

Global rates of convergence for nonconvex optimization on manifolds

Nicolas Boumal* P.-A. Absil† Coralia Cartis‡

March 8, 2022

Abstract

We consider the minimization of a cost function f on a manifold \mathcal{M} using Riemannian gradient descent and Riemannian trust regions (RTR). We focus on satisfying necessary optimality conditions within a tolerance ε . Specifically, we show that, under Lipschitz-type assumptions on the pullbacks of f to the tangent spaces of \mathcal{M} , both of these algorithms produce points with Riemannian gradient smaller than ε in $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^2)$ iterations. Furthermore, RTR returns a point where also the Riemannian Hessian's least eigenvalue is larger than $-\varepsilon$ in $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^3)$ iterations. There are no assumptions on initialization. The rates match their (sharp) unconstrained counterparts as a function of the accuracy ε (up to constants) and hence are sharp in that sense.

These are the first deterministic results for global rates of convergence to approximate first- and second-order Karush–Kuhn–Tucker points on manifolds. They apply in particular for optimization constrained to compact submanifolds of \mathbb{R}^n , under simpler assumptions.

Published in IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drx080>.

1 Introduction

Optimization on manifolds is concerned with solving nonlinear and typically nonconvex computational problems of the form

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{M}} f(x), \tag{P}$$

where \mathcal{M} is a (smooth) Riemannian manifold and $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a (sufficiently smooth) cost function (Gabay, 1982; Smith, 1994; Edelman et al., 1998; Absil et al., 2008). Applications abound in machine learning, computer vision, scientific computing, numerical linear algebra, signal processing, etc. In typical applications, x is a matrix and \mathcal{M} could be a Stiefel manifold of orthonormal frames (including spheres and groups of rotations), a Grassmann manifold of subspaces, a cone of positive definite matrices, or simply a Euclidean space such as \mathbb{R}^n .

*Mathematics Department and PACM, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA.

†ICTEAM Institute, Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

‡Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

The standard theory for optimization on manifolds takes the standpoint that optimizing on a manifold \mathcal{M} is not fundamentally different from optimizing in \mathbb{R}^n . Indeed, many classical algorithms from unconstrained nonlinear optimization such as gradient descent, nonlinear conjugate gradients, BFGS, Newton’s method and trust-region methods (Nocedal and Wright, 1999; Ruszczyński, 2006) have been adapted to apply to the larger framework of (P) (Adler et al., 2002; Absil et al., 2007, 2008; Ring and Wirth, 2012; Huang et al., 2015; Sato, 2016). Software-wise, a few general toolboxes for optimization on manifolds exist now, e.g., Manopt (Boumal et al., 2014), PyManopt (Townsend et al., 2016) and ROPTLIB (Huang et al., 2016).

As (P) is typically nonconvex, one does not expect general purpose, efficient algorithms to converge to global optima of (P) in general. Indeed, the class of problems (P) includes known NP-hard problems. Even computing *local* optima is NP-hard in general (Vavasis, 1991, §5).

Nevertheless, one may still hope to compute points of \mathcal{M} which satisfy first- and second-order necessary optimality conditions. These conditions take up the same form as in unconstrained nonlinear optimization, with *Riemannian* notions of gradient and Hessian. For \mathcal{M} defined by equality constraints, these conditions are equivalent to first- and second-order Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) conditions, but are simpler to manipulate because the Lagrangian multipliers are automatically determined.

The proposition below states these necessary optimality conditions. Recall that to each point x of \mathcal{M} corresponds a tangent space (a linearization) $T_x\mathcal{M}$. The Riemannian gradient $\text{grad}f(x)$ is the unique tangent vector at x such that $Df(x)[\eta] = \langle \eta, \text{grad}f(x) \rangle$ for all tangent vectors η , where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the Riemannian metric on $T_x\mathcal{M}$, and $Df(x)[\eta]$ is the directional derivative of f at x along η . The Riemannian Hessian $\text{Hess}f(x)$ is a symmetric operator on $T_x\mathcal{M}$, corresponding to the derivative of the gradient vector field with respect to the Levi–Civita connection—see (Absil et al., 2008, §5). These objects are easily computed in applications. A summary of relevant concepts about manifolds can be found in Appendix A.

Proposition 1 (Necessary optimality conditions). *Let $x \in \mathcal{M}$ be a local optimum for (P). If f is differentiable at x , then $\text{grad}f(x) = 0$. If f is twice differentiable at x , then $\text{Hess}f(x) \succeq 0$ (positive semidefinite).*

Proof. See (Yang et al., 2014, Rem. 4.2 and Cor. 4.2). □

A point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ which satisfies $\text{grad}f(x) = 0$ is a (*first-order*) *critical point* (also called a stationary point). If x furthermore satisfies $\text{Hess}f(x) \succeq 0$, it is a *second-order critical point*.

Existing theory for optimization algorithms on manifolds is mostly concerned with establishing global convergence to critical points without rates (where global means regardless of initialization), as well as local rates of convergence. For example, gradient descent is known to converge globally to critical points, and the convergence rate is linear once the iterates reach a *sufficiently small neighborhood* of the limit point (Absil et al., 2008, §4). Early work of Udriste (1994) on local convergence rates even bounds distance to optimizers as a function of iteration count, assuming initialization in a set where the Hessian of f is positive definite, with lower and upper bounds on the eigenvalues; see also (Absil et al., 2008, Thm. 4.5.6, Thm. 7.4.11). Such guarantees adequately describe the empirical behavior of those methods, but give no information about how many iterations are required to reach the local regime from an arbitrary initial point x_0 ; that is: the worst-case scenarios are not addressed.

For classical unconstrained nonlinear optimization, this caveat has been addressed by bounding the number of iterations required by known algorithms to compute points which

satisfy necessary optimality conditions within some tolerance, without assumptions on the initial iterate. Among others, [Nesterov \(2004\)](#) gives a proof that, for $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^n$ and Lipschitz differentiable f , gradient descent with an appropriate step-size computes a point x where $\|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon$ in $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^2)$ iterations. This is sharp ([Cartis et al., 2010](#)). [Cartis et al. \(2012\)](#) prove the same for trust-region methods, and further show that if f is twice Lipschitz continuously differentiable, then a point x where $\|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon$ and $\text{Hess}f(x) \succeq -\varepsilon \text{Id}$ is computed in $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^3)$ iterations, also with examples showing sharpness.

In this paper, we extend the unconstrained results to the larger class of optimization problems on manifolds (P). This work builds upon the original proofs ([Nesterov, 2004](#); [Cartis et al., 2012](#)) and on existing adaptations of gradient descent and trust-region methods to manifolds ([Absil et al., 2007, 2008](#)). One key step is the identification of a set of relevant Lipschitz-type regularity assumptions which allows the proofs to carry over from \mathbb{R}^n to \mathcal{M} with relative ease.

Main results

We state the main results here informally. We use the notion of *retraction* Retr_x (see Definition 1 below), which allows to map tangent vectors at x to points on \mathcal{M} . Iterates are related by $x_{k+1} = \text{Retr}_{x_k}(\eta_k)$ for some tangent vector η_k at x_k (the step). Hence, $f \circ \text{Retr}_x$ is a lift of the cost function from \mathcal{M} to the tangent space at x . For $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^n$, the standard retraction gives $\text{Retr}_{x_k}(\eta_k) = x_k + \eta_k$. By $\|\cdot\|$, we denote the norm associated to the Riemannian metric.

About gradient descent (See Theorems 5 and 8.) For problem (P), if f is bounded below on \mathcal{M} and $f \circ \text{Retr}_x$ has Lipschitz gradient with constant L_g independent of x , then Riemannian gradient descent with constant step size $1/L_g$ or with backtracking Armijo line-search returns x with $\|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon$ in $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^2)$ iterations.

About trust regions (See Theorem 12.) For problem (P), if f is bounded below on \mathcal{M} and $f \circ \text{Retr}_x$ has Lipschitz gradient with constant independent of x , then RTR returns x with $\|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon_g$ in $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon_g^2)$ iterations, under weak assumptions on the model quality. If further $f \circ \text{Retr}_x$ has Lipschitz Hessian with constant independent of x , then RTR returns x with $\|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon_g$ and $\text{Hess}f(x) \succeq -\varepsilon_H \text{Id}$ in $\mathcal{O}(\max\{1/\varepsilon_H^3, 1/\varepsilon_g^2 \varepsilon_H\})$ iterations, provided the true Hessian is used in the model and a second-order retraction is used.

About compact submanifolds (See Lemmas 4 and 9.) The first-order regularity conditions above hold in particular if \mathcal{M} is a compact submanifold of a Euclidean space \mathcal{E} (such as \mathbb{R}^n) and $f: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has a locally Lipschitz continuous gradient. The second-order regularity conditions hold if furthermore f has a locally Lipschitz continuous Hessian on \mathcal{E} and the retraction is second order (Definition 2).

Since the rates $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^2)$ and $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^3)$ are sharp for gradient descent and trust regions when $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^n$ ([Cartis et al., 2010, 2012](#)), they are also sharp for \mathcal{M} a generic Riemannian manifold. Below, constants are given explicitly, thus precisely bounding the total amount of work required in the worst case to attain a prescribed tolerance.

The theorems presented here are the first deterministic results about the worst-case iteration complexity of computing (approximate) first- and second-order critical points on manifolds. The choice of analyzing Riemannian gradient descent and RTR first is guided by practical concerns, as these are among the most commonly used methods on manifolds so far. The proposed complexity bounds are particularly relevant when applied to problems for which second-order necessary optimality conditions are also sufficient. See for example (Sun et al., 2017a,b; Boumal, 2015b, 2016; Bandeira et al., 2016; Bhojanapalli et al., 2016; Ge et al., 2016) and the example in Section 4.

Related work

The complexity of Riemannian optimization is discussed in a few recent lines of work. Zhang and Sra (2016) treat geodesically convex problems over Hadamard manifolds. This is a remarkable extension of important pieces of classic convex optimization theory to manifolds with negative curvature. Because of the focus on geodesically convex problems, those results do not apply to the more general problem (P), but have the clear advantage of guaranteeing global optimality. In (Zhang et al., 2016), which appeared a day before the present paper on public repositories, the authors also study the iteration complexity of nonconvex optimization on manifolds. Their results differ from the ones presented here in that they focus on *stochastic* optimization algorithms, aiming for first-order conditions. Their results assume bounded curvature for the manifold. Furthermore, their analysis relies on the Riemannian exponential map, whereas we cover the more general class of retraction maps (which is computationally advantageous). We also do not use the notions of Riemannian parallel transport or logarithmic map, which, in our view, makes for a simpler analysis.

Sun et al. (2017a,b) consider dictionary learning and phase retrieval, and show that these problems, when appropriately framed as optimization on a manifold, are low dimensional and have no spurious local optimizers. They derive the complexity of RTR specialized to their application. In particular, they combine the global rate with a local convergence rate, which allows them to establish an overall better complexity than $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^3)$, but with an idealized version of the algorithm and restricted to these relevant applications. In this paper, we favor a more general approach, focused on algorithms closer to the ones implemented in practice.

Recent work by Bento et al. (2017) (which appeared after a first version of this paper) focuses on iteration complexity of gradient, subgradient and proximal point methods for the case of convex cost functions on manifolds, using the exponential map as retraction.

For the unconstrained case, optimal complexity bounds of order $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^{1.5})$ to generate x with $\|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon$ have also been given for cubic regularization methods (Cartis et al., 2011a,b) and sophisticated trust region variants (Curtis et al., 2016). Bounds for regularization methods can be further improved given higher-order derivatives (Birgin et al., 2017).

Worst-case evaluation complexity bounds have been extended to constrained smooth problems in (Cartis et al., 2014, 2015a,b). There, it is shown that some carefully devised, albeit impractical, phase 1–phase 2 methods can compute approximate KKT points with global rates of convergence of the same order as in the unconstrained case. We note that when the constraints are convex (but the objective may not be), practical, feasible methods have been devised (Cartis et al., 2015a) that connect to our approach below. Second-order optimality for the case of convex constraints with nonconvex cost is recently addressed in (Cartis et al., 2017).

2 Riemannian gradient descent methods

Consider the generic Riemannian descent method described in Algorithm 1. We first prove that, provided sufficient decrease in the cost function is achieved at each iteration, the algorithm computes a point x_k such that $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon$ with $k = \mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^2)$. Then, we propose a Lipschitz-type assumption which is sufficient to guarantee that simple strategies to pick the steps η_k indeed ensure sufficient decrease. The proofs parallel the standard ones (Nesterov, 2004, §1.2.3). The main novelty is the careful extension to the Riemannian setting, which requires the well-known notion of retraction (Definition 1) and the new assumption A3 (see below).

The step η_k is a tangent vector to \mathcal{M} at x_k . Because \mathcal{M} is nonlinear (in general), the operation $x_k + \eta_k$ is undefined. The notion of *retraction* provides a theoretically sound replacement. Informally, $x_{k+1} = \text{Retr}_{x_k}(\eta_k)$ is a point on \mathcal{M} one reaches by moving away from x_k , along the direction η_k , while remaining on the manifold. The Riemannian exponential map (which generates geodesics) is a retraction. The crucial point is that many other maps are retractions, often far less difficult to compute than the exponential. The definition of retraction below can be traced back to Shub (1986) and it appears under that name in (Adler et al., 2002); see also (Absil et al., 2008, Def. 4.1.1 and §4.10) for additional references.

Definition 1 (Retraction). *A retraction on a manifold \mathcal{M} is a smooth mapping Retr from the tangent bundle¹ $\text{T}\mathcal{M}$ to \mathcal{M} with the following properties. Let $\text{Retr}_x: \text{T}_x\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ denote the restriction of Retr to $\text{T}_x\mathcal{M}$.*

- (i) $\text{Retr}_x(0_x) = x$, where 0_x is the zero vector in $\text{T}_x\mathcal{M}$;
- (ii) The differential of Retr_x at 0_x , $\text{DRetr}_x(0_x)$, is the identity map.

