

# Complexity of linearized augmented Lagrangian for optimization with nonlinear equality constraints

Lahcen El Bourkhissi · Ion Necoara

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** In this paper, we consider a nonconvex optimization problem with nonlinear equality constraints. We assume that both, the objective function and the functional constraints are locally smooth. For solving this problem, we propose a linearized augmented Lagrangian method, i.e., we linearize the functional constraints in the augmented Lagrangian at the current iterate and add a quadratic regularization, yielding a subproblem that is easy to solve, and whose solution is the next iterate. Under a dynamic regularization parameter choice, we prove global asymptotic convergence of the iterates to a critical point of the problem. We also derive convergence guarantees for the iterates of our method to an  $\epsilon$  first-order optimal solution in  $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$  outer iterations. Finally, we show that, when the problem data are e.g., semialgebraic, the sequence generated by our algorithm converges and we derive convergence rates. We validate the theory and the performance of the proposed algorithm by numerically comparing it with the existing methods from the literature.

**Keywords** Nonconvex optimization · linearized augmented Lagrangian · nonlinear functional constraints · convergence analysis.

---

The research leading to these results has received funding from: the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 953348; NO Grants 2014-2021, RO-NO- 2019-0184, under project ELO-Hyp, contract no. 24/2020; UEFISCDI, PN-III-P4-PCE-2021-0720, under project L2O-MOC, nr. 70/2022.

---

Lahcen El Bourkhissi  
Department of Automatic Control and Systems Engineering, University Politehnica Bucharest, Bucharest, 060042, Romania  
E-mail: lel@stud.acs.upb.ro

Ion Necoara  
Department of Automatic Control and Systems Engineering, University Politehnica Bucharest, Bucharest, 060042, Romania.  
Gheorghe Mihoc-Caius Iacob Institute of Mathematical Statistics and Applied Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, 050711 Bucharest, Romania.  
E-mail: ion.necoara@upb.ro

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2020)** 68Q25 · 90C06 · 90C30.

## 1 Introduction

In many fields, such as machine learning, matrix optimization, statistics, control and signal processing, one finds applications that can be recast as nonconvex optimization problems with nonlinear functional equality constraints, see, e.g., [10, 17, 19, 24]. In this paper, we solve this optimization problem by means of an augmented Lagrangian approach. The augmented Lagrangian method, also known as the method of multipliers, was initially proposed in [14, 16, 22] to minimize objective functions subject to (linear) equality constraints. It provides many theoretical advantages, even for non-convex problems, e.g., no duality gap and exact penalty representation, see [23]. Moreover, the augmented Lagrangian framework is at the heart of the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM), a very efficient method for large-scale (distributed) optimization [5–8, 11, 12, 30].

The augmented Lagrangian approach has been extensively studied in the literature for convex problems, see e.g., [2–4, 7, 12, 26], and recently it has been extended to non-convex (smooth/non-smooth) problems with linear equality constraints in [15, 17, 18, 30, 32]. However, there are very few studies on the use of the augmented Lagrangian framework for nonconvex optimization with nonlinear equality constraints, see [8, 29]. In [29] a Proximal Augmented Lagrangian (Proximal AL) is proposed to solve nonconvex, but smooth optimization problems. In Proximal AL a static regularization (proximal) term is added to the original augmented Lagrangian function. The authors prove that when an approximate first- (second)-order solution of the subproblem is found, with an error approaching asymptotically zero, then an  $\epsilon$ - first ( $\epsilon$ -second)-order solution of the original problem is obtained within  $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{2-\eta})$  outer iterations, where  $\eta \in [0, 2]$  is an user-defined parameter. Note that when  $\eta$  is close to 2, the complexity reduces to  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  outer iterations, but the subproblem, which is already nonconvex due to the nonlinearity of the constraints, gets ill-conditioned as the penalty parameter in the augmented Lagrangian is inversely proportional to  $\epsilon^\eta$ . In addition, the total iteration complexity is derived when the Newton conjugate gradient method from [25] is used to solve the subproblem at each outer iteration of Proximal AL algorithm. In [30], a PL-ADMM was proposed to solve nonsmooth nonconvex problems with linear equality constraints for two blocks. In this setting, the problem is smooth in one block and nonsmooth in the other. PL-ADMM algorithm uses a dynamic metric proximal term in the primal update and an overrelaxation step in the dual update. It is proved in [30] that the sequence generated by this algorithm is bounded and each limit point of this sequence is a stationary point of the original problem. Additionally, it is shown that under the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz (KL) property, the error converges either in a finite number of iterations, sublinearly or linearly, depending on the exponent associated with

the KL property. Similar convergence results are obtained in [8] for an algorithm solving problems having nonlinear constraints in the first block (for which the corresponding objective function is smooth) and linear constraints in the second block. The algorithm proposed in [8], called DAM (Dynamic linearized Alternating direction method of Multipliers), linearizes the smooth part of the augmented Lagrangian and adds a proximal regularization, where the proximal parameter is dynamically generated.

A different approach, that does not rely on the augmented Lagrangian framework, is presented in [20, 27] and is called Sequential Convex Programming (SCP). This method solves a sequence of convex approximations of the original problem by linearizing the nonconvex parts of the objective and of the functional constraints and preserving the structures that can be exploited by convex optimization techniques. In this case the subproblem has a (strongly) convex objective and linear constraints, for which efficient solution methods exist, e.g., [13, 21]. However, to the best of our knowledge, SCP methods converge under mild assumptions only locally [20, 27].

Due to the high cost of solving the nonconvex subproblem in Proximal AL [29] and the fact that SCP type schemes [20, 27] have only local convergence guarantees, in this paper we propose a novel Linearized Augmented Lagrangian method (called Linearized AL) for solving smooth nonconvex problems with nonlinear equality constraints, that overcomes these limitations. More precisely, in our algorithm we linearize the functional constraints in the augmented Lagrangian at the current iterate and add a dynamic regularization term, yielding a subproblem that is easy to solve, and whose solution is the next iterate. Indeed, if the objective function is (weakly) convex, our subproblem is strongly convex and thus can be solved efficiently. Hence, our method borrows the advantages of both approaches, Proximal AL and SCP, since it converges globally and the subproblem is strongly convex and thus easy to solve. We prove that the sequence generated by our algorithm is bounded, each limit point of this sequence is a stationary point and under the KL property we prove convergence for the whole sequence. More precisely, under a dynamic regularization parameter choice, we prove global asymptotic convergence of the iterates to a critical point of the problem. We also derive convergence guarantees for the iterates of our method to an  $\epsilon$  first-order optimal solution in  $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$  outer iterations. Finally, we show that under the KL property the whole sequence generated by the proposed algorithm converges and we derive convergence rates depending on the KL parameter. Unlike [29], in our method the penalty parameter is independent on the required accuracy  $\epsilon$ . Moreover, in comparison with [20], our convergence results here are global, while only local convergence has been proved for SCP. The preliminary numerical results confirm the efficiency of our Linearized AL algorithm.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we introduce our problem of interest and some notions necessary for our analysis. In Section 3, we present our algorithm, followed in Section 4 by its convergence analysis. Finally, in Section 5, we compare numerically our method with existing algorithms.

## 2 Problem formulation and preliminaries

In this paper, we consider the following nonlinear optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & F(x) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $F(x) \triangleq (f_1(x), \dots, f_m(x))^T$ , with  $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for all  $i = 1 : m$ . We assume the functions  $f, f_i \in \mathcal{C}^2$  for all  $i = 1 : m$ ,  $f$  is (weakly) convex and  $F$  is nonlinear. For this problem we consider the following assumptions:

**Assumption 1** Assume that there exists  $\rho_0 \geq 0$  such that  $f(x) + \frac{\rho_0}{2} \|F(x)\|^2$  has compact level sets, i.e., for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , the following set is empty or compact:

$$\mathcal{S}_\alpha^0 \triangleq \{x : f(x) + \frac{\rho_0}{2} \|F(x)\|^2 \leq \alpha\}.$$

**Assumption 2** Given a compact set  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , there exist positive constants  $M_f, M_F, \sigma, L_f, L_F$  such that  $f$  and  $F$  satisfy the following conditions:

- (i)  $\|\nabla f(x)\| \leq M_f$ ,  $\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \leq L_f \|x - y\|$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$ .
- (ii)  $\|\nabla F(x)\| \leq M_F$ ,  $\sigma_{\min}(\nabla F(x)) \geq \sigma > 0$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$ .
- (iii)  $\|\nabla F(x) - \nabla F(y)\| \leq L_F \|x - y\|$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$ .

**Assumption 3** There exists finite  $\bar{U}$  such that  $f(x) \leq \bar{U}$  for all  $x \in \{x : \|F(x)\| \leq 1\}$ .

Note that these assumptions are standard in the nonconvex optimization literature, see e.g., [8, 29]. In fact, these assumptions are not restrictive because they need to hold only locally. Indeed, large classes of problems satisfy these assumptions as discussed below.

*Remark 1* Assumption 1 holds e.g., when  $f(x) + \rho_0 \|F(x)\|^2$  is coercive for some  $\rho \geq 0$ , or when  $f(x)$  is strongly convex or  $f(x)$  is bounded below and  $F(x) = x^T x - 1$ , as is the case in dictionary learning applications. It also holds when  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2} x^T Q x - p^T x$ ,  $F(x) = Ax - b$  and  $Q$  is a positive definite matrix on  $\text{null}(A) := \{x : Ax = 0\}$ .

*Remark 2* Assumption 2 allows general classes of problems. In particular, conditions (i) hold if  $f(x)$  is differentiable and  $\nabla f(x)$  is *locally* Lipschitz continuous on a neighborhood of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Conditions (ii) hold when  $F(x)$  is differentiable on a neighborhood of  $\mathcal{S}$  and satisfies an LICQ condition over  $\mathcal{S}$ . Finally, condition (iii) holds if  $\nabla F(x)$  is *locally* Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{S}$ .

*Remark 3* For Assumption 3 to hold, it is sufficient the set  $\{x : \|F(x)\| \leq 1\}$  to be compact. In fact, we do not need this assumption if we can choose the starting point  $x_0$  such that  $F(x_0) = 0$ , that is, the initial point is feasible.

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of Assumption 1.

**Lemma 1** *If Assumption 1 holds, then  $f(x) + \frac{\rho_0}{2}\|F(x)\|^2$  is lower bounded:*

$$\bar{L} \triangleq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ f(x) + \frac{\rho_0}{2} \|F(x)\|^2 \right\} > -\infty. \quad (2)$$

*Proof* See Appendix.

Further, let us introduce the following definitions (see also [29]):

**Definition 1** [First-order solution and  $\epsilon$  first-order solution of (1)] The vector  $x^*$  is said to be first-order solution of (1) if  $\exists \lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$  such that:

$$\nabla f(x^*) + \nabla F(x^*)^T \lambda^* = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad F(x^*) = 0.$$

Moreover,  $x^*$  is an  $\epsilon$  first-order solution of (1) if  $\exists \lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$  such that:

$$\|\nabla f(x^*) + \nabla F(x^*)^T \lambda^*\| \leq \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|F(x^*)\| \leq \epsilon.$$

Let  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  be a proper lower semicontinuous function. For  $-\infty < \tau_1 < \tau_2 \leq +\infty$ , we define  $[\tau_1 < \Phi < \tau_2] = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \tau_1 < \Phi(x) < \tau_2\}$ . Let  $\tau \in (0, +\infty]$ . We denote by  $\Psi_\tau$  the set of all continuous concave functions  $\varphi : [0, \tau] \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  such that  $\varphi(0) = 0$  and  $\varphi$  is continuously differentiable on  $(0, \tau)$ , with  $\varphi'(s) > 0$  over  $(0, \tau)$ .

