

Submitted to *MATHEMATICS OF OPERATIONS RESEARCH*

Lower Complexity Bounds of First-order Methods for Affinely Constrained Composite Non-convex Problems

Wei Liu

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, NY, liuw16@rpi.edu

Qihang Lin

Department of Business Analytics, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, qihanglin@uiowa.edu

Yangyang Xu

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, NY, xuy21@rpi.edu

Abstract. Many recent studies on first-order methods (FOMs) focus on *composite non-convex non-smooth* optimization with linear and/or nonlinear function constraints. Upper (or worst-case) complexity bounds have been established for these methods. However, little can be claimed about their optimality as no lower bound is known, except for a few special *smooth non-convex* cases. In this paper, we make the first attempt to establish lower complexity bounds of FOMs for solving a class of composite non-convex non-smooth optimization with linear constraints. Assuming two different first-order oracles, we establish lower complexity bounds of FOMs to produce a (near) ϵ -stationary point of a problem (and its reformulation) in the considered problem class, for any given tolerance $\epsilon > 0$. Our lower bounds indicate that the existence of a non-smooth convex regularizer can evidently increase the difficulty of an affinely constrained regularized problem over its nonregularized counterpart. In addition, we show that our lower bound of FOMs with the second oracle is tight, with a difference of up to a logarithmic factor from an upper complexity bound established in the extended arXiv version of this paper; see (Liu et al. 2023a).

Key words: non-convex non-smooth optimization, first-order methods, lower complexity bound.

Subject classifications: 90C26, 90C06, 90C60, 49M37, 68Q25, 65Y20.

Area of review: Continuous optimization.

1. Introduction First-order methods (FOMs) have attracted increasing attention because of their efficiency in solving large-scale problems arising from machine learning and other areas. The recent studies on FOMs have focused on non-convex problems, and one of the actively studied topics is the oracle complexity for finding a near-stationary point under various assumptions. In this paper, we explore this topic for problems with a composite non-convex non-smooth objective function and linear equality constraints, formulated as

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} F_0(\mathbf{x}) := f_0(\mathbf{x}) + g(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (\text{P})$$

Here, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $f_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L_f -smooth and potentially non-convex, i.e., $\|\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}')\| \leq L_f \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|$, $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a proper lower semicontinuous convex function but potentially non-smooth.

Due to non-convexity, computing or even approximating a global optimal solution for problem (P) is intractable in general; see (Murty and Kabadi 1985). Hence, we focus on using an FOM to find a (near) ϵ -stationary point of problem (P) for a given tolerance $\epsilon > 0$; see Definition 1. An FOM finds a (near) ϵ -stationary point by querying information from some oracles, which typically dominates the runtime of the method, so its efficiency can be measured by the number of oracles it queries, which is defined as the method's *oracle complexity*. The goal of this paper is to establish lower bounds for the oracle complexity of a class of FOMs to find a (near) ϵ -stationary point of problem (P) that satisfies certain properties.

1.1. Problem Class, Oracles, and Algorithm Classes We will study the lower complexity bounds of FOMs for solving the following problem class.

PROBLEM CLASS 1. Any problem instance in this class is in the form of (P) and satisfies the conditions: (i) $\inf_{\mathbf{x}} F_0(\mathbf{x}) > -\infty$; (ii) f_0 is L_f -smooth; (iii) $g(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{g}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x} + \bar{\mathbf{b}})$, where $\bar{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n} \times d}$, $\bar{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}$, and $\bar{g} : \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a proper lower semicontinuous convex function with $\text{reint}(\text{dom}(\bar{g})) \neq \emptyset$.

Notice that we require $\text{reint}(\text{dom}(\bar{g})) \neq \emptyset$ in Problem Class 1. This is to ensure the existence of a KKT point. It also excludes the case where \bar{g} is the indicator function on $\{\mathbf{0}\}$, for which the resulting problem looks like an affinely constrained *composite non-smooth* problem but is actually a *smooth* problem. Undoubtedly, an algorithm's oracle complexity depends on what oracle information the algorithm can utilize and what operations it can perform by using the oracle. Since we focus on FOMs, we assume that a first-order oracle is accessible and each generated iterate is a certain combination of the oracle information. We assume different first-order oracles and consider two different classes of FOMs toward solving Problem Class 1.

We assume the following oracles accessible at any given input.

$$\text{ORACLE}_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \eta) \text{ returns } (\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}, \text{prox}_{\eta g}(\mathbf{x})), \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \eta > 0, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{ORACLE}_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \eta) \text{ returns } (\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}), \bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}, \text{prox}_{\eta \bar{g}}(\mathbf{y})), \quad (2)$$

$$\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \eta > 0,$$

where the proximal mapping is defined as

$$\text{prox}_{\eta g}(\mathbf{x}) := \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}'} \left\{ g(\mathbf{x}') + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \right\}, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \eta > 0. \quad (3)$$

When $g(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{g}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x} + \bar{\mathbf{b}})$, it can be significantly more difficult to evaluate $\text{prox}_{\eta g}(\cdot)$ than $\text{prox}_{\eta \bar{g}}(\cdot)$. In this case, ORACLE_1 is stronger than ORACLE_2 . Notice that both oracles can return a bundle of vectors.

However, if only one returned vector such as $\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x})$ is needed in an update, one can still call the oracle, and we still count the call once. We will study lower complexity bounds of FOMs that belong to the following algorithm classes for solving Problem Class 1. An FOM in Algorithm Class 1 uses ORACLE_1 in (1), while an FOM in Algorithm Class 2 uses ORACLE_2 in (2).

ALGORITHM CLASS 1. Given $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the iterates are generated such that for any $t \geq 1$, $\mathbf{x}^{(t)} \in \text{span} \left(\{ \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \text{prox}_{\eta_t g}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}) \} \right)$, where $\eta_t > 0$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)} \in \text{span} \left(\{ \mathbf{x}^{(s)}, \nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^{(s)}), \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}^{(s)} \}_{s=0}^{t-1} \right)$.

ALGORITHM CLASS 2. Given $(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}^{(0)}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}$, the sequence $\{(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})\}_{t=1}^\infty$ is generated such that, for all $t \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{(t)} &\in \text{span} \left(\{ \mathbf{x}^{(s)}, \nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^{(s)}), \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}^{(s)}, \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{x}^{(s)}, \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \mathbf{y}^{(s)} \}_{s=0}^{t-1} \right), \\ \mathbf{y}^{(t)} &\in \text{span} \left(\{ \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \text{prox}_{\eta_t \bar{g}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}) \} \right), \text{ where } \eta_t > 0 \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)} \in \text{span} \left(\{ \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{y}^{(s)}, \bar{\mathbf{A}} \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \mathbf{y}^{(s)}, \bar{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{x}^{(s)} \}_{s=0}^{t-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Examples. Several existing FOMs while applied to solve (P) belong to Algorithm Class 1, e.g., those in (Kong et al. 2019, Melo et al. 2020, Xu 2021, Liu et al. 2022, Lin et al. 2022, Zhang and Luo 2022). On instances in Problem Class 1, Algorithm Class 2 includes FOMs that are designed based on quadratic penalty or augmented Lagrangian method (ALM) and linearized alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) (Goncalves et al. 2017, Xu 2017, Zhang and Luo 2022) for solving the equivalent Splitting Problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := f_0(\mathbf{x}) + \bar{g}(\mathbf{y}), \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{y} = \bar{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{x} + \bar{\mathbf{b}}. \quad (\text{SP})$$

By the Lagrangian function, the problems in (P) and (SP) can be formulated into bilinear saddle-point problems. Hence, existing FOMs on solving minimax-structured optimization can be applied. Examples of FOMs include the proximal dual implicit accelerated gradient algorithm (Thekumparampil et al. 2019), the gradient descent-ascent method (Lin et al. 2020, Xu et al. 2023) and the gradient descent maximization method (Lu et al. 2020, Lin et al. 2020, Xu 2024) if an FOM is applied to perform the dual maximization. When applied to the saddle-point reformulation of (P) (resp. (SP)), these FOMs belong to Algorithm Class 1 (resp. Algorithm Class 2) if the dual iterate is initialized properly. In particular, let us focus on problem (P). Let $\mathbf{z}^{(t)}$ for $t = 0, 1, \dots$ be the Lagrangian multiplier (i.e., dual iterate) to the linear constraint $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$ generated at the t -th iteration of an FOM for a minimax problem. Then, the aforementioned FOMs belong to Algorithm Class 1 if they are initialized with $\mathbf{z}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ or $\mathbf{z}^{(0)} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}^{(0)} + \mathbf{b}$. Although $\mathbf{z}^{(t)}$ is not defined in Algorithm Class 1, it can be proved that these algorithms can be implemented equivalently by updating $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} := \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}^{(t)}$ without calculating $\mathbf{z}^{(t)}$ explicitly, and $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}$ are generated by following the condition of Algorithm Class 1.

It should be noted that FOMs in Algorithm Classes 1 and 2 are allowed to access $\text{prox}_{\eta g}$ or $\text{prox}_{\eta \bar{g}}$ but not the projection onto the affine set $\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0} \}$. It is also worth noting that our considered Algorithm Classes do not include subgradient methods. In general, computing $\text{prox}_{\eta g}$ is more difficult than

computing a subgradient of g , and finding an ϵ -stationary point of non-smooth optimization is impossible for subgradient methods with finite iterations; see (Zhang et al. 2020). Moreover, notice that though an FOM in Algorithm Class 2 can utilize the compositional structure of g specified in Condition (iii) of Problem Class 1, one FOM in Algorithm Class 1 does not assume such a structure and can be applied to the case with a general convex function g . However, we still restrict our consideration to a structured g while establishing lower complexity bounds of FOMs in Algorithm Class 1, because it enables us to *explicitly* quantify, via the condition number $\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])$ defined in (6) below, the difficulty caused by the interaction of g and the affine constraint $\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$.

1.2. Background and Main Question FOMs have been developed with theoretically proved oracle complexity for finding a (near) ϵ -stationary point of problem (P) or a more general problem. We refer readers to (Bian and Chen 2015, Haeser et al. 2019, Kong et al. 2019, Jiang et al. 2019, Melo et al. 2020, Zhang and Luo 2020, O'Neill and Wright 2021, Zhang and Luo 2022) for problems with affine constraints and (Cartis et al. 2014, 2017, Sahin et al. 2019, Xie and Wright 2021, Grapiglia and Yuan 2021, Lin et al. 2022, Xiao et al. 2023, Kong et al. 2023, Liu et al. 2023b, Dahal et al. 2023, Huang and Lin 2023) for problems with nonlinear constraints. These results are stated as *upper bounds* for the maximum number of oracles those algorithms require to reach a (near) ϵ -stationary point. In special cases of problem (P), some existing algorithms' oracle complexity is known to be non-improvable (also called optimal) because it matches, up to constant factors, a theoretical *lower bound* of oracle complexity (Nemirovsky and Yudin 1983), which is the minimum number of oracles an algorithm needs to find a (near) ϵ -stationary point. Below we discuss two special cases of (P).

Composite non-convex optimization. When the linear constraint $\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$ does not exist, problem (P) becomes a composite non-convex optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} F_0(\mathbf{x}) = f_0(\mathbf{x}) + g(\mathbf{x}). \quad (4)$$

When $g \equiv 0$, a lower complexity bound of $O(L_f \Delta_{F_0} \epsilon^{-2})$ is given by (Carmon et al. 2020, 2021) to produce an ϵ -stationary point $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ by an FOM, i.e., $\|\nabla f_0(\bar{\mathbf{x}})\| \leq \epsilon$, where $\Delta_{F_0} := F_0(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x}} F_0(\mathbf{x})$. On the other side, the steepest gradient descent can reach the same-order complexity bound (Cartis et al. 2012). Hence, the lower bound of $O(L_f \Delta_{F_0} \epsilon^{-2})$ is tight. Since smooth non-convex optimization is a subclass of composite non-convex optimization (4) if no restriction is imposed on g , $O(L_f \Delta_{F_0} \epsilon^{-2})$ is a valid lower bound for FOMs on solving (4). It is well-known that the proximal gradient method can find an ϵ -stationary point of (4) within $O(L_f \Delta_{F_0} \epsilon^{-2})$ iterations; see (Lan 2020) for example. This implies that $O(L_f \Delta_{F_0} \epsilon^{-2})$ is also a tight lower bound of FOMs for solving composite non-convex optimization, and we can make the following claim.

CLAIM 1. *If $\mathbf{prox}_{\eta g}$ is accessible for any $\eta > 0$, the convex regularizer g in composite non-convex optimization (4) does not increase the lower complexity bound for FOMs or make the problem harder.*

Affinely constrained smooth non-convex optimization. When $g \equiv 0$, problem (P) becomes a linear equality-constrained smooth non-convex optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} f_0(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (5)$$

It is known that, if exact projection onto the feasible set $\{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}\}$ is allowed, the projected gradient method can find an ϵ -stationary point in $O(L_f \Delta_{f_0} \epsilon^{-2})$ iterations, where $\Delta_{f_0} := f_0(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x}} f_0(\mathbf{x})$. When exact projection is prohibited, one can perform inexact projection through the matrix-vector multiplications with \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{A}^\top , which are allowed in ORACLE₁ and ORACLE₂. This way, with $O(\kappa(\mathbf{A}) \log(\epsilon^{-1}))$ multiplications, one can project any point to the feasible set with a $\text{poly}(\epsilon)$ error. Here, $\text{poly}(\epsilon)$ denotes a polynomial of ϵ , $\kappa(\mathbf{A})$ is the condition number of \mathbf{A} defined as

$$\kappa(\mathbf{A}) := \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top)}{\lambda_{\min}^+(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top)}},$$

where $\lambda_{\min}^+(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top)$ are the smallest positive and the largest eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$, respectively. Using this inexact projection as a subroutine, one can easily develop an inexact projected gradient method to (5) with oracle complexity of $O(\kappa(\mathbf{A}) \log(\epsilon^{-1}) L_f \Delta_{f_0} \epsilon^{-2})$. This complexity matches the lower bound $O(\kappa(\mathbf{A}) L_f \Delta_{f_0} \epsilon^{-2})$ in (Sun and Hong 2019) up to a logarithmic factor and thus is nearly optimal.

By a similar discussion for composite non-convex optimization, we notice that $O(\kappa(\mathbf{A}) L_f \Delta_{F_0} \epsilon^{-2})$ is also a valid lower complexity bound of FOMs for solving (P) in Problem Class 1, as it permits the case of $g \equiv 0$ or $\bar{g} \equiv 0$. However, no existing FOM can (nearly) reach this complexity. Hence, it is unknown if this lower bound of $O(\kappa(\mathbf{A}) L_f \Delta_{F_0} \epsilon^{-2})$ is (nearly) tight or not for solving affinely constrained composite non-convex optimization (P). This leads to a natural question as follows.

