

EXTENDED ALTERNATING STRUCTURE-ADAPTED PROXIMAL GRADIENT ALGORITHM FOR NONCONVEX NONSMOOTH PROBLEMS

YING GAO, CHUNFENG CUI, WENXING ZHANG, AND DEREN HAN

ABSTRACT. Alternating structure-adapted proximal (ASAP) gradient algorithm (M. Nikolova and P. Tan, SIAM J Optim, 29:2053-2078, 2019) has drawn much attention due to its efficiency in solving nonconvex nonsmooth optimization problems. However, the multiblock nonseparable structure confines the performance of ASAP to far-reaching practical problems, e.g., coupled tensor decomposition. In this paper, we propose an extended ASAP (eASAP) algorithm for nonconvex nonsmooth optimization whose objective is the sum of two nonseparable functions and a coupling one. By exploiting the blockwise restricted prox-regularity, eASAP is capable of minimizing the objective whose coupling function is multiblock nonseparable. Moreover, we analyze the global convergence of eASAP by virtue of the Aubin property on partial subdifferential mapping and the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property on the objective. Furthermore, the sublinear convergence rate of eASAP is built upon the proximal point algorithmic framework under some mild conditions. Numerical simulations on multimodal data fusion demonstrate the compelling performance of the proposed method.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we focus on the structured optimization problem

$$(1) \quad \min_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m} J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s) + G(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_t) + H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}),$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are variables with subvector $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ ($i = 1, \dots, s$) and $\mathbf{y}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{m_j}$ ($j = 1, \dots, t$), respectively; $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty := \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, $G : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ and $H : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ are proper closed functions. Problem (1) captures a plethora of models in diversified applications, such as candidate extraction in image colorization [30, 36], blind source separation in signal processing [3, 11], and coupled tensor decomposition in multimodal data fusion [10, 33].

Over the past decades, we have witnessed a flurry of research activities on structured optimization problem (1) with two blocks, i.e., $s = t = 1$. A canonical method for solving (1) is the block coordinate descent method (BCD), which minimizes J alternatively over \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} .

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 65K10, 90C26, 90C30, 65K05, 65F22, 49M37.

Key words and phrases. Nonconvex nonsmooth function, multiblock nonseparable structure, restricted prox-regularity, Aubin property, global convergence, coupled tensor decomposition.

The convergence of BCD can be guaranteed under some conditions [4], e.g., strict convexity of the objective J or boundedness of its level set. Particularly, when J is continuously differentiable, Bertsekas [5] stated that the subproblems of BCD admit unique optima and the sequence $\{(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ generated by BCD converges to the critical point of (1). To weaken the convergent requirements of BCD, Auslender [2] proposed the following proximal BCD

$$(2a) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^k) + \frac{\tau}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^k\|_2^2 \right\}, \\ \mathbf{y}^{k+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left\{ J(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}) + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^k\|_2^2 \right\}, \end{cases}$$

where $\tau > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$ are stepsizes. Therein, the convergence of (2) was analyzed when J is convex. By exploiting the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property, Attouch et al. [1] studied the global convergence of (2) when J is nonconvex nonsmooth. Thereby, the rationale of KL property motivates a great deal of theoretical and algorithmic advances for solving nonconvex nonsmooth optimization (see e.g., [8, 9, 23, 24, 41] and references therein).

Practically, the subproblems in (2) are nontrivial to admit closed-form solutions. When the component function, e.g., F , G or H is continuously differentiable, the linearization on these differentiable component functions facilitate the development of efficient numerical algorithms. For instance, Bolte et al. [7] proposed the following proximal alternating linearized minimization (PALM) algorithm when H is continuously differentiable

$$(3a) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ F(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \mathbf{x}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) \rangle + \frac{\tau^k}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^k\|_2^2 \right\}, \\ \mathbf{y}^{k+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left\{ G(\mathbf{y}) + \langle \mathbf{y}, \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} H(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^k) \rangle + \frac{\sigma^k}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^k\|_2^2 \right\}, \end{cases}$$

where $\tau^k > 0$ and $\sigma^k > 0$ are the varying stepsizes determined by the Lipschitz constants of $\nabla H(\cdot, \mathbf{y}^k)$ and $\nabla H(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \cdot)$, respectively. With the KL property, it was verified that any bounded sequence $\{(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ generated by (3) can converge globally to the critical point of (1). Afterwards, we have witnessed numerous ameliorations of PALM by deploying inexact approximation, inertial acceleration, and stochastic strategies (see, e.g., [13, 16, 25, 31] and references therein). Alternatively, Nikolova and Tan [29] devised an alternating structure-adapted proximal (ASAP) gradient descent algorithm when F , G admit Lipschitz continuous

gradients

$$(4a) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^k) + \langle \mathbf{x}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} F(\mathbf{x}^k) \rangle + \frac{\tau}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^k\|_2^2 \right\}, \\ (4b) \quad \mathbf{y}^{k+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left\{ H(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}) + \langle \mathbf{y}, \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} G(\mathbf{y}^k) \rangle + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^k\|_2^2 \right\}. \end{cases}$$

In contrast to PALM (3), the stepsizes (τ, σ) in ASAP (4) involve the Lipschitz constants of ∇F and ∇G . The global convergence of ASAP was analyzed in [29, Theorem 5.15] under the assumptions: (C1) H can be split as the sum of a nonsmooth function and a partially differential function in variable \mathbf{x} ; and (C2) the objective J admits the KL property at the critical point. Thenceforth, variants of ASAP were developed by deploying inertial acceleration, extrapolation techniques, and stochastic strategies (see e.g., [15, 17, 36, 42] and references therein). It is worth noting that assumptions (C1)-(C2) are indispensable for the convergence analysis of these ASAP variants.

PALM and ASAP can be easily extended to solve (1) with

$$(5) \quad F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{i=1}^s F_i(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad G(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_t) = \sum_{j=1}^t G_j(\mathbf{y}_j).$$

The interested reader can refer to, e.g., [29, 40], for more discussions on the applications of PALM and ASAP to (1) with separable F and G as in (5). However, to the best of our knowledge, few literature were devoted to solving (1) with nonseparable F and G , particularly, the case of H is nonseparable (possibly nonconvex and nonsmooth) whilst F, G are continuously differentiable.

In this paper, pursuing the track of ASAP in [29], we focus on an extended ASAP algorithm (“eASAP” for short) to solve (1) with the multiblock nonseparable structure. The Gauss-Seidel algorithmic framework is exploited to minimize \mathbf{x}_i - and \mathbf{y}_j -subproblems cyclically. Besides, the aforementioned assumption (C1) for guaranteeing the global convergence of ASAP is weakened by deploying some novel analytical techniques. The contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

1. Nonseparable extension. Compared to the traditional separable extension (5), we generalize the ASAP to solve (1) with multiblock nonseparable structure, which subsumes a variety of models in, e.g., coupled tensor decomposition. As a peculiarity, the proposed eASAP can reduce to ASAP (4).

2. Weaker assumption. The global convergence of ASAP (4) requires the splitting property on the component function H . However, under the blockwise restricted prox-regularity (see Definition 2.7) on H in (1), we verify that eASAP can be applicable to diversified nonconvex nonsmooth optimization, even if H is nonseparable. Furthermore, we prove that any limit point of the sequence generated by eASAP is a critical point of (1).
3. Novel analytical techniques. Essentially, there are two difficulties in the convergence analysis of ASAP (4): (i) closedness of the partial subdifferentials of J ; and (ii) boundedness of subdifferentials. Under the Aubin property on partial subdifferential mapping and the KL property on objective, we establish the global convergence of eASAP. Moreover, we build upon the sublinear convergence rate of eASAP by virtue of the proximal point algorithmic framework.

The applications of (1) to coupled tensor decomposition are recently gaining much attention in multimodal data fusion [10, 19, 26]. A large number of practical models fall into the form of (1). For instance, the Bayesian framework based coupled tensor decomposition model in [14] reads

$$(6) \quad \min_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}} \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbf{Y} - \llbracket \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{A}_3 \rrbracket \right\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbf{Y}' - \llbracket \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2, \mathbf{B}_3 \rrbracket \right\|_F^2 + \mu H(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}),$$

where $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3}$ and $\mathbf{Y}' \in \mathbb{R}^{J_1 \times J_2 \times J_3}$ are three-order tensors; $\mathbf{A}_l \in \mathbb{R}^{I_l \times r}$ ($l = 1, 2, 3$) and $\mathbf{B}_l \in \mathbb{R}^{J_l \times r}$ ($l = 1, 2, 3$) are factor matrices from the CANDECOMP/PARAFAC (CP) decomposition of tensors \mathbf{Y} and \mathbf{Y}' , respectively; $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{A}_1; \mathbf{A}_2; \mathbf{A}_3]$ and $\mathbf{B} = [\mathbf{B}_1; \mathbf{B}_2; \mathbf{B}_3]$ denote the stacked matrices; H is a nonseparable function in variables \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} , which quantifies the statistical dependence between \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} ; and $\mu > 0$ accounts for the trade-off among objectives; Some preliminaries of tensor are elaborated in section 5. Table 1 lists several canonical coupling functions for H in (6). Therein, the “vec” denotes the vectorization of a matrix. \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q} are given structured matrix and positive definite matrix, respectively. Actually, (6) falls into the form of (1) with nonseparable (possibly nonconvex nonsmooth) coupling function H . Accordingly, it is desirable to develop an efficient and provably convergent algorithm for (1) by extending ASAP algorithm.

TABLE 1. Several choices of H in (6).

Coupling distribution	$H(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$	Properties
Hybrid Gauss	$\ \text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{PB})\ _2^2$	convex and smooth
Joint Gauss	$\ \text{vec}([\mathbf{A}; \mathbf{B}])\ _Q^2$	convex and smooth
Laplacian	$\ \text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{PB})\ _1$	convex and nonsmooth
Uniform	$\ \text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{PB})\ _\infty$	convex and nonsmooth
Cauchy-type	$\ \text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{PB})\ _p^p$ ($0 < p < 1$)	nonconvex and nonsmooth

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we summarize some preliminaries for the upcoming discussions. We present the iterative scheme of eASAP in section 3, followed by its global convergence and convergence rate analysis under some prerequisites in section 4. In section 5, we test a class of coupled tensor decomposition problems on both synthetic and real data to demonstrate the numerical performance of the proposed method. Finally, some concluding remarks are drawn in section 6.

2. PRELIMINARIES

For $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\|\mathbf{x}\|_p := (\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p)^{1/p}$ ($1 \leq p < \infty$) and $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty := \max_{i=1, \dots, n} |x_i|$ denote the ℓ^p - and ℓ^∞ - norm of \mathbf{x} , respectively. Particularly, $\|\mathbf{x}\| := \|\mathbf{x}\|_2$ for brevity. Let \mathbf{I} (resp., $\mathbf{0}$) denote the identity matrix (resp., zero vector/matrix) whose dimension can be clear from the context. The distance from $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to a set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Omega) := \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \Omega} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$. $\mathcal{B}_p^r(\mathbf{x}) := \{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|_p \leq r\}$ denotes the ℓ^p -norm ball centered at \mathbf{x} with radius $r > 0$. For brevity, we abuse $\mathcal{B}^r(\mathbf{x})$ or $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x})$ as the neighborhood of \mathbf{x} regardless of its metric and/or radius.

The function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ is proper if $\text{dom}(f) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(\mathbf{x}) < +\infty\}$ is nonempty, f is closed if $\text{epi}(f) := \{(\mathbf{x}, r) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \mid f(\mathbf{x}) \leq r\}$ is closed, and f is lower bounded if $\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{dom}(f)} f(\mathbf{x}) > -\infty$. The proximity of a proper closed function f , denoted by prox_f , is defined by

$$(7) \quad \text{prox}_f(\mathbf{x}) := (\mathbf{I} + \partial f)^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) = \underset{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ f(\mathbf{x}') + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right\} \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\partial f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}^n}$ is the subdifferential of f as follows.

2.1. Subdifferential and partial subdifferential. The definitions of (partial) subdifferential can be referred to, e.g., [29, 34].

Definition 2.1 ([34]). *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ be proper closed.*

(i) *The Fréchet subdifferential of f at $\mathbf{x} \in \text{dom}(f)$ is defined by*

$$\hat{\partial}f(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle + o(\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|)\}.$$

(ii) *The limiting subdifferential of f at $\mathbf{x} \in \text{dom}(f)$ is defined by*

$$\partial f(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists \mathbf{x}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, f(\mathbf{x}^k) \rightarrow f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{d}^k \in \hat{\partial}f(\mathbf{x}^k) \rightarrow \mathbf{d}, \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty\}.$$

Notationally, $\hat{\partial}f(\mathbf{x}) = \partial f(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$ for all $\mathbf{x} \notin \text{dom}(f)$. It follows from Definition 2.1 that $\hat{\partial}f(\mathbf{x}) \subset \partial f(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \text{dom}(f)$. Moreover, $\hat{\partial}f(\mathbf{x})$ is closed convex whilst $\partial f(\mathbf{x})$ is merely closed. Particularly, if f is convex, then

$$\hat{\partial}f(\mathbf{x}) = \partial f(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \quad \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

The partial subdifferential plays a crucial role in nonsmooth analysis. The partial subdifferential of a proper closed function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ with respect to \mathbf{x} (or equivalently, the subdifferential of $h(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$) is denoted by $\partial_{\mathbf{x}}h$. The parametric closedness of partial subdifferential is defined as follows.

