

A warmstarting technique for general conic optimization in interior point methods

Yuwen Chen¹, Paul Goulart², and Colin Jones¹

¹School of Engineering, EPFL, Lausanne, Switzerland

²Department of Engineering Science, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

December 2, 2025

Abstract

We propose a novel warmstarting method for primal-dual interior point methods based on a smoothing operator that generates a starting point on the central path from the previous optimum. Compared to traditional approaches that prioritize minimizing infeasibility residuals, our method focuses on maintaining proximity to the central path. Computation of a smoothing operator is efficient and can be parallelized for conic constraints. We also prove that the residual of the smoothed starting point remains comparable to the one before the smoothing step. The numerical tests show that the proposed warmstarting strategy can reduce iteration numbers and computational time effectively across test problems.

1 Introduction

Conic optimization is a powerful generalization of linear programming that extends its capabilities by incorporating convex cones into the constraint structure [1]. While retaining linear equality constraints, conic formulations allow for more expressive inequality constraints through cones such as second-order cones, exponential cones, power cones and positive semidefinite cones [2, 3]. This added flexibility makes conic optimization highly versatile, enabling it to effectively model uncertainty and risk in a wide range of applications, including risk measurement of portfolio optimization [4], the safety guarantees in control engineering [5] and robust model design in machine learning [6].

The primal-dual interior point method [7, 8] is a second-order method based on the Newton method and has been widely used for conic optimization problems. It uses a barrier function to ensure that the iterates remain within the feasible region of a cone where the function penalizes solutions that approach the boundary of it. The self-scaled property [9] of a barrier function determines whether a cone is symmetric or not, and also affects the way we characterize the central path in the implementation of a primal-dual interior point method. The central path builds up the link between primal and dual variables with the centering parameter μ via the logarithmically homogeneous self-concordant barrier function. It has a lot of useful quantities that link different orders of derivatives given the cone degree ν and are detailed in [9]. The symmetric cones of the self-scaled property enables the use of Jordan algebra and an alternative form of the central path is used in practice [9, 10].

Warmstarting is a technique that can significantly reduce the number of iterations required and can save computational time. It is effective for parametric programming [11] where the structure and dimensions of a problem remain consistent over time, with only slight variations in parameter

values. When these parameters are updated, the optimal solution from the previous problem can be reused as the initial point for an optimization solver. Applications of this class include portfolio optimization [4], model predictive control [12], and hyperparameter tuning for machine learning models [13]. First-order methods have no additional requirements over the initial point and warmstarting new problem from the previous optimum is directly applicable and is already supported in many first-order solvers like SCS [14] and OSQP [15].

Compared to first-order methods, warmstarting interior point methods is not straightforward since interior point methods often struggle with starting points that are too close to the boundary of the feasible region, which can block the search direction and slow the convergence of interior point methods. Research into warmstarting interior point methods has been studied for many years [16, 17, 18] although most of them are for the case of linear programming or quadratic programming with linear constraints rather than general conic optimization problems. A tailored warmstarting strategy is also proposed for optimal control problems where the temporal causality imposes constraints on adjacent state and input variables [19].

Warmstarting for general conic optimization in interior point methods is a relatively new research direction as conic optimization has become more popular in recent years. Skajaa et al. [20] proposed a warmstarting approach for homogeneous and self-dual interior point methods by taking the convex combination of the optimal solution of the previous problem and the default coldstarting point. An extension work [21] presented how to exploit the idea of convex combination within mixed integer second-order cone programming. However, the ratio of convex combination is chosen empirically without taking into account the residual level of the original optimal solution on the perturbed problem.

In summary, the core idea for warmstarting an interior point method is to generate a starting point that keeps infeasibility violation small and is close to the central path.

In the context of parametric programming, where the previous optimum can be leveraged for warmstarting, we proposed a method that meets both of these criteria. Previous warmstarting approaches for conic optimization [20] primarily focus on reducing feasibility residuals, placing less emphasis on maintaining proximity to the central path. Moreover, these methods are limited to symmetric cones that admit a Jordan algebra structure. On the contrary, our approach prioritizes proximity to the central path over feasibility satisfaction, guaranteeing large step size in the following interior point method while still keeping the feasibility residuals reasonably small. In addition, the proposed warmstarting strategy is also applicable to general cone constraints. The main contributions of our approach are outlined below:

1. We propose the smoothing operator for general convex cones with valid logarithmically-homogeneous self-concordant barrier functions. The smoothing operator is a proximal operator that is decomposable with respect to each conic constraint, and the computation can be parallelized.
2. We propose a warmstarting strategy based on the smoothing operation. We prove that our warmstarting strategy can generate a starting point on the central path of primal-dual interior point methods.
3. We prove that the residual of the starting point is at the same level as the previous optimum for nonnegative cones, second-order cones and positive semidefinite cones. The new error introduced by the smoothing step is proportional to the norm of constraint matrix and the initial centering parameter μ^0 .
4. The experiments illustrate that the proposed warmstarting strategy can effectively reduce the number of iterations and computation time of a primal-dual interior point algorithm

when the perturbation is not too large. The experiments validate that the reduction ratio of both time and iteration number decrease when the magnitude of perturbation increases.

Notation We denote $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{K}}(x)$ as the indicator function of cone \mathcal{K} and $\Pi_{\mathcal{K}}(x)$ as the projection of x onto cone \mathcal{K} . The dual cone of \mathcal{K} is denoted as \mathcal{K}^* . The negative of dual cone \mathcal{K}^* is called the polar cone denoted as \mathcal{K}° . We denote $\text{int } \mathcal{C}$ as the interior set of \mathcal{C} . $\llbracket n \rrbracket$ denotes the index set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. The second-order cone is abbreviated as $\mathcal{K}_{\text{soc}}^n := \{(x_0, x_1) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_0^2 - \|x_1\|^2 \geq 0\}$. \mathbb{S}_+^n denotes the set of positive semidefinite cones. $\text{diag}(x)$ transforms a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ into a diagonal matrix and $\text{mat}(s)$ transforms a vector $s \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ into a square matrix.

2 Background

We consider the following conic optimization problem with a quadratic objective in this work:

$$\begin{aligned} p^* := \min_{x,s} \quad & \frac{1}{2}x^\top Px + q^\top x \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Ax + s = b, \quad s \in \mathcal{K} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric positive semidefinite, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. The dual problem is

$$\begin{aligned} d^* := \max_{x,z} \quad & -\frac{1}{2}x^\top Px - b^\top z \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Px + A^\top z + q = 0, \quad z \in \mathcal{K}^*. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

We assume that the primal problem (1) and the dual problem (2) satisfy Slater's condition and the optimal solution (x^*, s^*, z^*) satisfies the *Karush-Kuhn-Tucker* (KKT) condition

$$\begin{aligned} Ax^* + s^* &= b, \\ Px^* + A^\top z^* + q &= 0, \\ s^* &\in \mathcal{K}, z^* \in \mathcal{K}^*, \\ \langle s^*, z^* \rangle &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

2.1 Logarithmically-homogeneous self-concordant barrier function

The interior-point methods deal with conic constraints by imposing penalties over $s \in \text{int } \mathcal{K}$, $z \in \text{int } \mathcal{K}^*$. The function value $f(s)$ should converge to $+\infty$ when any sequence of points in cone \mathcal{K} converges to a boundary point of \mathcal{K} (barrier property). A function is *self-concordant* if it satisfies the barrier property and

$$|\nabla^3 f(s)[r, r, r]| \leq 2 \left(\nabla^2 f(s)[r, r] \right)^{3/2}, \quad \forall s \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K}), r \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4)$$

Moreover, a self-concordant function is called a *ν -logarithmically-homogeneous self-concordant barrier* (LHSCB) function for cone \mathcal{K} , if it further satisfies

$$f(\lambda s) = f(s) - \nu \log(\lambda), \quad \forall s \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K}), \lambda > 0. \quad (5)$$

We call $\nu > 0$ the *degree* of f . The convex conjugate f^* of function f is defined as

$$f^*(y) := \sup_{s \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K})} \{-\langle y, s \rangle - f(s)\}, \quad (6)$$

which is also a ν -LHSCB for \mathcal{K}^* [9] and we call $f^*(y)$ the *conjugate barrier*. The gradient ∇f^* of f^* is the solution of

$$\nabla f^*(y) := -\arg \sup_{s \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K})} \{-\langle y, s \rangle - f(s)\}. \quad (7)$$

There are some key properties of LHSCB $f(s), \forall s \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f(\tau s) &= \frac{1}{\tau} \nabla f(s), \quad \nabla^2 f(\tau s) = \frac{1}{\tau^2} \nabla^2 f(s), \\ \langle \nabla f(s), s \rangle &= -\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and its relation with the conjugate barrier $f^*(y), \forall y \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K}^*)$:

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla f(s) &\in \text{int}(\mathcal{K}^*), \quad -\nabla f^*(y) \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K}), \\ f^*(-\nabla f(s)) &= -\nu - f(s), \quad f(-\nabla f^*(y)) = -\nu - f^*(y), \\ \nabla f^*(-\nabla f(s)) &= -s, \quad \nabla f(-\nabla f^*(y)) = -y. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Relevant barrier functions for commonly supported cones in conic solvers can be found in Appendix A.

