

# A first-order method for nonconvex-strongly-concave constrained minimax optimization\*

Zhaosong Lu <sup>†</sup> Sanyou Mei <sup>‡</sup>

May 12, 2024 (Revised: October 23, 2025)

## Abstract

In this paper we study a nonconvex-strongly-concave constrained minimax problem. Specifically, we propose a first-order augmented Lagrangian method for solving it, whose subproblems are nonconvex-strongly-concave unconstrained minimax problems and suitably solved by a first-order method developed in this paper that leverages the strong concavity structure. Under suitable assumptions, the proposed method achieves an *operation complexity* of  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-3.5} \log \varepsilon^{-1})$ , measured in terms of its fundamental operations, for finding an  $\varepsilon$ -KKT solution of the constrained minimax problem, which improves the previous best-known operation complexity by a factor of  $\varepsilon^{-0.5}$ .

**Keywords:** minimax optimization, augmented Lagrangian method, first-order method, operation complexity

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 90C26, 90C30, 90C47, 90C99, 65K05

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider a nonconvex-strongly-concave constrained minimax problem

$$F^* = \min_{c(x) \leq 0} \max_{d(x,y) \leq 0} \{F(x,y) := f(x,y) + p(x) - q(y)\}. \quad (1)$$

For notational convenience, throughout this paper we let  $\mathcal{X} := \text{dom } p$  and  $\mathcal{Y} := \text{dom } q$ , where  $\text{dom } p$  and  $\text{dom } q$  denote the domain of  $p$  and  $q$ , respectively. Assume that problem (1) has at least one optimal solution and the following additional assumptions hold.

- Assumption 1.** (i)  $f$  is  $L_{\nabla f}$ -smooth on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , and  $f(x, \cdot)$  is  $\sigma$ -strongly-concave for some constant  $\sigma > 0$  for any given  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .<sup>1</sup>
- (ii)  $p : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  and  $q : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  are proper closed convex functions, and the proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$  can be exactly evaluated.
- (iii)  $c : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n}}$  is  $L_{\nabla c}$ -smooth and  $L_c$ -Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $d : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{m}}$  is  $L_{\nabla d}$ -smooth and  $L_d$ -Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , and  $d_i(x, \cdot)$  is convex for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .
- (iv) The sets  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  (namely,  $\text{dom } p$  and  $\text{dom } q$ ) are compact.

Problem (1) has found application in various areas, such as perceptual adversarial robustness [27], robust adversarial classification [21], adversarial attacks in resource allocation [52], network interdiction problem [14, 48], and power networks [43].

In recent years, the minimax problem of a simpler form has gained significant attention:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(x; y), \quad (2)$$

\*This work was partially supported by the Office of Naval Research under Award N00014-24-1-2702, the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under Award FA9550-24-1-0343, and the National Science Foundation under Award IIS-2211491. It was primarily conducted during Sanyou Mei's Ph.D. studies at the University of Minnesota.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University of Minnesota, USA (email: [zhaosong@umn.edu](mailto:zhaosong@umn.edu)).

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Industrial Engineering and Decision Analytics, the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong, China (email: [symei@ust.hk](mailto:symei@ust.hk)).

<sup>1</sup>The definition of  $L_F$ -Lipschitz continuity,  $L_{\nabla f}$ -smoothness and  $\sigma$ -strongly-concavity is given in Subsection 1.1.

where  $X$  and  $Y$  are closed sets. This problem has found wide applications in various areas, including adversarial training [18, 35, 47, 53], generative adversarial networks [15, 17, 44], reinforcement learning [8, 12, 37, 40, 49], computational game [1, 41, 50], distributed computing [36, 46], prediction and regression [4, 51, 57, 58], and distributionally robust optimization [13, 45]. Numerous methods have been developed to solve problem (2) when  $X$  and  $Y$  are *simple closed convex sets* (e.g., see [6, 20, 22, 28, 29, 31, 34, 38, 39, 55, 59, 60, 61, 63]). In addition, first-order methods were developed in [25, 64] for solving problem (1) with  $c(x) \equiv 0$  and  $d(x, y) \equiv 0$ .

