

OEF (Proximal) Newton-type Method with Inexact Derivatives for Unconstrained Optimization

Hong Zhu*

School of Mathematical Sciences, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, 212013, Jiangsu, China.

Abstract

In this paper, we propose objective-evaluation-free (OEF) variants of the proximal Newton method for nonconvex composite optimization problems and the regularized Newton method for unconstrained optimization problems, respectively, using inexact evaluations of gradients and Hessians. Theoretical analysis demonstrates that the global/local convergence rates of the proposed algorithms are consistent with those achieved when both objective function and derivatives are evaluated exactly. Additionally, we present an OEF regularized Newton and negative curvature algorithm that uses inexact derivatives to find approximate second-order stationary points for unconstrained optimization problems. The worst-case iteration/(sample) operation complexity of the proposed algorithm matches the optimal results reported in the literature.

Keywords: Objective-evaluation-free method inexact gradients and Hessians Global and local convergence Iteration/(sample) operation complexity .

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the objective-evaluation-free methods for nonconvex composite optimization problems

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(x) := f(x) + h(x), \quad (1.1)$$

unconstrained optimization problems

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x), \quad (1.2)$$

and its finite-sum form

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x) \quad (1.3)$$

under the condition that both gradients and Hessians are approximated.

Optimization methods with inexact gradients and Hessians have been studied in literature. For instance, relevant works can be found in [Devolder et al., 2014, Dvurechensky, 2022, Gratton et al., 2025b, Hamadouche et al., 2024, Schmidt et al., 2011] for Problem (1.1), and in [Arjevani et al., 2020, Bellavia et al., 2022b, Bergou et al., 2022, d’Aspremont, 2008, Liu et al., 2023, Roosta-Khorasani and Mahoney, 2019] for Problems (1.2) or (1.3). For strongly convex finite-sum problems (1.3), Roosta and Mahoney [Roosta-Khorasani and Mahoney, 2019] proposed sub-sampled Newton methods with sampled gradients and Hessians. Exact evaluation of the objective function values is required to determine the step size. Research on the proximal

*zhuhongmath@126.com

Newton method and the regularized Newton method with inexact gradients and Hessians remains relatively limited. Numerous studies have shown that the accuracy of the (noisy) objective function is significantly more critical to ensure convergence than that of the computed (noisy) derivatives [Bellavia et al., 2022a, 2023, Blanchet et al., 2019, Cartis and Scheinberg, 2018, Chen et al., 2018]. The evaluation of the objective function may have similar computational cost to the gradient evaluation. *In this paper, we propose an OEF variant of the proximal Newton method for Problem (1.1), which only requires approximate gradients and Hessians. The global and local convergence rates under high-order metric subregularity assumption of the proposed method are identical to those of its counterparts that use exact function values and derivatives. Furthermore, we derive an OEF regularized Newton method for Problems (1.2) and (1.3), which can be regarded as a special case of the OEF Proximal Newton-type method applied to these problems. The local Q -linear/superlinear convergence rate is attainable. By appropriately designing the accuracy criterion for the approximate gradients and Hessians, the OEF regularized Newton method attains local quadratic convergence when applied to the strongly convex problem (1.2), which improves the convergence rate obtained in [Roosta-Khorasani and Mahoney, 2019].*

A point x is called an ϵ_g -first-order stationary point (FOSP) of Problem (1.2) if $\|\nabla f(x)\| \leq \epsilon_g$ for some $\epsilon_g > 0$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm. A point x is called an (ϵ_g, ϵ_h) -second-order stationary point (SOSP) if it further satisfies $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x)) \geq -\epsilon_h$ for some $\epsilon_h > 0$, where $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ denotes the minimal eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix. Second-order methods for computing an $(\epsilon, \epsilon^{1/2})$ -SOSP of Problem (1.2) with the optimal iteration complexity $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3/2})$ have been widely studied in literature (e.g., [Cartis et al., 2011a,b, Curtis et al., 2021, 2017, Gratton et al., 2020, Griewank, 1981, He et al., 2025b,a, Nesterov and Polyak, 2006, Royer et al., 2020, Royer and Wright, 2018, Toint, 2013, Zhang et al., 2025]), among which [Cartis et al., 2011a,b] allow for the approximate Hessians. Xu et al. [Xu et al., 2020] proposed variants of trust-region and adaptive cubic regularization methods for nonconvex finite-sum problems based on the approximate Hessian, achieving the optimal iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3/2})$. Tripuraneni et al. [Tripuraneni et al., 2018] presented a stochastic cubic regularization method for nonconvex stochastic optimization using approximate gradients and Hessians, which attains an $(\epsilon, \sqrt{L_h}\epsilon)$ -SOSP in at most $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3/2})$ iterations with $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-7/2})$ stochastic gradient and stochastic Hessian-vector evaluations. Here, L_h denotes the Lipschitz constant of $\nabla^2 f(x)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\cdot)$ hides poly-logarithmic factors. Yao [Yao et al., 2021] proposed inexact variants of trust region and adaptive cubic regularization methods incorporating approximate gradients and Hessians, which reach an (ϵ_g, ϵ_h) -SOSP in at most $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon_g^{-2}\epsilon_h^{-1})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon_g^{-3/2}\epsilon_h^{-3})$ iterations, respectively. Most of the aforementioned methods involve solving nonconvex subproblems and require exact function evaluations. Yao et al. [Yao et al., 2023] proposed an inexact Newton-CG method without line search for Problem (1.2), which achieves an $(\epsilon, \sqrt{L_h}\epsilon)$ -SOSP in at most $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3/2})$ iterations with high probability. For Problem (1.3), the total sample operation complexity (counting evaluations of ∇f_i and Hessian-vector products) is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-7/2})$. However, the accuracy criterion for the approximate gradient in this algorithm depends on two vectors that are not yet available (as their computation relies on the approximate gradient itself). Recently, Li and Wright [Li and Wright, 2025] proposed a randomized algorithm for Problem (1.2) that avoids function value evaluations, attaining an $(\epsilon, \sqrt{L_h}\epsilon)$ -SOSP in at most $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-2})$ iterations with high probability, along with $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-9/4})$ gradient and Hessian-vector evaluations. For Problem (1.3), the total sample operation complexity is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4})$. *In this paper, we propose an OEF regularized Newton and negative curvature method to find $(\epsilon, \sqrt{L_h}\epsilon)$ -SOSP of Problem (1.2), which achieves the iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3/2})$ and operator complexity of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-7/4})$. For Problem (1.3), we show the sample operation complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-7/2})$.*

Organization. The main results of this paper are summarized in Table 1. The remainder of this

paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we propose an OEF proximal Newton-type method with approximate gradients and Hessians for Problem (1.1); its iteration complexity and local convergence rate are detailed in Subsection 2.2 and 2.3, respectively. In Section 3, we discuss the special case of the OEF proximal Newton-type method applied to Problems (1.2) and (1.3), namely the OEF regularized Newton method. At the end of this section, we establish the local quadratic convergence of the method for unconstrained strongly convex optimization problems. Section 4 presents an OEF regularized Newton and negative curvature method: Subsection 4.1 details its iteration and operation complexity for Problems (1.2), while Subsection 4.2 details its iteration and sample operation complexity for Problem (1.3). Concluding remarks are provided in Section 5.

Table 1: Summary of the main results. For Problem (1.1), ϵ -FOSP refers to a point satisfies $\|\mathcal{G}(x)\| \leq \epsilon$, where $\mathcal{G}(x) = x - \text{prox}_h(x - \nabla f(x))$ also known as the KKT residual mapping of Problem (1.1). Here, $\text{prox}_h(u) = \arg \min_x \{h(x) + \frac{1}{2}\|x - u\|^2\}$. “iter. comp.” and “oper. comp.” are short for “iteration complexity” and “(sample) operation complexity”, respectively.

Probs.	ϵ -FOSP				$(\epsilon, \sqrt{L_h\epsilon})$ -SOSP		
	Global		Local		Global		
	Alg.	Th.	Alg.	Th.	Alg.	iter. comp.	oper. comp.
(1.1)	1	Th. 1 $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$	1	Th. 2 superlinear			
(1.2)	2	Th. 3 $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$	2	Th. 4 superlinear	4	Th. 9 $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3/2})$	Cor. 10 $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-7/4})$
			3	Th. 7 quadratic			
(1.3)	2	Th. 5 $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$	2	Th. 6 superlinear	4	Th. 11 $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3/2})$	Cor. 12 $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-7/2})$
			3	Th. 8 quadratic			

2 OEF proximal Newton-type method

In this section, we study the OEF Proximal Newton-type Method (OEF-PNM) for Problem (1.1). We assume that the solution set of Problem (1.1) is non-empty and denote φ_* as the optimal function value. We also assume the following standard assumptions hold.

Assumption 1. (i) $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is twice continuously differentiable on an open set Ω_1 containing the effective domain $\text{dom}h$ of h and ∇f is L_g -Lipschitz continuous over Ω_1 .

(ii) $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is proper convex, nonsmooth and lower semicontinuous.

(iii) For any $x_0 \in \text{dom}h$, the level set $\mathcal{L}_\varphi(x_0) = \{x | \varphi(x) \leq \varphi(x_0)\}$ is bounded.

Let \mathcal{S}^* be the set of stationary points of Problem (1.1). Then $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{S}^*$ if and only if $\mathcal{G}(\bar{x}) = 0$.

2.1 Algorithm

At each iteration $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we require the approximate gradient and Hessian satisfy the following conditions.

Assumption 2. The approximate gradient g_k and Hessian Q_k at iteration k satisfy

$$\|g_k - \nabla f(x_k)\| \leq \delta_k^g \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|Q_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k)\| \leq \delta_k^h,$$

where $\delta_k^g \in [0, \bar{\delta}^g]$ for some $\bar{\delta}^g < \frac{1}{2}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k) = x_k - \text{prox}_h(x_k - g_k)$, and $\delta_k^h \in (0, \bar{\delta}^h]$ for some $\bar{\delta} > 0$.

Under Assumption 2, we have

$$\|\mathcal{G}(x_k) - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\| \leq \|\nabla f(x_k) - g_k\| \leq \delta_k^g \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\|, \quad \forall x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n; \quad (2.1a)$$

$$\|Q_k\| \leq \|\nabla^2 f(x_k)\| + \delta_k^h \leq L_g + \delta_k^h, \quad \forall x_k \in \Omega_1. \quad (2.1b)$$

For the current iterate x_k , define $H_k = Q_k + ([-\lambda_{\min}(Q_k)]_+ + c_k)I_n$ for some $c_k > 0$, where $[-\lambda_{\min}(Q_k)]_+ = \max\{-\lambda_{\min}(Q_k), 0\}$. Under Assumption 2, we have $\|H_k\| \leq 2L_g + 2\delta_k^h + c_k$. Define $f_k(x) = f(x_k) + \langle g_k, x - x_k \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle x - x_k, H_k(x - x_k) \rangle$ and $\varphi_k(x) = f_k(x) + h(x)$. The key to OEF-PNM lies in approximately minimizing $\varphi_k(x)$. We present the OEF-PNM for Problem (1.1) in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 OEF proximal Newton-type method (OEF-PNM).

Require: $L_g, x_0 \in \text{dom}h$, $\{\eta_k\} \subseteq [0, 1)$, $\gamma > 1$, $\bar{\delta}^g \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\{\delta_k^g\} \subseteq [0, \bar{\delta}^g]$, $\bar{\delta}^h > 0$, and $\{\delta_k^h\} \subseteq [0, \bar{\delta}^h]$.

- 1: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots$, **do**
- 2: compute g_k and Q_k ;
- 3: compute $c_k = \gamma \frac{L_g + \eta_k + 2\delta_k^g(1 + \frac{\eta_k}{2} + 2L_g + 2\delta_k^h)}{1 - 2\delta_k^g}$ and $H_k = Q_k + ([-\lambda_{\min}(Q_k)]_+ + c_k)I_n$;
- 4: compute $x_{k+1} \approx \min_x \varphi_k(x)$ such that there exists $\xi_k \in \partial\varphi_k(x_{k+1})$ satisfies

$$\|\xi_k\| \leq \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|. \quad (2.2)$$

5: **end for**

6: **return** $\{x_k\}$

Remark 1. Accuracy criterion given in (2.2) can be achieved by several proximal-type method, such as the proximal gradient method [Beck, 2017] and the FIAST method [Beck, 2017]. Further discussions on solvers that satisfy (2.2) can be found in [Zhu, 2025]. Here are some special case of Algorithm 1.

