

Riemannian Smoothing Gradient Type Algorithms for Nonsmooth Optimization Problem on Manifolds

Zheng Peng · Wei-He Wu · Jiang Hu · Kang-Kang Deng

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In this paper, we introduce the notion of generalized ϵ -stationarity for a class of nonconvex and nonsmooth composite minimization problems on Riemannian manifolds embedding in Euclidean space. To find a generalized ϵ -stationarity point, we develop a family of Riemannian gradient type methods based on the Moreau envelope technique with a decreasing sequence of smoothing parameters, namely Riemannian smoothing gradient and Riemannian smoothing stochastic gradient methods. We prove that the Riemannian smoothing gradient method has the iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$ for driving a generalized ϵ -stationary point. To our knowledge, this is the best-known computational complexity result for the nonconvex and nonsmooth composite problem on manifolds. For the Riemannian smoothing stochastic gradient method, one can achieve the iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-5})$ for driving a generalized ϵ -stationary point.

Keywords Moreau envelope · smoothing technique · iteration complexity · Riemannian gradient methods

This research was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China with grant 12071398, the Natural Science Foundation of Hunan Province with grant 2020JJ4567, and the Key Scientific Research Found of Hunan Education Department with grants 20A097 and 18A351.

Zheng Peng
School of Mathematics and Computational Science, Xiangtan University, Xiangtan 411105, China
E-mail: pzheng@xtu.edu.cn

Wei-He Wu
School of Mathematics and Computational Science, Xiangtan University, Xiangtan 411105, China
E-mail: 1009248350@qq.com

Jiang Hu
Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, Boston, MA 02114
E-mail: hujiangopt@gmail.com

Corresponding author. Kang-Kang Deng
Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
E-mail: freedeng1208@gmail.com

Mathematics Subject Classification: 90C26, 90C30, 90C15, 90C06, 90C90

1 Introduction

We consider a general nonsmooth optimization problem on manifolds:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \varphi(x) := f(x) + h(\mathcal{A}x), \quad (1.1)$$

where \mathcal{M} is a Riemannian manifold, $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuously-differentiable nonconvex function; $h : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a nonsmooth weakly-convex function with a readily available proximal operator, and \mathcal{A} is a linear operator. The model (1.1) includes a wide range of fundamental problems such as sparse principal component analysis (SPCA) [19], range-based independent component analysis [30, 31] and robust low-rank matrix completion [8, 17], see [2] for more examples. In those applications, h is often a sparse regularization function, and problem (1.1) becomes a sparse optimization problem on Riemannian manifolds.

In many applications of model (1.1), \mathcal{M} is a submanifold embedded in Euclidean space, for example, Stiefel manifold. There has a connection in function properties over Riemannian manifolds and Euclidean space, including smoothness and convexity. So it allows us to extend some classical optimization methods in Euclidean space to Riemannian manifolds. Indeed, many classical optimization methods for smooth optimization problems in Euclidean space have been successfully generalized to the problems on Riemannian manifolds, e.g., gradient-based methods [7, 25], Newton-based methods [1, 18], splitting based methods [13, 20] and stochastic gradient methods [5, 29]. The reader is referred to [3] for a comprehensive review. However, these methods are not adapted to problem (1.1) since there exists a nonsmooth term in the objective. In this paper, we propose a homotopy smoothing method to solve problem (1.1) in some general settings. Firstly, we utilize the Moreau envelope technique to obtain a smooth approximation of nonsmooth function h and employ Riemannian optimization methods to the smoothed problem. Then, we apply a homotopy technique during the iterations to obtain a good enough approximation by gradually decreasing the homotopy parameter. By combining Riemannian optimization methods, smoothing techniques, and several additional assumptions, the proposed method can achieve better convergence results (computational complexity) than the existing subgradient methods.

1.1 Related works

1.1.1 Lipschitz continuous function minimization

Riemannian gradient sampling methods are motivated by gradient sampling algorithms for nonconvex nonsmooth optimization in Euclidean space. As introduced in [12, 15], given the current iterate x_k , a typical Riemannian gradient sampling algorithm first samples some points $\{x_k^j\}_{j=1}^J$ in the neighborhood of x_k at which the objective function f is differentiable, where the number of sampled points J

usually needs to be larger than the dimension of the manifold \mathcal{M} . Then, it solves the following quadratic optimization problem for obtaining a descent direction:

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_k = - \underset{\mathbf{g} \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{W})}{\text{argmin}} \|\mathbf{g}\|^2,$$

where $\text{conv}(\mathcal{W})$ denotes the convex hull of $\mathcal{W} := \{\text{grad } f(x_k^1), \dots, \text{grad } f(x_k^J)\}$ and $\text{grad } f$ is the Riemannian gradient of f on \mathcal{M} . The update can then be performed via classical retractions on \mathcal{M} using the descent direction $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k$. This type of algorithm can potentially be utilized to solve a large class of Riemannian nonsmooth optimization problems. However, they are only known to converge asymptotically without any rate guarantee [16, 17]. Moreover, to tackle problem (1.1) with the high dimension using the Riemannian gradient sampling algorithm, one has to sample a large number of Riemannian gradients at each iteration, which makes the subproblem-solver very expensive. The proximal point-type method iteratively computes the proximal mapping of the objective function over the Riemannian manifold [9, 14]. The main issue with these methods is that each subproblem is as difficult as the original problem, which renders them not practical.

1.1.2 Smoothing techniques for nonsmooth problem

In Euclidean space, a variable smoothing algorithm based on the Moreau envelope with a decreasing sequence of smoothing parameters was developed in [4], and it is proven to have a complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$ to achieve an ϵ -approximate solution. We will extend this work to a class of nonsmooth problems on manifolds and develop an analog variable smoothing technique on Riemannian manifolds. Such variable smoothing technique allows us to resort to the analysis techniques for nonconvex minimization in the Euclidean space, and give some new convergence results for the proposed Riemannian smoothing gradient-type methods. Lin et al. [23] proposed a smoothing stochastic gradient method by incorporating the smoothing technique into the stochastic gradient descent algorithm, and Xu et al. [36] proposed a novel homotopy smoothing algorithm for solving a family of non-smooth problems which achieves the iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$. For a class of nonsmooth convex problems with linear constraint, Wei et al. [35] proposed a primal-dual homotopy smoothing algorithm achieving lower complexity than $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$. For other works on the smoothing method, the readers are referred to [6, 10, 26, 27, 33].

The smoothing technique on the Riemannian optimization problem is still scarcely explored. The authors in [24, 28] presented a smooth approximation for minimizing a nonsmooth function on Riemannian manifolds, they did not utilize the Moreau envelope technique to obtain a smooth approximation, and the smoothing parameter is fixed. Cambier and Absil [8] provided a homotopy smoothing strategy to solve robust low-rank matrix completion problems, but they did not give the convergence analysis. Zhang et al. [37] proposed a Riemannian smoothing steepest descent method to minimize a nonconvex and non-Lipschitz function on manifolds, and gave an asymptotic convergence result.

1.1.3 Computational complexity on Riemannian nonsmooth problem

For the computational complexity of algorithms for solving nonsmooth and nonconvex minimization problems on Riemannian manifolds, Li et al. [22] presented a

family of Riemannian subgradient-type methods and show that it has an iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ for driving a natural stationarity measure below ϵ . However, if the function has more structure, it is possible to design algorithms that achieve better complexity. Indeed, if the proximal operator of the nonsmooth function can be calculated analytically, i.e., $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{I}$ in (1.1), Chen et al. [11] proposed a retraction-based proximal gradient method in Stiefel manifold and achieves an iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ for obtaining an ϵ -stationary solution. The Riemannian smoothing gradient method proposed in our paper achieves an iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$, which interpolates between $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$. Very recently, based on the smoothing technique, a Riemannian alternating direction method of multipliers (RADMM) is proposed in [21] with complexity result of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$ for driving a Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) residual based stationarity.

1.2 Main contributions

In this paper, we propose two Riemannian smoothing gradient-based methods for solving problem (1.1), the Riemannian smoothing gradient method and Riemannian smoothing stochastic gradient method. To analyze the convergence behavior of the proposed methods, we introduce the concept of generalized ϵ -stationary point for a class of nonsmooth problems on manifolds, which is a weak version of the classical ϵ -stationary point. By using the Moreau envelope technique, we obtain a smoothing subproblem of origin problem (1.1) in Euclidean space and prove that it is also smooth on the Riemannian compact submanifold. We show that the iterates generated by the aforementioned Riemannian smoothing gradient-type methods will drive a generalized ϵ -stationary point within computational complexity $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-5})$, respectively. Such complexity guarantee matches the result in [4], which is a host of algorithms for solving composite weakly convex minimization problems in the Euclidean space.

