

On iteratively regularized first-order methods for simple bilevel optimization

Sepideh Samadi

Daniel Burbano

Farzad Yousefian *

April 14, 2025

Abstract

We consider simple bilevel optimization problems where the goal is to compute among the optimal solutions of a composite convex optimization problem, one that minimizes a secondary objective function. Our main contribution is threefold. (i) When the upper-level objective is a composite strongly convex function, we propose an iteratively regularized proximal gradient method in that the regularization parameter is updated at each iteration under a prescribed rule. We establish the asymptotic convergence of the generated iterate to the unique optimal solution. Further, we derive simultaneous sublinear convergence rates for suitably defined infeasibility and suboptimality error metrics. When the optimal solution set of the lower-level problem admits a weak sharp minimality condition, utilizing a constant regularization parameter, we show that this method achieves simultaneous linear convergence rates. (ii) For addressing the setting in (i), we also propose a regularized accelerated proximal gradient method. We derive quadratically decaying sublinear convergence rates for both infeasibility and suboptimality error metrics. When weak sharp minimality holds, a linear convergence rate with an improved dependence on the condition number is achieved. (iii) When the upper-level objective is a smooth nonconvex function, we propose an inexact projected iteratively regularized gradient method. Under suitable assumptions, we derive new convergence rate statements for computing a stationary point of the simple bilevel problem. We present preliminary numerical experiments for resolving three instances of ill-posed linear inverse problems.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider a class of constrained optimization problems, called simple bilevel optimization (SBO), of the form

$$\min \bar{f}(x) \triangleq f(x) + \omega_f(x), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x \in X_h^* \triangleq \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{h}(x) \triangleq h(x) + \omega_h(x), \quad (1)$$

where the upper- and lower-level objectives have a composite structure. Here, $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth (possibly nonconvex) function, $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth convex function, and $\omega_f, \omega_h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ are extended-valued nonsmooth convex functions that may represent structural constraints or regularization terms. SBO problems naturally arise in optimal solution selection, a fundamental approach for addressing ill-posed optimization problems in image processing, machine learning, and

*The authors are affiliated with Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA. They are contactable at sepi-deh.samadi@rutgers.edu, daniel.burbano@rutgers.edu, and farzad.yousefian@rutgers.edu, respectively. A substantially preliminary version of this work appeared in the proceedings of the 2024 American Control Conference [26]. This work was funded in part by the NSF under CAREER grant ECCS-2323159, in part by the ONR under grant N00014-22-1-2757, and in part by the DOE under grant DE-SC0023303.

signal processing [13]. Beyond ill-posed problems, optimal solution selection is crucial in training over-parameterized models [26], portfolio optimization [4], and stability analysis in multi-agent systems [23, 18, 12]. A key challenge in addressing this class of problems is that the standard constraint qualification conditions, e.g., Slater condition, often fail to hold [13]. This shortcoming has recently motivated the need for the design and analysis of iterative methods for addressing this class of problems.

1.1 Related work

In Table 1, we provide a survey of the most relevant works that address SBO problems. In this table, we have attempted to summarize both the asymptotic and nonasymptotic convergence results. Let \bar{h}^* and \bar{f}^* denote the optimal values of the lower- and upper-level objectives. Then, a vector x generated by a method is an approximate optimal solution to (1) if both the infeasibility error metric $|\bar{h}(x) - \bar{h}^*|$ and the suboptimality error metric $|\bar{f}(x) - \bar{f}^*|$ are sufficiently close to zero. Accordingly, in Table 1, we present the existing results on both the lower and upper bounds for each of the suboptimality and infeasibility metrics. We also summarize results in terms of the distance of the method’s output from the optimal solution set of the SBO problem. Notably, some works establish asymptotic convergence or convergence rates for different settings, considering cases both with and without conditions such as weak sharp minimality. Next, we provide a brief overview of the literature on addressing the problem in (1) and its smooth variants.

The study of SBO problems traces its origins to Tikhonov’s seminal work on regularization methods for ill-posed problems [32]. His pioneering insights laid the foundation for a class of iterative regularization (IR) techniques. Early advancements in addressing SBO problems primarily focused on asymptotic guarantees or lower-level infeasibility, often lacking simultaneous convergence rates for the both levels. Notably, Solodov [28] proposed an explicit gradient descent method with asymptotic convergence guarantees, which was later extended to accommodate nonsmooth upper- and lower-level functions using bundle methods [29]. The Minimal Norm Gradient (MNG) method in [4] was proposed where the upper-level objective function is assumed to be smooth and strongly convex. A convergence rate of the order $\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$ for the lower-level problem was achieved, where K denotes the number of iterations. Later, in [25], this rate was improved to $\frac{1}{K}$ where it is assumed that the lower-level objective function admits a composite structure. Leveraging Tikhonov’s regularization framework, the work in [1] developed the Iterative Regularized Incremental Projected (sub)Gradient (IR-IG) method. Their setting assumes nondifferentiable strongly convex upper-level objectives and nondifferentiable convex lower-level objectives, achieving a suboptimality convergence rate of the order $\frac{1}{K^b}$, for any $0 < b < 0.5$, and an asymptotic convergence guarantee to the unique optimal solution of the SBO problem. Motivated by the absence of simultaneous nonasymptotic guarantees for both the lower- and upper-level metrics, the work in [19] developed the Iteratively Regularized Gradient (a-IRG) method for solving optimization problems with variational inequality (VI) constraints (capturing SBO problems) and, for the first time, simultaneous convergence rates for both levels were obtained. Extensions of IR schemes to distributed networked systems are studied more recently in [34, 18, 23].

Subsequent studies focused on achieving improved convergence rates. For instance, the work in [11] proposed the Iterative Approximation and Level-set EXpansion (ITALEX) method with guarantees for addressing SBO with norm-like upper-level objective function. Moreover, [20] introduced the Bi-Sub-Gradient (Bi-SG) method for composite convex and strongly convex upper-level objectives. Recently, [27] introduced iteratively regularized methods equipped with a set of both asymptotic and nonasymptotic guarantees for addressing simple bilevel VIs, a problem class that subsumes the SBO problem with smooth objectives.

Table 1: Most relevant existing works for addressing the simple bilevel problem in (1).

Reference	w.sh. on X_1^*	U.L.P		L.L.P		Convergence rates			
		Obj.f.	Map.	Obj.f.	Map.	Suboptimality		Infeasibility	$\text{dist}(w_k, X_u^*)$
						L.B.	U.B.		
Solodov [28]	\times	LS.C.	-	LS.C.	-	-	-	-	Asym.
Solodov [29]	\times	NS.C.	-	NS.C.	-	-	-	-	Asym.
Beck et al. [4]	\times	D.S.C.	-	LS.C.	-	-	-	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$	Asym.
Helou et al. [15]	\times	C.	-	LS.C.	-	-	-	-	Asym.
Sabach et al. [25]	\times	LS.SC.	-	Comp.C.	-	-	-	$\frac{1}{K}$	-
Amini et al. [1]	\times	ND.SC.	-	ND.C.	-	-	-	$\frac{1}{K^p}$	Asym.
Kaushik et al. [19]	\times	LC.C.	-	-	C.	-	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$	-
	\times	LS.SC.	-	-	C.	-	-	-	Asym.
Doron et al. [11]	\times	LS.C.NL.	-	Comp.C.	-	-	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$	$\frac{1}{K}$	-
Merchav et al. [20]	\times	Comp.C.	-	Comp.C.	-	-	$\frac{1}{K^{1-c}}$	$\frac{1}{K^c}$, Asym.	Asym.
	\times	Comp.SC.	-	Comp.C.	-	-	$\rho_1^{K^{1-c}}$	$\frac{1}{K^c}$	-
	\times	-	LS.C.	-	LS.C.	Asym.	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$	-
	$m \geq 1$	-	LS.C.	-	LS.C.	$-2m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K}}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$	-
	$m = 1$	-	LS.C.	-	LS.C.	$\frac{1}{K}$	$\frac{1}{K}$	$\frac{1}{K}$	-
Samadi et al. [27]	\times	-	LS.SC.	-	LS.C.	Asym.	$\frac{1}{K}$	$\frac{1}{K}$	Asym.
	$m \geq 1$	-	LS.SC.	-	LS.C.	$-m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K}}$	$\frac{1}{K}$	$\frac{1}{K}$	$m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K}}$
	\times	-	LS.SC.	-	LS.SC.	-	$\frac{1}{K^p}$	$\frac{1}{K^p}$	-
	$m \geq 1$	-	LS.SC.	-	LS.C.	$-m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K}}$	$\frac{1}{K^p}$	$\frac{1}{K^p}$	$m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K}}$
	$m = 1$	-	LS.SC.	-	LS.C.	$-m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K}}$	$\frac{1}{K^p}$	$\frac{1}{K^p}$	$m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K}}$
	$m = 1$	-	LS.SC.	-	LS.C.	$-m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K}}$	$\frac{1}{K^p}$	$\frac{1}{K^p}$	$m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K}}$
	$m \geq 1$	LS.NC.	-	-	LS.C.	0	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$	$\frac{1}{K}$	-
	$m = 1$	LS.NC.	-	-	LS.C.	0	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$	$\frac{1}{K}$	-
Samadi et al. [26]	\times	LS.C.	-	Comp.C.	-	-	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$	$\frac{1}{K}$	-
	$m = 1$	LS.C.	-	Comp.C.	-	$-\frac{1}{K^2}$	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	$\frac{1}{K^2}$
Merchav et al. [21]	\times	Comp.C.	-	Comp.C.	-	-	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	-
	$m = 2$	Comp.C.	-	Comp.C.	-	$-\frac{1}{K^{2-d}}$	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	Asym.
Cao et al. [10]	\times	LS.C.	-	LS.C.	-	-	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	-
	$m \geq 1$	LS.C.	-	LS.C.	-	$-\frac{1}{K^{2/2m-1}} - \frac{1}{K^{2/m}}$	$\frac{1}{K^{2m/2m-1}} + \frac{1}{K^2}$	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	-
	$m = 1$	LS.C.	-	LS.C.	-	$-\frac{1}{K^2}$	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	-
Giang et al. [14]	\times	LS.C.	-	LS.C.	-	Asym.	Asym.	Asym.	-
	\times	LS.C.	-	LS.C.	-	-	$\frac{1}{K^{1-q}}$	$\frac{1}{K^q}$	-
	$m = 2$	LS.C.	-	LS.C.	-	-	$\frac{1}{K^{1-q}}$	$\frac{1}{K^q}$	-
	$m = 2$	LS.SC.	-	LS.C.	-	-	$\frac{1}{K^{\min\{q, 1-q\}}}$	$\frac{1}{K^{\min\{2q, 1\}}}$	-

w.sh. denotes weak sharp minima of order m ; U.L. and L.L. denote upper- and lower-level problems, respectively; LS., NS., and S. denote L-smooth, nonsmooth, and smooth functions, respectively; SC., C., and NC. denote strongly convex, convex, and nonconvex functions, respectively; LC. denotes Lipschitz continuity; D. and ND. denote differentiable and nondifferentiable cases, respectively; Asym. denotes asymptotic. The notation w_K represents the output of the method, with parameter ranges: $b \in (0, 0.5)$, $c \in (0.5, 1)$, $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 \in (0, 1)$, $d \in (1, 2)$, $q \in (0, 1)$, and $p \geq 1$. Comp. denotes composite functions. NL. denotes norm-like functions; Obj.f. refers to the objective function, and Map. represents the mapping F in $\text{VI}(X, F)$. The sets X_u^* and X_l^* denote the optimal solutions of SBO and lower-level problem, respectively. For nonconvex cases, the error metric used is the suboptimality error bound, measured by the ℓ_2 -norm of the residual mapping.

In a recent preliminary study to our current paper, presented in [26], we proposed a regularized proximal gradient method for addressing the SBO problem with a composite lower-level objective and established simultaneous convergence rates of the order $1/K$ for $\max\{f(x_K) - f^*, \bar{h}(x_K) - \bar{h}^*\}$, while ensuring that $\bar{h}(x_K) - \bar{h}^* \geq 0$. Further, when the lower-level problem admits a weak sharp minimality property and the regularization parameter falls below a priori known threshold, we showed that $\max\{|f(x_k) - f^*|, |\bar{h}(x_K) - \bar{h}^*|\} \leq \mathcal{O}(1/K^2)$. To the best of our knowledge, this was the first time that complexity guarantees for SBO problems were shown to match optimal complexity bounds for single-level convex optimization [5].

More recently, iteratively regularized proximal gradient methods were developed in [21] for SBO problems with convex lower and upper objectives. Accelerated gradient methods [10] and iteratively regularized conditional gradient methods [14] were introduced for addressing SBO problems.

Table 1 provides a clear overview of the methods discussed in this section, highlighting their main assumptions and results.

1.2 Contributions

Our main contributions are presented in the following and are also concisely summarized in Table 2.

(i) *An iteratively regularized proximal method with new guarantees for composite SBO with a strongly convex upper-level objective.* We propose IR-ISTA_s for addressing SBO problems with a composite strongly convex upper-level objective function and a composite convex lower-level objective function. Under a diminishing regularization update rule, we show that the generated iterate converges asymptotically to the unique solution of the SBO problem. Further, we establish simultaneous sublinear convergence rates for infeasibility and the upper bound of suboptimality. Under a weak sharp minimality assumption, we derive explicit nonasymptotic error bounds on both infeasibility and suboptimality metrics. We also extend the rate analysis to the setting with a constant regularization parameter, where we refer to the method as R-ISTA_s. Under a weak sharp minimality assumption for the lower-level problem, R-ISTA_s attains a linear convergence rate. All these results appear to be novel for this class of problems. Importantly, when compared with existing methods in Table 1, IR-ISTA_s is among the first IR schemes that is equipped with both asymptotic and (simultaneous) nonasymptotic convergence guarantees for resolving SBO problems.

(ii) *A regularized accelerated proximal method for composite SBO with a strongly convex upper-level objective.* To improve the convergence rates in (i) further, we propose Regularized Variant of FISTA (R-VFISTA_s). We derive quadratically decaying sublinear convergence rates for both infeasibility and suboptimality error metrics. When weak sharp minimality holds, a linear convergence rate with an improved dependence on the condition number is achieved. It appears that this is the first time simultaneous accelerated sublinear convergence rates are achieved for composite SBO problems.

