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ABSTRACT

We propose a novel trust region method for solving a class of nonsmooth and nonconvex composite-type optimization problems. The approach embeds inexact semismooth Newton steps for finding zeros of a normal map-based stationarity measure for the problem in a trust region framework. Based on a new merit function and acceptance mechanism, global convergence and transition to fast local \( q \)-superlinear convergence are established under standard conditions. In addition, we verify that the proposed trust region globalization is compatible with the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) inequality yielding finer convergence results. We further derive new normal map-based representations of the associated second-order optimality conditions that have direct connections to the local assumptions required for fast convergence. Finally, we study the behavior of our algorithm when the Hessian matrix of the smooth part of the objective function is approximated by BFGS updates. We successfully link the KL theory, properties of the BFGS approximations, and a Dennis-Moré-type condition to show superlinear convergence of the quasi-Newton version of our method. Numerical experiments on sparse logistic regression and image compression illustrate the efficiency of the proposed algorithm.
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1 Introduction

In this paper, we develop and analyze a novel normal-map based second-order approach for the composite optimization problem

\[
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \psi(x) := f(x) + \varphi(x),
\]

(1)

where \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) is a continuously differentiable (not necessarily convex) function and \( \varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \to (-\infty, +\infty] \) is a convex, lower semicontinuous, and proper (not necessarily smooth) mapping.

Composite-type problems of the form (1) have become a popular and ubiquitous tool in optimization to model a large variety of applications, including, e.g., sparse \( \ell_1 \)-regularized problems \([154, 144, 55, 145, 13]\), group sparse problems
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Many common and recent algorithmic approaches for solving problem (1) are based on classical forward-backward splitting techniques or proximal gradient steps [64, 34, 45, 44, 110]. Specifically, at each iteration $k$, the traditional forward-backward splitting method performs a gradient descent step for the smooth function $f$ followed by a proximal “backward” step for the nonsmooth mapping $\varphi$,

$$x_{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\Lambda}^\Lambda(x_k - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla f(x_k)),$$

where $\text{prox}_{\Lambda}^\Lambda : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{prox}_{\Lambda}^\Lambda(x) := \arg\min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(y) + \frac{1}{2\Lambda}\|x - y\|^2$ denotes the well-known proximity operator of $\varphi$, $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a symmetric and positive definite parameter matrix. Alternatively, the forward-backward scheme in (2) can also be interpreted as a fixed-point procedure applied to the nonsmooth equation:

$$F_{\text{nat}}^\Lambda : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n, \quad F_{\text{nat}}^\Lambda(x) := x - \text{prox}_{\Lambda}^\Lambda(x - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla f(x)) = 0.$$

Here, the natural residual $F_{\text{nat}}^\Lambda$ can be shown to represent the first-order necessary optimality conditions of problem (1) (see, e.g., section 2) which explains and stresses the fundamental role of $F_{\text{nat}}^\Lambda$ and of the proximal updates (2) in the design and analysis of methodologies for solving (1). The second-order approach investigated in this work is based on a different characterization of the associated optimality conditions of problem (1) using the so-called normal map

$$F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n, \quad F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z) := \nabla f(\text{prox}_{\Lambda}^\Lambda(z)) + \Lambda(z - \text{prox}_{\Lambda}^\Lambda(z)) = 0.$$

The normal map $F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda$ was initially introduced by Robinson in [132] and has been primarily utilized in the context of classical variational inequalities (VI) and generalized equations for the special case where the proximity operator $\text{prox}_{\varphi}^\Lambda$ reduces to the projection $P_C$ onto a closed, convex set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. We refer to the monograph [60] for further discussions and background. Similar to the observations in [132, 60] and since the range of $\text{prox}_{\varphi}^\Lambda$ coincides with $\text{dom}(\partial \varphi)$ and is a subset of the effective domain $\text{dom}(\varphi)$, (see [133, section 24]), the normal map remains well-defined if $\nabla f$ is only defined on $\text{dom}(\varphi)$. This attractive feature is a distinctive advantage of the normal map and one of the main motivations for developing normal map-based algorithms.

1.1 Contributions

Our basic algorithmic idea is to apply a semismooth Newton method, [125, 121], to solve the nonsmooth equation

$$F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z) = 0.$$  

In particular, we combine approximate semismooth Newton steps for (5), generated via an inexact CG-solver, and a globalization technique that is based on a trust region-like mechanism to control the acceptance of the Newton steps. In this way, the resulting trust region-type algorithm can be guaranteed to converge globally and locally at a q-superlinear rate.

Our algorithmic framework closely follows a normal map-based approach proposed in [113] by Pieper. The normal map scheme developed in [113] also utilizes a trust region-type strategy and has already been successfully applied in a heuristic manner in several other works, see, e.g., [82, 22, 138, 139, 93, 94]. However, only limited convergence results are available so far. Our goal in this work is to propose and design a modified version of this original normal map-based method that allows to establish full global and local convergence results while maintaining the favorable numerical performance reported in [113, 82, 22, 138, 139, 93, 94]. We now briefly summarize our contributions:

- We propose a new normal map-based merit function for problem (1) that has better descent properties than the original objective function $\psi$ and that is compatible with our trust region strategy. By incorporating this novel merit function in the trust region acceptance mechanism, we are able to globalize the semismooth Newton method for (5) and we can provide a full and unified convergence analysis. In particular, we establish regular global convergence in terms of the normal map

$$\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty,$$

where $\{z_k\}$ denotes a sequence of iterates generated by our approach. Moreover, we verify that the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) framework is applicable yielding finer global convergence results and convergence of the whole sequence $\{z_k\}$. Finally, under mild local assumptions, we show that our algorithm can locally turn into a pure (inexact) semismooth Newton method and that a fast q-superlinear rate of convergence can be achieved.

- We derive new normal map-based representations of the second-order optimality conditions of problem (1). Specifically, we show that many second-order concepts, such as the second-order sufficient conditions, strong metric subregularity, and quadratic growth conditions, have an equivalent (and often simpler) characterization using the normal map which underlines the strong link between the natural residual and $F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda$. We further show that some of our assumptions required for local convergence are directly connected to second-order conditions.
• We study the convergence properties of a practical quasi-Newton variant of our method using BFGS updates to approximate the Hessian of \( f \). After refining some classical results for BFGS updates, we show that BFGS techniques are fully compatible with the KL theory and some of our earlier convergence results. This allows us to derive a Dennis-Moré-type condition yielding local superlinear convergence. In contrast to other nonsmooth quasi-Newton methods and techniques, [76, 39, 122, 85, 148, 153], we do not need to assume differentiability of the normal map \( F_{nor}^A \). Instead, since we only approximate the curvature information of the smooth function \( f \), we will work with a slightly stronger second-order-type condition involving \( \nabla x f \).

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work which fully links the KL theory, boundedness of the BFGS updates, and a Dennis-Moré-type condition to establish fast q-superlinear convergence of the semismooth quasi-Newton method.

• We finally conduct numerical experiments and comparisons on a sparse logistic regression and a nonconvex image compression problem that demonstrate the favorable performance of the proposed normal map-based semismooth Newton method.

### 1.2 Related Work

The importance and popularity of semismoothness, [98, 125, 121], and of the semismooth Newton method, [125, 121, 124], stems from the fact that nonsmooth versions of Newton’s method applied to a nonlinear, nonsmooth equation

\[
F(x) = 0
\]

are well-defined and can be shown to converge locally at least q-superlinearly under suitable conditions if the mapping \( F \) is semismooth. While the local convergence of the semismooth Newton method can be established in a very broad and universal context, globalization techniques and global convergence results are typically more tailored to the considered application and can depend on the specific problem structure. In the last decades, a variety of globalization schemes for semismooth Newton methods have been proposed for different problems. For instance, this includes line-search based globalization techniques [71, 121, 95, 35] (on suitable merit functions, such as, e.g., \( \frac{1}{2} \| F(x) \|^2 \)), specialized globalization schemes for complementarity problems and KKT systems [49, 59, 61, 81, 104], projection methods for monotone equations [146, 161], and lesser studied trust region-type globalization mechanisms [156]. There is also a considerable amount of literature on specialized semismooth Newton methods that are based on the natural residual \( F_{nor}^A \). For \( \ell_1 \)-optimization problems with \( \varphi \equiv \mu \| \cdot \|_1, \mu > 0 \), various semismooth Newton schemes have been proposed in [68, 100, 72, 24]. An extension of the approach discussed in [100] to general composite-type problems can also be found in Milzarek’s PhD thesis [99]. Moreover, in [111, 112, 148], the authors introduce the so-called forward-backward envelope (FBE) as a smooth merit function for problem (1) and different semismooth Newton methods with line search-type globalization are analyzed. In [153], Themelis, Stella, and Patrinos present further extensions of the FBE framework to problems where the nonsmooth mapping \( \varphi \) can be nonconvex.

As mentioned, Robinson’s normal map has been mainly used for classical variational inequalities and generalized equations. In particular, it is the basis of the path search damped Newton methods investigated in [127, 54] and of a projected gradient hybrid scheme for nonlinear complementarity problems proposed by Ferris and Ralph in [62]. In [70], Han and Sun discuss the convergence properties of a Newton and quasi-Newton method applied to a normal map formulation of VI problems on polyhedral sets. Zhao and Li, [169], derive general monotonicity results for the normal map and residual and analyze an inexact Newton method for VI problems. In [170], Zhou, Toh, and Sun propose a smoothing Newton method for a normal map-based reformulation of a nonsmooth \( \ell_2 \)-norm regression problem. Furthermore, Huang, Sun, and Zhao, [75], develop a smoothing Newton-type normal map algorithm for a convex program with convex quadratic inequality constraints. For more background on the normal map and additional classical normal map-based approaches, let us again refer to the monograph [60].

To the best of our knowledge, there are only few works that directly utilize the normal map to solve general composite-type problems of the form (1). Specifically, besides Pieper’s PhD thesis [113], this mainly includes the works [93, 94] by Mannel and Rund where local properties of a quasi-Newton variant of Pieper’s normal map-based trust region method using Broyden-like updates are established in a Banach space setting. In addition, in [89, 48], the authors study an algorithm with Anderson acceleration that is based on the backward-forward fixed-point iteration:

\[
z_{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\Lambda}^A(z_k) - \Lambda^{-1} \nabla f(\text{prox}_{\Lambda}^A(z_k)) = [(I - \Lambda^{-1} \nabla f) \circ \text{prox}_{\Lambda}^A](z_k).
\]

Using the definition of the normal map in (4), this update is identical to a normal map step \( z_{k+1} = z_k - \Lambda^{-1} F_{nor}^A(z_k) \).

The semismooth Newton method is also an integral component of various other related classes of algorithms for solving problem (1). For instance, in proximal Newton approaches [83], the semismooth Newton method can be used to compute the proximity operator \( \text{prox}_B^\eta \) where \( B \approx \nabla x f \) is a suitable approximation of the Hessian. We refer to [14, 80] for recent discussions and applications of this technique. Moreover, the semismooth Newton method is also the core
of several augmented Lagrangian approaches and proximal point algorithms developed in [168, 77, 162, 33, 88] for semidefinite programming, nuclear and spectral norm minimization, and Lasso-type problems.

Finally, we note that various types of nonsmooth trust region methods have been studied and analyzed for the general optimization problem $\inf_{x} \psi(x)$ during the last decades. A majority of these approaches are based on abstract model functions that are often not further specified. In [50], a nonsmooth trust region method is proposed for the problem $\inf_{x} \psi(x)$ under the assumption that $\psi$ is regular. A nonsmooth trust region algorithm with an abstract first-order model (that does not necessarily use subgradient information or directional derivatives) is investigated in [126]. Global convergence properties of nonsmooth trust region methods are typically shown under strong assumptions on the accuracy of the model and rely on the concept of a “strict model” introduced by Noll in [106]. This often limits the direct applicability and numerical tractability of nonsmooth trust region approaches. In [42], Christof, De Los Reyes, and Meyer propose a hybrid method that combines simpler quadratic trust region models and a more complicated second model to overcome some of the practical limitations of strict models. More related to our work, Chen, Milzarek, and Wen, [40], propose a normal map-based trust region framework for composite problems. However, the method in [40] is based on steepest descent-type directions and truncations to control the accuracy of the utilized quadratic models. As a consequence, the convergence analysis in [40] requires relatively strong assumptions and is closer to the analyses of some of the other trust region methods mentioned here. A recent nonsmooth trust region scheme with proximal quasi-Newton models is presented in [5]. Let us also refer to [2, 3] for further related nonsmooth trust region methods.

A more detailed discussion of related literature concerning nonsmooth second-order theory and (nonsmooth) quasi-Newton schemes can be found in section 7 and section 8.

1.3 Organization

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce several first-order optimality conditions and the normal map and we list required concepts from nonsmooth analysis. In section 3, we discuss and motivate our algorithmic framework. Specifically, we introduce a novel merit function for problem (1) and a new reduction ratio controlling the acceptance of trust region steps. Basic global convergence properties of our algorithm are presented and derived in section 4. In section 5, we investigate convergence of the proposed approach under the KL inequality. We first connect the KL properties of the objective function $\psi$ and of our new merit function and then establish finer convergence results. In section 6, we discuss local convergence properties and transition to fast local $q$-superlinear convergence. In section 7, we derive a novel representation of the second-order optimality conditions for problem (1) using the normal map perspective. This allows to establish connections between the local assumptions in section 6 and second-order optimality. In section 8, we present an in-depth study of a BFGS-type version of our method. Finally, in section 9 we illustrate and discuss the numerical performance of our algorithm.

1.4 Notation

Our notation is standard and follows [133, 135, 43]. By $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\| \cdot \|$ we denote the standard Euclidean inner product and norm. For matrices, the norm $\| \cdot \|$ is the standard spectral norm. The sets of symmetric and symmetric positive definite $n \times n$ matrices are denoted by $\mathbb{S}_+^n$ and $\mathbb{S}_+^{n 	imes n}$, respectively. For a given matrix $A \in \mathbb{S}_+^{n 	imes n}$, we define the norm $\| x \|_A := \sqrt{\langle x, A x \rangle}$. The effective domain of a function $\theta: \mathbb{R}^n \to (-\infty, \infty]$ is defined as $\text{dom}(\theta) := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \theta(x) < +\infty \}$. For a mapping $F: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$, the set $\mathcal{R}(F) := \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ with } y = F(x) \}$ is the range of $F$. Let $x \in \text{dom}(\theta)$ be given. The lower directional epi-derivative or lower subderivative of $\theta$ at $x$ in the direction $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as follows

$$\theta^+_l(x; h) := \lim \inf_{t \downarrow 0, \, \tilde{h} \to h} \Delta_t \theta(x)(\tilde{h}), \quad \Delta_t \theta(x)(h) := \frac{\theta(x + t h) - \theta(x)}{t}. \tag{6}$$

We say that $\theta$ is directionally epi-differentiable at $x$ in the direction $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with epi-derivative $\theta^+_l(x; h)$ if and only if for every sequence $(t_k)_k$, $t_k \downarrow 0$, it holds that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \inf_{t \downarrow 0} \Delta_{t_k} \theta(x)(h^k) \geq \theta^+_l(x; h) \quad \text{for every sequence } h^k \to h,$$

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \sup_{t \downarrow 0} \Delta_{t_k} \theta(x)(h^k) \leq \theta^+_l(x; h) \quad \text{for some sequence } h^k \to h.$$

The function $\theta$ is called directionally differentiable at $x$ in the direction $h$ if the limit $\theta^l(x; h) := \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \Delta_t \theta(x)(h)$ exists. Moreover, we say that $\theta$ is semidifferentiable or directionally differentiable in the sense of Hadamard at $x$ in the direction $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ if the limit $\lim_{t \downarrow 0, \, \tilde{h} \to h} \Delta_t \theta(x)(\tilde{h})$ exists. In this case, we will also use the term $\theta^l(x; h)$ to denote its limit. Let us note that the latter two definitions do also make sense for mappings $F: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$. In this paper, $\partial \theta$ denotes Clarke’s subdifferential for extended-valued functions or for locally Lipschitz continuous mappings.
θ : R^n → R^m, see, e.g., [135, section 8.J] or [43, section 2.4]. For two matrices A, B ∈ S^n, we write A ⪰ B if A − B is positive semidefinite. We use ri(S) to denote the relative interior of a convex set S ⊂ R^n.

Throughout this work, we assume that f : R^n → R is continuously differentiable and φ : R^n → (−∞, +∞] is a convex, lower semicontinuous, and proper mapping.

## 2 First-Order Optimality and Preliminaries

Suppose that x ∈ dom(φ) is a local minimum of problem (1). Then, x satisfies the first-order optimality condition

\[ 0 \in \partial \psi(x) = \nabla f(x) + \partial \phi(x), \quad (7) \]

where ∂φ is the standard subdifferential for convex functions. A point x ∈ dom(φ) is called a stationary point of (1) if it holds that 0 ∈ ∂φ(x) and we use crit(ψ) to denote the set of all stationary points of ψ. The optimality condition (7) can be equivalently represented as a nonsmooth equation:

\[ x \in \text{crit}(\psi) \iff F^{\Lambda}_{\text{nat}}(x) := x - \text{prox}^{\Lambda}_{\psi}(x - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla f(x)) = 0, \quad \Lambda \in S^n_++. \]

As mentioned, the mapping prox^\Lambda denotes the proximity operator of φ with respect to the parameter matrix Λ. The proximity operator is a Λ-firmly nonexpansive operator, i.e., we have

\[ \|\text{prox}_\psi^\Lambda(x) - \text{prox}_\psi^\Lambda(y)\|_\Lambda \leq \langle \Lambda(x - y), \text{prox}_\psi^\Lambda(x) - \text{prox}_\psi^\Lambda(y) \rangle \quad \forall x,y \in R^n. \quad (8) \]

In particular, prox^\Lambda is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the norm ∥ · ∥_Λ with constant 1. Moreover, the proximity operator can be characterized by the associated optimality conditions of its underlying optimization problem:

\[ \text{prox}_\psi^\Lambda(x) \in x - \Lambda^{-1}\partial \phi(\text{prox}_\psi^\Lambda(x)). \quad (9) \]

We will also work with the Moreau envelope env^\Lambda := \min_y \phi(y) + \frac{1}{2}\|x - y\|_\Lambda^2. It is well known that env^\Lambda is a convex and continuously differentiable mapping and its gradient is given by \nabla env^\Lambda(x) = \Lambda(x - \text{prox}^\Lambda(x)).

Let us further note that due to the convexity of φ and differentiability of f, Clarke’s subdifferential ∂φ coincides with the regular and limiting subdifferential of ψ. We refer to [103, 135, 11] for additional details and background.

Next, we summarize the different stationarity concepts for problem (1) and connect them to Robinson’s normal map F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}. Specifically, we show that every solution z of the nonsmooth equation

\[ F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z) := \nabla f(\text{prox}^\Lambda(z)) + \Lambda(z - \text{prox}^\Lambda(z)) = 0 \quad (10) \]

corresponds to a stationary point of the problem (1) via \bar{x} = \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\psi}(\bar{z}).

**Lemma 2.1.** Let Λ ∈ S^n_+ be an arbitrary parameter matrix. Then, the following conditions are mutually equivalent:

(i) It holds that 0 ∈ ∇f(\bar{x}) + ∂φ(\bar{x}).

(ii) The point \bar{x} is a solution of fixed-point type equation F^\Lambda_{\text{nat}}(\bar{x}) = 0.

(iii) We have ψ^\Lambda(\bar{x}; h) ≥ 0 for all h ∈ R^n.

Furthermore, if \bar{x} is a stationary point of (1), then \bar{z} = \bar{x} - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla f(\bar{x}) is a zero of the normal map F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}. Conversely, if \bar{z} is a zero of the normal map F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}, it holds that prox^\Lambda_{\psi}(\bar{z}) ∈ crit(ψ).

**Proof.** The inclusion in (i) is equivalent to \bar{x} ∈ \bar{x} - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla f(\bar{x}) - \Lambda^{-1}\partial \phi(\bar{x}). Since the proximity operator is uniquely determined by (9), this implies that condition (i) is equivalent to \bar{x} = \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\psi}(\bar{x} - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla f(\bar{x})). Next, let us note that the convexity of φ and differentiability of f imply that ψ is directionally epi-differentiable at all x ∈ dom(φ) and by [135, Exercise 8.4] we have ∂ψ(x) = \{v : ⟨v, h⟩ ≤ ψ^\Lambda(x; h) for all h ∈ R^n\} for all x ∈ dom(φ). This shows that the statements (i) and (iii) are equivalent. Finally, let us suppose that \bar{x} is a zero of the natural residual F^\Lambda_{\text{nat}}. Then, setting \bar{z} = \bar{x} - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla f(\bar{x}), it follows

\[ F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(\bar{z}) = \nabla f(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\psi}(\bar{x} - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla f(\bar{x}))) + \Lambda(F^\Lambda_{\text{nat}}(\bar{x} - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla f(\bar{x}))) = 0. \]

Conversely, let \bar{z} be a solution of (10) and let us set \bar{x} = \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\psi}(\bar{z}). Using this definition and rearranging the terms in F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}, this yields \bar{z} = \bar{x} - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla f(\bar{x}) and hence, we obtain F^\Lambda_{\text{nat}}(\bar{x}) = \bar{x} - \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\psi}(\bar{z}) = 0. \quad \square

The next result establishes a subtler connection between the natural residual and the normal map.
Lemma 2.2. Let $\Lambda \in S^n_{++}$ be a symmetric, positive definite matrix and let $x \in \text{dom}(\partial \psi)$ be given. Then, it holds that
\[
\|\Lambda^{-1}\|^{-1}\|F^\Lambda_{\text{nat}}(x)\| \leq \inf_{v \in \partial \psi(x)} \|v\| = \text{dist}(0, \partial \psi(x)) = \inf\limits_{z} \{\|F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z)\| : x = \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z)\}.
\]

Proof. The first inequality is well known, see, e.g., [57, Theorem 3.5]. A full proof of Lemma 2.2 can be found in [99, Lemma 4.1.6] and will be omitted here. \hfill \Box

Let us recall the definition of semismoothness. Following [125, 157], a mapping $F: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be semismooth at $x$ if $F$ is Lipschitz continuous in a neighborhood of $x$, directionally differentiable at $x$, and it holds that
\[
\sup_{M \in \partial F(x+h)} \|F(x+h) - F(x) - Mh\| = o(\|h\|) \quad \text{as} \quad h \to 0.
\]

If the property (11) holds for all elements $M \in \mathcal{M}(x+h)$, where $\mathcal{M}: \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a set-valued mapping (that can be different from Clarke’s subdifferential $\partial F$), then $F$ is called semismooth at $x$ with respect to $\mathcal{M}$.

We now briefly discuss semismoothness of the normal map $F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}$.

Lemma 2.3. Suppose that $f$ is twice continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of $\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z})$ and let us assume that $\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}$ is semismooth at $\bar{z}$. We define the following set-valued mapping $\mathcal{M}^\Lambda: \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$:
\[
\mathcal{M}^\Lambda(z) := \{M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : M = \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(z))D + \Lambda(I - D), \ D \in \partial \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(z)\}. \tag{12}
\]

Then, $F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}$ is semismooth at $\bar{z}$ with respect to $\mathcal{M}^\Lambda$.

Proof. The twice differentiability of $f$ and the semismoothness of $\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}$ imply that $F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}$ is directionally differentiable at $\bar{z}$. Furthermore, the local Lipschitz continuity of $F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}$ follows from the Lipschitz continuity of the proximity operator and from the Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla f$ around $\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z})$. Using a Taylor expansion of $\nabla f$, the uniform continuity of $\nabla^2 f$ in a sufficiently small neighborhood of $\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z})$, and the $\Lambda$-nonexpansiveness of $\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}$, we obtain
\[
\nabla f(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(z)) - \nabla f(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z})) = \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(z))(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(z) - \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z})) + o(\|z - \bar{z}\|) \quad \text{as} \quad z \to \bar{z}.
\]

The claim then follows from the semismoothness of $\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}$. \hfill \Box

In general, the set $\mathcal{M}^\Lambda(z)$ does not necessarily coincide with Clarke’s subdifferential $\partial F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z)$. However, as just shown, this does not affect the semismoothness of the normal map $F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}$. We refer to [109] for a related discussion.

Finally, we state several structural properties of the generalized derivatives of the proximity operator which will be used in the subsequent sections of this paper.

Lemma 2.4. Let $D \in \partial \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be an arbitrary generalized derivative. Then, it holds that:

(i) Both $\Lambda D$ and $\Lambda(I - D)$ are symmetric and positive semidefinite matrices.

(ii) The matrix $D\Lambda(I - D)$ is positive semidefinite.

Proof. See [97, Proposition 1] and [99, Lemma 3.3.5]. \hfill \Box

3 Algorithmic Framework

In this section, we develop and motivate our algorithmic approach in detail. We split and organize our discussion according to the different main components of the algorithm.

3.1 Semismooth Newton Steps

Following the original normal map-based approach proposed in [113], our core idea is to apply the semismooth Newton method, [125, 121], in order to solve the nonsmooth equation $F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z) = 0$. Specifically, at iteration $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider semismooth Newton steps of the form:
\[
M_k s_k = -F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z_k), \quad z_{k+1} = z_k + s_k, \quad M_k \in \mathcal{M}^\Lambda(z_k), \tag{13}
\]
where the set-valued mapping of generalized derivatives $M^A : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is given as in (12). The method described in [113] embeds this basic step in a trust region-like framework to elegantly unify regularization schemes and inexact solution methods for the linear system of equations (13). In this paper, we provide a detailed convergence theory for a slightly modified version of the method developed in [113]. In particular, we utilize a different merit function and acceptance mechanism which ultimately allows us to derive some of the first full convergence results for this type of method.

We now consider the step in (13) in more detail. Let $M_k = \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}_A^\Lambda(z_k))D_k + \Lambda(I - D_k)$ with $D_k \in \partial\text{prox}_A^\Lambda(z_k)$ be given. We first notice that the matrix $M_k$ and the system (13) are typically not symmetric. However, by multiplying the linear equation in (13) with $D_k^\top$ from the left, we can obtain the following symmetric linear system:

$$D_k^\top M_k s = -D_k^\top F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z_k).$$  

(14)

Since the matrix $D_k^\top M_k$ is now symmetric, we can use standard approaches for solving (14). Furthermore, it is often possible to exploit the structure of the generalized derivative $D_k$ to reduce the dimension and complexity of the linear system (14), see, e.g., Lemma 3.4 for further details. Following [113], our idea is to integrate this lower dimensional linear system in a trust region-type framework and to use the Steihaug-CG method, [147], to solve it inexactly.

Naturally, one might wonder how (inexact) solutions of the systems (14) and (13) are connected with each other. The next lemma reveals that there is indeed a close relationship between the linear systems in (13) and (14).

**Lemma 3.1.** Let $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a symmetric matrix and let $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\Lambda \in \mathbb{S}^+_n$, $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$ be given. Suppose that $\Delta D$ is symmetric and let us set $M = BD + \Lambda(I - D)$. Furthermore, assume that $y$ satisfies the condition $\|D^\top(My + r)\| \leq \epsilon$. Then, setting $x = y - \Lambda^{-1}(My + r)$, it follows $\|Mx + r\| \leq \|I - B\Lambda^{-1}\| \epsilon$.

**Proof.** Using $D = \Lambda^{-1} D^\top \Lambda$, it holds that:

$$M \Lambda^{-1} = BD \Lambda^{-1} + \Lambda(I - D) \Lambda^{-1} = (B \Lambda^{-1} - I) D^\top + I.$$  

(15)

Thus, we obtain $\|Mx + r\| = \|My - M \Lambda^{-1}(My + r) + r\| = \|(I - B \Lambda^{-1}) D^\top(My + r)\| \leq \|I - B \Lambda^{-1}\| \epsilon$. $\square$

Hence, we can recover a solution of the full system (13) by solving the reduced and symmetric system (14). Details of the Steihaug-CG method and additional properties are presented in Algorithm 3 and in the next subsections.

### 3.2 Trust Region Globalization

We now develop a trust region framework in order to control the quality of the generated inexact semismooth Newton steps and to ensure global convergence of the approach. Formally, we can design a trust region subproblem associated with the linear system (14) as follows:

$$\min_q \ m_k(q) := (F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z_k), D_k q) + \frac{1}{2}(M_k q, D_k q) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|q\| \leq \Delta_k,$$  

(16)

where $\Delta_k$ is the trust region radius. As mentioned, we can utilize the Steihaug-CG method to solve the subproblem (16) inexactly. Let $\tilde{q}_k$ denote an approximate solution returned by the CG-method. Motivated by our previous discussion, we can then generate a lifted and rescaled step $s_k$ via

$$\tilde{s}_k = q_k - \Lambda^{-1}(F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z_k) + M_k \tilde{q}_k) \quad \text{and} \quad s_k = \min\{1, \Delta_k / \|\tilde{s}_k\| \} \tilde{s}_k,$$

which corresponds to an approximate step for the original system (13) that additionally satisfies the trust region-type constraint $\|s_k\|_A \leq \Delta_k$. In the following, we will briefly clarify the choice of the model $m_k$ and present our acceptance mechanism for the step $s_k$.

**Choice of the Trust Region Model $m_k$.** In order to motivate the model $m_k$, let us at this point assume that $f$ and the proximity operator $\text{prox}_A^\Lambda$ are sufficiently smooth. Let us consider the auxiliary function $z \mapsto \varphi(z) := (\psi \circ \text{prox}_A^\Lambda)(z)$ and let us set $D_k = D \text{prox}_A^\Lambda(z_k)$. Due to $\psi(\text{prox}_A^\Lambda(z)) = f(\text{prox}_A^\Lambda(z)) + \text{env}_A^\Lambda(z) - \frac{1}{2}\|z - \text{prox}_A^\Lambda(z)\|_A^2$, we obtain

$$\nabla \varphi(z_k) = D_k^\top \nabla f(\text{prox}_A^\Lambda(z_k)) + \Lambda (z_k - \text{prox}_A^\Lambda(z_k)) - (I - D_k)^\top \Lambda(z_k - \text{prox}_A^\Lambda(z_k)) = D_k^\top F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z_k),$$

$$\nabla^2 \varphi(z_k)(q,q) = (F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z_k), D^2 \text{prox}_A^\Lambda(z_k)(q,q)) + (D_k q, \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}_A^\Lambda(z_k)) D_k q + \Lambda(I - D_k) q) \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Thus, $m_k$ can be interpreted as a nonsmooth second-order model for the function $\varphi$ that omits the curvature term $q \mapsto (F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z_k), D^2 \text{prox}_A^\Lambda(z_k)(q,q))$. Since this term vanishes at solutions of the nonsmooth equation (10), this strategy shares similarities with the traditional Gauss-Newton method applied to nonlinear least-squares problems. In section 6
and section 7, we will investigate this outlined connection between \( \psi, \psi \circ \prox_{\tau}^\Lambda \), and \( m_k \) rigorously and in more detail without requiring differentiability of the proximity operator. Our discussion demonstrates that \( m_k \) is not just an artificial by-product of our globalization but it indeed is a proper model for the minimization problem \( \min_z (\psi \circ \prox_{\tau}^\Lambda)(z) \).

