

# Tilt stability of Ky-Fan $\kappa$ -norm composite optimization

Yulan Liu\*, Shaohua Pan<sup>†</sup> and Wen Song<sup>‡</sup>

## Abstract

This paper concerns the tilt stability for the minimization of the sum of a twice continuously differentiable matrix-valued function and the Ky-Fan  $\kappa$ -norm. By using the expression of second subderivative of the Ky-Fan  $\kappa$ -norm, we derive a verifiable criterion to identify the tilt stability of a local minimum for this class of nonconvex and nonsmooth problems. As a byproduct, a practical criterion is achieved for the tilt stable solution of the nuclear-norm regularized minimization.

**Keywords** Tilt stability; matrix composite optimization; second subderivative

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2020)** 49J52; 49J53; 49K40; 90C31; 90C56

## 1 Introduction

Let  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  ( $n \leq m$ ) represent the space of all  $n \times m$  real matrices endowed with the trace inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and its induced Frobenius norm  $\| \cdot \|_F$ . For an integer  $1 \leq \kappa \leq n$ , let  $\Psi_\kappa(X) := \sum_{i=1}^\kappa \sigma_i(X)$  denote the Ky-Fan  $\kappa$ -norm, where  $\sigma_i(X)$  means the  $i$ th largest singular value of  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ . We are interested in the following composite optimization problem

$$\min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}} \Theta_{\nu, \kappa}(X) := \nu f(X) + \Psi_\kappa(X), \quad (1)$$

where  $f : \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a twice continuously differentiable function, and  $\nu > 0$  is a regularization parameter. Such a problem has an extensive application in many fields such as matrix norm approximation [3], matrix completion and sensing [2, 24], control and system identification [10], signal and image processing [13], and so on.

### 1.1 Related works

Tilt stability of a local minimum of an extended real-valued function, first introduced by Poliquin and Rockafellar [22], is a kind of single-valued Lipschitzian behavior of local minimizers with respect to one-parametric linear or tilt perturbation. Until now, many

---

\* (ylliu@gdut.edu.cn), School of Mathematics and Statistics, Guangdong University of Technology, Guangzhou

<sup>†</sup> (shhpan@scut.edu.cn), School of Mathematics, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou.

<sup>‡</sup> (wsong@hrbnu.edu.cn), School of Mathematical and Sciences, Harbin Normal University, Harbin.

different characterizations have been delved for it. In the original paper [22], the limiting coderivative of the subdifferential mapping/generalized Hessian of the objective function is used to characterize tilt stability, and a quantitative version of this characterization was also given by Mordukhovich and Nghia [19]. Drusvyatskiy et al. [8, 9] established that tilt stability, uniform second-order growth, and strong metric regularity of subdifferential mapping are equivalent for any lower semicontinuous (lsc) extended real-valued function. Chieu et al. [4] characterized tilt stability by the positive definiteness of the subgradient graphical derivative. Recently, for the minimization of the sum of a twice continuously differentiable convex function and a proper lsc convex function  $g$ , Nghia [20] presented a novel characterization for tilt stability by leveraging the second-order growth of  $g$  with respect to a certain set containing a subgradient of the reference point and the subdifferential mapping  $\partial g$  having a relative approximations onto the same set, and obtained the verifiable criterion for three classes of specific  $g$ . For the applications of the equivalent characterization of tilt stability from [22] in different setting, see [15, 11, 18, 19].

## 1.2 Main contribution

Inspired by [20], this work aims to provide a verifiable characterization for the tilt-stability of the Ky-Fan  $\kappa$ -norm composite problem (1). Let  $\Phi_\kappa(Z) := \sum_{i=1}^\kappa \lambda_i(Z)$  denote the sum function of the first  $\kappa$  largest eigenvalues of matrices from  $\mathbb{S}^p$ , where  $\lambda_i(Z)$  is the  $i$ th largest eigenvalue of  $Z$ . Note that  $\Psi_\kappa(X) = \Phi_\kappa(\mathcal{B}(X))$  is the composition of  $\Phi_\kappa$  and the linear mapping  $\mathcal{B}$ , where  $\mathcal{B} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{m+n}$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{B}(X) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X \\ X^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for } X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}. \quad (2)$$

We first characterize the expression of the second subderivative of  $\Psi_\kappa$  by the chain rule developed in [17], and then follow the same line as in [20] to establish a sufficient and necessary criterion for identifying the tilt stability of a local minimum of problem (1); see Theorem 4.1. This criterion is point-based and checkable. As a byproduct, we recover the practical criterion obtained in [20] for the nuclear norm regularized problem. Different from [20], our work establishes the equivalent characterization of tilt stability for (1) by operating directly the expression of the second subderivative of Ky-Fan  $\kappa$ -norm, without using the relative approximation of the subdifferential mapping  $\partial\Psi_\kappa$ .

## 1.3 Notation

Throughout this paper,  $\mathbb{S}^p$  represents the space of all  $p \times p$  real symmetric matrices,  $\mathbb{S}_+^p$  denotes the set of all positive semidefinite matrices in  $\mathbb{S}^p$ , and  $\mathbb{O}^{p \times k}$  denotes the set of all  $p \times k$  real matrices with orthonormal columns and write  $\mathbb{O}^p := \mathbb{O}^{p \times p}$ . The notation  $I_p$  means a  $p \times p$  identity matrix, and  $I_p^\uparrow$  denotes the  $p \times p$  anti-diagonal matrix whose anti-diagonal entries are all ones and others are zeros. For an integer  $k \geq 1$ , write  $[k] := \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . For a matrix  $Z \in \mathbb{S}^p$ ,  $\lambda_i(Z)$  means the  $i$ th largest eigenvalue of  $Z$ , and  $\mathbb{O}^p(Z) := \{P \in \mathbb{O}^p \mid Z = P \text{Diag}(\lambda(Z)) P^\top\}$  with  $\lambda(Z) := (\lambda_1(Z), \dots, \lambda_p(Z))^\top$ . For

a matrix  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ,  $\sigma_i(Z)$  means the  $i$ th largest singular value of  $Z$ , and  $\mathbb{O}^{n,m}(X) := \{(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^n \times \mathbb{O}^m \mid X = U[\text{Diag}(\sigma(X) \ 0]V^\top\}$  with  $\sigma(X) = (\sigma_1(X), \dots, \sigma_n(X))^\top$ . For a matrix  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ,  $\|X\|_2$  and  $\|X\|_*$  denote the spectral norm and nuclear norm of  $X$ , respectively,  $X^\dagger$  means the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse of  $X$ ,  $X_{IJ} \in \mathbb{R}^{|I| \times |J|}$  for index sets  $I \subseteq [n]$  and  $J \subseteq [m]$  denotes the submatrix obtained by removing all rows not in  $I$  and all columns not in  $J$ , and write  $X_J := X_{IJ}$  for  $I = [n]$ . Write

$$\mathcal{S}(X) := (X + X^\top)/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}(X) := (X - X^\top)/2 \quad \text{for} \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}.$$

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $\mathbb{X}$  be a finite dimensional real vector space equipped with the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and its induced norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . An extended real-valued function  $h: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is said to be proper if its domain  $\text{dom } h := \{x \in \mathbb{X} \mid h(x) < \infty\}$  is nonempty. We first recall from the monograph [23] the regular and basic subdifferentials of  $h$  at a point  $x \in \text{dom } h$ .

**Definition 2.1** Consider a function  $h: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  and a point  $x$  with  $h(x)$  finite. The regular subdifferential of  $h$  at  $x$ , denoted by  $\widehat{\partial}h(x)$ , is defined as

$$\widehat{\partial}h(x) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{X} \mid \liminf_{x' \rightarrow x} \frac{h(x') - h(x) - \langle v, x' - x \rangle}{\|x' - x\|} \geq 0 \right\},$$

and the basic (known as limiting or Mordukhovich) subdifferential of  $h$  at  $x$  is defined as

$$\partial h(x) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{X} \mid \exists x^k \rightarrow x \text{ with } h(x^k) \rightarrow h(x) \text{ and } v^k \rightarrow v \text{ with } v^k \in \widehat{\partial}h(x^k) \right\}.$$

By Definition 2.1,  $\widehat{\partial}h(x) \subset \partial h(x)$ ,  $\widehat{\partial}h(x)$  is a closed convex set, and  $\partial h(x)$  is closed but generally nonconvex. When  $h$  is convex,  $\widehat{\partial}h(x) = \partial h(x)$ , and they reduce to the subdifferential in the sense of convex analysis. Next we recall the subderivative of  $h$ .

**Definition 2.2** (see [23, Definition 7.20]) Consider a function  $h: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  and a point  $x \in \text{dom } h$ . The subderivative function  $dh(x): \mathbb{X} \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$  of  $h$  at  $x$  is defined as

$$dh(x)(w) := \liminf_{\tau \downarrow 0, w' \rightarrow w} \frac{h(x + \tau w') - h(x)}{\tau} \quad \text{for } w \in \mathbb{X},$$

and  $h$  is said to be (properly) epi-differentiable at  $x$  if the first-order quotient function  $\Delta_\tau h(x)(\cdot) := \frac{h(x + \tau \cdot) - h(x)}{\tau}$  epi-converges to the (proper) function  $dh(x)$  as  $\tau \downarrow 0$ .

When  $h: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is directionally differentiable,  $dh(x) \leq h'(x; \cdot)$ , and the inequality becomes an equality if  $h$  is strictly continuous at  $x$ . With the subderivative function, we introduce the critical cone to  $h$  at a point  $(x, v)$  with  $v \in \partial h(x)$ :

$$\mathcal{C}_h(x, v) := \{w \in \mathbb{X} \mid dh(x)(w) = \langle v, w \rangle\}.$$

Next we recall the second subderivative of an extended real-valued function.

**Definition 2.3** (see [23, Definition 13.3]) Given a function  $h : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , a point  $x \in \text{dom } h$  and a vector  $v \in \mathbb{X}$ . The second subderivative of  $h$  at  $x$  for  $v$  and  $w$  is defined as

$$d^2h(x|v)(w) := \liminf_{\substack{\tau \downarrow 0 \\ w' \rightarrow w}} \frac{h(x + \tau w') - h(x) - \tau \langle v, w' \rangle}{\tau^2/2},$$

and  $h$  is said to be (properly) twice epi-differentiable at  $x$  for  $v$  if the second-order quotient  $\Delta_\tau^2 h(x|v)(\cdot) := \frac{h(x + \tau \cdot) - h(x) - \tau \langle v, \cdot \rangle}{\tau^2/2}$  epi-converges to the (proper) function  $d^2h(x|v)$  as  $\tau \downarrow 0$ .

From [23, Proposition 13.5],  $d^2h(x|v)$  is lsc and positively homogeneous of degree 2, and  $\text{dom } d^2h(x|v) \subset \{w \in \mathbb{X} \mid dh(x) \leq \langle v, w \rangle\}$ , and moreover, the properness of  $d^2h(x|v)$  implies that  $v \in \partial h(x)$  and  $\text{dom } d^2h(x|v) \subset \mathcal{C}_h(x, v)$ .

## 2.1 Tilt stability of a class of composite problems

We first recall the formal definition of tilt-stable local minimum from the work [22].

**Definition 2.4** For a proper lsc  $h : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , a point  $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } h$  is called a tilt-stable local minimum of problem  $\min_{x \in \mathbb{X}} h(x)$  if there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that the solution mapping

$$M_\delta(v) := \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \delta)} \{h(x) - h(\bar{x}) - \langle v, x - \bar{x} \rangle\}$$

is single-valued and Lipschitz continuous on some neighborhood of  $v=0$  with  $M_\delta(0) = \{\bar{x}\}$ .

As mentioned in the introduction, Nghia [20] recently used the second subderivative to provide a characterization for the tilt stability of the minimizer of a proper lsc convex  $h$ . Here, we extend the characterization of [20] to a class of composite optimization

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{X}} h(x) := \vartheta(x) + g(x) \tag{3}$$

where  $\vartheta : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a twice continuously differentiable function, and  $g : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is a proper lsc convex function. Obviously,  $h$  is prox-regular and subdifferential continuous, and model (3) covers the case that  $g$  is weakly convex. From the twice continuous differentiability of  $\vartheta$  and [23, Exercise 13.18], the second subderivative of  $h$  at  $x$  for  $v$  and  $w$  has the following form

$$d^2h(x|v)(w) = \langle \nabla^2 \vartheta(x)(w), w \rangle + d^2g(x|v - \nabla \vartheta(x))(w), \forall w \in \mathbb{X}. \tag{4}$$

**Proposition 2.1** Suppose that  $\bar{x}$  is a local minimizer of  $h$  with  $\nabla^2 \vartheta(x) \succeq 0$  on an open neighborhood  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $\bar{x}$ . Then,  $\bar{x}$  is a tilt-stable solution of (3) iff there exist  $\ell > 0$  and an open neighborhood  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$  of  $(\bar{x}, 0)$  such that for all  $(x, v) \in \text{gph } \partial h \cap [\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}]$  and  $w \in \mathbb{X}$

$$d^2h(x|v)(w) \geq \ell \|w\|^2. \tag{5}$$

**Proof:**  $\Leftarrow$ . Suppose that (5) holds for some  $\ell > 0$  and neighborhood  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$  of  $(\bar{x}, 0)$ . Fix any  $w \in \mathbb{X}$ . Pick any  $z \in D\partial h(x|v)(w)$  with  $(x, v) \in \text{gph } \partial h \cap [(\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{N}) \times \mathcal{V}]$ , where  $D\partial h(x|v)(\cdot)$  is known as the subgradient graphical derivative, see [23, Definition 8.33]. Clearly,  $z - \nabla^2\vartheta(x)(w) \in D\partial g(x|v - \nabla\vartheta(x))(w)$ . By invoking [20, Lemma 2.4], it follows

$$\langle z - \nabla^2\vartheta(x)(w), w \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2}d^2g(x|v - \nabla\vartheta(x))(w),$$

which along with the positive semidefiniteness of  $\nabla^2\vartheta(x)$  and (4) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle z, w \rangle &\geq \langle \nabla^2\vartheta(x)(w), w \rangle + \frac{1}{2}d^2g(x|v - \nabla\vartheta(x))(w) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}[\langle \nabla^2\vartheta(x)(w), w \rangle + d^2g(x|v - \nabla\vartheta(x))(w)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}d^2h(x|v)(w) \geq \frac{1}{2}\ell\|w\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

That is,  $\langle z, w \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2}\ell\|w\|^2$  when  $z \in D\partial h(x|v)(w)$  with  $(x, v) \in \text{gph } \partial h \cap [(\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{N}) \times \mathcal{V}]$ . By invoking [4, Theorem 3.3],  $\bar{x}$  is a tilt-stable solution of problem (3).