1.3 Notation

Throughout, Euclidean space, denoted by \mathbb{R}^n , equipped with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and inducing norm $\|x\| = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}$. Given a matrix A , we use $\|A\|_F$ to denote the Frobenius norm, $\|A\|_1 := \sum_{ij} |A_{ij}|$ to denote the ℓ_1 norm. For a vector x , we use $\|x\|_2$ and $\|x\|_1$ to denote Euclidean norm and ℓ_1 norm, respectively. The indicator function of a set \mathcal{C} , denoted by $\delta_{\mathcal{C}}$, is set to be zero on \mathcal{C} and $+\infty$ otherwise. The distance from x to \mathcal{C} is denoted by $\text{dist}(x, \mathcal{C}) := \min_{y \in \mathcal{C}} \|x - y\|$. For a differentiable function f on \mathcal{M} , let $\text{grad } f(x)$ be its Riemannian gradient. If f can be extended to the ambient Euclidean space, we denote its Euclidean gradient by $\nabla f(x)$.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce some relevant concepts for Riemannian optimization, which can be regarded as some generalizations from Euclidean space to Riemannian manifolds. We refer the reader to [3] for more details. We will also introduce subdifferential and the Moreau envelope technique.

2.1 Riemannian optimization

A d -dimensional manifold \mathcal{M} is a Hausdorff and second-countable topological space, where each point has a neighborhood that is homomorphic to the d -dimensional Euclidean space. For all $x \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists a chart (U, ψ) such that U is an open set and ψ is a homeomorphism between U and an open set $\psi(U)$ in Euclidean space. A tangent vector η_x to \mathcal{M} at x is defined as tangents of parametrized curves γ on \mathcal{M} such that $\gamma(0) = x$ and

$$\eta_x u := \dot{\gamma}(0)u = \left. \frac{d(u(\gamma(t)))}{dt} \right|_{t=0}, \forall u \in \wp_x \mathcal{M},$$

where $\wp_x \mathcal{M}$ is the set of all real-valued functions f defined in a neighborhood of x in \mathcal{M} . Then, the tangent space $T_x \mathcal{M}$ of a manifold \mathcal{M} at x is defined as the set of all tangent vectors at point x . The manifold \mathcal{M} is called a Riemannian manifold if it is equipped with an inner product on the tangent space $T_x \mathcal{M}$ at each $x \in \mathcal{M}$. In case that \mathcal{M} is a Riemannian submanifold of Euclidean space \mathcal{E} , the inner product is defined as Euclidean inner product: $\langle \eta_x, \xi_x \rangle_x = \langle \eta_x, \xi_x \rangle$. The Riemannian gradient $\text{grad } f(x) \in T_x \mathcal{M}$ is the unique tangent vector satisfying

$$\langle \text{grad } f(x), \xi \rangle_x = df(x)[\xi], \forall \xi \in T_x \mathcal{M}.$$

If \mathcal{M} is a Riemannian manifold embedded in Euclidean space, we have that $\text{grad } f(x) = \mathcal{P}_{T_x \mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x))$, where $\nabla f(x)$ is Euclidean gradient, $\mathcal{P}_{T_x \mathcal{M}}$ is the projection operator on to the tangent space $T_x \mathcal{M}$. Retraction is the most important operator for manifold optimization, which turns the element of $T_x \mathcal{M}$ into the points in \mathcal{M} .

Definition 1 (Retraction) A retraction on a manifold \mathcal{M} is a smooth mapping $\mathcal{R} : T\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ with the following properties. Let $\mathcal{R}_x : T_x \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be the retraction of \mathcal{R} to $T_x \mathcal{M}$:

- $\mathcal{R}_x(0_x) = x$, where 0_x is the zero element of $T_x \mathcal{M}$,
- $d\mathcal{R}_x(0_x) = id_{T_x \mathcal{M}}$, where $id_{T_x \mathcal{M}}$ is the identity mapping on $T_x \mathcal{M}$.

2.2 Subdifferential and Moreau envelope

Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ be a proper, lower semicontinuous, and extended real-valued function. The domain of φ is defined as $\text{dom}(\varphi) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \varphi(x) < +\infty\}$. A vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be a Fréchet subgradient of φ at $x \in \text{dom}(\varphi)$ if

$$\liminf_{\substack{y \rightarrow x \\ y \neq x}} \frac{\varphi(y) - \varphi(x) - \langle v, y - x \rangle}{\|y - x\|} \geq 0. \quad (2.1)$$

The set of vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying (2.1) is called the Fréchet subdifferential of φ at $x \in \text{dom}(\varphi)$ and denoted by $\widehat{\partial}\varphi(x)$. The limiting subdifferential, or simply the subdifferential, of φ at $x \in \text{dom}(\varphi)$ is defined as

$$\partial\varphi(x) = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n : \exists x^k \rightarrow x, v^k \rightarrow v \text{ with } \varphi(x^k) \rightarrow \varphi(x), v^k \in \widehat{\partial}\varphi(x^k) \right\}.$$

By convention, if $x \notin \text{dom}(\varphi)$, then $\partial\varphi(x) = \emptyset$. The domain of $\partial\varphi$ is defined as $\text{dom}(\partial\varphi) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \partial\varphi(x) \neq \emptyset\}$. For the indicator function $\delta_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{0, +\infty\}$ associated with the non-empty closed set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\widehat{\partial}\delta_{\mathcal{S}}(x) = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n : \limsup_{y \rightarrow x, y \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\langle v, y - x \rangle}{\|y - x\|} \leq 0 \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial\delta_{\mathcal{S}}(x) = \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{S}}(x).$$

for any $x \in \mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{S}}(x)$ is the normal cone to \mathcal{S} at x .

Definition 2 (Weakly convex) Function g is said to be ρ -weakly convex if $g + \frac{\rho}{2}\|\cdot\|^2$ is convex for some $\rho \geq 0$.

Definition 3 For a proper, ρ -weakly convex and lower semicontinuous function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Moreau envelope of h with the parameter $\mu \in (0, \rho^{-1})$ is given by

$$h_{\mu}(y) := \inf_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ h(z) + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|z - y\|^2 \right\}.$$

Lemma 1 [4] Let h be a proper, closed, and ρ -weakly convex function, and h is also ℓ_h -Lipschitz continuous. Then

$$h_{\mu_2}(y) \leq h_{\mu_1}(y) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{\mu_2} \mu_1 \ell_h^2,$$

where μ_1 and μ_2 satisfy that $0 < \mu_2 \leq \mu_1 < \rho^{-1}$.

Proposition 1 [4] Let h be a proper, ρ -weakly convex, and lower semicontinuous function, and let $\mu \in (0, \rho^{-1})$. Then, Moreau envelope h_{μ} has Lipschitz continuous gradient over \mathbb{R}^n with constant $\max\{\mu^{-1}, \frac{\rho}{1-\rho\mu}\}$, and the gradient is given by

$$\nabla h_{\mu}(x) = \frac{1}{\mu} (x - \text{prox}_{\mu h}(x)) \in \partial h(\text{prox}_{\mu h}(x)), \quad (2.2)$$

where $\text{prox}_{\mu h}(x) := \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{h(y) + \frac{1}{2\mu}\|y - x\|^2\}$ is the proximal operator.

The Moreau envelope h_{μ} can be used for approximating nonsmooth function h , and parameter μ is used to control the smoothness of h_{μ} .

Definition 4 (Retraction smooth) A function $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be retraction smooth (short to retraction-smooth) with constant ℓ and a retraction \mathcal{R} , if for $\forall x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ it holds that

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \text{grad } f(x), \xi \rangle_x + \frac{\ell}{2} \|\xi\|_x^2, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\xi \in T_x \mathcal{M}$ and $y = \mathcal{R}_x(\xi)$.

Throughout this paper, we make the following assumptions.

Assumption 1

- A:** The manifold \mathcal{M} is a compact Riemannian submanifold embedded in \mathbb{E} ;
- B:** The function f is $\ell_{\nabla f}$ -smooth but not necessarily convex. The function h is ρ -weakly convex and ℓ_h -Lipschitz continuous, but non-smooth; φ is bounded from below.

C: There exist constants $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ such that, for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and all $u \in T_x\mathcal{M}$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \|\mathcal{R}_x(u) - x\| \leq \alpha\|u\|, \\ \|\mathcal{R}_x(u) - x - u\| \leq \beta\|u\|^2. \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

Remark 1 Assumption 1.C is standard: The first inequality is common, and the second inequality follows that a retraction operator on a compact submanifold always satisfies a second-order boundedness property [7]: $\mathcal{R}_x(u) = x + u + \mathcal{O}(\|u\|^2)$.

