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ABSTRACT
In this paper, we study parametric analysis of semidefinite optimization problems with respect to the perturbation of objective function. We investigate the behavior of the optimal partition and optimal set mapping in a so called nonlinearity interval. Furthermore, we investigate the sensitivity of the approximation of the optimal partition, which have been recently studied by Mohammad-Nezhad and Terlaky. The approximation of the optimal partition was obtained from a bounded sequence of interior solutions on, or in a neighborhood of the central path. We derive an upper bound on the distance between the invariant subspaces spanned by the approximation of the optimal partition.
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1. Introduction

In this paper, we study parametric analysis of a semidefinite optimization (SDO) problem in which the objective function is perturbed along a fixed direction. Mathematically, we consider

\[(P_\epsilon) \quad \min \left\{ \langle C + \epsilon \bar{C}, X \rangle \mid \langle A^i, X \rangle = b_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m, \quad X \succeq 0 \right\},\]

\[(D_\epsilon) \quad \max \left\{ b^T y \mid \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i A^i + S = C + \epsilon \bar{C}, \quad S \succeq 0, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^m \right\},\]

where \(C, X, A^i \in \mathbb{S}^n\) for \(i = 1, \ldots, m\), \(b \in \mathbb{R}^m\), \(\bar{C} \in \mathbb{S}^n\) is a fixed direction, and \(\mathbb{S}^n\) denotes the vector space of symmetric \(n \times n\) matrices endowed with the inner product \(\langle C, X \rangle := \text{Tr}(CX)\). In this context, \(X \succeq 0\) means that \(X\) belongs to the cone of positive semidefinite matrices, which is denoted by \(\mathbb{S}^n_+\). The primal and dual feasible
set mappings are defined as

\[ P(\epsilon) := \{ X \mid \langle A^i, X \rangle = b_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m, \ X \succeq 0 \}, \]

\[ D(\epsilon) := \{ (y, S) \mid \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A^i + S = C + \epsilon C \}. \]

Since \( P(.) \) is independent of \( \epsilon \), primal feasibility either holds or fails for all \( \epsilon \). Thus, we assume that \( P(\epsilon) \neq \emptyset \) for all \( \epsilon \).

The optimal value of \( (P_\epsilon) \) yields the optimal value function \( v : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\} \).

Let \( \mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \) be the set of all \( \epsilon \) for which \( v(\epsilon) > -\infty \), and assume that \( \mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset \). Then it is proven that \( v(.) \) is a proper concave function \(^{[26]}\), and that it is continuous on \( \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \), see Corollary 2.109 in \(^{[8]}\). Furthermore, \( \mathcal{E} \) is a closed (possibly unbounded) interval, see e.g., Lemma 2.2 in \(^{[4]}\).

In order to guarantee zero duality gap and attainment of the optimal values, see e.g., \(^{[8]}\), we make the following assumptions throughout this paper:

**Assumption 1.** The matrices \( A^i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, m \) are linearly independent.

**Assumption 2.** The domain \( \mathcal{E} \) is nonempty, and the interior point condition holds for both \( (P_\epsilon) \) and \( (D_\epsilon) \) for all \( \epsilon' \in \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \), i.e., there exists a feasible solution \((X^\circ(\epsilon'), y^\circ(\epsilon'), S^\circ(\epsilon'))\) such that \( X^\circ(\epsilon'), S^\circ(\epsilon') \succ 0 \), where \( > 0 \) means positive definite.

The primal and dual optimal set mappings are defined as

\[ P^*(\epsilon) := \{ X \mid \langle C + \epsilon \bar{C}, X \rangle = v(\epsilon), \ X \in P(\epsilon) \}, \]

\[ D^*(\epsilon) := \{ (y, S) \mid b^T y = v(\epsilon), \ (y, S) \in D(\epsilon) \}. \]

Our analysis relies on the existence of central path and maximally complementary solutions \(^{[10]}\), as formally defined below.

**Definition 1.1.** An optimal solution \((X^\circ(\epsilon), y^\circ(\epsilon), S^\circ(\epsilon))\) is called maximally complementary if

\[ X^\circ(\epsilon) \in \text{ri} \left( P^*(\epsilon) \right), \quad (y^\circ(\epsilon), S^\circ(\epsilon)) \in \text{ri} \left( D^*(\epsilon) \right), \]

where \( \text{ri}(.) \) denotes the relative interior of a convex set. A maximally complementary solution \((X^\circ(\epsilon), y^\circ(\epsilon), S^\circ(\epsilon))\) is called strictly complementary if

\[ X^\circ(\epsilon) + S^\circ(\epsilon) \succ 0. \]

By Assumptions \(^{[4]}\) and \(^{[2]}\) strong duality \(^{[1]}\) holds, and both \( P^*(\epsilon') \) and \( D^*(\epsilon') \) are nonempty and compact for all \( \epsilon' \in \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \), see e.g., Theorem 5.81 in \(^{[8]}\). Therefore, for every \( \epsilon' \in \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \) there exists a maximally complementary solution, and any primal-dual optimal solution \((X(\epsilon'), y(\epsilon'), S(\epsilon'))\) satisfies the complementarity condition \( X(\epsilon') S(\epsilon') = 0 \). It is known that an SDO problem, and in general a linear conic

\(^{[1]}\)Strong duality in this paper means that both the primal and dual problems admit optimal solutions with equal objective values.
optimization problem, may have no strictly complementary solution.

Steady advances in computational optimization have enabled us to solve a wide variety of SDO problems in polynomial time. Nevertheless, sensitivity analysis tools are still the missing parts of SDO solvers, e.g., interior point methods (IPMs) in SeDuMi [32], SDPT3 [33], and MOSEK [3]. Shapiro [28] established the differentiability of the optimal solution for a nonlinear SDO problem using the standard implicit function theorem. Under linear perturbations in the objective vector, the coefficient matrix, and the right hand side, Nayakkankuppam and Overton [23] derived the region of stability around an optimal solution of SDO which satisfies the strict complementarity and nondegeneracy conditions. The sensitivity of central solutions for SDO was considered in [25,31]. Based on IPMs, Yildirim and Todd [37] proposed a sensitivity analysis approach for linear optimization (LO) and SDO. Recently, Cheung and Wolkowicz [9] and Sekiguchi and Waki [27] studied the continuity of the optimal value function for SDO problems, which fail the interior point condition. A comprehensive study on sensitivity and stability of nonlinear optimization problems was given by Bonnans and Shapiro [7,8]. The results are mostly valid in a neighborhood of a given optimal solution, and they depend on strong second-order sufficient conditions. We refer the reader to [12] for a survey on classical results.

Adler and Monteiro [1] studied the parametric analysis of LO problems using the concept of optimal partition. Another treatment of sensitivity analysis for LO based on the optimal partition approach was given by Jansen et al. [21] and Greenberg [16]. Berkelaar et al. [5] extended the optimal partition approach to linearly constrained quadratic optimization (LCQO) with perturbation in the right hand side vector and showed that the optimal value function is convex and piecewise quadratic. There have been further studies on optimal partition and parametric analysis of conic optimization problems. Goldfarb and Scheinberg [14] considered a parametric SDO problem, where the objective is perturbed along a fixed direction. They derived auxiliary problems to compute the directional derivatives of the optimal value function and the so called linearity interval of the optimal partition. The optimal value function for SDO has been shown to be piecewise algebraic [24], i.e., for each piece there exists a polynomial function $\Psi(\cdot,\cdot)$ so that $\Psi(v(\epsilon),\epsilon) = 0$. Yildirim [36] extended the concept of the optimal partition and the auxiliary problems in [14] for linear conic optimization problems.

The regularity and stability of the trajectory of the optimal set mapping for conic optimization problems have received very few attention within the past twenty years. In this paper, we take an initial step to fill this gap by revisiting parametric analysis of SDO problems. We introduce the concepts of nonlinearity interval and transition point for the optimal partition and provide sufficient conditions to get a subinterval of a nonlinearity interval. Furthermore, we investigate the sensitivity of the approximation of the optimal partition given in [22] for SDO. In [22], the approximation of the optimal partition was obtained from the eigenvectors of interior solutions on, or in a neighborhood of the central path. Such solutions are usually generated by a feasible primal-dual IPM, whose accumulation points form orthonormal bases for the subspaces of the optimal partition. Roughly speaking, our main contributions are

- Characterization of nonlinearity intervals and transition points of the optimal partition;
- Upper bounds on the sensitivity of subspaces spanned by the approximation of the optimal partition.

[https://www.mosek.com/]
The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we concisely review the concepts of the nondegeneracy and optimal partition for SDO. In Section 3, we review the concept of a linearity interval from [14] and prove additional results. Furthermore, we introduce the notions of a nonlinearity interval and a transition point and present the behavior of the optimal partition in linearity and nonlinearity intervals. In Section 4, we investigate the sensitivity of the approximation of the optimal partition with respect to the perturbation of objective vector. Our concluding remarks and topics for future studies are stated in Section 5.

**Notation:** Throughout this paper, for any given \( \epsilon' \in \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \), \((X(\epsilon'), y(\epsilon'), S(\epsilon'))\) denotes a primal-dual optimal solution, and a maximally complementarity solution is denoted by \((X^*(\epsilon'), y^*(\epsilon'), S^*(\epsilon'))\). For a given matrix, \( R(\cdot) \) stands for its column space, and \( \text{Null}(\cdot) \) represents its null space. Furthermore, \( \lambda_{[i]}(X) \) denotes the \( i \)th largest eigenvalue of \( X \). Thus, \( \lambda_{\text{max}}(X) := \lambda_{[1]}(X) \), \( \lambda_{\text{min}}(X) := \lambda_{[n]}(X) \), and \( \Lambda(X) \) denotes the diagonal matrix of the eigenvalues of \( X \in \mathbb{S}^n \). The Frobenius norm is indicated by \( \|\cdot\|_F \), and the \( l_2 \) norm and the induced 2-norm (spectral norm) for the vectors and matrices are denoted by \( \|\cdot\|_2 \). By \( \text{dist}(\Psi_1, \Psi_2) \) we mean the distance between two subspaces \( \Psi_1 \) and \( \Psi_2 \) of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) with the same dimension, which is defined as

\[
\text{dist}(\Psi_1, \Psi_2) := \| \text{Proj}_{\Psi_1} - \text{Proj}_{\Psi_2} \|_2,
\]

where \( \text{Proj}_{\Psi_1} \) and \( \text{Proj}_{\Psi_2} \) are the orthogonal projections onto the subspaces \( \Psi_1 \) and \( \Psi_2 \), respectively, see Section 2.5.3 in [15]. We adopt the notation \((\cdot;\cdot;\cdot;\cdot;\cdot)\) and \((\cdot;\cdot;\cdot;\cdot;\cdot;\cdot;\cdot)\) to indicate the concatenation and side by side arrangement of column vectors, respectively.