These combined conditions ensure retraction curves $t \mapsto \text{Retr}_x(t\eta)$ agree up to first order with geodesics passing through x with velocity η , around $t = 0$. Sometimes, we allow Retr_x to be defined only locally, in a closed ball of radius $\varrho(x) > 0$ centered at 0_x in $\text{T}_x\mathcal{M}$.

In linear spaces such as \mathbb{R}^n , the typical choice is $\text{Retr}_x(\eta) = x + \eta$. On the sphere, a popular choice is $\text{Retr}_x(\eta) = \frac{x+\eta}{\|x+\eta\|}$.

Remark 2. *If the retraction at x_k is only defined in a ball of radius $\varrho_k = \varrho(x_k)$ around the origin in $\text{T}_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$, we limit the size of step η_k to ϱ_k . Theorems in this section provide a complexity result provided $\varrho = \inf_k \varrho_k > 0$. If the injectivity radius of the manifold is positive, retractions satisfying the condition $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \varrho(x) > 0$ exist. In particular, compact manifolds have positive injectivity radius (Chavel, 2006, Thm. III.2.3). The option to limit the step sizes is also useful when the constant L_g in A3 below does not exist globally.*

The two central assumptions and a general theorem about Algorithm 1 follow.

A1 (Lower bound). *There exists $f^* > -\infty$ such that $f(x) \geq f^*$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$.*

A2 (Sufficient decrease). *There exist $c, c' > 0$ such that, for all $k \geq 0$,*

$$f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq \min(c\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|, c')\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|.$$

¹Informally, the tangent bundle $\text{T}\mathcal{M}$ is the set of all pairs (x, η_x) where $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\eta_x \in \text{T}_x\mathcal{M}$. See (Absil et al., 2008) for a proper definition of $\text{T}\mathcal{M}$ and of what it means for Retr to be smooth.

Algorithm 1 Generic Riemannian descent algorithm

1: **Given:** $f: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ differentiable, a retraction Retr on \mathcal{M} , $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, $\varepsilon > 0$
2: **Init:** $k \leftarrow 0$
3: **while** $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| > \varepsilon$ **do**
4: Pick $\eta_k \in T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$ (e.g., as in Theorem 5 or Theorem 8)
5: $x_{k+1} = \text{Retr}_{x_k}(\eta_k)$
6: $k \leftarrow k + 1$
7: **end while**
8: **return** x_k $\triangleright \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon$

Theorem 3. Under A1 and A2, Algorithm 1 returns $x \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $f(x) \leq f(x_0)$ and $\|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon$ in at most

$$\left\lceil \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{c} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \right\rceil$$

iterations, provided $\varepsilon \leq \frac{c'}{c}$. If $\varepsilon > \frac{c'}{c}$, at most $\left\lceil \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{c'} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil$ iterations are required.

Proof. If Algorithm 1 executes $K - 1$ iterations without terminating, then $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| > \varepsilon$ for all k in $0, \dots, K - 1$. Then, using A1 and A2 in a classic telescoping sum argument gives:

$$f(x_0) - f^* \geq f(x_0) - f(x_K) = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) > K \min(c\varepsilon, c')\varepsilon.$$

By contradiction, the algorithm must have terminated if $K \geq \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\min(c\varepsilon, c')\varepsilon}$.

□

To ensure A2 with simple rules for the choice of η_k , it is necessary to restrict the class of functions f . For the particular case $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\text{Retr}_x(\eta) = x + \eta$, the classical assumption is to require f to have a Lipschitz continuous gradient (Nesterov, 2004), that is, existence of L_g such that:

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \|\text{grad}f(x) - \text{grad}f(y)\| \leq L_g \|x - y\|. \quad (1)$$

As we argue momentarily, generalizing this property to manifolds is impractical. On the other hand, it is well known that (1) implies (see for example (Nesterov, 2004, Lemma 1.2.3); see also (Berger, 2017, App. A) for a converse):

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad |f(y) - [f(x) + \langle y - x, \text{grad}f(x) \rangle]| \leq \frac{L_g}{2} \|y - x\|^2. \quad (2)$$

It is the latter we adapt to manifolds. Consider the *pullback*² $\hat{f}_x = f \circ \text{Retr}_x: T_x\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, conveniently defined on a vector space. It follows from the definition of retraction that $\text{grad}\hat{f}_x(0_x) = \text{grad}f(x)$.³ Thinking of x as x_k and of y as $\text{Retr}_{x_k}(\eta)$, we require the following.

²The composition $f \circ \text{Retr}_x$ is called the pullback because it, quite literally, pulls back the cost function f from the manifold \mathcal{M} to the linear space $T_x\mathcal{M}$.

³ $\forall \eta \in T_x\mathcal{M}$, $\langle \text{grad}\hat{f}_x(0_x), \eta \rangle = D\hat{f}_x(0_x)[\eta] = Df(x)[D\text{Retr}_x(0_x)[\eta]] = Df(x)[\eta] = \langle \text{grad}f(x), \eta \rangle$.

A3 (Restricted Lipschitz-type gradient for pullbacks). *There exists $L_g \geq 0$ such that, for all x_k among $x_0, x_1 \dots$ generated by a specified algorithm, the composition $\hat{f}_k = f \circ \text{Retr}_{x_k}$ satisfies*

$$|\hat{f}_k(\eta) - [f(x_k) + \langle \eta, \text{grad} f(x_k) \rangle]| \leq \frac{L_g}{2} \|\eta\|^2 \quad (3)$$

for all $\eta \in T_{x_k} \mathcal{M}$ such that $\|\eta\| \leq \varrho_k$.⁴ In words, the pullbacks \hat{f}_k , possibly restricted to certain balls, are uniformly well approximated by their first-order Taylor expansions around the origin.

To the best of our knowledge, this specific assumption has not been used to analyze convergence of optimization algorithms on manifolds before. As will become clear, it allows for simple extensions of existing proofs in \mathbb{R}^n .

Notice that, if each \hat{f}_k has a Lipschitz continuous gradient with constant L_g independent of k ,⁵ then **A3** holds; but the reverse is not necessarily true as **A3** gives a special role to the origin. In this sense, the condition on \hat{f}_k is weaker than Lipschitz continuity of the gradient of \hat{f}_k . On the other hand, we are requiring this condition to hold for all x_k with the same constant L_g . This is why we call the condition *Lipschitz-type* rather than Lipschitz.

The following lemma states that if \mathcal{M} is a compact submanifold of \mathbb{R}^n , then a sufficient condition for **A3** to hold is for $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to have locally Lipschitz continuous gradient (so that it has Lipschitz continuous gradient on any compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n). The proof is in Appendix B.

Lemma 4. *Let \mathcal{E} be a Euclidean space (for example, $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{R}^n$) and let \mathcal{M} be a compact Riemannian submanifold of \mathcal{E} . Let Retr be a retraction on \mathcal{M} (globally⁶ defined). If $f: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has Lipschitz continuous gradient in the convex hull of \mathcal{M} , then the pullbacks $f \circ \text{Retr}_x$ satisfy (3) globally with some constant L_g independent of x ; hence, **A3** holds for any sequence of iterates and with $\varrho_k = \infty$ for all k .*

There are mainly two difficulties with generalizing (1) directly to manifolds. Firstly, $\text{grad} f(x)$ and $\text{grad} f(y)$ live in two different tangent spaces, so that their difference is not defined; instead, $\text{grad} f(x)$ must be *transported* to $T_y \mathcal{M}$, which requires the introduction of a *parallel transport* $P_{x \rightarrow y}: T_x \mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_y \mathcal{M}$ along a minimal geodesic connecting x and y . Secondly, the right hand side $\|x - y\|$ should become $\text{dist}(x, y)$: the *geodesic distance* on \mathcal{M} . Both notions involve subtle definitions and transports may not be defined on all of \mathcal{M} . Overall, the resulting assumption would read as: there exists L_g such that

$$\forall x, y \in \mathcal{M}, \quad \|P_{x \rightarrow y} \text{grad} f(x) - \text{grad} f(y)\| \leq L_g \text{dist}(x, y). \quad (4)$$

It is of course possible to work with (4)—see for example (Absil et al., 2008, Def. 7.4.3) and recent work of Zhang and Sra (2016); Zhang et al. (2016)—but we argue that it is conceptually and computationally advantageous to avoid it if possible. The computational advantage comes from the freedom in **A3** to work with any retraction, whereas parallel transport and geodesic distance are tied to the exponential map.

We note that, if the retraction is the exponential map, then it is known that **A3** holds if (4) holds—see for example (Bento et al., 2017, Def. 2.2 and Lemma 2.1).

⁴See Remark 2; $\varrho_k = \infty$ is valid if the retraction is globally defined and f is sufficiently nice (e.g., Lemma 4).

⁵This holds in particular in the classical setting $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{Retr}_x(\eta) = x + \eta$ and $\text{grad} f$ is L_g -Lipschitz.

⁶This is typically not an issue in practice. For example, globally defined, practical retractions are known for the sphere, Stiefel manifold, orthogonal group, their products and many others (Absil et al., 2008, §4).

2.1 Fixed step-size gradient descent method

Leveraging the regularity assumption A3, an easy strategy is to pick the step η_k as a fixed scaling of the negative gradient, possibly restricted to a ball of radius ϱ_k .

Theorem 5 (Riemannian gradient descent with fixed step-size). *Under A1 and A3, Algorithm 1 with the explicit strategy*

$$\eta_k = -\min\left(\frac{1}{L_g}, \frac{\varrho_k}{\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|}\right) \text{grad}f(x_k)$$

returns a point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $f(x) \leq f(x_0)$ and $\|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon$ in at most

$$\left\lceil 2(f(x_0) - f^*)L_g \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \right\rceil$$

iterations provided $\varepsilon \leq \varrho L_g$, where $\varrho = \inf_k \rho_k$. If $\varepsilon > \varrho L_g$, the algorithm succeeds in at most $\left\lceil 2(f(x_0) - f^)\frac{1}{\varrho} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil$ iterations. Each iteration requires one cost and gradient evaluation, and one retraction.*

Proof. The regularity assumption A3 provides an upper bound for the pullback for all k :

$$\forall \eta \in T_{x_k}\mathcal{M} \text{ with } \|\eta\| \leq \varrho_k, \quad f(\text{Retr}_{x_k}(\eta)) \leq f(x_k) + \langle \eta, \text{grad}f(x_k) \rangle + \frac{L_g}{2}\|\eta\|^2. \quad (5)$$

For the given choice of η_k and using $x_{k+1} = \text{Retr}_{x_k}(\eta_k)$, it follows easily that

$$\begin{aligned} & f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \\ & \geq \min\left(\frac{\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|}{L_g}, \varrho_k\right) \left[1 - \frac{L_g}{2} \min\left(\frac{1}{L_g}, \frac{\varrho_k}{\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|}\right)\right] \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|. \end{aligned}$$

The term in brackets is at least 1/2. Thus, A2 holds with $c = \frac{1}{2L_g}$ and $c' = \frac{\varrho}{2}$, allowing to conclude with Theorem 3. \square

Corollary 6. *If there are no step-size restrictions in Theorem 5 ($\rho_k \equiv \infty$), the explicit strategy*

$$\eta_k = -\frac{1}{L_g} \text{grad}f(x_k)$$

returns a point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $f(x) \leq f(x_0)$ and $\|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon$ in at most

$$\left\lceil 2(f(x_0) - f^*)L_g \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \right\rceil$$

iterations for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

2.2 Gradient descent with backtracking Armijo line-search

The following lemma shows that a basic Armijo-type backtracking line-search, Algorithm 2, computes a step η_k satisfying A2 in a bounded number of function calls, without the need to know L_g . The statement allows search directions other than $-\text{grad}f(x_k)$, provided they remain “related” to $-\text{grad}f(x_k)$. This result is well known in the Euclidean case and carries over seamlessly under A3.

Algorithm 2 Backtracking Armijo line-search

1: **Given:** $x_k \in \mathcal{M}$, $\eta_k^0 \in T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$, $\bar{t}_k > 0$, $c_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\tau \in (0, 1)$
 2: **Init:** $t \leftarrow \bar{t}_k$
 3: **while** $f(x_k) - f(\text{Retr}_{x_k}(t \cdot \eta_k^0)) < c_1 t \langle -\text{grad}f(x_k), \eta_k^0 \rangle$ **do**
 4: $t \leftarrow \tau \cdot t$
 5: **end while**
 6: **return** t and $\eta_k = t\eta_k^0$.

Lemma 7. For each iteration k of Algorithm 1, let $\eta_k^0 \in T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$ be the initial search direction to be considered for line-search. Assume there exist constants $c_2 \in (0, 1]$ and $0 < c_3 \leq c_4$ such that, for all k ,

$$\langle -\text{grad}f(x_k), \eta_k^0 \rangle \geq c_2 \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \|\eta_k^0\| \quad \text{and} \quad c_3 \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \|\eta_k^0\| \leq c_4 \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|.$$

Under A3, backtracking Armijo (Algorithm 2) with initial stepsize \bar{t}_k such that $\bar{t}_k \|\eta_k^0\| \leq \varrho_k$ returns a positive t and $\eta_k = t\eta_k^0$ such that

$$f(x_k) - f(\text{Retr}_{x_k}(\eta_k)) \geq c_1 c_2 c_3 t \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad t \geq \min\left(\bar{t}_k, \frac{2\tau c_2(1-c_1)}{c_4 L_g}\right) \quad (6)$$

in

$$1 + \log_\tau(t/\bar{t}_k) \leq \max\left(1, 2 + \left\lceil \log_{\tau^{-1}}\left(\frac{c_4 \bar{t}_k L_g}{2c_2(1-c_1)}\right) \right\rceil\right)$$

retractions and cost evaluations (not counting evaluation of f at x_k).