**Definition 2** Let  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  be a proper lower semicontinuous function that takes constant value on  $\Omega$ . We say that  $\Phi$  satisfies the KL property on  $\Omega$  if there exists  $\epsilon > 0, \tau > 0$ , and  $\varphi \in \Psi_\tau$  such that for every  $x^* \in \Omega$  and every element  $x$  in the intersection  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \text{dist}(x, \Omega) < \epsilon\} \cap [\Psi(x^*) < \Psi(x) < \Psi(x^*) + \tau]$ , we have:

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

This definition covers many classes of functions arising in practical optimization problems. For example, if  $f$  is a proper closed semialgebraic function, then  $f$  is a KL function with exponent  $\nu \in [0, 1)$  [1]. The function  $g(Ax)$ , where  $g$  is strongly convex on a compact set and twice differentiable, and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , is a KL function. Convex piecewise linear quadratic functions such as  $\|x\|_1, \|x\|_0, \gamma \sum_{i=1}^k |x_{[i]}|$ , where  $|x_{[i]}|$  is the  $i$ th largest entry in  $x$ ,  $k \leq n$  and  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ ; the indicator function  $\delta_\Delta(x)$ , where  $\Delta = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : e^T x = 1, x \geq 0\}$ ; least-squares problems with the Smoothly Clipped Absolute Deviation (SCAD) [9]; Minimax Concave Penalty (MCP) regularized functions [31] are all KL functions. The KL property characterizes the local geometry of a function around the set of critical points.

### 3 A linearized augmented Lagrangian method

In this section, we propose a new algorithm for solving problem (1) using the augmented Lagrangian framework. Let us first introduce few notations. The augmented Lagrangian associated with the problem (1) is:

$$\mathcal{L}_\rho(x, \lambda) = f(x) + \langle \lambda, F(x) \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x)\|^2 = f(x) + \psi(x, \lambda),$$

where  $\psi(x, \lambda) = \langle \lambda, F(x) \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x)\|^2$ . The gradient of  $\psi$  is:  $\nabla_x \psi(x, \lambda) = \nabla F(x)^T (\lambda + \rho F(x))$  and  $\nabla_\lambda \psi(x, \lambda) = F(x)$ . In the rest of this paper, for the sake of clarity, we provide the proofs of all the lemmas in Appendix. The following lemma shows that  $\psi$  is locally smooth, (i.e., it has Lipschitz continuous gradient locally).

**Lemma 2** [*Smoothness of  $\psi$* ] *If Assumption 2 holds, then for any compact set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  there exists  $L_\psi > 0$  such that:*

$$\|\nabla \psi(x, \lambda) - \nabla \psi(x', \lambda')\| \leq L_\psi \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x - x' \\ \lambda - \lambda' \end{pmatrix} \right\| \quad \forall (x, \lambda), (x', \lambda') \in \mathcal{S} \times A,$$

where  $L_\psi = \sup_{(x, \lambda) \in \mathcal{S} \times A} \{L_F \|\lambda + \rho F(x)\| + M_F(2 + \rho M_F)\}$ .

*Proof* See Appendix.

Further, let us denote the following function derived from linearization of the functional constraints, at a given point  $\bar{x}$ , in the augmented Lagrangian:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x, \lambda; \bar{x}) \\ = f(x) + \langle \lambda, F(\bar{x}) + \nabla F(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(\bar{x}) + \nabla F(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x})\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

To solve the optimization problem (1) we propose the following *Linearized augmented Lagrangian* (Linearized AL) algorithm, i.e., we linearize the functional constraints in the augmented Lagrangian at the current iterate and add a quadratic regularization.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Linearized augmented Lagrangian

---

- 1: **Initialization:**  $x_0, \lambda_0$ , and  $\rho > 0$ ;
  - 2:  $k \leftarrow 0$
  - 3: **while** stopping criterion is not satisfied **do**
  - 4:     generate a proximal parameter  $\beta_{k+1} > 0$
  - 5:      $x_{k+1} \leftarrow \arg \min_x \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x, \lambda_k; x_k) + \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|x - x_k\|^2$  ▷ The subproblem
  - 6:      $\lambda_{k+1} \leftarrow \lambda_k + \rho \left( F(x_k) + \nabla F(x_k)(x_{k+1} - x_k) \right)$
  - 7:      $k \leftarrow k + 1$
  - 8: **end while**
- 

*To the best of our knowledge Linearized AL algorithm is new and its convergence behaviour has not been analyzed before in the literature. Note that if*

$f$  is (weakly) convex function, the objective function in the subproblem of step 5 of Algorithm 1 is strongly convex, provided that  $\beta_{k+1}$  is chosen adequately. In particular, if  $f$  is a quadratic function, then finding a solution of the subproblem in step 5 is even equivalent with solving a linear system of equalities. In these cases, efficient solution methods exist for solving the subproblem, see e.g., [13, 21]. It is also important to note that our update of the dual multipliers is different from the literature, i.e., instead of evaluating the functional constraints at the new test point  $x_{k+1}$  and updating  $\lambda_{k+1} = \lambda_k + \rho F(x_{k+1})$  [8, 29], we evaluate their linearization at  $x_k$  in the new point  $x_{k+1}$  and update  $\lambda_{k+1} = \lambda_k + \rho(F(x_k) + \nabla F(x_k)(x_{k+1} - x_k))$ . In the sequel, we denote:

$$\Delta x_k = x_k - x_{k-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta \lambda_k = \lambda_k - \lambda_{k-1} \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Then, from Lemma 2 we can choose  $\beta_{k+1}$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi(x_{k+1}, \lambda_k) - \psi(x_k, \lambda_k) - \langle \nabla_x \psi(x_k, \lambda_k), x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \\ & \leq \frac{(1 - \alpha)\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \quad \forall k \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Note that for any  $k \geq 1$ ,  $\beta_k$  is well defined since  $\psi$  is smooth, see Lemma 2. This regularization parameter  $\beta_k$  can be found using e.g., a backtracking scheme as in [8]. In the sequel, we assume that  $\beta_k$  satisfies the following:

**Assumption 4** [*Proximal parameter sequence is bounded*] Assume that the generated parameter sequence  $\{\beta_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  is bounded, i.e.,

$$\beta := \sup_{k \geq 1} \beta_k < \infty.$$

## 4 Convergence analysis

In this section, we derive the asymptotic convergence of Linearized AL algorithm (Algorithm 1) and its efficiency to obtain an  $\epsilon$  first-order solution for problem (1). Moreover, we provide convergence rates under the KL condition. Note that for some intermediate steps in the convergence analysis we follow a similar methodology as in [29]. Let us start by proving the decrease with respect to the first argument for the augmented Lagrangian function.

**Lemma 3** [*Descent of  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$  w.r.t. primal variables*] If Assumption 2 holds, then we have the following descent:

$$\mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_k) \leq \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_k, \lambda_k) - \frac{\rho\sigma^2 + \alpha\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

*Proof* See Appendix.

Let us define the following Lyapunov function (inspired from [29]):

$$P(x, \lambda, y, \gamma) = \mathcal{L}_\rho(x, \lambda) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x - y\|^2. \quad (4)$$

The evaluation of the Lyapunov function along the iterates of Linearized AL algorithm is denoted by:

$$P_k = P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k) \quad \forall k \geq 1, \quad (5)$$

with  $\gamma_k > 0$  to be defined later. We prove next that  $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  is decreasing and bounded from below. Let us first prove that it is decreasing. Indeed:

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{k+1} - P_k \\ &= \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) - \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_k) + \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_k) - \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_k, \lambda_k) \\ & \quad + \frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|^2 \\ & \leq \langle F(x_{k+1}) - F(x_k) - \nabla F(x_k)(x_{k+1} - x_k), \Delta\lambda_{k+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{\rho} \|\Delta\lambda_{k+1}\|^2 \\ & \quad - \frac{\rho\sigma^2 + \alpha\beta_{k+1} - \gamma_{k+1}}{2} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \\ & \leq \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\rho}^{\eta-1}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \|\Delta\lambda_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \\ & \quad - \left( \frac{\rho\sigma^2 + \alpha\beta_{k+1} - \gamma_{k+1}}{2} - 2M_F^2 \sqrt{\rho}^{\eta-1} \right) \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 3 and from the update of the dual multipliers in Step 6 of Algorithm 1. The second inequality holds for any  $\eta > 1$  and follows from Assumption 2 and the inequality:

$$\langle a, b \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2r} \|a\|^2 + \frac{r}{2} \|b\|^2 \quad \forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}^m \text{ and } r > 0. \quad (7)$$

Next, let us bound  $\|\Delta\lambda_{k+1}\|^2$ .

**Lemma 4** [Bound for  $\|\Delta\lambda_{k+1}\|$ ] *If Assumption 2 holds on some compact set  $\mathcal{S}$  and the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 is in  $\mathcal{S}$ , then we have:*

$$\|\Delta\lambda_{k+1}\|^2 \leq c_1(\beta_{k+1}) \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + c_2(\beta_k) \|\Delta x_k\|^2, \quad (8)$$

where  $c_1(\beta_{k+1}) = 2 \frac{(L_f + \beta_{k+1})^2}{\sigma^2}$  and  $c_2(\beta_k) = 2 \frac{(M_f L_F + (2M_F + \sigma)\beta_k)^2}{\sigma^4}$ .

*Proof* See Appendix.



Subsequently, using (8) in (6), we obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{k+1} - P_k \leq & \left[ \left[ \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\eta]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) c_1(\beta_{k+1}) - \frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{2} \right] \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{\sqrt[\eta]{\rho^{\eta-1}}(\sqrt[\eta]{\rho}\sigma^2 - 4M_F^2) + \alpha\beta_{k+1} - 2\gamma_{k+1}}{2} \right] \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 \\ & + \left[ \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\eta]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) c_2(\beta_k) - \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \right] \|\Delta x_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if we choose  $\gamma_k \leq \frac{\alpha\beta_k}{2}$  and  $\rho \geq \left(\frac{4M_F^2}{\sigma^2}\right)^\eta$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{k+1} - P_k \leq & \left[ \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\eta]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) c_1(\beta_{k+1}) - \frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{2} \right] \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 \\ & + \left[ \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\eta]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) c_2(\beta_k) - \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \right] \|\Delta x_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in order to obtain a decreasing Lyapunov function along iterates, we must take into account when choosing  $\gamma_k$  the following:

$$\gamma_k > 2 \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\eta]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \max\{c_1(\beta_k), c_2(\beta_k)\}.$$

Hence, we want the parameter  $\gamma_k$  to satisfy the following requirements:

$$2 \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\eta]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \max\{c_1(\beta_k), c_2(\beta_k)\} < \gamma_k \leq \frac{\alpha\beta_k}{2} \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (9)$$

Choosing  $\gamma_k = 4 \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\eta]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \max\{c_1(\beta_k), c_2(\beta_k)\}$ , one can see that it already satisfies the left inequality in (9). It remains to check the right inequality in (9). To do so, we have to check if there exists a  $\beta_k > 0$  which satisfies the following inequality:

$$8 \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\eta]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \max\{c_1(\beta_k), c_2(\beta_k)\} \leq \alpha\beta_k. \quad (10)$$

Let us determine  $\max\{c_1(\beta_k), c_2(\beta_k)\}$ . Using the definitions of  $c_1(\beta_k)$  and  $c_2(\beta_k)$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & c_1(\beta_k) - c_2(\beta_k) \\ &= \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \left[ \left( L_f - \frac{M_f L_F}{\sigma} \right) - \frac{2M_F}{\sigma} \beta_k \right] \left[ \left( L_f + \frac{M_f L_F}{\sigma} \right) + \left( \frac{2M_F}{\sigma} + 2 \right) \beta_k \right], \end{aligned}$$

which leads to two different cases.

