

A globally convergent regularized Newton method for ℓ_q -norm composite optimization problems

Yuqia Wu*, Shaohua Pan[†] and Xiaoqi Yang[‡]

March 8, 2022

Abstract

This paper is concerned with ℓ_q ($0 < q < 1$)-norm regularized minimization problems with a twice continuously differentiable loss function. For this class of nonconvex and nonsmooth composite problems, many algorithms have been proposed to solve them and most of which are of the first-order type. In this work, we propose a hybrid of proximal gradient method and subspace regularized Newton method, named HpgSRN. Unlike existing global convergent results for (regularized) Newton methods, the whole iterate sequence produced by HpgSRN is proved to have a finite length and converge to an L -type stationary point under a mild curve-ratio condition and the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property of the cost function, which does linearly if further a Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property of exponent $1/2$ holds. Moreover, a superlinear convergence rate for the iterate sequence is also achieved under an additional local error bound condition. Our convergence results do not require the isolatedness and strict local minimum properties of the L -stationary point. Numerical comparisons with ZeroFPR, a hybrid of proximal gradient method and quasi-Newton method for the forward-backward envelope of the cost function, proposed in [A. Themelis, L. Stella, and P. Patrinos, *SIAM J. Optim.*, 28(2018), pp. 2274-2303] for the ℓ_q -norm regularized linear and logistic regressions on real data indicate that HpgSRN not only requires much less computing time but also yields comparable even better sparsities and objective values.

Keywords: ℓ_q -norm regularized composite optimization, regularized Newton method, global convergence, superlinear convergence rate; KL property, local error bound

* (yuqia.wu@connect.polyu.hk) Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong.

[†] (shhpan@scut.edu.cn) School of Mathematics, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou.

[‡] (mayangxq@polyu.edu.hk) Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong.

1 Introduction

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be a data matrix, and let $f: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a twice continuously differentiable function with $c_f := \inf_{z \in \mathbb{R}^m} f(z) > -\infty$ and gradient function ∇f being Lipschitz continuous. Denote by $L_{\nabla f}$ the Lipschitz constant of ∇f . We consider the ℓ_q ($0 < q < 1$)-norm regularized composite optimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} F(x) := f(Ax) + \lambda \|x\|_q^q, \quad (1)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the regularization parameter and $\|x\|_q := (\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^q)^{1/q}$ denotes the ℓ_q quasi-norm of x . When $f(\cdot) = \|\cdot - b\|^2$ for a vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, the problem (1) reduces to the familiar ℓ_q -norm regularized least square problem.

The model (1) first appears in statistics as the bridge penalty regression [15], and later appears in optimization as a special case of nonsmooth and nonconvex penalty problems studied by Luo et al. [26] and Yang and Huang [19, 39] for nonlinear optimization problems. In signal processing, Chartrand [10] early showed that the ℓ_q ($0 < q < 1$)-norm can substantially reduce the number of measurements required by ℓ_1 -norm for exact recovery of signals, which motivates the frequent use of the ℓ_q ($0 < q < 1$)-norm in compressed sensing. Observe that for any given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\|x\|_q^q \rightarrow \|x\|_0$ as $q \downarrow 0$, where $\|x\|_0$ denotes the zero-norm (cardinality) of x . As a nonconvex surrogate of the zero-norm regularized problem, the model (1) has been found to have a wide spectrum of applications in signal and image processing, statistics, and machine learning (see, e.g., [31, 28, 13, 38, 9]). Inspired by wide applications of the problem (1), this work aims to propose a globally convergent subspace regularized Newton method, that is, a hybrid of proximal gradient method and subspace regularized Newton method, for solving it.

1.1 Related works

Due to the nonconvex and non-Lipschitz continuity of the ℓ_q -norm, the problem (1) is a class of difficult nonconvex and nonsmooth optimization problems. In the past decade, many first-order methods have been developed for seeking its critical points. For f being a quadratic function and some special q , say $q = 1/2$ or $2/3$, since the proximal mapping of the ℓ_q -norm has a closed-form solution in Xu et al. [37, 9], the proximal gradient (PG) method becomes a class of popular ones for solving (1) with such q . For a general $q \in (0, 1)$, Hu et al. also proposed an exact PG in [16] and an inexact PG method in [17] for (1). When assuming that the limit point is a local minimum, a linear convergence rate was obtained in [16, 17, 37]. Moreover a class of PG methods called SpaRSA with various options including the Barzilai-Borwein rule and monotone-type line searches was proposed in Wright et al. [36]. For the model (1) also with a general $q \in (0, 1)$, the reweighted ℓ_1 -minimization method [25, 12, 21] is another class of common first-order methods, which finds a critical point of (1) by solving a sequence of weighted ℓ_1 -norm regularized minimization problems. To overcome the non-Lipschitz difficulty of the ℓ_q -norm, Chen et al. [11] proposed a class of smoothing method by constructing a

smooth approximation of the ℓ_q -norm and using the steepest descent method to solve the constructed smooth approximation problem.

As is well known, first-order methods have many advantages such as cheap computational cost in each iterate, weak global convergence conditions and easy implementation, but their convergence rate is at most linear. Second-order methods normally have a local superlinear convergence rate. However, it is not an easy task for them to achieve the global convergence of the whole iterate sequence. For unconstrained nonconvex and smooth optimization, the global convergence analysis for the Newton method with line search is limited to the subsequential convergence of the iterate sequence [29] and references therein, let alone for the problem (1). In addition, for unconstrained smooth optimization problems, to the best of our knowledge, the current weakest condition for a second-order method to have a local superlinear convergence rate is a local error bound condition at local minima; see [35, 23, 14]. Therefore, for the problem (1) or the following general nonconvex and nonsmooth composite problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \Psi(x) := \psi(x) + g(x), \quad (2)$$

where $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is a closed proper function and ψ is twice continuously differentiable on an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n containing the effective domain of g , it is natural to ask whether it is possible to design a globally convergent Newton-type method with a local superlinear convergence rate under a similar local error bound condition.

Recently, for the problem (2) with both ψ and g convex, there are some active investigations in this direction. Lee et al. [22] proposed an inexact proximal Newton-type method and achieved the local quadratic convergence rate of the iterate sequence under the strong convexity of ψ . Yue et al. [41] proposed an inexact regularized proximal Newton method and established the local linear, superlinear and quadratic convergence rate of the iterate sequence (by the approximation degree to the Hessian matrix of ψ), under Luo-Tseng error bound. Mordukhovich et al. [27] proposed a proximal Newton-type method and obtained the quadratic convergence rate of the iterate sequence under the metric subregularity of the subdifferential mapping $\partial\Psi$.

By following a different line, the forward-backward envelope (FBE) of Ψ has been extensively investigated for designing a hybrid of PG and second-order methods. For g in (2) being convex with a cheap computable proximal mapping, Stella et al. [32] combined PG and a quasi-Newton method to minimize the FBE of Ψ and proved the convergence of the whole sequence under KL property and the superlinear convergence rate under the local strong convexity of the FBE of Ψ . For (2) with ψ being additionally convex and g just having a cheap computable proximal mapping, Themelis et al. [33] proposed a hybrid of PG and inexact Newton methods by using FBE of Ψ (named FBTN) and proved that $\text{dist}(x^k, \mathcal{X}^*)$ converges superlinearly to 0 under an assumption without requiring the singleton of the solution set \mathcal{X}^* of (2). In [34] Themelis et al. used the FBE of Ψ to develop a hybrid framework of PG and quasi-Newton methods (ZeroFPR), and achieved the global convergence of the iterate sequence by virtue of the KL property of the FBE, and its local superlinear rate under the Dennis-Moré condition and the strong local minimum of the limit point. The convergence rate results in [32, 34] require the

isolatedness of the limit point. Very recently, Ahookhosh et al. [1] utilized the Bregman FBE of Ψ to develop a more general hybrid framework of PG and second-order methods, BELLA. They obtained the global convergence of the iterate sequence under the KL property of Ψ and the local superlinear rate of the distance of the iterate sequence to the set of fixed points of the Bregman FBE by assuming that the second-order directions are the superlinear ones with order 1 and KL property of exponent $\theta \in (0, 1)$ of Ψ . This work greatly improved the results of [32, 34] by removing the isolatedness restriction on local minima and established that the second-order directions are indeed the superlinear ones with order 1 under the assumptions that the limit point is a strong local minimum and a Dennis-Moré condition holds. It is unclear what conditions are sufficient for second-order directions to be superlinear without the strong local minimum property. To achieve the global convergence, a boundedness condition of the search directions (see (16)) is also required in [32, 34, 1]. We also notice that the inexact proximal Newton-type method in [22] was recently extended by Kanzow and Lechner [20] to solve the problem (2) with only a convex g , which essentially belongs to weakly convex optimization. Their global and local superlinear convergence results require the local strong convexity of Ψ around any stationary point.

It is worth noting that when ψ and g in (2) are convex, the local quadratic or superlinear convergence to a nonisolated optimal solution of second-order methods was obtained in [41, 27]. To the best of our knowledge, the paper [1] is the first to achieve the superlinear convergence of the distance function of the iterate sequence without requiring the isolatedness assumption for solving model (2) with nonconvex and nonsmooth g . In addition, Zhou et al. [42] proposed a subspace Newton method for the case $g(x) \equiv \|x\|_0$ by its stationary point equation and established the local quadratic convergence rate of the iterate sequence under the local strong convexity of ψ around any stationary point.

1.2 Main contributions

In this paper, we propose a hybrid of PG and a subspace regularized Newton method (HpgSRN) for the problem (1). Though the model (1) is a special case of (2), our HpgSRN is quite different from ZeroFPR [34] and BELLA [1]; see the discussions in Remark 3.2 (c). In the sequel, we always write

$$\psi(x) := f(Ax) \text{ and } g(x) := \|x\|_q^q \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We now describe the flow of HpgSRN. For any given $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, let $\psi_S(u) := f(A_S u)$, $g_S(u) := \sum_{i \in S} |u_i|^q$ and

$$F_S(u) := \psi_S(u) + \lambda g_S(u) \text{ for } u \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}. \quad (3)$$

By Lemma 2.3, for $S = \text{supp}(x)$, such F_S is twice continuously differentiable at x_S .

As mentioned before, the PG method requires a weak condition for global convergence and a very cheap computation cost in each iterate, but has only a linear convergence speed. Hence, we use the PG method to seek a good estimate in some neighborhood of the potential critical point, and enhance the local convergence speed by using a regularized

Newton method in the subspace associated to the support of the iterate given by the PG method. Specifically, with the current x^k , the PG step yields \bar{x}^k by computing

$$\bar{x}^k \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \psi(x^k) + \langle \nabla \psi(x^k), x - x^k \rangle + \frac{\bar{\mu}_k}{2} \|x - x^k\|^2 + \lambda g(x) \right\},$$

where the step-size $\bar{\mu}_k$ depends on $L_{\nabla \psi}$ (the Lipschitz constant of $\nabla \psi$). Write $S_k := \text{supp}(x^k)$ and $S_k^c := \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus S_k$. If $\text{sign}(x^k) \neq \text{sign}(\bar{x}^k)$ or some other conditions are not satisfied, (see the formal statement of HpgSRN below), let $x^{k+1} := \bar{x}^k$ and return to the PG step; otherwise switch to a regularized Newton step. In particular, the Newton direction d^k takes the form of $(d_{S_k}^k; 0)$ and $d_{S_k}^k$ satisfies

$$d_{S_k}^k := \arg \min_{d_{S_k} \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_k|}} \left\{ F_{S_k}(u^k) + \langle \nabla F_{S_k}(u^k), d_{S_k} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle (\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(u^k) + \xi_k I) d_{S_k}, d_{S_k} \rangle \right\} \quad (4)$$

for $u^k = x_{S_k}^k$ and ξ_k is a constant such that $\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(u^k) + \xi_k I$ is positive definite. It is easy to verify that $d_{S_k}^k$ is the unique root of the system of linear equations

$$(\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(u^k) + \xi_k I) d_{S_k} = -\nabla F_{S_k}(u^k).$$

We then perform the Armijo line search along the direction d^k to seek an appropriate step-size α_k , set $x^{k+1} := x^k + \alpha_k d^k$ and return to PG step in order to guarantee that the iterate sequence has the global convergence property.

From the above statement, the iterate sequence $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of HpgSRN consists of two parts: the iterates given by the PG step and those generated by the subspace regularized Newton step. Some switching conditions including $\text{sign}(x^k) = \text{sign}(\bar{x}^k)$ decide which step a given iterate x^k comes from. For the subspace regularized Newton step, calculating the inverse of the approximation G^k to the reduced Hessian $\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(u^k)$ needs about $O(|S_k|^3)$ flops, so HpgSRN is well adapted to high dimensional problems if $n \gg |S_k|$.

The main contributions of this paper include three aspects:

- (i) We propose a hybrid of the PG and subspace regularized Newton methods. Different from ZeroFPR and BELLA, each iterate of HpgSRN does not necessarily perform a second-order step until sufficiently many steps are performed and the computation of the regularized Newton step fully exploits the subspace structure, which substantially reduces the computation cost. Numerical comparison with ZeroFPR indicates that HpgSRN not only requires much less computing time (especially for those problem with $n \gg m$) but also yields comparable even better sparsity and the objective value.
- (ii) For the proposed HpgSRN, we achieve the global convergence of the iterate sequence under the Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla^2 f$ on a bounded set (see Assumption 4.1), the KL assumption on F , and a curve-ratio assumption on the subspace regularized Newton directions (see Assumption 4.2). Among others, Assumption 4.1

is a common one in the convergence analysis of Newton-type methods, while Assumption 4.2 is shown to be weaker than the one used by ZeroFPR and BELLA on the second-order directions for global convergence, see Lemma 4.6 and Example 4.1 below.

- (iii) Under Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2, if the KL property of F is strengthened to be the KL property of exponent $1/2$, we establish the R -linear convergence rate of the iterate sequence. While under Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2, if in addition a local error bound condition holds at the limit point, the iterate sequence is shown to converge superlinearly with a order $(1+\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in (0, 1/2]$. This not only removes the local optimality of the limit point as required by ZeroFPR and BELLA, but also gets rid of the isolatedness of the limit point as BELLA does.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives some preliminaries, including the subdifferential characterization of F and the equivalence between the KL property of exponent $1/2$ of F and that of F_S . Section 3 presents the formal iterate steps of HpgSRN and some auxiliary results. Section 4 provides the global and local convergence analysis of HpgSRN. Finally, in section 5 we conduct numerical experiments for HpgSRN on ℓ_q -norm regularized linear and logistics regressions on real data and compare its performance with ZeroFPR and SpARSA solvers.

1.3 Notation

Throughout this paper, \mathbb{R}^n denotes the n -dimensional Euclidean space, equipped with the standard inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and its induced norm $\|\cdot\|$, and I is an identity matrix whose dimension is known from the context. For a symmetric matrix H , $\lambda_{\min}(H)$ and $\|H\|$ respectively denote the smallest eigenvalue and the spectral norm of H , and $H \succ 0$ means that H is positive definite. For a closed set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, Π_C denotes the projection operator onto the set C and $\text{dist}(x, C)$ denotes the distance from a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to C . The notation \circ means the Hadamard product operation of vectors. For an integer $k \geq 1$, write $[k] := \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$; and for integers $k_2 > k_1 \geq 1$, write $[k_1, k_2] := \{k_1, \dots, k_2\}$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{supp}(x) := \{i \in [n] \mid x_i \neq 0\}$ denotes its support and $|x|_{\min} := \min_{i \in \text{supp}(x)} |x_i|$ represents the smallest absolute value of the nonzero entries of x . For an index set $S \subseteq [n]$, write $S^c := [n] \setminus S$ and denote by $x_S \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}$ the vector consisting of those x_j with $j \in S$, and by $A_S \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times |S|}$ the matrix consisting of those columns A_j with $j \in S$. For $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lceil a \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer greater than a .

