

Accelerating Inexact Successive Quadratic Approximation for Regularized Optimization Through Manifold Identification

Ching-pei Lee

Abstract For regularized optimization that minimizes the sum of a smooth term and a regularizer that promotes structured solutions, inexact proximal-Newton-type methods, or successive quadratic approximation (SQA) methods, are widely used for their superlinear convergence in terms of iterations. However, unlike the counter parts in smooth optimization, they suffer from lengthy running time in solving regularized subproblems because even approximate solutions cannot be computed easily, so their empirical time cost is not as impressive. In this work, we first show that for partly smooth regularizers, although general inexact solutions cannot identify the active manifold that makes the objective function smooth, approximate solutions generated by commonly-used subproblem solvers will identify this manifold, even with arbitrarily low solution precision. We then utilize this property to propose an improved SQA method, ISQA⁺, that switches to efficient smooth optimization methods after this manifold is identified. We show that for a wide class of degenerate solutions, ISQA⁺ possesses superlinear convergence not only in iterations, but also in running time because the cost per iteration is bounded. In particular, our superlinear convergence result holds on problems satisfying a sharpness condition that is more general than that in existing literature. We also prove iterate convergence under a sharpness condition for inexact SQA, which is novel for this family of methods that could easily violate the classical relative-error condition frequently used in proving convergence under similar conditions. Experiments on real-world problems confirm that ISQA⁺ greatly improves the state of the art for regularized optimization.

Keywords Variable metric · Manifold identification · Regularized optimization · Inexact method · Superlinear convergence

Mathematics Subject Classification 49M15 · 90C55 · 49K40 · 90C31 · 90C55 · 65K05

1 Introduction

Consider the following regularized optimization problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{E}} F(x) := f(x) + \Psi(x), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{E} is a Euclidean space with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and its induced norm $\|\cdot\|$, the regularizer Ψ is extended-valued, convex, proper, and lower-semicontinuous, f is continuously differentiable with Lipschitz-continuous gradients, and the solution set Ω is non-empty. This type of problems is ubiquitous in applications such as machine learning and signal processing (see, for example, [8, 9, 40]). One widely-used method for (1) is inexact successive quadratic approximation (ISQA). At the t th iteration with iterate x^t , ISQA obtains the update direction p^t by approximately solving

$$p^t \approx \arg \min_{p \in \mathcal{E}} Q_{H_t}(p; x^t), \quad (2)$$

$$Q_{H_t}(p; x^t) := \langle \nabla f(x^t), p \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle p, H_t p \rangle + \Psi(x^t + p) - \Psi(x^t), \quad (3)$$

where H_t is a self-adjoint positive-semidefinite linear endomorphism of \mathcal{E} . The iterate is then updated along p^t with a step size $\alpha_t > 0$.

ISQA is among the most efficient for (1). Its variants differ in the choice of H_t and α_t , and how accurately (2) is solved. In this class, proximal Newton (PN) [22, 26] and proximal quasi-Newton (PQN) [38] are popular for their fast convergence in iterations. Regrettably, their subproblem has no closed-form solution as H_t is non-diagonal, so one needs to use an iterative solver for (2) and the running time to reach the accuracy requirement

Version of June 27, 2026. This work was supported in part by NSTC of R.O.C. grants 109-2222-E-001-003-MY3 and 111-2628-E-001-003-, and Academia Sinica grant AS-GCS-111-M05.

Ching-pei Lee

E-mail: leechingpei@gmail.com. Institute of Statistical Mathematics, Tokyo, Japan

can hence be lengthy. For example, to attain the same superlinear convergence as truncated Newton for smooth optimization, PN that takes $H_t = \nabla^2 f$ requires increasing accuracies for the subproblem solution, implying a growing and unbounded number of inner iterations of the subproblem solver. Its superlinear convergence thus gives little practical advantage in running time. On the contrary, in smooth optimization, one can solve (2) with a bounded cost by either conjugate gradient (CG) or matrix factorizations since $\Psi \equiv 0$. The advantage of second-order methods over the first-order ones in regularized optimization is therefore not as significant as that in smooth optimization.

A possible remedy when Ψ is partly smooth [24] is to switch to smooth optimization after identifying an active manifold \mathcal{M} that contains a solution \hat{x} to (1) and makes Ψ confined to it smooth. We say an algorithm can identify \mathcal{M} if there is a neighborhood U of \hat{x} such that $x^t \in U$ implies $x^{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}$, and call it possesses the manifold identification property. Unfortunately, for ISQA, this property in general only holds when (2) is always solved exactly. Indeed, even if each p^t is arbitrarily close to the corresponding exact solution, it is possible that no iterate lies in the active manifold, as shown below.

Example 1 Consider the following simple example of (1) with $\Psi(\cdot) = \|\cdot\|_1$:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} (x_1 - 2.5)^2 + (x_2 - 0.3)^2 + \|x\|_1,$$

whose only solution is $\hat{x} = (2, 0)$, and $\|x\|_1$ is smooth relative to $\mathcal{M} = \{x \mid x_2 = 0\}$ around \hat{x} . Consider $\{x^t\}$ with $x_1^t = 2 + f(t)$, $x_2^t = f(t)$, for some $f(t) > 0$ with $f(t) \downarrow 0$, and let $H_t \equiv I$, $\alpha_t \equiv 1$, and $p^t = x^{t+1} - x^t$. The optimum of (2) is $p^{t*} = \hat{x} - x^t$, so $\|x^t - \hat{x}\| = O(f(t))$ and $\|p^t - p^{t*}\| = O(f(t))$. As f is arbitrary, both the subproblem approximate solutions and their corresponding objectives converge to the optimum arbitrarily fast, but $x^t \notin \mathcal{M}$ for all t . \square

Moreover, some versions of inexact PN generalize the stopping condition of CG for truncated Newton to require $\|r^t\| \rightarrow 0$, where

$$r^t := \arg \min_r \|r\|, \quad \text{subject to} \quad r \in \partial_p Q_{H_t}(p^t; x^t), \quad (4)$$

but Example 1 gives a sequence of $\{\|r^t\|\}$ converging to 1, hinting that such a condition might have an implicit relation with manifold identification.

Interestingly, in our numerical experience in [20, 21, 27], ISQA with approximate subproblem solutions, even without an increasing solution precision and on problems that are not strongly convex, often identifies the active manifold rapidly. We thus aim to provide theoretical support for such a phenomenon and utilize it to devise more efficient and practical methods that trace the superior performance of second-order methods in smooth optimization.

In this work, we show that ISQA essentially possesses the manifold identification property, by giving a sufficient condition for inexact solutions of (2) in ISQA to identify the active manifold that is satisfied by the output of most of the widely-used subproblem solvers even if (2) is solved arbitrarily roughly. We also show that $\|r^t\| \downarrow 0$ is indeed sufficient for manifold identification, so PN can achieve superlinear convergence in a more efficient way through this property. When the iterates do not lie in a compact set, it is possible that the iterates do not converge, in which case even algorithms possessing the manifold identification property might fail to identify the active manifold because the iterates never enter a neighborhood that enables the identification. Therefore, we also show convergence of the iterates under a sharpness condition widely-seen in real-world problems that generalizes the quadratic growth condition and the weak sharp minima. Under convexity, this sharpness condition is equivalent to a type of the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz (KL) condition [18, 29], but convergence of general ISQA methods under the KL condition is unknown since the inexactness condition can easily violate the relative-error condition needed in [2, 4], and thus our analysis provides a novel approach to obtain iterate convergence for this family of algorithms. Based on these results, we propose an improved, practical algorithm ISQA^+ that switches to smooth optimization after the active manifold is presumably identified. We show that ISQA^+ is superior to existing PN-type methods as it possesses the same superlinear and even quadratic rates in iterations but has bounded per-iteration cost. ISQA^+ hence also converges superlinearly in running time, which, to our best knowledge, is the first of the kind. Our analysis is more general than existing ones in guaranteeing superlinear convergence in a broader class of degenerate problems. Numerical results also confirm ISQA^+ 's much improved efficiency over PN and PQN.

1.1 Related Work

ISQA for (1) or the special case of constrained optimization has been well-studied, and we refer the readers to [20] for a detailed review of related methods. We mention here in particular the works [7, 22, 26, 47] that provided superlinear convergence results. Lee et al [22] first analyzed the superlinear convergence of PN and PQN. Their analysis considers only strongly convex f , so both the convergence of the iterate and the positive-definiteness

of the Hessian are guaranteed. Their inexact version requires $\|r^t\| \downarrow 0$, which might not happen when the solutions to (2) are only approximate, as illustrated in Example 1. With the same requirement for $\|r^t\|$ as [22], Li et al [26] showed that superlinear convergence for inexact PN can be achieved when f is self-concordant. Byrd et al [7] focused on $\Psi(\cdot) = \|\cdot\|_1$ and showed superlinear convergence of PN under the subproblem stopping condition (10) defined in Section 2, which is achievable as long as p^t is close enough to the optimum of (2). To cope with degenerate cases in which the Hessian is only positive semidefinite, Yue et al [47] used the stopping condition of [7] to propose a damping PN for general Ψ and showed that its iterates converge and achieve superlinear convergence under convexity and the error-bound (EB) condition [30] even if F is not coercive. A common drawback of [7, 22, 26, 47] is that they all require increasing precisions in solving the subproblem, so the superlinear rate is observed only in iterations but not in running time in their experiments. In contrast, by switching to smooth optimization after identifying the active manifold, ISQA⁺ achieves superlinear convergence not only in iterations but also in time, and is thus much more efficient in practice. Our superlinear convergence result also allows a broader range of degeneracy than that in [47].

Although ISQA is intensively studied, its ability for manifold identification is barely discussed because this does not in general hold, as noted in Example 1. Hare [14] showed that ISQA identifies the active manifold under the impractical assumptions that (2) is always solved exactly and the iterates converge, and his analysis cannot be extended to inexact versions. Our observation in [20, 21, 27] that ISQA identifies the active manifold empirically motivated this work to provide theoretical guarantees for this phenomenon.

Manifold identification requires the iterates, or at least a subsequence, to converge to a point of partial smoothness. In most existing analyses for (1), iterate convergence is proven under either: (i) f is convex and the algorithm is a first-order one, (ii) F is strongly convex, or (iii) the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) condition holds. Analyses for the first scenario rely on the implicit regularization of first-order methods such that their iterates lie in a bounded region [28], but this is not applicable to ISQA. Under the second condition, convergence of the objective directly implies that of the iterates. For the third case, convergence of the full iterate sequence is usually proven under an assumption of a relative-error behavior, of the form

$$\min_{v \in \partial F(x^{t+1})} \|v\| \leq b \|x^{t+1} - x^t\|, \forall t$$

for some $b > 0$, as done in [2, 5, 10], but this condition can easily be violated when inexactness kicks in in ISQA, as argued by Bonettini et al [5]. To work around this issue, [5] further assumed that the forward-backward envelope [39] of F satisfies the KL condition and obtained iterate convergence under such a situation, but whether KL condition of F implies that of its forward-backward envelope is unclear. The only exception to get convergence under the KL condition of F for a specific type of SQA method is [47] that shows the convergence of the iterates for their specific algorithm under EB and convexity of f but [47] requires H_t in (2) to be the Hessian of f plus a multiple of identity and their analysis cannot be extended to general H_t . On the other hand, our analysis for iterate convergence is novel and more general in covering a much broader algorithmic framework and requiring only a general sharpness condition for F that contains both EB and the weak-sharp minima [6] as special cases.