Definition 2.2 ([29]). *Let $h : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ be proper closed and let $\{(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)\}_{k=0}^\infty \subset \text{dom}(h)$ be a sequence converging to $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. The partial subdifferential $\partial_{\mathbf{x}}h$ is said to be parametrically closed at $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ with respect to $\{(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ if, for any sequence $\{\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ satisfying $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}}^k \in \partial_{\mathbf{x}}h(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}}^k = \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}$, there is $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}} \in \partial_{\mathbf{x}}h(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$.*

The parametric closedness of $\partial_{\mathbf{y}}h$ can be defined accordingly. Note that the parametric closedness of partial subdifferential is possibly invalid for generic function, even if the subdifferential is closed (see, e.g., [29, Example 4.5] for counterexample). We now present a class of functions with parametrically closed partial subdifferential.

2.2. Restricted prox-regularity. Let $c > 0$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ be proper closed. We define the exclusion set by

$$\mathcal{S}_f^c := \{\mathbf{x} \in \text{dom}(f) \mid \|\mathbf{d}\| > c \quad \forall \mathbf{d} \in \partial f(\mathbf{x})\},$$

which contains the points in $\text{dom}(f)$ that the norms of subgradients are greater than a threshold c . For all $c_1 \geq c_2 > 0$, we have $\mathcal{S}_f^{c_1} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_f^{c_2}$.

Definition 2.3 ([38]). *A proper closed function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ is said to be restricted prox-regular if, for any $c > 0$ and bounded set $\Omega \subset \text{dom}(f)$, there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that*

$$f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle - \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{S}_f^c, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega, \mathbf{d} \in \partial f(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}\| \leq c.$$

A large amount of functions are restricted prox-regular, e.g., convex function, semiconvex function, smooth function with Lipschitz continuous gradient, ℓ^p -quasi-norm function ($0 < p < 1$), Schatten- p quasi-norm function ($0 < p < 1$), and indicator function of compact smooth manifold (see [38] for more details).

Definition 2.4 ([6]). *A proper closed function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ is said to be semiconvex with modulus $\gamma > 0$ if $f + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\cdot\|^2$ is convex, i.e.,*

$$(8) \quad f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle - \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \text{dom}(f) \text{ and } \mathbf{d} \in \partial f(\mathbf{x}).$$

In contrast to Definition 2.3, the semiconvexity is essentially a special case of restricted prox-regularity with $\mathcal{S}_f^c = \emptyset$.

Let $C_L^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the set of k times continuously differentiable functions on \mathbb{R}^n whose p th order derivatives are L -Lipschitz continuous. The following lemma warrants a sufficient descent property of the functions in $C_L^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (see, e.g., [5]).

Lemma 2.5. *Let $f \in C_L^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then*

$$|f(\mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle| \leq \frac{L_f}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Lemma 2.6. *For a bounded set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let $f_1 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ be restricted prox-regular on Ω and let $f_2 \in C_L^{1,1}(\Omega)$. Then $f = f_1 + f_2$ is also restricted prox-regular on Ω .*

Proof. Since $f_2 \in C_L^{1,1}(\Omega)$, it follows from Lemma 2.5 that

$$(9) \quad f_2(\mathbf{y}) \geq f_2(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \nabla f_2(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle - \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega.$$

Since Ω is bounded, there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that $\|\nabla f_2(\mathbf{x})\| \leq c_2$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$. Since f_1 is restricted prox-regular on Ω , then, for all $c_1 > c_2$, there exist $\gamma_1 > 0$ and an exclusion set $\mathcal{S}_{f_1}^{c_1}$ such that

$$(10) \quad f_1(\mathbf{y}) \geq f_1(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle - \frac{\gamma_1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{S}_{f_1}^{c_1}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega,$$

for all $\mathbf{d}_1 \in \partial f_1(\mathbf{x})$ with $\|\mathbf{d}_1\| \leq c_1$. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{S}_f^{c_3} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega \mid \|\mathbf{d}_1 + \nabla f_2(\mathbf{x})\| \leq c_3\}$, by letting $c_3 = c_1 - c_2$, we derive

$$\|\mathbf{d}_1\| = \|\mathbf{d}_1 + \nabla f_2(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f_2(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \|\mathbf{d}_1 + \nabla f_2(\mathbf{x})\| + \|\nabla f_2(\mathbf{x})\| \leq c_1,$$

which indicates $\Omega \setminus \mathcal{S}_f^{c_3} \subseteq \Omega \setminus \mathcal{S}_{f_1}^{c_1}$. Thus, summing (9)-(10) yields

$$f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \mathbf{d}_1 + \nabla f_2(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle - \left(\frac{\gamma_1}{2} + L\right) \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{S}_f^{c_3}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega.$$

Namely, $f = f_1 + f_2$ is a restricted prox-regular function on Ω . \square

We define blockwise restricted prox-regular and blockwise semiconvex functions as follows.

Definition 2.7. *A proper closed function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ is said to be blockwise restricted prox-regular if $h(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ and $h(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ are restricted prox-regular. Particularly, h is said to be blockwise semiconvex if $h(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ and $h(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ are semiconvex.*

The following lemma states the parametric closedness of partial subdifferentials for blockwise restricted prox-regular functions.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $h : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ be blockwise restricted prox-regular and let $\{(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be the sequence converging to $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \text{dom}(h)$. For any $c > 0$, $\mathbf{d}_x^k \in \partial_x h(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)$ and $\mathbf{d}_y^k \in \partial_y h(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)$, if*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{d}_x^k = \bar{\mathbf{d}}_x \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{d}_y^k = \bar{\mathbf{d}}_y$$

with $\|\bar{\mathbf{d}}_x\| < c$ and $\|\bar{\mathbf{d}}_y\| < c$, then $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_x \in \partial_x h(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ and $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_y \in \partial_y h(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. Namely, $\partial_x h$ and $\partial_y h$ are parametrically closed at $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ with respect to the sequence $\{(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$.

Proof. Recall that h is blockwise restricted prox-regular. Accordingly, for any $c > 0$, bounded set $\Omega \subset \text{dom}(h(\cdot, \mathbf{y}))$ and exclusion set $\mathcal{S}_{h(\cdot, \mathbf{y})}^c = \{\mathbf{x} \in \text{dom}(h(\cdot, \mathbf{y})) \mid \|\mathbf{d}\| > c \quad \forall \mathbf{d} \in \partial_x h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\}$, there exist $\gamma_1 > 0$ and a sequence $\{(\mathbf{x}^{k_l}, \mathbf{y}^{k_l})\}_{l=0}^\infty$ such that

$$(11) \quad h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^{k_l}) \geq h(\mathbf{x}^{k_l}, \mathbf{y}^{k_l}) + \langle \mathbf{d}_x^{k_l}, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{k_l} \rangle - \frac{\gamma_1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{k_l}\|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{x}^{k_l} \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{S}_{h(\cdot, \mathbf{y})}^c,$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ and $\|\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k_l}\| \leq c$. The limit points $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{y}}$ are bounded by c . Hence, the sequence $\{(\mathbf{x}^{k_l}, \mathbf{y}^{k_l})\}_{l=0}^{\infty}$ satisfying (11) is a subsequence of $\{(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$. By the fact that all subsequences of a convergent sequence admit identical limit point, we pass $l \rightarrow \infty$ in (11) to yield

$$h(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \geq h(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) + \langle \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle - \frac{\gamma_1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2.$$

By Definition 2.1 (i), we have $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}} \in \hat{\partial}_{\mathbf{x}} h(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \subset \partial_{\mathbf{x}} h(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. Hence, $\partial_{\mathbf{x}} h$ is parametrically closed at $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ with respect to the sequence $\{(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$. The above deduction can also be extended for the \mathbf{y} block, which completes the proof. \square

Note that although the blockwise restricted prox-regularity in Lemma 2.8 is described for h with two block variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , the statement can be easily generalized to h with multiblock variables.

2.3. KL property. The KL property is a powerful tool for analyzing nonconvex nonsmooth optimization (see, e.g. [7]). For any $-\infty < c_1 < c_2 \leq \infty$, a sublevel set of f is defined by

$$[c_1 < f < c_2] := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid c_1 < f(\mathbf{x}) < c_2\}.$$

For any $\eta \in (0, \infty]$, let Φ_{η} denote the class of continuous concave functions $\varphi : [0, \eta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ ¹ satisfying

- (i) φ is continuous at origin and $\varphi(0) = 0$;
- (ii) φ is continuously differentiable on $(0, \eta)$;
- (iii) $\varphi'(t) > 0$ for all $t \in (0, \eta)$.

Definition 2.9 ([1]). *A proper closed function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\infty}$ admits the KL property at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(\partial f) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \partial f(\mathbf{x}) \neq \emptyset\}$ if there exist $\eta \in (0, \infty]$, $\varphi \in \Phi_{\eta}$ and a neighbourhood of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ (denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$) such that*

$$(12) \quad \varphi'(f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) \text{dist}(0, \partial f(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \cap [f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) < f(\mathbf{x}) < f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \eta]$. Moreover, f is called a KL function if it admits the KL property for all $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(\partial f)$.

The following lemma states the uniformized KL property on the compact set [7].

¹ \mathbb{R}_+ denotes the positive scalar set.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be compact and let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ be proper closed with KL property on Ω . If f is a constant for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, then there exist $\epsilon > 0$, $\eta > 0$ and $\varphi \in \Phi_\eta$ such that (12) holds for all $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Omega) < \epsilon\} \cap \{f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) < f(\mathbf{x}) < f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \eta\}$.*

2.4. Aubin property. Let $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}^m}$ be a set-valued function. The graph of T is defined by $\text{gph}(T) := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \mid \mathbf{y} \in T(\mathbf{x})\}$.

Definition 2.11 ([34]). *For any $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, a set-valued function $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}^m}$ is said to be Lipschitz-like on \mathcal{X} relative to \mathcal{Y} if there exists $L_T > 0$ such that*

$$(13) \quad T(\mathbf{x}) \cap \mathcal{Y} \subset T(\mathbf{x}') + L_T \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| \mathcal{B}^1 \quad \forall \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}.$$

For any $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \text{gph}(T)$, T admits Aubin property (or locally Lipschitz-like) around $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ if (13) holds with $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbf{y}})$, whilst T is said to be L_T -Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{X} if (13) holds with $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^m$. Particularly, if T is a single-valued function, the L_T -Lipschitz continuity on \mathcal{X} reduces to

$$\|T(\mathbf{x}) - T(\mathbf{x}')\| \leq L_T \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

For the clarity of description, the above definitions can be presented under the distance metric. Concretely, T admits Aubin property around $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \text{gph}(T)$ if there exist $\mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$, $\mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbf{y}})$ and $L_T > 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{y}, T(\mathbf{x})) \leq L_T \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \cap T(\mathbf{x}').$$

3. EXTENDED ASAP ALGORITHM

We now present the extended ASAP (eASAP) for solving (1). For notational convenience, we denote $\mathbf{z} := (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. Furthermore, let the symbols, e.g.,

$$(14) \quad \mathbf{x}_{\leq i} := (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_i), \quad \mathbf{x}_{> i} := (\mathbf{x}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{x}_{-i} := (\mathbf{x}_{< i}, \mathbf{x}_{> i})$$

be the truncations of \mathbf{x} by index $i = 1, \dots, s$. Extremely, we denote $\mathbf{x}_{< 1} = \mathbf{x}_{> s} = \emptyset$. Given $\mathbf{x}_{-i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-n_i}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{-j} \in \mathbb{R}^{m-m_j}$, let $F_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ ($i = 1, \dots, s$) and $G_j : \mathbb{R}^{m_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ ($j = 1, \dots, t$) be the ‘‘partial’’ functions of F and G , which are defined by

$$(15) \quad F_i(\cdot) := F(\mathbf{x}_{< i}, \cdot, \mathbf{x}_{> i}) \quad \text{and} \quad G_j(\cdot) := G(\mathbf{y}_{< j}, \cdot, \mathbf{y}_{> j}).$$

Throughout, we make the following assumptions on the proposed eASAP method.

Algorithm 1 eASAP for solving (1) with multiblock nonseparable structure.