3 Stationary points

In this section, we will discuss the stationary point of problem (1.1) and the smoothed problem induced by the Moreau envelope function. Recall the original problem, i.e.,

$$\min_x f(x) + h(\mathcal{A}x), \quad \text{s.t. } x \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (3.1)$$

We say $x \in \mathcal{M}$ is a ϵ -stationary point of problem (3.1) if there exists $\xi \in \partial h(\mathcal{A}x)$ such that $\|P_{T_x\mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x) + \mathcal{A}^*\xi)\| \leq \epsilon$. As in [38], there is no finite time algorithm that can guarantee ϵ -stationarity in the nonconvex nonsmooth setting. Motivated by the notion of (δ, ϵ) -stationarity introduced in [38], we introduce a generalized ϵ -stationarity for problem (3.1).

Definition 5 We say that, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies the generalized ϵ -stationary condition of problem (3.1) if there exists $x \in \mathcal{M}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \text{dist}(0, P_{T_x\mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(y) + \mathcal{A}^*\partial h(\mathcal{A}y))) \leq \epsilon, \\ \|x - y\| \leq \epsilon. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Remark 2 Note that x is indeed a generalized ϵ -stationary point if x is an ϵ -stationary point. If $\epsilon = 0$ in Definition 5, the generalized ϵ -stationarity will reduced to ϵ -stationarity (actually ‘stationarity’).

Consider the associated smoothing problem:

$$\min_x f(x) + h_\mu(\mathcal{A}x), \quad \text{s.t. } x \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (3.3)$$

We say that $x^* \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfies the ϵ -stationary condition of problem (3.3) if

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{T_{x^*}\mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x^*) + \mathcal{A}^*\nabla h_\mu(\mathcal{A}x^*))\| \leq \epsilon. \quad (3.4)$$

The relationship between the ϵ -stationary point of problem (3.1) and (3.3) is elaborated as follows. The proof is followed by [4].

Lemma 2 Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and \mathcal{A} is surjective. If x is an ϵ -stationary point of problem (3.3), and

$$0 < \mu \leq \min\left\{\frac{1}{\ell_h\ell_{\nabla f}}, \frac{2}{\ell_h}\right\}\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{A})\epsilon$$

where $\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{A})$ is the smallest singular value of \mathcal{A} , and y satisfy that $Ay = \text{prox}_{\mu h}(\mathcal{A}x)$. Then y is a generalized 2ϵ -stationary point of problem (3.1).

Proof By $\mathcal{A}y = \text{prox}_{\mu h}(\mathcal{A}x)$, we have $y = x - \mathcal{A}^\dagger(\mathcal{A}x - \text{prox}_{\mu h}(\mathcal{A}x))$, where $\mathcal{A}^\dagger = \mathcal{A}^*(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}$. Since f is $\ell_{\nabla f}$ -Lipschitz continuous, h is ℓ_h -Lipschitz continuous and the norm of \mathcal{A}^\dagger is bounded by $\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$, we have that $\|x - y\| \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})\mu\ell_h \leq 2\epsilon$. Furthermore, follows (3.4) and Assumption 1.B we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_x\mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(y) + \mathcal{A}^*\partial h(\mathcal{A}y))) \\ &= \text{dist}(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_x\mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(y) - \nabla f(x) + \nabla f(x) + \mathcal{A}^*\partial h(\mathcal{A}y))) \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{P}_{T_x\mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(y) - \nabla f(x))\| + \text{dist}(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_x\mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x) + \mathcal{A}^*\partial h(\text{prox}_{\mu h}(\mathcal{A}x)))) \\ &\leq \ell_{\nabla f}\|x - y\| + \|\mathcal{P}_{T_x\mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x) + \mathcal{A}^*\nabla h_\mu(\mathcal{A}x))\| \\ &\leq \ell_{\nabla f}\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})\mu\ell_h + \epsilon \leq 2\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality utilizes that the projection on tangent space is non-expansive and $\nabla h_\mu(\mathcal{A}x) \in \partial h(\text{prox}_{\mu h}(\mathcal{A}x))$, which given in Proposition 1.

4 Riemannian homotopy smoothing framework

In this section, we focus on the problem (3.1). Let

$$F_k(x) := f(x) + h_{\mu_k}(\mathcal{A}x), \quad (4.1)$$

which is a smoothing approximation of $F(x)$. By Proposition 1 and chain rule, we obtain

$$\nabla F_k(x) = \nabla f(x) + \frac{1}{\mu_k}\mathcal{A}^*(\mathcal{A}x - \text{prox}_{\mu_k h}(\mathcal{A}x)), \quad (4.2)$$

and its Riemannian gradient:

$$\text{grad } F_k(x) = \mathcal{P}_{T_x\mathcal{M}}(\nabla F_k(x)). \quad (4.3)$$

The following lemma states that, if \mathcal{M} is a compact submanifold of Euclidean space \mathcal{E} , then the smoothness of function on a compact subset of \mathcal{E} reduces to its retraction-smoothness over \mathcal{M} . This is an extension of Lemma 2.7 in [7].

Lemma 3 *Let \mathcal{E} be a Euclidean space (for example, $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{R}^n$) and \mathcal{M} be a compact Riemannian submanifold of \mathcal{E} . Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Then, for F_k given in (4.1), there exists finite G such that $\|\nabla F_k(x)\| \leq G$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$, and F_k is retraction-smooth in the sense that*

$$F_k(\mathcal{R}_x(\eta)) \leq F_k(x) + \langle \eta, \text{grad } F_k(x) \rangle + \frac{\ell_k}{2}\|\eta\|^2 \quad (4.4)$$

for all $\eta \in T_x\mathcal{M}$, where

$$\ell_k = \alpha^2\ell_{\nabla f} + \alpha^2\|\mathcal{A}\|^2 \max\{\mu_k^{-1}, \frac{\rho}{1-\rho\mu_k}\} + 2G\beta.$$

If $\rho\mu_k < 1/2$, it reduces to

$$\ell_k = \alpha^2\ell_{\nabla f} + \alpha^2\|\mathcal{A}\|^2\mu_k^{-1} + 2G\beta. \quad (4.5)$$

Proof By Proposition 1, one shows that ∇F_k is Lipschitz continuous with constant $\ell_{\nabla f} + \|\mathcal{A}\|^2 \max\{\mu_k^{-1}, \frac{\rho}{1-\rho\mu_k}\}$. Since ∇F_k is continuous on the compact manifold \mathcal{M} , there exists $G > 0$ such that $\|\nabla F_k(x)\| \leq G$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$. The proof is completed by combining Assumption 1.C with Lemma 2.7 in [7].

4.1 Riemannian smoothing gradient method

Our first algorithm takes Riemannian gradient descent steps on the smoothed problem, which is

$$x^{k+1} = \mathcal{R}_{x^k}(-\gamma_k \text{grad } F_k(x^k)). \quad (4.6)$$

The basic algorithm is described in Algorithm 1. This algorithm is a gradient method and advanced splitting techniques [32, 34] can be adopted to minimize (4.1). Note that the Riemannian ADMM [21] shows a favorable performance. Our focus is to derive a sharper complexity analysis and we will not present numerical results.

Algorithm 1: Riemannian smoothing gradient method for solving (3.1).

Input: $x^1 \in \mathcal{M}$
1 **while** the terminal criteria is not met **do**
2 Set $\mu_k = (2\rho)^{-1}k^{-1/3}$, let ℓ_k be as in (4.5), and $\gamma_k = 1/\ell_k$;
3 $x^{k+1} = \mathcal{R}_{x^k}(-\gamma_k \text{grad } F_k(x^k))$;
4 **end**

With Assumption 1, we are going to show the convergence results of the proposed Riemannian smoothing gradient method, Algorithm 1. The main difference with its Euclidean analog [4, Algorithm 1] lies in the retraction-smooth result given in Lemma 1 and the analysis of the new stationarity given in Definition 5. By Lemma 1 and Assumption 1.B, one can obtain that F_k is bounded from below for all k . Let $F^* := \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} F_k(x^k)$.