- (a) If $\delta_k^g = 0$ and $\delta_k^h = 0$, then $c_k = \gamma(L_g + 2\eta_k)$ and Algorithm 1 reduces to the inexact Proximal Newton method [Zhu, 2025, Algorithm 2].
- (b) If $\delta_k^g = 0$ and $\delta_k^h \neq 0$, then Algorithm 1 is also known as the inexact Proximal quasi-Newton method.
- (c) If $Q_k \equiv 0$, then Assumption 2 can be satisfied with $\delta_k^h \equiv L_g$ and Algorithm 1 can be seen as an inexact proximal gradient method with approximate gradient. In this case, x_{k+1} is updated by

$$x_{k+1} \approx \arg \min_x \{ \langle g_k, x - x_k \rangle + \frac{c_k}{2} \|x - x_k\|^2 + h(x) \},$$

where $c_k = \gamma \frac{(1 + 8\delta_k^g)L_g + 2\delta_k^g}{1 - 2\delta_k^g}$ and there exists $\xi_k \in \partial h(x_{k+1}) + g_k + c_k(x_{k+1} - x_k)$ such that $\|\xi_k\| \leq \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|$. When $\text{prox}_h(\cdot)$ is efficiently solvable, we can set $x_{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\frac{1}{c_k}h}(x_k - \frac{1}{c_k}g_k)$. This iteration can be seen as a special case of the I-PGM presented in [Nabou et al., 2025] with $q = 1$ and $\rho = \frac{(\gamma - 1 + 2(4\gamma + 1)\delta_k^g)L_g + 2\gamma\delta_k^g}{1 - 2\delta_k^g}$. In case $\delta_k^g \equiv 0$, we obtain the proximal gradient method with $c_k = \gamma L_g$.

2.2 Global convergence of OEF-PNM

Lemma 1. *Suppose Assumption 1 is satisfied. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then*

$$\|\tilde{G}(x_k)\| \leq (1 + \frac{\eta_k}{2} + \|H_k\|)\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|. \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. Define $r_k(x) = x - \text{prox}_h(x - (g_k + H_k(x - x_k)))$. We have

$$x_{k+1} - r_k(x_{k+1}) = \text{prox}_h(x_{k+1} - (g_k + H_k(x_{k+1} - x_k))). \quad (2.4)$$

From accuracy criterion given in (2.2), x_{k+1} can be stated as

$$x_{k+1} = \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\varphi_k(x) + \langle -\xi_k, x - x_k \rangle\}, \quad (2.5)$$

which combine with the definition of φ_k yields

$$x_{k+1} = \text{prox}_h(x_{k+1} - (g_k + H_k(x_{k+1} - x_k)) + \xi_k). \quad (2.6)$$

Using the nonexpansivity of prox_h [Beck, 2017, Th. 6.42], (2.4) and (2.6) yields

$$\|r_k(x_{k+1})\| \leq \|\xi_k\| \stackrel{(2.2)}{\leq} \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|. \quad (2.7)$$

Notice that (2.4) also implies

$$r_k(x_{k+1}) - (g_k + H_k(x_{k+1} - x_k)) \in \partial h(x_{k+1} - r_k(x_{k+1})). \quad (2.8)$$

From the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)$, we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k) - g_k \in \partial h(x_k - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)). \quad (2.9)$$

Using the monotonicity of ∂h , (2.8) and (2.9) yield

$$\langle \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k) + H_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) - r_k(x_{k+1}), x_k - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k) - x_{k+1} + r_k(x_{k+1}) \rangle \geq 0,$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k) - r_k(x_{k+1})\|^2 \\ & \leq \langle \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k) - r_k(x_{k+1}), x_k - x_{k+1} \rangle - \langle \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k) - r_k(x_{k+1}), H_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) - \langle H_k(x_{k+1} - x_k), x_k - x_{k+1} \rangle \rangle \\ & \leq \langle \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k) - r_k(x_{k+1}), x_k - x_{k+1} + H_k(x_k - x_{k+1}) \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds since $H_k \succ 0$. Hence, we have

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k) - r_k(x_{k+1})\| \leq (1 + \|H_k\|)\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|.$$

Therefore,

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\| \leq \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k) - r_k(x_{k+1})\| + \|r_k(x_{k+1})\| \stackrel{(2.7)}{\leq} (1 + \|H_k\|)\|x_k - x_{k+1}\| + \frac{\eta_k}{2}\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|.$$

The desired result is satisfied. \square

Lemma 2. *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then*

$$\varphi(x_k) \geq \varphi(x_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2}(c_k - L_g - \eta_k - 2\delta_k^g(1 + \frac{\eta_k}{2} + \|H_k\|))\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2. \quad (2.10)$$

Proof. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(x_k) &= \varphi_k(x_k) \geq \varphi_k(x_{k+1}) + \langle \xi_k, x_k - x_{k+1} \rangle \geq \varphi_k(x_{k+1}) - \|\xi_k\| \|x_k - x_{k+1}\| \\
&\geq \varphi_k(x_{k+1}) - \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 \\
&= \varphi(x_{k+1}) - f(x_{k+1}) + f(x_k) + \langle \nabla f(x_k), x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle + \langle g_k - \nabla f(x_k), x_{k+1} - x_k \rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, H_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) \rangle - \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 \\
&\geq \varphi(x_{k+1}) - \frac{L_g}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 - \delta_k^g \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\| \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \frac{1}{2} \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, H_k(x_{k+1} - x_k) \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(2.3)}{\geq} \varphi(x_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2} \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, (H_k - (L_g + \eta_k)I_n)(x_{k+1} - x_k) \rangle - \delta_k^g (1 + \frac{\eta_k}{2} + \|H_k\|) \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 \\
&\geq \varphi(x_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2} (c_k - L_g - \eta_k - 2\delta_k^g (1 + \frac{\eta_k}{2} + \|H_k\|)) \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since $\varphi_k(x)$ is convex and $\xi_k \in \partial\varphi_k(x_{k+1})$, the forth inequality follows from Assumptions 1 (i) and 2, and the last inequality follows from $H_k \succeq c_k I_n$, $\eta_k \leq 1$, and $\delta_k^g \leq 1$.

The desired result is satisfied. \square

Theorem 1. Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then the following statements hold.

- (a) Let $\omega(x_0)$ be the cluster points set of $\{x_k\}$. Then $\omega(x_0) \subseteq \mathcal{S}^*$ is nonempty and compact.
- (b) Let

$$\bar{K}_1 = \lceil \frac{2(\frac{3}{2} + \beta_0^2)(\varphi(x_0) - \varphi_*)}{(\gamma - 1)L_g \varepsilon^2} \rceil.$$

Then Algorithm 1 terminates in at most \bar{K}_1 iterations at a point x satisfying $\|\mathcal{G}(x)\| \leq \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon$.

Proof. (a) Notice that $c_k = \gamma \frac{L_g + \eta_k + 2\delta_k^g(1 + \frac{\eta_k}{2} + 2L_g + 2\delta_k^h)}{1 - 2\delta_k^g}$, from (2.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(x_k) &\geq \varphi(x_{k+1}) + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} (L_g + \eta_k + 2\delta_k^g(1 + \frac{\eta_k}{2} + 2L_g + 2\delta_k^h)) \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 \\
&\geq \varphi(x_{k+1}) + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} L_g \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(2.3)}{\geq} \varphi(x_{k+1}) + \frac{(\gamma - 1)L_g}{2(1 + \frac{\eta_k}{2} + \|H_k\|)^2} \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\|^2 \\
&\geq \varphi(x_{k+1}) + \frac{(\gamma - 1)L_g}{2(\frac{3}{2} + \beta_0)^2} \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

where $\beta_0 = 2L_g + 2\bar{\delta}^h + \frac{\gamma(L_g + 1 + 2\bar{\delta}^g(\frac{3}{2} + 2L_g + 2\bar{\delta}^h))}{1 - 2\bar{\delta}^g}$.

From (2.11), we have

- $\{x_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\varphi(x_0)$, which implies that $\omega(x_0)$ is nonempty and bounded under Assumption 1 (i);

- $\{\varphi(x_k)\}$ is monotonically non-increasing, which implies $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\| = 0$. Recall (2.1a), we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{G}(x_k)\| = 0.$$

Combine with the continuity of \mathcal{G} , we obtain the closedness of $\omega(x_0)$. Moreover, $\|\mathcal{G}(\bar{x})\| = 0$ for any $\bar{x} \in \omega(x_0)$, which yields $\omega(x_0) \subseteq \mathcal{S}^*$.

(b) We first show that $\|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x)\| \leq \varepsilon$ in at most \bar{K}_1 iterations. Suppose that $\|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_{k+1})\| > \varepsilon$ for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, \bar{K}_1$. From (2.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x_0) - \varphi(x_{\bar{K}_1+1}) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\bar{K}_1} \varphi(x_l) - \varphi(x_{l+1}) \geq \frac{(\gamma-1)L_g}{2(\frac{3}{2} + \beta_0)^2} \sum_{l=0}^{\bar{K}_1} \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{(\gamma-1)L_g(\bar{K}+1)\varepsilon^2}{2(1+\bar{\delta}g)^2} > \varphi(x_0) - \varphi_*, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of \bar{K}_1 . The above inequality contradicts the definition of φ_* .

If $\|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon$ for some x_k , then from (2.1a) and the condition $\delta_k^g < \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{G}(x_k)\| \leq (1 + \delta_k^g) \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\| \leq \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon.$$

□

2.3 Local convergence of OEF-PNM

In this section, we establish the superlinear convergence of Algorithm 1 in terms of $\text{dist}(x^*, \mathcal{S}^*)$ under the high-order metric subregularity property of the residual mapping $\mathcal{G}(x)$, where $\text{dist}(x, S)$ denotes the Euclidean distance of a vector x to the closed set S .

Assumption 3. *For any $\bar{x} \in \omega(x_0)$, the metric q -subregularity at \bar{x} with $q > 1$ on \mathcal{S}^* holds, that is, there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and $\kappa > 0$ such that*

$$\text{dist}(x, \mathcal{S}^*) \leq \kappa \|\mathcal{G}(x)\|^q, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon),$$

where $\mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon)$ denotes the open Euclidean norm ball centered at \bar{x} with radius ϵ .

The concept of higher-order metric subregularity for subgradient mappings with $q > 1$ was first introduced in [Mordukhovich and Ouyang, 2015], where it was applied to establish local convergence results for Newton-type methods [Mordukhovich and Ouyang, 2015, Mordukhovich et al., 2023]. The equivalence between q -subregularity of the subgradient mapping and that of the residual mapping was established in [Liu et al., 2024]. The latter was applied to establish local convergence results of Proximal Newton method for nonconvex composite optimization problems in [Liu et al., 2024, Zhu, 2025].

We also assume that f and g satisfy the following assumption.

Assumption 4. (i) $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is twice continuously differentiable on an open set Ω_2 containing the effective domain $\text{dom} h$ of h , ∇f is L_g -Lipschitz continuous over Ω_2 ; $\nabla^2 f$ is L_h -Lipschitz continuous over an open neighborhood of $\omega(x_0)$ with radius ϵ_0 for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$.

(ii) $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is proper convex, nonsmooth and continuous.

(iii) For any $x_0 \in \text{dom}h$, the level set $\mathcal{L}_\varphi(x_0) = \{x | \varphi(x) \leq \varphi(x_0)\}$ is bounded.

Under Assumption 4 (i) and (ii), $\nabla f(\cdot) + \partial g(\cdot)$ is outer semicontinuous over $\text{dom}h$ [Rockafellar and Wets, 1998]. Hence, the stationary set \mathcal{S}^* is closed.

Define $\bar{x}_k = \arg \min_x \{\varphi_k(x)\}$. The following statement holds.

