

# On the role of semismoothness in the implicit programming approach to selected nonsmooth optimization problems

Helmut Gfrerer<sup>1</sup>, Michal Kočvara<sup>2,3</sup>, Jiří V. Outrata<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Johann Radon Institute for Computational and Applied Mathematics (RICAM), Austrian Academy of Sciences, Altenbergerstr. 69, Linz, A-404, Austria.

<sup>2</sup>School of Mathematics, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, U.K.

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Information Theory and Automation, Czech Academy of Sciences, Pod vodárenskou věží 4, Prague, 18208, Czech Republic.

Contributing authors: [helmut.gfrerer@ricam.oeaw.ac.at](mailto:helmut.gfrerer@ricam.oeaw.ac.at); [m.kocvara@bham.ac.uk](mailto:m.kocvara@bham.ac.uk); [outrata@utia.cas.cz](mailto:outrata@utia.cas.cz);

## Abstract

The paper deals with the implicit programming approach to a class of Mathematical Programs with Equilibrium Constraints (MPECs) and bilevel programs in the case when the corresponding reduced problems are solved using a bundle method of nonsmooth optimization. The results obtained allow us to supply the bundle algorithm with suitable, easily computable “pseudogradients”, ensuring convergence to points satisfying a stationary condition. Both the theory and computational implementation heavily rely on the notion of SCD (subspace containing derivatives) mappings and the associated calculus. The approach is validated via a complex MPEC with equilibrium governed by a variational inequality of the 2nd kind and by an academic bilevel program with a nonsmooth upper-level objective.

**Keywords:** Nonsmooth problems, semismoothness, Implicit programming approach

## 1 Introduction

It is well-known that most rules of generalized differentiation attain the form of inclusions, unless rather restrictive qualification conditions have been applied. This might cause difficulties in connection with computational techniques such as subgradient and bundle methods of nonsmooth optimization. Beginning with [24, 25], mathematicians sought to ensure the convergence of these methods, even in cases where exact subgradients could not be provided at every iteration. This led to the concept of pseudogradients, as introduced in [22]. Subsequent research has recognized that this challenge can be addressed using certain semismoothness property, which does not necessarily rely on generalized gradients or generalized Jacobians; see, e.g., [3, 19, 21]. A recent study, [14], provides an in-depth analysis of this issue in the context of the “model” problem

$$\min \varphi(x, y)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{subject to } & 0 \in F(x, y), \\ & x \in U_{ad}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a locally Lipschitz function,  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  is a set-valued mapping, and  $U_{ad} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a closed set.

The main goal of this paper is to extend the results from [14] to the case when (1) corresponds either to a *mathematical program with equilibrium constraints* (MPEC) or to a problem of *bilevel programming*.

Under suitable assumptions on the problem data, it is possible to convert problem (1) to the so-called reduced problem in variable  $x$  only and solve it using an appropriate method of nonsmooth optimization. This methodology is referred to as the *implicit programming approach* (ImP approach), and is also widely applied in connection with other minimization techniques. It has been extensively studied and applied in numerous works, including the monographs [27] and [5]. However, in many of these problems, it is not always possible to provide the bundle method with the correct Clarke subgradients of the reduced objective, as required. This limitation arises due to the inclusions inherent in the applied calculus rules. Notice that, in [6], the authors addressed a specific bilevel program and, utilizing the pseudogradient theory developed in [22], they demonstrated that the bundle trust method (BT) [30] converges and produces points satisfying the so-called pseudostationarity condition. This approach was extended to more general bilevel programs in the monograph [5].

In [14], it has been shown, in general terms, that the Clarke subgradients of the reduced objective in the employed bundle method can be effectively replaced with computable “pseudogradients”, provided

1. the mapping  $S : x \mapsto y$ , defined implicitly through the inclusion  $0 \in F(x, y)$ , satisfies some natural assumptions, and
2. the mappings  $\varphi$  and  $S$  are semismooth in the prescribed sense.

Under these conditions the described variant of the ImP approach works and generates solutions which are stationary in a reasonable sense.

This paper deals with a particular instance of (1), when it models either an MPEC or a bilevel program. In the former case one has

$$F(x, y) = f(x, y) + Q(x, y),$$

where  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $Q : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  whereas, in case of bilevel programming,

$$S(x) = \operatorname{argmin}_y \{ \psi(x, y) + q(x, y) \}$$

with  $\psi$  and  $q$  mapping  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$  into  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , respectively.

We further assume that multifunction  $Q$  possesses the so-called SCD (subspace containing derivative) property; cf. [12]. This assumption is not restrictive and allows us to weaken the assumptions needed for applying this approach, as well as to simplify the computation of the pseudogradients. That is why we (in Sections 3.1, 3.2) explain in detail how to compute appropriate SCD subspaces for several commonly encountered multifunctions  $Q$ .

The solutions of MPECs, computed by the presented approach, satisfy a stationarity condition that is always weaker (less restrictive) than the Clarke stationarity. On the other hand, under some additional assumptions, they satisfy the Clarke stationarity condition of an equivalent MPEC, where an additional control arises as a canonical perturbation. This serves as a kind of “seal of quality” for this approach.

The concept of the so-called  $\Psi$ -semismoothness plays a central role also in the numerical solution of a decomposable optimization problem in two variables via a (semismooth) Newton method discussed in [21, 31]. This problem has the structure of the model problem (1) but can be efficiently solved by the semismooth Newton method.

The paper is organized as follows. The preliminary Section 2 includes basic notions of variational analysis and all elements from the theory of semismooth and SCD mappings, needed throughout the text. Section 3 focuses on MPECs. In addition to theoretical results, it contains a test example, a complex Stackelberg game of producers/firms in an oligopolistic market. This model is adapted from [15]. The approach to bilevel programs, including an illustrative test example, is discussed in Section 4. It can be viewed as an alternative to [5, Section 6.2], where pseudostationary points are computed under different assumptions. In both test examples we use algorithms and software from the family BT (bundle trust),

described in [29, 30, 32]. Finally, Section 5 discusses the proposed approach for handling the considered decomposable programs.

The following notation is employed. Given a linear subspace  $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $L^\perp$  denotes its orthogonal complement. Further, given a multifunction  $F$ ,  $\text{gph} F := \{(x, y) \mid y \in F(x)\}$  stands for its graph. For an element  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\|u\|$  denotes its Euclidean norm and  $\mathcal{B}_\delta(u)$  denotes the open ball around  $u$  with radius  $\delta$ . In a product space we use the norm  $\|(u, v)\| := \sqrt{\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2}$ . The space of all  $m \times n$  matrices is denoted by  $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ . For a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , we employ the operator norm  $\|A\|$  with respect to the Euclidean norm and denote the range of  $A$  by  $\text{rge } A$ . If  $A$  is a square nonsingular matrix, we write  $A^{-T} := (A^{-1})^T$ . We use  $I_n$  to represent the  $n \times n$  identity matrix. Given a set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^s$ , we define the distance of a point  $x$  to  $\Omega$  by  $\text{dist}(x, \Omega) := \inf\{\|y - x\| \mid y \in \Omega\}$  and the indicator function is denoted by  $\delta_\Omega$ .

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Nonsmooth analysis

Consider a mapping  $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is an open set. In the sequel we denote by  $\mathcal{O}_F$  the set of points where  $F$  is (Fréchet) differentiable and we denote the Jacobian by  $\nabla F(x)$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{O}_F$ . We use this notation also for real-valued functions  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  when  $\nabla f(x)$  is an  $1 \times n$  matrix, i.e., a row vector.

The *B-Jacobian* (*B-differential*) is defined as

$$\bar{\nabla} F(\bar{x}) = \text{Limsup}_{x \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_F} \bar{x}} \{\nabla F(x)\}, \quad \bar{x} \in \Omega.$$

Then the Clarke generalized Jacobian is given by  $\text{conv } \bar{\nabla} F(\bar{x})$ .

If  $F$  is locally Lipschitz, by Rademacher's Theorem the set  $\Omega \setminus \mathcal{O}_F$  is negligible, i.e., has Lebesgue measure 0. Since the Jacobians  $\nabla F(x)$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{O}_F$ , are also locally bounded by the Lipschitz constant, we obtain  $\emptyset \neq \bar{\nabla} F(x) \subset \text{conv } \bar{\nabla} F(x)$ ,  $x \in \Omega$ .

We say that  $F$  is *strictly differentiable* at  $\bar{x} \in \Omega$  if there is an  $m \times n$  matrix  $A$  such that

$$\lim_{\substack{x, x' \rightarrow \bar{x} \\ x \neq x'}} \frac{F(x') - F(x) - A(x' - x)}{\|x' - x\|} = 0.$$

Of course, this implies that  $F$  is differentiable at  $\bar{x}$  and  $\nabla F(\bar{x}) = A$ .

For a locally Lipschitz function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  open, we can define the *Clarke subdifferential* as

$$\partial_c f(x) := \text{conv } \bar{\nabla} f(x)^T := \{g^T \mid g \in \text{conv } \bar{\nabla} f(x)\}, \quad x \in \Omega.$$

The elements of  $\partial_c f(x)$  are called *subgradients* and are column vectors.

Given any extended real-valued function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ , we always assume that  $f$  is proper, i.e.,  $f(x) > -\infty$  for all  $x$  and  $\text{dom } f := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(x) < \infty\} \neq \emptyset$ . Given a point  $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } f$ , the *regular (Fréchet) subdifferential* of  $f$  at  $\bar{x}$  is given by

$$\hat{\partial} f(\bar{x}) := \left\{ x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \liminf_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}} \frac{f(x) - f(\bar{x}) - \langle x^*, x - \bar{x} \rangle}{\|x - \bar{x}\|} \geq 0 \right\},$$

while the *limiting (Mordukhovich) subdifferential* is defined by

$$\partial f(\bar{x}) := \{x^* \mid \exists (x_k, x_k^*) \xrightarrow{\text{gph } \hat{\partial} f} (\bar{x}, x^*) \text{ with } f(x_k) \rightarrow f(\bar{x})\}.$$

If  $\Omega := \text{dom } f$  is open, then clearly  $\mathcal{O}_f \subset \text{dom } \hat{\partial} f$  and  $\bar{\nabla} f(\bar{x})^T \subset \partial f(\bar{x})$ , provided that  $f$  is continuous at  $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ . If  $f$  is locally Lipschitz on  $\Omega$  then

$$\partial_c f(x) = \text{conv } \partial f(x), \quad x \in \Omega;$$

cf. [28, Theorem 9.61]. Further, if  $f$  is a lower semicontinuous (lsc) convex function then  $\partial f$  coincides with the Moreau-Rockafellar subdifferential from convex analysis.

## 2.2 Variational geometry and differentiation of multifunctions

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $A$  be a set in  $\mathbb{R}^s$  and let  $\bar{x} \in A$ . Then

- (i) The *tangent (contingent, Bouligand) cone* to  $A$  at  $\bar{x}$  is given by

$$T_A(\bar{x}) := \text{Lim sup}_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{A - \bar{x}}{t}.$$

- (ii) The set

$$\widehat{N}_A(\bar{x}) := (T_A(\bar{x}))^\circ,$$

i.e., the (negative) polar cone to the tangent cone  $T_A(\bar{x})$ , is the *regular (Fréchet) normal cone* to  $A$  at  $\bar{x}$ , and

$$N_A(\bar{x}) := \text{Lim sup}_{\substack{A \\ x \rightarrow \bar{x}}} \widehat{N}_A(x)$$

is the *limiting (Mordukhovich) normal cone* to  $A$  at  $\bar{x}$ .