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall some necessary concepts and present some preliminary results. For a proper lower semicontinuous (lsc) function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$, its proximal mapping associated to a parameter $\mu > 0$ is defined by

$$\text{prox}_{\mu h}(x) := \arg \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\mu} \|z - x\|^2 + h(z) \right\} \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

For the proximal mapping of g , from [11, Theorem 2.1] we have the following result.

Lemma 2.1 *Fix any $\mu > 0$. For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any $\bar{y} \in \text{prox}_{\mu g}(y)$, it holds that $|\bar{y}|_{\min} \geq (\mu q(1-q))^{\frac{1}{2-q}}$.*

Next we recall from the monograph [30] the notion of the regular, limiting and horizon subdifferentials for an extended real-valued function.

2.1 Generalized subdifferentials

Definition 2.1 ([30, Definition 8.3]) *Consider a function $h: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ and a point x with $h(x)$ finite. The regular subdifferential of h at x is defined as*

$$\widehat{\partial}h(x) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \liminf_{x' \rightarrow x} \frac{h(x') - h(x) - \langle v, x' - x \rangle}{\|x' - x\|} \geq 0 \right\},$$

the basic (limiting or Mordukhovich) subdifferential of h at x is defined as

$$\partial h(x) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists x^k \xrightarrow{h} x \text{ and } v^k \in \widehat{\partial}h(x^k) \text{ with } v^k \rightarrow v \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty \right\},$$

and the horizon subdifferential of h at x is defined as

$$\partial^\infty h(x) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists x^k \xrightarrow{h} x \text{ and } v^k \in \widehat{\partial}h(x^k) \text{ with } \lambda^k v^k \rightarrow v \text{ for some } \lambda^k \downarrow 0 \right\}$$

where the above notation $x^k \xrightarrow{h} x$ means $x^k \rightarrow x$ and $h(x^k) \rightarrow h(x)$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$.

For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $h(x)$ finite, the set $\widehat{\partial}h(x)$ is closed and convex, $\partial h(x)$ is closed but generally nonconvex, and the inclusion $\widehat{\partial}h(x) \subseteq \partial h(x)$ holds. The set of those points x^* at which $0 \in \partial h(x^*)$ is called the critical point set of h , denoted by $\text{crit } h$.

By Definition 2.1 and the expressions of g and F , after an elementary calculation, it is not hard to verify that the following two lemmas hold.

Lemma 2.2 *Fix any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, $\widehat{\partial}g(x) = \partial g(x) = T_1(x_1) \times \cdots \times T_n(x_n)$ where $T_i(x_i) = \{q \text{sign}(x_i)|x_i|^{q-1}\}$ if $x_i \neq 0$, otherwise $T_i(x_i) = \mathbb{R}$; and $\partial^\infty g(x) = [\widehat{\partial}g(x)]^\infty$ where $[\widehat{\partial}g(x)]^\infty$ is the recession cone of $\widehat{\partial}g(x)$. Hence, g is (subdifferentially) regular.*

Lemma 2.3 *For the objective function F of (1), the following statements hold.*

- (i) *For any given index set $S \subseteq [n]$ and any given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\text{supp}(x) = S$, the function F_S is twice continuously differentiable at x_S with*

$$\nabla F_S(x_S) = A_S^\top \nabla f(A_S x_S) + \lambda q \text{sign}(x_S) \circ |x_S|^{q-1}, \quad (5a)$$

$$\nabla^2 F_S(x_S) = A_S^\top \nabla^2 f(A_S x_S) A_S + \lambda q(q-1) \text{Diag}(|x_S|^{q-2}), \quad (5b)$$

and the function g_S is three times continuously differentiable at x_S with

$$D^3 g_S(x_S)(w) = q(q-1)(q-2) \text{Diag}(\text{sign}(x_S) \circ |x_S|^{q-3} \circ w) \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}. \quad (6)$$

(ii) For any given bounded set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and any given constant $\kappa > 0$, there exist $\widehat{c}_1 > 0, \widehat{c}_2 > 0$ and $\widehat{c}_3 > 0$ such that for all $x \in C$ with $\min_{i \in \text{supp}(x)} |x_i| \geq \kappa$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla F_{\text{supp}(x)}(x_{\text{supp}(x)})\| &\leq \widehat{c}_1, \quad \|\nabla^2 F_{\text{supp}(x)}(x_{\text{supp}(x)})\| \leq \widehat{c}_2, \\ \|D^3 g_{\text{supp}(x)}(x_{\text{supp}(x)})\| &\leq \widehat{c}_3. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x)) = \|\nabla F_{\text{supp}(x)}(x_{\text{supp}(x)})\|$.

To end this subsection, inspired by [5, Definition 4.1], we introduce a class of L -type stationary points for the problem (1).

Definition 2.2 A vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called an L -type stationary point of the problem (1) if there exists a constant $\mu > 0$ such that $x \in \text{prox}_{\mu^{-1}(\lambda g)}(x - \mu^{-1} \nabla \psi(x))$.

By Lemma 2.2, it is not hard to verify that every L -type stationary point of (1) is an element of $\text{crit} F$.

2.2 Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property

In the past ten years, it has witnessed the significant role of the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property of the objective function in the convergence analysis of first-order algorithms for nonconvex and nonsmooth optimization problems (see, e.g., [2, 3, 7]). Next we recall its definition and establish the equivalence between the KL property of exponent 1/2 of F and that of F_S .

Definition 2.3 A proper extended real-valued function $h: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is said to have the KL property at a point $\bar{x} \in \text{dom} \partial h$ if there exist $\eta \in (0, \infty]$, a neighborhood \mathcal{U} of \bar{x} , and a continuous concave function $\varphi: [0, \eta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying

$$\varphi(0) = 0, \varphi \text{ is continuously differentiable on } (0, \eta) \text{ and } \varphi'(s) > 0 \quad \forall s \in (0, \eta) \quad (7)$$

such that for all $x \in \mathcal{U} \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h(\bar{x}) < h < h(\bar{x}) + \eta\}$,

$$\varphi'(h(x) - h(\bar{x})) \text{dist}(0, \partial h(x)) \geq 1.$$

If φ can be chosen as $\varphi(s) = c\sqrt{s}$ for a certain constant $c > 0$, then h is said to have the KL property of exponent 1/2 at \bar{x} . If h has the KL property of exponent 1/2 at each point of $\text{dom} \partial h$, then h is called a KL function of exponent 1/2.

Remark 2.1 By [2, Lemma 2.1] a proper lsc function $h: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ has the KL property of exponent 1/2 at all noncritical points. Thus, to show that it is a KL function of exponent 1/2, it suffices to check its KL property of exponent 1/2 at critical points. On the calculation of KL exponent, refer to the recent works [24, 40].

The following proposition establishes the equivalence between KL property of exponent 1/2 of F and that of F_S .

Proposition 2.1 For any given $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, F has the KL property of exponent $1/2$ at \bar{x} if and only if $F_{\bar{S}}$ with $\bar{S} = \text{supp}(\bar{x})$ has the KL property of exponent $1/2$ at $\bar{u} = \bar{x}_{\bar{S}}$.

Proof: By Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 (i), it is easy to verify that $\bar{x} \in \text{crit}F$ if and only if $\bar{x}_{\bar{S}} \in \text{crit}F_{\bar{S}}$ for $\bar{S} = \text{supp}(\bar{x})$. Then, by Remark 2.1, it suffices to consider the case that $\bar{x} \in \text{crit}F$.

\implies Since F has the KL property of exponent $1/2$ at \bar{x} , there exist $\eta > 0, \varepsilon > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that for all $x \in \Gamma(\varepsilon, \eta) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|x - \bar{x}\| \leq \varepsilon, F(\bar{x}) < F(x) < F(\bar{x}) + \eta\}$,

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x)) \geq c\sqrt{F(x) - F(\bar{x})}. \quad (8)$$

Since $\bar{x}_i \neq 0$ for each $i \in \bar{S}$, there exists $\varepsilon' > 0$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \varepsilon')$ and all $i \in \bar{S}$, $z_i \neq 0$. Set $\tilde{\varepsilon} := \min\{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'\}$. Pick any $u \in \Gamma_{\bar{S}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}, \eta) := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\bar{S}|} \mid \|u - \bar{u}\| \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}, F_{\bar{S}}(\bar{u}) < F_{\bar{S}}(u) < F_{\bar{S}}(\bar{u}) + \eta\}$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x_{\bar{S}} = u$ and $x_{\bar{S}^c} = 0$. Clearly, $\text{supp}(x) = \bar{S}$. From Lemma 2.3 (iii), it follows that $\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x)) = \|\nabla F_{\bar{S}}(u)\|$. Also, from $F_{\bar{S}}(u) = F(x)$ and $F_{\bar{S}}(\bar{u}) = F(\bar{x})$, we have $x \in \Gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)$. Along with (8), we get

$$\|\nabla F_{\bar{S}}(u)\| = \text{dist}(0, \partial F(x)) \geq c\sqrt{F(x) - F(\bar{x})} = c\sqrt{F_{\bar{S}}(u) - F_{\bar{S}}(\bar{u})}. \quad (9)$$

By the arbitrariness of u in $\Gamma_{\bar{S}}(\varepsilon, \eta)$, $F_{\bar{S}}$ has the KL property of exponent $1/2$ at \bar{u} .

\Leftarrow Since $F_{\bar{S}}$ has the KL property of exponent $1/2$ at \bar{u} , there are $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0, \tilde{\eta} > 0, c > 0$ such that for all $u \in \Gamma_{\bar{S}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\eta}) := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\bar{S}|} \mid \|u - \bar{u}\| \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}, F_{\bar{S}}(\bar{u}) < F_{\bar{S}}(u) < F_{\bar{S}}(\bar{u}) + \tilde{\eta}\}$,

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial F_{\bar{S}}(u)) \geq c\sqrt{F_{\bar{S}}(u) - F_{\bar{S}}(\bar{u})}.$$

Since every entry of \bar{u} is nonzero, by reducing $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ if necessary, for any u with $\|u - \bar{u}\| \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}$, its entries are all nonzero. Thus, the last inequality can be rewritten as

$$\|\nabla F_{\bar{S}}(u)\| \geq c\sqrt{F_{\bar{S}}(u) - F_{\bar{S}}(\bar{u})}. \quad (10)$$

By the continuity, there exists $\varepsilon' > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \varepsilon')$, $\text{supp}(x) \supseteq \bar{S}$. Let $\hat{\omega} := \max_{\|x - \bar{x}\| \leq 1} \|A^{\mathbb{T}} \nabla f(Ax)\|_{\infty}$. Set $\varepsilon := \min\{\frac{1}{4}, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \varepsilon', (\frac{\hat{\omega} + 1}{\lambda q})^{\frac{1}{q-1}}\}$ and $\eta := \frac{1}{2} \min\{\tilde{\eta}, 1\}$.

Let $T_1(\varepsilon, \eta) := \{x \in \Gamma(\varepsilon, \eta) \mid \text{supp}(x) = \bar{S}\}$ where $\Gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)$ is defined as above, and $T_2(\varepsilon, \eta) := \Gamma(\varepsilon, \eta) \setminus T_1(\varepsilon, \eta)$. Pick any $x \in \Gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)$. We proceed the proof by two cases.

Case 1: $x \in T_1(\varepsilon, \eta)$. Let $u = x_{\bar{S}}$. By Lemma 2.3 (iii), $\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x)) = \|\nabla F_{\bar{S}}(u)\|$. Since $\varepsilon < \tilde{\varepsilon}$ and $\eta < \tilde{\eta}$, we have $u \in \Gamma_{\bar{S}}(\varepsilon, \eta)$ and $\Gamma_{\bar{S}}(\varepsilon, \eta) \subseteq \Gamma_{\bar{S}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\eta})$. From (10),

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x)) = \|\nabla F_{\bar{S}}(u)\| \geq c\sqrt{F_{\bar{S}}(u) - F_{\bar{S}}(\bar{u})} = c\sqrt{F(x) - F(\bar{x})}.$$

Case 2: $x \in T_2(\varepsilon, \eta)$. Notice that $\text{supp}(x) \supseteq \bar{S}$. Together with the definition of $T_2(\varepsilon, \eta)$, there exists $i \notin \bar{S}$ such that $0 < |x_i| \leq \varepsilon$. Write $S := \text{supp}(x)$. Since F_S is continuously differentiable at x_S by Lemma 2.3 (iii), for all $i \in S \setminus \bar{S}$ it holds that,

$$\begin{aligned} |[\nabla F_S(x)]_i| &= |A_i^{\mathbb{T}} \nabla f(Ax) + \lambda q \text{sign}(x_i) |x_i|^{q-1}| \\ &\geq \lambda q |x_i|^{q-1} - |A_i^{\mathbb{T}} \nabla f(Ax)| > \lambda q \varepsilon^{q-1} - \hat{\omega} \geq 1, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the last inequality follows by the definition of ε . Since $F(\bar{x}) < F(x) < F(\bar{x}) + \eta$ and $0 < \eta < 1$, we have $\sqrt{F(x) - F(\bar{x})} < 1$. Together with (11), we have

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x)) \geq |[\nabla F(x)]_i| > 1 > \sqrt{F(x) - F(\bar{x})}.$$

From the above two cases and the arbitrariness of x in $\Gamma(\varepsilon, \eta)$, the function F has the KL property of exponent $1/2$ at \bar{x} . Thus, we complete the proof. \square

3 A hybrid of PG and subspace regularized Newton methods

In this section, we describe the iterate steps of HpgSRN, a hybrid of PG and subspace regularized Newton methods. First of all, we introduce the basic iterate of the PG method with a monotone line search (PGls), that is, a monotone version of SpaRSA [36]. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the current iterate and $\mu > 0$ be an initial step-size. One step of the PGls returns a new iterate x^+ and the used step-size μ_+ such that $F(x^+)$ has a certain decrease.

Algorithm 1 ($[x^+, \mu_+] := \mathcal{G}(x, \mu; \tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\alpha}, \lambda)$)

Input: $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and parameters $\mu > 0, \tilde{\tau} > 1$ and $\tilde{\alpha} > 0$.

Set $l := 0, \mu_l := \mu$ and $x^0 := \text{prox}_{\mu_l^{-1}(\lambda g)}(x - \mu_l^{-1} \nabla \psi(x))$.

while $F(x^l) > F(x) - (\tilde{\alpha}/2)\|x^l - x\|^2$

- Let $\mu_{l+1} = \tilde{\tau} \mu_l$ and $l \leftarrow l + 1$;
- Seek $x^l \in \text{prox}_{\mu_l^{-1}(\lambda g)}(x - \mu_l^{-1} \nabla \psi(x))$;

end (while)

$x^+ \leftarrow x^l$ and $\mu_+ \leftarrow \mu_l$.

Remark 3.1 (a) *In some scenarios, one cannot compute the Lipschitz constant of $\nabla \psi$, instead of an upper estimation for it. In the rest of this paper, we denote by \tilde{L} an upper estimation for it. Next we show that Algorithm 1 is well defined. Indeed, if l is a positive integer such that $\mu_l \geq \tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L}$, by the descent lemma [6, Proposition A.24] it follows that*

$$\begin{aligned} F(x^l) &\leq \psi(x) + \langle \nabla \psi(x), x^l - x \rangle + (\tilde{L}/2)\|x^l - x\|^2 + \lambda g(x^l) \\ &\leq \psi(x) + \langle \nabla \psi(x), x^l - x \rangle + \frac{\mu_l}{2}\|x^l - x\|^2 + \lambda g(x^l) - \frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{2}\|x^l - x\|^2 \\ &\leq \psi(x) + \lambda g(x) - (\tilde{\alpha}/2)\|x^l - x\|^2 = F(x) - (\tilde{\alpha}/2)\|x^l - x\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the last inequality is obtained by the definition of x^l . Then, $\mu_+ \leq \tilde{\tau}(\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L})$ and the smallest nonnegative integer l such that (12) holds is $\lceil \log_{\tilde{\tau}}(\frac{\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L}}{\mu}) \rceil + 1$.