(iii) *New convergence guarantees for composite SBO problems with a smooth nonconvex upper-level objective.* When the upper-level objective is a smooth nonconvex function, we propose a method called Inexactly Projected Regularized VFISTA (IPR-VFISTA_{nc}). Under suitable assumptions, we derive new convergence rate statements for computing a stationary point of the SBO problem. This is the first time that an accelerated IR scheme is developed for addressing SBO problems with a nonconvex upper objective. Our theory improves the guarantees in the prior work [27] through utilizing an acceleration. The key assumptions and the corresponding convergence rate statements are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of main contributions in this work in addressing the problem in (1)

Composite strongly convex upper-level and composite convex lower-level						
Our method	M.A.	Error metric				
	X_h^*	$\bar{f}(w_K) - \bar{f}^*$		$\bar{h}(w_K) - \bar{h}^*$		$\ w_K - x^*\ _2^2$
	w.sh.	L.B.	U.B.	L.B.	U.B.	U.B.
IR-ISTA _s	\times	Asym.	$\frac{1}{K}$	0	$\frac{1}{K}$	Asym.
	$m \geq 1$	$-m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K}}$	$\frac{1}{K}$	0	$\frac{1}{K}$	$m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K}}$
R-ISTA _s	\times	-	$\frac{1}{K^q}$	0	$\frac{1}{K^{q+1}} + \frac{1}{K}$	-
	$m \geq 1$	$-m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K^{q+1}} + \frac{1}{K}}$	$\frac{1}{K^q}$	0	$\frac{1}{K^{q+1}} + \frac{1}{K}$	$\frac{1}{K^q} + m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K^{q+1}} + \frac{1}{K}}$
	$m = 1$	$-\frac{1}{\eta}(1 - \frac{\eta}{\kappa\eta})^K$	$\frac{1}{\eta}(1 - \frac{\eta}{\kappa\eta})^K$	0	$(1 - \frac{\eta}{\kappa\eta})^K$	$\frac{1}{\eta\mu_f}(1 - \frac{\eta}{\kappa\eta})^K$
R-VFISTA _s	\times	-	$\frac{1}{K^{p-1}}$	0	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	-
	$m \geq 1$	$-m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K^2}}$	$\frac{1}{K^{p-1}}$	0	$\frac{1}{K^2}$	$\frac{1}{K^{p-1}} + m\sqrt{\frac{1}{K^2}}$
	$m = 1$	$-\frac{1}{\eta}(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa\eta}})^K$	$\frac{1}{\eta}(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa\eta}})^K$	0	$(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa\eta}})^K$	$\frac{1}{\eta\mu_f}(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa\eta}})^K$
Smooth nonconvex upper-level and composite convex lower-level						
Our method	M.A.	Error metric				
	X_h^*	$\ G_{1/\gamma}(\bar{w}_K^*)\ _2^2$		$\text{dist}(w_K, X_h^*)$		
	q.g.	L.B.	U.B.	L.B.	U.B.	
IPR-VFISTA _s	\checkmark	0	$\frac{1}{K^q}$	0	$\frac{1}{K^q}$	

Notation: w.sh. denotes α -weak sharp minima of order m ; $a \geq 2$; $p > 2\sqrt{a} > 0$; w_K is output of the method; q.g. denotes quadratic growth property; L.B. and U.B. stand for lower bound and upper bound, respectively; Asym. denotes asymptotic convergence; M.A. denotes main assumption on; We ignore logarithmic numerical factors; We consider both $m \geq 1$ and $m = 1$, the rates for $m = 1$ are included within the analysis for $m \geq 1$. Additionally, we derive improved rates by explicitly setting $m = 1$ in a separate case in which we assume that η falls below a threshold.

1.3 Outline of the paper

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, some preliminaries are presented. In section 3, we address the composite bilevel optimization problem with a strongly convex upper-level objective function and a convex lower-level objective function. In section 4, we provide convergence rate statements for the SBO problem with a smooth nonconvex upper-level objective function and a composite convex lower-level objective function. In section 5, we present preliminary numerical results. Concluding remarks are provided in section 6.

1.4 Notation

For given column vectors x and y in \mathbb{R}^n , we let $\langle x, y \rangle$ denote their inner product and x^\top denote the transpose of x . We let $\|\bullet\|_p$ denote the ℓ_p -norm of a vector, where $p \geq 1$. We denote the proximal map of a function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ at a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by $\text{prox}_g[x]$, and its formal definition can be found in Definition 1. For a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote the gradient mapping at $x \in \text{dom}(f)$ by $\nabla f(x)$. A vector $\tilde{\nabla} f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a subgradient of a convex function f at x if $f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle \tilde{\nabla} f(x), y - x \rangle$ for all $y \in \text{dom}(f)$. We denote the subdifferential set of f at $x \in \text{dom}(f)$ by $\partial f(x)$. We denote the Euclidean projection operator of a vector x onto a set X as $\Pi_X[x]$, and the distance of vector x from the nonempty closed convex set X by $\text{dist}(x, X) = \|x - \Pi_X[x]\|_2$. In addressing the problem in (1), we define the set X^* as the optimal solution set and \bar{f}^* as the optimal value of \bar{f} . We define $X_h^* \triangleq \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{h}(x)$ and $\bar{h}^* \triangleq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{h}(x)$. We denote the relative interior and the interior of set C by $\text{ri}(C)$ and $\text{int}(C)$, respectively. We let \mathcal{B} denote an arbitrary bounded box set with dimension n and define $f^{\mathcal{B}} = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{B}} \|f(x)\|_2$. We also let $(\cdot)^\dagger$ denote the Moore–Penrose Pseudoinverse of a matrix. We let $\mathbb{I}_S(x)$ denote the indicator function associated with the set S . We define $\hat{C}_{\bar{f}} = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{f}(x)$.

2 Preliminaries

We present some definitions and preliminary results.

Definition 1 ([3, Definition 6.1]). Given a function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$, its proximal map is given as $\text{prox}_g[x] \triangleq \arg \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{g(u) + \frac{1}{2}\|u - x\|_2^2\}$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 1 ([3, Theorem 6.39]). Given a proper, closed, and convex function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$, $z \triangleq \text{prox}_{\gamma g}[u]$ if and only if for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\gamma > 0$, we have $(u - z) \in \gamma \partial g(z)$.

Definition 2. Consider the problem in (1) where $f, h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega_f, \omega_h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ are given functions. For $\eta, \gamma > 0$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} g_\eta(x) &\triangleq h(x) + \eta f(x), & \omega_\eta(x) &\triangleq \omega_h(x) + \eta \omega_f(x), \\ \bar{g}_\eta(x) &\triangleq g_\eta(x) + \omega_\eta(x), & \text{and } q_\eta(x) &\triangleq \text{prox}_{\gamma \omega_\eta}[x - \gamma(\nabla h(x) + \eta \nabla f(x))]. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3 ([3, Definition 2.13]). A proper function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is called coercive, if $\lim_{\|x\|_2 \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = \infty$.

Definition 4 (Weak sharp minima [31, Definition 1.1]). Consider the problem $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x)$, where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$. Let $X_f^* \triangleq \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x)$ be a nonempty set. The set X_f^* is a weak sharp minima of order $m \geq 1$, if there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that $f(x) - \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \geq \alpha \text{dist}^m(x, X_f^*)$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Under some non-degeneracy conditions, the optimal solution set of linear programs and linear complementary problems admits weak sharp minima of order $m = 1$ [31]. Further, quadratic programs under some assumptions admit the weak sharp minimality of order $m = 1$ [9, Section 3]. In nonlinear programming, this condition is also referred to as the Hölder continuity property of the solution set, e.g., see [16, 8, 17, 7]. The weak sharp minimality for problems with a unique optimal solution is also studied in [2, 30, 33]. Some examples that satisfy Definition 4 with $m = 2$ are provided in [17, 7]. In particular, an example is discussed next.

Remark 1. Consider the optimization problem

$$\min h(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}x - b\|_2^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|x\|_2 \leq 1, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a nonzero, symmetric, and positive semidefinite matrix and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Define $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ and $q = \mathbf{A}^\top b$. Let λ_{\min} denote the smallest eigenvalue of \mathbf{Q} . Let h^* be the optimal objective value of the problem in (2). If $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} h(x) < h^*$, then (2) admits the α -weak sharp minimality of order $m = 2$ in view of [17, Lemma 3.6]. If $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} h(x) = h^*$, this condition still holds under either of the following conditions: (a) if $\lambda_{\min} > 0$ in which the property holds with $\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}}}$. (b) if $\lambda_{\min} = 0$ and $\|\mathbf{Q}^\dagger q\| < 1$. Thus, there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\alpha \text{dist}(x, X_{\bar{h}^*})^2 \leq \bar{h}(x) - \bar{h}^*$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\bar{h}(x) = h(x) + \mathbb{I}_S(x)$, \bar{h}^* is the optimal objective function of (2), and $S = \{x : \|x\|_2 \leq 1\}$.

Remark 2. Note that the weak sharp minimality of the optimal solution set of the lower-level problem is not a standing assumption throughout this work. It is only utilized for some cases, as indicated in Table 2.

Lemma 2 ([24, Theorem 27.2]). Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ be a proper closed convex function. Then, the optimal solution set of $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x)$ is convex.

Lemma 3. Let $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c, d > 0$ be given. Consider the sequence $\{r_k\}$ satisfying the recursion $r_{k+1} \leq b + \frac{c}{k^d} r_k$, for any $k \geq 1$. Let $\hat{r} = \max_{1 \leq k \leq \lceil \sqrt[2]{2c} \rceil} \{r_k, 2b\}$. Then, $r_k \leq \max\{\hat{r}, 2b\}$, for all $k \geq 1$.

Proof. First, we use mathematical induction to show that $r_k \leq \max\{\hat{r}, 2b\}$, for any k such that $k^d \geq 2c$. Let $k = \lceil \sqrt[d]{2c} \rceil$. By the definition of \hat{r}_k , we have $r_k \leq \hat{r} \leq \max\{\hat{r}, 2b\}$. Thus, the base case holds true. Now assume that r_k is bounded by $\max\{\hat{r}, 2b\}$, for some k such that $k^d > \lceil 2c \rceil$. We aim to show that r_{k+1} is bounded by $\max\{\hat{r}, 2b\}$. Considering the inductive hypothesis, we may have two cases. The first case is when $\max\{\hat{r}, 2b\} = 2b$. We have

$$r_{k+1} \leq b + \frac{c}{k^d} r_k \leq b + \frac{2cb}{k^d} \leq b + \frac{2cb}{2c} = 2b \leq \max\{\hat{r}, 2b\}.$$

The second case is when $\max\{\hat{r}, 2b\} = \hat{r}$. Then, we have

$$r_{k+1} \leq b + \frac{c}{k^d} r_k \leq b + \frac{c\hat{r}}{k^d} \leq b + \frac{c\hat{r}}{2c} \leq \frac{\hat{r}}{2} + \frac{\hat{r}}{2} = \hat{r} = \max\{\hat{r}, 2b\}.$$

In either case, we conclude that $r_{k+1} \leq \max\{\hat{r}, 2b\}$. Since the finite number of initial terms of $\{r_k\}$ for $1 \leq k \leq \lceil \sqrt[d]{2c} \rceil$ are captured by the definition of \hat{r} , it follows that $r_k \leq \max\{\hat{r}, 2b\}$ for all $k \geq 1$. \square

3 Composite SBO with a strongly convex upper-level objective

In this section, we consider addressing the problem in (1) under the following assumption.

Assumption 1. Consider the problem in (1). Let the following hold.

- (i) $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L_f -smooth and μ_f -strongly convex.
- (ii) $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L_h -smooth and convex.
- (iii) ω_f and $\omega_h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ are proper, closed, and convex.
- (iv) The set X_h^* is nonempty.
- (v) $\hat{C}_{\bar{f}} = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{f}(x) > -\infty$.
- (vi) $x^* \in \text{int}(\text{dom}(\omega_f))$, where x^* is the unique optimal solution to (1).
- (vii) $\text{ri}(\text{dom}(\omega_f)) \cap X_h^* \neq \emptyset$.

Remark 3. According to [6, Prop. 2.1.1], if any of the following three conditions hold, then X_h^* is nonempty and compact. These conditions are as follows. (a) $\text{dom}(\bar{h})$ is bounded, (b) there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the level set $\{x | \bar{h}(x) \leq \lambda\}$ is nonempty and bounded, and (c) \bar{h} is coercive. Additionally, under Assumption 1 (i) and by invoking [3, Thm. 2.12], we conclude that X^* is nonempty. In another case, if ω_h is an indicator function of a compact set C , then under Assumption 1 (i) and using [3, Thm. 2.12], we conclude that X_h^* is nonempty. Given that $X_h^* \subseteq C$, it follows that X_h^* is compact. Also, in the case that $\omega_f = 0$ and ω_h is the indicator function of a closed set and both functions h and f are coercive, by invoking [3, Thm. 2.14], X^* is nonempty. Notably, if \bar{f} is coercive, then Assumption 1 (v) is satisfied. This condition holds when the upper-level objective serves as a regularizer, as considered in the numerical experiments in this work.

Remark 4 (Uniqueness of the optimal solution). The nonemptiness of X_h^* , the convexity of this set (cf. Lemma 2), and the strong convexity of \bar{f} guarantee that the problem in (1) admits a unique optimal solution (see [6, Prop. 2.1.2]).

Definition 5. Consider Assumption 1 (i) and (ii) hold. For each $k \geq 0$, define $L_{\eta_k} = L_h + \eta_k L_f$, where $\eta_k > 0$.

3.1 The IR-ISTA_s method

We propose Algorithm 1 to address the problem in (1) under Assumption 1. This method is an iteratively regularized single-timescale proximal method, which we refer to as the Iteratively Regularized Iterative Shrinkage-Thresholding Algorithm (IR-ISTA_s). IR-ISTA_s builds on the classical ISTA method [5, Section 10.5], which addresses single-level composite optimization problems. IR-ISTA_s employs (i) an iterative regularization technique, whereby at each iteration k , x_k is updated using the proximal operator applied to the regularized function $\bar{h}(\bullet) + \eta_k \bar{f}(\bullet)$ and (ii) a weighted averaging sequence in which the weights, θ_k , are updated following a geometric pattern.

