

ARTICLE TEMPLATE

An Inexact First-Order Method for Constrained Nonlinear Optimization

Hao Wang^a and Fan Zhang^b and Jiashan Wang^c and Yuyang Rong^d

^{a, b, d}School of Information Science and Technology, ShanghaiTech University, Shanghai, China;

^bShanghai Institute of Microsystem and Information Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shanghai, China;

^bUniversity of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China;

^cDepartment of Mathematics, University of Washington.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled November 19, 2019

ABSTRACT

The primary focus of this paper is on designing an inexact first-order algorithm for solving constrained nonlinear optimization problems. By controlling the inexactness of the subproblem solution, we can significantly reduce the computational cost needed for each iteration. A penalty parameter updating strategy [during the process of solving the subproblem](#) enables the algorithm to automatically detect infeasibility. Global convergence for both feasible and infeasible cases are proved. Complexity analysis for the KKT residual is also derived under [mild](#) assumptions. Numerical experiments exhibit the ability of the proposed algorithm to rapidly find inexact optimal solution through cheap computational cost.

KEYWORDS

nonlinear optimization, sequential linear optimization, constrained problems, exact penalty functions, convex composite optimization, first-order methods

1. Introduction

In the last few years, a number of advances on first-order optimization methods have been made for unconstrained/constrained optimization problems in a wide range of applications including machine learning, compressed sensing and signal processing. This is largely due to their relatively low iteration computational cost, as well as their implementation easiness. Numerous works have emerged for solving unconstrained optimization problems, e.g. the stochastic gradient descent methods [7–9, 26] and mirror descent methods [4, 27] [for](#) solving machine learning problems, soft-thresholding type algorithms [5, 18] for solving sparse reconstruction problems. For certain structured constrained optimization problems, many first-order methods have also captured researchers' attention, such as conditional gradient methods (also known as Frank-Wolfe methods) for solving principle component analysis problems [31], gradient projection methods for solving various problems with structured constraints [19, 35], and gradient methods on Riemannian manifolds [1, 34].

On the contrary, little attention has been paid on first-order methods for solving general constrained optimization problems in the past decades. This is mainly due to the *slow tail convergence* of first-order methods, since it can cause heavy computational burden for obtaining accurate solutions. Most of the research efforts can date back to the successive linear programming (SLP) algorithms [3, 30] designed in 1960s-1980s for solving pooling problems in oil refinery. Among various SLP algorithms, the most famous SLP algorithm is proposed by Fletcher and Maza in [20, 21], which analyzes the global convergence as well as the local convergence under strict complementarity, second-order sufficiency and regularity conditions. The other well-known work is the active-set algorithmic option implemented in the off-the-shelf solver `Knitro` [15], which sequentially solves a linear optimization subproblem and an equality constrained quadratic optimization subproblem.

The primary focus of this paper is to design an algorithmic framework of first-order methods for nonlinear constrained optimization. Despite of their weakness on tail convergence, first-order methods are widely used for quickly computing relatively inaccurate solutions, which can also be used for initializing a high-order method or quickly identifying the active-set [15, 32]. Unlike second-order methods, the subproblems in first-order methods are often easier to tackle. If only inexact subproblem solutions are required to enforce the global convergence, the computational cost per iteration could further be reduced, which may be able to compensate for the inefficiency of the entire algorithm. To achieve this, one must carefully handle the possible infeasibility of the subproblem constraints. Many nonlinear solvers need sway away from the main algorithm and turn to a so-called *feasibility restoration phase* to improve the constraint satisfaction. In a penalty method, the penalty parameter needs to be properly tuned so that the feasibility of the nonlinear problem is not deteriorated, such penalty parameter updating strategy have been studied in [11, 13, 14, 16] for sequential quadratic programming methods.

1.1. Contributions

The major contribution of this paper is an algorithmic framework of inexact first-order penalty methods. The novelties of the proposed methods include three aspects. First, only inexact solve of each subproblem is needed, which can significantly reduce computational effort for each subproblem. Indeed, if the subproblem is a linear optimization problem, then only a few pivots by simplex methods can be witnessed, making the fast computation of relatively inaccurate solutions possible. The second novelty of our proposed methods is the ability of automatic detection of potential constraint inconsistencies, so that the algorithm can automatically solve for optimality if the problem is feasible or find an **infeasible** stationary point if the problem is (locally) infeasible. The last novel feature of our work is the worst-case complexity analysis for the proposed algorithm under **mild** assumptions. We show that the KKT residuals for optimality problem and feasibility problems need at most $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ iterations to reach below ϵ and for feasible cases the constraint violation locally needs at most $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ iterations—a novelty rarely seen in general nonlinear constrained optimization methods.

1.2. Organization

In §2, we describe the proposed framework of inexact first-order penalty method. The global convergence and worst-case complexity analysis of the proposed methods are

analyzed in §3. Subproblems algorithms are discussed in §4. Implementations of the proposed methods and the numerical results are discussed in §5. Finally, concluding remarks are provided in §6.

2. A Framework of Inexact First-Order Methods

In this section, we formulate our problem of interest and outline a framework of inexact first-order penalty method. We present our algorithm in the context of the generic nonlinear optimization problem with equality and inequality constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \\ \text{s.t. } c_i(x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathcal{E}, \\ c_i(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathcal{I}, \end{aligned} \tag{NLP}$$

where the functions $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $c_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}$ are continuously differentiable. Our algorithms converge to stationary points for the *feasibility problem*

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} v(x) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} v_i(c_i(x)), \tag{FP}$$

with $v_i(z) = |z|$, $i \in \mathcal{E}$, where $v_i(z) = (z)_+$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and $(\cdot)_+ = \max\{\cdot, 0\}$. It can be shown that the Clarke's generalized gradients [17] of v , denoted by $\bar{\partial}v(x)$, is given by

$$\bar{\partial}v(x) = \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i \nabla c_i(x) \mid \lambda_i \in \partial_c v_i(c_i(x)) \right\},$$

where

$$\partial_c v_i(c_i(x)) = \begin{cases} [-1, 1] & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{E} \quad \text{and } c_i(x) = 0 \\ [0, 1] & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I} \quad \text{and } c_i(x) = 0 \\ \{-1\} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{E} \quad \text{and } c_i(x) < 0 \\ \{0\} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I} \quad \text{and } c_i(x) < 0 \\ \{1\} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I} \quad \text{and } c_i(x) > 0. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

A stationary point x for (FP) must satisfy

$$0 \in \bar{\partial}v(x), \tag{2}$$

and it is called an infeasible stationary point if $v(x) > 0$. If a minimizer of (FP) violates the constraints of (NLP), then it provides a certificate of **local** infeasibility for (NLP). Despite the possibility that problem (NLP) may be feasible elsewhere, it is deemed that no further progress on minimizing constraint violation locally can be made.

If the algorithm converges to a feasible point of problem (NLP), this point should be a stationary point of the ℓ_1 exact penalty function

$$\phi(x; \rho) := \rho f(x) + v(x), \tag{3}$$

with $v(x) = \phi(x; 0) = 0$ for final penalty parameter $\rho > 0$. Such points can be characterized by the $0 \in \bar{\partial}\phi(x; \rho) = \rho\nabla f(x) + \bar{\partial}v(x)$, which is equivalently to the first-order optimality condition

$$\rho\nabla f(x) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i \nabla c_i(x) = 0, \quad (4a)$$

$$\lambda_i \in [-1, 1], i \in \mathcal{E}; \lambda_i \in [0, 1], i \in \mathcal{I}, \quad (4b)$$

$$\sum_{c_i(x) > 0} (1 - \lambda_i) v_i(c_i(x)) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}, c_i(x) < 0} (1 + \lambda_i) v_i(c_i(x)) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}, c_i(x) < 0} \lambda_i |c_i(x)| = 0. \quad (4c)$$

A first-order stationary point x for (NLP) thus can be presented as a stationary point of the penalty function with $\rho > 0$ and satisfying $v(x) = 0$. Let $\lambda = [\lambda_{\mathcal{E}}^T, \lambda_{\mathcal{I}}^T]^T$ be the multipliers satisfying (4a)–(4c). Such a point (x, λ) is called stationary for (NLP) since it corresponds to a Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) point $(x, \lambda/\rho)$ for (NLP) [28, 29]. Also notice that (4) with $\rho = 0$ can be deemed as an equivalent statement of condition (2).

2.1. Subproblems

We now describe our technique for search direction computation which involves the inexact solution of subproblems that are constructed using merely the first-order information of (NLP).

At the k th iteration, the algorithm seeks to measure the possible improvement in minimizing the linearized model [33] $l(d; \rho, x^k)$ of the penalty function $\phi(x; \rho)$ at x^k

$$l(d; \rho, x^k) := \rho \langle \nabla f(x^k), d \rangle + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} v_i(c_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla c_i(x^k), d \rangle), \quad (5)$$

where the constant $\rho f(x^k)$ is omitted for the ease of presentation. The local model $l(\cdot; \rho, x^k)$ is convex and the subdifferential of $l(\cdot; \rho, x^k)$ at d is given by

$$\partial l(d; \rho, x^k) = \rho \nabla f(x^k) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \nabla c_i(x^k) \partial_c v_i(c_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla c_i(x^k), d \rangle). \quad (6)$$

In particular, its subdifferential at $d = 0$ coincides with the Clarke's generalized subdifferential of $\phi(\cdot; \rho)$ at $x = x^k$

$$\partial l(0; \rho, x^k) = \bar{\partial}\phi(x^k; \rho) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial l(0; 0, x^k) = \bar{\partial}v(x^k). \quad (7)$$

The subproblem solver aims to find a direction d^k that yields a nonnegative reduction in $l(\cdot; \rho, x^k)$ and $l(\cdot; 0, x^k)$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta l(d^k; \rho, x^k) &:= l(0; \rho, x^k) - l(d^k; \rho, x^k) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \\ \Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k) &:= l(0; 0, x^k) - l(d^k; 0, x^k) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Such a direction d^k can be found as an (approximate) minimizer of $l(\cdot; \rho_k, x^k)$ for appropriate $\rho_k \in (0, \rho_{k-1}]$ over a convex set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ containing $\{0\}$, i.e.,

$$d^k := \arg \min_{d \in X} l(d; \rho_k, x^k) \quad \text{for some } \rho_k \in (0, \rho_{k-1}]. \quad (\mathcal{P})$$

Here we introduce the set X for imposing a trust region to prevent infinite steps, which is defined as $X := \{d : \|d\| \leq \delta\}$ for trust region radius $\delta > 0$ and $\|\cdot\|$ satisfying

$$\|x\|_2 \leq \kappa_0 \|x\|_*, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (8)$$

for constant $\kappa_0 > 0$ with $\|\cdot\|_*$ denoting the dual norm of $\|\cdot\|$. The most popular choice for $\|\cdot\|$ is the ℓ_2 -norm and ℓ_∞ -norm. The latter option results in a linear optimization subproblem, but it is *not* a requirement in our algorithm. We refer to (\mathcal{P}) with $\rho > 0$ as the *penalty subproblem* and (\mathcal{P}) with $\rho = 0$ as the *feasibility subproblem*. In the remainder of this paper, let $d^*(\rho, x)$ denote a minimizer of $l(d; \rho, x)$.

To alleviate the computational burden of solving subproblems (\mathcal{P}) exactly, our algorithm accepts an inexact solution d^k of (\mathcal{P}) as long as it yields sufficient reduction in l compared with the optimal solution of (\mathcal{P}) , i.e.,

$$\Delta l(d^k; \rho, x^k) + \gamma_k \geq \beta_\phi [\Delta l(d^*(\rho, x^k); \rho, x^k) + \gamma_k], \quad (9a)$$

$$\Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k) + \gamma_k \geq \beta_v [\Delta l(d^*(0, x^k); 0, x^k) + \gamma_k] \quad (9b)$$

where $\beta_\phi, \beta_v \in (0, 1)$ with $\beta_v < \beta_\phi$ are prescribed constants and $\gamma_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is the relaxation error. Further details of γ_k will be discussed in §2.2.

It is often impractical to verify conditions (9a) and (9b), since it requires the exact optimal solution of subproblems. In our algorithm, we can indirectly evaluate the optimal value by using the dual value. The Lagrangian dual of (\mathcal{P}) is

$$\max_{-e \leq \lambda_{\mathcal{E}} \leq e, 0 \leq \lambda_{\mathcal{I}} \leq e} p(\lambda; \rho, x^k) := -\delta \|\rho \nabla f(x^k) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i \nabla c_i(x^k)\|_* + \langle c(x^k), \lambda \rangle, \quad (\mathcal{D})$$

where $\lambda = [\lambda_{\mathcal{E}}^T, \lambda_{\mathcal{I}}^T]^T$, $c(x) = [c_{\mathcal{E}}(x)^T, c_{\mathcal{I}}(x)^T]^T$ and e is the vector of all 1s with appropriate dimension. If λ is dual feasible, then by weak duality,

$$p(\lambda; 0, x_k) \leq l(d; 0, x_k) \quad \text{and} \quad p(\lambda; \rho, x_k) \leq l(d; \rho, x_k). \quad (10)$$

Using the dual values, we can require the direction d^k to satisfy

$$\Delta l(d^k; \rho, x^k) + \gamma_k \geq \beta_\phi [l(0; \rho, x^k) - p(\lambda^k; \rho, x^k) + \gamma_k] \quad (11a)$$

$$\Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k) + \gamma_k \geq \beta_v [l(0; 0, x^k) - p(\lambda^k; 0, x^k) + \gamma_k], \quad (11b)$$

for current dual feasible estimate λ^k , so that (9a) and (9b) are enforced to be satisfied.

An interesting aspect to notice is that $p(\lambda; \rho, x^k)$ consists of two parts. The first term is in fact the KKT optimality residual at (x^k, λ) scaled by the trust region radius δ , while for $\lambda_i \in \partial_c v_i(c_i(x^k))$, the second term $\langle c(x^k), \lambda \rangle = v(x^k)$ describes the complementarity, so that the problem (\mathcal{D}) is indeed seeking to minimize the KKT residual at x^k .