$\Rightarrow$ . Suppose that  $\bar{x}$  is a tilt-stable solution of (3). By [8, Theorem 3.3], there exist  $\ell' > 0$  and an open neighborhood  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$  of  $(\bar{x}, 0)$  such that for any  $(z, v) \in \text{gph } \partial h \cap [\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}]$  and any  $x \in \mathcal{U}$ ,

$$h(x) - h(z) - \langle v, x - z \rangle \geq (\ell'/2)\|x - z\|^2.$$

This means that any  $z$  with  $(z, v) \in \text{gph } \partial h \cap [\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}]$  is a strong local minimizer of  $h(\cdot) - \langle v, \cdot \rangle$  by [8, Definition 1.1]. So, by Definition 2.3, inequality (5) holds for all  $(x, v) \in \text{gph } \partial h \cap [\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}]$  and  $w \in \mathbb{X}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.2** *Let  $\bar{x}$  is a local minimizer of  $h$  with  $\nabla^2\vartheta(\bar{x}) \succeq 0$  on an open neighborhood  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $\bar{x}$ . Then,  $\bar{x}$  is a tilt-stable solution of (3) iff  $\text{Ker } \nabla^2\vartheta(\bar{x}) \cap \mathcal{W} = \{0\}$  where*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W} = \{w \in \mathbb{X} \mid \exists (x^k, y^k) \in \text{gph } \partial g \text{ and } w^k \in \mathbb{X} \text{ with } \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d^2g(x^k|y^k)(w^k) = 0 \\ \text{and } (x^k, y^k, w^k) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, -\nabla\vartheta(\bar{x}), w)\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof:**  $\Leftarrow$ . Suppose on the contrary that  $\bar{x}$  is not a tilt-stable solution (3). By Proposition 2.1, there exist sequences  $(x^k, v^k) \in \text{gph } \partial h$  with  $x^k \in \mathcal{N}$  and  $w^k \in \mathbb{X}$  with  $\|w^k\| = 1$  such that  $(x^k, v^k) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, 0)$  and  $d^2h(x^k|v^k)(w^k) < \frac{1}{k}\|w^k\|^2$ . So, from (4), it follows

$$\langle w^k, \nabla^2\vartheta^2(x^k)w^k \rangle + d^2g(x^k|y^k)(w^k) < \frac{1}{k}\|w^k\|^2, \text{ with } y^k := v^k - \nabla\vartheta(x^k). \quad (6)$$

Obviously,  $y^k \rightarrow -\nabla\vartheta(\bar{x})$ . Since  $\|w^k\| = 1$ , if necessary by taking a subsequence, we assume that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} w^k = w$ . Note that  $d^2g(x^k|y^k)(w^k) \geq 0$  by the convexity of  $g$ , the inequality (6) implies that  $\langle w^k, \nabla^2\vartheta^2(x^k)w^k \rangle < \frac{1}{k}\|w^k\|^2$ . Taking the limit  $k \rightarrow \infty$  leads to  $\langle w, \nabla^2\vartheta(\bar{x})w \rangle \leq 0$ . This along with  $\nabla^2\vartheta(\bar{x}) \succeq 0$  implies that  $w \in \text{Ker } \nabla^2\vartheta(\bar{x})$ . On the other hand, notice  $\nabla^2\vartheta(x^k) \succeq 0$  since  $x^k \in \mathcal{N}$ , so the inequality (6) implies that

$d^2g(x^k|y^k)(w^k) < \frac{1}{k}\|w^k\|^2$ . Taking the limit  $k \rightarrow \infty$  leads to  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d^2g(x^k|y^k)(w^k) \leq 0$ . This along with  $d^2g(x^k|y^k)(w^k) \geq 0$  implies that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d^2g(x^k|y^k)(w^k) = 0$ . Notice that  $(x^k, y^k) \in \text{gph}\partial g$  since  $(x^k, v^k) \in \text{gph}\partial h$  and  $(x^k, y^k, w^k) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, -\nabla\vartheta(\bar{x}), w)$ , we know  $w \in \mathcal{W}$ , which together with  $w \in \text{Ker}\nabla^2\vartheta(\bar{x})$  and the assumption  $\text{Ker}\nabla^2\vartheta(\bar{x}) \cap \mathcal{W} = \{0\}$  yields a contradiction to  $\|w\| = 1$ , then  $\bar{x}$  is a tilt-stable solution of (3).

$\Leftarrow$ . Let  $\bar{x}$  is a tilt-stable solution of (3). Pick any  $w \in \text{Ker}\nabla^2\vartheta(\bar{x}) \cap \mathcal{W}$ . Since  $w \in \mathcal{W}$ , there exist sequences  $(x^k, y^k) \in \text{gph}\partial g$  with  $x^k \in \mathcal{N}$  and  $w^k \in \mathbb{X}$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d^2g(x^k|y^k)(w^k) = 0 \text{ and } (x^k, y^k, w^k) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, -\nabla\vartheta(\bar{x}), w). \quad (7)$$

Denote  $v^k := y^k + \nabla\vartheta(x^k)$ . Then  $v^k \rightarrow 0$  and  $(x^k, v^k) \in \text{gph}\partial h$ . By the tilt-stability of  $\bar{x}$ , Proposition 2.1 and (4), there is  $\ell > 0$  such that for all  $k$  large enough,

$$\ell\|w^k\|^2 \leq d^2g(x^k|y^k)(w^k) + \langle w^k, \nabla^k\vartheta(x^k)w^k \rangle.$$

Together with (7) and the fact  $w \in \text{Ker}\nabla^2\vartheta(\bar{x})$ , passing the limit  $k \rightarrow \infty$  leads to  $\ell\|w\|^2 \leq \langle w, \nabla^2\vartheta(\bar{x})w \rangle = 0$  which implies that  $w = 0$ . The desired result is obtained.  $\square$

## 2.2 Twice epi-differentiability of $\Phi_\kappa$

For a given  $Z \in \mathbb{S}^p$ , let  $\mu_1(Z) > \dots > \mu_\varsigma(Z)$  denote the distinct eigenvalues of  $Z$  and

$$\theta_l(Z) := \{i \in [p] \mid \lambda_i(Z) = \mu_l(Z)\} \quad \text{for each } l \in [\varsigma], \quad (8)$$

where  $l_i(Z)$  denotes the number of eigenvalues that rank before  $\lambda_i(Z)$  and are equal to  $\lambda_i(Z)$  (including  $\lambda_i(Z)$ ), i.e., the eigenvalues of  $Z$  take the following form

$$\lambda_1(Z) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{i-l_i(Z)}(Z) > \lambda_{i-l_i(Z)+1}(Z) = \dots = \lambda_i(Z) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p(Z).$$

The following lemma characterizes the subdifferential of  $\Phi_\kappa$  and its second subderivative, whose proofs can be found in [21, Theorem 3.5] and [25, Theorem 2.5], respectively.

**Lemma 2.1** *Fix any  $Z \in \mathbb{S}^p$  with  $\varsigma$  distinct eigenvalues. Pick any  $Q \in \mathbb{O}^p(Z)$ . For each  $l \in [\varsigma]$ , let  $\theta_l = \theta_l(Z)$  with  $\theta_l(Z)$  defined by (8). Let  $r \in [\varsigma]$  be such that  $\kappa \in \theta_r$ . Then,*

(i) *the subdifferential of  $\Phi_\kappa$  at  $Z$  takes the following form*

$$\partial\Phi_\kappa(Z) = \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} Q_{\theta_l} Q_{\theta_l}^\top + \left\{ Q_{\theta_r} \text{Diag}(\xi) Q_{\theta_r}^\top \mid \xi \in \Omega_r \right\},$$

where  $\Omega_r := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{|\theta_r|} \mid 0 \leq z_i \leq 1 \text{ for each } i \in [|\theta_r|] \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{|\theta_r|} z_i = l_\kappa(Z)\}$ .

(ii) *The function  $\Phi_\kappa$  is semi-differentiable at  $Z$ , and for any  $H \in \mathbb{S}^p$ ,*

$$d\Phi_\kappa(Z)(H) = \Phi'_\kappa(Z; H) = \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \text{tr}(Q_{\theta_l}^\top H Q_{\theta_l}) + \Phi_{l_\kappa(Z)}(Q_{\theta_r}^\top H Q_{\theta_r}).$$

(iii)  $\Phi_\kappa$  is properly twice epi-differentiable at  $Z$ , and for any  $S \in \partial\Phi_\kappa(Z)$ , if a matrix  $H \in \mathbb{S}^p$  is such that  $\Phi_{l_\kappa(Z)}(Q_{\theta_r}^\top H Q_{\theta_r}) = \langle \tilde{S}, H \rangle$  with  $\tilde{S} := S - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} Q_{\theta_l} Q_{\theta_l}^\top$ , then

$$d^2\Phi_\kappa(Z|S)(H) = 2 \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \text{tr}(Q_{\theta_l}^\top H (\mu_l(Z)I_p - Z)^\dagger H Q_{\theta_l}) + 2\langle \tilde{S}, H (\mu_r(Z)I_p - Z)^\dagger H \rangle.$$

### 3 Characterization of second subderivative of $\Psi_\kappa$

Recall that  $\Psi_\kappa$  is the composition of  $\Phi_\kappa$  and the mapping  $\mathcal{B}$  in (2). We use the chain rule in [17, Theorem 5.4] to characterize the second subderivative of  $\Psi_\kappa$ . Before doing this, we introduce some notation for the subsequent analysis. For any  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , define

$$a(X) := \{i \in [n] \mid \sigma_i(X) > 0\}, \quad b(X) := \{i \in [n] \mid \sigma_i(X) = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad c := \{n+1, \dots, m\}. \quad (9)$$

Let  $\nu_1(X) > \dots > \nu_{s(X)}(X)$  be the nonzero distinct singular values of  $X$ , and write

$$a_l(X) := \{i \in [n] \mid \sigma_i(X) = \nu_l(X)\} \quad \forall l \in [s(X)] \quad \text{and} \quad a_{s(X)+1}(X) := b(X). \quad (10)$$

For any  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(X)$ , with  $a = a(X), b = b(X)$ , let  $U_a^\uparrow := U_a I_{|a|}^\uparrow, V_a^\uparrow := V_a I_{|a|}^\uparrow$ ,

$$P := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} U_a & U_b & 0 & U_b & U_a^\uparrow \\ V_a & V_b & \sqrt{2}V_c & -V_b & -V_a^\uparrow \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad P_0 := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} U_b & 0 & U_b \\ V_b & \sqrt{2}V_c & -V_b \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

It is easy to check that  $P \in \mathbb{O}^{n+m}$ . Also, from [12, Theorem 7.3.7], it follows that

$$P^\top \mathcal{B}(X) P = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Diag}(\sigma(X)) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\text{Diag}(I_n^\uparrow \sigma(X)) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that  $\Psi_\kappa(X) = h_\kappa(\sigma(X))$  with  $h_\kappa(x) = \sum_{i=1}^\kappa |x|_i^\downarrow$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Clearly,  $h_\kappa$  is absolutely symmetric, i.e.,  $h_\kappa(Qx) = h_\kappa(x)$  for any  $n \times n$  signed permutation matrix  $Q$ . By invoking [14, Corollary 2.5],  $\Gamma \in \partial\Psi_\kappa(X)$  if and only if  $\sigma(\Gamma) \in \partial h_\kappa(\sigma(X))$  and there exists  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(X) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\Gamma)$ , i.e., a simultaneous ordered SVD of the form

$$X = U [\text{Diag}(\sigma(X)) \quad 0] V^\top \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma = U [\text{Diag}(\sigma(\Gamma)) \quad 0] V^\top. \quad (12)$$

Together with [26, Lemma 2.3], we have the following characterization for the subdifferential of  $\Psi_\kappa$  at a point  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , which was also given in [7, Lemma 3].

**Lemma 3.1** *Consider any  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ . Let  $a_l = a_l(X)$  for each  $l \in [s(X)+1]$  with  $a_l(X)$  defined by (10), and let  $r \in [s(X)+1]$  be the integer such that  $\kappa \in a_r$ . Then,  $\Gamma \in \partial\Psi_\kappa(X)$  if and only if the following assertions hold:*

(i) when  $r \in [s(X)]$ , there exist integers  $0 \leq \kappa_0 \leq \kappa - 1$  and  $\kappa \leq \kappa_1 \leq n$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1(X) &\geq \cdots \geq \sigma_{\kappa_0}(X) > \sigma_{\kappa_0+1}(X) = \cdots = \sigma_{\kappa}(X) = \cdots = \sigma_{\kappa_1}(X) \\ &> \sigma_{\kappa_1+1}(X) \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_n(X) \geq 0, \\ \sigma_\alpha(\Gamma) &= e_\alpha, \quad \sum_{i \in \beta} \sigma_i(\Gamma) = \kappa - \kappa_0 \quad \text{with } 0 \leq \sigma_\beta(\Gamma) \leq e_\beta, \quad \sigma_\gamma(\Gamma) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha := [\kappa_0]$ ,  $\beta := \{\kappa_0+1, \dots, \kappa_1\} = a_r$ ,  $\gamma := \{\kappa_1+1, \dots, n\} = \bigcup_{l=r+1}^{s(X)+1} a_l$ ;

(ii) when  $r = s(X)+1$ , there exists an integer  $\kappa_0$  with  $0 \leq \kappa_0 \leq \kappa - 1$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1(X) &\geq \cdots \geq \sigma_{\kappa_0}(X) > \sigma_{\kappa_0+1}(X) = \cdots = \sigma_{\kappa}(X) = \cdots = \sigma_n(X) = 0, \\ \sigma_\alpha(\Gamma) &= e_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in \beta} \sigma_i(\Gamma) \leq \kappa - \kappa_0 \quad \text{with } 0 \leq \sigma_\beta(\Gamma) \leq e_\beta, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha := [\kappa_0] = \bigcup_{l=1}^r a_l$  and  $\beta := \{\kappa_0+1, \dots, n\} = b(X)$ .

Now we introduce the Lagrange multiplier set associated with  $(X, \Gamma)$  for  $\Gamma \in \partial\Psi_\kappa(X)$ :

$$\Lambda(X, \Gamma) := \left\{ M \in \partial\Phi_\kappa(\mathcal{B}(X)) \mid \mathcal{B}^*(M) = \Gamma \right\},$$

where  $\mathcal{B}^* : \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (m+n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  denotes the adjoint of the linear operator  $\mathcal{B}$ . The following lemma provides a specific characterization for such a multiplier set.

