing a random direction in a finite poll set rather than in the unit sphere. Still, some improvements can be obtained by decomposing $T(\mathbf{x}_k, \alpha_k)$ as the sum of a pointed cone and a subspace, and dealing with the subspace selecting a random direction in the corresponding unit sphere. The feasible direction framework using the $T(\cdot, \varepsilon)$ tangent cone was extended to the case of general algebraic unrelaxable smooth constraints in [74] by adding projections on the feasible set.

4.1.2 Riemannian direct search

Optimization problems defined on Riemannian manifolds have been the subject of increasing interest from the optimization community in recent years. The first direct-search proposal for Riemannian optimization problems is due to Dreisigmeyer [38], and consists in an extension of mesh adaptive direct-search methods to Riemannian manifolds. In the subsequent work [39], the special case of reductive homogeneous spaces, that includes several matrix manifolds, is discussed in more detail, yet without convergence guarantees. In [62] some basic direct-search schemes with or without linesearch and for both smooth and nonsmooth objectives are extended to problems defined on Riemannian manifolds, maintaining convergence properties analogous to those of the unconstrained setting. The key tool used to generate tentative points in that setting is given

by retractions, following previous works on gradient-based methods [20]. A smooth map R from the tangent manifold $T\mathcal{M}$ to the manifold itself is a retraction if

$$\left. \frac{dR(\mathbf{x}, t\mathbf{d})}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \mathbf{d} \quad (72)$$

for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathbf{d} \in T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M}$, i.e., applied in \mathbf{x} along the direction \mathbf{d} it generates a curve on the manifold starting from \mathbf{x} and with initial velocity \mathbf{d} . The consistency condition for the sequence of poll directions sets $\{\mathbf{d}_k^j\}_{j \in [0:K]} \subset T_{\mathbf{x}_k}\mathcal{M}$ mentioned in Remark 2.1 becomes in this setting

$$\text{dist}^*(\mathbf{d}_k^j, \mathbf{d}_{k+1}^j) \leq L_{\Gamma} \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1}), \quad (73)$$

where the distance dist^* is defined using a parallel transport Γ along minimal geodesics, and L_{Γ} is a positive constant. Condition (73) together with the spanning set condition can be ensured when the manifold is embedded in \mathbb{R}^n by defining \mathbb{D}_k as the projection of a fixed positive spanning basis on the tangent space $T_{\mathbf{x}_k}\mathcal{M}$.

4.1.3 Extreme barrier

The extreme barrier approach is possibly the most general way to handle constraints in direct-search methods so as to enforce feasibility. It consists in setting the objective equal to $+\infty$ outside the feasible set. The first proof of convergence (to Clarke stationary points) of an extreme barrier approach was done for mesh adaptive direct search [6], and for that reason most of the theory in Section 2.5 extends to the case of a constrained set handled through extreme barrier. We present the key elements to derive such a convergence result in the context of Algorithm 2 below, but note that similar arguments can be applied to any direct-search method with dense set of poll directions.

In order to account for the presence of constraints, we first define cones with respect to which stationary conditions hold, similarly to Section 4.1.1.

Definition 4.2. For $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, the hypertangent cone $T_{\Omega}^H(\mathbf{x})$ to Ω at \mathbf{x} is defined as the set of vectors \mathbf{d} such that for some $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbf{y} \in \Omega \cap B_{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{x})$ and $v \in B_{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{d})$ we have $\mathbf{y} + tv \in \Omega$ for $0 < t < \varepsilon$.

Using the concept of refining directions, one can provide the following generalization of Lemma 2.3.

Lemma 4.2. Suppose that f is Lipschitz continuous, and consider that Algorithm 2 is applied to (45) using an extreme barrier. Let $\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be an index subsequence such that $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ is a refining subsequence with refined point \mathbf{x}^* . Then, for any refining direction $\mathbf{d} \in T_{\Omega}^H(\mathbf{x}^*)$, it holds that

$$f^{\circ}(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{d}) \geq 0. \quad (74)$$

To obtain a convergence result from Lemma 4.2, we need an additional definition of a cone, stated below.

Definition 4.3. For $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, the Clarke tangent cone $T_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x})$ to Ω in \mathbf{x} is defined as the set of vector \mathbf{d} such that for some sequences $\{t_k\}$, $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$, $\{\mathbf{d}_k\}$ with $t_k \rightarrow 0^+$, $\mathbf{x}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{d}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{d}$ we have $\mathbf{x}_k + t_k \mathbf{d}_k \in \Omega$ for all k . The set Ω is called regular at \mathbf{x} if $T_{\Omega}(\mathbf{x})$ is the closure of $T_{\Omega}^H(\mathbf{x})$.

The notion of Clarke tangent cone provides a true stationarity condition for the problem, through the following extension of Theorem 2.5.