Question: For Problem Class 1, will the existence of a *non-smooth* convex regularizer g make the problem harder when $\mathbf{prox}_{\eta g}$ is accessible for any $\eta > 0$? If yes, what will a higher lower complexity bound be for FOMs in Algorithm Class 1?

We will provide an affirmative answer to the question above. In short, for FOMs in Algorithm Class 1 on solving Problem Class 1, **our new lower complexity bound can be significantly higher than** $O(\kappa(\mathbf{A}) L_f \Delta_{F_0} \epsilon^{-2})$. This is different from Claim 1. But we cannot show the tightness of the new lower bound, and we leave it to the future work. Nevertheless, we also establish a lower bound of FOMs in Algorithm Class 2 on solving Problem Class 1, for which we are able to show its tightness.

1.3. Contributions Our first major contribution is to establish a lower bound of the oracle complexity of FOMs in Algorithm Class 1 for finding a (near) ϵ -stationary point of problem instances in Problem Class 1. This is achieved by building a hard instance that belongs to Problem Class 1. We show that any FOM in Algorithm Class 1 needs at least $O(\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])L_f\Delta_{F_0}\epsilon^{-2})$ calls to ORACLE_1 to find a (near) ϵ -stationary point of the instance we design; see Theorem 1. Here

$$\Delta_{F_0} := F_0(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x}} F_0(\mathbf{x}), \quad [\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}] := \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{A}} \\ \mathbf{A} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}]) := \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{\max}([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}][\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}]^\top)}{\lambda_{\min}^+([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}][\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}]^\top)}}. \quad (6)$$

Our lower complexity bound can be viewed as a generalization of the lower bound $O(\kappa(\mathbf{A})L_f\Delta_{f_0}\epsilon^{-2})$ in (Sun and Hong 2019) for affinely constrained smooth problem (5). Our result provides a new insight that the difficulty of finding a (near) ϵ -stationary point of problem (P) depends on the interaction between the affine constraints and the regularizer g . In contrast to Claim 1 for an affinely constrained *smooth* non-convex optimization, we show that for *non-smooth* composite non-convex optimization (P), the non-smooth regularization term g can make the problem significantly harder even if $\text{prox}_{\eta g}$ is accessible for any $\eta > 0$; see Claim 2 below.

Our second contribution is to show that the minimum oracle complexity is $O(\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])L_f\Delta_{F_0}\epsilon^{-2})$ for any FOM in Algorithm Class 2 to find a near ϵ -stationary point of problem instances in Problem Class 1. The lower bound is established by using the same hard instance as that we use to prove the lower bound for FOMs in Algorithm Class 1. In Section 4 of the extended arXiv version (Liu et al. 2023a) of this paper, we give an inexact proximal gradient (IPG) method that belongs to Algorithm Class 2 for solving Problem Class 1. It can find a near ϵ -stationary point of any instance in Problem Class 1 by calling ORACLE_2 at most $\tilde{O}(\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])L_f\Delta_{F_0}\epsilon^{-2})$ times, which has a difference of up to a logarithmic factor from our lower bound. This shows that our lower oracle complexity bound is nearly tight. Similar results are shown in a concurrent paper (Zhu et al. 2023), which was released just a few weeks after the first version of our extended arXiv paper (Liu et al. 2023a). However, for non-convex problems, (Zhu et al. 2023) only studied lower complexity bounds of FOMs in our Algorithm Class 2, and in addition, they do not require $\text{relint}(\text{dom}(\bar{g})) \neq \emptyset$ and thus could directly use the result from (Sun and Hong 2019). In contrast, our problem class is sharper due to the requirement of $\text{relint}(\text{dom}(\bar{g})) \neq \emptyset$, and a new proof technique must be employed to handle a *real* composite non-convex optimization with affine constraints.

1.4. Related Work The *proximal gradient* (PG) method can find an ϵ -stationary point of the composite non-smooth non-convex problem (4) within $O(L_f\epsilon^{-2})$ iterations (Nesterov 2012), which matches the lower bound in (Carmon et al. 2020, 2021). When there is no affine constraints and $g \equiv 0$ in problem (P), our lower-bound complexity result is reduced to the lower bound in (Carmon et al. 2020). For the affinely constrained non-convex smooth problem (5), (Sun and Hong 2019) show a lower-bound complexity of $O(\kappa(\mathbf{A})L_f\epsilon^{-2})$ for finding an ϵ -stationary point. In the same paper, they give an FOM that achieves this

lower bound. When $g \equiv 0$, our complexity lower bounds are reduced to their lower bound. Lower complexity bounds of FOMs have also been established for *smooth* non-convex strongly-concave min-max problems in (Li et al. 2021, Zhang et al. 2021).

Before our work, there only exist upper bounds of oracle complexity for finding a (near) ϵ -stationary point of (P) and (SP) with a non-smooth g or \bar{g} . For instance, (Kong et al. 2019) develop a quadratic-penalty accelerated inexact proximal point method that finds an ϵ -stationary point of problem (P) with oracle complexity $O(\epsilon^{-3})$. (Lin et al. 2022) study a method similar to (Kong et al. 2019) and show that oracle complexity of $O(\epsilon^{-5/2})$ is sufficient. The ALM is another effective approach for problem (P). The oracle complexity of ALM for problem (P) has been studied by (Hong 2016, Hajinezhad and Hong 2019, Melo et al. 2020, Zhang and Luo 2022). For example, the inexact proximal accelerated ALM by (Melo et al. 2020) achieves oracle complexity of $O(\epsilon^{-5/2})$ and, in a special case where $g(\mathbf{x})$ is the indicator function of a polyhedron, the smoothed proximal ALM by (Zhang and Luo 2022) improves the complexity to $O(\epsilon^{-2})$. ADMM is an effective algorithm for optimization with a separable structure like that in problem (SP). ADMM and its variants have been studied by (Melo and Monteiro 2017, Goncalves et al. 2017, Jiang et al. 2019, Zhang and Luo 2020, Yashtini 2022, Zhang and Luo 2022, Hong et al. 2016) for constrained non-convex optimization problems including problem (SP). For example, it is shown by (Goncalves et al. 2017, Jiang et al. 2019, Yashtini 2022) that ADMM finds an ϵ -stationary point of problem (SP) with oracle complexity of $O(\epsilon^{-2})$.

The aforementioned methods for problem (P) all belong to Algorithm Class 1, and the aforementioned methods for problem (SP) all belong to Algorithm Class 2. However, the oracle complexity of those methods for finding an ϵ -stationary point either does not match or is not comparable with our lower-bound complexity for the corresponding problems. Specifically, the oracle complexity of ADMM in (Yashtini 2022) for solving problem (SP) depends on the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) coefficient, which is not directly comparable with our lower bound. The oracle complexity $O(\kappa^2([\mathbf{A}; \bar{\mathbf{A}}])L_f^2\Delta_F\epsilon^{-2})$ of ADMM for solving problem (SP) is presented in (Goncalves et al. 2017). The results in (Jiang et al. 2019) of ADMM are only applicable to problems (P) and (SP) with a separable structure and $\bar{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{I}_d$ or $g \equiv 0$, for which case their oracle complexity is $O(\kappa^2(\mathbf{A})L_f^2\Delta\epsilon^{-2})$ with $\Delta = \Delta_{F_0}$ or $\Delta = F(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}^{(0)}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. (Zhang and Luo 2022) study the complexity of ALM for problem (P) when g is the indicator function of a polyhedral set and the exact projection onto the polyhedral set can be computed. They obtained complexity of $O(\hat{\kappa}^2L_f^3\Delta_{F_0}\epsilon^{-2})$, where $\hat{\kappa}$ is a joint condition number of the equality $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$ and the inequality defining the polyhedral set. When $g \equiv 0$, their complexity is reduced to $O(\kappa^2(\mathbf{A})L_f^3\Delta_{F_0}\epsilon^{-2})$. (Zhang et al. 2022) further extend the results in (Zhang and Luo 2020, 2022) to problems with nonlinear convex inequality constraints. However, their algorithm requires exact projection to the set defined by the inequality constraints, which is impractical for many applications and does not belong to Algorithm Class 1.

1.5. Notations and Definitions For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we use $\lceil a \rceil$ to denote the smallest integer that is no less than a . $\text{Null}(\mathbf{H})$ represents the null space of a matrix \mathbf{H} . For any vector \mathbf{z} , $[\mathbf{z}]_j$ denotes its j -th coordinate. We denote $\mathbf{1}_p$ for an all-one vector in \mathbb{R}^p , and $\mathbf{0}$ to represent an all-zero vector when its dimension is clear from the context. \mathbf{I}_p denotes a $p \times p$ identity matrix and

$$\mathbf{J}_p := \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & & & & \\ & -1 & 1 & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & -1 & 1 & \\ & & & & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(p-1) \times p}. \quad (7)$$

A vector \mathbf{x} is said ω -close to another vector $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$ if $\|\mathbf{x} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\| \leq \omega$. For any set \mathcal{X} , we denote $\iota_{\mathcal{X}}$ as its indicator function, i.e., $\iota_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $+\infty$ otherwise, and $\text{relint}(\mathcal{X})$ denotes the relative interior of \mathcal{X} . We use \otimes for the Kronecker product, $\text{co}(\mathcal{S})$ for the convex hull of a set \mathcal{S} and $\overline{\text{co}}(\mathcal{S})$ for the closure of $\text{co}(\mathcal{S})$. For a function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, its directional derivative at \mathbf{x} along a direction $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is defined as

$$f'(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}) = \lim_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{f(\mathbf{x} + s\mathbf{v}) - f(\mathbf{x})}{s}, \quad (8)$$

where $s \downarrow 0$ means $s \rightarrow 0$ and $s > 0$. ∂g denotes the subdifferential of a closed convex function g .

DEFINITION 1. Given $\epsilon \geq 0$, a point \mathbf{x}^* is called an ϵ -stationary point of (P) if for some $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\max \left\{ \text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \mathbf{A}^\top \gamma + \partial g(\mathbf{x}^*)), \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{b}\| \right\} \leq \epsilon, \quad (9)$$

and a point $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is called an ϵ -stationary point of (SP) if for some $\mathbf{z}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}$ and $\mathbf{z}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\max \left\{ \text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial \bar{g}(\mathbf{y}^*) - \mathbf{z}_1), \|\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}_2\|, \|\mathbf{y}^* - \bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x}^* - \bar{\mathbf{b}}\|, \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{b}\| \right\} \leq \epsilon. \quad (10)$$

When $\epsilon = 0$, we simply call \mathbf{x}^* and $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ stationary points of problems (P) and (SP), respectively. We say that $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ is a near ϵ -stationary point of (P) if $\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*\| = O(\epsilon)$ where \mathbf{x}^* is an ϵ -stationary point of (P).

1.6. Organization The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present lower-bound complexity results of FOMs in Algorithm Class 1 for solving Problem Class 1. Then in Section 3, we show the lower-bound complexity results of FOMs in Algorithm Class 2 for solving Problem Class 1. Also we show the tightness of our lower complexity bounds for Algorithm Class 2. Concluding remarks and a few open questions are given in Section 4.

2. Lower Bound of Oracle Complexity for Algorithm Class 1 In this section, for a given $\epsilon > 0$, we derive a lower bound of the oracle complexity of an FOM in Algorithm Class 1 to find a (near) ϵ -stationary point of problem instances in Problem Class 1.

2.1. A Challenging Instance \mathcal{P} in Problem Class 1 Our hard instance is built based on the instance in (Sun and Hong 2019) by carefully separating its affine constraints. Some of its linear constraints are kept as hard constraints in our instance, and the others are used to design a non-smooth convex term in our objective function. The smooth term in the objective of our instance is almost the same as that in the instance of (Sun and Hong 2019), and a slight difference is in some coefficients that we choose to satisfy the smoothness condition with a given (but arbitrary) parameter $L_f > 0$. More precisely, we let m_1 and m_2 be positive integers such that $m_1 m_2$ is even and $m_1 \geq 2$. Let $m = 3m_1 m_2$ and \bar{d} be an odd positive integer such that $\bar{d} \geq 5$. Here, m will be proportional to $\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])$ for our instance; see lemma 3. Also, set $d = m\bar{d}$, and let

$$\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d, \text{ with } \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}, i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (11)$$

Moreover, we define a matrix $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m-1)\bar{d} \times m\bar{d}}$ by

$$\mathbf{H} := mL_f \cdot \mathbf{J}_m \otimes \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} = mL_f \cdot \underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{cc} -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} \\ & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} \\ & & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} \end{array} \right]}_{m \text{ blocks}} \Bigg\} m-1 \text{ blocks}. \quad (12)$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} &:= \{im_1 | i = 1, 2, \dots, 3m_2 - 1\}, \quad \mathcal{M}^C := \{1, 2, \dots, m-1\} \setminus \mathcal{M}, \\ n &= (m - 3m_2)\bar{d}, \quad \bar{n} = (3m_2 - 1)\bar{d}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and let

$$\bar{\mathbf{A}} := mL_f \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\mathcal{M}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}}, \quad \mathbf{A} := mL_f \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\mathcal{M}^C} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}}, \quad \bar{\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}, \quad \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (14)$$

where $\mathbf{J}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathbf{J}_{\mathcal{M}^C}$ are the rows of \mathbf{J}_m indexed by \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^C , respectively.

We partition the matrix \mathbf{H} into two submatrices $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ and \mathbf{A} as described in (14) for two primary goals. First, as we will argue later above Claim 2, it holds $\frac{\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])}{\kappa(\mathbf{A})} \geq \frac{3m_2}{4}$. This fact will be used to show that the existence of a nonsmooth g can make the problem significantly harder. Second, it is crucial that with the constructed $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ and \mathbf{A} , we can still obtain zero-respecting sequences, illustrated in Figure 1 below.