**Lemma 3.2** Fix any  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  and  $\Gamma \in \partial\Psi_\kappa(X)$ . Pick any  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n, m}(X)$ , and let  $P$  and  $P_0$  be defined by (11) with such  $(U, V)$  and the index sets  $a = a(X)$ ,  $b = b(X)$  and  $c$  from (9). Let  $a_l = a_l(X)$  for each  $l \in [s(X)+1]$  with  $a_l(X)$  defined by (10), and let  $r \in [s(X)+1]$  be the integer such that  $\kappa \in a_r$ . Then,  $M \in \Lambda(X, \Gamma)$  if and only if  $M = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & \Gamma/2 \\ \Gamma^\top/2 & M_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  for  $M_{11} \in \mathbb{S}^n$  and  $M_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$  and there exists  $\xi \in \Omega_r$  such that

$$M - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} P_{a_l} P_{a_l}^\top = \begin{cases} P_{a_r} \text{Diag}(\xi) P_{a_r}^\top & \text{if } r \in [s(X)], \\ P_0 \text{Diag}(\xi) P_0^\top & \text{if } r = s(X)+1, \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where  $\Omega_r$  is the same as in Lemma 2.1. When  $r \in [s(X)]$ , equality (13) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} U_{a_r} \text{Diag}(\xi) U_{a_r}^\top = 2M_{11} - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} U_{a_l}^\top, \\ V_{a_r} \text{Diag}(\xi) V_{a_r}^\top = 2M_{22} - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} V_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top, \\ U_{a_r} \text{Diag}(\xi) V_{a_r}^\top = \Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top; \end{cases}$$

when  $r = s(X)+1$ , by writing  $\xi := (\xi_1; \xi_2; \xi_3)$  with  $\xi_1, \xi_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{|b|}$  and  $\xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{|c|}$ , the above equality (13) can equivalently be written as

$$\begin{cases} U_b \text{Diag}(\xi_1 + \xi_3) U_b^\top = 2M_{11} - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} U_{a_l}^\top, \\ V_b \text{Diag}(\xi_1 + \xi_3) V_b^\top + 2V_c \text{Diag}(\xi_2) V_c^\top = 2M_{22} - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} V_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top, \\ U_b \text{Diag}(\xi_1 - \xi_3) V_b^\top = \Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top. \end{cases}$$

**Proof:** By the definition of the linear mapping  $\mathcal{B}$ , its adjoint  $\mathcal{B}^*: \mathbb{S}^{n+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  has the form  $\mathcal{B}^*(M) = 2M_{12}$  for  $M = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{12}^\top & M_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  with  $M_{11} \in \mathbb{S}^n, M_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$  and  $M_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ . Together with the definition of  $\Lambda(X, \Gamma)$ ,  $M \in \Lambda(X, \Gamma)$  if and only if  $M \in \partial\Phi_\kappa(\mathcal{B}(X))$  with  $M = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & \Gamma/2 \\ (\Gamma/2)^\top & M_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  for  $M_{11} \in \mathbb{S}^n$  and  $M_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$ . By Lemma 2.1 (i),  $M \in \partial\Phi_\kappa(\mathcal{B}(X))$  iff there exists  $\xi \in \Omega_r$  such that (13) holds. The first part then follows. The second part is immediate by using equality (13) and the expressions of  $P$  and  $P_0$  in (11).  $\square$

We are ready to provide a compact expression of the second subderivative of  $\Psi_\kappa$ .

**Proposition 3.1** *Fix any  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  and  $\Gamma \in \partial\Psi_\kappa(X)$ . Pick any  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n, m}(X)$ , and let  $P$  be defined by (11) with such  $(U, V)$  and the index sets  $a = a(X), b = b(X)$  and  $c$  from (9). Let  $a_l = a_l(X)$  for each  $l \in [s(X) + 1]$  with  $a_l(X)$  defined by (10), and let  $r \in [s(X) + 1]$  be the integer such that  $\kappa \in a_r$ . Then,  $\Psi_\kappa$  is properly twice epi-differentiable at  $X$  for  $\Gamma$  with  $\text{dom}d^2\Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma) = \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X, \Gamma)$ , and moreover, for any  $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X, \Gamma)$ , when  $r \in [s(X)]$ ,*

$$d^2\Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma)(G) = \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \text{tr}(\Xi_{a_l}(X, G)) + \left\langle U_{a_r}^\top \left( \Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top \right) V_{a_r}, \Xi_{a_r}(X, G) \right\rangle,$$

and when  $r = s(X) + 1$ ,

$$d^2\Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma)(G) = \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \text{tr}(\Xi_{a_l}(X, G)) - 2 \left\langle \Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top, G V_a \Sigma_a^{-1} U_a^\top G \right\rangle,$$

where, for each  $l \in [s(X)]$ ,  $\Xi_{a_l}(X, G) := 2P_{a_l}^\top \mathcal{B}(G)(\nu_l(X)I_{n+m} - \mathcal{B}(X))^\dagger \mathcal{B}(G)P_{a_l}$ .

**Proof:** From [17, Example 4.7(b)], the function  $\Phi_\kappa$  is parabolically regular at any  $Z \in \mathbb{S}^{m+n}$  for each  $W \in \partial\Phi_\kappa(Z)$  and is parabolically epi-differentiable at  $Z$  for any  $H \in \mathbb{S}^{m+n}$ . Since  $\Phi_\kappa$  is a Lipschitz continuous and convex function,  $\text{dom}\Phi_\kappa = \mathbb{S}^{m+n}$ , the assumption of the metric subregularity constraint qualification is satisfied automatically. From [17, Theorem 5.4] with  $g = \Phi_\kappa$  and  $F(\cdot) = \mathcal{B}(\cdot)$ , the twice epi-differentiable at  $X$  for  $\Gamma$  can be deduced. Moreover,  $\text{dom}d^2\Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma) = \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X, \Gamma)$ . Thus, the rest only needs to establish the expression of  $d^2\Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma)(G)$  for  $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X, \Gamma)$ . Pick any  $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X, \Gamma)$ . Again, using [17, Theorem 5.4] with  $g = \Phi_\kappa, F(\cdot) = \mathcal{B}(\cdot)$  leads to

$$d^2\Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma)(G) = \max_{M' \in \Lambda(X, \Gamma)} d^2\Phi_\kappa(Z|M')(\mathcal{B}(G)) \quad \text{with } Z = \mathcal{B}(X). \quad (16)$$

Let  $M \in \Lambda(X, \Gamma)$  be an optimal solution of the maximum problem in (16). Then,

$$d^2\Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma)(G) = d^2\Phi_\kappa(Z|M)(\mathcal{B}(G)). \quad (17)$$

**Case 1:**  $r \in [s(X)]$ . As  $M \in \Lambda(X|\Gamma)$ , by Lemma 3.2, there exists  $\xi \in \Omega_r$  such that

$$P_{a_r} \text{Diag}(\xi) P_{a_r}^\top = M - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} P_{a_l} P_{a_l}^\top \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top = U_{a_r} \text{Diag}(\xi) V_{a_r}^\top. \quad (18)$$

From  $\langle \Gamma, G \rangle = d\Psi_\kappa(X)(G)$  and the second equality in (18), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top + U_{a_r} \text{Diag}(\xi) V_{a_r}^\top, G \right\rangle &= \langle \Gamma, G \rangle = d\Psi_\kappa(X)(G) = d\Phi_\kappa(\mathcal{B}(X))(\mathcal{B}(G)) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \text{tr}(P_{a_l}^\top \mathcal{B}(G) P_{a_l}) + \Phi_{l_\kappa(Z)}(P_{a_r}^\top \mathcal{B}(G) P_{a_r}), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the third equality is obtained by using [17, Proposition 4.3] and the last one is due to Lemma 2.1 (ii). By the expression of  $P$  in (11),  $\langle \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top, G \rangle = \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \text{tr}(P_{a_l}^\top \mathcal{B}(G) P_{a_l})$  and  $\langle U_{a_r} \text{Diag}(\xi) V_{a_r}^\top, G \rangle = \langle P_{a_r} \text{Diag}(\xi) P_{a_r}^\top, \mathcal{B}(G) \rangle$ . Then equation (19) is equivalent to

$$\Phi_{l_\kappa(Z)}(P_{a_r}^\top \mathcal{B}(G) P_{a_r}) = \langle P_{a_r} \text{Diag}(\xi) P_{a_r}^\top, \mathcal{B}(G) \rangle.$$

By the first equality of (18), using Lemma 2.1 (iii) with  $H = \mathcal{B}(G)$ ,  $Q = P$  and  $\tilde{S} = P_{a_r} \text{Diag}(\xi) P_{a_r}^\top$  and noting that  $\mu_l(Z)$  for each  $l \in [s(X)]$  is precisely  $\nu_l(X)$  leads to

$$\begin{aligned} d^2\Phi_\kappa(Z|M)(\mathcal{B}(G)) &= \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \text{tr}(2P_{a_l}^\top \mathcal{B}(G)(\nu_l(X)I_{n+m} - \mathcal{B}(X))^\dagger \mathcal{B}(G) P_{a_l}) \\ &\quad + \langle \text{Diag}(\xi), 2P_{a_r}^\top \mathcal{B}(G)(\nu_r(X)I_{n+m} - \mathcal{B}(X))^\dagger \mathcal{B}(G) P_{a_r} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\text{Diag}(\xi) = U_{a_r}^\top (\Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top) V_{a_r}$  by the second equality of (18). Together with the above equality and equation (17) yields the desired result.

**Case 2:**  $r = s(X) + 1$ . As  $M \in \Lambda(X, \Gamma)$ , by invoking Lemma 3.2, there exists a vector  $\xi = (\xi_1; \xi_2; \xi_3) \in \Omega_r$  with  $\xi_1, \xi_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{|b|}$  and  $\xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{|c|}$  such that

$$P_0 \text{Diag}(\xi) P_0^\top = M - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} P_{a_l} P_{a_l}^\top \quad \text{and} \quad U_b \text{Diag}(\xi_1 - \xi_3) V_b^\top = \Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top. \quad (20)$$

By using the second equality in (20) and the similar arguments as above, we have

$$\left\langle \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top + U_b \text{Diag}(\xi_1 - \xi_3) V_b^\top, G \right\rangle = \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \text{tr}(P_{a_l}^\top \mathcal{B}(G) P_{a_l}) + \Phi_{l_\kappa(Z)}(P_{a_r}^\top \mathcal{B}(G) P_{a_r}). \quad (21)$$

By the expressions of  $P$  and  $P_0$  in equation (11),  $\langle \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top, G \rangle = \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \text{tr}(P_{a_l}^\top \mathcal{B}(G) P_{a_l})$  and  $\langle U_b \text{Diag}(\xi_1 - \xi_3) V_b^\top, G \rangle = \langle P_0 \text{Diag}(\xi) P_0^\top, \mathcal{B}(G) \rangle$ . Then equation (21) is equivalent to

$$\Phi_{l_\kappa(Z)}(P_{a_r}^\top \mathcal{B}(G) P_{a_r}) = \langle P_0 \text{Diag}(\xi) P_0^\top, \mathcal{B}(G) \rangle.$$

By the first equality in (20), using Lemma 2.1 (iii) with  $H = \mathcal{B}(G)$ ,  $Q = P$  and  $\tilde{S} = P_0 \text{Diag}(\xi) P_0^\top$  and noting that  $\mu_l(Z)$  for each  $l \in [s(X) + 1]$  is precisely  $\nu_l(X)$  leads to

$$\begin{aligned} d^2\Phi_\kappa(Z|M)(\mathcal{B}(G)) &= \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \text{tr}(2P_{a_l}^\top \mathcal{B}(G)(\nu_l(X)I_{n+m} - \mathcal{B}(X))^\dagger \mathcal{B}(G) P_{a_l}) \\ &\quad - \langle \text{Diag}(\xi), P_0^\top \mathcal{B}(G)(\mathcal{B}(X))^\dagger \mathcal{B}(G) P_0 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the expression of  $P_0$  into the second term on the right hand side, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \text{Diag}(\xi), P_0^\top \mathcal{B}(G)(\mathcal{B}(X))^\dagger \mathcal{B}(G)P_0 \rangle \\
&= \langle \text{Diag}(\xi_1 - \xi_3), U_b^\top G V_a \Sigma_a^{-1} U_a^\top G V_b + V_b^\top G^\top U_a \Sigma_a^{-1} V_a^\top G^\top U_b \rangle \\
&= 2 \langle U_b \text{Diag}(\xi_1 - \xi_3) V_b^\top, G V_a \Sigma_a^{-1} U_a^\top G \rangle = 2 \left\langle \Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top, G V_a \Sigma_a^{-1} U_a^\top G \right\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to the second equality in (20). Combining the above two equations with (17) yields the desired result. The proof is completed.  $\square$

When  $X$  and  $\Gamma$  in Proposition 3.1 have the simultaneous ordered SVD as in (12), i.e.,  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(X) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\Gamma)$ , we have the specific expression of the second subderivative of  $\Psi_\kappa$  as stated in the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.2** *Fix any  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  and  $\Gamma \in \partial \Psi_\kappa(X)$ . Pick any  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(X) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\Gamma)$  with  $V = [V_1 \ V_c]$  for  $V_1 \in \mathbb{O}^{m \times n}$ . Let  $P$  be the matrix defined by (11) with such  $(U, V)$  and  $a = a(X)$ ,  $b = b(X)$  and  $c$  from (9), let  $a_l = a_l(X)$  for each  $l \in [s(X) + 1]$  with  $a_l(X)$  defined by (10), and let  $r \in [s(X) + 1]$  be the integer such that  $\kappa \in a_r$ . Let  $\zeta_1(\Gamma) > \dots > \zeta_q(\Gamma)$  be the nonzero distinct entries of the set  $\{\sigma_i(\Gamma) \mid i \in a_r\}$ , and write*

$$\beta_l(\Gamma) := \{i \in a_r \mid \sigma_i(\Gamma) = \zeta_l(\Gamma)\} \quad \text{for } l \in [q] \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_0(\Gamma) := \{i \in a_r \mid \sigma_i(\Gamma) = 0\}. \quad (22)$$

Then, for any  $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X, \Gamma)$ , when  $r \in [s(X)]$ ,  $d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma)(G)$  is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{\nu'=r+1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)_{a_l a_{\nu'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_{\nu'}(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{2(1 - \zeta_j(\Gamma))}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_r(X)} \|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)_{a_l \beta_j}\|_F^2 \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{\nu'=r+1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma) \|\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\beta_j a_{\nu'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_r(X) - \nu_{\nu'}(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{\nu'=1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)_{a_l a_{\nu'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) + \nu_{\nu'}(X)} \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{\nu'=1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma) \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_j a_{\nu'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_r(X) + \nu_{\nu'}(X)} + \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{\zeta_j(\Gamma)}{\nu_r(X)} \|U_{\beta_j}^\top G V_c\|_F^2 \\
&+ \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{\|U_{a_l}^\top G V_c\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)_{a_l \beta_0}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_r(X)},
\end{aligned}$$

when  $r = s(X) + 1$ ,  $d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma)(G)$  is equal to the following sum

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{2(1 - \zeta_j(\Gamma))}{\nu_l(X)} \|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)_{a_l \beta_j}\|_F^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{\nu'=1}^{r-1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)_{a_l a_{\nu'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) + \nu_{\nu'}(X)} \\
&+ \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)_{a_l \beta_0}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{\|U_{a_l}^\top G V_c\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{2(1 + \zeta_j(\Gamma))}{\nu_l(X)} \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)_{a_l \beta_j}\|_F^2.
\end{aligned}$$

**Proof:** Fix any  $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X, \Gamma)$ . By the definition of  $\Xi_{a_l}$  in Proposition 3.1 and the expression of  $P$  in (11), for each  $l \in [s(X)]$ , we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi_{a_l}(X, G) &= 2[\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)]_{a_l}^\top (\nu_l(X)I_{n+m} - \text{Diag}(\sigma(X)))^\dagger [\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)]_{a_l} \\ &\quad + 2[\mathcal{T}(U^\top GV_1)]_{a_l}^\top (\nu_l(X)I_{n+m} + \text{Diag}(\sigma(X)))^\dagger [\mathcal{T}(U^\top GV_1)]_{a_l} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\nu_l(X)} U_{a_l}^\top G V_c V_c^\top G^\top U_{a_l}^\top,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{l=1}^r \text{tr}(\Xi_{a_l}(X, G)) &= \sum_{l=1}^r \sum_{l' \neq l}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)]_{a_l a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_{l'}(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^r \frac{1}{\nu_l(X)} \|U_{a_l}^\top G V_c\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^r \sum_{l'=1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{T}(U^\top GV_1)]_{a_l a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) + \nu_{l'}(X)}.\end{aligned}\quad (23)$$