Theorem 4.4. Let K be a sequence of unsuccessful steps for a direct-search method applied to problem (45) with extreme barrier. Assume that $\lim_{k \in K} \alpha_k = 0$, $\mathbf{x}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{x}^*$, and that for every direction $\mathbf{d} \in T_{\Omega}^H(\mathbf{x}^*)$ there exists $L \subset K$ such that $\mathbf{d}_k \in \mathbb{D}_k$ and $\lim_{k \in L} \frac{\mathbf{d}_k}{\|\mathbf{d}_k\|} = \frac{\mathbf{d}}{\|\mathbf{d}\|}$ with $\mathbf{d}_k \in \mathbb{D}_k$. Then if Ω is regular in \mathbf{x} the point \mathbf{x}^* is Clarke stationary for problem (45).

The extreme barrier approach thus provides a straightforward way of extending direct search to constraint sets while preserving convergence guarantees. Still, it does not provide information about infeasible points, and this motivated the use of infeasible schemes as described in the next section.

4.2 Infeasible methods

This section is concerned with direct-search schemes that allow for evaluating the objective outside of the feasible set. Such methods are termed *infeasible*, and apply to problems with quantitative relaxable constraints of the form

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mathbf{0}, \quad (75)$$

where $\mathbf{g} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$. Thanks to the quantitative nature of the constraints, it is possible to define an infeasibility measure $h(\cdot)$ that quantifies the distance to infeasibility. Typical choices for such measures are

$$h_1(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^l \max\{0, g_i(\mathbf{x})\}, \quad (76)$$

for nonsmooth functions g_i , and

$$h_2(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^l \max\{0, g_i(\mathbf{x})^2\} \quad (77)$$

for smooth functions g_i . A number of methods balance the minimization of the infeasibility measure with the minimization of the objective. A simple, two-phase strategy consists in first applying a direct-search method to the unconstrained minimization of h (assuming derivatives of \mathbf{g} are unavailable) to obtain a feasible point. Once such a point is found, one can tackle the original problem (75) using the extreme barrier approach describe in Section 4.1.3. For the first phase, the acceptance condition (2) is replace by

$$h(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad h(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{s}) < h(\mathbf{x}_k) - \rho(\alpha_k). \quad (78)$$

Since direct-search methods are local in nature, the first phase is not guarantee to produce a feasible point, but merely a stationary point for the infeasibility measure. However, if the iterates converge towards the feasible set, then a feasible set is found in finitely many iterations, after which the second-phase process enjoys the same guarantees than an extreme barrier approach. Theorem 4.5 summarizes these observations in the context of the first infeasibility measure (76).

Theorem 4.5. *Consider a two phase direct-search scheme applied to problem (75) using the infeasibility measure (76), and suppose that this measure is Lipschitz continuous. Let \mathbb{K} be a sequence of unsuccessful iterations, and let $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ be a refining subsequence with refined point \mathbf{x}^* . For any refining direction \mathbf{d} , the following results hold:*

- If $h(\mathbf{x}^*) > 0$, then $h^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{d}) \geq 0$.
- If $h(\mathbf{x}_k) = 0$ for k large enough and $\mathbf{d} \in T_\Omega^H(\mathbf{x}^*)$ then \mathbf{x}^* is feasible and $f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{d}) \geq 0$.
- Assume $h^\circ(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*; \tilde{\mathbf{d}}) \leq -\varepsilon$ for $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*$ in a neighborhood of \mathbf{x}^* intersected with $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}$ in a neighborhood of \mathbf{d} . Then if $h(\mathbf{x}_k) \rightarrow 0$ we have $h(\mathbf{x}_k) = 0$ for k large enough, i.e., a feasible point is found by the algorithm.

Proof. The first two points directly follow from the results of Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 4.4, respectively. We prove the third point by contradiction. Suppose that $h(\mathbf{x}_k) > 0$ for every k . By the generalized mean value theorem, we get

$$h(\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_k \mathbf{d}_k) - h(\mathbf{x}_k) \leq \alpha_k \sup_{t \in [0,1]} h^\circ(\mathbf{x}_k + t\alpha_k; \mathbf{d}_k) \leq -\varepsilon \alpha_k = \Theta(\alpha_k). \quad (79)$$

But since $\rho(\alpha_k) = o(\alpha_k)$ (79) implies that $h(\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_k \mathbf{d}_k) - h(\mathbf{x}_k) < -\rho(\alpha_k)$ for $k \in K$ large enough. This contradicts the assumption that the steps in K are unsuccessful. \square

Note that a similar result can be obtained using (77) in lieu of (76), assuming differentiability of the function g and a weak linear independence condition [7, Theorem 3.8]. In both cases, the results illustrate a shortcoming of the approach already mentioned for extreme barrier techniques, namely that the information at infeasible points is not used. In practice, however, improving the objective function, even while significantly worsening infeasibility, can prove beneficial. In the next three sections, we describe algorithms based on this paradigm.