Input: Choose the stepsizes and the initial points $\mathbf{z}^0 = (\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{y}^0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. Set $\varepsilon > 0$.

```

1: repeat
2:   for  $i = 1, \dots, s$  do
3:      $\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}} \left\{ H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + \langle \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^k, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\geq i}^k) \rangle + \frac{\tau_i^k}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 \right\}$ .
4:   end for
5:   for  $j = 1, \dots, t$  do
6:      $\mathbf{y}_j^{k+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{y}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{m_j}} \left\{ H(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{<j}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k) + \langle \mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{y}_j^k, \nabla_{\mathbf{y}_j} G(\mathbf{y}_{<j}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{\geq j}^k) \rangle + \frac{\sigma_j^k}{2} \|\mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2 \right\}$ .
7:   end for
8: until  $\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\| \leq \varepsilon$ .

```

Assumption 3.1.

- (i) $F_i \in C_{\mu_i}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^{n_i})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$, and $G_j \in C_{\nu_j}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^{m_j})$ for all $j = 1, \dots, t$.
- (ii) $H : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ is proper closed and lower bounded.
- (iii) $J : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ is lower bounded.

Remark 3.1. By the definitions of F_i and G_j in (15), the Lipschitz constants μ_i and ν_j in Assumption 3.1 (i) should be relevant to \mathbf{x}_{-i} and \mathbf{y}_{-j} , respectively. For instance, given $\mathbf{x}_{-i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-n_i}$, $F_i \in C_{\mu_i}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^{n_i})$ implies

$$\|\nabla F_i(\mathbf{x}_i) - \nabla F_i(\mathbf{x}'_i)\| \leq \mu_i(\mathbf{x}_{-i}) \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}'_i\| \quad \forall \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}'_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}.$$

Hereafter, for notational convenience, we denote

$$(16a) \quad \bar{\mu}_i := \sup\{\mu_i(\mathbf{x}_{-i}) \mid \forall \mathbf{x}_{-i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-n_i}\}, \quad \underline{\mu}_i := \inf\{\mu_i(\mathbf{x}_{-i}) \mid \forall \mathbf{x}_{-i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-n_i}\},$$

$$(16b) \quad \bar{\nu}_j := \sup\{\nu_j(\mathbf{y}_{-j}) \mid \forall \mathbf{y}_{-j} \in \mathbb{R}^{m-m_j}\}, \quad \underline{\nu}_j := \inf\{\nu_j(\mathbf{y}_{-j}) \mid \forall \mathbf{y}_{-j} \in \mathbb{R}^{m-m_j}\},$$

By deploying the algorithmic framework of Gauss-Seidel, we present the pseudo codes of eASAP for solving (1) in Algorithm 1. Some remarks on eASAP are provided as follows.

Remark 3.2.

- (i) The \mathbf{x}_i - and \mathbf{y}_j -subproblems in Algorithm 1 are involved in the proximity of $H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}, \cdot, \mathbf{x}_{>i}, \mathbf{y})$ and $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<j}, \cdot, \mathbf{y}_{>j})$, respectively. Accordingly, by the definition of proximity in (7),

the \mathbf{x}_i - and \mathbf{y}_j -subproblems can be reformulated as

$$(17a) \quad \mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} = \left[\mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{\tau_i^k} \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^{k+1}, \cdot, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) \right]^{-1} \left(\mathbf{x}_i^k - \frac{1}{\tau_i^k} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\geq i}^k) \right),$$

$$(17b) \quad \mathbf{y}_j^{k+1} = \left[\mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{\sigma_j^k} \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} H(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{<j}^{k+1}, \cdot, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k) \right]^{-1} \left(\mathbf{y}_j^k - \frac{1}{\sigma_j^k} \nabla_{\mathbf{y}_j} G(\mathbf{y}_{<j}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{\geq j}^k) \right).$$

In practice, the proximity of $H(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ and $H(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ may be nontrivial to attainable. However, the blockwise proximity of $H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}, \cdot, \mathbf{x}_{>i}, \mathbf{y})$ and $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<j}, \cdot, \mathbf{y}_{>j})$ may admit closed closed-form solutions or can be solved efficiently by some subroutines.

- (ii) As an ad hoc instance, the eASAP (i.e., Algorithm 1) reduced to ASAP (4) with varying stepsizes as $s = t = 1$.
- (iii) By the optimality conditions of \mathbf{x}_i - and \mathbf{y}_j -subproblems in Algorithm 1, we have

$$(18a) \quad -\tau_i^k (\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\geq i}^k) \in \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} H(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k),$$

$$(18b) \quad -\sigma_j^k (\mathbf{y}_j^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}_j^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}_j} G(\mathbf{y}_{<j}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{\geq j}^k) \in \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} H(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{\leq j}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k).$$

4. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

We now analyze the convergence of eASAP under some mild conditions. Firstly, the descent property of the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 will be discussed in subsection 4.1. Secondly, by the blockwise restricted prox-regularity of H , we shall prove that any limit point of the sequence generated by eASAP is a critical point of (1). Furthermore, with the Aubin property of partial subdifferential mappings $\partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} J$ and $\partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} J$, we shall prove the global convergence of Algorithm 1 with the KL property in subsection 4.3. Finally, in subsection 4.4, we shall analyze the sublinear convergence rate of Algorithm 1 by the error function (see (42) for the definition) under some peculiar conditions on stepsizes.

4.1. Descent property of Algorithm 1. To facilitate the upcoming analysis, we present some properties involving the proximal gradient descent method. For the separable optimization problem

$$(19) \quad \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) + \psi(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $\varphi \in C_{L_\varphi}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ is proper closed, the recursion of proximal gradient descent method for solving (19) reads

$$(20) \quad \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{prox}_{\psi/\tau}(\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{\tau} \nabla \varphi(\mathbf{x})), \quad \tau > 0,$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ is a new iterate point from previous point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The following lemma can be referred to, e.g., [7].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\varphi \in C_{L_\varphi}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ be proper closed, and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ be produced by (20) with some $\tau > 0$. Then*

$$\psi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \varphi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \psi(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\tau - L_\varphi}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that Assumption 3.1 holds. Then for all $i = 1, \dots, s$ and $j = 1, \dots, t$, the sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^k := (\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ generated by Algorithm 1 satisfies*

$$(21a) \quad \begin{aligned} H(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + F(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^k) &\leq H(\mathbf{x}_{< i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\geq i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + F(\mathbf{x}_{< i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\geq i}^k) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}(\tau_i^k - \mu_i^k) \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$(21b) \quad \begin{aligned} H(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{\leq j}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{> j}^k) + G(\mathbf{y}_{\leq j}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{> j}^k) &\leq H(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{< j}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{\geq j}^k) + G(\mathbf{y}_{< j}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{\geq j}^k) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_j^k - \nu_j^k) \|\mathbf{y}_j^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where μ_i^k and ν_j^k are the Lipschitz constants of $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}_{< i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^k)$ and $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}_j} G(\mathbf{y}_{< i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{y}_{> j}^k)$, respectively.

Proof. Essentially, the \mathbf{x}_i -subproblem in Algorithm 1 is a special case of (20) with $\tau := \tau_i^k$, $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x}_i^k$, $\psi(\cdot) := H(\mathbf{x}_{< i}^{k+1}, \cdot, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)$ and $\varphi(\cdot) := F(\mathbf{x}_{< i}^{k+1}, \cdot, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^k)$. Accordingly, (21a) can be derived tractably from Lemma 4.1. Analogously, by setting $\tau := \sigma_j^k$, $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{y}_j^k$, $\psi(\cdot) := H(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{< j}^{k+1}, \cdot, \mathbf{y}_{> j}^k)$ and $\varphi(\cdot) := G(\mathbf{y}_{< j}^{k+1}, \cdot, \mathbf{y}_{> j}^k)$ in (20), we can derive (21b) from Lemma 4.1. \square

The descent properties of the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 can be readily attainable from Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that Assumption 3.1 holds. Let $\{\mathbf{z}^k = (\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be the sequence produced by Algorithm 1 with the stepsizes (τ_i^k, σ_i^k) satisfying*

$$(22a) \quad \tau_i^k = \gamma_i \mu_i^k \quad \text{with } \gamma_i > 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, s,$$

$$(22b) \quad \sigma_j^k = \gamma'_j \nu_j^k \quad \text{with } \gamma'_j > 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, t,$$

where μ_i^k and ν_j^k are as in Lemma 4.2. Then, the following statements hold.

(i) The sequence $\{J(\mathbf{z}^k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is nonincreasing and there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$(23) \quad J(\mathbf{z}^{k+1}) \leq J(\mathbf{z}^k) - c\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2 \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

(ii) $\sum_{k=0}^\infty \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2 < +\infty$, hence $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\| = 0$.

Proof. By summing (21a) over $i = 1, \dots, s$ and recalling the notations in (14), we have

$$(24) \quad H(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^k) + F(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) \leq H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + F(\mathbf{x}^k) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^s (\tau_i^k - \mu_i^k) \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2.$$

Analogously, by summing (21b) over $j = 1, \dots, t$, we have

$$(25) \quad H(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^{k+1}) + G(\mathbf{y}^{k+1}) \leq H(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^k) + G(\mathbf{y}^k) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t (\sigma_j^k - \nu_j^k) \|\mathbf{y}_j^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2.$$

Furthermore, by summing (24)-(25) and using the definition of J in (1), we derive

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} J(\mathbf{z}^{k+1}) &\leq J(\mathbf{z}^k) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^s (\tau_i^k - \mu_i^k) \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t (\sigma_j^k - \nu_j^k) \|\mathbf{y}_j^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2 \\ &\leq J(\mathbf{z}^k) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^s (\gamma_i - 1) \underline{\mu}_i \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t (\gamma'_j - 1) \underline{\nu}_j \|\mathbf{y}_j^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (16) and (22). By defining $c := \frac{1}{2} \min\{(\gamma_i - 1) \underline{\mu}_i, (\gamma'_j - 1) \underline{\nu}_j \mid i = 1, \dots, s, j = 1, \dots, t\}$, we derive (23) from (26). Furthermore, it follows from (22) that $c > 0$, which implies the statement (i) holds. With the lower boundedness of J in Assumption 3.1 (iii), the sequence $\{J(\mathbf{z}^k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ converges to some finite value, denoted by J^* .

By summing (23) over $k = 0, 1, \dots, \infty$, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^\infty \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{c} [J(\mathbf{z}^0) - J^*] < +\infty,$$

which indicates the statement (ii). \square

4.2. Subsequential convergence. Let $\hat{\mathbf{z}} := (\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ be a critical point of (1), i.e., $\mathbf{0} \in \partial J(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$. The critical point set of (1) is denoted by $\text{crit}(J)$. It follows from the objective of (1) that

$$(27) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}) + \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), & i = 1, \dots, s, \\ \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{y}_j} G(\mathbf{y}) + \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), & j = 1, \dots, t. \end{cases}$$

We shall verify that all the cluster points of the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 fall into $\text{crit}(J)$. Let us start with a preliminary lemma on the boundedness of partial subdifferentials.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that Assumption 3.1 holds. Let $\{(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 and denote*

$$(28a) \quad \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^{k+1} := \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}_{< i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\geq i}^k) - \tau_i^k (\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k), \quad i = 1, \dots, s,$$

$$(28b) \quad \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^{k+1} := \nabla_{\mathbf{y}_j} G(\mathbf{y}_{\leq j}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{> j}^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{y}_j} G(\mathbf{y}_{< j}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{\leq j}^k) - \sigma_j^k (\mathbf{y}_j^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}_j^k), \quad j = 1, \dots, t.$$

Then $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^{k+1} \in \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} J(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^{k+1} \in \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} J(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{\leq j}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}_{> j}^k)$. Particularly, for the constants $\bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\nu}_j$ in (16), and γ_i, γ'_j in (22), the following inequalities hold.

$$(29a) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^{k+1}\| \leq (\gamma_i + 1)\bar{\mu}_i \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|,$$

$$(29b) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^{k+1}\| \leq (\gamma'_j + 1)\bar{\nu}_j \|\mathbf{y}_j^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|.$$

Proof. We limit our discussion to (29a). The (29b) can be derived analogously. By summing $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^k)$ to both sides of (18a), we obtain

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^k) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}_{< i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{\geq i}^k) - \tau_i^k (\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k) \in \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} H(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^k).$$

By (27) and the definition of $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^{k+1}$ in (28a), the inclusion reduces to $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^{k+1} \in \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} J(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}^{k+1}, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)$.

Furthermore, it follows from (28a) and the Lipschitz continuity of ∇F_i in Assumption 3.1 (i) that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^{k+1}\| \leq (\mu_i^k + \tau_i^k) \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k\| \leq (\gamma_i + 1)\bar{\mu}_i \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|,$$

where the last inequality can be deduced by the $\bar{\mu}_i$ in (16) and the stepsizes τ_i^k in (22a). \square

We now present some assumptions on H in (1) for the convergence analysis of Algorithm 1 (see also [29]).

Assumption 4.1.

(i) *The $\text{dom}(H)$ is closed and the partial subdifferential of H satisfies*

$$\otimes_{i=1}^s \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \times \otimes_{j=1}^t \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \subset \partial H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \text{dom}(H),$$

where \otimes denotes the Cartesian product of sets.