Before proceeding to the design of penalty parameter updating strategy, we first provide a couple of results related to our subproblems and their solutions.

Lemma 2.1. *The following statements hold at any x with $\delta > 0$.*

- (i) $\Delta l(d^*(0, x); 0, x) \geq 0$ where the equality holds if and only if x is stationary for $v(\cdot)$.

- (ii) $\Delta l(d^*(\rho, x); \rho, x) \geq 0$ where the equality holds if and only if x is stationary for $\phi(\cdot; \rho)$.
- (iii) If $\Delta l(d^*(\rho, x); \rho, x) = 0$ for $\rho > 0$ and $v(x) = 0$, then x is a KKT point for (NLP).

Proof. Note that $\Delta l(d^*(0, x); 0, x) = v(x) - l(d^*(0, x); 0, x) \geq v(x) - l(0; 0, x) = 0$. Now we investigate the case where the equality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
l(0; 0, x) = l(d^*(0, x); 0, x) &\iff 0 \text{ is stationary for } l(d; 0, x) \\
&\iff 0 \in \partial l(d; 0, x) \\
&\iff 0 \in \bar{\partial} v(x) \\
&\iff x \text{ is stationary for } v(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equivalence is by (7). This proves (i).

Following the same argument for $l(d; \rho, x)$ and $\phi(x; \rho)$ using (7), (ii) holds true.

To prove (iii), we know from (ii) that the condition in (iii) means x is stationary for $\phi(x; \rho)$. Therefore, there must exist $\lambda_i \in \partial_c v(c_i(x))$ such that $0 = \rho \nabla f(x) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i \nabla c_i(x)$, which is equivalent to

$$\nabla f(x) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} (\lambda_i / \rho) \nabla c_i(x) = 0.$$

Furthermore, it follows from $\lambda_i \in \partial_c v(c_i(x))$ that

$$\lambda_i \geq 0, i \in \mathcal{I}, \quad \text{with } \lambda_i = 0, \text{ if } c_i(x) < 0 \text{ and } i \in \mathcal{I},$$

meaning the complementary condition is satisfied. The constraints are all satisfied since $v(x) = 0$. Overall, we have shown that x is a KKT point with multipliers λ_i / ρ , $i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}$, as desired. \square

Overall, the k th iteration of our proposed method proceeds as in Algorithm 1. A direction and penalty parameter pair (d^k, ρ_k) is firstly computed by a subproblem solver such that d^k yields reductions that satisfy our conditions (11a) and (11b). Then a line search is executed to find a step size α_k . Finally, the new iterate is set as $x^{k+1} \leftarrow x^k + \alpha_k d^k$ and the algorithm proceeds to the next iteration. The proposed first-order method for nonlinear constrained optimization, hereinafter nicknamed FoNCO, is presented as Algorithm 1.

2.2. Penalty parameter update

At the k th iteration, the value $\rho_k \in (0, \rho_{k-1}]$ needs to be updated to ensure the direction satisfies (11a) and (11b) as described in the previous subsection can successfully be found. The updating strategy for penalty parameter ρ consists of two phases. The first phase occurs within the subproblem solver and the second phase happens after solving the subproblem.

For ease of presentation, we drop the iteration number k and utilize the following shorthand notation

$$g = \nabla f(x^k), \quad a^i = \nabla c_i(x^k), \quad b_i = c_i(x^k), \quad A = [a^1, \dots, a^m]^T, \quad (13)$$

Algorithm 1 *First-order methods for Nonlinear Constrained Optimization (FoNCO)*

- 1: Require $\{\gamma_0, \theta_\alpha, \beta_\alpha\} \in (0, 1)$, $\rho_{-1} \in (0, \infty)$.
- 2: Choose $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- 3: **for** $k \in \mathbb{N}$ **do**
- 4: Solve (\mathcal{P}) (approximately) to obtain $(d^k, \rho_k) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \rho_{k-1}]$
- 5: or stop if a stationarity certificate is satisfied.
- 6: Let α_k be the largest value in $\{\theta_\alpha^0, \theta_\alpha^1, \theta_\alpha^2, \dots\}$ such that

$$\phi(x^k; \rho_k) - \phi(x^k + \alpha_k d^k; \rho_k) \geq \beta_\alpha \alpha_k \Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k). \quad (12)$$

- 7: Set $x^{k+1} = x^k + \alpha_k d^k$, choose $\gamma_{k+1} \in (0, \gamma_k]$
 - 8: **end for**
-

$l(d; \rho)$ and $p(\lambda; \rho)$ for the k th primal and dual subproblem objectives, respectively. Now (\mathcal{P}) can be written as

$$\min_{d \in X} l(d; \rho), \quad \text{where } l(d; \rho) = \langle \rho g, d \rangle + l(d; 0), \quad (\mathcal{P}')$$

with its dual (\mathcal{D}) written as

$$\max_{-e \leq \lambda_\varepsilon \leq e, 0 \leq \lambda_{\mathcal{I}} \leq e} p(\lambda; \rho) := -\delta \|\rho g\| + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i a^i \|_* + \langle b, \lambda \rangle. \quad (\mathcal{D}')$$

After dropping the iteration number k , we can use $(d_\rho^*, \lambda_\rho^*)$ to represent an optimal primal-dual pair for the penalty subproblem corresponding to ρ ; in particular, (d_0^*, λ_0^*) represents an optimal primal-dual pair for the feasibility subproblem. Meanwhile, we use super/sub-script (j) to denote the j th iteration of the subproblem solver.

We are now ready to introduce the first phase of the ρ updating strategy. Suppose the subproblem solver generates a sequence of primal-dual iterates $\{d^{(j)}, \lambda^{(j)}, \nu^{(j)}\}$ where $d^{(j)}$ represents the feasible solution estimate for the primal penalty subproblem, $\lambda^{(j)}$ and $\nu^{(j)}$ are the dual feasible solution estimate for the dual penalty and feasibility subproblems, respectively. First of all, we assume the subproblem solver finds primal solution estimate $d^{(j)}$ no worse than a trivial zero step

$$l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)}) \leq l(0; \rho_{(j)}), \quad (14)$$

the feasibility dual solution $\nu^{(j)}$ is no worse than the penalty dual solution $\lambda^{(j)}$ and both of them are no worse than the initial penalty dual solution

$$p(\nu^{(j)}; 0) \geq p(\lambda^{(j)}; 0) \geq p(\lambda^{(0)}; 0) > -\infty. \quad (15)$$

Both of these are reasonable assumptions. If (14) were not to hold, Lemma 2.1 indicates that this must be a certificate of stationarity for optimality or infeasibility. For dual iterates, one can simply use $\nu^{(j)} = \lambda^{(j)} = \lambda^{(0)}$ if there is no better dual estimate than the initial dual estimate.

Now, at the j th iteration of the subproblem solver, two ratios are defined:

$$r_v^{(j)} := \frac{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; 0)}{l_\gamma^{(0)} - (p(\nu^{(j)}; 0))_+} \quad \text{and} \quad r_\phi^{(j)} := \frac{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})}{l_\gamma^{(0)} - p(\lambda^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})}, \quad (16)$$

here $l_\gamma^{(0)} := l^{(0)} + \gamma$ with $\gamma > 0$ and $l^{(0)} := l(0; \rho) = l(0; 0) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} v_i(b_i) = v(x^k) \geq 0$ being the primal penalty and feasibility subproblem objectives at $d = 0$ for any $\rho \geq 0$. Note that the numerators of ratios $r_v^{(j)}$ and $r_\phi^{(j)}$ are positive due to the presence of γ . If at the j th iteration, we have

$$r_v^{(j)} \geq \beta_v, \quad (\mathbf{R}_v)$$

then the model reduction must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; 0) &\geq \beta_v (l_\gamma^{(0)} - (p(\nu^{(j)}; 0))_+) \\ &\geq \beta_v (l_\gamma^{(0)} - p(\lambda_0^*; 0)) = \beta_v (l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d_0^*; 0)), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where the first and second inequality follows by (\mathbf{R}_v) and the optimality of λ_0^* with respect to the feasibility subproblem (which is known that $p(\lambda_0^*, 0) \geq 0$) respectively, and the third one follows by strong duality. Thus condition (9a) is satisfied. In a similar way, if at the j th iteration, we have

$$r_\phi^{(j)} \geq \beta_\phi, \quad (\mathbf{R}_\phi)$$

then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)}) &\geq \beta_\phi (l_\gamma^{(0)} - p(u^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})) \\ &\geq \beta_\phi (l_\gamma^{(0)} - p(\lambda_{\rho_{(j)}}^*; \rho_{(j)})) = \beta_\phi (l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d_{\rho_{(j)}}^*; \rho_{(j)})). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Thus condition (9b) is satisfied.

As discussed above, the values of ratios $r_v^{(j)}$ and $r_\phi^{(j)}$ reflect the inexactness of current primal-dual $\{d^{(j)}, \lambda^{(j)}, \nu^{(j)}\}$. We need another ratio to measure the satisfaction of the complementarity. Define the index sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_+(d) &:= \{i \in \mathcal{E} : \langle a^i, d \rangle + b_i > 0\}, \\ \mathcal{E}_-(d) &:= \{i \in \mathcal{E} : \langle a^i, d \rangle + b_i < 0\}, \\ \text{and } \mathcal{I}_+(d) &:= \{i \in \mathcal{I} : \langle a^i, d \rangle + b_i > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The complementarity measure can be defined accordingly:

$$\chi(d, \lambda) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}_+(d) \cup \mathcal{I}_+(d)} (1 - \lambda_i) v_i(\langle a^i, d \rangle + b_i) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}_-(d)} (1 + \lambda_i) v_i(\langle a^i, d \rangle + b_i).$$

With an optimal primal-dual solution $(d_\rho^*, \lambda_\rho^*)$ for a penalty subproblem, one has $\lambda_i(\lambda_\rho^*) = 1$ for $i \in \mathcal{E}_+(d_\rho^*)$, $\lambda_i(\lambda_\rho^*) = -1$ for $i \in \mathcal{E}_-(d_\rho^*)$, and $\lambda_i(\lambda_\rho^*) = 1$ for $i \in \mathcal{I}_+(d_\rho^*)$,

from which it follows that $\chi(d_\rho^*, \lambda_\rho^*) = 0$. For an inexact solution, we require that $(d^{(j)}, \lambda^{(j)})$ satisfies

$$\chi^{(j)} := \chi(d^{(j)}, \lambda^{(j)}) \leq (1 - \beta_v)^2 l_\gamma^{(0)},$$

or, equivalently,

$$r_c^{(j)} := 1 - \sqrt{\frac{\chi^{(j)}}{l_\gamma^{(0)}}} \geq \beta_v. \quad (\text{R}_c)$$

Note that the numerator in $r_c^{(j)}$ is always positive due to the presence of $\gamma > 0$. Therefore, for a given $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$, (R_c) will hold for sufficiently accurate primal-dual solutions of the penalty subproblem.

For a fixed ρ , conditions (R_ϕ) and (R_c) will eventually be satisfied as the subproblem algorithm proceeds. However, this may not be the case for condition (R_v) . When this happens, d^k is deemed to be a “successful” inexact direction for minimizing the penalty function, but an “unsuccessful” direction for improving feasibility. The intuition underlying this phenomenon is that a large penalty parameter places too much emphasis on the objective function—a reason to reduce the penalty parameter. Thus we can update the parameter while solving the subproblem as follows. Given

$$0 < \beta_v < \beta_\phi < 1, \quad (19)$$

we initialize $\rho_{(0)} \leftarrow \rho_{k-1}$ (from the preceding iteration of the outer iteration) and apply the subproblem solver to (\mathcal{P}') to generate $\{(d^{(j)}, \lambda^{(j)}, \nu^{(j)})\}$. We continue to iterate toward solving (\mathcal{P}') until (R_ϕ) and (R_c) are satisfied. Then we terminate the subproblem algorithm if (R_v) is also satisfied or reduce the penalty parameter by setting

$$\rho_{(j+1)} \leftarrow \theta_\rho \rho_{(j)} \quad (20)$$

for some prescribed $\theta_\rho \in (0, 1)$.

It is possible that (R_ϕ) , (R_c) , and (R_v) all hold with $d^{(j)} = 0$ causing the subproblem solver takes a null step. In such a case, we have the subproblem solver terminate with $d^{(j)} = 0$, causing the outer iteration to take a null step in the primal space. This would be followed by a decrease in γ , prompting the outer iteration to eventually make further progress through solving the subproblem or terminate with a stationarity certificate.

On the other hand, if x^k is not stationary with respect to $\phi(\cdot, \rho)$ for any $\rho \in (0, \rho_{k-1}]$, but is stationary with respect to v , then for (d_0^*, λ_0^*) one has

$$\frac{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d_0^*; 0)}{l_\gamma^{(0)} - (p(\lambda_0^*; 0))_+} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma} = 1,$$

meaning that $r_v^{(j)} > \beta_v$ for $(d^{(j)}, \nu^{(j)})$ in a neighborhood of (d_0^*, λ_0^*) . One should expect that (DUST) would only reduce the penalty parameter a finite number of times during one subproblem solver. If x^k is near an infeasible stationary point, this may happen consecutively for many subproblems. This may quickly drive the penalty to 0, leading to an infeasible stationary point.

