

Level Constrained First Order Methods for Function Constrained Optimization

Digvijay Boob^{*} Qi Deng[†] Guanghui Lan[‡]

May 18, 2022

Abstract

We present a new feasible proximal gradient method for constrained optimization where both the objective and constraint functions are given by summation of a smooth, possibly nonconvex function and a convex simple function. The algorithm converts the original problem into a sequence of convex subproblems. Either exact or approximate solutions of convex subproblems can be computed efficiently in many cases. For the inexact case, computing the solution of the subproblem requires evaluation of at most one gradient/function-value of the original objective and constraint functions. An important feature of the algorithm is the constraint level parameter. By carefully increasing this level for each subproblem, we provide a simple solution to overcome the challenge of bounding the Lagrangian multipliers, and show that the algorithm follows a strictly feasible solution path till convergence to the stationary point. Finally, we develop a simple, proximal gradient descent type analysis, showing that the complexity bound of this new algorithm is comparable to gradient descent for the unconstrained setting which is new in the literature. Exploiting this new design and analysis technique, we extend our algorithms to some more challenging constrained optimization problems where 1) the objective is a stochastic or finite-sum function, and 2) structured nonsmooth functions replace smooth components of both objective and constraint functions. Complexity results for these problems also seem to be new in the literature. We also show that our method can be applied for convex function constrained problems where we show complexities similar to the proximal gradient method.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the following constrained optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \quad & \psi_0(x) := f_0(x) + \chi_0(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \psi_i(x) := f_i(x) + \chi_i(x) \leq \eta_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\psi_i(x)$ is a composite function that sums up functions $f_i(x)$ and $\chi_i(x)$. Here, $f_i, i = 0, 1, \dots, m$, are smooth functions, $\chi_0(x)$ is a proper, convex, lower-semicontinuous (lsc) function and $\chi_i(x), i = 1, \dots, m$, are convex continuous functions over the domain of χ_0 (i.e. $\text{dom } \chi_0$). We consider that $\chi_i, i = 0, \dots, m$ are ‘simple’ functions, namely, a feasible optimization problem of the form below

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{ \|x - a^0\|^2 + \chi_0(x) : \|x - a^i\|^2 + \chi_i(x) \leq b^i, i = 1, \dots, m. \} \tag{1.2}$$

can be solved to efficiently obtain either an exact solution or an inexact solution of desired accuracy. Note that if $\chi_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, m$, then (1.2) becomes a proximal operator for function χ_0 on the intersection of balls. If we further assume $\chi_0 = 0$, then (1.2) is a special type of quadratically constrained quadratic programming (QCQP) that can be solved efficiently because all the Hessians are identity matrices. In addition, we consider the case where constraints $f_i, i = 1, \dots, m$, are structured nonsmooth functions which can be approximated by smooth functions (also called as smoothable functions). Note that problem (1.1) covers a variety of convex and nonconvex function constrained optimization depending on the assumptions of $f_i, i = 0, \dots, m$.

^{*}dboob@smu.edu, Operations Research and Engineering Management, Southern Methodist University.

[†]qideng@sufe.edu.cn, School of Information Management and Engineering, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics.

[‡]george.lan@isye.gatech.edu, Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology.

Nonlinear optimization with function constraints has been a classic topic in continuous optimization. While earlier study focused on the asymptotic performance, recent work has put more emphasis on the complexity analysis of the algorithms, mainly driven by the growing interests in large-scale optimization and machine learning. For most of our discussion on complexity analysis, we generally require convergence to an ϵ -approximate KKT point (c.f. Definition 3). Penalty methods [9, 25, 18], including augmented Lagrangian methods [15, 16, 26, 17], is one popular approach for constrained optimization. In [8], Cartis et al. presented an exact penalty method by minimizing a sequence of convex composition functions. When the penalty weight is bounded, this method requires to solve $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ trust region subproblems, and when the penalty weight is unbounded, the complexity is $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{2.5})$ to reach an ϵ -KKT point. In a subsequent work [9], the authors provided a target following method that achieves complexity $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ regardless the growth of the penalty. In [25], Wang et al. extended the penalty method to solving constrained problems where the objective takes the expectation forms. Sequential quadratic programming (SQP) is another important approach for constrained optimization. Typically, SQP involves linearization of the constraints, quadratic approximation of the objective and possibly some trust region constraint for convergence guarantee [6, 7]. The recent work [10] established a unified convergence analysis of SQP (GSQP) in more general settings when the feasibility and constraint qualification may or may not hold. Different from standard SQP, the Moving Balls Approximation (MBA) method [1] follows a feasible solution path and transforms the initial problems into diagonal QCQP. A subsequent work [3] presented a unified analysis of MBA and other variants of SQP methods. Under the assumption of Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property, they establish global rates of convergence in which the result depends on the Łojasiewicz exponent.

Despite much recent progress in the prior work, there are some significant remaining issues. Specifically, most of the analyses are carried out only for smooth optimization and require that the exact optimal solution of the convex subproblems are readily available. Unfortunately, both assumptions can be unrealistic in many large scale applications. To overcome these issues, [4, 19, 18] presented some new proximal point algorithms that iteratively solves the strongly convex proximal subproblem inexactly by first order methods. A great computational advantage is that first order methods only need to compute a relatively easy proximal gradient mapping in each iteration. In particular, [4] proposed to solve the proximal point subproblem by a new first order primal-dual method called **ConEx**. Under some strict feasibility assumption, they derived the total complexities of the overall algorithm for which the objective and constraints can be either stochastic or deterministic, and either nonsmooth or smooth. Notably, for nonconvex and smooth constrained problems, inexact proximal point [4] requires $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{1.5})$ function/gradient evaluations. A similar complexity bound is obtained by the proximal point penalty method [18] when a feasible point is available. Nevertheless, at this point, it may be difficult to directly compare the efficiency of proximal point with the earlier approach, given that very different oracles are employed in each method. Inexact proximal point appears to be less efficient in terms of gradient and function value computations, since first order penalty method [9] and a variant of SQP [10] (where surrogate is formed by first order approximation) has an $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ complexity bound. Nevertheless, inexact proximal point might be more efficient if the corresponding proximal mapping is much easier to solve than the the subproblems in penalty or SQP methods.

In this paper, we attempt to alleviate some of the aforementioned issues in solving nonconvex constrained optimization. Our main contribution is the development of a novel **Level Constrained Proximal Gradient (LCPG)** method for constrained optimization, basing on the following key ideas.

First, we convert the original problem (1.1) into a sequence of simple convex subproblems of form (1.2) for which an exact or an approximate solution can be computed efficiently. In particular, solving the subproblem requires at most one gradient and function value computation for $f_i, i = 0, \dots, m$. This phenomenon is quite similar to simple single-loop methods even though LCPG method can be multi-loop since we allow for an inexact solution of (1.2) using some kind of iterative scheme.

Second, starting from a strictly feasible initial point and carefully controlling the feasibility levels of the subproblem constraints, we ensure that LCPG follows a strictly feasible solution path. This also allows us to deal with nonsmooth constraints where χ_i is not necessarily 0 and further extends LCPG to the inexact case where the subproblem admits an approximate solution. Even though subtle, the level-control design is crucial in bounding the Lagrange multipliers under the well-known Mangasarian-Fromovitz constraint qualification (MFCQ)[20, 4]. Subsequently, we also show asymptotic convergence of the LCPG method.

Third, we offer a new insight into the complexity analysis of LCPG as a gradient descent type method, which could be of independent interests. When the objective and constraints are nonconvex composite, we

aim to find a first-order ϵ -KKT point (c.f. Definition 3) under aforementioned MFCQ assumption. We can show that LCPG method converges in $O(1/\epsilon)$ iterations. Furthermore, each subproblem requires at most one function-value and gradient computation. The net outcome is that *gradient complexity* of our method is of $O(1/\epsilon)$. Notice that the number of iterations required by proximal point method under MFCQ assumption is also $O(1/\epsilon)$ (see [4, Theorem 5]). However, each iteration of this method requires $O(1/\epsilon^{0.5})$ gradient computation, and hence its total gradient complexity can be bounded by $O(1/\epsilon^{1.5})$. This is much worse than LCPG method. We compare with some significant lines of work in Table 1.

Exploiting the intrinsic connection between LCPG and proximal gradient (without function constraints), we extend LCPG to a variety of cases. We can show a similar $O(1/\epsilon)$ gradient complexity for the inexact LCPG method. We also extend LCPG method to stochastic (LCSPG) and variance-reduced (LCSV RG) variants when f_0 is either stochastic or finite-sum function, respectively. LCSPG and LCSV RG require $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ (similar to SGD [12]) and $O(\sqrt{n}/\epsilon)$ (similar to SVRG [13]) stochastic gradients, respectively, where n is the number of components in the finite-sum objective. The details of complexity of variants of LCPG method for stochastic cases can also be seen in Table 2. We also consider the case when function $f_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ are nondifferentiable, but contain a smooth saddle structure (referred to as *structured nonsmooth*). We extend LCPG method for such nonsmooth nonconvex function constrained problem using Nesterov’s smoothing scheme [22]. In this case, LCPG method requires $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ gradients.

We show that GD type analysis of the LCPG method can be extended to the convex case. In particular, when the objective and constraint functions are convex, we show that LCPG method requires $O(1/\epsilon)$ gradient computations for smooth and composite constrained problems, and this complexity improves to $O(\log(1/\epsilon))$ when the objective is smooth and strongly-convex. Furthermore, we develop the complexity of inexact variants of LCPG method by leveraging the analysis of gradient descent with inexact projection oracles [24]. Inexact LCPG method maintains the gradient complexity of $O(1/\epsilon)$ and $O(\log(1/\epsilon))$ for convex and strongly convex problems, respectively.

It should be noted that throughout our analysis, we require that the Lagrange multipliers for the convex subproblems of type (1.2) are bounded. This problem is addressed in different ways in arguably all works in the literature. In this paper, we show that under the assumption of MFCQ, Lagrange multipliers associated with the sequence of subproblems remain bounded by a quantity specified as B . Even then, the value of B cannot be estimated a priori. Fortunately, this bound is not needed in the implementation of our methods. However, it plays a role in the complexity analysis. Hence, our comparison with the existing complexity literature (e.g., proximal point method of [4]) is valid when bound B on sequence of Lagrange multiplier largely depends on the problem itself and not on the sequence of subproblems. One can easily see that such uniform bounds on Lagrange multipliers hold under the strong feasibility constraint qualification [4], a similar uniform Slater’s condition [19] or for nonsmooth nonconvex relaxation in the application of sparsity constrained optimization [5]. The problem of comparing bounds B on Lagrange multipliers requires getting into specific applications, which is not the purpose of this paper. Hence, throughout our comparison with existing literature, we assume that bound B for different methods is of similar order.

Comparison with MBA method Auslender et al. [1] provided a Moving Balls Approximation (MBA) method for smooth constrained problems, i.e. $\chi_i(x), i = 0, \dots, m$, are not present. They use Lipschitz continuity of constraint gradients along with MFCQ to ensure that sequence of subproblems satisfy Slater’s conditions (see [1, Proposition 2.1(iii)]). Similar result is also used in [27] where they provide a line-search version of MBA for functions satisfying certain KL-properties. The MBA method was studied for semi-algebraic functions in [3] where they used KL property of semi-algebraic functions. The work [1] also provides the complexity guarantee for constrained program with a smooth and strongly convex objective. Our results differ from the past studies in the following several aspects. First, we do not assume any KL assumptions on the class of functions, hence making the method applicable for a wider class of problems. Second, we show complexity analysis for variety of cases, e.g., stochastic, finite-sum or structured nonsmooth cases. Note that complexity results are not known for MBA type method even for purely smooth problem. Third, we show complexity results for both convex and strongly convex cases which strictly subsumes the results in [1]. Fourth, it should be noted that [1] also considered the efficiency of solving subproblems. They proposed an accelerated gradient method that obtains $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$ complexity for solving the dual of the QCQP subproblem. However, it is unclear what accuracy is enough for ensuring asymptotic convergence of the whole algorithm.

Algorithms	Function type	Composite?	Inexact?	CQ	Criteria	Complexity
MBA [1]	str cvx	no	no	Feasibility+MFCQ	Opt. gap	$\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\epsilon))$
GSQP [10]	noncvx	no	no	Extended MFCQ	KKT	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$
IPP +ConEx [4]	noncvx	yes	yes	Strong feasibility	KKT	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{1.5})$
IPPP [18]	noncvx	no	yes	Feasibility + Nonsingularity	KKT	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{1.5})$
				Nonsingularity		$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$
IQRC[19]	noncvx	yes*	yes	Uniform Slater	KKT	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{1.5})$
LCPG (this work)	cvx	yes	yes	Slater+MFCQ	Opt. gap	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$
	str cvx				Opt. gap	$\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\epsilon))$
	noncvx				KKT	$\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$

Table 1: Comparison of algorithm function/gradient evaluation complexities. **cvx**: convex, **str cvx**: strongly convex, and **noncvx**: nonconvex.

For convex problems, we consider the complexity to reach a feasible solution with $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -optimality gap. For nonconvex problems, we consider the complexity to reach an approximate KKT solution that satisfies $\|\partial\mathcal{L}\|_*^2 \leq \epsilon$. Note that different works have quite different error measurements of the complementary slackness. For example, in our translation, [10, 18] requires an $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon})$ error on the complementary slackness and feasibility. Our measure requires 0-feasibility error and $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -complementary slackness error.

* IQRC does not explicitly discuss the composite case. Their subproblem oracle can be upgraded to handle proximal case relatively easily.

	LCPG	LCSPG	LCSV RG
Complexity	$\mathcal{O}(n\epsilon^{-1})$	$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$	$\mathcal{O}(n^{1/2}\epsilon^{-1})$

Table 2: Total number of stochastic gradient evaluations to obtain $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ randomized KKT points in the finite sum problem.

Comparison with generalized SQP The work [10] developed the first complexity analysis of generalized SQP (GSQP) method by using a novel ghost penalty approach. Different from our feasible method, they consider a general setting where the feasibility and constraint qualification may or may not hold. They show that SQP-type methods have an $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ complexity for reaching some ϵ -approximate generalized stationary point. Under an extended MFCQ condition, they established an improved complexity $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ for reaching the scaled-KKT point, which matches our complexity result under a similar MFCQ assumption. Notably, both their analysis and ours rely on MFCQ to show that the global upper bound (constant B) on the multipliers of the subproblems exists. However, in order to obtain the best $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ complexity, GSQP explicitly relies on the value of such unknown upper bound to determine the stepsize, which appears to be rather challenging in practical use. In contrast, our algorithm does not involve the constant B in the algorithm implementation; we only require the Lipschitz constants of the gradients, which is standard for gradient descent methods.

Outline This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes notations and assumptions. It also provides various definitions used throughout the paper. Section 3 presents the LCPG method which uses exact solutions of subproblems. It also establishes asymptotic convergence and convergence rate results. Section 4.1 and Section 4.2 provides the LCSPG and LCSV RG method for stochastic and finite-sum problems, respectively. Section 5 shows extension of LCPG for nonsmooth nonconvex function constraints. Section 6 introduces the inexact LCPG method and provides its complexity analysis when the subproblems are inexactly solved by an interior point method or first-order method. Finally, Section 7 extends LCPG method for convex optimization problems and establishes its complexity for both strongly convex and convex problems.

2 Notations and assumptions

Notations. \mathbb{R}_+^n stands for the non-negative orthant in \mathbb{R}^n . We use $\|\cdot\|$ to express the Euclidean norm. For a set \mathcal{X} , we define $\|\mathcal{X}\|_- = \text{dist}(0, \mathcal{X}) = \inf \{\|x\|, x \in \mathcal{X}\}$. If \mathcal{X} is a convex set then we denote its normal cone at x as $N_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$. Furthermore, we denote the dual cone of normal cone at x as $N_{\mathcal{X}}^*(x)$. Let e be a vector full of elements one. For simplicity, we denote $[m] = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, $f(x) = [f_1(x), \dots, f_m(x)]^T$, $\chi(x) = [\chi_1(x), \dots, \chi_m(x)]^T$, and $\psi(x) = [\psi_1(x), \psi_2(x), \dots, \psi_m(x)]^T$. For vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $x \leq y$ is understood as $x_i \leq y_i$ for $i \in [m]$.

Assumption 1 (General). *We assume that the optimal value of problem (1.1) is finite: $\psi_0^* > -\infty$. Furthermore, the objective and constraint functions have the following properties.*

- 1: χ_0 is a proper, convex and lower semi-continuous (lsc) function. Moreover, we assume that for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, the function $\chi_i(x)$ is convex continuous over $\text{dom } \chi_0$.
- 2: $f_i(x)$ is L_i -Lipschitz smooth on $\text{dom } \chi_0$: $\|\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f_i(y)\| \leq L_i \|x - y\|$ for any $x, y \in \text{dom } \chi_0$. For brevity, we denote $L = [L_1, \dots, L_m]^T$.
- 3: The feasible set for (1.1), i.e., $\bigcap_{i \in [m]} \{x : \psi_i(x) \leq \eta_i\} \cap \text{dom } \chi_0$ is nonempty and compact¹.

The Lagrangian function of problem (1.1) is denoted by

$$\mathcal{L}(x, \lambda) = \psi_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i [\psi_i(x) - \eta_i]. \quad (2.1)$$

For functions ψ_i , we denote its subdifferential as

$$\partial \psi_i(x) = \{\nabla f_i(x)\} + \partial \chi_i(x), i = 0, \dots, m,$$

where the sum is in the Minkowski sense.

Definition 1 (KKT condition). We say $x \in \text{dom } \chi_0$ is a KKT point of problem (1.1) if x is feasible and there exists a vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ such that

$$0 \in \partial_x \mathcal{L}(x, \lambda), \quad 0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i [\psi_i(x) - \eta_i]. \quad (2.2)$$

The values $\{\lambda_i\}$ are called Lagrange multipliers.

It is known that the KKT condition is necessary for optimality under the assumption of certain constraint qualification (c.f. [2]). Our result will be based on a variant of Mangasarian-Fromovitz constraint qualification, which is formally given below.

Definition 2 (MFCQ). We say that a point x satisfies the Mangasarian-Fromovitz constraint qualification for (1.1) if there exists a vector $z \in -N_{\text{dom } \chi_0}^*(x)$ such that

$$\max_{v \in \partial \psi_i(x)} \langle v, z \rangle < 0, \quad i \in \mathcal{A}(x), \quad (2.3)$$

where $\mathcal{A}(x) = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq m, \psi_i(x) = \eta_i\}$.

Proposition 1 (Necessary condition). *Let x be a local optimal solution of Problem (1.1). If it satisfies MFCQ (2.3), then there is a vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ such that the KKT condition (1) holds.*

Next, we introduce some optimality measures before formally presenting any algorithms. It is natural to characterize algorithm performance by measuring the error of satisfying KKT condition. Towards this goal, we have the following definition.

Definition 3. We say that x is an ϵ type-I (approximate) KKT point if it is feasible (i.e. $\psi(x) \leq \eta$), and there exists a vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$\|\partial_x \mathcal{L}(x, \lambda)\|_-^2 \leq \epsilon \quad (2.4)$$

$$-\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i [\psi_i(x) - \eta_i] \leq \epsilon. \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover, x is randomized ϵ type-I KKT point if both x and λ are feasible randomized primal-dual solutions and conditions (2.4) and (2.5) are satisfied in expectation over the randomness of x and λ .

