

A New Full-Newton step $O(n)$ Infeasible Interior-Point Algorithm for Semidefinite Optimization*

H. Mansouri^{†‡} C. Roos[‡]

[†] *Department of Mathematical Science,
Shahrekord University, P.O. Box 115, Shahrekord, Iran*

[‡] *Department of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science,
Delft University of Technology,
P.O. Box 5031, 2600 GA Delft, The Netherlands
e-mail: [H.Mansouri, C.Roos]@tudelft.nl*

Abstract

Interior-point methods for semidefinite optimization have been studied intensively, due to their polynomial complexity and practical efficiency. Recently, the second author designed an efficient primal-dual infeasible interior-point algorithm with full Newton steps for linear optimization problems. In this paper we extend the algorithm to semidefinite optimization. The algorithm constructs strictly feasible iterates for a sequence of perturbations of the given problem and its dual problem, close to their central paths. Two types of full-Newton steps are used, feasibility steps and (ordinary) centering steps, respectively. The algorithm starts from strictly feasible iterates of a perturbed pair, on its central path, and feasibility steps find strictly feasible iterates for the next perturbed pair. By using centering steps for the new perturbed pair, we obtain strictly feasible iterates close enough to the central path of the new perturbed pair. The starting point depends on a positive number ζ . The algorithm terminates in at most $O(n \log \frac{n}{\varepsilon})$ steps either by finding an ε -solution or by determining that the primal-dual problem pair has no optimal solution with vanishing duality gap satisfying a condition in terms of ζ .

Keywords: Semidefinite optimization, infeasible interior-point method, primal-dual method, polynomial complexity.

1 Introduction

Semidefinite optimization problems (SDO) are convex optimization problems over the intersection of an affine set and the cone of positive semidefinite matrices. SDO arises in many scientific and engineering fields. For applications in system and control theory we refer to [6, 7] and for

*This paper is part of the PhD thesis of the first author, defended in June 2008 [31]. The results were presented during the Joint EUROPT-OMS Meeting, July 4-7, 2007, in Prague, Czech Republic.

applications in combinatorial optimization to [2, 13, 19, 26, 39, 48]. SDO also has been utilized in solving polynomial optimization problems [11, 25, 38]. For recent applications in engineering problems see, e.g., [5, 24, 59].

Semidefinite optimization has recently attracted active research from the interior-point methods (IPMs) community. A rather comprehensive list of references for theory and applications in this field can be found in [1, 2, 8, 12, 15, 18, 37, 51].

Primal-dual IPMs have proven to belong to the most efficient methods in linear optimization, and many polynomiality results exist for these methods. The first primal-dual interior-point method for LO were constructed by Megiddo [32], Monteiro and Adler [35], Tanabe [49] and Kojima et al. [21].

Extending methods for LO to SDO has been successful in many cases. See, e.g., [23, 36, 53, 55]. For example Nesterov and Todd [36] showed that the primal-dual algorithm for LO maintains its theoretical efficiency when the nonnegativity constraints in LO are replaced by a convex cone, as long as the cone is homogeneous and self-dual, or in the terminology of Nesterov and Todd, as long as the cone is self-scaled. Self-scaled cones are the class of cones that have an associated self-scaled barrier, and they include the non-negative orthant and the cone of positive semidefinite matrices as special cases.

Recently, J.Peng et al. [40, 41] designed primal-dual feasible IPMs by using self-regular functions for LO and also extended the approach to SDO. The complexity bounds obtained by these authors are $O(\sqrt{n}) \log \frac{n}{\epsilon}$ and $O(\sqrt{n} \log n) \log \frac{n}{\epsilon}$, for small-update methods and large update methods, respectively, which are currently the best known bounds. Bai et al. [3, 4] introduced some kernel functions and designed primal-dual feasible IPMs for LO and they extended their algorithms to SDO successfully [54].

The methods mentioned in the preceding two paragraphs are so-called feasible IPMs. Feasible IPMs start with a strictly feasible interior point and keep feasibility during the solution process. It is not at all trivial how to find an initial feasible interior point, however. One method to overcome this problem is to use the homogeneous embedding model as presented first by Ye et al. [56] for LO and extended to SDO by De Klerk et al. [10] and independently by Luo et al. [27].

Infeasible IPMs (IIPMs) start with an arbitrary positive point and feasibility is reached as optimality is approached. The choice of the starting point in IIPMs is crucial for the performance. Lustig [28] and Tanabe [50] were the first to present IIPMs for LO. Kojima et al. [20] were the first that proved the global convergence of a primal-dual IIPM for LO. Zhang [57] was the first who Presented a primal-dual IIPM with polynomial iteration complexity $O(n^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ for LO and he also extended it to SDO [58]. Mizuno [33] and Potra [42, 43] also introduced a primal-dual IIPM for LO with polynomial iteration complexity $O(n \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$.

Kojima et al. [22] and Potra and Sheng [44] independently analyzed a generalization to SDO of the Mizuno-Todd-Ye predictor corrector method [34] for infeasible starting points and they proved that the complexity of this algorithm is

$$O\left(n \log \frac{\max\{\text{Tr}(X^0 S^0), \|R_c^0\|, \|r_b^0\|\}}{\epsilon}\right). \quad (1)$$

Here R_c^0 and r_b^0 denote the initial values of the primal and dual residuals as defined in Section 3.3. It is assumed in this result that there exist optimal solutions X^* and (y^*, S^*) for primal

and dual problems (P) and (D) as defined in Section 2.1 such that $\|X^*\| \leq \zeta$ and $\|S^*\| \leq \zeta$ and the starting point is $(X^0, y^0, S^0) = \zeta(I, 0, I)$.

The second author in [45] designed a new IIPM algorithm. This algorithm uses intermediate problems. These problems are suitable perturbations of the given problems (P) and (D) so that at any stage the iterates are strictly feasible for the current perturbed problem pair. In each iteration the size of the perturbation decreases at the same speed as the barrier parameter μ . When μ changes to a smaller value, the perturbed problem pair corresponding to μ changes, and hence also the current central path. The iterates are kept feasible for the new perturbed problem pair and close to its central path. To achieve this the algorithm uses a so-called ‘feasibility step’. This step serves to get iterates that are strictly feasible for the new perturbed problem pair and belong to the region of quadratic convergence of its μ^+ -centers, where μ^+ is the barrier parameter after updating. Now the algorithm can start from the point obtained in the feasibility step and perform few centering steps to obtain iterates that are close enough to the μ^+ -center of the new perturbed problem pair. This process continues until the algorithm finds an ε -solution or detects that the primal-dual problem pair has no optimal solutions with zero duality gap.

In this paper, we discuss an extension to SDO of the just described algorithm. We show that the techniques that have been developed in the field of feasible full-Newton step IPMs for SDO are sufficient to get a full-Newton step IIPM whose complexity is given by (1) and hence it is at least as good as the best known complexity of IIPMs.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we first recall some tools in the analysis of a feasible IPM that we use also in the analysis of IIPMs proposed in this paper. In Section 3 we describe a primal-dual IIPM method for SDO. The analysis of the feasibility step of our method, the most tedious part of the analysis, is carried out in Section 4. In Section 5 we will derive a complexity bound for our algorithm. Finally, some concluding remarks follow in Section 6.

Notations

Some notations used throughout the paper are as follows. The superscript T denotes transpose. \mathbf{R}^n , \mathbf{R}_+^n and \mathbf{R}_{++}^n denote the set of vectors with n components, the set of nonnegative vector and the set of positive vectors, respectively. $\mathbf{R}^{m \times n}$ is the space of all $m \times n$ matrices. \mathbf{S}^n , \mathbf{S}_+^n and \mathbf{S}_{++}^n denote the cone of symmetric, symmetric positive semidefinite and symmetric positive definite $n \times n$ matrices, respectively. \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{D} denote the feasible sets of primal and dual problems respectively. $\text{ri}(\mathcal{C})$ denotes the relative interior of a convex set \mathcal{C} . I denotes $n \times n$ identity matrix. We use the classical Löwner partial order \succeq for symmetric matrices. So $A \succeq B$ ($A \succ B$) means that $A - B$ is positive semidefinite (positive definite). The sign \sim denotes similarity of two matrices. The matrix inner product is defined by $A \bullet B = \text{Tr}(A^T B)$. For any symmetric positive definite matrix $Q \in \mathbf{S}_{++}^n$, the expression $Q^{\frac{1}{2}}$ denotes the symmetric square root of Q . For any $x = (x_1; x_2; \dots; x_n) \in \mathbf{R}^n$, $x_{\min} = \min(x_1; x_2; \dots; x_n)$ and $x_{\max} = \max(x_1; x_2; \dots; x_n)$. For any symmetric matrix G , $\lambda_{\min}(G)$ ($\lambda_{\max}(G)$) denotes the minimal (maximal) eigenvalue of G . When λ is vector we denote the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(\lambda)$ with entries λ_i by Λ . For any $V \in \mathbf{S}_{++}^n$, we denote by $\lambda(V)$ the vector of eigenvalues of V arranged in non-increasing order, that is, $\lambda_{\max}(V) = \lambda_1(V) \geq \lambda_2(V) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(V) = \lambda_{\min}(V)$. The Frobenius matrix norm is given by $\|U\|^2 := \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n U_{ij}^2 = \text{Tr}(U^T U)$. For any $p \times q$ matrix A , $\text{vec}(A)$ denotes the

pq -vector obtained by stacking the columns of A . The Kronecker product of two matrices A and B is denoted by $A \otimes B$ (we refer to [16] for a comprehensive treatment on Kronecker products and related topics).