2. Preliminaries

For the sake of simplicity, we assume that \( \epsilon = 0 \), and define \((P) := (P_0)\) and \((D) := (D_0)\). We adopt this notation for an optimal solution, a maximally complementary solution, and central solutions as well.

2.1. Nondegeneracy conditions

The primal and dual nondegeneracy conditions were studied for SDO in [2]. Let \((X, y, S) \in P \times D\) be a primal-dual feasible solution. Consider the eigenvalue decompositions

\[
X = MA(X)M^T, \quad S = NA(S)N^T,
\]

where \( M := (M_1, M_2) \) and \( N := (N_1, N_2) \) are orthogonal matrices, and \( M_1 \) and \( N_2 \) correspond to the positive eigenvalues of \( X \) and \( S \), respectively. A primal feasible solution \( X \) is called primal nondegenerate if the matrices

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
M_1^T A_i^T M_1 & M_1^T A_i^T M_2 \\
M_2^T A_i^T M_1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

for \( i = 1, \ldots, m \) are linearly independent in \( \mathbb{S}^n \). A dual feasible solution \((y, S)\) is called dual nondegenerate if the matrices \( N_2^T A_i N_1 \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, m \) span \( \mathbb{S}^{n-\text{rank}(S)} \). If there
exists a primal nondegenerate (dual nondegenerate) optimal solution, then the dual (primal) optimal solution is unique. In case that the strict complementarity condition holds, then a unique primal (dual) optimal solution implies the existence of a dual (primal) nondegenerate optimal solution. The proofs can be found in [10].

2.2. Optimal partition of SDO

It is known [10] that the optimal partition is well-defined under the interior point condition. Let \((X^*, y^*, S^*) \in \text{ri} (\mathcal{P}^* \times \mathcal{D}^*)\) be a maximally complementary solution, where \(X^*\) and \(S^*\) have a common eigenvector basis \(Q^*\) due to the complementarity condition \(X^*S^* = 0\). All \(X^* \in \text{ri}(\mathcal{P}^*)\) and \((y^*, S^*) \in \text{ri}(\mathcal{D}^*)\) have the highest rank among the primal and dual optimal solutions, respectively, see e.g., Lemma 2.3 in [10]. The subspaces \(\mathcal{R}(X^*)\) and \(\mathcal{R}(S^*)\) are orthogonal by the complementarity condition, and they are spanned by the eigenvectors corresponding to the positive eigenvalues of \(X^*\) and \(S^*\), respectively. Let \(\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{R}(X^*), \mathcal{N} := \mathcal{R}(S^*), \) and \(\mathcal{T} := (\mathcal{R}(X^*) + \mathcal{R}(S^*))^\perp\). Then \((\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{N})\) is called the optimal partition of \((\mathcal{P})\) and \((\mathcal{D})\). It is immediate that \(\mathcal{T} = \{0\}\) if and only if \((\mathcal{P})\) and \((\mathcal{D})\) have a strictly complementary solution. Since \((X^*, y^*, S^*)\) has the highest rank in \(\mathcal{P}^* \times \mathcal{D}^*\), the optimal partition is invariant with respect to the choice of a maximally complementary solution. We use the notation \(Q := (Q_B, Q_T, Q_N)\) to denote an orthonormal basis partitioned according to the subspaces \(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{T},\) and \(\mathcal{N}\). Let us define \(n_B := \text{dim}(\mathcal{B}), n_N := \text{dim}(\mathcal{N}),\) and \(n_T := \text{dim}(\mathcal{T})\). By the interior point condition, at least one of \(n_B\) or \(n_N\) has to be positive, see Remark 2 in [22].

**Theorem 2.1** (Theorem 2.7 in [10]). Any \((\check{X}, \check{y}, \check{S}) \in \mathcal{P}^* \times \mathcal{D}^*\) can be represented as

\[
\check{X} = Q_B U_{\check{X}} Q_B^T, \quad \check{S} = Q_N U_{\check{S}} Q_N^T,
\]

for unique \(U_{\check{X}} \succeq 0\) and \(U_{\check{S}} \succeq 0\). If \(n_B > 0\) and \(X^* \in \text{ri}(\mathcal{P}^*),\) then \(U_{\check{X}^*} > 0\). Analogously, if \(n_N > 0\) and \((y^*, S^*) \in \text{ri}(\mathcal{D}^*),\) then \(U_{\check{S}^*} > 0\).

2.3. Approximation of the optimal partition

The central path is a smooth trajectory of solutions to

\[
\langle A^i, X \rangle = b_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m, \quad X \succeq 0,
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{m} A^i y_i + S = C, \quad S \succeq 0, \quad (1)
\]

\[
XS = \mu I_n,
\]

where \(I_n\) denotes the identity matrix of size \(n\). For a given \(\mu > 0\), the unique solution of \((\mathcal{P}),\) denoted by \((X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu)\), is called a central solution. The existence and uniqueness follow from the linear independence of \(A^i\) for \(i = 1, \ldots, m\) and the interior point condition, see Theorem 3.1 in [10]. Furthermore, it is immediate from the nonlinear equations \(XS = \mu I_n\) that \(X^\mu\) and \(S^\mu\) have a common eigenvector basis for every \(\mu > 0\). Let \(\hat{X}^\mu := Q^T X^\mu Q\) and \(\hat{S}^\mu := Q^T S^\mu Q\) be the orthogonal transformation of \((X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu)\) with respect to the orthonormal basis \(Q\) as defined in Section 2.2. Then
we have

\[
\hat{X}^\mu := \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{X}_B^\mu & \hat{X}_{BT}^\mu & \hat{X}_{BN}^\mu \\
\hat{X}_{TB}^\mu & \hat{X}_T^\mu & \hat{X}_{TN}^\mu \\
\hat{X}_{NB}^\mu & \hat{X}_{NT}^\mu & \hat{X}_N^\mu 
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{S}^\mu := \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{S}_B^\mu & \hat{S}_{BT}^\mu & \hat{S}_{BN}^\mu \\
\hat{S}_{TB}^\mu & \hat{S}_T^\mu & \hat{S}_{TN}^\mu \\
\hat{S}_{NB}^\mu & \hat{S}_{NT}^\mu & \hat{S}_N^\mu 
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

As a consequence of Theorem 2.1 we have

\[
\lim_{\mu \to 0} Q_{T\cup N}^T X^\mu Q_{T\cup N} = 0, \quad \lim_{\mu \to 0} Q_{B\cup T}^T S^\mu Q_{B\cup T} = 0,
\]

where \(Q_{T\cup N} := (Q_T, Q_N)\) and \(Q_{B\cup T} := (Q_B, Q_T)\). Note that the limits in (2) exist, since the central path converges to a maximally complementary solution. The derivation of bounds in [22] for the vanishing blocks \(\hat{S}_B^\mu\) and \(\hat{X}_N^\mu\) are based on a condition number \(\sigma\) defined as

\[
\sigma_B := \begin{cases} 
\max_{X \in \mathcal{P}^*} \lambda_{\min}(Q_B^T X Q_B), & B \neq \{0\}, \\
\infty, & B = \{0\},
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\sigma_N := \begin{cases} 
\max_{(\hat{y}, \hat{S}) \in \mathcal{D}^*} \lambda_{\min}(Q_N^T \hat{S} Q_N), & N \neq \{0\}, \\
\infty, & N = \{0\},
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\sigma := \min\{\sigma_B, \sigma_N\}.
\]

Due to the interior point condition and the compactness of the optimal set, \(\sigma\) is well-defined, see Lemma 3.1 in [22].

Let \((\hat{X}, \hat{y}, \hat{S}) \in \mathcal{P}^* \times \mathcal{D}^*\), and define

\[
A := (svec(A^1), \ldots, svec(A^m))^T,
\]

where \(svec : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n(n+1)/2}\) is a linear operator which multiplies the off-diagonal entries of a symmetric matrix by \(\sqrt{2}\) and stacks the upper triangular part into a vector, i.e.,

\[
svec(A^i) := (A_{11}^i, \sqrt{2}A_{12}^i, \ldots, \sqrt{2}A_{1n}^i, A_{22}^i, \sqrt{2}A_{23}^i, \ldots, \sqrt{2}A_{2n}^i, \ldots, A_{nn}^i).
\]

Further, let \(\text{Mat} : \mathbb{R}^{n(n+1)/2} \to \mathbb{S}^n\) be the inverse of \(svec(.)\). The magnitude of \(\hat{X}_T^\mu\) and \(\hat{S}_T^\mu\) is estimated by using an error bound result for the following linear matrix inequality (LMI) systems

\[
\begin{cases}
Ax = b, \\
\text{svec}(\hat{S})^T x = 0, \\
\text{Mat}(x) \succeq 0,
\end{cases} \quad \begin{cases}
A^T y + s = svec(C), \\
\text{svec}(\hat{X})^T s = 0, \\
\text{Mat}(s) \succeq 0.
\end{cases}
\]

Using the LMIs given in [5], which indeed define the set of primal and dual optimal solutions, an upper bound is derived for the distance between a central solution and the optimal set. To that end, from the primal-dual feasibility constraints we derive
that
\[ \langle X^\mu - \bar{X}, S^\mu - \bar{S} \rangle = 0, \quad (6) \]
which, by the optimality of \( \bar{X} \) and \( \bar{S} \) and by \( \langle X^\mu, S^\mu \rangle = n\mu \), implies that
\[ \text{svec}(\bar{S})^T \text{svec}(X^\mu) \leq n\mu, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{svec}(\bar{X})^T \text{svec}(S^\mu) \leq n\mu. \]

