

A Variable Smoothing for Weakly Convex Composite Minimization with Nonconvex Constraint

Keita Kume^{1*} and Isao Yamada¹

^{1*}Dept. of Information and Communications Engineering,
Institute of Science Tokyo,* 2-12-1, Ookayama, 152-8550, Tokyo, Japan.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): kume@sp.ict.e.titech.ac.jp;
Contributing authors: isao@sp.ict.e.titech.ac.jp;

Abstract

In this paper, we address a nonconvexly constrained nonsmooth optimization problem involving the composition of a weakly convex function and a smooth mapping. To find a stationary point of the target problem, we propose a variable smoothing-type algorithm by combining the ideas of (i) translating the constrained problem into a Euclidean optimization problem with a smooth parametrization of the constraint set; (ii) exploiting a sequence of smoothed surrogate functions, of the cost function, given with the Moreau envelope of a weakly convex function. The proposed algorithm produces a vector sequence by the gradient descent update of a smoothed surrogate function at each iteration. In a case where the proximity operator of the weakly convex function is available, the proposed algorithm does not require any iterative solver for subproblems therein. By leveraging tools in the variational analysis, we show the so-called *gradient consistency property*, which is a key ingredient for smoothing-type algorithms, of the smoothed surrogate function used in this paper. Based on the gradient consistency property, we also establish an asymptotic convergence analysis for the proposed algorithm. Numerical experiments demonstrate the efficacy of the proposed algorithm.

Keywords: constrained nonsmooth optimization, weakly convex composite, variable smoothing, gradient consistency, Moreau envelope, parametrization

MSC Classification: 49J52 , 49K99

*Institute of Science Tokyo was established in October 2024 through the merger of Tokyo Institute of Technology and Tokyo Medical and Dental University.
January 24, 2025

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following nonsmooth optimization problem with a nonconvex constraint.

Problem 1.1. Let \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z} be Euclidean spaces, i.e., finite-dimensional real Hilbert spaces, and $(\emptyset \neq) C \subset \mathcal{X}$ a (possibly nonconvex) closed subset of \mathcal{X} . Then,

$$\text{find } \mathbf{x}^* \in \underset{\mathbf{x} \in C}{\operatorname{argmin}} \underbrace{(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S})}_{=: f}(\mathbf{x}) = \underset{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}}{\operatorname{argmin}} (h + g \circ \mathfrak{S} + \iota_C)(\mathbf{x}),$$

where ι_C is the indicator function of C defined by

$$\iota_C : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in C; \\ +\infty, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin C, \end{cases}$$

and C, h, \mathfrak{S} , and g satisfy the following:

- (i) $C \subset \mathcal{X}$ is a Clarke regular closed subset, where Clarke regularity (see Def. 2.3) is a fundamental property that appears in a variety of constraint sets including, e.g., closed convex sets, and embedded submanifolds in \mathcal{X} [1, Thm. 6.8, 6.9].
- (ii) $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable and its gradient $\nabla h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_{\nabla h} > 0$ over C , i.e.,

$$(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in C) \quad \|\nabla h(\mathbf{x}_1) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}_2)\| \leq L_{\nabla h} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|;$$

- (iii) $\mathfrak{S} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is a continuously differentiable (possibly nonlinear) mapping;
- (iv) $g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a (possibly nonsmooth) Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_g > 0$, i.e.,

$$(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in \mathcal{Z}) \quad |g(\mathbf{z}_1) - g(\mathbf{z}_2)| \leq L_g \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|,$$

and η -weakly convex function with $\eta > 0$, i.e., $g + \frac{\eta}{2} \|\cdot\|^2$ is convex over \mathcal{Z} .

- (v) f is bounded below over C , i.e., $\inf\{f(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x} \in C\} > -\infty$.

Problem 1.1 has been serving as key models, e.g., for finding sparse solutions, in wide range of signal processing and machine learning. Such applications include, e.g., sparse Principal Component Analysis (PCA) [2], sparse variable PCA [3], robust sparse PCA [4], orthogonal dictionary learning/robust subspace recovering [5], and sparse spectral clustering [6].

One of simple cases of Problem 1.1 is a convex case where h, g , and C are convex, and \mathfrak{S} is linear. For the convex case, the so-called *proximal splitting algorithms* have been extensively applied as computationally reliable algorithms (see, e.g., [7–9]). The algorithms consist of simple steps involving the gradient of h and the so-called *proximity operator* of g with index $\mu > 0$, which is defined by

$$(\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{Z}) \quad \operatorname{prox}_{\mu g}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) := \underset{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left(\mu g(\mathbf{z}) + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}\|^2 \right) = \underset{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left(g(\mathbf{z}) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}\|^2 \right).$$

Although the computation of $\text{prox}_{\mu g}$ requires, in general, to solve a convex optimization problem, the proximity operators for many commonly-used functions, e.g., ℓ_1 -norm and nuclear norm, have closed-form expressions (see, e.g., [7, 10]).

In Problem 1.1, restricting choices of g within convex functions are not always sufficient [11–16] in order to enhance estimation performance especially for sparsity-aware applications. For example, ℓ_1 -norm has been used widely as a best convex approximation of the naive sparsity promoting function, i.e., ℓ_0 -pseudonorm, which counts the number of nonzero entries of a vector. However, employment of ℓ_1 -norm as g leads to some underestimation of the desired sparse target because ℓ_1 -norm is a coercive function (see, e.g., [17]), i.e., ℓ_1 -norm excessively penalizes large magnitude of target. To overcome the underestimation effect caused mainly by the convex sparse promoting function, the utilization of weakly convex functions has been attracting great attentions [11, 13]. Recent advances in proximal splitting techniques [12, 14–16] encourage us to find a global minimizer of Problem 1.1 with a convex constraint set C if only $h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}$ achieves the overall convexity with a linear operator \mathfrak{S} even if g is weakly convex.

Beyond the convex cases, nonconvex optimization problems with nonconvex constraint have a great potential for flexible formulation to align with real-world tasks. Indeed, the minimization of nonconvex $g \circ \mathfrak{S}$ with a nonlinear smooth mapping \mathfrak{S} is known to have extremely wide applications including, e.g., robust phase retrieval [18], nonnegative matrix factorization [19], robust matrix recovery [20], and robust blind deconvolution [21]. In particular, nonconvexly constrained optimization has been continually attracting great attentions mainly by its remarkable expressive ability of the target conditions expected to be achieved by a solution (see, e.g., [22–25]). However, (i) the nonconvexity of the constraint and (ii) the nonconvexity and the nonsmoothness of the cost function certainly make the optimization problems very challenging.

In this paper, we address the nonconvex and nonsmooth Problem 1.1 by combining ideas in (i) parametrizing the constraint set C , e.g., [26–33] and (ii) smoothing the nonsmooth function, e.g., [34, 35].

More precisely, to deal with the constraint set C in Problem 1.1, we propose to exploit its available parametrization in terms of a Euclidean space \mathcal{Y} with a certain continuously differentiable mapping $F : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow C(\subset \mathcal{X})$ satisfying $F(\mathcal{Y}) := \{F(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{X} \mid \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}\} = C$. Such parametrizable constraint sets include, e.g., linear subspaces of \mathcal{X} , the Stiefel manifold [26–32], and the Grassmannian manifold [36]. With such a parametrization F , Problem 1.1 can be translated into the following unconstrained Problem 1.2:

Problem 1.2. Consider Problem 1.1. Let $F : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a continuously differentiable mapping such that $C = F(\mathcal{Y})$, where \mathcal{Y} is a Euclidean space. Then,

$$\text{find } \mathbf{y}^* \in \underset{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}}{\text{argmin}} (h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F(\mathbf{y}) (= f \circ F(\mathbf{y})).$$

Thanks to the surjectivity of F , a point $\mathbf{x}^* \in C$ is a global minimizer for Problem 1.1 if and only if $\mathbf{x}^* = F(\mathbf{y}^*)$ via a global minimizer $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{Y}$ for Problem 1.2, which implies that Problem 1.1 is equivalent to Problem 1.2 in view of their ultimate

goals for finding global minimizers. Nevertheless, due to the nonconvexities of Problem 1.1 and Problem 1.2, we are convinced that their realistic goals are respectively to find the so-called *stationary point* where a certain necessary condition, say a *first-order optimality condition* (see (15) and (16)), for a local minimizer is satisfied. We present, in Theorem 3.3, a useful condition for the equivalence between Problem 1.1 and Problem 1.2 in view of their stationary points.

For finding a stationary point of Problem 1.2, we propose an extension of the *variable smoothing algorithm* [34, 35] with a smoothed surrogate function ${}^\mu g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, called the *Moreau envelope* (see (11)), of g with index $\mu \in (0, \eta^{-1})$. The Moreau envelope enjoys remarkable properties (see Fact 2.6), e.g., (i) ${}^\mu g$ is continuously differentiable, (ii) $\lim_{\mathbb{R}_{++} \ni \mu \rightarrow 0} {}^\mu g(\mathbf{z}) = g(\mathbf{z})$ ($\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}$). Moreover, as will be shown in

Theorem 4.1, we can exploit the so-called *gradient consistency property* [37] (see also Remark 4.2) of ${}^\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}$ for $g \circ \mathfrak{S}$, which makes it possible to express the first-order optimality of Problem 1.2 in terms of a gradient sequence of $(h + {}^\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F$ with $\mu \searrow 0$, where \searrow stands for monotonically nonincreasing. The proposed algorithm in Section 4.1 is designed carefully based on a time-varying gradient descent update for $(h + {}^{\mu_n} g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F$ at n th iteration with $\mu_n \searrow 0$. We also present an asymptotic convergence analysis (Theorem 4.8) of the proposed algorithm under a certain Lipschitz continuity condition of the gradient of $(h + {}^{\mu_n} g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F$.

Numerical experiments, in Section 5, demonstrate the efficacy of the proposed algorithm in two scenarios of the sparse spectral clustering and the sparse principal component analysis.

A preliminary short version of this paper was partially presented in [36].

Notation

\mathbb{N} , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}_+ , and \mathbb{R}_{++} denote respectively the sets of all positive integers, all real numbers, all nonnegative real numbers, and all positive real numbers. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}}$ stand respectively for the standard inner product and its induced norm defined in the Euclidean space \mathcal{X} , i.e., $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathcal{X}} = \sqrt{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_{\mathcal{X}}}$ ($\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$). We simply use $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\|\cdot\|$ without any subscript if their domains are clear. The symbol Id stands for the identity operator. For a linear operator $A : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, its adjoint operator $A^* : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is defined as the linear operator satisfying $\langle \mathbf{x}, A^* \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathcal{X}} = \langle A \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}$ ($\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$), $\text{Ker}(A) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} \mid A \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}\}$ and $\text{Ran}(A) := \{A \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Y} \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ are respectively the kernel (null) space and the range space of A , and $\|A\|_{\text{op}} := \sup_{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq 1, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|A \mathbf{x}\|_{\mathcal{Y}}$ denotes the operator norm of A . The symbol $(\cdot)^\perp$ denotes the orthogonal complement subspace of a given set. For a matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $[\mathbf{X}]_{i,j}$ denotes the (i, j) entry of \mathbf{X} , and \mathbf{X}^\top denotes the transpose of \mathbf{X} . For a given point $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$ and a given set $E \subset \mathcal{X}$, $d : \mathcal{X} \times 2^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ stands for the distance function, i.e.,

$$d(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, E) := \begin{cases} \inf\{\|\mathbf{v} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \mid \mathbf{v} \in E\}, & \text{if } E \neq \emptyset; \\ +\infty, & \text{if } E = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

For a given sequence $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}$ and a given $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{R}$, both $a_n \searrow \bar{a}$ and $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty \searrow \bar{a}$ mean in this paper that $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is monotonically nonincreasing as well as $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \bar{a}$.

For a differentiable mapping $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, its Gâteaux derivative at $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$ is the linear operator $D\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}) : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ defined by

$$(\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}) \quad D\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y})[\mathbf{v}] = \lim_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \ni t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y} + t\mathbf{v}) - \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y})}{t}.$$

For a differentiable function $J : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\nabla J(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{X}$ is the gradient of J at $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ if $DJ(\mathbf{x})[\mathbf{v}] = \langle \nabla J(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle$ for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{X}$. Note that for a differentiable mapping $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, we have the expression¹ $\nabla(J \circ \mathcal{F})(\mathbf{y}) = (D\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}))^*[\nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}))]$ ($\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$). For a function $J : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, $\text{dom}(J) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} \mid J(\mathbf{x}) < +\infty\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ and $\text{epi}(J) := \{(\mathbf{x}, a) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \mid J(\mathbf{x}) \leq a\} \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$ denote respectively the domain and the epigraph of J . Moreover, J is said to be (i) *proper* if $\text{dom}(J) \neq \emptyset$; (ii) *lower semicontinuous* if $\text{epi}(J)$ is closed in $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$; (iii) *locally Lipschitz continuous* at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$ if there exist an open neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ and $L > 0$ such that $|J(\mathbf{x}_1) - J(\mathbf{x}_2)| \leq L \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|$ ($\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{N}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}$). For a function $J : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$, the *limit inferior* [1, Definition 1.5] and the *limit superior* [1, p.13] of J at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$ are defined respectively by

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\mathcal{X} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} J(\mathbf{x}) &:= \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \left(\inf_{\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| < \epsilon} J(\mathbf{x}) \right) := \sup_{\epsilon > 0} (\inf \{J(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\} \mid \|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| < \epsilon\}); \\ \limsup_{\mathcal{X} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} J(\mathbf{x}) &:= \inf_{\epsilon > 0} \left(\sup_{\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| < \epsilon} J(\mathbf{x}) \right) := \inf_{\epsilon > 0} (\sup \{J(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\} \mid \|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| < \epsilon\}). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

For a set sequence $(E_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with subsets $E_n \subset \mathcal{X}$, the *outer limit* [1, Definition 4.1] of $(E_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is defined by

$$\text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n := \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{X} \mid \exists \mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{N}, \exists \mathbf{v}_n \in E_n \ (n \in \mathcal{N}) \text{ with } |\mathcal{N}| = \aleph_0 \text{ and } \mathbf{v} = \lim_{\mathcal{N} \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}_n \right\},$$

where \aleph_0 stands for the cardinality of \mathbb{N} . With the outer limit of a set sequence, the outer limit [1, p.152] of a set-valued mapping $S : \mathcal{X} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{X}$ at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Lim sup}_{\mathcal{X} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} S(\mathbf{x}) &:= \bigcup_{\mathcal{X} \ni \mathbf{x}_n \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} \text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(\mathbf{x}_n) \\ &= \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{X} \mid \exists (\mathbf{x}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{X}, \exists \mathbf{v}_n \in S(\mathbf{x}_n) \text{ with } \bar{\mathbf{x}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}_n \text{ and } \mathbf{v} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}_n \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where we follow a clear notation “Lim sup” (used, e.g., in [38]). In this paper, even for the outer limit of a single-valued mapping $S : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, we use $\text{Lim sup}_{\mathcal{X} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} S(\mathbf{x}) :=$

¹It can be checked by $(\forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}) \langle \nabla(J \circ \mathcal{F})(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} = D(J \circ \mathcal{F})(\mathbf{x})[\mathbf{v}] = DJ(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}))[D\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x})[\mathbf{v}]] = \langle \nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x})), D\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x})[\mathbf{v}] \rangle_{\mathcal{X}} = \langle (D\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}))^*[\nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}))], \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}$.

Table 1 Summary of existing algorithms for Problem 1.1 and the proposed algorithm.

Reference	g	\mathfrak{S}	C	Any subproblem?
[34]/[35]	convex/ weakly convex	linear	unconstrained	No
[39]/[40]	convex/ weakly convex	smooth	unconstrained	Yes
[41]	convex	linear	manifold	Yes
[42]	convex	smooth	manifold	Yes
[43]	weakly convex	identity	manifold	No
[44]/[45]	convex/ weakly convex	linear	manifold	No
Alg. 1	weakly convex	smooth	Clarke regular, parameterizable set (including unconstrained)	No

$\limsup_{\mathcal{X} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} \{S(\mathbf{x})\}$ in order to distinguish the standard notation for the limit superior “lim sup” in (1).

Related works

In the following, we review some related works for Problem 1.1. Table 1 summarizes distinctions of target settings among algorithms in the related works.

(I) Problem 1.1 with unconstrained cases

The *variable smoothing algorithm*² in [35] has been proposed for Problem 1.1 in a special case where $C = \mathcal{X}$ and \mathfrak{S} is a (surjective) linear operator. The key idea behind [35] is utilization of the Moreau envelope ${}^\mu g$ of g with index $\mu \in (0, \eta^{-1})$ as a smoothed surrogate function of g . Then, the algorithm in [35] updates the estimate of a stationary point by using a simple gradient descent, at n th iteration, of a smooth function $h + {}^{\mu_n} g \circ \mathfrak{S}$ with $\mu_n \searrow 0$, where index μ_n is chosen carefully to guarantee a global convergence of an estimate sequence to a stationary point in the sense of a zero of the general subdifferential in Definition 2.1.

