

Convergence of Descent Methods under Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz Properties

G. C. Bento^{*} B. S. Mordukhovich[†] T. S. Mota[‡] Yu. Nesterov[§]

July 2, 2024

Abstract

This paper develops the novel convergence analysis of a generic class of descent methods in nonsmooth and nonconvex optimization under several versions of the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property. Along other results, we prove the finite termination of generic algorithms under the KL property with lower exponents. Specifications are given to convergence rates of some particular algorithms including inexact reduced gradient methods and the boosted algorithm in DC programming. It revealed, e.g., that the lower exponent KL property in the DC framework is incompatible with the gradient Lipschitz continuity for the plus function around a local minimizer. On the other hand, we show that the above inconsistency observation may fail if the Lipschitz continuity is replaced by merely the gradient continuity.

Keywords: nonsmooth optimization, descent methods, convergence, Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz properties

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020) 65K05, 65K10, 90C26, 47N10

1 Introduction and Basic Definitions

It has been well recognized in optimization theory and applications that several versions of the fundamental Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property play an important role in the study of convergence and convergence rates of various numerical algorithms. In this paper, we consider the following versions, where $\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$:

Definition 1 (KL properties). Let $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be an extended-real-valued lower semicontinuous (l.s.c.) function with the domain $\text{dom } \phi := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \phi(x) < \infty\}$. We say that the function ϕ satisfies:

(i) The *basic Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property* at $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } \phi$ if there exist a number $\eta \in (0, \infty)$, a neighborhood U of \bar{x} , and a concave continuous function $\varphi : [0, \eta] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, called the *desingularizing function*, such that

$$\varphi(0) = 0, \quad \varphi \in C^1(0, \eta), \quad \varphi'(s) > 0 \text{ for all } s \in (0, \eta), \text{ and} \quad (1)$$

$$\varphi'(\phi(x) - \phi(\bar{x})) \text{dist}(0, \partial\phi(x)) \geq 1 \text{ for all } x \in U \cap [\phi(\bar{x}) < \phi(x) < \phi(\bar{x}) + \eta], \quad (2)$$

where $\partial\phi(\bar{x})$ stands for the *Mordukhovich/limiting subdifferential* of the function ϕ at $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } \phi$ defined by

$$\partial\phi(\bar{x}) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists x_k \rightarrow \bar{x}, v_k \rightarrow v \text{ with } \phi(x_k) \rightarrow \phi(\bar{x}), \limsup_{u \rightarrow x_k} \frac{\phi(u) - \phi(x_k) - \langle v_k, u - x_k \rangle}{\|u - x_k\|} \geq 0, k \in \mathbb{N} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

(ii) The *symmetric KL property* at \bar{x} if ϕ is continuous around \bar{x} and $\partial\phi$ is replaced in (2) by the *symmetric subdifferential* of ϕ at \bar{x} defined by

$$\partial^0\phi(\bar{x}) := \partial\phi(\bar{x}) \cup (-\partial(-\phi)(\bar{x})). \quad (4)$$

(iii) The *strong KL property* if ϕ is Lipschitz continuous around \bar{x} and ∂ is replaced in (2) by the *Clarke/convexified subdifferential* of ϕ at \bar{x} given by

$$\overline{\partial}\phi(\bar{x}) := \text{co } \partial\phi(\bar{x}), \quad (5)$$

where “co” stands for the convex hull of the set in question.

(iv) The *exponent versions of the KL properties* in (i)–(iii) if the desingularizing function in (1) and (2) is selected in the form $\varphi(t) = Mt^{1-q}$, where M is a positive constant, and where $q \in [0, 1)$. We refer to the case where $q \in (0, 1/2)$ as the *KL property with lower exponents*.

^{*}Federal University of Goiás, Goiania, Goias, BR (gloydston@ufg.br)

[†]Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202, USA (boris@math.wayne.edu)

[‡]Federal University of Goiás, Goiania, Goias, BR (tiago.mota@discente.ufg.br)

[§]Catholic University of Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, BE (yurii.nesterov@uclouvain.be)

To the best of our knowledge, the KL property was originated independently by Lojasiewicz [13] in the form

$$\|\nabla\phi(x)\| \geq b|\phi(x) - \phi(\bar{x})|^q, \quad b := 1/M(1 - q),$$

in the general theory of real analytic functions, and by Polyak [18] when $q = 1/2$ for functions of class $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ (i.e., \mathcal{C}^1 functions with Lipschitzian gradients) who used it to prove linear convergence of the gradient descent method. This property is known in optimization as the *Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality*; see, e.g., [9] with more references. For the more general versions presented in Definition 1 in smooth and nonsmooth settings, we refer the reader to [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10] and the bibliographies therein. More details on the subgradient constructions used in the KL formulations could be found in [14, 15, 19].

In [6], Attouch, Bolté and Svaiter consider minimizing of a general class of l.s.c. functions $\phi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ by using a *generic* class of *descent methods* satisfying the following conditions:

(H1) *Sufficient decrease condition*: for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\phi(x^{k+1}) + a\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \leq \phi(x^k), \quad (6)$$

(H2) *Relative error condition*: for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\text{there is } w^{k+1} \in \partial\phi(x^{k+1}) \text{ with } \|w^{k+1}\| \leq b\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|, \quad (7)$$

with $a, b > 0$. It is shown in [6] that a great variety of important algorithms of optimization satisfy conditions (H1) and (H2). Employing the basic KL property from Definition 1(i), a generic convergence analysis, with arriving at the *limiting/(M)ordukhovich-stationary point* as $0 \in \partial\phi(\bar{x})$, is developed in [6] for the general class of descent algorithms satisfying the conditions in (H1) and (H2) while without establishing any convergence rate.

However, there exist remarkable descent methods for which the relative error condition (7) may not satisfy. For example, this has been observed by Aragón-Artacho and Vuong [4] for the *Boosted DCA* (BDCA) proposed in [2] in the case of DC (difference of convex) programs. As shown in [4], the convergence analysis of [6] can be given for BDCA with the DC decomposition $\phi = g - h$ *provided that* the relative error condition (7) is replaced by the following one that is expressed in terms via the convexified subdifferential (5): for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\text{there is } w^k \in \overline{\partial}\phi(x^k) \text{ with } \|w^k\| \leq b\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|. \quad (8)$$

To furnish this, it is assumed in [4] that the functions g and h in the DC decomposition of ϕ are strongly convex with g being of class $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$, and that the basic KL property in (2) is replaced by its strong version from Definition 1(iii). Moreover, [4] establishes convergence rates for BDCA under the exponent version of the KL property in Definition 1(iv) whenever $q \in [0, 1)$.