Algorithm 1 Iteratively Regularized ISTA (IR-ISTA_s)

- 1: **input:** $\bar{x}_0 = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, nonincreasing sequence $\{\eta_k\}$ for $k \geq 0$, stepsize $\gamma > 0$ such that $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{L_h + \eta_0 L_f}$, $\Gamma_0 = 0$, $\theta_0 = \frac{1}{(1 - \eta_0 \gamma \mu_f)}$, and $K \geq 1$.
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$ **do**
 - 3: $x_{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\gamma \omega_{\eta_k}} [x_k - \gamma (\nabla h(x_k) + \eta_k \nabla f(x_k))]$
 - 4: $\bar{x}_{k+1} = \frac{\Gamma_k \bar{x}_k + \eta_k \theta_k x_{k+1}}{\Gamma_{k+1}}$
 - 5: $\Gamma_{k+1} = \Gamma_k + \eta_k \theta_k$ and $\theta_{k+1} = \frac{\theta_k}{(1 - \eta_{k+1} \gamma \mu_f)}$
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: **return:** \bar{x}_K
-

In the next lemma, we study some properties of the sequence $\{\theta_k\}$.

Lemma 4. Consider the sequence $\{\theta_k\}$ generated by the recursive update rule in Algorithm 1. Then, the following statements hold.

- (i) $\theta_k = 1 / \prod_{t=0}^k (1 - \eta_t \gamma \mu_f)$, for all $k \geq 0$. Further, $\theta_k > 1$ for all $k \geq 0$.
- (ii) [diminishing regularization] Let $\eta_k = \frac{\eta_{0,u}}{\eta_{0,l} + k}$, where $\eta_{0,u} = (\gamma \mu_f)^{-1}$, $\eta_{0,l} = 2L_f / \mu_f$, and $\gamma \leq 0.5 / L_h$. Then, we have $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{L_h + \eta_0 L_f}$, $\theta_k = \frac{\eta_{0,l} + k}{\eta_{0,l} - 1}$ for all $k \geq 0$, $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k \eta_k = \frac{K}{\gamma(2L_f - \mu_f)}$, $\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \eta_j^2 \theta_j = \frac{\eta_{0,u}^2}{(\eta_{0,l} - 1)} (\eta_{0,l} + \ln(\frac{K + \eta_{0,l} - 1}{\eta_{0,l}}))$, and $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \theta_j \eta_j) / \theta_{k-1} < \infty$.
- (iii) [constant regularization] Let $\eta = (p + 1) \ln(K) / (\gamma \mu_f K)$, for some $p > 0$ and $K > 1$ such that $\frac{K}{\ln(K)} \geq 2(p + 1) \frac{L_f}{\mu_f}$. Suppose $\gamma \leq 0.5 / L_h$. Then, we have $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{L_h + \eta L_f}$ and $(\eta \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j)^{-1} \leq \frac{\gamma \mu_f}{(p+1) \ln(K) K^p}$.

Proof. (i) The equation follows directly from the update rule $\theta_{k+1} = \frac{\theta_k}{(1 - \eta_{k+1} \gamma \mu_f)}$ for all $k \geq 1$, where $\theta_0 = \frac{1}{(1 - \eta_0 \gamma \mu_f)}$. To show that $\theta_k > 1$, note that from the condition $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{L_h + \eta_0 L_f}$, we have $\eta_0 \gamma \mu_f < 1$, and thus $\eta_k \gamma \mu_f < 1$ for all $k \geq 0$.

(ii) From the update rule of η_k , we have $\eta_0 = 0.5 / (\gamma L_f)$. Together with $\gamma \leq 0.5 / L_h$, we obtain $\gamma(L_h + \eta_0 L_f) \leq 0.5 + 0.5 = 1$. Thus, $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{\eta_0 L_f + L_h}$. Next, we show $\theta_k = \frac{\eta_{0,l} + k}{\eta_{0,l} - 1}$. Using $\eta_k := \frac{\eta_{0,u}}{\eta_{0,l} + k}$, where $\eta_{0,u} = (\gamma \mu_f)^{-1}$ and $\eta_{0,l} = \frac{2L_f}{\mu_f}$, for any $k \geq 0$ we have $\prod_{t=0}^k (1 - \eta_t \gamma \mu_f) = \prod_{t=0}^k (1 - \frac{1}{t + \eta_{0,l}}) = \frac{\eta_{0,l} - 1}{\eta_{0,l} + k}$. From the equation in (i), we obtain $\theta_k = \frac{\eta_{0,l} + k}{\eta_{0,l} - 1}$ for all $k \geq 0$. Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k \eta_k = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{(\eta_{0,l} + k)}{(\eta_{0,l} - 1)} \frac{\eta_{0,u}}{(\eta_{0,l} + k)} = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\eta_{0,u}}{\eta_{0,l} - 1} = \frac{K \eta_{0,u}}{\eta_{0,l} - 1} = \frac{K}{\gamma(2L_f - \mu_f)}. \quad (3)$$

In addition, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k \eta_k^2 = \frac{\eta_{0,u}^2}{(\eta_{0,l-1})} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{(\eta_{0,l+k})} \leq \frac{\eta_{0,u}^2}{(\eta_{0,l-1})} (\eta_{0,l} + \ln(\frac{K+\eta_{0,l-1}}{\eta_{0,l}})),$$

where the last inequality is implied by invoking [35, Lemma 9]. Lastly, by considering the equation in part (i) and (3), we have $(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \theta_j \eta_j) / \theta_{k-1} = \frac{(\eta_{0,l-1})}{\gamma(2L_f - \mu_f)} \frac{K}{(\eta_{0,l} + K - 1)}$, implying that $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \theta_j \eta_j) / \theta_{k-1} < \infty$.

(iii) From the condition $\frac{K}{\ln(K)} \geq 2(p+1) \frac{L_f}{\mu_f}$ and the value of η , we have $\gamma \eta L_f \leq 0.5$. Thus, from $\gamma \leq 0.5/L_h$, it follows that $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{L_h + \eta L_f}$. From the equation in (i), for a constant regularization parameter η , we have $\theta_k = 1/(1 - \eta \gamma \mu_f)^{k+1}$ for all $k \geq 0$. Note that trivially, we can write $\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j > \theta_{K-1} = (1 - \eta \gamma \mu_f)^{-K}$. Thus, $(\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j)^{-1} \leq (1 - \eta \gamma \mu_f)^K$. From $\eta = \frac{(p+1) \ln(K)}{\gamma \mu_f K}$, we have $(1 - \eta \gamma \mu_f)^K = \left(1 - \frac{(p+1) \ln(K)}{K}\right)^K$. Note that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $1 - x \leq \exp(-x)$. We obtain

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j\right)^{-1} \leq (1 - \eta \gamma \mu_f)^K = \left(1 - \frac{(p+1) \ln(K)}{K}\right)^K \leq \exp(-(p+1) \ln(K)) = \frac{1}{K^{p+1}}.$$

Thus, from the value of η , we obtain $(\eta \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j)^{-1} \leq \frac{\gamma \mu_f}{(p+1) \ln(K) K^p}$. \square

In the following lemma, we show that the generated sequence $\{\bar{x}_k\}$ by Algorithm 1 is a weighted average sequence.

Lemma 5. Let $\{x_k\}$ and $\{\bar{x}_k\}$ be generated by Algorithm 1. Then, for any $K \geq 1$, we have $\bar{x}_K = \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k \eta_k x_{k+1}}{\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j}$.

Proof. We prove the lemma using mathematical induction on $K \geq 1$. Let $K = 1$. From Algorithm 1, we have $\bar{x}_1 = \frac{\Gamma_0 \bar{x}_0 + \eta_0 \theta_0 x_1}{\Gamma_1}$. Since $\Gamma_0 = 0$ and $\Gamma_1 = \eta_0 \theta_0$, this simplifies to $\bar{x}_1 = \frac{\eta_0 \theta_0 x_1}{\eta_0 \theta_0} = (\sum_{k=0}^0 \theta_k \eta_k x_{k+1}) / (\sum_{j=0}^0 \theta_j \eta_j)$. Thus, the base case holds true. Suppose $\bar{x}_K = (\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k \eta_k x_{k+1}) / (\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j)$, for some $K \geq 1$. We want to show that the statement holds for $K+1$. Using the inductive hypothesis, we substitute \bar{x}_K in $\bar{x}_{K+1} = \frac{\Gamma_K \bar{x}_K + \eta_K \theta_K x_{K+1}}{\Gamma_{K+1}}$ derived from Algorithm 1. Then, by recalling that $\Gamma_{K+1} = \sum_{j=0}^K \theta_j \eta_j$, we obtain

$$\bar{x}_{K+1} = \frac{\Gamma_K \bar{x}_K + \eta_K \theta_K x_{K+1}}{\Gamma_{K+1}} = \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k \eta_k x_{k+1} + \eta_K \theta_K x_{K+1}}{\Gamma_{K+1}} = \frac{\sum_{k=0}^K \theta_k \eta_k x_{k+1}}{\sum_{j=0}^K \theta_j \eta_j}.$$

Thus, by induction, the statement holds for all $K \geq 1$. \square

In the following, we derive a preliminary result that will be utilized in the analysis.

Lemma 6. Consider the problem in (1) under Assumption 1. Let x^* be the unique optimal solution to this problem. Then, the following statements hold.

(i) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*) \in \partial \bar{f}(x^*)$, we have

$$- \|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \text{dist}(x, X_h^*) + \frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \bar{f}(x) - \bar{f}^*. \quad (4)$$

(ii) If X_h^* is α -weak sharp minima of order $m \geq 1$. Then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\|x - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2}{\mu_f} \left(\bar{f}(x) - \bar{f}^* + \|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \sqrt[m]{\alpha^{-1} (\bar{h}(x) - \bar{h}^*)} \right). \quad (5)$$

Proof. (i) Under Assumption 1 (vi), the set $\partial \bar{f}(x^*)$ is nonempty and bounded [3, Theorems 3.14 and 3.18]. Let us define $\hat{x} \triangleq \Pi_{X_h^*}[x] \in X_h^*$. By invoking the optimality condition on the problem in (1) and in view of Lemma 2, we obtain $\langle \tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*), \hat{x} - x^* \rangle \geq 0$, where $\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*) \in \partial \bar{f}(x^*)$ [3, Corollary 3.68]. Then, by using the strong convexity property of \bar{f} and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain the desired lower bound for the suboptimality as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}(x) - \bar{f}^* &\geq \langle \tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*), x - x^* \rangle + \frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x - x^*\|_2^2 \\ &= \langle \tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*), x - \hat{x} \rangle + \langle \tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*), \hat{x} - x^* \rangle + \frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x - x^*\|_2^2 \\ &\geq -\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \text{dist}(x, X_h^*) + \frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x - x^*\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Consider a rearrangement of (4) as follows.

$$\frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \bar{f}(x) - \bar{f}^* + \|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \text{dist}(x, X_h^*). \quad (6)$$

The result follows by applying the weak sharp minimality of X_h^* in Definition 4. \square

Next, we provide an intermediary result to be utilized in the analysis.

Lemma 7. Consider the problem in (1) and let Assumption 1 hold. Let x^* be the unique optimal solution to the problem in (1) and $\{x_k\}$ be a sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then, for any $k \geq 0$,

$$\eta_k \left(\bar{f}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{f}^* \right) + \bar{h}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{h}^* \leq \frac{(L_{\eta_0} - \eta_k \mu_f)}{2} \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 - \frac{L_{\eta_0}}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2. \quad (7)$$

Further, for any $K \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k \eta_k (\bar{f}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{f}^*) \leq \frac{1}{2\gamma} \left(\|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2 - \theta_{K-1} \|x_K - x^*\|_2^2 \right). \quad (8)$$

Proof. By the strong convexity of $g_{\eta_k}(x) = \eta_k f(x) + h(x)$, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$g_{\eta_k}(x) - g_{\eta_k}(y) - \langle \nabla g_{\eta_k}(x), y - x \rangle \geq \left(\frac{\eta_k \mu_f}{2} \right) \|y - x\|_2^2. \quad (9)$$

By recalling that $\{\eta_k\}$ is a nonincreasing sequence and from Definition 2 and Definition 5, it follows that \bar{g}_{η_k} is L_{η_0} -smooth. Then, by applying [3, Theorem 10.16], we have the following inequality for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{g}_{\eta_k}(x) - \bar{g}_{\eta_k}(q_{\eta_k}(y)) &\geq \left(\frac{L_{\eta_0}}{2} \right) \|x - q_{\eta_k}(y)\|_2^2 - \left(\frac{L_{\eta_0}}{2} \right) \|x - y\|_2^2 + g_{\eta_k}(x) - g_{\eta_k}(y) \\ &\quad - \langle \nabla g_{\eta_k}(x), y - x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Next, by invoking (9), from the preceding inequality we obtain

$$\bar{g}_{\eta_k}(x) - \bar{g}_{\eta_k}(q_{\eta_k}(y)) \geq \left(\frac{L_{\eta_0}}{2} \right) \|x - q_{\eta_k}(y)\|_2^2 - \left(\frac{L_{\eta_0} - \eta_k \mu_f}{2} \right) \|x - y\|_2^2. \quad (10)$$

Note that, from Definition 2 and Algorithm 1, we can establish $q_{\eta_k}(x_k) = x_{k+1}$. Hence, by substituting y with x_k in (10), we obtain

$$\bar{g}_{\eta_k}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{g}_{\eta_k}(x) \leq \left(\frac{L_{\eta_0} - \eta_k \mu_f}{2} \right) \|x_k - x\|_2^2 - \left(\frac{L_{\eta_0}}{2} \right) \|x_{k+1} - x\|_2^2.$$

Then, (7) follows by substituting x by x^* in the preceding relation.