Lemma 3. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that

$$\|x_{k+1} - \bar{x}_k\| \leq \frac{\eta_k}{2c_k}(1 + \|H_k\|)\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|.$$

Proof. By the definition of \bar{x}_k and using the first-order optimality condition, we have

$$-g_k - H_k(\bar{x}_k - x_k) \in \partial h(\bar{x}_k). \quad (2.12)$$

Combining with (2.8), using the monotonicity of ∂h , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \langle x_{k+1} - \bar{x}_k - r_k(x_{k+1}), r_k(x_{k+1}) - H_k(x_{k+1} - \bar{x}_k) \rangle \\ &\leq \langle (x_{k+1} - \bar{x}_k) + H_k(x_{k+1} - \bar{x}_k), r_k(x_{k+1}) \rangle - \langle x_{k+1} - \bar{x}_k, H_k(x_{k+1} - \bar{x}_k) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $H_k \succeq c_k I_n$, the above inequality implies that

$$c_k \|x_{k+1} - \bar{x}_k\| \leq (1 + \|H_k\|)\|r_k(x_{k+1})\| \leq \frac{\eta_k}{2}(1 + \|H_k\|)\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|,$$

where the last inequality follows from (2.2) and (2.7). The desired result is satisfied. \square

Lemma 4. Consider any $\bar{x} \in \omega(x_0)$. Suppose that Assumption 4 holds. Then, for all $x_k \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_0/2)$ with ϵ_0 defined as in Assumption 4 (i), we have

$$\|x_k - \bar{x}_k\| \leq \frac{L_h}{2c_k}\|x_{k,*} - x_k\|^2 + \frac{L_g + 2\delta_k^h + 2c_k}{c_k}\|x_{k,*} - x_k\| + \frac{\delta_k^g}{c_k}\|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\|.$$

Proof. For any $x_k \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_0/2)$, let $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^*}(x_k)$ be the set of projections of x_k onto \mathcal{S}^* . Then $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^*}(x_k) \neq \emptyset$ since \mathcal{S}^* is closed. Pick $x_{k,*} \in \Pi_{\mathcal{S}^*}(x_k)$, we have

$$\|x_{k,*} - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x_{k,*} - x_k\| + \|x_k - \bar{x}\| \leq 2\|x_k - \bar{x}\| \leq \epsilon_0,$$

where the second inequality holds since $\bar{x} \in \omega(x_0) \subseteq \mathcal{S}^*$. Hence, $x_{k,*} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_0)$ and $(1-t)x_k + tx_{k,*} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_0) \cap \text{dom}h$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Notice that $x_{k,*} \in \mathcal{S}^*$, we have $-\nabla f(x_{k,*}) \in \partial h(x_{k,*})$. Combine with (2.12), using the monotonicity of ∂h , we have

$$0 \leq \langle x_{k,*} - \bar{x}_k, -\nabla f(x_{k,*}) + g_k + H_k(x_{k,*} - x_k) \rangle + \langle x_{k,*} - \bar{x}_k, H_k(\bar{x}_k - x_{k,*}) \rangle.$$

Using $H_k \succeq c_k I_n$ again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{x}_k - x_{k,*}\| &\leq \frac{1}{c_k}\|\nabla f(x_k) - \nabla f(x_{k,*}) + H_k(x_{k,*} - x_k) + g_k - \nabla f(x_k)\| \\ &= \frac{1}{c_k}\left\|\int_0^1 [H_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k + t(x_{k,*} - x_k))](x_{k,*} - x_k)dt\right\| + \frac{1}{c_k}\|g_k - \nabla f(x_k)\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c_k}\left\|\int_0^1 [\nabla^2 f(x_k) - \nabla^2 f(x_k + t(x_{k,*} - x_k))](x_{k,*} - x_k)dt\right\| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{c_k}\left\|\int_0^1 (Q_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k))(x_{k,*} - x_k)dt\right\| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{c_k}\left\|\int_0^1 ([-\lambda_{\min}(Q_k)]_+ + c_k)(x_{k,*} - x_k)dt\right\| + \frac{1}{c_k}\|g_k - \nabla f(x_k)\| \\ &\leq \frac{L_h}{2c_k}\|x_{k,*} - x_k\|^2 + \frac{L_g + 2\delta_k^h + c_k}{c_k}\|x_{k,*} - x_k\| + \frac{\delta_k^g}{c_k}\|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the desired inequality holds by noting that

$$\|x_k - \bar{x}_k\| \leq \|x_k - x_{k,*}\| + \|x_{k,*} - \bar{x}_k\|.$$

□

Theorem 2. Suppose that Assumptions 3 and 4 are satisfied. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 with $c_k = \bar{\gamma} \frac{\eta_k(1+2L_g+2\delta_k^h)+2\delta_k^g(1+\frac{\eta_k}{2}+2L_g+2\delta_k^h)}{2-\eta_k-2\delta_k^g}$ for some $\bar{\gamma} > 1$. Then for any $\bar{x} \in \omega(x_0)$, $\{x_k\}$ converges to \bar{x} with the Q -superlinear convergence rate of order q .

Proof. Define $\beta_1 = 2L_g + 2\bar{\delta}^h + \frac{\bar{\gamma}(1+2L_g+2\bar{\delta}^h+2\bar{\delta}_k^g(\frac{3}{2}+2L_g+2\bar{\delta}_k^h))}{1-2\bar{\delta}^g}$. Similarly to the proof of (2.11), when $c_k = \bar{\gamma} \frac{\eta_k(1+2L_g+2\delta_k^h)+2\delta_k^g(1+\frac{\eta_k}{2}+2L_g+2\delta_k^h)}{2-\eta_k-2\delta_k^g}$, we have

$$\varphi(x_k) - \varphi(x_{k+1}) \geq \frac{(\gamma-1)L_g}{2(\frac{3}{2}+\beta_1)^2} \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\|^2 \stackrel{(2.1a)}{\geq} \frac{(\gamma-1)L_g}{2(\frac{3}{2}+\beta_1)^2(1+\bar{\delta}^g)^2} \|\mathcal{G}(x_k)\|^2,$$

which implies $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{G}(x_k)\| = 0$.

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 1 (a), we have $\omega(x_0) \subseteq \mathcal{S}^*$, which yields $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{S}^*) = 0$.

From Lemmas 3 and 4, for any $x_k \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \frac{\epsilon_0}{2})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\| &\leq \|x_k - \bar{x}_k\| + \|\bar{x}_k - x_{k+1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{L_h}{2c_k} \|x_{k,*} - x_k\|^2 + \frac{L_g + 2\delta_k^h + 2c_k}{c_k} \|x_{k,*} - x_k\| + \frac{\delta_k^g}{c_k} \|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(x_k)\| + \frac{\eta_k}{2c_k} (1 + \|H_k\|) \|x_k - x_{k+1}\| \\ &\stackrel{(2.3)}{\leq} \frac{L_h}{2c_k} \|x_{k,*} - x_k\|^2 + \frac{L_g + 2\delta_k^h + 2c_k}{c_k} \|x_{k,*} - x_k\| \\ &\quad + \frac{\eta_k(1 + \|H_k\|) + 2\delta_k^g(1 + \frac{\eta_k}{2} + \|H_k\|)}{2c_k} \|x_k - x_{k+1}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Using the formula of c_k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| &\leq \frac{\bar{\gamma}L_h}{(\bar{\gamma}-1)(2-\eta_k-2\delta_k^g)} \|x_{k,*} - x_k\|^2 + 2\left(\frac{L_g + 2\delta_k^h}{\bar{\gamma}(2-\eta_k-2\delta_k^g)} + 1\right) \|x_{k,*} - x_k\| \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{\gamma}L_h}{(\bar{\gamma}-1)(2-\eta_k-2\delta_k^g)} \text{dist}^2(x_k, \mathcal{S}^*) + 2\left(\frac{L_g + 2\delta_k^h}{\bar{\gamma}(2-\eta_k-2\delta_k^g)} + 1\right) \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{S}^*). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists $\hat{k} \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $k \geq \hat{k}$,

$$\|\mathcal{G}(x_k)\| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|x_k - x_{k+1}\| \leq \alpha_1 \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{S}^*)$$

for some $\alpha_1 > 0$.

(a) We first show that for all $k \geq \hat{k}$, if $x_k \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_1)$ and $x_{k+1} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_1)$ for some $\epsilon_1 \leq \min\{\epsilon, \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}\}$, then we have

$$\text{dist}(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{S}^*) = o(\text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{S}^*)). \quad (2.13)$$

According to the definitions of $\mathcal{G}(x_{k+1})$ and $r_k(x_{k+1})$ and the nonexpansivity of prox_h , we

have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{G}(x_{k+1}) - r_k(x_{k+1})\| &\leq \|g_{k+1} - g_k - H_k(x_{k+1} - x_k)\| \\
&\leq \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k) - \nabla^2 f(x_k)(x_{k+1} - x_k)\| + \|g_{k+1} - \nabla f(x_{k+1})\| \\
&\quad + \|g_k - \nabla f(x_k)\| + \|(\nabla^2 f(x_k) - Q_k - [-\lambda_{\min}(Q_k)]_+ + c_k)I_n\|(x_{k+1} - x_k)\| \\
&\leq \frac{L_h}{2}\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 + \delta_{k+1}^g \|\tilde{G}(x_{k+1})\| + \delta_k^g \|\tilde{G}(x_k)\| + (L_g + 2\delta_k^h + c_k)\|x_k - x_{k+1}\| \\
&\stackrel{(2.3)}{\leq} \frac{L_h}{2}\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 + \delta_{k+1}^g \|\tilde{G}(x_{k+1})\| \\
&\quad + (\delta_k^g(1 + \frac{\eta_k}{2} + 2L_g + 2\delta_k^h + c_k) + (L_g + 2\delta_k^h + c_k))\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{G}(x_{k+1})\| &\leq \|\tilde{G}(x_{k+1}) - r_k(x_{k+1})\| + \|r_k(x_{k+1})\| \\
&\stackrel{(2.7)}{\leq} \frac{L_h}{2}\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 + \delta_{k+1}^g \|\tilde{G}(x_{k+1})\| + \frac{\eta_k}{2}\|x_k - x_{k+1}\| \\
&\quad + (\bar{\delta}^g(\frac{3}{2} + 2L_g + 2\bar{\delta}^h + c_k) + (L_g + 2\bar{\delta}^h + c_k))\|x_k - x_{k+1}\| \\
&\leq \frac{L_h}{2}\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 + \bar{\delta}^g \|\tilde{G}(x_{k+1})\| + \beta_2\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta_2 = \frac{5}{4} + 2L_g + 3\bar{\delta}^h + 2\bar{\gamma}\frac{\frac{5}{2} + 4L_g + 4\bar{\delta}^h}{2 - \bar{\delta}^g}$ and the last inequality follows the formula of c_k . Hence, we have

$$\|\tilde{G}(x_{k+1})\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\delta}^g} \left[\frac{L_h}{2}\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 + \beta_2\|x_k - x_{k+1}\| \right].$$

Under Assumption 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dist}(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{S}^*) &\leq \kappa \|\mathcal{G}(x_{k+1})\|^q \stackrel{(2.1a)}{\leq} \kappa (1 + \bar{\delta}^g)^q \|\tilde{G}(x_{k+1})\|^q \\
&\leq \frac{\kappa(1 + \bar{\delta}^g)^q}{(1 - \bar{\delta}^g)^q} \left[\frac{L_h}{2}\|x_k - x_{k+1}\|^2 + \beta_2\|x_k - x_{k+1}\| \right]^q \\
&\leq \frac{\kappa(1 + \bar{\delta}^g)^q}{(1 - \bar{\delta}^g)^q} \left[\frac{L_h \alpha_1^2}{2} \text{dist}^2(x_k, \mathcal{S}^*) + \beta_2 \alpha_1 \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{S}^*) \right]^q, \tag{2.14}
\end{aligned}$$

which yields (2.13) since $q > 1$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{S}^*) = 0$. Therefore, for any $\alpha_2 \in (0, 1)$, there exist $0 < \epsilon_2 < \epsilon_1$ and $\tilde{k} \geq \hat{k}$, such that for all $k \geq \tilde{k}$, if $x_k \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_2)$ and $x_{k+1} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_2)$, then we have

$$\text{dist}(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{S}^*) \leq \alpha_2 \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{S}^*). \tag{2.15}$$

(b) Next, we show that if $x_{k_0} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \bar{\epsilon})$ for some $k_0 \geq \tilde{k}$, where $\bar{\epsilon} = \{\frac{\epsilon_2}{2}, \frac{(1 - \alpha_2)\epsilon_2}{2\alpha_1}\}$, then we have $x_{k_0+1} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_2)$ for all $k \geq k_0$ by induction.

Notice that $\bar{x} \in \omega(x_0)$, there exists $k_0 \geq \tilde{k}$, such that $x_{k_0} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \bar{\epsilon})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{k_0+1} - \bar{x}\| &\leq \|x_{k_0} - \bar{x}\| + \|x_{k_0} - x_{k_0+1}\| \leq \|x_{k_0} - \bar{x}\| + \alpha_1 \text{dist}(x_{k_0}, \mathcal{S}^*) \\
&\leq \|x_{k_0} - \bar{x}\| + \alpha_1 \|x_{k_0} - \bar{x}\| \leq (1 + \alpha_1)\bar{\epsilon} \leq \epsilon_2,
\end{aligned}$$

which yields $x_{k_0+1} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_2)$.

For any $k > k_0$, suppose that for all $k_0 \leq l \leq k-1$, we have $x_{l+1} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_2)$. Then,

$$\|x_{k+1} - x_{k_0}\| \leq \sum_{l=k_0}^k \|x_{l+1} - x_l\| \leq \alpha_1 \sum_{l=k_0}^k \text{dist}(x_l, \mathcal{S}^*) \stackrel{(2.15)}{\leq} \alpha_1 \sum_{l=k_0}^k \alpha_2^{l-k_0} \text{dist}(x_{k_0}, \mathcal{S}^*) \leq \frac{\alpha_1}{1-\alpha_2} \|x_{k_0} - \bar{x}\|.$$

Therefore, $\|x_{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x_{k+1} - x_{k_0}\| + \|x_{k_0} - \bar{x}\| \leq (1 + \frac{\alpha_1}{1-\alpha_2}) \|x_{k_0} - \bar{x}\| \leq (1 + \frac{\alpha_1}{1-\alpha_2}) \bar{\epsilon} \leq \epsilon_2$. Hence, $x_{k+1} \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon_2)$.