Our design of the two-stage ISQA⁺ is inspired by [23, 27] in conjecturing that the active manifold is identified after the current manifold remains unchanged, but the design of the first stage is quite different and we also add in additional safeguards in the second stage. Lee and Wright [23] used dual averaging in the first stage for optimizing the expected value of an objective function involving random variables, so their algorithm is more suitable for stochastic settings. Li et al [27] focused on distributed optimization and their usage of manifold identification is for reducing the communication cost, instead of accelerating general regularized optimization considered in this work.

1.2 Outline

This work is outlined as follows. In Section 2, we describe the algorithmic framework and give preliminary properties. Technical results in Section 3 prove the manifold identification property of ISQA and the convergence of the iterates. We then describe the proposed ISQA⁺ and show its superlinear convergence in running time in Section 4. The effectiveness of ISQA⁺ is then illustrated through extensive numerical experiments in Section 5. Section 6 finally concludes this work. Our implementation of the described algorithms is available at https://www.github.com/leepei/ISQA_plus/.

2 Preliminaries

We denote the minimum of (1) by F^* ; the domain of Ψ by $\text{dom}(\Psi)$; and the set of convex, proper, and lower semicontinuous functions by Γ_0 . For any set C , $\text{relint}(C)$ denotes its relative interior. We will frequently use

the following notations.

$$\delta_t := F(x^t) - F^*, \quad P_\Omega(x) := \arg \min_{y \in \Omega} \|x - y\|, \quad \text{dist}(x, \Omega) := \|x - P_\Omega(x)\|.$$

The level set $\text{Lev}(\xi) := \{x \mid F(x) - F^* \leq \xi\}$ for any $\xi \geq 0$ is closed but not necessarily bounded. A function is L -smooth if it is differentiable with the gradient L -Lipschitz continuous. We denote the identity operator by I . For self-adjoint linear endomorphisms A, B of \mathcal{E} , $A \succ B$ (\succeq) means $A - B$ is positive definite (positive semidefinite). We abbreviate $A \succ \tau I$ to $A \succ \tau$ for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. The set of A with $A \succ 0$ is denoted by \mathcal{S}_{++} . The subdifferential $\partial\Psi(x)$ of Ψ at x is well-defined as $\Psi \in \Gamma_0$, hence so is the generalized gradient $\partial F(x) = \nabla f(x) + \partial\Psi(x)$. For any $g \in \Gamma_0$, $\tau \geq 0$, and $A \in \mathcal{S}_{++}$, the proximal mapping

$$\text{prox}_{\tau g}^A(x) := \arg \min_{y \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{1}{2} \langle x - y, A(x - y) \rangle + \tau g(y) \quad (5)$$

is continuous and finite in \mathcal{E} even outside $\text{dom}(g)$. When $A = I$, (5) is shorten to $\text{prox}_{\tau g}(x)$. For (2), we denote its optimal solution by p^{t*} . When there is no ambiguity, we abbreviate $Q_{H_t}(\cdot; x^t)$ to $Q_t(\cdot)$, $Q_t(p^t)$ to \hat{Q}_t , and $Q_t(p^{t*})$ to Q_t^* .

2.1 Algorithmic Framework

We give out details in defining the ISQA framework by discussing the choice of H_t , the subproblem solver and its stopping condition, and how sufficient objective decrease is ensured. We consider the algorithm a two-level loop procedure, where the outer loop updates the iterate x^t and the iterations of the subproblem solver form the inner loop.

After obtaining p^t from (2), we need to find a step size $\alpha_t > 0$ for it to ensure sufficient objective decrease. Given $\gamma, \beta \in (0, 1)$, we take α_t as the largest value in $\{\beta^0, \beta^1, \dots\}$ satisfying an Armijo-like condition.

$$F(x^t + \alpha_t p^t) \leq F(x^t) + \gamma \alpha_t Q_t(p^t). \quad (6)$$

This condition is satisfied by all α_t small enough as long as $Q_t(p^t) < 0$ and $Q_t(\cdot)$ is strongly convex; see [20, Lemma 3].

For the choice of H_t , we only make the following blanket assumption without further specification to make our analysis more general.

$$\exists M, m > 0, \quad \text{such that} \quad M \succeq H_t \succeq m, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (7)$$

For (2), any suitable solver for regularized optimization, such as (accelerated) proximal gradient, (variance-reduced) stochastic gradient methods, and their variants, can be used, and the following are common for their inner loop termination:

$$\hat{Q}_t - Q_t^* \leq \epsilon_t, \quad (8)$$

$$\|r^t\| \leq \epsilon_t, \quad \text{or} \quad (9)$$

$$G_{H_t}^\tau(p^t; x^t) := \|p^t - \bar{p}_\tau^t\| \leq \epsilon_t, \quad (10)$$

for some given $\epsilon_t \geq 0$ and $\tau > 0$, where

$$\bar{p}_\tau^t := \text{prox}_{\tau\Psi}((x^t + p^t) - \tau(\nabla f(x^t) + H_t p^t)) - x^t. \quad (11)$$

The point \bar{p}_τ^t in (11) is computed by taking a proximal gradient step of the subproblem (2) from p^t , and thus $\bar{p}_\tau^t - p^t$ is the proximal gradient (with step size τ) of Q_t at p^t . Because the subproblem is strongly convex, the norm of the proximal gradient is zero at p^t if and only if p^t is the unique solution to the subproblem. We will see in the next subsection that the norm of this proximal gradient squared is also equivalent to the objective distance to the optimum of the subproblem. We summarize this framework in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: A Framework of ISQA for (1)

input : $x^0 \in \mathcal{E}$, $\gamma, \beta \in (0, 1)$
for $t = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
 $\alpha_t \leftarrow 1$, pick $\epsilon_t \geq 0$ and H_t , and solve (2) for p^t satisfying (8), (9), or (10)
 while (6) is not satisfied **do** $\alpha_t \leftarrow \beta \alpha_t$
 $x^{t+1} \leftarrow x^t + \alpha_t p^t$

2.2 Basic Properties

Under (7), (3) is m -strongly convex with respect to p , so the following standard results hold for any $\tau \in (0, 1/M]$ and any $p^t \in \mathcal{E}$ [12, 32].

$$\|r^t\|^2 \geq 2m(Q_t(p^t) - Q_t^*) \geq \frac{m}{M} G_{H_t}^\tau(p^t; x^t)^2, \quad (12)$$

$$G_{H_t}^\tau(p^t; x^t)^2 \geq \tau \left(\frac{(2m^{-1} + \tau)(1 + M\tau)}{\tau} - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} (Q_t(\bar{p}_\tau^t) - Q_t^*). \quad (13)$$

Therefore, (10) and (8) are almost equivalent and implied by (9), while Example 1 has shown that (9) is a stronger condition not implied by (8). Although (13) does not show that (10) directly implies (8), once (10) is satisfied, we can use it to find \bar{p}_τ^t satisfying (8) from p^t .

A central focus of this work is manifold identification, so we first formally define manifolds following [42]. A set $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a p -dimensional \mathcal{C}^k manifold around $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ if there is a \mathcal{C}^k function $\Phi: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m-p}$ whose derivative at x is surjective such that for y close enough to x , $y \in \mathcal{M}$ if and only if $\Phi(y) = 0$. Through the implicit function theorem, we can also use a \mathcal{C}^k parameterization $\phi: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, with $\phi(y) = x$ and the derivative injective at y , to describe a neighborhood of x on \mathcal{M} . In our definition and proof below, we will require the function being (subdifferentially) regular and prox-regular at a point x . These two conditions are satisfied by convex functions everywhere and thus we do not provide their definitions here, and interested readers can refer to [37, Definition 7.25, Definition 13.27] for details. Now we are ready for the definition of partial smoothness [24] that we assume for the regularizer when discussing manifold identification.

Definition 1 (Partly smooth) A function Ψ is partly smooth at a point x^* relative to a set \mathcal{M} containing x^* if $\partial\Psi(x^*) \neq \emptyset$ and:

1. Around x^* , \mathcal{M} is a \mathcal{C}^2 -manifold and $\Psi|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is \mathcal{C}^2 .
2. The affine span of $\partial\Psi(x)$ is a translate of the normal space to \mathcal{M} at x^* .
3. $\partial\Psi$ is continuous at x^* relative to \mathcal{M} .
4. Ψ is regular at all points $x \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\partial\Psi(x) \neq \emptyset$ around x^* .

Intuitively, it means Ψ is smooth around x^* in \mathcal{M} but changes drastically along directions leaving the manifold. We also call this \mathcal{M} the active manifold.

As the original identification results in [15, Theorem 5.3] and [25, Theorem 4.10] require the sum F to be partly smooth but our setting does not require so for f , we first provide a result relaxing the conditions to ensure identification in our scenario.

Lemma 1 Consider (1) with $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$ and Ψ partly smooth at a point x^* relative to a \mathcal{C}^2 -manifold \mathcal{M} . If Ψ is prox-regular at x^* , the nondegenerate condition

$$0 \in \text{relint}(\partial F(x^*)) = \nabla f(x^*) + \text{relint}(\partial\Psi(x^*)) \quad (14)$$

holds, and there is a sequence $\{x^t\}$ converging to x^* with $F(x^t) \rightarrow F(x^*)$, then

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^t)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x^t \in \mathcal{M} \text{ for all } t \text{ large.}$$

Proof We first observe that as $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$, $x^t \rightarrow x^*$ implies $f(x^t) \rightarrow f(x^*)$, whose combination with $F(x^t) \rightarrow F(x^*)$ further implies $\Psi(x^t) \rightarrow \Psi(x^*)$. Therefore, the premises of [25, Theorem 4.10] on Ψ are satisfied. We then note that

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^t)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \text{dist}(-\nabla f(x^t), \partial\Psi(x^t)) \rightarrow 0. \quad (15)$$

Again from that $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$, $x^k \rightarrow x^*$ implies $\nabla f(x^k) \rightarrow \nabla f(x^*)$, so by (14), (15) is further equivalent to

$$\text{dist}(-\nabla f(x^*), \partial\Psi(x^t)) \rightarrow 0,$$

which is the necessary and sufficient condition for $x^t \in \mathcal{M}$ for all t large in [25, Theorem 4.10] because (14) indicates that $-\nabla f(x^*) \in \text{relint}(\partial\Psi(x^*))$. We then apply that theorem to obtain the desired result. Here we note that for the requirements \square

Using Lemma 1, we further state an identification result for (1) under our setting without the need to check whether $\{F(x^t)\}$ converges to $F(x^*)$. This will be useful in our later theoretical development.

Lemma 2 Consider (1) with $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$ and $\Psi \in \Gamma_0$. If Ψ is partly smooth relative to a manifold \mathcal{M} at a point x^* satisfying (14), and there is a sequence $\{x^t\}$ converging to x^* , then we have

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^t)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad x^t \in \mathcal{M} \text{ for all } t \text{ large.}$$

Proof As $\Psi \in \Gamma_0$, it is subdifferentially continuous at $x^* \in \text{dom}(\Psi)$ by [37, Example 13.30]. Thus, $\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^t)) \rightarrow 0 \in \partial F(x^*)$ and $x^t \rightarrow x^*$ imply that $F(x^t) \rightarrow F(x^*)$. The desired result is then obtained by applying Lemma 1. \square

We note that the requirement of the above two lemmas is partial smoothness of Ψ , instead of F , at x^* . Therefore, it is possible that $F|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is not \mathcal{C}^2 , as we only require $\Psi|_{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathcal{C}^2$ and f being L -smooth.

