

# An equivalent reformulation and multi-proximity gradient algorithms for a class of nonsmooth fractional programming

Junpeng Zhou<sup>1†</sup>, Na Zhang<sup>2†</sup>, Qia Li<sup>3\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>School of Computer Sciences and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University,  
Guangzhou, 510006, China.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Applied Mathematics, College of Mathematics and  
Informatics, South China Agricultural University, Guangzhou, 510642,  
China.

<sup>3</sup>School of Computer Sciences and Engineering, Guangdong Province  
Key Laboratory of Computational Science, Sun Yat-sen University,  
Guangzhou, 510006, China.

\*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): [liqia@mail.sysu.edu.cn](mailto:liqia@mail.sysu.edu.cn);  
Contributing authors: [zhoujp5@mail2.sysu.edu.cn](mailto:zhoujp5@mail2.sysu.edu.cn); [nzhsysu@gmail.com](mailto:nzhsysu@gmail.com);

<sup>†</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work.

## Abstract

In this paper, we consider a class of structured fractional programs, where the numerator part is the sum of a block-separable (possibly nonsmooth nonconvex) function and a locally Lipschitz differentiable (possibly nonconvex) function, while the denominator is a convex (possibly nonsmooth) function. We first present a novel reformulation for the original problem and show the relationship between optimal solutions, critical points and KL exponents of these two problems. Inspired by the reformulation, we propose a flexible framework of multi-proximity gradient algorithms (MPGA), which computes the proximity operator with respect to the Fenchel conjugate associated with the convex denominator of the original problem rather than evaluating its subgradient as in the existing methods. Also, MPGA employs a nonmonotone linear-search scheme in its gradient descent step, since the smooth part in the numerator of the original problem is not globally Lipschitz differentiable. Based on the framework of MPGA, we develop two specific algorithms, namely, cyclic MPGA and randomized MPGA, and establish their subsequential convergence under mild conditions.

Moreover, the sequential convergence of cyclic MPGA with the monotone line-search (CMPGA\_ML) is guaranteed if the extended objective associated with the reformulated problem satisfies the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property and some other mild assumptions. In particular, we prove that the corresponding KL exponents are  $\frac{1}{2}$  for several special cases of the fractional programs, and so, CMPGA\_ML exhibits a linear convergence rate. Finally, some preliminary numerical experiments are performed to demonstrate the efficiency of our proposed algorithms.

**Keywords:** fractional programming, equivalent reformulation, proximal algorithm, KL exponent

**MSC Classification:** 90C26 , 90C30 , 65K05

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider a class of single-ratio fractional optimization problem

$$\min \left\{ \frac{f(x) + h(x)}{g(x)} : x \in \Omega \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where  $f, g, h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  are proper lower semicontinuous functions and the set  $\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g(x) \neq 0\}$  is nonempty. Moreover, we assume that  $f$  is a block-separable function

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x_i),$$

where each  $x_i$  is a subvector of  $x$  with dimension  $n_i$ ,  $\{x_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$  forms a partition of the components of  $x$ , and each  $f_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is a proper lower semicontinuous function. Throughout the paper, we make the following blanket assumptions on problem (1).

**Assumption 1.**

- (i)  $f$  is continuous on  $\text{dom}(f)$  and each  $f_i$  is bounded below;
- (ii)  $h$  is locally Lipschitz differentiable on  $\Omega$ , i.e., for any  $x \in \Omega$ , there exist a neighborhood  $\mathcal{B}(x) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  and a constant  $L_x$  such that  $\|\nabla h(u) - \nabla h(v)\|_2 \leq L_x \|u - v\|_2$  holds for any  $u, v \in \mathcal{B}(x) \cap \Omega$ .
- (iii)  $g$  is convex, real-valued and non-negative on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .
- (iv)  $f + h$  is non-negative on  $\text{dom}(f)$ .

This class of fractional optimization problems encompasses many important optimization models arising from diverse areas. In this paper, we are particularly interested in the scale invariant sparse signal recovery models, which has recently received considerable attentions [21, 27, 32, 34, 35, 40, 42]. For example, the  $L_1/L_2$  (the quotient of the  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$  norms) least square model is in the form of

$$\min \left\{ \frac{\|x\|_1}{\|x\|_2} + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2 : \underline{x} \leq x \leq \bar{x}, x \neq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\underline{x}, \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\lambda > 0$ . Problem (2) is a special case of problem (1) when  $h(x) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x\|_2 \|Ax - b\|_2^2$ ,  $g(x) = \|x\|_2$ ,  $f_i$  is the sum of  $\ell_1$  norm and the indicator function on  $\{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i} : \underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \bar{x}_i\}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . One can easily check that problem (2) satisfies Assumption 1. As another example, we refer to the  $L_1/S_K$  (the quotient of  $\ell_1$  norm and the vector  $K$ -norm) sparse signal recovery model [21] which can be formulated into

$$\min \left\{ \frac{\|x\|_1 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2}{\|x\|_{(K)}} : \underline{x} \leq x \leq \bar{x}, x \neq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}. \quad (3)$$

In the above problem,  $\|x\|_{(K)}$  is the vector  $K$ -norm [18, 38] of  $x$ , which is defined as the sum of the  $K$  largest absolute values of entries in  $x$ . Clearly, problem (1) reduces to problem (3) when  $h(x) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2$ ,  $g(x) = \|x\|_{(K)}$  and  $f_i$  is chosen the same as those in the prior example. We can also easily verify that problem (3) satisfies Assumption 1.

For tackling single-ratio fractional optimization problems, one popular class of approaches is the Dinkelbach's method and its variants [16, 17, 19, 31]. Given an iterate  $x^k$ , this class of approaches for problem (1) typically generates the next iterate by solving the following optimization problem

$$\min \{f(x) + h(x) - c_k g(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}, \quad (4)$$

where  $c_k$  is renewed with  $c_k := \frac{f(x^k) + h(x^k)}{g(x^k)}$ . In general, it is very difficult and expensive to directly address (4) due to the possible non-convexity and non-smoothness. To remedy this issue, when  $h$  is globally Lipschitz differentiable, several first-order algorithms [9, 21, 43] are developed for solving problem (1) by processing  $f$ ,  $h$  and  $g$  separately. More precisely, in each iteration all these algorithms perform a gradient step with respect to  $h$ , a subgradient step with respect to  $g$  and a proximal step with respect to  $f$ . The subproblems involved are usually much easier to handle and sometimes even have closed-form solutions, which leads to the high efficiency of these algorithms. Subsequential convergence of the solution sequence generated by them is established, while sequential convergence is proved under further assumptions which includes the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property of some auxiliary functions.

Differently from the aforementioned work [9, 21, 43], this paper presents a novel reformulation for problem (1), and then develops multi-proximity algorithms based on this reformulated problem, which is in the form of

$$\min \left\{ \frac{f(x) + h(x)}{\langle x, y \rangle - g^*(y)} : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, \langle x, y \rangle - g^*(y) > 0 \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Here,  $g^* : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  denotes the classical Fenchel conjugate function of  $g$ . Specifically, the contributions of this paper are summarized as follow:

1. We give an equivalent reformulation (5) for problem (1) in the sense that both problems have the same optimal value, and  $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is an optimal solution of problem (1) if and only if  $(x^*, y^*)$  is an optimal solution of problem (5) for some

- $y^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Moreover, when  $g^*$  is continuous on its domain, we show that  $x^*$  is a critical point of problem (1) if and only if  $(x^*, y^*)$  is a stationary point of problem (5) for some  $y^*$ . Under further mild conditions, we prove that if the extended objective of problem (5) is a KL function with a certain KL exponent, then the extended objective of problem (1) is also a KL function with the same KL exponent.
2. By exploiting the structure of the numerator and denominator, we propose a general framework of multi-proximity gradient algorithms for solving problem (5). At each iteration, this method first picks a block from  $\{x_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$  and  $y$ , and then solves typically a proximal subproblem associated with the chosen block while fixing the remaining blocks at their last renewed values. Moreover, since  $h$  is not globally Lipschitz differentiable, a nonmonotone line-search scheme is incorporated to determine the step size of gradient descent if the block  $y$  is not selected. We prove that the MPGA always owns several favorable properties, regardless of the order for updating the blocks.
  3. We investigate the convergence of the MPGA in the case where the update block is chosen cyclically (CMPGA) or randomly (RMPGA). We show that any accumulation point of the solution sequence generated by CMPGA is a critical point of problem (1), while that by RMPGA is a critical point almost surely. In addition, we establish the convergence of the whole solution sequence generated by CMPGA with monotone line search (CMPGA\_ML), by further assuming that  $f$  is locally Lipschitz continuous,  $g^*$  satisfies the calmness condition on its domain, and the extended objective of problem (5) satisfies the KL property. The convergence rate of CMPGA\_ML is also estimated based on the KL exponent of the extended objective of problem (5). Specifically, we show that, for several special cases of problem (1), the KL exponents associated with their reformulated problem (5) are  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and thus CMPGA\_ML exhibits a linear convergence rate.

The remaining part of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce notation and some preliminaries. Section 3 is devoted to a study of connections between problem (1) and (5). We propose the multi-proximity gradient algorithm in Section 4 and analyze its subsequential convergence in Section 5. In Section 6, the sequential convergence and convergence rate of CMPGA\_ML is established. We present in Section 7 some numerical results for the  $L_1/L_2$  and  $L_1/S_K$  signal recovery problems to demonstrate the efficiency of our proposed algorithms.

## 2 Notation and preliminaries

We begin with our preferred notations. We denote the Euclidean space of dimension  $n$  and the set of nonnegative integers by  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathbb{N}_M := \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}_M^0 := \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}_M$  for a positive integer  $M$ , and  $[x]_+ := \max\{0, x\}$ . For a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we use  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  to denote an open neighborhood of  $x$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and use  $\mathcal{B}(x, \delta)$  to denote an open ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with the center  $x$  and the radius  $\delta > 0$ . Given a function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  being finite at  $x$  and a positive number  $\epsilon > 0$ , we use  $\mathcal{B}_\varphi^\epsilon(x, \delta)$  to denote the set  $\mathcal{B}(x, \delta) \cap \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \varphi(x) < \varphi(z) < \varphi(x) + \epsilon\}$ . Moreover, for a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $x_i$  always denotes a subvector of  $x$  with cardinality  $n_i$  and  $\{x_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_N\}$  forms a partition of the components of  $x$ . We use  $\nabla_i h$  to denote the partial gradient of  $h$  with respect to

$x_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ . The  $\ell_1$  norm, the  $\ell_2$  norm and the inner-product of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_1, \|\cdot\|_2$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ , respectively. We use  $x \in \mathcal{A} \rightarrow x^*$  to denote that the variant  $x$  converges to  $x^*$  within the set  $\mathcal{A}$  and use  $\{x^k : k \in \mathcal{K}\} \rightarrow x^*$  to denote that the sequence  $x^k$  indexed by  $\mathcal{K}$  converges to  $x^*$ , i.e.,  $\lim_{k \in \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \infty} x^k = x^*$ . The indicator function on a nonempty set  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is defined by

$$\iota_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{A}, \\ +\infty, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

For two sets  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$  denotes the Cartesian product of  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$ . The distance from a point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  to a set  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $\text{dist}(x, \mathcal{A}) := \inf\{\|x-y\|_2 : y \in \mathcal{A}\}$ , and we adopt  $\text{dist}(x, \emptyset) = +\infty$ .

In the remaining part of this section, we present some preliminaries on some generalized subdifferentials of nonconvex functions [24, 30] and the KL property [2].

## 2.1 Generalized subdifferentials

An extended-real-value function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is said to be proper if its domain  $\text{dom}(\varphi) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \varphi(x) < +\infty\}$  is nonempty. A proper function  $\varphi$  is said to be closed if  $\varphi$  is lower semicontinuous on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For a proper function  $\varphi$ , its Fréchet and limiting subdifferential at  $x \in \text{dom}(\varphi)$  are defined respectively by

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\partial}\varphi(x) &:= \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \liminf_{\substack{z \rightarrow x \\ z \neq x}} \frac{\varphi(z) - \varphi(x) - \langle y, z - x \rangle}{\|z - x\|_2} \geq 0 \right\}, \\ \partial\varphi(x) &:= \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \exists x^k \rightarrow x, \varphi(x^k) \rightarrow \varphi(x), y^k \in \widehat{\partial}\varphi(x^k) \text{ with } y^k \rightarrow y \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define  $\text{dom}(\partial\varphi) := \{x \in \text{dom}(\varphi) : \partial\varphi(x) \neq \emptyset\}$ . A vector  $x^* \in \text{dom}(\varphi)$  is said to be a stationary point of  $\varphi$  if  $0 \in \widehat{\partial}\varphi(x^*)$ . It is straightforward to verify that  $\widehat{\partial}\varphi(x) \subseteq \partial\varphi(x)$ ,  $\widehat{\partial}(\alpha\varphi)(x) = \alpha\widehat{\partial}\varphi(x)$  and  $\partial(\alpha\varphi)(x) = \alpha\partial\varphi(x)$  hold for any  $x \in \text{dom}(\varphi)$  and  $\alpha > 0$ . If  $\varphi$  is convex, Fréchet subdifferential and limiting subdifferential coincide with the classical subdifferential at any  $x \in \text{dom}(\varphi)$  ([30, Proposition 8.12]), i.e.,

$$\widehat{\partial}\varphi(x) = \partial\varphi(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \varphi(z) - \varphi(x) - \langle y, z - x \rangle \geq 0, \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

It is known that  $\widehat{\partial}\varphi(x) = \{\nabla\varphi(x)\}$  if  $\varphi$  is differentiable at  $x$ . We say  $\varphi$  is continuously differentiable at  $x$ , if  $\varphi$  is differentiable on some  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  and  $\nabla\varphi$  is continuous at  $x$ . It can be verify that  $\partial\varphi(x) = \{\nabla\varphi(x)\}$  holds if  $\varphi$  is continuously differentiable at  $x$ . In addition, there are some useful calculus results on Fréchet subdifferential. Let proper functions  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be closed, and  $x \in \text{dom}(\varphi_1) \cap \text{dom}(\varphi_2)$ , then  $\widehat{\partial}\varphi_1(x) + \widehat{\partial}\varphi_2(x) \subseteq \widehat{\partial}(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)(x)$  ([30, Corollary 10.9]), where the equality holds if  $\varphi_1$  or  $\varphi_2$  is differentiable at  $x$  ([30, Exercise 8.8(c)]). Note that,  $\partial(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)(x) \subseteq \partial\varphi_1(x) + \partial\varphi_2(x)$  holds when  $\varphi_1$  or  $\varphi_2$  is locally Lipschitz continuous at  $x$  ([30, Exercise 10.10]), and holds with equality when  $\varphi_1$  or  $\varphi_2$  is continuously differentiable at  $x$  ([30, Exercise 10.10 and Theorem 9.13(a)(c)]). Let proper functions  $\varphi_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ ,

$i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ , be closed, then for the block-separable function  $\varphi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(x_i)$ , there hold  $\widehat{\partial}\varphi(x) = \widehat{\partial}\varphi_1(x_1) \times \widehat{\partial}\varphi_2(x_2) \times \dots \times \widehat{\partial}\varphi_N(x_N)$  and  $\partial\varphi(x) = \partial\varphi_1(x_1) \times \partial\varphi_2(x_2) \times \dots \times \partial\varphi_N(x_N)$  at any  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \in \text{dom}(\varphi_1) \times \dots \times \text{dom}(\varphi_N)$  ([30, Proposition 10.5]).

Next we review quotient rules for the Fréchet subdifferential of  $\varphi_1/\varphi_2$ . To this end, we first assume  $\text{dom}(\varphi_2) = \mathbb{R}^n$  and introduce two functions related to the ratio of  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ . The first one is  $\tau : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  defined at  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  as

$$\tau(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{\varphi_1(x)}{\varphi_2(x)}, & \text{if } x \in \text{dom}(\varphi_1) \text{ and } \varphi_2(x) \neq 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

The second one is  $\rho : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  defined at  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  as

$$\rho(x, y) := \begin{cases} \frac{\varphi_1(x)}{\langle x, y \rangle - \varphi_2^*(y)}, & \text{if } (x, y) \in \text{dom}(\varphi_1) \times \text{dom}(\varphi_2^*) \text{ and } \langle x, y \rangle - \varphi_2^*(y) > 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

where  $\varphi_2^*$  is the convex conjugate of  $\varphi_2$ , i.e.,  $\varphi_2^*(y) := \sup\{\langle x, y \rangle - \varphi_2(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ . We also need the concept of calmness condition [30, Section 8.F]. The function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is said to satisfy the calmness condition at  $x \in \text{dom}(\varphi)$  relative to  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , if there exists  $\kappa_x > 0$  and a neighborhood  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  of  $x$ , such that  $|\varphi(u) - \varphi(x)| \leq \kappa_x \|u - x\|_2$  holds for any  $u \in \mathcal{B}(x) \cap \mathcal{A}$ . We say  $\varphi$  satisfies the calmness condition on  $\mathcal{A}$ , if  $\varphi$  satisfies the calmness condition at each point in  $\mathcal{A}$  relative to  $\mathcal{A}$ . The following proposition concerns the Fréchet subdifferentials of  $\tau$  and  $\rho$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $(x, y) \in \text{dom}(\varphi_1) \times \text{dom}(\varphi_2^*)$  and  $a_1 = \varphi_1(x)$ ,  $a_2 = \varphi_2(x)$ ,  $a_3 = \langle x, y \rangle - \varphi_2^*(y)$ . Suppose that  $\varphi_1$  is continuous at  $x$  relative to  $\text{dom}(\varphi_1)$ , then the following two statements hold.*

(i) [43, Proposition 2.2] *If  $a_2 > 0$  and  $\varphi_2$  satisfies the calmness condition at  $x$ , then*

$$\widehat{\partial}\tau(x) = \frac{\widehat{\partial}(a_2\varphi_1 - a_1\varphi_2)(x)}{a_2^2};$$

(ii) [21, Proposition 2.3] *If  $a_1 > 0$ ,  $a_3 > 0$  and  $\varphi_2^*$  satisfies the calmness condition at  $y$  relative to  $\text{dom}(\varphi_2^*)$ , then*

$$\widehat{\partial}\rho(x, y) = \frac{a_3\widehat{\partial}\varphi_1(x) - a_1y}{a_3^2} \times \frac{\widehat{\partial}(a_1\varphi_2^*)(y) - a_1x}{a_3^2}.$$

The following proposition is about the limiting subdifferentials of  $\tau$  and  $\rho$ .