Now we introduce the dynamic updating strategy (DUST) [11] stated as:

<p>Given $\rho_{(j)}$ and the jth iterate $(d^{(j)}, \lambda^{(j)}, \nu^{(j)})$, perform the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if (R_ϕ), (R_c), and (R_v) hold, then terminate; • else if (R_ϕ) and (R_c) hold, but (R_v) does not, then apply (20); • else set $\rho_{(j+1)} \leftarrow \rho_{(j)}$. 	(DUST)
--	--------

After solving the subproblem, we consider the second phase of the ρ updating strategy. Let $\tilde{\rho}_k$ be the value of the penalty parameter obtained by applying (DUST) within the k th **subproblem solver**. Then, given a constant $\beta_l \in (0, \beta_\phi(1 - \beta_v)]$, we require $\rho_k \in (0, \tilde{\rho}_k]$ so that

$$\Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k) + \gamma_k \geq \beta_l(\Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k) + \gamma_k), \quad (21)$$

where the right-hand side of this inequality is guaranteed to be positive due to (R_v) . This can be guaranteed by the following *Posterior Subproblem Strategy*:

$\rho_k \leftarrow \begin{cases} \tilde{\rho}_k & \text{if this yields (21)} \\ \frac{(1 - \beta_l)(\Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k) + \gamma_k)}{\langle \nabla f(x^k), d^k \rangle} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$	(PSST)
---	--------

It is possible that $\langle \nabla f(x^k), d^k \rangle \leq 0$, implying

$$\Delta l(d^k; \tilde{\rho}_k, x^k) = -\langle \tilde{\rho}_k \nabla f(x^k), d^k \rangle + \Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k) \geq \Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k),$$

so that (21) is always true by setting $\rho_k = \tilde{\rho}_k$. Thus the denominator in the latter formula (PSST) is always positive. On the other hand, if the choice $\rho_k = \tilde{\rho}_k$ does not yield (21), then, by setting ρ_k according to the latter formula in (PSST), it follows that

$$\rho_k \langle \nabla f(x^k), d^k \rangle \leq (1 - \beta_l)(\Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k) + \gamma_k),$$

which means that

$$\Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k) + \gamma_k = \Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k) - \rho_k \langle \nabla f(x^k), d^k \rangle + \gamma_k \geq \beta_l(\Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k) + \gamma_k),$$

implying that (21) holds. This idea is similar to the updating strategy in various algorithms employing a merit function such as [10]. The difference is that this model reduction condition is imposed inexactly (due to the presence of $\gamma_k > 0$), making (PSST) more suitable for an inexact algorithmic framework.

We summarize the framework of a subproblem solver employing the (DUST) and (PSST) in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 A Framework of Subproblem Algorithm for Solving (\mathcal{P}).

- 1: Require $(\gamma_k, \beta_\phi) \in (0, 1)$, $\beta_v \in (0, \beta_\phi)$, $\beta_l \in (0, \beta_\phi(1 - \beta_v))$ and $(\rho_{-1}, \gamma_0) \in (0, \infty)$
 - 2: Set $\rho_{(0)} \leftarrow \rho_{k-1}$
 - 3: **for** $j \in \mathbb{N}$ **do**
 - 4: Generate a primal-dual feasible solution estimate $(d^{(j)}, \lambda^{(j)}, \nu^{(j)})$
 - 5: Set $\rho_{(j+1)}$ by applying (DUST)
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: Set $d^k \leftarrow d^{(j)}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_k \leftarrow \rho_{(j)}$.
 - 8: Set ρ_k by applying (PSST)
-

3. Convergence analysis

In this section, we analyze the behavior of our proposed algorithmic framework. We first show that if (DUST) is employed within an algorithm for solving (\mathcal{P}'), then, under reasonable assumptions on the subproblem data, it is only triggered finite number of times. The second part of this section focuses on the global convergence, which [shows](#) that our proposed algorithm will either converge to a stationary point if (NLP) is feasible or an infeasible stationary point if (NLP) is [locally](#) infeasible under general assumptions.

One of the contributions in this paper is the complexity analysis for the proposed method. We derive the worst-case complexity analysis of the KKT residuals for both the nonlinear optimization problem (NLP) and the feasibility problem (FP). Local complexity analysis for constraint violation is also proved at the last part of this section.

3.1. Worse-case complexity for a single subproblem

The goal of this subsection is to show that the subproblem solver terminates after reducing the penalty parameter for a finite number of times by employing the (DUST) within the subproblem solver for solving (\mathcal{P}'). Specifically, we can show that there exists a sufficiently small $\tilde{\rho}$ such that for any $\rho \in (0, \tilde{\rho}]$, if (R_ϕ) and (R_c) are satisfied, then (R_v) is also satisfied—a criterion that (DUST) will not be triggered and the subproblem solver should be terminated at this moment. Our complete subproblem algorithm utilizing (DUST) and (PSST) is stated as Algorithm 2. It should be clear that in the inner loop (over j) one is solving a subproblem with quantities dependent on the k th iterate of the main algorithm; see (13).

The assumption needed for this analysis is simply the primal-dual feasibility of the iterates, which is formulated as the following.

Assumption 3.1. *For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, the sequence $\{(d^{(j)}, \lambda^{(j)}, \nu^{(j)})\}$ has $d^{(j)} \in X$, $\lambda^{(j)}$ and $\nu^{(j)}$ are feasible for (\mathcal{P}'), and (14) and (15) hold.*

We first show that the differences between the primal and dual values of the optimality and feasibility subproblems are bounded with respect to ρ . Therefore, as ρ tends sufficiently small, the optimality primal (dual) subproblem will approach the feasibility primal (dual) subproblem.

Lemma 3.2. *Under Assumptions 3.1, it follows that, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$|l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)}) - l(d^{(j)}; 0)| \leq \kappa_2 \rho_{(j)} \quad (22a)$$

$$\text{and } |p(\lambda^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)}) - p(\lambda^{(j)}; 0)| \leq \kappa_3 \rho_{(j)}, \quad (22b)$$

with $\kappa_2 := \kappa_0 \delta \|g\|_2$ and $\kappa_3 = \delta \|g\|$. In particular, $\kappa_2 = \delta \|g\|_2$ if $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_2$ and $\kappa_2 = \sqrt{n} \delta \|g\|_2$ if $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_\infty$.

Proof. For the primal values, it holds true that

$$|l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)}) - l(d^{(j)}; 0)| = |\rho_{(j)} \langle g, d^{(j)} \rangle| \leq \rho_{(j)} \|g\|_2 \|d^{(j)}\|_2 \leq \rho_{(j)} \kappa_0 \|g\|_2 \|d^{(j)}\|,$$

where the second inequality is from the requirement (8). It then follows that

$$|l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)}) - l(d^{(j)}; 0)| \leq \rho_{(j)} \kappa_0 \delta \|g\|_2 = \kappa_2 \rho_{(j)},$$

proving (22a).

The difference between the dual values is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & |p(\lambda^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)}) - p(\lambda^{(j)}; 0)| \\ &= |-\delta \|\rho_{(j)} g + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i a_i\| + \delta \|\sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i a_i\||, \\ &\leq \delta \|\sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i a_i - (\rho_{(j)} g + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i a_i)\|, \\ &= \rho_{(j)} \delta \|g\|, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof of (22b). □

Now we are ready to prove our main result in this section, which needs the following definition

$$\mathcal{R} = \{j : (d^{(j)}, \lambda^{(j)}) \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{R}_\phi) \text{ and } (\mathbf{R}_c) \text{ but not } (\mathbf{R}_v)\},$$

meaning that \mathcal{R} is the set of subproblem iterations in which (20) is triggered.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose Assumptions 3.1 holds and let*

$$\kappa_4 := \inf_{j \in \mathcal{R}} \{l^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})\} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_5 := \inf_{j \in \mathcal{R}} \{l^{(0)} - p(\lambda^{(j)}; 0)\} \geq 0.$$

Then we have the following two cases.

- (i) If $g = 0$, then (DUST) is never triggered during the *subproblem solver*.
- (ii) If $g \neq 0$, for $\rho_{(j)} \in (0, \hat{\rho}]$, where

$$\hat{\rho} := \frac{\gamma + \min\{\kappa_4, \kappa_5\}}{\max\{\kappa_2, \kappa_3\}} \left(1 - \sqrt{\beta_v / \beta_\phi}\right), \quad (23)$$

if $(d^{(j)}, \lambda^{(j)})$ satisfies (\mathbf{R}_ϕ) and (\mathbf{R}_c) , then $(d^{(j)}, \nu^{(j)})$ satisfies (\mathbf{R}_v) . In other words, for any $\rho_{(j)} \in (0, \hat{\rho}]$, the update (20) is never triggered by (DUST).

Proof. We first prove (i). If $g = 0$, we know that $l(d^{(j)}; \rho) = l(d^{(j)}; 0)$ and that $p(\nu^{(j)}; 0) \geq p(\lambda^{(j)}; 0) = p(\lambda^{(j)}; \rho)$ by the selection of $\nu^{(j)}$, implying $r_v^{(j)} \geq r_\phi^{(j)}$. Therefore, if (R_ϕ) and (R_c) are satisfied, then $r_v^{(j)} \geq r_\phi^{(j)} \geq \beta_\phi > \beta_v$ satisfying (R_v) , as desired.

As for (ii), the denominator of $\tilde{\rho}$ is positive since $g \neq 0$. We prove (ii) by contradiction and assume that \mathcal{R} is infinite, indicating that the subproblem solver is never terminated and $\rho_{(j)}$ is reduced infinite many times and driven to 0. We have from (22a) that

$$-\kappa_2 \rho_{(j)} \leq l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)}) - l(d^{(j)}; 0) \leq \kappa_2 \rho_{(j)} \quad \text{for any } j \in \mathcal{R},$$

which, after adding and dividing through by $l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})$, yields for $j \in \mathcal{R}$ that

$$1 - \frac{\kappa_2 \rho_{(j)}}{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})} \leq \frac{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; 0)}{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})} \leq 1 + \frac{\kappa_2 \rho_{(j)}}{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})}. \quad (24)$$

Thus, for any

$$\rho_{(j)} \leq \frac{\gamma + \kappa_4}{\kappa_2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\beta_v}{\beta_\phi}} \right) \leq \frac{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})}{\kappa_2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\beta_v}{\beta_\phi}} \right),$$

it follows from the first inequality of (24) that

$$\frac{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; 0)}{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\beta_v}{\beta_\phi}}. \quad (25)$$

Following a similar argument from (22b), it follows that for any

$$\rho_{(j)} \leq \frac{\gamma + \kappa_5}{\kappa_3} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\beta_v}{\beta_\phi}} \right) \leq \frac{l_\gamma^{(0)} - p(\lambda^{(j)}; 0)}{\kappa_3} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\beta_v}{\beta_\phi}} \right),$$

one finds that

$$\frac{l_\gamma^{(0)} - p(\lambda^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})}{l_\gamma^{(0)} - p(\lambda^{(j)}; 0)} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\beta_v}{\beta_\phi}}. \quad (26)$$

Overall, we have shown that for any $\rho_{(j)} \leq \tilde{\rho}$ with $\tilde{\rho}$ defined in (23), it follows that (25) and (26) both hold true.

Since our supposition that \mathcal{R} is infinite implies that $\rho_{(j)} \rightarrow 0$, we may now proceed under the assumption that $j \in \mathcal{R}$ with $\rho_{(j)} \in (0, \tilde{\rho}]$. Let us now define the ratios

$$\bar{r}_v^{(j)} := \frac{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; 0)}{l_\gamma^{(0)} - p(\lambda^{(j)}; 0)},$$

where it must be true that $r_v^{(j)} \geq \bar{r}_v^{(j)}$ by the definition of operator $(\cdot)_+$. From (25)

$$\frac{\bar{r}_v^{(j)}}{r_\phi^{(j)}} = \frac{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; 0)}{l_\gamma^{(0)} - l(d^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})} \frac{l_\gamma^{(0)} - p(\lambda^{(j)}; \rho_{(j)})}{l_\gamma^{(0)} - p(\lambda^{(j)}; 0)} \geq \frac{\beta_v}{\beta_\phi},$$

yielding

$$r_v^{(j)} \geq \bar{r}_v^{(j)} \geq \frac{\beta_v}{\beta_\phi} r_\phi^{(j)} \geq \beta_v.$$

However, this contradicts the fact that $j \in \mathcal{R}$. Overall, since we have reached a contradiction, we may conclude that \mathcal{R} is finite. \square

We can use Theorem 3.3 to estimate the number of reductions occurred during a single [subproblem solver](#), as well as a lower bound of the penalty parameter after solving the subproblem, which is summarized in the following theorem. Since it describes results about the main algorithm, we add back the k index to denote the k th iteration of main algorithm.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose Assumptions 3.1 holds, then after solving the k th subproblem, we have*

$$\tilde{\rho}_k \geq \min \left(\rho_{k-1}, \frac{\theta_\rho \gamma_k}{\max(\kappa_0^2, 1)\delta} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\beta_v}{\beta_\phi}} \right) \frac{1}{\|\nabla f(x^k)\|} \right). \quad (27)$$

Moreover, (DUST) is triggered at most

$$\left\lceil \frac{1}{\ln \theta_\rho} \ln \left(\frac{\gamma_k}{\max(\kappa_0^2, 1)\delta} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\beta_v}{\beta_\phi}} \right) \frac{1}{\rho_{k-1} \|\nabla f(x^k)\|} \right) \right\rceil \quad (28)$$

times during solving the k th subproblem.

Proof. From Theorem 3.3, we know that if $\hat{\rho}_k \geq \rho_{k-1}$, then (DUST) is never triggered. If this is not the case, since ρ is reduced by a fraction whenever it is updated, from Theorem 3.3, we know the final ρ returned by the subproblem solver must satisfy

$$\tilde{\rho}_k \geq \theta_\rho \hat{\rho}_k \geq \frac{\theta_\rho \gamma_k}{\max\{\kappa_0^2 \delta \|\nabla f(x^k)\|, \delta \|\nabla f(x^k)\|\}} \left(1 - \sqrt{\beta_v / \beta_\phi} \right).$$

by noticing

$$\|\nabla f(x^k)\|_2 \leq \kappa_0 \|\nabla f(x^k)\|.$$

This completes the proof of (27).

For (28), suppose $\hat{\rho}_k < \rho_{k-1}$ so that (DUST) is triggered during the [subproblem solver](#). Also suppose after \hat{j} reductions, we have $\theta_\rho^{\hat{j}} \rho_{k-1} \leq \hat{\rho}_k$. Taking logarithm of both sides, after simple rearrangement, we have

$$\hat{j} \leq \frac{\ln(\hat{\rho}_k / \rho_{k-1})}{\ln \theta_\rho}.$$

Notice that both the denominator and the numerator are negative. This inequality, combined with (27), proves (28). \square

From (27) and (28) in Theorem 3.4, it would be worth noticing that many factors may affect the the number of times that (DUST) is triggered within a single subproblem.