2.2 Central path

The LHSCB functions are not only used to tackle the conic constraints $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^*$ but also used to smooth the complementarity condition $\langle s, z \rangle$ within an interior point method. The residual mapping $R(x, s, z)$ is defined as

$$R(x, s, z) = \begin{bmatrix} r_d \\ r_p \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} P & A^\top \\ -A & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ z \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} q \\ b \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ s \end{bmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

The central path is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} R(x, s, z) &= \mu R(x^0, s^0, z^0), \\ z &= -\mu \nabla f(s), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where (x^0, s^0, z^0) is the initial point at the beginning of the interior point method and $\mu > 0$ is called the centering parameter of the central path. It is known that μ is continuously decreasing as an interior point method proceeds, and the limiting point of (11) at $\mu \rightarrow 0^+$ is also the solution of the original KKT system (3). For parametric programming where we need to solve a class of problems of the same structure repeatedly with different parameters, finding a warmstarting point (x^0, s^0, z^0) such that the initial residual $R(x^0, s^0, z^0)$ and the initial μ are smaller than the default cold-start point can reduce the number of iterations and computational time in a new problem. We can possibly utilize the optimal solution from the last problem when we assume the parameters of the new problem are only slightly different from the last one.

2.3 Moreau envelope

The *Moreau envelope* or *Moreau-Yosida regularization* is the foundation of the proximal algorithms [22] and defined as

$$f_\alpha(v) = \inf_x \left\{ f(x) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|x - v\|_2^2 \right\}, \quad (12)$$

where $\alpha > 0$ is the regularization term and $f(x)$ is a proper lower semi-continuous convex function. When we choose $\alpha = 1$, (12) then becomes the well-known proximal operator, i.e. $\text{prox}_f(v) := f_1(v)$. The *Moreau decomposition* states that

$$\text{prox}_f(v) + \text{prox}_{f^*}(-v) = v \quad (13)$$

when we follow the definition of conjugate function f^* in (7) [22, Section 2.5]. If f is set to be an indicator function of a closed convex cone \mathcal{K} , then (13) reduces to

$$v = \Pi_{\mathcal{K}}(v) + \Pi_{\mathcal{K}^\circ}(v) = \Pi_{\mathcal{K}}(v) - \Pi_{\mathcal{K}^*}(v),$$

which says any point $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be decomposed into two parts that fall into the cone \mathcal{K} and its dual cone \mathcal{K}^* (or its polar cone \mathcal{K}°) respectively. This is an important property underlying many operator splitting methods [23, 24, 14] where the intermediate primal-dual iterate $\{s^k, y^k\}$, $s^k \in \mathcal{K}$, $y^k \in \mathcal{K}^\circ$ always satisfies the complementarity condition $\langle s^k, y^k \rangle = 0$ for any iteration k .

2.4 Smoothing operator

Conic constraints are addressed differently between 1st-order optimization algorithms and 2nd-order optimization algorithms. Conic feasibility $s \in \mathcal{K}, z \in \mathcal{K}^*$ is guaranteed by projecting intermediate iterates back to conic constraints in 1st-order algorithms. The projection operation can be interpreted as a proximal operator $\Pi_{\mathcal{K}}$ as

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{K}}(c) := \arg \min_s \frac{1}{2} \|s - c\|^2 + \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{K}}(s), \quad (14)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{K}}$ is the indicator function of cone \mathcal{K} . The function $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{K}}$ is nonsmooth and not differentiable, so only the generalized Hessian information can be exploited for acceleration, as used in semismooth Newton methods [25, 26].

Recently, an ADMM-based interior point (ADMM-IPM) method has been proposed [27], where the indicator function in the projection operator (14) is replaced by the LHSCB $f(\cdot)$ of cone \mathcal{K} ,

$$S_{\mathcal{K},\eta}(c) := \arg \min_s f_{\eta}(s) := \frac{1}{2} \|s - c\|^2 + \eta f(s), \quad (15)$$

where $\eta > 0$ is called the smoothing parameter. The barrier function $f(\cdot)$ was originally used in interior point methods for penalizing conic constraints, but it has been shown that the optimal solution of ADMM-IPM is the point on the central path of classical interior point methods, given a fixed centering parameter $\eta > 0$ [27].

We call the operator $S_{\mathcal{K},\eta}(\cdot)$ above the *smoothing* operator, since the objective within the minimization problem (15) is continuously differentiable. Moreover, problem (15) is the minimization over a strictly convex function and the solution of $S_{\mathcal{K},\eta}(c)$ exists and is unique given the value of c .

3 Warmstarting point on the central path

Given a starting point $v^0 = (x^0, s^0, z^0)$, the complexity of an interior point method is $O\left(\sqrt{\nu} \frac{\Phi(v^0)}{\epsilon}\right)$ where

$$\Phi(v) = \max\{\mu(v), \|r_p(v)\|, \|r_d(v)\|\},$$

ν is the degree of the cone \mathcal{K} and ϵ is the desired accuracy level. The standard initial point for primal dual interior point methods is $C := (0, e_s, e_z)$, where $e_s = e_z$ is the identity vector

defined in Jordan Algebra for symmetric cones and e_s, e_z are constant vectors satisfying $e_z = -\nabla f(e_s)$, $e_s \in \text{int } \mathcal{K}$, $e_z \in \text{int } \mathcal{K}$ for nonsymmetric cones [28].

To obtain a better worst case complexity, we would need to initialize an interior point method at a point v^0 that is better than the cold start point C , which can be quantified by

$$\mu(v^0) < \mu(C), \quad \|r_p(v^0)\| < \|r_p(C)\|, \quad \|r_d(v^0)\| < \|r_d(C)\|. \quad (16)$$

In addition, the initial point also has to lie in the neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(\beta)$ of the central path

$$\mathcal{N}(\beta) := \{(s, z) \in \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K}^* \mid \nu_i \langle \nabla f(s_i), \nabla f^*(z_i) \rangle^{-1} \geq \beta \mu, i = 1, \dots, p\}, \quad (17)$$

where $\beta = 1$ characterizes the central path (11). It is known that the cold start C satisfies $\mu(C) = 1$ and lies on the central path. The ideal warmstarting point v^0 should satisfy (16) that yields a smaller $\Phi(v^0)$, and stay close to the central path, i.e. $\mathcal{N}(\beta)$ for a $\beta \in (0, 1]$ as close to 1 as possible, that can push the initial point away from cone boundary and accept a large step size for interior point update.

Our new warmstarting algorithm for primal dual interior point methods in conic optimization is summarized in Algorithm 1: Note that there is no valid barrier function for equality constraints

Algorithm 1 Warmstarting algorithm for parametric programming

Require: Input (x^*, s^*, z^*) from the last optimization problem, a given smoothing parameter $\mu^0 > 0$ and a scaling ratio $\lambda > 0$.