The current paper achieves more. First we conduct a comprehensive convergence analysis, with the convergence to a critical point $0 \in \partial\phi(\bar{x})$, under the fulfillment of (H1) and replacing (H2) by the new

(H3) *Modified error condition*: for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\text{there is } w^k \in \partial\phi(x^k) \text{ with } \|w^k\| \leq b\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \quad (9)$$

expressed in terms of the limiting subdifferential (3). This answers in the affirmative the question posted in [4] with even the improvement of the stronger condition (8) by (9) for the general class of l.s.c. functions. Furthermore, in contrast to [6], we establish *convergence rates* for the new generic algorithms satisfying the conditions in (H1) and (H3) under the exponent KL property with $\varphi(t) = t^{1-q}$, $q \in [0, 1)$, while obtaining the surprising result about the *finite termination* of the generic algorithm when $q \in [0, 1/2)$. Such a result was obtained before only for $q = 0$ for [5] for the proximal algorithm under some additional assumptions. Another surprise has been revealed for the case of difference programs to minimize $\phi = g - h$, where $h: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is convex while g is of class $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ without any convexity assumption. It is shown in this case that there exist *no functions* of the type $\varphi(t) = t^{1-q}$ with $q \in (0, 1/2)$ for which the KL property holds at *local minimizers* of ϕ .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we first show that the iteration sequence $\{x^k\}$, generated by any generic algorithm satisfying the conditions in (H1) and (H3), converge to an M -stationary point under the basic KL property from Definition 1(i). Furthermore, convergence rates are established for the generic algorithm under the exponent KL property from Definition 1(iv) whenever $q \in [0, 1)$. The finite termination conclusion we obtain in the case of lower exponents $q \in (0, 1/2)$ significantly improves the linear convergence rate derived in [5] for the proximal algorithm, while no convergence rate is established in the abstract scheme of [6].

Section 3 contains some specifications of applications to particular algorithms that lie within the generic class of algorithms satisfying the conditions in $(\mathcal{H}1)$ and $(\mathcal{H}3)$. These specific algorithms include a nonsmooth version of the inexact reduced gradient method recently proposed in [10], the aforementioned BDCA, and the algorithm of multiobjective optimization developed in [8]. It will be demonstrated that the obtained results for the generic descent method lead us to some improvements and extensions of the previously known ones.

Section 4 addresses the fulfillment of the exponent KL property with lower exponents $q \in (0, 1/2)$ in the case of minimizing functions that admit the difference decomposition $\phi = g - h$. It comes as a surprise that the $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ structure of g and the convexity of h is *inconsistent* with the lower exponent KL property of ϕ at local minimizers. Section 5 summarizes the main achievements of the paper and discusses some directions of the future research.

2 Convergence Analysis of Generic Algorithms

Our main attention here is paid to the broad class of descent methods satisfying the generic conditions $(\mathcal{H}1)$ and $(\mathcal{H}3)$. Similarly to [6] in the case where $(\mathcal{H}3)$ is replaced by $(\mathcal{H}2)$, we add to our convergence analysis under $(\mathcal{H}1)$ and $(\mathcal{H}2)$ the following technical assumption:

$(\mathcal{H}4)$ *Continuity condition*: There exists a subsequence $\{x^{k_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a point \bar{x} such that

$$x^{k_j} \rightarrow \bar{x} \text{ and } \phi(x^{k_j}) \rightarrow \phi(\bar{x}) \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Here is our first convergence theorem obtained under the basic KL property from Definition 1(i).

Theorem 1 (generic convergence under the basic KL property). *Let $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a proper l.s.c. function bounded from below, and let the sequence $\{x^k\}$ be constructed by a generic algorithm satisfying $(\mathcal{H}1)$, $(\mathcal{H}3)$, and $(\mathcal{H}4)$. If the basic KL property holds at some accumulation point \bar{x} of $\{x^k\}$, then we have that*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|x^k - x^{k+1}\| < \infty, \quad (10)$$

and that $\{x^k\}$ converges to \bar{x} as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, \bar{x} is an M -stationary point of ϕ .

Proof. Since $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an accumulation point of $\{x^k\}$, we find a subsequence $\{x^{k_j}\}$ of $\{x^k\}$ converging to \bar{x} as $j \rightarrow \infty$. By the boundedness from below of ϕ and the decreasing of $\{\phi(x^k)\}$, the continuity condition $(\mathcal{H}4)$ tells us that $\{\phi(x^k)\}$ converges to $\phi(\bar{x})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ with $\phi(\bar{x}) < \phi(x^k)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, we have

$$\phi(\bar{x}) < \phi(x^k) < \phi(\bar{x}) + \eta \text{ for large } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and small } \eta > 0.$$

Taking the latter into account, define the sequence $\{b_k\}$ by

$$b_k := \|x^k - \bar{x}\| + (a^{-1}(\phi(x^k) - \phi(\bar{x})))^{\frac{1}{2}} + ba^{-1}\varphi(\phi(x^k) - \phi(\bar{x}))$$

and deduce from the continuity of φ that the origin $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an accumulation point of $\{b_k\}$. Therefore, there exists $k_0 := k_{j_0}$ such that the inequalities

$$\|x^{k_0} - \bar{x}\| + a^{-1}(\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x}))^{\frac{1}{2}} + ba^{-1}\varphi(\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x})) < \epsilon, \quad (11)$$

$$\phi(\bar{x}) < \phi(x^{k_0}) < \phi(\bar{x}) + \eta \quad (12)$$

are satisfied and imply in turn the inclusions

$$x^{k_0} \in B(\bar{x}, \epsilon) \cap [\phi(\bar{x}) < \phi < \phi(\bar{x}) + \eta] \subset U \cap [\phi(\bar{x}) < \phi < \phi(\bar{x}) + \eta].$$

Moreover, conditions (6) and (12) ensure that

$$0 \leq \phi(x^{k_0+1}) - \phi(\bar{x}) \leq \phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x}) < \eta, \quad (13)$$

and thus the numbers $\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x})$ and $\phi(x^{k_0+1}) - \phi(\bar{x})$ are in the domain of φ . This tells us that

$$\varphi(\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x})) - \varphi(\phi(x^{k_0+1}) - \phi(\bar{x})) \geq \varphi'(\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x}))(\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(x^{k_0+1}))$$

by the concavity of φ . Combining (6) and (9) with $k := k_0$, we have

$$\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(x^{k_0+1}) \geq ba^{-1}\|x^{k_0+1} - x^{k_0}\| \cdot \|w^{k_0}\|.$$

