

An Inexact Augmented Lagrangian Framework for Non-Convex Optimization with Nonlinear Constraints

Mehmet Fatih Sahin Armin Eftekhari Ahmet Alacaoglu
Fabian Latorre Volkan Cevher*

LIONS, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland

Abstract

We propose a practical inexact augmented Lagrangian method (iALM) for nonconvex problems with nonlinear constraints. We characterize the total computational complexity of our method subject to a verifiable geometric condition.

In particular, when a first-order solver is used for the inner iterates, we prove that iALM finds a first-order stationary point with $\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^3)$ calls to the first-order oracle. Likewise, when a second-order solver is used for the inner iterates, we prove that iALM finds a second-order stationary point with $\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^5)$ calls to the second-order oracle. These complexity results match the known theoretical results in the literature with a simple, implementable and versatile algorithm.

We provide numerical evidence on large-scale machine learning problems, including the Burer-Monteiro factorization of standard form Semidefinite Programming (SDP) relaxations, for which we verify our geometric condition in specific cases. For these problems and under suitable assumptions, our algorithm in fact achieves global optimality for the underlying convex SDP.

1 Introduction

We study the nonconvex optimization problem

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x) + g(x) \\ A(x) = b, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is possibly nonconvex and $A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a nonlinear operator and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. For clarity of notation, we take $b = 0$ in the sequel, the extension to any b is trivial. We assume that $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a proximal-friendly (but possibly nonsmooth) convex function.

A host of problems in computer science [35, 40], machine learning [44, 60], and signal processing [58, 59] naturally fall under the template of (1), including max-cut, clustering, generalized eigenvalue, and community detection.

To address these applications, this paper builds up on the vast literature on the classical inexact augmented Lagrangian framework and proposes a simple, intuitive and easy-to-implement algorithm which enjoys total complexity results for (1), under an interpretable geometric condition detailed below. Before we elaborate on the results, let us first motivate (1) with an important application to Semidefinite Programming (SDP):

Vignette: Burer-Monteiro splitting. A powerful convex relaxation for max-cut, clustering, and several other applications we listed above is provided by the SDP

$$\begin{cases} \min_{X \in \mathbb{S}^{d \times d}} \langle C, X \rangle \\ B(X) = b, X \succeq 0, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

*mehmet.sahin@epfl.ch **AE: Fatih please add all emails!**

where $C \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and X is a positive semidefinite and symmetric $d \times d$ matrix, and $B : \mathbb{S}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a linear operator. If the unique-games conjecture is true, SDPs achieve the best approximation for the underlying discrete problem [56].

Since d is often large, many first- and second-order methods for solving such SDPs are immediately ruled out, not only due to their high computational complexity, but also due to their storage requirements, which are $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$.

A contemporary challenge in optimization is therefore to solve SDPs in small space and in a scalable fashion. A recent algorithm, i.e., Homotopy Conditional Gradient Method (HCGM), based on Linear Minimization Oracles (LMO), can address the template (2) in a small space via sketching [69]; however, such LMO-based methods are extremely slow in obtaining accurate solutions.

Alternatively, a powerful approach for solving (1), dating back to [16, 17], is the so-called Burer-Monteiro (BR) factorization $X = UU^\top$, where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and r is selected according to the guidelines in [53, 2]. Even though the resulting factorized problem is nonconvex, it has been shown that these bounds on the rank r , which are shown to be optimal [64], guarantee the removal of all spurious local minima, under mild additional assumptions [15]. This factorization results in the nonconvex problem

$$\begin{cases} \min_{U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}} \langle C, UU^\top \rangle \\ B(UU^\top) = b, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

which can be written in the form of (1).

To solve (3), the inexact Augmented Lagrangian Method (iALM) is widely used [16, 17, 38], due to its cheap per-iteration cost and also its empirical success in practice. Every (outer) iteration of iALM calls a solver to inexactly solve an intermediate augmented Lagrangian subproblem to near stationarity, and the user has freedom in choosing this solver, which could be a first-order algorithm (say, proximal gradient descent [51]) or a second-order algorithm, such as BFGS [48].

We argue that, unlike its convex counterpart [45, 39, 66], the convergence rate and the complexity of iALM for (3) are not well-understood, as detailed in Section 5. Indeed, addressing this important theoretical gap is one of the key contribution of the present work.

Summary of contributions:

- ▷ Our framework is future-proof in the sense that we obtain the convergence rate of iALM for (1) with an arbitrary solver for finding first- and second-order stationary points of each intermediate subproblem.
- ▷ We investigate the use of different solvers for augmented Lagrangian subproblems and provide overall iteration complexity bounds for finding first- and second-order stationary points of (1). Our complexity bounds match the best theoretical complexity results in optimization, see Section 5.
- ▷ We propose a novel geometric condition that simplifies the algorithmic analysis of iALM. We verify the condition for a few key problems described in Section 6.

Roadmap. Section 2 collects the technical tools and notation. We present iALM in Section 3 and obtain its convergence rate to first- and second-order stationary points in Section 4, alongside their total iteration complexities. A comprehensive review of the literature, highlighting the key distinctions of our framework, is presented in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 provides the numerical evidence and comparisons with the state-of-the-art.

2 Preliminaries

Notation. We use the notation $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\|\cdot\|$ for the standard inner product and the norm on \mathbb{R}^d . For matrices, $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_F$ denote the spectral and the Frobenius norms, respectively. For a convex function $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the subdifferential set at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by $\partial g(x)$ and we will occasionally use the notation $\partial g(x)/\beta = \{z/\beta : z \in \partial g(x)\}$. When presenting iteration complexity results, we often use $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\cdot)$ to suppress the logarithmic dependencies.

Throughout, the indicator function $\delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of a set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ takes x to

$$\delta_{\mathcal{X}}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in \mathcal{X} \\ \infty & x \notin \mathcal{X}. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

The distance function from a point x to \mathcal{X} is denoted by $\text{dist}(x, \mathcal{X}) = \min_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \|x - z\|$. For integers $k_0 \leq k_1$, we denote $[k_0 : k_1] = \{k_0, \dots, k_1\}$. For an operator $A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ with components $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^m$, we let $DA(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ denote the Jacobian of A , where the i th row of $DA(x)$ is the gradient vector $\nabla A_i(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Smoothness. We require $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ in (1) to be smooth, namely, there exists $\lambda_f, \lambda_A \geq 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(x')\| &\leq \lambda_f \|x - x'\|, \\ \|DA(x) - DA(x')\| &\leq \lambda_A \|x - x'\|, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for every $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Augmented Lagrangian Method (ALM). ALM is a classical algorithm, first appearing in [32, 55] and then extensively studied in [6]. Instead of (1), ALM proposes to solve the equivalent problem

$$\min_x \max_y \mathcal{L}_\beta(x, y) + g(x), \quad (6)$$

where, for $\beta > 0$, \mathcal{L}_β is the corresponding augmented Lagrangian, defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta(x, y) := f(x) + \langle A(x), y \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|A(x)\|^2. \quad (7)$$

The minimax formulation in (6) naturally suggests the following algorithm for solving (1): For dual step sizes $\{\sigma_k\}_k$, consider the iterates

$$x_{k+1} \in \underset{x}{\text{argmin}} \mathcal{L}_\beta(x, y_k) + g(x), \quad (8)$$

$$y_{k+1} = y_k + \sigma_k A(x_{k+1}).$$

Unfortunately, updating x_{k+1} above requires solving the nonconvex problem (8) to optimality, which is typically intractable. Instead, it is often easier to find an approximate first- or second-order stationary point of (8).

Our key contribution is that, by gradually improving the stationarity precision and increasing the penalty weight β above, we can reach a stationary point of the main problem in (1), as detailed in Section 3.