4.2.1 Filter-based methods

Filter based approaches roughly deals with the constraints using a bilevel optimization approach, with a set of so called "incumbent" points S_k updated at each iteration, and stored together with the corresponding objective values and infeasibility measures $\{(f(\mathbf{x}_k^{(i)}), h(\mathbf{x}_k^{(i)}))\}_{i \in S_k}$. A point \mathbf{x} is said to dominate a point \mathbf{y} , written $\mathbf{x} \succ \mathbf{y}$, if $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq f(\mathbf{y})$ and $h(\mathbf{x}) \geq h(\mathbf{y})$, with one of the two inequalities strict. At every iteration S_k is updated adding some suitably chosen points and discarding the points dominated by some of the newly added points. It is convenient to write S_k as the disjoint union of the feasible incumbent points I_k and of the unfeasible incumbent points U_k . The first instance of filter based direct-search method was presented by Audet and Dennis [5], but it was not proved to converge to stationary points for the original problem. Dennis et al. [32] described another filter based method was proved to converge to stationary points assuming however differentiability of the constraints with approximate gradients available, as well as of the objective at limit points. We focus on a third approach due to Audet and Dennis [7, 9] called *progressive barrier*, that combine MADS with a filter technique. A simplified version of this method based on using Algorithm 1 in lieu of MADS is described in Algorithm 8. We choose Algorithm 1 with sufficient decrease for simplicity, but note that using Algorithm 2 would lead to similar convergence results. The method uses relations of the form $\mathbf{x} \prec_\varepsilon \mathbf{y}$, which correspond $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{y}$ and $f(\mathbf{x}) < f(\mathbf{y}) - \varepsilon$ or $h(\mathbf{x}) < h(\mathbf{y}) - \varepsilon$, i.e., one of the two inequalities defining majorization is satisfied within a margin of ε .

Algorithm 8: Progressive barrier direct-search scheme

- 1: **Inputs:** A starting set of incumbents S_0 , an initial stepsize $\alpha_0 > 0$, a parameter for stepsize contraction $0 < \theta < 1$, a parameter for stepsize expansion $\gamma \geq 1$, forcing function $\rho : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, an initial unfeasibility threshold $h_0 > 0$.
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: Select a set \mathbb{D}_k of poll directions, an unfeasible incumbent poll center \mathbf{x}_k^U and, if $I_k \neq \emptyset$, a feasible incumbent poll center \mathbf{x}_k^I .
 - 4: **if** $\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{s} \prec_{\rho(\alpha_k)} \mathbf{y}$ holds for $\mathbf{s} \in \{\alpha \mathbf{d} \mid \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k\}$, and $\mathbf{y} \in \{\mathbf{x}_k^U, \mathbf{x}_k^I\}$ **then**
 - 5: Declare the iteration as successful, add $\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{s}$ to S_k , set $h_{k+1} = h_k$, and $\alpha_{k+1} = \gamma \alpha_k$.
Go to step 12.
 - 6: **end if**
 - 7: **if** $h(\mathbf{x}_k^U + \mathbf{s}) < h(\mathbf{x}_k^U) - \rho(\alpha_k)$ and $f(\mathbf{x}_k^U + \mathbf{s}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_k^I)$ hold for some $\mathbf{s} \in \{\alpha_k \mathbf{d} : \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_k\}$ **then**
 - 8: Declare the iteration as improving, add $\mathbf{x}_k^U + \mathbf{s}$ to S_k , and lower the acceptance threshold by choosing $h_{k+1} \in [\bar{h}_k, h_k - \rho(\alpha_k)]$. Set $\alpha_{k+1} = \alpha_k$. Go to step 12.
 - 9: **else**
 - 10: Declare the iteration unsuccessful, set $S_{k+1} = S_k$, $h_{k+1} = h_k$ and $\alpha_{k+1} = \theta \alpha_k$.
 - 11: **end if**
 - 12: Delete all the dominated points from S_{k+1} .
 - 13: **end for**
-

The key result for proving convergence of Algorithm 8 is given below.

Proposition 4.1. *Consider a sequence generated by Algorithm 8. Assume that, for some $\bar{f} > 0$, $f(\mathbf{y}) \leq \bar{f}$ for every $\mathbf{y} \in S_k$. Then we have $\lim \alpha_k = 0$.*

Proof. Assume, by contradiction, that we have an infinite number of improving or successful steps with $\alpha_k > \varepsilon$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$. First, since $\{h_k\}$ is non increasing and strictly decreases by $\rho(\alpha_k)$ at every improving step, there cannot be an infinite number of improving steps with $\alpha_k > \varepsilon$. Thus we must necessarily have an infinite number of successful steps with $\alpha_k \geq \varepsilon$. Now, on the one hand $\bar{S} = \cup_k \{(\lfloor f(\mathbf{y})/\rho(\varepsilon) \rfloor, \lfloor h(\mathbf{y})/\rho(\varepsilon) \rfloor)\}_{\mathbf{y} \in S_k}$ must be bounded because it is a subset of $[0 : \lfloor \bar{f}/\rho(\varepsilon) \rfloor] \times [0 : \lfloor h_0/\rho(\varepsilon) \rfloor]$. On the other hand, it is easy to check that due to the $\rho(\alpha_k)$ majorization condition at every successful iteration with $\alpha_k \geq \varepsilon$ a new point is added to \bar{S} , a contradiction. \square

Thanks to Proposition 4.1, the results of Theorem 4.5 can be applied directly to Algorithm 8.

