

First-order optimization on stratified sets*

Guillaume Olikier[†]Kyle A. Gallivan[‡]P.-A. Absil[†]

March 29, 2023

Abstract

We consider the problem of minimizing a differentiable function with locally Lipschitz continuous gradient on a stratified set and present a first-order algorithm designed to find a stationary point of that problem. Our assumptions on the stratified set are satisfied notably by the determinantal variety (i.e., matrices of bounded rank), its intersection with the cone of positive-semidefinite matrices, and the set of nonnegative sparse vectors. The iteration map of the proposed algorithm applies a step of projected-projected gradient descent with backtracking line search, as proposed by Schneider and Uschmajew (2015), to its input but also to a projection of the input onto each of the lower strata to which it is considered close, and outputs a point among those thereby produced that maximally reduces the cost function. Under our assumptions on the stratified set, we prove that this algorithm produces a sequence whose accumulation points are stationary, and therefore does not follow the so-called apocalypses described by Levin, Kileel, and Boumal (2022). We illustrate the apocalypse-free property of our method through a numerical experiment on the determinantal variety.

Keywords: Stationarity · Tangent cones · Steepest descent · Stratified set · Determinantal variety · Positive-semidefinite matrices.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 65K10, 49J53, 90C26, 90C46, 58A35, 14M12, 15B99.

1 Introduction

Given a Euclidean vector space \mathcal{E} with inner product and induced norm respectively denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\|\cdot\|$, a differentiable function $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with locally Lipschitz continuous gradient, and a nonempty closed subset C of \mathcal{E} , we consider the problem

$$\min_{x \in C} f(x) \tag{1}$$

of minimizing f on C . In general, problem (1) is intractable and one is thus content with finding a stationary point of that problem, i.e., a point satisfying a first-order necessary condition to be a local minimizer of $f|_C$. Every definition of stationarity is based on a tangent or normal cone. Classic notions of tangent or normal cone include the tangent cone, the regular normal cone, the normal cone, and the Clarke normal cone; they are reviewed in Section 4.3 based on [46, Chapter 6]. Each of these notions of normal cone yields a definition of stationarity. We review them briefly here and refer to [36, 27] for more details.

A point $x \in C$ is said to be *stationary* for (1) if it satisfies one of the following equivalent conditions:

1. $\langle \nabla f(x), v \rangle \geq 0$ for all $v \in T_C(x)$, where $T_C(x)$ denotes the tangent cone to C at x ;
2. $-\nabla f(x) \in \hat{N}_C(x)$, where $\hat{N}_C(x)$ denotes the regular normal cone to C at x ;

*This work was supported by the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique – FNRS and the Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek – Vlaanderen under EOS Project no 30468160. K. A. Gallivan is partially supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation under grant CIBR 1934157.

[†]ICTEAM Institute, UCLouvain, Avenue Georges Lemaître 4, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium (guillaume.olikier@uclouvain.be, pa.absil@uclouvain.be).

[‡]Department of Mathematics, Florida State University, 1017 Academic Way, Tallahassee, FL 32306-4510, USA (kgallivan@fsu.edu).

3. $s(x; f, C) = 0$, where the function

$$s(\cdot; f, C) : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : x \mapsto \|P_{T_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))\|, \quad (2)$$

called the *stationarity measure* of (1), returns the norm of any projection of $-\nabla f(x)$ onto $T_C(x)$.

The point x is said to be *Mordukhovich stationary* for (1) if $-\nabla f(x) \in N_C(x)$, where $N_C(x)$ denotes the normal cone to C at x . The inclusion $\widehat{N}_C(x) \subseteq N_C(x)$ always holds, and C is said to be *Clarke regular* at x if $\widehat{N}_C(x) = N_C(x)$. Thus, the stationarity of x implies the Mordukhovich stationarity of x , and the two conditions are equivalent if and only if C is Clarke regular at x . The point x is said to be *Clarke stationary* for (1) if $-\nabla f(x) \in \overline{N}_C(x)$, where $\overline{N}_C(x)$ denotes the Clarke normal cone to C at x defined as the closure of the convex hull of $N_C(x)$. If $x \in C$ is a local minimizer of $f|_C$, then x is stationary for (1), hence Mordukhovich stationary for (1), and hence Clarke stationary for (1). The stationarity of a point depends only on $f|_C$ since, by [35, Lemmas A.7 and A.8], the correspondence

$$C \mapsto \mathcal{E} : x \mapsto P_{T_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$$

depends on f only through $f|_C$. In contrast, the Mordukhovich stationarity depends on the values taken by f outside C .

To the best of our knowledge, without further assumptions, the algorithm in the literature with the strongest convergence guarantee for problem (1) is the projected gradient descent proposed in [30, Algorithm 3.1] and dubbed PGD in [35, §1]. Given $x \in C$ as input, the iteration map of PGD performs a projected line search along the direction of $-\nabla f(x)$, i.e., computes a point in $P_C(x - \alpha \nabla f(x))$ for decreasing values of $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ until an Armijo condition is satisfied. By [30, Theorem 3.4], PGD produces a sequence whose accumulation points are Mordukhovich stationary; it is an open question whether these accumulation points can fail to be stationary. Furthermore, as pointed out in [35, §1], a sequence produced by PGD generally depends on the values taken by f on $\mathcal{E} \setminus C$ which is, at least conceptually, unsatisfying.

A frequently encountered obstacle against guaranteeing convergence to stationary points of (1) is the possible presence in C of so-called apocalyptic points. By [35, Definition 2.7], a point $x \in C$ is said to be *apocalyptic* if there exist a sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in C converging to x and a continuously differentiable function $\phi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; \phi, C) = 0$ whereas $s(x; \phi, C) > 0$. Such a triplet $(x, (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \phi)$ is called an *apocalypse*. By [35, Corollary 2.15], if $x \in C$ is apocalyptic, then C is not Clarke regular at x . *Apocalyptic sets*, i.e., sets that have at least one apocalyptic point, include:

1. the *determinantal variety* [24, Lecture 9]

$$\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n} := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \mid \text{rank } X \leq r\}, \quad (3)$$

m , n , and r being positive integers such that $r < \min\{m, n\}$;

2. the closed cone

$$\mathbb{S}_{\leq r}^+(n) := \{X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{n \times n} \mid X^\top = X, X \succeq 0\}, \quad (4)$$

n and r being positive integers such that $r < n$, of order- n real symmetric positive-semidefinite matrices of rank at most r ;

3. the closed cone of nonnegative sparse vectors, specifically $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, n and s being positive integers such that $s < n$, where $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ is the set of s -sparse vectors of \mathbb{R}^n , i.e., those having at most s nonzero components, and \mathbb{R}_+^n is the nonnegative orthant of \mathbb{R}^n .

Problem (1) with C one of these three sets appears in numerous applications; see Section 6.

In this paper, we propose a first-order optimization algorithm (Algorithm 5.3), called P²GDR, that produces a sequence whose accumulation points are stationary for (1) (see Theorem 5.5) under assumptions on C (Assumption 2.2) that apply to the three apocalyptic sets listed (see Section 6). For a high-level description of the algorithmic strategy underlying the P²GDR algorithm, see Section 2.2.

When $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, the proposed P²GDR algorithm competes against two algorithms known to accumulate at stationary points of (1): the second-order method given in [35, Algorithm 1] and the

first-order method given in [40, Algorithm 3] and dubbed RFDR, which are reviewed in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, respectively. These three algorithms and others are compared based on the computational cost per iteration and the convergence guarantees in Section 6.2.6, and numerically on the instance of (1) from [35, §2.2] in Section 6.2.7. A concise overview of the algorithms on $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ and their properties can be found in Tables 6.2–6.4. Numerical experiments indicate that P²GDR converges faster than [35, Algorithm 1] (see Section 6.2.7) and RFDR (see Section 3.3).

When $C = \mathbb{S}_{\leq r}^+(n)$, [35, Algorithm 1] is the only algorithm known to accumulate at stationary points of (1) (provided that one can find a suitable hook which, to our knowledge, has not been done yet explicitly in the literature). Indeed, RFDR does not seem to easily extend to $\mathbb{S}_{\leq r}^+(n)$, hence P²GDR (and his variant using Algorithm 6.5 instead of Algorithm 5.2 in line 3) has no competitor in the realm of first-order optimization methods on $\mathbb{S}_{\leq r}^+(n)$ that accumulate at stationary points.

When $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $f(x) = \|Ax - b\|^2$ with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^q$, problem (1) is known as the s -sparse nonnegative least squares problem and can be solved exactly; see [38] and the references therein. However, we are not aware of algorithms designed to address other cost functions on that set.

This paper gathers, expands, and generalizes results of the technical reports [42] and [43]. P²GDR on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ (Algorithm 5.3 using Algorithm 6.3 in line 3) was proposed in [42] in response to a question raised in [33, §4]: “Is there an algorithm running directly on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ that only uses first-order information about the cost function and which is guaranteed to converge to a stationary point?” The proposed P²GDR algorithm (Algorithm 5.3) answers positively an open question raised in [35, §4]: “Is there an algorithm running directly on a general class of nonsmooth sets including $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ that only uses first-order information about the cost function, and which is guaranteed to converge to a stationary point?”

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we specify the assumptions on C (Assumption 2.2) and give an overview of the proposed P²GDR algorithm. In Section 3, we review prior work on problem (1). In Section 4, we introduce the background material needed to analyze the behavior of the algorithms. In Section 5, we define P²GDR and analyze its convergence properties under Assumption 2.2. In Section 6, we study the three apocalyptic sets listed and prove that they satisfy Assumption 2.2 (see Theorem 6.1). In Section 7, we propose complementary results that are not needed for the proofs of the main theorems (Theorems 5.5 and 6.1) but are of interest in the context of this work, notably because some of them relate Assumption 2.2 to known concepts of variational analysis or stratification theory. Section 8 contains concluding remarks, and Appendix A basic material on the gradient and the Hessian of a real-valued function on a Hilbert space.

2 Assumptions on the feasible set C and overview of the proposed algorithm

In this section, we introduce Assumption 2.2 and give an overview of the P²GDR algorithm (Algorithm 5.3). Based on Assumption 2.2, we prove that P²GDR produces a sequence whose accumulation points are stationary for (1) (see Theorem 5.5).

2.1 Assumptions on the feasible set C

The closure and the boundary of a subset S of \mathcal{E} are respectively denoted by \overline{S} and ∂S . The distance from $x \in \mathcal{E}$ to a nonempty subset S of \mathcal{E} is $d(x, S) := \inf_{y \in S} \|x - y\|$. For every $x \in \mathcal{E}$ and every $\rho \in (0, \infty)$, $B(x, \rho) := \{y \in \mathcal{E} \mid \|x - y\| < \rho\}$ and $B[x, \rho] := \{y \in \mathcal{E} \mid \|x - y\| \leq \rho\}$ are respectively the open and closed balls of center x and radius ρ in \mathcal{E} .

Assumption 2.1. For all $x \in C$,

$$u(x) := \sup_{v \in T_C(x) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{d(x + v, C)}{\|v\|^2} < \infty.$$

We relate Assumption 2.1 to the concept of parabolic derivability in Proposition 7.2. The concept of continuity for a correspondence which appears in Assumption 2.2 is reviewed in Section 4.2.

Assumption 2.2. The set C satisfies the following conditions:

1. there exist a positive integer p and nonempty smooth submanifolds S_0, \dots, S_p of \mathcal{E} contained in C such that:
 - (a) for all $i, j \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, $i \neq j$ implies $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$;
 - (b) $\overline{S_p} = C$ and, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, $\overline{S_i} = \bigcup_{j=0}^i S_j$;
 - (c) if $p \geq 2$, then, for all $i \in \{2, \dots, p\}$, all $x \in S_i$, and all $j \in \{1, \dots, i-1\}$, $d(x, S_j) < d(x, S_{j-1})$;
2. Assumption 2.1 holds and, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, $u|_{S_i}$ is locally bounded;
3. for every $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, $T_C(\cdot)$ is continuous on S_i relative to S_i (see the definition in Section 4.2).

Assumption 2.2 is related to several important observations. First, every real algebraic variety in \mathcal{E} can be partitioned into finitely many smooth submanifolds of \mathcal{E} [51] and therefore satisfies condition 1(a). Second, we require $p \geq 1$ because, if $p = 0$, then C is a closed smooth submanifold of \mathcal{E} and is thus Clarke regular by [46, Example 6.8], and P²GDR reduces to the Riemannian gradient descent (a particular case of [1, Algorithm 1]) which accumulates at stationary points of (1) as proven in [1, §4.3.3]. Third, condition 1(b) implies that, for every $x \in S_p$, $d(x, S_{p-1}) > 0$. Therefore, $C \cap B(x, d(x, S_{p-1})) = S_p \cap B(x, d(x, S_{p-1}))$. Thus, C is locally a smooth submanifold of \mathcal{E} around $x \in S_p$. Therefore, by [46, Example 6.8], the tangent cone $T_C(x)$ equals the tangent space $T_{S_p}(x)$, and the normal cones $\widehat{N}_C(x)$, $N_C(x)$, and $\overline{N}_C(x)$ equal the normal space $N_{S_p}(x)$. In particular, C is Clarke regular at $x \in S_p$ and hence, by [35, Corollary 2.15], x is not apocalyptic. Fourth, by Proposition 7.5, conditions 1(a) and 1(b) imply that $\{S_0, \dots, S_p\}$ is a *stratification* of C satisfying the *condition of the frontier* [37, §5]; therefore, S_0, \dots, S_p are called the *strata* of $\{S_0, \dots, S_p\}$, and C is called a *stratified set*. Fifth, condition 1(c) is added to condition 1(b) only to ensure that, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$, every point in $C \setminus \overline{S_i}$ has a projection onto S_i (Proposition 5.3). Sixth, by Proposition 4.8, if C satisfies Assumption 2.2 and $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in S_p such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$, then every accumulation point of $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Mordukhovich stationary for (1). Seventh, by Corollary 4.10, condition 3 implies that, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, $s(\cdot; f, C)|_{S_i}$ is continuous. Eighth, by Theorem 6.1, if C is one of the three apocalyptic sets listed in Section 1, then:

1. Assumption 2.2 is satisfied;
2. there exists $a \in (0, 1)$ such that, for all $x \in C$,

$$u(x) = \sup_{v \in T_C(x) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{d(x+v, C)}{\|v\|^2} \in [a\tilde{u}(x), \tilde{u}(x)],$$

where $\tilde{u}(x) := 0$ if $x \in S_0$ and $\tilde{u}(x) := \frac{1}{d(x, S_{i-1})}$ if $x \in S_i$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$;

3. u is not locally bounded at any point of $C \setminus S_p$;
4. the set of apocalyptic points of C is $C \setminus S_p$;
5. for all $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$ and all $x \in S_i$, $\overline{N}_C(x) = N_{S_i}(x)$.

The fourth and fifth statements respectively imply that, if C is one of the three sets, then $s(\cdot; f, C)$ is not necessarily lower semicontinuous at a point of $C \setminus S_p$, and a point $x \in S_i$ with $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$ is Clarke stationary for (1) if and only if x is stationary for the problem of minimizing f on $\bigcup_{j=0}^i S_j$.

2.2 Overview of the proposed algorithm

In this section, we give an overview of the P²GDR algorithm (Algorithm 5.3) which we introduce in Section 5. The iteration map of P²GDR (Algorithm 5.2), called the P²GDR map, uses the P²GD map (Algorithm 5.1) as a subroutine. The P²GD map essentially corresponds to the iteration map

of [47, Algorithm 3], dubbed P²GD in [35, §1], except that it is defined on any set C satisfying Assumption 2.1, and not only on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$. The name P²GD comes from the fact that each iteration involves two projections: given $x \in C$ as input, the P²GD map performs a projected line search along a direction $g \in P_{T_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$, i.e., computes a point in $P_C(x + \alpha g)$ for decreasing values of $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ until an Armijo condition is satisfied. P²GD has at least three desirable properties that PGD does not have. First, each sequence produced by P²GD depends on f only through $f|_C$ by [35, Lemmas A.7 and A.8]. Second, as shown in Section 5.2, if Assumption 2.2 holds, then P²GD reduces to the Riemannian gradient descent on the upper stratum S_p of C . Third, for certain sets C , the fact that the search direction is in the tangent cone to C makes the projection onto C easier to compute; this is the case if $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ as shown in [50, §3] and recalled in Section 6.2.2.

Unfortunately, P²GD can converge to a point that is Mordukhovich stationary for (1) but not stationary. Indeed, for some instances of problem (1), P²GD follows an apocalypse, i.e., produces a sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in C converging to a point $x \in C$ such that $(x, (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, f)$ is an apocalypse; an example is given in [35, §2.2] for the case where $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$. If C satisfies Assumption 2.2, then, by condition 3 and Corollary 4.10, an apocalypse can occur only if the sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ has finitely many elements in the stratum containing its limit. The P²GDR map is designed based on that fact. Given $x \in C$ as input, it applies the P²GD map to x but also to a projection of x onto each of the lower strata to which it is considered close, and outputs a point among those thereby produced that maximally decreases f . The R in P²GDR comes from the fact that, on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, a projection onto a lower stratum is a rank reduction.

3 Prior work

In this section, we review related work. In Section 3.1, we list several papers using the concept of stratified set in optimization. Then, in Section 3.2, we review [35, Algorithm 1] and, more generally, the main results of [34] which concern optimization through a smooth lift. Finally, in Section 3.3, we review the RFDR algorithm.

3.1 Stratified sets in optimization

The concept of stratification has been used in optimization but, to the best of our knowledge, only in nonsmooth optimization with the goal of finding a Clarke stationary point.

First, several works including [10, 29, 15, 5] concern the problem of minimizing a function whose graph admits a Whitney stratification. They consider Clarke stationarity: see [10, Definition 2] for the unconstrained case and [15, (6.2)] for the constrained case. For example, [15, Theorem 6.2] ensures, under suitable assumptions, that, almost surely, the proximal stochastic subgradient method produces a sequence whose accumulation points are Clarke stationary. It is an open question whether those points may fail to be stationary.

Second, the authors of [28] consider the problem of minimizing a locally Lipschitz continuous function on a real algebraic variety for which they propose a gradient sampling method. Being an algebraic variety, the feasible set admits a Whitney stratification [52]. By [28, Theorem 3.3], [28, Algorithm 1] accumulates at Clarke stationary points. Again, it is not known whether those points can fail to be stationary.

3.2 Optimization through a smooth lift

In [34], the authors study problem (1) under the assumption that there exist a smooth manifold \mathcal{M} and a smooth map $\varphi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ such that $\varphi(\mathcal{M}) = C$; they call φ a *smooth lift* of C . Specifically, they investigate how desirable points of the problem

$$\min_{y \in \mathcal{M}} (f \circ \varphi)(y) \tag{5}$$

map to desirable points of (1):

- [34, Theorem 2.8] gives a necessary and sufficient condition on φ for the property “for all continuous f , if $y \in \mathcal{M}$ is a local minimum of (5), then $\varphi(y)$ is a local minimum of (1)” to hold;
- [34, Theorem 2.10] implies that, for every $y \in \mathcal{M}$, if $T_C(\varphi(y))$ is not a linear subspace of \mathcal{E} , then there exists a differentiable f such that y is a stationary point of (5) and $\varphi(y)$ is not a stationary point of (1);
- [34, Theorem 2.12] gives two sufficient conditions and one necessary condition on φ for the property “for all twice differentiable f , if $y \in \mathcal{M}$ is a second-order stationary point of (5), then $\varphi(y)$ is a stationary point of (1)” to hold.

As can be seen in [34, Table 1], for many feasible sets C of interest, there exist smooth lifts φ mapping each second-order stationary point of (5) to a stationary point of (1). For example, [34, Table 1] gives such lifts for two of the three apocalyptic sets listed in Section 1:

- the map

$$\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} : (L, R) \mapsto LR^\top$$

is a smooth lift of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ called the rank factorization lift;

- the map

$$\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n \times r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : Y \mapsto YY^\top$$

is a smooth lift of $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ called the Burer–Monteiro lift.

For such feasible sets, one can find a stationary point of (1) by running on (5) an algorithm guaranteed to accumulate at second-order stationary points; the trust-region method given in [35, Algorithm 1] is an example of such an algorithm. This approach was successfully implemented in [35] for $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$.

3.3 The RFDR algorithm

In this section, we review the RFDR algorithm [40, Algorithm 3]. RFDR is defined on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ in [40, §5] and its convergence properties are analyzed in [40, §6]. More generally, it can be defined on the set C while preserving the convergence properties under Assumption 3.1, as proven in Section 7.3.

Assumption 3.1. The set C satisfies the following conditions:

1. conditions 1(a) and 1(b) of Assumption 2.2 hold and, if $p \geq 2$, then, for all $x \in S_p$, $d(x, S_{p-1}) < d(x, S_{p-2})$;
2. $\inf_{x \in C \setminus S_p, z \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|P_{T_C(x)}(z)\|}{\|z\|} > 0$;
3. C admits a *restricted tangent cone*, i.e., a correspondence $C \multimap \mathcal{E} : x \mapsto \check{T}_C(x)$ such that:
 - (a) for every $x \in C$, $\check{T}_C(x)$ is a closed cone contained in $T_C(x)$;
 - (b) for all $x \in C$ and all $z \in \check{T}_C(x)$, $x + z \in C$;
 - (c) there exists $\mu \in (0, 1]$ such that, for all $x \in C$ and all $z \in \mathcal{E}$, $\|P_{\check{T}_C(x)}(z)\| \geq \mu \|P_{T_C(x)}(z)\|$.

Observe that condition 1 of Assumption 3.1 is weaker than condition 1 of Assumption 2.2. The paper [40] is based on the fact that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ satisfies Assumption 3.1:

- we prove in Section 6.2.1 that condition 1 of Assumption 3.1 holds;
- by (31), condition 2 of Assumption 3.1 holds and the infimum equals $(\min\{m, n\} - r + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$;
- by [40, Proposition 3.2], which is based on [47, §3], condition 3 of Assumption 3.1 holds with $\mu := 2^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for the restricted tangent cone from [40, Definition 3.1].

We prove in Section 7.4 that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ satisfies Assumption 3.1, its tangent cone being itself a restricted tangent cone. However, to the best of our knowledge, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ are the only known examples of a set C that satisfies Assumption 3.1. In the rest of this section, we discuss the RFDR algorithm on a set C satisfying Assumption 3.1.

The iteration map of RFDR [40, Algorithm 2], called the RFDR map, uses the RFD map [40, Algorithm 1] as a subroutine. The RFD map essentially corresponds to the iteration map of [47, Algorithm 4], dubbed RFD in [40, §1]. The name RFD comes from the fact that it is a retraction-free descent method, i.e., it performs each update along a straight line: given $x \in C$ as input, the RFD map performs a line search along a direction selected in $P_{\tilde{T}_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$, which does not involve any projection onto C . This retraction-free property has two advantages. First, it is fundamental to define and analyze RFDR. Second, it saves the cost of computing a retraction, which, as pointed out in [47, §3.4], does not confer to RFD a significant advantage over P²GD if $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ and $r \ll \min\{m, n\}$ since every point produced by the P²GD map is in $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 2r}^{m \times n}$ (see Section 6.2.2) and reducing the rank from $2r$ to r is typically much less expensive than evaluating the cost function or its gradient.

By [47, Theorem 3.10], if $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ and f is real-analytic and bounded from below, then RFD either produces a convergent sequence along which the stationarity measure $s(\cdot; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n})$ goes to zero or produces a sequence diverging to infinity. We do not have such a guarantee for P²GD; see [47, Theorem 3.9]. However, as P²GD, RFD can converge to a point that is Mordukhovich stationary for (1) but not stationary. For example, by [40, (19)], RFD produces the same sequence as P²GD on the instance of (1) from [35, §2.2].

Given $x \in C$ as input, the RFDR map applies the RFD map to x but also, if $x \in S_p$ and x is considered close to S_{p-1} , to a projection of x onto S_{p-1} , and outputs a point among those thereby produced that maximally decreases f . Based on Assumption 3.1, [40, Theorem 6.2] (see also Theorem 7.9) states that RFDR produces a sequence whose accumulation points are stationary for (1).

Both P²GDR and RFDR provably accumulate at stationary points of (1). The main advantage of RFDR over P²GDR is that it does so by projecting its input onto at most one lower stratum while P²GDR can project its input onto each of the p lower strata in the worst case. On the other hand, P²GDR has two advantages over RFDR. First, as Assumption 2.2 is less restrictive than Assumption 3.1, P²GDR can be defined on a broader class of feasible sets. For example, no restricted tangent cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ or $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ is known to us. Second, the directions in $P_{T_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$ are more closely related to $-\nabla f(x)$ than those in $P_{\tilde{T}_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$; while this does not imply that P²GD converges faster than RFD, such an observation was made experimentally in [47, §3.4] for $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$.

4 Preliminaries

This section, mostly based on [46] and [35], introduces the background material needed in Sections 5, 6, and 7. In Section 4.1, we recall basic properties of the projection onto closed cones. In Section 4.2, we review the concepts of inner and outer limits and continuity of correspondences, and prove Proposition 4.4 on which Corollary 4.10 is based. In Section 4.3, we review the concepts of tangent and normal cones mentioned in Section 1 and related notions such as geometric derivability. In Section 4.4, we review basic properties of the stationarity measure $s(\cdot; f, C)$ defined in (2), and prove that it is continuous if the tangent cone $T_C(\cdot)$ is continuous (Corollary 4.10), a result which we use in Section 6 to prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, and $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ satisfy condition 3 of Assumption 2.2.

4.1 Projection onto closed cones

A set $S \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ is said to be *locally closed* at $x \in \mathcal{E}$ if there exists $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that $S \cap B[x, \delta]$ is closed; S is closed if and only if it is locally closed at every $x \in \mathcal{E}$. For every nonempty subset S of \mathcal{E} and every $x \in \mathcal{E}$, $P_S(x) := \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in S} \|x - y\|$ is the projection of x onto S . The set $P_S(x)$ can be empty in general but not if S is closed, as formulated in Proposition 4.1. If $P_S(x)$ is a singleton, we also use $P_S(x)$ to denote the element of the singleton.

Proposition 4.1 ([46, Example 1.20]). *For every nonempty closed subset S of \mathcal{E} and every $x \in \mathcal{E}$, $P_S(x)$ is nonempty and compact.*

A nonempty subset S of \mathcal{E} is said to be a *cone* if, for all $x \in S$ and all $\lambda \in [0, \infty)$, $\lambda x \in S$. In this paper, we mostly project onto closed cones and, in that case, Proposition 4.1 can be completed as follows.

Proposition 4.2 ([35, Proposition A.6]). *Let $S \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ be a closed cone. For all $x \in \mathcal{E}$ and all $y \in P_S(x)$,*

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \|y\|^2$$

and, in particular,

$$\|y\|^2 = \|x\|^2 - d(x, S)^2.$$

For every nonempty subset S of \mathcal{E} ,

$$S^* := \{y \in \mathcal{E} \mid \langle y, x \rangle \leq 0 \ \forall x \in S\}$$

is a closed convex cone called the (*negative*) *polar* of S . If S is a linear subspace of \mathcal{E} , then S^* equals the orthogonal complement S^\perp of S . If $\emptyset \neq S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, then $S_1^* \supseteq S_2^*$. Moreover, we have Proposition 4.3 which we use to prove Propositions 4.5 and 6.27.

Proposition 4.3. *If S is contained in a linear subspace V of \mathcal{E} , then*

$$S^* = (S^* \cap V) + V^\perp.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} S^* &= \{y \in \mathcal{E} \mid \langle y, x \rangle \leq 0 \ \forall x \in S\} \\ &= \{y_\parallel + y_\perp \mid y_\parallel \in V, y_\perp \in V^\perp, \langle y_\parallel + y_\perp, x \rangle \leq 0 \ \forall x \in S\} \\ &= \{y_\parallel + y_\perp \mid y_\parallel \in V, y_\perp \in V^\perp, \langle y_\parallel, x \rangle \leq 0 \ \forall x \in S\} \\ &= \{y_\parallel \in V \mid \langle y_\parallel, x \rangle \leq 0 \ \forall x \in S\} + V^\perp \\ &= (S^* \cap V) + V^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

□

4.2 Inner and outer limits, continuity of correspondences

This section is based on [46, Chapters 4 and 5]. For every sequence $(S_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of sets in a metric space $(\mathcal{M}, d_{\mathcal{M}})$, the two sets

$$\underline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} S_i := \{x \in \mathcal{M} \mid \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathcal{M}}(x, S_i) = 0\}, \quad \overline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} S_i := \{x \in \mathcal{M} \mid \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathcal{M}}(x, S_i) = 0\}$$

are closed and respectively called the *inner* and *outer limits* of $(S_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ [46, Definition 4.1, Exercise 4.2(a), and Proposition 4.4]. If $S_i \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\underline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} S_i$ and $\overline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} S_i$ are respectively the sets of all possible limits and of all possible accumulation points of sequences $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $x_i \in S_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. It is always true that $\underline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} S_i \subseteq \overline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} S_i$; if the inclusion is an equality, then $(S_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is said to *converge in the sense of Painlevé* and $\text{Lim}_{i \rightarrow \infty} S_i := \underline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} S_i = \overline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} S_i$ is called the *limit* of $(S_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$.

A *correspondence*, or a *set-valued mapping*, is a triplet $F := (A, B, G)$ where A and B are sets respectively called the *set of departure* and the *set of destination* of F , and G is a subset of $A \times B$ called the *graph* of F . If $F := (A, B, G)$ is a correspondence, written $F : A \multimap B$, then the *image* of $x \in A$ by F is $F(x) := \{y \in B \mid (x, y) \in G\}$ and the *domain* of F is $\text{dom } F := \{x \in A \mid F(x) \neq \emptyset\}$.

We now review a notion of continuity for correspondences $F : \mathcal{M}_1 \multimap \mathcal{M}_2$ where $(\mathcal{M}_1, d_{\mathcal{M}_1})$ and $(\mathcal{M}_2, d_{\mathcal{M}_2})$ are two metric spaces. Let S be a nonempty subset of $\text{dom } F$ and x be in S . The two sets

$$\underline{\text{Lim}}_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} F(z) := \bigcap_{S \ni x_i \rightarrow x} \underline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} F(x_i) = \{y \in \mathcal{M}_2 \mid \lim_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} d_{\mathcal{M}_2}(y, F(z)) = 0\}, \quad (6)$$

$$\overline{\text{Lim}}_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} F(z) := \bigcup_{S \ni x_i \rightarrow x} \overline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} F(x_i) = \{y \in \mathcal{M}_2 \mid \liminf_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} d_{\mathcal{M}_2}(y, F(z)) = 0\} \quad (7)$$

are closed and respectively called the inner and outer limits of F at x relative to S [46, 5(1)]. Clearly, $\underline{\text{Lim}}_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} F(z) \subseteq \overline{\text{Lim}}_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} F(z)$; if the inclusion is an equality, then $\text{Lim}_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} F(z) := \underline{\text{Lim}}_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} F(z) = \overline{\text{Lim}}_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} F(z)$ is called the limit of F at x relative to S . By [46, Definition 5.4], F is said to be *inner semicontinuous* at x relative to S if $\underline{\text{Lim}}_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} F(z) \supseteq F(x)$, *outer semicontinuous* at x relative to S if $\overline{\text{Lim}}_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} F(z) \subseteq F(x)$, and *continuous* at x relative to S if F is both inner and outer semicontinuous at x relative to S , i.e., $\text{Lim}_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} F(z) = F(x)$. Thus, F is continuous at x relative to S if and only if, for every sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in S converging to x , it holds that $\text{Lim}_{i \rightarrow \infty} F(x_i) = F(x)$, i.e., $\overline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} F(x_i) \subseteq F(x) \subseteq \underline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} F(x_i)$.