(c) Finally, we show that $\{x_k\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. For any $\hat{\epsilon} > 0$, there exists $\bar{k} \geq k_0$, such that

$$\text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{S}^*) < \tilde{\epsilon}, \quad \forall k > \bar{k}$$

since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{S}^*) = 0$, where $\tilde{\epsilon} = \frac{1-\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \hat{\epsilon}$. For any $k_1, k_2 > \bar{k}$, where without loss of generality we assume $k_1 > k_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{k_1} - x_{k_2}\| &\leq \sum_{j=k_2}^{k_1-1} \|x_{j+1} - x_j\| \leq \alpha_1 \sum_{j=k_2}^{k_1-1} \text{dist}(x_j, \mathcal{S}^*) \stackrel{(2.15)}{\leq} \alpha_1 \sum_{j=k_2}^{k_1-1} \alpha_2^{j-k_2} \text{dist}(x_{k_2}, \mathcal{S}^*) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha_1}{1-\alpha_2} \text{dist}(x_{k_2}, \mathcal{S}^*) < \frac{\alpha_1}{1-\alpha_2} \tilde{\epsilon} = \hat{\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the prove of Theorem 1 (a), the cluster point set $\omega(x_0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ of $\{x_k\}$ is closed. Hence, the Cauchy sequence $\{x_k\}$ converges to some $\bar{x} \in \omega(x_0)$. By passing the limit $k_1 \rightarrow \infty$ to the above formula and using (2.14), we have for any $k > \bar{k}$,

$$\|x_{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \leq \frac{\alpha_1}{1-\alpha_2} \text{dist}(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{S}^*) \leq \mathcal{O}(\text{dist}^q(x_k, \mathcal{S}^*)) \leq \mathcal{O}(\|x_k - \bar{x}\|^q).$$

Therefore, $\{x_k\}$ converges to \bar{x} with the Q-superlinear rate of order q . \square

3 OEF regularized Newton method

It can be observed that Algorithm 1 reduces to an inexact regularized Newton method with approximate gradients and Hessians for Problem (1.2) in case $h(x) \equiv 0$. We assume that the solution set of Problem (1.2) is non-empty and denote f_* as the optimal function value, as well as Assumption 1 holds with $h(x) \equiv 0$.

3.1 OEF regularized Newton method for nonconvex f

Notice that $\tilde{G}(x_k) = g_k$ provides $h(x) \equiv 0$. Assumption 2 can be stated as follows.

Assumption 5. *The approximate gradient g_k and Hessian Q_k at iteration k satisfy*

$$\|g_k - \nabla f(x_k)\| \leq \delta_k^g \|g_k\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|Q_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k)\| \leq \delta_k^h,$$

where $\delta_k^g \in [0, \bar{\delta}^g]$ for some $\bar{\delta}^g < \frac{1}{2}$, and $\delta_k^h \in (0, \bar{\delta}^h]$ for some $\bar{\delta}^h > 0$.

We present the OEF regularized Newton method (OEF-RNM) for Problem (1.2) in Algorithm 2.

The following lemma states that (3.1) can be satisfied when the Conjugate Gradient (CG) method was invoked to solve system $H_k d = -g_k$.

Lemma 5. *Suppose the CG method was invoked to solve system $H_k d = -g_k$. Let $\{d_{k,j}\}$ be the sequence generated by the CG method and $r_{k,j} := H_k d_{k,j} + g_k$. Then d_{k,j_*} satisfies (3.1) if $\|r_{k,j_*}\| \leq \varepsilon_k^{cg} \|g_k\|$, where $\varepsilon_k^{cg} = \frac{\eta_k/2}{2L_g + 2\bar{\delta}_k^h + c_k + \eta_k/2}$.*

Algorithm 2 OEF regularized Newton method (OEF-RNM).

Require: $L_g, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\{\eta_k\} \subseteq [0, 1)$, $\gamma > 1$, $\bar{\delta}^g \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\{\delta_k^g\} \subseteq [0, \bar{\delta}^g]$, $\bar{\delta}^h > 0$, and $\{\delta_k^h\} \subseteq [0, \bar{\delta}^h]$.

- 1: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots$, **do**
- 2: compute g_k and Q_k ;
- 3: compute $c_k = \gamma \frac{L_g + \eta_k + 2\delta_k^g(\frac{\eta_k}{2} + 2L_g + 2\delta_k^h)}{1 - 2\delta_k^g}$ and $H_k = Q_k + ([-\lambda_{\min}(Q_k)]_+ + c_k)I_n$;
- 4: compute $x_{k+1} = x_k + d_k$, where d_k satisfies

$$\|H_k d_k + g_k\| \leq \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|d_k\|. \quad (3.1)$$

- 5: **end for**
 - 6: **return** $\{x_k\}$
-

Proof. Notice that

$$\|r_{k,j_*}\| \leq \varepsilon_k^{cg} \|g_k\| \leq \varepsilon_k^{cg} (\|H_k d_{k,j_*}\| + \|r_{k,j_*}\|) \leq \varepsilon_k^{cg} ((2L_g + 2\delta_k^h + c_k) \|d_{k,j_*}\| + \|r_{k,j_*}\|),$$

which yields

$$\|r_{k,j_*}\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_k^{cg}}{1 - \varepsilon_k^{cg}} (2L_g + 2\delta_k^h + c_k) \|d_{k,j_*}\| = \frac{\eta_k}{2} \|d_{k,j_*}\|.$$

□

Similar to Theorem 1, the following result holds.

Theorem 3. Suppose Assumptions 1 with $h(x) \equiv 0$ and 5 are satisfied. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2 and

$$\bar{K}_2 = \lceil \frac{2(\frac{3}{2} + \tilde{\beta}_0^2)(f(x_0) - f_*)}{(\gamma - 1)L_g \varepsilon^2} \rceil.$$

Then Algorithm 2 terminates in at most \bar{K}_2 iterations at a point x satisfying $\|\nabla f(x)\| \leq \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon$.

In case $h(x) \equiv 0$, Assumptions 3 can be stated as follows.

Assumption 6. For any $\bar{x} \in \omega(x_0)$, there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}(x, \mathcal{S}^*) \leq \kappa \|\nabla f(x)\|^q, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{x}, \epsilon)$$

for some $q > 1$.

Assumption 6 was applied to establish local convergence result for the first phase of the Newton-CG method [Royer et al., 2020] in [Zhu and Xiao, 2024]. For instances exhibiting Assumption 6, see [Pang, 1997]. Similar to Theorem 2, the following local convergence result holds.

Theorem 4. Suppose Assumptions 4 with $h(x) \equiv 0$ and 6 are satisfied. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2 with $c_k = \bar{\gamma} \frac{\eta_k + 2\delta_k^g(\frac{\eta_k}{2} + 2L_g + 2\delta_k^h)}{2(1 - \delta_k^g)}$ for some $\bar{\gamma} > 1$. Then for any $\bar{x} \in \omega(x_0)$, $\{x_k\}$ converges to \bar{x} with the Q -superlinear convergence rate of order q .

3.2 OEF regularized Newton method for finite-sum problems

We discuss the complexity of Algorithm 2 for Problem (1.3). We consider subsampling schemes for estimating g_k and Q_k as in [Roosta-Khorasani and Mahoney, 2019, Xu et al., 2020]. Define

$$g(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_{g,k}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_{g,k}} \nabla f_i(x) \quad \text{and} \quad Q(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_h|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_h} \nabla^2 f_i(x), \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{g,k}, \mathcal{S}_h \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ are the subsample batches for the estimates of the gradient and Hessian, respectively, $|\mathcal{S}|$ denotes the cardinality of the index set \mathcal{S} . The follow statement holds according to [Roosta-Khorasani and Mahoney, 2019, Lemma 3] and [Xu et al., 2020, Lemma 16].

Lemma 6. *Suppose Assumption 1 with $h(x) \equiv 0$ is satisfied, and let $\bar{\delta} \in (0, 1)$ be given. Suppose that at iteration k of Algorithm 2, $\delta_k^g > 0$ and $\delta_k^h > 0$ are as defined in Assumption 5. Let $0 < \hat{U}_g, \hat{U}_h < +\infty$ be such that $\|\nabla f_i(x)\| \leq \hat{U}_g$ and $\|\nabla^2 f_i(x)\| \leq \hat{U}_h$ for all $x \in \mathcal{L}_f(x_0)$. For g_k and Q_k defined as in (3.2), and subsample sets $\mathcal{S}_{g,k}$ and \mathcal{S}_h satisfying*

$$|\mathcal{S}_{g,k}| \geq \frac{\hat{U}_g^2 (1 + \sqrt{8 \ln(1/\bar{\delta})})^2}{(\delta_k^g)^2 \varepsilon^2} \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{S}_h| \geq \frac{16 \hat{U}_h^2}{(\delta_k^h)^2} \log \frac{2n}{\bar{\delta}},$$

then Assumption 5 is satisfied at iteration k with probability at least $1 - \bar{\delta}$.

According to the proof of Theorems 3 (as well as Theorem 1) and 4, the following convergence results hold. We assume that failure to satisfy Assumption 5 never occurs at any iteration.

Theorem 5. *Suppose Assumptions 1 with $h(x) \equiv 0$ and 5 are satisfied. Let $\bar{\delta} \in (0, 1)$ be given, and suppose that at each iteration k , g_k and Q_k are obtained from (3.2), with $\mathcal{S}_{g,k}$ and \mathcal{S}_h satisfying the lower bounds in Lemma 6. Then with probability at least $(1 - \bar{\delta})^{\bar{K}_2}$, Algorithm 2 terminates in at most \bar{K}_2 iterations at a point x satisfying $\|\nabla f(x)\| \leq 2\varepsilon$, where \bar{K}_2 is defined as in Theorem 3.*

Theorem 6. *Suppose that Assumptions 4 with $h(x) \equiv 0$ and 6 hold. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2 with $c_k = \hat{\gamma}(L_g + \eta_k)$ for some $\hat{\gamma} > 1$. Let $\bar{\delta} \in (0, 1)$ be given, and suppose that at each iteration k , g_k and Q_k are obtained from (3.2), with $\mathcal{S}_{g,k}$ and \mathcal{S}_h satisfying*

$$|\mathcal{S}_{g,k}| \geq \frac{\hat{U}_g^2 (1 + \sqrt{8 \ln(1/\bar{\delta})})^2}{(\delta_k^g)^2 \|g_k\|^2} \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{S}_h| \geq \frac{16 \hat{U}_h^2}{(\delta_k^h)^2} \log \frac{2n}{\bar{\delta}}$$

for some $\delta_k^g \in [0, \bar{\delta}^g]$ and $\delta_k^h \in (0, \bar{\delta}^h]$. Then for any $\bar{x} \in \omega(x_0)$, with high probability, $\{x_k\}$ converges to \bar{x} with the Q -superlinear convergence rate of order q .

3.3 OEF Newton Method for strongly convex f

In this section, we assume that f is σ -strongly convex and denote $x^* = \arg \min_x f(x)$. According to the properties of strongly convex functions, the following inequality holds true identically.

$$\|x - x^*\| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \|\nabla f(x)\|, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (3.3)$$

We make the following basic assumption on Problem (1.2).

Assumption 7. *There exists $\hat{\varepsilon}_0 > 0$ such that, on an open neighborhood of $\mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\varepsilon}_0)$, $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is twice continuously differentiable, ∇f is L_g -Lipschitz continuous, and $\nabla^2 f$ is L_h -Lipschitz continuous.*

Under Assumption 7, for any $x \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_0)$, we have $\|\nabla f(x)\| \leq U_g$ for some $U_g > 0$ and $\|\nabla^2 f(x)\| \leq L_g$.

Assumption 8. *The approximate gradient g_k and Hessian Q_k satisfy*

$$\|g_k - \nabla f(x_k)\| \leq \delta_k^g \|g_k\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|Q_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k)\| \leq \delta_k^h,$$

where $\delta_k^g \in [0, \min\{\bar{\delta}^g, \|g_k\|^\theta\}]$ for some $\bar{\delta}^g < 1$ and $\theta \in [0, 1]$, and $\delta_k^h \in (0, \min\{\bar{\delta}^h, \|g_k\|^\theta\}]$ for some $\bar{\delta}^h \in (0, \sigma)$.

Under Assumption 8, for any $x_k \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_0)$, we have

$$\|\nabla f(x_k)\| \leq (1 + \delta_k^g) \|g_k\|; \quad (3.4a)$$

$$\|g_k\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\delta}^g} \|\nabla f(x_k)\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\delta}^g} U_g; \quad (3.4b)$$

$$\lambda_{\min}(Q_k) \geq \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x_k)) - \delta_k^h \geq \sigma - \delta_k^h > 0; \quad (3.4c)$$

$$\|Q_k\| \leq \|\nabla^2 f(x_k)\| + \delta_k^h \leq L_g + \delta_k^h; \quad (3.4d)$$

$$\|Q_k^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(Q_k)} \leq \frac{1}{\sigma - \delta_k^h}. \quad (3.4e)$$

We present the OEF Newton-type method for strongly convex optimization in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 OEF Newton-type method for strongly convex optimization.

Require: $\sigma, x_0, \theta \in [0, 1]$, and $\{\delta_k^h\} \subseteq [0, \sigma]$.