This feature will become important in our local convergence analysis.

**Accepting Trust Region Steps.** As in classical trust region methods, we base the acceptance of the current trust region trial step \( z_k + s_k \) on a reduction ratio test \( \rho_k \geq \eta \), \( \eta > 0 \), where

\[
\rho_k = \frac{\text{ared}_k(z_k)}{\text{pred}_k(z_k)} = \frac{\text{ared}_k(z_k)}{\text{pred}_k(z_k)}.
\]

The ratio \( \rho_k \) compares the actual reduction “\( \text{ared}_k \)” (based on the objective function or a suitable merit function) with some model-based predicted reduction “\( \text{pred}_k \)”.

The trial step \( z_k + s_k \) is then accepted as a new iterate if this ratio is sufficiently large. We are specifically interested in a ratio \( \rho_k \) and an acceptance mechanism that can guarantee the following global and local features:

- Accumulation points of a sequence generated by our normal map-based approach should be solutions of the equation \( F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z) = 0 \) and correspond to stationary points of \( 1 \).
- The condition “\( \rho_k \geq \eta \)” can be satisfied locally under suitable assumptions and if the involved subproblems are solved with sufficiently high accuracy. This should allow transition to the pure semismooth Newton method and to fast local convergence.

Due to the nonsmoothness and potential extended-real valuedness of the objective function \( \psi \), the design and correct choice of \( \rho_k \) is a challenging task. Based on our previous observations, a first potential candidate for the reduction ratio is given by:

\[
\hat{\rho}_k := \frac{\psi(\prox_{\tau}^\Lambda(z_k)) - \psi(\prox_{\tau}^\Lambda(z_k + \bar{q}_k))}{-m_k(\bar{q}_k)}.
\]

The ratio \( \hat{\rho}_k \) compares the reduction of the auxiliary function \( \psi \circ \prox_{\tau}^\Lambda \) with the reduction predicted by the model function \( m_k \). Acceptance based on \( \hat{\rho}_k \) coincides with traditional trust region mechanisms for \( \psi \circ \prox_{\tau}^\Lambda \) and in fact, the normal map approaches introduced and discussed in [113, 82, 93] utilize this criterion. However, since \( \hat{\rho}_k \) only measures the quality of \( \bar{q}_k \) and not of the lifted step \( s_k \), this trust region globalization generally cannot ensure that accumulation points of the generated iterates are solutions of \( 10 \). In addition, the predicted model decrease \( -m_k(\bar{q}_k) \) and \( \hat{\rho}_k \) are meaningless in certain situations, e.g., if \( D_k = 0 \). We refer to [113, Remark 3.9] for further comments on this problem.

In this work, we propose to measure the actual reduction based on a novel merit function that combines the auxiliary function \( \psi \circ \prox_{\tau}^\Lambda \) and the normal map \( F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda \).

**Definition 3.2.** Let \( \Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \) and \( \tau \in (0, 1) \) be given. We define the merit function \( H_\tau : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \),

\[
H_\tau(z) := \psi(\prox_{\tau}^\Lambda(z)) + \frac{\tau}{2} \| F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z) \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2.
\]

The choice of the merit function is not trivial. In particular, \( H_\tau \) needs to be compatible with the truncated semismooth Newton-type steps \( s_k \) and \( H_\tau \) should possess certain descent properties that prevent stagnation or failure of the trust region process. We will study the descent properties of \( H_\tau \) and their consequences in detail in the next section. Based on Definition 3.2, we can define the actual reduction term \( \text{ared}_k \) via:

\[
\text{ared}_k := H_\tau(z_k) - H_\tau(z_k + s_k).
\]

Our choice of \( \text{pred}_k \) is mainly motivated by the classical Cauchy decrease condition. Specifically, in order to control the accuracy of the inexact solutions \( \bar{q}_k \) of the subproblem \( 16 \), we typically require \( \bar{q}_k \) to satisfy a Cauchy decrease condition:

\[
-m_k(\bar{q}_k) \geq c\chi(z_k) \min\{1, \Delta_k, \chi(z_k)\}, \quad c > 0.
\]

Here, \( \chi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) is a continuous criticality measure such that \( \chi(z) = 0 \) if and only if \( F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z) = 0 \). Throughout this work, we will use with the following simple criticality measure:

\[
\chi(z) := \| F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z) \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}.
\]

We have already seen that the model \( m_k \) itself is not suitable to capture and predict the reduction achieved by the lifted step \( s_k \). Hence, we directly define the reduction term \( \text{pred}_k := \text{pred}(z_k, s_k, \Delta_k, \nu_k) \) as follows:

\[
\text{pred}(z, s, \Delta, \nu) := \frac{\tau}{2} \chi(z) \min\{1, \Delta, \chi(z)\} + \frac{\nu \chi(z)}{\min\{\Delta, \chi(z)\}} \| \prox_{\tau}^\Lambda(z + s) - \prox_{\tau}^\Lambda(z) \|_{\Lambda}^2,
\]
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Algorithm 1 A Trust Region-type Normal Map-Based Semismooth Newton Method

Initialization: Choose an initial point \( z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \), \( B_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n \), \( \Lambda \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n \), and \( \{ \epsilon_k \} \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \). Set iteration \( k = 0 \).

1: while \( F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z_k) \neq 0 \) do
2: Choose \( D_k \in \partial \text{prox}^\Lambda(z_k) \) and set \( M_k = B_k D_k + \Lambda (I - D_k) \).
3: Run Algorithm 3 with \( S = D_k M_k \), \( g = D_k^T F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z_k) \), \( \Delta = \Delta_k \), and \( \epsilon = \epsilon_k \geq 0 \) returning \( g_k = g \).
4: Set \( s_k = g_k - \Delta^{-1} (F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z_k) + M_k g_k) \) and \( s_k = \min\{1, \frac{\Delta_k}{\| s_k \|_2} \} s_k \).
5: if \( \rho_k = H_{z_k}(z_k) - H_{z_k}(z_k + s_k) < \eta_1 \) then
6: Set \( z_{k+1} = z_k + s_k \) and choose \( B_{k+1} \approx \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}^\Lambda(z_{k+1})) \);
7: else
8: Set \( z_{k+1} = z_k > s_k \) and choose \( B_{k+1} = B_k \);
9: end if
10: Set \( \Delta_{k+1} \) based on \( \rho_k \) by invoking Algorithm 2;
11: \( k \leftarrow k + 1 \);
12: end while

Algorithm 2 Update of the Trust Region Radius

Initialization: Input: \( \Delta_k, \rho_k \). Let \( \eta_1 \leq \eta_2 < 1 \) and \( 0 < \gamma_0 < \gamma_1 < 1 < \gamma_2 \), and \( \Delta_{\text{min}} \geq 0 \) be fixed.

1: if \( \rho_k < \eta_1 \) then
2: Set \( \Delta_{k+1} \in (\gamma_0 \Delta_k, \gamma_1 \Delta_k) \).
3: else if \( \rho_k \in [\eta_1, \eta_2) \) then
4: Set \( \Delta_{k+1} \in [\gamma_1 \Delta_k, \max\{\Delta_{\text{min}}, \Delta_k\}] \cap [\Delta_{\text{min}}, \infty) \);
5: else
6: Set \( \Delta_{k+1} \in (\Delta_k, \max\{\Delta_{\text{min}}, \gamma_2 \Delta_k\}) \cap [\Delta_{\text{min}}, \infty) \);
7: end if
8: Return \( \Delta_{k+1} \);

where \( \tau \in (0, 1) \) is given as in Definition 3.2 and \( \nu \in [0, 1) \) is a constant. In the next sections, we will show that this specific construction of \( \rho_k, \Delta_k \) and \( \text{pred}_k \) satisfies all the mentioned requirements. The full details of the method are presented in Algorithm 1. Notice that we additionally allow the usage of approximate Hessian information \( B_k \approx \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}^\Lambda(z_k)) \) in Algorithm 1. As usual, we will call iteration \( k \) successful if the trial point \( z_k + s_k \) is accepted as new iterate and we have \( z_{k+1} = z_k + s_k \).

Updating the Trust Region Radius. The trust region radius \( \Delta_k \) is updated as usual based on the ratio \( \rho_k \). Inspired by [156], we also consider a slightly modified strategy that requires the updated trust region radius \( \Delta_{k+1} \) to satisfy \( \Delta_{k+1} \geq \Delta_{\text{min}} \geq 0 \) if the iteration \( k \) has been successful. In most of our convergence results we will assume \( \Delta_{\text{min}} \) to be a positive (arbitrarily small) parameter. Our update scheme is summarized in Algorithm 2.

3.3 Properties of the CG-Method

In this subsection, we collect several properties of the Steihaug-CG method and of the linear systems (13) and (14) and their respective solutions. We consider the general setting of Lemma 3.1, i.e., let \( B \in \mathbb{S}^n \) be a symmetric matrix and let \( D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) and \( \Lambda \in \mathbb{S}^n_{++} \) be given such that \( AD \) is symmetric. Let us then define \( M := BD + \Lambda (I - D) \).

Lemma 3.3. Suppose that \( D^T M \) is positive semidefinite and \( M \) is invertible. Let us set \( g = D^T F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z) \) and let us assume \( \langle g, D^T M g \rangle \leq 0 \). Then, it holds that \( M \Lambda^{-1} F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z) = F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z) \).

Proof. Since \( D^T M \) is positive semidefinite and due to the symmetry of \( D^T M \), we have:
\[
\langle g, D^T M g \rangle \leq 0 \quad \iff \quad \| D^T M g \| = 0 \quad \iff \quad D^T M g = 0 \quad \iff \quad M^T D g = 0.
\]
Consequently, this implies \( D g = 0 \) and \( 0 = F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z)^T D g = \| g \|^2 \). Hence, using (15), we can infer \( M \Lambda^{-1} F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z) = (B \Lambda^{-1} - I) D^T F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z) + F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z) = F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z) \).

In the following result, we show that Algorithm 3 always terminates after a maximum of \( m = \text{rank}(D) = \text{dim} \mathcal{R}(AD) \) iterations. Specifically, if the generalized derivative \( D \) has low rank and satisfies \( m \ll n \), this allows to significantly reduce the complexity of computing the semismooth Newton step.
Algorithm 3 The Steihaug-CG Method

Initialization: Input: $S \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\epsilon$, $\Delta \geq 0$. Set $q_0 = 0$, $r_0 = g$, $p_0 = -g$ and $i = 0.$

1: if $\|r_0\| < \epsilon$ then
2: return $q = q_0$;
3: end if
4: while $i \leq n - 1$ do
5: if $\langle p_i, S p_i \rangle \leq 0$ then
6: Compute $\alpha_i$ such that $\alpha_i = \text{argmin}_{q_i + \alpha_i p_i} m(q_i + \alpha_i p_i)$ and return $q = q_i + \alpha_i p_i$;
7: else
8: Set $\alpha_i = \frac{\langle r_i, r_i \rangle}{\langle p_i, S p_i \rangle}$ and $q_{i+1} = q_i + \alpha_i p_i$;
9: if $\|q_{i+1}\| \geq \Delta$ then
10: Reset $\alpha_i$ such that $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $\|q_i + \alpha_i p_i\| = \Delta$ and return $q = q_i + \alpha_i p_i$;
11: end if
12: Set $r_{i+1} = r_i + \alpha_i S p_i$;
13: if $\|r_{i+1}\| < \epsilon$ then
14: Return $q = q_{i+1}$;
15: end if
16: Set $\beta_{i+1} = \frac{\|r_{i+1}\|^2}{\langle p_i, r_i \rangle}$ and $p_{i+1} = -r_{i+1} + \beta_{i+1} p_i$;
17: end if
18: $i \leftarrow i + 1$
19: end while

Lemma 3.4. Suppose that Algorithm 3 is run with $S = D^T M$ and $g = D^T F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z)$ and define $m = \text{dim} \mathcal{R}(\Lambda D)$. Then, it holds that:

(i) Algorithm 3 stops after at most $m \leq n$ iterations with $\|q\| \leq \Delta$.

(ii) In addition, assume that $D^T M$ is positive semidefinite and $M$ is invertible and that we have $\|M^{-1} F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z)\| \leq \Delta$. Algorithm 3 then returns $q$ with $\|D^T (M q + F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z))\| \leq \epsilon$.

A proof of Lemma 3.4 is presented in Appendix A.1.

4 Global Convergence Analysis

In this section, we investigate the global convergence properties of Algorithm 1. We start with listing our (additional) assumptions on the functions $f$ and $\varphi$.

Assumption 4.1. We consider the conditions:

(A.1) The gradient mapping $\nabla f$ is Lipschitz continuous on $\text{dom}(\varphi)$ with modulus $L$.

(A.2) The objective function $\psi$ is lower bounded on $\text{dom}(\partial \varphi)$.

Let $\Lambda \in S_{++}^n$ be the parameter matrix chosen in the initialization phase of Algorithm 1 and let us define $\lambda_M := \|\Lambda\| = \lambda_{\text{max}}(\Lambda)$, $\lambda_m := \|\Lambda^{-1}\|^{-1} = \lambda_{\text{min}}(\Lambda)$, and $\kappa := \kappa(\Lambda) = \lambda_m^{-1} \lambda_M$. We continue with several assumptions on the choice of the parameters and constants utilized in Algorithm 1.

Assumption 4.2. We assume:

(B.1) The parameters $\tau$ and $\nu_k$ satisfy the conditions:

\[ \nu \in [0, 1), \quad 0 \leq \nu_k \leq \nu, \quad \text{and} \quad \tau (L^2 + 2\lambda_m^2) < 2\lambda_m^2 (1 - \nu). \]

(B.2) It holds that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 + |B_k|)^{-1} = \infty$.

(B.3) There is $\kappa_B > 0$ such that $\|B_k\| \leq \kappa_B$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let us note that assumption (B.2) holds, e.g., if the matrices $\{B_k\}$ satisfy the bound $\|B_k\| \leq c_{B_1} + c_{B_2} k$ for all $k$ and for some constants $c_{B_1}, c_{B_2} > 0$. Hence, (B.2) is significantly weaker than condition (B.3). We will also use the notations

\[ \mu_k := \nu_k \chi(z_k) \min \{\Delta_k, \chi(z_k)\}^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad x_k := \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(z_k) \quad (17) \]
throughout the manuscript, where \( \{ z_k \} \) and \( \{ \Delta_k \} \) denote the associated sequences generated by Algorithm 1. Furthermore, let \( \{ j_i \} \) be an increasing sequence that enumerates the indices of the accepted iterates in step 8 of Algorithm 1. We then define the set of all successful iterations as follows \( S := \{ j_i : i \geq 0 \} = \{ k \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_k \geq \eta_1 \} \).

We first study the descent properties of the merit function \( H_x \).

**Lemma 4.3.** Suppose that condition (A.1) is satisfied and let \( z, e \in \mathbb{R}^n \), and \( \alpha \in (0, 1] \) be given. Setting \( d = -F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) \), it follows

\[
H_x (z + \alpha \Lambda^{-1} (d + e)) - H_x (z) \leq -\tau \alpha \| F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 - \frac{\nu}{2} \| p_a - x \|_\Lambda^2 + \frac{L\tau}{\lambda_m} + 1 - \tau \alpha \| e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \| d + e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \\
+ \frac{\tau \alpha}{2} \| e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 \| d + e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 + \frac{L^2 + 2\lambda^2_m}{2\lambda_m} \cdot \tau (1 - \nu) \frac{1}{\lambda_m} + \frac{2L - \lambda_m}{2} \| p_a - x \|_\Lambda^2,
\]

where \( p_a := \text{prox}_{\varphi}^\Lambda (z + \alpha \Lambda^{-1} (d + e)) \) and \( x := \text{prox}_{\varphi}^\Lambda (z) \).

**Proof.** Due to the Lipschitz continuity of \( f \) on \( \text{dom}(\varphi) \) and \( \nabla \text{env}_\varphi^\Lambda (z + \alpha \Lambda^{-1} (d + e)) \in \partial \varphi (p_a) \), see (9), we have

\[
\psi(p_a) - \psi(x) \leq \frac{L}{2} \| p_a - x \|_1^2 + \| \nabla f(x) , p_a - x \| + \langle \Lambda (z + \alpha \Lambda^{-1} (d + e) - p_a), p_a - x \rangle \\
- \alpha \| e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 \| d + e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 \\
= \langle F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) + \alpha (d + e), p_a - x \rangle - \| p_a - x \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 - \| p_a - x \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 \\
= (1 - \alpha) \langle F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) - e, p_a - x \rangle + \langle e, p_a - x \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \| p_a - x \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 - \| p_a - x \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2.
\]

Moreover, it holds that

\[
\frac{1}{2} \| F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z + \alpha \Lambda^{-1} (d + e)) \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 \\
= \frac{1}{2} \| F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) + \nabla f(p_a) - \nabla f(x) - \Lambda (p_a - x) + \alpha (d + e) \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 \\
= \frac{(1 - \alpha)^2}{2} \| F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 + (1 - \alpha) \langle F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z), \Lambda^{-1} \| \nabla f(p_a) - \nabla f(x) \| - (1 - \alpha) \langle F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z), p_a - x \rangle \\
+ (1 - \alpha) \langle F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z), \Lambda^{-1} e \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \| p_a - x \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 - \| e, p_a - x \| + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \| e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \| \nabla f(p_a) - \nabla f(x) \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 + \langle \nabla f(p_a) - \nabla f(x), x - p_a + \alpha \Lambda^{-1} e \rangle \\
\leq \frac{(1 - \alpha)^2}{2} \| F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 - (1 - \alpha) \langle F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) - e, p_a - x \rangle - \langle e, p_a - x \rangle + (1 - \alpha) \alpha \langle F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z), \Lambda^{-1} e \rangle \\
+ \left[ \frac{L^2}{2\lambda_m} + L \right] \| p_a - x \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| p_a - x \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 + \langle (1 - \alpha) F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) + \alpha e, \Lambda^{-1} \| \nabla f(p_a) - \nabla f(x) \| \rangle + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \| e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 \\
= \frac{1}{2} (1 - \alpha) \| F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 + \alpha \| d + e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 + (1 - \alpha) \langle d + e, p_a - x \rangle - \langle e, p_a - x \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2} \| e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 \\
+ \left[ \frac{L^2}{2\lambda_m} + L \right] \| p_a - x \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| p_a - x \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 + \langle (1 - \alpha) F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) + \alpha e, \Lambda^{-1} \| \nabla f(p_a) - \nabla f(x) \| \rangle,
\]

where we used \( 2 \langle F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z), \Lambda^{-1} e \rangle = \| F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 + \| e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 - \| d + e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 \) in the last step. Next, applying Young’s inequality, it follows

\[
\| d + e, \Lambda^{-1} \| \nabla f(p_a) - \nabla f(x) \| \leq \| d + e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \cdot \frac{L}{\lambda_m} \| p_a - x \| \leq \frac{\alpha}{2} \| d + e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 + \frac{L^2}{2\alpha\lambda_m} \| p_a - x \|^2
\]

and we have \( \| p_a - x \|_{\Lambda} \leq \| z + \alpha \Lambda^{-1} (d + e) - z \|_{\Lambda} = \alpha \| d + e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}, \)

\[
\langle e, \Lambda^{-1} \| \nabla f(p_a) - \nabla f(x) \| \rangle \leq \frac{L}{\lambda_m} \| e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \| p_a - x \| \leq \frac{L\alpha}{\lambda_m} \| e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \| d + e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}
\]

and \( \| e, p_a - x \| \leq \alpha \| e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \| d + e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}. \) This implies

\[
\frac{1}{2} \| F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z + \alpha \Lambda^{-1} (d + e)) \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} (1 - \alpha) \| F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z) \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 + (1 - \alpha) \langle d + e, p_a - x \rangle - \langle e, p_a - x \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2} \| e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}^2 \\
+ \left[ \frac{L^2}{2\alpha\lambda_m} + L \right] \| p_a - x \|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| p_a - x \|_{\Lambda}^2 + \frac{L\alpha}{\lambda_m} \| e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \| d + e \|_{\Lambda^{-1}}.
\]
Combining this result and the $\Lambda$-firm nonexpansiveness of the proximity operator (8),
\[
\langle F^\lambda_{\text{prox}}(z) - e, p_\alpha - x \rangle = -\frac{1}{\alpha} \langle z + \alpha \Lambda^{-1}(d + e) - z, \Lambda[p_\alpha - x] \rangle \leq -\frac{1}{\alpha} \|p_\alpha - x\|^2 \Lambda,
\]
and utilizing $\tau < 1 - \nu$, we finally obtain
\[
H_\tau(z + \alpha \Lambda^{-1}(d + e)) - H_\tau(z) = \psi(p_\alpha) - \psi(x) + \frac{\tau}{2} \|F^\lambda_{\text{prox}}(z + \alpha \Lambda^{-1}(d + e))\|^2 \Lambda - \frac{\tau}{2} \|F^\lambda_{\text{prox}}(z)\|^2 \Lambda - \frac{\nu}{\alpha} \|p_\alpha - x\|^2 \Lambda + \left[ (\frac{L^2}{2\alpha \lambda_m} + L) + \frac{L - \tau \lambda_m}{2} - \frac{(1 - \nu - \tau)\lambda_m}{\alpha} \right] \|p_\alpha - x\|^2 + (1 - \tau)\langle e, p_\alpha - x \rangle + \frac{L\tau \alpha}{\lambda_m} \|e\|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \|d + e\|_{\Lambda^{-1}} + \frac{\tau \alpha}{2} \|e\|^2 \Lambda^{-1},
\]
as desired.

**Remark 4.4.** In Lemma 4.3, suppose that condition (B.1) is additionally satisfied. Then, the factor $\frac{1}{2}(L^2 + 2\lambda_m^2)\lambda_m^{-1}\tau - (1 - \nu)\lambda_m$ is negative. Furthermore, defining $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha(L, \lambda_m, \nu)$ via
\[
\hat{\alpha} := \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } (2L - \lambda_m)\tau + L \leq 0, \\
\min \left\{ 1, \frac{L^2 + 2\lambda_m^2}{\lambda_m \tau - (1 + 2\tau)L\lambda_m} \right\} & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
(18)
\]
we can infer
\[
H_\tau(z + \alpha \Lambda^{-1}(d + e)) - H_\tau(z) \leq -\frac{\tau \alpha}{2} \chi(z)^2 - \frac{\nu}{\alpha} \|p_\alpha - x\|^2 \Lambda + \left[ \frac{L\tau}{\lambda_m} + 1 - \tau \right] \alpha \|e\|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \|d + e\|_{\Lambda^{-1}} + \frac{\tau \alpha}{2} \|e\|^2 \Lambda^{-1},
\]
for all $\alpha \in [0, \hat{\alpha}]$.

We now derive a first result that gives insight on the occurrence of successful steps. Specifically, we show that the trial point $z_k + s_k$ is always successful and accepted if the trust region radius $\Delta_k$ is sufficiently small. Lemma 4.5 is mainly based on the observations in Lemma 4.3 and Remark 4.4.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let the sequences $\{z_k\}$, $\{s_k\}$, and $\{\Delta_k\}$ be generated by Algorithm 1 and suppose that the assumptions (A.1) and (B.1) are satisfied. Then there exists a constant $\hat{c} > 0$ that only depends on $\hat{\alpha}$, $\eta_2$, $\tau$, $L$, and $\Lambda$ such that every iteration $k$ with
\[
\Delta_k \leq \hat{c}_k \chi(z_k), \quad \hat{c}_k := \frac{\hat{c}}{1 + \|B_k\|},
(19)
\]
is very successful, i.e., the condition (19) implies $\rho_k \geq \eta_2$ and $k \in S$.

**Proof.** First, by Lemma 2.4, we have $\|AD\| \geq 0$ and $\Lambda(I - D) \succeq 0$ for all $D \in \partial\text{prox}_\Lambda^\lambda(z)$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. This implies
\[
\|\Lambda D\| \leq \|\Lambda\|, \quad \|\Lambda(I - D)\| \leq \|\Lambda\|, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} D \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \leq 1 \quad \forall D \in \partial\text{prox}_\Lambda^\lambda(z), \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]
Hence, we obtain
\[
\|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}[\Lambda - M_k]\| = \|[\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} D_k \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} - \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} B_k D_k \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}] \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \\
\leq (\|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} B_k \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\| + 1)\|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \leq (1 + \|B_k\|) \max\{1, \lambda^{-1}_m\} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} =: \rho_0(1 + \|B_k\|).
(20)
\]
We now define the constants
\[
c_1 = \frac{\hat{\alpha}}{1 + \rho_0}, \quad c_2 = \frac{1 - \eta_2}{c_0}, \quad c_3 = \frac{\tau(1 - \eta_2)\lambda_m}{16c_0(L + \lambda_m)}, \quad c_4 = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \eta_2}}{2c_0}, \quad \text{and} \quad c_5 = \frac{1 - \eta_2}{2c_0^2 \eta_2},
\]
where $\hat{\alpha}$ was introduced in Remark 4.4. Furthermore, let us set
\[
\hat{c} := \min_{1 \leq i \leq 5} c_i \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{c}_k := \frac{\hat{c}}{1 + \|B_k\|}.
(21)
\]
In the following, we consider an arbitrary iteration \( k \) with \( \Delta_k \leq \hat{c}_k \chi(z_k) \). Let us define \( s_k^d := \Lambda^{-1} F_{\text{not}}^\Lambda(z_k) \). We have \( \|s_k\|_\Lambda \geq \|s_k^d\|_\Lambda - \|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}[\Lambda - M_k] \tilde{q}_k\|_\Lambda \) and by the algorithmic construction, it holds that \( \|\tilde{q}_k\| \leq \Delta_k \). Then, applying \( \|s_k^d\|_\Lambda = \chi(z_k) \), (20), and (21), it follows
\[
\|s_k\|_\Lambda \geq \|s_k^d\|_\Lambda - c_0(1 + \|B_k\|) \Delta_k \geq 1 \left[ \frac{1}{c_1} - c_0 \right] (1 + \|B_k\|) \Delta_k \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \Delta_k,
\]
\[
\|s_k\|_\Lambda \geq \chi(z_k) - c_0(1 + \|B_k\|) \hat{c}_k \chi(z_k) \geq [1 - c_0 c_2] \chi(z_k) = \eta_2 \chi(z_k),
\]
and \( \frac{\Delta_k}{\|s_k\|_\Lambda} \leq \min \{ \hat{a}, \frac{\Delta_k}{\chi(z_k)} \} \leq 1 \). Consequently, this yields \( s_k = \frac{\Delta_k}{\|s_k\|_\Lambda} \Lambda^{-1}(-F_{\text{not}}^\Lambda(z_k)) + (\Lambda - M_k) \tilde{q}_k \) and setting \( \alpha = \Delta_k \|s_k\|_\Lambda^{-1} \leq \hat{a}, e = (\Lambda - M_k) \tilde{q}_k \), and using \( d + e = \Lambda \tilde{s}_k \), Lemma 4.3 implies
\[
H_r(z_k + s_k) - H_r(z_k) \leq -\frac{\tau R}{2} \cdot \chi(z_k)^2 - \frac{\nu}{\alpha} \|\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\tau}(z_k + s_k) - x_k\|_\Lambda^2
\]
\[
+ \left( \frac{L}{\lambda m} + 1 - \tau \right) \|e\|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \|\tilde{s}_k\|_\Lambda \leq \frac{\tau}{\alpha} \frac{1 - \eta_2}{4} \cdot \chi(z_k)^2.
\]
Next, we give upper estimates for \( \|e\|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \) and \( \|\tilde{s}_k\|_\Lambda \). It holds that \( \|e\|_{\Lambda^{-1}} = \|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}[\Lambda - M_k] \tilde{q}_k\| \leq c_0(1 + \|B_k\|) \Delta_k \) and
\[
\|\tilde{s}_k\|_\Lambda \leq \|s_k^d\|_\Lambda + \|e\|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \leq [1 + c_0 \min \{ c_2, c_3 \}] \chi(z_k).
\]
Thus, we obtain
\[
\left[ \frac{L}{\lambda m} + 1 - \tau \right] \|e\|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \|\tilde{s}_k\|_\Lambda \leq \frac{L + \lambda m}{\lambda m} \left[ 1 + c_0 c_2 \cdot c_0 c_3 \cdot \chi(z_k)^2 \right] = \frac{\tau}{\alpha} \frac{1 - \eta_2}{4} \cdot \chi(z_k)^2
\]
and \( \|e\|_{\Lambda^{-1}} \leq \frac{c_0 c_2 \cdot \chi(z_k)^2}{2} = 0.25(1 - \eta_2) \cdot \chi(z_k)^2 \) and using (22), this implies
\[
H_r(z_k + s_k) - H_r(z_k) \leq -\frac{\tau R}{2} \cdot \chi(z_k)^2 + \frac{\nu}{\alpha} \|\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\tau}(z_k + s_k) - x_k\|_\Lambda^2
\]
\[
\leq -\frac{\tau R}{2} \cdot \chi(z_k)^2 - \frac{\eta_2 \nu}{\min \{ 1, \Delta_k/\chi(z_k) \}} \|\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\tau}(z_k + s_k) - x_k\|_\Lambda^2.
\]
By (23), we also have \( \|\tilde{s}_k\|_\Lambda \leq \|1 + c_0 c_3\| \chi(z_k) \leq (2\eta_2)^{-1}(1 + \eta_2) \chi(z_k) \) and together with (24) and \( \nu_k \leq \nu \), it follows
\[
H_r(z_k + s_k) - H_r(z_k) \leq -\frac{\eta_2 \nu}{2} \Delta_k \chi(z_k) - \eta_2 \nu_k \|\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\tau}(z_k + s_k) - x_k\|_\Lambda^2 = -\eta_2 \nu \text{pred}(z_k, s_k, \Delta_k, \nu_k).
\]
Consequently, we have \( \rho_k \geq \eta_2 \) which concludes the proof.

Remark 4.6. The result in Lemma 4.5 implies that the condition \( \Delta_k \leq \hat{c}_k \chi(z_k) \) cannot be satisfied for unsuccessful iterations \( k \notin S \). Let us further consider an iterate \( z_k \) with \( k \in S \). If \( k - 1 \notin S \), then we obtain \( \Delta_k \geq \Delta_{\min} \). Otherwise, if \( k - 1 \notin S \), we have \( B_k = B_{k-1} \) and we can infer \( \Delta_{k-1} > \hat{c}_{k-1} \chi(z_{k-1}) = \hat{c}_k \chi(z_k) \). Thus, by the algorithmic construction, it follows \( \Delta_k \geq \gamma_0 \Delta_{k-1} \geq \gamma_0 \hat{c}_k \chi(z_k) \) and we have
\[
\Delta_k \geq \min \{ \gamma_0 \hat{c}_k \chi(z_k), \Delta_{\min} \}
\]
for all \( k \in S \).

Lemma 4.5 allows us to prove that a sequence generated by Algorithm 1 contains infinitely many successful iterates.

