Abstract. In this paper we study the worst-case complexity of an inexact Augmented Lagrangian method for nonconvex constrained problems. Assuming that the penalty parameters are bounded, we prove a complexity bound of $O(|\log(\varepsilon)|)$ iterations for the referred algorithm generate an $\varepsilon$-approximate KKT point, for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. When the penalty parameters are unbounded, we prove an iteration complexity bound of $O(\varepsilon^{-2/(\alpha - 1)})$, where $\alpha > 1$ controls the rate of increase of the penalty parameters. For linearly constrained problems, these bounds yield to evaluation complexity bounds of $O(|\log(\varepsilon)|^2\varepsilon^{-p+1})$ and $O(\varepsilon^{-\frac{(p+1)}{p}})$, respectively, when suitable $p$-order methods ($p \geq 2$) are used to approximately solve the unconstrained subproblems at each iteration of our Augmented Lagrangian scheme.
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1. Introduction. In this paper we consider the constrained optimization problem

\begin{align}
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & \quad f(x), \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad c_i(x) = 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m_e, \\
& \quad c_i(x) \geq 0, \quad i = m_e + 1, \ldots, m,
\end{align}

where $f, c_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ ($i = 1, \ldots, m$) are continuously differentiable functions, possibly nonconvex. Augmented Lagrangian Methods are among the most efficient schemes for nonconvex constrained optimization problems (see [18, 21, 3, 4]). The theoretical analysis of these methods usually focus on global convergence properties. More specifically, in the case of (1.1)-(1.3), for any starting pair $(x_0, \lambda^{(0)}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (\mathbb{R}^{m_e} \times \mathbb{R}^{m - m_e}_+)$, one tries to show that the corresponding sequence $\{(x_k, \lambda^{(k)})\}_{k \geq 0}$ generated by the Augmented Lagrangian method possess the following asymptotic property [14]:

\textbf{GC}. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

\begin{align}
\|\nabla f(x_{k_0}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i^{(k_0)} \nabla c_i(x_{k_0})\| & \leq \varepsilon, \\
\|c_E(x_{k_0})\| & \leq \varepsilon, \\
\|c_I(x_{k_0})\| & \leq \varepsilon, \\
\lambda_i^{(k_0)} & \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in \{m_e + 1, \ldots, m\},
\end{align}
and

\[ \lambda_{i}^{(k_0)} = 0 \text{ whenever } c_i(x_{k_0}) > \epsilon, \quad \forall i \in \{m_e + 1, \ldots, m\}, \]

where \( c_E(x) = (c_1(x), \ldots, c_{m_e}(x)), \) \( c_f(x) = (c_{m_e+1}(x), \ldots, c_m(x)), \) and for any vector \( v, \) the corresponding vector \( v^{(-)} \) is defined by \( v_i^{(-)} = \min \{ v_i, 0 \}. \)

In this paper we obtain worst-case complexity bounds for the first \( k_0 \) such that \ref{eq:1.3} hold, where \( \left\{ (x_k, \lambda^{(k)}) \right\}_{k \geq 0} \) is generated by a certain Augmented Lagrangian method that allows inexact solutions of its subproblems. Assuming that the penalty parameters are bounded, we prove an iteration complexity bound of \( O \left( \frac{1}{\alpha \tau - 2} \right) \) of \( \lambda_{i}^{(k_0)} \) are given respectively by:

\begin{equation}
L(x, \lambda) = f(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i c_i(x),
\end{equation}

and

\begin{equation}
P(x, \lambda, \sigma) = f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ -\lambda_i c_i(x) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma c_i(x)^2 \right] 
+ \sum_{i=m_e+1}^{m} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
-\lambda_i c_i(x) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma c_i(x)^2 & \text{if } c_i(x) < \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma}, \\
-\frac{1}{2} \lambda_i^2 / \sigma & \text{otherwise},
\end{array} \right.
= f(x) + \frac{\sigma}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ \left( c_i(x) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 - \left( \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 \right] 
+ \frac{\sigma}{2} \sum_{i=m_e+1}^{m} \left[ \left( c_i(x) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 - \left( \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 \right],
\end{equation}

where \( \lambda_i (i = 1, \ldots, m) \) are Lagrange multipliers, \( \sigma \) is the penalty parameter, and \( (\tau)_- \equiv \min \{ 0, \tau \}. \)
Let us consider the following Augmented Lagrangian Method. It is a slight variation of Algorithm 10.4.1 in [22], with a different rule for updating the penalty parameter. Moreover, we allow inexact solutions of the subproblems.

Algorithm 1. Augmented Lagrangian Method

**Step 0.** Given a feasible point \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \) of (1.2)-(1.3), \( \lambda^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^m \) with \( \lambda_i^{(0)} \geq 0 \) for \( i = m_e + 1, \ldots, m \), \( \alpha > 1 \), \( \sigma^{(0)} > 0 \) and \( \gamma, \epsilon \in (0, 1) \), set \( k := 0 \).

**Step 1.** Find an approximate solution \( x_{k+1} \) to
\[
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} P(x, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}),
\]
such that
\[
P(x_{k+1}, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) \leq \min \left\{ P(x_k, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}), P(x_0, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) \right\},
\]
and
\[
\| \nabla_x P(x_{k+1}, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) \|_\infty \leq \epsilon.
\]

**Step 2.** Compute
\[
\theta^{(k+1)} = \max \left\{ \left\| \frac{\lambda^{(k)}}{\sigma^{(k)}} \right\|_\infty, \left\| c_E(x_{k+1}) - \frac{\lambda^{(k)}}{\sigma^{(k)}} \right\|_\infty, \| c_I^-(x_{k+1}) \|_\infty \right\},
\]
where \( \lambda^{(k)}_E = (\lambda^{(k)}_1, \ldots, \lambda^{(k)}_{m_e}) \). If \( k = 0 \), set \( \sigma^{(k+1)} = \sigma^{(k)} \). Otherwise, set
\[
\sigma^{(k+1)} = \begin{cases} 
\sigma^{(k)}, & \text{if } \theta^{(k+1)} \leq \gamma \theta^{(k)}, \\
\max \left\{ (k+1)^{\alpha}, \sigma^{(k)} \right\}, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