- 1: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots$, **do**
- 2: compute g_k and Q_k ;
- 3: compute $\mu_k = \min\{1, \frac{\sigma - \delta_k^h}{4\|g_k\|^\theta}\}$;
- 4: compute $x_{k+1} = x_k + d_k$, where d_k satisfies

$$\|r_k\| \leq \frac{\mu_k}{2} \|g_k\|^\theta \|d_k\| \quad \text{with} \quad r_k = Q_k d_k + g_k. \quad (3.5)$$

5: **end for**

6: **return** $\{x_k\}$

According to Lemma 5, (3.5) can be satisfied when the CG method is invoked to solve system $Q_k d = -g_k$ with the terminate condition $\|r_{k,j}\| \leq \frac{\mu_k \|g_k\|^\theta / 2}{2L_g + 2\delta_k^h + \mu_k \|g_k\|^\theta / 2} \|g_k\|$, where $r_{k,j} = Q_k d_{k,j} + g_k$ and $\{d_{k,j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ denotes the sequence generated by the CG method.

Next, we show the local convergence of Algorithm 3.

Lemma 7. *Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 3. Then*

$$\|g_k\| \leq (\|Q_k\| + \frac{\mu_k}{2} \|g_k\|^\theta) \|d_k\|. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. Notice that

$$\|g_k\| \leq \|g_k - r_k\| + \|r_k\| \stackrel{(3.5)}{\leq} (\|Q_k\| + \frac{\mu_k}{2} \|g_k\|^\theta) \|d_k\|.$$

The desired result is satisfied. □

Lemma 8. Suppose Assumptions 7 and 8 with $\delta_k^g \in [0, \min\{\bar{\delta}^g, \|g_k\|^\theta, \frac{\sigma - \delta_k^h}{2(L_g + \delta_k^h)}\}]$ are satisfied. If $x_k \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_0)$, then

$$\|d_k\| \leq \varsigma_0 \|x_k - x^*\|, \quad (3.7)$$

where $\varsigma_0 = \frac{2(L_h \hat{\epsilon}_0 + 2L_g)}{\sigma - \bar{\delta}^h}$.

Proof. Under Assumption 7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|d_k\| &= \|Q_k^{-1}(r_k - g_k)\| \\ &\leq \|Q_k^{-1}(\nabla f(x^*) - \nabla f(x_k) + \nabla^2 f(x_k)(x_k - x^*))\| + \|Q_k^{-1}(\nabla f(x_k) - g_k)\| \\ &\quad + \|Q_k^{-1}r_k\| + \|Q_k^{-1}(-\nabla^2 f(x_k)(x_k - x^*))\| \\ &\leq \frac{L_h}{2} \|Q_k^{-1}\| \|x_k - x^*\|^2 + \delta_k^g \|Q_k^{-1}\| \|g_k\| + \frac{\mu_k}{2} \|Q_k^{-1}\| \|g_k\|^\theta \|d_k\| + \|Q_k^{-1}\| \nabla^2 f(x_k) \|x_k - x^*\|. \end{aligned}$$

Recall (3.4e) and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|d_k\| &\leq \frac{L_h}{2(\sigma - \delta_k^h)} \|x_k - x^*\|^2 + \frac{\delta_k^g}{\sigma - \delta_k^h} (\|H_k\| + \frac{\mu_k}{2} \|g_k\|^\theta) \|d_k\| + \frac{\mu_k \|g_k\|^\theta}{2(\sigma - \delta_k^h)} \|d_k\| + \frac{L_g}{\sigma - \delta_k^h} \|x_k - x^*\| \\ &\leq \frac{L_h}{2(\sigma - \delta_k^h)} \|x_k - x^*\|^2 + \frac{L_g}{\sigma - \delta_k^h} \|x_k - x^*\| + \frac{2\delta_k^g(L_g + \delta_k^h + \mu_k \|g_k\|^\theta/2) + \mu_k \|g_k\|^\theta}{2(\sigma - \delta_k^h)} \|d_k\|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Notice that $\delta_k^g \in [0, \min\{\bar{\delta}^g, \|g_k\|^\theta, \frac{\sigma - \delta_k^h}{2(L_g + \delta_k^h)}\}]$, $\mu_k = \min\{1, \frac{\sigma - \delta_k^h}{4\|g_k\|^\theta}\}$ and $\delta_k^g < 1$, we have

$$1 - \frac{2\delta_k^g(L_g + \delta_k^h + \mu_k \|g_k\|^\theta/2) + \mu_k \|g_k\|^\theta}{2(\sigma - \delta_k^h)} = \frac{2(\sigma - \delta_k^h) - 2\delta_k^g(L_g + \delta_k^h) - \mu_k(1 + \delta_k^g)\|g_k\|^\theta}{2(\sigma - \delta_k^h)} \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Substituting the above inequality into (3.8), we obtain the desired inequality by noting that $\delta_k^h \leq \bar{\delta}^h$. \square

Lemma 9. Suppose Assumptions 7 and 8 with $\delta_k^g \in [0, \min\{\bar{\delta}^g, \|g_k\|^\theta, \frac{\sigma - \delta_k^h}{2(L_g + \delta_k^h)}\}]$ are satisfied. If $x_k \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_1)$ with $\hat{\epsilon}_1 = \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_0}{1 + \varsigma_0}$, then we have

$$x_{k+1} \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_0)$$

and

$$\|x_{k+1} - x^*\| \leq \varsigma_2 \|x_k - x^*\|^{1+\theta},$$

where $\varsigma_2 = \frac{1+\bar{\delta}^g}{\sigma} (\frac{L_h \varsigma_0^2 \hat{\epsilon}_1^{1-\theta}}{2(1-\bar{\delta}^g)} + \varsigma_1 \varsigma_0^{1+\theta})$ and $\varsigma_1 = \frac{1}{1-\bar{\delta}^g} ((L_g + \sigma + \frac{U_g^\theta}{2(1-\bar{\delta}^g)^\theta}) + \sigma + \frac{1}{2})(L_g + \sigma + \frac{U_g^\theta}{2(1-\bar{\delta}^g)^\theta})^\theta$.

Proof. Notice that $x_k \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_0)$ since $\hat{\epsilon}_1 \leq \hat{\epsilon}_0$. From Lemma 8, we have

$$\|x_{k+1} - x^*\| \leq \|x_k - x^*\| + \|d_k\| \leq (1 + \varsigma_0) \|x_k - x^*\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}_0,$$

which implies $x_{k+1} \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_0)$. From (3.3) and (3.4b), we have

$$\|x_{k+1} - x^*\| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \|\nabla f(x_{k+1})\| \leq \frac{1 + \delta_{k+1}^g}{\sigma} \|g_{k+1}\|. \quad (3.9)$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g_{k+1}\| &\leq \|g_{k+1} - r_k\| + \|r_k\| \\
&= \|g_{k+1} - g_k - Q_k(x_{k+1} - x_k)\| + \|r_k\| \\
&\leq \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k) - \nabla^2 f(x_k)(x_{k+1} - x_k)\| + \|g_{k+1} - \nabla f(x_{k+1})\| + \|g_k - \nabla f(x_k)\| \\
&\quad + \|(Q_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k))(x_{k+1} - x_k)\| + \|r_k\| \\
&\leq \frac{L_h}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \delta_{k+1}^g \|g_{k+1}\| + \delta_k^g \|g_k\| + (\delta_k^h + \frac{\mu_k}{2} \|g_k\|^\theta) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| \\
&\stackrel{(3.6)}{\leq} \frac{L_h}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \delta_{k+1}^g \|g_{k+1}\| + (\delta_k^g (L_g + \delta_k^h + \frac{\mu_k}{2} \|g_k\|^\theta) + \delta_k^h + \frac{\mu_k}{2} \|g_k\|^\theta) \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| \\
&\leq \frac{L_h}{2} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \delta_{k+1}^g \|g_{k+1}\| + \hat{\varsigma}_1 \|g_k\|^\theta \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\varsigma}_1 = (L_g + \sigma + \frac{U_g^\theta}{2(1-\delta^g)^\theta}) + \frac{3}{2}$ and the last inequality follows from $\delta_k^g \leq \|g_k\|^\theta$, $\delta_k^h \leq \sigma$, $\mu_k \leq 1$, and (3.4b). Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g_{k+1}\| &\leq \frac{L_h}{2(1-\bar{\delta}^g)} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{1-\bar{\delta}^g} \|g_k\|^\theta \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| \\
&\stackrel{(3.4b), (3.6)}{\leq} \frac{L_h}{2(1-\bar{\delta}^g)} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \varsigma_1 \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^{1+\theta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above inequality into (3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{k+1} - x^*\| &\leq \frac{1 + \delta_{k+1}^g}{\sigma} \left(\frac{L_h}{2(1-\bar{\delta}^g)} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \varsigma_1 \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^{1+\theta} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(3.7)}{\leq} \frac{1 + \delta_{k+1}^g}{\sigma} \left(\frac{L_h \varsigma_0^2}{2(1-\bar{\delta}^g)} \|x_k - x^*\|^2 + \varsigma_1 \varsigma_0^{1+\theta} \|x_k - x^*\|^{1+\theta} \right) \\
&\leq \varsigma_2 \|x_k - x^*\|^{1+\theta}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 10. Suppose Assumptions 7 and 8 with $\delta_k^g \in [0, \min\{\bar{\delta}^g, \|g_k\|^\theta, \frac{\sigma - \delta_k^h}{2(L_g + \delta_k^h)}\}]$ are satisfied. Let $\hat{\epsilon}_1 = \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_0}{1 + \varsigma_0}$. If $x_k \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_2)$ with $\hat{\epsilon}_2 = \min\{\hat{\epsilon}_1, (2\varsigma_2)^{-1/\theta}\}$, then

$$\|x_{k+1} - x^*\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|x_k - x^*\|. \tag{3.10}$$

If $x_0 \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_3)$ for some $\hat{\epsilon}_3 \in (0, \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_2}{1 + 2\varsigma_0}]$, then we have $x_k \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_2)$ for all k .

Proof. Inequality (3.10) follows from Lemma 9 and the definition of $\hat{\epsilon}_2$.

We prove the second statement by induction. According to Lemma 8, we have

$$\|x_1 - x^*\| \leq \|x_0 - x^*\| + \|d_0\| \stackrel{(3.7)}{\leq} \hat{\epsilon}_3 + \varsigma_0 \hat{\epsilon}_3 \leq \hat{\epsilon}_2.$$

Suppose for some $k > 0$, $x_l \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_2)$ for $l = 0, 1, \dots, k$. Then, from (3.10), we have

$$\|x_l - x^*\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|x_{l-1} - x^*\| \leq \dots \leq \frac{1}{2^l} \|x_0 - x^*\| \leq \frac{1}{2^l} \hat{\epsilon}_3.$$

Hence,

$$\|d_l\| \leq \varsigma_0 \|x_l - x^*\| \stackrel{(3.7)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2^l} \hat{\epsilon}_3 \varsigma_0.$$

Therefore,

$$\|x_{k+1} - x^*\| = \|x_1 + \sum_{l=1}^k -x^*\| \leq \|x_1 - x^*\| + \sum_{l=1}^k \|d_l\| \leq (1 + \varsigma_0)\hat{\epsilon}_3 + \hat{\epsilon}_3\varsigma_0 \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{1}{2^l} \leq (1 + 2\varsigma_0)\hat{\epsilon}_3 \leq \hat{\epsilon}_2.$$

□

Theorem 7. Suppose Assumptions 7 and 8 with $\delta_k^g \in [0, \min\{\bar{\delta}^g, \|g_k\|^\theta, \frac{\sigma - \delta_k^h}{2(L_g + \delta_k^h)}\}]$ are satisfied. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 3 with $x_0 \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_3)$, where $\hat{\epsilon}_3$ is defined as in Lemma 10. Then $\{x_k\}$ converges to x^* with convergence rate $1 + \theta$.

Proof. Notice that for any $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $p \geq q$, from Lemma 10, we have

$$\|x_p - x_q\| \leq \sum_{l=q}^{p-1} \|d_l\| \leq \varsigma_0 \hat{\epsilon}_3 \sum_{l=q}^{p-1} \frac{1}{2^l} \leq \frac{\varsigma_0 \hat{\epsilon}_3}{2^{q+1}}.$$

Hence, $\{x_k\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Moreover, $\{x_k\}$ converges to x^* with convergence rate $1 + \theta$ according to Lemma 9. □

From Theorem 7, $\{x_k\}$ converges to 0 linearly if $\theta = 0$, superlinearly if $\theta \in (0, 1)$, and quadratically if $\theta = 1$.