As  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(X) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\Gamma)$ , we have  $U_{a_r}^\top (\Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top) V_{a_r} = \text{Diag}(\sigma_{a_r}(\Gamma))$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle U_{a_r}^\top (\Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top) V_{a_r}, \Xi_{a_r}(X, G) \rangle \\ &= 2 \langle \text{Diag}(\sigma_{a_r}(\Gamma)), P_{a_r}^\top \mathcal{B}(G)(\nu_r(X)I - \mathcal{B}(X))^\dagger \mathcal{B}(G) P_{a_r} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^q \zeta_j(\Gamma) \text{tr}(2P_{\beta_j}^\top \mathcal{B}(G)(\nu_r(X)I - \mathcal{B}(X))^\dagger \mathcal{B}(G) P_{\beta_j}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{r' \neq l'=1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma) \|[\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)]_{\beta_j a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_r(X) - \nu_{l'}(X)} + \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{\zeta_j(\Gamma)}{\nu_r(X)} \|U_{\beta_j}^\top G V_c\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l'=1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma) \|[\mathcal{T}(U^\top GV_1)]_{\beta_j a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_r(X) + \nu_{l'}(X)}.\end{aligned}\quad (24)$$

By combining (23)-(24) with the equality in Proposition 3.1 for  $r \in [s(X)]$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}d^2 \Psi_k(X|\Gamma)(G) &= \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l' \neq l=1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)]_{a_l a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_{l'}(X)} + \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{r' \neq l'=1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma) \|[\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)]_{\beta_j a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_r(X) - \nu_{l'}(X)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{T}(U^\top GV_1)]_{a_l a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) + \nu_{l'}(X)} + \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{\zeta_j(\Gamma)}{\nu_r(X)} \|U_{\beta_j}^\top G V_c\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{1}{\nu_l(X)} \|U_{a_l}^\top G V_c\|_F^2 + \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l'=1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma) \|[\mathcal{T}(U^\top GV_1)]_{\beta_j a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_r(X) + \nu_{l'}(X)}.\end{aligned}\quad (25)$$

Observe that the sum of the first two terms on the right hand side is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{2\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{a_l a_r}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_r(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=r+1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{a_l a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_{l'}(X)} \\
& - \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l'=1}^{r-1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma)\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{\beta_j a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_{l'}(X) - \nu_r(X)} + \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l'=r+1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma)\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{\beta_j a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_r(X) - \nu_{l'}(X)} \\
& = \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{2\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{a_l \beta_j}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_r(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=r+1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{a_l a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_{l'}(X)} \\
& - \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l'=1}^{r-1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma)\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{\beta_j a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_{l'}(X) - \nu_r(X)} + \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l'=r+1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma)\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{\beta_j a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_r(X) - \nu_{l'}(X)} \\
& = \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{2(1 - \zeta_j(\Gamma))\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{a_l \beta_j}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_r(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=r+1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{a_l a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_{l'}(X)} \\
& + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{2\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{a_l \beta_0}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_r(X)} + \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l'=r+1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma)\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{\beta_j a_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_r(X) - \nu_{l'}(X)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Along with the last four terms on the right hand side of (25), the result for the case  $r \in [s(X)]$  holds. Next we focus on the case that  $r = s(X)+1$ . From  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(X) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\Gamma)$  and the definition of  $\zeta(\Gamma)$ ,  $\Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top = U_b \text{Diag}(\zeta(\Gamma)) V_b^\top$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\langle \Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top, G V_a \Sigma_a^{-1} U_a^\top G \rangle = 2\langle U_b \text{Diag}(\zeta(\Gamma)) V_b^\top, G V_a \Sigma_a^{-1} U_a^\top G \rangle \\
& = \langle \text{Diag}(\zeta(\Gamma)), U_b^\top G V_a \Sigma_a^{-1} U_a^\top G V_b + V_b^\top G^\top U_a \Sigma_a^{-1} V_a^\top G^\top U_b \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that in this case  $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_q$  is a partition of the index set  $b$ , so  $U_b = [U_{\beta_1} \cdots U_{\beta_q} U_{\beta_0}]$  and  $V_b = [V_{\beta_1} \cdots V_{\beta_q} V_{\beta_0}]$ . Then, an elementary calculation yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\langle \Gamma - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} U_{a_l} V_{a_l}^\top, G V_a \Sigma_a^{-1} U_a^\top G \rangle \\
& = \sum_{j=0}^q \zeta_j(\Gamma) \text{tr}(U_{\beta_j}^\top G V_a \Sigma_a^{-1} U_a^\top G V_{\beta_j} + V_{\beta_j}^\top G^\top U_a \Sigma_a^{-1} V_a^\top G^\top U_{\beta_j}) \\
& = \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma)}{\nu_l(X)} \langle [\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{a_l \beta_j}], [\mathcal{S}(V_1^\top G^\top U)_{\beta_j a_l}] \rangle \\
& = \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma)}{\nu_l(X)} (\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top GV_1)_{a_l \beta_j}\|_F^2 - \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top GV_1)_{a_l \beta_j}\|_F^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Together with (23) and the equality of Proposition 3.1 for  $r = s(X) + 1$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma)(G) &= \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l' \neq l=1}^r \frac{2 \|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l a_{l'}}^2}{\nu_l(X) - \nu_{l'}(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=1}^r \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l a_{l'}}^2}{\nu_l(X) + \nu_{l'}(X)} \\ &\quad - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{2 \zeta_j(\Gamma)}{\nu_l(X)} (\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l \beta_j}^2 - \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l \beta_j}^2) \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{1}{\nu_l(X)} \|U_{a_l}^\top G V_c\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the sum of the first three terms on the right hand side, we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{2}{\nu_l(X)} \|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l b}^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=1}^{r-1} \frac{2}{\nu_l(X) + \nu_{l'}(X)} \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l a_{l'}}^2 \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l b}^2}{\nu_l(X)} - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{2 \zeta_j(\Gamma)}{\nu_l(X)} (\|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l \beta_j}^2 - \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l \beta_j}^2) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{2(1 - \zeta_j(\Gamma))}{\nu_l(X)} \|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l \beta_j}^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{2}{\nu_l(X)} \|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l \beta_0}^2 \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=1}^{r-1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l a_{l'}}^2}{\nu_l(X) + \nu_{l'}(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{2(1 + \zeta_j(\Gamma))}{\nu_l(X)} \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l \beta_j}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain the desired result. The proof is completed.  $\square$

As a consequence of Proposition 3.2, we obtain the second subderivatives of the spectral norm  $\|\cdot\|$  and the nuclear norm  $\|\cdot\|_*$ , stated as in Corollaries 3.2 and 3.1.

**Corollary 3.1** *Fix any  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  and  $\Gamma \in \partial \|X\|_*$ . Pick  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n, m}(X) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n, m}(\Gamma)$  with  $V = [V_1 \ V_c]$  for  $V_1 \in \mathbb{O}^{m \times n}$ . Let  $a_l = a_l(X)$  for each  $l \in [s(X) + 1]$  with  $a_l(X)$  defined by (10). Let  $\zeta_1(\Gamma) > \dots > \zeta_q(\Gamma)$  be the nonzero distinct entries of the set  $\{\sigma_i(\Gamma) \mid i \in a_{s(X)+1}\}$ , and write  $\beta_0(\Gamma) := \{i \in a_{s(X)+1} \mid \sigma_i(\Gamma) = 0\}$  and  $\beta_l(\Gamma) := \{i \in a_{s(X)+1} \mid \sigma_i(\Gamma) = \zeta_l(\Gamma)\}$  for  $l \in [q]$ . Then, for any  $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\|\cdot\|_*}(X, \Gamma)$ , when  $\text{rank}(X) = n$ ,*

$$d^2 \|\cdot\|_*(X|\Gamma)(G) = \sum_{l=1}^{s(X)} \sum_{l'=1}^{s(X)} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l a_{l'}}^2}{\nu_l(X) + \nu_{l'}(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^{s(X)} \frac{1}{\nu_l(X)} \|U_{a_l}^\top G V_c\|_F^2;$$

when  $\text{rank}(X) < n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d^2 \|\cdot\|_*(X|\Gamma)(G) &= \sum_{l=1}^{s(X)} \sum_{l'=1}^{s(X)} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l a_{l'}}^2}{\nu_l(X) + \nu_{l'}(X)} + \sum_{l=1}^{s(X)} \frac{1}{\nu_l(X)} \|U_{a_l}^\top G V_c\|_F^2 \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^{s(X)} \sum_{j=0}^q \left[ \frac{2(1 - \zeta_j(\Gamma))}{\nu_l(X)} \|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l \beta_j}^2 + \frac{2(1 + \zeta_j(\Gamma))}{\nu_l(X)} \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{a_l \beta_j}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

**Corollary 3.2** Fix any  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  and  $\Gamma \in \partial \|X\|$ . Pick  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(X) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\Gamma)$  with  $V = [V_1 \ V_c]$  for  $V_1 \in \mathbb{O}^{m \times n}$ . Let  $a_l = a_l(X)$  for each  $l \in [s(X)+1]$  with  $a_l(X)$  defined by (10). Let  $\zeta_1(\Gamma) > \dots > \zeta_q(\Gamma)$  be the nonzero distinct entries of the set  $\{\sigma_i(\Gamma) \mid i \in a_1\}$ , and write  $\beta_0(\Gamma) := \{i \in a_1 \mid \sigma_i(\Gamma) = 0\}$  and  $\beta_l(\Gamma) := \{i \in a_1 \mid \sigma_i(\Gamma) = \zeta_l(\Gamma)\}$  for  $l \in [q]$ . Then, for any  $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\|\cdot\|}(X, \Gamma)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d^2 \|\cdot\|(X|\Gamma)(G) &= \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{\nu'=2}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma) \|\mathcal{S}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{\beta_j a_{\nu'}}^2}{\nu_1(X) - \nu_{\nu'}(X)} + \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{\zeta_j(\Gamma)}{\nu_1(X)} \|U_{\beta_j}^\top G V_c\|_F^2 \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{\nu'=1}^{s(X)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma) \|\mathcal{T}(U^\top G V_1)\|_{\beta_j a_{\nu'}}^2}{\nu_1(X) + \nu_{\nu'}(X)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma)$  is always nonnegative by the convexity of  $\Psi_\kappa$ . Together with its expression in Proposition 3.2, we have the following conclusion.

**Corollary 3.3** Fix any  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  and  $\Gamma \in \partial \Psi_\kappa(X)$ . Pick  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(X) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\Gamma)$  with  $V = [V_1 \ V_c]$  for  $V_1 \in \mathbb{O}^{m \times n}$ . For each  $l \in [s(X)]$ , let  $a_l = a_l(X)$  with  $a_l(X)$  defined by (10), and let  $r \in [s(X)+1]$  be the integer such that  $\kappa \in a_r$ . Write  $\alpha := \bigcup_{l=1}^{r-1} a_l$ ,  $\beta := a_r$ ,  $\gamma := \bigcup_{l=r+1}^{s(X)+1} a_l$  and  $\beta_+ := \beta \setminus (\beta_1 \cup \beta_0)$  with  $\beta_1 := \beta_1(\Gamma)$  and  $\beta_0 := \beta_0(\Gamma)$ . Then, for any  $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X, \Gamma)$ , when  $r \in [s(X)]$ ,  $d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma)(G) = 0$  if and only if

$$\begin{cases} (U^\top G V_1)_{(\alpha \cup \beta_1 \cup \beta_+)(\alpha \cup \beta_1 \cup \beta_+)} \in \mathbb{S}^{|\alpha|+|\beta_1|+|\beta_+|}, \end{cases} \quad (26a)$$

$$\begin{cases} (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_1 \beta_0} = (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_0 \beta_1}^\top, (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_+ \beta_0} = (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_0 \beta_+}^\top, \end{cases} \quad (26b)$$

$$\begin{cases} (U^\top G V_1)_{\alpha \beta_+} = (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_+ \alpha}^\top = 0, (U^\top G V_1)_{\alpha \beta_0} = (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_0 \alpha}^\top = 0, \end{cases} \quad (26c)$$

$$\begin{cases} (U^\top G V_1)_{\alpha \gamma} = (U^\top G V_1)_{\gamma \alpha}^\top = 0, \end{cases} \quad (26c)$$

$$\begin{cases} (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_1 \gamma} = (U^\top G V_1)_{\gamma \beta_1}^\top = 0, (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_+ \gamma} = (U^\top G V_1)_{\gamma \beta_+}^\top = 0, \end{cases} \quad (26d)$$

$$\begin{cases} (U^\top G V_1)_{\alpha c} = 0, (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_1 c} = 0, (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_+ c} = 0; \end{cases} \quad (26d)$$

and when  $r = s(X) + 1$ ,  $d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X|\Gamma)(G) = 0$  if and only if

$$\begin{cases} (U^\top G V_1)_{\alpha \alpha} \in \mathbb{S}^{|\alpha|}, (U^\top G V_1)_{\alpha \beta_1} = (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_1 \alpha}^\top, \end{cases} \quad (27a)$$

$$\begin{cases} (U^\top G V_1)_{\alpha c} = 0, (U^\top G V_1)_{\alpha \beta_+} = (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_+ \alpha}^\top = 0, \end{cases} \quad (27b)$$

$$\begin{cases} (U^\top G V_1)_{\alpha \beta_0} = (U^\top G V_1)_{\beta_0 \alpha}^\top = 0. \end{cases} \quad (27c)$$

## 4 Characterization of tilt stability for problem (1)

To provide a specific characterization of tilt stability for problem (1), we need the following technical lemma to present the critical cone of  $\Psi_\kappa$  at any point  $(X, \Gamma) \in \text{gph } \partial \Psi_\kappa$ .

**Lemma 4.1** (see [7, Proposition 10]) Consider any  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  and  $\Gamma \in \partial \Psi_\kappa(X)$ . Pick  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(X) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\Gamma)$ . Let  $a_l = a_l(X)$  for each  $l \in [s(X)+1]$  with  $a_l(X)$  defined by (10), let  $r \in [s(X)+1]$  be the integer such that  $\kappa \in a_r$ , and let  $\beta_l = \beta_l(\Gamma)$  for  $l = 0, 1, \dots, q$  with  $\beta_l(\Gamma)$  defined by (22) and  $\beta_+ := \bigcup_{j=2}^q \beta_j(\Gamma)$ . Then the following assertions hold.

