

## The regularization continuation method for optimization problems with nonlinear equality constraints

Xin-long Luo\* · Hang Xiao · Sen Zhang

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** This paper considers the regularization continuation method and the trust-region updating strategy for the nonlinearly equality-constrained optimization problem. Namely, it uses the inverse of the regularization quasi-Newton matrix as the pre-conditioner to improve its computational efficiency in the well-posed phase, and it adopts the inverse of the regularization two-sided projection of the Hessian as the pre-conditioner to improve its robustness in the ill-conditioned phase. Since it only solves a linear system of equations at every iteration and the sequential quadratic programming (SQP) needs to solve a quadratic programming subproblem at every iteration, it is faster than SQP. Numerical results also show that it is more robust and faster than SQP (the built-in subroutine `fmincon.m` of the MATLAB2020a environment and the subroutine `SNOPT` executed in GAMS v28.2 (2019) environment). The computational time of the new method is about one third of that of `fmincon.m` for the large-scale problem. Finally, the global convergence analysis of the new method is also given.

**Keywords** continuation method · preconditioned technique · trust-region method · regularization technique · quasi-Newton method

---

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

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

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

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

## 1 Introduction

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

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{x \in \mathfrak{R}^n} f(x) \\ & \text{subject to } c(x) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $f : \mathfrak{R}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  and  $c : \mathfrak{R}^m \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}^n$  ( $m \leq n$ ). This problem has many applications in engineering fields such as the visual-inertial navigation of an unmanned aerial vehicle maintaining the horizontal flight [11, 48], constrained sparse regression [8], sparse signal recovery [19, 82], image restoration and de-noising [20, 56, 76], the Dantzig selector [42], support vector machines [21], and sparse principal component analysis (PCA) methods [15, 85, 83]. And there are many practical methods [37, 41, 64] and many efficient solvers (the built-in subroutine `fmincon` [71] of MATLAB 2020a [59] and the subroutine `SNOPT` [28, 29] in the GAMS environment [22]) to solve it based on the sequential quadratic programming (SQP) method [30, 69, 84].

For the constrained optimization problem (1), the continuation method [3, 12, 23, 36, 66, 79] is another method other than the traditional optimization method such as SQP [30, 69, 70, 84] or the penalty function method [16]. The advantage of the continuation method over the SQP method is that the continuation method is capable of finding many local optimal points of the non-convex optimization problem by tracking its trajectory, and it is even possible to find the global optimal solution [6, 54, 72, 86]. However, the computational efficiency of the classical continuation methods is lower than that of the traditional optimization method such as SQP. Recently, Luo et al intensively investigate the continuation methods for nonlinear equations [49, 52], linear programming problems [50], linear complementarity problems [55], unconstrained optimization problems [51, 54], and linearly constrained optimization problems [48, 53]. And they obtain the more robust and faster continuation methods than the traditional optimization methods.

Here, we extend their ideas to the optimization problem with nonlinear equality constraints. In order to improve the computational efficiency of the continuation method for the large-scale optimization problem further, we consider the regularization BFGS (a special quasi-Newton method) preconditioned technique for the regularization continuation method and use an adaptive time step control based on the trust-region updating strategy in this article. Moreover, in order to improve its robustness, we replace the inverse of the regularization BFGS matrix with the inverse of the regularization two-sided projection of the Hessian matrix in the ill-posed phase.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give the regularization continuation method with the switching preconditioned technique and the trust-region updating strategy for the problem (1). In Section 3, we analyze the global convergence of this new method. In Section 4, we report some promising numerical

results of the new method, in comparison to the state-of-art optimization methods (SQP, the built-in subroutine `fmincon` [71] of MATLAB 2020a [59] and the subroutine SNOPT [28, 29] in the GAMS environment [22]) for some large-scale problems. Finally, we give some discussions and conclusions in Section 5.

## 2 The regularization continuation method

In this section, we give the regularization continuation method with the switching preconditioned technique and the adaptive time-stepping scheme based on the trust-region updating strategy [13] for the optimization problem with nonlinear equality constraints. Firstly, we consider the regularized projection gradient flow based on the KKT conditions of equality-constrained optimization problems. Then, we construct the regularization continuation method with the trust-region updating strategy to follow this special ordinary differential equations (ODEs). The new method uses the Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (BFGS) updating formula [5, 17, 24, 75] as the preconditioned technique to improve its computational efficiency in the well-posed phase, and it adopts the inverse of the regularized two-sided projection Hessian as the pre-conditioner to improve its robustness in the ill-posed phase. Furthermore, we use the generalized continuation Newton method [52] to find an initial feasible point.

### 2.1 The regularized projection Newton flow

For the nonlinearly constrained optimization problem (1), it is well known that its optimal solution  $x^*$  needs to satisfy the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions (p. 328, [64]) as follows:

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

$$c(x) = 0, \quad (3)$$

where  $A(x)^T = [\nabla c_1(x), \dots, \nabla c_m(x)]$  and the Lagrangian function  $L(x, \lambda)$  is defined by

$$L(x, \lambda) = f(x) + \lambda^T c(x). \quad (4)$$

Similarly to the method of the negative gradient flow for the unconstrained optimization problem [32], from the first-order necessary conditions (2)-(3), we can construct a dynamical system of differential-algebraic equations for problem (1) [14, 45, 46, 47, 48, 53, 73] as follows:

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

$$c(x) = 0. \quad (6)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dc(x)}{dt} &= A(x) \frac{dx}{dt} = -A(x) (\nabla f(x) + A(x)^T \lambda) \\ &= -A(x) \nabla f(x) - A(x) A(x)^T \lambda = 0.\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

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

$$\lambda = - (A(x) A(x)^T)^{-1} A(x) \nabla f(x). \quad (8)$$

By substituting  $\lambda$  of equation (8) into equation (5), we obtain the projected gradient flow [79] for the constrained optimization problem (1) as follows:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = - \left( I - A(x)^T (A(x) A(x)^T)^{-1} A(x) \right) \nabla f(x) = -P(x)g(x), \quad (9)$$

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

$$P(x) = I - A(x)^T (A(x) A(x)^T)^{-1} A(x). \quad (10)$$

It is not difficult to verify  $P^2(x) = P(x)$ . That is to say, the projection matrix  $P(x)$  is symmetric and its eigenvalues are 0 or 1. From Theorem 2.3.1 in p. 73 of [26], we know that its matrix 2-norm is

$$\|P(x)\| = 1. \quad (11)$$

We denote  $P(x)^+$  as the Moore-Penrose generalized inverse of the projection matrix  $P(x)$  (see p. 11, [78] or [63, 67]). Since the projection matrix  $P(x)$  is symmetric and  $P(x)^2 = P(x)$ , it is not difficult to verify

$$P(x)^+ = P(x). \quad (12)$$

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

*Remark 1* If  $x(t)$  is the solution of the ODE (9), it is not difficult to verify that  $x(t)$  satisfies  $A(x)(dx/dt) = 0$ . That is to say, if the initial point  $x_0$  satisfies  $c(x_0) = 0$ , the solution  $x(t)$  of the projected gradient flow (9) also satisfies  $c(x) = 0$ ,  $\forall t \geq 0$ . This property is very useful such that we can construct an ODE method to follow the trajectory of the ODE (9) and obtain its steady-state solution  $x^*$ .  $\square$

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

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

That is to say,  $f(x)$  is monotonically decreasing along the solution curve  $x(t)$  of the dynamical system (9). Furthermore, the solution  $x(t)$  converges to  $x^*$  when  $f(x)$  is lower bounded and  $t$  tends to infinity [32, 72, 79], where  $x^*$  satisfies the first-order Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions (2)-(3). Thus, we can follow the trajectory  $x(t)$  of the ODE (9) to obtain its steady-state solution  $x^*$ , which is also one stationary point of the original optimization problem (1).

However, since the right-hand-side function  $P(x)g(x)$  of the ODE (9) is rank-deficient, we will confront the numerical difficulties when we use the explicit ODE method to follow the projected gradient flow (9) [4, 7, 9]. In order to mitigate the stiffness of the ODE (9), we use the generalized inverse  $(P(x)\nabla^2 f(x)P(x))^+$  of the two-sided projection matrix  $P(x)\nabla^2 f(x)P(x)$  as the pre-conditioner for the ODE (9), which is used similarly to the system of nonlinear equations [49], the unconstrained optimization problem [32, 51, 54], the linear programming problem [50], the linear complementarity problem [55], the underdetermined system of nonlinear equations [48, 53] and the linearly constrained optimization problem [53].

By using the generalized inverse  $(P(x)\nabla^2 f(x)P(x))^+$  of  $P(x)\nabla^2 f(x)P(x)$  as the pre-conditioner for the ODE (9), we obtain the projected Newton flow

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = - (P(x)\nabla^2 f(x)P(x))^+ P(x)g(x). \quad (13)$$

Since  $P(x)\nabla^2 f(x)P(x)$  is singular, we reformulate equation (13) as

$$(P(x)\nabla^2 f(x)P(x)) \frac{dx(t)}{dt} = -P(x)g(x). \quad (14)$$

Although the projected Newton flow (14) mitigates the stiffness of the ODE such that we can adopt the explicit ODE method to integrate it on the infinite interval, there are two disadvantages. One is that the two-side projection matrix  $P(x)\nabla^2 f(x)P(x)$  may be not positive semi-definite. Consequently, it can not ensure the objective function  $f(x)$  is monotonically decreasing along the solution  $x(t)$  of the ODE (14). The other is that the solution  $x(t)$  of the ODE (14) can not ensure to satisfy the feasibility, i.e.,  $dc(x)/dt = A(x)dx(t)/dt = 0$ . In order to overcome these two shortcomings, we use the regularization technique [31, 80, 81] for the projected Newton flow (14) as follows:

$$(\sigma(x)I + P(x)\nabla^2 f(x)P(x)) \frac{dx(t)}{dt} = -P(x)g(x), \quad (15)$$

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

*Remark 2* If we assume that  $x(t)$  is the solution of the ODE (15), from the property  $A(x)P(x) = 0$ , we have

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

Consequently, we obtain  $\sigma(x)A(x)dx(t)/dt = 0$ , i.e.  $A(x)dx(t)/dt = 0$ . By integrating it, we obtain  $c(x) = c(x_0) = 0$ . That is to say, the solution  $x(t)$  of the ODE (15) preserves the feasibility  $c(x) = 0$  when  $c(x_0) = 0$ .  $\square$

*Remark 3* From  $P^2(x) = P(x)$ , we know that the solution  $x(t)$  of the ODE (15) satisfies  $P(x)dx(t)/dt = dx(t)/dt$ . Consequently, from equation (15) and the assumption  $\sigma(x) + \lambda_{\min}(P(x)\nabla^2 f(x)P(x)) \geq \sigma_{\min} > 0$ , we obtain

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

That is to say,  $f(x)$  is monotonically decreasing along the solution  $x(t)$  of the ODE (15). Furthermore, the solution  $x(t)$  converges to  $x^*$  when  $f(x)$  is lower bounded and  $\|P(x)\nabla^2 f(x)P(x)\| \leq M$  [32, 40, 72, 79], where  $M$  is a positive constant and  $x^*$  is the stationary point of the regularization projected Newton flow (15). Thus, we can follow the trajectory  $x(t)$  of the ODE (15) to obtain its stationary point  $x^*$ , which is also one stationary point of the original optimization problem (1).  $\square$

## 2.2 The regularization continuation method

The solution curve  $x(t)$  of the ODE (15) can not be efficiently followed by the general ODE method [4, 7, 9, 35] such as backward differentiation formulas (BDFs, the subroutine ode15s.m of the MATLAB R2020a environment [59]). Thus, we need to construct the particular method for this problem. We apply the first-order explicit Euler method [74] to the ODE (15), then we obtain the regularized projection Newton method as follows:

$$(\sigma_k I + P(x_k)\nabla^2 f(x_k)P(x_k)) d_k = -P(x_k)g(x_k), \quad (16)$$

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k, \quad (17)$$

where  $\alpha_k$  is the time step. When  $\alpha_k = 1$ , the regularized projection Newton method (16)-(17) is similar to the Levenberg-Marquardt method [39, 44, 61].

Since the time step  $\alpha_k$  of the regularized projection Newton method (16)-(17) is restricted by the numerical stability [74]. That is to say, for the linear test equation  $dx/dt = -\lambda x$ , its time step  $\alpha_k$  is restricted by the stable region  $|1 - \alpha_k \lambda / (\sigma_k + \lambda)| \leq 1$ . In order to avoid this disadvantage, similarly to the processing technique of the nonlinear equations [49, 50, 52], the unconstrained optimization problem [51, 53] and the linearly constrained optimization problem [53], we replace  $\alpha_k$  with  $\Delta t_k / (1 + \Delta t_k)$  in equation (17) and let  $\bar{\sigma}_k = \sigma_0 / \Delta t_k$  in equation (16). Then, we obtain the regularization continuation method:

$$\left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k \right) d_k = -P_k g_k, \quad s_k^p = \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} (P_k d_k), \quad (18)$$

$$x_{k+1}^p = x_k + s_k^p, \quad (19)$$

where  $\Delta t_k$  is the time step,  $P_k = P(x_k)$ ,  $g_k = \nabla f(x_k)$  and  $B_k = P(x_k)\nabla^2 f(x_k)P(x_k)$  or its quasi-Newton approximation.

We denote  $A_k = A(x_k)$ . The matrix  $A_k A_k^T$  may be ill-conditioned. Thus, the Cholesky factorization method may fail to solve the projection matrix defined by equation (10) for the large-scale problem. Therefore, we use the QR decomposition (pp. 247-248, [26]) to solve it as follows:

$$A_k^T = Q_k R_k, \quad (20)$$

where  $Q_k \in \mathfrak{R}^{n \times m}$  satisfies  $Q_k^T Q_k = I$  and  $R_k \in \mathfrak{R}^{m \times m}$  is an upper triangle matrix. Consequently, the projection matrix  $P_k$  defined by equation (10) can be simplified as follows:

$$P_k = I - Q_k Q_k^T. \quad (21)$$

From equations (18)-(19) and the property  $A(x_k)P(x_k) = 0$  of the projection matrix  $P(x_k)$ , it is not difficult to verify  $A(x_k)s_k^p = 0$ . Thus, when the constraint is linear, i.e.  $c(x) = Ax - b = 0$ ,  $x_{k+1}^p$  also satisfies the linear constraint  $Ax_{k+1}^p - b = 0$  if  $Ax_k - b = 0$  [53]. However, for the nonlinear constraint  $c(x) = 0$ , this property is not true. In other words, we may not have  $c(x_{k+1}^p) = 0$  when  $c(x_k) = 0$ , where  $x_{k+1}^p$  is the solution of equations (18)-(19). Therefore, we need to compute the correction step  $s_k$  such that  $x_{k+1} = x_k + s_k$  is pulled back to the constraint  $c(x) = 0$ . In order to save the computational time, we use the following generalized Newton iteration with the shortest increment [52] to achieve this aim:

$$\begin{aligned} s_k^c &= -(A_{k+1}^p)^+ c(x_{k+1}^p), \quad (A_{k+1}^p)^+ = (A_{k+1}^p)^T (A_{k+1}^p (A_{k+1}^p)^T)^{-1}, \\ s_k &= s_k^p + s_k^c, \quad x_{k+1} = x_{k+1}^p + s_k^c = x_k + s_k, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where  $A_{k+1}^p$  equals  $A(x_k)$  or  $A(x_{k+1}^p)$ . We first try  $A_{k+1}^p = A(x_k)$  and solve equation (22). If  $\|c(x_{k+1})\|_\infty > \varepsilon_0$ , we try  $A_{k+1}^p = A(x_{k+1}^p)$  and solve equation (22) again, where  $\varepsilon_0$  is a given small constant that is less than the termination tolerance  $\varepsilon$  such as  $\varepsilon_0 = 10^{-7}$  and  $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$ .