2 Preliminaries

2.1 The SDO problem

In this section we first introduce the SDO problem and the assumptions that will be used in the paper. We consider the standard form of the SDO problem:

$$(P) \quad \begin{aligned} \min \quad & C \bullet X \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & A_i \bullet X = b_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \quad X \succeq 0, \end{aligned}$$

and its dual:

$$(D) \quad \begin{aligned} \max \quad & b^T y \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i + S = C, \quad S \succeq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where each $A_i \in \mathbf{S}^n$, $b \in \mathbf{R}^m$, and $C \in \mathbf{S}^n$. Without loss of generality we assume that the matrices A_i are linearly independent.

It is worth noting that the duality theory of SDO is weaker than that of LO. Like in LO we have the weak duality property: for any $(X, y, S) \in \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{D}$ we have

$$C \bullet X - b^T y = \mathbf{Tr} \left(\left(S + \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i \right) X \right) - \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \mathbf{Tr} (A_i X) = \mathbf{Tr} (SX) \geq 0,$$

where the inequality follows from $X \succeq 0$ and $S \succeq 0$ (see Lemma 4.3). In other words, the duality gap is nonnegative for any feasible primal-dual pair. As a consequence, feasible solutions (X, y, S) with zero duality gap are optimal. Let p^* and d^* denote the optimal value of the primal and the dual problem respectively. The optimal sets for (P) and (D) are denoted as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}^* := \{X \in \mathcal{P} | C \bullet X = p^*\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}^* := \{(y, S) \in \mathcal{D} | b^T y = d^*\}.$$

A problem (P) (resp. (D)) is called solvable if \mathcal{P}^* (resp. \mathcal{D}^*) is nonempty.

The duality properties in SDO are less simple than LO. Recall that an LO problem may be feasible or infeasible. If it is feasible then it is either unbounded or bounded. In case it is bounded it is solvable and the dual problem is solvable as well, with zero duality gap. If it is infeasible then its dual is either unbounded or infeasible. So, for a single problem there are 3 possibilities: a problem is either solvable, unbounded or infeasible.

For an SDO problem, however, the situation is less simple, since a problem that is feasible and bounded is not necessarily solvable. So for a single problem there are now four cases: a problem is solvable, feasible and not solvable, unbounded or infeasible. As a consequence, for a primal-dual pair of SDO problems there are much more possible situations than in the LO case. For example, a problem may be solvable, whereas its dual is unsolvable. Also both problems can be

solvable but with positive duality gap. We assume that there exists optimal solutions with zero duality gap, i.e., we assume that the set

$$\mathcal{F}^* := \{(X, y, S) \in \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{D} : X \bullet S = 0\}$$

is nonempty.

2.2 The central path for SDO

We assume that (P) and (D) satisfy the interior-point condition (IPC), i.e., there exist $X \in \mathcal{P}$, $S \in \mathcal{D}$ with $X \succ 0$, $S \succ 0$. Under this assumption both problems are solvable and the optimality conditions for (P) and (D) can be written as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} A_i \bullet X &= b_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m, X \succeq 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i + S &= C, \quad S \succeq 0, \\ XS &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The basic idea of primal-dual IPMs is to replace the above complementarity condition $XS = 0$ by the parameterized equation $XS = \mu I$. Then we get the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} A_i \bullet X &= b_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m, X \succeq 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i + S &= C, \quad S \succeq 0, \\ XS &= \mu I, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where I denotes the $n \times n$ identity matrix and $\mu > 0$. It is well known that the system (3) has a unique solution, denoted $(X(\mu), y(\mu), S(\mu))$, and that the limit $\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} (X(\mu), y(\mu), S(\mu))$ exists and is a solution of system (2) (e.g., see [23]). The set of all solutions $(X(\mu), y(\mu), S(\mu))$ with $\mu > 0$ is known as the central path.

To obtain a search direction for IPMs an ordinary method is to follow an idea of Newton method and to linearize (3). However, the resulting system may yield as a solution a search direction ΔX which is not symmetric (ΔS is automatically symmetric). Since we want ΔX to be a symmetric matrix, one must "symmetrize" the linearization of the complementary equation. Based on different symmetrization schemes, several search directions have been proposed, as presented in [15, 23, 36, 47, 52, 58]. In this paper, we use the direction determined by the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} A_i \bullet \Delta X &= 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta y_i A_i + \Delta S &= 0, \\ \Delta X + P \Delta S P^T &= \mu S^{-1} - X, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where

$$P := X^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(X^{\frac{1}{2}} S X^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} X^{\frac{1}{2}} = S^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(S^{\frac{1}{2}} X S^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} S^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{5}$$

This direction was introduced by Nesterov and Todd [36]. The direction is called NT-direction, or simply Newton-direction, see [52]. The system (4) has a unique solution [55] and, obviously, ΔX and ΔS are symmetric. We will refer to the assignment

$$(X^+, S^+) := (X + \Delta X, S + \Delta S)$$

as a full NT step.

Let $D = P^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where $P^{\frac{1}{2}}$ denotes the symmetric square root of P . Then D can be used to scale X and S to the same matrix V , namely [9, 47, 54]:

$$V := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} D^{-1} X D^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} D S D. \quad (6)$$

It follows that

$$V^2 = \frac{1}{\mu} D^{-1} X S D. \quad (7)$$

Note that the matrices D and V are symmetric and positive definite. let us further define

$$\bar{A}_i := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} D A_i D, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

and

$$D_X := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} D^{-1} \Delta X D^{-1}; \quad D_S := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} D \Delta S D.$$

Then (4) can be written as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A}_i \bullet D_X &= 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta y_i \bar{A}_i + D_S &= 0, \\ D_X + D_S &= V^{-1} - V. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The first two equations in this system imply that ΔX and ΔS are orthogonal, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{Tr}(\Delta X \Delta S) = 0.$$

This implies that the directions D_X and D_S are also orthogonal:

$$\mathbf{Tr}(D_X D_S) = 0.$$

Hence, using the third equation in (8) and the Frobenius matrix norm we obtain

$$\|D_X\|^2 + \|D_S\|^2 = \|V^{-1} - V\|^2. \quad (9)$$

This implies that D_X, D_S are both zero if and only if $V^{-1} - V = 0$. In this case, X and S satisfy $X S = \mu I$, which indicates that X and S are the μ -centers. Thus, we can use $\|V^{-1} - V\|$ as the quantity to measure closeness to μ -centers. We define

$$\delta(X, S, \mu) := \delta(V) := \frac{1}{2} \|V^{-1} - V\|. \quad (10)$$

Primal-Dual Feasible IPM

Input:

Accuracy parameter $\varepsilon > 0$;
 threshold parameter $\tau < 1$;
 barrier update parameter $\theta, 0 < \theta < 1$;
 feasible pair (X^0, S^0) and $\mu^0 > 0$ such that
 $\delta(X^0, S^0, \mu^0) \leq \tau$.

begin

$X := X^0; S := S^0; \mu := \mu^0$;

while $\text{Tr}(XS) \geq \varepsilon$ **do**

begin

update of μ :

$$\mu := (1 - \theta)\mu;$$

centering step:

$$(X, S) := (X, S) + (\Delta X, \Delta S);$$

end

end

Figure 1: Feasible full-Newton-step algorithm

Note that for the special case of LO, V is a diagonal matrix and this proximity measure becomes the same as used in [17].

A pair $(X, S) \in \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{D}$, is called an ε -solution of (P) and (D) if $\text{Tr}(XS) \leq \varepsilon$. Assume that a pair $(X, S) \in \text{ri}(\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{D})$ is given that is ‘close to’ $(X(\mu), S(\mu))$, for some $\mu = \mu^0$. Then one finds an ε -solution after $O\left(\sqrt{n} \log \frac{n\mu^0}{\varepsilon}\right)$ iterations of the algorithm in Figure 1.

The following lemmas are crucial in the analysis of the algorithm. We recall them without proof. They describe the effect of a μ -update and of a full NT step on $\delta(X, S, \mu)$.

Lemma 2.1 (Lemma 7.5 in [9]) *Let $(X, S) \in \text{ri}(\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{D})$, $\mu = \text{Tr}(XS)/n$ and $\delta := \delta(X, S, \mu)$. If $\mu^+ = (1 - \theta)\mu$ for $0 < \theta < 1$, then one has*

$$\delta(X, S, \mu)^2 = \frac{n\theta^2}{4(1 - \theta)} + (1 - \theta)\delta^2.$$

Lemma 2.2 (Cf. Corollary 7.1 in [9]) *Let $(X, S) \in \text{ri}(\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{D})$ and $\mu > 0$. Then*

$$\text{Tr}(X^+S^+) = n\mu.$$

Lemma 2.3 (Quadratic convergence, Lemma 7.4 in [9]) *If $\delta := \delta(X, S, \mu) \leq 1$, then the full NT step is feasible, i.e., X^+ and S^+ are feasible. Moreover, if $\delta < 1$, then*

$$\delta(X^+, S^+, \mu) \leq \frac{\delta^2}{\sqrt{2(1 - \delta^2)}}.$$

Corollary 2.4 (Corollary 7.2 in [9]) *If $\delta(X, S, \mu) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, then $\delta(X^+, S^+, \mu) < \delta(X, S, \mu)^2$.*

This corollary implies that the Newton-process is quadratically convergent when started close to the μ -center.

The following result establishes a polynomial iteration bound of the above described algorithm; it easily follow from the above lemmas.

Theorem 2.5 (Theorem 7.1 in [9]) *If $\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\theta = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}}$, then the algorithm requires at most*

$$2\sqrt{n} \log \frac{n\mu^0}{\varepsilon}$$

iterations. The output is a primal-dual pair (X, S) such that $\mathbf{Tr}(XS) \leq \varepsilon$.