3 Manifold Identification of ISQA

Our first major result is the manifold identification property of Algorithm 1. We start with showing that the strong condition (9) with $\epsilon_t \downarrow 0$ is sufficient.

Theorem 1 Consider a point x^* satisfying (14) with $\Psi \in \Gamma_0$ partly smooth at x^* relative to some manifold \mathcal{M} . Assume f is locally L -smooth for $L > 0$ around x^* . If Algorithm 1 is run with the condition (9) and (7) holds, then there exist $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ such that $\|x^t - x^*\| \leq \delta, \epsilon_t \leq \epsilon$, and $\alpha_t = 1$ imply $x^{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proof Since each iteration of Algorithm 1 is independent of the previous ones, we abuse the notation to let x^t be the input of Algorithm 1 at the t th iteration and p^t the corresponding inexact solution to (2), but x^{t+1} is irrelevant to p^t or α_t . Assume for contradiction the statement is false. Then there exist a sequence $\{x^t\} \subset \mathcal{E}$ converging to x^* , a nonnegative sequence $\{\epsilon_t\}$ converging to 0, a sequence $\{H_t\} \subset \mathcal{S}_{++}$ satisfying (7), and a sequence $\{p^t\} \subset \mathcal{E}$ such that $Q_{H_t}(p^t; x^t)$ in (3) satisfies (9) for all t , yet $x^t + p^t \notin \mathcal{M}$ for all t . From (4),

$$r^t - \nabla f(x^t) - H_t p^t \in \partial \Psi(x^t + p^t), \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (16)$$

Therefore, we get from (16) that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^t + p^t)) &= \text{dist}(-\nabla f(x^t + p^t), \partial \Psi(x^t + p^t)) \\ &\leq \|-\nabla f(x^t + p^t) - (r^t - \nabla f(x^t) - H_t p^t)\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(x^t + p^t) - \nabla f(x^t)\| + \|r^t\| + \|H_t\| \|p^t\| \\ &\leq (L + M) \|p^t\| + \|r^t\|. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

From (7) and the convexity of Ψ , $Q_{H_t}(\cdot; x^t)$ is m -strongly convex, which implies

$$Q_{H_t}(p; x^t) - Q_{H_t}(p^{t*}; x^t) \geq \frac{m}{2} \|p - p^{t*}\|^2, \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (18)$$

Combining (18) and (12) shows that

$$m^{-1} \|r^t\| + \|p^{t*}\| \geq \|p^t\|. \quad (19)$$

Since $\{x^t\}$ converges to x^* , by the argument in [43, Lemma 3.2], we get

$$p^{t*} = O(\|x^t - x^*\|) \quad (20)$$

whenever x^t is close enough to x^* . Thus (19), (20), (9), and that $\epsilon_t \downarrow 0$ imply

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|p^t\| = 0, \quad (21)$$

Substituting (9) and (21) into (17) gives $\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^t)) \rightarrow 0$, and by (21) we also get $x^t + p^t \rightarrow x^* + 0 = x^*$. Therefore Lemma 2 implies that $x^t + p^t \in \mathcal{M}$ for all t large enough, proving the desired contradiction. \square

Theorem 1 shows that if a variant of PN or PQN needs $\|r^t\| \downarrow 0$ to achieve superlinear convergence, \mathcal{M} will be identified in the middle, so one can reduce the running time by switching to smooth optimization that can be conducted more efficiently while possessing the same superlinear convergence. Moreover, although Theorem 1 shows that (9) is sufficient for identifying the active manifold, it might never be satisfied as Example 1 showed. We therefore provide another sufficient condition for ISQA to identify the active manifold that is satisfied by most of the widely-used solvers for (2), showing that ISQA essentially possesses the manifold identification property. This result uses the condition (8), which is weaker than (4), and we follow [20] to define $\{\epsilon_t\}$ using a given $\eta \in [0, 1)$:

$$\epsilon_t = \eta(Q_t(0) - Q_t^*) = -\eta Q_t^*. \quad (22)$$

As argued in [20] and practically adopted in various implementations including [13, 19, 21], it is easy to ensure that (8) with (22) holds for some $\eta < 1$ under (7) (although the explicit value might be unknown) if we apply a linear-convergent subproblem solver with at least a pre-specified number of iterations to (2).

Theorem 2 Consider the setting of Theorem 1. If Algorithm 1 is run with (8) and (22) for some $\eta \in [0, 1)$, (7) holds, and the update direction p^t satisfies

$$x^t + p^t = \text{prox}_{\Psi}^{\Lambda_t} (y^t - \Lambda_t^{-1} (\nabla f(x^t) + H_t(y^t - x^t) + s^t)), \quad (23)$$

where s^t satisfies $\|s^t\| \leq R(\|y^t - (x^t + p^{t*})\|)$ for some $R : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ continuous in its domain with $R(0) = 0$, $\Lambda_t \in \mathcal{S}_{++}$ with $M_1 \succeq \Lambda_t$ for $M_1 > 0$, and y^t satisfies

$$\|(y^t - x^t) - p^{t*}\| \leq \eta_1 (Q_t(0) - Q_t^*)^\nu \quad (24)$$

for some $\nu > 0$ and $\eta_1 \geq 0$, then there exists $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ such that $\|x^t - x^*\| \leq \delta$, $|Q_t^*| \leq \epsilon$, and $\alpha_t = 1$ imply $x^{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proof Suppose the statement is not true for contradiction. Then there exist a continuous function $R : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $R(0) = 0$, $\eta_1 \geq 0$, $M_1 > 0$, a sequence $\{x^t\} \subset \mathcal{E}$ converging to x^* , a sequence $\{H_t\} \subset \mathcal{S}_{++}$ satisfying (7) and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \min_p Q_{H_t}(p; x^t) = 0, \quad (25)$$

three sequences $\{p^t\}, \{y^t\}, \{s^t\} \subset \mathcal{E}$ and a sequence $\{\Lambda_t\} \subset \mathcal{S}_{++}$ with $M_1 \succeq \Lambda_t$ such that (8) with (22) and (23)-(24) hold, yet $x^t + p^t \notin \mathcal{M}$ for all t . We abuse the notation to let p^{t*} and Q_t^* respectively denote the optimal solution and objective value for $\min_p Q_{H_t}(p; x^t)$, but x^{t+1} is irrelevant to p^t or α_t .

The optimality condition of (5) applied to (23) indicates that

$$-\Lambda_t(x^t - y^t) - (\nabla f(x^t) + H_t(y^t - x^t) + s^t) \in \partial\Psi(x^t + p^t). \quad (26)$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^t + p^t)) \\ & \leq \|\nabla f(x^t + p^t) - \Lambda_t(x^t + p^t - y^t) - \nabla f(x^t) - H_t(y^t - x^t) - s^t\| \\ & \leq \|\nabla f(x^t + p^t) - \nabla f(x^t)\| + M_1(\|x^t - y^t\| + \|p^t\|) + M\|y^t - x^t\| + \|s^t\| \\ & \leq (L + M_1)\|p^t\| + (M + M_1)\|y^t - x^t\| + \|s^t\|. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

For the first two terms in (27), the triangle inequality and (18) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|p^t\| & \leq \|p^t - p^{t*}\| + \|p^{t*}\| \leq \sqrt{2m^{-1}}\sqrt{Q_t(p^t) - Q_t^*} + \sqrt{2m^{-1}}\sqrt{0 - Q_t^*} \\ & \stackrel{(22)}{\leq} (\sqrt{\eta} + 1)\sqrt{2m^{-1}}\sqrt{-Q_t^*}, \text{ and} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

$$\|y^t - x^t\| \leq \|(y^t - x^t) - p^{t*}\| + \|p^{t*}\| \stackrel{(24)}{\leq} \eta_1 (-Q_t^*)^\nu + \sqrt{2m^{-1}}\sqrt{-Q_t^*}. \quad (29)$$

For the last term in (27), we have from our definition of s^t that

$$\|s^t\| \leq R(\|y^t - (x^t + p^{t*})\|). \quad (30)$$

By substituting (28)-(30) back into (27), clearly there are $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^t + p^t)) \leq C_1\sqrt{-Q_t^*} + C_2(-Q_t^*)^\nu + R(\|y^t - (x^t + p^{t*})\|). \quad (31)$$

Note that $Q_{H_t}(0; x^t) \equiv 0$, so $-Q_t^* \geq 0$ from its optimality and the right-hand side of (31) is well-defined. Next, we see from (25), (24), and the continuity of R that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|(y^t - x^t) - p^{t*}\| = 0, \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} R(\|(y^t - x^t) - p^{t*}\|) = 0. \quad (32)$$

Applying (25) and (32) to (31) and letting t approach infinity then yield

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(0, \partial F(x^t + p^t)) = 0. \quad (33)$$

Next, from (28) and (25), it is also clear that $\|p^t\| \rightarrow 0$, so from the convergence of x^t to x^* we have

$$x^t + p^t \rightarrow x^* + 0 = x^*. \quad (34)$$

Now (34) and (33) allow us to apply Lemma 2 so $x^t + p^t \in \mathcal{M}$ for all t large enough, leading to the desired contradiction. \square

The function R can be seen as a general residual function and we just need from it that s^t approaches 0 with $\|y^t - (x^t + p^{t*})\|$, and Theorem 2 can be used as long as we can show that such an R exists, even if the exact form is unknown. Condition (24) is deliberately chosen to exclude the objective $Q_t(y^t - x^t)$ so that broader algorithmic choices like those with $y^t \notin \text{dom}(\Psi)$ can be included.

One concern for Theorem 2 is the requirement of $|Q_t^*| \leq \epsilon$. Fortunately, for Algorithm 1 with (8) and (22), if α_t are lower-bounded by some $\bar{\alpha} > 0$ (which is true under (7) by [20, Corollary 1]) and F is lower-bounded, then (6) together with (8) and (22) shows that $-Q_t^*$ is summable and thus decreasing to 0.

We now provide several examples satisfying (23)-(24) to demonstrate the usefulness of Theorem 2. In our description below, $p^{t,i}$ denotes the i th iterate of the subproblem solver at the t th outer iteration and $x^{t,i} := x^t + p^{t,i}$.

- Using $x^{t+1} = x^t + \bar{p}_\tau^t$ from (11): Assume we have a tentative p^t that satisfies (10) for some $\hat{\epsilon}_t$, and we use (11) to generate \bar{p}_τ^t as the output satisfying (8) for a corresponding ϵ_t calculated by (13). We see that it is of the form (23) with $s^t = 0$, $y^t = x^t + p^t$, and $\Lambda_t = I/\tau$. From (13) we know that (8) is satisfied, while [12, Corollary 3.6] and (12) guarantees (24) with $\nu = 1/2$.
- Proximal gradient (PG): These methods generate the inner iterates by

$$x^{t,0} = x^t, x^{t,i+1} = \text{prox}_{\Psi}^{\lambda_{t,i}I} (x^{t,i} - \lambda_{t,i}^{-1} (\nabla f(x^t) + H_t(x^{t,i} - x^t))), \forall i > 0,$$

for some $\{\lambda_{t,i}\}$ bounded in a positive range that guarantees $\{Q_t(p^{t,i})\}_i$ is a decreasing sequence for all t (decided through pre-specification, line search, or other mechanisms). Therefore, for any t , no matter what value of i is the last inner iteration, (23) is satisfied with $y^t = x^{t,i-1}$, $s^t = 0$, $\Lambda_{t,i} = \lambda_{t,i-1}I$. The condition (22) holds for some $\eta < 1$ because proximal-gradient-type methods are a descent method with Q -linear convergence on strongly convex problems, and (24) holds for $\eta_1 \sqrt{2\eta/m}$ and $\nu = 1/2$ from (18).