If  $A$  is convex, then  $\widehat{N}_A(\bar{x}) = N_A(\bar{x})$  amounts to the classical normal cone in the sense of convex analysis and we will write  $N_A(\bar{x})$ .

The limiting normal cone enables us to describe the local behavior of set-valued maps via the following generalized derivative.

**Definition 2.2.** Consider a multifunction  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  and let  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$ .

The multifunction  $D^*F(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) : \mathbb{R}^m \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$ , defined by

$$\text{gph } D^*F(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \{(y^*, x^*) \mid (x^*, -y^*) \in N_{\text{gph } F}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})\}$$

is called the *limiting (Mordukhovich) coderivative* of  $F$  at  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ .

Given a set-valued mapping  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$ , we denote by  $\text{dom } F$  the set of all points  $x$  with  $F(x) \neq \emptyset$ . We call  $F$  *single-valued*, if for every  $x \in \text{dom } F$  the set  $F(x)$  is a singleton. In this case, we can omit the second argument and write  $D^*F(x)$  instead of  $D^*F(x, F(x))$ .

If a mapping  $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  open, is differentiable at  $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ , then it holds that  $\nabla F(\bar{x})^T v^* \in D^*F(\bar{x})(v^*)$ ,  $v^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . If  $F$  is even strictly differentiable at  $\bar{x}$ , then one also has

$$D^*F(\bar{x})(v^*) = \nabla F(\bar{x})^T v^*, \quad v^* \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

## 2.3 Closure of mappings

Recall the following definitions.

**Definition 2.3.** Consider a mapping  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$ .

1.  $\Psi$  is called *locally bounded* at  $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  if there is a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  and a nonnegative real  $M$  such that

$$\|y\| \leq M \quad \forall y \in \Psi(x) \quad \forall x \in U. \quad (2)$$

2.  $\Psi$  is called *outer semicontinuous (osc)* at  $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  if  $\text{Lim sup}_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}} \Psi(x) = \Psi(\bar{x})$ .
3.  $\Psi$  is called *upper semicontinuous (usc)* at  $\bar{x}$  if  $\Psi(\bar{x})$  is closed and for every open set  $V \supset \Psi(\bar{x})$  the set  $\{x \mid \Psi(x) \subset V\}$  is a neighborhood of  $\bar{x}$ .

These terms are invoked *on  $X$* , a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , when the property holds for every  $x \in X$ . The set  $X$  will not be mentioned if  $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ .

It is well-known that the Clarke subdifferential  $\partial_c \vartheta$  of a Lipschitz continuous function  $\vartheta : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  open, has the following properties:

- The mapping  $\partial_c \vartheta$  is locally bounded and usc on  $\Omega$ .
- The set  $\partial_c \vartheta(x)$  is nonempty, convex and compact for every  $x \in \Omega$ .

We now discuss a possibility how to extend an arbitrary locally bounded mapping to a mapping having the properties stated above.

Given a mapping  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$ , we denote by  $\text{cl}\Psi$  the mapping whose graph equals to the closure of  $\text{gph}\Psi$ , i.e.,

$$\text{gph}(\text{cl}\Psi) = \text{cl}(\text{gph}\Psi) = \{(x, y) \mid (x, y) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (x_k, y_k) \text{ for some sequence } (x_k, y_k) \in \text{gph}\Psi\}.$$

Further, we denote by  $\text{cocl}\Psi$  the mapping defined by

$$(\text{cocl}\Psi)(x) := \text{conv}((\text{cl}\Psi)(x)), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Obviously,  $\text{cl}(\text{cl}\Psi) = \text{cl}\Psi$  and for every  $x \in \text{dom}(\text{cl}\Psi)$  the set  $(\text{cl}\Psi)(x)$  is closed. Further,  $\text{dom}(\text{cl}\Psi) \subset \text{cl}(\text{dom}\Psi)$  and, by the definition,  $\text{cl}\Psi$  is osc. It is easy to see that  $\text{dom}(\text{cocl}\Psi) = \text{dom}(\text{cl}\Psi)$ .

**Lemma 2.4** ([14, Lemma 2.7]). *Let  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  be a mapping. If  $\Psi$  is locally bounded at  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  then  $\text{cl}\Psi$  and  $\text{cocl}\Psi$  are also locally bounded at  $x$  and  $(\text{cocl}\Psi)(x)$  is a convex and compact set. Further, both  $\text{cl}\Psi$  and  $\text{cocl}\Psi$  are both osc and usc at  $x$ .*

**Example 2.5.** Let  $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  open, be locally Lipschitz and consider the mapping  $\Psi_F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  given by

$$\Psi_F(x) := \begin{cases} \{\nabla F(x)\} & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{O}_F \\ \emptyset & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then for every  $x \in \Omega$  there holds  $\overline{\nabla}F(x) = (\text{cl}\Psi_F)(x)$  and  $\text{conv}\overline{\nabla}F(x) = (\text{cocl}\Psi_F)(x)$ . Further  $\text{cl}\overline{\nabla}F = \text{cl}(\text{cl}\Psi_F) = \text{cl}\Psi_F = \overline{\nabla}F$ .

## 2.4 SCD mappings

In this section we collect only those basic facts from the theory of SCD-mappings which are needed in this paper. We refer the interested reader to [12, 13] for more details and more far-reaching properties.

Let us denote by  $\mathcal{Z}_{nm}$  the metric space of all  $n$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  equipped with the metric

$$d_{\mathcal{Z}_{nm}}(L_1, L_2) := \|P_1 - P_2\|,$$

where  $P_i$  is the symmetric  $(n+m) \times (n+m)$  matrix representing the orthogonal projection onto  $L_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

For notational reasons, we usually identify  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  with  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ , i.e., for a subspace  $L \in \mathcal{Z}_{nm}$  we denote its elements by  $(u, v)$  instead of  $\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}$ . Analogously, given two matrices  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  so that  $L = \text{rge} \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix}$ , we write  $L = \text{rge}(A, B)$  and we call  $(A, B)$  a basis for  $L$ . Hence, given a matrix  $C = (C_x \dot{;} C_y) \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times (n+m)}$ , partitioned into submatrices  $C_x \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times n}$  and  $C_y \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times m}$ , the set

$$CL = C \text{rge}(A, B) = C \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} Ap \\ Bp \end{pmatrix} \mid p \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\} = \{(C_x A + C_y B)p \mid p \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$$

is a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^l$ . If  $(A, B) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  is an arbitrary basis for a subspace  $L \in \mathcal{Z}_{nm}$ , the set of all bases for this subspace is given by

$$\{(AC, BC) \mid C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \text{ nonsingular}\}.$$

**Lemma 2.6** ([13, Lemma 3.1]). *The metric space  $\mathcal{Z}_{nm}$  is (sequentially) compact.*

With each  $L \in \mathcal{Z}_{nm}$  one can associate its *adjoint* subspace  $L^*$  defined by

$$L^* := \{(-v^*, u^*) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid (u^*, v^*) \in L^\perp\}.$$

Since  $\dim L^\perp = m$ , it follows that  $L^* \in \mathcal{Z}_{mn}$  (i.e., its dimension is  $m$ ). It is easy to see that

$$L^* = S_{nm} L^\perp, \quad \text{where } S_{nm} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I_m \\ I_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Further we have  $(L^*)^* = L$  and  $d_{\mathcal{L}_{nm}}(L_1^*, L_2^*) = d_{\mathcal{L}_{nm}}(L_1, L_2)$  for all subspaces  $L_1, L_2 \in \mathcal{L}_{nm}$  and thus the mapping  $L \rightarrow L^*$  is an isometry between  $\mathcal{L}_{nm}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{nm}^*$ ; cf. [13]. In what follows, the symbol  $L^*$  signifies both the adjoint subspace to some  $L \in \mathcal{L}_{nm}$  as well as an arbitrary subspace from  $\mathcal{L}_{nm}$ . This double role, however, cannot lead to a confusion.

**Definition 2.7.** Consider a mapping  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$ .

1. We say that  $F$  is *graphically smooth of dimension  $n$*  at  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  if  $T_{\text{gph}F}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}_{nm}$ . By  $\mathcal{O}_F$  we denote the subset of  $\text{gph}F$ , where  $F$  is graphically smooth of dimension  $n$ .
2. The *SC (subspace containing) derivative* of  $F$  is the mapping  $\mathcal{S}F : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightrightarrows \mathcal{L}_{nm}$  given by

$$\mathcal{S}F(x, y) := \{L \in \mathcal{L}_{nm} \mid \exists(x_k, y_k) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_F}(x, y) \text{ such that } \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathcal{L}_{nm}}(L, T_{\text{gph}F}(x_k, y_k)) = 0\},$$

and the *adjoint SC derivative* of  $F$  is the mapping  $\mathcal{S}^*F : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightrightarrows \mathcal{L}_{nm}$  defined by

$$\mathcal{S}^*F(x, y) := \{L^* \mid L \in \mathcal{S}F(x, y)\}.$$

Both  $\mathcal{S}F$  and  $\mathcal{S}^*F$  are in fact special generalized derivatives of  $F$  whose elements, by virtue of the above definitions, are subspaces. Further we have the relation

$$L^* \subset \text{gph}D^*F(x, y) \quad \forall L^* \in \mathcal{S}^*F(x, y); \quad (3)$$

cf. [13, Eq (15)]. Let us mention that in [13] the SC adjoint derivative  $\mathcal{S}^*F$  was defined in a different but equivalent manner.

Since  $\mathcal{L}_{nm}$  is compact,  $\text{dom} \mathcal{S}F = \text{dom} \mathcal{S}^*F = \text{cl} \mathcal{O}_F$ . Further,  $\text{gph} \mathcal{S}F$  is closed in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathcal{L}_{nm}$  and, due to the isometry  $L \leftrightarrow L^*$ ,  $\text{gph} \mathcal{S}^*F$  is closed in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathcal{L}_{nm}$  as well. On the basis of these SC derivatives we may now introduce the following notion.

**Definition 2.8.** A mapping  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  is said to have the *SCD property* at  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph}F$ , provided  $\mathcal{S}^*F(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \neq \emptyset$ . Further  $F$  has the SCD property *around* a point  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph}F$ , if  $F$  has the SCD property at all points  $(x, y) \in \text{gph}F$  close to  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ . Finally,  $F$  is termed an *SCD mapping* if it has the SCD property at all points of  $\text{gph}F$ .

Using the above definition, the SCD property at  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  is obviously equivalent with the condition  $\mathcal{S}F(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \neq \emptyset$ .