4.2.2 Restoration based methods

Restoration based approaches rely on alternating steps to improve the objective with a restoration phase focusing on the improvement of the unfeasibility measure $h(\mathbf{x})$. Bueno et al.[22] proposed such an approach to deal with differentiable constraints, where a gradient-based restoration phase is alternated with a direct-search phase applied on a problem constrained with linear approximations of the constraints. Our result below is based on the method by Gratton and Vicente [49], where the following two conditions to determine success of the algorithm at iteration k :

$$h(\mathbf{x}_k) - h(\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_k \mathbf{d}_k) > \rho(\alpha_k) \quad \text{and} \quad h(\mathbf{x}_k) > C\rho(\alpha_k) \quad (80)$$

for some $C > 1$, and

$$M(\mathbf{x}_k, \mu) - M(\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_k \mathbf{d}_k, \mu) > \rho(\alpha_k) \quad (81)$$

for some $\mu > 0$, for $M(\mathbf{x}, \mu) = f(\mathbf{x}) + \mu h(\mathbf{x})$ referred to as merit function. Within the restoration phase, only (80) is considered. While the methodological and theoretical results presented by Gratton and Vicente [49] are beyond the scope of this survey, we show in the next proposition how a convergence result analogous to the one of two phase methods can be obtained by considering suitable sequences of unsuccessful steps.

Proposition 4.2. *Assume $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k \in K}$ is a converging subsequence of unsuccessful iterates where neither (80) nor (81) are satisfied in tentative points, and let \mathbf{d} be a refined direction for this subsequence. Then for \mathbf{x}^* limit point of $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$ we have $h^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{d}) \geq 0$ and $f^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{d}) \geq 0$ whenever $h^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{d}) = 0$. In particular, if $\cup_{k \in K} D_k$ is dense then \mathbf{x}^* is Clarke stationary for h . If furthermore h is a suitably defined infeasibility measure and $h(\mathbf{x}^*) = 0$, then \mathbf{x}^* is a KKT stationary point for the problem.*

Proof. We get $h^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{d}) \geq 0$ and $M^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*, \mu; \mathbf{d}) \geq 0$ with the usual arguments from the assumption that (80) and (81) respectively are not satisfied for $k \in K$. If $h^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{d}) = 0$ then

$$f^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{d}) = f^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{d}) + \mu h^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{d}) = M^\circ(\mathbf{x}^*, \mu; \mathbf{d}) \geq 0, \quad (82)$$

as desired. \square

4.2.3 Penalty approaches

In penalty based approaches, a direct-search scheme is applied to an auxiliary objective, that combines a measure of infeasibility with the objective function. A first approach of this form was the augmented Lagrangian technique proposed by Lewis and Torczon [67], that handled nonlinear relaxable equality constraints as well as bounds on the objective. This technique was later extended to handle linear constraints in addition to bound

constraints [60]. The underlying theoretical guarantees rely on using the stepsize as a stopping criterion for solving the subproblems.

In another line of work, Liuzzi et al. [70] proposed an exact penalty approach to reformulate problem constrained with nonlinear, relaxable inequalities. The resulting penalized objective was defined on an open set, and tackled with a line-search method akin to those described in Section 2.6. Liuzzi et al. [71] considered a sequential penalty approach for problems with smooth objective, inequality constraints and bound constraints. In this approach the inequality constraints other than bounds are relaxed and a line-search method is applied to minimize $f(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}h_2(\mathbf{x})$ under bound constraints, where h_2 is the smoothed infeasibility measure defined in (77) and $\varepsilon > 0$. A condition based on an upper bound on the stepsizes depending from μ is used to determine whether to decrease the penalty parameter ε at each iteration. The case of nonsmooth relaxable constraints combined with bounds was addressed by Fasano et al. [43]. Under constraint qualification and for small enough ε , it was then shown that all the stationary points corresponding to minimizing $f(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}h_1(\mathbf{x})$ under bound constraints are also (Clarke) stationary for the original problem.

5 Conclusion

Since their formal introduction more than 60 years ago, direct-search algorithms have been endowed with a rich convergence theory, that goes significantly beyond a basic analysis for smooth, unconstrained problems. In addition to possessing guarantees in that setting, direct-search methods can also be designed to cope with nonsmoothness in the objective function, constraints, and noisy estimates of all functions involved in the problem formulation. In this survey, we provided key results that we hope will convince the readers of the strong theoretical foundations upon which modern direct-search algorithms are built.

Our presentation has highlighted several results that we believe will play a key role in the future of direct-search techniques. Recent advances in analyzing randomized direct-search techniques pave the way for scaling up those algorithms, possibly through combination with other tools from high-dimensional statistics. Using modern constrained optimization techniques, such as Frank–Wolfe updates and manifold theory, provide principled ways of handling common constraints and sparse structures. Stochastic and numerical noise in function values is likely to keep growing in importance to address problems involving massive amounts of data samples such as hyperparameter tuning. These research directions are likely to form the basis of next-generation direct-search methods.