The last two inequalities above lead us to

$$\varphi(\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x})) - \varphi(\phi(x^{k_0+1}) - \phi(\bar{x})) \geq ba^{-1}\varphi'(\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x})) \|w^{k_0}\| \cdot \|x^{k_0} - x^{k_0+1}\| \text{ with } w^{k_0} \in \partial f(x^{k_0}) \quad (14)$$

and so the basic KL property of f at \bar{x} yields $0 \notin \partial f(x^{k_0})$, which ensures together with (2) that

$$\varphi'(\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x})) \|w^{k_0}\| \geq \varphi'(\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x})) \text{dist}(0, \partial\phi(x^{k_0})) \geq 1.$$

Combining the latter with (14) justifies the estimates

$$ba^{-1}(\varphi(\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x})) - \varphi(\phi(x^{k_0+1}) - \phi(\bar{x}))) \geq \|x^{k_0} - x^{k_0+1}\|. \quad (15)$$

Our next step is to verify the inclusion

$$x^k \in B(\bar{x}, \epsilon) \text{ for all } k \geq k_0. \quad (16)$$

To proceed by induction, observe that we have already proved that (16) holds for $k = k_0$ and now aim at showing that $x^{k_0+1} \in B(\bar{x}, \epsilon)$. It follows from (6) and (13) that

$$\|x^{k_0} - x^{k_0+1}\| \leq (a^{-1}\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(x^{k_0+1}))^{\frac{1}{2}} < (a^{-1}\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x}))^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (17)$$

The last estimate along with the triangle inequality gives us

$$\|\bar{x} - x^{k_0+1}\| \leq \|\bar{x} - x^{k_0}\| + \|x^{k_0} - x^{k_0+1}\| \leq \|\bar{x} - x^{k_0}\| + (a^{-1}\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x}))^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Combining this with (11) implies that $x^{k_0+1} \in B(\bar{x}, \epsilon)$. Take $j > 1$ and assume that (16) holds for all $k = k_0 + 1, \dots, k_0 + j - 1$. In this case, (15) holds for $k = k_0 + 1, \dots, k_0 + j - 1$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \|x^{i+k_0} - x^{i+k_0+1}\| \leq ba^{-1}(\varphi(\phi(x^{k_0+1}) - \phi(\bar{x})) - \varphi(\phi(x^{k_0+j}) - \phi(\bar{x}))).$$

Using the triangle inequality again tells us that

$$\|\bar{x} - x^{k_0+j}\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \|x^{i+k_0} - x^{i+k_0+1}\| + \|x^{k_0} - x^{k_0+1}\| + \|\bar{x} - x^{k_0}\|.$$

Now we combine the last two inequalities with (17) and get the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{x} - x^{k_0+j}\| &\leq ba^{-1}\varphi(\phi(x^{k_0+1}) - \phi(\bar{x})) + (a^{-1}(\phi(x^{k_0+1}) - \phi(\bar{x})))^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|\bar{x} - x^{k_0}\|, \\ &\leq b^{-1}a\varphi(\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x})) + (a^{-1}(\phi(x^{k_0+1}) - \phi(\bar{x})))^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|\bar{x} - x^{k_0}\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the second one follows from (13) and the fact that φ is increasing. The latter inequality along with (11) ensures that $x^{k_0+j} \in B(\bar{x}, \epsilon)$, which verifies (16) and shows that (15) holds for all $k \geq k_0$. Thus we arrive at

$$\sum_{k=k_0}^N \|x^k - x^{k+1}\| \leq ba^{-1}\varphi(\phi(x^{k_0}) - \phi(\bar{x})) \text{ whenever } k > k_0,$$

which clearly yields (10). This tells us that $\{x^k\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and hence converges to \bar{x} since it is an accumulation point of $\{x^k\}$. It follows from (9) and (10) that the sequence $\{w^k\}$ converges to zero. By definition (3) of the limiting subdifferential $\partial\phi$ and the convergence $\phi(x^k) \rightarrow \phi(\bar{x})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ shown above, we get that $0 \in \partial\phi(\bar{x})$, i.e., \bar{x} is an M -stationary point of ϕ , and the proof is complete. \square

The following remark reveals convergence properties of generic descent methods under the strong KL property.

Remark 1 (generic convergence under the strong KL property). Note first of all that Theorem 1 resolves in the affirmative the question posed in [4, Remark 4.5] about the possibility to provide a counterpart of the convergence analysis in [6] under the modified error bound condition (9). Moreover, the reader can see from the proof of Theorem 1 that our analysis also works with replacement (9) by (8) under the *strong KL* from Definition 1, while in this case we arrive at the less informative $C(\text{larke})$ -stationary point $0 \in \bar{\partial}\phi(\bar{x})$.

The next theorem establishes convergence rates for the class of generic algorithms of our study.

Theorem 2 (convergence rates under the exponent KL property). *In the setting of Theorem 1, assume that the exponent KL property of ϕ holds at \bar{x} with $\varphi(t) = Mt^{1-q}$ for some $M > 0$ and $q \in [0, 1)$. The following convergence rates are guaranteed for the generic iterative sequences:*

- (i) *If $q \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, then $\{x^k\}$ and $\{\phi(x^k)\}$ converge in a finite number of steps to \bar{x} and $\bar{\phi}$, respectively;*
- (ii) *If $q = \frac{1}{2}$, then the sequences $\{x^k\}$ and $\{\phi(x^k)\}$ converge linearly to \bar{x} and $\phi(\bar{x})$, respectively;*
- (iii) *If $q \in (1/2, 1)$, then there exists a positive constant σ such that*

$$\|x^k - \bar{x}\| \leq \sigma k^{-\frac{1-q}{2q-1}} \quad \text{for all large } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. It is shown in the proof of Theorem 1 that $\phi(x^k) \rightarrow \phi(\bar{x})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Defining $g(x) := \phi(x) - \phi(\bar{x})$, we see that the sequence $\{g(x^k)\} \subset [0, \infty)$ is decreasing, and hence $g(x^j) \geq t$ for all $t \in [g(x^{j+1}), g(x^j)]$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus

$$\frac{1}{g(x^j)^q} \leq \frac{1}{t^q} \quad \text{whenever } t \in [g(x^{j+1}), g(x^j)] \quad \text{and } q \in (0, 1),$$

which implies in turn that

$$\frac{g(x^j) - g(x^{j+1})}{g(x^j)^q} = \int_{g(x^{j+1})}^{g(x^j)} \frac{1}{g(x^j)^q} dt \leq \int_{g(x^{j+1})}^{g(x^j)} \frac{1}{t^q} dt.$$