Next, we show the inequality (8). By dropping the nonnegative term $\bar{h}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{h}^*$ from the left-hand side of (7) and invoking $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{L_{\eta_0}}$, we obtain

$$\eta_k(\bar{f}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{f}^*) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma} \right) \left((1 - \eta_k \gamma \mu_f) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 - \|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right). \quad (11)$$

Now, consider (11) for $k = 0$. By multiplying the both sides by θ_0 , we have

$$\theta_0 \eta_0 (\bar{f}(x_1) - \bar{f}^*) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma} \right) \left(\|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2 - \theta_0 \|x_1 - x^*\|_2^2 \right). \quad (12)$$

Considering (11) and multiplying both sides by $\theta_k = 1 / \prod_{t=0}^k (1 - \eta_t \gamma \mu_f)$, and recalling the nonincreasing property of $\{\eta_k\}$, we have for any $k \geq 1$

$$\theta_k \eta_k (\bar{f}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{f}^*) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma} \right) \left(\theta_{k-1} \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 - \theta_k \|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2 \right),$$

and by summing both sides over $k = 1, 2, \dots, K-1$, yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \theta_k \eta_k (\bar{f}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{f}^*) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma} \right) \left(\theta_0 \|x_1 - x^*\|_2^2 - \theta_{K-1} \|x_K - x^*\|_2^2 \right). \quad (13)$$

Finally, by summing (12) and (13), we obtain (8). \square

We now derive conditions under which the weighted average sequence $\{\bar{x}_k\}$ is bounded.

Proposition 1. Consider the problem in (1) under Assumption 1. Let x^* be the unique optimal solution to the problem in (1) and $\{\bar{x}_k\}$ be generated by Algorithm 1 where $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{L_h + \eta_0 L_f}$ and $\{\eta_k\}$ is a diminishing sequence. Suppose $\limsup_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j / \theta_{K-1} < \infty$ (e.g., see Lemma 4 (ii)). Then, the sequence $\{\bar{x}_k\}$ is bounded.

Proof. We first show that the sequence $\{x_k\}$ is bounded. Consider the following rearrangement of (8).

$$\left(\frac{1}{2\gamma} \right) \theta_{K-1} \|x_K - x^*\|_2^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k \eta_k (\bar{f}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{f}^*) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma} \right) \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2.$$

Dividing the both sides by $\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j$, applying Jensen's inequality, and invoking Lemma 5, yields

$$\left(\frac{\theta_{K-1} \|x_K - x^*\|_2^2}{2\gamma} \right) / \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j \leq \left(\left(\frac{\|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2}{2\gamma} \right) / \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j \right) + (\bar{f}^* - \bar{f}(\bar{x}_K)).$$

Multiplying the both sides by $\frac{2\gamma}{\theta_{K-1}}$, we have

$$\|x_K - x^*\|_2^2 / \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j \leq \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2 / \left(\theta_{K-1} \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j \right) + \left(\frac{2\gamma}{\theta_{K-1}} \right) (\bar{f}^* - \bar{f}(\bar{x}_K)).$$

Now, multiplying the both sides by $\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j$, we obtain

$$\|x_K - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2}{\theta_{K-1}} + (\bar{f}^* - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}}) \left(2\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j \right) / (\theta_{K-1}).$$

From Lemma 4 (i), $\theta_{K-1} \geq 1$ for all $K \geq 1$. Invoking the boundedness of the sequence $\left\{\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j / \theta_{K-1}\right\}$ and that $\theta_{K-1} \geq 1$ for all $K \geq 1$, it follows that $\{x_k\}$ is bounded. Therefore, there exists some $u > 0$ such that $\|x_k\|_2 \leq u$, for all $k \geq 0$. Then, by invoking Lemma 5, we have the following inequality for any $K \geq 1$.

$$\|\bar{x}_K\| = \left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k \eta_k \|x_{k+1}\|\right) / \left(\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j\right) \leq \left(u \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k \eta_k\right) / \left(\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j\right) = u.$$

Hence, $\|\bar{x}_K\|_2 \leq u$, for all $K \geq 1$ which implies that $\{\bar{x}_K\}$ is bounded. \square

In the following result, we establish suboptimality and infeasibility error bounds and provide an asymptotic convergence guarantee for IR-ISTA_s.

Theorem 1. Consider the problem in (1) under Assumption 1. Let x^* be the unique optimal solution to the problem in (1). Let $\{\bar{x}_k\}$ be a sequence generated by Algorithm 1 where $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{L_h + \eta_0 L_f}$ and $\{\eta_k\}$ is a nonincreasing sequence. Then, the following statements hold.

(i) [suboptimality bounds] For any $K \geq 1$,

$$-\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \text{dist}(\bar{x}_K, X_h^*) + \frac{\mu_f}{2} \|\bar{x}_K - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \bar{f}(\bar{x}_K) - \bar{f}^* \leq \frac{\|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2}{2\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j}.$$

(ii) [infeasibility bounds] For any $K \geq 1$,

$$0 \leq \bar{h}(\bar{x}_K) - \bar{h}^* \leq \left(\frac{\eta_0 \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2}{2\gamma} + (\bar{f}^* - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}}) \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \eta_j^2 \theta_j \right) / \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \eta_j \theta_j.$$

(iii) [asymptotic convergence] Let \bar{h} be a lower semicontinuous function. Suppose $\limsup_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j / \theta_{K-1} < \infty$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^k \eta_j^2 \theta_j / \sum_{j=0}^k \eta_j \theta_j = 0$, and $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \eta_j \theta_j = \infty$ (e.g., see Lemma 4 (ii)). Then, $\{\bar{x}_k\}$ has a limit point and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x}_k = x^*$.

Proof. (i) The lower bound holds due to (4). To obtain the upper bound, consider the following steps. By dropping the nonnegative term $\theta_{K-1} \|x_K - x^*\|_2^2$ from the right-hand side of (8) and dividing the both sides by $\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \eta_j$, using Jensen's inequality, and invoking Lemma 5, we obtain the result.

(ii) Note that $\bar{h}^* \triangleq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{h}(x)$ implies that the lower bound for infeasibility is zero. Then, by considering (7) and recalling that $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{L_{\eta_0}}$, we have

$$\bar{h}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{h}^* \leq \frac{(1 - \eta_k \gamma \mu_f) \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 - \|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2}{2\gamma} + \eta_k (\bar{f}^* - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}}). \quad (14)$$

Consider the preceding inequality for $k = 0$. By multiplying the both sides by $\eta_0 \theta_0 = \eta_0 / (1 - \eta_0 \gamma \mu_f)$, and recalling that $\eta_1 \leq \eta_0$, we have

$$\eta_0 \theta_0 (\bar{h}(x_1) - \bar{h}^*) \leq \frac{\eta_0 \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2 - \eta_1 \theta_0 \|x_1 - x^*\|_2^2}{2\gamma} + \eta_0^2 \theta_0 (\bar{f}^* - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}}). \quad (15)$$

By multiplying the both sides of (14) by $\eta_k \theta_k = \eta_k / \prod_{t=0}^k (1 - \eta_t \gamma \mu_f)$ and using $\eta_{k+1} \leq \eta_k$, we have for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\eta_k \theta_k (\bar{h}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{h}^*) \leq \frac{(\eta_k \theta_{k-1} \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 - \eta_{k+1} \theta_k \|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2)}{2\gamma} + \eta_k^2 \theta_k (\bar{f}^* - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}}).$$

By summing the both sides of the preceding inequality over $k = 1, \dots, K-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \eta_k \theta_k (\bar{h}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{h}^*) &\leq \frac{(\eta_1 \theta_0 \|x_1 - x^*\|_2^2 - \eta_K \theta_{K-1} \|x_K - x^*\|_2^2)}{2\gamma} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \eta_k^2 \theta_k (\bar{f}^* - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}}). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

By summing (15) and (16), and dropping $\eta_K \theta_{K-1} \|x_K - x^*\|_2^2 \geq 0$ from the right-hand side, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_k \theta_k (\bar{h}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{h}^*) \leq \frac{\eta_0 \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2}{2\gamma} + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_k^2 \theta_k (\bar{f}^* - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}}).$$

By dividing the both sides of the preceding inequality by $\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \eta_j \theta_j$ and invoking Jensen's inequality and Lemma 5, we obtain the result.

(iii) By invoking Proposition 1, $\{\bar{x}_k\}$ is a bounded sequence. By the Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem, there is at least one convergent subsequence of $\{\bar{x}_k\}$. Let $\{\bar{x}_{k_i}\}$ denote an arbitrary convergent subsequence of $\{\bar{x}_k\}$. Let \hat{x} denote the limit point of $\{\bar{x}_{k_i}\}$. Taking the limit along $\{\bar{x}_{k_i}\}$ on the relation in Theorem 1 (ii) and invoking $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^k \eta_j^2 \theta_j / \sum_{j=0}^k \eta_j \theta_j = 0$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \eta_j \theta_j = \infty$, we obtain $0 \leq \lim_{k_i \rightarrow \infty} \bar{h}(\bar{x}_{k_i}) - \bar{h}^* \leq 0$ implying $\lim_{k_i \rightarrow \infty} \bar{h}(\bar{x}_{k_i}) = \bar{h}^*$. Recalling that \bar{h} is lower-semicontinuous, then $\liminf_{k_i \rightarrow \infty} \bar{h}(\bar{x}_{k_i}) \geq \bar{h}(\hat{x})$ [6, Definition 1.1.4]. Thus, we obtain $\bar{h}^* \geq \bar{h}(\hat{x})$. But we also have $\bar{h}^* \leq \bar{h}(\hat{x})$. This implies that $\hat{x} \in X_h^*$ and so, $\text{dist}(\hat{x}, X_h^*) = 0$. Let us take the limit along the subsequence $\{\bar{x}_{k_i}\}$ from the relation in Theorem 1 (i). By using $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \eta_j \theta_j = \infty$ and invoking $\text{dist}(\hat{x}, X_h^*) = 0$, we obtain $\lim_{k_i \rightarrow \infty} \|\bar{x}_{k_i} - x^*\|^2 \leq 0$, and thus, $\lim_{k_i \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x}_{k_i} = x^*$. Hence, any arbitrary convergent subsequence of $\{\bar{x}_k\}$ converges to x^* . Thus, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x}_k = x^*$ \square

In the following result, we provide both the asymptotic guarantee and nonasymptotic rate statements under a prescribed diminishing regularization sequence.

Corollary 1. Consider the problem in (1) under Assumption 1. Let x^* be the unique optimal solution to the problem in (1) and $\{\bar{x}_k\}$ be generated by Algorithm 1. Let $\gamma \leq \frac{0.5}{L_h}$ and $\eta_k := \frac{\eta_{0,u}}{\eta_{0,l} + k}$, where $\eta_{0,u} = (\gamma \mu_f)^{-1}$ and $\eta_{0,l} = \frac{2L_f}{\mu_f}$. If \bar{h} is lower semicontinuous, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x}_k = x^*$. Additionally, the following results hold for any $K \geq 1$.

- (i) [suboptimality bounds] Let $u_1 = 0.5 \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2 (2L_f - \mu_f)$. For any $\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*) \in \partial \bar{f}(x^*)$, we have
$$-\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \text{dist}(\bar{x}_K, X_h^*) + \frac{\mu_f}{2} \|\bar{x}_K - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \bar{f}(\bar{x}_K) - \bar{f}^* \leq \frac{u_1}{K}.$$
- (ii) [infeasibility bounds] We have $0 \leq \bar{h}(\bar{x}_K) - \bar{h}^* \leq \frac{u_{2,K}}{K}$, where
$$u_{2,K} = \gamma(2L_f - \mu_f) \left(\frac{\eta_0 \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2}{2\gamma} + \left(\frac{(\bar{f}^* - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}}) \eta_{0,u}^2}{\eta_{0,l} - 1} (\eta_{0,l} + \ln(\frac{K + \eta_{0,l} - 1}{\eta_{0,l}})) \right) \right).$$
- (iii) [distance to the unique optimal solution] Suppose X_h^* is α -weak sharp minima of order $m \geq 1$. Then, $\|\bar{x}_K - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2u_1}{\mu_f K} + \frac{2\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2}{\mu_f} \sqrt[m]{\frac{u_{2,K}}{\alpha K}}$.
- (iv) [suboptimality lower bound] If X_h^* is α -weak sharp minima of order $m \geq 1$, then for any $\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*) \in \partial \bar{f}(x^*)$, $-\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \sqrt[m]{\frac{u_{2,K}}{\alpha K}} \leq \bar{f}(\bar{x}_K) - \bar{f}^*$.

Proof. The asymptotic convergence result holds by invoking Lemma 4 (ii) and then, Theorem 1 (iii).

(i) Consider Theorem 1 (i). The result follows by invoking Lemma 4 (ii).

(ii) Consider Theorem 1 (ii). The result follows by invoking Lemma 4 (ii).

(iii) Consider (5). The result is implied by invoking the bounds in (i) and (ii).

(iv) Consider (4). Dropping the nonnegative term $\frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x_K - x^*\|_2^2$ from the left-hand side and using Definition 4, we obtain the result. \square

Next, we provide rate statements under a constant regularization parameter.

Corollary 2. Consider the problem in (1) under Assumption 1. Let x^* be the unique optimal solution to this problem. Let \bar{x}_K be generated by Algorithm 1.

(1) Let $\gamma \leq \frac{0.5}{L_h}$ and $\eta := \frac{(p+1)\ln(K)}{\gamma\mu_f K}$ for some arbitrary $p > 0$ and $K > 1$ such that $\frac{K}{\ln(K)} \geq 2(p+1)\frac{L_f}{\mu_f}$. Then, the following results hold.

(1.i) [suboptimality bounds] Let $u_3 = \frac{0.5\|x_0-x^*\|_2^2\mu_f}{(p+1)}$. Then, for any $\tilde{\nabla}\bar{f}(x^*) \in \partial\bar{f}(x^*)$,

$$-\|\tilde{\nabla}\bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \text{dist}(\bar{x}_K, X_h^*) + \frac{\mu_f}{2}\|\bar{x}_K - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \bar{f}(\bar{x}_K) - \bar{f}^* \leq \frac{u_3}{\ln(K)K^p},$$

(1.ii) [infeasibility bounds] Let $u_4 = \frac{\|x_0-x^*\|_2^2}{2\gamma}$ and $u_5 = \frac{(p+1)(\bar{f}^* - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}})}{\gamma\mu_f}$. We have

$$0 \leq \bar{h}(\bar{x}_K) - \bar{h}^* \leq \frac{u_4}{K^{(p+1)}} + \frac{u_5 \ln(K)}{K}.$$

(1.iii) [distance to optimal solution] Suppose X_h^* is α -weak sharp minima of order $m \geq 1$. Then,

$$\|\bar{x}_K - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2u_3}{\mu_f \ln(K)K^p} + \frac{2\|\tilde{\nabla}\bar{f}(x^*)\|_2}{\mu_f} \sqrt{\frac{u_4}{\alpha K^{(p+1)}} + \frac{u_5 \ln(K)}{\alpha K}}.$$

(1.iv) [suboptimality lower bound] Furthermore, if X_h^* is α -weak sharp minima of order $m \geq 1$, then

$$-\|\tilde{\nabla}\bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \sqrt{\frac{u_4}{\alpha K^{(p+1)}} + \frac{u_5 \ln(K)}{\alpha K}} \leq \bar{f}(\bar{x}_K) - \bar{f}^*.$$

(2) Assume that X_h^* is α -weak sharp minima of order $m = 1$ and $\eta \leq \frac{\alpha}{2\|\tilde{\nabla}\bar{f}(x^*)\|_2}$, for some $\tilde{\nabla}\bar{f}(x^*) \in \partial\bar{f}(x^*)$. Then, the following results hold for any $K \geq 1$.