Theorem 2 *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. The iteration sequence $\{x^k\}$ is generated by Algorithm 1. Let $\omega_1 = \alpha^2 \ell_{\nabla f} + 2G\beta + 2\rho\alpha^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|^2$, $\omega_2 = F_1(x^1) - F^* + (2\rho)^{-1}\ell_h^2$, $\omega_3 = (\ell_{\nabla f} \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})(2\rho)^{-1.5}\ell_h)^2 / (\alpha^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|^2)$ be known constants. Then we have for given $K \in \mathbb{N}$ that*

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \text{dist} \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k} \mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x^k) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\text{prox}_{\mu_k h}(\mathcal{A}x^k))) \right) &\leq \frac{2\sqrt{\omega_1 \omega_2}}{K^{1/3}}, \\ \|\mathcal{A}x^k - \text{prox}_{\mu_k h}(\mathcal{A}x^k)\| &\leq \frac{(2\rho)^{-1}\ell_h}{k^{1/3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

If \mathcal{A} is also surjective, and $x_k^* = x^k - \mathcal{A}^\dagger(\mathcal{A}x^k - \text{prox}_{\mu_k h} \mathcal{A}x^k)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \text{dist} \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k} \mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x_k^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_k^*)) \right) &\leq \frac{2\sqrt{(\omega_1 \omega_3 \ln(3K) + 2\omega_1 \omega_2)}}{K^{1/3}}, \\ \|x^k - x_k^*\| &\leq \frac{\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})(2\rho)^{-1}\ell_h}{k^{1/3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Proof Since $\ell_k = 1/\gamma_k$ is the Lipschitz constant of $\text{grad } F_k$, let $\eta^k = -\gamma_k \text{grad } F_k(x^k)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_k(x^{k+1}) &\leq F_k(x^k) + \left\langle \text{grad } F_k(x^k), \eta^k \right\rangle + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \|\eta^k\|^2 \\ &\leq F_k(x^k) - \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2, \quad \forall k \geq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

By Lemma 1, for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{k+1}(x) &\leq F_k(x) + \frac{1}{2}(\mu_k - \mu_{k+1})\frac{\mu_k}{\mu_{k+1}}\|\nabla h_{\mu_k}(\mathcal{A}x)\|^2 \\ &\leq F_k(x) + (\mu_k - \mu_{k+1})\ell_h^2. \end{aligned}$$

Set $x = x^{k+1}$ in the above inequality and add it to (4.9), we obtain

$$F_{k+1}(x^{k+1}) \leq F_k(x^k) - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}\|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 + (\mu_k - \mu_{k+1})\ell_h^2.$$

By summing both sides of the above inequality over $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\gamma_k}{2}\|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 &\leq F_1(x^1) - F_K(x^K) + (\mu_1 - \mu_K)\ell_h^2 \\ &\leq F_1(x^1) - F^* + \mu_1\ell_h^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

By step 2 of Algorithm 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_k &= \frac{1}{\ell_k} = \frac{\mu_k}{\mu_k(\alpha^2\ell_{\nabla f} + 2G\beta) + \alpha^2\|\mathcal{A}\|^2} \\ &\geq \frac{(2\rho)^{-1}}{(2\rho)^{-1}(\alpha^2\ell_{\nabla f} + 2G\beta) + \alpha^2\|\mathcal{A}\|^2}k^{-1/3} \\ &= \omega_1^{-1}k^{-1/3}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Combining the above inequality with (4.10), we get

$$\min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K k^{-1/3} \right) \leq \omega_1\omega_2. \quad (4.12)$$

Note that

$$\sum_{k=1}^K k^{-1/3} \geq \sum_{k=1}^K \int_k^{k+1} x^{-1/3} dx \geq \frac{1}{2}K^{2/3}.$$

It follows that

$$\min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 \leq 4\omega_1\omega_2 \frac{1}{K^{2/3}}.$$

By combining this bound with Proposition 1, and letting $z^k := \text{prox}_{\mu_k h}(\mathcal{A}x^k)$, we obtain

$$\min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \text{dist} \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k} \mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x^k) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(z^k)) \right) \leq \min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{\omega_1\omega_2}}{K^{1/3}}. \quad (4.13)$$

It follows from Proposition 1 and the chain rule that

$$\nabla h_{\mu_k}(\mathcal{A}x^k) = \frac{1}{\mu_k} \left(\mathcal{A}x^k - \text{prox}_{\mu_k h}(\mathcal{A}x^k) \right),$$

Since h is ℓ_h -Lipschitz continuous, we have

$$\|\mathcal{A}x^k - z^k\| = \|\mu_k \nabla h_{\mu_k}(\mathcal{A}x^k)\| \leq \mu_k \ell_h = \frac{(2\rho)^{-1}\ell_h}{k^{1/3}}. \quad (4.14)$$

This implies that (4.7) holds. If \mathcal{A} is also surjective, the definition of x_k^* implies that

$$x^k - x_k^* = \mathcal{A}^\dagger(\mathcal{A}x^k - \text{prox}_{\mu_k h}(\mathcal{A}x^k)). \quad (4.15)$$

Due to that the operator norm of \mathcal{A}^\dagger is bounded by $\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$, we have

$$\|x^k - x_k^*\| \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})\|\mathcal{A}x^k - z^k\| \leq \frac{\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})(2\rho)^{-1}\ell_h}{k^{1/3}}. \quad (4.16)$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 2, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}\left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k}\mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x_k^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_k^*))\right) \\ & \leq \ell_{\nabla f}\|x^k - x_k^*\| + \text{dist}\left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k}\mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x^k) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(z^k))\right) \\ & \leq \frac{\ell_{\nabla f}\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})(2\rho)^{-1}\ell_h}{k^{1/3}} + \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

Note that

$$\gamma_k = \frac{\mu_k}{\mu_k(\alpha^2\ell_{\nabla f} + 2G\beta) + \alpha^2\|\mathcal{A}\|^2} \leq \frac{\mu_k}{\alpha^2\|\mathcal{A}\|^2} = k^{-1/3}\frac{1}{2\rho\alpha^2\|\mathcal{A}\|^2}. \quad (4.18)$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\gamma_k}{4} \text{dist}^2\left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k}\mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x_k^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_k^*))\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \frac{(\ell_{\nabla f}\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})(2\rho)^{-1}\ell_h)^2}{k^{2/3}} + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\omega_3}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{k} + \omega_2 \leq \frac{\omega_3}{2} \ln(3K) + \omega_2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

where the first inequality is based on the fact that $(a+b)^2 \leq 2(a^2+b^2)$ for any $a, b > 0$, the second inequality utilize (4.10), (4.18) and (4.16). Similar to the above analysis, one can obtain that

$$\min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \text{dist}^2\left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k}\mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x_k^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_k^*))\right) \leq 8\omega_1 \left(\frac{\omega_3}{2} \ln(3K) + \omega_2\right) \frac{1}{K^{2/3}}. \quad (4.20)$$

Combining with (4.16) implies that (4.8) holds. The proof is completed.

This theorem has a discrepancy between the two boundaries (4.7) and (4.8). The first bound (4.7) states that we will come across an iteration k where the first-order optimality condition is satisfied to within a tolerance of ϵ during the first $K = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$ iterations. The second bound on $\|x^k - x_k^*\|$, however, may not be particularly small because it might have been satisfied at an early iteration (i.e., $k \ll \epsilon^{-3}$). The algorithm used to correct this flaw is described in the following section.

4.2 Riemannian smoothing gradient method with epochs

We describe a variant of Algorithm 1 in which the steps are organized into a series of epochs, each of which is twice as long as the one before. This variant is described in Algorithm 2. We will show that, there is some iteration $k = O(\epsilon^{-3})$ such that both $\|Ax^k - \text{prox}_{\mu_k h}(Ax^k)\|$ and $\text{dist}\left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k} \mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(y^k) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}y^k))\right)$ are smaller than the given tolerance ϵ .

Algorithm 2: Riemannian smoothing gradient method with epochs for solving (3.1).

