

Convergence rates for an inexact linearized ADMM for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization with nonlinear equality constraints

Lahcen El Bourkhissi^{1†} and Ion Necoara^{1,2*†}

¹Automatic Control and Systems Engineering Department, National University of Science and Technology Politehnica Bucharest, 060042, Bucharest, Romania.

²Gheorghe Mihoc-Caius Iacob Institute of Mathematical Statistics and Applied Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, 050711, Bucharest, Romania.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): ion.necoara@upb.ro;

Contributing authors: lahcenelbourkhissi1997@gmail.com;

[†]The authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

In this paper, we consider nonconvex optimization problems with nonsmooth nonconvex objective function and nonlinear equality constraints. We assume that both the objective function and the functional constraints can be separated into 2 blocks. To solve this problem, we introduce a new inexact linearized alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) algorithm. Specifically, at each iteration, we linearize the smooth part of the objective function and the nonlinear part of the functional constraints within the augmented Lagrangian and add a dynamic quadratic regularization. We then compute the new iterate of the block associated with nonlinear constraints inexactly. This strategy yields subproblems that are easily solvable and their (inexact) solutions become the next iterates. Using Lyapunov arguments, we establish convergence guarantees for the iterates of our method toward an ϵ -first-order solution within $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ iterations. Moreover, we demonstrate that in cases where the problem data exhibit e.g., semi-algebraic properties or more general the KL condition, the entire sequence generated by our algorithm converges, and we provide convergence rates. To validate both the theory and the performance of our algorithm, we conduct numerical simulations for several nonlinear model predictive control and matrix factorization problems.

Keywords: Nonconvex optimization, linearized augmented Lagrangian method, alternating direction method of multipliers, convergence analysis.

1 Introduction

Many applications such as nonlinear model predictive control, state and parameter estimation of dynamical systems, training shallow neural networks, classification and signal processing can be formulated as the following structured nonsmooth nonconvex optimization problem with nonlinear equality constraints of the form (see for example [8, 12, 14, 23, 27]):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p} \quad & f(x) + g(x) + h(y) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & F(x) + Gy = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where \mathcal{Y} is a nonempty, closed subset of \mathbb{R}^p which admits an easy projection, the matrix $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$, the functions $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $h : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $F \triangleq (f_1, \dots, f_m)^T$, with $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, are nonlinear functions. We consider that f, h, f_i , for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, are continuously differentiable functions, f, h are possibly nonconvex and g is a proper lower semi-continuous and prox-bounded function relative to its domain $\text{dom} g$ (possibly nonconvex). Moreover, we assume that the problem is well-posed, i.e., the feasible set is nonempty and the optimal value is finite. Note that problem (1) is more general than the one considered e.g., in [8]; specifically, [8] can have constraints only on the block variables x , while we can impose constraints on both block variables x and y , respectively. Moreover, inequality constraints on x can be included in the function g using the indicator function. For example, any constrained composite optimization problem frequently appearing in optimal control [27]:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x) + h(F(x)) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad F(x) \in \mathcal{Y},$$

can be easily recast in the form of optimization problem (1) by defining $F(x) = y$, then $G = -I_m$ and g the indicator function of the set \mathcal{X} .

Related work. In this paper, we propose an augmented Lagrangian approach to address problem (1). The augmented Lagrangian method, or method of multipliers, was introduced in [17, 22] to minimize an objective function under equality constraints. It provides many theoretical advantages, even for non-convex problems (e.g., no duality gap and exact penalty representation), see [33]. In constrained optimization, the augmented Lagrangian approach has attracted considerable attention and has been widely studied for convex problems, for example in [1, 6, 21, 28, 30] and related references. More recently, researchers have extended this approach to non-convex problems, encompassing both smooth and non-smooth objectives with linear constraints, see for example [19, 23, 24, 31, 36, 40, 41]. However, there are very few studies on the use of the augmented Lagrangian framework for nonconvex optimization, where nonconvexity comes from constraints, e.g., [2, 8, 25, 39]. In particular, in [39], a proximal augmented Lagrangian (Proximal AL) algorithm is proposed to solve the problem (1);

in this method, a static proximal term is added to the original augmented Lagrangian function. It is proved that when an approximate first- (second-) order solution of the subproblem is found, then an ϵ first- (second-) order solution of the original problem (1) is obtained within $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{\eta-2})$ outer iterations, for some parameter $\eta \in [0, 2]$. Note that when η is close to 2, the efficiency is reduced to $\mathcal{O}(1)$ outer iterations, but the subproblem, which is already non-convex, becomes very ill-conditioned as the penalty parameter of the augmented Lagrangian is inversely proportional to ϵ^η .

On the other hand, when the optimization problem at hand possesses a specific structure, such as the separability discussed in this paper, it becomes feasible to leverage this inherent structure within the augmented Lagrangian framework. This approach leads to the well-known Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) (refer to [3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 15, 18, 40]). In particular, in [6], an ADMM method was introduced for solving a separable convex problem with linear constraints, and its asymptotic convergence was demonstrated. In [18], the authors established the convergence rate of an inexact ADMM, designed for solving a nonsmooth convex problem with linear constraints. It was proven that when the objective function is convex their method has complexity $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-0.5})$ in the strongly convex setting. Furthermore, [40] proposed a Proximal Linearized ADMM (PL-ADMM) to address nonsmooth nonconvex problems with linear equality constraints for two blocks. In this scenario, one block of the problem is smooth, and the other is nonsmooth. The PL-ADMM algorithm linearizes the smooth parts during each block update, incorporates a dynamic metric proximal term in the primal update, and includes an overrelaxation step in the dual update. Paper [40] demonstrated that each limit point of the sequence generated by this algorithm is a stationary point of the original problem. Additionally, it was shown that under the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz (KL) property, the method converges either in a finite number of iterations, sublinearly, or linearly, depending on the exponent associated with the KL condition.

However, for nonconvex problems with nonlinear equality constraints, limited research has been conducted, specifically in [3, 8, 9]. In [3], the authors addressed a special case of problem (1) ($g = 0$, $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $G = -I$, where I denotes the identity matrix of appropriate dimension), proving that when the primal iterates are approximate stationary points of the augmented Lagrangian function, each limit point is a first-order solution of the problem. Furthermore, it was demonstrated that, under KL, the entire sequence generated by their method converges to a first-order solution of the problem. Further, in [8], the authors proposed an augmented Lagrangian-based method to tackle the problem considered in this paper (with $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^n$) and under similar assumptions as ours. In this algorithm, the authors linearized the smooth part of the augmented Lagrangian function and added a dynamic quadratic regularization term, proving the convergence of the iterates of their method to a KKT point of problem (1) under the KL property. Furthermore, [20] considered nonconvex composite functional optimization problems. To handle this structure, the authors introduced a slack variable, leading to a problem of the form (1), where the function associated with the slack variable is lower semicontinuous and G is given by $-I_m$. In contrast, in our case h is smooth and \mathcal{Y} satisfies Assumption 2, while G is a general full row rank matrix (see Section 2). The authors in [20] then applied an ADMM scheme to solve the

reformulated problem, where each iteration involves linearizing the smooth component of the augmented Lagrangian function, leading to proximal updates at each step of the algorithm. Under the assumption that the dual multipliers remain bounded (as also assumed in this paper), their method achieves an ϵ -first-order solution within $\mathcal{O}(\rho^2/\epsilon^2)$ iterations. However, to ensure that the iterates remain ϵ -feasible after a certain number of iterations, the penalty parameter must satisfy $\rho \geq \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$. Consequently, based on the proof of Theorem 2 in [20], the overall complexity of their method ultimately reaches $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$. Finally, in [9], the authors considered a special case of problem (1) ($h = 0$, $G = -I$, while \mathcal{Y} is a general set). The authors proposed an augmented Lagrangian method with a variable penalty parameter proving that when the primal iterates are approximate stationary points of the augmented Lagrangian function and the dual updates are projected onto some compact set, each limit point is a stationary point of the feasible problem and no connection to KKT points could be established.

Contributions: Our approach, the inexact linearized ADMM, addresses several key limitations present in previous works. Notably, in [3, 9, 39], high computational costs are required for solving the nonconvex subproblems. In [6, 18, 40], only linear constraints were considered. Furthermore, in [8], no information about the Hessian of the augmented term is used, resulting in a low-quality approximation, and no constraints on the second block variables are allowed. Finally, although [9] considers a general set \mathcal{Y} , this leads to weak convergence results. Specifically, our main contributions are:

(i) At each iteration, we linearize the smooth part of the cost function and the nonlinear part of the functional constraints in the augmented Lagrangian function. Additionally, we introduce a dynamic regularization term. Furthermore, we solve the block associated with nonlinear constraints inexactly. This gives rise to a new algorithm, named the inexact Linearized ADMM (iL-ADMM) method, which, at each iteration, requires solving simple subproblems that are easy to address.

(ii) Nonlinearity in the constraints related to one block of variables in problem (1) introduces nontrivial challenges compared to the linear constraints case. More specifically, the usual ADMM algorithm developed originally for linear constraints must be properly modified and consequently a new convergence analysis is required. We provide rigorous proofs, based on Lyapunov function arguments, of global asymptotic convergence, proving that the iterates converge to a critical point of the augmented Lagrangian function. Additionally, our method guarantees convergence to an ϵ -first-order solution of the original problem in at most $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ iterations.

(iii) Under the (KL) property, which holds e.g., for semi-algebraic functions, we demonstrate the convergence of the entire sequence generated by our algorithm and derive improved convergence rates that depend on the KL parameter.

In comparison with [39], our approach effectively utilize the unique structure of the problem, particularly its separability. When comparing the complexity of the subproblems, the algorithms in [3, 39] is difficult to implement in practice due to their highly nonconvexity caused by the presence of nonlinear constraints in the subproblem from each iteration. Moreover, unlike [6, 18, 40], our iL-ADMM method can handle nonlinear equality constraints. Furthermore, unlike [8], our method uses a Gauss-Newton

approach to retain some information about the Hessian of the augmented term making use of only first-order derivatives. Finally, we compare the efficiency of our method with IPOPT [38] and the augmented Lagrangian method in [8] to solve nonlinear model predictive control and matrix factorization problems using real systems and datasets, respectively. This paper represents an extension of our earlier work [11]. The extension involves examining the impact of inexactness in solving the subproblem associated with the first block of the primal variables, diverging from the exact solution approach in [11]. Furthermore, we delve into the convergence rate analysis under general or KL conditions, in contrast to [11], which focused solely on proving asymptotic convergence. Additionally, our study incorporates more numerical tests.

The paper is structured as follows. In the next section, we introduce some mathematical preliminaries, in section 3 we present the iL-ADMM method followed in section 4 by its convergence analysis. Finally, section 5 presents detailed numerical results.

2 Preliminaries

We use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the 2–norm of a vector or of a matrix, respectively. For a differentiable function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $\nabla\phi(x) \in \mathbb{R}^l$ its gradient at a point x . For a differentiable function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, we denote its Jacobian at a given point x by $\nabla F(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Furthermore, $\partial g(x)$ refers to the limiting subdifferential of a proper, lsc function g , and $\partial^\infty g(x)$ refers to the horizon subdifferential. For more details about the subdifferential of nonsmooth nonconvex functions, we refer to [33]. Moreover, $N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)$ denotes the normal cone at $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ associated to the set \mathcal{Y} and \mathbb{Z}_+ is used to denote the set of positive integers. We further introduce the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} l_f(x; \bar{x}) &:= f(\bar{x}) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}), x - \bar{x} \rangle & \forall x, \bar{x}, \\ l_h(y; \bar{y}) &:= h(\bar{y}) + \langle \nabla h(\bar{y}), y - \bar{y} \rangle & \forall y, \bar{y}, \\ l_F(x; \bar{x}) &:= F(\bar{x}) + \nabla F(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) & \forall x, \bar{x}. \end{aligned}$$

A point $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p$ is said to be feasible for (1) if $(x^*, y^*) \in \text{dom } g \times \mathcal{Y}$ and $F(x^*) + Gy^* = 0$. Let us introduce the definition of a KKT point of problem (1) and motivate why we are interested in designing algorithms that yield such points.

Definition 1. [KKT and ϵ -KKT points] *The vector $(x^*, y^*) \in \text{dom } g \times \mathcal{Y}$ is said to be a KKT point of problem (1) (equivalently, first-order solution of problem (1)) if $\exists \lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that the following conditions are satisfied:*

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla f(x^*) - \nabla F(x^*)^T \lambda^* &\in \partial g(x^*), & 0 \in \nabla h(y^*) + G^T \lambda^* + N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y^*), \\ F(x^*) + Gy^* &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, let $\epsilon > 0$. The vector $(x_\epsilon^*, y_\epsilon^*) \in \text{dom } g \times \mathcal{Y}$ is said to be an ϵ -KKT point of problem (1) (equivalently, ϵ -first-order solution of problem (1)) if $\exists \lambda_\epsilon^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist} \left(-\nabla f(x_\epsilon^*) - \nabla F(x_\epsilon^*)^T \lambda_\epsilon^*, \partial g(x_\epsilon^*) \right) &\leq \epsilon, & \text{dist} \left(-\nabla h(y_\epsilon^*) - G^T \lambda_\epsilon^*, N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_\epsilon^*) \right) &\leq \epsilon, \\ \|F(x_\epsilon^*) + G y_\epsilon^*\| &\leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we present a constraint qualification condition for (1) at a feasible point (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) .