**Case 1:** If  $\beta_k \geq \frac{L_f \sigma - M_f L_F}{2M_F}$ , then  $\max\{c_1(\beta_k), c_2(\beta_k)\} = c_2(\beta_k)$ . Let us now check if  $\beta_k$ , which satisfies (10), is well-defined in this case. To do this, we replace the expression of  $c_2(\beta_k)$  in (10) and reformulate (10) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{16}{\sigma^4} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\rho]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \left[ (2M_F + \sigma)^2 \beta_k^2 + 2(2M_F + \sigma) M_f L_F \beta_k + (M_f L_F)^2 \right] \\ & \leq \alpha \beta_k. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Denoting:

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(\beta_k) = & \frac{16}{\sigma^4} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\rho]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) (2M_F + \sigma)^2 \beta_k^2 + \frac{16}{\sigma^4} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\rho]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) (M_f L_F)^2 \\ & + \left[ \frac{32}{\sigma^4} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\rho]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) (2M_F + \sigma) M_f L_F - \alpha \right] \beta_k, \end{aligned}$$

the inequality (11) is then equivalent to  $h_1(\beta_k) \leq 0$ . Since the roots of the second order equation  $h_1(\beta_k) = 0$  are:

$$\underline{\beta}_1 = \delta \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 - 1/\delta^2} \right) \frac{M_f L_F}{2M_F + \sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\beta}_1 = \delta \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 - 1/\delta^2} \right) \frac{M_f L_F}{2M_F + \sigma},$$

it follows that (9) and (11) are verified for any  $\beta_k$  satisfying  $\underline{\beta}_1 \leq \beta_k \leq \bar{\beta}_1$ . Also, it is clear that when  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ , the interval  $[\underline{\beta}_1, \bar{\beta}_1] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ . Therefore, we should choose  $\delta$  large enough so that  $\bar{\beta}_1 \geq \beta$ . If it happens that for some  $k \geq 1$ , we obtain from (3),  $\frac{L_f \sigma - M_f L_F}{2M_F} \leq \beta_k < \underline{\beta}_1$ , then we take  $\beta_k = \underline{\beta}_1$ . Note that when choosing  $\alpha$  one has to note that for  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , whereas for  $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ , the proximal parameter  $\beta_k$  might be large and similar  $\beta$  from Assumption 4.

**Case 2:** Similarly, if  $\beta_k < \frac{L_f \sigma - M_f L_F}{2M_F}$ , then  $\max\{c_1(\beta_k), c_2(\beta_k)\} = c_1(\beta_k)$ . Let us check if  $\beta_k$ , that satisfies (10), is well-defined. Replacing  $c_1(\beta_k)$  by its expression in (10), it allows us to recast (10) as:

$$\frac{16}{\sigma^2} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\rho]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) [\beta_k^2 + 2L_f \beta_k + L_f^2] \leq \alpha \beta_k. \quad (12)$$

Let us denote:

$$\begin{aligned} h_2(\beta_k) = & \frac{16}{\sigma^2} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\rho]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \beta_k^2 + \frac{16}{\sigma^2} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\rho]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) L_f^2 \\ & + \left[ \frac{32}{\sigma^2} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\rho]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) L_f - \alpha \right] \beta_k, \end{aligned}$$

then the inequality (12) is equivalent to  $h_2(\beta_k) \leq 0$ . Since the roots of the equation  $h_2(\beta_k) = 0$  are:

$$\underline{\beta}_2 = \delta' \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 - 1/\delta'^2} \right) L_f \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\beta}_2 = \delta' \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 - 1/\delta'^2} \right) L_f,$$

it follows that (9) and (12) are valid for all  $\underline{\beta}_2 \leq \beta_k \leq \bar{\beta}_2$ . We choose  $\delta'$  such that  $\bar{\beta}_2 = \frac{L_f \sigma - M_f L_F}{2M_F}$  (otherwise, if it happens that  $\beta_k > \frac{L_f \sigma - M_f L_F}{2M_F}$ , we have  $c_2(\beta_k) = \max\{c_1(\beta_k), c_2(\beta_k)\}$  and then we are in the first case discussed previously). If for some  $k \geq 1$ , we get from (3)  $\beta_k < \underline{\beta}_2$ , then we take  $\beta_k = \underline{\beta}_2$ .

In conclusion, from the two cases above, if we choose:

$$\rho \geq \max \left\{ \left( \frac{4M_F^2}{\sigma^2} \right)^\eta, \left( \frac{48(\delta' + 1)}{\alpha\sigma^2} L_f \right)^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}}, \left( \frac{48(\delta + 1)}{\alpha\sigma^4} (2M_F + \sigma) M_f L_F \right)^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}} \right\},$$

$$\gamma_k = 4 \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt[\eta]{\rho^{\eta-1}}} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \max\{c_1(\beta_k), c_2(\beta_k)\},$$

then we have:

$$\gamma_k \leq \frac{\alpha\beta_k}{2} \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (13)$$

This, in turn, implies that the Lyapunov function decreases along the iterates:

$$P_{k+1} - P_k \leq -\frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{4} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\gamma_k}{4} \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (14)$$

In the sequel, we assume that  $x_0$  is chosen such that:

$$\|F(x_0)\|^2 \leq \min \left\{ 1, \frac{c_0}{\rho} \right\} \quad \text{for some } c_0 > 0, \quad (15)$$

and that  $f(x_0) \leq \bar{U}$ . Let us define:

$$\hat{\alpha} \triangleq 4\bar{U} + 4c_0 - 3\bar{L} + 8\|\lambda_0\|^2 + 3, \quad (16)$$

and  $D_S := \max\{\|x - y\| : x, y \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^0\}$ . Moreover, let us choose:

$$\rho \geq \max \left\{ \left( \frac{4M_F^2}{\sigma^2} \right)^\eta, \left( \frac{48(\delta' + 1)}{\alpha\sigma^2} L_f \right)^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}}, \left( \frac{48(\delta + 1)}{\alpha\sigma^4} (2M_F + \sigma) M_f L_F \right)^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}}, \right.$$

$$\left. 3\rho_0, \rho_0 + \left( \frac{M_f(2M_F + \sigma) + 2\delta M_f L_F D_S}{\sqrt{2}\sigma(2M_F + \sigma)} \right)^2 \right\}. \quad (17)$$

Note that, if we choose  $\delta$  large enough so that  $\bar{\beta}_1 \geq \beta$ , we get:

$$\frac{(M_f(2M_F + \sigma) + 2\delta M_f L_F D_S)^2}{2\sigma^2(2M_F + \sigma)^2} \geq \frac{(M_f + \beta D_S)^2}{2\sigma^2}.$$

It follows that  $\rho \geq \rho_0 + \frac{(M_f + \beta D_S)^2}{2\sigma^2}$  and  $\frac{4M_F^2}{\sigma^2} > 1$ , which imply that  $\rho \geq 1$ . Using the definition of  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_0, \lambda_0) &= f(x_0) + \langle \lambda_0, F(x_0) \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_0)\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(7)}{\leq} f(x_0) + \frac{\|\lambda_0\|^2}{2\rho} + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_0)\|^2 + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_0)\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(15)}{\leq} \bar{U} + \frac{1}{2\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 + c_0. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

It then follows, after some re-arrangements, that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{U} + c_0 - \bar{L} &\geq f(x_0) + \langle \lambda_0, F(x_0) \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_0)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 - \bar{L} \\
&\stackrel{(\rho \geq 3\rho_0)}{\geq} f(x_0) + \frac{\rho_0}{2} \|F(x_0)\|^2 - \bar{L} + \langle \lambda_0, F(x_0) \rangle + \frac{\rho}{3} \|F(x_0)\|^2 - \frac{\|\lambda_0\|^2}{2\rho} \\
&\stackrel{(2)}{\geq} \frac{\rho}{3} \|F(x_0) + \frac{3\lambda_0}{2\rho}\|^2 - \frac{3}{4\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 - \frac{\|\lambda_0\|^2}{2\rho} \\
&\stackrel{(\rho \geq 1)}{\geq} -\frac{5}{4} \|\lambda_0\|^2. \tag{19}
\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma shows that the sequence  $\{(x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$  generated by Algorithm 1, is bounded.

**Lemma 5** *Consider Algorithm 1 and let  $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  as defined in (5). If Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold with  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_\alpha^0$  and  $\hat{\alpha}$  defined in (16) for any fixed constant  $c_0$  and  $D_S$  the radius of  $\mathcal{S}_{\hat{\alpha}^0}$ . If  $\rho$  is chosen as in (17) and  $x_0$  is chosen to satisfy (15), then we have the following:*

$$x_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^0, \tag{20a}$$

$$\|\lambda_k\|^2 \leq \frac{(M_f + \beta D_S)^2}{\sigma^2} \leq 2(\rho - \rho_0), \tag{20b}$$

$$P_k \leq 4\bar{U} + 4c_0 - 3\bar{L} + 8\|\lambda_0\|^2 + 2 \quad \forall k \geq 1. \tag{20c}$$

*Proof* See Appendix.

Next, we show that the Lyapunov sequence  $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  is bounded from below.

**Lemma 6** *Consider Algorithm 1 and let  $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  defined in (5). If Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold with  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_\alpha^0$  and  $\hat{\alpha}$  defined in (16) for any fixed constant  $c_0$  and  $D_S$  the radius of  $\mathcal{S}_{\hat{\alpha}^0}$ . If  $\rho$  is chosen as in (17) and  $x_0$  is chosen to satisfy (15), then we have the following:*

$$P_k \geq \bar{L} - 1 \quad \forall k \geq 1 \tag{21}$$

where  $\bar{L}$  is defined in (2).

*Proof* See Appendix.

Let us now bound the gradient of the augmented Lagrangian function.

**Lemma 7** *[Boundedness of  $\nabla \mathcal{L}_\rho$ ] Let  $\{(x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$  be a sequence generated by the Algorithm 1. If Assumption 2 holds, then:*

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1})\| \leq \Gamma(\beta_{k+1}) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \Gamma(\beta_k) \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|,$$

where the function

$$\Gamma(\beta_k) = \left( M_F + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \frac{M_f L_F + M_F L_f + (3M_F + \sigma)\beta_k}{\sigma^2} + 2M_F(\rho M_F + 1).$$

*Proof* See Appendix.

Note that if Assumption 4 is satisfied, then  $\{\Gamma(\beta_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$  is finite. Hence, in the sequel we define this bound as follows:

$$\Gamma_{\max} := \sup_{k \geq 1} \{\Gamma(\beta_k)\}. \quad (22)$$

#### 4.1 Global convergence

In this section we prove global convergence for the iterates generated by Algorithm 1 and also convergence rates to an  $\epsilon$  first-order solution. Based on the previous lemmas, we are now ready to present the global asymptotic convergence of the iterates of Algorithm 1.