Proof. See Appendix C □

The previous discussion can be particularized to bound the amount of work required by a gradient descent method using a backtracking Armijo line-search on manifolds. The constant L_g appears in the bounds but needs not be known. Note that, at iteration k , the last cost evaluation of the line-search algorithm is the cost at x_{k+1} : it needs not be recomputed.

Theorem 8 (Riemannian gradient descent with backtracking line-search). Under A1 and A3, Algorithm 1 with Algorithm 2 for line-search using initial search direction $\eta_k^0 = -\text{grad}f(x_k)$ with parameters c_1, τ and $\bar{t}_k \triangleq \min(\bar{t}, \varrho_k / \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|)$ for some $\bar{t} > 0$ returns a point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $f(x) \leq f(x_0)$ and $\|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon$ in at most

$$\left\lceil \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{c_1 \min\left(\bar{t}, \frac{2\tau(1-c_1)}{L_g}\right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \right\rceil$$

iterations, provided $\varepsilon \leq \frac{\varrho}{\min\left(\bar{t}, \frac{2\tau(1-c_1)}{L_g}\right)} \triangleq c$, where $\varrho = \inf_k \varrho_k$. If $\varepsilon > c$, the algorithm succeeds in at most $\left\lceil \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{c_1 \varrho} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil$ iterations. After computing $f(x_0)$ and $\text{grad}f(x_0)$, each iteration requires one gradient evaluation and at most $\max\left(1, 2 + \left\lceil \log_{\tau^{-1}}\left(\frac{\bar{t} L_g}{2(1-c_1)}\right) \right\rceil\right)$ cost evaluations and retractions.

Proof. Using $\eta_k^0 = -\text{grad}f(x_k)$, one can take $c_2 = c_3 = c_4 = 1$ in Lemma 7. Eq. (6) in that lemma combined with the definition of \bar{t}_k ensures

$$f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq c_1 \min \left(\bar{t}, \frac{2\tau(1-c_1)}{L_g}, \frac{\varrho_k}{\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|} \right) \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^2.$$

Thus, A2 holds with $c = c_1 \min \left(\bar{t}, \frac{2\tau(1-c_1)}{L_g} \right)$ and $c' = c_1 \varrho$. Conclude with Theorem 3. \square

3 Riemannian trust-region methods

The Riemannian trust-region method (RTR) is a generalization of the classical trust-region method to manifolds (Absil et al., 2007; Conn et al., 2000)—see Algorithm 3. The algorithm is initialized with a point $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ and a trust-region radius Δ_0 . At iteration k , the pullback $\hat{f}_k = f \circ \text{Retr}_{x_k}$ is approximated by a model $\hat{m}_k: T_{x_k}\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\hat{m}_k(\eta) = f(x_k) + \langle \eta, \text{grad}f(x_k) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \eta, H_k[\eta] \rangle, \quad (7)$$

where $H_k: T_{x_k}\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$ is a map chosen by the user. The tentative step η_k is obtained by approximately solving the associated trust-region subproblem:

$$\min_{\eta \in T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}} \hat{m}_k(\eta) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|\eta\| \leq \Delta_k. \quad (8)$$

The candidate next iterate $x_k^+ = \text{Retr}_{x_k}(\eta_k)$ is accepted ($x_{k+1} = x_k^+$) if the actual cost decrease $f(x_k) - f(x_k^+)$ is a sufficiently large fraction of the model decrease $\hat{m}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{m}_k(\eta_k)$. Otherwise, the candidate is rejected ($x_{k+1} = x_k$). Depending on the level of agreement between the model decrease and actual decrease, the trust-region radius Δ_k can be reduced, kept unchanged or increased, but never above some parameter $\bar{\Delta}$. The parameter $\bar{\Delta}$ can be used in particular in case of a non-globally defined retraction or if the regularity conditions on the pullbacks hold only locally.

We establish worst-case iteration complexity bounds for the computation of points $x \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq \varepsilon_g$ and $\text{Hess}f(x) \succeq -\varepsilon_H \text{Id}$, where $\text{Hess}f(x)$ is the Riemannian Hessian of f at x . Besides Lipschitz-type conditions on the problem itself, essential algorithmic requirements are that (i) the models \hat{m}_k should agree sufficiently with the pullbacks \hat{f}_k (locally); and (ii) sufficient decrease in the model should be achieved at each iteration. The analysis presented here is a generalization of the one in (Cartis et al., 2012) to manifolds.

3.1 Regularity assumptions

In what follows, for iteration k , we make assumptions involving the ball of radius $\Delta_k \leq \bar{\Delta}$ around 0_{x_k} in the tangent space at x_k . If Retr_x is only defined in a ball of radius $\varrho(x)$, one (conservative) strategy to ensure $\varrho_k \geq \Delta_k$ as required in the assumption below is to set $\bar{\Delta} \leq \inf_{x \in \mathcal{M}: f(x) \leq f(x_0)} \varrho(x)$, provided this is positive (see Remark 2).

A4 (Restricted Lipschitz-type gradient for pullbacks). *Assumption A3 holds in the respective trust regions of the iterates produced by Algorithm 3, that is, with $\varrho_k \geq \Delta_k$.*

Algorithm 3 Riemannian trust regions (RTR), modified to attain second-order optimality

```

1: Parameters:  $\bar{\Delta} > 0, 0 < \rho' < 1/4, \varepsilon_g > 0, \varepsilon_H > 0$ 
2: Input:  $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}, 0 < \Delta_0 \leq \bar{\Delta}$ 
3: Init:  $k \leftarrow 0$ 
4: while true do

5:   if  $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| > \varepsilon_g$  then ▷ First-order step.
6:     Obtain  $\eta_k \in \text{T}_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$  satisfying A8 (e.g., Lemma 10)
7:   else if  $\varepsilon_H < \infty$  then ▷ Second-order step.
8:     if  $\lambda_{\min}(H_k) < -\varepsilon_H$  then
9:       Obtain  $\eta_k \in \text{T}_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$  satisfying A9 (e.g., Lemma 11)
10:    else
11:      return  $x_k$  ▷  $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_g$  and  $\lambda_{\min}(H_k) \geq -\varepsilon_H$ .
12:    end if
13:  else
14:    return  $x_k$  ▷  $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_g$ .
15:  end if

16:  Compute

17:    
$$\rho_k = \frac{\hat{f}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{f}_k(\eta_k)}{\hat{m}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{m}_k(\eta_k)} \tag{9}$$


18:    
$$\Delta_{k+1} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}\Delta_k & \text{if } \rho_k < \frac{1}{4} \text{ (poor model-cost agreement),} \\ \min(2\Delta_k, \bar{\Delta}) & \text{if } \rho_k > \frac{3}{4} \text{ and } \|\eta_k\| = \Delta_k \text{ (good agreement, limiting TR),} \\ \Delta_k & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$


19:    
$$x_{k+1} = \begin{cases} \text{Retr}_{x_k}(\eta_k) & \text{if } \rho_k > \rho' \text{ (accept the step),} \\ x_k & \text{otherwise (reject).} \end{cases}$$


19:     $k \leftarrow k + 1$ 
20: end while

```

A5 (Restricted Lipschitz-type Hessian for pullbacks). *If $\varepsilon_H < \infty$, there exists $L_H \geq 0$ such that, for all x_k among $x_0, x_1 \dots$ generated by Algorithm 3 and such that $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_g$, \hat{f}_k satisfies*

$$\left| \hat{f}_k(\eta) - \left[f(x_k) + \langle \eta, \text{grad}f(x_k) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \eta, \nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k})[\eta] \rangle \right] \right| \leq \frac{L_H}{6} \|\eta\|^3 \tag{10}$$

for all $\eta \in \text{T}_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$ such that $\|\eta\| \leq \Delta_k$.

As discussed in Section 3.5 below, if Retr is a *second-order* retraction, then $\nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k})$ coincides with the Riemannian Hessian of f at x_k .

In the previous section, Lemma 4 gives a sufficient condition for A4 to hold; we complement this statement with a sufficient condition for A5 to hold as well. In a nutshell: if \mathcal{M} is a

compact submanifold of \mathbb{R}^n and $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has locally Lipschitz continuous Hessian, then both assumptions hold.

Lemma 9. *Let \mathcal{E} be a Euclidean space (for example, $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{R}^n$) and let \mathcal{M} be a compact Riemannian submanifold of \mathcal{E} . Let Retr be a second-order retraction on \mathcal{M} (globally defined). If $f: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has Lipschitz continuous Hessian in the convex hull of \mathcal{M} , then the pullbacks $f \circ \text{Retr}_x$ obey (10) with some constant L_H independent of x ; hence, A5 holds for any sequence of iterates and trust-region radii.*

The proof is in Appendix B. Here too, if \mathcal{M} is a Euclidean space and $\text{Retr}_x(\eta) = x + \eta$, then A4 and A5 are satisfied if f has Lipschitz continuous Hessian in the usual sense.

3.2 Assumptions about the models

The model at iteration k is the function \hat{m}_k (7) whose purpose is to approximate the pullback $\hat{f}_k = f \circ \text{Retr}_{x_k}$. It involves a map $H_k: T_{x_k}\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$. Depending on the type of step being performed (aiming for first- or second-order optimality conditions), we require different properties of the maps H_k . Conditions for first-order optimality are particularly lax.

A6. *If $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| > \varepsilon_g$ (so that we are only aiming for a first-order condition at this step), then H_k is radially linear. That is,*

$$\forall \eta \in T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}, \forall \alpha \geq 0, \quad H_k[\alpha\eta] = \alpha H_k[\eta]. \quad (11)$$

Furthermore, there exists $c_0 \geq 0$ (the same for all first-order steps) such that

$$\|H_k\| \triangleq \sup_{\eta \in T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}: \|\eta\| \leq 1} \langle \eta, H_k[\eta] \rangle \leq c_0. \quad (12)$$

Radial linearity and boundedness are sufficient to ensure first-order agreement between \hat{m}_k and \hat{f}_k . This relaxation from complete linearity of H_k —which would be the standard assumption—notably allows the use of nonlinear finite difference approximations of the Hessian (Boumal, 2015a). To reach second-order agreement, the conditions are stronger.

A7. *If $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_g$ and $\varepsilon_H < \infty$ (so that we are aiming for a second-order condition), then H_k is linear and symmetric. Furthermore, H_k is close to $\nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k})$ along η_k in the sense that there exists $c_1 \geq 0$ (the same for all second-order steps) such that:*

$$\left| \left\langle \eta_k, (\nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k}) - H_k)[\eta_k] \right\rangle \right| \leq \frac{c_1 \Delta_k}{3} \|\eta_k\|^2. \quad (13)$$

The smaller Δ_k , the more precisely H_k must approximate the Hessian of the pullback along η_k . Lemma 14 (below) shows Δ_k is lower-bounded in relation with ε_g and ε_H .

Eq. (13) involves η_k , the ultimately chosen step which typically depends on H_k . The stronger condition below does not reference η_k yet still ensures (13) is satisfied:

$$\left\| \nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k}) - H_k \right\| \leq \frac{c_1 \Delta_k}{3}.$$

Refer to Section 3.5 to relate H_k , $\nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k})$ and $\text{Hess}f(x_k)$.

3.3 Assumptions about sufficient model decrease

The steps η_k can be obtained in a number of ways, leading to different local convergence rates and empirical performance. As far as global convergence guarantees are concerned though, the requirements are modest. It is only required that, at each iteration, the candidate η_k induces sufficient decrease *in the model*. Known explicit strategies achieve these decreases. In particular, solving the trust-region subproblem (8) within some tolerance (which can be done in polynomial time if H_k is linear (Vavasis, 1991, §4.3)) is certain to satisfy the assumptions. The Steihaug–Toint truncated conjugate gradients method is a popular choice (Toint, 1981; Steihaug, 1983; Conn et al., 2000; Absil et al., 2007). See also (Sorensen, 1982; Moré and Sorensen, 1983) for more about the trust-region subproblem. Here, we describe simpler yet satisfactory strategies. For first-order steps, we require the following.

A8. *There exists $c_2 > 0$ such that, for all k such that $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| > \varepsilon_g$, the step η_k satisfies*

$$\hat{m}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{m}_k(\eta_k) \geq c_2 \min\left(\Delta_k, \frac{\varepsilon_g}{c_0}\right) \varepsilon_g. \quad (14)$$

As is well known, the explicitly computable *Cauchy step* satisfies this requirement. For convenience, let $g_k = \text{grad}f(x_k)$. By definition, the Cauchy step minimizes \hat{m}_k (7) in the trust region along the steepest descent direction $-g_k$. Owing to radial linearity (A6), this reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\alpha \geq 0} \hat{m}_k(-\alpha g_k) &= f(x_k) - \alpha \|g_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \langle g_k, H_k[g_k] \rangle \\ \text{s.t. } \alpha \|g_k\| &\leq \Delta_k. \end{aligned}$$

This corresponds to minimizing a quadratic in α over the interval $[0, \Delta_k/\|g_k\|]$. The optimal value is easily seen to be (Conn et al., 2000)

$$\alpha_k^C = \begin{cases} \min\left(\frac{\|g_k\|^2}{\langle g_k, H_k[g_k] \rangle}, \frac{\Delta_k}{\|g_k\|}\right) & \text{if } \langle g_k, H_k[g_k] \rangle > 0, \\ \frac{\Delta_k}{\|g_k\|} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 10. *Let $g_k = \text{grad}f(x_k)$. Under A6, setting η_k to be the Cauchy step $\eta_k^C = -\alpha_k^C g_k$ for first-order steps fulfills A8 with $c_2 = 1/2$. Computing η_k^C involves one gradient evaluation and one application of H_k .*

Proof. The claim follows as an exercise from $\hat{m}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{m}_k(\eta_k^C) = \alpha_k^C \|g_k\|^2 - \frac{(\alpha_k^C)^2}{2} \langle g_k, H_k[g_k] \rangle$ and $\langle g_k, H_k[g_k] \rangle \leq c_0 \|g_k\|^2$ owing to A6. \square

The Steihaug–Toint truncated conjugate gradient method (Toint, 1981; Steihaug, 1983) is a monotonically improving iterative method for the trust-region subproblem whose first iterate is the Cauchy step; as such, it necessarily achieves the required model decrease.