Therefore, we arrive at the inequality

$$\frac{g(x^j) - g(x^{j+1})}{g(x^j)^q} \leq \frac{1}{1-q} (g(x^j)^{1-q} - g(x^{j+1})^{1-q}),$$

which gives us the estimate

$$\sum_{j=k}^{k+l} \frac{g(x^j) - g(x^{j+1})}{g(x^j)^q} \leq \frac{1}{1-q} (g(x^k)^{1-q} - g(x^{k+l+1})^{1-q}) \quad \text{for all } k, l \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (18)$$

On the other hand, combining (6), the construction of g , and (9) in $(\mathcal{H}3)$ yields

$$g(x^{k+1}) \leq g(x^k) - a\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \leq g(x^k) - \frac{a}{b^2}\|w^k\|^2.$$

By the KL property (2) with $\varphi(t) = Mt^{1-q}$, we find $M > 0$ such that

$$\|w^k\| \geq \text{dist}(0, \partial\phi(x)) \geq \frac{1}{M(1-q)} (\phi(x^k) - \phi(\bar{x}))^q. \quad (19)$$

Using the latter together with (19) tells us that

$$g(x^{k+1}) \leq g(x^k) - \frac{a}{b^2 M^2 (1-q)^2} (g(x^k))^{2q}. \quad (20)$$

To furnish now the proof of assertion (i), consider first the case where $q \in (0, 1/2)$ and suppose, arguing by contradiction, that the sequence $\{x^k\}$ is infinitely generated, which tells us that $g(x^k) > 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall the convergence $g(x^k) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and deduce from $2q - 1 < 0$, (20), and the equality

$$g(x^k) - \frac{a}{b^2 M^2 (1-q)^2} g(x^k)^{2q} = g(x^k) \left(1 - \frac{a}{b^2 M^2 (1-q)^2}\right) (g(x^k))^{2q-1}$$

that there exists a number $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$g(x^{k_0+1}) \leq g(x^{k_0}) \left(1 - \frac{a}{b^2 M^2 (1-q)^2} (g(x^{k_0}))^{2q-1}\right) < 0,$$

which contradicts the fact that $g(x^k) > 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, in the case where $q \in (0, 1/2)$, the sequence $\{x^k\}$ reaches the M -stationary point \bar{x} in a finite number of steps.

To verify (i), it remains to consider the case where $q = 0$. Arguing again by contradiction, suppose that the sequence $\{x^k\}$ is infinitely generated and deduce from (19) with $q = 0$ that $\|w^k\| \geq (M)^{-1}$ for all large k , which tells us together with (9) in (\mathcal{H}_2) that $(Mb)^{-1} \leq \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|$. This contradicts the fact that $\{x^k\}$ converges to \bar{x} and thus concludes the proof of assertion (i).

To prove now assertion (ii), we get from (20) with $q = 1/2$ that

$$g(x^{k+1}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{4a}{b^2M}\right)g(x^k), \quad (21)$$

Due to $g(x^k) \geq 0$ as $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows from (21) that $4a(b^2M)^{-1} \in (0, 1)$, and hence $\{\phi(x^k)\}$ converges linearly to $\phi(\bar{x})$. On the other hand, we have by (6) and (9) that

$$\phi(x^{k+1}) \leq \phi(x^k) - ab^{-1}\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \cdot \|w^k\| \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

which being combined with (19), the construction of g , and $\lambda_0 > \lambda_k$ whenever $k \in \mathbb{N}$, yields

$$g(x^{k+1}) \leq g(x^k) - \frac{2a}{Mb}\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|(g(x^k))^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The obtained inequality readily ensures the estimate

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \leq \frac{Mb}{2a} \left(\frac{g(x^k) - g(x^{k+1})}{g(x^k)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right),$$

which tells us together with (18) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=k}^{k+l} \|x^{j+1} - x^j\| &\leq \frac{Mb}{2a} \sum_{j=k}^{k+l} \frac{g(x^j) - g(x^{j+1})}{g(x^j)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq \frac{Mb}{a} (g(x^k)^{\frac{1}{2}} - g(x^{k+l+1})^{\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

By taking the limit in the last inequality as $l \rightarrow \infty$, we arrive at

$$s_k := \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \|x^{j+1} - x^j\| \leq \frac{Mb}{a} (g(x^k))^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which being combined with (19) and (9) brings us to the estimates

$$s_{k+1} \leq \frac{Mb}{a} (g(x^k))^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{M^2b}{2a} \|w^k\| \leq \frac{M^2b^2}{2a} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|.$$

Since $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| = s_k - s_{k+1}$, the last inequality implies that

$$s_{k+1} \leq (2a)^{-1} M^2 b^2 (s_k - s_{k+1}),$$

from which it clearly follows that

$$s_{k+1} \leq \frac{\tau}{1+\tau} s_k \text{ with } \tau := \frac{M^2 b^2}{2a}.$$

This tells us that the sequence $\{s_k\}$ converges linearly to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, using the triangle inequality yields $\|x^k - x^{k+l}\| \leq \sum_{j=k}^{k+l} \|x^{j+1} - x^j\|$ from which we get that $\|x^k - \bar{x}\| \leq s_k$. Therefore, the linear convergence of $x^k \rightarrow \bar{x}$ follows from the linear convergence of $s_k \rightarrow 0$, and thus (ii) is fully justified. Assertion (iii) can be verified similarly to proof of [5, Theorem 2] given in the case of the proximal algorithm. \square

Remark 2 (novelty in convergence rates). While the convergence rate results obtained in Theorem 2 under the exponent KL property for $q = 0$ and $q \in [1/2, 1)$ are generic extensions of those given for particular algorithms (see, e.g., [2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 10, 16]), we are not familiar with any publication that establishes the *finite termination* of a particular descent algorithm in the case where $q \in (0, 1/2)$.

3 Specifications of the Generic Descent Algorithms

This section discusses some specifications of the general class of descent methods and convergence analysis for them developed in Section 2. We consider here the three particular methods and start with the following model.