**Proposition 2.2.** *Suppose that  $\varphi_1$  is closed and continuous on  $\text{dom}(\varphi_1)$ .*

- (i) Let  $x \in \text{dom}(\tau)$  with  $a_1 = \varphi_1(x) > 0$  and  $a_2 = \varphi_2(x) > 0$ . If  $\varphi_2$  is locally Lipschitz continuous around  $x$  and such that  $\widehat{\partial}\varphi_2(x)$  is nonempty around this point,<sup>1</sup> then

$$\partial\tau(x) \subseteq \frac{1}{a_2} \left( \partial\varphi_1(x) - \frac{a_1}{a_2} \partial\varphi_2(x) \right), \quad (6)$$

and hence  $\text{dom}(\partial\tau) \subseteq \text{dom}(\partial\varphi_1)$ . Furthermore, the relation (6) becomes an equality if  $\varphi_2$  is continuously differentiable at  $x$ .

- (ii) Let  $(x, y) \in \text{dom}(\rho)$  with  $a_1 = \varphi_1(x) > 0$  and  $a_3 = \langle x, y \rangle - \varphi_2^*(y) > 0$ . If  $\varphi_2^*$  satisfies the calmness condition around  $x$  relative to  $\text{dom}(\varphi_2^*)$ , then

$$\partial\rho(x, y) = \frac{1}{a_3} \left( \left( \partial\varphi_1(x) - \frac{a_1}{a_3} y \right) \times \frac{a_1}{a_3} (\partial\varphi_2^*(y) - x) \right),$$

and hence  $\text{dom}(\partial\rho) = \text{dom}(\partial\varphi_1) \times \text{dom}(\partial\varphi_2^*)$ .

*Proof.* Due to the continuity of  $\varphi_1$  on  $\text{dom}(\varphi_1)$  and the Lipschitz continuity of  $\varphi_2$  around  $x$ , there exists some neighborhood  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  of  $x$  such that  $\varphi_1 > 0$  and  $\varphi_2 > 0$  holds on  $\mathcal{B}(x) \cap \text{dom}(\tau)$ , while  $\widehat{\partial}\varphi_2$  is uniformly bounded on  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  (see [24, Theorem 3.52]). Let  $w \in \partial\tau(x)$ . By the definition of limiting subdifferentials, there exists some  $x^k \in \mathcal{B}(x) \cap \text{dom}(\tau) \rightarrow x$  with  $\tau(x^k) \rightarrow \tau(x)$ ,  $w^k \in \widehat{\partial}\tau(x^k)$  and  $w^k \rightarrow w$ . Owing to  $\varphi_1(x^k) > 0$  and  $\varphi_2(x^k) > 0$ , Proposition 2.1 (i) indicates that

$$\widehat{\partial}\tau(x^k) = \frac{\widehat{\partial}(\varphi_1 - \tau(x^k)\varphi_2)(x^k)}{\varphi_2(x^k)} \subseteq \frac{1}{\varphi_2(x^k)} \left( \widehat{\partial}\varphi_1(x^k) - \tau(x^k)\widehat{\partial}\varphi_2(x^k) \right), \quad (7)$$

where the last relation is deduced by invoking [25, Theorem 3.1] and noting that  $\widehat{\partial}\varphi_2(x)$  is nonempty for the real-valued function  $\varphi$ . It follows from (7) that each  $w^k \in \widehat{\partial}\tau(x^k)$  can be represented by  $w^k = (v_1^k - \tau(x^k)v_2^k) / \varphi_2(x^k)$  with some  $(v_1^k, v_2^k) \in \widehat{\partial}\varphi_1(x^k) \times \widehat{\partial}\varphi_2(x^k)$ . Since  $x^k$  belongs to  $\mathcal{B}(x)$ , where  $\widehat{\partial}\varphi_2$  is uniformly bounded, the boundedness of  $\{v_2^k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  yields some subsequence  $v_2^{k_j} \in \widehat{\partial}\varphi_2(x^{k_j})$  converging to some  $v_2 \in \partial\varphi_2(x)$ . By passing to the limit with  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , we then obtain  $v_1 := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} v_1^{k_j} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_2(x^{k_j})w^{k_j} + \tau(x^{k_j})v_2^{k_j} = a_2w + \frac{a_1}{a_2}v_2$ . Besides, we have  $v_1 \in \partial\varphi_1(x)$  due to  $v_1^k \in \widehat{\partial}\varphi_1(x^k)$ ,  $v_1^k \rightarrow v_1$ ,  $x^k \rightarrow x$  and the continuity of  $\varphi_1$  on  $\text{dom}(\varphi_1)$ . Consequently, for any  $w \in \partial\tau(x)$ , there exists some  $(v_1, v_2) \in \partial\varphi_1(x) \times \partial\varphi_2(x)$  such that  $w = \frac{1}{a_2}(v_1 - \frac{a_1}{a_2}v_2)$ , and hence the relation (6) holds. Specially when  $\varphi_2$  is continuously differentiable around  $x$ , the relation (6) holds with equality since (7) becomes equality. Item (ii) is derived from Proposition 2.1 (ii), while the proof is omitted here for the similarity to the proof of Item (i).  $\square$

To end this subsection, we recall some useful properties on the subdifferential of a convex real-valued function. Let  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be convex. Then  $\varphi$  is locally Lipschitz continuous [5, Corollary 8.31, Theorem 8.29], and  $\cup_{x \in \mathcal{A}} \partial\varphi(x)$  is nonempty and

---

<sup>1</sup>These assumptions on  $\varphi_2$  automatically hold when  $\varphi_2$  is convex and continuous around  $x$ .

bounded on any compact set  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  ([8, Proposition 5.4.2]). For a proper closed convex function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ , the conjugate  $\varphi^*$  is also a proper closed convex function ([30, Theorem 11.1]) and  $(\varphi^*)^* = \varphi$  ([6, Theorem 4.8]). Moreover, it is known that the following equivalence holds ([30, Proposition 11.3]):

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \varphi(x) + \varphi^*(y) \Leftrightarrow y \in \partial\varphi(x) \Leftrightarrow x \in \partial\varphi^*(y).$$

## 2.2 KL property

We now recall KL property, which has been used extensively in the convergence analysis of various first-order methods.

**Definition 1** (KL property and KL exponent [2]). *A proper function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is said to satisfy the KL property at  $x \in \text{dom}(\partial\varphi)$  if there exist  $\epsilon \in (0, +\infty]$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and a continuous concave function  $\phi : [0, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ := [0, +\infty)$  such that:*

- (i)  $\phi(0) = 0$ ;
- (ii)  $\phi$  is continuously differentiable on  $(0, \epsilon)$  with  $\phi' > 0$ ;
- (iii) For any  $z \in \mathcal{B}_\varphi^\epsilon(x, \delta)$ , there holds  $\phi'(\varphi(z) - \varphi(x)) \text{dist}(0, \partial\varphi(z)) \geq 1$ .

If  $\varphi$  satisfies the KL property at  $x \in \text{dom}(\partial\varphi)$  and the  $\phi$  can be chosen as  $\phi(z) = a_0 z^{1-\theta}$  for some  $a_0 > 0$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1)$ , then we say that  $\varphi$  satisfies the KL property at  $x$  with the exponent  $\theta$ .

A proper function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is called a KL function if it satisfies the KL property at any point in  $\text{dom}(\partial\varphi)$ , and a proper function  $\varphi$  satisfying the KL property with exponent  $\theta \in [0, 1)$  at every point in  $\text{dom}(\partial\varphi)$  is called a KL function with exponent  $\theta$ . For connections between the KL property and the well-known error bound theory [23, 26], we refer the interested refers to [12, 20].

A wide range of functions are KL functions. Among those functions, the proper lower semicontinuous semialgebraic functions (see [13, Theorem 3]) cover most frequently appearing functions in applications. A function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is said to be semialgebraic if its graph  $\text{Graph}(\varphi) := \{(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} : s = \varphi(x)\}$  is a semialgebraic subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , that is, there exist a finite number of real polynomial functions  $G_{ij}, H_{ij} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\text{Graph}(\varphi) = \bigcup_{j=1}^p \bigcap_{i=1}^q \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : G_{ij}(z) = 0, H_{ij}(z) < 0\}.$$

In addition, [2] and [11, Theorem 3.1] pointed out that a proper closed semialgebraic function is a KL function with some exponent  $\theta \in [0, 1)$ .

The following lemma regards the result of the uniformized KL property.

**Lemma 2.3** (Uniformized KL property). *Let  $\Upsilon \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be a compact set, and the proper function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be constant on  $\Upsilon$ .*

- (i) *If  $\varphi$  satisfies the KL property at each point of  $\Upsilon$ , then there exist  $\epsilon > 0$  and a continuous concave function  $\phi : [0, \epsilon) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  satisfying Definition 1 (i) and (ii); besides, there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\phi'(\varphi(z) - \varphi(x)) \text{dist}(0, \partial\varphi(z)) \geq 1$  holds for any  $x \in \Upsilon$  and  $z \in \mathcal{B}_\varphi^\epsilon(x, \delta)$ .*



- (ii) If  $\varphi$  satisfies the KL property at each point of  $\Upsilon$  with the exponent  $\theta \in [0, 1)$ , then there exist  $\epsilon, \delta, c > 0$  such that  $\text{dist}(0, \partial\varphi(z)) \geq c(\varphi(z) - \varphi(x))^\theta$  holds for any  $x \in \Upsilon$  and  $z \in \mathcal{B}_\varphi^\epsilon(x, \delta)$ .

Lemma 2.3 can be found in [13, Lemma 6] and [41, Lemma 2.2] with an additional assumption that  $\varphi$  is lower semicontinuous on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . However, we notice that this assumption is not used in the proof of [13, Lemma 6] and [41, Lemma 2.2]. Thus, we present Lemma 2.3 without assuming the lower semicontinuity of  $\varphi$ . Thanks to Lemma 2.3, we generalize the framework proposed in [3, Theorem 1] for proving global sequential convergence in the next proposition.

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $H : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be proper, and  $\{a_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a nonnegative scalar sequence. Consider a bounded sequence  $\{(x^k, y^k) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  satisfying the following three conditions:*

- (i) (Sufficient decrease condition.) *There exist  $C_1 > 0$  and  $K_1 > 0$  such that*

$$H(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) + C_1 (\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2^2 + a_k \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|_2^2) \leq H(x^k, y^k)$$

*holds for any  $k \geq K_1$ ;*

- (ii) (Relative error condition.) *There exist  $C_2 > 0$  and  $K_2 > 0$  such that*

$$\|w^{k+1}\|_2 \leq C_2 (\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2 + \sqrt{a_k} \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|_2)$$

*holds with some  $w^{k+1} \in \partial H(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  for any  $k \geq K_2$ ;*

- (iii) (Continuity condition.)  *$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} H(x^k, y^k) = \xi$  exists, and  $H \equiv \xi$  holds on  $\Upsilon$ , where  $\Upsilon$  is the set of accumulation points of  $\{(x^k, y^k) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .*

*If  $H$  satisfies the KL property at each point of  $\Upsilon$ , then there hold:*

- (i)  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2 + \sqrt{a_k} \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|_2) < +\infty$ ;  
(ii)  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x^k = x^*$  for some  $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ;  
(iii)  $0 \in \partial H(x^*, y^*)$  for any  $(x^*, y^*) \in \Upsilon$ .

We prove this Proposition 2.4 in Appendix A.

### 3 The relationship between problems (1) and (5)

In this section, we establish the relationship between optimal solutions and critical points, as well as KL exponents for the extended objectives of problem (1) and problem (5). The extended objective  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  of problem (1) is defined at  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  as

$$F(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{f(x)+h(x)}{g(x)}, & \text{if } x \in \Omega \cap \text{dom}(f), \\ +\infty, & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

By introducing  $\zeta(x) := f(x) + h(x)$  and  $\eta(x, y) := \langle x, y \rangle - g^*(y)$ , the extended objective  $Q : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  of problem (5) is defined at  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  as

$$Q(x, y) := \begin{cases} \frac{\zeta(x)}{\eta(x, y)}, & \text{if } (x, y) \in \text{dom}(f) \times \text{dom}(g^*) \text{ and } \eta(x, y) > 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

It is worth noting that: (i) For any  $x \in \text{dom}(F)$ , we have  $\{x\} \times \partial g(x) \subseteq \text{dom}(Q)$ ; (ii) For any  $(x, y) \in \text{dom}(Q)$ , there holds  $x \in \text{dom}(F)$ . Thanks to the above extended objectives, problems (1) and (5) can be rewritten as  $\min\{F(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$  and  $\min\{Q(x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n\}$ , respectively. We next prove the equivalence of problems (1) and (5) in the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.1.** *The functions  $F$  and  $Q$  respectively given by (8) and (9) have the same infimum. Let  $(x^*, y^*) \in \text{dom}(Q)$ . Then,  $x^*$  is a global minimizer of  $F$  with  $F(x^*)y^* \in F(x^*)\partial g(x^*)$ , if and only if  $(x^*, y^*)$  is a global minimizer of  $Q$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $f + h \geq 0$  and  $\partial g(x) \neq \emptyset$  holds for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the Fenchel-Young Inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf \{F(x) : x \in \text{dom}(F)\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \frac{f(x) + h(x)}{\langle x, y \rangle - g^*(y)} : x \in \text{dom}(f), \langle x, y \rangle - g^*(y) > 0, y \in \partial g(x) \right\} \quad (10) \\ &= \inf \{Q(x, y) : (x, y) \in \text{dom}(Q)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $x^*$  be a global minimizer of  $F$  and  $F(x^*)y^* \in F(x^*)\partial g(x^*)$ . Then, when  $F(x^*) > 0$ , there holds

$$\frac{f(x^*) + h(x^*)}{\langle x^*, y^* \rangle - g^*(y^*)} = \frac{f(x^*) + h(x^*)}{g(x^*)} = \inf \{F(x) : x \in \text{dom}(F)\}, \quad (11)$$

hence it follows from (10) and (11) that  $(x^*, y^*)$  is a global minimizer of  $Q$ . Besides,  $(x^*, y^*)$ , taking  $Q(x^*, y^*) = 0$ , is still a global minimizer of  $Q$  when  $F(x^*) = 0$ . Conversely, suppose  $(x^*, y^*) \in \text{dom}(Q)$  is a global minimizer of  $Q$ . Then we have

$$\frac{f(x^*) + h(x^*)}{g(x^*)} \leq \frac{f(x^*) + h(x^*)}{\langle x^*, y^* \rangle - g^*(y^*)} = \inf \{Q(x, y) : (x, y) \in \text{dom}(Q)\}. \quad (12)$$

By combining (10) and (12), we deduce that  $x^*$  is a global minimizer of  $F$ . Therefore, it is derived from the first relation of (12), which holds with equality actually, that  $F(x^*)(\langle x^*, y^* \rangle - g^*(y^*)) = f(x^*) + h(x^*) = F(x^*)g(x^*)$ , then  $F(x^*)y^* \in F(x^*)\partial g(x^*)$  follows. This completes the proof.  $\square$

We next shall show the connections between critical points of  $F$  and stationary points of  $Q$ . To this end, we recall the definition of critical points of problem (1).

**Definition 2** (Critical points of  $F$  [43, Definition 3.4]). *Let  $F$  be defined as (8). Then  $x^* \in \text{dom}(F)$  is said to be a critical point of  $F$  if*

$$0 \in \widehat{\partial}f(x^*) + \nabla h(x^*) - F(x^*)\partial g(x^*).$$

It is demonstrated by [43, below Definition 3.4] that the statement that  $x^* \in \text{dom}(F)$  is a critical point of  $F$  coincides with the statements that  $x^* \in \text{dom}(F)$  is a stationary point of  $F$ , i.e.,  $0 \in \widehat{\partial}F(x^*)$ , when the denominator  $g$  is differentiable. The

following proposition shows the equivalence between critical points of  $F$  and stationary points of  $Q$ , when  $g^*$  is continuous on its domain.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $(x^*, y^*) \in \text{dom}(Q)$ , and  $g^*$  be continuous on  $\text{dom}(g^*)$ . Then,  $x^*$  is a critical point of  $F$  with  $F(x^*)y^* \in F(x^*)\partial g(x^*)$ , if and only if  $(x^*, y^*)$  is a stationary point of  $Q$ , i.e.,  $0 \in \widehat{\partial}Q(x^*, y^*)$ .*

*Proof.* It is trivial for Proposition 3.2 when  $F(x^*) = 0$ , since  $x^*$  and  $(x^*, y^*)$  are global minimizers of  $F$  and  $Q$ , respectively. Now we deal with the case when  $F(x^*) > 0$ . To this end, we introduce an auxiliary function for  $(x^*, y^*) \in \text{dom}(Q)$  by

$$\phi_{(x^*, y^*)}(x, y) := \eta(x^*, y^*)\zeta(x) - \zeta(x^*)\eta(x, y).$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\substack{(x, y) \in \text{dom}(Q) \\ (x, y) \rightarrow (x^*, y^*)}} \frac{Q(x, y) - Q(x^*, y^*)}{\|(x, y) - (x^*, y^*)\|_2} &= \liminf_{\substack{(x, y) \in \text{dom}(Q) \\ (x, y) \rightarrow (x^*, y^*)}} \frac{\phi_{(x^*, y^*)}(x, y)}{\eta(x^*, y^*)\eta(x, y)\|(x, y) - (x^*, y^*)\|_2} \\ &= \eta^{-2}(x^*, y^*) \liminf_{\substack{(x, y) \in \text{dom}(\phi_{(x^*, y^*)}) \\ (x, y) \rightarrow (x^*, y^*)}} \frac{\phi_{(x^*, y^*)}(x, y)}{\|(x, y) - (x^*, y^*)\|_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the last equality follows from the continuity of  $g^*$  on  $\text{dom}(g^*)$  and  $\eta(x^*, y^*) > 0$ . Besides, for any  $(x, y) \in \text{dom}(\phi_{(x^*, y^*)}) = \text{dom}(f) \times \text{dom}(g^*)$ , there holds

$$\widehat{\partial}\phi_{(x^*, y^*)}(x, y) = \left( \eta(x^*, y^*)\widehat{\partial}\zeta(x) - \zeta(x^*)y \right) \times \left( \widehat{\partial}(\zeta(x^*)g^*)(y) - \zeta(x^*)x \right).$$

If  $x^*$  is a critical point of  $F$  with  $y^* \in \partial g(x^*)$ , there holds  $0 \in \widehat{\partial}\phi_{(x^*, y^*)}(x^*, y^*)$ , and thus we derive  $0 \in \widehat{\partial}Q(x^*, y^*)$  from (13) with the fact that  $\phi_{(x^*, y^*)}(x^*, y^*) = 0$ . Conversely, based on (13), the statement  $0 \in \widehat{\partial}Q(x^*, y^*)$  indicates  $0 \in \widehat{\partial}\phi_{(x^*, y^*)}(x^*, y^*)$ , with which we deduce that  $x^*$  is a critical point of  $F$  and  $y^* \in \partial g(x^*)$  owing to  $\zeta(x^*) = F(x^*)g(x^*) > 0$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

In particular when  $g$  is continuously differentiable on  $\Omega$  and  $g^*$  satisfies the calmness condition on  $\text{dom}(g^*)$ , we have  $\eta(x, \nabla g(x)) = g(x)$  and  $x \in \partial g^*(\nabla g(x))$  for any  $x \in \Omega$ . Then, there holds for any  $x \in \text{dom}(F)$  that

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x)) = \text{dist}(0, \partial Q(x, \nabla g(x))). \quad (14)$$

Specifically speaking, in the case when  $\zeta(x) > 0$ , the equation (14) holds due to  $\partial F(x) = \frac{1}{g(x)}(\partial\zeta(x) - F(x)\nabla g(x))$  and  $\partial Q(x, \nabla g(x)) = \partial F(x) \times \frac{F(x)}{g(x)}(\partial g^*(\nabla g(x)) - x)$ , which is indicated by Proposition 2.2. In the case when  $\zeta(x) = 0$ , since  $x$  and  $(x, \nabla g(x))$  become global minimizers of  $F$  and  $Q$ , respectively, we have  $0 \in \partial F(x)$  and  $0 \in \partial Q(x, \nabla g(x))$ . Thus, it follows that  $\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x)) = \text{dist}(0, \partial Q(x, \nabla g(x))) = 0$ . Owing to the closedness of the limiting subdifferential, we further deduce from (14) that  $0 \in \partial F(x)$  coincides with  $0 \in \partial Q(x, \nabla g(x))$ .

