Journal of XXX manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

The regularization continuation method with an adaptive time step control for linearly constrained optimization problems

Xin-long Luo* · **Hang Xiao**

arXiv:2106.01122v3 [math.NA] 8 Apr 2022

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract This paper considers the regularization continuation method and the trust-region updating strategy for the optimization problem with linear equality constraints. The proposed method utilizes the linear conservation law of the regularization continuation method such that it does not need to compute the correction step for preserving the feasibility other than the previous continuation methods and the quasi-Newton updating formulas for the linearly constrained optimization problem. Moreover, the new method uses the special limited-memory Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (L-BFGS) formula as the preconditioning technique to improve its computational efficiency in the well-posed phase, and it uses the inverse of the regularized two-sided projection of the Lagrangian Hessian as the pre-conditioner to improve its robustness. Numerical results also show that the new method is more robust and faster than the traditional optimization method such as the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM), the sequential quadratic programming (SQP) method (the built-in subroutine fmincon.m of the MATLAB2020a environment), and the recent continuation method (Ptctr). The computational time of the new method is about 1/3 of that of SQP (fmincon.m). Finally, the global convergence analysis of the new method is also given.

Keywords continuation method · preconditioned technique · trust-region method · linear conservation law · regularization method · quasi-Newton formula

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 90C53 · 65K05 · 65L05 · 65L20

Xin-long Luo
Corresponding author. School of Artificial Intelligence,
Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, P. O. Box 101,
Xitucheng Road No. 10, Haidian District, 100876, Beijing China
E-mail: luoxinlong@bupt.edu.cn

Hang Xiao
School of Artificial Intelligence,
Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, P. O. Box 101,
Xitucheng Road No. 10, Haidian District, 100876, Beijing China
E-mail: xiaohang0210@bupt.edu.cn

1 Introduction

In this article, we consider the optimization problem with linear equality constraints as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{x\in\Re^n} \ f(x) \\ &\text{subject to } \ Ax = b, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $A \in \Re^{m\times n}$ is a matrix and $b \in \Re^m$ is a vector. This problem has many applications in engineering fields such as the visual-inertial navigation of an unmanned aerial vehicle maintaining the horizontal flight [12,40], constrained sparse regression [4], sparse signal recovery [16,69], image restoration and de-noising [18,52,63], the Dantzig selector [46], and support vector machines [21]. And there are many practical methods to solve it such as the sequential quadratic programming (SQP) method [32, 53], the penalty function method [17], feasible direction methods (see pp. 515-516, [65]), and the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM [9]).

For the constrained optimization problem (1), the continuation method [2,13,22, 30,55,66] is another method other than the traditional optimization method such as SQP, the penalty function method and ADMM. The advantage of the continuation method over the SQP method is that the continuation method is capable of finding many local optimal points of the non-convex optimization problem by following its trajectory, and it is even possible to find the global optimal solution [6,57,71]. However, the computational efficiency of the classical continuation method is inferior to that of the traditional optimization method such as SQP. Recently, the reference [40] gives a continuation method with the trusty time-stepping scheme (Ptctr) for the problem (1) and it is faster than SQP and the penalty method. In order to improve the computational efficiency and the robustness of the continuation method for the large-scale optimization problem further, we consider a special limited-memory Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (L-BFGS) updating formula [5,19,23,62] as the preconditioned technique in the well-posed phase and use the inverse of the regularized two-sided projection of the Lagrangian Hessian as the pre-conditioner in the ill-posed phase. Moreover, the new method utilizes the linear conservation law of the regularization method and it does not need to compute the correction step for preserving the feasibility other than the previous continuation method [40] and the quasi-Newton method [53,65].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we give the regularization continuation method with the switching preconditioned technique and the trust-region updating strategy for the linearly constrained optimization problem (1). In section 3, we analyze the global convergence of this new method. In section 4, we report some promising numerical results of the new method, in comparison to the traditional optimization method such as SQP (the built-in subroutine fmincon.m of the MATLAB2020a environment [49]), the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM [9], only for convex problems), and the recent continuation method (Ptctr [40]) for some large-scale problems. Finally, we give some discussions and conclusions in section 5.

2 The adaptive regularization continuation method

In this section, we give the regularization continuation method with the switching preconditioned technique and an adaptive time-step control based on the trust-region updating strategy [14] for the linearly constrained optimization problem (1). Firstly, we consider the regularized projection Newton flow based on the KKT conditions of linearly constrained optimization problem. Then, we give the regularization continuation method with the trust-region updating strategy to follow this special ordinary differential equations (ODEs). The new method uses a special L-BFGS updating formula as the preconditioned technique to improve its computational efficiency in the well-posed phase, and it uses the inverse of the regularized two-sided projection of the Lagrangian Hessian as the pre-conditioner to improve its robustness in the ill-posed phase. Finally, we give a preprocessing method for the infeasible initial point.

2.1 The regularization projected Newton flow

For the linearly constrained optimization problem (1), its optimal solution x^* needs to satisfy the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions (p. 328, [53]) as follows:

$$\nabla_x L(x,\lambda) = \nabla f(x) + A^T\lambda = 0, \tag{2}$$

$$Ax - b = 0, \tag{3}$$

where the Lagrangian function $L(x,\lambda)$ is defined by

$$L(x,\lambda) = f(x) + \lambda^T(Ax-b). \tag{4}$$

Similarly to the method of the negative gradient flow for the unconstrained optimization problem [27], from the first-order necessary conditions (2)-(3), we construct a dynamical system of differential-algebraic equations for problem (1) [15,37,38,39,58] as follows:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = -\nabla L_x(x,\lambda) = -\left(\nabla f(x) + A^T\lambda\right), \tag{5}$$

$$Ax - b = 0. \tag{6}$$

By differentiating the algebraic constraint (6) with respect to t and substituting it into the differential equation (5), we obtain

$$A\frac{dx}{dt} = -A\left(\nabla f(x) + A^T\lambda\right) = -A\nabla f(x) - AA^T\lambda = 0. \tag{7}$$

If we assume that matrix A has full row rank further, from equation (7), we obtain

$$\lambda = -\left(AA^T\right)^{-1}A\nabla f(x). \tag{8}$$

By substituting λ of equation (8) into equation (5), we obtain the projected gradient flow [66] for the constrained optimization problem (1) as follows:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = -\left(I - A^T\left(AA^T\right)^{-1}A\right)\nabla f(x) = -Pg(x), \tag{9}$$

where $g(x) = \nabla f(x)$ and the projection matrix P is defined by

$$P = I - A^T\left(AA^T\right)^{-1}A. \tag{10}$$

It is not difficult to verify $P^2 = P$. That is to say, the projection matrix P is symmetric and its eigenvalues are either 0 or 1. From Theorem 2.3.1 (see p. 73, [24]), we know that its matrix 2-norm is

$$\|P\| = 1. \tag{11}$$

We denote P^+ as the Moore-Penrose generalized inverse of the projection matrix P (see p. 11, [65]). Since the projection matrix P is symmetric and $P^2 = P$, it is not difficult to verify

$$P^+ = P. \tag{12}$$

Actually, from equation (12), we have $PP^+P = P(P)P = P = P^+$, $P^+PP^+ = P^3 = P$, $(P^+P)^T = P^+P = P$ and $(PP^+)^T = PP^+ = P$.

Furthermore, from equation (10), we have $AP = 0$. We denote $\mathcal{N}(A)$ as the null space of A. Since the rank of A is m, we know that the rank of $\mathcal{N}(A)$ equals $n-m$ and there are $n-m$ linearly independent vectors $x_i\,(i = 1, \ldots, n-m)$ to satisfy $Ax_i = 0\,(i = 1, \ldots, n-m)$. From equation (10), we know that those $n-m$ linearly independent vectors $x_i\,(i = 1, \ldots, n-m)$ satisfy $Px_i = x_i\,(i = 1, \ldots, n-m)$. That is to say, the projection matrix P has $n-m$ linearly independent eigenvectors associated with eigenvalue 1. Consequently, the rank of P is $n-m$. By combining it with $AP = 0$, we know that P spans the null space of A.

Remark 1 If $x(t)$ is the solution of the ODE (9), it is not difficult to verify that $x(t)$ satisfies $A(dx/dt) = 0$. That is to say, if the initial point x_0 satisfies $Ax_0 = b$, the solution $x(t)$ of the projected gradient flow (9) also satisfies the feasibility $Ax(t) = b$, $\forall t \geq 0$. This linear conservation property is very useful when we construct a structure-preserving algorithm [25,59,60] to follow the trajectory of the ODE (9) to obtain its steady-state solution x^*.

If we assume that $x(t)$ is the solution of the ODEs (9), by using the property $P^2 = P$, we obtain

$$\frac{df(x)}{dt} = (\nabla f(x))^T\frac{dx}{dt} = -(\nabla f(x))^T P\nabla f(x) = -g(x)^T P^2 g(x) = -\|Pg(x)\|^2 \leq 0.$$

That is to say, $f(x)$ is monotonically decreasing along the solution curve $x(t)$ of the dynamical system (9). Furthermore, the solution $x(t)$ converges to x^* when $f(x)$ is lower bounded and t tends to infinity [27,57,66], where x^* satisfies the first-order

Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions (2)-(3). Thus, we can follow the trajectory $x(t)$ of the ODE (9) to obtain its steady-state solution x^*, which is also one stationary point of the original optimization problem (1).

However, since the Jacobian $P\nabla^2 f(x)$ of $Pg(x)$ is rank-deficient, we will confront the numerical difficulties when we use the explicit ODE method to follow the projected gradient flow (9) [3,7,8]. In order to mitigate the stiffness of the ODE (9), we use the generalized inverse $(P\nabla^2 f(x)P)^+$ of the two-sided projection $P\nabla^2 f(x)P$ of the Lagrangian Hessian $\nabla^2_{xx}L(x,\lambda)$ as the pre-conditioner for the ODE (9), which is used similarly to the system of nonlinear equations [41], the unconstrained optimization problem [27,43,45], the linear programming problem [42] and the underdetermined system of nonlinear equations [44].

Firstly, we integrate the ODE (9) from zero to t, then we obtain

$$x(t) = x(t_0) - \int_0^t Pg(x(\tau))d\tau = x(t_0) - P\int_0^t g(x(\tau))d\tau. \tag{13}$$

We denote $z(t) = -\int_0^t g(x(\tau))d\tau$. Thus, from equation (13), we have

$$x(t) = x(t_0) + Pz(t). \tag{14}$$

By substituting it into the ODE (9), we obtain

$$P\frac{dz(t)}{dt} = -Pg(x(t_0) + Pz(t)). \tag{15}$$

Then, by using the generalized inverse $\left(P\nabla^2 f(x(t_0)+Pz(t))P\right)^+$ of the Jacobian matrix $P\nabla^2 f(x(t_0)+Pz(t))P$ as the pre-conditioner for the ODE (15), we have

$$P\frac{dz(t)}{dt} = -\left(P\nabla^2 f(x(t_0)+Pz(t))P\right)^+ Pg(x(t_0)+Pz(t)). \tag{16}$$

We reformulate equation (16) as

$$\left(P\nabla^2 f(x(t_0)+Pz(t))P\right)\frac{dPz(t)}{dt} = -Pg(x(t_0)+Pz(t)), \tag{17}$$

where we use the property $P^2 = P$. We let $x(t) = Pz(t) + x(t_0)$ and substitute it into equation (17). Then, we obtain the projected Newton flow for problem (1) as follows:

$$\left(P\nabla^2 f(x)P\right)\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = -Pg(x). \tag{18}$$

Although the projected Newton flow (18) mitigates the stiffness of the ODE such that we can adopt the explicit ODE method to integrate it on the infinite interval, there are two disadvantages yet. One is that the two-side projection $P\nabla^2 f(x)P$ may be not positive semi-definite. Consequently, it can not ensure that the objective function $f(x)$ is monotonically decreasing along the solution $x(t)$ of the ODE (18). The other is that the solution $x(t)$ of the ODE (18) may not satisfy the linear conservation law $Adx(t)/dt = 0$. In order to overcome these two disadvantages, we use the similar

regularization technique of solving the ill-posed problem [26,67] for the projected Newton flow (18) as follows:

$$\left(\sigma(x)I + P\nabla^2 f(x)P\right)\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = -Pg(x), \tag{19}$$

where the regularization parameter $\sigma(x)$ satisfies $\sigma(x) + \mu_{min}\left(P\nabla^2 f(x)P\right) \geq \sigma_{min} > 0$. Here, $\mu_{min}(B)$ represents the smallest eigenvalue of matrix B.