- (ii) H is blockwise restricted prox-regular on any bounded set. More precisely, for any (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) in a bounded set, the partial functions $H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}, \cdot, \mathbf{x}_{>i}, \mathbf{y})$ ($i = 1, \dots, s$) and $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<j}, \cdot, \mathbf{y}_{>j})$ ($j = 1, \dots, t$) are restricted prox-regular.

Remark 4.5. Since $F_i \in C_{\mu_i}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^{n_i})$ and $G_j \in C_{\nu_j}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^{m_j})$ (see Assumption 3.1 (i)), Assumption 4.1 (i) implies that

$$(30) \quad \otimes_{i=1}^s \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \times \otimes_{j=1}^t \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \subset \partial J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \text{dom}(J).$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{Z}^* := \{\hat{\mathbf{z}} \mid 0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} J(\hat{\mathbf{z}}), 0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} J(\hat{\mathbf{z}}), i = 1, \dots, s, j = 1, \dots, t\}$ is the subset of $\text{crit}(J)$.

For a sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ generated by Algorithm 1 with some initial point $\mathbf{z}^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$, let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0)$ be the set of cluster points of $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$, i.e.,

$$(31) \quad \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0) := \{\mathbf{z}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \mid \exists \text{ a subsequence } \{\mathbf{z}^{k_l}\}_{l=0}^\infty \subset \{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty \text{ satisfying } \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{z}^{k_l} = \mathbf{z}^*\}.$$

Moreover, as stated in [7], $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0)$ is a nonempty compact set when $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is bounded. By the boundedness of partial subgradients in Lemma 4.4, we now verify that $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0) \subset \text{crit}(J)$.

Lemma 4.6. Suppose that Assumptions 3.1-4.1 hold, and the stepsizes (τ_i^k, σ_i^k) satisfy (22). If the sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ generated by Algorithm 1 is bounded, then the following statements hold.

- (i) J is finite and constant on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0)$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0) \subset \text{crit}(J)$.
- (iii) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(\mathbf{z}^k, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0)) = 0$.

Proof. (i) For any $\mathbf{z}^* \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0)$, there exists a subsequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{k_l}\}_{l=0}^\infty$ such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{z}^{k_l} = \mathbf{z}^*$. By the closedness of J , we have $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} J(\mathbf{z}^{k_l}) \geq J(\mathbf{z}^*)$.

(ii) We have from Lemma 4.3 (ii) that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{x}^{k_l+1} - \mathbf{x}^{k_l}\| = 0$ and $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{y}^{k_l+1} - \mathbf{y}^{k_l}\| = 0$. It follows from (29) that

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \xi_{\mathbf{x}_i}^{k_l} \rightarrow 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, s, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \xi_{\mathbf{y}_j}^{k_l} \rightarrow 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, t.$$

By the blockwise restricted prox-regularity on H (see Assumption 4.1 (ii)) and gradient Lipschitz continuity of F_i, G_j (see Assumption 3.1 (i)), we have from Lemma 2.6 that J is blockwise restricted prox-regular on any bounded set. Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 2.8 that the

partial subdifferentials of J are parametrically closed at \mathbf{z}^* with respect to the subsequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{k_l}\}_{l=0}^\infty$. Accordingly, we obtain

$$\mathbf{0} \in \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} J(\mathbf{z}^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{0} \in \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} J(\mathbf{z}^*).$$

Finally, we have from (30) that $\mathbf{0} \in \partial J(\mathbf{z}^*)$, which implies $\mathbf{z}^* \in \text{crit}(J)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0) \subset \text{crit}(J)$.

(iii) Suppose for contradiction that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(\mathbf{z}^k, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0)) \neq 0$. Then there exist the strictly increasing sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{k_m}\}_{m=0}^\infty$ and a constant $\tilde{c} > 0$ such that

$$(32) \quad \|\mathbf{z}^{k_m} - \mathbf{z}^*\| \geq \text{dist}(\mathbf{z}^{k_m}, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0)) > \tilde{c} \quad \forall \mathbf{z}^* \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0).$$

Since $\{\mathbf{z}^{k_m}\}_{m=0}^\infty$ is a subsequence of the bounded sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$, then it has a convergent subsequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{k_{m_l}}\}_{l=0}^\infty$ with the limit point in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0)$. Hence, $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(\mathbf{z}^{k_{m_l}}, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0)) = 0$, which is a contradiction to (32). This completes the proof. \square

4.3. Convergence of the iterative sequence. We now present several stronger convergence results of Algorithm 1 under the following extra assumption.

Assumption 4.2. For all $i = 1, \dots, s$, $j = 1, \dots, t$, and $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{Z}^*$, the set-valued functions $\partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} J$ and $\partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} J$ admit Aubin property around $(\hat{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{0})$ with moduli $\eta_i > 0$ and $\eta'_j > 0$, respectively.

Lemma 4.7. Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 4.1 and 4.2 hold, and the stepsizes (τ_i^k, σ_j^k) satisfy (22). If the sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ generated by Algorithm 1 is bounded, then there exists $k' > 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial J(\mathbf{z}^k)) \leq \varrho \|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k-1}\| \quad \forall k > k' \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial J(\mathbf{z}^k)) = 0,$$

where

$$\varrho = \sqrt{2(s+t) \left(\max\{\eta_i^2, (\gamma_i + 1)^2 \bar{\mu}_i^2 \mid i = 1, \dots, s\} + \max\{(\eta'_j)^2, (\gamma'_j + 1)^2 \bar{\nu}_j^2 \mid j = 1, \dots, t\} \right)}.$$

Proof. By the definitions of $(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k)$ in (28), we denote

$$(33) \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k := \underset{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\mathbf{x}_i} \in \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} J(\mathbf{z}^k)}{\text{argmin}} \|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\mathbf{x}_i} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k\| \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k := \underset{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\mathbf{y}_j} \in \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} J(\mathbf{z}^k)}{\text{argmin}} \|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\mathbf{y}_j} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k\|.$$

We have from Lemma 4.4 that $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k \in \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} J(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}^k, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^{k-1})$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k \in \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} J(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}_{\leq j}^k, \mathbf{y}_{> j}^{k-1})$. Since $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is bounded, it follows from Lemma 4.6 that, for the critical point $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0) \subset \text{crit}(J)$, there exists $k' > 0$ such that $\mathbf{z}^k \in \mathcal{B}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$, $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k \in \mathcal{B}^{\delta_1}(\mathbf{0})$, $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k \in \mathcal{B}^{\delta_2}(\mathbf{0})$ for all $k > k'$. By

the Aubin property of $\partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} J$ and $\partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} J$ in Assumption 4.2, we have

$$(34a) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k, \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} J(\mathbf{z}^k)) &= \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k\| \leq \eta_i \|(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) - (\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}^k, \mathbf{x}_{> i}^{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^{k-1})\| \\ &= \eta_i \|(\mathbf{x}_{> i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) - (\mathbf{x}_{> i}^{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^{k-1})\|, \end{aligned}$$

$$(34b) \quad \text{dist}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k, \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} J(\mathbf{z}^k)) = \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k\| \leq \eta'_j \|(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) - (\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}_{\leq j}^k, \mathbf{y}_{> j}^{k-1})\| = \eta'_j \|\mathbf{y}_{> j}^k - \mathbf{y}_{> j}^{k-1}\|.$$

We have from (29a) and (34a) that

$$(35) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k\|^2 &\leq 2\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k\|^2 + 2\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k\|^2 \\ &\leq 2(\tau_i^{k-1} + \mu_i^{k-1})^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2 + 2\eta_i^2 \|(\mathbf{x}_{> i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) - (\mathbf{x}_{> i}^{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^{k-1})\|^2 \\ &\leq 2(\gamma_i + 1)^2 \bar{\mu}_i^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2 + 2\eta_i^2 \|(\mathbf{x}_{> i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) - (\mathbf{x}_{> i}^{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^{k-1})\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\bar{\vartheta}^2 \|(\mathbf{x}_{\geq i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) - (\mathbf{x}_{\geq i}^{k-1}, \mathbf{y}^{k-1})\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\vartheta} := \max \{\eta_i, (\gamma_i + 1)\bar{\mu}_i \mid i = 1, \dots, s\}$. Analogously, we have from (29b) and (34b) that

$$(36) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k\|^2 &\leq 2\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k\|^2 + 2\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k\|^2 \\ &\leq 2(\sigma_j^{k-1} + \nu_j^{k-1})^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^{k-1}\|^2 + 2(\eta'_j)^2 \|\mathbf{y}_{> j}^k - \mathbf{y}_{> j}^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\leq 2(\gamma'_j + 1)^2 \bar{\nu}_j^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^{k-1}\|^2 + 2(\eta'_j)^2 \|\mathbf{y}_{> j}^k - \mathbf{y}_{> j}^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\leq 2(\bar{\vartheta}')^2 \|\mathbf{y}_{\geq j}^k - \mathbf{y}_{\geq j}^{k-1}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\vartheta}' := \max \{\eta'_j, (\gamma'_j + 1)\bar{\nu}_j \mid j = 1, \dots, t\}$. Therefore,

$$\left(\text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial J(\mathbf{z}^k))\right)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^s \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^t \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k\|^2 \leq 2(s+t) (\bar{\vartheta}^2 + (\bar{\vartheta}')^2) \|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k-1}\|^2 =: \varrho^2 \|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k-1}\|^2.$$

Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 4.3 (ii) that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial J(\mathbf{z}^k)) = 0$. \square

Remark 4.8. For Assumption 4.2, it is typically difficult to check the Aubin property of set-valued functions in Assumption 4.2 because $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ is unknown. However, as discussed in [22, section 5], the prox-regularity can guarantee the Aubin property of the subdifferential mappings holds. Actually, it follows from Lemma 4.6 that any subsequence of the bounded sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ converges to a critical point $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{Z}^*$. Hence, given $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{Z}^*$, there exists $k' \geq 1$ such that $\mathbf{z}^k \in \mathcal{B}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$, $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k \in \mathcal{B}^{\delta_1}(\mathbf{0})$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k \in \mathcal{B}^{\delta_2}(\mathbf{0})$ for all $k \geq k'$. It implies that J admits the blockwise prox-regularity around $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$. Namely, Assumption 4.2 holds logically from Assumptions 3.1-4.1. The interested readers can refer to, e.g., [18, 21, 27], for more details.

Theorem 4.9. *Suppose that J is a KL function, Assumptions 3.1, 4.1 and 4.2 hold, and the stepsizes satisfy (22). If the sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ generated by Algorithm 1 is bounded, then the following statements hold.*

- (i) *The sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ has finite length, i.e., $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\| < \infty$.*
- (ii) *The sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ converges to a critical point of J .*

Proof. By the boundedness of $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$, there exists a subsequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{k_l}\}_{l=0}^\infty$ such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{z}^{k_l} = \mathbf{z}^*$. Since $\{J(\mathbf{z}^k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is nonincreasing and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J(\mathbf{z}^k) \geq J(\mathbf{z}^*) = J^*$, there exists integer $k_0 > 0$ such that

$$J(\mathbf{z}^*) < J(\mathbf{z}^{k_0}) < J(\mathbf{z}^*) + d \quad \forall d > 0,$$

i.e., $\mathbf{z}^k \in [J(\mathbf{z}^*) < J(\mathbf{z}^{k_0}) < J(\mathbf{z}^*) + d]$ for all $k > k_0$. On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 4.6 (iii) that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(\mathbf{z}^k, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0)) = 0$. Therefore, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists integer $k_1 > 0$ such that $\text{dist}(\mathbf{z}^k, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0)) < \epsilon$ for all $k > k_1$. Additionally, for the k' in Lemma 4.7, we deduce that \mathbf{z}^k belongs to the intersection for all $k > l := \max\{k_0, k_1, k'\} + 1$.