The next theorem demonstrates the connections between KL exponents of  $F$  and  $Q$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $\bar{x} \in \text{dom}(\partial F)$ . Suppose that  $g^*$  satisfies the calmness condition on  $\text{dom}(g^*)$ . If  $Q$  satisfies the KL property with the exponent  $\theta \in [0, 1)$  at  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  for any  $\bar{y} \in \partial g(\bar{x})$ , then  $F$  satisfies the KL property with the same exponent  $\theta$  at  $\bar{x}$ .*

*Proof.* We first claim that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}} \left\{ \text{dist}(y, \partial g(\bar{x})) : y \in \partial g(x) \right\} = 0. \quad (15)$$

We prove the equation (15) by contradiction. Suppose (15) does not hold, then there exist some  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $x^k \rightarrow \bar{x}$  and  $y^k \in \partial g(x^k)$  such that  $\text{dist}(y^k, \partial g(\bar{x})) > \epsilon$ , since  $\partial g(x)$  is nonempty and compact for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . The boundedness of  $\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \partial g(x^k)$  implies some subsequence  $y^{k_j} \rightarrow y^*$ , and  $\text{dist}(y^*, \partial g(\bar{x})) \geq \epsilon$  follows. However, by the definition of limiting subdifferentials, we have  $y^* \in \partial g(\bar{x})$  upon the fact that  $y^{k_j} \in \partial g(x^{k_j})$  and  $x^{k_j} \rightarrow \bar{x}$ . Thus, the contradiction implies that (15) holds.

Now we go back to the proof of the KL exponents of  $F$ . Since  $Q \equiv F(\bar{x})$  holds on the compact set  $\{\bar{x}\} \times \partial g(\bar{x})$ , the function  $Q$  has the uniformized KL exponent with the help of Lemma 2.3 (ii). That is, there exists  $c, \delta_1 > 0$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, +\infty]$  such that

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial Q(x, y)) \geq c(Q(x, y) - F(\bar{x}))^\theta \quad (16)$$

holds for any  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U} := \{(x, y) : \text{dist}((x, y), (\bar{x}, \partial g(\bar{x}))) \leq \delta_1\}$  satisfying  $Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) < Q(x, y) < Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + \epsilon$ . With regard to  $g(\bar{x}) > 0$ , we assume further that the  $\delta_1 > 0$  is small enough so that  $g > 0$  holds on  $\mathcal{U}$ . Besides, the equation (15) implies some  $\delta_2 > 0$  such that  $\sup\{\text{dist}(y, \partial g(\bar{x})) : y \in \partial g(x)\} \leq \delta_1$  holds for any  $x \in \mathcal{B}(\bar{x}, \delta_2)$ . By taking  $\delta := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ , one can verify that (16) holds for any  $x \in \mathcal{B}_F^\epsilon(\bar{x}, \delta)$  and  $y \in \partial g(x)$ , meanwhile  $\zeta > 0$  and  $g > 0$  holds on  $\mathcal{B}_F^\zeta(\bar{x}, \delta)$ . Owing to Proposition 2.2 (i), it holds for any  $x \in \mathcal{B}_F^\epsilon(\bar{x}, \delta) \cap \text{dom}(\partial F)$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(0, \partial F(x)) &\geq \text{dist}\left(0, \frac{1}{g(x)}(\partial \zeta(x) - F(x)\partial g(x))\right) \\ &\stackrel{(I)}{=} \min \left\{ \text{dist}\left(0, \frac{1}{g(x)}(\partial \zeta(x) - F(x)y)\right) : y \in \partial g(x) \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ \text{dist}\left(0, \frac{1}{\eta(x, y)}(\partial \zeta(x) - Q(x, y)y, Q(x, y)(\partial g^*(y) - x))\right) : y \in \partial g(x) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(II)}{=} \min\{\text{dist}(0, \partial Q(x, y)) : y \in \partial g(x)\} \\ &\stackrel{(III)}{\geq} \min\{c(Q(x, y) - F(\bar{x}))^\theta : y \in \partial g(x)\} = c(F(x) - F(\bar{x}))^\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where (I) follows from the compactness of  $\partial g(x)$ , and (II) comes from Proposition 2.2 (ii), and (III) holds thanks to (16). This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 4 A framework of multi-proximity gradient algorithms

In this section, we propose a framework of multi-proximity gradient algorithms for solving problem (1) and show that it has several desired properties. We first introduce the notion of proximity operators. For a proper closed function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ , the proximity operator of  $\varphi$  at  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , denoted by  $\text{prox}_\varphi(x)$ , is defined by

$$\text{prox}_\varphi(x) := \arg \min \left\{ \varphi(z) + \frac{1}{2} \|z - x\|_2^2 : z \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}.$$

The proximity operator  $\text{prox}_\varphi(x)$  is single-valued if  $\varphi$  is convex and may be set-valued when  $\varphi$  is nonconvex. Below we present a sufficient condition for a stationary point of  $Q$  and a critical point of  $F$  using proximity operators of  $f_i$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$  and  $g^*$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *If  $(x^*, y^*) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfies*

$$y^* = \text{prox}_{\alpha_0 g^*}(y^* + \alpha_0 x^*), \quad (17)$$

$$x_i^* \in \text{prox}_{\alpha_i f_i}(x_i^* - \alpha_i \nabla_i h(x^*) + \alpha_i Q(x^*, y^*) y_i^*), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N, \quad (18)$$

for some  $\alpha_i > 0$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$ , then  $x^*$  is a critical point of  $F$  with  $y^* \in \partial g(x^*)$ , and hence  $(x^*, y^*) \in \text{dom}(Q)$  is a stationary point of  $Q$  if  $g^*$  is continuous on  $\text{dom}(g^*)$ .

*Proof.* By the definition of proximity operators and the generalized *Fermat's Rule*, (17) implies  $0 \in \partial g^*(y^*) - x^*$ . Therefore, we obtain  $y^* \in \partial g(x^*)$ ,  $\eta(x^*, y^*) = g(x^*) > 0$  and  $Q(x^*, y^*) = F(x^*)$ . Moreover, (18) implies

$$0 \in \widehat{\partial} f_i(x_i^*) + \nabla_i h(x^*) - F(x^*) y_i^*, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N. \quad (19)$$

In view of Definition 2 and  $\widehat{\partial} f(x^*) = \widehat{\partial} f_1(x_1^*) \times \widehat{\partial} f_2(x_2^*) \times \dots \times \widehat{\partial} f_N(x_N^*)$ , we deduce that  $x^*$  is a critical point of  $F$  with  $y^* \in \partial g(x^*)$ . Besides, with the help of Proposition 3.2, we obtain  $0 \in \widehat{\partial} Q(x^*, y^*)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Motivated by Proposition 4.1, we propose a framework of multi-proximity gradient algorithms (MPGA) for solving problem (1), which is described in Algorithm 1. Each iteration of MPGA starts with picking an index  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$ . If the selected  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ , then the algorithm solves a proximal subproblem associated with  $x_i$  while keeping the other blocks at their last updated values. Also, we take advantage of the nonmonotone line search scheme in [14, 22, 33, 37] to find an appropriate step-size which can ensure a certain progress is achieved at the iteration. If the selected  $i = 0$ , then the MPGA simply performs a proximity step of  $g^*$  with respect to  $y$ , while fixing  $x$  at its newest updated value. This framework of MPGA is very flexible since the way to choose an index  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$  is not specified. We next discuss the well-definedness of MPGA. Specifically, according to MPGA, we shall show that the nonmonotone line search can terminate in finite steps, and the sequence  $(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)})$  generated by MPGA falls into  $\text{dom}(Q)$ , in the sense that the denominator  $\eta$  which the objective  $Q$  involves is

always positive at each iteration  $(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)})$ . To this end, we introduce the following assumption.

---

**Algorithm 1** A framework of multi-proximity gradient algorithm (MPGA) for solving problem (1).

---

- Step 0.** Input  $x^{(0)} \in \text{dom}(F)$ ,  $y^{(0)} \in \partial g(x^{(0)})$ ,  
 $0 < \underline{\alpha} \leq \bar{\alpha}$ ,  $\sigma > 0$ ,  $0 < \gamma < 1$  and an integer  $M \geq 0$ . Set  $t \leftarrow 0$ .
- Step 1.** Compute  $Q_{(t)} = Q(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)})$ .  
Compute  $l(t) = \max\{j \leq t : Q_{(j)} = \max\{Q_{(s)} : [t - M]_+ \leq s \leq t\}\}$ .
- Step 2.** Pick  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$ . If  $i = 0$ , set  $\alpha := \tilde{\alpha}_Y \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$  and go to Step 2-Y;  
otherwise, set  $\alpha := \tilde{\alpha}_{(t)} \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$  and go to Step 2-X.
- Step 2-Y. Compute  $y^{(t)}(\alpha) = \text{prox}_{\alpha g^*}(y^{(t)} + \alpha x^{(t)})$ .  
Set  $(x^{(t+1)}, y^{(t+1)}) \leftarrow (x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}(\alpha))$ . Go to **Step 3**.
- Step 2-X. Compute  $x_i^{(t)}(\alpha) \in \text{prox}_{\alpha f_i}(x_i^{(t)} - \alpha \nabla_i h(x^{(t)}) + \alpha Q_{(t)} y_i^{(t)})$ .  
Let  $x^{(t),i}(\alpha) = [x_1^{(t)}; x_2^{(t)}; \dots; x_{i-1}^{(t)}; x_i^{(t)}(\alpha); x_{i+1}^{(t)}; \dots; x_N^{(t)}]$ .  
If  $\zeta(x^{(t),i}(\alpha)) + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|x^{(t),i}(\alpha) - x^{(t)}\|_2^2 \leq Q_{(l(t))} \eta(x^{(t),i}(\alpha), y^{(t)})$ .  
then set  $(x^{(t+1)}, y^{(t+1)}) \leftarrow (x^{(t),i}(\alpha), y^{(t)})$  and go to **Step 3**;  
Else, set  $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha \gamma$  and go to Step 2-X.
- Step 3.** Record  $i_{(t)} := i$  and  $\alpha_{(t)} := \alpha$ , set  $t \leftarrow t + 1$ , and go to **Step 1**.
- 

**Assumption 2.** The level set  $\mathcal{X} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : F(x) \leq F(x^{(0)})\}$  is compact.

We remark that boundedness of the level set associated with the extended objective is a standard assumption in the literatures of nonconvex optimization, while its closedness automatically holds in many cases due to the lower semi-continuity of the extended objective. However,  $F$  in (8) may be not lower semicontinuous in general, which necessitates the closedness condition in Assumption 2. In [43, Proposition 4.4], it is shown that  $F$  is lower semicontinuous once  $\zeta$  and  $g$  do not attain zero simultaneously. This condition, in particular, is satisfied for the  $L_1/S_K$  sparse signal recovery model (3), where the numerator always takes positive values. Combining this observation and invoking the constraint  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \underline{x} \leq x \leq \bar{x}\}$ , we conclude that Assumption 2 is fulfilled by MPGA for model (3) with an arbitrary initial point  $x^{(0)}$ . On the other hand, if  $\zeta$  and  $g$  do attain zero simultaneously, we can still ensure the closedness of  $\mathcal{X}$  by properly choosing  $x^{(0)}$  as shown in the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.2.** Suppose that the set  $\mathcal{O} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \zeta(x) = g(x) = 0\}$  is nonempty. Then,  $\mathcal{X}$  is closed, if  $x^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfies

$$F(x^{(0)}) < \inf \left\{ \liminf_{z \rightarrow x} F(z) : x \in \mathcal{O} \right\}. \quad (20)$$

*Proof.* We shall show that  $\mathcal{X}$  is closed by verifying that each accumulation point of  $\mathcal{X}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{X}$  when (20) is satisfied. Let  $x^*$  be an accumulation point of  $\mathcal{X}$  and some

sequence  $\{x^k : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  converge to  $x^*$ . Then there holds  $\zeta(x^k) \leq F(x^{(0)})g(x^k)$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  due to  $x^k \in \mathcal{X}$ , and  $\zeta(x^*) \leq F(x^{(0)})g(x^*)$  follows from the lower semi-continuity of  $\zeta$  and the continuity of  $g$ . Assume that  $g(x^*) = 0$ . This together with  $\zeta(x^*) \leq F(x^{(0)})g(x^*)$  leads to  $x^* \in \mathcal{O}$ . By invoking this and (20), we get  $F(x^{(0)}) < \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(x^k)$ , which contradicts the fact that  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(x^k) \leq F(x^{(0)})$ . Hence, we conclude that  $g(x^*) > 0$  and thus  $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ .  $\square$

For the  $L_1/L_2$  sparse signal recovery model (2), the zero vector is the unique point at which both  $\zeta$  and  $g$  vanish. According to Proposition 4.2 and model (2), if  $x^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfies  $F(x^{(0)}) < \liminf_{z \rightarrow 0} F(z) = 1 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|b\|_2^2$ , then the level set  $\mathcal{X}$  is closed. This with the boundedness of the constrain  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \underline{x} \leq x \leq \bar{x}\}$  tells that Assumption 2 is satisfied by MPGA for model (2) given a suitable initial point  $x^{(0)}$ .

**Remark 1.** Assumption 2 directly yields the following two results, which will be frequently used in our analysis for MPGA: (i) There exists  $\bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}} > 0$  such that  $\eta(x, y) \leq g(x) \leq \bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}}$  holds for any  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ ; (ii) In view of [15, Chapter 1, Exercise 7.5(c)], there exist some  $\mu > 0$  and  $L > 0$  such that  $\|\nabla h(u) - \nabla h(v)\|_2 \leq L\|u - v\|_2$  holds for any  $u, v \in \mathcal{X}_\mu$ , where  $\mathcal{X}_\mu := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{dist}(z, \mathcal{X}) \leq \mu\}$ .

To discuss that the proposed algorithm MPGA is well-defined, we need the following three technical lemmas. The first two focus on Step 2-Y, and the last one is on Step 2-X.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ , and  $y^+(\alpha) = \text{prox}_{\alpha g^*}(y + \alpha x)$ . Then the following statements hold:

- (i)  $\frac{y - y^+(\alpha)}{\alpha} + x \in \partial g^*(y^+(\alpha))$ ;
- (ii)  $\eta(x, y) + \frac{\|y - y^+(\alpha)\|_2^2}{\alpha} \leq \eta(x, y^+(\alpha)) \leq g(x)$ ;
- (iii) if  $(x, y) \in \text{dom}(Q)$ , then  $(x, y^+(\alpha)) \in \text{dom}(Q)$ , and

$$\zeta(x) + \frac{c}{\alpha}\|y - y^+(\alpha)\|_2^2 \leq c\eta(x, y^+(\alpha)) \quad (21)$$

holds for any  $c \in [Q(x, y), +\infty)$ .

*Proof.* By the definition of proximity operators and the convexity of  $g^*$ , we derive that  $0 \in \partial(\alpha g^*)(y^+(\alpha)) + (y^+(\alpha) - y - \alpha x)$ , and thus obtain Item (i). From Item (i), we have  $g^*(y) \geq g^*(y^+(\alpha)) + \langle \frac{1}{\alpha}(y - y^+(\alpha)) + x, y - y^+(\alpha) \rangle$ , which implies the first relation of Item (ii). By invoking the definition of  $\eta$ , the second relation of Item (ii) follows from the *Fenchel-Young Inequality*.

We finally prove Item (iii). Suppose  $(x, y) \in \text{dom}(Q)$ . Then Item (ii) and the fact that  $\eta(x, y) > 0$  leads to  $\eta(x, y^+(\alpha)) > 0$ . Hence, the assertion  $(x, y^+(\alpha)) \in \text{dom}(Q)$  follows from  $\eta(x, y^+(\alpha)) > 0$  and the fact that  $(x, y^+(\alpha)) \in \text{dom}(f) \times \text{dom}(g^*)$ . By multiplying  $c$  on the both sides of Item (ii), (21) is derived upon the fact  $\zeta(x) = Q(x, y)\eta(x, y) \leq c\eta(x, y)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Let  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $(x, y) \in \text{dom}(Q)$ , and  $\underline{\alpha} > 0$ . For any  $\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, +\infty)$ , the vector  $y^+(\alpha) = \text{prox}_{\alpha g^*}(y + \alpha x)$  falls into the compact set  $\mathcal{Y} := \cup_{z \in \mathcal{X}_{\underline{\alpha}}} \partial g(z)$  with  $\mathcal{X}_{\underline{\alpha}} := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{dist}^2(z, \mathcal{X}) \leq \bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}}/\underline{\alpha}\}$ , where  $\bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}} > 0$  is given by Remark 1 (i).