There have also been several studies on other special cases of problem (1). Specifically, in [16], two first-order methods called max-oracle gradient-descent and nested gradient descent/ascent methods were proposed for solving (1). These methods assume that  $c(x) \equiv 0$  and  $p$  and  $q$  are the indicator function of simple compact convex sets  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively. They also require the convexity of  $V(x) = \max_{y \in Y} \{f(x, y) : d(x, y) \leq 0\}$ , as well as the ability to compute an optimal Lagrangian multiplier associated with the constraint  $d(x, y) \leq 0$  for each  $x \in X$ . Moreover, in [11], an augmented Lagrangian (AL) method was recently proposed for solving (1) with only equality constraints,  $p(x) \equiv 0$ ,  $q(y) \equiv 0$  and  $c(x) \equiv 0$ . This method assumes that a local min-max point of the AL subproblem can be found at each iteration. Furthermore, [52] introduced a multiplier gradient descent method for solving (1) with  $c(x) \equiv 0$ ,  $d(x, y)$  being an affine mapping, and  $p$  and  $q$  being the indicator function of a simple compact convex set. In addition, [9] developed a proximal gradient multi-step ascent-descent method for problem (1) with  $c(x) \equiv 0$ ,  $d(x, y)$  being an affine mapping, and  $f(x, y) = g(x) + x^T A y - h(y)$ , assuming that  $f(x, y) - q(y)$  is *strongly concave* in  $y$ . Furthermore, primal dual alternating proximal gradient methods were proposed in [62] for solving (1) under the conditions of  $c(x) \equiv 0$ ,  $d(x, y)$  being an affine mapping, and either  $f(x, y)$  being strongly concave in  $y$  or  $[q(y) \equiv 0 \text{ and } f(x, y) \text{ being a linear function in } y]$ . While the aforementioned studies [9, 16, 62] established the iteration complexity of the methods for finding an approximate stationary point of a special minimax problem, the operation complexity, measured by fundamental operations such as gradient evaluations of  $f$  and proximal operator evaluations of  $p$  and  $q$ , was not studied in these works.

Recently, a first-order augmented Lagrangian (AL) method was proposed in [32, Algorithm 3] for solving a nonconvex-concave constrained minimax problem in the form of (1) in which  $f(x, \cdot)$  is however merely concave for any given  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Under suitable assumptions, this method achieves an operation complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-4} \log \varepsilon^{-1})$ , measured by the amount of evaluations of  $\nabla f$ ,  $\nabla c$ ,  $\nabla d$  and proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$ , for finding an  $\varepsilon$ -KKT solution of the problem. While this method is applicable to problem (1), it does not exploit the strong concavity structure of  $f(x, \cdot)$ . Consequently, it may not be the most efficient method for solving (1).

In this paper, we propose a first-order AL method for solving problem (1). Our approach follows a similar framework as [32, Algorithm 3], but we enhance it by leveraging the strong concavity of  $f(x, \cdot)$ . As a result, our method achieves a substantially improved operation complexity compared to [32, Algorithm 3]. Specifically, given an iterate  $(x^k, y^k)$  and a Lagrangian multiplier estimate  $(\lambda_x^k, \lambda_y^k)$  at the  $k$ th iteration, the next iterate  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  of our method is obtained by finding an approximate stationary point of the AL subproblem

$$\min_x \max_y \mathcal{L}(x, y, \lambda_x^k, \lambda_y^k; \rho_k) \quad (3)$$

for some  $\rho_k > 0$ , where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the AL function of (1) defined as

$$\mathcal{L}(x, y, \lambda_x, \lambda_y; \rho) = F(x, y) + \frac{1}{2\rho} (\|[\lambda_x + \rho c(x)]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_x\|^2) - \frac{1}{2\rho} (\|[\lambda_y + \rho d(x, y)]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_y\|^2), \quad (4)$$

which is a generalization of the AL function introduced in [11] for an equality constrained minimax problem. The Lagrangian multiplier estimate is then updated by  $\lambda_x^{k+1} = \Pi_{\mathbb{B}_\Lambda^+}(\lambda_x^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1}))$  and  $\lambda_y^{k+1} = [\lambda_y^k + \rho_k d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})]_+$  for some  $\Lambda > 0$ , where  $\Pi_{\mathbb{B}_\Lambda^+}(\cdot)$  and  $[\cdot]_+$  are defined in Subsection 1.1. Given that problem (3) is a nonconvex-strongly-concave unconstrained minimax problem, we develop an efficient first-order method for finding an approximate stationary point of it by utilizing its strong concavity structure.

The main contributions of this paper are summarized below.

- We propose a first-order method for solving a nonconvex-strongly-concave unconstrained minimax problem. Under suitable assumptions, we show that this method achieves an operation complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-2} \log \varepsilon^{-1})$ , measured by its fundamental operations, for finding an  $\varepsilon$ -primal-dual stationary point of the problem, which improves the previous best-known operation complexity achieved by [32, Algorithm 1] by a factor of  $\varepsilon^{-0.5}$ .