References

- [1] J. Achddou, O. Cappé, and A. Garivier. Regret analysis of the stochastic direct search method for blind resource allocation. *arXiv*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.05222>.
- [2] S. Alarie, C. Audet, P.-Y. Bouchet, and S. Le Digabel. Optimisation of stochastic blackboxes with adaptive precision. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(4):3127–3156, 2021. doi:[10.1137/20M1318894](https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1318894).
- [3] C. Audet. A survey on direct search methods for blackbox optimization and their applications. In P. Pardalos and T. Rassias, editors, *Mathematics Without Boundaries: Surveys in Interdisciplinary Research*, chapter 2, pages 31–56. Springer, New York, NY, 2014. doi:[10.1007/978-1-4939-1124-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1124-0).
- [4] C. Audet and J. E. Dennis, Jr. Analysis of generalized pattern searches. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 13(3):889–903, 2002. doi:[10.1137/S1052623400378742](https://doi.org/10.1137/S1052623400378742).
- [5] C. Audet and J. E. Dennis, Jr. A pattern search filter method for nonlinear programming without derivatives. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 14(4):980–1010, 2004. doi:[10.1137/S105262340138983X](https://doi.org/10.1137/S105262340138983X).

- [6] C. Audet and J. E. Dennis, Jr. Mesh adaptive direct search algorithms for constrained optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 17(1):188–217, 2006. doi:[10.1137/040603371](https://doi.org/10.1137/040603371).
- [7] C. Audet and J. E. Dennis, Jr. A progressive barrier for derivative-free nonlinear programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(1):445–472, 2009. doi:[10.1137/070692662](https://doi.org/10.1137/070692662).
- [8] C. Audet and W. Hare. *Derivative-Free and Blackbox Optimization*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 2017. doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-68913-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68913-5).
- [9] C. Audet, J. E. Dennis, Jr., and S. Le Digabel. Globalization strategies for mesh adaptive direct search. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 46(2):193–215, 2010. doi:[10.1007/s10589-009-9266-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-009-9266-1).
- [10] C. Audet, K. J. Dzahini, M. Kokkolaras, and S. Le Digabel. Stochastic mesh adaptive direct search for blackbox optimization using probabilistic estimates. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 79(1):1–34, 2021. doi:[10.1007/s10589-020-00249-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-020-00249-0).
- [11] T. Bäck. *Evolutionary Algorithms in Theory and Practice: Evolution Strategies, Evolutionary Programming, Genetic Algorithms*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY, USA, 1996. doi:[10.1093/oso/9780195099713.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195099713.001.0001).
- [12] A. S. Berahas, R. H. Byrd, and J. Nocedal. Derivative-free optimization of noisy functions via quasi-newton methods. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(2):965–993, 2019. doi:[10.1137/18M1177718](https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1177718).
- [13] A. S. Berahas, L. Cao, and K. Scheinberg. Global convergence rate analysis of a generic line search algorithm with noise. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(2):1489–1518, 2021. doi:[10.1137/19M1291832](https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1291832).
- [14] E. H. Bergou, E. Gorbunov, and P. Richtárik. Stochastic three points method for unconstrained smooth minimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 30(4):2726–2749, 2020. doi:[10.1137/19M1244378](https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1244378).
- [15] J. Blanchet, C. Cartis, M. Menickelly, and K. Scheinberg. Convergence rate analysis of a stochastic trust-region method via submartingales. *INFORMS Journal on Optimization*, 1(2):92–119, 2019. doi:[10.1287/ijoo.2019.0016](https://doi.org/10.1287/ijoo.2019.0016).
- [16] R. Bollapragada and S. M. Wild. Adaptive sampling quasi-newton methods for zeroth-order stochastic optimization. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 15(2):327–364, 2023. doi:[10.1007/s12532-023-00233-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12532-023-00233-9).
- [17] I. M. Bomze, F. Rinaldi, and D. Zeffiro. Frank–wolfe and friends: a journey into projection-free first-order optimization methods. *4OR*, 19(3):313–345, 2021. doi:[10.1007/s10288-021-00493-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10288-021-00493-y).
- [18] A. J. Booker, J. E. Dennis, Jr., P. D. Frank, D. B. Serafini, V. Torczon, and M. W. Trosset. A rigorous framework for optimization of expensive functions by surrogates. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 17(1):1–13, 1999. doi:[10.1007/BF01197708](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01197708).
- [19] P.-Y. Bouchet. *Théorie de l’optimisation sans dérivées dans le cas discontinu*. PhD thesis, Polytechnique Montréal, December 2023.
- [20] N. Boumal. *An introduction to optimization on smooth manifolds*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 2023. doi:[10.1017/9781009166164](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009166164).
- [21] A. Brilli, M. Kimiaiei, G. Liuzzi, and S. Lucidi. Worst case complexity bounds for linesearch-type derivative-free algorithms. *arXiv*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.05274>.