¹This assumption is used to ensure the limit point of a certain sequence in the analysis. There are other conditions that can ensure the existence of a limit point as we will discuss in Remark 1.

Besides the above definition, we invoke a second optimality measure which will be helpful for analyzing the performance of a proximal algorithm (see, for example, [4]). Therein it is arguably more convenient to approach the proximity of some nearly stationary points.

Definition 4. We say that x is a (ϵ, ν) type-II KKT point if there exists an ϵ type-I KKT point \hat{x} and $\|x - \hat{x}\|^2 \leq \nu$. Similarly, x is a randomized (ϵ, ν) type-II KKT point if \hat{x} is a random vector and $\mathbb{E}[\|x - \hat{x}\|^2] \leq \nu$.

3 A proximal gradient method

We present the level constrained proximal gradient (LCPG) method in Algorithm 1. The main idea of this algorithm is to turn the original nonconvex problem into a sequence of relatively easier subproblems which involve some convex surrogate functions $\psi_i^k(x)$ ($0 \leq i \leq m$) and variable constraint levels η^k :

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \quad & \psi_0^k(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \psi_i^k(x) \leq \eta_i^k, \quad i \in [m]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Above, we take the surrogate function $\psi_i^k(x)$ ($0 \leq i \leq m$) by partially linearizing $\psi_i(x)$ at x^k and adding the proximal term $\frac{L_i}{2}\|x - x^k\|^2$:

$$\psi_i^k(x) := f_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla f_i(x^k), x - x^k \rangle + \frac{L_i}{2}\|x - x^k\|^2 + \chi_i(x). \quad (3.2)$$

It should be noted that our algorithm would not be well-defined were it initialized by an infeasible solution x^0 . On the opposite side, we require an initial point strictly feasible to the nonlinear constraints $\psi(x) \leq \eta$. Therefore, we explicitly state this assumption below and assume it holds throughout the paper.

Assumption 2 (Strict feasibility). *There exists a point $x^0 \in \text{dom } \chi_0$ and a vector $\eta^0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that*

$$\psi_i(x^0) < \eta_i^0 < \eta.$$

With a strictly feasible solution, we assume that the constraint levels $\{\eta^k\}$ are incrementally updated and converge to the constraint levels for the original problem:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_i^k = \eta_i, \quad i \in [m].$$

Algorithm 1: Level constrained proximal gradient method (LCPG)

Input: x^0, η^0 ;

for $k=0, 1, 2, \dots, K$ **do**

For $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$, set $\psi_i^k(x)$ by (3.2) ;

Update x^{k+1} by solving (3.1);

Choose $\delta^k > 0$ and update η^{k+1} by

$$\eta_i^{k+1} = \eta_i^k + \delta_i^k < \eta_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m. \quad (3.3)$$

end

Output: $x^{\hat{k}+1}$ where \hat{k} is a random index sampled from $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, K\}$.

The following Lemma will be used many times throughout the rest of the paper.

Lemma 1 (Three-point inequality). *Let $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ be a proper lsc convex function and*

$$x^+ = \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ g(z) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|z - y\|^2 \right\},$$

then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$g(x^+) - g(x) \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} (\|x - y\|^2 - \|x^+ - y\|^2 - \|x - x^+\|^2). \quad (3.4)$$

Next, we present some important properties about the generated solutions in the following theorem.

Proposition 2. *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds, then Algorithm 1 has the following properties.*

1. The sequence $\{x^k\}$ is well-defined and is feasible for problem (1.1). $\{x^k\}$ satisfies the sufficient descent property:

$$\frac{L_0}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \leq \psi_0(x^k) - \psi_0(x^{k+1}). \quad (3.5)$$

Moreover, the sequence of objective values $\{\psi_0(x^k)\}$ is monotonically decreasing and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi_0(x^k)$ exists.

2. There exists a vector $\lambda^{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ such that the KKT condition holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \psi_0^k(x^{k+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{k+1} \partial \psi_i^k(x^{k+1}) \ni 0 \\ \lambda_i^{k+1} [\psi_i^k(x^{k+1}) - \eta_i^k] = 0, \quad i \in [m]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. Part 1). First, we show that $\{x^k\}$ is a well-defined sequence, namely, $\mathcal{X}_k \cap \text{dom } \chi_0$ is a nonempty set where $\mathcal{X}_k = \{x : \psi_i^k(x) \leq \eta_i^k\}$. This result clearly holds for $k = 0$ by Assumption 2. We show the general case ($k > 0$) by induction. Suppose that x^k is well-defined, i.e., $\mathcal{X}_{k-1} \cap \text{dom } \chi_0$ is nonempty. Then, by the definition of ψ_i^k, ψ_i^{k-1} and the definition x^k , we have $x^k \in \text{dom } \chi_0$ and

$$\psi_i^k(x^k) = \psi_i(x^k) \leq \psi_i^{k-1}(x^k) \leq \eta_i^{k-1} < \eta_i^k \quad \text{for all } i \in [m]. \quad (3.7)$$

Here, the first inequality follows due to the smoothness of $f_i(x)$ which ensures for all x ,

$$f_i(x) \leq f_i(x^{k-1}) + \langle \nabla f_i(x^{k-1}), x - x^{k-1} \rangle + \frac{L_i}{2} \|x - x^{k-1}\|^2, \quad \forall i \in [m].$$

This is equivalent to $x^k \in \mathcal{X}_k \cap \text{dom } \chi_0$, implying that $\mathcal{X}_k \cap \text{dom } \chi_0$ is nonempty. We conclude that x^{k+1} is well-defined. Hence, by induction, we conclude that $\{x^k\}$ is a well-defined sequence. Furthermore, in view of $x^k \in \text{dom } \chi_0$, relation (3.7) and the fact that $\eta_i^k < \eta_i$, we have $x^k \in \text{dom } \chi_0 \cap \{x : \psi_i(x) \leq \eta_i, i = 1, \dots, m\}$. Hence, the whole sequence $\{x^k\}$ remains feasible for the original problem.

Now, let us apply Lemma 1 with $g(x) = \langle \nabla f_0(x^k), x \rangle + \chi_0(x) + \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}_k}(x)$ and $\gamma = L_0$. Then, for any $x \in \text{dom } \chi_0 \cap \mathcal{X}_k$, we have

$$\langle \nabla f_0(x^k), x^{k+1} - x \rangle + \chi_0(x^{k+1}) - \chi_0(x) \leq -L_0 \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2.$$

Placing $x = x^k$ in the above relation, we have

$$\langle \nabla f_0(x^k), x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \chi_0(x^{k+1}) - \chi_0(x^k) \leq -L_0 \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2. \quad (3.8)$$

Moreover, since $f_0(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz smooth, we have that

$$f_0(x^{k+1}) \leq f_0(x^k) + \langle f_0(x^k), x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \frac{L_0}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2.$$

Summing up the above two inequalities and using the definition $\psi_0 = f_0 + \chi_0$, we conclude (3.5). Hence, the sequence $\{\psi_0(x^k)\}$ is monotonically decreasing. The convergence of $\{\psi_0(x^k)\}$ follows from the lower boundedness assumption.

Part 2). Note that (3.7) ensures the strict feasibility of x^k w.r.t. the constraint set \mathcal{X}_k for the k -th subproblem. Therefore, Slater's condition for (3.1) and the optimality of x^{k+1} imply that there must exist a vector $\lambda^{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ satisfying KKT condition (3.6). Hence we complete the proof. \square

In order to show convergence to the KKT solutions, we need the following constraint qualifications.

Assumption 3 (Strong MFCQ). *All the feasible points of problem (1.1) satisfy MFCQ.*

We state the main asymptotic convergence property of LCPG in the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that Assumption 3 holds, then we have the following conclusions.*

1. The dual solutions $\{\lambda^{k+1}\}$ are bounded from above. Namely, there exists a constant $B > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq k \leq \infty} \|\lambda^{k+1}\| < B. \quad (3.9)$$

2. Every limit point of Algorithm 1 is a KKT point.

Proof. Part 1). First, we can immediately see that $\{x^k\}$ is a bounded sequence and hence the limit point exists. This result is from Assumption 1.3 and the feasibility of x^k for problem (1.1) (c.f. Proposition 2, Part 1). Without loss of generality, we can assume $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x^k = \bar{x}$. For the sake of contradiction, suppose that λ^{k+1} is unbounded, then passing to a subsequence if necessary, we can assume $\|\lambda^{k+1}\| \rightarrow \infty$ for simplicity. Note that we also have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 = 0$ due to the sufficient descent property (3.5). From the KKT condition (3.6), we have

$$\psi_0^k(x) + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, \psi^k(x) - \eta^k \rangle \geq \psi_0^k(x^{k+1}) + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, \psi^k(x^{k+1}) - \eta^k \rangle, \quad \forall x \in \text{dom } \chi_0. \quad (3.10)$$

Let $X := \bigcap_{i \in [m]} \{x : \psi_i(x) \leq \eta_i\} \cap \text{dom } \chi_0$ be the feasible domain for problem (1.1). Due to the fact that $x^k \in X$ (Proposition 2), boundedness of X (Assumption 1.3) and strong convexity of ψ_0^k , there exists $l_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $X \subset \{x : \psi_0^k(x) < l_0\}$ for all k . Then, using (3.10) for all $x \in \text{dom } \chi_0 \cap \{\psi_0^k(x) \leq l_0\}$ and dividing both sides by $\|\lambda^{k+1}\|$, we have

$$\psi_0^k(x)/\|\lambda^{k+1}\| + \langle \lambda^{k+1}/\|\lambda^{k+1}\|, \psi^k(x) \rangle \geq \psi_0^k(x^{k+1})/\|\lambda^{k+1}\| + \langle \lambda^{k+1}/\|\lambda^{k+1}\|, \psi^k(x^{k+1}) \rangle. \quad (3.11)$$

Let us take $k \rightarrow \infty$ on both sides of (3.11). Note that for all $x \in \text{dom } \chi_0 \cap \{\psi_0^k(x) \leq l_0\}$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi_0^k(x)/\|\lambda^{k+1}\| = 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi_0^k(x^{k+1})/\|\lambda^{k+1}\| = 0, \quad (3.12)$$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi_i^k(x) = f_i(\bar{x}) + \langle \nabla f_i(\bar{x}), x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{L_i}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 + \chi_i(x), \quad i \in [m], \quad (3.13)$$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi_i^k(x^{k+1}) = f_i(\bar{x}) + \chi_i(\bar{x}) = \psi_i(\bar{x}), \quad i \in [m], \quad (3.14)$$

where (3.12) is due to boundedness of $\psi_0^k(x)$ on $\text{dom } \chi_0 \cap \{\psi_0^k(x) \leq l_0\}$ and boundedness of $\psi_0^k(x^{k+1})$ since $x^{k+1} \in X$ which is a bounded set. Moreover, (3.13) and (3.14) use the continuity of $f_i(x)$ and $\chi_i(x)$, $i \in [m]$. Next, we consider the sequence $\{u^k = \lambda^{k+1}/\|\lambda^{k+1}\|\}$. Since $\|u^k\|$ is a bounded sequence, it has a convergent subsequence. Let \bar{u} be a limit point of $\{u^k\}$ and the subsequence $\{j_k\} \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots\}$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u^{j_k} = \bar{u}$. Since the subsequence of a convergent sequence is also convergent, we pass to the subsequence j_k in (3.11) and apply (3.12), (3.13) and (3.14), yielding

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{u}_i [\langle \nabla f_i(\bar{x}), x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{L_i}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 + \chi_i(x)] \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{u}_i \chi_i(\bar{x}), \quad (3.15)$$

for all $x \in \text{dom } \chi_0 \cap \{\psi_0^k(x) \leq l_0\}$. Hence, \bar{x} minimizes $\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{u}_i [\langle \nabla f_i(\bar{x}), x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{L_i}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 + \chi_i(x)]$ on $\text{dom } \chi_0 \cap \{\psi_0^k(x) \leq l_0\}$. Now noting $\bar{x} \in X \subset \{\psi_0^k(x) < l_0\}$ and using stationarity condition for optimality of \bar{x} , we have

$$0 \in \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{u}_i [\nabla f_i(\bar{x}) + \partial \chi_i(\bar{x})] + N_{\text{dom } \chi_0}(\bar{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{u}_i \partial \psi_i(\bar{x}) + N_{\text{dom } \chi_0}(\bar{x}), \quad (3.16)$$

where we dropped the constraint $\psi_0^k(x) \leq l_0$ due to complementary slackness and the fact that $\psi_0^k(\bar{x}) < l_0$.

Let $\mathcal{B} = \{i : \bar{u}_i > 0\}$, then we must have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_i^{j_k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}_i \|\lambda^{j_k}\| = \infty$ for $i \in \mathcal{B}$. Based on complementary slackness, we have $\psi_i^{j_k}(x^{j_k+1}) = \eta_i^{j_k}$ for any $i \in \mathcal{B}$ for large enough k . Due to (3.14), we have the limit: $\psi_i(\bar{x}) = \eta_i$. Therefore, the i -th constraint is active at \bar{x} , i.e. $i \in \mathcal{A}(\bar{x})$. In view of (3.16), there exists subgradients $v_i \in \partial \psi_i(\bar{x})$, $i \in [m]$ and $v_0 \in N_{\text{dom } \chi_0}(\bar{x})$ such that

$$0 = v_0 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \bar{u}_i v_i. \quad (3.17)$$

However, equation (3.17) contradicts to the MFCQ assumption. This is because MFCQ guarantees the existence of $z \in -N_{\text{dom } \chi_0}^*(\bar{x})$ such that $\langle z, v_i \rangle < 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{A}(\bar{x})$, which implies

$$0 = \langle z, v_0 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \bar{u}_i v_i \rangle \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \bar{u}_i \langle z, v_i \rangle \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \bar{u}_i \max_{v \in \partial \psi_i(\bar{x})} \langle z, v \rangle < 0,$$

where the first inequality follows since $z \in -N_{\text{dom } \chi_0}(\bar{x})$ and $v_0 \in N_{\text{dom } \chi_0}(\bar{x})$ implying that $\langle z, v_0 \rangle \leq 0$, the second inequality follow since $\bar{u}_i \geq 0$ and $v_i \in \partial \psi_i(\bar{x})$, and the last strict inequality follows due to MFCQ (c.f. (2.3)) and $\bar{u}_i > 0$ for at least one $i \in \mathcal{B}$. This clearly leads to a contradiction. Hence, we conclude that $\{\lambda^{k+1}\}$ is a bounded sequence and conclude the proof.

Part 2). Without loss of generality, we assume that \bar{x} is the only limit point. Since $\{\lambda^{k+1}\}$ is a bounded sequence, there exists a limit point $\bar{\lambda}$. Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we have $\lambda^{k+1} \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}$.

From the optimality condition $0 \in \partial_x \mathcal{L}_k(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})$, for any x , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \nabla f_0(x^k) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{k+1} \nabla f_i(x^k), x^{k+1} - x \rangle + \chi_0(x^{k+1}) - \chi_0(x) + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, \chi(x^{k+1}) - \chi(x) \rangle \\ & \leq \frac{L_0 + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle}{2} [\|x - x^k\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 - \|x - x^{k+1}\|^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Let us take $k \rightarrow \infty$ on both sides of (3.18). We note that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x^k - x^{k+1}\| = 0$ due to Proposition 2, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \chi_i(x^{k+1}) = \chi_i(\bar{x})$ due to the continuity of χ_i ($i \in [m]$), and $\chi_0(\bar{x}) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \chi_0(x^k)$ due to the lower semi-continuity of $\chi_0(\cdot)$. It then follows that

$$\langle \nabla f_0(\bar{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{\lambda}_i \nabla f_i(\bar{x}), \bar{x} - x \rangle + \chi_0(\bar{x}) - \chi_0(x) + \langle \bar{\lambda}, \chi(\bar{x}) - \chi(x) \rangle \leq 0.$$

In other words, \bar{x} is the minimizer of convex optimization problem $\min_x \langle \nabla f_0(\bar{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{\lambda}_i \nabla f_i(\bar{x}), x \rangle + \chi_0(x) + \bar{\lambda}[\chi(x) - \eta]$ over $\text{dom } \chi_0$. Hence we have

$$0 \in \nabla f_0(\bar{x}) + \partial \chi_0(\bar{x}) + \langle \bar{\lambda}, \partial \psi(\bar{x}) \rangle. \quad (3.19)$$

In addition, using the complementary slackness, we have

$$0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{k+1} [\psi_i^k(x^{k+1}) - \eta_i^k]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{k+1} [f_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla f_i(x^k), x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \frac{L_i}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + \chi_i(x^{k+1}) - \eta_i^k] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{\lambda}_i [f_i(\bar{x}) + \chi_i(\bar{x}) - \eta_i] \\
&= \langle \bar{\lambda}, \psi(\bar{x}) - \eta \rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

due to the convergence $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^{k+1} = \bar{\lambda}$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta^k = \eta$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \chi(x^{k+1}) = \chi(\bar{x})$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| = 0$. Putting (3.19) and (3.20) together, we conclude that $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$ satisfies the KKT condition. \square

Remark 1. To show the existence of a limit point \bar{x} , we use Assumption 1.3 to ensure that the sequence x^k remains in a bounded domain. For the sake of conciseness, we henceforth assume the existence of a limit point \bar{x} and do not delve into the technical assumption used to ensure this condition. Moreover, it should be noted that the boundedness property can be obtained under other assumptions, .e.g., assuming the compactness of sublevel set $\{x : \psi_0(x) \leq \psi_0(x^0)\}$ and using the sufficient descent condition (3.5), we can immediately show the existence of \bar{x} . However, it appears to be more challenging to show convergence via this approach when sufficient descent condition fails (e.g., in the forthcoming stochastic optimization).

We next develop some non-asymptotic result of Algorithm 1.