*Proof.* We first prove  $y^+(\alpha) \in \mathcal{Y}$ . On the one hand, Lemma 4.3 (ii) implies that  $\frac{1}{\alpha^2}\|y - y^+(\alpha)\|_2^2 \leq g(x)/\alpha \leq g(x)/\underline{\alpha}$  due to  $\eta(x, y) > 0$  following from  $(x, y) \in \text{dom}(Q)$ . On the other hand, from Lemma 4.3 (i), we derive  $w^+ := \frac{1}{\alpha}(y - y^+(\alpha)) + x \in \partial g^*(y^+(\alpha))$ , or equivalently,  $y^+(\alpha) \in \partial g(w^+)$ . Therefore, we conclude  $y^+(\alpha) \in \mathcal{Y}$  from  $y^+(\alpha) \in \partial g(w^+)$ ,  $\|w^+ - x\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{\alpha^2}\|y - y^+(\alpha)\|_2^2 \leq g(x)/\underline{\alpha}$  and the fact  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

Next, we shall show that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is compact. The boundedness of  $\mathcal{Y}$  follows from the boundedness of  $\mathcal{X}_{\underline{\alpha}}$ . We demonstrate the closedness of  $\mathcal{Y}$  by verifying that any accumulation point  $y^*$  belongs to the set  $\mathcal{Y}$ . To this end, we let  $\{y^k : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$  and  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y^k = y^*$ . Then, there exists  $w^k \in \mathcal{X}_{\underline{\alpha}}$  such that  $y^k \in \partial g(w^k)$ . Due to the compactness of  $\mathcal{X}_{\underline{\alpha}}$ , there exists a subsequence  $\{w^{k_j} : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$  converging to some  $w^* \in \mathcal{X}_{\underline{\alpha}}$ . Therefore, by letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$  in  $y^{k_j} \in \partial g(w^{k_j})$ , we have  $y^* \in \partial g(w^*)$ . Since  $w^* \in \mathcal{X}_{\underline{\alpha}}$ , we obtain the closedness of  $\mathcal{Y}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Combining the set  $\mathcal{X}$  defined in Assumption 2 and the set  $\mathcal{Y}$  defined in Lemma 4.4, we study the behavior of MPGA within the set  $\mathcal{S}$  which is defined by

$$\mathcal{S} := \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} : \eta(x, y) > 0\}. \quad (22)$$

In particular, one can verify that  $\mathcal{S}$  is a bounded subset of  $\text{dom}(Q)$  if Assumption 2 holds. The following lemma concerns the Step 2-X in MPGA restricted to  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Lemma 4.5.** *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. For  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{S}$  satisfying  $Q(x, y) \leq F(x^{(0)})$ , let  $x_i^+(\alpha) \in \text{prox}_{\alpha f_i}(x_i - \alpha \nabla_i h(x) + \alpha Q(x, y)y_i)$ , and  $x^{+,i}(\alpha) = [x_1; \dots; x_{i-1}; x_i^+(\alpha); x_{i+1}; \dots; x_N]$ . Then the following statements hold:*

(i) *For any  $\sigma > 0$ , there exists  $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{S}, \sigma} > 0$ , such that*

$$\zeta(x^{+,i}(\alpha)) + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x\|_2^2 \leq c\eta(x^{+,i}(\alpha), y) \quad (23)$$

*holds for any  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{S}$  with  $Q(x, y) \leq F(x^{(0)})$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{S}, \sigma})$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$  and  $c \in [Q(x, y), +\infty)$ ;*

(ii) *If  $x^{+,i}(\alpha)$  satisfies (23) for some  $c \in [0, F(x^{(0)})]$ , then  $(x^{+,i}(\alpha), y) \in \mathcal{S}$ .*

*Proof.* We first prove Item (i). It is the result of the proximity operator that, for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ , there holds

$$f_i(x_i^+(\alpha)) + \frac{\|x_i^+(\alpha) - x_i\|_2^2}{2\alpha} + \langle x_i^+(\alpha) - x_i, \nabla_i h(x) - Q(x, y)y_i \rangle - f_i(x_i) \leq 0.$$

This implies

$$f(x^{+,i}(\alpha)) + \frac{\|x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x\|_2^2}{2\alpha} + \langle x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x, \nabla h(x) - Q(x, y)y \rangle - f(x) \leq 0. \quad (24)$$

Utilizing the *Cauchy–Schwarz Inequality*, we further obtain

$$\frac{\|x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x\|_2^2}{2\alpha} - \|\nabla h(x) - Q(x, y)y\|_2 \|x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x\|_2 + f(x^{+,i}(\alpha)) - f(x) \leq 0,$$



which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x\|_2 &\leq \alpha \|\nabla h(x) - Q(x, y)y\|_2 \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\alpha^2 \|\nabla h(x) - Q(x, y)y\|_2^2 + 2\alpha(f(x) - f(x^{+,i}(\alpha)))}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

On the right side of (25), the term  $\|\nabla h(x) - Q(x, y)y\|_2$  is bounded for any  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  due to the continuity of  $\nabla h$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ , the compactness of  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  and  $Q(x, y) \leq F(x^{(0)})$ . Besides, the term  $(f(x) - f(x^{+,i}(\alpha)))$  is bounded above, according to any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\alpha > 0$ , since  $f$  is continuous on the compact  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{dom}(f)$  and bounded below over  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (see Assumption 1). It means that the value of  $\|x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x\|_2$  can be narrowed down by the positive scalar  $\alpha$  with the help of (25). Therefore, recalling the statement in Remark 1 (ii) that  $h$  is globally Lipschitz differentiable on  $\mathcal{X}_\mu$  with the modulus  $L > 0$ , we deduce from (25) that there exists some small enough  $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{S},\sigma} \in (0, \frac{1}{\sigma+L})$  such that  $\|x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x\|_2 \leq \mu/2$  for any  $\alpha \in (0, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{S},\sigma})$ , and hence we have

$$\alpha h(x^{+,i}(\alpha)) \leq \alpha \left( h(x) + \langle \nabla h(x), x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x\|_2^2 \right) \quad (26)$$

for any  $\alpha \in (0, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{S},\sigma})$ . Combining with (24) and (26) and rearranging terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \zeta(x^{+,i}(\alpha)) + \frac{1 - \alpha L}{2} \|x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x\|_2^2 &\leq \alpha \zeta(x) + \alpha \langle x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x, Q(x, y)y \rangle \\ &= \alpha Q(x, y) \eta(x^{+,i}(\alpha), y) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

for any  $\alpha \in (0, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{S},\sigma})$ . Due to the non-negative of the left side of (27) and  $Q \geq 0$ , the equation (27) implies  $\eta(x^{+,i}(\alpha), y) \geq 0$ . Therefore, we deduce Item (i) by multiplying  $1/\alpha$  on the both sides of (27) and noting that  $\alpha < \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{S},\sigma} < \frac{1}{\sigma+L}$  and  $Q(x, y) \leq c$ .

We next prove Item (ii). For the case  $\|x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x\|_2 = 0$ , Item (ii) is derived from  $(x^{+,i}(\alpha), y) = (x, y) \in \mathcal{S}$ . For the case  $\|x^{+,i}(\alpha) - x\|_2 > 0$ , the relation (23) implies  $\eta(x^{+,i}(\alpha), y) > 0$  due to  $\zeta \geq 0$  and  $c \geq 0$ . By dividing by  $\eta(x^{+,i}(\alpha), y)$  on the both sides of (23), we have  $c \geq \zeta(x^{+,i}(\alpha))/\eta(x^{+,i}(\alpha), y) = Q(x^{+,i}(\alpha), y)$ , and then  $c \geq F(x^{+,i}(\alpha))$  follows from the relation  $Q(x^{+,i}(\alpha), y) \geq F(x^{+,i}(\alpha))$ , which follows from the *Fenchel-Young Inequality* and the definitions of  $Q$  and  $F$ . Hence, when  $c \leq F(x^{(0)})$ , we conclude that  $x^{+,i}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{X}$ , and derive  $(x^{+,i}(\alpha), y) \in \mathcal{S}$  from the definition of  $\mathcal{S}$  (see (22)).  $\square$

Now we are ready to demonstrate that MPGA is the well-defined.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Then the following statements hold:*

- (i) *Step 2-X terminates in finite steps at some  $\alpha \geq \underline{\alpha}_*$ , where  $\underline{\alpha}_* := \min\{\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{S},\sigma}\} \gamma$  with  $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{S},\sigma} > 0$  given by Lemma 4.5 (i). In other words,  $\alpha_{(t)} \geq \underline{\alpha}_*$  holds for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ;*
- (ii) *The sequence  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by MPGA falls into  $\mathcal{S}$ . For any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have*

$$\zeta(x^{(t+1)}) + C_0(\|x^{(t+1)} - x^{(t)}\|_2^2 + Q_{(l(t))} \|y^{(t+1)} - y^{(t)}\|_2^2) \leq Q_{(l(t))} \eta_{(t+1)}, \quad (28)$$

$$Q(x^{(t+1)}, y^{(t+1)}) \leq Q_{(l(t+1))} \leq Q_{(l(t))} \leq F(x^{(0)}), \quad (29)$$

where  $C_0 := \min\{\sigma/2, 1/\bar{\alpha}\} > 0$  and  $\eta_{(t+1)} := \eta(x^{(t+1)}, y^{(t+1)})$ .

*Proof.* We prove this theorem by induction. It is straightforward to verify that  $(x^{(0)}, y^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $Q_{(l(0))} = Q(x^{(0)}, y^{(0)}) = F(x^{(0)})$ . We shall show that Item (i),  $(x^{(t+1)}, y^{(t+1)}) \in \mathcal{S}$ , (28) and (29) hold under the inductive hypothesis that  $(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $Q_{(l(t))} \leq F(x^{(0)})$  in the  $t$ -th iteration.

We first prove Item (i). The scalar  $\alpha_{(t)} \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$  directly follows from Step 2-Y in MPGA when  $i_{(t)} = 0$ , and  $\alpha_{(t)} \geq \min\{\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{S}, \sigma}\} \gamma$  is derived from Lemma 4.5 (i) when Step 2-X is implemented with  $i_{(t)} \in \mathbb{N}_N$ .

We next prove  $(x^{(t+1)}, y^{(t+1)}) \in \mathcal{S}$  and (28). Similarly, we consider cases  $i_{(t)} = 0$  and  $i_{(t)} \in \mathbb{N}_N$  separately. For the case when  $i_{(t)} = 0$ , the Step 2-Y of MPGA yields  $x^{(t+1)} = x^{(t)}$  and  $y^{(t+1)} = \text{prox}_{\alpha_{(t)} g^*}(y^{(t)} + \alpha_{(t)} x^{(t)})$ . Then, invoking Lemma 4.3 (iii), we deduce that  $(x^{(t)}, y^{(t+1)}) \in \text{dom}(Q)$  and (28) holds. Due to the fact  $x^{(t+1)} = x^{(t)}$ , the hypothesis  $(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) \in \mathcal{S}$  results in  $x^{(t+1)} \in \mathcal{X}$ , and the assertion  $(x^{(t)}, y^{(t+1)}) \in \text{dom}(Q)$  leads to  $\eta(x^{(t+1)}, y^{(t+1)}) > 0$ . Together with  $y^{(t+1)} \in \mathcal{Y}$ , which follows from Lemma 4.4, we conclude that  $(x^{(t+1)}, y^{(t+1)}) \in \mathcal{S}$  by the definition of  $\mathcal{S}$  (see (22)). For the case when  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ , we can verify that the relation (28) holds with the help of Lemma 4.5 (i) and the fact  $y^{(t+1)} = y^{(t)}$ . Besides, the assertion  $(x^{(t+1)}, y^{(t+1)}) \in \mathcal{S}$  follows from Lemma 4.5 (ii).

We finally prove (29) upon the assertion  $(x^{(t+1)}, y^{(t+1)}) \in \mathcal{S}$ . It suffices to show that the second relation holds in (29), wherein the first and third relations follow from the definition of  $Q_{(l(t+1))}$  and the hypothesis  $Q_{(l(t))} \leq F(x^{(0)})$ , respectively. Let  $Q_{(t+1)} := Q(x^{(t+1)}, y^{(t+1)})$ . Dividing by  $\eta_{(t+1)}$  on the both sides of (28), we deduce  $Q_{(t+1)} = \zeta(x^{(t+1)})/\eta_{(t+1)} \leq Q_{(l(t))}$ . Then, we have  $Q_{(l(t+1))} \leq \max\{Q_{(t+1)}, Q_{(l(t))}\} \leq Q_{(l(t))}$ , and hence the second relation of (29) holds.  $\square$

At the rest of this section, we establish some basic convergence results of MPGA. To this end, we first show the continuity of the extended objective  $Q$  on the set  $\mathcal{S}$  in the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.7.** *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Let  $\eta : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$  be defined at  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  as  $\eta(x, y) = \langle x, y \rangle - g^*(y)$ . Then  $\eta$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , and thus the objective  $Q$  given by (9) is continuous on  $\mathcal{S}$ .*

*Proof.* Due to the compactness of  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , it suffices to show that  $g^*$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Let  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$ . According to the definition of  $\mathcal{Y}$  (see Lemma 4.4), there exists some  $w_i \in \partial g^*(y_i)$  satisfying  $\text{dist}^2(w_i, \mathcal{X}) \leq \underline{\alpha}^{-1} \bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}}$  for any  $i = 1, 2$ . By the convexity of  $g^*$ , there holds that  $g^*(y_2) \geq g^*(y_1) + \langle w_1, y_2 - y_1 \rangle$  and  $g^*(y_1) \geq g^*(y_2) + \langle w_2, y_1 - y_2 \rangle$ . Together with these two relations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |g^*(y_1) - g^*(y_2)| &\leq \max\{\|w_1\|_2, \|w_2\|_2\} \|y_1 - y_2\|_2 \\ &\leq \sup \left\{ \|x\|_2 + \sqrt{\underline{\alpha}^{-1} \bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}}} : x \in \mathcal{X} \right\} \|y_1 - y_2\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof by the boundedness of  $\mathcal{X}$ .  $\square$

We finally present the convergence results of MPGA in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.8.** *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds and the sequence  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be generated by MPGA with some  $\mathcal{I}_\infty = (i_{(0)}, i_{(1)}, i_{(2)}, \dots)$ . Then  $\{Q_{(l(t))} : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  descends monotonically, and there holds*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Q_{(l(t))} = Q_{\mathcal{I}_\infty} \quad (30)$$

for some  $Q_{\mathcal{I}_\infty} \in [0, F(x^{(0)})]$ . Furthermore, there holds

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|x^{(t+1)} - x^{(t)}\|_2^2 + Q_{\mathcal{I}_\infty} \|y^{(t+1)} - y^{(t)}\|_2^2 = 0. \quad (31)$$

*Proof.* The relation (29) reveals that  $\{Q_{(l(t))} : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  descends monotonically and  $Q_{(l(t))} \geq Q_{(x^{(t+1)}, y^{(t+1)})}$  holds for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, the relation (30) follows from the fact  $Q \geq 0$ . We next dedicate to proving (31). It is straightforward to verify (31) by passing to the limit on the both sides of (28) when  $Q_{\mathcal{I}_\infty} = 0$ . Therefore, we suppose  $Q_{\mathcal{I}_\infty} > 0$  in the rest of the proof. Let  $d_{(t+1)} := \|x^{(t+1)} - x^{(t)}\|_2^2 + Q_{(l(t))} \|y^{(t+1)} - y^{(t)}\|_2^2$  for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, it is derived from (28) that

$$C_0 d_{(t+1)} \leq (Q_{(l(t))} - Q_{(t+1)}) \eta_{(t+1)}. \quad (32)$$

Notice that  $d_{(t+1)} \in \{d_{(l(t+M+1)-j)} : j \in \mathbb{N}_M\}$  holds for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . We shall show that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{(l(t+M+1)-j)} = 0$  holds for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}_M$  by induction.

First, for the case when  $j = 0$ , replacing  $t$  by  $l(t+M+1) - 1$  in (32), we obtain

$$C_0 d_{(l(t+M+1))} \leq (Q_{(l(t))} - Q_{(l(t+M+1))}) \bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}}, \quad (33)$$

where  $\bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}} > 0$  is given by Remark 1 (i). Owing to (30), we deduce  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{(l(t+M+1))} = 0$  by passing to the limit on (33) with  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Second, under the inductive hypothesis that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{(l(t+M+1)-j)} = 0$  holds for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}_J$  with some  $J < M$ , we shall show  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{(l(t+M+1)-(J+1))} = 0$  by contradiction. If  $\epsilon := \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{(l(t+M+1)-(J+1))} > 0$ , there exists some subsequence  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\lim_{t \in \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \infty} d_{(l(t+M+1)-(J+1))} = \epsilon > 0. \quad (34)$$

Since Theorem 4.6 (ii) shows that  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  falls into the compact set  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , there exists some subsequence  $\mathcal{K}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{K}$  such that

$$\lim_{t \in \mathcal{K}_2 \rightarrow \infty} (x^{(l(t+M+1)-(J+1))}, y^{(l(t+M+1)-(J+1))}) = (\hat{x}^{J+1}, \hat{y}^{J+1}) \quad (35)$$

holds for some  $(\hat{x}^{J+1}, \hat{y}^{J+1}) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . Replacing  $t$  by  $l(t+M+1) - (J+1) - 1$  in (32) and passing to the limit with  $t \in \mathcal{K}_2 \rightarrow \infty$ , we deduce  $\eta(\hat{x}^{J+1}, \hat{y}^{J+1}) > 0$  upon the fact that  $\eta$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  (see Lemma 4.7), and hence we have  $(\hat{x}^{J+1}, \hat{y}^{J+1}) \in \mathcal{S}$ . Besides, in view of the induction hypothesis and  $Q_{\mathcal{I}_\infty} > 0$ , we derive from (35) that

$$\lim_{t \in \mathcal{K}_2 \rightarrow \infty} (x^{(l(t+M+1))}, y^{(l(t+M+1))}) = (\hat{x}^{J+1}, \hat{y}^{J+1}). \quad (36)$$

Due to the continuity of  $Q$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  (see Lemma 4.7), we finally obtain from (35) and (36) that

$$\lim_{t \in \mathcal{K}_2 \rightarrow \infty} Q_{(l(t+M+1)-(J+1))} = Q(\hat{x}^{J+1}, \hat{y}^{J+1}) = \lim_{t \in \mathcal{K}_2 \rightarrow \infty} Q_{(l(t+M+1))} = Q_{\mathcal{I}_\infty}. \quad (37)$$

Notice that (32) and (37) imply

$$\lim_{t \in \mathcal{K}_2 \rightarrow \infty} C_0 d_{(l(t+M+1)-(J+1))} \leq \lim_{t \in \mathcal{K}_2 \rightarrow \infty} (Q_{(l(t+M+1))} - Q_{(l(t+M+1)-(J+1))}) \bar{g}_X = 0,$$

which contradicts (34). Consequently,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{(l(t+M+1)-j)} = 0$  holds for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}_M$ , and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{(t)} = 0$  follows immediately. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5 Subsequential convergence analysis of CMPGA and RMPGA

In this section, we investigate the subsequential convergence of two specific algorithms within the framework of MPGA, namely, cyclic MPGA (CMPGA) and randomized MPGA (RMPGA), where the update block at each iteration are chosen in cyclic and randomized fashions respectively. The first subsection concerns the subsequential convergence of CMPGA, while the second subsection regards that of RMPGA.