Therefore, by the orthogonal projection of \( \text{svec}(X^\mu) \) and \( \text{svec}(S^\mu) \) onto the affine subspaces
\[
\bar{\mathcal{L}}_P := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{n(n+1)/2} \mid x \in \text{svec}(\bar{X}) + \text{Null}(A), \ \text{svec}(\bar{S})^T x = 0 \right\}, \\
\bar{\mathcal{L}}_D := \left\{ s \in \mathbb{R}^{n(n+1)/2} \mid s \in \text{svec}(\bar{S}) + \mathcal{R}(A^T), \ \text{svec}(\bar{X})^T s = 0 \right\},
\]
we get
\[ \text{dist} \left( \text{svec}(X^\mu), \bar{\mathcal{L}}_P \right) \leq \theta_1 n\mu, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist} \left( \text{svec}(S^\mu), \bar{\mathcal{L}}_D \right) \leq \theta_2 n\mu, \quad (7) \]
in which
\[ \text{dist} \left( \text{svec}(X^\mu), \bar{\mathcal{L}}_P \right) := \min \left\{ \| x - \text{svec}(X^\mu) \|_2 \mid x \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}_P \right\} \]
stands for the distance of \( \text{svec}(X^\mu) \) from the affine subspace \( \bar{\mathcal{L}}_P \), and the condition numbers \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) depend on \( A \) and \( \bar{S} \) and \( \bar{A} \) and \( \bar{X} \), respectively.\(^3\) Interestingly, \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) can be considered as Hoffman \(^{20}\) condition numbers. As a consequence, if
\[ \mu \leq \hat{\mu} := \frac{1}{n} \min \left\{ \theta_1^{-1}, \theta_2^{-1} \right\}, \quad (8) \]
then it holds that
\[ \text{dist} \left( \text{svec}(X^\mu), \bar{\mathcal{L}}_P \right) \leq 1, \quad \text{dist} \left( \text{svec}(S^\mu), \bar{\mathcal{L}}_D \right) \leq 1. \quad (9) \]

Lemma \( \ref{lemma:2.2} \) is in order.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let a central solution \( (X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu) \) be given, where \( \mu \) satisfies \( \ref{eq:mu} \). Then there exist a positive condition number \( c \) independent of \( \mu \) and a positive exponent \( \gamma \geq 2^{1-n} \) such that
\[
\text{dist} \left( X^\mu, \text{Mat} \left( \bar{\mathcal{L}}_P \right) \cap \mathcal{S}_+^n \right) \leq c(n\mu)^\gamma, \\
\text{dist} \left( S^\mu, \text{Mat} \left( \bar{\mathcal{L}}_D \right) \cap \mathcal{S}_+^n \right) \leq c(n\mu)^\gamma. \quad (10)
\]

**Proof.** For all \( 0 < \mu \leq \hat{\mu} \) the set of central solutions is bounded, see Lemma 3.2 in \( \ref{lemma:3.2} \), and \( \ref{lemma:3.6} \) holds. Then we can apply Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.6 from \( \ref{lemma:3.6} \) which state

\(^3\)The upper bounds in \( \ref{eq:7} \) can be simply obtained by minimizing \( \| x - \text{svec}(X^\mu) \|_2^2 \) and \( \| s - \text{svec}(S^\mu) \|_2^2 \) on the affine subspaces \( \bar{\mathcal{L}}_P \) and \( \bar{\mathcal{L}}_D \), respectively, and using Lagrange multipliers method.
that there exist positive $c_1$ and $c_2$, both independent of $\mu$, and $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \geq 2^{1-n}$ so that
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dist} \left( X^\mu, \text{Mat} (\mathcal{L}_P) \cap \mathbb{S}^n_+ \right) &\leq c_1 (n\mu)^{\gamma_1}, \\
\text{dist} \left( S^\mu, \text{Mat} (\mathcal{L}_D) \cap \mathbb{S}^n_+ \right) &\leq c_2 (n\mu)^{\gamma_2}.
\end{align*}
\]

The result follows by setting $\gamma := \min\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$ and $c := \max\{c_1, c_2\}$. \hfill \Box

**Remark 1.** The exponents $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ depend on the degree of singularity\footnote{The degree of singularity \cite{34} is defined as the number of facial reduction steps to get the minimal face of $\mathbb{S}^n_+$ which includes the feasible set of an LMI system, as defined in \cite{33}.} of the minimal subspaces which contain the primal and dual optimal sets in \cite{33}, respectively. However, we are not aware of any upper bound on $c$. We refer the reader to Section 4 in \cite{33} for further details.

Consider the eigenvalue decompositions $X^\mu = Q^\mu \Lambda(X^\mu)(Q^\mu)^T$ and $S^\mu = Q^\mu \Lambda(S^\mu)(Q^\mu)^T$, where $Q^\mu$ is a common orthonormal eigenvector basis. Observe that $\lambda_{[i]}(X^\mu)$ and $\lambda_{[n-i+1]}(S^\mu)$ share the same eigenvector for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Lemma 2.3 specifies lower and upper bounds on the eigenvalues of $X^\mu$ and $S^\mu$ using condition number $\sigma$ and the error bounds in \cite{10}, see also Theorem 3.6 in \cite{22}. The following result from \cite{30} will be used in the lemma:
\[
\lambda_{[n-k+1]}(X) + \ldots + \lambda_{[n]}(X) = \min\{\text{Tr}(Y^TXY) \mid Y^TY = I_n\},
\]

where $X \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let a central solution $(X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu)$ with $\mu \leq \hat{\mu}$ be given. Then we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda_{[n-i+1]}(S^\mu) &\leq \frac{n\mu}{\sigma}, & \lambda_{[i]}(X^\mu) &\geq \frac{\sigma}{n}, & i &= 1, \ldots, n_B, \\
\lambda_{[n-i+1]}(X^\mu) &\leq \frac{n\mu}{\sigma}, & \lambda_{[i]}(S^\mu) &\geq \frac{\sigma}{n}, & i &= 1, \ldots, n_N, \\
\frac{\mu}{c\sqrt{n}(n\mu)^{\gamma_2}} &\leq \lambda_{[i]}(X^\mu), \lambda_{[n-i+1]}(S^\mu) &\leq c\sqrt{n}(n\mu)^{\gamma}, & i &= n_B + 1, \ldots, n_B + n_T.
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof.** By the compactness of the optimal set and the continuity of the eigenvalues, the optimal values in \cite{3} and \cite{4} are attained. Therefore, there exists $(\bar{X}, \bar{y}, \bar{S}) \in \mathcal{P}^* \times \mathcal{D}^*$ such that $\lambda_{\text{min}}(U_{\bar{X}}) \geq \sigma$ and $\lambda_{\text{min}}(U_{\bar{S}}) \geq \sigma$, where $U_{\bar{X}} = Q_{EB}^T \bar{X} Q_B$ and $U_{\bar{S}} = Q_{EN}^T \bar{S} Q_N$. Then, from \cite{3} and the optimality of $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{S}$, we have
\[
\langle Q_{EN}^T X^\mu Q_N, U_{\bar{S}} \rangle + (U_{\bar{X}}, Q_{EB}^T S^\mu Q_B) = \langle X^\mu, \bar{S} \rangle + \langle \bar{X}, \bar{S}^\mu \rangle = n\mu.
\]

Since both terms in the left hand side of \cite{15} are positive, thus we get
\[
\lambda_{\text{min}}(U_{\bar{X}}) \text{ Tr} (\bar{S}_B^\mu) \leq \langle U_{\bar{X}}, \bar{S}_B^\mu \rangle \leq n\mu,
\]

from which we arrive at the upper bound $\text{Tr} (\bar{S}_B^\mu) \leq n\mu/\sigma$. Analogously, we can obtain an upper bound on $\text{Tr} (\bar{X}_N^\mu)$. Theorem 2.1 and the compactness of $\mathcal{P}^* \times \mathcal{D}^*$ ensure the
existence of a primal-dual solution \((X_\mu, y_\mu, S_\mu) \in \mathcal{P}^* \times \mathcal{D}^*\) with \(X_\mu = Q_B U_{X_\mu} Q_T^T\) and \(S_\mu = Q_N U_{S_\mu} Q_N^T\) for unique \(U_{X_\mu}, U_{S_\mu} \succeq 0\) so that (10) holds. Then we get

\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \text{Tr} \left( Q_{T \cup N}^T X^{\mu} Q_{T \cup N} \right) \leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \hat{X}_T^{\mu} & \hat{X}_{N \cup T}^{\mu} \\ X_N^{\mu} & X_N^{\mu} \end{bmatrix} \right\| = \left\| Q_{T \cup N}^T (X^{\mu} - X_\mu) Q_{T \cup N} \right\| \leq \left\| X^{\mu} - X_\mu \right\| \leq c(n\mu)^\gamma,
\]

\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \text{Tr} \left( Q_{B \cup T}^T S^{\mu} Q_{B \cup T} \right) \leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \hat{S}_T \mu_B & \hat{S}_{N \cup T}^{\mu} \\ \hat{S}_{T \cup B} & \hat{S}_T \mu \end{bmatrix} \right\| = \left\| Q_{B \cup T}^T (S^{\mu} - S_\mu) Q_{B \cup T} \right\| \leq \left\| S^{\mu} - S_\mu \right\| \leq c(n\mu)^\gamma,
\]

which yield upper bounds on \(\text{Tr} \left( Q_{T \cup N}^T X^{\mu} Q_{T \cup N} \right)\) and \(\text{Tr} \left( Q_{B \cup T}^T S^{\mu} Q_{B \cup T} \right)\).