- [22] L. F. Bueno, A. Friedlander, J. M. Martinez, and F. N. C. Sobral. Inexact restoration method for derivative-free optimization with smooth constraints. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(2):1189–1213, 2013. doi:[10.1137/110856253](https://doi.org/10.1137/110856253).
- [23] C. Cartis, N. I. M. Gould, and P. L. Toint. *Evaluation Complexity of Algorithms for Nonconvex Optimization: Theory, Computation and Perspectives*, volume MO30 of *MOS-SIAM Series on Optimization*. SIAM, 2022. doi:[10.1137/1.978161197699](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.978161197699).
- [24] K. H. Chang. Stochastic Nelder–Mead simplex method – A new globally convergent direct search method for simulation optimization. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 220(3):684–694, 2012. doi:[10.1016/j.ejor.2012.02.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2012.02.028).
- [25] R. Chen, M. Menickelly, and K. Scheinberg. Stochastic optimization using a trust-region method and random models. *Mathematical Programming*, 169(2):447–487, 2018. doi:[10.1007/s10107-017-1141-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-017-1141-8).
- [26] F. H. Clarke. *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1983. ISBN 9780898712568. doi:[10.1137/1.9781611971309](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611971309). Reissued in 1990 by SIAM Publications, Philadelphia, as Vol. 5 in the series *Classics in Applied Mathematics*.
- [27] A. R. Conn, K. Scheinberg, and L. N. Vicente. *Introduction to Derivative-Free Optimization*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 2009. ISBN 978-0-898716-68-9. doi:[10.1137/1.9780898718768](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898718768).
- [28] I. D. Coope and C. J. Price. On the convergence of grid-based methods for unconstrained optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 11(4):859–869, 2001. doi:[10.1137/S1052623499354989](https://doi.org/10.1137/S1052623499354989).
- [29] A. Cristofari and F. Rinaldi. A derivative-free method for structured optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(2):1079–1107, 2021. doi:[10.1137/20M1337417](https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1337417).
- [30] A. L. Custódio and L. N. Vicente. Analysis of direct searches for discontinuous functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 133:299–325, 2012. doi:[10.1007/s10107-010-0429-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-010-0429-8).
- [31] R. De Leone, M. Gaudioso, and L. Grippo. Stopping criteria for linesearch methods without derivatives. *Mathematical Programming*, 30:285–300, 1984. doi:[10.1007/BF02591934](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02591934).
- [32] J. E. Dennis, Jr., C. J. Price, and I. D. Coope. Direct search methods for nonlinearly constrained optimization using filters and frames. *Optimization and Engineering*, 5(2):123–144, 2004. doi:[10.1023/B:OPTE.0000033371.04406.e0](https://doi.org/10.1023/B:OPTE.0000033371.04406.e0).
- [33] M. A. Diniz-Ehrhardt, J. M. Martínez, and M. Raydán. A derivative-free nonmonotone line-search technique for unconstrained optimization. *Journal of computational and applied mathematics*, 219(2):383–397, 2008. doi:[10.1016/j.cam.2007.07.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2007.07.017).
- [34] Y. Diouane, V. Kungurtsev, F. Rinaldi, and D. Zeffiro. Inexact direct-search methods for bilevel optimization problems. *arXiv*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09924>.
- [35] M. Dodangeh and L. N. Vicente. Worst case complexity of direct search under convexity. *Mathematical Programming*, 155(1-2):307–332, 2016. doi:[10.1007/s10107-014-0847-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-014-0847-0).
- [36] M. Dodangeh, L. N. Vicente, and Z. Zhang. On the optimal order of worst case complexity of direct search. *Optimization Letters*, 10:699–708, 2016. doi:[10.1007/s11590-015-0908-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11590-015-0908-1).
- [37] E. D. Dolan, R. M. Lewis, and V. Torczon. On the local convergence of pattern search. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 14(2):567–583, 2003. doi:[10.1137/S1052623400374495](https://doi.org/10.1137/S1052623400374495).