### 5.1 Subsequential convergence of CMPGA

This subsection is devoted to the subsequential convergence analysis of CMPGA. For this algorithm, the index  $i$  of Step 1 at the  $t$ -th iteration is chosen by  $i := t \bmod (N+1)$ , i.e., the remainder of  $t$  divided by  $N+1$ . Hence, every  $N+1$  iterations consist of an epoch. For ease of presentation, we shall convert the corner-marks of the sequence  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by CMPGA into some  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_N^0$  via  $k := \lfloor t/(N+1) \rfloor$  and  $i := t \bmod (N+1)$ , i.e.,

$$(x^{(k,i)}, y^{(k,i)}) = (x^{(k(N+1)+i)}, y^{(k(N+1)+i)}). \quad (38)$$

With these new corner-marks, we now give a brief description on an epoch of CMPGA. Given  $(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,0)}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , CMPGA performs the Step 2-Y at the first iteration of the  $k$ -th epoch to generate  $y^{(k,1)}$  as

$$y^{(k,1)} = \text{prox}_{\alpha_{(k,0)} g^*} (y^{(k,0)} + \alpha_{(k,0)} x^{(k,0)}) \quad (39)$$

with some  $\alpha_{(k,0)} \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ , while keeping  $x^{(k,1)} = x^{(k,0)}$ . Then, at the  $(i+1)$ -th iteration of an epoch,  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ , CMPGA keeps  $y^{(k,i+1)} = y^{(k,i)}$  and conduct the Step 2-X to produce the new iteration  $x^{(k,i+1)}$  by updating only the  $i$ -th block of  $x^{(k,i)}$  as

$$x_i^{(k,i+1)} \in \text{prox}_{\alpha_{(k,i)} f_i} \left( x_i^{(k,i)} - \alpha_{(k,i)} \nabla_i h(x^{(k,i)}) + \alpha_{(k,i)} Q(x^{(k,i)}, y^{(k,i)}) y_i^{(k,i)} \right) \quad (40)$$

with some  $\alpha_{(k,i)} \in [\underline{\alpha}_*, \bar{\alpha}]$ . Overall, in the  $k$ -th epoch of CMPGA, for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ , we have

$$y^{(k,i)} = y^{(k+1,0)} \quad \text{and} \quad x_j^{(k,i)} = \begin{cases} x_j^{(k,0)}, & \text{if } j \geq i, \\ x_j^{(k+1,0)}, & \text{if } j < i. \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

The following lemma is the direct result of Theorem 4.6 (ii) and Theorem 4.8.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Let the sequence  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be generated by CMPGA, and  $\{(x^{(k,i)}, y^{(k,i)}) : (k,i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_N^0\}$  be defined by (38). Then, the following statements hold:*

(i) *For any  $(k,i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ , there holds  $(x^{(k,i)}, y^{(k,i)}) \in \mathcal{S}$  and*

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(x^{(k,i+1)}) + C_0(\|x^{(k,i+1)} - x^{(k,i)}\|_2^2 + Q_{(l(k(N+1)+i)})\|y^{(k,i+1)} - y^{(k,i)}\|_2^2) \\ \leq Q_{(l(k(N+1)+i))}\eta(x^{(k,i+1)}, y^{(k,i+1)}); \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

(ii) *There exists some  $Q_{c_\infty} \in [0, F(x^{(0)})]$  such that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Q_{(l(k(N+1)+i))} = Q_{c_\infty}$$

*holds for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$ ;*

(iii) *Furthermore, there holds*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x^{(k,i+1)} - x^{(k,i)}\|_2^2 + Q_{c_\infty} \|y^{(k,i+1)} - y^{(k,i)}\|_2^2 = 0 \quad (43)$$

*for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

Now we are ready to establish the subsequential convergence for CMPGA.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Suppose Assumption 2 holds. Let  $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  be an accumulation point of  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by CMPGA. Then the following statements hold:*

(i)  *$(x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $\eta_c := \inf\{\eta(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\} > 0$ ;*

(ii)  *$x^* \in \text{dom}(F)$  is a critical point of  $F$  with  $F(x^*)y^* \in F(x^*)\partial g(x^*)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\{(x^{(k,i)}, y^{(k,i)}) : (k,i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_N^0\}$  be defined by (38). In view of the Pigeon-hole Principle, there exists a subsequence  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\{(x^{(k,\bar{i})}, y^{(k,\bar{i})}) : k \in \mathcal{K}\}$  with a uniform  $\bar{i} \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$  converges to  $(x^*, y^*)$ , i.e.,

$$\lim_{k \in \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \infty} (x^{(k,\bar{i})}, y^{(k,\bar{i})}) = (x^*, y^*). \quad (44)$$

We first prove  $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{S}$  in Item (i). According to the definition of  $\mathcal{S}$  (see (22)), it suffices to prove  $\eta(x^*, y^*) > 0$ , since  $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  follows from the compactness of  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  immediately. We shall prove  $\eta(x^*, y^*) > 0$  by contradiction. Suppose  $\eta(x^*, y^*) \leq 0$ . Notice that the relation (41) indicates that  $y^{(k,1)} = y^{(k,i+1)}$  holds for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ , and Lemma 5.1 (iii) implies that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x^{(k,i)} - x^{(k,0)}\| = 0$  holds for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$ . Then, the equation (44) implies

$$\lim_{k \in \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \infty} (x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,1)}) = (x^*, y^*) \quad (45)$$

Owing to (39), there holds for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  that

$$\text{dist}(x^{(k,0)}, \partial g^*(y^{(k,1)})) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_{(k,0)}} \|y^{(k,0)} - y^{(k,1)}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{\underline{\alpha}} \eta(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,1)})}, \quad (46)$$

where the first relation follows from Lemma 4.3 (i), and the second relation follows from Lemma 4.3 (ii),  $\eta(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,1)}) > 0$  and  $\alpha_{(k,0)} \geq \underline{\alpha}$ . From (46), we deduce that, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists some  $z_{\epsilon,k} \in \partial g^*(y^{(k,1)})$  such that

$$\|x^{(k,0)} - z_{\epsilon,k}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{\underline{\alpha}} \eta(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,1)})} + \epsilon, \quad (47)$$

which implies the boundedness of  $\{z_{\epsilon,k} : k \in \mathcal{K}\}$  owing to the boundedness of  $\mathcal{X}$ , which is the supset of  $\{x^{(k,0)} : k \in \mathcal{K}\}$ , and  $\eta(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,1)}) \leq \bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}}$  given by Remark 1 (i). Inspired of this, we further assume the subsequence  $\mathcal{K}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{K}$  so that  $\{z_{\epsilon,k} : k \in \mathcal{K}_2\}$  converges to some  $z_{\epsilon,\infty}$ . Invoking the continuity of  $\eta$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  by Lemma 4.7, we derive  $z_{\epsilon,\infty} \in \partial g^*(y^*)$  from the definition of limiting subdifferentials due to  $\{y^{(k,1)} : k \in \mathcal{K}_2\} \rightarrow y^*$  by (45) and  $z_{\epsilon,k} \in \partial g^*(y^{(k,1)})$  for any  $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$ . Passing to the limit on the both sides of (47) with  $k \in \mathcal{K}_2 \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain  $\|x^* - z_{\epsilon,\infty}\|_2 \leq \epsilon$  from the continuity of  $\eta$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  by Lemma 4.7, (45) and  $\eta(x^*, y^*) \leq 0$ . Due to the arbitrariness of  $\epsilon$ , we deduce  $\text{dist}(x^*, \partial g^*(y^*)) = 0$ , or equally,  $x^* \in \partial g^*(y^*)$  owing to the closedness of  $\partial g^*(y^*)$ . Consequently, the assumption  $\eta(x^*, y^*) \leq 0$  results in  $x^* \in \partial g^*(y^*)$  and leads to  $g(x^*) = 0$ . However,  $g(x^*) \neq 0$  follows from the fact  $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ . Therefore, we deduce  $\eta(x^*, y^*) > 0$  by the contradiction, and  $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{S}$  follows immediately. Besides,  $\underline{\eta}_{\mathcal{C}} > 0$  is derived since the statement  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\} \in \mathcal{S}$  in Theorem 4.6 (ii) indicates that  $\eta(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) > 0$  holds for each  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\eta(x^*, y^*) > 0$  holds for each  $(x^*, y^*)$  being an accumulation point of  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . This completes the proof of Item (i).

We next prove Item (ii). The statement that  $x^* \in \text{dom}(F)$  in Item (ii) is the direct result of  $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{S}$  given by Item (i), and  $g(x^*) \neq 0$  follows from  $x^* \in \text{dom}(F)$  and the definition of  $F$  (see (8)). When  $\zeta(x^*) = 0$ , Item (ii) comes immediately since  $x^*$  is a global minimizer of  $F$  with  $F(x^*) = \zeta(x^*)/g(x^*) = 0$ . We next focus on the case when  $\zeta(x^*) > 0$ . Replacing  $i$  with  $\bar{i} - 1$  in (42), we deduce that

$$\zeta(x^{(k,\bar{i})}) \leq Q_{(l(k(N+1)+\bar{i}-1))} \eta(x^{(k,\bar{i})}, y^{(k,\bar{i})}) \leq Q_{(l(k(N+1)+\bar{i}-1))} \bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}}, \quad (48)$$

where  $\bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}} \geq 0$  is given by Remark 1 (i). Passing to the limit on the both sides of (48) with  $k \in \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain  $\zeta(x^*) \leq Q_{c_\infty} \bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}}$  due to (44), the continuity of  $\zeta$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  and Lemma 5.1 (ii). Thus,  $\zeta(x^*) > 0$  forces  $Q_{c_\infty} > 0$ . Owing to  $Q_{c_\infty} > 0$ , (43) and (44), there holds for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$  that

$$\lim_{k \in \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \infty} (x^{(k,i)}, y^{(k,i)}) = (x^*, y^*). \quad (49)$$

Then, according to CMPGA, we derive from (39) that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{(k,0)}g^*(y^{(k,1)}) + \frac{1}{2}\|y^{(k,1)} - y^{(k,0)} - \alpha_{(k,0)}x^{(k,0)}\|_2^2 \\ \leq \alpha_{(k,0)}g^*(y) + \frac{1}{2}\|y - y^{(k,0)} - \alpha_{(k,0)}x^{(k,0)}\|_2^2 \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

holds for any  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and (50) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} g^*(y^{(k,1)}) + \frac{1}{2\bar{\alpha}}\|y^{(k,1)} - y^{(k,0)}\|_2^2 + \langle y^{(k,1)} - y^{(k,0)}, x^{(k,0)} \rangle \\ \leq g^*(y) + \frac{1}{2\bar{\alpha}}\|y - y^{(k,0)}\|_2^2 + \langle y - y^{(k,0)}, x^{(k,0)} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

By passing to the limit on the both sides of (51) with  $k \in \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain that  $g^*(y^*) \leq g^*(y) + \frac{1}{2\bar{\alpha}}\|y - y^*\|_2^2 + \langle y - y^*, x^* \rangle$  holds for any  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , which indicates

$$y^* = \text{prox}_{\underline{\alpha}g^*}(y^* + \underline{\alpha}x^*). \quad (52)$$

Similarly, there holds for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$  that

$$x_i^* \in \text{prox}_{\underline{\alpha}_*f_i}(x_i^* - \underline{\alpha}_*\nabla_i h(x^*) + \underline{\alpha}_*Q(x^*, y^*)y_i^*), \quad (53)$$

owing to (40), (44),  $\alpha_{(k,i)} \in [\underline{\alpha}_*, \bar{\alpha}]$ ,  $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{S}$  and the continuity of  $Q$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  (see Lemma 4.7). Together with (52) and (53), we derive Item (ii) with the help of Proposition 4.1.  $\square$

## 5.2 Subsequential convergence of RMPGA

This subsection is devoted to the subsequential convergence of RMPGA. At the  $t$ -th iteration, RMPGA picks an index  $i$  from  $\mathbb{N}_N^0$  with probability  $p_i^{(t)} \geq p_{\min} > 0$ , where  $\{p_i^{(t)} : i \in \mathbb{N}_N^0\}$  forms a probability distribution. For convenience, we use  $(x^{(t),i}, y^{(t),i})$  to denote the point generated by the  $t$ -th iteration of RMPGA if a specific index  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$  is chosen. Given  $(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , if the index  $i = 0$  is picked at the  $t$ -th iteration, then RMPGA keeps  $x^{(t+1)} = x^{(t)}$  and performs Step 2-Y to set  $y^{(t+1)} = y^{(t),+}$ , where

$$y^{(t),+} = \text{prox}_{\alpha_{(t),0}g^*}(y^{(t)} + \alpha_{(t),0}x^{(t)}) \quad (54)$$

for some  $\alpha_{(t),0} \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ . When an index  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$  is chosen at the  $t$ -th iteration, RMPGA keeps  $y^{(t+1)} = y^{(t)}$  while performing Step 2-X to generate the new iterator  $x^{(t+1)}$  as

$$x_j^{(t+1)} = \begin{cases} x_j^{(t)}, & j \neq i, \\ x_j^{(t),+}, & j = i, \end{cases}$$

where

$$x_j^{(t),+} \in \text{prox}_{\alpha_{(t),j}f_j}(x_j^{(t)} - \alpha_{(t),j}\nabla_j h(x^{(t)}) + \alpha_{(t),j}Q(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)})y_j^{(t)}) \quad (55)$$

with some  $\alpha_{(t),j} \in [\underline{\alpha}_*, \bar{\alpha}]$ . We establish the subsequential convergence of RMPGA in the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Suppose Assumption 2 holds. Let  $(x^*, y^*)$  be an accumulation point of  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by RMPGA. Then  $x^* \in \text{dom}(F)$  is a critical point of  $F$  with  $F(x^*)y^* \in F(x^*)\partial g(x^*)$  almost surely.*

*Proof.* Invoking Lemma 4.4, we deduce  $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  by the compactness of  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . When  $\zeta(x^*) = 0$ , this theorem follows immediately since  $x^*$  is a global minimizer of  $F$  with  $F(x^*) = 0$ . We next focus on the case when  $\zeta(x^*) > 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a subsequence such that  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathcal{K}\}$  converges to  $(x^*, y^*)$ . Then  $\lim_{t \in \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \infty} x^{(t+1)} = x^*$  follows from (31), and  $\zeta(x^*) \leq Q_{\mathcal{I}_\infty} \eta(x^*, y^*)$  is derived by passing to the limit with  $t \in \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \infty$  on the both sides of (28) and noting that  $\eta$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  by Lemma 4.7. Hence,  $\zeta(x^*) > 0$  results in  $\eta(x^*, y^*) > 0$  and  $Q_{\mathcal{I}_\infty} > 0$ . On the one hand,  $\eta(x^*, y^*) > 0$  and  $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  indicate  $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{S}$ . On the other hand,  $Q_{\mathcal{I}_\infty} > 0$  and (31) yield that both of  $\{\|x^{(t+1)} - x^{(t)}\| : t \in \mathcal{K}\}$  and  $\{\|y^{(t+1)} - y^{(t)}\| : t \in \mathcal{K}\}$  converge to zero. Let  $\hat{x}^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be defined by  $\hat{x}_j^{(t)} = x_j^{(t),+}$  for  $j \in \mathbb{N}_N$  and  $\hat{y}^{(t)} = y^{(t),+}$ . Notice that for any  $\xi > 0$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , there holds in the sense of probability that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left[ \|x^{(t+1)} - x^{(t)}\|_2^2 + \|y^{(t+1)} - y^{(t)}\|_2^2 > \frac{\xi}{(N+1)} \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^N p_i^{(t)} \mathbb{P} \left[ \|x_i^{(t),i} - x_i^{(t)}\|_2^2 + \|y^{(t),i} - y^{(t)}\|_2^2 > \frac{\xi}{(N+1)} \right] \\ &\geq p_{\min} \mathbb{P} \left[ \|\hat{x}^{(t)} - x^{(t)}\|_2^2 + \|\hat{y}^{(t)} - y^{(t)}\|_2^2 > \xi \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, under the prior hypothesis  $\zeta(x^*) > 0$ , we deduce that  $\{(\hat{x}^{(t)}, \hat{y}^{(t)}) : t \in \mathcal{K}\}$  converges to  $(x^*, y^*)$  in probability. Invoking [28, Theorem 6.3.1 (b)], we claim some subsequence  $\mathcal{K}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{K}$  such that  $\{(\hat{x}^{(t)}, \hat{y}^{(t)}) : t \in \mathcal{K}_2\}$  converges to  $(x^*, y^*)$  almost surely under  $\zeta(x^*) > 0$ . By passing to the limit with  $t \in \mathcal{K}_2 \rightarrow \infty$  after replacing  $y^{(t),+}$  by  $\hat{y}^{(t)}$  in (54) and replacing  $x_j^{(t),+}$  by  $\hat{x}_j^{(t)}$  in (55), we deduce that the following two relations hold almost surely under  $\zeta(x^*) > 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} y^* &\in \text{prox}_{\underline{\alpha}g^*}(y^* + \underline{\alpha}x^*), \\ x_j^* &\in \text{prox}_{\underline{\alpha}_*f_j}(x_j^* - \underline{\alpha}_*\nabla_j h(x^*) + \underline{\alpha}_*Q(x^*, y^*)y_j^*), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_N, \end{aligned}$$

owing to  $\alpha_{(t),0} \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ ,  $\alpha_{(t),j} \in [\underline{\alpha}_*, \bar{\alpha}]$ ,  $(x^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{S}$  and the continuity of  $Q$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  by Lemma 4.7. Consequently, this theorem is obtained with the help of Proposition 4.1.  $\square$

## 6 Sequential convergence and convergence rate of monotone CMPGA

In this section, we investigate the sequential convergence and convergence rate of the entire solution sequence  $\{x^{(t)} : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by CMPGA with a monotone



line-search scheme (CMPGA\_ML), i.e., CMPGA with the parameter  $M = 0$ , under suitable assumptions.

## 6.1 Sequential convergence of CMPGA\_ML

In this subsection, we consider the sequential convergence of CMPGA\_ML. By assuming the KL property of  $Q$  defined in (9), our convergence analysis will show that  $\{(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,0)}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by CMPGA\_ML and  $Q$  satisfy all the requirements in Proposition 2.4 under suitable conditions, and thus yields the sequential convergence of  $\{x^{(t)} : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  to a critical point of  $F$ . Specifically, the boundedness of  $\{(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,0)}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by CMPGA\_ML is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.1 (i) and the boundedness of  $\mathcal{S}$  defined in (22), while Items (i) and (iii) of Proposition 2.4 are verified for  $\{(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,0)}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and  $Q$  in the next proposition. To simplify the notation, we denote  $Q(x^{(k,i)}, y^{(k,i)})$  by  $Q_{(k,i)}$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$ .