Lemma 2. In Algorithm 1, for $k = 1, 2, \dots$, we have

$$\|\partial_x \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_- \leq 2(L_0 + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle) \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|. \tag{3.21}$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{L}_k be the Lagrangian function of subproblem (3.1):

$$\mathcal{L}_k(x, \lambda) = \psi_0^k(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i [\psi_i^k(x) - \eta_i^k]. \tag{3.22}$$

Using (2.1) and (3.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_x \mathcal{L}_k(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1}) \\
&= \nabla f_0(x^k) + L_0(x^{k+1} - x^k) + \partial \chi_0(x^{k+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{k+1} [\nabla f_i(x^k) + L_i(x^{k+1} - x^k) + \partial_x \chi_i(x^{k+1})] \\
&= \partial_x \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1}) + \nabla f_0(x^k) - \nabla f_0(x^{k+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{k+1} [\nabla f_i(x^k) - \nabla f_i(x^{k+1})] \\
&\quad + (L_0 + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle)(x^{k+1} - x^k).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Using the smoothness of $f_i(x)$, the optimality condition $0 \in \partial_x \mathcal{L}_k(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})$ and the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\|\partial_x \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_- \leq 2L_0 \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| + 2\langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|. \tag{3.24}$$

Hence we conclude the proof. \square

In view of Lemma 2, we derive the complexity of LCPG to attain approximate KKT solutions in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. Let $\alpha_k > 0$ ($k = 0, 1, \dots, K$) be a non-decreasing sequence and suppose that Assumption 3 holds, then there exists a constant $B > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\partial_x \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_-^2 \leq 8(L_0 + B\|L\|)^2 D^2 \alpha_K, \tag{3.25}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \langle \lambda^{k+1}, |\psi(x^{k+1}) - \eta| \rangle \leq 2B\|L\| D^2 \alpha_K + B \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\eta - \eta^k\|, \tag{3.26}$$

where $D = \sqrt{\frac{\psi_0(x^0) - \psi_0^*}{L_0}}$. Moreover, if we choose the index $\hat{k} \in \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$ with probability $\mathbb{P}(\hat{k} = k) = \alpha_k / (\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k)$, then $x^{\hat{k}+1}$ is a randomized ϵ_K type-I KKT point with

$$\epsilon_K = \frac{1}{\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k} \max \{8(L_0 + B\|L\|)^2 D^2 \alpha_K, 2B\|L\| D^2 \alpha_K + B \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\eta - \eta^k\|\} \tag{3.27}$$

Proof. From the sufficient descent property (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{L_0} \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k [\psi_0(x^k) - \psi_0(x^{k+1})] \\
&= \frac{2}{L_0} [\alpha_0 \psi_0(x^0) + \sum_{k=1}^K (\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1}) \psi_0(x^k) - \alpha_K \psi_0(x^{K+1})] \\
&\leq \frac{2\alpha_K}{L_0} [\psi_0(x^0) - \psi_0(x^{K+1})] \\
&\leq \frac{2\alpha_K}{L_0} [\psi_0(x^0) - \psi_0(x^*)] = 2\alpha_K D^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

where the second inequality use the monotonicity of sequence $\psi_0(x^k)$. In view of Theorem 1 and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have $\langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle \leq \|\lambda^{k+1}\| \|L\| \leq B \|L\|$. This relation and (3.21) implies

$$\|\partial_x \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|^2 \leq 4(L_0 + B \|L\|)^2 \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2.$$

Combining the above inequality with (3.28) immediately yields (3.25).

Next, we bound the error of complementary slackness. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{k+1} |\psi_i(x^{k+1}) - \eta_i| &= \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{k+1} |\psi_i^k(x^{k+1}) - \eta_i^k - (\eta_i - \eta_i^k) + \psi_i(x^{k+1}) - \psi_i^k(x^{k+1})| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m [\lambda_i^{k+1} |\psi_i^k(x^{k+1}) - \eta_i^k| + \lambda_i^{k+1} (\eta_i - \eta_i^k)] \\ &\quad + \lambda_i^{k+1} |f_i(x^{k+1}) - f_i(x^k) - \langle \nabla f_i(x^k), x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle - \frac{L_i}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{k+1} (\eta_i - \eta_i^k) + \lambda_i^{k+1} L_i \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\ &\leq B \|\eta - \eta^k\| + B \|L\| \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

where the first inequality uses the triangle inequality, the second inequality uses complementary slackness and the Lipschitz smoothness of $f_i(\cdot)$, and the last inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and boundedness of λ^{k+1} . Summing up (3.29) weighted by α_k for $k = 0, \dots, K$, we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \langle \lambda^{k+1}, |\psi(x^{k+1}) - \eta| \rangle \leq \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k [B \|L\| \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + B \|\eta - \eta^k\|].$$

Combining the above result with (3.28) gives (3.26). Finally, the fact that $x^{\hat{k}+1}$ is a randomized ϵ_K type-I KKT point for ϵ_K defined in (3.27) is immediately follows from (3.25), (3.26) and Definition 3. \square

The following corollary shows that the output of Algorithm 1 is a randomized $\mathcal{O}(1/K)$ KKT point under more specific parameter selection.

Corollary 1. *In Algorithm 1, suppose that all the assumptions of Theorem 2 hold. Set $\delta^k = \frac{\eta - \eta^0}{(k+1)(k+2)}$ and $\alpha_k = k + 1$. Then $x^{\hat{k}+1}$ is a randomized ϵ Type-I KKT point with*

$$\epsilon = \frac{2}{K+2} \max \{8(L_0 + B \|L\|)^2 D^2, 2B \|L\| D^2 + B \|\eta - \eta^0\|\} \quad (3.30)$$

Proof. Notice that $\alpha_K = K + 1$, $\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k = \frac{(K+1)(K+2)}{2}$. Moreover, for $i \in [m]$ and $k \geq 0$, we have

$$\eta_i^k = \eta_i^0 + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \delta^i = \eta_i^0 + (\eta_i - \eta_i^0) \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{(i+1)(i+2)} = \frac{k}{k+1} \eta_i + \frac{1}{k+1} \eta_i^0,$$

which implies that $\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\eta - \eta^k\| = (K + 1) \|\eta - \eta^0\|$. Plugging these values into (3.27) gives us the desired conclusion. \square

Remark 2. *Corollary 1 shows that the gradient complexity of LCPG for smooth composite constrained problems is on a par with that of gradient descent for unconstrained optimization problems. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first complexity result for constrained problem when the constraint functions can be nonsmooth. Note that the convergence rate involves the unknown bound B on the Lagrangian multipliers. The presence of such a constant is not new in nonlinear programming literature [1, 8, 11, 9, 10]. Fortunately, we can safely implement LCPG method since the step-size scheme does not rely on B . On the other hand, the bound B is often a problem-dependent quantity. E.g., in [4] authors show a class of problems for which an a priori bound B can be established, or [5] shows the exact value of B for class of nonconvex relaxations of sparse optimization problems. In such cases, our comparisons are arguably fair. Hence, throughout the paper, we make comparative statements under the assumption that B largely depends on the problem.*

4 Stochastic optimization

The goal of this section is to extend our proposed framework to stochastic constrained optimization where the objective f_0 is an expectation function:

$$f_0(x) := \mathbb{E}_{\xi \in \Xi} [F(x, \xi)]. \quad (4.1)$$

Here, $F(x, \xi)$ is differentiable and ξ denotes a random variable following from some distribution Ξ . In general, it can be very difficult to evaluate either the objective or the gradient of f_0 directly. In order to handle such stochastic nature of the objective, we make some additional assumptions.

Assumption 4. *The information of f_0 is available via a stochastic first-order oracle (SFO). Given any input x and a random sample ξ , SFO outputs a stochastic gradient $\nabla F(x, \xi)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\nabla F(x, \xi)] = \nabla f_0(x), \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla F(x, \xi) - \nabla f_0(x)\|^2] \leq \sigma^2,$$

for some $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$.

4.1 Level constrained stochastic proximal gradient In Algorithm 2, we present a stochastic variant of LCPG for solving problem 1.1 with f_0 defined by (4.1). As observed in (4.2) and (4.3), the LCSPG method uses a mini-batch of random samples to estimate the true gradient in each iteration. It should be noted that the value $f_0(x^k)$ is presented in (4.3) only for the ease of description, it is not required when solving (3.1). Note that proximal point method of [4] does not need to account for a stochastic nonconvex problem

Algorithm 2: Level constrained stochastic proximal gradient (LCSPG)

Input: $x^0, \eta^0 < \eta, b_k, \delta^k$;

for $k=0, 1, 2, \dots, K$ **do**

 Sample a mini-batch B_k of size b_k and compute

$$G^k = \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=1}^{m_k} \nabla F(x^k, \xi_{i,k}); \quad (4.2)$$

 Set $\psi_0^k(x)$ by

$$\psi_0^k(x) := f_0(x^k) + \langle G^k, x - x^k \rangle + \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|x - x^k\|^2 + \chi_i(x); \quad (4.3)$$

 For $i = 1, \dots, m$, set $\psi_i^k(x)$ by (3.2);

 Update x^{k+1} by (3.1) and update η^{k+1} by (3.3);

end

Output: $x^{\hat{k}+1}$ where \hat{k} is a random index sampled from $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, K\}$.

separately since they solve corresponding stochastic convex subproblems using a ConEx method developed in their work. On the contrary, LCSPG directly applies to stochastic nonconvex function constrained problems and convex subproblems are deterministic in nature. Hence, we need to develop asymptotic convergence and convergence rates for the LCSPG method separately.

Let $\zeta^k = G^k - \nabla f(x^k)$ denote the error of gradient estimation. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta^k\|^2] = \frac{1}{b_k^2} \sum_{i=1}^{b_k} \mathbb{E}_\xi[\|\nabla F(x^k, \xi_{i,k}) - \nabla f(x^k)\|^2] \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{b_k}.$$

The following proposition summarizes some important properties about the generated solutions of LCSPG.

Proposition 3. *In Algorithm 2, for any $\beta_k \in (0, 2\gamma_k - L_0)$, we have*

$$\psi_0(x^{k+1}) \leq \psi_0(x^k) - \frac{2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + \frac{\|\zeta^k\|^2}{2\beta_k}. \quad (4.4)$$

Moreover, there exists a vector $\lambda^{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ such that the KKT condition (3.6) (with ψ_0^k defined in (4.3)) holds.

Proof. By the KKT condition, x^{k+1} is the minimizer of $\mathcal{L}_k(\cdot, \lambda^{k+1})$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_k(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1}) + \frac{\gamma_k + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \leq \mathcal{L}_k(x, \lambda^{k+1}), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (4.5)$$

Placing $x = x^k$ in (4.5) and using (3.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle G^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \chi_0(x^{k+1}) - \chi_0(x^k) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{k+1} [\psi_i^k(x^k) - \eta_i^k] - \lambda_i^{k+1} [\psi_i^k(x^{k+1}) - \eta_i^k] - \gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\ & \leq -\gamma_k \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where the second inequality is due to the complementary slackness $\lambda_i^{k+1} [\psi_i^k(x^{k+1}) - \eta_i^k] = 0$ and strict feasibility $\lambda_i^{k+1} [\psi_i^k(x^k) - \eta_i^k] = \lambda_i^{k+1} [\psi_i(x^k) - \eta_i^k] < 0$. Using (4.6) and Lipschitz smoothness of f_0 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(x^{k+1}) &= f_0(x^{k+1}) + \chi_0(x^{k+1}) \\ &\leq f_0(x^k) + \langle \nabla f_0(x^k), x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \frac{L_0}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + \chi_0(x^{k+1}) \\ &\leq f_0(x^k) + \chi_0(x^{k+1}) + \langle G^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \frac{L_0}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 - \langle \zeta^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle \\ &\leq \psi_0(x^k) - \frac{2\gamma_k - L_0}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 - \langle \zeta^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle \\ &= \psi_0(x^k) - \frac{2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + \|\zeta^k\| \cdot \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| - \frac{\beta_k}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \psi_0(x^k) - \frac{2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + \frac{\|\zeta^k\|^2}{2\beta_k}. \quad (4.7)$$

The existence of KKT condition follows a similar argument of proving part 2, Proposition 2. \square

We prove a technical result in the following lemma which plays a crucial role in proving boundedness of the dual.

Lemma 3. *Let $\{X_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random vectors such that $\mathbb{E}[X_k] = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 \leq M < \infty$ where $\sigma_k := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|X_k\|^2]}$. Then, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} X_k = 0$ almost surely (a.s.).*

Proof. We prove this result by contradiction. If the result does not hold then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\limsup_k \|X_k\| \geq \epsilon\right) \geq c. \quad (4.8)$$

However, due to Chebyshev's inequality, we have $\mathbb{P}(\|X_k\| \geq \epsilon) \leq \frac{\sigma_k^2}{\epsilon^2}$. Since σ_k^2 is summable, there exists k_0 such that $\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\|X_k\| \geq \epsilon) \leq \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma_k^2}{\epsilon^2} < c$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\limsup_k \|X_k\| \geq \epsilon\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\limsup_{k \geq k_0} \|X_k\| \geq \epsilon\right) \leq \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\|X_k\| \geq \epsilon) < c.$$

The above relation contradicts (4.8). Hence, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} X_k = 0$ a.s. \square

In the following theorem, we present the main asymptotic property of LCSPG.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k^{-1} < \infty$, then we have that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| = 0$, a.s. Moreover, suppose that Assumption 3 holds, $\gamma_k < \infty$, β_k is lower bounded and $2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0 > 0$, then we have that 1) $\sup_k \|\lambda^k\| < \infty$ a.s., and 2) all the limit points of Algorithm 2 satisfy the KKT condition, a.s.*

Proof. First we fix notations. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be the probability space defined over the sampling minibatches B_0, B_1, \dots . Let $\mathbb{E}_k[\cdot]$ be the expectation conditioned on the sub σ -algebra generating B_0, B_1, \dots, B_{k-1} . Applying it to (4.4) gives

$$\mathbb{E}_k[\psi_0(x^{k+1})] \leq \psi_0(x^k) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2b_k \beta_k}.$$

In view of the super-martingale convergence theorem [23], we have that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi_0(x^k) \text{ exists and is finite a.s., when } \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (b_k \beta_k)^{-1} < \infty. \quad (4.9)$$

Let $C_{k+1} = \sum_{s=0}^k \frac{2\gamma_s - \beta_s - L_0}{2} \|x^{s+1} - x^s\|^2$ for $k \geq 0$ and $C_0 = 0$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}_k[\psi_0(x^{k+1}) + C_{k+1}] \leq \psi_0(x^k) + C_k + \frac{\sigma^2}{2b_k \beta_k}.$$

Applying the super-martingale convergence theorem [23] again we can show that the limit of $\psi_0(x^k) + C_k$ exists a.s. Together with (4.9) and lower-boundedness of β_k and $2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0$, we have that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 = 0$, a.s.

Next, we prove the boundedness of $\|\lambda^k\|$. Let us consider the events

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} &= \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \sup_k \|\lambda^k(\omega)\| = \infty \right\}, \quad \mathcal{A} = \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \sup_k \|G^k(\omega)\| < \infty \right\}, \\ \mathcal{B} &= \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \lim_k \|x^{k+1}(\omega) - x^k(\omega)\| = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We just argued $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) = 1$. It is easy to see that if both conditions (i) $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) = 1$ and (ii) $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^c \cup \mathcal{B}^c$ hold, then we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c) = 0$. Hence $\{\lambda^k\}$ is a bounded sequence a.s.

Since $\{b_k^{-1}\}$ is summable, we have $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta^k\|^2] \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{b_k} < \infty$. Hence, using Lemma 3, we have that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \zeta^k = 0$ a.s. Due to the boundedness of $\nabla f(x^k)$, we have that $G^k = \zeta^k + \nabla f(x^k)$ is bounded, a.s.

We prove condition (ii) by contradiction. Suppose that our claim fails. We take an element $\omega \in \mathcal{U} \cap (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B})$ and then pass to a subsequence $\{j_k\}$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda^{j_k}(\omega)\| = \infty$. In the rest of the proof, we skip ω for brevity. Passing to another subsequence if necessary, let \bar{x} be a limit point of $\{x^{j_k}\}$. By our presumption, \bar{x} satisfies MFCQ. Moreover, the KKT condition implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle G^{j_k}, x^{j_k+1} \rangle + \chi_0(x^{j_k+1}) + \frac{\gamma_{j_k}}{2} \|x^{j_k+1} - x^{j_k}\|^2 + \langle \lambda^{j_k+1}, \psi^{j_k}(x^{j_k+1}) \rangle \\ &\leq \langle G^{j_k}, x \rangle + \chi_0(x) + \frac{\gamma_{j_k}}{2} \|x - x^{j_k}\|^2 + \langle \lambda^{j_k+1}, \psi^{j_k}(x) \rangle, \quad \forall x \in \text{dom } \chi_0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Dividing both sides by $\|\lambda^{j_k+1}\|$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & [\langle G^{j_k}, x^{j_k+1} \rangle + \chi_0(x^{j_k+1}) + \frac{\gamma_{j_k}}{2} \|x^{j_k+1} - x^{j_k}\|^2] / \|\lambda^{j_k+1}\| + \langle u^k, \psi^{j_k}(x^{j_k+1}) \rangle \\ & \leq [\langle G^{j_k}, x \rangle + \chi_0(x) + \frac{\gamma_{j_k}}{2} \|x - x^{j_k}\|^2] / \|\lambda^{j_k+1}\| + \langle u^k, \psi^{j_k}(x) \rangle, \quad \forall x \in \text{dom } \chi_0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where we denote $u^k = \frac{\lambda^{j_k+1}}{\|\lambda^{j_k+1}\|}$. Since $\{u^k\}$ is bounded, passing to a subsequence if needed, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u^k = \bar{u}$. Since $\omega \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$, $\{G^{j_k}\}$ is bounded and $\{\frac{\gamma_{j_k}}{2} \|x^{j_k+1} - x^{j_k}\|^2\}$ converges to 0. Therefore, taking $k \rightarrow \infty$ on both sides of (4.11), we have

$$\langle \bar{u}, \chi(\bar{x}) \rangle \leq \langle \bar{u}, \psi(\bar{x}) + \langle \nabla \psi(\bar{x}), x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 + \chi(x) \rangle, \quad \forall x \in \text{dom } \chi_0. \quad (4.12)$$

Analogous to the proof of Theorem 1, it is easy to show that \bar{x} violates MFCQ, which however, contradicts to Assumption 3. As a consequence of this argument, we have $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^c \cup \mathcal{B}^c$. Hence, we claim that the event $\sup_k \|\lambda^k\| < \infty$ will happen a.s. and complete our proof of the boundedness condition.