- Smaller $\|\nabla f(x^k)\|$ will result in fewer (DUST) updates. Intuitively, in this case, $l(d; \rho, x^k)$ is close to $l(d; 0, x^k)$, so that any direction successful for optimality may be also successful for feasibility. As for larger $\|\nabla f(x^k)\|$, we may need more updates.
- The accuracy tolerance γ_k also affects the number of updates needed. If we have aggressively small γ_k , meaning the subproblem needs to be solved more accurately, then (DUST) updates may happen more frequently.
- The trust region radius also plays a role in the number of (DUST) updates, and smaller δ may lead to fewer updates. This is reasonable since the difference between $l(d; \rho, x^k)$ and $l(d; 0, x^k)$ should be smaller in this case within trust region X .
- We can also see the influence of the algorithmic parameters here. A smaller θ_ρ naturally leads to fewer updates but possibly smaller ρ since it is reduced more aggressively each time. It would be interesting to see that if one chooses $\beta_v \rightarrow \beta_\phi$ (note $\beta_v < \beta_\phi$), then (DUST) may occur a lot more times. The intuition of this case is that we require a direction successful for optimality should also be the same successful for feasibility, which could only happen for very small ρ .

3.2. Global Convergence

In this subsection, we show that if (DUST) and (PSST) are used to solve (NLP) in a [penalty-SLP algorithm, then the algorithm can converge from any starting point using reasonable assumptions](#). Specifically, if (DUST) and (PSST) are only triggered a finite number of times, then every limit point of the iterates is either infeasible stationary or first-order stationary for (NLP). Otherwise, if (DUST) and (PSST) are triggered an infinite number of times, driving the penalty parameter to zero, then every limit point of the iterates is either an infeasible stationary point or a feasible point at which a constraint qualification fails to hold.

For the analysis in this section, we extend our use of the sub/superscript k to represent the value of quantities associated with iteration $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For instance, \mathcal{R}^k denotes the set \mathcal{R} defined in §3.1 at the k th iteration.

In the whole process of analysis, we assume the following.

Assumption 3.5. *Functions f and c_i for all $i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}$, and their first- and second-order derivatives, are all bounded in an open convex set containing $\{x^k\}$ and $\{x^k + d^k\}$. Also assume that $\gamma_k \rightarrow 0$.*

Define the index set

$$\mathcal{U} := \{k \in \mathbb{N} : \mathcal{R}^k \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Moreover, for every $k \in \mathcal{U}$, let j_k be the subproblem iteration number corresponding

to the value of the smallest ratio r_v , i.e.,

$$r_v^{(j_k)} \leq r_v^{(i_k)} \quad \text{for any } i_k \in \mathcal{R}^k.$$

Also, define the index set

$$\mathcal{T} := \{k \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_k \text{ is reduced by (PSST)}\}.$$

From these definitions, it follows that $\rho_k < \rho_{k-1}$ if and only if $k \in \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{T}$.

We also have the following fact about the subproblem solutions, the proof of which is skipped here since it can be easily derived by noticing $\|d^k\|_2 \leq \kappa_0 \|d^k\| \leq \kappa_0 \delta$ in the proof of [11, Lemma 10].

Lemma 3.6. *Under Assumption 3.1 and 3.5, it follows that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the stepsize satisfies*

$$\alpha_k \geq \frac{\theta_\alpha(1 - \beta_\alpha)}{\delta \kappa_0 \kappa_1} \Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k).$$

We now prove that, in the limit, the reductions in the models of the constraints violation measure and the penalty function vanish. For this purpose, it will be convenient to work with the shifted penalty function

$$\varphi(x, \rho) := \rho(f(x) - \underline{f}) + v(x) \geq 0,$$

where \underline{f} (its existence follows from Assumption 3.5) is the infimum of f over the smallest convex set containing $\{x^k\}$. In the following lemma, it proves that the function φ possesses a useful monotonicity property.

Lemma 3.7. *Under Assumption 3.1 and 3.5, it holds that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\varphi(x^{k+1}, \rho_{k+1}) \leq \varphi(x^k, \rho_k) - \frac{\theta_\alpha(1 - \beta_\alpha)\beta_\alpha}{\delta \kappa_0 \kappa_1} [\Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k)]^2, \quad (29)$$

Proof. From the line search condition (12)

$$\varphi(x^{k+1}, \rho_{k+1}) \leq \varphi(x^k, \rho_k) - (\rho_k - \rho_{k+1})(f(x^{k+1}) - \underline{f}) - \beta_\alpha \alpha_k \Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k).$$

Then (29) follows from this inequality, Lemma 3.6, the fact that $\{\rho_k\}$ is monotonically decreasing, and $f(x^{k+1}) \geq \underline{f}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

We now show the model reductions and duality gap all vanish asymptotically.

Lemma 3.8. *Under Assumption 3.1 and 3.5, the following limits hold.*

- (i) $0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k),$
- (ii) $0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [l(0; \rho_k, x^k) - p(\lambda^k; \rho_k, x^k)] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [l(0; 0, x^k) - p(\nu^k; 0, x^k)],$
- (iii) $0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Delta l(d^*(0, x^k); 0, x^k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Delta l(d^*(\rho_k, x^k); \rho_k, x^k),$
- (iv) $0 = \Delta l(d^*(0, x^*); 0, x^*) = \Delta l(d^*(\rho_*, x^*); \rho_*, x^*)$ with $\rho_* := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho_k$ for any limit point x^* of $\{x^k\}$.

Proof. Let us first prove (i) by contradiction. Suppose that $\Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k)$ does not converge to 0. Then, there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$ and an infinite $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k) \geq \epsilon$ for all $k \in \mathcal{K}$. It then follows from Lemma 3.7 that $\varphi(x^k; \rho_k) \rightarrow -\infty$, which contradicts the fact that $\{\varphi(x^k, \rho_k)\}$ is bounded below by zero. Therefore, $\Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k) \rightarrow 0$. The second limit in (i) follows from (21) and $\gamma_k \rightarrow 0$.

The limits in (ii) and (iii) follow directly from the limits in (i) and the inequalities in (17) and (18) along with $\gamma_k \rightarrow 0$; (iv) follows directly from (iii). \square

We now provide our first global convergence theorem.

Theorem 3.9. *Under Assumption 3.1 and 3.5, the following statements hold.*

- (i) *Any limit point of $\{x^k\}$ is first-order stationary for v , i.e., it is feasible or an infeasible stationary point for (NLP).*
- (ii) *If $\rho_k \rightarrow \rho_*$ for some constant $\rho_* > 0$ and $v(x^k) \rightarrow 0$, then any limit point x^* of $\{x^k\}$ with $v(x^*) = 0$ is a KKT point for (NLP).*
- (iii) *If $\rho_k \rightarrow 0$, then either all limit points of $\{x^k\}$ are feasible for (NLP) or all are infeasible.*

Proof. Part (i) and part (ii) follow by combining Lemma 3.8(iv) with Lemma 2.1(i) and Lemma 3.8(iv) with Lemma 2.1(iii) respectively.

We prove (iii) by contradiction. Suppose there exist infinite $\mathcal{K}^* \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{K}^\times \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}^*} \rightarrow x^*$ with $v(x^*) = 0$ and $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}^\times} \rightarrow x^\times$ with $v(x^\times) = \epsilon > 0$. Since $\rho_k \rightarrow 0$, there exists $k^* \geq 0$ such that for all $k \in \mathcal{K}^*$ and $k \geq k^*$ one has that $\rho_k(f(x^k) - \underline{f}) < \epsilon/4$ and $v(x^k) < \epsilon/4$, meaning that $\varphi(x^k, \rho_k) < \epsilon/2$. On the other hand, it follows that $\rho_k(f(x^k) - \underline{f}) \geq 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and there exists $k^\times \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $v(x^k) \geq \epsilon/2$ for all $k \geq k^\times$ with $k \in \mathcal{K}^\times$, meaning that $\varphi(x^k, \rho_k) \geq \epsilon/2$. This contradicts Lemma 3.7, which shows that $\varphi(x^k, \rho_k)$ is monotonically decreasing. Therefore, the set of limit points of $\{x^k\}$ must be all feasible or all infeasible. \square

In the following results, we look further at the case that $\rho_k \rightarrow 0$. We show that in this case any limit point of the algorithm is an infeasible stationary point or a feasible point satisfying the *approximate KKT* (AKKT) [2, 6], which is defined as follows.

Definition 3.10. Assume that $v(x^*) = 0$. We say that x^* satisfies AKKT if there exist sequences $\{x^k\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($\{x^k\}$ is called an AKKT sequence), $\{\mu^k\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}|}$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x^k = x^*$ and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \nabla f(x^k) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \mu_i^k \nabla c_i(x^k) = 0, \quad (30)$$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \min\{\mu_i^k, -c_i(x^k)\} = 0, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (31)$$

Defining

$$\mathcal{A}(x) = \{i \in \mathcal{I} : c_i(x) = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}(x) = \{i \in \mathcal{I} : c_i(x) < 0\},$$

our main result for the case $\rho_k \rightarrow 0$ is summarized below.

Theorem 3.11. *Suppose Assumption 3.1 and 3.5 hold and $\rho_k \rightarrow 0$. Let x^* be a limit point of $\{x^k\}$ with $v(x^*) = 0$. Then x^* satisfies AKKT.*

Proof. Consider a subsequence $\{x^k\}_{\mathcal{K}} \rightarrow x^*$. By Lemma 2.1, the subproblem at x^* have $d^*(0, x^*) = 0$. Therefore, for sufficiently large $k \in \mathcal{K}$, we know the k th subproblem must have sufficiently small optimal solution such that $\|d^*(\rho_k, x^k)\| < \delta$, meaning the trust region constraint is inactive. Notice that the subproblem may not have a unique optimal solution and it is possible that it has optimal solution on the trust region boundary. Therefore, for every sufficiently large $k \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists $\bar{\lambda}^k \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}|}$ such that

$$\rho_k \nabla f(x^k) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \bar{\lambda}_i^k \nabla c_i(x^k) = 0 \quad (32)$$

$$\min\{\bar{\lambda}_i^k, -(c_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla c_i(x^k), d^k \rangle)\} = 0, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (33)$$

Letting $\mu^k := \bar{\lambda}^k / \rho^k$, it follows from (32) that

$$\nabla f(x^k) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \mu_i^k \nabla c_i(x^k) = \nabla f(x^k) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \frac{\bar{\lambda}_i^k}{\rho^k} \nabla c_i(x^k) = 0,$$

meaning (30) is satisfied.

Now we verify (31). For each $i \in \mathcal{N}(x^*)$ and sufficiently large $k \in \mathcal{K}$, we have $c_i(x^k) < c_i(x^*)/2 < 0$ and $\langle \nabla c_i(x^k), d^k \rangle < -c_i(x^*)/4$, implying $c_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla c_i(x^k), d^k \rangle < 0$. It follows from (33) that $\bar{\lambda}_i^k = 0$. Hence for sufficiently large $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}(x^*)$, we have $\mu_i^k = 0$ which proves (31). On the other hand, for each $i \in \mathcal{A}(x^*)$, since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, k \in \mathcal{K}} c_i(x^k) = 0$, it holds naturally that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, k \in \mathcal{K}} \min\{\bar{\lambda}_i^k / \rho^k, -c_i(x^k)\} = 0$. Overall, we have shown that x^* satisfies AKKT, completing the proof. \square

Strict Constraint Qualifications (SCQ) together with AKKT guarantees the KKT conditions are satisfied [2, 6], i.e.,

$$\text{AKKT} + \text{SCQ} \implies \text{KKT}.$$

It is shown that many well-known CQs are SCQs, such as the Mangasarian-Fromovitz CQ and linear independence of the gradients of active constraints (LICQ), and the weakest possible SCQ known in the literature is so-called the Cone-continuity Property (CCP) [6], which is defined as following.

Definition 3.12 (Cone-Continuity Property (CCP)). [6] We say that $x \in \Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid c_i(x) = 0, i \in \mathcal{E} \text{ and } c_i(x) \leq 0, i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ satisfies CCP if the set-valued mapping (multifunction) $\mathbb{R}^n \ni x \rightrightarrows K(x) := \{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} \mu_i \nabla c_i(x) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}(x)} \mu_i \nabla c_i(x) \text{ with } \mu_i \geq 0, i \in \mathcal{A}(x^*)\}$, is outer semicontinuous at x^* , that is,

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow x^*} K(x) \subset K(x^*).$$

In the following corollary, we summarize the results of all of our theorems.

Corollary 3.13. *Suppose Assumption 3.1 and 3.5 hold. Then, exactly one of the following occurs*

- (i) $\rho_k \rightarrow \rho_*$ for some constant $\rho_* > 0$ and each limit point of $\{x^k\}$ either corresponds to a KKT point or an infeasible stationary point for problem (NLP).
- (ii) $\rho_k \rightarrow 0$ and all limit points of $\{x^k\}$ are infeasible stationary points for (NLP).
- (iii) $\rho_k \rightarrow 0$, all limit points of $\{x^k\}$ are feasible for (NLP), and are either KKT points or points where the CCP fails.

It should be noticed that the results above discuss cases where $\{x^k\}$ has limit points. If this is not the case, meaning $\{x^k\}$ is unbounded, we can still show the optimality residuals (KKT error) converge for both the penalty problem and feasibility problem. In fact, in all the cases we can show the worst-case complexity of optimality residuals, which is discussed in the next subsection.