Lemma 4.7. Under the assumptions (A.1) and (B.1), Algorithm 1 either terminates after finitely many steps or it generates infinitely many successful steps.

Proof. Conversely, let us assume that Algorithm 1 generates an infinite sequence \( \{ z_k \} \) with only finitely many successful steps. Let \( k' \in \mathbb{N} \) denote the last successful iteration, i.e., it holds that \( z_k = z_{k'} \) for all \( k \geq k' \). The update rule for the trust region radius then implies \( \Delta_k \to 0 \). Furthermore, since the matrices \( B_k \) are no longer updated for all \( k \geq k' \), we obtain \( \hat{c}_k = \hat{c}_{k'} \) for all \( k \geq k' \) where the parameter \( \hat{c}_k \) is defined in (19). Due to \( \Delta_k \to 0 \) there then exists \( \ell > k' \) with \( \Delta_\ell \leq \hat{c}_k \chi(z_{k'}) = \hat{c}_\ell \chi(z_\ell) \) which, by Lemma 4.5, yields \( \ell \in S \). However, this is a contradiction to our assumption and finishes the proof of Lemma 4.7.

We now present our main global convergence result. Our analysis does not require the selected matrices \( \{ B_k \} \) to be uniformly bounded (as stated in (B.3)). Instead we will work with the weaker condition (B.2).
Theorem 4.8. Suppose that the conditions (A.1)-(A.2), (B.1)-(B.2), and $\Delta_{\min} > 0$ are satisfied and assume that Algorithm 1 does not terminate after finitely many steps. Then, we have

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \chi(z_k) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu_k \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2_\Lambda < \infty. \tag{25}$$

Proof. Lemma 4.7 implies $|S| = \infty$ and it holds that

$$\sum_{k \in S} H_r(z_k) - H_r(z_{k+1}) \geq \sum_{k \in S} \eta_1 \operatorname{pred}(z_k, s_k, \Delta_k, \nu_k).$$

Furthermore, by assumption (A.2), the merit function $H_r$ is bounded from below on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Hence, since the sequence $\{H_r(z_k)\}$ is non-increasing, there exists $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\lim_{k \to \infty} H_r(z_k) = \zeta$ and it follows

$$\sum_{k \in S} \mu_k \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2_\Lambda < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k \in S} \chi(z_k) \min\{1, \Delta_k, \chi(z_k)\} < \infty. \tag{26}$$

We now proceed as in [119] and first show the weaker condition $\liminf_{k \to \infty} \chi(z_k) = 0$. Let us assume that there exists $\epsilon \in (0, \min\{1, \Delta_{\min}\})$ with $\chi(z_k) \geq \epsilon$ for all $k$ sufficiently large. Then, utilizing Remark 4.6 and (26), we obtain

$$\alpha > \sum_{k \in S} \epsilon \min\{1, \Delta_k, \epsilon\} \geq \epsilon \sum_{k \in S} \min\left\{\epsilon, \frac{\hat{c}_\Delta}{1 + \|B_k\|}\right\} \tag{27}$$

Due to $|S| = \infty$, we can infer $(1 + \|B_k\|)^{-1} \to 0$ as $S \ni k \to \infty$ and hence, it follows $\sum_{k \in S} (1 + \|B_k\|)^{-1} \leq \infty$. Let us recall the notation $S = \{j_i : i > 0\}$ and let us consider an arbitrary unsuccessful iteration $j_i + 1 \leq k \leq j_i + 1 - 1$. Using the trust region update mechanism and Lemma 4.3, this yields

$$\frac{\hat{c}_\Delta}{1 + \|B_k\|} \leq \hat{c}_k \chi(z_k) \leq \Delta_k \leq \gamma_1^{k-j_i} \Delta_{j_i}.$$ 

Summing this estimate, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=j_i}^{j_i+1-1} \frac{1}{1 + \|B_k\|} \leq \frac{\Delta_j}{\hat{c}_\Delta} \sum_{k=j_i+1}^{j_i+1-1} \gamma_1^{k-j_i} \leq \frac{\Delta_j}{\hat{c}_\Delta} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_1^k - 1 \right] = \frac{\gamma_1}{(1 - \gamma_1)\hat{c}_\Delta} \Delta_{j_i}. \tag{28}$$

Summing this expression once more for all $i$, we can infer $\sum_{k \in S} (1 + \|B_k\|)^{-1} \leq \frac{\gamma_1}{(1 - \gamma_1)\hat{c}_\Delta} \sum_{k \in S} \Delta_k$. As before, the summability condition in (27) implies $\Delta_k \to 0$ as $S \ni k \to \infty$ and hence, combining the last steps, it follows

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + \|B_k\|} < \infty.$$

However, this contradicts (B.2) and thus, our assumption was wrong and we have $\liminf_{k \to \infty} \chi(z_k) = 0$. To show convergence of the full sequence $\{\chi(z_k)\}$, we can follow the strategies used in the convergence analysis of classical trust region-type methods, see, e.g., [46, Theorem 6.4.6]. Let us suppose that $\{\chi(z_k)\}$ does not converge. Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ and infinite, increasing sequences $\{t_i\}_i \subset S$ and $\{\ell_i\}_i \subset S$ such that $t_i > t_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\chi(z_k) \geq 2\epsilon$, $\chi(z_{\ell_i}) < \epsilon$, and $\chi(z_k) \geq \epsilon$ for all $k = t_i + 1, \ldots, \ell_i - 1$. Let us now define $K := \{k \in S : t_i \leq k \leq \ell_i\}$. Due to $K \subseteq S$, the second condition in (26) implies

$$\infty > \sum_{k \in K} \chi(z_k) \min\{1, \Delta_k, \chi(z_k)\} \geq \sum_{k \in K} \epsilon \min\{1, \Delta_k, \epsilon\}.$$

As a consequence, it holds that $\Delta_k \to 0$ as $K \ni k \to \infty$ and hence, utilizing $\rho_k \geq \eta_1$ for all $k \in K$, it follows $\Delta_k \leq \frac{2}{\tau_0\epsilon} \|H_r(z_k) - H_r(z_{k+1})\|$ for all $k \in K$ sufficiently large. Next, the Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla f$ and nonexpansiveness of the proximity operator yield

$$\|\chi(w) - \chi(z)\| \leq \|F^\Lambda_{\min}(w) - F^\Lambda_{\min}(z)\| \leq \|\nabla f(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\rho}(w)) - \nabla f(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\rho}(z))\| + 2\|w - z\| \leq 2(1 + L\lambda^{-1})\|w - z\| \tag{28}$$

for all $w, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, setting $L_\gamma := 2 + L\lambda^{-1}$ and combining the last results, we obtain

$$\epsilon < |\chi(z_{t_i}) - \chi(z_{t_i})| \leq L_\gamma \sum_{k=t_i}^{\ell_i-1} \|s_k\| \leq L_\gamma \sum_{k=t_i}^{\ell_i-1} \Delta_k \leq \frac{2L\lambda^{-1}}{\tau_0\epsilon} \|H_r(z_k) - H_r(z_{k+1})\|. \tag{29}$$

Due to $H_r(z_k) \to \zeta$, the right hand side of the last inequality has to converge to zero which is a contradiction. \qed
Related results for classical trust-region methods have been shown in [119, 166, 120, 67] and [46, Section 8.4]. Here, based on the Lipschitz assumption (A.1) and similar to [156, Theorem 4.9], the special definition of our predicted reduction term \( \text{pred}(z_k, s_k, \Delta_k, v_k) \) allows us to obtain stronger results and convergence of the whole sequence \( \{ \chi(z_k) \} \) – even if the matrices \( \{ B_k \} \) are not bounded.

**Remark 4.9.** Theorem 4.8 has an interesting consequence concerning stationarity properties of the sequence \( \{ x_k \} \).

Let us consider the index set

\[
\mathcal{T} := \{ k \in \mathbb{N} : x_{k+1} \neq x_k \}
\]

and let us suppose \( |\mathcal{T}| < \infty \). Then, there exist \( \bar{x} \) and \( k' \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( x_k = \bar{x} \) for all \( k \geq k' \) and we have

\[
F_{\text{nat}}^A(z_k) = \nabla f(x_k) + \Lambda(z_k - x_k) = \nabla f(\bar{x}) - \Lambda \bar{x} + \Lambda z_k \quad \forall k \geq k'.
\]

Applying Theorem 4.8, we can infer \( z_k \to \bar{x} - \Lambda^{-1} \nabla f(\bar{x}) =: \bar{z} \) and \( F_{\text{nat}}^A(\bar{z}) = 0 \) and hence, \( \bar{x} \) is a stationary point of problem (1). This observation can also be used algorithmically. In particular, whenever there is a successful iteration \( k \in \mathcal{S} \) with \( x_{k+1} = x_k \) or \( x_{k+1} \approx x_k \), we can check whether the natural stationarity criterion \( F_{\text{nat}}^A(x_{k+1}) = x_{k+1} - \text{prox}_{\Lambda}(z_{k+1} - \Lambda^{-1} F_{\text{nat}}^A(z_{k+1})) \approx 0 \) is satisfied to terminate earlier.

Based on the proof of Theorem 4.8 and under the stronger assumption (B.3), we can additionally establish square summability of the criticality measure \( \chi(z_k) \).

**Corollary 4.10.** Let us assume that the conditions (A.1)–(A.2), (B.1), (B.3), and \( \Delta_{\min} > 0 \) are satisfied and suppose that Algorithm 1 does not terminate after finitely many steps. Then, it holds that

\[
\sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \chi(z_k)^2 < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu_k \| x_{k+1} - x_k \|^2_\Lambda < \infty.
\]

**Proof.** Using (B.3) and Remark 4.6, we obtain \( \Delta_k \geq \min \{ \gamma_0 \hat{c}(1 + \kappa_B)^{-1} \chi(z_k), \Delta_{\min} \} \) for all \( k \in \mathcal{S} \). Hence, square summability of \( \{ \chi(z_k) \}_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \) follows easily from (26).

## 5 Convergence Properties Under the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz Inequality

We now investigate additional convergence properties of Algorithm 1 utilizing the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) inequality. Our approach is primarily motivated by the general KL-framework provided in [7, 9, 18, 63] and by the convergence results for the forward-backward quasi-Newton method presented in [148, section 3.2] and [153]. Specifically, we will show how these techniques and the KL-inequality can be transferred to our nonsmooth trust-region method allowing us to establish convergence of the whole sequence \( \{ z_k \} \) and local rates of convergence.

Let us note that for smooth trust region methods the applicability of the KL-theory is typically based on a subtle connection between the trust region radius \( \Delta_k \), the trust region step \( s_k \), and the criticality measure and on a strict descent condition, see, e.g., [1, 107]. We will see that such an additional condition is not required in our framework.

### 5.1 Definitions and Assumptions

In the following, we introduce the class of so-called desingularizing functions that will be used in the definition of the KL-property. By \( \mathcal{G}_\eta \), we denote the class of all continuous and concave functions \( \varrho : [0, \eta) \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) such that

\[
\varrho \in C^1((0, \eta)), \quad \varrho(0) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \varrho'(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in (0, \eta).
\]

We also consider the subclass of Łojasiewicz functions

\[
\mathcal{L} := \{ \varrho : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+ : \exists \ c > 0, \ \theta \in [0, 1) : \varrho(x) = cx^{1-\theta} \}.
\]

Obviously, it holds \( \mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{G}_\eta \) for all \( \eta > 0 \).

For the ease of exposition, we define the KL-property for lower semicontinuous functions \( \psi : \mathbb{R}^n \to (-\infty, \infty] \) of the form \( \psi = f + \varphi \), where \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) is continuously differentiable and \( \varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \to (-\infty, \infty] \) is a convex, lower semicontinuous, and proper function.

**Definition 5.1.** Let \( \varrho = f + \varphi \) be a proper, lower semicontinuous function as specified above. We say that \( \psi \) has the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property at \( \bar{x} \in \text{dom}(\partial \varphi) \) if there exists \( \eta \in (0, \infty] \), a neighborhood \( U \) of \( \bar{x} \), and a function \( \varrho \in \mathcal{G}_\eta \) such that for all \( x \in U \cap \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 < \varphi(x) - \psi(\bar{x}) < \eta \} \) the KL-inequality holds, i.e.,

\[
\varrho'(\psi(x) - \psi(\bar{x})) \cdot \text{dist}(0, \partial \varphi(x)) \geq 1.
\]

If the mapping \( \varrho \) can be chosen from \( \mathcal{L} \) and satisfies \( \varrho(x) = cx^{1-\theta} \) for some \( c > 0 \) and \( \theta \in [0, 1) \), then we say that \( \psi \) has the KL-property at \( \bar{x} \) with exponent \( \theta \).
Let \( \{ z_k \}, \{ x_k \}, \) and \( \{ s_k \} \) be generated by Algorithm 1 and let us introduce the set of accumulation points
\[ \mathfrak{A} := \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \exists \text{ a subsequence } \{ k_\ell \} \text{ with } z_{k_\ell} \to z, \ell \to \infty \}. \]
Notice that \( \mathfrak{A} \) is closed-valued by definition. Next, we formulate our main assumptions of this section.

**Assumption 5.2.** We consider the conditions:

1. **(C.1)** The merit function \( H_\tau \) satisfies the following KL-type property on \( \mathfrak{A} \): for all \( \bar{z} \in \mathfrak{A} \) there exist \( \eta \in (0, \infty) \), a neighborhood \( V \) of \( \bar{z} \), and a function \( \varrho \in \mathcal{S}_\eta \) such that we have
   \[ \varrho' (H_\tau (z) - H_\tau (\bar{z})) \cdot \chi(z) \geq 1 \quad \forall z \in V \cap \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 < H_\tau (z) - H_\tau (\bar{z}) < \eta \}. \]

2. **(C.2)** The sequence \( \{ z_k \} \) is bounded.

3. **(C.3)** Setting \( n_\mathcal{S}(k) := |\mathcal{S} \cap \{ 0, 1, \ldots, k - 1 \} | \), we assume that the parameters \( \nu \) and \( \nu_k \) satisfy
   \[ \nu > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_k \geq \min \{ \nu, a^2_{\nu, \varrho(k)} \| \text{prox}_{\varrho}^A (z_k + s_k) - x_k \|^{2p} \} \]
   for all \( k \), where \( p > 0 \) is a constant and \( \{ a_k \} \) is a positive sequence with \( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k^{-1/p} < \infty \).

The condition (C.2) is a typical and ubiquitous prerequisite appearing in the application of the KL-framework, see, e.g., [7, 8, 9, 18, 108, 19]. Assumption (C.3) specifies the behavior of the parameters \( \{ \nu_k \} \). The lower bound in (C.3) is motivated by the convergence analysis in Theorem 5.5 and in section 6 and will allow us to establish full global-local results. Assumption (C.1) can be interpreted as a specialized variant of the usual KL-condition that is tailored to our situation. In the following, we will show that this condition is satisfied at a point \( \bar{z} \in \mathfrak{A} \) when \( \psi \) has the KL-property at \( \text{prox}_{\varrho}^A (\bar{z}) \) with exponent \( \theta \). In this case, the desingularizing function \( \varrho \) in (C.1) can also be chosen from the class \( \mathcal{S} \) with exponent \( \max \{ \theta, \frac{1}{2} \} \). Hence and similar to the forward-backward envelope, the merit function \( H_\tau \) can preserve the KL-properties of the original objective function. We refer to [163] and [148, 153] for comparison and further details.

**Lemma 5.3.** Suppose that \( \psi \) satisfies the KL-property at a stationary point \( \bar{x} = \text{prox}_{\varrho}^A (\bar{z}) \) in \( \text{crit} \psi \) with exponent \( \theta \). Then, the merit function \( H_\tau \) satisfies the KL-type property defined in (C.1) at \( \bar{z} \) with exponent \( \max \{ \theta, \frac{1}{2} \} \).

**Proof.** Let \( \varrho(x) = cx^{1-\theta} \) be the associated desingularizing function. By definition, there exists \( \epsilon, \eta > 0 \) such that
\[ [c(1 - \theta)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{dist}(0, \partial \psi(x))^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \psi(x) - \psi(\bar{x}) \]
for all \( x \) with \( \| x - \bar{x} \| \leq \epsilon \) and \( \psi(x) < \psi(\bar{x}) + \eta \). (The inequality is obviously true in the case \( \psi(x) \leq \psi(\bar{x}) \)).

Furthermore, by Lemma 2.2, we obtain
\[ \text{dist}(0, \partial \psi(\text{prox}_{\varrho}^A (z))) \leq \| F_{\text{nor}}^A (z) \| \leq \sqrt{\lambda} \chi(z) \]
for all \( z \). We now choose \( \delta \leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda M \epsilon \) sufficiently small such that \( \chi(z) \leq 1 \) for all \( z \in B_\delta (\bar{z}) \). Then, for all \( z \) with \( \| z - \bar{z} \| \leq \delta \) and \( H_\tau (\bar{z}) = \psi(\bar{x}) < H_\tau (z) < H_\tau (\bar{z}) + \eta \), we have \( \| \text{prox}_{\varrho}^A (z) - \bar{x} \| \leq \epsilon \) and \( \psi(\text{prox}_{\varrho}^A (z)) < \psi(\bar{x}) + \eta \) and hence, setting \( a_0 := [c \sqrt{\lambda} (1 - \theta)]^{1/\theta} \), it follows \( a_0 \| F_{\text{nor}}^A (z) \|^{1/\theta} \geq \psi(\text{prox}_{\varrho}^A (z)) - \psi(\bar{x}) \) and
\[ [a_0 + \frac{\eta}{2}] \chi(z)^{\text{min} \{ \frac{1}{2}, \theta \}} \geq a_0 \| F_{\text{nor}}^A (z) \|^{1/\theta} + \frac{\eta}{2} \| F_{\text{nor}}^A (z) \|^{2/\theta} \geq H_\tau (z) - H_\tau (\bar{z}). \]

This implies that \( H_\tau \) satisfies the KL-type inequality at \( \bar{z} \) with exponent \( \max \{ \theta, \frac{1}{2} \} \).

5.2 Properties of the Set of Accumulation Points and Convergence

In the following, we study the properties of the set of accumulation points \( \mathfrak{A} \). Our next result can be seen as an analogue of [18, Lemma 5].

**Lemma 5.4.** Let the sequence \( \{ z_k \} \) be generated by Algorithm 1 and suppose that the conditions (A.1)–(A.2), (B.1)–(B.2), (C.2), and \( \Delta_{\min} > 0 \) are satisfied. Then, we have:

(i) The set \( \mathfrak{A} \) is compact and nonempty and satisfies \( \text{prox}_{\varrho}^A (\mathfrak{A}) \subseteq \text{crit} (\psi) \).

(ii) We have \( \lim_{k \to \infty} \text{dist}(z_k, \mathfrak{A}) = 0 \).

(iii) The functions \( \psi \circ \text{prox}_{\varrho}^A \) and \( H_\tau \) are constant and finite on \( \mathfrak{A} \).
Proof. Theorem 4.8 and Lemma 2.1 imply that \( \text{prox}_\varphi^A(z) \) is a subset of \( \text{crit}(\psi) \). The compactness of \( A \) can be shown as in [18, Lemma 5(iii)]. The second part of Lemma 5.4 principally follows from the definition of the set \( A \). We continue with the proof of part (iii). Following the proof of Theorem 4.8 there exists \( \zeta \in \mathbb{R} \) with \( \lim_{k \to \infty} H_\tau(z_k) = \zeta \). Using \( \lim_{k \to \infty} \chi(z_k) = 0 \) and since the functions \( \psi \circ \text{prox}_\varphi^A \) and \( H_\tau \) are continuous, we can infer
\[
\psi(\text{prox}_\varphi^A(z)) = H_\tau(z) = \zeta \in \mathbb{R} \quad \forall \ z \in A.
\]
This concludes the proof of Lemma 5.4.

The properties (i)–(iii) in Lemma 5.4 allow us to derive a uniformized version of the KL-type inequality (30). Specifically, suppose that the KL-type property holds on the set \( A \) (and each desingularizing function can be chosen from \( \mathcal{L} \)). Then, there exist \( \delta, \eta > 0 \) and \( \varrho \in \mathcal{L}_\tau (\varrho \in \mathcal{L}) \) such that for all \( z \in \mathcal{A} \) and \( z \in V_{\delta, \eta} := \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{dist}(z, \mathcal{A}) < \delta \} \cap \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 < H_\tau(z) - H_\tau(\bar{z}) < \eta \} \), we have:
\[
\varrho'(H_\tau(z) - H_\tau(\bar{z})) \cdot \chi(z) \geq 1.
\]
The proof of this result is identical to the verification of the standard uniformized KL-property given in [18, Lemma 6] and will be omitted. Next, we present our main convergence result of this section.

**Theorem 5.5.** Let \( \{ z_k \} \) be generated by Algorithm 1 and let us assume that the conditions (A.1), (B.1)–(B.2), (C.1)–(C.3), and \( \Delta_{\min} > 0 \) are satisfied. Then, it holds that:

1. The sequence \( \{ z_k \} \) converges to some \( \bar{z} = \text{prox}_\varphi^A(\bar{z}) \in \text{crit}(\psi) \), i.e., we have \( \text{prox}_\varphi^A(\mathcal{A}) = \{ \bar{z} \} \).

2. Suppose that the uniformized KL-type inequality holds on \( \mathcal{A} \) for some \( \varrho \in \mathcal{L} \) with exponent \( \theta \in [0, 1) \) and, in addition, let assumption (B.3) be satisfied.
   - If \( \theta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}) \), the sequence \( \{ z_k \} \) converges within a finite number of steps.
   - If \( \theta = \frac{1}{2} \), then \( \{ \chi(z_k) \} \) and \( \{ z_k \} \) converge \( r \)-linearly to 0 and \( \bar{z} \), respectively.
   - If \( \theta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \), then the sequences \( \{ \chi(z_k) \} \) and \( \{ z_k \} \) converge with the following rates:
     \[
     \chi(z_k) = O(n_S(k)^{-\frac{1-\theta}{1+\theta}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \| z_k - \bar{z} \| = O(n_S(k)^{-\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{(1+\theta)^2}}) \quad \text{for} \quad k \in S.
     \]

Proof. Let \( \delta, \eta > 0 \) be the constants appearing in the definition of the uniformized KL-type inequality. First, the proof of Theorem 4.8 implies that the sequence \( \{ H_\tau(z_k) \} \) is non-increasing and converges to some \( \chi \in \mathbb{R} \). Suppose now there exists \( \ell \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( H_\tau(z_{\ell}) = \chi \). Then, we necessarily have \( H_\tau(z_k) = \chi \) for all \( k \geq \ell \). However, by Lemma 4.7 there is \( S \ni k \geq \ell \) with \( 0 = H_\tau(z_k) - H_\tau(z_{k+1}) \geq 0.5\eta \tau \chi(z_k) \min\{1, \Delta_k, \chi(z_k)\} \) which implies \( \chi(z_k) = 0 \) and hence, the algorithm would terminate after finitely many steps. As a consequence and using Lemma 5.4 (ii) and (iii), there exist \( \bar{z} \in \mathcal{A} \) with \( H_\tau(z) = \chi \) and \( k' \) such that \( H_\tau(z_k) > H_\tau(\bar{z}) \) and \( z_k \in V_{\delta, \eta} \) for all \( k \geq k' \). Recall \( S = \{ z_i : i \geq 0 \} \) and let \( \ell' \) be the smallest index such that \( j_{\ell'} \geq k' \). To prove the global convergence of \( \{ z_k \} \), it suffices to prove convergence of \( \{ z_{j_i} \} \). Since the uniformized KL-type inequality is applicable for the latter iterates, we have
\[
\varrho'(H_{\tau}(z_{j_i}) - H_{\tau}(\bar{z})) \cdot \chi(z_{j_i}) \geq 1 \quad \forall \ i \geq \ell'.
\]
Next, due to the concavity of \( \varrho \) and setting \( \delta_k := \varrho(H_{\tau}(z_k) - H_{\tau}(\bar{z})) \), we obtain
\[
\delta_i - \delta_{i+1} \geq \varrho'(H_{\tau}(z_i) - H_{\tau}(\bar{z}))[H_{\tau}(z_i) - H_{\tau}(z_{i+1})] \geq \frac{H_{\tau}(z_i) - H_{\tau}(z_{i+1})}{\chi(z_{j_i})} = \frac{H_{\tau}(z_i) - H_{\tau}(z_{i+1})}{\chi(z_{j_i})}
\]
for all \( i \geq \ell' \), where we have used the fact \( z_{j_i+1} = z_{j_i+1} \) for \( j_i \in S \). Summing this expression for \( i \geq \ell' \), it follows
\[
\delta_i = \sum_{i=\ell'}^{\infty} \delta_i - \delta_{i+1} \geq \sum_{i=\ell'}^{\infty} \eta_i \left[ \frac{r}{2} \min\{1, \Delta_j, \chi(z_{j_i})\} + \frac{\nu_j}{\min\{\Delta_j, \chi(z_{j_i})\}} \| x_{j_i+1} - x_{j_i} \|^2_A \right],
\]
where we applied \( x_{j_i+1} = x_{j_i+1} \) for \( j_i \), the continuity of \( \varrho \), and \( \varrho(0) = 0 \). Due to Young’s inequality, we have
\[
\sqrt{2r\nu_j} \| x_{j_i+1} - x_{j_i} \| \leq \sqrt{2r\nu_j} \| x_{j_i+1} - x_{j_i} \|_A \sqrt{\min\{\Delta_j, \chi(z_{j_i})\}} \leq \sqrt{2r \min\{\Delta_j, \chi(z_{j_i})\}} \| x_{j_i+1} - x_{j_i} \|_A \leq \frac{\nu_j}{\min\{\Delta_j, \chi(z_{j_i})\}} \| x_{j_i+1} - x_{j_i} \|^2_A + \tau \min\{\Delta_j, \chi(z_{j_i})\}.
\]
Thus, utilizing \( \lim_{k \to \infty} \chi(z_k) = 0 \), we can infer
\[
\sqrt{2r\eta_i} \sum_{i=\ell'}^{\infty} \| x_{j_i+1} - x_{j_i} \| \leq \delta_i.
\]
for some $\ell'' > \ell'$. Notice that the assumptions (B.1) and (C.3) imply $\nu_k = \nu$ if $a^2_{k} \phi_{\rho, k}(z_k + s_k) - x_k \geq \nu$. Hence, introducing the index sets $I_1 := \{i \geq \ell' : \nu_j = \nu\}$ and $I_2 := \{i \geq \ell' : i \notin I_1\}$, we obtain

$$\sum_{i \in I_1} \|x_{j,i} - x_j\|_{\Lambda} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in I_2} a_i \|x_{j,i} - x_j\|_{\Lambda}^{1+p} < \infty,$$

where we used $n_{S}(j_i) = \{|j_0, \ldots, j_{i-1}\} = i$. Next, in order to estimate the second term, we apply the reverse Hölder inequality

$$\infty > \sum_{i \in I_2} a_i \|x_{j,i} - x_j\|_{\Lambda}^{1+p} \geq \left[ \sum_{i \in I_2} a_i^{-1/p} \right]^{-p} \left[ \sum_{i \in I_2} \|x_{j,i} - x_j\|_{\Lambda} \right]^{1+p}$$

and consequently, due to $\bar{a} := \sum a_i^{-1/p} < \infty$, we can infer $\sum \|x_{j,i} - x_j\|_{\Lambda} < \infty$. This implies that $\{x_k\}_k$ and $\{x_k\}$ are Cauchy sequences that converge to the (same) limit $\bar{x}$. By Theorem 4.8 and similar to Remark 4.9, the convergence of $\{x_k\}$ also yields convergence of $\{z_k\}$:

$$z_k = x_k - \Lambda^{-1} \nabla f(x_k) + \Lambda^{-1} F_{\text{nor}}(z_k) \to \bar{x} - \Lambda^{-1} \nabla f(\bar{x}) =: \bar{z} \quad k \to \infty,$$

and thus, we have $\bar{x} = \proxA_{\tau}(\bar{z}) \in \text{crit}(\bar{\psi})$. We now continue with the proof of the second part. Using $\varrho(x) = c \tau^{-1}$ and the KL-type inequality (32), it holds that

$$\delta_{j,i} = \varrho(H_{\tau}(z_{j,i}) - H_{\tau}(z)) = c \left[ \frac{c(1-\theta)}{\varrho(H_{\tau}(z_{j,i}) - H_{\tau}(z))} \right]^{\frac{1-p}{p}} \leq c \left[ \varrho_{\tau} \frac{c}{1}\right]^{\frac{1-p}{p}} \frac{1}{p} \chi(z_{j,i}) \frac{1}{p},$$

for all $i \geq \ell''$. Due to $\lim_{k \to \infty} \chi(z_k) = 0$, we can assume that $\ell''$ is chosen sufficiently large to guarantee $\chi(z_{j,i}) < \Delta_{\min}$ for all $i \geq \ell''$. Then, utilizing Remark 4.6, (B.3), and (33), we have

$$2\delta_{j,i} \geq \eta_{\tau} \eta_{\tau} \min_{i \geq \ell} \{1, \Delta_{j,i}, \chi(z_{j,i})\} \geq \eta_{\tau} \eta_{\tau} \min_{i \geq \ell} \{1, \gamma_0 \frac{1}{1+\kappa_B^{-1}}\} \chi(z_{j,i})$$

for every $\ell \geq \ell''$. Setting $\Gamma_{\ell} := \sum_{i=\ell}^{\infty} \chi(z_{j,i})$ and $C_{\varrho} := 2c(1-\theta)^{1-\varrho}[\eta_{\tau} \tau \min\{1, \gamma_0 \frac{1}{1+\kappa_B^{-1}}\}]^{-1}$, this yields

$$C_{\varrho}(\Gamma_{\ell} - \Gamma_{\ell+1}) \geq \Gamma_{\ell}.$$

Next, we discuss different cases depending on the KL-exponent $\theta \in [0,1)$. In the case $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, it follows $\frac{1}{2} - 2 > 0$ and $C_{\varrho} \chi(z_{j,i}) \frac{1}{2} \geq 1$. Due to $\chi(z_k) \to 0$, this condition can only hold for finitely many $\ell$ and hence, $\{z_k\}$ has to converge in finitely many steps. Notice that the KL-inequality (32) reduces to $c \chi(z_{j,i}) \geq 1$ in the case $\theta = 0$ which again implies finite step convergence. In the case $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$, if $C_{\varrho} \leq 1$, we obtain $\Gamma_{\ell+1} \leq 0$ and finite step convergence. Otherwise, we can infer $\Gamma_{\ell+1} \leq [1 - 1/C_{\varrho}] \Gamma_{\ell}$ which proves q-linear convergence of $\{\Gamma_{\ell}\}$ and hence, $\{\chi(z_{j,i})\}$ converges r-linearly to zero. Combining the last steps, (34), (35) and (35) and using $\|x + y\|^{1+p} \leq 2^{p} \|x\|^{1+p} + \|y\|^{1+p}$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain

$$\frac{c^2}{2\sqrt{2} \tau_{\theta}} \chi(z_{j,i}) \geq \delta_{j,i} \geq \sqrt{\varrho} \sum_{i \in I_{\ell}, i \geq \ell} \|x_{j,i} - x_j\|_{\Lambda} + \bar{a} \left[ \sum_{i \in I_{\ell}, i \geq \ell} \|x_{j,i} - x_j\|_{\Lambda} \right]^{1+p}$$

$$\geq 2^{-2p} \min \{\sqrt{\varrho}, \bar{a}^{-p}\} \left[ \sum_{i \geq \ell} \|x_{j,i} - x_j\|_{\Lambda} \right]^{1+p} \geq 2^{-2p} \min \{\sqrt{\varrho}, \bar{a}^{-p}\} \|x_{j,i} - x_j\|_{\Lambda}^{1+p}$$

for all $\ell \geq \ell''$ sufficiently large. This proves r-linear convergence of $\{x_{j,i}\}$ to $\bar{x}$. Moreover, we note that

$$\|z_k - \bar{z}\|_{\Lambda} = \|x_k - \bar{x} - \Lambda^{-1} \nabla f(x_k) - \Lambda^{-1} \nabla f(\bar{x})\|_{\Lambda} \leq \Lambda_{\min}^{-1} \|x_k - \bar{z}\|_{\Lambda} + \chi(z_k).$$

Therefore, the r-linear convergence of $\{x_{j,i}\}$ and $\{\chi(z_{j,i})\}$ imply r-linear convergence of the sequence $\{z_{j,i}\}$. Finally, let us consider the case $\theta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Rearranging the terms in (36) and using the monotonicity of the function $t \mapsto t^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}}$, we have

$$\Gamma_{\ell} \geq C_{\varrho}^{-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} \Gamma_{\ell+1} \geq C_{\varrho}^{-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} \Gamma_{\ell+1}.$$

Hence, since the mapping $\hat{\varrho}(t) := t^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}}$ is monotonically decreasing, we can infer

$$\hat{\varrho}(C_{\varrho}) \leq \hat{\varrho}(\Gamma_{\ell} - \Gamma_{\ell+1}) \leq \int_{\Gamma_{\ell+1}}^{\Gamma_{\ell}} \hat{\varrho}(t) \, dt = \hat{\varrho}(\Gamma_{\ell} - \hat{\varrho}(\Gamma_{\ell+1}) = \frac{1-\theta}{1-2\theta} \left[ \frac{1-\theta}{1-2\theta} \right] \left[ \frac{1-\theta}{1-2\theta} \right] = 1.$$
6 Local Superlinear Convergence

In this section, we develop and present our local convergence theory. Specifically, we will establish that a sequence generated by Algorithm 1 converges q-superlinearly to a solution $\bar{z}$ of the nonsmooth equation (10) under suitable local conditions. We first list our required assumptions for proving fast local convergence:

**Assumption 6.1.** Let $\{z_k\}$ be generated by Algorithm 1 and suppose that $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{R}$ is an accumulation point of the sequence $\{z_k\}$. We then consider:

- (D.1) The sequence $\{z_k\}$ converges to $\bar{z}$.
- (D.2) The function $f$ is twice continuously differentiable on $\text{dom}(\varphi)$.
- (D.3) The mapping $\text{prox}_\varphi^\lambda$ is semismooth at $\bar{z}$.
- (D.4) There exists $\kappa_M > 0$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k \geq K$ the matrix $D_k^* M_k$ is positive semidefinite and $M_k$ is invertible with $\|M_k^{-1}\| \leq \kappa_M$.
- (D.5) The matrices $\{B_k\}$ satisfy the following Dennis-Moré-type condition:
  \[
  \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\|B_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k)(x_k - \bar{x})\|}{\|x_k - \bar{x}\|} = 0 \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{x} = \text{prox}_\varphi^\lambda(\bar{z}).
  \]
- (D.6) The error threshold $\epsilon_k$ used in the Steihaug-CG method satisfies $\epsilon_k \leq \mathcal{E}(F_{\text{not}}^\lambda(z_k))$ where $\mathcal{E} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is a continuous function with $\mathcal{E}(0) = 0$ and $\mathcal{E}(h) = o(h)$ as $h \to 0$.
- (D.7) The parameter $\nu_k$ satisfies $\nu_k \leq a^2_{s(k)} \|\text{prox}_\varphi^\lambda(z_k + s_k) - x_k\|^2_{\lambda} p$, where $\{a_k\}$ is a positive sequence with $\limsup_{k \to \infty} a_k/\kappa_k < \infty$ and $\limsup_{k \to \infty} a_{k+1}/a_k = \bar{\kappa}_a < \infty$.