For second-order steps, the requirement is as follows.

A9. *There exists $c_3 > 0$ such that, for all k such that $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_g$ and $\lambda_{\min}(H_k) < -\varepsilon_H$, the step η_k satisfies*

$$\hat{m}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{m}_k(\eta_k) \geq c_3 \Delta_k^2 \varepsilon_H. \quad (15)$$

This can be achieved by making a step of maximal length along a direction which certifies that $\lambda_{\min}(H_k) < -\varepsilon_H$ (Conn et al., 2000): this is called an *eigenstep*. Like Cauchy steps, eigensteps can be computed in a finite number of operations, independently of ε_g and ε_H .

Lemma 11. *Under A7, if $\lambda_{\min}(H_k) < -\varepsilon_H$, there exists a tangent vector $u_k \in \mathbb{T}_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$ with*

$$\|u_k\| = 1, \quad \langle u_k, \text{grad}f(x_k) \rangle \leq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle u_k, H_k[u_k] \rangle < -\varepsilon_H.$$

Setting η_k to be any eigenstep $\eta_k^E = \Delta_k u_k$ for second-order steps fulfills A9 with $c_3 = 1/2$.

Let v_1, \dots, v_n be an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{T}_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$, where $n = \dim \mathcal{M}$. One way of computing η_k^E involves the application of H_k to v_1, \dots, v_n plus $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ arithmetic operations. The amount of work is independent of ε_g and ε_H .

Proof. Compute H , a symmetric matrix of size n which represents H_k in the basis v_1, \dots, v_n , as $H_{ij} = \langle v_i, H_k[v_j] \rangle$. Compute a factorization $LDL^\top = H + \varepsilon_H I$ where I is the identity matrix, L is invertible and triangular, and D is block diagonal with blocks of size 1×1 and 2×2 . The factorization can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ operations (Golub and Van Loan, 2012, §4.4)—see the reference for a word of caution regarding pivoting for stability; pivoting is easily incorporated in the present argument. D has the same inertia as $H + \varepsilon_H I$, hence D is not positive semidefinite (otherwise $H \succeq -\varepsilon_H I$.) The structure of D makes it easy to find $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x^\top D x < 0$. Solve the triangular system $L^\top y = x$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Now, $0 > x^\top D x = y^\top L D L^\top y = y^\top (H + \varepsilon_H I) y$. Consequently, $y^\top H y < -\varepsilon_H \|y\|^2$. We can set $u_k = \pm \sum_{i=1}^n y_i v_i / \|y\|$, where the sign is chosen to ensure $\langle u_k, \text{grad}f(x_k) \rangle \leq 0$. To conclude, check that $\hat{m}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{m}_k(\eta_k^E) = -\langle \eta_k^E, \text{grad}f(x_k) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \eta_k^E, H_k[\eta_k^E] \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \Delta_k^2 \varepsilon_H$. \square

Notice from the proof that this strategy either certifies that $\lambda_{\min}(H_k) \succeq -\varepsilon_H \text{Id}$ (which must be checked at step 8 in Algorithm 3) or certifies otherwise by providing an escape direction. We further note that, in practice, one usually prefers to use iterative methods to compute an approximate leftmost eigenvector of H_k without representing it as a matrix.

3.4 Main results and proofs for RTR

Under the discussed assumptions, we now establish our main theorem about computation of approximate first- and second-order critical points for (P) using RTR in a bounded number of iterations. The following constants will be useful:

$$\lambda_g = \frac{1}{4} \min \left(\frac{1}{c_0}, \frac{c_2}{L_g + c_0} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_H = \frac{3}{4} \frac{c_3}{L_H + c_1}. \quad (16)$$

Theorem 12. *Under A1, A4, A6, A8 and assuming $\varepsilon_g \leq \frac{\Delta_0}{\lambda_g}$,⁷ Algorithm 3 produces an iterate x_{N_1} satisfying $\|\text{grad}f(x_{N_1})\| \leq \varepsilon_g$ with*

$$N_1 \leq \frac{3}{2} \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\rho' c_2 \lambda_g} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_g^2} + \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left(\frac{\Delta_0}{\lambda_g \varepsilon_g} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_g^2} \right). \quad (17)$$

⁷Theorem 12 is scale invariant, in that if the cost function $f(x)$ is replaced by $\alpha f(x)$ for some positive α (which does not meaningfully change (P)), it is sensible to also multiply $L_g, L_H, c_0, c_1, \varepsilon_g$ and ε_H by α ; consequently, the upper bounds on ε_g and ε_H and the upper bounds on N_1 and N_2 are invariant under this scaling. If it is desirable to always allow $\varepsilon_g, \varepsilon_H$ in, say, $(0, 1]$, one possibility is to artificially make L_g, L_H, c_0, c_1 larger (which is always allowed).

Furthermore, if $\varepsilon_H < \infty$, then under additional assumptions [A5](#), [A7](#), [A9](#) and assuming $\varepsilon_g \leq \frac{c_2 \lambda_H}{c_3 \lambda_g^2}$ and $\varepsilon_H \leq \frac{c_2}{c_3} \frac{1}{\lambda_g}$, Algorithm [3](#) also produces an iterate x_{N_2} satisfying $\|\text{grad} f(x_{N_2})\| \leq \varepsilon_g$ and $\lambda_{\min}(H_{N_2}) \geq -\varepsilon_H$ with

$$N_1 \leq N_2 \leq \frac{3}{2} \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\rho' c_3 \lambda^2} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 \varepsilon_H} + \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left(\frac{\Delta_0}{\lambda \varepsilon} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 \varepsilon_H} \right), \quad (18)$$

where we defined $(\lambda, \varepsilon) = (\lambda_g, \varepsilon_g)$ if $\lambda_g \varepsilon_g \leq \lambda_H \varepsilon_H$, and $(\lambda, \varepsilon) = (\lambda_H, \varepsilon_H)$ otherwise. Since the algorithm is a descent method, $f(x_{N_2}) \leq f(x_{N_1}) \leq f(x_0)$.

Remark 13. Theorem [12](#) makes a statement about $\lambda_{\min}(H_k)$ at termination, not about $\lambda_{\min}(\text{Hess} f(x_k))$. See Section [3.5](#) to connect these two quantities.

To establish Theorem [12](#), we work through a few lemmas, following the proof technique in ([Cartis et al., 2012](#)). We first show Δ_k is bounded below in proportion to the tolerances ε_g and ε_H . This is used to show that the number of successful iterations in Algorithm [3](#) before termination (that is, iterations where $\rho_k > \rho'$ ([9](#))) is bounded above. It is then shown that the total number of iterations is at most a constant multiple of the number of successful iterations, which implies termination in bounded time. We start by showing that the trust-region radius is bounded away from zero. Essentially, this is because if Δ_k becomes too small, then the Cauchy step and eigenstep are certain to be successful owing to the quality of the model in such a small region, so that the trust-region radius could not decrease any further.

Lemma 14. Under the assumptions of Theorem [12](#), if Algorithm [3](#) executes N iterations without terminating, then

$$\Delta_k \geq \min(\Delta_0, \lambda_g \varepsilon_g, \lambda_H \varepsilon_H) \quad (19)$$

for $k = 0, \dots, N$, where λ_g and λ_H are defined in ([16](#)).

Proof. This follows essentially the proof of ([Absil et al., 2008](#), Thm. 7.4.2) which itself follows classical proofs ([Conn et al., 2000](#)). The core idea is to control ρ_k ([9](#)) close to 1, to show that there cannot be arbitrarily many trust-region radius reductions. The proof is in two parts.

For the first part, assume $\|\text{grad} f(x_k)\| > \varepsilon_g$. Then, consider the gap

$$|\rho_k - 1| = \left| \frac{\hat{f}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{f}_k(\eta_k)}{\hat{m}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{m}_k(\eta_k)} - 1 \right| = \left| \frac{\hat{m}_k(\eta_k) - \hat{f}_k(\eta_k)}{\hat{m}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{m}_k(\eta_k)} \right|. \quad (20)$$

From [A8](#), we know the denominator is not too small:

$$\hat{m}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{m}_k(\eta_k) \geq c_2 \min \left(\Delta_k, \frac{\varepsilon_g}{c_0} \right) \varepsilon_g.$$

Now consider the numerator:

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{m}_k(\eta_k) - \hat{f}_k(\eta_k)| &= \left| f(x_k) + \langle \text{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \eta_k, H_k[\eta_k] \rangle - \hat{f}_k(\eta_k) \right| \\ &\leq |f(x_k) + \langle \text{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k \rangle - \hat{f}_k(\eta_k)| + \frac{1}{2} |\langle \eta_k, H_k[\eta_k] \rangle| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (L_g + c_0) \|\eta_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used A4 for the first term, and A6 for the second term. Assume for the time being that $\Delta_k \leq \min\left(\frac{\varepsilon_g}{c_0}, \frac{c_2 \varepsilon_g}{L_g + c_0}\right) = 4\lambda_g \varepsilon_g$. Then, using $\|\eta_k\| \leq \Delta_k$, it follows that

$$|\rho_k - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{L_g + c_0}{c_2 \min\left(\Delta_k, \frac{\varepsilon_g}{c_0}\right) \varepsilon_g} \Delta_k^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{L_g + c_0}{c_2 \varepsilon_g} \Delta_k \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Hence, $\rho_k \geq 1/2$, and by the mechanism of Algorithm 3, it follows that $\Delta_{k+1} \geq \Delta_k$.

For the second part, assume $\|\text{grad} f(x_k)\| < \varepsilon_g$ and $\lambda_{\min}(H_k) < -\varepsilon_H$. Then, by A9,

$$\hat{m}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{m}_k(\eta_k) \geq c_3 \Delta_k^2 \varepsilon_H.$$

Thus, by A5 and A7,

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{m}_k(\eta_k) - \hat{f}_k(\eta_k)| &= \left| f(x_k) + \langle \text{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \eta_k, H_k[\eta_k] \rangle - \hat{f}_k(\eta_k) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{L_H}{6} \|\eta_k\|^3 + \frac{1}{2} \left| \langle \eta_k, (\nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k}) - H_k)[\eta_k] \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \frac{L_H + c_1}{6} \Delta_k^3. \end{aligned}$$

As previously, combine these observations into (20) to see that, if $\Delta_k \leq \frac{3c_3}{L_H + c_1} \varepsilon_H = 4\lambda_H \varepsilon_H$, then

$$|\rho_k - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{L_H + c_1}{3c_3 \varepsilon_H} \Delta_k \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (21)$$

Again, this implies $\Delta_{k+1} \geq \Delta_k$.

Now combine the two parts. We have established that, if $\Delta_k \leq 4 \min(\lambda_g \varepsilon_g, \lambda_H \varepsilon_H)$, then $\Delta_{k+1} \geq \Delta_k$. To conclude the proof, consider the fact that Algorithm 3 cannot reduce the radius by more than $1/4$ in one step. \square

By an argument similar to the one used for gradient methods, Lemma 14 implies an upper bound on the number of successful iterations required in Algorithm 3 to reach termination.

Lemma 15. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 12, if Algorithm 3 executes N iterations without terminating, define the set of successful steps as*

$$S_N = \{k \in \{0, \dots, N\} : \rho_k > \rho'\}$$

and let U_N designate the unsuccessful steps, so that S_N and U_N form a partition of $\{0, \dots, N\}$. Assume $\varepsilon_g \leq \Delta_0/\lambda_g$. If $\varepsilon_H = \infty$, the number of successful steps obeys

$$|S_N| \leq \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\rho' c_2 \lambda_g} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_g^2}. \quad (22)$$

Otherwise, if additionally $\varepsilon_g \leq \frac{c_2 \lambda_H}{c_3 \lambda_g^2}$ and $\varepsilon_H \leq \frac{c_2}{c_3} \frac{1}{\lambda_g}$, we have the bound

$$|S_N| \leq \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\rho' c_3} \frac{1}{\min(\lambda_g \varepsilon_g, \lambda_H \varepsilon_H)^2 \varepsilon_H}. \quad (23)$$

Proof. The proof parallels (Cartis et al., 2012, Lemma 4.5). Clearly, if $k \in U_N$, then $f(x_k) = f(x_{k+1})$. On the other hand, if $k \in S_N$, then $\rho_k \geq \rho'$ (9). Combine this with A8 and A9 to see that, for $k \in S_N$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) &\geq \rho' (\hat{m}_k(0_{x_k}) - \hat{m}_k(\eta_k)) \\ &\geq \rho' \min \left(c_2 \min \left(\Delta_k, \frac{\varepsilon_g}{c_0} \right) \varepsilon_g, c_3 \Delta_k^2 \varepsilon_H \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 14 and the assumption $\lambda_g \varepsilon_g \leq \Delta_0$, it holds that $\Delta_k \geq \min(\lambda_g \varepsilon_g, \lambda_H \varepsilon_H)$. Furthermore, using $\lambda_g \leq 1/c_0$ shows that $\min(\Delta_k, \varepsilon_g/c_0) \geq \min(\Delta_k, \lambda_g \varepsilon_g) \geq \min(\lambda_g \varepsilon_g, \lambda_H \varepsilon_H)$. Hence,

$$f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq \rho' \min(c_2 \lambda_g \varepsilon_g^2, c_2 \lambda_H \varepsilon_g \varepsilon_H, c_3 \lambda_g^2 \varepsilon_g^2 \varepsilon_H, c_3 \lambda_H^2 \varepsilon_H^3). \quad (24)$$

If $\varepsilon_H = \infty$, this simplifies to

$$f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq \rho' c_2 \lambda_g \varepsilon_g^2.$$

Sum over iterations up to N and use A1 (bounded f):

$$f(x_0) - f^* \geq f(x_0) - f(x_{N+1}) = \sum_{k \in S_N} f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq |S_N| \rho' c_2 \lambda_g \varepsilon_g^2.$$

Hence,

$$|S_N| \leq \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\rho' c_2 \lambda_g \varepsilon_g^2}.$$

On the other hand, if $\varepsilon_H < \infty$, then, starting over from (24) and assuming both $c_3 \lambda_g^2 \varepsilon_g^2 \varepsilon_H \leq c_2 \lambda_H \varepsilon_g \varepsilon_H$ and $c_3 \lambda_g^2 \varepsilon_g^2 \varepsilon_H \leq c_2 \lambda_g \varepsilon_g^2$ (which is equivalent to $\varepsilon_g \leq c_2 \lambda_H / c_3 \lambda_g^2$ and $\varepsilon_H \leq c_2 / c_3 \lambda_g$), it comes with the same telescoping sum that

$$f(x_0) - f^* \geq |S_N| \rho' c_3 \min(\lambda_g \varepsilon_g, \lambda_H \varepsilon_H)^2 \varepsilon_H.$$

Solve for $|S_N|$ to conclude. \square

Finally, we show that the total number of steps N before termination cannot be more than a fixed multiple of the number of successful steps $|S_N|$.