- We propose a first-order AL method for solving nonconvex-strongly-concave constrained minimax problem (1). Under suitable assumptions, we show that this method achieves an operation complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-3.5} \log \varepsilon^{-1})$ , measured by its fundamental operations, for finding an  $\varepsilon$ -KKT solution of (1), which improves the previous best-known operation complexity achieved by [32, Algorithm 3] by a factor of  $\varepsilon^{-0.5}$ .

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Subsection 1.1, we introduce some notation and terminology. In Section 2, we propose a first-order method for solving a nonconvex-concave minimax problem and study its complexity. In Section 3, we propose a first-order AL method for solving problem (1) and present complexity results for it. Finally, we provide the proof of the main results in Section 5.

## 1.1 Notation and terminology

The following notation will be used throughout this paper. Let  $\mathbb{R}^n$  denote the Euclidean space of dimension  $n$  and  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$  denote the nonnegative orthant in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The standard inner product,  $l_1$ -norm and Euclidean norm are denoted by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and  $\|\cdot\|$ , respectively. For any  $\Lambda > 0$ , let  $\mathbb{B}_\Lambda^+ = \{x \geq 0 : \|x\| \leq \Lambda\}$ , whose dimension is clear from the context. For any  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , let  $v_+$  denote the nonnegative part of  $v$ , that is,  $(v_+)_i = \max\{v_i, 0\}$  for all  $i$ . Given a point  $x$  and a closed set  $S$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , let  $\text{dist}(x, S) = \min_{x' \in S} \|x' - x\|$ ,  $\Pi_S(x)$  denote the Euclidean projection of  $x$  onto  $S$ , and  $\mathcal{I}_S$  denote the indicator function associated with  $S$ .

A function or mapping  $\phi$  is said to be  $L_\phi$ -Lipschitz continuous on a set  $S$  if  $\|\phi(x) - \phi(x')\| \leq L_\phi \|x - x'\|$  for all  $x, x' \in S$ . In addition, it is said to be  $L_{\nabla\phi}$ -smooth on  $S$  if  $\|\nabla\phi(x) - \nabla\phi(x')\| \leq L_{\nabla\phi} \|x - x'\|$  for all  $x, x' \in S$ . A function is said to be  $\sigma$ -strongly-convex if it is strongly convex with modulus  $\sigma > 0$ . For a closed convex function  $p : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ , the *proximal operator* associated with  $p$  is denoted by  $\text{prox}_p$ , that is,

$$\text{prox}_p(x) = \arg \min_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|x' - x\|^2 + p(x') \right\} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Given that evaluation of  $\text{prox}_{\gamma p}(x)$  is often as cheap as  $\text{prox}_p(x)$ , we count the evaluation of  $\text{prox}_{\gamma p}(x)$  as one evaluation of proximal operator of  $p$  for any  $\gamma > 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

For a lower semicontinuous function  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ , its *domain* is the set  $\text{dom } \phi := \{x | \phi(x) < +\infty\}$ . The *upper subderivative* of  $\phi$  at  $x \in \text{dom } \phi$  in a direction  $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is defined by

$$\phi'(x; d) = \limsup_{\substack{d' \rightarrow d \\ x' \xrightarrow{\phi} x, t \downarrow 0}} \frac{\phi(x' + td') - \phi(x')}{t},$$

where  $t \downarrow 0$  means both  $t > 0$  and  $t \rightarrow 0$ , and  $x' \xrightarrow{\phi} x$  means both  $x' \rightarrow x$  and  $\phi(x') \rightarrow \phi(x)$ . The *subdifferential* of  $\phi$  at  $x \in \text{dom } \phi$  is the set

$$\partial\phi(x) = \{s \in \mathbb{R}^n | s^T d \leq \phi'(x; d) \quad \forall d \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

We use  $\partial_{x_i}\phi(x)$  to denote the subdifferential with respect to  $x_i$ . In addition, for an upper semicontinuous function  $\phi$ , its subdifferential is defined as  $\partial\phi = -\partial(-\phi)$ . If  $\phi$  is locally Lipschitz continuous, the above definition of subdifferential coincides with the Clarke subdifferential. Besides, if  $\phi$  is convex, it coincides with the ordinary subdifferential for convex functions. Also, if  $\phi$  is continuously differentiable at  $x$ , we simply have  $\partial\phi(x) = \{\nabla\phi(x)\}$ , where  $\nabla\phi(x)$  is the gradient of  $\phi$  at  $x$ . In addition, it is not hard to verify that  $\partial(\phi_1 + \phi_2)(x) = \nabla\phi_1(x) + \partial\phi_2(x)$  if  $\phi_1$  is continuously differentiable at  $x$  and  $\phi_2$  is lower or upper semicontinuous at  $x$ . See [7, 54] for more details.