By virtue of (3), the adjoint SC derivative  $\mathcal{S}^*F$  forms some kind of skeleton for the limiting coderivative  $D^*F$  for SCD mappings. It contains the information which is important in applications, in particular for numerical computations, but it is much easier to compute than the limiting coderivative. Note that in these applications we only have to compute *one* subspace belonging to  $\mathcal{S}^*F(x, y)$  and not the whole adjoint SC derivative. On the other hand, the limiting coderivative is a more general notion important for arbitrary set-valued mappings.

The derivatives  $\mathcal{S}F$  and  $\mathcal{S}^*F$  can be considered as a generalization of the B-Jacobian to multifunctions. In case of single-valued continuous mappings one has the following relationship.

**Lemma 2.9** ([13, Lemma 3.5]). *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be open and let  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  be continuous. Then for every  $x \in \Omega$  there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}f(x) &:= \mathcal{S}(x, f(x)) \supseteq \{\text{rge}(I_n, A) \mid A \in \bar{\nabla}f(x)\}, \\ \mathcal{S}^*f(x) &:= \mathcal{S}^*(x, f(x)) \supseteq \{\text{rge}(I_m, A^T) \mid A \in \bar{\nabla}f(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

*If  $f$  is Lipschitz near  $x$ , these inclusions hold with equality and  $f$  has the SCD property at all points  $x'$  sufficiently close to  $x$ .*

We now provide some important examples of SCD mappings; cf. [12].

**Example 2.10.**

1. Every maximally monotone mapping  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$  is an SCD mapping.
2. In particular, the subgradient mapping  $\partial q$  of an lsc convex function  $q : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  is an SCD mapping. Further,  $\mathcal{S}(\partial q)(x, x^*) = \mathcal{S}^*(\partial q)(x, x^*)$ ,  $(x, x^*) \in \text{gph} \partial q$  and every subspace  $L \in \mathcal{S}(\partial q)(x, x^*)$

is self-adjoint, i.e.,  $L = L^*$  and admits the basis representation  $L = \text{rge}(B, I_n - B)$  for some symmetric positive semidefinite matrix  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  with  $\|B\| \leq 1$ ; cf. [12]. For instance, when  $q$  is twice continuously differentiable then  $B = (I_n + \nabla^2 q(x))^{-1}$ .

3. Also the subgradient mapping of prox-regular and subdifferentially continuous functions is an SCD mapping. Recall that an lsc function  $q : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is prox-regular at  $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } q$  for a subgradient  $\bar{x}^* \in \partial q(\bar{x})$ , if there exist  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $r \geq 0$  such that

$$q(x') \geq q(x) + \langle x^*, x' - x \rangle - \frac{r}{2} \|x' - x\|^2$$

whenever  $x' \in \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(\bar{x})$  and  $(x, x^*) \in \text{gph } \partial q \cap (\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(\bar{x}) \times \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(\bar{x}^*))$  with  $q(x) < q(\bar{x}) + \varepsilon$ . Further,  $q$  is called subdifferentially continuous at  $\bar{x}$  for  $\bar{x}^*$  if for every sequence  $(x_k, x_k^*) \xrightarrow{\text{gph } \partial q} (\bar{x}, \bar{x}^*)$  one has  $q(x_k) \rightarrow q(\bar{x})$ .

If  $q : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is both prox-regular and subdifferentially continuous at  $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } q$  for  $\bar{x}^* \in \partial q(\bar{x})$ , then  $q$  has the SCD property around  $(\bar{x}, \bar{x}^*)$  and for every  $(x, x^*)$  sufficiently close to  $(\bar{x}, \bar{x}^*)$  there holds  $\mathcal{S}(\partial q)(x, x^*) = \mathcal{S}^*(\partial q)(x, x^*)$ . Every subspace  $L \in \mathcal{S}(\partial q)(x, x^*)$  is again self-adjoint and admits now a basis representation  $L = \text{rge}(P, W)$ , where  $P$  and  $W$  are symmetric  $n \times n$  matrices satisfying

$$P^2 = P, \quad W(I_n - P) = I_n - P;$$

cf. [9]. For instance, when  $q$  is twice continuously differentiable at  $\bar{x}$  then  $P = I_n$ ,  $W = \nabla^2 q(\bar{x})$ . In case when  $q$  is convex, the matrix  $W$  is positive semidefinite.

All the examples above are special cases of *graphically Lipschitz mappings* ([28, Definition 9.66]), which possess also the SCD property; cf. [13].

## 2.5 Semismooth\* mappings

The following definition is adapted from [8].

**Definition 2.11.**

1. A set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is called *semismooth\** at a point  $\bar{x} \in A$  if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is some  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$|\langle x^*, x - \bar{x} \rangle| \leq \varepsilon \|x - \bar{x}\| \|x^*\| \quad \forall x \in A \cap \mathcal{B}_\delta(\bar{x}) \quad \forall x^* \in N_A(x).$$

2. A set-valued mapping  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  is called *semismooth\** at a point  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$ , if  $\text{gph } F$  is semismooth\* at  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ , i.e., for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is some  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle x^*, x - \bar{x} \rangle - \langle y^*, y - \bar{y} \rangle| \\ & \leq \varepsilon \|(x, y) - (\bar{x}, \bar{y})\| \|(y^*, x^*)\| \quad \forall (x, y) \in \text{gph } F \cap \mathcal{B}_\delta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \quad \forall (y^*, x^*) \in \text{gph } D^*F(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Note that the semismooth\* property was defined in [8] in a different but equivalent way. The class of semismooth\* mappings is rather broad. We mention here two important classes of multifunctions having this property.

**Proposition 2.12** ([12, Proposition 2.10]).

- (i) Every mapping whose graph is the union of finitely many closed convex sets is semismooth\* at every point of its graph.
- (ii) Every mapping with closed subanalytic graph is semismooth\* at every point of its graph.

For single-valued functions there holds the following result.

**Proposition 2.13** ([8, Proposition 3.7]). Assume that  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is a single-valued mapping which is Lipschitz near  $\bar{x}$ . Then the following two statements are equivalent.

- (i)  $F$  is semismooth\* at  $\bar{x}$ .
- (ii) For every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is some  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\|F(x) - F(\bar{x}) - C(x - \bar{x})\| \leq \varepsilon \|x - \bar{x}\| \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(\bar{x}) \quad \forall C \in \text{conv } \bar{\nabla} F(x),$$



i.e.,

$$\sup_{C \in \text{conv } \nabla F(x)} \|F(x) - F(\bar{x}) - C(x - \bar{x})\| = o(\|x - \bar{x}\|). \quad (5)$$

In the following definition of the SCD-semismooth\* property we replace  $\text{gph } D^*F(x, y)$  in the relation (4) by the smaller set given by the union of all subspaces  $L^* \in \mathcal{S}^*F(x, y)$ .

**Definition 2.14.** We say that the mapping  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  is SCD-semismooth\* at  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$  if it has the SCD property around  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  and for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is some  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle x^*, x - \bar{x} \rangle - \langle y^*, y - \bar{y} \rangle| \\ & \leq \varepsilon \|(x, y) - (\bar{x}, \bar{y})\| \|(y^*, x^*)\| \forall (x, y) \in \text{gph } F \cap \mathcal{B}_\delta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \text{ and } \forall (y^*, x^*) \in L^*, L^* \in \mathcal{S}^*F(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

## 2.6 On $\Psi$ -semismooth single-valued mappings

The following definition is closely related to the definitions of Newton maps [21], G-semismoothness [16], Newton (slant) differentiability [3, 19] and semismooth operators in Banach spaces; cf. [31, Definition 3.1].

**Definition 2.15.** Consider the mapping  $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is open, and the multifunction  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ .

1. We say that  $F$  is *semismooth with respect to  $\Psi$*  (shortly  $\Psi$ -ss) at  $\bar{x} \in \Omega$  if  $\text{dom } \Psi$  is a neighborhood of  $\bar{x}$ ,  $\Psi$  is locally bounded at  $\bar{x}$  and

$$\lim_{\substack{x \xrightarrow{\Omega} \bar{x} \\ x \neq \bar{x}}} \frac{\sup\{\|F(x) - F(\bar{x}) - A(x - \bar{x})\| \mid A \in \Psi(x)\}}{\|x - \bar{x}\|} = 0.$$

2. We say that  $F$  is  $\Psi$ -ss on a subset  $U \subset \Omega$  if  $F$  is  $\Psi$ -ss at every  $x \in U$ .

Clearly, continuously differentiable mappings  $F$  are  $\nabla F$ -ss. Moreover,  $\Psi$ -ss mappings obey the following chain rule.

**Lemma 2.16** ([14, Lemma 3.4]). *Consider the mappings  $F_1 : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $F_2 : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $V \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  are open sets with  $F_1(U) \subset V$ . Assume that  $F_1$  is  $\Psi_1$ -ss at  $\bar{x} \in U$  and that  $F_2$  is  $\Psi_2$ -ss at  $F_1(\bar{x})$ , where  $\Psi_1 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ ,  $\Psi_2 : \mathbb{R}^p \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ . Then the composite mapping  $F : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  given by  $F(x) := F_2(F_1(x))$  is  $\Psi$ -ss at  $\bar{x}$  with  $\Psi$  given by*

$$\Psi(x) := \{BA \mid A \in \Psi_1(x), B \in \Psi_2(F_1(x))\}.$$

The next auxiliary statement is important in the application we have in mind.

**Lemma 2.17** ([14, Lemma 3.6]). *Let  $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  open, be continuous and assume that  $F$  is  $\Psi$ -ss at  $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ . Then  $F$  is also  $\text{cocl } \Psi$ -ss at  $\bar{x}$ .*

Consider now the following definition.

**Definition 2.18** ([24, 25]). A function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called *generalized differentiable* if there exists an usc mapping  $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$  with nonempty, convex and compact values  $G(x)$  such that for every  $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  there holds

$$\sup_{g \in G(x)} |f(x) - f(\bar{x}) - \langle g, x - \bar{x} \rangle| = o(\|x - \bar{x}\|).$$

The elements of  $G(x)$  are called *pseudogradients* in [22].

By Lemma 2.17, a  $\Psi$ -ss function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is also generalized differentiable with

$$G(x) = \{g \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid g^T \in (\text{cocl } \Psi)(x)\}.$$

Note that pseudogradients are column vectors whereas the elements of  $\Psi$  are  $1 \times n$  matrices, i.e., row vectors.

Generalized differentiable functions have many interesting properties, cf. [22, 24, 25], which can be carried over to  $\Psi$ -semismooth functions  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  open. Some of these results can be generalized to vector-valued mappings.



**Proposition 2.19** ([14, Proposition 3.9]). *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be open and assume that  $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is semismooth on  $\Omega$  with respect to a mapping  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ . Then the following statements hold:*

- (i)  *$F$  is locally Lipschitz on  $\Omega$ .*
- (ii) *For every  $x \in \Omega$  there holds  $\emptyset \neq \text{conv } \bar{\nabla}F(x) \subset (\text{cocl } \Psi)(x)$ .*
- (iii) *Let  $\Omega_\Psi$  denote the set of all  $x \in \Omega$  such that  $(\text{cocl } \Psi)(x)$  is a singleton. Then  $\Omega \setminus \Omega_\Psi$  has Lebesgue measure zero. Moreover, the mapping  $F$  is strictly differentiable at every  $x \in \Omega_\Psi$  with  $\{\nabla F(x)\} = (\text{cocl } \Psi)(x)$  and the mapping  $x \mapsto \nabla F(x)$  is continuous on  $\Omega_\Psi$ .*

In particular, on  $\Omega_\Psi$  there holds  $(\text{cocl } \Psi) = \text{conv } \bar{\nabla}F (= \nabla F)$  and therefore the set, where  $\text{cocl } \Psi$  differs from  $\text{conv } \bar{\nabla}F$ , has Lebesgue measure zero.