Consequently, applying the centrality condition \(\lambda_{[i]}(X^{\mu}) \lambda_{[n-i+1]}(S^{\mu}) = \mu\) and (11) to \(\text{Tr} \left( \hat{X}_N^{\mu} \right)\) and \(\text{Tr} \left( \hat{S}_B^{\mu} \right)\) gives

\[
\lambda_{[n-i+1]}(S^{\mu}) \leq \frac{n\mu}{\sigma}, \quad \lambda_{[i]}(X^{\mu}) \geq \frac{\sigma}{n}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n_B,
\]

\[
\lambda_{[n-i+1]}(X^{\mu}) \leq \frac{n\mu}{\sigma}, \quad \lambda_{[i]}(S^{\mu}) \geq \frac{\sigma}{n}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n_N.
\]

In a similar manner, the application of the centrality condition and (11) to \(\text{Tr} \left( Q_{T \cup N}^T X^{\mu} Q_{T \cup N} \right)\) and \(\text{Tr} \left( Q_{B \cup T}^T S^{\mu} Q_{B \cup T} \right)\) leads to

\[
\lambda_{[n-i+1]}(X^{\mu}) \leq c\sqrt{n}(n\mu)^\gamma, \quad \lambda_{[i]}(S^{\mu}) \geq \frac{\mu}{c\sqrt{n}(n\mu)^\gamma}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n_N + n_T,
\]

\[
\lambda_{[n-i+1]}(S^{\mu}) \leq c\sqrt{n}(n\mu)^\gamma, \quad \lambda_{[i]}(X^{\mu}) \geq \frac{\mu}{c\sqrt{n}(n\mu)^\gamma}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n_B + n_T,
\]

which give the bounds in (14). This completes the proof. \(\square\)

Recall that the \(i^{th}\) largest eigenvalue of \(X^{\mu}\) and the \(i^{th}\) smallest eigenvalue of \(S^{\mu}\) have an identical eigenvector. One can observe from (12) to (14) that if \(\mu\) is so small that

\[
\frac{\mu}{c\sqrt{n}(n\mu)^\gamma} \leq c\sqrt{n}(n\mu)^\gamma, \quad \frac{n\mu}{\sigma} < \frac{\mu}{c\sqrt{n}(n\mu)^\gamma}, \quad c\sqrt{n}(n\mu)^\gamma < \frac{\sigma}{n}, \quad \frac{\mu}{c\sqrt{n}(n\mu)^\gamma} < \frac{n\mu}{\sigma} < \frac{\sigma}{n},
\]

or equivalently

\[
\mu < \bar{\mu} := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \left( \frac{\sigma}{cn^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2}, \hat{\mu} \right\}, \quad (16)
\]

Then, for a fixed \(\mu\) with \(\mu < \bar{\mu}\), we refer to \(\mathcal{R}(Q_B^\mu), \mathcal{R}(Q_T^\mu),\) and \(\mathcal{R}(Q_N^\mu)\) as approximations of \(B, T,\) and \(N\), respectively.
3. Sensitivity of the optimal partition

In this section, we investigate the behavior of the optimal partition and the optimal set mapping under perturbation of the objective vector. From now on,

$$\pi(\epsilon) := (B(\epsilon), T(\epsilon), N(\epsilon))$$

denotes the optimal partition of $(P_\epsilon)$ and $(D_\epsilon)$ for a given $\epsilon$. We introduce and characterize the subintervals of $\text{int}(E)$ on which the optimal partition or the dimension of both $B(\epsilon)$ and $N(\epsilon)$ is stable. The discussion is motivated by minimizing a parametric objective function on the 3-elliptope $[6]$:

$$\left\{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \left| \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x & y \\ x & 1 & z \\ y & z & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \right. \right\}.$$  

Example 3.1. Consider the following SDO problem:

$$A^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A^3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$  

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & -2 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad b = (1, 1, 1)^T.$$  

For all $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ a maximally complementary solution is given by

$$X^*(\epsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon & \frac{e}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon & 1 & 1 - 2(e - \frac{1}{2})^2 \\ e - \frac{1}{2} & 1 - 2(e - \frac{1}{2})^2 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$  

$$S^*(\epsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} (2\epsilon - 1)^2 & 2\epsilon - 1 & 1 - 2\epsilon \\ 2\epsilon - 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 - 2\epsilon & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$  

$$y^*(\epsilon) = (-(2\epsilon - 1)^2, -1, -1)^T,$$

where the eigenvalues of $X^*(\epsilon)$ and $S^*(\epsilon)$ are given by

$$\lambda_{[1]}(X^*(\epsilon)) = -2\epsilon^2 + 2\epsilon + \frac{3}{2}, \quad \lambda_{[2]}(X^*(\epsilon)) = 2\epsilon^2 - 2\epsilon + \frac{3}{2}, \quad \lambda_{[3]}(X^*(\epsilon)) = 0,$$

$$\lambda_{[1]}(S^*(\epsilon)) = 4\epsilon^2 - 4\epsilon + 3, \quad \lambda_{[2]}(S^*(\epsilon)) = 0, \quad \lambda_{[3]}(S^*(\epsilon)) = 0.$$  

The optimal partition at $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ is given by

$$B(\epsilon) = \mathcal{R}\left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1/\sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 1/\sqrt{2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad T(\epsilon) = \{0\}, \quad N(\epsilon) = \mathcal{R}\left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1/\sqrt{2} \\ 1/\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix} \right).$$
while for all $\epsilon \in [0, 1] \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}$ we have

$$
B(\epsilon) = \mathcal{R} \left( \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 2\text{sgn}(2\epsilon - 1) \sqrt{\frac{2}{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 4}} \\
1/\sqrt{2} & -|2\epsilon - 1| \sqrt{\frac{2}{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 4}} \\
1/\sqrt{2} & |2\epsilon - 1| \sqrt{\frac{2}{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 4}}
\end{bmatrix},
\right)
$$

$$
T(\epsilon) = \{0\},
$$

$$
N(\epsilon) = \mathcal{R} \left( \begin{bmatrix}
(1 - 2\epsilon) \sqrt{\frac{2}{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 2}} \\
-1/\sqrt{2} & \sqrt{\frac{2}{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 2}} \\
1/\sqrt{2} & \sqrt{\frac{2}{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 2}}
\end{bmatrix},
\right)
$$

where $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ denotes the signum function. We can observe that $(X^*(\epsilon), y^*(\epsilon), S^*(\epsilon))$ is strictly complementary for all $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, and both rank $(X^*(\epsilon))$ and rank $(S^*(\epsilon))$ are constant on $[0, 1]$. It can be further investigated that the primal and dual nondegeneracy conditions hold at all $\epsilon \in [0, 1] \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}$, and at $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ the dual nondegeneracy condition fails. For instance, for all $\epsilon \in [0, 1] \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}$ a common orthonormal eigenvector basis of $X^*(\epsilon)$ and $S^*(\epsilon)$ is given by

$$
Q^*(\epsilon) = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 2\text{sgn}(2\epsilon - 1) \sqrt{\frac{2}{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 4}} & (1 - 2\epsilon) \sqrt{\frac{2}{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 2}} \\
1/\sqrt{2} & -|2\epsilon - 1| \sqrt{\frac{2}{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 4}} & -1/\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 2}} \\
1/\sqrt{2} & |2\epsilon - 1| \sqrt{\frac{2}{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 4}} & 1/\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 2}}
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

Then, using the conditions in Section 2.1 one can check that the matrices

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & (2\text{sgn}(2\epsilon - 1)/\nu_1)^2 & 2\text{sgn}(2\epsilon - 1)(1 - 2\epsilon)/(\nu_1\nu_2) \\
0 & 2\text{sgn}(2\epsilon - 1)(1 - 2\epsilon)/(\nu_1\nu_2) & 0
\end{bmatrix},
$$

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
1/2 & -|2\epsilon - 1|/(\sqrt{2}\nu_1) & -1/(\sqrt{2}\nu_2) \\
-1/(\sqrt{2}\nu_2) & (2\epsilon - 1)/\nu_1 & |2\epsilon - 1|/(\nu_1\nu_2) \\
1/(\sqrt{2}\nu_2) & |2\epsilon - 1|/(\nu_1\nu_2) & 0
\end{bmatrix},
$$

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
1/2 & |2\epsilon - 1|/(\sqrt{2}\nu_1) & \sqrt{2}/(\nu_2) \\
|2\epsilon - 1|/(\sqrt{2}\nu_1) & (2\epsilon - 1)/\nu_1^2 & |2\epsilon - 1|/(\nu_1\nu_2) \\
1/(\sqrt{2}\nu_2) & |2\epsilon - 1|/(\nu_1\nu_2) & 0
\end{bmatrix},
$$

where

$$
\nu_1 := \sqrt{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 4},
$$

$$
\nu_2 := \sqrt{2(2\epsilon - 1)^2 + 2},
$$

are linearly independent. Furthermore, we can observe that the following matrices span $S^2$:

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 \\
0 & (2\text{sgn}(2\epsilon - 1)/\nu_1)^2
\end{bmatrix},
$$

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
1/2 & -|2\epsilon - 1|/(\sqrt{2}\nu_1) \\
-1/(\sqrt{2}\nu_2) & (2\epsilon - 1)/\nu_1^2
\end{bmatrix},
$$

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
1/2 & |2\epsilon - 1|/(\sqrt{2}\nu_1) \\
|2\epsilon - 1|/(\sqrt{2}\nu_1) & (2\epsilon - 1)/\nu_1^2
\end{bmatrix},
$$
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which implies dual nondegeneracy of the optimal solution.

As indicated in [14] and also demonstrated by Example 3.1, the optimal partition might vary with \( \epsilon \) in a subinterval of \( \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \). However, the dimension of \( \mathcal{B}(\cdot) \) and \( \mathcal{N}(\cdot) \), or equivalently rank \( (X^*(\cdot)) \) and rank \( (S^*(\cdot)) \), might be stable in certain subintervals. This is in contrast to LO, where the interval \( \mathcal{E} \) is divided into subintervals each with a unique optimal partition.

Motivated by this observation, we make the following definitions:

**Definition 3.2.** The two optimal partitions \( \pi(\epsilon') \) and \( \pi(\epsilon'') \) are called identical if \( \pi(\epsilon') = \pi(\epsilon'') \), i.e.,

\[
\mathcal{B}(\epsilon') = \mathcal{B}(\epsilon'') \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}(\epsilon') = \mathcal{N}(\epsilon'').
\]

Otherwise, if

\[
\dim(\mathcal{B}(\epsilon')) = \dim(\mathcal{B}(\epsilon'')) \quad \text{and} \quad \dim(\mathcal{N}(\epsilon')) = \dim(\mathcal{N}(\epsilon'')),
\]

then the two optimal partitions \( \pi(\epsilon') \) and \( \pi(\epsilon'') \) are called weakly identical, and it is denoted by \( \pi(\epsilon') \equiv_w \pi(\epsilon'') \).

It is immediate from the definition that if the partitions are not weakly identical, then they are not identical either. In the following sections, we review linearity intervals from [14] and then introduce nonlinearity intervals and transition points of the optimal partition for \( (P_\epsilon) \) and \( (D_\epsilon) \).

### 3.1. Linearity intervals

Let \( \mathcal{I}_{\text{lin}} \) be a subset of \( \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \). Then \( \mathcal{I}_{\text{lin}} \) is called a linearity interval if \( \pi(\epsilon') = \pi(\epsilon'') \) for all \( \epsilon' \), \( \epsilon'' \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{lin}} \). The following result is an extension from LCQO [5].