(i) When  $r \in [s(X)]$ ,  $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X, \Gamma)$  if and only if there exists  $\varpi \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\lambda_1(\mathcal{S}(U_{\beta_0}^\top G V_{\beta_0})) \leq \varpi \leq \lambda_{|\beta_1|}(\mathcal{S}(U_{\beta_1}^\top G V_{\beta_1})),$$

$$\mathcal{S}(U_{a_r}^\top G V_{a_r}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S}(U_{\beta_1}^\top G V_{\beta_1}) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varpi I_{|\beta_+|} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathcal{S}(U_{\beta_0}^\top G V_{\beta_0}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

(ii) When  $r = s(X) + 1$  and  $\|\Gamma\|_* < \kappa$ ,  $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X, \Gamma)$  iff  $\mathcal{S}(U_{\beta_1}^\top G V_{\beta_1}) \in \mathbb{S}_+^{|\beta_1|}$  and

$$[U_{a_r}^\top G V_{a_r} \quad U_{a_r}^\top G V_c] = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{S}(U_{\beta_1}^\top G V_{\beta_1}) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

(iii) When  $r = s(X) + 1$  and  $\|\Gamma\|_* = \kappa$ ,  $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X, \Gamma)$  iff there is  $\varpi \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\sigma_1([U_{\beta_0}^\top G V_{\beta_0} \quad U_{\beta_0}^\top G V_c]) \leq \varpi \leq \lambda_{|\beta_1|}(\mathcal{S}(U_{\beta_1}^\top G V_{\beta_1})),$$

$$[U_{a_r}^\top G V_{a_r} \quad U_{a_r}^\top G V_c] = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{S}(U_{\beta_1}^\top G V_{\beta_1}) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varpi I_{|\beta_+|} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & U_{\beta_0}^\top G V_{\beta_0} & U_{\beta_0}^\top G V_c \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Theorem 4.1** Let  $\bar{X}$  be a local optimal solution of problem (1) with  $\bar{\Gamma} := -\nu \nabla f(\bar{X})$ . Suppose that there is a neighborhood  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $\bar{X}$  such that  $\nabla^2 f(X)$  is a positive semidefinite linear mapping on  $\mathcal{N}$ . For each  $l \in [s(\bar{X})]$ , let  $\bar{a}_l = a_l(\bar{X})$  with  $a_l(\bar{X})$  defined by (10) for  $X = \bar{X}$ , and let  $\bar{r} \in [s(\bar{X}) + 1]$  be the integer such that  $\kappa \in \bar{a}_{\bar{r}}$ . Write

$$\alpha := \bigcup_{l=1}^{\bar{r}-1} \bar{a}_l, \quad \beta := \bar{a}_{\bar{r}}, \quad \gamma := \bigcup_{l=\bar{r}+1}^{s(\bar{X})+1} \bar{a}_l \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_+ := \beta \setminus (\beta_1 \cup \beta_0)$$

with  $\beta_1 := \{i \in \beta \mid \sigma_i(\bar{\Gamma}) = 1\}$  and  $\beta_0 := \{i \in \beta \mid \sigma_i(\bar{\Gamma}) = 0\}$ . Then  $\bar{X}$  is a tilt-stable solution of problem (1) if and only if  $\text{Ker} \nabla^2 f(\bar{X}) \cap \Upsilon = \{0\}$  where, if  $\bar{r} \in [s(\bar{X})]$ ,

$$\Upsilon = \left\{ G \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \mid \exists (\bar{U}, \bar{V}) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\bar{X}) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\bar{\Gamma}), D \in \mathbb{R}^{|\beta_0| \times |\beta_0|}, \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ B^\top & C \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{S}^{|\alpha| + |\beta_1|}, \right.$$

$$\left. \lambda_1(\mathcal{S}(D)) \leq \varpi \leq \lambda_{|\beta_1|}(\mathcal{S}(C)), \begin{pmatrix} E_{11} & E_{12} \\ E_{21} & E_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(|\beta_0| + |\gamma|) \times (|\gamma| + |c|)}, \right.$$

$$\left. \text{such that } \bar{U}^\top G \bar{V} = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ B^\top & C & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \varpi I_{|\beta_+|} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & D & E_{11} & E_{12} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & E_{21} & E_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right\};$$

if  $\bar{r} = s(\bar{X}) + 1$  and  $\|\bar{\Gamma}\|_* < \kappa$ ,

$$\Upsilon = \left\{ G \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \mid \exists (\bar{U}, \bar{V}) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\bar{X}) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\bar{\Gamma}), A \in \mathbb{S}^{|\alpha|}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{|\alpha| \times |\beta_1|}, \right. \\ \left. C \in \mathbb{S}^{|\beta_1|} \text{ such that } \bar{U}^\top G \bar{V} = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ B^\top & C & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\};$$

and if  $\bar{r} = s(\bar{X}) + 1$  and  $\|\bar{\Gamma}\|_* = \kappa$ ,

$$\Upsilon = \left\{ G \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \mid \exists (\bar{U}, \bar{V}) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\bar{X}) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\bar{\Gamma}), A \in \mathbb{S}^{|\alpha|}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{|\alpha| \times |\beta_1|}, C \in \mathbb{S}^{|\beta_1|}, \right. \\ \left. D \in \mathbb{R}^{|\beta_0| \times |\beta_0|}, \sigma_1([D \ E]) \leq \varpi \leq \lambda_{|\beta_1|}(\mathcal{S}(C)), E \in \mathbb{R}^{|\beta_0| \times |c|}, \right. \\ \left. \text{such that } \bar{U}^\top G \bar{V} = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ B^\top & C & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \varpi I_{|\beta_+|} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & D & E \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

**Proof:** From Proposition 2.2 with taking  $\vartheta = \nu f$ ,  $g = \Psi_\kappa$  and  $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ,  $\bar{X}$  is a tilt-stable solution of (1) if and only if  $\text{Ker} \nabla^2 f(\bar{X}) \cap \mathcal{G} = \{0\}$ , where

$$\mathcal{G} = \{G \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \mid \exists (X^k, \Gamma^k) \in \text{gph} \partial \Psi_\kappa \text{ and } G^k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \text{ with } \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0 \\ \text{and } (X^k, \Gamma^k, G^k) \rightarrow (\bar{X}, \bar{\Gamma}, G)\}.$$

Hence, it is sufficient to argue that  $\mathcal{G} = \Upsilon$ .

Now, take any matrix  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ . Then there exist sequences  $(X^k, \Gamma^k) \in \text{gph} \partial \Psi_\kappa$  and  $G^k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0, \text{ and } (X^k, \Gamma^k, G^k) \rightarrow (\bar{X}, \bar{\Gamma}, G). \quad (28)$$

From  $\Gamma^k \in \partial \Psi_\kappa(X^k)$ , the convexity of  $\Psi_k$  and [14, Corollary 2.5],  $X^k$  and  $\Gamma^k$  have a simultaneous ordered SVD, i.e., there exists  $(U^k, V^k) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(X^k) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\Gamma^k)$ . Note that  $\{(U^k, V^k)\}$  is bounded, and the multifunction  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \ni Z \rightrightarrows \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(Z)$  is outer semicontinuous in [5, Lemma 2.1]. Then there exist an infinite index set  $K \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\lim_{K \ni k \rightarrow \infty} (U^k, V^k) = (\bar{U}, \bar{V}) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\bar{X}) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\bar{\Gamma})$ . Then

$$\bar{X} = \bar{U} [\text{Diag}(\sigma(\bar{X})) \ 0] \bar{V}^\top \text{ and } \bar{\Gamma} = \bar{U} [\text{Diag}(\sigma(\bar{\Gamma})) \ 0] \bar{V}^\top$$

with  $\bar{V} = [\bar{V}_1 \ \bar{V}_c]$  for  $\bar{V}_1 \in \mathbb{O}^{m \times n}$ . In the following, we argue that  $G \in \Upsilon$  by three cases.

**Case 1:**  $\bar{r} \in [s(\bar{X})]$ . Note that  $\bar{\Gamma} \in \partial \Psi_\kappa(\bar{X})$ . By invoking Lemma 3.1 (i) with  $(X, \Gamma) = (\bar{X}, \bar{\Gamma})$ , there exist integers  $\bar{\kappa}_0$  and  $\bar{\kappa}_1$  with  $0 \leq \bar{\kappa}_0 \leq \kappa - 1$  and  $\kappa \leq \bar{\kappa}_1 \leq n$  such that

$$\sigma_1(\bar{X}) \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_{\bar{\kappa}_0}(\bar{X}) > \sigma_{\bar{\kappa}_0+1}(\bar{X}) = \cdots = \sigma_\kappa(\bar{X}) = \cdots = \sigma_{\bar{\kappa}_1}(\bar{X}) \\ > \sigma_{\bar{\kappa}_1+1}(\bar{X}) \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_n(\bar{X}) \geq 0, \\ \sigma_\alpha(\bar{\Gamma}) = e_\alpha, \sum_{i \in \beta} \sigma_i(\bar{\Gamma}) = \kappa - \bar{\kappa}_0 \text{ with } 0 \leq \sigma_\beta(\bar{\Gamma}) \leq e_{|\beta|}, \text{ and } \sigma_\gamma(\bar{\Gamma}) = 0,$$

where  $[\bar{\kappa}_0] = \alpha$ ,  $\{\bar{\kappa}_0+1, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_1\} = \beta$  and  $\{\bar{\kappa}_1+1, \dots, n\} = \gamma$ . Since  $\lim_{K \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(X^k) = \sigma(\bar{X})$ , there must exist integers  $\kappa_0$  and  $\kappa_1$  with  $\bar{\kappa}_0 \leq \kappa_0 \leq \bar{\kappa}_1 - 1$  and  $\kappa \leq \kappa_1 \leq \bar{\kappa}_1$  and an infinite index set  $\widehat{K} \subset K$  such that for all  $k \in \widehat{K}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1(X^k) &\geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\kappa_0}(X^k) > \sigma_{\kappa_0+1}(X^k) = \dots = \sigma_{\kappa}(X^k) = \dots = \sigma_{\kappa_1}(X^k) \\ &> \sigma_{\kappa_1+1}(X^k) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_n(X^k) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Together with  $\Gamma^k \in \partial \Psi_{\kappa}(X^k)$  and Lemma 3.1 for  $(X, \Gamma) = (X^k, \Gamma^k)$ , for each  $k \in \widehat{K}$ ,

$$\sigma_{\widehat{\alpha}}(\Gamma^k) = e_{|\widehat{\alpha}|}, \sum_{i \in \widehat{\beta}} \sigma_i(\Gamma^k) = \kappa - \kappa_0 \text{ with } 0 \leq \sigma_{\widehat{\beta}}(\Gamma^k) \leq e_{|\widehat{\beta}|}, \text{ and } \sigma_{\widehat{\gamma}}(\Gamma^k) = 0 \quad (30)$$

where  $\widehat{\alpha} := \{1, \dots, \kappa_0\}$ ,  $\widehat{\beta} := \{\kappa_0+1, \dots, \kappa_1\}$  and  $\widehat{\gamma} := \{\kappa_1+1, \dots, n\}$ . Clearly, for all  $k \in \widehat{K}$ ,  $\{i \in \beta \mid \sigma_i(X^k) > \sigma_{\kappa}(X^k)\} = \{\bar{\kappa}_0+1, \dots, \kappa_0\} := \eta^1$ ,  $\{i \in \beta \mid \sigma_i(X^k) = \sigma_{\kappa}(X^k)\} = \widehat{\beta}$  and  $\{i \in \beta \mid \sigma_i(X^k) < \sigma_{\kappa}(X^k)\} = \{\kappa_1+1, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_1\} := \eta^3$ . If necessary by taking an infinite subset of  $\widehat{K}$ , for all  $k \in \widehat{K}$ , the sets  $\{i \in \widehat{\beta} \mid \sigma_i(\Gamma^k) = 1\}$ ,  $\{i \in \widehat{\beta} \mid 0 < \sigma_i(\Gamma^k) < 1\}$  and  $\{i \in \widehat{\beta} \mid \sigma_i(\Gamma^k) = 0\}$  keep unchanged, and for convenience we always write

$$\widehat{\beta}_1 := \{i \in \widehat{\beta} \mid \sigma_i(\Gamma^k) = 1\}, \widehat{\beta}_+ := \{i \in \widehat{\beta} \mid 0 < \sigma_i(\Gamma^k) < 1\}, \widehat{\beta}_0 := \{i \in \widehat{\beta} \mid \sigma_i(\Gamma^k) = 0\}.$$

Let  $\widehat{\beta}_+^1 := \{i \in \widehat{\beta}_+ \mid \sigma_i(\bar{\Gamma}) = 1\}$ ,  $\widehat{\beta}_+^0 := \{i \in \widehat{\beta}_+ \mid \sigma_i(\bar{\Gamma}) = 0\}$ ,  $\beta_+ := \{i \in \widehat{\beta}_+ \mid \sigma_i(\bar{\Gamma}) \in (0, 1)\}$ . From the definitions of the above index sets, it is not difficult to see that

$$\widehat{\alpha} = \alpha \cup \eta^1, \widehat{\gamma} = \gamma \cup \eta^3, \beta = \beta_1 \cup \beta_0 \cup \beta_+ = \eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta} \cup \eta^3, \widehat{\beta} = \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+ \cup \widehat{\beta}_0, \quad (31)$$

$$\widehat{\beta}_+ = \widehat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+ \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^0, \beta_1 = \eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1, \beta_0 = \widehat{\beta}_+^0 \cup \widehat{\beta}_0 \cup \eta^3. \quad (32)$$

By (29),  $s(X^k)$  is independent of  $k \in \widehat{K}$  and so is  $a_l(X^k)$  for each  $l \in [s(X^k)]$ , where  $a_l(X^k)$  is the index set defined by (10) with  $X = X^k$ . Then we write  $\widehat{a}_l = a_l(X^k)$  for each  $l \in [s(X^k)]$ . Let  $r \in [s(X^k)]$  be the integer such that  $\kappa \in \widehat{a}_r$ , and let  $\zeta_1(\Gamma^k) > \dots > \zeta_q(\Gamma^k)$  be the nonzero distinct entries in  $\{\sigma_i(\Gamma^k) \mid i \in \widehat{a}_r\}$ . For each  $l \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ , let  $\widehat{\beta}_q := \beta_q(\Gamma^k)$  with  $\beta_q(\Gamma^k)$  defined by (22) for  $\Gamma = \Gamma^k$ . Clearly,  $\widehat{\beta} = \bigcup_{j=0}^q \widehat{\beta}_j$ . From Proposition 3.2 with  $(X, \Gamma) = (X^k, \Gamma^k)$ , for every  $k \in \widehat{K}$ ,  $d^2 \Psi_{\kappa}(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k)$  equals