3 Infeasible full-Newton step IPM

In this section we present an infeasible-start interior-point algorithm that generates an ε -solution of (P) and (D) , if it exists, or establishes that no such solution exists.

3.1 The perturbed problems

We start with choosing arbitrarily $X^0 \succ 0$ and $y^0, S^0 \succ 0$ such that $X^0 S^0 = \mu^0 I$ for some (positive) number μ^0 . For any ν with $0 < \nu \leq 1$ we consider the perturbed problem (P_ν) , defined by

$$(P_\nu) \quad \min \left\{ \left(C - \nu \left(C - \sum_{i=1}^m y_i^0 A_i - S^0 \right) \right) \bullet X : A_i \bullet X = b_i - \nu (b_i - A_i \bullet X^0), X \succeq 0 \right\},$$

and its dual problem (D_ν) , which is given by

$$(D_\nu) \quad \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m (b_i - \nu (b_i - A_i \bullet X^0)) y_i : \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i + S = C - \nu \left(C - \sum_{i=1}^m y_i^0 A_i - S^0 \right), S \succeq 0 \right\}.$$

Note that if $\nu = 1$ then $X = X^0$ yields a strictly feasible solution of (P_ν) , and $(y, S) = (y^0, S^0)$ a strictly feasible solution of (D_ν) . We conclude that if $\nu = 1$ then (P_ν) and (D_ν) satisfy the IPC.

Lemma 3.1 *Let the original problems, (P) and (D) , be feasible. Then for each ν satisfying $0 < \nu \leq 1$ the perturbed problems (P_ν) and (D_ν) satisfy the IPC.*

Proof: Suppose that (P) and (D) are feasible. Let \bar{X} be feasible solution of (P) and (\bar{y}, \bar{S}) a feasible solution of (D) . Then $A_i \bullet \bar{X} = b_i$ $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{y}_i A_i + \bar{S} = C$, with $\bar{X} \succeq 0$ and $\bar{S} \succeq 0$. Now let $0 < \nu \leq 1$, and consider

$$X = (1 - \nu) \bar{X} + \nu X^0, \quad y = (1 - \nu) \bar{y} + \nu y^0, \quad S = (1 - \nu) \bar{S} + \nu S^0.$$

One has for all $i = 1, \dots, m$ that,

$$\begin{aligned} A_i \bullet X &= A_i \bullet ((1 - \nu) \bar{X} + \nu X^0) \\ &= (1 - \nu) A_i \bullet \bar{X} + \nu A_i \bullet X^0 \\ &= b_i - \nu (b_i - A_i \bullet X^0), \end{aligned}$$

showing that X is feasible for (P_ν) . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i + S &= (1 - \nu) \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{y}_i A_i + \bar{S} \right) + \nu \left(\sum_{i=1}^m y_i^0 A_i + S^0 \right) \\ &= (1 - \nu) C + \nu \left(\sum_{i=1}^m y_i^0 A_i + S^0 \right) = C - \nu \left(C - \sum_{i=1}^m y_i^0 A_i - S^0 \right), \end{aligned}$$

showing that (y, S) is feasible for (D_ν) . Since $\nu > 0$, X and S are positive definite, thus this proves that (P_ν) and (D_ν) satisfy the IPC. \square

3.2 Central path of the perturbed problems

We assume that (P) and (D) are feasible. Letting $0 < \nu \leq 1$, Lemma 3.1 implies that the problems (P_ν) and (D_ν) satisfy the IPC, and hence their central paths exist. This means that the system

$$b_i - A_i \bullet X = \nu(b_i - A_i \bullet X^0), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \quad X \succeq 0 \quad (11)$$

$$C - \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i - S = \nu(C - \sum_{i=1}^m y_i^0 A_i - S^0), \quad S \succeq 0 \quad (12)$$

$$XS = \mu I.$$

has a unique solution, for every $\mu > 0$. In the sequel this unique solution is denoted as $(X(\mu, \nu), y(\mu, \nu), S(\mu, \nu))$. These are the μ -centers of the perturbed problems (P_ν) and (D_ν) . Note that since $X^0 S^0 = \mu^0 I$, X^0 is the μ^0 -center of the perturbed problem (P_1) and (y^0, S^0) the μ^0 -center of (D_1) . In other words, $(X(\mu^0, 1), y(\mu^0, 1), S(\mu^0, 1)) = (X^0, y^0, S^0)$. In the sequel we will always have $\mu = \nu \mu^0$, and we will accordingly denote $(X(\mu, \nu), y(\mu, \nu), S(\mu, \nu))$ simply as $(X(\nu), y(\nu), S(\nu))$.

3.3 An iteration of our algorithm

We just established that if $\nu = 1$ and $\mu = \mu^0$, then $X = X^0$ and $(y, S) = (y^0, S^0)$ are the μ -center of (P_ν) and (D_ν) respectively. These are our initial iterates.

We measure proximity to the μ -center of the perturbed problems by the quantity $\delta(X, S, \mu)$ as defined in (9). So, initially we have $\delta(X, S, \mu) = 0$. In the sequel we assume that at the start of each iteration, just before the μ -update, $\delta(X, S, \mu)$ is smaller than or equal to a (small) threshold value $\tau > 0$. So this is certainly true at the start of the first iteration.

Now we describe one iteration of our algorithm. Suppose that for some $\mu \in (0, \mu^0]$ we have X , y and S satisfying the feasibility conditions (11) and (12) for $\nu = \frac{\mu}{\mu^0}$, and such that $\mathbf{Tr}(XS) = n\mu$ and $\delta(X, S, \mu) \leq \tau$. We reduce μ to $\mu^+ = (1 - \theta)\mu$, with $\theta \in (0, 1)$, and find new iterates X^+ , y^+ and S^+ that satisfy (11) and (12), with μ replaced by μ^+ and ν by $\nu^+ = \frac{\mu^+}{\mu^0}$, and such that $\mathbf{Tr}(XS) = n\mu^+$ and $\delta(X^+, S^+, \mu^+) \leq \tau$. Note that $\nu^+ = (1 - \theta)\nu$.

To be more precise, this is achieved as follows. Each main iteration consists of a feasibility step and a few centering steps. The feasibility step serves to get iterates (X^f, y^f, S^f) that are strictly feasible for (P_{ν^+}) and (D_{ν^+}) , and moreover belong to the region of quadratic convergence of their μ^+ -centers $(X(\nu^+), y(\nu^+), S(\nu^+))$, in other words $\delta(X^f, S^f, \mu^+) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. Since the triple (X^f, y^f, S^f) is strictly feasible for (P_{ν^+}) and (D_{ν^+}) , we can perform a few centering steps starting at (X^f, y^f, S^f) targeting at the μ^+ -centers of (P_{ν^+}) and (D_{ν^+}) and obtain iterates (X^+, y^+, S^+) that are feasible for (P_{ν^+}) and (D_{ν^+}) and such that $\delta(X^+, S^+, \mu^+) \leq \tau$.

Before describing the feasibility step it will be convenient to introduce some new notations. We denote the initial values of the primal and dual residuals as r_b^0 and R_c^0 , respectively:

$$(r_b^0)_i = b_i - A_i \bullet X^0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (13)$$

$$R_c^0 = C - \sum_{i=1}^m y_i^0 A_i - S^0. \quad (14)$$

Using these notations the feasibility conditions for (P_ν) and (D_ν) are

$$\begin{aligned} A_i \bullet X &= b_i - \nu (r_b^0)_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad X \succeq 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i + S &= C - \nu R_c^0, \quad S \succeq 0. \end{aligned}$$

and for (P_{ν^+}) and (D_{ν^+}) the feasibility conditions are

$$\begin{aligned} A_i \bullet X &= b_i - \nu^+ (r_b^0)_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad X \succeq 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i + S &= C - \nu^+ R_c^0, \quad S \succeq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that (X, y, S) is feasible for (P_ν) and (D_ν) . For finding iterates that are feasible for (P_{ν^+}) and (D_{ν^+}) we need search directions $\Delta^f X$, $\Delta^f y$ and $\Delta^f S$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} A_i \bullet (X + \Delta^f X) &= b_i - \nu^+ (r_b^0)_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m (y_i + \Delta^f y) A_i + (S + \Delta^f S) &= C - \nu^+ R_c^0. \end{aligned}$$

Since X and (y, S) are feasible for (P_ν) and (D_ν) respectively, it follows that $\Delta^f X$, $\Delta^f y$ and $\Delta^f S$ should satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} A_i \bullet \Delta^f X &= (b_i - A_i \bullet X) - \nu^+ (r_b^0)_i = \nu (r_b^0)_i - \nu^+ (r_b^0)_i = \theta \nu (r_b^0)_i, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta^f y_i A_i + \Delta^f S &= \left(C - \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i - S \right) - \nu^+ R_c^0 = \nu R_c^0 - \nu^+ R_c^0 = \theta \nu R_c^0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the following system is used to define $\Delta^f X$, $\Delta^f y$ and $\Delta^f S$:

$$A_i \bullet \Delta^f X = \theta \nu (r_b^0)_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (15)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \Delta^f y_i A_i + \Delta^f S = \theta \nu R_c^0 \quad (16)$$

$$\Delta^f X + P \Delta^f S P^T = \mu S^{-1} - X, \quad (17)$$

where we used the NT-‘trick’ to symmetrize $\Delta^f X$ with P as defined in (5). After the feasibility step the iterates are given by

$$X^f = X + \Delta^f X, \quad (18)$$

$$y^f = y + \Delta^f y,$$

$$S^f = S + \Delta^f S. \quad (19)$$

By definition, after the feasibility step the iterates satisfy the affine equations in (11) and (12), with $\nu = \nu^+$. The hard part in the analysis will be to guarantee that X^f and S^f are positive definite and satisfy $\delta(X^f, S^f, \mu^+) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$.