**Lemma 3.3.** Let \( \epsilon', \epsilon'' \in \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \). If \( \pi(\epsilon') = \pi(\epsilon'') \) and \( \epsilon_\rho := \rho \epsilon' + (1 - \rho) \epsilon'' \) for every \( 0 \leq \rho \leq 1 \), then \( \pi(\epsilon') = \pi(\epsilon'') = \pi(\epsilon_\rho) \). Moreover,

\[
X^*(\epsilon_\rho) := \rho X^*(\epsilon') + (1 - \rho) X^*(\epsilon''),
\]

\[
y^*(\epsilon_\rho) := \rho y^*(\epsilon') + (1 - \rho) y^*(\epsilon''),
\]

\[
S^*(\epsilon_\rho) := \rho S^*(\epsilon') + (1 - \rho) S^*(\epsilon''),
\]

is a maximally complementary solution of \( (P_{\epsilon_\rho}) \) and \( (D_{\epsilon_\rho}) \).

**Proof.** Since \( \mathcal{B}(\epsilon') = \mathcal{B}(\epsilon'') \) and \( \mathcal{N}(\epsilon') = \mathcal{N}(\epsilon'') \), it is easy to see from Theorem 2.1 that \( (X^*(\epsilon_\rho), y^*(\epsilon_\rho), S^*(\epsilon_\rho)) \) is a primal-dual optimal solution of \( (P_{\epsilon_\rho}) \) and \( (D_{\epsilon_\rho}) \). Furthermore, from (17) we get

\[
X^*(\epsilon_\rho) = Q_B(\epsilon_\rho) (\rho U_{X^*(\epsilon')} + (1 - \rho) U_{X^*(\epsilon''})) Q_B^T(\epsilon_\rho), \quad \rho U_{X^*(\epsilon')} + (1 - \rho) U_{X^*(\epsilon'')} > 0,
\]

\[
S^*(\epsilon_\rho) = Q_N(\epsilon_\rho) (\rho U_{S^*(\epsilon')} + (1 - \rho) U_{S^*(\epsilon''})) Q_N^T(\epsilon_\rho), \quad \rho U_{S^*(\epsilon')} + (1 - \rho) U_{S^*(\epsilon'')} > 0,
\]

and we have

\[
\pi(\epsilon_\rho) \equiv_w \pi(\epsilon'') \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(\epsilon_\rho) \equiv_w \pi(\epsilon''').
\]
which implies
\[
B(\epsilon') = \mathcal{R}(X^*(\epsilon_\rho)) \subseteq B(\epsilon_\rho), \quad \mathcal{N}(\epsilon') = \mathcal{R}(S^*(\epsilon_\rho)) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\epsilon_\rho),
\]
where the inclusions follow from the definition of a maximally complementary solution. Using the same argument, we can choose a sufficiently small \(\kappa\) to generate
\[
X((1 + \kappa)e'' - \kappa\epsilon') = Q_{B(\epsilon')}((1 + \kappa)U_{X^*(\epsilon') - \kappa U_{X^*(\epsilon')}})Q^T_{B(\epsilon')},
\]
\[
S((1 + \kappa)e'' - \kappa\epsilon') = Q_{\mathcal{N}(\epsilon')}((1 + \kappa)U_{S^*(\epsilon') - \kappa U_{S^*(\epsilon')}})Q^T_{\mathcal{N}(\epsilon')},
\]
which is an optimal solution for \((P_{(1+\kappa)e''-\kappa\epsilon'})\) and \((D_{(1+\kappa)e''-\kappa\epsilon'})\). Note that \(\kappa\) can be made so small that \((1 + \kappa)e'' - \kappa\epsilon' \in \text{int}(E)\). Now, if \(T(\epsilon') \supseteq T(\epsilon_\rho)\), then there would exist \(0 \neq q \in \mathcal{R}(Q_{T(\epsilon')})\) so that
\[
q^T(X^*(\epsilon_\rho) + S^*(\epsilon_\rho))q > 0. \tag{18}
\]
However, this would contradict the optimal partition at \(\epsilon'\) and \(e''\). To see this, we can check that
\[
\epsilon'' = \frac{\kappa}{\kappa + \rho} \epsilon_\rho + \frac{\rho}{\kappa + \rho} e'',
\]
where \(e'' := (1 + \kappa) e'' - \kappa \epsilon'\). Then
\[
X(\epsilon'') = \frac{\kappa}{\kappa + \rho} X^*(\epsilon_\rho) + \frac{\rho}{\kappa + \rho} X^*(e''),
\]
\[
y(\epsilon'') = \frac{\kappa}{\kappa + \rho} y^*(\epsilon_\rho) + \frac{\rho}{\kappa + \rho} y^*(e''),
\]
\[
S(\epsilon'') = \frac{\kappa}{\kappa + \rho} S^*(\epsilon_\rho) + \frac{\rho}{\kappa + \rho} S^*(e'')
\]
gives a primal-dual optimal solution for \((P_{e''})\) and \((D_{e''})\), since both \((X^*(\epsilon_\rho), y^*(\epsilon_\rho), S^*(\epsilon_\rho))\) and \((X^*(e''), y^*(e''), S^*(e''))\) can be represented using \(Q_{B(\epsilon')}\) and \(Q_{\mathcal{N}(\epsilon')}\). However, we have from \[(18)\] that
\[
q^T(X(\epsilon'') + S(\epsilon''))q > 0,
\]
which is a contradiction, since \(q\) is a common eigenvector of \(X(\epsilon'')\) and \(S(\epsilon'')\). Therefore, we have \(T(\epsilon') = T(\epsilon_\rho)\), which induces \(B(\epsilon') = B(\epsilon_\rho)\) and \(\mathcal{N}(\epsilon') = \mathcal{N}(\epsilon_\rho)\). The second part of the proof is immediate. \(\square\)

Let \(\bar{\epsilon} \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{lin}}\). By the definition of a linearity interval, \(\mathcal{I}_{\text{lin}}\) is the set of all \(\epsilon' \in \text{int}(E)\) for which the system
\[
\langle A^i, Q_{B(\epsilon')}U_XQ^T_{B(\epsilon')} \rangle = b_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m, \quad U_X > 0,
\]
\[
\sum_{i=1}^m A^i y_i + Q_{\mathcal{N}(\epsilon')}U_SQ^T_{\mathcal{N}(\epsilon')} = C + \epsilon \tilde{C}, \quad U_S > 0
\]
remain feasible. Therefore, from Lemma 3.3 it is immediate that \(\mathcal{I}_{\text{lin}}\) is either a singleton or an open (possibly unbounded) interval.
Remark 2. It follows from Lemma 3.3 that
\[
\langle C + \epsilon_\rho \bar{C}, X^*(\epsilon_\rho) \rangle = \rho \langle C + \epsilon' \bar{C}, X^*(\epsilon') \rangle + (1 - \rho) \langle C + \epsilon'' \bar{C}, X^*(\epsilon'') \rangle,
\]
i.e., the optimal value function is indeed linear in a linearity interval, see Example 2 in [14]. Furthermore, there exists either a unique primal optimal solution or a unique primal optimal set associated with a linearity interval. This is an extension of Corollary 2 in [21].

A linearity interval can be computed by solving a pair of auxiliary SDO problems. The linear conic optimization counterpart can be found in Section 4 in [36].

Lemma 3.4 (Lemma 4.1 in [14]). Assume that \( \bar{\epsilon} \) belongs to a bounded linearity interval \( I_{\text{lin}} \). Then the extreme points of \( I_{\text{lin}} \) can be obtained by solving
\[
\alpha_{\text{lin}}(\beta_{\text{lin}}) := \inf(\sup) \epsilon \\
\text{s.t.} \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i A^i + Q_{\mathcal{N}(\epsilon)} U S Q_{\mathcal{T}(\epsilon)}^T = C + \epsilon \bar{C}, \\
U_S > 0.
\]
If \( I_{\text{lin}} \) is unbounded, then we have either \( \alpha_{\text{lin}} = -\infty, \beta_{\text{lin}} = \infty \), or both. \( \square \)

Remark 3. The stability of strict complementarity in a linearity interval follows from the definition, i.e., it either holds or fails at every \( \epsilon' \in I_{\text{lin}} \). The stability holds as well for both the primal and dual nondegeneracy conditions. The case for primal nondegeneracy is obvious, since the primal optimal set mapping is constant in a linearity interval. Let \( \bar{\epsilon} \in I_{\text{lin}} \) and assume that \( (y^*(\bar{\epsilon}), S^*(\bar{\epsilon})) \) is dual nondegenerate. Then, due to the condition given in Section 2.1, the matrices
\[
Q_{B(\epsilon) \cup T(\epsilon)}^T A_i Q_{B(\epsilon) \cup T(\epsilon)}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m
\]
span \( \mathbb{S}^{n-n_{\mathcal{N}(\epsilon)}} \). Since the orthonormal basis \( Q_{B(\cdot) \cup T(\cdot)} \) is constant on \( I_{\text{lin}} \), the dual nondegeneracy condition follows for all \( \epsilon' \in I_{\text{lin}} \).

3.2. Transition points and nonlinearity intervals

As a result of Lemma 3.4 if \( \alpha_{\text{lin}} < \beta_{\text{lin}} \), then \( \alpha_{\text{lin}} < \bar{\epsilon} < \beta_{\text{lin}} \) belongs to the linearity interval \( (\alpha_{\text{lin}}, \beta_{\text{lin}}) \). Otherwise, \( \alpha_{\text{lin}} = \bar{\epsilon} = \beta_{\text{lin}} \) indicates that the optimal partition changes in every neighborhood of \( \bar{\epsilon} \). In other words, the optimal partitions around \( \bar{\epsilon} \) are either nonidentical or weakly identical with \( \pi(\bar{\epsilon}) \). In the latter case, \( \bar{\epsilon} \) belongs to a subinterval of \( \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \), where \( \text{rank}(X^*(\cdot)) \) and \( \text{rank}(S^*(\cdot)) \) remain constant. In Example 3.1 [0, 1] is such a subinterval.

Definition 3.5. The point \( \bar{\epsilon} \in \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \) is called a transition point if for every \( \xi > 0 \) there exists \( \epsilon' \in (\bar{\epsilon} - \xi, \bar{\epsilon} + \xi) \subseteq \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \) such that \( \pi(\bar{\epsilon}) \neq \pi(\epsilon') \). A nonlinearity interval is defined as a (possibly unbounded) subinterval of maximal length \( I_{\text{non}} \subseteq \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \) such that \( \pi(\epsilon') \equiv \pi(\epsilon'') \) for all \( \epsilon', \epsilon'' \in I_{\text{non}} \).