Definition 2. [Constraint Qualification (CQ)] Let (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) be a feasible point for problem (1). The pair (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) is regular if the following constraint qualification conditions hold:

- (i) $\partial^\infty g(\bar{x}) \cap \text{range}(\nabla F(\bar{x})^T) = \{0\}$.
- (ii) $N_{\mathcal{Y}}(\bar{y}) \cap \text{range}(G^T) = \{0\}$.

Next lemma shows why KKT points are interesting to us (its proof can be found in [26](Proposition 6.9)).

Lemma 1. [Local minima + CQ = KKT points] Let $(x^*, y^*) \in \text{dom } g \times \mathcal{Y}$ be a local minimizer of problem (1), which satisfies CQ. Then, (x^*, y^*) is a KKT point of (1).

Lemma 1 shows that the KKT conditions are necessary for local minimizers, provided that some constraint qualification conditions hold at those points. This is the primary motivation for designing algorithms that converge to KKT points. The convergence analysis of this paper will show that the limit points of the iterates generated by our algorithm proposed in Section 3 are KKT points, which, according to the previous lemma, may be local minima, provided that the constraint qualification from Definition 2 holds at such points. However, for the convergence analysis conducted in the next sections, we only consider the following assumptions:

Assumption 1. Given the compact sets $\mathcal{S}_x \subseteq \text{dom } g$ and $\mathcal{S}_y \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$, there exist positive constants σ, L_f, L_h, L_F such that the functions f, h and F satisfy the following conditions for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{S}_x$ and for all $y, y' \in \mathcal{S}_y$:

- (i) $\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(x')\| \leq L_f \|x - x'\|$,
- (ii) $\|\nabla h(y) - \nabla h(y')\| \leq L_h \|y - y'\|$,
- (iii) $\|\nabla F(x) - \nabla F(x')\|_2 \leq L_F \|x - x'\|$,
- (iv) $\sigma_{\min}(G) \geq \sigma$.

An immediate consequence of the above assumption is that if Assumption 1 is satisfied on the compact sets $\mathcal{S}_x, \mathcal{S}_y$, then there exist positive constants M_h, M_F such that the functions h and F satisfy the following conditions for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{S}_x \times \mathcal{S}_y$ (a given compact set):

$$\|\nabla h(y)\| \leq M_h, \quad \|\nabla F(x)\|_2 \leq M_F. \quad (2)$$

Note that these assumptions are standard in nonconvex optimization, see e.g., [8, 39]. In fact, it covers a large class of problems; more precisely, (i) and (ii) hold if f and h are smooth on a neighborhood of \mathcal{S}_x and \mathcal{S}_y , respectively. Similarly, (iii) is valid if F is smooth on a neighborhood of \mathcal{S}_x . Note that these assumptions are not very restrictive because they are satisfied locally for any $f, h, F \in \mathcal{C}^2$. Moreover, assumption (iv) is equivalent to the matrix G having full row rank. In addition, the structure in the problem (1) allows us to make more relaxed assumptions compared to problems without any linear part in the functional constraints. For example, instead of

assuming that the Jacobian of the nonlinear functional constraints satisfies the Linear Independence Constraint Qualification (LICQ) on a given set, which is difficult to check, (see e.g., [39]), our assumption (iv) asks a simple and easily verifiable condition only on the matrix G corresponding to the block of the decision variables y .

For this structured problem, one can develop pure augmented Lagrangian-based algorithms with simple subproblems (see our algorithm below). We further introduce the following notations:

$$\psi_\rho(x, y, \lambda) = f(x) + \langle \lambda, F(x) + Gy \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x) + Gy\|^2.$$

The gradient of ψ_ρ is given by:

$$\begin{cases} \nabla_x \psi_\rho(x, y, \lambda) = \nabla f(x) + \nabla F(x)^T (\lambda + \rho(F(x) + Gy)), \\ \nabla_y \psi_\rho(x, y, \lambda) = G^T (\lambda + \rho(F(x) + Gy)), \\ \nabla_\lambda \psi_\rho(x, y, \lambda) = F(x) + Gy. \end{cases}$$

Remark 1. Note that if Assumption 1 holds on a compact set $\mathcal{S}_x \times \mathcal{S}_y \subseteq \text{dom } g \times \mathcal{Y}$, then for any ball $\mathbb{B}_r \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ centered at zero with radius $0 \leq r < \infty$, the function ψ_ρ has Lipschitz continuous gradient on the compact set $\mathcal{S}_x \times \mathcal{S}_y \times \mathbb{B}_r$ with Lipschitz constant (see Lemma 4.1 in [8]):

$$L_\psi = L_f + \sup_{(x, y, \lambda) \in \mathcal{S}_x \times \mathcal{S}_y \times \mathbb{B}_r} \{L_F \|\lambda + \rho(F(x) + Gy)\|\} + (M_F + \|G\|)(2 + \rho(M_F + \|G\|)).$$

Let us now define the Hausdorff distance between two bounded sets, which will be used in our convergence analysis.

Definition 3 (Hausdorff distance [10]). Given two bounded sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, the Hausdorff distance between A and B is defined as:

$$\text{dist}_H(A, B) := \max \left\{ \sup_{a \in A} \text{dist}(a, B), \sup_{b \in B} \text{dist}(A, b) \right\},$$

where $\text{dist}(a, B) = \inf_{b \in B} \|a - b\|$ and $\text{dist}(A, b) = \inf_{a \in A} \|a - b\|$.

Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ be a nonempty closed set. We denote a space of nonempty bounded subsets of the normal cones of \mathcal{Y} as follows:

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{Y}} := \{ \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) \mid \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) \subset N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y), \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) \text{ bounded}, y \in \mathcal{Y} \},$$

where $N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)$ is the normal cone to \mathcal{Y} at y . For example, for a general set \mathcal{Y} and for a given $r > 0$, we can define:

$$\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) = N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) \cap \mathbb{B}_r \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbb{B}_r \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ denotes the ball centered at zero with radius r , and then:

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{Y}} := \{ N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) \cap \mathbb{B}_r \mid y \in \mathcal{Y} \}.$$

Moreover, if \mathcal{Y} is a differentiable manifold, i.e., $\mathcal{Y} := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^p | H(y) = 0\}$, where $H : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ is a continuously differentiable function with its Jacobian having full row rank on \mathcal{Y} , then its normal cone is described by $N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^p | w = \nabla H(y)^T \lambda, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^q\}$ and we can define:

$$\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^p | w = \nabla H(y)^T \lambda, \lambda \in \mathbb{B}_r\} \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad (4)$$

and then:

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{Y}} := \{\{\nabla H(y)^T \lambda, \lambda \in \mathbb{B}_r\} \mid y \in \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

We equip such a space $\Sigma_{\mathcal{Y}}$ with the metric given by the Hausdorff distance. Then, in the sequel, we also impose the following restriction on the set \mathcal{Y} :

Assumption 2. *We assume that the set \mathcal{Y} admits a Lipschitz continuous normal cone mapping, i.e., for $\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\cdot)$ either of the form (3) or (4), there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that:*

$$\text{dist}_H(\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y), \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y')) \leq \kappa \|y - y'\| \quad \forall y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

Below, we provide some examples when Assumption 2 holds.

Lemma 2. *[Sets with Lipschitz continuous normal cones] For any set of the form $\mathcal{Y} := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^p | H(y) = 0\}$, where $H : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ has the Jacobian, ∇H , Lipschitz continuous and, additionally, it is of full row rank on \mathcal{Y} , the normal cone mapping $y \mapsto \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}} = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^p | w = \nabla H(y)^T \lambda, \lambda \in \mathbb{B}_r\}$ is Lipschitz continuous for any $r > 0$. In particular, the full space \mathbb{R}^p , any affine subspace or sphere yield Lipschitz continuous normal cone mappings $\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\cdot)$, for both (3) and (4).*

Proof. Let H have the Jacobian Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant $L_H > 0$ and, additionally, the Jacobian has full row rank on \mathcal{Y} . Then, the tangent and normal cones of \mathcal{Y} at a given point $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $T_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)$ and $N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)$, are defined as:

$$T_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^p | \nabla H(y)v = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^p | w = \nabla H(y)^T \lambda, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^q\},$$

respectively. Further, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}_H(\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y), \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y')) \\ &= \max \left\{ \sup_{a \in \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)} \text{dist}_H(a, \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y')), \sup_{b \in \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y')} \text{dist}_H(\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y), b) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the Jacobian has full row rank and $r > 0$, we have from (4):

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{a \in \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)} \text{dist}_H(a, \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y')) \\ &= \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{B}_r} \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{B}_r} \|\nabla H(y)^T \lambda - \nabla H(y')^T \theta\| \\ &= \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{B}_r} \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{B}_r} \|(\nabla H(y) - \nabla H(y'))^T \lambda + \nabla H(y')^T (\lambda - \theta)\| \\ &\leq \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{B}_r} \left(\|(\nabla H(y) - \nabla H(y'))^T \lambda\| + \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{B}_r} \|\nabla H(y')^T (\lambda - \theta)\| \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{B}_r} \| (\nabla H(y) - \nabla H(y'))^T \lambda \| \\
&\leq \| \nabla H(y) - \nabla H(y') \| \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{B}_r} \| \lambda \| \\
&\leq L_H \| y - y' \| r = \kappa \| y - y' \|,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa = L_H \times r$. Similarly, by symmetry arguments, we have:

$$\sup_{b \in \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y')} \text{dist}_H(\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y), b) \leq \kappa \| y - y' \|.$$

Hence, there exists $\kappa = r \times L_H > 0$ such that:

$$\text{dist}_H(\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y), \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y')) \leq \kappa \| y - y' \| \quad \forall y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

Since affine subspaces and spheres are special cases of the set $\mathcal{Y} = \{y | H(y) = 0\}$, from the proof above it follows that the corresponding normal cone mapping $\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)$ defined by (4) is Lipschitz continuous. On the other hand, for $\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)$ defined in (3), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{full space } (\mathbb{R}^p) : \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) &= N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) = \{0\}, \\
\text{affine subspace } (Ay = b) : \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) &= \{A^T \lambda \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^q\} \cap \mathbb{B}_r, \\
\text{sphere } (\|y\|^2 = 1) : \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) &= \{\lambda y \mid \lambda \geq 0\} \cap \mathbb{B}_r,
\end{aligned}$$

and then using similar argument as above, the second claim follows. \square

The reader may find other examples of sets \mathcal{Y} satisfying Assumption 2. Let us also introduce the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz (KL) property, which will lead to improvements in the convergence rates of our algorithm. Let $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ be a proper lsc function. For $-\infty < \tau_1 < \tau_2 \leq +\infty$, we define $[\tau_1 < \Phi < \tau_2] = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \tau_1 < \Phi(x) < \tau_2\}$. Denote Ψ_τ the set of all continuous concave functions $\varphi : [0, \tau] \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that $\varphi(0) = 0$ and φ is continuously differentiable on $(0, \tau)$, with $\varphi'(s) > 0$ over $(0, \tau)$.

Definition 4. Let $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ be a proper lower semicontinuous function that takes constant value on a set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. We say that Φ satisfies the KL property on Ω if there exists $\epsilon > 0, \tau > 0$, and $\varphi \in \Psi_\tau$ such that for every $x^* \in \Omega$ and any x in the intersection $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \text{dist}(x, \Omega) < \epsilon\} \cap [\Phi(x^*) < \Phi(x) < \Phi(x^*) + \tau]$, we have:

$$\varphi'(\Phi(x) - \Phi(x^*)) \text{dist}(0, \partial\Phi(x)) \geq 1.$$

The KL property holds for a large class of functions including semi-algebraic functions (e.g., real polynomial functions), vector or matrix (semi)norms (e.g., $\|\cdot\|_p$ with $p \geq 0$ rational number), logarithm functions, exponential functions and uniformly convex functions, see [4] for a comprehensive list. For the rest of this paper, we use the following notation:

$$l_{\psi_\rho}(x, \bar{y}, \bar{\lambda}; \bar{x}) := \psi_\rho(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{\lambda}) + \langle \nabla \psi_\rho(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{\lambda}), x - \bar{x} \rangle \quad \forall x, \bar{x}.$$

The augmented Lagrangian associated with (1) is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_\rho(x, y, \lambda) &= f(x) + g(x) + h(y) + \langle \lambda, F(x) + Gy \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x) + Gy\|^2 \\ &= g(x) + h(y) + \psi_\rho(x, y, \lambda).\end{aligned}$$

Given a pair (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) , we introduce the following linearized augmented Lagrangian:

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x, y, \lambda; \bar{x}, \bar{y}) = l_f(x; \bar{x}) + g(x) + l_h(y; \bar{y}) + \langle \lambda, l_F(x; \bar{x}) + Gy \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|l_F(x; \bar{x}) + Gy\|^2.$$

Note that this approximation, $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho$, of the true augmented Lagrangian, \mathcal{L}_ρ , retains curvature information from F through the term $\nabla F^T \nabla F$.