## 2.7 On semismoothness of solution mappings for generalized equations

In this section we consider GEs of the form

$$0 \in F(x, y) := f(x, y) + Q(x, y), \quad (6)$$

where  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is continuously differentiable and  $Q : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  has a closed graph.

**Lemma 2.20.** *Assume that  $Q$  has the SCD property at  $((x, y), z) \in \text{gph } Q$ . Then  $F$  has the SCD property at  $((x, y), f(x, y) + z)$  and*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}F((x, y), f(x, y) + z) &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} I_{n+m} & 0 \\ \nabla f(x, y) & I_m \end{pmatrix} L \mid L \in \mathcal{S}Q((x, y), z) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{S}^*F((x, y), f(x, y) + z) &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} I_m & 0 \\ \nabla f(x, y)^T & I_{n+m} \end{pmatrix} L^* \mid L^* \in \mathcal{S}^*Q((x, y), z) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Follows from [14, Proposition 2.15]. □

By considering basis representations  $L^* = \text{rge}(Z^*, X^*, Y^*)$  with matrices  $Z^*, Y^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  and  $X^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , we arrive at the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^*F((x, y), f(x, y) + z) &= \left\{ \text{rge}(Z^*, \nabla_x f(x, y)^T Z^* + X^*, \nabla_y f(x, y)^T Z^* + Y^*) \mid \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{rge}(Z^*, X^*, Y^*) \in \mathcal{S}^*Q((x, y), z), Z^*, Y^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}, X^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Using this formula, [14, Corollary 5.12] reads as follows.

**Theorem 2.21.** *Consider the mapping  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  given by (6) and a continuous mapping  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  open, satisfying  $0 \in F(x, \sigma(x))$ ,  $x \in \Omega$ . Further assume that for every  $x \in \Omega$  the mapping  $Q$  is SCD semismooth\* at  $(x, \sigma(x), -f(x, \sigma(x)))$  and for every subspace  $\text{rge}(Z^*, X^*, Y^*) \in \mathcal{S}^*Q(x, \sigma(x), -f(x, \sigma(x)))$ , where  $Z^*, Y^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  and  $X^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , the  $m \times m$  matrix  $\nabla_y f(x, \sigma(x))^T Z^* + Y^*$  is nonsingular.*

*Then  $\sigma$  is semismooth on  $\Omega$  with respect to the mapping  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  given by*

$$\Psi(x) := \begin{cases} \left\{ -(\nabla_y f(x, y)^T Z^* + Y^*)^{-T} (Z^{*T} \nabla_x f(x, y) + X^{*T}) \mid \right. & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ \left. \text{rge}(Z^*, X^*, Y^*) \in \mathcal{S}^*Q((x, \sigma(x)) - f(x, \sigma(x))) \right\} & \\ \emptyset & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

*In particular, for every function  $\varphi : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined on an open set  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$  containing  $\text{gph } \sigma$ , which is semismooth on  $\text{gph } \sigma$  with respect to some mapping  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (n+m)}$ , the function  $\vartheta$  defined by  $\vartheta(x) := \varphi(x, \sigma(x))$ , is semismooth on  $\Omega$  with respect to the mapping  $\Theta : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$  given by*

$$\Theta(x) := \begin{cases} \{g_x^T + g_y^T A \mid (g_x^T, g_y^T) \in \Phi(x, \sigma(x)), A \in \Psi(x)\} & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ \emptyset & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

*Remark 1.* By Proposition 2.19, the semismoothness of  $\sigma$  with respect to  $\Psi$  ensures that  $\sigma$  is locally Lipschitz on  $\Omega$ .

Note that in case when  $Q(x, y) = \tilde{Q}(y)$  does not depend on  $x$ , we have

$$\mathcal{S}^*Q(x, y, z) = \{\text{rge}(Z^*, 0, Y^*) \mid \text{rge}(Z^*, Y^*) \in \mathcal{S}^*\tilde{Q}(y, z)\}.$$

### 3 On the ImP approach to mathematical programs with equilibrium constraints

This section addresses the specific case of model (1) in which the multifunction  $F$  attains the form (6). This results in a parameter-dependent GE that is very well suited for the description of the behavior of a large class of parameter-dependent equilibrium problems. Problem (1) is now formulated as the following MPEC

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \varphi(x, y) \\ & \text{subject to} && 0 \in f(x, y) + Q(x, y), \\ & && x \in U_{ad}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where  $x, y$  can be interpreted as the *control* and *state* variables, respectively, and  $U_{ad}$  is the set of *admissible* controls.

Throughout the whole section, we will impose the following standing assumptions:

(A1) The *solution mapping*  $S: \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  defined by

$$S(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \text{GE (6) is fulfilled}\} \tag{10}$$

is single-valued and continuous on an open set  $\Omega \supset U_{ad}$ .

(A2)  $U_{ad}$  is a convex polyhedron.

(A3)  $Q$  is SCD semismooth\* (in the sense of Definition 2.14) at every point  $((x, S(x)), -f(x, S(x)))$ ,  $x \in \Omega$ .

Assumption (A1) is indispensable and is imposed essentially in all works using the ImP approach to the numerical solution of MPECs. Its fulfillment can be ensured in different ways. One possibility is to combine the Mordukhovich criterion ensuring the Aubin property of  $S$  with a condition guaranteeing the uniqueness of the solution to (6) for admissible controls  $x \in U_{ad}$ . Alternatively, if  $Q$  depends only on  $y$ , one could employ the notion of strong regularity; cf. [7, Chapter 3B], [27, Chapter 5].

Under (A1), MPEC (9) amounts to the single-level nonsmooth optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \vartheta(x) \\ & \text{subject to} && x \in U_{ad}, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where the objective  $\vartheta: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined via the composition  $\vartheta(x) := \varphi(x, S(x))$ . Various available ImP techniques differ in the way how a solution to (11) is computed. Here we will use similarly to [27], [6], [2], [20] the bundle trust-region (BT) algorithm of Schramm and Zowe ([30, 32]) which is able to deal only with constraints in form of linear equalities and inequalities. This is the reason for imposing (A2).

Assumption (A3), at the first glance, might look rather restrictive, but it turns out that it holds in case of most major classes of equilibria considered in the literature so far. In particular, it is fulfilled in all classes of MPECs considered below.

In its original form, the BT algorithm requires from the user (similarly to most existing bundle methods) to compose a so-called oracle in which, given an  $x \in U_{ad}$ , one computes the corresponding state variable  $y = S(x)$ , the function value  $\vartheta(x)$  and a subgradient  $\xi \in \partial_c \vartheta(x)$ . Then it can be shown, that under the additional assumption that  $\vartheta$  is weakly semismooth and under boundedness of the sequence of iterates  $x^{(k)}$  there is an accumulation point  $\hat{x}$  of this sequence which is C-stationary, i.e.,  $0 \in \partial_c \vartheta(\hat{x}) + N_{U_{ad}}(\hat{x})$ .

As observed in [6], it is not really necessary that the oracle returns a subgradient in order that the BT-algorithm works. Only a pseudogradient  $\xi$  in the sense of Definition 2.18 is required, i.e., a semismoothness condition has to be fulfilled. The price we have to pay is that no accumulation point needs to be C-stationary. However, it holds that at least one of them fulfills the weaker necessary optimality condition saying that 0 is the sum of a pseudogradient and a normal to  $U_{ad}$ .

We clarify this issue in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.1** ([14, Theorem 3.10]). *Consider problem (11) and assume that the objective  $\vartheta$  is semismooth with respect to a mapping  $\Theta: \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$  on an open set  $\Omega \supset U_{ad}$ . Assume that the BT-algorithm is applied to this problem along with an oracle which returns for each  $x \in U_{ad}$  besides the function value  $\vartheta(x)$  an element  $\xi$  with  $\xi^T \in \Theta(x)$ . If, moreover, the BT-algorithm generates a bounded sequence of iterates  $x^{(k)}$ , then this sequence possesses an accumulation point  $\hat{x}$  satisfying the optimality condition*

$$0 \in (\text{cocl}\Theta)(\hat{x})^T + N_{U_{ad}}(\hat{x}). \quad (12)$$

Recall that in the ImP approach the function  $\vartheta$  is given by  $\vartheta(x) = \varphi(x, S(x))$ . By Theorem 2.21,  $\vartheta$  is semismooth with respect to the mapping  $\Theta$  given by (8) (with  $\sigma$  replaced by  $S$ ) under the following additional assumptions:

- (A4) For every  $x \in \Omega$  and for every subspace  $L^* = \text{rge}(Z^*, X^*, Y^*) \in \mathcal{S}^*Q(x, S(x), -f(x, S(x)))$ , where  $Z^*, Y^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  and  $X^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , the  $m \times m$  matrix  $\nabla_y f(x, S(x))^T Z^* + Y^*$  is nonsingular.
- (A5) The function  $\varphi$  is semismooth on  $\{(x, S(x)) \mid x \in \Omega\}$  with respect to some mapping  $\Phi: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (n+m)}$

Since for every subspace  $L^* \in \mathcal{S}^*Q(x, S(x), -f(x, S(x)))$  we have  $L^* \subset D^*Q(x, S(x), -f(x, S(x)))$ , and by taking into account (7), one can easily show that Assumption (A4) is fulfilled under the assumptions of [23, Corollary 4.60].

Assumption (A5) is tailored to the situation that the mapping  $\varphi = \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2 \circ \dots \circ \varphi_l$  is the composition of various mappings  $\varphi_i: \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_{i-1}}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, l$ , each being semismooth with respect to  $\bar{\nabla}\varphi_i$ . By the chain rule (Lemma 2.16) we know that  $\varphi$  is semismooth with respect to

$$\Phi(x) = \{A_1 A_2 \dots A_l \mid A_i \in \bar{\nabla}\varphi_i(\varphi_{i+1} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_l(x)), i = 1, \dots, l\}$$

In the oracle given below for computing one element  $\xi^T \in \Theta(x)$  we only need one element  $g^T \in \Phi(x)$ . To this end it is only necessary that for every mapping  $\varphi_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, l$  we have at our disposal an oracle which returns for  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$  the value  $\varphi_i(x_i)$  and one element  $A_i \in \bar{\nabla}\varphi_i(x_i)$ . This feature is appropriate for the usage of automatic differentiation tools.

We are now in the position to explicitly formulate the oracle needed for applying the BT-algorithm to problem (11).