In contrast to the definition of a linearity interval, it does not follow from Definition 3.5
whether a nonlinearity interval is open. However, a sufficient condition can be given for the openness of a nonlinearity interval.

**Lemma 3.6.** Let $I_{\text{non}}$ be a nonlinearity interval. If for each $\epsilon' \in I_{\text{non}}$ and for every $\{\epsilon_k\} \to \epsilon'$ there exists a sequence of maximally complementary solutions $(X^*(\epsilon_k), y^*(\epsilon_k), S^*(\epsilon_k))$ converging to a maximally complementary solution $(X^*(\epsilon'), y^*(\epsilon'), S^*(\epsilon'))$, then $I_{\text{non}}$ is an open interval.

**Proof.** The proof follows from the fact that the rank is constant in a nonlinearity interval, and the fact that for every $\epsilon' \in I_{\text{non}}$ the eigenvalues of $X^*(\cdot)$ and $S^*(\cdot)$ vary continuously in a small neighborhood of $\epsilon'$.

Using continuity arguments and the strict complementarity condition, we can provide sufficient conditions which guarantee that $\bar{\epsilon} \in \text{int}(E)$ belongs to the interior of a nonlinearity interval.

**Lemma 3.7.** Assume that the strict complementarity condition holds at $\bar{\epsilon} \in \text{int}(E)$. If for every sequence $\{\epsilon_k\} \to \bar{\epsilon}$ there exists a sequence of optimal solutions $(X(\epsilon_k), y(\epsilon_k), S(\epsilon_k))$ converging to a strictly complementary solution $(X^*(\bar{\epsilon}), y^*(\bar{\epsilon}), S^*(\bar{\epsilon}))$, then $\bar{\epsilon}$ belongs to the interior of a nonlinearity interval.

**Proof.** Since $(X^*(\bar{\epsilon}), y^*(\bar{\epsilon}), S^*(\bar{\epsilon}))$ is strictly complementary, we have

$$\text{rank} \left( X^*(\bar{\epsilon}) \right) + \text{rank} \left( S^*(\bar{\epsilon}) \right) = n. \quad (19)$$

Then by the assumption and the lower semicontinuity of the rank function, see [19], there exists a primal-dual optimal solution $(X(\epsilon_k), y(\epsilon_k), S(\epsilon_k))$ such that

$$\text{rank} \left( X(\epsilon_k) \right) \geq \text{rank} \left( X^*(\bar{\epsilon}) \right),$$
$$\text{rank} \left( S(\epsilon_k) \right) \geq \text{rank} \left( S^*(\bar{\epsilon}) \right)$$

for sufficiently large $k$, i.e., $(X(\epsilon_k), y(\epsilon_k), S(\epsilon_k))$ is a strictly complementary solution for sufficiently large $k$. Therefore, it follows from [19] that the ranks of $X(\cdot)$ and $S(\cdot)$ stay constant in a small neighborhood of $\bar{\epsilon}$.

A special case of Lemma 3.7 happens when $(X^*(\bar{\epsilon}), y^*(\bar{\epsilon}), S^*(\bar{\epsilon}))$ is unique and strictly complementary. Note that the optimality conditions for $(P_\epsilon)$ and $(D_\epsilon)$ can be written as

$$A \text{svec}(X) = b,$$
$$A^T y + \text{svec}(S) = \text{svec}(C) + \epsilon \text{svec}(\bar{C}),$$
$$\frac{1}{2} \text{svec}(XS + SX) = 0,$$
$$X, S \succeq 0. \quad (20)$$

Then the Jacobian of the linear equations in (20) is given by

$$J(X, y, S) := \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A^T & I_{(n+1)/2} \\ S \otimes_s I_n & 0 & X \otimes_s I_n \end{bmatrix},$$
follows from Lemma 3.7. If neither of the conditions fails, then there exists a neighborhood of \( \bar{\epsilon} \) on which (Lemma 3.8) the Jacobian 
\[
J(X^*(\epsilon), y^*(\epsilon), S^*(\epsilon))
\]
is nonsingular if and only if the optimal solution \((X^*(\epsilon), y^*(\epsilon), S^*(\epsilon))\) satisfies strict complementarity, and both the primal and dual nondegeneracy conditions.

**Proof.** The first part of proof follows from Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8 and the implicit function theorem. For the second part, note that

\[
[S^*(\cdot) \otimes_s I_n \quad 0 \quad X^*(\cdot) \otimes_s I_n]
\]
is rank deficient at \( \hat{\epsilon} \), due to failure of the strict complementarity condition. Hence, at least one of \( \text{rank}(X^*(\cdot)) \) or \( \text{rank}(S^*(\cdot)) \) must decrease at \( \hat{\epsilon} \).

**Remark 4.** Notice that if the strict complementarity condition holds at \( \hat{\epsilon} \) in Lemma 3.9, then \( \hat{\epsilon} \) might belong to the nonlinearity interval containing \( \bar{\epsilon} \). For instance, one can observe from Example 3.4 that the Jacobian is nonsingular on \([0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1]\), while \( \hat{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{2} \) is not a transition point. As a consequence, \( \mathcal{I}_{\text{inv}} \) does not necessarily coincide with \( \mathcal{I}_{\text{non}} \) for a parametric SDO.

Lemma 3.7 indicates that at a transition point \( \bar{\epsilon} \) which satisfies the strict complementarity condition, at least one of \( X^*(\cdot) \) or \( S^*(\cdot) \) has to be discontinuous, i.e., there exists a sequence \( \{\epsilon_k\} \to \bar{\epsilon} \) so that \((X(\epsilon_k), y(\epsilon_k), S(\epsilon_k))\) has no accumulation point\(^4\) in \( \text{ri}(P^*(\bar{\epsilon}) \times D^*(\bar{\epsilon})) \). Then the following result is immediate.

**Corollary 3.10.** At a transition point \( \bar{\epsilon} \), at least one of the strict complementarity, primal nondegeneracy, or dual nondegeneracy conditions has to fail.

**Proof.** If neither of the conditions fails, then there exists a neighborhood of \( \bar{\epsilon} \) on which \((X^*(\cdot), y^*(\cdot), S^*(\cdot))\) is uniquely defined and continuously differentiable. Then the result follows from Lemma 3.7.

---

\(^5\)The symmetric Kronecker product of any two square matrices \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) is defined as a mapping

\[
(K_1 \otimes_s K_2)\text{svec}(H) := \frac{1}{2} \text{svec}(K_2HK_1^T + K_1HK_2^T),
\]

where \( H \) is a symmetric matrix. See e.g., [12] for more details.

\(^6\)Recall that a nonlinearity interval may have no extreme point.

\(^7\)An accumulation point exists, since \( P^*(\cdot) \) and \( D^*(\cdot) \) are uniformly bounded near any \( \epsilon' \in \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \). This directly follows from the interior point condition, see e.g., Lemma 3.11 in [27].
The converse of the statement in Corollary 3.10 is not necessarily true. The following second-order cone optimization (SOCO) problem in SDO form is a counterexample:

$$\min -\epsilon x_1 + (1 - \epsilon) x_2$$

subject to:

$$\begin{pmatrix}
1 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
x_1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
x_2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
x_3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 + x_3 & x_1 & x_2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & 1 + x_3 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_2 & 0 & 1 + x_3 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_2 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_2 & 0 & 1 + x_3 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_2 & 0 & 1 + x_3 \\
\end{pmatrix} \succeq 0,$$

where $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{R}$. For this problem strict complementarity fails at any given $\epsilon'$, but the primal and dual nondegeneracy conditions hold. It can be verified that on $\mathcal{E}$ both the primal and the dual optimal solutions are unique, continuous, and their ranks are stable, i.e., there is no transition point.

**Remark 5.** In contrast to LO and LCQO, where the transition points and non-differentiable points of the optimal value function coincide, for SDO and SOCO the optimal value function might be infinitely many times differentiable at a transition point. For instance, the problem

$$\min (1 - 2\epsilon)x_1 - x_2$$

subject to:

$$\begin{pmatrix}
1 & x_1 & x_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
x_1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
x_2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & x_1 & x_2 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_2 & 0 + \frac{1}{4} \\
\end{pmatrix} \succeq 0$$

has a strictly complementary solution at $\bar{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{2}$, and the primal optimal solution is unique. On the intervals $(0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ both $X^*(\cdot)$ and $S^*(\cdot)$ are unique and continuous, and they have identical ranks. At $\bar{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{2}$ there is a transition point, and all the higher order derivatives of the optimal value function exist.

### 4. Sensitivity of the approximation of the optimal partition

In this section, we resort to the perturbation theory of eigenspaces in [29] to measure the sensitivity of the approximation of the optimal partition at a given $\bar{\epsilon} \in \text{int}(\mathcal{E})$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\bar{\epsilon} = 0$. Even though multiplicity of the eigenvalues causes discontinuous behavior of the eigenvectors, the range space of these eigenvectors are, in general, less sensitive to the perturbation of matrix entries, see e.g., [29]. Throughout this section, unless stated otherwise, we always assume that $\mu$ is positive. For the sake of simplicity, we drop $\epsilon$ from the optimal partition and optimal solutions at $\bar{\epsilon} = 0$. 
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Consider an equivalent form of the perturbed central path equations as follows

\[
F(X, y, S, \mu, \epsilon) := \begin{bmatrix}
A \text{vec}(X) - b \\
AT + \text{vec}(S) - \text{vec}(C) - \epsilon \text{vec}(C) \\
\frac{1}{2} \text{vec}(XS + SX - \mu I_n)
\end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad X, S \succeq 0. \tag{21}
\]

It can be shown that \( J(X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu) \) is nonsingular, see e.g., Theorem 3.3 in [11]. As a result, system \( \text{(21)} \) is solvable for all \( \epsilon \) in a neighborhood of 0. This directly follows from the implicit function theorem and continuity arguments. For every \( \epsilon \) the unique solution of \( \text{(21)} \) is denoted by \( (X^\mu(\epsilon), y^\mu(\epsilon), S^\mu(\epsilon)) \) and a common eigenvector basis is represented by \( Q^\mu(\epsilon) \).