3.1 Inexact Reduced Graduate Methods

A class of *inexact reduced graduate (IRG) methods* with various stepsize selections have been recently proposed and developed by Khanh et al. [10] for problems of smooth nonconvex optimization. The model unifying the IRG methods in [10] considers the objective function $\phi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the iterative sequence $\{x^k\}$ as $k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$\phi(x^k) - \phi(x^{k+1}) \geq \frac{\beta}{t_k} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla\phi(x^k)\| \leq \frac{c}{t_k} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|, \quad (22)$$

where $t_k \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\beta, c > 0$. This can be viewed as a smooth version of the general nonsmooth scheme investigated in the previous section. The convergence analysis of IRG algorithms conducted in [10] is based on the observation that the sequences of iterates generated by (22) satisfy the following properties:

- *Primary descent condition:* There exists $\sigma > 0$ such that for sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the estimate

$$\phi(x^k) - \phi(x^{k+1}) \geq \sigma \|\nabla\phi(x^k)\| \cdot \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|.$$

- *Complementary descent condition:* For sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the implication

$$[\phi(x^{k+1}) = \phi(x^k)] \implies [x^{k+1} = x^k].$$

In fact, the latter conditions, while not (22), are used by Absil et al. [1] to prove convergence of the corresponding iterative sequences when the cost function is real analytical. Let us emphasize that the general scheme (22) comprises new linesearch methods with inexact gradient information for finding stationary points of \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth functions for different choices of stepsize rules. To the best of our knowledge, [10] is a first paper dealing with convergence rates for methods satisfying condition (22). In particular, it extends some particular settings considered, e.g., in [18] and [9], where the authors analyze convergence of the exact gradient method for functions satisfying the Polyak–Łojasiewicz inequality. More precisely, [10, Theorem 2.5] extends the scope of applicability of the results in the aforementioned papers. The results obtained in Section 2 for the generic nonsmooth model allow us to essentially improve those obtained in [10] for IRG methods and their various linesearch specifications. In particular, we now have the *finite termination* of such algorithms under (22) and the exponent KL with $q \in [0, 1/2)$ at *any accumulation point* of the iterative sequences.

3.2 Boosted DC Algorithm

Let us recall the following Boosted DC Algorithm with Backtracking (BDCA), which was proposed and investigated by Aragon-Artacho and Vuong [4] to solve the problem:

$$(\mathcal{P}) \quad \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \phi(x) := g(x) - h(x),$$

where both $g, h: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ are convex functions, with g being strictly differentiable at the points in question:

Algorithm 1 BDCA

1. Fix $\alpha > 0, \bar{\lambda} > 0$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Let x_0 be any initial point and set $k := 0$.
2. Select $u_k \in \partial h(x^k)$ and solve the strongly convex optimization problem

$$(\mathcal{P}k') \quad \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} g(x) - \langle u_k, x \rangle$$

to obtain the unique solution y^k .

3. Let $d^k := y^k - x^k$. If $d^k = 0$, **STOP** and **RETURN** x^k . Otherwise, go to Step 4.
 4. Choose any $\bar{\lambda}_k \geq 0$. Set $\lambda_k := \bar{\lambda}_k$. **WHILE** $\phi(y^k + \lambda_k d^k) > \phi(y^k) - \alpha \lambda_k^2 \|d^k\|^2$, **DO** $\lambda_k := \beta \lambda_k$.
 5. Let $x^{k+1} := y^k + \lambda_k d^k$. If $x^{k+1} = x^k$, **STOP** and **RETURN** x^k . Otherwise, set $k := k + 1$ and go to Step 2.
-

When g is also smooth, BDCA was introduced and analyzed in Aragón-Artacho et al. [2], where the authors noted that, without loss of generality, g and h can be assumed strongly convex with modulus $\rho > 0$. In both papers, BDCA accelerates the convergence of the classical Difference of Convex Functions Algorithm (DCA). It is shown in [4] that the strong KL property of ϕ at an accumulation point yields the global convergence of iterates with deriving convergence rates under the strong KL property with $\varphi(t) = Mt^{1-q}$ for $q \in [0, 1)$ and $M > 0$. Moreover,

it is observed in [4, Remark 4.4], with the reference to the second author of the current paper, that for Lipschitz continuous functions ϕ , the strong KL property may be replaced by the symmetric one.

Next we show that BDCA can be viewed as a specification, for non-Lipschitzian *continuous* functions ϕ , of the generic algorithm developed in Section 2 with using the *symmetric subdifferential* (4) and the *symmetric KL property* of ϕ . This approach allows us to improve and extend the results of [4] about the convergence and convergence rates of BDCA to the case of continuous functions. First we recall some properties of the symmetric subdifferential of continuous functions used below; all of them and much more on (4) (including full calculus) can be found in [14, 15].

(A₁) $\partial^0(-\phi(x)) = -\partial^0\phi(x)$ (plus-minus symmetry).

(A₂) $\partial^0\phi(x) = \{\nabla\phi(x)\}$ when ϕ is strictly differentiable.

(A₃) $\partial^0\phi(\bar{x}) = \partial\phi(\bar{x}) = \{x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle x^*, x - \bar{x} \rangle \leq \phi(x) - \phi(\bar{x}) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ when ϕ is convex.

(A₄) If $\phi = f_1 + f_2$ with f_1 being strictly differentiable, then $\partial^0\phi(x) = \nabla f_1(x) + \partial^0 f_2(x)$.

Observe that $\partial^0\psi(x)$ is often nonconvex being significantly smaller than Clarke's subdifferential $\bar{\partial}\psi(x)$, with the relationship $\bar{\partial}\psi(x) = \text{co}\partial^0\phi(x)$ when ϕ is locally Lipschitzian around x . Note also that Clarke's counterpart of the plus-minus symmetry property as in (A₁) requires the local Lipschitz continuity of ϕ around \bar{x} .

Here is the theorem including BDCA into the generic class above and providing its convergence analysis.