We close this section by proving Proposition 4.4 on which Corollary 4.10 is based.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $g : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be continuous, $F : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be closed-valued, and S be a nonempty subset of $\text{dom } F$. If F is continuous at $x \in S$ relative to S , then the function*

$$\text{dom } F \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : y \mapsto d(g(y), F(y))$$

is continuous at x relative to S .

Proof. Let $x \in S$. For all $y \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned} |d(g(x), F(x)) - d(g(y), F(y))| &\leq |d(g(x), F(x)) - d(g(x), F(y))| \\ &\quad + |d(g(x), F(y)) - d(g(y), F(y))| \end{aligned}$$

and, by [53, Proposition 1.3.17],

$$|d(g(x), F(y)) - d(g(y), F(y))| \leq \|g(x) - g(y)\|.$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$. First, by [46, Proposition 5.11(c)], the function

$$\text{dom } F \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : y \mapsto d(g(x), F(y))$$

is continuous at x relative to S . Thus, there exists $\delta_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for all $y \in B[x, \delta_1] \cap S$,

$$|d(g(x), F(x)) - d(g(x), F(y))| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Second, since g is continuous at x , there exists $\delta_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for all $y \in B[x, \delta_2]$,

$$\|g(x) - g(y)\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Therefore, if $\delta := \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$, then, for all $y \in B[x, \delta] \cap S$,

$$|d(g(x), F(x)) - d(g(y), F(y))| \leq \varepsilon,$$

which completes the proof. \square

4.3 Tangent and normal cones and geometric derivability

In this section, based on [46, Chapters 6 and 13], we review the concepts of tangent cone, geometric derivability, regular normal cone, normal cone, Clarke normal cone, second-order tangent set, and parabolic derivability. Tangent and normal cones play a fundamental role in constrained optimization to describe admissible search directions and, in particular, to formulate optimality conditions. They notably appear in Section 4.4, in the description of the stationarity measure and in the characterization of apocalyptic points (Proposition 4.9). The concept of parabolic derivability is related to Assumption 2.1, as shown in Section 7.1.

In the rest of this section, x is a point in a subset S of \mathcal{E} . The tangent cone to S , the regular normal cone to S , the normal cone to S , and the Clarke normal cone to S are correspondences with sets of departure and of destination both equal to \mathcal{E} , and domain equal to S .

The set

$$T_S(x) := \overline{\lim_{t \searrow 0}} \frac{S - x}{t} \quad (8)$$

$$= \left\{ v \in \mathcal{E} \mid \liminf_{t \searrow 0} \frac{d(x + tv, S)}{t} = 0 \right\} \quad (9)$$

$$= \left\{ v \in \mathcal{E} \mid \exists \begin{array}{l} (t_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ in } (0, \infty) \text{ converging to } 0 \\ (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ in } S \text{ converging to } x \end{array} : \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x_i - x}{t_i} = v \right\} \quad (10)$$

is a closed cone called the *tangent cone* to S at x [46, Definition 6.1 and Proposition 6.2]. The equality between (8) and (10) follows from the first equality in (7) while the equality between (8) and (9) follows from the second equality in (7) and the identity

$$\frac{d(x + tv, S)}{t} = d\left(v, \frac{S - x}{t}\right) \quad (11)$$

holding for all $t \in (0, \infty)$ and all $v \in \mathcal{E}$. The closedness of $T_S(x)$ follows from the fact that it is an outer limit. The fact that $T_S(x)$ is a cone is clear from (9).

By [46, Definition 6.1], $v \in T_S(x)$ is said to be *derivable* if there exists $\gamma : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ with $\tau \in (0, \infty)$, $\gamma([0, \tau]) \subseteq S$, $\gamma(0) = x$, and $\gamma'(0) = v$, and S is said to be *geometrically derivable* at x if every $v \in T_S(x)$ is derivable. By [46, Proposition 6.2], the set of all $v \in T_S(x)$ that are derivable is

$$\underline{\lim}_{t \searrow 0} \frac{S - x}{t} = \left\{ v \in \mathcal{E} \mid \lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{d(x + tv, S)}{t} = 0 \right\},$$

and, in particular, S is geometrically derivable at x if and only if

$$\underline{\lim}_{t \searrow 0} \frac{S - x}{t} = \overline{\lim}_{t \searrow 0} \frac{S - x}{t}.$$

By [46, Definition 6.3 and Proposition 6.5],

$$\hat{N}_S(x) := T_S(x)^* \quad (12)$$

is called the *regular normal cone* to S at x ,

$$N_S(x) := \overline{\lim_{S \ni z \rightarrow x}} \hat{N}_S(z) \quad (13)$$

is a closed cone called the *normal cone* to S at x , the inclusion

$$\hat{N}_S(x) \subseteq N_S(x)$$

holds, and S is said to be *Clarke regular* at x if it is locally closed at x and $\hat{N}_S(x) = N_S(x)$. By [46, 6(19)], the closure of the convex hull of $N_S(x)$ is denoted by $\overline{N}_S(x)$ and called the *convexified normal cone* to S at x . By [46, Exercise 6.38], if S is closed, then $\overline{N}_S(x)$ is also called the *Clarke normal cone* to S at x .

By [46, Example 6.8], if S is a smooth manifold in \mathcal{E} around x , then $T_S(x)$ equals the tangent space to S at x , and $\hat{N}_S(x)$, $N_S(x)$, and $\overline{N}_S(x)$ equal the normal space to S at x which is the orthogonal complement of $T_S(x)$.

Proposition 4.5 studies the influence of the ambient space on the tangent and normal cones, and is used in Section 6.3.3.

Proposition 4.5. *If S is contained in a linear subspace V of \mathcal{E} , then, for all $x \in S$,*

$$T_S(x) \subseteq V, \quad \hat{N}_S(x) = (\hat{N}_S(x) \cap V) + V^\perp, \quad N_S(x) = (N_S(x) \cap V) + V^\perp.$$

Proof. The inclusion is clear from (10). The first equality follows from the inclusion and Proposition 4.3. Let us establish the second equality. By (13), (7), and the first equality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
N_S(x) &= \overline{\lim}_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} \hat{N}_S(z) \\
&= \left\{ w \in \mathcal{E} \mid \liminf_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} d(w, \hat{N}_S(z)) = 0 \right\} \\
&= \left\{ w_{\parallel} + w_{\perp} \mid w_{\parallel} \in V, w_{\perp} \in V^{\perp}, \liminf_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} d(w_{\parallel} + w_{\perp}, (\hat{N}_S(z) \cap V) + V^{\perp}) = 0 \right\} \\
&= \left\{ w_{\parallel} + w_{\perp} \mid w_{\parallel} \in V, w_{\perp} \in V^{\perp}, \liminf_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} d(w_{\parallel}, \hat{N}_S(z) \cap V) = 0 \right\} \\
&= \left\{ w_{\parallel} \in V \mid \liminf_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} d(w_{\parallel}, \hat{N}_S(z) \cap V) = 0 \right\} + V^{\perp} \\
&= \left(\overline{\lim}_{S \ni z \rightarrow x} (\hat{N}_S(z) \cap V) \right) + V^{\perp} \\
&= (N_S(x) \cap V) + V^{\perp},
\end{aligned}$$

where the fourth equality follows from the fact that, for all $w_{\parallel} \in V$, all $w_{\perp} \in V^{\perp}$, and all $z \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned}
d(w_{\parallel} + w_{\perp}, (\hat{N}_S(z) \cap V) + V^{\perp})^2 &= \inf_{\substack{v_{\parallel} \in \hat{N}_S(z) \cap V \\ v_{\perp} \in V^{\perp}}} \|(w_{\parallel} + w_{\perp}) - (v_{\parallel} + v_{\perp})\|^2 \\
&= \inf_{\substack{v_{\parallel} \in \hat{N}_S(z) \cap V \\ v_{\perp} \in V^{\perp}}} \|(w_{\parallel} - v_{\parallel}) + (w_{\perp} - v_{\perp})\|^2 \\
&= \inf_{\substack{v_{\parallel} \in \hat{N}_S(z) \cap V \\ v_{\perp} \in V^{\perp}}} (\|w_{\parallel} - v_{\parallel}\|^2 + \|w_{\perp} - v_{\perp}\|^2) \\
&= \inf_{v_{\parallel} \in \hat{N}_S(z) \cap V} \|w_{\parallel} - v_{\parallel}\|^2 + \inf_{v_{\perp} \in V^{\perp}} \|w_{\perp} - v_{\perp}\|^2 \\
&= d(w_{\parallel}, \hat{N}_S(z) \cap V)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Given $v \in T_S(x)$, the set

$$T_S^2(x|v) := \overline{\lim}_{t \searrow 0} \frac{S - x - tv}{\frac{t^2}{2}} \quad (14)$$

$$= \left\{ w \in \mathcal{E} \mid \liminf_{t \searrow 0} \frac{d(x + tv + \frac{t^2}{2}w, S)}{\frac{t^2}{2}} = 0 \right\} \quad (15)$$

$$= \left\{ w \in \mathcal{E} \mid \exists \begin{array}{l} (t_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ in } (0, \infty) \text{ converging to } 0 \\ (w_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ in } \mathcal{E} \text{ converging to } w \end{array} : x + t_i v + \frac{t_i^2}{2} w_i \in S \ \forall i \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \quad (16)$$

is closed and called the *second-order tangent set* to S at x for v [46, Definition 13.11]. The equality between (14) and (16) follows from the first equality in (7) while the equality between (14) and (15) follows from the second equality in (7) and the identity

$$\frac{d(x + tv + \frac{t^2}{2}w, S)}{\frac{t^2}{2}} = d\left(w, \frac{S - x - tv}{\frac{t^2}{2}}\right) \quad (17)$$

holding for all $t \in (0, \infty)$ and all $w \in \mathcal{E}$. The closedness of $T_S^2(x|v)$ follows from the fact that it is an outer limit.

We say that $w \in T_S^2(x|v)$ is derivable for $v \in T_S(x)$ if there exists $\gamma : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ with $\tau \in (0, \infty)$, $\gamma([0, \tau]) \subseteq S$, $\gamma(0) = x$, $\gamma'(0) = v$, and $\gamma''(0) = w$. By [46, Definition 13.11], S is said to be *parabolically derivable* at x for $v \in T_S(x)$ if $T_S^2(x|v) \neq \emptyset$ and every $w \in T_S^2(x|v)$ is derivable for v . The set of all

$w \in T_S^2(x|v)$ that are derivable for v is

$$\underline{\text{Lim}}_{t \searrow 0} \frac{S - x - tv}{\frac{t^2}{2}} = \left\{ w \in \mathcal{E} \mid \lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{d(x + tv + \frac{t^2}{2}w, S)}{\frac{t^2}{2}} = 0 \right\},$$

and, in particular, S is parabolically derivable at x if and only if

$$\emptyset \neq \underline{\text{Lim}}_{t \searrow 0} \frac{S - x - tv}{\frac{t^2}{2}} = \overline{\text{Lim}}_{t \searrow 0} \frac{S - x - tv}{\frac{t^2}{2}}.$$

4.4 Stationarity measure

In this section, after recalling basic properties of the stationarity measure $s(\cdot; f, C)$ defined in (2), we review the complementary notions of apocalyptic and serendipitous points introduced in [35]. Finally, we prove that the continuity of the correspondence $T_C(\cdot)$ implies the continuity of the function $s(\cdot; f, C)$ (Corollary 4.10), a property that we use in Section 6 to prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, and $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ satisfy condition 3 of Assumption 2.2.

By Proposition 4.2, $s(\cdot; f, C)$ is well defined and, for all $x \in C$,

$$s(x; f, C) = \sqrt{\|\nabla f(x)\|^2 - d(-\nabla f(x), T_C(x))^2}. \quad (18)$$

The following result is stated in Section 1.

Proposition 4.6. *For every differentiable function $\phi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:*

1. *the correspondence*

$$C \multimap \mathcal{E} : x \mapsto P_{T_C(x)}(-\nabla \phi(x))$$

depends on ϕ only through its restriction $\phi|_C$;

2. *the following conditions are equivalent and are satisfied if $x \in C$ is a local minimizer of $\phi|_C$:*

- (a) $\langle \nabla \phi(x), v \rangle \geq 0$ for all $v \in T_C(x)$;
- (b) $-\nabla \phi(x) \in \hat{N}_C(x)$;
- (c) $s(x; \phi, C) = 0$.

Proof. The first statement follows from [35, Lemmas A.7 and A.8], and the second from [46, Theorem 6.12] and [35, Proposition 2.5]. \square

The notion of apocalyptic point is defined in Section 1. By [35, Definition 2.8], $x \in C$ is said to be *serendipitous* if there exist a sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in C converging to x , a continuously differentiable function $\phi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ such that $s(x_i; \phi, C) > \varepsilon$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, yet $s(x; \phi, C) = 0$.

Proposition 4.7 illustrates the complementarity between the notions of apocalyptic point and serendipitous point. It states that, for every sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in C converging to a point $x \in C$, for x to be a stationary point of (1), the condition $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$ is necessary if x is not serendipitous and sufficient if x is not apocalyptic. We use this result in Section 5.3 to deduce Corollary 5.6 from Theorem 5.5.

Proposition 4.7. *Let $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in C converging to a point $x \in C$.*

- *If x is not apocalyptic, then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$ implies $s(x; f, C) = 0$.*
- *If x is not serendipitous, then $s(x; f, C) = 0$ implies $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of the definitions of apocalyptic point and serendipitous point. \square

Proposition 4.7 has a practical interest. An iterative algorithm designed to find a stationary point of (1) produces a sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in C . However, in practice, the algorithm is stopped after a finite number of iterations based on a stopping criterion. By Proposition 4.7, if C has no serendipitous point and $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ has an accumulation point that is stationary for (1), then, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, the set $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid s(x_i; f, C) \leq \varepsilon\}$ is infinite, which provides us with a stopping criterion: given $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, stop the algorithm at iteration

$$i_\varepsilon := \min\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid s(x_i; f, C) \leq \varepsilon\}. \quad (19)$$

Nevertheless, as pointed out in [35, §1], this stopping criterion must be treated with circumspection if C has apocalyptic points since the condition $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$ is not sufficient for x to be a stationary point of (1) if x is apocalyptic. Corollary 5.6 shows that, if C has no serendipitous point and the generated sequence does not diverge to infinity, then this stopping criterion is always eventually satisfied by the proposed P²GDR algorithm.

Proposition 4.8 states that, if C satisfies condition 1 of Assumption 2.2 and $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in S_p , then the condition $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$ is sufficient for the accumulation points of $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ to be Mordukhovich stationary for (1).

Proposition 4.8. *If C satisfies condition 1 of Assumption 2.2, $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in S_p , and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$, then every accumulation point of $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Mordukhovich stationary for (1).*

Proof. We follow the argument from [27, §3.4]. Assume that C satisfies condition 1 of Assumption 2.2 and let $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in S_p having $x \in C$ as accumulation point and such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$-\nabla f(x_i) = P_{T_{S_p}(x_i)}(-\nabla f(x_i)) + P_{N_{S_p}(x_i)}(-\nabla f(x_i)).$$

Let $(x_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a subsequence converging to x . Since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s(x_{i_k}; f, C) = 0$, it holds that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P_{N_{S_p}(x_{i_k})}(-\nabla f(x_{i_k})) = -\nabla f(x).$$

Thus, $-\nabla f(x) \in \overline{\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} N_{S_p}(x_i)} = \overline{\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \hat{N}_C(x_i)} \subseteq N_C(x)$. □

The characterization of apocalyptic and serendipitous points given in Proposition 4.9 allows us to prove Propositions 6.10, 6.14, 6.31, and 7.19.

Proposition 4.9 ([35, Theorems 2.13 and 2.17]). *A point $x \in C$ is:*

- *apocalyptic if and only if there exists a sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in C converging to x such that $(\overline{\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_C(x_i)})^*$ is not a subset of $\hat{N}_C(x)$;*
- *serendipitous if and only if there exists a sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in C converging to x such that $\hat{N}_C(x)$ is not a subset of $(\overline{\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_C(x_i)})^*$.*

We close this section by proving Corollary 4.10 which states that the function $s(\cdot; f, C)$ is continuous if the correspondence $T_C(\cdot)$ is continuous.

Corollary 4.10. *For every nonempty subset S of C and every continuously differentiable function $\phi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if the tangent cone $T_C(\cdot)$ is continuous on S relative to S , then the restriction $s(\cdot; \phi, C)|_S$ is continuous.*

Proof. Let $x \in S$. We have to prove that $s(\cdot; \phi, C)$ is continuous at x relative to S . By assumption, $T_C(\cdot)$ is continuous at x relative to S . Thus, by Proposition 4.4, the function

$$C \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : y \mapsto d(-\nabla \phi(y), T_C(y))$$

is continuous at x relative to S . The result then follows from (18). □

5 The proposed algorithm and its convergence analysis

In this section, under Assumption 2.2, we define P²GDR (Algorithm 5.3) and prove that it produces a sequence whose accumulation points are stationary for (1) (Theorem 5.5). The organization of the section is described hereafter and summarized in Table 5.1. In Section 5.1, under Assumption 2.1, we prove that the P²GD map (Algorithm 5.1) produces a point satisfying an Armijo condition (Corollary 5.2). In Section 5.2, under Assumption 2.2, we introduce the P²GDR map (Algorithm 5.2), which uses the P²GD map as a subroutine, and, based on Corollary 5.2, prove Proposition 5.4. Finally, in Section 5.3, we introduce the P²GDR algorithm and prove Theorem 5.5 based on Proposition 5.4. Using the concept of serendipitous point (see Section 4.4), we also deduce Corollary 5.6 from Theorem 5.5.

<i>Section</i>	<i>Assumption</i>	<i>Algorithm</i>	<i>Main result</i>
Section 5.1	Assumption 2.1	P ² GD map (Algorithm 5.1)	Corollary 5.2
Section 5.2	Assumption 2.2	P ² GDR map (Algorithm 5.2)	Proposition 5.4
Section 5.3		P ² GDR (Algorithm 5.3)	Theorem 5.5

Table 5.1: Assumptions, algorithms, and main results of Section 5.

5.1 The P²GD map

In this section, under Assumption 2.1, we prove that the P²GD map (Algorithm 5.1) is well defined and produces a point satisfying an Armijo condition (Corollary 5.2). For convenience, we recall that Assumption 2.1 states that, for all $x \in C$,

$$u(x) := \sup_{v \in T_C(x) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{d(x+v, C)}{\|v\|^2} < \infty.$$

Note that, by Proposition 7.2, if C is parabolically derivable at $x \in C$ for $v \in T_C(x)$, then

$$\sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{d(x+tv, S)}{t^2} < \infty.$$

If $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, the P²GD map corresponds to the iteration map of [47, Algorithm 3] except that the initial step size for the backtracking procedure is chosen in a given bounded interval.

Algorithm 5.1 P²GD map

Require: $(\mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$ where \mathcal{E} is a Euclidean vector space, C is a nonempty closed subset of \mathcal{E} satisfying Assumption 2.1, $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable with ∇f locally Lipschitz continuous, $0 < \underline{\alpha} \leq \bar{\alpha} < \infty$, and $\beta, c \in (0, 1)$.

Input: $x \in C$ such that $s(x; f, C) > 0$.

Output: $y \in \text{P}^2\text{GD}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$.

- 1: Choose $g \in P_{T_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$, $\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$, and $y \in P_C(x + \alpha g)$;
 - 2: **while** $f(y) > f(x) - c\alpha s(x; f, C)^2$ **do**
 - 3: $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha\beta$;
 - 4: Choose $y \in P_C(x + \alpha g)$;
 - 5: **end while**
 - 6: Return y .
-

Let us recall that, since ∇f is locally Lipschitz continuous, for every closed ball $\mathcal{B} \subsetneq \mathcal{E}$,

$$\text{Lip}(\nabla f) := \sup_{\substack{x, y \in \mathcal{B} \\ x \neq y}} \frac{\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|}{\|x - y\|} < \infty,$$

which implies, by [39, Lemma 1.2.3], that, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$|f(y) - f(x) - \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle| \leq \frac{\text{Lip}_{\mathcal{B}}(\nabla f)}{2} \|y - x\|^2. \quad (20)$$

Proposition 5.1. *Let $x \in C$ and $\bar{\alpha} \in (0, \infty)$. Let $\mathcal{B} \subsetneq \mathcal{E}$ be a closed ball such that, for all $g \in P_{T_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$ and all $\alpha \in [0, \bar{\alpha}]$, $P_C(x + \alpha g) \subseteq \mathcal{B}$; an example of such a ball is $\mathcal{B}[x, 2\bar{\alpha} s(x; f, C)]$. If C satisfies Assumption 2.1, then, for all $g \in P_{T_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$ and all $\alpha \in [0, \bar{\alpha}]$,*

$$\sup f(P_C(x + \alpha g)) \leq f(x) + s(x; f, C)^2 \alpha (-1 + \kappa_{\mathcal{B}}(x; f, \bar{\alpha}) \alpha), \quad (21)$$

where

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{B}}(x; f, \bar{\alpha}) := u(x) \|\nabla f(x)\| + \frac{1}{2} \text{Lip}_{\mathcal{B}}(\nabla f) (\bar{\alpha} u(x) s(x; f, C) + 1)^2.$$

Proof. The example $\mathcal{B}[x, 2\bar{\alpha} s(x; f, C)]$ is correct because, for all $v \in T_C(x)$ and all $y \in P_C(x + v)$,

$$\|y - x\| = \|y - (x + v) + v\| \leq \|y - (x + v)\| + \|v\| = d(x + v, C) + \|v\| \leq \|(x + v) - x\| + \|v\| = 2\|v\|.$$

Let $g \in P_{T_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$. The proof of (21) is based on (20) and the equality $\langle \nabla f(x), g \rangle = -s(x; f, C)^2$ which holds by Proposition 4.2 since $T_C(x)$ is a closed cone. Let $L := \text{Lip}_{\mathcal{B}}(\nabla f)$. For all $\alpha \in [0, \bar{\alpha}]$ and all $y \in P_C(x + \alpha g)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & f(y) - f(x) \\ & \leq \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|y - x\|^2 \\ & = \langle \nabla f(x), y - (x + \alpha g) + \alpha g \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|y - (x + \alpha g) + \alpha g\|^2 \\ & = -\alpha s(x; f, C)^2 + \langle \nabla f(x), y - (x + \alpha g) \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|y - (x + \alpha g) + \alpha g\|^2 \\ & \leq -\alpha s(x; f, C)^2 + \|\nabla f(x)\| d(x + \alpha g, C) + \frac{L}{2} (d(x + \alpha g, C) + \alpha s(x; f, C))^2 \\ & \leq -\alpha s(x; f, C)^2 + \|\nabla f(x)\| u(x) \alpha^2 s(x; f, C)^2 + \frac{L}{2} (u(x) \alpha^2 s(x; f, C)^2 + \alpha s(x; f, C))^2 \\ & = \alpha s(x; f, C)^2 \left(-1 + \alpha \left(\|\nabla f(x)\| u(x) + \frac{L}{2} (u(x) \alpha s(x; f, C) + 1)^2 \right) \right) \\ & \leq \alpha s(x; f, C)^2 (-1 + \alpha \kappa_{\mathcal{B}}(x; f, \bar{\alpha})), \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows from Assumption 2.1. \square

In Proposition 5.1, the existence of a ball \mathcal{B} crucially relies on the upper bound $\bar{\alpha}$ required by Algorithm 5.1. Corollary 5.2 states that the while loop in Algorithm 5.1 terminates and produces a point satisfying an Armijo condition. It plays an instrumental role in the proof of Proposition 5.4.

Corollary 5.2. *The while loop in Algorithm 5.1 terminates and every $y \in \text{P}^2\text{GD}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$ satisfies the Armijo condition*

$$f(y) \leq f(x) - c \alpha s(x; f, C)^2$$

for some $\alpha \in \left[\min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, \beta \frac{1-c}{\kappa_{\mathcal{B}}(x; f, \bar{\alpha})} \right\}, \bar{\alpha} \right]$, where \mathcal{B} is any closed ball as in Proposition 5.1.

Proof. For all $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$,

$$f(x) + s(x; f, C)^2 \alpha (-1 + \kappa_{\mathcal{B}}(x; f, \bar{\alpha}) \alpha) \leq f(x) - c s(x; f, C)^2 \alpha \quad \text{iff} \quad \alpha \leq \frac{1-c}{\kappa_{\mathcal{B}}(x; f, \bar{\alpha})}.$$

Since the left-hand side of the first inequality is an upper bound on $f(P_C(x + \alpha g))$ for all $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha}]$, the Armijo condition is necessarily satisfied if $\alpha \in (0, \min\{\bar{\alpha}, \frac{1-c}{\kappa_{\mathcal{B}}(x; f, \bar{\alpha})}\}]$. Therefore, either the initial step size chosen in $[\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ satisfies the Armijo condition or the while loop ends with α such that $\frac{\alpha}{\beta} > \frac{1-c}{\kappa_{\mathcal{B}}(x; f, \bar{\alpha})}$. \square

5.2 The P²GDR map

In this section, under Assumption 2.2, we introduce the P²GDR map (Algorithm 5.2) and prove Proposition 5.4 from which we deduce Theorem 5.5 in Section 5.3. For convenience, we recall that Assumption 2.2 states that C satisfies the following conditions:

1. there exist a positive integer p and nonempty smooth submanifolds S_0, \dots, S_p of \mathcal{E} contained in C such that:
 - (a) for all $i, j \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, $i \neq j$ implies $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$;
 - (b) $\overline{S_p} = C$ and, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, $\overline{S_i} = \bigcup_{j=0}^i S_j$;
 - (c) if $p \geq 2$, then, for all $i \in \{2, \dots, p\}$, all $x \in S_i$, and all $j \in \{1, \dots, i-1\}$, $d(x, S_j) < d(x, S_{j-1})$;
2. Assumption 2.1 holds and, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, $u|_{S_i}$ is locally bounded;
3. for every $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, $T_C(\cdot)$ is continuous on S_i relative to S_i .

Note that, under Assumption 2.2, if its input x is in the stratum S_p , then the P²GD map (Algorithm 5.1) performs an iteration of the Riemannian gradient descent on S_p . Indeed, as explained in Section 2.1, for every $x \in S_p$, the tangent cone $T_C(x)$ equals the tangent space $T_{S_p}(x)$.

The P²GDR map involves the P²GD map and projections of a point onto its lower strata; the projection of a point onto each of its lower strata exists by the second statement of Proposition 5.3.

Proposition 5.3. *Assume that conditions 1(a) and 1(b) of Assumption 2.2 hold.*

1. *For all $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and all $x \in S_i$, $d(x, S_{i-1}) > 0$ and, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, i\}$, $d(x, S_j) \leq d(x, S_{j-1})$.*
2. *Condition 1(c) is equivalent to the following property: for all $i \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$ and all $x \in C \setminus \overline{S_i}$, $P_{S_i}(x) = P_{\overline{S_i}}(x)$.*

Proof. The first statement follows directly from condition 1(b). To prove the second, we assume that condition 1(c) holds and show that, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$ and all $x \in C \setminus \overline{S_i}$, $P_{\overline{S_i}}(x) \subseteq S_i$; this implies $P_{S_i}(x) = P_{\overline{S_i}}(x)$. If $i = 0$, this is because, by condition 1(b), $\overline{S_0} = S_0$. If $i \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$, this is because, by conditions 1(b) and 1(c), $d(x, \overline{S_i} \setminus S_i) = d(x, \overline{S_{i-1}}) = d(x, S_{i-1}) > d(x, S_i)$.

Conversely, assume that the property holds and that $p \geq 2$. Let $i \in \{2, \dots, p\}$, $x \in S_i$, and $j \in \{1, \dots, i-1\}$. By the first statement, $d(x, S_j) \leq d(x, S_{j-1})$. If $d(x, S_j) = d(x, S_{j-1})$, then $\overline{S_{j-1}} \cap P_{\overline{S_j}}(x) \neq \emptyset$, in contradiction with the property. Thus, $d(x, S_j) < d(x, S_{j-1})$. \square

The first statement of Proposition 5.3 shows that adding condition 1(c) to condition 1(b) ensures that the second inequality of the first statement is strict. The second statement shows that condition 1(c) ensures that the projection of a point onto each of its lower strata exists. In general, condition 1(c) cannot be removed. For example, if $\mathcal{E} := \mathbb{R}^2$, $C := \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (0, \infty)^2$, $S_0 := \{(0, 0)\}$, $S_1 := ((0, \infty) \times \{0\}) \cup (\{0\} \times (0, \infty))$, and $S_2 := \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus [0, \infty)^2$, then conditions 1(a) and 1(b) are satisfied but no point of $(-\infty, 0]^2$ has a projection onto S_1 .

The P²GDR map is defined as Algorithm 5.2. Given $x \in C$ as input, it proceeds as follows: (i) it finds $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$ such that $x \in S_i$ and computes i_* as the smallest $j \in \{0, \dots, i\}$ such that $d(x, S_j) \leq \Delta$ for some threshold $\Delta \in (0, \infty)$, (ii) for every $j \in \{i_*, \dots, i\}$, it applies the P²GD map (Algorithm 5.1) to a projection \hat{x}^j of x onto S_j , thereby producing a point \tilde{x}^j , and (iv) it outputs a point among $\tilde{x}^{i_*}, \dots, \tilde{x}^i$ that maximally decreases f .

Algorithm 5.2 P²GDR map

Require: $(\mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$ where \mathcal{E} is a Euclidean vector space, C is a nonempty closed subset of \mathcal{E} satisfying Assumption 2.2, $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable with ∇f locally Lipschitz continuous, $0 < \underline{\alpha} \leq \bar{\alpha} < \infty$, $\beta, c \in (0, 1)$, and $\Delta \in (0, \infty)$.

Input: $x \in C$ such that $s(x; f, C) > 0$.

Output: $y \in \text{P}^2\text{GDR}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$.

- 1: Let $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$ be such that $x \in S_i$;
 - 2: $i_* \leftarrow \min\{j \in \{0, \dots, i\} \mid d(x, S_j) \leq \Delta\}$;
 - 3: **for** $j \in \{i_*, \dots, i\}$ **do**
 - 4: Choose $\hat{x}^j \in P_{S_j}(x)$;
 - 5: Choose $\tilde{x}^j \in \text{P}^2\text{GD}(\hat{x}^j; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$;
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: Return $y \in \arg\min_{\{\tilde{x}^j \mid j \in \{i_*, \dots, i\}\}} f$.
-

Proposition 5.4 states that, given $\underline{x} \in C$ such that $s(\underline{x}; f, C) > 0$, the minimum decrease of the cost function obtained by applying the P²GDR map to any x sufficiently close to \underline{x} is bounded away from zero. This fundamental property, on which Theorem 5.5 is based, is not shared by the P²GD map. Indeed, the minimum decrease of the cost function obtained by applying the P²GD map to x that is guaranteed by the Armijo condition given in Corollary 5.2 can be arbitrarily small in any neighborhood of \underline{x} : if $s(\cdot; f, C)$ is not lower semicontinuous at \underline{x} , which is the case if \underline{x} is apocalyptic for f , or u is not locally bounded at \underline{x} , then, even for arbitrarily small $\rho \in (0, \infty)$, it may happen that

$$\inf_{x \in B[\underline{x}, \rho]} c \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, \beta \frac{1-c}{\kappa_B(x; f, \bar{\alpha})} \right\} s(x; f, C)^2 = 0.$$

In contrast, if x is sufficiently close to \underline{x} , by exploring potentially several strata, the P²GDR map applies the P²GD map notably to a projection of x onto the stratum containing \underline{x} which, by the standing assumptions and Corollary 5.2, produces a sufficient decrease of f .