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=r+1}^{s(X^k)+1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\widehat{a}_l \widehat{a}_{l'}}^2}{\nu_l(X^k) - \nu_{l'}(X^k)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{2(1 - \zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\nu_l(X^k) - \nu_r(X^k)} \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\widehat{a}_l \widehat{\beta}_j}^2 \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l'=r+1}^{s(X^k)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma^k) \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\widehat{\beta}_j \widehat{a}_{l'}}^2}{\nu_r(X^k) - \nu_{l'}(X^k)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{\|(U_{\widehat{a}_l}^k)^\top G^k V_c^k\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k)} \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l'=1}^{s(X^k)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma^k) \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\widehat{\beta}_j \widehat{a}_{l'}}^2}{\nu_r(X^k) + \nu_{l'}(X^k)} + \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{\zeta_j(\Gamma^k)}{\nu_r(X^k)} \|(U_{\widehat{\beta}_j}^k)^\top G^k V_c^k\|_F^2 \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=1}^{s(X^k)+1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\widehat{a}_l \widehat{a}_{l'}}^2}{\nu_l(X^k) + \nu_{l'}(X^k)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\widehat{a}_l \widehat{\beta}_0}^2}{\nu_l(X^k) - \nu_r(X^k)}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Together with  $\lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$  by (28), we have the following relations

$$\begin{cases} (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{(\hat{\alpha} \cup \hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+)(\hat{\alpha} \cup \hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+)} \in \mathbb{S}^{|\hat{\alpha}| + |\hat{\beta}_1| + |\hat{\beta}_+^1| + |\beta_+|}, & (34a) \\ (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{(\hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+)(\hat{\beta}_+^0 \cup \hat{\beta}_0)} = (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{(\hat{\beta}_+^0 \cup \hat{\beta}_0)(\hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+)}^\top, & (34b) \\ (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\alpha}(\beta_+ \cup \hat{\beta}_+^0)} = (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{(\beta_+ \cup \hat{\beta}_+^0)\hat{\alpha}}^\top = 0, & (34c) \\ (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}_0} = (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\beta}_0\hat{\alpha}}^\top = 0, & (34d) \\ (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\gamma}} = (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\gamma}\hat{\alpha}}^\top = 0, & (34e) \\ (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{(\hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+)\hat{\gamma}} = (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\gamma}(\hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+)}^\top = 0, & (34f) \\ (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\alpha}c} = 0, (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\beta}_1c} = 0, (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{(\hat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+)c} = 0, & (34g) \end{cases}$$

and the detailed arguments are included in Appendix A. In addition, as  $G^k \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X^k, \Gamma^k)$ , according to Lemma 4.1 (i), for each  $k \in \hat{K}$  there exists  $\varpi_k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\lambda_1[\mathcal{S}((U_{\hat{\beta}_0}^k)^\top G^k V_{\hat{\beta}_0}^k)] \leq \varpi_k \leq \lambda_{|\hat{\beta}_1|}[\mathcal{S}((U_{\hat{\beta}_1}^k)^\top G^k V_{\hat{\beta}_1}^k)]$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}((U_{\hat{\beta}}^k)^\top G^k V_{\hat{\beta}}^k) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S}((U_{\hat{\beta}_1}^k)^\top G^k V_{\hat{\beta}_1}^k) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varpi_k I_{|\hat{\beta}_+|} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathcal{S}((U_{\hat{\beta}_0}^k)^\top G^k V_{\hat{\beta}_0}^k) \end{bmatrix}.$$

We assume  $\lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \varpi_k = \varpi$  if necessary by taking a subsequence. From the above equations, it holds that  $\lambda_1([\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\hat{\beta}_0 \hat{\beta}_0}) \leq \varpi \leq \lambda_{|\hat{\beta}_1|}([\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\hat{\beta}_1 \hat{\beta}_1})$  and

$$\lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{S}((U_{\hat{\beta}}^k)^\top G^k V_{\hat{\beta}}^k) = \begin{bmatrix} [\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\hat{\beta}_1 \hat{\beta}_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varpi I_{|\hat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+ \cup \hat{\beta}_+^0|} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & [\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\hat{\beta}_0 \hat{\beta}_0} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (35)$$

Take  $A = (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\alpha\alpha}$ ,  $B = (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\alpha(\eta^1 \cup \hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1)}$ ,  $C = (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{(\eta^1 \cup \hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1)(\eta^1 \cup \hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1)}$ ,  $D = \begin{pmatrix} \varpi I_{|\hat{\beta}_+^0|} & 0 \\ 0 & (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{(\hat{\beta}_0 \cup \eta^3)(\hat{\beta}_0 \cup \eta^3)} \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $[E_{11} \ E_{12}] = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{|\hat{\beta}_+^0|} & 0 \\ (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{(\hat{\beta}_0 \cup \eta^3)\gamma} & (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{(\hat{\beta}_0 \cup \eta^3)c} \end{pmatrix}$  and  $[E_{21} \ E_{22}] = [(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\gamma\gamma} \ (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\gamma c}]$ . Along with (34a)-(34g) and (35), and the relations  $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha \cup \eta^1$ ,  $\beta_1 = \eta^1 \cup \hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1$ ,  $\beta_0 = \hat{\beta}_+^0 \cup \hat{\beta}_0 \cup \eta^3$  in (31)-(32), we have  $G \in \Upsilon$ . **Case 2:**  $\bar{r} = s(\bar{X}) + 1$  and  $\|\bar{\Gamma}\|_* < \kappa$ . By invoking Lemma 3.1 (ii) with  $(X, \Gamma) = (\bar{X}, \bar{\Gamma})$ , there exist an integer  $\bar{\kappa}_0$  with  $0 \leq \bar{\kappa}_0 \leq \kappa - 1$  such that

$$\sigma_1(\bar{X}) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\bar{\kappa}_0}(\bar{X}) > \sigma_{\bar{\kappa}_0+1}(\bar{X}) = \dots = \sigma_\kappa(\bar{X}) = \dots = \sigma_n(\bar{X}) = 0, \quad (36)$$

$$\sigma_\alpha(\bar{\Gamma}) = e_\alpha \text{ and } \sum_{i \in \beta} \sigma_i(\bar{\Gamma}) \leq \kappa - \bar{\kappa}_0 \text{ with } 0 \leq \sigma_\beta(\bar{\Gamma}) \leq e_{|\beta|}. \quad (37)$$

where  $[\bar{\kappa}_0] = \alpha$  and  $\{\bar{\kappa}_0+1, \dots, n\} = \beta$ . Now there must exist an infinite index set  $\tilde{K} \subset K$  such that  $\sigma_\kappa(X^k) = 0$  for each  $k \in \tilde{K}$ . If not, there will exist  $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\sigma_\kappa(X^k) > 0$  for all  $K \ni k > \bar{k}$ . By Lemma 3.1 (i) with  $(X, \Gamma) = (X^k, \Gamma^k)$  for each  $k \in K$ , we have  $\|\Gamma^k\|_* = \kappa$  for all  $K \ni k > \bar{k}$ . On the other hand, from  $\lim_{K \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \|\Gamma^k\|_* = \|\bar{\Gamma}\|_* < \kappa$ , there exists  $\hat{k} \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\|\Gamma^k\|_* < \kappa$  for all  $K \ni k > \hat{k}$ . Then,  $\kappa = \|\Gamma^k\|_* < \kappa$  for all  $K \ni k > \max\{\bar{k}, \hat{k}\}$ , which is impossible. Since  $\lim_{\tilde{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(X^k) = \sigma(\bar{X})$ , there is an integer  $\kappa_0$  with  $\bar{\kappa}_0 \leq \kappa_0 \leq \kappa - 1$  and an infinite index set  $\hat{K} \subseteq \tilde{K}$  such that for all  $k \in \hat{K}$ ,

$$\sigma_1(X^k) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\kappa_0}(X^k) > \sigma_{\kappa_0+1}(X^k) = \dots = \sigma_\kappa(X^k) = \dots = \sigma_n(X^k) = 0, \quad (38)$$

$$\sigma_{\hat{\alpha}}(\Gamma^k) = e_{|\hat{\alpha}|} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in \hat{\beta}} \sigma_i(\Gamma^k) \leq \kappa - \kappa_0 \quad \text{with} \quad 0 \leq \sigma_{\hat{\beta}}(\Gamma^k) \leq e_{|\hat{\beta}|}, \quad (39)$$

where  $\hat{\alpha} := [\kappa_0]$  and  $\hat{\beta} := \{\kappa_0 + 1, \dots, n\}$ . Then, following the same arguments as those for Case 1, the relations in (31)-(32) still hold with  $\hat{\gamma} = \emptyset$ , i.e.,

$$\hat{\alpha} = \alpha \cup \eta^1, \quad \beta = \beta_1 \cup \beta_0 \cup \beta_+ = \eta^1 \cup \hat{\beta}, \quad \hat{\beta} = \hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+ \cup \hat{\beta}^0, \quad (40)$$

$$\hat{\beta}_+ = \hat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+ \cup \hat{\beta}_+^0, \quad \beta_1 = \eta^1 \cup \hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1, \quad \beta_0 = \hat{\beta}_+^0 \cup \hat{\beta}_0. \quad (41)$$

By (38),  $s(X^k)$  is independent of  $k \in \hat{K}$  and so is  $a_l(X^k)$  for each  $l \in [s(X^k)]$ , where  $a_l(X^k)$  is the index set defined by (10) with  $X = X^k$ . Hence, for each  $l \in [s(X^k)]$ , we write  $\hat{a}_l := a_l(X^k)$ . By (38),  $\kappa \in \hat{a}_{s(X^k)+1}$ , and we let  $r := s(X^k) + 1$ . Let  $\zeta_1(\Gamma^k) > \dots > \zeta_q(\Gamma^k)$  be the nonzero distinct entries of the set  $\{\sigma_i(\Gamma^k) \mid i \in \hat{a}_r\}$ . For each  $l \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ , let  $\hat{\beta}_q := \beta_q(\Gamma^k)$  with  $\beta_q(\Gamma^k)$  defined by (22) for  $\Gamma = \Gamma^k$ .

Now passing the limit  $\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$  by (28). By using Proposition 3.2 with  $(X, \Gamma) = (X^k, \Gamma^k)$ , for every  $k \in \hat{K}$ ,  $d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k)$  equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{2(1-\zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\nu_l(X^k)} \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\hat{a}_l \hat{\beta}_j}^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=1}^{r-1} \frac{2\|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\hat{a}_l \hat{a}_{l'}}^2}{\nu_l(X^k) + \nu_{l'}(X^k)} \\ & + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{2\|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\hat{a}_l \hat{\beta}_0}^2}{\nu_l(X^k)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{\|(U^k)^\top G^k V_c^k\|_{\hat{a}_l}^2}{\nu_l(X^k)} \\ & + \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{2(1+\zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\nu_l(X^k)} \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\hat{a}_l \hat{\beta}_j}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Together with the limit  $\lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$ , we have the following relations

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} & (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{S}^{|\alpha|}, \quad (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\alpha}(\hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+)} = (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{(\hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+) \hat{\alpha}}^\top, \end{aligned} \right. \quad (43a)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} & (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\alpha} c} = 0, \quad (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\alpha}(\beta_+ \cup \hat{\beta}_+^0)} = (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{(\beta_+ \cup \hat{\beta}_+^0) \hat{\alpha}}^\top = 0, \end{aligned} \right. \quad (43b)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} & (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\alpha} \hat{\beta}_0} = (\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)_{\hat{\beta}_0 \hat{\alpha}}^\top = 0, \end{aligned} \right. \quad (43c)$$

whose proof is included in Appendix B. In addition, as  $\|\Gamma^k\|_* < \kappa$  and  $G^k \in \mathcal{C}_{\|\cdot\|_{(k)}}(X^k, \Gamma^k)$ , according to Lemma 4.1 (ii), for each  $k \in \widehat{K}$ , we have  $\mathcal{S}((U_{\widehat{\beta}_1}^k)^\top G^k V_{\widehat{\beta}_1}^k) \in \mathbb{S}_+^{|\widehat{\beta}_1|}$  and

$$[(U_{\widehat{\beta}}^k)^\top G^k V_{\widehat{\beta}}^k \quad (U_{\widehat{\beta}}^k)^\top G^k V_c^k] = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S}((U_{\widehat{\beta}_1}^k)^\top G^k V_{\widehat{\beta}_1}^k) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Passing the limit  $\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty$  yields that  $\mathcal{S}(U_{\widehat{\beta}_1}^\top G V_{\widehat{\beta}_1}) \in \mathbb{S}_+^{|\widehat{\beta}_1|}$  and

$$\lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} [(U_{\widehat{\beta}}^k)^\top G^k V_{\widehat{\beta}}^k \quad (U_{\widehat{\beta}}^k)^\top G^k V_c^k] = \begin{bmatrix} [\mathcal{S}(\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)]_{\widehat{\beta}_1 \widehat{\beta}_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (44)$$

Take  $A = (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{\alpha\alpha}$ ,  $B = (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{\alpha(\eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1)}$ ,  $C = (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{(\eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1)(\eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1)}$ . Together with equations (43a)-(43c) and (44), and the relations  $\widehat{\alpha} = \alpha \cup \eta^1$ ,  $\beta_1 = \eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1$  and  $\beta_0 = \widehat{\beta}_+^0 \cup \widehat{\beta}_0$  in (40)-(41), we conclude that  $G \in \Upsilon$ .

**Case 3:**  $\bar{r} = s(\overline{X})+1$  and  $\|\overline{\Gamma}\|_* = \kappa$ . By Lemma 3.1 (ii) with  $(X, \Gamma) = (\overline{X}, \overline{\Gamma})$ , there exist an integer  $\bar{\kappa}_0$  with  $0 \leq \bar{\kappa}_0 \leq \kappa - 1$  such that (36)-(37) hold. We consider two subcases.

**Subcase 3.1: there is an infinite index set  $K^1$  such that  $\sigma_\kappa(X^k) > 0$  for all  $k \in K^1$ .** Note that equations (29)-(30) and the discussions after them with  $\gamma = \emptyset$  are applicable to this case. By combining equation (33) with  $\lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$  leads to equations (34a)-(34g) and (35). Construct  $A = (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{\alpha\alpha}$ ,  $B = (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{\alpha(\eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1)}$ ,

$$C = (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{(\eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1)(\eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1)}, \quad D = \begin{pmatrix} \varpi I_{|\widehat{\beta}_+^0|} & 0 \\ 0 & (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{(\widehat{\beta}_0 \cup \eta^3)(\widehat{\beta}_0 \cup \eta^3)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and } E =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{(\widehat{\beta}_0 \cup \eta^3)c} \end{pmatrix}. \quad \text{Together with equations (34a)-(34g) and (35), and the relations } \widehat{\alpha} = \alpha \cup \eta^1, \beta_1 = \eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1, \beta_0 = \widehat{\beta}_+^0 \cup \widehat{\beta}_0 \cup \eta^3 \text{ in (31)-(32), we have } G \in \Upsilon.$$

**Subcase 3.2: there is an infinite index set  $\widehat{K} \subset K$  such that  $\sigma_\kappa(X^k) = 0$  for all  $k \in \widehat{K}$ .** Note that equations (38)-(39) and the analysis after them are applicable to this case. By combining equation (42) with  $\lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$  leads to

$$\begin{cases} (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{\widehat{\alpha}\widehat{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{S}^{|\alpha|}, (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{\widehat{\alpha}(\widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1)} = (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{(\widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1)\widehat{\alpha}}^\top, & (45a) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{\widehat{\alpha}c} = 0, (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{\widehat{\alpha}(\beta_+ \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^0)} = (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{(\beta_+ \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^0)\widehat{\alpha}}^\top = 0, & (45b) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{\widehat{\alpha}\widehat{\beta}_0} = (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{\widehat{\beta}_0\widehat{\alpha}}^\top = 0. & (45c) \end{cases}$$

Take  $A = (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{\alpha\alpha}$ ,  $B = (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{\alpha(\eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1)}$ ,  $C = (\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)_{(\eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1)(\eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1)}$ ,  $D = 0$  and  $E = 0$ . Along with equations (43a)-(43c) and (44), and the relations  $\widehat{\alpha} = \alpha \cup \eta^1$ ,  $\beta_1 = \eta^1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1$  and  $\beta_0 = \widehat{\beta}_+^0 \cup \widehat{\beta}_0$  in (40)-(41), we conclude that  $G \in \Upsilon$ .

In the following we argue  $\Upsilon \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ . Pick any  $G \in \Upsilon$ . We shall prove that  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  by the following three cases.