Input: $x^1 \in \mathcal{M}$ and tolerance $\epsilon > 0$;

```

1 for  $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  do
2   set  $S_l \leftarrow \infty$ , and  $k_l \leftarrow 2^l$ ;
3   for  $k = 2^l, 2^l + 1, \dots, 2^{l+1} - 1$  do
4     set  $\mu_k = (2\rho)^{-1} k^{-1/3}$ , let  $\ell_k$  be as in (4.5), set  $\gamma_k = 1/\ell_k$ ;
5      $x^{k+1} = \mathcal{R}_{x^k}(-\gamma_k \text{grad } F_k(x^k))$ ;
6     if  $\|\text{grad } F_{k+1}(x^{k+1})\| \leq S_l$  then
7        $S_l \leftarrow \|\text{grad } F_{k+1}(x^{k+1})\|$ ,  $k_l \leftarrow k + 1$ ;
8       if  $S_l \leq \epsilon$  and  $\|Ax^{k+1} - \text{prox}_{\mu_{k+1} h}(Ax^{k+1})\| \leq \epsilon$  then
9         break;
10      end
11    end
12  end
13 end

```

Theorem 3 Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Consider using Algorithm 2 to problem (3.1), and F^* is finite. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$ be constants defined by Theorem 2. Then, for a given tolerance $\epsilon > 0$ and some $k = O(\epsilon^{-3})$, the iterate x^k satisfies that

$$\text{dist}\left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k} \mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x^k) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\text{prox}_{\mu_k h}(Ax^k)))\right) \leq \epsilon \text{ and } \|Ax^k - \text{prox}_{\mu_k h}(Ax^k)\| \leq \epsilon.$$

Proof As in (4.10), by using monotonicity of $\{\text{grad } F_k(x_k)\}$ and discarding non-negative terms, we have that

$$\sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 \leq \omega_2. \quad (4.21)$$

With the same arguments as in the earlier proof, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} k^{-1/3} &\geq \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \int_k^{k+1} x^{-1/3} dx = \int_{2^l}^{2^{l+1}} x^{-1/3} dx \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \left((2^{l+1})^{2/3} - (2^l)^{2/3} \right) = \frac{3}{2} \left(2^{2/3} - 1 \right) (2^l)^{2/3} \geq \frac{1}{2} (2^l)^{2/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting it and (4.11) into (4.21) yields

$$\min_{2^l \leq k \leq 2^{l+1}-1} \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{\omega_1 \omega_2}}{(2^l)^{1/3}}.$$

Let $z^k := \text{prox}_{\mu_k h}(\mathcal{A}x^k)$, we have as in (4.13) that

$$\min_{2^l \leq k \leq 2^{l+1}-1} \|\mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k} \mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x^k) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(z^k))\| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{\omega_1 \omega_2}}{(2^l)^{1/3}}. \quad (4.22)$$

Furthermore, for all $2^l \leq k \leq 2^{l+1} - 1$ we have

$$\|\mathcal{A}x^k - z^k\| \leq \mu_k \ell_h \leq \frac{(2\rho)^{-1} \ell_h}{k^{1/3}} \leq \frac{(2\rho)^{-1} \ell_h}{(2^l)^{1/3}}. \quad (4.23)$$

By (4.22) and (4.23) we deduce that Algorithm 2 must terminate before the end of epoch l , i.e., before 2^{l+1} iterations, where l is the smallest nonnegative integer such that

$$2^l \geq \max \left\{ 8\sqrt{\omega_1^3 \omega_2^3}, (2\rho)^{-3} \ell_h^3 \right\} \epsilon^{-3}.$$

Thus, termination occurs at most $2 \max \left\{ 8\sqrt{\omega_1^3 \omega_2^3}, (2\rho)^{-3} \ell_h^3 \right\} \epsilon^{-3}$ iterations.

For the case of \mathcal{A} surjective, we have the following stronger result.

Corollary 1 *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$ be constants defined by Theorem 2. Assume that \mathcal{A} is also surjective, and that the condition $\|\mathcal{A}x^{k+1} - \text{prox}_{\mu_{k+1} h}(\mathcal{A}x^{k+1})\| \leq \epsilon$ in Algorithm 2 is replaced by $\|x^{k+1} - x_{k+1}^*\| \leq \epsilon$, where $x_{k+1}^* = x^k - \mathcal{A}^\dagger(\mathcal{A}x^{k+1} - \text{prox}_{\mu_{k+1} h}(\mathcal{A}x^{k+1}))$. Then, for some $k' = O(\epsilon^{-3})$, we have that*

$$\text{dist} \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k} \mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x_{k'}^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_{k'}^*)) \right) \leq \epsilon, \quad \|x^{k'} - x_{k'}^*\| \leq \epsilon.$$

Proof If \mathcal{A} is surjective, the operator norm of \mathcal{A}^\dagger is bounded by $\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$. Therefore, for all $2^l \leq k \leq 2^{l+1} - 1$, the definition of x_k^* implies that

$$\|x^k - x_k^*\| \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) \|\mathcal{A}x^k - z^k\| \leq \frac{\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) (2\rho)^{-1} \ell_h}{(2^l)^{1/3}}. \quad (4.24)$$

Note that

$$\sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} k^{-1} \leq \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \int_{k-1}^k x^{-1} dx = \int_{2^l-1}^{2^{l+1}-1} x^{-1} dx \leq \ln(2^{l+1}) - \ln(2^l-1) = \ln(4). \quad (4.25)$$

Combining (4.17), (4.21) and (4.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \frac{\gamma_k}{4} \text{dist}^2 \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k} \mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x_k^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_k^*)) \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \frac{(\ell \nabla f \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) (2\rho)^{-1} \ell_h)^2}{k^{2/3}} + \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\omega_3}{2} \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \frac{1}{k} + \omega_2 \leq \frac{\omega_3}{2} \ln(4) + \omega_2 \leq \omega_2 + \omega_3. \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

Similar to the above analysis, one can obtain that

$$\min_{2^l \leq k \leq 2^{l+1}-1} \text{dist} \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k} \mathcal{M}} (\nabla f(x_k^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_k^*)) \right) \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\omega_1(\omega_2 + \omega_3)}}{(2^l)^{1/3}}. \quad (4.27)$$

With the considerations made in the previous proof, we can choose l to be the smallest positive integer such that

$$2^{l+1} \geq 2 \max \left\{ 8\sqrt{\omega_1^3(\omega_2 + \omega_3)^3}, \sigma_{\min}^{-3}(\mathcal{A})\ell_h^3(2\rho)^{-3} \right\} \epsilon^{-3}.$$

The claim then holds for some $k' \leq 2^{l+1}$.

4.3 Riemannian smoothing stochastic gradient method

Now we turn to analyze the Riemannian smoothing stochastic gradient method. In particular, we consider the following stochastic optimization problem on manifolds:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{M}} F(x) := \mathbb{E}_{\xi \in \mathcal{D}} [f(x, \xi)] + h(\mathcal{A}x). \quad (4.28)$$

Here, we assume that the function h is ρ -weakly convex and ℓ_h -Lipschitz continuous, $f(x) := \mathbb{E}_{\xi \in \mathcal{D}} [f(x, \xi)]$ is $\ell_{\nabla f}$ -Lipschitz continuous. We define the smoothed approximation F_k in k -iteration as follows:

$$F_k(x) := \mathbb{E}_{\xi \in \mathcal{D}} [f(x, \xi)] + h_{\mu_k}(\mathcal{A}x). \quad (4.29)$$

Proposition 1 implies that F_k is continuous differentiable with gradient

$$\nabla F_k(x) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi \in \mathcal{D}} [\nabla f(x, \xi)] + \frac{1}{\mu_k} \mathcal{A}^* (\mathcal{A}x - \text{prox}_{\mu_k h}(\mathcal{A}x)). \quad (4.30)$$

The Riemannian gradient is as follows:

$$\text{grad } F_k(x) = \mathcal{P}_{T_x \mathcal{M}} (\nabla F_k(x)). \quad (4.31)$$

By Lemma 3, when $\rho\mu_k \leq 1/2$, F_k satisfies (4.4) with constant ℓ_k given by

$$\ell_k = \alpha^2 \ell_{\nabla f} + \alpha^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|^2 \mu_k^{-1} + 2G\beta. \quad (4.32)$$

Let $G(x, \xi)$ denote the stochastic gradient of $f(x, \xi)$ respect to x , $\nabla F_k(x, \xi)$ and $\text{grad } F_k(x, \xi)$ denote the Euclidean stochastic gradient and Riemannian stochastic gradient of $F_k(x)$, respectively. The following assumptions are made for the stochastic gradient $G(x_k, \xi_k)$:

Assumption 4 *We make the following assumptions:*

- The algorithm can generate independent and identically distributed samples according to the distribution D .
- For any x , the algorithm generates a sample $\xi \sim D$ and returns a stochastic gradient $G(x, \xi)$, there exists a parameter $\sigma > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi} [G(x, \xi)] = \nabla f(x), \quad (4.33)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi} \left[\|G(x, \xi) - \nabla f(x)\|^2 \right] \leq \sigma^2. \quad (4.34)$$

Under this assumption, for any $k > 1$ we can conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi [\text{grad } F_k(x, \xi)] = \mathcal{P}_{T_x \mathcal{M}} \left(\nabla f(x) + \frac{1}{\mu_k} \mathcal{A}^*(\mathcal{A}x - \text{prox}_{\mu_k h}(\mathcal{A}x)) \right) = \text{grad } F_k(x), \quad (4.35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\|\text{grad } F_k(x, \xi) - \text{grad } F_k(x)\|^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\|\mathcal{P}_{T_x \mathcal{M}}(\nabla F_k(x, \xi) - \nabla F_k(x))\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\|\nabla F_k(x, \xi) - \nabla F_k(x)\|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\|G(x, \xi) - \nabla f(x)\|^2 \right] \leq \sigma^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

At iteration k , the Riemannian smoothing stochastic gradient algorithm generates a sample $\xi_k \sim D$ that is independent of $\{\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{k-1}\}$, and returns a Riemannian stochastic gradient $\text{grad } F_k(x^k, \xi_k)$. Then it generates the next iterate x^{k+1} via

$$x^{k+1} = \mathcal{R}_{x^k}(-\gamma_k \text{grad } F_k(x^k, \xi_k)).$$

The detail of the Riemannian smoothing stochastic gradient algorithm is presented in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3: Riemannian smoothing stochastic gradient method (RSSG) for solving (4.28).