3 A new Inexact Linearized ADMM algorithm

In this section, we propose an augmented Lagrangian-based method (Algorithm 1), which shares similarities with the approach introduced in [8], albeit featuring a distinctive update for the primal variables (refer to Steps 4 and 5 below). While [8] linearizes the smooth part of the augmented Lagrangian function, ψ_ρ , with respect to x and incorporates a dynamic quadratic regularization term, our methodology adopts a Gauss-Newton type approach; linearizing the nonlinear functional constraint F within ψ_ρ . This choice enhances the accuracy of our model's approximation to the original augmented Lagrangian function compared to the method in [8]. The reason being, the linearization technique used in [8] neglects curvature information about the nonlinear constraints F , whereas our algorithm leverages (partial) curvature information from F through the term $\nabla F^T \nabla F$ present in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho$. This improved approximation of the augmented Lagrangian not only provides theoretical advantages but also demonstrates practical implications, as demonstrated in our numerical simulations. Furthermore, in our approach, we solve the subproblem in Step 4 inexactly, diverging from [8], where an exact solution is sought. Additionally, the regularization in Step 5 is dynamically chosen in our case, in contrast to [8], where it is static, and additionally, we allow explicit constraints on y .

Note that the dominant steps in Algorithm 1 are Step 4 and Step 5, as the former involves the nonsmooth function g in addition to a quadratic term. When g is convex or weakly convex, the objective function of the subproblem in Step 4 is strongly convex. In contrast, Step 5 involves projecting onto the set \mathcal{Y} , which may be nonconvex. However, when \mathcal{Y} is convex, the objective function of the subproblem in Step 5 of Algorithm 1 is always a strongly convex quadratic function, even if h is nonconvex. The dual variables are updated in Step 6 using the conventional update of the dual multipliers in traditional augmented Lagrangian-based methods, see [33]. Before proceeding, we introduce an assumption about the sequence of iterates generated by Algorithm 1, which will play a crucial role in the subsequent convergence analysis.

Assumption 3. *The sequence $\{(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ generated by Algorithm 1 is bounded.*

This assumption is standard in the context of nonconvex nonsmooth optimization, see e.g., [3, 8, 20]. Boundedness of the primal iterates can be ensured e.g., if $\text{dom } g$ and \mathcal{Y}

Algorithm 1 Inexact Linearized ADMM (iL-ADMM)

- 1: **Initialization:** x_0, y_0, λ_0 and $\rho, \theta_0, \beta_0, \alpha > 0$
- 2: $k \leftarrow 0$
- 3: **while** stopping criterion is not satisfied **do**
- 4: generate a proximal parameter $\beta_{k+1} \geq \beta_0$ such that

$$x_{k+1} \approx \arg \min_x \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x, y_k, \lambda_k; x_k, y_k) + \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|x - x_k\|^2$$

satisfies an inexact stationary condition and a descent:

$$\exists s_{k+1} \in \partial_x \left(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x, y_k, \lambda_k; x_k, y_k) + \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|x - x_k\|^2 \right) \Big|_{x=x_{k+1}}$$

such that

$$\|s_{k+1}\| \leq \alpha \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|, \quad (5)$$

$$\psi_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k) - l_{\psi_\rho}(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k; x_k) \leq \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{4} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2. \quad (6)$$

- 5: generate a proximal parameter $\theta_{k+1} \geq \theta_0$ such that

$$y_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y, \lambda_k; x_{k+1}, y_k) + \frac{\theta_{k+1}}{2} \|y - y_k\|^2$$

satisfies the following inequality:

$$h(y_{k+1}) - l_h(y_{k+1}; y_k) \leq \frac{\theta_{k+1}}{4} \|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2. \quad (7)$$

- 6: Update

$$\lambda_{k+1} \leftarrow \lambda_k + \rho (F(x_{k+1}) + G y_{k+1}).$$

- 7: $k \leftarrow k + 1$
 - 8: **end while**
-

are bounded sets or the augmented Lagrangian function is coercive or level bounded. However, proving boundedness of the dual iterates in the nonconvex setting remains an open question as pointed out in [20].

Note that β_k and θ_k in Algorithm 1 are well defined since ψ_ρ and h are smooth functions according to Assumption 1. To determine these regularization parameters, one approach is to use a backtracking scheme, as described in Algorithm 2 in [8].

Remark 2. *If Assumption 3 holds and Assumption 1 is satisfied on a compact set containing the iterates, then ψ_ρ and h are smooth functions on this compact set. Consequently, for any $k \geq 0$, it is always possible to determine β_{k+1} and θ_{k+1} that satisfy*

(6) and (7), respectively. Moreover, we have:

$$\beta := \sup_{k \geq 1} \beta_k \leq 2L_\psi, \quad \theta := \sup_{k \geq 1} \theta_k \leq 2L_h. \quad (8)$$

Remark 3. Note that any descent algorithm, initialized at the current iterate x_k , applied for solving the simple (possibly nonconvex) subproblem in Step 4 can always ensure the descent:

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k; x_k, y_k) + \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \leq \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k; x_k, y_k). \quad (9)$$

Hence, in the sequel we assume that x_{k+1} automatically satisfies the descent (9), besides the conditions (5) and (6). It is also worth mentioning that we can also impose other definitions for inexactness, e.g., one can replace the condition (5) with the following one: choose $\beta_{k+1} > \alpha$ such that

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k; x_k, y_k) + \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \leq \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k; x_k, y_k) + \frac{\alpha}{4} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2.$$

Our convergence results are also valid under this inexact setting. Let us denote the difference of the steps in x, y and λ , for all $k \geq 1$ as:

$$\Delta x_k = x_k - x_{k-1}, \quad \Delta y_k = y_k - y_{k-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta \lambda_k = \lambda_k - \lambda_{k-1}.$$

4 Convergence analysis for iL-ADMM

In this section, we first derive the asymptotic convergence, then first-order complexity and finally improved rates under the KL condition for the proposed scheme iL-ADMM (Algorithm 1).

4.1 Asymptotic convergence

First, let us derive the asymptotic convergence of iL-ADMM. We start proving the decrease with respect to the first argument of the augmented Lagrangian function.

Lemma 3. [Descent of \mathcal{L}_ρ w.r.t. the first block of primal variables] Let $\{(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. If Assumption 3 holds and Assumption 1 is satisfied on a compact set where the iterates belong to, then we have the following descent for \mathcal{L}_ρ w.r.t. x :

$$\mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k) \leq \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k) - \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{4} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

Proof. From the definition of x_{k+1} and (9), we have:

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k; x_k, y_k) + \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \leq \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k; x_k, y_k) = \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k).$$

Further, from definition of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho$ and \mathcal{L}_ρ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & l_f(x_{k+1}; x_k) + g(x_{k+1}) + \langle \lambda_k, l_F(x_{k+1}; x_k) \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|l_F(x_{k+1}; x_k) + Gy_k\|^2 \\ & \leq f(x_k) + g(x_k) + \langle \lambda_k, F(x_k) \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_k) + Gy_k\|^2 - \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the above inequality, it follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & g(x_{k+1}) - g(x_k) \\ & \leq -\langle \nabla f(x_k), \Delta x_{k+1} \rangle - \langle \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1}, \lambda_k \rangle - \frac{\rho}{2} \langle \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1}, 2(F(x_k) + Gy_k) \rangle \\ & \quad - \frac{\rho}{2} \langle \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1}, \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1} \rangle - \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 \\ & = -\langle \nabla f(x_k) + \nabla F(x_k)^T (\lambda_k + \rho(F(x_k) + Gy_k)), \Delta x_{k+1} \rangle \\ & \quad - \frac{\rho}{2} \|\nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 \\ & \leq -\langle \nabla_x \psi_\rho(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k), \Delta x_{k+1} \rangle - \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Using the definitions of \mathcal{L}_ρ and ψ_ρ , we further obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k) - \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k) \\ & = g(x_{k+1}) - g(x_k) + \psi_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k) - \psi_\rho(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k) \\ & \stackrel{(6),(10)}{\leq} -\frac{\beta_{k+1}}{4} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This proves our statement. \square

Let us now prove the decrease with respect to the second argument, y , for the augmented Lagrangian function.

Lemma 4. *[Descent of \mathcal{L}_ρ w.r.t. second block of primal variables] Let $\{(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. If Assumption 3 holds and Assumption 1 is satisfied on a compact set where the iterates belong to, then we have the following descent for \mathcal{L}_ρ w.r.t. y for all $k \geq 0$:*

$$\mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) \leq \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k) - \frac{\theta_{k+1}}{4} \|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2.$$

Proof. Using the definition of \mathcal{L}_ρ and the optimality conditions for y_{k+1} , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k; x_k, y_k) + \frac{\theta_{k+1}}{2} \|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2 & \leq \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k; x_k, y_k) \\ & = \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k). \end{aligned}$$

Or, we have:

$$\mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) + l_h(y_{k+1}; y_k) = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k; x_k, y_k) + h(y_{k+1}).$$

Then, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) - \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k) &\leq h(y_{k+1}) - l_h(y_{k+1}; y_k) - \frac{\theta_{k+1}}{2} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(7)}{\leq} -\frac{\theta_{k+1}}{4} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes our proof. \square

Let us now bound the dual variables by the primal variables.

Lemma 5. [Bound for $\|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|$] Let $\{(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. If Assumptions 2 and 3 hold and Assumption 1 is satisfied on a compact set where the iterates belong to, then there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that:

$$\|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2 \leq 2 \frac{(\theta_{k+1} + \kappa)^2}{\sigma^2} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 + 2 \frac{(\theta_k + L_h)^2}{\sigma^2} \|\Delta y_k\|^2. \quad (11)$$

Proof. First, using the optimality condition for y_{k+1} combined with the update in Step 6 of Algorithm 1, we get:

$$-\nabla h(y_k) - G^T \lambda_{k+1} - \theta_{k+1} \Delta y_{k+1} \in N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_{k+1}). \quad (12)$$

By replacing k with $k - 1$, we obtain:

$$-\nabla h(y_{k-1}) - G^T \lambda_k - \theta_k \Delta y_k \in N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_k). \quad (13)$$

Moreover, using Assumptions 1 and 3, it follows that $\theta_k \leq \theta$ from (8) and there exists a constant $0 < R < \infty$ such that:

$$\|-\nabla h(y_{k-1}) - G^T \lambda_k - \theta_k \Delta y_k\| \leq R \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (14)$$

Since \mathcal{Y} satisfies Assumption 2, it follows that there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}_H(\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_k), \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_{k+1})) \leq \kappa \|y_{k+1} - y_k\| \quad \forall k \geq 1, \quad (15)$$

where $\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)$ is defined either in (3) or (4). Note that, if $\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)$ is defined by (3), i.e.:

$$\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) = N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) \cap \mathbb{B}_R,$$

with R given in (14), we always have

$$-\nabla h(y_{k-1}) - G^T \lambda_k - \theta_k \Delta y_k \in \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_k) \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (16)$$

On the other hand, if $\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)$ is defined by (4), i.e.:

$$\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) = \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}^p \mid w = \nabla H(y)^T \lambda, \lambda \in \mathbb{B}_{\frac{R}{\sigma_H}} \right\},$$

with R given in (14) and $\sigma_H > 0$ satisfying $\sigma_H \|\lambda\| \leq \|\nabla H(y)^T \lambda\|$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we have

$$-\nabla h(y_{k-1}) - G^T \lambda_k - \theta_k \Delta y_k \in \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_k) \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (17)$$

In conclusion, from (16) and (17) and the definition of the Hausdorff distance, we have for any $k \geq 1$:

$$\|\nabla h(y_k) - \nabla h(y_{k-1}) + G^T \Delta \lambda_{k+1} + \theta_{k+1} \Delta y_{k+1} - \theta_k \Delta y_k\| \leq \text{dist}_H(\bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_k), \bar{N}_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_{k+1})).$$

Using (15) and the triangle inequality, it follows that:

$$\|G^T \Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| \leq \kappa \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \|\nabla h(y_k) - \nabla h(y_{k-1})\| + \theta_{k+1} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \theta_k \|\Delta y_k\|.$$

Moreover, since h is smooth, we obtain:

$$\|G^T \Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| \leq (\kappa + \theta_{k+1}) \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + (L_h + \theta_k) \|\Delta y_k\|.$$

Further, using Assumption 1, we get $\forall k \geq 1$:

$$\|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \left((\kappa + \theta_{k+1}) \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + (\theta_k + L_h) \|\Delta y_k\| \right). \quad (18)$$

Since $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$, we finally get (11). \square

Our convergence proofs use control theoretic tools such as Lyapunov functions. For our algorithm we define the following Lyapunov function inspired from [39] (see also [8]):

$$P(x, y, \lambda, \bar{y}, \gamma) = \mathcal{L}_\rho(x, y, \lambda) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|y - \bar{y}\|^2, \quad (19)$$

with $\gamma > 0$ to be defined later. The evaluation of the Lyapunov function along the iterates of Algorithm 1 is denoted by:

$$P_k = P(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k, y_{k-1}, \gamma_k) \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (20)$$

In the following lemma, we prove that the Lyapunov function (19) decreases along the trajectory generated by iL-ADMM, i.e., $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a decreasing sequence.