Remark 2 If we assume that $x(t)$ is the solution of the ODE (19), from the property $AP = 0$, we have

$$A\left(\sigma(x)I + P\nabla^2 f(x)P\right)\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = -APg(x) = 0.$$

Consequently, we obtain $A\sigma(x)dx(t)/dt = 0$. By integrating it, we obtain $Ax(t) = Ax(t_0) = b$. That is to say, the solution $x(t)$ of the ODE (19) satisfies the linear conservation law $Ax = b$.

Remark 3 From the property $P^2 = P$ and the ODE (19), we have

$$\left(\sigma(x)P + P\nabla^2 f(x)P\right)\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = -Pg(x). \tag{20}$$

By subtracting equation (20) from equation (19), we obtain

$$\sigma(x)P\frac{dx(t)}{dt} - \sigma(x)\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = 0.$$

Namely, when $x(t)$ is the solution of (19), it satisfies

$$P\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = \frac{dx(t)}{dt}. \tag{21}$$

Consequently, from equations (19), (21) and $\sigma(x) + \lambda_{min}\left(P\nabla^2 f(x)P\right) \geq \sigma_{min} > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{df(x(t))}{dt} &= (\nabla f(x))^T\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = (\nabla f(x))^T P\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = (Pg(x))^T\frac{dx(t)}{dt}\\ &= -(Pg(x))^T\left(\sigma(x)I + P^T\nabla^2 f(x)P\right)^{-1}(Pg(x)) \leq 0.\end{aligned}$$

That is to say, $f(x)$ is monotonically decreasing along the solution $x(t)$ of the ODE (19). Furthermore, the solution $x(t)$ converges to x^* when $f(x)$ is lower bounded and $\|P\nabla^2 f(x)P\| \leq M$ [27,34,57,66], where M is a positive constant and x^* is the stationary point of the regularized projection Newton flow (19). Thus, we can follow the trajectory $x(t)$ of the ODE (19) to obtain its stationary point x^*.

2.2 The regularization continuation method

The solution curve $x(t)$ of the ODE (19) may not be efficiently solved by the general ODE method such as backward differentiation formulas (BDFs, the subroutine ode15s.m of the MATLAB R2020a environment) [3,7,8,29]. Thus, we need to construct the particular method for this problem. We apply the first-order explicit Euler method [61] to the ODE (19), then we obtain the regularized projection Newton method:

$$\left(\sigma_k I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P\right) d_k = -Pg(x_k), \tag{22}$$

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k, \tag{23}$$

where α_k is the time step. When $\alpha_k = 1$, the regularized projection Newton method (22)-(23) equals the Levenberg-Marquardt method [33,36,40,50].

Since the time step α_k of the regularized projection Newton method (22)-(23) is restricted by the numerical stability [61]. That is to say, for the linear test equation $dx/dt = -\lambda x$, its time step α_k is restricted by the stable region $|1 - \alpha_k\lambda/(\sigma_k + \lambda)| \leq 1$. Therefore, the large time step can not be adopted in the steady-state phase. In order to avoid this disadvantage, similarly to the processing technique of the nonlinear equations [41,42,44] and the unconstrained optimization problem [43,45], we replace α_k with $\Delta t_k/(1+\Delta t_k)$ in equation (23) and let $\sigma_k = \sigma_0/\Delta t_k$ in equation (22). Then, we obtain the regularization continuation method:

$$B_k d_k = -Pg(x_k),\ s_k = \frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} d_k, \tag{24}$$

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + s_k, \tag{25}$$

where Δt_k is the time step and $B_k = \left((\sigma_0/\Delta t_k)I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P\right)$ or its quasi-Newton approximation.

Remark 4 The time step Δt_k of the regularization continuation method (24)-(25) is not restricted by the numerical stability. Therefore, the large time step Δt_k can be adopted in the steady-state phase such that the regularization continuation method (24)-(25) mimics the projected Newton method near the stationary point x^* and it has the fast convergence rate. The most of all, the new step $\alpha_k = \Delta t_k/(\Delta t_k + 1)$ is favourable to adopt the trust-region updating strategy to adjust the time step Δt_k such that the regularization continuation method (24)-(25) accurately follows the trajectory of the regularization flow (19) in the transient-state phase and achieves the fast convergence rate near its stationary point x^*.

When B_k is updated by the BFGS quasi-Newton formula [5,10,19,23,62] as follows

$$B_{k+1} = B_k + \frac{y_k y_k^T}{y_k^T s_k} - \frac{B_k s_k s_k^T B_k}{s_k^T B_k s_k},\ B_0 = I, \tag{26}$$

where $y_k = Pg(x_{k+1}) - Pg(x_k),\ s_k = x_{k+1} - x_k$, there is an invariance for the transformation matrix P and we state it as the following lemma 1.

Lemma 1 *Assume that B_k is updated by the BFGS quasi-Newton formula (26) and s_k is solved by equation (24), then we have $P(B_k - I) = B_k - I$ and $Ps_k = s_k$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$.*

Proof. We prove this property by induction. When $k = 0$, from $P^2 = P$, we have $P(B_0 - I) = 0 = B_0 - I$ and $Ps_0 = s_0$. We assume that $P(B_l - I) = B_l - I$ and $Ps_l = s_l$ when $k = l$. Then, when $k = l+1$, from $P^2 = P$, $Py_l = P(Pg(x_{l+1}) - Pg(x_l)) = y_l$ and equation (26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} PB_{l+1} &= PB_l + \frac{Py_l y_l^T}{y_l^T s_l} - \frac{PB_l s_l s_l^T B_l}{s_l^T B_l s_l} \\ &= P + B_l - I + \frac{y_l y_l^T}{y_l^T s_l} - \frac{(P + B_l - I) s_l s_l^T B_l}{s_l^T B_l s_l} \\ &= P - I + B_l + \frac{y_l y_l^T}{y_l^T s_l} - \frac{B_l s_l^T s_l B_l}{s_l^T B_l s_l} = P - I + B_{l+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Consequently, we obtain $P(B_{l+1} - I) = B_{l+1} - I$.

From equation (24) and equation (27), we have

$$PB_{l+1}d_{l+1} = P(B_{l+1}d_{l+1}) = -P(Pg(x_{l+1})) = -Pg(x_{l+1}) = B_{l+1}d_{l+1}, \tag{28}$$

$$PB_{l+1}d_{l+1} = (PB_{l+1})d_{l+1} = (P + B_{l+1} - I)d_{l+1}. \tag{29}$$

Consequently, from equations (28)-(29), we have $Pd_{l+1} = d_{l+1}$. By combining it with equation (24), we obtain $Ps_{l+1} = s_{l+1}$. Therefore, we know that the conclusion is true by induction. □

Remark 5 From equations (24)-(25), Lemma 1 and the property $AP = 0$, it is not difficult to verify $As_k = 0$. Thus, if the initial point x_0 is feasible, i.e. $Ax_0 = b$, x_k also satisfies the linear constraint $Ax_k = b$. That is to say, the regularization continuation method (24)-(25) satisfies the linear conservation law such that it does not need to compute the correction step for preserving the linear feasibility other than the previous continuation method and the quasi-Newton formula [40] for the linearly constrained optimization problem (1).

2.3 The adaptive step control

Another issue is how to adaptively adjust the time step Δt_k at every iteration. We borrow the adjustment technique of the trust-region radius from the trust-region method due to its robustness and its fast convergence rate [14,72]. According to the linear conservation law of the regularization continuation method (24)-(25), x_{k+1} will preserve the feasibility when $Ax_k = b$. That is to say, x_{k+1} satisfies $Ax_{k+1} = b$. Therefore, we use the objective function $f(x)$ instead of the nonsmooth penalty function $f(x) + \sigma\|Ax - b\|$ as the merit function. Similarly to the stepping-time scheme of the ODE method for the unconstrained optimization problem [28,36,40,43], we also

need to construct a local approximation model of $f(x)$ around x_k. Here, we adopt the following quadratic function as its approximation model:

$$q_k(s) = f(x_k) + s^T g_k + \frac{1}{2} s^T B_k s, \tag{30}$$

where $g_k = \nabla f(x_k)$ and $B_k = (\sigma_0/\Delta t_k)I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P$ or its quasi-Newton approximation.

In order to save the computational time, from the regularization continuation method (24)-(25), we simplify the quadratic model $q_k(s_k) - q(0)$ as follows:

$$m_k(s_k) = g_k^T s_k - \frac{0.5\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} g_k^T s_k = \frac{1+0.5\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} g_k^T s_k \approx q_k(s_k) - q_k(0). \tag{31}$$

We enlarge or reduce the time step Δt_k at every iteration according to the following ratio:

$$\rho_k = \frac{f(x_k) - f(x_k + s_k)}{m_k(0) - m_k(s_k)}. \tag{32}$$

A particular adjustment strategy is given as follows:

$$\Delta t_{k+1} = \begin{cases} \gamma_1 \Delta t_k, & \text{if } 0 \le |1-\rho_k| \le \eta_1, \\ \Delta t_k, & \text{else if } \eta_1 < |1-\rho_k| < \eta_2, \\ \gamma_2 \Delta t_k, & \text{others}, \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

where the constants are selected as $\eta_1 = 0.25,\ \gamma_1 = 2,\ \eta_2 = 0.75,\ \gamma_2 = 0.5$ according to our numerical experiments. We accept the trial step s_k and let $x_{k+1} = x_k + s_k$, when $\rho_k \ge \eta_a$ and the approximation model $m_k(0) - m_k(s_k)$ satisfies the Armijo sufficient descent condition:

$$m_k(0) - m_k(s_k) \ge \eta_m \|s_k\| \|p_{g_k}\|, \tag{34}$$

where η_a and η_m are the small positive constants such as $\eta_a = \eta_m = 1.0 \times 10^{-6}$. Otherwise, we discard it and let $x_{k+1} = x_k$.

Remark 6 This new time-stepping scheme based on the trust-region updating strategy has some advantages, in comparison to the traditional line search strategy [35]. If we use the line search strategy and the damped projected Newton method (22)-(23) to solve the projected Newton flow (19), in order to achieve the fast convergence rate in the steady-state phase, the time step α_k of the damped projected Newton method is tried from 1 and reduced by half with many times at every iteration. Since the linear model $f(x_k) + g_k^T s_k$ may not approximate $f(x_k + s_k)$ well in the transient-state phase, the time step α_k will be small. Consequently, the line search strategy consumes the unnecessary trial steps in the transient-state phase. However, the selection scheme of the time step based on the trust-region strategy (32)-(33) can overcome this shortcoming.

2.4 The switching preconditioned technique

For the large-scale problem, the numerical evaluation of the two-sided projection $P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P$ of the Lagrangian Hessian $\nabla^2_{xx}L(x,\lambda)$ consumes much time. In order to overcome this shortcoming, in the well-posed phase, we use the limited-memory BFGS quasi-Newton formula (see [5,19,23,47,62] or pp. 222-230, [53]) to approximate the regularized two-sided projection $\left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k}I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P\right)$ of the regularization continuation method (24)-(25).