**Proposition 6.1.** *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Let the sequence  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be generated by CMPGA\_ML, and  $\{(x^{(k,i)}, y^{(k,i)}) : (k, i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_N^0\}$  be defined by (38). Then the following two statements hold:*

- (i) *There exist  $C_1 > 0$  and  $K_1 > 0$  such that*

$$Q_{(k+1,0)} + C_1 \left( \|x^{(k+1,0)} - x^{(k,0)}\|_2^2 + Q_{(k+1,0)} \|y^{(k+1,0)} - y^{(k,0)}\|_2^2 \right) \leq Q_{(k,0)}$$

*holds for any  $k \geq K_1$ ;*

- (ii)  *$\xi := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Q_{(k,0)}$  exists and  $Q$  takes the value  $\xi$  at any accumulation point of  $\{(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,0)}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .*

*Proof.* We first prove Item (i). The monotone line search scheme adopted by CMPGA\_ML implies that

$$Q_{(k+1,0)} = Q_{(l((k+1)(N+1)+0))} \leq Q_{(l(k(N+1)+i))} = Q_{(k,i)} \quad (56)$$

holds for any  $i \leq N + 1$ . By dividing by  $\eta(x^{(k,i+1)}, y^{(k,i+1)})$  on the both sides of (42) and combining (56), we obtain for any  $(k, i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_N^0$  that

$$Q_{(k,i+1)} + \frac{C_0}{\bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}}} \left( \|x^{(k,i+1)} - x^{(k,i)}\|_2^2 + Q_{(k,i)} \|y^{(k,i+1)} - y^{(k,i)}\|_2^2 \right) \leq Q_{(k,i)}, \quad (57)$$

where  $\bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}} \geq \eta(x^{(k,i+1)}, y^{(k,i+1)})$  is given by Remark 1 (i). Summing up (57) over  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$ , we derive Item (i) with  $C_1 = C_0/\bar{g}_{\mathcal{X}}$  in view of (41) and (56).

Then, since Item (i) shows that the nonnegative scalar sequence  $\{Q_{(k,0)} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  decreases monotonously, we conclude Item (ii) by the continuity of  $Q$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  (see Lemma 4.7) and the fact that each accumulation point of  $\{(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,0)}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{S}$  (see Theorem 5.2 (i)).  $\square$

Now it remains to prove that  $\{(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,0)}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by CMPGA\_ML satisfies Item (ii) of Proposition 2.4 with  $H := Q$ . To this end, we introduce the following two assumptions and a technical lemma.

**Assumption 3.** The function  $f$  is locally Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

**Assumption 4.** The function  $g^*$  satisfies calmness condition on  $\text{dom}(g^*)$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** Suppose that Assumptions 2 and 3 hold. Let  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be generated by `CMPGA_ML`. Then there exists  $L_Q > 0$  such that

$$|Q_{(t_1)} - Q_{(t_2)}| \leq L_Q \left( \|x^{(t_1)} - x^{(t_2)}\|_2 + \min\{Q_{(t_1)}, Q_{(t_2)}\} \|y^{(t_1)} - y^{(t_2)}\|_2 \right)$$

holds for any  $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* Assume  $Q_{(t_1)} \geq Q_{(t_2)}$  without loss of generality. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_{(t_1)} - Q_{(t_2)}| &= \left| \frac{\zeta(x^{(t_1)})}{\eta_{(t_1)}} - \frac{\zeta(x^{(t_2)})}{\eta_{(t_1)}} + \frac{\zeta(x^{(t_2)})}{\eta_{(t_1)}} - \frac{\zeta(x^{(t_2)})}{\eta_{(t_2)}} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{|\zeta(x^{(t_1)}) - \zeta(x^{(t_2)})|}{\underline{\eta}_c} + \frac{|\eta_{(t_1)} - \eta_{(t_2)}|}{\underline{\eta}_c} Q_{(t_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where  $\eta_{(t_i)} = \eta(x^{(t_i)}, y^{(t_i)})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $\underline{\eta}_c > 0$  is given by Theorem 5.2 (i). Notice that  $\zeta$  is globally Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X}$  under Assumptions 2 and 3, and  $\eta$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{S}$  by Lemma 4.7. This lemma is derived from (58) and the fact that  $Q_{(t_2)} \leq F(x^{(0)})$ .  $\square$

With the help of Assumptions 2-4 and Lemma 6.2, we have the following proposition regarding the relative error condition of Proposition 2.4.

**Proposition 6.3.** Suppose that Assumptions 2-4 hold. Let the sequence  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be generated by `CMPGA_ML`, and  $(x^{(k,i)}, y^{(k,i)})$  be defined by (38). Then, there exist  $\tilde{C}_2 > 0$ ,  $K_2 > 0$  and  $w^{k+1} \in \hat{\partial}Q(x^{(k+1,0)}, y^{(k+1,0)})$  such that

$$\|w^{k+1}\|_2 \leq \tilde{C}_2 \left( \|x^{(k+1,0)} - x^{(k,0)}\|_2 + Q_{(k+1,0)} \|y^{(k+1,0)} - y^{(k,0)}\|_2 \right)$$

holds for any  $k \geq K_2$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.1 (ii), it suffices to show that some  $(w_x^{k+1}, w_y^{k+1})$  satisfies

$$w_x^{k+1} \in \frac{\hat{\partial}\zeta(x^{(k+1,0)}) - Q_{(k+1,0)} y^{(k+1,0)}}{\eta_{(k+1,0)}}, \quad (59)$$

$$w_y^{k+1} \in \frac{Q_{(k+1,0)}(\partial g^*(y^{(k+1,0)}) - x^{(k+1,0)})}{\eta_{(k+1,0)}}, \quad (60)$$

and both of  $\|w_x^{k+1}\|_2$  and  $\|w_y^{k+1}\|_2$  can be bounded by  $\|x^{(k+1,0)} - x^{(k,0)}\|_2 + Q_{(k+1,0)} \|y^{(k+1,0)} - y^{(k,0)}\|_2$ .

Firstly, it follows from (39) and Lemma 4.3 (i) that  $\frac{1}{\alpha_{(k,0)}}(y^{(k,0)} - y^{(k,1)}) + x^{(k,0)} \in \partial g^*(y^{(k,1)})$  holds for some  $\alpha_{(k,0)} \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ . By setting

$$w_y^{k+1} = \frac{\frac{Q_{(k+1,0)}}{\alpha_{(k,0)}}(y^{(k,0)} - y^{(k,1)}) + Q_{(k+1,0)}(x^{(k,0)} - x^{(k+1,0)})}{\eta_{(k+1,0)}},$$

we derive (60) and  $\|w_y^{k+1}\|_2 \leq \frac{Q_{(k+1,0)}}{\underline{\alpha}\eta_c} \|y^{(k,0)} - y^{(k+1,0)}\|_2 + \frac{Q_{(k+1,0)}}{\eta_c} \|x^{(k,0)} - x^{(k+1,0)}\|_2$  due to  $y^{(k,1)} = y^{(k+1,0)}$ . This together with the fact that  $Q_{(k+1,0)} \leq F(x^{(0)})$  implies some  $C_{2,y} > 0$  such that

$$\|w_y^{k+1}\|_2 \leq C_{2,y} (\|x^{(k,0)} - x^{(k+1,0)}\|_2 + Q_{(k+1,0)} \|y^{(k,0)} - y^{(k+1,0)}\|_2). \quad (61)$$

Secondly, it is derived from (40) that

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_{(k,i)}} (x_i^{(k,i)} - x_i^{(k,i+1)}) - \nabla_i h(x^{(k,i)}) + Q_{(k,i)} y_i^{(k,i)} \in \widehat{\partial} f_i(x_i^{(k,i+1)}) \quad (62)$$

holds for some  $\alpha_{(k,i)} \in [\underline{\alpha}_*, \bar{\alpha}]$ . Let  $\Lambda^{(k)}, \Xi^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be block diagonal matrices whose  $i$ -th diagonal matrices are  $\frac{1}{\alpha_{(k,i)}} I_{n_i}$  and  $Q_{(k,i)} I_{n_i}$ , respectively, with  $I_{n_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$  being the identity matrix,  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ , and  $\widehat{h}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be defined by

$$\widehat{h}^{(k)} := [\nabla_1 h(x^{(k,1)}), \nabla_2 h(x^{(k,2)}), \dots, \nabla_N h(x^{(k,N)})].$$

Then, by combining (62) over  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ , there holds for CMPGA-ML that

$$\Lambda^{(k)}(x^{(k,0)} - x^{(k+1,0)}) - \widehat{h}^{(k)} + \Xi^{(k)} y^{(k+1,0)} \in \widehat{\partial} f(x^{(k+1,0)}). \quad (63)$$

Therefore, we derive (59) from (63) with

$$w_x^{k+1} = \left( \Lambda^{(k)}(x^{(k,0)} - x^{(k+1,0)}) + \nabla h(x^{(k+1,0)}) - \widehat{h}^{(k)} + \Xi^{(k)} y^{(k+1,0)} - Q_{(k+1,0)} y^{(k+1,0)} \right) \eta_{(k+1,0)}^{-1}. \quad (64)$$

For the term  $\nabla h(x^{(k+1,0)}) - \widehat{h}^{(k)}$  on the right side of (64), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla h(x^{(k+1,0)}) - \widehat{h}^{(k)}\|_2 &= \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N \|\nabla_i h(x^{(k+1,0)}) - \nabla_i h(x^{(k,i)})\|_2^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N L^2 \|x^{(k+1,0)} - x^{(k,i)}\|_2^2} \leq L\sqrt{N} \|x^{(k+1,0)} - x^{(k,0)}\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where the last relation holds due to  $\|x^{(k+1,0)} - x^{(k,i)}\|_2 \leq \|x^{(k+1,0)} - x^{(k,0)}\|_2$  (see (41)). Besides, according to the term  $\Xi^{(k)} y^{(k+1,0)} - Q_{(k+1,0)} y^{(k+1,0)}$  on the right side of (64), by exploiting Lemma 6.2, there holds with  $I_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  being the identity matrix that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \Xi^{(k)} - Q_{(k+1,0)} I_n \right\|_2 = \sup \{ |Q_{(k,i)} - Q_{(k+1,0)}| : i \in \mathbb{N}_N \} \\ & \leq L_Q \sup \{ \|x^{(k,i)} - x^{(k+1,0)}\|_2 + Q_{(k+1,0)} \|y^{(k,i)} - y^{(k+1,0)}\|_2 : i \in \mathbb{N}_N \} \\ & \leq L_Q \|x^{(k,0)} - x^{(k+1,0)}\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where the second relation follows from Lemma 6.2, and the third relation follows from (41). Hence, the equation (64) leads to some  $C_{2,x} > 0$  so that

$$\|w_x^{k+1}\|_2 \leq C_{2,x} \|x^{(k,0)} - x^{(k+1,0)}\|_2, \quad (67)$$

owing to  $\|\Lambda^{(k)}\|_2 \leq \underline{\alpha}_*^{-1}$ , (65), (66), the boundedness of  $\{y^{(k,0)} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and Theorem 5.2 (i). Finally, this lemma follows from (61) and (67).  $\square$

In view of Lemma 5.1 (iii) and Proposition 6.3, we get the following corollary.

**Corollary 6.4.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2-4 hold. Let the sequence  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be generated by CMPGA\_ML, and  $(x^{(k,i)}, y^{(k,i)})$  be defined by (38). Then,*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist} \left( 0, \widehat{\partial} Q(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,0)}) \right) = 0. \quad (68)$$

We remark that, by following the same arguments, one can show that results in Lemma 6.2 and Proposition 6.3 also hold when  $\{(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is generated by CMPGA equipped with a nonmonotone line-search scheme, i.e.,  $M > 0$ . Consequently, the convergence result (68) obtained in Corollary 6.4 holds for CMPGA, regardless of the choice of  $M$ .

With the help of Proposition 6.1 and Proposition 6.3, we are now ready to establish the sequential convergence of CMPGA\_ML.

**Theorem 6.5.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2-4 hold. If  $Q$  satisfies the KL property at any  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{S}$ , then the sequence  $\{x^{(t)} : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by CMPGA\_ML converges to a critical point  $x^*$  of  $F$ .*

*Proof.* Proposition 6.3 yields some  $K_2 > 0$  and some  $w^{k+1} \in \widehat{\partial} Q(x^{(k+1,0)}, y^{(k+1,0)})$  such that

$$\|w^{k+1}\|_2 \leq C_2 \left( \|x^{(k+1,0)} - x^{(k,0)}\|_2 + \sqrt{Q_{(k+1,0)}} \|y^{(k+1,0)} - y^{(k,0)}\|_2 \right)$$

holds for any  $k \geq K_2$  with  $C_2 := \widetilde{C}_2 \max\{1, \sqrt{F(x^{(0)})}\}$  owing to  $Q_{(k+1,0)} \leq F(x^{(0)})$ . This indicates that the condition (ii) in Proposition 2.4 holds for the sequence  $\{(x^{(k,0)}, y^{(k,0)}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by CMPGA\_ML. Then, invoking Proposition 6.1,

we derive from Proposition 2.4 that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|x^{(k+1,0)} - x^{(k,0)}\|_2 < \infty. \quad (69)$$

Notice that, according to CMPGA, the relation (41) yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \|x^{(k,i+1)} - x^{(k,i)}\|_2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \|x_i^{(k+1,0)} - x_i^{(k,0)}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{N} \|x^{(k+1,0)} - x^{(k,0)}\|_2. \quad (70)$$

In view of (69) and (70), we derive

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \|x^{(t+1)} - x^{(t)}\|_2 = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^N \|x^{(k,i+1)} - x^{(k,i)}\|_2 < +\infty.$$

Therefore, the sequence  $\{x^{(t)} : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  converges to some  $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and Theorem 5.2 (ii) demonstrates that the  $x^*$  belongs to  $\text{dom}(F)$  and is a critical point of  $F$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Finally, we shall show that Assumptions 3-4 and the KL condition in Theorem 6.5 hold for the sparse signal recovery problems (2) and (3), which together with Assumption 2 lead to the sequential convergence of CMPGA\_ML for solving these two problems. Recall that  $f$  in both problems can be viewed as the sum of  $\ell_1$  norm and the indicator function on  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \underline{x} \leq x \leq \bar{x}\}$ , while  $g^*$  is indicator functions on the  $\ell_2$  unit ball and  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_{\infty} \leq 1, \|x\|_1 \leq K\}$  respectively. Hence, Assumptions 3 and 4 are automatically fulfilled for problems (2) and (3). In the literature, the KL property of a concrete function is often verified via showing that it is a proper, closed and semi-algebraic function. Since  $Q$  may be not lower semicontinuous on  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , we could not deduce its KL property even if it is a proper semi-algebraic function. To remedy this issue, we introduce a potential function  $Q_{\epsilon} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  for  $\epsilon > 0$ , which is defined as the sum of  $Q$  and the indicator function on the set  $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n : \eta(x, y) \geq \epsilon\}$ . Clearly, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $Q_{\epsilon}$  is closed on  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . Furthermore, we show the connection between the KL property of  $Q$  and  $Q_{\epsilon}$  in the next proposition.

**Proposition 6.6.** *Suppose that  $g^*$  is continuous on  $\text{dom}(g^*)$ . If for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $Q_{\epsilon}$  is a KL function, then  $Q$  is also a KL function.*

*Proof.* Let  $(x, y) \in \text{dom}(\partial Q)$  and  $\epsilon := \frac{1}{2}\eta(x, y)$ . Then one can check that  $Q = Q_{\epsilon}$  holds on  $\mathcal{B}((x, y), \delta)$  for some  $\delta > 0$  due to the continuity of  $g^*$  on  $\text{dom}(g^*)$ . Therefore,  $Q$  satisfies the KL property at  $(x, y)$  since  $Q_{\epsilon}$  is a KL function.  $\square$

By the definition of a semi-algebraic function, one can easily check that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , the respective  $Q_{\epsilon}$  for problems (2) and (3) is a proper closed semi-algebraic function, which together with [2, Theorem 4.1] indicates that  $Q_{\epsilon}$  is a KL function for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . Hence, with the help of Proposition 6.6, we conclude that the respective  $Q$

for these two problems is a KL function. Using the above display and the discussions below Assumption 2, we finally obtain the following theorems concerning the sequential convergence of CMPGA\_ML for solving problems (2) and (3), respectively.

**Theorem 6.7.** *The sequence  $\{x^{(t)} : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by CMPGA\_ML for problem (2) converges to a critical point of  $F$ , if  $F(x^{(0)}) < 1 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|b\|_2^2$ .*

**Theorem 6.8.** *The sequence  $\{x^{(t)} : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by CMPGA\_ML for problem (3) globally converges to a critical point of  $F$ .*

## 6.2 Convergence rate of CMPGA\_ML

This subsection is devoted into the convergence rate analysis of CMPGA\_ML. We first deduce generally the asymptotic convergence rate of CMPGA\_ML based on the KL exponent of  $Q$  in the next theorem. The proof follows a similar line of arguments to other convergence rate analysis based on the KL property (see [1, 36, 39], for example) and thus are omitted here for brevity.

**Theorem 6.9.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2-4 hold. Let  $\{x^{(t)} : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be the sequence generated by CMPGA\_ML. If  $\{x^{(t)} : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  converges to some  $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $Q$  satisfies the KL property at each  $(x^*, y) \in \mathcal{S}$  with an exponent  $\theta \in [0, 1)$ , then the following statements hold:*

- (i) *If  $\theta = 0$ ,  $\{x^{(t)} : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  converges to  $x^*$  finitely;*
- (ii) *If  $\theta \in (0, 1/2]$ ,  $\|x^{(t)} - x^*\|_2 \leq c_1 \tau^t$ ,  $\forall t \geq T_1$  for some  $T_1 > 0$ ,  $c_1 > 0$ ,  $\tau \in (0, 1)$ ;*
- (iii) *If  $\theta \in (1/2, 1)$ ,  $\|x^{(t)} - x^*\|_2 \leq c_2 t^{-(1-\theta)/(2\theta-1)}$ ,  $\forall t \geq T_2$ , for some  $T_2 > 0$ ,  $c_2 > 0$ .*

While it is routine to obtain the results in Theorem 6.9, it is more challenging to estimate the KL exponent of  $Q$  for a concrete model of (1). In what follows, we shall show that the KL exponent of  $Q$  is  $\frac{1}{2}$  under further assumptions on  $f$ ,  $h$  and  $g$  in problem (1). These assumptions, in particular, hold for the sparse signal recovery problem (3). The following theorem tells that we can estimate the KL exponents of  $Q$  via a non-fractional auxiliary function, whose proof is inspired by [42, Theorem 4.2]. We point out that the result of [42, Theorem 4.2] can not be directly applied to Theorem 6.10, since  $g^*$  is not necessarily differentiable.