The so-called *prox-linear method*, e.g., [39, 40], has been proposed for minimization of $h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}$ over \mathcal{X} , where $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ are proper and lower semicontinuous functions, h is convex, g is (weakly) convex, and $\mathfrak{S} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is a continuously differentiable mapping. Under a certain condition, e.g., the Lipschitz continuity of $D\mathfrak{S}(\cdot)$ (see (29)), the prox-linear methods are guaranteed to converge to a stationary point in the sense of a zero of the general subdifferential. However, prox-linear methods proposed in [39, 40] require some iterative solver for solving the so-called *proximal subproblem* to update from $\mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{X}$ to $\mathbf{x}_{n+1} \in \mathcal{X}$, e.g., in [39]:

$$\mathbf{x}_{n+1} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \left(h(\mathbf{x}) + g(\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x}_n) + D\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x}_n)[\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_n]) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_n\|^2 \right) \text{ with } \mu \in \mathbb{R}_{++}. \quad (3)$$

²The variable smoothing algorithm seems to date back to a proposal in [34] for convex optimization problems.

(II) Problem 1.1 with Riemannian constrained cases

Fairly standard unconstrained optimization methods have been extended for optimization problems defined over a Riemannian manifold C [22–24]. For example, the proximal gradient method (also known as an instance of the forward-backward splitting method, e.g., [7, 9]) has been extended for Problem 1.1 with a Riemannian manifold C in a special case where h is continuously differentiable with a Lipschitzian gradient, g is convex, and \mathfrak{S} is linear [41]. Such an extended proximal gradient method [41] requires some iterative solvers for a certain proximal subproblem at every iteration, which is defined as convex optimization problems over the tangent (vector) space (see (53)). So far, closed-form solutions of such proximal subproblems have not yet been found even for simple cases, e.g., $g := \|\cdot\|_1$. In a case where \mathfrak{S} is smooth, the prox-linear method [39, 40] has been extended by [42], which also requires some iterative solver for a certain proximal subproblem related to (3).

For Problem 1.1 in a special case of linear \mathfrak{S} and Riemannian manifold C , we also found several algorithms that do not require any iterative solver for subproblems [43–45]. A Riemannian subgradient method [43] is one of such algorithms, and uses subgradients of the cost function for updating iterates (see (52)). Under the linearity of \mathfrak{S} , Riemannian smoothing gradient algorithms [44, 45] have been proposed as an extension of the variable smoothing algorithm [34, 35] from the unconstrained case to the Riemannian constrained case, where these algorithms exploit gradients of $h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}$ with $\mu \in (0, \eta^{-1})$ for updating iterates (see (51)).

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Subdifferential and Normal Cone

We review some necessary notions in nonsmooth analysis primarily based on notations in [1].

Definition 2.1 (Subdifferential [1, Definition 8.3]). For a possibly nonconvex function $J : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, the general subdifferential of J at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$ is defined by

$$\partial J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) := \begin{cases} \text{Lim sup}_{\substack{\mathcal{X} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}} \\ J(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow J(\bar{\mathbf{x}})}} \hat{\partial} J(\mathbf{x}), & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(J); \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \notin \text{dom}(J), \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where

$$\hat{\partial} J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) := \begin{cases} \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{X} \mid \liminf_{\mathcal{X} \setminus \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}\} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} \frac{J(\mathbf{x}) - J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|} \geq 0 \right\}, & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(J); \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \notin \text{dom}(J) \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

is called the regular subdifferential of J at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$ (Note: in a case where J is convex, ∂J and $\hat{\partial} J$ are identical to the standard convex subdifferential of J [1, Prop. 8.12]).

Example 2.2 (Normal cones).

- (a) (General normal cone to general set [1, Def. 6.3, Prop. 6.5, and Ex. 8.14]) For a nonempty subset $C \subset \mathcal{X}$, the general normal cone and the regular normal cone to C at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$ are defined respectively by

$$N_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) := \partial\iota_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \begin{cases} \text{Lim sup}_{\iota_C(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \iota_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}})}^{\mathcal{X} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} \widehat{\partial}\iota_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(\iota_C) = C; \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \notin \text{dom}(\iota_C) = C, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

and by

$$\widehat{N}_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) := \widehat{\partial}\iota_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \begin{cases} \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{X} \mid \limsup_{C \setminus \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}\} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|} \leq 0 \right\}, & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in C; \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \notin C, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where we used in (7):

$$(\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in C) \quad \liminf_{\mathcal{X} \setminus \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}\} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} \frac{\iota_C(\mathbf{x}) - \iota_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|} = - \limsup_{C \setminus \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}\} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|}.$$

- (b) (Normal cone to convex set [1, Theorem 6.9]) For a nonempty convex set $C \subset \mathcal{X}$, the general normal cone N_C and the regular normal cone \widehat{N}_C at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$ are identical to the standard convex normal cone, i.e.,

$$N_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \widehat{N}_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \begin{cases} \{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{X} \mid (\forall \mathbf{x} \in C) \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \leq 0 \}, & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in C; \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \notin C. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

- (c) (Normal cone to embedded submanifold in \mathcal{X} [1, Example 6.8]) Let $(\emptyset \neq) C \subset \mathcal{X}$ be a d ($\leq \dim(\mathcal{X})$)-dimensional embedded submanifold in \mathcal{X} , i.e., for each $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in C$, there exist (i) an open neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ in \mathcal{X} and (ii) a smooth mapping $H_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} : \mathcal{N}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\dim(\mathcal{X})-d}$, such that $C \cap \mathcal{N}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} = H_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}^{-1}(\mathbf{0})$ and $\text{Rank}(DH_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) = \dim(\mathcal{X}) - d$ (Note: by Whitney's embedding theorem (see, e.g., [46, Thm. 6.15]), every d -dimensional smooth manifold can be seen as an embedded submanifold in \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}). Then, according to [1, Exm. 6.8], N_C coincides with \widehat{N}_C , i.e.,

$$N_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \widehat{N}_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \begin{cases} \text{Ran}((DH_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))^*) \subset \mathcal{X}, & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in C; \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \notin C. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

In this case, $N_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ is a linear subspace of \mathcal{X} , and its orthogonal complement subspace

$$T_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) := (N_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))^\perp = \begin{cases} \text{Ker}(DH_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) \subset \mathcal{X}, & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in C; \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } \bar{\mathbf{x}} \notin C \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

is called the *tangent cone to C at $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$* (Note: $N_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ and $T_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ are also called respectively the normal space and the tangent space to the manifold C at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in C$ [24, Theorem 3.15, Definition 3.16, and p.107]).

For a nonempty set $C \subset \mathcal{X}$, we have $N_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \supset \widehat{N}_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ ($\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$), but its converse does not necessarily hold. The Clarke regularity defined below ensures $N_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \widehat{N}_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ ($\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$). Note that, in many optimization problems, constraint sets defined as closed convex sets and embedded submanifolds in \mathcal{X} enjoy the Clarke regularity (see (8) and (9)).

Definition 2.3 (Clarke regular subset [1, Definition 6.4]). A nonempty set $C \subset \mathcal{X}$ is said to be *Clarke regular* at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in C$ if (i) $N_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \widehat{N}_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$, and (ii) $C \cap \overline{\mathcal{N}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}}$ is closed for some closed neighborhood³ $\overline{\mathcal{N}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$. Moreover, C is said to be Clarke regular if it is Clarke regular at every $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in C$.

The following states a relation of the normal cone to the parameterized set, and the parametrization F .

Fact 2.4 (Normal cone to image sets [1, Theorem 6.43]). Let \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} be Euclidean spaces, and $F : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ a continuously differentiable mapping. Then, for every $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in F(\mathcal{Y})$,

$$\widehat{N}_{F(\mathcal{Y})}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \subset \bigcap_{\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in F^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})} \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{X} \mid (DF(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))^*[\mathbf{v}] \in \widehat{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) = \{\mathbf{0}\} \right\} = \bigcap_{\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in F^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})} \text{Ker}((DF(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))^*),$$

where $F^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) := \{\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{Y} \mid F(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) = \bar{\mathbf{x}}\} \subset \mathcal{Y}$ is the preimage of $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$ under F .

Proof. The first inclusion is verified by [1, Thm. 6.43]. The equality follows by the relation $(DF(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))^*[\mathbf{v}] \in \{\mathbf{0}\} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{v} \in \text{Ker}((DF(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))^*)$ ($\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in F^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$). \square

2.2 Proximity Operator and Moreau Envelope

The *proximity operator* and the *Moreau envelope* have been serving as key ingredients for minimization of nonsmooth convex functions (see, e.g., [7–9]). Even for weakly convex functions, they are useful in design of nonsmooth optimization algorithms. We note that closed-form expressions of the proximity operators for commonly-used weakly convex functions have been found, e.g., ℓ_1 -norm [7], Minimax Concave Penalty (MCP) [17], Smoothly Clipped Absolute Deviation (SCAD) [47], log-sum penalty [48], piece-wise exponential function [49], and arctangent penalty [50].

Definition 2.5 (Proximity operator and Moreau envelope [1, Definition 1.22]). Let $g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be proper lower semicontinuous, and η -weakly convex, i.e., $g + \eta/2 \|\cdot\|^2$ is convex with $\eta > 0$. For $\mu \in (0, \eta^{-1})$, the *proximity operator* and the *Moreau envelope* of g of index μ are defined respectively as

$$\begin{aligned} (\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{Z}) \text{prox}_{\mu g}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) &:= \underset{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}}{\text{argmin}} \left(g(\mathbf{z}) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}\|^2 \right); \\ (\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{Z}) \text{}^\mu g(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) &:= \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} \left(g(\mathbf{z}) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}\|^2 \right) = g(\text{prox}_{\mu g}(\bar{\mathbf{z}})) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\text{prox}_{\mu g}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) - \bar{\mathbf{z}}\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\text{prox}_{\mu g}(\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is single-valued, and “inf” in (11) can be replaced by “min” because the unique existence of the minimizer is guaranteed by the strong convexity of $g(\cdot) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\cdot - \bar{\mathbf{z}}\|^2$.

³In other words, $\overline{\mathcal{N}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}}$ is a closed set that contains $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ as an interior point of $\overline{\mathcal{N}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}}$.

Fact 2.6 (Properties of Moreau envelope of weakly convex function). Let $g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be proper lower semicontinuous, and η -weakly convex with some $\eta > 0$. Then, the following hold:

- (a) For any $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $(z_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{Z}$ satisfying $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n = \bar{z}$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{prox}_{\mu_n g}(z_n) = P_{\overline{\text{dom}(\partial g)}}(\bar{z})$ if $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty \searrow 0$ with $\mu_n \in (0, \eta^{-1})$ [51, Lemma 2.3], where $\text{dom}(\partial g) := \{z \in \mathcal{Z} \mid \partial g(z) \neq \emptyset\} \subset \mathcal{Z}$, $\overline{(\cdot)}$ denotes the closure of a given set, and $P_{\overline{\text{dom}(\partial g)}} = \text{prox}_{\overline{\text{dom}(\partial g)}}$ denotes the projection mapping onto the closed convex set $\overline{\text{dom}(\partial g)} \subset \mathcal{Z}$.
- (b) For any $\mu \in (0, \eta^{-1})$, (i) ${}^\mu g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable with $\nabla^\mu g = \frac{\text{Id} - \text{prox}_{\mu g}}{\mu}$, and (ii) $\nabla^\mu g$ is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $\max\left\{\mu^{-1}, \frac{\eta}{1-\eta\mu}\right\}$ [52, Corollary 3.4].
- (c) ($\bar{z} \in \mathcal{Z}, \mu \in (0, \eta^{-1})$) $\nabla^\mu g(\bar{z}) \in \partial g(\text{prox}_{\mu g}(\bar{z}))$ [35, Lemma 3.2].
- (d) Assume that g is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_g > 0$. By [35, Lemma 3.3] and [53, Proposition 3.4]⁴, the following hold:

$$(\bar{z} \in \mathcal{Z}, \mu \in (0, \eta^{-1})) \quad \|\nabla^\mu g(\bar{z})\| \leq L_g; \quad (12)$$

$$(\bar{z} \in \mathcal{Z}, \mu \in (0, \eta^{-1})) \quad {}^\mu g(\bar{z}) \leq g(\bar{z}) \leq {}^\mu g(\bar{z}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu L_g^2. \quad (13)$$

Moreover, for $0 < \mu_2 < \mu_1 < \eta^{-1}$, we have [1, Theorem 1.25], [35, Lemma 4.1]

$$(\bar{z} \in \mathcal{Z}) \quad {}^{\mu_1} g(\bar{z}) \leq {}^{\mu_2} g(\bar{z}) \leq {}^{\mu_1} g(\bar{z}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{\mu_2} \mu_1 L_g^2. \quad (14)$$

3 Relation between First-order Optimality Conditions of Problems 1.1 and 1.2

We begin by defining the notions of optimality.

Definition 3.1 (Optimality). Let $J : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be proper.

- (a) (Local minimizer) $\mathbf{x}^{**} \in \text{dom}(J)$ is said to be a *local minimizer* of J if there exists an open neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{x}^{**}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ of \mathbf{x}^{**} such that $J(\mathbf{x}^{**}) \leq J(\mathbf{x})$ ($\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{x}^{**}}$).
- (b) (Stationary point) $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{X}$ is said to be a *stationary point* of J if $\partial J(\mathbf{x}^*) \ni \mathbf{0}$.

By Fermat's rule [1, Theorem 10.1], for a proper function $J : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, $\mathbf{x}^{**} \in \mathcal{X}$ is a stationary point of J if \mathbf{x}^{**} is a local minimizer of J . Thus, the condition $\partial J(\mathbf{x}^*) \ni \mathbf{0}$ at $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{X}$ seems to be the most versatile expressions of *the first-order optimality condition* for minimization of J at \mathbf{x}^* (see, e.g., [1, p.207]). For this reason, we focus on finding such stationary points of Problem 1.1 and Problem 1.2 throughout this paper. More precisely, with Lemma 3.2 below, the first-order optimality conditions

⁴In [53, Proposition 3.4], the inequality (13) is proved under the convexity of g . However, the proof in [53, Proposition 3.4] can be applied to the weakly convex case as well.

can be expressed respectively as:

$$\partial(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S} + \iota_C)(\mathbf{x}^*) \stackrel{(18)}{=} \partial(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S})(\mathbf{x}^*) + N_C(\mathbf{x}^*) \ni \mathbf{0} \quad (15)$$

for $\mathbf{x}^* \in C$ to be a stationary point of Problem 1.1, and

$$\partial((h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}^*) \stackrel{(19)}{=} (DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*[\partial(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S})(F(\mathbf{y}^*))] \ni \mathbf{0}, \quad (16)$$

$$\text{or equivalently, } d(\mathbf{0}, \partial((h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}^*)) = 0 \quad (17)$$

for $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{Y}$ to be a stationary point of Problem 1.2.

Lemma 3.2 (Subdifferential calculus for Problems 1.1 and 1.2). *Consider Problems 1.1 and 1.2. Then, we have the following relations:*

$$(\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in C) \quad \partial(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S} + \iota_C)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \partial(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S})(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + N_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}); \quad (18)$$

$$(\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{Y}) \quad \partial((h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) = (DF(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))^*[\partial(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S})(F(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))]. \quad (19)$$

Proof. See Appendix A. □

The following theorem presents a relation between (15) and (16). In a special case where the cost function $f = h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}$ is smooth, i.e., $g \circ \mathfrak{S} \equiv 0$, a similar relation between the first-order optimality conditions is found in [33, Theorem 2.4]. Moreover, the conditions (15) and (16) are equivalent under a mild condition (see Corollary 3.5).

Theorem 3.3 (Point-wise relation between the first-order optimality conditions (15) and (16)). *Consider Problems 1.1 and 1.2. Let $\mathbf{x}^* := F(\mathbf{y}^*) \in C$ with some $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then, the following hold:*

(a) *If \mathbf{x}^* satisfies (15), then \mathbf{y}^* satisfies (16).*

(b) *Assume $N_C(\mathbf{x}^*) \supset \text{Ker}((DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*)$. If \mathbf{y}^* satisfies (16), then \mathbf{x}^* satisfies (15).*

To prove Theorem 3.3, we use the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *Consider Problem 1.1. Let $F : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow C$ be continuously differentiable, and let $\bar{\mathbf{x}} := F(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in C$ with some $\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then, $N_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \subset \text{Ker}((DF(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))^*)$.*

Proof. Recall $\hat{N}_{F(\mathcal{Y})}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \subset \text{Ker}((DF(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))^*)$ from Fact 2.4. Moreover, we have $\hat{N}_{F(\mathcal{Y})}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \supset \hat{N}_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = N_C(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$, where “ \supset ” follows⁵ by $F(\mathcal{Y}) \subset C$, and the equality follows by the Clarke regularity of C (Note: “ \supset ” can be replaced by “ $=$ ” if F is surjective onto C , i.e., $F(\mathcal{Y}) = C$). By combining these inclusions, we complete the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 3.3. For simplicity, let $f := h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}$.

⁵We can check the inclusion by showing $\limsup_{F(\mathcal{Y}) \setminus \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}\} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|} \leq \limsup_{C \setminus \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}\} \ni \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{x}}} \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|}$ from (7). The inequality can be verified with (1) from $\inf_{\epsilon > 0} \left(\sup_{\substack{0 < \|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| < \epsilon \\ \mathbf{x} \in F(\mathcal{Y})}} \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|} \right)^{F(\mathcal{Y}) \subset C} \leq \inf_{\epsilon > 0} \left(\sup_{\substack{0 < \|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\| < \epsilon \\ \mathbf{x} \in C}} \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|} \right)$.