Furthermore, given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, we define $\bar{g} : \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\bar{g}(\mathbf{y}) := \frac{\beta}{mL_f} \|\mathbf{y}\|_1 = \max \left\{ \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{y} \mid \|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\beta}{mL_f} \right\}, \quad (15)$$

and

$$g(\mathbf{x}) := \bar{g}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x}) = \beta \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{i+1}\|_1, \quad (16)$$

where \mathbf{x} has the block structure in (11), \mathcal{M} is defined in (13), and β is a constant satisfying

$$\beta > (50\pi + 1 + \|\mathbf{A}\|)\sqrt{m}\epsilon. \quad (17)$$

Finally, we design the smooth function f_0 to complete the instance of (P) in Problem Class 1. Let $\Psi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be defined as

$$\Psi(u) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } u \leq 0, \\ 1 - e^{-u^2}, & \text{if } u > 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(v) := 4 \arctan v + 2\pi. \quad (18)$$

In addition, for each $j = 1, \dots, \bar{d}$, we define function $\varphi(\cdot, j) : \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\varphi(\mathbf{z}, j) := \begin{cases} -\Psi(1)\Phi([\mathbf{z}]_1), & \text{if } j = 1, \\ \Psi(-[\mathbf{z}]_{j-1})\Phi(-[\mathbf{z}]_j) - \Psi([\mathbf{z}]_{j-1})\Phi([\mathbf{z}]_j), & \text{if } j = 2, \dots, \bar{d}, \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

and for $i = 1, \dots, m$, we define $h_i : \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$h_i(\mathbf{z}) := \begin{cases} \varphi(\mathbf{z}, 1) + 3 \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \bar{d}/2 \rfloor} \varphi(\mathbf{z}, 2j), & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3}], \\ \varphi(\mathbf{z}, 1), & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + 1, \frac{2m}{3}], \\ \varphi(\mathbf{z}, 1) + 3 \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \bar{d}/2 \rfloor} \varphi(\mathbf{z}, 2j + 1), & \text{if } i \in [\frac{2m}{3} + 1, m]. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Now for the given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $L_f > 0$, we define $f_i : \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$f_i(\mathbf{z}) := \frac{300\pi\epsilon^2}{mL_f} h_i \left(\frac{\sqrt{m}L_f\mathbf{z}}{150\pi\epsilon} \right), \forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}, \forall i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (21)$$

and let $f_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be

$$f_0(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(\mathbf{x}_i), \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ with the structure in (11)}. \quad (22)$$

Putting all the components given above, we obtain a specific instance of (P). We formalize it in the following definition.

DEFINITION 2 (INSTANCE \mathcal{P}). Given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $L_f > 0$, let m_1, m_2 and \bar{d} be integers such that $m_1 \geq 2$ is even and $\bar{d} \geq 5$ is odd. We refer to as *instance \mathcal{P}* the instance of problem (P) where f_0 is given in (22) with each f_i defined in (21), g is given in (16) with β satisfying (17), and $(\mathbf{A}, \bar{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{b}, \bar{\mathbf{b}})$ is given in (14).

2.2. Properties of Instance \mathcal{P} In order to show the challenge of instance \mathcal{P} for an FOM in Algorithm Class 1, we give a few facts and properties about \mathcal{P} . First, notice that $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ and \mathbf{A} in (14) are two block submatrices of \mathbf{H} in rows. It is easy to obtain the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 1. *By the definitions in (11) through (16), it holds*

- (a) $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2 = \dots = \mathbf{x}_m$ if and only if $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$;
- (b) $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_{i+1}$ for $i \in \mathcal{M}$ if and only if $\bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ or equivalently $g(\mathbf{x}) = 0$;
- (c) $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_{i+1}$ for $i \in \mathcal{M}^C$ if and only if $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$;
- (d) $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2 = \dots = \mathbf{x}_m$ if and only if $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ and $g(\mathbf{x}) = 0$.

Second, it is straightforward to have $\left\{ \frac{\partial h_i(\mathbf{z})}{\partial [\mathbf{z}]_j} \right\}$ based on three cases of j , also given in (Sun and Hong 2019).

Case i) When $j = 1$,

$$\frac{\partial h_i(\mathbf{z})}{\partial [\mathbf{z}]_j} = \begin{cases} -\Psi(1)\Phi'([\mathbf{z}]_1) + 3[-\Psi'(-[\mathbf{z}]_1)\Phi(-[\mathbf{z}]_2) - \Psi'([\mathbf{z}]_1)\Phi([\mathbf{z}]_2)], & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3}], \\ -\Psi(1)\Phi'([\mathbf{z}]_1), & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + 1, m]. \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Case ii) When j is even,

$$\frac{\partial h_i(\mathbf{z})}{\partial [\mathbf{z}]_j} = \begin{cases} 3[-\Psi(-[\mathbf{z}]_{j-1})\Phi'(-[\mathbf{z}]_j) - \Psi([\mathbf{z}]_{j-1})\Phi'([\mathbf{z}]_j)], & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3}], \\ 0, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + 1, \frac{2m}{3}], \\ 3[-\Psi'(-[\mathbf{z}]_j)\Phi(-[\mathbf{z}]_{j+1}) - \Psi'([\mathbf{z}]_j)\Phi([\mathbf{z}]_{j+1})], & \text{if } i \in [\frac{2m}{3} + 1, m]. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Case iii) When j is odd and $j \neq 1$,

$$\frac{\partial h_i(\mathbf{z})}{\partial [\mathbf{z}]_j} = \begin{cases} 3[-\Psi'(-[\mathbf{z}]_j)\Phi(-[\mathbf{z}]_{j+1}) - \Psi'([\mathbf{z}]_j)\Phi([\mathbf{z}]_{j+1})], & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3}], \\ 0, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + 1, \frac{2m}{3}], \\ 3[-\Psi(-[\mathbf{z}]_{j-1})\Phi'(-[\mathbf{z}]_j) - \Psi([\mathbf{z}]_{j-1})\Phi'([\mathbf{z}]_j)], & \text{if } i \in [\frac{2m}{3} + 1, m]. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Thirdly, instance \mathcal{P} belongs to Problem Class 1. By (16), it is clear that \bar{g} is convex and $\text{relint}(\text{dom}(\bar{g})) \neq \emptyset$. To verify the other requirements, we need the next lemma.

LEMMA 1. *Let Ψ , Φ and h_i be given in (18) and (20). The following statements hold:*

- (a) $\Psi(u) = 0$ and $\Psi'(u) = 0$ for all $u \leq 0$, and $0 \leq \Psi(u) < 1$, $0 \leq \Psi'(u) \leq \sqrt{2/e}$, $0 < \Phi(v) < 4\pi$, and $0 < \Phi'(v) \leq 4$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (b) $\Psi(u)\Phi'(v) > 1$ for all u and v satisfying $u \geq 1$ and $|v| < 1$.
- (c) $h_i(\mathbf{0}) - \inf_{\mathbf{z}} h_i(\mathbf{z}) \leq 10\pi\bar{d}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.
- (d) ∇h_i is 75π -Lipschitz continuous for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.
- (e) h_i is $25\pi\sqrt{\bar{d}}$ -Lipschitz continuous for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

Proof of Lemma 1. (a)-(d) are directly from (Sun and Hong 2019, Lemma 3.1). By (23)–(25), we obtain that, for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\left| \frac{\partial h_i(\mathbf{z})}{\partial [\mathbf{z}]_j} \right| \leq \max \left\{ \sup_u |\Psi(1)\Phi'(u)| + 6 \sup_u |\Psi'(u)| \sup_v |\Phi(v)|, 6 \sup_u |\Psi(u)| \sup_v |\Phi'(v)| \right\} < 25\pi, \forall i, j, \quad (26)$$

where the second inequality is from Lemma 1(a) and the fact that $\sup_v |\Psi(1)\Phi'(v)| \leq 4(1 - e^{-1}) < \pi$ by the definition of Φ . Hence, $\|\nabla h_i(\mathbf{z})\| \leq 25\pi\sqrt{\bar{d}}$. Thus (e) holds, and we complete the proof. \square

From the definition of f_i in (21) and the chain rule, we have

$$[\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})]_j = \frac{2\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}} \left[\nabla h_i \left(\frac{\sqrt{m}L_f \mathbf{z}}{150\pi\epsilon} \right) \right]_j, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, m, \quad (27)$$

which together with Lemma 1 clearly indicates the properties below about $\{f_i\}_{i=0}^m$.

LEMMA 2. *Let $\{f_i\}_{i=0}^m$ be defined in (21) and (22). Then*

- (a) $f_i(\mathbf{0}) - \inf_{\mathbf{z}} f_i(\mathbf{z}) \leq 3000\pi^2 \bar{d}\epsilon^2 / mL_f$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $f_0(\mathbf{0}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x}} f_0(\mathbf{x}) \leq 3000\pi^2 \bar{d}\epsilon^2 / L_f$.
- (b) ∇f_i is L_f -Lipschitz continuous for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$.
- (c) f_i is $\frac{50\pi\epsilon\sqrt{\bar{d}}}{\sqrt{m}}$ -Lipschitz continuous for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and f_0 is $50\pi\epsilon\sqrt{m\bar{d}}$ -Lipschitz continuous.

By Lemma 2 and $\bar{g} \geq 0$, we immediately have the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 2. *Instance \mathcal{P} given in Definition 2 belongs to Problem Class 1.*

The following lemma characterizes the joint condition number of $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ and \mathbf{A} defined in (6), which will appear in our lower bound of oracle complexity.

LEMMA 3. *Let \mathbf{A} and $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ be given in (14). Then $\frac{m}{4} \leq \kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}]) = \kappa(\mathbf{H}) = \frac{\sin(\frac{(3m_1 m_2 - 1)\pi}{6m_1 m_2})}{\sin(\frac{\pi}{6m_1 m_2})} < m$.*

Proof of Lemma 3. The first equality holds because \mathbf{H} are split into $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ and \mathbf{A} in rows. Let

$$\bar{\mathbf{H}} = mL_f \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m-1) \times m}.$$

We then have $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^\top = (\bar{\mathbf{H}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}})(\bar{\mathbf{H}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}})^\top = (\bar{\mathbf{H}}\bar{\mathbf{H}}^\top) \otimes (\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}}\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}}^\top) = (\bar{\mathbf{H}}\bar{\mathbf{H}}^\top) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}}$. Let $\lambda_i(\bar{\mathbf{H}}\bar{\mathbf{H}}^\top)$ be the i -th largest eigenvalue of $\bar{\mathbf{H}}\bar{\mathbf{H}}^\top$. Since $\bar{\mathbf{H}}\bar{\mathbf{H}}^\top$ is tridiagonal and Toeplitz, its eigenvalues have closed forms (Gray 2006):

$$\lambda_i(\bar{\mathbf{H}}\bar{\mathbf{H}}^\top) = 4m^2 L_f^2 \sin^2\left(\frac{i\pi}{6m_1 m_2}\right), \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, m-1.$$

It then yields that $\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}]) = \kappa(\mathbf{H}) = \kappa(\bar{\mathbf{H}}) = \frac{\sin(\frac{(3m_1 m_2 - 1)\pi}{6m_1 m_2})}{\sin(\frac{\pi}{6m_1 m_2})}$. Because $\sin(z) \leq 1, \forall z$, $\sin(z) \geq \frac{2z}{3}$ for $z \in [0, \pi/12]$, and $m_1 m_2 \geq 2$, we have $\frac{\sin(\frac{(3m_1 m_2 - 1)\pi}{6m_1 m_2})}{\sin(\frac{\pi}{6m_1 m_2})} \leq \frac{1}{\frac{9\pi}{4m_1 m_2}} = \frac{3m}{\pi} < m$. Also, because $z \geq \sin(z) \geq \frac{z}{2}$ for $z \in [0, \pi/2]$ and $m_1 m_2 \geq 2$, we have $\frac{\sin(\frac{(3m_1 m_2 - 1)\pi}{6m_1 m_2})}{\sin(\frac{\pi}{6m_1 m_2})} \geq \frac{\frac{(m-1)\pi}{4m}}{\frac{\pi}{2m}} = \frac{m-1}{2} \geq \frac{m}{4}$. Hence, we have obtained all desired results and complete the proof. \square

2.3. An Auxiliary Problem and Its Properties To establish a lower bound of the oracle complexity of FOMs in Algorithm Class 1 for solving Problem Class 1, we consider an auxiliary problem of instance \mathcal{P} in this subsection and analyze its properties. The Auxiliary Problem is given as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f_0(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (\text{AP})$$

where \mathbf{H} and f_0 are defined in (22) and (12). An ϵ -stationary point \mathbf{x}^* of problem (AP) satisfies

$$\max \left\{ \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}^*\|, \min_{\gamma' \in \mathbb{R}^{(m-1)\bar{d}}} \|\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \mathbf{H}^\top \gamma'\| \right\} \leq \epsilon. \quad (28)$$

The next lemma characterizes the relationship between the (near-)stationary points of instance \mathcal{P} and the auxiliary problem (AP).

LEMMA 4. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given in Definition 2 for instance \mathcal{P} . Then for any $\hat{\epsilon} \in [0, \epsilon]$, an $\hat{\epsilon}$ -stationary point of instance \mathcal{P} is also an $\hat{\epsilon}$ -stationary point of the auxiliary problem (AP).