Optimality conditions. First-order necessary optimality conditions for (1) are well-understood. Indeed, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a first-order stationary point of (1) if there exists $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla f(x) - DA(x)^\top y \in \partial g(x) \\ A(x) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where $DA(x)$ is the Jacobian of A at x . Recalling (7), we observe that (9) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_\beta(x, y) \in \partial g(x) \\ A(x) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

which is in turn the necessary optimality condition for (6). Inspired by this, we say that x is an (ϵ_f, β) first-order stationary point of (1) if

$$\begin{cases} \text{dist}(-\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_\beta(x, y), \partial g(x)) \leq \epsilon_f \\ \|A(x)\| \leq \epsilon_f, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where $\epsilon_f \geq 0$. In light of (11), a suitable metric for evaluating the stationarity of a pair $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m$ is

$$\text{dist}(-\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_\beta(x, y), \partial g(x)) + \|A(x)\|, \quad (12)$$

which we will use as the first-order stopping criterion. As an example, for a convex set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, suppose that $g = \delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the indicator function on \mathcal{X} . Let also $T_{\mathcal{X}}(x) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the tangent cone to \mathcal{X} at x , and with $P_{T_{\mathcal{X}}(x)} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote the orthogonal projection onto this tangent cone. Then, for $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it is not difficult to verify that

$$\text{dist}(u, \partial g(x)) = \|P_{T_{\mathcal{X}}(x)}(u)\|. \quad (13)$$

When $g = 0$, a first-order stationary point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of (1) is also second-order stationary if

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla_{xx}\mathcal{L}_{\beta}(x, y)) > 0, \quad (14)$$

where $\nabla_{xx}\mathcal{L}_{\beta}$ is the Hessian with respect to x , and $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ returns the smallest eigenvalue of its argument. Analogously, x is an $(\epsilon_f, \epsilon_s, \beta)$ second-order stationary point if, in addition to (11), it holds that

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla_{xx}\mathcal{L}_{\beta}(x, y)) \geq -\epsilon_s, \quad (15)$$

for $\epsilon_s > 0$. Naturally, for second-order stationarity, we will use $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla_{xx}\mathcal{L}_{\beta}(x, y))$ as the stopping criterion.

Smoothness lemma. This next result controls the smoothness of $\mathcal{L}_{\beta}(\cdot, y)$ for a fixed y . The proof is standard but nevertheless included in Appendix C for completeness.

Lemma 2.1 (smoothness). *For fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\rho, \rho' \geq 0$, it holds that*

$$\|\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta}(x, y) - \nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta}(x', y)\| \leq \lambda_{\beta} \|x - x'\|, \quad (16)$$

for every $x, x' \in \{x'' : \|A(x'')\| \leq \rho, \|x''\| \leq \rho'\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\beta} &\leq \lambda_f + \sqrt{m}\lambda_A \|y\| + (\sqrt{m}\lambda_A \rho + d\lambda_A'^2)\beta \\ &=: \lambda_f + \sqrt{m}\lambda_A \|y\| + \lambda''(A, \rho, \rho')\beta. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Above, λ_f, λ_A were defined in (5) and

$$\lambda_A' := \max_{\|x\| \leq \rho'} \|DA(x)\|. \quad (18)$$

3 Our optimization framework

To solve the equivalent formulation of (1), introduced in (6), we propose the inexact Augmented Lagrangian Method (iALM), detailed in Algorithm 1.

At the k th iteration, Step 2 of Algorithm 1 calls a solver that finds an approximate stationary point of the augmented Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{\beta_k}(\cdot, y_k)$ with the accuracy of ϵ_{k+1} ; this accuracy gradually increases throughout the iterations in a controlled fashion.

The increasing sequence of penalty weights $\{\beta_k\}_k$ and the dual update (Steps 4 and 5 of Algorithm 1) are responsible for continuously enforcing the constraints in (1). As we will see in the convergence analysis, the particular choice of the dual step size σ_k in Algorithm 1 ensures that the dual variable y_k remains bounded; see [5] for a precedent in the ALM literature where a similar choice for σ_k is considered.

Step 3 of Algorithm 1 removes pathological cases with divergent iterates. As an example, suppose that $g = \delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ in (1) is the indicator function for a bounded convex set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and take $\rho' > \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|x\|$. Then, for sufficiently large k , it is not difficult to verify that all the iterates of Algorithm 1 automatically satisfy $\|x_k\| \leq \rho'$ without the need to execute Step 3.

4 Convergence Rate

In this section, we derive the convergence rate of Algorithm 1 for finding first-order and second-order stationary points of (1), and present the corresponding total iteration complexity results. All the proofs are deferred to Appendix A for the clarity.

Let us now turn to the details. Theorem 4.1 below, proved in Appendix A, characterizes the convergence rate of Algorithm 1 for finding stationary points in terms of the number of outer iterations.

Algorithm 1 Inexact AL for solving (1)

Input: $\rho, \rho', \rho'' > 0$, a non-decreasing, positive, unbounded sequence $\{\beta_k\}_{k \geq 1}$, stopping thresholds τ_f and τ_s .

Initialization: $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|A(x_1)\| \leq \rho$ and $\|x_1\| \leq \rho'$, $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$, σ_1 .

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

1. **(Update tolerance)** $\epsilon_{k+1} = 1/\beta_k$.

2. **(Inexact primal solution)** Obtain $x_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\text{dist}(-\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_k}(x_{k+1}, y_k), \partial g(x_{k+1})) \leq \epsilon_{k+1}$$

for first-order stationarity and, in addition,

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla_{xx} \mathcal{L}_{\beta_k}(x_{k+1}, y_k)) \geq -\epsilon_{k+1}$$

for second-order-stationarity.

3. **(Control)** If necessary, project x_{k+1} to ensure that $\|x_{k+1}\| \leq \rho'$.

4. **(Update dual step size)**

$$\sigma_{k+1} = \sigma_1 \min \left(\frac{\|A(x_1)\| \log^2 2}{\|A(x_{k+1})\| (k+1) \log^2(k+2)}, 1 \right).$$

5. **(Dual ascent)** $y_{k+1} = y_k + \sigma_{k+1} A(x_{k+1})$.

6. **(Stopping criterion)** If

$$\text{dist}(-\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_k}(x_{k+1}, y_k), \partial g(x_{k+1})) + \sigma_{k+1} \|A(x_{k+1})\| \leq \tau_f,$$

for first-order stationarity and if also $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla_{xx} \mathcal{L}_{\beta_k}(x_{k+1}, y_k)) \geq -\tau_s$ for second-order stationarity, then quit and return x_{k+1} as an (approximate) stationary point of (1).

end for

Theorem 4.1. (convergence rate) *Suppose that f and A are smooth in the sense specified in (5). For $\rho' > 0$, let*

$$\lambda'_f = \max_{\|x\| \leq \rho'} \|\nabla f(x)\|, \quad \lambda'_A = \max_{\|x\| \leq \rho'} \|DA(x)\|, \quad (19)$$

be the (restricted) Lipschitz constants of f and A , respectively. For sufficiently large integers $k_0 \leq k_1$, consider the interval $K = [k_0 : k_1]$, and let $\{x_k\}_{k \in K}$ be the output sequence of Algorithm 1 on the interval K . For $\nu > 0$, assume that

$$\nu \|A(x_k)\| \leq \text{dist} \left(-DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k), \frac{\partial g(x_k)}{\beta_{k-1}} \right), \quad (20)$$

for every $k \in K$. We consider two cases:

- *If a first-order solver is used in Step 2, then x_k is an $(\epsilon_{k,f}, \beta_k)$ first-order stationary point of (1) with*

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{k,f} &= \frac{1}{\beta_{k-1}} \left(\frac{2(\lambda'_f + \lambda'_A y_{\max})(1 + \lambda'_A \sigma_k)}{\nu} + 1 \right) \\ &=: \frac{Q(f, g, A, \sigma_1)}{\beta_{k-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

for every $k \in K$, where the expression for $y_{\max} = y_{\max}(x_1, y_0, \sigma_1)$ is given in (48).

- *If a second-order solver is used in Step 2, then x_k is an $(\epsilon_{k,f}, \epsilon_{k,s}, \beta_k)$ second-order stationary*




Figure 1: Solving (1) can be particularly difficult, even when it is a convex program. We present a pathological geometry where the Slater’s condition does not apply. See the first remark after Theorem 4.1 for more details.

point of (1) with $\epsilon_{k,s}$ specified above and with

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{k,s} &= \epsilon_{k-1} + \sigma_k \sqrt{m} \lambda_A \frac{2\lambda'_f + 2\lambda'_A y_{\max}}{\nu \beta_{k-1}} \\ &= \frac{\nu + \sigma_k \sqrt{m} \lambda_A 2\lambda'_f + 2\lambda'_A y_{\max}}{\nu \beta_{k-1}} =: \frac{Q'}{\beta_{k-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Loosely speaking, Theorem 4.1 states that Algorithm 1 converges to a (first- or second-) order stationary point of (1) at the rate of $1/\beta_k$. A few remarks are in order.