(b) By using $\mu_+ \leq \tilde{\tau}(\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L})$ and Lemma 2.1 with $\mu = \mu_+$ and $y = x - \mu^{-1}\nabla\psi(x)$, the vector x^+ returned by Algorithm 1 satisfies $|x^+|_{\min} \geq \left(\frac{\lambda q(1-q)}{\tilde{\tau}(\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L})}\right)^{\frac{1}{2-q}} := \nu$.

Now we are in a position to present the detailed iterate steps of our HpgSRN.

Algorithm 2 (a hybrid of PG and subspace regularized Newton methods)

Initialization: Choose $\tilde{\tau} > 1, \tilde{\alpha} > 0, 0 < \mu_{\min} < \tilde{L}, \sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}], \varrho \in (0, \frac{1}{2}), \beta \in (0, 1), b_1 > 1$ and $b_2 > 0$. Choose an initial $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $k := 0$.

while the stopping condition is not satisfied

- **Step 1: proximal gradient step**

- (S1) Let $S_k = \text{supp}(x^k)$ and $u^k = x_{S_k}^k$. Choose an initial step-size $\mu_k \geq \mu_{\min}$.
- (S2) Set $[\bar{x}^k, \bar{\mu}_k] := \mathcal{G}(x^k, \mu_k; \tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\alpha}, \lambda)$. Let $\bar{S}_k = \text{supp}(\bar{x}^k)$ and $\bar{u}^k = \bar{x}_{\bar{S}_k}^k$.
- (S3) Set $\bar{\omega}_k := \bar{\mu}_k + \lambda q(q-1)|\bar{x}_{\min}^k|^{q-2}$. If the following conditions are satisfied

$$\text{sign}(x^k) = \text{sign}(\bar{x}^k) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mu}_k + \lambda q(q-1)|x_{\min}^k|^{q-2} \geq \frac{1}{2}\bar{\omega}_k, \quad (13)$$

then go to **Step 2**. Otherwise, let $x^{k+1} := \bar{x}^k, k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to (S1).

- **Step 2: subspace regularized Newton step**

- (S4) Seek a subspace Newton direction Δu^k by solving the linear system

$$G^k \Delta u = -\nabla F_{S_k}(u^k) \quad \text{for} \quad G^k = \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(u^k) + (b_1 \zeta_k + b_2 \|\nabla F_{S_k}(u^k)\|^\sigma) I$$

with $\zeta_k = \max\{-\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(u^k)), 0\}$. Let $d_{S_k}^k = \Delta u^k$ and $d_{S_k^c}^k = 0$.

- (S5) Let m_k be the smallest nonnegative integer m for which

$$F_{S_k}(u^k + \beta^m d_{S_k}^k) \leq F_{S_k}(u^k) + \varrho \beta^m \langle \nabla F_{S_k}(u^k), d_{S_k}^k \rangle. \quad (14)$$

- (S6) Set $\alpha_k := \beta^{m_k}$ and $x^{k+1} := x^k + \alpha_k d^k$. Let $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to **Step 1**.

end (while)

Remark 3.2 (a) We see that each iterate of Algorithm 2 executes Step 1, but does not necessarily execute Step 2. Step 1 aims to ensure the convergence of the whole iterate sequence, while Step 2 is a subspace regularized Newton step used to enhance the convergence speed whenever the iterates are stable. As will be shown in Proposition 3.1 later, the regularized Newton step will be performed in an infinite number of times if Algorithm 2 does not stop within a finite number of steps.

(b) The two conditions in (13) compose a criterion to judge whether an iterate switches to Step 2. The first condition in (13) aims to check whether the sign supports of the iterates are stable, while the second one is to ensure that $|x^k|_{\min} > \nu$. Indeed, the second condition is equivalent to $|x^k|_{\min}^{q-2} \leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_k}{2\lambda q(1-q)} + \frac{1}{2}|\bar{x}^k|_{\min}^{q-2}$, and this together with $\bar{\mu}^k < \tilde{\tau}(\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L})$ and the definition of ν (see Remark 3.1 (b)) implies that

$$|x^k|_{\min} \geq \left[\frac{\tilde{\tau}(\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L})}{2\lambda q(1-q)} + \frac{1}{2}\nu^{q-2} \right]^{\frac{1}{q-2}} = \left[\frac{\tilde{\tau}(\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L})}{2\lambda q(1-q)} + \frac{\tilde{\tau}(\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L})}{2\lambda q(1-q)} \right]^{\frac{1}{q-2}} = \nu. \quad (15)$$

The switching criterion in (13) plays a crucial role in the later convergence analysis.

(c) Although Algorithm 2 is a hybrid of PG and second-order methods, it is not a special case of ZeroFPR [34] and FBTN [33] due to the following three aspects. Firstly, each iterate of Algorithm 2 does not necessarily perform the second-order Newton step, while each iterate of ZeroFPR and FBTN must execute a second-order step. Secondly, Algorithm 2 is using the Armijo line search, which is totally different from the ones used in ZeroFPR and FBTN. For (1), the line search of ZeroFPR with $p_k \equiv 1$ is to seek the smallest nonnegative integer m_k of those m 's such that

$$F(\bar{x}^k + \beta^m \bar{d}^k) - F(x^k) \leq \eta_1 \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2,$$

where $\eta_1 > 0$ is a constant related to the Lipschitz constant of $\nabla\psi$, and then set $x^{k+1} = \bar{x}^k + \beta^{m_k} \bar{d}^k$, where \bar{d}^k is a Newton-type direction at \bar{x}^k rather than x^k ; and the line search of FBTN is to seek the smallest nonnegative integer m_k of those m 's such that

$$F((1 - \beta^m)\bar{x}^k + \beta^m(x^k + d^k)) - F(x^k) \leq \eta_2 \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2,$$

where $\eta_2 > 0$ is a constant related to the Lipschitz constant of $\nabla\psi$, and then set $x^{k+1} = (1 - \beta^{m_k})\bar{x}^k + \beta^{m_k}(x^k + d^k)$, where d^k is a second-order direction at x^k . It is not hard to see that the decrease of the successive iterates for ZeroFPR and FBTN, i.e. $F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})$, is controlled by $\|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2$, while the decrease of the successive iterates for Algorithm 2 is controlled by the curve ratio $\alpha_k \langle \nabla F_{S_k}(u^k), d_{S_k}^k \rangle$ which, as will be shown in Proposition 4.1 (i), can also be controlled by $\|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2$. Finally, the global convergence analysis of ZeroFPR requires the second-order direction d^k to satisfy the condition

$$\exists \text{ a constant } \hat{c} > 0 \text{ such that } \|d^k\| \leq \hat{c} \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\| \text{ for all } k, \quad (16)$$

In the rest of this section, we illustrate that the sequence $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ generated by Algorithm 2 is well-defined and present some auxiliary properties for convergence analysis in next section.

Lemma 3.1 *The sequence $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ generated by Algorithm 2 is well defined. Also, $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_F(x^0) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid F(x) \leq F(x^0)\}$ and $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. Moreover, $\{F(x^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is convergent.*

Proof: By Remark 3.1, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, \bar{x}^k generated by Step 1 is well-defined, so it suffices to argue that the line search in Step 2 is well-defined. Fix any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. From

Lemma 2.3 (i), F_{S_k} is continuously differentiable at u^k . Since f is bounded from below on \mathbb{R}^m , F_{S_k} is bounded from below on $\mathbb{R}^{|S_k|}$. In addition, since $G^k \succ 0$, we have $\langle \nabla F_{S_k}(u^k), d_{S_k}^k \rangle = -\langle G^k d_{S_k}^k, d_{S_k}^k \rangle < 0$, which implies that $d_{S_k}^k$ is a descent direction of F_{S_k} at u^k . Thus, by following the same arguments as those for [29, Lemma 3.1], the smallest nonnegative integer m_k in (14) exists, i.e., the line search is well-defined.

Fix any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $x^{k+1} = \bar{x}^k$, by Algorithm 1 $F(x^{k+1}) \leq F(x^k)$. Otherwise,

$$F_{S_k}(u^{k+1}) \leq F_{S_k}(u^k) + \varrho \beta^{m_k} \langle \nabla F_{S_k}(u^k), d_{S_k}^k \rangle \leq F_{S_k}(u^k),$$

which means that $F_{S_k}(u^{k+1}) \leq F_{S_k}(u^k)$ or equivalently $F(x^{k+1}) \leq F(x^k)$ due to $S_{k+1} \subseteq S_k$ in this case. The two sides show that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $F(x^{k+1}) \leq F(x^k)$. Since g is coercive and f is lower bounded, it follows that $\mathcal{L}_F(x^0)$ is a compact set and the sequence $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. Combining the lower boundedness of F and the nonincreasing of $\{F(x^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, we have $\{F(x^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is convergent. \square

In the sequel, we denote by $\Omega(x^0)$ the cluster point set of the sequence $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. By Lemma 3.1, it is nonempty. Moreover, it is also compact.

From the iterate steps of Algorithm 2, it is not hard to see that the sequence $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ consists of two parts, i.e., $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = \{x^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}_1} \cup \{x^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}_2}$ where

$$\mathcal{K}_1 := \{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid x^{k+1} \text{ is generated by Step 1}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}_2 := \mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{K}_1. \quad (17)$$

We will show that \mathcal{K}_2 contains an infinite number of indices and then Algorithm 2 is different from a PG method. To this end, we take a closer look at the second-order derivative of the cost function of the problem, defining the proximal mapping of the ℓ_q -norm, at the global optimal solution. For any given $\gamma > 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$h_{\gamma,s}(t) := \frac{\gamma}{2}(t-s)^2 + \lambda|t|^q \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (18)$$

It is easy to verify that $h_{\gamma,s}$ has at most two global minimizers, and when it has two global minimizers, one of them must be zero. Let $\bar{t}(\gamma, s) \in \arg \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}} h_{\gamma,s}(t)$. If $\bar{t}(\gamma, s) \neq 0$, by [16, Lemma 14] it holds that $h''_{\gamma,s}(\bar{t}(\gamma, s)) = \gamma + \lambda q(q-1)|\bar{t}(\gamma, s)|^{q-2} > 0$. However, it is unclear whether there is a constant $\varpi > 0$ such that for all $\gamma > 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $h''_{\gamma,s}(\bar{t}(\gamma, s)) \geq \varpi$. The following lemma resolves this question and states that such ϖ exists for those $\gamma > 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\bar{t}(\gamma, s)$ lies in a compact set. Its proof exploits the special property of ℓ_q -norm and uses an integral mean-value theorem.

Lemma 3.2 *For any given $0 < v < M < +\infty$, there exists a constant $\varpi > 0$ such that for any $\gamma > 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\bar{t}(\gamma, s)| \in [v, M]$,*

$$h''_{\gamma,s}(\bar{t}(\gamma, s)) = \gamma + \lambda q(q-1)|\bar{t}(\gamma, s)|^{q-2} \geq \varpi.$$

Proof: Suppose that the conclusion does not hold. Then, there exist sequences $\{\gamma_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\{s_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $\bar{t}(\gamma_k, s_k) \in [v, M]$ such that $h''_{\gamma_k, s_k}(\bar{t}(\gamma_k, s_k)) \leq \frac{1}{k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\bar{t}_k = \bar{t}(\gamma_k, s_k)$ and $\vartheta_k = h_{\gamma_k, s_k}$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by the expression of h_{γ_k, s_k} , for all t with $|t| \in (0, M]$ the following inequality holds:

$$|\vartheta_k'''(t)| = \lambda q(q-1)(q-2)|t|^{q-3} \geq \lambda q(q-1)(q-2)M^{q-3} := \kappa. \quad (19)$$

Consequently, there exists $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k > \bar{k}$, $\vartheta_k''(\bar{t}_k) < \varepsilon := \frac{\kappa v}{10}$. Fix any $k > \bar{k}$. We proceed the arguments by two cases: $\bar{t}_k \in [v, M]$ and $\bar{t}_k \in [-M, -v]$.

Case 1: $\bar{t}_k \in [v, M]$. Since $\vartheta_k''(\bar{t}_k) < \varepsilon$ and for all $t \in (0, M]$, $\vartheta_k''(t) > \kappa$, from the integral mean-value theorem, $\vartheta_k''(\bar{t}_k) > \vartheta_k''(\bar{t}_k - \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa}) + \varepsilon$, which along with $\vartheta_k''(\bar{t}_k) < \varepsilon$ implies that $\vartheta_k''(\bar{t}_k - \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa}) < 0$. Together with $\vartheta_k''(\bar{t}_k) > 0$ (see [16, Lemma 14]), there exists $c \in (\bar{t}_k - \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa}, \bar{t}_k)$ such that $\vartheta_k''(c) = 0$ or there exists $0 < \delta < \varepsilon/\kappa$ such that $\vartheta_k''(\bar{t}_k - \delta) = 0$. Recall that $\vartheta_{k_j}'''(t) > \kappa > 0$ for all $t \in (0, M]$. Then, it holds that

$$\vartheta_k''(t) < 0 \text{ for } t \in (0, \bar{t}_k - \delta) \text{ and } \vartheta_k''(t) > 0 \text{ for } t \in (\bar{t}_k - \delta, M]. \quad (20)$$

The second inequality in (20), along with $\vartheta_k'(\bar{t}_k) = 0$, implies that $\vartheta_k'(\bar{t}_k - \delta) < 0$. Also, since $0 < \vartheta_k''(t) < \varepsilon$ for all $t \in (\bar{t}_k - \delta, \bar{t}_k)$, from the integral mean-value theorem, we obtain $\vartheta_k'(\bar{t}_k - \delta) > \vartheta_k'(\bar{t}_k) - \varepsilon\delta = -\varepsilon\delta$ and then $\vartheta_k'(\bar{t}_k - \delta) \in (-\varepsilon\delta, 0)$. Next we seek a point $\tilde{t}_k \in (0, \bar{t}_k - \delta)$ such that $\vartheta_k'(\tilde{t}_k) = 0$. Notice that for any $t \in (0, \bar{t}_k - \delta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\varepsilon\delta < \vartheta_k'(\bar{t}_k - \delta) &= \vartheta_k'(t) + \int_t^{\bar{t}_k - \delta} \vartheta_k''(s) ds = \vartheta_k'(t) + \int_t^{\bar{t}_k - \delta} [\vartheta_k''(s) - \vartheta_k''(\bar{t}_k - \delta)] ds \\ &\leq \vartheta_k'(t) + \int_t^{\bar{t}_k - \delta} \kappa(s - \bar{t}_k + \delta) ds = \vartheta_k'(t) - \frac{\kappa}{2}(t - \bar{t}_k + \delta)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is using $\vartheta_k''(\bar{t}_k - \delta) = 0$ and the second inequality is by (19). The last inequality implies that

$$\vartheta_k'(t) > 0 \text{ for all } t \leq \bar{t}_k - \delta - \sqrt{2\varepsilon\delta/\kappa}. \quad (21)$$

Along with $\vartheta_k'(\bar{t}_k - \delta) < 0$, there exists $\tilde{t}_k \in (\bar{t}_k - \delta - \sqrt{\frac{2\varepsilon\delta}{\kappa}}, \bar{t}_k - \delta)$ such that $\vartheta_k'(\tilde{t}_k) = 0$. By combing this with the first inequality in (20), it is immediate to deduce that

$$\vartheta_k'(t) > 0 \text{ for } t \in (0, \tilde{t}_k) \text{ and } \vartheta_k'(t) < 0 \text{ for } t \in (\tilde{t}_k, \bar{t}_k - \delta). \quad (22)$$