Lemma 6. *[Decrease] Let $\{(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. If Assumptions 2 and 3 hold and Assumption 1 is satisfied on a compact set where the*

iterates belong to. Choosing

$$\rho \geq 32 \frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\theta_0 \sigma^2}, \quad \gamma_k = \frac{\theta_k}{4}, \quad (21)$$

then the Lyapunov function decreases along the iterates according to the following formula:

$$P_{k+1} - P_k \leq -\frac{\beta_{k+1}}{4} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\theta_{k+1}}{16} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\theta_k}{16} \|\Delta y_k\|^2 \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (22)$$

Proof. Using the definition of P_k in (20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{k+1} - P_k \\ &= \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) - \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) + \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_k) - \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k) \\ & \quad + \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_k, \lambda_k) - \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k) + \frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{2} \|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|y_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{4} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\theta_{k+1} - 2\gamma_{k+1}}{4} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|\Delta y_k\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where the inequality follows from Lemmas 3, 4 and from the update of the dual multipliers in Step 6 of Algorithm 1. Now, using the inequality (11) in (23), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{k+1} - P_k & \leq -\frac{\beta_{k+1}}{4} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{4} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\gamma_k}{4} \|\Delta y_k\|^2 \\ & \quad - \left(\frac{\theta_{k+1} - 3\gamma_{k+1}}{4} - \frac{2(\theta_{k+1} + \kappa)^2}{\rho \sigma^2} \right) \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 - \left(\frac{\gamma_k}{4} - \frac{2(\theta_k + L_h)^2}{\rho \sigma^2} \right) \|\Delta y_k\|^2 \\ & \stackrel{(21)}{\leq} -\frac{\beta_{k+1}}{4} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\theta_{k+1}}{16} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\theta_k}{16} \|\Delta y_k\|^2 \\ & \quad - \left(\frac{\theta_{k+1}}{16} - \frac{2(\theta_{k+1} + \kappa)^2}{\rho \sigma^2} \right) \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 - \left(\frac{\theta_k}{16} - \frac{2(\theta_k + L_h)^2}{\rho \sigma^2} \right) \|\Delta y_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\theta_0 \leq \theta_k \leq 2L_h$, $\forall k \geq 1$, then by choosing ρ as in (21), the decrease in (22) follows. \square

Before proving the global convergence for the iterates generated by Algorithm 1, let us first bound $\partial \mathcal{L}_\rho$. Here, $\partial \mathcal{L}_\rho$ denotes the limiting subdifferential of \mathcal{L}_ρ .

Lemma 7. [Bound for $\partial \mathcal{L}_\rho$] Let $\{z_k := (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. If Assumption 3 holds and Assumption 1 is satisfied on a compact set where the iterates belong to, then there exists $v_{k+1} \in \partial \mathcal{L}_\rho(z_{k+1})$ satisfying:

$$\|v_{k+1}\| \leq c \|z_{k+1} - z_k\| \quad k \geq 1,$$

where $c = L_\psi + \beta + \alpha + \rho M_F^2 + L_h + \theta + \|G\| + \rho^{-1}$.

Proof. We note that for every $v_{k+1} = (v_{k+1}^x, v_{k+1}^y, v_{k+1}^\lambda) \in \partial \mathcal{L}_\rho(z_{k+1})$, we have

$$v_{k+1}^x \in \partial_x \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) = \partial g(x_{k+1}) + \nabla_x \psi_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}), \quad (24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} v_{k+1}^y &\in \partial_y \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) \\ &= \nabla h(y_{k+1}) + \nabla_y \psi_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) + N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_{k+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

$$v_{k+1}^\lambda = \nabla_\lambda \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) = F(x_{k+1}) - G y_{k+1}.$$

Using the optimality (5), it follows that there exists $s_{k+1}^g \in \partial g(x_{k+1})$ such that

$$\|s_{k+1}^g + \nabla_x \psi_\rho(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k) + \beta_{k+1} \Delta x_{k+1} + \rho \nabla F(x_k)^T \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1}\| \leq \alpha \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|.$$

It follows that there exists v_{k+1}^x as in (24), such that

$$\|v_{k+1}^x\| \leq \|\nabla_x \psi_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) - \nabla_x \psi_\rho(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\| + (\beta_{k+1} + \alpha + \rho M_F^2) \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|.$$

Since $\nabla_x \psi_\rho$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, noting that the sequence $\{z_k := (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ is bounded and $\beta_k \leq \beta$, it follows that:

$$\|v_{k+1}^x\| \stackrel{(8)}{\leq} (L_\psi + \beta + \alpha + \rho M_F^2) \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|. \quad (26)$$

Next, we note that

$$\nabla_y \psi_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) = G^T (2\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k), \quad (27)$$

where the second equality is due to the multiplier update at Step 6 of Algorithm 1. Moreover, from the first-order optimality condition of Step 5 of Algorithm 1, we have:

$$-\nabla h(y_k) - \theta_{k+1} \Delta y_{k+1} \in G^T \lambda_{k+1} + N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_{k+1}).$$

It then follows that:

$$G^T \Delta \lambda_{k+1} - \nabla h(y_k) - \theta_{k+1} \Delta y_{k+1} \in \nabla_y \psi_\rho(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) + N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_{k+1}).$$

Together with (25), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{k+1}^y\| &\leq \|\nabla h(y_{k+1}) - \nabla h(y_k)\| + \|G\| \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| + \theta_{k+1} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| \\ &\leq (L_h + \theta_{k+1}) \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \|G\| \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| \stackrel{(8)}{\leq} (L_h + \theta + \|G\|) \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Finally, we note that

$$\|v_{k+1}^\lambda\| = \|F(x_{k+1}) + G y_{k+1}\| = \rho^{-1} \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|, \quad (29)$$

where the second equality in (29) is due to the multiplier update at Step 6 in Algorithm 1. Thus, by summing the bounds for $\|v_{k+1}^x\|$, $\|v_{k+1}^y\|$, and $\|v_{k+1}^\lambda\|$, we get:

$$\|v_{k+1}\| \leq c\|z_{k+1} - z_k\|, \quad (30)$$

with $c = L_{\psi} + \beta + \alpha + \rho M_F^2 + L_h + \theta + \|G\| + \rho^{-1} > 0$. \square

Let us now present the global asymptotic convergence for the iterates of Algorithm 1.

Theorem 1. *[Limit points are stationary points] Let $\{z_k := (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. If Assumptions 2 and 3 hold, Assumption 1 is satisfied on a compact set where the iterates belong to and ρ is chosen as in Lemma 6, then any limit point $z^* := (x^*, y^*, \lambda^*)$ of $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a stationary point of the augmented Lagrangian function, i.e., $0 \in \partial \mathcal{L}_\rho(x^*, y^*, \lambda^*)$. Equivalently, z^* is a KKT point of problem (1).*

Proof. Since $\beta \geq \beta_0$ and $\theta_k \geq \theta_0$, for any $k \geq 1$, it then follows from (22) that, for any $k \geq 1$ we have:

$$\frac{\beta_0}{4} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{\theta_0}{16} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{\theta_0}{16} \|\Delta y_k\|^2 \leq P_k - P_{k+1}.$$

Let $k \geq 1$, by summing up the above inequality from $i = 1$ to $i = k$, we obtain:

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{\beta_0}{4} \|\Delta x_{i+1}\|^2 + \frac{\theta_0}{16} \|\Delta y_{i+1}\|^2 + \frac{\theta_0}{16} \|\Delta y_i\|^2 \right) \leq P_1 - P_{k+1} \leq P_1 - \bar{P}, \quad (31)$$

where \bar{P} is a lower bound on the sequence $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ (it is finite since z_k is bounded). Since (31) holds for any $k \geq 1$, we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\beta_0}{4} \|\Delta x_{i+1}\|^2 + \frac{\theta_0}{16} \|\Delta y_{i+1}\|^2 + \frac{\theta_0}{16} \|\Delta y_i\|^2 \right) < \infty.$$

This, together with the fact that $\beta_0, \theta_0 > 0$, yields that:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\Delta x_k\| = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\Delta y_k\| = 0. \quad (32)$$

From Lemma 5, it follows that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|z_{k+1} - z_k\| = 0.$$

Since the sequence $\{(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ is bounded, according to Assumption 3, there exists a convergent subsequence, let us say $\{(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$, with the limit (x^*, y^*, λ^*) . From Lemma 7, we have $v_{k+1} \in \partial \mathcal{L}_\rho(z_{k+1})$ such that:

$$\lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \|v_{k+1}\| \leq c \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \|z_{k+1} - z_k\| = 0.$$

Thus, from the closedness of the map $\partial\mathcal{L}_\rho$, it follows that $0 \in \partial\mathcal{L}_\rho(x^*, y^*, \lambda^*)$, which completes the proof. \square

4.2 First-order convergence rate

Let us now derive the complexity (i.e., convergence rate) of the proposed method for finding an ϵ -KKT point of problem (1). For the remainder of this paper, we define:

$$\gamma := \min\{4\beta_0, \theta_0\} > 0. \quad (33)$$

Theorem 2. *[First-order complexity] Let $\{z_k := (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. If Assumptions 2 and 3 hold, Assumption 1 is satisfied on a compact set where the iterates belong to, and ρ is chosen as in Lemma 6, then for any $\epsilon > 0$, Algorithm 1 yields an ϵ -first-order solution of (1) after $K = 16c^2 \left(1 + 2\frac{\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\}}{\sigma}\right)^2 \left(\frac{P_1 - \bar{P}}{\gamma}\right) \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$ iterations.*

Proof. Let $K \geq 1$, then from (31) and (33), we have:

$$\frac{\gamma}{16} \sum_{i=1}^K (\|\Delta x_{i+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_{i+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_i\|^2) \leq P_1 - \bar{P},$$

we recall that \bar{P} is a lower bound on the sequence $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$. Therefore, there exists $k^* \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ such that:

$$\|\Delta x_{k^*+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_{k^*+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_{k^*}\|^2 \leq 16 \frac{P_1 - \bar{P}}{K\gamma}.$$

It implies that: $\|\Delta x_{k^*+1}\| \leq 4\sqrt{\frac{(P_1 - \bar{P})}{K\gamma}}$, $\|\Delta y_{k^*+1}\| \leq 4\sqrt{\frac{(P_1 - \bar{P})}{K\gamma}}$ and $\|\Delta y_{k^*}\| \leq 4\sqrt{\frac{(P_1 - \bar{P})}{K\gamma}}$. Hence, from Lemma 7 and (18), there exists $v_{k^*+1} \in \partial\mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k^*+1}, y_{k^*+1}, \lambda_{k^*+1})$ such that:

$$\|v_{k^*+1}\| \leq c\|\Delta z_{k^*+1}\| \leq 4c \left(1 + 2\frac{\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\}}{\sigma}\right) \sqrt{\frac{(P_1 - \bar{P})}{K\gamma}}.$$

It follows that for any $\epsilon > 0$, $\|v_{k^*+1}\| \leq \epsilon$ when $K \geq 16c^2 \left(1 + 2\frac{\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\}}{\sigma}\right)^2 \left(\frac{P_1 - \bar{P}}{\gamma\epsilon^2}\right)$. Consequently, after

$$K = 16c^2 \left(1 + 2\frac{\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\}}{\sigma}\right)^2 \left(\frac{P_1 - \bar{P}}{\gamma}\right) \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$$

iterations, Algorithm 1 yields an ϵ -first-order solution of problem (1). This concludes our proof. \square

From Theorem 2, it follows that Algorithm 1 yields an ϵ -KKT point of problem (1) within $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\right)$ iterations, hence matching the optimal complexity of first-order methods for solving nonconvex nonsmooth problems, see e.g., [1–3, 5, 8, 36].