3.3. Worst-case complexity for KKT residuals

In this subsection, we aim to show the worst-case complexity of the KKT residuals for both the penalty problem and the feasibility problem, which are denoted as

$$E_{opt}(x, \lambda, \rho) = \|\rho \nabla f(x) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i \nabla c_i(x)\|_*$$

and $E_{fea}(x, \nu) = \|\sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \nu_i \nabla c_i(x)\|_*$,

The subproblem always chooses dual feasible variables λ^k and ν^k satisfying (4b). Therefore, we verify the satisfaction of complementarity (4c) by defining the complementary residual as

$$E_c(x, \lambda) = \sum_{c_i > 0} (1 - \lambda_i) v_i(c_i(x)) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}, c_i < 0} (1 + \lambda_i) v_i(c_i(x)) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}, c_i < 0} \lambda_i |c_i(x)|.$$

If $E_{opt}(x^k, \lambda^k, \rho_k) = 0$, $E_c(x^k, \lambda^k) = 0$ and $v(x^k) = 0$ with $\rho_k > 0$, we know x^k is stationary for (NLP). If $E_{fea}(x, \nu)$, $E_c(x^k, \nu^k) = 0$ and $v(x^k) > 0$, then x^k is an infeasible stationary point.

Obviously, the KKT residual complexities depend on many factors especially the subproblem tolerance $\{\gamma_k\}$, since they represent how accurately the subproblems are solved. We make the following assumption about $\{\gamma_k\}$.

Assumption 3.14. *The subproblem tolerance $\{\gamma_k\}$ are selected such that $\gamma_k \leq \eta k^{-\zeta/2}$ with constant $\eta > 0$ and $\zeta \geq 1$.*

The parameters η and ζ control accuracy of the subproblem solution. Larger ζ or small η means more accurate subproblem solution is needed.

The following lemma establishes the relationship between the KKT residual and complementarity residual for feasibility and optimality problems.

Lemma 3.15. *Under Assumption 3.1, 3.5 and 3.14, it holds that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$E_{opt}(x^k, \lambda^k, \rho^k) \leq \frac{1}{\delta\beta_\phi} \Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k) + \frac{1 - \beta_\phi}{\delta\beta_\phi} \gamma_k, \quad (34)$$

$$E_c(x^k, \lambda^k) \leq \frac{1}{\beta_\phi} \Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k) + \frac{1 - \beta_\phi}{\beta_\phi} \gamma_k, \quad (35)$$

$$E_{fea}(x^k, \nu^k) \leq \frac{1}{\delta\beta_v} \Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k) + \frac{1 - \beta_v}{\delta\beta_v} \gamma_k, \quad (36)$$

$$\text{and } E_c(x^k, \nu^k) \leq \frac{1}{\beta_\phi} \Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k) + \frac{1 - \beta_v}{\beta_v} \gamma_k. \quad (37)$$

Proof. For dual feasible λ^k

$$v(x^k) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i^k c_i(x^k) = E_c(x^k, \lambda^k) \quad (38)$$

which follows from the fact that (where we temporarily use $c_i^k = c_i(x^k)$ due to space limit)

$$\begin{cases} v_i(c_i^k) - \lambda_i^k c_i^k = v_i(c_i^k) - \lambda_i^k v_i(c_i^k) = (1 - \lambda_i^k) v_i(c_i^k) & \text{if } c_i^k > 0, \\ v_i(c_i^k) - \lambda_i^k c_i^k = v_i(c_i^k) + \lambda_i^k v_i(c_i^k) = (1 + \lambda_i^k) v_i(c_i^k) & \text{if } c_i^k < 0, i \in \mathcal{E} \\ v_i(c_i^k) - \lambda_i^k c_i^k = 0 - \lambda_i^k c_i^k = \lambda_i^k |c_i^k|, & \text{if } c_i^k < 0, i \in \mathcal{I}. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} l(0; \rho_k, x^k) - p(\lambda^k; \rho_k, x^k) &= \delta E_{opt}(x^k, \lambda^k, \rho_k) + v(x^k) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i^k c_i(x^k) \\ &= \delta E_{opt}(x^k, \lambda^k, \rho_k) + E_c(x^k, \lambda^k). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it holds that

$$l(0; \rho_k, x^k) - p(\lambda^k; \rho_k, x^k) \leq \frac{1}{\beta_\phi} \Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k) + \frac{1 - \beta_\phi}{\beta_\phi} \gamma_k$$

from (R_φ). Combining the above yields (34) and (35). The same argument applied to $l(0; 0, x^k) - p(\lambda^k; 0, x^k)$ and (R_v) proves (36) and (37). \square

As the sequence $\{\varphi(x^k, \rho_k)\}$ has been shown in Lemma 3.7 to be monotonically decreasing, we can denote the initial penalty function value $\varphi^0 := \varphi(x^0, \rho_0)$ and the limit $\varphi^* := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x^k, \rho_k)$ and derive the following complexity results for model reductions.

Lemma 3.16. *Under Assumption 3.1, 3.5 and 3.14, for any $\epsilon > 0$, the following statements hold true*

(i) *It needs at most*

$$\frac{\delta\kappa_0\kappa_1(\varphi^0 - \varphi^*)}{\theta_\alpha\beta_\alpha(1 - \beta_\alpha)} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$$

iterations to reach $\inf_{i=0}^k \Delta l(d^i; \rho_i, x^i) \leq \epsilon$.
(ii) It needs at most

$$\max \left\{ \frac{4\delta\kappa_0\kappa_1(\varphi^0 - \varphi^*)}{\theta_\alpha\beta_l^2\beta_\alpha(1 - \beta_\alpha)} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}, \left[\frac{2\eta(1 - \beta_l)}{\beta_l\epsilon} \right]^{\frac{2}{\zeta}} \right\}$$

iterations to reach $\inf_{i=0}^k \Delta l(d^i; 0, x^i) \leq \epsilon$.

Proof. For Part (i), from Lemma 3.7, summing up both sides of (29) from 0 to k gives

$$\sum_{t=0}^k [\Delta l(d^t; \rho_t, x^t)]^2 \leq \frac{\delta\kappa_0\kappa_1}{\theta_\alpha(1 - \beta_\alpha)\beta_\alpha} [\varphi(x^0, \rho_0) - \varphi(x^{k+1}, \rho_{k+1})] \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (39)$$

Therefore,

$$\inf_{i=0}^k [\Delta l(d^i; \rho_i, x^i)]^2 \leq \frac{\delta\kappa_0\kappa_1}{k\theta_\alpha(1 - \beta_\alpha)\beta_\alpha} [\varphi(x^0, \rho_0) - \varphi^*],$$

completing the proof of (i).

It follows from (21) that

$$\Delta l(d^k; 0, x^k) \leq \frac{1}{\beta_l} \Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k) + \frac{1 - \beta_l}{\beta_l} \gamma_k.$$

Part (i) and Assumption 3.14 implies if

$$k \geq \max \left\{ \frac{4\delta\kappa_0\kappa_1[\varphi(x^0, \rho_0) - \varphi^*]}{\theta_\alpha\beta_l^2\beta_\alpha(1 - \beta_\alpha)} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}, \left[\frac{2\eta(1 - \beta_l)}{\beta_l\epsilon} \right]^{\frac{2}{\zeta}} \right\},$$

then

$$\inf_{i=0}^k \frac{1}{\beta_l} \Delta l(d^i; \rho_i, x^i) \leq \epsilon/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1 - \beta_l}{\beta_l} \gamma_k \leq \epsilon/2,$$

completing the proof. \square

Lemma 3.15 and 3.16 immediately lead to our main results.

Theorem 3.17. *Under Assumption 3.1, 3.5 and 3.14, given $\epsilon > 0$, the following statements hold true.*

(i) It requires at most

$$\max \left\{ \frac{4\kappa_0\kappa_1(\varphi^0 - \varphi^*)}{\delta\beta_\phi^2\theta_\alpha\beta_\alpha(1 - \beta_\alpha)} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}, \left[\frac{2\eta(1 - \beta_\phi)}{\delta\beta_\phi} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right]^{\frac{2}{\zeta}} \right\}$$

iterations to reach $\inf_{i=0}^k E_{opt}(x^i, \lambda^i, \rho_i) \leq \epsilon$.

(ii) It requires at most

$$\max \left\{ \frac{4\delta\kappa_0\kappa_1(\varphi^0 - \varphi^*)}{\beta_\phi^2\theta_\alpha\beta_\alpha(1 - \beta_\alpha)} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}, \left[\frac{2\eta(1 - \beta_\phi)}{\beta_\phi} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right]^{\frac{2}{\zeta}} \right\}$$

iterations to reach $\inf_{i=0}^k E_c(x^i, \lambda^i) \leq \epsilon$.

(iii) It requires at most

$$\max \left\{ \frac{16\kappa_0\kappa_1(\varphi^0 - \varphi^*)}{\delta\theta_\alpha\beta_v^2\beta_l\beta_\alpha(1 - \beta_\alpha)} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}, \left[\frac{2\eta(1 - \beta_l)}{\delta\beta_v\beta_l\epsilon} \right]^{\frac{2}{\zeta}}, \left[\frac{2\eta(1 - \beta_v)}{\delta\beta_v\epsilon} \right]^{\frac{2}{\zeta}} \right\}$$

iterations to reach $\inf_{i=0}^k E_{fea}(x^i, \nu^i) \leq \epsilon$.

(iv) It requires at most

$$\max \left\{ \frac{16\kappa_0\kappa_1(\varphi^0 - \varphi^*)}{\theta_\alpha\beta_\phi^2\beta_l\beta_\alpha(1 - \beta_\alpha)} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}, \left[\frac{2\eta(1 - \beta_l)}{\beta_\phi\beta_l\epsilon} \right]^{\frac{2}{\zeta}}, \left[\frac{2\eta(1 - \beta_v)}{\beta_v\epsilon} \right]^{\frac{2}{\zeta}} \right\}$$

iterations to reach $\inf_{i=0}^k E_c(x^i, \nu^i) \leq \epsilon$.

Proof. Part (i) can be derived by requiring $\frac{1}{\delta\beta_\phi} \inf_{i=0}^k \Delta l(d^i; \rho_i, x^i) \leq \epsilon/2$ and $\frac{1-\beta_\phi}{\delta\beta_\phi} \gamma_k \leq \epsilon/2$ and then combining (34) and Lemma 3.16(i).

Part (ii) can be derived by requiring $\frac{1}{\beta_\phi} \inf_{i=0}^k \Delta l(d^i; \rho_i, x^i) \leq \epsilon/2$ and $\frac{1-\beta_\phi}{\beta_\phi} \gamma_k \leq \epsilon/2$ and then combining (35) and Lemma 3.16(i).

Part (iii) is from (36), Lemma 3.16(ii) by requiring $\frac{1}{\delta\beta_v} \inf_{i=0}^k \Delta l(d^i; 0, x^i) \leq \epsilon/2$ and $\frac{1-\beta_v}{\delta\beta_v} \gamma_k \leq \epsilon/2$.

Part (iv) is from (37), Lemma 3.16(ii) by requiring $\frac{1}{\beta_\phi} \inf_{i=0}^k \Delta l(d^i; 0, x^i) \leq \epsilon/2$ and $\frac{1-\beta_v}{\beta_v} \gamma_k \leq \epsilon/2$. □

3.4. Local complexity of constraint violation

We have summarized the (global) complexity of stationarity and complementarity for both feasible and infeasible cases in Theorem 3.17, and the dual feasibility is maintained all the time during the iteration of the algorithm. Therefore, we still need to analyze the complexity of primal feasibility when the iterates converge to an optimal solution. Notice that this is not a concern in the infeasible case, since Theorem 3.17 is sufficient for the complexity of KKT residuals of the feasibility problems. Therefore, in this section, we assume that $\{x^k\}$ only has feasible limit points.

The analysis of the behavior $v(x)$ may rely on the monotonic behavior of the penalty function. However, from Corollary 3.13, one cannot expect $v(x)$ decreases steadily over the iterations. In early iterations, it could happen that the constraint violation continues deteriorating while the objective is improving. Instead we should focus on the local behavior of $v(x)$ around a limit point x^* . Our analysis for $v(x)$ applies to the case that $\{x^k\}$ converges to a feasible x^* where strict complementarity is satisfied.

We summarize the local complexity of constraint violation $v(x)$ of $\{x^k\}$ in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.18. *Under Assumption 3.1, 3.5 and 3.14, suppose that $\{(x^k, \lambda^k)\} \rightarrow (x^*, \lambda^*)$ with $v(x^*) = 0$ and $-e < \lambda_{\mathcal{E}}^* < e, 0 < \lambda_{\mathcal{A}}^* < e$. Then for any $0 < \tau < 1 - \|\lambda^*\|_{\infty}$, there exists $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following statements hold true:*

- (i) $v(x_k) \leq E_c(x^k; \lambda^k)/\tau$ for any $k > \bar{k}$.
- (ii) It requires at most

$$\max \left\{ \frac{4\delta\kappa_0\kappa_1[\varphi(x^{\bar{k}}, \rho_{\bar{k}}) - \varphi^*]}{\tau\beta_{\phi}^2\theta_{\alpha}\beta_{\alpha}(1-\beta_{\alpha})} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}, \frac{1}{\tau} \left[\frac{2\eta(1-\beta_{\phi})}{\beta_{\phi}} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right]^{\frac{2}{\zeta}} \right\}$$

additional iterations to reach $\inf_{i=\bar{k}}^k v(x^i) \leq \epsilon$ for given $\epsilon > 0$.

Proof. We first prove Part (i). Given $0 < \tau < 1 - \|\lambda^*\|_{\infty}$, there exists $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k \geq \bar{k}$, the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} -1 + \tau &\leq \lambda_i^k \leq 1 - \tau, & i \in \mathcal{E} \\ 0 < \lambda_i^k &\leq 1 - \tau, & i \in \mathcal{A}(x^*) \\ 0 \leq \lambda_i^k &\leq \tau, & i \in \mathcal{N}(x^*). \\ c_i(x^k) &\leq 0, & i \in \mathcal{N}(x^*). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} v_i(c_i^k) - \lambda_i^k c_i^k &= |c_i^k| - \lambda_i^k c_i^k \geq |c_i^k| - (1 - \tau)|c_i^k| \geq \tau|c_i^k|, & i \in \mathcal{E} \\ v_i(c_i^k) - \lambda_i^k c_i^k &= (c_i^k)_+ - \lambda_i^k c_i^k \geq (c_i^k)_+ - (1 - \tau)(c_i^k)_+ \geq \tau(c_i^k)_+, & i \in \mathcal{A}(x^*) \\ v_i(c_i^k) - \lambda_i^k c_i^k &= (c_i^k)_+ - \lambda_i^k c_i^k = 0 - \lambda_i^k c_i^k \geq 0, & i \in \mathcal{N}(x^*). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$v(x^k) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i^k c_i^k = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}} (v_i(c_i^k) - \lambda_i^k c_i^k) \geq \tau v(x^k).$$

This, combined with (38), yields $E_c(x^k; \lambda^k) \geq \tau v(x^k)$, completing the proof of Part (i).