(2.i) [infeasibility bounds] We have $0 \leq \bar{h}(\bar{x}_K) - \bar{h}^* \leq \frac{\|x_0-x^*\|_2^2}{\gamma}(1 - \eta\gamma\mu_f)^K$.

(2.ii) [distance to lower-level solution set] $\text{dist}(\bar{x}_K, X_h^*) \leq \frac{\|x_0-x^*\|_2^2}{\alpha\gamma}(1 - \eta\gamma\mu_f)^K$.

(2.iii) [suboptimality bounds] The suboptimality bounds are as follows.

$$-\frac{\|x_0-x^*\|_2^2}{2\eta\gamma}(1 - \gamma\eta\mu_f)^K \leq \bar{f}(\bar{x}_K) - \bar{f}^* \leq \frac{\|x_0-x^*\|_2^2}{2\eta\gamma}(1 - \gamma\eta\mu_f)^K.$$

(2.iv) [distance to optimal solution] We have $\|\bar{x}_K - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2\|x_0-x^*\|_2^2}{\eta\gamma\mu_f}(1 - \eta\gamma\mu_f)^K$.

Proof. (1.i) The lower bound is obtained from (4). The upper bound follows by considering the relation in Theorem 1 (i) for a constant η , and then by invoking Lemma 4 (iii).

(1.ii) Consider the relation in Theorem 1 (ii) with the constant regularization. Then, by invoking Lemma 4 (iii), we obtain the result.

(1.iii) Consider (5). Then, we obtain the results by applying (1.i) and (1.ii).

(1.iv) By considering (4) and dropping the nonnegative term from the left-hand side, and using Definition 4, we derive the result.

(2.i) Note that $\bar{h}^* \triangleq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{h}(x)$ implies that the lower bound for infeasibility is zero. Now, consider (4). By dropping the nonnegative term $\frac{\mu_f}{2}\|\bar{x}_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2$ from the left-hand side, we obtain

$$-\|\tilde{\nabla}\bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \text{dist}(\bar{x}_{k+1}, X_h^*) \leq \bar{f}(\bar{x}_{k+1}) - \bar{f}^*. \quad (17)$$

By considering (7) with constant η , multiplying the both sides by $\frac{2}{L_\eta}$, and recalling $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{L_\eta}$, we obtain

$$2\gamma\eta(\bar{f}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{f}^*) + 2\gamma(\bar{h}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{h}^*) \leq (1 - \eta\gamma\mu_f)\|x_K - x^*\|_2^2 - \|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2.$$

By invoking (17) in the preceding inequality and using Definition 4, we arrive at

$$2\gamma \left(1 - \frac{\eta \|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2}{\alpha}\right) \left(\bar{h}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{h}^*\right) \leq (1 - \eta\gamma\mu_f) \|x_K - x^*\|_2^2 - \|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2.$$

By multiplying the both sides by $\theta_k = 1/(1 - \eta\gamma\mu_f)^{k+1}$, we obtain

$$2\gamma \left(1 - \frac{\eta \|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2}{\alpha}\right) \theta_k \left(\bar{h}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{h}^*\right) \leq \frac{\|x_K - x^*\|_2^2}{(1 - \eta\gamma\mu_f)^k} - \frac{\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2}{(1 - \eta\gamma\mu_f)^{k+1}}.$$

By summing the both sides over $k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$, for $K \geq 1$, and dropping the nonnegative term $\theta_{K-1} \|x_{K+1} - x^*\|_2^2$ from the left-hand side, we obtain

$$2\gamma(1 - \eta \|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2/\alpha) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k \left(\bar{h}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{h}^*\right) \leq \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2.$$

By using Jensen's inequality and Lemma 5, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{2\gamma}{\alpha}\right)(\alpha - \eta \|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k\right) \left(\bar{h}(\bar{x}_K) - \bar{h}^*\right) \leq \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2.$$

From $\eta \leq \frac{\alpha}{2\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2}$, we have $\alpha \leq 2(\alpha - \eta \|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2)$. Then, in view of $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k \geq \theta_{K-1} = 1/(1 - \eta\gamma\mu_f)^K$ (cf. Lemma 4 (i)), and multiplying the both sides by $\alpha > 0$, we arrive at the result.

(2.ii) The result follows from (2.i) and Definition 4.

(2.iii) By considering the relation in Theorem 1 (i) for a constant η and using $\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \theta_j \geq \theta_{K-1} = 1/(1 - \eta\gamma\mu_f)^K$ once again, we have

$$\bar{f}(\bar{x}_K) - \bar{f}^* \leq \frac{\|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2}{2\eta\gamma} (1 - \eta\gamma\mu_f)^K. \quad (18)$$

To obtain the lower bound, consider (17). Then, by using (2.ii) and $\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{\alpha}{2\eta}$, we obtain the lower bound.

(2.iv) Consider (4). the result follows by using (2.ii), (18), and $\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{\alpha}{2\eta}$. \square

Remark 5. Notably, it appears that the asymptotic convergence guarantee in Theorem 1, exemplified by Corollary 1, is established for the first time in the literature for addressing the problem in (1). Additionally, the nonasymptotic convergence rate statements in Corollary 1 and Corollary 2 for addressing the SBO problem are novel and are concisely presented in Table 2.

3.2 The R-VFISTA_s method

We devise Algorithm 2 to address the problem in (1) under Assumption 1. R-VFISTA_s is a regularized accelerated single-timescale proximal method with a constant regularization parameter. A key novelty of this method is employing the regularization technique in the method called VFISTA [5, Section 10.7.7]. At each iteration k , we update the vector x_k by using the proximal operator applied to the regularized function $\bar{h}(\bullet) + \eta\bar{f}(\bullet)$.

Next, we provide an inequality that will be used in the analysis of R-VFISTA_s.

Proposition 2. Consider the problem in (1) under Assumption 1. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2 for addressing this problem. Let κ_η be given in Algorithm 1. Then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\bar{g}_\eta(x_k) - \bar{g}_\eta(x) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}}\right)^k \left(\bar{g}_\eta(x_0) - \bar{g}_\eta(x) + \frac{\eta\mu_f}{2} \|x_0 - x\|_2^2\right). \quad (19)$$

Algorithm 2 Regularized Variant of FISTA (R-VFISTA_s)

- 1: **input:** $y_0 = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\eta > 0$, $\kappa_\eta = \frac{L_h + \eta L_f}{\eta \mu_f}$, $\gamma = 1/(L_h + \eta L_f)$, and $K \geq 1$.
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K - 1$ **do**
 - 3: $x_{k+1} := \text{prox}_{\gamma \omega_\eta} [y_k - \gamma (\nabla h(y_k) + \eta \nabla f(y_k))]$
 - 4: $y_{k+1} := x_{k+1} + (\frac{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta} + 1})(x_{k+1} - x_k)$
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: **return:** x_K
-

Proof. Under Assumption 1 and in view of Definition 2, the required conditions to apply [3, Theorem 10.42] are met. By applying this theorem to the function $\bar{g}_\eta = \bar{h}(x) + \eta \bar{f}(x)$ which is a $\eta \mu_f$ -strongly convex, we conclude that for the unique optimal solution x^* to the problem in (1) and for any $k \geq 0$ with $\kappa_\eta = \frac{L_h + \eta L_f}{\eta \mu_f}$,

$$\bar{g}_\eta(x_k) - \bar{g}_\eta(x^*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}}\right)^k \left(\bar{g}_\eta(x_0) - \bar{g}_\eta(x^*) + \frac{\eta \mu_f}{2} \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2\right).$$

From the proof of [3, Theorem 10.42], we observe that the preceding relation holds if we substitute x^* by any arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. This completes the proof. \square

In the following theorem, we provide convergence rate statements for R-VFISTA_s.

Theorem 2 (error bounds for R-VFISTA_s). Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Let x_K be generated by Algorithm 2. The results in the following two settings hold.

- (1) Let $\eta = \frac{(L_h + \eta L_f)}{\mu_f} \left(\frac{(p+1)\ln(K)}{K}\right)^2$, where $\bar{\eta} > 0$ and $p > 2$ are arbitrary. Then, for K satisfying $\frac{(L_h + \bar{\eta} L_f)(p+1)^2}{\mu_f \bar{\eta}} \leq \left(\frac{K}{\ln(K)}\right)^2$, the following statements hold.
- (1.i) [suboptimality bounds]

$$-\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \text{dist}(x_K, X_h^*) + \frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x_K - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \bar{f}(x_K) - \bar{f}^* \leq \frac{u_6}{K^{(p+1)}} + \frac{u_7}{K^{(p-1)\ln(K)}},$$

where $u_6 = \bar{f}(x_0) - \bar{f}^* + \frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2$ and $u_7 = \frac{\mu_f(\bar{h}(x_0) - \bar{h}^*)}{(L_h + \bar{\eta} L_f)(p+1)}$.

- (1.ii) [infeasibility bounds]

$$0 \leq \bar{h}(x_K) - \bar{h}^* \leq u_8 \left(\frac{\ln(K)}{K}\right)^2 + \frac{u_9(\ln(K))^2}{K^{(p+3)}} + \frac{u_{10}}{K^{(p+1)}},$$

where $u_8 = \frac{(\bar{f}(\Pi_{X_h^*}[x_0]) - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}})(L_h + \bar{\eta} L_f)(p+1)^2}{\mu_f}$, $u_9 = \frac{(L_h + \bar{\eta} L_f)(p+1)^2}{\mu_f} (\bar{f}(x_0) - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}} + \frac{\mu_f}{2} \text{dist}^2(x_0, X_h^*))$, and $u_{10} = \bar{h}(x_0) - \bar{h}^*$.

- (1.iii) [distance to optimal solution] If X_h^* is α -weak sharp minima of order $m \geq 1$, then

$$\frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{u_6}{K^{(p+1)}} + \frac{u_7}{K^{(p-1)\ln(K)}} + \frac{\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2}{\sqrt[m]{\alpha}} \sqrt[m]{u_8 \left(\frac{\ln(K)}{K}\right)^2 + \frac{u_9(\ln(K))^2}{K^{(p+3)}} + \frac{u_{10}}{K^{(p+1)}}}.$$

- (1.iv) [suboptimality lower bound] Furthermore, if X_h^* is α -weak sharp minima of order $m \geq 1$, then for any $K \geq 1$, we obtain

$$-\frac{\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2}{\sqrt[m]{\alpha}} \sqrt[m]{u_8 \left(\frac{\ln(K)}{K}\right)^2 + \frac{u_9(\ln(K))^2}{K^{(p+3)}} + \frac{u_{10}}{K^{(p+1)}}} \leq \bar{f}(x_K) - \bar{f}^*.$$

(2) Assume that X_h^* is α -weak sharp minima of the order $m = 1$. Let $\eta \leq \frac{\alpha}{2\|\tilde{\nabla}f(x^*)\|_2}$, for some $\tilde{\nabla}f(x^*) \in \partial\bar{f}(x^*)$. Let us define $u_{11} = \bar{f}(x_0) - \bar{f}^* + \frac{\bar{h}(x_0) - \bar{h}^*}{\eta} + \frac{\mu_f \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2}{2}$. Then, for any $K \geq 1$, we have the following statements.

- (2.i) [infeasibility bounds] $0 \leq \bar{h}(x_K) - \bar{h}^* \leq 2\eta u_{11}(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K$.
- (2.ii) [distance to the lower-level solution set] $\text{dist}(x_K, X_h^*) \leq \frac{2\eta u_{11}}{\alpha}(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K$.
- (2.iii) [suboptimality bounds] $-u_{11}(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K \leq \bar{f}(x_K) - \bar{f}^* \leq u_{11}(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K$.
- (2.iv) [distance to optimal solution] $\|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{4u_{11}}{\mu_f}(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K$.

Proof. (1.i) The lower bound follows from (4). Next, we show the upper bound. From the condition $\left(\frac{K}{\ln(K)}\right)^2 \geq \frac{(L_h + \bar{\eta}L_f)(p+1)^2}{\mu_f \bar{\eta}}$, we have $\bar{\eta} \geq \frac{(L_h + \bar{\eta}L_f)}{\mu_f} \left(\frac{(p+1)\ln(K)}{K}\right)^2$. This implies that $\eta \leq \bar{\eta}$ and thus $(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K \leq (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\bar{\kappa}_\eta}})^K$, where $\bar{\kappa}_\eta = \frac{L_h + \bar{\eta}L_f}{\eta\mu_f}$. Now, by invoking the preceding inequality in (19), for any $k = K$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\eta\bar{f}(x_K) - \eta\bar{f}(x) + \bar{h}(x_K) - \bar{h}(x) \leq (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K \left(\bar{g}_\eta(x_0) - \bar{g}_\eta(x) + \frac{\eta\mu_f}{2} \|x_0 - x\|_2^2 \right),$$

By substituting $x = x^*$, using $0 \leq \bar{h}(x_K) - \bar{h}^*$, and dividing both sides by η , we obtain

$$\bar{f}(x_K) - \bar{f}^* \leq \left(\bar{f}(x_0) - \bar{f}^* + \frac{\bar{h}(x_0) - \bar{h}^*}{\eta} + \frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2 \right) (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K. \quad (20)$$

From $\eta = \frac{(L_h + \bar{\eta}L_f)}{\mu_f} \left(\frac{(p+1)\ln(K)}{K}\right)^2$ and that $1 - x \leq \exp(-x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K \leq \exp(\frac{-K}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}}) = \exp(-(p+1)\ln(K)) \leq \frac{1}{K^{(p+1)}}. \quad (21)$$

The upper bound in (1.i) is obtained by substituting the value of η in $\frac{\bar{h}(x_0) - \bar{h}^*}{\eta}$ in (20) and then, by invoking (21).