- 1: Compute $c := s^* - \lambda z^*$.
 - 2: Compute the smoothed primal variable $s^0 = S_{\mathcal{K}, \mu^0}(c)$ by (15).
 - 3: Compute the smoothed dual variable $z^0 = \frac{s^0 - (s^* - \lambda z^*)}{\lambda}$.
 - 4: Set $x^0 = x^*$
 - 5: Output (x^0, s^0, z^0)
-

corresponding to $\mathcal{K} = \{0\}^n$. Hence, we choose the initial point $(s^0, z^0) = (s^*, z^*)$ for primal and dual variables when $\mathcal{K} = \{0\}^n$.

We prove that Algorithm 1 can generate an initial primal-dual pair (s^0, z^0) on the central path.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose we have a solution (x^*, s^*, z^*) from a given optimization problem, a smoothing parameter μ^0 and a scaling parameter λ for the smoothing operator (15). The initial point generated by Algorithm 1 satisfies $(s^0, z^0) \in \text{int } \mathcal{K} \times \text{int } \mathcal{K}^*$ by setting $f(\cdot)$ to the ν -LHSCB function of \mathcal{K} . If we also set $x^0 = x^*$, then the initial point (x^0, s^0, z^0) is on the new central path parametrized by*

$$\begin{aligned} R(x, s, z) &= \mu r^0, \\ z &= -\mu \nabla f(x), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where $r^0 = \frac{\lambda}{\mu^0} R(x^0, s^0, z^0)$, and we have $\langle s^0, z^0 \rangle = \frac{\nu \mu^0}{\lambda}$, i.e. (s^0, z^0) is on the central path with parameter $\mu = \frac{\mu^0}{\lambda}$.

Proof. The problem (15) is strongly convex and therefore we can obtain a unique solution $s^0 = S_{\mathcal{K}, \mu^0}(s^* - \lambda z^*)$ of it when we set $c = s^* - \lambda z^*$ with $\lambda > 0$. The constrained domain of LHSCB function $f(\cdot)$ ensures $s^0 \in \text{int } \mathcal{K}$. Considering the optimality condition of the problem (15) with $\mu = \mu^0$,

$$s^0 - (s^* - \lambda z^*) + \mu^0 \nabla f(s^0) = 0,$$

which implies

$$\lambda z^0 = s^0 - (s^* - \lambda z^*) = -\mu^0 \nabla f(s^0) \in \text{int } \mathcal{K}^*$$

due to (9) and

$$\langle s^0, z^0 \rangle = -\frac{\mu^0}{\lambda} \langle s^0, \nabla f(s^0) \rangle = \frac{\nu \mu^0}{\lambda}.$$

due to (8). □

4 Choice of the initial centering parameter μ^0

The centering parameter μ is used to characterize the central path and the limiting point 0 corresponds to the optimal solution of the optimization problem. The initial point (x^0, s^0, z^0) is determined by the choice of initial smoothing parameter μ^0 , which affects both the complementarity value $\langle s^0, z^0 \rangle$ but also the linear residual $R(x^0, s^0, z^0)$. Both have to be kept small for fast convergence of interior point methods. We propose the following strategy for selecting smoothing parameter μ^0 in Theorem 3.1, which is based on the information from the previous optimal solution x^*, s^*, z^* . For nonnegative cones, second-order cones and PSD cones, we prove that our warmstarting guarantees the linear residual $R(x^0, s^0, z^0)$ stays in the same precision level as the residual $R(x^*, s^*, z^*)$ before the smoothing step.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose x^*, s^*, z^* is the optimal solution from the previous problem. We choose the value μ^0 to be the same magnitude of the residual $R(x^*, s^*, z^*)$ in the new problem, e.g. $\mu^0 = \|R(x^*, s^*, z^*)\|_\infty$. For Algorithm 1, we have the following results:*

- *For $s^*, z^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we assume at least one of s_i^*, z_i^* is nonzero $\forall i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and set $\lambda = 1$ in Algorithm 1. The residuals of the initial point (x^0, s^0, z^0) is within the magnitude of $O(\mu^0)$ for optimization problems with linear constraints.*
- *For $S^*, Z^* \in \mathcal{K}_\geq^n$, we assume $\text{rank}(S^*) + \text{rank}(Z^*) = n$ and set $\lambda = 1$ in Algorithm 1. The residuals of the initial point (x^0, s^0, z^0) is within the magnitude of $O(\mu^0)$ for optimization problems with PSD constraints.*
- *For a second-order cone constraint where $s^* := (s_0^*, s_1^*), z^* := (z_0^*, z_1^*) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $s^*, z^* \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{soc}}^n$, we assume $s_0^*, z_0^* > 0$ and set $\lambda = s_0^*/z_0^*$. The value μ^0 is set to $\mu^0 = \lambda \|R(x^*, s^*, z^*)\|_\infty$. The residuals of the initial point (x^0, s^0, z^0) is within the magnitude of $O(\mu^0)$ for second-order cone constraints.*

Proof. Given the settings in Theorem 3.1, we have $s^0 - z^0 = s^* - z^*$ for $c = s^* - z^*$, which implies the change is equal for both primal and dual variables, i.e. $\Delta s = s^0 - s^* = z^0 - z^* = \Delta z$. The complementarity slackness says $\langle s^*, z^* \rangle = 0$.

1. We first prove $O(\mu^0)$ deviation after the smoothing step for nonnegative cones. Assume at least one of s_i^*, z_i^* is nonzero $\forall i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, then c_i is either positive when $s_i^* > 0$ or negative when $z_i^* > 0$. We also assume $\mu_0 \ll |c_i|, \forall i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$.

For $c_i > 0$, we have $s_i^* = c_i > 0$ and the change Δs_i becomes

$$\Delta s_i = s_i^0 - s_i^* = \frac{\sqrt{c_i^2 + 4\mu^0} - c_i}{2} = \frac{2\mu^0}{\sqrt{c_i^2 + 4\mu^0} + c_i} \leq \min\left\{\frac{\mu^0}{c^0}, 1\right\}, \quad (19)$$

is of magnitude $O(\mu^0)$ for $\mu_0 \ll |c_i|$. For $c_i < 0$, we have $s_i^* = 0$ and the change

$$\Delta s_i = s_i^0 = \frac{\sqrt{c_i^2 + 4\mu^0} + c_i}{2} = \frac{2\mu^0}{\sqrt{c_i^2 + 4\mu^0} - c_i} \leq \min\left\{\frac{\mu^0}{|c_i|}, 1\right\}, \quad (20)$$

is also of the magnitude $O(\mu^0)$. Then, the change of residual due to the smoothing operator (15) is

$$\|R(x^0, s^0, z^0) - R(x^*, s^*, z^*)\|_\infty = \left\| \frac{A^\top \Delta z}{\Delta s} \right\|_\infty \leq (\|A\|_\infty + 1) \|\Delta s\|_\infty,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|R(x^0, s^0, z^0)\|_\infty &\leq \|R(x^*, s^*, z^*)\|_\infty + \|R(x^0, s^0, z^0) - R(x^*, s^*, z^*)\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|R(x^*, s^*, z^*)\|_\infty + (\|A\|_\infty + 1) \|\Delta s\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\mu^0 = \|R(x^*, s^*, z^*)\|_\infty$ in the inequality above yields

$$\|R(x^0, s^0, z^0)\|_\infty \leq \left[1 + \frac{\|A\|_\infty + 1}{\min_{i \in [n]} \{|c_i|\}} \right] \mu^0.$$

Moreover, the duality gap is related to the complementarity quantity $\langle s^0, z^0 \rangle / \nu = \mu^0$, which is also dependent on the choice of μ^0 like the linear residual $R(x^0, s^0, z^0)$.