**Case 1:**  $\bar{r} \in [s(\bar{X})]$ . From  $G \in \Upsilon$ , there exist  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\bar{X}) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\bar{\Gamma})$ ,  $A \in \mathbb{S}^{|\alpha|}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{|\alpha| \times |\beta_1|}$ ,  $C \in \mathbb{S}^{|\beta_1|}$ ,  $D \in \mathbb{R}^{|\beta_0| \times |\beta_0|}$ ,  $\begin{pmatrix} E_{11} & E_{12} \\ E_{21} & E_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(|\beta_0|+|\gamma|) \times (|\gamma|+|c|)}$  and  $\varpi \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\lambda_1(\mathcal{S}(D)) \leq \varpi \leq \lambda_{|\beta_1|}(\mathcal{S}(C)) \quad \text{and} \quad U^\top G V = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ B^\top & C & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \varpi I_{|\beta_+|} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & D & E_{11} & E_{12} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & E_{21} & E_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (46)$$

We construct the sequence  $\{(X^k, \Gamma^k, G^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $\Gamma^k := \bar{\Gamma}$ ,  $G^k := G$  and

$$X^k = \bar{X} + U \begin{pmatrix} 0_\alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{k} I_{|\beta_1|} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} V^\top \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since the set  $\{i \in \beta \mid \sigma_i(X^k) = \sigma_\kappa(X^k)\}$  is independent of  $k$ , we denote it by  $\widehat{\beta}$ . Write  $\widehat{\beta}_1 := \{i \in \widehat{\beta} \mid \sigma_i(\Gamma^k) = 1\}$ ,  $\widehat{\beta}_+ := \{i \in \widehat{\beta} \mid 0 < \sigma_i(\Gamma^k) < 1\}$  and  $\widehat{\beta}_0 := \{i \in \widehat{\beta} \mid \sigma_i(\Gamma^k) = 0\}$ . By Lemma 3.1, for all sufficiently large  $k$ ,  $\Gamma^k \in \partial \Psi_\kappa(X^k)$ , i.e.,  $(X^k, \Gamma^k) \in \text{gph} \partial \Psi_\kappa$ . Let  $r$  be the integer such that  $\kappa \in \widehat{a}_r := a_r(X^k)$ . We claim that for all sufficiently large  $k$ ,  $G^k \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X^k, \Gamma^k)$ . Indeed, when  $\kappa \notin \beta_1$ , we have  $\widehat{\beta}_1 = \emptyset$ ,  $\widehat{\beta}_+ = \beta_+$  and  $\widehat{\beta}_0 = \beta_0$ , which along with  $G^k = G$  and (46) implies that  $\mathcal{S}(U_{\widehat{a}_r}^\top G^k V_{\widehat{a}_r}) = \begin{bmatrix} \varpi I_{|\beta_+|} & 0 \\ 0 & D \end{bmatrix}$ .

Thus, by Lemma 4.1 (i) with  $(X, \Gamma) = (X^k, \Gamma^k)$ , the claimed inclusion holds. When  $\kappa \in \beta_1$ , we have  $\widehat{\beta}_+ = \emptyset = \widehat{\beta}_0$ , which along with  $\widehat{\beta} = \widehat{\beta}_1 = \beta_1$  and (46) implies that  $\mathcal{S}(U_{\widehat{a}_r}^\top G^k V_{\widehat{a}_r}) = C \in \mathbb{S}^{|\beta_1|}$ . Then, by Lemma 4.1 (i) with  $(X, \Gamma) = (X^k, \Gamma^k)$ , the claimed inclusion also holds. By comparing (46) with Corollary 3.3, it is not hard to obtain that  $d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$  for all sufficiently large  $k$ . So, along with  $(X^k, \Gamma^k, G^k) \rightarrow (\bar{X}, \bar{\Gamma}, G)$  and  $(X^k, \Gamma^k) \in \text{gph} \partial \Psi_\kappa$ , we can deduce that  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ .

**Case 2:**  $\bar{r} = s(\bar{X}) + 1$  and  $\|\bar{\Gamma}\|_* < \kappa$ . From  $G \in \Upsilon$ , there exist  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\bar{X}) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\bar{\Gamma})$ ,  $A \in \mathbb{S}^{|\alpha|}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{|\alpha| \times |\beta_1|}$ ,  $C \in \mathbb{S}^{|\beta_1|}$  such that

$$U^\top G V = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ B^\top & C & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (47)$$

Let  $\{(X^k, \Gamma^k, G^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the sequence constructed in the same way as in Case 1, and let  $\widehat{\beta}_1, \widehat{\beta}_+$  and  $\widehat{\beta}_0$  be the index sets defined as in Case 1. Let  $r$  be the integer such that  $\kappa \in \widehat{a}_r := a_r(X^k)$ . We claim that for all sufficiently large  $k$ ,  $G^k \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X^k, \Gamma^k)$ . Indeed, when  $\kappa \notin \beta_1$ , we have  $\widehat{\beta}_1 = \emptyset$ ,  $\widehat{\beta}_+ = \beta_+$  and  $\widehat{\beta}_0 = \beta_0$ , which along with  $G^k = G$  and (47) implies that  $\mathcal{S}(U_{\widehat{a}_r}^\top G^k V_{\widehat{a}_r}) = 0$ ; when  $\kappa \in \beta_1$ , we have  $\widehat{\beta}_+ = \emptyset = \widehat{\beta}_0$ , which along with

$\widehat{\beta} = \widehat{\beta}_1 = \beta_1$  and (47) implies that  $\mathcal{S}(U_{\widehat{a}_r}^\top G^k V_{\widehat{a}_r}) = C \in \mathbb{S}^{|\beta_1|}$ . Thus, by Lemma 4.1 (i) with  $(X, \Gamma) = (X^k, \Gamma^k)$ , the claimed inclusion holds. By comparing (47) with Corollary 3.3, it is easy to obtain that  $d^2\Psi_\kappa(X^k|\Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$  for all sufficiently large  $k$ . Then, following the same arguments as those for Case 1 leads to  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ .

**Case 3:**  $\bar{r} = s(\overline{X}) + 1$  and  $\|\overline{\Gamma}\|_* = \kappa$ . From  $G \in \Upsilon$ , there exist  $(U, V) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\overline{X}) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\overline{\Gamma})$ ,  $A \in \mathbb{S}^{|\alpha|}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{|\alpha| \times |\beta_1|}$ ,  $C \in \mathbb{S}^{|\beta_1|}$ ,  $D \in \mathbb{R}^{|\beta_0| \times |\beta_0|}$ ,  $E \in \mathbb{R}^{|\beta_0| \times |c|}$ ,  $\varpi \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\varpi \geq \sigma_1([D \ E]) \quad \text{and} \quad U^\top G V = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ B^\top & C & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \varpi I_{|\beta_+|} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & D & E \end{pmatrix}. \quad (48)$$

Let  $\{(X^k, \Gamma^k, G^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the sequence constructed in the same way as in Case 1, and let  $\widehat{\beta}_1, \widehat{\beta}_+$  and  $\widehat{\beta}_0$  be the index sets defined as in Case 1. Let  $r$  be the integer such that  $\kappa \in \widehat{a}_r := a_r(X^k)$ . We claim that for all sufficiently large  $k$ ,  $G^k \in \mathcal{C}_{\Psi_\kappa}(X^k, \Gamma^k)$ . Indeed, when  $\kappa \notin \beta_1$ , we have  $\widehat{\beta}_1 = \emptyset, \widehat{\beta}_+ = \beta_+$  and  $\widehat{\beta}_0 = \beta_0$ , which along with  $G^k = G$  and (48) implies that  $\mathcal{S}(U_{\widehat{a}_r}^\top G^k V_{\widehat{a}_r}) = \begin{bmatrix} \varpi I_{|\beta_+|} & 0 \\ 0 & D \end{bmatrix}$ ; when  $\kappa \in \beta_1$ , we have  $\widehat{\beta}_+ = \emptyset = \widehat{\beta}_0$ , which along with  $\widehat{\beta} = \widehat{\beta}_1 = \beta_1$  and (48) implies that  $\mathcal{S}(U_{\widehat{a}_r}^\top G^k V_{\widehat{a}_r}) = C \in \mathbb{S}^{|\beta_1|}$ . Thus, by Lemma 4.1 (i) with  $(X, \Gamma) = (X^k, \Gamma^k)$ , the claimed inclusion holds. By comparing (48) with Corollary 3.3, it is easy to obtain that  $d^2\Psi_\kappa(X^k|\Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$  for all sufficiently large  $k$ . Then, following the same arguments as those for Case 1 results in  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ .  $\square$

As a byproduct of Theorem 4.1, we get the sufficient and necessary condition for the tilt-stability of the nuclear norm regularized problem established in [20, Theorem 4.6].

**Corollary 4.1** *Let  $\overline{X}$  be a local optimal solution of problem (1) with  $\kappa = n$ , and write  $\overline{\Gamma} := -\nu \nabla f(\overline{X})$ . If there is a neighborhood  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $\overline{X}$  such that  $\nabla^2 f(X)$  is positive semidefinite on  $\mathcal{N}$ , then  $\overline{X}$  is a tilt-stable solution of (1) if and only if*

$$\text{Ker} \nabla^2 f(\overline{X}) \cap \Upsilon = \{0\},$$

where  $\Upsilon := \left\{ \overline{U} \begin{pmatrix} Z & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \overline{V}^\top \mid (\overline{U}, \overline{V}) \in \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\overline{X}) \cap \mathbb{O}^{n,m}(\overline{\Gamma}), Z \in \mathbb{S}^{|\alpha \cup \beta_1|} \right\}$ .

**Proof:** If  $\sigma_n(\overline{X}) > 0$ , then  $\|\overline{\Gamma}\|_* = n$ , so that  $\alpha = [n]$  and  $\beta_1 = \beta, \beta_+ = \beta_0 = \gamma = \emptyset$ . The desired result follows by the first part of Theorem 4.1. If  $\sigma_n(\overline{X}) = 0$  and  $\|\overline{\Gamma}\|_* < n$ , then  $\gamma = \emptyset$ . Consequently, the desired result follows from the second part of Theorem 4.1. If  $\sigma_n(\overline{X}) = 0$  and  $\|\overline{\Gamma}\|_* = n$ , then  $\beta_+ = \beta_0 = \emptyset$  since  $\overline{\Gamma} \in \partial \|\overline{X}\|_*$ . Hence,  $\alpha \cup \beta_1 = [n]$ . Consequently, the desired result follows from the last part of Theorem 4.1.  $\square$

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we obtain necessary and sufficient conditions of tilt stability for the model (3). In contrast to [20], our work establishes the equivalent characterization of tilt stability by using the second subderivative of  $g$ , without the second-order growth of  $g$  with

respect to a certain set and a relative approximations of  $\partial g$  onto the same set. In particular, by characterization of second subderivative of the Ky-Fan  $\kappa$ -norm, we derive a verifiable criterion to identify the tilt stability of a local minimum for the model (1). A useful criterion for the tilt stable solution of the nuclear-norm regularized minimization is consequently presented.

## References

- [1] J. F. BONNANS AND A. SHAPIRO, *Perturbation Analysis of Optimization Problems*, Springer, New York. 2000.
- [2] E. CANDÉS AND B. RECHT, *Exact matrix completion via convex optimization*, Communications of the ACM, 55 (2012): 111–119.
- [3] C. H. CHEN, Y. J. LIU, D. F. SUN AND K. C. TOH, *A Semismooth Newton-CG Based Dual PPA for Matrix Spectral Norm Approximation Problems*, Mathematical Programming, Ser. A, 155 (2016): 435-470.
- [4] N. H. CHIEU, L. V. HIEN, AND T. T. A. NGHIA, *Characterization of tilt stability via subgradient graphical derivative with applications to nonlinear programming*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 28 (2018): 2246–2273.
- [5] Y. CUI, C. DING, AND X. Y. ZHAO, *Quadratic growth conditions for convex matrix optimization problems associated with spectral functions*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 27 (2017): 2332–2355.
- [6] C. DING, *An Introduction to a Class of Matrix Optimization Problems*, 2012, Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore.
- [7] C. DING, *Variational analysis of the Ky Fan  $k$ -norm*, Set-valued and Variational Analysis, 25 (2017): 265-296.
- [8] D. DRUSVYATSKIY AND A. S. LEWIS, *Tilt stability, uniform quadratic growth, and strong metric regularity of the subdifferential*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 23 (2014): 256–267.
- [9] D. DRUSVYATSKIY, B. S. MORDUKHOVICH, AND T. T. A. NGHIA, *Second order growth, tilt stability, and metric regularity of the subdifferential*, Journal of Convex Analysis, 21 (2014): 1165–1192.
- [10] M. FAZEL, T. K. PONG, D. SUN AND P. TSENG, *Hankel matrix rank minimization with applications to system identification and realization*, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 34 (2013): 946-977.
- [11] H. GFRERER AND B. S. MORDUKHOVICH, *Complete characterizations of tilt stability in nonlinear programming under weakest qualification conditions*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 25 (2015): 2081–2119.

- [12] R. A. HORN AND C. R. JOHNSON, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [13] M. KOLIADA, *Ky fan norm application for video segmentation*, Herald of Advanced Information Technology, 1 (2020): 345–351.
- [14] A. S. LEWIS, *The convex analysis of unitarily invariant matrix functions*, Journal of Convex Analysis, 2 (1995): 173–183.
- [15] A. S. LEWIS AND S. ZHANG, *Partial smoothness, tilt stability, and generalized Hessians*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 23 (2013): 74–94.
- [16] Y. L. LIU AND S. H. PAN, *Twice epi-differentiability of a class of non-amenable composite functions*, arXiv:2212.00303v3, 2023.
- [17] A. MOHAMMADI AND M. E. SARABI, *Twice epi-differentiability of extended-real-valued functions with applications in composite optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 30 (2020) : 2379–2409.
- [18] B. S. MORDUKHOVICH AND E. SARABI, *Generalized Newton algorithms for tilt-stable minimizers in nonsmooth optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 31 (2021): 1184–1214.
- [19] B. S. MORDUKHOVICH AND T. T. A. NGHIA, *Second-order characterizations of tilt stability with applications to nonlinear programming*, Mathematical Programming, 149 (2015): 83–104.
- [20] T. T. A. NGHIA, *Geometric characterizations of Lipschitz stability for convex optimization problems*, arXiv:2402.05215v1, 2024.
- [21] M. L. OVERTON AND R. S. WOMERSLEY, *Optimality conditions and duality theory for minimizing sums of the largest eigenvalues of a symmetric matrix*, Mathematical Programming, 62 (1993): 321–357.
- [22] R. A. POLIQUIN AND R. T. ROCKAFELLAR, *Tilt stability of a local minimum*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 8 (1998): 287–299.
- [23] R. T. ROCKAFELLAR AND R. J-B. WETS, *Variational Analysis*, Springer, 1998.
- [24] B. RECHT, M. FAZEL AND P. A. PARRILO, *Guaranteed Minimum-Rank Solutions of Linear Matrix Equations via Nuclear Norm Minimization*, SIAM Review, 52 (2010): 471–501.
- [25] M. TORKI, *First- and second-order epi-differentiability in eigenvalue optimization*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Application, 234 (1999): 391–416.
- [26] B. WU, C. DING, D. F. SUN AND K. C. TOH, *On the Moreau-Yosida regularization of the vector  $k$ -norm related functions*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 24 (2014): 766–794.