**Theorem 1** [*Limit points are stationary points*] *If Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold with  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{\hat{\alpha}}^0$  and  $\hat{\alpha}$  defined in (16) for any fixed constant  $c_0$  and  $D_S$  the radius of  $\mathcal{S}_{\hat{\alpha}^0}$ . If  $\rho$  is chosen as in (17) and  $x_0$  is chosen to satisfy (15), then any limit point  $(x^*, \lambda^*)$  of the sequence  $\{(x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ , generated by Algorithm 1, is a stationary point, i.e.,  $\nabla \mathcal{L}_\rho(x^*, \lambda^*) = 0$ . Equivalently:*

$$\nabla f(x^*) + \nabla F(x^*)^T \lambda^* = 0, \quad F(x^*) = 0.$$

*Proof* Using (14) and the fact that  $\gamma_k > 0$ , we have:

$$\frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{4} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{\gamma_k}{4} \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \leq P_k - P_{k+1} \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

Let  $k \geq 1$ , by summing up the above inequality from  $i = 1$  to  $i = k$ , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k \left( \frac{\gamma_{i+1}}{4} \|\Delta x_{i+1}\|^2 + \frac{\gamma_i}{4} \|\Delta x_i\|^2 \right) &\leq P_1 - P_{k+1} \stackrel{\text{Lemma 6}}{\leq} P_1 - (\bar{L} - 1) \\ &\stackrel{(20c)}{\leq} 4\bar{U} + 4c_0 - 3\bar{L} + 8\|\lambda_0\|^2 + 3 - \bar{L} \\ &= \hat{\alpha} - \bar{L}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Since (23) holds for any  $k \geq 1$ , we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\gamma_{i+1}}{4} \|\Delta x_{i+1}\|^2 + \frac{\gamma_i}{4} \|\Delta x_i\|^2 \right) < \infty.$$

This, together with the fact that  $\gamma_k > 0$ , yields that:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\Delta x_k\| = 0. \quad (24)$$

From (20b), (20a) and the fact that  $\mathcal{S}_{\hat{\alpha}}^0$  is compact, it follows that the sequence  $\{(x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$  is bounded and there exists a convergent subsequence, let us say  $\{(x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ , with the limit  $(x^*, \lambda^*)$ . From Lemma 7 and (22), we have:

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_\rho(x^*, \lambda^*)\| = \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_k, \lambda_k)\| \leq \Gamma_{\max} \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} (\|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta x_{k-1}\|) = 0.$$

Therefore,  $\nabla \mathcal{L}_\rho(x^*, \lambda^*) = 0$ , which completes our proof.  $\square$

For the remainder of this paper, we define:

$$\bar{\gamma} := \sup_{k \geq 1} \{\gamma_k\} \stackrel{(13), \text{Ass. 4}}{<} \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\gamma} := \inf_{k \geq 1} \{\gamma_k\} > 0. \quad (25)$$

Let us now present one of the main results of this paper, which derives the outer complexity of Algorithm 1 to find an  $\epsilon$  first-order solution of problem (1).

**Theorem 2** [First-order complexity] Consider Algorithm 1 and let  $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  be defined as in (5). If Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold with  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_\alpha^0$  and  $\hat{\alpha}$  defined in (16) and  $\rho$  is chosen as in (17), then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , Algorithm 1 yields an  $\epsilon$  first-order solution of (1) after  $K = 16\Gamma_{\max}^2 \left(\frac{\hat{\alpha} - \bar{L}}{\underline{\gamma}}\right) \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$  outer iterations.

*Proof* Let  $K \geq 1$ , then from (23) and (25), we have:

$$\frac{\underline{\gamma}}{4} \sum_{i=1}^K (\|\Delta x_{i+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_i\|^2) \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \left( \frac{\gamma_{i+1}}{4} \|\Delta x_{i+1}\|^2 + \frac{\gamma_i}{4} \|\Delta x_i\|^2 \right) \leq \hat{\alpha} - \bar{L}.$$

Therefore, there exists  $k^* \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  such that:

$$\|\Delta x_{k^*+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_{k^*}\|^2 \leq 4 \frac{\hat{\alpha} - \bar{L}}{K \underline{\gamma}}.$$

It implies that:  $\|\Delta x_{k^*+1}\| \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\hat{\alpha} - \bar{L}}{K \underline{\gamma}}}$  and  $\|\Delta x_{k^*}\| \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\hat{\alpha} - \bar{L}}{K \underline{\gamma}}}$ . Hence, from Lemma 7 and (22), we get:

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k^*+1}, \lambda_{k^*+1})\| \leq \Gamma_{\max} \left( \|\Delta x_{k^*+1}\| + \|\Delta x_{k^*}\| \right) \leq 4\Gamma_{\max} \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\alpha} - \bar{L}}{K \underline{\gamma}}}.$$

It follows that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k^*+1}, \lambda_{k^*+1})\| \leq \epsilon$  when  $K \geq 16\Gamma_{\max}^2 \left(\frac{\hat{\alpha} - \bar{L}}{\underline{\gamma} \epsilon^2}\right)$ . Consequently, after  $K = 16\Gamma_{\max}^2 \left(\frac{\hat{\alpha} - \bar{L}}{\underline{\gamma}}\right) \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$  outer iterations Algorithm 1 yields an  $\epsilon$  first-order solution of (1). This concludes our proof.  $\square$

## 4.2 Improved rates under KL

In this section, under the KL condition, we provide better convergence rates for the iterates of Algorithm 1. In particular, we prove that the whole sequence  $\{(x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$  converges. In order to show these results, we first bound the full gradient  $\nabla P(\cdot)$  (recall that  $P(\cdot)$  is the function defined in (4)).

**Lemma 8** [Boundedness of  $\nabla P$ ] Let  $\{(x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$  be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. If Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold with  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_\alpha^0$  and  $\hat{\alpha}$  defined in (16) for any fixed constant  $c_0$ ,  $D_S$  is the radius of  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^0$  and  $\rho$  is chosen as in (17), then we have for any  $k \geq 1$ :

$$\|\nabla P(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}, x_k, \gamma_{k+1})\| \leq (\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}) (\|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|),$$

where,  $\Gamma_{\max}$  and  $\bar{\gamma}$  are defined in (22) and (25), respectively.

*Proof* See Appendix.

The above lemma directly implies the following:

$$\|\nabla P(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}, x_k, \gamma_{k+1})\|^2 \leq 2(\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma})^2 (\|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_k\|^2). \quad (26)$$

Then, it follows from (26) and (14), that:

$$P_{k+1} - P_k \leq -\frac{\gamma}{8(\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma})^2} \|\nabla P(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}, x_k, \gamma_{k+1})\|^2. \quad (27)$$

Let us denote  $z_k = (x_k, \lambda_k)$  and  $u_k = (x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)$ . Moreover,  $\text{crit } P$  denote the set of critical points of the function  $P(\cdot)$  defined in (5). Furthermore, we denote  $\mathcal{E}_k = P_k - P^*$ , where  $P^* = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P_k$  (recall that the sequence  $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  is decreasing and bounded from below according to (14) and Lemma 6, respectively, hence it is convergent). Let us denote the set of limit points of  $\{u_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  by:

$$\Omega := \{u^* : \exists \text{ a convergent subsequence } \{u_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \text{ such that } \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k = u^*\}.$$

Let us now prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 9** *Consider Algorithm 1 and let  $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  be defined as in (4). If Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold, with  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{\hat{\alpha}}^0$  and  $\hat{\alpha}$  defined in (16) for any fixed constant  $c_0$ ,  $D_S$  is the radius of  $\mathcal{S}_{\hat{\alpha}}^0$  and  $\rho$  is chosen as in (17), then the following statements hold:*

- (i)  $\Omega$  is a compact subset of  $\text{crit } P$  and  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(u_k, \Omega) = 0$ .
- (ii) For any  $u \in \Omega$ , we have  $P(u) = P^*$ .
- (iii) For any  $(x, \lambda, y, \gamma) \in \text{crit } P$ , we have  $(x, \lambda)$  a stationary point of (1).

*Proof* See Appendix.

Let us now prove that the sequence  $\left\{ \|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| \right\}_{k \geq 1}$  has finite length, provided that a KL condition holds.

**Lemma 10** *Let  $\{(x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$  be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Let Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold, with  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{\hat{\alpha}}^0$  and  $\hat{\alpha}$  defined in (16) for any fixed constant  $c_0$ , and  $D_S$  is the radius of  $\mathcal{S}_{\hat{\alpha}}^0$ . Moreover, assume that  $P(\cdot)$  defined in (4) satisfies the KL property on  $\Omega$ . Then,  $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1} = \{(x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$  satisfies the finite length property, i.e.,*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| < \infty,$$

*and consequently converges to a stationary point of (1).*

*Proof* See Appendix.

Lemma 10 shows that the set of limit points of the sequence  $\{(x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$  is a singleton. Let us denote its limit by  $(x^*, \lambda^*)$ . We are now ready to present the convergence rates of the whole sequence generated by Algorithm 1 (see also [30] for a similar reasoning).

**Theorem 3** [Convergence rates of  $\{(x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ ] *If Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold and  $z^* := (x^*, \lambda^*)$  is a limit point of the sequence  $\{z_k := (x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$  generated by Algorithm 1, then:*

1. *If  $P(\cdot)$  satisfies KL property at  $u^* := (x^*, \lambda^*, x^*, \gamma^*)$ , where  $\gamma^*$  is a limit point of the sequence  $\{\gamma_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ , then there exists  $k_1 \geq 1$  such that for all  $k \geq k_1$  we have:*

$$\|z_k - z^*\| \leq C \max\{\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k), \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}\},$$

where  $C > 0$  and  $\varphi \in \Psi_\tau$ , with  $\tau > 0$ , denotes a desingularizing function.

2. *Moreover, if  $P(\cdot)$  satisfies KL property with desingularizing function*

$$\varphi : [0, \tau) \rightarrow [0, +\infty), \quad \varphi(s) = s^{1-\nu}, \quad \text{where } \nu \in [0, 1),$$

then the following rates hold

- (a) *If  $\nu = 0$ , then  $z_k$  converges to  $z^*$  in a finite number of iterations.*
- (b) *If  $\nu \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ , then for all  $k \geq k_1$ , we have:*

$$\|z_k - z^*\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k_1}}}{\sqrt{(1 + \bar{c}\mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{2\nu-1})^{k-k_1}}}, \quad \text{where } \bar{c} = \frac{\gamma}{8(\Gamma_{max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma})^2}.$$

- (c) *If  $\nu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , then for all  $k > k_1$ , we have:*

$$\|z_k - z^*\| \leq \left( \frac{1}{\mu(k - k_1) + \mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{1-2\nu}} \right)^{\frac{1-\nu}{2\nu-1}}.$$

*Proof* 1. Using Lemma 4, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta\lambda_{k+1}\|^2 &\leq c_1(\beta)\|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + c_2(\beta)\|\Delta x_k\|^2 \\ &\leq \max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} \left[ \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Adding the term  $\|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_k\|^2$  on both sides in (28), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 &= \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta\lambda_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta\lambda_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(28)}{\leq} (\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1) \left[ \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$



Considering (25), we can then rewrite (14) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{k+1} - P_k &\stackrel{(14)}{\leq} -\frac{\gamma}{4} \left[ \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(29)}{\leq} -\frac{\gamma}{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)} \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Based on our choice of  $\rho$  and  $\gamma_k$ , the sequence  $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  is monotonically decreasing, see (14), and consequently  $\{\mathcal{E}_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  is monotonically decreasing. Using (30) and the fact that  $\{\mathcal{E}_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  is non-negative, we have for all  $k \geq 1$ :

$$\|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{2(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)}{\gamma}} \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_k}. \quad (31)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\gamma^*$  is unique. Since  $P_k \rightarrow P^*$ ,  $u_k \rightarrow u^*$  and  $P(\cdot)$  satisfies the KL property at  $u^*$ , then there exists  $k_1 = k_1(\epsilon, \tau) \geq 1$  such that  $\forall k > k_1$ , we have  $\|u_k - u^*\| \leq \epsilon$  and  $P^* < P_k < P^* + \tau$ , and the following KL property holds:

$$\varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k) \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| \geq 1. \quad (32)$$

Since  $\varphi$  is concave function, we have  $\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1}) \geq \varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k)(\mathcal{E}_k - \mathcal{E}_{k+1})$ . Therefore, from (30) and (32), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 \\ &\leq \varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k) \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| \\ &\leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)}{\gamma} \varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k)(\mathcal{E}_k - \mathcal{E}_{k+1}) \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| \\ &\leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)}{\gamma} \left( \varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1}) \right) \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\|. \end{aligned}$$