Input: Initial point x^1 , iteration limit K , stepsizes $\{\gamma_k\}_{k \geq 1}$.

- 1 **for** $k = 1, \dots, K$ **do**
- 2 Sample $\xi_k \in D$, let $\mu_k = (2\rho)^{-1}k^{-1/5}$ and ℓ_k be as in (4.32).
- 3 Compute the Riemannian stochastic gradient via (4.31).
- 4 Update x^{k+1} via

$$x^{k+1} = \mathcal{R}_{x^k}(-\gamma_k \text{grad } F_k(x^k, \xi_k)). \quad (4.37)$$
- end**
- 5 Sample $R \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ according to $\text{Prob}(R = k) = \frac{2\gamma_k - \ell_k \gamma_k^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K (2\gamma_k - \ell_k \gamma_k^2)}$.

Output: x^R

The following result gives some convergence properties of the RSSG method.

Theorem 5 *Suppose that Assumption 1 and 4 hold, and the stepsizes $\{\gamma_k\}$ are chosen such that $\gamma_k < 2/\ell_k$. Let x^R be the point returned by Algorithm 3. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\text{grad } F_R(x^R)\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{2\omega_2 + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \ell_k \gamma_k^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K (2\gamma_k - \ell_k \gamma_k^2)}, \quad (4.38)$$

where the expectation is taken over all random choices.

Proof Let $\eta^k = -\gamma_k \text{grad } F_k(x^k, \xi_k)$ and $\delta_k \equiv \text{grad } F_k(x^k, \xi_k) - \text{grad } F_k(x^k), \forall k \geq 1$. Using the assumption that $F \in \mathcal{C}_L^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, retraction-smoothing property (2.3) and

iterate formulation (4.37), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [F_k(x^{k+1})] &\leq F_k(x^k) + \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\langle \text{grad } F_k(x^k), \eta^k \rangle] + \frac{\ell_k}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\eta^k\|^2] \\
&= F_k(x^k) - \gamma_k \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\langle \text{grad } F_k(x^k), \text{grad } F_k(x^k) + \delta_k \rangle] + \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\text{grad } F_k(x^k) + \delta_k\|^2] \\
&= F_k(x^k) - \gamma_k (\|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\langle \text{grad } F_k(x^k), \delta_k \rangle]) \\
&\quad + \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 [\|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\langle \text{grad } F_k(x^k), \delta_k \rangle] + \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\delta_k\|^2]] \\
&= F_k(x^k) - \left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 \\
&\quad - \left(\gamma_k - \ell_k \gamma_k^2 \right) \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\langle \text{grad } F_k(x^k), \delta_k \rangle] + \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\|\delta_k\|^2], \tag{4.39}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality utilizes (4.4) and (4.37). It follows from (4.35) that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [\langle \text{grad } F_k(x^k), \delta_k \rangle] = 0. \tag{4.40}$$

Combining (4.40), (4.36) and (4.39), we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} [F_k(x^{k+1})] \leq F_k(x^k) - \left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 + \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \sigma^2. \tag{4.41}$$

Taking expectations with respect to all the previous realizations ξ_1, \dots, ξ_{k-1} on both sides of (4.41) yields

$$\mathbb{E} [F_k(x^{k+1})] \leq \mathbb{E} [F_k(x^k)] - \left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \mathbb{E} [\|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2] + \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \sigma^2. \tag{4.42}$$

From Lemma 1, we have for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$

$$F_{k+1}(x) \leq F_k(x) + \frac{1}{2} (\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}) \frac{\mu_k}{\mu_{k+1}} \|\nabla h_{\mu_k}(\mathcal{A}x)\|^2 \leq F_k(x) + (\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}) \ell_h^2.$$

We set $x = x^{k+1}$ and take expectations on both sides for the above inequality, and substitute it into (4.42) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [F_{k+1}(x^{k+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E} [F_k(x^k)] - \left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \mathbb{E} [\|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \sigma^2 + (\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}) \ell_h^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up the above inequalities and re-arranging the terms yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \mathbb{E} [\|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2] \\
&\leq F_1(x^1) - F_{K+1}(x^{K+1}) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \ell_k \gamma_k^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K (\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}) \ell_h^2 \tag{4.43} \\
&\leq \omega_2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \ell_k \gamma_k^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The definition of x^R implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\text{grad } F_R(x^R)\|^2 \right] = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K (2\gamma_k - \ell_k \gamma_k^2) \mathbb{E} \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K (2\gamma_k - \ell_k \gamma_k^2)}. \quad (4.44)$$

Dividing both sides of (4.43) by $\sum_{k=1}^K (\gamma_k - \ell_k \gamma_k^2/2)$ and substituting it into (4.44) yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\text{grad } F_R(x^R)\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^K (2\gamma_k - \ell_k \gamma_k^2)} \left[2\omega_2 + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^N \ell_k \gamma_k^2 \right], \quad (4.45)$$

which clearly implies (4.38).

The following lemma will be useful to prove our main result.

Lemma 4 *For any positive integer $K > 0$, it follows that*

$$\sum_{k=1}^K k^{-3/5} \geq \frac{5}{2} K^{2/5}, \quad \sum_{k=1}^K k^{-1} \leq \ln(3K). \quad (4.46)$$

Proof Note that

$$\sum_{k=1}^K k^{-3/5} \geq \sum_{k=1}^K \int_k^{k+1} x^{-3/5} dx = \int_1^{K+1} x^{-3/5} dx = \frac{5}{2} \left((K+1)^{2/5} - 1 \right) \geq \frac{5}{2} K^{2/5}.$$

Similarly,

$$\sum_{k=1}^K k^{-1} = 1 + \sum_{k=2}^K k^{-1} \leq 1 + \sum_{k=2}^K \int_{k-1}^k x^{-1} dx = 1 + \int_1^K x^{-1} dx = 1 + \ln(K) \leq \ln(3K).$$

Corollary 2 *Suppose that Assumption 1 and 4 hold. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$ be constants given in Theorem 2 and $\omega_4 = 2\rho\alpha^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|^2$. Let $\omega(K) := 4\omega\omega_1^{-3} - \omega^2\omega_4^{-5} \ln(3K)K^{-2/5}$ and suppose $\omega(K) \geq 0$. Let $\omega = 2\omega_1^{-1}\omega_4^3$, and stepsize γ_k is given by*

$$\gamma_k = \frac{\omega}{\ell_k^3}, k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (4.47)$$

Then we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\text{grad } F_R(x^R)\|^2 \right] \leq \mathcal{B}_K := \left(\omega_2\omega_1^4\omega_4^{-3} + 2\sigma^2\omega_1^2\omega_4^{-2} \ln(3K) \right) K^{-2/5}, \quad (4.48)$$

If \mathcal{A} is also surjective, then for x_R^ defined by $x_R^* = x^R - \mathcal{A}^\dagger(\mathcal{A}x^R - \text{prox}_{\mu_R h}(\mathcal{A}x^R))$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{dist} \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^R} \mathcal{M}} \left(\nabla f(x_R^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_R^*) \right) \right) \right] &\leq CK^{-1/5} \\ \|x^R - X_R^*\| &\leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})(2\rho)^{-1} R^{-1/5} \ell_h. \end{aligned} \quad (4.49)$$

where $C = \sqrt{((\omega_3 \ln(3K) + \omega_2)\omega_1^4\omega_4^{-3} + 2\sigma^2\omega_1^2\omega_4^{-2} \ln(3K))}$.