- (i) By Lemma 2.10, there exists a concave function $\varphi \in \Phi_\eta$ such that

$$\varphi'(J(\mathbf{z}^k) - J(\mathbf{z}^*)) \text{dist}(0, \partial J(\mathbf{z}^k)) \geq 1 \quad \forall k \geq l.$$

Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 4.7 that

$$(37) \quad \varphi'(J(\mathbf{z}^k) - J(\mathbf{z}^*)) \geq \left(\text{dist}(0, \partial J(\mathbf{z}^k)) \right)^{-1} \geq \left(\varrho \|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k-1}\| \right)^{-1}.$$

By the concavity of φ , we have

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi(J(\mathbf{z}^k) - J(\mathbf{z}^*)) - \varphi(J(\mathbf{z}^{k+1}) - J(\mathbf{z}^*)) &\geq \varphi'(J(\mathbf{z}^k) - J(\mathbf{z}^*)) (J(\mathbf{z}^k) - J(\mathbf{z}^{k+1})) \\ &\geq \frac{c \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2}{\varrho \|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k-1}\|}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma 4.3 (i) and (37). By defining $r_k := \varphi(J(\mathbf{z}^k) - J(\mathbf{z}^*))$, we have $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is nonincreasing since $\varphi'(t) > 0$. Let $\underline{r} := \inf_{k \geq 0} r_k$ and $c' = \varrho/c$. Then, (38) can be rewritten as

$$\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\|^2 \leq \left(c'(r_k - r_{k+1}) \|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k-1}\| \right)^{1/2}.$$

By the identity $2\sqrt{ab} \leq a + b$ for all $a, b \geq 0$, we deduce

$$(39) \quad 2\|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\| \leq c'(r_k - r_{k+1}) + \|\mathbf{z}^k - \mathbf{z}^{k-1}\|.$$

By summing (39) over $k = l + 1, \dots, K$, it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=l+1}^K \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\| &\leq c'(r_{l+1} - r_{K+1}) + \|\mathbf{z}^{K+1} - \mathbf{z}^K\| \\ &\leq c'(r_{l+1} - \underline{r}) + \|\mathbf{z}^{K+1} - \mathbf{z}^K\|. \end{aligned}$$

By letting $K \rightarrow \infty$, we have from Lemma 4.3 that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\| < \infty$. This implies that

$$\|\mathbf{z}^{k_m} - \mathbf{z}^{k_n}\| \leq \sum_{k=k_n}^{k_m-1} \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\| < \sum_{k=k_n}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{z}^{k+1} - \mathbf{z}^k\| \quad \forall k_m > k_n \geq l.$$

By taking $k_n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $\|\mathbf{z}^{k_m} - \mathbf{z}^{k_n}\| \rightarrow 0$ from Lemma 4.3 (ii). It implies that $\{\mathbf{z}^{k_n}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence, and hence a convergent sequence. It follows from Lemma 4.6 that $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ converges to a $\mathbf{z}^* \in \text{crit}(J)$. \square

Theorem 4.10. *Supposed that Assumptions 3.1, 4.1 and 4.2 hold. Let $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ be a sequence generated by Algorithm 1 with initial point \mathbf{z}^0 . Assume that J admits the KL property and $\varphi(t) = \frac{c}{\theta} t^\theta$ with $\theta \in (0, 1]$ and $c > 0$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (i) *If $\theta = 1$, Algorithm 1 terminates in a finite number of iterations.*
- (ii) *If $\theta \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, then there exist $k_2 \geq 1$, $w > 0$ and $q \in [0, 1)$ such that*

$$J(\mathbf{z}^k) - J^* \leq wq^{k-k_2} \quad \forall k > k_2,$$

where $J^* = J(\mathbf{z}^*)$ for all $\mathbf{z}^* \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0)$.

- (iii) *If $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, then there exists an integer $k_3 > 0$ and a constant $w > 0$ such that*

$$J(\mathbf{z}^k) - J^* \leq \left(\frac{w}{(k - k_3)(1 - 2\theta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-2\theta}} \quad \forall k > k_3.$$

Proof. The above theorem is an immediately consequence of [7, Remark 6]. Herein, we omit the proof for brevity. \square

4.4. Convergence rate of the iterative sequence. Now we analyze the sublinear convergence rate of Algorithm 1 under the mild conditions on stepsizes. Compared to the \mathbf{x}_i - and \mathbf{y}_j -subproblems in Algorithm 1, we define the auxiliary iterate $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^k := (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^k)$ by

$$(40a) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}} \left\{ H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^k, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + \langle \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^k, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}^k) \rangle + \frac{\tilde{\tau}_i^k}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 \right\}, \end{array} \right.$$

$$(40b) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{y}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{m_j}} \left\{ H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}_{<j}^k, \mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k) + \langle \mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{y}_j^k, \nabla_{\mathbf{y}_j} G(\mathbf{y}^k) \rangle + \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_j^k}{2} \|\mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2 \right\}, \end{array} \right.$$

where $\tilde{\tau}_i^k > 0$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_j^k > 0$. Note that the auxiliary iterate $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^k$ is essentially futile for numerical computation but is merely used to establish the convergence rate.

Given $\mathbf{x}_{-i} = (\mathbf{x}_{<i}, \mathbf{x}_{>i}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-n_i}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{-j} = (\mathbf{y}_{<j}, \mathbf{y}_{>j}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m-m_j}$, by using the proximity of $H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}, \cdot, \mathbf{x}_{>i}, \mathbf{y})$ and $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<j}, \cdot, \mathbf{y}_{>j})$, we define the error function by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}_i}(\mathbf{z}) &:= \mathbf{x}_i - \left(\mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{\tau_i} \partial_{\mathbf{x}_i} H\right)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{x}_i - \frac{1}{\tau_i} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}) \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, s, \\ \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{y}_j}(\mathbf{z}) &:= \mathbf{y}_j - \left(\mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{\sigma_j} \partial_{\mathbf{y}_j} H\right)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{y}_j - \frac{1}{\sigma_j} \nabla_{\mathbf{y}_j} G(\mathbf{y}) \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, t.\end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, by the optimality conditions of (40), we have

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k = \mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}_i}(\mathbf{z}^k), \\ \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k = \mathbf{y}_j^k - \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{y}_j}(\mathbf{z}^k). \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, we denote

$$(42) \quad \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{z}) := \otimes_{i=1}^s \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}_i}(\mathbf{z}) \times \otimes_{j=1}^t \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{y}_j}(\mathbf{z}).$$

It follows from (40) that $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{z}^k) = \mathbf{z}^k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^k$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ be a critical point of (1). By the optimality condition, we have $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{E}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$. Hence, $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{z}^k)$ essentially quantifies the violation of stationary of \mathbf{z}^k .

Lemma 4.11. *Suppose that Assumption 3.1 holds. Then, the sequence $\{\bar{\mathbf{z}}^k = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ defined by (40) satisfies*

$$(43a) \quad H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + F(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k) \leq H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + F(\mathbf{x}^k) - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\tau}_i^k - \tilde{\mu}_i^k) \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2,$$

$$(43b) \quad H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}_{<j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k) + G(\mathbf{y}_{<j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k) \leq H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + G(\mathbf{y}^k) - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\sigma}_j^k - \tilde{\nu}_j^k) \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, s$ and $j = 1, \dots, t$, where $\tilde{\mu}_i^k$ and $\tilde{\nu}_j^k$ are the Lipschitz constants of $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} F(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^k, \cdot, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k)$ and $\nabla_{\mathbf{y}_j} G(\mathbf{y}_{<j}^k, \cdot, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k)$, respectively.

Proof. Indeed, (40a) is a special case of (20) with $\tau := \tilde{\tau}_i^k$, $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x}_i^k$, $\psi(\cdot) := H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^k, \cdot, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)$ and $\varphi(\cdot) := F(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^k, \cdot, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k)$. Accordingly, (43a) can be deduced by Lemma 4.1. Analogously, by setting $\tau := \tilde{\sigma}_j^k$, $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{y}_j^k$, $\psi(\cdot) := H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}_{<j}^k, \cdot, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k)$ and $\varphi(\cdot) := G(\mathbf{y}_{<j}^k, \cdot, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k)$ in (20), we can derive (43b) by Lemma 4.1. \square

We now define a Lyapunov sequence by

$$(44) \quad R^k := J(\mathbf{z}^k) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^s (\tau_i^{k-1} - \mu_i^{k-1}) \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t (\sigma_j^{k-1} - \nu_j^{k-1}) \|\mathbf{y}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^{k-1}\|^2.$$

Besides, we denote

$$(45) \quad \bar{\eta} := \max\{\eta_i \mid i = 1, \dots, s\}, \quad \bar{\eta}' := \max\{\eta'_j \mid j = 1, \dots, t\},$$

where η_i and η'_j are defined in Assumption 4.2, and let

$$(46) \quad \delta_i^k := \frac{1}{2}(10\tau_i^k - 2\tilde{\mu}_i^k - \alpha_i - 20\mu_i^{k-1}), \quad \rho_j^k := \frac{1}{2}(10\sigma_j^k - 2\tilde{\nu}_j^k - \beta_j - 20\nu_j^{k-1}),$$

where μ_i^k and ν_j^k are as in Lemma 4.2, $\tilde{\mu}_i^k$ and $\tilde{\nu}_j^k$ are as in Lemma 4.11, α_i and β_j are blockwise semiconvex constants of H (more details can be seen in the following lemma).

Lemma 4.12. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 4.1 (i) and 4.2 hold. For all $i = 1, \dots, s$ and $j = 1, \dots, t$, assume $H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}, \cdot, \mathbf{x}_{>i}, \mathbf{y})$ and $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<j}, \cdot, \mathbf{y}_{>j})$ are semiconvex with moduli α_i and β_j , respectively. Let $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be the bounded sequence generated by Algorithm 1 and $\{\bar{\mathbf{z}}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be the sequence defined in (40). If the stepsizes (τ_i^k, σ_j^k) of Algorithm 1 satisfy*

$$(47a) \quad 4\mu_i^k > \tau_i^k > \max\left\{\bar{\eta} - \mu_i^k, \frac{2\tilde{\mu}_i^k + \alpha_i}{10} + 2\mu_i^{k-1}\right\},$$

$$(47b) \quad 4\nu_j^k > \sigma_j^k > \max\left\{\bar{\eta}' - \nu_j^k, \frac{2\tilde{\nu}_j^k + \beta_j}{10} + 2\nu_j^{k-1}\right\},$$

Then for $\delta_i^k > 0$ and $\rho_j^k > 0$, we have

$$R^{k+1} \leq R^k - \delta_i^k \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 - \rho_j^k \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2.$$

Proof. By summing (43a)-(43b) and using the definition of J in (1), we have

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} & H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + F(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k) + H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}_{<j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k) + G(\mathbf{y}_{<j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k) \\ & \leq J(\mathbf{z}^k) + H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\tau}_i^k - \tilde{\mu}_i^k) \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\sigma}_j^k - \tilde{\nu}_j^k) \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since H is blockwise semiconvex with with moduli $\alpha_i (i = 1, \dots, s)$ and $\beta_j (j = 1, \dots, t)$, it follows from Assumption 3.1 (i) that J is also blockwise semiconvex. Hence,