**Step 3.** Set
\[
\lambda_i^{(k+1)} = \lambda_i^{(k)} - \sigma^{(k)} c_i(x_{k+1}), \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, m_e,
\]
and
\[
\lambda_i^{(k+1)} = \max \left\{ \lambda_i^{(k)} - \sigma^{(k)} c_i(x_{k+1}), 0 \right\} \text{ for } i = m_e + 1, \ldots, m.
\]

**Step 4.** Set \( k := k + 1 \) and go back to Step 1.

In this section, our goal is to establish iteration complexity bounds for Algorithm 1, that is, upper bounds on the number of iterations necessary to generate a pair \((x_k, \lambda^{(k)})\) such that
\[
\| \nabla_x L(x_k, \lambda^{(k)}) \|_\infty \leq \epsilon,
\]
\[
\| c_E(x_k) \|_\infty \leq \epsilon, \quad \| c_I^-(x_k) \|_\infty \leq \epsilon,
\]
\[
\lambda_i^{(k)} \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in \{m_e + 1, \ldots, m\},
\]
and

\begin{equation}
\lambda^{(k)}_i = 0 \quad \text{whenever} \quad c_i(x_k) > \epsilon, \quad \forall i \in \{m_e + 1, \ldots, m\},
\end{equation}

for a given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. For that, we need four auxiliary results. The first one states that the augmented Lagrangian function is bounded from above by the objective function on points of the feasible set.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let $\sigma > 0$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\lambda_i \geq 0$ for $i = m_e + 1, \ldots, m$, and $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a feasible point of (1.2)-(1.3). Then,

\begin{equation}
P(\bar{x}, \lambda, \sigma) \leq f(\bar{x}).
\end{equation}

**Proof.** By assumptions, for $i = m_e + 1, \ldots, m$, we have $c_i(\bar{x}) \geq 0$ and $\frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \geq 0$. Thus,

\[ c_i(\bar{x}) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \geq -\frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma}. \]

Consequently,

\[ 0 \geq \left( c_i(\bar{x}) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right) \geq -\frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma}, \]

which shows that

\[ \left( c_i(\bar{x}) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 \leq \left( \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2, \quad i = m_e + 1, \ldots, m. \]

Then, (2.15) follows from the above inequality, the equality $c_i(\bar{x}) = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m_e$ and (2.3). \( \square \)

The next lemma provides an upper bound for the constraint violation on infeasible points.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let $\sigma > 0$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\lambda_i \geq 0$ for $i = m_e + 1, \ldots, m$, and $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a feasible point of (1.2)-(1.3). If $x^+$ is an infeasible point of (1.2)-(1.3) such that

\begin{equation}
P(x^+, \lambda, \sigma) \leq P(\bar{x}, \lambda, \sigma),
\end{equation}

then

\begin{equation}
\frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda_i^2}{\sigma} \right) + f(\bar{x}) - f(x^+) \geq \frac{\sigma}{2} \max \left\{ \left\| c_E(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_E}{\sigma} \right\|_{\infty}, \left\| c_I(x^+) \right\|_{\infty} \right\}^2,
\end{equation}

where $\lambda_E = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{m_e})$. 

\[ \quad \]
Thus, combining (2.18), (2.19), (2.20) and the norm inequality (2.20), it follows that
\[
0 \leq P(\bar{x}, \lambda, \sigma) - P(x^+, \lambda, \sigma)
\leq f(\bar{x}) - f(x^+) - \frac{\sigma}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ \left( c_i(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 - \left( \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 \right]
- \frac{\sigma}{2} \sum_{i=m_e+1}^{m} \left[ \left( c_i(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 - \left( \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 \right]
= f(\bar{x}) - f(x^+) + \frac{\sigma}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 - \frac{\sigma}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( c_i(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2
- \frac{\sigma}{2} \sum_{i=m_e+1}^{m} \left( c_i(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2.
\]

Therefore, (2.18)
\[
\frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{\lambda_i^2}{\sigma} \right) + f(\bar{x}) - f(x^+) \geq \frac{\sigma}{2} \max \left\{ \left\| c_E(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_E}{\sigma} \right\|_2^2 , \sum_{i=m_e+1}^{m} \left( c_i(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 \right\}.
\]

Let \( J = \{ j \in \{ m_e + 1, \ldots, m \} \mid c_j(x^+) < 0 \} \). Since \( x^+ \) is an infeasible point to \( (1.2) \), we may have \( J \neq \emptyset \). In this case,
\[
(2.19) \sum_{i=m_e+1}^{m} \left( c_i(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 \geq \sum_{i \in J} \left( c_i(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 \geq \sum_{i \in J} \left( c_i(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2.
\]

For \( i \in J \), we have
\[
\left( c_i(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right) \leq \left( c_i(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right) < 0,
\]
which gives
\[
\sum_{i \in J} \left( c_i(x^+) - \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} \right)^2 \geq \sum_{i \in J} c_i(x^+)^2 = \sum_{i=m_e+1}^{m} \min \left\{ c_i(x^+), 0 \right\}^2
= \sum_{i=m_e+1}^{m} c_i^{(-)}(x^+)^2
\]
(2.20)
\[
= \| c^{(-)}(x^+) \|_2^2.
\]

Thus, combining (2.18), (2.19), (2.20) and the norm inequality \( \| \cdot \|_2 \geq \| \cdot \|_{\infty} \), we get (2.17).