(a) Let \mathbf{x}^* satisfy (15), i.e., there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \partial f(\mathbf{x}^*)$ such that $-\mathbf{v} \in N_C(\mathbf{x}^*)$. Then, Lemma 3.4 implies $-\mathbf{v} \in N_C(\mathbf{x}^*) \subset \text{Ker}((DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*)$. By combining this inclusion with the linearity of $\text{Ker}((DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*)$, we have $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Ker}((DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*)$. Thus, $(DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*[\partial f(F(\mathbf{y}^*))] \ni \mathbf{0}$, i.e., \mathbf{y}^* satisfies (16).

(b) Let $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{Y}$ satisfy (16), i.e., there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \partial f(F(\mathbf{y}^*))$ such that $(DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*[\mathbf{v}] = \mathbf{0}$. The linearity of $\text{Ker}((DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*)$ implies $-\mathbf{v} \in \text{Ker}((DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*)$, and then the assumption $N_C(\mathbf{x}^*) \supset \text{Ker}((DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*)$ yields $-\mathbf{v} \in N_C(F(\mathbf{y}^*))$. Thus, we have $\mathbf{0} \in \partial f(F(\mathbf{y}^*)) + N_C(F(\mathbf{y}^*)) = \partial f(\mathbf{x}^*) + N_C(\mathbf{x}^*)$, i.e., \mathbf{x}^* satisfies (15). \square

Corollary 3.5 (Special case for (15) and (16) to be equivalent). *Consider Problems 1.1 and 1.2. Let $\mathbf{x}^* := F(\mathbf{y}^*) \in C$ with some $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{Y}$. Suppose that (i) C is an embedded submanifold in \mathcal{X} (thus C is Clarke regular, see Example 2.2 (c)), and (ii) F is submersion at \mathbf{y}^* , i.e., $\text{Ran}(DF(\mathbf{y}^*)) = T_C(\mathbf{x}^*)$ holds (see (10) for T_C). Then, \mathbf{x}^* satisfies (15) if and only if \mathbf{y}^* satisfies (16).*

(Note: the condition (ii) in Corollary 3.5 is achieved if $F : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow C$ is a local diffeomorphism at $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{Y}$ (see [46, Prop. 4.8]), i.e., there exists an open neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}^*} \subset \mathcal{Y}$ of \mathbf{y}^* such that the restriction $F|_{\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}^*}} : \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}^*} \rightarrow F(\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}^*}) (\subset C)$ of F is bijective and differentiable, and its inversion $F|_{\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}^*}}^{-1} : F(\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}^*}) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}^*}$ is also differentiable).

Proof. From Theorem 3.3, it suffices to show $N_C(\mathbf{x}^*) \supset \text{Ker}((DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*)$. This inclusion can be verified by $N_C(\mathbf{x}^*) \stackrel{(10)}{=} (T_C(\mathbf{x}^*))^\perp = (\text{Ran}(DF(\mathbf{y}^*)))^\perp = \text{Ker}((DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*)$, where the second equality follows by the assumption $\text{Ran}(DF(\mathbf{y}^*)) = T_C(\mathbf{x}^*)$, and the last one follows by $(\text{Ran}(DF(\mathbf{y}^*)))^\perp = \text{Ker}((DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*)$ ⁶. \square

Remark 3.6 (Case for $F(\mathcal{Y}) \subsetneq C$). Even in a case where $F : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow C$ is not surjective onto C , the same conclusions as in Theorem 3.3 (a) and (b), and in Corollary 3.5 can be achieved because the surjectivity of F is not used in their proofs at all.

Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.5 encourage us to focus on finding a stationary point of Problem 1.2 for our goal of finding a stationary point of Problem 1.1. Since Problem 1.2 is an unconstrained optimization problem thanks to the available parametrization F , Problem 1.2 seems to be more tractable than Problem 1.1 in terms of designing iterative algorithms. Indeed, such iterative algorithms with parametrization has been proposed in a case where the cost function $f = h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}$ is smooth [26–32, 54–56], i.e., $g \circ \mathfrak{S} \equiv 0$. In the next section, we propose an iterative algorithm for Problem 1.2 of nonsmooth cost function $f = h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}$ and parametrization F .

4 Variable Smoothing Algorithm for Problem 1.2

4.1 Variable Smoothing Algorithm

Problem 1.2 is still challenging due to the nonsmoothness of g . In this section, for finding a stationary point of Problem 1.2, we present an approach by leveraging the Moreau envelope ${}^\mu g$ (see (11)) as a smoothed surrogate function of g . From (17), an

⁶ $\mathbf{u} \in (\text{Ran}(DF(\mathbf{y}^*)))^\perp \Leftrightarrow (\forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}) \langle \mathbf{u}, DF(\mathbf{y}^*)[\mathbf{v}] \rangle = 0 \Leftrightarrow (\forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}) \langle (DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*[\mathbf{u}], \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0 \Leftrightarrow (DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*[\mathbf{u}] = \mathbf{0} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{u} \in \text{Ker}((DF(\mathbf{y}^*))^*)$.

approximation of a stationary point of Problem 1.2 can be reformulated as finding $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{Y}$ where the value $d(\mathbf{0}, \partial((h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}^*))$ is sufficiently small. Theorem 4.1 below presents an upper bound of this distance by using the gradient of ${}^\mu g$.

Theorem 4.1 (Gradient sub-consistency of smoothed surrogate functions).

- (a) Let \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{Z} be Euclidean spaces. Let $J : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ η -weakly convex, and $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ be continuously differentiable. Then, ${}^\mu J \circ \mathcal{F}$ enjoys the gradient sub-consistency property (see Remark 4.2) for $J \circ \mathcal{F}$, i.e.,

$$(\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{Y}) \quad \text{Lim sup}_{\mathbb{R}_{++} \ni \mu \searrow 0, \mathcal{Y} \ni \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{y}}} \nabla({}^\mu J \circ \mathcal{F})(\mathbf{y}) \subset \partial(J \circ \mathcal{F})(\bar{\mathbf{y}}). \quad (20)$$

- (b) Consider Problem 1.2. Then, we have

$$\text{Lim sup}_{\mathbb{R}_{++} \ni \mu \searrow 0, \mathcal{Y} \ni \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{y}}} \nabla((h + {}^\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}) \subset \partial((h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}). \quad (21)$$

Moreover, if a given sequence $(\mathbf{y}_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{Y}$ converges to some $\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{Y}$, and $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty \searrow 0$ with $\mu_n \in (0, \eta^{-1})$, then

$$d(\mathbf{0}, \partial((h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}})) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla((h + \mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\|. \quad (22)$$

Proof. See Appendix B. □

Remark 4.2 (Gradient (sub-)consistency).

- (a) Although the converse inclusion of (20) is not required for this paper, the stronger relation

$$(\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{Y}) \quad \text{Lim sup}_{\mathbb{R}_{++} \ni \mu \searrow 0, \mathcal{Y} \ni \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{y}}} \nabla({}^\mu J \circ \mathcal{F})(\mathbf{y}) = \partial(J \circ \mathcal{F})(\bar{\mathbf{y}}),$$

called the *gradient consistency property* [37] of ${}^\mu J \circ \mathcal{F}$ for $J \circ \mathcal{F}$, can also be shown (i) by checking that ${}^\mu J \circ \mathcal{F}$ *epi-converges* to $J \circ \mathcal{F}$ (see [1, Definition 7.1] for the definition of epi-convergence); and (ii) by applying [38, Lemma 3.4] to ${}^\mu J \circ \mathcal{F}$. Indeed, (i) can be verified by [1, Theorem 7.4(d)] and ${}^\mu J \circ \mathcal{F} \nearrow J \circ \mathcal{F}$ as $\mu \searrow 0$. The gradient consistency property is a key ingredient in smooth approximation approaches, e.g., [37, 57–60], for finding a stationary point of a nonsmooth cost function (see Remark 4.10 (b)).

- (b) For a proper lower semicontinuous convex function $J : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, and a continuously differentiable mapping $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$, the gradient consistency property of ${}^\mu J \circ \mathcal{F}$ for $J \circ \mathcal{F}$ has been found in [38, Corollary 5.8] under a certain constraint qualification. In contrast, since J in Theorem 4.1 (a) is not convex, a different approach is taken for the proof of Theorem 4.1 (a). To the best of the authors' knowledge, this is the first result on the gradient consistency property for the composition of a weakly convex function and a smooth mapping.

The inequality (22) implies that finding $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{Y}$ satisfying (17) can be reduced to

$$\text{find a convergent sequence } (\mathbf{y}_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{Y} \text{ such that} \quad (23)$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla((h + \mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\| = 0 \text{ with } (\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, \eta^{-1}) \searrow 0.$$

Algorithm 1 Variable smoothing for Problem 1.2 (VSmooth)

Input: $\mathbf{y}_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$, $c \in (0, 1)$, $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, (2\eta)^{-1}]$ satisfying (24) (see Example 4.3)

- 1: $n \leftarrow 1$
- 2: **while** stopping criteria are not satisfied **do**
- 3: Set $f_n := (h + \mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S})$
- 4: Find $\gamma_n > 0$ satisfying (28) with c (see Example 4.7)
- 5: $\mathbf{y}_{n+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{y}_n - \gamma_n \nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)$
- 6: $n \leftarrow n + 1$
- 7: **end while**

Output: $\mathbf{y}_n \in \mathcal{Y}$

Inspired by [35], for the problem in (23), we present a variable smoothing algorithm in Algorithm 1. The proposed algorithm is designed with a time-varying gradient descent update for minimization of

$$f_n \circ F := (h + \mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F \text{ with } f_n : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \bar{\mathbf{x}} \mapsto (h + \mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S})(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$$

at n th update from $\mathbf{y}_n \in \mathcal{Y}$ to $\mathbf{y}_{n+1} := \mathbf{y}_n - \gamma_n \nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n) \in \mathcal{Y}$ with $\mu_n \searrow 0$ and a stepsize $\gamma_n > 0$. Since every $\mu_n g$ is continuously differentiable by Fact 2.6 (b), $f_n \circ F$ is also continuously differentiable and its gradient is available in a case where $\text{prox}_{\mu_n g}$ has a closed-form expression.

The index $\mu_n \in (0, (2\eta)^{-1}]$ in Algorithm 1 is designed to establish a convergence analysis in Section 4.2 as

$$(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, (2\eta)^{-1}] \text{ satisfies } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(i) } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n = 0, \text{ (ii) } \sum_{n=1}^\infty \mu_n = +\infty, \text{ (iii) } \mu_{n+1} \leq \mu_n \text{ (} n \in \mathbb{N}), \\ \text{(iv) } (\exists M \geq 1, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \frac{\mu_n}{\mu_{n+1}} \leq M, \end{array} \right. \quad (24)$$

where $\eta > 0$ is the level of the weak convexity of g (see Problem 1.1). A clear sufficient condition for the condition (iv) in (24) is the condition (v) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n / \mu_{n+1} = 1$, which has been used in [61] as a condition of a parameter for Halpern-type fixed point iteration. Moreover, the conditions (i), (ii), and (v) are identical to the conditions in [61, (1),(2), and (3')] in p. 244], and thus we have many choices of $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ enjoying (24) as shown in Example 4.3 (see Remark 4.9 for a reasonable choice of $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty$).

Example 4.3 ($(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ satisfying (24)).

- (a) For any $\alpha \geq 1$, $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty := ((2\eta)^{-1} n^{-1/\alpha})_{n=1}^\infty$ satisfies (24).
- (b) $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty := \left(\frac{1}{2\eta(n+1) \log(n+1)} \right)_{n=1}^\infty$ satisfies (24).

Proof. (a) Let $\alpha \geq 1$ be chosen arbitrarily. Clearly, $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, (2\eta)^{-1}]$ satisfies the conditions (i) and (iii) in (24). For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\mu_n / \mu_{n+1} = (1 + n^{-1})^{1/\alpha} \leq 2^{1/\alpha}$ ($n \in$

\mathbb{N}), implying the condition (iv). Moreover, the condition (ii) can be checked by

$$\sum_{n=1}^K n^{-1/\alpha} = \sum_{n=1}^K \int_n^{n+1} n^{-1/\alpha} dx \geq \int_1^{K+1} x^{-1/\alpha} dx = \begin{cases} \frac{(K+1)^{1-\alpha^{-1}} - 1}{1-\alpha^{-1}} & (\alpha > 1) \\ \log(K+1) & (\alpha = 1) \end{cases} \stackrel{K \rightarrow \infty}{\rightarrow} +\infty. \quad (25)$$

(b) Clearly, $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, (2\eta)^{-1}]$ satisfies the conditions (i) and (iii). The condition (iv) follows by $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n / \mu_{n+1} = 1$ (see the sentence just after (24)). The condition (ii) can be checked by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^K \frac{1}{(n+1) \log(n+1)} &= \sum_{n=1}^K \int_n^{n+1} \frac{dx}{(n+1) \log(n+1)} \geq \int_1^{K+1} \frac{dx}{(x+1) \log(x+1)} \\ &\stackrel{u=\log(x+1)}{=} \int_{\log(2)}^{\log(K+2)} \frac{du}{u} = \log(\log(K+2)) - \log(\log(2)) \stackrel{K \rightarrow \infty}{\rightarrow} +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

□

Every stepsize $\gamma_n > 0$ in Algorithm 1 is chosen to enjoy the so-called *Armijo condition* (see, e.g., [62, Theorem 1.1]) with a predetermined constant $c \in (0, 1)$:

$$f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}_n - \gamma_n \nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)) \leq f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}_n) - c\gamma_n \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\|^2. \quad (26)$$

In a case where γ_n satisfies the Armijo condition (26), the descent condition $f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}_n - \gamma_n \nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)) < f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}_n)$ is achieved if $\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n) \neq \mathbf{0}$, and thus we update $\mathbf{y}_{n+1} := \mathbf{y}_n - \gamma_n \nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)$.

To use γ_n satisfying (26) in Algorithm 1, we assume Assumption 4.4 below. As will be shown in Proposition 4.5 and in Remark 4.6, there are many examples enjoying Assumption 4.4 (a). Moreover, Example 4.7 presents typical choices of γ_n achieving Assumption 4.4 (b) under Assumption 4.4 (a).

Assumption 4.4. Consider Problem 1.2 and Alg. 1. For $f_n = h + \mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S}$, we assume:

(a) (Gradient Lipschitz continuity condition)

$$(\exists \varpi_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+, \exists \varpi_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N})$$

$$\nabla(f_n \circ F) \text{ is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant } L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)} := \varpi_1 + \frac{\varpi_2}{\mu_n}. \quad (27)$$

(Note: under the condition (27), we have $L_{\nabla(f_{n+1} \circ F)} \geq L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)} \geq \dots \geq L_{\nabla(f_1 \circ F)}$ by $\mu_n \searrow 0$ [see the condition (iii) in (24)] for $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty$)

(b) (Lower bound condition for stepsizes)

$$(\exists \beta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \gamma_n \in \mathbb{R}_{++} \text{ satisfies (26) and } \gamma_n \geq \beta L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)}^{-1}. \quad (28)$$

Proposition 4.5 (Sufficient condition for Assumption 4.4 (a)). *Consider Problem 1.2 and the following conditions:*

(A1) *The operator norm of $(D\mathfrak{S}(\cdot))^*$ is bounded above by $\kappa_{\mathfrak{S}} > 0$ over the convex hull $\text{Conv}(C) := \{t\mathbf{x}_1 + (1-t)\mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X} \mid \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in C, t \in [0, 1]\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ of C , i.e.,*

$$(\exists \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}} > 0, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \text{Conv}(C)) \quad \|(D\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x}))^*\|_{\text{op}} \leq \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}};$$

(A2) $(D\mathfrak{S}(\cdot))^*$ is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_{D\mathfrak{S}} > 0$ over C , i.e.,

$$(\exists L_{D\mathfrak{S}} > 0, \forall \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in C) \|(D\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x}_1))^* - (D\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x}_2))^*\|_{\text{op}} \leq L_{D\mathfrak{S}} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|; \quad (29)$$

(A3) The norm of ∇h is bounded above by $\kappa_h > 0$ over C , i.e.,

$$(\exists \kappa_h > 0, \forall \mathbf{x} \in C) \|\nabla h(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \kappa_h;$$

(A4) The operator norm of $(DF(\cdot))^*$ is bounded above by $\kappa_F > 0$ over \mathcal{Y} ;

(A5) $(DF(\cdot))^*$ is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_{DF} > 0$ over \mathcal{Y} .

Then, for $\mu \in (0, 2^{-1}\eta^{-1}]$, the following hold:

- (a) If the conditions (A1) and (A2) hold, then $\nabla(h + {}^\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S})$ is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_{\nabla(h+{}^\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S})} := L_{\nabla h} + L_g L_{D\mathfrak{S}} + \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}}^2 \mu^{-1} > 0$ over C .
- (b) If the conditions (A1)-(A5) hold, then $\nabla((h + {}^\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)$ is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_{\nabla((h+{}^\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)} := \varpi_1 + \varpi_2 \mu^{-1} > 0$ over \mathcal{Y} , where constants $\varpi_1 := \kappa_F^2 (L_{\nabla h} + L_g L_{D\mathfrak{S}}) + L_{DF}(\kappa_h + \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}} L_g)$ and $\varpi_2 := \kappa_F^2 \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}}^2$ do not depend on μ .