Also, we deduce from (20) that ϑ_k' is decreasing in $(\tilde{t}_k, \bar{t}_k - \delta)$ and is increasing in $(\bar{t}_k - \delta, \bar{t}_k)$. This means that $\vartheta_k'(t) \geq \vartheta_k'(\bar{t}_k - \delta) > -\varepsilon\delta$ for all $t \in (\tilde{t}_k, \bar{t}_k)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta_k(\bar{t}_k) - \vartheta_k(\tilde{t}_k) &= \int_{\tilde{t}_k}^{\bar{t}_k} \vartheta_k'(s) ds > -\varepsilon\delta(\bar{t}_k - \tilde{t}_k) > -\varepsilon\delta\left(\delta + \sqrt{\frac{2\varepsilon\delta}{\kappa}}\right) \\ &> -\left(\frac{\varepsilon^3}{\kappa^2} + \sqrt{2}\frac{\varepsilon^3}{\kappa^2}\right) > -3\frac{\varepsilon^3}{\kappa^2} = -\frac{3\kappa}{1000}v^3, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where the third inequality is due to $0 < \delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa}$. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta_k(\tilde{t}_k) - \vartheta_k(0) &= \int_0^{\tilde{t}_k} \int_{\tilde{t}_k}^s \vartheta_k''(\tau) d\tau ds = \int_0^{\tilde{t}_k} \int_{\tilde{t}_k}^s [\vartheta_k''(\tau) - \vartheta_k''(\bar{t}_k - \delta)] d\tau ds \\ &\geq \int_0^{\tilde{t}_k} \int_{\tilde{t}_k}^s \kappa(\tau - \bar{t}_k + \delta) d\tau ds = \int_0^{\tilde{t}_k} \frac{\kappa}{2}s^2 - \frac{\kappa}{2}\tilde{t}_k^2 + \kappa(\bar{t}_k - \delta)(\tilde{t}_k - s) ds \\ &= \frac{\kappa}{6}\tilde{t}_k^3 - \frac{\kappa}{2}\tilde{t}_k^3 + \frac{\kappa\tilde{t}_k^2}{2}(\bar{t}_k - \delta) \geq \frac{\kappa}{6}\tilde{t}_k^3 \frac{\kappa}{6}\left(\bar{t}_k - \delta - \sqrt{\frac{2\varepsilon\delta}{\kappa}}\right)^3 \geq \frac{\kappa}{6}\left(v - \frac{3\varepsilon}{\kappa}\right)^3, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where the first equality is due to $\vartheta'_k(\bar{t}_k) = 0$, the second one is using $\vartheta''_k(\bar{t}_k - \delta) = 0$, the first inequality is using (19) and the last inequality is due to $0 < \delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa}$ and $\bar{t}_k \geq \nu$. Thus, from (23) and (24) and $\varepsilon := \frac{\kappa\nu}{10}$, we have $\vartheta_k(\bar{t}_k) - \vartheta_k(0) > \frac{465\kappa}{6000}\nu^3 > 0$, contradicting that \bar{t}_k is a global minimizer of $\vartheta_k = h_{\gamma_k, s_k}$. The conclusion then holds.

Case 2: $\bar{t}_k \in [-M, -\nu]$. By using (19) and the similar arguments to those for Case 1, one can verify that the conclusion holds. Here, we omit the details. \square

Proposition 3.1 *Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\bar{x}^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequences generated by Algorithm 2. Then, the following two statements hold:*

- (i) *There exists $\varpi > 0$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\bar{\omega}_k \geq \varpi$.*
- (ii) *There is $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_2 - k_1 > \bar{k}$, $[k_1, k_2] \cap \mathcal{K}_2 \neq \emptyset$, which implies that the set \mathcal{K}_2 contains an infinite number of indices.*

Proof: (i) By Step (S2) of Algorithm 2 and Remark 3.1, $\{\bar{\mu}_k\} \subseteq (0, \tilde{\tau}(\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L})]$ and $|\bar{x}_i^k| \geq \nu$ for each $i \in \bar{S}_k$. From (12), $F(\bar{x}^k) \leq F(x^k)$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and then

$$c_f + \lambda \|\bar{x}^k\|_q^q \leq f(A\bar{x}^k) + \lambda \|\bar{x}^k\|_q^q = F(\bar{x}^k) \leq F(x^k) \leq F(x^0),$$

which implies that $\|\bar{x}^k\|_q^q \leq \lambda^{-1}(F(x^0) - c_f)$ and for each $i \in \bar{S}_k$, $|\bar{x}_i^k| \leq \left(\frac{F(x^0) - c_f}{\lambda}\right)^{1/q}$. Let $y^k := x^k - \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_k} \nabla \psi(x^k)$. Then, for each $i \in \bar{S}_k$, $\bar{x}_i^k \in \arg \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}} h_{\bar{\mu}_k, y_i^k}(t)$ where $h_{\bar{\mu}_k, y_i^k}$ is defined by (18) with $(\gamma, s) = (\bar{\mu}_k, y_i^k)$. By using Lemma 3.2 with $v = \nu$ and $M = \left(\frac{F(x^0) - c_f}{\lambda}\right)^{1/q}$, we have $\bar{\omega}_k = \bar{\mu}_k + \lambda q(q-1) |\bar{x}^k|_{\min}^{q-2} \geq \varpi$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) Set $\delta = \min\left\{\frac{\nu}{2}, \frac{\varpi}{2\lambda q(1-q)(2-q)\nu^{q-3}}\right\}$, where ϖ is same as in part (i). We first claim that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, if $k-1 \in \mathcal{K}_1$ and $\|x^k - \bar{x}^k\| < \delta$, then the two conditions in (13) are both satisfied. Indeed, since $k-1 \in \mathcal{K}_1$, we have $x^k = \bar{x}^{k-1}$. By Remark 3.1 (b), $|x^k|_{\min} \geq \nu$. If there exists i such that $\text{sign}(x_i^k) \neq \text{sign}(\bar{x}_i^k)$, then $\|x^k - \bar{x}^k\| \geq |x_i^k - \bar{x}_i^k| \geq \nu$, contradicting to $\|x^k - \bar{x}^k\| < \delta \leq \nu/2$. Thus, $\text{sign}(x^k) = \text{sign}(\bar{x}^k)$. Since $\text{sign}(x^k) = \text{sign}(\bar{x}^k)$, we have $S_k = \bar{S}_k$. For the second condition, from $S_k = \bar{S}_k$ and part (i), it suffices to argue that $\frac{\varpi}{2} + \lambda q(q-1)(|x^k|_{\min}^{q-2} - |\bar{x}^k|_{\min}^{q-2}) \geq 0$ or equivalently $|x^k|_{\min}^{q-2} - |\bar{x}^k|_{\min}^{q-2} \leq \frac{\varpi}{2\lambda q(1-q)}$. Indeed, by the integral mean-value theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} |x^k|_{\min}^{q-2} - |\bar{x}^k|_{\min}^{q-2} &= \int_{|\bar{x}^k|_{\min}}^{|\bar{x}^k|_{\min}} (2-q)t^{q-3} dt \\ &\leq (2-q) \left(\min(|x^k|_{\min}, |\bar{x}^k|_{\min})\right)^{q-3} |x^k|_{\min} - |\bar{x}^k|_{\min}| \\ &\leq (2-q)\nu^{q-3} |x^k|_{\min} - |\bar{x}^k|_{\min} \leq (2-q)\nu^{q-3} \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to $|\bar{x}^k|_{\min} \geq \nu$ and $|x^k|_{\min} \geq \nu$, and the last one is using $S_k = \bar{S}_k$. Along with $\|x^k - \bar{x}^k\| < \delta$, the stated inequality holds.

Let $\bar{k} = \lceil \frac{2(F(x^0) - c_f)}{\tilde{\alpha}\delta^2} \rceil + 1$. Then, for any $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_2 - k_1 > \bar{k}$, $[k_1, k_2] \cap \mathcal{K}_2 \neq \emptyset$. If not, there exist $\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\hat{k}_2 - \hat{k}_1 > \bar{k}$ such that $[\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2] \cap \mathcal{K}_2 = \emptyset$. Clearly, $[\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2] \subseteq \mathcal{K}_1$. From the above discussions, for every $k-1 \in [\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2-1]$, $\|\bar{x}^k - x^k\| \geq \delta$ must

hold (if not, $[\widehat{k}_1+1, \widehat{k}_2]$ will contain an index of \mathcal{K}_2). Notice that for every $k \in [\widehat{k}_1, \widehat{k}_2] \subset \mathcal{K}_1$, we also have $x^{k+1} = \bar{x}^k$. From Algorithm 1, it follows that for every $k \in [\widehat{k}_1, \widehat{k}_2]$, $F(x^{k+1}) \leq F(x^k) - \frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{2} \|\bar{x}^k - x^k\|^2$, and consequently,

$$\frac{2(F(x^{\widehat{k}_1+1}) - c_f)}{\tilde{\alpha}} \geq \frac{2(F(x^{\widehat{k}_1+1}) - F(x^{\widehat{k}_2+1}))}{\tilde{\alpha}} \geq \sum_{i=\widehat{k}_1+1}^{\widehat{k}_2} \|\bar{x}^i - x^i\|^2 \geq (\widehat{k}_2 - \widehat{k}_1)\delta^2,$$

where the last inequality is due to $\|\bar{x}^k - x^k\| \geq \delta$ for every $k \in [\widehat{k}_1+1, \widehat{k}_2]$. Together with $F(x^{\widehat{k}_1+1}) \leq F(x^0)$, we obtain $\widehat{k}_2 - \widehat{k}_1 \leq \frac{2(F(x^0) - c_f)}{\tilde{\alpha}\delta^2} \leq \bar{k}$, a contradiction to the given condition $\widehat{k}_2 - \widehat{k}_1 > \bar{k}$. The proof is then completed. \square

We have shown that Algorithm 2 is well-defined and different from a PG method. In fact, we will see later that after a certain $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}$, its iterates are always from Step 2.

4 Convergence analysis

For convenience, in the sequel, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, write

$$r^k := \nabla F_{S_k}(u^k) \quad \text{and} \quad H^k := \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(u^k).$$

Before analyzing the convergence of the iterate sequence $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ generated by Algorithm 2, we first show that the sequence $\{d^k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}_2}$ is bounded.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2. Then, there exists a constant $r_{\max} > 0$ such that for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$, $\|r^k\| \leq r_{\max}$ and $\|d^k\| \leq b_2^{-1} r_{\max}^{1-\sigma}$.*

Proof: Fix any $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$. By Step (S3) and Remark 3.2 (b), $\text{sign}(x^k) = \text{sign}(\bar{x}^k)$ and $|x_i^k| \geq \nu$ for all $i \in S_k$. Also, the former implies that $\bar{S}_k = S_k$. By invoking Lemma 2.3 (ii) with $\kappa = \nu/2$ and $C = \{z \in \mathcal{L}_F(x^0) \mid |z_i| \geq \nu/2 \text{ for all } i \in S_k\}$ and noting that $x^k \in C$ by Lemma 3.1 and $|x_i^k| \geq \nu$ for all $i \in S_k$, there exists $r_{\max} > 0$ (independent of k) such that $\|r^k\| \leq r_{\max}$. Along with $\lambda_{\min}(G^k) \geq b_2 \|r^k\|^\sigma$, we have

$$\|d^k\| = \|d_{S_k}^k\| \leq \|(G^k)^{-1}\| \|r^k\| \leq b_2^{-1} \|r^k\|^{1-\sigma} \leq b_2^{-1} r_{\max}^{1-\sigma}. \quad (25)$$

By the arbitrariness of $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$, we obtain the desired result. \square

Next we prove that the step-size α_k from the Armijo line search is lower bounded under Assumption 4.1, which requires the Lipschitz continuity of $\nabla^2 f$ on a certain set.

Assumption 4.1 $\nabla^2 f$ is Lipschitz continuous on the set $A(\mathcal{L}_F(x^0) + \frac{1}{2}\nu\mathbb{B})$.

Lemma 4.2 *Under Assumption 4.1 there is $\underline{\alpha} > 0$ such that for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$, $\alpha_k \geq \underline{\alpha}$.*

Proof: Take $C = \mathcal{L}_F(x^0) + \frac{1}{2}\nu\mathbb{B}$. There exists a constant $L_{\nabla^2 f} > 0$ such that

$$\|\nabla^2 f(Ay) - \nabla^2 f(Az)\| \leq L_{\nabla^2 f} \|A(y - z)\| \quad \forall y, z \in C. \quad (26)$$

Fix any integer $m \geq 0$ with $\beta^m \leq \min(1, \frac{1}{2}\nu b_2 r_{\max}^{\sigma-1})$. Fix any $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$. By Lemma 4.1 and $d_{S_k^c}^k = 0$ and $|x_i^k| \geq \nu$ for all $i \in S_k$, for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$ we have $\text{sign}(x^k + \tau\beta^m d^k) = \text{sign}(x^k)$ and $|x^k + \tau\beta^m d^k|_{\min} \geq \frac{\nu}{2}$. Then, F_{S_k} is twice continuously differentiable on an open set containing the line segment between u^k and $u^k + \beta^m d_{S_k}^k$. By the Taylor expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} & F_{S_k}(u^k + \beta^m d_{S_k}^k) - F_{S_k}(u^k) - \langle r^k, \beta^m d_{S_k}^k \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \beta^{2m} \langle \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(u^k + \tau_k \beta^m d_{S_k}^k) d_{S_k}^k, d_{S_k}^k \rangle \quad \text{for some } \tau_k \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Observe that $x^k + \tau\beta^m d^k \in C$ for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$ by Lemma 4.1. By invoking Lemma 2.3 (ii) with $\kappa = \nu$, there exists a constant $\widehat{c}_3 > 0$ (independent of k) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2 g_{S_k}(u^k) - \nabla^2 g_{S_k}(u^k + \tau_k \beta^m d_{S_k}^k)\| &\leq \int_0^{\tau_k} \|D^3 g_{S_k}(u^k + t\beta^m d_{S_k}^k)\| \beta^m d_{S_k}^k \|dt \\ &\leq \tau_k \widehat{c}_3 \beta^m \|d_{S_k}^k\|. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, since $x^k, x^k + \tau_k \beta^m d^k \in C$, using the inequality (26) with $y = x^k$ and $z = x^k + \tau_k \beta^m d^k$ and noting that $\text{supp}(x^k) = \text{supp}(x^k + \tau_k \beta^m d^k) = S_k$, we have

$$\|A_{S_k}^{\top} \nabla^2 f(A_{S_k} u^k) A_{S_k} - A_{S_k}^{\top} \nabla^2 f(A_{S_k}(u^k + \tau_k \beta^m d_{S_k}^k)) A_{S_k}\| \leq \tau_k L_{\nabla^2 f} \|A_{S_k}\|^2 \beta^m \|d_{S_k}^k\|.$$

By combining the last two inequalities with the expression of $\nabla^2 F_{S_k}$, we obtain that

$$\|H^k - \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(u^k + \tau_k \beta^m d_{S_k}^k)\| \leq (L_{\nabla^2 f} \|A\|^2 + \lambda \widehat{c}_3) \beta^m \|d_{S_k}^k\|. \quad (28)$$

Now by combining (27) and (28) with Step 2 of Algorithm 2, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & F_{S_k}(u^k) - F_{S_k}(u^k + \beta^m d_{S_k}^k) + \varrho \beta^m \langle r^k, d_{S_k}^k \rangle \\ &= (1 - \varrho) \beta^m \left\langle (H^k + b_1 \zeta_k I + b_2 \|r^k\|^\sigma I) d_{S_k}^k, d_{S_k}^k \right\rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \beta^{2m} \langle d_{S_k}^k, \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(u^k + \tau_k \beta^m d_{S_k}^k) d_{S_k}^k \rangle \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} b_2 \beta^m \|r^k\|^\sigma \|d_{S_k}^k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \beta^{2m} \left\langle (H^k - \nabla^2 F_{S_k}(u^k + \tau_k \beta^m d_{S_k}^k)) d_{S_k}^k, d_{S_k}^k \right\rangle \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} b_2 \beta^m \|r^k\|^\sigma \|d_{S_k}^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} (L_{\nabla^2 f} \|A\|^2 + \lambda \widehat{c}_3) \beta^{3m} \|d_{S_k}^k\|^3 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \beta^m \|d_{S_k}^k\|^3 \left(b_2 \frac{\|r^k\|^\sigma}{\|d_{S_k}^k\|} - \widetilde{c}_3 \beta^{2m} \right) \quad \text{with } \widetilde{c}_3 := L_{\nabla^2 f} \|A\|^2 + \lambda \widehat{c}_3, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where the first equality is using $r^k = -G^k d_{S_k}^k$ by (S4), and the first inequality is due to $H^k + b_1 \zeta_k I \succeq 0$, $\varrho \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $\zeta_k \geq 0$. By the definition of $d_{S_k}^k$ and Lemma 4.1,

$$\frac{\|d_{S_k}^k\|}{\|r^k\|^\sigma} \leq \frac{\|(G^k)^{-1}\| \|r^k\|}{\|r^k\|^\sigma} \leq \frac{\|r^k\|^{1-2\sigma}}{b_2} \leq \frac{r_{\max}^{1-2\sigma}}{b_2}. \quad (30)$$

The above arguments demonstrate that whenever $\beta^m \leq \min\left(1, \frac{1}{2}\nu b_2 r_{\max}^{\sigma-1}, \frac{b_2}{\sqrt{c_3 r_{\max}^{1-2\sigma}}}\right)$,

$$F_{S_k}(u^k) - F_{S_k}(u^k + \beta^m d_{S_k}^k) + \varrho \beta^m \langle r^k, d_{S_k}^k \rangle \geq 0.$$

Let $\underline{\alpha} := \beta \min\left(1, \frac{1}{2}\nu b_2 r_{\max}^{\sigma-1}, \frac{b_2}{\sqrt{c_3 r_{\max}^{1-2\sigma}}}\right)$. Then, for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$, $\alpha_k \geq \underline{\alpha}$. \square

We next argue that the residual $\|r^k\|$ in (S4) is lower bounded by $\|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|$.