- Accelerated proximal gradient (APG): The iterates are generated by

$$\begin{cases} y^{t,1} &= x^{t,0} = x^t, \\ y^{t,i} &= x^{t,i-1} + \left(1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\kappa(H_t)}+1}\right) (x^{t,i-1} - x^{t,i-2}), \forall i > 1, \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

$$x^{t,i} = \text{prox}_{\Psi}^{\|H_t\|I} \left(y^{t,i} - \|H_t\|^{-1} (\nabla f(x^t) + H_t(y^{t,i} - x^t)) \right), \forall i > 1, \quad (36)$$

where $\kappa(H_t) \geq 1$ is the condition number of H_t . APG satisfies [32]:

$$Q_t(x^{t,i} - x^t) - Q_t^* \leq -2 \left(1 - \kappa(H_t)^{-1/2}\right)^i Q_t^*, \quad \forall i > 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (37)$$

Since $\kappa(H_t) \geq 1$, $p^{t,i}$ satisfies (8) with (22) for all $i \geq \ln 2\sqrt{\kappa(H_t)}$. If such a $p^{t,i}$ is output as our p^t , we see from (36) that (23) holds with $s^t = 0$ and $\Lambda_t = \|H_t\|I$. The only condition to check is hence whether $y^{t,i}$ satisfies (24). The case of $i = 1$ holds trivially with $\eta_1 = \sqrt{2/m}$. For $i > 1$, (24) holds with $\eta_1 = 3\sqrt{2\eta m^{-1}}$ and $\nu = 1/2$ because

$$\begin{aligned} & \|y^{t,i} - (x^t + p^{t*})\| \\ & \stackrel{(35)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\kappa(H_t)}+1}\right) \|x^{t,i-1} - x^{t,i-2}\| + \|x^{t,i-1} - (x^t + p^{t*})\| \\ & \stackrel{(18),(37)}{\leq} (\|x^{t,i-1} - x^t - p^{t*}\| + \|x^{t,i-2} - x^t - p^{t*}\|) + \sqrt{2\eta m^{-1}} \sqrt{-Q_t^*} \\ & \leq 3\sqrt{2\eta m^{-1}} \sqrt{-Q_t^*}. \end{aligned}$$

- Prox-SAGA/SVRG: These methods update the iterates by

$$x^{t,i} = \text{prox}_{\Psi}^{\lambda_t I} (x^{t,i-1} - \lambda_t^{-1} (\nabla f(x^t) + H_t(x^{t,i-1} - x^t) + s^t)),$$

with $x^{t,0} = x^t$, $\{\lambda_t\}$ bounded in a positive range, and $\{s^{t,i}\}$ are random variables converging to 0 as $x^{t,i} - x^t$ approaches p^{t*} . (For a detailed description, see, for example, [36].) It is shown in [45] that for prox-SVRG, $Q_t(x^{t,i} - x^t) - Q_t^*$ converges linearly to 0 with respect to i if λ_t is small enough, so (8) with (22) is satisfied. A similar but more involved bound for prox-SAGA can be derived from the results in [11]. When $p^{t,i} = x^{t,i} - x^t$ for some $i > 0$ is output as p^t , we get $y^t = x^{t,i-1}$, $\Lambda_t = \lambda_t I$, and $s^t = s^{t,i}$ in (23), so the requirements of Theorem 2 hold.

If Ψ is block-separable and \mathcal{M} decomposable into a product of submanifolds that conform with the blocks of Ψ , (23) can be modified easily to suit block-wise solvers like block-coordinate descent. This extension simply adapts the analysis above to the block-wise setting, so the proof is straightforward and omitted for brevity.

3.1 Iterate Convergence

Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 both indicate that for Algorithm 1 to identify \mathcal{M} , we need x^t (or at least a subsequence) to converge to a point x^* of partial smoothness. We thus complement our analysis to show the convergence of the iterates under convexity of f and a local sharpness condition, which is a special case of the KL condition and is universal in real-world problems, without any additional requirement on the algorithm such as the relative-error condition in [2, 4, 5]. In particular, we assume F satisfy the following for some $\zeta, \xi > 0$, and $\theta \in (0, 1]$:

$$\zeta \text{dist}(x, \Omega) \leq (F(x) - F^*)^\theta, \quad \forall x \in \text{Lev}(\xi). \quad (38)$$

This becomes the well-known quadratic growth condition when $\theta = 1/2$, and $\theta = 1$ corresponds to the weak-sharp minima [6]. As discussed in Section 1.1, under convexity of f , [47] showed that the iterates of their PN variant converge to some $x^* \in \Omega$ if F satisfies EB, which is equivalent to the quadratic growth condition in their setting [12]. Our analysis allows broader choices of H_t and (strong) iterate convergence is proven for $\theta \in (1/4, 1]$.

Theorem 3 *Consider Algorithm 1 with any $x^0 \in \mathcal{E}$. Assume that $\Omega \neq \emptyset$, f is convex and L -smooth for $L > 0$, $\Psi \in \Gamma_0$, (7) holds, there is $\eta \in [0, 1)$ such that p^t satisfies (8) with (22) for all t , and that (38) holds for $\xi, \zeta > 0$ and $\theta \in (1/4, 1]$. Then $x^t \rightarrow x^*$ for some $x^* \in \Omega$.*

The convergence in Theorem 3 holds true in infinite dimensional real Hilbert spaces with strong convergence (which is indistinguishable from weak convergence in the finite-dimensional case), and the proof in Appendix B is written in this general scenario. The key of its proof is our following improved convergence rate, which might have its own interest. Except for that the case of $\theta = 1/2$ has been proven by Peng et al [34] and that $\theta = 0$ reduces to the general convex case analyzed in [20], this faster convergence rate is, up to our knowledge, new for ISQA.

Theorem 4 *Consider the settings of Theorem 3 but with $\theta \in [0, 1]$, \mathcal{E} a real Hilbert space and $x^0 \in \text{Lev}(\xi)$. Then there is $\bar{\alpha} > 0$ such that $\alpha_t \geq \bar{\alpha}$ for all t and the following hold.*

1. For $\theta \in (1/2, 1]$: When δ_t is large enough such that

$$\delta_t > (\zeta^2 M^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2\theta-1}}, \quad (39)$$

we have

$$\delta_{t+1} \leq \delta_t \left(1 - \frac{(1-\eta)\alpha_t \gamma \zeta^2 \xi^{1-2\theta}}{2M} \right). \quad (40)$$

Next, let t_0 be the first index failing (39), then for all $t \geq t_0$ we have

$$\delta_{t+1} \leq \delta_t \left(1 - \frac{(1-\eta)\alpha_t \gamma}{2} \right). \quad (41)$$

2. For $\theta = 1/2$, we have global Q -linear convergence of δ_t in the form

$$\frac{\delta_{t+1}}{\delta_t} \leq 1 - (1-\eta)\alpha_t \gamma \cdot \begin{cases} \frac{\zeta^2}{2\|H_t\|}, & \text{if } \zeta^2 \leq \|H_t\|, \\ \left(1 - \frac{\|H_t\|}{2\zeta^2} \right), & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (42)$$

3. For $\theta \in [0, 1/2)$, (41) takes place when δ_t is large enough to satisfy (39). Let t_0 be the first index such that (39) fails, then

$$\frac{\delta_t}{\delta_{t_0}} \leq \left((1-2\theta) \sum_{i=t_0}^{t-1} \alpha_i \right)^{-\frac{1}{1-2\theta}} \leq ((1-2\theta)(t-t_0)\bar{\alpha})^{-\frac{1}{1-2\theta}}, \quad \forall t \geq t_0. \quad (43)$$

For the range of θ in Theorem 3, convergence of the iterates generated by inexact SQA is a new result. Moreover, even if the additional conditions on the forward-backward envelope in [5] also hold, although their analysis also uses the subproblem stopping condition (8), they need a much stricter stopping tolerance of the form

$$\epsilon_t = -\tau_t Q_t^*, \quad \sum \sqrt{\tau_t} < \infty,$$

which clearly requires τ_t to converge to 0 fast enough and thus costs much more time in the subproblem solve. In contrast, we just need ϵ_t to be a constant factor of Q_t^* in (22), so the number of inner iterations and thus the cost of subproblem solve can be a constant.

Algorithm 3: Truncated semismooth Newton on Manifold

input : $x^t \in \mathcal{E}$, $c > 0$, $\rho \in (0, 1]$, $\underline{\alpha}, \beta, \gamma \in (0, 1)$, and a manifold \mathcal{M}
 Obtain parameterization ϕ_t for \mathcal{M} and point y^t with $\phi_t(y^t) = x^t$
 $\alpha_t \leftarrow 1$, and compute g^t in (45)
 Obtain by PCG an approximation solution q^t to (45) satisfying (46)
if $\langle q^t, g^t \rangle \geq 0$ **then** Report MO step fails and exit
while $F(\phi_t(y^t + \alpha_t q^t)) > F(x^t)$ and $\alpha_t > \underline{\alpha}$ **do** $\alpha_t \leftarrow \beta \alpha_t$
if $\alpha_t \leq \underline{\alpha}$ **then** Report MO step fails
else $x^{t+1} \leftarrow \phi_t(y^t + \alpha_t q^t)$

preconditioned CG (PCG, see for example [33, Chapter 5]) to find an approximate solution for

$$\begin{aligned} q^t &\approx \arg \min_q \langle g^t, q \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle q, H_t q \rangle, \quad \text{or equivalently} \quad H_t q^t \approx -g^t, \\ g^t &:= \nabla F(\phi_t(y^t)), \quad H_t := \nabla^2 F(\phi_t(y^t)) + \mu_t I, \quad \mu_t := c \|g^t\|^\rho, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

that satisfies

$$\|H_t q^t + g^t\| \leq 0.1 \min \left\{ \|g^t\|, \|g^t\|^{1+\rho} \right\} \quad (46)$$

with pre-specified $c > 0$ and $\rho \in (0, 1]$. We then run a backtracking line search procedure to find a suitable step size $\alpha_t > 0$. For achieving superlinear convergence, we should accept unit step size whenever possible, so we only require the objective not to increase. If q^t is not a descent direction or α_t is too small, we consider the MO step failed and go back to the first stage. If $\alpha_t < 1$, the superlinear convergence phase is not entered yet, and likely \mathcal{M} has not been correctly identified, so we also switch back to the first stage. This algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 3. When products between $\nabla^2 F(\phi_t(y^t))$ and arbitrary points, required by PCG, cannot be done easily, one can adopt Riemannian quasi-Newton approaches like [17] instead.