Theorem 3 (BDCA for continuous functions). *Consider problem (P), where ϕ is continuous on its domain. Let the sequence $\{x^k\}$ be generated by the above BDCA with the given parameters therein, and let ∇g be L -Lipschitz continuous around an accumulation point \bar{x} of $\{x^k\}$. Then for all large $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have the conditions*

$$\phi(x^{k+1}) \leq \phi(x^k) - \frac{\alpha\lambda_k^2 + \rho}{(1 + \lambda_k)^2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2, \quad (23)$$

$$\text{there exists } w^k \in \partial^0\phi(x^k) \text{ such that } \|w^k\| \leq L\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|, \quad (24)$$

and $\{x^k\}$ converges to \bar{x} as $k \rightarrow \infty$, which is a critical point of (P) satisfying $0 \in \partial^0\phi(\bar{x}) = \nabla g(\bar{x}) - \partial h(\bar{x})$. If furthermore ϕ has the exponent KL property with $\varphi(t) = Mt^{1-q}$ for some $M > 0$ and $q \in [0, 1)$, then the convergence rates of $x^k \rightarrow \bar{x}$ are as in Theorem 2.

Proof. Using the definitions of x^{k+1} and d^k in BDCA gives us the equalities

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| = \|y^k + \lambda_k d^k - x^k\| = \|y^k + \lambda_k(y^k - x^k) - x^k\| = (1 + \lambda_k)\|d^k\|$$

from which we deduce the estimate

$$\|d^k\| = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_k} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \leq \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|. \quad (25)$$

Hence the estimate in (23) follows from the conditions

$$\phi(y^k) \leq \phi(x^k) - \rho\|d^k\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(y^k + \lambda_k d^k) \leq \phi(y^k) - \alpha\lambda_k^2\|d^k\|^2 \quad \text{for some } \delta_k > 0$$

obtained for BDCA in [4, Proposition 3.1]. To verify further (24), we employ properties (A₁)–(A₄) of the symmetric subdifferential and get the relationships

$$\nabla g(y_k) - \nabla g(x_k) \in \partial h(x_k) - \nabla g(x_k) = \partial^0(-\phi(x_k)) = -\partial^0\phi(x_k).$$

Recalling that y^k is the unique solution to the subproblem (P'_k) in BDCA, i.e., $u^k = \nabla g(y^k)$ ensures that $w^k := \nabla g(x^k) - \nabla g(y^k) \in \partial^0\phi(x^k)$. Take now a neighborhood U of \bar{x} on which ∇f_1 is L -Lipschitz continuous. It follows from (25) that $x^k, y^k \in U$ for all large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and hence

$$\|\nabla g(x^k) - \nabla g(y^k)\| \leq L\|x^k - y^k\|,$$

which yields (24). Since \bar{x} is an accumulation point of $\{x^k\}$, and since ϕ is continuous on its domain, we deduce from (23) and (24) by the proof of Theorem 1 that $x_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ with $0 \in \partial^0\phi(\bar{x})$. The latter implies by (A₁)–(A₄) that $0 \in \nabla g(\bar{x}) - \partial h(\bar{x})$. The convergence rates under the exponent KL property follows from Theorem 2. \square

Note that the finite termination result for BDCA at any accumulation point under the exponent KL property with $q \in (0, 1/2)$ is a significant improvement of [4] even for Lipschitz continuous objectives, where merely linear convergence of $\{x^k\}$ is justified. We'll see in 4 the further clarification of this fact at local minimizers of ϕ .

3.3 Nonsmooth Multiobjective Optimization

The recent paper [8] addresses the class of multiobjective optimization problems written as

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) := (f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_m(x)), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (26)$$

where “min” is understood in term of finding *Pareto efficient points*, and where each function f_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, is locally Lipschitzian. The following algorithm is proposed in [8], where the descent directions are determined via certain approximations of Clarke’s general gradients of f_i .

Algorithm 2 Descent multiobjective method

Require: Initial point $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, tolerances $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$, Armijo parameters $c \in]0, 1[$, $t_0 > 0$.

- 1: Set $k = 1$.
- 2: Compute a descent direction v_k .
- 3: If $\|v_k\| \leq \delta$, then stop.
- 4: Compute

$$\bar{s} = \inf \{s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \mid f_i(x_k + 2^{-s}t_0v_k) \leq f_i(x_k) - 2^{-s}t_0c\|v_k\|^2 \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \dots, m\}\}$$

and set $\bar{t} := \max \{2^{-\bar{s}}t_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{\|v_k\|}\}$.

- 5: Set $x_{k+1} = x_k + \bar{t}v_k$, $k = k + 1$, and go to Step 2.
-

The authors of [8] did not provide any convergence analysis of their algorithm, while derive conditions of reaching the so-called (ε, δ) -critical point. It is not difficult to check that the above algorithmic model can be viewed as a particular case of the generic framework characterized by $(\mathcal{H}1)$, $(\mathcal{H}3)$, and $(\mathcal{H}4)$, and thus the convergence analysis developed in Section 2 is applied to this multiobjective setting.

4 KL property with Lower Exponents

In this section, we take a close look at the exponent KL property from Definition 1(iv) with *lower exponents* $q \in (0, 1/2)$. As shown in [7, Theorem 1]¹, the classical Lojasiewicz gradient inequality always holds for any *analytic* function $\phi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with some exponent $q \in [1/2, 1)$. Although it does not exclude the fulfillment of the KL property with lower exponents, we show below that this property *fails* for *local minimizers* of smooth functions with Lipschitzian gradients, i.e., of class $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$. In fact, our analysis provides such a result for minimization problems in the difference form (\mathcal{P}) with $\phi = g - h$, where g is of class $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ (may not be convex), while $h: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is l.s.c. and convex. Recall that for any $x \in \text{int}(\text{dom } h)$, the directional derivative of ϕ is represented by

$$\phi'(x, d) = \langle \nabla g(x), d \rangle - \max_{v \in \partial h(x)} \langle v, d \rangle \quad \text{whenever } d \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (27)$$

Now we introduce the two important *measures of stationarity* at the point $x \in \text{int}(\text{dom } h)$. Note from (27) that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\|d\|=1} \phi'(x, d) &= \min_{\|d\|=1} \left\{ \langle \nabla g(x), d \rangle - \max_{v \in \partial h(x)} \langle v, d \rangle \right\} = \min_{\|d\|=1} \min_{v \in \partial h(x)} \langle \nabla g(x) - v, d \rangle \\ &= \min_{v \in \partial h(x)} \left(\{-\|\nabla g(x) - v\|\} \right) = - \max_{v \in \partial h(x)} \|\nabla g(x) - v\| := -\sigma_1(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\sigma_1(x)$ measures the *fastest local decrease* of the function ϕ . For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, fix now some

$$v_1(x) \in \operatorname{argmax}_{v \in \partial h(x)} \|\nabla g(x) - v\|$$

and note that this point satisfies the necessary condition for local maximum

$$\langle v_1(x) - \nabla g(x), v - v_1(x) \rangle \leq 0 \quad \text{whenever } v \in \partial h(x).$$

In other words, we have the equality

$$\langle \nabla g(x) - v_1(x), v_1(x) \rangle = \min_{v \in \partial h(x)} \langle \nabla g(x) - v_1(x), v \rangle. \quad (28)$$

¹The authors are grateful to Guoyin Li (UNSW, Sydney, Australia) for drawing our attention to [7].