After the feasibility step we perform centering steps in order to get iterates (X^+, y^+, S^+) that satisfy $\mathbf{Tr}(X^+ S^+) = n\mu^+$ and $\delta(X^+, S^+, \mu^+) \leq \tau$. By using Corollary 2.4, the required number of centering steps can easily be obtained. Indeed, assuming $\delta = \delta(X^f, S^f, \mu^+) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, after k centering steps we will have iterates (X^+, y^+, S^+) that are still feasible for (P_{ν^+}) and (D_{ν^+}) that satisfy

$$\delta(X^+, S^+, \mu^+) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2^k}.$$

Hence, just as in the linear case [45] the number of centering steps is at most

$$k \geq \log_2 \left(\log_2 \frac{1}{\tau^2} \right). \quad (20)$$

3.4 The algorithm

A formal description of the algorithm is given in Figure 2. One may easily verify after each iteration the residuals and the duality gap are reduced by a factor $1 - \theta$. The algorithm stops if the norms of residuals and the duality gap are less than the accuracy parameter ε .

4 An analysis of the algorithm

Let X , y and S denote the iterates at the start of an iteration with $\mathbf{Tr}(XS) = n\mu$ and $\delta(X, S, \mu) \leq \tau$. Recall that at the start of first iteration this is certainly true, because $\mathbf{Tr}(X^0 S^0) = n\mu^0$ and $\delta(X^0, S^0, \mu^0) = 0$.

Before dealing with the analysis of the algorithm we recall some lemmas which we use several times in this paper.

Primal-Dual Infeasible IPM

Input:

Accuracy parameter $\varepsilon > 0$;
barrier update parameter θ , $0 < \theta < 1$;
threshold parameter $\tau > 0$;
 $X^0, S^0 \succ 0$, $y^0 = 0$ and $\mu^0 > 0$ such that $X^0 S^0 = \mu^0 I$.

begin

$X := X^0$, $S := S^0 \succ 0$, $y := y^0$; $\mu := \mu^0$;
while $\max(\mathbf{Tr}(XS), \|r_b\|, \|R_c\|) \geq \varepsilon$ **do**

begin

feasibility step:

$$(X, y, S) := (X, y, S) + (\Delta^f X, \Delta^f y, \Delta^f S);$$

μ -update:

$$\mu := (1 - \theta)\mu;$$

centering steps:

while $\delta(X, S, \mu) \geq \tau$ **do**

begin

$$(X, y, S) := (X, y, S) + (\Delta X, \Delta y, \Delta S);$$

end

end

end

Figure 2: Infeasible full-Newton-step algorithm

Lemma 4.1 (Lemma A.1 in [9]) *Let $Q \in \mathbf{S}_{++}^n$, and let $M \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$ be skew-symmetric ($M = -M^T$). One has $\det(Q + M) > 0$. Moreover, if $\lambda_i(Q + M) \in \mathbf{R}$, ($i = 1, \dots, n$), then*

$$0 < \lambda_{\min}(Q) \leq \lambda_{\min}(Q + M) \leq \lambda_{\max}(Q + M) \leq \lambda_{\max}(Q).$$

Lemma 4.2 (Lemma 1.2.4 in [14]) *Let $A, B \in \mathbf{S}_+^n$. Then we have following inequalities*

$$\lambda_{\min}(A) \lambda_{\max}(B) \leq \lambda_{\min}(A) \mathbf{Tr}(B) \leq \mathbf{Tr}(AB) \leq \lambda_{\max}(A) \mathbf{Tr}(B) \leq n \lambda_{\max}(A) \lambda_{\max}(B).$$

Lemma 4.3 (Theorem A.4 in [9]) *Let $A \in \mathbf{S}_{++}^n$ and $B \in \mathbf{S}_{++}^n$. Then all the eigenvalues of AB are real and positive.*

4.1 The effect of the feasibility step and the choice of θ

As we established in Section 3.3, the feasibility step generates new iterates X^f , y^f and S^f that satisfy the feasibility equations for (P_{ν^+}) and (D_{ν^+}) . A crucial element in the analysis is to show that after the feasibility step $\delta(X^f, S^f, \mu^+) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, i.e., that the new iterates are within the

region where the Newton process targeting at the μ^+ -centers of (P_{ν^+}) and (D_{ν^+}) is quadratically convergent.

We define

$$D_X^f := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} D^{-1} \Delta^f X D^{-1}, \quad D_S^f := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} D \Delta^f S D, \quad (V^f)^2 := \frac{1}{\mu} D^{-1} X^f S^f D, \quad (21)$$

with D as defined in Section 2.2. We can now rewrite (15),(16) and (17) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} DA_i D \bullet D_X^f &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} \theta \nu (r_b^0)_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\Delta y_i}{\sqrt{\mu}} DA_i D + D_S^f &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} \theta \nu D R_c^0 D, \\ D_X^f + D_S^f &= V^{-1} - V. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

From the third equation in (22) we obtain, by multiplying both side from the left with V ,

$$V D_X^f + V D_S^f = I - V^2. \quad (23)$$

Using (6), (18), (19) and (21), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} X^f &= X + \Delta^f X = \sqrt{\mu} D (V + D_X^f) D, \\ S^f &= S + \Delta^f S = \sqrt{\mu} D^{-1} (V + D_S^f) D^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$X^f S^f = \mu D (V + D_X^f) (V + D_S^f) D^{-1}.$$

The last matrix is similar to $\mu (V + D_X^f) (V + D_S^f)$. Thus we have

$$X^f S^f \sim \mu (V + D_X^f) (V + D_S^f).$$

To simplify the notation in the sequel we introduce

$$D_{XS}^f := \frac{1}{2} (D_X^f D_S^f + D_S^f D_X^f), \quad (24)$$

and

$$M := (D_X^f V - V D_S^f) + \frac{1}{2} (D_X^f D_S^f - D_S^f D_X^f). \quad (25)$$

Note that D_{XS}^f is symmetric and M is skew-symmetric.

Now we may write, using (23),

$$\begin{aligned} (V + D_X^f) (V + D_S^f) &= V^2 + V D_S^f + D_X^f V + D_X^f D_S^f \\ &= I - V D_X^f + D_X^f V + D_X^f D_S^f. \end{aligned}$$

By subtracting and adding $\frac{1}{2} D_S^f D_X^f$ to the last expression we get

$$I + \frac{1}{2} (D_X^f D_S^f + D_S^f D_X^f) + (D_X^f V - V D_S^f) + \frac{1}{2} (D_X^f D_S^f - D_S^f D_X^f).$$

Using (24) and (25) we obtain

$$X^f S^f \sim \mu \left(I + D_{XS}^f + M \right). \quad (26)$$

Lemma 4.4 *Let $X \succ 0$ and $S \succ 0$. Then the iterates (X^f, y^f, S^f) are strictly feasible if*

$$I + D_{XS}^f \succ 0.$$

Proof: For the proof we introduce a step length $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, and we define

$$X^\alpha = X + \alpha \Delta^f X, \quad y^\alpha = y + \alpha \Delta^f y, \quad S^\alpha = S + \alpha \Delta^f S.$$

We then have $X^0 = X$, $X^1 = X^f$ and similar relations for y and S . Obviously $\det(X^0 S^0) = \det(\mu^0 I) = (\mu^0)^n > 0$. Our aim is to show that the determinant of $X^\alpha S^\alpha$ remains positive for all $\alpha \leq 1$. We may write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{X^\alpha S^\alpha}{\mu} &\sim \left(V + \alpha D_X^f \right) \left(V + \alpha D_S^f \right) \\ &= \left(V^2 + \alpha \left(D_X^f V + V D_S^f \right) + \alpha^2 D_X^f D_S^f \right) \\ &= \left(V^2 + \alpha \left(V D_X^f + V D_S^f \right) + \alpha \left(D_X^f V - V D_X^f \right) + \alpha^2 D_X^f D_S^f \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using (23) we get

$$\frac{X^\alpha S^\alpha}{\mu} = \left(V^2 + \alpha (I - V^2) + \alpha \left(D_X^f V - V D_X^f \right) + \alpha^2 D_X^f D_S^f \right).$$

By subtracting and adding $\alpha^2 I$, $\alpha^2 \left(D_X^f V - V D_X^f \right)$ and $\frac{1}{2} \left(D_X^f D_S^f + D_S^f D_X^f \right)$ to the right hand side of the above equality we obtain

$$\frac{X^\alpha S^\alpha}{\mu} = \left((1 - \alpha) V^2 + \alpha (1 - \alpha) I + \alpha^2 \left(D_{XS}^f + I \right) \right) + \alpha \left((1 - \alpha) \left(D_X^f V - V D_X^f \right) + \alpha M \right).$$

The matrix $(1 - \alpha) \left(D_X^f V - V D_X^f \right) + \alpha M$ is skew-symmetric for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Lemma 4.1 therefore implies that the determinant of $X^\alpha S^\alpha$ will be positive if the symmetric matrix

$$(1 - \alpha) V^2 + \alpha (1 - \alpha) I + \alpha^2 \left(D_{XS}^f + I \right)$$

is positive definite. The latter is true for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. So $X^\alpha S^\alpha$ has positive determinant for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. This implies that X^α and S^α are nonsingular for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Since X^0 and S^0 are positive definite and since X^α and S^α depend continuously on α , it follows that X^1 and S^1 are positive definite as well. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 4.5 *The iterates (X^f, y^f, S^f) are certainly strictly feasible if*

$$\left| \lambda_i \left(D_{XS}^f \right) \right| < 1, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Proof: By Lemma 4.4 X^f and S^f are strictly feasible if $I + D_{XS}^f \succ 0$. Since the last inequality certainly holds if $\left| \lambda_i \left(D_{XS}^f \right) \right| < 1$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, the corollary follows. \square