Lemma 16. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 12, if Algorithm 3 executes N iterations without terminating, using the notation S_N and U_N of Lemma 15, it holds that*

$$|S_N| \geq \frac{2}{3}(N+1) - \frac{1}{3} \max \left(0, \log_2 \left(\frac{\Delta_0}{\lambda_g \varepsilon_g} \right), \log_2 \left(\frac{\Delta_0}{\lambda_H \varepsilon_H} \right) \right). \quad (25)$$

Proof. The proof rests on the lower bound for Δ_k obtained in Lemma 14. It parallels (Cartis et al., 2012, Lemma 4.6). For all $k \in S_N$, it holds that $\Delta_{k+1} \leq 2\Delta_k$. For all $k \in U_k$, it holds that $\Delta_{k+1} \leq \frac{1}{4}\Delta_k$. Hence,

$$\Delta_N \leq 2^{|S_N|} \left(\frac{1}{4} \right)^{|U_N|} \Delta_0.$$

On the other hand, Lemma 14 gives

$$\Delta_N \geq \min(\Delta_0, \lambda_g \varepsilon_g, \lambda_H \varepsilon_H).$$

Combine, divide by Δ_0 and take the log in base 2:

$$|S_N| - 2|U_N| \geq \min\left(0, \log_2\left(\frac{\lambda_g \varepsilon_g}{\Delta_0}\right), \log_2\left(\frac{\lambda_H \varepsilon_H}{\Delta_0}\right)\right).$$

Use $|S_N| + |U_N| = N + 1$ to conclude. \square

We can now prove the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 12. It is sufficient to combine Lemmas 15 and 16 in both regimes. First, we get that if $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| > \varepsilon_g$ for $k = 0, \dots, N$, then

$$N + 1 \leq \frac{3}{2} \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\rho' c_2 \lambda_g} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_g^2} + \frac{1}{2} \log_2\left(\frac{\Delta_0}{\lambda_g \varepsilon_g}\right).$$

(The term $\log_2\left(\frac{\Delta_0}{\lambda_H \varepsilon_H}\right)$ from Lemma 16 is irrelevant up to that point, as ε_H could just as well have been infinite.) Thus, after a number of iterations larger than the right hand side, an iterate with sufficiently small gradient must have been produced, to avoid a contradiction.

Second, we get that if for $k = 0, \dots, N$ no iterate satisfies both $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_g$ and $\lambda_{\min}(H_k) \geq -\varepsilon_H$, then

$$N + 1 \leq \frac{3}{2} \frac{f(x_0) - f^*}{\rho' c_3} \frac{1}{\min(\lambda_g \varepsilon_g, \lambda_H \varepsilon_H)^2 \varepsilon_H} + \frac{1}{2} \max\left(\log_2\left(\frac{\Delta_0}{\lambda_g \varepsilon_g}\right), \log_2\left(\frac{\Delta_0}{\lambda_H \varepsilon_H}\right)\right).$$

Conclude with the same argument. \square

3.5 Connecting H_k and $\text{Hess}f(x_k)$

Theorem 12 states termination of Algorithm 3 in terms of $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|$ and $\lambda_{\min}(H_k)$. Ideally, the latter must be turned into a statement about $\lambda_{\min}(\text{Hess}f(x_k))$, to match the second-order necessary optimality conditions of (P) more closely (recall Proposition 1). A7 itself only requires H_k to be (weakly) related to $\nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k})$ (the Hessian of the pullback of f at x_k), which is different from the Riemannian Hessian of f at x_k in general. It is up to the user to provide H_k sufficiently related to $\nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k})$. Additional control over the retraction at x_k can further relate $\nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k})$ to $\text{Hess}f(x_k)$, as we do now. Proofs for this section are in Appendix D.

Lemma 17. *Define the maximal acceleration of Retr at x as the real a such that*

$$\forall \eta \in T_x \mathcal{M} \text{ with } \|\eta\| = 1, \quad \left\| \frac{D^2}{dt^2} \text{Retr}_x(t\eta) \Big|_{t=0} \right\| \leq a,$$

where $\frac{D^2}{dt^2} \gamma$ denotes acceleration of the curve $t \mapsto \gamma(t)$ on \mathcal{M} (Absil et al., 2008, §5). Then,

$$\left\| \text{Hess}f(x) - \nabla^2 \hat{f}_x(0_x) \right\| \leq a \cdot \|\text{grad}f(x)\|.$$

In particular, if x is a critical point or if $a = 0$, the Hessians agree: $\text{Hess}f(x) = \nabla^2 \hat{f}_x(0_x)$.

The particular cases appear as (Absil et al., 2008, Prop. 5.5.5, 5.5.6). This result highlights the crucial role of retractions with zero acceleration, known as *second-order retractions* and defined in (Absil et al., 2008, Prop. 5.5.5); we are not aware of earlier references to this notion.

Definition 2. *A retraction is a second-order retraction if it has zero acceleration, as defined in Lemma 17. Then, retracted curves locally agree with geodesics up to second order.*

Proposition 18. *Let $x_k \in \mathcal{M}$ be the iterate returned by Algorithm 3 under the assumptions of Theorem 12. It satisfies $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_g$ and $H_k \succeq -\varepsilon_H \text{Id}$. Assume H_k is related to the Hessian of the pullback as $\|\nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k}) - H_k\| \leq \delta_k$. Further assume the retraction has acceleration at x_k bounded by a_k , as defined in Lemma 17. Then,*

$$\text{Hess}f(x_k) \succeq -(\varepsilon_H + a_k \varepsilon_g + \delta_k) \text{Id}.$$

In particular, if the retraction is second-order and $H_k = \nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k})$, then $\text{Hess}f(x_k) \succeq -\varepsilon_H \text{Id}$.

We note that second-order retractions are frequently available in applications. Indeed, retractions for submanifolds obtained as (certain types of) projections—arguably one of the most natural classes of retractions for submanifolds—are second order (Absil and Malick, 2012, Thm.22). For example, the sphere retraction $\text{Retr}_x(\eta) = (x + \eta)/\|x + \eta\|$ is second order. Such retractions for low-rank matrices are also known (Absil and Oseledets, 2015).

4 Example: smooth semidefinite programs

This example is based on (Boumal et al., 2016). Consider the following semidefinite program, which occurs in robust PCA (McCoy and Tropp, 2011) and as a convex relaxation of combinatorial problems such as Max-Cut, \mathbb{Z}_2 -synchronization and community detection in the stochastic block model (Goemans and Williamson, 1995; Bandeira et al., 2016):

$$\min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}} \text{Tr}(CX) \text{ subject to } \text{diag}(X) = \mathbf{1}, X \succeq 0. \quad (26)$$

The symmetric cost matrix C depends on the application. Interior point methods solve this problem in polynomial time, though they involve significant work to enforce the conic constraint $X \succeq 0$ (X symmetric, positive semidefinite). This motivates the approach of Burer and Monteiro (2005) to parameterize the search space as $X = YY^\top$, where Y is in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ for some well-chosen p :

$$\min_{Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}} \text{Tr}(CYY^\top) \text{ subject to } \text{diag}(YY^\top) = \mathbf{1}. \quad (27)$$

This problem is of the form of (P), where $f(Y) = \text{Tr}(CYY^\top)$ and the manifold is a product of n unit spheres in \mathbb{R}^p :

$$\mathcal{M} = \{Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} : \text{diag}(YY^\top) = \mathbf{1}\} = \{Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} : \text{each row of } Y \text{ has unit norm}\}. \quad (28)$$

In principle, since the parameterization $X = YY^\top$ breaks convexity, the new problem could have many spurious local optimizers and saddle points. Yet, for $p = n + 1$, it has recently been shown that approximate second-order critical points Y map to approximate global optimizers $X = YY^\top$, as stated in the following proposition. (In this particular case, there is no need to control $\|\text{grad}f(Y)\|$ explicitly.)

Proposition 19 (Boumal et al. (2016)). *If X^* is optimal for (26) and Y is feasible for (27) with $p > n$ and $\text{Hess}f(Y) \succeq -\varepsilon_H \text{Id}$, the optimality gap is bounded as*

$$0 \leq \text{Tr}(CYY^\top) - \text{Tr}(CX^*) \leq \frac{n}{2}\varepsilon_H.$$

Since f is smooth in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and \mathcal{M} is a compact submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, the regularity assumptions A4 and A5 hold with any second-order retraction (Lemmas 4 and 9). In particular, they hold if $\text{Retr}_Y(\dot{Y})$ is the result of normalizing each row of $Y + \dot{Y}$ (Section 3.5), or if the exponential map is used (which is cheap for this manifold, see Appendix E). Theorem 12 then implies that RTR applied to the nonconvex problem (27) computes a point $X = YY^\top$ feasible for (26) such that $\text{Tr}(CX) - \text{Tr}(CX^*) \leq \delta$ in $\mathcal{O}(1/\delta^3)$ iterations. Appendix E bounds the total work with an explicit dependence on the problem dimension n as $\mathcal{O}(n^{10}/\delta^3)$ arithmetic operations, where \mathcal{O} hides factors depending on the data C and an additive log-term. This result follows from a bound $L_H \leq 8\|C\|_2\sqrt{n}$ for A5 which is responsible for a factor of n in the complexity—the remaining factors could be improved, see below.

In (Boumal et al., 2016), it is shown that, generically in C , if $p \geq \lceil \sqrt{2n} \rceil$, then all second-order critical points of (27) are globally optimal (despite nonconvexity). This means RTR globally converges to global optimizers with cheaper iterations (due to reduced dimensionality). Unfortunately, there is no statement of quality pertaining to *approximate* second-order critical points for such small p , so that this analysis is not sufficient to obtain an improved worst-case complexity bound.

These bounds are worse than guarantees provided by interior point methods. Indeed, following (Nesterov, 2004, §4.3.3, with eq. (4.3.12)), interior point methods achieve a solution in $\mathcal{O}(n^{3.5} \log(n/\delta))$ arithmetic operations. Yet, numerical experiments in (Boumal et al., 2016) suggest RTR often outperforms interior point methods, indicating the bound $\mathcal{O}(n^{10}/\delta^3)$ is wildly pessimistic. We report it here mainly because, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first explicit bound for a Burer–Monteiro approach to solving a semidefinite program.

A number of factors drive the gap between our worst-case bound and practice. In particular, strategies far more efficient than the LDL^\top factorization in Lemma 11 are used to compute second-order steps, and they can exploit structure in C . High accuracy solutions are reached owing to RTR typically converging superlinearly, locally. And p is chosen much smaller than $n + 1$.

See also (Mei et al., 2017) for formal complexity results in a setting where p is allowed to be independent of n ; this precludes reaching an objective value arbitrarily close to optimal, in exchange for cheaper computations.

5 Conclusions and perspectives

We presented bounds on the number of iterations required by the Riemannian gradient descent algorithm and the Riemannian trust-region algorithm to reach points which approximately satisfy first- and second-order necessary optimality conditions, under some regularity assumptions but regardless of initialization. When the search space \mathcal{M} is a Euclidean space, these bounds were already known. For the more general case of \mathcal{M} being a Riemannian manifold, these bounds are new.

As a subclass of interest, we showed the regularity requirements are satisfied if \mathcal{M} is a compact submanifold of \mathbb{R}^n and f has locally Lipschitz continuous derivatives of appropriate

order. This covers a rich class of practical optimization problems. While there are no explicit assumptions made about \mathcal{M} , the smoothness requirements for the pullback of the cost—A3, A4 and A5—implicitly restrict the class of manifolds to which these results apply. Indeed, for certain manifolds, even for nice cost functions f , there may not exist retractions which ensure the assumptions hold. This is the case in particular for certain incomplete manifolds, such as open Riemannian submanifolds of \mathbb{R}^n and certain geometries of the set of fixed-rank matrices—see also Remark 2 about injectivity radius. For such sets, it may be necessary to adapt the assumptions. For fixed-rank matrices for example, Vandereycken (2013, §4.1) obtains convergence results assuming a kind of coercivity on the cost function: for any sequence of rank- k matrices $(X_i)_{i=1,2,\dots}$ such that the first singular value $\sigma_1(X_i) \rightarrow \infty$ or the k th singular value $\sigma_k(X_i) \rightarrow 0$, it holds that $f(X_i) \rightarrow \infty$. This ensures iterates stay away from the open boundary.

The iteration bounds are sharp, but additional information may yield more favorable bounds in specific contexts. In particular, when the studied algorithms converge to a non-degenerate local optimizer, they do so with an at least linear rate, so that the number of iterations is merely $\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\varepsilon))$ once in the linear regime. This suggests a stitching approach: for a given application, it may be possible to show that rough approximate second-order critical points are in a local attraction basin; the iteration cost can then be bounded by the total work needed to attain such a crude point starting from anywhere, plus the total work needed to refine the crude point to high accuracy with a linear or even quadratic convergence rate. This is, to some degree, the successful strategy in (Sun et al., 2017a,b).