**Theorem 6.10.** *Let  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{dom}(\partial Q)$ ,  $\alpha := Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  and  $g^*$  satisfy the calmness condition on  $\text{dom}(g^*)$ . Let  $\psi_\alpha : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be defined at  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  as*

$$\psi_\alpha(x, y) := \begin{cases} \zeta(x) + \alpha(g^*(y) - \langle x, y \rangle), & \text{if } (x, y) \in \text{dom}(\zeta) \times \text{dom}(g^*), \\ +\infty, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

*If  $\psi_\alpha$  satisfies the KL property with the exponent  $\theta \in [0, 1)$  at  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ , then  $Q$  satisfies the KL property with the same exponent  $\theta \in [0, 1)$  at  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\psi_\alpha$  has the KL exponent  $\theta$  at  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  and  $\psi_\alpha(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = 0$ , there exist  $\epsilon, \delta_1, c > 0$  such that

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial\psi_\alpha(x, y)) \geq c(\psi_\alpha(x, y))^\theta \quad (71)$$

holds for any  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{B}_{\psi_\alpha}^\epsilon((\bar{x}, \bar{y}), \delta_1)$ . It is worthy noting that  $\mathcal{B}_{\psi_\alpha}^\epsilon((\bar{x}, \bar{y}), \delta_1) \subseteq \text{dom}(\zeta) \times \text{dom}(g^*)$ . Let  $\eta(x, y) := \langle x, y \rangle - g^*(y)$  and  $G := \|\bar{y}\|_2 + 2\eta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + \delta_1$ . Owing to the continuity of  $\eta$  and  $\frac{\psi_\alpha^{1-\theta}}{\eta}$  at  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  and the fact that  $\frac{\psi_\alpha^{1-\theta}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})}{\eta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})} = 0$ , there exists

some  $\delta_2 \leq \delta_1$ , such that, for any  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{B}_{\psi_\alpha}^\epsilon((\bar{x}, \bar{y}), \delta_2)$ , it holds

$$\frac{\eta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})}{2} \leq \eta(x, y) \leq G, \quad (72)$$

$$\frac{\psi_\alpha^{1-\theta}(x, y)}{\eta(x, y)} \leq \frac{c}{2G}. \quad (73)$$

Set  $\epsilon' = \epsilon/G$ . Then  $0 < \psi_\alpha(x, y) < \epsilon'G = \epsilon$  holds for any  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{B}_Q^{\epsilon'}((\bar{x}, \bar{y}), \delta_2)$  upon the fact that

$$\psi_\alpha(x, y) = (Q(x, y) - \alpha)\eta(x, y). \quad (74)$$

Therefore, we deduce that (72) and (73) hold for any  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{B}_Q^{\epsilon'}((\bar{x}, \bar{y}), \delta_2)$ .

Let  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{B}_Q^{\epsilon'}((\bar{x}, \bar{y}), \delta_2) \cap \text{dom}(\partial Q)$ . Then we have  $\zeta(x) > 0$  and  $\eta(x, y) > 0$ . By Proposition 2.2 (ii), there holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(0, \partial Q(x, y)) &= \frac{1}{\eta(x, y)} \text{dist}\left(0, (\partial\zeta(x) - Q(x, y)y) \times Q(x, y)(\partial g^*(y) - x)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta(x, y)} \inf \left\{ \sqrt{\|u - Q(x, y)y\|_2^2 + \|Q(x, y)(v - x)\|_2^2} : (u, v) \in \partial\zeta(x) \times \partial g^*(y) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(I)}{\geq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}G} \left( \inf\{\|u - Q(x, y)y\|_2 : u \in \partial\zeta(x)\} + \inf\{\|Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y})(v - x)\|_2 : v \in \partial g^*(y)\} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(II)}{\geq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}G} \left( \inf\{\|u - \alpha y\|_2 : u \in \partial\zeta(x)\} + \inf\{\|\alpha(v - x)\|_2 : v \in \partial g^*(y)\} \right) \\ &\quad - |Q(x, y) - \alpha| \frac{\|y\|_2}{\sqrt{2}G} \stackrel{(III)}{\geq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}G} \text{dist}(0, \partial\psi_\alpha(x, y)) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |Q(x, y) - \alpha| \\ &\stackrel{(IV)}{\geq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \frac{c}{G} (\psi_\alpha(x, y))^\theta - \frac{\psi_\alpha(x, y)}{\eta(x, y)} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \frac{c}{G} - \frac{\psi_\alpha^{1-\theta}(x, y)}{\eta(x, y)} \right) (\psi_\alpha(x, y))^\theta \\ &\stackrel{(V)}{\geq} \frac{c}{2\sqrt{2}G} \psi_\alpha^\theta(x, y) \stackrel{(VI)}{=} \frac{c}{2\sqrt{2}G} (\eta(x, y))^\theta (Q(x, y) - \alpha)^\theta \\ &\stackrel{(VII)}{\geq} \frac{c}{2\sqrt{2}G} \left( \frac{\eta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})}{2} \right)^\theta (Q(x, y) - \alpha)^\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where (I) follows from (72),  $Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) < Q(x, y)$ , and the fact that  $\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} \geq (\alpha + \beta)/\sqrt{2}$  holds for any  $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ ; (II) comes from the triangle inequality; (III) is derived from the relation  $(\partial\zeta(x) - \alpha y) \times \alpha(\partial g^*(y) - x) \subseteq \partial\psi_\alpha(x, y)$  and the fact that  $\|y\|_2 \leq \delta_2 + \|\bar{y}\|_2 \leq G$ ; (IV) holds due to (71) and (74); (V) – (VII) respectively come from (73), (74) and (72).  $\square$

It is proved by [20, Corollary 5.2] that the proper closed function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is a KL function with the exponent 1/2, if  $f$  can be written as

$$f(x) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq T} \left\{ \Psi_i(x) + \frac{1}{2} x^\top P_i x + q_i^\top x + s_i \right\}, \quad (75)$$

where  $\Psi_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  are proper closed polyhedral functions,  $P_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  are symmetric,  $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $s_i \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}_T$  and some  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ . Recall that a function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is said to be a polyhedral function if its epigraph  $\text{epi}(\varphi) := \{(x, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \varphi(x) \leq \alpha\}$  is a polyhedral set, and a set  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is said to be polyhedral if there exists a finite set  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  such that  $\mathcal{S} = \bigcap_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle a, (x, 1) \rangle \leq 0\}$ . For the case when  $f$  has the form (75), the next proposition demonstrates that the KL exponents of  $Q$  and  $F$  are  $1/2$  under some further requirements.

**Proposition 6.11.** *Suppose that  $f$  can be formulated as (75),  $h$  is a quadratic function, and one of the following assumption on  $g$  holds:*

- (i)  $g$  is a polyhedral function;
  - (ii)  $g$  is a positive semi-definite quadratic function, that is,  $g(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^\top Px + q^\top x + s$  for some  $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , and symmetric positive semi-definite matrix  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ .
- Then the function  $F$  given by (8) and the function  $Q$  given by (9) are both KL functions with the exponent  $\theta = 1/2$ .

*Proof.* For Item (i), it is revealed by [29, Theorem 19.2] that  $\text{dom}(g^*)$  is polyhedral, and  $g^* = \widehat{\Psi}_* + \iota_{\text{dom}(g^*)}$  holds for some real-valued polyhedral function  $\widehat{\Psi}_*$ . As to Item (ii), we have  $g^*(y) = \frac{1}{2}(y - q)^\top P^\dagger (y - q) - s + \iota_{\text{Range}(P) + \{q\}}(y)$ , where  $P^\dagger$  denotes the Moore-Penrose inverse of  $P$ . Generally speaking, either for Item (i) or Item (ii), the conjugate of  $g$  takes the form

$$g^*(y) = \widehat{\Psi}_*(y) + \iota_{\mathcal{A}}(y) + \frac{1}{2}y^\top P_* y + q_*^\top y + s_*,$$

where  $\widehat{\Psi}_* : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a real-valued polyhedral function,  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is a polyhedral set,  $P_* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is symmetric,  $q_* \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $s_* \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, the auxiliary function introduced in Theorem 6.10 can be rewritten as

$$\psi_\alpha(x, y) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq T} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} P_i & -\alpha I_n \\ -\alpha I_n & \alpha P_* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} q_i \\ \alpha q_* \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} + \tilde{s}_i + h(x) + \tilde{\Psi}_i(x, y) \right\},$$

where  $\alpha := Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  for the given  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{dom}(\partial Q)$ ,  $\tilde{s}_i := s_i + \alpha s_*$ , and  $\tilde{\Psi}_i(x, y) := \Psi_i(x) + \alpha \widehat{\Psi}_*(y) + \iota_{\mathcal{A}}(y)$  is a polyhedral function for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}_T$ . Also by exploiting [20, Corollary 5.2], we derive that, for an arbitrary  $\alpha \geq 0$ , the  $\psi_\alpha$  is a KL function with the exponent  $\theta = 1/2$ . Note that  $g^*$  satisfies the calmness condition on  $\text{dom}(g^*)$ , since  $g^*(y)$  takes the value by the real-valued convex function  $\widehat{\Psi}_*(y) + y^\top P_* y + q_*^\top y + s_*$  for any  $y \in \text{dom}(g^*)$ . Therefore, we deduce that  $Q$  is a KL function with the exponent  $\theta = 1/2$  with the help of Theorem 6.10, and  $F$  is a KL function with the same exponent  $\theta = 1/2$  with the help of Theorem 3.3.  $\square$

We notice that the vector  $K$ -norm is a polyhedral function, since

$$\text{epi}(\|\cdot\|_{(K)}) = \{(x, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \|x\|_{(K)} \leq \alpha\}$$



$$= \bigcap_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \{(x, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : a^\top x \leq \alpha\} = \bigcap_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ (x, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} a \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \alpha \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \leq 0 \right\},$$

where  $\mathcal{A} = \{a \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^n : \|a\|_0 = K\}$  is a finite set. Thanks to Proposition 6.11, we conclude that the extended objective  $F$  and  $Q$  for problem (3) are both KL functions with exponent  $\frac{1}{2}$ . By Theorem 6.8 and Theorem 6.9, it leads to the following convergence rate theorem concerning CMPGA\_ML for solving problem (3).

**Theorem 6.12.** *The solution sequence  $\{x^{(t)} : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  generated by CMPGA\_ML for problem (3) converges  $R$ -linearly to a critical point of  $F$ .*

## 7 Numerical experiments

In this section, we conduct some preliminary numerical experiments to test the performance of our proposed algorithms, namely, CMPGA and RMPGA. All the experiments are conducted in MATLAB R2022a on a desktop with an Intel Core i5-9500 CPU (3.00 GHz) and 16GB of RAM.

In our numerical tests, we focus on the two ratio regularized sparse signal recovery problems (2) and (3) with highly coherent matrices  $A$ , on which the standard  $\ell_1$  sparse signal recovery model usually fails. Following the works of [27, 35], the matrix  $A$  is generated by oversampled discrete cosine transform (DCT), i.e.,  $A = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  with

$$a_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi\omega j}{D}\right), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_n, \quad (76)$$

where  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is a random vector following the uniform distribution in  $[0, 1]^m$  and  $D > 0$  is a parameter measuring how coherent the matrix is. The parameters of the proposed algorithms are set as follows. We set  $M = 2$ ,  $\sigma = 10^{-6}$ ,  $\gamma = 0.5$ ,  $\tilde{\alpha}_Y \equiv 1000$  and  $\bar{\alpha} = 10^8$  throughout the experiments. Motivated from Barzilai-Borwein spectral method [4],  $\tilde{\alpha}_{(t)}$  is updated by the following formula:

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{(t)} = \begin{cases} \max\left\{\underline{\alpha}, \min\left\{\bar{\alpha}, \frac{\|\Delta x^{(t)}\|_2^2}{|\langle \Delta x^{(t)}, \Delta h^{(t)} \rangle|}\right\}\right\}, & \text{if } |\langle \Delta x^{(t)}, \Delta h^{(t)} \rangle| \geq 10^{-12}, \\ \tilde{\alpha}_{(t-1)}, & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (77)$$

where  $\Delta x^{(t)} := x^{(t)} - x^{(t-1)}$ ,  $\Delta h^{(t)} := \nabla h(x^{(t)}) - \nabla h(x^{(t-1)})$ . Moreover, we set  $\tilde{\alpha}_{(0)} = 1$  and  $\underline{\alpha} = 10^{-8}$  in (77) for solving problem (2), while both  $\tilde{\alpha}_{(0)}$  and  $\underline{\alpha}$  are chosen as  $1.99/(\lambda \|A\|_2^2)$  for problem (3) due to the global Lipschitz differentiability of  $h$  involved. Besides, the index  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$  is picked according to the uniform probability distribution in Step 2 of RMPGA, i.e.,  $p_j^{(t)} \equiv 1/(N+1)$  holds for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}_N^0$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ .

### 7.1 $L_1/S_K$ sparse signal recovery problem (3)

We first generate random instances of problem (3), following similar experimental setting to those of [21, Section 5]. Given  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $D > 0$ , the matrix  $A$  is simulated as (76). The ground truth  $x^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is an  $r$ -sparse signal that has a minimum separation of  $2D$  in its support. Moreover, the nonzero entries of  $x^\dagger$  are set as 1 or

-1 according to two-point distribution. We compute  $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$  by  $b = Ax^\dagger$  and choose  $\underline{x} = -2 \times \mathbf{1}_n$  and  $\bar{x} = 2 \times \mathbf{1}_n$ , where  $\mathbf{1}_n$  denotes the  $n$ -dimensional vector with all entries being 1. Now we get an instance of problem (3) of which  $x^\dagger$  is a critical point as shown in [21, Section 5].

We compare the proposed algorithms with PGSA\_NL [43] and PGSA\_BE [21] for solving problem (3). The parameters of these two algorithms are set as suggested in [21, Section 5]. Note that the proposed algorithms involve the proximity operator with respect to the conjugate function of  $g := \|x\|_{(K)}$ , which can be evaluated using the fact  $\text{prox}_{\alpha g^*}(z) = z - \alpha \text{prox}_{g/\alpha}(\frac{z}{\alpha})$ , for  $\alpha > 0$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . In our implementations, we adopt Algorithm 3 in [10] to compute  $\text{prox}_{\|\cdot\|_{(K)}}$ , of which the computational complexity is  $O(n \log n + n)$ . Throughout the experiments, we fix  $m = 640$ ,  $n = 5400$ ,  $r = 100$ ,  $\lambda = 200$ , and vary the coherent parameter  $D$  from  $\{1, 2, \dots, 9, 10\}$ . For each  $D$ , we generate 50 instances randomly as described above. For each instance, the same initial point  $x^{(0)} = x^\dagger + 0.2\tilde{e}$  is selected for all the algorithms, where the entries of  $\tilde{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  are drawn randomly from the uniform distribution on  $[-1, 1]^n$ . Moreover, all the algorithms are terminated when they reach the precision

$$\frac{\|x^{(k,0)} - x^\dagger\|_2}{\|x^\dagger\|_2} < 10^{-3}. \quad (78)$$

Figure 1 shows a study of the performance of the proposed algorithms with different number of blocks  $N$ . Figures 1(a) and 1(b) respectively plot the averaged number of epochs ( $n/(N+1)$  iterations) and computational time over 50 instances with  $D = 10$ , when CMPGA and RMPGA use various  $N$  ranging from 1 to 40. As we can see from Figure 1(a), the number of epochs required decreases when the number of blocks is increased, which indicates that using larger the number of blocks is more efficient in terms of the overall computation work (e.g., measured in total flops). However, this does not mean shorter computational time. One can observe from Figure 1(b) that using an appropriate number of blocks may take the least amount of computational time, which is not surprising since less number of blocks may benefit better from modern multi-core computers for parallel computing and thus help to reduce the actual computational time.

Table 1 summarizes the results averaged over 50 instances with  $D$  for PGSA\_NL, PGSA\_BE, CMPGA with  $N = 1$  and 8, and RMPGA with  $N = 8$ . For each  $D$ , the averaged number of epochs and computational time (in seconds) for these algorithms are presented in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. We can find that CMPGA with  $N = 1$  performs comparably to PGSA\_NL and PGSA\_BE, while CMPGA and RMPGA with  $N = 8$  outperform the other algorithms.

## 7.2 $L_1/L_2$ sparse signal recovery problem (2)

This subsection is devoted into numerical experiments on the proposed algorithms for solving problem (2). First, we describe how to construct an instance of problem (2) in our test. Given positive integers  $m, n$  and a positive number  $D$ , a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  is produced by (76). As suggested in [35], the ground truth  $x^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is simulated as an  $r$ -sparse signal, which has a minimum separation of at least  $2D$  in its support.

**Table 1** Results for averaged epochs for solving problem (3).

$D$	PGSA_NL	PGSA_BE	CMPGA ( $N=1$ )	CMPGA ( $N=8$ )	RMPGA ( $N=8$ )
1	170	217	163	65	81
2	171	217	163	64	81
3	187	226	178	64	86
4	199	236	191	71	94
5	212	242	203	82	107
6	224	251	215	93	120
7	236	262	225	105	134
8	247	272	235	121	145
9	257	285	244	133	155
10	267	295	253	148	165

**Table 2** Results for averaged computational time for solving problem (3).

$D$	PGSA_NL	PGSA_BE	CMPGA ( $N=1$ )	CMPGA ( $N=8$ )	RMPGA ( $N=8$ )
1	0.379	0.437	0.485	0.200	0.210
2	0.370	0.418	0.466	0.187	0.205
3	0.402	0.435	0.508	0.188	0.213
4	0.427	0.455	0.543	0.205	0.231
5	0.455	0.464	0.574	0.227	0.255
6	0.484	0.483	0.619	0.258	0.289
7	0.501	0.500	0.629	0.282	0.310
8	0.527	0.517	0.657	0.316	0.335
9	0.552	0.547	0.686	0.346	0.366
10	0.581	0.573	0.713	0.384	0.378


Besides, we require the dynamic range of  $x^\dagger$ , which is defined by the ratio of the maximum and minimum in the absolute values of its nonzero entries, to be 1000. In our implementations, the nonzero entries of  $x^\dagger$  is generated by the following MATLAB command:

```
sign(randn(mu,1)).*10.^(3*rand(mu,1));
```

Accordingly, we set  $\underline{x} = -1000 \times \mathbf{1}_n$  and  $\bar{x} = 1000 \times \mathbf{1}_n$  in problem (2), where  $\mathbf{1}_n$  denotes the  $n$ -dimensional vector with all entries being 1. Given  $A, x^\dagger, \underline{x}, \bar{x}$  and a model parameter  $\lambda > 0$ , we can construct a vector  $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $x^\dagger$  is a critical point of problem (2) following a similar way to the work of [32, Section 6.1]. Now we obtain a concrete instance of problem (2) with  $x^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^n$  being one of its critical points.