(1.ii) Note that $\bar{h}^* \triangleq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{h}(x)$ implies that the lower bound for infeasibility is zero. Now, consider (19) for $k = K$ and $x := \Pi_{X_h^*}[x_0]$. Then, by recalling $\bar{h}(\Pi_{X_h^*}[x_0]) = \bar{h}^*$ and $\|x_0 - \Pi_{X_h^*}[x_0]\|_2^2 = \text{dist}^2(x_0, X_h^*)$ and also by considering $\hat{C}_{\bar{f}} \leq \bar{f}(x_K)$ and $\hat{C}_{\bar{f}} \leq \bar{f}(\Pi_{X_h^*}[x_0])$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{h}(x_K) - \bar{h}^* &\leq \eta(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K \left(\bar{f}(x_0) - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}} + \frac{\mu_f}{2} \text{dist}^2(x_0, X_h^*) \right) \\ &\quad + (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K (\bar{h}(x_0) - \bar{h}^*) + \eta(\bar{f}(\Pi_{X_h^*}[x_0]) - \hat{C}_{\bar{f}}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\bar{\eta} > \eta$. By substituting $\eta = \frac{(L_h + \bar{\eta}L_f)}{\mu_f} \left(\frac{(p+1)\ln(K)}{K}\right)^2$ and applying (21) to the preceding inequality, we obtain the result.

(1.iii) By applying the weak sharp minimality of X_h^* as defined in Definition 4 to (4), and invoking Theorem 2 (1.i) and (1.ii), we obtain the result.

(1.iv) By considering (4) and then dropping the nonnegative term from the right-hand side and use Definition 4, we obtain the result.

(2.i) Note that $\bar{h}^* \triangleq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{h}(x)$ implies that infeasibility is bounded below by zero. Consider (19) for $k := K$ and $x := \Pi_{X^*}[x_0]$. Then, from (4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{h}(x_K) - \bar{h}^* - \eta\|\tilde{\nabla}f(x^*)\|_2 \text{dist}(x_K, X_h^*) + \frac{\eta\mu_f}{2} \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2 \\ \leq (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K \left(\bar{g}_\eta(x_0) - \bar{g}_\eta(x^*) + \frac{\eta\mu_f}{2} \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

From the α -weak sharp minimality of X_h^* and dropping the nonnegative term from the left-hand side, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{h}(x_K) - \bar{h}^* - \eta \|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 (\bar{h}(x_K) - \bar{h}^*) \alpha^{-1} &\leq (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K (\bar{g}_\eta(x_0) - \bar{g}_\eta(x^*)) \\ &\quad + \frac{\eta \mu_f}{2} \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

In view of $\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{\alpha}{2\eta}$, we obtain

$$\bar{h}(x_K) - \bar{h}^* \leq (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K (2(\bar{g}_\eta(x_0) - \bar{g}_\eta(x^*)) + \eta \mu_f \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2).$$

Therefore, in view of Definition 2, we obtain the result.

(2.ii) This result follows by recalling Definition 4 and using Theorem 2 (2.i).

(2.iii) Now, consider (19) for $k := K$. Let us choose $x := \Pi_{X^*}[x_0]$. Then, noting that $\bar{h}(\Pi_{X^*}[x_0]) = \bar{h}^*$ and $\bar{f}(\Pi_{X^*}[x_0]) = \bar{f}^*$, we obtain

$$\bar{f}(x_K) - \bar{f}^* \leq (\bar{f}(x_0) - \bar{f}^* + \frac{1}{\eta}(\bar{h}(x_0) - \bar{h}^*) + \frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2) (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K. \quad (22)$$

To obtain the lower bound, consider (4). By dropping $\frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x^*\|_2^2$ from the left-hand side, we obtain $-\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \text{dist}(x_{k+1}, X_h^*) \leq \bar{f}(x_{k+1}) - \bar{f}^*$. Then, from Theorem 2 (2.ii) and $\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{\alpha}{2\eta}$ in the preceding inequality, we obtain the result.

(2.iv) Consider (4). From $\|\tilde{\nabla} \bar{f}(x^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{\alpha}{2\eta}$ and Theorem 2 (2.ii), we obtain

$$\frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x_k - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \bar{f}(x_K) - \bar{f}^* + \left(\bar{f}(x_0) - \bar{f}^* + \frac{\bar{h}(x_0) - \bar{h}^*}{\eta} + \frac{\mu_f \|x_0 - x^*\|_2^2}{2} \right) (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\eta}})^K.$$

By using the upper bound for $\bar{f}(x_K) - \bar{f}^*$ in (22), we arrive at the result. \square

Remark 6. In Theorem 2, by choosing $p = 3$, we derive quadratically decaying sublinear convergence rates of the order $1/K^2$ for both infeasibility and suboptimality error metrics. These appear to be the fastest known rates in addressing the SBO problem in (1). When weak sharp minimality holds, a linear convergence rate is obtained. Notably, when compared to $R\text{-ISTA}_s$, the linear rate has an improved dependence on the condition number. The details are presented in Table 2.

4 Composite SBO with a smooth nonconvex upper-level objective

In this section, we consider the following problem.

$$\min f(x), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{h}(x) \triangleq h(x) + \omega_h(x), \quad (23)$$

where $f(x)$ is not necessarily convex. The formal assumptions are stated below.

Assumption 2. Consider the problem in (23). Let the following hold.

- (i) $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L_f -smooth and possibly nonconvex.
- (ii) $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L_h -smooth and convex.
- (iii) $\omega_h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is proper, closed, and convex.
- (iv) X_h^* admits a quadratic growth property with parameter $\alpha > 0$, given by $\bar{h}(x) - \bar{h}^* \geq \alpha \text{dist}^2(x, X_h^*)$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

(v) $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) > -\infty$.

(vi) X_h^* is a bounded set.

Remark 7. Note that Assumption 2 (iv) holds for some problem classes, examples of which were discussed in Remark 1. Moreover, note that we previously discussed in Remark 3 the scenarios where Assumption 2 (vi) holds.

Definition 6. Let Assumption 2 hold and $0 < \hat{\gamma} < \frac{1}{L_f}$. The residual mapping is given as $G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}} \left(x - \Pi_{X_h^*}[x - \hat{\gamma} \nabla f(x)] \right)$, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

4.1 The IPR-VFISTA_{nc} method

We propose a method called Inexactly Projected Regularized Variant of FISTA (IPR-VFISTA_{nc}), as presented in Algorithm 3. At each outer-loop iteration k , it employs R-VFISTA_s presented in Algorithm 2 with a predetermined number of inner-loop iterations J_k , as well as parameters η_k and κ_k , that are updated at each outer iteration k . To elaborate, we reformulate the problem in (23) as $\min_{x \in X_h^*} f(x)$, where X_h^* is the optimal solution set of the lower-level problem $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{h}(x)$. One may consider the standard projected gradient method $\hat{x}_{k+1} = \Pi_{X_h^*}[\hat{x}_k - \hat{\gamma} \nabla f(\hat{x}_k)]$. However, since X_h^* is not explicitly known, an exact projection is impossible. Motivated by the work in [27] for addressing nonconvex optimization with variational inequity constraints, we employ an inexact projection. Given $z_k := \hat{x}_k - \hat{\gamma} \nabla f(\hat{x}_k)$, consider the projection problem

$$\min_{x \in X_h^*} f_{s,k}(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \|x - z_k\|_2^2, \quad (24)$$

where we use the label s to emphasize on the strong convexity of the objective. Let $x_{f_{k,s}}^*$ denote the unique optimal solution to the problem in (24), i.e., $x_{f_{k,s}}^* = \Pi_{X_h^*}[z_k]$. Since the problem in (24) satisfies Assumption 1, Algorithm 2 can be employed to obtain this inexact projection. However, inexact projections may lead to infeasibility of \hat{x}_k for the problem in (23). Therefore, we carefully design the parameters J_k , η_k , and κ_k associated with R-VFISTA_s to establish convergence guarantees. Note that, we initialize R-VFISTA_s at each outer-loop iteration k with $y_{k+1,0} = x_{k+1,0} = \Pi_{\mathcal{B}}[x_{k,J_k}]$, where \mathcal{B} is an arbitrary bounded box set and x_{k,J_k} is the output of R-VFISTA_s after J_k inner iterations at iteration k . This initialization ensures that the sequence of starting points for the inner-loop remains bounded.

Definition 7. Let us define $z_k \triangleq \hat{x}_k - \hat{\gamma} \nabla f(\hat{x}_k)$, $\delta_k \triangleq \hat{x}_{k+1} - \Pi_{X_h^*}[z_k]$, and $e_k \triangleq \hat{x}_k - \Pi_{X_h^*}[\hat{x}_k]$, i.e., $\|e_k\|_2 \triangleq \text{dist}(\hat{x}_k, X_h^*)$, for $k \geq 0$.

Definition 8. Let $T_{1,k} = (L_h + \bar{\eta}) \left(f_{s,k}(x_{k,0}) + 0.5 \text{dist}^2(x_{k,0}, X_h^*) \right)$, $T_{2,k} = \bar{h}(x_{k,0}) - \bar{h}^*$, $T_{3,k} = (L_h + \bar{\eta})(f_{s,k}(\Pi_{X_h^*}[x_{k,0}]))$, $T_{4,k} = 2(f_{s,k}(x_{k,0}) + \frac{1}{2} \|x_{k,0} - x_{f_{k,s}}^*\|_2^2)$, and $T_{5,k} = \frac{T_{2,k}}{2(L_h + \bar{\eta})}$, for $k \geq 0$.

Definition 9. Let $D_{X_h^*} = \sup_{x \in X_h^*} \|x\|_2$, $B_{X_h^*} = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{B}} \text{dist}(x, X_h^*)$, $B_f = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{B} \cup X_h^*} \|\nabla f(x)\|_2$, $B_{\mathcal{B}} = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{B}} \|x\|_2$, and $B_{\bar{h}} = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{B}} \bar{h}(x) - \bar{h}^*$.

In the next proposition, we provide upper bounds for $\|e_k\|_2$ and $\|\delta_k\|_2^2$.

Algorithm 3 Inexactly Projected Regularized VFISTA (IPR-VFISTA_{nc})

1: **input:** Initial vectors $\hat{x}_0, y_{0,0} = x_{0,0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, outer-loop stepsize $\hat{\gamma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \leq \frac{1}{2L_f}$, total number of inner-loop iterations $J_k = (k+1)^a$ with $a \geq 2$, any scalar $\bar{\eta} > 0$, regularization parameter $\eta_k = 16(L_h + \bar{\eta})(\frac{\ln(J_k)}{J_k})^2$, inner-loop stepsize $\gamma_k = \frac{1}{L_h + \eta_k}$, a bounded box set $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and total number of outer-loop iterations $K \geq 1$.

2: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K-1$ **do**

3: $z_k = \hat{x}_k - \hat{\gamma} \nabla f(\hat{x}_k)$

4: $J_k = (k+1)^a, \eta_k = 16(L_h + \bar{\eta})(\frac{\ln(J_k)}{J_k})^2, \kappa_k = \frac{L_h + \eta_k}{\eta_k}, \gamma_k = \frac{1}{L_h + \eta_k}$

5: **for** $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, J_k - 1$ **do**

6: $x_{k,j+1} := \text{prox}_{\gamma_k \omega_h} [y_{k,j} - \gamma_k (\nabla h(y_{k,j}) + \eta_k (y_{k,j} - z_k))]$

7: $y_{k,j+1} := x_{k,j+1} + (\frac{\sqrt{\kappa_k} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa_k} + 1})(x_{k,j+1} - x_{k,j})$

8: **end for**

9: $\hat{x}_{k+1} = x_{k,J_k}, y_{k+1,0} = x_{k+1,0} = \Pi_{\mathcal{B}}[x_{k,J_k}]$

10: **end for**

11: **return:** \hat{x}_K

Proposition 3. Consider the problem in (23) and let Assumption 2 hold. Let $\{\hat{x}_k\}$ be generated by Algorithm 3. Let $\eta_k = 16(L_h + \bar{\eta})(\frac{\ln(J_k)}{J_k})^2$ for some arbitrary $\bar{\eta} > 0$. Consider Definition 8. Then, for all J_k satisfying $16 + 16\frac{L_h}{\bar{\eta}} \leq (\frac{J_k}{\ln(J_k)})^2$, we have the following inequalities.

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_k\|_2 &\leq \sqrt{\alpha^{-1} \left(\frac{(\ln(J_{k-1}))^2}{J_{k-1}^2} 16 (T_{1,k-1} + T_{3,k-1}) + \frac{T_{2,k-1}}{J_{k-1}^4} \right)}, \\ \|\delta_k\|_2^2 &\leq \frac{T_{4,k}}{J_k^4} + \frac{T_{5,k}}{J_k^2 \ln(J_k)} + 2 \alpha^{-1} \left(\left(\frac{16(T_{1,k-1} + T_{3,k-1})(\ln(J_{k-1}))^2}{J_{k-1}^2} + \frac{T_{2,k-1}}{J_{k-1}^4} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \left(\frac{16 T_{1,k}(\ln(J_k))^2}{J_k^6} + \frac{T_{2,k}}{J_k^4} + \frac{16 T_{3,k}(\ln(J_k))^2}{J_k^2} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2 \hat{\gamma} \|\nabla f(\hat{x}_k)\|}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{16 T_{1,k}(\ln(J_k))^2}{J_k^6} + \frac{T_{2,k}}{J_k^4} + \frac{16 T_{3,k}(\ln(J_k))^2}{J_k^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Consider Algorithm 3 implying that $x_{k-1,J_{k-1}}$ is the output of Algorithm 2 after J_{k-1} iterations to address the problem in (24). Also, in view of Algorithm 3, we have $\hat{x}_k = x_{k-1,J_{k-1}}$ for $k \geq 1$. Now, by invoking Theorem 2 (1.ii) with $p = 3$ and noting that the nonnegativity of $f_{s,k}(x)$, we obtain

$$0 \leq \bar{h}(\hat{x}_k) - \bar{h}^* \leq \frac{16T_{1,k-1}(\ln(J_{k-1}))^2}{J_{k-1}^6} + \frac{T_{2,k-1}}{J_{k-1}^4} + \frac{16T_{3,k-1}(\ln(J_{k-1}))^2}{J_{k-1}^2}.$$

Recalling that $\|e_k\|_2 = \text{dist}(\hat{x}_k, X_h^*) \leq \sqrt{\alpha^{-1}(\bar{h}(\hat{x}_k) - \bar{h}^*)}$, from the preceding inequality, we obtain the first inequality.