4.3 Improved convergence rate under KL

Previous theorems shows that (limit) points of the sequence $\{z_k := (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ generated by Algorithm 1 are ϵ -KKT (stationary points) of problem (1), respectively. The goal in this section is to prove that under the additional KL condition (see Definition 4) the whole sequence $(z_k)_{k \geq 1}$ generated by Algorithm 1 converges to a KKT point of problem (1) and derive also improved rates. Recall that the KL property holds for a large class of functions including semi-algebraic functions and sum of square functions with uniform non-degenerate Jacobian [4]. In order to show these results, we first bound the full gradient $\nabla P(\cdot)$ (recall that $P(\cdot)$ is the Lyapunov function defined in (19)). Throughout this section, for simplicity of the exposition, we assume that g is a continuous function.

Lemma 8. *[Boundedness of ∇P] Let $\{z_k := (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. If Assumption 3 holds and Assumption 1 is satisfied on a compact set where the iterates belong to and $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is defined as in (20), then there exists $p_{k+1} \in \partial P(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}, y_k, \gamma_{k+1})$, such that for any $k \geq 0$, we have:*

$$\|p_{k+1}\| \leq \left(\frac{2c + \theta + D_S}{2} \right) \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|,$$

where c is defined in Lemma 7.

Proof. If $p_{k+1} \in \partial P(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}, y_k, \gamma_{k+1})$, then there exists $v_{k+1} \in \partial \mathcal{L}_\rho(z_{k+1})$ such that:

$$\|p_{k+1}\| \leq \|v_{k+1}\| + 2\gamma_{k+1} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \frac{1}{2} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2.$$

By defining $D_S := \sup_{y, y' \in \mathcal{S}_y} \|y - y'\|$ and making use of Lemma 7, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_{k+1}\| &\leq \|v_{k+1}\| + 2\gamma_{k+1} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \frac{D_S}{2} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| \\ &\stackrel{(21),(8)}{\leq} \left(c + \frac{\theta + D_S}{2} \right) \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|. \end{aligned}$$

□

The above lemma directly implies the following:

$$\|p_{k+1}\|^2 \leq \left(\frac{2c + \theta + D_S}{2} \right)^2 \|\Delta z_{k+1}\|^2. \quad (34)$$

Then, it follows from (34) and (22), that:

$$P_{k+1} - P_k \leq -\frac{\underline{\gamma}}{4(2c + \theta + D_S)^2} \|p_{k+1}\|^2. \quad (35)$$

Let us denote $z_k = (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)$ and $u_k = (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)$. Moreover, $\text{crit } P$ denotes the set of critical points of the Lyapunov function P defined in (20). Furthermore, we denote $\mathcal{E}_k = P_k - P^*$, where $P^* = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P_k$ (recall that the sequence $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is decreasing and bounded from below, hence it is convergent). Let us denote the set of limit points of $\{u_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ by:

$$\Omega := \{u^* : \exists \text{ a convergent subsequence } \{u_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \text{ such that } \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k = u^*\}.$$

Let us now prove the following lemma.

Lemma 9. *Let $\{z_k := (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. If Assumption 3 holds, Assumption 1 is satisfied on a compact set where the iterates belong to, $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is defined as in (20) and the function g is continuous, then the following hold:*

- (i) Ω is a compact subset of $\text{crit } P$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(u_k, \Omega) = 0$.
- (ii) For any $u \in \Omega$, we have $P(u) = P^*$.
- (iii) For any $(x, y, \lambda, z, \gamma) \in \text{crit } P$, we have that (x, y, λ) is a stationary point of original problem (1).

Proof. (i) Since $\{u_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is bounded, there exists a convergent subsequence $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ such that $\lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k = u^*$. Hence Ω is nonempty. Moreover, Ω is compact since it is bounded and closed. On the other hand, for any $u^* \in \Omega$, there exists a sequence of increasing integers \mathcal{K} such that $\lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k = u^*$ and using Lemma 8 and (32), it follows that there exists $p^* \in \partial P(u^*)$:

$$\|p^*\| = \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \|p_{k+1}\| = 0.$$

Hence, $u^* \in \text{crit } P$ and $0 \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(u_k, \Omega) \leq \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \text{dist}(u_k, \Omega) = \text{dist}(u^*, \Omega) = 0$.

(ii) Since P is continuous (recall that problem's data are all assumed to be continuous functions) and $\{P(u_k) = P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ converges to P^* , then any subsequence $\{P(u_k) = P_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ that converges, it must converge to the same limit P^* .

(iii) Let $(x, y, \lambda, z, \gamma) \in \text{crit } P$, that is, there exists $0 \in \partial P(x, y, \lambda, \bar{y}, \gamma)$. It then follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\in \partial_x P(x, y, \lambda, \bar{y}, \gamma) = \partial_x \mathcal{L}_\rho(x, y, \lambda), \\ 0 &\in \partial_y P(x, y, \lambda, \bar{y}, \gamma) = \partial_y \mathcal{L}_\rho(x, y, \lambda) + \gamma(y - \bar{y}) \\ \nabla_\lambda P(x, y, \lambda, \bar{y}, \gamma) &= \nabla_\lambda \mathcal{L}_\rho(x, y, \lambda) = 0 \\ \nabla_{\bar{y}} P(x, y, \lambda, \bar{y}, \gamma) &= \gamma(\bar{y} - y) = 0 \\ \nabla_\gamma P(x, y, \lambda, \bar{y}, \gamma) &= \frac{1}{2} \|y - \bar{y}\|^2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

With some minor rearrangements, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla f(x) - \nabla F(x)^T \lambda &\in \partial g(x), \quad 0 \in \nabla h(y) + G^T \lambda + N_{\mathcal{Y}}(y), \\ F(x) + Gy &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (x, y, λ) is a stationary point of (1). □

Let us now prove that the sequence $\left\{ \|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta y_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| \right\}_{k \geq 1}$ has finite length, provided that P satisfies the KL property. It is known that e.g., semi-algebraic functions satisfy the KL condition and they are stable under operations such as addition and multiplication. Therefore, if the data functions in our problem (i.e., f , g , h , and F) are e.g., semi-algebraic, the Lyapunov function P defined in (19) will be also semi-algebraic, thus satisfying the KL property.

Lemma 10. *Let $\{z_k := (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. If Assumption 3 holds, Assumption 1 is satisfied on a compact set where the iterates belong to, $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is defined as in (20), the function g is continuous, ρ is chosen as in Lemma 6 and, additionally, assume that P defined in (19) satisfies the KL property on Ω , then $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ satisfies the finite length property, i.e.:*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta y_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| < \infty,$$

and consequently converges to a stationary point of (1).

Proof. From boundedness of $\|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2$ (see (11)), we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2 &\leq 2 \frac{\theta_{k+1}^2}{\sigma^2} \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 + 2 \frac{(\theta_k + L_h)^2}{\sigma^2} \|\Delta y_k\|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \frac{(\theta + L_h)^2}{\sigma^2} (\|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_k\|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Adding the term $\|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_k\|^2$ on both sides in (36), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 &= \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_k\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(36)}{\leq} \left(2 \frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2} + 1 \right) (\|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_k\|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Considering (33), we can then rewrite (22) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{k+1} - P_k &\stackrel{(22)}{\leq} -\frac{\gamma}{16} (\|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_k\|^2) \\ &\stackrel{(37)}{\leq} -\frac{\gamma}{16 \left(2 \frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2} + 1 \right)} \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Since $P_k \rightarrow P^*$ and $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is monotonically decreasing to P^* , then it follows that the error sequence $\{\mathcal{E}_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is non-negative, monotonically decreasing and converges to 0. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1: There exists $k_1 \geq 1$ such that $\mathcal{E}_{k_1} = 0$. Then, $\mathcal{E}_k = 0 \forall k \geq k_1$ and using (38), we have:

$$\|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 \leq \frac{16 \left(2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1 \right)}{\gamma} (\mathcal{E}_k - \mathcal{E}_{k+1}) = 0 \quad \forall k \geq k_1.$$

Since the sequence $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is bounded, we have:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta y_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| = \sum_{k=1}^{k_1} \|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta y_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| < \infty.$$

Case 2: The error $\mathcal{E}_k > 0 \forall k \geq 1$. Then, there exists $k_1 = k_1(\epsilon, \tau) \geq 1$ such that $\forall k \geq k_1$ we have $\text{dist}(u_k, \Omega) \leq \epsilon$, $P^* < P(u_k) < P^* + \tau$ and

$$\varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k) \|\partial P(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k, y_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| \geq 1, \quad (39)$$

where $\epsilon > 0, \tau > 0$ and $\varphi \in \Psi_\tau$ are defined from the KL property of P on Ω . Since φ is concave, we have $\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1}) \geq \varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k)(\mathcal{E}_k - \mathcal{E}_{k+1})$. Then, from (38) and (39):

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 &\stackrel{(39)}{\leq} \varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k) \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 \|\partial P(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k, z_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| \\ &\stackrel{(38)}{\leq} \frac{16 \left(2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1 \right)}{\gamma} \varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k) (\mathcal{E}_k - \mathcal{E}_{k+1}) \|\partial P(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k, z_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| \\ &\leq \frac{16 \left(2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1 \right)}{\gamma} \left(\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1}) \right) \|\partial P(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k, z_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\Delta z_{k+1}\|^2 = \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2$. Using the fact that for any $a, b, c, d, e \geq 0$, if $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 \leq d \times e$, then $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 4(a^2 + b^2 + c^2) \leq 4d \times e \leq 2(d^2 + e^2) \leq 4(d + e)^2$, it follows that for any $\eta > 0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{32 \left(2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1 \right) \eta}{\gamma} \left(\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1}) \right) + \frac{2}{\eta} \|\partial P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\|. \quad (40) \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, from Lemma 8, there exists $p_k \in \partial P(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k, y_{k-1}, \gamma_k)$ such that:

$$\|p_k\| \leq \left(\frac{2c + \theta + D_S}{2} \right) \|z_k - z_{k-1}\|.$$

It then follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| &\leq \frac{32 \left(2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1 \right) \eta}{\gamma} \left(\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1}) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2c + \theta + D_S}{\eta} (\|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta y_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\|). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Let us now choose $\eta > 0$ such that $0 < \frac{2c + \theta + D_S}{\eta} < 1$ and define a parameter δ_0 as $\delta_0 = 1 - \frac{2c + \theta + D_S}{\eta} > 0$. Then, by summing up the above inequality from $k = \underline{k} \geq k_1$ to $k = K$ and using the property: $\sum_{k=\underline{k}}^K \|\Delta z_k\| = \sum_{k=\underline{k}}^K \|\Delta z_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta z_{\underline{k}}\| - \|\Delta z_{K+1}\|$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=\underline{k}}^K \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| &\leq \frac{32 \left(2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1 \right) \eta}{\gamma \delta_0} \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{\underline{k}}) \\ &\quad + \frac{2c + \theta + D_S}{\eta \delta_0} (\|\Delta x_{\underline{k}}\| + \|\Delta y_{\underline{k}}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{\underline{k}}\|). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that the right-hand side of the above inequality is bounded for any $K \geq \underline{k}$. Letting $K \rightarrow \infty$, we get that:

$$\sum_{k=\underline{k}}^{\infty} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| < \infty.$$

Since the sequence $\{(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ is bounded, it follows that:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\underline{k}} \|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta y_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| < \infty.$$

Hence: $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta y_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| < \infty$. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $n \geq m$, we have:

$$\|z_n - z_m\| = \left\| \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \Delta z_{k+1} \right\| \leq \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \|\Delta z_{k+1}\| \leq \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} (\|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|).$$

Since $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| < \infty$, it follows that $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\forall m, n \geq N$ where $n \geq m$, we have: $\|z_n - z_m\| \leq \varepsilon$. This implies that $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence and thus converges. Moreover, by Theorem 1, $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ converges to a stationary point of (1). This concludes our proof. \square

Lemma 10 shows that the set of limit points of the sequence $\{(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a singleton. Let us denote its limit by (x^*, y^*, λ^*) . We are now ready to present the

convergence rates of the whole sequence generated by Algorithm 1 (see also [40] for a similar reasoning).

Lemma 11. *[Convergence rates of $\{(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$] Let $\{z_k := (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. If Assumption 3 holds, Assumption 1 is satisfied on a compact set where the iterates belong to, $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is defined as in (20), the function g is continuous, ρ is chosen as in Lemma 6 and, additionally, P defined in (19) satisfies the KL property at $u^* := (x^*, y^*, \lambda^*, y^*, \gamma^*)$, where $z^* := (x^*, y^*, \lambda^*)$ is the limit point of $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ and γ^* is a limit point of $\{\gamma_k\}_{k \geq 1}$, then there exists $k_1 \geq 1$ such that for all $k \geq k_1$ we have:*

$$\|z_k - z^*\| \leq C \max\{\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k), \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}\},$$

where $C > 0$ and $\varphi \in \Psi_\tau$, with $\tau > 0$, denotes a desingularizing function.