Lemma 4.3 *Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\bar{x}^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be generated by Algorithm 2. Then, for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$, $\|r^k\| \geq \frac{1}{4}\varpi \|u^k - \bar{u}^k\|$, where ϖ is the same as the one in Proposition 3.1.*

Proof: Fix any $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$. From the iterates of Algorithm 2, $\text{sign}(x^k) = \text{sign}(\bar{x}^k)$. Write $B_k := A_{S_k}$ and $v^k := u^k - \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_k} B_k^\top \nabla f(B_k u^k)$. Let $h_k(u) := \sum_{i=1}^{|S_k|} h_{\bar{\mu}_k, v_i^k}(u_i)$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_k|}$, where $h_{\bar{\mu}_k, v_i^k}$ is the function defined in (18) with $(\gamma, s) = (\bar{\mu}_k, v_i^k)$. Since $S_k = \bar{S}_k$ for each $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$, $\bar{u}^k \in \arg \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_k|}} h_k(u)$. From its optimality condition,

$$\nabla h_k(\bar{u}^k) = \bar{\mu}_k (\bar{u}^k - v^k) + \lambda q \text{sign}(\bar{u}^k) \circ |\bar{u}^k|^{q-1} = 0. \quad (31)$$

By combining Proposition 3.1 (i) and the step (S3) of Algorithm 2, it follows that

$$\varpi/2 \leq \bar{\mu}_k + \lambda q(q-1) |x^k|_{\min}^{q-2} = \bar{\mu}_k + \lambda q(q-1) |u^k|_{\min}^{q-2} = h''_{\bar{\mu}_k, v_i^k}(|u^k|_{\min}). \quad (32)$$

Define the index sets $\mathcal{I}_1^k := \{i \in [|S_k|] \mid u_i^k > 0\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_2^k := [|S_k|] \setminus \mathcal{I}_1^k$. For each $i \in [|S_k|]$, let $\tilde{u}_i^k := \text{sign}(u_i^k) \min\{|u_i^k|, |\bar{u}_i^k|\}$. Note that each $h_{\bar{\mu}_k, v_i^k}$ is twice continuously differentiable at any $t \neq 0$ and $h''_{\bar{\mu}_k, v_i^k}$ is nonincreasing at $(-\infty, 0)$ and nondecreasing at $(0, +\infty)$. From (32), it follows that $h''_{\bar{\mu}_k, v_i^k}(\tilde{u}_i^k) \geq \varpi/2$ for all $i \in [|S_k|]$. Consequently, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that when $t \in (\tilde{u}_i^k - \epsilon, \infty)$, $h''_{\bar{\mu}_k, v_i^k}(t) > \frac{\varpi}{4}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}_1^k$; and when $t \in (-\infty, \tilde{u}_i^k + \epsilon)$, $h''_{\bar{\mu}_k, v_i^k}(t) > \frac{\varpi}{4}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}_2^k$. Define

$$\Omega_k := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_k|} \mid u_i > \tilde{u}_i^k - \epsilon \text{ for } i \in \mathcal{I}_1^k \text{ and } u_i < -\tilde{u}_i^k + \epsilon \text{ for } i \in \mathcal{I}_2^k\}.$$

Then, h_k is twice continuously differentiable on the convex set Ω_k with $\nabla^2 h_k(u) \succ \frac{\varpi}{4} I$ for all $u \in \Omega_k$, which implies that $\tilde{h}_k(u) := h_k(u) - \frac{\varpi}{8} \|u - v^k\|^2$ is strongly convex on the set Ω_k . From (31) and the expression of \tilde{h}_k , clearly, $\nabla \tilde{h}_k(\bar{u}^k) = \frac{\varpi}{4} (v^k - \bar{u}^k)$. Let $\hat{u}^k := u^k + \frac{4}{\varpi} \nabla \tilde{h}_k(u^k)$. By the convexity of \tilde{h}_k on Ω_k and $u^k, \bar{u}^k \in \Omega_k$, we have

$$0 \leq \langle \nabla \tilde{h}_k(\bar{u}^k) - \nabla \tilde{h}_k(u^k), \bar{u}^k - u^k \rangle = \frac{\varpi}{4} \langle (v^k - \bar{u}^k) - (\hat{u}^k - u^k), \bar{u}^k - u^k \rangle,$$

which implies that $\|u^k - \bar{u}^k\| \leq \|v^k - \hat{u}^k\| = \|u^k - \bar{\mu}_k^{-1} B_k^\top \nabla f(B_k u^k) - \hat{u}^k\|$. Together with $\frac{\varpi}{4} (\hat{u}^k - u^k) = \nabla \tilde{h}_k(u^k) = (\bar{\mu}_k - \frac{\varpi}{4})(u^k - v^k) + \lambda q \text{sign}(u^k) \circ |u^k|^{q-1}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|r^k\| &= \left\| B_k^\top \nabla f(B_k u^k) + \lambda q \text{sign}(u^k) \circ |u^k|^{q-1} \right\| \\ &= \left\| B_k^\top \nabla f(B_k u^k) - (\bar{\mu}_k - \frac{\varpi}{4})(u^k - v^k) + \frac{\varpi}{4}(u^k - \hat{u}^k) \right\| \\ &= \frac{\varpi}{4} \left\| \bar{\mu}_k^{-1} B_k^\top \nabla f(B_k u^k) - u^k + \hat{u}^k \right\| \geq \frac{\varpi}{4} \|u^k - \bar{u}^k\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality is by the definition of v^k . The proof is completed. \square

4.1 Convergence analysis of objective sequence

Now we are ready to establish the convergence of the objective value sequence $\{F(x^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Proposition 4.1 *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\bar{x}^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequences generated by Algorithm 2. Then, the following assertions hold.*

- (i) *There exists $\hat{\gamma} > 0$ such that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $F(x^{k+1}) \leq F(x^k) - \frac{\hat{\gamma}}{2} \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2$.*
- (ii) *$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\| = 0$.*
- (iii) *The function F keeps a constant on the nonempty compact set $\Omega(x^0)$.*
- (iv) *Every element of $\Omega(x^0)$ is an L -type stationary point of the problem (1).*

Proof: (i)-(ii) Fix any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We first consider the case $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$. By Lemma 3.1, $x^k \in \mathcal{L}_F(x^0)$, a compact set. Since $|x^k|_{\min} \geq \nu$ by Remark 3.2 (b), from Lemma 2.3 (ii) with $C = \mathcal{L}_F(x^0)$ and $\kappa = \nu$, there exists $\hat{c}_2 > 0$ (independent of k) such that $\|H^k\| = \|\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(u^k)\| \leq \hat{c}_2$. Along with the expression of G^k in (S4) and Lemma 4.1,

$$G^k \preceq [(1+b_1)\|H^k\| + b_2\|r^k\|^\sigma]I \preceq [(1+b_1)\hat{c}_2 + b_2r_{\max}^\sigma]I. \quad (33)$$

From the line search step in (S5), Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3, it then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^k) &\leq \alpha_k \varrho \langle r^k, d_{S_k}^k \rangle = -\alpha_k \varrho \langle r^k, (G^k)^{-1} r^k \rangle \\ &\leq -\frac{\varrho \alpha}{(1+b_1)\hat{c}_2 + b_2r_{\max}^\sigma} \|r^k\|^2 \leq -\frac{\varrho \alpha \varpi^2}{16[(1+b_1)\hat{c}_2 + b_2r_{\max}^\sigma]} \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is using $\text{sign}(x^k) = \text{sign}(\bar{x}^k)$ implied by $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$. When $k \in \mathcal{K}_1$, from (12) we have $F(x^{k+1}) \leq F(x^k) - \frac{\hat{\gamma}}{2} \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2$. Combining these two inequalities, the result in part (i) holds with $\hat{\gamma} = \min \left\{ \frac{\varrho \alpha \varpi^2}{8[(1+b_1)\hat{c}_2 + b_2r_{\max}^\sigma]}, \tilde{\alpha} \right\}$. By part (i) and the lower boundedness of F , we obtain the conclusion of part (ii).

(iii) Let F^* be the limit of the sequence $\{F(x^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Pick any $x^* \in \Omega(x^0)$. Then there exists a subsequence $\{x^{k_j}\}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x^{k_j} = x^*$. By the continuity of F , $F(x^*) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} F(x^{k_j}) = F^*$. This means that F is a constant on $\Omega(x^0)$.

(iv) Pick any $x^* \in \Omega(x^0)$. Then, there exists a subsequence $\{x^{k_j}\}$ such that $x^{k_j} \rightarrow x^*$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Together with part (ii), we have $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x}^{k_j} = x^*$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, by Step (S2) of Algorithm 2, $\bar{x}^{k_j} \in \text{prox}_{\bar{\mu}_{k_j}^{-1}(\lambda g)}(x^{k_j} - \bar{\mu}_{k_j}^{-1} \nabla \psi(x^{k_j}))$; while by Remark 3.1,

$\bar{\mu}_{k_j} \in [\mu_{\min}, \tilde{\tau}(\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L})]$. If necessary taking a subsequence, we assume that $\bar{\mu}_{k_j} \rightarrow \bar{\mu}_*$. Define $\mathcal{F}(\mu, x) := \text{prox}_{\mu^{-1}(\lambda g)}(x - \mu^{-1} \nabla \psi(x))$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mu \in [\mu_{\min}, \tilde{\tau}(\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L})]$. From [8, Proposition 4.4], the mapping \mathcal{F} is upper semicontinuous at $(\bar{\mu}_*, x^*)$ and then is outer semicontinuous at $(\bar{\mu}_*, x^*)$. Thus, we have $x^* \in \text{prox}_{\bar{\mu}_*^{-1}(\lambda g)}(x^* - \bar{\mu}_*^{-1} \nabla \psi(x^*))$, and the desired result holds. The proof is completed. \square

The following lemma is used to achieve the convergence rate of $\{F(x^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 4.4 *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\bar{x}^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be generated by Algorithm 2. Then, there exists a constant $\hat{c}_2 > 0$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\|r^k\| = \text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^k)) \leq \tilde{c}_2 \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\| \quad \text{with } \tilde{c}_2 = [(1 + \tilde{\tau})\tilde{L} + \tilde{\tau}\tilde{\alpha} + \hat{c}_2],$$

and consequently, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|r^k\| = 0$ and $\lim_{\mathcal{K}_2 \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \|d^k\| = 0$.

Proof: Fix any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\bar{x}^k \in \text{prox}_{\bar{\mu}_k^{-1}(\lambda g)}(x^k - \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_k} A^\top \nabla f(Ax^k))$, it holds that

$$0 \in A^\top \nabla f(Ax^k) + \bar{\mu}_k(\bar{x}^k - x^k) + \lambda \partial g(\bar{x}^k).$$

Notice that $\partial F(\bar{x}^k) = A^\top \nabla f(A\bar{x}^k) + \lambda \partial g(\bar{x}^k)$ by [30, Exercise 8.8]. Then, we have

$$A^\top \nabla f(A\bar{x}^k) - A^\top \nabla f(Ax^k) + \bar{\mu}_k(x^k - \bar{x}^k) \in \partial F(\bar{x}^k).$$

Along with the Lipschitz continuity of ∇f , Lemma 2.3 (iii) and $\bar{\mu}_k \leq \tilde{\tau}(\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{L})$, we get

$$\|\nabla F_{S_k}(\bar{u}^k)\| = \text{dist}(0, \partial F(\bar{x}^k)) \leq [(1 + \tilde{\tau})\tilde{L} + \tilde{\tau}\tilde{\alpha}] \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|. \quad (34)$$

When $k \in \mathcal{K}_1$, since $x^{k+1} = \bar{x}^k$, we have $\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^{k+1})) \leq ((1 + \tilde{\tau})\tilde{L} + \tilde{\tau}\tilde{\alpha}) \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|$, so it suffices to consider the case $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$. Recall that $\text{sign}(u^k) = \text{sign}(\bar{u}^k)$. Let C be a bounded open convex set containing $\mathcal{L}_F(x^0)$. Recall that $\{x^j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{L}_F(x^0)$. Since $F(\bar{x}^j) \leq F(x^j)$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we also have $\{\bar{x}^j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{L}_F(x^0)$. From the convexity of C , clearly, $\bar{u}^k + \tau(u^k - \bar{u}^k) \in C$ for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$. Since $|\bar{u}_i^k| \geq \nu$ and $|u_i^k| \geq \nu$ for all $i \in S_k$ and $\text{sign}(u^k) = \text{sign}(\bar{u}^k)$, for any $\tau \in [0, 1]$ we have $|\bar{u}^k + \tau(u^k - \bar{u}^k)|_{\min} \geq \nu$ and $\text{sign}(\bar{u}^k + \tau(u^k - \bar{u}^k)) = \text{sign}(u^k)$. By Lemma 2.3 (ii), there exists a constant $\hat{c}_2 > 0$ (independent of k) such that for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$, $\|\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(\bar{u}^k + \tau(u^k - \bar{u}^k))\| \leq \hat{c}_2$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|r^k\| &= \|r^k - \nabla F_{S_k}(\bar{u}^k) + \nabla F_{S_k}(\bar{u}^k)\| \leq \|r^k - \nabla F_{S_k}(\bar{u}^k)\| + \|\nabla F_{S_k}(\bar{u}^k)\| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \|\nabla^2 F_{S_k}(\bar{u}^k + \tau(u^k - \bar{u}^k))(u^k - \bar{u}^k)\| d\tau + \|\nabla F_{S_k}(\bar{u}^k)\| \\ &\leq \hat{c}_2 \|u^k - \bar{u}^k\| + \|\nabla F_{S_k}(\bar{u}^k)\| \leq [(1 + \tilde{\tau})\tilde{L} + \tilde{\tau}\tilde{\alpha} + \hat{c}_2] \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (34). The first part of the conclusions follows. Together with (25) and Proposition 4.1 (ii), we obtain the second part. \square

Recall that in Lemma 3.1 we have shown that $\{F(x^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a convergent sequence. Now we are in a position to achieve the Q -linear convergence rate of the objective sequence $\{F(x^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ under the KL property of the exponent 1/2 of F .