Next, we prove asymptotic convergence to KKT solutions. For any random element ω , let $\bar{x}(\omega)$ be any limit point of $\{x^k\}$. Passing to some subsequence if necessary, we assume that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x^k = \bar{x}$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^{k+1} = \bar{\lambda}$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle G^k + \nabla f(x^k) \lambda^{k+1}, x^{k+1} - x \rangle + \chi_0(x^{k+1}) - \chi_0(x) + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, \chi(x^{k+1}) - \chi(x) \rangle \\ & \leq \frac{\gamma_k + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle}{2} (\|x - x^k\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 - \|x - x^{k+1}\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle G^k, x^{k+1} - x \rangle &= \langle \nabla f_0(x^k), x^{k+1} - x \rangle + \langle \zeta^k, x^{k+1} - x \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla f_0(x^k), x^{k+1} - x \rangle + \langle \zeta^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \langle \zeta^k, x^k - x \rangle \\ &\geq \langle \nabla f_0(x^k), x^{k+1} - x \rangle - \|\zeta^k\| \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| + \langle \zeta^k, x^k - x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two results, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \nabla f_0(x^k) + \nabla f(x^k) \lambda^{k+1}, x^{k+1} - x \rangle + \chi_0(x^{k+1}) - \chi_0(x) + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, \chi(x^{k+1}) - \chi(x) \rangle \\ & \leq \frac{\gamma_k + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle}{2} (\|x - x^k\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 - \|x - x^{k+1}\|^2) + \|\zeta^k\| \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| + \langle \zeta^k, x - x^k \rangle \\ & \leq \frac{\gamma_k + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle}{2} (\|x - x^k\|^2 - \|x - x^{k+1}\|^2) + \frac{\|\zeta^k\|^2}{2(\gamma_k + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle)} + \langle \zeta^k, x - x^k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $k \rightarrow \infty$ in the above relation and noting that almost surely we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \zeta^k = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x^k - x^{k+1}\| = 0$, then

$$\langle \nabla f_0(\bar{x}) + \nabla f(\bar{x}) \bar{\lambda}^{k+1}, \bar{x} - x \rangle + \chi_0(\bar{x}) - \chi_0(x) + \langle \bar{\lambda}^{k+1}, \chi(\bar{x}) - \chi(x) \rangle \leq 0, \quad a.s.$$

Using an argument similar to the one in Theorem 1, we can show that \bar{x} is almost surely a KKT point. \square

Our next goal is to develop the iteration complexity of Algorithm 2. To achieve this goal, we need to assume that the dual is uniformly bounded, namely, condition (3.9) holds for all the random events. While this condition is stronger than the almost sure boundedness of λ^{k+1} shown by Theorem 3, it is indeed satisfied in many scenarios (see [4, 5]). We present the main complexity result in the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *Suppose that condition (3.9) holds. Then, the sequence $\{(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\}$ satisfies that*

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\alpha_k (2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0)}{4(\gamma_k + L_0 + 2B\|L\|)^2} \|\partial \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_-^2 \leq L_0 D^2 \alpha_K + \sum_{k=0}^K \left(\frac{\alpha_k (2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0)}{2(\gamma_k + L_0 + 2B\|L\|)^2} + \frac{\alpha_K}{2\beta_k} \right) \|\zeta^k\|^2 \quad (4.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k (2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0) \langle \lambda^{k+1}, |\psi(x^{k+1}) - \eta| \rangle &\leq 2BL_0 \|L\| D^2 \alpha_K + B\|L\| \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\alpha_K \|\zeta^k\|^2}{\beta_k} \\ &\quad + B \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k (2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0) \|\eta - \eta^k\|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Proof. First, appealing to (4.3), (2.1) and (3.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \mathcal{L}_k(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1}) &= \partial \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1}) + \nabla f_0(x^k) - \nabla f_0(x^{k+1}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{k+1} [\nabla f_i(x^k) - \nabla f_i(x^{k+1})] + (\gamma_k + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle) (x^{k+1} - x^k) + \zeta^k. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_- \\ & \leq \|\nabla f_0(x^k) - \nabla f_0(x^{k+1})\| + \|\zeta^k\| + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{k+1} \|\nabla f_i(x^k) - \nabla f_i(x^{k+1})\| + (\gamma_k + \langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle) \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \\ & \leq (\gamma_k + L_0 + 2\langle \lambda^{k+1}, L \rangle) \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| + \|\zeta^k\|. \end{aligned}$$

In view of the above result and basic inequality $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$, we have

$$\|\partial\mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_-^2 \leq 2(\gamma_k + L_0 + 2B\|L\|)^2 \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + 2\|\zeta^k\|^2. \quad (4.15)$$

Let us denote an auxiliary sequence $C_k = \begin{cases} \psi_0(x^0) & k = 0 \\ \psi_0(x^k) - \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \frac{\|\zeta^s\|^2}{2\beta_s} & k > 0 \end{cases}$. Lemma 3 implies that

$$\frac{2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \leq C_k - C_{k+1}. \quad (4.16)$$

Putting this relation and (4.15) together, we have

$$\frac{2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0}{4(\gamma_k + L_0 + 2B\|L\|)^2} \|\partial\mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_-^2 \leq C_k - C_{k+1} + \frac{2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0}{2(\gamma_k + L_0 + 2B\|L\|)^2} \|\zeta^k\|^2. \quad (4.17)$$

Summing up (4.17) over $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$ weighted by α_k leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\alpha_k(2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0)}{4(\gamma_k + L_0 + 2B\|L\|)^2} \|\partial\mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_-^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k(C_k - C_{k+1}) + \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\alpha_k(2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0)}{2(\gamma_k + L_0 + 2B\|L\|)^2} \|\zeta^k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $\{C_k\}$ is monotonically decreasing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k(C_k - C_{k+1}) & \leq \alpha_0 C_0 + \sum_{k=1}^K (\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1})C_k - \alpha_K C_{K+1} \\ & \leq \alpha_K(C_0 - C_{K+1}) \leq L_0 D^2 \alpha_K + \alpha_K \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\|\zeta^k\|^2}{2\beta_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two relations leads to our first result (4.13).

For the second part, note that (3.29) remains valid in the stochastic setting. Putting (3.29) and (4.16) together, we obtain

$$(2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0) \langle \lambda^{k+1}, |\psi(x^{k+1}) - \eta\rangle \leq 2B\|L\|(C_k - C_{k+1}) + B(2\gamma_k - \beta_k - L_0) \|\eta - \eta^k\|.$$

Multiplying both ends by α_k and then summing up the resulting terms over $k = 0, \dots, K$ gives (4.14). \square

We next obtain more specific convergence rate by choosing the parameters properly.

Corollary 2. *In Algorithm LCSPG, set $\gamma_k = L_0$, $\beta_k = L_0/2$, $\alpha_k = k + 1$, $b_k = K + 1$ and $\delta^k = \frac{(\eta - \eta^0)}{(k+1)(k+2)}$. Then $x^{\hat{k}+1}$ is a randomized ϵ type-I KKT point with*

$$\epsilon = \frac{4}{K+2} \max \left\{ 8(L_0 + B\|L\|)^2 (D^2 + \frac{17\sigma^2}{16L_0^2}), 2B\|L\|D^2 + \frac{2B\|L\|\sigma^2}{L_0^2} + \frac{B\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{2} \right\}.$$

Proof. Plugging in the value of γ_k , α_k , β_k in the relation (4.13) and taking expectation over all the randomness, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{L_0}{32(L_0 + B\|L\|)^2} \sum_{k=0}^K (k+1) \mathbb{E}[\|\partial\mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_-^2] \\ & \leq L_0 D^2 (K+1) + \sum_{k=0}^K \left(\frac{L_0(k+1)}{16(L_0 + B\|L\|)^2} + \frac{k+1}{L_0} \right) \mathbb{E}[\|\delta^k\|^2] \\ & \leq L_0 D^2 (K+1) + \frac{17\sigma^2}{16L_0} (K+1). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, due to the random sampling of \hat{k} , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{k}}[\|\partial_x \mathcal{L}(x^{\hat{k}+1}, \lambda^{\hat{k}+1})\|_-^2] = \frac{2}{(K+1)(K+2)} \sum_{k=0}^K (k+1) \|\partial_x \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_-^2.$$

Combining the above two results, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\partial\mathcal{L}(x^{\hat{k}+1}, \lambda^{\hat{k}+1})\|_-^2] \leq \frac{32(L_0 + B\|L\|)^2}{K+2} \left(D^2 + \frac{17\sigma^2}{16L_0^2} \right).$$

Second, plugging in the values of γ_k , β_k and δ^k in (4.14), we have

$$\frac{L_0}{2} \sum_{k=0}^K (k+1) \langle \lambda^{k+1}, |\psi(x^{k+1}) - \eta\rangle \leq 2BL_0\|L\|D^2(K+1) + 2B\|L\| \frac{\sigma^2(K+1)}{L_0} + \frac{BL_0\|\eta - \eta^0\|(K+1)}{2}. \quad (4.18)$$

It then follows from (4.18) and the definition of \hat{k} that

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \lambda^{\hat{k}+1}, |\psi(x^{\hat{k}+1}) - \eta\rangle] \leq \frac{4}{K+2} \left\{ 2B\|L\|D^2 + \frac{2B\|L\|\sigma^2}{L_0^2} + \frac{B\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{2} \right\}.$$

This completes our proof. \square

Remark 3. *In order to obtain some ϵ -error in satisfying the type I KKT condition, LCSPG requires a number of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ calls to the SFO, which matches the complexity bound of stochastic gradient descent for unconstrained nonconvex optimization [12]. Moreover, due to minibatching, LCSPG obtains an even better $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ complexity in the number of evaluations of $f_i(x)$ and $\nabla f_i(x)$ ($i \in [m]$).*

4.2 Level constrained stochastic variance reduced gradient descent We consider the finite sum problem:

$$f_0(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \xi_i), \quad (4.19)$$

where each $F(x, \xi_i)$ is Lipschitz smooth with parameter L_0 . To further improve the convergence performance in this setting, we present a new variant of stochastic gradient method by extending the stochastic variance reduced gradient descent to the constrained setting.

Algorithm 3: Level constrained stochastic variance-reduced gradient descent (LCSVRG)

Input: $x^0, x^{-1}, \eta_0 < \eta, T$;
for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$ **do**
 if $k \% T == 0$ **then**
 $G^k = \nabla f_0(x^k)$;
 else
 Sample a mini-batch B_k of size b uniformly at random and compute

$$G^k = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{i \in B_k} [\nabla F(x^k, \xi_i) - \nabla F(x^{k-1}, \xi_i)] + G^{k-1}; \quad (4.20)$$

 end
 Set $\psi_0^k(x)$ by (4.3) and set $\psi_i^k(x)$ by (3.2) for $i \in [m]$;
 Update x^{k+1} by (3.1) and update η^{k+1} by (3.3);
end

We present the level constrained stochastic variance-reduced gradient descent (LCSVRG) in Algorithm 3, which extends the nonconvex variance reduced mirror descent (see [14]) to handle nonlinear constraint. Algorithm 3 can be viewed as a double-loop algorithm in which the outer loop computes the full gradient $\nabla f(x^k)$ once every T iterations and the nested loop performs stochastic proximal gradient updates based on an unbiased estimator of true gradient. In this view, we let k indicate the t -th iteration at the r -th epoch, for some value t and r . Then we use k and (r, t) interchangeably throughout the rest of this section. We keep the notation ζ^k (or $\zeta^{(r,j)}$) for expressing $G^k - \nabla f(x^k)$ and note that $\zeta^{(r,0)} = 0$.

Our next goal is to develop some iteration complexity result of LCSVRG. We skip the asymptotic analysis since it is similar to that of LCSPG. The following Lemma (see [14, Lemma 6.10]) presents a key insight of Algorithm 3 that the variance is controlled by the point distances. We provide a proof for completeness.

Lemma 4. *In Algorithm 3, G^k is an unbiased estimator of $\nabla f_0(x^k)$. Moreover, Let (r, t) correspond to k . If $t > 0$, then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta^{(r,t)}\|^2] \leq \frac{L_0^2}{b} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}[\|x^{(r,i+1)} - x^{(r,i)}\|^2].$$

Proof. We prove the first part by induction. When $k = 0$, we have $G^0 = \nabla f_0(x^0)$. Then for $k > 0$, if $k \% T == 0$, we have $G^k = \nabla f(x^k)$ by definition. Otherwise, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_k[G^k] = \nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^{k-1}) + G^{k-1} = \nabla f_0(x^k)$$

by induction hypothesis $\mathbb{E}_{k-1}[G^{k-1}] = \nabla f(x^{k-1})$.

Next we estimate the variance of stochastic gradient. Appealing to (4.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_k[\|\zeta^k\|^2] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{b} \sum_{i \in B_k} [\nabla F(x^k, \xi_i) - \nabla F(x^{k-1}, \xi_i)] + G^{k-1} - \nabla f(x^k)\right\|^2\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{b} \sum_{i \in B_k} [\nabla F(x^k, \xi_i) - \nabla F(x^{k-1}, \xi_i)] - [\nabla f(x^k) - \nabla f(x^{k-1})] + \zeta^{k-1}\right\|^2\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{b} \sum_{i \in B_k} [\nabla F(x^k, \xi_i) - \nabla F(x^{k-1}, \xi_i) - \nabla f(x^k) + \nabla f(x^{k-1})]\right\|^2 + \|\zeta^{k-1}\|^2\right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{b^2} \sum_{i \in B_k} \mathbb{E}_\xi \|\nabla F(x^k, \xi) - \nabla F(x^{k-1}, \xi)\|^2 + \|\zeta^{k-1}\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{L_0^2}{b} \|x^k - x^{k-1}\|^2 + \|\zeta^{k-1}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality uses the independence of B_k and ζ^{k-1} , the first inequality uses the bound $\text{Var}(x) \leq \mathbb{E}\|x\|^2$, and the second inequality uses the Lipschitz smoothness of $F(\cdot, \xi)$. Taking expectation over all the

randomness generating $B_{(r,1)}, B_{(r,2)}, \dots, B_{(r,t)}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta^k\|^2] \leq \frac{L_0^2}{b} \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbb{E}[\|x^{(r,i)} - x^{(r,i-1)}\|^2].$$

□

The next Lemma shows that the generated solutions satisfy certain property of sufficient descent on expectation.

Lemma 5. *Assume that $\gamma_k = \gamma$ and $\beta_k = \beta$ and $\tilde{L} := \frac{2\gamma - \beta - L_0}{2} - \frac{L_0^2(T-1)}{2\beta b} > 0$. Then we have*

$$\tilde{L} \sum_{j=0}^t \mathbb{E}[\|x^{(r,j+1)} - x^{(r,j)}\|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(r,0)})] - \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(r,t+1)})], \quad 0 \leq t < T. \quad (4.21)$$

Proof. In view of (3), at the j -th iteration of the r -th epoch, we have

$$\psi_0(x^{(r,j+1)}) \leq \psi_0(x^{(r,j)}) - \frac{2\gamma - \beta - L_0}{2} \|x^{(r,j+1)} - x^{(r,j)}\|^2 + \frac{\|\zeta^{(r,j)}\|^2}{2\beta}.$$

Summing up the above result over $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, t$ ($t < T$) and using Lemma 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2\gamma - \beta - L_0}{2} \sum_{j=0}^t \mathbb{E}[\|x^{(r,j+1)} - x^{(r,j)}\|^2] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(r,0)})] - \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(r,t+1)})] + \frac{L_0^2}{2\beta b} \sum_{j=0}^t \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \mathbb{E}[\|x^{(r,i+1)} - x^{(r,i)}\|^2] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(r,0)})] - \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(r,t+1)})] + \frac{L_0^2 t}{2\beta b} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}[\|x^{(r,i+1)} - x^{(r,i)}\|^2] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(r,0)})] - \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(r,t+1)})] + \frac{L_0^2(T-1)}{2\beta b} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}[\|x^{(r,i+1)} - x^{(r,i)}\|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Here we use $\sum_{j=0}^{-1} = 0$. □

We present the main convergence property of Algorithm 3 in the next theorem.

Theorem 5. *Suppose that condition (3.9) and assumptions of Lemma 5 hold, $b \geq 2T$ and $K = r_0T + j_0$ for some $r_0, j_0 \geq 0$. Let $\{\alpha_k\}$ be a non-decreasing sequence and $\{\alpha_{(r,j)}\}$ be its equivalent form in (r, j) notations. Suppose that $\alpha_{(r,j)} = \alpha_{(r,0)}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, T-1$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \mathbb{E}[\|\partial \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_-^2] \leq 8\tilde{L}^{-1} L_0 (\gamma + L_0 + B\|L\|)^2 D^2 \alpha_{(r,0)}, \quad (4.22)$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \mathbb{E}[\langle \lambda^{k+1}, |\psi(x^{k+1}) - \eta| \rangle] \leq B \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\eta - \eta_k\| + B\tilde{L}^{-1} \|L\| L_0 D^2 \alpha_{(r,0)}. \quad (4.23)$$

Moreover, if we take $T = \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$, $b = 8T$, $\gamma = L_0$, $\beta = L_0/2$, and $\alpha_k = T \lfloor k/T \rfloor + 1$, and set $\delta^k = \frac{\eta - \eta^0}{(k+1)(k+2)}$.

Then $x^{\hat{k}+1}$ is a randomized Type-I ϵ -KKT point with

$$\epsilon = \frac{K+1}{(K-T+1)^2} \max \{ 128(2L_0 + B\|L\|)^2 D^2, B\|\eta - \eta^0\| + 16B\|L\| D^2 \}. \quad (4.24)$$

Proof. First, using Lemma 4 and the assumption that $b \geq 2T$, for any $t \leq T-1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^t \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta^{(r,j)}\|^2] & \leq \frac{L_0^2}{b} \sum_{j=0}^t \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \mathbb{E}[\|x^{(r,i+1)} - x^{(r,i)}\|^2] \\ & \leq \frac{L_0^2 t}{b} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}[\|x^{(r,i+1)} - x^{(r,i)}\|^2] \\ & \leq \frac{L_0^2}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}[\|x^{(r,i+1)} - x^{(r,i)}\|^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

Note that (4.15) still holds. Therefore, combining (4.15) and (4.25) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^t \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{L}(x^{(r,j+1)}, \lambda^{(r,j+1)})\|_-^2] & \leq 2(\gamma + L_0 + 2B\|L\|)^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \mathbb{E}[\|x^{(r,j+1)} - x^{(r,j)}\|^2] + 2 \sum_{j=0}^t \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta^{(r,j)}\|^2] \\ & \leq 8(\gamma + L_0 + B\|L\|)^2 \sum_{j=0}^t \mathbb{E}[\|x^{(r,j+1)} - x^{(r,j)}\|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from Lemma 5 that

$$\sum_{j=0}^t \mathbb{E}[\|\partial \mathcal{L}(x^{(r,j+1)}, \lambda^{(r,j+1)})\|_-^2] \leq 8\tilde{L}^{-1} (\gamma + L_0 + B\|L\|)^2 \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(r,0)}) - \psi_0(x^{(r,t+1)})]. \quad (4.26)$$

Let $K = r_0T + j_0$. Summing up the above inequality weighted by α_k and exchanging the notation $\alpha_k \leftrightarrow \alpha_{(r,j)}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \mathbb{E}[\|\partial \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_-^2] \\ & = \sum_{r=0}^{r_0-1} \sum_{j=0}^{T-1} \alpha_{(r,j)} \mathbb{E}[\|\partial \mathcal{L}(x^{(r,j+1)}, \lambda^{(r,j+1)})\|_-^2] + \sum_{j=0}^{j_0} \alpha_{(r_0,j)} \mathbb{E}[\|\partial \mathcal{L}(x^{(r_0,j+1)}, \lambda^{(r_0,j+1)})\|_-^2] \\ & \leq 8\tilde{L}^{-1} (\gamma + L_0 + B\|L\|)^2 \left\{ \sum_{r=0}^{r_0-1} \alpha_{(r,0)} \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(r,0)}) - \psi_0(x^{(r+1,0)})] + \alpha_{(r_0,0)} \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(r_0,0)}) - \psi_0(x^{(r_0,j_0+1)})] \right\} \\ & \leq 8\tilde{L}^{-1} (\gamma + L_0 + B\|L\|)^2 \alpha_{(r_0,0)} \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(0,0)}) - \psi_0(x^{(r_0,j_0+1)})] \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 8\tilde{L}^{-1}L_0(\gamma + L_0 + B\|L\|)^2D^2\alpha_{(r_0,0)}. \quad (4.27)$$

Above, the first inequality applies (4.26) and uses $x^{(r,T)} = x^{(r+1,0)}$ while the second inequality uses the monotonicity of $\{\psi_0(x^k)\}$ and an argument similar to (3.28).