Proposition 5.4. *For every $\underline{x} \in C$ such that $s(\underline{x}; f, C) > 0$, there exist $\varepsilon(\underline{x}), \delta(\underline{x}) \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for all $x \in B[\underline{x}, \varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap C$ and all $y \in \text{P}^2\text{GDR}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$,*

$$f(y) - f(x) \leq -\delta(\underline{x}). \quad (22)$$

Proof. Let $\underline{x} \in C$ be such that $s(\underline{x}; f, C) > 0$. Let $\underline{i} \in \{0, \dots, p\}$ be such that $\underline{x} \in S_{\underline{i}}$. The proof is divided into six steps. First, using the positivity of $d(\underline{x}, S_{\underline{i}-1})$ if $\underline{i} \geq 1$ (condition 1(b) of Assumption 2.2), the local boundedness of $u|_{S_{\underline{i}}}$ at \underline{x} (condition 2 of Assumption 2.2), the continuity of $s(\cdot; f, C)|_{S_{\underline{i}}}$ at \underline{x} (which holds by condition 3 of Assumption 2.2 and Corollary 4.10), the continuity of f at \underline{x} , and the local Lipschitz continuity of ∇f , we define $\bar{\rho}(\underline{x})$, $\bar{\kappa}(\underline{x}; f, \bar{\alpha})$, $\delta(\underline{x})$, and $\varepsilon(\underline{x})$ respectively as in (23), (24), (25), and (26). These definitions notably ensure that $f(B[\underline{x}, 2\varepsilon(\underline{x})]) \subseteq [f(\underline{x}) - \delta(\underline{x}), f(\underline{x}) + \delta(\underline{x})]$ and $s(B[\underline{x}, 2\varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap S_{\underline{i}}; f, C) \subseteq [\frac{1}{2}s(\underline{x}; f, C), \frac{3}{2}s(\underline{x}; f, C)]$. Second, we deduce from the preceding step that, for all $\hat{x} \in B[\underline{x}, 2\varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap S_{\underline{i}}$, $\kappa_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\hat{x}; f, \bar{\alpha}) \leq \bar{\kappa}(\underline{x}; f, \bar{\alpha})$. Third, we establish the inclusion $B[\underline{x}, \varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap C \subseteq \bigcup_{i=\underline{i}}^p S_i$. Fourth, we prove that, given $x \in B[\underline{x}, \varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap C$ as input, the P²GDR map considers $\hat{x}^{\underline{i}} \in P_{S_{\underline{i}}}(x) \subseteq B[\underline{x}, 2\varepsilon(\underline{x})]$ and $\tilde{x}^{\underline{i}} \in \text{P}^2\text{GD}(\hat{x}^{\underline{i}}; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$. Fifth, we prove that Corollary 5.2 applies to $\tilde{x}^{\underline{i}}$ with the ball $B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]$. Sixth, we deduce the inequality (22) from the upper bound $\bar{\kappa}(\underline{x}; f, \bar{\alpha})$ and the Armijo condition respectively obtained in the second and fifth steps.

Step 1: definition of $\bar{\rho}(\underline{x})$, $\bar{\kappa}(\underline{x}; f, \bar{\alpha})$, $\delta(\underline{x})$, and $\varepsilon(\underline{x})$. By condition 2 of Assumption 2.2, $u|_{S_{\underline{i}}}$ is locally bounded at \underline{x} and thus there exist $\rho_u(\underline{x}), \bar{u}(\underline{x}) \in (0, \infty)$ such that $u(B[\underline{x}, \rho_u(\underline{x})] \cap S_{\underline{i}}) \subseteq [0, \bar{u}(\underline{x})]$. Define

$$\bar{\rho}(\underline{x}) := 3\bar{\alpha} s(\underline{x}; f, C) + \Delta, \quad (23)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}(\underline{x}; f, \bar{\alpha}) := \frac{3}{2}\bar{u}(\underline{x})\|\nabla f(\underline{x})\| + \frac{1}{2} \text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\nabla f) \left(\frac{3}{2}\bar{\alpha}\bar{u}(\underline{x}) s(\underline{x}; f, C) + 1 \right)^2, \quad (24)$$

$$\delta(\underline{x}) := \frac{c}{12} \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, \beta \frac{1-c}{\bar{\kappa}(\underline{x}; f, \bar{\alpha})} \right\} s(\underline{x}; f, C)^2. \quad (25)$$

Since f is continuous at \underline{x} , there exists $\rho_f(\underline{x}) \in (0, \infty)$ such that $f(B[\underline{x}, \rho_f(\underline{x})]) \subseteq [f(\underline{x}) - \delta(\underline{x}), f(\underline{x}) + \delta(\underline{x})]$. By condition 3 of Assumption 2.2 and Corollary 4.10, $s(\cdot; f, C)|_{S_i}$ is continuous at \underline{x} and thus there exists $\rho(\underline{x}) \in (0, \infty)$ such that $s(B[\underline{x}, \rho(\underline{x})] \cap S_i; f, C) \subseteq [\frac{1}{2}s(\underline{x}; f, C), \frac{3}{2}s(\underline{x}; f, C)]$. By Proposition 5.3, if $i \geq 1$, then $d(\underline{x}, S_{i-1}) > 0$. Define

$$\varepsilon(\underline{x}) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \rho_u(\underline{x}), \rho_f(\underline{x}), \rho(\underline{x}), \Delta, \frac{\|\nabla f(\underline{x})\|}{2 \text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \Delta]}(\nabla f)}, d(\underline{x}, S_{i-1}) \right\} & \text{if } i \geq 1, \\ \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \rho_u(\underline{x}), \rho_f(\underline{x}), \rho(\underline{x}), \Delta, \frac{\|\nabla f(\underline{x})\|}{2 \text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \Delta]}(\nabla f)} \right\} & \text{if } i = 0. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

Step 2: for all $\hat{x} \in B[\underline{x}, 2\varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap S_i$, $\kappa_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\hat{x}; f, \bar{\alpha}) \leq \bar{\kappa}(\underline{x}; f, \bar{\alpha})$. Let $\hat{x} \in B[\underline{x}, 2\varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap S_i$. Since $2\varepsilon(\underline{x}) \leq \rho_u(\underline{x})$, we have $u(\hat{x}) \leq \bar{u}(\underline{x})$. Since $2\varepsilon(\underline{x}) \leq \Delta$, it holds that $\underline{x}, \hat{x} \in B[\underline{x}, \Delta]$ and thus

$$\|\nabla f(\hat{x}) - \nabla f(\underline{x})\| \leq \text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \Delta]}(\nabla f) \|\hat{x} - \underline{x}\| \leq \text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \Delta]}(\nabla f) 2\varepsilon(\underline{x}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(\underline{x})\|,$$

where the last inequality follows from the inequality $2\varepsilon(\underline{x}) \leq \frac{\|\nabla f(\underline{x})\|}{2 \text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \Delta]}(\nabla f)}$. Thus, since $\|\nabla f(\hat{x})\| - \|\nabla f(\underline{x})\| \leq \|\nabla f(\hat{x}) - \nabla f(\underline{x})\|$, we have $\|\nabla f(\hat{x})\| \in [\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla f(\underline{x})\|, \frac{3}{2}\|\nabla f(\underline{x})\|]$. Therefore, by (24),

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\hat{x}; f, \bar{\alpha}) &= u(\hat{x}) \|\nabla f(\hat{x})\| + \frac{1}{2} \text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\nabla f) (\bar{\alpha} u(\hat{x}) s(\hat{x}; f, C) + 1)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \bar{u}(\underline{x}) \|\nabla f(\underline{x})\| + \frac{1}{2} \text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\nabla f) \left(\frac{3}{2} \bar{\alpha} \bar{u}(\underline{x}) s(\underline{x}; f, C) + 1 \right)^2 \\ &= \bar{\kappa}(\underline{x}; f, \bar{\alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: $B[\underline{x}, \varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap C \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^p S_i$. Let $x \in B[\underline{x}, \varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap C$. Let $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$ be such that $x \in S_i$. Then, $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. This is obvious if $i = 0$. If $i \geq 1$, this is because

$$d(x, S_{i-1}) \geq d(\underline{x}, S_{i-1}) - \|x - \underline{x}\| \geq d(\underline{x}, S_{i-1}) - \varepsilon(\underline{x}) \geq \frac{1}{2} d(\underline{x}, S_{i-1}) > 0,$$

where the first inequality follows from [53, Proposition 1.3.17].

Step 4: given $x \in B[\underline{x}, \varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap C$ as input, the $P^2\text{GDR}$ map considers $\hat{x}^i \in P_{S_i}(x) \subseteq B[\underline{x}, 2\varepsilon(\underline{x})]$ and $\tilde{x}^i \in P^2\text{GD}(\hat{x}^i; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$. Since

$$d(x, S_i) \leq \|x - \underline{x}\| \leq \varepsilon(\underline{x}) \leq \Delta,$$

it holds that $i_* \leq i \leq i$ and thus, given x as input, the $P^2\text{GDR}$ map considers $\hat{x}^i \in P_{S_i}(x)$ and $\tilde{x}^i \in P^2\text{GD}(\hat{x}^i; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$. Moreover,

$$\|\hat{x}^i - \underline{x}\| \leq \|\hat{x}^i - x\| + \|x - \underline{x}\| \leq d(x, S_i) + \varepsilon(\underline{x}) \leq 2\varepsilon(\underline{x}).$$

Step 5: Corollary 5.2 applies to \tilde{x}^i with the ball $B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]$. By the preceding step, $\hat{x}^i \in B[\underline{x}, 2\varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap S_i$. Therefore, since $2\varepsilon(\underline{x}) \leq \rho(\underline{x})$, $s(\hat{x}^i; f, C) \in [\frac{1}{2}s(\underline{x}; f, C), \frac{3}{2}s(\underline{x}; f, C)]$. Thus, $B[\hat{x}^i, 2\bar{\alpha}s(\hat{x}^i; f, C)] \subseteq B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]$; indeed, by (23), for all $y \in B[\hat{x}^i, 2\bar{\alpha}s(\hat{x}^i; f, C)]$,

$$\|y - \underline{x}\| \leq \|y - \hat{x}^i\| + \|\hat{x}^i - \underline{x}\| \leq 2\bar{\alpha}s(\hat{x}^i; f, C) + 2\varepsilon(\underline{x}) \leq 3\bar{\alpha}s(\underline{x}; f, C) + \Delta = \bar{\rho}(\underline{x}).$$

Step 6: conclusion. Since $\hat{x}^i \in B[\underline{x}, 2\varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap S_i$, it holds that $f(\hat{x}^i) \leq f(x) + 2\delta(\underline{x})$ (because $|f(x) - f(\underline{x})| \leq \delta(\underline{x})$ and $|f(\hat{x}^i) - f(\underline{x})| \leq \delta(\underline{x})$) and $\kappa_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\hat{x}^i; f, \bar{\alpha}) \leq \bar{\kappa}(\underline{x}; f, \bar{\alpha})$. Therefore, by applying Corollary 5.2 to \tilde{x}^i with the ball $B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]$, we successively obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(\tilde{x}^i) &\leq f(\hat{x}^i) - c \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, \beta \frac{1-c}{\kappa_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\hat{x}^i; f, \bar{\alpha})} \right\} s(\hat{x}^i; f, C)^2 \\ &\leq f(x) + 2\delta(\underline{x}) - \frac{c}{4} \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, \beta \frac{1-c}{\bar{\kappa}(\underline{x}; f, \bar{\alpha})} \right\} s(\underline{x}; f, C)^2 \\ &= f(x) - \delta(\underline{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $y \in \text{P}^2\text{GDR}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$,

$$f(y) \leq f(\hat{x}^i) \leq f(x) - \delta(\underline{x}),$$

which completes the proof. \square

5.3 The P^2GDR algorithm

The P^2GDR algorithm is defined as Algorithm 5.3. It produces a sequence along which f is strictly decreasing.

Algorithm 5.3 P^2GDR

Require: $(\mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$ where \mathcal{E} is a Euclidean vector space, C is a nonempty closed subset of \mathcal{E} satisfying Assumption 2.2, $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable with ∇f locally Lipschitz continuous, $0 < \underline{\alpha} \leq \bar{\alpha} < \infty$, $\beta, c \in (0, 1)$, and $\Delta \in (0, \infty)$.

Input: $x_0 \in C$.

Output: a sequence in C .

```

1:  $i \leftarrow 0$ ;
2: while  $s(x_i; f, C) > 0$  do
3:   Choose  $x_{i+1} \in \text{P}^2\text{GDR}(x_i; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$ ;
4:    $i \leftarrow i + 1$ ;
5: end while
```

Theorem 5.5 states that P^2GDR accumulates at stationary points of (1) and is thus apocalypse-free. However, it does not state that an accumulation point necessarily exists.

Theorem 5.5. *Consider a sequence constructed by P^2GDR (Algorithm 5.3). If this sequence is finite, then its last element is stationary for (1), i.e., is a zero of the stationarity measure $s(\cdot; f, C)$ defined in (2). If it is infinite, then all of its accumulation points are stationary for (1).*

Proof. We use the framework proposed in [45, §1.3]. Clearly, if P^2GDR produces a finite sequence, then its last element is stationary. Let us therefore assume that P^2GDR produces an infinite sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and that a subsequence $(x_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $x \in C$. For the sake of contradiction, assume that x is not stationary for (1) and let $\varepsilon(x)$ and $\delta(x)$ be given by Proposition 5.4. There exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all integers $k \geq K$, $x_{i_k} \in B[x, \varepsilon(x)]$ and thus $f(x_{i_{k+1}}) - f(x_{i_k}) \leq -\delta(x)$. Thus, since $(f(x_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is decreasing, for all integers $k \geq K$,

$$f(x_{i_{k+1}}) - f(x_{i_k}) \leq -\delta(x). \quad (27)$$

Since f is continuous, $(f(x_{i_k}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $f(x)$. Therefore, letting k tend to infinity in (27) yields a contradiction. \square

Corollary 5.6 considers a sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ produced by P^2GDR . It guarantees that, if C has no serendipitous point, which is notably the case of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ (Proposition 6.14), and the sublevel set $\{x \in C \mid f(x) \leq f(x_0)\}$ is bounded, then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$, and all accumulation points, of which there exists at least one, have the same image by f .

Corollary 5.6. *Let $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence produced by P^2GDR (Algorithm 5.3). The sequence has at least one accumulation point if and only if $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|x_i\| < \infty$. If C has no serendipitous point, then, for every convergent subsequence $(x_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s(x_{i_k}; f, C) = 0$. If, moreover, $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, which is the case notably if the sublevel set $\{x \in C \mid f(x) \leq f(x_0)\}$ is bounded, then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$, and all accumulation points have the same image by f .*

Proof. The “if and only if” statement is a classical result. Assume that C has no serendipitous point. Then, Proposition 4.7 implies that $s(\cdot; f, C)$ goes to zero along every convergent subsequence of $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Assume further that $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded and let us prove that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$. Observe that $(s(x_i; f, C))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded and let $s \in [0, \infty)$ be an accumulation point. It suffices to prove

that $s = 0$. There exists a subsequence $(x_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $s = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s(x_{i_k}; f, C)$. Since $(x_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, it contains a convergent subsequence $(x_{i_{k_l}})_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ and, by Proposition 4.7, $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} s(x_{i_{k_l}}; f, C) = 0$, which establishes the result. The final claim follows from the argument given in the proof of [45, Theorem 65]. Specifically, if $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, then it contains at least one convergent subsequence. Assume that $(x_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(x_{j_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converge respectively to \underline{x} and \bar{x} . The sequence $(f(x_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is decreasing and, since $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded and f is continuous, it converges to $\inf_{i \in \mathbb{N}} f(x_i)$. Therefore, $f(\underline{x}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(x_{i_k}) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} f(x_i) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(x_{j_k}) = f(\bar{x})$. \square

Corollary 5.6 shows that the stopping criterion defined by (19) is always eventually satisfied by P²GDR if C has no serendipitous point and the generated sequence has an accumulation point. Indeed, if C has no serendipitous point and P²GDR produces a sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ that has an accumulation point, i.e., that does not diverge to infinity, then, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, the set $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid s(x_i; f, C) \leq \varepsilon\}$ is nonempty and thus its minimum i_ε exists. We further discuss this stopping criterion in Section 6.2.6 and use it in Section 6.2.7.

6 Examples of stratified sets satisfying Assumption 2.2

In this section, we prove Theorem 6.1.

Theorem 6.1. *If C is $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, or $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$, then:*

1. *Assumption 2.2 is satisfied;*
2. *there exists $a \in (0, 1)$ such that, for all $x \in C$,*

$$u(x) = \sup_{v \in T_C(x) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{d(x + v, C)}{\|v\|^2} \in [a\tilde{u}(x), \tilde{u}(x)],$$

where $\tilde{u}(x) := 0$ if $x \in S_0$ and $\tilde{u}(x) := \frac{1}{d(x, S_{i-1})}$ if $x \in S_i$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$;

3. *u is not locally bounded at any point of $C \setminus S_p$;*
4. *the set of apocalyptic points of C is $C \setminus S_p$;*
5. *for all $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$ and all $x \in S_i$, $\overline{N}_C(x) = N_{S_i}(x)$.*

Moreover, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ has no serendipitous point while, if C is $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ or $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$, then the set of serendipitous points of C is $C \setminus S_p$.

Proof. The sets $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, and $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ are studied in Sections 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3, respectively. As shown in Table 6.1, most of the statements of the theorem are proven in those three sections. We complete the proof here. First, we establish the second statement for $x \in S_0$. If C is one of the three sets, then C is a closed cone, which implies $T_C(0) = C$, and $S_0 = \{0\}$. The result follows. Second, we prove that condition 2 of Assumption 2.2 is satisfied. For every $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, $\tilde{u}|_{S_i}$ is locally bounded. This is clear if $i = 0$ since $\tilde{u}|_{S_0} = 0$. If $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, then $\tilde{u}|_{S_i}$ is continuous (as the inverse of $d(\cdot, S_{i-1})|_{S_i}$ which is continuous by [53, Proposition 1.3.17] and positive by Proposition 5.3) and thus locally bounded. The result then follows from the second statement. Third, we prove that u is not locally bounded at $\underline{x} \in S_i$ if $i \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$. Let $M, \delta \in (0, \infty)$. By condition 1(b) of Assumption 2.2, $\underline{x} \in \overline{S_{i+1}}$ and thus there exists $x \in B[\underline{x}, \min\{\delta, \frac{a}{M}\}] \cap S_{i+1}$. It follows that $u(x) \geq \frac{a}{d(x, S_i)} \geq \frac{a}{\|x - \underline{x}\|} \geq M$. \square

Applications of problem (1) with C being $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, or $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ abound; we give some examples here and refer to [30, §5], [38], and the references therein. If $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, applications include matrix equations, model reduction, matrix sensing, and matrix completion; see, e.g., [47, 23] and the references therein. Problem (1) with $C = S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ appears as the relaxation of combinatorial optimization problems. Motivated by that application, the feasible set $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ is studied in [13, 14] with a linear cost function and in [31] with a smooth cost function. Problem (1) with $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ includes

<i>Result</i>	$C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$	$C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$	$C = \mathbb{S}_{\leq r}^+(n)$
Condition 1 of Assumption 2.2	Proposition 6.3	Section 6.2.1	Section 6.3.1
Second statement for $x \in C \setminus S_0$	Proposition 6.5	Proposition 6.12	Proposition 6.23
Condition 3 of Assumption 2.2	Proposition 6.6	[41, Theorem 4.1]	Proposition 6.26
Fourth and “Moreover” statements	Proposition 6.10	[35, Proposition 2.10] Proposition 6.14	Proposition 6.31
Fifth statement	Corollary 6.9	Proposition 6.13	Corollary 6.30

Table 6.1: Proof of Theorem 6.1.

the sparse nonnegative least squares problem as a particular instance; see [38] and the references therein.

In what follows, for all integers i and j , we write $\delta_{i,j} := 1$ if $i = j$ and $\delta_{i,j} := 0$ if $i \neq j$.

6.1 The set of nonnegative sparse vectors

In this section, $\mathcal{E} := \mathbb{R}^n$ and $C := \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ for some positive integers n and $s < n$, and \mathbb{R}^n is endowed with the *dot product* $\langle x, y \rangle := \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i$. We use the following notation throughout the section. If $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, x_i denotes the i th component of x , and we also write x as $(x_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{R}_+^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_i \geq 0 \ \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}, \quad \mathbb{R}_-^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_i \leq 0 \ \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}.$$

A sequence in \mathbb{R}^n is denoted by $(x^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. By [21, Definition 2.1], the *support* of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as

$$\text{supp}(x) := \{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid x_i \neq 0\}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |\text{supp}(x)| \leq s\}.$$

We also write

$$\mathbb{R}_{< s}^n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |\text{supp}(x)| < s\}$$

and, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$,

$$\mathbb{R}_i^n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |\text{supp}(x)| = i\}.$$

For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, it holds that

$$\text{supp}(x + y) \subseteq \text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(y). \quad (28)$$

In Section 6.1.1, projection onto $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is constructed (Proposition 6.2) and it is proven that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ admits a stratification satisfying condition 1 of Assumption 2.2 (Proposition 6.3). In Section 6.1.2, we determine the tangent cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ (Proposition 6.4) and deduce that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ satisfies the second statement of Theorem 6.1 (Proposition 6.5) and condition 3 of Assumption 2.2 (Proposition 6.6). In Section 6.1.3, we deduce the regular normal cone, the normal cone, and the Clarke normal cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, and prove that the sets of apocalyptic and serendipitous points of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ both equal $\mathbb{R}_{< s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ (Proposition 6.10). Finally, in Section 6.1.4, we present an example of P^2 GD following an apocalypse on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$.

6.1.1 Stratification of the set of nonnegative sparse vectors

In this section, we prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ admits a stratification satisfying condition 1 of Assumption 2.2. The number of nonzero components stratifies $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$:

$$\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n = \bigcup_{i=0}^s \mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

Proposition 6.2 shows how to project onto $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and is used in the proof that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ satisfies condition 1(c) of Assumption 2.2.

Proposition 6.2 (projection onto the set of nonnegative sparse vectors [48, Proposition 3.2]). *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $P_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$ is the set of all possible outputs of Algorithm 6.1, and $d(x, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)$ is the sum of the absolute values of the components of x that have been set to zero by the projection.*

Algorithm 6.1 Projection onto the set of nonnegative sparse vectors

Require: (n, s) where n and s are positive integers such that $s < n$.

Input: $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Output: $y \in P_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$.

```

1:  $y \leftarrow x$ ;
2: for  $i \in \text{supp}(x)$  do
3:   if  $x_i < 0$  then
4:      $y_i \leftarrow 0$ ;
5:   end if
6: end for
7: while  $|\text{supp}(y)| > s$  do
8:   Choose  $i \in \arg\min_{j \in \text{supp}(y)} |y_j|$ ;
9:    $y_i \leftarrow 0$ ;
10: end while
11: Return  $y$ .
```

Based on Proposition 6.2, we now prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ satisfies condition 1 of Assumption 2.2.

Proposition 6.3 (stratification of the set of nonnegative sparse vectors). *The stratification $\{\mathbb{R}_0^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n, \dots, \mathbb{R}_s^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n\}$ of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ satisfies condition 1 of Assumption 2.2.*

Proof. Using the submanifold property [1, Proposition 3.3.2], we first prove that, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$, $\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is an i -dimensional embedded submanifold of \mathbb{R}^n . For $\mathbb{R}_0^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n = \{0\}^n$, we take $U := \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n : x \mapsto x$, and we have

$$\{x \in U \mid \varphi(x) \in \{0\}^n\} = \{0\}^n = (\mathbb{R}_0^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap U.$$

Let $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. For $U := B(\underline{x}, d(\underline{x}, \mathbb{R}_{i-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n))$ and

$$\varphi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n : x \mapsto ((x_j)_{j \in \text{supp}(\underline{x})}, (x_j)_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(\underline{x})}),$$

we have

$$\{x \in U \mid \varphi(x) \in \mathbb{R}^i \times \{0\}^{n-i}\} = \{x \in U \mid x_j = 0 \forall j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(\underline{x})\} = (\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap U.$$

Thus, condition 1(a) is satisfied. By Proposition 6.2, condition 1(c) is satisfied too. To establish condition 1(b), it suffices to prove that, for all $i, j \in \{0, \dots, s\}$, $(\mathbb{R}_j^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap \overline{\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n} = \emptyset$ if $j > i$ and $\mathbb{R}_j^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}$ if $j \leq i$. Let $i, j \in \{0, \dots, s\}$. If $j > i$, then, by Proposition 6.2, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_j^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, $B(x, d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)) \cap (\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n) = \emptyset$ and thus $x \notin \overline{\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}$. If $j \leq i$, then, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_j^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, $B[x, \varepsilon] \cap (\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n) \neq \emptyset$. This is clear if $j = i$. Let us prove it in the case where $j < i$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_j^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$. Let $I(x) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$ such that $|I(x)| = i - j$. Define $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by $y_k := \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}$ if $k \in I(x)$ and $y_k := 0$ otherwise. Then, $x + y \in B[x, \varepsilon] \cap (\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)$. \square

6.1.2 Tangent cone to the set of nonnegative sparse vectors

In this section, we give an explicit description of the tangent cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and show how to project onto it (Proposition 6.4). Then, we prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ satisfies the second statement of Theorem 6.1 (Proposition 6.5) and condition 3 of Assumption 2.2 (Proposition 6.6).

Proposition 6.4 (tangent cone to the set of nonnegative sparse vectors). *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$,*

$$T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |\text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(v)| \leq s, v_i \geq 0 \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\},$$

$\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is geometrically derivable at x , and, for every $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)}(v)$ is the set of all possible outputs of Algorithm 6.2.

Proof. We establish the equation for the tangent cone; the projection onto it follows. Since $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is a closed cone, $T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(0) = \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, in agreement with the equation, and $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is geometrically derivable at 0. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_j^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ with $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Then, $d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n) = \min_{i \in \text{supp}(x)} x_i$ and for all $t \in \left(0, \frac{d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)}{2\|v\|_\infty}\right)$:

- for all $i \in \text{supp}(x) \setminus \text{supp}(v)$, $x_i + tv_i = x_i \geq d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)$;
- for all $i \in \text{supp}(v) \setminus \text{supp}(x)$, $|x_i + tv_i| = t|v_i| \in (0, \frac{1}{2}d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n))$;
- for all $i \in \text{supp}(x) \cap \text{supp}(v)$, $x_i + tv_i \geq x_i - t|v_i| > \frac{1}{2}d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)$;
- for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus (\text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(v))$, $x_i + tv_i = 0$.

Thus, for all $t \in \left(0, \frac{d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)}{2\|v\|_\infty}\right)$, $\text{supp}(x + tv) = \text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(v)$.

We establish the inclusion \supseteq . Assume that $|\text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(v)| \leq s$ and $v_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$. Then, for all $t \in \left(0, \frac{d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)}{2\|v\|_\infty}\right)$, $x + tv \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and thus $d(x + tv, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)/t = 0$. Therefore, $\lim_{t \searrow 0} d(x + tv, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)/t = 0$ and it follows that $v \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$ and v is geometrically derivable.

We now establish the inclusion \subseteq . Assume that v is not in the right-hand side. We first consider the case where there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$ such that $v_i < 0$. Then, for all $t \in \left(0, \frac{d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)}{2\|v\|_\infty}\right)$, $x + tv \notin \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $d(x + tv, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)/t \geq -v_i$. Therefore, $\lim_{t \searrow 0} d(x + tv, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)/t = -v_i > 0$ and it follows that $v \notin T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$. We now consider the case where $|\text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(v)| > s$. Then, $\text{supp}(v) \setminus \text{supp}(x) \neq \emptyset$ and, for all $t \in \left(0, \frac{d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)}{2\|v\|_\infty}\right)$, $x + tv \notin \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $d(x + tv, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)/t \geq \min_{i \in \text{supp}(v) \setminus \text{supp}(x)} |v_i|$. Therefore, $\lim_{t \searrow 0} d(x + tv, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)/t \geq \min_{i \in \text{supp}(v) \setminus \text{supp}(x)} |v_i| > 0$, which shows that $v \notin T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$. \square

Algorithm 6.2 Projection onto the tangent cone to the set of nonnegative sparse vectors

Require: (n, s, x) where n and s are positive integers such that $s < n$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$.

Input: $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Output: $w \in P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)}(v)$.

```

1:  $w \leftarrow v$ ;
2: for  $i \in \text{supp}(v) \setminus \text{supp}(x)$  do
3:   if  $v_i < 0$  then
4:      $w_i \leftarrow 0$ ;
5:   end if
6: end for
7: while  $|\text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(w)| > s$  do
8:   Choose  $i \in \arg\min_{j \in \text{supp}(w) \setminus \text{supp}(x)} |w_j|$ ;
9:    $w_i \leftarrow 0$ ;
10: end while
11: Return  $w$ .
```

Proposition 6.5 shows that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ satisfies the second statement of Theorem 6.1.

Proposition 6.5. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus \{0\}^n$,

$$\sup_{v \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) \setminus \{0\}^n} \frac{d(x+v, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)}{\|v\|^2} \in \left[\frac{1}{4} \tilde{u}(x), \tilde{u}(x) \right],$$

where $\tilde{u}(x) := \frac{1}{d(x, \mathbb{R}_{i-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)}$ if $x \in \mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$.

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_j^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ with $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. We first establish the upper bound. If $\|v\| < \frac{1}{\tilde{u}(x)}$, then $x+v \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Indeed:

- for all $i \in \text{supp}(x) \setminus \text{supp}(v)$, $x_i + v_i = x_i \geq d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)$;
- for all $i \in \text{supp}(v) \setminus \text{supp}(x)$, $x_i + v_i = v_i \in (0, d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n))$;
- for all $i \in \text{supp}(x) \cap \text{supp}(v)$, $x_i + v_i \geq x_i - |v_i| > 0$;
- for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus (\text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(v))$, $x_i + v_i = 0$.

Thus, if $\|v\| < \frac{1}{\tilde{u}(x)}$, then $d(x+v, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n) = 0$ and $d(x+v, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)/\|v\|^2 = 0 \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{u}(x)}$. If $\|v\| \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{u}(x)}$, then

$$\frac{d(x+v, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)}{\|v\|^2} \leq \frac{\|(x+v) - x\|}{\|v\|^2} = \frac{1}{\|v\|} \leq \tilde{u}(x).$$

The lower bound follows from the fact that, if $i \in \text{supp}(x)$, $x_i = d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)$, and $v := (-2x_i \delta_{i,k})_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) \setminus \{0\}^n$, then $d(x+v, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)/\|v\|^2 = \tilde{u}(x)/4$. \square

Proposition 6.6 states that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ satisfies condition 3 of Assumption 2.2.

Proposition 6.6. For every $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$, the correspondence $T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(\cdot)$ is continuous at every $x \in \mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ relative to $\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$.