Proof. From Lemma 6, the sequence $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is monotonically decreasing, and consequently $\{\mathcal{E}_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is monotonically decreasing. Using (38) and the fact that $\{\mathcal{E}_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is non-negative, we have for all $k \geq 1$:

$$\|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| \leq 8 \sqrt{\frac{2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1}{\gamma}} \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_k}. \quad (42)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that γ^* is unique. Since $P_k \rightarrow P^*$, $u_k \rightarrow u^*$ and P satisfies the KL property at u^* , then there exists $k_1 = k_1(\epsilon, \tau) \geq 1$ such that $\forall k > k_1$, we have $\|u_k - u^*\| \leq \epsilon$ and $P^* < P_k < P^* + \tau$, and the following KL property holds:

$$\varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k) \|\partial P(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k, y_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| \geq 1. \quad (43)$$

Hence, using the same argument as in **Case 2** in the proof of Lemma 10, (41) follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| &\leq \frac{32 \left(2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1\right) \eta}{\gamma} \left(\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1})\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2c + \theta + D_S}{\eta} (\|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta y_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\|). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now choose $\eta > 0$ such that $0 < \frac{2c + \theta + D_S}{\eta} < 1$ and define a parameter δ_0 as $\delta_0 = 1 - \frac{2c + \theta + D_S}{\eta} > 0$. Then, summing up the above inequality over $k > k_1$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \geq k_1} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta y_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| &\leq \frac{32 \left(2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1\right) \eta}{\gamma \delta_0} \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k_1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{2c + \theta + D_S}{\eta \delta_0} (\|\Delta x_{k_1}\| + \|\Delta y_{k_1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k_1}\|). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the triangle inequality, we get for any $k \geq k_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_k - z^*\| &\leq \sum_{l \geq k} \|z_l - z_{l+1}\| \leq \sum_{l \geq k} \|\Delta x_{l+1}\| + \|\Delta y_{l+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{l+1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{32 \left(2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1 \right) \eta}{\gamma \delta_0} \varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) + \frac{2c + \theta + D_S}{\eta \delta_0} \left(\|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta y_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Further, using (42), it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|z_k - z^*\| \\ &\leq \frac{32 \left(2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1 \right) \eta}{\gamma \delta_0} \varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) + \frac{8(2c + \theta + D_S)}{\eta \delta_0} \sqrt{\frac{2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1}{\gamma}} \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}} \\ &\leq C \max\{\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k), \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C = \max \left\{ \frac{32 \left(2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1 \right) \eta}{\gamma \delta_0}, \frac{8(2c + \theta + D_S)}{\eta \delta_0} \sqrt{\frac{2^{\frac{(\theta + \max\{L_h, \kappa\})^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1}{\gamma}} \right\}.$$

This concludes our proof. \square

The following theorem derives the convergence rate of the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 when the Lyapunov function satisfies the KL property with the special desingularizing function φ (this is the case when e.g., P is semi-algebraic [4]):

$$\varphi : [0, \tau) \rightarrow [0, +\infty), \varphi(s) = s^{1-\nu}, \text{ where } \nu \in [0, 1).$$

Theorem 3. [Convergence rates of $\{(x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$] Let assumptions of Lemma 11 hold and $z^* := (x^*, y^*, \lambda^*)$ be the limit point of the sequence $\{z_k := (x_k, y_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ generated by Algorithm 1. If P satisfies the KL property at $u^* := (x^*, y^*, \lambda^*, y^*, \gamma^*)$, where γ^* is a limit point of the sequence $\{\gamma_k\}_{k \geq 1}$, with the following special desingularizing function:

$$\varphi : [0, \tau) \rightarrow [0, +\infty), \varphi(s) = s^{1-\nu}, \text{ where } \nu \in [0, 1),$$

then the following rates hold:

1. If $\nu = 0$, then z_k converges to z^* in a finite number of iterations.
2. If $\nu \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, then for all $k \geq k_1$, we have:

$$\|z_k - z^*\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k_1}}}{\sqrt{(1 + \bar{c}\mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{2\nu-1})^{k-k_1}}},$$

where $\bar{c} = \frac{\gamma}{4(2c+\theta+D_S)^2}$.

3. If $\nu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, then for all $k > k_1$, we have:

$$\|z_k - z^*\| \leq \left(\frac{1}{\mu(k - k_1) + \mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{1-2\nu}} \right)^{\frac{1-\nu}{2\nu-1}}.$$

Proof. Let $\nu \in [0, 1)$ and for all $s \in [0, \tau)$, $\varphi(s) = s^{1-\nu}$ and $\varphi'(s) = (1-\nu)s^{-\nu}$. It follows that $\forall k \geq k_1$, we have:

$$\|z_k - z^*\| \leq C \max\{\mathcal{E}_k^{1-\nu}, \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}\}. \quad (44)$$

Furthermore, (43) yields:

$$\mathcal{E}_k^\nu \leq \|\partial P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| \quad \forall k \geq k_1.$$

Moreover, from (35) and Lemma 8, there exists $p_k \in \partial P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)$ such that for any $k \geq 1$, we have:

$$\|p_k\|^2 \leq \frac{4(2c + \theta + D_S)^2}{\gamma} (\mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k).$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{E}_k^{2\nu} \leq \frac{4(2c + \theta + D_S)^2}{\gamma} (\mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k) \quad \forall k > k_1.$$

Setting $\bar{c} = \frac{\gamma}{4(2c+\theta+D_S)^2} > 0$, we get the recurrence

$$\bar{c}\mathcal{E}_k^{2\nu} \leq \mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k \quad \forall k > k_1.$$

1. Let $\nu = 0$. If $\mathcal{E}_k > 0$ for any $k > k_1$, we have $\bar{c} \leq \mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k$. As k goes to infinity, the right hand side approaches zero. Then, $0 < \bar{c} \leq 0$ which is a contradiction. Hence, there exists $k > k_1$ such that $\mathcal{E}_k = 0$. Then, $\mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow 0$ in a finite number of steps and from (44), $z_k \rightarrow z^*$ in a finite number of steps.
2. Let $\nu \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then, $2\nu - 1 \leq 0$. Let $k > k_1$. Since $\{\mathcal{E}_i\}_{i \geq k_1}$ is monotonically decreasing, then $\mathcal{E}_i \leq \mathcal{E}_{k_1}$ for any $i \in \{k_1 + 1, k_1 + 2, \dots, k\}$ and

$$\bar{c}\mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{2\nu-1}\mathcal{E}_k \leq \mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k \quad \forall k > k_1.$$

Rearranging this, we get for all $k > k_1$:

$$\mathcal{E}_k \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}{1 + \bar{c}\mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{2\nu-1}} \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}_{k-2}}{(1 + \bar{c}\mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{2\nu-1})^2} \leq \dots \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}_{k_1}}{(1 + \bar{c}\mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{2\nu-1})^{k-k_1}}.$$

Then, we have $\max\{\mathcal{E}_k^{1-\nu}, \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}\} = \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}$. It then follows that:

$$\|z_k - z^*\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k_1}}}{\sqrt{(1 + \bar{c}\mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{2\nu-1})^{k-k_1}}},$$

3. Let $\nu \in (1/2, 1)$, we have:

$$\bar{c} \leq (\mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k)\mathcal{E}_k^{-2\nu} \quad \forall k > k_1. \quad (45)$$

Let $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as $h(s) = s^{-2\nu}$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$. It is clear that h is monotonically decreasing and $\forall s \in \mathbb{R}_+, h'(s) = -2\nu s^{-(1+2\nu)} < 0$. Since $\mathcal{E}_k \leq \mathcal{E}_{k-1}$ for all $k > k_1$, then $h(\mathcal{E}_{k-1}) \leq h(\mathcal{E}_k)$ for all $k > k_1$. We consider two cases:

Case 1: Let $r_0 \in (1, +\infty)$ such that: $h(\mathcal{E}_k) \leq r_0 h(\mathcal{E}_{k-1})$, $\forall k > k_1$. Then, from (45) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{c} &\leq r_0(\mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k)h(\mathcal{E}_{k-1}) \leq r_0 h(\mathcal{E}_{k-1}) \int_{\mathcal{E}_k}^{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}} 1 ds \\ &\leq r_0 \int_{\mathcal{E}_k}^{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}} h(s) ds = r_0 \int_{\mathcal{E}_k}^{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}} s^{-2\nu} ds = \frac{r_0}{1-2\nu} (\mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{1-2\nu} - \mathcal{E}_k^{1-2\nu}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\nu > \frac{1}{2}$, it follows that:

$$0 < \frac{\bar{c}(2\nu-1)}{r_0} \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{1-2\nu} - \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{1-2\nu}.$$

Let us define $\hat{c} = \frac{\bar{c}(2\nu-1)}{r_0}$ and $\hat{\nu} = 1 - 2\nu < 0$. We get:

$$0 < \hat{c} \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{\hat{\nu}} - \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} \quad \forall k > k_1. \quad (46)$$

Case 2: Let $r_0 \in (1, +\infty)$ such that: $h(\mathcal{E}_k) > r_0 h(\mathcal{E}_{k-1})$, $k > k_1$. We then have $\mathcal{E}_k^{-2\nu} \geq r_0 \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{-2\nu}$. This leads to

$$q\mathcal{E}_{k-1} \geq \mathcal{E}_k,$$

where $q = r_0^{-\frac{1}{2\nu}} \in (0, 1)$. Since $\hat{\nu} = 1 - 2\nu < 0$ we have $q^{\hat{\nu}} \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{\hat{\nu}}$ and then, it follows that:

$$(q^{\hat{\nu}} - 1)\mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} \leq \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} - \mathcal{E}_k^{\hat{\nu}}.$$

Since $q^{\hat{\nu}} - 1 > 0$ and $\mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow 0^+$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, there exists \tilde{c} such that $(q^{\hat{\nu}} - 1)\mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} \geq \tilde{c}$ for all $k > k_1$. Therefore, we obtain:

$$0 < \tilde{c} \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{\hat{\nu}} - \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} \quad \forall k > k_1. \quad (47)$$

By choosing $\mu = \min\{\hat{c}, \tilde{c}\} > 0$, one can combine (46) and (47) to obtain

$$0 < \mu \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{\hat{\nu}} - \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} \quad \forall k > k_1.$$

Summing the above inequality from $k_1 + 1$ to some $k > k_1$ gives

$$\mu(k - k_1) + \mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{\hat{\nu}} \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{\hat{\nu}}.$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{E}_k \leq (\mu(k - k_1) + \mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{\hat{\nu}})^{\frac{1}{\hat{\nu}}} = (\mu(k - k_1) + \mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{1-2\nu})^{\frac{1}{1-2\nu}}.$$

Since $\nu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, then $\max\{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{1-\nu}, \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}\} = \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{1-\nu}$. Then, (44) becomes:

$$\|z_k - z^*\| \leq \left(\frac{1}{\mu(k - k_1) + \mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{1-2\nu}} \right)^{\frac{1-\nu}{2\nu-1}}, \quad \forall k > k_1.$$

This concludes our proof. \square

Note that our convergence analysis under KL is similar to that found in the literature, see e.g., [3, 8, 40] (although the convergence analysis under the KL property was also addressed in [8], explicit rates associated with this property were not provided there). In conclusion, in addition to its straightforward implementation and simplicity of iteration steps, our algorithm iL-ADMM enjoys mathematical guarantees of convergence, ensuring that it can reliably find optimal solutions to a wide range of nonconvex problems.

4.4 Selection of penalty parameter ρ

The previous convergence results rely on the assumption that the penalty parameter ρ exceeds a certain threshold, see (21). However, in practice, determining this threshold beforehand poses challenges as it depends on unknown parameters of the problem's data and the algorithm's parameters. To overcome this challenge, we propose in this

Algorithm 2 iL-ADMM method with trial values of ρ

- 1: **Initialization:** Choose $(x_{-1}^*, y_{-1}^*, \lambda_{-1}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^m$, $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 > 1$, $\epsilon > 0$, $\rho_0 > 0$, and $K_0 > 0$.
 - 2: $t \leftarrow 0$
 - 3: **while** ϵ -KKT conditions are not satisfied **do**
 - 4: Call **Algorithm 1** with $\rho = \rho_t$ and warm start $(x_0, y_0, \lambda_0) \leftarrow (x_{t-1}^*, y_{t-1}^*, \lambda_{t-1}^*)$ for K_t iterations, yielding $(x_{K_t}, y_{K_t}, \lambda_{K_t})$.
 - 5: Update $(x_t^*, y_t^*, \lambda_t^*) \leftarrow (x_{K_t}, y_{K_t}, \lambda_{K_t})$.
 - 6: Update $K_{t+1} \leftarrow \zeta_1 K_t$ and $\rho_{t+1} \leftarrow \zeta_2 \rho_t$.
 - 7: $t \leftarrow t + 1$
 - 8: **end while**
-

section an outer algorithm that repeatedly calls Algorithm 1 for a fixed number of iterations, denoted as K_t , using a penalty parameter ρ_t . If Algorithm 1 does not yield an ϵ -KKT point for the problem (1) within K_t iterations, then both K_t and ρ_t are increased geometrically. Specifically, we set $K_{t+1} = \zeta_1 K_t$ and $\rho_{t+1} = \zeta_2 \rho_t$, where $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 > 1$. The resulting procedure can be summarized in Algorithm 2.