Part (ii) follows naturally from Theorem 3.17(ii) by replacing starting point x^0 with $x^{\bar{k}}$. \square

We emphasize that the local complexity result is derived under quite **mild** assumptions compared with other nonlinear optimization methods. The strictly complementary condition in Theorem 3.18 is commonly used in penalty-SQP methods for analyzing the local convergence rate [10, 14]. Indeed, second-order methods (interior point methods or SQP methods) for constrained nonlinear optimization generally analyze local convergence by assuming strictly complementary condition, regular condition and second-order sufficient condition. These three conditions are also required to hold true in [21] for analyzing the local behavior of the SLP algorithm.

The other aspect to notice is about the constant ζ , which controls how fast γ_k tends to 0. The complexity results we have derived consists $O(\epsilon^{-2})$ and $O(\epsilon^{-2/\zeta})$. If we choose $\zeta \geq 1$, meaning $\gamma_k \sim O(k^{-1})$, then overall we have $O(\epsilon^{-2})$ in the complexity results. On the contrary, if we want to drive γ_k to zero slower than $O(k^{-1})$, then we have $O(\epsilon^{-2/\zeta})$ in the complexity results.

4. Subproblem algorithms

In this section, we apply simplex methods to solve the subproblem by focus on ℓ_∞ norm trust region in (\mathcal{P}') . Since the discussion focus on the subproblem at the k th iteration, we drop x^k and the iteration number k and use the shorthand notation as introduced in §2.2. **It should be noticed that using primal simplex is not required in our proposed method, and our framework can accept any subproblem solver that can generate primal-dual feasible iterates.**

Using ℓ_∞ norm trust region in (\mathcal{P}') results in subproblem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(d,r,s,t)} \quad & \langle \rho g, d \rangle + \langle e, r + s \rangle + \langle e, t \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \langle a_i, d \rangle + b_i = r_i - s_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{E}, \\ & \langle a_i, d \rangle + b_i \leq t_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}, \\ & -\delta e \leq d \leq \delta e, \quad (r, s, t) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

by adding auxiliary variables (r, s, t) . To see how a primal simplex method could benefit from the structures of (40), we rewrite the standard form of (40) as

$$\min_{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}} \bar{c}^T \bar{x} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \bar{A} \bar{x} = \bar{b}, \quad \bar{x} \geq 0 \quad (41)$$

with $\bar{n} = 4n + 2|\mathcal{E}| + 2|\mathcal{I}|$ by splitting d into (d_+, d_-) and adding slack variables (z, u, v) , where

$$\bar{c} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho g \\ -\rho g \\ e \\ e \\ -e \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{x} = \begin{bmatrix} d_+ \\ d_- \\ r \\ t \\ s \\ z \\ u \\ v \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{A} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{\mathcal{E}}^T & -a_{\mathcal{E}}^T & -I_{\mathcal{E}} & 0 & I_{\mathcal{E}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a_{\mathcal{I}}^T & -a_{\mathcal{I}}^T & 0 & -I_{\mathcal{I}} & 0 & I_{\mathcal{I}} & 0 & 0 \\ I_n & -I_n & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I & 0 \\ -I_n & I_n & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{b} = \begin{bmatrix} -b_{\mathcal{E}} \\ -b_{\mathcal{I}} \\ \delta e \\ \delta e \end{bmatrix}.$$

The initial tableau can be set as

Table 1.: Initial simplex tableau

basic	nonbasic	rhs	dual
\bar{B}	\bar{N}	\bar{b}	I_N
$-\bar{c}_B$	$-\bar{c}_N$	0	0

Table 2.: Simplex tableau

basic	nonbasic	rhs	dual
I_N	$\bar{B}^{-1}\bar{N}$	$\bar{B}^{-1}\bar{b}$	\bar{B}^{-1}
0	$\bar{c}_B\bar{B}^{-1}\bar{N} - \bar{c}_N$	$\bar{c}_B\bar{B}^{-1}\bar{b}$	λ

The benefits of using a simplex for solving such a linear optimization subproblem in our proposed method can be summarized as follows.

- The linear optimization subproblem (40) is always feasible and bounded due to the presence of slack variables and the trust region.
- There exists a basic feasible solution for the tableau

$$(d_+, d_-, r, s, t, z, u, v) = (0, 0, (b_{\mathcal{E}})_+, (b_{\mathcal{I}})_+, -(b_{\mathcal{E}})_-, -(b_{\mathcal{I}})_-, \delta e, \delta e),$$

so that tableau can always be trivially initialized.

- After each pivot, the multipliers can also be extracted from the tableau ($\lambda = \bar{c}_B \bar{B}^{-1}$ in Table 2). We can then project those multipliers onto the dual feasible region to ensure dual feasibility.
- The quantities $l(d; \rho)$, $p(\lambda; \rho)$ and $v_i(\langle a_i, d \rangle + b_i)$ used for computing ratios r_ϕ , r_c and r_v can be easily extracted from the tableau. Moreover, d can be extracted easily from the last column of the tableau and λ can also be extract from the last row of the tableau.
- After reducing ρ during pivoting, it is only needed to change the row of the objective vector in the tableau. With a new ρ , the current iterate remains basic feasible, so that the simplex method can continue with a “warm-start” basic feasible initial point.

5. Numerical experiments

In this section, we test FoNCO on a collections of nonlinear problems.

5.1. Trust region radius updates

We fix the trust region radius to simplify the analysis. However, in practice, dynamically adjusting the radius helps to improve the algorithm efficiency. In our implementation, the radius is adjusted as described below. Define ratio

$$\sigma_k := \frac{\phi(x^k, \rho_k) - \phi(x^k + d^k, \rho_k)}{\Delta l(d^k; \rho_k, x^k)}.$$

The trust radius is updated as

$$\delta_{k+1} = \begin{cases} \min(2\delta_k, \delta_{\max}) & \text{if } \sigma_k > \bar{\sigma} \\ \max(\delta_k/2, \delta_{\min}) & \text{if } \sigma_k < \underline{\sigma} \\ \delta_k & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $0 < \underline{\sigma} < \bar{\sigma} < 1$ and $\delta_{\max} > \delta_{\min}$ are prescribed parameters.

We choose $\bar{\sigma} > \beta_\alpha$ such that the Armijo line search condition holds naturally true if $\sigma_k > \bar{\sigma}$. In this case, the back-tracking line search is skipped after solving the subproblem. We do not consider repeatedly rejecting the trust region radius and resolving the subproblem if $\sigma_k < \underline{\sigma}$. If the trust region radius is reduced to be smaller than δ_{\min} , we stop further reducing the trust region radius and continue with line search. In either case, our theoretical analysis still holds.

5.2. Implementation

Our code¹ is a prototype Python implementation using package NumPy. Define the relative KKT error as

$$\epsilon_{kkt} := \frac{\max(E_{opt}(x^k, \lambda^k, \rho_k), E_c(x^k, \lambda^k))}{\max(1, E_{opt}(x^0, \lambda^0, \rho_0), E_c(x^0, \lambda^0))}. \quad (42)$$

¹<https://github.com/DataCorrupted/FoNCO>.

The algorithm is terminated if $\epsilon_{kkt} < 10^{-4}$ and constraint violation $v(x^k) < 10^{-4}$. Otherwise, the algorithm is deemed to fail within the maximum number of iterations. Denote Iter^{ps} as the maximum number of iterations for the subproblem solver. The relaxation parameter γ_k is updated as $\gamma_k = \gamma_0 \theta_\gamma^{k-1}$. The parameter values used in our implementation are listed in the following Table 3.

Table 3.: Parameters in FoNCO

Parameter	ρ_0	β_α	β_v	β_ϕ	β_l	γ_0	θ_γ	θ_α	δ_0
Value	1	10^{-4}	0.3	0.75	0.135	0.01	0.7	0.5	1
Parameter	$\bar{\sigma}$	$\underline{\sigma}$	δ_{\min}	δ_{\max}	Iter	Iter^{ps}			
Value	0.3	0.75	64	10^{-4}	1024	100			

We tested our implementation on 126 Hock Schittkowski problems [25] of CUTer [22] on a ThinkPad T470 with i5-6700U processor. The detailed performance statistics of FoNCO is provided in Table 5, where column name is explained in Table 4.

Table 4.: Column Explanation

Problem	The name of the problem
# iter	Number of iterations
# pivot	Total number of pivots
# f	Number of function evaluations
$f(x^*)$	Final objective value
$v(x^*)$	Final constraint violation
KKT	Final relative KKT error defined in (42)
ρ^*	Final ρ
Exit	1(Success) or -1 (Iter exceeded)

We have the following observations from the experiment.

- Our algorithm solves 113 out of these 126 problems, attaining a success rate $\approx 89.7\%$. We noticed that some problems are sensitive to the selection of trust region radius. For examples, problems HS87, HS93 HS101, HS102 and HS103 failed with initial trust region radius 1. We re-ran those 5 problems with a smaller initial trust region radius $\delta_0 = 10^{-4}$. All these 5 problems are solved successfully. We believe the robustness of our proposed algorithm could be improved with a more sophisticated trust region radius updating strategy.
- Simplex method employed in our implementation is very efficient. Figure 1 shows the histogram of average number of pivots per iteration for 113 successful problems. We can see that for the majority of the cases, pivot per iteration is less than 5.
- Compared with second-order methods, SLP may take more outer iterations to compute for a high accuracy solution. However, the lower computational cost of each subproblem might be able to compensate for more outer iterations.

We also tested our proposed method on a subset of the large-scale CUTer problems and compared with the exact SLP algorithm. For the exact solver, we set $\beta_\phi = 1$ to enforce the subproblem to be solved accurately. This resembles the “traditional” exact penalty SLP methods and the classic penalty parameter updating strategy used in




Figure 1.: Pivots per iteration for 113 successful cases.

[12, 23, 24] where the penalty parameter is updated after the subproblem is solved. Table 6 shows the test results, where a problem name with subscript *_ex* denotes the test results of the exact solver, \downarrow % is the improvement percentage on number of pivots by the inexact algorithm compared with the exact version, # cons is the number of constraints, and # vars is the number of variables. We make the following observation from Table 6,

- Our proposed method successfully solves the 23 examples, and has fewer number of function evaluations or pivots than the exact SLP method, whereas the exact penalty-SLP method fails at two problems.
- The number of pivots needed per iteration is still not very large considering the problem sizes.

It should be noticed that the results in Table 6 are preliminary and may be further improved by implementing a powerful large-scale LP solver, e.g., the interior point method. However, this would be out of the scope of this paper’s focus.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed, analyzed, and tested an algorithmic framework of first-order methods for solving nonlinear constrained optimization problems that possesses global convergence guarantees for both feasible and infeasible problems instances. The worst-case complexity of KKT residuals for feasible and infeasible cases have been studied as well as the local complexity for constraint violation for feasible cases.

Numerical results demonstrated that the proposed methods work on HS test problems. We remark, however, the selection of trust region radius and its updating strategy plays a key role in the robustness of the methods. It would be interesting to develop more efficient updating strategies and study how the complexity could be affected by

the trust region.