Oracle:

- 1) Given  $\bar{x} \in U_{ad}$ , compute  $\bar{y} = S(\bar{x})$  and select some arbitrary vectors  $(g_x^T, g_y^T) \in \Phi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ .
- 2) Determine a subspace  $L^* \in \mathcal{S}^*Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, -f(\bar{x}, \bar{y}))$  and its basis representation  $(Z^*, X^*, Y^*)$  with matrices  $Z^*, Y^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  and  $X^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ .
- 3) Compute the unique solution  $\bar{p}$  of the linear system
$$(\nabla_y f(\bar{x}, \bar{y})^T Z^* + Y^*)\bar{p} = -g_y \quad (13)$$

and set

$$x^* := (\nabla_x f(\bar{x}, \bar{y})^T Z^* + X^*)\bar{p}. \quad (14)$$
- 4) Return the function value  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  and the column vector
$$\xi = g_x + x^*. \quad (15)$$

*Remark 2.* Since  $L^* = \text{rge}(Z^*, X^*, Y^*) \subset \text{gph}D^*Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ , we have  $(X^*\bar{p}, Y^*\bar{p}) \in D^*Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y})(Z^*\bar{p})$  and thus the inclusion

$$\begin{pmatrix} x^* \\ -g_y \end{pmatrix} \in \nabla f(\bar{x}, \bar{y})^T z^* + D^*Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y})(z^*) \quad (16)$$

holds with  $z^* = Z^*\bar{p}$ .

By Theorem 2.21, under the posed assumptions we obtain that  $\xi$ , returned by the oracle, is a pseudogradient of  $\vartheta$  at  $\bar{x}$ . Thus, the convergence result of Theorem 3.1 holds and we want to illustrate the sharpness of condition (12). To this aim assume that a strengthened variant of (A1) is fulfilled, namely

(A1') The mapping  $\tilde{S}: \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  given by

$$\tilde{S}(u, x) := \{y \mid u \in f(x, y) + Q(x, y)\}$$

is single-valued and locally Lipschitz on  $\mathcal{B}_\delta(0) \times \Omega$  for some  $\delta > 0$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Under Assumption (A1') there holds for every  $(u, x) \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(0) \times \Omega$  that*

$$\mathcal{S}^*(f + Q)((x, \tilde{S}(u, x)), u) = \{\text{rge}(B_u^T, -B_x^T, I_m) \mid B = (B_u \dot{;} B_x) \in \overline{\nabla} \tilde{S}(u, x), B_u \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}, B_x \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}\}. \quad (17)$$

*Proof.* Consider the linear mapping  $\Xi: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$  given by  $\Xi(x, y, u) = (u, x, y)$ . Then

$$\text{gph}(f + Q) \cap (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathcal{B}_\delta(0)) = \{(x, y, u) \in (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathcal{B}_\delta(0)) \mid \Xi(x, y, u) \in \text{gph} \tilde{S}\}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{S}^* \tilde{S}((u, x), \tilde{S}(u, x)) = \{\text{rge}(I_m, B^T) \mid B \in \overline{\nabla} \tilde{S}(u, x)\}$ ,  $(u, x) \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(0) \times \Omega$ , equation (17) follows from [13, Theorem 4.1].  $\square$

Further, define the function  $\tilde{\vartheta}: \mathcal{B}_\delta(0) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\tilde{\vartheta}(u, x) = \varphi(x, \tilde{S}(u, x))$$

and consider the *enhanced* problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \tilde{\vartheta}(u, x) \\ & \text{subject to} && (u, x) \in \{0\} \times U_{ad}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

We observe that under (A1') problem (18) is well-defined and  $\hat{x}$  is a solution of (11) if and only if  $(0, \hat{x})$  is a solution of (18).

**Proposition 3.3.** *Apart from (A1') assume that  $\varphi$  is continuously differentiable on  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m$ . Then (12) amounts to the Clarke stationarity (C-stationarity) condition for problem (18) at  $(0, \hat{x})$ .*

*Proof.* By comparing (7) and (17) we can deduce that for every  $x \in \Omega$  and every subspace  $\text{rge}(Z^*, X^*, Y^*) \in \mathcal{S}^* Q(x, S(x))$ ,  $Z^*, Y^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ ,  $X^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , there is a matrix  $B = (B_u \dot{;} B_x) \in \overline{\nabla} \tilde{S}(0, x)$  such that

$$B_u^T = Z^* (\nabla_y f(x, y)^T Z^* + Y^*)^{-1}, \quad -B_x^T = (\nabla_x f(x, y)^T Z^* + X^*) (\nabla_y f(x, y)^T Z^* + Y^*)^{-1},$$

and vice versa. Hence the mapping  $\Theta$  from Theorem 2.21 has the representation

$$\Theta(x) = \{\nabla_x \vartheta(x, S(x)) + \nabla_y \vartheta(x, S(x)) B_x \mid B = (B_u \dot{;} B_x) \in \overline{\nabla} \tilde{S}(0, x)\}$$

implying  $\Theta(x) = (\text{cl} \Theta)(x)$  and

$$(\text{cocl} \Theta)(x) = \{\nabla_x \vartheta(x, S(x)) + \nabla_y \vartheta(x, S(x)) B_x \mid B = (B_u \dot{;} B_x) \in \text{conv} \overline{\nabla} \tilde{S}(0, x)\}.$$

By the chain rule [4, Theorem 2.6.6] we have

$$\partial_c \tilde{\vartheta}(0, x)^T = \{(\nabla_y \vartheta(x, S(x)) B_u, \nabla_x \vartheta(x, S(x)) + \nabla_y \vartheta(x, S(x)) B_x) \mid B = (B_u \dot{;} B_x) \in \text{conv} \overline{\nabla} \tilde{S}(0, x)\}.$$

Thus, when the optimality condition (12) holds, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} u^* \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \partial_c \tilde{\vartheta}(0, \hat{x}) + \{0\} \times N_{U_{ad}}(\hat{x})$$

for some  $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Since  $N_{\{0\} \times U_{ad}}(0, \hat{x}) = \mathbb{R}^m \times N_{U_{ad}}(\hat{x})$ , we can conclude that the C-stationarity condition

$$0 \in \partial_c \tilde{\vartheta}(0, \hat{x}) + N_{\{0\} \times U_{ad}}(0, \hat{x})$$

for the enhanced problem is fulfilled.  $\square$

Although the multifunction  $(\text{cocl } \Theta)^T$  differs from  $\partial_c \vartheta$  on  $\Omega$  only on a set of measure 0, we are aware that condition (12) can be definitely less sharp than standard C-stationarity conditions for (11). This can be explained by the theory of explicit and implicit variables ([1]) and it is documented by the following example.

**Example 3.4.** Consider an MPEC (9) with  $x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^2, U_{ad} = [-1, 1]$ ,

$$\varphi(x, y) = -0.5y_1 + y_2,$$

and an equilibrium governed by the linear complementarity problem

$$0 \in f(x, y) + Q(y) := \begin{pmatrix} y_1 + y_2 - x \\ y_2 + x \end{pmatrix} + N_{\mathbb{R}_+^2}(y).$$

It is easy to see that

$$S(x) = \begin{cases} (x, 0)^T & \text{for } x \geq 0, \\ (0, -x)^T & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \vartheta(x) = \begin{cases} -0.5x & \text{if } x \geq 0, \\ -x & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

and so assumption (A1) is fulfilled. Clearly, (A2) is fulfilled as well and (A3) holds true by [13, Proposition 5.3].

We observe that

$$N_{\mathbb{R}_+^2}(S(x)) \ni -f(x, S(x)) = \begin{cases} (0, -x)^T & \text{if } x \geq 0, \\ (2x, 0)^T & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{S}^* N_{\mathbb{R}^2}(S(x), -f(x, S(x))) \\ &= \begin{cases} \{(\mathbb{R} \times \{0\}) \times (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R})\} & \text{if } x > 0, \\ \{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \{(0, 0)\}, (\mathbb{R} \times \{0\}) \times (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}), (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}) \times (\mathbb{R} \times \{0\}), \{(0, 0)\} \times \mathbb{R}^2\} & \text{if } x = 0, \\ \{(\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}) \times (\mathbb{R} \times \{0\})\} & \text{if } x < 0; \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

cf. Section 3.1 below. Some calculations yield that the mappings  $\Psi$  and  $\Theta$  from Theorem 2.21 are given by

$$\Psi(x) = \begin{cases} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\} & \text{if } x > 0, \\ \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\} & \text{if } x = 0, \\ \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} & \text{if } x < 0, \end{cases} \quad \Theta(x) = \begin{cases} \{-0.5\} & \text{if } x > 0, \\ \{-2, -0.5, -1, 0\} & \text{if } x = 0, \\ \{-1\} & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

We see that for all  $x \neq 0$  there holds  $\Psi(x) = \bar{\nabla} S(x)$ ,  $\Theta(x) = \partial_c \vartheta(x)$ , but  $\Psi(0) \neq \bar{\nabla} S(0)$  and  $\Theta(0) \not\subset \partial_c \vartheta(0) = [-1, -0.5]$ .

Consequently, if the BT-algorithm encounters one iterate  $x^{(k)} = 0$ , our oracle could return the pseudogradient  $\xi = 0$  and the BT-algorithm would stop. Nevertheless, note that if we start with a randomly chosen starting point  $x^{(0)}$ , then all iterates  $x^{(k)}$  will be different from 0 with probability 1 and actually, the BT-algorithm will terminate after a few iterations with the exact solution  $\hat{x} = 1$ .

The only complicated step in the above approach is the specification of a suitable linear subspace  $L^* \in \mathcal{S}^*Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  and its basis representation as range of suitable matrices  $Z^*, X^*, Y^*$  (or  $Z^*, Y^*$ , if  $Q$  does not depend on  $x$ ).

In the next sections we will explain how these subspaces and their basis representation can be computed in some frequently arising cases.

### 3.1 Normal cone mapping to convex polyhedral sets

Consider first the (easy) case that  $Q(y) = \widehat{N}_C(y)$ , where

$$C := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \langle a_i, y \rangle \leq b_i, i = 1, \dots, l\}$$

is a convex polyhedral set having the representation above with vectors  $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and reals  $b_i, i = 1, \dots, l$ . Given  $(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*) \in \text{gph}N_C$  it is well-known ([13, Proposition 5.3]) that

$$\mathcal{S}N_C(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*) = \mathcal{S}^*N_C(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*) = \{(F - F) \times (F - F)^\perp \mid F \text{ is face of } \mathcal{K}_C(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*)\},$$

where  $\mathcal{K}_C(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*) = \{v \in T_C(\bar{y}) \mid \langle \bar{y}^*, v \rangle = 0\}$  denotes the critical cone to  $C$  at  $\bar{y}$  with respect to  $\bar{y}^*$ . The computation of *all* the subspaces in  $\mathcal{S}^*N_C(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*)$  might be puzzling, but for our oracle we only need *one* of them. This subspace can be chosen as the one which is induced by the face  $F = \text{lin}T_D(\bar{y})$ , the *lineality space* of the tangent cone  $T_D(\bar{y})$  given by  $\text{lin}T_D(\bar{y}) = \{v \mid \langle a_i, v \rangle = 0, i \in I(\bar{y})\} =: E$ , where

$$I(\bar{y}) := \{i \in \{1, \dots, l\} \mid \langle a_i, \bar{y} \rangle = b_i\}.$$

Since  $E$  is a subspace, we have  $E = E - E$  and the subspace  $L^*$ , required for our oracle, can be chosen as  $L^* = E \times E^\perp$ . There remains to compute a basis representation of  $L^*$ . To this aim we may employ the (full) QR factorization of the matrix  $D$ , where  $D$  is composed from the normalized vectors  $a_i/\|a_i\|, i \in I(\bar{y})$  as columns. Let

$$DP = Q \begin{pmatrix} R_{11} & R_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $P$  is an  $|I(\bar{y})| \times |I(\bar{y})|$  permutation matrix,  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  is orthogonal,  $R_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times s}$  is a nonsingular upper triangular matrix,  $R_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times (|I(\bar{y})| - s)}$  and  $s$  is the rank of  $D$ . If we partition  $Q = (Q_1 \dot{=} Q_2)$  with  $Q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times s}$ ,  $Q_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (m-s)}$ , there holds  $E = \text{rge} Q_2$ ,  $E^\perp = \text{rge} Q_1$  and consequently  $L^* = E \times E^\perp = \text{rge} (Z^*, Y^*)$  with  $Z^* = (Q_2 \dot{=} 0)$ ,  $Y^* = (0 \dot{=} Q_1)$ .