When  $A_{k+1}^p = A(x_k) = A_k$ , we have obtained its QR decomposition (20) and let  $Q_k^p = Q_k$ ,  $R_k^p = R_k$ . If  $A_{k+1}^p = A(x_{k+1}^p)$ , we also use the QR decomposition (pp. 247-248, [26]) to factorize it as  $(A_{k+1}^p)^T = Q_k^p R_k^p$ , where  $Q_k^p \in \mathfrak{R}^{n \times m}$  satisfies  $(Q_k^p)^T Q_k^p = I$  and  $R_k^p \in \mathfrak{R}^{m \times m}$  is an upper triangle matrix. Then, we solve the linear system (22) as follows:

$$(R_k^p)^T d_k^c = -c(x_{k+1}^p), \quad s_k^c = Q_k^p d_k^c, \quad x_{k+1} = x_{k+1}^p + s_k^c. \quad (23)$$

We define the quadratic model  $q_k(s)$  as follows:

$$q_k(s) = f(x_k) + s^T g_k + \frac{1}{2} s^T B_k s, \quad (24)$$

where  $g_k = \nabla f(x_k)$  and  $B_k = P(x_k)\nabla^2 f(x_k)P(x_k)$  or its quasi-Newton approximation. Similarly to the trust-region subproblem of the null space method (pp. 571-574, [78]), we decompose the predicted reduction into two parts:

$$Hpred_k = q_k(0) - q_k(s_k^p), \quad Vpred_k = q_k(s_k^p) - q_k(s_k^p + s_k^c). \quad (25)$$

Thus, in order to ensure the global convergence of the regularization continuation method (18)-(23), the accepted prediction step  $s_k^p$  and the correction step  $s_k^c$  need to satisfy the following conditions:

$$\|s_k^c\| \leq \theta_1 \|s_k^p\|, \quad (26)$$

where  $\theta_1$  is a large positive constant such as  $10^6$ .

*Remark 4* The time step  $\Delta t_k$  of the regularization continuation method (18)-(22) is not restricted by the numerical stability. Therefore, the large time step  $\Delta t_k$  can be adopted in the steady-state phase such that the regularization continuation method (18)-(22) mimics the projected Newton method near the stationary point  $x^*$  and it has the fast rate of convergence. The most of all, the new step  $\alpha_k = \Delta t_k / (\Delta t_k + 1)$  is favourable to adopt the trust-region updating strategy for adjusting the time step  $\Delta t_k$ . Consequently, the regularization continuation method (18)-(22) accurately follows the trajectory of the regularization flow (15) in the transient-state phase and achieves the fast rate of convergence near the stationary point  $x^*$ .  $\square$

### 2.3 The adaptive step control

Another issue is how to adaptively adjust the time step  $\Delta t_k$  at every iteration. We borrow the adjustment technique of the trust-region method due to its robustness and its fast rate of convergence [13, 87]. According to the structure-preserving property of the regularization continuation method (18)-(22),  $x_{k+1}$  will be expected to preserve the feasibility by computing the correction step  $s_k^c$  of equation (23). That is to say,  $x_{k+1}$  satisfies  $c(x_{k+1}) \approx 0$ . Therefore, we use the objective function  $f(x)$  instead of the nonsmooth penalty function  $f(x) + \sigma \|c(x)\|_1$  as the merit function. Similarly to the stepping-time scheme of the ODE method for the unconstrained optimization problem [33, 44, 51] and the linearly constrained optimization problem [48, 53], we also need to construct a local approximation model of  $f(x)$  around  $x_k$ . Here, we adopt the quadratic function defined by equation (24) as its approximation model.

We enlarge or reduce the time step  $\Delta t_{k+1}$  at every iteration according to the following ratio:

$$\rho_k = \frac{f(x_k) - f(x_k + s_k)}{q_k(0) - q_k(s_k)}. \quad (27)$$

A particular adjustment strategy is given as follows:

$$\Delta t_{k+1} = \begin{cases} \gamma_1 \Delta t_k, & \text{if } (\|c(x_k + s_k)\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_0 \text{ and } \rho_k \geq \eta_2), \\ \Delta t_k, & \text{else if } (\|c(x_k + s_k)\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_0 \text{ and } \eta_1 < \rho_k < \eta_2), \\ \gamma_2 \Delta t_k, & \text{others,} \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

where the constants are selected as  $\eta_1 = 0.25$ ,  $\gamma_1 = 2$ ,  $\eta_2 = 0.75$ ,  $\gamma_2 = 0.5$  and  $\varepsilon < 10^{-6}$  according to our numerical experiments. We accept the trial step  $s_k$  and let  $x_{k+1} = x_k + s_k$ , when  $\rho_k \geq \eta_a$ ,  $\|c(x_k + s_k)\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_0$  and the approximation model  $q_k(0) - q_k(s_k)$  satisfies the Armijo sufficient descent condition:

$$q_k(0) - q_k(s_k) \geq \eta_q \|s_k^p\| \|p_{g_k}\|, \quad (29)$$

where  $p_{g_k} = P(x_k)g(x_k) = P(x_k)\nabla f(x_k)$  and  $s_k^p$  are computed by equation (18)-(19), and  $\eta_a, \eta_q$  are the small positive constants such as  $\eta_a = \eta_q = 10^{-6}$ . Otherwise, we discard it and let  $x_{k+1} = x_k$ .

*Remark 5* This new time-stepping scheme based on the trust-region updating strategy has some advantages compared to the traditional line search strategy [43]. If we use the line search strategy and the damped projection Newton method (16)-(17) to follow the trajectory  $x(t)$  of the projected Newton flow (15), in order to achieve the fast rate of convergence in the steady-state phase, the time step  $\alpha_k$  of the damped projection Newton method is tried from 1 and reduced by half with many times at every iteration. Since the linear model  $f(x_k) + \nabla f(x_k)^T s_k$  may not approximate  $f(x_k + s_k)$  well in the transient-state phase, the time step  $\alpha_k$  will be small. Consequently, the line search strategy consumes the unnecessary trial steps in the transient-state phase. However, the selection scheme of the time step based on the trust-region strategy (27)-(28) can overcome this shortcoming.  $\square$

#### 2.4 The adaptively preconditioned technique

For the large-scale problem, the numerical evaluation of the two-sided projection matrix  $P(x_k)\nabla^2 f(x_k)P(x_k)$  consumes much time. In order to overcome this shortcoming, in the well-posed phase, we use the Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (BFGS) quasi-Newton matrix (see [5, 17, 24, 57, 75] or pp. 222-230, [64]) to approximate the two-sided projection matrix  $P(x_k)\nabla^2 f(x_k)P(x_k)$  of the regularization continuation method (18)-(23) as follows:

$$B_{k+1} = \begin{cases} B_k + \frac{y_k y_k^T}{y_k^T s_k} - \frac{B_k s_k s_k^T B_k}{s_k^T B_k s_k}, & \text{if } y_k^T s_k > 0, \\ B_k, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

where  $y_k = P(x_{k+1})g(x_{k+1}) - P(x_k)g(x_k)$ ,  $s_k = x_{k+1} - x_k$  and  $B_0 = I$ .

The BFGS updating matrix  $B_k$  has some nice properties. For example,  $B_{k+1}$  is symmetric positive definite when  $B_k$  is symmetric positive definite and  $B_{k+1}$  is updated by the BFGS formula (30) (p. 199, [64]). For the large-scale problem, it consumes much time to solve the large-scale system (18) of linear equations. In order to save the computational time of solving linear equations, we obtain the inverse  $(\sigma_k I + B_k)^{-1}$  of the regularization matrix  $(\sigma_k I + B_k)$  by using the following Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula (p. 17, [78]):

$$(B + SV^T)^{-1} = B^{-1} - B^{-1}S(I + V^T B^{-1}S)^{-1}V^T B^{-1}, \quad (31)$$

where  $B$  is an  $n \times n$  nonsingular matrix and  $S, V$  are two  $p \times n$  matrices. Generally speaking,  $p$  is less more than  $n$ . We denote matrices  $S_k$  and  $V_k$  as follows:

$$S_k = \begin{cases} \left[ S_{k-1}, \frac{y_k}{(s_k^T y_k)^{1/2}}, \frac{m_k}{(s_k^T m_k)^{1/2}} \right], & \text{if } y_k^T s_k > 0, \\ [S_{k-1}, 0, 0], & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

$$V_k = \begin{cases} \left[ V_{k-1}, \frac{y_k}{(s_k^T y_k)^{1/2}}, -\frac{m_k}{(s_k^T m_k)^{1/2}} \right], & \text{if } y_k^T s_k > 0, \\ [V_{k-1}, 0, 0], & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

where  $m_k = B_k s_k = s_k + S_{k-1}(V_{k-1}^T s_k)$ . Then, from equations (32)-(33), the BFGS quasi-Newton formula (30) can be written as

$$B_{k+1} = I + S_k V_k^T. \quad (34)$$

By using the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula (31), from equation (34), we obtain

$$(\sigma_k I + B_k)^{-1} = \frac{1}{1 + \sigma_k} \left( I - S_{k-1} \left( (1 + \sigma_k) I + V_{k-1}^T S_{k-1} \right)^{-1} V_{k-1}^T \right). \quad (35)$$

*Remark 6* It is worthwhile to discuss whether matrix  $I + V^T B^{-1} S$  in equation (31) is nonsingular or not. Actually, when matrix  $B$  is symmetric positive definite and matrix  $B + SV^T$  is positive definite (that is to say, all eigenvalues of  $B + SV^T$  are greater than 0),  $I + V^T B^{-1} S$  is nonsingular.

**Proof.** Since  $B$  is symmetric positive definite, it can be decomposed as  $B = LL^T$  by the Cholesky factorization (p. 163, [26]), where  $L$  is a nonsingular matrix. Thus, we have  $B + SV^T = L(I + (L^{-1}S)(V^T L^{-T}))L^T$ . By combining the positive definiteness of  $B + SV^T$ , we know that  $I + (L^{-1}S)(V^T L^{-T})$  is positive definite. Therefore, all eigenvalues of  $(L^{-1}S)(V^T L^{-T})$  are greater than -1. Furthermore, the eigenvalues of  $(L^{-1}S)(V^T L^{-T})$  equal that of  $(V^T L^{-T})(L^{-1}S)$  except for their zero eigenvalues. Consequently, all eigenvalues of  $(V^T L^{-T})(L^{-1}S)$  are greater than -1. Namely, all eigenvalues of  $V^T B^{-1} S$  are greater than -1. Therefore,  $I + V^T B^{-1} S$  is a nonsingular matrix.  $\square$

According to our numerical experiments [48, 53], the regularization continuation method (18)-(23) with the BFGS updating formula (32)-(35) works well for most problems and the objective function decreases very fast in the well-posed phase. However, for the ill-posed problems, the regularization continuation method (18)-(23) with the BFGS updating formula (32)-(35) will approach the stationary solution  $x^*$  very slow in the ill-posed phase. Furthermore, it fails to get close to the stationary solution  $x^*$  sometimes.

In order to improve the robustness of the regularization continuation method (18)-(23), we set  $B_k = P(x_k) \nabla^2 f(x_k) P(x_k)$  in the ill-posed phase. Now, the problem is how to automatically identify the ill-posed phase and switch to  $B_k = P(x_k) \nabla^2 f(x_k) P(x_k)$  from the BFGS updating formula (30). Here, we adopt the simple criterion. That is to

say, we regard that the regularization continuation method (18)-(23) is in the ill-posed phase once there exists the time step  $\Delta t_k \leq 10^{-3}$ .

In the ill-posed phase, the computational time of the projected Hessian matrix  $P(x_k)\nabla^2 f(x_k)P(x_k)$  is heavy if we update it at every iteration. In order to save the computational time of the Hessian evaluation  $\nabla^2 f(x_k)$ , we set  $B_{k+1} = B_k$  when  $q_k(0) - q_k(s_k)$  approximates  $f(x_k) - f(x_k + s_k)$  well, where the approximation model  $q_k(s)$  is defined by equation (24). Otherwise, we update  $B_{k+1} = P(x_{k+1})\nabla^2 f(x_{k+1})P(x_{k+1})$  in the ill-posed phase [52, 53]. In the ill-posed phase, a practice updating strategy is give by

$$B_{k+1} = \begin{cases} B_k, & \text{if } |1 - \rho_k| \leq \eta_1, \\ P(x_{k+1})\nabla^2 f(x_{k+1})P(x_{k+1}), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

where  $\rho_k$  is defined by equations (24)-(27) and  $\eta_1 = 0.25$ .

## 2.5 Finding an initial feasible point

For the regularization continuation method based on the ODE system (15), one of the important issues is how to find an initial feasible point  $x_0$ . That is to say, the initial point  $x_0$  needs to satisfy  $c(x_0) = 0$ . Here, we use the generalized continuation Newton method [52] to solve the under-determined system  $c(x) = 0$  due to its robustness and efficiency. For convenience, we give the rough description of the generalized continuation Newton method. Its detailed description and its convergence analysis can be found in reference [52].

For the under-determined system  $c(z) = 0$ , we construct the generalized Newton flow

$$\frac{dz(\tau)}{d\tau} = -A(z)^+c(z), \quad z(\tau_0) = z_0, \quad (37)$$

where  $A(z)^+$  is the Moore-Penrose generalized inverse of the Jacobian matrix  $A(z)$  (p. 11, [78] or p. 290, [26]). Then, we construct the generalized continuation Newton method [52] to follow the generalized Newton flow (37) and obtain its steady-state solution  $z^*$  as follows:

$$\Delta z_j = -\frac{\Delta \tau_j}{1 + \Delta \tau_j} A_j^+ c(z_j), \quad z_{j+1} = z_j + \Delta z_j, \quad (38)$$

where  $A_j$  equals  $A(x_j)$  or its approximation according to the following ratio

$$r_j = \frac{\|c(z_j)\| - \|c(z_j + \Delta z_j)\|}{\|c(z_j)\| - \|c(z_j) + A_j \Delta z_j\|} = \frac{\|c(z_j)\| - \|c(z_j + \Delta z_j)\|}{(\Delta \tau_j / (1 + \Delta \tau_j)) \|c(z_j)\|}. \quad (39)$$

In other words, we update the Jacobian matrix  $A_{j+1}$  according to the following strategy:

$$A_{j+1} = \begin{cases} A_j, & \text{if } |1 - r_j| \leq \eta_1, \\ A(z_{j+1}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

For a real-world problem,  $A_j A_j^T$  may be ill-conditioned. Thus, the Cholesky decomposition may fail to solve the linear system (38) for the large-scale problem. In order to improve its robustness, we use the QR decomposition to solve it as follows:

$$A_j^T = U_j W_j, W_j^T \Delta z_j^m = -c(z_j), \Delta z_j^N = U_j \Delta z_j^m, \Delta z_j = \frac{\Delta \tau_j}{1 + \Delta \tau_j} \Delta z_j^N, \quad (41)$$

where  $U_j \in \mathfrak{R}^{n \times m}$  satisfies  $U_j^T U_j = I$  and  $W_j \in \mathfrak{R}^{m \times m}$  is an upper triangle matrix. In practice, in order to save the computational time of decomposing the matrix  $A_{j+1}$  when  $A_j$  performs well, i.e.  $|1 - r_j| \leq \eta_1$ , according to the updating formula (40), we set  $W_{j+1} = W_j$  and  $U_{j+1} = U_j$  in equation (41).

The adaptive time step  $\Delta \tau_j$  of the generalized continuation Newton method (38) is adjusted by the following trust-region updating strategy:

$$\Delta \tau_{j+1} = \begin{cases} \gamma_1 \Delta \tau_j, & \text{if } |1 - r_j| \leq \eta_1, \\ \Delta \tau_j, & \text{else if } \eta_1 < |1 - r_j| < \eta_2, \\ \gamma_2 \Delta \tau_j, & \text{others,} \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

where the constants are selected as  $\gamma_1 = 2$ ,  $\gamma_2 = 0.5$ ,  $\eta_1 = 0.25$ ,  $\eta_2 = 0.75$ , according to our numerical experiments.