The following lemma specializes the upper bound from Lemma 2.2 to points generated by Algorithm 1.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let the sequence \( \{ (x_k, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) \}_{k \geq 0} \) be generated by Algorithm 1. If \( f(x) \) is bounded from below by \( f_{low} \), then, for all \( k \geq 1 \), we have (2.21)
\[
k \left[ \| \mu^{(0)} \|_2^2 + 4(f(x_0) - f_{low}) \right] \geq \sigma^{(k)} \max \left\{ \left\| c_E(x_{k+1}) - \frac{\lambda_{E(k)}}{\sigma^{(k)}} \right\|_{\infty} , \| c^{(-)}(x_{k+1}) \|_{\infty} \right\}^2.
\]
where

\[(2.22) \quad \mu_i^{(k)} = \frac{\lambda_i^{(k)}}{\sigma^{(k)}}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m.\]

**Proof.** Since \(x_0\) is a feasible point of (1.2) - (1.3), it follows from (2.5), Lemma 2.2, (2.22) and the bound \(f(x_{k+1}) \geq f_{low}\) that

\[(2.23) \quad \frac{1}{2} \|\mu^{(k)}\|^2_2 + f(x_0) - f_{low} \geq \frac{\sigma^{(k)}}{2} \max \left\{ \left\| \frac{c_E(x_{k+1}) - \lambda_E^{(k)}}{\sigma^{(k)}} \right\|_\infty, \|c_i^{-}(x_{k+1})\|_\infty \right\}^2.

Now, let us compute an upper bound for \(\|\mu^{(k)}\|^2_2\). From (2.22), (2.5), (2.9), (2.10), (2.2), Lemma 2.1 and (2.5), we have

\[
\|\mu^{(k+1)}\|^2_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{[\lambda_i^{(k+1)}]^2}{\sigma^{(k+1)}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{[\lambda_i^{(k)}]^2}{\sigma^{(k)}}
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{[\lambda_i^{(k)}]^2}{\sigma^{(k)}} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( \frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} - \sigma^{(k)} c_i(x_{k+1})}{\sigma^{(k)}} \right)^2 - \left( \frac{[\lambda_i^{(k)}]^2}{\sigma^{(k)}} \right)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{i=m+1}^{m} \left( \max \left\{ \lambda_i^{(k)} - \sigma^{(k)} c_i(x_{k+1}), 0 \right\} \right)^2 - \left( \frac{[\lambda_i^{(k)}]^2}{\sigma^{(k)}} \right)
\]

\[
= \|\mu^{(k)}\|^2_2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ -\lambda_i^{(k)} c_i(x_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^{(k)} c_i(x_{k+1})^2 \right]
\]

\[
+ 2 \sum_{i=m+1}^{m} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
-\lambda_i^{(k)} c_i(x_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^{(k)} c_i(x_{k+1})^2, & \text{if } c_i(x_{k+1}) < \frac{\lambda_i^{(k)}}{\sigma^{(k)}} \\
-\frac{[\lambda_i^{(k)}]^2}{2 \sigma^{(k)}}, & \text{otherwise}
\end{array} \right.
\]

\[
= \|\mu^{(k)}\|^2_2 + 2 \left[ P(x_{k+1}, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) - f(x_{k+1}) \right]
\]

\[
\leq \|\mu^{(k)}\|^2_2 + 2 \left[ P(x_{k+1}, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) - f(x_{k+1}) \right] - 2 \left[ P(x_0, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) - f(x_0) \right]
\]

\[
= \|\mu^{(k)}\|^2_2 + 2 \left[ P(x_{k+1}, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) - P(x_0, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) \right] + 2 \left[ f(x_0) - f(x_{k+1}) \right]
\]

\[
\leq \|\mu^{(k)}\|^2_2 + 2 \left( f(x_0) - f_{low} \right).
\]

Therefore, by induction,

\[(2.24) \quad \|\mu^{(k)}\|^2_2 \leq \|\mu^{(0)}\|^2_2 + 2 \left( f(x_0) - f_{low} \right) k\]

Finally, combining (2.23) and (2.24) we get (2.21). \(\square\)

Our last auxiliary result gives an upper bound for \(\theta^{(k)}\).

**Lemma 2.4.** Let the sequence \(\{(x_k, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)})\}_{k \geq 0}\) be generated by Algorithm 1. If \(f(x)\) is bounded from below by \(f_{low}\), then

\[(2.25) \quad k \left[ \|\mu^{(0)}\|^2_2 + 4 \left( f(x_0) - f_{low} \right) \right] \geq \sigma^{(k)} \left[ \theta^{(k+1)} \right]^2, \quad \forall k \geq 1,
\]

where \(\theta^{(k)}\) is defined in (2.7).
Proof. By (2.22) and (2.24), we have

\begin{equation}
\|\mu^{(k)}\|_2 \geq \|\mu^{(0)}\|_\infty = \left\| \frac{\lambda^{(k)}}{\sqrt{\sigma^{(k)}}} \right\|_\infty = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda^{(k)}}{\sigma^{(k)}}} \sqrt{\sigma^{(k)}}.
\end{equation}

Thus, combining (2.26) and (2.24), it follows that

\begin{equation}
\sigma^{(k)} \left\| \frac{\lambda^{(k)}}{\sigma^{(k)}} \right\|_\infty^2 \leq \|\mu^{(k)}\|_2^2 \leq \|\mu^{(0)}\|_2^2 + 2(f(x_0) - f_{low}) k
\end{equation}

Finally, combining (2.27), (2.21) and (2.7), we obtain (2.25).

Now, we will analyse the iteration-complexity of Algorithm 1 considering separately the following cases:

(i) \(\{\sigma^{(k)}\}_{k \geq 0}\) is bounded from above by \(\sigma_{\text{max}}\).

(ii) \(\lim_{k \to +\infty} \sigma^{(k)} = +\infty\).