We continue with several remarks. As just seen in Theorem 5.5, convergence of the whole sequence $\{z_k\}$ – as stated in assumption (D.1) – can be ensured by using the KL-framework. The conditions (D.2) and (D.3) are standard assumptions that guarantee sufficient smoothness and semismoothness of the normal map. Assumption (D.6) implies that the linear systems (14) are solved sufficiently accurate as $k$ increases and that the tolerance parameter $\epsilon_k$ is connected to the residual $F_{\text{not}}^\lambda(z_k)$. In (D.4), we formulate our main curvature and boundedness assumptions which are related to (but weaker than) the CD-regularity of the normal map $F_{\text{not}}^\lambda$ at $\bar{z}$. We will discuss assumption (D.4) in more detail in the next section and analyze its connection to second-order conditions for problem (1). A similar variant of the Dennis-Moré condition in (D.5) has also been utilized recently in [94]. In section 8, we verify that this form of the Dennis-Moré condition does hold under suitable assumptions when the Hessian approximations $B_k$ are built via BFGS updates. Moreover, assumption (D.5) is obviously satisfied when we work with the full Hessian $B_k = \nabla^2 f(x_k)$. Finally, we propose the following simple choice for $\{\nu_k\}$ and $\{a_k\}$:

\[

\nu_k := \min\{\nu, a^2_{s(k)} \|\text{prox}_\varphi^\lambda(z_k + s_k) - x_k\|^2_{\lambda} p\} \quad \text{and} \quad a_k := \kappa_a^{\alpha/2}.
\]

Then, the assumptions (B.1), (C.3), and (D.7) are all satisfied if $\sum k^{-\frac{\alpha}{p}} < \infty$ and $\alpha \leq 1 + p$. In particular, this holds if $\alpha \in (2p, 1 + p]$ and $p \in (0, 1)$. Next, we state the main convergence result of this section.

**Theorem 6.2.** Suppose that the conditions (A.1)–(A.2), (B.1), (B.3), and (D.1)–(D.7) are satisfied. Furthermore, let us assume that Algorithm 1 does not terminate after finitely many steps and we choose $\Delta_{\text{min}} > 0$. Then, we have:

- Every trust region step is eventually successful, i.e., there exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \in S$ for all $k \geq K$ and the sequence $\{z_k\}$ converges q-superlinearly to $\bar{z}$.

- In addition, if $\text{prox}_\varphi^\lambda$ is $\beta$-order semismooth at $\bar{z}$ for some $\beta \in (0, 1]$, the error function $\mathcal{E}$ in (D.6) satisfies $\mathcal{E}(h) = O(h^{1+\beta})$, $h \to 0$ and if we choose $B_k = \nabla^2 f(x_k)$ and $\nabla^2 f$ is Lipschitz continuous near $\bar{z}$, then the rate of convergence is of order $1 + \beta$.

The proof of Theorem 6.2 requires some preparations and is split into several parts. In order to show acceptance of the trust region steps, we need to investigate the behavior of the reduction ratio $\rho_k$ and the descent properties of the merit function $H_k$ along the directions returned by the Steihaug-CG method. This analysis is carried out in detail in subsection 6.2. In particular, we will see that the matrix $D^* \bar{M}$ essentially captures the curvature of the nonsmooth mapping $\psi \circ \text{prox}_\varphi^\lambda$. In subsection 6.1, we first derive an equivalent formulation of assumption (D.4) that will then be used as a key tool to prove the results in subsection 6.2. Finally, in subsection 6.3, we combine our observations, assumptions, and results and give the full proof of Theorem 6.2.
6.1 An Alternative Formulation of Condition (D.4)

We now first present an alternative characterization of the positive semidefiniteness and invertibility condition mentioned in assumption (D.4). We consider the following general situation.

**Lemma 6.3.** Let $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be symmetric and let $D \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\Lambda \in S_+^n$ be given. Suppose that the matrix $\Lambda D$ is symmetric and let us set $M := BD + \Lambda I - D$. If $D^T M$ is positive semidefinite and $M$ is invertible, then it holds that

$$\langle h, D^T M h \rangle \geq \sigma \|Dh\|_A^2 \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\sigma := \|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [DM^{-1}] \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^{-1}$. Conversely, assume that condition (38) is satisfied for some $\sigma > 0$. Then, $D^T M$ is positive semidefinite and $M$ is invertible with $\|M^{-1}\| \leq \|\Lambda^{-1}\| \{1 + \sigma^{-1} \|[I - \Lambda^{-1} B]\|\}$.

**Proof.** We start with the proof of the first part. Let $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary and let us set $s := (I - \sigma M^{-1} \Lambda D) h$. Using the symmetry of $D^T M$ and $M^{-T} D^T M = D$, it holds that

$$\langle h, D^T M s \rangle = \langle h - \sigma M^{-1} \Lambda D h, D^T (M - \sigma \Lambda D) h \rangle$$

$$= \langle h, D^T M h \rangle - \sigma \langle h, D^T M D h \rangle - \sigma \langle h, D^T M \Lambda D h \rangle + \sigma^2 \langle h, D^T M \Lambda D h \rangle$$

$$\leq \langle h, D^T M h \rangle - \sigma \|Dh\|_A^2 + \sigma^2 \|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [DM^{-1}] \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|Dh\|_2^2.$$

Consequently, the positive semidefiniteness of $D^T M$ implies (38). Now, let us assume that condition (38) holds for some $\sigma > 0$. Then, $D^T M$ is obviously positive semidefinite. Next, let $y$ be an arbitrary vector with $M y = 0$. Then, due to (38), we have $D y = 0$ and we can infer

$$M y = 0 \iff (B - \Lambda) D y + \Lambda y = 0 \implies y = 0.$$

Thus, $M$ is invertible. Let $y$ and $r$ now be given with $M y = -r$. By Lemma 3.1, we know that $\bar{y} = y - \Lambda^{-1} (y + r) = (I - \Lambda^{-1} B) D y - \Lambda^{-1} r$ satisfies $M \bar{y} = -r$. Hence, it follows $y = \bar{y}$ and applying (38), we obtain

$$\|D y\|_A^2 \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \langle y, D^T M y \rangle = \frac{1}{\sigma} \langle D y, r \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \|D y\|_A \|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} r\|.$$

Together, this yields $\|y\| = \|\bar{y}\| \leq (1 + \|I - \Lambda^{-1} B\| \|\sigma\|^{-1}) \|\Lambda^{-1}\| \cdot \|r\|$ which concludes the proof of Lemma 6.3.

Consequently, under condition (D.4) and using the estimate $\|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [D_k M_{k-1}^{-1}] \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \leq \|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} D_k \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\| \|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \|M_{k-1}^{-1}\| \leq \lambda_{M_k M},$ there exists $\hat{\sigma} > 0$ such that

$$\langle h, D_k^T M_k h \rangle \geq \hat{\sigma} \|D_k h\|_A^2 \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

for all $k \geq K$. Furthermore, if assumption (B.3) and (39) are satisfied, then Lemma 6.3 implies that (D.4) has to hold.

6.2 Descent Properties of the Merit Function $H_r$

We start with an expansion result that allows to interpret the matrices $D^T M$ as curvature terms of $\psi \circ \text{prox}_{\chi}$. As mentioned in subsection 3.2, this provides an additional and rigorous explanation of the specific choice of our trust region model.

**Proposition 6.4.** Let $\bar{z}$ be a zero of the normal map $F^A_{\text{nor}}$ and assume that $f$ is twice continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of $\text{prox}_{\chi}^A(\bar{z})$ and $\text{prox}_{\chi}^A$ is semismooth at $\bar{z}$. Then, we have

$$\psi(\text{prox}_{\chi}^A(z)) - \psi(\text{prox}_{\chi}^A(\bar{z})) = \frac{1}{2} (z - \bar{z}, D^T M (z - \bar{z})) + o(\|z - \bar{z}\|^2) \quad \text{as} \quad z \to \bar{z},$$

for all $D \in \partial \text{prox}_{\chi}^A(z)$ and $M = \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}_{\chi}^A(z)) D + \Lambda (I - D) \in \mathcal{M}^A(z)$.

**Proof.** By assumption, the Moreau envelope $\text{env}_{\chi}^A$ is semismooth differentiable at $\bar{z}$, i.e., it is continuously differentiable around $\bar{z}$ with semismooth gradient at $\bar{z}$. By [60, Proposition 7.4.10], this implies

$$\text{env}_{\chi}^A(z) - \text{env}_{\chi}^A(\bar{z}) = \langle \nabla \text{env}_{\chi}^A(z), z - \bar{z} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle z - \bar{z}, \Lambda(I - D)(z - \bar{z}) \rangle + o(\|z - \bar{z}\|^2)$$

(40)

for every $D \in \partial \text{prox}_{\chi}^A(z)$ and for $z \to \bar{z}$. Moreover, setting $x = \text{prox}_{\chi}^A(z)$ and $\bar{x} = \text{prox}_{\chi}^A(\bar{z})$, we obtain

$$f(x) - f(\bar{x}) = \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}), x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle x - \bar{x}, \nabla^2 f(x)(x - \bar{x}) \rangle + o(\|x - \bar{x}\|^2)$$

(41)
as \( x \to \bar{x} \). Due to the Lipschitz continuity of \( \operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z \), it follows \(|x - \bar{x}| = O(z - \bar{z})\) and \( o(|x - \bar{x}|^2) = o(z - \bar{z})^2\).

Next, using (40) and \( \nabla \operatorname{env}_\Lambda^z(z) = \Lambda(\bar{z} - \bar{x}) \), we have

\[
\varphi(x) - \varphi(\bar{x}) = \operatorname{env}_\Lambda^z(z) - \operatorname{env}_\Lambda^z(\bar{z}) - \frac{1}{2} \|z - x\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{z} - \bar{x}\|^2
\]

\[
= \langle \Lambda(\bar{z} - \bar{x}, z - \bar{z}) + \frac{1}{2} \|z - \bar{z}\|^2 \rangle_{\Lambda(I-D)} - \frac{1}{2} \|z - x\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{z} - \bar{x}\|^2
\]

\[
= \langle \Lambda(z - x, x - \bar{x}) - \frac{1}{2} \|z - \bar{z}\|^2 \rangle_{\Lambda D} + \frac{1}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 + o(|z - \bar{z}|^2)
\]

(42)

for all \( D \in \partial \operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z(z) \) and \( z \to \bar{z} \). Notice that the semismoothness of \( \operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z \) implies \( x - \bar{x} = D(z - \bar{z}) + o(|z - \bar{z}|) \) for all \( D \in \partial \operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z(z) \) and \( z \to \bar{z} \). Combining this with (41), (42), and \( \nabla f(\bar{x}) = \Lambda(\bar{z} - \bar{x}) \), it follows

\[
\psi(x) - \psi(\bar{x}) = \langle \Lambda(z - \bar{z} - (x - \bar{x}), x - \bar{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 \rangle_{\Lambda D} + \frac{1}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \|z - \bar{z}\|^2 \rangle_{\Lambda D} + \frac{1}{2} \|D(z - \bar{z}), \nabla^2 f(\operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z(z))D(z - \bar{z})\rangle_{\Lambda} - \frac{1}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \langle z - \bar{z}, M(x - \bar{x}) \rangle \) + o(|z - \bar{z}|^2)
\]

(43)

for all \( D \in \partial \operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z(z), M = \nabla^2 f(\operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z(z))D + \Lambda(I - D) \) and \( z \to \bar{z} \).

Next, we study the descent properties of the merit function \( H_\tau \) along a sequence of directions \( \{d_k\} \) that is superlinearly convergent with respect to \( \{z_k\} \).

**Lemma 6.5.** Assume that the conditions (A.1), (B.3), and (D.1)–(D.5) are satisfied and let \( \{d_k\} \) be a superlinearly convergent sequence in the following sense

\[
\|z_k + d_k - \bar{z}\| = o(|z_k - \bar{z}|) \quad k \to \infty.
\]

Then, for all \( \eta \in (0, 1) \) there exists \( \bar{\sigma} > 0 \) (which is independent of \( \eta \)) and \( K_\eta \geq K \) such that

\[
H_\tau(z_k + d_k) - H_\tau(z_k) \leq -\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{2} \|\operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z(z_k + d_k) - \operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z(z_k)\|^2_{\Lambda} - \frac{\eta^T}{2} \|F_{\Lambda}(z_k)\|^2_{\Lambda^{-1}} \quad \forall k \geq K_\eta.
\]

(45)

**Proof.** We first set \( \bar{x} = \operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z(\bar{z}) \) and \( \bar{x}_{k+1} := \operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z(z_k + d_k) \). Then, by applying Proposition 6.4 and (44), it follows

\[
\psi(\bar{x}_{k+1}) - \psi(\bar{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \langle z_k + d_k - \bar{z}, \bar{H}_k(z_k + d_k - \bar{z}) \rangle + o(|z_k - \bar{z}|^2)
\]

as \( k \to \infty \),

where \( \bar{H}_k := \nabla^2 f(\bar{x}_{k+1})\bar{D}_k + \Lambda(I - \bar{D}_k) \) and \( \bar{D}_k \in \partial \operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z(z_k + d_k) \). Since the sequence \( \{z_k + d_k\} \) converges and \( f \) is twice continuously differentiable on \( \operatorname{dom}(\varphi) \), the matrices \( \{\bar{H}_k\} \) need to be bounded. Hence, we can infer \( \psi(\bar{x}_{k+1}) - \psi(\bar{x}) = o(|z_k - \bar{z}|^2) \) as \( k \to \infty \). We further note that the semismoothness of the proximity operator implies

\[
x_k - \bar{x} = D_k(z_k - \bar{z}) + o(|z_k - \bar{z}|^2)
\]

as \( k \to \infty \),

where \( D_k \in \partial \operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z(z_k) \) is the generalized derivative chosen in step 2 of Algorithm 1. Next, due to condition (D.4) and as shown in (39), there exists \( \bar{\sigma} > 0 \) with \( \langle h, D_k^T M_k h \rangle \geq \bar{\sigma} \|D_k h\|^2_{\Lambda} \) for all \( h \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( k \geq K \). Using Proposition 6.4 a second time, (B.3), the boundedness of \( \{\nabla^2 f(x_k)\} \), and (D.5), this yields

\[
\psi(\bar{x}_{k+1}) - \psi(x_k) = \frac{1}{2} \langle z_k - \bar{z}, D_k^T H_k(z_k - \bar{z}) \rangle + o(|z_k - \bar{z}|^2)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \langle z_k - \bar{z}, D_k^T M_k(z_k - \bar{z}) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle z_k - \bar{z}, D_k^T [B_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k)]D_k(z_k - \bar{z}) \rangle + o(|z_k - \bar{z}|^2)
\]

\[
\leq -\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{2} \|D_k(z_k - \bar{z})\|^2_{\Lambda} + o(|z_k - \bar{z}|^2)
\]

for \( k \geq K \) and \( k \to \infty \), where \( H_k := \nabla^2 f(x_k)D_k + \Lambda(I - D_k) \). Furthermore, due to the \( \Lambda \)-nonexpansiveness of \( \operatorname{prox}_\Lambda^z \), we have \( \|\bar{x}_{k+1} - \bar{x}\| = O(|z_k + d_k - \bar{z}|) = o(|z_k - \bar{z}|) \) and \( \|x_k - \bar{x}\| = O(|z_k - \bar{z}|) \). Combining the last results, we then obtain

\[
\|\bar{x}_{k+1} - x_k\|^2_{\Lambda} = \|x_k - \bar{x}\|^2_{\Lambda} + o(|z_k - \bar{z}|^2) = \|D_k(z_k - \bar{z})\|^2_{\Lambda} + o(|z_k - \bar{z}|^2).
\]
Using (A.1) and the nonexpansiveness of the proximity operator, it is not hard to show that the normal map \( z \mapsto F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z) \) is a Lipschitz continuous mapping, see, e.g., (28) for comparison. Thus, invoking (44), it holds that
\[
\chi(z_k + d_k)^2 = \|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z_k + d_k) - F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (\bar{z})\|^2_{\Lambda^{-1}} = O(\|z_k + d_k - \bar{z}\|^2) = o(\|z_k - \bar{z}\|^2)
\]
and together it follows
\[
H_T(z_k + d_k) - H_T(z_k) \leq -\sigma \|\text{prox}_{\frac{1}{\sigma}}^\Lambda (z_k + d_k) - \text{prox}_{\frac{1}{\sigma}}^\Lambda (z_k)\|^2_{\Lambda^{-1}} - \frac{\tau}{2}\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z_k)\|^2_{\Lambda^{-1}} + o(\|z_k - \bar{z}\|^2)
\]
for \( k \to \infty \). Let us set \( \kappa_H := \sup_k \|\nabla^2 f(x_k)\| < \infty \). We now choose \( K_\eta \geq K \) sufficiently large, such that
\[
\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z_k) - F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (\bar{z}) - H_k(z_k - \bar{z})\| \leq (6\kappa_M)^{-1}\|z_k - \bar{z}\|, \quad \|\nabla^2 f(x_k) - B_k\|\|x_k - \bar{x}\| \leq (6\kappa_M)^{-1}\|z_k - \bar{z}\|,
\]
and
\[
H_T(z_k + d_k) - H_T(z_k) \leq -\frac{\sigma}{2}\|\hat{x}_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 - \frac{\tau}{2}\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda (z_k)\|^2_{\Lambda^{-1}} + c\|z_k - \bar{z}\|^2 \quad \text{with} \quad c = (1 - \eta)\tau/(8\kappa_M^2\lambda_M)
\]
for all \( k \geq K_\eta \). This is possible due to the semismoothness of \( F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda \) and \( \text{prox}_{\frac{1}{\sigma}}^\Lambda \) at \( \bar{z} \) (see Lemma 2.3 and (D.5)).

The bounded invertibility of the matrices \( \{M_k\} \) then implies
\[
\|z_k - \bar{z}\| \leq \kappa_M\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k) - F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(\bar{z}) - H_k(z_k - \bar{z})\| + \|\nabla^2 f(x_k) - B_k\|\|x_k - \bar{x} - D_k(z_k - \bar{z})\| + \|\nabla^2 f(x_k - B_k)(x_k - \bar{x})\| + \|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \leq 0.5\|z_k - \bar{z}\| + \kappa_M\|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \cdot \chi(z_k).
\]
and consequently, we have \( \|z_k - \bar{z}\|^2 \leq 4\kappa_M^2\lambda_M \cdot \chi(z_k)^2 \). Finally, the choice of \( c \) ensures that the bound stated in Lemma 6.5 holds for all \( k \geq K_\eta \).

Notice that the result in Lemma 6.5 remains valid if condition (44) is only satisfied on a subsequence. In that case, the descent property (45) still holds if it is restricted to such subsequence.

### 6.3 Acceptance of Trust Region Steps and Proof of Theorem 6.2

In this subsection, we collect and combine the different results to prove Theorem 6.2. We first provide a technical lemma that shows that the norm of a trust region step \( s_k \) can be upper bounded by \( \|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \).

**Lemma 6.6.** Suppose that the assumptions (B.5) and (D.4) are satisfied. Then, it holds that
\[
\|s_k\| \leq \|\hat{s}_k\| \leq \kappa_s\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \quad \forall k \geq K,
\]
where \( \kappa_s := \max\{\lambda_m^{-1}, \kappa_M\} + \kappa_M\sqrt{\kappa_M(1 + \lambda_m^{-1}\kappa_B)} \).

**Proof.** We discuss three different cases.

**Case 1:** \( \epsilon_k \geq \sqrt{\kappa_M}\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \). Then, we have
\[
\|r_0\| = \|D_k^T F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \leq \|D_k^T\|\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \leq \|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}D_k\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \leq \sqrt{\kappa_M}\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| < \epsilon_k,
\]
where we have used the facts \( \Delta D_k \leq \Lambda \) and \( \frac{1}{2}\Delta D_k \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq I \). Hence, the CG-method terminates in the first step with \( \hat{q}_k = q_0 = 0 \) and \( \|s_k\| \leq \|\hat{s}_k\| = \|\Lambda^{-1}F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \leq \lambda_m^{-1}\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \).

**Case 2:** \( \epsilon_k \leq \sqrt{\kappa_M}\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \) and \( \Delta_k \geq \|M_k^{-1} F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \). In this case, Lemma 3.4 is applicable and it follows
\[
\|D_k^T M_k \hat{q}_k + D_k^T F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \leq \epsilon_k. \quad \text{Using Lemma 3.1, we have} \quad \|M_k \hat{s}_k + F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \leq \|I - B_k\Lambda^{-1}\|\|\epsilon_k\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|s_k\| \leq \|\hat{s}_k\| \leq \kappa_M\|M_k \hat{s}_k\| \leq \kappa_M\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| + \|I - B_k\Lambda^{-1}\|\|\epsilon_k\| \leq \kappa_M(1 + (1 + \lambda_m^{-1}\kappa_B)\sqrt{\kappa_M})\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\|.
\]

**Case 3:** \( \epsilon_k \leq \sqrt{\kappa_M}\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \) and \( \Delta_k < \|M_k^{-1} F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| \). In this case, we obtain
\[
\|(I - \Lambda^{-1}M_k)\hat{q}_k\| = \|(I - \Lambda^{-1}B_k)D_k\|\|\hat{q}_k\| \leq \sqrt{\kappa_M}\|I - \Lambda^{-1}B_k\|\Delta_k \leq \kappa_M\sqrt{\kappa_M(1 + \lambda_m^{-1}\kappa_B)}\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\|
\]
and
\[
\|s_k\| \leq \|\hat{s}_k\| \leq \|\Lambda^{-1}F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\| + \|(I - \Lambda^{-1}M_k)\hat{q}_k\| \leq [\lambda_m^{-1} + \kappa_M\sqrt{\kappa_M(1 + \lambda_m^{-1}\kappa_B)}]\|F_{\text{nor}}^\Lambda(z_k)\|.
\]
Overall, by combining the different cases, it follows $\|s_k\| \leq \bar{s}_k \leq \kappa_s \|F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k)\|$. \hfill \Box

We now present the proof of Theorem 6.2. Our overall strategy is to show that the directions \{s_k\} are superlinearly convergent with respect to \{z_k\}. As in the proof of Lemma 6.5, this is mainly a consequence of the semismoothness of $\text{prox}_{\lambda}^A$ and $F^A_{\text{nor}}$ and of the Dennis-Moré condition (D.5). The derivation utilizes the properties of the Steihaug-CG method, $\Delta_{\min} > 0$, and the assumptions (B.3), (D.4), and (D.6). In the second part of the proof, we then discuss the behavior of the sequences \{\nu_k\} and \{\mu_k\} to ensure $\rho_k \geq \eta_1$ for all $k$ sufficiently large.