$$(49a) \quad \begin{aligned} H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + F(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k) & \geq H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + F(\mathbf{x}^k) + \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k \rangle \\ & \quad - \frac{\alpha_i + \tilde{\mu}_i^k}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$(49b) \quad \begin{aligned} H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}_{<j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k) + G(\mathbf{y}_{<j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k) & \geq H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + G(\mathbf{y}^k) + \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{\mathbf{y}_j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k \rangle \\ & \quad - \frac{\beta_j + \tilde{\nu}_j^k}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\zeta}_{x_i}^k \in \partial_{x_i} J(\mathbf{z}^k)$ and $\bar{\zeta}_{y_j}^k \in \partial_{y_j} J(\mathbf{z}^k)$. Summing (49a) and (49b), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& H(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + F(\mathbf{x}_{<i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k, \mathbf{x}_{>i}^k) + H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}_{<j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k) + G(\mathbf{y}_{<j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k, \mathbf{y}_{>j}^k) \\
& \geq J(\mathbf{z}^k) + H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) + \langle \bar{\zeta}_{x_i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k \rangle + \langle \bar{\zeta}_{y_j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k \rangle - \frac{\alpha_i + \tilde{\mu}_i^k}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 - \frac{\beta_j + \tilde{\nu}_j^k}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2 \\
& \geq J(\mathbf{z}^{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^s (\tau_i^k - \mu_i^k) \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t (\sigma_j^k - \nu_j^k) \|\mathbf{y}_j^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2 + H(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) \\
(50) \quad & + \langle \bar{\zeta}_{x_i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k \rangle + \langle \bar{\zeta}_{y_j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k \rangle - \frac{\alpha_i + \tilde{\mu}_i^k}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 - \frac{\beta_j + \tilde{\nu}_j^k}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is obtained by (26). Combining (48) and (50) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& J(\mathbf{z}^{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^s (\tau_i^k - \mu_i^k) \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t (\sigma_j^k - \nu_j^k) \|\mathbf{y}_j^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2 \\
& \leq J(\mathbf{z}^k) - \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\tau}_i^k - 2\tilde{\mu}_i^k - \alpha_i) \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\sigma}_j^k - 2\tilde{\nu}_j^k - \beta_j) \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2 \\
(51) \quad & - \langle \bar{\zeta}_{x_i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k \rangle - \langle \bar{\zeta}_{y_j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for all $a^{k-1} > 0$, $b^{k-1} > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-\langle \bar{\zeta}_{x_i}^k, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k \rangle - \langle \bar{\zeta}_{y_j}^k, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k \rangle & \leq \frac{1}{2a^{k-1}} \|\bar{\zeta}_{x_i}^k\|^2 + \frac{a^{k-1}}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{2b^{k-1}} \|\bar{\zeta}_{y_j}^k\|^2 + \frac{b^{k-1}}{2} \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}$ is bounded and J is blockwise semiconvex, it follows from Lemma 4.6 that, for the critical point $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{z}^0) \subset \text{crit}(J)$, there exist $\delta_1 > 0$ and $\delta_2 > 0$ such that $\mathbf{z}^k \in \mathcal{B}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$, $\xi_{x_i}^k \in \mathcal{B}^{\delta_1}(\mathbf{0})$, $\xi_{y_j}^k \in \mathcal{B}^{\delta_2}(\mathbf{0})$ for all $k \geq 0$. By (35) and (36), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2a^{k-1}} \|\bar{\zeta}_{x_i}^k\|^2 & \leq \frac{1}{a^{k-1}} \left((\tau_i^{k-1} + \mu_i^{k-1})^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2 + \sum_{l_1=i+1}^s \eta_{l_1}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_{l_1}^k - \mathbf{x}_{l_1}^{k-1}\|^2 + \eta_i^2 \|\mathbf{y}^k - \mathbf{y}^{k-1}\|^2 \right), \\
\frac{1}{2b^{k-1}} \|\bar{\zeta}_{y_j}^k\|^2 & \leq \frac{1}{b^{k-1}} \left((\sigma_j^{k-1} + \nu_j^{k-1})^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^{k-1}\|^2 + \sum_{l_2=j+1}^t (\eta'_{l_2})^2 \|\mathbf{y}_{l_2}^k - \mathbf{y}_{l_2}^{k-1}\|^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we deduce from (51) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& J(\mathbf{z}^{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^s (\tau_i^k - \mu_i^k) \|\mathbf{x}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t (\sigma_j^k - \nu_j^k) \|\mathbf{y}_j^{k+1} - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2 \\
& \leq J(\mathbf{z}^k) + \frac{1}{a^{k-1}} (\tau_i^{k-1} + \mu_i^{k-1})^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{\eta_i^2}{a^{k-1}} \sum_{l_1=i+1}^s \|\mathbf{x}_{l_1}^k - \mathbf{x}_{l_1}^{k-1}\|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{b^{k-1}} (\sigma_j^{k-1} + \nu_j^{k-1})^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{(\eta'_j)^2}{b^{k-1}} \sum_{l_2=j+1}^t \|\mathbf{y}_{l_2}^k - \mathbf{y}_{l_2}^{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{\eta_i^2}{a^{k-1}} \|\mathbf{y}^k - \mathbf{y}^{k-1}\|^2. \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\tau}_i^k - 2\tilde{\mu}_i^k - \alpha_i - a^{k-1}) \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\sigma}_j^k - 2\tilde{\nu}_j^k - \beta_j - b^{k-1}) \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it follows from the definition of R^k in (44) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& R^{k+1} \\
& \leq R^k - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l_1=1}^{i-1} (\tau_{l_1}^{k-1} - \mu_{l_1}^{k-1}) \|\mathbf{x}_{l_1}^k - \mathbf{x}_{l_1}^{k-1}\|^2 - \left(\frac{\tau_i^{k-1} - \mu_i^{k-1}}{2} - \frac{1}{a^{k-1}} (\tau_i^{k-1} + \mu_i^{k-1})^2 \right) \|\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^{k-1}\|^2 \\
& \quad - \sum_{l_1=i+1}^s \left(\frac{\tau_{l_1}^{k-1} - \mu_{l_1}^{k-1}}{2} - \frac{\eta_i^2}{a^{k-1}} \right) \|\mathbf{x}_{l_1}^k - \mathbf{x}_{l_1}^{k-1}\|^2 - \sum_{l_2=1}^{j-1} \left(\frac{\sigma_{l_2}^{k-1} - \nu_{l_2}^{k-1}}{2} - \frac{\eta_i^2}{a^{k-1}} \right) \|\mathbf{y}_{l_2}^k - \mathbf{y}_{l_2}^{k-1}\|^2 \\
& \quad - \left(\frac{\sigma_j^{k-1} - \nu_j^{k-1}}{2} - \frac{1}{b^{k-1}} (\sigma_j^{k-1} + \nu_j^{k-1})^2 - \frac{\eta_i^2}{a^{k-1}} \right) \|\mathbf{y}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^{k-1}\|^2 \\
& \quad - \sum_{l_2=j+1}^t \left(\frac{\sigma_{l_2}^{k-1} - \nu_{l_2}^{k-1}}{2} - \frac{(\eta'_{l_2})^2}{b^{k-1}} - \frac{\eta_i^2}{a^{k-1}} \right) \|\mathbf{y}_{l_2}^k - \mathbf{y}_{l_2}^{k-1}\|^2 \\
& \quad (52) \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\tau}_i^k - 2\tilde{\mu}_i^k - \alpha_i - a^{k-1}) \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\sigma}_j^k - 2\tilde{\nu}_j^k - \beta_j - b^{k-1}) \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For all $k \geq 0$, choosing $(a^k, b^k) := (20\mu_i^k, 20\nu_j^k)$ and $(\tilde{\tau}_i^k, \tilde{\sigma}_j^k) := (10\tau_i^k, 10\sigma_j^k)$ in (40) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} (\tau_i^k - \mu_i^k) & \geq \frac{1}{a^k} (\tau_i^k + \mu_i^k)^2 \geq \frac{\bar{\eta}}{a^k}, \\
\frac{1}{2} (\sigma_j^k - \nu_j^k) & \geq \frac{1}{b^k} (\sigma_j^k + \nu_j^k)^2 + \frac{\bar{\eta}^2}{a^k} \geq \frac{(\bar{\eta}')^2}{b^k} + \frac{\bar{\eta}^2}{a^k}, \\
\tilde{\tau}_i^k - 2\tilde{\mu}_i^k - \alpha_i - a^{k-1} & > 0, \quad \tilde{\sigma}_j^k - 2\tilde{\nu}_j^k - \beta_j - b^{k-1} > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\eta}$ and $\bar{\eta}'$ are denoted in (45). Hence, we have

$$(53a) \quad \frac{a^k}{4} - \mu_i^k \geq \tau_i^k \geq \bar{\eta} - \mu_i^k, \quad \tau_i^k > \frac{1}{10}(a^{k-1} + \alpha_i + 2\tilde{\mu}_i^k);$$

$$(53b) \quad \frac{b^k}{4} - \nu_j^k \geq \sigma_j^k \geq \bar{\eta}' - \nu_j^k, \quad \sigma_j^k > \frac{1}{10}(b^{k-1} + \beta_j + 2\tilde{\nu}_j^k).$$

Furthermore, from $a^{k-1} = 20\mu_i^{k-1}$, $b = 20\nu_j^{k-1}$ and (53), we obtain (47). It follows from (46) and (47) that $\delta_i^k > 0$ and $\rho_j^k > 0$. Finally, by the definition of R^k in (44) and inequality (52) we obtain the desired result, which completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.13. *Actually, the sets about stepsizes in (47) are nonempty if the moduli $(\underline{\mu}_i, \bar{\mu}_i)$, $(\underline{\nu}_j, \bar{\nu}_j)$ defined in (16), (η_i, η'_j) defined in Assumption 4.2, and (α_i, β_j) defined in Lemma 4.12 satisfy*

$$(54) \quad \begin{aligned} (5 - \sqrt{5})\bar{\mu}_i &< \bar{\eta} < 5\underline{\mu}_i, & \bar{\eta}^2 &< 6\underline{\mu}_i\underline{\nu}_j, \\ 0 < \alpha_i &< 40\underline{\mu}_i - 22\bar{\mu}_i, & 0 < \beta_j &< 40\underline{\nu}_j - 22\bar{\nu}_j, \\ 5\bar{\nu}_j - \underline{\nu}_j - 5\underline{\nu}_j &\sqrt{\frac{1}{5} - \frac{\eta_i^2}{30\underline{\nu}_j\underline{\mu}_i}} &< \bar{\eta}' &< 5\underline{\nu}_j. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.14. *Suppose Assumptions 3.1, 4.1 (i) and 4.2 hold and H is blockwise semiconvex with moduli α_i and β_j for all $i = 1, \dots, s$ and $j = 1, \dots, t$. Let $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be the bounded sequence generated by Algorithm 1 and $\{\bar{\mathbf{z}}^k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be the sequence defined in (40). If (54) holds and the stepsizes satisfy (47), for any iterative point $\mathbf{z}^\Theta = (\mathbf{x}^\Theta, \mathbf{y}^\Theta)$ from Algorithm 1, there exists $\hat{\delta} > 0$ such that*

$$\text{dist}(0, \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{z}^\Theta))^2 \leq \frac{J(\mathbf{z}^\Theta) - J}{\lambda K}, \quad \text{with } \lambda := \frac{\hat{\delta}}{(s+t)^2}.$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\delta}^k := \min\{\delta_i^k, \rho_j^k \mid i = 1, \dots, s, j = 1, \dots, t\} > 0$. From Lemma 4.12, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} R^{k+1} &\leq R^k - \delta_i^1 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 - \delta_j^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2 \\ &\leq R^k - \hat{\delta}^k \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 - \hat{\delta}^k \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which indicates that

$$(55) \quad \hat{\delta}^k \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 + \hat{\delta}^k \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2 \leq R^k - R^{k+1}.$$

Summing (55) over $i = 1, \dots, s$ and $j = 1, \dots, t$, we obtain

$$(56) \quad \frac{\hat{\delta}^k}{s+t} \|\mathbf{z}^k - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^k\|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^s \hat{\delta}^k \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^k - \mathbf{x}_i^k\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{\delta}^k \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_j^k - \mathbf{y}_j^k\|^2 \leq (s+t)(R^k - R^{k+1}).$$

Likewise, setting $\hat{\delta} := \min\{\hat{\delta}^k \mid k = 0, \dots, K-1\} > 0$ and summing (56) over $k = 0, \dots, K-1$ yield

$$(57) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{z}^k))^2 \leq \frac{(s+t)^2}{\hat{\delta}} (R^0 - R^K) \leq \frac{(s+t)^2}{\hat{\delta}} (R^0 - \underline{J}).$$

By taking $\mathbf{z}^{-1} := \mathbf{z}^0$, it follows from (44) that $R^0 = J(\mathbf{z}^0)$. For any iterative point \mathbf{z}^Θ from Algorithm 1, the equality (57) reduces to the desired result, which completes the proof. \square

5. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we shall conduct some numerical simulations of (1) on synthetic and real data to demonstrate the performance of eASAP. All codes for the upcoming numerical experiments are written in MATLAB and implemented on a Lenovo portable computer with Intel Core (TM) CPU 4800 MHZ and 16G memory.

We now present briefly the tensors for the upcoming numerical simulations. The interested reader can refer to, e.g., [20, 28, 32, 37], for more details about tensor and tensor decomposition. For an N -order tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_1 \times \dots \times I_N}$, the CANDECOMP/PARAFAC (CP) decomposition of \mathcal{T} is defined by

$$\mathcal{T} = \llbracket \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N \rrbracket = \sum_{i=1}^r \mathbf{A}_1(:, i) \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{A}_N(:, i),$$

where r is the CP rank of \mathcal{T} , $\mathbf{A}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{I_n \times r}$ ($n = 1, \dots, N$) are factor matrices, and \circ denotes the outer product of vectors. The mode- n unfolding of \mathcal{T} , denoted by $\mathbf{T}_{(n)}$, is a I_n -by- J_n matrix ($J_n = I_1 \times \dots \times I_{n-1} \times I_{n+1} \times \dots \times I_N$) satisfying $\mathbf{T}_{(n)}(j, i_n) = \mathcal{T}(i_1, \dots, i_N)$, where $j = 1 + \sum_{k=1, k \neq n}^N (i_k - 1) \bar{J}_k$ and $\bar{J}_k = \prod_{m=1, m \neq n}^{k-1} I_m$. An equivalent reformulation of CP decomposition reads (see, e.g., [20]) $\mathbf{T}_{(n)} = \mathbf{A}_n \mathbf{H}_{(n)}^\top$, where $\mathbf{H}_{(n)} = \mathbf{A}_N \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{A}_{n+1} \odot \mathbf{A}_{n-1} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{A}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{J_n \times r}$ with \odot denoting the Khatri-Rao product of matrices. Let $\|\mathcal{T}\|_F := (\sum_{i_1=1}^{I_1} \dots \sum_{i_N=1}^{I_N} t_{i_1, \dots, i_N}^2)^{1/2}$ denote the Frobenius norm of tensor \mathcal{T} . Accordingly, the minimization of CP decomposition is

$$(58) \quad \min_{\{\mathbf{A}_n\}_{n=1}^N} f(\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathcal{T} - \llbracket \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N \rrbracket \right\|_F^2.$$

The objective of (58) is continuously differentiable, and

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{A}_n} f = \mathbf{A}_n \mathbf{H}_{(n)}^\top \mathbf{H}_{(n)} - \mathbf{T}_{(n)} \mathbf{H}_{(n)}, \quad \text{for } n = 1, \dots, N.$$

5.1. Synthetic data. We first consider the Laplacian stochastic coupling model (6) for multi-modal data fusion. Specifically, let \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{Y}' denote the required fusion tensors. By assuming that coupling occurs between \mathbf{A}_3 and \mathbf{B}_1 . Accordingly, the model can be formulated as

$$(59) \quad \min_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}} \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathcal{Y} - \llbracket \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{A}_3 \rrbracket \right\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathcal{Y}' - \llbracket \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2, \mathbf{B}_3 \rrbracket \right\|_F^2 + \mu \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_3 - \mathbf{B}_1)\|_1,$$

where μ is a trade-off parameter. It falls into the abstract model (1) with

$$F(\mathbf{A}) := \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathcal{Y} - \llbracket \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{A}_3 \rrbracket \right\|_F^2, \quad G(\mathbf{B}) := \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathcal{Y}' - \llbracket \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2, \mathbf{B}_3 \rrbracket \right\|_F^2, \quad H(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}) := \mu \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_3 - \mathbf{B}_1)\|_1,$$

where $\mathbf{A} := [\mathbf{A}_1; \mathbf{A}_2; \mathbf{A}_3]$, and $\mathbf{B} := [\mathbf{B}_1; \mathbf{B}_2; \mathbf{B}_3]$.