By (2.1), (2.9), (2.10), (2.2) and (2.6), we have

\begin{equation}
\|\nabla_x L(x_k, \lambda^{(k)})\|_\infty = \left\| \nabla f(x_k) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i^{(k)} \nabla c_i(x_k) \right\|_\infty
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= \left\| \nabla f(x_k) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( \lambda_i^{(k-1)} - \sigma^{(k-1)} c_i(x_k) \right) \nabla c_i(x_k) \right\|_\infty
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
- \sum_{i=m_e+1}^{m} \max_{i=1} \left\{ \lambda_i^{(k-1)} - \sigma^{(k-1)} c_i(x_k), 0 \right\} \nabla c_i(x_k) \right\|_\infty
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= \|\nabla_x P(x_k, \lambda^{(k-1)}, \sigma^{(k-1)})\|_\infty \leq \epsilon,
\end{equation}

for all \(k \geq 1\). Thus, to bound the number of iterations necessary to ensure (2.11)-(2.14), we only need to bound the number of iterations in which (2.12) or (2.14) does not hold. Note that, if

\begin{equation}
\theta^{(k)} \leq \epsilon
\end{equation}

and \(c_i(x_k) > \epsilon\), then

\begin{equation}
\lambda_i^{(k-1)} - \sigma^{(k-1)} c_i(x_k) < \epsilon - \epsilon = 0,
\end{equation}

and so

\begin{equation}
\lambda_i^{(k-1)} - \sigma^{(k-1)} c_i(x_k) < 0.
\end{equation}

Therefore, if (2.28) holds, by (2.10) we have

\begin{equation}
\lambda_i^{(k)} = 0 \quad \text{whenever} \quad c_i(x_k) > \epsilon, \quad \forall i \in \{m_e + 1, \ldots, m\}.
\end{equation}
On the other hand, it is easy to see that
\[ \theta^{(k)} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \implies \max \left\{ \|c_E(x_k)\|_\infty, \|c_I^{(-)}(x_k)\|_\infty \right\} \leq \epsilon. \]

In view of these remarks, all we have to do is to bound the number of iterations in which
\[ \theta^{(k)} > \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \]

The theorem below gives an upper bound of \( \mathcal{O}(\log(\epsilon^{-1})) \) iterations in case (i).

**Theorem 2.5.** Let the sequence \( \{(x_k, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)})\}_{k \geq 0} \) be generated by Algorithm 1. Suppose that \( f(x) \) is bounded from below by \( f_{\text{low}} \) and \( \{\sigma^{(k)}\}_{k \geq 0} \) is bounded from above by \( \sigma_{\text{max}} \). If
\[ T > \sigma_{\text{max}}^\alpha + 2 + \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{\|\mu^{(0)}\|^2_2 + 4[f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}]}{\log(\gamma^{-1})} \right) \]
then
\[ \theta^{(T)} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \]
where \( \mu^{(0)} \) is defined by (2.23) and \( \alpha \) and \( \gamma \) are the parameters in (2.8).

**Proof.** Consider the set
\[ \mathcal{U} = \left\{ j \in \mathbb{N} \mid \theta^{(j+1)} > \gamma \theta^{(j)} \right\}. \]

Given \( k \in \mathcal{U} \), we must have \( k \leq \sigma_{\text{max}}^\alpha \), since otherwise, by (2.23) we would have \( \sigma^{(k+1)} \geq (k + 1)^\alpha > \sigma_{\text{max}} \), contradicting our assumption on the penalty parameters.

Let us denote \( \bar{k} = \max \{ j \mid j \in \mathcal{U} \} \). By (2.29), we have \( T = \bar{k} + 2 + s \) with
\[ s \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{\|\mu^{(0)}\|^2_2 + 4[f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}]}{\log(\gamma^{-1})} \right). \]

Note that
\[ \{\bar{k} + 2, \ldots, \bar{k} + 2 + s\} = \{\bar{k} + 2, \ldots, T\} \subset \mathbb{N} - \mathcal{U}. \]

Consequently,
\[ \theta^{(T)} = \theta^{(\bar{k} + 2 + s)} \leq \gamma^s \theta^{(\bar{k} + 2)}. \]

Since \( \bar{k} \in \mathcal{U} \), it follows that \( \sigma^{(\bar{k} + 1)} \geq (\bar{k} + 1)^\alpha \). Thus, by Lemma 2.4 we have
\[ (\bar{k} + 1)^\alpha \left[ \theta^{(\bar{k} + 2)} \right]^2 \leq \left[ \|\mu^{(0)}\|^2_2 + 4[f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}] \right] (\bar{k} + 1) \]
\[ \implies \left[ \theta^{(\bar{k} + 2)} \right]^2 \leq \left[ \|\mu^{(0)}\|^2_2 + 4[f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}] \right] \frac{(\bar{k} + 1)}{(k + 1)^\alpha} \]
\[ \leq \left[ \|\mu^{(0)}\|^2_2 + 4[f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}] \right]. \]
(2.34) \[ \theta^{(k+2)} \leq \left( \|\mu_0\|^2 + 4 \|f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}\| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \]

Combining (2.33) and (2.34), we obtain
\[ \theta^{(T)} \leq \gamma^s \left( \|\mu_0\|^2 + 4 \|f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}\| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \]

By (2.32),
\[ \gamma^s \left( \|\mu_0\|^2 + 4 \|f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}\| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \]

Therefore,
\[ \theta^{(T)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \]

and the proof is complete. \( \square \)

The next theorem establishes an upper bound of \( O\left( \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{\alpha}} \right) \) iterations in case (ii).

**Theorem 2.6.** Let the sequence \( \{(x_k, \lambda(k), \sigma(k))\}_{k \geq 0} \) be generated by Algorithm 1 such that

(2.35) \[ \theta^{(T)} > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \text{for } k = 1, \ldots, T. \]

If \( f(x) \) is bounded from below by \( f_{\text{low}} \) and \( \lim_{k \to +\infty} \sigma^{(k)} = +\infty \), then

(2.36) \[ T < 4 + \left( 2\|\mu_0\|^2 + 8\|f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}\| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{\alpha}} + \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \|\mu_0\|^2 + 4 \|f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}\| \right) + \log(2) + \log(\varepsilon^{-1}) \]

where \( \mu_0 \) is defined by (2.22) and \( \alpha \) and \( \gamma \) are the parameters in (2.8).