Recently, Ullah, Sabi'u and Shah [68] give an efficient L-BFGS updating formula for the system of monotone nonlinear equations. Furthermore, the reference [43] also tests its efficiency for some unconstrained optimization problems. Therefore, we adopt the L-BFGS updating formula to approximate $\left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k}I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P\right)$ in the well-posed phase via slightly revising it as

$$B_{k+1} = \begin{cases} I - \frac{s_k s_k^T}{s_k^T s_k} + \frac{y_k y_k^T}{y_k^T y_k}, \text{ if } \left|s_k^T y_k\right| > \theta\|s_k\|^2, \\ I, \text{ otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

where $s_k = x_{k+1} - x_k$, $y_k = P\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - P\nabla f(x_k)$ and θ is a small positive constant such as $\theta = 10^{-6}$.

By using the Sherman-Morrison-Woodburg formula (p. 17, [65]), from equation (35), when $\left|y_k^T s_k\right| > \theta\|s_k\|^2$, we obtain the inverse of B_{k+1} as follows:

$$B_{k+1}^{-1} = I - \frac{y_k s_k^T + s_k y_k^T}{y_k^T s_k} + 2\frac{y_k^T y_k}{(y_k^T s_k)^2} s_k s_k^T. \tag{36}$$

The initial matrix B_0 can be simply selected as an identity matrix. From equation (36), it is not difficult to verify

$$B_{k+1}s_k = \frac{y_k^T s_k}{y_k^T y_k} y_k.$$

That is to say, B_{k+1} satisfies the scaling quasi-Newton property.

The L-BFGS updating formula (35) has some nice properties such as the symmetric positive definite property and the positive lower bound of its eigenvalues.

Lemma 2 *When $\left|s_k^T y_k\right| > \theta\|s_k\|^2$, B_{k+1} is symmetric positive definite and its eigenvalues are greater than $\left(\theta^2\|s_k\|^2\right)/\left(2\|y_k\|^2\right)$ and less than 2. Consequently, when $\left|s_k^T y_k\right| > \theta\|s_k\|^2$, the eigenvalues of B_{k+1}^{-1} are greater than $1/2$ and less than $\frac{2\|y_k\|^2}{\theta^2\|s_k\|^2}$.*

Proof. (i) For any nonzero vector $z \in \Re^n$, from equation (35), we have

$$z^T B_{k+1} z = \|z\|^2 - \frac{\left(z^T s_k\right)^2}{\|s_k\|^2} + \frac{\left(z^T y_k\right)^2}{\|y_k\|^2} \geq \frac{\left(z^T y_k\right)^2}{\|y_k\|^2} \geq 0. \tag{37}$$

In the first inequality of equation (37), we use the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality $\|z^T s_k\| \leq \|z\|\|s_k\|$ and its equality holds if only if $z = ts_k$. Therefore, B_{k+1} is symmetric positive semi-definite. When $z = ts_k$, since $s_k^T y_k \neq 0$, from equation (37), we have $z^T B_{k+1} z = t^2 \left(s_k^T y_k\right)^2 / \|y_k\|^2 > 0$. Consequently, B_{k+1} is symmetric positive definite when $s_k^T y_k \neq 0$.

(ii) It is not difficult to know that there exist at least $(n-2)$ linearly independent vectors $z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{n-2}$ to satisfy $s_k^T z_i = 0, y_k^T z_i = 0\,(i = 1:(n-2))$. That is to say, matrix B_{k+1} defined by equation (35) has at least $(n-2)$ linearly independent eigenvectors associated with eigenvalue 1. We denote the other two eigenvalues of B_{k+1} as $\mu_i^{k+1}\,(i = 1:2)$ and set $\mathrm{tr}(C) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_{ii}, C \in \Re^{n\times n}$. Then, we have $\mathrm{tr}(B_{k+1}) = \mu_1^{k+1} + \mu_2^{k+1} + (n-2)$. By substituting it into equation (35), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1^{k+1} + \mu_2^{k+1} &= \mathrm{tr}(B_{k+1}) - (n-2)\\ &= \mathrm{tr}(I) - \mathrm{tr}\left(\frac{s_k s_k^T}{s_k^T s_k}\right) + \mathrm{tr}\left(\frac{y_k y_k^T}{y_k^T y_k}\right) - (n-2) = 2,\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where we use the property $\mathrm{tr}\left(AB^T\right) = \mathrm{tr}\left(B^T A\right)$ of matrices $A, B \in \Re^{m\times n}$. Since matrix B_{k+1} is symmetric positive definite, we know that its eigenvalues are greater than 0, namely $\mu_i^{k+1} > 0\,(i = 1, 2)$. By substituting it into equation (38), we obtain

$$0 < \mu_i^{k+1} < \mu_1^{k+1} + \mu_2^{k+1} = 2,\ i = 1, 2. \tag{39}$$

Furthermore, the symmetric matrix B_{k+1} has a multiple eigenvalue 1 associated with $(n-2)$ linearly independent eigenvectors. Therefore, by combining it with equation (39), we know that the eigenvalues of matrix B_{k+1} are less than 2.

We denote $\mu_i^{k+1}\,(i = 1:n)$ as the eigenvalues of B_{k+1}. Then, we have $\mu_i^{k+1} = 1\,(i = 3:n)$. By using the property $\det(B_{k+1}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mu_i^{k+1} = \mu_1^{k+1}\mu_2^{k+1}$, from equation (35), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1^{k+1}\mu_2^{k+1} = \det(B_{k+1}) &= \det\left(\left(I + \frac{y_k y_k^T}{y_k^T y_k}\right)\left(I - \left(I + \frac{y_k y_k^T}{y_k^T y_k}\right)^{-1} s_k \frac{s_k^T}{s_k^T s_k}\right)\right)\\ &= \det\left(I + \frac{y_k y_k^T}{y_k^T y_k}\right)\det\left(I - \left(I + \frac{y_k y_k^T}{y_k^T y_k}\right)^{-1} s_k \frac{s_k^T}{s_k^T s_k}\right)\\ &= 2\left(1 - \frac{1}{\|s_k\|^2} s_k^T \left(I + \frac{y_k y_k^T}{y_k^T y_k}\right)^{-1} s_k\right)\\ &= 2\left(1 - \frac{1}{\|s_k\|^2} s_k^T \left(I - \frac{y_k y_k^T}{2y_k^T y_k}\right) s_k\right) = \frac{\left(s_k^T y_k\right)^2}{\left(y_k^T y_k\right)\left(s_k^T s_k\right)}.\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

From equation (39), we know $0 < \mu_i^k < 2\,(i = 1, 2)$. By substituting it into equation (40), we obtain

$$\mu_i^{k+1} > \frac{1}{2}\frac{\left(s_k^T y_k\right)^2}{\|s_k\|^2\|y_k\|^2},\ i = 1, 2. \tag{41}$$

By combining it with $\mu_i^{k+1} = 1\,(i = 3:n)$, we have

$$\mu_i^{k+1} \geq \min\left\{1,\ \frac{1}{2}\frac{\left(s_k^T y_k\right)^2}{\|s_k\|^2\|y_k\|^2}\right\} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\left(s_k^T y_k\right)^2}{\|s_k\|^2\|y_k\|^2} \geq \frac{1}{2}\theta^2\frac{\|s_k\|^2}{\|y_k\|^2}, \tag{42}$$

where we use the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality $|s_k^T y_k| \leq \|s_k\|\|y_k\|$.

Since the matrix B_{k+1} is symmetric positive definite when $\left|s_k^T y_k\right| > \theta\|s_k\|^2$, the inverse of B_{k+1} exists. Furthermore, the eigenvalues of B_{k+1}^{-1} equal $1/\mu_i^{k+1}\,(i = 1:n)$. By combining it with equations (39) and (42), we know that the eigenvalues of B_{k+1}^{-1} are greater than 1/2 and less than $\left(2\|y_k\|^2\right)/\left(\theta^2\|s_k\|^2\right)$ when $\left|s_k^T y_k\right| > \theta\|s_k\|^2$. □

According to our numerical experiments [43], the L-BFGS updating formula (35) works well for most problems and the objective function decreases very fast in the well-posed phase. However, for the ill-posed problems, the L-BFGS updating formula (35) will approach the stationary solution x^* very slow in the ill-posed phase. Furthermore, it fails to get close to the stationary solution x^* sometimes.

In order to improve the robustness of the regularization continuation method (24)-(25), we adopt the inverse B_{k+1}^{-1} of the regularized two-side projection of the Lagrangian Hessian $\nabla_{xx}^2 L(x,\lambda)$ as the pre-conditioner in the ill-posed phase, where B_{k+1} is defined by

$$B_{k+1} = \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_{k+1}} I + P\nabla^2 f(x_{k+1})P. \tag{43}$$

Now, the problem is how to automatically identify the ill-posed phase and switch to the inverse of the regularized two-sided projection from the L-BFGS updating formula (35). Here, we adopt the simple switching criterion. Namely, we regard that the regularization continuation method (24)-(25) is in the ill-posed phase once there exists the time step $\Delta t_K \leq 10^{-3}$.

In the ill-posed phase, the computational time of the two-sided projection of the Lagrangian Hessian $\nabla_{xx}^2 L(x,\lambda)$ is heavy if we update the two-sided projection $P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P$ at every iteration. In order to save its computational time, we set $B_{k+1} = B_k$ when $m_k(0) - m_k(s_k)$ approximates $f(x_k) - f(x_k + s_k)$ well, where the approximation model $m_k(s_k)$ is defined by equation (31). Otherwise, we update $B_{k+1} = \left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_{k+1}} I + P\nabla^2 f(x_{k+1})P\right)$ in the ill-posed phase. In the ill-posed phase, a practice updating strategy is give by

$$B_{k+1} = \begin{cases} B_k, \text{ if } |1-\rho_k| \leq \eta_1, \\ \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_{k+1}} I + P\nabla^2 f(x_{k+1})P, \text{ otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{44}$$

where ρ_k is defined by equations (31)-(32) and $\eta_1 = 0.25$.

For a real-world problem, the analytical Hessian matrix $\nabla^2 f(x_k)$ may not be offered. Thus, in practice, we replace the two-sided projection $P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P$ with its difference approximation as follows:

$$P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P \approx \left[\frac{Pg(x_k + \varepsilon Pe_1) - Pg(x_k)}{\varepsilon}, \ldots, \frac{Pg(x_k + \varepsilon Pe_n) - Pg(x_k)}{\varepsilon}\right], \tag{45}$$

where the elements of e_i equal 0 except for the i-th element equaling 1, and the parameter ε can be selected as 10^{-6} according to our numerical experiments.

2.5 The treatment of rank-deficient problems and infeasible initial points

For a real-world problem, matrix A may be deficient-rank. We assume that the rank of A is r and we use the QR decomposition (pp.276-278, [24]) to factor A^T into a product of an orthogonal matrix $Q \in \Re^{n\times n}$ and an upper triangular matrix $R \in \Re^{n\times m}$ as follows:

$$A^T E = QR = \left[Q_1 | Q_2\right] \begin{bmatrix} R_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{46}$$

where $E \in \Re^{m\times m}$ is a permutation matrix, $R_1 = R(1:r, 1:m)$ is an upper triangular matrix and its diagonal elements are non-zero, and $Q_1 = Q(1:n, 1:r)$, $Q_2 = Q(1:n, (r+1):n)$ satisfy $Q_1^T Q_1 = I$, $Q_2^T Q_2 = I$ and $Q_1^T Q_2 = 0$. Then, we reduce the linear constraint $Ax = b$ to

$$Q_1^T x = b_r, \tag{47}$$

where $b_r = \left(R_1 R_1^T\right)^{-1} \left(R_1 \left(E^T b\right)\right)$.