We now synthesize the noisy tensors $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{30 \times 40 \times 50}$ and $\mathcal{Y}' \in \mathbb{R}^{50 \times 60 \times 70}$. Firstly, we generate the ideal tensors $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{30 \times 40 \times 50}$ and $\mathcal{X}' \in \mathbb{R}^{50 \times 60 \times 70}$. Let $\text{rank}_{cp}(\mathcal{X}) = \text{rank}_{cp}(\mathcal{X}') = 5$. The ideal factor matrices $\mathbf{A}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{30 \times 5}$, $\mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{40 \times 5}$, $\mathbf{A}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{50 \times 5}$, $\mathbf{B}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{60 \times 5}$, $\mathbf{B}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{70 \times 5}$ can be generated by MATLAB syntax `rand` with related dimension and $\mathbf{B}_1 = \mathbf{A}_3 + \Gamma_{i,j}$ with $\gamma_{i,j} \sim \text{Laplace}(0, 0.1)$. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{X} = \llbracket \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{A}_3 \rrbracket$ and $\mathcal{X}' = \llbracket \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2, \mathbf{B}_3 \rrbracket$. Both of them are ground truth of (59). Then adding noise tensor \mathcal{N} with entries drawn from a standard normal distribution as follows,

$$\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} + 10^{-s/20} \frac{\|\mathcal{X}\|_F}{\|\mathcal{N}\|_F} \mathcal{N},$$

where s denotes the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). Let $s = 14$ dB, we can obtain tensors \mathcal{Y} , \mathcal{Y}' directly.

Throughout this numerical simulation, we take the trade-off parameter $\mu = 0.01$ for (59) and random initial points by MATLAB syntax `rand/randn` (i.e., $\mathbf{A}_3^0, \mathbf{B}_2^0, \mathbf{B}_3^0$ generated by `rand` and $\mathbf{A}_1^0, \mathbf{A}_2^0, \mathbf{B}_1^0$ generated by `randn`) for all test methods. We compare Algorithm 1 with ASAP in [29] (i.e., the recursion (4) with two blocks \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}) and accelerated ASAP with extrapolation in [42]. The stepsizes are taken as $(\tau_i^k, \sigma_j^k) = (\text{trace}(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{A}_i^k}) + k, \text{trace}(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{B}_j^k}) + k)$ for Algorithm 1, $(\tau^k, \sigma^k) = (\text{trace}(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{A}^k}), \text{trace}(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{B}^k}))$ for ASAP and accelerated-ASAP. Herein, the matrices for calculating stepsizes are listed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{A}_1^k} &:= \mathbf{A}_3^k \odot \mathbf{A}_2^k, & \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{A}_2^k} &= \mathbf{A}_3^k \odot \mathbf{A}_1^{k+1}, & \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{A}_3^k} &= \mathbf{A}_2^{k+1} \odot \mathbf{A}_1^{k+1}, \\ \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{B}_1^k} &:= \mathbf{B}_3^k \odot \mathbf{B}_2^k, & \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{B}_2^k} &= \mathbf{B}_3^k \odot \mathbf{B}_1^{k+1}, & \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{B}_3^k} &= \mathbf{B}_2^{k+1} \odot \mathbf{B}_1^{k+1}, \\ \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{A}^k} &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_3^k \odot \mathbf{A}_2^k \\ \mathbf{A}_3^k \odot \mathbf{A}_1^k \\ \mathbf{A}_2^k \odot \mathbf{A}_3^k \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{B}^k} &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}_3^k \odot \mathbf{B}_2^k \\ \mathbf{B}_3^k \odot \mathbf{B}_1^k \\ \mathbf{B}_2^k \odot \mathbf{B}_3^k \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 1. The objective function values with respect to iterations (left) and CPU time (right) for solving problem (59).




FIGURE 2. The relative error (Relerr) and factor match score (FMS) with respect to iterations for solving problem (59).

Moreover, the extrapolation parameter for accelerated-ASAP is given by $\alpha_i^k = \beta_j^k = 1 - (t_{k-1} - 1)/t_k$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $j = 1, 2, 3$, where $t_k := (1 + \sqrt{1 + 4t_{k-1}^2})/2$ with $t_{-1} = t_0 = 1$. Particularly, let $f(\mathbf{x}) := \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}\|_1 = \sum_{l=1}^n |x_l - b_l|$ and the closed-form proximity of f involving the \mathbf{A}_3 - or \mathbf{B}_1 - subproblem is

$$\text{prox}_{t,f}(\mathbf{x}) = (\text{soft}_{[-t,t]}(\mathbf{x}_l))_{1 \leq l \leq n}, \quad \text{with} \quad \text{soft}_{[-t,t]}(x_l) = \begin{cases} x_l + t, & x_l < b_l - t; \\ b_l, & b_l - t \leq x_l \leq b_l + t; \\ x_l - t, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Figure 1 displays some evolutions of objective function values in (59) with respect to iterations and computing time in seconds. Those evolutions illustrate that Algorithm 1 renders fast decays of objective function values (always with little perceptual modifications after 10

iterations), which demonstrate that Algorithm 1 outperforms accelerated-ASAP and ASAP to reach stable evolutions. To quantify the numerical performances of test methods, we adopt the measurements relative error (“Relerr”) and factor match score (“FMS”) as in [35, 40]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Relerr} &:= \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\mathbf{Y} - \llbracket \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{A}_3 \rrbracket\|_F^2 / \|\mathbf{Y}\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{Y}' - \llbracket \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2, \mathbf{B}_3 \rrbracket\|_F^2 / \|\mathbf{Y}'\|_F^2 \right), \\ \text{FMS} &:= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{5} \sum_{r=1}^5 \prod_{i=1}^3 \frac{\langle \mathbf{A}_i(:, r), \mathbf{A}_i^{\text{true}}(:, r) \rangle}{\|\mathbf{A}_i(:, r)\| \|\mathbf{A}_i^{\text{true}}(:, r)\|} + \frac{1}{5} \sum_{r=1}^5 \prod_{i=1}^3 \frac{\langle \mathbf{B}_i(:, r), \mathbf{B}_i^{\text{true}}(:, r) \rangle}{\|\mathbf{B}_i(:, r)\| \|\mathbf{B}_i^{\text{true}}(:, r)\|} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Higher FMS value and lower Relerr value indicate a more preferred reconstruction performance. Figure 2 displays the evolutions of Relerr and FMS with respect to iterations. Visually, the Gauss-Seidel algorithmic framework of eASAP facilitates more accurate numerical solution at the initial stage of iterations and our eASAP also outperforms the other two algorithms in solution quality.

5.2. Real image data. For the numerical experiments on real data, we focus on the hyperspectral super-resolution problem. Concretely, it refers to fusing a hyperspectral image (HSI) and multispectral image (MSI) to produce a super-resolution image (SRI) with good spatial and spectral resolutions. This task is illustrated in Figure 3. Based on coupled tensor CP




FIGURE 3. Illustration of the hyperspectral super-resolution task [19].

decomposition, Charilaos et al. [19] developed a model for hyperspectral super-resolution as follows

$$(60) \quad \min_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}} \left\| \mathbf{Y}_h - \llbracket \mathbf{P}_1 \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{P}_2 \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C} \rrbracket \right\|_F^2 + \lambda \left\| \mathbf{Y}_m - \llbracket \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{P}_m \mathbf{C} \rrbracket \right\|_F^2,$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_h \in \mathbb{R}^{I_h \times J_h \times K}$ and $\mathbf{Y}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times J \times K_m}$ are the given HSI and MSI, respectively. \mathbf{P}_1 , \mathbf{P}_2 , \mathbf{P}_m are the known degradation operators. The fusion SRI is obtained by $\mathbf{Y}_s = \llbracket \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C} \rrbracket$. In [19], the alternating minimization method is adopted to solve (60). However, there is no guaranteed convergence for this method and it is heavily dependent on the initial point. Hence,

we modify (60) to a joint Gauss coupling model for hyperspectral super-resolution problem. More concretely, the modified model is

$$(61) \quad \min_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}} \left\| \mathcal{Y}_h - \llbracket \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{A}_3 \rrbracket \right\|_F^2 + \lambda \left\| \mathcal{Y}_m - \llbracket \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2, \mathbf{B}_3 \rrbracket \right\|_F^2 + \mu \left\| [\mathbf{A}; \mathbf{B}] \right\|_Q^2,$$

where

$$\mathbf{Q} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\mathbf{P}^\top & -\mathbf{P}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \\ -\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\mathbf{P}^\top & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{P} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P}_1 & & \\ & \mathbf{P}_2 & \\ & & \mathbf{P}_m \end{pmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 := \sigma_1\mathbf{I}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 := \sigma_2\mathbf{I}.$$

As a comprehensive description, we expand the last term in (61) by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \left\| [\mathbf{A}; \mathbf{B}] \right\|_Q^2 &= \sigma_1 \left\| \mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{B}_1 \right\|_F^2 + \sigma_1 \left\| \mathbf{A}_2 - \mathbf{P}_2\mathbf{B}_2 \right\|_F^2 + \sigma_1 \left\| \mathbf{A}_3 - \mathbf{P}_m\mathbf{B}_3 \right\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + \sigma_2 \left\| \mathbf{B}_1 \right\|_F^2 + \sigma_2 \left\| \mathbf{B}_2 \right\|_F^2 + \sigma_2 \left\| \mathbf{B}_3 \right\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{I_h \times R}$, $\mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{J_h \times R}$ and $\mathbf{A}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times R}$; and $\mathbf{B}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times R}$, $\mathbf{B}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{J \times R}$ and $\mathbf{B}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{K_m \times R}$. Obviously, it falls into the abstract model (1) with

$$F(\mathbf{A}) := \left\| \mathcal{Y}_h - \llbracket \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{A}_3 \rrbracket \right\|_F^2, \quad G(\mathbf{B}) := \lambda \left\| \mathcal{Y}_m - \llbracket \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2, \mathbf{B}_3 \rrbracket \right\|_F^2, \quad H(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}) := \mu \left\| [\mathbf{A}; \mathbf{B}] \right\|_Q^2,$$

where $\mathbf{A} := [\mathbf{A}_1; \mathbf{A}_2; \mathbf{A}_3]$, $\mathbf{B} := [\mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2, \mathbf{B}_3]$.




FIGURE 4. Testing hyperspectral images. (a) $80 \times 80 \times 204$ subscene of Salinas datasets. (b) $144 \times 144 \times 220$ subscene of Indian Pines dataset. (c) $300 \times 300 \times 102$ subscene of Pavia Centre dataset.

The testing hyperspectral images² are shown in Figure 4. We follow the convention in [19] that these hyperspectral images act as target SRIs. Hence, the recovery performance can be measured. The degradations from SRI to HSI and MSI are as follows: (i) SRI is first blurred by a 9×9 Gaussian kernel and then downsampled every 4 pixels along each spatial dimension, then degradation matrices \mathbf{P}_1 , \mathbf{P}_2 and HSI are obtained; (ii) According to spectral

²https://www.ehu.es/ccwintco/index.php/Hyperspectral_Remote_Sensing_Scenes

degradation sensors LANDSAT³ and QuickBird⁴, we can form the spectral degradation matrix \mathbf{P}_m and MSI; (iii) Zero-mean white Gauss noise is added to HSI and MSI with SNR being 20 dB and 30 dB, respectively.

To evaluate the quality of recovered SRIs, we adopt several metrics: reconstruction signal-to-noise (R-SNR), structural similarity (SSIM), cross correlation (CC), root mean square error (RMSE), spectral angle mapper (SAM). The interested reader can refer to, e.g., [12, 19, 39], for definitions. Additionally, higher R-SNR, SSIM, CC, and lower RMSE, SAM indicate better reconstruction performance.