One can notice the following trivial inequality: for any  $a, b, c, d \geq 0$ , if  $a^2 + b^2 \leq c \times d$ , then  $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2 \leq 2c \times d \leq c^2 + d^2 \leq (c + d)^2$ . Using this relation and the fact that  $\|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 = \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2$ , we have for any  $\theta > 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| &\leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)\theta}{\gamma} \left( \varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1}) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\theta} \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Furthermore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| &\leq \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_k, \lambda_k)\| + 2\bar{\gamma} \|x_k - x_{k-1}\| \\ &\leq (\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}) (\|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\|), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$  and the properties of the derivative together with Lemma 7 and (22). Then, (33) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| &\leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)\theta}{\gamma} (\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1})) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}}{\theta} (\|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\|). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now choose  $\theta > 0$  such that  $0 < \frac{\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}}{\theta} < 1$  and define a parameter  $\delta_0$  as  $\delta_0 = 1 - \frac{\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}}{\theta} > 0$ . Then, summing up the above inequality over  $k > k_1$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \geq k_1} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| &\leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)\theta}{\gamma \delta_0} \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k_1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}}{\theta \delta_0} (\|\Delta x_{k_1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k_1}\|). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the triangle inequality, we get for any  $k \geq k_1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_k - z^*\| &\leq \sum_{l \geq k} \|z_l - z_{l+1}\| \leq \sum_{l \geq k} \|\Delta x_{l+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{l+1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)\theta}{\gamma \delta_0} \varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) + \frac{\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}}{\theta \delta_0} (\|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\|). \end{aligned}$$

Further, using (31), it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_k - z^*\| &\leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)\theta}{\gamma \delta_0} \varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) \\ &\quad + \frac{2(\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma})}{\theta \delta_0} \sqrt{\frac{2(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)}{\gamma}} \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}} \\ &\leq C \max\{\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k), \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C = \max \left\{ \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)\theta}{\gamma \delta_0}, \frac{2(\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma})}{\theta \delta_0} \sqrt{\frac{2(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)}{\gamma}} \right\}.$$

2. Let  $\nu \in [0, 1)$  and for all  $s \in [0, \tau)$ ,  $\varphi(s) = s^{1-\nu}$  and  $\varphi'(s) = (1-\nu)s^{-\nu}$ . It follows that  $\forall k \geq k_1$ , we have:

$$\|z_k - z^*\| \leq C \max\{\mathcal{E}_k^{1-\nu}, \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}\}. \quad (34)$$

Furthermore, (32) yields:

$$\mathcal{E}_k^\nu \leq \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| \quad \forall k \geq k_1.$$

Moreover, from (27), we have for any  $k \geq 1$ :

$$\|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{8(\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma})^2}{\gamma} (\mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k).$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{E}_k^{2\nu} \leq \frac{8(\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma})^2}{\gamma} (\mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k) \quad \forall k > k_1.$$

Setting  $\bar{c} = \frac{\gamma}{8(\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma})^2} > 0$ , we get the recurrence

$$\bar{c}\mathcal{E}_k^{2\nu} \leq \mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k \quad \forall k > k_1.$$

- (a) Let  $\nu = 0$ . If  $\mathcal{E}_k > 0$  for any  $k > k_1$ , we have  $\bar{c} \leq \mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k$ . As  $k$  goes to infinity, the right hand side approaches zero. Then,  $0 < \bar{c} \leq 0$  which is a contradiction. Hence, there exists  $k > k_1$  such that  $\mathcal{E}_k = 0$ . Then,  $\mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow 0$  in a finite number of steps and from (34),  $z_k \rightarrow z^*$  in a finite number of steps.
- (b) Let  $\nu \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . Then,  $2\nu - 1 < 0$ . Let  $k > k_1$ . Since  $\{\mathcal{E}_i\}_{i \geq k_1}$  is monotonically decreasing, then  $\mathcal{E}_i \leq \mathcal{E}_{k_1}$  for any  $i \in \{k_1 + 1, k_1 + 2, \dots, k\}$  and

$$\bar{c}\mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{2\nu-1}\mathcal{E}_k \leq \mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k \quad \forall k > k_1.$$

Rearranging this, we get for all  $k > k_1$ :

$$\mathcal{E}_k \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}{1 + \bar{c}\mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{2\nu-1}} \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}_{k-2}}{(1 + \bar{c}\mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{2\nu-1})^2} \leq \dots \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}_{k_1}}{(1 + \bar{c}\mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{2\nu-1})^{k-k_1}}.$$

Then, we have  $\max\{\mathcal{E}_k^{1-\nu}, \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}\} = \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}$ . It then follows that:

$$\|z_k - z^*\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k_1}}}{\sqrt{(1 + \bar{c}\mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{2\nu-1})^{k-k_1}}},$$

- (c) Let  $\nu \in (1/2, 1)$ , we have:

$$\bar{c} \leq (\mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k)\mathcal{E}_k^{-2\nu} \quad \forall k > k_1. \quad (35)$$

Let  $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined as  $h(s) = s^{-2\nu}$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . It is clear that  $h$  is monotonically decreasing and  $\forall s \in \mathbb{R}_+, h'(s) = -2\nu s^{-(1+2\nu)} < 0$ . Since  $\mathcal{E}_k \leq \mathcal{E}_{k-1}$  for all  $k > k_1$ , then  $h(\mathcal{E}_{k-1}) \leq h(\mathcal{E}_k)$  for all  $k > k_1$ . We consider two cases:

**Case 1:** Let  $r_0 \in (1, +\infty)$  such that:  $h(\mathcal{E}_k) \leq r_0 h(\mathcal{E}_{k-1})$   $k > k_1$ . Then, from (35) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{c} &\leq r_0(\mathcal{E}_{k-1} - \mathcal{E}_k)h(\mathcal{E}_{k-1}) \leq r_0 h(\mathcal{E}_{k-1}) \int_{\mathcal{E}_k}^{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}} 1 ds \\ &\leq r_0 \int_{\mathcal{E}_k}^{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}} h(s) ds = r_0 \int_{\mathcal{E}_k}^{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}} s^{-2\nu} ds = \frac{r_0}{1-2\nu} (\mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{1-2\nu} - \mathcal{E}_k^{1-2\nu}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\nu > \frac{1}{2}$ , it follows that:

$$0 < \frac{\bar{c}(2\nu-1)}{r_0} \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{1-2\nu} - \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{1-2\nu}.$$

Let us define  $\hat{c} = \frac{\bar{c}(2\nu-1)}{r_0}$  and  $\hat{\nu} = 1 - 2\nu < 0$ . We then get:

$$0 < \hat{c} \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{\hat{\nu}} - \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} \quad \forall k > k_1. \quad (36)$$

**Case 2:** Let  $r_0 \in (1, +\infty)$  such that:  $h(\mathcal{E}_k) > r_0 h(\mathcal{E}_{k-1})$ ,  $k > k_1$ . We then have  $\mathcal{E}_k^{-2\nu} \geq r_0 \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{-2\nu}$ . This leads to

$$q\mathcal{E}_{k-1} \geq \mathcal{E}_k,$$

where  $q = r_0^{-\frac{1}{2\nu}} \in (0, 1)$ . Since  $\hat{\nu} = 1 - 2\nu < 0$  we have  $q^{\hat{\nu}} \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{\hat{\nu}}$  and then, it follows that:

$$(q^{\hat{\nu}} - 1)\mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} \leq \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} - \mathcal{E}_k^{\hat{\nu}}.$$

Since  $q^{\hat{\nu}} - 1 > 0$  and  $\mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow 0^+$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , there exists  $\tilde{c}$  such that  $(q^{\hat{\nu}} - 1)\mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} \geq \tilde{c}$  for all  $k > k_1$ . Therefore, we obtain:

$$0 < \tilde{c} \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{\hat{\nu}} - \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} \quad \forall k > k_1. \quad (37)$$

By choosing  $\mu = \min\{\hat{c}, \tilde{c}\} > 0$ , one can combine (36) and (37) to obtain

$$0 < \mu \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{\hat{\nu}} - \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{\hat{\nu}} \quad \forall k > k_1.$$

Summing the above inequality from  $k_1 + 1$  to some  $k > k_1$  gives

$$\mu(k - k_1) + \mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{\hat{\nu}} \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{\hat{\nu}}.$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{E}_k \leq (\mu(k - k_1) + \mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{\hat{\nu}})^{\frac{1}{\hat{\nu}}} = (\mu(k - k_1) + \mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{1-2\nu})^{\frac{1}{1-2\nu}}.$$

Since  $\nu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , then  $\max\{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{1-\nu}, \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{k-1}}\} = \mathcal{E}_{k-1}^{1-\nu}$ . Then, (34) becomes:

$$\|z_k - z^*\| \leq \left( \frac{1}{\mu(k - k_1) + \mathcal{E}_{k_1}^{1-2\nu}} \right)^{\frac{1-\nu}{2\nu-1}}, \quad \forall k > k_1.$$

This concludes our proof.  $\square$

## 5 Numerical results


In this section we numerically compare Algorithm 1 (Linearized AL) with SCP algorithm [20] and IPOPT [28] on quadratic problems with quadratic equality constraints (QPQCs). Note that Proximal Augmented Lagrangian method presented in [29] is very slow compared to these three methods, hence we decided not to include it in our comparisons. The simulations are implemented in MATLAB and executed on a PC with (CPU 2.70GHz, 16GB RAM). For the implementation of our method, we choose  $\beta_k$  constant and equal to 1 and the penalty parameter  $\rho = 10^3$  if not specified differently. Since one cannot guarantee that the SCP iterates converge to a KKT point, we choose the following stopping criteria: we stop the algorithms when the difference between two consecutive values of the objective function is less than a tolerance  $\epsilon_1 = 10^{-3}$  and the norm of constraints is less than a tolerance  $\epsilon_2 = 10^{-5}$ . The numerical results are illustrated in Table 1 and Figure 1.

In Table 1, we compare the number of iterations, cpu time (sec), objective value and feasibility violation for Linearized AL, SCP and IPOPT on QPQCs from the CUTEst collection (the first part of the table) and randomly generated QCQP (the last 10 test cases in Table 1). Note that for the test cases from CUTEst our algorithm, Linearized AL, is the best in terms of cpu time. The "-" indicates that an algorithm is unable to solve the corresponding problem in less than two hours. As one can see from Table 1, IPOPT could not find solutions of some random problems during the fixed time. Note that the last five random cases (in the second part of the table) have sparse data, while the first five random problems have dense data. This explains why the algorithms are faster for the sparse problems compared to the first five ones in this second part of the table, even though the latter have much smaller dimensions. Table 1 shows that our method is faster than SCP and IPOPT (in average it is 4 times faster than SCP and 10 times faster than IPOPT). For the optimal value function, we can see that sometimes Linearized AL and SCP methods obtain a worse optimal value than IPOPT. However, in our case by increasing the penalty parameter  $\rho$ , we can also find the same optimal value as IPOPT, whereas this is not the case for SCP.