Table 5.: Numerical Experiment

Problem	# iter	# pivot	# f	$f(x^*)$	$v(x^*)$	KKT	ρ_*	Exit
HS1	260	504	440	7.490597E-02	0.0E+00	9.7E-05	1.6E-03	1
HS10	16	25	40	-1.000002E+00	4.8E-06	6.3E-06	1.0E+00	1
HS100	99	545	394	6.806299E+02	9.8E-05	6.2E-05	7.0E-01	1
HS100LNP	243	1653	1725	6.806300E+02	3.2E-05	9.8E-05	5.9E-01	1
HS100MOD	32	129	52	6.786796E+02	1.1E-05	6.9E-05	6.2E-01	1
HS101	1025	5089	8011	3.000007E+03	7.6E-03	3.6E-13	1.0E-04	-1
HS102	66	311	89	1.000775E+03	4.1E-06	7.4E-05	1.0E-04	1
HS103	71	382	100	7.201554E+02	6.2E-05	9.8E-05	4.3E-05	1
HS104	5	27	6	4.200000E+00	8.0E-08	8.8E-16	1.0E+00	1
HS105	244	1904	1045	1.044612E+03	0.0E+00	1.4E-05	2.1E-06	1
HS106	1025	15683	1117	2.146195E+03	1.1E+00	1.1E-03	7.2E-04	-1
HS107	1025	7191	1078	2.713610E+06	5.2E+00	2.3E+05	2.6E-10	-1
HS108	32	1198	135	-8.660254E-01	2.0E-07	6.1E-05	9.0E-01	1
HS109	1025	4727	1049	0.000000E+00	5.4E+03	1.0E+00	1.0E+00	-1
HS11	26	60	60	-8.498486E+00	7.2E-06	4.2E-05	2.6E-01	1
HS110	23	170	92	-4.577848E+01	0.0E+00	6.4E-05	1.0E+00	1
HS111	298	3823	515	-4.776118E+01	1.1E-05	8.4E-05	5.4E-02	1
HS111LNP	298	3823	515	-4.776118E+01	1.1E-05	8.4E-05	5.4E-02	1
HS112	54	691	216	-4.776109E+01	8.1E-16	6.3E-05	1.3E-03	1
HS113	34	338	74	2.430622E+01	1.5E-05	8.8E-05	2.8E-01	1
HS114	1025	25291	1073	-1.636123E+03	0.0E+00	1.0E+00	3.3E-47	-1
HS116	10	77	12	2.500000E+02	9.0E-07	3.6E-15	1.0E+00	1
HS117	352	8011	466	3.234873E+01	0.0E+00	8.2E-05	3.6E-04	1
HS118	18	319	19	9.329922E+02	0.0E+00	1.9E-16	7.4E-02	1
HS119	16	436	20	2.449598E+02	1.9E-15	7.3E-05	1.5E-01	1
HS12	10	20	15	-3.000000E+01	4.6E-10	7.7E-06	1.0E+00	1
HS13	15	26	16	4.000000E+00	0.0E+00	8.5E-05	1.0E-04	1
HS14	9	19	16	1.393465E+00	1.0E-14	3.0E-07	4.0E-01	1
HS15	78	167	132	3.065000E+02	0.0E+00	3.2E-17	1.0E-03	1
HS16	35	79	77	2.314466E+01	0.0E+00	1.9E-08	2.8E-02	1
HS17	17	42	38	1.000000E+00	6.1E-21	8.4E-08	4.7E-01	1
HS18	13	26	34	5.000000E+00	0.0E+00	9.4E-06	1.0E+00	1
HS19	173	359	189	-6.961814E+03	0.0E+00	1.9E-08	9.6E-05	1
HS2	15	26	54	4.941229E+00	0.0E+00	3.1E-05	9.0E-01	1
HS20	40	88	314	4.019873E+01	0.0E+00	2.3E-07	8.1E-03	1
HS21	5	7	6	-9.996000E+01	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	1.0E+00	1
HS21MOD	15	23	19	-9.596000E+01	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	1.7E-01	1
HS22	5	10	6	1.000000E+00	0.0E+00	3.7E-09	1.0E+00	1
HS23	18	37	225	2.000000E+00	0.0E+00	1.0E-07	3.1E-01	1
HS24	3	6	38	-1.000000E+00	0.0E+00	1.9E-16	1.0E+00	1
HS25	1	0	1	3.283500E+01	0.0E+00	1.9E-08	1.0E+00	1
HS26	86	254	415	8.505871E-06	5.4E-06	9.8E-05	7.2E-01	1
HS268	249	1259	827	3.075321E+00	0.0E+00	9.6E-05	1.1E-04	1
HS27	16	33	22	4.000000E-02	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	3.1E-01	1
HS28	6	15	9	0.000000E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	9.0E-01	1
HS29	360	1230	2659	-2.262742E+01	8.2E-06	7.7E-05	1.0E+00	1
HS3	518	1019	519	2.490010E-04	0.0E+00	9.9E-05	1.0E-04	1
HS30	7	20	8	1.000061E+00	0.0E+00	3.0E-05	1.0E+00	1
HS31	129	315	599	5.999992E+00	1.3E-06	5.2E-05	1.0E-01	1
HS32	11	47	17	1.000000E+00	0.0E+00	9.2E-17	2.0E-01	1
HS33	291	589	292	-4.000000E+00	0.0E+00	2.6E-07	5.8E-09	1
HS34	11	50	12	-8.340324E-01	4.5E-10	4.2E-06	1.0E+00	1
HS35	18	42	87	1.111111E-01	0.0E+00	1.3E-05	6.5E-01	1
HS35I	18	42	87	1.111111E-01	0.0E+00	1.3E-05	6.5E-01	1
HS35MOD	2	5	3	2.500000E-01	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	1.0E+00	1
HS36	376	1093	377	-3.300000E+03	0.0E+00	2.8E-16	2.0E-08	1
HS37	389	1136	408	-3.456000E+03	0.0E+00	1.9E-05	1.5E-08	1
HS38	44	139	78	1.070841E-02	0.0E+00	4.8E-05	7.8E-03	1
HS39	28	83	46	-1.000044E+00	4.3E-05	8.5E-06	8.1E-01	1
HS3MOD	28	33	29	0.000000E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	5.9E-01	1
HS4	9	23	16	2.666667E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	1.8E-01	1

Continued on next page

Table 5 – continued from previous page

Problem	# iter	# pivot	# f	$f(x^*)$	$v(x^*)$	KKT	ρ_*	Exit
HS40	41	1826	174	-2.500000E-01	1.6E-09	8.6E-05	1.5E-01	1
HS41	176	636	215	1.925926E+00	0.0E+00	5.8E-05	1.0E-07	1
HS42	20	62	50	1.385786E+01	1.6E-07	5.1E-05	3.1E-01	1
HS43	24	93	48	-4.400000E+01	1.5E-08	5.6E-05	4.5E-01	1
HS44	98	398	99	-1.500000E+01	0.0E+00	4.4E-16	1.0E-04	1
HS44NEW	91	380	92	-1.500000E+01	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	1.1E-04	1
HS45	4	17	5	1.000000E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	1.0E+00	1
HS46	90	470	248	1.987922E-05	4.8E-06	8.8E-05	1.0E+00	1
HS47	41	247	80	2.842654E-05	3.6E-05	8.2E-05	8.1E-01	1
HS48	4	16	6	1.109336E-31	0.0E+00	3.7E-17	1.0E+00	1
HS49	20	116	27	4.978240E-03	0.0E+00	8.1E-05	2.8E-01	1
HS5	8	12	39	-1.913223E+00	0.0E+00	3.8E-05	1.0E+00	1
HS50	10	53	17	1.232595E-32	4.4E-16	7.0E-19	1.8E-01	1
HS51	13	59	23	2.170139E-08	0.0E+00	8.3E-05	7.2E-01	1
HS52	37	213	109	5.326649E+00	1.6E-16	9.0E-05	5.0E-02	1
HS53	22	110	45	4.093023E+00	1.1E-16	6.4E-05	1.2E-01	1
HS54	5	8	37	-1.539517E-01	0.0E+00	1.4E-06	1.0E+00	1
HS55	1	7	2	6.666667E+00	1.1E-16	3.7E-17	1.0E+00	1
HS56	2	5	3	-1.000000E+00	1.2E-15	2.7E-05	1.0E-04	1
HS57	7	7	61	3.064631E-02	0.0E+00	9.6E-05	1.0E+00	1
HS59	9	13	10	3.012922E+01	1.4E-07	9.5E-06	1.0E+00	1
HS6	314	789	1710	1.503772E-13	7.7E-06	8.5E-05	9.0E-01	1
HS60	117	397	834	3.256821E-02	2.0E-09	9.8E-05	1.0E+00	1
HS61	18	60	34	-1.436462E+02	5.3E-05	7.2E-05	4.9E-01	1
HS62	258	745	1395	-2.627251E+04	1.6E-16	8.4E-05	3.1E-05	1
HS63	16	54	46	9.617152E+02	2.7E-06	1.7E-05	5.5E-01	1
HS64	43	101	51	6.299779E+03	3.4E-05	1.8E-06	4.9E-02	1
HS65	23	59	30	9.535289E-01	1.7E-10	4.3E-05	1.0E+00	1
HS66	23	61	84	5.181632E-01	2.4E-07	7.0E-05	5.3E-01	1
HS67	1025	3071	1034	-9.162074E+02	0.0E+00	7.3E-02	1.5E-04	-1
HS68	38	138	389	2.400000E-05	0.0E+00	4.2E-14	1.7E-03	1
HS69	62	281	505	-9.280357E+02	1.1E-10	4.4E-05	2.8E-08	1
HS7	17	32	51	-1.732051E+00	3.0E-09	4.7E-05	9.0E-01	1
HS70	1025	4056	2799	1.866660E-02	0.0E+00	1.7E-02	9.6E-03	-1
HS71	28	529	237	1.701402E+01	3.9E-08	9.1E-05	3.9E-01	1
HS72	99	333	104	7.276793E+02	4.4E-09	7.0E-05	1.7E-05	1
HS73	31	272	33	2.989438E+01	1.5E-07	2.3E-06	3.7E-02	1
HS74	51	200	64	5.126498E+03	1.4E-06	4.6E-05	1.3E-01	1
HS75	1025	6031	1042	5.127004E+03	3.1E-02	4.9E-05	2.4E-03	-1
HS76	23	97	68	-4.681818E+00	0.0E+00	2.6E-05	3.9E-01	1
HS76I	23	97	68	-4.681818E+00	0.0E+00	2.6E-05	3.9E-01	1
HS77	49	245	141	2.415043E-01	1.8E-05	7.2E-05	1.0E+00	1
HS78	19	111	73	-2.919700E+00	2.7E-07	4.7E-05	8.1E-01	1
HS79	226	1653	1181	7.877686E-02	2.9E-06	8.7E-05	1.0E+00	1
HS8	5	10	6	-1.000000E+00	6.4E-07	0.0E+00	1.0E+00	1
HS80	136	864	1662	5.394985E-02	2.6E-09	3.7E-05	1.0E+00	1
HS81	69	497	294	5.394986E-02	2.0E-05	9.5E-05	8.1E-01	1
HS83	1025	99668	34494	-2.539096E+04	2.5E+00	1.8E+45	9.1E-49	-1
HS84	1025	100970	1083	-2.325944E+09	3.8E+05	1.7E+45	2.0E-47	-1
HS85	1025	5148	3315	4.374488E+01	9.3E+06	1.0E+00	5.7E-04	-1
HS86	25	146	64	-3.234868E+01	2.2E-16	9.8E-05	5.6E-02	1
HS87	15	52	16	8.997184E+03	1.6E-09	2.3E-07	1.0E-04	1
HS88	59	98	163	1.349683E+00	1.2E-05	8.3E-05	1.0E-04	1
HS89	187	545	778	1.357072E+00	5.4E-06	9.1E-05	1.0E-04	1
HS9	4	10	6	-5.000000E-01	0.0E+00	8.5E-09	1.0E+00	1
HS90	679	3485	3923	1.385570E+00	5.0E-06	9.9E-05	1.0E-04	1
HS91	525	2535	2481	1.357178E+00	5.2E-06	7.9E-05	1.0E-04	1
HS92	421	2645	1628	1.349981E+00	1.2E-05	7.5E-05	1.0E-04	1
HS93	1025	7846	6127	1.353296E+02	1.9E-06	3.2E-03	2.2E-05	-1
HS95	33	206	62	1.561953E-02	0.0E+00	2.7E-17	1.0E-02	1
HS96	30	206	64	1.561953E-02	0.0E+00	1.0E-16	1.0E-02	1
HS97	53	1007	81	4.071246E+00	0.0E+00	7.2E-15	7.0E-04	1
HS98	36	303	102	3.135809E+00	0.0E+00	1.8E-15	1.1E-03	1
HS99	57	348	462	-8.310799E+08	1.0E-11	6.2E-05	3.8E-01	1
HS99EXP	1025	32423	1025	0.000000E+00	5.2E+03	1.2E+00	1.0E+00	-1

Table 6.: Comparison with exact algorithm

Problem	# cons	# vars	# iter	# pivot	↓ %	# f	$f(x^*)$	$v(x^*)$	KKT	ρ_*	Exit
ARGTRIG	200	200	3	592	1.1%	4	0.0000E+00	2.6E-06	0.0E+00	1.0E+00	1
ARGTRIG_ex	200	200	3	599		4	0.0000E+00	9.3E-08	0.0E+00	1.0E+00	1
GMNCASE1	175	300	38	13049	30.8%	142	2.6779E-01	2.0E-06	9.7E-05	2.1E-01	1
GMNCASE1_ex	175	300	41	18857		190	2.6779E-01	4.0E-15	6.8E-05	1.1E-01	1
GMNCASE2	175	1050	172	80617	51.0%	1229	-9.9445E-01	4.2E-15	1.0E-04	3.0E-03	1
GMNCASE2_ex	175	1050	335	164478		3179	-9.9443E-01	1.6E-06	9.9E-05	1.5E-01	1
DTOC6	100	201	94	23430	57.1%	258	7.2798E+02	1.2E-05	4.8E-04	4.9E-03	1
DTOC6_ex	100	201	190	54667		902	7.2798E+02	6.9E-06	4.7E-04	3.9E-03	1
EIGMAXA	101	101	3	305	-1.0%	4	-1.0000E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	1.0E+00	1
EIGMAXA_ex	101	101	3	302		38	-1.0000E+00	2.8E-17	4.5E-28	1.0E+00	1
EIGMINA	101	101	6	986	-27.7%	41	1.0000E+00	1.9E-17	9.2E-29	6.2E-01	1
EIGMINA_ex	101	101	7	713		8	1.0000E+00	4.5E-14	1.7E-07	5.7E-01	1
LUKVLE3	2	100	48	879	46.7%	100	2.7587E+01	1.8E-05	8.6E-05	4.2E-02	1
LUKVLE3_ex	2	100	54	1650		91	2.7586E+01	5.7E-05	5.7E-05	3.8E-02	1
LUKVLE5	96	102	95	26275	59.8%	188	2.6393E+00	7.2E-05	1.0E-04	1.0E+00	1
LUKVLE5_ex	96	102	143	65431		350	2.6393E+00	5.6E-05	8.8E-05	5.9E-01	1
LUKVLE6	49	99	20	1442	50.1%	25	6.0399E+03	9.1E-04	4.0E-05	1.0E+00	1
LUKVLE6_ex	49	99	20	2887		30	6.0376E+03	7.4E-04	4.2E-06	6.6E-01	1
LUKVLE7	4	100	319	11080	78.3%	1777	-2.5945E+01	1.7E-05	1.0E-04	5.2E-02	1
LUKVLE7_ex	4	100	513	51103		3252	-2.5944E+01	1.3E-05	2.9E-04	2.8E-02	-1
LUKVL8	98	100	157	15970	-15.6%	244	1.0587E+03	1.7E-07	6.5E-05	2.7E-04	1
LUKVL8_ex	98	100	128	18920		163	1.0587E+03	1.5E-07	3.1E-05	2.5E-04	1
LUKVL16	49	99	23	1680	42.6%	29	6.0386E+03	2.8E-04	2.7E-05	1.0E+00	1
LUKVL16_ex	49	99	20	2927		30	6.0376E+03	7.4E-04	4.2E-06	6.6E-01	1
LUKVL18	98	100	145	16372	55.7%	259	1.0587E+04	1.1E-07	7.2E-05	2.9E-04	1
LUKVL18_ex	98	100	255	36952		715	1.0587E+04	4.2E-08	7.1E-05	2.8E-04	1
NONSCOMPL	0	500	24	1061	27.8%	53	2.7000E-05	0.0E+00	5.6E-05	1.0E+00	1
NONSCOMPL_ex	0	500	26	1470		70	2.3100E-05	0.0E+00	7.4E-05	1.0E+00	1
NONSCOMPNE	100	100	7	695	-9.1%	8	0.0000E+00	8.1E-07	1.8E-11	1.0E+00	1
NONSCOMPNE_ex	100	100	6	643		7	0.0000E+00	4.2E-08	1.2E-06	1.0E+00	1
ORTHREGC	50	105	27	3712	92.1%	53	1.9756E+00	9.9E-04	9.8E-04	1.0E+00	1
ORTHREGC_ex	50	105	205	46737		1231	1.9755E+00	8.4E-05	7.4E-04	1.0E+00	1
ORTHREGD	50	103	82	12336	85.6%	173	1.5590E+01	9.1E-04	4.2E-06	1.0E+00	1
ORTHREGD_ex	50	103	513	85794		3623	3.9532E+01	8.7E-04	3.3E-01	1.5E-02	-1
ORTHREGF	49	152	39	5406	60.8%	66	1.3152E+00	3.9E-04	9.0E-04	1.0E+00	1
ORTHREGF_ex	49	152	48	13792		155	1.3150E+00	4.4E-04	9.7E-04	1.0E+00	1
OSCIGRNE	0	1000	6	752	0.0%	7	0.0000E+00	2.4E-08	8.3E-25	1.0E+00	1
OSCIGRNE_ex	0	1000	6	752		7	0.0000E+00	2.4E-08	8.3E-25	1.0E+00	1
PENLTINE	101	100	40	980	52.3%	62	0.0000E+00	9.9E-04	1.6E-08	1.0E+00	1
PENLTINE_ex	101	100	36	2054		44	0.0000E+00	9.9E-04	9.6E-09	1.0E+00	1
PRIMAL1	85	325	42	21042	0.0%	232	-3.5010E-02	4.5E-14	1.4E-04	1.0E+00	1
PRIMAL1_ex	85	325	42	21042		232	-3.5010E-02	4.5E-14	1.4E-04	1.0E+00	1
SOSQP1	101	200	3	373	7.2%	4	0.0000E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	1.0E+00	1
SOSQP1_ex	101	200	3	402		4	0.0000E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	1.0E+00	1
STCQP2	101	200	74	13022	11.0%	317	1.4294E+03	0.0E+00	4.7E-04	2.3E-07	1
STCQP2_ex	101	200	77	14624		111	1.4294E+03	0.0E+00	4.0E-04	1.1E-03	1