For a real-world problem, the analytical Jacobian  $A(z_j)$  may not be offered. Thus, in practice, we replace the Jacobian matrix  $A(z_j)$  with its difference approximation as follows:

$$A(z_k) \approx \left[ \frac{c(z_j + \varepsilon e_1) - c(z_j)}{\varepsilon}, \dots, \frac{c(z_j + \varepsilon e_n) - c(z_j)}{\varepsilon} \right], \quad (43)$$

where the elements of  $e_i$  equal zeros except for the  $i$ -th element which equals 1, and the parameter  $\varepsilon$  can be selected as  $10^{-6}$  according to our numerical experiments.

According to the above descriptions, we give the detailed implementation of the generalized continuation Newton method with the trust-region updating strategy (GCNMtr) to find an initial feasible point  $z^*$  of  $c(z) = 0$  in Algorithm 1.

By combining the discussions of the previous sections and Algorithm 1, we give the detailed implementation of the regularization continuation method and the trust-region updating strategy for the optimization problem (1) with nonlinear equality constraints in Algorithm 2.

### 3 Algorithm Analysis

In this section, we analyze the global convergence of the regularization continuation method (18)-(23) and the adaptive time step control for the nonlinearly equality-constrained optimization problem (i.e. Algorithm 2). Similarly to the result of the trust-region method for the unconstrained optimization problem [68] and the continuation method for linearly constrained optimization problem [48], we have the following lower bound estimation of  $q_k(0) - q_k(s_k^p)$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** Generalized continuation Newton methods and the trust-region updating strategy for the under-determined system (The GCNMTr method)

---

**Input:**

Function  $c : \mathfrak{R}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}^m$ ,  $m \leq n$ , the initial point  $z_0$  (optional), and the tolerance  $\varepsilon$  (optional).

**Output:**

An approximation solution  $z^*$  of nonlinear equations.

- 1: Set the default  $z_0 = \text{ones}(n, 1)$  and  $\varepsilon = 10^{-7}$ , when  $z_0$  or  $\varepsilon$  is not provided.
  - 2: Initialize the parameters:  $\eta_a = 10^{-6}$ ,  $\eta_1 = 0.25$ ,  $\gamma_1 = 2$ ,  $\eta_2 = 0.75$ ,  $\gamma_2 = 0.5$ ,  $\text{maxit} = 400$ .
  - 3: Set  $\Delta \tau_0 = 10^{-2}$ ,  $\text{flag\_success\_trialstep} = 1$ ,  $\text{itc} = 0$ ,  $j = 0$ .
  - 4: Evaluate  $c_j = c(z_j)$ .
  - 5: Set  $r_{j-1} = 0$ .
  - 6: **while** ( $\text{itc} < \text{maxit}$ ) **do**
  - 7:   **if** ( $\text{flag\_success\_trialstep} == 1$ ) **then**
  - 8:     Set  $\text{itc} = \text{itc} + 1$ .
  - 9:     Compute  $\text{Res}_j = \|c_j\|_\infty$ .
  - 10:    **if** ( $\text{Res}_j < \varepsilon$ ) **then**
  - 11:     **break**;
  - 12:    **end if**
  - 13:    **if** ( $|1 - r_{j-1}| > \eta_1$ ) **then**
  - 14:     Evaluate  $A_j = A(z_j)$  from equation (43).
  - 15:     Use the QR decomposition  $[\bar{U}_j, \bar{W}_j] = \text{qr}(A_j^T)$  and set  $U_j = \bar{U}_j(:, 1:m)$ ,  $W_j = \bar{W}_j(1:m, 1:m)$ .
  - 16:    **else**
  - 17:     Set  $U_j = U_{j-1}$ ,  $W_j = W_{j-1}$ .
  - 18:    **end if**
  - 19:    By solving  $W_j^T \Delta z_j^N = -c_j$  and  $\Delta z_j^N = U_j \Delta z_j^m$ , we obtain the Newton step  $\Delta z_j^N$ .
  - 20:    **end if**
  - 21:    Set  $\Delta z_j = \Delta \tau_j / (1 + \Delta \tau_j) \Delta z_j^N$ ,  $z_{j+1} = z_j + \Delta z_j$ .
  - 22:    Evaluate  $c_{j+1} = c(z_{j+1})$ .
  - 23:    **if** ( $\|c_j\| < \|c_{j+1}\|$ ) **then**
  - 24:     Set  $r_j = -1$ ;
  - 25:    **else**
  - 26:     Compute the ratio  $r_j$  from equation (39).
  - 27:    **end if**
  - 28:    Adjust the time step size  $\Delta \tau_{j+1}$  according to the trust-region updating strategy (42).
  - 29:    **if** ( $r_j \geq \eta_a$ ) **then**
  - 30:     Accept the trial point  $z_{j+1}$ . Set  $\text{flag\_success\_trialstep} = 1$ .
  - 31:    **else**
  - 32:     Set  $z_{j+1} = z_j$ ,  $c_{j+1} = c_j$ ,  $\Delta z_{j+1}^N = \Delta z_j^N$ ,  $\text{flag\_success\_trialstep} = 0$ .
  - 33:    **end if**
  - 34:    Set  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ .
  - 35: **end while**
- 

**Lemma 1** Assume that the quadratic model  $q_k(s)$  is defined by equation (24) and  $d_k$  is the solution of equation (18). Furthermore, we suppose that the time step  $\Delta t_k$  satisfies

$$\left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k \right) \succ 0 \text{ and } \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k - P_k^T B_k P_k \right) \succeq 0, \quad (44)$$

where  $P_k = P(x_k)$  is the projection matrix defined by equation (10). Then, we have

$$q_k(0) - q_k(P_k d_k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|p_{g_k}\| \min \left\{ \|P_k d_k\|, \frac{\|p_{g_k}\|}{3 \|B_k\|} \right\}, \quad (45)$$

where  $p_{g_k} = P_k g_k$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** The regularization continuation method for optimization problems with nonlinear equality constraints (the Rcm method)

---

**Input:** the objective function  $f: \mathfrak{X}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ , the equality constraints  $c(x) = 0$ ,  $c: \mathfrak{X}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}^m$ , the initial point  $z_0$  (optional), the terminated parameter  $\varepsilon$  (optional).

**Output:** the optimal approximation solution  $x^*$ .

- 1: If  $z_0$  or  $\varepsilon$  is not provided, we set  $z_0 = \text{ones}(n, 1)$  or  $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$ .
  - 2: Initialize parameters:  $\eta_a = 10^{-6}$ ,  $\eta_m = 10^{-6}$ ,  $\eta_1 = 0.25$ ,  $\gamma_1 = 2$ ,  $\eta_2 = 0.75$ ,  $\gamma_2 = 0.5$ ,  $\sigma_0 = 10^{-5}$ ,  $\Delta t_K = 10^{-3}$ ,  $\text{max\_itc} = 300$ . Set  $\Delta t_0 = 10^{-2}$ ,  $\text{flag\_illposed\_phase} = 0$ ,  $\text{flag\_success\_trialstep} = 1$ ,  $s_{-1} = 0$ ,  $y_{-1} = 0$ ,  $\rho_{-1} = 0$ ,  $B_0 = I$ ,  $H_0 = I$ ,  $Q_{-1}^b = I$ ,  $R_{-1}^b = I$ ,  $S_{-1} = \text{zeros}(n, 1)$ ,  $V_{-1} = \text{zeros}(n, 1)$ ,  $\text{itc} = 0$ .
  - 3: Use the generalized continuation Newton method (the GCNMTr method, Algorithm 1) to find an initial feasible point from  $z_0$  and denote this initial feasible point as  $x_0$ .
  - 4: Set  $k = 0$ . Evaluate  $f_0 = f(x_0)$  and  $g_0 = \nabla f(x_0)$ . Evaluate  $A_0 = A(x_0)$  from equation (43).
  - 5: Factorize  $A_0^T$  by the QR decomposition  $[\bar{Q}_0, \bar{R}_0] = \text{qr}(A_0^T)$ .
  - 6: Set  $Q_0 = \bar{Q}_0(:, 1:m)$ ,  $R_0 = \bar{R}_0(1:m, 1:m)$ .
  - 7: Compute the projected gradient  $p_{g_0} = P_0 g_0$ , where  $P_0$  is computed by equation (21).
  - 8: **while** ( $(\|p_{g_k}\|_\infty > \varepsilon)$  and  $(\text{itc} < \text{max\_itc})$ ) **do**
  - 9:    $\text{itc} = \text{itc} + 1$ ;
  - 10:   **if**  $\Delta t_k < \Delta t_K$  **then**
  - 11:     Set  $\text{flag\_illposed\_phase} = 1$ .
  - 12:   **end if**
  - 13:   **if**  $(\text{flag\_illposed\_phase} == 0)$  **then**
  - 14:     **if**  $(\text{flag\_success\_trialstep} == 1)$  **then**
  - 15:       **if**  $k > 0$  **then**
  - 16:         Solve equations (32)-(33) to obtain matrices  $S_{k-1}$  and  $V_{k-1}$ .
  - 17:         **else**
  - 18:         Set  $S_{-1} = \text{zeros}(n, 1)$  and  $V_{-1} = \text{zeros}(n, 1)$ .
  - 19:         **end if**
  - 20:         Solve equations (18) and (35) to obtain
 
$$d_k = - \left( \left( p_{g_k} - S_{k-1} \left( \left( (1 + \sigma_0 / \Delta t_k) I + V_{k-1}^T S_{k-1} \right)^{-1} \left( V_{k-1}^T p_{g_k} \right) \right) \right) \right) / (1 + \sigma_0 / \Delta t_k).$$
  - 21:         **end if**
  - 22:         **else**
  - 23:         **if**  $(\|p_{k-1} - 1\| > \eta_1)$  **then**
  - 24:         Evaluate  $H_k = P_k \nabla^2 f(x_k) P_k$  from equation (115).
  - 25:         Set  $B_k = (\sigma_0 / \Delta t_k) I + H_k$  and use the QR decomposition  $B_k = Q_k^b R_k^b$ .
  - 26:         **else**
  - 27:          $Q_k^b = Q_{k-1}^b$ ,  $R_k^b = R_{k-1}^b$ ;
  - 28:         **end if**
  - 29:         Solve the linear system  $R_k^b d_k = -(Q_k^b)^T p_{g_k}$  to obtain  $d_k$ .
  - 30:         **end if**
  - 31:         Set  $s_k^p = \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} (P_k d_k)$  and  $x_{k+1}^p = x_k + s_k^p$ . Evaluate  $c_{k+1}^p = c(x_{k+1}^p)$ .
  - 32:         Solve the linear systems  $(R_k)^T d_k^c = -c_{k+1}^p$ ,  $s_k^c = Q_k d_k^c$ .
  - 33:         Set  $x_{k+1} = x_{k+1}^p + s_k^c$ ,  $c_{k+1} = c(x_{k+1})$ .
  - 34:         **if**  $(\|c_{k+1}\|_\infty > \varepsilon)$  **then**
  - 35:         Evaluate  $A_{k+1}^p = A(x_{k+1}^p)$  from equation (43).
  - 36:         Solve the linear system (23) to obtain  $x_{k+1}$  and evaluate  $c_{k+1} = c(x_{k+1})$ .
  - 37:         **end if**
  - 38:         Evaluate  $f_{k+1} = f(x_{k+1})$  and compute the ratio  $\rho_k$  from equations (24)-(27).
  - 39:         **if**  $(\rho_k \geq \eta_a, \|c_{k+1}\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon)$  and  $s_k$  satisfies the sufficient descent condition (29) **then**
  - 40:         Set  $\text{flag\_success\_trialstep} = 1$ . Evaluate  $g_{k+1} = \nabla f(x_{k+1})$ .
  - 41:         Evaluate  $A_{k+1} = A(x_{k+1})$  from equation (43).
  - 42:         Factorize  $A_{k+1}^T$  by the QR decomposition  $[\bar{Q}_{k+1}, \bar{R}_{k+1}] = \text{qr}(A_{k+1}^T)$ .
  - 43:         Set  $Q_{k+1} = \bar{Q}_{k+1}(:, 1:m)$ ,  $R_{k+1} = \bar{R}_{k+1}(1:m, 1:m)$ .
  - 44:         Set  $p_{g_{k+1}} = P_{k+1} g_{k+1}$ , where  $P_{k+1}$  is computed by equation (21).
  - 45:         Set  $s_k = x_{k+1} - x_k$  and  $y_k = p_{g_{k+1}} - p_{g_k}$ .
  - 46:         **else**
  - 47:         Set  $\text{flag\_success\_trialstep} = 0$ .
  - 48:          $x_{k+1} = x_k$ ,  $f_{k+1} = f_k$ ,  $p_{g_{k+1}} = p_{g_k}$ ,  $g_{k+1} = g_k$ ,  $H_{k+1} = H_k$ ,  $d_{k+1} = d_k$ .
  - 49:         **end if**
  - 50:         Adjust the time step  $\Delta t_{k+1}$  based on the trust-region updating strategy (28).
  - 51:         Set  $k \leftarrow k + 1$ .
  - 52: **end while**
-

**Proof.** Let  $\tau_k = \sigma_0/\Delta t_k$ . From equation (18), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q_k(0) - q_k(P_k d_k) &= -\frac{1}{2} (d_k^T P_k^T B_k P_k d_k) - (P_k g_k)^T d_k \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} (d_k^T P_k^T B_k P_k d_k) + p_{g_k}^T (\tau_k I + B_k)^{-1} p_{g_k} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left( p_{g_k}^T (\tau_k I + B_k)^{-1} p_{g_k} + d_k^T (-P_k^T B_k P_k + \tau_k I + B_k) d_k \right). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

We denote  $\mu_{\min}(B_k - P_k^T B_k P_k)$  as the smallest eigenvalue of matrix  $(B_k - P_k^T B_k P_k)$ , and set

$$\tau_{lb} = \min \{0, \mu_{\min}(B_k - P_k^T B_k P_k)\}. \quad (47)$$

From equations (44), (46)-(47) and the bound on the eigenvalues of matrix  $(\tau_k I + B_k)^{-1}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q_k(0) - q_k(P_k d_k) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left( p_{g_k}^T (\tau_k I + B_k)^{-1} p_{g_k} + (\tau_k + \tau_{lb}) \|d_k\|^2 \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\|p_{g_k}\|^2}{\tau_k + \|B_k\|} + (\tau_k + \tau_{lb}) \|d_k\|^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

In the above second inequality, we use the property  $|\mu_i(B_k)| \leq \|B_k\|$ , where  $\mu_i(B_k)$  is an eigenvalue of matrix  $B_k$ .

Now we consider the properties of the function

$$\varphi(\tau) \triangleq \tau \|d_k\|^2 + \|p_{g_k}\|^2 / (\tau - \tau_{lb} + \|B_k\|). \quad (49)$$

From equation (49), we have  $\varphi''(\tau) = 2\|p_{g_k}\|^2 / (\tau - \tau_{lb} + \|B_k\|)^3 \geq 0$  when  $(\tau - \tau_{lb} + \|B_k\|) > 0$ . Thus, the function  $\varphi(\tau)$  attains its minimum  $\varphi(\tau_{\min})$  when  $\tau_{\min}$  satisfies  $\varphi'(\tau_{\min}) = 0$  and  $\tau \geq -(\tau_{lb} + \|B_k\|)$ . Namely, we have

$$\varphi(\tau_{\min}) = 2\|p_{g_k}\| \|d_k\| + (\tau_{lb} - \|B_k\|) \|d_k\|^2, \quad (50)$$

where

$$\tau_{\min} = \frac{\|p_{g_k}\|}{\|d_k\|} + \tau_{lb} - \|B_k\|. \quad (51)$$

We prove the property (45) via separately considering  $\tau_{\min} \geq 0$  or  $\tau_{\min} < 0$  as follows.