Figure 1 shows the performance profiling for computation time (left) and number of iterations (right) for the 3 algorithms. In the performance profiling, the vertical axis  $P(r_{p,s} \leq \tau)$  ( $P(r_{p,s} \leq k)$ ) represent the proportion of problems in the numerical experiments for which  $r_{p,s}$  does not exceed  $\tau$  ( $k$ ), respectively, where  $r_{p,s}$  is the ratio of the computational time (number of iterations) that the  $s$  solver takes to solve problem  $p$  to the shortest computational time (number of iterations) among the three algorithms to solve problem  $p$ , respectively. It is clear from the computational time profile, Figure 1 (left), that the proposed algorithm, Linearized AL, approaches 1 faster than SCP and IPOPT. However, for the number of iterations this is not always the case. From these preliminary experiments we can conclude that our new algorithm, Linearized AL, is an efficient method to solve optimization problems with nonlinear equality

(n,m) \ Alg	Linearized AL		SCP		IPOPT	
	# iter $f^*$	cpu $\ F\ $	# iter $f^*$	cpu $\ F\ $	# iter $f^*$	cpu $\ F\ $
OPTCTRL3 (119,80)	5	<b>0.12</b>	5	0.17	7	7.40
	2048.01	5.42e-14	2048.01	4.18e-12	2048.01	1.84e-08
OPTCTRL3; $\rho = 10^3$ (1199,800)	15	<b>1.38</b>	16	3.34	10	11.99
	19877.75	1.10e-08	19877.75	1.56e-09	18460.22	6.33e-09
OPTCTRL3; $\rho = 7 \times 10^5$ (1199,800)	87	9.44	16	<b>3.34</b>	10	11.99
	18460.23	4.09e-07	19877.75	1.56e-09	18460.22	6.33e-09
OPTCTRL3 (4499,3000)	44	<b>15.44</b>	44	209.41	11	26.95
	74465.03	8.43e-09	74465.03	2.82e-09	74465.03	1.09e-08
DTOC4 (299,198)	3	<b>0.05</b>	3	0.24	3	7.61
	2.95	3.65e-07	2.95	2.75e-07	2.94	1.02e-08
DTOC4 (1497,998)	3	<b>0.35</b>	3	0.91	3	12.45
	2.88	4.26e-07	2.88	7.85e-09	2.88	1.20e-08
DTOC4 (4497,2998)	3	<b>4.35</b>	3	16.74	3	29.02
	2.87	2.06e-07	2.87	4.87e-10	2.87	3.66e-08
DTOC5; $\rho = 10^3$ (998,499)	4	<b>0.33</b>	4	0.51	3	12.06
	1.61	1.67e-07	1.61	6.75e-08	1.53	7.76e-07
DTOC5; $\rho = 2 \times 10^4$ (998,499)	120	7.63	4	<b>0.51</b>	3	12.06
	1.54	5.79e-07	1.61	6.75e-08	1.53	7.76e-07
DTOC5 (9998,4999)	5	<b>53.05</b>	4	138.74	3	75.25
	1.62	3.92e-08	1.62	1.68e-10	1.53	2.49e-07
ORTHREGA (517,256)	37	<b>0.91</b>	39	1.73	76	10.14
	1414.05	1.23e-06	1664.80	1.24e-06	1414.05	6.19e-10
ORTHREGA (2053,1024)	53	<b>13.27</b>	67	31.78	14	23.99
	5661.43	7.90e-07	6654.78	2.07e-06	5661.43	9.25e-07
ORTHREGA (8197,4096)	38	<b>65.72</b>	193	3798.87	20	71.78
	22647.84	1.83e-07	22647.84	3.12e-06	22647.84	1.86e-09
(10,9)	27	<b>0.07</b>	34	0.14	7	0.21
	0.21	9.49e-06	0.21	1.05e-15	0.21	2.17e-10
(20,13)	15	<b>0.12</b>	15	0.39	13	0.65
	-2.61	6.01e-06	-2.61	6.01e-06	-2.61	3.85e-15
(50,43)	62	<b>3.90</b>	61	4.68	12	87.75
	-12.95	8.43e-06	-12.95	9.86e-06	-1.98	2.92e-14
(100,91)	629	22.53	204	<b>6.42</b>	21	143.74e
	-742.21	4.16e-06	-300.72	9.70e-06	-113.52	5.44e-12
(150,140)	1165	75.53	505	<b>24.89</b>	37	417.87
	-1027.24	1.51e-06	-358.67	9.79e-06	-231.26	3.382-11
(1000,500)	17	<b>1.37</b>	25	1.76	5	140.34
	-0.27	3.13e-06	-0.27	1.76e-08	-0.27	1.36e-10
(10000,500)	7	<b>3.67</b>	7	11.64	-	-
	1.46	9.48e-07	1.46	3.40e-07	-	-
(100000,500)	7	<b>34.12</b>	7	73.43	-	-
	2.47	6.59e-06	2.47	5.87e-06	-	-
(100000,1000)	7	<b>76.21</b>	7	134.07	-	-
	33.81	1.59e-06	33.81	1.54e-09	-	-
(300000,700)	7	<b>164.54</b>	7	178.35	-	-
	33.59	2.55e-06	33.59	2.44e-07	-	-

**Table 1** Comparison between Linearized AL, SCP and IPOPT on QCQPs from CUTEst (top) and randomly generated QCQPs (bottom).



**Fig. 1** Performance profiles for the computation time (left) and the number of iterations (right).

constraints, usually much faster than well established solvers such as IPOPT and SCP.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed a linearized augmented Lagrangian method for solving (locally) smooth optimization problems with nonlinear equality constraints. In this method we have linearized the functional constraints within the augmented Lagrangian function and added a regularization term. By dynamically generating the regularization (proximal) parameter, we have proved global asymptotic convergence, convergence rate to an  $\epsilon$  first-order optimal solution and improved convergence rates under the KL condition. Moreover, we have numerically shown that the proposed algorithm is efficient, comparing it with two known algorithms, SCP and IPOPT.

## Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## Data availability

It is not applicable.

## Appendix

**Proof of Lemma 2** Using the definition of  $\psi$  and  $\nabla_x \psi$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla_x \psi(x, \lambda) - \nabla_x \psi(x', \lambda')\| \\
&= \|\nabla F(x)^T(\lambda + \rho F(x)) - \nabla F(x')^T(\lambda' + \rho F(x'))\| \\
&= \left\| \left( \nabla F(x) - \nabla F(x') \right)^T (\lambda + \rho F(x)) + \nabla F(x')^T (\lambda - \lambda' + \rho(F(x) - F(x'))) \right\| \\
&\leq \|\nabla F(x) - \nabla F(x')\| \|\lambda + \rho F(x)\| + \|\nabla F(x')\| (\|\lambda - \lambda'\| + \rho \|F(x) - F(x')\|) \\
&\stackrel{\text{Ass. 2}}{\leq} \left( L_F \|\lambda + \rho F(x)\| + \rho M_F^2 \right) \|x - x'\| + M_F \|\lambda - \lambda'\| \\
&\leq \left( L_F \|\lambda + \rho F(x)\| + M_F(1 + \rho M_F) \right) \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ \lambda' \end{pmatrix} \right\| \\
&\leq \sup_{x, \lambda} \{L_\psi(x, \lambda)\} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ \lambda' \end{pmatrix} \right\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $L_\psi(x, \lambda) = L_F \|\lambda + \rho F(x)\| + M_F(1 + \rho M_F)$ . Similarly, using the expression of  $\nabla_\lambda \psi$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_\lambda \psi(x, \lambda) - \nabla_\lambda \psi(x', \lambda')\| &= \|F(x) - F(x')\| \\
&\stackrel{\text{Ass. 2}}{\leq} M_F \|x - x'\| \leq M_F \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ \lambda' \end{pmatrix} \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, using basic properties of the Euclidean norm, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla \psi(x, \lambda) - \nabla \psi(x', \lambda')\| \\
&\leq \|\nabla_x \psi(x, \lambda) - \nabla_x \psi(x', \lambda')\| + \|\nabla_\lambda \psi(x, \lambda) - \nabla_\lambda \psi(x', \lambda')\| \\
&\leq \sup_{(x, \lambda) \in \mathcal{S} \times \Lambda} \left\{ L_F \|\lambda + \rho F(x)\| + M_F(2 + \rho M_F) \right\} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x - x' \\ \lambda - \lambda' \end{pmatrix} \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes our proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 3** Using the optimality of  $x_{k+1}$ , we have:

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_k; x_k) + \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \leq \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho(x_k, \lambda_k; x_k) = \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_k, \lambda_k).$$

Further, from definitions of  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\rho$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& f(x_{k+1}) + \langle \lambda_k, F(x_k) + \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1} \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_k) + \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 \\
&\leq f(x_k) + \langle \lambda_k, F(x_k) \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_k)\|^2 - \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging this inequality, it follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_k) \\
&\leq -\frac{\rho}{2} \langle \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1}, 2F(x_k) + \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1} \rangle - \langle \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1}, \lambda_k \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 \\
&\leq -\frac{\rho}{2} \|\nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 - \langle \nabla F(x_k)^T (\lambda_k + \rho F(x_k)), \Delta x_{k+1} \rangle - \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{\text{Ass. 2}}{\leq} -\frac{\rho}{2} \sigma^2 \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 - \langle \nabla F(x_k)^T (\lambda_k + \rho F(x_k)), \Delta x_{k+1} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$



Using the definitions of  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$  and  $\psi$ , we further obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_k) - \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_k, \lambda_k) &= f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_k) + \psi(x_{k+1}, \lambda_k) - \psi(x_k, \lambda_k) \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{\leq} -\frac{\rho\sigma^2 + \alpha\beta_{k+1}}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This proves our statement.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 4** Using the optimality condition for  $x_{k+1}$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f(x_{k+1}) + \nabla F(x_k)^T \lambda_k + \rho \nabla F(x_k)^T \left( F(x_k) + \nabla F(x_k)(x_{k+1} - x_k) \right) \\ + \beta_{k+1}(x_{k+1} - x_k) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the update in Step 6 of Algorithm 1, we get:

$$\nabla f(x_{k+1}) + \nabla F(x_k)^T \lambda_{k+1} + \beta_{k+1}(x_{k+1} - x_k) = 0. \quad (38)$$

By replacing  $k$  with  $k-1$ , we obtain:

$$\nabla f(x_k) + \nabla F(x_{k-1})^T \lambda_k + \beta_k(x_k - x_{k-1}) = 0. \quad (39)$$

Subtracting (39) from (38), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k) + \nabla F(x_k)^T \Delta \lambda_{k+1} + (\nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x_{k-1}))^T \lambda_k \\ + \beta_{k+1} \Delta x_{k+1} - \beta_k \Delta x_k = 0 \quad \forall k \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Further, using Assumption 2, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k)\| + \|\nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x_{k-1})\| \|\lambda_k\| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \beta_{k+1} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \beta_k \|\Delta x_k\| \right) \quad \forall k \geq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

From (39), we further have:

$$\|\lambda_k\| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( \|\nabla f(x_k)\| + \beta_k \|\Delta x_k\| \right) \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( M_f + \beta_k \|\Delta x_k\| \right). \quad (41)$$

Moreover, from Assumption 2, we have:

$$\|\nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x_{k-1})\| \leq L_F \|\Delta x_k\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla F(x_k) - \nabla F(x_{k-1})\| \leq 2M_F.$$

By replacing, the above inequalities and (41) in (40), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( L_f \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \frac{M_f L_F + 2M_F \beta_k}{\sigma} \|\Delta x_k\| + \beta_{k+1} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \beta_k \|\Delta x_k\| \right) \\ &= \frac{L_f + \beta_{k+1}}{\sigma} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \frac{M_f L_F + (2M_F + \sigma) \beta_k}{\sigma^2} \|\Delta x_k\|. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Since  $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ , we finally get (8).  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 5** We prove this result using induction arguments. From Lemma 3 for  $k=0$ , we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_1) + \langle \lambda_0, F(x_1) \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_1)\|^2 + \frac{\rho\sigma^2 + \alpha\beta_1}{2} \|x_1 - x_0\|^2 \\ \leq f(x_0) + \langle \lambda_0, F(x_0) \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_0)\|^2 \\ \stackrel{(18)}{\leq} \bar{U} + \frac{1}{2\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 + c_0. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

For  $i = 0$  and  $i = 1$ , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x_i) + \frac{\rho_0}{2} \|F(x_i)\|^2 &\stackrel{(\rho \geq 3\rho_0)}{\leq} f(x_i) + \frac{\rho}{6} \|F(x_i)\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(18),(43)}{\leq} \bar{U} + \frac{1}{2\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 + c_0 - \langle \lambda_0, F(x_i) \rangle - \frac{\rho}{3} \|F(x_i)\|^2 \\
&\leq \bar{U} + \frac{1}{2\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 + c_0 - \frac{\rho}{3} \|F(x_i) + \frac{3\lambda_0}{2\rho}\|^2 + \frac{3\|\lambda_0\|^2}{4\rho} \\
&\leq \bar{U} + c_0 + \frac{5\|\lambda_0\|^2}{4\rho} \\
&\stackrel{(19)}{\leq} \bar{U} + c_0 + \frac{5\|\lambda_0\|^2}{4\rho} + 3(\bar{U} + c_0 - \bar{L} + \frac{5\|\lambda_0\|^2}{4\rho}) \\
&\stackrel{(\rho \geq 1)}{\leq} 4\bar{U} + 4c_0 - 3\bar{L} + 5\|\lambda_0\|^2 \leq \hat{\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we find that  $x_0, x_1 \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^0$ . Moreover, using the optimality condition (39) for  $k = 1$ , we have:

$$\nabla f(x_1) + \nabla F(x_0)^T \lambda_1 + \beta_1(x_1 - x_0) = 0.$$

Since  $x_0, x_1 \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^0$  and  $D_S$  is the diameter of  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^0$ , then from Assumption 2:

$$\|\lambda_1\| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} (\|\nabla f(x_1)\| + \beta_1 \|\Delta x_1\|) \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} (M_f + \beta D_S) \leq 2(\rho - \rho_0).$$