Proof. The result is clear if $i = 0$ since $\mathbb{R}_0^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n = \{0\}^n$. Let us therefore consider $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. We have to prove that, for every sequence $(x^j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ converging to $x \in \mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, it holds that

$$\overline{\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^j)} \subseteq T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) \subseteq \underline{\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^j)}.$$

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Then, for all $y \in B(x, d(x, \mathbb{R}_{i-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)) \cap (\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)$, $\text{supp}(y) = \text{supp}(x)$ and thus, by Proposition 6.4, $T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(y) = T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$. Thus, the result follows from the fact that a sequence $(x^j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ converging to x contains finitely many elements in $\mathbb{R}_i^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B(x, d(x, \mathbb{R}_{i-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n))$. \square

6.1.3 Normal cones to the set of nonnegative sparse vectors

In this section, we determine the regular normal cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ (Proposition 6.7). Based on that, we deduce the normal cone and the Clarke normal cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ (Proposition 6.8 and Corollary 6.9), and we prove that the sets of apocalyptic and serendipitous points of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ both equal $\mathbb{R}_{< s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ (Proposition 6.10).

Proposition 6.7 (regular normal cone to the set of nonnegative sparse vectors). For all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$,

$$\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) = \begin{cases} \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\} & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}_s^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\ \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\} & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}_{< s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The proof is based on Proposition 6.4. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$. By (12),

$$\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) = \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle w, v \rangle \leq 0 \ \forall v \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) \right\}.$$

Assume that $x \in \mathbb{R}_{< s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Then, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $v := (\delta_{i,j})_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$ and, for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\langle w, v \rangle = w_i$. Moreover, for all $i \in \text{supp}(x)$, $v := (-\delta_{i,j})_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$ and,

for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\langle w, v \rangle = -w_i$. Thus, $\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\}$. Assume now that $x \in \mathbb{R}_s^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Then, for all $v \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$ and all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$, $v_i = 0$. Thus, for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $v \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$, $\langle w, v \rangle = \sum_{i \in \text{supp}(x)} w_i v_i$. Since, for all $i \in \text{supp}(x)$, $v := (\delta_{i,j})_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$, $-v \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$, and, for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\langle w, v \rangle = w_i$, we have $\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) \subseteq \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\}$. The converse inclusion also holds, and the result follows. \square

Proposition 6.8 (normal cone to the set of nonnegative sparse vectors [48, Theorem 3.4]). *For all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$,*

$$N_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) = \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) \cup \{w \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq n-s}^n \mid \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\}.$$

In particular, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is not Clarke regular on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$.

Proof. We provide an alternative proof to the one of [48, Theorem 3.4]. This argument is based on the definition (13) of the normal cone and is used again in the proof of Proposition 6.10.

By [46, Example 6.8], the result follows from Proposition 6.7 if $x \in \mathbb{R}_s^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$. We first establish the inclusion \subseteq . Let $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ converging to x . We have to prove that

$$\overline{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}} \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^k) \subseteq \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) \cup \{w \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq n-s}^n \mid \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\}.$$

Let $w \in \overline{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}} \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^k)$. Then, w is an accumulation point of a sequence $(w^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $w^k \in \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^k)$. If $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ contains finitely many elements in \mathbb{R}_s^n , then $w \in \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$. Indeed, in that case, there exists a strictly increasing sequence $(k_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} such that $(w^{k_l})_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to w and, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $x^{k_l} \in \mathbb{R}_{< s}^n$, $\text{supp}(x) \subseteq \text{supp}(x^{k_l})$, and $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq \text{supp}(w^{k_l})$. Thus, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, since $w^{k_l} \in \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^{k_l})$, it holds that $w^{k_l} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $\text{supp}(w^{k_l}) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x^{k_l})$. Therefore, $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq \text{supp}(w^{k_0}) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x^{k_0}) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$, which shows that $w \in \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$. If $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ contains infinitely many elements in \mathbb{R}_s^n , then $w \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq n-s}^n$ and $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$. Indeed, in that case, there exists a strictly increasing sequence $(k_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} such that $(w^{k_l})_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to w and, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $x^{k_l} \in \mathbb{R}_s^n$, $\text{supp}(x) \subseteq \text{supp}(x^{k_l})$, and $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq \text{supp}(w^{k_l})$. Thus, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, since $w^{k_l} \in \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^{k_l})$, it holds that $\text{supp}(w^{k_l}) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x^{k_l})$. Therefore, $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq \text{supp}(w^{k_0}) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x^{k_0}) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$ and $|\text{supp}(w)| \leq n - s$.

We now establish the inclusion \supseteq . The inclusion $N_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) \supseteq \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$ holds by definition of the normal cone. Let $w \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq n-s}^n$ such that $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$. Let $I(x) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus (\text{supp}(w) \cup \text{supp}(x))$ such that $|I(x)| = s - |\text{supp}(x)|$; this is possible since $|\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus (\text{supp}(w) \cup \text{supp}(x))| = n - |\text{supp}(w)| - |\text{supp}(x)| \geq s - |\text{supp}(x)|$. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let

$$x_i^k := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k+1} & \text{if } i \in I(x), \\ x_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{supp}(x^k) = \text{supp}(x) \cup I(x)$, thus $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x^k)$, and therefore $w \in \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^k)$. It follows that $w \in \overline{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}} \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^k)$. \square

Corollary 6.9 (Clarke normal cone to the set of nonnegative sparse vectors). *For all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$,*

$$\overline{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\}.$$

By Proposition 6.8, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is not Clarke regular on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Proposition 6.10 states that every point of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is apocalyptic, which is a stronger result by [35, Corollary 2.15].

Proposition 6.10. *The set of apocalyptic points of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and the set of serendipitous points of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ both equal $\mathbb{R}_{< s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$.*

Proof. We use Proposition 4.9. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_s^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ converging to x . Since $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ contains finitely many elements not in $B(x, d(x, \mathbb{R}_{s-1}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_s^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, we can assume that $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is in $\mathbb{R}_s^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Therefore, by Proposition 6.6, $\overline{\lim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^k) = T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$, and thus $(\overline{\lim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^k))^* = \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$. It follows that x is neither apocalyptic nor serendipitous.

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_j^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ with $j \in \{0, \dots, s-1\}$. Let $I(x) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$ such that $|I(x)| = s - j$. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$x_i^k := \begin{cases} x_i & \text{if } i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus I(x), \\ \frac{1}{k+1} & \text{if } i \in I(x). \end{cases}$$

Then, $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to x . Moreover, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, since $\text{supp}(x^k) = \text{supp}(x) \cup I(x)$, it holds that $x^k \in \mathbb{R}_s^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and

$$T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^k) = T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^0).$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^k) = T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^0).$$

Therefore,

$$\left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^k) \right)^* = \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^0).$$

The result follows from Proposition 4.9 since, by Proposition 6.7, neither of $\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x)$ and $\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^0)$ is a subset of the other. \square

6.1.4 P²GD following an apocalypse on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$

On $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, P²GD follows the same apocalypse as the one on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ described in Proposition 7.20. This is because, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, it holds that $x^{k,j} \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^{k,j})}(-\nabla f(x^{k,j})) =$

$$P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n}(x^{k,j})}(-\nabla f(x^{k,j})).$$

6.2 The real determinantal variety

In this section, $\mathcal{E} := \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $C := \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ for some positive integers m, n , and $r < \min\{m, n\}$, $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is endowed with the *Frobenius inner product* $\langle X, Y \rangle := \text{tr } Y^\top X$, and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Frobenius norm. The spectral norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_2$.

In Section 6.2.1, we review the stratification of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ by the rank, which satisfies conditions 1(a) and 1(b) of Assumption 2.2. We also recall basic facts about singular values showing that the stratification satisfies condition 1(c) and providing a formula to project onto $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ and its strata. In Section 6.2.2, we review an explicit description of the tangent cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ and a formula to project onto it (Proposition 6.11). Based on this description, we prove that the second statement of Theorem 6.1 holds (Proposition 6.12). In Section 6.2.3, we review the regular normal cone, the normal cone, and the Clarke normal cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ (Proposition 6.13) and prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ has no serendipitous point (Proposition 6.14). In Section 6.2.4, we present an alternative version of the P²GDR map on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ (Algorithm 6.3) and show that the general theory developed in Section 5 also applies to that version (Proposition 6.16). We notably deduce Corollary 6.17. In Section 6.2.5, we discuss the practical implementation of [35, Algorithm 1]. In Section 6.2.6, we compare PGD, P²GD, RFD, P²GDR, RFDR, and [35, Algorithm 1] based on the computational cost per iteration (Table 6.3) and the convergence guarantees (Table 6.4). In Section 6.2.7, we numerically compare PGD, P²GD, P²GDR, and [35, Algorithm 1] on the example of apocalypse presented in [35, §2.2]. Finally, in Section 6.2.8, we give an example of P²GD following an apocalypse on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}$.

6.2.1 Stratification of the determinantal variety

The rank stratifies the determinantal variety $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$:

$$\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n} = \bigcup_{i=0}^r \mathbb{R}_i^{m \times n}$$

where, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, r\}$,

$$\mathbb{R}_i^{m \times n} := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \mid \text{rank } X = i\} \quad (29)$$

is the smooth manifold of real $m \times n$ rank- i matrices [25, Proposition 4.1]. Observe that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}^{m \times n} = \mathbb{R}_0^{m \times n} = \{0_{m \times n}\}$. Thus, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ satisfies condition 1(a) of Assumption 2.2. By [41, Proposition 2.1], condition 1(b) is satisfied too. To establish condition 1(c), we first review basic facts about singular values and rank reduction.

In what follows, the singular values of $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ are denoted by $\sigma_1(X) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\min\{m,n\}}(X) \geq 0$, as in [22, §2.4.1]. Moreover, if $X \neq 0_{m \times n}$, then $\sigma_1(X)$ and $\sigma_{\text{rank } X}(X)$ are respectively denoted by $\sigma_{\max}(X)$ and $\sigma_{\min}(X)$. By reducing the rank of $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \setminus \{0_{m \times n}\}$, we mean computing an element of $P_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq \underline{r}}^{m \times n}}(X)$ for some nonnegative integer $\underline{r} < \text{rank } X$. According to the Eckart–Young theorem [18], this can be achieved by truncating an SVD of X . In particular, for every nonnegative integer $\underline{r} < \min\{m, n\}$ and every $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$:

1. if $\text{rank } X \leq \underline{r}$, then $P_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq \underline{r}}^{m \times n}}(X) = X$;

2. if $\text{rank } X > \underline{r}$, then $d(X, \mathbb{R}_{\leq \underline{r}}^{m \times n}) = d(X, \mathbb{R}_{\underline{r}}^{m \times n}) = \sqrt{\sum_{j=\underline{r}+1}^{\text{rank } X} \sigma_j^2(X)}$ and $P_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq \underline{r}}^{m \times n}}(X) = P_{\mathbb{R}_{\underline{r}}^{m \times n}}(X)$.

In particular, condition 1(c) of Assumption 2.2 is satisfied.

6.2.2 Tangent cone to the determinantal variety

We review in Proposition 6.11 formulas describing $T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X)$ and $P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X)}(Z)$ for every $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ and every $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ based on orthonormal bases of $\text{im } X$, $\text{im } X^\top$, and their orthogonal complements. Those formulas can be obtained from (10). For every $i, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i \leq q$,

$$\text{St}(i, q) := \{U \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times i} \mid U^\top U = I_i\} \quad (30)$$

is a Stiefel manifold [1, §3.3.2]. For every $q \in \mathbb{N}$, $O(q) := \text{St}(q, q)$ is an orthogonal group.

Proposition 6.11 (tangent cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ [47, Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.3]). *Let $\underline{r} \in \{0, \dots, r\}$, $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\underline{r}}^{m \times n}$, $U \in \text{St}(\underline{r}, m)$, $U_\perp \in \text{St}(m - \underline{r}, m)$, $V \in \text{St}(\underline{r}, n)$, $V_\perp \in \text{St}(n - \underline{r}, n)$, $\text{im } U = \text{im } X$, $\text{im } U_\perp = (\text{im } X)^\perp$, $\text{im } V = \text{im } X^\top$, and $\text{im } V_\perp = (\text{im } X^\top)^\perp$. Then,*

$$T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X) = [U \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{R}^{\underline{r} \times \underline{r}} & \mathbb{R}^{\underline{r} \times n - \underline{r}} \\ \mathbb{R}^{m - \underline{r} \times \underline{r}} & \mathbb{R}^{m - \underline{r} \times n - \underline{r}} \end{bmatrix} [V \ V_\perp]^\top.$$

Moreover, if $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is written as

$$Z = [U \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ D & E \end{bmatrix} [V \ V_\perp]^\top$$

with $A = U^\top ZV$, $B = U^\top ZV_\perp$, $D = U_\perp^\top ZV$, and $E = U_\perp^\top ZV_\perp$, then

$$P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X)}(Z) = [U \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ D & P_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r - \underline{r}}^{m - \underline{r} \times n - \underline{r}}}(E) \end{bmatrix} [V \ V_\perp]^\top$$

and

$$\|Z\| \geq \|P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X)}(Z)\| \geq \sqrt{\frac{r - \underline{r}}{\min\{m, n\} - \underline{r}}} \|Z\|. \quad (31)$$

For efficiency note the following.

1. In practice, the projection onto $T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X)$ can be computed by [47, Algorithm 2]. This does not rely on U_{\perp} and V_{\perp} , which are huge in the frequently encountered case where $r \ll \min\{m, n\}$.
2. For all $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ and all $Z \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X)$, $X + Z \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq 2r}^{m \times n}$. Indeed, if

$$X = [U \ U_{\perp}] \text{diag}(\Sigma, 0_{m-r \times n-r}) [V \ V_{\perp}]^{\top}$$

is an SVD and $Z \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X)$ is written as

$$Z = [U \ U_{\perp}] \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ D & E \end{bmatrix} [V \ V_{\perp}]^{\top}$$

with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n-r}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{m-r \times r}$, and $E \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r-r}^{m-r \times n-r}$, then, by [41, Proposition 3.1],

$$X + Z = [U \ U_{\perp}] \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma + A & B \\ D & E \end{bmatrix} [V \ V_{\perp}]^{\top} \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r+r}^{m \times n} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\leq 2r}^{m \times n}.$$

Proposition 6.12 shows that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ satisfies the second statement of Theorem 6.1.

Proposition 6.12. *For all $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n} \setminus \{0_{m \times n}\}$,*

$$\frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{r+1} \frac{1}{2\sigma_{\min}(X)} \leq \sup_{Z \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X) \setminus \{0_{m \times n}\}} \frac{d(X+Z, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n})}{\|Z\|^2} \leq \frac{1}{2\sigma_{\min}(X)}.$$

Proof. Let $r := \text{rank } X$. We first establish the upper bound. Let

$$X = [U \ U_{\perp}] \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma & \\ & 0_{m-r \times n-r} \end{bmatrix} [V \ V_{\perp}]^{\top}$$

be an SVD, and $Z \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X) \setminus \{0_{m \times n}\}$. By Proposition 6.11, there are $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n-r}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{m-r \times r}$, and $E \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r-r}^{m-r \times n-r}$ such that

$$Z = [U \ U_{\perp}] \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ D & E \end{bmatrix} [V \ V_{\perp}]^{\top}.$$

Define the function

$$\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n} : t \mapsto (U + t(U_{\perp}D + \frac{1}{2}UA)\Sigma^{-1})\Sigma(V + t(V_{\perp}B^{\top} + \frac{1}{2}VA^{\top})\Sigma^{-1})^{\top} + tU_{\perp}EV_{\perp}^{\top},$$

where the first term is inspired from [54, (13)]; γ is well defined since the ranks of the two terms are respectively upper bounded by r and $r - r$. For all $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\gamma(t) = X + tZ + \frac{t^2}{4} [U \ U_{\perp}] \begin{bmatrix} A \\ 2D \end{bmatrix} \Sigma^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} A & 2B \end{bmatrix} [V \ V_{\perp}]^{\top}$$

thus

$$d(X + tZ, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) \leq \|(X + tZ) - \gamma(t)\| = \frac{t^2}{4} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} A\Sigma^{-1}A & 2A\Sigma^{-1}B \\ 2D\Sigma^{-1}A & 4D\Sigma^{-1}B \end{bmatrix} \right\|.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \begin{bmatrix} A\Sigma^{-1}A & 2A\Sigma^{-1}B \\ 2D\Sigma^{-1}A & 4D\Sigma^{-1}B \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2 &= \|A\Sigma^{-1}A\|^2 + 4\|A\Sigma^{-1}B\|^2 + 4\|D\Sigma^{-1}A\|^2 + 16\|D\Sigma^{-1}B\|^2 \\
&\leq \|\Sigma^{-1}\|_2^2 \left(\|A\|^4 + 4\|A\|^2\|B\|^2 + 4\|A\|^2\|D\|^2 + 16\|B\|^2\|D\|^2 \right) \\
&\leq \|\Sigma^{-1}\|_2^2 \|Z\|^4 \max_{\substack{x,y,z \in \mathbb{R} \\ x^2+y^2+z^2=1}} x^4 + 4x^2y^2 + 4x^2z^2 + 16y^2z^2 \\
&= 4\|\Sigma^{-1}\|_2^2 \|Z\|^4 \\
&= \frac{4}{\sigma_{\mathbb{L}}^2(X)} \|Z\|^4.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for all $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$d(X + tZ, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) \leq t^2 \frac{1}{2\sigma_{\mathbb{L}}(X)} \|Z\|^2.$$

Choosing $t = 1$ yields the upper bound.

We now establish the lower bound. Let

$$X = [U \ U_{\perp}] \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{\mathbb{L}}, 0_{m-\mathbb{L} \times n-\mathbb{L}}) [V \ V_{\perp}]^{\top}$$

be an SVD, and observe that

$$Z := [U \ U_{\perp}] \sigma_{\mathbb{L}} \text{diag}(0_{\mathbb{L}-1}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, I_{r-\mathbb{L}}, 0_{m-r-1 \times n-r-1}) [V \ V_{\perp}]^{\top} \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X).$$

The nonzero singular values of

$$X + Z = [U \ U_{\perp}] \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{\mathbb{L}-1}, \sigma_{\mathbb{L}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \sigma_{\mathbb{L}} I_{r-\mathbb{L}}, 0_{m-r-1 \times n-r-1}) [V \ V_{\perp}]^{\top}$$

are $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{\mathbb{L}}$ and the absolute values of the eigenvalues of $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ multiplied by $\sigma_{\mathbb{L}}$, i.e., $\frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}\sigma_{\mathbb{L}}$ and $\frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2}\sigma_{\mathbb{L}}$. Thus, $d(X + Z, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) = \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2}\sigma_{\mathbb{L}}$, $\|Z\|^2 = (r - \mathbb{L} + 2)\sigma_{\mathbb{L}}^2 \leq (r + 1)\sigma_{\mathbb{L}}^2$, and the lower bound follows. \square

Proposition 6.12 can be related to geometric principles. Let γ be a curve on the submanifold $\mathbb{R}_r^{m \times n}$ of $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. In view of the Gauss formula along a curve [32, Corollary 8.3], the normal part of the acceleration of γ is given by $\mathbb{I}(\gamma', \gamma')$, where \mathbb{I} denotes the second fundamental form. In view of [19, §4], the largest principal curvature of $\mathbb{R}_r^{m \times n}$ at X is $1/\sigma_r(X)$; hence $\|\mathbb{I}(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t))\| \leq \|\gamma'(t)\|^2/\sigma_r(\gamma(t))$, and the bound is attained when $\gamma'(t)$ is along the corresponding principal direction.

6.2.3 Normal cones to the determinantal variety

In Proposition 6.13, we review formulas describing $\widehat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X)$, $N_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X)$, and $\overline{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X)$ for every $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ based on orthonormal bases of $(\text{im } X)^{\perp}$ and $(\text{im } X^{\top})^{\perp}$. Then, in Proposition 6.14, we deduce that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ has no serendipitous point.

Proposition 6.13 shows that a point $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{L}}^{m \times n}$ with $\mathbb{L} \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ is Mordukhovich stationary if and only if it is stationary for the problem of minimizing f on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq \mathbb{L}}^{m \times n}$ and $\text{rank } \nabla f(X) \leq \min\{m, n\} - r$.

Proposition 6.13 (normal cones to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$). *Let $\mathbb{L} \in \{0, \dots, r\}$, $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{L}}^{m \times n}$, $U_{\perp} \in \text{St}(m - \mathbb{L}, m)$, $V_{\perp} \in \text{St}(n - \mathbb{L}, n)$, $\text{im } U_{\perp} = (\text{im } X)^{\perp}$, and $\text{im } V_{\perp} = (\text{im } X^{\top})^{\perp}$. If $\mathbb{L} = r$, then*

$$\widehat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X) = N_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X) = \overline{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X) = N_{\mathbb{R}_r^{m \times n}}(X) = U_{\perp} \mathbb{R}^{m-r \times n-r} V_{\perp}^{\top}.$$

If $\mathbb{L} < r$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X) &= \{0_{m \times n}\}, \\
N_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X) &= N_{\mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{L}}^{m \times n}}(X) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\leq \min\{m, n\}-r}^{m \times n}, \\
\overline{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X) &= N_{\mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{L}}^{m \times n}}(X).
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Proof. The tangent space to \mathbb{R}_r is given in [25, Proposition 4.1] and the normal space to \mathbb{R}_r is its orthogonal complement. The regular normal cone, the normal cone, and the Clarke normal cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ are described respectively in [27, Corollary 2.3], [27, Theorem 3.1], and [27, Corollary 3.2]. \square

Proposition 6.14. *No point of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ is serendipitous.*

Proof. We use Proposition 4.9. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$. Let us prove that X is not serendipitous. Let $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ converging to X . If $\text{rank } X = r$, then, by [41, Proposition 4.3], $\overline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X_i) = T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X)$, and thus $(\overline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X_i))^* = \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X)$. If $\text{rank } X < r$, then

$$\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X) = \{0_{m \times n}\} \subseteq \left(\overline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}}(X_i) \right)^*,$$

where the equality follows from (32). \square

6.2.4 A variant of the P²GDR map on the determinantal variety

In this section, we propose as Algorithm 6.3 the variant of the P²GDR map on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ obtained by measuring the distance from the input to the lower strata using the spectral norm instead of the Frobenius norm. To this end, we recall from [22, (5.4.5)] that, given $\Delta \in [0, \infty)$, the Δ -rank of $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, denoted $\text{rank}_\Delta X$, is defined as the number of singular values of X that are larger than Δ :

$$\text{rank}_\Delta X := |\{i \in \{1, \dots, \min\{m, n\}\} \mid \sigma_i(X) > \Delta\}|.$$

Proposition 6.15 states that the minimum computed in line 2 of Algorithm 5.2 equals the Δ -rank if the distance is measured with respect to the spectral norm. For every nonempty subset \mathcal{S} of $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and every $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, let $d_2(X, \mathcal{S}) := \inf_{Y \in \mathcal{S}} \|X - Y\|_2$.

Proposition 6.15. *For all $\Delta \in [0, \infty)$ and all $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$,*

$$\min\{j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X\} \mid d_2(X, \mathbb{R}_j^{m \times n}) \leq \Delta\} = \text{rank}_\Delta X.$$

Proof. Let $\Delta \in [0, \infty)$ and $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. By the Eckart–Young theorem [18], for all $j \in \{0, \dots, \min\{m, n\}\}$,

$$d_2(X, \mathbb{R}_j^{m \times n}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \text{rank } X \leq j, \\ \sigma_{j+1}(X) & \text{if } \text{rank } X > j. \end{cases}$$

Thus, the result is clear if $\text{rank}_\Delta X = \text{rank } X$. If $\text{rank}_\Delta X < \text{rank } X$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}_\Delta X &= |\{j \in \{1, \dots, \text{rank } X\} \mid \sigma_j(X) > \Delta\}| \\ &= \text{rank } X - |\{j \in \{1, \dots, \text{rank } X\} \mid \sigma_j(X) \leq \Delta\}| \\ &= \text{rank } X - |\{j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X - 1\} \mid \sigma_{j+1}(X) \leq \Delta\}| \\ &= \min\{j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X - 1\} \mid \sigma_{j+1}(X) \leq \Delta\} \\ &= \min\{j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X - 1\} \mid d_2(X, \mathbb{R}_{j+1}^{m \times n}) \leq \Delta\} \\ &= \min\{j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X\} \mid d_2(X, \mathbb{R}_j^{m \times n}) \leq \Delta\}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Given $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ as input, Algorithm 6.3 proceeds as follows: (i) it applies the P²GD map to X , thereby producing a point \tilde{X}^0 , (ii) if $\text{rank}_\Delta X < \text{rank } X$, it applies the P²GD map to $\hat{X}^j \in P_{\mathbb{R}_{\text{rank } X - j}^{m \times n}}(X)$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, \text{rank } X - \text{rank}_\Delta X\}$, then producing points $\tilde{X}^1, \dots, \tilde{X}^{\text{rank } X - \text{rank}_\Delta X}$, and (iii) it outputs a point among $\tilde{X}^0, \dots, \tilde{X}^{\text{rank } X - \text{rank}_\Delta X}$ that maximally decreases f .

Algorithm 6.3 Variant of the P²GDR map on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$

Require: $(f, r, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$ where $f : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable with ∇f locally Lipschitz continuous, $r < \min\{m, n\}$ is a positive integer, $0 < \underline{\alpha} \leq \bar{\alpha} < \infty$, $\beta, c \in (0, 1)$, and $\Delta \in (0, \infty)$.

Input: $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ such that $s(X; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) > 0$.

Output: $Y \in \text{Algorithm 6.3}(X; f, r, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$.

- 1: **for** $j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X - \text{rank}_\Delta X\}$ **do**
 - 2: Choose $\hat{X}^j \in P_{\mathbb{R}_{\text{rank } X - j}^{m \times n}}(X)$;
 - 3: Choose $\tilde{X}^j \in \text{P}^2\text{GD}(\hat{X}^j; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$;
 - 4: **end for**
 - 5: Return $Y \in \arg\min_{\{\tilde{X}^j | j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X - \text{rank}_\Delta X\}\}} f$.
-

Proposition 6.16 states that this variant satisfies the same decrease guarantee as the original version.

Proposition 6.16. *Proposition 5.4 holds for Algorithm 6.3.*

Proof. For all $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, since $\|X\|_2 \leq \|X\|$, it holds that

$$\{j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X\} \mid d_2(X, \mathbb{R}_j^{m \times n}) \leq \Delta\} \supseteq \{j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X\} \mid d(X, \mathbb{R}_j^{m \times n}) \leq \Delta\}$$

and thus

$$\min\{j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X\} \mid d_2(X, \mathbb{R}_j^{m \times n}) \leq \Delta\} \leq \min\{j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X\} \mid d(X, \mathbb{R}_j^{m \times n}) \leq \Delta\}.$$

Therefore, given $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ as input, Algorithm 6.3 explores the strata explored by Algorithm 5.2, and hence produces a point of cost not larger than the cost of the point produced by Algorithm 5.2. \square

It is possible to prove Proposition 6.16 without relying on condition 3 of Assumption 2.2 and Corollary 4.10. Indeed, using the same notation as in the proof of Proposition 5.4, if $\text{rank } \underline{X} = r$, then $s(\cdot; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n})$ is continuous at \underline{X} since $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ is identical to the smooth manifold $\mathbb{R}_r^{m \times n}$ around \underline{X} , i.e., $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n} \cap B(\underline{X}, \sigma_r(\underline{X})) = \mathbb{R}_r^{m \times n} \cap B(\underline{X}, \sigma_r(\underline{X}))$, and, on $\mathbb{R}_r^{m \times n} \cap B(\underline{X}, \sigma_r(\underline{X}))$, $s(\cdot; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n})$ therefore coincides with the norm of the Riemannian gradient of $f|_{\mathbb{R}_r^{m \times n}}$, which is continuous. If $\text{rank } \underline{X} < r$, then, in view of (31) and the continuity of ∇f , $s(\cdot; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n})$ is bounded away from zero on the intersection of $\mathbb{R}_{< r}^{m \times n}$ and a sufficiently small ball centered at \underline{X} . However, we chose to keep the proof of Proposition 6.16 as it stands to highlight that it follows from Proposition 5.4 in our abstract setting.

We can now state the main result of this section.

Corollary 6.17. *Consider P²GDR on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, i.e., Algorithm 5.3 using either Algorithm 5.2 or Algorithm 6.3 in line 3. Then, Theorem 5.5 holds. Let $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence produced by P²GDR. The sequence has at least one accumulation point if and only if $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|X_i\| < \infty$. For every convergent subsequence $(X_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s(X_{i_k}; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) = 0$. If $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, which is the case notably if the sublevel set $\{X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n} \mid f(X) \leq f(X_0)\}$ is bounded, then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(X_i; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) = 0$, and all accumulation points have the same image by f .*

Proof. The first claim follows from Proposition 6.16. The rest follows from Corollary 5.6 and Proposition 6.14 since $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ satisfies Assumption 2.2. \square

6.2.5 Practical implementation of [35, Algorithm 1] on the determinantal variety

In this section, we detail the implementation of [35, Algorithm 1] with the rank factorization lift

$$\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} : (L, R) \mapsto LR^\top$$

given in [35, (1.1)] and the hook of [35, Example 3.11].

We consider the lifted cost function $g := f \circ \varphi$. We assume that $\nabla f : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is continuously differentiable and let $\nabla^2 f$ denote the Hessian of f , defined as the derivative of ∇f , i.e., $\nabla^2 f : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}) : X \mapsto (\nabla f)'(X)$, where $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{m \times n})$ denotes the Banach space of all continuous linear operators on $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ (see Appendix A).

Proposition 6.18. *For all $(L, R), (\dot{L}, \dot{R}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla g(L, R) &= (\nabla f(LR^\top)R, \nabla f(LR^\top)^\top L), \\ \nabla^2 g(L, R)(\dot{L}, \dot{R}) &= (\nabla^2 f(LR^\top)(\dot{L}R^\top + L\dot{R}^\top)R + \nabla f(LR^\top)\dot{R}, \\ &\quad \nabla^2 f(LR^\top)(\dot{L}R^\top + L\dot{R}^\top)^\top L + \nabla f(LR^\top)^\top \dot{L}).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We have

$$\varphi'(L, R)(\dot{L}, \dot{R}) = \dot{L}R^\top + L\dot{R}^\top.$$

By the chain rule,

$$g'(L, R) = f'(\varphi(L, R)) \circ \varphi'(L, R).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}g'(L, R)(\dot{L}, \dot{R}) &= f'(\varphi(L, R))(\varphi'(L, R)(\dot{L}, \dot{R})) \\ &= \langle \nabla f(\varphi(L, R)), \varphi'(L, R)(\dot{L}, \dot{R}) \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla f(\varphi(L, R)), \dot{L}R^\top \rangle + \langle \nabla f(\varphi(L, R)), L\dot{R}^\top \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla f(\varphi(L, R))R, \dot{L} \rangle + \langle \nabla f(\varphi(L, R))^\top L, \dot{R} \rangle \\ &= \langle ((\nabla f) \circ \varphi)(L, R)R, ((\nabla f) \circ \varphi)(L, R)^\top L, (\dot{L}, \dot{R}) \rangle\end{aligned}$$

and we deduce that

$$\nabla g(L, R) = (((\nabla f) \circ \varphi)(L, R)R, ((\nabla f) \circ \varphi)(L, R)^\top L).$$

The formula for $\nabla^2 g(L, R)(\dot{L}, \dot{R})$ follows from the product rule and the chain rule. \square

Given $(L, R) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$, the eigenvalues of $\nabla^2 g(L, R)$, which is a self-adjoint linear operator on $\mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$, are the eigenvalues of the matrix representing it in any basis of $\mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$. Here, we use the orthonormal basis formed by the concatenation of the sequences $((\delta_{p,l})_{i,k=1}^{m,r}, 0_{n \times r})_{p,l=1}^{m,r}$ and $(0_{m \times r}, (\delta_{q,l})_{j,k=1}^{n,r})_{q,l=1}^{n,r}$. The matrix $H(L, R)$ representing $\nabla^2 g(L, R)$ in that basis can be formed as follows. For every $(i, k) \in \{1, \dots, m\} \times \{1, \dots, r\}$, the $(i-1)r+k$ th column of $H(L, R)$ is the vector formed by concatenating the rows of $\nabla^2 f(LR^\top)((\delta_{i,k})_{p,l=1}^{m,r}R^\top)R$ and those of $\nabla^2 f(LR^\top)((\delta_{i,k})_{p,l=1}^{m,r}R^\top)^\top L + \nabla f(LR^\top)^\top (\delta_{i,k})_{p,l=1}^{m,r}$. Then, for every $(j, k) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, r\}$, the $mr + (j-1)r + k$ th column of $H(L, R)$ is the vector formed by concatenating the rows of $\nabla^2 f(LR^\top)(L(\delta_{j,k})_{q,l=1}^{n,r})^\top R + \nabla f(LR^\top)(\delta_{j,k})_{q,l=1}^{n,r}$ and those of $\nabla^2 f(LR^\top)(L(\delta_{j,k})_{q,l=1}^{n,r})^\top L$.