### 3.2 Normal cone mapping to inequality constraints

Consider now the case when  $Q(y) = \widehat{N}_\Gamma(y)$  with

$$\Gamma = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid g_i(y) \leq 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, l\}, \quad (20)$$

where the functions  $g_i : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are convex and twice continuously differentiable. This situation has been thoroughly investigated in [27] (even for  $x$ -dependent inequalities and equalities) under the *linear independence constraint qualification* (LICQ). Here we present a modification of this approach which is simpler and enables us to replace LICQ by the following (weaker) assumption.

(CQ) For all  $x \in U_{ad}$  and  $y = S(x)$  the inequality system in (20) fulfills the *Mangasarian-Fromovitz CQ* (denoted by MFCQ) and the *constant rank CQ* (denoted by CRCQ).

(CQ) will allow us to invoke a result from [18] or [11], essential in the proof of Proposition 3.5 below.

So, throughout the rest of this section we assume that (CQ) is fulfilled and consider a triple  $(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*, \bar{\lambda})$ , where  $\bar{y} = S(\bar{x})$  for some admissible control  $\bar{x}, \bar{y}^* \in Q(\bar{y})$  and  $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^l$  is an arbitrary *Lagrange multiplier* satisfying the conditions

$$\bar{y}^* = \sum_{i=1}^l \bar{\lambda}_i \nabla g_i(\bar{y})^T, \quad \bar{\lambda} \geq 0, \quad \langle \bar{\lambda}, g(\bar{y}) \rangle = 0 \quad (21)$$

with  $g(\bar{y}) = (g_1(\bar{y}), \dots, g_l(\bar{y}))^T$ .

Further, for the sake of notational simplicity, we introduce the notation

$$A := \sum_{i=1}^l \bar{\lambda}_i \nabla^2 g_i(\bar{y}) = A^T \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H} = K_\Gamma(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*) := \{h \in T_\Gamma(\bar{y}) \mid \langle \bar{y}^*, h \rangle = 0\},$$

i.e., it is the critical cone to  $\Gamma$  at  $\bar{y}$  with respect to  $\bar{y}^*$ . Let

$$I(y) := \{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\} \mid g_i(y) = 0\}$$

denote the index set of active inequalities (at  $y$ ).

**Proposition 3.5.** *In the setting described above let*

$$E := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \nabla g_i(\bar{y})z = 0 \text{ for } i \in I(\bar{y})\},$$

and consider the subspace  $M \in \mathcal{L}_{mm}$  given by

$$M = E \times E^\perp.$$

Then for

$$L := \left\{ (h, k) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \mid \begin{pmatrix} h \\ k - Ah \end{pmatrix} \in M \right\}$$

one has

$$L = L^* \in \mathcal{S}Q(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*) = \mathcal{S}^*Q(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*). \quad (22)$$

*Proof.* Consider a multiplier  $\bar{\lambda}$  satisfying (21) and assume that  $\bar{\lambda}_i = 0$  for  $i$  from an index set  $J \subset I(\bar{y})$ . Next let us construct a perturbed multiplier  $\tilde{\lambda}$  such that, with some  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_i &= \bar{\lambda}_i & \text{for } i \in I(\bar{y}) \setminus J \\ \tilde{\lambda}_i &= \varepsilon & \text{for } i \in J. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that with

$$y_\varepsilon^* := \sum_{i \in I(\bar{y})} \tilde{\lambda}_i \nabla g_i(\bar{y})$$

one has

$$K_\Gamma(\bar{y}, y_\varepsilon^*) = E.$$

We may now invoke [18, Theorem 3.1] or [11, Theorem 1], according to which

$$T_{\text{gph}Q}(\bar{y}, y_\varepsilon^*) = \{(h, k) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \mid k \in A_\varepsilon h + N_E(h)\} = \{(h, k) \mid h \in E, k - A_\varepsilon h \in E^\perp\},$$

where  $A_\varepsilon = \sum_{i \in I(\bar{y})} \tilde{\lambda}_i \nabla^2 q_i(\bar{y})$ . Since  $T_{\text{gph}Q}(\bar{y}, y_\varepsilon^*)$  admits the representation

$$T_{\text{gph}Q}(\bar{y}, y_\varepsilon^*) = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -A_\varepsilon & I \end{pmatrix}^{-1} M = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ A_\varepsilon & I \end{pmatrix} M \quad (23)$$

and  $M \in \mathcal{L}_{mm}$ , it follows that  $T_{\text{gph}Q}(\bar{y}, y_\varepsilon^*) \in \mathcal{L}_{mm}$  as well.

To prove (22) it suffices now to invoke [12, Lemma 3.1(iii)]. Since  $A_\varepsilon \rightarrow A$  for  $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ , it follows from [12, Lemma 3.1] that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ A_\varepsilon & I \end{pmatrix} M = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ A & I \end{pmatrix} M = L \in \mathcal{S}Q(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*). \quad (24)$$

Finally, since  $Q$  is the subgradient mapping of the convex lsc function  $\delta_\Gamma$ , the relations  $L = L^*$  and  $\mathcal{S}Q(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*) = \mathcal{S}^*Q(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*)$  follow and we are done.  $\square$



It remains to find a suitable basis representation of  $L^*$ . Denoting by  $D$  the  $m \times |I(\bar{y})|$  matrix having the normalized vectors  $\nabla g_i(\bar{y})^T / \|\nabla g_i(\bar{y})\|$ ,  $i \in I(\bar{y})$ , as columns, we can proceed as in Section 3.1 to find an orthogonal  $m \times m$  matrix  $Q = (Q_1 \dot{:} Q_2)$  with  $Q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times s}$ ,  $Q_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (m-s)}$ , where  $s$  denotes the rank of  $D$ , so that  $M = \text{rge}((Q_2 \dot{:} 0), (0 \dot{:} Q_1))$  and by using (24) we obtain that

$$L^* = \text{rge}(Z^*, Y^*) \text{ with } Z^* = (Q_2 \dot{:} 0), Y^* = (AQ_2 \dot{:} Q_1).$$

Thus the linear system (13) and formula (14) amount to

$$(\nabla_y f(\bar{x}, \bar{y})^T + A)Q_2 p_1 + Q_1 p_2 = -g_y \quad \text{with } p_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m-s}, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}^s \quad (25)$$

and

$$x^* = \nabla_x f(\bar{x}, \bar{y})^T Q_2 \bar{p}_1. \quad (26)$$

By multiplying the linear system (25) by  $Q_2^T$ , the computation of  $\bar{p}_1$  simplifies to the solution of the reduced system

$$Q_2^T (\nabla_y f(\bar{x}, \bar{y})^T + A)Q_2 p_1 = -Q_2^T g_y$$

in  $m-s$  variables. This system is smaller than the one used in the approach from [27] where a system of  $m+s$  equations has to be solved. On the other hand, the approach of [27] enables us to handle the rarely arising situation, when  $\varphi$  depends also on the multiplier  $\lambda$ .

*Remark 3.* Note that under Assumption (CQ), we only know *one* subspace  $L^* \in \mathcal{S}^* Q(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*)$ . It might be subject of further research to compute the whole SC derivative  $\mathcal{S}^* Q(\bar{y}, \bar{y}^*)$ .

### 3.3 Stackelberg games

Consider the case when the equilibrium is governed by a VI of the second kind that can be written down in the form (6) with

$$x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y = (y^1, y^2, \dots, y^l) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^l \quad \text{and} \quad Q(x, y) = Q(y) = \partial q(y) = \prod_{i=1}^l \partial q^i(y^i). \quad (27)$$

In (27) functions  $q^i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  are proper convex and lower semicontinuous.

In this way one can model, e.g., a parameter-dependent Nash game, where  $x$  is the parameter,  $y^i$  is the strategy of the  $i$ -th player,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$ , and  $q^i$  is the nonsmooth part of his objective which does not depend on the strategies of the remaining players. In our application of this model we have

$$q^i(y^i) = \tilde{q}^i(y^i) + \delta_{\kappa_i}(y^i), \quad i = 1, \dots, l, \quad (28)$$

where  $\kappa_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is the closed convex set of admissible strategies of the  $i$ -th player and  $\tilde{q}^i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex and continuous. Put  $m := nl$ . As already pointed out in Example 2.10,  $Q = \partial q$  is an SCD mapping. Further, due to the imposed separability of  $q$  and to [10, Proposition 3.5], the matrices  $Z^*, Y^*$  have the block diagonal structure

$$Z^* = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & B_2 & & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & B_l \end{pmatrix} \quad Y^* = \begin{pmatrix} I - B_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & I - B_2 & & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & I - B_l \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\text{rge}(B_i, I - B_i) \in \mathcal{S}^* \partial q^i(\bar{y}^i, \bar{y}^{*i})$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$ , with  $\bar{y}^* = -f(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ .

As a numerical test example of an MPEC with such an equilibrium we will consider an oligopolistic market, where each player (firm) produces at most  $n$  commodities and tries to maximize his profit. When

each player knows all data of his rivals, the equilibrium state of such a market is the Cournot–Nash non-cooperative equilibrium ([27, Chapter 12]). Consider now the situation, when one of the players decides to replace his original non-cooperative strategy by the Stackelberg one and becomes thus the Leader. The remaining players share the rest of the market by computing a new Cournot–Nash equilibrium among themselves. In this case the Leader has to solve MPEC (9), where  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is his own production,  $U_{ad}$  is his set of admissible productions and  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is his loss function. In the respective GE (6) the multi-valued part is given by (27), (28) and the  $i$ -th component of the single-valued part  $f$  amounts to

$$f_i(x, y) = \nabla_{y_i} \pi_i(x, y), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, l,$$

where  $\pi_i : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the loss function of the  $i$ -th firm (depending naturally on all strategies of his rivals including the Leader). Finally, functions  $\tilde{q}_i$  in (28) model the so-called costs of change, representing the expenses associated with any change of the production profile of the  $i$ -th firm. Naturally, these expenses may be nil. The concrete form of all these functions has been taken over from [15], where this equilibrium problem has been solved via the SCD semismooth\* Newton method proposed in [12]. It is important to note that the assumptions, imposed in [15] on the above listed problem data, ensure in particular the fulfillment of principal assumptions (A1)-(A5) and thus the possibility to solve this MPEC via the suggested approach. Then the SCD semismooth\* Newton method, applied to the numerical solution of the equilibrium problem, allows us to make use of the subspaces, computed in the framework of the Newton method. Concretely, the Newton method in [15] computes several subspaces  $L^{(k)} \in \mathcal{S}^* Q(y^{(k)}, y^{*(k)})$  together with their basis representations at iterates  $(y^{(k)}, y^{*(k)})$  and the last of these subspaces can be used for the respective computation in the oracle.