Proof of Lemma 4. Suppose \mathbf{x}^* is an $\hat{\epsilon}$ -stationary point of instance \mathcal{P} , i.e., for some $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \partial g(\mathbf{x}^*)$ such that

$$\|\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \boldsymbol{\xi} + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}\| \leq \hat{\epsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^*\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}. \quad (29)$$

By the definitions of g in (15) and (16), there exists $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \mathbf{u}$ and thus the first condition in (29) becomes

$$\|\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}. \quad (30)$$

Hence, in order to show that \mathbf{x}^* is an $\hat{\epsilon}$ -stationary point of problem (AP), we only need to prove $\|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}^*\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}$. To show this, we first notice from the definition in (8) that, for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{Null}(\mathbf{A})$,

$$F'_0(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{v}^\top \nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + g'(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{v}) \geq \mathbf{v}^\top \nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{v}^\top (\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \boldsymbol{\xi} + \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \geq -\hat{\epsilon} \|\mathbf{v}\|, \quad (31)$$

where the first inequality follows from (Clarke 1990)

$$g'(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}) = \sup_{\boldsymbol{\xi}' \in \partial g(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}', \forall \mathbf{x} \in \text{dom}(g), \forall \mathbf{v}, \quad (32)$$

and the second inequality is by (29) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Second, we claim $\bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{0}$, namely, $\mathbf{x}_i^* = \mathbf{x}_{i+1}^*$ for all $i \in \mathcal{M}$, where \mathcal{M} is defined in (13). Suppose this claim is not true. Then for some $\bar{i} \in \mathcal{M}$, it holds $\mathbf{x}_{\bar{i}}^* \neq \mathbf{x}_{\bar{i}+1}^*$. We let

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} := \mathbf{x}_{\bar{i}+1}^* - \mathbf{x}_{\bar{i}}^* \neq \mathbf{0}, \quad (33)$$

and $\mathbf{v}^* = (\mathbf{v}_1^{*\top}, \mathbf{v}_2^{*\top}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_m^{*\top})^\top$ where each $\mathbf{v}_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{v}_i^* = \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}, \text{ if } i \leq \bar{i}, \text{ and } \mathbf{v}_i^* = \mathbf{0}, \text{ if } i > \bar{i}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathbf{v}_i^* = \mathbf{v}_{i+1}^*$ for any $i \neq \bar{i}$. Thus by Proposition 1(c), $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}^* = \mathbf{0}$ and, for any $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{x}^* + s\mathbf{v}^*) &= \beta \sum_{i < \bar{i}} \|\mathbf{x}_i^* + s\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \mathbf{x}_{i+1}^* - s\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\|_1 + \beta \|\mathbf{x}_{\bar{i}}^* + s\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \mathbf{x}_{\bar{i}+1}^*\|_1 + \beta \sum_{i > \bar{i}} \|\mathbf{x}_i^* - \mathbf{x}_{i+1}^*\|_1 \\ &= \beta \sum_{i < \bar{i}} \|\mathbf{x}_i^* - \mathbf{x}_{i+1}^*\|_1 + \beta(1-s) \|\mathbf{x}_{\bar{i}}^* - \mathbf{x}_{\bar{i}+1}^*\|_1 + \beta \sum_{i > \bar{i}} \|\mathbf{x}_i^* - \mathbf{x}_{i+1}^*\|_1 = g(\mathbf{x}^*) - s\beta \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\|_1, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where the first and last equalities follow from (16) and the definition of \mathbf{v}^* , and the second one is by (33) and $s \in (0, 1)$. In addition, from (21) and (26), we have that, for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$,

$$\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})\|_\infty = \frac{2\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}} \left\| \nabla h_i \left(\frac{\sqrt{m}L_f \mathbf{z}}{150\pi\epsilon} \right) \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{50\pi\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}}. \quad (35)$$

Moreover, by the definition of \mathbf{v}_i^* for $i = 1, \dots, m$, we have

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^* + s\mathbf{v}_i^*) - f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*) = s\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^* + s'\mathbf{v}_i^*)^\top \mathbf{v}_i^* \leq s\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^* + s'\mathbf{v}_i^*)\|_\infty \|\mathbf{v}_i^*\|_1 \stackrel{(35)}{\leq} \frac{50s\pi\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}} \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\|_1,$$

where the equality holds from the mean value theorem for some $s' \in (0, s)$. The inequality above, together with (22) and (34), implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s} \left(F_0(\mathbf{x}^* + s\mathbf{v}^*) - F_0(\mathbf{x}^*) \right) = \frac{1}{s} \left(f_0(\mathbf{x}^* + s\mathbf{v}^*) - f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + g(\mathbf{x}^* + s\mathbf{v}^*) - g(\mathbf{x}^*) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{s} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m (f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^* + s\mathbf{v}_i^*) - f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*)) + g(\mathbf{x}^* + s\mathbf{v}^*) - g(\mathbf{x}^*) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{s} (50\pi s\epsilon\sqrt{m}\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\|_1 - \beta s\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\|_1) = (50\pi\epsilon\sqrt{m} - \beta) \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit of the left-hand side of the inequality above as s approaching zero, we have

$$(50\pi\epsilon\sqrt{m} - \beta) \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\|_1 \geq F'_0(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{v}).$$

Thus by (31) and the choice of \mathbf{v}^* , we have

$$(50\pi\epsilon\sqrt{m} - \beta) \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\|_1 \geq -\hat{\epsilon}\|\mathbf{v}^*\| \geq -\hat{\epsilon}\sqrt{i}\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\| \geq -\hat{\epsilon}\sqrt{m}\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\|_1.$$

This leads to a contradiction as $\beta > (50\pi + 1)\epsilon\sqrt{m}$ from (17) and $\hat{\epsilon} \leq \epsilon$. Therefore, the claim $\bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{0}$ is true. Thus the second condition in (29) indicates $\|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}^*\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}$, and we complete the proof. \square

By Lemma 4, if \mathbf{x}^* is not an ϵ -stationary point of the auxiliary instance (AP), it cannot be an ϵ -stationary point of instance \mathcal{P} . In other words, the number of oracles needed to find an ϵ -stationary point of \mathcal{P} is at least the number of oracles needed to find an ϵ -stationary point of (AP). Note that the auxiliary instance (AP) of instance \mathcal{P} is the worst-case instance used in (Sun and Hong 2019) to establish the lower-bound complexity for affinely constrained smooth optimization. In fact, according to (Sun and Hong 2019), any algorithm that can access ∇f_0 and matrix-vector multiplication with \mathbf{H} and \mathbf{H}^\top at any historical solutions needs at least $\Theta(\kappa(\mathbf{H})L_f\Delta_{f_0}\epsilon^{-2})$ oracles to find an ϵ -stationary point of (AP), where $\Delta_{f_0} := f_0(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x}} f_0(\mathbf{x})$. However, we cannot directly apply the lower bound here because the instance \mathcal{P} that we consider has both affine constraints and a non-smooth term g , and FOMs in Algorithm Class 1 cannot apply \mathbf{H} and \mathbf{H}^\top for matrix-vector multiplications but instead can use \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{A}^\top as well as $\mathbf{prox}_{\eta g}$ for any $\eta > 0$. Notice that as $\eta \rightarrow \infty$, for instance \mathcal{P} , $\mathbf{prox}_{\eta g}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ will reduce to the projection of $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ onto the set $\{\mathbf{x} : \bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}\}$. Next, we show that even with the stronger oracle, any FOM in Algorithm Class 1 still needs at least $\Theta(\kappa(\mathbf{H})L_f\Delta_{f_0}\epsilon^{-2})$ oracles to find an ϵ -stationary point of the auxiliary instance (AP) of instance \mathcal{P} .

To do so, we need the following lemma, which is essentially the same as that in (Sun and Hong 2019, Lemma 3.3). Due to the difference of coefficients, we provide a proof in Appendix A for the sake of completeness.

LEMMA 5. *Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ be defined in (21) with $\epsilon > 0$. For any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$, if $\|[\mathbf{z}]_{\bar{j}}\| < \frac{150\pi\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}L_f}$ for some $\bar{j} \in \{1, 2, \dots, \bar{d}\}$, then $\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \nabla f_i(\mathbf{z}) \right\| > \frac{2\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}}$.*

The following lemma provides a lower bound to the stationarity measure of a point \mathbf{x} as a solution to problem (AP). Its proof is given in Appendix A.

LEMMA 6. *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be given in (11), \mathbf{H} in (12), and $\{f_i\}_{i=0}^m$ in (21) and (22). Then*

$$\max \left\{ \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}\|, \min_{\gamma} \|\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{H}^\top \gamma\| \right\} \geq \frac{\sqrt{m}}{2} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \nabla f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right\|, \text{ with } \bar{\mathbf{x}} := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{x}_i.$$

The previous two lemmas imply that if there exists $\bar{j} \in \{1, 2, \dots, \bar{d}\}$ such that $[\bar{\mathbf{x}}]_{\bar{j}} = 0$, where $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{x}_i$, then \mathbf{x} cannot be an ϵ -stationary point of the auxiliary problem (AP) of instance \mathcal{P} .

2.4. Lower Bound of Oracle Complexity In this subsection, we provide a lower bound of the oracle complexity of FOMs in Algorithm Class 1 for solving Problem Class 1, by showing that a large number of calls to ORACLE₁ will be needed to find a (near) ϵ -stationary point of instance \mathcal{P} .

For any integer $t \geq 0$, let

$$\mathbf{x}^{(t)} = (\mathbf{x}_1^{(t)\top}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m^{(t)\top})^\top \text{ with each } \mathbf{x}_i^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}, \text{ and } \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{x}_i^{(t)} \quad (36)$$

be the t -th iterate of an algorithm and the block average. Without loss of generality, we assume $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$. Otherwise, we can change $f_0(\mathbf{x})$ to $f_0(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(0)})$, $g(\mathbf{x})$ to $g(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(0)})$, and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ to $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(0)}) = \mathbf{b}$ in instance \mathcal{P} . Then, the resulting instance becomes $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} F_0(\mathbf{x}) := f_0(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(0)}) + g(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(0)})$, s.t. $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(0)}) + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$, and we can process the rest of the proof with this new instance. Our lower bound will be established based on the fact that, if t is not large enough, $\text{supp}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}$ for some $\bar{j} \in \{1, 2, \dots, \bar{d}\}$. Hence, $[\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}]_{\bar{j}} = 0$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ cannot be a (near) ϵ -stationary point due to Lemmas 5 and 6. From the way that the iterates are generated in Algorithm Class 1, $\text{supp}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)})$ is influenced by $\text{supp}(\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}))$, which is characterized by the following lemma.

LEMMA 7. *Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ be defined in (21). Given any $\bar{j} \in \{1, \dots, \bar{d}\}$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$ with $\text{supp}(\mathbf{z}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}$, it holds that*

1. When $\bar{j} = 1$, $\text{supp}(\mathbf{z}) = \emptyset$, $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{0}$, and $\text{supp}(\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})) \subset \{1\}$, for any $i \in [1, m]$;
2. When \bar{j} is even,

$$\text{supp}(\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3}], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + 1, m]; \end{cases}$$

3. When \bar{j} is odd and $\bar{j} \neq 1$,

$$\text{supp}(\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{2m}{3}], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{2m}{3} + 1, m]. \end{cases}$$

Proof of Lemma 7. Denote $\bar{\mathbf{z}} = \frac{\sqrt{m}L_f \mathbf{z}}{150\pi\epsilon}$ and recall definition (27). By Lemma 1(a), we have

$$\Psi(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j) = \Psi([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j) = \Psi'(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j) = \Psi'([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j) = 0, \forall j \geq \bar{j}. \quad (37)$$

Therefore, by definitions (23)–(25), the support of \mathbf{z} leads to the following structure of $[\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})]_j$ for $j \geq \bar{j}$:

- If $j = 1$, $[\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})]_j = -\Psi(1)\Phi'([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j)$, for any $i \in [1, m]$;
- If j is even,

$$[\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})]_j = \begin{cases} -\frac{6\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}} [\Psi(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j-1})\Phi'(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j) + \Psi([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j-1})\Phi'([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j)], & \text{for } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3}], \\ 0, & \text{for } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + 1, m]; \end{cases}$$

- If j is odd and $j \neq 1$,

$$[\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})]_j = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for } i \in [1, \frac{2m}{3}], \\ -\frac{6\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}} [\Psi(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j-1})\Phi'(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j) + \Psi([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j-1})\Phi'([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j)], & \text{for } i \in [\frac{2m}{3} + 1, m]. \end{cases}$$

Since $\Psi(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j-1}) = \Psi([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j-1}) = 0$ for any $j > \bar{j}$, the structures above imply $[\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})]_j = 0, \forall j > \bar{j}$ and thus give the desired claims. \square

According to the structure of \mathbf{A} given in (14), $\text{supp}((\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x})_i)$ is determined by $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{i-1})$, $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{i+1})$. Also, $\text{supp}(\mathbf{prox}_{\eta g}(\mathbf{x}))$ has a similar property according to the definition of g in (16). These properties are formally stated in the following lemma.

LEMMA 8. *Let \mathbf{x} be the structured vector given in (11), \mathbf{A} in (14), and g be given in (16). Define $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}_{m+1} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$. The following statements hold:*

- (a) *Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} = (\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1^\top, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_m^\top)^\top$ with each $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$. Then*

$$\text{supp}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i) \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{i-1}) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{i+1}), \forall i \in [1, m]. \quad (38)$$

- (b) *For any $\eta > 0$, let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{prox}_{\eta g}(\mathbf{x}) = (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1^\top, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_m^\top)^\top$ with each $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$. Then*

$$\text{supp}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i) \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{i-1}) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{i+1}), \forall i \in [1, m].$$

Proof of Lemma 8. (a) The relation in (38) immediately follows from the observation

$$\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{B} & & \\ & \mathbf{B} & \\ & & \ddots \\ & & & \mathbf{B} \end{array} \right] \left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{B} & & \\ & \mathbf{B} & \\ & & \ddots \\ & & & \mathbf{B} \end{array}} \right\} 3m_2 \text{ blocks, with } \mathbf{B} = m^2 L_f^2 \underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \\ -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & 2\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & 2\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} \\ & & & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} \end{array} \right]}_{m_1 \text{ blocks}} \left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \\ -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & 2\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & 2\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} \\ & & & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} \end{array}} \right\} m_1 \text{ blocks.} \quad (39)$$

- (b) Given any x_1 and x_2 in \mathbb{R} and any $c > 0$, consider the following optimization problem in \mathbb{R}^2 :

$$(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2) = \arg \min_{z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2}(z_1 - x_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(z_2 - x_2)^2 + c|z_1 - z_2|.$$

The optimal solution of this problem is

$$(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2) = \begin{cases} ((x_1 + x_2)/2, (x_1 + x_2)/2), & \text{if } |x_1 - x_2| \leq 2c \\ (x_1 - c \cdot \text{sign}(x_1 - x_2), x_2 + c \cdot \text{sign}(x_1 - x_2)), & \text{if } |x_1 - x_2| > 2c. \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

Recall the definition of g in (16) and $\mathbf{prox}_{\eta g}$, we obtain that

$$\mathbf{prox}_{\eta g}(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}} \eta\beta \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{i+1}\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2.$$

It then holds that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = \begin{cases} \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}_i} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|^2, & \text{if } i-1, i \notin \mathcal{M}, \\ \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}_i} \eta\beta \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{i-1}\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|^2, & \text{if } i-1 \in \mathcal{M}, \\ \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}_i} \eta\beta \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{i+1}\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|^2, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{M}. \end{cases}$$

By (40) and the separability property of $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|^2$, we have that for any $j \in \{1, \dots, \bar{d}\}$,

$$[\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i]_j = \begin{cases} [\mathbf{x}_i]_j, & \text{if } i-1, i \notin \mathcal{M}, \\ ([\mathbf{x}_{i-1}]_j + [\mathbf{x}_i]_j)/2, & \text{if } i-1 \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } |[\mathbf{x}_{i-1}]_j - [\mathbf{x}_i]_j| \leq \eta\beta, \\ ([\mathbf{x}_i]_j + [\mathbf{x}_{i+1}]_j)/2, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } |[\mathbf{x}_i]_j - [\mathbf{x}_{i+1}]_j| \leq \eta\beta, \\ [\mathbf{x}_i]_j + \eta\beta \cdot \text{sign}([\mathbf{x}_{i-1}]_j - [\mathbf{x}_i]_j), & \text{if } i-1 \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } |[\mathbf{x}_{i-1}]_j - [\mathbf{x}_i]_j| > \eta\beta, \\ [\mathbf{x}_i]_j - \eta\beta \cdot \text{sign}([\mathbf{x}_{i-1}]_j - [\mathbf{x}_i]_j), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } |[\mathbf{x}_{i-1}]_j - [\mathbf{x}_i]_j| > \eta\beta, \end{cases}$$

which implies

$$\text{supp}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i) \subset \begin{cases} \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i), & \text{if } i-1, i \notin \mathcal{M}, \\ \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{i-1}) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i), & \text{if } i-1 \in \mathcal{M}, \\ \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{i+1}), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{M}. \end{cases}$$

The proof is then completed. \square

Now we are ready to show an important result, in Proposition 3, on how fast $\text{supp}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)})$ can expand with t . By Lemmas 7 and 8, if $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$, then $\text{supp}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)})$ will grow slowly. Roughly speaking, Proposition 3 shows that turning a zero in $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ to non-zero will take at least $\frac{m}{6}$ oracles after the second iteration. Figure 1 illustrates the process of how zero elements turn to non-zero along the iterations by using the first-order oracle information. It explains the core idea of the proof of Proposition 3.