4.1 Global Convergence

This section provides global convergence guarantees for Algorithm 2. Because MO steps do not increase the objective value, global convergence of Algorithm 2 follows from the analysis in [20] by treating (44) as solving (2) with $H_t = \hat{L}I$ and noting that this update always satisfies (6) with $\alpha_t = 1$. For completeness, we still state these results, and provide a proof in Appendix C.

First, we restate a result in [20] to bound the number of steps spent in the while-loop for enlarging H_t in Algorithm 2.

Lemma 3 ([20, Lemma 4]) *Given an initial choice H_t^0 for H_t at the t th iteration of Algorithm 2 (so initially we start with $H_t = H_t^0$ and modify it when (6) fails with $\alpha_t = 1$) and a parameter $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Consider the following two variants for enlarging H_t , starting with $\sigma = 1$:*

$$\sigma \leftarrow \beta \sigma, \quad H_t \leftarrow H_t^0 / \sigma, \quad (\text{Variant 1})$$

$$H_t \leftarrow H_t^0 + \sigma^{-1} I, \quad \sigma \leftarrow \beta \sigma. \quad (\text{Variant 2})$$

We then have the following bounds if every time the approximate solution to (2) always satisfies $Q_{H_t}(p^t; x^t) \leq 0$.

1. If H_t^0 satisfies $M_0^t \succeq H_t^0 \succeq m_0^t$ for some $M_0^t \geq m_0^t > 0$, then the final H_t from (Variant 1) satisfies $\|H_t\| \leq M \max\{1, L/(\beta m)\}$, and the while-loop terminates within $\lceil \log_{\beta^{-1}} L/m \rceil$ rounds.
2. If $H_t^0 \succeq 0$, then the final H_t from (Variant 2) satisfies $\|H_t\| \leq M + \max\{1, L/\beta\}$ and the while-loops terminates within $1 + \lceil \log_{\beta^{-1}} L \rceil$ rounds.

Now we provide global convergence guarantees for Algorithm 2 without the need of manifold identification. From Lemma 3, we can simply assume without loss of generality that (7) holds for the final H_t that leads to the final update direction that satisfies (6).

Theorem 5 *Consider (1) with f L -smooth for $L > 0$, $\Psi \in \Gamma_0$, and $\Omega \neq \emptyset$. Assume Algorithm 2 is applied with an initial point x^0 , the estimate \hat{L} satisfies $\hat{L} \succeq L$, (7) holds for the final H_t after exiting the while-loop, and (8) is satisfied with (22) for some $\eta \in [0, 1]$ fixed over t . Let $\{k_t\}$ be the iterations that the MO step is not attempted (so either (2) is solved approximately or (44) is conducted), then we have $k_t \leq 2t$ for all t . By denoting $\tilde{M} := \max\{\hat{L}, M\}$, $\tilde{m} := \min\{\hat{L}, m\}$, we have the following convergence rate guarantees.*

1. Let $G_t := \arg \min_p Q_I(p; x^t)$, then $\|G_{k_t}\| \rightarrow 0$, and for all $t \geq 0$, we have

$$\min_{0 \leq i \leq t} \|G_{k_i}\|^2 \leq \frac{F(x^0) - F^*}{\gamma(t+1)} \frac{\tilde{M}^2 \left(1 + \tilde{m}^{-1} + \sqrt{1 - 2\tilde{M}^{-1} + \tilde{m}^{-2}}\right)^2}{2(1-\eta)\tilde{m}}.$$

Moreover, $G_t = 0$ if and only if $0 \in \partial F(x^t)$, and therefore any limit point of $\{x^{k_t}\}$ is a stationary point of (1).

2. If in addition f is convex and there exists $R_0 \in [0, \infty)$ such that

$$\sup_{x: F(x) \leq F(x^0)} \|x - P_\Omega(x)\| = R_0 \quad (47)$$

(in other words, (38) holds with $\theta = 0$, $\zeta = R_0^{-1}$, and $\xi = F(x^0) - F^*$), then:

2.1. When $F(x^{k_t}) - F^* \geq \tilde{M}R_0^2$, we have

$$F(x^{k_{t+1}}) - F^* \leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma(1-\eta)}{2}\right) (F(x^{k_t}) - F^*).$$

2.2. Let $t_0 := \arg \min_t \{t : F(x^{k_t}) - F^* < \tilde{M}R_0^2\}$, we have for all $t \geq t_0$ that

$$F(x^{k_t}) - F^* \leq \frac{2\tilde{M}R_0^2}{\gamma(1-\eta)(t-t_0)+2}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$t_0 \leq \max \left\{ 0, 1 + \frac{2}{\gamma(1-\eta)} \log \frac{F(x^0) - F^*}{\tilde{M}R_0^2} \right\}.$$

In summary, we have $F(x^t) - F^* = O(t^{-1})$.

3. The results of Theorem 4 hold, with M and $\|H_t\|$ replaced by \tilde{M} , δ_t by δ_{k_t} , α_t and $\bar{\alpha}$ by 1, δ_t by δ_{k_t} , δ_{t+1} by $\delta_{k_{t+1}}$, and δ_{t_0} by $\delta_{k_{t_0}}$.

4.2 Superlinear and Quadratic Convergence

Following the argument in the previous subsection to treat (44) as solving (2) exactly, the manifold identification property of (44) also follows from Theorem 2. We thus focus on its local convergence in this subsection. In what follows, we will show that x^t converges to a stationary point x^* satisfying (14) superlinearly or even quadratically in the second stage.

Let \mathcal{M} be the active manifold of x^* and ϕ be a parameterization of \mathcal{M} with $\phi(y^*) = x^*$ for some point y^* . We can thus assume without loss of generality $\phi_t = \phi$ for all t that identified \mathcal{M} . We denote $F_\phi(y) := F(\phi(y))$. For simplicity, we assume that F_ϕ is twice-differentiable with its Hessian locally Lipschitz continuous around y^* . In particular, we just need the following property to hold locally in a neighborhood U_0 of y^* :

$$\nabla F_\phi(y_1) - \nabla F_\phi(y_2) - \nabla^2 F_\phi(y_2) = O(\|y_1 - y_2\|^2), \quad \forall y_1, y_2 \in U_0. \quad (48)$$

We do not assume $\nabla^2 F_\phi(y^*) \succ 0$ like existing analyses for Newton's method, but consider a degenerate case in which there is a neighborhood U_1 of y^* such that

$$\nabla^2 F_\phi(y) \succeq 0, \quad \forall y \in U_1. \quad (49)$$

Note that (49) implies that F_ϕ is convex within U_1 . We can decompose \mathcal{E} into the direct sum of the tangent and the normal spaces of \mathcal{M} at x^* , and thus its stationarity implies $\nabla F_\phi(y^*) = 0$. This and (49) mean y^* is a local optimum of F_ϕ , and hence x^* is a local minimum of F when f is L -smooth, following the argument of [43, Theorem 2.5]. We also assume that F_ϕ satisfies a sharpness condition similar to (38) in a neighborhood U_2 of y^* :

$$\zeta^{\hat{\theta}} \|y - y^*\| \leq (F_\phi(y) - F(y^*))^{\hat{\theta}}, \quad \forall y \in U_2, \quad (50)$$

for some $\zeta > 0$ and $\hat{\theta} \in (0, 1/2]$.¹ By shrinking the neighborhoods if necessary, we assume without loss of generality that $U_0 = U_1 = U_2$ and denote it by U . Note that the conventional assumption of positive-definite Hessian at y^* is a special case that satisfies (49) and (50) with $\hat{\theta} = 1/2$.

We define $d_t := \|y^t - y^*\|$ and use it to bound $y^t + q^t$ and $\nabla F_\phi(y^t + q^t)$.

¹ $\hat{\theta} > 1/2$ cannot happen unless F_ϕ is a constant in U_2 .

Lemma 4 Consider a stationary point x^* of (1) with Ψ partly smooth at it relative to a manifold \mathcal{M} with a parameterization ϕ and a point y^* such that $\phi(y^*) = x^*$, and assume that within a neighborhood U of y^* , F_ψ is twice-differentiable with (48) and (49) hold. Then $y^t \in U$ implies that any q^t satisfying (46) is bounded by

$$\|q^t\| \leq 2d_t + \mu_t^{-1} O(d_t^2) + 0.1\mu_t^{-1} \|g^t\|^{1+\rho}. \quad (51)$$

Proof From (46), we can find $\psi_t \in \mathcal{E}$ such that

$$H_t q^t + g^t = \psi_t, \quad \|\psi_t\| \leq 0.1 \|g^t\|^{1+\rho}. \quad (52)$$

From (49) and (45), we have

$$H_t \succeq \mu_t \succ 0, \quad (53)$$

so H_t is invertible. We then get

$$\begin{aligned} \|y^t + q^t - y^*\| &\stackrel{(52)}{=} \|H_t^{-1}(\psi_t - g^t + H_t(y^t - y^*))\| \\ &\stackrel{(45)}{\leq} \|H_t^{-1}\| (\|\psi_t\| + \|g^t - \nabla^2 F(\phi_t(y^t)) d_t\| + \mu_t d_t) \\ &\stackrel{(53), (52), (48)}{\leq} 0.1\mu_t^{-1} \|g^t\|^{1+\rho} + \mu_t^{-1} O(d_t^2) + d_t. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

From the triangle inequality, we have $\|q^t\| \leq \|y^t - y^*\| + \|y^t + q^t - y^*\|$, whose combination with (54) proves (51). \square

Lemma 5 Consider the setting of Lemma 4 and further assume that $\Psi \in \Gamma_0$ and f is L -smooth. The following hold.

1. If $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and F_ϕ satisfies (50) with $\hat{\theta} = 1/2$ for some $\zeta > 0$, then

$$\|y^t + q^t - y^*\| = O(d_t^{1+\rho}), \quad \|\nabla F_\phi(y^t + q^t)\| = O(\|g^t\|^{1+\rho}). \quad (55)$$

2. If $\rho = 0.69$ and F_ϕ satisfies (50) for some $\zeta > 0$ and $\hat{\theta} \geq 3/8$, then

$$\|y^t + q^t - y^*\| = o(d_t), \quad \|\nabla F_\phi(y^t + q^t)\| = o(\|g^t\|). \quad (56)$$

Proof From the assumptions on Ψ , ϕ , and f , F_ϕ is twice-differentiable almost everywhere, and within any compact set K containing y^* , any $\nabla^2 F_\phi \in \partial \nabla F_\phi$ is upper-bounded by some $L_K > 0$ ($f(\phi(y))$ is differentiable with the gradient Lipschitz-continuous, and $\nabla^2(\Psi(\phi(y)))$ is upper-bounded), so F_ϕ is L_K -smooth within K . Since K is arbitrary, we let $K \supset U$ and obtain

$$\|g^t\| \leq L_K d_t. \quad (57)$$

Since (49) implies that F_ϕ is convex in U , (50) leads to

$$\|\nabla F_\phi(y)\| \geq \zeta \|y - y^*\|^{(1-\hat{\theta})/\hat{\theta}}, \quad \forall y \in U. \quad (58)$$

For the first case, (57)-(58) show $g^t = \Theta(d_t)$, so Lemma 4 implies

$$\|q^t\| = O(d_t) = O(g^t). \quad (59)$$

Thus, by the triangle inequality, (55) is proven by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla F_\phi(y^t + q^t)\| &= \|\nabla F_\phi(y^t + q^t) + \psi_t - \psi_t\| \\ &\stackrel{(52)}{\leq} \|\nabla F_\phi(y^t + q^t) - g^t - H_t q^t\| + 0.1 \|g^t\|^{1+\rho} \\ &\stackrel{(48), (45)}{\leq} O(\|q^t\|^2) + \mu_t \|q^t\| + 0.1 \|g^t\|^{1+\rho} \stackrel{(59), (45)}{=} O(\|g^t\|^{1+\rho}). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

In the second case, $\hat{\theta}/(1-\hat{\theta}) \geq 3/5$, so (45), Lemma 4 and (57)-(58) imply

$$\|q^t\| = O(d_t^{0.85}). \quad (61)$$

We then get from $\rho = 0.69$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla F_\phi(y^t + q^t)\| &\stackrel{(60)}{\leq} O(\|q^t\|^2) + \mu_t \|q^t\| + 0.1 \|g^t\|^{1.69} \\ &\stackrel{(57), (45), (61)}{=} O(d_t^{1.7}) + 2\mu d_t + O(d_t^2) + O(d_t^{1.69}) = O(d_t^{1.69}). \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

From (58) we get that

$$\|y^t + q^t - y^*\| = O(\|\nabla F_\phi(y^t + q^t)\|^{0.6}) \stackrel{(62)}{\leq} O((d_t^{1.69})^{0.6}) = O(d_t^{1.014}),$$

proving the first equation in (56). The second one is then proven by

$$\|\nabla F_\phi(y^t + q^t)\| \stackrel{(62)}{\leq} O((d_t^{1.69})^{0.6}) \stackrel{(58)}{=} O(\|g^t\|^{1.014}). \quad \square$$

Now we are able to show two-step superlinear convergence of $\|x - x^*\|$.