Regularity. The key condition in Theorem 4.1 is (20) which, broadly speaking, controls the geometry of the problem $uujq$.

As the penalty weight β_k grows, the primal solver in Step 2 places an increasing emphasis on reducing the feasibility gap and (20) formalizes this intuition. In contrast to most conditions in the nonconvex optimization literature, such as [28] **AE: Fatih, please cite here all papers with nonconvex Slater conditions**, our condition in (20) appears to be easier to verify, as we see in Section 6.

We now argue that such a condition is necessary for controlling the feasibility gap of (1) and ensuring the success of Algorithm 1. For instance, consider the case where $f = 0$ and $g = \delta_{\mathcal{X}}$, where \mathcal{X} is a convex set, A is a linear operator. In this case, solving (1) finds a point in $\mathcal{X} \cap \text{null}(A)$, where the subspace $\text{null}(A) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : A(x) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the null space of A . Here, (1) is convex and the Slater’s condition requires that

$$\text{relint}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \text{null}(A) \neq \emptyset. \quad (23)$$

In general, the Slater’s condition plays a key role in convex optimization as a sufficient condition for strong duality and, as a result, guarantees the success of a variety of primal-dual algorithms for linearly-constrained convex programs [3]. Intuitively, the Slater’s condition here removes any pathological cases by ensuring that the subspace $\text{null}(A)$ is not tangent to \mathcal{X} , see Figure 1. In such pathological cases, solving (1), namely, finding a point in $\mathcal{X} \cap \text{null}(A)$, can be particularly difficult. For instance, the alternating projection algorithm (which iteratively projects onto \mathcal{X} and $\text{null}(A)$) has arbitrarily slow convergence, see Figure 1.

Computational complexity. Theorem 4.1 allows us to specify the number of iterations that Algorithm 1 requires to reach a near-stationary point of (1) with a prescribed precision and, in particular, specifies the number of calls made to the solver in its Step 2. In this sense, Theorem 4.1 does not fully capture the computational complexity of Algorithm 1, as it does not take into account the computational cost of the solver in its Step 2.

To understand the total complexity of Algorithm 1, we consider two scenarios in the following. In the first scenario, we take the solver in Step 2 to be the Accelerated Proximal Gradient Method (APGM), a well-known first-order algorithm [30]. In the second scenario, we will use the second-order trust region method developed in [19].

4.1 First-Order Optimality

Let us first consider the first-order optimality case where the solver in Step 2 is APGM [30]. APGM makes use of $\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_\beta(x, y)$, the proximal operator prox_g , and the classical Nesterov's acceleration [47] to obtain first-order stationarity guarantees for solving the subproblem (8). Suppose that $g = \delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the indicator function of a bounded convex set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and let

$$x_{\max} = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|x\|, \quad (24)$$

be the radius of a ball centered at the origin that includes \mathcal{X} . Then, adapting the results in [30] to our setup, APGM reaches x_k in Step 2 of Algorithm 1 after

$$\mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\beta_k}^2 x_{\max}^2}{\epsilon_{k+1}} \right) \quad (25)$$

(inner) iterations, where λ_{β_k} denotes the Lipschitz constant of $\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_k}(x, y)$, bounded in (17). We note that, for simplicity, we use a looser bound in (25) than the original in [30]. Using (25), we derive the following corollary, describing the total computational complexity of Algorithm 1 in terms of the calls to the first-order oracle in APGM.

Corollary 4.2. *For $b > 1$, let $\beta_k = b^k$ for every k . If we use APGM from [30] for Step 2 of Algorithm 1, the algorithm finds an (ϵ_f, β_k) first-order stationary point, see (11), after T calls to the first-order oracle, where*

$$T = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{Q^3 x_{\max}^2}{\epsilon^3} \log_b \left(\frac{Q}{\epsilon} \right) \right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{Q^3 x_{\max}^2}{\epsilon^3} \right). \quad (26)$$

For Algorithm 1 to reach a near-stationary point with an accuracy of ϵ_f in the sense of (11) and with the lowest computational cost, we therefore need to perform only one iteration of Algorithm 1, with β_1 specified as a function of ϵ_f by (21) in Theorem 4.1. In general, however, the constants in (21) are unknown and this approach is intractable. Instead, the homotopy approach taken by Algorithm 1 ensures achieving the desired accuracy by gradually increasing the penalty weight. This homotopy approach increases the computational cost of Algorithm 1 only by a factor logarithmic in the ϵ_f , as detailed in the proof of Corollary 4.2.

4.2 Second-Order Optimality

Let us now consider the second-order optimality case where the solver in Step 2 is the trust region method developed in [19]. The trust region method minimizes quadratic approximation of the function within a dynamically updated trust-region radius. The particular second-order trust region method that we consider in this section makes use of Hessian (or an approximation of Hessian) of the augmented Lagrangian in addition to first order oracles.

As shown in [49], finding approximate second-order stationary points of convex-constrained problems is in general NP-hard. For this reason, we focus in this section on the special case of (1) with $g = 0$.

Let us compute the total computational complexity of Algorithm 1 with the trust region method in Step 2, in terms of the number of calls made to the second-order oracle. By adapting the result in [19] to our setup, we find that the number of (inner) iterations required in Step 2 of Algorithm 1 to produce x_{k+1} is

$$\mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\beta_k, H}^2 (\mathcal{L}_{\beta_k}(x_1, y) - \min_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_k}(x, y))}{\epsilon_k^3} \right), \quad (27)$$

where $\lambda_{\beta, H}$ is the Lipschitz constant of the Hessian of the augmented Lagrangian, which is of the order of β , as can be proven similar to Lemma 2.1 and x_1 is the initial iterate of the given outer loop. In [19], the term $\mathcal{L}_{\beta}(x_1, y) - \min_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta}(x, y)$ is bounded by a constant independent of ϵ . We assume a uniform bound for this quantity for all β_k , instead of for one value of β_k as in [19]. Using (27) and Theorem 4.1, we arrive at the following:

Corollary 4.3. *For $b > 1$, let $\beta_k = b^k$ for every k . We assume that*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta}(x_1, y) - \min_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta}(x, y) \leq L_u, \quad \forall \beta. \quad (28)$$

If we use the trust region method from [19] for Step 2 of Algorithm 1, the algorithm finds an ϵ -second-order stationary point of (1) in T calls to the second-order oracle where

$$T \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L_u Q'^5}{\epsilon^5} \log_b\left(\frac{Q'}{\epsilon}\right)\right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{L_u Q'^5}{\epsilon^5}\right). \quad (29)$$

Before closing this section, we note that the remark after Corollary 4.2 applies here as well.

5 Related works

ALM has a long history in the optimization literature, dating back to [32, 55]. In the special case of (1) with a convex function f and a linear operator A , standard, inexact and linearized versions of ALM have been extensively studied [39, 45, 63, 66].

Classical works on ALM focused on the general template of (1) with nonconvex f and nonlinear A , with arguably stronger assumptions and required exact solutions to the subproblems of the form (8), which appear in Step 2 of Algorithm 1, see for instance [6].

A similar analysis was conducted in [26] for the general template of (1). The authors considered inexact ALM and proved convergence rates for the outer iterates, under specific assumptions on the initialization of the dual variable. However, unlike our results, the authors did not analyze how to solve the subproblems inexactly and they did not provide total complexity results and verifiable conditions, see Section 6.

Problem (1) is also studied in [9] and [20] for first-order and second-order stationarity, respectively, with explicit iteration complexity analysis and similar assumptions to us. As we have mentioned in Section 4, our iteration complexity results matches these theoretical algorithms with a far simpler algorithm and a straightforward analysis. In addition, these algorithms require setting final accuracies in advance, since they utilize this information in the algorithm. In contrast to [9, 20], Algorithm 1 does not set the final accuracy a priori.