(i) When  $(\|p_{g_k}\|/\|d_k\| + (\tau_{lb} - \|B_k\|)) \geq 0$ , from equation (51), we have  $\tau_{\min} \geq 0$ . From the assumption (44) and the definition (47) of  $\tau_{lb}$ , we have  $\tau_k \geq -\tau_{lb}$ . Thus, from equations (48)-(51), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q_k(0) - q_k(P_k d_k) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left( (\tau_k + \tau_{lb}) \|d_k\|^2 + \frac{\|p_{g_k}\|^2}{\tau_k + \|B_k\|} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \varphi(\tau_k + \tau_{lb}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \varphi(\tau_{\min}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\|p_{g_k}\| \|d_k\| + (\|p_{g_k}\| \|d_k\| + (\tau_{lb} - \|B_k\|) \|d_k\|^2)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|p_{g_k}\| \|d_k\|. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

(ii) The other case is  $(\|p_{gk}\|/\|d_k\| + (\tau_{lb} - \|B_k\|)) < 0$ . In this case, from equation (51), we have  $\tau_{\min} < 0$ . It is not difficult to verify that  $\varphi(\tau)$  is monotonically increasing when  $\tau \geq 0$  and  $\tau_{\min} < 0$ . From the definition (47) of  $\tau_{lb}$  and the property (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_{lb}| &\leq |\mu_{\min}(B_k - P_k^T B_k P_k)| \leq \|B_k - P_k^T B_k P_k\| \leq \|B_k\| + \|P_k^T B_k P_k\| \\ &\leq \|B_k\| + \|P_k^T\| \|B_k\| \|P_k\| = 2\|B_k\|. \end{aligned}$$

By using this property and the monotonicity of  $\varphi(\tau)$ , from equations (48)-(49), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q_k(0) - q_k(P_k d_k) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left( (\tau_k + \tau_{lb}) \|d_k\|^2 + \frac{\|p_{gk}\|^2}{\tau_k + \|B_k\|} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \varphi(\tau_k + \tau_{lb}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \varphi(0) = \frac{1}{2(-\tau_{lb} + \|B_k\|)} \|p_{gk}\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{6\|B_k\|} \|p_{gk}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

From equations (52)-(53), we get

$$q_k(0) - q_k(P_k d_k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|p_{gk}\| \min \left\{ \|d_k\|, \frac{\|p_{gk}\|}{3\|B_k\|} \right\}. \quad (54)$$

By using the property (11) of matrix  $P_k$ , we have

$$\|P_k d_k\| \leq \|P_k\| \|d_k\| = \|d_k\|. \quad (55)$$

Therefore, from inequalities (54)-(55), we obtain the estimation (45).  $\square$

When  $\Delta t_k \leq \frac{\sigma_0}{2\|B_k\|}$ , by using the property  $\|P_k\| = 1$  of the projection matrix  $P_k$ , we have

$$\left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k \right) \succ 0 \text{ and } \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k - P_k^T B_k P_k \right) \succeq 0. \quad (56)$$

Thus, from equation (18) and Lemma 1, when  $\Delta t_k \leq \frac{\sigma_0}{4\|B_k\|}$ , we obtain the estimation of the predicted reduction of the horizontal step as follows.

**Lemma 2** Assume that the quadratic model  $q_k(s)$  is defined by equation (24) and  $s_k^p$  is solved by the regularization method (18). Then, when  $\Delta t_k \leq \frac{\sigma_0}{4\|B_k\|}$ , we have the lower bounded estimation of  $q_0 - q_k(s_k^p)$  as follows:

$$H_{pred_k} = q_k(0) - q_k(s_k^p) = q_k(0) - q_k \left( \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} P_k d_k \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\|. \quad (57)$$

**Proof.** We prove this result via considering two different cases, i.e.  $(s_k^p)^T B_k s_k^p \leq 0$  or  $(s_k^p)^T B_k s_k^p > 0$ . (i) When  $(s_k^p)^T B_k s_k^p \leq 0$ , from equation (24) and equation (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_k(0) - q_k(s_k^p) &= -g_k^T s_k^p - \frac{1}{2} (s_k^p)^T B_k s_k^p \geq -g_k^T s_k^p = -\frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} (P_k g_k)^T d_k \\ &= \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} (P_k g_k)^T \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k \right)^{-1} (P_k g_k) \geq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \frac{1}{\sigma_0/\Delta t_k + \|B_k\|} \|P_k g_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Furthermore, from equation (18), when  $\Delta t_k < \frac{\sigma_0}{\|B_k\|}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_k g_k\| &= \left\| \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k \right) d_k \right\| \geq (\sigma_0 / \Delta t_k - \|B_k\|) \|d_k\| \\ &\geq (\sigma_0 / \Delta t_k - \|B_k\|) \|P_k d_k\|. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

By substituting equation (59) into equation (58), when  $\Delta t_k \leq \frac{\sigma_0}{4\|B_k\|}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q_k(0) - q_k(s_k^p) &\geq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \frac{\sigma_0 / \Delta t_k - \|B_k\|}{\sigma_0 / \Delta t_k + \|B_k\|} \|P_k g_k\| \|P_k d_k\| \\ &\geq \frac{\sigma_0 / \Delta t_k - \|B_k\|}{\sigma_0 / \Delta t_k + \|B_k\|} \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\| \geq \frac{4\|B_k\| - \|B_k\|}{4\|B_k\| + \|B_k\|} \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\| = \frac{3}{5} \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\|. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Thus, the result (57) is true for the case  $(s_k^p)^T B_k s_k^p \leq 0$ .

(ii) When  $(s_k^p)^T B_k s_k^p \geq 0$ , i.e.  $(P_k d_k)^T B_k (P_k d_k) \geq 0$ , from equation (24) and equation (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_k(0) - q_k(s_k^p) &= -g_k^T s_k^p - \frac{1}{2} (s_k^p)^T B_k s_k^p \\ &= -\frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} g_k^T (P_k d_k) - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \right)^2 (P_k d_k)^T B_k (P_k d_k) \\ &\geq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \left( -g_k^T (P_k d_k) - \frac{1}{2} (P_k d_k)^T B_k (P_k d_k) \right) = \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} (q_k(0) - q_k(P_k d_k)). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

When  $\Delta t_k \leq \frac{\sigma_0}{4\|B_k\|}$ , by substituting equation (45) and equation (59) into equation (61), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q_k(0) - q_k(s_k^p) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \|P_k g_k\| \min \left\{ \|P_k d_k\|, \frac{\|P_k g_k\|}{3\|B_k\|} \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \|P_k g_k\| \min \left\{ \|P_k d_k\|, \frac{(\sigma_0 / \Delta t_k - \|B_k\|) \|P_k d_k\|}{3\|B_k\|} \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \|P_k g_k\| \|P_k d_k\| = \frac{1}{2} \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\|. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Thus, the result (57) is also true for the case  $(s_k^p)^T B_k s_k^p > 0$ .  $\square$

In the following analysis of Algorithm 2,  $f(x)$  and  $c(x)$  are assumed to satisfy Assumption 1.

**Assumption 1** Assume that  $f(x)$  is twice continuously differentiable and  $c(x)$  is continuously differentiable, that the sequence  $\{x_k\}$  is generated by Algorithm 2 in an open set  $S$ , that  $\nabla f(x)$ ,  $\nabla^2 f(x)$ ,  $A(x)$  are bounded above on  $S$ . We also assume that  $\|B_k\|$  ( $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) are uniformly bounded. Namely, there exists three positive constants  $M_B, M_g, M_A$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2 f(x)\| &\leq M_B, \|A(x)\| \leq M_A, \|A(x)^+\| \leq M_A, \forall x \in S, \\ \text{and } \|B_k\| &\leq M_B, \|\nabla f(x_k)\| \leq M_g, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

hold.

By combining the property  $\|P_k\| = 1$  of the projection matrix  $P_k$ , from the assumption (63), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_k \nabla^2 f(x_k) P_k\| &\leq \|P_k\| \|\nabla^2 f(x_k)\| \|P_k\| = \|\nabla^2 f(x_k)\| \leq M_B, \\ \|P_k B_k P_k\| &\leq \|P_k\| \|B_k\| \|P_k\| = \|B_k\| \leq M_B, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

According to the property of the matrix norm, we know that the absolute eigenvalue of  $P_k \nabla^2 f(x_k) P_k$  is less than  $M_B$ . If we denote  $\mu(P_k \nabla^2 f(x_k) P_k)$  as the eigenvalue of  $P_k \nabla^2 f(x_k) P_k$ , we know that the eigenvalue of  $\left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + P_k \nabla^2 f(x_k) P_k\right)$  is  $\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} + \mu(P_k \nabla^2 f(x_k) P_k)$ . Consequently, from equation (64), we know that

$$\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + P_k \nabla^2 f(x_k) P_k \succ 0, \quad \text{when } \Delta t_k < \frac{\sigma_0}{M_B}. \quad (65)$$

**Lemma 3** Assume that  $c(x)$  is continuously differentiable and its Jacobian matrix  $A(x)$  is Lipschitz continuous. Namely, there exists a positive constant  $L_A$  such that

$$\|A(x) - A(y)\| \leq L_A \|x - y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathfrak{X}^n. \quad (66)$$

Furthermore, we suppose  $s_k$  is solved by equation (18) and  $B_k, \nabla f(x_k)$  ( $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) are uniformly bounded. Namely, they satisfy Assumption 1. Then, there exists a positive constant  $\delta_c$  such that

$$\|c(x_k + s_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_0, \quad (67)$$

when  $\Delta t_k \leq \delta_c$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \min\{1/(L_A M_A^2), \varepsilon\}$  and  $\|c(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_0$ .

**Proof.** When  $A_{k+1}^p = A(x_k)$  and  $\|c(x_{k+1})\| \leq \varepsilon_0$ , we obtain the result (67). Therefore, we only need to consider the case  $A_{k+1}^p = A(x_{k+1}^p)$  below. From the first-order Taylor expansion and equation (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} c(x_k + s_k) &= c(x_k + s_k^p + s_k^c) = c(x_{k+1}^p + s_k^c) = c(x_{k+1}^p) + \int_0^1 A(x_{k+1}^p + t s_k^c) s_k^c dt \\ &= c(x_{k+1}^p) + A(x_{k+1}^p) s_k^c + \int_0^1 (A(x_{k+1}^p + t s_k^c) - A(x_{k+1}^p)) s_k^c dt \\ &= \int_0^1 (A(x_{k+1}^p + t s_k^c) - A(x_{k+1}^p)) s_k^c dt. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

By substituting the Lipschitz continuity (66) of  $A(x)$  and the bounded assumption  $\|A(x)^+\| \leq M_A$  into equation (68), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|c(x_k + s_k)\| &\leq \int_0^1 \|A(x_{k+1}^p + t s_k^c) - A(x_{k+1}^p)\| \|s_k^c\| dt \leq \frac{1}{2} L_A \|s_k^c\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} L_A \|A(x_{k+1}^p)^+ c(x_{k+1}^p)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} L_A \|A(x_{k+1}^p)^+\|^2 \|c(x_{k+1}^p)\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} L_A M_A^2 \|c(x_{k+1}^p)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

In order to estimate the upper bound of  $\|c(x_k + s_k)\|$ , we need to estimate the upper bound of  $\|c(x_{k+1}^p)\|$ . From the property  $A_k P_k = 0$  of the projection matrix  $P_k$ , we have

$$A_k s_k^p = \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} A_k P_k d_k = 0. \quad (70)$$

Thus, from the first-order Taylor expansion, the property (70) and the Lipschitz continuity (66) of  $A(x)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|c(x_{k+1}^p)\| &= \left\| c(x_k) + \int_0^1 A(x_k + t s_k^p) s_k^p dt \right\| = \left\| c(x_k) + \int_0^1 (A(x_k + t s_k^p) - A(x_k)) s_k^p dt \right\| \\ &\leq \|c(x_k)\| + \int_0^1 \|A(x_k + t s_k^p) - A(x_k)\| \|s_k^p\| dt \leq \|c(x_k)\| + \frac{1}{2} L_A \|s_k^p\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Furthermore, from equation (18) and the assumption (63) of  $g(x)$  and  $B_k$ , when  $\Delta t_k \leq \sigma_0/(2M_B)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|s_k^p\| &= \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \left\| \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k \right)^{-1} P_k g_k \right\| \leq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \frac{\|P_k g_k\|}{\sigma_0/\Delta t_k - \|B_k\|} \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \frac{\|P_k\| \|g_k\|}{\sigma_0/\Delta t_k - M_B} \leq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \frac{M_g}{2M_B - M_B} = \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \frac{M_g}{M_B}. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

According to the inductive hypothesis, we have  $\|c(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_0$ . By substituting it and equation (72) into equation (71), when  $\Delta t_k \leq \sigma_0/(2M_B)$ , we obtain

$$\|c(x_{k+1}^p)\| \leq \varepsilon_0 + \frac{1}{2} L_A \left( \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \frac{M_g}{M_B} \right)^2. \quad (73)$$

Thus, from equation (69) and equation (73), when  $\Delta t_k \leq \sigma_0/(2M_B)$ , we prove  $\|c(x_k + s_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_0$  if only we prove

$$\frac{1}{2} L_A M_A^2 \left( \varepsilon_0 + \frac{1}{2} L_A \left( \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \frac{M_g}{M_B} \right)^2 \right)^2 \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

Namely, when  $\Delta t_k \leq \sigma_0/(2M_B)$ , we only need to prove

$$\frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \leq \frac{2M_B^2}{L_A M_g^2} \left( -\varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{\frac{2\varepsilon_0}{L_A M_A^2}} \right). \quad (74)$$

We select

$$\delta_c = \min \left\{ \frac{\sigma_0}{4M_B}, \frac{\frac{2M_B^2}{L_A M_g^2} \left( -\varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{\frac{2\varepsilon_0}{L_A M_A^2}} \right)}{\left| 1 - \frac{2M_B^2}{L_A M_g^2} \left( -\varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{\frac{2\varepsilon_0}{L_A M_A^2}} \right) \right|} \right\}. \quad (75)$$

Then, when  $\Delta t_k \leq \delta_c$  and  $\varepsilon_0 \leq \min\{1/(L_A M_A^2), \varepsilon\}$ , we know that equation (74) is true. Namely, we have  $\|c(x_k + s_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_0$  when  $\Delta t_k \leq \delta_c$  and  $\varepsilon_0 \leq \min\{1/(L_A M_A^2), \varepsilon\}$ .  $\square$

In order to prove that  $p_{g_k}$  converges to zero when  $k$  tends to infinity, we need to estimate the lower bound of time step sizes  $\Delta t_k$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ). By using Lemma 1 and Lemma 3, we can obtain the lower bound of time step sizes  $\Delta t_k$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ) as follows.

**Lemma 4** Assume that  $c(x)$  is continuously differentiable and its Jacobian matrix  $A(x)$  satisfies the Lipschitz continuity (66). Furthermore, we suppose  $s_k^p$  is solved by equation (18) and  $B_k$  ( $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) are uniformly bounded. Namely,  $B_k$  ( $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) satisfy equation (63). Assume that  $\|P_k g_k\| \geq \varepsilon$  ( $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ). Then, there exists five positive constants  $\theta_c$ ,  $\theta_v$ ,  $\delta_0$ ,  $\delta_v$  and  $\delta_{\varepsilon_0}$  such that

$$\|s_k^c\| \leq \theta_c \|s_k^p\|^2 \text{ and } |Vpred_k| \leq \theta_v \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\|, \quad (76)$$

when  $\delta_0 \leq \Delta t_k \leq \delta_v$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \delta_{\varepsilon_0}$  and  $\|c(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_0$ , where  $0 < \theta_v < 1/2$ ,  $s_k^c$  is solved by equation (22), and  $Vpred_k$  is defined by equation (25).