**Proof.** Again, consider the set \( \mathcal{U} \) defined in (2.31). Given \( k \in \mathcal{U} \), it follows from (2.38) and Lemma 2.4 that

\[ (k + 1) \left( \|\mu_0\|^2 + 4\|f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}\| \right) \geq (k + 1) \alpha^2 \left( \theta^{(k+2)} \right)^2 \]

\[ \implies \left( \theta^{(k+2)} \right)^2 \leq \left( \|\mu_0\|^2 + 4\|f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}\| \right) \frac{1}{(k + 1)^{\alpha^2 - 1}}. \]

Thus,
\[ k \in \mathcal{U} \quad \text{and} \quad k + 1 \geq \left( 2\|\mu_0\|^2 + 8\|f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}\| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{\alpha}} \implies \theta^{(k+2)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \]

By (2.35), this means that
\[ \tilde{k} = \max \{ k \in \{1, \ldots, T - 2\} \mid k \in \mathcal{U} \} \leq \left( 2\|\mu_0\|^2 + 8\|f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}\| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{\alpha}}. \]

Suppose that \( T - 2 > \tilde{k} + 2 \) and define \( s = (T - 2) - (\tilde{k} + 2) \). Then,
\[ \{\tilde{k} + 2, \ldots, \tilde{k} + 2 + s\} = \{\tilde{k} + 2, \ldots, T - 2\} \subset \mathbb{N} - \mathcal{U}, \]
and so
\begin{equation}
\theta^{(T-2)} = \theta^{(k+2+s)} \leq \gamma^s \theta^{(k+2)}.
\end{equation}

Since \( \tilde{k} \in \mathcal{U} \), it follows that \( \sigma^{(k+1)} \geq (k+1)^\alpha \). Thus, using Lemma 2.4 as in the proof of Theorem 2.5, we obtain
\begin{equation}
\theta^{(k+2)} \leq \left( \|\mu^{(0)}\|_2^2 + 4[f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}] \right)^{1/2}.
\end{equation}

Combining (2.37) and (2.38), we obtain
\begin{equation}
\theta^{(T-2)} \leq \gamma^s \left( \|\mu^{(0)}\|_2^2 + 4[f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}] \right)^{1/2}.
\end{equation}

Note that, if
\[
s \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{\|\mu^{(0)}\|_2^2 + 4[f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}]}{\log(\gamma^{-1})} \right) + \log(2) + \log(\epsilon^{-1}),
\]
we would have
\[
\theta^{(T-2)} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2},
\]
contradicting (2.35). Hence, we must have
\[
s < \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{\|\mu^{(0)}\|_2^2 + 4[f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}]}{\log(\gamma^{-1})} \right) + \log(\epsilon^{-1}).
\]

Therefore,
\[
T - 2 = \tilde{k} + 2 + s < \left( 2\|\mu^{(0)}\|_2^2 + 8[f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}] \right)^{1/2} \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2\alpha}} + 2
+ \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{\|\mu^{(0)}\|_2^2 + 4[f(x_0) - f_{\text{low}}]}{\log(\gamma^{-1})} \right) + \log(2) + \log(\epsilon^{-1}),
\]
which gives (2.36). \( \square \)

In summary, Theorem 2.5 means that if the sequence of penalty parameters is bounded from above, then Algorithm 1 takes at most \( O(\log(\epsilon^{-1})) \) iterations to generate \( (x_k, \lambda^{(k)}) \) satisfying (2.11)-(2.14), that is, an \( \epsilon \)-approximate KKT point of (1.1)-(1.3). On the other hand, if the sequence of penalty parameters is unbounded, Theorem 2.6 gives an upper bound of \( O(\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2\alpha}}) \) iterations, where \( \alpha > 1 \) defines the increase of the penalty parameter. As expected (see [3], p. 104), the bigger is \( \alpha \), the more aggressive is the update of the penalty parameter, and the smaller is the number of iterations needed for Algorithm 1 to find an \( \epsilon \)-approximate KKT point.

3. Evaluation Complexity for Linearly Constrained Problems. At each iteration of Algorithm 1, subproblem (2.4) must be approximately solved. In general, this is done by applying an iterative optimization method for unconstrained problems. On its turn, this unconstrained method requires a certain number of calls of the oracle\(^1\) which is proportional to the number of inner iterations. Therefore, a full
estimation of the worst-case complexity of Algorithm 1 must also take into account the iteration complexity of the auxiliary unconstrained method used to solve the subproblems. With this goal in mind, now we shall consider the following special case of (1.1)-(1.3):

\begin{align}
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & \ f(x), \\
\text{s.t.} & \ a_i^T x - b_i = 0, \ i = 1, \ldots, m,
\end{align}

where \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) is \( p \)-times differentiable (\( p \geq 2 \)), possibly nonconvex, \( a_i \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( b_i \in \mathbb{R} \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, m \). This is a particular case of (1.1)-(1.3) with \( m = m_e \). Given \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m \) and \( \sigma > 0 \), the corresponding augmented Lagrangian function to (3.1)-(3.2) is

\begin{equation}
P(x, \lambda, \sigma) = f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ -\lambda_i (a_i^T x - b_i) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma (a_i^T x - b_i)^2 \right].
\end{equation}

For each \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), let us denote by \( a_{ij} \) the \( j \)th component of vector \( a_i \).