From equations (10) and (47), we simplify the projection matrix P as

$$P = I - Q_1 Q_1^T = Q_2 Q_2^T. \tag{48}$$

In practical computation, we adopt the different formulas of the projection matrix P according to $r \le n/2$ or $r > n/2$. Thus, we give the computational formula of the projected gradient Pg_k as follows:

$$Pg_k = \begin{cases} g_k - Q_1 \left(Q_1^T g_k\right), \text{ if } r \le \frac{1}{2}n, \\ Q_2 \left(Q_2^T g_k\right), \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{49}$$

where r is the number of columns of Q_1, i.e. the rank of A.

For a real-world optimization problem (1), we probably meet the infeasible initial point x_0. In other words, the initial point may not satisfy the constraint $Ax = b$. We handle this problem by solving the following projection problem:

$$\min_{x\in\Re^n} \|x - x_0\|^2 \text{ subject to } Q_1^T x = b_r, \tag{50}$$

where $b_r = \left(R_1 R_1^T\right)^{-1} \left(R_1 \left(E^T b\right)\right)$. By using the Lagrangian multiplier method to solve problem (50), we obtain the initial feasible point x_0^F of problem (1) as follows:

$$x_0^F = x_0 - Q_1 \left(Q_1^T x_0 - b_r\right). \tag{51}$$

For convenience, we set $x_0 = x_0^F$ in line 4 of Algorithm 1.

According to the above discussions, we give the detailed implementation of the regularization continuation method with the trust-region updating strategy for the linearly constrained optimization problem (1) in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 The regularization continuation method with the trust-region updating strategy for linearly constrained optimization problems (Rcmtr)

Input: the objective function $f:\ \Re^n \to \Re$, the linear constraint $Ax = b$, $A \in \Re^{m\times n}$, $b \in \Re^m$, the initial point x_0 (optional), the tolerance error ε (optional).

Output: the optimal approximation solution x^*.

If x_0 or ε is not provided, we set $x_0 = \text{ones}(n,1)$ or $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$.

Initialize the parameters: $\eta_a = 10^{-6}$, $\eta_m = 10^{-10}$, $\eta_1 = 0.25$, $\gamma_1 = 2$, $\eta_2 = 0.75$, $\gamma_2 = 0.5$, $\theta = 10^{-6}$, max_itc = 300. Set $\sigma_0 = 10^{-4}$, $\Delta t_0 = 10^{-2}$, flag_illposed_phase = 0, flag_success_trialstep = 1, $s_{-1} = 0$, $y_{-1} = 0$, $\rho_{-1} = 0$, $B_0 = I$, $H_0 = I$, itc = 0.

Factorize matrix A^T into $A^T E = Q_1 R_1$ with the QR decomposition (46). Solve the linear system $\left(R_1 R_1^T\right) b_r = R_1\left(E^T b\right)$ to obtain b_r.

Compute

$$x_0 \leftarrow x_0 - Q_1\left(Q_1^T x_0 - b_r\right),$$

such that x_0 satisfies the linear constraint $Ax_0 = b$.

Set $k = 0$. Evaluate $f_0 = f(x_0)$ and $g_0 = \nabla f(x_0)$.

Compute the projected gradient $p_{g_0} = Pg_0$ according to the formula (49).

while $\left(\left(\|p_{g_k}\| > \varepsilon\right)$ and $(\text{itc} < \text{max_itc})\right)$ **do**

  itc = itc + 1;

  if $\Delta t_k < 10^{-3}$ **then**

    Set flag_illposed_phase = 1.

  end if

  if (flag_illposed_phase == 0) **then**

    if (flag_success_trialstep == 1) **then**

      if $\left(|s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1}| > \theta\|s_{k-1}\|^2\right)$ **then**

        $d_k = -\left(p_{g_k} - \frac{y_{k-1}(s_{k-1}^T p_{g_k}) + s_{k-1}(y_{k-1}^T p_{g_k})}{y_{k-1}^T s_{k-1}} + 2\frac{\|y_{k-1}\|^2 (s_{k-1}^T p_{g_k})}{(y_{k-1}^T s_{k-1})^2} s_{k-1}\right)$.

      else

        $d_k = -p_{g_k}$.

      end if

    end if

  else

    if (flag_success_trialstep == 0) **then**

      Set $B_k = (\sigma_0/\Delta t_k)I + H_k$ and factorize B_k into $B_k = Q_k R_k$ with the QR decomposition.

    else if $((|\rho_{k-1} - 1| > 0.25)$ **then**

      Evaluate $H_k = P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P$ from equation (45).

      Set $B_k = (\sigma_0/\Delta t_k)I + H_k$ and factorize B_k into $B_k = Q_k R_k$ with the QR decomposition.

    else

      $Q_k = Q_{k-1}$, $R_k = R_{k-1}$.

    end if

    Solve the linear system $R_k d_k = -Q_k^T p_{g_k}$ to obtain d_k.

  end if

  Set $s_k = \frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} d_k$ and $x_{k+1} = x_k + s_k$.

  Evaluate $f_{k+1} = f(x_{k+1})$ and compute the ratio ρ_k from equations (31)-(32).

  if ($\rho_k \geq \eta_a$ and s_k satisfies the sufficient descent condition (34)) **then**

    Set flag_success_trialstep = 1 and evaluate $g_{k+1} = \nabla f(x_{k+1})$.

    Compute $p_{g_{k+1}} = Pg_{k+1}$ according to the formula (49). Set $y_k = p_{g_{k+1}} - p_{g_k}$.

  else

    Set flag_success_trialstep = 0 and $x_{k+1} = x_k$, $f_{k+1} = f_k$, $p_{g_{k+1}} = p_{g_k}$, $g_{k+1} = g_k$, $H_{k+1} = H_k$, $d_{k+1} = d_k$.

  end if

  Adjust the time step Δt_{k+1} according to the trust-region updating strategy (33).

  Set $k \leftarrow k+1$.

end while

3 Algorithm Analysis

In this section, we analyze the global convergence of the regularization continuation method (24)-(25) with the trust-region updating strategy and the switching preconditioned technique for the linearly constrained optimization problem (i.e. Algorithm 1). Firstly, we give a lower-bounded estimation of $m_k(0) - m_k(s_k)$ $(k = 1, 2, \ldots)$. This result is similar to that of the trust-region method for the unconstrained optimization problem [56]. For simplicity, we assume that the rank of matrix A is full and f satisfies Assumption 1.

Assumption 1 *Assume that $f(\cdot)$ is twice continuously differential and there exists a positive constant M such that*

$$\left\|\nabla^2 f(x)\right\| \leq M, \tag{52}$$

holds for all $x \in S_f$, where $S_f = \{x : Ax = b\}$.

By combining the property $\|P\| = 1$ of the projection matrix P, from the assumption (52), we obtain

$$\left\|P\nabla^2 f(x)P\right\| \leq \|P\| \left\|\nabla^2 f(x)\right\| \|P\| = \left\|\nabla^2 f(x)\right\| \leq M. \tag{53}$$

According to the property of the matrix norm, we know that the absolute eigenvalue of $P\nabla^2 f(x)P$ is less than M. We denote $\mu(C)$ as the eigenvalue of matrix C. Then, we know that the eigenvalue of $((\sigma_0/\Delta t)I + P\nabla^2 f(x)P)$ is $\sigma_0/\Delta t + \mu(P\nabla^2 f(x)P)$. Consequently, from equation (53), we known that

$$\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t} I + P\nabla^2 f(x)P \succ 0,\ x \in S_f,\ \text{when } \Delta t < \frac{\sigma_0}{M}. \tag{54}$$

Lemma 3 *Assume that the approximation model $m_k(s)$ is defined by equation (31) and s_k is computed by the regularization continuation method (24)-(25), where matrices $B_k\,(k = 1, 2, \ldots)$ are updated by the L-BFGS formula (35) in the well-posed phase. Then, we have*

$$m_k(0) - m_k(s_k) \geq \frac{\Delta t_k}{4(1+\Delta t_k)} \left\|p_{g_k}\right\|^2 \geq c_w \|p_{g_k}\| \|s_k\|, \tag{55}$$

where c_m is a positive constant, $p_{g_k} = Pg_k = P\nabla f(x_k)$ and the projection matrix P is defined by equation (10).

Proof. From Lemma 1, the L-BFGS formula (35) and the regularization continuation method (24)-(25), we know that $Ps_k = s_k\,(k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots)$. Furthermore, from the L-BFGS formula and Lemma 2, we know that the eigenvalues of B_k^{-1} are greater than 1/2. By combining them into equation (31) and using the symmetric Shur decomposition (p. 440, [24]) of B_k^{-1}, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m_k(0) - m_k(s_k) &= -\frac{1+0.5\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} g_k^T s_k = -\frac{1+0.5\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} g_k^T (Ps_k) = -\frac{1+0.5\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} p_{g_k}^T s_k \\ &= \frac{1+0.5\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} \frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} p_{g_k}^T B_k^{-1} p_{g_k} \geq \frac{1+0.5\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} \frac{\Delta t_k}{2(1+\Delta t_k)} \|p_{g_k}\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

By using the property $(1+0.5\Delta t_k)/(1+\Delta t_k) \geq (0.5+0.5\Delta t_k)/(1+\Delta t_k) = 0.5$, from equation (56), we have

$$m_k(0) - m_k(s_k) \geq \frac{\Delta t_k}{4(1+\Delta t_k)} \|p_{g_k}\|^2. \tag{57}$$

From equation (53), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_{k-1}\| &= \|Pg(x_{k-1}) - Pg(x_{k-2})\| = \left\| \int_0^1 P\nabla^2 f(x_{k-2} + ts_{k-1}) s_{k-1} dt \right\| \\ &= \left\| \int_0^1 P\nabla^2 f(x_{k-2} + ts_{k-1}) P s_{k-1} dt \right\| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \left\| P\nabla^2 f(x_{k-2} + ts_{k-1}) P \right\| \|s_{k-1}\| dt \leq M \|s_{k-1}\|. \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

From Lemma 2, we know that the eigenvalues of B_k are greater than $\frac{\theta^2 \|s_{k-1}\|^2}{2\|y_{k-1}\|^2}$. By combining it with inequality (58), we know that the eigenvalues of B_k are greater than $\theta^2/(2M^2)$. Furthermore, from the symmetric Shur decomposition (p. 440, [24]), we know that there exists an orthogonal matrix U_k such that $B_k = U_k^T \operatorname{diag}\left(\mu_1^k, \ldots, \mu_n^k\right) U_k$, where $\mu_1^k \geq \mu_2^k \geq \cdots \geq \mu_n^k$ are the eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix B_k. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_k s_k\|^2 &= \left\| (U_k B_k U_k^T) U_k s_k \right\|^2 = (U_k s_k)^T \operatorname{diag}\left((\mu_1^k)^2, \ldots, (\mu_n^k)^2 \right) (U_k s_k) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{\theta^2}{2M^2} \right)^2 s_k^T U_k^T U_k s_k = \left(\frac{\theta^2}{2M^2} \right)^2 \|s_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\|B_k s_k\| \geq \frac{\theta^2}{2M^2} \|s_k\|. \tag{59}$$

By combining it with equations (24) and (57), we obtain

$$m_k(0) - m_k(s_k) \geq \frac{\Delta t_k}{4(1+\Delta t_k)} \|p_{g_k}\|^2 = \frac{1}{4} \|p_{g_k}\| \|B_k s_k\| \geq \frac{\theta^2}{8M^2} \|p_{g_k}\| \|s_k\|. \tag{60}$$

We set $c_w = \theta^2/(8M^2)$. Then, from equation (60), we obtain the result (55). □

Lemma 4 *Assume that the approximation model $m_k(s)$ is defined by equation (31) and s_k is computed by the regularization continuation method (24)-(25), where $B_k = \left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k) P \right)$ and $\Delta t_k \leq \frac{\sigma_0}{2M}$ in the ill-posed phase. Then, we have*

$$m_k(0) - m_k(s_k) \geq \frac{\Delta t_k}{4(1+\Delta t_k)} \left\| p_{g_k} \right\|^2 \geq c_b \|p_{g_k}\| \|s_k\|, \tag{61}$$

where c_b is a positive constant, $p_{g_k} = Pg_k = P\nabla f(x_k)$ and the projection matrix P is defined by equation (10).