2. For positive semidefinite cones, we assume $\text{rank}(S^*) + \text{rank}(Z^*) = n$. Since the previous optimal solution S^*, Z^* satisfies $S^* Z^* = 0$, we can find the eigenvalue decomposition such that

$$S^* = Q^\top \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} Q, \quad Z^* = Q^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \\ & D_2 \end{bmatrix} Q,$$

where Q is the matrix for eigenvectors and D_1, D_2 are diagonal matrices corresponding to positive eigenvalues. The complementarity condition implies

$$C = Q^\top \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & \\ & -D_2 \end{bmatrix} Q.$$

Combining it with (35), we find the change of variables $\Delta S, \Delta Z$ are

$$\Delta S = \Delta Z = Q^\top \Delta D Q,$$

where ΔD is

$$(\Delta D)_{ii} := \begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{d_i^2 + 4\mu^0} - d_i}{2} = \frac{2\mu^0}{\sqrt{d_i^2 + 4\mu^0} + d_i}, & d_i > 0 \\ \frac{\sqrt{d_i^2 + 4\mu^0} + d_i}{2} = \frac{2\mu^0}{\sqrt{d_i^2 + 4\mu^0} - d_i}, & d_i < 0 \end{cases}, \quad \forall i \in [n]. \quad (21)$$

Hence, the change of primal variable is bounded by

$$\|\Delta s\|_\infty = \|\Delta S\|_{\max} \leq \|\Delta S\| \leq \|\Delta D\| \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\mu^0}{\min_{i \in [n]} \{|d_i|\}}, 1 \right\},$$

and the change of dual variable

$$\begin{aligned} \|A^\top \Delta z\|_\infty &= \left\| \begin{matrix} \vdots \\ \text{tr}(A_i \Delta Z) \\ \vdots \end{matrix} \right\|_\infty \leq \left\| \begin{matrix} \vdots \\ \text{tr}|A_i| \|\Delta Z\| \\ \vdots \end{matrix} \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \max_{i \in [m]} \{\text{tr}|A_i|\} \|\Delta Z\| \leq \frac{\max_{i \in [m]} \{\text{tr}|A_i|\}}{\min_{i \in [n]} \{|d_i|\}} \mu^0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the change of residual due to the smoothing operator (15) is

$$\|R(x^0, s^0, z^0) - R(x^*, s^*, z^*)\|_\infty = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} A^\top \Delta z \\ \Delta s \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\max_{i \in \llbracket m \rrbracket} \{\text{tr } |A_i|\} + 1}{\min_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} \{|d_i|\}} \mu^0,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|R(x^0, s^0, z^0)\|_\infty &\leq \|R(x^*, s^*, z^*)\|_\infty + \left\| \begin{bmatrix} A^\top \Delta z \\ \Delta s \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \left[1 + \frac{\max_{i \in \llbracket m \rrbracket} \{\text{tr } |A_i|\} + 1}{\min_{i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} \{|d_i|\}} \right] \mu^0. \end{aligned}$$

The complementarity quantity is $S^0 Z^0 = S^0(S^0 - C) = S^0 \cdot \mu(S^0)^{-1} = \mu$.

3. For $s^*, z^* \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{soc}}^n$ from the previous optimization problem, we have $\langle s^*, z^* \rangle = s_0^* z_0^* + \langle s_1^*, z_1^* \rangle = 0$, due to the complementarity slackness. Also, we have $\langle s^*, z^* \rangle = s_0^* z_0^* + \langle s_1^*, z_1^* \rangle \geq s_0^* z_0^* - \|s_1^*\| \cdot \|z_1^*\| \geq \|s_1^*\| \cdot (z_0^* - \|z_1^*\|) \geq 0$ due to $s^*, z^* \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{soc}}^n$. The active constraints imply $s_0^* = \|s_1^*\|$, $z_0^* = \|z_1^*\|$ and $\langle \frac{s_1^*}{s_0^*}, \frac{z_1^*}{z_0^*} \rangle = -1$ (s_1^*, z_1^* have the opposite direction). We can derive both s^* and z^* are on the boundary of $\mathcal{K}_{\text{soc}}^n$ and $s_1^* = -\lambda z_1^*$ with $\lambda = \frac{s_0^*}{z_0^*}$. Then, we have

$$c = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -2\lambda z_1^* \end{bmatrix}.$$

According to the analysis in Section B, the smoothed value s^0, z^0 are

$$s^0 = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\mu^0 + \|c_1\|^2/4} \\ \frac{c_1}{2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\mu^0 + \|s_1^*\|^2} \\ s_1^* \end{bmatrix}, \quad z^0 = \frac{s^0 - c}{\lambda} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\mu^0/\lambda^2 + \|z_1^*\|^2} \\ z_1^* \end{bmatrix},$$

which result in the complementarity quantity $\langle s^0, z^0 \rangle = \mu^0/\lambda$ and s^0, z^0 are on the nonlinear trajectory $z = -\mu \nabla f(x)$ at $\mu = \mu^0/\lambda$. The change of variables are, given $s_0^* = \|s_1^*\|$,

$$\Delta s = s^0 - s^* = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\mu^0 + s_0^{*2}} - s_0^* \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\mu^0}{\sqrt{\mu^0 + s_0^{*2}} + s_0^*} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Delta z = z^0 - z^* = \frac{s^0 - s^*}{\lambda} = \Delta s / \lambda.$$

Hence, the change of residual due to the smoothing operator $s^0 = S_{\mathcal{K}, \mu^0}(s^* - \lambda z^*)$ is

$$\|R(x^0, s^0, z^0) - R(x^*, s^*, z^*)\|_\infty = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} A^\top \Delta z \\ \Delta s \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty \leq (\|A\|_\infty / \lambda + 1) \|\Delta s\|_\infty,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|R(x^0, s^0, z^0)\|_\infty &\leq \|R(x^*, s^*, z^*)\|_\infty + (\|A\|_\infty / \lambda + 1) \|\Delta s\|_\infty \\ &\leq \left[\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{\|A\|_\infty / \lambda + 1}{2s_0^*} \right] \mu^0 = \left[1 + \frac{\|A\|_\infty + \lambda}{2s_0^*} \right] \|R(x^*, s^*, z^*)\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

□

5 Efficient computation for smoothing operators

In this section, we will show that the smoothing operator (15) is computationally efficient for several commonly supported cones in state-of-the-arts solvers [2, 3, 29].

Computation of the smoothing operator (15) for nonnegative cones, second-order cones and positive semidefinite cones have analytical solutions, which have already discussed in the use of ABMM-IPM algorithm [27]. We summarize the relevant computation in Appendix B.

Compared to nonnegative cones, second-order cones and positive-semidefinite cones, we can not obtain an analytical solution of (15) for general conic constraints. Instead, we choose to compute (15) numerically for general nonsymmetric cones via the damped Newton method, i.e.

$$s^{k+1} = s^k - \alpha_k [\nabla^2 f_\mu(s^k)]^{-1} \nabla f_\mu(s^k), \quad (22)$$

where

$$\alpha_k = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1+\lambda(f_\mu, s^k)} & , \quad \lambda(f_\mu, s^k) \geq \lambda^* \\ 1 & , \quad \text{else} \end{cases},$$

$\lambda^* = 2 - \sqrt{3}$ and $\lambda(f_\mu, s)$ is the Newton decrement defined as

$$\lambda(f_\mu, s) := \|[\nabla^2 f_\mu(s)]^{-1/2} \nabla f_\mu(s)\|, \quad s \in \text{int } \mathcal{K}.$$

We solve (15) iteratively via (22) and it will finally converge to the unique solution of (15). We can show that the Newton method is computationally efficient on it for general nonsymmetric cones.

Theorem 5.1. *Given a barrier function $f(s)$ that is self-concordant and lower-bounded, with the initial point $s^0 \in \text{int } \mathcal{K}$, $f_\mu(s)$ is also self-concordant and the damped Newton iterates are well defined, i.e. $s^k \in \text{int } \mathcal{K}$ and converge to the optimal solution of $f_\mu(s)$. Moreover, s^k exhibits a quadratic convergence rate once the Newton decrement becomes sufficiently small, e.g. $\lambda(f_\mu, s^k) \leq \lambda^*$.*

Proof. We can easily verify that the quadratic term $\frac{1}{2} \|s - c\|^2$ satisfies (4) and is self-concordant. Since the self-concordance is preserved under the direct summation (Proposition 2.1.1 [30]), $f_\mu(s)$ remains to be self-concordant.