We solved several MPECs of this type with various numbers of players ( $l + 1$ ) and commodities ( $n$ ). Here we report results of an academic example fully described in [15, p. 1480]. To solve the problems, we used the code BTNCLC from the family of BT codes; see [29] and [30]. With  $n = 3$ ,  $l = 4$  and  $m = 12$  and the required accuracy  $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$  we needed 44 iterations to obtain the results presented in Table 1.

**Table 1** Optimal production for the Stackelberg strategy.

	Leader	Follower 1	Follower 2	Follower 3	Follower 4
Commodity 1	61.7342	53.5983	20.4201	50.1653	44.7341
Commodity 2	78.6542	64.7525	29.8977	57.1949	49.8414
Commodity 3	47.8100	84.8591	49.6823	70.5791	59.9312

In Table 2 we present the values of the loss functions and compare them with the ones of the non-cooperative strategy. We see that the leader only gains 17,98 units with the Stackelberg strategy, whereas the followers loose between 31,25 units (Follower 2) and 92,87 units (Follower 1).

**Table 2** Loss function values.

Stackelberg strategy	Leader -2210,94	Follower 1 -2818,06	Follower 2 -1978,79	Follower 3 -2688,34	Follower 4 -2506,05
non-cooperative strategy	Player 1 -2192,96	Player 2 -2910,93	Player 3 -2010,04	Player 4 -2767,10	Player 5 -2573,26

## 4 Bilevel programming

In this section we are dealing with an optimistic bilevel program of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \varphi(x, y) \\ & \text{subject to } y \in \arg \min_y \{ \psi(x, y) + q(x, y) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$x \in U_{ad},$$

where  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is locally Lipschitz,  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuously differentiable and  $q : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is an lsc function. Consider now the following assumption.

(B1) There is an open set  $\Omega \supset U_{ad}$  such that for every  $x \in \Omega$  the set of optimal solutions

$$\arg \min_y \{ \psi(x, y) + q(x, y) \} =: \{ \sigma(x) \}$$

is a singleton. Moreover, for every  $\bar{x} \in \Omega$  the function  $q(\cdot, \sigma(\bar{x}))$  is continuous at  $\bar{x}$  and there is a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that the set of global solutions  $\{ \sigma(x) \mid x \in U \}$  is bounded.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Under Assumption (B1) the mapping  $\sigma$  is continuous on  $\Omega$ .*

*Proof.* Consider  $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ . By the posed assumption, we can find a neighborhood  $U$  and a compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $\{ \sigma(x) \mid x \in U \} \subset \text{int} K$ . Then we may add to  $q(x, y)$  the indicator function  $\delta_K(y)$  without changing the optimal solution sets for  $x \in U$  and for the level set of the lower-level problem one has

$$\{ y \mid \psi(x, y) + q(x, y) + \delta_K(y) \leq \alpha \} \subset K, \quad x \in U, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Now continuity of  $\sigma$  at  $\bar{x}$  follows from [28, Theorem 1.17]. □

Obviously,  $\sigma(x)$  satisfies the first-order optimality conditions

$$0 \in \nabla_y \psi(x, \sigma(x))^T + \partial_y q(x, \sigma(x))$$

and is therefore a solution of the GE (6) with  $f := \nabla_y \psi^T$  and  $Q := \partial_y q$ . However, the solution set  $S(x)$  consists of all stationary solutions of the lower-level program and might not be a singleton. Nevertheless, if all the assumptions (A2)–(A5) are fulfilled with  $S(x)$  replaced by  $\sigma(x)$ , Theorem 3.1 remains valid by virtue of Theorem 2.21.

**Example 4.2.** Consider the bilevel program (29) with  $n = 1$ ,  $m = 2$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x, y) &= -x + y_1, \quad U_{ad} = [-1, 1], \\ \psi(x, y) &= \frac{1}{2}y_1^2 - \frac{1}{2}y_2^2 - xy_1, \quad q(x, y) = \delta_\Gamma(y) \text{ with } \Gamma := \{(y_1, y_2) \mid -\frac{1}{4}y_1 \leq y_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}y_1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\arg \min_y \{ \psi(x, y) + q(x, y) \} = \{ \sigma(x) \} = \begin{cases} \{ (\frac{4}{3}x, \frac{2}{3}x)^T \} & \text{if } x \geq 0, \\ \{ (0, 0)^T \} & \text{if } x < 0 \end{cases}$$

and it follows that Assumption (B1) is fulfilled. For the objective function of the leader we obtain

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{3}x & \text{if } x \geq 0 \\ -x & \text{if } x < 0 \end{cases}$$

and hence  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = (0, (0, 0))$  is a solution of the problem.

However, the mapping  $S(x) = \{ y \mid 0 \in \nabla_y \psi(x, y)^T + \partial_y q(x, y) \}$  of stationary solutions of the lower-level problem can be computed as

$$S(x) = \begin{cases} \{ \sigma(x), (\frac{16}{15}x, -\frac{4}{15}x)^T, (x, 0)^T \} & \text{if } x \geq 0 \\ \{ \sigma(x) \} & \text{if } x < 0 \end{cases}$$

showing that  $S$  is not single-valued. Further, there does not even exist a single-valued localization of  $S$  around  $(0, (0, 0))$ . Nevertheless, Assumptions (A2)–(A5) are fulfilled with  $S$  replaced by  $\sigma$ ,  $f = \nabla_y \psi^T$  and  $Q = \nabla_y q$ . Clearly, (A2) and (A5) are fulfilled. Since  $\delta_\Gamma$  is convex lsc and  $\text{gph} Q = \mathbb{R}^n \times \text{gph} N_\Gamma$  is the

union of finitely many convex sets, (A3) holds by virtue of Example 2.10 and Proposition 2.12. Since  $C$  is a convex polyhedral set, the adjoint SC derivative of  $Q = N_C$  can be computed via

$$\mathcal{S}^* N_\Gamma(\sigma(x), -\nabla_y \psi(x, \sigma(x))^T) = \begin{cases} \{L_1^*\} & \text{if } x > 0, \\ \{L_2^*\} & \text{if } x < 0, \\ \{L_1^*, L_2^*, L_3^*, L_4^*\} & \text{if } x = 0 \end{cases}$$

with  $L_2^* = \text{rge}(0, I_2)$ ,  $L_4^* = \text{rge}(I_2, 0)$  and

$$L_1^* = \text{rge} \left( \left( \begin{pmatrix} \frac{4}{5} & \frac{2}{5} \\ \frac{2}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{5} & -\frac{2}{5} \\ -\frac{2}{5} & \frac{4}{5} \end{pmatrix} \right), L_3^* = \text{rge} \left( \left( \begin{pmatrix} \frac{16}{17} & -\frac{4}{17} \\ -\frac{4}{17} & \frac{1}{17} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{17} & \frac{4}{17} \\ \frac{4}{17} & \frac{16}{17} \end{pmatrix} \right);$$

cf. Section 3.1. The matrices  $\nabla_y f(x, \sigma(x))^T Z^* + Y^*$  which have to be checked in (A4) are therefore given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{4}{5} & \frac{3}{5} \end{pmatrix}, I_2, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \frac{8}{17} & \frac{14}{17} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and are obviously nonsingular. Thus (A4) also hold and it follows that we can solve this bilevel optimization problem with the BT-algorithm using the ImP approach, provided we can actually compute a global solution of the lower level problem, which is of course a very stringent assumption.

**Example 4.3.** As a numerical experiment let us consider a bilevel program where the lower level objective is strictly convex in  $y$  and therefore the map  $S(x)$  is single-valued. We set  $n = m = 3$ ,

$$\psi(x, y) := \frac{1}{2}(y - y_0)^T C(x)(y - y_0), \quad q(x, y) := \delta_{\Gamma(y)},$$

where  $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is a given point. The  $3 \times 3$  diagonal matrix  $C(x) = \text{diag}(x_1, x_2, x_3)$  depends on  $x$  and  $\Gamma$  is a closed convex set given by the five inequalities

$$\frac{1}{2}y_1^2 \pm y_1 - y_3 \leq 0, \quad \frac{1}{2}y_2^2 \pm y_2 - y_3 \leq 0, \quad y_3 \geq 0.$$

Note that LICQ is violated at  $y = (0, 0, 0)^T$ . For our numerical experiments, we chose a nondifferentiable function  $\varphi(x, y) := \|y\|_1$  and  $U_{ad} := [1, 50]^3$ .

We used the ImP-approach as described in Section 3. The subspaces  $L^* \in \mathcal{S}^* Q(x, S(x))$  were computed as explained in Section 3.2. The resulting nonsmooth optimization problem was solved by the code BTNCBC [29]. For the lower-level quadratic optimization problems we used the software Gurobi [17].




Fig. 1 Set  $\Gamma$  from Example 4.3 in two different views.

We solved the problem with two target points,  $y_0^{(1)} = (1, 2, 3)^T$  and  $y_0^{(2)} = (1, 2, -0.5)^T$ . In both cases, the initial point for BTNCBC was  $x = (3, 3, 3)^T$ .

In case of  $y_0^{(1)}$ , BTNCBC needed 8 iterations to converge to the required accuracy  $10^{-6}$ . As expected, at the optimum, the third component of  $x$  was on the upper bound:  $\hat{x} = (3.000013, 3.000013, 49.999994)$  with corresponding  $y^* = (1.000004, 1.648760, 3.007966)^T$ .

For  $y_0^{(2)}$ , BTNCBC reached the solution in 18 iterations giving  $\hat{x} = (3.000001, 3.000001, 31.270435)$  and  $y^*$  with components of order  $10^{-11}$ .

*Remark 4.* For the numerical solution of the above problem one could alternatively use the approach from [5, Section 6.2] provided the upper objective  $\varphi$  were continuously differentiable. Note that in our approach the adjoint equation (13) has a smaller dimension than its counterpart in [5].