Furthermore, exploiting the definition of  $P_k$  for  $k = 1$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &= \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_1, \lambda_1) + \frac{\gamma_1}{2} \|x_1 - x_0\|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_1, \lambda_1) - \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_1, \lambda_0) + \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_1, \lambda_0) - \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_0, \lambda_0) + \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_0, \lambda_0) \\
&\quad + \frac{\gamma_1}{2} \|x_1 - x_0\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma 3}}{\leq} \langle \lambda_1 - \lambda_0, F(x_1) \rangle - \frac{\rho\sigma^2 + \alpha\beta_1 - \gamma_1}{2} \|x_1 - x_0\|^2 + \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_0, \lambda_0) \\
&\stackrel{(7)}{\leq} \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_1)\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\rho} \|\lambda_1 - \lambda_0\|^2 + \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_0, \lambda_0). \tag{44}
\end{aligned}$$

From (43), it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\rho}{6} \|F(x_1)\|^2 \\
&\leq \bar{U} + \frac{1}{2\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 + c_0 - \frac{\rho}{6} \|F(x_1)\|^2 - \langle \lambda_0, F(x_1) \rangle - f(x_1) - \frac{\rho}{6} \|F(x_1)\|^2 \\
&= \bar{U} + \frac{1}{2\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 + c_0 - \frac{\rho}{6} \|F(x_1) + \frac{3\lambda_0}{\rho}\|^2 + \frac{3}{2\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 - f(x_1) - \frac{\rho}{6} \|F(x_1)\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(\rho \geq 3\rho_0)}{\leq} \bar{U} + \frac{1}{2\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 + c_0 + \frac{3}{2\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 - f(x_1) - \frac{\rho_0}{2} \|F(x_1)\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \bar{U} + \frac{2}{\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 + c_0 - \bar{L} \stackrel{(\rho \geq 1)}{\leq} \bar{U} + c_0 - \bar{L} + 2\|\lambda_0\|^2. \tag{45}
\end{aligned}$$

Using (45) in (44), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &\leq 3(\bar{U} + c_0 - \bar{L} + 2\|\lambda_0\|^2) + \frac{1}{\rho} \|\lambda_1\|^2 + \frac{1}{\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 + \bar{U} + c_0 + \frac{1}{2\rho} \|\lambda_0\|^2 \\
&\leq 4\bar{U} + 4c_0 - 3\bar{L} + 8\|\lambda_0\|^2 + 2.
\end{aligned}$$

It then follows that for  $k = 1$ , (20) is verified. Now, assume that (20) holds for some  $k \geq 1$  (induction hypothesis) and we will prove that it continues to hold for  $k + 1$ . Using Lemma 3 together with the definition of  $P_k$ , we have:

$$\mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_k) \leq \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_k, \lambda_k) \leq P_k.$$

By using the expression of  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$ , we have that:

$$f(x_{k+1}) + \langle \lambda_k, F(x_{k+1}) \rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_{k+1})\|^2 \leq P_k.$$

Thus, using (7), it follows that:

$$f(x_{k+1}) - \frac{\|\lambda_k\|^2}{2(\rho - \rho_0)} - \frac{(\rho - \rho_0)\|F(x_{k+1})\|^2}{2} + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_{k+1})\|^2 \leq P_k,$$

which yields the following:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_{k+1}) + \frac{\rho_0}{2} \|F(x_{k+1})\|^2 &\leq P_k + \frac{\|\lambda_k\|^2}{2(\rho - \rho_0)} \leq P_k + 1 \\ &\leq 4\bar{U} + 4c_0 - 3\bar{L} + 8\|\lambda_0\|^2 + 3 = \hat{\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last two inequalities are due to the induction hypothesis. Therefore,  $x_{k+1} \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^0$ . Using the same arguments as for  $k = 1$ , the optimality condition (38) and the fact that  $x_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^0$  from the induction hypothesis, it follows that:

$$\|\lambda_{k+1}\|^2 \leq \frac{(M_f + \beta D_S)^2}{\sigma^2} \leq 2(\rho - \rho_0).$$

Since  $x_k, x_{k+1} \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^0$  and from (14), we have:

$$P_{k+1} - P_k \leq -\frac{\gamma^{k+1}}{4} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{\gamma^k}{4} \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \leq 0.$$

Together with the induction hypothesis, we obtain:

$$P_{k+1} \leq P_k \leq 4\bar{U} + 4c_0 - 3\bar{L} + 8\|\lambda_0\|^2 + 2.$$

Finally, (20) is proved, which completes our proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 6** Using (5), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} P_k &\geq f(x_k) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_k)\|^2 + \langle \lambda_k, F(x_k) \rangle \\ &\geq f(x_k) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|F(x_k)\|^2 - \frac{\|\lambda_k\|^2}{2(\rho - \rho_0)} - \frac{\rho - \rho_0}{2} \|F(x_k)\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(20b)}{\geq} f(x_k) + \frac{\rho_0}{2} \|F(x_k)\|^2 - 1 \stackrel{(\text{Lemma 2})}{\geq} \bar{L} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the sequence  $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  is bounded from below.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 7** Using the optimality condition (38), we have:

$$\nabla f(x_{k+1}) = -\nabla F(x_k)^T \lambda_{k+1} - \beta_{k+1}(x_{k+1} - x_k).$$

It then follows, by exploiting the definition of  $\mathcal{L}_\rho$  and the properties of the derivative, that:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) &= \nabla f(x_{k+1}) + \nabla F(x_{k+1})^T (\lambda_{k+1} + \rho F(x_{k+1})) \\ &= (\nabla F(x_{k+1}) - \nabla F(x_k))^T \lambda_{k+1} + \nabla F(x_{k+1})^T \Delta \lambda_{k+1} - \beta_{k+1} \Delta x_{k+1} \\ &\quad + \rho \nabla F(x_{k+1})^T (F(x_{k+1}) - F(x_k) - \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Using basic properties of the Euclidean norm, we further get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1})\| \\
& \leq \|\nabla F(x_{k+1}) - \nabla F(x_k)\| \|\lambda_{k+1}\| + \|\nabla F(x_{k+1})\| \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| \\
& \quad + \beta_{k+1} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \rho \|\nabla F(x_{k+1})\| \|F(x_{k+1}) - F(x_k) - \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1}\| \\
& \stackrel{\text{Ass. 2, (41)}}{\leq} \frac{M_f L_F + 2M_F \beta_{k+1}}{\sigma} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + M_F \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| \\
& \quad + \beta_{k+1} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + 2\rho M_F^2 \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| \\
& = \left( \frac{M_f L_F + (2M_F + \sigma) \beta_{k+1}}{\sigma} + 2\rho M_F^2 \right) \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + M_F \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| \quad (46) \\
& \stackrel{(42)}{\leq} \left( \frac{M_f L_F + M_F L_f + (3M_F + \sigma) \beta_{k+1}}{\sigma} + 2\rho M_F^2 \right) \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| \\
& \quad + \frac{M_F}{\sigma} \frac{M_f L_F + (2M_F + \sigma) \beta_k}{\sigma} \|\Delta x_k\| \\
& \leq \left( \frac{M_F}{\sigma} \frac{M_f L_F + M_F L_f + (3M_F + \sigma) \beta_{k+1}}{\sigma} + 2\rho M_F^2 \right) \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| \\
& \quad + \left( \frac{M_F}{\sigma} \frac{M_f L_F + M_F L_f + (3M_F + \sigma) \beta_k}{\sigma} + 2\rho M_F^2 \right) \|\Delta x_k\|
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla_\lambda \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1})\| = \|F(x_{k+1})\| \\
& \leq \|F(x_{k+1}) - F(x_k) - \nabla F(x_k) \Delta x_{k+1}\| + \frac{1}{\rho} \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| \\
& \stackrel{\text{Ass. 2}}{\leq} 2M_F \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \frac{1}{\rho} \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| \quad (47) \\
& \stackrel{(42)}{\leq} \left( 2M_F + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{L_f + \beta_{k+1}}{\sigma} \right) \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{M_f L_F + (2M_F + \sigma) \beta_k}{\sigma^2} \|\Delta x_k\| \\
& \leq \left( 2M_F + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{L_f \sigma + M_f L_F + (2M_F + \sigma) \beta_{k+1}}{\sigma^2} \right) \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| \\
& \quad + \left( 2M_F + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{L_f \sigma + M_f L_F + (2M_F + \sigma) \beta_k}{\sigma^2} \right) \|\Delta x_k\|
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is obtained from the multipliers update in Step 6 of Algorithm 1. Hence, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1})\| & \leq \|\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1})\| + \|\nabla_\lambda \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1})\| \\
& \leq \Gamma(\beta_{k+1}) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \Gamma(\beta_k) \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Gamma(\beta_k) = \left( M_F + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \frac{M_f L_F + M_F L_f + (3M_F + \sigma) \beta_k}{\sigma^2} + 2M_F(\rho M_F + 1).$$

This proves our claim.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 8** By exploiting the definition of  $P(\cdot)$  defined in (4), we have that for any  $k \geq 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_x P(x, \lambda, y, \gamma) & = \nabla_x \mathcal{L}_\rho(x, \lambda) + \gamma(x - y), \quad \nabla_\lambda P(x, \lambda, y, \gamma) = \nabla_\lambda \mathcal{L}_\rho(x, \lambda) \\
\nabla_y P(x, \lambda, y, \gamma) & = \gamma(y - x) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_\gamma P(x, \lambda, y, \gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \|x - y\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla P(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}, x_k, \gamma_{k+1})\| &\leq \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1})\| + 2\gamma_{k+1}\|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \frac{1}{2}\|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq (\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma})(\|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta x_k\|), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 7, (22) and (25). This proves our claim.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 9** (i) From Lemma 5 and Assumption 4, it follows that  $\{u_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  is bounded and therefore, there exists a convergent subsequence  $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$  such that  $\lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k = u^*$ . Hence  $\Omega$  is nonempty. Moreover,  $\Omega$  is compact since it is bounded and closed. On the other hand, for any  $u^* \in \Omega$ , there exists a sequence of increasing integers  $\mathcal{K}$  such that  $\lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k = u^*$  and using Lemma 8 and (24), it follows that:

$$\|\nabla P(u^*)\| = \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \|\nabla P(u_k)\| = 0.$$

Hence,  $u^* \in \text{crit } P$  and  $0 \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(u_k, \Omega) \leq \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \text{dist}(u_k, \Omega) = \text{dist}(u^*, \Omega) = 0$ .

(ii) Since  $P(\cdot)$  is continuous and  $\{P(u_k) = P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  converges to  $P^*$ , then any subsequence  $\{P(u_k) = P_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$  that converges, it converges to the same limit  $P^*$ .