The second part is similar to the argument of Theorem 4. Particularly, combining (3.29) and (4.21) gives

$$\sum_{j=0}^t \mathbb{E} \langle \lambda^{(r,j+1)}, |\psi_i(x^{(r,j+1)}) - \eta \rangle \leq B\tilde{L}^{-1}\|L\| \mathbb{E}[\psi_0(x^{(r,0)}) - \psi_0(x^{(r,t+1)})] + B\sum_{j=0}^t \|\eta - \eta^{(r,j+1)}\| \quad (4.28)$$

Consequently, using the above relation and an argument similar to show (3.28), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \mathbb{E} \langle \lambda^{k+1}, |\psi(x^{k+1}) - \eta \rangle \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^{r_0-1} \sum_{j=0}^{T-1} \alpha_{(r,j)} \mathbb{E} \langle \lambda^{(r,j+1)}, |\psi(x^{(r,j+1)}) - \eta \rangle + \sum_{j=0}^{j_0} \alpha_{(r_0,j)} \mathbb{E} \langle \lambda^{(r_0,j+1)}, |\psi(x^{(r_0,j+1)}) - \eta \rangle \\ &= B\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\eta - \eta_k\| \\ & \quad + B\tilde{L}^{-1}\|L\| \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{r=0}^{r_0-1} \alpha_{(r,0)} [\psi_0(x^{(r,0)}) - \psi_0(x^{(r+1,0)})] + \alpha_{(r_0,0)} [\psi_0(x^{(r_0,0)}) - \psi_0(x^{(r_0,j_0+1)})] \right\} \\ & \leq B\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\eta - \eta_k\| + B\tilde{L}^{-1}\|L\|L_0D^2\alpha_{(r_0,0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we complete the proof of (4.22) and (4.23).

Using the provided parameter setting, we have $\tilde{L} = \frac{2\gamma - L_0 - \beta}{2} - \frac{L_0^2(T-1)}{2\beta b} \geq \frac{L_0}{4} - \frac{L_0}{8} = \frac{L_0}{8}$. Moreover, since $\alpha_k = T \lfloor k/T \rfloor + 1$, we have $\alpha_k \leq T \cdot k/T + 1 \leq k + 1$. It is easy to check

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k = T + \sum_{k=T}^K (\lfloor \frac{k}{T} \rfloor T + 1) \geq T + \sum_{k=T}^K [\lfloor \frac{k}{T} - 1 \rfloor T + 1] \geq \frac{(K-T+1)^2}{2}. \quad \square$$

Remark 4. It is interesting to compare the performance of *LCSVRG* with the other two level constrained first order methods in the finite sum setting (4.19). Similar to *LCPG*, *LCSVRG* runs for $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ iterations to compute Type-I ε -KKT point. Moreover, *LCSVRG* has an appealing feature that the number of stochastic gradient $\nabla F(x, \xi)$ computed can be significantly reduced for large value of n . Specifically, Algorithm 3 requires a full gradient $\nabla f_0(x)$ every T iterations, which contributes $N_1 = \mathcal{O}(n \lfloor \frac{K}{T} \rfloor) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n}K)$ number of stochastic gradient computation. During the other iterations, Algorithm 3 invokes a batch of size $b = \mathcal{O}(T)$ each time, exhibiting a complexity of $N_2 = \mathcal{O}(bK) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n}K)$. Therefore, the total number of stochastic gradient computation is $N = N_1 + N_2 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n}K)$. This is better than the $\mathcal{O}(nK)$ stochastic gradients computed by *LCPG*. Moreover, it is a better than the bound $\mathcal{O}(K^2)$ of *LCSPG* when K is at an order larger than $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ which corresponds to higher accuracy regime of $\varepsilon \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$. The complexities of all the proposed algorithms for getting some ε -KKT solutions are listed in Table 2.

5 Smooth optimization of nonsmooth constrained problems

In this section, we consider the constrained problem (1.1) with a nonsmooth objective and nonsmooth constraint functions. We assume that f_i ($i \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$) exhibits a difference-of-convex (DC) structure $f_i(x) := g_i(x) - h_i(x)$: 1) h_i is an L_{h_i} -Lipschitz-smooth convex function and 2) g_i is a structured nonsmooth convex function:

$$g_i(x) = \max_{y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i} \langle A_i x, y_i \rangle - p_i(y_i),$$

where $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{a_i \times n}$ is a linear mapping, $\mathcal{Y}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{a_i}$ is a convex compact set and $p_i : \mathcal{Y}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex continuous function. In view of such nonsmooth structure, we can not simply apply the *LCPG* method, as the crucial quadratic upperbound on $f_i(x)$ does not hold in the nonsmooth cases. However, as pointed out by Nesterov [22], the nonsmooth convex function g_i can be closely approximated by a smooth convex function. Let us denote $\hat{y}_i := \operatorname{argmin}_{y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i} \|y_i\|$, $D_{\mathcal{Y}_i} := \max_{y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i} \|y_i - \hat{y}_i\|$ and define the approximation function

$$g_i^{\beta_i}(x) := \max_{y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i} \langle A_i x, y_i \rangle - p(y_i) - \frac{\beta_i}{2} \|y_i - \hat{y}_i\|^2, \quad f_i^{\beta_i}(x) := g_i^{\beta_i}(x) - h_i(x), \quad \text{where } \beta_i > 0.$$

Given some properly chosen smoothing parameter β_i , we propose to apply *LCPG* to solve the following smooth approximation problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_x \quad & \psi_0^{\beta_0}(x) = f_0^{\beta_0}(x) + \chi_0(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \psi_i^{\beta_i}(x) = f_i^{\beta_i}(x) + \chi_i(x) \leq \eta_i \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

Prior to the analysis of our algorithm, we need to develop some property of smooth function $f_i^{\beta_i}$. We first

present a key Lemma which builds some important connection between quadratic approximation of smooth function and Lipschitz smoothness. The proof is left in Appendix A.

Lemma 6. *Suppose $p(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable function satisfying*

$$-\frac{\mu}{2}\|x - y\|^2 \leq p(x) - p(y) - \langle \nabla p(y), x - y \rangle \leq \frac{L}{2}\|x - y\|^2, \quad (5.2)$$

for all x, y . Then, $p(\cdot)$ satisfies

$$\|\nabla p(x) - \nabla p(y)\| \leq \max\{L, \mu\}\|x - y\|. \quad (5.3)$$

In smooth approximation, it is shown in [22] that $g_i^{\beta_i}$ is a Lipschitz smooth function and it approximates the function value of g_i with some $\mathcal{O}(\beta_i)$ -error:

$$g_i^{\beta_i}(x) \leq g_i(x) \leq g_i^{\beta_i}(x) + \frac{\beta_i D_{\mathcal{Y}_i}^2}{2}, \quad \forall x, \quad (5.4)$$

$$\|\nabla g_i^{\beta_i}(x) - \nabla g_i^{\beta_i}(z)\| \leq L_{g_i}^{\beta_i}\|x - z\|, \quad \forall x, z, \quad L_{g_i}^{\beta_i} := \frac{\|A_i\|^2}{\beta_i}. \quad (5.5)$$

Similar properties of function $f_i^{\beta_i}$ are developed in the following proposition.

Proposition 4. *We have the following properties about the approximation function $f_i^{\beta_i}$ ($\beta_i > 0$).*

1. Let $\bar{\beta}_i \in [0, \beta_i]$, then we have

$$f_i^{\beta_i}(x) \leq f_i^{\bar{\beta}_i}(x) \leq f_i^{\beta_i}(x) + \frac{(\beta_i - \bar{\beta}_i)D_{\mathcal{Y}_i}^2}{2}. \quad (5.6)$$

2. $f_i^{\beta_i}(x)$ has upper curvature $L_{g_i}^{\beta_i}$ and negative lower curvature $-L_{h_i}$, namely,

$$f_i^{\beta_i}(x) \leq f_i^{\beta_i}(y) + \langle \nabla f_i^{\beta_i}(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{L_{g_i}^{\beta_i}}{2}\|x - y\|^2, \quad (5.7)$$

$$f_i^{\beta_i}(x) \geq f_i^{\beta_i}(y) + \langle \nabla f_i^{\beta_i}(y), x - y \rangle - \frac{L_{h_i}}{2}\|x - y\|^2. \quad (5.8)$$

3. $f_i^{\beta_i}$ is Lipschitz smooth with modulus $L_i^{\beta_i} := \max\{L_{g_i}^{\beta_i}, L_{h_i}\}$. Namely, for any x, y , we have

$$\|\nabla f_i^{\beta_i}(x) - \nabla f_i^{\beta_i}(y)\| \leq L_i^{\beta_i}\|x - y\|. \quad (5.9)$$

Proof. Part 1. If $\bar{\beta} < \beta$, then by definition we have $f_i^{\bar{\beta}_i}(x) \geq f_i^{\beta_i}(x)$. On the other hand, using the boundedness of \mathcal{Y}_i , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^{\beta_i}(x) &= \max_{y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i} \langle A_i x, y_i \rangle - p(y_i) - \frac{\bar{\beta}_i}{2}\|y_i - \hat{y}_i\|^2 - \frac{\beta_i - \bar{\beta}_i}{2}\|y_i - \hat{y}_i\|^2 - h(x) \\ &\geq \max_{y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i} \langle A_i x, y_i \rangle - p(y_i) - \frac{\bar{\beta}_i}{2}\|y_i - \hat{y}_i\|^2 - h(x) - \frac{\beta_i - \bar{\beta}_i}{2}D_{\mathcal{Y}_i}^2 \\ &= f_i^{\bar{\beta}_i}(x) - \frac{\beta_i - \bar{\beta}_i}{2}D_{\mathcal{Y}_i}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two results gives the desired inequality.

Part 2. Since $g_i^{\beta_i}$ and h_i are both convex and smooth functions, we have

$$g_i^{\beta_i}(x_1) \leq g_i^{\beta_i}(x_2) + \langle \nabla g_i^{\beta_i}(x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle + \frac{L_{g_i}^{\beta_i}}{2}\|x_1 - x_2\|^2,$$

$$h_i(x_1) \leq h_i(x_2) - \langle \nabla h_i(x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle.$$

Summing up the above two inequalities and noting the definition of $f_i^{\beta_i}$, $\nabla f_i^{\beta_i}$, we conclude that $f_i^{\beta_i}$ has an upper curvature of $L_{g_i}^{\beta_i}$. Similarly, using convexity of $g_i^{\beta_i}$ and smoothness of h_i , we obtain that $f_i^{\beta_i}$ has a negative lower curvature $-L_{h_i}$.

Part 3. The Lipschitz continuity (5.9) is an immediate consequence of part 2) and Lemma 6. \square

Remark 5. When $\bar{\beta}_i = 0$, Relation (5.6) reads $f_i^{\beta_i}(x) \leq f_i(x) \leq f_i^{\beta_i}(x) + \frac{\beta_i D_{\mathcal{Y}_i}^2}{2}$. Together with Assumption 2, it can be seen that x^0 is also strictly feasible for problem (5.1). This justifies that LCPG is well-defined for problem (5.1).

Remark 6. The Lipschitz constant of $\nabla f_i^{\beta_i}$ can be derived in a different way. Since $\nabla g_i^{\beta_i}$ and ∇h_i are $L_{g_i}^{\beta_i}$ and L_{h_i} Lipschitz continuous, respectively, we can show by triangle inequality that $\nabla f_i^{\beta_i}(x)$ is $L_{g_i}^{\beta_i} + L_{h_i}$ -Lipschitz continuous. In contrast, by exploiting the asymmetry between lower and upper curvature, Proposition 4 derived a slightly sharper bound on the gradient Lipschitz constant.

Throughout this section, we choose specific β_i to ensure $\beta_i D_{\mathcal{Y}_i}^2$ is constant for all $i \in [m]$. Hence, we can define the additive approximation factor above as

$$\nu := \frac{\beta_i D_{\mathcal{Y}_i}^2}{2}, \quad i \in [m]. \quad (5.10)$$

Note that (5.4) provides an approximation error for function values, or the so called zeroth order oracle of function g_i . However, convergence result for nonconvex optimization are generally given in terms of first-order stationarity measure, implying that we need approximation for first-order oracle for function f_i and consequently function g_i . Below we discuss a widely used approximate subdifferential for convex functions and generalize it for nonsmooth nonconvex functions.

Definition 5 (ν -subdifferential). We say that a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a ν -subgradient of the convex function $p(\cdot)$ at x if for any z , we have

$$p(z) \geq p(x) + \langle v, z - x \rangle - \nu.$$

The set of all ν -subgradients of p at x is called the ν -subdifferential, denoted by $\partial^\nu p(x)$. Moreover, we define ν subdifferential of nonconvex function f_i as $\partial^\nu f_i(x) := \partial^\nu g_i(x) + \{-\nabla h_i(x)\}$ where the addition of sets is in Minkowski sense.

Finally, we define a generalization of type-I KKT convergence criterion for structured nonsmooth nonconvex function constrained optimization problem:

Definition 6. We say that a point x is an (ϵ, ν) type-III KKT point of (1.1) if there exists $\lambda \geq 0$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$\|\partial^\nu \psi_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \partial^\nu \psi_i(x)\|_-^2 \leq \epsilon, \quad (5.11)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i |\psi_i(x) - \eta_i| \leq \epsilon, \quad (5.12)$$

$$\|[\psi(x) - \eta]_+\|_1 \leq \epsilon. \quad (5.13)$$

Moreover, we say that x is a randomized (ϵ, ν) type-III KKT point of (1.1) if (5.11), (5.12) and (5.13) are satisfied in expectation.

The ϵ -subdifferential and the type-III KKT point are essential for associating smooth approximation with the original nonsmooth problem. We build some important properties in the following proposition.

Proposition 5. Let β_i and ν satisfy (5.10).

1. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have $\nabla f_i^{\beta_i}(x) \in \partial^\nu f_i(x)$, $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m$.
2. Suppose that x is a (randomized) Type-I ϵ -KKT point of problem (5.1) and λ is the associated dual variable with bound $\|\lambda\| \leq B$, then x is a (randomized) Type-III $(\bar{\epsilon}, \nu)$ -KKT point of problem (1.1) for $\bar{\epsilon} = \max\{\epsilon + B\nu, m\nu\}$.

Proof. Part 1. It suffices to show $\nabla g_i^{\beta_i}(x) \in \partial^\nu g_i(x)$. Due to the convexity of $g_i^{\beta_i}$ and (5.4), we have

$$g_i(z) \geq g_i^{\beta_i}(z) \geq g_i^{\beta_i}(x) + \langle \nabla g_i^{\beta_i}(x), z - x \rangle \geq g_i(x) + \langle \nabla g_i^{\beta_i}(x), z - x \rangle - \frac{\beta_i D_{\mathcal{Y}_i}^2}{2},$$

where the first inequality follows from the first relation in (5.4), and the third inequality follows from second relation in (5.4). Noting the definition of ν -subgradient, we conclude the proof.

Part 2. It suffices to show the conversion of randomized Type-I KKT point to randomized Type-III KKT point. Suppose that x is a randomized Type-I ϵ -KKT point and we have $\|\lambda\|_1 \leq B$. Using Part 1 it is easy to see $\partial \mathcal{L}(x, \lambda) \subseteq \partial^\nu \psi_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \partial^\nu \psi_i(x)$, therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \|\partial^\nu \psi(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \partial^\nu \psi_i(x)\|_-^2 \leq \epsilon.$$

Using Proposition 4, we have

$$\lambda_i (\psi_i^{\beta_i}(x) - \eta_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i (\psi_i(x) - \eta_i) \leq \lambda_i (\psi_i^{\beta_i}(x) - \eta_i) + \lambda_i \nu \leq \lambda_i \nu.$$

This implies

$$|\lambda_i (\psi_i(x) - \eta_i)| \leq \max\{|\lambda_i (\psi_i^{\beta_i}(x) - \eta_i)|, \lambda_i \nu\}.$$

Summing up this inequality over $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, m$ and taking expectation with all the randomness, we have the

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} |\lambda_i (\psi_i(x) - \eta_i)| \leq \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^m |\lambda_i (\psi_i^{\beta_i}(x) - \eta_i)| + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \nu \leq \epsilon + B\nu.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^m [\psi_i(x) - \eta_i]_+ = \sum_{i=1}^m [\psi_i^{\beta_i}(x) - \eta_i + \psi_i(x) - \psi_i^{\beta_i}(x)]_+ \leq \sum_{i=1}^m [\psi_i(x) - \psi_i^{\beta_i}(x)] \leq m\nu.$$

□

Now, we are ready to discuss the convergence rate of LCPG for nonsmooth nonconvex function constrained optimization.

Theorem 6. *Assume that β_i, ν satisfy (5.10) and set $\delta^k = \frac{\eta - \eta^0}{(k+1)(k+2)}$ when running LCPG to solve problem (5.1). Denote $c_i = \|A_i\|^2 D_{y_i}^2$ ($0 \leq i \leq m$), $c = [c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m]^T$ and let $\|\lambda^k\|_1 \leq B$. Suppose that $\nu = o(\frac{c_i}{L_{h_i}})$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m$, then $x^{\hat{k}+1}$ is a randomized Type-III $(\bar{\epsilon}, \nu)$ -KKT point with*

$$\bar{\epsilon} = \mathcal{O}\left\{\frac{2}{K+2}\left[\left(\frac{8(c_0+B\|c\|)^2}{c_0\nu} + \frac{2B\|c\|}{c_0}\right)(\Delta + \nu) + B\|\eta - \eta^0\|\right] + B\nu + m\nu\right\}.$$

Proof. Our analysis resembles the proof of Theorem 2. Using a similar argument in (3.28), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 &\leq \frac{2\alpha_K}{L_0} [\psi_0^{\beta_0}(x^0) - \psi_0^{\beta_0}(x^{K+1})] \\ &\leq \frac{2\alpha_K}{L_0^{\beta_0}} [\psi_0(x^0) - \psi_0(x^{K+1}) + \nu]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

Combining this result with Lemma 2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\partial_x \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})\|_-^2 &\leq 8 \frac{(L_0^{\beta_0} + B\|L^\beta\|)^2}{L_0^{\beta_0}} \alpha_K (\Delta + \nu), \\ \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \langle \lambda^{k+1}, |\psi(x^{k+1}) - \eta| \rangle &\leq 2B \frac{\|L^\beta\|}{L_0^{\beta_0}} \alpha_K (\Delta + \nu) + B \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\eta - \eta^k\|, \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

where $\Delta = \psi_0(x^0) - \psi_0(x^*)$, $\alpha_k \geq 0$ and $L^\beta(x, \lambda) := \psi_0^{\beta_0}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i (\psi_i^{\beta_i}(x) - \eta_i)$. Taking $\delta^k = \frac{\eta - \eta^0}{(k+1)(k+2)}$ and $\alpha_k = k + 1$ in (5.15), we see that $x^{\hat{k}+1}$ is a Type-I ϵ -KKT point for

$$\epsilon = \frac{2}{K+2} \max \left\{ \frac{8(L_0^{\beta_0} + B\|L^\beta\|)^2}{L_0^{\beta_0}} (\Delta + \nu), \frac{2B\|L^\beta\|}{L_0^{\beta_0}} (\Delta + \nu) + B\|\eta - \eta^0\| \right\}.$$

Noting that $L_{g_i}^{\beta_i} = \frac{\|A_i\|^2}{\beta_i} = \frac{\|A_i\|^2 D_{y_i}^2}{2\nu} = \frac{c_i}{2\nu}$ and $\nu = o(\frac{c_i}{L_{h_i}})$, we have $\frac{(L_0^{\beta_0} + B\|L^\beta\|)^2}{L_0^{\beta_0}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(c_0 + B\|c\|)^2}{c_0\nu}\right)$ and $\frac{\|L^\beta\|}{L_0^{\beta_0}} = \frac{\|c\|}{c_0}$. Using the definition of \hat{k} and Proposition 5 we obtain the desired result. □

6 Inexact LCPG

LCPG requires the exact optimal solution of subproblem (3.1), which, however, poses a great challenge when the subproblem is difficult to solve. To alleviate such an issue, we consider an inexact variant of LCPG method for which the update of x^{k+1} only solves problem (3.1) approximately. This section is organized as follows. First, we present a general convergence property of inexact LCPG when the subproblem solutions satisfy certain approximation criterion. Next, we analyze the efficiency of inexact LCPG when the subproblems are handled by different external solvers. When the subproblem is a quadratically constrained quadratic program (QCQP), we propose an efficient interior point algorithm by exploiting the diagonal structure. When the subproblem has general proximal components, we propose to solve it by first order methods. Particularly, we consider solving the subproblem by the constraint extrapolation (ConEx) method and develop the total iteration complexity of ConEx-based LCPG.