PROPOSITION 3. *Suppose an FOM in Algorithm Class 1 is applied to instance \mathcal{P} from $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ and generates a sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 0}$. By notations in (36), it holds for any $\bar{j} \in \{2, 3, \dots, \bar{d}\}$ that*

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m \text{ and } t \leq 1 + m(\bar{j} - 2)/6. \quad (41)$$

Proof of Proposition 3. We prove the claim by induction on \bar{j} . Let $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)} = (\boldsymbol{\xi}_1^{(t)\top}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_m^{(t)\top})^\top$ with $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^{(t)} = \mathbf{prox}_{\eta_t g}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}) = (\boldsymbol{\zeta}_1^{(t)\top}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_m^{(t)\top})^\top$ with $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}, \forall i$ for $t \geq 1$. Since $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$, we have $\text{supp}(\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(0)})) \subset \{1\}, \forall i$ from Lemma 7. Notice $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$. Hence, $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{(1)}) \subset \{1\}, \forall i$, which further indicates $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i^{(1)}) \subset \{1\}, \forall i$ by Lemma 8(b), and thus $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(1)}) \subset \{1\}, \forall i$. This proves the claim in (41) for $\bar{j} = 2$. Now suppose that the claim (41) holds for some $\bar{j} \geq 2$. We go to prove it for $\bar{j} + 1$.




FIGURE 1. **Illustration of the zero-respecting sequences.** Each subfigure represents one whole vector \mathbf{x} in a matrix format, with the first column corresponding to matrix $[\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{m/3}]$, the second column to $[\mathbf{x}_{m/3+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{2m/3}]$, the last column to $[\mathbf{x}_{2m/3+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m]$, and the i -th row representing the row vector $[\mathbf{x}_1]_i, [\mathbf{x}_2]_i, \dots, [\mathbf{x}_m]_i$. A cell is plotted white if all its elements are zero and otherwise in blue. By Lemmas 5 and 6, if any row is zero, then \mathbf{x} cannot be an ϵ -stationary point of instance \mathcal{P} . Starting from $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, the figure shows how the zero elements are changed to non-zero by using the oracle information. After the first iteration, all elements in the first row can be made non-zero according to Lemma 7(1). Next, all elements in the first column of the second row can be made non-zero. As the iteration proceeds, in the second column of the second row, the element $[\mathbf{x}_{m/3+1}]_2$ is the first to become non-zero by the operator $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top(\cdot)$. Then, the operator $\text{prox}_{\eta g}$ makes the next element $[\mathbf{x}_{m/3+2}]_2$ non-zero, followed by the operator $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top(\cdot)$, which changes $[\mathbf{x}_{m/3+3}]_2$ to non-zero, and so on. It needs at least $m/6$ iterations (i.e., oracles) to make the entire second column of the second row non-zero. Then under the action of the operators $\text{prox}_{\eta g}$ and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top(\cdot)$, the element $[\mathbf{x}_{2m/3+1}]_2$ can turn to non-zero; by Lemma 7(3), $[\mathbf{x}_{2m/3+1}]_3$ turns to non-zero by using ∇f_0 ; this process continues.

According to the hypothesis of the induction, we have

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, \forall i \in [1, m] \text{ and } \forall r \leq \bar{t} := 1 + m(\bar{j} - 2)/6. \quad (42)$$

Below we let $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(r)} = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}^{(r)}$ for any $r \geq 0$ and consider two cases: \bar{j} is even and \bar{j} is odd.

Case 1: Suppose \bar{j} is even. We claim that, for $s = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m}{6}$,

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3} + 2s], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + 2s + 1, m], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \leq \bar{t} + s. \quad (43)$$

We prove this claim by induction. First, notice (42) implies (43) for $s = 0$. Second, we suppose (43) holds for some integer $s \in [0, \frac{m}{6})$ and go to show that (43) also holds for $s + 1$. By Lemma 7 and $\frac{m}{3} + 2s \leq \frac{2m}{3}$, it holds

$$\text{supp}(\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)})) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3} + 2s], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + 2s + 1, m], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \leq \bar{t} + s.$$

By our induction hypothesis, the claim in (43) holds for some $s \in [0, \frac{m}{6})$, thus we obtain from Lemma 8(a) that

$$\text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i^{(r)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3} + 2s + 1], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + 2s + 2, m], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \leq \bar{t} + s.$$

Hence, by Algorithm Class 1, we have

$$\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3} + 2s + 1], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + 2s + 2, m], \end{cases}$$

and thus it follows from Lemma 8(b) and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^{(t)} = \text{prox}_{\eta t g}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)})$, $\forall t \geq 1$ that

$$\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3} + 2s + 2], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + 2s + 3, m]. \end{cases}$$

Now since $\mathbf{x}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)} \in \text{span}(\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}\})$ by Algorithm Class 1, we have

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3} + 2s + 2], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + 2s + 3, m], \end{cases}$$

which means (43) holds for $s + 1$ as well. Therefore, by induction, (43) holds for all $s = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m}{6}$. Let $s = \frac{m}{6}$ in (43). We have $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}$ for any i and $r \leq \bar{t} + \frac{m}{6} = 1 + m(\bar{j} - 2)/6 + \frac{m}{6} = 1 + m(\bar{j} - 1)/6$.

Case 2: Suppose \bar{j} is odd. We claim that, for $s = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m}{6}$,

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{2m}{3} - 2s], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{2m}{3} - 2s + 1, m], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \leq \bar{t} + s. \quad (44)$$

Again (42) implies (44) for $s = 0$. Suppose it holds for an integer $s \in [0, \frac{m}{6})$. Then by Lemma 7,

$$\text{supp}(\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)})) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{2m}{3} - 2s], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{2m}{3} - 2s + 1, m], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \leq \bar{t} + s.$$

By the induction hypothesis, the claim in (44) holds for some $s \in [0, \frac{m}{6})$, and thus we obtain from Lemma 8(a) that

$$\text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i^{(r)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{2m}{3} - 2s - 1], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{2m}{3} - 2s, m], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \leq \bar{t} + s.$$

Hence, by Algorithm Class 1, we have

$$\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{2m}{3} - 2s - 1], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{2m}{3} - 2s, m], \end{cases}$$

and then it follows from Lemma 8(b) $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^{(t)} = \mathbf{prox}_{\eta t g}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)})$, $\forall t \geq 1$ that

$$\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{2m}{3} - 2s - 2], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{2m}{3} - 2s - 1, m]. \end{cases}$$

Again since $\mathbf{x}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)} \in \text{span}(\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}\})$ by Algorithm Class 1, we have

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{2m}{3} - 2s - 2], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{2m}{3} - 2s - 1, m], \end{cases}$$

which means (44) holds for $s + 1$ as well. By induction, (44) holds for $s = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m}{6}$. Let $s = \frac{m}{6}$ in (44).

We have $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}$ for any i and $r \leq \bar{t} + \frac{m}{6} = 1 + m(\bar{j} - 2)/6 + \frac{m}{6} = 1 + m(\bar{j} - 1)/6$.

Therefore, we have proved that (41) holds for $\bar{j} + 1$, when \bar{j} is either even or odd. By induction, (41) holds for any integer $\bar{j} \in [2, \bar{d}]$, and we complete the proof. \square

Finally, we are ready to give our main result about the lower bound of oracle complexity.

THEOREM 1. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $L_f > 0$ be given. Then for any $\omega \in [0, \frac{150\pi\epsilon}{L_f})$, there exists an instance of problem (P) in Problem Class 1, i.e., instance \mathcal{P} in Definition 2, such that any FOM in Algorithm Class 1 needs at least $\left\lceil \frac{\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])L_f\Delta_{F_0}}{36000\pi^2}\epsilon^{-2} \right\rceil$ calls to ORACLE₁ to obtain a point that is ω -close to an ϵ -stationary point of the instance, where $\Delta_{F_0} = F_0(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x}} F_0(\mathbf{x})$.*

Proof of Theorem 1. As we discussed below (36), we assume $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ without loss of generality. Thus by the notation in (36), Proposition 3 indicates that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{d} - 1\}$ for any $i \in [1, m]$ and any $t \leq 1 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/6$, which means $[\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}]_{\bar{d}} = 0$ if $t \leq 1 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/6$, where $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}$.

On the other hand, suppose \mathbf{x}^* with the structure as in (36) is an ϵ -stationary point of instance \mathcal{P} . Then by Lemma 4, it must also be an ϵ -stationary point of (AP). Hence, by Lemmas 5 and 6, we have $|[\bar{\mathbf{x}}^*]_j| \geq \frac{150\pi\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}L_f}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, \bar{d}$, where $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^* = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{x}_i^*$. Therefore, by the convexity of the square function, it follows that

$$\|\mathbf{x}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \left([\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}]_{\bar{d}} - [\mathbf{x}_i^*]_{\bar{d}} \right)^2 \geq m \left([\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}]_{\bar{d}} - [\bar{\mathbf{x}}^*]_{\bar{d}} \right)^2 \geq m \left(\frac{150\pi\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}L_f} \right)^2 > \omega^2,$$

and thus $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ is not ω -close to \mathbf{x}^* if $t \leq 1 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/6$.

Moreover, by Lemma 2(a) and the fact that $g(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) = 0$ and $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, \forall \mathbf{x}$, it holds that

$$\bar{d} \geq \frac{L_f (F_0(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x}} F_0(\mathbf{x}))}{3000\pi^2} \epsilon^{-2} = \frac{L_f \Delta_{F_0}}{3000\pi^2} \epsilon^{-2}.$$

In other words, in order for $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ to be ω -close to an ϵ -stationary point of instant \mathcal{P} , the algorithm needs at least $t = 2 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/6$ calls to ORACLE₁. We complete the proof by noticing

$$2 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/6 \geq m\bar{d}/12 \geq \frac{mL_f \Delta_{F_0}}{36000\pi^2} \epsilon^{-2} > \frac{\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])L_f \Delta_{F_0}}{36000\pi^2 \epsilon^2},$$

where the first inequality is because $\bar{d} \geq 5$, and the last one is by Lemma 3. \square

By Lemma 3 and the block diagonal structure of \mathbf{A} in (14), we have $\kappa(\mathbf{A}) \leq m_1$ and thus $\frac{\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])}{\kappa(\mathbf{A})} \geq \frac{m}{4m_1} = \frac{3m_2}{4}$, which can be arbitrarily large as there is no restriction on m_2 . Therefore, by choosing appropriate m_1 and m_2 , we have the following claim, which answers the question that we raise in the beginning.

CLAIM 2. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $L_f > 0$ be given. For any $C > 1$, there exists an instance in Problem Class 1, such that the number of calls to ORACLE₁ by an FOM in Algorithm Class 1 is at least $\lceil C\kappa(\mathbf{A})L_f \Delta_{F_0} \epsilon^{-2} \rceil$ to produce an ϵ -stationary point of the instance. Namely, the existence of a non-smooth regularizer g in problem (P) can make the problem significantly harder.*

REMARK 1 (COMPARISON TO THE LOWER COMPLEXITY BOUND IN (SUN AND HONG 2019)).

The class of affinely constrained smooth problems considered in (Sun and Hong 2019) is a strict subclass of Problem Class 1 that we consider. Claim 2 indicates that our lower complexity bound for a broader problem class can be significantly higher than the lower bound shown in (Sun and Hong 2019) for a smaller problem class, even if the proximal mapping of the non-smooth term is accessible.

3. Lower Bound of Oracle Complexity for Algorithm Class 2 In Algorithm Class 1, an FOM is allowed to call the operator $\mathbf{prox}_{\eta g}(\cdot)$ that may be nontrivial when g has the structure as that in Problem Class 1. Calculating $\mathbf{prox}_{\eta g}(\cdot)$ to a high accuracy or exactly may require many (or even infinitely many) calls to $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{b}}$. In contrast, \bar{g} is simpler than g , making $\mathbf{prox}_{\eta \bar{g}}(\cdot)$ easier to compute such as when $\bar{g}(\cdot) = \lambda \|\cdot\|_1$ for some $\lambda > 0$ as in instance \mathcal{P} . These observations motivate us to reformulate (P) into (SP) and seek an ϵ -stationary point of (SP) by an FOM in Algorithm Class 2.

Consequently, two intriguing questions arise: (i) whether finding an ϵ -stationary point of (SP) by an FOM in Algorithm Class 2 is easier or more challenging compared to finding an ϵ -stationary point of its corresponding problem (P) in Problem Class 1 by an FOM in Algorithm Class 1, and (ii) whether finding a near ϵ -stationary point of problem (P) in Problem Class 1 by an FOM in Algorithm Class 2 is easier or harder compared to that by an FOM in Algorithm Class 1. We provide an answer to the first question, by showing that the same-order lower bound of complexity in Theorem 1 holds for finding an ϵ -stationary point of (SP) by an FOM in Algorithm Class 2. Moreover, we provide an answer to the second question, by

showing that the lower bound of oracle complexity for finding a near ϵ -stationary point of problem (P) in Problem Class 1 is $O(\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])L_f\Delta_{F_0}\epsilon^{-2})$ by an FOM in either Algorithm Class 1 or Algorithm Class 2; see Theorem 1 and Corollary 1.

Before we give our main results in this section, we introduce an instance of (SP) that is a reformulation of instant \mathcal{P} in Definition 2. We show that an ϵ -stationary point of the reformulation (SP) of instant \mathcal{P} is a 2ϵ -stationary point of the auxiliary problem (AP) of instant \mathcal{P} . This is formally stated in the lemma below.