Proof. See Appendix C. □

Remark 4.6 (Sufficient conditions for assumptions in Proposition 4.5).

- (a) (Sufficient conditions regarding \mathfrak{S}) In a case where \mathfrak{S} is a linear operator, the conditions (A1) and (A2) in Proposition 4.5 are automatically satisfied. In another case where C is compact and \mathfrak{S} is twice continuously differentiable, the conditions (A1), (A2) and (A3) are automatically satisfied.
- (b) (Sufficient conditions regarding F) The conditions (A4) and (A5) are automatically satisfied in a case where C is a linear subspace of \mathcal{X} and F is a linear operator. Even for the other cases, we will present an example of (C, F) , in Corollary 5.1 (see also Lemma D.2), achieving the conditions (A4) and (A5).

Example 4.7 (Stepsize achieving Assumption 4.4 (b)). Under Assumption 4.4 (a), we have mainly two choices of γ_n achieving (28) (see, e.g., [62, Theorem 1.1]):

- (a) With the Lipschitz constant $L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$,

$$(n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \gamma_n := \beta L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)}^{-1} := 2(1 - c) L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)}^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}_{++} \quad (30)$$

satisfies the Armijo condition (26) with $c \in (0, 1)$, and thus (28).

- (b) The so-called *backtracking algorithm* in Algorithm 2 returns γ_n enjoying the Armijo condition (26) with $c \in (0, 1)$, where $\gamma_{\text{initial}} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is an initial guess for γ_n , and $\rho \in (0, 1)$. In this case, γ_n is known to have the following lower bound:

$$(n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \gamma_n \geq \min \{ \gamma_{\text{initial}} L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)}, 2\rho(1 - c) \} L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)}^{-1} \geq \beta L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)}^{-1} \quad (31)$$

with $\beta := \min \{ \gamma_{\text{initial}} L_{\nabla(f_1 \circ F)}, 2\rho(1 - c) \} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, where the first inequality follows by [62, Theorem 1.1], and the second inequality follows⁷ by $L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)} \geq L_{\nabla(f_1 \circ F)}$ (see the sentence just after (27)). From (31), Algorithm 2 is guaranteed

⁷The derivation of the second inequality is inspired by [44, the equality just after (4.12)].

Algorithm 2 Backtracking algorithm to find γ_n satisfying (26)

Input: $c \in (0, 1), \rho \in (0, 1), \gamma_{\text{initial}} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$

$\gamma_n \leftarrow \gamma_{\text{initial}}$
while $f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}_n - \gamma_n \nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)) > f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}_n) - c\gamma_n \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\|^2$ **do**
 $\gamma_n \leftarrow \rho\gamma_n$
end while

Output: γ_n

to terminate in finite updates, and γ_n given by Algorithm 2 satisfies (28). We note that any knowledge on $L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)}$ is not required in Algorithm 2.

4.2 Convergence Analysis

We present below a convergence analysis of Algorithm 1 under Assumption 4.4.

Theorem 4.8 (Convergence analysis of Algorithm 1). *Consider Problem 1.2. Choose arbitrarily $\mathbf{y}_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$, $c \in (0, 1)$, and $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, (2\eta)^{-1}]$ satisfying (24). Suppose that $(\mathbf{y}_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{Y}$ is generated by Algorithm 1 under Assumption 4.4 with $f_n := h + \mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S}$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$). Then, $f_n \circ F$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) and $(\mathbf{y}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ enjoy the following:*

(a) *There exists a constant $\chi \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that, for any pair $(\underline{k}, \bar{k}) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ satisfying $\underline{k} \leq \bar{k}$,*

$$\min_{\underline{k} \leq n \leq \bar{k}} \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\chi}{\sum_{n=\underline{k}}^{\bar{k}} \mu_n}}. \quad (32)$$

(b)

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\| = 0. \quad (33)$$

(c) *Choose a subsequence $(\mathbf{y}_{m(l)})_{l=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{Y}$ of $(\mathbf{y}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla(f_{m(l)} \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_{m(l)})\| = 0$, where $m : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is monotonically increasing⁸. Then, every cluster point $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{Y}$ of $(\mathbf{y}_{m(l)})_{l=1}^\infty$ is a stationary point of Problem 1.2 in the sense of (16).*

Proof. The proof for (a) is inspired partially by that for [35, Theorem 4.1].

(a) Since $\gamma_n > 0$ satisfies the Armijo condition (26) by Assumption 4.4 (b), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}_{n+1}) &= f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}_n - \gamma_n \nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)) \\ &\leq f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}_n) - c\gamma_n \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

By (14) in Fact 2.6, we have

$$(\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}) \quad f_{n+1} \circ F(\mathbf{y}) = h(F(\mathbf{y})) + \mu_{n+1} g(\mathfrak{S}(F(\mathbf{y})))$$

⁸From Theorem 4.8 (b), we can construct such a subsequence $(\mathbf{y}_{m(l)})_{l=1}^\infty$ by using, e.g.,

$$m(l) := \begin{cases} 1 & (l = 1) \\ \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n > m(l-1), \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\| \leq 2^{-l}\} & (l > 1). \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(14)}{\leq} h(F(\mathbf{y})) + \mu_n g(\mathfrak{S}(F(\mathbf{y}))) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu_n - \mu_{n+1}}{\mu_{n+1}} \mu_n L_g^2 \\
&\leq f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}) + \frac{M}{2} (\mu_n - \mu_{n+1}) L_g^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where we used $\mu_n/\mu_{n+1} \leq M$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) with some constant $M \geq 1$ (see the condition (iv) in (24)). By combining (34) and (35), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad f_{n+1} \circ F(\mathbf{y}_{n+1}) &\stackrel{(35)}{\leq} f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}_{n+1}) + \frac{M}{2} (\mu_n - \mu_{n+1}) L_g^2 \\
&\stackrel{(34)}{\leq} f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}_n) - c\gamma_n \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\|^2 + \frac{M}{2} (\mu_n - \mu_{n+1}) L_g^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

and thus

$$(n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad f_{n+1} \circ F(\mathbf{y}_{n+1}) \leq f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}_n) + \frac{M}{2} (\mu_n - \mu_{n+1}) L_g^2. \tag{37}$$

By summing (36) up from $n = \underline{k}$ to \bar{k} , the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
c \sum_{n=\underline{k}}^{\bar{k}} \gamma_n \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\|^2 &\leq f_{\underline{k}} \circ F(\mathbf{y}_{\underline{k}}) - f_{\bar{k}+1} \circ F(\mathbf{y}_{\bar{k}+1}) + \frac{M}{2} (\mu_{\underline{k}} - \mu_{\bar{k}+1}) L_g^2 \\
&\leq f_{\underline{k}} \circ F(\mathbf{y}_{\underline{k}}) - \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} f_1 \circ F(\mathbf{y}) + \frac{M}{2} (\mu_{\underline{k}} - \mu_{\bar{k}+1}) L_g^2 \\
&\leq f_1 \circ F(\mathbf{y}_1) - \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} f_1 \circ F(\mathbf{y}) + \frac{M}{2} (\mu_1 - \mu_{\bar{k}+1}) L_g^2 \\
&\leq f_1 \circ F(\mathbf{y}_1) - \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} f_1 \circ F(\mathbf{y}) + \frac{M}{2} \mu_1 L_g^2 < +\infty,
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where the second inequality follows by $\inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} f_1 \circ F(\mathbf{y}) \stackrel{(14)}{\leq} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} f_{\bar{k}+1} \circ F(\mathbf{y}) \leq f_{\bar{k}+1} \circ F(\mathbf{y}_{\bar{k}+1})$, and the third inequality follows by using (37) recursively. The last inequality in (38) follows by $\inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} f_1 \circ F(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}$, which can be checked by (i) $(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F$ is bounded below by the condition (v) in Problem 1.1; and by (ii) $(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F(\mathbf{y}) - \frac{1}{2} \mu_1 L_g^2 \leq (h + \mu_1 g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F(\mathbf{y}) = f_1 \circ F(\mathbf{y})$ ($\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$) from (13) in Fact 2.6.

By Assumption 4.4, recall that (i) $\nabla(f_n \circ F)$ is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)} = \varpi_1 + \varpi_2 \mu_n^{-1}$ with some constants $\varpi_1, \varpi_2 > 0$; (ii) every γ_n is bounded below by $\beta L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)}^{-1}$ with some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, from which we have

$$(n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \gamma_n \geq \beta L_{\nabla(f_n \circ F)}^{-1} = \frac{\beta \mu_n}{\varpi_1 \mu_n + \varpi_2} = \frac{\beta \eta \mu_n}{\varpi_1 \eta \mu_n + \eta \varpi_2} \geq \frac{\beta \eta}{\varpi_1 + \eta \varpi_2} \mu_n,$$

where the last inequality follows by $\eta\mu_n \in (0, 2^{-1}]$. Then, the LHS in (38) can be further bounded below as

$$\begin{aligned} c \sum_{n=\underline{k}}^{\bar{k}} \gamma_n \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\|^2 &\geq \frac{c\beta\eta}{\varpi_1 + \eta\varpi_2} \sum_{n=\underline{k}}^{\bar{k}} \mu_n \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{c\beta\eta}{\varpi_1 + \eta\varpi_2} \min_{\underline{k} \leq n \leq \bar{k}} \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\|^2 \sum_{n=\underline{k}}^{\bar{k}} \mu_n. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

By (38) and (39), (32) holds with

$$\chi := \frac{(f_1 \circ F(\mathbf{y}_1) - \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} f_1 \circ F(\mathbf{y}) + \frac{M}{2} \mu_1 L_g^2)(\varpi_1 + \eta\varpi_2)}{c\beta\eta} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}.$$

(b) Let $a_n := \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\|$, and $b_n := \inf\{a_m \mid m \geq n\}$. For every $\underline{k} \in \mathbb{N}$, the inequality (32) with $\bar{k} \rightarrow \infty$ implies $b_{\underline{k}} = 0$ thanks to the nonsummability of $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ (see the condition (ii) in (24)). This implies $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla(f_n \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\| = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = 0$.

(c) Let $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{Y}$ be a cluster point of $(\mathbf{y}_{m(l)})_{l=1}^{\infty}$. The relation (22) in Theorem 4.1 (b) with Theorem 4.8 (b) yields $d(\mathbf{0}, \partial((h+g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}^*)) = 0$, implying \mathbf{y}^* satisfies (16). \square

Remark 4.9 (Choice of $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$).

(a) (Tradeoff regarding convergence speeds) Under the setting of Theorem 4.8, we have the following decaying rates as $n \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\min_{1 \leq k \leq n} \|\nabla(f_k \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_k)\| \stackrel{(32)}{=} \mathfrak{o} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n \mu_k}} \right); \quad (40)$$

$$\sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} |f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}) - f \circ F(\mathbf{y})| \stackrel{(13)}{=} \mathfrak{o}(\mu_n), \quad (41)$$

where \mathfrak{o} stands for the Landau's Big O notation. These rates demonstrate a tradeoff between convergence speeds to 0 of $\sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} |f_n \circ F(\mathbf{y}) - f \circ F(\mathbf{y})|$ and that of $\min_{1 \leq k \leq n} \|\nabla(f_k \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_k)\|$, although the both values are clearly desired to converge to 0 quickly.

(b) (Reasonable choice of $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$) By using $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} := ((2\eta)^{-1} n^{-1/3})_{n=1}^{\infty}$, we can achieve the same decaying rates $\mathfrak{o} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n \mu_k}} \right) = \mathfrak{o}(\mu_n)$ in (40) and (41) (see (25)). Indeed, this choice of $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has been used in variable smoothing-type algorithms [35, 44, 45] (see Remark 4.10 (a)) as a reasonable choice.

Remark 4.10 (Relation to existing algorithms).

(a) (Variable smoothing in [35]) In a special case where $C := \mathcal{X}$, $F := \text{Id}$ and \mathfrak{S} is linear, the variable smoothing in [35, Alg. 1] is reproduced as Alg. 1 with $c = 2^{-1}$, $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} := ((2\eta)^{-1} n^{-1/3})_{n=1}^{\infty}$, and γ_n given by (30). Our convergence

analysis (Theorem 4.8) of Alg. 1 can be applied to this case assumed in [35] because Assumption 4.4 (a) is automatically satisfied [35, (22)] (see Prop. 4.5 and Remark 4.6 (a)). Therefore, Alg. 1 serves as an extension of the variable smoothing [35] in two senses: (i) from unconstrained optimization to nonconvexly constrained optimization; (ii) from linear \mathfrak{S} to nonlinear but smooth \mathfrak{S} .

- (b) (Smooth approximation approach, e.g., [37]) For finding a stationary point of a nonsmooth function $J : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, smooth approximation approaches have been extensively discussed [37, 57–60] with a smoothed surrogate function, say $J^{\langle \mu \rangle} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$)⁹, having the (sub-)gradient consistency property (see Remark 4.2). The basic idea of the smooth approximation approaches is finding an approximate stationary point $\mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{X}$ of $J^{\langle \mu_n \rangle}$ satisfying $\|\nabla J^{\langle \mu_n \rangle}(\mathbf{x}_n)\| \leq \mu_n$ at n th iteration with $\mu_n \searrow 0$. Thanks to the (sub-)gradient consistency property of $J^{\langle \mu \rangle}$, every cluster point of $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a stationary point of J [37].

The smooth approximation approaches can be applied to Problem 1.2 thanks to the (sub-)gradient consistency property of $(h + {}^\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F$ ($\mu \in (0, \eta^{-1})$) for $(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F$ (see Theorem 4.1 (b) and Remark 4.2). However, the smooth approximation approaches require some iterative solver for finding an approximate stationary point $\mathbf{y}_n \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\|\nabla((h + {}^\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\| \leq \mu_n$ at every iteration while the proposed Algorithm 1 does not require any iterative solver mainly because of useful properties of ${}^\mu g$ in Fact 2.6.

5 Numerical experiments

We demonstrate the efficacy of Algorithm 1 with γ_n given by Algorithm 2¹⁰ by numerical experiments in scenarios of two applications: (i) the sparse spectral clustering (SSC) and (ii) the sparse principal component analysis (SPCA). In the SSC application (Section 5.1), we present a new formulation of SSC, via Problem 1.1 with a weakly convex and smooth composition, and demonstrate how this new formulation improves estimation performance of the existing SSC algorithm. In the SPCA application (Section 5.2), we demonstrate the efficient numerical performance of the proposed Algorithm 1 by comparing its empirical results, e.g., convergence speed, with those of fairly standard Riemannian nonsmooth optimization algorithms [41, 43, 44] (Note: the proposed Algorithm 1 and the standard algorithms [41, 43, 44] are applicable to the SPCA problem). All experiments were performed by MATLAB on MacBookPro (Apple M3, 16GB).

The both applications are reduced to nonsmooth optimization problems over an embedded submanifold, say the Stiefel manifold $\text{St}(p, N) := \{\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times p} \mid \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}_p\}$ ($p \leq N$), in $\mathbb{R}^{N \times p}$ [22, Section 3.3.2]. In order to apply Algorithm 1 to such problems, we employ the generalized inverse Cayley transform [32] as a parametrization F of $\text{St}(p, N)$:

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} : (\mathcal{Y} :=) Q_{N,p} \rightarrow \text{St}(p, N) \setminus E_{N,p}(\mathbf{S}) : \mathbf{V} \mapsto \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V})(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V})^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{N \times p} \quad (42)$$

⁹ $J^{\langle \mu \rangle}$ is not limited to be the Moreau envelope in this case.

¹⁰In our preliminary experiments, we examined that Algorithm 1 with γ_n given by Algorithm 2 achieves faster convergence than Algorithm 1 with γ_n in (30). Therefore, in the numerical experiments, we demonstrate the efficacy of Algorithm 1 with γ_n given by Algorithm 2.

with $\mathbf{S} \in \text{O}(N) := \text{St}(N, N)$, where

$$Q_{N,p} := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & -\mathbf{B}^\top \\ \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \mid \begin{array}{l} -\mathbf{A}^\top = \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}, \\ \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-p) \times p} \end{array} \right\} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{Np-p(p+1)/2}$$

is the set of skew-symmetric matrices, $E_{N,p}(\mathbf{S}) := \{\mathbf{U} \in \text{St}(p, N) \mid \det(\mathbf{I}_p + \mathbf{I}_{N \times p}^\top \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{U}) = 0\}$ is called the *singular-point set*, and $\mathbf{I}_{N \times p} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times p}$ is the first p column vectors of the N -by- N identity matrix \mathbf{I} . Although the image $\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(Q_{N,p}) = \text{St}(p, N) \setminus E_{N,p}(\mathbf{S})$ is a proper subset of $\text{St}(p, N)$, $\text{St}(p, N) \setminus E_{N,p}(\mathbf{S})$ is open¹¹ and dense¹² in $\text{St}(p, N)$ [32, Theorem 2.3 (b)], implying thus almost all points in $\text{St}(p, N)$ can be parametrized in terms of the Euclidean space $Q_{N,p}$ with $\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$.

Corollary 5.1 below implies that $\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$ possesses well-suited properties for its application to Algorithm 1 as a parametrization F . More precisely, with $C := \text{St}(p, N)$ and $F := \Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$, (i) Corollary 5.1 (a) implies the equivalence of the first-order optimality conditions for Problem 1.1 and Problem 1.2; (ii) Corollary 5.1 (b) and Theorem 4.8 imply that Algorithm 1 is guaranteed to find a stationary point of Problem 1.2.