Next we give the initial point and the stopping criteria for the proposed algorithms. Recall that to satisfy Assumption 2, the initial point  $x^{(0)}$  for the proposed algorithms can be selected such that  $F(x^{(0)}) < 1 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|b\|_2^2$ . For  $j \in \mathbb{N}_n$ , we denote by  $e_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$  the one-sparse vector whose  $j$ -th entry is 1. In view of  $-\underline{x} = \bar{x} = 1000 \times \mathbf{1}_n$ , it is easy to verify that for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}_n$  with  $a_j^\top b \neq 0$ ,  $\text{sign}(a_j^\top b) \min\{|a_j^\top b|/\|a_j\|_2^2, \bar{x}\} e_j$  satisfies the aforementioned condition required for  $x^{(0)}$ . In our tests, we simply find  $j_0 := \min\{j \in \mathbb{N}_n : a_j^\top b \neq 0\}$  and set the initial point  $x^{(0)} = \text{sign}(a_{j_0}^\top b) \min\{|a_{j_0}^\top b|/\|a_{j_0}\|_2^2, \bar{x}\} e_{j_0}$  for

**Fig. 1** Performance of CMPGA and RMPGA with different number of blocks.



all the proposed algorithms. Furthermore, we terminate the proposed algorithms when

$$\frac{\text{dist}(0, \partial Q(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}))}{\|(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)})\|_2} < 10^{-7}. \quad (79)$$

Below we show that for problem (2) the distance  $\text{dist}(0, \partial Q(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}))$  at any  $(x, y) \in \text{dom}(Q)$  can be computed in an explicit way. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote the box  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \underline{x} \leq x \leq \bar{x}\}$ . In the case of  $\zeta(x) > 0$ , by Proposition 2.2 (ii), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}^2(0, \partial Q(x, y)) = \eta^{-2}(x, y) & \left( \text{dist}^2(Q(x, y)y - \nabla h(x), \partial \iota_{\mathcal{C}}(x) + \partial \|\cdot\|_1(x)) \right. \\ & \left. + Q^2(x, y) \text{dist}^2(x, \partial(\|\cdot\|_2)^*(y)) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Note that  $\partial \iota_{\mathcal{C}}(x) + \partial \|\cdot\|_1(x)$  is a cuboid in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , while  $\partial(\|\cdot\|_2)^*(y) = \{0_n\}$  for  $\|y\|_2 < 1$  and  $\partial(\|\cdot\|_2)^*(y) = \{\beta y : \beta \geq 0\}$  for  $\|y\|_2 = 1$ . Hence,  $\text{dist}(0, \partial Q(x, y))$  can be directly evaluated via (80) if  $\zeta(x) > 0$ . On the other hand, if  $\zeta(x) = 0$ , it is trivial that  $Q$  attains its global minimum at  $(x, y)$  and thus  $\text{dist}(0, \partial Q(x, y)) = 0$ .

We compare the proposed algorithms with the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) for solving problem (2), which is recently developed in [35]. Followig the notations and suggestions in [35, Section 5], we set  $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = \beta = 1$ , and choose  $\bar{\epsilon} = 10^{-6}$  and  $\text{j\_max} = 5$  for the inner iterations of ADMM. Besides, the initial point and stopping criteria of ADMM are set as the same as those of the proposed algorithms. In particular, for ADMM, we set  $y^{(t)} := \nabla g(x^{(t)}) = \frac{x^{(t)}}{\|x^{(t)}\|_2}$  to verify the stopping condition (79).

In our experiments, we set  $(m, n, r) = (64R, 540R, \tilde{r}R)$  with  $\tilde{r} \in \{6, 8, 10, 12, 14\}$  and  $R \in \{8, 10, 12\}$ . Also, we fix the coherent parameter  $D = 1$  and the model parameter  $\lambda = 2 \times 10^{-4}$ . For each triple  $(m, n, r)$ , we generate 50 instances of problem (2) as described above. Then we run ADMM, RMPGA with the block number  $N = 8$ , as well as CMPGA with  $N = 1$  and 8, for solving the above instances of problem (2). The

computational results averaged over the 50 instances with the same  $(m, n, r)$  are presented in Tables 3 and 4, which correspond to the objective values and computational time<sup>2</sup> (in seconds), respectively. One can observe that the proposed algorithms significantly outperform ADMM in terms of CPU time, while the objective values found by the tested algorithms are comparable. Also, CMPGA with  $N = 8$  takes about one half of the CPU time needed by the ones with  $N = 1$  to achieve the same accuracy, which tells that properly exploiting the block separable structure of  $f$  can help to improve the computational efficiency. Moreover, we observe that the deterministic algorithm (CMPGA with  $N = 8$ ) slightly outperform its randomized counterpart (RMPGA with  $N = 8$ ), which is reasonable as a similar observations have been found in the literature, see [7, Section 3.2], for example.

**Table 3** Results for objective values for solving problem (2).

$(m, n, r)$	ADMM	CMPGA ( $N=1$ )	CMPGA ( $N=8$ )	RMPGA ( $N=8$ )
(512, 4320, 48)	84.35	84.35	84.35	84.35
(512, 4320, 64)	68.99	68.99	68.99	68.99
(512, 4320, 80)	73.51	73.51	73.51	73.51
(512, 4320, 96)	28.35	28.35	28.35	28.35
(512, 4320, 112)	24.90	24.90	24.90	24.90
(640, 5400, 60)	31.66	31.66	31.66	31.66
(640, 5400, 80)	36.73	36.73	36.73	36.73
(640, 5400, 100)	22.90	22.90	22.90	22.90
(640, 5400, 120)	22.53	22.53	22.53	22.53
(640, 5400, 140)	47.41	47.41	47.41	47.41
(768, 6480, 72)	19.15	19.15	19.15	19.15
(768, 6480, 96)	19.41	19.41	19.41	19.41
(768, 6480, 120)	13.73	13.73	13.73	13.73
(768, 6480, 144)	21.00	21.00	21.00	21.00
(768, 6480, 168)	24.60	24.60	24.60	24.60

**Acknowledgments.** We would like to thank Prof. Lixin Shen for his helpful discussions and valuable suggestions.

## Declarations

- Funding: The work of Na Zhang was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China grant number 12271181, by the Guangzhou Basic Research Program grant number 202201010426 and by the Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation of Guangdong Province grant number 2023A1515030046. The work of Qia Li was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China grant 11971499 and the Guangdong Province Key Laboratory of Computational Science at the Sun Yat-sen University (2020B1212060032).

---

<sup>2</sup>The computational time reported does not include the time for verifying the stopping criteria (79).

**Table 4** Results for computational time for solving problem (2).

$(m, n, r)$	ADMM	CMPGA ( $N=1$ )	CMPGA ( $N=8$ )	RMPGA ( $N=8$ )
(512, 4320, 48)	3.94	0.16	0.12	0.12
(512, 4320, 64)	4.24	0.15	0.09	0.14
(512, 4320, 80)	4.67	0.16	0.10	0.15
(512, 4320, 96)	5.64	0.21	0.11	0.19
(512, 4320, 112)	6.82	0.27	0.15	0.22
(640, 5400, 60)	6.58	0.23	0.13	0.17
(640, 5400, 80)	7.23	0.31	0.16	0.21
(640, 5400, 100)	7.99	0.31	0.15	0.24
(640, 5400, 120)	9.48	0.37	0.16	0.29
(640, 5400, 140)	11.17	0.48	0.23	0.39
(768, 6480, 72)	9.90	0.32	0.16	0.24
(768, 6480, 96)	10.92	0.44	0.22	0.29
(768, 6480, 120)	12.80	0.72	0.37	0.38
(768, 6480, 144)	15.00	0.63	0.28	0.57
(768, 6480, 168)	18.14	0.82	0.39	0.63

## Appendix A The proof of Proposition 2.4

*Proof.* For convenience, we let

$$d_k := \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2^2 + a_k \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_k := \phi(H(x^k, y^k) - \xi).$$

It follows from Condition (i) that  $\{H(x^k, y^k) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is non-increasing. This together with Condition (iii) implies  $H(x^k, y^k) \geq \xi$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $H(x^{k_0}, y^{k_0}) = \xi$  for some  $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , Condition (i) yields that  $H(x^k, y^k) = \xi$  and  $d_k = 0$  hold for any  $k \geq k_0$ . Then, we obtain this proposition from Condition (ii) immediately. Hence, we only need to consider the case when

$$H(x^k, y^k) > \xi \tag{A1}$$

holds for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We first show that there exist  $K_3 \geq 0$  and a continuous concave function  $\phi : [0, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  satisfying Items (i)-(ii) in Definition 1 such that there holds, for  $k \geq K_3$ ,

$$\phi'(H(x^k, y^k) - \xi) \text{dist}(0, \partial H(x^k, y^k)) \geq 1. \tag{A2}$$

Since  $\{(x^k, y^k) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is bounded, the set  $\Upsilon$  is compact. In view of Condition (iii) and (A1), for any  $\delta > 0$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $K_3 > 0$  such that

$$(x^k, y^k) \in \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m : \text{dist}((x, y), \Upsilon) < \delta, \xi < H(x, y) < \xi + \epsilon\}$$

holds for any  $k \geq K_3$ . Hence, by invoking Lemma 2.3 (i), we deduce that (A2) holds for any  $k \geq K_3$ .

Then, for  $k \geq K := \max\{K_1, K_2, K_3\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{d_k} &\stackrel{(I)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{1}{C_1}(H(x^k, y^k) - H(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}))} \\
&\stackrel{(II)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{1}{C_1}(\gamma_k - \gamma_{k+1})/\phi'(H(x^k, y^k) - \xi)} \\
&\stackrel{(III)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{2C_2}{C_1}(\gamma_k - \gamma_{k+1})\frac{1}{2}(\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|_2 + \sqrt{a_{k-1}}\|y^k - y^{k-1}\|_2)} \\
&\stackrel{(IV)}{\leq} \frac{C_2}{C_1}(\gamma_k - \gamma_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{4}(\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|_2 + \sqrt{a_{k-1}}\|y^k - y^{k-1}\|_2) \\
&= \frac{C_2}{C_1}(\gamma_k - \gamma_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{d_{k-1} + 2\sqrt{a_{k-1}}\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|_2\|y^k - y^{k-1}\|_2} \\
&\stackrel{(V)}{\leq} \frac{C_2}{C_1}(\gamma_k - \gamma_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{2d_{k-1}} \leq \frac{C_2}{C_1}(\gamma_k - \gamma_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{d_{k-1}}, \tag{A3}
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality (I) follows from Condition (i); the inequality (II) follows from the concavity of  $\phi$ ; the inequality (III) follows from (A2) and Condition (ii); the inequalities (IV) and (V) follow from the facts that  $\sqrt{\alpha\beta} \leq \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}$  and  $2\alpha\beta \leq \alpha^2 + \beta^2$  hold for any  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ , respectively. By summing (A3) from  $k = K+1$  to  $k = J > K+1$ , we have

$$\sum_{k=K+1}^J \sqrt{d_k} \leq \frac{C_2}{C_1}(\gamma_{K+1} - \gamma_{J+1}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=K}^{J-1} \sqrt{d_k}.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=K+1}^{J-1} \sqrt{d_k} \leq \frac{C_2}{C_1}(\gamma_{K+1} - \gamma_{J+1}) - \sqrt{d_J} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{d_K} \leq \frac{C_2}{C_1}\gamma_{K+1} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{d_K}. \tag{A4}$$

By passing to the limit with  $J \rightarrow \infty$  on the both sides of (A4), we obtain  $\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \sqrt{d_k} < +\infty$  and Item (i). Item (ii) is the direct result of Item (i), and Item (iii) follows from Item (i) and Condition (ii).  $\square$

## References

- [1] H. ATTOUCH AND J. BOLTE, *On the convergence of the proximal algorithm for nonsmooth functions involving analytic features*, Mathematical Programming, 116 (2009), pp. 5–16.
- [2] H. ATTOUCH, J. BOLTE, P. REDONT, AND A. SOUBEYRAN, *Proximal alternating minimization and projection methods for nonconvex problems: An approach based on the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz inequality*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 35 (2010), pp. 438–457.

- [3] S. BANERT AND R. I. BOŢ, *A general double-proximal gradient algorithm for DC programming*, *Mathematical Programming*, 178 (2019), pp. 301–326.
- [4] J. BARZILAI AND J. M. BORWEIN, *Two-point step size gradient methods*, *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 8 (1988), pp. 141–148.
- [5] H. H. BAUSCHKE, P. L. COMBETTES, ET AL., *Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces*, vol. 408, Springer, 2011.
- [6] A. BECK, *First-order Methods in Optimization*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2017.
- [7] A. BECK AND L. TETRUASHVILI, *On the convergence of block coordinate descent type methods*, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23 (2013), pp. 2037–2060.
- [8] D. BERTSEKAS, *Convex Optimization Theory*, vol. 1, Athena Scientific, 2009.
- [9] R. I. BOŢ, M. N. DAO, AND G. LI, *Extrapolated proximal subgradient algorithms for nonconvex and nonsmooth fractional programs*, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47 (2022), pp. 2415–2443.
- [10] M. BOGDAN, E. VAN DEN BERG, C. SABATTI, W. SU, AND E. J. CANDÈS, *SLOPE—Adaptive variable selection via convex optimization*, *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 9 (2015), pp. 1103 – 1140.
- [11] J. BOLTE, A. DANIILIDIS, AND A. LEWIS, *The Lojasiewicz inequality for nonsmooth subanalytic functions with applications to subgradient dynamical systems*, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 17 (2007), pp. 1205–1223.
- [12] J. BOLTE, T. P. NGUYEN, J. PEYPOUQUET, AND B. W. SUTER, *From error bounds to the complexity of first-order descent methods for convex functions*, *Mathematical Programming*, 165 (2017), pp. 471–507.
- [13] J. BOLTE, S. SABACH, AND M. TEBoulLE, *Proximal alternating linearized minimization for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems*, *Mathematical Programming*, 146 (2014), pp. 459–494.
- [14] X. CHEN, Z. LU, AND T. K. PONG, *Penalty methods for a class of non-lipschitz optimization problems*, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 26 (2016), pp. 1465–1492.
- [15] F. H. CLARKE, Y. S. LEDYAEV, R. J. STERN, AND P. R. WOLENSKI, *Nonsmooth analysis and control theory*, vol. 178, Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [16] J.-P. CROUZEIX, J. FERLAND, AND S. SCHAIBLE, *An algorithm for generalized fractional programs*, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 47 (1985), pp. 35–49.
- [17] W. DINKELBACH, *On nonlinear fractional programming*, *Management Science*,



- 13 (1967), pp. 492–498.
- [18] J.-Y. GOTOH, A. TAKEDA, AND K. TONO, *DC formulations and algorithms for sparse optimization problems*, *Mathematical Programming*, 169 (2018), pp. 141–176.
- [19] T. IBARAKI, *Parametric approaches to fractional programs*, *Mathematical Programming*, 26 (1983), pp. 345–362.
- [20] G. LI AND T. K. PONG, *Calculus of the exponent of Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz inequality and its applications to linear convergence of first-order methods*, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 18 (2018), pp. 1199–1232.
- [21] Q. LI, L. SHEN, N. ZHANG, AND J. ZHOU, *A proximal algorithm with backtracked extrapolation for a class of structured fractional programming*, *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 56 (2022), pp. 98–122.
- [22] Z. LU AND L. XIAO, *A randomized nonmonotone block proximal gradient method for a class of structured nonlinear programming*, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 55 (2017), pp. 2930–2955.
- [23] Z.-Q. LUO AND J.-S. PANG, *Error bounds for analytic systems and their applications*, *Mathematical Programming*, 67 (1994), pp. 1–28.
- [24] B. S. MORDUKHOVICH, *Variational analysis and generalized differentiation I: Basic theory*, vol. 330, Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [25] B. S. MORDUKHOVICH, N. M. NAM, AND N. YEN, *Fréchet subdifferential calculus and optimality conditions in nondifferentiable programming*, *Optimization*, 55 (2006), pp. 685–708.
- [26] J.-S. PANG, *Error bounds in mathematical programming*, *Mathematical Programming*, 79 (1997), pp. 299–332.
- [27] Y. RAHIMI, C. WANG, H. DONG, AND Y. LOU, *A scale-invariant approach for sparse signal recovery*, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 41 (2019), pp. A3649–A3672.
- [28] S. I. RESNICK, *A Probability Path*, Birkhäuser Boston, MA, 2014.
- [29] R. T. ROCKAFELLAR, *Convex Analysis*, Princeton University Press, NJ, 1970.
- [30] R. T. ROCKAFELLAR AND R. J.-B. WETS, *Variational Analysis*, Springer New York, NY, 1998.
- [31] S. SCHAIBLE, *Fractional programming. II, on Dinkelbach’s algorithm*, *Management Science*, 22 (1976), pp. 868–873.

- [32] M. TAO, *Minimization of  $l_1$  over  $l_2$  for sparse signal recovery with convergence guarantee*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 44 (2022), pp. A770–A797.
- [33] K. TONO, A. TAKEDA, AND J. YA GOTOH, *Efficient DC algorithm for constrained sparse optimization*, ArXiv preprint arXiv:1701.08498, (2017).
- [34] C. WANG, M. TAO, J. G. NAGY, AND Y. LOU, *Limited-angle CT reconstruction via the  $l_1/l_2$  minimization*, SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences, 14 (2021), pp. 749–777.
- [35] C. WANG, M. YAN, Y. RAHIMI, AND Y. LOU, *Accelerated schemes for the  $l_1/l_2$  minimization*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 68 (2020), pp. 2660–2669.
- [36] B. WEN, X. CHEN, AND T. K. PONG, *A proximal difference-of-convex algorithm with extrapolation*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 69 (2018), pp. 297–324.
- [37] S. J. WRIGHT, R. D. NOWAK, AND M. A. FIGUEIREDO, *Sparse reconstruction by separable approximation*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 57 (2009), pp. 2479–2493.
- [38] B. WU, C. DING, D. SUN, AND K.-C. TOH, *On the Moreau–Yosida regularization of the vector  $k$ -norm related functions*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 24 (2014), pp. 766–794.
- [39] Y. XU AND W. YIN, *A block coordinate descent method for regularized multiconvex optimization with applications to nonnegative tensor factorization and completion*, SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences, 6 (2013), pp. 1758–1789.
- [40] P. YIN, E. ESSER, AND J. XIN, *Ratio and difference of  $l_1$  and  $l_2$  norms and sparse representation with coherent dictionaries*, Communications in Information and Systems, 14 (2014), pp. 87–109.
- [41] P. YU, G. LI, AND T. PONG, *Kurdyka–łojasiewicz exponent via inf-projection*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics, 22 (2022), p. 1171–1217.
- [42] L. ZENG, P. YU, AND T. K. PONG, *Analysis and algorithms for some compressed sensing models based on  $l_1/l_2$  minimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 31 (2021), pp. 1576–1603.
- [43] N. ZHANG AND Q. LI, *First-order algorithms for a class of fractional optimization problems*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 32 (2022), pp. 100–129.