Next, we show the second inequality. Consider Definition 7. In view of Algorithm 3, we have $\hat{x}_{k+1} = x_{k,J_k}$ and also, recall that $x_{f_{k,s}}^* = \Pi_{X_h^*}[z_k]$. Thus, we have $\delta_k = x_{k,J_k} - x_{f_{k,s}}^*$. By invoking Theorem 2 (1.iii) with $p = 3$ and $m = 2$, we obtain

$$\|\delta_k\|_2^2 \leq \frac{T_{4,k}}{J_k^4} + \frac{T_{5,k}}{J_k^2 \ln(J_k)} + \frac{2\|\nabla f_{k,s}(x_{f_{k,s}}^*)\|_2}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{16 T_{1,k}(\ln(J_k))^2}{J_k^6} + \frac{T_{2,k}}{J_k^4} + \frac{16 T_{3,k}(\ln(J_k))^2}{J_k^2}}. \quad (25)$$

Now, consider (24). We have $\|\nabla f_{s,k}(x)\|_2 = \|z_k - x\|_2$. Then, by substituting $x = x_{f_{s,k}}^* = \Pi_{X_h^*}[z_k]$, we get $\|\nabla f_{s,k}(x_{f_{s,k}}^*)\|_2 = \|z_k - \Pi_{X_h^*}[z_k]\|_2$. In view of Algorithm 3, we have $z_k = \hat{x}_k - \hat{\gamma} \nabla f(\hat{x}_k)$. Invoking the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\|\nabla f_{s,k}(x_{f_{s,k}}^*)\|_2 \leq \|\hat{x}_k - \Pi_{X_h^*}[\hat{x}_k]\|_2 + \hat{\gamma} \|\nabla f(\hat{x}_k)\|_2 = \|e_k\|_2 + \hat{\gamma} \|\nabla f(\hat{x}_k)\|_2. \quad (26)$$

Using (26), (25), and the bound on $\|e_k\|_2$, we obtain the second inequality. \square

While we assume that \bar{X}_h^* is a bounded set, Algorithm 3 projects inexactly onto this unknown set, which does not inherently guarantee the boundedness of $\{\hat{x}_k\}$. In the next lemma, we show that $\{\hat{x}_k\}$ is indeed a bounded sequence.

Lemma 8. Let Assumption 2 hold. Let $\{\hat{x}_k\}$ be generated by Algorithm 3. Then, the following statements hold.

- (i) $\{\hat{x}_k\}$ is bounded.
- (ii) Consider $\{T_{i,k}\}$, for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, and $k \geq 0$ given in Definition 8. For every $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, there exists some $M_i > 0$ such that $T_{i,k} \leq M_i$.

Proof. (i) In view of Definition 7, we have $\|e_k\|_2 = \|\hat{x}_k - \Pi_{X_h^*}[\hat{x}_k]\|_2$. By invoking the triangle inequality, we obtain $\|\hat{x}_k\|_2 \leq D_{X_h^*} + \|e_k\|_2$. Next, by squaring the both sides and invoking Proposition 3, we obtain

$$\|\hat{x}_k\|_2^2 \leq 2 D_{X_h^*}^2 + \frac{2}{\alpha} \left(\frac{(\ln(J_{k-1}))^2}{J_{k-1}^2} 16 (T_{1,k-1} + T_{3,k-1}) + \frac{T_{2,k-1}}{J_{k-1}^4} \right). \quad (27)$$

Next, we derive an upper bound for $T_{1,k-1}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{s,k-1}(x_{k-1,0}) &= 0.5 \|x_{k-1,0} - z_{k-1}\|_2^2 = 0.5 \|x_{k-1,0} - \hat{x}_{k-1} + \hat{\gamma} \nabla f(\hat{x}_{k-1})\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|x_{k-1,0} - \hat{x}_{k-1}\|_2^2 + \|\hat{\gamma} \nabla f(\hat{x}_{k-1}) - \hat{\gamma} \nabla f(x_{k-1,0}) + \hat{\gamma} \nabla f(x_{k-1,0})\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|x_{k-1,0} - \hat{x}_{k-1}\|_2^2 + 2\hat{\gamma}^2 L_f^2 \|x_{k-1,0} - \hat{x}_{k-1}\|_2^2 + 2\hat{\gamma}^2 B_f^2 \\ &\leq 2(1 + 2\hat{\gamma}^2 L_f^2) \|x_{k-1,0}\|_2^2 + 2(1 + 2\hat{\gamma}^2 L_f^2) \|\hat{x}_{k-1}\|_2^2 + 2\hat{\gamma}^2 B_f^2 \\ &\leq 3B_B^2 + 3\|\hat{x}_{k-1}\|_2^2 + 2\hat{\gamma}^2 B_f^2, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where we used $2\hat{\gamma}^2 L_f^2 \leq 0.5$ in the last inequality. We obtain

$$T_{1,k-1} \leq c_1 + c_2 \|\hat{x}_{k-1}\|_2^2, \quad (29)$$

where $c_1 = 2(L_h + \bar{\eta})(1.5B_B^2 + \hat{\gamma}^2 B_f^2 + 0.25B_{X_h^*}^2)$ and $c_2 = 3(L_h + \bar{\eta})$. We also have

$$T_{2,k-1} = \bar{h}(x_{k-1,0}) - \bar{h}^* \leq B_{\bar{h}}. \quad (30)$$

Next, we provide an upper bound for $T_{3,k-1}$. Following the approach used in (28), we obtain $f_{s,k-1}(\Pi_{X_h^*}[x_{k-1,0}]) \leq 3D_{X_h^*}^2 + 3\|\hat{x}_{k-1}\|_2^2 + 2\hat{\gamma}^2 B_f^2$, implying that

$$T_{3,k-1} \leq c_3 + c_2 \|\hat{x}_{k-1}\|_2^2, \quad (31)$$

where $c_3 = 2(L_h + \bar{\eta})(1.5D_{X_h^*}^2 + \hat{\gamma}^2 B_f^2)$. Now, consider (27). Then, by invoking (29), (30), (31), and $J_k = (k+1)^a$, we have for any $a \geq 2$ and $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{x}_k\|_2^2 &\leq 2D_{X_h^*} + \frac{2}{\alpha} \left(\frac{16a^2(\ln(k))^2}{k^{2a}} \left(c_1 + c_3 + 2c_2 \|\hat{x}_{k-1}\|_2^2 \right) + \frac{B_{\bar{h}}}{k^{4a}} \right) \\ &\leq 2D_{X_h^*} + \left(\frac{32a^2}{\alpha k^{2a-2}} \left(c_1 + c_3 + 2c_2 \|\hat{x}_{k-1}\|_2^2 \right) + \frac{2B_{\bar{h}}}{\alpha k^{4a}} \right) \\ &\leq 2D_{X_h^*} + \frac{32a^2}{\alpha} (c_1 + c_3) + \frac{2B_{\bar{h}}}{\alpha} + \frac{64a^2 c_2}{\alpha k^{2a-2}} \|\hat{x}_{k-1}\|_2^2 \leq c_4 + \frac{c_5}{k^{2a-2}} \|\hat{x}_{k-1}\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_4 = 2D_{X_h^*} + \frac{32a^2}{\alpha} (c_1 + c_3) + \frac{2B_{\bar{h}}}{\alpha}$ and $\frac{64a^2 c_2}{\alpha}$. Then, by invoking Lemma 3, we conclude that $\{\hat{x}_k\}$ is bounded.

(ii) From part (i), there exists some $M > 0$ such that $\|\hat{x}_k\|_2^2 \leq M$, for all $k \geq 0$. By substituting $\|\hat{x}_k\|_2^2 \leq M$ into (29) and (31), we conclude that there exist constants $M_1 = c_1 + c_2 M$ and $M_3 = c_3 + c_2 M$, such that $T_{1,k} \leq M_1$ and $T_{3,k} \leq M_3$. Let $M_2 = B_{\bar{h}}$. From (30), we conclude that $T_{2,k} \leq M_2$. Also, $T_{5,k} \leq M_5$ for $M_5 = \frac{M_2}{2(L_h + \eta_K)}$. The boundedness of $\{T_{4,k}\}$ follows by invoking $x_{f,s,k}^* \in X_h^*$, $x_{k,0} \in \mathcal{B}$, and (28). \square

Definition 10. In view of Lemma 8 (i), we define the following terms. Let $\hat{B}_f = \sup_{k \geq 1} \|\nabla f(\hat{x}_k)\|_2$, $\hat{D}_f = \sup_{k \geq 1} \|f(\hat{x}_k)\|_2$, and $\hat{C}_f = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x)$.

Remark 8. Consider Definition 6. In view of [3, Theorem 10.7], x^* is a stationary point to the problem in (23), if and only if $G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(x^*) = 0$.

Lemma 9. Consider the problem in (23) and let Assumption 2 hold. Let $\{\hat{x}_k\}$ be generated by Algorithm 3 and suppose that $\hat{\gamma} \leq \frac{1}{2L_f}$. Then, the following two inequalities hold, for all $k \geq 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\hat{\gamma}^2}{2} G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{x}_k) &\leq \|\hat{x}_{k+1} - \hat{x}_k\|_2^2 + \|\delta_k\|_2^2, \\ \|G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{x}_k)\|_2^2 &\leq \frac{4}{\hat{\gamma}} (f(\hat{x}_k) - f(\hat{x}_{k+1})) + L_f \hat{\gamma} \hat{B}_f^2 + \frac{80}{L_f \hat{\gamma}^3} (\|\delta_k\|_2^2 + \|e_k\|_2^2). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Proof. Consider Definitions 6 and 7. Then, the proof of the first relation can be done similar to the proof of Lemma 5.6 in [26]. Additionally, taking the same steps as in Proposition 5.7 in [26], we obtain the second inequality. \square

In the next theorem, we provide convergence rate statements for IPR-VFISTA_{nc}.

Theorem 3 (error bounds for IPR-VFISTA_{nc}). Consider the problem in (23) under Assumption 2. Let the sequence $\{\hat{x}_k\}$ be generated by Algorithm 3. Let $\eta_k = 16(L_h + \bar{\eta})(\frac{\ln(J_k)}{J_k})^2$ for an arbitrary $\bar{\eta} > 0$. Suppose $J_k = (k+1)^a$, $a \geq 2$. Let us define $\|G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{x}_k^*)\|_2 = \min_{k=\lfloor K/2 \rfloor, \dots, K-1} \|G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{x}_k)\|_2$. Let $\hat{\gamma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \leq \frac{1}{2L_f}$. Let M_i , for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ be defined as in Lemma 8. Let us define $c_{e,K} = 16\alpha^{-1}a^2(\ln(K))^2(M_1 + M_2 + M_3)$ and $c_{\delta,K} = \left(\frac{M_4 + M_5}{a} \right) + 2c_{e,K} + 2\hat{\gamma}B_f\sqrt{c_{e,K}}$. Then, the following statements hold.

- (i) [infeasibility bound] For any K such that $16 + 16\frac{L_h}{\bar{\eta}} \leq \left(\frac{(\lfloor K/2 \rfloor + 1)^a}{a \ln(\lfloor K/2 \rfloor + 1)} \right)^2$, we have $\text{dist}(\hat{x}_K, X_h^*) \leq 4\sqrt{\alpha^{-1}(M_1 + M_2 + M_3)} \frac{\ln(K)}{K^a}$.
- (ii) [residual mapping bound] For any $K \geq \max\{6, 4L_f^2\}$ such that $16 + 16\frac{L_h}{\bar{\eta}} \leq \left(\frac{(\lfloor K/2 \rfloor + 1)^a}{a \ln(\lfloor K/2 \rfloor + 1)} \right)^2$, we have

$$\|G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{x}_K^*)\|_2^2 \leq \frac{8(\hat{D}_f - \hat{C}_f)}{\sqrt{K}} + \frac{2L_f \hat{B}_f^2}{\sqrt{K}} + \left(\frac{320(c_{e,K} + c_{\delta,K})^3}{L_f(a-1)} \right) \frac{1}{K^{a-1.5}}. \quad (33)$$

(iii) [overall iteration complexity] The total iteration complexity is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2a-2})$, where $a \geq 2$ and $\epsilon > 0$ is an arbitrary scalar such that $\|G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{x}_K^*)\|_2^2 \leq \epsilon$.

Proof. (i) Consider Definition 7 and Lemma 8 (ii). Then, by invoking Proposition 3, we obtain $\text{dist}(\hat{x}_K, X_h^*) = \|e_K\|_2 \leq \frac{\ln(J_{K-1})}{J_{K-1}} 4\sqrt{\alpha^{-1}(M_1 + M_2 + M_3)}$. Using $J_K = (K+1)^a$ with $a \geq 2$, where $16 + 16\frac{L_h}{\eta} \leq \left(\frac{J_K}{\ln(J_K)}\right)^2$, we obtain the result in (i).