**Proof.** From equation (18), when  $\Delta t_k < \sigma_0/\|B_k\|$ , we have

$$P_k d_k = -P_k \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k \right)^{-1} P_k g_k.$$

By combining it with the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality  $|x^T y| \leq \|x\| \|y\|$  and  $P_k^2 = P_k$ , when  $\Delta t_k < \sigma_0/\|B_k\|$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_k g_k\| \|P_k d_k\| &\geq |g_k^T P_k^2 d_k| = \left| (P_k g_k)^T \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k \right)^{-1} (P_k g_k) \right| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sigma_0/\Delta t_k + \|B_k\|} \|P_k g_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Namely, when  $\Delta t_k < \sigma_0/\|B_k\|$ , from equation (77), we have

$$\|s_k^p\| = \left\| \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} P_k d_k \right\| = \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \|P_k d_k\| \geq \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} \frac{1}{\sigma_0/\Delta t_k + \|B_k\|} \|P_k g_k\|. \quad (78)$$

Thus, according to the assumptions  $\|B_k\| \leq M_B$  and  $\|P_k g_k\| \geq \varepsilon$ , when  $\delta_0 \leq \Delta t_k < \sigma_0/M_B$ , from equation (78), we have

$$\|s_k^p\| \geq \frac{\delta_0}{1 + \delta_0} \frac{1}{\sigma_0/\delta_0 + M_B} \varepsilon = \frac{\delta_0 \varepsilon}{(1 + \delta_0)(\sigma_0/\delta_0 + M_B)}. \quad (79)$$

From equation (22), the Lipschitz continuity (66) and equation (71), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|s_k^c\| &= \|A(x_{k+1}^p)^+ c(x_{k+1}^p)\| \leq M_A \|c(x_{k+1}^p)\| = M_A \|c(x_k + s_k^p)\| \\ &\leq M_A \left( \|c(x_k)\| + \frac{1}{2} L_A \|s_k^p\|^2 \right) \leq M_A \left( \varepsilon_0 + \frac{1}{2} L_A \|s_k^p\|^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

We select

$$\delta_{\varepsilon_0} = \min \left\{ \left( \frac{\delta_0 \varepsilon}{(1 + \delta_0)(\sigma_0/\delta_0 + M_B)} \right)^2, \frac{1}{L_A M_A^2} \right\}. \quad (81)$$

Then, from equations (79)-(81), when  $\varepsilon_0 \leq \delta_{\varepsilon_0}$ , we have

$$\|s_k^c\| \leq M_A \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} L_A \right) \|s_k^p\|^2 = \theta_c \|s_k^p\|^2, \quad (82)$$

where we select  $\theta_c = M_A(1 + 0.5L_A)$ . Thus, we prove the first inequality of equation (76).

From equation (18), when  $\Delta t_k \leq \sigma_0/(2M_B)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|s_k^p\| &= \left\| \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} P_k d_k \right\| \leq \|P_k d_k\| \leq \|d_k\| = \left\| \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k \right)^{-1} P_k g_k \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma_0/\Delta t_k - M_B} \|P_k g_k\| \leq \frac{M_g}{M_B}. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Thus, from equation (25), equation (82) and the assumption (63), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Vpred_k| &= |q_k(s_k^p) - q_k(s_k^p + s_k^c)| = \left| (s_k^c)^T \nabla q_k(s_k^p) + \frac{1}{2} (s_k^c)^T \nabla^2 q_k(s_k^p) s_k^c \right| \\ &= \left| (s_k^c)^T \left( g_k + B_k s_k^p + \frac{1}{2} B_k s_k^c \right) \right| \leq \|s_k^c\| \left\| g_k + B_k s_k^p + \frac{1}{2} B_k s_k^c \right\| \\ &\leq \|s_k^c\| (\|g_k\| + \|B_k\| (\|s_k^p\| + \|s_k^c\|)) \leq \theta_c (M_g + M_B (\|s_k^p\| + \|s_k^c\|)) \|s_k^p\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

By substituting equation (82) and equation (83) into equation (84), when  $\Delta t_k \leq \sigma_0/(2M_B)$ , we obtain

$$|Vpred_k| \leq \frac{\theta_c (2M_g M_B + \theta_c M_g^2)}{M_B} \|s_k^p\|^2 \leq \frac{\theta_c (2M_g M_B + \theta_c M_g^2)}{M_B (\sigma_0/\Delta t_k - M_B)} \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\|. \quad (85)$$

We select

$$\delta_v = \min \left\{ \frac{\sigma_0}{4M_B}, \delta_c, \frac{\sigma_0 M_B \theta_v}{(2M_g M_B + \theta_c M_g^2) \theta_c + M_B^2 \theta_v} \right\}, \quad (86)$$

where the positive constant  $\delta_c$  is defined by equation (75). Thus, from equations (85)-(86), when  $\Delta t_k \leq \delta_v$ , we have  $|Vpred_k| \leq \theta_v \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\|$ . We select the small positive constant  $\delta_0$  to satisfy  $\delta_0 \leq \delta_v$ . Then, by combining equation (82), when  $\delta_0 \leq \Delta t_k \leq \delta_v$  and  $\varepsilon_0 \leq \delta_{\varepsilon_0}$ , we obtain the result (76).  $\square$

*Remark 7* We select

$$\theta_1 \geq \frac{\theta_c M_g}{M_B}. \quad (87)$$

Then, from equations (82)-(87), when  $\delta_0 \leq \Delta t_k < \sigma_0/(2M_B)$  and  $\varepsilon_0 \leq \delta_{\varepsilon_0}$ , we have

$$\|s_k^c\| \leq \theta_1 \|s_k^p\|. \quad (88)$$

Namely, the condition (26) is satisfied.  $\square$

**Lemma 5** Assume that  $f : \mathfrak{R}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  is twice continuously differentiable and  $\nabla f(x)$  is Lipschitz continuous. Namely, there exists a positive constant  $L_g$  such that

$$\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \leq L_g \|x - y\|, \forall x, y \in \mathfrak{R}^n. \quad (89)$$

Assume that  $c(x)$  is continuously differentiable and its Jacobian matrix  $A(x)$  satisfies the Lipschitz continuity (66). We suppose that the sequence  $\{x_k\}$  is generated by Algorithm 2 and Assumption 1 holds. Furthermore, we assume

$$\|P_k g_k\| > \varepsilon \quad (90)$$

holds for all  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , where  $g_k = g(x_k) = \nabla f(x_k)$ ,  $P_k = P(x_k)$  and the projection matrix  $P(x)$  is defined by equation (10). Then, it exists a positive constant  $\delta_{\Delta t}$  such that

$$\Delta t_k \geq \gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t} > 0, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \quad (91)$$

where  $\Delta t_k$  is adaptively adjusted by the trust-region updating strategy (27)-(28).

**Proof.** According to Lemma 3, by induction, when  $\delta_0 \leq \Delta t_k \leq \delta_v$  and  $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \delta_{\varepsilon_0}$ , we have

$$\|c(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon_0, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \quad (92)$$

where  $\delta_{\varepsilon_0}$  is defined by equation (81) and  $\delta_v$  is defined by equation (86).

From equation (11), we know  $\|P_k\| = 1$ . By using this property and the assumption (63), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu_{\min}(B_k - P_k^T B_k P_k)| &\leq \|B_k - P_k^T B_k P_k\| \\ &\leq \|B_k\| + \|P_k^T\| \|B_k\| \|P_k\| = 2\|B_k\| \leq 2M_B, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

where  $\mu_{\min}(B)$  represents the smallest eigenvalue of matrix  $B$ . Thus, from equation (93), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\min}\left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k - P_k^T B_k P_k\right) &= \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} + \mu_{\min}(B_k - P_k^T B_k P_k) \\ &\geq \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} - 2M_B, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Similarly, from the assumption (63), we have

$$\mu_{\min}\left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} I + B_k\right) = \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} + \mu_{\min}(B_k) \geq \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_k} - M_B, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (95)$$

Therefore, the positive definite conditions of equation (44) are satisfied when  $\Delta t_k \leq \sigma_0 / (2M_B)$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ).

From the Lipschitz continuity (89) of  $\nabla f(x)$  and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality  $|x^T y| \leq \|x\| \|y\|$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^1 (\nabla f(x_k + ts_k) - \nabla f(x_k))^T s_k dt \right| &\leq \int_0^1 \|\nabla f(x_k + ts_k) - \nabla f(x_k)\| \|s_k\| dt \\ &\leq \int_0^1 L_g \|s_k\|^2 t dt = \frac{1}{2} L_g \|s_k\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} L_g (\|s_k^p + s_k^c\|)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} L_g (\|s_k^p\| + \|s_k^c\|)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

By substituting equation (76) and equation (83) into equation (96), when  $\delta_0 \leq \Delta t_k \leq \delta_v$  and  $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \delta_{\varepsilon_0}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^1 (\nabla f(x_k + ts_k) - \nabla f(x_k))^T s_k dt \right| &\leq \frac{1}{2} L_g (\|s_k^p\| + \theta_c \|s_k^p\|^2)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} L_g \left( 1 + \frac{\theta_c M_g}{M_B} \right)^2 \|s_k^p\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} |s_k^T B_k s_k| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|B_k\| \|s_k\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} M_B \|s_k^p + s_k^c\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} M_B (\|s_k^p\| + \|s_k^c\|)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} M_B (\|s_k^p\| + \theta_c \|s_k^p\|^2)^2 = \frac{1}{2} M_B (1 + \theta_c \|s_k^p\|)^2 \|s_k^p\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} M_B \left( 1 + \theta_c \frac{M_g}{M_B} \right)^2 \|s_k^p\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

From the first-order Taylor expansion of  $f(x_k + s_k)$  and equation (97), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x_k) - f(x_k + s_k) + \nabla f(x_k)^T s_k| &= \left| \nabla f(x_k)^T s_k - \int_0^1 \nabla f(x_k + ts_k)^T s_k dt \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^1 (\nabla f(x_k) - \nabla f(x_k + ts_k))^T s_k dt \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} L_g \left( 1 + \frac{\theta_c M_g}{M_B} \right)^2 \|s_k^p\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

From equation (57) and equation (76), we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_k(0) - q_k(s_k) &= (q_k(0) - q_k(s_k^p)) - (q_k(s_k^p) - q_k(s_k^p + s_k^c)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\| - \theta_v \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\| = (0.5 - \theta_v) \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\|. \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

Thus, from equations (24), (27), (57), (76) and (98)-(100), when  $\delta_0 \leq \Delta t_k \leq \delta_v$  and  $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \delta_{\varepsilon_0}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\rho_k - 1| &= \left| \frac{(f(x_k) - f(x_k + s_k)) - (q_k(0) - q_k(s_k))}{q_k(0) - q_k(s_k)} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{0.5(L_g + M_B)(1 + (\theta_c M_g)/M_B)^2 \|s_k^p\|^2}{|q_k(0) - q_k(s_k)|} \\ &\leq \frac{0.5(L_g + M_B)(1 + (\theta_c M_g)/M_B)^2 \|s_k^p\|^2}{\left| |q_k(0) - q_k(s_k^p)| - |q_k(s_k^p) - q_k(s_k^p + s_k^c)| \right|} \\ &\leq \frac{0.5(L_g + M_B)(1 + (\theta_c M_g)/M_B)^2 \|s_k^p\|^2}{(0.5 - \theta_v) \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\|}. \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

By substituting equation (83) into equation (101), we obtain

$$|\rho_k - 1| \leq \frac{0.5(L_g + M_B)(1 + (\theta_c M_g)/M_B)^2}{(0.5 - \theta_v)(\sigma_0/\Delta t_k - M_B)}. \quad (102)$$

We denote

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{ub} &= \frac{(0.5 - \theta_v)(1 - \eta_2)\sigma_0}{0.5(L_g + M_B)(1 + (\theta_c M_g)/M_B)^2 + (0.5 - \theta_v)(1 - \eta_2)M_B}, \\ \delta_{\Delta t} &\triangleq \min \left\{ \delta_{ub}, \frac{\sigma_0}{4M_B}, \delta_v, \Delta t_0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

Thus, from equations (102)-(103), when  $\delta_0 \leq \Delta t_k \leq \delta_{\Delta t}$ , we have  $\rho_k \geq \eta_2$ . We select  $\delta_0 \leq \gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t}$ . We assume that  $K$  is the first index such that  $\Delta t_K \leq \delta_{\Delta t}$ . Then, from equations (102)-(103), we know that  $\rho_K \geq \eta_2$ . According to the time-stepping adjustment formula (28) and Lemma 3, when  $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \delta_{\varepsilon_0}$ ,  $x_K + s_K$  will be accepted and the time step  $\Delta t_{K+1}$  will be enlarged. Consequently,  $\Delta t_k \geq \gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t}$  holds for all  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$   $\square$

*Remark 8* We select  $\eta_q \leq 0.5 - \theta_v$ . Then, when  $\delta_0 \leq \Delta t_k \leq \delta_v$ , from equation (100), we have

$$q_k(0) - q_k(s_k) \geq (0.5 - \theta_v) \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\| \geq \eta_q \|P_k g_k\| \|s_k^p\|. \quad (104)$$

Namely, the sufficient descent condition (29) is satisfied.  $\square$

By using the results of Lemma 3 and Lemma 5, we prove the global convergence of Algorithm 2 for the equality-constrained optimization problem (1) as follows.

**Theorem 1** *Assume that Assumption 1 holds,  $\nabla f(x)$  satisfies the Lipschitz continuity (89), and the Jacobian matrix  $A(x)$  of  $c(x)$  satisfies the Lipschitz continuity (66). We suppose that the sequence  $\{x_k\}$  is generated by Algorithm 2 and  $f(x_k)$  ( $k = 0, 1, \dots$ ) are bounded below. Then, for any positive constant  $\varepsilon$ , we can select a sufficiently small constant  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that*

$$\|P_K g_K\| \leq \varepsilon \text{ and } \|c(x_K)\| \leq \varepsilon_0 \quad (105)$$

hold for an index  $K$  when  $\|c(x_0)\| \leq \varepsilon_0$ .

**Proof.** We prove this result by contradiction. Assume that the result (105) is not true. Then, we have

$$\|P_k g_k\| > \varepsilon \text{ for all } k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (106)$$

Thus, from Lemma 3 and Lemma 5, we can select a sufficiently small constant  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  and there exists an infinite subsequence  $\{x_{k_i}\}$  such that the trial steps  $s_{k_i}$  are accepted, i.e.,  $\rho_{k_i} \geq \eta_a$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ . Otherwise, all steps are rejected after a given iteration

index, then the time step will keep decreasing, which contradicts (91). Therefore, from equation (27), we have  $\|c(x_{k_i})\| \leq \varepsilon_0$  and

$$f_0 - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_k = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (f_k - f_{k+1}) \geq \eta_a \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (q_{k_i}(0) - q_{k_i}(s_{k_i})), \quad (107)$$

where  $s_{k_i}$  is computed by equation (18) and equation (22).