LEMMA 9. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given in Definition 2 for instance \mathcal{P} , and let $\hat{\epsilon} \in [0, \epsilon]$. Suppose $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is an $\hat{\epsilon}$ -stationary point of the reformulation (SP) of instant \mathcal{P} . Then \mathbf{x}^* is a $2\hat{\epsilon}$ -stationary point of the auxiliary problem (AP) of instant \mathcal{P} .*

Proof of Lemma 9. By Definition 1, there exist $\mathbf{z}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}$ and $\mathbf{z}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the conditions in (10) hold. Hence, for some $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \partial\bar{g}(\mathbf{y}^*)$, we have $\|\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{z}_1\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}$, and

$$\|\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi} + \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}_2\| \leq \|\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}_2\| + \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\|\hat{\epsilon} \leq \hat{\epsilon} + \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\|\hat{\epsilon}. \quad (45)$$

Moreover, (10) implies that, for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{Null}(\mathbf{A})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F'(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{v}, \bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{v}) &= \mathbf{v}^\top \nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \bar{g}'(\mathbf{y}^*; \bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{v}) \\ &\geq \mathbf{v}^\top \nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \mathbf{v}^\top \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{v}^\top (\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi} + \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}_2) \geq -\hat{\epsilon}(1 + \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\|)\|\mathbf{v}\|, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where the first inequality follows from (32) with g replaced by \bar{g} , and the second one is by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (45).

Below we prove $\mathbf{y}^* = \mathbf{0}$. We write it into the block-structured form

$$\mathbf{y}^* = (\mathbf{y}_1^{*\top}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{3m_2-1}^{*\top})^\top \text{ with } \mathbf{y}_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}, \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, 3m_2 - 1.$$

If $\mathbf{y}^* \neq \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathbf{y}_i^* \neq \mathbf{0}$ for some $\bar{i} \in \{1, 2, \dots, 3m_2 - 1\}$. Let $\mathbf{v}^* = (\mathbf{v}_1^{*\top}, \mathbf{v}_2^{*\top}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_m^{*\top})^\top$ where $\mathbf{v}_i^* = \mathbf{y}_i^*/(mL_f)$ for $i \leq \bar{i}m_1$, and $\mathbf{v}_i^* = \mathbf{0}$ otherwise. We then have $\mathbf{v}_i^* = \mathbf{v}_{i+1}^*$ for any $i \neq \bar{i}m_1$, so $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}^* = \mathbf{0}$ by Proposition 1(c). Moreover, let $\mathbf{u}^* = \bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{v}^* = (\mathbf{u}_1^{*\top}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{3m_2-1}^{*\top})^\top$ with $\mathbf{u}_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 3m_2 - 1$. We must have $\mathbf{u}_i^* = -\mathbf{y}_i^*$ for $i = \bar{i}$ and $\mathbf{u}_i^* = \mathbf{0}$ for $i \neq \bar{i}$. Therefore by (15), for any $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$\bar{g}(\mathbf{y}^* + s\mathbf{u}^*) = \frac{\beta}{mL_f} \sum_{i < \bar{i}} \|\mathbf{y}_i^*\|_1 + \frac{\beta}{mL_f} \|\mathbf{y}_{\bar{i}}^* - s\mathbf{y}_{\bar{i}}^*\|_1 + \frac{\beta}{mL_f} \sum_{i > \bar{i}} \|\mathbf{y}_i^*\|_1 = \bar{g}(\mathbf{y}^*) - \frac{s\beta}{mL_f} \|\mathbf{y}_{\bar{i}}^*\|_1. \quad (47)$$

Now by (35), the choice of \mathbf{v}_i^* , and the mean value theorem, we have for any $i = 1, \dots, m$ that

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^* + s\mathbf{v}_i^*) - f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*) = s \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^* + s'\mathbf{v}_i^*)^\top \mathbf{v}_i^* \leq s \|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^* + s'\mathbf{v}_i^*)\|_\infty \|\mathbf{v}_i^*\|_1 \leq \frac{50s\pi\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{y}_i^*\|_1}{mL_f},$$

where $s' \in (0, s)$. The inequality above, together with (47) and the definition of f_0 in (22), implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{s} \left(F(\mathbf{x}^* + s\mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{y}^* + s\mathbf{u}^*) - F(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*) \right) = \frac{1}{s} \left(f_0(\mathbf{x}^* + s\mathbf{v}^*) - f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \bar{g}(\mathbf{y}^* + s\mathbf{u}^*) - \bar{g}(\mathbf{y}^*) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{s} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m (f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^* + s\mathbf{v}_i^*) - f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*)) + \bar{g}(\mathbf{y}^* + s\mathbf{u}^*) - \bar{g}(\mathbf{y}^*) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{smL_f} (50\pi s\epsilon\sqrt{m}\|\mathbf{y}_{\bar{i}}^*\|_1 - \beta s\|\mathbf{y}_{\bar{i}}^*\|_1) = \frac{(50\pi\epsilon\sqrt{m} - \beta)\|\mathbf{y}_{\bar{i}}^*\|_1}{mL_f}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $s \downarrow 0$ in the inequality above gives $\frac{(50\pi\epsilon\sqrt{m}-\beta)\|\mathbf{y}_i^*\|_1}{mL_f} \geq F'(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*; \mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{u}^*)$. Recall $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}^* = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{u}^* = \bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{v}^*$. Hence, we have from (46) and the choice of \mathbf{v}^* that

$$\frac{(50\pi\epsilon\sqrt{m}-\beta)\|\mathbf{y}_i^*\|_1}{mL_f} \geq -\hat{\epsilon}(1 + \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\|)\|\mathbf{v}^*\| \geq -\hat{\epsilon}(1 + \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\|)\frac{\sqrt{i}\|\mathbf{y}_i^*\|}{mL_f} \geq -\hat{\epsilon}(1 + \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\|)\frac{\sqrt{m}\|\mathbf{y}_i^*\|_1}{mL_f}.$$

Since $\beta > (50\pi + 1 + \|\mathbf{A}\|)\sqrt{m}\epsilon$, $\epsilon \geq \hat{\epsilon}$ and $\|\mathbf{A}\| \geq \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\|$, the inequalities above can hold only when $\mathbf{y}_i^* = \mathbf{0}$. This contradicts to the hypothesis $\mathbf{y}_i^* \neq \mathbf{0}$. Hence, $\mathbf{y}^* = \mathbf{0}$, which together with (10) gives $\|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x}^*\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}$. Furthermore, $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^*\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}$ from (10). Thus $\|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}^*\| \leq \|\bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x}^*\| + \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^*\| \leq 2\hat{\epsilon}$, which, together with $\|\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^*) + \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{z}_2\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}$ from (10), indicates that \mathbf{x}^* a $2\hat{\epsilon}$ -stationary point of (AP). \square

With Lemma 9, we can establish the lower-bound complexity for solving problem (SP) in a similar way to show Theorem 1. In particular, Lemma 9 indicates that a solution $(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})$ cannot be an $\epsilon/2$ -stationary point of the reformulation (SP) of instant \mathcal{P} , if $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ is not an ϵ -stationary point of (AP). By Lemmas 5 and 6, if there exists $\bar{j} \in \{1, 2, \dots, \bar{d}\}$ such that $[\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}]_{\bar{j}} = 0$, where $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}$, then $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ cannot be an ϵ -stationary point of problem (AP) and thus cannot be an $\epsilon/2$ -stationary point of the reformulation (SP) of instant \mathcal{P} . Finally, similar to Proposition 3, we can show that, for any FOM in Algorithm Class 2 that is applied to the reformulation (SP) of instance \mathcal{P} , if it starts from $(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}^{(0)}) = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$ and generates a sequence $\{(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})\}_{t \geq 1}$, then $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}$ for some $\bar{j} \in \{1, 2, \dots, \bar{d}\}$ if t is not large enough. Hence, $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ cannot be ω -close to any ϵ -stationary point of instance \mathcal{P} for any $\omega \in [0, \frac{150\pi\epsilon}{L_f})$, according to the proof of Theorem 1. This way, we can obtain a lower bound of oracle complexity to produce an ϵ -stationary point of (SP) and also a lower bound to obtain a near ϵ -stationary point of (P). Since the aforementioned arguments are similar to those for proving Theorem 1, we simply present the lower complexity bounds in the theorem and the corollary below and put the proofs in Appendix B.

THEOREM 2. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $L_f > 0$ be given. Then there exists an instance in Problem Class 1, i.e., instance \mathcal{P} in Definition 2, such that any FOM in Algorithm Class 2 requires at least $\left\lceil \frac{\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])L_f\Delta_{F_0}}{72000\pi^2} \epsilon^{-2} \right\rceil$ calls to ORACLE₂ to obtain an ϵ -stationary point of the reformulation (SP) of that instance, where $\Delta_{F_0} = F_0(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x}} F_0(\mathbf{x})$.*

COROLLARY 1. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $L_f > 0$ be given. Then for any $\omega \in [0, \frac{150\pi\epsilon}{L_f})$, there exists an instance of problem (P), i.e., instance \mathcal{P} in Definition 2, such that any FOM in Algorithm Class 2 requires at least $\left\lceil \frac{\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])L_f\Delta_{F_0}}{18000\pi^2} \epsilon^{-2} \right\rceil$ calls to ORACLE₂ to obtain a point $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ that is ω -close to an ϵ -stationary point of instance \mathcal{P} , where $\Delta_{F_0} = F_0(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x}} F_0(\mathbf{x})$.*

Tightness of Lower Complexity Bounds For Problem Class 1, we give in the extended arXiv version (Liu et al. 2023a) of this paper an FOM that belongs to Algorithm Class 2. When $[\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}]$ has full row rank and \bar{g} is Lipschitz continuous, the FOM in (Liu et al. 2023a) can find a point that is ϵ -close to an ϵ -stationary point of Problem Class 1 by $\tilde{O}(\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])L_f\Delta_{F_0}\epsilon^{-2})$ calls to ORACLE₂. It can also find

an ϵ -stationary point of the reformulation (SP) by the same-order complexity. Notice that the instance \mathcal{P} we use to establish our lower complexity bounds satisfies the full row-rankness condition and the Lipschitz continuity of \bar{g} . Thus comparing the upper complexity bound in (Liu et al. 2023a) to the lower bounds we establish in Theorem 2 and Corollary 1, we claim that our lower complexity bounds of Algorithm Class 2 are tight up to a logarithmic factor under the additional restriction that \bar{g} is Lipschitz continuous and $[\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}]$ has full row rank, which indicates $\bar{n} + n \leq d$. We are unable to claim the tightness of our lower complexity bound of Algorithm Class 1 in Theorem 1 for solving Problem Class 1. However, notice that $\mathbf{prox}_{\eta g}$ is harder than $\mathbf{prox}_{\eta \bar{g}}$ to evaluate. In this sense, ORACLE₁ is stronger than ORACLE₂. Hence, we conjecture that our lower complexity bound of Algorithm Class 1 in Theorem 1 is also nearly tight under the additional conditions mentioned above.

Before concluding this section, we make a few more discussions on the challenges of claiming a (nearly) tight lower complexity bound for Algorithm Class 1. In literature, for a certain special g , some existing FOMs in Algorithm Class 1 can achieve a complexity of $O(\epsilon^{-2})$, where the hidden key constants are the same as but in a higher order than those in our lower bound. For example, when g is the indicator function of a polyhedral set \mathcal{C} and the exact projection onto \mathcal{C} can be computed, (Zhang and Luo 2022) give an ALM-based FOM for problem (P) and obtain a complexity of $O(\hat{\kappa}^2 L_f^3 \Delta_{F_0} \epsilon^{-2})$, where $\hat{\kappa}$ is a joint condition number of the equality $\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$ and $g = 0$. When g is a general convex function, the best-known complexity bound of FOMs in Algorithm Class 1 is $O(\epsilon^{-5/2})$ to find an ϵ -KKT point of problem (P), e.g., in (Lin et al. 2022, Li and Xu 2021, Kong et al. 2023). The dependence on ϵ is in a higher order than our lower bound. In addition, these upper bound results have a higher-order dependence on Δ_{F_0} . For example, the result in (Lin et al. 2022) has a dependence of $\Delta_{F_0}^{5/4}$. However, some other key constants concealed in $O(\epsilon^{-5/2})$ are not revealed in our lower complexity bound, such as a uniform upper bound on the dual variables in (Lin et al. 2022). This can be one main reason for the discrepancy between the $O(\epsilon^{-5/2})$ upper complexity bound and our established lower bound. Though we may express our lower bound in a different formulation to reveal the dependence on the key constants in these existing upper bound results, we prefer our formulation because it more clearly shows the difficulty caused by the nonsmooth convex regularizer g , while the existing $O(\epsilon^{-5/2})$ results remain in the same order even if $g \equiv 0$. It is possible to have an upper bound that has a lower-order than $O(\epsilon^{-5/2})$, if the upper bound reveals a dependence on a certain ‘‘condition number’’ that quantifies the difficulty caused by the interaction of g and the linear constraint $\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$, e.g., the difficulty of solving $\min_{\mathbf{x}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 + \alpha \cdot g(\mathbf{x}), \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0} \right\}$ to a high accuracy for any $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\alpha > 0$, by using ORACLE₁ in (1). However, it is unclear how to define such a ‘‘condition number’’ for a general convex function g . Our results, though not providing a complete solution here, offer insights into the complexity of FOMs under the imposed conditions, thereby enlightening the field and paving the way for future research.

4. Conclusion and Open Questions We have studied lower bounds of the oracle complexity of first-order methods for finding a (near) ϵ -stationary point of a non-convex composite non-smooth optimization problem with affine equality constraints. We have shown that the non-smooth term can cause the problem significantly harder even if its proximal mapping is accessible. This is fundamentally different from composite non-smooth optimization without affine constraints. When the non-smooth term has a special structure, we give an explicit formula of the lower bound, and we show that the same-order lower bound holds for first-order methods applied to a splitting reformulation of the original problem. In addition, by relating our lower bounds to an upper complexity bound result in the extended arXiv version (Liu et al. 2023a) of this paper, we show that our lower bounds are tight, up to a logarithmic factor, when the non-smooth term has a special structure and a certain full row-rankness holds.