(ii) By summing the both sides of (32) over $k = \lfloor K/2 \rfloor, \dots, K-1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=\lfloor K/2 \rfloor}^{K-1} \|G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{x}_k)\|_2^2 &\leq \frac{4(f(\hat{x}_{\lfloor K/2 \rfloor}) - f(\hat{x}_K))}{\hat{\gamma}} + KL_f \hat{\gamma} \hat{B}_f^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{80}{L\hat{\gamma}^3} \sum_{k=\lfloor K/2 \rfloor}^{K-1} (\|\delta_k\|_2^2 + \|e_k\|_2^2). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

From the definition of \hat{x}_K^* and that $K/2 \leq K - \lfloor K/2 \rfloor$, we have $\frac{K}{2} \|G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{x}_K^*)\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{k=\lfloor K/2 \rfloor}^{K-1} \|G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{x}_k)\|_2^2$. Then, from the preceding inequality in (34) and $\hat{\gamma} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \leq \frac{1}{2L_f}$, we obtain the following inequality for $K \geq \max\{6, 4L_f^2\}$ and $k \geq 2$.

$$\|G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{x}_K^*)\|_2^2 \leq \frac{8(\hat{D}_f - \hat{C}_f)}{\sqrt{K}} + \frac{2L_f \hat{B}_f^2}{\sqrt{K}} + \frac{160\sqrt{K}}{L_f} \sum_{k=\lfloor K/2 \rfloor}^{K-1} (\|\delta_k\|_2^2 + \|e_k\|_2^2). \quad (35)$$

In view of $16 + 16\frac{L_h}{\eta} \leq \left(\frac{(\lfloor K/2 \rfloor + 1)^a}{a \ln(\lfloor K/2 \rfloor + 1)}\right)^2$ and that $\frac{(\lfloor K/2 \rfloor + 1)^a}{a \ln(\lfloor K/2 \rfloor + 1)} \leq \frac{(k+1)^a}{a \ln(k+1)}$ for any $\lfloor K/2 \rfloor \leq k \leq K$, the conditions in Proposition 3 are met. Then, in view of $\hat{\gamma} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$, for any $\lfloor K/2 \rfloor \leq k \leq K$, we obtain $\|e_k\|_2^2 \leq \frac{c_{e,K}}{k^{2a}}$ and $\|\delta_k\|_2^2 \leq \frac{c_{\delta,K}}{k^a}$. Thus, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=\lfloor K/2 \rfloor}^{K-1} (\|e_k\|_2^2 + \|\delta_k\|_2^2) \leq (c_{e,K} + c_{\delta,K}) \sum_{k=\lfloor K/2 \rfloor}^{K-1} \frac{1}{k^a}.$$

Now, by invoking [35, Lemma 9], $a \geq 2$, and $\lfloor K/2 \rfloor \geq \frac{K}{3}$ for $K \geq 2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=\lfloor K/2 \rfloor}^{K-1} \frac{1}{k^a} &= \sum_{k=\lfloor K/2 \rfloor - 1}^{K-2} (k+1)^{-a} \leq \lfloor K/2 \rfloor^{-a} + \frac{\lfloor K/2 \rfloor^{1-a} - K^{1-a}}{a-1} \\ &\leq \lfloor K/2 \rfloor^{-a} + \frac{\lfloor K/2 \rfloor^{1-a}}{a-1} \leq \frac{3^a}{K^a} + \frac{3^{a-1}}{K^{a-1}(a-1)} \leq \left(\frac{2 \times 3^a}{a-1}\right) \frac{1}{K^{a-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the preceding two inequalities with (35), we obtain the result.

(iii) From part (ii) and noting that $a \geq 2$, we have $\|G_{1/\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{x}_K^*)\|_2^2 \leq \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}})$. Then, from $J_k = (k+1)^a$, the total iteration complexity is $\sum_{k=0}^{\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})} (k+1)^a = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2a-2})$. \square

Remark 9. Theorem 3 provides, for the first time, an iteration complexity bound for addressing SBO problems with a smooth nonconvex upper objective and a composite convex lower objective. Importantly, choosing $a = 2$, the total iteration complexity of IPR-VFISTA_{nc} is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-6})$ which is an improvement over the $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-8})$ complexity in [27] for nonconvex optimization with variational inequality constraints.

5 Numerical experiments

In this section, we assess the performance of our proposed algorithms by addressing a SBO problem arising in ill-posed optimization [13]. To evaluate IR-ISTA_s and R-VFISTA_s, we consider the problem

$$\min_x \bar{f}(x) \triangleq \frac{\mu_f}{2} \|x\|_2^2 + \|x\|_1, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{h}(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}x - b\|_2^2, \quad (36)$$

where μ_f is the strong convexity parameter of the function \bar{f} , and the matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and the vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are given. To assess the performance of IPR-VFISTA_{nc}, we consider a smooth approximation of the log-sum penalty as the upper-level objective function, given by $l(x) := \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 + |x_i| \varepsilon^{-1})$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ and x_i denotes the i th coordinate of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Although function l is nonsmooth and nonconvex [22], we employ the Moreau envelope to make it smooth as follows. Following [3, Definition 6.52], the Moreau envelope of function l with smoothing parameter $\delta > 0$ is given by $M_l^\delta(x) = l(\text{prox}_{\delta l}[x]) + \frac{1}{2\delta} \|x - \text{prox}_{\delta l}[x]\|_2^2$. Moreover, as noted in [3, Remark 6.7], the proximal operator $\text{prox}_{\delta l}[x]$ is defined as $\text{prox}_{\delta l}[x] = (\text{prox}_{\delta l_i}[x_i])_{i=1}^n$, where $l_i(x_i) = \log(1 + |x_i| \varepsilon^{-1})$. From [22, Proposition 1], if $\delta > 0$ and $\sqrt{\delta} \leq \varepsilon$, the proximal operator of $l_i(x_i)$ is given by 0 when $|x_i| \leq \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}$, and for $|x_i| > \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}$, it is given by $0.5 \text{sign}(x_i)(|x_i| - \varepsilon + \sqrt{(|x_i| + \varepsilon)^2 - 4\delta})$. As a result, the Moreau envelope $M_l^\delta(x)$ is $\frac{1}{\delta}$ -smooth and $\nabla M_l^\delta(x) = \frac{1}{\delta} (x - \text{prox}_{\delta l}[x])$. For the lower-level problem in the nonconvex setting, we consider $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{h}(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}x - b\|_2^2$ subject to $\|x\|_2 \leq 1$. Note that, the optimal solution set of the preceding optimization problem admits the quadratic growth property, as we discussed in Remark 1. We employ IPR-VFISTA_{nc} to address the following SBO problem.

$$\min_x \bar{f}(x) \triangleq M_l^\delta(x), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x \in \arg \min_{\|x\|_2 \leq 1} h(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}x - b\|_2^2. \quad (37)$$

5.1 Experiments and setup

Similar to [4, 1, 25], we consider three inverse problems: “Baart,” “Philips,” and “Foxgood.” These problems differ in the methods used to generate the matrix $\mathbf{A}_{n \times n}$ and vector $b_{n \times 1}$ (see the Regularization Tools package¹). We conduct experiments across three different classes of inverse problems and implement Algorithms 1 and 2 with the initial vector $x_0 = \mathbf{1}_{n \times 1}$ to address the problem in (36) with different dimensions n . Furthermore, we implement Algorithm 3 to address the problem in (37) with the feasible initial vector $x_0 = \frac{\mathbf{1}_{n \times 1}}{\|\mathbf{1}_{n \times 1}\|_2}$.

5.2 Results and insights

The results of implementing Algorithm 1 with a diminishing regularization parameter (IR-ISTA_s) are presented in Figure 1. We observe that for all dimensions n and the three inverse problems, the upper-level objective function value stabilizes over time. This behavior can be attributed to the fact that problem in (36) is a constrained optimization problem, resulting that the sequence generated to minimize the upper-level objective may not always be feasible for the lower-level problem. Additionally, we observe that the value of lower-level objective function \bar{h} decreases over time for all values of n , which aligns with our findings regarding the infeasibility error metric.

Figure 2 presents the results of implementing Algorithm 2. For the same reasons discussed in the context of Figure 1, these results confirm the effectiveness of Algorithm 2. Lastly, the implementation results for Algorithm 3 are shown in Figure 3. Notably, the upper-level and lower-level objective function values decrease over time across all three inverse problems.

6 Concluding remarks

In conclusion, this work introduces novel methods for addressing simple bilevel optimization problems. When the upper objective is a composite strongly convex function, we propose an iteratively regularized proximal gradient method and establish both the asymptotic convergence and simultaneous nonasymptotic sublinear convergence rates. We further propose a regularized

¹Available at <https://www2.imm.dtu.dk/~pcha/Regutools/>




Figure 1: Performance of IR-ISTA_s on three ill-posed problems.




Figure 2: Performance of R-VFISTA_s on three ill-posed problems.

accelerated proximal gradient method and derive quadratically decaying sublinear convergence rates for both infeasibility and suboptimality error metrics. When the upper-level objective is a smooth nonconvex function, we propose an inexactly projected iteratively regularized gradient method and derive new convergence rate statements for computing a stationary point of the simple bilevel problem.

References

- [1] M. AMINI AND F. YOUSEFIAN, *An iterative regularized incremental projected subgradient method for a class of bilevel optimization problems*, in 2019 American Control Conference (ACC), IEEE, 2019, pp. 4069–4074.
- [2] A. AUSLENDER, *Stability in mathematical programming with nondifferentiable data*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 22 (1984), pp. 239–254.
- [3] A. BECK, *First-order methods in optimization*, SIAM, 2017.
- [4] A. BECK AND S. SABACH, *A first order method for finding minimal norm-like solutions of convex optimization problems*, Mathematical Programming, 147 (2014), pp. 25–46.




Figure 3: Performance of IPR-VFISTA_{nc} on three ill-posed problems.

- [5] A. BECK AND M. TEBoulLE, *A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems*, SIAM journal on imaging sciences, 2 (2009), pp. 183–202.
- [6] D. BERTSEKAS, A. NEDIĆ, AND A. OZDAGLAR, *Convex analysis and optimization*, vol. 1, Athena Scientific, 2003.
- [7] J. BOLTE, T. P. NGUYEN, J. PEYPOUQUET, AND B. W. SUTER, *From error bounds to the complexity of first-order descent methods for convex functions*, Mathematical Programming, 165 (2017), pp. 471–507.
- [8] J. F. BONNANS AND A. D. IOFFE, *Quadratic growth and stability in convex programming problems with multiple solutions*, J. Convex Anal, 2 (1995), pp. 41–57.
- [9] J. V. BURKE AND M. C. FERRIS, *Weak sharp minima in mathematical programming*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 31 (1993), pp. 1340–1359.
- [10] J. CAO, R. JIANG, E. YAZDANDOOST HAMEDANI, AND A. MOKHTARI, *An accelerated gradient method for convex smooth simple bilevel optimization*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 37 (2024), pp. 45126–45154.
- [11] L. DORON AND S. SHTERN, *Methodology and first-order algorithms for solving nonsmooth and non-strongly convex bilevel optimization problems*, Mathematical Programming, 201 (2023), pp. 521–558.
- [12] M. EBRAHIMI, U. V. SHANBHAG, AND F. YOUSEFIAN, *Distributed gradient tracking methods with guarantees for computing a solution to stochastic MPECs*, in 2024 American Control Conference (ACC), IEEE, 2024, pp. 2182–2187.
- [13] M. P. FRIEDLANDER AND P. TSENG, *Exact regularization of convex programs*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 18 (2008), pp. 1326–1350.
- [14] K.-H. GIANG-TRAN, N. HO-NGUYEN, AND D. LEE, *A projection-free method for solving convex bilevel optimization problems*, Mathematical Programming, (2024), pp. 1–34.
- [15] E. S. HELOU AND L. E. SIMÕES, *ϵ -subgradient algorithms for bilevel convex optimization*, Inverse Problems, 33 (2017), p. 055020.

- [16] A. IOFFE, *On sensitivity analysis of nonlinear programs in banach spaces: the approach via composite unconstrained optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 4 (1994), pp. 1–43.
- [17] R. JIANG AND X. LI, *Hölderian error bounds and kurdyka-lojasiewicz inequality for the trust region subproblem*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 47 (2022), pp. 3025–3050.
- [18] H. D. KAUSHIK, S. SAMADI, AND F. YOUSEFIAN, *An incremental gradient method for optimization problems with variational inequality constraints*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, (2023).
- [19] H. D. KAUSHIK AND F. YOUSEFIAN, *A method with convergence rates for optimization problems with variational inequality constraints*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 31 (2021), pp. 2171–2198.
- [20] R. MERCHAV AND S. SABACH, *Convex bi-level optimization problems with nonsmooth outer objective function*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 33 (2023), pp. 3114–3142.
- [21] R. MERCHAV, S. SABACH, AND M. TEBoulLE, *A fast algorithm for convex composite bi-level optimization*, arXiv e-prints, (2024), pp. arXiv–2407.
- [22] A. PRATER-BENNETTE, L. SHEN, AND E. E. TRIPP, *The proximity operator of the log-sum penalty*, Journal of Scientific Computing, 93 (2022), p. 67.
- [23] Y. QIU, F. YOUSEFIAN, AND B. ZHANG, *Iteratively regularized gradient tracking methods for optimal equilibrium seeking*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.18883, (2024).
- [24] R. T. ROCKAFELLAR, *Convex analysis*, vol. 28, Princeton university press, 1997.
- [25] S. SABACH AND S. SHTERN, *A first order method for solving convex bilevel optimization problems*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 27 (2017), pp. 640–660.
- [26] S. SAMADI, D. BURBANO, AND F. YOUSEFIAN, *Achieving optimal complexity guarantees for a class of bilevel convex optimization problems*, in 2024 American Control Conference (ACC), IEEE, 2024, pp. 2206–2211.
- [27] S. SAMADI AND F. YOUSEFIAN, *Improved guarantees for optimal Nash equilibrium seeking and bilevel variational inequalities*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 35 (2025), pp. 369–399.
- [28] M. SOLODOV, *An explicit descent method for bilevel convex optimization*, Journal of Convex Analysis, 14 (2007), p. 227.
- [29] M. V. SOLODOV, *A bundle method for a class of bilevel nonsmooth convex minimization problems*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 18 (2007), pp. 242–259.
- [30] M. STUDNIARSKI, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for isolated local minima of nonsmooth functions*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 24 (1986), pp. 1044–1049.
- [31] M. STUDNIARSKI AND D. E. WARD, *Weak sharp minima: characterizations and sufficient conditions*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 38 (1999), pp. 219–236.
- [32] A. N. TIKHONOV, *On the solution of ill-posed problems and the method of regularization*, in Doklady akademii nauk, vol. 151, Russian Academy of Sciences, 1963, pp. 501–504.

- [33] D. WARD, *Characterizations of strict local minima and necessary conditions for weak sharp minima*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 80 (1994), pp. 551–571.
- [34] F. YOUSEFIAN, *Bilevel distributed optimization in directed networks*, in 2021 American Control Conference (ACC), IEEE, 2021, pp. 2230–2235.
- [35] F. YOUSEFIAN, A. NEDIĆ, AND U. V. SHANBHAG, *On smoothing, regularization, and averaging in stochastic approximation methods for stochastic variational inequality problems*, Mathematical Programming, 165 (2017), pp. 391–431.