Proof. From equations (24)-(25) and $B_k = \left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P\right)$, we have

$$P\left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P\right) s_k = -\frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} P^2 g_k. \tag{62}$$

By substituting $P^2 = P$ into equation (62), we obtain $Ps_k = s_k$. Consequently, by combining it with the property $AP = 0$, we obtain $As_k = 0$, i.e. $x_{k+1} \in S_f$ if $x_k \in S_f$. By induction, we obtain $x_k \in S_f\,(k = 1, 2, \ldots)$ when $x_0 \in S_f$. Therefore, according to the assumption $\Delta t_k \le \frac{\sigma_0}{2M}$, from equation (54), we know

$$\left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P\right) \succ 0. \tag{63}$$

From equations (24), (63) and $Ps_k = s_k$, by using the symmetric Shur decomposition (p. 440, [24]), we have

$$\begin{aligned} -s_k^T g_k &= -(Ps_k)^T g_k = -s_k^T (Pg_k) = \frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} p_{g_k}^T \left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P\right)^{-1} p_{g_k} \\ &\ge \frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} \frac{1}{\sigma_0/\Delta t_k + \|P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P\|} \|p_{g_k}\|^2 \ge \frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} \frac{1}{\sigma_0/\Delta t_k + M} \|p_{g_k}\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

Similarly to the estimation of equation (59), from equation (24) and the symmetric Shur decomposition (p. 440, [24]), we have

$$\|B_k s_k\| = \left\| \left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P\right) s_k \right\| \ge \left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} - M\right) \|s_k\|, \tag{65}$$

where we use the property that the absolute eigenvalues of $P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P$ are less than M. From equations (24) and (64)-(65), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -s_k^T g_k &\ge \frac{\|B_k s_k\| \|p_{g_k}\|}{\sigma_0/\Delta t_k + M} \ge \frac{\sigma_0/\Delta t_k - M}{\sigma_0/\Delta t_k + M} \|p_{g_k}\| \|s_k\| \\ &\ge \frac{2M - M}{2M + M} \|p_{g_k}\| \|s_k\| = \frac{1}{3} \|p_{g_k}\| \|s_k\|, \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

where we use the assumption $\Delta t_k \le \sigma_0/(2M)$ and the monotonically increasing property of $\alpha(t) = (t - M)/(t + M)$ when $t > M$.

From the approximation model (31) and the estimation (66), we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_k(0) - m_k(s_k) &= -\frac{1 + 0.5\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} g_k^T s_k \ge \frac{1}{3} \frac{1 + 0.5\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} \|p_{g_k}\| \|s_k\| \\ &= \frac{1}{3} \frac{0.5 + 0.5(1+\Delta t_k)}{1+\Delta t_k} \|p_{g_k}\| \|s_k\| \ge \frac{1}{6} \|p_{g_k}\| \|s_k\|, \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

where we use the property $0.5 + 0.5(1 + \Delta t_k) \ge 0.5(1 + \Delta t_k)$. We set $c_b = 1/6$. Then, from equation (67), we obtain the estimation (61). □

In order to prove that p_{g_k} converges to zero when k tends to infinity, we need to estimate the lower bound of time steps $\Delta t_k\,(k = 1, 2, \ldots)$.

Lemma 5 *Assume that f satisfies Assumption 1 and the sequence $\{x_k\}$ is generated by Algorithm 1. Then, there exists a positive constant $\delta_{\Delta t}$ such that*

$$\Delta t_k \geq \gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t} \tag{68}$$

holds for all $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, where Δt_k is adaptively adjusted by the trust-region updating strategy (31)-(33).

Proof. From the first-order Taylor expansion, we have

$$f(x_k + s_k) = f(x_k) + \int_0^1 s_k^T g(x_k + t s_k) dt. \tag{69}$$

Thus, from equations (31)-(32), (69), the Armijo sufficient descent condition (34) and the assumption (52), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\rho_k - 1| &= \left| \frac{(f(x_k) - f(x_k + s_k)) - (m_k(0) - m_k(s_k))}{m_k(0) - m_k(s_k)} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\left| \int_0^1 s_k^T (g(x_k + t s_k) - g(x_k)) dt \right|}{m_k(0) - m_k(s_k)} + \frac{0.5 \Delta t_k}{1 + 0.5 \Delta t_k} \\ &\leq \frac{\int_0^1 \|s_k\| \|g(x_k + t s_k) - g(x_k)\| dt}{m_k(0) - m_k(s_k)} + \frac{0.5 \Delta t_k}{1 + 0.5 \Delta t_k} \\ &\leq \frac{0.5 M \|s_k\|^2}{m_k(0) - m_k(s_k)} + \frac{0.5 \Delta t_k}{1 + 0.5 \Delta t_k}. \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

From Lemma 3 and Lemma 4, we know that there exists a constant η_m such as $\eta_m = \min\{c_w, c_b\}$ such that the approximation model $m_k(0) - m_k(s_k)$ satisfies the Armijo sufficient descent condition (34) when $\Delta t_k \leq 1/(2M)$ and $f(\cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 1. By substituting the sufficient descent condition (34) into equation (70), we obtain

$$|\rho_k - 1| \leq \frac{0.5M}{\eta_m} \frac{\|s_k\|}{\|p_{g_k}\|} + \frac{0.5 \Delta t_k}{1 + 0.5 \Delta t_k}. \tag{71}$$

When B_k is updated by the L-BFGS formula (35) in the well-posed phase, from Lemma 2, we know that the eigenvalues of B_k^{-1} are less than $\max\left\{1, \frac{2\|y_{k-1}\|^2}{\theta^2 \|s_{k-1}\|^2}\right\}$. By combining it with equations (35) and (53), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|s_k\| &= \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \left\| B_k^{-1} p_{g_k} \right\| \leq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \max\left\{1, \frac{2\|y_{k-1}\|^2}{\theta^2 \|s_{k-1}\|^2}\right\} \|p_{g_k}\| \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \max\left\{1, \frac{2\|Pg(x_{k-1} + s_{k-1}) - Pg(x_{k-1})\|^2}{\theta^2 \|s_{k-1}\|^2}\right\} \|p_{g_k}\| \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \max\left\{1, \frac{2M^2}{\theta^2}\right\} \|p_{g_k}\| = \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} L_w \|p_{g_k}\|, \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

where $L_w \triangleq \max\left\{1,\ 2M^2/\theta^2\right\}$.

When $B_k = \left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P\right)$ and $\Delta t_k \leq \sigma_0/(2M)$, from equations (24) and (53), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|s_k\| &= \frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k}\left\|B_k^{-1} p_{g_k}\right\| = \frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k}\left\|\left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + P\nabla^2 f(x_k)P\right)^{-1} p_{g_k}\right\| \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k}\frac{1}{\sigma_0/\Delta t_k - M}\|p_{g_k}\| \leq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k}\frac{1}{M}\|p_{g_k}\|. \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Thus, when B_k are updated by the formula (44) and $\Delta t_k \leq \sigma_0/(2M)$ in the ill-posed phase, from equation (73), we have

$$\|s_k\| \leq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k}\frac{1}{M}\|p_{g_k}\|. \tag{74}$$

We set $L_u \triangleq \max\{L_w,\ 1/M\}$. By substituting equations (72) and (74) into equation (71), when $\Delta t_k \leq \sigma_0/(2M)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|\rho_k - 1| &\leq \frac{0.5ML_u}{\eta_m}\frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} + \frac{0.5\Delta t_k}{1+0.5\Delta t_k} \\ &\leq \frac{0.5ML_u}{\eta_m}\frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k} + \frac{0.5\Delta t_k}{0.5+0.5\Delta t_k} \leq \frac{0.5ML_u+\eta_m}{\eta_m}\frac{\Delta t_k}{1+\Delta t_k}. \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

We set

$$\delta_{\Delta t} \triangleq \min\left\{\frac{\eta_1\eta_m}{0.5ML_u+\eta_m},\ \frac{\sigma_0}{2M},\ \Delta t_0\right\}. \tag{76}$$

Then, from equations (75)-(76), when $\Delta t_k \leq \delta_{\Delta t}$, it is not difficult to verify

$$|\rho_k - 1| \leq \eta_1. \tag{77}$$

We assume that K is the first index such that $\Delta t_K \leq \delta_{\Delta t}$ where $\delta_{\Delta t}$ is defined by equation (76). Then, from equations (76)-(77), we know that $|\rho_K - 1| \leq \eta_1$. According to the time step adjustment formula (33), $x_K + s_K$ will be accepted and the time step Δt_{K+1} will be enlarged. Consequently, $\Delta t_k \geq \gamma_2\delta_{\Delta t}$ holds for all $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. □

By using the result of Lemma 5, we prove the global convergence of Algorithm 1 for the linearly constrained optimization problem (1) in Theorem 1.

Theorem 1 *Assume that f satisfies Assumption 1 and $f(x)$ is lower bounded when $x \in S_f$, where $S_f = \{x :\ Ax = b\}$. The sequence $\{x_k\}$ is generated by Algorithm 1. Then, we have*

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty}\|Pg_k\| = 0, \tag{78}$$

where $g_k = \nabla f(x_k)$ and the projection matrix P is defined by equation (10).

Proof. We prove the result (78) by contradiction. Assume that there exists a positive constant ε such that

$$\|Pg_k\| > \varepsilon \tag{79}$$

holds for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. According to Lemma 5 and Algorithm 1, we know that there exists an infinite subsequence $\{x_{k_i}\}$ such that the trial steps $s_{k_i}\,(i = 1, 2, \ldots)$ are accepted. Otherwise, all steps are rejected after a given iteration index, then the time step will keep decreasing to zero, which contradicts (68). Therefore, from equations (32), (34) and (79), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_0) - \lim_{k\to\infty} f(x_k) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1})) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (f(x_{k_i}) - f(x_{k_i} + s_{k_i})) \\ &\geq \eta_a \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(m_{k_i}(0) - m_{k_i}(s_{k_i})\right) \geq \eta_a \eta_m \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \|Pg_{k_i}\| \|s_{k_i}\| \geq \eta_a \eta_m \varepsilon \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \|s_{k_i}\|. \end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

Since $f(x)$ is lower bounded when $x \in S_f$ and the sequence $\{f(x_k)\}$ is monotonically decreasing, we have $\lim_{k\to\infty} f(x_k) = f^*$. By substituting it into equation (80), we obtain

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \|s_{k_i}\| = 0. \tag{81}$$

When B_k is updated by the L-BFGS formula (2) in the well-posed phase, from Lemma 2, we know $\|B_k\| \leq 2$. When B_k is updated by the formula (44) in the ill-posed phase, from equations (53) and (68), we know that $\|B_k\| \leq \left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t}} + M\right)$. We set

$$L_B \triangleq \max\left\{2, \left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t}} + M\right)\right\}. \tag{82}$$

By substituting equations (68) and (82) into equation (24), we obtain

$$\|Pg_{k_i}\| = \frac{1 + \Delta t_{k_i}}{\Delta t_{k_i}} \left\|B_{k_i} s_{k_i}\right\| = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\Delta t_{k_i}}\right) \left\|B_{k_i} s_{k_i}\right\| \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t}}\right) L_B \left\|s_{k_i}\right\|. \tag{83}$$

By substituting equation (83) into equation (81), we obtain

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \|Pg_{k_i}\| = 0,$$

which contradicts the assumption (78). Consequently, the result (78) is true. □

4 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we conduct some numerical experiments to test the performance of Algorithm 1 (Rcmtr). The codes are executed by a HP notebook with the Intel quad-core CPU and 8Gb memory in the MATLAB R2020a environment [49]. The two-sided projection $P\nabla^2 f(x)P$ of Algorithm 1 is approximated by the difference formula (45).