Suppose $s^k \in \text{int } \mathcal{K}$. We define the step direction $\Delta^k = [\nabla^2 f_\mu(s^k)]^{-1} \nabla f_\mu(s^k)$, the Euclidean seminorm of Δ^k becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \|s^{k+1} - s^k\|_{s^k, f_\mu}^2 &= \frac{\|[\nabla^2 f_\mu(s^k)]^{-1} \nabla f_\mu(s^k)\|_{s^k, f_\mu}^2}{(1 + \lambda(f_\mu, s^k))^2} = \frac{\nabla f_\mu(s^k)^\top [\nabla^2 f_\mu(s^k)]^{-1} \nabla f_\mu(s^k)}{(1 + \lambda(f_\mu, s^k))^2} \\ &= \frac{\lambda(f_\mu, s^k)^2}{(1 + \lambda(f_\mu, s^k))^2} < 1, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. the radius of the Dikin's ellipsoid at s^k is less than 1, which implies $s^{k+1} \in \text{int } \mathcal{K}$ (Theorem 2.1.1 [30]). According to Theorem 2.2.1 in [30], the damped Newton method is monotonically decreasing

$$f_\mu(s^{k+1}) \leq f_\mu(s^k) - \omega(\lambda(f_\mu, s^k)), \quad (23)$$

where

$$\omega(t) = t - \log(1 + t)$$

is monotonically increasing and positive for $\forall t > 0$. Since $f_\mu(s^k)$ is lower bounded and monotone decreasing, $\omega(\lambda(f_\mu, s^k))$ will converge to 0 and the same for the Newton decrement $\lambda(f_\mu, s^k)$ by monotonicity. Once we have $\lambda(f_\mu, s^k) < \lambda^*$, it has been proved $\|s^{k+1} - s^k\|_{s^k, f_\mu}^2 \leq \lambda^{*2}$ and the Newton decrement $\lambda(f_\mu, s^k)$ will converge quadratically under the standard Newton method with step size $\alpha_k = 1$ (Theorem 2.2.3 [30]) and the functional value $f_\mu(s^k)$ converges to the minimum of $f_\mu(s)$ (Theorem 2.2.2 [30]). \square

Since we usually exploit the warmstarting technique within a problem that needs to be solved repetitively with slight perturbation on parameters between two consecutive problems, it is likely that the initial point s^0 resides in the neighbourhood of the optimum of (15) and the damped Newton method is prone to start from the region with quadratic convergence rate.

Note that two common nonsymmetric cones that are supported in modern conic solvers [2, 3] are exponential and power cones. Both of them are 3-dimensional and the Newton method will be computationally efficient for their smoothing operators (15).

6 Primal-dual interior point methods

The proposed warmstarting strategy is applicable for the class of primal-dual interior point methods. We test it on the Clarabel conic solver [3], which is based on a primal-dual interior point method with a predictor-corrector framework. Since our warmstarting strategy is independent from other parts of a primal-dual interior point method, we omit the implementation of Clarabel and refer readers to [3] for details of Clarabel solver.

6.1 Warmstarting with homogeneous embedding

General conic solvers also need to consider the case when a problem is infeasible. The homogeneous embedding is widely used within an interior point method for infeasibility detection, e.g. Mosek [2] and Clarabel [3] solver. The central path is then defined slightly differently compared to (11), which is

$$\begin{aligned} G(v) &= \mu G(v^0), \\ z &= -\mu \nabla f(s), \\ \tau \kappa &= \mu, \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where the monotone mapping $G(v)$ is defined as, given $v := (x, z, s, \tau, \kappa)$,

$$G(v) := \begin{bmatrix} P & A^\top & q \\ -A & 0 & b \\ -q^\top & -b^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ z \\ \tau \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \frac{1}{\tau} x^\top P x \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ s \\ \kappa \end{bmatrix}. \tag{25}$$

The initial values x^0, s^0, z^0 are set as we proposed before. We then set the initial value $\tau^0 = 1$ and $\kappa^0 = \mu$ so that the initial pair (τ^0, κ^0) also lies on the new central path (24).

6.2 Termination criterion

The interior point method is an iterative method and solves an optimization problem approximately to ϵ -optimality. For checks of primal and dual feasibility, we define primal and dual objectives as

$$\begin{aligned} g_p &:= \frac{1}{2} x^\top P x + q^\top x \\ g_d &:= -\frac{1}{2} x^\top P x - b^\top z, \end{aligned}$$

and use the primal residual r_p and the dual residual r_d defined in (10).

We then declare convergence if all of the following three conditions holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \|r_p\| &< \epsilon \cdot \max\{1, \|b\|_\infty + \|x\| + \|s\|\} \\ \|r_d\| &< \epsilon \cdot \max\{1, \|q\|_\infty + \|x\| + \|z\|\} \\ |g_p - g_d| &< \epsilon \cdot \max\{1, \min\{|g_p|, |g_d|\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The precision is set to $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$ by default for later experiments if we do not specify it explicitly. For infeasibility check, we declare primal infeasibility if

$$\begin{aligned}\|A^\top z\| &< -\epsilon_{i,r} \cdot \max(1, \|x\| + \|z\|) \cdot (b^\top z) \\ b^\top z &< -\epsilon_{i,a},\end{aligned}$$

and dual infeasibility if

$$\begin{aligned}\|Px\| &< -\epsilon_{i,r} \cdot \max(1, \|x\|) \cdot (b^\top z) \\ \|Ax + s\| &< -\epsilon_{i,r} \cdot \max(1, \|x\| + \|s\|) \cdot (q^\top x) \\ q^\top x &< -\epsilon_{i,a},\end{aligned}$$

where we set $\epsilon_{i,r} = \epsilon_{i,a} = 10^{-8}$ by default.

7 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we evaluate the efficacy of the proposed smoothing operator (15) for warmstarting across a variety of problem sets.¹ We begin by outlining the general methodology employed in our testing. Subsequently, we present the results, focusing on applications such as hyperparameter tuning in machine learning and iterative reoptimization in portfolio optimization under diverse models. Lastly, we check how the effectiveness of our warmstarting is affected by the magnitude of perturbation on parameters.

7.1 General metric

We compare the proposed warmstarting method with the standard coldstarting used in current solvers [2, 3]. Both are implemented based on the Clarabel solver [3]. We use the same metric in [20] to measure the efficacy of our warmstarting technique. Given a problem \mathcal{P}_i , we define the reduction ratio of the warmstarting technique as

$$\mathcal{R}_i = \frac{\text{number of iterations of the warmstarted IPM on } \mathcal{P}_i}{\text{number of iterations of the coldstarted IPM on } \mathcal{P}_i}.$$

For a set of test problems $\mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_N$, we evaluate the overall reduction rate \mathcal{R} of warmstarting by the geometric mean defined as

$$\mathcal{R} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^N \mathcal{R}_i \right)^{\frac{1}{N}}.$$

A lower value of \mathcal{R} means the warmstarting is more effective on reducing computation over test problems.

7.2 Tuning hyperparameters in support vector machines

The support vector machine (SVM) is a classical machine learning model where the training process can be formulated as solving a convex optimization problem. Suppose we have a set of training samples $\{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^m \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \{-1, +1\}$ for a standard binary classification problem, the

¹See tests on https://github.com/oxfordcontrol/Clarabel.jl/tree/yc/warmstart/warmstart_test.

final classifier will be $h_{w,b}(x) = \text{sgn}(\langle w, x \rangle + b)$, where the parameters w, b are the solution of the following convex optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{w,b,\xi} : \quad & \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i + R(w, b) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \xi_i \geq 1 - y_i (\langle w, x_i \rangle + b), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m \\ & \xi_i \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the slack variable characterizing prediction error and $R(w, b)$ is the regularization for parameters w, b .

7.2.1 SVM with L_1 regularization

When we choose the norm-1 regularization, i.e. $R(w, b) = \lambda \|w\|_1$, the problem (26) becomes a linear program where $\lambda > 0$ is a hyperparameter that should be finely tuned. We initially solve (26) with $\lambda = 0.01$ and then obtain a pair of parameter (w^*, b^*) . Then, we increase λ by 0.01 and warmstart the new problem with (w^*, b^*) and repeat the tuning process several times for better predicting performance, which is called the hyperparameter tuning in machine learning.