Suppose that for \( \bar{\epsilon} = 0 \) a central solution \( (X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu) \) is given, where \( \mu < \bar{\mu} \) as defined in [16]. The eigenvectors of \( X^\mu \) and \( S^\mu \) can be rearranged so that

\[
Q^\mu := (Q^\mu_B, Q^\mu_T, Q^\mu_N).
\]

It is known that \( \mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_B) \), \( \mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_T) \), and \( \mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_N) \) are invariant subspaces of both \( X^\mu \) and \( S^\mu \), since, e.g., \( X^\mu \mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_B) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_B) \) and \( S^\mu \mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_N) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_N) \). We are interested in the variation of \( \mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_B) \) and \( \mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_N) \), when \( \epsilon \) belongs to a sufficiently small neighborhood of 0.

The idea in [29] is to span an invariant subspace of \( X^\mu(\epsilon) \), with \( \epsilon \in \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \), using the first \( n_B \) columns of \( Q^\mu W^\mu_B \), where

\[
W^\mu_B := \begin{bmatrix}
I_{n_B} & -(V^\mu_B)^T \\
V^\mu_B & I_{n_T + n_N}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
(I_{n_B} + (V^\mu_B)^T V^\mu_B)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & 0 \\
0 & (I_{n_T + n_N} + V^\mu_B (V^\mu_B)^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{22}
\]

is an \( n \times n \) orthogonal matrix and \( V^\mu_B \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_T + n_N) \times n_B} \). Hence, the problem is equivalent to choosing \( V^\mu_B \) such that the column space of

\[
Y^\mu_B := (Q^\mu_B + Q^\mu_{B \cup N} V^\mu_B) \left( I_{n_B} + (V^\mu_B)^T V^\mu_B \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tag{23}
\]

becomes an invariant subspace of \( X^\mu(\epsilon) \). Analogously, an invariant subspace of \( S^\mu(\epsilon) \) can be formulated as the column space of

\[
Y^\mu_N := (Q^\mu_N + Q^\mu_{B \cup T} V^\mu_N) \left( I_{n_N} + (V^\mu_N)^T V^\mu_N \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}},
\]

where \( V^\mu_N \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_B + n_T) \times n_N} \). Notice that \( \mathcal{R}(Y^\mu_B) \) and \( \mathcal{R}(Y^\mu_N) \) are not necessarily approximations, in terms of the discussion in Section 2.3, for \( B(\epsilon) \) and \( N(\epsilon) \), respectively, see also the argument after Theorem 4.6.

A sufficient condition for the existence of \( V^\mu_B \) and an upper bound on \( \|V^\mu_B\| \) are specified in the following theorem adopted from [13], see Theorem 4.11 in [29] for more general results. For the ease of exposition, we have tailored the theorem for central solutions by introducing

\[
\Xi^\mu_X := X^\mu(\epsilon) - X^\mu, \quad \Xi^\mu_S := S^\mu(\epsilon) - S^\mu.
\]
Theorem 4.1 (Theorem 8.1.10 in [15]). Let a central solution \((X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu)\) with \(\mu < \tilde{\mu}\) be given. If \(\lambda_{[n^a]}(X^\mu) - \lambda_{[n^a+1]}(X^\mu) > 0\) and
\[
\left\Vert \Xi^\mu_X \right\Vert \leq \frac{\lambda_{[n^a]}(X^\mu) - \lambda_{[n^a+1]}(X^\mu)}{5},
\]
then there exists \(V^\mu_B\) so that
\[
\left\Vert V^\mu_B \right\Vert \leq \frac{4\left\Vert (Q^\mu_B)^T \Xi^\mu_X Q^\mu_B \right\Vert}{\lambda_{[n^a]}(X^\mu) - \lambda_{[n^a+1]}(X^\mu)}.
\]

Remark 6. Using the bounds in Lemma 2.3 it is easy to verify that
\[
\lambda_{[n^a]}(X^\mu) - \lambda_{[n^a+1]}(X^\mu) \geq \phi^\mu := \frac{\sigma}{n} - c\sqrt{n}(n\mu)^\gamma,
\]
where the right hand side in (26) is positive when \(\mu < \tilde{\mu}\).

The following technical lemma bounds the distance between \(\mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_B)\) and \(\mathcal{R}(Y^\mu_B)\). For brevity, we only state the result for \(Y^\mu_B\). The proof can be found in Corollary 8.1.11 in [15].

Lemma 4.2. Let \(Y^\mu_B\) be defined as in (23). Then we have
\[
\text{dist} \left( \mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_B), \mathcal{R}(Y^\mu_B) \right) \leq \left\Vert V^\mu_B \right\Vert_2,
\]
where the distance between two subspaces is defined at the end of Section 7. 

4.1. Upper bound on \(\left\Vert \Xi^\mu_X \right\Vert\) and \(\left\Vert \Xi^\mu_S \right\Vert\)

The application of Theorem 4.1 requires an estimate of the effect of the perturbation on the central solutions. Due to the nonsingularity of the Jacobian, an upper bound on \(\left\Vert \Xi^\mu_X \right\Vert\) and \(\left\Vert \Xi^\mu_S \right\Vert\) can be obtained by using the Kantorovich theorem, see e.g., Theorem 5.3.1 in [11]. The Kantorovich theorem was applied in [23] to (21) at \(\mu = 0\) under strict complementarity and both the primal and dual nondegeneracy conditions.

Theorem 4.3 (Theorem 5.3.1 in [11]). Given a solution \(x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n\), let \(G : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n\) be a mapping which is continuously differentiable on \(\left\Vert x - x_0 \right\Vert_2 \leq r\). Assume that \(\nabla G(x_0)\) is nonsingular and Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant \(\tau\) on \(\left\Vert x - x_0 \right\Vert_2 \leq r\). Furthermore, define
\[
\theta := \left\Vert \nabla G^{-1}(x_0) \right\Vert_2, \quad \eta := \left\Vert \nabla G^{-1}(x_0)G(x_0) \right\Vert_2.
\]
If \(\tau\eta \leq \frac{1}{2}\) and \((1 - \sqrt{1 - 2\tau\theta\eta})/(\theta\tau) \leq r\), then there exists a solution \(x^*\) to \(G(x) = 0\) such that
\[
\left\Vert x^* - x_0 \right\Vert_2 \leq \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 2\tau\theta\eta}}{\theta\tau}.
\]
Now, we apply Kantorovich theorem to $F$, as defined in \[21\]. To that end, we define

$$
\delta^\mu := \min \left\{ \lambda_{[n_B]}(X^\mu), \lambda_{[n_N]}(S^\mu), \lambda_{[n_B+n_T]}(X^\mu) \right\},
$$

$$
\theta^\mu := \| J^{-1}(X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu) \|_2,
$$

$$
\eta^\mu := \| J^{-1}(X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu) F(X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu, \mu, \epsilon) \|_2.
$$

**Lemma 4.4.** Let $(X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu)$ be a central solution, where $\mu < \tilde{\mu}$. If $\epsilon$ is chosen in such a way that

$$
|\epsilon| < \min \left\{ \frac{\delta^\mu}{2\theta^\mu \| C \|}, \frac{1}{2(\theta^\mu)^2 \| C \|} \right\}, \tag{27}
$$

then $\epsilon \in \operatorname{int}(E)$, and there exists a central solution $(X^\mu(\epsilon), y^\mu(\epsilon), S^\mu(\epsilon))$ so that

$$
\| \Xi^\mu_X \| \leq \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 2|\epsilon|((\theta^\mu)^2 \| C \|)}}{\theta^\mu}, \tag{28}
$$

$$
\| \Xi^\mu_S \| \leq \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 2|\epsilon|((\theta^\mu)^2 \| C \|)}}{\theta^\mu}.
$$

**Proof.** Note that $F$ is continuously differentiable, and $J$ is Lipschitz continuous with global Lipschitz constant 1, see Lemma 2 in \[23\]. Furthermore, we have

$$
\eta^\mu \leq \| J^{-1}(X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu) \|_2 \| F(X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu, \mu, \epsilon) \|_2
$$

$$
= |\epsilon| \theta^\mu \| C \|,
$$

where the last equality follows from

$$
F(X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu, \mu, \epsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\epsilon \operatorname{vec}(\bar{C}) \end{bmatrix}.
$$

Thus, by the condition of Kantorovich theorem, if

$$
\eta^\mu \theta^\mu \leq |\epsilon|((\theta^\mu)^2 \| C \|) \leq \frac{1}{2},
$$

then there exists an $(X^\mu(\epsilon), y^\mu(\epsilon), S^\mu(\epsilon))$ satisfying the equations in \[21\], such that

$$
\| (\operatorname{vec}(X^\mu(\epsilon) - X^\mu); y^\mu(\epsilon) - y^\mu; \operatorname{vec}(S^\mu(\epsilon) - S^\mu)) \|_2 \leq \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 2|\epsilon|((\theta^\mu)^2 \| C \|)}}{\theta^\mu}.
$$
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In particular, this implies that for \( i = 1, \ldots, n_B + n_T \)

\[
|\lambda_{ij}(X^\mu(\varepsilon)) - \lambda_{ij}(X^\mu)| \leq \|\Xi^E_{N}\| \leq \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 2|\varepsilon|(|\theta^\mu|^2\|\tilde{C}\|)}}{\theta^\mu},
\]  

(29)

and that for \( j = 1, \ldots, n_N \)

\[
|\lambda_{ij}(S^\mu(\varepsilon)) - \lambda_{ij}(S^\mu)| \leq \|\Xi^S_{\bar{n}}\| \leq \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 2|\varepsilon|(|\theta^\mu|^2\|\tilde{C}\|)}}{\theta^\mu}.
\]  

(30)

On the other hand, \( X^\mu(\varepsilon) \) and \( S^\mu(\varepsilon) \) stay positive definite if

\[
|\lambda_{ij}(X^\mu(\varepsilon)) - \lambda_{ij}(X^\mu)| < \delta^\mu,
\]

\( i = 1, \ldots, n_B + n_T, \)

\[
|\lambda_{ij}(S^\mu(\varepsilon)) - \lambda_{ij}(S^\mu)| < \delta^\mu,
\]

\( j = 1, \ldots, n_N, \)

which together with (29) and (30) induces the following bound:

\[
\delta^\mu > \frac{1 - (1 - 2|\varepsilon|(|\theta^\mu|^2\|\tilde{C}\|))}{\theta^\mu} \geq \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 2|\varepsilon|(|\theta^\mu|^2\|\tilde{C}\|)}}{\theta^\mu},
\]  

(31)

where the second inequality in (31) follows from \( 2|\varepsilon|(|\theta^\mu|^2\|\tilde{C}\|) \leq 1 \). Note that if (31) holds, then \( \lambda_{ij}(X^\mu(\varepsilon)) > 0 \) for \( i = n - n_N + 1, \ldots, n \) and \( \lambda_{ij}(S^\mu(\varepsilon)) > 0 \) for \( j = n_N + 1, \ldots, n \) are immediate from the centrality condition. Consequently, if (27) holds, then solution \((X^\mu(\varepsilon), y^\mu(\varepsilon), S^\mu(\varepsilon))\) satisfies (21), and it is indeed a central solution for the perturbed SDO problem. The proof is complete.