6.1 Convergence analysis under an inexactness criterion Throughout the rest of this section, we will denote the exact primal-dual solution of (3.1) as $(\hat{x}^{k+1}, \hat{\lambda}^{k+1})$. We use the following criterion for measuring the accuracy of subproblem solutions.

Definition 7. We say that a point x is an ϵ -solution of (3.1) if

$$\psi_0^k(x) - \psi_0^k(\hat{x}^{k+1}) \leq \epsilon, \quad \|\psi^k(x)\|_+ \leq \epsilon, \quad \mathcal{L}_k(x, \hat{\lambda}^{k+1}) \leq \mathcal{L}_k(\hat{x}^{k+1}, \hat{\lambda}^{k+1}) + \epsilon.$$

The following theorem shows asymptotic convergence to stationarity for inexact LCPG method under mild assumptions. Since the proof is similar to previous argument, we present the details in Appendix B for the sake of completeness. Note that the theorem applies to general nonconvex problem and hence applies to convex problems as well.

Theorem 7. Suppose that Assumption 3 holds and let x^{k+1} be an ϵ_k -solution of (3.1) satisfying $\epsilon_k < \min_{i \in [m]} \delta_i^k$. Then all the conclusions of Theorem 1 still hold. Then the dual sequence $\{\tilde{\lambda}^k\}$ is uniformly bounded by a constant $B > 0$. Moreover, every limit point of inexact LCPG is a KKT point.

Under the inexactness condition in Definition 7, we establish the complexity of inexact LCPG in the following theorem.

Theorem 8. Under the assumptions of Theorem 7, we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\partial_x \mathcal{L}(\tilde{x}^{k+1}, \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1})\|_-^2 \leq \frac{8(L_0 + B\|L\|)^2}{L_0} \tilde{\Delta}, \quad (6.1)$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, |\psi(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) - \eta| \rangle \leq B \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\eta - \eta^k\| + \frac{2B\|L\|}{L_0} \tilde{\Delta}, \quad (6.2)$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|x^k - \tilde{x}^{k+1}\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{L_0} \tilde{\Delta}, \quad (6.3)$$

where $\tilde{\Delta} = \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k [\psi_0(x^k) - \psi_0(x^{k+1}) + \epsilon_k]$. Moreover, if we choose the index $\hat{k} \in \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$ with probability $\mathbb{P}(\hat{k} = k) = \alpha_k / (\sum_{i=0}^K \alpha_i)$, then $x^{\hat{k}}$ is a randomized (ϵ, δ) type-II KKT point with

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &= 1 / (\sum_{i=0}^K \alpha_i) \max \left\{ \frac{8(L_0 + B\|L\|)^2}{L_0} \tilde{\Delta}, B \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\eta - \eta^k\| + \frac{2B\|L\|}{L_0} \tilde{\Delta} \right\}, \\ \delta &= 2\tilde{\Delta} / (L_0 \sum_{i=0}^K \alpha_i). \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

In particular, using $\alpha_k = k + 1$, $\epsilon_k = \min_{i \in [m]} \frac{\delta_i^k}{2}$ and $\delta_i^k = \frac{\eta_i - \eta_i^k}{(k+1)(k+2)}$, we have $x^{\hat{k}}$ is (ϵ, δ) type-II KKT point of (1.1) where

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &= \frac{2}{K+2} \max \left\{ 4(L_0 + B\|L\|)^2 [2D^2 + \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0}], B\|\eta - \eta^0\| + B\|L\| [2D^2 + \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0}] \right\}, \\ \delta &= \frac{2}{K+2} (2D^2 + \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

Proof. Using (3.8) with x^{k+1} replaced by \tilde{x}^{k+1} (the optimal solution of problem (3.1)) and adding $f(x^k) + \frac{L_0}{2} \|x^k - \tilde{x}^{k+1}\|^2$ on both sides, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L_0}{2} \|x^k - \tilde{x}^{k+1}\|^2 &\leq \psi_0^k(x^k) - \psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) \\ &\leq \psi_0(x_k) - \psi_0^k(x^{k+1}) + \epsilon_k \\ &\leq \psi_0(x_k) - \psi_0(x^{k+1}) + \epsilon_k, \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

where the second inequality follows from $\psi_0^k(x^k) = \psi_0(x^k)$ as well as x^{k+1} being an ϵ_k -solution (see Definition 7) of subproblem (3.1), and the third inequality follows from the fact that $\psi_0^k(x) \geq \psi_0(x)$ for all $x \in \text{dom } \chi_0$.

Using Lemma 2 (again x^{k+1} is replaced by \tilde{x}^{k+1}), noting that ϵ_k satisfies the requirements of Theorem 7 implying that $\|\tilde{\lambda}^k\| \leq B$ and using (6.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x \mathcal{L}(\tilde{x}^{k+1}, \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1})\|_-^2 &\leq 4(L_0 + B\|L\|)^2 \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{8(L_0 + B\|L\|)^2}{L_0} [\psi_0(x^k) - \psi_0(x^{k+1}) + \epsilon_k]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

Similar to the argument of (3.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\lambda}_i^{k+1} |\psi_i(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) - \eta_i| &\leq B\|\eta - \eta^k\| + B\|L\| \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\ &\leq B\|\eta - \eta^k\| + \frac{2B\|L\|}{L_0} [\psi_0(x^k) - \psi_0(x^{k+1}) + \epsilon_k]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

Multiplying (6.6), (6.7) and (6.8) by α_k and summing over $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$ give (6.1), (6.2) and (6.3).

We derive a convergence rate based on the specified parameters. First, from relation (6.6), we note that $\psi_0(x^{k+1}) \leq \psi_0(x^k) + \epsilon_k$. Hence, we have by induction that

$$\psi_0(x^{k+1}) \leq \psi_0(x^0) + \sum_{i=0}^k \epsilon_i. \quad (6.9)$$

By setting $\alpha_k = (k + 1)$ and $\epsilon_k = \min_{i \in [m]} \frac{\delta_i^k}{2} = \min_{i \in [m]} \frac{\eta_i - \eta_i^k}{2(k+1)(k+2)}$ for all $k \geq 0$ (note that ϵ_k satisfies the requirement of Theorem 7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Delta} &= \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k [\psi_0(x^k) - \psi_0(x^{k+1})] + \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \epsilon_k \\ &= \alpha_0 \psi_0(x^0) + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_k) \psi_0(x^{k+1}) - \alpha_K \psi_0(x^{K+1}) + \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \epsilon_k \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \alpha_0 \psi_0(x^0) + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_k) [\psi_0(x^0) + \sum_{i=0}^k \epsilon_i] - \alpha_K \psi_0(x^{K+1}) + \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \epsilon_k \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \alpha_K [\psi_0(x^0) - \psi_0(x^{K+1})] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{i=0}^k \epsilon_i + \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \epsilon_k \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \alpha_K[\psi_0(x^0) - \psi_0(x^{K+1})] + \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} \sum_{k=i}^{K-1} \epsilon_i + \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \epsilon_k \\
&\stackrel{\text{(iii)}}{=} \alpha_K[\psi_0(x^0) - \psi_0(x^{K+1})] + \sum_{i=0}^K (K-i)\epsilon_i + \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \epsilon_k \\
&\stackrel{\text{(iv)}}{\leq} \alpha_K[\psi_0(x^0) - \psi_0(x^{K+1})] + \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{2} \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{K-k}{(k+1)(k+2)} + \frac{1}{k+2} \\
&= \alpha_K[\psi_0(x^0) - \psi_0(x^{K+1})] + \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{2} \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{K+1}{(k+1)(k+2)} \\
&\leq \alpha_K[\psi_0(x^0) - \psi_0(x^{K+1}) + \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{2}]. \tag{6.10}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, (i), (ii) follows from (6.9) and $\alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_k = 1 (> 0)$, (iii) follows $(K-i)$ is 0 at $i = K$, (iv) follows by observing $\epsilon_k \leq \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{2(k+1)(k+2)}$ and last inequality follows since $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k+1)(k+2)} = 1$ and $\alpha_K = K + 1$.

Applying same arguments as those in Corollary 1, we have $\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \|\eta - \eta^k\| = \alpha_K \|\eta - \eta^0\|$. Using this relation along with $\sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k = \frac{(K+1)(K+2)}{2}$ and (6.10) inside (6.4), we have (6.5). Hence, we conclude the proof. \square

Remark 7. Compared to the convergence result (3.26) for exact LCPG, we have to control the accumulated error in $\tilde{\Delta}$ for the inexact case (6.4). However, we need an even more stringent condition on the error to ensure asymptotic convergence. Specifically, we assume ϵ_k to be smaller than the level increments δ_i^k to ensure that each subsequent subproblem is strictly feasible. As long as the subproblems are solved deterministically with sufficient accuracy, we can ensure such feasibility as well as the boundedness of the dual.

6.2 Solving the subproblem with the interior point method Our goal is to develop an efficient interior point algorithm to solve problem (3.1) when $\chi_i(x) = 0$, $i \in [m]$. Without loss of generality, we express the subproblem as the following QCQP:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \quad & g_0(x) := \frac{L_0}{2} \|x - a_0\|^2 \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & g_i(x) := \frac{L_i}{2} \|x - a_i\|^2 - b_i \leq 0, \quad i \in [m].
\end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

We assume that the initial solution \hat{x} of such problem is strictly feasible, namely, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$g_i(\hat{x}) \leq -\delta, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m. \tag{6.12}$$

Let $e_1 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. With a slight abuse of notation, we can formulate (6.11) as the following problem

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & e_1^T u \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \tilde{g}_0(u) = g_0(x) - \eta \leq 0, \\
& \tilde{g}_i(u) = g_i(x) \leq 0, \quad i \in [m], \\
& \tilde{g}_{m+1}(u) = \frac{L_{m+1}}{2} \|u - (0, a_{m+1})^T\|^2 - b_{m+1} \leq 0, \\
& u = (\eta, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

Here we set artificial variables $L_{m+1} = 1$, $a_{m+1} = 0$ and $b_{m+1} = \frac{1}{2}R^2$ for some sufficiently large R . We explicitly add such a ball constraint to ensure bound on (η, x) . Note that the bound R always exists since our domain is compact and the objective is Lipschitz continuous. Our goal is to apply the path-following method to solve (6.13). We denote

$$\phi(u) = -\sum_{i=0}^{m+1} \log -\tilde{g}_i(u) \tag{6.14}$$

Since each $\tilde{g}_i(u)$ is convex quadratic in u , $\phi(u)$ is a self-concordant barrier with $v = m + 2$. The key idea of path-following algorithm is to approximately solve a sequence of penalized approximated problems

$$\min_u \quad \phi_\tau(u) := \tau\eta + \phi(u) \tag{6.15}$$

with increased values of τ , and generate a sequence of strictly feasible solution u_τ close to the central path—a trajectory composed of the minimizers $u_\tau^* = \operatorname{argmin}_u \phi_\tau(u)$.

We apply a standard path-following algorithm (See Ch. 4 [21]) for solving the quadratic constrained problem, and outline the overall procedure in Algorithm 4. This algorithm consists of two main steps:

1. Initialization: We seek a solution u^0 near the analytic center (i.e. minimizer of $\phi(u)$). To this end, we solve a sequence of auxiliary problems $\hat{\phi}_\tau(u) = \tau w^T u + \phi(u)$ where $w = -\nabla \phi(\hat{u})$. It can be readily seen

that \hat{u} is in the central path of this auxiliary problem with $\tau = 1$. Performing a reverse path-following scheme (decreasing rather than increasing τ), we gradually converge to the analytic center.

2. Path-following: We solve a sequence of penalized problems with increasing value of τ by a damped version of Newton's method, which ensures the solutions in the proximity of central path.

Algorithm 4: Path-following Interior Point Method

```

/* Newton decrement  $n(f, u) := \sqrt{\nabla f(u)^T [\nabla^2 f(u)]^{-1} \nabla f(u)}$  */
Input:  $\hat{u}, \kappa \in (0, 1), \gamma > 0, \varepsilon;$ 
Set  $\tau_0 = 1, u^0 = \hat{u};$ 
/* Phase Zero: Approximate analytic center */
for  $i=0, 1, \dots$  do
     $\tau_{i+1} = \left(1 + \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{v}}\right)^{-1} \tau_i;$ 
    Obtain  $u^{i+1}$  from calling Newton( $\phi_{\tau_{i+1}}, u^i, \tau_{i+1}, \kappa/2$ );
    if  $n(\phi, u^{i+1}) \leq \frac{3}{4}\kappa$  then
        | Set  $u^* = u^{i+1}$  and Break;
    end
end
/* Phase One: Path-following scheme */
Set  $u^0 = u^*, \tau_0 = \max\{\tau : n(\phi_\tau, u^0) \leq \kappa\}, s = \left\lceil \frac{\sqrt{v}}{\gamma} \ln \frac{2v}{\tau_0 \varepsilon} \right\rceil - 1;$ 
for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, s$  do
    |  $\tau_{i+1} = \left(1 + \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{v}}\right) \tau_i;$ 
    | Obtain  $u^{i+1}$  from calling Newton( $\phi_{\tau_{i+1}}, u^i, \tau_{i+1}, \kappa$ );
end
Output:  $u^{s+1}.$ 
/* Damped Newton method for solving the subproblem. */
Procedure Newton( $f, v^0, \tau, \epsilon$ ):
    | for  $s = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$  do
        | if  $n(f, v^s) \leq \epsilon$  then Break;
        |  $v^{s+1} = v^s - \frac{1}{1+n(f, v^s)} [\nabla^2 f(v^s)]^{-1} \nabla f(v^s);$ 
    | end
return  $v^s.$ 

```

6.2.1 Solving Newton Equations

First we calculate the gradient and Hessian map of $\phi_t(\cdot)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \phi_\tau(u) &= \tau e_1 + \sum_{i=0}^{m+1} \theta_i \nabla \tilde{g}_i(u), \\ \nabla^2 \phi_\tau(u) &= \sum_{i=0}^{m+1} \theta_i^2 \nabla \tilde{g}_i(u) \tilde{g}_i(u)^T + \sum_{i=0}^{m+1} \theta_i \nabla^2 \tilde{g}_i(u) = NN^T + \Gamma, \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta_i = -\tilde{g}_i(u)^{-1}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} N &= [\theta_0 \nabla \tilde{g}_0(u), \dots, \theta_{m+1} \nabla \tilde{g}_{m+1}(u)] \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times (m+2)}, \\ \Gamma &= \begin{bmatrix} \theta_{m+1} L_{m+1} & 0 \\ 0 & \sum_{i=0}^{m+1} \theta_i L_i I_d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times (d+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that computing the gradient $\nabla \phi_t(u)$ takes $\mathcal{O}(dm)$, hence the computation burden is from forming and solving the Newton systems. This is divided into two cases.

1. $m < d$. Then the Hessian is the sum of a low rank matrix and a diagonal matrix. Based on Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula, we have

$$[\nabla^2 \phi_\tau(u)]^{-1} = \Gamma^{-1} - \Gamma^{-1} N (I + N^T \Gamma^{-1} N)^{-1} N^T \Gamma^{-1}. \quad (6.16)$$

Computing the product $N^T \Gamma^{-1} N$ takes $\mathcal{O}(m^2 d)$ while performing Cholesky factorization takes $\mathcal{O}(m^3)$. Therefore, the overall complexity of each Newton step is $\mathcal{O}(m^3 + m^2 d) = \mathcal{O}(m^2 d)$.

2. $m \geq d$. In such case, we can directly compute NN^T in $\mathcal{O}(md^2)$ and then perform Cholesky factorization $\nabla^2 \phi_\tau(x) = LL^T$ in $\mathcal{O}(d^3)$, followed by two triangle systems. Hence the overall complexity of a Newton step is $\mathcal{O}(d^3 + md^2) = \mathcal{O}(md^2)$.

Due to the above discussion, the cost of computing each Newton system is

$$\mathcal{O}(\min\{d, m\} \cdot md). \quad (6.17)$$

6.2.2 Complexity

Before deriving the complexity of solving the subproblems, we require some additional assumptions. We assume that $M = \max_x \{\|\nabla g_i(x)\|\}$ and $\max g_0(x) - \min_x g_0(x) \leq V$. Note that these assumptions are easily satisfied if we assume functions in the original problem have bounded level sets.

According to Theorem 4.5.1 [21], the complexity of interior point methods depends not only on the time to follow the central path, but also on the time to arrive near the analytic center from an arbitrary initial point. Let us put it in the context of Algorithm 1. Despite the strict feasibility guarantee, we do not know whether x^k is near the analytic center of each subproblem. It remains to show how to control the complexity of approximating the analytic center.

To measure the strict feasibility of the initial point, we use the Minkowsky function of the domain, which is defined by $\pi_x(y) = \inf\{t > 0 : x + t^{-1}(y - x) \in D\}$ for any given x in the interior of the domain. With the help of the Minkowsky function, we bound the distance between the initial point and the boundary in the following proposition.

Proposition 6. *Let $\hat{u} = (g_0(\hat{\eta}), \hat{x})$ where $\hat{\eta} = g_0(\hat{x}) + \delta$. If $\|u - \hat{u}\| \leq \frac{\delta}{M+1}$, then u is feasible for problem (6.13). Moreover, we have*

$$\pi_{u^*}(\hat{u}) \leq \frac{(M+1)R}{(M+1)R + \delta}. \quad (6.18)$$

Proof. We have

$$|\tilde{g}_0(u) - \tilde{g}_0(\hat{u})| \leq |g_0(x) - g_0(\hat{x})| + |\eta - \hat{\eta}| \leq \frac{M}{M+1}\delta + \frac{\delta}{M+1} = \delta,$$

implying that

$$\tilde{g}_0(u) \leq \tilde{g}_0(\hat{u}) + \delta = g_0(\hat{x}) - \hat{\eta} + \delta = 0.$$

Analogously, for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$, we have

$$|g_i(x) - g_i(\hat{x})| \leq M\|x - \hat{x}\| \leq \frac{M}{M+1}\delta \leq \delta.$$

Using triangle inequality, we have $\tilde{g}_i(u) = g_i(x) \leq g_i(\hat{x}) + \delta = 0$. The last constraint in (6.13) is trivially satisfied for sufficiently large R . Therefore, u is a feasible point of (6.13).

Let $t^+ = \frac{(M+1)\|\hat{u} - u^*\|}{(M+1)\|\hat{u} - u^*\| + \delta}$, then from the above analysis, we know that the point

$$u^+ = u^* + \frac{1}{t^+}(\hat{u} - u^*) = \hat{u} + \frac{\delta(\hat{u} - u^*)}{(M+1)\|\hat{u} - u^*\|}$$

must be a feasible solution. Using the last constraint $\|u\| \leq R$, we immediately obtain the bound (6.18). \square

Using Theorem 4.5.1 [21] and Proposition 6, we can derive the total complexity of solving the diagonal QCQP.