Theorem 6 *Consider the setting of Lemma 5 and assume in addition that x^* satisfies (14). Then there is a neighborhood V of x^* such that if at the t_0 th iteration of Algorithm 2 for some $t_0 > 0$ we have that $x^{t_0} \in V$, $U_{\text{unchanged}} \geq S$, \mathcal{M} is correctly identified with parameterization ϕ and $\phi(y^*) = x^*$, and $\alpha_t = 1$ is taken in Algorithm 3 for all $t \geq t_0$, we get the following for all $t \geq t_0$.*

1. For $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and F_ϕ satisfying (50) with $\hat{\theta} = 1/2$ for some $\zeta > 0$:

$$\|x^{t+2} - x^*\| = O(\|x^t - x^*\|^{1+\rho}), \quad \|\nabla F_\phi(y^{t+2})\| = O(\|\nabla F_\phi(y^t)\|^{1+\rho}). \quad (63)$$

2. For $\rho = 0.69$ and F_ϕ satisfying (50) for some $\zeta > 0$ and $\hat{\theta} \geq 3/8$,

$$\|x^{t+2} - x^*\| = o(\|x^t - x^*\|).$$

Proof In our discussion below, V_i and U_i for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are respectively neighborhoods of x^* and y^* .

Since ϕ is \mathcal{C}^2 , there is U_1 of y^* such that

$$\phi(y) - \phi(y^*) = \langle \nabla \phi(y^*), y - y^* \rangle + O(\|y - y^*\|^2), \quad \forall y \in U_1. \quad (64)$$

Because the derivative of ϕ at y^* is injective, (64) implies

$$\|\phi(y) - \phi(y^*)\| = \Theta(\|y - y^*\|), \quad \forall y \in U_1. \quad (65)$$

If the t th iteration is a TSSN step, we define y^t to be the point such that $\phi(y^t) = x^t$. If either case in Lemma 5 holds and q^t satisfies (46), from that $\|y^t + q^t - y^*\| = o(\|y^t - y^*\|)$ we can find $U_2 \subset U$ such that $y^t \in U_2$ implies $y^t + q^t \in U_2$. Take $U_3 := U_1 \cap U_2 \subset U$, for $y^t \in U_3$ and $x^{t+1} = \phi(y^t + q^t)$, we get $y^t + q^t \in U_3 \subset U_1$, and hence the following from (65).

$$\|x^{t+1} - x^*\| = \Theta(\|y^t + q^t - y^*\|), \quad \|x^t - x^*\| = \Theta(\|y^t - y^*\|). \quad (66)$$

On the other hand, consider the case in which the t th iteration is a PG step. As ϕ is \mathcal{C}^2 and $\phi(y^*) = x^*$, we can find V_1 such that $\phi(U_3) \supset V_1 \cap \mathcal{M}$. From [43, Lemma 3.2], there is V_2 such that $x^t \in V_2$ implies

$$\|x^{t+1} - x^*\| = O(\|x^t - x^*\|), \quad (67)$$

so there is $V_3 \subset V_2$ such that $x^{t+1} \in V_1$ if $x^t \in V_3$. Therefore, from Theorem 2 (applicable because we have assumed (14)), there is V_4 such that $x^t \in V_4$ implies $x^{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}$. Take $V_5 := V_4 \cap V_3$, then $x^t \in V_5$ implies $x^{t+1} \in V_1 \cap \mathcal{M}$, thus we can find $y^{t+1} \in U_3$ with $\phi(y^{t+1}) = x^{t+1}$.

Now consider the first case in the statement. If at the t th iteration we have $x^t \in V_5$ and have taken (44), then $x^{t+1} \in V_1 \cap \mathcal{M}$ with $x^{t+1} = \phi(y^{t+1})$ for some $y^{t+1} \in U_3$, so we can take a TSSN step at the $(t+1)$ th iteration and

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{t+2} - x^*\| &\stackrel{(66)}{=} \Theta(\|y^{t+1} + q^{t+1} - y^*\|) \stackrel{\text{Lemma 5}}{=} O(\|y^{t+1} - y^*\|^{1+\rho}) \\ &\stackrel{(66)}{=} O(\|x^{t+1} - x^*\|^{1+\rho}) \stackrel{(67)}{=} O(\|x^t - x^*\|^{1+\rho}), \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

so there is $V_6 \subset V_5$ such that $x^t \in V_6$ implies $x^{t+2} \in V_6$ as well and the superlinear convergence in (68) propagates to $t+2, t+4, \dots$. We therefore see that $\|x^{t+2i+1} - x^*\| = O(\|x^{t+2i-1} - x^*\|^{1+\rho})$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ as well, so there is $V_7 \subset V_1$ such that $x^{t+2i-1} \in V_7 \cap \mathcal{M}$ implies $x^{t+2i+1} \in V_7 \cap \mathcal{M}$ as well.

Let $V = V_7 \cap V_6$, we see that $x^t \in V \cap \mathcal{M}$ implies $x^{t+2} \in V \cap \mathcal{M}$ no matter we take PG or TSSN first, proving the first equation in (63). The convergence of ∇F_ϕ then follows from (57) and (58). The superlinear convergence in the second case follows the same argument. \square

Note that when $\rho = 1$ in the first case, we obtain quadratic convergence.

The analysis in [47] assumed directly (58) instead of (50), together with a Lipschitzian Hessian for f , under the setting of regularized optimization to get a superlinear rate. In the context of smooth optimization, our analysis is more general in giving a wider range for superlinear convergence. In particular, for (58), [47] only allowed $\hat{\theta} = 1$, where $\hat{\theta} := \hat{\theta}/(1 - \hat{\theta})$, whereas our result extends the range of superlinear convergence to $\hat{\theta} \geq 0.6$.

Remark 1 PCG returns the exact solution of (45) in d steps, where d is the dimension of \mathcal{M} , and each step involves only a bounded number of basic linear algebra operations, so the running time of Algorithm 3 is upper bounded. Therefore, superlinear convergence of Algorithm 2 in terms of iterations, from Theorem 6, implies that in terms of running time as well. This contrasts with existing PN approaches, as they all require applying an iterative subproblem solver to (2) with increasing precision, which also takes increasing time per iteration because (2) has no closed-form solution.

5 Numerical Results

We conduct numerical experiments on ℓ_1 -regularized logistic regression to support our theory, which is of the form in (1) with $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{R}^d$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Psi(x) = \lambda \|x\|_1, \quad f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 + \exp(-b_i \langle a_i, x \rangle)), \quad (69)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ decides the weight of the regularization and $(a_i, b_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \{-1, 1\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ are the data points. Note that $\lambda \|x\|_1$ is partly smooth at every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ relative to $\mathcal{M}_x := \{y \mid y_i = 0, \forall i \in J_x\}$, where $J_x := \{i \mid x_i = 0\}$. Let I be the identity matrix, and $J_x^C := \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus J_x$, then viewing from the definition of \mathcal{M}_x here, the parameterization we use at each iteration is simply projecting $y_t \in \mathbb{R}^{|J_x^C|}$ back to \mathbb{R}^d . Namely,

$$\phi_t(y_t) := I_{\cdot, J_x^C} y_t.$$

We use public available real-world data sets listed in Table 1.² All experiments are conducted with $\lambda = 1$ in (69). All methods are implemented in C++, and we set $\gamma = 10^{-4}$, $\beta = 0.5$, $T = 5$ throughout for ISQA and ISQA⁺.

5.1 Manifold Identification of Different Subproblem Solvers

We start with examining the ability for manifold identification of different subproblem solvers. We run both ISQA and the first stage of ISQA⁺ (by setting $S = \infty$) and consider two settings for H_t . The first is the L-BFGS approximation with a safeguard in [21], and we set $m = 10$ and $\delta = 10^{-10}$ in their notation following their experimental setting. The second is a PN approach in [47] that uses $H_t = \nabla^2 f(x^t) + c \|x^t - \text{prox}_{\mathcal{M}}(x^t - \nabla f(x^t))\|^\rho I$, and we set $\rho = 0.5$, $c = 10^{-6}$ following their suggestion. In both cases, we enlarge H_t in Algorithm 2 through $H_t \leftarrow 2H_t$.

We compare the following subproblem solvers.

- SpaRSA [44]: a backtracking PG-type method with the initial step sizes estimated by the Barzilai-Borwein method.
- APG [31]: See (35)-(36). We use a simple heuristic of restarting whenever the objective is not decreasing.
- Random-permutation cyclic coordinate descent (RPCD): Cyclic proximal coordinate descent with the order of coordinates reshuffled every epoch.

² Downloaded from <http://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvmtools/datasets/>.

Table 1: Data statistics.

Dataset	#instances (n)	#features (d)
a9a	32,561	123
realsim	72,309	20,958
news20	19,996	1,355,191
ijcnn1	49,990	22
covtype.scale	581,012	54
rcv1-test	677,399	47,226
epsilon	400,000	2,000
webspam	350,000	16,609,143

The results presented in Table 2 show that all subproblem solvers for ISQA^+ can identify the active manifold, verifying Theorem 2. Because the step sizes are mostly one in this experiment, even solvers for ISQA can identify the active manifold. Among the solvers, RPCD is the most efficient and stable in identifying the active manifold, so we stick to it in subsequent experiments.

5.2 Comparing ISQA^+ with Existing Algorithms

We proceed to compare ISQA^+ with the following state of the art for (1) using the relative objective value: $(F(x) - F^*)/F^*$.

- LHAC [38]: an inexact proximal L-BFGS method with RPCD for (2) and a trust-region-like approach. Identical to our L-BFGS variant, we set $m = 10$ for constructing H_t in this experiment.
- NewGLMNET [46]: a line-search PN with an RPCD subproblem solver.