SQP [20,23,53,70] is the traditional-representative method for the constrained optimization problems. Ptctr is the recent continuation method and its computational efficiency is significantly better than that of SQP for linearly constrained optimization problems according to the numerical results in [40]. Therefore, we select these two typical methods as the basis for comparison. The implementation code of SQP is the built-in subroutine fmincon.m of the MATLAB2020a environment [49]. The alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM [9]) is an efficient method for some convex optimization problems and studied by many researchers in recent years. Therefore, we also compare Rcmtr with ADMM for some linearly constrained convex optimization problems. The compared ADMM subroutine [9] is downloaded from the web site at `https://web.stanford.edu/~boyd/papers/admm/`.

We select 57 optimization problems from references [1,40,51,64] as the test problems, some of which are the unconstrained optimization problems [1,51,64] and we add the same linear constraint $Ax = b$, where $b = 2 * \text{ones}(n,1)$ and A is defined as follows:

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & \cdots & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & \cdots & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, A = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & , A_2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{84}$$

The termination conditions of the four compared methods are all set by

$$\|\nabla_x L(x_k, \lambda_k)\|_\infty \leq 1.0 \times 10^{-6}, \tag{85}$$

$$\|Ax_k - b\|_\infty \leq 1.0 \times 10^{-6},\ k = 1, 2, \ldots, \tag{86}$$

where the Lagrange function $L(x, \lambda)$ is defined by equation (4) and λ is defined by equation (8).

We test those 57 problems with $n = 2$ to $n \approx 1000$. The numerical results are arranged in Tables 1-2 for the convex problems, and Tables 3-4 for the non-convex problems. The computational time and the number of iterations of Rcmtr, Ptctr and SQP are illustrated in Figure 1 and Figure 2, respectively. From Table 1 and Table 2, we find that Rcmtr can solve those convex optimization problems with linear equality constraints well. However, there are 3 convex problems of 17 convex test problems

can not be solved by Ptctr and SQP, respectively. ADMM can not work well for those 17 test convex problems.

From Table 3 and Table 4, we find that Rcmtr can solve those 40 non-convex linearly constrained optimization problems well except for a particularly difficult problem (Strectched V Function [64]). For this problem, Ptctr and SQP can not solve it, too. Ptctr and SQP can not solve two non-convex problems and five non-convex problems of 40 non-convex problems, respectively. Furthermore, from Tables 2-4 and Figure 1, we find that the computational time of Rcmtr is significantly less than those of Ptctr and SQP for most of test problems, respectively. The computational time of Rcmtr is about 1/3 of that of SQP (fmincon.m).

From the numerical results, we find that Rcmtr works significantly better than the other three methods. One of the reasons is that Rcmtr uses the L-BFGS method (36) as the preconditioned technique to follow their trajectories in the well-posed phase. Consequently, Rcmtr only involves three pairs of the inner product of two vectors and one matrix-vector product ($p_{g_k} = Pg_k$) to obtain the trial step s_k and involves about $(n-m)n$ flops at every iteration in the well-posed phase. However, Ptctr needs to solve a linear system of equations with an $n \times n$ symmetric positive definite coefficient matrix and involves about $\frac{1}{3}n^3$ flops (p. 169, [24]) at every iteration. SQP needs to solve a linear system of equations with dimension $(m+n)$ when it solves a quadratic programming subproblem at every iteration (pp. 531-532, [53]) and involves about $\frac{2}{3}(m+n)^3$ flops (p. 116, [24]).




Fig. 1: The computational time (s) of Ptctr, Rcmtr and SQP for test problems.

Table 1: Numerical results of Rcmtr and ADMM for convex problems.

Problems	Rcmtr		ADMM	
	steps (time)	$f(x^\star)$ (KKT)	steps (time)	$f(x^\star)$ (KKT)
Exam. 1 Kim Problem 1 [31,40] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	13 (0.24)	7.27e+03 (3.44e-07)	3 (0.04)	2.20e+04 (40.00) (failed)
Exam. 2 LLS Problem 1 [40] (n = 1200, m = n/3)	17 (0.42)	1.44e+03 (9.37e-07)	21 (0.07)	2.73e+03 (4.00) (failed)
Exam. 3 Obsborne Problem 1 [40,54] (n = 1200, m = 2/3n)	1 (0.55)	7.15e+02 (1.27e-15)	60 (0.18)	8.48e+02 (2.80) (failed)
Exam. 4 Mak Problem [40,48] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	11 (0.47)	97.96 (7.74e-07)	4 (0.05)	1.32e+02 (1.00) (failed)
Exam. 5 LLS Problem 2 [40] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	14 (0.66)	82.43 (7.54e-08)	12 (0.04)	8.00e+03 (32.00) (failed)
Exam. 6 Osborne Problem 2 [40,54] (n = 1200, m = n/2)	14 (0.97)	5.14e+02 (8.75e-07)	60 (0.20)	7.86e+02 (2.80) (failed)
Exam. 7 Carlberg Problem [11,40] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	15 (0.74)	1.19e+04 (1.66e-06)	3 (0.04)	1.40e+04 (32.00) (failed)
Exam. 8 Kim Problem 2 [31,40] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	21 (1.59)	4.22e+04 (1.43e-06)	3 (0.33)	3.28e+05 (1.92e+03) (failed)
Exam. 9 Yamashita Problem [40,71] (n = 1200, m = n/3)	25 (2.62)	0.50 (3.67e-07)	16 (0.06)	25.10 (0.50) (failed)
Exam. 10 Quartic With Noise Function [1](n = 1000, m = n/2)	7 (0.08)	1.01e+02 (2.69e-07)	400 (0.40)	1.01e+02 (3.98) (failed)
Exam. 11 Rotated Hyper Ellopsoid Function [64](n = 1000, m = n/2)	6 (2.50)	1.25e+05 (8.30e-06)	400 (1.04)	1.26e+05 (2.00e+05) (failed)
Exam. 12 Sphere Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	1 (0.08)	1.67e+02 (3.13e-15)	400 (0.27)	1.67e+02 (2.00) (failed)
Exam. 13 Sum Squares Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	28 (4.08)	4.08e+04 (1.58e-06)	400 (0.32)	4.16e+04 (9.98e+02) (failed)
Exam. 14 Trid Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	38 (2.61)	5.82e+02 (5.36e-07)	400 (0.36)	5.85e+02 (3.99) (failed)
Exam. 15 Booth Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	13 (1.00e-03)	9.00 (1.98e-07)	18 (1.00e-03)	45.00 (30.00) (failed)
Exam. 16 Matyas Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	17 (1.00e-04)	0.18 (4.44e-07)	18 (2.00e-03)	2.60 (5.20) (failed)
Exam. 17 Zakharov Function [64] (n = 10, m = n/2)	21 (8.00e-03)	7.31 (1.65e-07)	21 (1.00e-03)	4.33e+02 (1.87e+03) (failed)

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we give the regularization continuation method with the trust-region updating strategy (Rcmtr) for linearly constrained optimization problems. Moreover, we reveals and utilizes the linear conservation law of the regularization method and

Table 2: Numerical results of Ptctr, Rcmtr and SQP for convex problems.

Problems	Ptctr		Rcmtr		SQP	
	steps (time)	$f(x^\star)$ (KKT)	steps (time)	$f(x^\star)$ (KKT)	steps (time)	$f(x^\star)$ (KKT)
Exam. 1 Kim Problem 1 [31,40] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	11 (0.56)	7.27e+03 (5.79e-08)	13 (0.24)	7.27e+03 (3.44e-07)	2 (0.36)	7.27e+03 (8.30e-13)
Exam. 2 LLS Problem 1 [40] (n = 1200, m = n/3)	17 (1.01)	1.44e+03 (7.36e-07)	17 (0.42)	1.44e+03 (9.37e-07)	13 (2.59)	1.44e+03 (3.42e-07)
Exam. 3 Obsborne Problem 1 [40,54] (n = 1200, m = 2/3n)	12 (1.01)	7.15e+02 (2.30e-07)	1 (0.55)	7.15e+02 (1.27e-15)	3 (1.48)	7.14e+02 (2.22e-15)
Exam. 4 Mak Problem [40,48] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	11 (0.59)	97.96 (3.50e-07)	11 (0.47)	97.96 (7.74e-07)	8 (1.18)	97.96 (1.34e-10)
Exam. 5 LLS Problem 2 [40] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	14 (0.69)	82.43 (8.79e-08)	14 (0.66)	82.43 (7.54e-08)	11 (1.65)	82.43 (1.78e-09)
Exam. 6 Osborne Problem 2 [40,54] (n = 1200, m = n/2)	13 (1.04)	5.14e+02 (1.79e-07)	14 (0.97)	5.14e+02 (8.75e-07)	15 (5.86)	5.14e+02 (1.75e-06)
Exam. 7 Carlberg Problem [11,40] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	10 (0.54)	1.19e+04 (1.23e-07)	15 (0.74)	1.19e+04 (1.66e-06)	14 (1.96)	1.19e+04 (1.13e-05)
Exam. 8 Kim Problem 2 [31,40] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	12 (0.73)	4.22e+04 (6.14e-06)	21 (1.59)	4.22e+04 (1.43e-06)	29 (3.27)	4.22e+04 (3.05e-06)
Exam. 9 Yamashita Problem [40,71] (n = 1200, m = n/3)	16 (0.89)	0.50 (4.39e-07)	25 (2.62)	0.50 (3.67e-07)	14 (2.64)	0.50 (1.01e-07)
Exam. 10 Quartic With Noise Function [1] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	9 (0.42)	1.01e+02 (3.14e-07)	7 (0.08)	1.01e+02 (2.69e-07)	4 (0.64)	1.01e+02 (1.25e-09)
Exam. 11 Rotated Hyper Ellopsoid Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	8 (0.72)	1.25e+05 (2.08e-04) (failed)	6 (2.50)	1.25e+05 (8.30e-06)	400 (55.18)	1.46e+05 (3.22e+02) (failed)
Exam. 12 Sphere Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	10 (0.43)	1.67e+02 (1.11e-07)	1 (7.50e-02)	1.67e+02 (3.13e-15)	3 (0.44)	1.67e+02 (7.67e-10)
Exam. 13 Sum Squares Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	17 (9.77)	4.08e+04 (1.85e-04) (failed)	28 (4.08)	4.08e+04 (1.58e-06)	400 (44.36)	4.10e+04 (1.01e+02) (failed)
Exam. 14 Trid Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	304 (9.18)	5.82e+02 (8.34e-04) (failed)	38 (2.61)	5.82e+02 (5.36e-07)	400 (44.05)	5.82e+02 (1.56e-04) (failed)
Exam. 15 Booth Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	12 (1.00e-04)	9.00 (1.74e-07)	13 (1.00e-03)	9.00 (1.98e-07)	17 (6.00e-03)	9.00 (3.55e-15)
Exam. 16 Matyas Function[64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	11 (4.00e-03)	0.18 (1.87e-08)	17 (1.00e-04)	0.18 (4.44e-07)	3 (5.00e-03)	0.18 (1.67e-16)
Exam. 17 Zakharov Function[64] (n = 10, m = n/2)	15 (6.00e-03)	7.31 (2.93e-08)	21 (8.00e-03)	7.31 (1.65e-07)	21 (7.00e-03)	7.31 (8.50e-06)

the quasi-Newton method such that it does not need to compute the correction step other than the previous continuation method. The new continuation method uses the inverse of the regularization two-sided projection of the Lagrangian Hessian as the pre-conditioner to improve its robustness, which is other than the previous quasi-Newton methods. Numerical results show that Rcmtr is more robust and faster than the traditional optimization method such as SQP (the built-in subroutine fmincon.m

Table 3: Numerical results of Ptctr, Rcmtr, SQP for large-scale nonconvex problems.