Proposition 4.2 *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds and that F is a KL function of exponent 1/2. Then $\{F(x^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some value F^* in a Q -linear rate.*

Proof: If there exists $\bar{k}_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $F(x^{\bar{k}_1}) = F(x^{\bar{k}_1+1})$, by Proposition 4.1 (i) we deduce that $x^k = \bar{x}^k$ for all $k \geq \bar{k}_1$, which means that the criterion (13) is always satisfied for all $k \geq \bar{k}_1$ and then $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$ for all $k \geq \bar{k}_1$. From (S4) and (14), for $k = \bar{k}_1$,

$0 \leq \langle \nabla F_{S_k}(u^k), d_{S_k}^k \rangle = -\langle G^k d_{S_k}^k, d_{S_k}^k \rangle$, which implies that $\|d^{\bar{k}_1}\| = 0$ and $x^{\bar{k}_1} = x^{\bar{k}_1+1}$. Using the induction yields that $x^k = x^{\bar{k}_1}$ for all $k \geq \bar{k}_1$. That is, $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges within a finite number of steps. Then it suffices to consider that $F(x^k) > F(x^{k+1})$ for all $k \geq \bar{k}_1$. Since F is assumed to be a KL function of exponent $1/2$, by [7, Lemma 6] there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ such that for all $\bar{x} \in \Omega(x^0)$ and all $z \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{dist}(x, \Omega(x^0)) < \varepsilon\} \cap [F(\bar{x}) < F < F(\bar{x}) + \eta]$,

$$\varphi'(F(z) - F(\bar{x}))\text{dist}(0, \partial F(z)) \geq 1$$

where the concave function φ is given by $\varphi(t) = c\sqrt{t}$ for some $c > 0$. Let x^* be an arbitrary cluster point of $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Clearly, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(x^k, \Omega(x^0)) = 0$. Together with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(x^k) = F(x^*)$, there exists $\mathbb{N} \ni \bar{k}_2 \geq \bar{k}_1$ such that for all $k \geq \bar{k}_2$, $x^k \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{dist}(x, \Omega(x^0)) < \varepsilon\} \cap [F(x^*) < F < F(x^*) + \eta]$, and consequently,

$$\frac{c}{2}(F(x^k) - F(x^*))^{-1/2}\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^k)) \geq 1.$$

Let $\Delta_k = F(x^k) - F(x^*)$ for each k . Combining this inequality with Lemma 4.4 yields

$$\begin{aligned} 4c^{-2} &\leq [(\Delta_k)^{-1/2}\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^k))]^2 \leq \tilde{c}_2^2(\Delta_k)^{-1}\|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\tilde{c}_2^2\hat{\gamma}^{-1}(\Delta_k)^{-1}[F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})] = 2\tilde{c}_2^2\hat{\gamma}^{-1}(\Delta_k)^{-1}(\Delta_k - \Delta_{k+1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality is due to Proposition 4.1 (i). Then, for all $k \geq \bar{k}_2$, we have $\Delta_{k+1} \leq \rho\Delta_k$ with $\rho = 1 - \frac{2\hat{\gamma}}{(c\tilde{c}_2)^2}$. This, along with $\Delta_k > 0$ for all $k \geq \bar{k}_2$, implies that the sequence $\{F(x^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some value F^* in a Q -linear rate. \square

4.2 Convergence analysis of iterate sequence

In order to achieve the convergence of the iterate sequence $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, we first show that the support of the iterates will become stable for sufficiently large k and there exists $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k \geq \bar{k}$, $x^k \in \mathcal{K}_2$, i.e., after a finite number of iterates, Algorithm 2 reduces to a regularized Newton method for minimizing the function F_{S_k} .

Lemma 4.5 *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds. Let $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\bar{x}^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequences generated by Algorithm 2. Then, the following assertions hold.*

(i) *there exist $\tilde{k} \in \mathbb{N}$ and an index set $S_* \subseteq [n]$ such that for all $k \geq \tilde{k}$,*

$$\text{supp}(x^k) = \text{supp}(\bar{x}^k) = S_*;$$

(ii) *there exists $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k \geq \bar{k}$, $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$;*

(iii) *for every cluster point x^* of $\{x^k\}$, $\text{supp}(x^*) = S_*$ where S_* is same as in (i).*

Proof: (i) First we argue that there exists $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k \geq k_1$, $|x^k|_{\min} > \frac{\nu}{2}$. Indeed, if $k-1 \in \mathcal{K}_1$, i.e., $x^k = \bar{x}^{k-1}$, by Remark 3.1 (b) we have $|x^k|_{\min} \geq \nu$. If $k-1 \in \mathcal{K}_2$, by Remark 3.2 (b) we have $|x^{k-1}|_{\min} \geq \nu$. By Lemma 4.4, there exists $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k > k_1$, $\|d^{k-1}\| < \frac{\nu}{3}$. Along with $x^k = x^{k-1} + \alpha_k d^k$, $\alpha_k \in (0, 1]$, $d_{S_k^c}^k = 0$ and $|x^{k-1}|_{\min} \geq \nu$, we have $|x^k|_{\min} > \frac{\nu}{2}$.

Next we argue that for all sufficiently large k , $\text{supp}(x^k) = \text{supp}(\bar{x}^k)$. Indeed, by Proposition 4.1 (ii), there exists $k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k \geq k_2$, $\|x^k - \bar{x}^k\| < \frac{\nu}{3}$. Fix any $k \geq \max\{k_1, k_2\}$. Then, for every $i \in \text{supp}(x^k)$, we have $|\bar{x}_i^k| \geq |x_i^k| - |x_i^k - \bar{x}_i^k| > \frac{\nu}{2} - \frac{\nu}{3} > 0$, which implies that $\text{supp}(x^k) \subseteq \text{supp}(\bar{x}^k)$; while for every $i \in \text{supp}(\bar{x}^k)$, we have $|x_i^k| > |\bar{x}_i^k| - \frac{\nu}{3} > 0$, which implies that $\text{supp}(\bar{x}^k) \subseteq \text{supp}(x^k)$. The two sides show that for all $k \geq \max\{k_1, k_2\}$, $\text{supp}(\bar{x}^k) = \text{supp}(x^k)$.

It remains to show that for all sufficient large k , $\text{supp}(x^k) = \text{supp}(x^{k+1})$. Pick any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $k \in \mathcal{K}_1$, the conclusion holds by the first part. If $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$, by Lemma 4.4 there exists $k_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k \geq k_3$, $\|d^k\| < \frac{\nu}{3}$ and then $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| < \frac{\nu}{3}$. From the arguments for the first part, we have $\text{supp}(x^k) = \text{supp}(x^{k+1})$ for all $k \geq k_3$.

To sum up, for all $k \geq \tilde{k} := \max\{k_1, k_2, k_3\}$, $\text{supp}(x^{k+1}) = \text{supp}(x^k) = \text{supp}(\bar{x}^k)$.

(ii) Using part (i) and Proposition 4.1 (ii) and Lemma 4.4 and following the same arguments as those for Proposition 3.1 (ii), we obtain the desired result.

(iii) This result is immediate due to part (i) and $|x^k|_{\min} \geq \nu$. \square

To achieve the convergence of $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, we also need the following assumption:

Assumption 4.2 $\liminf_{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_2 \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\langle r^k, d_{S_k}^k \rangle}{\|r^k\| \|d_{S_k}^k\|} > 0$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_2 := \{k \in \mathcal{K}_2 \mid F(x^k) > F(x^{k+1})\}$.

This assumption essentially requires the angle between $\frac{r^k}{\|r^k\|}$ and $\frac{d_{S_k}^k}{\|d_{S_k}^k\|}$ is sufficiently greater than $\pi/2$. As will be shown in Lemma 4.6 and Example 4.1, it is strictly weaker than the condition (16) used for the global convergence of ZeroFPR [34] and BELLA [1]. Now we are ready to establish the convergence of the iterate sequence.

Theorem 4.1 *Suppose Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 hold. The following assertions hold.*

(i) *If F is a KL function, then*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| < \infty,$$

and consequently $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to an L -type stationary point of (1), say x^ .*

(ii) *If F is a KL function of exponent $1/2$, $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to x^* R -linearly.*

Proof: (i) By the proof of Proposition 4.2, we suffices to consider the case where $F(x^k) > F(x^{k+1})$ for all k . By [7, Lemma 6], there exist $\varepsilon > 0, \eta > 0$ and a continuous concave $\varphi : [0, \eta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying (7) such that for all $\bar{x} \in \Omega(x^0)$ and all $x \in \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{dist}(z, \Omega(x^0)) < \varepsilon\} \cap [F(\bar{x}) < F < F(\bar{x}) + \eta]$,

$$\varphi'(F(x) - F(\bar{x})) \text{dist}(0, \partial F(x)) \geq 1.$$

Let x^* be an arbitrary cluster point of $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Clearly, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(x^k, \Omega(x^0)) = 0$. Together with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(x^k) = F(x^*)$, there exists \bar{k}_1 such that for all $k \geq \bar{k}_1$, $x^k \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{dist}(x, \Omega(x^0)) < \varepsilon\} \cap [F(x^*) < F < F(x^*) + \eta]$, and consequently,

$$\varphi'(F(x^k) - F(x^*)) \text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^k)) \geq 1. \quad (35)$$

By Assumption 4.2, there exist $\mathbb{N} \ni \bar{k}_2 \geq \bar{k}$ and $c_{\min} > 0$ such that for all $k \geq \bar{k}_2$,

$$-\langle r^k, d_{S_k}^k \rangle > c_{\min} \|r^k\| \|d_{S_k}^k\|, \quad (36)$$

where \bar{k} is the one in Lemma 4.5 (ii). Then, by Lemma 4.5 (i), for all $k \geq \hat{k} := \max\{\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2, \tilde{k}\}$, we have $S_k = S_{k+1}$ and then $\|u^{k+1} - u^k\| = \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|$. Together with (36), for all $k \geq \hat{k}$ we have

$$\frac{F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})}{\|r^k\|} \geq \frac{-\varrho \alpha_k \langle r^k, d_{S_k}^k \rangle}{\|r^k\|} \geq \varrho c_{\min} \|\alpha_k d_{S_k}^k\| = \varrho c_{\min} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|. \quad (37)$$

For each k , let $\Delta_k = \varphi(F(x^k) - F(x^*))$. By the concavity of φ on $[0, \eta]$, for all $k \geq \hat{k}$,

$$\varphi(F(x^k) - F(x^*)) - \varphi(F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^*)) \geq \varphi'(F(x^k) - F(x^*)) (F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})). \quad (38)$$

Together with the above (35) and (37), it immediately follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_k - \Delta_{k+1} &\geq \varphi'(F(x^k) - F(x^*)) (F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})) \\ &\geq \frac{F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})}{\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^k))} = \frac{F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})}{\|r^k\|} \geq \varrho c_{\min} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|. \end{aligned}$$

Now for any $k > \hat{k}$ summing this inequality from \hat{k} to k yields that

$$\sum_{j=\hat{k}}^k \|x^{j+1} - x^j\| \leq \frac{1}{\varrho c_{\min}} \sum_{j=\hat{k}}^k (\Delta_j - \Delta_{j+1}) = \frac{1}{\varrho c_{\min}} (\Delta_{\hat{k}} - \Delta_{k+1}) \leq \frac{1}{\varrho c_{\min}} \Delta_{\hat{k}}.$$

Passing the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ to this inequality yields that $\sum_{j=\hat{k}}^{\infty} \|x^{j+1} - x^j\| < \infty$. Thus the sequence $\{x^k\}$ converges. By Proposition 4.1 (iv), the desired result then follows.

(ii) For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, write $\Delta_k = F(x^k) - F(x^*)$. Let \hat{k} be same as above. From the proof of Proposition 4.2, there exists $\bar{k}_1 \geq \hat{k}$ such that for all $k \geq \bar{k}_1$,

$$F(x^k) - F(x^*) \leq \Delta_{\bar{k}_1} \rho^{k-\bar{k}_1}. \quad (39)$$

By (25) and Lemma 4.4, we have for all $k \geq \bar{k}_1$,

$$\|d^k\| \leq b_2^{-1} \tilde{c}_2^{1-\sigma} \|x^k - \bar{x}^k\|^{1-\sigma}.$$

Together with part (i), Proposition 4.1 (i) and (39), for all $k \geq \bar{k}_1$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x^k - x^*\| &\leq \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \|x^j - x^{j+1}\| \leq \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \|d^j\| \leq b_2^{-1} \tilde{c}_2^{1-\sigma} \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \|x^j - \bar{x}^j\|^{1-\sigma} \\
&\leq b_2^{-1} \tilde{c}_2^{1-\sigma} \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2(F(x^j) - F(x^{j+1}))}{\hat{\gamma}} \right)^{\frac{1-\sigma}{2}} \\
&\leq b_2^{-1} \tilde{c}_2^{1-\sigma} \left(\frac{2\Delta_{\bar{k}_1}}{\hat{\gamma}\rho^{\bar{k}_1}} \right)^{\frac{1-\sigma}{2}} \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \rho^{\frac{(1-\sigma)j}{2}} \leq \left(\frac{2\Delta_{\bar{k}_1}}{\hat{\gamma}\rho^{\bar{k}_1}} \right)^{\frac{1-\sigma}{2}} \frac{\tilde{c}_2^{1-\sigma}}{b_2(1-\rho^{1/4})} \rho^{k/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

This means that the sequence $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to x^* in an R -linear rate. \square

Now we establish the superlinear convergence rate of $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ under the local error bound condition.

Theorem 4.2 *Suppose that Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 hold, and that F is a KL function. Let x^* be the limit point of $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $S_* = \text{supp}(x^*)$. If $\nabla^2 F_{S_*}(u^*) \succeq 0$ with $u^* = x_{S_*}^*$ and there exist $\delta > 0$ and $\kappa_1 > 0$ such that for all $u \in \mathbb{B}(u^*, \delta)$,*

$$\kappa_1 \text{dist}(u, \mathcal{U}^*) \leq \|\nabla F_{S_*}(u)\|, \quad (40)$$

where $\mathcal{U}^* := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_*|} \mid \nabla F_{S_*}(u) = 0, \nabla^2 F_{S_*}(u) \succeq 0\}$, then the sequence $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to x^* in a Q -superlinear rate of order $1+\sigma$.