IRPN [47] is another PN method that performs slightly faster than NewGLMNET, but their algorithmic frameworks are similar and the experiment in [47] showed that the running time of NewGLMNET is competitive. We thus use NewGLMNET as the representative because its code is open-sourced.

For ISQA^+ , we set $S = 10$ and use both PN and L-BFGS variants with RPCD in the first stage and Algorithm 3 with $\rho = 0.5, c = 10^{-6}$ in the second. For PCG, we use the diagonals of H_t as the preconditioner. We use a heuristic to let PCG start with an iteration bound $T_0 = 5$, double it whenever $\alpha_t = 1$ until reaching the dimension of \mathcal{M} , and reset it to 5 when $\alpha_t < 1$. For the value of S , although tuning it properly might lead to even better performance, we observe that the current setting already suffices to demonstrate the improved performance of the proposed algorithm.

Results in Fig. 1 show the superlinear convergence in running time of ISQA^+ , while LHAC and NewGLMNET only exhibit linear convergence. We observe that for data with $n \gg d$, including a9a, ijcnn1, covtype.scale, and epsilon, L-BFGS approaches are faster because $H_t p$ can be evaluated cheaply (LHAC failed on covtype.scale due to implementation issues), and PN approaches are faster otherwise, so no algorithm is always superior. Nonetheless, for the same type of H_t , ISQA^+ -L-BFGS and ISQA^+ -Newton respectively improve state-of-the-art algorithms LHAC and NewGLMNET greatly because of the fast local convergence, especially when the base method converges slowly.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we showed that for regularized problems with a partly smooth regularizer, inexact successive quadratic approximation is essentially able to identify the active manifold because a mild sufficient condition is satisfied by most of commonly-used subproblem solvers. An efficient algorithm ISQA^+ utilizing this property is proposed to attain superlinear convergence on a wide class of degenerate problems in running time, greatly improving upon state of the art for regularized problems that only exhibit superlinear convergence in outer iterations. Numerical evidence illustrated that ISQA^+ significantly improves the running time of state of the art for regularized optimization.

Table 2: Outer iterations and time (seconds) for different subproblem solvers to identify the active manifold. For each ISQA^+ variant, the fastest running time among all subproblem solvers is boldfaced.

Dataset		a9a		realsim		news20	
		Time	Iter.	Time	Iter.	Time	Iter.
ISQA^+ -L-BFGS	SpaRSA	0.7	229	5.0	185	10.3	136
	APG	1.3	408	11.8	408	16.7	230
	RPCD	0.6	190	5.7	165	9.6	131
ISQA -L-BFGS	SpaRSA	0.9	238	5.9	225	6.1	129
	APG	1.8	617	12.5	418	11.9	237
	RPCD	0.8	238	6.1	174	7.8	149
ISQA^+ -Newton	SpaRSA	3.3	16	13.9	11	6.6	19
	APG	6.3	45	99.6	76	8.7	19
	RPCD	6.6	371	1.6	11	0.5	7
ISQA -Newton	SpaRSA	3.4	16	14.2	11	6.4	19
	APG	6.3	45	88.5	76	8.8	19
	RPCD	6.8	371	1.6	11	0.6	7




Fig. 1: Comparison of Different Algorithms. For covtype.scale, LHAC is not shown because it failed to converge.

Acknowledgements

I thank Steve Wright for pointing to me the direction of manifold identification. It is my great pleasure to have worked with him during my PhD study, and this work is extended from my research in that period. I also thank Michael Ferris for the inspiration of the sharpness condition.

References

1. Absil PA, Mahony R, Sepulchre R (2009) Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds. Princeton University Press 10
2. Attouch H, Bolte J, Redont P, Soubeyran A (2010) Proximal alternating minimization and projection methods for nonconvex problems: An approach based on the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz inequality. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 35(2):438–457 2, 3, 9
3. Bolte J, Nguyen TP, Peypouquet J, Suter BW (2017) From error bounds to the complexity of first-order descent methods for convex functions. *Mathematical Programming* 165(2):471–507 20
4. Bonettini S, Loris I, Porta F, Prato M, Rebegoldi S (2017) On the convergence of a linesearch based proximal-gradient method for nonconvex optimization. *Inverse Problems* 33(5) 2, 9
5. Bonettini S, Prato M, Rebegoldi S (2020) Convergence of inexact forward-backward algorithms using the forward-backward envelope. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 30(4):3069–3097 3, 9
6. Burke JV, Ferris MC (1993) Weak sharp minima in mathematical programming. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 31(5):1340–1359 3, 9
7. Byrd RH, Nocedal J, Oztoprak F (2016) An inexact successive quadratic approximation method for $L - 1$ regularized optimization. *Mathematical Programming* 157(2):375–396 2, 3
8. Candès EJ, Recht B (2009) Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Foundations of Computational mathematics* 9(6):717–772 1

9. Candès EJ, Romberg JK, Tao T (2006) Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Journal Issued by the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences* 59(8):1207–1223 1
10. Chouzenoux E, Pesquet JC, Repetti A (2014) Variable metric forward–backward algorithm for minimizing the sum of a differentiable function and a convex function. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 162(1):107–132 3
11. Defazio A, Bach F, Lacoste-Julien S (2014) Saga: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp 1646–1654 8
12. Drusvyatskiy D, Lewis AS (2018) Error bounds, quadratic growth, and linear convergence of proximal methods. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 43(3):919–948 5, 8, 9
13. Dünner C, Lucchi A, Gargiani M, Bian A, Hofmann T, Jaggi M (2018) A distributed second-order algorithm you can trust. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning* 6
14. Hare W (2011) Identifying active manifolds in regularization problems. In: *Fixed-Point Algorithms for Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering*, Springer, pp 261–271 3
15. Hare WL, Lewis AS (2004) Identifying active constraints via partial smoothness and prox-regularity. *Journal of Convex Analysis* 11(2):251–266 5
16. Hiriart-Urruty JB, Strodriot JJ, Nguyen VH (1984) Generalized Hessian matrix and second-order optimality conditions for problems with $C^{1,1}$ data. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization* 11(1):43–56 10
17. Huang W, Gallivan KA, Absil PA (2015) A Broyden class of quasi-Newton methods for Riemannian optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 25(3):1660–1685 11
18. Kurdyka K (1998) On gradients of functions definable in \mathcal{o} -minimal structures. In: *Annales de l’institut Fourier*, vol 48, pp 769–783 2
19. Lee Cp, Chang KW (2020) Distributed block-diagonal approximation methods for regularized empirical risk minimization. *Machine Learning* 109:813–852 6
20. Lee Cp, Wright SJ (2019) Inexact successive quadratic approximation for regularized optimization. *Computational Optimization and Applications* 72:641–674 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 19, 20, 21
21. Lee Cp, Lim CH, Wright SJ (2019) A distributed quasi-Newton algorithm for primal and dual regularized empirical risk minimization. *Tech. rep.* 2, 3, 6, 15
22. Lee JD, Sun Y, Saunders MA (2014) Proximal Newton-type methods for minimizing composite functions. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 24(3):1420–1443 1, 2, 3
23. Lee S, Wright SJ (2012) Manifold identification in dual averaging for regularized stochastic online learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 13:1705–1744 3
24. Lewis AS (2002) Active sets, nonsmoothness, and sensitivity. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 13(3):702–725 2, 5
25. Lewis AS, Zhang S (2013) Partial smoothness, tilt stability, and generalized Hessians. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 23(1):74–94 5
26. Li J, Andersen MS, Vandenberghe L (2017) Inexact proximal Newton methods for self-concordant functions. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research* 85(1):19–41 1, 2, 3
27. Li YS, Chiang WL, Lee Cp (2020) Manifold identification for ultimately communication-efficient distributed optimization. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning* 2, 3
28. Liang J, Fadili J, Peyré G (2017) Activity identification and local linear convergence of forward–backward-type methods. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 27(1):408–437 3
29. Łojasiewicz S (1963) Une propriété topologique des sous-ensembles analytiques réels. In: *Les Équations aux Dérivées Partielles*, Éditions du centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 2
30. Luo ZQ, Tseng P (1992) Error bound and convergence analysis of matrix splitting algorithms for the affine variational inequality problem. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 2(1):43–54 3
31. Nesterov Y (2013) Gradient methods for minimizing composite functions. *Mathematical Programming* 140(1):125–161 15
32. Nesterov Y (2018) *Lectures on convex optimization*, vol 137. Springer 5, 8
33. Nocedal J, Wright SJ (2006) *Numerical optimization*, 2nd edn. Springer 11
34. Peng W, Zhang H, Zhang X, Cheng L (2020) Global complexity analysis of inexact successive quadratic approximation methods for regularized optimization under mild assumptions. *Journal of Global Optimization* pp 1–21 9
35. Polyak BT (1987) *Introduction to Optimization*. Translation Series in Mathematics and Engineering 19
36. Poon C, Liang J, Schönlieb CB (2018) Local convergence properties of SAGA/prox-SVRG and acceleration. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning* 8
37. Rockafellar RT, Wets RJB (2009) *Variational analysis*, vol 317. Springer Science & Business Media 5, 6
38. Scheinberg K, Tang X (2016) Practical inexact proximal quasi-Newton method with global complexity analysis. *Mathematical Programming* 160(1-2):495–529 1, 16

39. Stella L, Themelis A, Patrinos P (2017) Forward–backward quasi-Newton methods for nonsmooth optimization problems. *Computational Optimization and Applications* 67(3):443–487 3
40. Tibshirani R (1996) Regression shrinkage and selection via the LASSO. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B* 58:267–288 1
41. Tseng P, Yun S (2009) A coordinate gradient descent method for nonsmooth separable minimization. *Mathematical Programming* 117(1):387–423 21
42. Vaisman I (1984) *Monographs and textbooks in pure and applied mathematics*, Marcel Dekker, New York 5
43. Wright SJ (2012) Accelerated block-coordinate relaxation for regularized optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 22(1):159–186 6, 12, 14
44. Wright SJ, Nowak RD, Figueiredo MAT (2009) Sparse reconstruction by separable approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 57(7):2479–2493 15
45. Xiao L, Zhang T (2014) A proximal stochastic gradient method with progressive variance reduction. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 24(4):2057–2075 8
46. Yuan GX, Ho CH, Lin CJ (2012) An improved GLMNET for L_1 -regularized logistic regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 13:1999–2030 16
47. Yue MC, Zhou Z, So AMC (2019) A family of inexact SQA methods for non-smooth convex minimization with provable convergence guarantees based on the Luo–Tseng error bound property. *Mathematical Programming* 174(1-2):327–358 2, 3, 9, 15, 16

A Proof of Theorem 4

Proof For any $t \geq 0$, [20, Lemma 5] gives

$$Q_t^* \leq \min_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \lambda(F^* - F(x^t)) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \|H_t\| \text{dist}(x^t, \Omega)^2. \quad (70)$$

Combining (70) and (38) then leads to

$$Q_t^* \leq -\lambda \delta_t + \frac{\lambda^2 \|H_t\| \delta_t^{2\theta}}{2\zeta^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \in [0,1]. \quad (71)$$

Through (6), (8), and (22), we can further deduce from (71) that

$$\delta_{t+1} - \delta_t \leq \alpha_t \gamma (1 - \eta) Q_t^* \leq \alpha_t \gamma (1 - \eta) \left(-\lambda \delta_t + \frac{\lambda^2 M \delta_t^{2\theta}}{2\zeta^2} \right), \quad \forall \lambda \in [0,1]. \quad (72)$$

When $\theta = 1/2$, clearly (71)-(72) imply

$$\delta_{t+1} \leq \min_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \delta_t \left(1 - \alpha_t \gamma (1 - \eta) \left(\lambda - \frac{\lambda^2 \|H_t\|}{2\zeta^2} \right) \right). \quad (73)$$

Setting $\lambda = \min \{1, \zeta^2 \|H_t\|^{-1}\}$ in (73) then proves (42).