Since  $f_k = f(x_k)$  ( $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) are bounded below and the sequence  $\{f_k\}$  decreases monotonically, we know that the limit of the sequence  $\{f(x_k)\}$  exists and we denote it as  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_k = f^*$ . Thus, from equation (107), we have

$$\lim_{k_i \rightarrow \infty} (q_{k_i}(0) - q_{k_i}(s_{k_i})) = 0. \quad (108)$$

By substituting equation (29) into equation (108), we obtain

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|P_{k_i} g_{k_i}\| \|s_{k_i}^p\| = 0. \quad (109)$$

According to the assumption  $\|P_k g_k\| > \varepsilon > 0$ , from equation (109), we have

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|s_{k_i}^p\| = 0. \quad (110)$$

From Lemma 5, we know that it exists a positive constant  $\delta_{\Delta t}$  such that

$$\Delta t_k \geq \gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t} > 0, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (111)$$

(i) When  $B_{k_i}$  is updated by the BFGS quasi-Newton formula (30), we know that  $B_{k_i} \succ 0$ . Thus, by substituting equation (111) into equation (78), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|s_{k_i}^p\| &\geq \frac{\Delta t_{k_i}}{1 + \Delta t_{k_i}} \frac{1}{\sigma_0 / \Delta t_{k_i} + \|B_{k_i}\|} \|P_{k_i} g_{k_i}\| \\ &\geq \frac{\gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t}}{1 + \gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t}} \frac{1}{\sigma_0 / (\gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t}) + M_B} \|P_{k_i} g_{k_i}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

(ii) When  $B_{k_i} = P_{k_i} \nabla^2 f(x_{k_i}) P_{k_i}$ , from equation (18), we have

$$P_{k_i} \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_{k_i}} I + P_{k_i} \nabla^2 f(x_{k_i}) P_{k_i} \right) d_{k_i} = -P_{k_i}^2 g_{k_i} = -P_{k_i} g_{k_i} = \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_{k_i}} I + P_{k_i} \nabla^2 f(x_{k_i}) P_{k_i} \right) d_{k_i},$$

which gives  $P_{k_i} d_{k_i} = d_{k_i}$ . By combining it with equation (18) and equation (111), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t}}{1 + \gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t}} \|P_{k_i} g_{k_i}\| &\leq \left\| \frac{\Delta t_{k_i}}{1 + \Delta t_{k_i}} P_{k_i} g_{k_i} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \frac{\Delta t_{k_i}}{1 + \Delta t_{k_i}} \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_{k_i}} I + P_{k_i} \nabla^2 f(x_{k_i}) P_{k_i} \right) d_{k_i} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \frac{\Delta t_{k_i}}{1 + \Delta t_{k_i}} \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_{k_i}} I + P_{k_i} \nabla^2 f(x_{k_i}) P_{k_i} \right) P_{k_i} d_{k_i} \right\| = \left\| \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_{k_i}} I + P_{k_i} \nabla^2 f(x_{k_i}) P_{k_i} \right) s_{k_i}^p \right\| \\ &\leq \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\Delta t_{k_i}} + \|B_{k_i}\| \right) \|s_{k_i}^p\| \leq \left( \frac{\sigma_0}{\gamma_2 \delta_{\Delta t}} + M_B \right) \|s_{k_i}^p\|. \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

By substituting equations (112)-(113) into equation (110), we obtain

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|P_{k_i} g_{k_i}\| = 0, \quad (114)$$

which contradicts the bounded assumption (106) of  $P_k g_k$  ( $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ). Therefore, the result (105) is true.  $\square$

#### 4 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we conduct some numerical experiments to test the performance of Algorithm 2 (the Rcm method). The codes are executed by a HP notebook with the Intel quad-core CPU and 8Gb memory in the MATLAB R2020a environment [59]. For a real-world problem, the analytical Hessian matrix  $\nabla^2 f(x_k)$  may not be offered. Thus, in practice, we replace the two sided projection  $P(x_k) \nabla^2 f(x_k) P(x_k)$  of the Hessian matrix with its difference approximation as follows:

$$P_k \nabla^2 f(x_k) P_k \approx \left[ \frac{P_k g(x_k + \varepsilon P_k e_1) - P_k g(x_k)}{\varepsilon}, \dots, \frac{P_k g(x_k + \varepsilon P_k e_n) - P_k g(x_k)}{\varepsilon} \right], \quad (115)$$

where the elements of  $e_i$  equal zeros except for the  $i$ -th element which equals 1,  $P_k = P(x_k)$  and the parameter  $\varepsilon$  can be selected as  $10^{-6}$  according to our numerical experiments.

SQP [18, 24, 64, 84] is a representative method for constrained optimization problems. And there are two representative implementation codes of the SQP method. One is the built-in subroutine fmincon.m of the MATLAB2020a environment [59, 71]. The other is the subroutine SNOPT [28, 29] executed in GAMS v28.2 (2019) environment [22]). fmincon and SNOPT are two robust and efficient solvers for nonlinear equality-constrained optimization problems. Therefore, we select these two typical solvers as the basis for comparison.

We select 40 nonlinear equality-constrained optimization problems from CUTEst [25] and construct 60 test problems. Therefore, we use these 100 problems to test their performance of these three algorithms (Rcm, fmincon and SNOPT). For those 60 constructed test problems, we use Ackley Function [77] as their objective functions. Ackley Function can be written as:

$$f(x) = -a e^{-b \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}} - e^{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \cos(2\pi x_i)} + a + e, \quad (116)$$

where  $a = 20$ ,  $b = 0.2$ ,  $n = 2000$ . Then, we use the gradients of 20 unconstrained optimization problems from [1, 38, 60, 77] as their constrained functions. In order to test the performance of the method for the different dimensions of constraints, we test the problems with few constraints ( $m \ll n$  such as  $m = 10$ ,  $n = 2000$ ), medium constraints ( $m \approx \frac{1}{2}n$  such as  $m = 1000$ ,  $n = 2000$ ) and many constraints ( $m \approx n$  such as  $m = 1999$ ,  $n = 2000$ ).

The termination conditions of three compared algorithms (Rcm, fmincon and SNOPT) are all set by

$$\|\nabla_x L(x_k, \lambda_k)\|_\infty \leq 1.0 \times 10^{-6}, \quad (117)$$

$$\|c(x_k)\|_\infty \leq 1.0 \times 10^{-6}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (118)$$

where the Lagrange function  $L(x, \lambda)$  is defined by equation (4) and  $\lambda$  is defined by equation (8). We test those 100 problems with  $n \approx 1000$  to  $n = 2000$ . Numerical results are arranged in Tables 1-5. Numerical results of 40 constrained optimization problems from CUTEst [25] are arranged in Tables 1-2. And numerical results of 60 constructed constrained optimization problems are arranged in Tables 3-5. The computational time and the number of iterations of Rcm, fmincon and SNOPT are illustrated in Figure 1-2, respectively.

Since Algorithm 2 (Rcm) use Algorithm 1 (GCNMTr) to find an initial feasible point, we count its iterations including the iterations of GCNMTr (which are represented by  $it_{c_G}$ ) and the self iterations of Rcm (which are represented by  $it_{c_R}$ ) in Tables 1-5. SNOPT gives the number of solving QP subproblems (which are represented by “Major”) and uses SQOPT solver [29] to find a solution of the QP subproblem. SNOPT also gives the total iterations of solving QP subproblems, which are represented by “ICTS”. In order to ensure the evaluation objectivity, we count the number of solving QP subproblems and the total iterations of solving QP subproblems for SNOPT in Tables 1-5. fmincon only gives the number of solving QP subproblems and we denote them as “steps” in Tables 1-5.

From Tables 1-5, we find that Rcm can solve most of test problems and only one problem can not be solved. However, fmincon fails to solve CUTEst problems about 22/100 and SNOPT fails to solve problems about 18/100. From Tables 1-5 and Figure 2, we find that the computational time of Rcm is significantly less than that of fmincon for most of test problems. From Tables 1-5 and Figure 1, we also find that the iterations of Rcm is significantly less than that of SNOPT for most of test problems. One of reasons is that Rcm only needs to solve a linear system of equations with dimension  $n$  at every iteration. SQP needs to solve a linear system of equations with dimension  $(m+n)$  when it solves a quadratic programming subproblem at every iteration (pp. 531-532, [64]) and involves about  $\frac{2}{3}(m+n)^3$  flops (p. 116, [26]). The other reason is that Rcm uses the adaptive updating technique of the Jacobian matrix  $A(x)$  of constraints  $c(x) = 0$  when it uses Algorithm 1 (GCNMTr) to find an initial feasible point. This technique can significantly save the computational time when GCNMTr solves an under-determined system of nonlinear equations [52].




Fig. 1: Iterations of Rcm, fmincon and SNOPT for test problems.




Fig. 2: CPU time of Rcm, fmincon and SNOPT for test problems.

Table 1: Numerical results of Rcm, fmincon and SNOPT for CUTEst problems (Exam. 1-20).

Problems	Rcm		fmincon		SNOPT	
	$it_G + it_R$ (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^d)\ _\infty$	steps (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^d)\ _\infty$	Major+ICTS (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^d)\ _\infty$
Exam. 1 LUKVLE1 [25] (n = 1000, m = 998)	4+10 (7.93)	4.59e-06 (2.66e-15)	32 (19.68)	1.32e-04 (1.78e-15)	17+23 (0.34)	1.40e-07 (8.55e-13)
Exam. 2 LUKVLE2 [25] (n = 1000, m = 993)	5+27 (4.43)	3.96e-06 (2.50e-16)	38 (14.57)	2.67e-04 (5.82e-11)	3+10 (0.03)	1.70e+01 (2.51e+01) (failed)
Exam. 3 LUKVLE14 [25] (n = 1001, m = 666)	4+41 (5.02)	7.41e-06 (1.78e-15)	99 (25.84)	1.92e-03 (7.52e-08) (failed)	25+361 (0.42)	1.80e-06 (5.06e-13)
Exam. 4 LUKVLE11 [25] (n = 1001, m = 666)	5+17 (3.61)	4.41e-06 (8.88e-16)	20 (8.29)	4.00e-06 (8.88e-16)	35+405 (0.61)	1.20e-06 (3.84e-10)
Exam. 5 LUKVLE16 [25] (n = 1001, m = 750)	3+13 (2.13)	8.47e-06 (8.88e-16)	17 (5.64)	3.32e-06 (7.54e-12)	18+269 (0.22)	2.90e-07 (3.41e-13)
Exam. 6 LUKVLE17 [25] (n = 1001, m = 750)	4+35 (5.34)	4.50e-06 (2.22e-16)	25 (10.76)	7.08e-06 (4.46e-11)	15+266 (0.19)	3.90e-07 (6.18e-09)
Exam. 7 LUKVLE9 [25] (n = 1000, m = 6)	1+50 (2.91)	9.90e-06 (7.92e-07)	99 (13.27)	3.78 (8.20e-02) (failed)	2+506 (1.27)	4.00e+00 (3.10e-02) (failed)
Exam. 8 BDVALUE [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	2+0 (0.87)	0 (2.08e-08)	4 (2.84)	0 (4.83e-16)	5+1 (0.03)	9.10e-10 (1.72e-10)
Exam. 9 BDQRTIC [25] (n = 1000, m = 996)	6+5 (18.68)	2.81e-02 (1.10) (failed)	94 (36.80)	1.36 (3.30) (failed)	222+4185 (23.86)	1.60e-06 (1.62e+00) (failed)
Exam. 10 BDEXP [25] (n = 1000, m = 998)	21+0 (2.63)	0 (1.46e-07)	12 (5.00)	0 (9.53e-07)	15+34 (0.03)	1.80e-06 (3.10e-07)
Exam. 11 BROVDNBD [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	4+0 (0.82)	0 (1.47e-09)	6 (2.78)	0 (8.88e-16)	7+0 (0.02)	1.60e-13 (4.96e-10)
Exam. 12 YAO [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	1+7 (0.72)	1.33e-06 (0)	4 (1.28)	4.14e-08 (0)	7+1007 (0.36)	5.40e-07 (0)
Exam. 13 WOODSNE [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	4+0 (0.72)	0 (7.23e-09)	6 (2.57)	0 (1.27e-12)	7+500 (0.03)	8.00e-07 (1.16e-07)
Exam. 14 WOODS [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	6+0 (0.92)	3.33e-16 (7.04e-08)	9 (3.64)	1.50e-08 (8.96e-14)	10+500 (0.03)	5.10e-10 (1.68e-08)
Exam. 15 SOSQPI [25] (n = 1000, m = 501)	1+0 (0.81)	6.66e-15 (4.15e-10)	2 (5.36)	1.10e-13 (1.14e-13)	3+505 (0.11)	9.80e-12 (1.31e-11)
Exam. 16 ARGLEALE [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	1+0 (0.34)	0 (1.65e-08)	2 (1.09)	0 (3.29e-11)	0+0 (1.69)	0 (1.60e-12)
Exam. 17 AUG2D [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	1+0 (11.91)	0 (0)	1 (34.11)	0 (0)	0+0 (0.00)	0.00e+0 (0)
Exam. 18 BLOCKQP1 [25] (n = 501, m = 1005)	1+0 (0.18)	5.08e-15 (9.99e-08)	2 (0.50)	1.55e-14 (4.44e-15)	50+602 (0.34)	2.70e-12 (1.65e+07) (failed)
Exam. 19 BROWNAL [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	2+0 (2.48)	6.46e-14 (8.82e-08)	1 (6.67)	6.63e-06 (1.50e-06)	22+520 (20.53)	2.50e-08 (2.36e-11)
Exam. 20 BROVDEN3D [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	2+0 (0.46)	0 (3.72e-08)	5 (2.18)	5.08e-11 (1.11e-15)	5+2 (0.02)	1.70e-08 (1.56e-05)

Table 2: Numerical results of Rcm, fmincon and SNOPT for CUTEst problems (Exam. 21-40).

Problems	Rcm		fmincon		SNOPT	
	$\hat{it}c_G + \hat{it}c_R$ (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^f)\ _\infty$	steps (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^f)\ _\infty$	Major+ICTS (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^f)\ _\infty$
Exam. 21 CHENHARK [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	1+0 (7.18)	9.76e-15 (8.25e-09)	2 (24.94)	1.55e-06 (1.55e-15)	36+682 (0.13)	3.00e-10 (4.75e-07)
Exam. 22 CHNROSNB [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	7+0 (1.01)	1.55e-15 (4.94e-08)	10 (3.68)	1.85e-08 (7.99e-15)	11+2 (0.02)	1.40e-08 (7.85e-08)
Exam. 23 DIXON3DQ [25] (n = 1000, m = 0)	0+83 (13.34)	9.91e-06 (0)	99 (23.44)	6.66e-02 (0) (failed)	168685+184416 (733.17)	1.80e-06 (0)
Exam. 24 DIXMAANA [25] (n = 1000, m = 0)	0+16 (2.37)	3.19e-06 (0)	16 (6.45)	3.81e-06 (0)	12+1216 (1.06)	2.60e-07 (0)
Exam. 25 ORTHGDS [25] (n = 1003, m = 1000)	1+40 (5.79)	3.76e-08 (1.32e-07)	95 (49.52)	5.31e+02 (9.61e+02) (failed)	41+549 (1.59)	1.20e-06 (2.45e-11)
Exam. 26 VARDIM [25] (n = 1000, m = 0)	1+10 (1.72)	1.60e-14 (0)	16 (3.98)	7.07e-06 (0)	3+1003 (0.38)	9.30e-06 (0)
Exam. 27 SVANBERG [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	24+33 (0.16)	6.04e-06 (6.34e-07)	88 (3.71)	8.64e+01 (2.12) (failed)	0+1050 (0.19)	2.00e+0 (2.10e+01) (failed)
Exam. 28 SROSENBR [25] (n = 1000, m = 0)	0+24 (2.07)	1.88e-06 (0)	98 (23.87)	8.43e+02 (0) (failed)	21+1036 (0.56)	3.70e-08 (0)
Exam. 29 SREADING3 [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	1+0 (0.55)	2.08e-06 (2.08e-08)	3 (2.03)	2.08e-06 (3.06e-12)	2+497 (0.16)	1.90e-06 (7.43e-06)
Exam. 30 SOSQP2 [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	1+50 (4.18)	3.84e-06 (7.40e-07)	99 (17.20)	1.03e-04 (1.33e-11)	38+538 (0.31)	2.00e-06 (2.81e-11)
Exam. 31 SINROSNB [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	2+7 (5.73)	5.17e-06 (2.22e-16)	69 (9.36e+03)	4.18e+04 (2.12e-02) (failed)	18+22 (0.31)	5.400e-07 (2.44e-13)
Exam. 32 SIPOW1 [25] (n = 1000, m = 2)	1+0 (0.02)	8.70e-19 (1.16e-08)	2 (15.35)	2.83e-06 (1.96e-18)	0+0 (0.00)	0 (0)
Exam. 33 SINQUAD [25] (n = 1000, m = 0)	0+39 (3.26)	8.65e-06 (0)	57 (14.03)	2.17e-06 (0)	247+1419 (1.94)	1.70e-06 (0)
Exam. 34 SINEALI [25] (n = 1000, m = 0)	0+42 (4.61)	8.80e-16 (0)	38 (9.24)	6.78e+03 (0) (failed)	16+1017 (0.38)	8.80e-07 (0)
Exam. 35 SEMICON1 [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	74+0 (8.19)	0 (1.63e-08)	88 (31.28)	0 (3.80e-13)	9+1 (0.05)	1.00e-01 (6.79e+02) (failed)
Exam. 36 READING1 [25] (n = 1000, m = 999)	1+19 (7.98)	4.26e-06 (5.28e-08)	24 (12.27)	1.25e-03 (1.04e-02) (failed)	104+5740 (5.38)	1.10e+03 (3.11e+05) (failed)
Exam. 37 POWELL20 [25] (n = 1000, m = 1000)	1+6 (4.41)	3.10e-07 (1.14e-13)	1 (0.84)	3.46e-11 (3.67e-12)	3+3 (0.00)	2.27e-13 (0)
Exam. 38 LUKVLE3 [25] (n = 1000, m = 2)	3+43 (1.45)	9.52e-08 (5.98e-07)	56 (6.07)	2.67e-04	24+36 (0.02)	1.00e-06 (3.52e-13)
Exam. 39 LUKVLE7 [25] (n = 1000, m = 4)	4+54 (2.15)	1.10e-06 (6.03e-07)	98 (12.30)	1.08e+05 (2.66e+03) (failed)	1150+2210 (122.55)	4.10e-04 (6.85e-12)
Exam. 40 LUKVLE12 [25] (n = 1001, m = 750)	2+11 (1.78)	7.24e-06 (8.88e-16)	6 (1.97)	1.63e-06 (3.41e-10)	20+524 (0.30)	1.70e-07 (2.62e-12)

Table 3: Numerical results of Rcm, fmincon and SNOPT for large-scale problems with  $n = 2000, m = 10$ .