At the same time, the following relationships are satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\|d\|=1} \phi'(x, d) &= \max_{\|d\|=1} \left\{ \langle \nabla g(x), d \rangle - \max_{v \in \partial h(x)} \langle v, d \rangle \right\} = \max_{\|d\| \leq 1} \min_{v \in \partial h(x)} \langle \nabla g(x) - v, d \rangle \\ &= \min_{v \in \partial h(x)} \max_{\|d\| \leq 1} \langle \nabla g(x) - v, d \rangle = \min_{v \in \partial h(x)} \|\nabla g(x) - v\| := \sigma_0(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\sigma_0(x)$ measures the *fastest local increase* of the function ϕ . We obviously have that

$$\sigma_0(x) \leq \sigma_1(x) \quad \text{whenever } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (29)$$

Given an arbitrary point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, consider its *own level set* $\mathcal{L}(x_0)$, which is the maximal connected component in $\{x \mid \phi(x) \leq \phi(x_0)\}$ containing x_0 . Let us define the *exact Lipschitzian bound* of ∇g with respect to $\mathcal{L}(x_0)$ by

$$L(x_0) = \inf \{L \mid \|\nabla g(x) - \nabla g(y)\| \leq L\|x - y\| \text{ over } x, y \in \mathcal{L}(x_0)\}. \quad (30)$$

The following lemma measures the difference between $\phi(x_0)$ and the global minimum of ϕ with respect to the level set $\mathcal{L}(x_0)$ in terms of the exact Lipschitzian bound (30) and the stationarity measure $\sigma_1(x_0)$.

Lemma 1 (distance estimate from global minimum). *Let $\bar{x} \in \text{int}(\text{dom } h)$ be a global minimizer of the function ϕ in (\mathcal{P}) with respect to the level set $\mathcal{L}(x_0)$, i.e.,*

$$\phi(x) \geq \phi(\bar{x}) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{L}(x_0).$$

If $L(x_0) < \infty$, then for $d(x_0) := \nabla g(x_0) - v_1(x_0)$ and any $\alpha \in [0, 1/L(x_0)]$, we have the estimate

$$\phi(x_0) - \phi(\bar{x}) \geq \phi(x_0) - \phi(x_0 - \alpha d(x_0)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \alpha (2 - \alpha L(x_0)) \sigma_1^2(x_0). \quad (31)$$

Proof. Since the case where $\sigma_1(x_0) = 0$ is obvious, we suppose that $\sigma_1(x_0) > 0$. Take the points $x_\alpha := x_0 - \alpha d(x_0)$ for $\alpha \geq 0$ and define the function $\xi(\alpha) := \phi(x_\alpha)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \xi'(0, 1) &= \phi'(x_0, -d(x_0)) = \langle \nabla g(x_0), -d(x_0) \rangle - \max_{v \in \partial h(x_0)} \langle v, -d(x_0) \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla g(x_0), -d(x_0) \rangle + \min_{v \in \partial h(x_0)} \langle v, d(x_0) \rangle \stackrel{(28)}{=} -\sigma_1(x_0) < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\bar{\alpha}$ the smallest element of the set $\Sigma = \{\alpha \geq 0 \mid \xi'(\alpha, 1) \geq 0\}$. If $\Sigma = \emptyset$, then $\bar{\alpha} = \infty$. Since $\xi'(0, 1) < 0$, we have $\xi'(\alpha, 1) < 0$ for all $\alpha \in [0, \bar{\alpha})$. Thus all the points x_α with $\alpha \in [0, \bar{\alpha}]$ belong to the set $\mathcal{L}(x_0)$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \xi'(\alpha, 1) &= \langle \nabla g(x_\alpha), -d(x_0) \rangle - \max_{v \in \partial h(x_\alpha)} \langle v, -d(x_0) \rangle \\ &\leq \langle \nabla g(x_\alpha), -d(x_0) \rangle - \max_{v \in \partial h(x_0)} \langle v, -d(x_0) \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(28)}{=} \langle \nabla g(x_\alpha), -d(x_0) \rangle + \langle v_1(x_0), d(x_0) \rangle \\ &\leq (\alpha L(x_0) - 1) \sigma_1^2(x_0). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\bar{\alpha} \geq \hat{\alpha} := 1/L(x_0)$, and therefore for all $\alpha \in [0, \hat{\alpha}]$ we have

$$\xi(\alpha) = \xi(0) + \int_0^\alpha \xi'(t, 1) dt \leq \xi(0) + \int_0^\alpha (tL(x_0) - 1) \sigma_1^2(x_0) dt = \xi(0) - \frac{\alpha(2 - \alpha L(x_0))}{2} \sigma_1^2(x_0).$$

By $x_{\hat{\alpha}} \in \mathcal{L}(x_0)$, this means that $\phi(x_0) - \phi(\bar{x}) \geq \phi(x_0) - \phi(x_{\hat{\alpha}}) \geq \frac{\sigma_1^2(x_0)}{2L(x_0)}$ and thus completes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to establish our major observation about the lower exponent KL property for problems of difference programming (\mathcal{P}) with $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ functions g and convex functions h at local minimizers.