Corollary 5.1 (Properties of $\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$ in (42) as parametrization of $\text{St}(p, N)$). *Consider Problem 1.1 with $C := \text{St}(p, N)$. Let $F := \Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} : (\mathcal{Y} :=) Q_{N,p} \rightarrow \text{St}(p, N) \setminus E_{N,p}(\mathbf{S})$ with arbitrarily chosen $\mathbf{S} \in \text{O}(N)$. Then, the following hold:*

(a) For $\mathbf{V}^* \in Q_{N,p}$ and $\mathbf{U}^* := F(\mathbf{V}^*) = \Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V}^*) \in \text{St}(p, N) \setminus E_{N,p}(\mathbf{S})$,

$$\partial(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S} + \iota_C)(\mathbf{U}^*) \ni \mathbf{0} \Leftrightarrow \partial((h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{V}^*) \ni \mathbf{0}.$$

(b) If \mathfrak{S} is twice continuously differentiable, then Assumption 4.4 (a) with $C := \text{St}(p, N)$ and $F := \Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$ is satisfied.

Proof. See Appendix D. □

Remark 5.2 (Singular-point issue for minimizing $f \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$). The procedure for minimization of $f \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$ with $\mathbf{S} \in \text{O}(N)$ fixed may suffer from slow convergence of updating iterates [32] in a case where a minimizer $\mathbf{U}^* \in \text{St}(p, N)$ of $f : \mathbb{R}^{N \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ over $\text{St}(p, N)$ is close to the singular-point set $E_{N,p}(\mathbf{S})$. To suppress such a performance degradation called a singular-point issue, we recently proposed an adaptive parametrization strategy [56, 63] that updates \mathbf{S} adaptively so that $E_{N,p}(\mathbf{S})$ is located far away from \mathbf{U}^* , and its efficacy has been demonstrated numerically therein. This indicates that a similar adaptive parametrization strategy may improve the convergence speed of Algorithm 1, however this improvement is beyond the scope of this paper, and thus will be addressed in future work.

5.1 Sparse Spectral Clustering (SSC)

The spectral clustering (SC) [64] is one of powerful modern clustering algorithms, where the goal of clustering is to split given data $(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ into $K \leq N$ groups without requiring labels of data. The SC has been used not only for clustering on

¹¹There exists an open subset $O \subset \mathbb{R}^{N \times p}$ in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{N \times p}$ such that $\text{St}(p, N) \setminus E_{N,p}(\mathbf{S}) = O \cap \text{St}(p, N)$.

¹²For any $\mathbf{U} \in \text{St}(p, N)$, there exists $(\mathbf{U}_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \text{St}(p, N) \setminus E_{N,p}(\mathbf{S})$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{U}_n = \mathbf{U}$.

Algorithm 3 (Sparse) Spectral clustering

Input: Data $(\xi_i)_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

- 1: Construct an affinity matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ whose entries $[\mathbf{W}]_{i,j} \geq 0$ stands for the similarity between ξ_i and ξ_j .
 - 2: Compute the normalized Laplacian $\mathbf{L} := \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ by regarding \mathbf{W} as the adjacency matrix of a certain graph \mathcal{G} , where $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is the degree (diagonal) matrix of \mathbf{W} , i.e., $[\mathbf{D}]_{i,i} = \sum_{j=1}^N [\mathbf{W}]_{i,j}$.
 - 3: Compute $\mathbf{U}^* \in \text{St}(K, N)$ by solving (43) ((44) in case of Sparse Spectral Clustering).
 - 4: Form $\hat{\mathbf{U}}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times K}$ by normalizing each row $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^K$ of \mathbf{U}^* to length 1.
 - 5: Treat each row $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^K$ of $\hat{\mathbf{U}}^*$ as a feature vector of ξ_i , and cluster $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i^*)_{i=1}^N$ into K clusters by the k-means algorithm.
-

graphs [65] in graph signal processing, but also for single-cell RNA sequence [42], remote sensing image analysis [66], and detecting clusters in networks [67].

To split given data $(\xi_i)_{i=1}^N$ into K groups, the SC is executed as in Algorithm 3 based on the graph theory (see, e.g., [68]). The SC consists of two parts: (i) constructing an affinity matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and an affinity graph \mathcal{G} , e.g., k-nearest neighborhood graph [69], of $(\xi_i)_{i=1}^N$; (ii) decomposing \mathcal{G} into K connected subgraphs based on a certain spectral behavior of the normalized Laplacian $\mathbf{L} := \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ of \mathcal{G} , where $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is the degree matrix of \mathcal{G} . More precisely for (ii), the SC exploits the fact that if \mathbf{L} has an eigenvalue 0 with the multiplicity K , then \mathcal{G} can be decomposed into K connected subgraphs by clustering the eigenvectors associated with the eigenvalue 0 (see, e.g., [68]). By leveraging this fact, the SC computes the K smallest eigenvectors of \mathbf{L} , in the third step of Algorithm 3, which can be characterized as a minimizer of the following optimization problem:

$$\underset{\mathbf{U} \in \text{St}(K, N)}{\text{find}} \mathbf{U}^* \in \underset{\mathbf{U} \in \text{St}(K, N)}{\text{argmin}} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}). \quad (43)$$

In the fourth step of Algorithm 3, we normalize each row vector, say $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^K$, of \mathbf{U}^* as $\|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i^*\|_2 = 1$. Finally, we cluster $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i^*)_{i=1}^N$ into K groups by using the k-means algorithm.

In order to improve the numerical performance of the SC, the sparse SC (SSC) [6, 42] exploits a prior knowledge that the affinity matrix \mathbf{W} and Laplacian \mathbf{L} can be block diagonal, in the ideal case where there is no edge between nodes in different groups, by using a certain permutation $p : \{1, 2, \dots, N\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ of indices of $(\xi_i)_{i=1}^N$ as

$$\underbrace{(\xi_{p(1)}, \xi_{p(2)}, \dots, \xi_{p(\mathcal{I}_1)})}_{\text{1st group}}, \underbrace{(\xi_{p(\mathcal{I}_1+1)}, \dots, \xi_{p(\mathcal{I}_1+\mathcal{I}_2)})}_{\text{2nd group}}, \dots, \underbrace{(\xi_{p(\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathcal{I}_k+1)}, \dots, \xi_{p(N)})}_{\text{Kth group}},$$

where $\mathcal{I}_k \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the size of k th group. The block diagonality of \mathbf{L} indicates the block diagonality of $\mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{U}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ with $\mathbf{U}^* \in \text{St}(K, N)$ in (43), thereby inducing the sparsity of $\mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{U}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. Although the above permutation is not available in general,

$\mathbf{U}^*\mathbf{U}^*$ is expected to be sparse even if any permutation is employed. Therefore, in the SSC, the sparsity of $\mathbf{U}^*\mathbf{U}^*$ is promoted via solving the following problem in place of (43):

$$\text{find } \mathbf{U}^* \in \underset{\mathbf{U} \in \text{St}(K, N)}{\text{argmin}} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}) + \lambda \psi \circ \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{U}), \quad (44)$$

where $\lambda > 0$, $\mathfrak{S} : \mathbb{R}^{N \times K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} : \mathbf{U} \mapsto \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^\top$, and $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a sparsity promoting function, e.g., ℓ_1 -norm, MCP, and SCAD (see, e.g., [7, 10]).

By Corollary 5.1, the problem (44) can be reformulated as Problem 1.2 with $C := \text{St}(K, N)$, $F := \Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$ in (42), $h(\mathbf{U}) := \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U})$ and $g := \lambda \psi$:

$$\text{find } \mathbf{V}^* \in \underset{\mathbf{V} \in Q_{N, K}}{\text{argmin}} \underbrace{(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S})}_{=: f} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V}). \quad (45)$$

By employing a Lipschitz continuous and weakly convex function as ψ , we can find a stationary point of (44) by Algorithm 1 (see Theorem 4.8 with Corollary 5.1). We note that (i) standard Riemannian nonsmooth optimization algorithms, e.g., [41, 44, 45], can not be applied to the problem (44) because \mathfrak{S} is nonlinear; (ii) [42] reported a prox-linear method for the problem (44) in a case where ψ is a convex ℓ_1 -norm.

In this numerical experiment, we evaluated the numerical performance of SSC via the formulation in (45) by applying Algorithm 1 with γ_n given by Algorithm 2 under the setting (for a choice of $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, see Remark 4.9)

$$(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty = ((2\eta)^{-1} n^{-1/3})_{n=1}^\infty, c = 2^{-13}, \rho = 0.5, \gamma_{\text{initial}} = \min\{1, \|\nabla(f_1 \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1})(\mathbf{V}_0)\|_F^{-1}\}, \quad (46)$$

where f_1 is defined as in Algorithm 1, and $(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{V}_0) \in O(N) \times Q_{N, K}$ was chosen¹³ to satisfy $\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V}_0) = \mathbf{U}_0$ for an initial guess $\mathbf{U}_0 \in \text{St}(K, N)$. In order to examine how much weakly convex regularizers can enhance the performance, we compared (i) the proposed SSC (SSC+MCP) by employing MCP [17]

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}) \quad \psi_\theta^{\text{MCP}}(\mathbf{X}) &:= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} r_\theta^{\text{MCP}}([\mathbf{X}]_{i, j}) \\ \text{with } r_\theta^{\text{MCP}}([\mathbf{X}]_{i, j}) &:= \begin{cases} |[\mathbf{X}]_{i, j}| - \frac{[\mathbf{X}]_{i, j}^2}{2\theta} & (\text{if } |[\mathbf{X}]_{i, j}| \leq \theta) \\ \frac{\theta}{2} & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

with a parameter $\theta > 0$ with (ii) the proposed SSC (SSC+ ℓ_1) by employing ℓ_1 -norm $\|\mathbf{X}\|_1 := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} |[\mathbf{X}]_{i, j}|$ ($\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$) as ψ (for the closed-form expressions of proximity operators of $\|\cdot\|_1$ and ψ_θ^{MCP} , see [7, Example 24.22] and [35] respectively). Since ψ_θ^{MCP} is θ^{-1} -weakly convex, and $\|\cdot\|_1$ is convex, i.e., η -weakly convex with any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, we used $\eta := \theta^{-1}$ for MCP, and $\eta := 1$ for ℓ_1 -norm in Algorithm 1. Since MCP can alleviate underestimation of desired sparse target compared with ℓ_1 -norm

¹³By following [32, Theorem 2.7], a pair $(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{V}_0) \in O(N) \times Q_{N, K}$ satisfying $\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V}_0) = \mathbf{U}_0$ can be chosen as $\mathbf{S} := \text{diag}(\mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{Q}_2^\top, \mathbf{I}_{N-K})$ and $\mathbf{V}_0 := \Phi_{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{U}_0)$, where $\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2 \in O(K)$ are obtained by a singular-value decomposition of the upper block matrix $\mathbf{U}_{0\text{up}} = \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{Q}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ of \mathbf{U}_0 with a nonnegative-valued diagonal matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$, and $\Phi_{\mathbf{S}} : \text{St}(K, N) \setminus E_{N, K}(\mathbf{S}) \rightarrow Q_{N, K}$ is the generalized Cayley transform [32, (10)-(12)] (Note: $\Phi_{\mathbf{S}} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} = \text{Id}$ and $\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{S}} = \text{Id}$ hold respectively on their domains).

(see, e.g., [12, 14, 15]), SSC+MCP is expected to achieve better performance than SSC+ ℓ_1 .

Moreover, we compared (i) SSC+MCP and (ii) SSC+ ℓ_1 with (iii) the SC [64], which solves the problem (43); (iv) the SSC [6] denoted by SSC[relax]¹⁴, which solves a certain convex relaxation of (44) as

$$\text{find } \mathbf{P}^* \in \underset{\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}, \mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{P} \leq \mathbf{I}, \text{Tr}(\mathbf{P})=K}{\text{argmin}} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{L}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{P}\|_1, \quad (48)$$

where $\{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \mid \mathbf{U} \in \text{St}(K, N)\}$ is relaxed to the convex set $\{\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \mid \mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{P} \leq \mathbf{I}, \text{Tr}(\mathbf{P}) = K\}$. The problem (48) can be solved by classical convex optimization algorithms, e.g., ADMM (see, e.g., [9]). In the SSC[relax] [6], \mathbf{U}^* in the third step of Algorithm 3 is obtained as first K eigenvectors corresponding to the largest K eigenvalues of \mathbf{P}^* in (48).

To evaluate clustering performance, we computed two standard criteria: the Normalized Mutual Information (NMI) [70] and the Adjusted Rand Index (ARI) [71]. These scores closer to one indicate better clustering performance.

We evaluated performances of algorithms by using 7 real-world datasets in UCI Machine Learning Repository [72]: (i) “iris”; (ii) “shuttle” (chosen 1500 samples randomly); (iii) “segmentation”; (iv) “breast cancer”; (v) “glass”; (vi) “wine”; and (vii) “seeds”, where the number K of clusters for each dataset was assumed to be known. For each dataset, we made an affinity matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ of data $(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)_{i=1}^N$ by following [69]¹⁵ as the first step of Algorithm 3. For SSC[relax], SSC+ ℓ_1 and SSC+MCP, parameters λ in the problem (45) and (48), and θ for MCP in (47) were chosen from $\{10^{-i} \mid i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ to achieve the highest value $(\text{NMI} + \text{ARI})/2$. All algorithms except for SC were terminated when running CPU time exceeded 120 seconds or the iteration number exceeded 10000.

Table 2 shows the averaged NMI and ARI by running k-means algorithm in the fifth step of Algorithm 3 for 100 times. The values in bold indicate the best results among all algorithms. We see that three SSCs almost achieve higher NMIs and ARIs than those of SC, implying thus three SSCs outperform SC. We also observe that SSC+ ℓ_1 is competitive to SSC[relax]. Moreover, among all four algorithms, SSC+MCP achieves the highest NMIs (except for “wine”) and ARIs as we expected. In particular, for “breast cancer”, SSC+MCP overwhelms the others. From these results, SSC via the formulation in (45) with a weakly convex regularizer (MCP) has a great potential to improve the numerical performance of SSC.

5.2 Sparse Principal Component Analysis (SPCA)

We consider the SPCA (see, e.g., [41, 44, 45]) formulated as

$$\text{find } \mathbf{U}^* \in \underset{\mathbf{U} \in \text{St}(p, N)}{\text{argmin}} \underbrace{-\text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}^T \boldsymbol{\Xi}^T \boldsymbol{\Xi} \mathbf{U})}_{=:h(\mathbf{U})} + \lambda \underbrace{\|\mathbf{U}\|_1}_{=:g(\mathbf{U})} \quad (49)$$

¹⁴We used codes in <https://github.com/canyilu/LibADMM-toolbox>.

¹⁵We used codes in <https://github.com/mashaan14/Spectral-Clustering>.

Table 2 Averaged NMI and ARI of each algorithm.

	iris	shuttle	segmentation	breast cancer	glass	wine	seeds
NMI							
SC	0.778	0.435	0.501	0.417	0.321	0.433	0.662
SSC[relax]	0.785	0.485	0.503	0.433	0.322	0.433	0.671
SSC+ ℓ_1	0.785	0.486	0.503	0.433	0.323	0.433	0.667
SSC+MCP	0.794	0.496	0.507	0.514	0.331	0.432	0.698
ARI							
SC	0.745	0.231	0.341	0.419	0.174	0.363	0.659
SSC[relax]	0.786	0.315	0.343	0.462	0.174	0.363	0.675
SSC+ ℓ_1	0.786	0.317	0.343	0.462	0.175	0.363	0.668
SSC+MCP	0.794	0.397	0.352	0.595	0.181	0.388	0.709

where $\Xi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I} \times N}$ is a data matrix, $\mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number of data, N is the dimension of each data, and $\lambda > 0$ is a predetermined weight. The SPCA in (49) is a special instance of Problem 1.1 with $C := \text{St}(p, N)$ and $\mathfrak{S} = \text{Id}$. By Corollary 5.1, the SPCA in (49) can be reformulated as Problem 1.2 with $C := \text{St}(p, N)$ and $F := \Phi_{\mathfrak{S}}^{-1}$ in (42):

$$\text{find } \mathbf{V}^* \in \underset{\mathbf{V} \in Q_{N,p}}{\text{argmin}} (h + g) \circ \Phi_{\mathfrak{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V}) \quad (50)$$

In this experiment, we applied Algorithm 1 (VSmooth) to the problem in (50) under the setting (46) with γ_n given by Algorithm 2.