\textbf{Remark 7.} Assume that the Jacobian is nonsingular at \((X^*, y^*, S^*)\), i.e., strict complementarity, and both the primal and dual nondegeneracy conditions hold at \((X^*, y^*, S^*)\). Note that condition (27) guarantees that \( J(X^\mu(\varepsilon), y^\mu(\varepsilon), S^\mu(\varepsilon)) \) is nonsingular for every \( 0 \leq \mu < \tilde{\mu} \), see Corollary 1 in [23]. Then, by the Lipschitz continuity of the Jacobian, Lemma 3.8, and the fact that the partition \( \mathcal{T} \) does not exist, the right hand side in (27) converges to a finite positive value as \( \mu \to 0 \). Since \((X^*, y^*, S^*)\) is the unique optimal solution, then (27) gives a subinterval of a nonlinearity interval at the limit, which contains \( \bar{\varepsilon} = 0 \). Consequently, the nonlinearity interval can be estimated using (27) and the trajectory of central solutions when \( \mu < \tilde{\mu} \). In case that \( \theta^\mu \to \infty \), the right hand side of (27) converges to 0, providing no information about neither a linearity nor a nonlinearity interval.

Regardless of the strict complementarity condition, Lemma 4.4 gives an estimation of the length of \( \mathcal{E} \). The following result is immediate.

\textbf{Corollary 4.5.} The length of \( \mathcal{E} \) is bounded below by

\[
\sup_{0 < \mu < \tilde{\mu}} \min \left\{ \frac{\delta^\mu}{2\theta^\mu\|\tilde{C}\|}, \frac{1}{2(\theta^\mu)^2\|\tilde{C}\|} \right\}.
\]  

\( \square \)
4.2. Change in $\mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_B)$ and $\mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_N)$

Using the results in Lemma 4.4, we can now derive upper bounds for the sensitivity of $\mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_B)$ and $\mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_N)$.

**Theorem 4.6.** Let a central solution $(X^\mu, y^\mu, S^\mu)$ with $\mu < \tilde{\mu}$ be given. If $\epsilon$ is chosen so that

$$|\epsilon| < \min\left\{\frac{\delta^\mu}{2\theta^\mu\|C\|}, \frac{1}{2(\theta^\mu)^2\|C\|}, \frac{\phi^\mu}{100\theta^\mu\|C\|}\right\}$$

holds, then $\epsilon \in \text{int}(\mathcal{E})$, and there exist $V^\mu_B$ and $V^\mu_N$ with

$$\|V^\mu_B\| \leq \frac{4\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - 2|\epsilon|(\theta^\mu)^2\|C\|}\right)}{\theta^\mu\phi^\mu},$$

$$\|V^\mu_N\| \leq \frac{4\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - 2|\epsilon|(\theta^\mu)^2\|C\|}\right)}{\theta^\mu\phi^\mu},$$

so that $\mathcal{R}(Y^\mu_B)$ and $\mathcal{R}(Y^\mu_N)$ are invariant subspaces of $X^\mu(\epsilon)$ and $S^\mu(\epsilon)$, respectively. Furthermore, we have

$$\text{dist}\left(\mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_B), \mathcal{R}(Y^\mu_B)\right) \leq \frac{4\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - 2|\epsilon|(\theta^\mu)^2\|C\|}\right)}{\theta^\mu\phi^\mu},$$

$$\text{dist}\left(\mathcal{R}(Q^\mu_N), \mathcal{R}(Y^\mu_N)\right) \leq \frac{4\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - 2|\epsilon|(\theta^\mu)^2\|C\|}\right)}{\theta^\mu\phi^\mu}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

**Proof.** Condition (21), after including (26) and (28), holds if

$$\frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 2|\epsilon|(\theta^\mu)^2\|C\|}}{\theta^\mu} \leq \frac{1 - (1 - 2|\epsilon|(\theta^\mu)^2\|C\|)}{\theta^\mu} \leq \frac{\phi^\mu}{5},$$

which gives the upper bound

$$|\epsilon| \leq \frac{\phi^\mu}{10\theta^\mu\|C\|}.$$ 

The upper bounds on $\|V^\mu_B\|$, and on the distance between the subspaces are then immediate from (27) and Lemma 4.2. The proof for $\|V^\mu_N\|$ and (33) is analogous. \hfill $\square$

Notice that $\tilde{\mu}$ is actually dependent on $\epsilon$, and it should be denoted by $\tilde{\mu}(\epsilon)$, because the optimal set and thus the condition number $\sigma$ vary with $\epsilon$. All this hints that $\mathcal{R}(Y^\mu_B)$ and $\mathcal{R}(Y^\mu_N)$ cannot be necessarily considered as approximations of $B(\epsilon)$ and $N(\epsilon)$, respectively. The reason lies in the fact that the perturbation of the objective vector might give $\mu > \tilde{\mu}(\epsilon)$, which disallows the identification of eigenvectors whose accumulation points form orthonormal bases for the optimal partition, or even $\epsilon$ might
be a transition point. However, in case that \((X^*, y^*, S^*)\) is unique and strictly complementary, we can provide conditions to ensure that \(\mathcal{R}(Y_B^\mu)\) and \(\mathcal{R}(Y_N^\mu)\) are valid approximations of \(\mathcal{B}(\epsilon)\) and \(\mathcal{N}(\epsilon)\).

**Lemma 4.7.** Assume that the Jacobian is nonsingular at \((X^*, y^*, S^*)\). If \(\epsilon\) satisfies

\[
|\epsilon| < \inf_{0 \leq \hat{\mu} < \mu} \min \left\{ \frac{\delta\hat{\mu}}{2\theta\hat{\mu}^2\|C\|}, \frac{1}{2(\theta\hat{\mu})^2\|C\|}, \frac{\delta\hat{\mu}}{10\theta\hat{\mu}\|C\|} \right\},
\]

(34)

then \(\mathcal{R}(Y_B^\mu)\) and \(\mathcal{R}(Y_N^\mu)\), with \(\mu < \tilde{\mu}(\epsilon)\), are approximations of \(\mathcal{B}(\epsilon)\) and \(\mathcal{N}(\epsilon)\).

**Proof.** Recall from Lemma 3.9 and Remark 7 that the right hand side in (34) is positive, and that \(\text{rank}(X^*(\epsilon)) = \text{rank}(X^*)\) and \(\text{rank}(S^*(\epsilon)) = \text{rank}(S^*)\) for all \(\epsilon\) satisfying (34). Furthermore, condition (34) guarantees that the central path exists for \((P_\epsilon)\) and \((D_\epsilon)\), and for a sequence \(\{\mu_k\} \to 0\) there exists an orthogonal matrix \(W_B^{\mu_k}\), defined in (22), so that

\[
(W_B^{\mu_k})^T(Q^{\mu_k})^T X^{\mu_k}(\epsilon) Q^{\mu_k} W_B^{\mu_k} = D^{\mu_k} := \begin{bmatrix} D_B^{\mu_k} & 0 \\ 0 & D_N^{\mu_k} \end{bmatrix}
\]

for sufficiently large \(k\), where \(D_B^{\mu_k}\) and \(D_N^{\mu_k}\) are positive definite matrices, see Lemma 4.4 and Theorem 4.6. Since the eigenvalues of \(X^{\mu_k}(\epsilon)\) and \(D^{\mu_k}\) are equal and bounded, then \(D_B^{\mu_k}\) has an accumulation point \(\bar{D}_B > 0\), and any accumulation point of \(D_N^{\mu_k}\) is the zero matrix. Additionally, \(W_B^{\mu_k}, Y_B^{\mu_k}\), and \(Q^{\mu_k}\) have accumulation points \(\bar{W}_B, \bar{Y}_B,\) and \(\bar{Q}\), since they exist and belong to compact sets. Therefore, we have

\[
\mathcal{R}(X^*) = \mathcal{R}\left(\bar{Q}\bar{W}_B \begin{bmatrix} \bar{D}_B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \bar{W}_B^T \bar{Q}^T\right) = \mathcal{R}\left(\bar{Q}\bar{W}_B \begin{bmatrix} \bar{D}_B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) = \mathcal{R}(\bar{Y}_B \bar{D}_B) = \mathcal{R}(\bar{Y}_B),
\]

which implies that \(\bar{Y}_B\) forms an orthonormal basis for \(\mathcal{B}(\epsilon)\). Analogous results hold for \(S^{\mu_k}(\epsilon)\) and \(Y_N^{\mu_k}\). Hence, \(\mathcal{R}(Y_B^\mu)\) and \(\mathcal{R}(Y_N^\mu)\) are valid approximations of \(\mathcal{B}(\epsilon)\) and \(\mathcal{N}(\epsilon)\) when \(\mu < \tilde{\mu}(\epsilon)\), see also the discussion after Lemma 2.3. This completes the proof.

5. Concluding remarks and future studies

In this paper, we revisited the parametric analysis and the identification of the optimal partition for SDO problems, when the objective function is perturbed along a fixed direction. We characterized the nonlinearity interval of the optimal partition, where the ranks of primal and dual optimal solutions, belonging to the relative interior of the optimal set, remain constant. Further, we studied the sensitivity of \(\mathcal{R}(Q_B^\mu)\) and \(\mathcal{R}(Q_N^\mu)\) with respect to \(\epsilon\) and derived an upper bound on the distance between the invariant subspaces spanned by the approximation of the optimal partition. We showed that if the Jacobian is nonsingular at \((X^*(\bar{\epsilon}), y^*(\bar{\epsilon}), S^*(\bar{\epsilon}))\), then \(\bar{\epsilon}\) belongs to the interior of a nonlinearity interval.

The continuity and differentiability of primal and dual optimal solutions in a nonlinearity interval are subjects of future studies. Currently, we are investigating theoretical and numerical methods for exact identification of a nonlinearity interval.
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