This approach has been also used, e.g., in [39]. Following similar arguments as in [39], we can prove that the above algorithm is well-defined and it yields an ϵ -KKT point of problem (1) in a finite number of calls of Algorithm 1.

5 Numerical results

In this section, we compare iL-ADMM algorithm with the dynamic linearized alternating direction method of multipliers (DAM) from [8] and the solver IPOPT [38] for solving nonlinear model predictive control and matrix factorization problems using real dynamical systems and datasets, respectively. The implementation details are conducted using MATLAB on a laptop equipped with an i7 CPU operating at 2.9 GHz and 16 GB of RAM.

5.1 Nonlinear model predictive control

In this section, we consider nonlinear model predictive control (NMPC) problems for several nonlinear systems: inverted pendulum on a cart (IPOC) system [7], single machine infinite bus (SMIB) system [35], lane tracking (LT) system from MathWorks' MPC toolbox, four tanks (4T) system [32], and free-flying robot (FFR) system [34]. For a continuous nonlinear system we employ Euler discretization with a sampling time T to obtain a discrete-time model of the form:

$$z(t+1) := \psi(z(t), u(t)),$$

where $u \in \mathbb{R}^{i_d}$ denotes the inputs and $z \in \mathbb{R}^{s_d}$ the states. For all systems, we consider input constraints of the form:

$$u_{\min} \leq u(t) \leq u_{\max}.$$

Our goal is to drive the system to a desired state z_e and input u_e . To achieve this, we apply a NMPC scheme. To formulate the NMPC problem as a nonconvex optimization problem, we adopt a single shooting approach, where the state variables are eliminated under the assumption of a piecewise constant input trajectory. Then, we use auxiliary variables to equate the states of the system at hand. The decision variables for NMPC are given by $x = (u(0), \dots, u(N-1)) \in \mathbb{R}^{N i_d}$, where N is the prediction horizon. If we introduce a sequence of functions $F_j : \mathbb{R}^{N i_d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{s_d}$ defined as

$$F_0(x) = z(0), \quad F_{j+1}(x) = \psi(F_j(x), u(j)), \quad j = 0 : N-1,$$

System \ Parameters	N_{sim}	N	T	$z(0)$
SMIB	50	10	0.01	$[0.05, 0.1, 0.1, 0.2]^T$
IPOC	40	10	0.1	$[0, 0, 0.5, 0]^T$
4T	100	20	3	$[20, 20, 20, 20]^T$
LT	50	10	0.1	$[0.1, 0.5, 25, 0.1, 0.1, 0.001, 0]^T$
FFR	50	30	0.4	$[-10, -10, \frac{\pi}{2}, 0, 0, 0]^T$

Table 1 Systems and nonlinear MPC setup.

Method \ Parameters	ρ	β_k	θ_k
DAM from [8]	3	10	1
iL-ADMM	5	1	1

Table 2 Parameters for iL-ADMM and DAM used in NMPC.

then the resulting NMPC problem that needs to be solved at each sampling time is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{(x, \{y^{j+1}\}_{j=0}^{N-1})} \varphi(x, y) &:= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|y^{j+1} - z_e\|_Q^2 + \|u(j) - u_e\|_R^2 \\
\text{s.t.:} \quad &F_{j+1}(x) - y^{j+1} = 0, \quad z(0) \text{ given} \\
&u_{\min} \leq x \leq u_{\max}, \quad j = 0 : N - 1,
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where the matrices $Q, R \succeq 0$ and we used the notation $\|z\|_Q^2 = z^T Q z$. The nonconvex problem described in (48) can be reformulated as problem (1), where $-G$ is the identity matrix of dimension Ns_d . The smooth functions f and h are convex quadratic, the nonsmooth function g is the indicator function of the set describing the input box constraints and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^{Ns_d}$. At this point, it is worth mentioning that since g is the indicator function of a box set, then Step 4 of iL-ADMM reduces to finding a solution of a strongly convex QP with box constraints, which is solved with `quadprog` from Matlab, and its counterpart in DAM [8] basically reduce to computing a projection onto some box constraints. On the other hand, Step 5 in iL-ADMM and its counterpart in DAM reduces to a gradient step.

For simulations, the parameters of the systems, of the constraints and of the stage costs (matrices Q, R) are taken as in the cited references for each system. For NMPC we used the setup from Table 1 (here N_{sim} denotes the simulation horizon, i.e., the number of times we solve the NMPC optimization problems at different $z(0)$'s associated with each system). We initialize all the algorithms, in the first step of NMPC, randomly, while in the subsequent NMPC steps we use a warm start strategy, i.e., we use the solution of the current NMPC step as the initialization for the algorithms in the next NMPC step. In our simulations, we stop iL-ADMM and DAM when $\|\mathcal{F}_k\| \leq 10^{-6}$ and $|\varphi_k - \varphi_{k-1}| \leq 10^{-5}$, where \mathcal{F}_k and φ_k denote the functional constraints and the objective function evaluated at the current iterate (x_k, y_k) , respectively.

System (i_d, s_d)	Algorithm	iL-ADMM			DAM [8]			IPOPT		
		E(# iter)	E(cpu)	φ^*	E(# iter)	E(cpu)	φ^*	E(# iter)	E(cpu)	φ^*
		σ (# iter)	σ (cpu)	$\ \mathcal{F}\ $	σ (# iter)	σ (cpu)	$\ \mathcal{F}\ $	σ (# iter)	σ (cpu)	$\ \mathcal{F}\ $
SMIB (2,4)		548.24	0.98	0.3087	3877.83	9.95	0.3089	87.28	1.12	0.3087
		0.09	1.63e-4	9.91e-7	0.22	0.01	9.99e-7	6e-2	1e-3	2.87e-8
IPOC (1,4)		153.74	0.36	166.60	576.36	17.41	166.60	28.7	0.57	166.60
		0.03	1.23e-4	7.56e-7	0.08	5.57e-3	8.01e-7	2.3e-2	1.04e-3	3.69e-8
4T (2,6)		1643.72	4.37	87.94	6464.35	15.03	87.94	187.64	2.79	87.94
		0.02	2.1e-3	2.45e-7	0.38	0.07	6.34e-8	2.66e-3	4.36e-2	3.68e-8
LT (2,7)		169.46	0.82	6.98	732.06	7.74	6.98	32.94	1.03	6.98
		0.007	1.75e-4	1.42e-7	0.14	0.008	9.36e-7	0.005	1.24e-4	4.93e-8
FFR for each system (2,6)		102.01	1.33	1066.24	1877.13	12.76	1066.42	23.94	2.88	1065.87
		0.01	2.84e-5	9.74e-7	0.17	0.01	9.94e-7	0.02	1.69e-4	1.87e-7

Table 3 Numerical results comparing iL-ADMM, DAM and IPOPT on solving N_{sim} nonlinear MPC problems for 5 dynamical systems of different dimensions.

Moreover, after some search we found that iL-ADMM and DAM algorithms are performing well on all test systems with the parameter choices from Table 2. Note that the same parameters are used to solve all the NMPC problems. For DAM, a larger value of β_k is required to cover the big approximation error generated by the linearization of the full smooth part of the augmented Lagrangian function. On the other hand, we chose $\theta_k = 1$ for both methods. This table shows the robustness of our method iL-ADMM w.r.t. its parameters, as it requires minimum tuning.

In Table 3, we report for each system the average number of iterations, $E(\#\text{iter})$, required for each algorithm to solve the nonlinear MPC problems over the simulation horizon N_{sim} and the standard deviation, $\sigma(\#\text{iter})$ ¹; similarly, the average CPU time (in seconds), $E(\text{cpu})$, and the corresponding standard deviation, $\sigma(\text{cpu})$; the optimal value, φ^* , found by each algorithm for the first NMPC problem for each system, and the corresponding infeasibility $\|\mathcal{F}\|$. As can be seen from Table 3, in comparison to DAM, our algorithm iL-ADMM requires fewer iterations to solve the problem since the model considered in Step 4 approximates the original augmented Lagrangian better than the one considered in DAM, resulting in our algorithm being faster than DAM in terms of cpu time. When compared with IPOPT, our method iL-ADMM appears superior in terms of CPU time for all systems except for one, the four-tank system, where IPOPT finds a solution in less CPU time, but still comparable to our method. However, for the number of iterations, IPOPT consistently requires fewer iterations than our method. We attribute this to the fact that IPOPT uses second derivative information, but, on the other hand, this necessitates more time to evaluate them. For all the systems, Table 3 clearly indicates that both, the proposed method iL-ADMM and DAM algorithm achieve an optimal value for the first NMPC problem that is very close (generally coinciding) to that of the IPOPT solver.

¹Standard deviation is computed as: $\sigma(\#\text{iter}) = \left(1/N_{\text{sim}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{sim}}} (\#\text{iter}(i) - E(\#\text{iter}))^2\right)^{0.5}$.




Fig. 1 Closed-loop nonlinear MPC trajectories over a simulation horizon $N_{\text{sim}} = 50$ for the single machine infinite bus system computed using iL-ADMM, DAM and IPOPT (2 inputs, 4 states).

Figure 1 illustrates the closed-loop NMPC trajectories of inputs and states over a simulation horizon of length $N_{\text{sim}} = 50$ for the single machine infinite bus system obtained using iL-ADMM (Algorithm 1), DAM, and IPOPT. The figure distinctly demonstrates the success of all methods in stabilizing the system. Moreover, it reveals that these methods yield (nearly) identical solutions to the optimization problem (48) for different $z(0)$'s over N_{sim} , as indicated by the similarities in the closed-loop NMPC trajectories among all three methods.

5.2 Nonnegative orthogonal matrix factorization

In this section, we consider factorizing a nonnegative matrix as a product of two nonnegative matrices and, additionally, one is required to be orthogonal (note that orthogonal and nonnegative constraints lead to sparsity in the corresponding matrix). This problem can be formulated as follows [16]:

$$\min_{U, V \geq 0} \frac{1}{2} \|A - UV^T\|_F^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|V^T V - I_r\|_F^2, \quad (49)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N \times d}$ is a given hyperspectral image with N denoting the number of pixels and d the number of spectral bands, $U \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N \times r}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}_+^{d \times r}$ are nonnegative matrices and r is the latent dimension (rank of the factorization). To smoothly enforce orthogonality on V , we introduce a regularization term controlled by a parameter $\gamma > 0$. Adding a slack variable y , problem (49) can be formulated as a particular case

of (1), where $x = (U, V)$, $f(x) = \frac{\gamma}{2} \|V^\top V - I_r\|_F^2$, g is the indicator function of the positive orthant, $F(x) = UV^\top$, $h(y) = \frac{1}{2} \|A - y\|_F^2$, $G = -I$ (hence, $m = p$) and \mathcal{Y} is the full space. This reformulation allows us to leverage our proposed algorithm and DAM to solve the nonnegative orthogonal matrix factorization problem. On the other hand, since this reformulation yields many constraints and since IPOPT has difficulties when solving problems with many constraints, we use IPOPT to solve the original problem (49).

In the experiments, we consider two values for the factorization rank, $r = 3$ and $r = 10$, and two values of the orthogonality parameter, $\gamma = 10^{-2}$ and $\gamma = 10^2$. We initialize all algorithms at the same randomly chosen starting point. The stopping criteria for iL-ADMM and DAM are the following ϵ -KKT conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(x_k) - y_k\| &\leq 10^{-3} \\ \text{dist} \left(-\nabla f(x_k) - \nabla F(x_k)^T \lambda_k, \partial g(x_k) \right) + \|\nabla h(y_k) - \lambda_k\| &\leq 10^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

The subproblem in Step 4 of iL-ADMM has strongly convex quadratic objective and nonnegative constraints and it is solved using the accelerated gradient method [29], which is stopped when condition (5) is satisfied with $\alpha = 10$, while Step 5 reduces to a gradient update. The parameters β_k and θ_k are chosen to satisfy the conditions in (6) and (7), respectively. For the penalty parameter ρ , we experiment with different values: $\rho_{\text{iL-ADMM}}$ equal to the lower bound in (21); $\rho_{\text{iL-ADMM}}/2$, which does not satisfy the condition (21); and $2\rho_{\text{iL-ADMM}}$, to assess the robustness of our algorithm with respect to ρ . Similarly, for DAM, we generate β_k dynamically and set $\theta_k = 2L_h = 2$, see (4.5) and (4.27) in [8], respectively. For ρ we select the lower bound from condition (4.27) in [8], along with $\rho_{\text{DAM}}/2$, which does not satisfy the condition (4.27), and $2\rho_{\text{DAM}}$.