[21] also considers the same template (1) for first-order stationarity with a penalty-type method instead of ALM. Even though the authors show $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ complexity, this result is obtained by assuming that the penalty parameter remains bounded. We note that such an assumption can also be used to match our complexity results.

[11] studies the general template (1) with specific assumptions involving local error bound conditions for (1). These conditions are studied in detail in [10], but their validity for general SDPs in (2) has never been established. This work also lacks the total iteration complexity analysis presented here.

Another work [24] focused on solving (1) by adapting the primal-dual method of Chambolle and Pock [22]. The authors proved the convergence of the method and provided convergence rate by imposing error bound conditions on the objective function that do not hold for standard SDPs.

[16, 17] is the first work that proposes the splitting $X = UU^\top$ for solving SDPs of the form (2). Following these works, the literature on Burer-Monteiro (BM) splitting for the large part focused on using ALM for solving the reformulated problem (3). However, this approach has a few drawbacks: First, it requires exact solutions in Step 2 of Algorithm 1 in theory, which in practice is replaced with inexact solutions. Second, their results only establish convergence without providing the rates. In this sense, our work provides a theoretical understanding of the BM splitting with inexact solutions to Step 2 of Algorithm 1 and complete iteration complexities.

[8, 52] are among the earliest efforts to show convergence rates for BM splitting, focusing on the special case of SDPs without any linear constraints. For these specific problems, they prove the convergence of gradient descent to global optima with convergence rates, assuming favorable initialization. These results, however, do not apply to general SDPs of the form (2) where the difficulty arises due to the linear constraints.

[7] focused on the quadratic penalty formulation of (1), namely,

$$\min_{X \succeq 0} \langle C, X \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|B(X) - b\|^2, \quad (30)$$

which after BM factorization becomes

$$\min_{U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}} \langle C, UU^\top \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|B(UU^\top) - b\|^2, \quad (31)$$

for which they study the optimality of the second-order stationary points. These results are for establishing a connection between the stationary points of (31) and global optima of (30). In contrast, we focus on the relation of the stationary points of (6) to the constrained problem (1).

Another popular method for solving SDPs are due to [14, 13, 15], focusing on the case where the constraints in (1) can be written as a Riemannian manifold after BM splitting. In this case, the authors apply the Riemannian gradient descent and Riemannian trust region methods for obtaining first- and second-order stationary points, respectively. They obtain $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ complexity for finding first-order stationary points and $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^3)$ complexity for finding second-order stationary points.

While these complexities appear better than ours, the smooth manifold requirement in these works is indeed restrictive. In particular, this requirement holds for max-cut and generalized eigenvalue problems, but it is not satisfied for other important SDPs such as quadratic programming (QAP), optimal power flow and clustering with general affine constraints. In addition, as noted in [13], per iteration cost of their method for max-cut problem is an astronomical $\mathcal{O}(d^6)$.

Lastly, there also exists a line of work for solving SDPs in their original convex formulation, in a storage efficient way [46, 68, 69]. These works have global optimality guarantees by their virtue of directly solving the convex formulation. On the downside, these works require the use of eigenvalue routines and exhibit significantly slower convergence as compared to nonconvex approaches [34].

6 Numerical evidence

We first begin with a caveat: It is known that quasi-Newton methods, such as BFGS and LBFGS, might not converge for non-convex problems [25, 42]. For this reason, we have used the trust region method as the second-order solver in our analysis in Section 4, which is well-studied for non-convex problems [19].

Empirically, however, BFGS and LBFGS are extremely successful and we have also opted for those solvers in this section since the subroutine does not affect Theorem 4.1 as long as the subsolver can perform in practice.

6.1 k-Means Clustering

Given data points $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^n$, the entries of the corresponding Euclidean distance matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are $D_{i,j} = \|z_i - z_j\|^2$. Clustering is then the problem of finding a co-association matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that $Y_{i,j} = 1$ if points z_i and z_j are within the same cluster and $Y_{i,j} = 0$ otherwise. In [54], the authors provide a SDP relaxation of the clustering problem, specified as

$$\begin{cases} \min_{Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}} \text{tr}(DY) \\ Y\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}, \text{tr}(Y) = k, Y \succeq 0, Y \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

where k is the number of clusters and Y is both positive semidefinite and has nonnegative entries. Standard SDP solvers do not scale well with the number of data points n , since they often require projection onto the semidefinite cone with the complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. We instead use the Burer-Monteiro splitting, sacrificing convexity to reduce the computational complexity. More specifically, we solve the program

$$\begin{cases} \min_{V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}} \text{tr}(DVV^\top) \\ VV^\top \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}, \|V\|_F^2 \leq k, V \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

where $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the vector of all ones. Note that $Y \geq 0$ in (32) is replaced above by the much stronger but easier to enforce constraint $V \geq 0$ constraint above, see [38] for the reasoning behind this relaxation. Now, we can cast (33) as an instance of (1). Indeed, for every $i \leq n$, let $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^r$ denote the i th row of V . We next form $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $d = nr$ by expanding the factorized variable V , namely,

$$x = [x_1^\top, \dots, x_n^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and then set

$$f(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n D_{i,j} \langle x_i, x_j \rangle, \quad g = \delta_C,$$




Figure 2: Convergence of different algorithms for k-Means clustering with fashion MNIST dataset. The solution rank for the template (32) is known and it is equal to number of clusters k (Theorem 1. [38]). As discussed in [62], setting rank $r > k$ leads more accurate reconstruction in expense of speed. Therefore, we set the rank to 20.

$$A(x) = [x_1^\top \sum_{j=1}^n x_j - 1, \dots, x_n^\top \sum_{j=1}^n x_j - 1]^\top, \quad (34)$$

where C is the intersection of the positive orthant in \mathbb{R}^d with the Euclidean ball of radius \sqrt{k} . In Appendix D, we somewhat informally verify that Theorem 4.1 applies to (1) with f, g, A specified above.

In our simulations, we use two different solvers for Step 2 of Algorithm 1, namely, APGM and IBFGS. APGM is a solver for non-convex problems of the form (8) with convergence guarantees to first-order stationarity, as discussed in Section 4. IBFGS is a limited-memory version of BFGS algorithm in [27] that approximately leverages the second-order information of the problem. We compare our approach against the following convex methods:

- ▷ HCGM: Homotopy-based Conditional Gradient Method in [69] which directly solves (32).
- ▷ SDPNAL+: A second-order augmented Lagrangian method for solving SDP's with nonnegativity constraints [67].

As for the dataset, our experimental setup is similar to that described by [43]. We use the publicly-available fashion-MNIST data in [65], which is released as a possible replacement for the MNIST handwritten digits. Each data point is a 28×28 gray-scale image, associated with a label from ten classes, labeled from 0 to 9. First, we extract the meaningful features from this dataset using a simple two-layer neural network with a sigmoid activation function. Then, we apply this neural network to 1000 test samples from the same dataset, which gives us a vector of length 10 for each data point, where each entry represents the posterior probability for each class. Then, we form the ℓ_2 distance matrix D from these probability vectors. The results are depicted in Figure 2. We implemented 3 algorithms on MATLAB and used the software package for SDPNAL+ which contains mex files. Convergence of the nonconvex approach will be much faster once mex implementation is used.

6.2 Generalized eigenvalue problem

Generalized eigenvalue problem has extensive applications in machine learning, statistics and data analysis [29]. The well-known nonconvex formulation of the problem is [15].

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} x^\top C x \\ x^\top B x = 1, \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

where $B, C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are symmetric matrices and B is positive definite, i.e. $B \succ 0$. The generalized eigenvector computation is equivalent to performing principal component analysis (PCA) of C in the norm B . Moreover, it is also equivalent to computing the top eigenvector of symmetric matrix $S = B^{-1/2} C B^{1/2}$ and multiplying the resulting vector by $B^{-1/2}$. However, for sufficiently large

n , computing $B^{-1/2}$ is extremely expensive. The natural convex sdP relaxation for (35) involves lifting $Y = xx^\top$ and removes the non-convex $\text{rank}(Y) = 1$ constraint,

$$\begin{cases} \min_{Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}} \text{tr}(CY) \\ \text{tr}(BY) = 1, \quad X \succeq 0. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

Here, we solve (35) because it directly fits into our template with,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= x^\top Cx, & g(x) &= 0 \\ A(x) &= x^\top Bx - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

We compare our approach against 3 different methods. Manifold based Riemannian gradient descent and Riemannian trust region methods in [13] and generalized eigenvector via linear system solver (abbreviated as GenELin) in [29]. We have used Manopt software package in [12] for the manifold based methods. For GenELin, we have utilized Matlab's backslash operator as the linear solver. The results are compiled in Figure 3.