We now compare the numerical performance of Algorithm 1 with FUSE [39] and STEREO [19] on solving (61). Note that STEREO is used to solve minimization (60), and FUSE contributes to solving the Sylvester equation. The step sizes in Algorithm 1 are taken as

$$\tau_i^k = \text{trace}(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{A}_i^k}) \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_j^k = \text{trace}(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{B}_j^k}) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, 3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{A}_1^k} &:= \mathbf{A}_3^k \odot \mathbf{A}_2^k, & \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{A}_2^k} &:= \mathbf{A}_3^k \odot \mathbf{A}_1^{k+1}, & \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{A}_3^k} &:= \mathbf{A}_2^{k+1} \odot \mathbf{A}_1^{k+1}, \\ \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{B}_1^k} &:= \mathbf{B}_3^k \odot \mathbf{B}_2^k, & \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{B}_2^k} &:= \mathbf{B}_3^k \odot \mathbf{B}_1^{k+1}, & \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{B}_3^k} &:= \mathbf{B}_2^{k+1} \odot \mathbf{B}_1^{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

The initial point $(\mathbf{A}^0, \mathbf{B}^0)$ is chosen by the initialization technique of STEREO (see e.g., [19] for more details). The model parameters $\lambda, \sigma_1, \sigma_2$ and rank_{cp} for (61); λ , and rank_{cp} for (60); the number of endmembers (model rank) F for FUSE; and all data scales are listed in Table 2.

Figure 5 exhibits the 32-th band of the estimated SRIs, corresponding residual images $\mathcal{Y}_s - \hat{\mathcal{Y}}_s$, and SAM maps on Salines data. Those figures illustrate that Algorithm 1 has small residues across all pixels, while other algorithm's residuals maps are less smooth. Meanwhile, the SAM map of our algorithm is relative closer to the ideal one, which is displayed in the last column. The results on Indian Pines data and Pavia Centra data are displayed in Figures 6 and 7, respectively. More details for numerical comparisons under the five aforementioned metrics can be seen in Table 3. Therein, numbers in bold indicate the best performance. In conclusion, our proposed Algorithm 1 outperforms the baseline FUSE entirely and performs better than STEREO.

³<https://landsat.gsfc.nasa.gov>

⁴<https://www.satimagingcorp.com/satellite-sensors/quickbird/>

TABLE 2. Data scale and model settings for solving problem (61).

	Data Scale				Ours			STEREO		FUSE
	\mathcal{Y}_h	\mathcal{Y}_m	$\mathbf{P}_1/\mathbf{P}_2$	\mathbf{P}_m	λ	(σ_1, σ_2)	rank_{cp}	λ	rank_{cp}	F
Salines	$20 \times 20 \times 204$	$80 \times 80 \times 6$	20×80	6×204	0.1	(1, 1)	30	1	30	6
Indian Pines	$36 \times 36 \times 220$	$144 \times 144 \times 6$	36×144	6×220	10	(10, 100)	80	1	80	16
Pavia Centre	$75 \times 75 \times 102$	$300 \times 300 \times 4$	75×300	4×102	10	(1, 1)	300	1	300	9

TABLE 3. Performance of all test algorithms on three real image data for solving problem (61).

Method (Ideal)	Salines			Indian Pines			Pavia Centre		
	FUSE	STEREO	Ours	FUSE	STEREO	Ours	FUSE	STEREO	Ours
R-SNR (∞)	23.658	24.536	25.606	21.777	23.564	24.485	21.455	21.877	22.450
SSIM (1)	0.8937	0.9132	0.9359	0.2789	0.3361	0.3777	0.8304	0.8329	0.8481
CC (1)	0.8008	0.8075	0.8308	0.5872	0.6172	0.6448	0.9835	0.9850	0.9981
RMSE (0)	0.0131	0.0119	0.0105	0.0241	0.0196	0.0136	0.0131	0.0124	0.0907
SAM (0)	0.0619	0.0557	0.0492	0.0749	0.0636	0.0511	0.1228	0.1197	0.0977

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we developed an extended ASAP (eASAP) for solving nonconvex nonsmooth optimization problem with the multiblock nonseparable structure. Under some mild assumptions, we analyzed the convergence (rate) of eASAP. Concretely, by the blockwise restricted prox-regularity of H in Assumption 4.1, we proved that any limit point of the sequence generated by eASAP is a critical point of (1). Furthermore, we established the global convergence when the objective fulfills Assumption 4.2 and the KL property. Finally, we built upon the sublinear convergence rate based on the error function. Our novel convergence analysis covers a variety of nonconvex nonsmooth nonseparable coupling functions, which further extends the range of the model. Besides, as a peculiarity, eASAP can be reduced to ASAP when $s = t = 1$. Numerical simulations on multimodal data fusion demonstrate the compelling performance of the proposed method.




FIGURE 5. Results of Salinas reconstructions by solving (61). The first row: the 32-th band of recovered SRIs. The second row: the 32-th band of corresponding residual images. The last row: the SAM maps.




FIGURE 6. Results of Indian Pines reconstructions by solving (61). The first row: the 125-th band of recovered SRIs. The second row: the 125-th band of corresponding residual images. The last row: the SAM maps.




FIGURE 7. Results of Pavia Centre reconstructions by solving (61). The first row: the 100-th band of recovered SRIs. The second row: the 100-th band of corresponding residual images. The last row: the SAM maps.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Attouch, J. Bolte, P. Redont, and A. Soubeyran. Proximal alternating minimization and projection methods for nonconvex problems: An approach based on the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz inequality. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 35(2):438–457, 2010.
- [2] A. Auslender. Asymptotic properties of the Fenchel dual functional and applications to decomposition problems. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 73:427–449, 1992.
- [3] A. Beck, S. Sabach, and M. Teboulle. An alternating semiproximal method for nonconvex regularized structured total least squares problems. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 37(3):1129–1150, 2016.
- [4] D. Bertsekas and J. Tsitsiklis. *Parallel and distributed computation: Numerical methods*. Athena Scientific, Nashua, NH, 2003.
- [5] D. P. Bertsekas. *Nonlinear programming*. Athena Scientific, Belmont, MA, 1995.
- [6] J. Bolte, A. Daniilidis, O. Ley, and L. Mazet. Characterizations of Lojasiewicz inequalities: Subgradient flows, talweg, convexity. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 362(6):3319–3363, 2010.
- [7] J. Bolte, S. Sabach, and M. Teboulle. Proximal alternating linearized minimization for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems. *Math. Program.*, 146(1-2):459–494, 2014.
- [8] R. I. Boş, E. R. Csetnek, and D.-K. Nguyen. A proximal minimization algorithm for structured nonconvex and nonsmooth problems. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 29(2):1300–1328, 2019.
- [9] R. I. Boş and D.-K. Nguyen. The proximal alternating direction method of multipliers in the nonconvex setting: Convergence analysis and rates. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 45(2):682–712, 2020.
- [10] C. Chatzichristos, E. Kofidis, W. Van Paesschen, L. De Lathauwer, S. Theodoridis, and S. Van Huffel. Early soft and flexible fusion of electroencephalography and functional magnetic resonance imaging via double coupled matrix tensor factorization for multisubject group analysis. *Hum Brain Mapp.*, 43(4):1231–1255, 2022.
- [11] J. Chung and J. G. Nagy. An efficient iterative approach for large-scale separable nonlinear inverse problems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 31(6):4654–4674, 2010.

- [12] M. Ding, X. Fu, T.-Z. Huang, J. Wang, and X.-L. Zhao. Hyperspectral super-resolution via interpretable block-term tensor modeling. *IEEE J. Sel. Top Signal Process.*, 15(3):641–656, 2020.
- [13] D. Driggs, J. Tang, J. Liang, M. Davies, and C.-B. Schonlieb. A stochastic proximal alternating minimization for nonsmooth and nonconvex optimization. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 14(4):1932–1970, 2021.
- [14] R. C. Farias, J. E. Cohen, and P. Comon. Exploring multimodal data fusion through joint decompositions with flexible couplings. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 64(18):4830–4844, 2016.
- [15] X. Gao, X. Cai, X. Wang, and D. Han. An alternating structure-adapted bregman proximal gradient descent algorithm for constrained nonconvex nonsmooth optimization problems and its inertial variant. *J. Global Optim.*, pages 1–24, 2023.
- [16] Y. Hu and X. Liu. The convergence properties of infeasible inexact proximal alternating linearized minimization. *Sci. China Math.*, pages 1–26, 2023.
- [17] Z. Jia, W. Zhang, X. Cai, and D. Han. Stochastic alternating structure-adapted proximal gradient descent method with variance reduction for nonconvex nonsmooth optimization. *Math. Comp.*, 93(348):1677–1714, 2024.
- [18] A. Jourani, L. Thibault, and D. Zagrodny. $C^{1,\omega}$ -regularity and Lipschitz-like properties of subdifferential. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 105(1):189–223, 2012.
- [19] C. I. Kanatsoulis, X. Fu, N. D. Sidiropoulos, and W.-K. Ma. Hyperspectral super-resolution: A coupled tensor factorization approach. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 66(24):6503–6517, 2018.
- [20] T. G. Kolda and B. W. Bader. Tensor decompositions and applications. *SIAM Rev.*, 51(3):455–500, 2009.
- [21] A. Levy and R. Poliquin. Characterizing the single-valuedness of multifunctions. *Set-Valued Var. Anal.*, 5: 351–364, 1997.
- [22] A. B. Levy, R. A. Poliquin, and R. T. Rockafellar. Stability of locally optimal solutions. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 10(2):580–604, 2000.
- [23] G. Li and T. K. Pong. Global convergence of splitting methods for nonconvex composite optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 25(4):2434–2460, 2015.
- [24] G. Li and T. K. Pong. Calculus of the exponent of Kurdyka–Lojasiewicz inequality and its applications to linear convergence of first-order methods. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 18(5):1199–1232, 2018.
- [25] H. Li and Z. Lin. Accelerated proximal gradient methods for nonconvex programming. *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, 28, 2015.
- [26] S. Li, R. Dian, L. Fang, and J. M. Bioucas-Dias. Fusing hyperspectral and multispectral images via coupled sparse tensor factorization. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 27(8):4118–4130, 2018.
- [27] B. S. Mordukhovich and N. M. Nam. Subgradient of distance functions with applications to Lipschitzian stability. *Math. Program.*, 104(2):635–668, 2005.
- [28] J. Nie, Z. Yang, and X. Zhang. A complete semidefinite algorithm for detecting copositive matrices and tensors. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 28(4):2902–2921, 2018.
- [29] M. Nikolova and P. Tan. Alternating structure-adapted proximal gradient descent for nonconvex nonsmooth block-regularized problems. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 29(3):2053–2078, 2019.
- [30] F. Pierre, J.-F. Aujol, A. Bugeau, N. Papadakis, and V.-T. Ta. Luminance-chrominance model for image colorization. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 8(1):536–563, 2015.
- [31] T. Pock and S. Sabach. Inertial proximal alternating linearized minimization (iPALM) for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 9(4):1756–1787, 2016.
- [32] L. Qi, Y. Chen, M. Bakshi, and X. Zhang. Triple decomposition and tensor recovery of third order tensors. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 42(1):299–329, 2021.
- [33] M. Roald, C. Schenker, V. D. Calhoun, T. Adali, R. Bro, J. E. Cohen, and E. Acar. An AO-ADMM approach to constraining PARAFAC2 on all modes. *SIAM J. Math. Data Sci.*, 4(3):1191–1222, 2022.
- [34] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J. Wets. *Variational Analysis*. Springer, Berlin, 1998.
- [35] C. Schenker, J. E. Cohen, and E. Acar. A flexible optimization framework for regularized matrix-tensor factorizations with linear couplings. *IEEE J. Sel. Top Signal Process.*, 15(3):506–521, 2020.
- [36] P. Tan, F. Pierre, and M. Nikolova. Inertial alternating generalized forward–backward splitting for image colorization. *J. Math. Imaging Vision*, 61:672–690, 2019.
- [37] N. Vervliet, O. Debals, and L. De Lathauwer. Exploiting efficient representations in large-scale tensor decompositions. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 41(2):A789–A815, 2019.

- [38] Y. Wang, W. Yin, and J. Zeng. Global convergence of ADMM in nonconvex nonsmooth optimization. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 78:29–63, 2019.
- [39] Q. Wei, N. Dobigeon, and J.-Y. Tournet. Fast fusion of multi-band images based on solving a Sylvester equation. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 24(11):4109–4121, 2015.
- [40] Y. Xu and W. Yin. A block coordinate descent method for regularized multiconvex optimization with applications to nonnegative tensor factorization and completion. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 6(3):1758–1789, 2013.
- [41] L. Yang, T. K. Pong, and X. Chen. Alternating direction method of multipliers for a class of nonconvex and nonsmooth problems with applications to background/foreground extraction. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 10(1):74–110, 2017.
- [42] X. Yang and L. Xu. Some accelerated alternating proximal gradient algorithms for a class of nonconvex nonsmooth problems. *J. Global Optim.*, pages 1–26, 2022.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIHANG UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100191, CHINA.

Email address: `yinggao@buaa.edu.cn`

LMIB OF THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIHANG UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100191, CHINA.

Email address: `chunfengcui@buaa.edu.cn`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF ELECTRONIC SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OF CHINA, CHENGDU 611731, CHINA.

Email address: `zhangwx@uestc.edu.cn`

LMIB OF THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIHANG UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100191, CHINA.

Email address: `handr@buaa.edu.cn`