Theorem 8. Suppose Assumptions 7 and 8 with $\delta_k^g \in [0, \min\{\bar{\delta}^g, \|g_k\|^\theta, \frac{\sigma - \delta_k^h}{2(L_g + \delta_k^h)}\}]$ are satisfied. Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 3 with $x_0 \in \mathbb{B}(x^*, \hat{\epsilon}_3)$, where $\hat{\epsilon}_3$ is defined as in Lemma 10. Let $\bar{\delta} \in (0, 1)$ be given, and suppose that at each iteration k , g_k and Q_k is obtained from (3.2), with $\mathcal{S}_{g,k}$ and \mathcal{S}_h satisfying

$$|\mathcal{S}_{g,k}| \geq \frac{\widehat{U}_g^2 (1 + \sqrt{8 \ln(1/\bar{\delta})})^2}{(\delta_k^g)^2 \|g_k\|^2} \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{S}_h| \geq \frac{16 \widehat{U}_h^2}{(\delta_k^h)^2} \log \frac{2n}{\bar{\delta}}$$

for some $\delta_k^h \in (0, \min\{\bar{\delta}^h, \|g_k\|^\theta\}]$. Then we get

$$\frac{\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|}{\|x_k - x^*\|^{1+\theta}} \leq \varsigma_2$$

with probability $(1 - \bar{\delta})^k$, where ς_2 is defined as in Lemma 9.

Remark 2. Algorithm 3 differs from the subsampled Newton method [Roosta-Khorasani and Mahoney, 2019, Algorithm 5] in the accuracy criterion for the approximate gradients and Hessians, and for the approximate solution to $Q_k d = -g_k$. To establish the Q -superlinear/quadratic convergence rate of the iterates, we require g_k and Q_k to satisfy $\|g_k - \nabla f(x_k)\| = \mathcal{O}(\|g_k\|^{1+\theta})$ and $\|Q_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k)\| = \mathcal{O}(\|g_k\|^\theta)$, respectively, and the approximate solution satisfies (3.5). In [Roosta-Khorasani and Mahoney, 2019], the accuracy criterion for the approximate gradients and Hessians is problem-independent, and that for the approximate solution to the linear system is specified as $\|Q_k d_k + g_k\| \leq \theta_1 \|g_k\|$ and $g_k^\top d_k \leq -(1 - \theta_2) d_k^\top Q_k d_k$ for some $0 \leq \theta_1, \theta_2 < 1$. The subsampled Newton method achieves the local R -linear convergence rate in terms of iterations.

4 OEF regularized Newton and negative curvature method

In this section, we study the OEF regularized Newton and negative curvature method (OEF-RN2CM) to find the $(\varepsilon_g, \varepsilon_h)$ -second-order stationary point for some $\varepsilon_g, \varepsilon_h > 0$.

4.1 OEF-RN2CM for nonconvex problem

We make the following assumption on Problem (1.2).

Assumption 9. *f is bounded below by the finite value f_* . For any given $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, suppose*

- (i) *the level set $\mathcal{L}_f(x_0) = \{x | f(x) \leq f(x_0)\}$ is bounded.*
- (ii) *f has Lipschitz continuous gradient and Hessian on an open set \mathcal{B} containing all line segments $[x_k, x_k + d_k]$ for iterates x_k and search directions d_k generated by the algorithm.*

From Assumption 9, there exist $L_g > 0$ and $L_h > 0$, such that for any $x, y \in \mathcal{B}$, it holds that $\|\nabla^2 f(x)\| \leq L_g$ and

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \nabla f(x)^\top (y - x) + \frac{1}{2}(y - x)^\top \nabla^2 f(x)(y - x) + \frac{L_h}{6}\|y - x\|^3. \quad (4.1)$$

We assume that $\varepsilon_g, \varepsilon_h \ll \min\{L_g, L_h\}$. At each iteration $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we require the approximate gradient and Hessian satisfy the following conditions.

Assumption 10. *The approximate gradient g_k and Hessian Q_k at iteration k satisfy*

$$\|g_k - \nabla f(x_k)\| \leq \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_g \quad \text{and} \quad \|Q_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k)\| \leq \frac{1}{18}\varepsilon_h.$$

OEF-RN2CM requires estimating the eigenvector corresponding to the smallest eigenvalue of Q_k to design the search direction, where the accuracy of the estimator meets the following assumption.

Assumption 11. *Let \hat{p}_k be an unit approximate eigenvector of Q_k corresponding to its approximate smallest eigenvalue and $\hat{\lambda} := \hat{p}_k^\top Q_k \hat{p}_k$. We assume that*

$$\hat{\lambda}_k - \lambda_{\min}(Q_k) \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_h.$$

Under Assumptions 10 and 11, if $\|g_k\| \leq \varepsilon_g$ and $\hat{\lambda}_k \geq -\varepsilon_h$, then we have

$$\|\nabla f(x_k)\| \leq \frac{4}{3}\varepsilon_g \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x_k)) \geq -\frac{14}{9}\varepsilon_h.$$

We present the OEF regularized Newton and negative curvature method in Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4 is a two-phases method. It performs the first phase when $\|g_k\| \geq \varepsilon_g$. If $\hat{\lambda}_k < -\varepsilon_h$, then a negative curvature step is taken along the direction $-\text{sign}(g_k^\top \hat{p}_k)\hat{p}_k$ with a fixed step size $\frac{5}{2L_h}\varepsilon_h$; otherwise, the CG method is used to solve the inexact regularized Newton equation $(Q_k + 2\varepsilon_h I_n)d = -g_k$. If the vector d_k returned by the CG method has a small norm, then the algorithm takes an unit step along d_k and then terminates. We will show that in this case, Algorithm 4 returns an approximate second-order stationary point; otherwise, an approximate Newton step is taken along d_k with the step size $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3(L_h + \eta)\|d_k\|}}\varepsilon_g^{1/2}$ for some $\eta > 0$. The algorithm turns to the second phase in case $\|g_k\| < \varepsilon_g$. If $\hat{\lambda}_k \geq -\varepsilon_h$, then the algorithm terminate; otherwise, a negative curvature step is taken along the direction $-\text{sign}(g_k^\top \hat{p}_k)\hat{p}_k$ with the fixed step size $\frac{5}{2L_h}\varepsilon_h$. The estimator \hat{p}_k can be obtained via the Lanczos algorithm [Royer et al., 2020, Algorithm 5]. Furthermore, \hat{p}_k and the approximate solution d_k to Equation (4.2) can be computed simultaneously using a variant of the Krylov subspace method (for details, refer to [Gratton et al., 2025a, Section 5.2]).

Algorithm 4 OEF regularized Newton and negative curvature method (OEF-RN2CM).

Require: $L_h, \varepsilon_g \in (0, L_h)$, $\varepsilon_h = \sqrt{L_h \varepsilon_g}$, $\hat{\mu} > 0$, and $\eta > 0$

```

1: for  $k = 0, 1, \dots$  do
2:   if  $\|g_k\| \geq \varepsilon_g$  then ▷ first phase
3:     compute  $Q_k$  and  $(\hat{\lambda}_k, \hat{p}_k)$ ;
4:     if  $\hat{\lambda}_k < -\varepsilon_h$  then
5:        $d_{\text{type}} = \text{NC}$ ; ▷ negative curvature step
6:     else
7:       Invoke the CG method to solve the linear system  $(Q_k + 2\varepsilon_h I_n)d = -g_k$  with the
       zero vector as the initial guess, and return a vector  $d_k$  that satisfies
       
$$\|(Q_k + 2\varepsilon_h I_n)d_k + g_k\| \leq \hat{\mu}\varepsilon_h\|d_k\|; \quad (4.2)$$

8:       if  $\|d_k\| \leq \frac{2\varepsilon_g}{\varepsilon_h}$  then
9:         Terminate and return  $x_k + d_k$ ;
10:      else
11:         $d_{\text{type}} = \text{SOL}$ ; ▷ approximate Newton step
12:      end if
13:    end if
14:  else ▷ second phase
15:    compute  $Q_k$  and  $(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{p}_k)$ ;
16:    if  $\hat{\lambda}_k \geq -\varepsilon_h$  then
17:      Terminate and return  $x_k$ ;
18:    else
19:       $d_{\text{type}} = \text{NC}$ ; ▷ negative curvature step
20:    end if
21:  end if
22:  if  $d_{\text{type}} = \text{NC}$  then
23:     $d_k = -\text{sign}(g_k^\top \hat{p}_k)\hat{p}_k$  and  $\alpha_k = \frac{17}{12L_h}\varepsilon_h$ ;
24:  else
25:     $\alpha_k = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3(L_h + \eta)\|d_k\|}}\varepsilon_g^{1/2}$ ;
26:  end if
27:   $x_{k+1} \leftarrow x_k + \alpha_k d_k$ ;
28:  compute  $g_{k+1}$ .
29: end for

```

Remark 3. The main difference between Algorithm 4 and [Yao et al., 2023, Algorithm 4] resides in the specification of the negative curvature direction: Algorithm 4 employs the unit eigenvector corresponding to the estimated smallest eigenvalue of Q_k as the negative curvature direction, rather than an arbitrary negative curvature vector detected by the Capped CG method [Royer et al., 2020] (as adopted in [Yao et al., 2023, Algorithm 4]). This design simplifies the accuracy criterion for the approximate gradient. Specifically, [Yao et al., 2023, Algorithm 4] imposes the condition $\|g_k\| \leq \frac{1-\zeta}{8} \min\{\frac{3\varepsilon_h^2}{65(L_h+\eta)}, \max\{\varepsilon_g, \min\{\varepsilon_h\|d_k\|, \|g_k\|, \|g_{k+1}\|\}\}\}$ for some $\zeta, \eta \in (0, 1)$, where d_k and g_k are unknown and depend on g_k for computation. In contrast, Algorithm 4 enforces a stricter accuracy criterion when $\|g_k\|$ is large. It can be proven that the results presented in this section remain valid if we require $\|g_k\| \leq \frac{1}{3} \max\{\varepsilon_g, \min\{\varepsilon_h\|d_k\|, \|g_k\|\}\}$.

Lemma 11. Suppose Assumptions 9, 10 and 11 are satisfied. If, at iteration k of Algorithm 4,

$d_{\text{type}} = \text{NC}$, then we have

$$f(x_{k+1}) \leq f(x_k) - \frac{17}{10368\sqrt{L_h}}\varepsilon_g^{3/2}. \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. Notice that

$$|\hat{p}_k^\top Q_k \hat{p}_k - \hat{p}_k^\top \nabla^2 f(x_k) \hat{p}_k| \leq \|Q_k - \nabla^2 f(x_k)\| \|\hat{p}_k\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{18}\varepsilon_h \leq \frac{1}{18}|\hat{\lambda}_k|,$$

where the second inequality follows from $\|\hat{p}_k\| = 1$ and the last inequality follows from $\hat{\lambda}_k < -\varepsilon_h$ when $d_{\text{type}} = \text{NC}$.

Hence, we have

$$\hat{p}_k^\top \nabla^2 f(x_k) \hat{p}_k \leq \frac{1}{18}|\hat{\lambda}_k| + \hat{p}_k^\top Q_k \hat{p}_k = -\frac{17}{18}|\hat{\lambda}_k|. \quad (4.4)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_k + \alpha_k d_k) &\stackrel{(4.1)}{\leq} f(x_k) + \alpha_k \nabla f(x_k)^\top d_k + \frac{\alpha_k^2}{2} d_k^\top \nabla^2 f(x_k) d_k + \frac{L_h \alpha_k^3}{6} \|d_k\|^3 \\ &= f(x_k) - \alpha_k \text{sign}(g_k^\top \hat{p}_k) \nabla f(x_k)^\top \hat{p}_k + \frac{\alpha_k^2}{2} \hat{p}_k^\top \nabla^2 f(x_k) \hat{p}_k + \frac{L_h \alpha_k^3}{6} \\ &\stackrel{(4.4)}{\leq} f(x_k) - \alpha_k \text{sign}(g_k^\top \hat{p}_k) (g_k^\top \hat{p}_k) - \frac{17\alpha_k^2}{36} |\hat{\lambda}_k| + \frac{L_h \alpha_k^3}{6} - \alpha_k \text{sign}(g_k^\top \hat{p}_k) (\nabla f(x_k) - g_k)^\top \hat{p}_k \\ &\leq f(x_k) - \alpha_k |g_k^\top \hat{p}_k| - \frac{\alpha_k}{3} \left(\frac{17}{12} \varepsilon_h \alpha_k - \frac{L_h}{2} \alpha_k^2 - \varepsilon_g \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from $\|d_k\| = 1$ and the last inequality follows from $|\hat{\lambda}_k| > \varepsilon_h$ and Assumption 10. If $\alpha_k = \frac{17}{12L_h}\varepsilon_h$ and $\varepsilon_h = \sqrt{L_h}\varepsilon_g$, then we have

$$\frac{\alpha_k}{3} \left(\frac{17}{12} \varepsilon_h \alpha_k - \frac{L_h}{2} \alpha_k^2 - \varepsilon_g \right) = \frac{17}{10368\sqrt{L_h}}\varepsilon_g^{3/2}.$$

The desired result is satisfied¹. □

Lemma 12. Suppose Assumptions 9, 10 and 11 are satisfied. If, at iteration k of Algorithm 4, $d_{\text{type}} = \text{SOL}$, then we have

$$f(x_{k+1}) \leq f(x_k) - \frac{\sqrt{2}\eta}{9\sqrt{3}(L_h + \eta)^{3/2}}\varepsilon_g^{3/2}.$$

Proof. Notice that

$$Q_k + 2\varepsilon_h I_n \succeq (\lambda_{\min}(Q_k) + 2\varepsilon_h) I_n \succeq (\hat{\lambda}_k + 2\varepsilon_h - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_h) I_n \succeq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_h I_n,$$

where the second inequality follows from Assumption 11 and the last inequality follows from $\hat{\lambda}_k \geq -\varepsilon_h$ when $d_{\text{type}} = \text{SOL}$.