We synthetically generate the real and symmetric matrices B and C with $n = 10^3$. The main assumption in (35) is that B is positive definite. Therefore, we generated B with all positive repeated eigenvalues in all the experiments. We analyze different eigenvalue structures for C . Second and forth row of Figure 3 depicts corresponding eigenvalue structures for B and C . λ_i^C and λ_i^B denotes i^{th} largest eigenvalue in magnitude for C and B , respectively.

Our augmented Lagrangian based method for the generalized eigenvalue problem outperforms the first order Riemannian gradient descent and GenELin in most of the cases. It is promising to see that such a general method can perform well without exploiting any structural property in the constraint set as manifold based methods does.

6.3 Basis Pursuit

Basis Pursuit (BP) finds sparsest solutions of an under-determined system of linear equations, namely,

$$\begin{cases} \min_z \|z\|_1 \\ Bz = b, \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. BP has found many applications in machine learning, statistics and signal processing [23, 18, 1]. A huge number of primal-dual convex optimization algorithms are proposed to solve BP, including, but not limited to [63, 22]. There also exists many line of works [4] to handle sparse regression problem via regularization with ℓ_1 norm.

Here, we take a different approach and cast (38) as an instance of (1). Note that any $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ can be decomposed as $z = z^+ - z^-$, where $z^+, z^- \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are the positive and negative parts of z , respectively. Then consider the change of variables $z^+ = u_1^{\circ 2}$ and $z^- = u_2^{\circ 2} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where \circ denotes element-wise power. Next, we concatenate u_1 and u_2 as $x := [u_1^\top, u_2^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and define $\bar{B} := [B, -B] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2d}$. Then, (38) is equivalent to (1) with

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \|x\|_2^2, & g(x) &= 0 \\ A(x) &= \bar{B}x^{\circ 2} - b. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

In Appendix F, we verify with minimal detail that Theorem 4.1 indeed applies to (1) with the above f, A .

We draw the entries of B independently from a zero-mean and unit-variance Gaussian distribution. For a fixed sparsity level k , the support of $z_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and its nonzero amplitudes are also drawn from the standard Gaussian distribution. Then the measurement vector is created as $b = Bz + \epsilon$, where ϵ is the noise vector with entries drawn independently from the zero-mean Gaussian distribution with variance $\sigma^2 = 10^{-6}$.

Figure 4 compiles our results for the proposed relaxation. It is, indeed, interesting to see that these type of non-convex relaxations gives the solution of convex one and first order methods succeed.




Figure 3: (*Top*) Objective convergence for calculating top generalized eigenvalue and eigenvector of B and C . (*Bottom*) Eigenvalue structure of the matrices. For (i),(ii) and (iii), C is positive semidefinite; for (iv), (v) and (vi), C contains negative eigenvalues. [(i): Generated by taking symmetric part of iid Gaussian matrix. (ii): Generated by randomly rotating $\text{diag}(1^{-p}, 2^{-p}, \dots, 1000^{-p})$ ($p = 1$). (iii): Generated by randomly rotating $\text{diag}(10^{-p}, 10^{-2p}, \dots, 10^{-1000p})$ ($p = 0.0025$).]




Figure 4: Convergence with different subsolvers for the aforementioned non-convex relaxation.

Discussion: The true potential of our reformulation is in dealing with more structured norms rather than ℓ_1 , where computing the proximal operator is often intractable. One such case is the

latent group lasso norm [50], defined as

$$\|z\|_{\Omega} = \sum_{i=1}^I \|z_{\Omega_i}\|,$$

where $\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^I$ are (not necessarily disjoint) index sets of $\{1, \dots, d\}$. Although not studied here, we believe that the non-convex framework presented in this paper can serve to solve more complicated problems, such as the latent group lasso. We leave this research direction for future work.

6.4 Adversarial Denoising with GANs

Projection onto the range of a neural network $G : \mathbb{R}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ has been considered by [57, 33] as a defense mechanism against adversarial examples [61]. In their settings, samples are denoised by projecting on the range of a pre-trained *generator*, from either the GAN [31] or VAE framework [37], before being fed to a classifier. Even though the adversarial noise introduced is typically bounded in ℓ_{∞} norm [41], the projection is performed in the ℓ_2 metric. We instead propose to directly project using the ℓ_{∞} norm that limits the attacker, i.e. we solve the program

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x,z} \|x - x^{\sharp}\|_{\infty} \\ G(z) = x, \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

with our proposed algorithm (1) (AL). On the optimization side, projections are usually performed by solving, for a particular choice of norm $\|\cdot\|$, the non-convex program

$$\min_z \|G(z) - x^{\sharp}\| \quad (41)$$

using off-the-shelf optimizers like gradient descent (GD) or ADAM [36]. Indeed, we assign equal computational budget to ADAM and GD for solving (41) with the ℓ_{∞} norm, and to our algorithm (AL) for solving (40). We choose a test image in the range of the generator G by sampling z at random and setting $x^{\sharp} = G(z) + \eta$ for η a random noise bounded in ℓ_{∞} norm. For each algorithm we allow two random restarts.

Results and discussion. For a noise level $\|\eta\| \leq 0.1$ we plot the objective function value across iterations (for our algorithm we plot the value $\|G(z_t) - x^{\sharp}\|_{\infty}$). The MNIST images we use are normalized in the range $[0, 1]$. We plot the mean value across 6 different random images. We observe that our algorithm *AL* is the only one capable of consistently decreasing the value of the objective function, while ADAM only does so slightly. Even after extensive tuning of the GD step size, we could not observe any improvement in the objective value.




Figure 5: ℓ_{∞} measurement error vs iterations

Acknowledgements

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement n^o 725594 - time-data), and was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) under grant number 200021_178865 / 1.

References

- [1] Sanjeev Arora, Mikhail Khodak, Nikunj Saunshi, and Kiran Vodrahalli. A compressed sensing view of unsupervised text embeddings, bag-of-n-grams, and lstms. 2018.
- [2] Alexander I. Barvinok. Problems of distance geometry and convex properties of quadratic maps. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 13(2):189–202, 1995.
- [3] Heinz H Bauschke, Patrick L Combettes, et al. *Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces*, volume 408. Springer, 2011.
- [4] Amir Beck and Marc Teboulle. A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems. *SIAM journal on imaging sciences*, 2(1):183–202, 2009.
- [5] Dimitri P Bertsekas. On penalty and multiplier methods for constrained minimization. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 14(2):216–235, 1976.
- [6] Dimitri P Bertsekas. *Constrained optimization and Lagrange multiplier methods*. Academic press, 2014.
- [7] Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Nicolas Boumal, Prateek Jain, and Praneeth Netrapalli. Smoothed analysis for low-rank solutions to semidefinite programs in quadratic penalty form. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.00186*, 2018.
- [8] Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Anastasios Kyrillidis, and Sujay Sanghavi. Dropping convexity for faster semi-definite optimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 530–582, 2016.
- [9] Ernesto G Birgin, JL Gardenghi, José Mario Martinez, SA Santos, and Ph L Toint. Evaluation complexity for nonlinear constrained optimization using unscaled kkt conditions and high-order models. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 26(2):951–967, 2016.
- [10] Jérôme Bolte, Trong Phong Nguyen, Juan Peypouquet, and Bruce W Suter. From error bounds to the complexity of first-order descent methods for convex functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 165(2):471–507, 2017.
- [11] Jérôme Bolte, Shoham Sabach, and Marc Teboulle. Nonconvex lagrangian-based optimization: monitoring schemes and global convergence. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2018.
- [12] N. Boumal, B. Mishra, P.-A. Absil, and R. Sepulchre. Manopt, a Matlab toolbox for optimization on manifolds. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15:1455–1459, 2014.
- [13] Nicolas Boumal, P-A Absil, and Coralia Cartis. Global rates of convergence for nonconvex optimization on manifolds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.08101*, 2016.
- [14] Nicolas Boumal, Bamdev Mishra, P-A Absil, and Rodolphe Sepulchre. Manopt, a matlab toolbox for optimization on manifolds. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1455–1459, 2014.
- [15] Nicolas Boumal, Vlad Voroninski, and Afonso Bandeira. The non-convex burer-monteiro approach works on smooth semidefinite programs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2757–2765, 2016.
- [16] Samuel Burer and Renato DC Monteiro. A nonlinear programming algorithm for solving semidefinite programs via low-rank factorization. *Mathematical Programming*, 95(2):329–357, 2003.
- [17] Samuel Burer and Renato DC Monteiro. Local minima and convergence in low-rank semidefinite programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 103(3):427–444, 2005.
- [18] Emmanuel J Candès and Michael B Wakin. An introduction to compressive sampling. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 25(2):21–30, 2008.
- [19] Coralia Cartis, Nicholas IM Gould, and Ph L Toint. Complexity bounds for second-order optimality in unconstrained optimization. *Journal of Complexity*, 28(1):93–108, 2012.