Problems	Rcm		fmincon		SNOPT	
	$it_{CG} + it_{CR}$ (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^*)\ _\infty$	steps (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^*)\ _\infty$	Major+ICTS (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^*)\ _\infty$
41. Trid Function [77] (n = 2000, m = 10)	1+12 (1.10)	8.23e-06 (3.55e-15)	13 (7.72)	4.88e-06 (1.30e-11)	4+1995 (3.48)	7.20e-07 (0)
42. Grewank Function [77] (n = 2000, m = 10)	6+10 (3.59)	7.02e-06 (4.98e-15)	99 (69.52)	69.56 (1.12e-03) (failed)	12+2013 (18.03)	2.000e-07 (9.96e-12)
43. Dixon Price Function [77] (n = 2000, m = 10)	5+9 (1.05)	5.01e-06 (7.72e-12)	25 (19.37)	2.45e-06 (3.17e-08)	31+2030 (44.95)	9.20e-08 (2.38e-10)
44. Rosenbrock Function [60] (n = 2000, m = 10)	5+14 (1.50)	5.21e-06 (1.10e-08)	15 (7.73)	1.44e-06 (2.96e-06)	401+5952 (549.72)	1.00e-06 (5.97e-11)
45. Trigonometric Function [60] (n = 2000, m = 10)	1+12 (3.68)	8.58e-06 (1.43e-12)	53 (45.72)	5.98e-05 (1.32e-10)	97+4126 (425.56)	2.00e-06 (2.00e+03) (failed)
46. Singular Broyden Function [38] (n = 2000, m = 10)	10+34 (3.72)	7.22e-06 (8.45e-07)	32 (18.91)	4.11e-06 (4.91e-11)	211+2320 (321.55)	1.500e-06 (2.11e+00) (failed)
47. Extended Powell Singular Function [60] (n = 2000, m = 10)	12+35 (9.30)	9.28e-06 (4.44e-16)	27 (14.53)	7.14e-06 (1.43e-13)	33+2025 (41.11)	1.30e-06 (6.11e-08)
48. Tridiagonal System Function [38] (n = 2000, m = 10)	1+28 (2.25)	5.99e-06 (8.86e-15)	64 (37.47)	8.08e-06 (1.94e-10)	5+1996 (8.89)	4.60e-07 (0)
49. Discrete Boundary-Value Function [38] (n = 2000, m = 10)	1+7 (5.10)	4.05e-06 (4.24e-22)	3 (4.54)	4.01e-06 (5.59e-14)	6+1997 (10.80)	1.40e-07 (1.88e-09)
50. Broyden Tridiagonal Function [38] (n = 2000, m = 10)	2+9 (0.92)	8.38e-07 (2.15e-10)	13 (7.38)	2.46e-06 (1.48e-08)	68+2072 (93.66)	1.40e-06 (1.35e+00) (failed)
51. Extended Wood Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 10)	11+14 (1.58)	1.20e-06 (1.08e-06)	58 (38.54)	6.27e-08 (3.48e-09)	23+2013 (35.87)	1.10e-07 (9.54e-11)
52. Extended Cliff Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 10)	6+7 (1.11)	1.41e-06 (6.66e-16)	9 (4.79)	8.18e-06 (1.35e-14)	8+2003 (11.91)	2.00e-08 (8.26e-06)
53. Extended Hiebert Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 10)	1+56 (4.95)	9.91e-07 (2.71e-25)	99 (49.24)	1.10e+03 (8.42e+04) (failed)	7+1997 (12.02)	3.30e-07 (5.02e-09)
54. Extended Maratos Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 10)	10+6 (1.06)	1.76e-06 (1.42e-14)	99 (63.59)	3.31e+03 (3.40e+02) (failed)	19+2014 (27.06)	5.20e-08 (2.77e-05)
55. Extended Psc1 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 10)	7+8 (2.95)	5.93e-06 (2.22e-16)	19 (13.39)	3.77e-05 (7.77e-16)	11+2006 (18.78)	8.20e-09 (5.58e-08)
56. Extended Quadratic Penalty QP 1 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 10)	1+9 (1.17)	2.61e-06 (4.18e-41)	6 (3.95)	3.17e-07 (3.52e-10)	8+1998 (13.36)	2.10e-07 (0)
57. Extended Quadratic Penalty QP 2 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 10)	1+6 (2.58)	2.32e-06 (6.07e-39)	5 (5.04)	1.73e-04 (1.60e+10)	8+1998 (17.22)	2.80e-08 (0)
58. Extended TET Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 10)	7+6 (3.34)	1.77e-06 (0)	9 (6.67)	5.15e-06 (2.22e-16)	16+2011 (26.36)	2.30e-09 (1.27e-08)
59. EG2 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 10)	1+6 (2.72)	5.10e-06 (2.95e-07)	6 (5.93)	7.18e-06 (1.89e-07)	6+1996 (12.55)	1.70e-07 (1.14e-05)
60. Extended BD1 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 10)	5+6 (1.46)	1.35e-06 (0)	7 (4.29)	8.82e-06 (2.22e-15)	8+2003 (12.09)	1.70e-06 (9.65e-08)

Table 4: Numerical results of Rcm, fmincon and SNOPT for large-scale problems with  $n = 2000, m = 1000$ .

Problems	Rcm		fmincon		SNOPT	
	$it_{CG} + it_{CR}$ (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^k)\ _\infty$	steps (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^k)\ _\infty$	Major+ICTS (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^k)\ _\infty$
61. Trid Function [77] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	1+1 (0.90)	2.65e-06 (1.80e-06)	7 (17.97)	1.98e-05 (5.82e-11)	0+1 (0.02)	1.40e-13 (3.64e-12)
62. Grewank Function [77] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	14+6 (8.66)	4.07e-06 (3.30e-12)	59 (1.07e+02)	5.21e-06 (7.70e-164)	32+2035 (84.20)	1.40e-06 (4.64e-13)
63. Dixon Price Function [77] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	8+11 (7.28)	2.34e-06 (1.01e-07)	13 (17.11)	7.09e-07 (7.41e-07)	219+1254 (41.47)	8.20e-07 (1.82e-09)
64. Rosenbrock Function [60] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	6+14 (7.60)	7.02e-06 (1.70e-08)	16 (20.98)	4.59e-06 (2.11e-05)	276+2727 (55.38)	7.00e-08 (2.19e-08)
65. Trigonometric Function [60] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	8+7 (7.67)	9.74e-06 (5.58e-11)	94 (1.23e+02)	2.45e-02 (4.80e-11) (failed)	245+7140 (1003.45)	5.90e+02 (1.28e+03) (failed)
66. Singular Broyden Function [38] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	10+15 (9.97)	8.38e-06 (1.92e-06)	29 (39.45)	3.25e-05 (3.24e-12)	5413+84179 (91.94)	1.20e-03 (2.16e+00) (failed)
67. Extended Powell Singular Function [60] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	12+10 (7.89)	8.45e-06 (2.05e-14)	16 (21.15)	4.34e-06 (2.95e-09)	18+1270 (6.06)	1.80e-06 (1.62e-05)
68. Tridiagonal System Function [38] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	1+22 (8.64)	9.80e-06 (1.55e-15)	27 (36.08)	9.80e-06 (1.34e-08)	4+1006 (1.89)	1.20e-07 (0)
69. Discrete Boundary-Value Function [38] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	1+7 (8.78)	2.51e-06 (6.94e-18)	6 (12.44)	7.90e-07 (2.76e-14)	5+1007 (2.28)	5.20e-07 (2.96e-07)
70. Broyden Tridiagonal Function [38] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	2+10 (5.04)	4.43e-06 (5.46e-09)	14 (18.19)	4.43e-06 (6.80e-09)	11+15 (0.03)	9.40e-14 (1.41) (failed)
71. Extended Wood Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	11+6 (6.58)	1.29e-06 (0)	58 (38.54)	6.27e-08 (3.48e-09)	13+1013 (4.77)	1.40e-06 (8.53e-05)
72. Extended Cliff Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	6+7 (5.61)	1.41e-06 (6.66e-16)	13 (16.95)	4.01e-09 (6.66e-16)	12+1512 (3.34)	3.30e-09 (5.82e-05)
73. Extended Hiebert Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	1+43 (32.32)	1.55e-06 (2.96e-23)	99 (1.24e+02)	2.03e+04 (3.09e+04) (failed)	6+1006 (2.09)	1.60e-07 (5.02e-09)
74. Extended Maratos Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	10+6 (6.31)	2.00e-06 (1.42e-14)	90 (2.01e+02)	2.52e-07 (1.42e-14)	37+1537 (8.81)	2.80e-07 (5.34e-05)
75. Extended Psc1 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	7+8 (7.49)	5.94e-06 (5.55e-16)	48 (68.38)	3.95e-05 (8.21e-12)	12+1512 (2.34)	6.40e-07 (2.43e-13)
76. Extended Quadratic Penalty QP 1 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	6+5 (4.72)	6.86e-06 (8.31e-34)	10 (14.46)	1.85e-06 (8.40e-10)	12+1012 (98.39)	1.20e-08 (7.88e-06)
77. Extended Quadratic Penalty QP 2 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	6+6 (6.19)	2.20e-06 (6.62e-35)	11 (36.49)	1.22e-06 (1.99e-12)	89+1094 (261.47)	1.60e+01 (0.32) (failed)
78. Extended TET Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	7+6 (7.19)	4.67e-06 (0)	11 (16.70)	6.61e-07 (0)	18+1518 (4.88)	5.90e-07 (7.02e-14)
79. EG2 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	1+6 (5.06)	5.11e-06 (2.95e-07)	6 (12.34)	7.72e-06 (1.59e-07)	6+1006 (2.81)	3.60e-08 (1.89e-08)
80. Extended BD1 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1000)	5+6 (5.08)	1.89e-06 (0)	9 (13.34)	2.50e-07 (0)	9+1509 (2.58)	2.30e-07 (6.53e-05)

Table 5: Numerical results of Rcm, fmincon and SNOPT for large-scale problems with  $n = 2000$ ,  $m = 1999$ .

Problems	Rcm		fmincon		SNOPT	
	$itc_G + itc_R$ (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^d)\ _\infty$	steps (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^d)\ _\infty$	Major+ICTS (time)	KKT $\ Cons(x^d)\ _\infty$
81. Trid Function [77] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	1+1 (1.95)	9.21e-06 (1.67e-08)	2 (12.19)	2.54e-06 (2.33e-10)	0+1 (0.02)	3.70e-12 (7.28e-12)
82. Grewank Function [77] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	21+8 (12.67)	9.48e-06 (7.76e-17)	32 (1.86e+02)	5.47e-04 (2.53e-15)	30+2037 (121.20)	1.70e-07 (4.11e-10)
83. Dixon Price Function [77] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	8+6 (5.32)	2.20e-06 (1.42e-09)	97 (5.44e+02)	1.25e+03 (1.95e+02) (failed)	11+16 (0.03)	1.10e-08 (7.46e-07)
84. Rosenbrock Function [60] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	6+27 (21.10)	2.25e-06 (6.20e-09)	20 (64.61)	1.39e-06 (1.07e-06)	253+223 (3.19)	6.30e-05 (7.58e-07)
85. Trigonometric Function [60] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	1+13 (15.29)	1.24e-06 (1.13e-15)	15 (68.47)	1.41e-03 (2.89e-13) (failed)	96+10417 (1003.13)	1.60e+03 (9.71e+02) (failed)
86. Singular Broyden Function [38] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	10+6 (19.26)	1.84e-06 (6.40e-07)	74 (2.87e+02)	28.52 (9.41e-13) (failed)	49586+606083 (480.78)	3.70e-03 (2.16e+00) (failed)
87. Extended Powell Singular Function [60] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	12+26 (21.14)	5.45e-06 (6.38e-11)	27 (1.04e+02)	6.46e-06 (7.70e-12)	23+525 (0.22)	4.00e-07 (5.30e-08)
88. Triagonal System Function [38] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	1+15 (9.00)	9.28e-06 (1.55e-15)	35 (1.08e+02)	1.28e-02 (4.88e-15)	1+3 (0.02)	6.10e-18 (0)
89. Discrete Boundary-Value Function [38] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	1+7 (10.60)	7.57e-06 (8.32e-17)	17 (70.40)	1.16e-06 (2.49e-16)	7+10 (0.03)	1.60e-07 (8.72e-07)
90. Broyden Tridiagonal Function [38] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	2+7 (6.32)	2.47e-06 (7.15e-10)	11 (33.86)	2.77e-06 (2.46e-06)	11+16 (0.11)	1.20e-08 (1.41e+00) (failed)
91. Extended Wood Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	11+5 (9.35)	3.69e-06 (3.79e-09)	37 (1.46e+02)	2.56e-08 (4.14e-11)	54+55 (0.23)	7.00e-09 (3.30e-08)
92. Extended Cliff Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	6+7 (8.60)	1.41e-06 (6.66e-16)	8 (45.13)	1.29e-08 (1.13e-13)	9+1009 (0.09)	1.30e-08 (7.52e-07)
93. Extended Hiebert Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	1+10 (7.61)	8.09e-06 (3.28e-42)	5 (16.01)	1.90e-06 (2.02e-13)	6+12 (0.03)	1.40e-06 (5.02e-09)
94. Extended Maratos Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	10+14 (12.98)	7.99e-06 (2.20e-06)	99 (3.08e+02)	73.00 (49.68) (failed)	27+1027 (0.23)	1.50e-06 (6.32e-10)
95. Extended Psc1 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	7+14 (13.73)	2.20e-06 (3.33e-16)	14 (43.92)	9.75e-06 (4.49e-11)	12+1012 (0.13)	7.50e-07 (7.61e-07)
96. Extended Quadratic Penalty QP 1 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	13+19 (17.29)	9.63e-06 (7.22e-07)	53 (1.64e+02)	8.95e-02 (1.74e-61) (failed)	16+17 (121.86)	1.30e-09 (6.16e-09)
97. Extended Quadratic Penalty QP 2 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	14+16 (11.52)	2.42e-06 (1.27e-08)	12 (44.11)	4.27e-06 (8.08e-10)	1+2 (605.25)	3.00e-04 (1.59e+10) (failed)
98. Extended TET Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	7+7 (10.34)	5.45e-06 (5.50e-12)	12 (38.43)	4.53e-07 (1.26e-07)	21+1021 (0.17)	1.30e-06 (9.35e-08)
99. EG2 Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	3+6 (7.80)	1.30e-06 (3.68e-13)	8 (26.53)	1.80e-06 (3.68e-13)	10+11 (0.27)	2.50e-08 (2.99e-10)
100. Extended BDI Function [1] (n = 2000, m = 1999)	5+21 (14.41)	3.88e-06 (2.03e-09)	13 (42.83)	8.68e-08 (8.60e-10)	14+1014 (0.19)	6.50e-07 (6.60e-06)

## 5 Conclusions

In this paper, we give the regularization continuation method with the trust-region updating strategy (Rcm) for nonlinear equality-constrained optimization problems. Namely, we use the inverse of the regularization quasi-Newton matrix as the pre-conditioner to improve its computational efficiency in the well-posed phase, and we use the inverse of the regularization two-sided projection of the Hessian matrix as the pre-conditioner to improve its robustness in the ill-conditioned phase. Since Rcm only solves a linear system of equations at every iteration and SQP needs to solve a quadratic programming subproblem at every iteration, Rcm is faster than SQP. Numerical results also show that Rcm is more robust and faster than SQP (the built-in subroutine `fmincon.m` of the MATLAB2020a environment [59, 71] and the subroutine SNOPT [28, 29] executed in GAMS v28.2 (2019) environment [22]). The computational time of Rcm is about one third of that `fmincon.m` for the large-scale problem. Therefore, Rcm is an alternating solver for equality-constrained optimization problems and the regularization continuation method is worthy to be explored further for inequality-constrained optimization problems.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by Grant 61876199 from National Natural Science Foundation of China, Grant YBWL2011085 from Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., and Grant YJCB2011003HI from the Innovation Research Program of Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.