We take half of data from the MNIST dataset and train a binary SVM classifier with the norm-1 regularization. The results for both warmstarting and coldstarting are shown in Table 1. The overall reduction rate of the iteration number is $\mathcal{R}_{iter} = 0.4984$ and the reduction rate of the solve time is $\mathcal{R}_t = 0.4561$, which shows our warmstarting technique is effective for the hyperparameter tuning.

Table 1: Tuning the regularization parameter λ in SVMs

λ value	iterations		solve time (s)	
	Warm	Cold	Warm	Cold
0.02	33	49	47.4	72.9
0.03	21	20	30.7	31.2
0.04	11	20	15.6	30.7
0.05	10	19	14.1	29
0.06	9	20	12.8	32
0.07	8	21	11.5	33.4
0.08	8	20	11.4	30
0.09	8	19	10.8	28
0.1	8	20	10.9	31.8
0.11	8	20	11.1	31.6

7.2.2 Robust SVM with L_2 regularization

When we choose the norm-2 regularization, i.e. $R(w, b) = \lambda \|w\|_2$, the problem (26) can be interpreted as a robust optimization problem [6], which can be reformulated as a second-order cone program. We initialize $\lambda = 0.01$ and then repeat the tuning of λ with increment equal to 0.01.

Table 2: Tuning the regularization parameter λ in robust SVMs

λ value	iterations		solve time (s)	
	Warm	Cold	Warm	Cold
0.02	30	58	43	84.6
0.03	28	53	40.2	77.3
0.04	27	50	39	72.5
0.05	28	50	40.1	72.8
0.06	29	53	41.5	77.8
0.07	31	48	43.2	67.9
0.08	28	45	38.7	67.2
0.09	30	45	42.9	65.9
0.1	28	43	40	63
0.11	28	41	40.2	61.7

The overall reduction rate of the iteration number is $\mathcal{R}_{iter} = 0.5931$ and the reduction rate of the solve time is $\mathcal{R}_t = 0.5775$.

7.3 Portfolio optimization

Portfolio optimization is a classical model used in quantitative finance [31], which is of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_x \quad & \mathcal{R}(-r^\top x) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{e}^\top x = 1, \\
& \bar{r}^\top x \geq r_0, \\
& x \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$


The return $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for each asset is unknown and we need to estimate the expected return \bar{r} from historical data. The problem (27) aims to minimize the risk of loss $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ if we aim to find a portfolio $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that the expected return is no less than r_0 . The sum of portfolio is normalized to 1 and $x \geq 0$ imposes no short-selling constraint.

Suppose we consider the standard mean-variance model [31] where we choose the risk \mathcal{R} to be the variance of random variable r . The problem (27) can be reformulated as a second-order cone program by introducing the slack variable t :

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{t,x} \quad & t \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{e}^\top x = 1, \\
& \sqrt{x^\top \Sigma_r x} \leq t, \\
& \bar{r}^\top x \geq r_0, \\
& x \geq 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where Σ_r is the variance matrix for the return variable r . Given the return matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ for the last d days, the expected return \bar{r} is the mean of R over each column and the variance matrix Σ_r is obtained from $\Sigma_r = (d-1)^{-1}(R - \mathbf{e}\bar{r}^\top)^\top(R - \mathbf{e}\bar{r}^\top)$. We input the variance constraint as an second-order constraint $(t, Ux) \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{soc}}^n$ in Clarabel solver [3], where U is from the Cholesky factorization of the variance matrix $\Sigma_r = U^\top U$. We set $d = 500$ and $n = 300$ in this section

Figure 1: 100 consecutive transactions for the mean-variance model



and the historical return R is extracted from n stocks in the S&P500 stock index. We first test frequent portfolio rebalancing and efficient frontier problems similar to [20], and then test with a different risk measure based on the power cone [4].

7.3.1 Frequent portfolio rebalancing

Given a fixed selection of n assets, the portfolio optimization problem (28) needs to be reoptimized over time with slight changes for values of \bar{r}, Σ_r as they are estimated from the last d days. The problem can be regarded as a parametric second-order cone programming w.r.t. \bar{r}, Σ_r . We estimate parameters \bar{r}, Σ_r by the same procedure everyday, where the time horizon is shifted by one day compared to the last estimate, and reoptimize the portfolio with new estimates \bar{r}, Σ_r in (28). We expect the optimal solution is close to the solution from the last day and the warmstarting should be effective in reducing computational time. We reuse the optimal solution (t^*, x^*) from the last day as the input for the smoothing operator (15). The output of the smoothing operator is then used as the warmstarting point for the next run.

The results are shown in Figure 1 where the transaction is simulated for $N = 100$ repeated times. We find that the warmstarting is always faster than the coldstarting in the portfolio rebalancing problem, and the overall reduction rate of the iteration number is $\mathcal{R}_{iter} = 0.6277$ and the reduction rate of the solve time is $\mathcal{R}_t = 0.5934$.

7.3.2 Efficient frontier

Computing efficient frontier in the Markowitz portfolio selection can also benefit from warmstarting strategies when we need to solve a sequence of portfolio optimization problems with different choices of the minimum return r_0 in (28). The *efficient frontier* of problem (28) is the pair of points $(r_0, f(r_0))$ for $t \in [0, \max(\bar{r})]$ where $f(r_0)$ is the optimum of (28) that is parametrized by the selection of r_0 . We compute the optimal solution of problem (28) with the initial value $r_0 = 0.001$ and then increase r_0 by 0.0001 for every new problem up to $r_0 = 0.002$, where we apply the warmstarting technique we proposed and compare it with the coldstart.

The results are shown in Table 3 where we list values of r_0 and $f(r_0)$, along with the corresponding iteration number and solve time. The risk $f(r_0)$ is increasing as we set higher return goal for our portfolio, which is consistent with our expectation. The overall reduction rate of the iteration number is $\mathcal{R}_{iter} = 0.5353$, which is close to the reduction rate of the solve time is $\mathcal{R}_t = 0.5021$. It implies the additional time spent on warmstarting is negligible compared to solve time within an interior point method for second-order cone optimization.

Table 3: Efficient frontier

Values		iterations		solve time (s)	
r_0	$f(r_0)$	Warm	Cold	Warm	Cold
0.0011	0.0137	11	20	0.0868	0.172
0.0012	0.0138	10	20	0.0811	0.171
0.0013	0.014	9	19	0.0721	0.161
0.0014	0.0142	9	19	0.072	0.156
0.0015	0.0145	12	22	0.0929	0.181
0.0016	0.0147	11	18	0.0893	0.15
0.0017	0.015	13	19	0.101	0.16
0.0018	0.0153	11	20	0.0851	0.172
0.0019	0.0157	10	21	0.0769	0.184
0.002	0.016	11	21	0.127	0.179

7.3.3 Higher-moment coherent risk measures

Higher-moment coherent risk measures (HMC_R) is the generalization of the conditional value-at-risk measure (CVaR),


$$HMC_{R,p,\alpha}(X) := \min_{\eta} \eta + (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \|(X - \eta)^+\|_p, p > 1,$$

and works effectively within the stochastic programming of problem (27). Suppose we have the return matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ recording returns of n assets across d consecutive days. we choose the risk measure to be the higher-moment coherent risk measures, $\mathcal{R}(X) = HMC_{R,p,\alpha}(X)$, and take d different days as the scenarios in stochastic programming. Then the problem (27) is equivalent to the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \eta + \frac{t}{(1 - \alpha)d^{\frac{1}{p}}} \\
s.t. \quad & \mathbf{e}^\top x = 1, \\
& \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{i=1}^n R_{j,i} x_i \geq r_0, \\
& w \geq -Rx - \eta \cdot \mathbf{e}, \\
& t \geq (w_1^p + \dots + w_d^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \\
& x \geq 0, w \geq 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $w_i, i = 1, \dots, d$ is the slack variable for i -th scenario. The expected return over d scenarios should be no less than r_0 . The p -th moment coherent risk measures can be formulated as a p -norm conic constraint, which is equivalent to d power cone constraints plus a linear constraint

Figure 2: 100 consecutive transactions with higher-moment coherent risk measures



as follows [2]:

$$(r_i, t, w_i) \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{pow}}^{1/p}, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, d,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^d r_i = t.$$


Results are shown in Figure 2. We set the accuracy level to $\epsilon = 1e^{-7}$ and simulate it for $N = 100$ times. The overall reduction rate for the iteration number of and solve time are $\mathcal{R}_{\text{iter}} = 0.6191$ and $\mathcal{R}_t = 0.6013$ respectively. $\mathcal{R}_{\text{iter}} \approx \mathcal{R}_t$ shows that the computational time for the smoothing operator (15) is negligible within the warmstarting scheme for this portfolio optimization problem with power cones.