- [20] Coralia Cartis, Nicholas IM Gould, and Ph L Toint. Optimality of orders one to three and beyond: characterization and evaluation complexity in constrained nonconvex optimization. *Journal of Complexity*, 2018.
- [21] Coralia Cartis, Nicholas IM Gould, and Philippe L Toint. On the evaluation complexity of composite function minimization with applications to nonconvex nonlinear programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21(4):1721–1739, 2011.
- [22] Antonin Chambolle and Thomas Pock. A first-order primal-dual algorithm for convex problems with applications to imaging. *Journal of mathematical imaging and vision*, 40(1):120–145, 2011.
- [23] Scott Shaobing Chen, David L Donoho, and Michael A Saunders. Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit. *SIAM review*, 43(1):129–159, 2001.
- [24] Christian Clason, Stanislav Mazurenko, and Tuomo Valkonen. Acceleration and global convergence of a first-order primal–dual method for nonconvex problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03347*, 2018.
- [25] Yu-Hong Dai. Convergence properties of the bfgs algorithm. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 13(3):693–701, 2002.
- [26] Damián Fernández and Mikhail V Solodov. Local convergence of exact and inexact augmented lagrangian methods under the second-order sufficient optimality condition. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(2):384–407, 2012.
- [27] Roger Fletcher. *Practical methods of optimization*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- [28] Fabián Flores-Bazán, Fernando Flores-Bazán, and Cristián Vera. A complete characterization of strong duality in nonconvex optimization with a single constraint. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 53(2):185–201, 2012.
- [29] Rong Ge, Chi Jin, Praneeth Netrapalli, Aaron Sidford, et al. Efficient algorithms for large-scale generalized eigenvector computation and canonical correlation analysis. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2741–2750, 2016.
- [30] Saeed Ghadimi and Guanghui Lan. Accelerated gradient methods for nonconvex nonlinear and stochastic programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 156(1-2):59–99, 2016.
- [31] I. J. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio. Generative Adversarial Networks. *ArXiv e-prints*, June 2014.
- [32] Magnus R Hestenes. Multiplier and gradient methods. *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, 4(5):303–320, 1969.
- [33] Andrew Ilyas, Ajil Jalal, Eirini Asteri, Constantinos Daskalakis, and Alexandros G. Dimakis. The Robust Manifold Defense: Adversarial Training using Generative Models. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1712.09196, December 2017.
- [34] Martin Jaggi. Revisiting frank-wolfe: Projection-free sparse convex optimization. In *ICML (1)*, pages 427–435, 2013.
- [35] Subhash Khot and Assaf Naor. Grothendieck-type inequalities in combinatorial optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1108.2464*, 2011.
- [36] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1412.6980, December 2014.
- [37] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1312.6114, December 2013.
- [38] Brian Kulis, Arun C Surendran, and John C Platt. Fast low-rank semidefinite programming for embedding and clustering. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 235–242, 2007.

- [39] Guanghui Lan and Renato DC Monteiro. Iteration-complexity of first-order augmented lagrangian methods for convex programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 155(1-2):511–547, 2016.
- [40] László Lovász. Semidefinite programs and combinatorial optimization. In *Recent advances in algorithms and combinatorics*, pages 137–194. Springer, 2003.
- [41] Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [42] Walter F Mascarenhas. The bfgs method with exact line searches fails for non-convex objective functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 99(1):49–61, 2004.
- [43] Dustin G Mixon, Soledad Villar, and Rachel Ward. Clustering subgaussian mixtures by semidefinite programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.06612*, 2016.
- [44] Elchanan Mossel, Joe Neeman, and Allan Sly. Consistency thresholds for the planted bisection model. In *Proceedings of the forty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 69–75. ACM, 2015.
- [45] Valentin Nedelcu, Ion Necoara, and Quoc Tran-Dinh. Computational complexity of inexact gradient augmented lagrangian methods: application to constrained mpc. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 52(5):3109–3134, 2014.
- [46] Yurii Nesterov. Primal-dual subgradient methods for convex problems. *Mathematical programming*, 120(1):221–259, 2009.
- [47] Yurii E Nesterov. A method for solving the convex programming problem with convergence rate $o(1/k^2)$. In *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, volume 269, pages 543–547, 1983.
- [48] J. Nocedal and S. Wright. *Numerical Optimization*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer New York, 2006.
- [49] Maher Nouiehed, Jason D Lee, and Meisam Razaviyayn. Convergence to second-order stationarity for constrained non-convex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.02024*, 2018.
- [50] Guillaume Obozinski, Laurent Jacob, and Jean-Philippe Vert. Group lasso with overlaps: the latent group lasso approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1110.0413*, 2011.
- [51] Neal Parikh, Stephen Boyd, et al. Proximal algorithms. *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, 1(3):127–239, 2014.
- [52] Dohyung Park, Anastasios Kyrillidis, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Constantine Caramanis, and Sujay Sanghavi. Provable burer-monteiro factorization for a class of norm-constrained matrix problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01316*, 2016.
- [53] Gábor Pataki. On the rank of extreme matrices in semidefinite programs and the multiplicity of optimal eigenvalues. *Mathematics of operations research*, 23(2):339–358, 1998.
- [54] J. Peng and Y. Wei. Approximating K-means-type clustering via semidefinite programming. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 18(1):186–205, 2007.
- [55] Michael JD Powell. A method for nonlinear constraints in minimization problems. *Optimization*, pages 283–298, 1969.
- [56] Prasad Raghavendra. Optimal algorithms and inapproximability results for every csp? In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 245–254. ACM, 2008.
- [57] Pouya Samangouei, Maya Kabkab, and Rama Chellappa. Defense-GAN: Protecting classifiers against adversarial attacks using generative models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.

- [58] Amit Singer. Angular synchronization by eigenvectors and semidefinite programming. *Applied and computational harmonic analysis*, 30(1):20, 2011.
- [59] Amit Singer and Yoel Shkolnisky. Three-dimensional structure determination from common lines in cryo-em by eigenvectors and semidefinite programming. *SIAM journal on imaging sciences*, 4(2):543–572, 2011.
- [60] Le Song, Alex Smola, Arthur Gretton, and Karsten M Borgwardt. A dependence maximization view of clustering. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 815–822. ACM, 2007.
- [61] Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1312.6199, December 2013.
- [62] Mariano Tepper, Anirvan M Sengupta, and Dmitri Chklovskii. Clustering is semidefinitely not that hard: Nonnegative sdp for manifold disentangling. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(82), 2018.
- [63] Quoc Tran-Dinh, Ahmet Alacaoglu, Olivier Fercoq, and Volkan Cevher. An adaptive primal-dual framework for nonsmooth convex minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.04648*, 2018.
- [64] Irène Waldspurger and Alden Waters. Rank optimality for the burer-monteiro factorization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.03046*, 2018.
- [65] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms, 2017.
- [66] Yangyang Xu. Iteration complexity of inexact augmented lagrangian methods for constrained convex programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05812v2*, 2017.
- [67] Liuqin Yang, Defeng Sun, and Kim-Chuan Toh. Sdpnal+: a majorized semismooth newton-cg augmented lagrangian method for semidefinite programming with nonnegative constraints. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 7(3):331–366, 2015.
- [68] Alp Yurtsever, Quoc Tran Dinh, and Volkan Cevher. A universal primal-dual convex optimization framework. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3150–3158, 2015.
- [69] Alp Yurtsever, Olivier Fercoq, Francesco Locatello, and Volkan Cevher. A conditional gradient framework for composite convex minimization with applications to semidefinite programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.08544*, 2018.