**Appendix A: Proof of equations (34a)-(34g).** Recall that  $\lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(X^k) = \sigma(\overline{X})$ . By the definition of  $\widehat{a}_l$  and equation (29), if necessary by taking an infinite subset of  $\widehat{K}$ , there must exist integer  $r_0$  and  $r_1$  with  $1 \leq r_0 < r < r_1 \leq s(X^k) + 1$  such that

$$\bigcup_{l'=1}^{\bar{r}-1} \bar{a}_{l'} = \alpha = \bigcup_{l=1}^{r_0} \widehat{a}_l, \eta^1 = \bigcup_{l=r_0+1}^{r-1} \widehat{a}_l, \eta^3 = \bigcup_{l=r+1}^{r_1} \widehat{a}_l, \bigcup_{l'=\bar{r}+1}^{s(\overline{X})+1} \bar{a}_{l'} = \gamma = \bigcup_{l=r_1+1}^{s(X^k)+1} \widehat{a}_l. \quad (49)$$

By using the relations in (49) and  $\lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=1}^{s(X^k)+1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\widehat{a}_l \widehat{a}_{l'}}^2}{\nu_l(X^k) + \nu_{l'}(X^k)} \\ &= \lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \alpha \cup \eta^1} \sum_{j \in [n]} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{ij}^2}{\sigma_i(X^k) + \sigma_j(X^k)} = \sum_{i \in \alpha \cup \eta^1} \sum_{j \in [n]} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}(\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)\|_{ij}^2}{\sigma_i(\overline{X}) + \sigma_j(\overline{X})} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l'=1}^{s(X^k)+1} \frac{2 \zeta_j(\Gamma^k) \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\widehat{\beta}_j \widehat{a}_{l'}}^2}{\nu_r(X^k) + \nu_{l'}(X^k)} \\ &= \lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j \in \widehat{\beta} \setminus \widehat{\beta}_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{2 \zeta_j(\Gamma^k) \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{ji}^2}{\nu_r(X^k) + \sigma_i(X^k)} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \widehat{\beta} \setminus \widehat{\beta}_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{2 \zeta_j(\overline{\Gamma}) \|\mathcal{T}(\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)\|_{ji}^2}{\nu_r(\overline{X}) + \sigma_i(\overline{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

Along with  $\widehat{\beta} \setminus \widehat{\beta}_0 = \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup (\widehat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+ \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^0)$  and  $[n] = \widehat{\alpha} \cup \widehat{\beta} \cup \widehat{\gamma}$ , we get (34a)-(34b), and

$$\mathcal{T}(\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)|_{\widehat{\alpha}(\widehat{\beta}_+^0 \cup \widehat{\beta}_0 \cup \widehat{\gamma})} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}(\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)|_{(\widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+) \widehat{\gamma}} = 0. \quad (50)$$

By using the relations in (49) and the limit  $\lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$  and noting

that  $\lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_l(X^k) = \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{l'}(X^k) = \sigma_r(\bar{X})$  for any  $l, l' \in \eta^1 \cup \eta^3$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=r+1}^{s(X^k)+1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k) - \nu_{l'}(X^k)} \\
&= 2 \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \sum_{l=1}^{r_0} \sum_{l'=r+1}^{r_1} \frac{\|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k) - \nu_{l'}(X^k)} + \sum_{l=1}^{r_0} \sum_{l'=r_1+1}^{s(X^k)+1} \frac{\|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k) - \nu_{l'}(X^k)} \right] \\
&\quad + \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=r_0+1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=r+1}^{r_1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k) - \nu_{l'}(X^k)} \\
&\quad + \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=r_0+1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=r_1+1}^{s(X^k)+1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k) - \nu_{l'}(X^k)} \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{\bar{r}-1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\bar{a}_l \eta^3}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(\bar{X}) - \nu_r(\bar{X})} + \sum_{l=1}^{\bar{r}-1} \sum_{l'=r+1}^{s(\bar{X})+1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\bar{a}_l \bar{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(\bar{X}) - \nu_{l'}(\bar{X})} \\
&\quad + \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\hat{a}_l \subseteq \eta^1} \sum_{\hat{a}_{l'} \subseteq \eta^3} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k) - \nu_{l'}(X^k)} + \sum_{l'=r+1}^{s(\bar{X})+1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\eta^1 \bar{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_r(\bar{X}) - \nu_{l'}(\bar{X})},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\alpha \eta^3} = 0$ ,  $[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\alpha \gamma} = 0$ ,  $[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\eta^1 \gamma} = 0$  and  $\lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\hat{a}_l \subseteq \eta^1} \sum_{\hat{a}_{l'} \subseteq \eta^3} \|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2 = 0$ . Clearly, the limit implies that  $[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\eta^1 \eta^3} = 0$ . Then,  $[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\hat{\alpha} \hat{\gamma}} = 0$ , which along with the first equality of (50) leads to (34e). Similarly, using by using (49) and  $\lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{2(1-\zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\nu_l(X^k) - \nu_r(X^k)} \|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{\beta}_j}\|_F^2 \\
&= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r_0} \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{2(1-\zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\nu_l(X^k) - \nu_r(X^k)} \|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{\beta}_j}\|_F^2 \\
&\quad + \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=r_0+1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{2(1-\zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\nu_l(X^k) - \nu_r(X^k)} \|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{\beta}_j}\|_F^2 \\
&= \sum_{i \in \alpha} \sum_{j \in \hat{\beta}} \frac{2(1-\sigma_j(\bar{\Gamma}))}{\sigma_i(\bar{X}) - \nu_r(\bar{X})} \|[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{ij}\|_F^2 \\
&\quad + \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \eta^1} \sum_{j \in \hat{\beta} \setminus \hat{\beta}_1} \frac{2(1-\sigma_j(\Gamma^k))}{\sigma_i(X^k) - \nu_r(X^k)} \|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{ij}\|_F^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which means that  $[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\alpha[\hat{\beta} \setminus (\hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_1^+)]} = 0$  and  $[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\eta^1[\hat{\beta} \setminus (\hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_1^+)]} = 0$ , i.e.,

$[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G\bar{V}_1)]_{\hat{\alpha}(\beta_+ \cup \hat{\beta}_+^0 \cup \hat{\beta}_0)} = 0$ , which by the first equality of (50) results in (34c)-(34d); and

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{\nu'=r+1}^{s(X^k)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma^k) \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\hat{\beta}_j \hat{a}_{\nu'}}^2}{\nu_r(X^k) - \nu_{\nu'}(X^k)} \\
&= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{\nu'=r+1}^{r_1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma^k) \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\hat{\beta}_j \hat{a}_{\nu'}}^2}{\nu_r(X^k) - \nu_{\nu'}(X^k)} \\
&\quad + \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{\nu'=r_1+1}^{s(X^k)+1} \frac{2\zeta_j(\Gamma^k) \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\hat{\beta}_j \hat{a}_{\nu'}}^2}{\nu_r(X^k) - \nu_{\nu'}(X^k)} \\
&= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j \in \hat{\beta} \setminus \hat{\beta}_0} \sum_{i \in \eta^3} \frac{2\sigma_j(\Gamma^k) \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{ji}^2}{\nu_r(X^k) - \sigma_i(X^k)} + \sum_{j \in \hat{\beta} \setminus \hat{\beta}_0} \sum_{i \in \gamma} \frac{2\sigma_j(\bar{\Gamma}) \|\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G\bar{V}_1)\|_{ji}^2}{\nu_{\bar{r}}(\bar{X}) - \sigma_i(\bar{X})}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G\bar{V}_1)]_{[\hat{\beta} \setminus (\hat{\beta}_0 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^0)] \cap [\eta^3 \cup \gamma]} = 0$ , i.e.,  $[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G\bar{V}_1)]_{[\hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+]} \hat{\gamma} = 0$ . Together with the second equality in (50), we obtain (34f). In addition, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{\|(U^k)_{\hat{a}_l}^\top G^k V_c^k\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k)} = \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \alpha \cup \eta^1} \frac{\|(U^k)_i^\top G^k V_c^k\|_F^2}{\sigma_i(X^k)} = \sum_{i \in \alpha \cup \eta^1} \frac{\|\bar{U}_i^\top G\bar{V}_c\|_F^2}{\sigma_i(\bar{X})}, \\
0 &= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{\zeta_j(\Gamma^k) \|U_{\hat{\beta}_j}^\top G V_c^k\|_F^2}{\nu_r(X^k)} = \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j \in \hat{\beta}} \frac{\sigma_j(\Gamma^k) \|U_j^\top G V_c^k\|_F^2}{\nu_r(X^k)} = \sum_{j \in \hat{\beta}} \frac{\sigma_j(\bar{\Gamma}) \|U_j^\top G\bar{V}_c\|_F^2}{\nu_{\bar{r}}(\bar{X})},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $[U^\top G\bar{V}]_{[\hat{\beta}_1 \cup \hat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+]} = 0$  and  $[\bar{U}^\top G\bar{V}_1]_{\hat{\alpha}c} = 0$ , i.e., (34g) holds.

**Appendix B: Proof of equations (43a)-(43c).** Recall that  $\lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(X^k) = \sigma(\bar{X})$ . By the definition of  $\hat{a}_l$  and equation (38), if necessary by taking an infinite subset of  $\hat{K}$ , there must exist integer  $r_0$  with  $1 \leq r_0 < r \leq s(X^k) + 1$  such that

$$\bigcup_{\nu'=1}^{r-1} \hat{a}_{\nu'} = \alpha = \bigcup_{l=1}^{r_0} \hat{a}_l, \quad \eta^1 = \bigcup_{l=r_0+1}^{r-1} \hat{a}_l. \quad (51)$$

By using (51) and  $\lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$  and noting that  $\lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_i(X^k) = \sigma_\kappa(\bar{X}) = 0$  for any  $i \in \eta^1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{2(1+\zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\nu_l(X^k)} \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\hat{a}_l \hat{\beta}_j}^2 \\
&= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r_0} \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{2(1+\zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\nu_l(X^k)} \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\hat{a}_l \hat{\beta}_j}^2 \\
&\quad + \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=r_0+1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{2(1+\zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\nu_l(X^k)} \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\hat{a}_l \hat{\beta}_j}^2 \\
&= \sum_{i \in \alpha} \sum_{j \in \hat{\beta}} \frac{2(1+\zeta_j(\bar{\Gamma}))}{\sigma_i(\bar{X})} \|\mathcal{T}(\bar{U}^\top G\bar{V}_1)\|_{ij}^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \eta^1} \sum_{j \in \hat{\beta}} (1+\zeta_j(\bar{\Gamma})) \frac{\|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)\|_{\hat{a}_i \hat{\beta}_j}^2}{\nu_l(X^k)}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $[\mathcal{T}(\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)]_{\alpha \cup \eta^1, \widehat{\beta}} = 0$ . Along with  $\widehat{\alpha} = \alpha \cup \eta^1$  and  $\widehat{\beta} = \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+ \cup \widehat{\beta}_0$  and  $\widehat{\beta}_+ = \widehat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+ \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^0$ , we get that

$$[\mathcal{T}(\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)]_{\widehat{\alpha}(\widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1 \cup \beta_+ \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^0 \cup \widehat{\beta}_0)} = 0, \quad (52)$$

which implies that the second equation holds in (43a). Similarly, by using (51) and  $\lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=1}^{r-1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\widehat{a}_l \widehat{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k) + \nu_{l'}(X^k)} \\ &= \lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \sum_{l=1}^{r_0} \sum_{l'=1}^{r-1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\widehat{a}_l \widehat{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k) + \nu_{l'}(X^k)} + \sum_{l=r_0+1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=1}^{r_0} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\widehat{a}_l \widehat{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k) + \nu_{l'}(X^k)} \right] \\ &\quad + \lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=r_0+1}^{r-1} \sum_{l'=r_0+1}^{r-1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\widehat{a}_l \widehat{a}_{l'}}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k) + \nu_{l'}(X^k)} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \alpha} \sum_{j \in \alpha \cup \eta^1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}(\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)]_{ij}\|_F^2}{\sigma_i(\overline{X}) + \sigma_j(\overline{X})} + \sum_{i \in \eta^1} \sum_{j \in \alpha} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}(\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)]_{ij}\|_F^2}{\sigma_j(\overline{X})} \\ &\quad + \lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \eta^1} \sum_{j \in \eta^1} \frac{2 \|\mathcal{T}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\widehat{a}_i \widehat{a}_j}\|_F^2}{\nu_i(X^k) + \nu_j(X^k)}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the first equation in (43a) holds. Hence, the equations (43a) holds. Again by using (51) and  $\lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} d^2 \Psi_\kappa(X^k | \Gamma^k)(G^k) = 0$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{2(1-\zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\nu_l(X^k)} \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\widehat{a}_l \widehat{\beta}_j}\|_F^2 \\ &= \lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r_0} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{2(1-\zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\nu_l(X^k)} \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\widehat{a}_l \widehat{\beta}_j}\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + \lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=r_0+1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{2(1-\zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\nu_l(X^k)} \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\widehat{a}_l \widehat{\beta}_j}\|_F^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \in \alpha} \sum_{j \in \widehat{\beta} \setminus \widehat{\beta}_0} \frac{2(1-\zeta_j(\overline{\Gamma}))}{\sigma_i(\overline{X})} \|\mathcal{S}(\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)]_{ij}\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + \lim_{\widehat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \eta^1} \sum_{j \in \widehat{\beta} \setminus \widehat{\beta}_0} \frac{2(1-\zeta_j(\Gamma^k))}{\sigma_i(X^k)} \|\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{ij}\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $[\mathcal{S}(\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)]_{\alpha \cup \eta^1, \widehat{\beta} \setminus (\widehat{\beta}_0 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1)} = 0$ . Along with  $\widehat{\beta} \setminus (\widehat{\beta}_0 \cup \widehat{\beta}_1 \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^1) = \beta_+ \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^0$ ,  $\alpha \cup \eta^1 = \widehat{\alpha}$ , we have that  $[\mathcal{S}(\overline{U}^\top G \overline{V}_1)]_{\widehat{\alpha}, \beta_+ \cup \widehat{\beta}_+^0} = 0$  and then the second equation holds in

(43b) with (52). In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{\|(U^k)_{\hat{a}_l}^\top G^k V_c^k\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k)} \\
&= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r_0} \frac{\|(U^k)_{\hat{a}_l}^\top G^k V_c^k\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k)} + \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=r_0+1}^{r-1} \frac{\|(U^k)_{\hat{a}_l}^\top G^k V_c^k\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k)} \\
&= \sum_{i \in \alpha} \frac{\|\bar{U}_i^\top G \bar{V}_c\|_F^2}{\sigma_i(\bar{X})} + \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \eta^1} \frac{\|(U^k)_i^\top G^k V_c^k\|_F^2}{\sigma_i(X^k)},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $\bar{U}_{\alpha \cup \eta^1}^\top G \bar{V}_c = 0$ , i.e., the first equation holds in (43b), and

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{\beta}_0}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k)} \\
&= \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{r_0} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{\beta}_0}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k)} + \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=r_0+1}^{r-1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{\hat{a}_l \hat{\beta}_0}\|_F^2}{\nu_l(X^k)} \\
&= \sum_{i \in \alpha} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{i \hat{\beta}_0}\|_F^2}{\sigma_i(\bar{X})} + \lim_{\hat{K} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \eta^1} \frac{2\|[\mathcal{S}((U^k)^\top G^k V_1^k)]_{i \hat{\beta}_0}\|_F^2}{\sigma_i(X^k)},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $[\mathcal{S}(\bar{U}^\top G \bar{V}_1)]_{\alpha \cup \eta^1, \hat{\beta}_0} = 0$  and then (43c) holds with (52).