- [38] D. W. Dreisigmeyer. Equality constraints, riemannian manifolds and direct search methods. Technical Report LA-UR-06-7406, Los Alamos National Laboratory, 2006.
- [39] D. W. Dreisigmeyer. Direct search methods on reductive homogeneous spaces. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 176(3):585–604, 2018. doi:[10.1007/s10957-018-1225-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-018-1225-5).
- [40] K. J. Dzahini. Expected complexity analysis of stochastic direct-search. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 81(1):179–200, 2022. doi:[10.1007/s10589-021-00329-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-021-00329-9).
- [41] K. J. Dzahini and S. M. Wild. Sparse Johnson–Lindenstrauss transforms and analysis of their extreme singular values. *arXiv*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.14858>.
- [42] K. J. Dzahini, M. Kokkolaras, and S. Le Digabel. Constrained stochastic blackbox optimization using a progressive barrier and probabilistic estimates. *Mathematical Programming*, 198(1):675–732, 2023. doi:[10.1007/s10107-022-01787-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-022-01787-7).
- [43] G. Fasano, G. Liuzzi, S. Lucidi, and F. Rinaldi. A linesearch-based derivative-free approach for nonsmooth constrained optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(3):959–992, 2014. doi:[10.1137/130940037](https://doi.org/10.1137/130940037).
- [44] U. M. García-Palomares and J. F. Rodríguez. New sequential and parallel derivative-free algorithms for unconstrained minimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 13(1):79–96, 2002. doi:[10.1137/S1052623400370606](https://doi.org/10.1137/S1052623400370606).
- [45] R. Garmanjani and L. N. Vicente. Smoothing and worst-case complexity for direct-search methods in nonsmooth optimization. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 33(3):1008–1028, 2013. doi:[10.1093/imanum/drs027](https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drs027).
- [46] M. G. Gasparo, A. Papini, and A. Pasquali. Nonmonotone algorithms for pattern search methods. *Numerical Algorithms*, 28:171–186, 2001. doi:[10.1023/A:1014046817188](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014046817188).
- [47] S. Ghadimi and G. Lan. Stochastic first-and zeroth-order methods for nonconvex stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(4):2341–2368, 2013. doi:[10.1137/120880811](https://doi.org/10.1137/120880811).
- [48] A. A. Goldstein. Optimization for Lipschitz continuous functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 13(1):14–22, 1977. doi:[10.1007/BF01584320](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01584320).
- [49] S. Gratton and L. N. Vicente. A merit function approach for direct search. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(4):1980–1998, 2014. doi:[10.1137/130917661](https://doi.org/10.1137/130917661).
- [50] S. Gratton, C. W. Royer, L. N. Vicente, and Z. Zhang. Direct search based on probabilistic descent. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(3):1515–1541, 2015. doi:[10.1137/140961602](https://doi.org/10.1137/140961602).
- [51] S. Gratton, C. W. Royer, L. N. Vicente, and Z. Zhang. Direct search based on probabilistic feasible descent for bound and linearly constrained problems. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 72(3):525–559, 2019. doi:[10.1007/s10589-019-00062-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-019-00062-4).
- [52] L. Grippo and F. Rinaldi. A class of derivative-free nonmonotone optimization algorithms employing coordinate rotations and gradient approximations. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 60:1–33, 2015. doi:[10.1007/s10589-014-9665-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-014-9665-9).
- [53] L. Grippo, F. Lampariello, and S. Lucidi. Global convergence and stabilization of unconstrained minimization methods. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 56:385–406, 1988. doi:[10.1007/BF00939550](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00939550).

- [54] R. Hooke and T. A. Jeeves. “Direct search” solution of numerical and statistical problems. *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery*, 8(2):212–229, 1961. doi:[10.1145/321062.321069](https://doi.org/10.1145/321062.321069).
- [55] B. Jin, K. Scheinberg, and M. Xie. High probability complexity bounds for line search based on stochastic oracles. In *NeurIPS*, volume 34, pages 9193–9203, 2021.
- [56] B. Jin, K. Scheinberg, and M. Xie. Sample complexity analysis for adaptive optimization algorithms with stochastic oracles. *arXiv*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.06838>.
- [57] C. T. Kelley. *Implicit Filtering*. Software Environment and Tools. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, 2011.
- [58] T. G. Kolda, R. M. Lewis, and V. Torczon. Optimization by direct search: New perspectives on some classical and modern methods. *SIAM Review*, 45(3):385–482, 2003. doi:[10.1137/S003614450242889](https://doi.org/10.1137/S003614450242889).
- [59] T. G. Kolda, R. M. Lewis, and V. Torczon. Stationarity results for generating set search for linearly constrained optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 17(4):943–968, 2006. doi:[10.1137/S1052623403433638](https://doi.org/10.1137/S1052623403433638).
- [60] T. G. Kolda, R. M. Lewis, and V. Torczon. A generating set direct search augmented lagrangian algorithm for optimization with a combination of general and linear constraints. Technical report, Technical Report SAND2006-5315, Sandia National Laboratories, 2006.
- [61] J. Konečný and P. Richtárik. Simple complexity analysis of simplified direct search. *arXiv*, 2014. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1410.0390>.
- [62] V. Kungurtsev, F. Rinaldi, and D. Zeffiro. Retraction based direct search methods for derivative free riemannian optimization. *arXiv*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.11052>.
- [63] S. Lacoste-Julien and M. Jaggi. On the global linear convergence of Frank–Wolfe optimization variants. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.
- [64] J. Larson, M. Menickelly, and S. M. Wild. Derivative-free optimization methods. *Acta Numerica*, 28: 287–404, 2019. doi:[10.1017/s0962492919000060](https://doi.org/10.1017/s0962492919000060).
- [65] S. Le Digabel. Algorithm 909: NOMAD: Nonlinear optimization with the MADS algorithm. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, 37(4):44:1–44:15, 2011. doi:[10.1145/1916461.1916468](https://doi.org/10.1145/1916461.1916468).
- [66] S. Le Digabel and S. M. Wild. A taxonomy of constraints in black-box simulation-based optimization. *Optimization and Engineering*, pages 1–19, 2023. doi:[10.1007/s11081-023-09839-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11081-023-09839-3).
- [67] R. M. Lewis and V. Torczon. A globally convergent augmented lagrangian pattern search algorithm for optimization with general constraints and simple bounds. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 12(4): 1075–1089, 2002. doi:[10.1137/S105262349833972](https://doi.org/10.1137/S105262349833972).
- [68] R. M. Lewis, V. Torczon, and M. W. Trosset. Direct search methods: Then and now. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 124(1–2):191–207, 2000. doi:[10.1016/S0377-0427\(00\)00423-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-0427(00)00423-4).
- [69] T. Lin, Z. Zheng, and M. Jordan. Gradient-free methods for deterministic and stochastic nonsmooth nonconvex optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:26160–26175, 2022.
- [70] G. Liuzzi and S. Lucidi. A derivative-free algorithm for inequality constrained nonlinear programming via smoothing of an ℓ_∞ penalty function. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(1):1–29, 2009. doi:[10.1137/070711451](https://doi.org/10.1137/070711451).