Define $r_k = (Q_k + 2\varepsilon_h I_n) d_k + g_k$. For any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha g_k^\top d_k + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} d_k^\top Q_k d_k &= \alpha (r_k - (Q_k + 2\varepsilon_h I_n) d_k)^\top d_k + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} d_k^\top Q_k d_k \\ &= \alpha r_k^\top d_k - \alpha \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) d_k^\top (Q_k + 2\varepsilon_h I_n) d_k - \alpha^2 \varepsilon_h \|d_k\|^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \alpha \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \varepsilon_h \|d_k\|^2 \leq -\frac{1}{4} \alpha \varepsilon_h \|d_k\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

¹From the proof of the theorem, it can be observed that $\alpha_k = \frac{\varepsilon_h}{L_h} \alpha$ (for some $\alpha \in (\frac{4}{3}, \frac{3}{2})$) is an alternative choice, which still yields a function value decrease of $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_g^{3/2})$.

where the first inequality follows from the property of the CG method, which guarantees $r_k^\top d_k = 0$, and the second inequality follows from $1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x_k + \alpha d_k) &\stackrel{(4.1)}{\leq} f(x_k) + \alpha \nabla f(x_k)^\top d_k + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} d_k^\top \nabla^2 f(x_k) d_k + \frac{L_h \alpha^3}{6} \|d_k\|^3 \\
&= f(x_k) + \alpha g_k^\top d_k + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} d_k^\top Q_k d_k + \alpha (\nabla f(x_k) - g_k)^\top d_k + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} d_k^\top (\nabla^2 f(x_k) - Q_k) d_k + \frac{L_h \alpha^3}{6} \|d_k\|^3 \\
&\leq f(x_k) - \frac{\alpha}{4} \varepsilon_h \|d_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{3} \varepsilon_g \|d_k\| + \frac{\alpha^2}{36} \varepsilon_h \|d_k\|^2 + \frac{L_h \alpha^3}{6} \|d_k\|^3 \\
&\leq f(x_k) + \frac{\alpha}{3} \varepsilon_g \|d_k\| - \frac{2\alpha}{9} \varepsilon_h \|d_k\|^2 + \frac{L_h \alpha^3}{6} \|d_k\|^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Notice that $\|d_k\| > \frac{2\varepsilon_g}{\varepsilon_h}$, we have $\alpha_k^2 = \frac{2\varepsilon_g}{3(L_h + \eta)\|d_k\|^2} < \frac{L_h}{6(L_h + \eta)} < 1$ and

$$\frac{\alpha_k}{3} \varepsilon_g \|d_k\| - \frac{2\alpha_k}{9} \varepsilon_h \|d_k\|^2 + \frac{L_h \alpha_k^3}{6} \|d_k\|^3 < -\frac{\sqrt{2}\eta}{9\sqrt{3}(L_h + \eta)^{3/2}} \varepsilon_g^{3/2}.$$

Substituting the above equation into (4.5), we obtain the desired result. \square

It can be observed that when $d_{type} = \text{SOL}$, the key factor leading to the function value decrease achieving $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{3/2})$ is $\|d_k\| > \frac{2\varepsilon_g}{\varepsilon_h}$, which is independent of the accuracy condition (4.2).

Similar to [Yao et al., 2023, Lemma 8], the following statement holds when Algorithm 4 terminates at iteration k on line 8.

Lemma 13. *Suppose that Assumptions 9, 10 and 11 are satisfied. If Algorithm 4 terminates at iteration k on line 8, then we have*

$$\|\nabla f(x_k + d_k)\| \leq \left(\frac{58}{9} + 2\hat{\mu}\right) \varepsilon_g$$

and

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x_k + d_k)) \geq -\frac{32}{9} \sqrt{L_h \varepsilon_g}.$$

Proof. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla f(x_k + d_k)\| &\leq \|\nabla f(x_k + d_k) - \nabla f(x_k) - \nabla^2 f(x_k) d_k\| + \|\nabla f(x_k) - g_k\| + \|(\nabla^2 f(x_k) - Q_k) d_k\| \\
&\quad + \|(Q_k + 2\varepsilon_h I_n) d_k + g_k\| + 2\varepsilon_h \|d_k\| \\
&\leq \frac{L_h}{2} \|d_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{3} \varepsilon_g + \left(\frac{37}{18} + \hat{\mu}\right) \varepsilon_h \|d_k\| \\
&\leq \left(\frac{58}{9} + 2\hat{\mu}\right) \varepsilon_g,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Assumptions 9 (ii), 10, and (4.2), the last inequality follows from $\|d_k\| \leq \frac{2\varepsilon_g}{\varepsilon_h}$,

Under Assumption 9 (ii), we have

$$\|\nabla^2 f(x_k + d_k) - \nabla^2 f(x_k)\| \leq L_h \|d_k\|,$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x_k + d_k)) &\geq \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x_k)) - L_h \|d_k\| \geq \lambda_{\min}(Q_k) - \frac{1}{18} \varepsilon_h - L_h \|d_k\| \\
&\geq \hat{\lambda}_k - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_h - \frac{1}{18} \varepsilon_h - L_h \|d_k\| \geq -\frac{14}{9} \varepsilon_h - L_h \frac{2\varepsilon_g}{\varepsilon_h} = -\frac{32}{9} \sqrt{L_h \varepsilon_g}^{1/2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Assumption 10, the third inequality follows from Assumption (11), and the forth inequality follows from $\hat{\lambda}_k \geq -\varepsilon_h$. \square

Notice that, from (4.2), we have

$$\|g_k\| \leq \|(Q_k + 2\varepsilon_h I_n)d_k\| + \hat{\mu}\varepsilon_h\|d_k\| \leq (L_g + (\frac{37}{18} + \hat{\mu})\varepsilon_h)\|d_k\|,$$

which indicates that Step 8 of Algorithm 4 is not invoked when $\|g_k\| > 2(L_g + (\frac{37}{18} + \hat{\mu})\varepsilon_h)\frac{\varepsilon_g}{\varepsilon_h}$.

Theorem 9. *Suppose that Assumptions 9, 10 and 11 are satisfied. For a given $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\varepsilon_g = \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon_h = \sqrt{L_h}\varepsilon$. Let*

$$\bar{K}_3 := \left\lceil \frac{2(f(x_0) - f_*)}{\min\{c_{nc}, c_{sol}\}} \varepsilon^{-3/2} \right\rceil + 1,$$

where $c_{sol} = \frac{\sqrt{2}\eta}{9\sqrt{3}(L_h + \eta)^{3/2}}$ and $c_{nc} = \frac{17}{10368\sqrt{L_h}}$. Then Algorithm 4 terminates in at most \bar{K}_3 iterations at a point x satisfying² $\|\nabla f(x)\| \lesssim \varepsilon$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x)) \gtrsim -\sqrt{L_h}\varepsilon$.

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that Algorithm 4 runs for at least K steps, for some $K > \bar{K}_3$, we define the following four classes of indices.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_1 &:= \{k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1 \mid \|g_k\| < \varepsilon\}; \\ \mathcal{K}_2 &:= \{k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1 \mid \|g_k\| \geq \varepsilon, d_{\text{type}} = \text{NC}\}; \\ \mathcal{K}_3 &:= \{k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1 \mid \|g_k\| \geq \varepsilon, \hat{\lambda}_k \geq -\sqrt{L_h}\varepsilon, \|d_k\| \leq \frac{2\varepsilon^{1/2}}{\sqrt{L_h}}\}; \\ \mathcal{K}_4 &:= \{k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1 \mid \|g_k\| \geq \varepsilon, \hat{\lambda}_k \geq -\sqrt{L_h}\varepsilon, d_{\text{type}} = \text{SOL}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We consider each of these types of steps in turn.

Case 1: if $k \in \mathcal{K}_1$, then either the algorithm terminates or from Lemma 11, we have

$$f(x_{k+1}) \leq f(x_k) - c_{nc}\varepsilon^{3/2}. \quad (4.6)$$

Case 2: if $k \in \mathcal{K}_2$, then from Lemma 11, we have (4.6).

Case 3: if $k \in \mathcal{K}_3$, then the algorithm is terminated and we have $|\mathcal{K}_3| \leq 1$.

Case 4: if $k \in \mathcal{K}_4$, then from Lemma 12, we have

$$f(x_{k+1}) \leq f(x_k) - c_{sol}\varepsilon^{3/2}. \quad (4.7)$$

From (4.6), we have

$$f(x_0) - f_* \geq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2} f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq (|\mathcal{K}_1| + |\mathcal{K}_2|)c_{nc}\varepsilon_g^{3/2}.$$

From (4.7), we have

$$f(x_0) - f_* \geq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_4} f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1}) \geq |\mathcal{K}_4|c_{sol}\varepsilon_g^{3/2}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} K = |\mathcal{K}_1| + |\mathcal{K}_2| + |\mathcal{K}_3| + |\mathcal{K}_4| &\leq \frac{f(x_0) - f_*}{c_{nc}} \varepsilon^{-3/2} + \frac{f(x_0) - f_*}{c_{sol}} \varepsilon^{-3/2} + 1 \leq \frac{2(f(x_0) - f_*)}{\min\{c_{nc}, c_{sol}\}} \varepsilon^{-3/2} + 1 \\ &\leq \bar{K}_3, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts our assumption that $K > \bar{K}_3$. \square

²‘ \lesssim ’ and ‘ \gtrsim ’ denote that the corresponding inequality holds up to a certain constant that is independent of ε and L_h .

We now give the operation complexity of Algorithm 4 in terms of gradient evaluation (g_k) and Hessian-vector products ($Q_k v$ for some $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$). According to [Royer et al., 2020, Lemma 10], when Lanczos method is used to estimate the smallest eigenvalue of Q_k starting with a random vector uniformly generated on the unit sphere, for given $0 < \delta \ll 1$, Assumption 11 can be satisfied in at most

$$\min\{n, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ln(n/\delta))\} \quad (4.8)$$

matrix-vector multiplications by Q_k , which probability at least $1 - \delta$. According to [Royer et al., 2020, Lemma 1], when the CG method is invoked to solve the system $(Q_k + 2\varepsilon_h I_n)d = -g_k$, the number of iterations is bounded by

$$\min\{n, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon_h^{-1/2})\}. \quad (4.9)$$

Corollary 10. *Suppose that Assumptions 9 and 10 are satisfied and the number of iterations to satisfy Assumption 11 is bounded by (4.8). Let \bar{K}_3 be defined as in Theorem 9. Then for given $0 < \delta \ll 1$, with probability at least $(1 - \delta)^{\bar{K}_3}$, Algorithm 4 terminates at a point x satisfying $\|\nabla f(x)\| \lesssim \varepsilon$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x)) \gtrsim -\sqrt{L_h \varepsilon}$ after at most*

$$\mathcal{O}(\bar{K}_3 \min\{n, \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}} \ln(n\delta^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}})\})$$

Hessian-vector products and /or gradient evaluations. (With probability at least $1 - (1 - \delta)^{\bar{K}_3}$, it terminates incorrectly with this complexity at a point x satisfying $\|\nabla f(x)\| \lesssim \varepsilon$.) For n sufficiently large, with probability at least $(1 - \delta)^{\bar{K}_3}$, the bound is $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-\frac{7}{4}})$.

Proof. From (4.8) and (4.9), Hessian-vector products of Algorithm 4 can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^{\bar{K}_3-1} \min\{n, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon_h^{-1/2})\} + \min\{n, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ln(n/\delta))\} \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\bar{K}_3 \min\{2n, n + \varepsilon_h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ln(n/\delta), n + \varepsilon_h^{-1/2} \ln(\varepsilon_h^{-1}), \varepsilon_h^{-1/2} \ln(\varepsilon_h^{-1}) + \varepsilon_h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ln(n/\delta)\}) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\bar{K}_3 \min\{2n, n + \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}} \ln(n/\delta), n + \varepsilon^{-1/4} \ln(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \varepsilon^{-1/4} \ln(n\delta^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}})\}). \end{aligned}$$

For n sufficiently large, the above bound becomes to

$$\mathcal{O}(\bar{K}_3 \varepsilon^{-1/4} \ln(n\delta^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}})) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-\frac{3}{2}} \varepsilon^{-1/4} \ln(n\delta^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}})) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-\frac{7}{4}}).$$

□

4.2 OEF-RN2CM for finite-sum

In this section, we study the complexity of Algorithm 4 for finite-sum problem (1.3). We consider subsampling schemes (3.2) for estimating g_k and Q_k . The follow statement holds.