7.4 Perturbation effects on the warmstarting strategy

Finally, we test how the performance of the warmstarting strategy varies with changes in the magnitude of the perturbation. We benchmark the model predictive control (MPC) problems [12] with quadratic objectives from the benchmark collection [32], which are in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{y, x, u} \quad & \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \begin{pmatrix} y_i - y_i^r \\ u_i - u_i^r \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Q_k & S_k \\ S_k^T & R_k \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y_i - y_i^r \\ u_i - u_i^r \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} g_k^y \\ g_k^u \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} y_i - y_i^r \\ u_i - u_i^r \end{pmatrix} \\ & + (x_N - x_N^r)^\top P (x_N - x_N^r) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \left. \begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= A_k x_k + B_k u_k + f_k \\ y_k &= C_k x_k + D_k u_k + e_k \\ d_k^\ell &\leq M_k x_k + N_k u_k \leq d_k^u \\ u_k &\in \mathcal{U}_k, \quad y_k \in \mathcal{Y}_k \end{aligned} \right\} \quad k = 0 \dots N-1 \\ & T x_N \in \mathcal{T}, \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Figure 3: Geometric mean \mathcal{R} vs perturbation δ



where the constraint sets \mathcal{U}_k , \mathcal{Y}_k and \mathcal{T} are interval constraints and cost matrices satisfy $Q_k \succeq 0$, $R_k \succeq 0$ and $P \succ 0$. The dimension of the states x_k and inputs u_k are relatively small (max 12 and 4, respectively), with horizons N up to 100.

Similar to [20], we generate the perturbation δ for parameters b, q, A respectively, where 10% but at most 20 elements are changed after perturbation. Given the changing parameter v , each entry of v is modified as follows,

$$v_i := \begin{cases} \delta r & \text{if } |v_i| \leq 10^{-6} \\ (1 + \delta r)v_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where r is a random number generated from the uniform distribution $[-1, 1]$. Figure 3 shows how the size of perturbation affects the reduction ratio of the proposed warmstarting strategy. The y-axis denotes the geometric mean of the number of iterations for MPC problems. The warmstarting is quite effective when the perturbation δ is small enough and the geometric mean of the iteration number is non-decreasing as the magnitude of perturbation δ grows up.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed a warmstarting method that is applicable for conic optimization problems. Our warmstarting is based on a smoothing operator that can be computed in parallel for different cones. We have shown that the smoothing operator has an analytic solution for nonnegative cones, second-order cones and positive semidefinite cones, and the Newton method can find the unique solution of the smoothing operator with a locally quadratic convergence rate for any cone of a self-concordant barrier function. Compared to previous work on warmstarting, our method can generate an initial point on the central path of a primal-dual interior point method and the analysis shows that the infeasibility residuals of our initial point is at most $O(\mu)$ deviation from that of the optimum of the last problem.

Note that nonnegative cones, second-order cones and positive semidefinite cones all belong to

the class of symmetric cones. Future work can be extending the current $O(\mu)$ error analysis for general symmetric cones, or nonsymmetric cones if possible.

References

- [1] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenbergh. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [2] MOSEK ApS. *MOSEK Optimization Suite 10.0*, 2023.
- [3] Paul J. Goulart and Yuwen Chen. Clarabel: An interior-point solver for conic programs with quadratic objectives, 2024.
- [4] PAVLO A. Krokmal. Higher moment coherent risk measures. *Quantitative Finance*, 7(4):373–387, August 2007.
- [5] Stephen Boyd, Laurent El Ghaoui, Eric Feron, and Venkataramanan Balakrishnan. *Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, 1994.
- [6] Huan Xu, Constantine Caramanis, and Shie Mannor. Robustness and Regularization of Support Vector Machines. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10(51):1485–1510, 2009.
- [7] Y. Nesterov, M. J. Todd, and Y. Ye. Infeasible-start primal-dual methods and infeasibility detectors for nonlinear programming problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 84(2):227–267, 1999.
- [8] Stephen J. Wright. *Primal-Dual Interior-Point Methods*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1997.
- [9] Y. E. Nesterov and M. J. Todd. Self-scaled barriers and interior-point methods for convex programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 22(1):1–42, 1997.
- [10] Lieven Vandenbergh. *The CVXOPT linear and quadratic cone program solvers*, 2010.
- [11] Martin Herceg, Michal Kvasnica, Colin N. Jones, and Manfred Morari. Multi-Parametric Toolbox 3.0. In *2013 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 502–510, July 2013.
- [12] Francesco Borrelli, Alberto Bemporad, and Manfred Morari. *Predictive control for linear and hybrid systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [13] Christopher M. Bishop. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning (Information Science and Statistics)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006.
- [14] Brendan O’Donoghue, Eric Chu, Neal Parikh, and Stephen Boyd. Conic optimization via operator splitting and homogeneous self-dual embedding. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 169(3):1042–1068, 2016.
- [15] Bartolomeo Stellato, Goran Banjac, Paul Goulart, Alberto Bemporad, and Stephen Boyd. OSQP: an operator splitting solver for quadratic programs. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 12(4):637–672, December 2020.
- [16] E. Alper Yildirim and Stephen J. Wright. Warm-Start Strategies in Interior-Point Methods for Linear Programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 12(3):782–810, January 2002. Publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [17] Jacek Gondzio and Andreas Grothey. Reoptimization With the Primal-Dual Interior Point Method. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 13(3):842–864, January 2002. Publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.

- [18] Jacek Gondzio and Andreas Grothey. A New Unblocking Technique to Warmstart Interior Point Methods Based on Sensitivity Analysis. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19(3):1184–1210, January 2008. Publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [19] Amir Shahzad and Paul J. Goulart. A New Hot-start Interior-point Method for Model Predictive Control*. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 44(1):2470–2475, January 2011.
- [20] Anders Skajaa, Erling D. Andersen, and Yinyu Ye. Warmstarting the homogeneous and self-dual interior point method for linear and conic quadratic problems. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 5(1):1–25, March 2013.
- [21] Sertalp B. Çay, Imre Pólik, and Tamás Terlaky. Warm-start of interior point methods for second order cone optimization via rounding over optimal Jordan frames, May 2017.
- [22] Neal Parikh and Stephen Boyd. Proximal Algorithms. *Found. Trends Optim.*, 1(3):127–239, January 2014.
- [23] Michael Garstka, Mark Cannon, and Paul Goulart. COSMO: A conic operator splitting method for convex conic problems. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 190(3):779–810, 2021.
- [24] Yuwen Chen, Catherine Ning, and Paul Goulart. A unified early termination technique for primal-dual algorithms in mixed integer conic programming. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 7:2803–2808, 2023.
- [25] Alnur Ali, Eric Wong, and J. Zico Kolter. A semismooth Newton method for fast, generic convex programming. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70*, ICML’17, pages 70–79, Sydney, NSW, Australia, August 2017. JMLR.org.
- [26] Xudong Li, Defeng Sun, and Kim-Chuan Toh. QSDPNAL: a two-phase augmented Lagrangian method for convex quadratic semidefinite programming. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 10(4):703–743, December 2018.
- [27] Qi Deng, Qing Feng, Wenzhi Gao, Dongdong Ge, Bo Jiang, Yuntian Jiang, Jingsong Liu, Tianhao Liu, Chenyu Xue, Yinyu Ye, and Chuwen Zhang. An enhanced alternating direction method of multipliers-based interior point method for linear and conic optimization. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 37(2):338–359, 2025.
- [28] Joachim Dahl and Erling D. Andersen. A primal-dual interior-point algorithm for nonsymmetric exponential-cone optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 2021.
- [29] Yuwen Chen, Danny Tse, Parth Nobel, Paul Goulart, and Stephen Boyd. Cuclarabel: GPU acceleration for a conic optimization solver, 2024.
- [30] Yurii Nesterov and Arkadii Nemirovskii. *Interior-Point Polynomial Algorithms in Convex Programming*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, January 1994.
- [31] G. Cornuejols and R. Tütüncü. *Optimization Methods in Finance*. Mathematics, Finance and Risk. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [32] D. Kouzoupis, A. Zanelli, H. Peyrl, and H. J. Ferreau. Towards proper assessment of QP algorithms for embedded model predictive control. In *2015 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 2609–2616, 2015.