**Lemma 3.1.** Given \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \), \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m \) and \( \sigma > 0 \), let \( P(x, \lambda, \sigma) \) be defined by (3.3). If \( f \) is \( p \)-times differentiable with \( p \geq 2 \), then

\begin{align}
D^p P(x, \lambda, \sigma) &= \begin{cases} 
\nabla^2 f(x) + \sigma A^T A, & \text{if } p = 2, \\
D^p f(x), & \text{if } p \geq 3,
\end{cases}
\end{align}

where the \( i \)th row of \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \) is vector \( a_i^T \).

Proof. Indeed, from (5.3), a direct calculation shows that

\[ \frac{\partial P}{\partial x_j} (x, \lambda, \sigma) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} (x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ -\lambda_i a_{ij} + \sigma (a_i^T x - b_i) a_{ij} \right]. \]

Then,

\[ \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial x_k \partial x_j} (x, \lambda, \sigma) = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_k \partial x_j} (x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sigma a_{ik} a_{ij}. \]

which gives

\[ \frac{\partial^3 P}{\partial x_i \partial x_k \partial x_j} (x, \lambda, \sigma) = \frac{\partial^3 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_k \partial x_j} (x). \]

Therefore, (3.4) holds. \( \square \)

From Lemma 3.1 it follows that \( \nabla^2 P(., \lambda, \sigma) \) is \( L_2 \)-Lipschitz continuous when \( \nabla^2 f(.) \) is \( L_2 \)-Lipschitz continuous. In this case, one can minimize \( P(., \lambda, \sigma) \) by using a second-order method \( M_2 \). More specifically, let us consider the following assumptions on \( f \) and \( M_2 \):

**A1.** There exists \( f_{low} \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( f(x) \geq f_{low} \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), and \( \nabla^2 f(.) \) is \( L_2 \)-Lipschitz continuous, i.e.,

\[ \|\nabla^2 f(x) - \nabla^2 f(y)\| \leq L_2 \|x - y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n. \]
A2. If A1 holds and \( P(\cdot, \lambda, \sigma) \) in (3.3) is below bounded by \( P_{low} \), method \( M_2 \), with starting point \( \tilde{x} \), can find an \( \epsilon \)-approximate stationary point of \( P(\cdot, \lambda, \sigma) \) in at most
\[
C_{M_2} \sqrt{L_2} \left( P(\tilde{x}, \lambda, \sigma) - P_{low} \right) \epsilon^{-\frac{2}{3}}
\]
iterations, where \( C_{M_2} \) is a positive constant that depends only on the method \( M_2 \).

An important class of unconstrained methods that satisfy A2 is the class of methods based on the cubic regularization of Newton’s method (see, e.g., [20, 10, 6, 15]). The next lemma establishes an upper bound on the number of iterations for these methods to compute approximate solutions of (2.4) satisfying (2.5)-(2.6).

Lemma 3.2. Let \( \{(x_j, \lambda^{(j)}, \sigma^{(j)})\}_{j=0}^k \) be generated by Algorithm 1 applied to (3.1)-(3.2), with \( k \) iterations to generate \( \tilde{x} \) satisfying A1. Moreover, assume that at each iteration of Algorithm 1, a monotone method \( M_2 \) satisfying A2 is used to approximately solve (2.4) with starting point \( x, \lambda, \sigma \).

If A1 holds and A2, then \( M_2 \) takes at most \( O(k\epsilon^{-\frac{2}{3}}) \) iterations to generate \( \tilde{x}_{k,\ell} \) such that
\[
\| \nabla_x P(\tilde{x}_{k,\ell}, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) \|_2 \leq \epsilon.
\]

Proof. By (2.3), (2.22), A1 and (2.24), we have
\[
P(x, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) \geq f(x) - \frac{\sigma^{(k)}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( \frac{\lambda^{(k)}}{\sigma^{(k)}} \right)^2
\]
\[
= f(x) - \frac{1}{2} \| \mu^{(k)} \|_2^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n
\]
\[
\geq f_{low} - \frac{1}{2} \| \mu^{(0)} \|_2^2 - (f(x_0) - f_{low}) k,
\]
which gives the lower bound
\[
P_{low} = f_{low} - \frac{1}{2} \| \mu^{(0)} \|_2^2 - (f(x_0) - f_{low}) k,
\]
for \( P(x, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) \). On the other hand, it follows from (3.3) and Lemma 2.1 that
\[
P(\tilde{x}_{k,0}) \leq P(x_0, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) \leq f(x_0).
\]

Thus, by A2, (3.6) and (3.7), we conclude that method \( M_2 \) takes at most
\[
C_{M_2} \sqrt{L_2} \left( f(x_0) - f_{low} + \frac{1}{2} \| \mu^{(0)} \|_2^2 + [f(x_0) - f_{low}] k \right) \epsilon^{-\frac{2}{3}}
\]
iterations to generate an \( \epsilon \)-approximate stationary point of \( P(\cdot, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)}) \).

Now, combining Theorems 2.6 and 2.8 with Lemma 3.2 we can obtain worst-case complexity bounds for the total number of inner iterations performed in Algorithm 1 to find an \( \epsilon \)-approximate KKT point of (3.1)-(3.2).

Theorem 3.3. Suppose that Algorithm 1 is applied to solve (3.1)-(3.2) with \( f \) satisfying A1. Moreover, assume that at each iteration of Algorithm 1, a monotone method \( M_2 \) satisfying A2 is used to approximately solve (2.4) with starting point \( \tilde{x}_{k,0} \) given in (3.5). Then, the following statements are true:
(a) If \( \{\sigma^{(k)}\}_{k \geq 0} \) is bounded from above by \( \sigma_{\max} \), then Algorithm 1 takes at most \( O\left( |\log(\epsilon)|^{2} \epsilon^{-\frac{2}{\rho}} \right) \) inner iterations of \( M_2 \) to generate an \( \epsilon \)-approximate KKT point of \( (3.1)-(3.2) \).

(b) If \( \lim_{k \to +\infty} \sigma^{(k)} = +\infty \), then Algorithm 1 takes at most \( O\left( \epsilon^{-\left(\frac{4}{\rho} + \frac{1}{\rho^2}\right)} \right) \) inner iterations of \( M_2 \) to generate an \( \epsilon \)-approximate KKT point of \( (3.1)-(3.2) \).