We compared the numerical performance of VSmooth with that of three Riemannian nonsmooth optimization algorithms applied to the problem in (49): (i) the Riemannian smoothing gradient algorithm [44, Section 4.1] (RSmooth), (ii) the Riemannian subgradient method [43, (2.6)] (RSub), and (iii) the Riemannian proximal gradient method [41, Algorithm 2] (ManPGAda¹⁶). For each Riemannian optimization algorithm, the update from $\mathbf{U}_n \in \text{St}(p, N)$ to $\mathbf{U}_{n+1} \in \text{St}(p, N)$ is expressed as

$$\mathbf{U}_{n+1} := R_{\mathbf{U}_n}(\gamma_n \mathcal{D}_n)$$

with a stepsize $\gamma_n > 0$ and a search direction $\mathcal{D}_n \in T_{\text{St}(p,N)}(\mathbf{U}_n) := \{\mathcal{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times p} \mid \mathbf{U}_n^\top \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{D}^\top \mathbf{U}_n = \mathbf{0}\}$ in the tangent space $T_{\text{St}(p,N)}(\mathbf{U}_n)$ (see Example 2.2 (c)), where $R_{\mathbf{U}_n} : T_{\text{St}(p,N)}(\mathbf{U}_n) \rightarrow \text{St}(p, N)$ is a *retraction* satisfying $R_{\mathbf{U}_n}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{U}_n$ and $\text{DR}_{\mathbf{U}_n}(\mathbf{0})[\mathcal{D}] = \mathcal{D}$ ($\mathcal{D} \in T_{\text{St}(p,N)}(\mathbf{U}_n)$) (see, e.g., [22–24]). For these algorithms, we employed the polar decomposition-based retraction [22] $R_{\mathbf{U}}^{\text{polar}}(\mathcal{D}) := (\mathbf{U} + \mathcal{D})(\mathbf{I}_p + \mathcal{D}^\top \mathcal{D})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ ($\mathbf{U} \in \text{St}(p, N)$, $\mathcal{D} \in T_{\text{St}(p,N)}(\mathbf{U})$) as the retraction $R_{\mathbf{U}}$ because $R_{\mathbf{U}}^{\text{polar}}$ is the retraction that was used in [41, 43, 44]. Every search direction is given respectively by:

$$\mathcal{D}_n^{\text{RSmooth}} := -P_{T_{\text{St}(p,N)}(\mathbf{U}_n)}(\nabla(h + \mu_n g)(\mathbf{U}_n)) \text{ with } \mu_n \searrow 0; \quad (51)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_n^{\text{RSub}} := -P_{T_{\text{St}(p,N)}(\mathbf{U}_n)}(\nabla h(\mathbf{U}_n) + \mathcal{G}) \text{ with } \mathcal{G} \in \partial g(\mathbf{U}_n); \quad (52)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_n^{\text{ManPGAda}} &:= \underset{\mathcal{D} \in T_{\text{St}(p,N)}(\mathbf{U}_n)}{\text{argmin}} \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{U}_n), \mathcal{D} \rangle + \frac{1}{2t_n} \|\mathcal{D}\|_F^2 + g(\mathbf{U}_n + \mathcal{D}) \\ &\text{with } t_n > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

¹⁶We used codes in. <https://github.com/chenshixiang/ManPG>.

Table 3 Running CPU time t (seconds)

	p=1	p=100/N	p=10/N
N=200	0.5	0.5	1.5
N=500	1.5	1.5	3.0
N=1000	3.0	3.0	9.0

where $P_{T_{\text{St}(p,N)}(\mathbf{U}_n)} : \mathbb{R}^{N \times p} \rightarrow T_{\text{St}(p,N)}(\mathbf{U}_n)$ is the orthogonal projection mapping onto $T_{\text{St}(p,N)}(\mathbf{U}_n)$ (see, e.g., [22]), and $t_n > 0$ for ManPGAda [41] is adaptively designed to accelerate convergence speed. Clearly, ManPGAda requires some iterative solver for the subproblem (53) to find a search direction while the others do not require. For RSmooth, we employed $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty = ((2\eta)^{-1}n^{-1/3})_{n=1}^\infty$ because RSmooth with this $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ achieves the best convergence rate [44, Remark 4.1]. In this experiment, to find a stepsize γ_n , we used backtracking algorithms for ManPGAda and RSmooth suggested in [41] and in [44] respectively, and we employed $\gamma_n := 0.99^n$ for RSub.

For the problem (49) with each $N \in \{200, 500, 1000\}$, $p \in \{1, N/100, N/10\}$ and $\lambda = 0.1$, we tested performance of all algorithms with 10 random $\Xi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I} \times N}$ with $\mathcal{I} = 5000$ generated by the following procedure: (i) generate $\Xi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I} \times N}$ from the standard normal distribution; (ii) shift the columns of Ξ to have zero means; (iii) normalize Ξ such that $\|\Xi\|_F = 1$. For each trial, all algorithms started with the same initial guess $\mathbf{U}_0 \in \text{St}(p, N)$ generated by a MATLAB code “orth(randn(N,p))”, and were terminated when running CPU time exceeded $t(> 0)$ seconds (see Table 3 for t).

Figure 1 demonstrates the convergence histories for the problem (49), where the plots show CPU time on the horizontal axis versus the average of the value of the cost function on the vertical axis. The detailed results are demonstrated in Table 4, where for each final estimate $\mathbf{U}^\diamond \in \text{St}(p, N)$, ‘fval’ means the value $f(\mathbf{U}^\diamond)$, ‘feasi’ means the feasibility error $\|\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{U}^{\diamond\top}\mathbf{U}^\diamond\|_F$ of \mathbf{U}^\diamond from the constraint set $\text{St}(p, N)$, ‘itr’ means the number of iterations, ‘time’ means the CPU time (s), and ‘sparsity’ means the ratio of entries in \mathbf{U}^\diamond such that $|[\mathbf{U}^\diamond]_{i,j}| < 10^{-4}$.

From Figure 1, we see that the proposed VSmooth converges faster than RSmooth and RSub for all problem size. Thus, VSmooth achieves the best performance among algorithms that do not require any iterative solver for subproblems. For $p \in \{1, N/100\}$, VSmooth seems to be competitive or inferior to ManPGAda. However, for $N \in \{500, 1000\}$ and large $p = N/10$, the performance of ManPGAda severely deteriorates while no such deterioration is observed for VSmooth. Moreover, we also observe that ManPGAda updates for only a few iterations from Table 4. This is because ManPGAda took a long time to find an approximated solution of a subproblem in (53) at every iteration. This implies that VSmooth is more computationally reliable than ManPGAda for large problem sizes. From these observations, VSmooth has a comparable numerical performance compared to the fairly standard Riemannian nonsmooth optimization algorithms [41, 43, 44] even for Problem 1.1 with a simple case, i.e., g is convex and $G = \text{Id}$.




Fig. 1 Convergence histories of all algorithms for the problem (49) regarding the value $f(\mathbf{U})$ at CPU time for each problem size. Markers are put at every 100 iterations.

6 Conclusions

We addressed a nonconvexly constrained nonsmooth optimization problem, where the cost function consists of a smooth function and the composite function of a weakly convex function and a smooth (nonlinear) mapping. For the target problem, we proposed a variable smoothing algorithm with a parametrization of a nonconvex constraint set. We also presented an asymptotic convergence analysis of the proposed algorithm in terms of stationary points. The numerical experiments demonstrate that (i) the proposed algorithm improves the numerical performance of sparsity-aware application by using a weakly convex regularizer; (ii) the proposed algorithm has a comparable numerical performance compared with the existing Riemannian nonsmooth optimization algorithms based on a retraction.

Acknowledgements. This work was supported partially by JSPS Grants-in-Aid (19H04134, 22KJ1270, 24K23885) and by JST SICORP (JPMJSC20C6).

Table 4 Performance of all algorithms for the problem (49).

Algorithm	fval	feasi	itr	time	sparsity
$(N, p) = (200, 1)$					
RSmooth	9.50229e-02	7.216e-16	3673.8	0.50	9.950e-01
RSub	9.50082e-02	0.000e+00	17357	0.50	9.950e-01
ManPGAda	9.50082e-02	2.220e-17	3927.5	0.50	9.950e-01
VSmooth	9.50728e-02	2.220e-16	5493	0.50	9.950e-01
$(N, p) = (200, 2)$					
RSmooth	1.90027e-01	9.578e-16	2292.4	0.50	9.950e-01
RSub	1.89986e-01	9.687e-106	11810.9	0.50	9.950e-01
ManPGAda	1.89973e-01	2.116e-16	1956.2	0.50	9.950e-01
VSmooth	1.90124e-01	7.477e-16	2994.9	0.50	9.950e-01
$(N, p) = (200, 20)$					
RSmooth	1.90032e+00	5.081e-15	1646.5	1.50	9.950e-01
RSub	1.89997e+00	3.513e-15	8918.2	1.50	9.950e-01
ManPGAda	1.89987e+00	6.250e-15	1377.4	1.50	9.950e-01
VSmooth	1.90149e+00	3.050e-15	2552.4	1.50	9.950e-01
$(N, p) = (500, 1)$					
RSmooth	9.80240e-02	7.661e-16	1943	1.50	9.980e-01
RSub	9.80058e-02	0.000e+00	7027.6	1.50	9.980e-01
ManPGAda	9.80058e-02	2.220e-17	1805.2	1.50	9.980e-01
VSmooth	9.80899e-02	1.554e-16	2513.7	1.50	9.980e-01
$(N, p) = (500, 5)$					
RSmooth	4.90112e-01	3.119e-15	1133.5	1.50	9.980e-01
RSub	4.89997e-01	9.807e-16	4875.8	1.50	9.980e-01
ManPGAda	4.90014e-01	2.370e-15	784.8	1.50	9.980e-01
VSmooth	4.90525e-01	2.025e-15	1299.5	1.50	9.980e-01
$(N, p) = (500, 50)$					
RSmooth	4.98856e+00	1.732e-14	774.8	4.51	9.977e-01
RSub	4.90002e+00	9.091e-15	2145.3	4.50	9.980e-01
ManPGAda	1.02775e+01	1.992e-14	5	5.57	8.736e-01
VSmooth	4.90486e+00	6.629e-15	1150.1	4.50	9.980e-01
$(N, p) = (1000, 1)$					
RSmooth	9.90208e-02	8.882e-16	1076.8	3.00	9.990e-01
RSub	9.89987e-02	0.000e+00	3238	3.00	9.990e-01
ManPGAda	9.89987e-02	4.441e-17	967.9	3.00	9.990e-01
VSmooth	9.91019e-02	3.775e-16	1338.7	3.00	9.990e-01
$(N, p) = (1000, 10)$					
RSmooth	1.02418e+00	6.645e-15	570.5	3.01	9.988e-01
RSub	9.90010e-01	2.970e-14	1700.3	3.00	9.990e-01
ManPGAda	9.90017e-01	4.901e-15	328.8	3.00	9.990e-01
VSmooth	9.91335e-01	3.006e-15	612.5	3.00	9.990e-01
$(N, p) = (1000, 100)$					
RSmooth	1.12218e+01	3.053e-14	376.2	9.02	9.973e-01
RSub	1.02637e+01	3.397e-14	723.6	9.01	9.051e-01
ManPGAda	4.77660e+01	3.306e-14	3	18.35	3.618e-01
VSmooth	1.01238e+01	9.032e-15	502.4	9.01	9.989e-01

References

- [1] Rockafellar, R., Wets, R.J.-B.: Variational Analysis, 3rd edn. Springer, Heidelberg, Berlin, New York (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02431-3>
- [2] Benidis, K., Sun, Y., Babu, P., Palomar, D.P.: Orthogonal sparse PCA and covariance estimation via procrustes reformulation. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* **64**(23), 6211–6226 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2016.2605073>
- [3] Ulfarsson, M.O., Solo, V.: Sparse variable PCA using geodesic steepest descent. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* **56**(12), 5823–5832 (2008) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2008.2006587>
- [4] Breloy, A., Kumar, S., Sun, Y., Palomar, D.P.: Majorization-minimization on the Stiefel

- manifold with application to robust sparse PCA. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* **69**, 1507–1520 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2021.3058442>
- [5] Chen, S., Deng, Z., Ma, S., So, A.M.-C.: Manifold proximal point algorithms for dual principal component pursuit and orthogonal dictionary learning. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* **69**, 4759–4773 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2021.3099643>
- [6] Lu, C., Yan, S., Lin, Z.: Convex sparse spectral clustering: single-view to multi-view. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.* **25**(6), 2833–2843 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIP.2016.2553459>
- [7] Bauschke, H.H., Combettes, P.L.: *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, 2nd edn. Springer, Heidelberg, Berlin, New York (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48311-5>
- [8] Yamada, I., Yamagishi, M.: Hierarchical convex optimization by the hybrid steepest descent method with proximal splitting operators—enhancements of SVM and lasso. In: Bauschke, H.H., Burachik, R.S., Luke, D.R. (eds.) *Splitting Algorithms, Modern Operator Theory, and Applications*, pp. 413–489. Springer, Cham (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25939-6_16
- [9] Condat, L., Kitahara, D., Contreras, A., Hirabayashi, A.: Proximal splitting algorithms for convex optimization: a tour of recent advances, with new twists. *SIAM Review* **65**(2), 375–435 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1379344>
- [10] Chierchia, G., Chouzenoux, E., Combettes, P.L., Pesquet, J.-C.: The Proximity Operator Repository. <https://proximity-operator.net/>
- [11] Chen, L., Gu, Y.: The convergence guarantees of a non-convex approach for sparse recovery. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* **62**(15), 3754–3767 (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2014.2330349>
- [12] Selesnick, I.: Sparse regularization via convex analysis. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* **65**(17), 4481–4494 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2017.2711501>
- [13] Yang, C., Shen, X., Ma, H., Chen, B., Gu, Y., So, H.C.: Weakly convex regularized robust sparse recovery methods with theoretical guarantees. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* **67**(19), 5046–5061 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2019.2935906>
- [14] Abe, J., Yamagishi, M., Yamada, I.: Linearly involved generalized moreau enhanced models and their proximal splitting algorithm under overall convexity condition. *Inverse Problems* **36**(3), 035012 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6420/ab551e>
- [15] Yata, W., Yamagishi, M., Yamada, I.: A constrained LiGME model and its proximal splitting algorithm under overall convexity condition. *J. Appl. Numer. Optim.* **4**(2), 245–271 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.23952/jano.4.2022.2.09>
- [16] Kuroda, H.: A convex-nonconvex framework for enhancing minimization induced penalties, 1–19 (2024) [arXiv:2407.14819v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.14819v2) [math.OC]
- [17] Zhang, C.-H.: Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty. *Ann. Stat.* **38**(2), 894–942 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1214/09-AOS729>
- [18] Duchi, J.C., Ruan, F.: Solving (most) of a set of quadratic equalities: composite optimization for robust phase retrieval. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA* **8**(3), 471–529 (2018) <https://doi.org/10.1093/imaiai/ia015>
- [19] Gillis, N.: Introduction to nonnegative matrix factorization. *SIAG/OPT Views News* **25**, 7–16 (2017)
- [20] Charisopoulos, V., Chen, Y., Davis, D., Díaz, M., Ding, L., Drusvyatskiy, D.: Low-rank matrix recovery with composite optimization: Good conditioning and rapid convergence. *Found. Comput. Math.* **21**(6), 1505–1593 (2021)

- <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-020-09490-9>
- [21] Charisopoulos, V., Davis, D., Díaz, M., Drusvyatskiy, D.: Composite optimization for robust rank one bilinear sensing. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA* **10**(2), 333–396 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1093/imaiai/iaaa027>
- [22] Absil, P.-A., Mahony, R., Sepulchre, R.: *Optimization Algorithms on Matrix Manifolds*. Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ) (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400830244>
- [23] Sato, H.: *Riemannian Optimization and Its Applications*. Springer, New York (NY) (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-62391-3>
- [24] Boumal, N.: *An Introduction to Optimization on Smooth Manifolds*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009166164>
- [25] Absil, P.-A., Hosseini, S.: A collection of nonsmooth Riemannian optimization problems. In: Hosseini, S., Mordukhovich, B.S., Uschmajew, A. (eds.) *Nonsmooth Optimization and Its Applications*, pp. 1–15. Springer, Cham (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11370-4_1
- [26] Yamada, I., Ezaki, T.: An orthogonal matrix optimization by dual Cayley parametrization technique. In: *Proceedings of ICA*, pp. 35–40 (2003)
- [27] Fraikin, C., Hüper, K., Dooren, P.V.: Optimization over the Stiefel manifold. In: *PAMM*, vol. 7, pp. 1062205–1062206 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pamm.200700861> . Wiley Online Library
- [28] Hori, G., Tanaka, T.: Pivoting in Cayley transform-based optimization on orthogonal groups. In: *APSIPA*, pp. 181–184 (2010)
- [29] Helfrich, K., Willmott, D., Ye, Q.: Orthogonal recurrent neural networks with scaled Cayley transform. In: *ICML*, pp. 1969–1978 (2018)
- [30] Lezcano-Casado, M.: Trivializations for gradient-based optimization on manifolds. In: *NeurIPS*, pp. 9157–9168 (2019)
- [31] Kume, K., Yamada, I.: A global Cayley parametrization of Stiefel manifold for direct utilization of optimization mechanisms over vector spaces. In: *IEEE ICASSP*, pp. 5554–5558 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP39728.2021.9414157>
- [32] Kume, K., Yamada, I.: Generalized left-localized Cayley parametrization for optimization with orthogonality constraints. *Optimization* **73**(4), 1113–1159 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1080/02331934.2022.2142471>
- [33] Levin, E., Kileel, J., Boumal, N.: The effect of smooth parametrizations on nonconvex optimization landscapes. *Math. Program.*, 1–49 (2024) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-024-02058-3>
- [34] Boğ, R.I., Hendrich, C.: A variable smoothing algorithm for solving convex optimization problems. *TOP* **23**(1), 124–150 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11750-014-0326-z>
- [35] Böhm, A., Wright, S.J.: Variable smoothing for weakly convex composite functions. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **188**(3), 628–649 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-020-01800-z>
- [36] Kume, K., Yamada, I.: A variable smoothing for nonconvexly constrained nonsmooth optimization with application to sparse spectral clustering. In: *IEEE ICASSP*, pp. 9296–9300 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP48485.2024.10447693>
- [37] Chen, X.: Smoothing methods for nonsmooth, nonconvex minimization. *Math. Program.* **134**(1), 71–99 (2012) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-012-0569-0>
- [38] Burke, J.V., Hoheisel, T.: Epi-convergent smoothing with applications to