For numerical simulations we consider a hyperspectral remote sensing scene, **Salinas** dataset, taken from [37]. We pre-process **Salinas** dataset, reducing the spatial dimension using filtering, while preserving the number of spectral bands. The results of the numerical experiments are presented in Table 4, which shows the number of iterations (# iter), CPU time in sec. (cpu), the optimal objective value (φ^*), and the norm of the functional constraints ($\|\mathcal{F}\|$) for iL-ADMM and DAM (recall that IPOPT solves the problem without functional constraints). Additionally, we include the factorization error ($\|UV^\top - A\|_F$) and the orthogonality error ($\|VV^\top - I_r\|_F$). Note that (n, p) in Table 4 refers to the dimensions of problem (1), where n is the dimension of x and p is the dimension of the slack variables y . In this case, we have $m = p$, where m is the number of functional constraints. From Table 4, we observe that our algorithm outperforms DAM and IPOPT in terms of computational time. In particular, IPOPT is consistently much slower than iL-ADMM and DAM, which we attribute to large dimension of the problem and its reliance on second derivatives. Furthermore, the objective values obtained by iL-ADMM and DAM are consistently better than those produced by IPOPT. We attribute this to the fact that IPOPT solves a formulation with fewer decision variables compared to iL-ADMM and DAM. We also note that iL-ADMM and DAM exhibit robustness with respect to the penalty parameter ρ . As ρ increases, feasibility improves, while CPU time worsens, likely due to the

r	(n, p)	γ	$\rho_{\text{iL-ADMM}}$	iL-ADMM			DAM [8]			IPOPT		
				# iter	φ^*	$\ UV^T - A\ _F$	# iter	φ^*	$\ UV^T - A\ _F$	# iter	φ^*	$\ UV^T - A\ _F$
				cpu	$\ \mathcal{F}\ $	$\ V^T V - I_r\ _F$	cpu	$\ \mathcal{F}\ $	$\ V^T V - I_r\ _F$	cpu	-	$\ V^T V - I_r\ _F$
3	(699, 2016)	10^{-2}	144	571	1.87	1.84	2626	1.88	1.77	1567	48.42	9.84
			20	1.08	2e-5	6.00	1.17	1.7e-4	7.78			
			72	478	1.88	1.82	2112	1.88	1.77			
			10	0.83	6.7e-5	6.58	1.15	4.2e-4	7.8			
			288	1032	1.87	1.84	2954	1.88	1.77			
			40	3.21	5.1e-6	6.02	1.31	5.7e-5	7.82			
		10^2	144	910	50.18	0.32	16865	50.18	0.32	445	539.9	8.93
			20	2.61	2.5e-5	1.00	7.27	8.2e-5	1.00			
			72	660	50.18	0.38	13420	50.18	0.40			
			10	1.94	8.7e-5	1.00	5.90	2.4e-4	1.00			
			288	1813	50.18	0.32	17247	50.19	0.43			
			40	5.16	6.2e-6	1.00	7.62	4e-5	1.00			
10	(2330, 2016)	10^{-2}	144	1725	0.89	1.29	18125	0.89	1.27	2409	15.98	5.64
			20	4.83	4.1e-5	3.28	9.19	4.4e-5	3.98			
			72	1370	0.88	1.28	17733	0.88	1.27			
			10	3.94	1e-5	3.36	8.80	2.8e-4	3.98			
			288	3469	0.88	1.28	23003	0.89	1.27			
			40	9.79	1e-5	3.29	10.77	4.2e-5	3.98			
		10^2	144	3354	11.83	4.75	14131	11.84	4.64	632	225.88	12.31
			20	5.44	9.2e-7	0.1	6.47	3.5e-4	0.14			
			72	2396	11.83	4.75	11970	11.82	4.63			
			10	4.61	2.2e-6	0.1	4.78	7.6e-4	0.13			
			288	6838	11.83	4.75	14811	11.83	4.64			
			40	13.28	2.2e-7	0.1	5.92	1.1e-4	0.14			

Table 4 Numerical results comparing iL-ADMM, DAM and IPOPT on solving nonnegative orthogonal matrix factorization problems for Salinas dataset.

fact that large values of ρ can introduce ill-conditioning in the subproblems. Clearly, higher values of γ lead to a smaller orthogonality error relative to the factorization error. Finally, regarding the impact of factorization rank r , we find that increasing r improves factorization performance, as indicated by a lower factorization error, but worsens the computational time.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we introduced an inexact linearized ADMM method for solving structured nonsmooth nonconvex optimization problems. By linearizing the smooth term of the objective function and functional constraints within the augmented Lagrangian, we derived simple updates. Moreover, we solved the subproblem corresponding to the first block of primal variables inexactly. We established that the iterates of our method

globally converge to a critical point of the original problem, and we derived convergence rates to an ϵ -first-order optimal solution, along with improved convergence rates under the KL condition. Furthermore, the numerical experiments have demonstrated the effectiveness of our proposed algorithm in solving nonlinear MPC and matrix factorization problems. Our work could be extended by exploring the distributed case, which could involve the development of a coordinate descent ADMM algorithm.

Data availability

The data that support the finding of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Funding

The research leading to these results has received funding from: the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 953348; UEFISCDI, Romania, PN-III-P4-PCE-2021-0720, under project L2O-MOC, nr. 70/2022.

References

- [1] D.P. Bertsekas *Constrained Optimization and Lagrange Multiplier Methods*, Athena Scientific, 1996.
- [2] E.G. Birgin and J.M. Martínez, *Practical augmented Lagrangian methods for constrained optimization*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2014.
- [3] J. Bolte, S. Sabach and M. Teboulle, *Nonconvex Lagrangian-based optimization: monitoring schemes and global convergence*, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 43(4): 1210–1232, 2018.
- [4] J. Bolte, A. Daniilidis, A. Lewis and M. Shiota, *Clarke subgradients of stratifiable functions*, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 18(2): 556-572, 2007.
- [5] R.I. Bot and D.K. Nguyen, *The proximal alternating direction method of multipliers in the nonconvex setting: convergence analysis and rates*, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 45(2): 682–712, 2020.
- [6] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato and J. Eckstein, *Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers*, *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning* 3(1): 1–122, 2011.

- [7] A. Brendon and V. Lua, *Inverted pendulum stabilization via learning-based MPC*, Lecture Notes, 2019.
- [8] E. Cohen, N. Hallak and M. Teboulle, *A Dynamic alternating direction of multipliers for nonconvex minimization with nonlinear functional equality constraints*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 193: 324–353, 2022.
- [9] A. De Marchi, X. Jia, C. Kanzow and P. Mehlitz, *Constrained composite optimization and augmented Lagrangian methods*, Mathematical Programming, 201: 863–896, 2023.
- [10] A.L. Dontchev, *Lectures on Variational Analysis*, Springer, 2021.
- [11] L. El Bourkhissi, I. Necoara and P. Patrinos, *Linearized ADMM for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization with nonlinear equality constraints*, Conference on Decision and Control, 7312-7317, 2023.
- [12] J.A. Fessler, *Optimization methods for magnetic resonance image reconstruction: key models and optimization algorithms*, IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, 37(1): 33–40, 2020.
- [13] G. Gabay and B. Mercier, *A dual algorithm for the solution of nonlinear variational problems via finite element approximation*, Computers and Mathematics with Applications, 2(1): 17–40, 1976.
- [14] D. Gamarnik, E.C. Kizildag and I. Zadik, *Stationary points of a shallow neural network with quadratic activations and the global optimality of the gradient descent algorithm*, Mathematics of Operations Research, doi: 10.1287/moor.2021.0082, 2024.
- [15] R. Glowinski and P. Le Tallec, *Augmented Lagrangian and operator-splitting methods in nonlinear mechanics*, SIAM, 1989.
- [16] N. Gillis, *Nonnegative matrix factorization*, SIAM, 2020.
- [17] P.C. Haarhoff, J.D. Buys, *A new method for the optimization of a nonlinear function subject to nonlinear constraints*, Computer Journal, 13(2): 178–184, 1970.
- [18] W. Hager and H. Zhang, *Convergence rates for an inexact ADMM applied to separable convex optimization*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 77: 729–754, 2020.
- [19] D. Hajinezhad and M. Hong, *Perturbed proximal primal-dual algorithm for nonconvex nonsmooth optimization*, Mathematical Programming, 176(1): 207–245, 2019.
- [20] N. Hallak and M. Teboulle, *An adaptive Lagrangian-based scheme for nonconvex composite optimization*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 48(4): 2337-2352,

2023.

- [21] B. He, X. Yuan and W. Zhang, *A customized proximal point algorithm for convex minimization with linear constraints*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 56: 559–572, 2013.
- [22] M. Hestenes, *Multiplier and gradient methods*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 4: 303–320, 1969.
- [23] M. Hong, D. Hajinezhad and M.M. Zhao, *Prox-PDA: The proximal primal-dual algorithm for fast distributed nonconvex optimization and learning over networks*, International Conference on Machine Learning, 70: 1529–1538, 2017.
- [24] B. Jiang, T. Lin, S. Ma and S. Zhang, *Structured nonconvex and nonsmooth optimization: algorithms and iteration complexity analysis*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 72(1): 115–157, 2019.
- [25] N. Krejic, J.M. Martínez, M. Mello and E. Pilotta, *Validation of an augmented Lagrangian algorithm with a Gauss-Newton hessian approximation using a set of hard-spheres problems*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 16: 247–263, 2000.
- [26] A.Y. Kruger and P. Mehlitz, *Optimality conditions, approximate stationarity, and applications - a story beyond Lipschitzness*, ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations, 28, 2022.
- [27] F. Messerer, K. Baumgärtner and M. Diehl, *Survey of sequential convex programming and generalized Gauss-Newton methods*, ESAIM: Proceedings and Surveys, 71: 64–88, 2021.
- [28] V. Nedelcu, I. Necoara and Q. Tran-Dinh, *Computational complexity of inexact gradient augmented Lagrangian methods: application to constrained MPC*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 52(5): 3109–3134, 2014.
- [29] Y. Nesterov, *Lectures on Convex Optimization*, Springer, Berlin, Germany, Vol. 137, 2018.
- [30] A. Patrascu, I. Necoara and Q. Tran-Dinh, *Adaptive inexact fast augmented Lagrangian methods for constrained convex optimization*, Optimization Letters, 11(3): 609–626, 2017.
- [31] L. Qinghua, S. Xinyue and G. Yuantao, *Linearized ADMM for non-convex nonsmooth optimization with convergence analysis*, IEEE Access, doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2914461, 2019.
- [32] T. Raff, S. Huber, Z.K. Nagy and F. Allgower, *Nonlinear model predictive control of a four tank system: an experimental stability study*, Conference on Computer

- Aided Control System Design, 237-242, 2006.
- [33] R. Rockafellar and R. Wets, *Variational Analysis*, Springer, 1998.
 - [34] Y. Sakawa, *Trajectory planning of a free-flying robot by using the optimal control*, Optimal Control Applications and Methods, 20: 235-248, 1999.
 - [35] M.B. Thabit, H. Al-Duwaish and Z. Al-Hamouz, *Design of a nonlinear model predictive controller to enhance single machine infinite bus stability*, Conference on Energy Conversion, 122-127, 2014.
 - [36] A. Themelis and P. Patrinos, *Douglas–Rachford splitting and ADMM for non-convex optimization: tight convergence results*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 30(1): 149-181, 2020.
 - [37] Hyperspectral Remote Sensing Scenes: https://www.ehu.eus/ccwintco/index.php/Hyperspectral_Remote_Sensing_Scenes.
 - [38] A. Wächter and L.T. Biegler, *On the implementation of a primal-dual interior point filter line search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming*, Mathematical Programming, 106(1): 25-57, 2006.
 - [39] Y. Xie and S.J. Wright, *Complexity of proximal augmented Lagrangian for non-convex optimization with nonlinear equality constraints*, Journal of Scientific Computing, 86(3): 1-30, 2021.
 - [40] M. Yashtini, *Convergence and rate analysis of a proximal linearized ADMM for nonconvex nonsmooth optimization*, Journal of Global Optimization, 84(4): 913-939, 2022.
 - [41] J. Zhang and Z.Q. Luo, *A proximal alternating direction method of multiplier for linearly constrained nonconvex minimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 30(3): 2272–2302, 2020.