Problems	Ptctr		Rcmtr		SQP	
	steps (time)	$f(x^\star)$ (KKT)	steps (time)	$f(x^\star)$ (KKT)	steps (time)	$f(x^\star)$ (KKT)
Exam. 18 LLS Problem 3 [40] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	38 (2.45)	1.96e+02 (1.17e-05)	25 (10.27)	-3.03e+03 (4.86e-07)	42 (7.70)	1.88e+02 (7.97e-06)
Exam. 19 Ackly Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	1 (0.11)	2.64 (1.87e-07)	1 (7.10e-02)	2.64 (7.50e-07)	2 (0.37)	2.42 (1.94e-07)
Exam. 20 Rosenbrock Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	9 (0.64)	9.26e+03 (9.03e-06)	20 (0.78)	9.26e+03 (2.15e-06)	400 (44.68)	9.26e+03 (5.00e-03) (failed)
Exam. 21 Dixon-Price Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	400 (15.54)	8.97e+04 (2.42e-02) (failed)	25 (2.35)	9.00e+04 (1.74e-09)	400 (46.97)	8.24e+06 (1.28e+05) (failed)
Exam. 22 Griewank Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	20 (0.73)	0.86 (4.81e-07)	12 (0.35)	0.86 (4.40e-08)	9 (1.12)	0.86 (1.07e-10)
Exam. 23 Levy Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	70 (1.83)	71.06 (2.36e-08)	56 (0.12)	71.06 (8.25e-07)	31 (3.82)	71.06 (1.11e-07)
Exam. 24 Molecular Energy Function [51] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	30 (0.94)	4.69e+02 (4.38e-07)	55 (0.75)	4.69e+02 (8.66e-07)	16 (2.04)	4.69e+02 (1.71e-06)
Exam. 25 Powell Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	11 (0.67)	4.26e+03 (1.77e-06)	17 (9.50e-02)	4.26e+03 (4.52e-07)	364 (41.34)	4.26e+03 (1.38e-04) (failed)
Exam. 26 Rastrigin Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	20 (0.63)	2.93e+03 (6.42e-07)	24 (0.11)	2.93e+03 (1.56e-06)	7 (1.00)	4.44e+03 (1.13e-06)
Exam. 27 Schwefel Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	109 (3.17)	4.19e+05 (3.74e-07)	71 (1.16)	4.19e+05 (4.16e-06)	51 (5.49)	4.02e+05 (2.31e-06)
Exam. 28 Styblinski Tang Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	76 (2.05)	-9.61e+03 (1.12e-05)	89 (8.02)	-9.61e+03 (4.57e-06)	172 (21.46)	-2.56e+04 (7.03e-04) (failed)
Exam. 29 Shubert Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	6 (0.53)	2.65e+03 (1.43e-06)	8 (8.40e-02)	2.65e+03 (8.92e-07)	3 (0.47)	2.65e+03 (1.42e-05)
Exam. 30 Strectched V Function [64] (n = 1000, m = n/2)	1 (0.39)	3.10e-03 (1.08e+05) (failed)	16 (18.86)	2.30e+02 (2.41e-03) (failed)	6 (0.95)	1.28 (34.15) (failed)

of the MATLAB2020a environment [49]), the recent continuation method such as Ptctr [40] and the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM [9]). Therefore, Rcmtr is worth exploring further, and we will extend it to the nonlinearly constrained optimization problem in the future.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by Grant 61876199 from National Natural Science Foundation of China, Grant YBWL2011085 from Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., and Grant YJCB2011003HI from the Innovation Research Program of Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.. The authors are grateful to the anonymous referee for his comments and suggestions which greatly improve presentation of this paper.

Conflicts of interest/Competing interests: Not applicable.

Table 4: Numerical results of Ptctr, Rcmtr, SQP for small-scale nonconvex problems.

Problems	Ptctr		Rcmtr		SQP	
	steps (time)	$f(x^*)$ (KKT)	steps (time)	$f(x^*)$ (KKT)	steps (time)	$f(x^*)$ (KKT)
Exam. 31 Beale Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	11 (2.00e-03)	3.35 (2.23e-08)	19 (2.00e-03)	3.35 (8.92e-07)	8 (7.00e-03)	3.35 (1.50e-06)
Exam. 32 Branin Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	23 (2.00e-03)	15.90 (1.51e-08)	28 (1.00e-03)	15.90 (3.53e-07)	6 (6.00e-03)	34.37 (4.55e-06)
Exam. 33 Eason Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	10 (5.00e-03)	-4.19e-06 (4.08e-06)	25 (3.00e-03)	-4.19e-06 (1.06e-07)	9 (6.00e-03)	-4.55e-06 (5.80e-07)
Exam. 34 Hosaki Function [1] (n = 2, m = n/2)	12 (1.20e-02)	-0.56 (4.21e-07)	11 (2.00e-03)	-0.56 (3.24e-08)	6 (5.00e-03)	-0.56 (9.77e-07)
Exam. 35 Levy Function N. 13 [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	8 (4.00e-03)	0.63 (9.51e-07)	10 (1.00e-04)	0.63 (1.61e-07)	9 (8.00e-03)	0.98 (1.42e-05)
Exam. 36 McCormick Function [64] (n = 12, m = n/2)	12 (3.00e-03)	1.31 (1.05e-07)	13 (1.00e-04)	1.31 (8.42e-07)	5 (5.00e-03)	1.31 (2.64e-09)
Exam. 37 Perm Function d, β [64] (n = 4, m = n/2)	25 (4.00e-03)	1.19e+03 (2.59e-06)	40 (1.70e-02)	1.19e+03 (3.85e-06)	28 (8.00e-03)	1.19e+03 (7.41e-05)
Exam. 38 Power Sum Function [64] (n = 4, m = n/2)	1 (6.00e-03)	1.52e+04 (2.59e-06)	1 (2.00e-03)	1.52e+04 (1.85e-13)	2 (6.00e-03)	1.52e+04 (1.14e-12)
Exam. 39 Price Function [1] (n = 2, m = n/2)	8 (6.00e-03)	7.06 (1.50e-07)	9 (1.10e-02)	7.06 (1.85e-07)	11 (6.00e-03)	7.06 (7.77e-06)
Exam. 40 Bohachevsky Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	9 (4.00e-03)	2.36 (1.75e-07)	11 (4.00e-03)	2.36 (7.12e-07)	9 (6.00e-03)	1.15 (1.00e-08)
Exam. 41 Colville Function [64] (n = 4, m = n/2)	13 (2.00e-03)	21.14 (1.35e-07)	26 (1.70e-02)	21.14 (5.81e-07)	11 (5.00e-03)	5.19 (3.37e-05)
Exam. 42 Drop Wave Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	10 (2.00e-03)	-0.79 (2.12e-07)	9 (2.00e-03)	-0.7858 (9.15e-07)	5 (5.00e-03)	-0.79 (3.73e-09)
Exam. 43 Schaffer Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	14 (5.00e-03)	0.61 (7.18e-08)	13 (3.00e-03)	0.61 (1.04e-07)	8 (5.00e-03)	0.61 (1.62e-07)
Exam. 44 Six-Hump Camel Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	10 (4.00e-03)	0.74 (1.73e-07)	18 (2.00e-03)	0.74 (4.09e-07)	11 (5.00e-03)	0.74 (2.00e-08)
Exam. 45 Three-Hump Camel Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	15 (4.00e-03)	0.55 (3.91e-07)	24 (1.00e-04)	0.55 (4.82e-07)	7 (4.00e-03)	0.55 (1.46e-07)
Exam. 46 Trecanni Function [1] (n = 2, m = n/2)	11 (4.00e-03)	2.36 (2.78e-08)	13 (1.00e-04)	2.36 (4.91e-07)	9 (4.00e-03)	2.36 (4.19e-08)
Exam. 47 Box Bettes Exponential Quadratic Function [1] (n = 3, m = 2)	20 (2.60e-02)	1.42e-11 (9.96e-07)	35 (8.00e-03)	3.01e-13 (7.07e-07)	13 (6.00e-03)	3.26e-16 (2.57e-08)
Exam. 48 Chichinad Function [1] (n = 2, m = n/2)	8 (5.00e-03)	8.01 (9.15e-09)	9 (5.00e-03)	8.01 (4.47e-08)	6 (3.00e-03)	-20.06 (8.52e-07)
Exam. 49 Eggholder Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	17 (3.00e-03)	-69.16 (4.17e-07)	22 (2.00e-02)	-69.60 (9.45e-07)	9 (6.00e-03)	-69.16 (5.77e-08)
Exam. 50 Exp2 Function [1] (n = 2, m = n/2)	11 (2.00e-03)	9.19 (1.53e-08)	15 (3.00e-03)	8.45 (6.63e-07)	6 (5.00e-03)	9.19 (6.60e-07)
Exam. 51 Hansen Function [1] (n = 2, m = n/2)	9 (6.00e-03)	-12.10 (3.98e-08)	8 (2.00e-03)	-12.10 (1.69e-07)	6 (5.00e-03)	-32.36 (5.21e-05)
Exam. 52 Hartmann 3-D Function [64] (n = 3, m = 2)	13 (2.00e-03)	-3.84 (1.36e-07)	22 (2.00e-03)	-3.84 (8.13e-07)	2 (4.00e-03)	-1.31e-30 (2.22e-16)
Exam. 53 Holder Table Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	13 (2.00e-03)	-1.68 (1.65e-07)	16 (2.00e-03)	-1.68 (5.82e-07)	5 (5.00e-03)	-3.51e-02 (9.62e-07)
Exam. 54 Michalewicz Function [64] (n = 2, m = n/2)	15 (4.00e-03)	-1.00 (7.24e-08)	16 (3.00e-03)	-1.00 (6.12e-07)	2 (4.00e-03)	-7.18e-12 (1.20e-10)
Exam. 55 Schaffer Function N. 4 [64] (n = 4, m = n/2)	8 (5.00e-03)	0.30 (9.11e-07)	11 (1.00e-04)	0.30 (8.35e-07)	6 (6.00e-03)	0.29 (7.68e-07)
Exam. 56 Trefethen 4 Function [1] (n = 2, m = n/2)	9 (5.00e-03)	1.20 (7.61e-08)	24 (3.00e-04)	-1.36 (1.51e-07)	8 (6.00e-03)	-2.02 (7.45e-05)
Exam. 57 Zettl Function [1] (n = 2, m = n/2)	11 (4.00e-03)	0.14 (3.26e-08)	17 (1.00e-04)	0.14 (8.27e-07)	11 (4.00e-03)	0.14 (1.84e-09)




Fig. 2: The number of iterations of Ptctr, Rcmtr and SQP for test problems.

Availability of data and material (data transparency): If it is requested, we will provide the test data.

Code availability (software application or custom code): If it is requested, we will provide the code.