Proof: Since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x^k = x^*$, by Lemma 4.5 there exists $\mathbb{N} \ni \tilde{k}_1 \geq \max(\tilde{k}, \bar{k})$ such that for all $k \geq \tilde{k}_1$, $\text{supp}(x^k) = \text{supp}(x^*) = S_*$, where \tilde{k} and \bar{k} are same as those in Lemma 4.5. Now by comparing the iterate steps of Algorithm 2 with those of E-RNM proposed in [35], we conclude that the sequence $\{x_{S_*}^k\}_{k \geq \tilde{k}_1}$ is same as the one generated by E-RNM of [35]. For each $k \geq \tilde{k}_1$, pick any $\tilde{u}_k \in \Pi_{\mathcal{U}^*}(u^k)$. Clearly, it holds that $\nabla^2 F_{S_*}(\tilde{u}_k) \succeq 0$ for all $k \geq \tilde{k}_1$. Together with the proof of [35, Lemma 5.2], there exist $\mathbb{N} \ni \tilde{k}_2 \geq \tilde{k}_1$ and a constant $c_H > 0$ such that for all $k \geq \tilde{k}_2$, $\zeta_k \leq c_H \text{dist}(u^k, \mathcal{U}^*)$. Then, by invoking [35, Theorem 5.1] and using $u^k = x_{S_*}^k$, $\text{dist}(x_{S_*}^k, \mathcal{U}^*)$ converges to 0 at the rate of $1+\sigma$. Write $X^* := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_{S_*} \in \mathcal{U}^*, x_{S_*^c} = 0\}$. From $S_k = S_*$, clearly, $\text{dist}(x^k, X^*) = \text{dist}(x_{S_*}^k, \mathcal{U}^*)$ for all $k \geq \tilde{k}_2$. Consequently, $\text{dist}(x^k, X^*)$ converges to 0 at the rate of $1+\sigma$. That is, there exists $\mathbb{N} \ni \tilde{k}_3 \geq \tilde{k}_2$ such that for all $k \geq \tilde{k}_3$,

$$\text{dist}(x^{k+1}, X^*) = O((\text{dist}(x^k, X^*))^{1+\sigma}). \quad (41)$$

Also, by [35, Lemma 5.3] there exist $\mathbb{N} \ni \tilde{k}_4 \geq \tilde{k}_3$ and a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|d_{S_k}^k\| = \|d_{S_*}^k\| \leq c_0 \text{dist}(u^k, \mathcal{U}^*) = c_0 \text{dist}(x^k, X^*).$$

For each $k \geq \tilde{k}_4$, pick any $\tilde{x}^k \in \Pi_{X^*}(x^k)$. By the definition of X^* , $\text{supp}(\tilde{x}^k) \subseteq S_*$. In addition, since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x^k = x^*$, we have $\text{supp}(\tilde{x}^k) \supseteq S_*$ for all $k \geq \tilde{k}_4$ (if necessary by increasing \tilde{k}_4). Then, for all $k \geq \tilde{k}_4$, $\text{supp}(\tilde{x}^k) = S_*$. In addition, by (41) there exists

$\rho \in (0, 1)$ such that $\text{dist}(x^{k+1}, X^*) \leq \rho \text{dist}(x^k, X^*)$. Together with the above inequality, for all $k \geq \tilde{k}_4$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^k - x^*\| &\leq \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \|x^j - x^{j+1}\| \leq \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \|d_{S_j}^j\| \leq c_0 \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \text{dist}(x^j, X^*) \\ &< c_0 \left(\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \rho^{j-k} \right) \text{dist}(x^k, X^*) = \frac{c_0}{1-\rho} \text{dist}(x^k, X^*). \end{aligned}$$

By combining this inequality and (41), it follows that for all $k > \tilde{k}_4$,

$$\|x^k - x^*\| \leq \frac{c_0}{1-\rho} \text{dist}(x^k, X^*) = O((\text{dist}(x^{k-1}, X^*))^{1+\sigma}) \leq O(\|x^{k-1} - x^*\|^{1+\sigma}).$$

The desired conclusion then follows. The proof is completed. \square

Remark 4.1 *The local error bound condition in (40) is a little stronger than the metric subregularity of ∇F_{S^*} at $x_{S^*}^*$ for the origin because \mathcal{U}^* may be a strict subset of $\nabla F_{S^*}^{-1}(0)$, but it does not require the isolatedness and the local optimality of x^* . As mentioned in the introduction, Ahookhosh et al. [1] recently obtained a local superlinear rate for BELLA without the isolatedness of the limit point, but their superlinear rate is about $\text{dist}(x^k, \mathcal{X}_*)$ rather than the iterate sequence $\{x^k\}$, where \mathcal{X}_* is assumed to be the set of fixed points of the Bregman FBE and moreover, they require the second-order directions to be superlinear and F to be a KL function of exponent $\theta \in (0, 1)$.*

Lemma 4.6 *Under Assumption 4.1, the condition (16) implies Assumption 4.2.*

Proof: Suppose that Assumption 4.1 and the condition (16) hold. Let x^* be an arbitrary accumulation point of $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then, there exists a subsequence $\{x^{k_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x^{k_j} = x^*$. By Lemma 4.5, there exists $\bar{j} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $j \geq \bar{j}$, $k_j \geq \max\{\bar{k}, \bar{k}\}$ and then $\text{supp}(x^{k_j}) = \text{supp}(x^*) = S_*$. From the continuity, the sequence $\{G^{k_j}\}$ is convergent and let $G^* = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} G^{k_j}$ and $s = |S_*|$. Clearly, G^* is an $s \times s$ positive semidefinite matrix. Let $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_s \geq 0$ denote the eigenvalues of G^* . For each $j \geq \bar{j}$, let $\lambda_1^{k_j} \geq \lambda_2^{k_j} \geq \dots \geq \lambda_s^{k_j}$ denote the eigenvalues of the $s \times s$ positive definite matrix G^{k_j} . Clearly, for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$, $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_i^{k_j} = \lambda_i$.

Case 1: $\lambda_s > 0$. Now G^* is positive definite. Also, there exists $\bar{j}_1 \geq \bar{j}$ such that for all $j \geq \bar{j}_1$, $\lambda_s^{k_j} > \frac{\lambda_s}{2}$ and $0 < \lambda_1^{k_j} \leq \frac{3\lambda_1}{2}$. Consequently, for all $j \geq \bar{j}_1$,

$$\frac{-\langle r^{k_j}, d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j} \rangle}{\|r^{k_j}\| \|d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j}\|} = \frac{\langle G^{k_j} d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j}, d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j} \rangle}{\|G^{k_j} d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j}\| \|d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j}\|} \geq \frac{\lambda_s^{k_j} \|d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j}\|^2}{\lambda_1^{k_j} \|d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j}\|^2} \geq \frac{\lambda_s}{3\lambda_1} > 0. \quad (42)$$

Case 2: $\lambda_s = 0$. Now there exists $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ such that $\lambda_i = 0$ for $i = t, \dots, s$ and $\lambda_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, t-1$. Fix any $0 < \epsilon < \min(\frac{\varpi}{8c}, \frac{\varpi}{4c\sqrt{s-t+1}})$. From $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_i^{k_j} = \lambda_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, s$, there exists $\bar{j}_2 \geq \bar{j}$ such that for all $j \geq \bar{j}_2$,

$$0 < \lambda_i^{k_j} < \epsilon \text{ for } i = t, \dots, s \text{ and } \frac{1}{2}\lambda_i < \lambda_i^{k_j} < \frac{3}{2}\lambda_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, t-1. \quad (43)$$

Also, we can argue that $t > 1$. If not, then $t = 1$ and for all $j > \bar{j}_2$, by Lemma 4.3, $\|d^{k_j}\| = \|(G^{k_j})^{-1}r^{k_j}\| \geq \frac{\|r^{k_j}\|}{\lambda_1^{k_j}} \geq \frac{\varpi}{4\lambda_1^{k_j}}\|x^{k_j} - \bar{x}^{k_j}\| \geq \frac{\varpi}{4\epsilon}\|x^{k_j} - \bar{x}^{k_j}\|$, which along with $\epsilon \leq \frac{\varpi}{8\hat{c}}$ implies that $\|d^{k_j}\| > 2\hat{c}\|x^{k_j} - \bar{x}^{k_j}\|$, a contradiction to the assumption that the condition (16) hold. Therefore, it holds that $t > 1$. Now for each $j \geq \bar{j}_2$ let G^{k_j} have the eigenvalue decomposition given by $G^{k_j} = (V^{k_j})^T \text{diag}(\lambda_1^{k_j}, \dots, \lambda_s^{k_j}) V^{k_j}$, where V^{k_j} is an $s \times s$ orthogonal matrix. For each $j \geq \bar{j}_2$, since the column vectors $v_1^{k_j}, \dots, v_s^{k_j}$ of the matrix V^{k_j} are linearly independent, there exist $\gamma_1^{k_j}, \dots, \gamma_s^{k_j} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\frac{r^{k_j}}{\|r^{k_j}\|} = \sum_{i=1}^s \gamma_i^{k_j} v_i^{k_j} \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{i=1}^s (\gamma_i^{k_j})^2 = 1. \quad (44)$$

Together with the definition of $d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j}$, it follows that for each $j \geq \bar{j}_2$,

$$\frac{d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j}}{\|r^{k_j}\|} = \frac{-(G^{k_j})^{-1}r^{k_j}}{\|r^{k_j}\|} = -\sum_{i=1}^s \frac{\gamma_i^{k_j}}{\lambda_i^{k_j}} v_i^{k_j}. \quad (45)$$

By combining the condition (16) and Lemma 4.3, for each $j \geq \bar{j}_2$, we have

$$\|d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j}\| = \|d^{k_j}\| \leq (4\hat{c}/\varpi)\|r^{k_j}\|, \quad (46)$$

which along with (45) means that $\sum_{i=1}^s (\gamma_i^{k_j}/\lambda_i^{k_j})^2 \leq \frac{16\hat{c}^2}{\varpi^2}$. This by (43) implies that $\gamma_i^{k_j} \leq \frac{4\epsilon\hat{c}}{\varpi}$ for each $i = t, \dots, s$, which along with $\sum_{i=1}^s (\gamma_i^{k_j})^2 = 1$ means that $\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (\gamma_i^{k_j})^2 \geq 1 - \frac{16(s-t+1)\epsilon^2\hat{c}^2}{\varpi^2}$ and then there exists $l \in \{1, \dots, t-1\}$ such that $(\gamma_l^{k_j})^2 \geq \frac{\varpi^2 - 16(s-t+1)\epsilon^2\hat{c}^2}{\varpi^2(t-1)}$.

Thus, for each $j \geq \bar{j}_2$, from (44)-(46) we have

$$\frac{-\langle r^{k_j}, d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j} \rangle}{\|r^{k_j}\| \|d_{S_{k_j}}^{k_j}\|} \geq \frac{\varpi}{4\hat{c}} \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{(\gamma_i^{k_j})^2}{\lambda_i^{k_j}} \geq \frac{\varpi(\gamma_l^{k_j})^2}{4\hat{c}\lambda_l^{k_j}} \geq \frac{\varpi^2 - 16(s-t+1)\epsilon^2\hat{c}^2}{6\hat{c}\lambda_l\varpi(t-1)} > 0,$$

where the third inequality is also using $\lambda_l^{k_j} \leq \frac{3}{2}\lambda_l$, and the last one is by $0 < \epsilon < \frac{\varpi}{4\hat{c}\sqrt{s-t+1}}$. From the last inequality and (42), we obtain the conclusion. \square

The example given below shows that the inverse of Lemma 4.6 does not hold and therefore, Assumption 4.2 is strictly weaker than condition (16).

Example 4.1 Consider the problem $\min_{t \in \mathbb{R}} h(t) + |t|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with h defined as follows:

$$h(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{49}{8}t^2 - \frac{67}{4}t + \frac{85}{8} & \text{if } t \in (-\infty, 1), \\ (t-2)^4 - t^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } t \in [1, 4), \\ \frac{1537}{64}t^2 - \frac{5132}{32}t + \frac{1085}{4} & \text{if } t \in [4, \infty). \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check that h is a twice continuously differentiable function and h' is Lipschitz continuous with the Lip-constant $\frac{1537}{32}$. We use Algorithm 2 with $\tau = 2$, $\alpha = 1$, $\mu_{\min} =$

40, $\tilde{L} = 49$ and $\sigma = \frac{1}{3}, b_2 = 1, \varrho = 10^{-4}, \beta = \frac{1}{2}, t^0 = 2.1$ to seek a critical point of this problem. From the iterate steps of Algorithm 2, it follows that

$$\bar{t}^0 = 2.0999, \bar{\mu}_0 = 40, \bar{\omega}^0 = 39.9178 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mu}_0 + \lambda q(q-1)|t^0|^{-\frac{3}{2}} = 39.9178,$$

and hence the conditions in (13) hold for $k = 0$ and $0 \in \mathcal{K}_2$. Then, we calculate that

$$d^0 = -0.0144, h(t^0 + d^0) = 5.3815 \times 10^{-5}, h(t^0) = 0.0001, d^0 \cdot h'(0) = -5.7401 \times 10^{-5}.$$

Therefore, (14) is satisfied with $\alpha_0 = 1$ and thus $t^1 = t^0 + d^0 = 2.0856$. By repeating the above computation from t^1 , we can obtain that the sequence $\{t^k\}$ is generated by the Newton step with $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^k = 2$. When the iterate t^k is sufficiently close to 2,

$$|d^k| = \left| \frac{4(t^k - 2)^3}{12(t^k - 2)^2 + 4^{\frac{1}{3}}(t^k - 2)} \right| = O(|t^k - 2|^2).$$

By Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4 it holds that $|t_k - \bar{t}_k| = O(|h'(t_k)|) = O(|t_k - 2|^3)$. Then, $|t^k - \bar{t}^k| = o(|d^k|)$ and the condition in (16) does not hold for all k large enough. However, Assumption 4.2 always holds because $-\frac{d^k h'(t^k)}{|d^k| |h'(t^k)|} = 1$ for all k .

5 Numerical experiments

In this section we apply HpgSRN to solve the ℓ_q -norm regularized linear and logistics regression problems on real data, which are respectively the problem (1) with $f = f_1$ or f_2 , where $f_1(z) := \frac{1}{2}\|z - b\|^2$ and $f_2(z) := \sum_{i=1}^m \log(1 + \exp(-b_i z_i))$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Here, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a given vector. Clearly, such f satisfies Assumption 4.1 and the associated F is a KL function. All numerical experiments are performed on a desktop running on 64-bit Windows System with an Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-10700 CPU 2.90GHz and 32.0 GB RAM.

5.1 Implementation of HpgSRN

The initial step-size μ_k in each iterate of Algorithm 2 is chosen by the Barzilai-Borwein (BB) rule [4], that is,

$$\mu_k = \max \left\{ \mu_{\min}, \min \left\{ \mu_{\max}, \frac{\langle x^k - x^{k-1}, \nabla \psi(x^k) - \nabla \psi(x^{k-1}) \rangle}{\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2} \right\} \right\}$$

with $\mu_{\min} = 10^{-20}$ and $\mu_{\max} = 10^{20}$. Since $L_{\nabla \psi} = L_{\nabla f} \|A\|^2$ is available for the two classes of problems, we set $\tilde{L} = L_{\nabla \psi}$ with $\|A\|^2$ obtained via the following sentence

```
eigsopt.issym = 1; Amap=@(x) A*x; Atmap=@(x) A'*x;
AAAtmap=@(x) Amap(Atmap(x)); Asnorm = eigs(AAAtmap,m,1,'LA',eigsopt).
```

We choose $x^0 = 0$ as the starting point, and choose the parameters of HpgSRN by

$$\tilde{\tau} = 10, \tilde{\alpha} = 10^{-4}\tilde{L}, \sigma = 0.5, b_1 = 1 + 10^{-3}, b_2 = 10^{-3}, \varrho = 10^{-4}, \beta = 2.$$

Although $x^0 = 0$ is a critical point of F , it is not a good one. During the testing, we solve the linear system in (S4) via a direct method if $|S_k| < 500$, otherwise the conjugate gradient method. We terminate HpgSRN at the iterate x^k if $\|\nabla F_{S_k}(u^k)\|_\infty < 10^{-3}$ or $k \geq 50000$. Clearly, the output x^k with $k < 50000$ can be viewed as an approximate critical point of F . Our preliminary tests indicate that the model (1) with $q = 1/2$ usually has better performance than the model (1) with other $q \in (0, 1)$ in terms of the CPU time and the sparsity. This coincides with the conclusion in [16, 38]. Inspired by this, we choose $q = 1/2$ for the subsequent numerical experiments. The parameter λ in (1) is specified in the corresponding experiments.

We compare the performance of HpgSRN with that of ZeroFPR [34]. For ZeroFPR, we adopt the default stopping criterion $\|\frac{1}{\gamma}(x^k - \text{prox}_{\gamma\lambda g}(x^k - \gamma\nabla\psi(x^k)))\|_\infty < 10^{-3}$, where γ is some constant related to $L_{\nabla\psi}$. The code package of ZeroFPR is downloaded from <http://github.com/kul-forbes/ForBES>. Consider that the iterate step of SpaRSA is the same as (12) plus the above BB rule for updating μ_k . We also compare the performance of HpgSRN with that of SpaRSA to check the effect of the additional subspace regularized Newton step on HpgSRN. The parameters of SpaRSA are chosen to be the same as those involved in Step 1 of HpgSRN except $\tilde{\tau} = 2$. In addition, SpaRSA uses the same stopping condition as for HpgSRN.