In the sequel we denote

$$\omega(V) := \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\|D_X^f\|^2 + \|D_S^f\|^2}, \quad (27)$$

which implies $\|D_X^f\| \leq 2\omega(V)$ and $\|D_S^f\| \leq 2\omega(V)$. Here we recall from [29] two properties of the Frobenius matrix norm. One has for any symmetric matrix A of size $n \times n$

$$\|A\|^2 = \mathbf{Tr}(A^2) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(A^2) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(A)^2.$$

This norm is also sub-multiplicative, i.e., for any two square matrices A and B ,

$$\|AB\| \leq \|A\| \|B\|.$$

By using these properties and (27) we have

$$\|D_{XS}^f\| \leq \|D_X^f\| \|D_S^f\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\|D_X^f\|^2 + \|D_S^f\|^2 \right) = 2\omega(V)^2 \quad (28)$$

$$|\lambda_i(D_{XS}^f)| \leq \|D_{XS}^f\| \leq 2\omega(V)^2, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (29)$$

Lemma 4.6 *If $\omega(V) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ then the iterates (X^f, y^f, S^f) are strictly feasible.*

Proof: Let $\omega(V) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. Then (29) implies that $|\lambda_i(D_{XS}^f)| < 1$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. By Corollary 4.5 this implies the statement in the lemma. \square

Assuming $\omega(V) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, which guarantees strict feasibility of the iterates (X^f, y^f, S^f) , we proceed by deriving an upper bound for $\delta(X^f, S^f, \mu^+)$. Recall from definition (10) that

$$\delta(X^f, S^f, \mu^+) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| (V^f)^{-1} - V^f \right\|, \quad (30)$$

with $(V^f)^2$ as defined in (21). In the sequel we denote $\delta(X^f, S^f, \mu^+)$ also by shortly by $\delta(V^f)$. We proceed to find an upper bound for $\delta(V^f)$ in terms of $\omega(V)$. To this end we need some technical results which give information on the eigenvalues and the norm of V^f .

Lemma 4.7 *One has*

$$\lambda_{\min} \left((V^f)^2 \right) \geq \frac{1}{1-\theta} \left(1 - 2\omega(V)^2 \right).$$

Proof: Using (26), after division of both sides by $\mu^+ = (1-\theta)\mu$ we get

$$(V^f)^2 \sim \frac{\mu(I + D_{XS}^f + M)}{\mu^+} = \frac{I + D_{XS}^f + M}{1-\theta}. \quad (31)$$

It follows that

$$\lambda_{\min} \left((V^f)^2 \right) = \frac{1}{1-\theta} \lambda_{\min} \left(I + D_{XS}^f + M \right).$$

Since M is skew-symmetric, Lemma 4.1 implies

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{\min}\left(\left(V^f\right)^2\right) &\geq \frac{1}{1-\theta}\lambda_{\min}\left(I+D_{XS}^f\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\theta}\left(1+\lambda_{\min}\left(D_{XS}^f\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Substitution of the bound for $\left|\lambda_{\min}\left(D_{XS}^f\right)\right|$ in (29) yields

$$\lambda_{\min}\left(\left(V^f\right)^2\right) \geq \frac{1}{1-\theta}\left(1-2\omega(V)^2\right),$$

which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.8 *One has*

$$\left\|I-\left(V^f\right)^2\right\| \leq \frac{2\omega(V)^2+\theta\sqrt{n}}{1-\theta}.$$

Proof: Using (31) and properties of the Frobenius norm we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|I-\left(V^f\right)^2\right\|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n\left(\frac{\lambda_i\left(I+D_{XS}^f+M\right)}{1-\theta}-1\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{(1-\theta)^2}\sum_{i=1}^n\left(\lambda_i\left(I+D_{XS}^f+M\right)-1+\theta\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{(1-\theta)^2}\sum_{i=1}^n\left(\lambda_i\left(D_{XS}^f+M\right)+\theta\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{(1-\theta)^2}\left(n\theta^2+\sum_{i=1}^n\left(\lambda_i\left(D_{XS}^f+M\right)\right)^2+2\theta\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda_i\left(D_{XS}^f+M\right)\right)\end{aligned}$$

Since $\left(\lambda_i\left(D_{XS}^f+M\right)\right)^2=\lambda_i\left(\left(D_{XS}^f+M\right)^2\right)$, for each i , we obtain

$$\left\|I-\left(V^f\right)^2\right\|^2=\frac{1}{(1-\theta)^2}\left(n\theta^2+\mathbf{Tr}\left(\left(D_{XS}^f+M\right)^2\right)+2\theta\mathbf{Tr}\left(D_{XS}^f+M\right)\right). \quad (32)$$

Using the skew-symmetry of M we obtain $\mathbf{Tr}\left(D_{XS}^f+M\right)=\mathbf{Tr}\left(D_{XS}^f\right)$ and

$$\mathbf{Tr}\left(\left(D_{XS}^f+M\right)^2\right)=\mathbf{Tr}\left(\left(D_{XS}^f\right)^2+MD_{XS}^f+D_{XS}^fM-MM^T\right).$$

Since $MD_{XS}^f+D_{XS}^fM$ is skew-symmetric we obtain

$$\mathbf{Tr}\left(\left(D_{XS}^f+M\right)^2\right)=\mathbf{Tr}\left(\left(D_{XS}^f\right)^2-MM^T\right)\leq\mathbf{Tr}\left(\left(D_{XS}^f\right)^2\right)=\left\|D_{XS}^f\right\|^2,$$

where the inequality follows since the matrix MM^T is positive semidefinite. Substitution in (32) gives

$$\left\| I - (V^f)^2 \right\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{(1-\theta)^2} \left(n\theta^2 + \|D_{XS}^f\|^2 + 2\theta \text{Tr}(D_{XS}^f) \right).$$

Now let $\lambda(D_{XS}^f)$ be the vector consisting of the eigenvalues of D_{XS}^f . Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and (28) we get

$$\text{Tr}(D_{XS}^f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(D_{XS}^f) = e^T \lambda(D_{XS}^f) \leq \|e\| \|\lambda(D_{XS}^f)\| = \|e\| \|D_{XS}^f\| \leq 2\sqrt{n} \omega(V)^2.$$

Substitution gives, also using (29),

$$\left\| I - (V^f)^2 \right\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{(1-\theta)^2} \left(n\theta^2 + 4\omega(V)^4 + 4\theta\sqrt{n}\omega(V)^2 \right) = \left(\frac{2\omega(V)^2 + \theta\sqrt{n}}{1-\theta} \right)^2.$$

which implies the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.9 *Let $\omega(V) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. Then one has*

$$2\delta(V^f) \leq \frac{2\omega(V)^2 + \theta\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{(1-\theta)(1-2\omega(V)^2)}}.$$

Proof: We may write, using (30),

$$\begin{aligned} 2\delta(V^f) &= \left\| V^f - (V^f)^{-1} \right\| = \left\| (V^f)^{-1} \left(I - (V^f)^2 \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \lambda_{\max} \left((V^f)^{-1} \right) \left\| I - (V^f)^2 \right\| = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}((V^f))} \left\| I - (V^f)^2 \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Using the bounds in Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.8 the lemma follows. \square

Recall from Section 3.3 that we need to have $\delta(V^f) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. By Lemma 4.9 it suffices for this that

$$\frac{2\omega(V)^2 + \theta\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{(1-\theta)(1-2\omega(V)^2)}} \leq \sqrt{2}. \quad (33)$$

Lemma 4.10 *Let $\omega(V) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and*

$$\theta = \frac{\alpha}{2(\sqrt{n}+1)}, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1. \quad (34)$$

Then the iterates (X^f, y^f, S^f) are strictly feasible and $\delta(V^f) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$.

Proof: Due to Lemma 4.6 and $\omega(V) \leq \frac{1}{2}$, the iterates (X^f, y^f, S^f) are strictly feasible. We just established that if inequality (33) is satisfied then $\delta(V^f) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. The left hand side in this inequality is monotonically increasing in $\omega(V)$. By substituting $\omega(V) = \frac{1}{2}$, the inequality (33) reduces to

$$\frac{\frac{1}{2} + \theta \sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(1 - \theta)}} \leq \sqrt{2},$$

which is equivalent to

$$4n\theta^2 + 4(\sqrt{n} + 1)\theta - 3 \leq 0.$$

The largest possible value of θ satisfying this inequality is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \theta &= \frac{3}{2\left(\sqrt{n} + 1 + \sqrt{(\sqrt{n} + 1)^2 + 3n}\right)} \\ &\geq \frac{3}{2\left(\sqrt{n} + 1 + \sqrt{(\sqrt{n} + 1)^2 + 3(\sqrt{n} + 1)^2}\right)} = \frac{1}{2(\sqrt{n} + 1)}, \end{aligned}$$

which is in agreement with (34). Thus the lemma has been proved. \square

4.2 An upper bound for $\omega(V)$

As became clear in (22), the system (15)-(17), which defines the search directions $\Delta^f X$, $\Delta^f y$ and $\Delta^f S$, can be expressed in terms of scaled search directions D_X^f and D_S^f . We define the linear space \mathcal{L} as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} := \{\xi \in \mathbf{S}^n \quad : \quad DA_i D \bullet \xi = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

Using the linear space \mathcal{L} , it is clear from the first equation in (22) that the affine space

$$\left\{ \xi \in \mathbf{S}^n \quad : \quad DA_i D \bullet \xi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} \theta \nu (r_b^0)_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \right\}$$

equals $D_X^f + \mathcal{L}$. By the second equation in system (22), we have $D_S^f \in \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} \theta \nu DR_c^0 D + \mathcal{L}^\perp$. Since $\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{L}^\perp = \{0\}$, the spaces $D_X^f + \mathcal{L}$ and $D_S^f + \mathcal{L}^\perp$ meet in a unique matrix. This matrix is denoted below by Q .