Proof. By Theorems 2.5 and 2.6, there exists an iteration number \( T \) such that \( (2.11)-(2.14) \) hold for \( k = T + 1 \). By Lemma 3.2, the total number of inner iterations of \( M_2 \) performed until iteration \( T + 1 \) of Algorithm 1 is proportional to

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{T+2} \epsilon^{-\frac{2}{\rho}} = O\left( (T + 2)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \epsilon^{-\frac{2}{\rho}} \right).
\]

Thus, (a) and (b) follow directly from the upper bounds on \( T \) given in \( (2.29) \) and \( (2.33) \), respectively. \( \square \)

If \( D^p f(\cdot) \) is Lipschitz continuous for \( p \geq 3 \), it follows from Lemma 3.1 that \( D^p P(\cdot, \lambda, \sigma) \) is also Lipschitz continuous. In this case, one can minimize \( P(\cdot, \lambda, \sigma) \) using a tensor method \( M_p \). More specifically, let us consider now the following assumptions on \( f \) and \( M_p \):

**A1’**. There exists \( f_{\text{low}} \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( f(x) \geq f_{\text{low}} \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and, for some \( p \geq 3 \), \( D^p f(\cdot) \) is \( L_p \)-Lipschitz continuous, i.e.,

\[
\|D^p f(x) - D^p f(y)\| \leq L_p\|x - y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

**A2’**. If A1’ holds and \( P(\cdot, \lambda, \sigma) \) in (3.3) is below bounded by \( P_{\text{low}} \), method \( M_p \), with starting point \( \tilde{x} \), can find an \( \epsilon \)-approximate stationary point of \( P(\cdot, \lambda, \sigma) \) in at most

\[
C_{M_p} L_p^{\frac{1}{\rho}} (P(\tilde{x}, \lambda, \sigma) - P_{\text{low}}) \epsilon^{-\frac{p+1}{\rho}}
\]

iterations, where \( C_{M_p} \) is a positive constant that depends only on the method \( M_p \).

Recently, several tensor methods satisfying A2’ have been proposed (see, e.g., [6, 13, 16]). The use of these tensor methods to approximately solve \( 2.4 \) give us complexity bounds better than the ones obtained in Theorem 3.3 as we can see below.

**Theorem 3.4.** Suppose that Algorithm 1 is applied to solve \( (3.1)-(3.2) \) with \( f \) satisfying A1’. Moreover, assume that at each iteration of Algorithm 1, a monotone method \( M_p \) satisfying A2’ is used to approximately solve \( 2.4 \) with starting point \( \tilde{x}_{k,0} \) given in (3.9). Then, the following statements are true:

(a) If \( \{\sigma^{(k)}\}_{k \geq 0} \) is bounded from above by \( \sigma_{\max} \), then Algorithm 1 takes at most \( O\left( |\log(\epsilon)|^{2} \epsilon^{-\frac{2}{\rho}} \right) \) inner iterations of \( M_p \) to generate an \( \epsilon \)-approximate KKT point of \( (3.1)-(3.2) \).

(b) If \( \lim_{k \to +\infty} \sigma^{(k)} = +\infty \), then Algorithm 1 takes at most \( O\left( \epsilon^{-\left(\frac{4}{\rho} + \frac{1}{\rho^2}\right)} \right) \) inner iterations of \( M_p \) to generate an \( \epsilon \)-approximate KKT point of \( (3.1)-(3.2) \).

Proof. As in Lemma 3.2, we conclude that, at the \( k \)th iteration, method \( M_p \) takes at most \( O\left( k \epsilon^{-\frac{2}{\rho}} \right) \) iterations to generate \( \tilde{x}_{k,\ell} \) such that

\[
\|\nabla_x P(\tilde{x}_{k,\ell}, \lambda^{(k)}, \sigma^{(k)})\|_2 \leq \epsilon.
\]
Thus, the total number of inner iterations of $\mathcal{M}_p$ performed until iteration $T + 1$ is proportional to

$$
\left( \sum_{k=1}^{T+2} k \right) \varepsilon^{-\frac{p+1}{p}} = \mathcal{O} \left( (T + 2)^2 \varepsilon^{-\frac{p+1}{p}} \right).
$$

Thus, (a) and (b) follow directly from the upper bounds on $T$ given in (2.29) and (2.36).

4. Discussion.

4.1. Related Literature. Hong [19] proposed a Primal-Dual Algorithm (Prox-PDA) for the linearly constrained problem

$$
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x),
$$

s.t. $a_i^T x - b_i = 0, \; i = 1, \ldots, m.$

It was shown that Prox-PDA enjoys an iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1})$. Therefore, even when the penalty parameters in Algorithm 1 are unbounded, the iteration complexity bound of $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-\frac{p+1}{p}})$ given by Theorem 2.6 is better than the one proved in [19], if we take $\alpha > 3$.

Birgin et al. [5] proposed a Two-Phases Algorithm (FTarget) for the general constrained optimization problem

$$
(4.1) \quad \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x),
$$

$$
(4.2) \quad \text{s.t. } c_i(x) = 0, \; i = 1, \ldots, m_c,
$$

$$
(4.3) \quad \text{s.t. } c_i(x) \geq 0, \; i = m_c + 1, \ldots, m.
$$

Under suitable smoothness conditions, they proved that if the subproblems of FTarget are approximately solved by a $p$-order method $\mathcal{M}_p$ satisfying A2 (if $p = 2$) or A2' (if $p \geq 3$), then FTarget can find an $\varepsilon$-approximate KKT point of (4.1)-(4.3) performing at most $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-\frac{p+1}{p}-1})$ problem’s evaluations. Thus, even when the penalty parameters in Algorithm 1 are unbounded, our evaluation complexity bound of $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-\frac{p+1}{p}})$ for problem (3.1)-(3.2) is better than the one proved in [5], if we take $\alpha > 1 + \frac{4}{p}$.