Proof By the definition of μ_k in Algorithm 3 and (4.32), we deduce that

$$k^{-1/5}\omega_1^{-1} = k^{-1/5} \frac{1}{(\alpha^2 \ell_{\nabla f} + 2G\beta) + 2\rho\alpha^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|^2} \leq \frac{1}{\ell_k} \leq k^{-1/5} \frac{1}{2\rho\alpha^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|^2} = k^{-1/5} \omega_4^{-1}. \quad (4.50)$$

Combining Lemma 4 and (4.47) yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \ell_k \gamma_k^2 = \omega^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \ell_k^{-5} \leq \omega^2 \omega_4^{-5} \sum_{k=1}^K k^{-1} \leq \omega^2 \omega_4^{-5} \ln(3K), \quad (4.51)$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \gamma_k = \omega \sum_{k=1}^K \ell_k^{-3} \geq \omega \omega_1^{-3} \sum_{k=1}^K k^{-3/5} \geq \frac{5}{2} \omega \omega_1^{-3} K^{2/5}. \quad (4.52)$$

It is clear that

$$0 < \gamma_k = \frac{\omega}{\ell_k^3} = \frac{2\omega_4^3}{\omega_1} \ell_k^{-3} \leq k^{-3/5} \frac{2}{\omega_1} \leq k^{-1/5} \frac{2}{\omega_1} \leq \frac{2}{\ell_k}. \quad (4.53)$$

Thus $2\gamma_k - \ell_k \gamma_k^2 > 0$ for all $k > 0$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\omega_2 + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \ell_k \gamma_k^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K (2\gamma_k - \ell_k \gamma_k^2)} &\leq \frac{2\omega_2 + \sigma^2 \omega^2 \omega_4^{-5} \ln(3K)}{5\omega \omega_1^{-3} K^{2/5} - \omega^2 \omega_4^{-5} \ln(3K)} \\ &= \frac{(2\omega_2 + \sigma^2 \omega^2 \omega_4^{-5} \ln(3K)) K^{-2/5}}{5\omega \omega_1^{-3} - \omega^2 \omega_4^{-5} \ln(3K) K^{-2/5}} \\ &= \frac{(2\omega_2 + 4\sigma^2 \omega_1^{-2} \omega_4 \ln(3K)) K^{-2/5}}{\omega \omega_1^{-3} + \omega(K)} \\ &\leq \frac{(2\omega_2 + 4\sigma^2 \omega_1^{-2} \omega_4 \ln(3K)) K^{-2/5}}{2\omega_1^{-4} \omega_4^3} \\ &= \left(\omega_2 \omega_1^4 \omega_4^{-3} + 2\sigma^2 \omega_1^2 \omega_4^{-2} \ln(3K) \right) \times K^{-2/5}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.54)$$

where the first inequality utilizes (4.51) and (4.52), the second inequality is due to that $\omega(K) > 0$. Combining with (4.38) implies (4.48). If \mathcal{A} is also surjective, the definition of x_R^* implies that

$$\|x^R - x_R^*\| \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) \|Ax^R - z^R\| \leq \frac{\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})(2\rho)^{-1} \ell_h}{R^{1/5}}.$$

Furthermore, (4.17) implies that

$$\text{dist}\left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^R} \mathcal{M}}(\nabla f(x_R^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_R^*))\right) \leq \frac{\ell_{\nabla f} \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})(2\rho)^{-1} \ell_h}{R^{1/5}} + \|\text{grad } F_R(x^R)\|. \quad (4.55)$$

Note that

$$\left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \leq \omega \ell_k^{-3} - \frac{1}{2} \omega^2 \ell_k^{-5} \leq \omega \omega^{-3} k^{-3/5}. \quad (4.56)$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \text{dist}^2 \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x^k} \mathcal{M}} \left(\nabla f(x_k^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A} x_k^*) \right) \right) \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \frac{(\ell_{\nabla f} \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) (2\rho)^{-1} \ell_h)^2}{k^{2/5}} + 2 \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 \\
& \leq 2\omega_3 \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{k} + 2\omega_2 + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \ell_k \gamma_k^2 \leq 2\omega_3 \ln(3K) + 2\omega_2 + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \ell_k \gamma_k^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.57}$$

Similar to the above analysis, one can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\text{dist}^2 \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_R} \mathcal{M}} \left(\nabla f(x_R^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A} x_R^*) \right) \right) \right] \\
& \leq \left((\omega_3 \ln(3K) + \omega_2) \omega_1^4 \omega_4^{-3} + 2\sigma^2 \omega_1^2 \omega_4^{-2} \ln(3K) \right) \times K^{-2/5},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.58}$$

which implies that (4.49) holds. The proof is completed.

Remark 3 In Corollary 2, we assume that $\omega(K) \geq 0$, it is reasonable because that when K is large enough $\ln(3K)K^{-2/5}$ will tend to zero. Corollary 2 claims that, given $\epsilon > 0$, the total iterations performed by Algorithm 3 is $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-5})$.

4.4 Riemannian smoothing stochastic gradient method with epochs

We give a variant of Algorithm 3 in which the steps are organized into a series of epochs, each of which is twice as long as the one before, which is described in Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4: Riemannian smoothing stochastic gradient method with epochs for solving (4.28).

Input: $x^1 \in \mathcal{M}$ and tolerance $\epsilon > 0$;

- 1 **for** $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
- 2 **for** $k = 2^l, 2^l + 1, \dots, 2^{l+1} - 1$ **do**
- 3 Sample $\xi_k \in D$, set $\mu_k = (2\rho)^{-1} k^{-1/5}$ and set ℓ_k as in (4.32).
- 4 Compute the stochastic gradient $\text{grad } F_k(x^k, \xi_k)$ via (4.31).
- 5 Update x^{k+1} via

$$x^{k+1} = \mathcal{R}_{x^k}(-\gamma_k \text{grad } F_k(x^k, \xi_k)). \tag{4.59}$$
- 6 **end**
- 6 Sample $R_l \in \{2^l, \dots, 2^{l+1} - 1\}$ via $\text{Prob}(R_l = k) = \frac{2\gamma_k - \ell_k \gamma_k^2}{\sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} (2\gamma_k - \ell_k \gamma_k^2)}$. **end**

Theorem 6 Suppose that Assumption 1 and 4 hold. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4, \omega$ be constants given in Corollary 2. The iteration sequence $\{x^k\}$ is produced by Algorithm 4 for solving

problem (4.28). Assume that \mathcal{A} is surjective. Then, for some $k' = O(\epsilon^{-5})$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\text{dist} \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_{k'}}} \mathcal{M} \left(\nabla f(x_{k'}) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_{k'}) \right) \right) \right] \leq \epsilon, \quad \|x^{k'} - x_{k'}^*\| \leq \epsilon. \quad (4.60)$$

Proof As (4.43), by the monotonicity of $\{\text{grad } F_k(x_k)\}$ and discarding nonnegative terms, we have

$$\sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \mathbb{E}_\xi \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 \leq \omega_2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \ell_k \gamma_k^2. \quad (4.61)$$

Similar to Lemma 4, one can easily show that

$$\sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} k^{-3/5} \geq \frac{1}{2} (2^l)^{2/5}, \quad \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} k^{-1} \leq \ln(4) \leq 2. \quad (4.62)$$

Furthermore, the definition of $x_{R_l}^*$ implies that

$$\|x^{R_l} - x_{R_l}^*\| \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) \|\mathcal{A}x^{R_l} - z^{R_l}\| \leq \frac{\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})(2\rho)^{-1} \ell_h}{R_l^{1/5}} \leq \frac{\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})(2\rho)^{-1} \ell_h}{(2^l)^{1/5}}.$$

As in (4.17), one can obtain that

$$\text{dist} \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_{R_l}}} \mathcal{M} \left(\nabla f(x_{R_l}^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_{R_l}^*) \right) \right) \leq \frac{\ell_{\nabla f} \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})(2\rho)^{-1} \ell_h}{R_l^{1/5}} + \|\text{grad } F_{R_l}(x^{R_l})\|. \quad (4.63)$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \text{dist}^2 \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_k}} \mathcal{M} \left(\nabla f(x_k^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_k^*) \right) \right) \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \frac{(\ell_{\nabla f} \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})(2\rho)^{-1} \ell_h)^2}{k^{2/5}} + 2 \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \left(\gamma_k - \frac{\ell_k}{2} \gamma_k^2 \right) \|\text{grad } F_k(x^k)\|^2 \\ & \leq 2\omega_3 \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \frac{1}{k} + 2\omega_2 + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \ell_k \gamma_k^2 \leq 4\omega_3 + 2\omega_2 + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=2^l}^{2^{l+1}-1} \ell_k \gamma_k^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.64)$$

where the second inequality utilizes (4.56) and the last inequality utilizes (4.62).