Theorem 4 (inconsistency of the lower exponent KL property with Lipschitz continuity of gradients). *Let $\bar{x} \in \text{int}(\text{dom } h)$ be a local minimizer of problem (\mathcal{P}) , where g is of class $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ around \bar{x} , and where h is convex. Then the exponent KL property of ϕ at \bar{x} fails whenever $q \in (0, 1/2)$.*

Proof. Observe that the exponent KL property of ϕ at \bar{x} can be represented, provided that ϕ is locally continuous around \bar{x} as assumed in the theorem, in the following form: there exist a constant $M > 0$ and a neighborhood U of \bar{x} such that for all $x \in U$ taken inside of $\mathcal{L}(x_0)$, we have the inequality

$$\sigma(x) \geq M[\phi(x) - \phi(\bar{x})]^q, \quad (32)$$

where $\sigma(x)$ is some estimate for the norm of the corresponding subgradient from (2) of the function ϕ at x . The standard class $\sigma(x)$ is $\sigma(x) = \sigma_0(x)$, but we consider even a broader class where $\sigma(x) = \sigma_1(x)$ in (32). Then Lemma 1 tells us for any $x_0 \in U$, the estimates

$$M \left[\frac{1}{2L(x_0)} \sigma_1^2(x_0) \right]^q \leq M [\phi(x_0) - \phi(\bar{x})]^q \stackrel{(32)}{\leq} \sigma_1(x_0)$$

are satisfied by definition (30). This implies that

$$M \sigma_1^{2q-1}(x_0) \leq [2L(x_0)]^q. \quad (33)$$

Therefore, it follows from (33) that for $q \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we have $L(x_0) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x_0 \rightarrow \bar{x}$, which is inconsistent with the Lipschitz continuity of ∇g around \bar{x} and thus completes the proof of the theorem. \square

As we see, the inconsistency result of Theorem 4 affects also problems of unconstrained minimization of $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ functions at their local minimizers, which has not been observed in the previous publications involving the lower exponent KL property. The following example shows that the inconsistency observation may *fail* if g is *not of class* $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$. The function below is taken from [12, Example 4.6], where it is used to demonstrate that the tight *quadratic* convergence rate can be achieved for the proximal methods applied to this function.

Example 1 ($\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ property is essential for inconsistency with lower exponent KL). Consider the univariate function $\phi(x) := |x|^{3/2}$, which has the global minimizer $\bar{x} = 0$. It is straightforward to compute that

$$\phi'(0) = \frac{3}{2} \text{sign}(x) |x|^{\frac{1}{2}} = \begin{cases} \frac{3}{2} x^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } x > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0, \\ -\frac{3}{2} (-x)^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, the derivative of ϕ is not locally Lipschitzian around \bar{x} . On the other hand, it is not difficult to check that the lower exponent KL property holds for this function with $\varphi(t) = t^{1-q}$ and $q = 1/3$.

5 Conclusions

This paper conducts a comprehensive convergence analysis of generic descent algorithms under several versions of the KL property. Convergence rates are established by using the exponent KL property, where some surprising results are obtained for the case of lower exponents. It is shown, in particular, that the lower exponent KL property is inconsistent with the Lipschitz continuity of the gradient ∇g for problems of minimizing the difference functions $g-h$, where h is convex. A challenging open question is to study this phenomenon for the case where h is nonconvex with some specific structures, e.g., being *prox-regular* [16, 19]. Among other algorithms, we plan to investigate from this viewpoint the semi-Newton regularized method of [3] in difference programming as well as the cubic Newton method by Nesterov and Polyak [17] and its far-going extension in [12].

Acknowledgements

Research of Boris S. Mordukhovich was partly supported by the US National Science Foundation under grant DMS-2204519, by the Australian Research Council under Discovery Project DP190100555, and by the Project 111 of China under grant D21024. Research of Glaydston de C. Bento was supported in part by CNPq grants 314106/2020-0 and the research of Yurii Nesterov was partly supported from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 788368).

References

- [1] Absil, P.A., Mahony, R., Andrews, B.: Convergence of the iterates of descent methods for analytic cost functions. *SIAM J. Optim.* 16, 531–547 (2005)

- [2] Aragón-Artacho, F.J., Fleming, R.M., Vuong, P.T.: Accelerating the dc algorithm for smooth functions. *Math. Program.* 169, 95–118 (2018)
- [3] Aragón-Artacho, F.J., Mordukhovich, B.S., Pérez-Aros, P.: Coderivative-based semi-newton method in nonsmooth difference programming. *Math. Program.*, to appear, arXiv:2301.03491 (2024)
- [4] Aragón-Artacho, F.J., Vuong, P.T.: The boosted difference of convex functions algorithm for nonsmooth functions. *SIAM J. Optim.* 30, 980–1006 (2020)
- [5] Attouch, H., Bolté, J.: On the convergence of the proximal algorithm for nonsmooth functions involving analytic features. *Math. Program.* 116, 5–16 (2009)
- [6] Attouch, H., Bolté, J., Svaiter, B.F.: Convergence of descent methods for semialgebraic and tame problems: proximal algorithms, forward–backward splitting, and regularized Gauss–Seidel methods. *Math. Program.* 137, 91–129 (2013)
- [7] Feehan, P.M.N.: Resolution of singularities and geometric proofs of the Lojasiewicz inequalities. *Geom. Topol.* 23 3273–3313 (2019)
- [8] Gebken B., Peitz. S.: An efficient descent method for locally Lipschitz multiobjective optimization problems. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 188, 696–723 (2021)
- [9] Karimi, H., Nutini, J., Schmidt, M.: Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the Polyak-Lojasiewicz condition. *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases, Part 1*, 795–811. Springer, Cham, Switzerland (2016)
- [10] Khanh, P.D., Mordukhovich, B.S., Tran, D.B.: Inexact reduced gradient methods in nonconvex optimization. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* DOI: 10.1007/s10957-023-02319-9 (2024)
- [11] Kurdyka, K.: On gradients of functions definable in o-minimal structures. *Ann. Inst. Fourier* 48, 769–783 (1998)
- [12] Li, G., Mordukhovich, B.S., Zhu, J.: Generalized metric subregularity with applications to high-order regularized Newton methods. arXiv:2406.13207 (2024)
- [13] Lojasiewicz, S.: Une propriété topologique des sous-ensembles analytiques réels. *Coll. du CNRS, Les équations aux dérivées partielles*, 87–89 (1963)
- [14] Mordukhovich, B.S.: *Variational Analysis and Generalized Differentiation I: Basic Theory*. Springer, Berlin (2006)
- [15] Mordukhovich, B.S.: *Variational Analysis and Applications*. Springer, Cham, Switzerland (2018)
- [16] Mordukhovich, B.S.: *Second-Order Variational Analysis in Optimization, Variational Stability, and Control: Theory, Algorithms, Applications*. Springer, Cham, Switzerland (2024)
- [17] Nesterov, Yu., Polyak, B.T.: Cubic regularization of Newton method and its global performance. *Math. Program.* 108, 177–205 (2006)
- [18] Polyak, B.T.: Gradient methods for the minimization of functionals. *USSR Comput. Math. Math. Phys.* 3(4), 864–878 (1963)
- [19] Rockafellar, R.T., Wets, R.J-B.: *Variational Analysis*. Springer, Berlin (1998)