A Barrier functions for a class of cones

We list barrier functions for cones that are commonly supported in state-of-the-art conic optimization solvers [2, 3, 29]:

- The *nonnegative cone*, which is used to formulate linear inequality constraints, is defined as

$$\mathbb{R}_+^n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_i \geq 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, n\},$$

with its LHSCB function of degree n ,

$$f(x) = - \sum_{i \in [n]} \log(x_i), \quad x \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K}_{\geq}^n).$$

- The *second-order cone* $\mathcal{K}_{\text{soc}}^n$ (also sometimes called the *quadratic* or *Lorentz cone*), is defined as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{soc}}^n := \{(t, x) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \|x\|_2 \leq t\},$$

with the LHSCB function of degree 1,

$$f(x) = -\frac{1}{2} \log \left(x_1^2 - \sum_{i=2}^n x_i^2 \right), \quad x \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K}_q^n).$$

- The *positive semidefinite cone* \mathcal{K}_{\succeq}^n is defined as:

$$\mathcal{K}_{\succeq}^n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n(n+1)/2} \mid \text{mat}(x) \succeq 0\},$$

with the LHSCB function of degree n ,

$$f(x) = -\log \det(\text{mat}(x)), \quad \text{mat}(x) \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K}_{\succeq}^n).$$

- The *exponential cone* is a 3-dimensional cone defined as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{exp}} := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x_2 \geq 0, x_2 \exp\left(\frac{x_3}{x_2}\right) \leq x_1 \right\} \cup \{(x_1, 0, x_3) \mid x_1 \geq 0, x_3 \leq 0\},$$

with the LHSCB function of degree 3,

$$f(x) = -\log(x_2 \log(x_1/x_2) - x_3) - \log x_1 - \log x_2, \quad x \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K}_{\text{exp}}).$$

- The 3-dimensional *power cone* with exponent $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{pow}, \alpha} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x_1^\alpha x_2^{1-\alpha} \geq |x_3|, x_1, x_2 \geq 0\},$$

with the LHSCB function of degree 3,

$$f(x) = -\log \left(x_1^{2\alpha} x_2^{2(1-\alpha)} - x_3^2 \right) - (1-\alpha) \log(x_1) - \alpha \log(x_2), \quad x \in \text{int}(\mathcal{K}_{\text{pow}}). \quad (31)$$

B Computation for smoothing operators over cones

Nonnegative cones

For nonnegative cones $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ that generalize linear inequality constraints, the LHSCB function is $f(s) = -\sum_{i=1}^n \log(s_i)$ and the 1st-order optimality condition of the inner problem of (15) is

$$s_i - c_i - \frac{\mu}{s_i} = 0, \quad \forall i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket,$$

which yields

$$s_i = \frac{c_i + \sqrt{c_i^2 + 4\mu}}{2} \quad (32)$$

since $s_i > 0, \forall i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$.

Second-order cones

The LHSCB function $f(\cdot)$ for a second-order cone is

$$f(s) = -\frac{1}{2} \log(s_0^2 - \|s_1\|^2), \quad \forall (s_0, s_1) \in \text{int } \mathcal{K}_{\text{soc}}^n.$$

Suppose we denote $t_s := s_0^2 - \|s_1\|^2$, the 1st-order optimality condition of (15) is

$$-\frac{\mu}{t_s} \begin{bmatrix} s_0 \\ -s_1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} s_0 \\ s_1 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (33)$$

We compute (s_0, s_1) in two different ways depending on the value of c_0 .

- If $c_0 = 0$, the first equality of (33) yields $\mu = t_s = s_0^2 - \|s_1\|^2$ and the second equality becomes $s_1 = c_1/2$. Therefore, we can compute s_0 via

$$s_0 = \sqrt{\mu + \|s_1\|^2} = \sqrt{\mu + \|c_1\|^2/4}.$$

- When $c_0 \neq 0$, the optimality condition (33) implies

$$s_0 = \frac{t_s}{t_s - \mu} c_0, \quad s_1 = \frac{t_s}{t_s + \mu} c_1,$$

and we have the equation

$$t_s = \left(\frac{t_s}{t_s - \mu} \right)^2 c_0^2 - \left(\frac{t_s}{t_s + \mu} \right)^2 \|c_1\|^2,$$

which reduces to

$$(t_s^2 - \mu^2)^2 = t_s(t_s + \mu)^2 c_0^2 - t_s(t_s - \mu)^2 \|c_1\|^2.$$

We define $\rho = t_s/\mu$ and the equation above becomes

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho^2 - 1)^2 &= \frac{\rho}{\mu} (\rho + 1)^2 c_0^2 - \frac{\rho}{\mu} (\rho - 1)^2 \|c_1\|^2, \\ \rho^4 - 2\rho^2 + 1 &= \frac{c_0^2 - \|c_1\|^2}{\mu} \rho^3 + \frac{2(c_0^2 + \|c_1\|^2)}{\mu} \rho^2 + \frac{c_0^2 - \|c_1\|^2}{\mu} \rho, \\ \rho^2 + \frac{1}{\rho^2} - \frac{c_0^2 - \|c_1\|^2}{\mu} \left(\rho + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) - \frac{2(c_0^2 + \|c_1\|^2)}{\mu} - 2 &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which reduces to

$$\gamma^2 - \frac{c_0^2 - \|c_1\|^2}{\mu} \gamma - \frac{2(c_0^2 + \|c_1\|^2)}{\mu} - 4 = 0 \quad (34)$$

where we define $\gamma := \rho + 1/\rho > 2$, and we can obtain

$$\gamma = \frac{\frac{c_0^2 - \|c_1\|^2}{\mu} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{c_0^2 - \|c_1\|^2}{\mu}\right)^2 + \frac{8(c_0^2 + \|c_1\|^2)}{\mu} + 16}}{2}.$$

Then, we can obtain the value of ρ by

$$\rho = \begin{cases} \frac{\gamma + \sqrt{\gamma^2 - 4}}{2}, & c_0 > 0, \\ \frac{\gamma - \sqrt{\gamma^2 - 4}}{2}, & c_0 < 0, \end{cases}.$$

s_0, s_1 can be computed via

$$s_0 = \frac{\rho}{\rho - 1} c_0, \quad s_1 = \frac{\rho}{\rho + 1} c_1.$$

Positive semidefinite cones

For positive semidefinite (PSD) cones where the LHSCB function is

$$f(S) = -\log \det(S), \quad \forall S \in \mathbb{S}_+^n,$$

where $S = \text{mat}(s)$. The optimality condition of (15) becomes, given $C = \text{mat}(c)$,

$$S - C - \mu(S)^{-1} = 0.$$

Following the same derivation for the proximal operator of semidefinite cones from [27], we can obtain S by $S = Q^\top E Q$, where Q is from the eigenvalue decomposition of $C = Q^\top D Q$ and E is a diagonal matrix that

$$E = \text{diag}(e), \quad e_i = \frac{d_i + \sqrt{d_i^2 + 4\mu}}{2}, \quad \forall i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, \quad (35)$$

where d_i is the eigenvalue of C in the diagonal matrix $D = \text{diag}(d)$.