Lemma 4.11 *Let Q be the (unique) matrix in the intersection of the affine spaces $D_X + \mathcal{L}$ and $D_S + \mathcal{L}^\perp$. Then*

$$2\omega(V) \leq \sqrt{\|Q\|^2 + \left(\|Q\|^2 + 2\delta(V)\right)^2}.$$

Proof: The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.6 in [45], and is therefore omitted. \square

From Lemma 4.10 we know that we want to have $\omega(V) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ because then $\delta(V^+) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. Due to Lemma 4.11 this will hold if $\|Q\|$ satisfies

$$\|Q\| + (\|Q\| + 2\delta(V))^2 \leq 1. \tag{35}$$

4.3 An upper bound for $\|Q\|$

Recall from Lemma 4.11 that Q is the unique solution of the system

$$\begin{aligned} DA_i D \bullet Q &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} \theta \nu (r_b^0)_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\xi_i}{\sqrt{\mu}} DA_i D + Q &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} \theta \nu DR_c^0 D. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

We proceed to finding an upper bound for $\|Q\|$. Before doing this we choose the initial iterates (X^0, y^0, S^0) as follows:

$$X^0 = S^0 = \zeta I, \quad y^0 = 0, \quad \mu^0 = \zeta^2, \quad (37)$$

where $\zeta > 0$ is such that

$$X^* + S^* \preceq \zeta I, \quad (38)$$

for some $(X^*, y^*, S^*) \in \mathcal{F}^*$. For the moment, let us write

$$(r_b)_i = \theta \nu (r_b^0)_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \quad R_c = \theta \nu R_c^0,$$

and let r_b be the vector $((r_b)_1; (r_b)_2; \dots; (r_b)_m)$. For any two matrices $E (m \times n)$ and $F (p \times q)$ the Kronecker product $E \otimes F$ is the $mp \times nq$ block matrix

$$E \otimes F = \begin{bmatrix} E_{11}F & \cdots & E_{1n}F \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ E_{m1}F & \cdots & E_{mn}F \end{bmatrix}.$$

We recall from [29] some properties of Kronecker product and the operator $\mathbf{vec}(\cdot)$ that are useful for our purpose. These properties are

(a) $(E \otimes F)^T = E^T \otimes F^T$.

(b) If E and F are square and nonsingular, then

$$(E \otimes F)^{-1} = E^{-1} \otimes F^{-1}.$$

(c) For any $E (m \times n)$, $F (n \times r)$ and $H (r \times s)$, we have

$$\mathbf{vec}(EHF) = (F^T \otimes E) \mathbf{vec}(H).$$

By using these properties and the definition of the inner product of two matrices the system (36) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{vec}(A_i)^T (D \otimes D) \mathbf{vec}(Q) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} (r_b)_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\xi_i}{\sqrt{\mu}} (D \otimes D) \mathbf{vec}(A_i) + \mathbf{vec}(Q) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} (D \otimes D) \mathbf{vec}(R_c). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Let $\mathcal{A}^T = [\mathbf{vec}(A_1) \quad \mathbf{vec}(A_2) \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{vec}(A_m)]$ and $\xi = (\xi_1; \xi_2; \dots; \xi_m)$. One may easily verify that we can rewrite the system (39) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} (D \otimes D) \mathbf{vec}(Q) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} r_b, \\ (D \otimes D) \mathcal{A}^T \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{\mu}} + \mathbf{vec}(Q) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} (D \otimes D) \mathbf{vec}(R_c), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Lemma 4.12 *With (X^0, y^0, S^0) as defined in (37) and (38), we have*

$$\|Q\| \leq \theta \sqrt{\nu \mathbf{Tr}(P^2 + P^{-2})}. \quad (41)$$

Proof: Replacing \mathcal{A} , $D \otimes D$ and $\mathbf{vec}(Q)$ in system (40) by A , D and q , respectively, yields exactly the same system as in the proof of Lemma 4.7 in [45]. By using similar arguments as there, we obtain the following result:

$$\sqrt{\mu} \|\mathbf{vec}(Q)\| \leq \theta \nu \sqrt{\|\mathbf{vec}(D(S^0 - \bar{S})D)\|^2 + \|\mathbf{vec}(D^{-1}(X^0 - \bar{X})D^{-1})\|^2},$$

where \bar{X} , \bar{y} and \bar{S} satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Avec}(\bar{X}) &= b, \\ \mathcal{A}^T \bar{y} + \mathbf{vec}(\bar{S}) &= \mathbf{vec}(C). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Using $\|\mathbf{vec}(U)\| = \|U\|$ for any matrix U , we obtain

$$\sqrt{\mu} \|Q\| \leq \theta \nu \sqrt{\|(D(S^0 - \bar{S})D)\|^2 + \|D^{-1}(X^0 - \bar{X})D^{-1}\|^2}. \quad (43)$$

We are still free to choose \bar{X} and \bar{S} , such that (42) is satisfied. We use $\bar{X} = X^*$ and $\bar{S} = S^*$, with X^* and S^* as in (38). Then we have

$$0 \preceq X^0 - \bar{X} = X^0 - X^* \preceq \zeta I, \quad 0 \preceq S^0 - \bar{S} = S^0 - S^* \preceq \zeta I.$$

It follows that

$$\|D(S^0 - \bar{S})D\|^2 \leq \zeta^2 \|D^2\|^2 = \zeta^2 \|P\|^2 = \zeta^2 \mathbf{Tr}(P^2),$$

where we used Lemma 4.2 and $D = P^{\frac{1}{2}}$. In the same way it follows that

$$\|D^{-1}(X^0 - \bar{X})D^{-1}\|^2 \leq \zeta^2 \mathbf{Tr}(P^{-2}).$$

Substituting the last inequalities and $\mu = \nu \mu^0 = \nu \zeta^2$ into (43) gives

$$\|Q\| \leq \theta \sqrt{\nu \mathbf{Tr}(P^2 + P^{-2})},$$

proving the lemma. □

Lemma 4.13 *With (X^0, y^0, S^0) as defined in (37) and (38), we have*

$$\|Q\| \leq \frac{\theta}{\zeta \lambda_{\min}(V)} \mathbf{Tr}(X + S). \quad (44)$$

Proof: Using (5) and Lemma 4.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Tr}(P^2) &= \mathbf{Tr}\left(X^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(X^{\frac{1}{2}} S X^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} X \left(X^{\frac{1}{2}} S X^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} X^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &= \mathbf{Tr}\left(X \left(X^{\frac{1}{2}} S X^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} X \left(X^{\frac{1}{2}} S X^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}\left(\left(X^{\frac{1}{2}} S X^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)} \mathbf{Tr}\left(X^2 \left(X^{\frac{1}{2}} S X^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbf{Tr}(X^2)}{\lambda_{\min}\left(X^{\frac{1}{2}} S X^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)} = \frac{\mathbf{Tr}(X^2)}{\mu \lambda_{\min}(V^2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the last equality we used $V^2 \sim \frac{X^{\frac{1}{2}}SX^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\mu} \sim \frac{XS}{\mu}$. In the same way we set

$$\mathbf{Tr}(P^{-2}) \leq \frac{\mathbf{Tr}(S^2)}{\mu \lambda_{\min}(V^2)}.$$

Thus we obtain

$$\sqrt{\mathbf{Tr}(P^2 + P^{-2})} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(V)} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{Tr}(X^2 + S^2)}{\mu}}. \quad (45)$$

Moreover, by the positive definiteness of X and S and Lemma 4.3 it follows that

$$\mathbf{Tr}(X^2 + S^2) \leq \mathbf{Tr}(X^2 + S^2 + XS + SX) = \mathbf{Tr}\left((X + S)^2\right) \leq \mathbf{Tr}(X + S)^2. \quad (46)$$

Substituting (45) and (46) in (41) gives

$$\|Q\| \leq \frac{\theta}{\lambda_{\min}(V)} \sqrt{\frac{\nu}{\mu} \mathbf{Tr}(X + S)^2}.$$

Since $\mu = \nu\mu^0 = \nu\zeta^2$, the lemma follows. \square

4.4 Some bounds for $\mathbf{Tr}(X + S)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(V)$. The choice of τ and α

Let X be feasible for (P_ν) and (y, S) for (D_ν) . We need to find an upper bound for $\mathbf{Tr}(X + S)$ and lower bound on the eigenvalues of V as defined in (6). We can rewrite $\delta(V)$ in (10) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 4\delta(V)^2 &= \|V - V^{-1}\|^2 \\ &= \mathbf{Tr}\left((V - V^{-1})^T (V - V^{-1})\right) \\ &= \mathbf{Tr}(V^2 - 2I + V^{-2}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\lambda_i(V)^2 - 2 + \frac{1}{\lambda_i(V)^2} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\lambda_i(V) - \frac{1}{\lambda_i(V)} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Using this one easily derives the following result, which we state without further proof.