Proof. Theorem 4.8 ensures that $\bar{z}$ is a solution of the nonsmooth equation (10) and that the sequences \{\chi(z_k)\} and \{\bar{F}^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k)\} converge to zero. Furthermore, as a consequence of the assumptions (D.1), (D.4), and (D.7), there exists $K' \geq K$ such that the conditions

- (a) $\Delta_{\min} \geq \max\{\|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|, \kappa_M, \|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\| \kappa_s\} \|F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k)\|$ and $\chi(z_k) \leq 1$;
- (b) $D^r_k M_k \geq 0$ and $\|M_k^{-1}\| \leq \kappa_M$;
- (c) $a_{\kappa_2}(k+1)/a_{\kappa_2}(k) \leq 2\kappa_a$

hold for all $k \geq K'$. By the algorithmic construction and Lemma 6.6, we then have $\Delta_k \geq \Delta_{\min} \geq \kappa_M \|F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k)\| \geq \|M_k^{-1}F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k)\|$ and $\Delta_k \geq \Delta_{\min} \geq \|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\| \|\bar{s}_k\| \geq \|\bar{s}_k\| \kappa_a$ for all $k \geq K'$ and $k-1 \in S$. This establishes $s_k = \bar{s}_k$ for all $k \geq K'$, $k \in S$. Moreover, Lemma 3.4 (ii) is applicable and thus the CG-method will return an $\epsilon_k$-accurate solution $s_k$ of the linear system (14). Similar to (46) and utilizing Lemma 3.1, (D.4), and (D.6), this implies

$$\|z_k + s_k - \bar{z}\| = \|z_k + \bar{s}_k - \bar{z}\| \leq \kappa_M \|F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k) - F^A_{\text{nor}}(\bar{z}) - M_k(z_k - \bar{z})\| + \|F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k) + M_k\bar{s}_k\|$$

for all $k \geq K'$, $k \in S$, where $H_k = \nabla^2 f(x_k)D_k + \Lambda (I - D_k)$. Next, the Lipschitz continuity of $F^A_{\text{nor}}$ and condition (D.6) readily yield $\mathcal{E} (F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k)) = o(\|z_k - \bar{z}\|)$ as $k \to \infty$. The assumptions (D.2)–(D.3) then imply that $F^A_{\text{nor}}$ is semismooth at $\bar{z}$ and as before due to (B.3), (D.1), (D.3), and (D.5), we have

$$\|z_k + s_k - \bar{z}\| = o(\|z_k - \bar{z}\|) \quad S' \ni k \to \infty,$$

where $S' := \{k : k - 1 \in S\}$. Notice that Lemma 4.7 ensures $|S| = \infty$ and $|S'| = \infty$. Let $L_F$ denote the Lipschitz constant of the normal map $F^A_{\text{nor}}$. Thus, using Lemma 6.5 (on the subsequence defined by $S'$) and (48), there exists $K'' \geq K'$ and $\sigma > 0$ such that the conditions (a)–(c), and

- (d) $H_r(z_k + s_k) - H_r(z_k) \leq -\sigma \|\text{prox}_{\lambda}^A(z_k + s_k) - \text{prox}_{\lambda}^A(z_k)\|^2 - \frac{\eta_1}{2} \|F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k)\|^2$;
- (e) $\|z_k + s_k - \bar{z}\| \leq \|z_k - \bar{z}\| / \kappa_b$ where $\kappa_b := 2L_F \kappa_M (2\kappa_a)^{1+\frac{1}{1+p}}$;
- (f) and $\|z_k - \bar{z}\| \leq 2\kappa_M \|F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k)\|$

are satisfied for all $k \in S'' := \{k : k \in S', k \geq K''\}$. Notice that condition (f) can be shown as in (46) and is a consequence of the semismoothness of $F^A_{\text{nor}}$. In addition, the Lipschitz continuity of $F^A_{\text{nor}}$ and (e)–(f) imply

$$\|F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k + s_k)\| \leq L_F \|z_k + s_k - \bar{z}\| \leq \frac{L_F}{\kappa_b} \|z_k - \bar{z}\| \leq (2\kappa_a)^{-\frac{1}{1+p}} \|F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k)\| \quad \forall k \in S''.$$

We now assume that there exists an index $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\ell \in S'', \quad a_{\kappa_2}(\ell) \|F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_\ell)\|^{2+2p} \leq \frac{\sigma}{2\eta_1 (\kappa^p \|\Lambda\|)^{1+p}}.$$

Let us first estimate the parameter $\mu_\ell$. Due to condition (a) and $\ell - 1 \in S$, we have $\min\{\Delta_\ell, \chi(z_\ell)\} = \chi(z_\ell)$. Hence, using (D.7), Lemma 6.6, (50), and (d), it follows

$$\mu_\ell \leq \frac{\chi(z_\ell) \cdot a^2_{\kappa_2}(\ell) \|\text{prox}_{\lambda}^A(z_\ell + s_\ell) - \text{prox}_{\lambda}^A(z_\ell)\|^2 + 2p}{\min\{\Delta_\ell, \chi(z_\ell)\}} = a^2_{\kappa_2}(\ell) \|\text{prox}_{\lambda}^A(z_\ell + s_\ell) - \text{prox}_{\lambda}^A(z_\ell)\|^{2+2p} \leq \frac{\sigma}{2\eta_1}.$$
and $H_\tau(z_\ell) - H_\tau(z_\ell + s_\ell) \geq \eta_1 \text{pred}(z_\ell, s_\ell, \Delta_\tau, \nu_\ell)$ which shows $\ell \in S$ and $\ell + 1 \in S'$. Moreover, by (49) and (c), we have

$$a_{n_\mathcal{S}(\ell + 1)}^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_\ell + 1)\|^{2+2p} = a_{n_\mathcal{S}(\ell + 1)}^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_\ell + 1)\|^{2+2p} \leq 4K^2 a_{n_\mathcal{S}(\ell)}^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_\ell + 1)\|^{2+2p} \leq a_{n_\mathcal{S}(\ell)}^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_\ell)\|^{2+2p}.$$  

Consequently, the conditions in (50) are also satisfied for the next iteration $\ell + 1$ and inductively (since the conditions (a)-(f) hold for all $k \in S'$), we obtain $k \in S$ for all $k \geq \ell - 1$. The $q$-superlinear convergence of $\{z_k\}$ then follows from (48) (which now holds for all $k \geq \ell$). Finally, to complete the proof, we need to verify existence of such an index $\ell$ as in (50). Due to the Lipschitz continuity of $F_{\text{nor}}^A$ and Lemma 6.6, we obtain

$$\|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_{k+1})\| \leq \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_k + s_k) - F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_k)\| + \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_k)\| \leq L_F \|s_k\| + \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_k)\| \leq (1 + L_F K_k) \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_k)\|$$

for all $k + 1 \in S'$. Thus, applying Corollary 4.10, we have

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_{i+1})\|^2 = \sum_{k \in S} \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_k)\|^2 \leq (1 + L_F K_k)^2 \sum_{k \in S} \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_k)\|^2 < \infty,$$

which implies $\liminf_{\mathcal{S}' \ni k \to \infty} \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_k)\| / n_\mathcal{S}(k) = \liminf_{\mathcal{S}' \ni k \to \infty} \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_{i+1})\| / \sqrt{i + 1} = 0$ (otherwise the last sum expression would be infinite). By (D.7), it holds that $\limsup_{\mathcal{S}' \ni k \to \infty} a_{n_\mathcal{S}(k)}^2 / n_\mathcal{S}(k) \leq 1 + p < \infty$. Thus, it follows

$$\liminf_{\mathcal{S}' \ni k \to \infty} a_{n_\mathcal{S}(k)}^2 \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_k)\|^{2+2p} \leq \limsup_{\mathcal{S}' \ni k \to \infty} a_{n_\mathcal{S}(k)}^2 / n_\mathcal{S}(k) \leq 1 + p \leq 0,$$

which proves the existence of such an index $\ell$. The additional conditions in the second statement of Theorem 6.2 imply that the normal map is $\beta$-order semismooth at $\tilde{z}$. Hence, the estimate in (47) can be improved to $\|z_k + s_k - \tilde{z}\| \leq O(\|z_k - \tilde{z}\|^{1+\beta})$ which proves convergence of order $1 + \beta$. 

**Remark 7.6.** As seen in Lemma 6.5, the achievable descent of the merit function $H_{\tau}$ largely depends on the curvature constant $\bar{\sigma}$ which is typically unknown. Hence, in order to guarantee $\eta_1 \mu_k \leq 0.5 \bar{\sigma}$ (for all $k$ sufficiently large) and to show transition to fast local convergence, the parameter sequences $\{\nu_k\}$ and $\{\mu_k\}$ have to be chosen to converge to zero. In contrast and as verified in section 5, the parameters $\{\nu_k\}$ should also not decrease too quickly to still allow applicability of the KL-theory. Thus, the specific and implementable choices of $\{\nu_k\}$ and $\{\mu_k\}$ presented in (37) and (17) balance these requirements and allow us to establish unified global-local convergence results for Algorithm 1.

## 7 Second-Order Properties

The goal of this section is to study second-order properties of the functions $\psi \circ \text{prox}_z^A$ and $H_{\tau}$ and to investigate different second-order optimality conditions and concepts for the original minimization problem (1) and for the auxiliary problem $\min_{\mathcal{Z}} (\psi \circ \text{prox}_z^A)(\tilde{z})$. In particular, our results will allow us to discuss the conditions for superlinear convergence stated in Assumption 6.1 in more detail and to connect them to second-order optimality conditions.

### 7.1 Preliminaries and Basic Differentiability Properties

Due to the intrinsic nonsmoothness of the proximity operator, we can not expect that $\psi \circ \text{prox}_z^A$ or $H_{\tau}$ are differentiable everywhere like the forward-backward envelope introduced in [111, 112]. However, in the following proposition, we show that the mapping $\psi \circ \text{prox}_z^A$ enjoys stronger differentiability properties than $\psi$ at a stationary point.

**Proposition 7.7.** Let $\tilde{z}$ be a given solution of the nonsmooth equation (10). Then, both $\psi \circ \text{prox}_z^A$ and $H_{\tau}$ are strictly differentiable at $\tilde{z}$ with $\nabla (\psi \circ \text{prox}_z^A)(\tilde{z}) = 0$.

**Proof.** We first prove the conclusion for $\psi \circ \text{prox}_z^A$. By the definition of strict differentiability, see, e.g., [135, Definition 9.13], we need to show:

$$\lim_{z, z' \to \tilde{z}} \frac{\psi(\text{prox}_z^A(z)) - \psi(\text{prox}_z^A(z'))}{\|z - z'\|} = 0.$$  

(51)

Setting $x = \text{prox}_z^A(z)$, $x' = \text{prox}_z^A(z')$, we have:

$$\text{env}_z^A(z) - \text{env}_z^A(z') = (\nabla \text{env}_z^A(z'), z - z') + o(\|z - z'\|), \quad f(x) - f(x') = (\nabla f(x'), x - x') + o(\|x - x'\|),$$

and

$$H_{\tau}(z) - H_{\tau}(z) = o(\|z - z'\|).$$

Finally, we obtain:

$$\frac{\psi(\text{prox}_z^A(z)) - \psi(\text{prox}_z^A(z'))}{\|z - z'\|} = \frac{\psi(\text{prox}_z^A(z)) - \psi(\text{prox}_z^A(z'))}{\|z - z'\|}.$$  

(52)

and...
as \( z, z' \to \bar{z} \). These two expansions are uniform near \( \bar{z} \) because both \( \nabla \text{env}_\varepsilon^\Lambda \phi \) and \( \nabla f \) are Lipschitz continuous near \( \bar{z} \).

As in the proof of Proposition 6.4 and by the definition of the Moreau envelope \( \text{env}_\varepsilon^\Lambda \phi \), we can infer

\[
\psi(x) - \psi(x') = f(x) + \text{env}_\varepsilon^\Lambda (z) - f(x') - \text{env}_\varepsilon^\Lambda (z') - \frac{1}{2} \|x - z\|^2_\Lambda + \frac{1}{2} \|x' - z'\|^2_\Lambda \\
= \langle \nabla f(x'), x - x' \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|z - x\|^2_\Lambda - \frac{1}{2} \|x - z\|^2_\Lambda + o(\|z - z'\|) = \langle F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z'), x - x' \rangle + o(\|z - z'\|),
\]

where we have used the fact that \( \phi(x) = o(\|x - z'\|) \). Then, (51) follows from the continuity of \( F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}} \). To prove the claim for \( H_\varepsilon \), it suffices to show that \( g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}, g(z) = \frac{1}{2} \|F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z)\|^2_\Lambda \), is strictly differentiable at \( \bar{z} \) with zero gradient. Setting \( h(z) = \frac{1}{2} \|z\|^2_\Lambda - z \cdot \bar{z} \), we can write \( g = \bar{h} \circ F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}} \). Moreover, we have \( \partial \bar{h}(F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z)) = \{ \nabla h(F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z)) \} = \{ \Lambda^{-1} F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(z) \} \). Hence, applying [43, Proposition 2.2.4], we get the conclusion.

In the following, we briefly introduce different notions of generalized second-order differentiability that will be the basis of our analysis. We will mainly work with the second-order epi-derivative in the sense of (6). We will use \( d^2 \theta(x) \) to denote the corresponding epi-limit. The mapping \( \theta \) is called twice semidifferentiable at \( x \) if it is semidifferentiable and if the limit

\[
\lim_{t \downarrow 0, h \to h} \frac{\theta(x + th) - \theta(x) - t \cdot \langle \alpha, h \rangle}{\|t\|^2}
\]

exists for all \( h \in \mathbb{R}^n \). The limiting function will then be denoted by \( \theta''(x; \cdot) \). The interested reader is referred to [135, Chapter 13] and [20, Sections 2.2 and 3.3.5] for a thorough discussion of these second-order concepts. Let us recall that a function \( \varrho : \mathbb{R}^n \to (-\infty, \infty] \) is called proper if \( \varrho(x) > -\infty \) and \( \text{dom}(\varrho) \neq \emptyset \). We now collect several useful properties of the lower second-order subderivative which have been established in [135, Proposition 13.5 and 13.20].

**Lemma 7.2.** Let \( \theta : \mathbb{R}^n \to (-\infty, \infty] \) and \( (x, \alpha) \in \text{dom}(\theta) \times \mathbb{R}^n \) be given.

(i) The subderivative \( d^2 \theta(x; \alpha) : \mathbb{R}^n \to (-\infty, \infty] \) is lower semicontinuous and positively homogeneous of degree 2, i.e., \( d^2 \theta(x; \alpha)(th) = t^2 d^2 \theta(x; \alpha)(h) \) for all \( t > 0 \) and \( h \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

(ii) If \( d^2 \theta(x; \alpha) \) is a proper function, then it follows \( \text{dom}(d^2 \theta(x; \alpha)) \subset C(x; \alpha) := \{ h : \langle \alpha, h \rangle = \theta^>_1(x; h) \}. \)

Suppose that \( \theta \) is convex and let \( \alpha \in \partial \theta(x) \) be given. Then, it additionally holds that:

(iii) We have \( d^2 \theta(x; \alpha)(h) \geq 0 \) for all \( h \in \mathbb{R}^n \). If \( \theta \) is twice epi-differentiable at \( x \) for \( \alpha \), then \( h \mapsto d^2 \theta(x; \alpha)(h) \) is a convex function.

We call the pair \( (\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \in \text{dom}(\varrho) \times \mathbb{R}^n \) a criticality pair of problem (1), if \( F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(\bar{x}) = F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(\bar{z}) = 0 \) and if \( \bar{x} = \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varrho}(\bar{z}) \) or, equivalently, \( \bar{z} = \bar{x} = \Lambda^{-1} \nabla f(\bar{x}) \). Next, we formulate our main second-order differentiability assumptions.

**Assumption 7.3.** Let \( (\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \in \text{dom}(\varrho) \times \mathbb{R}^n \) be a criticality pair of problem (1). We assume:

(E.1) The mapping \( \varrho \) is twice epi-differentiable at \( \bar{x} \) for \( -\nabla f(\bar{x}) \).

(E.2) The function \( \varrho \) is twice epi-differentiable at \( \bar{x} \) for \( -\nabla f(\bar{x}) \) and it holds that

\[
d^2 \varrho(\bar{x}) - \nabla f(\bar{x}))(h) = (h, Qh) + l_S(h) \quad \forall h,
\]

where \( Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) is some symmetric, positive semidefinite matrix and \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is a linear subspace.

Using the correspondence between \( \bar{x} \) and \( \bar{z} \), condition (E.1) coincides with assuming twice epi-differentiability of \( \varrho \) at \( \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varrho}(\bar{z}) \) for \( -\nabla \text{env}_\varepsilon^\Lambda(\varrho) \). Furthermore, due to \( -\nabla f(\bar{x}) \in \partial \varrho(\bar{x}) \) and Lemma 7.2 (i) and (iii), the second-order subderivative \( h \mapsto Y(h) := d^2 \varrho(\bar{x}) - \nabla f(\bar{x}))(h) \) is a proper function. Assumption (E.2) additionally requires that \( Y \) is a generalized quadratic. Hence, condition (E.2) essentially coincides with the second-order assumptions stated and utilized in [148, 153, 89].
The class of functions and applications for which the second-order subderivative \( \Upsilon \) is a generalized quadratic and satisfies the structural property stated in condition (E.2) is rather rich and encompasses (fully) amenable mappings, see, e.g., [114, 115] or [135, Chapter 10 and 13], \( C^2 \)-cone reducible constraints [20, Section 3.4.4], and decomposable functions [143, 99]. More specific examples and related references are discussed, e.g., in [99, Section 5.3].

Twice epi-differentiability is a powerful tool and allows to characterize differentiability properties of the Moreau envelope and proximity operator. In the following and based on the pioneering observations in [117, 116, 135], we briefly state some of these fundamental connections for our special situation.

**Theorem 7.4.** The following conditions are equivalent:

(i) The mapping \( \varphi \) satisfies assumption (E.1).

(ii) The proximity operator \( \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi} \) is semidifferentiable at \( \bar{z} \).

(iii) The Moreau envelope \( \text{env}^\Lambda_{\varphi} \) is twice semidifferentiable at \( \bar{z} \).

Furthermore, in this case, it follows \((\text{env}^\Lambda_{\varphi})''(\bar{z}; h) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} d^2\varphi(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z}))|\nabla \text{env}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z}))(y) + \|h - y\|^2_\Lambda\) and we have \((\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi})'(\bar{z}; h) = \arg\min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} d^2\varphi(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z}))|\nabla \text{env}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z}))(y) + \|h - y\|^2_\Lambda\). In addition, assumption (E.2) is equivalent to the condition \( \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi} \) is differentiable at \( \bar{z} \).

**Proof.** The equivalence of the first three conditions and the formulae for \((\text{env}^\Lambda_{\varphi})''\) and \((\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi})'\) can be shown as in [116, Theorem 3.5] or [135, Exercise 13.45]. The equivalence of (E.2) and (52) essentially follows from [116, Theorem 3.8].

Let us notice that the results in Theorem 7.4 do also hold in a much more general setting when \( \varphi \) is only assumed to be prox-bounded and prox-regular. However, since our algorithmic framework currently relies on the (uniform) \( \Lambda \)-firm nonexpansiveness of the proximity operator, we will concentrate on the convex case.

**Remark 7.5.** It is possible to connect the linear subspace \( S \) introduced in (E.2) to the associated critical cone

\[ C(\bar{x}) := \{ h : \psi^+(\bar{x}; h) = 0 \} = \{ h : \psi^+(\bar{x}; h) = -\langle \nabla f(\bar{x}), h \rangle \} = N_{\partial \varphi(\bar{x})}(-\nabla f(\bar{x})), \]

where \( N_{\partial \varphi(\bar{x})}(-\nabla f(\bar{x})) = \{ v : \langle v, y + \nabla f(\bar{x}) \rangle \leq 0, \forall y \in \partial \varphi(\bar{x}) \} \) denotes the standard normal cone. Using this representation of the critical cone and applying [84, Proposition 2.2], it can be shown that the strict complementarity condition

\[ -\nabla f(\bar{x}) \in \text{ri}(\partial \varphi(\bar{x})) \]

is equivalent to saying that \( C(\bar{x}) \) is a subspace. Moreover, differentiability of the proximity operator \( \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi} \) will remain fully equivalent to assumption (E.2) with \( S = C(\bar{x}) \) under an additional parabolic derivability condition. We refer to [135, Definition 13.11 and Example 13.62] and [101, 102] for more details and novel results on parabolic derivability and parabolic epi-differentiability.

### 7.2 Second-Order Optimality and Strong Metric Subregularity of \( F^\Lambda_{\text{nat}} \) and \( F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}} \)

Based on Theorem 7.4, we first express and calculate the second-order derivatives of \( \psi \circ \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi} \).

**Lemma 7.6.** Let \( \bar{z} \) be a solution of (10) at which (E.1) is satisfied and let \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) be twice continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of \( \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z}) \). Then, the mapping \( \psi \circ \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi} \) is twice semidifferentiable at \( \bar{z} \) and we have

\[ (\psi \circ \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi})''(\bar{z}; h) = ((\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi})'(\bar{z}; h), (F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}})'(\bar{z}; h)) \]

\[ = ((\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi})'(\bar{z}; h), \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z})))(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi})'(\bar{z}; h) + \Lambda(h - (\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi})'(\bar{z}; h))) \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^n. \]

**Proof.** Let \( \bar{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n \) be given and let us define \( p_t := \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z} + t\bar{h}) \) and \( \bar{x} = \text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z}) \). Similar to the analysis in section 6, it follows

\[ \psi(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z} + t\bar{h})) - \psi(\text{prox}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z})) \]

\[ = f(p_t) - f(\bar{x}) + \text{env}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z} + t\bar{h}) - \text{env}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z}) + \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{z} - \bar{x}\|^2_\Lambda - \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{z} + t\bar{h} - p_t\|^2_\Lambda \]

\[ = \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}), p_t - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{1}{2}(p_t - \bar{x}, \nabla^2 f(\bar{x})(p_t - \bar{x})) + \text{env}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z} + t\bar{h}) - \text{env}^\Lambda_{\varphi}(\bar{z}) + \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{z} - \bar{x}\|^2_\Lambda \]

...
This finishes the proof of Lemma 7.6. Assume that condition Proposition 7.7. 

\[ \text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}} \text{ is single-valued, then strong metric subregularity implies that} \]

\[ \lim_{t \to 0} (\bar{\mathbf{y}}(h), h) d\tau = (h - \text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}; h), \Lambda h). \]

Here, we used \( (\nabla \text{env}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda)'(\bar{\mathbf{y}}; h) = \Lambda(h - \text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}; h), \Lambda h) \). (Notice that this limit has to coincide with the second-order semiderivative of \( \text{env}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda \) at \( \bar{\mathbf{y}} \)). Since \( \psi \circ \text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda \) is strictly differentiable at \( \bar{\mathbf{y}} \) with \( \nabla(\psi \circ \text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) = 0 \), it now follows

\[ (\psi \circ \text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda)'(\bar{\mathbf{y}}; h) = ((\text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda)'(\bar{\mathbf{y}}; h), \nabla^2 f(\bar{\mathbf{y}})(\text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda)'(\bar{\mathbf{y}}; h)) + (\text{env}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda)'(\bar{\mathbf{y}}; h) - ||h - (\text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda)'(\bar{\mathbf{y}}; h)||^2_{\Lambda}. \]

This finishes the proof of Lemma 7.6.

We now establish second-order optimality conditions and several second-order properties. Specifically, we will derive a sufficient condition for strong metric subregularity of the functions \( F_{\text{nat}}^\Lambda \) and \( F_{\text{mat}}^\Lambda \). Here, we say that a set-valued mapping \( F : \mathbb{R}^n \Rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) is strongly metrically subregular at \( \xi \) for \( \bar{y} \) if \( \bar{y} \in F(\xi) \) and there exists a constant \( \kappa > 0 \) and a neighborhood \( U \) of \( \xi \) such that

\[ ||x - \xi|| \leq \kappa \text{dist}(\bar{y}, F(x)) \quad \forall x \in U. \]

If \( F \) is single-valued, then strong metric subregularity implies that \( \bar{y} \) is an isolated solution of the equation \( F(x) = \bar{y} \).

**Proposition 7.7.** Assume that condition \( (E.1) \) is satisfied at the criticality pair \( (\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \in \text{dom}(\varphi) \times \mathbb{R}^n \) and let \( f \) be twice continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of \( \bar{x} \).

(i) Suppose that \( \bar{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is a local minimum of the mapping \( \psi \circ \text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda \). Then, we have

\[ \max_{D \in \partial \text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda(\bar{z})} \langle Dh, \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda(\bar{z}))Dh + \Lambda(I - D)h \rangle \geq \langle (\text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda)'(\bar{z}; h), (F_{\text{mat}}^\Lambda)'(\bar{z}; h) \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^n. \]  

(ii) The quadratic growth condition

\[ \exists \sigma, \delta > 0 \quad \psi(\text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda(\bar{z})) \geq \psi(\text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda(\bar{z})) + \frac{\sigma}{2} ||\text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda(\bar{z}) - \text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda(\bar{z})||^2_{\Lambda} \quad \forall \bar{z} \in B_\delta(\bar{z}) \]

implies the following second-order optimality condition:

\[ \langle (\text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda)'(\bar{z}; h), (F_{\text{mat}}^\Lambda)'(\bar{z}; h) \rangle > 0 \quad \forall h \text{ with } (\text{prox}_{\mathcal{F}}^\Lambda)'(\bar{z}; h) \neq 0. \]

Moreover, if condition \( (55) \) is satisfied, then the mappings \( F_{\text{mat}}^\Lambda \) and \( F_{\text{nat}}^\Lambda \) are strongly metrically subregular at \( \bar{z} \) and \( \bar{x} \) for 0, respectively.
Proof. We first verify part (i). By [135, Theorem 13.24], the local minimum $\bar{z}$ satisfies the second-order necessary condition $d^2(\psi \circ \text{prox}_\lambda^A)(\bar{z})h \geq 0$ for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Due to $F^\text{nor}_\lambda(\bar{z}) = 0$, Proposition 7.1, and Lemma 7.6, the function $\psi \circ \text{prox}_\lambda^A$ is twice semidifferentiable at $\bar{z}$ with $\nabla(\psi \circ \text{prox}_\lambda^A)(\bar{z}) = 0$ and thus, it follows
\[
d^2(\psi \circ \text{prox}_\lambda^A)(\bar{z})h = (\psi \circ \text{prox}_\lambda^A)'\nabla^2 f(\bar{z}; h) \geq 0 \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]
Applying [125, Lemma 2.2], for every $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists $D \in \partial \text{prox}_\lambda^A(\bar{z})$ such that $Dh = (\text{prox}_\lambda^A)'(\bar{z}; h)$ which establishes the maximum expression in (53). We now continue with the proof of the second. Using Proposition 7.1 and Lemma 7.6, it is easy to show that the second-order growth condition implies
\[
(\psi \circ \text{prox}_\lambda^A)'(\bar{z}; h; \lambda) \geq \sigma \|\text{prox}_\lambda^A(\bar{z})\|^2 \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]
Next, let the second-order optimality condition (55) be satisfied and suppose that the normal map is not strongly metrically subregular at $\bar{z}$ for 0. Then there exist sequences $\{z_k\}$ and $\{\sigma_k\}$ with $z_k \to \bar{z}$ and $\sigma_k \to 0$ such that
\[
\|F^\text{nor}_\lambda(z_k)\| \leq \sigma_k \|z_k - \bar{z}\|.
\]
Let us define $t_k = \|z_k - \bar{z}\|$ and $h_k = t_k^{-1}(z_k - \bar{z})$. Without loss of generality we may assume that the sequence $\{h_k\}$ converges to some $h$ with $\|h\| = 1$. Using the semidifferentiability of $F^\text{nor}_\lambda$ and $\text{prox}_\lambda^A$, this yields
\[
\|F^\text{nor}_\lambda(\bar{z})\| = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\|F^\text{nor}_\lambda(\bar{z} + t_k h_k) - F^\text{nor}_\lambda(\bar{z})\|}{t_k} \leq \lim_{k \to \infty} \sigma_k = 0.
\]
By the second-order condition (55) this can only happen in the case $(\text{prox}_\lambda^A)'(\bar{z}; h) = 0$. However, we then obtain $0 = (F^\text{nor}_\lambda)'(\bar{z}; h) = \lambda h$ which is a contradiction to $\|h\| = 1$. Similarly, if $F^\text{nor}_\lambda$ is not strongly metrically subregular at $\bar{x}$ for 0, there exists $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|h\| = 1$ and $(F^\text{nor}_\lambda)'(\bar{x}; h) = 0$. Setting $V = I - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla^2 f(\bar{x})$ and utilizing $\bar{x} - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla f(\bar{x}) = \bar{z}$, it follows
\[
0 = \Lambda V(\text{prox}_\lambda^A)'(\bar{x}; h) = \Lambda V[h - (\text{prox}_\lambda^A)'(\bar{z}; Vh)] = \Lambda[Vh - (\text{prox}_\lambda^A)'(\bar{z}; Vh) + \nabla^2 f(\bar{x})(\text{prox}_\lambda^A)'(\bar{z}; Vh)] = (F^\text{nor}_\lambda)'(\bar{z}; Vh) = 0.
\]
Again, by (55), this implies $(\text{prox}_\lambda^A)'(\bar{z}; Vh) = 0$ and $h = (F^\text{nor}_\lambda)'(\bar{x}; h) + (\text{prox}_\lambda^A)'(\bar{z}; Vh) = 0$ which is a contradiction. This concludes the proof of Proposition 7.7.

In the following, we discuss connections between second-order optimality conditions and several second-order concepts for the problems $\min_x \psi(x)$ and $\min_z (\psi \circ \text{prox}_\lambda^A)(z)$.

**Theorem 7.8.** Let $(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \in \text{dom}(\psi) \times \mathbb{R}^n$ be a given criticality pair and let $f$ be twice continuously differentiable around $\bar{x}$. Suppose that assumption (E.1) is satisfied. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:

(i) The second-order sufficient condition holds at $\bar{z}$:
\[
d^2\psi(\bar{z}0)(h) = \langle h, \nabla^2 f(\bar{x})h \rangle + d^2 \varphi(\bar{x}) - \nabla f(\bar{x}) \rangle(0) > 0 \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}.
\]

(ii) There exists $\sigma, \delta > 0$ such that $\psi(x) \geq \psi(\bar{x}) + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2$ for all $x \in B_\delta(\bar{x})$.

(iii) The mapping $F^\text{nor}_\lambda$ is strongly metrically subregular at $\bar{x}$ for 0 and the second-order necessary condition $d^2\psi(\bar{x}0)(h) \geq 0$ holds for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

(iv) The subdifferential $\partial \psi$ is strongly metrically subregular at $\bar{x}$ for 0 and the necessary condition $d^2\psi(\bar{x}0)(h) \geq 0$ is satisfied for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

(v) The second-order sufficient optimality condition formulated in (55) is fulfilled, i.e., we have
\[
(\text{prox}_\lambda^A)'(\bar{z}; h, (F^\text{nor}_\lambda)'(\bar{z}; h)) > 0 \quad \forall h \text{ with } (\text{prox}_\lambda^A)'(\bar{z}; h) \neq 0.
\]

(vi) The quadratic growth condition (54) holds at $\bar{z}$.

(vii) The normal map $F^\text{nor}_\lambda$ is strongly metrically subregular at $\bar{z}$ for 0 and the second-order necessary optimality condition $(\text{prox}_\lambda^A)'(\bar{z}; h, (F^\text{nor}_\lambda)'(\bar{z}; h)) \geq 0$ is satisfied for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$. 
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Proof. By [135, Theorem 13.24] and Lemma 7.2, the assertions (i) and (ii) are equivalent. Notice that the representation of the subderivative $d^2\psi(\bar{x}|0)$ in (i) can be shown by applying a second-order Taylor expansion of $f$. The implications “(ii) $\implies$ (vi)”, “(vii) $\implies$ (v)”, and “(v) $\implies$ (vii)” are an immediate consequence of the $\Lambda$-nonexpansiveness of the proximity operator and of Proposition 7.7. Next, we verify that the two second-order necessary conditions stated in (iii), (iv), and (vii) are actually equivalent. 

Due to Theorem 7.4 and Lemma 7.6, it holds that
\[
d^2\psi(\bar{x}|0)((\prox^\Lambda)(\bar{z};h)) = d^2(\psi \circ \prox^\Lambda)(\bar{z}|0)(h) = \langle (\prox^\Lambda)'(\bar{z};h), (F^\Lambda)''(\bar{z};h) \rangle \quad \forall \ h \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]
Hence, the standard necessary optimality conditions for the original problem $\min_x \psi(x)$ in (iii) are generally stronger and imply (53). To establish full equivalence, we now show $\mathcal{R}(\prox^\Lambda)'(\bar{z};\cdot) = \dom(\partial \Upsilon)$ where $\Upsilon(h) := d^2\psi(\bar{x}|0) - \nabla f(\bar{x})(h)$. By Lemma 7.2, the mapping $\Upsilon$ is convex, lower semicontinuous, nonnegative, positively homogeneous of degree 2, and proper. Thus, utilizing Theorem 7.4, we have the following characterization
\[
p'(\bar{z};h) = (\prox^\Lambda)'(\bar{z};h) \iff 0 \in \partial \Upsilon(p') + 2\Lambda(p'-h).
\]
Let $h \in \dom(\partial \Upsilon)$ with $y \in \partial \Upsilon(h)$ be arbitrary. Then, we obtain
\[
0 \in \partial \Upsilon(h) + 2\Lambda(h - [h + \frac{1}{2}\Lambda^{-1}y]) \implies h = (\prox^\Lambda)'(\bar{z};h) + \frac{1}{2}\Lambda^{-1}y)
\]
which yields $\mathcal{R}(\prox^\Lambda)'(\bar{z};\cdot) = \dom(\partial \Upsilon)$. Therefore, the second-order necessary condition (53) implies
\[
d^2\psi(\bar{x}|0)(h) \geq 0 \quad \forall \ h \in \dom(\partial \Upsilon).
\]
By [11, Proposition 16.28 and Corollary 16.29], $\dom(\partial \Upsilon)$ is dense in $\dom(\Upsilon)$ and for every $h \in \dom(\Upsilon)$ there exists a sequence $\{h_k\} \subset \dom(\partial \Upsilon)$ with $h_k \to h$ and $\Upsilon(h_k) \to \Upsilon(h)$. Due to $\dom(d^2\psi(\bar{x}|0)) = \dom(\Upsilon)$, this finally establishes $d^2\psi(\bar{x}|0)(h) \geq 0$ for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and proves the implication “(v) $\implies$ (iii)”. We now continue with the verification of “(iii), (iv), (vii) $\implies$ (i)”.