In the next two subsections, we will conduct the experiments on real data and report the numerical results including the number of iterations, the CPU times in seconds, the objective values and the cardinality of the outputs. To check the effect of the regularized Newton steps in HpgSRN, we record its number of iterations in the form Titer (Niter), where Titer means the total number of iterates and Niter means the number of regularized Newton steps.

5.2 ℓ_q -norm regularized linear regression

We conduct the experiments for the ℓ_q -norm regularized linear regressions with (A, b) from LIBSVM datasets (see <https://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw>). As suggested in [18], for **housing** and **space_ga**, we expand their original features with polynomial basis functions. The second column of Table 1 lists the values of $\|A\|^2$ and $\|b\|^2$, which respectively reflect the condition number of the Hessian matrix of the loss function ψ and the quality of the starting point x^0 since $F(0) = \frac{1}{2}\|b\|^2$. For each dataset, we solve the problem (1) associated to f_1 and $\lambda = \lambda_c\|A^\top b\|_\infty$ for two different λ_c 's with the three solvers.

From Table 1, we see that HpgSRN spends the least time for all test examples, and for **log1p.E2006.train** with $\lambda_c = 10^{-5}$, ZeroFPR and SpaRSA respectively require more than one hour to yield a output with the given accuracy, but HpgSRN returns a output with the given accuracy within 450s. In addition, for all examples, the outputs of HpgSRN have comparable even better quality than those of ZeroFPR and SpaRSA do in terms of the objective value and the sparsity; for example, for **housing7** the outputs

of HpgSRN have better objective values than those of ZeroFPR and SpaRSA do though their sparsity is much less than those of the latter.

Table 1: Comparisons on ℓ_q -regularized linear regressions with LIBSVM datasets

Data (m, n)	$\frac{\ A\ ^2}{\ b\ ^2}$	λ_c	Index	HpgSRN	ZeroFPR	SpaRSA
space_ga9 (3107, 5505)	4.01e3 1.15e3	10^{-3}	Iter	12(3)	43	168
			Time	0.07	1.13	0.70
			Fval	34.16	37.24	37.15
			Nnz	7	7	6
	10^{-4}	Iter	149(51)	476	3178	
		Time	1.609	10.30	14.66	
		Fval	20.95	20.30	21.57	
		Nnz	15	19	15	
housing7 (506, 77520)	3.28e5 2.99e5	10^{-3}	Iter	596(145)	4164	12975
			Time	11.64	2.41e2	1.63e2
			Fval	2.40e3	2.57e3	2.44e3
			Nnz	27	49	51
	10^{-4}	Iter	2524(818)	18007	50000	
		Time	60.05	1.24e3	6.78e2	
		Fval	8.72e2	9.27e2	8.91e2	
		Nnz	80	123	125	
E2006.test (3308, 72812)	4.79e4 4.92e4	10^{-4}	Iter	2(0)	3	2
			Time	0.02	0.45	0.02
			Fval	2.45e2	2.45e2	2.45e2
			Nnz	1	1	1
	10^{-5}	Iter	4(0)	4	4	
		Time	0.03	0.38	0.03	
		Fval	2.40e2	2.40e2	2.40e2	
		Nnz	1	1	1	
E2006.train (16087, 150348)	1.91e5 2.05e5	10^{-4}	Iter	2(0)	2	2
			Time	0.08	1.69	0.06
			Fval	1.22e3	1.22e3	1.22e3
			Nnz	1	1	1
	10^{-5}	Iter	4(0)	4	4	
		Time	0.14	1.78	0.14	
		Fval	1.20e3	1.20e3	1.20e3	
		Nnz	1	1	1	
log1p.E2006.test (3308, 1771946)	1.46e7 4.92e4	10^{-4}	Iter	363(87)	827	1632
			Time	20.35	3.20e2	77.98
			Fval	2.35e2	2.43e2	2.37e2
			Nnz	5	4	6
	10^{-5}	Iter	1010(260)	6708	25561	
		Time	1.02e2	2.49e3	1.69e3	
		Fval	1.60e2	1.53e2	1.51e2	
		Nnz	325	460	378	
log1p.E2006.train (16087, 4265669)	5.86e7 2.05e5	10^{-4}	Iter	285(63)	855	2796
			Time	83.14	1.31e3	4.71e2
			Fval	1.16e3	1.16e3	1.16e3
			Nnz	5	5	5
	10^{-5}	Iter	911(218)	5610	30079	
		Time	4.35e2	5.70e3	5.00e3	
		Fval	1.02e3	1.02e3	1.02e3	
		Nnz	142	184	134	

5.3 ℓ_q -norm regularized logistics regression

We conduct the experiments for the ℓ_q -norm regularized logistics regressions with (A, b) from LIBSVM datasets. For each data, we solve the problem (1) associated to f_2 and $\lambda = \lambda_c \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \|A_j\|_1$ for two different λ_c 's with the three solvers. The last three columns of Table 2 record their numerical results. We see that in terms of CPU time, HpgSRN is still the best one among three solvers; while in terms of the quality of the outputs, HpgSRN has better performance than ZeroFPR does for all test examples except **news20** with $\lambda_c = 0.01$, and a comparable performance with SpaRSA does.

Table 2: Comparisons on ℓ_q -regularized logistics regressions with LIBSVM datasets

Data (m, n)	$\ A\ ^2$	λ_c	Index	HpgSRN	ZeroFPR	SpaRSA
colon-cancer (62, 2000)	1.94e4	10^{-2}	Iter	56(6)	703	104
			Time	0.03	0.61	0.03
			Fval	7.80	10.58	7.60
			Nnz	9	9	9
		10^{-3}	Iter	105(10)	1853	132
			Time	0.05	1.83	0.05
			Fval	0.97	1.07	1.07
			Nnz	8	12	12
rcv1 (20242, 47236)	4.48e2	10^{-2}	Iter	75(11)	432	1245
			Time	0.97	7.92	9.76
			Fval	4.23e3	4.35e3	4.24e3
			Nnz	160	167	168
		10^{-3}	Iter	343(80)	1897	5100
			Time	5.13	38.53	50.23
			Fval	1.32e3	1.53e3	1.30e3
			Nnz	703	741	703
news20 (19996, 1355191)	1.17e3	10^{-2}	Iter	74(13)	159	1105
			Time	5.14	58.97	77.68
			Fval	9.78e3	1.04e4	9.76e3
			Nnz	49	42	45
		10^{-3}	Iter	520(138)	1470	18878
			Time	54.31	6.34e2	1.59e3
			Fval	4.40e3	4.71e3	4.29e3
			Nnz	366	371	383

To sum up, HpgSRN requires the least CPU time for all test examples than ZeroFPR and SpaRSA do, and for those large scale examples, HpgSRN is at least ten times faster than ZeroFPR and SpaRSA do. The outputs yielded by HpgSRN have a comparable even better quality in terms of the objective values and the sparsity. This means that the introduction of second-order steps improves greatly the performance of the first-order method. We also observe that for those examples with smaller λ , HpgSRN usually requires more time to return a desirable output. The reason is that the stationary points of (1) associated to smaller λ have a large cardinality, and HpgSRN needs more time to compute the inverse of Hessian. In addition, when the cardinality is large, the support of the iterates will become unstable, and more second-order steps are needed to attain a neighborhood of a potential critical point.

6 Conclusion

For the ℓ_q -norm regularized composite problem (1), we proposed a globally convergent regularized Newton method by exploiting the special structures of the ℓ_q -norm. This is another attempt to combine a first-order method and a second-order method while maintaining the good properties of both methods. We not only established the convergence of the whole iterate sequence under a mild curve-ratio condition and the KL property of F , but also achieved its superlinear convergence rate under an additional local error bound condition. In particular, the local superlinear convergence result neither requires the isolatedness of the limit point nor its strict local minimum property. Notice that the theoretical results were now obtained for the exact regularized Newton direction. In our future research work, we will adapt them to a practical inexact version.

References

- [1] M. AHOOKHOSH, A. THEMELIS, AND P. PATRINOS, *A bregman forward-backward linesearch algorithm for nonconvex composite optimization: superlinear convergence to nonisolated local minima*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 31 (2021), pp. 653–685.
- [2] H. ATTOUCH, J. BOLTE, P. REDONT, AND A. SOUBEYRAN, *Proximal alternating minimization and projection methods for nonconvex problems: An approach based on the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz inequality*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 35 (2010), pp. 438–457.
- [3] H. ATTOUCH, J. BOLTE, AND B. F. SVAITER, *Convergence of descent methods for semi-algebraic and tame problems: proximal algorithms, forward-backward splitting, and regularized Gauss-Seidel methods*, Mathematical Programming, 137 (2013), pp. 91–129.
- [4] J. BARZILAI AND J. M. BORWEIN, *Two-point step size gradient methods*, IMA journal of numerical analysis, 8 (1988), pp. 141–148.
- [5] A. BECK AND N. HALLAK, *Optimization problems involving group sparsity terms*, Mathematical Programming, 178 (2019), pp. 39–67.
- [6] D. P. BERTSEKAS, *Nonlinear programming*, Journal of the Operational Research Society, 48 (1997), pp. 334–334.
- [7] J. BOLTE, S. SABACH, AND M. TEBoulLE, *Proximal alternating linearized minimization for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems*, Mathematical Programming, 146 (2014), pp. 459–494.
- [8] J. F. BONNANS AND A. SHAPIRO, *Perturbation analysis of optimization problems*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

- [9] W. CAO, J. SUN, AND Z. XU, *Fast image deconvolution using closed-form thresholding formulas of $L_q(q = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3})$ regularization*, Journal of Visual Communication and Image representation, 24 (2013), pp. 31–41.
- [10] R. CHARTRAND, *Exact reconstruction of sparse signals via nonconvex minimization*, IEEE Signal Processing Letters, 14 (2007), pp. 707–710.
- [11] X. CHEN, F. XU, AND Y. YE, *Lower bound theory of nonzero entries in solutions of $\ell_2 - \ell_p$ minimization*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 32 (2010), pp. 2832–2852.
- [12] X. CHEN AND W. ZHOU, *Convergence of the reweighted ℓ_1 minimization algorithm for $\ell_2 - \ell_q$ minimization*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 59 (2014), pp. 47–61.
- [13] M. A. FIGUEIREDO, J. M. BIUCAS-DIAS, AND R. D. NOWAK, *Majorization-minimization algorithms for wavelet-based image restoration*, IEEE Transactions on Image processing, 16 (2007), pp. 2980–2991.
- [14] A. FISCHER, *Local behavior of an iterative framework for generalized equations with nonisolated solutions*, Mathematical Programming, 94 (2002), pp. 91–124.
- [15] L. E. FRANK AND J. H. FRIEDMAN, *A statistical view of some chemometrics regression tools*, Technometrics, 35 (1993), pp. 109–135.
- [16] Y. HU, C. LI, K. MENG, J. QIN, AND X. YANG, *Group sparse optimization via $\ell_{p,q}$ regularization*, The Journal of Machine Learning Research, 18 (2017), pp. 960–1011.
- [17] Y. HU, C. LI, K. MENG, AND X. YANG, *Linear convergence of inexact descent method and inexact proximal gradient algorithms for lower-order regularization problems*, Journal of Global Optimization, 79 (2021), pp. 853–883.
- [18] L. HUANG, J. JIA, B. YU, B.-G. CHUN, P. MANIATIS, AND M. NAIK, *Predicting execution time of computer programs using sparse polynomial regression*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 23 (2010), pp. 883–891.
- [19] X. HUANG AND X. YANG, *A unified augmented lagrangian approach to duality and exact penalization*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 28 (2003), pp. 533–552.
- [20] C. KANZOW AND T. LECHNER, *Globalized inexact proximal newton-type methods for nonconvex composite functions*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 78 (2021), pp. 377–410.
- [21] M.-J. LAI, Y. XU, AND W. YIN, *Improved iteratively reweighted least squares for unconstrained smoothed ℓ_q minimization*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 51 (2013), pp. 927–957.

- [22] J. D. LEE, Y. SUN, AND M. A. SAUNDERS, *Proximal newton-type methods for minimizing composite functions*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 24 (2014), pp. 1420–1443.
- [23] D.-H. LI, M. FUKUSHIMA, L. QI, AND N. YAMASHITA, *Regularized newton methods for convex minimization problems with singular solutions*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 28 (2004), pp. 131–147.
- [24] G. LI AND T. K. PONG, *Calculus of the exponent of Kurdyka–Łojasiewicz inequality and its applications to linear convergence of first-order methods*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics, 18 (2018), pp. 1199–1232.
- [25] Z. LU, *Iterative reweighted minimization methods for ℓ_p regularized unconstrained nonlinear programming*, Mathematical Programming, 147 (2014), pp. 277–307.
- [26] Z.-Q. LUO, J.-S. PANG, AND D. RALPH, *Mathematical programs with equilibrium constraints*, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [27] B. S. MORDUKHOVICH, X. YUAN, S. ZENG, AND J. ZHANG, *A globally convergent proximal newton-type method in nonsmooth convex optimization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.08166, (2020).
- [28] M. NIKOLOVA, M. K. NG, S. ZHANG, AND W.-K. CHING, *Efficient reconstruction of piecewise constant images using nonsmooth nonconvex minimization*, SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences, 1 (2008), pp. 2–25.
- [29] J. NOCEDAL AND S. WRIGHT, *Numerical optimization*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [30] R. T. ROCKAFELLAR AND R. J.-B. WETS, *Variational analysis*, vol. 317, Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [31] R. SAAB, R. CHARTRAND, AND O. YILMAZ, *Stable sparse approximations via nonconvex optimization*, in 2008 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing, IEEE, 2008, pp. 3885–3888.
- [32] L. STELLA, A. THEMELIS, AND P. PATRINOS, *Forward–backward quasi-newton methods for nonsmooth optimization problems*, Computational Optimization and Applications, 67 (2017), pp. 443–487.
- [33] A. THEMELIS, M. AHOOKHOSH, AND P. PATRINOS, *On the acceleration of forward-backward splitting via an inexact newton method*, in Splitting Algorithms, Modern Operator Theory, and Applications, Springer, 2019, pp. 363–412.
- [34] A. THEMELIS, L. STELLA, AND P. PATRINOS, *Forward-backward envelope for the sum of two nonconvex functions: Further properties and nonmonotone linesearch algorithms*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 28 (2018), pp. 2274–2303.

- [35] K. UEDA AND N. YAMASHITA, *Convergence properties of the regularized newton method for the unconstrained nonconvex optimization*, Applied Mathematics and Optimization, 62 (2010), pp. 27–46.
- [36] S. J. WRIGHT, R. D. NOWAK, AND M. A. FIGUEIREDO, *Sparse reconstruction by separable approximation*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 57 (2009), pp. 2479–2493.
- [37] Z. XU, X. CHANG, F. XU, AND H. ZHANG, *$\ell_{1/2}$ regularization: A thresholding representation theory and a fast solver*, IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems, 23 (2012), pp. 1013–1027.
- [38] Z. XU, H. ZHANG, Y. WANG, X. CHANG, AND Y. LIANG, *$l_{1/2}$ regularization*, Science China Information Sciences, 53 (2010), pp. 1159–1169.
- [39] X. YANG AND X. HUANG, *A nonlinear lagrangian approach to constrained optimization problems*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 11 (2001), pp. 1119–1144.
- [40] P. YU, G. LI, AND T. K. PONG, *Deducing Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz exponent via inf-projection*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.03635, (2019).
- [41] M.-C. YUE, Z. ZHOU, AND A. M.-C. SO, *A family of inexact SQA methods for non-smooth convex minimization with provable convergence guarantees based on the Luo-Tseng error bound property*, Mathematical Programming, 174 (2019), pp. 327–358.
- [42] S. ZHOU, L. PAN, AND N. XIU, *Newton method for ℓ_0 -regularized optimization*, Numerical Algorithms, 88 (2021), pp. 1541–1570.