Similar to the above analysis, one can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\text{dist}^2 \left(0, \mathcal{P}_{T_{x_{R_l}}} \mathcal{M} \left(\nabla f(x_{R_l}^*) + \mathcal{A}^* \partial h(\mathcal{A}x_{R_l}^*) \right) \right) \right] \\ & \leq \left((2\omega_3 + \omega_2) \omega_1^4 \omega_4^{-3} + 2\sigma^2 \omega_1^2 \omega_4^{-2} \ln(3K) \right) \times (2^l)^{-2/5}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.65)$$

With the considerations made in the previous proof, we can choose l to be the smallest positive integer such that

$$2^{l+1} \geq 2 \max \left\{ 8 \sqrt{\omega_1^3 (\omega_2 + \omega_3)^3}, \sigma_{\min}^{-3}(\mathcal{A}) \ell_h^3 (2\rho)^{-3} \right\} \epsilon^{-3}.$$

The claim then holds for some $k' \leq 2^{l+1}$. The proof is completed.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we develop a family of Riemannian gradient type methods, namely Riemannian smoothing gradient and Riemannian smoothing stochastic gradient, to find a generalized ϵ -stationarity point of a class of nonconvex and nonsmooth problem on Riemannian manifolds. The objective function of the problems under consideration is the sum of a differentiable component and a nonsmooth weakly convex function composed with a linear operator, and the variables to be optimized is restricted on Riemannian manifolds embedding in Euclidean space. This kind of problem has a wide range of applications in the real world. We first introduce the notion of generalized ϵ -stationarity, which is a generalization of ϵ -stationarity. Then, based on the Moreau envelope with a decreasing sequence of smoothing parameters, we obtain the smoothed problem on Euclidean space and prove the problem is also smooth on the Riemannian compact submanifold. We have shown that the proposed algorithms have the iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-5})$ for driving a generalized ϵ -stationarity, respectively.

References

1. Absil, P.A., Baker, C.G., Gallivan, K.A.: Trust-region methods on Riemannian manifolds. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* **7**(3), 303–330 (2007)
2. Absil, P.A., Hosseini, S.: A collection of nonsmooth Riemannian optimization problems. In: *Nonsmooth Optimization and Its Applications*, pp. 1–15. Springer (2019)
3. Absil, P.A., Mahony, R., Sepulchre, R.: *Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds*. Princeton University Press (2009)
4. Böhm, A., Wright, S.J.: Variable smoothing for weakly convex composite functions. *Journal of optimization theory and applications* **188**(3), 628–649 (2021)
5. Bonnabel, S.: Stochastic gradient descent on riemannian manifolds. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **58**(9), 2217–2229 (2013)
6. Bot, R.I., Böhm, A.: Variable smoothing for convex optimization problems using stochastic gradients. arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.06553 (2019)
7. Boumal, N., Absil, P.A., Cartis, C.: Global rates of convergence for nonconvex optimization on manifolds. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* **39**(1), 1–33 (2019)
8. Cambier, L., Absil, P.A.: Robust low-rank matrix completion by Riemannian optimization. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **38**(5), S440–S460 (2016)
9. de Carvalho Bento, G., da Cruz Neto, J.X., Oliveira, P.R.: A new approach to the proximal point method: convergence on general Riemannian manifolds. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* **168**(3), 743–755 (2016)
10. Chambolle, A., Pock, T.: A first-order primal-dual algorithm for convex problems with applications to imaging. *Journal of mathematical imaging and vision* **40**(1), 120–145 (2011)
11. Chen, S., Ma, S., Man-Cho So, A., Zhang, T.: Proximal gradient method for nonsmooth optimization over the stiefel manifold. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **30**(1), 210–239 (2020)
12. Chen, W., Ji, H., You, Y.: An augmented Lagrangian method for 1-regularized optimization problems with orthogonality constraints. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **38**(4), B570–B592 (2016)
13. Deng, K., Peng, Z.: A manifold inexact augmented Lagrangian method for nonsmooth optimization on Riemannian submanifolds in Euclidean space. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* (2022). URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drac018>
14. Ferreira, O., Oliveira, P.: Proximal point algorithm on Riemannian manifolds. *Optimization* **51**(2), 257–270 (2002)
15. Hosseini, S.: Convergence of nonsmooth descent methods via Kurdyka–Lojasiewicz inequality on Riemannian manifolds. Hausdorff Center for Mathematics and Institute for Numerical Simulation, University of Bonn (2015,(INS Preprint No. 1523)) (2015)

16. Hosseini, S., Huang, W., Yousefpour, R.: Line search algorithms for locally Lipschitz functions on Riemannian manifolds. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **28**(1), 596–619 (2018)
17. Hosseini, S., Uschmajew, A.: A Riemannian gradient sampling algorithm for nonsmooth optimization on manifolds. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **27**(1), 173–189 (2017)
18. Huang, W., Absil, P.A., Gallivan, K.A.: A Riemannian BFGS method without differentiated retraction for nonconvex optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **28**(1), 470–495 (2018)
19. Jolliffe, I.T., Trendafilov, N.T., Uddin, M.: A modified principal component technique based on the LASSO. *Journal of computational and Graphical Statistics* **12**(3), 531–547 (2003)
20. Kovnatsky, A., Glashoff, K., Bronstein, M.M.: MADMM: a generic algorithm for non-smooth optimization on manifolds. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 680–696. Springer (2016)
21. Li, J., Ma, S., Srivastava, T.: A Riemannian ADMM. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.02163* (2022)
22. Li, X., Chen, S., Deng, Z., Qu, Q., Zhu, Z., Man-Cho So, A.: Weakly convex optimization over Stiefel manifold using Riemannian subgradient-type methods. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **31**(3), 1605–1634 (2021)
23. Lin, Q., Chen, X., Peña, J.: A smoothing stochastic gradient method for composite optimization. *Optimization Methods and Software* **29**(6), 1281–1301 (2014)
24. Liu, C., Boumal, N.: Simple algorithms for optimization on Riemannian manifolds with constraints. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization* **82**(3), 949–981 (2020)
25. Luenberger, D.G.: The gradient projection method along geodesics. *Management Science* **18**(11), 620–631 (1972)
26. Metel, M., Takeda, A.: Simple stochastic gradient methods for non-smooth non-convex regularized optimization. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4537–4545 (2019)
27. Ouyang, H., Gray, A.: Stochastic smoothing for nonsmooth minimizations: Accelerating sgd by exploiting structure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.4481* (2012)
28. Qu, Q., Li, X., Zhu, Z.: A nonconvex approach for exact and efficient multichannel sparse blind deconvolution. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 4017–4028 (2019)
29. Sato, H., Kasai, H., Mishra, B.: Riemannian stochastic variance reduced gradient algorithm with retraction and vector transport. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **29**(2), 1444–1472 (2019)
30. Selvan, S.E., Borckmans, P.B., Chattopadhyay, A., Absil, P.A.: Spherical mesh adaptive direct search for separating quasi-uncorrelated sources by range-based independent component analysis. *Neural computation* **25**(9), 2486–2522 (2013)
31. Selvan, S.E., George, S.T., Balakrishnan, R.: Range-based ICA using a nonsmooth quasi-Newton optimizer for electroencephalographic source localization in focal epilepsy. *Neural computation* **27**(3), 628–671 (2015)
32. Themelis, A., Patrinos, P.: Douglas–Rachford splitting and ADMM for nonconvex optimization: Tight convergence results. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **30**(1), 149–181 (2020)
33. Tran-Dinh, Q.: Adaptive smoothing algorithms for nonsmooth composite convex minimization. *Computational Optimization and Applications* **66**(3), 425–451 (2017)
34. Wang, Y., Yin, W., Zeng, J.: Global convergence of ADMM in nonconvex nonsmooth optimization. *Journal of Scientific Computing* **78**(1), 29–63 (2019)
35. Wei, X., Yu, H., Ling, Q., Neely, M.: Solving non-smooth constrained programs with lower complexity than $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$: A primal-dual homotopy smoothing approach. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 3995–4005 (2018)
36. Xu, Y., Yan, Y., Lin, Q., Yang, T.: Homotopy smoothing for non-smooth problems with lower complexity than $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$. In: *Advances In Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1208–1216 (2016)
37. Zhang, C., Chen, X., Ma, S.: A Riemannian smoothing steepest descent method for non-Lipschitz optimization on submanifolds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.04199* (2021)
38. Zhang, J., Lin, H., Jegelka, S., Sra, S., Jadbabaie, A.: Complexity of finding stationary points of nonconvex nonsmooth functions. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 11,173–11,182. PMLR (2020)