Lemma 4.14 (Cf. Lemma II.60 in [46]) *Let $\delta = \delta(V)$ be given by (47). Then*

$$\frac{1}{\rho(\delta)} \leq \lambda_i(V) \leq \rho(\delta), \quad (48)$$

where

$$\rho(\delta) := \delta + \sqrt{1 + \delta^2}. \quad (49)$$

Lemma 4.15 *Let X and (y, S) be feasible for the perturbed problems (P_ν) and (D_ν) respectively and let (X^0, y^0, S^0) and $(X^*, y^*, S^*) \in \mathcal{F}^*$ be as defined in (37) and (38). Then we have*

$$\nu\zeta\mathbf{Tr}(X + S) \leq S \bullet X + \nu n\zeta^2.$$

Proof: Let

$$\begin{aligned} X' &= X - \nu X^0 - (1 - \nu) X^*, \\ y' &= y - \nu y^0 - (1 - \nu) y^*, \\ S' &= S - \nu S^0 - (1 - \nu) S^*. \end{aligned}$$

From (13), (14) and definition of perturbed problems (P_ν) and (D_ν) , it is easily seen that (X', y', S') satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} A_i \bullet X' &= 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m y'_i A_i + S' &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $X' \bullet S' = 0$. i.e.,

$$(X - \nu X^0 - (1 - \nu) X^*) \bullet (S - \nu S^0 - (1 - \nu) S^*) = 0.$$

By expanding the last equality and using the fact that $X^* \bullet S^* = 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(S^0 \bullet X + X^0 \bullet S) &= S \bullet X + \nu^2 S^0 \bullet X^0 \\ &\quad + \nu(1 - \nu)(S^0 \bullet X^* + X^0 \bullet S^*) - (1 - \nu)(S \bullet X^* + S^* \bullet X). \end{aligned}$$

Since (X^0, y^0, S^0) are as in (37) we have

$$S^0 \bullet X + X^0 \bullet S = \zeta \mathbf{Tr}(X + S), \quad S^0 \bullet X^0 = n\zeta^2, \quad S^0 \bullet X^* + X^0 \bullet S^* = \zeta \mathbf{Tr}(X^* + S^*).$$

Due to (38) we have $\mathbf{Tr}(X^* + S^*) \leq n\zeta$. Substitution gives

$$\begin{aligned} \nu\zeta\mathbf{Tr}(X + S) &= S \bullet X + \nu^2 n\zeta^2 + \nu(1 - \nu)\zeta\mathbf{Tr}(X^* + S^*) - (1 - \nu)(S \bullet X^* + S^* \bullet X) \\ &\leq S \bullet X + \nu^2 n\zeta^2 + \nu(1 - \nu)n\zeta^2 - (1 - \nu)(S \bullet X^* + S^* \bullet X) \\ &= S \bullet X + \nu n\zeta^2 - (1 - \nu)(S \bullet X^* + S^* \bullet X) \\ &= S \bullet X + \nu n\zeta^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact $S \bullet X^* + S^* \bullet X \geq 0$. Hence the proof is complete. \square

Lemma 4.16 *Using the same notations as in Lemma 4.15, one has*

$$\mathbf{Tr}(X + S) \leq \left(\rho(\delta)^2 + 1\right) n\zeta, \tag{50}$$

where $\rho(\delta)$ as defined in (49).

Proof: Dividing both sides of the inequality in Lemma 4.15 by $\nu\zeta$, while using that $\mu = \nu\zeta^2$, we get

$$\text{Tr}(X + S) \leq \mathbf{Tr}\left(\frac{SX}{\mu}\right)\zeta + n\zeta.$$

Hence it suffices for the proof if we show that

$$\mathbf{Tr}\left(\frac{SX}{\mu}\right) \leq n\rho(\delta)^2.$$

Since $SX \sim \mu V^2$, which is immediately clear from (7), the left-hand side equals $\mathbf{Tr}(V^2)$. So we can rewrite the last inequality as

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(V)^2 \leq n\rho(\delta)^2.$$

But this inequality is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.14. Hence the proof is complete. \square

By substituting (48) and (50) into (44) we get

$$\|Q\| \leq n\theta\rho(\delta)\left(1 + \rho(\delta)^2\right).$$

At this stage we choose

$$\tau = \frac{1}{8}. \tag{51}$$

Since $\delta \leq \tau = \frac{1}{8}$ and $\rho(\delta)$ is monotonically increasing in δ , we have

$$\|Q\| \leq n\theta\rho(\delta)\left(1 + \rho(\delta)^2\right) \leq n\theta\rho\left(\frac{1}{8}\right)\left(1 + \rho\left(\frac{1}{8}\right)^2\right) = 2.586n\theta.$$

By using $\theta = \frac{\alpha}{2(\sqrt{n+1})}$ (see Lemma 4.10) we obtain the following upper bound for the norm of Q :

$$\|Q\| \leq \frac{2.586n\alpha}{2(\sqrt{n+1})}.$$

In (35) we found that in order to have $\delta(V^f) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, we should have $\|Q\|^2 + (\|Q\| + 2\delta(V))^2 \leq 1$.

Therefore, since $\delta(V) \leq \tau = \frac{1}{8}$, it suffices if Q satisfies $\|Q\|^2 + (\|Q\| + \frac{1}{4})^2 \leq 1$. So we have $\delta(V^f) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ if $\|Q\| \leq 0.57097$. The latter inequality is certainly satisfied if

$$\frac{2.586n\alpha}{2(\sqrt{n+1})} \leq 0.57097.$$

By taking

$$\alpha = \frac{2(\sqrt{n+1})}{5n}, \tag{52}$$

this holds, as one easily verifies, and hence we then have $\delta(V^f) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$.

5 Complexity

In the previous sections we have found that if at the start of an iteration the iterates satisfy $\delta(X, S; \mu) \leq \tau$, with τ as defined in (51), and θ as in (34), then after the feasibility step and the μ -update the iterates satisfy $\delta(X, S; \mu^+) \leq 1/\sqrt{2}$.

According to (20), at most

$$\log_2 \left(\log_2 \frac{1}{\tau^2} \right) = \log_2 (\log_2 64) \leq 3$$

centering steps suffice to get iterates that satisfy $\delta(X, S; \mu^+) \leq \tau$. So each iteration consists of one feasibility step and at most 3 centering steps. In each iteration both the duality gap and the norms of the residual vectors are reduced by the factor $1 - \theta$. Hence, using $X^0 \bullet S^0 = n\zeta^2$, the total number of iterations is bounded above by

$$\frac{1}{\theta} \log \frac{\max \{n\zeta^2, \|r_b^0\|, \|R_c^0\|\}}{\varepsilon}.$$

Due to (34) and (52) we have

$$\theta = \frac{\alpha}{2(\sqrt{n} + 1)} = \frac{1}{5n}.$$

Hence the total number of inner iterations is bounded above by

$$20n \log \frac{\max \{n\zeta^2, \|r_b^0\|, \|R_c^0\|\}}{\varepsilon}.$$

Note that the order of this bound is the same as the bound in [30, 45] for LO. We may state without further proof our main result.

Theorem 5.1 *If (P) and (D) have optimal solutions $(X^*, y^*, S^*) \in \mathcal{F}^*$ such that $X^* + S^* \preceq \zeta I$, then after at most*

$$20n \log \frac{\max \{n\zeta^2, \|r_b^0\|, \|R_c^0\|\}}{\varepsilon}$$

iterations the algorithm finds an ε -solution of (P) and (D).

The above theorem gives a convergence result under the assumption (38). One might ask what if this condition is not satisfied. From Lemma 4.13 under conditions (37) and (38) we know that during the course of the algorithm the matrix Q satisfies $\|Q\| \leq 0.57097$. So, if during the execution of the algorithm $\|Q\| > 0.57097$, then we may conclude that there exists no optimal solutions (X^*, y^*, S^*) with zero duality gap such that

$$X^* + S^* \preceq \zeta I.$$

6 Concluding remarks

We extended the full-Newton infeasible interior-point algorithm for LO as developed in [45], to SDO. We obtained an iteration bound of the same order as in the LO case [30, 45].

Some interesting topics remain for further research. First, the search direction used in this paper is based on the NT-symmetrization scheme and it is natural to ask if other symmetrization schemes can be used. Second, similar as we discussed for the linear case in [30] we might replace the equation $\Delta^f X + P\Delta^f SP = \mu I - XS$ in the system of the feasibility step by either

$$\Delta^f X + P\Delta^f SP^T = 0 \tag{53}$$

or

$$\Delta^f X + P\Delta^f SP^T = (1 - \theta)\mu S^{-1} - X.$$

In [30] we used (53) which made the analysis of the feasibility step for LO easier than in [45]. For the SDO case we leave it to the future to analyze a full-Newton step method based on these search directions, but is unlikely that this will lead to a better iteration bound.

References

- [1] Alizadeh, F., *Combinatorial Optimization with Interior Point Methods and Semi-Definite Matrices*, PhD thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, 1991.
- [2] Alizadeh, F., Interior point methods in semidefinite programming with applications to combinatorial optimization, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 13–51, 1995.
- [3] Bai, Y. Q., El Ghami, M., and Roos, c., A comparative study of kernel functions for primal-dual interior-point algorithms in linear optimization, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 101–128, 2004.
- [4] Bai, Y. Q., and Roos, C., A primal-dual interior-point method based on a new kernel function with linear growth rate, In L. Caccetta and V. Rehbock, editors, *Industrial Optimisation Volume 1. Proceedings of Symposium on Industrial Optimisation and the 9TH Australian Optimisation Day*, Curtin University of Technology, Australia, Western Australian Centre of Excellence in Industrial Optimisation, pp. 15–28, 2005.
- [5] Ben-Tal, A., and Nemirovski, A., *Lectures on modern convex optimization*, MPS/SIAM Series on Optimization. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2001. Analysis, algorithms, and engineering applications.
- [6] Boyd, S. E., El Ghaoui, L., Feron, E., and Balakrishnan, V., *Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory*, SIAM Studies in Applied Mathematics. SIAM, Philadelphia, USA, 1994.
- [7] Boyd, S. E., and Vandenberghe, L., *Convex optimization*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [8] Boyd, S. E., and Vandenberghe, L., Semidefinite programming, *SIAM Review*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 49–96, 1996.
- [9] De Klerk, E., *Aspects of Semidefinite Programming*, volume 65 of *Applied Optimization*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2002.