References

1. E. P. Adorio and U. P. Diliman, *MVF - Multivariate test functions library in C for unconstrained global optimization*, http://www.geocities.ws/eadorio/mvf.pdf, 2005.
2. E. L. Allgower and K. Georg, *Introduction to Numerical Continuation Methods*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2003.
3. U. M. Ascher and L. R. Petzold, *Computer Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations and Differential-Algebraic Equations*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1998.
4. J. M. Bioucas-Dias and M. A. T. Figueiredo, *Alternating direction algorithms for constrained sparse regression: Application to hyperspectral unmixing*, 2010 2nd Workshop on Hyperspectral Image and Signal Processing: Evolution in Remote Sensing, 2010, 1-4, http://doi.org/10.1109/WHISPERS.2010.5594963.
5. C. G. Broyden, *The convergence of a class of double-rank minimization algorithms*, J Inst Math Appl **6** (1970), 76-90.
6. A. A. Brown and M. C. Bartholomew-Biggs, *ODE versus SQP methods for constrained optimization*, J Optim Theory Appl **62** (1989), 371-386.
7. K. E. Brenan, S. L. Campbell and L. R. Petzold, *Numerical solution of initial-value problems in differential-algebraic equations*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1996.
8. J. C. Butcher and Z. Jackiewicz, *Construction of high order diagonally implicit multistage integration methods for ordinary differential equations*, Appl Numer Math **27** (1998), 1-12.
9. S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato and J. Eckstein, *Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers*, Found Trends Mach Learn **3** (2011), 1-122, software available at https://web.stanford.edu/~boyd/papers/admm/.

10. R. Byrd, J. Nocedal and Y. X. Yuan, *Global convergence of a class of quasi-Newton methods on convex problems*, SIAM J Numer Anal **24** (1987), 1171-1189.
11. K. Carlberg, *Lecture notes of constrained optimization*, https://www.sandia.gov/~ktcarlb/opt_class/OPT_Lecture3.pdf, 2009.
12. F. Caballero, L. Merino, J. Ferruz and A. Ollero, *Vision-based odometry and SLAM for medium and high altitude flying UAVs*, J Intell Robot Syst **54** (2009), 137-161.
13. T. S. Coffey, C. T. Kelley and D. E. Keyes, *Pseudotransient continuation and differential-algebraic equations*, SIAM J Sci Comput **25** (2003), 553-569.
14. A. R. Conn, N. Gould and Ph. L. Toint, *Trust-Region Methods*, SIAM, Philadelphia, USA, 2000.
15. M. T. Chu and M. M. Lin, *Dynamical system characterization of the central path and its variants- a vevisit*, SIAM J Appl Dyn Syst **10** (2011), 887-905.
16. J. M. Fadili, J. L. Starck, *Monotone operator splitting for optimization problems in sparse recovery*, IEEE ICIP, Nov 2009, Cairo, Egypt., 1461-1464, http://doi.org/10.1109/ICIP.2009.5414555.
17. A. V. Fiacco and G. P. McCormick, *Nonlinear programming: Sequential Unconstrained Minimization Techniques*, SIAM, 1990.
18. M. A. T. Figueiredo and J. M. Bioucas-Dias, *Restoration of Poissonian images using alternating direction optimization*, IEEE Trans Image Process **19** (2010), 3133-3145.
19. R. Fletcher, *A new approach to variable metric algorithms*, Comput J **13** (1970), 317-322.
20. R. Fletcher and M. J. D. Powell, *A rapidly convergent descent method for minimization*, Comput J **6** (1963), 163-168.
21. P. A. Forero, A. Cano and G. B. Giannakis, *Consensus-based distributed support vector machines*, J Mach Learn Res **11** (2010), 1663-1707.
22. B. S. Goh, *Approximate greatest descent methods for optimization with equality constraints*, J Optim Theory Appl **148** (2011), 505-527.
23. D. Goldfarb, *A family of variable metric updates derived by variational means*, Math Comput **24** (1970), 23-26.
24. G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations*, 4th ed., The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Mayryland, 2013.
25. E. Hairer, C. Lubich and G. Wanner, *Geometric Numerical Integration: Structure-Preserving Algorithms for Ordinary Differential Equations*, 2nd ed., Springer, Berlin, 2006.
26. P. C. Hansen, *Regularization Tools: A MATLAB package for analysis and solution of discrete ill-posed problems*, Numer Algorithms **6** (1994), 1-35.
27. U. Helmke and J. B. Moore, *Optimization and Dynamical Systems*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, London, 1996.
28. D. J. Higham, *Trust region algorithms and timestep selection*, SIAM J Numer Anal **37** (1999), 194-210.
29. Z. Jackiewicz and S. Tracogna, *A general class of two-step Runge-Kutta methods for ordinary differential equations*, SIAM J Numer Anal **32** (1995), 1390-1427.
30. C. T. Kelley, L.-Z. Liao, L. Qi, M. T. Chu, J. P. Reese and C. Winton, *Projected Pseudotransient Continuation*, SIAM J Numer Anal **46** (2008), 3071-3083.
31. N. H. Kim, *Leture notes of constrained optimization*, https://mae.ufl.edu/nkim/eas6939/ConstrainedOpt.pdf, 2010.
32. J. H. Lee, Y. M Jung, Y. X. Yuan and S. Yun, *A subsapce SQP method for equality constrained optimization*, Comput Optim Appl **74** (2019), 177-194.
33. K. Levenberg, *A method for the solution of certain problems in least squares*, Q Appl Math **2** (1944), 164-168.
34. L.-Z. Liao, H. D. Qi, and L. Q. Qi, *Neurodynamical optimization*, J Glob Optim **28** (2004), 175-195.
35. X.-L. Luo, *Singly diagonally implicit Runge-Kutta methods combining line search techniques for unconstrained optimization*, J Comput Math **23** (2005), 153-164.
36. X.-L. Luo, L.-Z. Liao and H.-W. Tam, *Convergence analysis of the Levenberg-Marquardt method*, Optim Methds Softw **22** (2007), 659-678.
37. S.-T. Liu and X.-L. Luo, *A method based on Rayleigh quotient gradient flow for extreme and interior eigenvalue problems*,Linear Algebra Appl **432** (2010), 1851-1863.
38. X.-L. Luo, *A dynamical method of DAEs for the smallest eigenvalue problem*, J Comput Sci **3** (2012), 113-119.
39. X.-L. Luo, J.-R. Lin and W.-L. Wu, *A prediction-correction dynamic method for large-scale generalized eigenvalue problems*, Abstr Appl Anal (2013), Article ID 845459, 1-8, http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/845459.

40. X.-L. Luo, J.-H. Lv and G. Sun, *Continuation methods with the trusty time-stepping scheme for linearly constrained optimization with noisy data*, Optim Eng (2021), published online at http://doi.org/10.1007/s11081-020-09590-z, 1-35.
41. X.-L. Luo, H. Xiao and J.-H. Lv, *Continuation Newton methods with the residual trust-region time-stepping scheme for nonlinear equations*, Numer Algorithms (2021), published online at http://doi.org/10.1007/s11075-021-01112-x, 1-25.
42. X.-L. Luo and Y.-Y. Yao, *Primal-dual path-following methods and the trust-region updating strategy for linear programming with noisy data*, J Comput Math (2021), published online at http://doi.org/10.4208/jcm.2101-m2020-0173, 1-21.
43. X.-L. Luo, H. Xiao, J.-H. Lv and S. Zhang, *Explicit pseudo-transient continuation and the trust-region updating strategy for unconstrained optimization*, Appl Numer Math **165** (2021), 290-302.
44. X.-L. Luo and H. Xiao,*Generalized continuation Newton methods and the trust-region updating strategy for the underdetermined system*, J Sci Comput, **88** (2021), published online at http://doi.org/10.1007/s10915-021-01566-0, pp. 1-22, July 13, 2021.
45. X.-L. Luo and H. Xiao, *Continuation Newton methods with deflation techniques and quasi-genetic evolution for global optimization problems*, arXiv preprint available at http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.13864, or Research Square preprint available at https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1102775/v1, July 30, 2021. Software available at https://teacher.bupt.edu.cn/luoxinlong/zh_CN/zzcg/41406/list/index.htm.
46. Z. S. Lu, K. K. Pong and Y. Zhang, *An alternating direction method for finding Dantzig selectors*, Comput Stat Data Anal **56** (2012), 4037-4046, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2012.04.019.
47. M. F. Mascarenhas, *The BFGS method with exact line searches fails for non-convex objective functions*, Math Program **99** (2004), 49-61.
48. M.-W. Mak, *Lecture notes of constrained optimization and support vector machines*, http://www.eie.polyu.edu.hk/~mwmak/EIE6207/ContOpt-SVM-beamer.pdf, 2019.
49. MATLAB v9.8.0 (R2020a), The MathWorks Inc., http://www.mathworks.com, 2020.
50. D. Marquardt, *An algorithm for least-squares estimation of nonlinear parameters*, SIAM J Appl Math **11** (1963), 431-441.
51. N. Maculan and C. Lavor, *A function to test methods applied to global minimization of potential energy of molecules*, Numer Algorithms, **35** (2004), 287-300.
52. M. Ng, P. Weiss and X.-M. Yuan, *Solving constrained total-variation image restoration and reconstruction problems via alternating direction methods*, SIAM J Sci Comput **32** (2010), 2710-2736, http://doi.org/10.1137/090774823.
53. J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright, *Numerical Optimization*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
54. M. J. Osborne, *Mathematical methods for economic theory*, https://mjo.osborne.economics.utoronto.ca/index.php/tutorial/index/1/mem, 2016.
55. P.-Q. Pan, *New ODE methods for equality constrained optimization (2): algorithms*, J Comput Math **10** (1992), 129-146.
56. M. J. D. Powell, *Convergence properties of a class of minimization algorithms*, in: O.L. Mangasarian, R. R. Meyer and S. M. Robinson, eds., *Nonlinear Programming 2*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 1-27, 1975.
57. J. Schropp, *A dynamical systems approach to constrained minimization*, Numer Funct Anal Optim **21** (2000), 537-551.
58. J. Schropp, *One and multistep discretizations of index 2 differential algebraic systems and their use in optimization*, J Comput Appl Math **150** (2003), 375-396.
59. L. F. Shampine, *Linear conservation laws for ODEs*, Comput Math Appl **35** (1998), 45-53.
60. L. F. Shampine, *Conservation laws and the numerical solution of ODEs II*, Comput Math Appl **38** (1999), 61-72.
61. L. F. Shampine, I. Gladwell and S. Thompson, *Solving ODEs with MATLAB*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
62. D. F. Shanno, *Conditioning of quasi-Newton methods for function minimization*, Math Comput **24** (1970), 647-656.
63. G. Steidl and T. Teuber, *Removing multiplicative noise by Douglas-Rachford splitting methods*, J Math Imaging Vis **36** (2010), 168-184.
64. S. Surjanovic and D. Bingham, *Virtual library of simulation experiments: Test functions and datasets*, retrieved from http://www.sfu.ca/~ssurjano, January 2020.
65. W. Y. Sun and Y. X. Yuan, *Optimization Theory and Methods: Nonlinear Programming*, Springer, New York, 2006.

66. K. Tanabe, *A geometric method in nonlinear programming*, J Optim Theory Appl **30** (1980), 181-210.
67. A. N. Tikhonov and V. Y. Arsenin, *Solutions of Ill-posed Problems*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, Toronto, London, 1977.
68. N. Ullah, J. Sabi'u and A. Shah, *A derivative-free scaled memoryless BFGS method for solving a system of monotone nonlinear equations*, Numer Linear Algebra Appl. 2021;e2374. https://doi.org/10.1002/nla.2374.
69. R. Vanderbei, K. Lin, H. Liu and L. Wang, *Revisiting compressed sensing: exploiting the efficiency of simplex and sparsification methods*, Math Prog Comp **8** (2016), 253–269, http://doi.org/10.1007/s12532-016-0105-y.
70. R. B. Wilson, *A Simplicial Method for Convex Programming*, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1963.
71. H. Yamashita, *A differential equation approach to nonlinear programming*, Math Program **18** (1980), 155-168.
72. Y. Yuan, *Recent advances in trust region algorithms*, Math Program **151** (2015), 249-281.