- convex composite functions. *SIAM J. Optim.* **23**(3), 1457–1479 (2013) <https://doi.org/10.1137/120889812>
- [39] Drusvyatskiy, D., Paquette, C.: Efficiency of minimizing compositions of convex functions and smooth maps. *Math. Program.* **178**(1-2), 503–558 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-018-1311-3>
- [40] Lewis, A.S., Wright, S.J.: A proximal method for composite minimization. *Math. Program.* **158**(1), 501–546 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-015-0943-9>
- [41] Chen, S., Ma, S., Man-Cho So, A., Zhang, T.: Proximal gradient method for nonsmooth optimization over the Stiefel manifold. *SIAM J. Optim.* **30**(1), 210–239 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M122457X>
- [42] Wang, Z., Liu, B., Chen, S., Ma, S., Xue, L., Zhao, H.: A manifold proximal linear method for sparse spectral clustering with application to single-cell RNA sequencing data analysis. *INFORMS J. on Optim.* **4**(2), 200–214 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1287/ijoo.2021.0064>
- [43] Li, X., Chen, S., Deng, Z., Qu, Q., Zhu, Z., Man-Cho So, A.: Weakly convex optimization over Stiefel manifold using Riemannian subgradient-type methods. *SIAM J. Optim.* **31**(3), 1605–1634 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1321000>
- [44] Beck, A., Rosset, I.: A dynamic smoothing technique for a class of nonsmooth optimization problems on manifolds. *SIAM J. Optim.* **33**(3), 1473–1493 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1489447>
- [45] Peng, Z., Wu, W., Hu, J., Deng, K.: Riemannian smoothing gradient type algorithms for nonsmooth optimization problem on compact Riemannian submanifold embedded in Euclidean space. *Appl. Math. Optim.* **88**(3), 1–32 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00245-023-10061-x>
- [46] Lee, J.M.: *Introduction to Smooth Manifolds*. Springer, New York (NY) (2012). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-9982-5_5
- [47] Fan, J., Li, R.: Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **96**(456), 1348–1360 (2001) <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214501753382273>
- [48] Prater-Bennette, A., Shen, L., Tripp, E.E.: The proximity operator of the log-sum penalty. *J. Sci. Comput.* **93**(67), 1–34 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10915-022-02021-4>
- [49] Liu, Y., Zhou, Y., Lin, R.: The proximal operator of the piece-wise exponential function. *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.* **31**, 894–898 (2024) <https://doi.org/10.1109/LSP.2024.3370493>
- [50] He, Z., Shu, Q., Wen, J., So, H.C.: A novel iterative thresholding algorithm for arctangent regularization problem. In: *IEEE ICASSP*, pp. 9651–9655 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP48485.2024.10448179>
- [51] Atenas, F.: Understanding the Douglas–Rachford splitting method through the lenses of Moreau-type envelopes. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* (2025) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-024-00646-9>
- [52] Hoheisel, T., Laborde, M., Oberman, A.: A regularization interpretation of the proximal point method for weakly convex functions. *J. Dyn. Games* **7**(1), 79–96 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.3934/jdg.2020005>
- [53] Planiden, C., Wang, X.: Proximal mappings and Moreau envelopes of single-variable convex piecewise cubic functions and multivariable gauge functions. In: Hosseini, S., Mordukhovich, B.S., Uschmajew, A. (eds.) *Nonsmooth Optimization and Its Applications*,

- pp. 89–130. Springer, Cham (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11370-4_5
- [54] Ha, W., Liu, H., Barber, R.F.: An equivalence between critical points for rank constraints versus low-rank factorizations. *SIAM J. Optim.* **30**(4), 2927–2955 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1231675>
- [55] Criscitiello, C., Boumal, N.: An accelerated first-order method for non-convex optimization on manifolds. *Found. Comput. Math.* **23**(4), 1433–1509 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-022-09573-9>
- [56] Kume, K., Yamada, I.: Adaptive localized Cayley parametrization for optimization over Stiefel manifold and its convergence rate analysis. *IEEE Access* **12**, 31312–31323 (2024) <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3368631>
- [57] Garmanjani, R., Jádice, D., Vicente, L.N.: Trust-region methods without using derivatives: Worst case complexity and the nonsmooth case. *SIAM J. Optim.* **26**(4), 1987–2011 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1137/151005683>
- [58] Lai, Z., Yoshise, A.: Completely positive factorization by a Riemannian smoothing method. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* **83**(3), 933–966 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-022-00417-4>
- [59] Zhang, C., Chen, X., Ma, S.: A Riemannian smoothing steepest descent method for non-Lipschitz optimization on embedded submanifolds of \mathbb{R}^n . *Math. Oper. Res.* **49**(3), 1710–1733 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.2022.0286>
- [60] Nishioka, A., Kanno, Y.: Smoothing inertial method for worst-case robust topology optimization under load uncertainty. *Struct. Multidiscipl. Optim.* **66**(82), 1–16 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00158-023-03543-7>
- [61] Xu, H.-K.: Iterative algorithms for nonlinear operators. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **66**(1), 240–256 (2002) <https://doi.org/10.1112/S0024610702003332>
- [62] Andrei, N.: *Nonlinear Conjugate Gradient Methods for Unconstrained Optimization*. Springer, Heidelberg, Berlin, New York (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-42950-8>
- [63] Kume, K., Yamada, I.: Adaptive localized Cayley parametrization for optimization over Stiefel manifold, 1–29 (2023) [arXiv:2305.17901](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.17901) [math.OC]
- [64] Ng, A., Jordan, M., Weiss, Y.: On spectral clustering: analysis and an algorithm. In: *NeurIPS*, vol. 14, pp. 1–8 (2001)
- [65] Dong, X., Frossard, P., Vandergheynst, P., Nefedov, N.: Clustering with multi-layer graphs: a spectral perspective. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* **60**(11), 5820–5831 (2012) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2012.2212886>
- [66] Taşdemir, K., Yalçın, B., Yildirim, I.: Approximate spectral clustering with utilized similarity information using geodesic based hybrid distance measures. *Pattern Recognit.* **48**(4), 1465–1477 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2014.10.023>
- [67] Wang, T.-S., Lin, H.-T., Wang, P.: Weighted-spectral clustering algorithm for detecting community structures in complex networks. *Artif. Intell. Rev.* **47**(4), 463–483 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-016-9488-4>
- [68] Luxburg, U.: A tutorial on spectral clustering. *Stat. Comput.* **17**(4), 395–416 (2007) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11222-007-9033-z>
- [69] Alshammari, M., Stavrakakis, J., Takatsuka, M.: Refining a k-nearest neighbor graph for a computationally efficient spectral clustering. *Pattern Recognit.* **114**, 107869 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2021.107869>
- [70] Strehl, A., Ghosh, J.: Cluster ensembles — a knowledge reuse framework for combining multiple partitions. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **3**, 583–617 (2003)

<https://doi.org/10.1162/153244303321897735>

- [71] Hubert, L., Arable, P.: Comparing partitions. *J. Classif.* **2**(1), 193–218 (1985)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01908075>
- [72] Dua, D., Graff, C.: UCI Machine Learning Repository (2017).
<http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>
- [73] Cui, Y., Pang, J.-S.: Modern Nonconvex Nondifferentiable Optimization, pp. 149–252. SIAM, Philadelphia (2021). Chap. 4. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611976748.ch4>

A Proof of Lemma 3.2

Although Lemma 3.2 can be checked by the subdifferential calculus rules [1, Theorem 10.6, Corollary 10.9], we present a short proof of Lemma 3.2 with some necessary facts in order to increase the readability for researchers in the area of applications. The subdifferential calculus rules heavily rely on the *horizontal subdifferential*, which gives constraint qualifications, and the *subdifferential regularity* of a function.

Definition A.1. Let $J : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a proper lower semicontinuous function.

- (a) (Horizontal subdifferential [1, Def. 8.3 and Thm. 8.9]) $\partial^\infty J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) := \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{X} \mid (\mathbf{v}, 0) \in N_{\text{epi}(J)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))\}$ is called the *horizontal subdifferential* of J at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(J)$ ¹⁷.
- (b) (Subdifferential regularity [1, Def. 7.25]) J is said to be *subdifferentially regular* at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(J)$ if $\text{epi}(J) \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$ is Clarke regular at $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))$. Moreover, J is said to be subdifferentially regular if it is subdifferentially regular at every $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(J)$.

Fact A.2 presents useful properties, regarding $\partial^\infty J$, that will be used for our analyses. Example A.3 illustrates examples of subdifferentially regular functions.

Fact A.2 (Horizontal subdifferential being zero [1, Theorem 9.13]). Let $J : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a proper lower semicontinuous function. Then, for $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(J)$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (a) $\partial^\infty J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$.
- (b) J is locally Lipschitz continuous at $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$.
- (c) ∂J is *locally bounded* at $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$, i.e., there exists an open neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ such that $\partial J(\mathcal{N}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}} \partial J(\mathbf{x})$ is bounded.

Moreover, if these conditions hold at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(J)$, then $\partial J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \neq \emptyset$.

Example A.3 (Subdifferentially regular functions). Subdifferentially regular functions include, e.g., continuously differentiable functions [1, Exm. 7.28], proper lower semicontinuous (weakly) convex functions [1, Exm. 7.27] [73, Prop. 4.4.15], and indicator functions of Clarke regular subsets [1, Exm. 7.28].

Fact A.4 (Calculus rules for subdifferential). Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} be Euclidean spaces. Let $J_1, J_2 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be proper lower semicontinuous and subdifferentially

¹⁷The general and regular normal cones to $\text{epi}(J)$ at $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\alpha}) \in \text{epi}(J)$ are expressed respectively as:

$$N_{\text{epi}(J)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\alpha}) = \text{Lim sup}_{\text{epi}(J) \ni (\mathbf{x}, \alpha) \rightarrow (\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\alpha})} \widehat{N}_{\text{epi}(J)}(\mathbf{x}, \alpha);$$

$$\widehat{N}_{\text{epi}(J)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\alpha}) = \left\{ (\mathbf{v}, u) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \mid \limsup_{\text{epi}(J) \setminus \{(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\alpha})\} \ni (\mathbf{x}, \alpha) \rightarrow (\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\alpha})} \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + u(\alpha - \bar{\alpha})}{\sqrt{\|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 + |\alpha - \bar{\alpha}|^2}} \leq 0 \right\}.$$

regular functions, and $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a continuously differentiable mapping. Then, the following hold:

- (a) (Chain rule [1, Theorem 10.6]) If the constraint qualification $\partial^\infty J_1(\mathcal{F}(\bar{\mathbf{y}})) \cap \text{Ker}((D\mathcal{F}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))^*) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ holds at $\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \text{dom}(J_1 \circ \mathcal{F})$, then $J_1 \circ \mathcal{F}$ is subdifferentially regular at $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$ and

$$\partial(J_1 \circ \mathcal{F})(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) = (D\mathcal{F}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))^*[\partial J_1(\mathcal{F}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))]; \quad (54)$$

$$\partial^\infty(J_1 \circ \mathcal{F})(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) = (D\mathcal{F}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))^*[\partial^\infty J_1(\mathcal{F}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))]. \quad (55)$$

- (b) (Sum rule [1, Corollary 10.9, Exercise 8.8]) If the constraint qualification $\partial^\infty J_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \cap (-\partial^\infty J_2(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ holds at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(J_1 + J_2)$, then $J_1 + J_2$ is subdifferentially regular at $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$, and

$$\partial(J_1 + J_2)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \partial J_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \partial J_2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (56)$$

Moreover, if J_2 is continuously differentiable, then $J_1 + J_2$ is subdifferentially regular at $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{dom}(J_1)$, and

$$\partial(J_1 + J_2)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \partial J_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \nabla J_2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}); \quad (57)$$

$$\partial^\infty(J_1 + J_2)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \partial^\infty J_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (58)$$

Proof of Lemma 3.2. (Step 1) We show the subdifferential regularity of $h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}$ and $\partial^\infty(h + g \circ \mathfrak{S})(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ ($\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$). By the latter part of Fact A.4 (b) and (58) with the continuous differentiability of h , it suffices to show (i) the subdifferential regularity of $g \circ \mathfrak{S}$ and (ii) $\partial^\infty(g \circ \mathfrak{S})(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ ($\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$). Recall that g is subdifferentially regular from its weak convexity (see Example A.3). Since g is (locally) Lipschitz continuous, Fact A.2 ensures $\partial^\infty g(\mathfrak{S}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, implying thus the constraint qualification in Fact A.4 (a) holds with $J_1 := g$ and $\mathcal{F} := \mathfrak{S}$. Then, Fact A.4 (a) implies (i) the subdifferential regularity of $g \circ \mathfrak{S}$, and (ii) $\partial^\infty(g \circ \mathfrak{S})(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \stackrel{(55)}{=} (D\mathfrak{S}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))^*[\partial^\infty g(\mathfrak{S}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))] = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ ($\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$).

(Step 2) Recall that ι_C is subdifferentially regular (see Example A.3), and lower semicontinuous due to the closedness of C . Then, the equalities (18) and (19) can be verified respectively by (56) and (54) in Fact A.4 with the setting $J_1 := h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}$, $J_2 := \iota_C$, and $\mathcal{F} := F$, where J_1 is subdifferentially regular and $\partial^\infty J_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ ($\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}$) from (Step 1). \square

B Proof of Theorem 4.1

To prove Theorem 4.1, we need the following lemma.

Lemma B.1 (Subdifferential limit). *Let \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{Z} be Euclidean spaces. Let $J : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be locally Lipschitz continuous at $\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{Z}$, and $A : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ a linear operator. Suppose that (i) an arbitrarily given $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{Z}$ satisfies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathbf{z}}_n = \bar{\mathbf{z}}$; (ii) an arbitrarily*

given $(A_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ with linear operators $A_n : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) satisfies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = A$. Then,

$$\text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} (A_n(\partial J(\bar{z}_n))) \subset A \left(\text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \partial J(\bar{z}_n) \right) \subset A(\partial J(\bar{z})). \quad (59)$$

Proof. The last inclusion in (59) can be checked by

$$\text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \partial J(\bar{z}_n) \subset \bigcup_{\mathcal{Z} \ni \mathbf{z}_n \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{z}}} \text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \partial J(\mathbf{z}_n) \stackrel{(2)}{=} \text{Lim sup}_{\mathcal{Z} \ni \mathbf{z} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{z}}} \partial J(\mathbf{z}) = \partial J(\bar{\mathbf{z}}),$$

where the last equality follows by the *outer semicontinuity* of the general subdifferential [1, Prop. 8.7].