(iii) Let  $(x, \lambda, y, \gamma) \in \text{crit } P$  that is  $\nabla P(x, \lambda, y, \gamma) = 0$ . It then follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x P(x, \lambda, y, \gamma) = \nabla_x \mathcal{L}_\rho(x, \lambda) + \gamma(x - y) = 0, \quad \nabla_\lambda P(x, \lambda, y, \gamma) = \nabla_\lambda \mathcal{L}_\rho(x, \lambda) = 0 \\ \nabla_y P(x, \lambda, y, \gamma) = \gamma(y - x) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_\gamma P(x, \lambda, y, \gamma) = \frac{1}{2}\|x - y\|^2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

With some minor rearrangements, we obtain:

$$\nabla f(x) + \nabla F(x)^T \lambda = 0, \quad F(x) = 0.$$

Hence,  $(x, \lambda)$  is a stionary point of (1). This concludes our proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 10** From the boundedness of  $\|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2$  derived in (8), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2 &\leq c_1(\beta)\|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + c_2(\beta)\|\Delta x_k\|^2 \\ &\leq \max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} \left[ \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Adding the term  $\|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_k\|^2$  on both sides in (48), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 &= \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(48)}{\leq} (\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1) \left[ \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Considering (25), we can then rewrite (14) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{k+1} - P_k &\stackrel{(14)}{\leq} -\frac{\gamma}{4} \left[ \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta x_k\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(49)}{\leq} -\frac{\gamma}{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)} \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Since  $P_k \rightarrow P^*$  and  $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  is monotonically decreasing to  $P^*$ , then it follows that the error sequence  $\{\mathcal{E}_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ , is non-negative, monotonically decreasing and converges to 0. We distinguish two cases.

**Case 1:** There exists  $k_1 \geq 1$  such that  $\mathcal{E}_{k_1} = 0$ . Then,  $\mathcal{E}_k = 0 \forall k \geq k_1$  and using (50), we have:

$$\|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 \leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)}{\gamma} (\mathcal{E}_k - \mathcal{E}_{k+1}) = 0 \quad \forall k \geq k_1.$$

From Lemma 5 the sequence  $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  is bounded, and thus:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| = \sum_{k=1}^{k_1} \|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| < \infty.$$

**Case 2:** The error  $\mathcal{E}_k > 0 \forall k \geq 1$ . Then, there exists  $k_1 = k_1(\epsilon, \tau) \geq 1$  such that  $\forall k \geq k_1$  we have  $\text{dist}(u_k, \Omega) \leq \epsilon$ ,  $P^* < P(u_k) < P^* + \tau$  and

$$\varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k) \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| \geq 1, \quad (51)$$

where  $\epsilon > 0, \tau > 0$  and  $\varphi \in \Psi_\tau$  are well defined and correspond to those in Definition 2, recall that  $P(\cdot)$  satisfies the KL property on  $\Omega$ . Since  $\varphi$  is concave, we have  $\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1}) \geq \varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k)(\mathcal{E}_k - \mathcal{E}_{k+1})$ . Then, from (50) and (51) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 \\ & \leq \varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k) \|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| \\ & \leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)}{\gamma} \varphi'(\mathcal{E}_k)(\mathcal{E}_k - \mathcal{E}_{k+1}) \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| \\ & \leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)}{\gamma} (\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1})) \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\|z_{k+1} - z_k\|^2 = \|\Delta x_{k+1}\|^2 + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|^2$ . Using the fact that for any  $a, b, c, d \geq 0$ , if  $a^2 + b^2 \leq c \times d$ , then  $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2 \leq 2c \times d \leq c^2 + d^2 \leq (c + d)^2$ , it follows that for any  $\theta > 0$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| & \leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)\theta}{\gamma} (\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1})) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\theta} \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Furthermore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla P(x_k, \lambda_k, x_{k-1}, \gamma_k)\| & \leq \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_\rho(x_k, \lambda_k)\| + 2\bar{\gamma} \|x_k - x_{k-1}\| \\ & \stackrel{(46), (47)}{\leq} (\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}) (\|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\|). \end{aligned}$$

Then, (52) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| & \leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)\theta}{\gamma} (\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1})) \\ & \quad + \frac{\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}}{\theta} (\|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\|). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now choose  $\theta > 0$  so that  $0 < \frac{\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}}{\theta} < 1$  and define the parameter  $\delta_0$  as:  $\delta_0 = 1 - \frac{\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}}{\theta} > 0$ . Then, by summing up the above inequality from  $k = \bar{k}$  to  $k = K$  and using the property:  $\sum_{k=\bar{k}}^K \|\Delta x_k\| = \sum_{k=\bar{k}}^K \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta x_{\bar{k}}\| - \|\Delta x_{K+1}\|$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=\bar{k}}^K \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| & \leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)\theta}{\gamma \delta_0} (\varphi(\mathcal{E}_{\bar{k}}) - \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{K+1})) \\ & \quad + \frac{\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}}{\theta \delta_0} (\|\Delta x_{\bar{k}}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{\bar{k}}\|) - \frac{\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}}{\theta \delta_0} (\|\Delta x_{K+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{K+1}\|). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that  $\{\mathcal{E}_k\}_{k \geq k_1}$  is monotonically decreasing and that the function  $\varphi$  is positive and increasing, which yields  $\varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) \geq \varphi(\mathcal{E}_{k+1}) > 0$ , then:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=k}^K \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| &\leq \frac{4(\max\{c_1(\beta), c_2(\beta)\} + 1)\theta}{\gamma\delta_0} \varphi(\mathcal{E}_k) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Gamma_{\max} + D_S + 2\bar{\gamma}}{\theta\delta_0} (\|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\|). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that the right-hand side of the above inequality is bounded for any  $K \geq k$ . Letting  $K \rightarrow \infty$ , we get that:

$$\sum_{k=k}^{\infty} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| < \infty.$$

From Lemma 5, the sequence  $\{(x_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$  is bounded. Then, it follows that:

$$\sum_{k=1}^k \|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| < \infty.$$

Hence:  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\Delta x_k\| + \|\Delta \lambda_k\| < \infty$ . Let  $m, n \in \mathcal{Z}_+$  such that  $n \geq m$ , we have:

$$\|z_n - z_m\| = \left\| \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \Delta z_{k+1} \right\| \leq \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \|\Delta z_{k+1}\| \leq \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\|.$$

Since  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\Delta x_{k+1}\| + \|\Delta \lambda_{k+1}\| < \infty$ , it follows that  $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N \in \mathcal{Z}_+$  such that  $\forall m, n \in \mathcal{Z}_+$  where  $n \geq m$ , we have:  $\|z_n - z_m\| \leq \varepsilon$ . This implies that  $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  is a Cauchy sequence and converges. Moreover, by Theorem 1,  $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  converges to a stationary point of (1). This concludes our proof.  $\square$

## References

1. H. Attouch, J. Bolte and B. Svaiter, *Convergence of descent methods for semi-algebraic and tame problems: proximal algorithms, forward-backward splitting, and regularized Gauss–Seidel methods*, Math. Program. Ser. A 137, 91–129, 2013.
2. D. P. Bertsekas *Constrained Optimization and Lagrange Multiplier Methods*, Athena Scientific, Belmont, MA 1996.
3. D. P. Bertsekas *Convex Optimization Algorithms*, Athena Scientific, Belmont, MA 2015.
4. D. P. Bertsekas, and J. N. Tsitsiklis, *Parallel and Distributed Computation: Numerical Methods*, Athena Scientific, 2003.
5. J. Bolte, S. Sabach and M. Teboulle, *Proximal alternating linearized minimization for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems*, Math. Program. 146(1–2), 459–494, 2014.
6. R. I. Bot and D. K. Nguyen, *The proximal alternating direction method of multipliers in the nonconvex setting: convergence analysis and rates*, Math. Op. Res. 45(2), 682–712, 2020.
7. S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein, *Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers*, Found. Trends Mach. Learn. 3(1), 1–122, 2011.
8. E. Cohen, N. Hallak and M. Teboulle, *A Dynamic Alternating Direction of Multipliers for Nonconvex Minimization with Nonlinear Functional Equality Constraints*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 193, 324–353, 2022.
9. J. Fan, *Comments on “wavelets in statistics: a review*, by A. Antoniadis. J. Ital. Stat. Soc. 6, 131–138, 1997.
10. J. A. Fessler, *Optimization methods for magnetic resonance image reconstruction, key models and optimization algorithms*. IEEE Signal Process. Mag. 37(1), 33–40, 2020.

11. G. Gabay, and B. Mercier, *A dual algorithm for the solution of nonlinear variational problems via finite element approximation*, Comput. Math. Appl. 2(1), 17–40, 1976.
12. R. Glowinski, and P. Le Tallec, *Augmented Lagrangian and Operator-Splitting Methods in Nonlinear Mechanics*, SIAM, vol. 9, 1989.
13. M. Grant and S. Boyd, *CVX: Matlab Software for Disciplined Convex Programming*, version 2.1, 2014. [Online]. Available: <http://cvxr.com/cvx>, Mar. 2014
14. P. C. Haarhoff, J. D. Buys, *A new method for the optimization of a nonlinear function subject to nonlinear constraints*, Computer Journal, 13, 178–184, 1970.
15. D. Hajinezhad and M. Hong, *Perturbed proximal primal-dual algorithm for nonconvex nonsmooth optimization*, Math. Program. 2019.
16. M. Hestenes, *Multiplier and gradient methods*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 4, 303–320, 1969.
17. M. Hong, D. Hajinezhad, and M. M. Zhao, *Prox-PDA: The proximal primal-dual algorithm for fast distributed nonconvex optimization and learning over networks*. In: D. Precup, Y.W. Teh (eds.) Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 70, pp. 1529–1538, PMLR 2017.
18. B. Jiang, T. Lin, S. Ma and S. Zhang, *Structured nonconvex and nonsmooth optimization: algorithms and iteration complexity analysis*, Comput. Optim. Appl. 72(1), 115–157, 2019.
19. D. R. Luke, S. Sabach, and M. Teboulle, *Optimization on spheres: models and proximal algorithms with computational performance comparisons*. SIAM J. Math. Data Sci. 1(3), 408–445, 2019.
20. F. Messerer, K. Baumgärtner and M. Diehl, *Survey of sequential convex programming and generalized Gauss-Newton methods*, ESAIM: Proceedings and Surveys, 2021.
21. I. Necoara and S. Kvamme, *DuQuad: A toolbox for solving convex quadratic programs using dual (augmented) first order algorithms*, 2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pp. 2043–2048, 2015.
22. M. J. D. Powell, *A method for nonlinear optimization in minimization problems*, in Optimization (R. Fletcher, ed.), Academic Press, 283–298, 1969.
23. R. Rockafellar and R. Wets, *Variational Analysis*, Springer, Berlin, 1998.
24. J. O. Royset, *Variational Analysis in Modern Statistics*, Special Issue Mathematical Programming, Series B, Volume 174, 2019.
25. C. W. Royer, M. O’Neill and S. J. Wright, *A Newton-CG algorithm with complexity guarantees for smooth unconstrained optimization*, Mathematical Programming, 2019.
26. R. Shefi and M. Teboulle, *Rate of convergence analysis of decomposition methods based on the proximal method of multipliers for convex minimization*, SIAM J. Optim. 24(1), 269–297, 2014.
27. Q. Tran-Dinh and M. Diehl, *Local convergence of sequential convex programming for nonconvex optimization*. In M. Diehl, F. Glineur, E. Jarlebring, and W. Michiels, editors, *Recent advances in optimization and its application in engineering*, pages 93–103. Springer-Verl., 2010.
28. A. Wächter and L. T. Biegler, *On the Implementation of a Primal-Dual Interior Point Filter Line Search Algorithm for Large-Scale Nonlinear Programming*, Mathematical Programming 106(1), 25–57, 2006.
29. Y. Xie, S. J. Wright, *Complexity of Proximal Augmented Lagrangian for Nonconvex Optimization with Nonlinear Equality Constraints*, Journal of Scientific Computing, 86, 38, 2021.
30. M. Yashtini, *Convergence and rate analysis of a proximal linearized ADMM for nonconvex nonsmooth optimization*, Journal of Global Optimization, 2022.
31. C. Zhang, *Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty*, Ann. Stat. 38, 894–942, 2010.
32. J. Zhang and Z. Q. Luo, *A proximal alternating direction method of multiplier for linearly constrained nonconvex minimization*, SIAM J. Optim. 30(3), 2272–2302, 2020.