6.2.6 Comparison of six optimization algorithms on the determinantal variety

In this section, we compare the six algorithms listed in Table 6.2 based on the computational cost per iteration (Table 6.3) and the convergence guarantees (Table 6.4). As in Section 6.2.5, we consider [35, Algorithm 1] with the rank factorization lift and the hook of [35, Example 3.11].

The respective computational costs per iteration of P²GD, RFD, P²GDR, and RFDR are compared in [40, §7] based on detailed implementations of these algorithms involving only evaluations of f and ∇f and some operations from linear algebra:

1. matrix multiplication;
2. thin QR factorization with column pivoting (see, e.g., [22, Algorithm 5.4.1]);
3. *small scale* (truncated) SVD, i.e., the smallest dimension of the matrix to decompose is at most $2r$;

<i>Algorithm</i>	<i>Original paper</i>	<i>Citations in this paper</i>
PGD	[30, Algorithm 3.1]	Section 1
P ² GD	[47, Algorithm 3]	Sections 2.2 and 5.1
RFD	[47, Algorithm 4]	Sections 3.3 and 7.3.1
P ² GDR	Algorithm 5.3	Sections 2.2, 5.2, and 5.3
RFDR	[40, Algorithm 3]	Sections 3.3, 7.3.2, and 7.3.3
[35, Algorithm 1]	[35, §3]	Sections 3.2 and 6.2.5

Table 6.2: Index of algorithms aiming to solve problem (1) with $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$.

4. large scale truncated SVD, i.e., truncated SVD that is not small scale.

In this list, only the (truncated) SVD cannot be executed within a finite number of arithmetic operations. Before including PGD and [35, Algorithm 1] in the comparison, we recall available upper bounds on the number of iterations in the backtracking procedures of P²GD, RFD, P²GDR, and RFDR. By [40, (17)], given $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ as input and using $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ as initial step size for the backtracking procedure, the P²GD map evaluates f from 1 to

$$1 + \max \left\{ 0, \left\lceil \ln \left(\frac{1 - c}{\alpha \kappa_{\text{B}[X, \alpha \text{s}(X; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n})]}(X; f, \alpha) \right) / \ln \beta \right\rceil \right\} \quad (33)$$

times, where the second term is the maximum number of iterations in the backtracking loop. By [40, (18)], given $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ as input and using $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ as initial step size for the backtracking procedure, the RFD map evaluates f from 1 to

$$1 + \max \left\{ 0, \left\lceil \ln \left(\frac{2(1 - c)}{\alpha \text{Lip}_{\text{B}[X, \alpha \text{s}(X; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n})]}(\nabla f) \right) / \ln \beta \right\rceil \right\} \quad (34)$$

times, where the second term is the maximum number of iterations in the backtracking loop.

We now analyze the computational cost per iteration of PGD and [35, Algorithm 1]. The paper [30] gives no explicit bound on the number of inner iterations performed by PGD. Nevertheless, every (outer) iteration of PGD requires projecting $X - \alpha \nabla f(X)$ onto $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ and $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ being respectively the current iterate and the step size, which, in general, involves the computation of a large scale truncated SVD.

From the analysis conducted in Section 6.2.5, we know that every iteration of [35, Algorithm 1] requires the computation of a smallest eigenvalue of the order- $(m+n)r$ matrix representing $\nabla^2 g(L, R)$ in a given basis of $\mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$, (L, R) being the current iterate, which involves the computation of a large scale truncated SVD. Moreover, each iteration updating the current iterate requires a hook. The hook of [35, Example 3.11] involves the computation of a thin QR factorization of LR^\top and of an SVD of the R factor, which is a small scale SVD.

The convergence guarantees offered by the six algorithms are compared in Table 6.4. We make three remarks.

First, we recall from Proposition 6.13 that Mordukhovich stationarity is weaker than stationarity at every $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\underline{r}}^{m \times n}$ with $\underline{r} \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$. Indeed, while the latter amounts to $\nabla f(X) = 0_{m \times n}$, the former only amounts to the stationarity of X on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq \underline{r}}^{m \times n}$ together with the inequality $\text{rank } \nabla f(X) \leq \min\{m, n\} - r$.

Second, we recall from Section 3.3 that the property “ $\text{s}(\cdot; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) \rightarrow 0$ ” holds for RFD if f is real-analytic and bounded from below. By Proposition 4.8, if, moreover, the sequence generated by RFD is contained in $\mathbb{R}_r^{m \times n}$, then the property “Mordukhovich” also holds.

Third, Table 6.4 does not give any information on the performance of the algorithms after a finite number of iterations, which depends on the stopping criterion. In the rest of this section, we discuss this for the three apocalypse-free algorithms, namely P²GDR, RFDR, and [35, Algorithm 1].

<i>Algorithm</i>	f	∇f	$\nabla^2 f$	QR	small SVD	large SVD
PGD	$1 + i_*$	1	0	0	0	$1 + i_*$
P ² GD	1	1	0	2	1	0
	(33)			4	(33)	1
RFD	1	1	0	1	0	0
	(34)					1
P ² GDR	1	1	0	2	1	0
	(34) + $r \cdot (33)$	$r + 1$		$4r - 2$	$r \cdot (33)$	r
RFDR	1	1	0	0	1	0
	$2 \cdot (34)$	2			2	1
[35, Algorithm 1]	1	1	1	0	0	1
				1	1	

Table 6.3: Operations required by six algorithms aiming to solve problem (1) with $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ to perform one iteration, matrix multiplication excluded. The fields “ f ”, “ ∇f ”, “ $\nabla^2 f$ ”, “QR”, “small SVD”, and “large SVD” respectively correspond to “evaluation of f ”, “evaluation of ∇f ”, “evaluation of $\nabla^2 f$ ”, “QR factorization with column pivoting”, “small scale (truncated) SVD”, and “large scale truncated SVD”. When two subrows appear in a row, the upper entry corresponds to the best case and the lower one to the worst case. In the “PGD” line, i_* denotes the number of inner iteration(s) performed. An iteration of [35, Algorithm 1] performs no QR and no small SVD if and only if it does not change the iterate, i.e., the algorithm does not progress.

Since $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ has no serendipitous point (Proposition 6.14), if $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence generated by any of the three algorithms and does not diverge to infinity, then, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, the set $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid s(X_i; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) \leq \varepsilon\}$ is nonempty and thus the stopping criterion defined by (19) is eventually satisfied: stop the algorithm at iteration

$$i_\varepsilon := \min\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid s(X_i; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

Two facts should be pointed out, however. First, no a priori upper bound on i_ε is known, as explained in the next paragraph. Second, since the set of apocalyptic points of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ is $\mathbb{R}_{< r}^{m \times n}$, X_{i_ε} can be close either to an apocalyptic point or a stationary point, as explained after Proposition 4.7, and none of the two cases can be excluded a priori, which makes the choice of the parameter $\Delta \in (0, \infty)$ of P²GDR significant, as illustrated in Sections 6.2.7 and 6.2.8.

No a priori upper bound on i_ε is known for P²GDR and RFDR. In contrast, [35, Algorithm 1] enjoys the guarantees given in [35, Theorems 3.4 and 3.16]. However, those guarantees do not yield the upper bound sought, as explained next. Given $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in (0, \infty)$, [35, Theorem 3.4] provides, under reasonable conditions, an upper bound on the number of iterations required by [35, Algorithm 1] to produce a point $(L, R) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ that is $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -approximate second-order stationary for $\min_{\mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}} g$, i.e., $\|\nabla g(L, R)\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}} \leq \varepsilon_1$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 g(L, R)) \geq -\varepsilon_2$. Moreover, by [35, Theorem 3.16], if such a point (L, R) is obtained by [35, Algorithm 1] and $X = LR^\top$, then

$$s(X; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) \leq \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sigma_r(X)}} \varepsilon_1, \sqrt{\text{rank } \nabla f(X)} \left(\varepsilon_2 + 2 \underset{\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}}{\text{Lip}}(\nabla f) \sigma_r(X) \right) \right\}. \quad (35)$$

Unfortunately, this does not give us an upper bound on i_ε since X_{i_ε} is unknown. Indeed, based on (35), if nothing is known on $\sigma_r(X)$, in particular whether it is zero or not, then the only way to ensure that $s(X; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) \leq \varepsilon$ is to take $\varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon \sqrt{\sigma_r(X)/2}$ and $\varepsilon_2 \leq \varepsilon / \sqrt{\min\{m, n\}}$. The upper bound on ε_2 is exploitable but not the one on ε_1 since $\sigma_r(X)$ is unknown, even in a bounded sublevel set.

<i>Algorithm</i>	<i>Order</i>	$s(\cdot; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) \rightarrow 0$	Mordukhovich	Stationary
PGD	1	?	✓	?
P ² GD	1	?	?	✗
RFD	1	✓	?	✗
P ² GDR	1	✓	✓	✓
RFDR	1	✓	✓	✓
[35, Algorithm 1]	2	✓	✓	✓

Table 6.4: Comparison of the convergence guarantees of six algorithms aiming to solve problem (1) with $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$. The property “ $s(\cdot; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}) \rightarrow 0$ ” means that $s(\cdot; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n})$ goes to zero along every convergent subsequence of the generated sequence. The properties “Mordukhovich” and “Stationary” mean that the algorithm accumulates at Mordukhovich stationary points and stationary points, respectively. The symbols “✓”, “✗”, and “?” respectively mean “yes”, “no”, and “open question”.

6.2.7 Numerical comparison of four algorithms on the instance of [35, §2.2]

In this section, we compare numerically PGD, P²GD, P²GDR (Algorithm 5.3 using Algorithm 6.3 in line 3), and [35, Algorithm 1] on the problem presented in [35, §2.2]. We recall from Section 3.3 that, on this problem, RFD produces the same sequence as P²GD.

In [35, §2.2], the following instance of (1) with $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq 2}^{3 \times 3}$ is considered: minimizing

$$f : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : X \mapsto Q(X(1:2, 1:2)) + \phi(X(3, 3))$$

on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 2}^{3 \times 3}$, where $X(1:2, 1:2)$ is the upper-left 2×2 submatrix of X , $X(3, 3)$ its bottom-right entry, $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : x \mapsto \frac{x^4}{4} - \frac{(x+1)^2}{2}$, $Q : \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : Y \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \|D(Y - Y^*)\|^2$, $D := \text{diag}(1, \frac{1}{2})$, and $Y^* := \text{diag}(1, 0)$. First, it is observed that $\text{argmin } \phi = x_0 \approx 1.32471795724475$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{argmin } f &= \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & a_1 \\ 0 & 0 & a_2 \\ a_3 & a_4 & x_0 \end{bmatrix} \mid a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in \mathbb{R} \right\}, \\ \text{argmin}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 2}^{3 \times 3}} f &= \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & a_1 \\ 0 & 0 & a_2 \\ a_3 & a_4 & x_0 \end{bmatrix} \mid a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in \mathbb{R}, a_2 a_4 = 0 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $f^* := \min f = \min_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 2}^{3 \times 3}} f = \phi(x_0) \approx -1.932257884495233$. Second, it is proven analytically that P²GD follows the apocalypse $(\text{diag}(1, 0, 0), (\text{diag}(1 + (-\frac{3}{5})^i, (\frac{3}{5})^i, 0))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, f)$ if used on this problem with $X_0 := \text{diag}(2, 1, 0)$, $\underline{\alpha} := \bar{\alpha} := \frac{8}{5}$, any $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and $c := \frac{1}{5}$.

In this section, we compare numerically PGD, P²GD, P²GDR, and [35, Algorithm 1] on that instance, based on our Matlab implementations of these algorithms.¹ We use the parameters described in Table 6.5. Furthermore, we use [35, Algorithm 1] with the rank factorization lift, i.e., $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{m \times r} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} : (L, R) \mapsto LR^\top$, the hook of [35, Example 3.11], and the Cauchy point at each iteration. Thus, we apply [35, Algorithm 1] to $g := f \circ \varphi$. For PGD, P²GD, and P²GDR, we use the stopping criterion defined by (19); specifically, we stop them as soon as the stationarity measure $s(\cdot; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 2}^{3 \times 3})$ becomes smaller than or equal to $3 \cdot 10^{-9}$. In contrast, we let [35, Algorithm 1] run for $5.5 \cdot 10^5$ iterations. We obtain the plots in Figure 6.1a where we observe that [35, Algorithm 1] stagnates after less than $5.5 \cdot 10^5$ iterations.

We observe that P²GD behaves as predicted in [35, §2.2] and is the only algorithm among the four to follow an apocalypse. In particular, P²GDR behaves in agreement with Theorem 5.5 and Corollary 5.6, and [35, Algorithm 1] in agreement with [35, Theorem 1.1]; these results hold since all sublevel sets of f are bounded. We also observe that [35, Algorithm 1] converges much more slowly than PGD and

¹Those implementations are available at <https://github.com/golikier/ApocalypseFreeLowRankOptimization/blob/main/README>

PGD [30, Algorithm 3.1]	$X_0 := \text{diag}(2, 1, 0), \gamma_{\min} := \gamma_{\max} := \frac{5}{8}, \tau := 2, \sigma := \frac{1}{5}, m := 0$
P ² GD and P ² GDR	$X_0 := \text{diag}(2, 1, 0), \underline{\alpha} := \bar{\alpha} := \frac{8}{5}, \beta := \frac{1}{2}, c := \frac{1}{5}, \Delta := \frac{1}{10}$
[35, Algorithm 1]	$L_0 := R_0 := \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \underline{\gamma} := \bar{\gamma} := 1, \gamma_c := \frac{1}{2}, \eta := \frac{1}{10}$

Table 6.5: Parameters of the algorithms for the numerical comparison of Section 6.2.7.

P²GDR. The slow convergence of [35, Algorithm 1] is in agreement with [35, Theorem 3.4]. Indeed, for the parameters of Table 6.5, $k(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) := \lfloor 160 \max\{\varepsilon_1^{-2}, \varepsilon_2^{-3}\} \rfloor$ is a lower bound on the upper bound on the number of iterations required by [35, Algorithm 1] to produce an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -approximate second-order stationary point given in [35, (3.11)], and we observe in Figure 6.1b that every iteration number i satisfies $i \leq k_i := k(\|\nabla g(L_i, R_i)\|, -\lambda_i)$, where λ_i denotes a smallest eigenvalue of $\nabla^2 g(L_i, R_i)$, which implies that the upper bound given in [35, (3.11)] is respected. Figure 6.1b also shows that the upper bound given in [35, (3.11)] is very pessimistic in this experiment.

The only iteration of P²GDR that differs from a P²GD iteration is the fifth one, where $\text{rank}_\Delta X_5 = 1$, $\hat{X}_5^1 = \text{diag}(1, 0, 0)$, and X_6 is selected in P²GD($\hat{X}_5^1; \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 2}^{3 \times 3}, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c$). This unique intervention of the rank reduction mechanism prevents P²GDR from following the apocalypse.

If the behavior of P²GDR on this example seems satisfying, it should however be noted that, if $\Delta < (\frac{3}{5})^{38}$, then P²GDR produces the exact same (finite) sequence of iterates as P²GD because $\text{rank}_\Delta X_{38} = 2$ and $s(X_{39}; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 2}^{3 \times 3}) \leq 3 \cdot 10^{-9}$. This shows that, in a practical implementation of P²GDR where the stopping criterion defined by (19) is used, i.e., the algorithm is stopped as soon as the stationarity measure becomes smaller than or equal to some threshold $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, it is important to choose Δ in such a way that the algorithm does not stop while it is heading towards an apocalyptic point, which is $\text{diag}(1, 0, 0)$ in this case, in the sense that, if we had continued with $\varepsilon := \Delta := 0$, an apocalypse would have occurred.

6.2.8 P²GD following an apocalypse on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}$

In this section, we present an example of P²GD following an apocalypse on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}$. For the function


$$f : \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : X \mapsto \frac{X(1, 1)^2 + (X(2, 2) - 1)^2 + (X(1, 2) - X(2, 1))^2}{2},$$

we have $\min_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}} f = 0$ and $\text{argmin}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}} f = \text{diag}(0, 1)$. Proposition 6.19 states that P²GD used with an initial step size for the backtracking procedure smaller than 1 can follow an apocalypse by trying to minimize f on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}$. Before introducing that proposition, we give an intuitive explanation of the result. Given any point $\text{diag}(x_0, 0)$ with $x_0 \in (0, \infty)$, P²GD produces a sequence converging to $0_{2 \times 2}$, thereby minimizing the first term of f . However, no iteration affects the second term because the search direction $\text{diag}(0, 1)$, which would enable the minimization of the second term, is not available until $0_{2 \times 2}$ is reached, which never happens. The third term of f makes its global minimizer on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}$ unique without affecting the iterations.


Proposition 6.19. *Let $x_0 \in (0, \infty)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. With f on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}$ as defined above, starting from $X_0 := \text{diag}(x_0, 0)$, and using $\underline{\alpha} := \bar{\alpha} := \alpha$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and $c \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, P²GD produces the sequence $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by*

$$X_i := \text{diag}((1 - \alpha)^i x_0, 0) \tag{36}$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, $s(X_i; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}) = (1 - \alpha)^i x_0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, since $s(0_{2 \times 2}; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}) = \|\nabla f(0_{2 \times 2})\| = 1$, $(0_{2 \times 2}, (X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, f)$ is an apocalypse.



(a) Evolutions of the stationarity measure, the cost function, and the distance to a global minimizer along the sequences produced by PGD, P²GD, P²GDR, and [35, Algorithm 1].



(b) Evolutions of the smallest eigenvalue of the Hessian and the lower bound on the right-hand side of [35, (3.11)] along the sequence produced by [35, Algorithm 1].

Figure 6.1: Numerical comparison of PGD, P²GD, P²GDR, and [35, Algorithm 1] on the problem of Section 6.2.7 with the parameters of Table 6.5.

Proof. The formula (36) holds for $i = 0$. Furthermore, for all $X \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$,

$$\nabla f(X) = X - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & X(2, 1) \\ X(1, 2) & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$-\nabla f(X_i) = \text{diag}(-(1 - \alpha)^i x_0, 1), \quad P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}}(X_i)}(-\nabla f(X_i)) = \text{diag}(-(1 - \alpha)^i x_0, 0),$$

and the formula for $s(X_i; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2})$ is valid. Thus, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_{i+1} &= X_i + \alpha P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}}(X_i)}(-\nabla f(X_i)), \\ f(X_{i+1}) &\leq f(X_i) - c \alpha s(X_i; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2})^2, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that the sequence defined by (36) is indeed the one produced by P²GD. The expression for $s(0_{2 \times 2}; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2})$ follows from the fact that $-\nabla f(0_{2 \times 2}) = \text{diag}(0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2} = T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}}(0_{2 \times 2})$. \square

Proposition 6.20 shows that P²GDR (Algorithm 5.3 using Algorithm 6.3 in line 3) escapes the apocalypse due to its rank reduction mechanism. During the first iterations, P²GDR produces the same iterates as P²GD. However, when the numerical rank of the iterate becomes smaller than its rank, i.e., when its smallest singular value becomes smaller than or equal to Δ , P²GDR realizes that a stronger decrease of f is obtained by first reducing the rank and then applying an iteration of P²GD. As a result, the first term of f is minimized within a finite number of iterations, after which the minimization of the second term can start.

Proposition 6.20. *Consider the same problem as in Proposition 6.19 with the same parameters and $\Delta \in (0, \infty)$. Then, P²GDR produces the sequence $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by*

$$X_i := \begin{cases} \text{diag}((1 - \alpha)^i x_0, 0) & \text{if } i \leq i_\Delta \\ \text{diag}(0, 1 - (1 - \alpha)^{i - i_\Delta}) & \text{if } i > i_\Delta \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

where $i_\Delta := \max \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{\ln(\frac{\Delta}{x_0})}{\ln(1 - \alpha)} \right\rceil, 0 \right\}$. In particular, $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\text{diag}(0, 1)$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(X_i; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}) = 0$.

Proof. The formula (37) is correct for $i = 0$. If $i_\Delta > 0$, then $(1 - \alpha)^i x_0 > \Delta$ for every $i \in \{0, \dots, i_\Delta - 1\}$, and (37) thus holds for every $i \in \{1, \dots, i_\Delta\}$ in view of Proposition 6.19. It remains to prove (37) for every integer $i > i_\Delta$. Let us look at iteration i_Δ . Since $\hat{X}_{i_\Delta}^1 = 0_{2 \times 2}$, $-\nabla f(0_{2 \times 2}) = \text{diag}(0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2} = T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}}(0_{2 \times 2})$, $s(0_{2 \times 2}; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}) = 1$, $\hat{X}_{i_\Delta}^1 - \alpha \nabla f(\hat{X}_{i_\Delta}^1) = \text{diag}(0, \alpha)$, and

$$f(\hat{X}_{i_\Delta}^1) - f(\text{diag}(0, \alpha)) \geq c \alpha s(\hat{X}_{i_\Delta}^1; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2})^2,$$

we have $\tilde{X}_{i_\Delta}^1 = \text{diag}(0, \alpha)$. As $\hat{X}_{i_\Delta}^0 = X_{i_\Delta}$, Proposition 6.19 yields $\tilde{X}_{i_\Delta}^0 = \text{diag}((1 - \alpha)^{i_\Delta + 1} x_0, 0)$. Since

$$f(\tilde{X}_{i_\Delta}^1) = \frac{(1 - \alpha)^2}{2} < \frac{(1 - \alpha)^{2(i_\Delta + 1)} x_0^2 + 1}{2} = f(\tilde{X}_{i_\Delta}^0),$$

we have $X_{i_\Delta + 1} = \tilde{X}_{i_\Delta}^1$, in agreement with (37). Let us now assume that (37) holds for some integer $i > i_\Delta$ and prove that it also holds for $i + 1$. As $\hat{X}_i^0 = X_i$, $-\nabla f(X_i) = \text{diag}(0, (1 - \alpha)^{i - i_\Delta}) \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}}(X_i)$, $s(X_i; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}) = (1 - \alpha)^{i - i_\Delta}$, $X_i - \alpha \nabla f(X_i) = \text{diag}(0, 1 - (1 - \alpha)^{i + 1 - i_\Delta}) \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}$, and $f(X_i) - f(\text{diag}(0, 1 - (1 - \alpha)^{i + 1 - i_\Delta})) \geq c \alpha s(X_i; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2})^2$, we have $\tilde{X}_i^0 = \text{diag}(0, 1 - (1 - \alpha)^{i + 1 - i_\Delta})$. If $\text{rank}_\Delta X_i = 0$, then P²GDR also considers $\hat{X}_i^1 = 0_{2 \times 2}$ and, from what precedes, $\tilde{X}_i^1 = \text{diag}(0, \alpha)$. Since $f(\tilde{X}_i^0) < f(\tilde{X}_i^1)$, we have $X_{i+1} = \tilde{X}_i^0$, as wished. The other two claims follow. \square




Figure 6.2: Iterates X_i produced by P²GDR for the problem of Section 6.2.8 with $x_0 := 1$, $\alpha := \frac{3}{5}$, and $\Delta := \frac{1}{5}$ in the xy -plane of $\text{diag}(x, y)$ matrices. The arrows represent $-\alpha \nabla f(X_i)$. The circles represent sublevel sets of f .

The iterates of P²GDR computed in Proposition 6.20 are represented in Figure 6.2, which illustrates how the apocalypse is avoided. As explained, P²GD follows an apocalypse because, at any point $\text{diag}(x, 0)$ with $x \in (0, \infty)$, the projection of $-\nabla f$ onto the tangent cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}$ is parallel to the x -axis, and can thus minimize only the first term of f . The descent direction $\text{diag}(0, 1)$, which enables the minimization of the second term of f , becomes accessible only at $\text{diag}(0, 0)$.

Although P²GDR avoids the apocalypse for every $\Delta \in (0, \infty)$, it should be noted that, if $\Delta \geq \alpha$, then its rank reduction mechanism makes it apply the P²GD map to $0_{2 \times 2}$ in at least one iteration from iteration $i_\Delta + 1$, thereby constructing points that are not used, as shown in the proof of Proposition 6.20. For those iterations, P²GDR therefore produces the same iterates as P²GD at a higher computational cost.

We close this section by discussing how P²GDR behaves on this problem if it is used with the stopping criterion defined by (19), i.e., if it is stopped when the stationarity measure $s(\cdot; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2})$ becomes smaller than or equal to some threshold $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$. If $\Delta := 0$, it returns the sequence $(X_i)_{i=0}^{i_\varepsilon}$ defined by (36), where $i_\varepsilon := \max \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{\ln(\frac{\varepsilon}{x_0})}{\ln(1-\alpha)} \right\rceil, 0 \right\}$. Thus, in view of (37), for P²GDR to avoid stopping while it is heading towards the apocalyptic point, we must have $i_\Delta < i_\varepsilon$, i.e., $\Delta \geq (1 - \alpha)^{i_\varepsilon - 1} x_0$.

6.3 The cone of symmetric positive-semidefinite matrices of bounded rank

In this section, $\mathcal{E} := \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and

$$C := S_{\leq r}^+(n) := \{X \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{n \times n} \mid X^\top = X, X \succeq 0\}$$

for some positive integers n and $r < n$, $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is endowed with the Frobenius inner product, and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Frobenius norm. For every $q \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $S(q) := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q} \mid X^\top = X\}$ denote the linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ consisting of all real $q \times q$ symmetric matrices, $S^+(q) := \{X \in S(q) \mid X \succeq 0\}$ the closed convex cone of real $q \times q$ symmetric positive-semidefinite matrices, and $S^-(q) := \{X \in S(q) \mid X \preceq 0\}$ the closed convex cone of real $q \times q$ symmetric negative-semidefinite matrices. We also write $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times r} := \mathbb{R}_r^{n \times r}$ and $S_{\leq r}^+(n) := S^+(n) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{n \times n}$.

In Section 6.3.1, we review the stratification of $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ by the rank, which satisfies conditions 1(a) and 1(b) of Assumption 2.2. We also recall basic facts about real symmetric positive-semidefinite matrices showing that condition 1(c) is satisfied and providing a formula to project onto $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ and its strata. In Section 6.3.2, we review an explicit description of the tangent cone to $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ and derive a formula to project onto it (Proposition 6.22). Based on this description, we prove that $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ satisfies the second statement of Theorem 6.1 (Proposition 6.23) and condition 3 of Assumption 2.2 (Proposition 6.26). In Section 6.3.3, we deduce the regular normal cone, the normal cone, and the Clarke normal cone to $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ and show that the sets of apocalyptic and serendipitous points of $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ both equal $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ (Proposition 6.31). Finally, in Section 6.3.4, we present an alternative version of the P²GDR map on $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ (Algorithm 6.5) and show that the general theory developed in Section 5 also applies to this version (Proposition 6.32). We notably deduce Corollary 6.33.

6.3.1 Stratification of the cone of positive-semidefinite matrices of bounded rank

The rank stratifies $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$:

$$S_{\leq r}^+(n) = \bigcup_{i=0}^r S_i^+(n)$$

where, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, r\}$,

$$S_i^+(n) := S^+(n) \cap \mathbb{R}_i^{n \times n}$$

is the smooth manifold of $n \times n$ rank- i symmetric positive-semidefinite matrices [25, Proposition 2.1]. Observe that $S_{\leq 0}^+(n) = S_0^+(n) = \{0_{n \times n}\}$. The stratification of $S^+(n)$ by the rank follows from the fact that $S^+(n)$ is in bijection with the orbit space $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}/O(n)$, as shown in [49, §3.1] based on [2].

It follows that $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ satisfies condition 1(a) of Assumption 2.2. By [25, Proposition 2.1], condition 1(b) is satisfied too. To establish condition 1(c), we first review basic facts about the eigenvalues of a real symmetric matrix.

In what follows, the eigenvalues of $X \in S(n)$, which are real [26, Theorem 4.1.3], are denoted by $\lambda_1(X) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(X)$, as in [22, 2.1.7]; moreover, $\lambda_1(X)$ and $\lambda_n(X)$ are respectively denoted by $\lambda_{\max}(X)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(X)$. By the spectral theorem for real symmetric matrices [22, Theorem 8.1.1], for every $X \in S(n)$, there exists $U \in O(n)$ such that

$$X = U \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1(X), \dots, \lambda_n(X)) U^\top. \quad (38)$$

Moreover, if $X \succeq 0$, then $\lambda_{\min}(X) \geq 0$ [26, Theorem 4.1.8], thus the eigendecomposition (38) is an SVD, and the singular values of X are its eigenvalues.

Proposition 6.21 shows how to project onto $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ and implies that $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ satisfies condition 1(c) of Assumption 2.2.

Proposition 6.21 (projection onto $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ [16, Corollary 17]). *For every $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $P_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)$ is the set of all possible outputs of Algorithm 6.4; in particular, if $X_{\text{sym}} := \frac{1}{2}(X + X^\top)$ and*

$$i := \begin{cases} \max\{j \in \{1, \dots, r\} \mid \lambda_j(X_{\text{sym}}) > 0\} & \text{if } \lambda_1(X_{\text{sym}}) > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then

$$d(X, S_{\leq r}^+(n)) = \sqrt{\|X\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^i \lambda_j^2(X_{\text{sym}})}.$$

Algorithm 6.4 Projection onto $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$

Require: (n, r) where $n, r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $r < n$.

Input: $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$.

Output: $Y \in P_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)$.

- 1: $X_{\text{sym}} \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}(X + X^\top)$;
 - 2: Choose $U \in O(n)$ such that $X_{\text{sym}} = U \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1(X_{\text{sym}}), \dots, \lambda_n(X_{\text{sym}})) U^\top$;
 - 3: **if** $\lambda_1(X_{\text{sym}}) > 0$ **then**
 - 4: $i \leftarrow \max\{j \in \{1, \dots, r\} \mid \lambda_j(X_{\text{sym}}) > 0\}$;
 - 5: $Y \leftarrow U(:, 1:i) \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1(X_{\text{sym}}), \dots, \lambda_i(X_{\text{sym}})) U(:, 1:i)^\top$;
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: $Y \leftarrow 0_{n \times n}$;
 - 8: **end if**
 - 9: Return Y .
-

6.3.2 Tangent cone to the cone of positive-semidefinite matrices of bounded rank

In Proposition 6.22, we review a formula describing $T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)$ for every $X \in S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ based on orthonormal bases of $\text{im } X$ and $(\text{im } X)^\perp$, and we deduce a formula to project onto $T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)$.