We mimic the strategy in the proof of [101, Theorem 9.2] and assume that the second-order sufficient conditions are not satisfied, i.e., there exists $h \neq 0$ with
\[
d^2\psi(\bar{x}|0)(h) = 0.
\]
By the second-order necessary optimality conditions, this implies that $\bar{h}$ is a solution of the minimization problem $\min_h d^2\psi(\bar{x}|0)(h)$. Using the representation (57) and the calculus mentioned in section 2, $\bar{h}$ then has to satisfy the first-order optimality condition
\[
0 \in \partial d^2\psi(\bar{x}|0)(\bar{h}) = 2\nabla^2 f(\bar{x})\bar{h} + \partial \Upsilon(\bar{h}).
\]
Moreover, due to (58), we can infer $\bar{h} = (\prox^\Lambda)'(\bar{z};\bar{h} - \Lambda^{-1}\nabla f(\bar{x})\bar{h})$ or equivalently $(F^\Lambda)'(\bar{x};\bar{h}) = 0$. Since the strong metric subregularity of $F^\Lambda_{\text{nat}}$ and $F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}$ imply
\[
\exists \sigma_1, \sigma_2 > 0 : \\|(F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}})'(\bar{z};h)\| \geq \sigma_1\|h\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|(F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}})'(\bar{z};h)\| \geq \sigma_2\|h\| \quad \forall \ h \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\]
the implication “(iii) $\implies$ (i)” follows immediately from (59) and from the resulting contradiction $\bar{h} = 0$. Furthermore, if $F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}$ is strongly metrically subregular, we can use (36) and (59) to obtain $V\bar{h} = 0$ and $\bar{h} = (\prox^\Lambda)'(\bar{z};V\bar{h}) = (\prox^\Lambda)(\bar{z};\bar{h}) = 0$ which is again a contradiction and yields “(vii) $\implies$ (i)”. Finally, the strong metric subregularity of the subdifferential $\partial \psi$, (31), and the nonexpansiveness of proximity operator guarantee the existence of $\sigma_3, \delta_3 > 0$ such that
\[
\|F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}(\bar{z})\| \geq \text{dist}(0, \partial \psi(\prox^\Lambda(\bar{z}))) \geq \sigma_3\|\prox^\Lambda(\bar{z}) - (\prox^\Lambda)(\bar{z})\| \quad \forall \ z \in B_{\delta_3}(\bar{z}).
\]
As before this implies $\|F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}'(\bar{z};\bar{h})\| \geq \sigma_3\|\prox^\Lambda(\bar{z}) - (\prox^\Lambda)(\bar{z})\|$ for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and by (56) we conclude $(F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}})'(\bar{z};V\bar{h}) = (\prox^\Lambda)'(\bar{z};V\bar{h}) = 0$. This is a contradiction and establishes “(iv) $\implies$ (i)”. The remaining implication “(iii) $\implies$ (iv)” is a simple consequence of Lemma 2.2.

The results in Theorem 7.8 are quite satisfactory and provide a precise characterization of the gap between second-order necessary and sufficient optimality conditions as well as a strong connection between the different optimality concepts involving the normal residual $F^\Lambda_{\text{nat}}$ and the normal map $F^\Lambda_{\text{nor}}$. Let us note that a similar result for prox-regular and subdifferentially continuous problems was recently established in [41] using the subgradient graphical derivative. Further related second-order results based on parabolic epi-differentiability and parabolic regularity can be found in [102]. We also refer to [6, 58, 56, 53, 101, 102] for more discussions. A possible extension of Theorem 7.8 to the fully nonconvex, prox-regular setting as in [41, Theorem 3.8] and [102, Theorem 6.1 and 6.3] is left for future work. The novel normal map-based second-order conditions in part (v) and (vii) of Theorem 7.8 complement the results in [102] and are an appealing alternative to the classical conditions in (i) or (iii), since they only depend on the (existence of) the directional derivative of the proximity operator and can be formulated without requiring more involved geometrical or variational tools.
Remark 7.9. The conditions in Theorem 7.8 imply that the merit function $H_f$ satisfies the KL-type inequality stated in assumption (C.1) with exponent $\frac{3}{4}$. Specifically, using the Lipschitz continuity of the mappings $\text{prox}_{\phi}^A$ and $F_{\text{nor}}^A$, the twice semidifferentiability of $\psi \circ \text{prox}_{\phi}^A$, and [135, Exercise 13.7], we have

$$
\psi(\text{prox}_{\phi}^A(z)) - \psi(\text{prox}_{\phi}^A(\bar{z})) = \frac{1}{2}(\psi \circ \text{prox}_{\phi}^A)'(\bar{z}; z - \bar{z}) + o(\|z - \bar{z}\|^2) \leq L_p\|z - \bar{z}\|^2
$$

for $z \to \bar{z}$ and for some constant $L_p > 0$. Our claim then follows easily from the strong metric subregularity of the normal map $F_{\text{nor}}^A$, see also Lemma 5.3 for comparison.

7.3 Second-Order Conditions and Bounded Invertibility under Assumption (E.2)

Next, we present a special case of Theorem 7.8 under the stronger condition (E.2).

Corollary 7.10. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be twice continuously differentiable and suppose that assumption (E.2) is satisfied at a criticality pair $(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \in \text{dom}(\varphi) \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, the conditions (i)--(vi) in Theorem 7.8 are further equivalent to

- $DF_{\text{nor}}^A(\bar{z})$ is invertible and $D\text{prox}_{\phi}^A(\bar{z})^TDF_{\text{nor}}^A(\bar{z})$ is positive semidefinite,

where $DF_{\text{nor}}^A(\bar{z})$ and $D\text{prox}_{\phi}^A(\bar{z})$ denote the (Fréchet) derivative of $F_{\text{nor}}^A$ and $\text{prox}_{\phi}^A$ at $\bar{z}$, respectively.

Proof. The differentiability of $\text{prox}_{\phi}^A$ and $F_{\text{nor}}^A$ is shown in Theorem 7.4. Defining $D := D\text{prox}_{\phi}^A(\bar{z})$ and following the proof of Proposition 7.7, we also have

$$
\langle Dh, D\text{prox}_{\phi}^A(z)h \rangle \geq \sigma \|Dh\|_A^2 \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^n,
$$

for some $\sigma > 0$ which is a consequence of the growth condition (54). Hence, the assertion in Corollary 7.10 now directly follows from Lemma 6.3.

We conclude this section and show that assumption (E.2) implies CD-regularity of $F_{\text{nor}}^A$. This further allows us to fully connect the second-order results in Corollary 7.10 and condition (D.4).

Proposition 7.11. In addition to the assumptions stated in Corollary 7.10, let us assume that $\text{prox}_{\phi}^A$ is semismooth at $\bar{z}$. Then, the second-order conditions in Corollary 7.10 imply that $F_{\text{nor}}^A$ is CD-regular at $\bar{z}$. Moreover, there exist $\bar{\sigma}, \delta > 0$ such that we have

$$
\langle Dh, Mh \rangle \geq \bar{\sigma} \|Dh\|_A^2 \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^n,
$$

for all $z \in B_\delta(\bar{z})$ and $M \in \mathcal{M}^A(z)$ with $M = \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}_{\phi}^A(z))D + \Lambda(I - D)$ and $D \in \partial \text{prox}_{\phi}^A(z)$.

Thus, the second-order optimality condition (55), (E.2), and the semismoothness of $\text{prox}_{\phi}^A$ are sufficient to guarantee the invertibility assumption (D.4).

Proof. The differentiability and semismoothness of $\text{prox}_{\phi}^A$ imply that the proximity operator $\text{prox}_{\phi}^A$ and $F_{\text{nor}}^A$ are strictly differentiable at $\bar{z}$ and Clarke’s subdifferential $\partial \text{prox}_{\phi}^A(\bar{z})$ reduces to a singleton $\partial \text{prox}_{\phi}^A(\bar{z}) = \{D\text{prox}_{\phi}^A(\bar{z})\} = \{D\}$, see, e.g., [99, Theorem 2.6.7] and [135, Exercise 9.25 and Theorem 9.62]. In addition, $\partial F_{\text{nor}}^A(\bar{z})$ coincides with $\mathcal{M}^A(\bar{z})$ and both sets reduce to the singleton $\{\nabla^2 f(\bar{x})D + \Lambda(I - D)\}$ where $\bar{x} = \text{prox}_{\phi}^A(\bar{z})$. We now show the following continuity property:

$$
\forall \epsilon > 0 \quad \exists \delta > 0 \quad \text{such that} \quad \|D(z) - D\bar{z}\| < \epsilon \quad \forall D(z) \in \partial \text{prox}_{\phi}^A(z) \quad \text{and} \quad z \in B_\delta(\bar{z}).
$$

Suppose that this assertion is wrong, i.e., there exists $\epsilon > 0$ and sequences $\{z_k\}$ and $\{D(z_k)\}$, $D(z_k) \in \partial \text{prox}_{\phi}^A(z_k)$, with $z_k \to \bar{z}$ and $\|D(z_k) - D\bar{z}\| \geq \epsilon$ for all $k$. Due the local boundedness and upper semicontinuity of Clarke’s subdifferential, there then exists a subsequence $\{k_\ell\}$ and $D \in \partial \text{prox}_{\phi}^A(\bar{z})$ such that $D(z_{k_\ell}) \to D$. Utilizing the strict differentiability of $\text{prox}_{\phi}^A$ at $\bar{z}$ this yields the contradiction $D = D\bar{z}$.

Next, let $z \in B_\delta(\bar{z})$ and $D(z) \in \partial \text{prox}_{\phi}^A(z)$ be arbitrary and let us define $\bar{D}(z) = \Lambda^\frac{1}{2} D(z)\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\bar{D} = \Lambda^\frac{1}{2} D\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Lemma 2.4 implies that the matrices $\bar{D}(z)$ and $\bar{D}$ are positive semidefinite with eigenvalues in $[0, 1]$. Let $\tilde{D}(z) = P(z)Q(z)P(z)^T$ be an eigenvalue decomposition of $\bar{D}(z)$ with $Q(z) = \text{diag}(q_1(z), ..., q_n(z))$ and $q_1(z) \geq ... \geq q_n(z)$. Thanks to the continuity property (60) and [151, Lemma 4.3] there then exists an orthogonal matrix $P$ such that

$$
\tilde{D} = PQP^T, \quad Q = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n), \quad \text{and} \quad \|P(z) - P\| = O(\|z - \bar{z}\|)
$$
(after possibly reducing $\delta > 0$). Let $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary and let us set $\tilde{h} = P \Lambda^{1/2} h$. Then, our assumption implies
\[
\langle \tilde{h}, \tilde{G}\tilde{h} \rangle \geq \sigma \|Q\tilde{h}\|^2, \quad \tilde{G} := P \Lambda^{-1/2} \tilde{D}^T \tilde{D} P_{\text{not}}(\tilde{z}) \Lambda^{-1/2} P^T,
\]
for some $\sigma > 0$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that the eigenvalues of $\tilde{D}$ satisfy $\lambda_1 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_\ell > 0 = \lambda_{\ell+1} = \ldots = \lambda_n$ for some $\ell \geq 1$. (The following proof will also work in the case $\ell = 0$.) Then there is a constant $\tilde{\sigma} > 0$ such that for any $y \in \text{span}\{e_1, \ldots, e_\ell\}$ we have
\[
\langle y, \tilde{G}y \rangle \geq \tilde{\sigma} \|y\|^2.
\]
Here, $\{e_i\}$ denotes the standard Euclidean basis. Notice that this property and the constant $\tilde{\sigma}$ do not depend on the choice of $P$, i.e., condition (62) holds for all $P \in \mathcal{P} := \{P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : P \text{ is orthogonal}; Q = P^T \tilde{D} P \text{ is diagonal with } Q_{11} \geq \ldots \geq Q_{nn}\}$.

We now set $M(z) := \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}_{\tilde{\lambda}^2}(z)) D_z \Lambda (I - D_z) \in \mathcal{M}(z)$ and $\tilde{G}(z) := P(z) \Lambda^{-1/2} D(z)^T M(z) \Lambda^{-1/2} P(z)^T$.

Reducing $\delta$ if necessary (this might change $P$), we obtain
\[
\langle y, \tilde{G}(z)y \rangle \geq \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{2} \|y\|^2 \quad \forall y \in \text{span}\{e_1, \ldots, e_\ell\}.
\]

Next, let $h = P(z) \Lambda^{1/2} h$ with $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary. As before, we then have $\langle h, D(z)^T M(z)h \rangle = \langle \tilde{h}, \tilde{G}(z)\tilde{h} \rangle$. Setting $h_1 = \sum_{i=1}^\ell (\tilde{h}, e_i) e_i$ and $h_2 = \tilde{h} - h_1$, we can deduce that:
\[
\langle h_1, \tilde{G}(z) h_1 \rangle \geq \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{2} \|h_1\|^2.
\]

Furthermore, setting $B(z) = P(z) \Lambda^{1/2} \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}_{\tilde{\lambda}^2}(z)) \Lambda^{-1/2} P(z)^T$, we have
\[
\langle h_2, \tilde{G}(z) h_2 \rangle = \langle Q(z) h_2, B(z) Q(z) h_2 \rangle + \langle h_2, Q(z) h_2 \rangle - \|Q(z) h_2\|^2 \geq \langle h_2, Q(z) h_2 \rangle - (1 + \|B(z)\| \|Q(z) h_2\|^2).
\]
Since the mappings $z \mapsto \partial \text{prox}_{\tilde{\lambda}^2}(z)$ and $z \mapsto \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}_{\tilde{\lambda}^2}(z))$ are uniformly bounded on $B_\delta(z)$ and $\Lambda$ is fixed, there exists $C_B > 0$ such that
\[
\max\{\|B(z)\|, \|Q(z) B(z) + I - Q(z)\|\} \leq C_B \quad \forall z \in B_\delta(z).
\]

Let us define $\tilde{\varepsilon} := 1/(1 + C_B + \frac{4C_B^2}{\delta} + \tilde{\sigma})$. Using the continuity of eigenvalues, $\lambda_i = 0$ for all $i = \ell + 1, \ldots, n$, and (60), we can decrease $\delta$ (if necessary) to guarantee
\[
q_k(z) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}, \quad \forall i \in \{\ell + 1, \ldots, n\}, \quad \forall z \in B_\delta(z).
\]

Hence, due to $h_2 \in \text{span}(\{e_{\ell+1}, \ldots, e_n\})$, this implies $\langle h_2, Q(z) h_2 \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \|Q(z) h_2\|^2$ and Young’s inequality yields
\[
\langle h_1, \tilde{G}(z) h_2 \rangle = \langle h_1, [Q(z) B(z) + I - Q(z)] Q(z) h_2 \rangle \geq -C_B \|h_1\| \|Q(z) h_2\| \geq -\frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{8} \|h_1\|^2 - \frac{2C_B^2}{\delta} \|Q(z) h_2\|^2.
\]

We now obtain
\[
\langle \tilde{h}, \tilde{G}(z)\tilde{h} \rangle = \langle h_1, \tilde{G}(z) h_1 \rangle + 2 \langle h_1, \tilde{G}(z) h_2 \rangle + \langle h_2, \tilde{G}(z) h_2 \rangle \geq \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{4} (\|h_1\|^2 + \|Q(z) h_2\|^2) \geq \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{4} \|Q(z)\tilde{h}\|^2,
\]
where we have used the fact $0 \leq Q(z) \leq I$. The conclusion follows from the observation $\|D(z) h\|_\Lambda^2 = \|Q(z) h\|^2$. \hfill $\square$

## 8 A Quasi-Newton Variant of Algorithm 1

In this section, we discuss a variant of our main algorithm that utilizes quasi-Newton updates to generate approximate and potentially cheaper second-order information while maintaining many of the convergence properties derived in the previous sections. Based on the structure of our approach, there are two different options on how such quasi-Newton updates can be built and used within the algorithm:

1. Approximation of the full (nonsmooth) curvature: $B_k \approx D_k^T M_k = D_k^T [\nabla^2 f(\text{prox}_{\tilde{\lambda}^2}(z_k))D_k + \Lambda(I - D_k)]$ where $D_k \in \partial \text{prox}_{\tilde{\lambda}^2}(z_k)$.

2. Approximation of the (smooth) Hessian information: $B_k \approx \nabla^2 f(\text{prox}_{\tilde{\lambda}^2}(z_k))$. 
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Approximations of type I basically lead to nonsmooth quasi-Newton methods which have been studied extensively in the literature, see, e.g., [76, 39, 122, 85, 148, 153]. More specialized quasi-Newton techniques have also been investigated for the Moreau envelope env_\phi and proximal point approaches in [37, 128, 23] and for nonsmooth reformulations of KKT systems in, e.g., [123, 87].

In this section, we propose a quasi-Newton variant of Algorithm 1 that follows the second strategy and only approximates the Hessian \nabla^2 f. Motivated by its convincing practical performance and high relevance, we will focus on Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (BFGS) updates to build the quasi-Newton approximations of \nabla^2 f. The full modified algorithm is presented in Algorithm 4. Approximations of type II exploit the structure of the underlying nonsmooth equation and problem. Related methods that apply similar strategies to smooth components of an underlying problem or smoothing techniques are developed and discussed in, e.g., [140, 38, 36, 150, 4]. In addition, in [70, 93, 94] local convergence properties of two related normal map-based approaches using Broyden-like updates are analyzed.

Our aim in this section is to prove q-superlinear convergence of Algorithm 4. Specifically, we want to show that the quasi-Newton approximations generated by Algorithm 4 are uniformly bounded and satisfy the Dennis-Moré condition formulated in (D.5). This then allows us to apply Theorem 6.2 to establish fast local convergence. We continue with several more detailed remarks on the Dennis-Moré condition and on the boundedness of the matrices \{B_k\}:

1. In the nonsmooth setting, Dennis-Moré conditions of the form (D.5) typically rely on strict differentiability and Lipschitz properties of the underlying nonsmooth equation, see, e.g., [76, 123, 87, 148, 153]. However, as discussed in Remark 7.5, differentiability of \partial_{\mathcal{A}} f or \text{prox}_{\phi} \text{ess} requires the strict complementarity condition to hold. Here, we wish to verify the Dennis-Moré condition without utilizing strict complementarity and hence, we work with a quasi-Newton scheme that only approximates the smooth Hessian \nabla^2 f.

2. Boundedness of the BFGS updates \{B_k\} is a classical topic that has been investigated thoroughly in the last 50 years, see, e.g., [51, 52, 28, 26]. In order to establish boundedness, the Hessian \nabla^2 f(\bar{x}) is typically assumed to be positive definite at the limit point \bar{x} = \lim_{k \to \infty} x_k and one of the following two conditions has to hold:

\[ \sum_k \| x_k - \bar{x} \| < \infty \quad \text{or} \quad \| B_0 - \nabla^2 f(\bar{x}) \| \text{ is sufficiently small.} \]

The latter condition requires the initial estimate \bar{B}_0 to be sufficiently close to the true Hessian and is known as a bounded deterioration property. We note that the alternative summability condition \[ \sum_k \| x_k - \bar{x} \| < \infty \] is certainly satisfied if the sequence \{x_k\} converges r-linearly to \bar{x} which usually can be ensured in the strongly convex case, see, e.g., [159, 130, 131, 28, 26]. Furthermore, in [148], Stella et al., utilize KL-results (for the forward-backward envelope with KL exponent 1/2) to justify the assumption \[ \sum_k \| x_k - \bar{x} \| < \infty \]. However, their framework requires the strict complementarity condition to hold and the generated quasi-Newton directions need to be gradient-related (in a uniform way). Unfortunately, it is not clear how the latter condition can be verified a priori if the quasi-Newton approximations \{B_k\} are not known to be bounded.

Overall, full global-to-local convergence results for BFGS-type approaches still seem to be fairly limited – especially in the nonsmooth setting we are considering in this paper – and require strong and additional assumptions. In the following, we will derive new KL-based results for the BFGS scheme used in Algorithm 4 that, to some extent, can overcome the mentioned limitations. Let us further note that the framework and results by Li et al., [87], are probably closest to our style of analysis. (However, the local convergence results in [87] are again based on the strict complementarity condition).

### 8.1 Refined Properties of BFGS-Updates and the Dennis-Moré Condition

In this subsection, we investigate the BFGS scheme utilized in Algorithm 4 and show that it can indeed satisfy the Dennis-Moré condition (D.5) which was an essential component of our convergence analysis in section 6. We first introduce several additional notations in the next definition.

**Definition 8.1.** We define the following terms:

(i) Let \( X := \{ k \in \mathbb{N} : k \in S, \| d_k \| \neq 0 \} = S \cap T \) denote the set of all successful iterates with \( x_{k+1} \neq x_k \).

(ii) For any set \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \), we define \( \Delta S := S - S \). Moreover, \text{aff}(S) denotes the affine hull of \( S \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \).

(iii) For a given set \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) and a matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \), we define \( \mathcal{H}(S, A) := \inf_{x \in S, \| x \| = 1} \langle x, Ax \rangle \). (Notice that we set \( \mathcal{H}(S, A) = \infty \) in the case \( S \cap \{ x : \| x \| = 1 \} = \emptyset \).)

Let \( \{ k_i : i \geq 0 \} \) enumerate the indices in the set \( X \). By the definition of \( X \), it follows

\[ x_j = x_{k_i+1} \quad \text{and} \quad B_j = B_{k_i+1} \quad \forall \ i, \ \forall \ j \text{ with } k_i + 1 \leq j \leq k_{i+1}. \] (63)
**Algorithm 4** A Trust Region-type Normal Map-based Quasi-Newton Method

**Initialization:** Choose an initial point $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and positive definite matrices $B_0, \Lambda \in S^n_+$. Choose $\xi > 0$ and sequences $\{\xi_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$, $\{\epsilon_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, and set $k = 0$.

1: while $F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k) \neq 0$ do
2:   Choose $D_k \in \partial \text{prox}^A(\varphi, z_k)$, and set $M_k = B_k D_k + \Lambda (I - D_k)$,
3:   Run Algorithm 3 with $S = D_k^T M_k g = D_k^T F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k)$, $\Delta = \Delta_k$, and $\epsilon = \epsilon_k \geq 0$, returning $\tilde{q}_k = q$
4:   Set $\bar{s}_k = \tilde{q}_k - \Lambda^{-1} (F^A_{\text{nor}}(z_k) + M_k \tilde{q}_k)$ and $s_k = \min\{1, \frac{\Delta_k}{\|\bar{s}_k\|}\} \bar{s}_k$
5:   if $\rho_k = \frac{H_r(z_k) - H_r(z_k + s_k)}{\text{pred}(z_k, s_k, \Delta_k, \bar{q}_k)} < \eta_1$ then
6:     Set $z_{k+1} = z_k + s_k$ and update the BFGS approximation
7:   $B_{k+1} = \begin{cases} B_k & \text{if } \|d_k\| = 0 \text{ or } d_k^T y_k < \min\{\xi, \epsilon_k\|d_k\|^2\}, \\
8:   B_k - \frac{B_k d_k d_k^T B_k + y_k y_k^T}{d_k^T y_k} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$
9:   else
10:     Set $z_{k+1} = z_k$ and $B_{k+1} = B_k$
11: end if
12: Update $\Delta_{k+1}$ based on $\rho_k$ by invoking Algorithm 2
13: $k \leftarrow k + 1$
end while

This structural property will be used frequently throughout this section. In the following, we formulate our main conditions which allow a refined analysis of the BFGS updates.

**Assumption 8.2.** Let $(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \in \text{dom}(\varphi) \times \mathbb{R}^n$ be a criticality pair of (1). We assume:

- (F.1) The sequence $\{x_k\}$ converges to $\bar{x}$ and has finite length, i.e., $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| < \infty$.
- (F.2) The mapping $f$ is twice continuously differentiable near $\bar{x}$ and $\nabla^2 f$ is Lipschitz continuous near $\bar{x}$ with modulus $L_f$.
- (F.3) It holds that $\lim inf_{s \to 0} \mathcal{H}(\text{aff}(\Delta S_\varepsilon), \nabla^2 f(\bar{x})) > 0$ where $S_\varepsilon := \{d \in \mathbb{R}^n : \exists \bar{z} \in B_\varepsilon(\bar{z}) \text{ with } d = \text{prox}^A(\varphi)(\bar{z}) - \text{prox}^A(\varphi)(\bar{z})\}$.
- (F.4) The parameters $\xi_k$ satisfy $\xi_k > 0$, $\lim_{k \to \infty} \xi_k = 0$, and $\lim inf_{k \to \infty} \xi_k \ln(k) > 0$.

As we have seen in the proof of Theorem 5.5, convergence and finite length of $\{x_k\}$ can be guaranteed under the standard KL-framework. Assumption (F.3) can be interpreted as a curvature condition. If $\text{prox}^A(\varphi)$ is directionally differentiable at $\bar{z}$, then (F.3) clearly implies

$$(\text{prox}^A(\varphi)'(\bar{z}, h), \nabla^2 f(\bar{x}) (\text{prox}^A(\varphi)'(\bar{z}, h))) \geq \delta \| (\text{prox}^A(\varphi)'(\bar{z}, h)) \|^2$$

for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for some $\delta > 0$. Thus, (F.3) is generally stronger than the second-order sufficient conditions studied in the last section. If $\varphi$ is polyhedral, a stronger connection between (F.3) and the second-order optimality conditions can be established and we can demonstrate that the curvature assumption in (F.3) can indeed be weaker than positive definiteness of $\nabla^2 f(\bar{x})$. A detailed discussion of these observations can be found in subsection 8.3.

Next, we collect some basic properties of the BFGS updates and show that the skipping mechanism in step 6 of Algorithm 4 and assumption (F.4) can ensure condition (B.2).

**Lemma 8.3.** Let the sequence $\{B_k\}$ be generated by Algorithm 4 and suppose that the initial matrix $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric and positive definite. Then, we have:

(i) The matrix $B_k$ is symmetric and positive definite for all $k \geq 0$.

(ii) In addition, if the assumptions (A.1), (C.2), and (F.4) are satisfied, then it follows $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 + \|B_k\|)^{-1} = \infty$.

**Proof.** Notice that the matrix $B_k$ is only updated in the case $d_k^T y_k > 0$. Due to $B_0 > 0$, the positive definiteness and symmetry of the matrices $\{B_k\}$ then follows from classical results, see, e.g., [52]. We continue with a verification of
part (ii). In the case \(\|d_k\| = 0\) or \(d_k^T y_k < \min\{\xi, \xi_k\|d_k\|^2\}\), we obtain \(\|B_{k+1}\| = \|B_k\|\). Otherwise, we have
\[
d^T B_{k+1} d = d^T B_k d - \left(\frac{d^T B_k d}{d_k^2} + \frac{d^T y_k}{d_k^2}\right)^2 + L^2 \|d_k\|^2 = \|B_k\| + L^2 \max \left\{\frac{\|d_k\|^2}{\xi}, \frac{1}{\xi_k}\right\}
\]
for all \(d \in \mathbb{R}^n\) with \(\|d\| = 1\). The continuity of \(\text{prox}_\phi\) and assumption (C.2) imply that \(\{\|d_k\|\}\) is bounded. Hence, utilizing \(\liminf_{k \to \infty} \xi_k \ln(k) > 0\), there exist constants \(c_D > 0\) and \(k' \in \mathbb{N}\) such that \(\|B_{k+1}\| \leq \|B_k\| + c_D \ln(k)\) for all \(k \geq k'\). Inductively, this yields
\[
\|B_k\| \leq \|B_{k'}\| + c_D \sum_{j=k'}^{k-1} \ln(j) \leq \|B_{k'}\| + c_D \int_{k'}^k \ln(j) = \|B_{k'}\| + c_D [k \ln(k) - 1] + 1
\]
for all \(k \geq k'\). Consequently, we can now select \(k'' \geq k'\) such that \(\|B_k\| \leq c_D \cdot k \ln(k) - 1\) for all \(k \geq k''\) and it follows
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 + \|B_k\|)^{-1} \geq \sum_{k=k''}^{\infty} (1 + \|B_k\|)^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{c_D} \sum_{k=k''}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\ln(k)} = \infty.
\]
This finishes the proof of Lemma 8.3. \(\square\)

In order to satisfy (F.4), we can simply set \(\xi_k = 1/\ln(k)\). Other choices and different skipping techniques are of course possible. Lemma 8.3 implies that the adaptive skipping strategy in Algorithm 4 ensures the nonsummability condition (B.2) which has been used in our global convergence analysis and in Theorem 5.5 (i). This result can be seen as a first building block allowing us to derive unified global and local results for Algorithm 4 and transition to fast local convergence without requiring global convexity of the problem. Next, we present a technical proposition that will be used in the proof of Theorem 8.5. A proof of Proposition 8.4 can be found in Appendix A.2.

**Proposition 8.4.** Let \(W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) be a linear subspace and let \(H : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{S}^n\) be a given continuous function. Suppose there exist \(w \in \mathbb{R}^n\) and \(\epsilon, \delta > 0\) such that
\[
d^T H(x)d \geq \delta \|d\|^2 \quad \forall \ d \in W, \quad \forall \ x \in B_r(w).
\]
Then there is a (not necessarily unique) continuous extension \(G : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{S}^n\) of \(H\) satisfying \(G(x)d = H(x)d\) for all \(d \in W\) and \(x \in B_r(w)\) and
\[
d^T G(x)d \geq \delta \frac{\|d\|^2}{2} \quad \forall \ d \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \forall \ x \in B_r(w).
\]
Furthermore, if the function \(H\) is Lipschitz continuous on \(B_r(w)\), then \(G\) can be chosen as a Lipschitz continuous mapping on \(B_r(w)\) as well.

We now show that many classical properties of the BFGS update can be transferred to the nonsmooth setting considered in this paper under the weaker conditions formulated in Assumption 8.2. Our proof is an extension of the seminal analysis presented in [26].

**Theorem 8.5.** Suppose that the conditions (F.1)–(F.3) are satisfied and let the initial matrix \(B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) be symmetric and positive definite. Then we have:

(i) The sequences \(\{\|B_k\|\}\) and \(\{\|B_k^{-1}\|\}\) are both uniformly bounded.

(ii) Setting \(E_k := B_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k)\), it holds that \(\sum_{k \in X} \|E_k d_k\|^2 / \|d_k\|^2 < \infty\).

(iii) It holds that \(\sum \|B_{k+1} - B_k\|^2 < \infty\).