Lemma 14. *Suppose Assumption 9 is satisfied, and let $\bar{\delta} \in (0, 1)$ be given. Suppose that at iteration k of Algorithm 4, $\delta_k^g > 0$ and $\delta_k^h > 0$ are as defined in Assumption 10. Let $0 < \hat{U}_g, \hat{U}_h < +\infty$ be such that $\|\nabla f_i(x)\| \leq \hat{U}_g$ and $\|\nabla^2 f_i(x)\| \leq \hat{U}_h$ for all $x \in \mathcal{L}_f(x_0)$. For g_k and Q_k defined as in (3.2), and subsample sets $\mathcal{S}_{g,k}$ and \mathcal{S}_h satisfying*

$$|\mathcal{S}_{g,k}| \geq \frac{9\hat{U}_g^2(1 + \sqrt{8\ln(1/\bar{\delta})})^2}{\varepsilon_g^2} \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{S}_h| \geq \frac{5184\hat{U}_h^2}{\varepsilon_h^2} \log \frac{2n}{\bar{\delta}},$$

then Assumptions 10 is satisfied at iteration k with probability at least $1 - \bar{\delta}$.

According to the proof of Theorem 9 and Corollary 10, the following complexity result holds. We assume that failure to satisfy Assumption 10 never occurs at any iteration.

Theorem 11. *Suppose Assumptions 9 and 11 are satisfied. Let $\bar{\delta} \in (0, 1)$ be given, and suppose that at each iteration k , g_k and Q_k are obtained from (3.2), with $\mathcal{S}_{g,k}$ and \mathcal{S}_h satisfying the lower bounds in Lemma 14. For a given $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\varepsilon_g = \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon_h = \sqrt{L_h}\varepsilon$. Then with probability at least $(1 - \bar{\delta})^{\bar{K}_3}$, Algorithm 4 terminates in at most \bar{K}_3 iterations at a point x satisfying $\|\nabla f(x)\| \lesssim \varepsilon$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x)) \gtrsim -\sqrt{L_h}\varepsilon$, where \bar{K}_3 is defined as in Theorem 9.*

Next, we give the sample operation complexity when Algorithm 4 working on finite-sum problem (1.3), which counts either an evaluation of a gradient ∇f_i for some $i = 1, \dots, m$ or a Hessian-vector product of the form $\nabla^2 f_i(x)p$ for some $i = 1, \dots, m$ and some $x, p \in \mathbb{R}^n$. It is noted that at each iteration k , there exists a possibility that Assumption 10 is not satisfied; furthermore, as noted in the previous section, Assumption 11 holds with a certain probability. For the results presented below, we consider the case where neither Assumption 10 nor Assumption 11 is violated in any iteration.

Corollary 12. *Suppose that Assumption 9 is satisfied. Let $\bar{\delta} \in (0, 1)$ be given, and suppose that at each iteration k , g_k and Q_k are obtained from (3.2), with $\mathcal{S}_{g,k}$ and \mathcal{S}_h satisfying the lower bounds in Lemma 14. Suppose that the number of iterations to satisfy Assumption 11 is bounded by (4.8). Let \bar{K}_3 be defined as in Theorem 9. Then for given $0 < \delta \ll 1$, with probability at least $(1 - \delta)^{\bar{K}_3}(1 - \bar{\delta})^{\bar{K}_3}$, Algorithm 4 terminates at a point x satisfying $\|\nabla f(x)\| \lesssim \varepsilon$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x)) \gtrsim -\sqrt{L_h}\varepsilon$ after at most*

$$\mathcal{O}(\bar{K}_3(\varepsilon^{-2} + \varepsilon^{-1} \min\{2n, n + \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}} \ln(n/\delta), n + \varepsilon^{-1/4} \ln(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \varepsilon^{-1/4} \ln(n\delta^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}})\})).$$

sample operations. For n sufficiently large, with probability at least $(1 - \delta)^{\bar{K}_3}(1 - \bar{\delta})^{\bar{K}_3}$, the bound is $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-\frac{7}{2}})$.

Proof. Define $\mathcal{C}_k = |\mathcal{S}_{g,k}| + |\mathcal{S}_h|(\min\{n, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon_h^{-1/2})\}) + \min\{n, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ln(n/\delta))\}$. From Lemma 14, we have $|\mathcal{S}_{g,k}| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ and $|\mathcal{S}_h| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1})$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{C}_k = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1}) \min\{2n, n + \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}} \ln(n/\delta), n + \varepsilon^{-1/4} \ln(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \varepsilon^{-1/4} \ln(n\delta^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}})\} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-2}).$$

The total number of sample operator is bounded by

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\bar{K}_3-1} \mathcal{C}_k = \mathcal{O}(\bar{K}_3(\varepsilon^{-2} + \varepsilon^{-1} \min\{2n, n + \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}} \ln(n/\delta), n + \varepsilon^{-1/4} \ln(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \varepsilon^{-1/4} \ln(n\delta^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}})\})).$$

For n sufficiently large, the above bound becomes to

$$\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-3/2}(\varepsilon^{-2} + \varepsilon^{-1}e_3)) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-3/2}(\varepsilon^{-2} + \varepsilon^{-5/4} \ln(n\delta^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1/2}))) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-7/2}).$$

□

5 Conclusions

This paper primarily studies OEF variants of Newton-type algorithms. We show that the global/local convergence rates or the iteration/operation complexity of these methods match those of the standard methods with exact derivatives. To avoid function value evaluations, our proposed algorithms rely on problem-dependent quantities, such as Lipschitz constants. In our future work, we will explore adaptive parameter adjustment strategies.

Funding

This work is supported by funds from National Natural Science Foundation of China (# 12271217).

References

- Y. Arjevani, Y. Carmon, J. C. Duchi, D. J. Foster, A. Sekhari, and K. Sridharan. Second-order information in non-convex stochastic optimization: power and limitations. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 242–299. PMLR, 2020.
- A. Beck. *First-Order Methods in Optimization*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2017. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611974997.
- S. Bellavia, G. Gurioli, B. Morini, and P. L. Toint. Adaptive regularization for nonconvex optimization using inexact function values and randomly perturbed derivatives. *Journal of Complexity*, 68:101591, 2022a.
- S. Bellavia, G. Gurioli, B. Morini, and P. L. Toint. Trust-region algorithms: Probabilistic complexity and intrinsic noise with applications to subsampling techniques. *EURO Journal on Computational Optimization*, 10:100043, 2022b.
- S. Bellavia, G. Gurioli, B. Morini, and P. L. Toint. The impact of noise on evaluation complexity: the deterministic trust-region case. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 196(2):700–729, 2023.
- E. H. Bergou, Y. Diouane, V. Kunc, V. Kungurtsev, and C. W. Royer. A subsampling line-search method with second-order results. *INFORMS Journal on Optimization*, 4(4):403–425, 2022.
- J. Blanchet, C. Cartis, M. Menickelly, and K. Scheinberg. Convergence rate analysis of a stochastic trust-region method via supermartingales. *INFORMS journal on optimization*, 1(2):92–119, 2019.
- C. Cartis and K. Scheinberg. Global convergence rate analysis of unconstrained optimization methods based on probabilistic models. *Mathematical Programming*, 169(2):337–375, 2018.
- C. Cartis, N. I. M. Gould, and P. L. Toint. Adaptive cubic regularisation methods for unconstrained optimization. part i: motivation, convergence and numerical results. *Mathematical Programming*, 127(2):245–295, 2011a.
- C. Cartis, N. I. M. Gould, and P. L. Toint. Adaptive cubic regularisation methods for unconstrained optimization. part ii: worst-case function-and derivative-evaluation complexity. *Mathematical programming*, 130(2):295–319, 2011b.
- R. Chen, M. Menickelly, and K. Scheinberg. Stochastic optimization using a trust-region method and random models. *Mathematical Programming*, 169(2):447–487, 2018.
- F. E. Curtis, D. P. Robinson, and M. Samadi. A trust region algorithm with a worst-case iteration complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3/2})$ for nonconvex optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 162(1):1–32, 2017.
- F. E. Curtis, D. P. Robinson, C. W. Royer, and S. J. Wright. Trust-region newton-cg with strong second-order complexity guarantees for nonconvex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(1):518–544, 2021.

- A. d’Aspremont. Smooth optimization with approximate gradient. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19(3):1171–1183, 2008.
- O. Devolder, F. Glineur, and Y. Nesterov. First-order methods of smooth convex optimization with inexact oracle. *Mathematical Programming*, 146(1):37–75, 2014.
- P. E. Dvurechensky. A gradient method with inexact oracle for composite nonconvex optimization. *Computer research and modeling*, 14(2):321–334, 2022.
- S. Gratton, C. W. Royer, and L. N. Vicente. A decoupled first/second-order steps technique for nonconvex nonlinear unconstrained optimization with improved complexity bounds. *Mathematical Programming*, 179(1):195–222, 2020.
- S. Gratton, S. Jerad, and P. L. Toint. Yet another fast variant of newton’s method for nonconvex optimization. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 45(2):971–1008, 2025a.
- S. Gratton, S. Jerad, and P. L. Toint. Complexity and performance for two classes of noise-tolerant first-order algorithms. *Optimization Methods and Software*, pages 1–27, 2025b.
- A. Griewank. The modification of newton’s method for unconstrained optimization by bounding cubic terms. Technical report, Technical report NA/12, 1981.
- A. Hamadouche, Y. Wu, A. M. Wallace, and J. F. C. Mota. Sharper bounds for proximal gradient algorithms with errors. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 34(1):278–305, 2024.
- C. He, H. Huang, and Z. Lu. Newton-cg methods for nonconvex unconstrained optimization with hölder continuous hessian. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2025a.
- C. He, Y. Jiang, C. Zhang, D. Ge, B. Jiang, and Y. Ye. Homogeneous second-order descent framework: a fast alternative to newton-type methods. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–62, 2025b.
- S. Li and S. J. Wright. A randomized algorithm for nonconvex minimization with inexact evaluations and complexity guarantees. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 207(3):66, 2025.
- L. Liu, X. Liu, C.-J. Hsieh, and D. Tao. Stochastic optimization for nonconvex problem with inexact hessian matrix, gradient, and function. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 2023.
- R. Liu, S. Pan, Y. Wu, and X. Yang. An inexact regularized proximal newton method for nonconvex and nonsmooth optimization. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 88(2):603–641, 2024.
- B. S. Mordukhovich and W. Ouyang. Higher-order metric subregularity and its applications. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 63(4):777–795, 2015.
- B. S. Mordukhovich, X. Yuan, S. Zeng, and J. Zhang. A globally convergent proximal newton-type method in nonsmooth convex optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 198(1):899–936, 2023.
- Y. Nabou, F. Glineur, and I. Necoara. Proximal gradient methods with inexact oracle of degree q for composite optimization. *Optimization Letters*, 19(2):285–306, 2025.
- Y. Nesterov and B. T. Polyak. Cubic regularization of newton method and its global performance. *Mathematical programming*, 108(1):177–205, 2006.

- J.-S. Pang. Error bounds in mathematical programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 79(1):299–332, 1997.
- R. T. Rockafellar and R. J. B. Wets. *Variational Analysis*. Springer, 1998.
- F. Roosta-Khorasani and M. W. Mahoney. Sub-sampled newton methods. *Mathematical Programming*, 174(1):293–326, 2019.
- C. W. Royer and S. J. Wright. Complexity analysis of second-order line-search algorithms for smooth nonconvex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(2):1448–1477, 2018.
- C. W. Royer, M. O’Neill, and S. J. Wright. A newton-cg algorithm with complexity guarantees for smooth unconstrained optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 180(1):451–488, 2020.
- M. Schmidt, N. Roux, and F. Bach. Convergence rates of inexact proximal-gradient methods for convex optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- P. L. Toint. Nonlinear stepsize control, trust regions and regularizations for unconstrained optimization. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 28(1):82–95, 2013.
- N. Tripuraneni, M. Stern, C. Jin, J. Regier, and M. I. Jordan. Stochastic cubic regularization for fast nonconvex optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- P. Xu, F. Roosta, and M. W. Mahoney. Newton-type methods for non-convex optimization under inexact hessian information. *Mathematical Programming*, 184(1):35–70, 2020.
- Z. Yao, P. Xu, F. Roosta, and M. W. Mahoney. Inexact nonconvex newton-type methods. *INFORMS Journal on Optimization*, 3(2):154–182, 2021.
- Z. Yao, P. Xu, F. Roosta, S. J. Wright, and M. W. Mahoney. Inexact newton-cg algorithms with complexity guarantees. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 43(3):1855–1897, 2023.
- C. Zhang, C. He, Y. Jiang, C. Xue, B. Jiang, D. Ge, and Y. Ye. A homogeneous second-order descent method for nonconvex optimization. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2025.
- H. Zhu. An inexact proximal newton method for nonconvex composite minimization. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 102(3):79, 2025.
- H. Zhu and Y. Xiao. A hybrid inexact regularized newton and negative curvature method. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 88(3):849–870, 2024.