Proposition 6.22 (tangent cone to $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$). *Let $\underline{r} \in \{0, \dots, r\}$, $X \in S_{\underline{r}}^+(n)$, $U \in \text{St}(\underline{r}, n)$, $U_\perp \in \text{St}(n - \underline{r}, n)$, $\text{im } U = \text{im } X$, and $\text{im } U_\perp = (\text{im } X)^\perp$. Then,*

$$T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X) = \left\{ [U \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B^\top & E \end{bmatrix} [U \ U_\perp]^\top \mid A \in S(\underline{r}), B \in \mathbb{R}^{\underline{r} \times n - \underline{r}}, E \in S_{\leq r - \underline{r}}^+(n - \underline{r}) \right\}.$$

Moreover, if $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is written as

$$Z = [U \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ D & E \end{bmatrix} [U \ U_\perp]^\top$$

with $A = U^\top Z U$, $B = U^\top Z U_\perp$, $D = U_\perp^\top Z U$, and $E = U_\perp^\top Z U_\perp$, then

$$P_{T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)}(Z) = [U \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(A + A^\top) & \frac{1}{2}(B + D^\top) \\ \frac{1}{2}(B^\top + D) & P_{S_{\leq r - \underline{r}}^+(n - \underline{r})}(E) \end{bmatrix} [U \ U_\perp]^\top.$$

Proof. The description of $T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)$ is given in [34, Proposition 3.4]. All $\tilde{Z} \in T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)$ can be written as

$$\tilde{Z} = [U \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A} & \tilde{B} \\ \tilde{B}^\top & \tilde{E} \end{bmatrix} [U \ U_\perp]^\top$$

with $\tilde{A} \in S(\underline{r})$, $\tilde{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{\underline{r} \times n - \underline{r}}$, and $\tilde{E} \in S_{\leq r - \underline{r}}^+(n - \underline{r})$, and

$$\|Z - \tilde{Z}\|^2 = \|A - \tilde{A}\|^2 + \|B - \tilde{B}\|^2 + \|D - \tilde{B}^\top\|^2 + \|E - \tilde{E}\|^2$$

is minimized if and only if $\tilde{A} \in P_{S(\underline{r})}(A) = \frac{1}{2}(A + A^\top)$, $\tilde{B} = \frac{1}{2}(B + D^\top)$, and $\tilde{E} \in P_{S_{\leq r - \underline{r}}^+(n - \underline{r})}(E)$. \square

Proposition 6.23 shows that $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ satisfies the second statement of Theorem 6.1.

Proposition 6.23. *For all $X \in S_{\underline{r}}^+(n)$ with $\underline{r} \in \{1, \dots, r\}$,*

$$\frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{r + 1} \frac{1}{2\lambda_{\underline{r}}(X)} \leq \sup_{Z \in T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X) \setminus \{0_{n \times n}\}} \frac{d(X + Z, S_{\leq r}^+(n))}{\|Z\|^2} \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda_{\underline{r}}(X)}.$$

Proof. We prove only the upper bound; the lower bound can be obtained as the one in Proposition 6.12. Let

$$X = [U \ U_\perp] \text{diag}(\Lambda, 0_{n - \underline{r} \times n - \underline{r}}) [U \ U_\perp]^\top$$

be an eigendecomposition, and $Z \in T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X) \setminus \{0_{n \times n}\}$. By Proposition 6.22, there are $A \in S(\underline{r})$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{\underline{r} \times n - \underline{r}}$, and $E \in S_{\leq r - \underline{r}}^+(n - \underline{r})$ such that

$$Z = [U \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B^\top & E \end{bmatrix} [U \ U_\perp]^\top.$$

Define the function

$$\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow S_{\leq r}^+(n) : t \mapsto (U + t(U_\perp B^\top + \frac{1}{2} U A) \Lambda^{-1}) \Lambda (U + t(U_\perp B^\top + \frac{1}{2} U A^\top) \Lambda^{-1})^\top + t U_\perp E U_\perp^\top;$$

γ is well defined since the ranks of the two terms are respectively upper bounded by \underline{r} and $r - \underline{r}$, and the sum of two positive-semidefinite matrices is positive-semidefinite. For all $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\gamma(t) = X + tZ + \frac{t^2}{4}[U \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} A \\ 2B^\top \end{bmatrix} \Lambda^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} A & 2B \end{bmatrix} [U \ U_\perp]^\top$$

thus

$$d(X + tZ, S_{\leq r}^+(n)) \leq \|(X + tZ) - \gamma(t)\| = \frac{t^2}{4} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} A\Lambda^{-1}A & 2A\Lambda^{-1}B \\ 2B^\top\Lambda^{-1}A & 4B^\top\Lambda^{-1}B \end{bmatrix} \right\|.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} A\Lambda^{-1}A & 2A\Lambda^{-1}B \\ 2B^\top\Lambda^{-1}A & 4B^\top\Lambda^{-1}B \end{bmatrix} \right\| &= \sqrt{\|A\Lambda^{-1}A\|^2 + 4\|A\Lambda^{-1}B\|^2 + 4\|B^\top\Lambda^{-1}A\|^2 + 16\|B^\top\Lambda^{-1}B\|^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\|A\Lambda^{-1}A\|^2 + 8\|A\Lambda^{-1}B\|^2 + 16\|B^\top\Lambda^{-1}B\|^2} \\ &\leq \|\Lambda^{-1}\|_2 \left(\|A\|^2 + 4\|B\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \|\Lambda^{-1}\|_2 \|Z\|^2 \max_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{R} \\ x^2 + 2y^2 = 1}} x^2 + 4y^2 \\ &= 2\|\Lambda^{-1}\|_2 \|Z\|^2 \\ &= \frac{2}{\lambda_{\underline{r}}(X)} \|Z\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for all $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$d(X + tZ, S_{\leq r}^+(n)) \leq t^2 \frac{1}{2\lambda_{\underline{r}}(X)} \|Z\|^2.$$

Choosing $t = 1$ yields the result. \square

We now prove Proposition 6.26 which states that $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ satisfies condition 3 of Assumption 2.2. To this end, we need some preliminary results. Proposition 6.24 allows us to deduce Lemma 6.25 from [41, Lemma 4.1].

Proposition 6.24. *For every $W \in \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times r}$, $P_{\text{St}(r, n)}(W) = U$ and $\text{im } U = \text{im } W$. Moreover, the function*

$$P_{\text{St}(r, n)}(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times r} \rightarrow \text{St}(r, n)$$

is continuous.

Proof. The first part follows from [4, Theorem 10.2]. The second part then follows from [20, Theorem 2.26] since $\text{St}(r, n)$ is compact. \square

Lemma 6.25. *Let $\underline{r} \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $S_{\underline{r}}^+(n)$ converging to $X \in S_{\underline{r}}^+(n)$, $U \in \text{St}(\underline{r}, n)$, $\text{im } U = \text{im } X$, $U_\perp \in \text{St}(n - \underline{r}, n)$, and $\text{im } U_\perp = (\text{im } X)^\perp$. Then, there exist sequences $(U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\text{St}(\underline{r}, n)$ and $(U_{i\perp})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\text{St}(n - \underline{r}, n)$ respectively converging to U and U_\perp , and such that, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{im } U_i = \text{im } X_i$ and $\text{im } U_{i\perp} = (\text{im } X_i)^\perp$.*

Proof. By [41, Lemma 4.1], there exist sequences $(\tilde{U}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times \underline{r}}$ and $(\tilde{U}_{i\perp})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times n - \underline{r}}$ respectively converging to U and U_\perp , and such that, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{im } \tilde{U}_i = \text{im } X_i$ and $\text{im } \tilde{U}_{i\perp} = (\text{im } X_i)^\perp$. By Proposition 6.24, we can take $U_i := P_{\text{St}(\underline{r}, n)}(\tilde{U}_i)$ and $U_{i\perp} := P_{\text{St}(n - \underline{r}, n)}(\tilde{U}_{i\perp})$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Lemma 6.25 allows us to prove Proposition 6.26 which states that $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ satisfies condition 3 of Assumption 2.2.

Proposition 6.26. *For every $\underline{r} \in \{0, \dots, r\}$, the correspondence $T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(\cdot)$ is continuous at every $X \in S_{\underline{r}}^+(n)$ relative to $S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)$.*

Proof. The result is clear if $\underline{r} = 0$ since $S_{\leq 0}^+(n) = S_0^+(n) = \{0_{n \times n}\}$. Let us therefore consider $\underline{r} \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $X \in S_{\underline{r}}^+(n)$. We must prove that, for every sequence $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)$ converging to $X \in S_{\underline{r}}^+(n)$, it holds that

$$\overline{\lim}_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)}(X_i) \subseteq T_{S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)}(X) \subseteq \underline{\lim}_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)}(X_i).$$

We recall that the concepts of inner and outer limits of a sequence of sets have been reviewed in Section 4.2. By Proposition 6.21, every sequence in $S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)$ converging to a point in $S_{\underline{r}}^+(n)$ contains finitely many elements in $S_{< \underline{r}}^+(n)$. Thus, it suffices to consider a sequence $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $S_{\underline{r}}^+(n)$ converging to $X \in S_{\underline{r}}^+(n)$. Let $U \in \text{St}(\underline{r}, n)$, $\text{im } U = \text{im } X$, $U_{\perp} \in \text{St}(n - \underline{r}, n)$, and $\text{im } U_{\perp} = (\text{im } X)^{\perp}$. We apply Lemma 6.25 to $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and X .

Let us establish the first inclusion. Let $Z \in \overline{\lim}_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)}(X_i)$, i.e., Z is an accumulation point of a sequence $(Z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $Z_i \in T_{S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)}(X_i)$. We need to prove that $Z \in T_{S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)}(X)$. By Proposition 6.22, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $Z_i = [U_i \ U_{i\perp}] \begin{bmatrix} A_i & B_i \\ B_i^{\top} & E_i \end{bmatrix} [U_i \ U_{i\perp}]^{\top}$ with $A_i = U_i^{\top} Z_i U_i \in S(\underline{r})$, $B_i = U_i^{\top} Z_i U_{i\perp} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n - \underline{r}}$, and $E_i = U_{i\perp}^{\top} Z_i U_{i\perp} \in S_{\leq r - \underline{r}}^+(n - \underline{r})$. Let $(Z_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a subsequence of $(Z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to Z . Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $Z_{i_k} = [U_{i_k} \ U_{i_k\perp}] \begin{bmatrix} A_{i_k} & B_{i_k} \\ B_{i_k}^{\top} & E_{i_k} \end{bmatrix} [U_{i_k} \ U_{i_k\perp}]^{\top}$, and, since the subsequences $(A_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(B_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $(E_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ respectively converge to $A := U^{\top} Z U \in S(\underline{r})$, $B := U^{\top} Z U_{\perp}$, and $E := U_{\perp}^{\top} Z U_{\perp} \in S_{\leq r - \underline{r}}^+(n - \underline{r})$, we have $Z = [U \ U_{\perp}] \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B^{\top} & E \end{bmatrix} [U \ U_{\perp}]^{\top}$, which shows that $Z \in T_{S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)}(X)$ by Proposition 6.22.

Let us establish the second inclusion. Let $Z \in T_{S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)}(X)$. We have to prove that there exists a sequence $(Z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to Z and such that $Z_i \in T_{S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)}(X_i)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By Proposition 6.22, there exist $A \in S(\underline{r})$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n - \underline{r}}$, and $E \in S_{\leq r - \underline{r}}^+(n - \underline{r})$ such that $Z = [U \ U_{\perp}] \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B^{\top} & E \end{bmatrix} [U \ U_{\perp}]^{\top}$. By Proposition 6.22, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $Z_i := [U_i \ U_{i\perp}] \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B^{\top} & E \end{bmatrix} [U_i \ U_{i\perp}]^{\top} \in T_{S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)}(X_i)$. Since $(Z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to Z , the proof is complete. \square

6.3.3 Normal cones to the cone of positive-semidefinite matrices of bounded rank

In this section, we compute the polar of $S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)$ (Proposition 6.27), the regular normal cone to $S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)$ (Proposition 6.28), the normal cone to $S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)$ (Proposition 6.29), and the Clarke normal cone to $S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)$ (Corollary 6.30). To this end, we use Proposition 4.5 and the fact that

$$S(n)^{\perp} = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid X^{\top} = -X\}.$$

Finally, using Proposition 4.9, we prove that the sets of apocalyptic points and of serendipitous points of $S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)$ both equal $S_{< \underline{r}}^+(n)$ (Proposition 6.31).

Proposition 6.27 (polar of $S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)$). *For all $\underline{r} \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,*

$$S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)^* = S^-(n) + S(n)^{\perp}.$$

Proof. By Proposition 4.3, it suffices to prove that $S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)^* \cap S(n) = S^-(n)$. The inclusion \supseteq holds since, for all $X, Y \in S^+(n)$, $\langle X, Y \rangle \geq 0$. Let us establish the inclusion \subseteq . Let $X \in S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)^* \cap S(n)$. Then, there exists $U \in O(n)$ such that $X = U \text{diag}(\lambda_1(X), \dots, \lambda_n(X)) U^{\top}$. Moreover, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $Y := U \text{diag}(\delta_{1,i}, \dots, \delta_{n,i}) U^{\top} \in S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)$ and thus $0 \geq \langle X, Y \rangle = \lambda_i(X)$. Therefore, $X \preceq 0$. \square

Proposition 6.28 (regular normal cone to $S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)$). *For all $X \in S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)$,*

$$\hat{N}_{S_{\leq \underline{r}}^+(n)}(X) = S(n)^{\perp} + \begin{cases} \{Z \in S^-(n) \mid XZ = 0_{n \times n}\} & \text{if } \text{rank } X < r, \\ \{Z \in S(n) \mid XZ = 0_{n \times n}\} & \text{if } \text{rank } X = r. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By (12) and Propositions 6.22 and 6.27, we have

$$\hat{N}_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(0_{n \times n}) = T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(0_{n \times n})^* = S_{\leq r}^+(n)^* = S^-(n) + S(n)^\perp.$$

Let $\underline{r} \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $X \in S_{\underline{r}}^+(n)$, $U \in \text{St}(\underline{r}, n)$, $U_\perp \in \text{St}(n - \underline{r}, n)$, $\text{im } U = \text{im } X$, and $\text{im } U_\perp = (\text{im } X)^\perp$. By Proposition 4.5, it suffices to prove that

$$\hat{N}_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X) \cap S(n) = \begin{cases} \{Z \in S^-(n) \mid XZ = 0_{n \times n}\} & \text{if } \underline{r} < r, \\ \{Z \in S(n) \mid XZ = 0_{n \times n}\} & \text{if } \underline{r} = r. \end{cases}$$

Let $Z \in S(n)$ be written as

$$Z = [U \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A} & \tilde{B} \\ \tilde{B}^\top & \tilde{D} \end{bmatrix} [U \ U_\perp]^\top$$

with $\tilde{A} = U^\top Z U$, $\tilde{B} = U^\top Z U_\perp$, and $\tilde{D} = U_\perp^\top Z U_\perp$. Then, $Z \in \hat{N}_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X) \cap S(n)$ if and only if $\langle Z, Y \rangle \leq 0$ for all $Y \in T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)$. By Proposition 6.22, all $Y \in T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)$ can be written as

$$Y = [U \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B^\top & D \end{bmatrix} [U \ U_\perp]^\top,$$

with $A \in S(\underline{r})$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{\underline{r} \times n - \underline{r}}$, and $D \in S_{\leq r - \underline{r}}^+(n - \underline{r})$, and

$$\langle Z, Y \rangle = \text{tr } A\tilde{A} + 2\text{tr } B\tilde{B}^\top + \text{tr } D\tilde{D}.$$

Thus, $\langle Z, Y \rangle \leq 0$ for all $Y \in T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)$ if and only if $\tilde{A} = 0_{\underline{r} \times \underline{r}}$, $\tilde{B} = 0_{\underline{r} \times n - \underline{r}}$, and $\tilde{D} \in S_{\leq r - \underline{r}}^+(n - \underline{r})^* \cap S(n - \underline{r})$. Therefore, $Z \in U_\perp S^-(n - \underline{r}) U_\perp^\top$ if $\underline{r} < r$ (by Proposition 6.27) and $Z \in U_\perp S(n - r) U_\perp^\top$ if $\underline{r} = r$ (because $\{0_{n - r \times n - r}\}^* = \mathbb{R}^{n - r \times n - r}$). The result follows. \square

The normal cone to $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ in $S(n)$ is given in [48, Theorem 3.12]. In Proposition 6.29, we deduce the normal to $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ thanks to Proposition 4.5.

Proposition 6.29 (normal cone to $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$). *For all $X \in S_{\leq r}^+(n)$,*

$$N_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X) = \{Z \in S^-(n) \cup S_{\leq n - r}(n) \mid XZ = 0_{n \times n}\} + S(n)^\perp.$$

In particular, $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ is not Clarke regular on $S_{< r}^+(n)$.

Proof. This follows from Proposition 4.5 and [48, Theorem 3.12]. \square

Corollary 6.30 (Clarke normal cone to $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$). *For all $X \in S_{\leq r}^+(n)$,*

$$\overline{N}_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X) = \{Z \in S(n) \mid XZ = 0_{n \times n}\} + S(n)^\perp.$$

By Proposition 6.29, $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ is not Clarke regular on $S_{< r}^+(n)$. Proposition 6.31 states that every point of $S_{< r}^+(n)$ is apocalyptic, which is a stronger result by [35, Corollary 2.15].

Proposition 6.31. *The set of apocalyptic points of $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ and the set of serendipitous points of $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ both equal $S_{< r}^+(n)$.*

Proof. We use Proposition 4.9. Let $X \in S_r^+(n)$ and $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ converging to X . By Proposition 6.21, $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ contains finitely many elements in $S_{< r}^+(n)$. Therefore, by Proposition 6.26, $\overline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X_i) = T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)$, and thus $(\overline{\text{Lim}}_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X_i))^* = \hat{N}_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)$. Thus, X is neither apocalyptic nor serendipitous.

Let $X \in S_{\underline{r}}^+(n)$ with $\underline{r} \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$. Let $\Lambda := \text{diag}(\lambda_1(X), \dots, \lambda_{\underline{r}}(X))$ and $U \in \text{St}(\underline{r}, n)$ be such that $X = U\Lambda U^\top$. Let $\bar{U}_\perp \in \text{St}(r-\underline{r}, n)$ and $U_\perp \in \text{St}(n-r, n)$ be such that $[U \ \bar{U}_\perp \ U_\perp] \in \text{O}(n)$. For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $X_i := [U \ \bar{U}_\perp] \text{diag}(\Lambda, \frac{\lambda_{\underline{r}}(X)}{i+1} I_{r-\underline{r}}) [U \ \bar{U}_\perp]^\top$. Thus, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X_i) = \left\{ [U \ \bar{U}_\perp \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} A & B & F \\ B^\top & D & G \\ F^\top & G^\top & 0_{n-r \times n-r} \end{bmatrix} [U \ \bar{U}_\perp \ U_\perp]^\top \mid \begin{array}{l} A \in S(\underline{r}), B \in \mathbb{R}^{\underline{r} \times r-\underline{r}}, \\ D \in S(r-\underline{r}), \\ F \in \mathbb{R}^{\underline{r} \times n-r}, G \in \mathbb{R}^{r-\underline{r} \times n-r} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\overline{\lim}_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X_i) = \left\{ [U \ \bar{U}_\perp \ U_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} A & B & F \\ B^\top & D & G \\ F^\top & G^\top & 0_{n-r \times n-r} \end{bmatrix} [U \ \bar{U}_\perp \ U_\perp]^\top \mid \begin{array}{l} A \in S(\underline{r}), B \in \mathbb{R}^{\underline{r} \times r-\underline{r}}, \\ D \in S(r-\underline{r}), \\ F \in \mathbb{R}^{\underline{r} \times n-r}, G \in \mathbb{R}^{r-\underline{r} \times n-r} \end{array} \right\}$$

and, by Proposition 4.3,

$$\left(\overline{\lim}_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X_i) \right)^* = S(n)^\perp + U_\perp \mathbb{R}^{n-r \times n-r} U_\perp^\top.$$

Furthermore, by Proposition 6.27,

$$\hat{N}_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X) = S(n)^\perp + [\bar{U}_\perp \ U_\perp] S^-(n-\underline{r}) [\bar{U}_\perp \ U_\perp]^\top.$$

Thus, since neither of $\hat{N}_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X)$ and $\left(\overline{\lim}_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{S_{\leq r}^+(n)}(X_i) \right)^*$ is a subset of the other, X is apocalyptic and serendipitous. The argument is the same if $X = 0_{n \times n}$. \square

6.3.4 A variant of the P²GDR map on the cone of positive-semidefinite matrices of bounded rank

The variant of the P²GDR map on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ given in Algorithm 6.3 can also be defined on $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$, yielding Algorithm 6.5.

Algorithm 6.5 Variant of the P²GDR map on $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$

Require: $(f, r, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$ where $f : \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable with ∇f locally Lipschitz continuous, $r \leq n$ is a positive integer, $0 < \underline{\alpha} \leq \bar{\alpha} < \infty$, $\beta, c \in (0, 1)$, and $\Delta \in (0, \infty)$.

Input: $X \in S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ such that $s(X; f, S_{\leq r}^+(n)) > 0$.

Output: $Y \in \text{Algorithm 6.5}(X; f, r, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$.

- 1: **for** $j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X - \text{rank}_\Delta X\}$ **do**
 - 2: Choose $\hat{X}^j \in P_{S_{\text{rank } X - j}^+(n)}^+(X)$;
 - 3: Choose $\tilde{X}^j \in \text{P}^2\text{GD}(\hat{X}^j; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, S_{\leq r}^+(n), f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$;
 - 4: **end for**
 - 5: Return $Y \in \arg\min_{\{\tilde{X}^j | j \in \{0, \dots, \text{rank } X - \text{rank}_\Delta X\}\}} f$.
-

Proposition 6.32 states that this variant satisfies the same decrease guarantee as the original version.

Proposition 6.32. *Proposition 5.4 holds for Algorithm 6.5.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Proposition 6.16. \square

The main result of this section is the following.

Corollary 6.33. *On $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$, Theorem 5.5 holds if Algorithm 5.2 is replaced by Algorithm 6.5 in line 3 of Algorithm 5.3.*

Proof. The result follows from Proposition 6.32 and Theorem 5.5 since $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ satisfies Assumption 2.2. \square

By Proposition 6.31, unlike on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, it is an open question whether P^2GDR on $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ (Algorithm 5.3 using either Algorithm 5.2 or Algorithm 6.5 in line 3) can follow a serendipity, i.e., produce a convergent sequence whose limit is stationary (by Corollary 6.33) but along which the stationarity measure $s(\cdot; f, S_{\leq r}^+(n))$ does not go to zero.

7 Complementary results

In this section, we prove complementary results to those presented in Sections 5 and 6. In Section 7.1, we show that Assumption 2.1 is related to the concept of parabolic derivability (Proposition 7.2). In Section 7.2, we prove that conditions 1(a) and 1(b) of Assumption 2.2 imply that $\{S_0, \dots, S_p\}$ is a stratification of C satisfying the condition of the frontier (Proposition 7.5). In Section 7.3, under Assumption 3.1, we define RFDR (Algorithm 7.3) and prove that it produces a sequence whose accumulation points are stationary for (1) (Theorem 7.9). In Section 7.4, we prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ satisfies Assumption 3.1. Finally, in Section 7.5, we show that the convergence analysis of the Riemannian rank-adaptive method given in [54, Algorithm 3] does not apply to all cost functions considered in [54].

7.1 Geometric and parabolic derivability of a set and distance from a tangent line

In this section, given a point x in a subset S of \mathcal{E} , we investigate the links between:

1. the derivability of $v \in T_S(x)$ and the existence of an upper bound on $\frac{d(x+tv, S)}{t}$ holding for all $t \in (0, \infty)$ sufficiently small (Proposition 7.1);
2. the parabolic derivability of S at $x \in S$ for $v \in T_S(x)$ and the existence of an upper bound on $\frac{d(x+tv, S)}{t^2}$ holding for all $t \in (0, \infty)$ (Proposition 7.2).

We recall that the concepts of geometric and parabolic derivability are reviewed in Section 4.3.

For all $x \in S$, all $v \in T_S(x)$, and all $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$d(x + tv, S) \leq \|(x + tv) - x\| = t\|v\|.$$

Proposition 7.1 shows that, if S is geometrically derivable at x , then the factor in front of t can be made arbitrarily small if t is sufficiently small.

Proposition 7.1. *If S is geometrically derivable at $x \in S$, then, for every $v \in T_S(x)$ and every $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, there exists $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for all $t \in [0, \delta]$,*

$$d(x + tv, S) \leq \varepsilon t.$$

Proof. Let $v \in T_S(x) \setminus \{0\}$. By assumption, there exists $\gamma : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ with $\tau \in (0, \infty)$, $\gamma([0, \tau]) \subseteq S$, $\gamma(0) = x$, and $\gamma'(0) = v$. Thus, for all $t \in (0, \tau]$,

$$\frac{d(x + tv, S)}{t} \leq \frac{\|\gamma(t) - (x + tv)\|}{t}.$$

Therefore, since

$$0 = \lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{\|\gamma(t) - (\gamma(0) + t\gamma'(0))\|}{t} = \lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{\|\gamma(t) - (x + tv)\|}{t},$$

it holds that

$$\lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{d(x + tv, S)}{t} = 0.$$

Thus, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, there exists $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for all $t \in (0, \delta]$,

$$d(x + tv, S) \leq \varepsilon t,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proposition 7.2 shows that, if S is parabolically derivable at $x \in S$ for $v \in T_S(x)$, then, for all $t \in (0, \infty)$, $\frac{d(x+tv, S)}{t^2}$ is bounded from above.

Proposition 7.2. *If S is parabolically derivable at $x \in S$ for $v \in T_S(x)$, then*

$$\sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{d(x+tv, S)}{t^2} < \infty.$$

Proof. Let $w \in T_S^2(x|v)$. By assumption, there exists $\gamma : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ with $\tau \in (0, \infty)$, $\gamma([0, \tau]) \subseteq S$, $\gamma(0) = x$, $\gamma'(0) = v$, and $\gamma''(0) = w$. Thus, for all $t \in (0, \tau]$,

$$\frac{d(x+tv+\frac{t^2}{2}w, S)}{\frac{t^2}{2}} \leq \frac{\|\gamma(t) - (x+tv+\frac{t^2}{2}w)\|}{\frac{t^2}{2}}.$$

Therefore, since

$$0 = \lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{\|\gamma(t) - (\gamma(0) + t\gamma'(0) + \frac{t^2}{2}\gamma''(0))\|}{\frac{t^2}{2}} = \lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{\|\gamma(t) - (x+tv+\frac{t^2}{2}w)\|}{\frac{t^2}{2}},$$

it holds that

$$\lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{d(x+tv+\frac{t^2}{2}w, S)}{\frac{t^2}{2}} = 0.$$

By [53, Proposition 1.3.17], for all $t \in (0, \tau]$,

$$\frac{|d(x+tv+\frac{t^2}{2}w, S) - d(x+tv, S)|}{\frac{t^2}{2}} \leq \|w\|.$$

Thus,

$$L_0 := \limsup_{t \searrow 0} \frac{d(x+tv, S)}{\frac{t^2}{2}} \leq \|w\|.$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ and $L_1 := \frac{L_0 + \varepsilon}{2}$. There exists $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\left| \sup_{t \in (0, \delta]} \frac{d(x+tv, S)}{\frac{t^2}{2}} - L_0 \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, for all $t \in [0, \delta]$, $d(x+tv, S) \leq L_1 t^2$. Let $L := \max\{L_1, \frac{\|v\|}{\delta}\}$. On the one hand, for all $t \in [0, \frac{\|v\|}{L}]$, $d(x+tv, S) \leq L_1 t^2 \leq L t^2$. On the other hand, for all $t \in (\frac{\|v\|}{L}, \infty)$, $d(x+tv, S) \leq t\|v\| < L t^2$. Hence, for all $t \in [0, \infty)$, $d(x+tv, S) \leq L t^2$. \square

7.2 Finite stratifications satisfying the condition of the frontier

In this section, we prove that conditions 1(a) and 1(b) of Assumption 2.2 imply that $\{S_0, \dots, S_p\}$ is a stratification of C satisfying the condition of the frontier (Proposition 7.5).

Let Z be a topological space. By [11, définition 2 & proposition 5], a subset of Z is locally closed if and only if it is the intersection of an open set and a closed set.

Proposition 7.3. *If A_1 and A_2 are two nonempty locally closed subsets of Z , then $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$ implies $\overline{A_1} \neq \overline{A_2}$.*

Proof. For every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, since A_i is nonempty and locally closed, there exist a nonempty open set O_i and a nonempty closed set C_i such that $A_i = O_i \cap C_i$. Then, either $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$ or $A_1 \cap A_2 \neq \emptyset$. If $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$, then $A_2 \subseteq \overline{A_2} \setminus \overline{A_1}$. Indeed, if $x \in A_2$, then, $x \in \overline{A_2}$ and $x \in O_2$. Thus, O_2 is a neighborhood of x that does not meet A_1 . Therefore, $x \notin \overline{A_1}$. If $A_1 \cap A_2 \neq \emptyset$, then $A_1 \cap A_2 \subseteq \overline{A_1} \setminus \overline{A_2}$. Indeed, let $x \in A_1 \cap A_2$. Then, $x \in \overline{A_1}$. Furthermore, since $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$, $x \notin C_2$. Since $Z \setminus C_2$ is open, there exists a neighborhood of x contained in $Z \setminus C_2$ and thus in $Z \setminus A_2$. Therefore, $x \notin \overline{A_2}$. \square

Proposition 7.4. *Let \mathcal{S} be a partition of Z the blocks of which are locally closed. If, for every $S \in \mathcal{S}$, $\overline{S} \setminus S$ is a union of elements of \mathcal{S} , then:*

1. *the relation $<$ defined as follows is a strict partial order on \mathcal{S} :*

$$S < S' \text{ iff } S \neq S' \text{ and } S \subseteq \overline{S'} \setminus S';$$

2. *if there exists $S \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $S < S'$ for all $S' \in \mathcal{S}$, then S is closed.*

Proof. 1. We have to prove that $<$ is irreflexive and transitive. The irreflexivity is clear. Let us prove the transitivity. Let $S, S', S'' \in \mathcal{S}$ be such that $S < S'$ and $S' < S''$. Then, $S \subseteq \overline{S''}$. Moreover, $S \neq S''$; if not, then $\overline{S} = \overline{S''}$ which is impossible in view of Proposition 7.3 since $S \neq S''$. Thus, $S \subseteq \overline{S''} \setminus S''$. Therefore, $S < S''$.

2. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that $\overline{S} \setminus S \neq \emptyset$. Then, since $\overline{S} \setminus S$ is a union of elements of \mathcal{S} , there exists $S' \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{S\}$ such that $S' \subseteq \overline{S} \setminus S$, i.e., $S' < S$, a contradiction. \square

Proposition 7.5. *Let \mathcal{E} be a Euclidean vector space and C be a nonempty closed subset of \mathcal{E} . The following statements are equivalent:*

1. *C admits a finite stratification satisfying the condition of the frontier [37, §5] and for which the partial order defined in Proposition 7.4 is total;*
2. *conditions 1(a) and 1(b) of Assumption 2.2 are satisfied.*

Proof. Clearly, the second statement implies the first. Let us prove the converse. In view of the definition given in [37, §5], if C admits a finite stratification, then C can be partitioned into finitely many smooth submanifolds of \mathcal{E} contained in C ; thus, condition 1(a) holds. Since any submanifold of \mathcal{E} is locally closed [37, §1], if the stratification satisfies the condition of the frontier as formulated in [37, §5], then Proposition 7.4 defines a strict partial order $<$. If, moreover, $<$ is total, then the stratification can be written as $\{S_0, \dots, S_p\}$ for some nonnegative integer p with, if $p \geq 1$, $S_i < S_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$. Let us prove that condition 1(b) holds. By Proposition 7.4, $\overline{S_0} = S_0$. If $p \geq 1$, let $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Then, $\bigcup_{j < i} S_j \subseteq \overline{S_i} \setminus S_i$. Let us prove that this inclusion is an equality. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that $\overline{S_i} \setminus S_i$ is not a subset of $\bigcup_{j < i} S_j$. Then, by the condition of the frontier, there exists $k \in \{i+1, \dots, p\}$ such that $S_k \subseteq \overline{S_i} \setminus S_i$, i.e., $k < i$, a contradiction. \square

7.3 Convergence analysis of RFDR under Assumption 3.1

In this section, under Assumption 3.1, we define RFDR (Algorithm 7.3) and prove that it produces a sequence whose accumulation points are stationary for (1) (Theorem 7.9). The organization of the section is described hereafter and summarized in Table 7.1. In Section 7.3.1, under condition 3 of Assumption 3.1, we prove that the RFD map (Algorithm 7.1) produces a point satisfying an Armijo condition (Corollary 7.7). In Section 7.3.2, under Assumption 3.1, we introduce the RFDR map (Algorithm 7.2), which uses the RFD map as a subroutine, and, based on Corollary 7.7, prove Proposition 7.8. Finally, in Section 7.3.3, we introduce the RFDR algorithm and prove Theorem 7.9 based on Proposition 7.8. Using the concept of serendipitous point (see Section 4.4), we also deduce Corollary 7.10 from Theorem 7.9.

Section	Assumption	Algorithm	Main result
Section 7.3.1	condition 3 of Assumption 3.1	RFD map (Algorithm 7.1)	Corollary 7.7
Section 7.3.2	Assumption 3.1	RFDR map (Algorithm 7.2)	Proposition 7.8
Section 7.3.3		RFDR (Algorithm 7.3)	Theorem 7.9

Table 7.1: Assumptions, algorithms, and main results of Section 7.3.

7.3.1 The RFD map

In this section, under condition 3 of Assumption 3.1, we prove that the RFD map (Algorithm 7.1) is well defined and produces a point satisfying an Armijo condition (Corollary 7.7). For convenience, we recall that condition 3 of Assumption 3.1 states that C admits a *restricted tangent cone*, i.e., a correspondence $C \multimap \mathcal{E} : x \mapsto \check{T}_C(x)$ such that:

1. for every $x \in C$, $\check{T}_C(x)$ is a closed cone contained in $T_C(x)$;
2. for all $x \in C$ and all $z \in \check{T}_C(x)$, $x + z \in C$;
3. there exists $\mu \in (0, 1]$ such that, for all $x \in C$ and all $z \in \mathcal{E}$, $\|P_{\check{T}_C(x)}(z)\| \geq \mu \|P_{T_C(x)}(z)\|$.

If $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, the RFD map corresponds to the iteration map of [47, Algorithm 4] except that the initial step size for the backtracking procedure is chosen in a given bounded interval.

Algorithm 7.1 RFD map

Require: $(\mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$ where \mathcal{E} is a Euclidean vector space, C is a nonempty closed subset of \mathcal{E} satisfying condition 3 of Assumption 3.1, $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable with ∇f locally Lipschitz continuous, $0 < \underline{\alpha} \leq \bar{\alpha} < \infty$, and $\beta, c \in (0, 1)$.

Input: $x \in C$ such that $s(x; f, C) > 0$.

Output: a point in $\text{RFD}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$.

- 1: Choose $g \in P_{\check{T}_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$ and $\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$;
 - 2: **while** $f(x + \alpha g) > f(x) - c\alpha\|g\|^2$ **do**
 - 3: $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha\beta$;
 - 4: **end while**
 - 5: Return $x + \alpha g$.
-

Proposition 7.6. *Let $x \in C$ and $\bar{\alpha} \in (0, \infty)$. Assume that C satisfies condition 3 of Assumption 3.1. Let $\mathcal{B} \subsetneq \mathcal{E}$ be a closed ball such that, for all $g \in P_{\check{T}_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$ and all $\alpha \in [0, \bar{\alpha}]$, $x + \alpha g \in \mathcal{B}$; an example of such a ball is $\mathcal{B}[x, \bar{\alpha}s(x; f, C)]$. Then, for all $g \in P_{\check{T}_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$ and all $\alpha \in [0, \bar{\alpha}]$,*

$$f(x + \alpha g) \leq f(x) + \|g\|^2 \alpha \left(-1 + \frac{\text{Lip}_{\mathcal{B}}(\nabla f)}{2} \alpha \right). \quad (39)$$

Proof. The example $\mathcal{B}[x, \bar{\alpha}s(x; f, C)]$ is correct because, for all $g \in P_{\check{T}_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$ and all $\alpha \in [0, \bar{\alpha}]$,

$$\|(x + \alpha g) - x\| = \alpha\|g\| \leq \bar{\alpha}s(x; f, C).$$

Let $g \in P_{\check{T}_C(x)}(-\nabla f(x))$. The proof of (39) is based on (20) and the equality $\langle \nabla f(x), g \rangle = -\|g\|^2$ which holds by Proposition 4.2 since $\check{T}_C(x)$ is a closed cone. For all $\alpha \in [0, \bar{\alpha}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x + \alpha g) - f(x) &\leq \langle \nabla f(x), (x + \alpha g) - x \rangle + \frac{\text{Lip}_{\mathcal{B}}(\nabla f)}{2} \|(x + \alpha g) - x\|^2 \\ &= -\alpha\|g\|^2 + \frac{\text{Lip}_{\mathcal{B}}(\nabla f)}{2} \alpha^2 \|g\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Two remarks on Proposition 7.6 can be made. First, the existence of a ball \mathcal{B} crucially relies on the upper bound $\bar{\alpha}$ required by Algorithm 7.1. Second, in contrast with (21), the upper bound (39) does not depend on the function u defined in Assumption 2.1. This fundamental difference is the reason why RFD accumulates at stationary points of (1) while requiring at most one projection onto S_{p-1} per iteration, whereas P²GDR can require a projection onto S_i for every $i \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$ per iteration.

Corollary 7.7 states that the while loop in Algorithm 7.1 terminates and produces a point satisfying an Armijo condition. It plays an instrumental role in the proof of Proposition 7.8. Observe that the μ^2 factor, which comes from condition 3(c) of Assumption 3.1, does not appear in the Armijo condition given in Corollary 5.2.

Corollary 7.7. *The while loop in Algorithm 7.1 terminates and every $\tilde{x} \in \text{RFD}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$ satisfies the Armijo condition*

$$f(\tilde{x}) \leq f(x) - \mu^2 c \alpha s(x; f, C)^2$$

for some $\alpha \in \left[\min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, 2\beta \frac{1-c}{\text{Lip}_{\mathcal{B}}(\nabla f)} \right\}, \bar{\alpha} \right]$, where \mathcal{B} is any closed ball as in Proposition 7.6.

Proof. For all $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$,

$$f(x) + \|g\|^2 \alpha \left(-1 + \frac{\text{Lip}_{\mathcal{B}}(\nabla f)}{2} \alpha \right) \leq f(x) - c \|g\|^2 \alpha \quad \text{iff} \quad \alpha \leq 2 \frac{1-c}{\text{Lip}_{\mathcal{B}}(\nabla f)}.$$

Since the left-hand side of the first inequality is an upper bound on $f(x + \alpha g)$ for all $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha}]$, the Armijo condition is necessarily satisfied if $\alpha \in (0, \min\{\bar{\alpha}, 2\frac{1-c}{\text{Lip}_{\mathcal{B}}(\nabla f)}\}]$. Therefore, either the initial step size chosen in $[\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ satisfies the Armijo condition or the while loop ends with α such that $\frac{\alpha}{\beta} > 2\frac{1-c}{\text{Lip}_{\mathcal{B}}(\nabla f)}$. The result then follows from condition 3(c) of Assumption 3.1. \square

7.3.2 The RFDR map

In this section, under Assumption 3.1, we introduce the RFDR map (Algorithm 7.2) and prove Proposition 7.8 from which we deduce Theorem 7.9 in Section 7.3.3. For convenience, we recall that Assumption 3.1 states that C satisfies the following conditions:

1. there exist a positive integer p and nonempty smooth submanifolds S_0, \dots, S_p of \mathcal{E} contained in C such that:
 - (a) for all $i, j \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, $i \neq j$ implies $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$;
 - (b) $\overline{S_p} = C$ and, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, $\overline{S_i} = \bigcup_{j=0}^i S_j$;
 - (c) if $p \geq 2$, then, for all $x \in S_p$, $d(x, S_{p-1}) < d(x, S_{p-2})$;
2. $\inf_{x \in C \setminus S_p, z \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|P_{T_C(x)}(z)\|}{\|z\|} > 0$;
3. C admits a *restricted tangent cone*, i.e., a correspondence $C \multimap \mathcal{E} : x \mapsto \check{T}_C(x)$ such that:
 - (a) for every $x \in C$, $\check{T}_C(x)$ is a closed cone contained in $T_C(x)$;
 - (b) for all $x \in C$ and all $z \in \check{T}_C(x)$, $x + z \in C$;
 - (c) there exists $\mu \in (0, 1]$ such that, for all $x \in C$ and all $z \in \mathcal{E}$, $\|P_{\check{T}_C(x)}(z)\| \geq \mu \|P_{T_C(x)}(z)\|$.

The RFDR map involves the projection of a point of S_p onto S_{p-1} which exists by condition 1(c) above.

The RFDR map is defined as Algorithm 7.2. Given $x \in C$ as input, it proceeds as follows: it applies the RFD map (Algorithm 7.1) to x , thereby producing a point \tilde{x} , (ii) if $x \in S_p$ and $d(x, S_{p-1}) \leq \Delta$ for some threshold $\Delta \in (0, \infty)$, it applies the RFD map to a projection \hat{x} of x onto S_{p-1} , then producing a point \tilde{x}^R , and (iii) it outputs a point among \tilde{x} and \tilde{x}^R that maximally decreases f .

Algorithm 7.2 RFDR map

Require: $(\mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$ where \mathcal{E} is a Euclidean vector space, C is a nonempty closed subset of \mathcal{E} satisfying Assumption 3.1, $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable with ∇f locally Lipschitz continuous, $0 < \underline{\alpha} \leq \bar{\alpha} < \infty$, $\beta, c \in (0, 1)$, and $\Delta \in (0, \infty)$.

Input: $x \in C$ such that $s(x; f, C) > 0$.

Output: a point in $\text{RFDR}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$.

- 1: Choose $\tilde{x} \in \text{RFD}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$;
 - 2: **if** $d(x, S_{p-1}) \in (0, \Delta]$ **then**
 - 3: Choose $\hat{x} \in P_{S_{p-1}}(X)$;
 - 4: Choose $\tilde{x}^R \in \text{RFD}(\hat{x}; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$;
 - 5: Return $y \in \text{argmin}_{\{\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}^R\}} f$.
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: Return \tilde{x} .
 - 8: **end if**
-

Proposition 7.8 is to the RFDR map as Proposition 5.4 is to the P²GDR map.

Proposition 7.8. *For every $\underline{x} \in C$ such that $s(\underline{x}; f, C) > 0$, there exist $\varepsilon(\underline{x}), \delta(\underline{x}) \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for all $x \in B[\underline{x}, \varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap C$ and all $y \in \text{RFDR}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$,*

$$f(y) - f(x) \leq -\delta(\underline{x}). \quad (40)$$

Proof. Let $\underline{x} \in C$ be such that $s(\underline{x}; f, C) > 0$. This proof constructs $\varepsilon(\underline{x})$ and $\delta(\underline{x})$ based on the Armijo condition given in Corollary 7.7. This requires to derive local lower and upper bounds on $s(\cdot; f, C)$ around \underline{x} . It first considers the case where $\underline{x} \in S_p$, in which the construction essentially relies on the continuity of $s(\cdot; f, C)$ on $B(\underline{x}, d(\underline{x}, S_{p-1})) \cap C$. Then, it focuses on the case where $\underline{x} \in C \setminus S_p$, in which the bounds on $s(\cdot; f, C)$ follow from the bounds (42) on ∇f thanks to condition 2 of Assumption 3.1. If $x \in C \setminus S_p$, then condition 2 of Assumption 3.1 readily gives a lower bound on $s(x; f, C)$. This is not the case if $x \in S_p$, however. This is where the projection mechanism comes into play. It considers a projection \hat{x} of x onto S_{p-1} , and condition 2 of Assumption 3.1 gives a lower bound on $s(\hat{x}; f, C)$. The inequality (40) is then obtained from (43) which follows from the continuity of f at \underline{x} .

Let us first consider the case where $\underline{x} \in S_p$. On $B(\underline{x}, d(\underline{x}, S_{p-1})) \cap C = B(\underline{x}, d(\underline{x}, S_{p-1})) \cap S_p$, $s(\cdot; f, C)$ coincides with the norm of the Riemannian gradient of the restriction of f to the smooth manifold S_p , which is continuous. In particular, there exists $\rho(\underline{x}) \in (0, d(\underline{x}, S_{p-1}))$ such that $s(B[\underline{x}, \rho(\underline{x})] \cap S_p; f, C) \subseteq [\frac{1}{2} s(\underline{x}; f, C), \frac{3}{2} s(\underline{x}; f, C)]$. Let $\bar{\rho}(\underline{x}) := \rho(\underline{x}) + \frac{3}{2} \bar{\alpha} s(\underline{x}; f, C)$, $\varepsilon(\underline{x}) := \rho(\underline{x})$, and

$$\delta(\underline{x}) := \frac{1}{4} c \mu^2 s(\underline{x}; f, C)^2 \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, 2\beta \frac{1-c}{\text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\nabla f)} \right\}.$$

Let $x \in B[\underline{x}, \varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap C$. Then, $B[x, \bar{\alpha} s(x; f, C)] \subseteq B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]$. Indeed, for all $z \in B[x, \bar{\alpha} s(x; f, C)]$,

$$\|z - \underline{x}\| \leq \|z - x\| + \|x - \underline{x}\| \leq \bar{\alpha} s(x; f, C) + \rho(\underline{x}) \leq \bar{\rho}(\underline{x}).$$

Therefore, Corollary 7.7 applies and, for all $\tilde{x} \in \text{RFD}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$,

$$f(\tilde{x}) \leq f(x) - c \mu^2 s(x; f, C)^2 \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, 2\beta \frac{1-c}{\text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\nabla f)} \right\} \leq f(x) - \delta(\underline{x}),$$

and thus, for all $y \in \text{RFDR}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$,

$$f(y) \leq f(\tilde{x}) \leq f(x) - \delta(\underline{x}).$$

This completes the proof for the case where $\underline{x} \in S_p$.

Let us now consider the case where $\underline{x} \in C \setminus S_p$. It holds that $\|\nabla f(\underline{x})\| \geq s(\underline{x}; f, C)$. Let $\bar{\rho}(\underline{x}) := \Delta + \frac{3}{2} \bar{\alpha} \|\nabla f(\underline{x})\|$ and

$$\delta(\underline{x}) := \frac{1}{12} c \mu^2 \left(\inf_{\substack{\hat{x} \in C \setminus S_p \\ z \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{0\}}} \frac{\|P_{T_C(\hat{x})}(z)\|}{\|z\|} \right)^2 \|\nabla f(\underline{x})\|^2 \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, 2\beta \frac{1-c}{\text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\nabla f)} \right\}. \quad (41)$$

Since f is continuous at \underline{x} , there exists $\rho_f(\underline{x}) \in (0, \infty)$ such that $f(B[\underline{x}, \rho_f(\underline{x})]) \subseteq [f(\underline{x}) - \delta(\underline{x}), f(\underline{x}) + \delta(\underline{x})]$. Let $\varepsilon(\underline{x}) := \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \Delta, \rho_f(\underline{x}), \frac{\|\nabla f(\underline{x})\|}{2 \text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \Delta]}(\nabla f)} \right\}$. Then, for all $z \in B[\underline{x}, 2\varepsilon(\underline{x})]$, since

$$\| \|\nabla f(z)\| - \|\nabla f(\underline{x})\| \| \leq \| \nabla f(z) - \nabla f(\underline{x}) \| \leq \underset{B[\underline{x}, \Delta]}{\text{Lip}}(\nabla f) \|z - \underline{x}\| \leq \underset{B[\underline{x}, \Delta]}{\text{Lip}}(\nabla f) 2\varepsilon(\underline{x}) \leq \frac{\|\nabla f(\underline{x})\|}{2},$$

it holds that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(\underline{x})\| \leq \|\nabla f(z)\| \leq \frac{3}{2} \|\nabla f(\underline{x})\|. \quad (42)$$

Let $x \in B[\underline{x}, \varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap C$. Let us first consider the case where $x \in S_p$. Then,

$$0 < d(x, S_{p-1}) \leq \|x - \underline{x}\| \leq \varepsilon(\underline{x}) \leq \Delta.$$

Thus, given x as input, the RFDR map considers $\hat{x} \in P_{S_{p-1}}(x) \subseteq B[\underline{x}, 2\varepsilon(\underline{x})] \cap S_{p-1}$ and $\tilde{x}^R \in \text{RFD}(\hat{x}; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$, where the inclusion holds because

$$\|\hat{x} - \underline{x}\| \leq \|\hat{x} - x\| + \|x - \underline{x}\| \leq d(x, S_{p-1}) + \varepsilon(\underline{x}) \leq 2\varepsilon(\underline{x}).$$

As $x, \hat{x} \in B[\underline{x}, \rho_f(\underline{x})]$, we have

$$f(\hat{x}) \leq f(x) + 2\delta(\underline{x}). \quad (43)$$

Since $B[\hat{x}, \bar{\alpha} s(\hat{x}, f, C)] \subseteq B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]$, Corollary 7.7 applies to \tilde{x}^R with $B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]$. The inclusion holds because, for all $z \in B[\hat{x}, \bar{\alpha} s(\hat{x}, f, C)]$,

$$\|z - \underline{x}\| \leq \|z - \hat{x}\| + \|\hat{x} - \underline{x}\| \leq \bar{\alpha} s(\hat{x}, f, C) + 2\varepsilon(\underline{x}) \leq \bar{\alpha} \|\nabla f(\hat{x})\| + \Delta \leq \bar{\rho}(\underline{x}),$$

where the last inequality follows from (42). Therefore, for all $y \in \text{RFDR}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(y) &\leq f(\tilde{x}^R) \\ &\leq f(\hat{x}) - c\mu^2 s(\hat{x}; f, C)^2 \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, 2\beta \frac{1-c}{\text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\nabla f)} \right\} \\ &\leq f(\hat{x}) - c\mu^2 \left(\inf_{\substack{\tilde{x} \in C \setminus S_p \\ z \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{0\}}} \frac{\|P_{T_C}(\tilde{x})(z)\|}{\|z\|} \right)^2 \|\nabla f(\hat{x})\|^2 \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, 2\beta \frac{1-c}{\text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\nabla f)} \right\} \\ &\leq f(\hat{x}) - 3\delta(\underline{x}) \\ &\leq f(x) - \delta(\underline{x}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Corollary 7.7, the third from condition 2 of Assumption 3.1, the fourth from (42) and (41), and the fifth from (43). Let us now consider the case where $x \in C \setminus S_p$. Let $\tilde{x} \in \text{RFD}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c)$. Since $B[x, \bar{\alpha} s(x, f, C)] \subseteq B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]$, Corollary 7.7 applies to \tilde{x} with $B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]$. The inclusion holds because, for all $z \in B[x, \bar{\alpha} s(x, f, C)]$,

$$\|z - \underline{x}\| \leq \|z - x\| + \|x - \underline{x}\| \leq \bar{\alpha} s(x, f, C) + \varepsilon(\underline{x}) < \bar{\alpha} \|\nabla f(x)\| + \Delta \leq \bar{\rho}(\underline{x}),$$

where the last inequality follows from (42). Therefore, for all $y \in \text{RFDR}(x; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(y) &\leq f(\tilde{x}) \\ &\leq f(x) - c\mu^2 s(x; f, C)^2 \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, 2\beta \frac{1-c}{\text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\nabla f)} \right\} \\ &\leq f(x) - c\mu^2 \left(\inf_{\substack{\tilde{x} \in C \setminus S_p \\ z \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{0\}}} \frac{\|P_{T_C}(\tilde{x})(z)\|}{\|z\|} \right)^2 \|\nabla f(x)\|^2 \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha}, 2\beta \frac{1-c}{\text{Lip}_{B[\underline{x}, \bar{\rho}(\underline{x})]}(\nabla f)} \right\} \\ &\leq f(x) - 3\delta(\underline{x}) \\ &\leq f(x) - \delta(\underline{x}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Corollary 7.7, the third from condition 2 of Assumption 3.1, and the fourth from (42) and (41). \square

7.3.3 The RFDR algorithm

The RFDR algorithm is defined as Algorithm 7.3. It produces a sequence along which f is strictly decreasing.

Algorithm 7.3 RFDR

Require: $(\mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$ where \mathcal{E} is a Euclidean vector space, C is a nonempty closed subset of \mathcal{E} satisfying Assumption 3.1, $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable with ∇f locally Lipschitz continuous, $0 < \underline{\alpha} \leq \bar{\alpha} < \infty$, $\beta, c \in (0, 1)$, and $\Delta \in (0, \infty)$.

Input: $x_0 \in C$.

Output: a sequence in C .

```

1:  $i \leftarrow 0$ ;
2: while  $s(x_i; f, C) > 0$  do
3:   Choose  $x_{i+1} \in \text{RFDR}(x_i; \mathcal{E}, C, f, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \beta, c, \Delta)$ ;
4:    $i \leftarrow i + 1$ ;
5: end while

```

Theorem 7.9 states that RFDR accumulates at stationary points of (1) and is thus apocalypse-free. However, it does not state that an accumulation point necessarily exists.

Theorem 7.9. *Consider a sequence constructed by RFDR (Algorithm 7.3). If this sequence is finite, then its last element is stationary for (1), i.e., is a zero of the stationarity measure $s(\cdot; f, C)$ defined in (2). If it is infinite, then all of its accumulation points are stationary for (1).*

Proof. The proof is the same as the one of Theorem 5.5 except that Proposition 7.8 replaces Proposition 5.4. \square

Corollary 7.10 considers a sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ produced by RFDR. It guarantees that, if C has no serendipitous point, which is notably the case of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ (Proposition 6.14), and the sublevel set $\{x \in C \mid f(x) \leq f(x_0)\}$ is bounded, then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$, and all accumulation points, of which there exists at least one, have the same image by f .

Corollary 7.10. *Let $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence produced by RFDR (Algorithm 7.3). The sequence has at least one accumulation point if and only if $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|x_i\| < \infty$. If C has no serendipitous point, then, for every convergent subsequence $(x_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s(x_{i_k}; f, C) = 0$. If, moreover, $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, which is the case notably if the sublevel set $\{x \in C \mid f(x) \leq f(x_0)\}$ is bounded, then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s(x_i; f, C) = 0$, and all accumulation points have the same image by f .*

Proof. The proof is the same as the one of Corollary 5.6. \square

Corollary 7.10 shows that the stopping criterion defined by (19) is always eventually satisfied by RFDR if C has no serendipitous point and the generated sequence has an accumulation point. Indeed, if C has no serendipitous point and RFDR produces a sequence $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ that has an accumulation point, i.e., that does not diverge to infinity, then, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, the set $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid s(x_i; f, C) \leq \varepsilon\}$ is nonempty and thus its minimum i_ε exists.

7.4 The set of sparse vectors satisfies Assumption 3.1

In this section, we prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ satisfies Assumption 3.1. Problem (1) with $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ appears in sparse signal approximation which has several applications in signal processing such as compressed sensing [7, 8, 9, 6].

In Section 7.4.1, we show how to project onto $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ (Proposition 7.11) and prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ admits a stratification satisfying condition 1 of Assumption 2.2 (Proposition 7.12). In Section 7.4.2, we review the tangent cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ (Proposition 7.13) and prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ satisfies Assumption 3.1 (Proposition 7.14). In Section 7.4.3, we deduce the regular normal cone, the normal cone, and the Clarke normal cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$, and prove that the set of apocalyptic points of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ is $\mathbb{R}_{< s}^n$ and that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ has no serendipitous point (Proposition 7.19). Finally, in Section 7.4.4, we present an example of P²GD following an apocalypse on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$.

7.4.1 Stratification of the set of sparse vectors

In this section, we prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ admits a stratification satisfying Assumption 3.1. The number of nonzero components stratifies $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$:

$$\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n = \bigcup_{i=0}^s \mathbb{R}_i^n$$

where, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$,

$$\mathbb{R}_i^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |\text{supp}(x)| = i\}$$

is the subset of \mathbb{R}^n containing the points having exactly i nonzero component(s).

Proposition 7.11 shows how to project onto $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ and is used in the proof that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ satisfies condition 1(c) of Assumption 2.2.

Proposition 7.11 (projection onto the set of sparse vectors [3, Proposition 3.6]). *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$, $P_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$ is the set of all possible outputs of Algorithm 7.4, and $d(x, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n)$ is the sum of the smallest $|\text{supp}(x)| - s$ absolute values of components of x .*

Algorithm 7.4 Projection onto the set of sparse vectors

Require: (n, s) where n and s are positive integers such that $s < n$.

Input: $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Output: $y \in P_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$.

- 1: $y \leftarrow x$;
 - 2: **while** $|\text{supp}(y)| > s$ **do**
 - 3: Choose $i \in \text{argmin}_{j \in \text{supp}(y)} |y_j|$;
 - 4: $y_i \leftarrow 0$;
 - 5: **end while**
 - 6: Return y .
-

Based on Proposition 7.11, we now prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ satisfies condition 1 of Assumption 2.2.

Proposition 7.12 (stratification of the set of sparse vectors). *The stratification $\{\mathbb{R}_0^n, \dots, \mathbb{R}_s^n\}$ of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ satisfies condition 1 of Assumption 2.2.*

Proof. Using the submanifold property [1, Proposition 3.3.2], we first prove that, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$, \mathbb{R}_i^n is an i -dimensional embedded submanifold of \mathbb{R}^n . For $\mathbb{R}_0^n = \{0\}^n$, we take $U := \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n : x \mapsto x$, and we have

$$\{x \in U \mid \varphi(x) \in \{0\}^n\} = \{0\}^n = \mathbb{R}_0^n \cap U.$$

Let $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}_i^n$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. For $U := B(\underline{x}, d(\underline{x}, \mathbb{R}_{i-1}^n))$ and

$$\varphi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n : x \mapsto ((x_j)_{j \in \text{supp}(\underline{x})}, (x_j)_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(\underline{x})}),$$

we have

$$\{x \in U \mid \varphi(x) \in \mathbb{R}^i \times \{0\}^{n-i}\} = \{x \in U \mid x_j = 0 \forall j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(\underline{x})\} = \mathbb{R}_i^n \cap U.$$

Thus, condition 1(a) is satisfied. By Proposition 7.11, condition 1(c) is satisfied too. To establish condition 1(b), it suffices to prove that, for all $i, j \in \{0, \dots, s\}$, $\mathbb{R}_j^n \cap \overline{\mathbb{R}_i^n} = \emptyset$ if $j > i$ and $\mathbb{R}_j^n \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{R}_i^n}$ if $j \leq i$. Let $i, j \in \{0, \dots, s\}$. If $j > i$, then, by Proposition 7.11, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_j^n$, $B(x, d(x, \mathbb{R}_{j-1}^n)) \cap \mathbb{R}_i^n = \emptyset$ and thus $x \notin \overline{\mathbb{R}_i^n}$. If $j \leq i$, then, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_j^n$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, $B[x, \varepsilon] \cap \mathbb{R}_i^n \neq \emptyset$. This is clear if $j = i$. Let us prove it in the case where $j < i$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_j^n$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$. Let $I(x) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$ such that $|I(x)| = i - j$. Define $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by $y_k := \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}$ if $k \in I(x)$ and $y_k := 0$ otherwise. Then, $x + y \in B[x, \varepsilon] \cap \mathbb{R}_i^n$. \square

7.4.2 Tangent cone to the set of sparse vectors

Proposition 7.13 gives an explicit description of the tangent cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ and show how to project onto it.

Proposition 7.13 (tangent cone to the set of sparse vectors). *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$,*

$$T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |\text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(v)| \leq s\},$$

$\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ is geometrically derivable at x , and, for every $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)}(v)$ is the set of all possible outputs of Algorithm 7.5.

Proof. The description of $T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$ is given in [3, Theorem 3.15] and the projection onto $T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$ follows. Thus, we only prove that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ is geometrically derivable. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $|\text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(v)| \leq s$. Then, for all $t \in (0, \infty)$, since $\text{supp}(tv) = \text{supp}(v)$ and, by (28), $\text{supp}(x + tv) \subseteq \text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(tv)$, it holds that $|\text{supp}(x + tv)| \leq s$, i.e., $x + tv \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$, and hence $d(x + tv, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n)/t = 0$. Thus, $\lim_{t \searrow 0} d(x + tv, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n)/t = 0$ and it follows that v is geometrically derivable. \square

Algorithm 7.5 Projection onto the tangent cone to the set of sparse vectors

Require: (n, s, x) where n and s are positive integers such that $s < n$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$.

Input: $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Output: $w \in P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)}(v)$.

- 1: $w \leftarrow v$;
 - 2: **while** $|\text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(w)| > s$ **do**
 - 3: Choose $i \in \arg\min_{j \in \text{supp}(w) \setminus \text{supp}(x)} |w_j|$;
 - 4: $w_i \leftarrow 0$;
 - 5: **end while**
 - 6: Return w .
-

Proposition 7.14 shows that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ satisfies Assumption 3.1.

Proposition 7.14. *The set $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ satisfies Assumption 3.1:*

1. for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ and all $v \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$, $x + v \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$;
2. for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ and all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\|P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)}(v)\| \geq \|v\|_\infty \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|v\|$.

Proof. The first property follows from (28) and Proposition 7.13. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$. Then, Algorithm 7.5 produces $w \in P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)}(v)$ such that $\max_{i \in \text{supp}(w) \setminus \text{supp}(x)} |w_i| = \max_{i \in \text{supp}(v) \setminus \text{supp}(x)} |v_i|$ and, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus (\text{supp}(v) \setminus \text{supp}(x))$, $w_i = v_i$. Hence, $\|w\|_\infty = \|v\|_\infty$, and the result follows. \square

Proposition 7.15 states that $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ satisfies condition 3 of Assumption 2.2.

Proposition 7.15. *For every $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$, the correspondence $T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(\cdot)$ is continuous at every $x \in \mathbb{R}_i^n$ relative to \mathbb{R}_i^n .*

Proof. The result is clear if $i = 0$ since $\mathbb{R}_0^n = \{0\}^n$. Let us therefore consider $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. We have to prove that, for every sequence $(x^j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{R}_i^n converging to $x \in \mathbb{R}_i^n$, it holds that

$$\overline{\lim}_{j \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^j) \subseteq T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x) \subseteq \underline{\lim}_{j \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^j).$$

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_i^n$. Then, for all $y \in B(x, d(x, \mathbb{R}_{i-1}^n)) \cap \mathbb{R}_i^n$, $\text{supp}(y) = \text{supp}(x)$ and thus, by Proposition 7.13, $T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(y) = T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$. Thus, the result follows from the fact that a sequence $(x^j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{R}_i^n converging to x contains finitely many elements in $\mathbb{R}_i^n \setminus B(x, d(x, \mathbb{R}_{i-1}^n))$. \square

7.4.3 Normal cone to the set of sparse vectors

In Proposition 7.16, we deduce the regular normal cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ from the description of the tangent cone to $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ given in Proposition 7.13.