To show the first inclusion in (59), let $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n(\partial J(\bar{z}_n))$, i.e., there exists a sequence $(\mathbf{v}_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{Y}$ with $\mathbf{v}_n \in A_n(\partial J(\bar{z}_n))$ such that its subsequence $(\mathbf{v}_{m(l)})_{l=1}^\infty$ converges to \mathbf{v} , where $m : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is monotonically increasing. Then, there exists a sequence $(\mathbf{u}_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{Z}$ with $\mathbf{u}_n \in \partial J(\bar{z}_n)$ satisfying $\mathbf{v}_n = A_n(\mathbf{u}_n)$. From Fact A.2, the locally Lipschitz continuity of J at $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ ensures the boundedness of $\bigcup_{n=n_0}^\infty \partial J(\bar{z}_n)$ with a sufficiently large $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies the boundedness of $(\mathbf{u}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, thereby its subsequence $(\mathbf{u}_{m(l)})_{l=1}^\infty$ converges to some $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{Z}$ (by passing to further subsequence if necessary), i.e., $\mathbf{u} \in \text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \partial J(\bar{z}_n)$. We get $\mathbf{v} = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} A_{m(l)} \mathbf{u}_{m(l)}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v} - A_{m(l)} \mathbf{u}_{m(l)}\| &\leq \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{m(l)}\| + \|\mathbf{v}_{m(l)} - A_{m(l)} \mathbf{u}_{m(l)}\| + \|A_{m(l)} \mathbf{u}_{m(l)} - A_{m(l)} \mathbf{u}_{m(l)}\| \\ &= \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{m(l)}\| + \|A_{m(l)} \mathbf{u}_{m(l)} - A_{m(l)} \mathbf{u}_{m(l)}\| \quad (\because \mathbf{v}_{m(l)} = A_{m(l)} \mathbf{u}_{m(l)}) \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{m(l)}\| + \|A_{m(l)} - A\|_{\text{op}} \|\mathbf{u}_{m(l)}\| \xrightarrow{l \rightarrow \infty} 0 \\ &\quad (\because \mathbf{v}_{m(l)} \xrightarrow{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}, A_{m(l)} \xrightarrow{l \rightarrow \infty} A, \mathbf{u}_{m(l)} \xrightarrow{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{u}). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Thus, $\mathbf{v} \stackrel{(60)}{=} \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} A_{m(l)} \mathbf{u}_{m(l)} = A \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{u}_{m(l)} = A \mathbf{u} \in A \left(\text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \partial J(\bar{z}_n) \right)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. (a) Let $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Lim sup}_{\mathbb{R}_{++} \ni \mu \searrow 0, \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{y}}} \nabla(\mu J \circ \mathcal{F})(\mathbf{y})$. Then, there exist (i) $(\mathbf{y}_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{Y}$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{y}_n = \bar{\mathbf{y}}$; (ii) $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, \eta^{-1})$ with $\mu_n \searrow 0$; and (iii) $\mathbf{v}_n := \nabla(\mu_n J \circ \mathcal{F})(\mathbf{y}_n) = (\text{D}\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n))^* [\nabla^{\mu_n} J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n))]$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}_n = \mathbf{v}$. From Fact 2.6 (c), we have $\nabla^{\mu_n} J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n)) \in \partial J(\text{prox}_{\mu_n J}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n)))$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$). This implies $\mathbf{v}_n \in (\text{D}\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n))^* [\partial J(\text{prox}_{\mu_n J}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n)))]$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$), and thus

$$\mathbf{v} \in \text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\text{D}\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n))^* [\partial J(\text{prox}_{\mu_n J}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n)))]]. \quad (61)$$

Let $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_n := \text{prox}_{\mu_n J}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n))$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) and $A_n := (\text{D}\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n))^*$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$). Then, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = (\text{D}\mathcal{F}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))^* =: A$ from the continuous differentiability of \mathcal{F} . Recall that J

is locally Lipschitz continuous¹⁸, and thus $\partial J(\mathbf{z}) \neq \emptyset$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}$, by Fact A.2, i.e., $\text{dom}(\partial J) = \mathcal{Z}$. Fact 2.6 (a) with $\text{dom}(\partial J) = \mathcal{Z}$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n) = \mathcal{F}(\bar{\mathbf{y}})$ implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathbf{z}}_n = \mathcal{F}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) =: \bar{\mathbf{z}}$. From the local Lipschitz continuity of J , Lemma B.1 with $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_n)_{n=1}^\infty \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathbf{z}}$ and $(A_n)_{n=1}^\infty \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} A$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\text{D}\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n))^* [\partial J(\text{prox}_{\mu_n J}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_n)))] &= \text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n(\partial J(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_n)) \stackrel{(59)}{\subset} A(\partial J(\bar{\mathbf{z}})) \\ &= (\text{D}\mathcal{F}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))^* [\partial J(\mathcal{F}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}))] \stackrel{(54)}{=} \partial(J \circ \mathcal{F})(\bar{\mathbf{y}}), \end{aligned}$$

from which $\mathbf{v} \in \partial(J \circ \mathcal{F})(\bar{\mathbf{y}})$ holds by (61).

(b) Theorem 4.1 (a) with $J := g$ and $\mathcal{F} := \mathfrak{S} \circ F$ yields $\partial(g \circ \mathfrak{S} \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \supset \text{Lim sup}_{\mathbb{R}_{++} \ni \mu \searrow 0, \mathcal{Y} \ni \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{y}}} \nabla(\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S} \circ F)(\mathbf{y})$. The inclusion in (21) is obtained by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial((h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) &= \partial(h \circ F + g \circ \mathfrak{S} \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \stackrel{(57)}{=} \nabla(h \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) + \partial(g \circ \mathfrak{S} \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \\ &\supset \nabla(h \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) + \text{Lim sup}_{\mathbb{R}_{++} \ni \mu \searrow 0, \mathcal{Y} \ni \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{y}}} \nabla(\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S} \circ F)(\mathbf{y}) = \text{Lim sup}_{\mathbb{R}_{++} \ni \mu \searrow 0, \mathcal{Y} \ni \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{y}}} \nabla((h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows by the continuity¹⁹ of $\nabla(h \circ F)$. Moreover, we have

$$\partial((h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \stackrel{(21)}{\supset} \text{Lim sup}_{\mathbb{R}_{++} \ni \mu \searrow 0, \mathcal{Y} \ni \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{y}}} \nabla((h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}) \stackrel{(2)}{\supset} \text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nabla((h + \mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n). \quad (62)$$

Then, the inequality in (22) is obtained by

$$\begin{aligned} d(\mathbf{0}, \partial((h + g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}})) &\stackrel{(62)}{\leq} d\left(\mathbf{0}, \text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nabla((h + \mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\right) \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\mathbf{0}, \nabla((h + \mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla((h + \mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows by the fact $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\mathbf{v}, E_n) = d\left(\mathbf{v}, \text{Lim sup}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n\right)$ for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}$ and a given sequence $(E_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of subsets $E_n \subset \mathcal{Y}$ (see [1, Exercise 4.8]). \square

¹⁸Since every finite convex function is locally Lipschitz continuous [1, Exm. 9.14], $J + \frac{\eta}{2} \|\cdot\|^2$ and $\frac{\eta}{2} \|\cdot\|^2$ are locally Lipschitz continuous due to the weak convexity of J . Then, $J = (J + \frac{\eta}{2} \|\cdot\|^2) + (-\frac{\eta}{2} \|\cdot\|^2)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous because the sum of locally Lipschitz continuous functions is locally Lipschitz continuous [1, Ex. 9.8].

¹⁹Indeed, the continuity of $\nabla(h \circ F)$ yields the following relation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v} \in \nabla(h \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) + \text{Lim sup}_{\mathbb{R}_{++} \ni \mu \searrow 0, \mathcal{Y} \ni \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{y}}} \nabla(\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S} \circ F)(\mathbf{y}) \\ \Leftrightarrow \exists (\mathbf{y}_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{Y}, \exists (\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, \eta^{-1}) \text{ such that } \bar{\mathbf{y}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{y}_n, \mu_n \searrow 0, \\ \text{and } \mathbf{v} = \nabla(h \circ F)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nabla(\mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S} \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\nabla(h \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n) + \nabla(\mu_n g \circ \mathfrak{S} \circ F)(\mathbf{y}_n)) \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{v} \in \text{Lim sup}_{\mathbb{R}_{++} \ni \mu \searrow 0, \mathcal{Y} \ni \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{y}}} (\nabla(h \circ F)(\mathbf{y}) + \nabla(\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S} \circ F)(\mathbf{y})) = \text{Lim sup}_{\mathbb{R}_{++} \ni \mu \searrow 0, \mathcal{Y} \ni \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{y}}} \nabla((h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)(\mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

C Proof of Proposition 4.5

To prove Proposition 4.5, we use the following lemma for two times.

Lemma C.1 (Lipschitz continuity of gradient of composite function). *Let \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K} be Euclidean spaces. Let $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ and $J : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuously differentiable, and let $(\emptyset \neq) E \subset \mathcal{K}$ be a subset of \mathcal{K} . Assume that*

- (i) *The operator norm of $(D\mathcal{F}(\cdot))^*$ is bounded above by $\kappa_{\mathcal{F}} > 0$ over $\text{Conv}(E)$, and thus \mathcal{F} is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $\kappa_{\mathcal{F}}$ over $\text{Conv}(E)$ by [1, Theorem 9.2].*
- (ii) *$(D\mathcal{F}(\cdot))^*$ is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_{D\mathcal{F}} > 0$ over E .*
- (iii) *The norm of ∇J is bounded above by $\kappa_J > 0$ over $\mathcal{F}(E)$.*
- (iv) *∇J is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_{\nabla J} > 0$ over $\mathcal{F}(E)$.*

Then, $\nabla(J \circ \mathcal{F})$ is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $\kappa_{\mathcal{F}}^2 L_{\nabla J} + \kappa_J L_{D\mathcal{F}}$ over E .

Proof. For $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in E$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla(J \circ \mathcal{F})(\mathbf{x}_1) - \nabla(J \circ \mathcal{F})(\mathbf{x}_2)\| = \|(D\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1))^*[\nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1))] - (D\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_2))^*[\nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_2))]\| \\
& \leq \|(D\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1))^*[\nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1)) - \nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_2))]\| + \|(D\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1) - D\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_2))^*[\nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_2))]\| \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \|(D\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1))^*\|_{\text{op}} \|\nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1)) - \nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_2))\| + L_{D\mathcal{F}} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\| \|\nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_2))\| \\
& \stackrel{(i), (iii)}{\leq} \kappa_{\mathcal{F}} \|\nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1)) - \nabla J(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_2))\| + \kappa_J L_{D\mathcal{F}} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\| \\
& \stackrel{(iv), (i)}{\leq} \kappa_{\mathcal{F}}^2 L_{\nabla J} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\| + \kappa_J L_{D\mathcal{F}} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\| = (\kappa_{\mathcal{F}}^2 L_{\nabla J} + \kappa_J L_{D\mathcal{F}}) \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 4.5. From Fact 2.6 (b), recall that $\nabla^\mu g$ is Lipschitz continuous with the Lipschitz constant $L_{\nabla^\mu g} := \max\left\{\mu^{-1}, \frac{\eta}{1-\eta\mu}\right\} = \mu^{-1}$ by $\mu \in (0, 2^{-1}\eta^{-1}]$.

(a) Since $\nabla^\mu g$ is Lipschitz continuous with the Lipschitz constant $L_{\nabla^\mu g}$ and $\|\nabla^\mu g(\mathbf{x})\| \leq L_g$ ($\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$) by (12), Lemma C.1 with setting $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{F}, J, E) := (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{X}, \mathfrak{S}, \mu g, C)$ ensures the Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla(\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S})$ with a Lipschitz constant $L_{\nabla(\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S})} := \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}}^2 L_{\nabla^\mu g} + L_g L_{D\mathfrak{S}} = \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}}^2 \mu^{-1} + L_g L_{D\mathfrak{S}}$. Thus, $\nabla(h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S})$ is Lipschitz continuous over C with a Lipschitz constant $L_{\nabla(h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S})} = L_{\nabla h} + L_g L_{D\mathfrak{S}} + \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}}^2 \mu^{-1}$, where $L_{\nabla h}$ is the Lipschitz constant of ∇h by the setting of Problem 1.2.

(b) To apply Lemma C.1, we derive an upper bound $\kappa_{h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}} := \kappa_h + \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}} L_g > 0$ of $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in C} \|\nabla(h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S})(\mathbf{x})\|$ as:

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in C} \|\nabla(h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S})(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in C} \|\nabla h(\mathbf{x})\| + \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in C} \|\nabla(\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S})(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \kappa_h + \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}} L_g,$$

where we used the inequality $\|\nabla(\mu g \circ \mathfrak{S})(\mathbf{x})\| = \|(D\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x}))^*[\nabla^\mu g(\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x}))]\| \leq \|(D\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x}))^*\|_{\text{op}} \|\nabla^\mu g(\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x}))\| \stackrel{(12)}{\leq} \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}} L_g$ ($\mathbf{x} \in C$). Then, by applying Lemma C.1 with setting $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{F}, J, E) := (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, F, h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}, \mathcal{Y})$ together with Proposition 4.5 (a), $\nabla((h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)$ is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant $L_{\nabla((h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}) \circ F)} = \kappa_F^2 L_{\nabla(h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S})} + \kappa_{h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}} L_{DF}$ over \mathcal{Y} . By substituting $L_{\nabla(h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S})} = L_{\nabla h} + L_g L_{D\mathfrak{S}} + \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}}^2 \mu^{-1}$ and $\kappa_{h + \mu g \circ \mathfrak{S}} = \kappa_h + \kappa_{\mathfrak{S}} L_g$, we obtain the desired Lipschitz constant. □

D Proof of Corollary 5.1

To prove Corollary 5.1, we need the following fact and lemma.

Fact D.1 ([32, Lemma A.4 and proof in Proposition 2.9]).

- (a) For $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times m}$ and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $\|\mathbf{AB}\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{A}\|_2 \|\mathbf{B}\|_F$ and $\|\mathbf{AB}\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \|\mathbf{B}\|_2$ hold, where $\|\cdot\|_F$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$ denote the Frobenius norm and the spectral norm.
- (b) For $\mathbf{V} \in Q_{N,p}$, we have $\|(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V})^{-1}\|_2 \leq 1$.
- (c) For $\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2 \in Q_{N,p}$, $\|(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1} - (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_2)^{-1}\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{V}_1 - \mathbf{V}_2\|_F$.
- (d) For $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{D} \in Q_{N,p}$, $\text{D}\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V})[\mathbf{D}] = -2\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V})^{-1}\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V})^{-1}\mathbf{I}_{N \times p}$

Lemma D.2 (Boundedness and Lipschitz continuity of $\text{D}\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V})$). For $\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$ in (42) with $\mathbf{S} \in \text{O}(N)$, we have

$$(\mathbf{V} \in Q_{N,p}) \quad \|\text{D}\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V})\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2; \quad (63)$$

$$(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2 \in Q_{N,p}) \quad \|\text{D}\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V}_1) - \text{D}\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V}_2)\|_{\text{op}} \leq 4\|\mathbf{V}_1 - \mathbf{V}_2\|_F. \quad (64)$$

Proof. (Proof of (63)) Let $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{D} \in Q_{N,p}$ such that $\|\mathbf{D}\|_F \leq 1$. By Fact D.1 (d), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{D}\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V})[\mathbf{D}]\|_F &= 2\|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V})^{-1}\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V})^{-1}\mathbf{I}_{N \times p}\|_F \\ &\stackrel{\text{Fact D.1 (a)}}{\leq} 2\|\mathbf{S}\|_2 \|(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V})^{-1}\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{D}\|_F \|\mathbf{I}_{N \times p}\|_2 \stackrel{\text{Fact D.1 (b)}}{\leq} 2\|\mathbf{D}\|_F \leq 2, \end{aligned}$$

implying thus (63), where we used $\|\mathbf{S}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{I}_{N \times p}\|_2 = 1$.

(Proof of (64)) Let $\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2, \mathbf{D} \in Q_{N,p}$ such that $\|\mathbf{D}\|_F \leq 1$. By Fact D.1 (d), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\text{D}\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V}_1)[\mathbf{D}] - \text{D}\Phi_{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V}_2)[\mathbf{D}]\|_F \\ &= 2\|\mathbf{S}((\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1} - (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_2)^{-1}\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_2)^{-1})\mathbf{I}_{N \times p}\|_F \\ &\stackrel{\text{Fact D.1 (a)}}{\leq} 2\|\mathbf{S}\|_2 \|(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1} - (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_2)^{-1}\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_2)^{-1}\|_F \|\mathbf{I}_{N \times p}\|_2 \\ &\leq 2\|(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{D}((\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1} - (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_2)^{-1})\|_F \\ &\quad + 2\|((\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1} - (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_2)^{-1})\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_2)^{-1}\|_F. \quad (\because \|\mathbf{S}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{I}_{N \times p}\|_2 = 1) \quad (65) \end{aligned}$$

The first term in (65) can be evaluated further as

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{D}((\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1} - (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_2)^{-1})\|_F \\ &\stackrel{\text{Fact D.1 (a)}}{\leq} \|(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1}\|_2 \|\mathbf{D}\|_F \|(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1} - (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_2)^{-1}\|_F \\ &\stackrel{\text{Fact D.1 (b)}}{\leq} \|\mathbf{D}\|_F \|(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1} - (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{V}_2)^{-1}\|_F \\ &\stackrel{\text{Fact D.1 (c)}}{\leq} \|\mathbf{D}\|_F \|\mathbf{V}_1 - \mathbf{V}_2\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{V}_1 - \mathbf{V}_2\|_F. \quad (66) \end{aligned}$$

Since the second term in (65) can be evaluated similarly to (66), we have $\|\mathrm{D}\Phi_{\mathfrak{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V}_1)[\mathbf{D}] - \mathrm{D}\Phi_{\mathfrak{S}}^{-1}(\mathbf{V}_2)[\mathbf{D}]\|_F \leq 4\|\mathbf{V}_1 - \mathbf{V}_2\|_F$, implying thus (64). \square

Proof of Corollary 5.1. (a) By noting that $\Phi_{\mathfrak{S}}^{-1} : Q_{N,p} \rightarrow \mathrm{St}(p, N) \setminus E_{N,p}(\mathfrak{S})$ is a diffeomorphism [32, Prop. 2.2], Corollary 3.5 with $C := \mathrm{St}(p, N)$ and $F := \Phi_{\mathfrak{S}}^{-1}$ completes the proof²⁰ (see also the sentence just after Corollary 3.5).

(b) To invoke Proposition 4.5, we check below the conditions (A1)-(A5) in Proposition 4.5 with $C := \mathrm{St}(p, N)$ and $F := \Phi_{\mathfrak{S}}^{-1}$. Since $\mathrm{St}(p, N)$ is compact and \mathfrak{S} is twice continuity differentiable, (A1)-(A3) are automatically satisfied (see Remark 4.6 (a)). For (A4)-(A5), see Lemma D.2. Therefore, by Proposition 4.5 (b), Assumption 4.4 (a) is satisfied with $C := \mathrm{St}(p, N)$ and $F := \Phi_{\mathfrak{S}}^{-1}$. \square

²⁰Although $\Phi_{\mathfrak{S}}^{-1}$ is not surjective onto $\mathrm{St}(p, N)$, the same statement in Corollary 3.5 follows (see Remark 3.6).