Finally, we introduce an (approximate) primal-dual stationary point (e.g., see [9, 10, 25]) for a general minimax problem

$$\min_x \max_y \Psi(x, y), \tag{5}$$

where  $\Psi(\cdot, y) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is a lower semicontinuous function, and  $\Psi(x, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  is an upper semicontinuous function.

**Definition 1.** A point  $(x, y)$  is said to be a primal-dual stationary point of the minimax problem (5) if

$$0 \in \partial_x \Psi(x, y), \quad 0 \in \partial_y \Psi(x, y).$$

In addition, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , a point  $(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$  is said to be an  $\epsilon$ -primal-dual stationary point of the minimax problem (5) if

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial_x \Psi(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)) \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{dist}(0, \partial_y \Psi(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)) \leq \epsilon.$$

One can see that  $(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$  is an  $\epsilon$ -primal-dual stationary point of (5) if and only if  $x_\epsilon$  and  $y_\epsilon$  are an  $\epsilon$ -stationary point of  $\min_x \Psi(x, y_\epsilon)$  and  $\max_y \Psi(x_\epsilon, y)$ , respectively.

## 2 A first-order method for nonconvex-strongly-concave unconstrained minimax optimization

In this section, we propose a first-order method for finding an  $\epsilon$ -primal-dual stationary point of a nonconvex-strongly-concave unconstrained minimax problem, which will be used as a subproblem solver for the first-order AL method proposed in Section 3. In particular, we consider a nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax problem

$$H^* = \min_x \max_y \{H(x, y) := h(x, y) + p(x) - q(y)\}. \quad (6)$$

Assume that problem (6) has at least one optimal solution and  $p, q$  satisfy Assumption 1. In addition,  $h$  satisfies the following assumption.

**Assumption 2.** *The function  $h$  is  $L_{\nabla h}$ -smooth on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , and moreover,  $h(x, \cdot)$  is  $\sigma_y$ -strongly-concave for some constant  $\sigma_y > 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , where  $\mathcal{X} := \text{dom } p$  and  $\mathcal{Y} := \text{dom } q$ .*

Several first-order methods have been developed for special classes of (6) with  $p, q$  being the indicator function of convex compact sets or entire spaces, and they enjoy an operation complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$ , measured by the amount of evaluations of  $\nabla h$  and proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$ , for finding an  $\epsilon$ -primal-dual stationary point of (6) with such  $p$  and  $q$  (e.g., see [29, 61]). They are however not applicable to (6) in general.

We now propose a first-order method for problem (6) by solving a sequence of subproblems

$$\min_x \max_y \{H_k(x, y) := h_k(x, y) + p(x) - q(y)\}, \quad (7)$$

which result from applying an inexact proximal point method [24] to the minimization problem  $\min_x \{\max_y h(x, y) + p(x) - q(y)\}$ , where

$$h_k(x, y) = h(x, y) + L_{\nabla h} \|x - x^k\|^2, \quad (8)$$

and  $x^k$  is an approximate  $x$ -solution of (7) with  $k$  replaced by  $k - 1$ . By Assumption 2, one can observe that (i)  $h_k$  is  $L_{\nabla h}$ -strongly convex in  $x$  and  $\sigma_y$ -strongly concave in  $y$  on  $\text{dom } p \times \text{dom } q$ ; (ii)  $h_k$  is  $3L_{\nabla h}$ -smooth on  $\text{dom } p \times \text{dom } q$ . Consequently, problem (7) is a special case of (90) and can be suitably solved by Algorithm 3 (see Appendix A). The resulting first-order method for (6) is presented in Algorithm 1.