An evaluation complexity bound of $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-3/2})$ was proved by Haeser, Liu and Ye [17] for a second-order Interior Trust-Region Point Algorithm designed to solve problems of the form

$$
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x),
$$

s.t. $a_i^T x - b_i = 0, \; i = 1, \ldots, m$

$$
x_j \geq 0, \; j = 1, \ldots, n,
$$

where $f$ is not necessarily twice differentiable on the boundary of the feasible region. A similar bound of $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-3/2})$ was also proved by Birgin and Martínez [7] for an algorithm to solve (5.1)-(5.2) based on active-set strategies. On the other hand, Cartis, Gould and Toint [10] proved an evaluation complexity bound of $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-(p+1)/p})$ for a $p$-order
tensor method \((p \geq 2)\) adapted to solve constrained problems of the form

\[
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x), \\
\text{s.t. } x \in F,
\]

where \(F \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) is closed, convex and non-empty. When the penalty parameters in Algorithm 1 are bounded, the evaluation complexity bounds of \(O\left(\frac{1}{\log(\epsilon)}\right)\) given in Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 (for \(p \geq 2\)) are slightly worse than the bounds mentioned above. It is worth to mention that a complexity bound of the same order can be obtained even when the penalty parameters are unbounded. For that, it is enough to replace (2.8) by the following update rule:

\[
\sigma^{(k+1)} = \begin{cases} 
\sigma^{(k)}, & \text{if } \theta^{(k+1)} \leq \gamma \theta^{(k)}, \\
\max\{4k+1, \sigma^{(k)}\}, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

Indeed, using (4.4) in the proof of Theorem 2.6, we can obtain \(\hat{k} \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\log(\epsilon)}\right)\) which gives an iteration complexity bound of \(O\left(\frac{1}{\log(\epsilon)}\right)\). This corresponds to an evaluation complexity bound of \(O\left(\frac{1}{\log(\epsilon)}\right)\) for problem (3.1)-(3.2) when the penalty parameters are unbounded. However, (4.4) increases the penalty parameters much more aggressively than (2.8), and can lead to a premature ill-conditioning of (2.4). Therefore, despite the improved worst-case complexity, it is unlikely that (4.4) will give an efficient algorithm in practice.

Finally, for \(p = 2\) our evaluation complexity bound of \(O\left(\frac{1}{\log(\epsilon)}\right)\) is better than the bounds of \(O(\epsilon^{-\frac{2}{3}})\) proved for the first-order schemes proposed by [9] and by [11], if \(\alpha > 9\). This is not surprising, since our result is obtained using a second-order method to solve the subproblems.

### 4.2. Nonconvex Problems with Quadratic Constraints.

Consider now the following problem

\[
\begin{align}
&\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x), \\
&\text{s.t. } x^T R_i x + s_i^T x + t_i = 0, \ i = 1, \ldots, m
\end{align}
\]

where \(f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) is four times differentiable, possibly nonconvex, \(R_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, s_i \in \mathbb{R}^n\) and \(t_i \in \mathbb{R}\), for \(i = 1, \ldots, m\). Let \(P(x, \lambda, \sigma)\) denote the augmented Lagrangian function corresponding to (4.5)-(4.6). Then, as in Lemma 3.1 one can see that \(D^4 P(x, \lambda, \sigma) = D^4 f(x)\) for all \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n\). Thus, if \(D^4 f(.)\) is bounded, it follows that \(D^3 P(x, \lambda, \sigma)\) is Lipschitz continuous, and we can apply Algorithm 1 to (4.5)-(4.6), solving (2.4) with a third-order tensor method. Specifically, if A1’ and A2’ hold for \(p = 3\), then (as in Theorem 3.4) we conclude that Algorithm 1 applied to (4.5)-(4.6) takes at most \(O\left(\frac{1}{\log(\epsilon)}\right)\) inner iterations of \(M_3\) if \(\{\sigma^{(k)}\}\) is bounded, and \(O\left(\epsilon^{-\frac{3}{10}}\right)\) inner iterations of \(M_3\) if \(\{\sigma^{(k)}\}\) is unbounded. In this case, a possible choice for \(M_3\) satisfying A2’ is given by [8].

### 5. Conclusion.

In this paper, we have studied the worst-case complexity of an inexact Augmented Lagrangian method for constrained optimization problems. For the case in which the penalty parameters are bounded, we established a complexity bound of \(O(\log(\epsilon))\) iterations for the referred algorithm generate an \(\epsilon\)-approximate
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KKT point, for $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. For the case in which the penalty parameters are unbounded, we proved an iteration complexity bound of $O\left(\epsilon^{-2/(\alpha-1)}\right)$, where $\alpha > 1$ controls the rate of increase of the penalty parameters. In the particular class of linearly constrained problems, these bounds yield to evaluation complexity bounds of $O(\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^{-1})$ and $O\left(\epsilon^{-\frac{4}{\alpha+1}}\right)$, respectively, when appropriate $p$-order methods ($p \geq 2$) are used to approximately solve the unconstrained subproblems at each iteration.

A key point in the Augmented Lagrangian method considered in this work is that it requires the feasibility of the starting point $x_0$, which may be difficult to compute for general nonconvex constraints. Moreover, the assumption that the objective function is bounded from below is also crucial in our complexity analysis. Up to now, it is not clear how these restrictions can be avoided. Another natural question is whether our analysis can be adapted in order to cover possibly less aggressive update rules for the penalty parameters, such as

$$
\sigma^{(k+1)} = \begin{cases} 
\sigma^{(k)}, & \text{if } \theta^{(k+1)} \leq \gamma \theta^{(k)}, \\
\alpha \sigma^{(k)}, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
$$

The authors are planning to address these and other interesting questions in their future research.
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