7. Appendix

Calculation of the dual subproblem

In this appendix, we show how the dual subproblem (\mathcal{D}) is derived. For this purpose, we use the shorthand defined by (13) and define the convex sets:

$$C_i = \{d \mid \langle a_i/\|a_i\|_2, d \rangle + b_i/\|a_i\|_2 = 0\}, \quad i \in \mathcal{E}$$

$$C_i = \{d \mid \langle a_i/\|a_i\|_2, d \rangle + b_i/\|a_i\|_2 \leq 0\}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}.$$

One finds that $\delta^*(u_i \mid C_i) < +\infty$ if and only if

$$\langle u_i, a_i \rangle = \pm \|u_i\|_2 \|a_i\|_2, \quad i \in \mathcal{E}, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle u_i, a_i \rangle = \|u_i\|_2 \|a_i\|_2, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}.$$

In this case, it must be true that

$$u_i = \lambda_i a_i/\|a_i\|_2 \text{ for some } \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{so that } \delta(u_i \mid C_i) = -\lambda_i b/\|a_i\|_2, \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{E},$$

$$u_i = \lambda_i a_i/\|a_i\|_2 \text{ for some } \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \text{so that } \delta(u_i \mid C_i) = -\lambda_i b/\|a_i\|_2, \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{I}.$$
(43)

For simplicity, suppose $\mathcal{E} = \{1, \dots, \bar{m}\}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \{\bar{m} + 1, \dots, m\}$. The primal problem

thus can be written as

$$\inf_d \langle g, d \rangle + \delta(d | X) + \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|_2 \text{dist}(d | C_i).$$

The primal problem thus can be rewritten as

$$\inf_{d, \mathbf{z}} \phi(d, \mathbf{z}) := \langle g, d \rangle + \delta(d | X) + \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|_2 [\delta^*(d - z_i | \mathbb{B}_2) + \delta(z_i | C_i)].$$

with $\mathbf{z} = [z_1^T, \dots, z_m^T]^T$ by noticing that the optimal $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is always the projection of d onto C_i .

To derive the dual, notice that the primal objective is equivalent to

$$\phi(d, \mathbf{z}) = \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} \mathcal{L}((d, \mathbf{z}), (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}))$$

with $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, \dots, m, v_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, \dots, m, m+1, \mathbf{u} = [u_1^T, \dots, u_m^T]^T, \mathbf{v} = [v_1^T, \dots, v_m^T, v_{m+1}^T]^T$ and the associated Lagrangian is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}((d, \mathbf{z}), (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})) &= \langle g, d \rangle + \langle v_{m+1}, d \rangle - \delta^*(v_{m+1} | X) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|_2 [\langle u_i, d - z_i \rangle - \delta(u_i | \mathbb{B}_2) + \langle v_i, z_i \rangle - \delta^*(v_i | C_i)] \\ &= \langle g + v_{m+1}, d \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|_2 \langle u_i, d \rangle - \delta^*(v_{m+1} | X) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|_2 [\langle -u_i + v_i, z_i \rangle - \delta(u_i | \mathbb{B}_2) - \delta^*(v_i | C_i)]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the dual objective is then

$$\psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) := \inf_{d, \mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}((d, \mathbf{z}), (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})),$$

The optimality conditions for the infimum in the definition of ψ are

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_d \mathcal{L} &= g + v_{m+1} + \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|_2 u_i = 0 \\ \nabla_{z_i} \mathcal{L} &= -\|a_i\|_2 u_i + \|a_i\|_2 v_i = 0 \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned}$$

Eliminating the d_i, z_i and v_i variables in \mathcal{L} using the above conditions yields the dual objective

$$\psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = -\delta^*(-g - \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|_2 u_i | X) - \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|_2 [\delta(u_i | \mathbb{B}_2) + \delta^*(u_i | C_i)],$$

which yields the associated dual problem

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mathbf{u}} \quad & \delta^*(-g - \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|_2 u_i \mid X) + \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|_2 \delta^*(u_i \mid C_i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & u_i \in \mathbb{B}_2 \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned}$$

We now use (43) to further simplify the dual problem, so that the dual problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\lambda} \quad & \delta^*(-g - \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i a_i \mid X) - \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \lambda_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & -1 \leq \lambda_i \leq 1, \quad i \in \mathcal{E}, \\ & 0 \leq \lambda_i \leq 1, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}. \end{aligned}$$

For the support function of norm ball $X = \{x \mid \|x\| \leq \gamma\}$ with radius $\gamma > 0$, we have $\delta^*(v \mid X) = \gamma \|v\|_*$. Hence, we finally derive our dual problem

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\lambda} \quad & \gamma \|g - \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i a_i\|_* - \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \lambda_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \lambda_i \in [-1, 1], \quad i \in \mathcal{E}, \\ & \lambda_i \in [0, 1], \quad i \in \mathcal{I}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, general convex analysis tells that

- The dual of ℓ_2 norm is the ℓ_2 norm.
- The dual of ℓ_1 norm is the ℓ_∞ norm.
- The dual of ℓ_∞ norm is the ℓ_1 norm.
- More generally, the dual of the ℓ_p norm is the ℓ_q norm with $1/p + 1/q = 1$.
- For matrix norms, the dual of ℓ_2 (or, the spectral) norm is the nuclear norm.
- The dual of the Frobenius norm is the Frobenius norm.

Hence, if we use an ℓ_2 norm ball for the trust region, then the dual problem is quadratic; if we use an ℓ_∞ norm ball for the trust region, then the dual problem has an ℓ_∞ norm in the objective.

References

- [1] P.A. Absil, R. Mahony, and R. Sepulchre, *Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds*, Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [2] R. Andreani, J.M. Martinez, A. Ramos, and P.J.S. Silva, *A cone-continuity constraint qualification and algorithmic consequences*, SIAM Journal on Optimization 26 (2016), pp. 96–110. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1008488>.
- [3] T.E. Baker and L.S. Lasdon, *Successive linear programming at Exxon*, Management science 31 (1985), pp. 264–274.
- [4] A. Beck and M. Teboulle, *Mirror descent and nonlinear projected subgradient methods for convex optimization*, Operations Research Letters 31 (2003), pp. 167–175.
- [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] E.G. Birgin and J.M. Martinez, *Practical Augmented Lagrangian Methods for Constrained Optimization*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2014, Available at <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611973365>.
- [7] L. Bottou, *Stochastic learning*, in *Advanced lectures on machine learning*, Springer, 2004, pp. 146–168.
- [8] L. Bottou, *Large-scale machine learning with stochastic gradient descent*, in *Proceedings of COMPSTAT'2010*, Springer, 2010, pp. 177–186.
- [9] L. Bottou, *Stochastic gradient descent tricks*, in *Neural networks: Tricks of the trade*, Springer, 2012, pp. 421–436.
- [10] J.V. Burke, F.E. Curtis, and H. Wang, *A sequential quadratic optimization algorithm with rapid infeasibility detection*, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 24 (2014), pp. 839–872.
- [11] J.V. Burke, F.E. Curtis, H. Wang, and J. Wang, *A dynamic penalty parameter updating strategy for matrix-free sequential quadratic optimization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.09224 (2018).
- [12] J. Burke, *A sequential quadratic programming method for potentially infeasible mathematical programs*, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 139 (1989), pp. 319–351.
- [13] R.H. Byrd, F.E. Curtis, and J. Nocedal, *An inexact sqp method for equality constrained optimization*, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 19 (2008), pp. 351–369.
- [14] R.H. Byrd, F.E. Curtis, and J. Nocedal, *Infeasibility detection and sqp methods for nonlinear optimization*, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 20 (2010), pp. 2281–2299.
- [15] R.H. Byrd, N.I. Gould, J. Nocedal, and R.A. Waltz, *An algorithm for nonlinear optimization using linear programming and equality constrained subproblems*, *Mathematical Programming* 100 (2003), pp. 27–48.
- [16] R.H. Byrd, J. Nocedal, and R.A. Waltz, *Steering exact penalty methods for nonlinear programming*, *Optimization Methods and Software* 23 (2008), pp. 197–213.
- [17] F.H. Clarke, *Generalized gradients and applications*, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 205 (1975), pp. 247–262.
- [18] I. Daubechies, M. Defrise, and C. De Mol, *An iterative thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems with a sparsity constraint*, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Journal Issued by the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences* 57 (2004), pp. 1413–1457.
- [19] J. Duchi, E. Hazan, and Y. Singer, *Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization*, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12 (2011), pp. 2121–2159.
- [20] R. Fletcher, *Practical methods of optimization*, John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- [21] R. Fletcher and E.S. de la Maza, *Nonlinear programming and nonsmooth optimization by successive linear programming*, *Mathematical Programming* 43 (1989), pp. 235–256.
- [22] N.I.M. Gould, D. Orban, and P.L. Toint, *Cutest: a constrained and unconstrained testing environment with safe threads for mathematical optimization*, *Computational Optimization and Applications* 60 (2015), pp. 545–557. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-014-9687-3>.
- [23] S.P. Han and O.L. Mangasarian, *Exact penalty functions in nonlinear programming*, *Mathematical programming* 17 (1979), pp. 251–269.
- [24] S.P. Han, *A globally convergent method for nonlinear programming*, *Journal of optimization theory and applications* 22 (1977), pp. 297–309.
- [25] W. Hock and K. Schittkowski, *Test examples for nonlinear programming codes*, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 30 (1980), pp. 127–129.
- [26] R. Johnson and T. Zhang, *Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction*, in *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 2013, pp. 315–323.
- [27] A. Juditsky, A. Nemirovski, and C. Tauvel, *Solving variational inequalities with stochastic mirror-prox algorithm*, *Stochastic Systems* 1 (2011), pp. 17–58.
- [28] W. Karush, *Minima of functions of several variables with inequalities as side conditions*, in *Traces and Emergence of Nonlinear Programming*, Springer, 2014, pp. 217–245.
- [29] H.W. Kuhn and A.W. Tucker, *Nonlinear programming*, in *Traces and emergence of non-*

- linear programming*, Springer, 2014, pp. 247–258.
- [30] L. Lasdon, A. Waren, S. Sarkar, and F. Palacios, *Solving the pooling problem using generalized reduced gradient and successive linear programming algorithms*, ACM Sigmap Bulletin (1979), pp. 9–15.
 - [31] R. Luss and M. Teboulle, *Conditional gradient algorithms for rank-one matrix approximations with a sparsity constraint*, SIAM Review 55 (2013), pp. 65–98.
 - [32] C. Oberlin and S.J. Wright, *Active set identification in nonlinear programming*, SIAM Journal on Optimization 17 (2006), pp. 577–605.
 - [33] B.N. Pshenichnyj, *The linearization method for constrained optimization*, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics (English summary) Translated from the 1983 Russian original by Stephen S. Wilson., Vol. 22, Springer-Verlag, 1994.
 - [34] C. Udriste, *Convex functions and optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds*, Vol. 297, Springer Science & Business Media, 1994.
 - [35] L. Xiao and T. Zhang, *A proximal stochastic gradient method with progressive variance reduction*, SIAM Journal on Optimization 24 (2014), pp. 2057–2075.