Finally, we note that it would also be interesting to study the global convergence rates of Riemannian versions of adaptive regularization algorithms using cubics (ARC), as in the Euclidean case these can achieve approximate first-order criticality in $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^{1.5})$ instead of $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^2)$ (Cartis et al., 2011a). Work in that direction could start with the convergence analyses proposed in (Qi, 2011).

Acknowledgments

NB was supported by the “Fonds Spéciaux de Recherche” (FSR) at UCLouvain and by the Chaire Havas “Chaire Economie et gestion des nouvelles données”, the ERC Starting Grant SIPA and a Research in Paris grant at Inria & ENS, and NSF DMS-1719558. This paper presents research results of the Belgian Network DYSCO (Dynamical Systems, Control, and Optimization), funded by the Interuniversity Attraction Poles Programme initiated by the Belgian Science Policy Office. This work was supported by the ARC “Mining and Optimization of Big Data Models”. CC acknowledges support from NERC through grant NE/L012146/1. We thank Alex d’Aspremont, Simon Lacoste-Julien, Ju Sun, Bart Vandereycken and Paul Van Dooren for helpful discussions.

References

- P.-A. Absil and J. Malick. Projection-like retractions on matrix manifolds. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(1):135–158, 2012. doi:[10.1137/100802529](https://doi.org/10.1137/100802529).
- P.-A. Absil and I. Oseledets. Low-rank retractions: a survey and new results. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 62(1):5–29, 2015. doi:[10.1007/s10589-014-9714-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-014-9714-4).

- P.-A. Absil, C. G. Baker, and K. A. Gallivan. Trust-region methods on Riemannian manifolds. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 7(3):303–330, 2007. doi:[10.1007/s10208-005-0179-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-005-0179-9).
- P.-A. Absil, R. Mahony, and R. Sepulchre. *Optimization Algorithms on Matrix Manifolds*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2008. ISBN 978-0-691-13298-3.
- P.-A. Absil, J. Trumpf, R. Mahony, and B. Andrews. All roads lead to Newton: Feasible second-order methods for equality-constrained optimization. Technical report, Technical Report UCL-INMA-2009.024, Departement d’ingenierie mathematique, UCLouvain, Belgium, 2009.
- P.-A. Absil, R. Mahony, and J. Trumpf. An extrinsic look at the Riemannian Hessian. In F. Nielsen and F. Barbaresco, editors, *Geometric Science of Information*, volume 8085 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 361–368. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013. ISBN 978-3-642-40019-3. doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-40020-9_39](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40020-9_39).
- R. Adler, J. Dedieu, J. Margulies, M. Martens, and M. Shub. Newton’s method on Riemannian manifolds and a geometric model for the human spine. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 22(3):359–390, 2002. doi:[10.1093/imanum/22.3.359](https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/22.3.359).
- A. Bandeira, N. Boumal, and V. Voroninski. On the low-rank approach for semidefinite programs arising in synchronization and community detection. In *Proceedings of The 29th Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2016, New York, NY, June 23–26, 2016*.
- G. Bento, O. Ferreira, and J. Melo. Iteration-complexity of gradient, subgradient and proximal point methods on Riemannian manifolds. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 173(2):548–562, 2017. doi:[10.1007/s10957-017-1093-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-017-1093-4).
- G. Berger. Fast matrix multiplication. Master’s thesis, Ecole polytechnique de Louvain, 2017. URL <http://hdl.handle.net/2078.1/thesis:10630>.
- S. Bhojanapalli, B. Neyshabur, and N. Srebro. Global optimality of local search for low rank matrix recovery. In D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. V. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, pages 3873–3881. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
- E. Birgin, J. Gardenghi, J. Martínez, S. Santos, and P. Toint. Worst-case evaluation complexity for unconstrained nonlinear optimization using high-order regularized models. *Mathematical Programming*, 163(1):359–368, May 2017. doi:[10.1007/s10107-016-1065-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-016-1065-8).
- N. Boumal. Riemannian trust regions with finite-difference Hessian approximations are globally convergent. In F. Nielsen and F. Barbaresco, editors, *Geometric Science of Information*, volume 9389 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 467–475. Springer International Publishing, 2015a. doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-25040-3_50](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-25040-3_50).
- N. Boumal. A Riemannian low-rank method for optimization over semidefinite matrices with block-diagonal constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.00575*, 2015b.
- N. Boumal. Nonconvex phase synchronization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 26(4):2355–2377, 2016. doi:[10.1137/16M105808X](https://doi.org/10.1137/16M105808X).

- N. Boumal, B. Mishra, P.-A. Absil, and R. Sepulchre. Manopt, a Matlab toolbox for optimization on manifolds. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15:1455–1459, 2014. URL <http://www.manopt.org>.
- N. Boumal, V. Voroninski, and A. Bandeira. The non-convex Burer–Monteiro approach works on smooth semidefinite programs. In D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. V. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, pages 2757–2765. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
- S. Burer and R. Monteiro. Local minima and convergence in low-rank semidefinite programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 103(3):427–444, 2005.
- C. Cartis, N. I. M. Gould, and P. L. Toint. On the complexity of steepest descent, Newton’s and regularized Newton’s methods for nonconvex unconstrained optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(6):2833–2852, 2010. doi:[10.1137/090774100](https://doi.org/10.1137/090774100).
- C. Cartis, N. Gould, and P. Toint. Adaptive cubic regularisation methods for unconstrained optimization. Part II: worst-case function- and derivative-evaluation complexity. *Mathematical Programming*, 130:295–319, 2011a. doi:[10.1007/s10107-009-0337-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-009-0337-y).
- C. Cartis, N. Gould, and P. Toint. Optimal Newton-type methods for nonconvex smooth optimization problems. Technical report, ERGO technical report 11-009, School of Mathematics, University of Edinburgh, 2011b.
- C. Cartis, N. Gould, and P. Toint. Complexity bounds for second-order optimality in unconstrained optimization. *Journal of Complexity*, 28(1):93–108, 2012. doi:[10.1016/j.jco.2011.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jco.2011.06.001).
- C. Cartis, N. Gould, and P. Toint. On the complexity of finding first-order critical points in constrained nonlinear optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 144(1–2):93–106, 2014. doi:[10.1007/s10107-012-0617-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-012-0617-9).
- C. Cartis, N. Gould, and P. Toint. Evaluation complexity bounds for smooth constrained nonlinear optimization using scaled KKT conditions and high-order models. Technical report, NA Technical Report, Maths E-print Archive1912, Mathematical Institute, Oxford University., 2015a.
- C. Cartis, N. Gould, and P. Toint. On the evaluation complexity of constrained nonlinear least-squares and general constrained nonlinear optimization using second-order methods. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 53(2):836–851, 2015b. doi:[10.1137/130915546](https://doi.org/10.1137/130915546).
- C. Cartis, N. Gould, and P. Toint. Second-order optimality and beyond: Characterization and evaluation complexity in convexly constrained nonlinear optimization. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, Sep 2017. doi:[10.1007/s10208-017-9363-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-017-9363-y).
- I. Chavel. *Riemannian geometry: a modern introduction*, volume 108 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- A. Conn, N. Gould, and P. Toint. *Trust-region methods*. MPS-SIAM Series on Optimization. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2000. ISBN 978-0-89871-460-9. doi:[10.1137/1.9780898719857](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898719857).

- F. E. Curtis, D. P. Robinson, and M. Samadi. A trust region algorithm with a worst-case iteration complexity of $O(\epsilon^{-3/2})$ for nonconvex optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–32, 2016. doi:[10.1007/s10107-016-1026-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-016-1026-2).
- A. Edelman, T. Arias, and S. Smith. The geometry of algorithms with orthogonality constraints. *SIAM journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 20(2):303–353, 1998.
- D. Gabay. Minimizing a differentiable function over a differential manifold. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 37(2):177–219, 1982.
- R. Ge, J. Lee, and T. Ma. Matrix completion has no spurious local minimum. In D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. V. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, pages 2973–2981. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
- M. Goemans and D. Williamson. Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 42(6):1115–1145, 1995. doi:[10.1145/227683.227684](https://doi.org/10.1145/227683.227684).
- G. Golub and C. Van Loan. *Matrix computations*, volume 3 of *Johns Hopkins Studies in the Mathematical Sciences*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 4th edition, 2012. doi:[10.1137/0720042](https://doi.org/10.1137/0720042).
- W. Huang, K. Gallivan, and P.-A. Absil. A Broyden class of quasi-Newton methods for Riemannian optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(3):1660–1685, 2015. doi:[10.1137/140955483](https://doi.org/10.1137/140955483).
- W. Huang, P.-A. Absil, K. Gallivan, and P. Hand. ROPTLIB: an object-oriented C++ library for optimization on Riemannian manifolds. Technical Report FSU16-14.v2, Florida State University, 2016.
- M. McCoy and J. Tropp. Two proposals for robust PCA using semidefinite programming. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 5:1123–1160, 2011. doi:[10.1214/11-EJS636](https://doi.org/10.1214/11-EJS636).
- S. Mei, T. Misiakiewicz, A. Montanari, and R. Oliveira. Solving SDPs for synchronization and MaxCut problems via the Grothendieck inequality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.08729*, 2017.
- M. G. Monera, A. Montesinos-Amilibia, and E. Sanabria-Codesal. The Taylor expansion of the exponential map and geometric applications. *Revista de la Real Academia de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales. Serie A. Matemáticas*, 108(2):881–906, 2014. doi:[10.1007/s13398-013-0149-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13398-013-0149-z).
- J. Moré and D. Sorensen. Computing a trust region step. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 4(3):553–572, 1983. doi:[10.1137/0904038](https://doi.org/10.1137/0904038).
- Y. Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87 of *Applied optimization*. Springer, 2004. ISBN 978-1-4020-7553-7.
- J. Nocedal and S. Wright. *Numerical optimization*. Springer Verlag, 1999.

- B. O'Neill. *Semi-Riemannian geometry: with applications to relativity*, volume 103. Academic Press, 1983.
- C. Qi. *Numerical optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds*. PhD thesis, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, 2011.
- W. Ring and B. Wirth. Optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds and their application to shape space. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(2):596–627, 2012. doi:[10.1137/11082885X](https://doi.org/10.1137/11082885X).
- A. Ruszczyński. *Nonlinear optimization*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2006.
- H. Sato. A Dai–Yuan-type Riemannian conjugate gradient method with the weak Wolfe conditions. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 64(1):101–118, 2016. doi:[10.1007/s10589-015-9801-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-015-9801-1).
- M. Shub. Some remarks on dynamical systems and numerical analysis. In L. Lara-Carrero and J. Lewowicz, editors, *Proc. VII ELAM.*, pages 69–92. Equinoccio, U. Simón Bolívar, Caracas, 1986.
- S. Smith. Optimization techniques on Riemannian manifolds. *Fields Institute Communications*, 3(3):113–135, 1994.
- D. Sorensen. Newton’s method with a model trust region modification. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 19(2):409–426, 1982. doi:[10.1137/0719026](https://doi.org/10.1137/0719026).
- T. Steihaug. The conjugate gradient method and trust regions in large scale optimization. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 20(3):626–637, 1983.
- J. Sun, Q. Qu, and J. Wright. Complete dictionary recovery over the sphere II: Recovery by Riemannian trust-region method. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 63(2): 885–914, Feb 2017a. doi:[10.1109/TIT.2016.2632149](https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2016.2632149).
- J. Sun, Q. Qu, and J. Wright. A geometric analysis of phase retrieval. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, Aug 2017b. doi:[10.1007/s10208-017-9365-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-017-9365-9).
- P. Toint. Towards an efficient sparsity exploiting Newton method for minimization. In I. Duff, editor, *Sparse Matrices and Their Uses*, pages 57–88. Academic Press, 1981.
- J. Townsend, N. Koep, and S. Weichwald. Pymanopt: a python toolbox for optimization on manifolds using automatic differentiation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17:1–5, 2016.
- C. Udriste. *Convex functions and optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds*, volume 297 of *Mathematics and its applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994. doi:[10.1007/978-94-015-8390-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-8390-9).
- B. Vandereycken. Low-rank matrix completion by Riemannian optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(2):1214–1236, 2013. doi:[10.1137/110845768](https://doi.org/10.1137/110845768).
- S. Vavasis. *Nonlinear optimization: complexity issues*. Oxford University Press, Inc., 1991.

- W. Yang, L.-H. Zhang, and R. Song. Optimality conditions for the nonlinear programming problems on Riemannian manifolds. *Pacific Journal of Optimization*, 10(2):415–434, 2014.
- H. Zhang and S. Sra. First-order methods for geodesically convex optimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1617–1638, 2016.
- H. Zhang, S. Reddi, and S. Sra. Riemannian SVRG: Fast stochastic optimization on Riemannian manifolds. In D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. V. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, pages 4592–4600. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.

A Essentials about manifolds

We give here a simplified refresher of differential geometric concepts used in the paper, restricted to Riemannian submanifolds. All concepts are illustrated with the sphere. See (Absil et al., 2008) for a more complete discussion, including quotient manifolds.