Theorem 9. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 6, the total number of Newton steps to get an ε solution is*

$$N_\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(1)\sqrt{m+2} \ln \left(\frac{(m+2)V((M+1)R + \delta)}{\delta\varepsilon} + 1 \right).$$

Corollary 3. *In the inexact LCPG method, assume that the subproblems are solved by Algorithm 4 and the returned solution satisfies the inexactness requirement in Theorem 8. Then to get an $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ Type-II KKT point, the overall arithmetic cost of Algorithm 4 is*

$$\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{O}(\min\{m, d\} \cdot m^{1.5} d \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \ln \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)).$$

Proof. According to Theorem 8, the total number of LCPG is $K = \mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon)$. In the k -th iteration of LCPG, we set the error criteria $\nu = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^2})$ and $\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k^2})$. Theorem 9 implies that the number of Newton steps is $N_k = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{m} \ln(k))$. Therefore, the total number of Newton steps in LCPG is $T_K = \sum_{k=0}^K N_k = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{m} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \ln(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$. Combining this result with (6.17) gives us the desired bound. \square

Remark 8. *First, at the k -th step of LCPG, we need $\log(k)$ iterations of interior point methods, of which the complexity order is equally contributed by the two phases of IPM. Specifically, we first require $\mathcal{O}(\ln(k))$ Newton steps to pull the iterates from near the boundary to the proximity of central path, and then require $\mathcal{O}(\ln(k))$ to obtain an $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ -accurate solution. Second, it is interesting to consider the case when the constraint is far less than the feature dimensionality, namely, $m \ll d$. We observe that the total computation*

$$\mathcal{O}(dm^{2.5} K \ln K)$$

is linear in the dimensionality. Third, despite the simplicity, the basic barrier method offers a relatively stronger approximate solution than what is needed in Theorem 8, the feasibility of solution path allows us to weaken the assumption to $\hat{\varepsilon}_k = 0$. Nevertheless, besides our approach, it is possible to employ long step and infeasible primal-dual interior point methods which may give better empirical performance.

6.3 Solving subproblems with the first-order method In this section, we use a previously proposed ConEx method [4] to solve the subproblem (3.1) when general proximal functions χ_i are present. Then, we analyze the overall complexity of LCPG method with ConEx method as a subproblem solver. First, we formally state the extended version of problem (6.11) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in X} \quad & \phi_0(x) := g_0(x) + \chi_0(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \phi_i(x) := g_i(x) + \chi_i(x) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

For the application of ConEx for the subproblem, we need access to a convex compact set X such that $\cap_i \text{dom } \chi_i \subseteq X$. Moreover, X is a “simple” set in the sense that it allows an easy computation of proximal operator of $\chi_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m w_i \chi_i(x)$ for any given weights $w_i, i = 1, \dots, m$. Such assumptions are not very restrictive as many machine learning and engineering problems explicitly seek on the optimal solution from a bounded set. Under these assumptions, we apply ConEx to solve the subproblem (3.1) of LCPG. We now reproduce simplified optimality guarantee of the ConEx method below without necessarily going into the details of the algorithm.

Theorem 10. *Let x be the output of ConEx after T iterations for problem (6.19). Assume that ϕ_0 is a strongly convex function and $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\lambda})$ is the optimal primal-dual solution. Moreover, Let B be a parameter of the ConEx method which satisfies $B > \|\tilde{\lambda}\|$. Then, the solution x satisfies*

$$\phi_0(x) - \phi_0(\tilde{x}) \leq \|[\phi(x)]_+\| \leq O\left(\frac{1}{T^2}(B^2 + \|\tilde{\lambda}\|^2)\right).$$

Even though ConEx can be applied to wider variety of convex function constrained problems, it has two vital and intricate issues that need to be addressed in our context:

1. The solution path of ConEx can be arbitrarily infeasible in the early iterations and successive iterations make the solutions infeasibility smaller. Note that the approximation criterion in Definition 7 requires guarantees on the amount of infeasibility. This implies ConEx has to run a significant number of iterations before getting sufficiently close to the feasible set.
2. Since ConEx is a primal-dual method, its convergence guarantees depend on the optimal dual solution λ^* . Moreover, a bound on the dual, $B (> \|\lambda^*\|)$, is required to implement the algorithm to achieve an accelerated convergence rate of $O(1/T^2)$ for strongly convex problems.

From Theorem 10, it is clear that ConEx requires a bound B . When applying for subproblem (3.1), we can easily find $B^k > \|\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}\|$ by using the difference in levels of successive iterations.

Proposition 7. *For subproblem (3.1), we have*

$$\|\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}\| \leq \frac{\psi_0^k(x^k) - \psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1})}{\min_{i \in [m]} \delta_i^k}. \tag{6.20}$$

Proof. By Slater's condition, we know that $\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}$ exists. Then, due to saddle point property of $(\tilde{x}^{k+1}, \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1})$, we have for all $x \in X$

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_0^k(x) + \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}[\psi^k(x) - \eta^{k+1}] &\geq \psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) + \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}[\psi^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) - \eta^{k+1}] \\ &= \psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}),\end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows by complementary slackness. Using $x = x^k$ in the above relation and noting that x^k satisfies $\psi(x^k) \leq \psi^{k-1}(x^k) \leq \eta^k$, we have $\eta^{k+1} - \psi^k(x^k) = \eta^{k+1} - \psi(x^k) \geq \eta^{k+1} - \eta^k = \delta^k$ implying that

$$\psi_0^k(x^k) - \psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) \geq \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \delta^k \rangle.$$

Finally, we note that that $\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1} \geq 0$ and $\delta^k > 0$ implies $\langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \delta^k \rangle \geq \|\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}\|_1 \cdot \min_{i \in [m]} \delta_i^k$, which along with previous relation and fact that $\|\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}\|_1 \geq \|\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}\|$ provides the desired result. \square

Computational complexity of ConEx-based LCPG Note that estimating $\psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1})$ for every k can be challenging. However, it can be further upper bounded as follows:

$$\psi_0^k(x^k) - \psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) = \psi_0(x^k) - \psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) \leq \psi_0(x^k) - \psi_0(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) \leq \psi_0(x^k) - \psi_0^*,$$

where the last inequality follows since \tilde{x}^{k+1} is feasible for the original problem (1.1). Hence, using Proposition 7, we can set $B^k := \frac{\psi_0(x^k) - \psi_0^*}{\delta_{i_*}^k}$ where $i_* := \operatorname{argmin}_{i \in m} \eta_i - \eta_i^0$. Then, required ConEx iterations T^k can be bounded by

$$T^k = O\left(\frac{B^k}{\sqrt{\epsilon_k}}\right)$$

Finally, in view of (6.9) and the fact that $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \epsilon_i \leq \|\eta - \eta^0\|$ implies that $B^k \leq \frac{1}{\delta_{i_*}^k} [\psi_0(x^0) - \psi_0^* + \|\eta - \eta^0\|]$

for all k . Moreover, for all $k \leq K$, we have $\epsilon_k = \frac{\delta_{i_*}^k}{2}$. Hence, we get $T^k = O(\epsilon_k^{-3/2}) = O(k^3)$. Finally, we have $\sum_{k=1}^K T^k = O(K^4)$ which is the overall computational complexity of LCPG method with ConEx as subproblem solver to obtain $(O(\frac{1}{K}), O(\frac{1}{K}))$ type-II KKT point.

Remark 9 (Gradient vs. computational complexity). *Note that evaluating the gradient of $\psi_i^k(x)$ is relatively simple since it does not involve any new computation of $\nabla f_i(x)$. In that sense, the entire inner loop requires only one ∇f_i computation and hence total gradient complexity of ∇f_i equals total outer loops of inexact LCPG. On the other hand, inner loop computation does contribute to computational complexity of the problem. However, such iterations are expected to be very cheap given the ease of obtaining gradients for the QP subproblem (3.1).*

7 LCPG for convex optimization

In this section, we establish the complexity of LCPG (i.e., Algorithm 1) when the objective f_0 and constraint $f_i, i \in [m]$ are convex. In particular, we consider two convex problems, depending on whether f_0 is convex or strongly convex. To provide a combined analysis of the two cases, we assume the following:

Assumption 5. $f_0(x)$ is μ_0 -convex function for some $\mu_0 \geq 0$. Namely,

$$f_0(x) \geq f_0(y) + \langle \nabla f_0(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{\mu_0}{2} \|x - y\|^2, \quad \text{for any } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Note that if $\mu_0 = 0$ then f_0 is simply a convex function. Now we provide the convergence rate of LCPG to optimality.

For more generality, we consider an inexact variant of LCPG for which an approximate solution in terms of Definition 7 is returned in each iteration. Let $(\tilde{x}^{k+1}, \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1})$ be the saddle-point solution $\mathcal{L}_k(x, \tilde{\lambda})$, i.e., \tilde{x}^{k+1} is an exact solution of the subproblem (3.1). First, we extend the three point inequality in Lemma 1 for an inexact solution.

Lemma 7. *Let z^+ be an ϵ -approximate solution of problem $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{g(x) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x - z\|^2\}$ where $g(x)$ is a proper, lsc and convex function. Then,*

$$g(z^+) - g(x) \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} [\|z - x\|^2 - \|z^+ - x\|^2 - \|z^+ - z\|^2] + \epsilon + \sqrt{2\gamma\epsilon} \|z^+ - x\|. \quad (7.1)$$

Proof. First, let x^+ be the optimal solution of $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{g(x) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x - z\|^2\}$. In view of Lemma 1, for any x , we have

$$g(x^+) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x^+ - z\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x - x^+\|^2 \leq g(x) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x - z\|^2. \quad (7.2)$$

Placing $x = z^+$ in above, we have

$$g(x^+) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|x^+ - z\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|z^+ - x^+\|^2 \leq g(z^+) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|z^+ - z\|^2. \quad (7.3)$$

On the other hand, by the definition of ϵ -solution, we have

$$g(z^+) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|z^+ - z\|^2 \leq g(x^+) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|x^+ - z\|^2 + \epsilon. \quad (7.4)$$

Combining the above two inequalities gives

$$\frac{\gamma}{2}\|z^+ - x^+\|^2 \leq \epsilon. \quad (7.5)$$

Summing up (7.2) and (7.4) again and then rearranging the terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned} g(z^+) - g(x) &\leq \frac{\gamma}{2}\|x - z\|^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2}\|z^+ - z\|^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2}\|x - x^+\|^2 + \epsilon \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma}{2}\|x - z\|^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2}\|z^+ - z\|^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2}\|x - z^+\|^2 + \gamma\|x - z^+\|\|z^+ - x^+\| + \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that $-\frac{1}{2}\|a+b\|^2 \leq -\frac{1}{2}\|a\|^2 - \langle a, b \rangle \leq -\frac{1}{2}\|a\|^2 + \|a\|\|b\|$ with $a = x - z^+$ and $b = z^+ - x^+$. Finally, combining the above two results gives the desired inequality (7.1). \square

Using the above lemma, we provide some main convergence property of LCPG for convex optimization.

Lemma 8. *Let x be feasible solution. Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(x^{k+1}) - \psi_0(x) &\leq \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \psi(x) - \eta^k \rangle + \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle - \mu_0}{2} \|x^k - x\|^2 - \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\epsilon_k + \sqrt{2(L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle)\epsilon_k} \|x^{k+1} - x\|. \end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(x^{k+1}) &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \psi_0^k(x^{k+1}) \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) + \epsilon_k \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{=} \psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \psi^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) - \eta^k \rangle + \epsilon_k \\ &\leq \psi_0^k(x^{k+1}) + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \psi^k(x^{k+1}) - \eta^k \rangle + \epsilon_k \\ &\stackrel{(iv)}{\leq} \psi_0^k(x) + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \psi^k(x) - \eta^k \rangle - \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\epsilon_k + \sqrt{2(L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle)\epsilon_k} \|x^{k+1} - x\|, \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

where (i) follows from the definition of ψ_0^k , (ii) follows since x^{k+1} is an ϵ_k solution of (3.1), (iii) follows by complementary slackness for the optimal primal-dual solution for (3.1) and (iv) follows from Lemma 7. In particular, we use $g(x) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|x - z\|^2 = \psi_0^k(x) + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \psi^k(x) - \eta^k \rangle$ with $z = x^k$, $z^+ = x^{k+1}$, $\epsilon = \epsilon_k$ and $\gamma = L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle$. Note that x^{k+1} is an ϵ_k -approximate solution for $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \psi_0^k(x) + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \psi^k(x) - \eta^k \rangle$ due to Definition 7.

Finally, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0^k(x) + \frac{\mu_0}{2}\|x - x^k\|^2 &\leq \psi_0(x) + \frac{L_0}{2}\|x - x^k\|^2, \\ \psi_i^k(x) &\leq \psi_i(x) + \frac{L_i}{2}\|x - x^k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the above two relation in (7.7), we obtain (7.6). Hence, we conclude the proof. \square

Let x^* be an optimal solution of (1.1) and $\tilde{D} := \max\{\|x - y\| : x, y \in \text{dom } \chi_0, \psi_i(x) \leq \eta_i, \psi_i(y) \leq \eta_i, \text{ for all } i \in [m]\}$. Now, we show convergence rate guarantees.

Theorem 11. *Consider general convex optimization problems with $\mu_0 = 0$. Suppose Assumption 3 is satisfied and set $\delta^k = \frac{(\eta - \eta^0)}{(k+1)(k+2)}$. Then we have*

$$\psi_0(\bar{x}_K) - \psi_0(x^*) \leq \frac{L_0 + B\|L\|}{(K+1)} [\tilde{D}^2 + \frac{(4B+2)\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0} + \tilde{D}\sqrt{\frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0}} + \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0} \frac{\log K}{K}] \quad (7.8)$$

Proof. From Lemma 8 with $\mu_0 = 0$ for convex part and $\psi(x^*) \leq \eta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(x^{k+1}) - \psi_0(x^*) &= \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \eta - \eta^k \rangle + \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle}{2} \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\epsilon_k + \sqrt{2(L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle)\epsilon_k} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by $\frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle}{2}$, we have

$$\frac{2[\psi_0(x^{k+1}) - \psi_0(x^*)]}{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle} \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{2\langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \eta - \eta^k \rangle}{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle} + \frac{4\epsilon_k}{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle} + \sqrt{\frac{8\epsilon_k}{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle}} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|$$

Note that the sequence $\{\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}\}$ is uniformly bounded above such that $\|\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}\| \leq B$ for all $k \geq 0$. Using this fact and the above relation, we have

$$\frac{2[\psi_0(x^{k+1}) - \psi_0(x^*)]}{L_0 + B\|L\|} \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{2B\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0} + \frac{4\epsilon_k}{L_0} + \sqrt{\frac{8\epsilon_k}{L_0}} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|. \quad (7.9)$$

Using $\delta_k = \frac{\eta - \eta^0}{(k+1)(k+2)}$ and $\epsilon_k = \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{2(k+1)(k+2)}$, we have x^k is strictly feasible solutions for (3.1) for all k . Hence, under Assumption 3, we can follow the steps of Theorem 1 to show uniform bound B on sequence $\{\|\tilde{\lambda}^k\|\}$. Using these values in (7.9), we have

$$\frac{2[\psi_0(x^{k+1}) - \psi_0(x^*)]}{L_0 + B\|L\|} \leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{2B\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0(k+1)} + \frac{2\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0(k+1)(k+2)} + \sqrt{\frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0}} \frac{1}{k+1} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|. \quad (7.10)$$

Due to the optimality of the exact solution \tilde{x}^{k+1} , we have $\psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) \leq \psi_0^k(x^k) = \psi_0(x^k)$. We also have $\psi_0(x^{k+1}) \leq \psi_0^k(x^{k+1}) \leq \psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) + \epsilon_k$. Combining these two relations, we get:

$$\psi_0(x^{k+1}) \leq \psi_0(x^k) + \epsilon_k.$$

Effectively, inexact LCPG method is almost (up to an additive error of ϵ_k) a descent method. Using this relation recursively, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(x^K) &\leq \psi_0(x^{k+1}) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{K-1} \epsilon_i. \\ &\leq \psi_0(x^{k+1}) + \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{2} \sum_{i=k+1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{(i+1)(i+2)} \\ &= \psi_0(x^{k+1}) + \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{2} \frac{(K-k-1)}{(k+2)(K+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the above relation in (7.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2[\psi_0(x^K) - \psi_0(x^*)]}{L_0 + B\|L\|} &\leq \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 + \frac{2B\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0(k+1)} + \frac{2\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0(k+1)(k+2)} + \sqrt{\frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0}} \frac{1}{k+1} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\| \\ &\quad + \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0 + B\|L\|} \frac{K-k-1}{(k+2)(K+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the above relation by $k+1$ and summing from $k=0$ to $K-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{K(K+1)[\psi_0(x^K) - \psi_0(x^*)]}{L_0 + B\|L\|} &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|x^k - x^*\|^2 + \frac{2B\|\eta - \eta^0\|K}{L_0} + \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\| \log(K+2)}{L_0} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0}} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\| + \frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|K}{L_0 + B\|L\|} \\ &\leq K\tilde{D}^2 + \frac{2(B+1)\|\eta - \eta^0\|K}{L_0} + \sqrt{\frac{\|\eta - \eta^0\|}{L_0}} K\tilde{D}. \end{aligned}$$

After rearranging, this relation implies (7.8). Hence, we conclude the proof. \square

Theorem 12. Consider strongly convex problems ($\mu_0 > 0$) and suppose that Assumption 3 is satisfied. Set $\delta^k = \rho^k(1 - \rho)(\eta - \eta^0)$ where $\rho = \frac{L_0 - \mu_0}{2(L_0 - a\mu_0)}$, $2\epsilon_k \leq a(1 - \rho)\rho^k\|\eta - \eta^0\|$ and $a \in (0, 1)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(x^K) - \psi_0(x^*) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{(1-a)\mu_0 K}{L_0 + B\|L\| - a\mu_0}\right) (L_0 + B\|L\| - \mu_0) \\ &\quad \left\{ \left[\frac{(4B+1)}{2(L_0 - \mu_0)} + \frac{L_0 + B\|L\| + 2a\mu_0}{\mu_0(L_0 - \mu_0)} (1 - \rho) \right] \|\eta - \eta^0\| + \frac{1}{2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.11)$$

Moreover, if $\epsilon_k = 0$, we have

$$\psi_0(x^K) - \psi_0(x^*) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\mu_0 K}{L_0 + B\|L\|}\right) (L_0 + B\|L\| - \mu_0) \left\{ \left[\frac{(4B+1)}{2(L_0 - \mu_0)} \right] \|\eta - \eta^0\| + \frac{1}{2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2 \right\}. \quad (7.12)$$

Proof. Proceeding similar to the convex case, using Lemma 8, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(x^{k+1}) - \psi_0(x^*) &= \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \eta - \eta^k \rangle + \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle - \mu_0}{2} \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\epsilon_k + \sqrt{2(L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle)} \epsilon_k \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|. \end{aligned}$$

For $0 < a < 1$, we have

$$\sqrt{2(L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle)} \epsilon_k \|x^{k+1} - x^*\| \leq \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle}{a\mu_0} \epsilon_k + \frac{a\mu_0}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2.$$