A Proof of Theorem 4.1

For every $k \geq 2$, recall from (7) and Step 2 of Algorithm 1 that x_k satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(-\nabla f(x_k) - DA(x_k)^\top y_{k-1} \\ & \quad - \beta_{k-1} DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k), \partial g(x_k)) \\ & = \text{dist}(-\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_{k-1}), \partial g(x_k)) \leq \epsilon_k. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

With an application of the triangle inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(-\beta_{k-1} DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k), \partial g(x_k)) \\ & \leq \|\nabla f(x_k)\| + \|DA(x_k)^\top y_{k-1}\| + \epsilon_k, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

which in turn implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(-DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k), \partial g(x_k)/\beta_{k-1}) \\ & \leq \frac{\|\nabla f(x_k)\|}{\beta_{k-1}} + \frac{\|DA(x_k)^\top y_{k-1}\|}{\beta_{k-1}} + \frac{\epsilon_k}{\beta_{k-1}} \\ & \leq \frac{\lambda'_f + \lambda'_A \|y_{k-1}\| + \epsilon_k}{\beta_{k-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where λ'_f, λ'_A were defined in (19). We next translate (44) into a bound on the feasibility gap $\|A(x_k)\|$. Using the regularity condition (20), the left-hand side of (44) can be bounded below as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(-DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k), \partial g(x_k)/\beta_{k-1}) \\ & \geq \nu \|A(x_k)\|, \quad (\text{see (20)}) \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

provided that ρ, ρ' satisfy

$$\max_{k \in K} \|A(x_k)\| \leq \rho, \quad \max_{k \in K} \|x_k\| \leq \rho'. \quad (46)$$

By substituting (45) back into (44), we find that

$$\|A(x_k)\| \leq \frac{\lambda'_f + \lambda'_A \|y_{k-1}\| + \epsilon_k}{\nu \beta_{k-1}}. \quad (47)$$

In words, the feasibility gap is directly controlled by the dual sequence $\{y_k\}_k$. We next establish that the dual sequence is bounded. Indeed, for every $k \in K$, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_k\| & = \|y_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i A(x_i)\| \quad (\text{Step 5 of Algorithm 1}) \\ & \leq \|y_0\| + \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i \|A(x_i)\| \quad (\text{triangle inequality}) \\ & \leq \|y_0\| + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\|A(x_1)\| \log^2 2}{k \log^2(k+1)} \quad (\text{Step 4}) \\ & \leq \|y_0\| + c \|A(x_1)\| \log^2 2 =: y_{\max}, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where

$$c \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k \log^2(k+1)}. \quad (49)$$

Substituting (48) back into (47), we reach

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(x_k)\| & \leq \frac{\lambda'_f + \lambda'_A y_{\max} + \epsilon_k}{\nu \beta_{k-1}} \\ & \leq \frac{2\lambda'_f + 2\lambda'_A y_{\max}}{\nu \beta_{k-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where the second line above holds if k_0 is large enough, which would in turn guarantees that $\epsilon_k = 1/\beta_{k-1}$ is sufficiently small since $\{\beta_k\}_k$ is increasing and unbounded. Let us now revisit and simplify (46). Note that ρ' automatically satisfies the second inequality there, owing to Step 3 of Algorithm 1. Also, ρ satisfies the first inequality in (46) if

$$\frac{\lambda'_f + \lambda'_A y_{\max}}{\nu_A \beta_1} \leq \rho/2, \quad (51)$$

and k_0 is large enough. Indeed, this claim follows directly from (50).

It remains to control the first term in (12). To that end, after recalling Step 2 of Algorithm 1 and applying the triangle inequality, we can write that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(-\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_k), \partial g(x_k)) \\ & \leq \text{dist}(-\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_{k-1}), \partial g(x_{k-1})) \\ & \quad + \|\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_k) - \nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_{k-1})\|. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

The first term on the right-hand side above is bounded by ϵ_k , by Step 5 of Algorithm 1. For the second term on the right-hand side of (52), we write that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_k) - \nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_{k-1})\| \\ & = \|DA(x_k)^\top (y_k - y_{k-1})\| \quad (\text{see (7)}) \\ & \leq \lambda'_A \|y_k - y_{k-1}\| \quad (\text{see (19)}) \\ & = \lambda'_A \sigma_k \|A(x_k)\| \quad (\text{see Step 5 of Algorithm 1}) \\ & \leq \frac{2\lambda'_A \sigma_k}{\nu \beta_{k-1}} (\lambda'_f + \lambda'_A y_{\max}). \quad (\text{see (50)}) \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

By combining (52,53), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_k), \partial g(x_k)) \\ & \leq \frac{2\lambda'_A \sigma_k}{\nu \beta_{k-1}} (\lambda'_f + \lambda'_A y_{\max}) + \epsilon_k. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

By combining (50,54), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(-\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_k), \partial g(x_k)) + \|A(x_k)\| \\ & \leq \left(\frac{2\lambda'_A \sigma_k}{\nu \beta_{k-1}} (\lambda'_f + \lambda'_A y_{\max}) + \epsilon_k \right) \\ & \quad + 2 \left(\frac{\lambda'_f + \lambda'_A y_{\max}}{\nu \beta_{k-1}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Applying $\sigma_k \leq \sigma_1$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(-\nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_k), \partial g(x_k)) + \|A(x_k)\| \\ & \leq \frac{2\lambda'_A \sigma_1 + 2}{\nu \beta_{k-1}} (\lambda'_f + \lambda'_A y_{\max}) + \epsilon_k. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

For the second part of the theorem, we use the Weyl's inequality and Step 5 of Algorithm 1 to write

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_{\min}(\nabla_{xx} \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_{k-1})) \geq \lambda_{\min}(\nabla_{xx} \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_k)) \\ & \quad - \sigma_k \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m A_i(x_k) \nabla^2 A_i(x_k) \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

The first term on the right-hand side is lower bounded by $-\epsilon_{k-1}$ by Step 2 of Algorithm 1. We next bound the second term on the right-hand side above as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_k \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m A_i(x_k) \nabla^2 A_i(x_k) \right\| \\ & \leq \sigma_k \sqrt{m} \max_i \|A_i(x_k)\| \|\nabla^2 A_i(x_k)\| \\ & \leq \sigma_k \sqrt{m} \lambda_A \frac{2\lambda'_f + 2\lambda'_A y_{\max}}{\nu \beta_{k-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (5,50). Plugging into (57) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_{\min}(\nabla_{xx}\mathcal{L}_{\beta_{k-1}}(x_k, y_{k-1})) \\ & \geq -\epsilon_{k-1} - \sigma_k \sqrt{m} \lambda_A \frac{2\lambda'_f + 2\lambda'_A y_{\max}}{\nu \beta_{k-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 4.1.

B Proof of Corollary 4.2

Let K denote the number of (outer) iterations of Algorithm 1 and let ϵ_f denote the desired accuracy of Algorithm 1, see (11). Recalling Theorem 4.1, we can then write that

$$\epsilon_f = \frac{Q}{\beta_K}, \quad (58)$$

or, equivalently, $\beta_K = Q/\epsilon_f$. We now count the number of total (inner) iterations T of Algorithm 1 to reach the accuracy ϵ_f . From (17) and for sufficiently large k , recall that $\lambda_{\beta_k} \leq \lambda''\beta_k$ is the smoothness parameter of the augmented Lagrangian. Then, from (25) and by summing over the outer iterations, we bound the total number of (inner) iterations of Algorithm 1 as

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\lambda_{\beta_{k-1}}^2 x_{\max}^2}{\epsilon_k}\right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathcal{O}(\beta_{k-1}^3 x_{\max}^2) \quad (\text{Step 1 of Algorithm 1}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(K \beta_{K-1}^3 x_{\max}^2) \quad (\{\beta_k\}_k \text{ is increasing}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{K Q^3 x_{\max}^2}{\epsilon_f^3}\right). \quad (\text{see (58)}) \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

In addition, if we specify $\beta_k = b^k$ for all k , we can further refine T . Indeed,

$$\beta_K = b^K \implies K = \log_b\left(\frac{Q}{\epsilon_f}\right), \quad (60)$$

which, after substituting into (59) gives the final bound in Corollary 4.2.