We endow \mathbb{R}^n with the classical Euclidean metric: for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\langle x, y \rangle = x^\top y$. Consider the smooth map $h: \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^m$ with $m \leq n$ and the constraint set

$$\mathcal{M} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : h(x) = 0\}.$$

Locally around each x , this set can be linearized by differentiating the constraint. The subspace corresponding to this linearization is the kernel of the differential of h at x (Absil et al., 2008, eq. (3.19)):

$$T_x \mathcal{M} = \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n : Dh(x)[\eta] = 0\}.$$

If this subspace has dimension $n - m$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$, then \mathcal{M} is a submanifold of dimension $n - m$ of \mathbb{R}^n (Absil et al., 2008, Prop. 3.3.3) and $T_x \mathcal{M}$ is called the tangent space to \mathcal{M} at x . For example, the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n is a submanifold of dimension $n - 1$ defined by

$$\mathcal{S}^{n-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x^\top x = 1\},$$

and the tangent space at x is

$$T_x \mathcal{S}^{n-1} = \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n : x^\top \eta = 0\}.$$

By endowing each tangent space with the (restricted) Euclidean metric, we turn \mathcal{M} into a Riemannian submanifold of the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n . (In general, the metric could be different, and would depend on x ; to disambiguate, one would write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_x$.) An obvious retraction for the sphere (see Definition 1) is to normalize:

$$\text{Retr}_x(\eta) = \frac{x + \eta}{\|x + \eta\|}.$$

Being an orthogonal projection to the manifold, this is actually a second-order retraction, see Definition 2 and (Absil and Malick, 2012, Thm. 22).

The Riemannian metric leads to the notion of Riemannian gradient of a real function f defined in an open set of \mathbb{R}^n containing \mathcal{M} .⁸ The Riemannian gradient of f at x is the (unique) tangent vector $\text{grad}f(x)$ at x satisfying

$$\forall \eta \in \text{T}_x\mathcal{M}, \quad \text{D}f(x)[\eta] = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x + t\eta) - f(x)}{t} = \langle \eta, \text{grad}f(x) \rangle.$$

In this setting, the Riemannian gradient is nothing but the orthogonal projection of the Euclidean (classical) gradient $\nabla f(x)$ to the tangent space. Writing $\text{Proj}_x: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \text{T}_x\mathcal{M}$ for the orthogonal projector, we have (Absil et al., 2008, eq. (3.37)):

$$\text{grad}f(x) = \text{Proj}_x(\nabla f(x)).$$

Continuing the sphere example, the orthogonal projector is $\text{Proj}_x(y) = y - (x^\top y)x$, and if $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^\top Ax$ for some symmetric matrix A , then

$$\nabla f(x) = Ax, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{grad}f(x) = Ax - (x^\top Ax)x.$$

Notice that the critical points of f on \mathcal{S}^{n-1} coincide with the unit eigenvectors of A .

We can further define a notion of Riemannian Hessian as the projected differential of the Riemannian gradient.⁹

$$\text{Hess}f(x)[\eta] = \text{Proj}_x\left(\text{D}(x \mapsto \text{Proj}_x \nabla f(x))(x)[\eta]\right).$$

$\text{Hess}f(x)$ is a linear map from $\text{T}_x\mathcal{M}$ to itself, symmetric with respect to the Riemannian metric. Given a second-order retraction (Definition 2), it is equivalently defined by:

$$\forall \eta \in \text{T}_x\mathcal{M}, \quad \langle \eta, \text{Hess}f(x)[\eta] \rangle = \left. \frac{\text{d}^2}{\text{d}t^2} f(\text{Retr}_x(t\eta)) \right|_{t=0},$$

see (Absil et al., 2008, eq. (5.35)). Continuing our sphere example,

$$\text{D}(x \mapsto \text{Proj}_x \nabla f(x))(x)[\eta] = \text{D}(x \mapsto Ax - (x^\top Ax)x)(x)[\eta] = A\eta - (x^\top A\eta)x.$$

Projection of the latter gives the Hessian:

$$\text{Hess}f(x)[\eta] = \text{Proj}_x(A\eta) - (x^\top A\eta)x.$$

Consider the implications of a positive semidefinite Hessian (on the tangent space):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hess}f(x) \succeq 0 &\iff \langle \eta, \text{Hess}f(x)[\eta] \rangle \geq 0 && \forall \eta \in \text{T}_x\mathcal{S}^{n-1} \\ &\iff \eta^\top A\eta \geq x^\top Ax && \forall \eta \in \text{T}_x\mathcal{S}^{n-1}, \|\eta\| = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Together with first-order conditions, this implies that x is a leftmost eigenvector of A .¹⁰ This is an example of optimization problem on a manifold for which second-order necessary optimality conditions are also sufficient. This is not the norm.

As another (very) special example, consider the case $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^n$; then, $\text{T}_x\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{Retr}_x(\eta) = x + \eta$ is the exponential map (a fortiori a second-order retraction), Proj_x is the identity, $\text{grad}f(x) = \nabla f(x)$ and $\text{Hess}f(x) = \nabla^2 f(x)$.

⁸ f needs not be defined outside of \mathcal{M} , but this is often the case in applications and simplifies exposition.

⁹Proper definition of Riemannian Hessians requires the notion of Riemannian connections, which we omit here; see (Absil et al., 2008, §5)

¹⁰Indeed, any $y \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ can be written as $y = \alpha x + \beta \eta$ with $x^\top \eta = 0$, $\|\eta\| = 1$ and $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$; then, $y^\top Ay = \alpha^2 x^\top Ax + \beta^2 \eta^\top A\eta + 2\alpha\beta \eta^\top Ax$; by first-order condition, $\eta^\top Ax = (x^\top Ax)\eta^\top x = 0$, and by second-order condition: $y^\top Ay \geq (\alpha^2 + \beta^2)x^\top Ax = x^\top Ax$, hence $x^\top Ax$ is minimal over \mathcal{S}^{n-1} .

B Compact submanifolds of Euclidean spaces

In this appendix, we prove Lemmas 4 and 9, showing that if f has locally Lipschitz continuous gradient or Hessian in a Euclidean space \mathcal{E} (in the usual sense), and it is to be minimized over a compact submanifold of \mathcal{E} , then A3, A4 and A5 hold.

Proof of Lemma 4. By assumption, ∇f is Lipschitz continuous along any line segment in \mathcal{E} joining x and y in \mathcal{M} . Hence, there exists L such that, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$|f(y) - [f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle]| \leq \frac{L}{2} \|y - x\|^2. \quad (29)$$

In particular, this holds for all $y = \text{Retr}_x(\eta)$, for any $\eta \in T_x \mathcal{M}$. Writing $\text{grad} f(x)$ for the Riemannian gradient of $f|_{\mathcal{M}}$ and using that $\text{grad} f(x)$ is the orthogonal projection of $\nabla f(x)$ to $T_x \mathcal{M}$ (Absil et al., 2008, eq. (3.37)), the inner product above decomposes as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla f(x), \text{Retr}_x(\eta) - x \rangle &= \langle \nabla f(x), \eta + \text{Retr}_x(\eta) - x - \eta \rangle \\ &= \langle \text{grad} f(x), \eta \rangle + \langle \nabla f(x), \text{Retr}_x(\eta) - x - \eta \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Combining (29) with (30) and using the triangle inequality yields

$$|f(\text{Retr}_x(\eta)) - [f(x) + \langle \text{grad} f(x), \eta \rangle]| \leq \frac{L}{2} \|\text{Retr}_x(\eta) - x\|^2 + \|\nabla f(x)\| \|\text{Retr}_x(\eta) - x - \eta\|.$$

Since $\nabla f(x)$ is continuous on the compact set \mathcal{M} , there exists G finite such that $\|\nabla f(x)\| \leq G$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$. It remains to show there exist finite constants $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ such that, for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and for all $\eta \in T_x \mathcal{M}$,

$$\|\text{Retr}_x(\eta) - x\| \leq \alpha \|\eta\|, \text{ and} \quad (31)$$

$$\|\text{Retr}_x(\eta) - x - \eta\| \leq \beta \|\eta\|^2. \quad (32)$$

For small η , this will follow from $\text{Retr}_x(\eta) = x + \eta + \mathcal{O}(\|\eta\|^2)$ by Definition 1; for large η this will follow a fortiori from compactness. This will be sufficient to conclude, as then we will have for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\eta \in T_x \mathcal{M}$ that

$$|f(\text{Retr}_x(\eta)) - [f(x) + \langle \text{grad} f(x), \eta \rangle]| \leq \left(\frac{L}{2} \alpha^2 + G\beta \right) \|\eta\|^2.$$

More formally, our assumption that the retraction is defined and smooth over the whole tangent bundle a fortiori ensures the existence of $r > 0$ such that Retr is smooth on $K = \{\eta \in T\mathcal{M} : \|\eta\| \leq r\}$, a compact subset of the tangent bundle (K consists of a ball in each tangent space). First, we determine α (31). For all $\eta \in K$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{Retr}_x(\eta) - x\| &\leq \int_0^1 \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \text{Retr}_x(t\eta) \right\| dt = \int_0^1 \|\text{DRetr}_x(t\eta)[\eta]\| dt \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \max_{\xi \in K} \|\text{DRetr}(\xi)\| \|\eta\| dt = \max_{\xi \in K} \|\text{DRetr}(\xi)\| \|\eta\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the max exists and is finite owing to compactness of K and smoothness of Retr on K ; note that this is uniform over both x and η . (If $\xi \in T_z\mathcal{M}$, the notation $\text{DRetr}(\xi)$ refers to $\text{DRetr}_z(\xi)$.) For all $\eta \notin K$, we have

$$\|\text{Retr}_x(\eta) - x\| \leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{M}) \leq \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{M})}{r} \|\eta\|,$$

where $\text{diam}(\mathcal{M})$ is the maximal distance between any two points on \mathcal{M} : finite by compactness of \mathcal{M} . Combining, we find that (31) holds with

$$\alpha = \max \left(\max_{\xi \in K} \|\text{DRetr}(\xi)\|, \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{M})}{r} \right).$$

Inequality (32) is established along similar lines. For all $\eta \in K$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{Retr}_x(\eta) - x - \eta\| &\leq \int_0^1 \left\| \frac{d}{dt} (\text{Retr}_x(t\eta) - x - t\eta) \right\| dt = \int_0^1 \|\text{DRetr}_x(t\eta)[\eta] - \eta\| dt \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \|\text{DRetr}_x(t\eta) - \text{Id}\| \|\eta\| dt \leq \frac{1}{2} \max_{\xi \in K} \|\text{D}^2\text{Retr}(\xi)\| \|\eta\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from $\text{DRetr}_x(0_x) = \text{Id}$ and

$$\|\text{DRetr}_x(t\eta) - \text{Id}\| \leq \int_0^1 \left\| \frac{d}{ds} \text{DRetr}_x(st\eta) \right\| ds \leq \|t\eta\| \int_0^1 \|\text{D}^2\text{Retr}_x(t\eta)\| ds.$$

The case $\eta \notin K$ is treated as before:

$$\|\text{Retr}_x(\eta) - x - \eta\| \leq \|\text{Retr}_x(\eta) - x\| + \|\eta\| \leq \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{M}) + r}{r^2} \|\eta\|^2.$$

Combining, we find that (32) holds with

$$\beta = \max \left(\frac{1}{2} \max_{\xi \in K} \|\text{D}^2\text{Retr}(\xi)\|, \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{M}) + r}{r^2} \right),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

We now prove the corresponding second-order result, whose aim is to verify A5.

Proof of Lemma 9. By assumption, $\nabla^2 f$ is Lipschitz continuous along any line segment in \mathcal{E} joining x and y in \mathcal{M} . Hence, there exists L such that, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$\left| f(y) - \left[f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle y - x, \nabla^2 f(x)[y - x] \rangle \right] \right| \leq \frac{L}{6} \|y - x\|^3. \quad (33)$$

Fix $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Let Proj_x denote the orthogonal projector from \mathcal{E} to $T_x\mathcal{M}$. Let $\text{grad}f(x)$ be the Riemannian gradient of $f|_{\mathcal{M}}$ at x and let $\text{Hess}f(x)$ be the Riemannian Hessian of $f|_{\mathcal{M}}$ at x (a symmetric operator on $T_x\mathcal{M}$). For Riemannian submanifolds of Euclidean spaces we

have these explicit expressions with $\eta \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ —see (Absil et al., 2008, eqs. (3.37), (5.15), Def. (5.5.1)) and (Absil et al., 2013):

$$\begin{aligned}\text{grad}f(x) &= \text{Proj}_x \nabla f(x), \text{ and} \\ \langle \eta, \text{Hess}f(x)[\eta] \rangle &= \langle \eta, D(x \mapsto \text{Proj}_x \nabla f(x))(x)[\eta] \rangle \\ &= \left\langle \eta, \left(D(x \mapsto \text{Proj}_x)(x)[\eta] \right) [\nabla f(x)] + \text{Proj}_x \nabla^2 f(x)[\eta] \right\rangle \\ &= \langle II(\eta, \eta), \nabla f(x) \rangle + \langle \eta, \nabla^2 f(x)[\eta] \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

where II , as implicitly defined above, is the *second fundamental form* of \mathcal{M} : $II(\eta, \eta)$ is a normal vector to the tangent space at x , capturing the second-order geometry of \mathcal{M} —see (Absil et al., 2009, 2013; Monera et al., 2014) for presentations relevant to our setting. In particular, $II(\eta, \eta)$ is the acceleration in \mathcal{E} at x of a geodesic $\gamma(t)$ on \mathcal{M} defined by $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\dot{\gamma}(0) = \eta$: $\ddot{\gamma}(0) = II(\eta, \eta)$ (O’Neill, 1983, Cor. 4.9).