- [71] G. Liuzzi, S. Lucidi, and M. Sciandrone. Sequential penalty derivative-free methods for nonlinear constrained optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(5):2614–2635, 2010. doi:[10.1137/090750639](https://doi.org/10.1137/090750639).
- [72] S. Lucidi and M. Sciandrone. A derivative-free algorithm for bound constrained optimization. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 21(2):119–142, 2002. doi:[10.1023/A:1013735414984](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013735414984).
- [73] S. Lucidi and M. Sciandrone. On the global convergence of derivative-free methods for unconstrained optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 13(1):97–116, 2002. doi:[10.1137/S1052623497330392](https://doi.org/10.1137/S1052623497330392).
- [74] S. Lucidi, M. Sciandrone, and P. Tseng. Objective-derivative-free methods for constrained optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 92:37–59, 2002. doi:[10.1007/s101070100266](https://doi.org/10.1007/s101070100266).
- [75] J. A. Nelder and R. Mead. A simplex method for function minimization. *The computer journal*, 7(4):308–313, 1965. doi:[10.1093/comjnl/7.4.308](https://doi.org/10.1093/comjnl/7.4.308).
- [76] Y. Nesterov and V. Spokoiny. Random gradient-free minimization of convex functions. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 17:527–566, 2017. doi:[10.1007/s10208-015-9296-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-015-9296-2).
- [77] C. Paquette and K. Scheinberg. A stochastic line search method with expected complexity analysis. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 30(1):349–376, 2020. doi:[10.1137/18M1216250](https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1216250).
- [78] B. Pauwels. *Optimisation sans dérivées sous incertitudes appliquées à des simulateurs coûteux*. PhD thesis, Université de Toulouse, March 2016. URL <http://thesesups.ups-tlse.fr/3103/1/2016TOU30035.pdf>.
- [79] F. Rinaldi and D. Zeffiro. Avoiding bad steps in Frank–Wolfe variants. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 84(1):225–264, 2023. doi:[10.1007/s10589-022-00434-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-022-00434-3).
- [80] F. Rinaldi, L. N. Vicente, and D. Zeffiro. Stochastic trust-region and direct-search methods: A weak tail bound condition and reduced sample sizing. *arXiv*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.11074>.
- [81] L. Roberts and C. W. Royer. Direct search based on probabilistic descent in reduced spaces. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 33(4):3057–3082, 2023. doi:[10.1137/22M1488569](https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1488569).
- [82] V. Torczon. On the convergence of pattern search algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 7(1):1–25, 1997. doi:[10.1137/S1052623493250780](https://doi.org/10.1137/S1052623493250780).
- [83] L. N. Vicente. Worst case complexity of direct search. *EURO Journal on Computational Optimization*, 1(1):143–153, 2013. doi:[10.1007/s13675-012-0003-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13675-012-0003-7).
- [84] M. H. Wright. Direct search methods: Once scorned, now respectable. *Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series*, 344:191–208, 1996. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:64988980>.
- [85] S. J. Wright and B. Recht. *Optimization for Data Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2022. doi:[10.1017/9781009004282](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009004282).

The submitted manuscript has been co-created by UChicago Argonne, LLC, Operator of Argonne National Laboratory (“Argonne”). Argonne, a U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science laboratory, is operated under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357. The U.S. Government retains for itself, and others acting on its behalf, a paid-up nonexclusive, irrevocable worldwide license in said article to reproduce, prepare derivative works, distribute copies to the public, and perform publicly and display publicly, by or on behalf of the Government. The Department of Energy will provide public access to these results of federally sponsored research in accordance with the DOE Public Access Plan. <http://energy.gov/downloads/doe-public-access-plan>.