- [10] De Klerk, E., Roos, C., and Terlaky, T., Initialization in semidefinite programming via a self-dual skew-symmetric embedding, *Operations Research Letters*, Vol. 20, pp. 213–221, 1997.
- [11] Elabwabi, G., *Topics in global optimization using semidefinite optimization*, PhD thesis, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, TU Delft, NL-2628 CD Delft, The Netherlands, March 2007.
- [12] Haeberley, J.-P. A., Alizadeh, F., and Overton, M. L., Complementarity and nondegeneracy in semidefinite programming, *Mathematical Programming*, Vol. 77, pp. 111–128, 1997.
- [13] Goemans, M. X., and Williamson, D. P., Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming, *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery*, Vol. 42, No. 6, pp. 1115–1145, 1995.
- [14] Helmberg, C., Semidefinite programming for combinatorial optimization. Technical Report 00-34, Konrad-Zuse-Zentrum für Informationstechnik Berlin, Takustraße 7, D-14195 Berlin, Germany, Germany, Oktober 2000.
- [15] Helmberg, C., Rendl, F., Vanderbei, R. J., and Wolkowicz, H., An interior point method for semidefinite programming, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, Vol. 6, pp. 342–361, 1994.
- [16] Horn, R. A., and Johnson, C. R., *Topics in Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1991.
- [17] Jansen, B., Roos, C., Terlaky, T., and Vial, J.-Ph., Primal-dual algorithms for linear programming based on the logarithmic barrier method, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, Vol. 83, pp. 1–26, 1994.
- [18] Jarre, F., An interior-point method for minimizing the largest eigenvalue of a linear combination of matrices, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, Vol. 31, pp. 1360–1377, 1993.
- [19] Karisch, E. S., Rendl, F., and Clausen, J., Solving graph bisection problems with semidefinite programming, *INFORMS Journal Computing*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 177–191, 2000.
- [20] Kojima, M., Megiddo, N., and Mizuno, S., A primal-dual infeasible-interior-point algorithm for linear programming, *Mathematical Programming*, Vol. 61, pp. 263–280, 1993.
- [21] Kojima, M., Mizuno, S., and Yoshise, A., A primal-dual interior point algorithm for linear programming, In N. Megiddo, editor, *Progress in Mathematical Programming: Interior Point and Related Methods*, Springer Verlag, New York, pp. 29–47, 1989.
- [22] Kojima, M., Shida, M., and Shindoh, M., Local convergence of predictor-corrector infeasible interior-point algorithm for SDPs and SDLCPs, *Mathematical Programming, Series A*, Vol. 80, pp. 129–160, 1998.
- [23] Kojima, M., Shindoh, M., and Hara, S., Interior point methods for the monotone linear complementarity problem in symmetric matrices, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, Vol. 7, pp. 86–125, 1997.

- [24] Lasserre, J. B., and Prieto-Rumeau, T., SDP vs. LP Relaxations for the moment approach in some performance evaluation problems, *Stochastic Models*, Vol. 20, pp. 439–456, 2004.
- [25] Lasserre, J. B., Global optimization with polynomials and the problems of moments, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, Vol. 11, pp. 796–817, 2001.
- [26] Lissner, A., and F. Rendl, F., Graph partitioning using linear and semidefinite programming, *Mathematical Programming, Series B*, Vol. 95, No. 1, pp. 91–101, 2003. ISMP 2000, Part 3 (Atlanta, GA).
- [27] Luo, Z. Q., Sturm, J. F., and Zhang, S., Conic convex programming and self-dual embedding, *Optimization Methods and Software*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 196–218, 2000.
- [28] Lustig, I. J., Feasible issues in primal-dual interior point method for linear programming, *Mathematical Programming*, Vol. 49, pp. 145–162, 1990/91.
- [29] Lütkepohl, H., *Handbook of matrices*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1996.
- [30] Mansouri, H., and Roos, C., Simplified $O(n)$ infeasible interior-point algorithm for linear optimization using full-Newton step, *Optimization Methods and Software*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 519–530, 2007.
- [31] Mansouri, H. *Full-Newton Step Interior-Point Methods for Conic Optimization*, PhD thesis, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, TU Delft, NL–2628 CD Delft, The Netherlands, June 2008.
- [32] Megiddo, N., Pathways to the optimal set in linear programming. In N. Megiddo, editor, *Progress in Mathematical Programming: Interior Point and Related Methods*, pages 131–158. Springer Verlag, New York, 1989. Identical version in : *Proceedings of the 6th Mathematical Programming Symposium of Japan, Nagoya, Japan*, pp. 1–35, 1986.
- [33] Mizuno, S., Polynomiality of infeasible interior point algorithms for linear programming, *Mathematical Programming*, Vol. 67, pp. 109–119, 1994.
- [34] Mizuno, S., Todd, M. J., and Ye, Y., On adaptive-step primal-dual interior-point algorithms for linear programming, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, Vol. 18, pp. 964–981, 1993.
- [35] Monteiro, R. D. C., and Adler, I., Interior-path following primal-dual algorithms : Part I : Linear programming, *Mathematical Programming*, Vol. 44, pp. 27–41, 1989.
- [36] Nesterov, Y., and Todd, M. J., Primal-dual interior point methods for self-scaled cones, *SIAM Journal on optimization*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 324–364, 1998.
- [37] Nesterov Y. E., and Nemirovski, A., *Interior Point Polynomial Methods in Convex Programming : Theory and Algorithms*, SIAM Publications. SIAM, Philadelphia, USA, 1993.
- [38] Parrilo, P. A., Semidefinite programming relaxations for semialgebraic problems. *Mathematical Programming*, Vol. 96, pp. 293–320, 2003.
- [39] Peña, J., Vera, J., and Zuluaga, L. F., Computing the stability number of a graph via linear and semidefinite programming, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 87–105 (electronic), 2007.

- [40] Peng, J., Roos, C., and Terlaky, T., Self-regular functions and new search directions for linear and semidefinite optimization, *Mathematical Programming, Series A*, Vol. 93, No. 1, pp. 129–171, 2002.
- [41] Peng, J., , Roos, C., and Terlaky, T., *Self-Regularity. A New Paradigm for Primal-Dual Interior-Point Algorithms*, Princeton University Press, 2002.
- [42] Potra, F. A., A quadratically convergent predictor-corrector method for solving linear programs from infeasible starting points, *Mathematical Programming, series A*, Vol. 67, No. 3, pp. 383–406, 1994.
- [43] Potra, F. A., An infeasible-interior-point predictor-corrector algorithm for linear programming, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* , Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 19–32, 1996.
- [44] Potra, F. A., and Sheng, R., A superlinearly convergent primal-dual infeasible-interior-point algorithm for semidefinite programming, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, Vol. 8, pp. 1007–1028, 1998.
- [45] Roos, C., A full-Newton step $O(n)$ infeasible interior-point algorithm for linear optimization, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 1110–1136.
- [46] Roos, C., Terlaky, T., and Vial, J.-Ph., *Theory and Algorithms for Linear Optimization. An Interior-Point Approach*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK, 1997 (2nd Edition, Springer, 2005).
- [47] Sturm, J. F., and Zhang, S., Symmetric primal-dual path following algorithms for semidefinite programming, *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 301–315, 1999.
- [48] Suzuka, A., Ryuhei, M., Yoshise, A., and Tomomi, M., Semidefinite programming based approaches to home-away assignment problems in sports scheduling, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Vol. 3521, pp. 95–103, 2005.
- [49] Tanabe, K., Centered Newton method for mathematical programming, *In System Modelling and Optimization*, pp. 197–206, 1988.
- [50] Tanabe, K., Centered Newton method for linear programming: Interior and 'exterior' point method (in Japanese), *In: New Methods for Linear Programming. K. Tone (Ed.) 3*, pp. 98–100, 1990.
- [51] Todd, M. J., Semidefinite optimization, *Acta Numerica*, Vol. 10, pp. 515–560, 2001.
- [52] Todd, M. J., Toh, K. C., and Tutuncu, R. H., On the Nesterov-Todd direction in semidefinite programming, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 769–796, 1998.
- [53] Vandenberghe, L., and Boyd, S., A primal-dual potential reduction method for problems involving matrix inequalities, *Mathematical Programming, Series B*, Vol. 69, pp. 205–236, 1995.
- [54] Wang, G. Q., Bai, Y. Q., and Roos, C., Primal-dual interior-point algorithms for semidefinite optimization based on a simple kernel function, *Journal of Mathematical Modelling and Algorithms*, Vol. 4, pp. 409–433, 2005.

- [55] Wolkowicz, H., Saigal, R., and Vandenberghe, L., *Handbook of semidefinite programming*, International Series in Operations Research & Management Science, 27. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA, 2000.
- [56] Ye, Y., Todd, M. J., and Mizuno, S., An $O(\sqrt{n}L)$ -iteration homogeneous and self-dual linear programming algorithm, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, Vol. 19, pp. 53–67, 1994.
- [57] Zhang, Y., On the convergence of a class of infeasible-interior-point methods for the horizontal linear complementarity problem, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, Vol. 4, pp. 208–227, 1994.
- [58] Zhang, Y., On extending primal-dual interior-point algorithms from linear programming to semidefinite programming, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 365–386, 1998.
- [59] Zhao, Z., Braams, B. J., Fukuda, M., Overton, M. L., and Percus, J. K., The reduced density matrix method for electronic structure calculations and role of three-index representability, *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, Vol. 120, pp. 2095–2104, 2004.