C Proof of Lemma 2.1

Note that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta}(x, y) = f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i(x) + \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i(x))^2, \quad (61)$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_x \mathcal{L}_{\beta}(x, y) \\ &= \nabla f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \nabla A_i(x) + \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m A_i(x) \nabla A_i(x) \\ &= \nabla f(x) + DA(x)^{\top} y + \beta DA(x)^{\top} A(x), \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

where $DA(x)$ is the Jacobian of A at x . By taking another derivative with respect to x , we reach

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x^2 \mathcal{L}_{\beta}(x, y) &= \nabla^2 f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m (y_i + \beta A_i(x)) \nabla^2 A_i(x) \\ &\quad + \beta \sum_{i=1}^m \nabla A_i(x) \nabla A_i(x)^{\top}. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla_x^2 \mathcal{L}_\beta(x, y)\| \\
& \leq \|\nabla^2 f(x)\| + \max_i \|\nabla^2 A_i(x)\| (\|y\|_1 + \beta \|A(x)\|_1) \\
& \quad + \beta \sum_{i=1}^m \|\nabla A_i(x)\|^2 \\
& \leq \lambda_h + \sqrt{m} \lambda_A (\|y\| + \beta \|A(x)\|) + \beta \|DA(x)\|_F^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

For every x such that $\|A(x)\| \leq \rho$ and $\|x\| \leq \rho'$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_x^2 \mathcal{L}_\beta(x, y)\| & \leq \lambda_f + \sqrt{m} \lambda_A (\|y\| + \beta \rho) \\
& \quad + \beta \max_{\|x\| \leq \rho'} \|DA(x)\|_F^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 2.1.

D Clustering

We only verify the condition in (20). Note that

$$A(x) = VV^\top \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1}, \tag{66}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
DA(x) & = \begin{bmatrix} w_{1,1}x_1^\top & \cdots & w_{1,n}x_1^\top \\ \vdots & & \\ w_{n,1}x_n^\top & \cdots & w_{n,n}x_n^\top \end{bmatrix} \\
& = [V \quad \cdots \quad V] + \begin{bmatrix} x_1^\top & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & x_n^\top \end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

where $w_{i,i} = 2$ and $w_{i,j} = 1$ for $i \neq j$. In the last line above, n copies of V appear and the last matrix above is block-diagonal. For x_k , define V_k as in the example and let $x_{k,i}$ be the i th row of V_k . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k) & = \begin{bmatrix} V_k^\top (V_k V_k^\top - I_n) \mathbf{1} \\ \vdots \\ V_k^\top (V_k V_k^\top - I_n) \mathbf{1} \end{bmatrix} \\
& \quad + \begin{bmatrix} x_{k,1} (V_k V_k^\top \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1})_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_{k,n} (V_k V_k^\top \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1})_n \end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

where $I_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the identity matrix. Let us make a number of simplifying assumptions. First, we assume that $x_k \in \text{relint}(C)$ so that $\partial g(x_k) = \{0\}$, which can be easily enforced in the iterates. Second, we assume that V_k has nearly orthonormal columns, namely, $V_k V_k^\top \approx I_n$. This can also be easily enforced in each iterate of Algorithm 1 and naturally corresponds to well-separated clusters. While a more fine-tuned argument can remove these assumptions, they will help us simplify the

derivations. Under these assumptions, the squared right-hand side of (20) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{dist} \left(-DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k), \frac{\partial g(x_k)}{\beta_{k-1}} \right)^2 \\
&= \text{dist} \left(-DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k), \{0\} \right)^2 \\
&= \|DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k)\|^2 \\
&= \left\| \begin{array}{c} x_{k,1}(V_k V_k^\top \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1})_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_{k,n}(V_k V_k^\top \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1})_n \end{array} \right\|^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_{k,i}\|^2 (V_k V_k^\top \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1})_i^2 \\
&\geq \min_i \|x_{k,i}\|^2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (V_k V_k^\top \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1})_i^2 \\
&= \min_i \|x_{k,i}\|^2 \cdot \|V_k V_k^\top \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1}\|^2. \tag{69}
\end{aligned}$$

We can enforce the iterates to satisfy $\|x_{k,i}\| \geq \nu$, which corresponds again to well-separated clusters, and guarantee (20). In practice, often n exceeds the number of true clusters and a more fine-tuned analysis is required to establish (20) by restricting the argument to a particular subspace of \mathbb{R}^n .

E Generalized eigenvalue problem

Here, we verify the regularity condition in (20) for problem (35). Note that

$$DA(x) = (2Bx)^\top$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dist} \left(-DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k), \frac{\partial g(x_k)}{\beta_{k-1}} \right)^2 &= \text{dist} \left(-DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k), \{0\} \right)^2 \\
&= \|DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k)\|^2 \\
&= \|2Bx(x^\top Bx - 1)\|^2 \\
&= 4(x^\top Bx - 1)^2 \|Bx\|^2 \\
&= 4\|Bx\|^2 \|A(x)\|^2 \\
&\geq \eta_{min}^2 \|x\|^2 \|A(x)\|^2 \\
&\geq \nu^2 \|A(x)\|^2. \tag{70}
\end{aligned}$$

where η_{min} is the smallest eigenvalue of the positive definite matrix B . Therefore, regularity condition holds with $\|x\| \geq \nu/\eta_{min}$.

F Basis Pursuit

We only verify the regularity condition in (20) for (1) with f, A specified in (39). Note that

$$DA(x) = 2\bar{B}\text{diag}(x),$$

where $\text{diag}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$ is the diagonal matrix formed by x . The left-hand side of (20) then reads as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{dist} \left(-DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k), \frac{\partial g(x_k)}{\beta_{k-1}} \right) \\
&= \text{dist} \left(-DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k), \{0\} \right) \\
&= \|DA(x_k)^\top A(x_k)\| \\
&= 2\|\text{diag}(x_k)\bar{B}^\top (\bar{B}x_k^{\circ 2} - b)\|. \tag{71}
\end{aligned}$$

To bound the last line above, let x_* be a solution of Program (1) and note that $\overline{B}x_*^{\circ 2} = b$ by definition. Let also $z_k, z_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the vectors corresponding to x_k, x_* . Corresponding to x_k , also define $u_{k,1}, u_{k,2}$ naturally and let $|z_k| = u_{k,1}^{\circ 2} + u_{k,2}^{\circ 2} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the amplitudes of z_k . To simplify matters, let us assume also that B is full-rank. We then rewrite the last line of (71) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\text{diag}(x_k)\overline{B}^\top(\overline{B}x_k^{\circ 2} - b)\|^2 \\
&= \|\text{diag}(x_k)\overline{B}^\top\overline{B}(x_k^{\circ 2} - x_*^{\circ 2})\|^2 \\
&= \|\text{diag}(x_k)\overline{B}^\top B(x_k - x_*)\|^2 \\
&= \|\text{diag}(u_{k,1})B^\top B(x_k - x_*)\|^2 \\
&\quad + \|\text{diag}(u_{k,2})B^\top B(x_k - x_*)\|^2 \\
&= \|\text{diag}(u_{k,1}^{\circ 2} + u_{k,2}^{\circ 2})B^\top B(x_k - x_*)\|^2 \\
&= \|\text{diag}(|z_k|)B^\top B(x_k - x_*)\|^2 \\
&\geq \eta_n(B\text{diag}(|z_k|))^2 \|B(x_k - x_*)\|^2 \\
&= \eta_n(B\text{diag}(|z_k|))^2 \|Bx_k - b\|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

where $\eta_n(\cdot)$ returns the n th largest singular value of its argument. We can therefore ensure that (20) holds by enforcing that

$$z_k \in \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \eta_n(B\text{diag}(|z|)) > \nu\}, \tag{73}$$

for every iteration k .