Though we make the first attempt on establishing lower complexity bounds of first-order methods for solving affine-constrained non-convex composite non-smooth problems, there are still a few open questions that are worth further exploration. First, for Algorithm Class 1 on solving Problem Class 1, can the lower bound $O(\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}])L_f\Delta_{F_0}\epsilon^{-2})$ be achieved, i.e., is it tight? The second question is how to formulate a lower complexity bound of Algorithm Class 1 on solving problem (P) if it does have the structure of $g(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{g}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x} + \bar{\mathbf{b}})$ as in Problem Class 1. Third, what will the lower bound look like if there are convex nonlinear inequality constraints?

Appendix A: Proofs of Some Lemmas In this section, we provide the proofs of some lemmas that we use in Section 2.

Proof of Lemma 5. Let $\bar{\mathbf{z}} = \frac{\sqrt{m}L_f\mathbf{z}}{150\pi\epsilon}$. We first consider the case where $|\mathbf{z}_j| < \frac{150\pi\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}L_f}$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{j}$. In this case, $|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1| = \frac{\sqrt{m}L_f|\mathbf{z}_1|}{150\pi\epsilon} < 1$. By (21), we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \nabla f_i(\mathbf{z}) \right\| \geq \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m [\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})]_1 \right| = \left| \frac{2\epsilon}{m\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^m [\nabla h_i(\bar{\mathbf{z}})]_1 \right|. \quad (48)$$

In addition, according to (23), we have

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m [\nabla h_i(\bar{\mathbf{z}})]_1 = -\Psi(1)\Phi'([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_1) + [-\Psi'(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_1)\Phi(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_2) - \Psi'([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_1)\Phi([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_2)] \leq -\Psi(1)\Phi'([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_1) < -1, \quad (49)$$

where the first inequality comes from the non-negativity of Ψ' and Φ by Lemma 1(a), and the second inequality is by Lemma 1(b) and $|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1| < 1$. Combing (48) and (49) yields the desired inequality.

Second, we consider the case where there exists $j \in \{2, \dots, \bar{j}\}$ such that $|\mathbf{z}_j| < \frac{150\pi\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}L_f} \leq |\mathbf{z}_{j-1}|$. In this case, $|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j| < 1 \leq |\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{j-1}|$. By (21) again, we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \nabla f_i(\mathbf{z}) \right\| \geq \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m [\nabla f_i(\mathbf{z})]_j \right| = \left| \frac{2\epsilon}{m\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^m [\nabla h_i(\bar{\mathbf{z}})]_j \right|. \quad (50)$$

According to (24) and (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m [\nabla h_i(\bar{\mathbf{z}})]_j \\ &= -\Psi(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j-1})\Phi'(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j) - \Psi([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j-1})\Phi'([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j) - \Psi'(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j)\Phi(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j+1}) - \Psi'([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j)\Phi([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j+1}) \\ &\leq -\Psi(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j-1})\Phi'(-[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j) - \Psi([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j-1})\Phi'([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j) = -\Psi(|[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j-1}|)\Phi'([\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j) < -1, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where the first inequality comes from the nonnegativity of Ψ' and Φ by Lemma 1(a), the second equality holds by the fact that $\Phi'(u) = \Phi'(-u)$ and $\Psi(u) = 0$ for all $u \leq 0$ from (18) and Lemma 1(a), and the second inequality is by Lemma 1(b) and the fact that $|[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_{j-1}| \geq 1$ and $|[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]_j| < 1$. Combining (50) and (51) yields the desired inequality and completes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 6. By simple calculation and the fact $\mathbf{Null}(\mathbf{H}) = \{\mathbf{1}_m \otimes \mathbf{u} : \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}\}$, we obtain

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \|\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{H}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{Proj}_{\mathbf{Null}(\mathbf{H})}(\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}))\|^2 = \frac{1}{m} \|\sum_{i=1}^m \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i)\|^2, \quad (52)$$

$$\|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}\|^2 = m^2 L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{i+1}\|^2. \quad (53)$$

By the L_f -Lipschitz continuity of ∇f_0 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \nabla f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right\|^2 - \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \right\|^2 \leq \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (\nabla f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i)) \right\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\nabla f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m L_f^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{L_f^2}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{L_f^2}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m \left[|j-i| \sum_{k=\min\{i,j\}}^{\max\{i,j\}-1} \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|^2 \right] \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{L_f^2}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m m \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|^2 \\ & = m L_f^2 \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{i+1}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) comes from $\|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_i\|^2 = \frac{1}{m^2} \|\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i\|^2$, (b) results from the fact that $\|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \leq |j-i| \sum_{k=\min\{i,j\}}^{\max\{i,j\}-1} \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}\|^2$, (c) holds by $|j-i| < m$, $\max\{i,j\} \leq m$ and $\min\{i,j\} \geq 1$.

Hence, by (52) and (53) and the fact $a + b \leq 2 \max\{a, b\}$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain the desired result from the inequality above and complete the proof. \square

Appendix B: Proofs of Theorem 2 and Corollary 1 In this section, we give a complete proof of Theorem 2 and Corollary 1. We first show a lemma and a proposition. According to the structure of \mathbf{A} and $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ given in (14), $\text{supp}((\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x})_i)$ and $\text{supp}((\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x})_i)$ are determined by $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{i-1})$, $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{i+1})$. Also, $\text{supp}(\text{prox}_{\eta\bar{g}}(\mathbf{y}))$, $\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ have a similar property. They are stated in the following lemma.

LEMMA 10. *Let \mathbf{x} be the structured vector given in (11), \mathbf{A} and $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ in (14), and \bar{g} be given in (15). Define $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}_{m+1} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$. The following statements hold:*

(a) Let $\widehat{\mathbf{x}} = (\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_1^\top, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_m^\top)^\top \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x}\}$ with $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$. Then

$$\text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i) \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{i-1}) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{i+1}), \forall i \in [1, m]. \quad (54)$$

(b) Let $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{3m_2-1}^\top)^\top$ with $\mathbf{y}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \mathbf{y}$. Then

$$\text{supp}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i) \subset \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } i-1, i \notin \mathcal{M}, \\ \text{supp}(\mathbf{y}_j) & \text{if } i-1 = jm_1 \in \mathcal{M}, \\ \text{supp}(\mathbf{y}_j) & \text{if } i = jm_1 \in \mathcal{M}, \end{cases} \forall i \in [1, m]. \quad (55)$$

(c) Let $\widehat{\mathbf{y}} = \bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{y}} = (\widehat{\mathbf{y}}_1^\top, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{y}}_{3m_2-1}^\top)^\top$ with $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$. Then

$$\text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{y}}_j) \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{jm_1}) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{jm_1+1}), \forall j \in [1, 3m_2-1]. \quad (56)$$

(d) It holds that

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{y}) = \text{supp}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \mathbf{y}), \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}. \quad (57)$$

(e) For any given $\eta > 0$, let $\widetilde{\mathbf{y}} = \text{prox}_{\eta\bar{g}}(\mathbf{y}) = (\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_1^\top, \dots, \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_{3m_2-1}^\top)^\top$ with $\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$. Then

$$\text{supp}(\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_j) \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{y}_j), \forall j \in [1, 3m_2-1]. \quad (58)$$

Proof of Lemma 10. (a) Recall that \mathbf{H} are split into $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ and \mathbf{A} in rows. The relation in (54) immediately follows from (39) the observation

$$\mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{H} = m^2 L_f^2 \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & & & & & \\ -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & 2\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & 2\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \\ & & & & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \end{bmatrix}}_{m-1 \text{ blocks}} \left. \vphantom{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & & & & & \\ -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & 2\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & 2\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \\ & & & & -\mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \mathbf{I}_{\bar{d}} & \end{bmatrix}} \right\} m-1 \text{ blocks and } \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{H} - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}. \quad (59)$$

(b) The relation in (55) immediately follows from the definitions of $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ and \mathcal{M} in (13).

(c) The relation in (56) immediately follows from the definition of $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ and \mathcal{M} in (13).

(d) The relation in (57) immediately follows from the fact that $\bar{\mathbf{A}}\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top = 2m^2 L_f^2 \mathbf{I}_{\bar{n}}$ by the definition of $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ and \mathcal{M} in (13).

(e) Given any $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $c > 0$, consider the following optimization problem in \mathbb{R} :

$$\widetilde{y} = \arg \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2} (z - y)^2 + c|z| = \text{sign}(y) \cdot (|y| - c)_+. \quad (60)$$

Recall the definition of \bar{g} in (15), we obtain that

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{y}} = \text{prox}_{\eta\bar{g}}(\mathbf{y}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}'} \frac{\beta}{mL_f} \|\mathbf{y}'\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y}' - \mathbf{y}\|^2.$$

Applying (60) to each coordinate of $\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}$ above, we have (58) and complete the proof. \square

Now we are ready to show the following result on how fast $\text{supp}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)})$ and $\text{supp}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)})$ can expand with t .

PROPOSITION 4. *Suppose an FOM in Algorithm Class 2 is applied to the reformulation (SP) of instance \mathcal{P} from an initial solution $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$, and generates a sequence $\{(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})\}_{t \geq 1}$. By notations in (36) and $\mathbf{y}^{(t)} = (\mathbf{y}_1^{(t)\top}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{3m_2-1}^{(t)\top})^\top$ with $\mathbf{y}_j^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$. It holds, for any $\bar{j} \in \{2, 3, \dots, \bar{d}\}$, that*

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\} \text{ and } \text{supp}(\mathbf{y}_j^{(t)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\} \quad (61)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, 3m_2 - 1$ and $t \leq 1 + m(\bar{j} - 2)/3$.

Proof of Proposition 4. We prove this claim by induction on \bar{j} . Let $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)} = (\boldsymbol{\xi}_1^{(t)\top}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{3m_2-1}^{(t)\top})^\top$ with $\boldsymbol{\xi}_j^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^{(t)} = \text{prox}_{\eta_t \bar{g}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}) = (\boldsymbol{\zeta}_1^{(t)\top}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{3m_2-1}^{(t)\top})^\top$ with $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_j^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}, \forall j$ for $t \geq 1$. Since the algorithm is initialized with $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$, we have $\text{supp}(\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(0)})) \subset \{1\}$ for any i according to Lemma 7. Notice $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{0}$. By Algorithm Class 2 and (58), we have $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(1)}) \subset \{1\}$ for any i . Meanwhile, we have $\boldsymbol{\xi}_j^{(1)} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_j^{(1)} = \mathbf{0}$ for any j . This implies $\mathbf{y}_j^{(1)} = \mathbf{0}$. Thus the claim in (61) holds for $\bar{j} = 2$. Suppose that we have proved the claim in (61) for all $\bar{j} \geq 2$. We next prove it for $\bar{j} + 1$. According to the hypothesis of the induction, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\} \text{ and } \text{supp}(\mathbf{y}_j^{(t)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, \\ \forall i \in [1, m], \forall j \in [1, 3m_2 - 1] \text{ and } r \leq \bar{t} := 1 + m(\bar{j} - 2)/3. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Below we let $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)}$ be any vector in $\text{span}\{\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}^{(s)}, \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{x}^{(s)}\}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(s)} = \bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top \mathbf{y}^{(s)}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^{(s)} = \bar{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{x}^{(s)}$ for any $s \geq 0$, and we consider two cases: \bar{j} is even and \bar{j} is odd.

Case 1: Suppose \bar{j} is even. We claim that, for $s = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m}{3}$,

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3} + s], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + s + 1, m], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \in [\bar{t} + s] \text{ and} \quad (63)$$

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{y}_j^{(r)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } j \in [1, m_2 + \lfloor \frac{s}{m_1} \rfloor], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } j \in [m_2 + \lfloor \frac{s}{m_1} \rfloor + 1, 3m_2 - 1], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \in [\bar{t} + s]. \quad (64)$$

Notice (62) implies (63) and (64) for $s = 0$. Suppose (63) and (64) hold for an integer s satisfying $0 \leq s \leq \frac{m}{3}$.

According to Lemma 7 and $\frac{m}{3} + s \leq \frac{2m}{3}$,

$$\text{supp}(\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)})) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3} + s], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + s + 1, m], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \in [\bar{t} + s].$$

In addition, by Lemma 10(a), we have from (55) that

$$\text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i^{(r)}), \text{supp}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{(r)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3} + s + 1], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + s + 2, m], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \in [\bar{t} + s].$$

Hence, by Algorithm Class 2, we have

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in [1, \frac{m}{3} + s + 1], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in [\frac{m}{3} + s + 2, m]. \end{cases}$$

This means the claim in (63) holds for $s + 1$ as well.

In addition, by the relation in (56), we have

$$\text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{y}}_j^{(r)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[1, m_2 + \lfloor \frac{s}{m_1} \rfloor\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[m_2 + \lfloor \frac{s}{m_1} \rfloor + 1, 3m_2 - 1\right], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \in [\bar{t} + s].$$

Together with (64) and (57), the inclusion above implies that

$$\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_j^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[1, m_2 + \lfloor \frac{s}{m_1} \rfloor\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[m_2 + \lfloor \frac{s}{m_1} \rfloor + 1, 3m_2 - 1\right]. \end{cases}$$

It then follows from (58) that

$$\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_j^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[1, m_2 + \lfloor \frac{s}{m_1} \rfloor\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[m_2 + \lfloor \frac{s}{m_1} \rfloor + 1, 3m_2 - 1\right]. \end{cases}$$

By Algorithm Class 2, we have

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{y}_j^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[1, m_2 + \lfloor \frac{s}{m_1} \rfloor\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[m_2 + \lfloor \frac{s}{m_1} \rfloor + 1, 3m_2 - 1\right]. \end{cases}$$

This means the claim in (64) holds for $s + 1$ as well. By induction, (63) and (64) hold for $s = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m}{3}$. Let $s = \frac{m}{3}$ in them. We have $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{y}_j^{(r)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}$ for any i, j and $r \leq \bar{t} + \frac{m}{3} = 1 + m(\bar{j} - 2)/3 + \frac{m}{3} = 1 + m(\bar{j} - 1)/3$.

Case 2: Suppose \bar{j} is odd. We claim that, for $s = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m}{3}$,

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in \left[1, \frac{2m}{3} - s\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in \left[\frac{2m}{3} - s + 1, m\right], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \in [\bar{t} + s], \quad \text{and} \quad (65)$$

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{y}_j^{(r)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[1, 2m_2 - \lceil \frac{s}{m_1} \rceil\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[2m_2 - \lceil \frac{s}{m_1} \rceil + 1, 3m_2 - 1\right], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \in [\bar{t} + s]. \quad (66)$$

Again (62) implies (65) and (66) for $s = 0$. Suppose (65) and (66) hold for an integer s satisfying $0 \leq s \leq \frac{m}{3}$.