Let $\eta \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ be arbitrary; $y = \text{Retr}_x(\eta) \in \mathcal{M}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle - \langle \text{grad}f(x), \eta \rangle &= \langle \nabla f(x), y - x - \eta \rangle \text{ and} \\ \langle y - x, \nabla^2 f(x)[y - x] \rangle - \langle \eta, \text{Hess}f(x)[\eta] \rangle &= 2 \langle \eta, \nabla^2 f(x)[y - x - \eta] \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle y - x - \eta, \nabla^2 f(x)[y - x - \eta] \rangle \\ &\quad - \langle \nabla f(x), II(\eta, \eta) \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{M} is compact and f is twice continuously differentiable, there exist G, H , independent of x , such that $\|\nabla f(x)\| \leq G$ and $\|\nabla^2 f(x)\| \leq H$ (the latter is the induced operator norm). Combining with (33) and using the triangle and Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities multiple times,

$$\begin{aligned}\left| f(y) - \left[f(x) + \langle \text{grad}f(x), \eta \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \eta, \text{Hess}f(x)[\eta] \rangle \right] \right| \\ \leq \frac{L}{6} \|y - x\|^3 + G \left\| y - x - \eta - \frac{1}{2} II(\eta, \eta) \right\| + H \|\eta\| \|y - x - \eta\| + \frac{1}{2} H \|y - x - \eta\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Using the same argument as for Lemma 4, we can find finite constants α, β independent of x and η such that (31) and (32) hold. Use $\|y - x - \eta\|^2 \leq \|y - x - \eta\| (\|y - x\| + \|\eta\|) \leq \beta(\alpha + 1)\|\eta\|^3$ to upper bound the right hand side above with

$$\left(\frac{L}{6} \alpha^3 + H\beta + \frac{H\beta(\alpha + 1)}{2} \right) \|\eta\|^3 + G \left\| y - x - \eta - \frac{1}{2} II(\eta, \eta) \right\|.$$

We turn to the last term. Consider $K \subset T\mathcal{M}$ as defined in the proof of Lemma 4 for some $r > 0$. If $\eta \notin K$, i.e., $\|\eta\| > r$, then, since II is bilinear for a fixed $x \in \mathcal{M}$, we can define

$$\|II\| = \max_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \max_{\xi \in T_x\mathcal{M}, \|\xi\| \leq 1} \|II(\xi, \xi)\|$$

(finite by continuity and compactness) so that $\|II(\eta, \eta)\| \leq \|II\| \|\eta\|^2$. Then,

$$\left\| y - x - \eta - \frac{1}{2} II(\eta, \eta) \right\| \leq \|y - x\| + \|\eta\| + \frac{1}{2} \|II(\eta, \eta)\| \leq \left(\frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{M})}{r^3} + \frac{1}{r^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|II\|}{r} \right) \|\eta\|^3.$$

Now assume $\eta \in K$, that is, $\|\eta\| \leq r$. Consider $\phi(t) = \text{Retr}_x(t\eta)$ (a curve on \mathcal{M}) and let ϕ'' denote its acceleration on \mathcal{M} and $\ddot{\phi}$ denote its acceleration in \mathcal{E} , while $\dot{\phi} = \phi'$ denotes velocity along the curve. It holds that $\ddot{\phi}(t) = \phi''(t) + II(\dot{\phi}(t), \dot{\phi}(t))$ (O'Neill, 1983, Cor. 4.9). Since Retr is a second-order retraction, acceleration on \mathcal{M} is zero at $t = 0$, i.e., $\phi''(0) = 0$, so that $\phi(0) = x$, $\dot{\phi}(0) = \eta$ and $\ddot{\phi}(0) = II(\eta, \eta)$. Then, by Taylor expansion of ϕ in \mathcal{E} ,

$$y = \text{Retr}_x(\eta) = \phi(1) = x + \eta + \frac{1}{2}II(\eta, \eta) + R_3(\eta),$$

where

$$\|R_3(\eta)\| = \left\| \int_0^1 \frac{(1-t)^2}{2} \ddot{\phi}(t) dt \right\| \leq \frac{1}{6} \max_{\xi \in K} \|D^3 \text{Retr}(\xi)\| \|\eta\|^3.$$

The combined arguments ensure existence of a constant γ , independent of x and η , such that

$$\left\| y - x - \eta - \frac{1}{2}II(\eta, \eta) \right\| \leq \gamma \|\eta\|^3.$$

Combining, we find that for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\eta \in T_x \mathcal{M}$,

$$\left| f(\text{Retr}_x(\eta)) - \left[f(x) + \langle \text{grad} f(x), \eta \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \eta, \text{Hess} f(x)[\eta] \rangle \right] \right| \leq \left(\frac{L}{6} \alpha^3 + \frac{H\beta(\alpha+3)}{2} + \gamma \right) \|\eta\|^3.$$

Since Retr is a second-order retraction, $\text{Hess} f(x)$ coincides with the Hessian of the pullback $f \circ \text{Retr}_x$ (Lemma 17). This establishes A5. \square

C Proof of Lemma 7 about Armijo line-search

Proof of Lemma 7. By A3, upper bound (5) holds with $\eta = t\eta_k^0$ for any t such that $\|\eta\| \leq \varrho_k$:

$$f(x_k) - f(\text{Retr}_{x_k}(t \cdot \eta_k^0)) \geq t \langle -\text{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k^0 \rangle - \frac{Lt^2}{2} \|\eta_k^0\|^2. \quad (34)$$

We determine a sufficient condition on t for the stopping criterion in Algorithm 2 to trigger. To this end, observe that the right hand side of (34) dominates $c_1 t \langle -\text{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k^0 \rangle$ if

$$t(1 - c_1) \cdot \langle -\text{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k^0 \rangle \geq \frac{Lt^2}{2} \|\eta_k^0\|^2.$$

Thus, the stopping criterion in Algorithm 2 is satisfied in particular for all t in

$$\left[0, \frac{2(1 - c_1) \langle -\text{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k^0 \rangle}{L_g \|\eta_k^0\|^2} \right] \supseteq \left[0, \frac{2c_2(1 - c_1) \|\text{grad} f(x_k)\|}{L_g \|\eta_k^0\|} \right] \supseteq \left[0, \frac{2c_2(1 - c_1)}{c_4 L_g} \right].$$

Unless it equals \bar{t}_k , the returned t cannot be smaller than τ times the last upper bound. In all cases, the cost decrease satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_k) - f(\text{Retr}_{x_k}(t \cdot \eta_k^0)) &\geq c_1 t \langle -\text{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k^0 \rangle \\ &\geq c_1 c_2 t \|\text{grad} f(x_k)\| \|\eta_k^0\| \\ &\geq c_1 c_2 c_3 t \|\text{grad} f(x_k)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

To count the number of iterations, consider that checking whether $t = \bar{t}_k$ satisfies the stopping criterion requires one cost evaluation. Following that, t is reduced by a factor τ exactly $\log_\tau(t/\bar{t}_k) = \log_{\tau^{-1}}(\bar{t}_k/t)$ times, each followed by one cost evaluation. \square

D Proofs for Section 3.5 about H_k and the Hessians

Proof of Lemma 17. The Hessian of f and that of the pullback are related by the following formulas. See (Absil et al., 2008, §5) for the precise meanings of the differential operators D and d . For all η in $T_x\mathcal{M}$, writing $\hat{f}_x = f \circ \text{Retr}_x$ for convenience,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}f(\text{Retr}_x(t\eta)) &= \left\langle \text{grad}f(\text{Retr}_x(t\eta)), \frac{D}{dt}\text{Retr}_x(t\eta) \right\rangle, \\ \left\langle \nabla^2 \hat{f}_x(0_x)[\eta], \eta \right\rangle &= \left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2}f(\text{Retr}_x(t\eta)) \right|_{t=0} \\ &= \left\langle \text{Hess}f(x) [D\text{Retr}_x(0_x)[\eta]], \frac{D}{dt}\text{Retr}_x(t\eta) \Big|_{t=0} \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \left\langle \text{grad}f(x), \frac{D^2}{dt^2}\text{Retr}_x(t\eta) \Big|_{t=0} \right\rangle \\ &= \langle \text{Hess}f(x)[\eta], \eta \rangle + \left\langle \text{grad}f(x), \frac{D^2}{dt^2}\text{Retr}_x(t\eta) \Big|_{t=0} \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

(To get the third equality, it is assumed one is working with the Levi–Civita connection, so that $\text{Hess}f$ is indeed the Riemannian Hessian.) Since the acceleration of the retraction is bounded, we get the result via Cauchy–Schwarz. \square

Proof of Proposition 18. Combine $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_g$ and $H_k \succeq -\varepsilon_H \text{Id}$ with

$$\left\| \text{Hess}f(x_k) - \nabla^2 \hat{f}_{x_k}(0_{x_k}) \right\| \leq a_k \cdot \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \nabla^2 \hat{f}_k(0_{x_k}) - H_k \right\| \leq \delta_k$$

by triangular inequality. \square

E Complexity dependence on n in the Max-Cut example

This appendix supports Section 4. By Proposition 19, running Algorithm 3 with $\varepsilon_g = \infty$ and $\varepsilon_H = \frac{2\delta}{n}$ yields a solution Y within a gap δ from the optimal value of (27). Let \underline{f} and \bar{f} denote the minimal and maximal values of $f(Y) = \langle C, YY^\top \rangle$ over \mathcal{M} (28), respectively, with metric $\langle A, B \rangle = \text{Tr}(A^\top B)$ and associated Frobenius norm $\|\cdot\|_F$. Then, using $\rho' = 1/10$, setting $c_3 = 1/2$ in A9 as allowed by Lemma 11 and using the true Hessian of the pullbacks for H_k so that $c_1 = 0$ in A7, Theorem 12 guarantees Algorithm 3 returns an answer in at most

$$214(\bar{f} - \underline{f}) \cdot L_H^2 \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon_H^3} + \log \text{ term} \tag{35}$$

iterations. Using the LDL^\top -factorization strategy of Lemma 11 with a randomly generated orthonormal basis at each tangent space encountered, since $\dim \mathcal{M} = n^2$ for $p = n + 1$, the cost of each iteration is $\mathcal{O}(n^6)$ arithmetic operations (dominated by the cost of the LDL^\top factorization). It remains to bound L_H , in compliance with A5.

Let $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as $g(t) = f(\text{Retr}_Y(t\dot{Y}))$. Then, using a Taylor expansion,

$$f(\text{Retr}_Y(\dot{Y})) = g(1) = g(0) + g'(0) + \frac{1}{2}g''(0) + \frac{1}{6}g'''(t) \tag{36}$$

for some $t \in (0, 1)$. Let $\hat{f}_Y = f \circ \text{Retr}_Y$. Definition 1 for retractions implies

$$g(0) = f(Y), \quad g'(0) = \langle \text{grad} f(Y), \dot{Y} \rangle, \quad g''(0) = \langle \dot{Y}, \nabla^2 \hat{f}_Y(0_Y)[\dot{Y}] \rangle, \quad (37)$$

so that it only remains to bound $|g'''(t)|$ uniformly over Y, \dot{Y} and $t \in [0, 1]$.

For this example, it is easier to handle g''' if the retraction used is the exponential map (similar bounds can be obtained with the orthogonal projection retraction, see (Mei et al., 2017, Lemmas 4 and 5)). This map is known in explicit form and is cheap to compute for the sphere $\mathbb{S}^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : x^\top x = 1\}$. Indeed, if $x \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and $\eta \in T_x \mathbb{S}^n$, following (Absil et al., 2008, Ex. 5.4.1),

$$\gamma(t) = \text{Exp}_x(t\eta) = \cos(t\|\eta\|)x + \sin(t\|\eta\|)\frac{1}{\|\eta\|}\eta. \quad (38)$$

Conceiving of γ as a map from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , its differentials are easily derived:

$$\dot{\gamma}(t) = -\|\eta\| \sin(t\|\eta\|)x + \cos(t\|\eta\|)\eta, \quad \ddot{\gamma}(t) = -\|\eta\|^2 \gamma(t), \quad \ddot{\gamma}(t) = -\|\eta\|^2 \dot{\gamma}(t). \quad (39)$$

Extending this map row-wise gives the exponential map for \mathcal{M} —of course, this is a second-order retraction. We define $\Phi(t) = \text{Retr}_Y(t\dot{Y})$ and $g(t) = f(\text{Retr}_Y(t\dot{Y})) = \langle C\Phi(t), \Phi(t) \rangle$. In particular, $\dot{\Phi}(t) = -D\Phi(t)$ and $\ddot{\Phi}(t) = -D\dot{\Phi}(t)$, where $D = \text{diag}(\|\dot{y}_1\|^2, \dots, \|\dot{y}_n\|^2)$ and \dot{y}_k^\top is the k th row of \dot{Y} . As a result, for a given Y and \dot{Y} , a little bit of calculus gives:

$$g'''(t) = -6 \langle C\dot{\Phi}(t), D\Phi(t) \rangle - 2 \langle C\Phi(t), D\dot{\Phi}(t) \rangle. \quad (40)$$

Using Cauchy–Schwarz multiple times, as well as the inequality $\|AB\|_F \leq \|A\|_2 \|B\|_F$ where $\|A\|_2$ denotes the largest singular value of A , and using that $\|\Phi(t)\|_F = \sqrt{n}$ and $\|\dot{\Phi}(t)\|_F = \|\dot{Y}\|_F$ for all t , and additionally that $\|D\|_2 \leq \text{Tr}(D) = \|\dot{Y}\|_F^2$, it follows that

$$\sup_{Y \in \mathcal{M}, \dot{Y} \in T_Y \mathcal{M}, \dot{Y} \neq 0, t \in (0, 1)} \frac{|g'''(t)|}{\|\dot{Y}\|_F^3} \leq 8 \|C\|_2 \sqrt{n}. \quad (41)$$

As a result, an acceptable constant L_H for A5 is $L_H = 8 \|C\|_2 \sqrt{n}$.

Combining all statements of this section, it follows that a solution Y within an absolute gap δ of the optimal value can be obtained for problem (27) using Algorithm 3 in at most $\mathcal{O}\left((\bar{f} - \underline{f}) \|C\|_2^2 \cdot n^{10} \cdot \frac{1}{\delta^3}\right)$ arithmetic operations, neglecting the additive logarithmic term.

Note that, following (Mei et al., 2017, Appendix A.2, points 1 and 2), it is also possible to bound L_H as $6 \|C\|_2 + 2 \|C\|_1$, where $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the ℓ_1 operator norm. This reduces the explicit dependence on n from n^{10} to n^9 in the bound on the total amount of work.