Proposition 7.16 (regular normal cone to the set of sparse vectors). *For all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$,*

$$\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x) = \begin{cases} \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\} & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}_s^n, \\ \{0\}^n & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}_{< s}^n. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The proof is based on Proposition 7.13. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$. By (12) and because $\text{supp}(-x) = \text{supp}(x)$, we have

$$\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x) = \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle w, v \rangle \leq 0 \ \forall v \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x) \right\} = \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle w, v \rangle = 0 \ \forall v \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x) \right\}.$$

Assume that $x \in \mathbb{R}_{< s}^n$. Then, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $v := (\delta_{i,j})_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$ and, for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\langle w, v \rangle = w_i$. Thus, $\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x) = \{0\}^n$. Assume now that $x \in \mathbb{R}_s^n$. Then, for all $v \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$ and all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$, $v_i = 0$. Thus, for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $v \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$, $\langle w, v \rangle = \sum_{i \in \text{supp}(x)} w_i v_i$. Since, for all $i \in \text{supp}(x)$, $v := (\delta_{i,j})_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$ and, for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\langle w, v \rangle = w_i$, we have $\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x) \subseteq \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\}$. The converse inclusion also holds, and the result follows. \square

Proposition 7.17 (normal cone to the set of sparse vectors [3, Theorem 3.9]). *For all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$,*

$$N_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x) = \{w \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq n-s}^n \mid \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\}.$$

In particular, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ is not Clarke regular on $\mathbb{R}_{< s}^n$.

Proof. We provide an alternative proof to the one of [3, Theorem 3.9]. This argument is based on the definition (13) of the normal cone and is used again in the proof of Proposition 7.19.

By [46, Example 6.8], the result follows from Proposition 7.16 if $x \in \mathbb{R}_s^n$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_{< s}^n$. We first establish the inclusion \subseteq . Let $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ converging to x . We have to prove that

$$\overline{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}} \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^k) \subseteq \{w \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq n-s}^n \mid \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\}.$$

If $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ contains finitely many elements in \mathbb{R}_s^n , then $\overline{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}} \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^k) = \{0\}^n$. Indeed, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large, $x^k \in \mathbb{R}_{< s}^n$ and thus, by Proposition 7.16, $\hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^k) = \{0\}^n$. Assume that $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ contains infinitely many elements in \mathbb{R}_s^n and let $w \in \overline{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}} \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^k)$. Then, w is an accumulation point of a sequence $(w^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $w^k \in \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^k)$. Moreover, there exists a strictly increasing sequence $(k_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} such that $(w^{k_l})_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to w and, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $x^{k_l} \in \mathbb{R}_s^n$, $\text{supp}(x) \subseteq \text{supp}(x^{k_l})$, and $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq \text{supp}(w^{k_l})$. Thus, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, since $w^{k_l} \in \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^{k_l})$, it holds that $\text{supp}(w^{k_l}) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x^{k_l})$. Therefore, $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq \text{supp}(w^{k_0}) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x^{k_0}) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$ and $|\text{supp}(w)| \leq n - s$.

We now establish the inclusion \supseteq . Let $w \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq n-s}^n$ such that $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$. Let $I(x) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus (\text{supp}(w) \cup \text{supp}(x))$ such that $|I(x)| = s - |\text{supp}(x)|$; this is possible since $|\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus (\text{supp}(w) \cup \text{supp}(x))| = n - |\text{supp}(w)| - |\text{supp}(x)| \geq s - |\text{supp}(x)|$. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let

$$x_i^k := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k+1} & \text{if } i \in I(x), \\ x_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{supp}(x^k) = \text{supp}(x) \cup I(x)$, thus $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x^k)$, and therefore $w \in \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^k)$. It follows that $w \in \overline{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}} \hat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^k)$. \square

Corollary 7.18 (Clarke normal cone to the set of sparse vectors). *For all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$,*

$$\overline{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x) = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{supp}(w) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)\}.$$

By Proposition 7.17, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ is not Clarke regular on $\mathbb{R}_{< s}^n$. Proposition 7.19 states that every point of $\mathbb{R}_{< s}^n$ is apocalyptic, which is a stronger result by [35, Corollary 2.15].

Proposition 7.19. *The set of apocalyptic points of $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ is $\mathbb{R}_{< s}^n$, and $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ has no serendipitous point.*

Proof. We use Proposition 4.9. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_s^n$ and $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$ converging to x . Since $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ contains finitely many elements not in $B(x, d(x, \mathbb{R}_{s-1}^n)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_s^n$, we can assume that $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is in \mathbb{R}_s^n . Therefore, by Proposition 7.15, $\overline{\text{Lim}}_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^k) = T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$ and thus $(\overline{\text{Lim}}_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^k))^* = \widehat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x)$. It follows that x is neither apocalyptic nor serendipitous.

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_i^n$ with $i \in \{0, \dots, s-1\}$. By Proposition 7.16, $\widehat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x) = \{0\}^n$ and thus x is not serendipitous. Let us prove that x is apocalyptic. Let $I(x) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \text{supp}(x)$ such that $|I(x)| = s - |\text{supp}(x)|$. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$x_j^k := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k+1} & \text{if } j \in I(x), \\ x_j & \text{if } j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus I(x). \end{cases}$$

Then, $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is in \mathbb{R}_s^n and converges to x . Define $\varepsilon := 1$ if $i = 0$ and $\varepsilon := d(x, S_{i-1})$ otherwise. There exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every integer $k \geq K$, $x^k \in B(x, \varepsilon)$, thus $\text{supp}(x^k) = \text{supp}(x^0)$ and

$$T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^k) = T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^0).$$

Thus,

$$\text{Lim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^k) = T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^0).$$

Therefore,

$$\left(\text{Lim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^k) \right)^* = \widehat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^0) \neq \emptyset = \widehat{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x).$$

It follows that x is apocalyptic. □

7.4.4 P²GD following an apocalypse on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$

Proposition 7.20 presents an example of P²GD following an apocalypse on $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n$.

Proposition 7.20.

1. *Define:*

- $x^* \in \mathbb{R}_s^n$ by $x_i^* := 1$ if $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $x_i^* := 0$ if $i \in \{s+1, \dots, n\}$;
- $x^0 := (\delta_{i,n})_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$;
- for all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $x^j := x^* - (\delta_{i,j})_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$;
- for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $x^{k,j} := (1 - 2^{-k})x^j + 2^{-k}x^0$.

Then, for every $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $(x^{k,j})_{k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}}$ is in \mathbb{R}_s^n and converges to x^j .

2. For $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : x \mapsto \frac{1}{4}\|x - x^*\|^2$, x^0 , $\bar{\alpha} := \underline{\alpha} := 1$, any $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and any $c \in (0, \frac{3}{4}]$, the set of sequences that P²GD can produce is $\{(x^{k,j})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mid j \in \{1, \dots, s\}\}$. Moreover, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $s(x^{k,j}; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n) = 2^{-k-1}\sqrt{s}$ and thus, since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s(x^{k,j}; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n) = 0$ and $s(x^j; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n) = \frac{1}{2}$, it follows that $(x^j, (x^{k,j})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, f)$ is an apocalypse.

Proof. The first part is clear. We therefore prove the second part. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\nabla f(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x - x^*)$. Thus, by Proposition 7.13,

$$P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^0)}(-\nabla f(x^0)) = \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(x^j - x^0) \mid j \in \{1, \dots, s\} \right\}$$

and, for all $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$,

$$P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^{k,j})}(-\nabla f(x^{k,j})) = 2^{-k-1}(x^j - x^0).$$

Furthermore, simple computations show that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$,

$$x^{k+1,j} = x^{k,j} + 2^{-k-1}(x^j - x^0), \quad f(x^{k+1,j}) \leq f(x^{k,j}) - cs(x^{k,j}; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n)^2.$$

It follows that, at the first iteration, the only choice to make is to choose one of the s elements of $P_{T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n}(x^0)}(-\nabla f(x^0))$ as a search direction. This choice defines $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. For all subsequent iterations, the P²GD map produces a singleton. \square

7.5 On the convergence analysis of a Riemannian rank-adaptive method

Proposition 7.21 shows that the convergence analysis of the Riemannian rank-adaptive method given in [54, Algorithm 3] does not apply to all cost functions considered in [54]. As the lower bounds in Propositions 6.12 and 6.23, this result is related to the curvature of the fixed-rank manifold (29).

Proposition 7.21. *There exists no rank-related retraction [54, Definition 2] such that [54, Assumption 6] holds for every analytic cost function $f : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{R} : \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \times \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ be a rank-related retraction [54, Definition 2], where we have identified the tangent bundle of $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ with $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \times \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$. Let us prove that, for the determinantal variety $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}$ and the cost function $f : \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : X \mapsto X_{2,2}$, the lifted function $f \circ \tilde{R}$ does not satisfy [54, Assumption 6]. For $X_* := 0_{2 \times 2}$, let δ_{X_*} and \mathcal{U}_* be respectively the positive real number and the neighborhood of X_* in $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}$ that correspond to X_* in [54, Definition 2]. Let $\beta_{\text{RL}} \in (0, \infty)$, $\delta_{\text{RL}} \in (0, \delta_{X_*})$, and $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_*$ be a neighborhood of X_* in $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}$. Let $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in (0, 1)$ be such that $\xi_1^2 + 2\xi_2^2 = 1$. Let $\sigma \in (0, \frac{\xi_2^2}{3\beta_{\text{RL}}})$ be such that $X := \text{diag}(\sigma, 0) \in \mathcal{U}$. Let $\tilde{R}_X : \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} : \xi \mapsto \tilde{R}(X, \xi)$. Then, $\xi := \begin{bmatrix} -\xi_1 & \xi_2 \\ \xi_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in T_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}}(X)$, $\|\xi\| = 1$, the *update-rank* [54, Definition 1] of ξ is 1, and the following properties hold: $\tilde{R}_X(0_{2 \times 2}) = X$, the function $[0, \delta_{X_*}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} : t \mapsto \tilde{R}_X(t\xi)$ is continuously differentiable, its image is contained in $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}^{2 \times 2}$, and $\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{R}_X(t\xi)|_{t=0} = \xi$. Since the function $[0, \delta_{X_*}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} : t \mapsto \tilde{R}_X(t\xi)$ is continuous and $(\tilde{R}_X(t\xi))_{1,1} = \sigma$, there exists $\tilde{\delta} \in (0, \delta_{\text{RL}})$ such that, for all $t \in [0, \tilde{\delta}]$, $(\tilde{R}_X(t\xi))_{1,1} \in [\frac{1}{2}\sigma, \frac{3}{2}\sigma]$. Therefore, for all $t \in [0, \tilde{\delta}]$, since $\det \tilde{R}_X(t\xi) = 0$, $\tilde{R}_X(t\xi) = \begin{bmatrix} x(t) & y(t) \\ z(t) & \frac{y(t)z(t)}{x(t)} \end{bmatrix}$, where $x : [0, \tilde{\delta}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $y : [0, \tilde{\delta}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $z : [0, \tilde{\delta}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuously differentiable, and such that $x(0) = \sigma$, $y(0) = z(0) = 0$, $\dot{x}(0) = -\xi_1$, $\dot{y}(0) = \dot{z}(0) = \xi_2$, and $x([0, \tilde{\delta}]) \subseteq [\frac{1}{2}\sigma, \frac{3}{2}\sigma]$. Let $\hat{f} : [0, \tilde{\delta}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : t \mapsto f(\tilde{R}_X(t\xi))$. Then, $\hat{f} = \frac{yz}{x}$ and $\dot{\hat{f}} = \frac{\dot{y}z}{x} + \frac{y\dot{z}}{x} - \frac{\dot{x}yz}{x^2}$. By continuity, there exists $\delta \in (0, \tilde{\delta}]$ such that $\dot{y}([0, \delta]), \dot{z}([0, \delta]) \subseteq [\frac{1}{2}\xi_2, \frac{3}{2}\xi_2]$, and $-\dot{x}([0, \delta]) \subseteq [\frac{1}{2}\xi_1, \frac{3}{2}\xi_1]$. Thus, since $\dot{\hat{f}}(0) = 0$, for all $t \in (0, \delta]$,

$$\frac{|\dot{\hat{f}}(t) - \dot{\hat{f}}(0)|}{t} = \frac{\dot{\hat{f}}(t)}{t} \geq \frac{\xi_2^2}{3\sigma} + \frac{\xi_1\xi_2^2}{18\sigma^2}t > \frac{\xi_2^2}{3\sigma} > \beta_{\text{RL}},$$

which completes the proof. \square

8 Conclusion

We close this work with five concluding remarks.

1. As in [35], the analysis conducted in Sections 5 and 7.3 remains true if f is only defined on an open subset of \mathcal{E} containing C .
2. To the best of our knowledge, Assumption 2.2 is new in the numerical optimization literature. We have drawn some links between this assumption and known concepts of variational analysis and stratification theory in Section 7. It is desirable to pursue this investigation, notably by focusing on the possible links between Assumption 2.2 and concepts of algebraic geometry or stratification theory such as the Whitney conditions [52]. If successful, this investigation may offer necessary or sufficient conditions for Assumption 2.2 to be satisfied or answer open questions such as the following. In Assumption 2.2, does condition 1 imply condition 3? Are the second, fourth, and fifth statements of Theorem 6.1 general facts for sets C satisfying Assumption 2.2?
3. The range of values of j in the for-loop of the P²GDR map (Algorithm 5.2) can be as large as $\{0, \dots, p\}$, and there are situations where this occurs each time the for-loop is reached (e.g., in the case of a bounded sublevel set, when Δ is chosen so large that $d(x, S_0) \leq \Delta$ for all x in the sublevel set). One can thus wonder whether it is possible to restrict (conditionally or not) the range of values of j while still accumulating at stationary points. This is an open question. It seems unlikely that P²GDR with a restricted for-loop can be analyzed along the lines of Section 5. Indeed, as pointed out in Section 2.1, if C is $\mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$, or $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$, then the function u defined in Assumption 2.1 is not locally bounded at any point of $C \setminus S_p$ and the function $s(\cdot; f, C)$ defined in (2) is not necessarily lower semicontinuous on $C \setminus S_p$. Two remarks on the case where $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ should be added. First, (31) can compensate for the discontinuity of $s(\cdot; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n})$, as explained after the proof of Proposition 6.16. Second, should the answer to the open question be negative, a counterexample other than the one of [35, §2.2] would be required in view of [35, Remark 2.11].
4. The preceding remark should be tempered by the following observation. In many practical situations, when Δ is chosen reasonably small, the distance between almost every iterate and its lower stratum is larger than Δ . For such an iterate, the range of values of j in the for-loop of the P²GDR map reduces to $\{0\}$, and the P²GDR map generates the same point as the P²GD map. In this scenario, the only computational overhead in P²GDR is the computation of the distance to the lower stratum. If C is one of the three sets studied in Theorem 6.1, then, in view of line 4 of Algorithm 5.1, it is reasonable to assume that every iterate has been obtained by a truncated SVD if C is $\mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ or $S_{\leq r}^+(n)$ and by Algorithm 6.1 if $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq s}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, in which case the distance to the lower stratum is immediately available, making the overhead insignificant. In summary, if C is one of the three sets studied in Theorem 6.1, then P²GDR offers stronger convergence properties than P²GD, and while incurring an insignificant overhead in many practical situations.
However, if P²GD follows an apocalypse, then there is at least one iterate for which the range of values of j in the for-loop of the P²GDR map does not reduce to $\{0\}$. It seems that this is the price to pay for this first-order algorithm to accumulate at stationary points of (1).
5. The comparison of the six algorithms listed in Table 6.2 conducted in Section 6.2.6 for $C = \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n}$ can be summarized as follows. PGD requires a large scale truncated SVD at each iteration where ∇f does not have low-rank, and it is not known whether it can converge to a Mordukhovich stationary point of (1) that is not stationary. P²GD and RFD are not apocalypse-free. P²GDR and RFDR are compared in the last paragraph of Section 3.3. Thus, it remains to compare P²GDR and [35, Algorithm 1]. First, P²GDR requires only first-order information about f while [35, Algorithm 1] requires second-order information. Second, Table 6.3 shows that every iteration of [35, Algorithm 1] requires one large scale truncated SVD while, in the worst case, an iteration of P²GDR requires r large scale truncated SVDs. However, as pointed out in the fourth remark, in many practical situations, a typical iteration of P²GDR requires no large scale (truncated) SVD. Third, as explained in Section 6.2.6, no upper bound on the number of iterations needed to satisfy the stopping criterion defined by (19), i.e., to bring $s(\cdot; f, \mathbb{R}_{\leq r}^{m \times n})$ below some threshold $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, is available for P²GDR or [35, Algorithm 1], although the

latter enjoys the guarantees given in [35, Theorems 3.4 and 3.16]. Fourth, on the numerical experiment described in Section 6.2.7, P²GDR converges much faster than [35, Algorithm 1].

Acknowledgements

This paper benefited from useful discussions with Laurent Jacques and Simon Vary.

A The gradient and Hessian of a real-valued function on a Hilbert space

Surprisingly, we did not find in the literature a proper introduction of the concept of Hessian for a real-valued function defined on some nonempty open subset of a real Hilbert space. As the Hessian and, in particular, its eigenvalues are needed in second-order optimization, notably in Section 6.2.5, this section provides such an introduction. Although the finite-dimensional case suffices for this work, we make no assumption on the dimension.

Multilinear mappings and, in particular, multilinear forms are defined, e.g., in [17, (A.6.1)]. Let X_1, \dots, X_n , and Y be real normed spaces. A necessary and sufficient condition for a multilinear mapping of $X_1 \times \dots \times X_n$ into Y to be continuous is given in [17, (5.5.1)]. The real normed space of all continuous multilinear mappings of $X_1 \times \dots \times X_n$ into Y is denoted by $\mathcal{L}(X_1, \dots, X_n; Y)$ [17, §5.7] and simply by $\mathcal{L}_n(X, Y)$ if $X_i = X$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$; it is complete if Y is complete [17, (5.7.3)]. If X is a real normed space, then the Banach space $\mathcal{L}(X, \mathbb{R})$ is called the *dual space* of X and denoted by X^* [12, §1.1]; an element of X^* is called a continuous linear form [17, §5.8] or a continuous linear functional [12, §1.1] on X . The Riesz–Fréchet representation theorem (see, e.g., [17, (6.3.2)] or [12, Theorem 5.5]) enables to identify X^* with X . Moreover, a consequence of this theorem (see, e.g., [44, Theorem 7.19]) enables to identify the Banach space $\mathcal{L}_2(X, \mathbb{R})$ of all continuous bilinear forms on X with $\mathcal{L}(X) := \mathcal{L}(X, X)$. The elements of $\mathcal{L}(X)$ are called *continuous linear operators* on X .

Let X be a real normed space, U be a nonempty open subset of X , and f be a real-valued function defined on U . For each $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, if f is p times differentiable in U , then the p th derivative of f is $f^{(p)} : U \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_p(X, \mathbb{R})$ and, by [17, (8.12.4)], for each $x \in U$, the p -linear form $f^{(p)}(x)$ is symmetric.

Assume now that X is a Hilbert space and that f is two times differentiable. By the Riesz–Fréchet representation theorem, for each $x \in U$, there exists a unique $g_x \in X$ such that, for all $z \in X$, $f'(x)(z) = \langle g_x, z \rangle$; g_x is called the *gradient* of f at x and denoted by $\nabla f(x)$. The gradient of f is $\nabla f : U \rightarrow X : x \mapsto \nabla f(x)$. By [44, Theorem 7.19], for each $x \in U$, there exists a unique $H_x \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ such that, for all $u, v \in X$, $f''(x)(u, v) = \langle H_x(u), v \rangle$; H_x is called the *Hessian* of f at x and denoted by $\nabla^2 f(x)$. The Hessian of f is $\nabla^2 f : U \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(X) : x \mapsto \nabla^2 f(x)$. For each $x \in U$, since the bilinear form $f''(x)$ is symmetric, the linear operator $\nabla^2 f(x)$ is *self-adjoint*, i.e., $\langle \nabla^2 f(x)(u), v \rangle = \langle u, \nabla^2 f(x)(v) \rangle$ for all $u, v \in X$ (see [17, §11.5] or [12, §6.4] for the definition).

Proposition A.1. *Let $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be differentiable. For each $x \in U$, $f' : U \rightarrow X^*$ is differentiable at x if and only if $\nabla f : U \rightarrow X$ is differentiable at x , in which case $(\nabla f)'(x) = \nabla^2 f(x)$.*

Proof. Let $L \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ be associated with $b \in \mathcal{L}_2(X, \mathbb{R})$. For all $u \in X$ such that $x + u \in U$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(x + u) - \nabla f(x) - L(u)\|_X &= \sup_{v \in B_X[0,1]} |\langle \nabla f(x + u) - \nabla f(x) - L(u), v \rangle| \\ &= \sup_{v \in B_X[0,1]} |\langle \nabla f(x + u), v \rangle - \langle \nabla f(x), v \rangle - \langle L(u), v \rangle| \\ &= \sup_{v \in B_X[0,1]} |f'(x + u)(v) - f'(x)(v) - b(u, v)| \\ &= \sup_{v \in B_X[0,1]} |(f'(x + u) - f'(x) - b(u, \cdot))(v)| \\ &= \|f'(x + u) - f'(x) - b(u, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. If f' is differentiable at x , then, by taking $b := f''(x)$ and $\nabla^2 f(x) := L$, we have $(\nabla f)'(x) = \nabla^2 f(x)$. Conversely, if ∇f is differentiable

at x , then, by choosing $L := \nabla^2 f(x) := (\nabla f)'(x)$, we have $f''(x) = b$. In both cases, since $f''(x)$ is symmetric, $\nabla^2 f(x)$ is self-adjoint. \square

If X is finite-dimensional, then the eigenvalues of $\nabla^2 f(x) \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ are the eigenvalues of the $\dim X \times \dim X$ matrix representing $\nabla^2 f(x)$ with respect to any basis of X ; this matrix is symmetric since $\nabla^2 f(x)$ is self-adjoint, and its eigenvalues are therefore real.

References

- [1] P.-A. Absil, R. Mahony, and R. Sepulchre. *Optimization Algorithms on Matrix Manifolds*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, USA, 2008.
- [2] D. Alekseevsky, A. Kriegl, M. Losik, and P. W. Michor. The Riemannian geometry of orbit spaces – the metric, geodesics, and integrable systems. *Publicationes Mathematicae*, 62(1):247–276, 2003. doi:10.5486/PMD.2003.2821.
- [3] H. H. Bauschke, D. R. Luke, H. M. Phan, and X. Wang. Restricted normal cones and sparsity optimization with affine constraints. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 14(1):63–83, February 2014. doi:10.1007/s10208-013-9161-0.
- [4] A. Bhattacharya and R. Bhattacharya. *Nonparametric Inference on Manifolds*. Institute of Mathematical Statistics Monographs. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [5] P. Bianchi, W. Hachem, and S. Schechtman. Stochastic subgradient descent escapes active strict saddles on weakly convex functions. 2022. arXiv:2108.02072v3.
- [6] J. D. Blanchard, J. Tanner, and K. Wei. CGIHT: conjugate gradient iterative hard thresholding for compressed sensing and matrix completion. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 4(4):289–327, 2015. doi:10.1093/imaiai/iav011.
- [7] T. Blumensath and M. E. Davies. Iterative thresholding for sparse approximations. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 14(5):629–654, 2008. doi:10.1007/s00041-008-9035-z.
- [8] T. Blumensath and M. E. Davies. Iterative hard thresholding for compressed sensing. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 27(3):265–274, 2009. doi:10.1016/j.acha.2009.04.002.
- [9] T. Blumensath and M. E. Davies. Normalized iterative hard thresholding: Guaranteed stability and performance. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 4(2):298–309, 2010. doi:10.1109/JSTSP.2010.2042411.
- [10] J. Bolte, A. Daniilidis, A. Lewis, and M. Shiota. Clarke subgradients of stratifiable functions. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 18(2):556–572, 2007. doi:10.1137/060670080.
- [11] N. Bourbaki. *Topologie générale*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. Réimpression inchangée de l’édition originale de 1971.
- [12] H. Brezis. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*. Universitext. Springer New York, 2011.
- [13] S. Burer and R. Monteiro. A nonlinear programming algorithm for solving semidefinite programs via low-rank factorization. *Mathematical Programming*, 95(2):329–357, 2003. doi:10.1007/s10107-002-0352-8.
- [14] S. Burer and R. Monteiro. Local minima and convergence in low-rank semidefinite programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 103(3):427–444, 2005. doi:10.1007/s10107-004-0564-1.
- [15] D. Davis, D. Drusvyatskiy, S. Kakade, and J. D. Lee. Stochastic subgradient method converges on tame functions. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 20(1):119–154, February 2020. doi:10.1007/s10208-018-09409-5.

- [16] A. Dax. Low-rank positive approximants of symmetric matrices. *Advances in Linear Algebra & Matrix Theory*, 4(3):172–185, September 2014. doi:10.4236/alamt.2014.43015.
- [17] J. Dieudonné. *Foundations of Modern Analysis*, volume 10-I of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, New York, 1969. Enlarged and Corrected Printing.
- [18] C. Eckart and G. Young. The approximation of one matrix by another of lower rank. *Psychometrika*, 1(3):211–218, September 1936. doi:10.1007/BF02288367.
- [19] F. Feppon and P. F. J. Lermusiaux. A geometric approach to dynamical model order reduction. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 39(1):510–538, 2018. doi:10.1137/16M1095202.
- [20] J. Fletcher and W. B. Moors. Chebyshev sets. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 98(2):161–231, 2015. doi:10.1017/S1446788714000561.
- [21] S. Foucart and H. Rauhut. *A Mathematical Introduction to Compressive Sensing*. Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis. Birkhäuser New York, NY, 2013.
- [22] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan. *Matrix Computations*. Johns Hopkins Studies in the Mathematical Sciences. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, USA, 4th edition, 2013.
- [23] W. Ha, H. Liu, and R. F. Barber. An equivalence between critical points for rank constraints versus low-rank factorizations. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 30(4):2927–2955, 2020. doi:10.1137/18M1231675.
- [24] J. Harris. *Algebraic Geometry*, volume 133 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag New York, 1992.
- [25] U. Helmke and M. A. Shayman. Critical points of matrix least squares distance functions. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 215:1–19, January 1995. doi:10.1016/0024-3795(93)00070-G.
- [26] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, New-York, NY, USA, 2nd edition, 2013.
- [27] S. Hosseini, D. R. Luke, and A. Uschmajew. *Nonsmooth Optimization and Its Applications*, volume 170 of *International Series of Numerical Mathematics*, chapter Tangent and Normal Cones for Low-Rank Matrices, pages 45–53. Birkhäuser, Cham, March 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-11370-4_3.
- [28] S. Hosseini and A. Uschmajew. A gradient sampling method on algebraic varieties and application to nonsmooth low-rank optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(4):2853–2880, 2019. doi:10.1137/17M1153571.
- [29] A. D. Ioffe. An invitation to tame optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19(5):1894–1917, 2009. doi:10.1137/080722059.
- [30] X. Jia, C. Kanzow, P. Mehlitz, and G. Wachsmuth. An augmented Lagrangian method for optimization problems with structured geometric constraints. *Mathematical Programming*, 2022. doi:10.1007/s10107-022-01870-z.
- [31] M. Journée, F. Bach, P.-A. Absil, and R. Sepulchre. Low-rank optimization on the cone of positive semidefinite matrices. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(5):2327–2351, 2010. doi:10.1137/080731359.
- [32] J. M. Lee. *Introduction to Riemannian Manifolds*, volume 176 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2nd edition, 2018.
- [33] E. Levin, J. Kileel, and N. Boumal. Finding stationary points on bounded-rank matrices: A geometric hurdle and a smooth remedy. 2021. e-print version 1. arXiv:2107.03877v1.

- [34] E. Levin, J. Kileel, and N. Boumal. The effect of smooth parametrizations on nonconvex optimization landscapes. 2022. [arXiv:2207.03512v2](#).
- [35] E. Levin, J. Kileel, and N. Boumal. Finding stationary points on bounded-rank matrices: A geometric hurdle and a smooth remedy. *Mathematical Programming*, 2022. doi:10.1007/s10107-022-01851-2.
- [36] J. Li, A. M.-C. So, and W.-K. Ma. Understanding notions of stationarity in nonsmooth optimization: A guided tour of various constructions of subdifferential for nonsmooth functions. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 37(5):18–31, September 2020. doi:10.1109/MSP.2020.3003845.
- [37] J. Mather. Notes on topological stability. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 49(4):475–506, October 2012. doi:10.1090/S0273-0979-2012-01383-6.
- [38] N. Nadisic, J. E. Cohen, A. Vandaele, and N. Gillis. Matrix-wise ℓ_0 -constrained sparse nonnegative least squares. *Machine Learning*, 111(12):4453–4495, 2022. doi:10.1007/s10994-022-06260-2.
- [39] Y. Nesterov. *Lectures on Convex Optimization*, volume 137 of *Springer Optimization and Its Applications*. Springer, Cham, 2nd edition, 2018.
- [40] G. Oliker and P.-A. Absil. An apocalypse-free first-order low-rank optimization algorithm with at most one rank reduction attempt per iteration. 2022. Submitted. [arXiv:2208.12051v1](#).
- [41] G. Oliker and P.-A. Absil. On the continuity of the tangent cone to the determinantal variety. *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, 30:769–788, 2022. doi:10.1007/s11228-021-00618-9.
- [42] G. Oliker, K. A. Gallivan, and P.-A. Absil. An apocalypse-free first-order low-rank optimization algorithm. Technical Report UCL-INMA-2022.01, 2022. [arXiv:2201.03962v1](#).
- [43] G. Oliker, K. A. Gallivan, and P.-A. Absil. Comparison of an apocalypse-free and an apocalypse-prone first-order low-rank optimization algorithm. Technical Report UCL-INMA-2022.02, 2022. [arXiv:2202.09107v1](#).
- [44] S. Ovchinnikov. *Functional Analysis: An Introductory Course*. Universitext. Springer Cham, 2018.
- [45] E. Polak. *Computational Methods in Optimization*, volume 77 of *Mathematics in Science and Engineering*. Academic Press, 1971.
- [46] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J.-B. Wets. *Variational Analysis*, volume 317 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1998. Corrected 3rd printing 2009.
- [47] R. Schneider and A. Uschmajew. Convergence results for projected line-search methods on varieties of low-rank matrices via Łojasiewicz inequality. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(1):622–646, 2015. doi:10.1137/140957822.
- [48] M. K. Tam. Regularity properties of non-negative sparsity sets. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 447(2):758–777, March 2017. doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2016.10.040.
- [49] Y. Thanwerdas and X. Pennec. Bures–Wasserstein minimizing geodesics between covariance matrices of different ranks. 2022. [arXiv:2204.09928v1](#).
- [50] B. Vandereycken. Low-rank matrix completion by Riemannian optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(2):1214–1236, 2013. doi:10.1137/110845768.
- [51] H. Whitney. Elementary structure of real algebraic varieties. *Annals of Mathematics*, 66(3):545–556, November 1957.
- [52] H. Whitney. Tangents to an analytic variety. *Annals of Mathematics*, 81(3):496–549, May 1965.

- [53] M. Willem. *Functional Analysis: Fundamentals and Applications*. Cornerstones. Birkhäuser New York, 2013.
- [54] G. Zhou, W. Huang, K. A. Gallivan, P. Van Dooren, and P.-A. Absil. A Riemannian rank-adaptive method for low-rank optimization. *Neurocomputing*, 192:72–80, June 2016. doi:10.1016/j.neucom.2016.02.030.