**Proof.** Applying (F.2) and (F.3), there are \(\epsilon, \delta > 0\) such that for every \(d \in \text{aff}(\Delta S_x)\) and \(x \in B_r(\bar{x})\), it holds that:
\[
d^T \nabla^2 f(x)d \geq \delta \|d\|^2.
\]
In addition, we can assume that \(\nabla^2 f\) is Lipschitz continuous on \(B_r(\bar{x})\) with constant \(L_H\). Hence, by Proposition 8.4 there exists a Lipschitz continuous extension \(G\) of \(\nabla^2 f\) satisfying \(\lambda_{\min}(G(x)) \geq \frac{\delta}{2}\) for all \(x \in B_r(\bar{x})\) and
\[
G(x)d = \nabla^2 f(x)d \quad \forall \ d \in \text{aff}(\Delta S_x), \quad \forall \ x \in B_r(\bar{x}).
\]
Since the sequence \(\{x_k\}\) converges to \(\bar{x}\) and we have \(\xi_k \to 0\) and \(d_k \to 0\), there exists \(k_0 \in \mathbb{N}\) with
\[
x_k \in B_r(\bar{x}), \quad \xi_k \leq \delta, \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_k \|d_k\|^2 \leq \xi \quad \forall \ k \geq k_0.
\]
In this case, we further have \( d_k \in \Delta S_c \), and hence, setting \( G_k := G(x_k) \), it follows

\[
\|y_k - G_k d_k\| = \|y_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k) d_k\| = \left\| \int_0^1 \left[ \nabla^2 f(x_k + t(x_{k+1} - x_k)) - \nabla^2 f(x_k) \right] d_k \, dt \right\| \leq \frac{L_H}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| \|d_k\|
\]

for all \( k \geq k_0 \) and \( k \in \mathcal{X} \). This also shows \( y_k^T d_k \geq \delta \|d_k\|^2 \geq \min\{\xi, \xi_k\} \|d_k\|^2 \) and thus, we can infer that the full BFGS update is performed for all \( k \in \mathcal{X} \cap [k_0, \infty) \). We now follow the proof of [26, Theorem 3.2]. Let us define

\[
\tilde{B}_k := G_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_k G_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \tilde{y}_k := G_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} y_k, \quad \tilde{d}_k := G_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} d_k, \quad \cos(\tilde{\vartheta}_k) := \frac{\tilde{y}_k^T \tilde{B}_k \tilde{d}_k}{\|\tilde{B}_k \tilde{d}_k\|}, \quad q_k := \frac{\tilde{d}_k^T \tilde{B}_k \tilde{d}_k}{\|\tilde{d}_k\|^2}.
\]

Recall that \( \{k_i : i \geq 0\} \) enumerates the indices in the set \( \mathcal{X} \cap [k_0, \infty) \). Then, we have

\[
\tilde{B}_{k_{i+1}} = G_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[ B_k - \frac{d_k^T B_k d_k}{d_k^T \tilde{B}_k d_k} \right] \tilde{B}_k + \frac{\tilde{y}_k^T}{\tilde{d}_k} \tilde{B}_k \frac{\tilde{d}_k^T}{\tilde{d}_k} \tilde{B}_k \frac{\tilde{y}_k}{\tilde{d}_k} = : P_{k_{i+1}}
\]

where we used \( B_{k+1} = B_k, d_{k+1} = d_k \), and \( y_{k+1} = y_k \) for all \( k \in \mathcal{X} \cap [k_0, \infty) \), see (63). As in [26], we will now bound the eigenvalues of \( B_k \) and \( \tilde{B}_k \) using the mapping \( \Psi(B) := \text{tr}(B) - \ln(\det(B)) \). Here, we obtain

\[
\Psi(\tilde{B}_{k_{i+1}}) = \text{tr}(P_k^T P_k \cdot Q_{k_i}) - \ln(\det(P_k^T P_k)) - \ln(\det(Q_{k_i})).
\]

for all \( i \geq 0 \). Setting \( \Xi_k := G_k^\frac{1}{2}(G_k^{-1} - G_k^\frac{1}{2}G_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \) and using \( P_k^T P_k = I + \Xi_k \) and \( Q_k \succ 0 \) and Neumann’s trace inequality, it follows

\[
\Psi(\tilde{B}_{k_{i+1}}) \leq (1 + \|\Xi_k\|) \text{tr}(Q_{k_i}) - \ln(\det(P_k^T P_k)) - \ln(\det(Q_{k_i})) \quad \forall \ i \geq 0.
\]

As in [26, Theorem 3.2], it holds that

\[
\text{tr}(Q_{k_i}) = \text{tr}(\tilde{B}_{k_{i+1}}) - \frac{\|\tilde{B}_{k_{i+1}} \tilde{d}_{k_{i+1}}\|^2}{d_k^T \tilde{B}_k d_k} + \frac{\|\tilde{y}_{k_{i+1}}\|^2}{\tilde{y}_k^T \tilde{d}_k} = \text{tr}(\tilde{B}_{k_{i+1}}) + \frac{\|\tilde{y}_{k_{i+1}}\|^2}{\tilde{y}_k^T \tilde{d}_k} - \frac{q_{k_i}}{\cos^2(\tilde{\vartheta}_k)},
\]

\[
\ln(\det(Q_{k_i})) = \ln(\det(\tilde{B}_{k_{i+1}})) + \ln(\frac{\tilde{y}_k^T \tilde{d}_k}{\|\tilde{d}_k\|^2}) = \ln(\det(\tilde{B}_{k_{i+1}})) + \ln(\frac{\tilde{y}_k^T \tilde{d}_k}{\|\tilde{d}_k\|^2}) - \ln(q_{k_i}).
\]

Defining \( \omega_1(t) := t - \ln(t) \), we have \( \omega_1(t) \geq \ln(t) \) for all \( t > 0 \). Let \( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n > 0 \) denote the eigenvalues of \( \tilde{B}_{k_i} \), then it holds that \( \Psi(\tilde{B}_{k_i}) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(\omega_1) \) and we can infer

\[
\Psi(\tilde{B}_{k_{i+1}}) \leq (1 + \|\Xi_k\|) \cdot \Psi(\tilde{B}_{k_{i+1}}) + \|\Xi_k\| \sum_{j=1}^n \ln(\lambda_j) + (1 + \|\Xi_k\|) \left[ \frac{\|\tilde{y}_{k_{i+1}}\|^2}{\tilde{y}_k^T \tilde{d}_k} - \frac{q_{k_i}}{\cos^2(\tilde{\vartheta}_k)} \right] - \ln(\frac{\tilde{y}_k^T \tilde{d}_k}{\|\tilde{d}_k\|^2})
\]

\[
+ \ln(q_{k_i}) - \ln(\det(P_k^T P_k)) \leq (1 + 2\|\Xi_k\|) \cdot \Psi(\tilde{B}_{k_{i+1}}) + (1 + \|\Xi_k\|) \cdot \|\tilde{y}_{k_{i+1}}\|^2 - \ln(\frac{\tilde{y}_k^T \tilde{d}_k}{\|\tilde{d}_k\|^2}) + \ln(\cos^2(\tilde{\vartheta}_k))
\]

\[
+ \left[ 1 - \frac{q_{k_i}}{\cos^2(\tilde{\vartheta}_k)} \right] + \ln(\frac{q_{k_i}}{\cos^2(\tilde{\vartheta}_k)}) \right] - \ln(\det(P_k^T P_k)).
\]

Next, the estimate in (64) yields

\[
\frac{\|\tilde{y}_k - \tilde{d}_k\|}{\|\tilde{d}_k\|} = \frac{G_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}|y_k - G_k d_k|}{\|d_k\|} \leq L_H \|G_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}\| \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| \cdot \|d_k\| \leq \frac{L_H}{2 \delta} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|
\]

(65)
for all \( k \in \mathcal{X} \cap [k_0, \infty) \). Hence, following the proof of [26, Theorem 3.2] and setting \( \epsilon_k := \| x_{k+1} - x_k \| \), we can show
\[
\frac{\tilde{y}_k^\top \tilde{d}_k}{\| \tilde{d}_k \|^2} \geq 1 - \frac{L_H \epsilon_k}{2 \delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\| \tilde{y}_k \|^2}{\| \tilde{d}_k \|^2} \leq \left[ 1 + \frac{L_H \epsilon_k}{2 \delta} \right]^2 \frac{\| \tilde{d}_k \|^2}{\| \tilde{y}_k \|^2}.
\]
Due to \( \epsilon_k \to 0 \) there then exists a constant \( \bar{L} > 0 \) such that \( \| \tilde{y}_k \|^2 / (\| \tilde{d}_k \|^2) \leq 1 + \bar{L} \epsilon_k \) for all \( k \in \mathcal{X} \cap [k_0, \infty) \) sufficiently large. In addition, using the standard logarithm inequality \( \ln \left(1 - t\right) \geq -\frac{t}{1-t}, \ t < 1 \), it follows \( \ln(1 - (2\delta)^{-1}L_H \epsilon_k) \geq -2\bar{L} \epsilon_k \) for all \( k \) with \( \bar{L} \epsilon_k < \frac{1}{2} \). Next, we derive estimates for the terms \( \| \Xi_k \| \) and \( \ln(\det(P_k^\top P_k)) \).

Let \( L_G \) denote the Lipschitz constant of the mapping \( G \), then by Banach’s perturbation lemma, we have
\[
\| \Xi_k \| \leq \| G_k \| \| G_{k+1}^{-1} - G_k^{-1} \| \leq \| G(\bar{x}) \| \| x_{k+1} - \bar{x} \| \cdot \left[ \frac{\| G_{k+1}^{-1} \| \| G_k^{-1} - G_{k+1}^{-1} \|}{1 - \| G_{k+1}^{-1} \| G_k^{-1} - G_{k+1}^{-1} \|} \right] \leq \frac{4L_G \| G(\bar{x}) \| + L_G \delta^2}{1 - \| G_{k}^{-1} \| G_k^{-1} - G_{k+1}^{-1} \|} \cdot \| x_{k+1} - x_k \|.
\]
Using \( \| x_{k+1} - x_k \| = \| x_{k+1} - x_k \| = \epsilon_k \) to 0 there exists another constant \( \bar{\epsilon} \) such that \( \| \Xi_k \| \leq \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon_k \) for all \( i \) sufficiently large. Furthermore, let \( \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n \) denote the eigenvalues of \( P_k^\top P_k \). Then using \( P_k^\top P_k = I + \Xi_k \), it holds that \( \sigma_j \geq 1 - \| \Xi_k \| \) for all \( j \). Hence, applying Bernoulli’s inequality, we obtain
\[
\det(P_k^\top P_k) \geq (1 - \| \Xi_k \|)^n \geq 1 - n \| \Xi_k \| \geq 1 - n \epsilon_k \bar{\epsilon} > 0
\]
for all \( i \) sufficiently large. As before this implies \( \ln(\det(P_k^\top P_k)) \geq -2n \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon_k \) for all \( i \) with \( n \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon_k \leq \frac{1}{2} \). Combining the last estimates and results, there exists \( i_0 \) such that we have
\[
\Psi(\bar{B}_{k+1}) \leq (1 + 2\bar{\epsilon} \epsilon_k) \cdot \Psi(\bar{B}_k) + (3\bar{L} + (2n + 2)\bar{\epsilon}) \epsilon_k + \ln(\cos^2(\theta_k)) - \omega_k,
\]
for all \( i \geq i_0 \), where \( \omega_k = \omega_2(\epsilon_k \| \bar{B}_k \|) \) and \( \omega_2(t) := t - 1 - \ln(t) \). Using the non-negativity of the mapping \( \omega_2 \) and the summability of \( \{ \epsilon_k \} \), this shows that \( \{ \Psi(\bar{B}_k) \} \) is a deterministic supermartingale-type sequence. In particular, due to [15, Proposition A.31] and \( \Psi(B) \geq n \) (see, e.g., [26]), it follows that \( \{ \Psi(\bar{B}_k) \} \) is bounded and we have
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \omega_k - \ln(\cos^2(\theta_k)) < \infty.
\]
As a consequence, the eigenvalues of the matrices \( \{ \bar{B}_k \} \) are contained in a compact interval \( J \subset \mathbb{R}_{++} \). Since the matrices \( \{ G_k \} \) satisfy \( G_k \geq \frac{1}{2} I \) and \( \| G_k \| \leq \| G(\bar{x}) \| + L_G \epsilon_k =: c_G \) for all \( k \geq k_0 \), this establishes uniform boundedness of \( \| \bar{B}_k \| \) and \( \{ \bar{B}_k^{-1} \} \). We further note that the condition (66), implies \( \cos(\theta_k) \to 1 \) and \( q_k \to 1 \) as \( i \to \infty \). Moreover, following equation (3.27) in [26], it holds that
\[
\epsilon_k^2 := \frac{\| E_k d_k \|^2}{\| d_k \|^2} = \frac{\| B_k - G_k d_k \|^2}{\| G_k^{-1} d_k \|^2} \leq \frac{c_G^2}{\| G_k^{-1} d_k \|^2} = \frac{c_G^2}{\| G_k^{-1} d_k \|^2} \left[ \frac{q_k^2}{\cos^2(\theta_k)} - 2q_k + 1 \right].
\]
Since we have \( q_k^2 / \cos^2(\theta_k) - 2q_k + 1 \to 0 \) and \( q_k / \cos^2(\theta_k) \geq q_k \), we can apply Lemma 2.3 and the estimate (2.16) in [137] to obtain
\[
\omega_k - \ln(\cos^2(\theta_k)) = \frac{q_k - \ln(q_k)}{\cos^2(\theta_k)} - 1 \geq 1 - 1 \left[ \frac{q_k^2}{\cos^2(\theta_k)} - 2q_k + 1 \right] \geq \frac{\epsilon_k^2}{4c_G^2}
\]
for all \( i \) sufficiently large. Hence, part (ii) follows from (66). Next, the uniform boundedness of \( \{ \bar{B}_k^{-1} \} \) ensures the existence of a constant \( \sigma_{\bar{B}} \) such that \( \bar{d}_k^\top \bar{B}_k \bar{d}_k \geq \sigma_{\bar{B}} \| \bar{d}_k \|^2 \) (for all \( k \) sufficiently large. Let us consider an arbitrary index \( k \in \mathcal{X} \cap [k_0, \infty) \). Then, using (65) and our earlier estimates, we have
\[
\epsilon_{k, \bar{B}}^2 := \frac{\| \tilde{y}_k \|}{\| \tilde{d}_k \|^2} \left[ \| \tilde{y}_k \|^2 - \| \tilde{d}_k \|^2 \right] \leq \frac{2(1 + \bar{L} \epsilon_k)^2}{\sigma_B^2} \left[ \| \tilde{d}_k \|^4 + \| \tilde{B}_k - I \| \| \tilde{d}_k \|^2 \right] \leq \frac{4}{\sigma_B^2} \left[ \frac{L_H^2}{4 \delta^2} \epsilon_k + \frac{4}{\delta^2} \epsilon_k^2 \right] \leq \max \left\{ \frac{L_H^2}{4 \delta^2} \epsilon_k^2, \epsilon_k^2 \right\}
\]
for all $k \in \mathcal{X}$ sufficiently large. Furthermore, due to $||\tilde{y}_k \tilde{y}_k^\top - \tilde{d}_k \tilde{d}_k^\top||_F^2 \leq (||\tilde{y}_k - \tilde{d}_k|| + 4||\tilde{y}_k - \tilde{d}_k||^2) \leq 2||\tilde{y}_k - \tilde{d}_k||^4 + 4||\tilde{y}_k - \tilde{d}_k||^2$, it holds that

$$E^2_{\Delta k} := \left\| \frac{\tilde{y}_k \tilde{y}_k^\top}{d_k^\top B_k d_k} - \frac{\tilde{y}_k \tilde{y}_k^\top}{d_k^\top B_k d_k} \right\|_F^2 \leq \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \left[ \left( \frac{\tilde{y}_k - \tilde{d}_k}{d_k^\top} \right)^{\frac{2}{2}} + 2 \left( \frac{\tilde{y}_k - \tilde{d}_k}{d_k^\top} \right)^{\frac{2}{2}} \right] = O(\varepsilon_k^2)$$

and similarly, we obtain

$$E^2_{\Delta k} := \left\| \frac{\tilde{d}_k \tilde{d}_k^\top}{d_k^\top B_k d_k} - \frac{\tilde{d}_k \tilde{d}_k^\top}{d_k^\top B_k d_k} \right\|_F^2 \leq \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \left[ \left( \frac{\tilde{B}_k - I}{d_k^\top} \right)^{\frac{2}{2}} + 2 \left( \frac{\tilde{B}_k - I}{d_k^\top} \right)^{\frac{2}{2}} \right] = \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \left[ 16 \varepsilon_k^4 + 8 \varepsilon_k^2 \right].$$

Finally, combining the last results, we can establish

$$\|B_{k+1} - B_k\|_F^2 \leq \left[ G^2_k \left[ \frac{\tilde{y}_k \tilde{y}_k^\top}{d_k^\top B_k d_k} - \frac{\tilde{B}_k \tilde{B}_k^\top}{d_k^\top B_k d_k} \right] \right] \left[ \frac{\|\tilde{E}_k\|_F^2}{\|\tilde{z}_k - \tilde{z}\|} \right] \leq \varepsilon_k^2 \cdot \left[ E^2_{1,k} + E^2_{2,k} + E^2_{3,k} \right].$$

Utilizing $B_{k+1} = B_k$ for all $k \notin \mathcal{X}$, the statement in part (iii) now follows from (ii) and (F.1).

**Remark 8.6.** Our analysis extends the existing classical results for BFGS updates (for smooth problems) provided in [52, 26] that are based on the stronger convergence condition

$$\sum \|x_k - \bar{x}\| < \infty.$$

In contrast, in Theorem 8.5 we have shown that many fundamental properties of the BFGS scheme still hold under the significantly weaker finite length assumption $\sum \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| < \infty$. This generalization is mainly achieved by considering an adaptive rescaling of $B_k$ based on $G_k = G(x_k)$ rather than on the fixed matrix $G := G(\bar{x})$.

Next, we establish the key result of this section. Specifically, based on the structural properties derived in Theorem 8.5, we show that the Dennis-Moré-type condition formulated in assumption (D.5) is satisfied when using BFGS approximations of the Hessian $\nabla^2 f$ as in Algorithm 4. Our result will allow us to link KL-theory to superlinear convergence of the quasi-Newton method.

Recall that the indices $\{j_\ell\}$ enumerate the elements of the set $\mathcal{S}$. Furthermore, the term $\Gamma_\ell$, which appeared in the proof of Theorem 5.5, was defined as follows $\Gamma_\ell := \sum_{k=\ell}^{\infty} \chi(z_{j_k})$.

**Theorem 8.7.** Suppose that the conditions (E.1) and (F.1)–(F.3) are satisfied and assume that the sequence $\{\Gamma_\ell\}$ converges q-linearly to zero. Then, we have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\|E_k(x_k - \bar{x})\|^2}{\|z_k - \bar{z}\|^2} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\|E_k(x_k - \bar{x})\|}{\|z_k - \bar{z}\|} = 0.$$

**Proof.** First, the q-linear convergence of $\{\Gamma_\ell\}$ yields $\chi(z_k) \to 0$ as $\mathcal{S} \ni k \to \infty$. As in Remark 4.9, condition (F.1) then allows us to infer $z_k \to \bar{z}$ as $k \to \infty$. Furthermore and as discussed earlier, the assumptions (E.1) and (F.3) imply that the second-order sufficient conditions hold at $\bar{z}$ and by Theorem 7.8, the normal map $P_{n,\mathcal{S}}$ is strongly metrically subregular at $\bar{z}$ for some $\bar{z}$. Since $\nabla f$ is locally Lipschitz continuous near $\bar{x}$ by (F.2), $\chi$ is also locally Lipschitz continuous near $\bar{z}$. Thus, there are constants $\kappa_{\chi}, L_{\chi} > 0$ such that we have

$$\kappa_{\chi} \|z_k - \bar{z}\| \leq \chi(z_k) \leq L_{\chi} \|z_k - \bar{z}\| \quad (67)$$

for all sufficiently large $k$. In addition, there exists $\bar{\gamma} \in (0, 1)$ with $\Gamma_{\ell+1} \leq \bar{\gamma} \Gamma_\ell$ for all $\ell$ sufficiently large. Let us now define $r_{k} := \|E_k(x_k - \bar{x})\|/\|n_{\mathcal{S}}(k)\|$. Let us first consider an index $j_\ell \notin \mathcal{X}$. Then, by (63), we have $x_{j_{\ell+1}} = x_{j_{\ell} + 1} = x_{j_{\ell}}$ and $B_{j_{\ell+1}} = B_{j_{\ell} + 1} = B_{j_{\ell}}$ and it follows

$$r_{j_{\ell}}^2 = \frac{\|E_{j_{\ell}}(x_{j_{\ell}} - \bar{x})\|^2}{\|n_{\mathcal{S}}(j_{\ell})\|^2} \leq \frac{\|E_{j_{\ell+1}}(x_{j_{\ell+1}} - \bar{x})\|^2}{\|n_{\mathcal{S}}(j_{\ell})\|^2} \leq \frac{\Gamma_{j_{\ell+1}}^2}{\Gamma_{j_{\ell}}^2} \Gamma_{j_{\ell}}^2 \cdot r_{j_{\ell+1}}^2 \leq \bar{\gamma} r_{j_{\ell+1}}^2.$$

For the case $j_\ell \in \mathcal{X}$, we first establish

$$\Gamma_{j_{\ell}} \geq \kappa_{\chi} \|z_{j_{\ell+1}} - \bar{z}\| \geq \kappa_{\chi} \|z_{j_{\ell+1}} - z_{j_{\ell}}\| = \kappa_{\chi} \|z_{j_{\ell}+1} - z_{j_{\ell}}\| \geq \kappa_{\chi}^{\frac{1}{2}} \kappa_{\chi} \|x_{j_{\ell}+1} - x_{j_{\ell}}\|, \quad (68)$$
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which follows from (67) (and also holds for $j_e \notin \mathcal{X}$) provided $\ell$ is sufficiently large. Using $x_{j_e+1} = x_{j_e+1}^+, E_{j_e+1} = E_{j_e+1}^+$, and Young’s inequality, we then obtain

$$r_{j_e}^2 \leq \left[ \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_{\lambda}}}{\kappa_{\lambda}} \frac{\left\| E_{j_e}(x_{j_e} - \bar{x}) \right\|}{\left\| x_{j_e+1} - \bar{x} \right\|} + \frac{\left\| (E_{j_e} - E_{j_e+1})(x_{j_e+1} - \bar{x}) \right\|}{\kappa_{\lambda}} + \frac{\left\| E_{j_e+1}(x_{j_e+1} - \bar{x}) \right\|}{\Gamma_{\ell}} \right]^2$$

$$\leq \left[ \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_{\lambda}}}{\kappa_{\lambda}} \left( e_{j_e} + \| B_{j_e+1} - B_{j_e} \| + L_H \| x_{j_e+1} - x_{j_e} \| \right) + \bar{\gamma} r_{j_e+1} \right]^2$$

$$\leq \frac{3\kappa_{\lambda}}{\kappa_{\lambda}^2} \frac{1}{1-\bar{\gamma}} \left[ e_{j_e} + \| B_{j_e+1} - B_{j_e} \|^2 + L_H^2 \| x_{j_e+1} - x_{j_e} \|^2 \right] + \bar{\gamma} r_{j_e+1}^2,$$

(69)

for all $\ell$ sufficiently large, where $L_H$ denotes the local Lipschitz constant of the Hessian $\nabla^2 f$. Moreover, applying (68), we have

$$r_{j_e} \leq \frac{\| E_{j_e}(x_{j_e} - \bar{x}) \|}{\kappa_{\lambda} \| z_{j_e} - \bar{z} \|} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_{\lambda}}}{\kappa_{\lambda}} \| E_{j_e} \| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_{\lambda}}}{\kappa_{\lambda}} \| B_{j_e} \| + \| \nabla^2 f(x_{j_e}) \|.$$

Hence, using Theorem 8.5 (i), $x_k \to \bar{x}$, and the continuity of $\nabla^2 f$, the sequence $\{ r_{j_e} \}$ needs to be bounded from above, i.e., there exists $\bar{\epsilon}$ such that $r_{j_e} \leq \bar{\epsilon}$ for all $\ell$. Next, let us choose a sufficiently large index $\ell' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the latter estimates hold for all $\ell \geq \ell'$. Summing the expression (69) for $\ell' \leq \ell \leq m - 1$, it follows

$$(1 - \bar{\epsilon}) \sum_{\ell=\ell'}^{m-1} r_{j_e}^2 + \bar{\epsilon} \left( r_{j_e}^2 - \bar{\epsilon}^2 \right) \leq \sum_{\ell=\ell'}^{m-1} \left[ r_{j_e}^2 - \bar{\epsilon} r_{j_e+1}^2 \right]$$

$$\leq \frac{3\kappa_{\lambda}}{\kappa_{\lambda}^2} \frac{1}{1-\bar{\epsilon}} \sum_{\ell' \leq \ell, j_e \in \mathcal{X}} \left[ e_{j_e} + \| B_{j_e+1} - B_{j_e} \|^2 + L_H^2 \| x_{j_e+1} - x_{j_e} \|^2 \right].$$

Consequently, taking the limit $m \to \infty$ and applying Theorem 8.5 (ii) and (iii) and (F.1), we can infer $\sum_{\ell} r_{j_e}^2 < \infty$. Finally, the $q$-linear convergence of $\{ \Gamma_{\ell} \}$ and (67) yield

$$\frac{\| E_{j_e}(x_{j_e} - \bar{x}) \|}{\| z_{j_e} - \bar{z} \|} \leq L_X \frac{\| E_{j_e}(x_{j_e} - \bar{x}) \|}{\chi(z_{j_e})} = L_X \frac{\| E_{j_e}(x_{j_e} - \bar{x}) \|}{\Gamma_{\ell} - \Gamma_{\ell+1}} \leq \frac{L_X}{1 - \bar{\epsilon}} r_{j_e}.$$

Since $z_k, x_k$, and $E_k$ remain unchanged for $k \notin \mathcal{S}$, this finishes the proof of Theorem 8.7.

Let us note that the condition derived in Theorem 8.7 is slightly different from the alternative and more standard Dennis-Moré condition

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\| E_k(\text{prox}_A^\lambda(z_k + s_k) - \text{prox}_A^\lambda(z_k)) \|}{\| s_k \|} = 0,$$

which appears frequently in the local convergence analysis of classical trust region-type methods [118, 166, 25, 31] (for the case $\varphi \equiv 0$). In our situation, this condition can only be guaranteed for successful iterations $k \in \mathcal{X}$ and does not necessarily hold for all iterations. We resolve this technical restriction and directly work with the Dennis-Moré-type condition stated in (D.5) and Theorem 8.7.

### 8.2 Summary and Superlinear Convergence

We are now in the position to fully connect our results established in section 5, section 6, and subsection 8.1. In the following, we give a schematic overview of our different global and local results for Algorithm 4 that illustrates how these results interact with each other leading to superlinear convergence.

#### A. Global Convergence and Standard KL

First, suppose that the conditions (A.1)–(A.2), (B.1), (C.1)–(C.3), (F.4), and $\Delta_{\text{min}} > 0$ are satisfied.

- Lemma 8.3 (ii) then implies that assumption (B.2) has to hold. Consequently, Theorem 4.8 and Theorem 5.5 (i) are applicable and we can infer that $\{ (z_k, x_k) \}$ converges to the criticality pair $(\bar{z}, \bar{x})$ and the sequence $\{ x_k \}$ has finite length, i.e., condition (F.1) is satisfied.

#### B. Strong KL and Dennis-Moré

In addition to the conditions in A, let the assumptions (D.3) and (F.2)–(F.3) hold.
Theorem 8.5 is then applicable and the BFGS approximations \{B_k\} need to stay in a compact subset of \(S_{++}^n\). Thus, assumption (B.3) is satisfied. Furthermore, since semismoothness implies semidifferentiability of \(\text{prox}_\alpha^A\) at \(\bar{z}\), see, e.g., [125], assumption (D.3) and (F.3) imply that the second-order sufficient conditions formulated in Theorem 7.8 hold and thus, by Remark 7.9, the merit function \(H_\epsilon\) satisfies the KL-type inequality stated in section 5 with exponent \(\frac{1}{2}\). Since the matrices \{B_k\} are now bounded, the stronger convergence results in Theorem 5.5 (ii) are applicable guaranteeing \(q\)-linear convergence of \(\{\Gamma_k\}\). Theorem 8.7 then implies that the Dennis-Moré condition (D.5) is satisfied. (Notice that assumption (E.1) is not required here thanks to Theorem 7.4). Finally, the uniform positive definiteness of the BFGS matrices \{B_k\} and Lemma 6.3 ensure assumption (D.4).

C. Superlinear Convergence. In addition to the assumptions in A–B, suppose that (D.6) and (D.7) hold.

- Every trust region step is eventually successful and the sequence \{z_k\} converges \(q\)-superlinearly to \(\bar{z}\).
- If the proximal mapping \(\text{prox}_\alpha^A\) is \(\beta\)-order semismooth at \(\bar{z}\) and if the error function \(E\) in (D.6) satisfies \(\mathcal{E}(h) = O(||h||^{1+\beta})\) as \(h \to 0\), then it further follows

\[
\sum_k \frac{\|z_{k+1} - \bar{z}\|^2}{\|z_k - \bar{z}\|^2} < \infty.
\]

Proof. The first part of Theorem 8.8 follows from our discussion in A–C. In order to establish the summability result in the second statement, we can mimic (47) to obtain

\[
\|z_{k+1} - \bar{z}\| \leq O(\|z_k - \bar{z}\|^{1+\beta}) + \kappa_M \|E_k(x_k - \bar{x})\|.
\]

Dividing both sides by \(\|z_k - \bar{z}\|\), taking squares, and using the \(q\)-superlinear convergence of \{z_k\} this yields (70).

Remark 8.9. Given the \(q\)-superlinear convergence of \{z_k\} as established in Theorem 8.8, it is possible to derive additional properties of the BFGS updates \{B_k\}. In particular, following [129, 149], we expect the matrices \(B_k\) to converge to some symmetric, positive definite matrix \(B_\cdot\) (which can be different from \(\nabla^2 f(\bar{z})\)). A detailed verification of this observation is left for future work.

Remark 8.10. The summability condition (70) can also be used to further specify the rate of convergence. Specifically, due to (70), for all \(\eta > 0\) there exists \(k_0 \in \mathbb{N}\) such that \(\sum_{j \geq k_0} \|z_{j+1} - \bar{z}\|^2/\|z_j - \bar{z}\|^2 \leq \eta\).

Applying the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality, it then follows

\[
\frac{\|z_k - \bar{z}\|}{\|z_{k_0} - \bar{z}\|} = \left(\frac{\prod_{j=k_0}^{k-1} \frac{\|z_{j+1} - \bar{z}\|^2}{\|z_j - \bar{z}\|^2}}{\prod_{j=k_0}^{k-1} \frac{\|z_{j+1} - \bar{z}\|^2}{\|z_j - \bar{z}\|^2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left[ \frac{1}{k - k_0} \cdot \sum_{j=k_0}^{k-1} \frac{\|z_{j+1} - \bar{z}\|^2}{\|z_j - \bar{z}\|^2} \right]^{\frac{k-k_0}{k-k_0}} = \left(\frac{\eta}{k - k_0}\right)^{\frac{k-k_0}{k-k_0}}
\]

for all \(k > k_0\). The structure of this rate is similar to the ones recently derived in [137, 136, 78]. Let us also note that the results in [137, 136, 78] are non-asymptotic and provide a more explicit dependence on the problem parameters (Lipschitz constants, strong convexity parameter, dimension, etc.). However, this non-asymptotic analysis requires stronger assumptions such as a bounded deterioration condition or strong self-concordance. In contrast, the rate in (71) is a simple consequence of our more classical convergence analysis of the BFGS method.