**Conflicts of interest / Competing interests:** Not applicable.

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

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

## References

1. N. Andrei, *An unconstrained optimization test functions collection*, Adv Model Optim **10** (2008), 147-161.
2. E. P. Adorio and U. P. Diliman, *MVF - Multivariate test functions library in C for unconstrained global optimization*, <http://www.geocities.ws/eadorio/mvf.pdf>, 2005.
3. E. L. Allgower and K. Georg, *Introduction to Numerical Continuation Methods*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2003.
4. U. M. Ascher and L. R. Petzold, *Computer Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations and Differential-Algebraic Equations*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1998.
5. C. G. Broyden, *The convergence of a class of double-rank minimization algorithms*, J Inst Math Appl **6** (1970), 76-90.
6. A. A. Brown and M. C. Bartholomew-Biggs, *ODE versus SQP methods for constrained optimization*, J Optim Theory Appl **62** (1989), 371-386.
7. K. E. Brenan, S. L. Campbell and L. R. Petzold, *Numerical Solution of Initial-Value Problems in Differential-Algebraic Equations*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1996.

8. J. M. Bioucas-Dias and M. A. T. Figueiredo, *Alternating direction algorithms for constrained sparse regression: Application to hyperspectral unmixing*, 2010 2nd Workshop on Hyperspectral Image and Signal Processing: Evolution in Remote Sensing, 2010, 1-4, <http://doi.org/10.1109/WHISPERS.2010.5594963>.
9. J. C. Butcher, Z. Jackiewicz, *Construction of high order diagonally implicit multistage integration methods for ordinary differential equations*, Appl Numer Math **27** (1998), 1-12.
10. R. Byrd, J. Nocedal and Y. X. Yuan, *Global convergence of a class of quasi-Newton methods on convex problems*, SIAM J Numer Anal **24** (1987), 1171-1189.
11. F. Caballero, L. Merino, J. Ferruz and A. Ollero, *Vision-based odometry and SLAM for medium and high altitude flying UAVs*, J Intell Robot Syst **54** (2009), 137-161.
12. T. S. Coffey, C. T. Kelley and D. E. Keyes, *Pseudotransient continuation and differential-algebraic equations*, SIAM J Sci Comput **25** (2003), 553-569.
13. A. R. Conn, N. Gould and Ph. L. Toint, *Trust-Region Methods*, SIAM, Philadelphia, USA, 2000.
14. M. T. Chu and M. M. Lin, *Dynamical system characterization of the central path and its variants-a revisit*, SIAM J Appl Dyn Syst **10** (2011), 887-905.
15. A. d'Aspremont, L. El Ghaoui, M. Jordan, G. R. Lanckriet, *A direct formulation for sparse PCA using semidefinite programming*, SIAM Rev **49** (2007), 434-448.
16. A. V. Fiacco and G. P. McCormick, *Nonlinear programming: Sequential Unconstrained Minimization Techniques*, SIAM, 1990.
17. R. Fletcher, *A new approach to variable metric algorithms*, Comput J **13** (1970), 317-322.
18. R. Fletcher and M. J. D. Powell, *A rapidly convergent descent method for minimization*, Comput J **6** (1963), 163-168.
19. J. M. Fadili, J. L. Starck, *Monotone operator splitting for optimization problems in sparse recovery*, IEEE ICIP, Nov 2009, Cairo, Egypt., 1461-1464, <http://doi.org/10.1109/ICIP.2009.5414555>.
20. M. A. T. Figueiredo and J. M. Bioucas-Dias, *Restoration of Poissonian images using alternating direction optimization*, IEEE Trans Image Process **19** (2010), 3133-3145.
21. P. A. Forero, A. Cano and G. B. Giannakis, *Consensus-based distributed support vector machines*, J Mach Learn Res **11** (2010), 1663-1707.
22. GAMS v28.2, GAMS Corporation, <https://www.gams.com/>, 2019.
23. B. S. Goh, *Approximate greatest descent methods for optimization with equality constraints*, J Optim Theory Appl **148** (2011), 505-527.
24. D. Goldfarb, *A family of variable metric updates derived by variational means*, Math Comput **24** (1970), 23-26.
25. N. I. M. Gould, D. Orban and P. L. Toint, *CUTEst: a constrained and unconstrained testing environment with safe threads for mathematical optimization*, Comput Optim Appl **60** (2015), 545-557.
26. G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations*, 4th ed., The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, 2013.
27. P. E. Gill, W. Murray and M. H. Wright, *Practical Optimization*, Academic Press, London, 1981.
28. P. E. Gill, W. Murray and M. A. Saunders, *SNOPT: An SQP algorithm for large-scale constrained optimization*, SIAM Rev **47**, (2005), 99-131.
29. P. E. Gill, W. Murray and M. A. Saunders, *User's guide for SQOPT Version 7: Software for large-scale linear and quadratic programming*, 2006.
30. S. P. Han, *A globally convergent method for nonlinear programming*, J Optim Theory Appl **22** (1977), 297-307.
31. P. C. Hansen, *Regularization Tools: A MATLAB package for analysis and solution of discrete ill-posed problems*, Numer Algorithms **6** (1994), 1-35.
32. U. Helmke and J. B. Moore, *Optimization and Dynamical Systems*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, London, 1996.
33. D. J. Higham, *Trust region algorithms and timestep selection*, SIAM J Numer Anal **37** (1999), 194-210.
34. W. Hock and K. Schittkowski, *A comparative performance evaluation of 27 nonlinear programming codes*, Computing **30** (1983), 335-358, available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02242139>.
35. Z. Jackiewicz and S. Tracogna, *A general class of two-step Runge-Kutta methods for ordinary differential equations*, SIAM J Numer Anal **32** (1995), 1390-1427.
36. C. T. Kelley, L.-Z. Liao, L. Qi, M. T. Chu, J. P. Reese and C. Winton, *Projected pseudotransient continuation*, SIAM J Numer Anal **46** (2008), 3071-3083.
37. J. H. Lee, Y. M. Jung, Y. X. Yuan and S. Yun, *A subsapce SQP method for equality constrained optimization*, Comput Optim Appl **74** (2019), 177-194.

38. L. Lukšan, *Inexact trust region method for large sparse systems of nonlinear equations*, J Optim Theory Appl **81**, 569-590 (1994)
39. K. Levenberg, *A method for the solution of certain problems in least squares*, Q Appl Math **2** (1944), 164-168.
40. L.-Z. Liao, H. D. Qi, and L. Q. Qi, *Neurodynamical optimization*, J Glob Optim **28** (2004), 175-195.
41. X.-W. Liu and Y.-Y. Yuan, *A sequential quadratic programming method without a penalty function or a filter for nonlinear equality constrained optimization*, SIAM J Optim **21** (2011), 545-571.
42. Z. S. Lu, K. K. Pong and Y. Zhang, *An alternating direction method for finding Dantzig selectors*, Comput Stat Data Anal **56** (2012), 4037-4046, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2012.04.019>.
43. X.-L. Luo, *Singly diagonally implicit Runge-Kutta methods combining line search techniques for unconstrained optimization*, J Comput Math **23** (2005), 153-164.
44. X.-L. Luo, L.-Z. Liao and H.-W. Tam, *Convergence analysis of the Levenberg-Marquardt method*, Optim Methods Softw **22** (2007), 659-678.
45. S.-T. Liu and X.-L. Luo, *A method based on Rayleigh quotient gradient flow for extreme and interior eigenvalue problems*, Linear Algebra Appl **432** (2010), 1851-1863.
46. X.-L. Luo, *A dynamical method of DAEs for the smallest eigenvalue problem*, J Comput Sci **3** (2012), 113-119.
47. X.-L. Luo, J.-R. Lin and W.-L. Wu, *A prediction-correction dynamic method for large-scale generalized eigenvalue problems*, Abstr Appl Anal (2013), Article ID 845459, 1-8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/845459>.
48. X.-L. Luo, J.-H. Lv and G. Sun, *Continuation methods with the trusty time-stepping scheme for linearly constrained optimization with noisy data*, Optim Eng **23** (2022), 329-360, <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11081-020-09590-z>.
49. X.-L. Luo, H. Xiao and J.-H. Lv, *Continuation Newton methods with the residual trust-region time-stepping scheme for nonlinear equations*, Numer Algorithms **89** (2022), 223-247, <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11075-021-01112-x>.
50. X.-L. Luo and Y.-Y. Yao, *Primal-dual path-following methods and the trust-region updating strategy for linear programming with noisy data*, J Comput Math **40** (2022), 760-780, <http://doi.org/10.4208/jcm.2101-m2020-0173>.
51. X.-L. Luo, H. Xiao, J.-H. Lv and S. Zhang, *Explicit pseudo-transient continuation and the trust-region updating strategy for unconstrained optimization*, Appl Numer Math **165** (2021), 290-302, <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnum.2021.02.019>.
52. X.-L. Luo and H. Xiao, *Generalized continuation Newton methods and the trust-region updating strategy for the underdetermined system*, J Sci Comput **88** (2021), article 56, pp. 1-22, <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10915-021-01566-0>.
53. X.-L. Luo and H. Xiao, *The regularization continuation method with an adaptive time step control for linearly constrained optimization problems*, Appl Numer Math **181** (2022), 255-276, published online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnum.2022.06.008>.
54. X.-L. Luo, H. Xiao and S. Zhang, *Continuation Newton methods with deflation techniques for global optimization problems*, arXiv preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.13864>, or Research Square preprint available at <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1102775/v1>, July 30, 2021. Software available at [https://teacher.bupt.edu.cn/luoxinlong/zh\\_CN/zzcg/41406/list/index.htm](https://teacher.bupt.edu.cn/luoxinlong/zh_CN/zzcg/41406/list/index.htm).
55. X.-L. Luo, S. Zhang and H. Xiao, *Residual regularization path-following methods for linear complementarity problems*, arXiv preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.10727>, pp. 1-30, May 21, 2022.
56. M. Ng, P. Weiss and X.-M. Yuan, *Solving constrained total-variation image restoration and reconstruction problems via alternating direction methods*, SIAM J Sci Comput **32** (2010), 2710-2736, <http://doi.org/10.1137/090774823>.
57. M. F. Mascarenhas, *The BFGS method with exact line searches fails for non-convex objective functions*, Math Program **99** (2004), 49-61.
58. M.-W. Mak, *Lecture notes of constrained optimization and support vector machines*, <http://www.eie.polyu.edu.hk/~mwmak/EIE6207/ContOpt-SVM-beamer.pdf>, 2019.
59. MATLAB v9.8.0 (R2020a), The MathWorks Inc., <http://www.mathworks.com>, 2020.
60. J. J. Moré, B. S. Garbow and K. E. Hillstom, *Testing unconstrained optimization software*, ACM Trans Math Softw **7** (1981), 17-41.
61. D. Marquardt, *An algorithm for least-squares estimation of nonlinear parameters*, SIAM J Appl Math **11** (1963), 431-441.

62. N. Maculan and C. Lavor, *A function to test methods applied to global minimization of potential energy of molecules*, Numer Algorithms **35** (2004), 287-300.
63. E. H. Moore, *On the reciprocal of the general algebraic matrix*, Bull New Ser Am Math Soc **26** (1920), 394-395.
64. J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright, *Numerical Optimization*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
65. M. J. Osborne, *Mathematical methods for economic theory*, <https://mjo.osborne.economics.utoronto.ca/index.php/tutorial/index/1/mem>, 2016.
66. P.-Q. Pan, *New ODE methods for equality constrained optimization (2): algorithms*, J Comput Math **10** (1992), 129-146.
67. R. A. Penrose, *Generalized inverses for matrices*, Math Proc Camb Philos Soc **51** (1955), 406-413.
68. M. J. D. Powell, *Convergence properties of a class of minimization algorithms*, in: O.L. Mangasarian, R. R. Meyer and S. M. Robinson, eds., *Nonlinear Programming 2*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 1-27, 1975.
69. M. J. D. Powell, *A fast algorithm for nonlinearly constrained optimization calculations*, in: G. A. Watson, eds., *Numerical Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, pp. 144-157, 1978.
70. M. J. D. Powell, *The convergence of variable metric methods for nonlinearly constrained optimization calculations* in: O.L. Mangasarian, R. R. Meyer and S. M. Robinson, eds., *Nonlinear Programming 3*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 27-63, 1978.
71. K. Schittkowski, *NLPQL: A fortran subroutine solving constrained nonlinear programming problems*, Ann Oper Res **5** (1986), 485-500, available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02739235>.
72. J. Schropp, *A dynamical systems approach to constrained minimization*, Numer Funct Anal Optim **21** (2000), 537-551.
73. J. Schropp, *One and multistep discretizations of index 2 differential algebraic systems and their use in optimization*, J Comput Appl Math **150** (2003), 375-396.
74. L. F. Shampine, I. Gladwell and S. Thompson, *Solving ODEs with MATLAB*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
75. D. F. Shanno, *Conditioning of quasi-Newton methods for function minimization*, Math Comput **24** (1970), 647-656.
76. G. Steidl and T. Teuber, *Removing multiplicative noise by Douglas-Rachford splitting methods*, J Math Imaging Vis **36** (2010), 168-184.
77. S. Surjanovic and D. Bingham, *Virtual library of simulation experiments: Test functions and datasets*, retrieved from <http://www.sfu.ca/~ssurjano>, January 2020.
78. W. Y. Sun and Y. X. Yuan, *Optimization Theory and Methods: Nonlinear Programming*, Springer, New York, 2006.
79. K. Tanabe, *A geometric method in nonlinear programming*, J Optim Theory Appl **30** (1980), 181-210.
80. A. N. Tikhonov, *The stability of inverse problems*, Dokl Akad Nauk SSSR **39** (1943), 176-179.
81. A. N. Tikhonov and V. Y. Arsenin, *Solutions of Ill-posed Problems*, John Wiley & Sons, New York-Toronto-London, 1977.
82. R. Vanderbei, K. Lin, H. Liu and L. Wang, *Revisiting compressed sensing: exploiting the efficiency of simplex and sparsification methods*, Math Prog Comp **8** (2016), 253-269, <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12532-016-0105-y>.
83. Z.-W. Wen and W.-T. Yin, *A feasible method for optimization with orthogonality constraints*, Math Program **142** (2013), 397-434.
84. R. B. Wilson, *A Simplicial Method for Convex Programming*, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1963.
85. D. M. Witten, R. Tibshirani and T. Hastie, *A penalized matrix decomposition, with applications to sparse principal components and canonical correlation analysis*, Biostatistics **10** (2009), 515-534.
86. H. Yamashita, *A differential equation approach to nonlinear programming*, Math Program **18** (1980), 155-168.
87. Y. Yuan, *Recent advances in trust region algorithms*, Math Program **151** (2015), 249-281.