According to Lemma 7 and $\frac{2m}{3} - s \geq \frac{m}{3}$, it holds

$$\text{supp}(\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)})) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in \left[1, \frac{2m}{3} - s\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in \left[\frac{2m}{3} - s + 1, m\right], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \in [\bar{t} + s].$$

In addition, by Lemma 10(a) and (55), we have

$$\text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i^{(r)}), \text{supp}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{(r)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in \left[1, \frac{2m}{3} - s - 1\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in \left[\frac{2m}{3} - s, m\right], \end{cases} \quad \forall r \in [\bar{t} + s].$$

Hence, by Algorithm Class 2, we have

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } i \in \left[1, \frac{2m}{3} - s - 1\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } i \in \left[\frac{2m}{3} - s, m\right]. \end{cases}$$

This means claim (65) holds for $s + 1$ as well.

In addition, by (56), we have

$$\text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{y}}_j^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[1, 2m_2 - \lceil \frac{s+1}{m_1} \rceil\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[2m_2 - \lceil \frac{s+1}{m_1} \rceil + 1, 3m_2 - 1\right]. \end{cases}$$

Together with (66), the inclusion above implies that

$$\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_j^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[1, 2m_2 - \lceil \frac{s+1}{m_1} \rceil\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[2m_2 - \lceil \frac{s+1}{m_1} \rceil + 1, 3m_2 - 1\right]. \end{cases}$$

It then follows from (58) that

$$\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_j^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[1, 2m_2 - \lceil \frac{s+1}{m_1} \rceil\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[2m_2 - \lceil \frac{s+1}{m_1} \rceil + 1, 3m_2 - 1\right]. \end{cases}$$

By Algorithm Class 2, we have

$$\text{supp}(\mathbf{y}_j^{(\bar{t}+s+1)}) \subset \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, \bar{j} - 1\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[1, 2m_2 - \lceil \frac{s+1}{m_1} \rceil\right], \\ \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}, & \text{if } j \in \left[2m_2 - \lceil \frac{s+1}{m_1} \rceil + 1, 3m_2 - 1\right], \end{cases}$$

which means (66) holds for $s + 1$ as well. By induction, (65) and (66) holds for $s = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m}{3}$. Let $s = \frac{m}{3}$ in (66). We have $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(r)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{y}_j^{(r)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{j}\}$ for any i, j and $r \leq \bar{t} + \frac{m}{3} = 1 + m(\bar{j} - 2)/3 + \frac{m}{3} = 1 + m(\bar{j} - 1)/3$.

Therefore, we have proved that (62) holds for $\bar{j} + 1$, when \bar{j} is either even or odd. By induction, (62) holds for any integer $\bar{j} \in [2, \bar{d}]$, and we complete the proof. \square

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. As we discussed below (36), we assume $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ without loss of generality. Thus by notation in (36), Proposition 4 indicates that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{d} - 1\}$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{y}_j^{(t)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{d} - 1\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, 3m_2 - 1$ for all $t \leq 1 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/3$, which means $[\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}]_{\bar{d}} = 0$ if $t \leq 1 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/3$. Hence, by Lemmas 5 and 6, we have

$$\max \left\{ \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|, \min_{\gamma} \|\nabla f_0(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) + \mathbf{H}^{\top} \gamma\| \right\} \geq \frac{\sqrt{m}}{2} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \nabla f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}) \right\| > \epsilon, \quad \forall t \leq 1 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/3.$$

Hence, $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ is not an ϵ -stationary point of problem (AP) if $t \leq m(\bar{d} - 1)/3$. Thus, $(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})$ cannot be an $\epsilon/2$ -stationary point of the reformulation (SP) of instance \mathcal{P} according to Corollary 9. Moreover, by Lemma 2(a) and the facts that $g(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) = 0$ and $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, it holds that

$$\bar{d} \geq \frac{L_f (f_0(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x}} f_0(\mathbf{x}))}{3000\pi^2} \epsilon^{-2} \geq \frac{L_f (F_0(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \inf_{\mathbf{x}} F_0(\mathbf{x}))}{3000\pi^2} \epsilon^{-2} = \frac{L_f \Delta_{F_0}}{3000\pi^2} \epsilon^{-2}. \quad (67)$$

In other words, in order for $(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})$ to be an $\epsilon/2$ -stationary point of (SP), the algorithm needs at least $t = 2 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/3$ oracles. Notice

$$2 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/3 \geq m\bar{d}/6 \stackrel{(67)}{\geq} \frac{mL_f\Delta_{F_0}}{18000\pi^2}\epsilon^{-2} > \frac{\kappa([\bar{\mathbf{A}};\mathbf{A}])L_f\Delta_{F_0}}{18000\pi^2}\epsilon^{-2}, \quad (68)$$

where the second inequality is because $\bar{d} \geq 5$ and the last inequality is by Lemma 3. The conclusion is then proved by replacing ϵ in (68) to 2ϵ . \square

Finally, we give the proof to Corollary 1.

Proof of Corollary 1. As we discussed in Section 3, we assume $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ without loss of generality. Thus by notation in (36), Proposition 4 indicates that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}) \subset \{1, \dots, \bar{d} - 1\}$ for any $i \in [1, m]$ and any $t \leq 1 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/3$, which means $[\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}]_{\bar{d}} = 0$ if $t \leq 1 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/3$, where $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}$.

On the other hand, suppose \mathbf{x}^* with the structure as in (36) is an ϵ -stationary point of instance \mathcal{P} . Then by Lemma 4, it must also be an ϵ -stationary point of (AP). Hence, by Lemmas 5 and 6, we have $|[\bar{\mathbf{x}}^*]_j| \geq \frac{150\pi\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}L_f}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, \bar{d}$, where $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^* = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{x}_i^*$. Therefore, by the convexity of the square function, it follows that

$$\|\mathbf{x}^{(t)} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \left([\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}]_{\bar{d}} - [\mathbf{x}_i^*]_{\bar{d}} \right)^2 \geq m \left([\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}]_{\bar{d}} - [\bar{\mathbf{x}}^*]_{\bar{d}} \right)^2 \geq m \left(\frac{150\pi\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}L_f} \right)^2 > \omega^2,$$

and thus $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ is not ω -close to \mathbf{x}^* if $t \leq 1 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/3$. In other words, in order for $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ to be ω -close to an ϵ -stationary point of instant \mathcal{P} , the algorithm needs at least $t = 2 + m(\bar{d} - 2)/3$ oracles. The proof is then completed by using (68). \square

Acknowledgements This work is partly supported by NSF awards DMS-2053493 and IIS-2147253 and the ONR award N00014-22-1-2573.

References

- Bian W, Chen X (2015) Linearly constrained non-Lipschitz optimization for image restoration. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences* 8(4):2294–2322.
- Carmon Y, Duchi JC, Hinder O, Sidford A (2020) Lower bounds for finding stationary points I. *Mathematical Programming* 184(1-2):71–120.
- Carmon Y, Duchi JC, Hinder O, Sidford A (2021) Lower bounds for finding stationary points II: first-order methods. *Mathematical Programming* 185(1-2):315–355.
- Cartis C, Gould N, Toint P (2012) How much patience do you have? a worst-case perspective on smooth nonconvex optimization. *Optima. Mathematical Optimization Society Newsletter* (88):1–10.
- Cartis C, Gould N, Toint P (2014) On the complexity of finding first-order critical points in constrained nonlinear optimization. *Mathematical Programming* 144(1-2):93–106.
- Cartis C, Gould N, Toint P (2017) Corrigendum: on the complexity of finding first-order critical points in constrained nonlinear optimization. *Mathematical Programming* 161:611–626.
- Clarke FH (1990) *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis*, volume 5 (Philadelphia: SIAM).
- Dahal H, Liu W, Xu Y (2023) Damped proximal augmented Lagrangian method for weakly-convex problems with convex constraints. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2311.09065.pdf>.
- Goncalves MLN, Melo JG, Monteiro RDC (2017) Convergence rate bounds for a proximal ADMM with over-relaxation stepsize parameter for solving nonconvex linearly constrained problems. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1702.01850.pdf>.
- Grapiglia GN, Yuan Y (2021) On the complexity of an augmented Lagrangian method for nonconvex optimization. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* 41(2):1546–1568.
- Gray RM (2006) Toeplitz and circulant matrices: a review. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory* 2(3):155–239.
- Haeser G, Liu H, Ye Y (2019) Optimality condition and complexity analysis for linearly-constrained optimization without differentiability on the boundary. *Mathematical Programming* 178:263–299.
- Hajinezhad D, Hong M (2019) Perturbed proximal primal–dual algorithm for nonconvex nonsmooth optimization. *Mathematical Programming* 176(1-2):207–245.

- Hong M (2016) Decomposing linearly constrained nonconvex problems by a proximal primal dual approach: algorithms, convergence, and applications. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1604.00543.pdf>.
- Hong M, Luo Z, Razaviyayn M (2016) Convergence analysis of alternating direction method of multipliers for a family of nonconvex problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 26(1):337–364.
- Huang Y, Lin Q (2023) Single-loop switching subgradient methods for non-smooth weakly convex optimization with non-smooth convex constraints. *Preprint, arXiv:2301.13314* URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2301.13314.pdf>.
- Jiang B, Lin T, Ma S, Zhang S (2019) Structured nonconvex and nonsmooth optimization: algorithms and iteration complexity analysis. *Computational Optimization and Applications* 72(1):115–157.
- Kong W, Melo JG, Monteiro RDC (2019) Complexity of a quadratic penalty accelerated inexact proximal point method for solving linearly constrained nonconvex composite programs. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 29(4):2566–2593.
- Kong W, Melo JG, Monteiro RDC (2023) Iteration complexity of a proximal augmented Lagrangian method for solving nonconvex composite optimization problems with nonlinear convex constraints. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 48(2):1066–1094.
- Lan G (2020) *First-order and stochastic optimization methods for machine learning*, volume 1 (Springer).
- Li H, Tian Y, Zhang J, Jadbabaie A (2021) Complexity lower bounds for nonconvex-strongly-concave min-max optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34:1792–1804.
- Li Z, Xu Y (2021) Augmented Lagrangian-based first-order methods for convex-constrained programs with weakly convex objective. *INFORMS Journal on Optimization* 3(4):373–397.
- Lin Q, Ma R, Xu Y (2022) Complexity of an inexact proximal-point penalty method for constrained smooth non-convex optimization. *Computational Optimization and Applications* 82(1):175–224.
- Lin T, Jin C, Jordan M (2020) On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 6083–6093 (PMLR).
- Liu W, Lin Q, Xu Y (2023a) First-order methods for affinely constrained composite non-convex non-smooth problems: Lower complexity bound and near-optimal methods. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2307.07605.pdf>.
- Liu W, Liu X, Chen X (2022) Linearly constrained nonsmooth optimization for training autoencoders. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 32(3):1931–1957.
- Liu W, Liu X, Chen X (2023b) An inexact augmented Lagrangian algorithm for training leaky ReLU neural network with group sparsity. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24(212):1–43.
- Lu S, Tsaknakis I, Hong M, Chen Y (2020) Hybrid block successive approximation for one-sided non-convex min-max problems: algorithms and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 68:3676–3691.
- Melo JG, Monteiro RDC (2017) Iteration-complexity of a Jacobi-type non-Euclidean ADMM for multi-block linearly constrained nonconvex programs. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1705.07229.pdf>.
- Melo JG, Monteiro RDC, Wang H (2020) Iteration-complexity of an inexact proximal accelerated augmented Lagrangian method for solving linearly constrained smooth nonconvex composite optimization problems URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2006.08048.pdf>.
- Murty KG, Kabadi SN (1985) Some NP-complete problems in quadratic and nonlinear programming. Technical report. URL <https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/6740/bam7058.0001.001.pdf?sequence=5>.
- Nemirovsky AS, Yudin DB (1983) *Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization* (Wiley-Interscience).
- Nesterov Y (2012) How to make the gradients small. *Optima. Mathematical Optimization Society Newsletter* (88):10–11.
- O’Neill M, Wright SJ (2021) A log-barrier Newton-CG method for bound constrained optimization with complexity guarantees. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* 41(1):84–121.
- Sahin MF, Eftekhari A, Alacaoglu A, Latorre F, Cevher V (2019) An inexact augmented Lagrangian framework for nonconvex optimization with nonlinear constraints. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 13965–13977.
- Sun H, Hong M (2019) Distributed non-convex first-order optimization and information processing: lower complexity bounds and rate optimal algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Signal processing* 67(22):5912–5928.
- Thekumparampil K, Jain P, Netrapalli P, Oh S (2019) Efficient algorithms for smooth minimax optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32.
- Xiao N, Liu X, Toh KC (2023) Dissolving constraints for Riemannian optimization. *Mathematics of Operations Research*. URL <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.2023.1360>.
- Xie Y, Wright SJ (2021) Complexity of proximal augmented Lagrangian for nonconvex optimization with nonlinear equality constraints. *Journal of Scientific Computing* 86:1–30.
- Xu Y (2017) Accelerated first-order primal-dual proximal methods for linearly constrained composite convex programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 27(3):1459–1484.
- Xu Y (2021) First-order methods for constrained convex programming based on linearized augmented Lagrangian function. *INFORMS Journal on Optimization* 3(1):89–117.
- Xu Y (2024) Decentralized gradient descent maximization method for composite nonconvex strongly-concave minimax problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 34(1):1006–1044.
- Xu Z, Zhang H, Xu Y, Lan G (2023) A unified single-loop alternating gradient projection algorithm for nonconvex–concave and convex–nonconcave minimax problems. *Mathematical Programming* 201(1):635–706.
- Yashtini M (2022) Convergence and rate analysis of a proximal linearized ADMM for nonconvex nonsmooth optimization. *Journal of Global Optimization* 84(4):913–939.
- Zhang J, Lin H, Jegelka S, Sra S, Jadbabaie S (2020) Complexity of finding stationary points of nonconvex nonsmooth functions. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 11173–11182 (PMLR).
- Zhang J, Luo Z (2020) A proximal alternating direction method of multiplier for linearly constrained nonconvex minimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 30(3):2272–2302.
- Zhang J, Luo Z (2022) A global dual error bound and its application to the analysis of linearly constrained nonconvex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 32(3):2319–2346.
- Zhang J, Pu W, Luo Z (2022) On the iteration complexity of smoothed proximal ALM for nonconvex optimization problem with convex constraints, URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2207.06304.pdf>.

- Zhang S, Yang J, Guzmán C, Kiyavash N, He N (2021) The complexity of nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax optimization. *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 482–492 (PMLR).
- Zhu Z, Chen F, Zhang J, Wen Z (2023) On the optimal lower and upper complexity bounds for a class of composite optimization problems. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2308.06470.pdf>.