Finally, we note that the summability condition in Theorem 8.8 is well-known in the smooth case, see, e.g., [130, 131]. A similar result has also been established recently for Broyden-like methods in [92, Theorem 1].

8.3 Further Comments on Condition (F.3)

Finally, let us briefly discuss possible further connections between assumption (F.3) and the second-order optimality conditions derived in section 7. As already mentioned, (F.3) is generally stronger than the second-order optimality
We start with a brief overview of the utilized parameters. Most of the parameters of our algorithm are fixed throughout the conducted numerical experiments. The trust region parameters used in Algorithm 2 are listed in Table 1. When updating the trust region radius, we set $\Delta_{k+1} = \gamma_0 \Delta_k$ if $\rho_k < \eta_1$ and $\Delta_{k+1} = \Delta_k$ if $\rho_k \in [\eta_1, \eta_2]$. In the case $\rho_k \geq \eta_2$, we choose $\Delta_{k+1} = \gamma_1 \Delta_k$.

The parameter $\nu_k$ in the predicted reduction term $\text{pred}_k$ is set as in (37). In particular, we select $a_k := \epsilon_a k^{\alpha/2}$ with $\alpha = 2p$ and $p \in (0,1)$. The specific choice of the parameters $\epsilon_a$, $\alpha$, and $p$ is given in Table 1. The parameter $\nu_k$ then is chosen as:

$$\nu_k = \min\{\nu, 10^{-3}(n_S(k))^{0.4}\|\text{prox}_\lambda(\bar{z}_k + s_k) - x_k\|_2^2\}$$

and $\lambda = \lambda I$, $\lambda > 0$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>TR Radius</th>
<th>Acceptance Threshold</th>
<th>$\nu_k$ and $\text{pred}_k$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta_{\min}$</td>
<td>$\gamma_0$</td>
<td>$\gamma_1$</td>
<td>$\eta_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>$10^{-2}$</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Parameters of the trust region method.

condition (57), since the curvature information of $\varphi$ is neglected in (F.3). However, if $\varphi$ is a polyhedral function, it can be shown that this curvature information will vanish.

Here, the function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \to (-\infty, \infty]$ is called polyhedral, if its epigraph $\text{epi}(\varphi)$ is a polyhedral set. In this case, the second-order subderivative of $\psi$ and $\varphi$ reduce to

$$d^2\psi(x)(0)(h) = \langle h, \nabla^2 f(x) h \rangle + d^2\varphi(x) - \nabla f(x)(h)$$

$$= \langle h, \nabla^2 f(x) h \rangle + \iota_{C(x)}(h) = \begin{cases} \langle h, \nabla^2 f(x) h \rangle & \text{if } h \in C(x), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $C(x) := \{ h : \psi(x; h) = 0 \}$ denotes the critical cone introduced in Remark 7.5, see, e.g., [134, Theorem 3.1]. Consequently, since $C(x)$ is a cone, we have the following equivalence:

$$d^2\psi(x)(0)(h) > 0 \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \iff \mathcal{H}(C(x), \nabla^2 f(x)) > 0.$$ 

Following [135, Proposition 12.30] and [60, section 4], we can infer that the proximity operator $\text{prox}_\lambda^\varphi$ is a piecewise affine-linear, semidifferentiable mapping and there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\text{prox}_\lambda^\varphi(z + h) - \text{prox}_\lambda^\varphi(z) = (\text{prox}_\lambda^\varphi)'(z; h) \quad \forall h \in B_\delta(0).$$

Hence, for all $\epsilon \in (0, \delta)$, it follows

$$S_\epsilon \subset \mathcal{R}((\text{prox}_\lambda^\varphi)'(\bar{z}; \cdot)) = \text{dom}(\partial \Upsilon) \subset \mathcal{C}(\bar{x}),$$

where $\Upsilon(h) := d^2\varphi(x) - \nabla f(x)(h)$. Notice that the result $\mathcal{R}((\text{prox}_\lambda^\varphi)'(\bar{z}; \cdot)) = \text{dom}(\partial \Upsilon)$ has been shown in the proof of Theorem 7.8 in a more general context. The condition (72) and [11, Proposition 6.4] then imply $\text{aff}(\partial S_\epsilon) \subset \text{aff}(\partial \mathcal{S}_\epsilon) = \text{aff}(\partial \mathcal{C}(\bar{x}))$ and

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \to 0} \mathcal{H}(\text{aff}(\partial S_\epsilon), \nabla^2 f(x)) \geq \mathcal{H}(\text{aff}(\partial \mathcal{C}(\bar{x})), \nabla^2 f(x)).$$

Consequently, in the polyhedral case, (F.3) is satisfied if the following strong second-order sufficient condition holds:

$$\langle h, \nabla^2 f(x) h \rangle > 0 \quad \forall h \in \text{aff}(\partial \mathcal{C}(\bar{x})) \setminus \{0\}.$$ 

Thus, positive definiteness of $\nabla^2 f(x)$ is only required on the affine hull of the critical cone $C(x)$.

9 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we demonstrate the efficiency of the proposed algorithm on a sparse logistic regression and a nonconvex image compression problem. All experiments are performed using MATLAB R2020a on a laptop with Intel Core i7 9750h (6 cores and 12 threads) 3.5GHz and 16GB memory.

9.1 Implementation Details

We first describe and discuss some general implementational details of Algorithm 1. In the following, we will refer to Algorithm 1 as TRSSN.

We start with a brief overview of the utilized parameters. Most of the parameters of our algorithm are fixed throughout the conducted numerical experiments. The trust region parameters used in Algorithm 2 are listed in Table 1. When updating the trust region radius, we set $\Delta_{k+1} = \gamma_0 \Delta_k$ if $\rho_k < \eta_1$ and $\Delta_{k+1} = \Delta_k$ if $\rho_k \in [\eta_1, \eta_2]$. In the case $\rho_k \geq \eta_2$, we choose $\Delta_{k+1} = \gamma_1 \Delta_k$.

The parameter $\nu_k$ in the predicted reduction term $\text{pred}_k$ is set as in (37). In particular, we select $a_k := \epsilon_a k^{\alpha/2}$ with $\alpha = 2p$ and $p \in (0,1)$. The specific choice of the parameters $\epsilon_a$, $\alpha$, and $p$ is given in Table 1. The parameter $\nu_k$ then is chosen as:

$$\nu_k = \min\{\nu, 10^{-3}(n_S(k))^{0.4}\|\text{prox}_\lambda(\bar{z}_k + s_k) - x_k\|_2^2\}$$
Furthermore, $\tau$ and $\nu$ are set to satisfy the requirements in (B.1). In our numerical experiments, we choose:
\[
\tau = \frac{2\lambda^2}{L^2 + 2\lambda^2}, \quad \nu = \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \tau, c_{\nu} \left[ 1 - \frac{\tau}{2} \left( \frac{L^2}{2\lambda^2} + 1 \right) \right] \right\},
\]
where $c_{\tau} = c_{\nu} = 0.05$. The tolerances $\{\epsilon_k\}$ in the CG-method are chosen adaptively as $\epsilon_k = \min\{\|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_k)\|^{2.5}, 0.01\}$. The maximal number of CG-iterations is limited to 10.

Since we need to compare our normal map-based algorithm with other approaches, we first generate a comparable pair of initial points $x_0$ and $z_0$. Specifically, for given $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we compute a corresponding initial point $z_0$ via:
\[
z_0 = \arg\min_{\text{prox}^A(z) = x_0} \|F_{\text{nor}}^A(z)\|.
\]
Fortunately, in our numerical experiments, this $z_0$ can always be computed explicitly.

The evaluation of the merit function $H_{\tau}$ requires an additional evaluation of the gradient $\nabla f$, which can cause higher computational costs. To avoid this computation, we first check the condition
\[
\psi(\text{prox}_A(z_k + s_k)) \geq H_{\tau}(z_k)
\] (73)
and, in such case, we set $\rho_k = -1$. Notice that (73) implies $H_{\tau}(z_k + s_k) \geq \psi(\text{prox}_A(z_k + s_k)) \geq H_{\tau}(z_k)$, i.e., we have $\rho_k \leq 0$ and this step would be rejected. Hence, we do not need to compute $F_{\text{nor}}^A(z_k + s_k)$ in this case. Since we mainly consider large-scale problems, we will utilize a limited memory version of the quasi-Newton method. Based on the classical work [27], we implement the following compact form of the (L-)BFGS scheme
\[
B_k = \gamma_k I - [S_k, Y_k] \left[ \frac{1}{\tau_k} S_k^\top S_k - \frac{1}{\tau_k} \mathcal{L}_k \right]^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{\tau_k} S_k^\top Y_k \right]
\]
where
\[
S_k = [d_{k-m}, \ldots, d_{k-1}], \quad Y_k = [y_{k-m}, \ldots, y_{k-1}],
\]
$\mathcal{L}_k$ is the strictly lower part of $S_k^\top Y_k$, $D_k$ is the diagonal part of $S_k^\top Y_k$, and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is a memory parameter. We choose $\gamma_k$ as $\gamma_k = \gamma_k y_k/(s_k^\top y_k)$. If an algorithm utilizes a quasi-Newton technique, then we apply L-BFGS approximations with memory $m = 10$.

### 9.2 Sparse Logistic Regression

In our first numerical experiment, we consider a sparse logistic regression problem of the form:
\[
\min_x \psi(x) = f(x) + \varphi(x), \quad f(x) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x), \quad \varphi(x) := \mu \|x\|_1,
\] (74)
where $f_i(x) := \log(1 + \exp(-b_i \cdot (a_i, x)))$ denotes the logistic loss function and the data pairs $(a_i, b_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \{-1, 1\}$ are given for all $i \in [N]$. The Lipschitz constant of $\nabla f$ can be computed explicitly via $L = \|A\|_2^2/(4N)$, where $A = (a_1, \ldots, a_N)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$. For this example, the proximal operator is the well-known shrinkage operator
\[
\text{prox}^A_{\mu\|\cdot\|_1}(z) = \text{prox}^M_{\mu\|\cdot\|_1}(z) = \max\left\{ 0, |z| - \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \right\} \odot \text{sgn}(z),
\] (75)
where all the operations are understood componentwisely. Due to the separability of the $\ell_1$-norm, the generalized derivatives of the proximity operator $\text{prox}^A_{\mu\|\cdot\|_1}$ at $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be represented as diagonal matrices with
\[
D(z) = \text{diag}(d(z)) \quad \text{and} \quad d(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |z_i| \leq \frac{\mu}{\lambda}, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
\] (76)
see, e.g., [100, 99]. We set $\lambda = \min\{\frac{L}{2}, 0.4\}$, $\Lambda = \lambda I$, and $x^0 = 0$ in all of our experiments. We compare TRSSN with the following methods:

- **PNOPT** [83]. PNOPT is a proximal Newton method which uses a quasi-Newton approximation of $\nabla^2 f$ as parameter matrix $\Lambda$ in the proximal step. We use the source code released by the authors’.

All the parameters are set to be the default values as specified in the source code.

---

1. [https://web.stanford.edu/group/SOL/software/pnopt/](https://web.stanford.edu/group/SOL/software/pnopt/)
• **ASSN** [161]. ASSN is a semismooth Newton method for solving monotone equations. Following [161, section 4.1] and based on the source code provided by the authors, we implement ASSN with full Hessian information to solve the nonsmooth equation $F_{\lambda I}^{nat}(x) = 0$. We have also tried an L-BFGS version of ASSN (called ASLB). However, its performance is not comparable with the base algorithm ASSN, which also agrees with an observation made in [161, section 4.2]. Thus, we only report the numerical performance of ASSN here. Moreover, as noted in [161], the parameter $\lambda$ should be no less than $L$ to ensure monotonicity of the natural residual $F_{\lambda I}^{nat}$. So we choose $\lambda = L$ in the ASSN code.

• **FISTA** [12]. FISTA is a first-order method with Nesterov-type acceleration. In our implementation, we use the known Lipschitz constant as step size.

• **DAL** [155]. DAL is a dual augmented Lagrangian algorithm. We use the code released by the authors. All parameters are set to default values.

• **ForBES** [148]. ForBES applies the semismooth Newton method to the natural residual $F_{\lambda I}^{nat}$ using a forward-backward envelope as the merit function. We use the code provided by the authors. We choose the Lipschitz constant $L$ as initial value for $\lambda$ and the released MATLAB function then corrects $\lambda$ to $\lambda = L/0.95$. All other parameters are set to be default values.

We have tested TRSSN and the mentioned algorithms on four different datasets (CINA, covtype, gisette, and rcv1). More information about these datasets can be found in Table 2. The results of our comparison are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2. Specifically, in Figure 1 and Figure 2, we plot the relative error $\text{rel}_\text{err} = (\psi(x) - \psi^*)/\max\{1, \psi^*\}$ with respect to the number of iterations and cpu-time. Here, $\psi^*$ is the lowest objective function value encountered by all the algorithms during the experiment.

In terms of iterations, the methods ForBES, PNOPT, and TRSSN achieve the best results and outperform the accelerated first-order approach FISTA and the augmented Lagrangian method DAL on all datasets. PNOPT seems to perform especially well in its early stage and it can quickly recover solutions with medium accuracy. However, PNOPT stagnates and converges slower when a higher precision ($\geq 10^{-8}$) is required. We note that DAL performs inner iterations that only update a dual variable. Hence, the function values $\psi(x)$ can only be updated in outer iterations which explains the different convergence behavior of DAL reported in Figure 1 and Figure 2. On the dataset covtype and rcv1, ASSN performs well and transition to fast local convergence can be observed (we believe that a more problem dependent and tuned choice of the involved parameters can also lead to earlier fast local convergence on the other datasets). Concerning cpu-time, TRSSN outperforms almost all of the other tested algorithms. We notice that ForBES and PNOPT utilize line search to damp the second-order step and to ensure convergence and ASSN utilizes alternative projection steps if the semismooth Newton step does not satisfy a certain acceptance criterion. In contrast, our trust region-type framework (paired with the inexact Steihaug CG-method) requires less computational steps and gradient and function values can be fully reused in case a trial step is unsuccessful.

In Figure 3, we discuss the performance of TRSSN on the datasets CINA and rcv1 for different choices of the L-BFGS memory parameter $m$. We have also included additional runs of TRSSN using full Hessian information. The results in Figure 3 demonstrate that full Hessian information can be beneficial in certain situations to further reduce the number of iterations. However, the computational costs per iteration can then also be higher as shown in Figure 3 (b). It turns out that the numerical performance of TRSSN with L-BFGS updates is not very sensitive to the choice of $m$.

### 9.3 Linear Diffusion Based Image Compression

Next, we test TRSSN on a linear diffusion based image compression problem. The compression model we consider has been studied in [65, 141]. The model utilizes a homogeneous diffusion based interpolation to find the optimal data.
A trust region-type globalization for a normal map-based semismooth Newton method

The associated optimization formulation is given by

$$\min_{x,c} \frac{1}{2} \|x - u\|^2 + \lambda \|c\|_1 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \text{diag}(c)(x - u) - (I - \text{diag}(c))Lu = 0,$$

where \(u \in \mathbb{R}^N\) denotes the (stacked) ground truth image, \(x \in \mathbb{R}^N\) is the reconstructed image, \(c \in \mathbb{R}^N\) denotes the inpainting or compression mask, and \(\mathcal{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}\) is the discretized Laplacian. If \(c \neq 0\) and \(c \in [0, 1]^n\), then the matrix \(A(c) := \text{diag}(c) + (\text{diag}(c) - I)\mathcal{L}\) can be shown to be invertible [90]. Setting \(x = A(c)^{-1}\text{diag}(c)u\), problem (77) can then be rewritten as:

$$\min_{c} \frac{1}{2} \|A(c)^{-1}\text{diag}(c)u - u\|^2 + \mu \|c\|_1 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad c \in [0, 1]^n.$$

Thus, problem (77) reduces to the standard form in (1) with \(f(c) = \frac{1}{2} \|A(c)^{-1}\text{diag}(c)u - u\|^2\) and \(\varphi(c) = \lambda \|c\|_1 + \iota_{[0, 1]^n}(c)\). By [108, Lemma 5.2], the gradient of \(f\) can be calculated as follows

$$\nabla f(c) = \text{diag}(-\mathcal{L}x + u - x)[A(c)^T]^{-1}(x - u) \quad \text{where} \quad x = A(c)^{-1}\text{diag}(c)u.$$

Since the Lipschitz constant of \(\nabla f\) can not be computed exactly, we use an adaptive strategy for choosing \(L\). First, we select an initial estimate \(L_0\). In each trial step, we then calculate \(c_{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\lambda \varphi}^\nabla(z_k + s_k)\) and choose

$$L_k = \max \left\{ 2 \frac{f(c_{k+1}) - f(c_k) - \langle \nabla f(c_k), c_{k+1} - c_k \rangle}{\|c_{k+1} - c_k\|^2}, 2L_{k-1} \right\}.$$
A trust region-type globalization for a normal map-based semismooth Newton method

Figure 2: Change of the relative error \( \text{rel}_\text{err} \) with respect to the cpu-time for solving the \( \ell_1 \)-logistic regression problem (74).

We reset \( \Lambda = L_k I \) and adjust \( \nu \) and \( \tau \) as specified in subsection 9.1. In all of our examples, we choose \( L_0 = 0.1 \). The proximity operator is slightly different to the one in subsection 9.2. According to [164, Theorem 1], we have

\[
\text{prox}_\Lambda \varphi(z) = P_{[0,1]^n} \circ \text{prox}_{\frac{\lambda}{\mu}} \| \cdot \|_1(z) = \min \{0, \max \{1, \text{prox}_{\frac{\lambda}{\mu}} \| \cdot \|_1(z) \}\},
\]

where the explicit form of \( \text{prox}_{\frac{\lambda}{\mu}} \| \cdot \|_1(z) \) can be found in (75) and all operations are understood componentwisely. The corresponding generalized derivative of this proximity operator can be constructed similarly to (76). Here, we choose

\[
D(z) = \text{diag}(d(z)) \quad \text{and} \quad d_i(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } z_i \leq \frac{\lambda}{\mu} \text{ or } z_i \geq \frac{\lambda}{\mu} + 1, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}
\]

see, e.g., [99, Example 4.2.17] for comparison. Because this problem is nonconvex, most of the algorithms tested in subsection 9.2 are no longer directly applicable. We compare our method with the following algorithms:

- **ForBES** [148]. We use the same source code as in subsection 9.2. In the ForBES code, \( f \) is assumed to be defined on the whole \( \mathbb{R}^n \) which is not the case for (77). To apply ForBES to (77), we have tested two strategies. The first variant, referred to as ForBES-S1, sets \( f \) to \( +\infty \) outside of the effective domain of \( \varphi \). In our second strategy, ForBES-S2, \( \nabla f \) is computed using (78) regardless of the constraint \( c \in [0,1]^n \). Unfortunately, both strategies cost too much time to converge to a reasonable solution. For ForBES-S1, the line search strategy typically reaches the maximum number of iterations. Specifically, if some of the components of \( x_k \) are exactly
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Figure 3: Results for the logistic regression problem. Comparison of TRSSN on CINA and rcv1 for different choices of the L-BFGS memory parameter \( m \).

0 (or 1) and the corresponding components of the descent direction \( d_k \) are negative (positive), then the line search step in [148] would stagnate and fail at this point. This is very likely to happen when the dimension of the problem is large. For ForBES-S2, we observe that the evaluation of the forward-backward envelope is very time-consuming since it involves the computation of the full gradient. In addition, backtracking requires a relatively high number of steps to converge since \( f \) and the forward-backward envelope change sharply when \( x_k \) is close to the boundary of \([0, 1]^n\). In our tests, ForBES-S2 needs around 24 hours to run 2500 iterations for a \( 512 \times 512 \) input image. Due to these limitations, we will not report the performance of ForBES here.

- iPiano [108]. iPiano is a first-order method applying momentum acceleration to forward-backward splitting. We implement this algorithm with backtracking following the recommendations in [108]. As in [108], we set \( \alpha = 1.99(1 - \beta)/L, \eta = 2, \) and \( \beta = 0.8 \). The initial Lipschitz constant \( L_0 \) is set to be 0.1. As suggested in [108], we increase the Lipschitz constant \( L \) adaptively by 5% after every five steps.

- SpaRSA [160]. SpaRSA is a proximal gradient method with Barzilai-Borwein step sizes. We implement this algorithm based on the source code provided by the authors. In SpaRSA, we set
\[
\alpha_k = \left( \frac{r_k}{s_k} \right)^\top \frac{r_k}{s_k}, \quad r_k = \nabla f(c_k) - \nabla f(c_{k-1}), \quad s_k = c_k - c_{k-1},
\]

\footnote{https://www.lx.it.pt/~mtf/SpaRSA/}
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as initial step size as suggested by the authors, see [160, section II.E]. Moreover, as in [160], the lower and upper bounds on $\alpha_k$ are given by $\alpha_{\text{min}} = 10^{-30}$ and $\alpha_{\text{max}} = 10^{30}$. Following a strategy proposed in [158], we utilize the nonmonotone line search procedure developed in [167] to ensure global convergence of the approach and stability of the Barzilai-Borwein step sizes.

Our results are summarized and shown in Figure 4–Figure 6. We compare the performance of the algorithms on the four different images books, coffee, mountain, and stones. All images have been rescaled to size $512 \times 512$ and we use $\mu = 0.01$ for books, $\mu = 0.003$ for coffee and stones, and $\mu = 0.02$ for mountain. In all tested examples, the performance of SpaRSA and iPiano is quite similar, while iPiano is generally more stable. Moreover, both SpaRSA and iPiano have large fluctuations throughout the iterative process (and on all tested images). As demonstrated in Figure 4 and Figure 5, TRSSN significantly outperforms the other first-order approaches both in terms of the number of iterations and cpu-time. In addition, the overall performance of TRSSN appears to be more stable.

10 Conclusion

In this work, we propose a trust region-type semismooth Newton method (TRSSN) for solving a class of nonsmooth nonconvex optimization problems. Our approach is based on a reformulation of the associated first-order optimality
conditions using Robinson’s normal map. We construct a novel merit function and reduction ratio that allow to embed the computation of inexact semismooth Newton-type steps for the normal map in a trust region framework and that can guarantee strong convergence properties. In particular, the Kurdyka–Lojasiewicz (KL) theory is applicable and transition to fast q-superlinear convergence can be established under appropriate local assumptions. We then show that the classical second-order necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for problem (1) have an alternative normal map-based and explicit representation that only involves directional derivatives. This allows to link different optimality concepts, such as, strong metric subregularity for $F_{\text{nat}}$ and $F_{\text{nor}}$, the quadratic growth condition, and second-order sufficient conditions, and can justify some of the assumptions required for local convergence. Furthermore, motivated by its high practical relevance, we investigate the convergence properties of a quasi-Newton version of TRSSN. In particular, we show that BFGS updates and the KL framework are highly compatible and new boundedness results are derived under a significantly weaker finite length condition. We then combine our global and local results, the KL and second-order theory, and a Dennis-Moré condition to establish superlinear convergence of the BFGS variant of TRSSN without requiring the strict complementarity condition. Finally, our numerical experiments on sparse logistic regression and an image compression problem indicate that TRSSN is a highly competitive algorithm on both convex and nonconvex problems.
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Figure 6: Illustration of the different ground truth images, the inpainting or compression masks, and the corresponding reconstructions. The density ($ds$) of the masks $c$ is calculated via $ds := 100\% \cdot ||\{i : c_i > 0\}||/(512 \times 512)$. 

(a) books – original figure. (b) books – mask ($ds = 8.43\%$). (c) books – reconstruction.

(d) coffee – original figure. (e) coffee – mask ($ds = 4.45\%$). (f) coffee – reconstruction.

(g) mountain – original figure. (h) mountain – mask ($ds = 3.99\%$). (i) mountain – reconstruction.
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Algorithm 3 obviously returns $q$ with $\|q\| \leq \Delta$. Moreover, using $D^T = AD$, we have $R(S) \subseteq R(AD)$, dim $R(S) \leq m$, and $q \in R(AD)$. Let us consider the iteration $i = m - 1$ and suppose that Algorithm 3 does not terminate in step 6 or 10. Following [74, 105], it can be shown that the CG-method has generated a sequence of vectors 
\[ \{r_0, r_1, ..., r_{m-1}\} \] and \[ \{p_0, p_1, ..., p_{m-1}\} \] with the properties
\[ \langle p_\ell, S p_j \rangle = 0, \quad \langle r_\ell, p_j \rangle = 0, \quad \text{span}\{r_0, ..., r_\ell\} = \text{span}\{p_0, ..., p_\ell\} = K^\ell(S, r_0), \] (79)
for all \( j = 0, \ldots, \ell - 1 \) and all \( \ell = 1, \ldots, m - 1 \). Here, \( K^j(S, r_0) \) denotes the Krylov space \( \operatorname{span}\{r_0, Sr_0, \ldots, S^j r_0\} \).

By construction, we have \( p_\ell, r_\ell \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}) \) and \( K^j(S, r_0) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}) \) for all \( \ell = 0, \ldots, m - 1 \). Moreover, due to the \( S \)-orthogonality and \( (p_\ell, Sp_\ell) > 0, \ell = 0, \ldots, m - 1 \), the vectors \( \{p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_{m-1}\} \) are linearly independent and hence, it follows

\[
\operatorname{span}\{p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_{m-1}\} = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}).
\]

Using the second equality in (79), we can infer \( \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}) \ni r_m \bot \operatorname{span}\{p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_{m-1}\} = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}) \) which implies \( r_m = r_0 + S \hat{q}_m = 0 \). Consequently, \( \text{Algorithm 3} \) would stop at iteration \( m \) with \( q = q_m \) satisfying \( S\hat{q} = -g \) and \( \|q\| \leq \Delta \). This finishes the proof of the first part. In order to prove the second part, we need to verify that \( \text{Algorithm 3} \) never terminates in step 6 or 10. If \( S \) is positive semidefinite and \( M \) is invertible, the condition \( (p_i, Sp_i) \leq 0 \) and the proof of \text{Lemma 3.3} \) imply \( Dp_i = 0 \). However, by [147, Lemma 2.2], we have \( \|p_i\|^2 = -\langle r_i, p_i \rangle = -\langle r_0, p_i \rangle = -\langle F_{\text{nor}}(z), Dp_i \rangle = 0 \). Hence, \( \text{Algorithm 3} \) would exit at the \( (i - 1) \)-th iteration when checking the norm of the residual \( \|r_i\| \) and therefore the method can not terminate at step 6. Now, due to the invertibility of \( M \), we have \( \mathcal{R}(S) = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}), \) \( g = r_0 \in \mathcal{R}(S) \), and \( r_\ell, p_\ell, q_\ell \in \mathcal{R}(S) \) for all \( \ell \). According to part (i), \( \text{Algorithm 3} \) would generate a solution \( q = q_m \) satisfying \( S\hat{q} = -g \) with \( q \in \mathcal{R}(S) \) unless it stops earlier in step 10. Since \( q \) lies in \( \mathcal{R}(S) \), it has to coincide with the minimum norm solution \( \hat{q} = -S^+ g \) where \( S^+ \) denotes the Moore-Penrose inverse of \( S \), see, e.g., [79] for comparison. Moreover, due to [147, Theorem 2.1], it follows

\[
0 = \|q_0\| < \|q_1\| < \cdots < \|q_j\| < \cdots < \|q_m\| = \|\hat{q}\| \leq \|M^{-1} F_{\text{nor}}(z)\| \leq \Delta.
\]

This shows that \( \text{Algorithm 3} \) can only terminate in step 14 which completes the proof. \( \square \)

A.2 Proof of Proposition 8.4

Proof. Let \( U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r} \) and \( V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n-r} \) be two orthonormal basis matrices of the subspaces \( \mathcal{W} \) and \( \mathcal{W}^\perp \), respectively. Thus, by definition, we have \( U^T V = 0 \) and introducing the orthogonal matrix \( Q = (U, V) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \), we can write

\[
H(x) = Q \begin{pmatrix} U^T H(x)U & U^T H(x)V \\ V^T H(x)U & V^T H(x)V \end{pmatrix} Q^T.
\]

Our assumption then implies that the matrix \( U^T H(x)U \) is positive definite with \( \lambda_{\min}(U^T H(x)U) \geq \delta \) for all \( x \in B_r(w) \). We now define \( G: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{S}^n \) via

\[
G(x) := Q \begin{pmatrix} U^T H(x)U & U^T H(x)V \\ V^T H(x)U & V^T H(x)V \end{pmatrix} Q^T, \quad \gamma(x) := \frac{2}{\delta}\|U^T H(x)V\|_2^2 + \frac{\delta}{2}.
\]

Now, for every \( d \in \mathcal{W} \) there exists \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}^r \) such that \( d = U\xi \) and thus, we obtain

\[
G(x)d = Q \begin{pmatrix} U^T H(x)U & U^T H(x)V \\ V^T H(x)U & V^T H(x)V \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = Q \begin{pmatrix} U^T H(x)d \\ V^T H(x)d \end{pmatrix} = H(x)d.
\]

Next, let \( d = UU^T d + VV^T d \in \mathbb{R}^n \) be arbitrary. Using the symmetry of \( H(x) \) and Young’s inequality, it holds that:

\[
d^T G(x)d = (U^T d)^T [U^T H(x)U] U^T d + 2(U^T d)^T [U^T H(x)V] V^T d + \gamma(x)\|V^T d\|^2 \\
\geq \delta\|U^T d\|^2 - \frac{\delta}{2}\|U^T d\|^2 - 2\|U^T H(x)V\|^2\|V^T d\|^2 + \gamma(x)\|V^T d\|^2 \\
= \frac{\delta}{2}\|U^T d\|^2 + \|V^T d\|^2 = \frac{\delta}{2}\|d\|^2.
\]

Finally, let us suppose that \( H \) is Lipschitz continuous on \( B_r(w) \) with constant \( L_H \). Since \( H \) is continuous, there is a constant \( C_H > 0 \) such that \( \sup_{x \in B_r(w)} \|H(x)\| \leq C_H \). Thus, for all \( d \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( x, y \in B_r(w) \) and using \( \|UU^T\| = \|VV^T\| = \|U\| = \|V\| = 1 \), we obtain

\[
\|G(x) - G(y)\| = \left\| Q \begin{pmatrix} U^T (H(x) - H(y))U & U^T (H(x) - H(y))V \\ V^T (H(x) - H(y))U & V^T (H(x) - H(y))V \end{pmatrix} \right\| \\
= \|UU^T (H(x) - H(y))d + VV^T (H(x) - H(y))UU^T d + [\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)]VV^T d\| \\
\leq 2L_H\|x - y\|\|d\| + \frac{2}{\delta}\|U^T (H(x) - H(y))V\| (\|UU^T H(x)V\| + \|U^T H(y)V\|)\|d\|.
\]

This shows that \( G \) is Lipschitz continuous on \( B_r(w) \) with constant \( (2 + \frac{4C_H}{\delta}) L_H \). \( \square \)