Combining the above two results, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(x^{k+1}) - \psi_0(x^*) &\leq \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \eta - \eta^k \rangle + \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle - \mu_0}{2} \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle - a\mu_0}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(2 + \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle}{a\mu_0}\right) \epsilon_k. \end{aligned}$$

Let us denote

$$\Gamma_k = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0; \\ \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^k, L \rangle - a\mu_0}{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^k, L \rangle - \mu_0} \Gamma_{k-1} & \text{if } k \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Multiplying both sides of the above inequality by $\frac{\Gamma_k}{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle - \mu_0}$ and noting that $\eta - \eta^k = \rho^k(\eta - \eta^0)$ (follows by the choice of δ^k), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\Gamma_k}{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle - \mu_0} [\psi_0(x^{k+1}) - \psi_0(x^*)] \\ & \leq \frac{\Gamma_k}{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle - \mu_0} \rho^k \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \eta - \eta^0 \rangle + \frac{\Gamma_k}{2} \|x^* - x^k\|^2 - \frac{\Gamma_{k+1}}{2} \|x^* - x^{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle + 2a\mu_0}{a\mu_0(L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle - \mu_0)} \Gamma_k \epsilon_k. \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

Since $\|\tilde{\lambda}^k\| \leq B$, we have $(\frac{L_0+B\|L\|-a\mu_0}{L_0+B\|L\|-\mu_0})^k \leq \Gamma_k \leq (\frac{L_0-a\mu_0}{L_0-\mu_0})^k$. Moreover, we have $2\epsilon_k \leq a(1-\rho)\rho^k\|\eta - \eta^0\|$ and $\rho = \frac{L_0-\mu_0}{2(L_0-a\mu_0)}$. Using these relations in (7.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\Gamma_k}{L_0+B\|L\|-\mu_0} [\psi_0(x^{k+1}) - \psi_0(x^*)] \\ & \leq \frac{B\|\eta-\eta^0\|}{L_0-\mu_0} \Gamma_k \rho^k + \frac{L_0+B\|L\|+2a\mu_0}{a\mu_0(L_0-\mu_0)} \Gamma_k \epsilon_k + \frac{\Gamma_k}{2} \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \frac{\Gamma_{k+1}}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{B\|\eta-\eta^0\|}{L_0-\mu_0} \frac{1}{2^k} + \frac{L_0+B\|L\|+2a\mu_0}{\mu_0(L_0-\mu_0)} \frac{1-\rho}{2^{k+1}} \|\eta - \eta^0\| + \frac{\Gamma_k}{2} \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \frac{\Gamma_{k+1}}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (7.14)$$

Similar to the convex part, we also have

$$\psi_0(x^K) \leq \psi_0(x^{k+1}) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{K-1} \epsilon_i \leq \psi_0(x^{k+1}) + \frac{\|\eta-\eta^0\|(1-\rho)}{2} \sum_{i=k+1}^{K-1} \rho^i \leq \psi_0(x^{k+1}) + \frac{\|\eta-\eta^0\|\rho^{k+1}}{2}.$$

Using the above relation into (7.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Gamma_k}{L_0+B\|L\|-\mu_0} [\psi_0(x^K) - \psi_0(x^*)] & \leq \frac{(4B+1)\|\eta-\eta^0\|}{L_0-\mu_0} \frac{1}{2^{k+2}} + \frac{L_0+B\|L\|+2a\mu_0}{\mu_0(L_0-\mu_0)} \frac{1-\rho}{2^{k+1}} \|\eta - \eta^0\| \\ & \quad + \frac{\Gamma_k}{2} \|x^k - x^*\|^2 - \frac{\Gamma_{k+1}}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summing the above relation from $k = 0$ to $K - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Gamma_{K-1}}{L_0+B\|L\|-\mu_0} [\psi_0(x^K) - \psi_0(x^*)] & \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{\Gamma_k}{L_0+B\|L\|-\mu_0} [\psi_0(x^K) - \psi_0(x^*)] \\ & \leq \left[\frac{(4B+1)}{2(L_0-\mu_0)} + \frac{L_0+B\|L\|+2a\mu_0}{\mu_0(L_0-\mu_0)} (1-\rho) \right] \|\eta - \eta^0\| + \frac{1}{2} \|x^0 - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\Gamma_{K-1}^{-1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{(1-a)\mu_0}{L_0+B\|L\|-a\mu_0}\right)^K \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(1-a)\mu_0 K}{L_0+B\|L\|-a\mu_0}\right).$$

Combining the above two relations we obtain the desired result (7.12). \square

8 Conclusion

In this work, we presented a new LCPG method for nonconvex function constrained optimization which can achieve gradient complexity of the same order as that of unconstrained nonconvex problems. The key ingredient in our algorithm design is the use of constraint levels to ensure the subproblem feasibility, which allows us to overcome a well-known difficulty in bounding the Lagrange multipliers in the presence of nonsmooth constraints. Moreover, a merit of our convergence analysis is its striking similarity with that of gradient descent methods for unconstrained problems. Therefore, we can easily extend our method to minimizing stochastic, finite-sum and structured nonsmooth functions with nonconvex function constraints; many of the complexity results were not known before. Another important feature of our work is that the method can deal with complex scenarios where the subproblems are not exactly solvable. To the best of our knowledge, existing work on sequential convex optimization (SQP, MBA) only assume the subproblems to be exactly solved. We provided a detailed complexity analysis of LCPG when the subproblems are inexactly solved by customized interior point method and first order method. Finally, we clearly distinguished the notion of gradient complexity from that of computational complexity. In terms of gradient complexity, all of our proposed methods are state of the art and easy to implement. Whether the computational complexity can be further improved for composite case remains an open problem which we leave as a future direction.

References

- [1] A. Auslender, R. Shefi, and M. Teboulle. A moving balls approximation method for a class of smooth constrained minimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(6):3232–3259, 2010.

- [2] D. P. Bertsekas. *Nonlinear programming*. Athena Scientific, 1999.
- [3] J. Bolte and E. Pauwels. Majorization-minimization procedures and convergence of sqp methods for semi-algebraic and tame programs. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 41(2):442–465, 2016.
- [4] D. Boob, Q. Deng, and G. Lan. Stochastic first-order methods for convex and nonconvex functional constrained optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–65, 2022.
- [5] D. Boob, Q. Deng, G. Lan, and Y. Wang. A feasible level proximal point method for nonconvex sparse constrained optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 16773–16784. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- [6] J. Burke. A sequential quadratic programming method for potentially infeasible mathematical programs. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 139(2):319–351, 1989.
- [7] J. V. Burke and S.-P. Han. A robust sequential quadratic programming method. *Mathematical Programming*, 43(1):277–303, 1989.
- [8] C. Cartis, N. I. Gould, and P. L. Toint. On the evaluation complexity of composite function minimization with applications to nonconvex nonlinear programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 4:1721–1739, 2011.
- [9] C. Cartis, N. I. Gould, and P. L. Toint. On the complexity of finding first-order critical points in constrained nonlinear optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 144(1):93–106, 2014.
- [10] F. Facchinei, V. Kungurtsev, L. Lampariello, and G. Scutari. Ghost penalties in nonconvex constrained optimization: Diminishing stepsizes and iteration complexity. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 46(2):595–627, 2021.
- [11] F. Facchinei, L. Lampariello, and G. Scutari. Feasible methods for nonconvex nonsmooth problems with applications in green communications. *Mathematical Programming*, 164(1):55–90, 2017.
- [12] S. Ghadimi and G. Lan. Stochastic first-and zeroth-order methods for nonconvex stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(4):2341–2368, 2013.
- [13] S. J. Reddi, S. Sra, B. Póczos, and A. J. Smola. Proximal stochastic methods for nonsmooth nonconvex finite-sum optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 29, 2016.
- [14] G. Lan. *First-order and Stochastic Optimization Methods for Machine Learning*. Springer, 2020.
- [15] G. Lan and R. D. C. Monteiro. Iteration-complexity of first-order penalty methods for convex programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 138:115–139, 2013.
- [16] G. Lan and R. D. C. Monteiro. Iteration-complexity of first-order augmented lagrangian methods for convex programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 155(1-2):511–547, 2016.
- [17] Z. Li and Y. Xu. Augmented lagrangian-based first-order methods for convex-constrained programs with weakly convex objective. *INFORMS Journal on Optimization*, 3(4):373–397, 2021.
- [18] Q. Lin, R. Ma, and Y. Xu. Inexact proximal-point penalty methods for constrained non-convex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.11518*, 2019.
- [19] R. Ma, Q. Lin, and T. Yang. Quadratically regularized subgradient methods for weakly convex optimization with weakly convex constraints. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6554–6564. PMLR, 2020.
- [20] O. Mangasarian and S. Fromovitz. The fritz john necessary optimality conditions in the presence of equality and inequality constraints. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 17:37–47, 1967.
- [21] A. Nemirovski. Interior point polynomial time methods in convex programming. *Lecture notes*, 2004.
- [22] Y. Nesterov. Smooth minimization of non-smooth functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 103(1):127–152, 2005.
- [23] H. Robbins and D. Siegmund. A convergence theorem for non negative almost supermartingales and some applications. *Optimizing Methods in Statistics*, pages 111–135, 1971.
- [24] M. Schmidt, N. L. Roux, and F. Bach. Convergence rates of inexact proximal-gradient methods for convex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1109.2415*, 2011.
- [25] X. Wang, S. Ma, and Y. Yuan. Penalty methods with stochastic approximation for stochastic nonlinear programming. *Mathematics of Computation*, 86(306):1793–1820, 2017.
- [26] Y. Xu. Iteration complexity of inexact augmented lagrangian methods for constrained convex programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 2019.
- [27] P. Yu, T. K. Pong, and Z. Lu. Convergence rate analysis of a sequential convex programming method with line search for a class of constrained difference-of-convex optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(3):2024–2054, 2021.

A Proof of Lemma 6

Let $\{\delta_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a function of C^∞ -smooth, real-valued mollifier functions over \mathbb{R}^d where, for every $n \geq 1$, we have: (i) $\delta_n \geq 0$, (ii) $\int \delta_n(\tau) d\tau = 1$, and (iii) $\delta_n(\tau) = 0$ for τ satisfying $\|\tau\| \geq \frac{1}{n}$. Moreover, we define $p_n = \delta_n * p$. It now follows that

$$p_n(x) - p_n(y) - \langle \nabla p_n(y), x - y \rangle = \delta_n * [p(x) - p(y)] - \langle \delta_n * \nabla p(y), x - y \rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{\tau} \delta_n(\tau) [p(x - \tau) - p(y - \tau)] d\tau - \langle \int_{\tau} \delta_n(\tau) \nabla p(y - \tau) d\tau, x - y \rangle \\
&= \int_{\tau} \delta_n(\tau) [p(x - \tau) - p(y - \tau) - \langle \nabla p(y - \tau), x - y \rangle] d\tau
\end{aligned}$$

Using (5.2) along with the above relation, noting that $\delta_n \geq 0$ and the fact $\int \delta_n(\tau) d\tau = 1$, we have

$$-\frac{\mu}{2} \|x - y\|^2 \leq p_n(x) - p_n(y) - \langle \nabla p_n(y), x - y \rangle \leq \frac{L}{2} \|x - y\|^2, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

for all x, y . Note that p_n is C^∞ -smooth. Hence, using Taylor's theorem, there exist $\xi \in [x, y]$ such that $p_n(x) - p_n(y) - \langle \nabla p_n(y), x - y \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle x - y, \nabla^2 p_n(\xi)(x - y) \rangle + o(\|x - y\|^2)$. Using this relation along with (A.1) and denoting $v := y - x$, we have

$$-\frac{\mu}{2} \|v\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \langle v, \nabla^2 p_n(\xi)v \rangle + o(\|v\|^2) \leq \frac{L}{2} \|v\|^2 \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Now, dividing both sides of the above relation by $\|v\|^2$, taking $y \rightarrow x$ which implies $\xi \rightarrow x$ and $\nabla^2 p_n(\xi) \rightarrow \nabla^2 p_n(x)$, we have

$$-\mu \leq \left\langle \frac{v}{\|v\|}, \nabla^2 p_n(x) \frac{v}{\|v\|} \right\rangle \leq L,$$

for all v and x . The above relation is equivalent to the fact that $\|\nabla^2 p_n(x)\| \leq \max\{L, \mu\}$ for all x . From here, for any x, y , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla p_n(x) - \nabla p_n(y)\| &= \left\| \int_{t=0}^1 \nabla^2 p(y + t(x - y))(x - y) dt \right\| \\
&\leq \int_{t=0}^1 \|\nabla^2 p(y + t(x - y))(x - y)\| dt \\
&\leq \int_{t=0}^1 \|\nabla^2 p(y + t(x - y))\| \|x - y\| dt \\
&\leq \max\{L, \mu\} \|x - y\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, taking $n \rightarrow \infty$ and noting that $\nabla p_n(x) \rightarrow \nabla p(x)$ for all x , we have (5.3). Hence, we conclude the proof.

B Proof of Theorem 7

First of all, using the definition of ϵ_k and the fact that $\psi_i^k(x^{k+1}) \leq \eta_i^k + \epsilon_k$ for all $i \in [m]$, we have

$$\psi_i^k(x^k) = \psi_i(x^k) \leq \psi_i^{k-1}(x^k) \leq \eta_i^{k-1} + \epsilon_{k-1} < \eta_i^{k-1} + \delta_i^{k-1} = \eta_i^k, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

Hence x^k is strictly feasible solution of (3.1). Due to Slater condition, there exists a pair of optimal primal and dual solutions, which we denote by \tilde{x}^{k+1} and λ^{k+1} . We first prove the following lemma. Our argument will be based on the following key result.

Lemma 9.

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x^k\| = 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| = 0 \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Proof. Using optimality of \tilde{x}^{k+1} , strong convexity of ψ_0^k , feasibility of x_k for the subproblem (3.1) and $\psi_0^k(x^{k+1}) \leq \psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) + \epsilon_k$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_0(x^{k+1}) &\leq \psi_0^k(x^{k+1}) \\
&\leq \psi_0^k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) + \epsilon_k \\
&\leq \psi_0^k(x^k) - \frac{L_0}{2} \|x^k - \tilde{x}^{k+1}\|^2 + \epsilon_k \\
&= \psi_0(x^k) - \frac{L_0}{2} \|x^k - \tilde{x}^{k+1}\|^2 + \epsilon_k.
\end{aligned}$$

Since ϵ_k is summable, we have that $\|x^k - \tilde{x}^{k+1}\|^2$ is summable. This implies $\|x^k - \tilde{x}^{k+1}\| \rightarrow 0$. Since $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ and \tilde{x}^{k+1} is a unique optimal solution of (3.1), we have $\|x^{k+1} - \tilde{x}^{k+1}\| \rightarrow 0$. Then, using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \leq \|x^{k+1} - \tilde{x}^{k+1}\| + \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x^k\|$ and hence, $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \rightarrow 0$. Hence, we conclude the proof. \square

Now, we show boundedness of $\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}$. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that $\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}$ is unbounded. Let \bar{x} be a limit point of $\{x^k\}$. Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we have $x^{j_k} \rightarrow \bar{x}$. Using Lemma 9, we have $\tilde{x}^{j_k+1} \rightarrow \bar{x}$ and $x^{j_k+1} \rightarrow \bar{x}$. Since $\|\tilde{\lambda}^{j_k+1}\| \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_0^{j_k}(x^{j_k+1}) + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{j_k+1}, \psi^{j_k}(x^{j_k+1}) \rangle &\leq \psi_0^{j_k}(\tilde{x}^{j_k+1}) + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{j_k+1}, \psi^{j_k}(\tilde{x}^{j_k+1}) \rangle + \epsilon_{j_k} \\
&\leq \psi_0^{j_k}(x) + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{j_k+1}, \psi^{j_k}(x) \rangle + \epsilon_{j_k} \\
\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\|\tilde{\lambda}^{j_k+1}\|} \psi_0^{j_k}(x^{j_k+1}) + \left\langle \frac{\tilde{\lambda}^{j_k+1}}{\|\tilde{\lambda}^{j_k+1}\|}, \psi^{j_k}(x^{j_k+1}) \right\rangle &\leq \frac{1}{\|\tilde{\lambda}^{j_k+1}\|} \psi_0^{j_k}(x) + \left\langle \frac{\tilde{\lambda}^{j_k+1}}{\|\tilde{\lambda}^{j_k+1}\|}, \psi^{j_k}(x) \right\rangle + \frac{\epsilon_{j_k}}{\|\tilde{\lambda}^{j_k+1}\|}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking limit $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have for all $x \in \text{dom } \chi_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi_0^{j_k}(x^{j_k+1})}{\|\lambda^{j_k+1}\|} &= 0, \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi_0^{j_k}(x)}{\|\lambda^{j_k+1}\|} &= 0, \quad \frac{\epsilon_{j_k}}{\|\lambda^{j_k+1}\|} = 0, \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi_i^{j_k}(x^{j_k+1}) &= f_i(\bar{x}) + \chi_i(\bar{x}) = \psi_i(\bar{x}), \\ \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi_i^{j_k}(x) &= f_i(\bar{x}) + \langle \nabla f_i(\bar{x}), x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{L_0}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 + \chi_i(x), \end{aligned}$$

From here, we follow the proof of Theorem 1 and conclude that the sequence $\{\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}\}$ is bounded.

Now, we prove limit point of $\{x^k\}$ is a KKT point. Since $\mathcal{L}_k(x^{k+1}, \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}) \leq \mathcal{L}_k(\tilde{x}^{k+1}, \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}) + \epsilon_k$, we rewrite (3.18) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \nabla f_0(x^k) + \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\lambda}_i^{k+1} \nabla f_i(x^k), x^{k+1} - x \rangle + \chi_0(x^{k+1}) - \chi_0(x) + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \chi(x^{k+1}) - \chi(x) \rangle \\ &\leq \langle \nabla f_0(x^k) + \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\lambda}_i^{k+1} \nabla f_i(x^k), \tilde{x}^{k+1} - x \rangle + \chi_0(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) - \chi_0(x) + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, \chi(\tilde{x}^{k+1}) - \chi(x) \rangle + \epsilon_k \\ &\leq \frac{L_0 + \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, L \rangle}{2} [\|x - x^k\|^2 - \|\tilde{x}^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 - \|x - \tilde{x}^{k+1}\|^2] + \epsilon_k. \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

Let \bar{x} be a limit point of sequence $\{x^k\}$. Since $\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}$ is bounded, we assume limit point $\bar{\lambda}$. Without loss of generality, we have $x^k \rightarrow \bar{x}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1} \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}$. Then, in view of Lemma 9, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x^{k+1} \rightarrow \bar{x}$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{x}^{k+1} \rightarrow \bar{x}$. Taking limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ in (B.2), we have

$$\langle \nabla f_0(\bar{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{\lambda}_i \nabla f_i(\bar{x}), \bar{x} - x \rangle + \chi_0(\bar{x}) - \chi_0(x) + \langle \bar{\lambda}, \chi(\bar{x}) - \chi(x) \rangle \leq 0.$$

From here, we follow the proof of Theorem 1 to conclude first-order stationarity of $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$. A similar argument can show complimentary slackness. Hence, we have that $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$ is KKT-solution and we conclude the proof.