For $\theta \neq 1/2$, we will use (72) with

$$\lambda = \min \left\{ 1, \zeta^2 \delta_t^{1-2\theta} M^{-1} \right\}. \quad (74)$$

The case in which $\lambda = 1$ in (74) suggests that $M \delta_t^{2\theta-1} \zeta^{-2} \leq 1$ and corresponds to the following linear decrease.

$$\delta_{t+1} - \delta_t \leq \alpha_t \gamma (1 - \eta) \delta_t \left(-1 + \frac{M \delta_t^{2\theta-1}}{2\zeta^2} \right) \leq -\delta_t \frac{\alpha_t \gamma (1 - \eta)}{2},$$

which is exactly (41). When $\theta > 1/2$, $2\theta - 1 > 0$ so $M \delta_t^{2\theta-1} \zeta^{-2} \leq 1$ if and only if (39) fails, and when $\theta < 1/2$, it is the opposite case because $2\theta - 1 < 0$.

When $\lambda = \zeta^2 \delta_t^{1-2\theta} M^{-1}$ in (74), (72) leads to

$$\delta_{t+1} \leq \delta_t - \frac{\alpha_t (1 - \eta) \gamma \zeta^2}{2M} \delta_t^{2-2\theta}. \quad (75)$$

For $\theta > 1/2$, this happens when (39) holds. The rate (40) is then obtained from (75) by $-\delta_t^{1-2\theta} \leq -\xi^{1-2\theta}$ for all t , implied by $x^0 \in \text{Lev}(\xi)$ and the monotonicity of $\{\delta_t\}$. For $\theta < 1/2$, since $1 - 2\theta > 0$, $\lambda < 1$ if δ_t is small enough to fail (39). We have $2 - 2\theta > 1$, so (75) and Lemma 6 in [35, Chapter 2.2] imply (43). \square

B Proof of Theorem 3

From Theorem 4, we have gotten a faster convergence speed of the objective. We then need to relate it to the decrease of \hat{Q}_t and Q_t^* before proving Theorem 3.

Lemma 6 Consider Algorithm 1. If $\Omega \neq \emptyset$, f is L -smooth for $L > 0$, $\Psi \in \Gamma_0$, and there are $m > 0$ and $\eta \in [0, 1)$ such that $H_t \geq m$ and p^t satisfies (8) with (22) for all t , then

$$\hat{Q}_t - Q_t^* \leq \frac{\eta \delta_t}{\gamma \bar{\alpha}(1-\eta)}, \quad -Q_t^* \leq \frac{\delta_t}{\gamma \bar{\alpha}(1-\eta)}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (76)$$

where $\bar{\alpha} > 0$ is the constant in Theorem 4.

Proof From (8), (22), and $Q_t(0) = 0$, we know that

$$-\hat{Q}_t \geq -(1-\eta)Q_t^*. \quad (77)$$

By (77), (6), $\delta_t \geq 0$, and $\alpha_t \geq \bar{\alpha}$ from Theorem 4, the second inequality of (76) is proven by

$$\delta_t \geq \delta_t - \delta_{t+1} \geq -\gamma \alpha_t (1-\eta) Q_t^* \geq -\gamma \bar{\alpha} (1-\eta) Q_t^*. \quad (78)$$

For the first inequality, the case of $\eta = 0$ holds trivially. If $\eta \in (0, 1)$, (77) implies

$$-\eta \hat{Q}_t \geq (1-\eta) (\hat{Q}_t - Q_t^*) \Rightarrow -\hat{Q}_t \geq \frac{1-\eta}{\eta} (\hat{Q}_t - Q_t^*). \quad (79)$$

Following the same logic for obtaining (78), we get from (6) and (79) that

$$\eta \delta_t \geq \gamma \alpha_t (1-\eta) (\hat{Q}_t - Q_t^*) \geq \gamma \bar{\alpha} (1-\eta) (\hat{Q}_t - Q_t^*). \quad \square$$

Proof (Proof of Theorem 3) Lemma 6 together with (18) implies that

$$\|p^t - p^{t*}\| = O\left(\delta_t^{\frac{1}{2}}\right), \quad \|p^{t*}\| = \|0 - p^{t*}\| = O\left(\delta_t^{\frac{1}{2}}\right). \quad (80)$$

Through the triangle inequality, we have from (80) and $\alpha_t \leq 1$ that

$$\|x^{t+1} - x^t\| = \|\alpha_t p^t\| = \alpha_t \|p^t\| \leq \|p^t\| \leq \|p^{t*}\| + \|p^t - p^{t*}\| = O\left(\delta_t^{\frac{1}{2}}\right). \quad (81)$$

Condition (38) implies that for any x^0 , $\text{dist}(x, \Omega)$ is upper-bounded for all $x \in \text{Lev}(F(x^0))$, as argued in [3]. Thus, [20, Theorem 1] implies that $\text{Lev}(\xi)$ is reached in finite iterations. As the asymptotic convergence is concerned, we assume $x^0 \in \text{Lev}(\xi)$ without loss of generality.

We now apply Theorem 4 and separately consider $\theta \in [1/2, 1]$ and $\theta \in (1/4, 1/2)$. When $\theta \in [1/2, 1]$, $\{\delta_t\}$ converges Q -linearly to 0, so there exist $t_0 \geq 0$ and $\tau \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$\delta_{t+1} \leq \tau \delta_t, \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

Thus for any $t_1 \geq t_2 \geq t_0$, we have from the triangle inequality and (81) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{t_1} - x^{t_2}\| &\leq \sum_{t=t_2}^{t_1-1} \|x^{t+1} - x^t\| \\ &= O\left(\sum_{t=t_2}^{t_1-1} \sqrt{\tau^{t-t_0} \delta_{t_0}}\right) = O\left(\sqrt{\delta_{t_0}} \sqrt{\tau^{t_2-t_0}} (1 - \sqrt{\tau^{t_1-t_2}}) (1 - \sqrt{\tau})^{-1}\right), \end{aligned}$$

whose right-hand side converges to 0 as t_2 approaches infinity. Therefore, $\{x^t\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and converges to a point x^* as \mathcal{E} is a complete space.

Similarly, for $\theta \in (1/4, 1/2)$, Theorem 4 implies that there is $t_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$\sqrt{\delta_t} = O\left(t^{-\frac{1}{2(1-2\theta)}}\right) = O(t^{-\tau}), \quad \forall t \geq t_0$$

with $\tau = 1/(2(1-2\theta)) \in (1, \infty)$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{t=t_2}^{\infty} t^{-\tau} = O\left(t_2^{-\tau+1}\right), \quad \forall t_2 \geq t_0,$$

and the right-hand side converges to 0. We thus have from above that $\sum_{t=t_2}^{t_1-1} \sqrt{\delta_t}$ converges to 0 as t_2 approaches infinity, and (81) shows that so does $\sum_{t=t_2}^{t_1-1} \|x^{t+1} - x^t\|$. This shows that $\{x^t\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and hence converges to a point $x^* \in \mathcal{E}$.

It remains to show that $x^* \in \Omega$. Since f is continuous and Ψ is lower semicontinuous, F is also lower semicontinuous. Therefore, we have that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(x^t) \geq F(x^*) \geq F^*. \quad (82)$$

However, [20, Theorem 1] implies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(x^t) = F^*$, which together with (82) shows that $F(x^*) = F^*$, and hence $x^* \in \Omega$. \square

C Proof of Theorem 5

Proof We first note that (44) can be seen as solving (2) exactly with $H_t = \hat{L}I$, and it is widely-known that for $\hat{L} \geq L$, (6) is always satisfied with $\alpha_t = 1$. Therefore, under (7), we have

$$\tilde{M} \succeq H_{k_t} \succeq \tilde{m}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (83)$$

and (8) with (22) holds for all k_t . For the MO steps, we note that it does not increase the objective value, so for any computation involving the objective change, we can safely skip them. That $k_t \leq 2t$ for any t is clear, since we do not conduct two consecutive MO steps.

1. The part of $G_t = 0$ if and only if $0 \in \partial F(x^t)$ is well-known. See, for example, [20, Lemma 7]. Thus, the claim of stationarity of the limit points follow directly from the claim that $G_{k_t} \rightarrow 0$.

Now let us prove that $G_{k_t} \rightarrow 0$ and the upper bound for $\min_{0 \leq k \leq t} \|G_{k_t}\|^2$. For the k_i th iteration, we get from (6), and that (22) indicates that $\hat{Q}_{k_i} < 0$, that

$$-\gamma \hat{Q}_{k_i} \leq F(x^{k_i}) - F(x^{k_i+1}). \quad (84)$$

By applying (22) and (8) to (84), we further get

$$-\gamma(1-\eta)Q_{k_i}^* \leq F(x^{k_i}) - F(x^{k_i+1}).$$

By summing (84) over $i = 0, \dots, t$, we get

$$-\gamma(1-\eta) \sum_{i=0}^t Q_{k_i}^* \leq \sum_{i=0}^t F(x^{k_i}) - F(x^{k_i+1}) \leq F(x^{k_0}) - F(x^{k_t+1}) \leq F(x^0) - F^*, \quad (85)$$

where the penultimate inequality is from that $F(x^t)$ is nonincreasing. Following [20, Lemma 7] and [41, Lemma 3], we then have from (83) that

$$\frac{F(x^0) - F^*}{\gamma(1-\eta)} \geq \sum_{i=0}^t -Q_{k_i}^* \geq \sum_{i=0}^t \frac{2\tilde{m}}{\tilde{M}^2 (1 + \tilde{m}^{-1} + \sqrt{1 - 2\tilde{M}^{-1} + \tilde{m}^{-2}})^2} \|G_{k_i}\|^2. \quad (86)$$

Since the above is true for any $t \geq 0$, it shows that $\{\|G_{k_t}\|^2\}$ is summable, so $\|G_{k_t}\|^2$ converges to 0, which implies that $G_{k_t} \rightarrow 0$. The rate is then obtained from (86) by noting that

$$\sum_{i=0}^t \|G_{k_i}\|^2 \geq (t+1) \min_{0 \leq i \leq t} \|G_{k_i}\|^2.$$

2. This part follows directly from the proof of [20, Theorem 1] by replacing t by t_k , noting that MO steps do not increase the objective value so $\delta_{k_{t+1}} \leq \delta_{k_t+1}$ for all t , and using the bound

$$\langle x^t - P_\Omega(x^t), H_t(x^t - P_\Omega(x^t)) \rangle \leq \tilde{M} \|x^t - P_\Omega(x^t)\|^2 \leq MR_0^2, \quad \forall t \geq 0$$

from (47).

3. This part follows from the proof of Theorem 4 again by using (83) and that $\delta_{k_{t+1}} \leq \delta_{k_t+1}$ for all t .