## 5 On a semismooth Newton method for decomposable optimization problems

Consider the problem

$$\min_{x,y} \varphi(x,y) \quad (30)$$

where  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is an lsc function. Assuming that minimization with respect to  $y$  can be efficiently conducted, one could attempt to eliminate  $y$  and to solve the reduced problem

$$\min_x \vartheta(x) := \min_y \varphi(x,y). \quad (31)$$

Under reasonable assumptions, the function  $\vartheta$  is continuously differentiable and the gradient  $\nabla \vartheta$  can be easily computed. Thus, numerous first-order methods are available for minimizing  $\vartheta$  and one might ask whether there are second-order methods yielding faster convergence. A candidate for such a second-order method would be the semismooth Newton approach. If  $\nabla \vartheta^T$  is semismooth with respect to a mapping  $\Theta : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , the semismooth Newton iteration is given by

$$x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} - G^{(k)-1} \nabla \vartheta(x^{(k)})^T \quad \text{with} \quad G^{(k)} \in \Theta(x^{(k)}). \quad (32)$$

If at a solution  $\hat{x}$  of (31) all matrices  $G \in (\text{cl } \Theta)(\hat{x})$  are nonsingular, there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\hat{x}$  such that for all starting points  $x^{(0)} \in U$  the sequence  $x^{(k)}$  given by (32) is well defined and converges superlinearly to  $\hat{x}$ ; cf. [31].

A crucial part of this semismooth Newton approach is the computation of the mapping  $\Theta$  and we will explain in the sequel how this can be done. Consider the following assumptions:

(SS1)  $\varphi(x,y) = \psi(x,y) + q(y)$ , where  $q : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is lsc and  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is twice continuously differentiable.

(SS2) There is an open set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$\arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} \varphi(x,y) = \{\sigma(x)\} \quad \text{is a singleton for every } x \in \Omega.$$

(SS3) For every  $\bar{x} \in \Omega$  there is a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that the set  $\{\sigma(x) \mid x \in U\}$  is bounded.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Assume that (SS1)-(SS3) are fulfilled. Then the mapping  $\sigma$  is continuous on  $\Omega$  and the function  $\vartheta$  given by (31) is continuously differentiable on  $\Omega$  with  $\nabla \vartheta(x) = \nabla_x \psi(x, \sigma(x))$ .*

*Proof.* Continuity of  $\sigma$  follows from Lemma 4.1. Further,  $\partial^\infty \varphi(x, \sigma(x)) = \{0\} \times \partial^\infty q(\sigma(x))$  and hence there does not exist  $x^* \neq 0$  with  $(x^*, 0) \in \partial^\infty \varphi(x, \sigma(x))$ , where for the definition and properties of the horizon subdifferential  $\partial^\infty$  we refer the reader to [28]. We may now conclude from [28, Corollary 10.14] that  $\vartheta$  is strictly differentiable at every  $x \in \Omega$  with  $\nabla \vartheta(x) = \nabla_x \psi(x, \sigma(x))$ . Together with continuity of  $\sigma$  we conclude that  $\vartheta$  is smooth on  $\Omega$ .  $\square$

In order to apply Theorem 2.21 with  $f = \nabla_y \psi^T$  and  $Q(x, y) = \partial q(y)$ , we need two additional assumptions:

(SS4) For every  $x \in \Omega$ , the subgradient mapping  $\partial q$  is SCD semismooth\* at  $(\sigma(x), -\nabla_y \psi(x, \sigma(x)))$ .

(SS5) For every  $x \in \Omega$  and for every subspace  $L^* = \text{rge}(Z^*, Y^*) \in \mathcal{S}^*(\partial q)(\sigma(x), -\nabla_y \psi(x, \sigma(x))^T)$ , where  $Z^*, Y^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ , there holds that the  $m \times m$  matrix  $\nabla_{yy}^2 \psi(x, \sigma(x))Z^* + Y^*$  is nonsingular.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Under Assumptions (SS1)–(SS5), the mapping  $\sigma$  is semismooth on  $\Omega$  with respect to the mapping  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  given by*

$$\Psi(x) := \begin{cases} \left\{ -(\nabla_{yy}^2 \psi(x, y)Z^* + Y^*)^{-T}(Z^{*T} \nabla_{yx}^2 \psi(x, y)) \mid \right. \\ \quad \left. \text{rge}(Z^*, Y^*) \in \mathcal{S}^*(\partial q)(\sigma(x), -\nabla_y \psi(x, \sigma(x))^T) \right\} & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ \emptyset & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Further,  $\nabla \vartheta(x)^T = \nabla_x \psi(x, \sigma(x))^T$  is semismooth on  $\Omega$  with respect to the mapping  $\Theta : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  given by

$$\Theta(x) := \begin{cases} \left\{ \nabla_{xx}^2 \psi(x, \sigma(x)) + \nabla_{xy}^2 \psi(x, \sigma(x))A \mid A \in \Psi(x) \right\} & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ \emptyset & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

The proof follows from Theorem 2.21. We may thus conclude that problem (31) can be solved numerically by the semismooth Newton approach given by (32).

## 6 Conclusion

Let us finish with a few observations.

The paper contains a certain “minimal” set of assumptions, under which a class of MPECs and bilevel programs can be numerically solved by the ImP approach combined with a bundle method.

In some MPECs the lower-level problem may be solved by the SCD semismooth\* Newton method ([12]). In such a case, in each iteration of the bundle method a suitable subspace  $L^*$  is available and the computation of pseudogradients reduces to the solution of the linear square system (13).

Nonsmooth upper-level objectives may appear, e.g., in connection with possible state constraints, augmented to the objective via an exact penalty; see [26].

## Declarations

**Conflict of interest.** The author has no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

**Data availability.** The data used in Section 3.3 are available from [15].

**Funding.** The work of M. Kočvara and J. Outrata has been supported by the Czech Science Foundation through project No. 22-15524S.

## References

- [1] M. BENKO, P. MEHLITZ, *On implicit variables in optimization theory*, J. of Nonsmooth Analysis and Optimization 2 (2021).
- [2] P. BEREMLIJSKI, J. HASLINGER, M. KOČVARA, R. KUČERA, J. V. OUTRATA, *Shape optimization in 3D contact problems with Coulomb friction*, SIAM J. Optimization 20(2009), pp. 416–444.
- [3] X. CHEN, Z. NASHED, L. QI, *Smoothing methods and semismooth methods for nondifferentiable operator equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 38 (2000), pp. 1200–1216.
- [4] F. H. CLARKE, *Optimization and nonsmooth analysis*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, Chichester, Brisbane, Toronto, Singapore, 1983.

- [5] S. DEMPE, *Foundations of Bilevel Programming*, Kluwer, New York, 2002.
- [6] S. DEMPE, J. F. BARD, *Bundle trust-region algorithm for bilinear bilevel programming*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 110 (2001), pp. 265–288.
- [7] A. L. DONTCHEV, R. T. ROCKAFELLAR, *Implicit Functions and Solution Mappings*, Springer, Heidelberg, 2014.
- [8] H. GFRERER, J. V. OUSRATA, *On a semismooth\* Newton method for solving generalized equations*, SIAM J. Optim. 31 (2021), pp. 489–517.
- [9] H. GFRERER, *On a globally convergent semismooth\* Newton method in nonsmooth nonconvex optimization*, preprint (2024), submitted, arXiv:2403.10142.
- [10] H. GFRERER, M. MANDLMAYR, J. V. OUSRATA, J. VALDMAN, *On the SCD semismooth\* Newton method for generalized equations with application to a class of static contact problems with Coulomb friction*, Comput. Optim. Appl. 86 (2023), pp. 1159–1191.
- [11] H. GFRERER, J. V. OUSRATA, *On computation of generalized derivatives of the normal-cone mapping and their applications*, Mathematics of Operations Research 41 (2016), pp. 1535–1556.
- [12] H. GFRERER, J. V. OUSRATA, *On (local) analysis of multifunctions via subspaces contained in graphs of generalized derivatives*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 508 (2022), article no. 125895.
- [13] H. GFRERER, J. V. OUSRATA, *On the isolated calmness property of implicitly defined multifunctions*, J. Convex Anal. 30 (2023), pp. 1001–1023.
- [14] H. GFRERER, J. V. OUSRATA, *On the role of semismoothness in nonsmooth numerical analysis: Theory*, preprint, submitted, arXiv:2405.14637 (2024).
- [15] H. GFRERER, J. V. OUSRATA, J. VALDMAN, *On the application of the SCD semismooth\* Newton method to variational inequalities of the second kind*, Set-Valued Var. Anal. (2023), pp. 1001–1023.
- [16] M. S. GOWDA, *Inverse and implicit function theorems for H-differentiable and semismooth functions*, Optim. Methods Softw. 19 (2004), pp. 443–461.
- [17] GUROBI OPTIMIZATION, LLC, *Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual*, (2024), <https://www.gurobi.com>.
- [18] R. HENRION, A. Y. KRUGER, J. V. OUSRATA, *Some remarks on stability of generalized equations*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 159 (2013), pp. 681–697.
- [19] M. HINTERMÜLLER, K. ITO, K. KUNISCH, *The primal-dual active set method as a semismooth Newton method*, SIAM J. Optimization 13 (2003), pp. 865–888.
- [20] M. KOČVARA, J. V. OUSRATA, *Inverse truss design as a conic mathematical program with equilibrium constraints*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical systems - Series S, 10(2017), pp. 1329–1350.
- [21] B. KUMMER, *Generalized Newton methods: Convergence, regularity, actions*, Discussiones Mathematicae - Differential Inclusions 20 (2000), pp. 209–244.
- [22] V. S. MIKHALEVICH, A. M. GUPAL, V. I. NORKIN, *Methods of Nonconvex Optimization*, Nauka, Moscow, Russia, 1987 (in Russian).
- [23] B. S. MORKUKHOVICH, *Variational Analysis and Generalized Differentiation I: Basic Theory*, Springer, Berlin, 2006.



- [24] V. I. NORKIN, *Nonlocal minimization algorithms for nondifferentiable functions*, Kibernetika, No. 5 (1978), pp. 57–60.
- [25] V. I. NORKIN, *Generalized-differentiable functions*, Kibernetika, No. 1(1980), pp. 9–11.
- [26] J. V. OUTRATA, M. ČERVINKA, *On the implicit programming approach in a class of mathematical programs with equilibrium constraints*, Control and Cybernetics 38 (2009), pp. 1557–1574.
- [27] J. V. OUTRATA, M. KOČVARA, J. ZOWE, *Nonsmooth Approach to Optimization Problems with Equilibrium Constraints*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1998.
- [28] R. T. ROCKAFELLAR, R. J.-B. WETS, *Variational Analysis*, Springer, Berlin, 1998.
- [29] H. SCHRAMM, J. ZOWE, *Bundle trust methods: Fortran codes for nondifferentiable optimization. User's guide*, Report 269, Mathematisches Institut, Universitaet Bayreuth.
- [30] H. SCHRAMM, J. ZOWE, *A version of the bundle idea for minimizing a nonsmooth function: conceptual idea, convergence analysis, numerical results*, SIAM J. Optim. 2(1992), pp.121–152.
- [31] M. ULBRICH, *Semismooth Newton methods for variational inequalities and constrained optimization problems in function spaces*, MOS-SIAM Series on Optimization, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2011.
- [32] J. ZOWE, *The BT algorithm for minimizing a nonsmooth functional subject to linear constraints*, in F. H. Clarke, V. F. Dem'yanov, F. Giannessi (eds.), *Nonsmooth Optimization and Related Topics*, Springer, New York (1989), pp.459–480.