---

### Algorithm 1 A first-order method for problem (6)

---

- Input:**  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\hat{\epsilon}_0 \in (0, \epsilon/2]$ ,  $(\hat{x}^0, \hat{y}^0) \in \text{dom } p \times \text{dom } q$ ,  $(x^0, y^0) = (\hat{x}^0, \hat{y}^0)$ , and  $\hat{\epsilon}_k = \hat{\epsilon}_0/(k + 1)$ .
- 1: **for**  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  **do**
  - 2:   Call Algorithm 3 (see Appendix A) with  $\bar{h} \leftarrow h_k$ ,  $\bar{\epsilon} \leftarrow \hat{\epsilon}_k$ ,  $\sigma_x \leftarrow L_{\nabla h}$ ,  $\sigma_y \leftarrow \sigma_y$ ,  $L_{\nabla \bar{h}} \leftarrow 3L_{\nabla h}$ ,  $\bar{z}^0 = z_f^0 \leftarrow -\sigma_x x^k$ ,  $\bar{y}^0 = y_f^0 \leftarrow y^k$ , and denote its output by  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$ , where  $h_k$  is given in (8).
  - 3:   Terminate the algorithm and output  $(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) = (x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  if

$$\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \leq \epsilon/(4L_{\nabla h}). \quad (9)$$

- 4: **end for**
- 

**Remark 1.** *It is seen from step 2 of Algorithm 1 that  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  results from applying Algorithm 3 to the subproblem (7). As will be shown in Lemma 1,  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  is an  $\hat{\epsilon}_k$ -primal-dual stationary point of (7).*

We next study complexity of Algorithm 1 for finding an  $\epsilon$ -primal-dual stationary point of problem (6). Before proceeding, we define

$$D_x := \max\{\|u - v\| \mid u, v \in \mathcal{X}\}, \quad D_y := \max\{\|u - v\| \mid u, v \in \mathcal{Y}\}, \quad (10)$$

$$H_{\text{low}} := \min \{H(x, y) \mid (x, y) \in \text{dom } p \times \text{dom } q\}. \quad (11)$$

By Assumption 1, one can observe that  $H_{\text{low}}$  is finite.

The following theorem presents *iteration and operation complexity* of Algorithm 1 for finding an  $\epsilon$ -primal-dual stationary point of problem (6), whose proof is deferred to Subsection 5.1.

**Theorem 1 (Complexity of Algorithm 1).** Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Let  $H^*$ ,  $H$ ,  $D_{\mathbf{x}}$ ,  $D_{\mathbf{y}}$ , and  $H_{\text{low}}$  be defined in (6), (10) and (11),  $L_{\nabla h}$  be given in Assumption 2,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\hat{\epsilon}_0$  and  $\hat{x}^0$  be given in Algorithm 1, and

$$\hat{\alpha} = \min \left\{ 1, \sqrt{8\sigma_y/L_{\nabla h}} \right\}, \quad (12)$$

$$\hat{\delta} = (2 + \hat{\alpha}^{-1})L_{\nabla h}D_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \max \{2\sigma_y, \hat{\alpha}L_{\nabla h}/4\}D_{\mathbf{y}}^2, \quad (13)$$

$$\hat{T} = \left[ 16(\max_y H(\hat{x}^0, y) - H^*)L_{\nabla h}\epsilon^{-2} + 32\hat{\epsilon}_0^2(1 + \sigma_y^{-2}L_{\nabla h}^2)\epsilon^{-2} - 1 \right]_+, \quad (14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{N} = 3397 \max & \left\{ 2, \sqrt{L_{\nabla h}/(2\sigma_y)} \right\} \\ & \times \left[ (\hat{T} + 1) \left( \log \frac{4 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2L_{\nabla h}}, \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2\sigma_y}, \frac{4}{\hat{\alpha}L_{\nabla h}} \right\} \right\} (\hat{\delta} + 2\hat{\alpha}^{-1}(H^* - H_{\text{low}} + L_{\nabla h}D_{\mathbf{x}}^2))}{(9L_{\nabla h}^2/\min\{L_{\nabla h}, \sigma_y\} + 3L_{\nabla h})^{-2}\hat{\epsilon}_0^2} \right)_+ \right. \\ & \left. + \hat{T} + 1 + 2\hat{T} \log(\hat{T} + 1) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Then Algorithm 1 terminates and outputs an  $\epsilon$ -primal-dual stationary point  $(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$  of (6) in at most  $\hat{T} + 1$  outer iterations that satisfies

$$\max_y H(x_\epsilon, y) \leq \max_y H(\hat{x}^0, y) + 2\hat{\epsilon}_0^2(L_{\nabla h}^{-1} + \sigma_y^{-2}L_{\nabla h}). \quad (16)$$

Moreover, the total number of evaluations of  $\nabla h$  and proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$  performed in Algorithm 1 is no more than  $\hat{N}$ , respectively.

**Remark 2.** One can observe from Theorem 1 that  $\hat{\alpha} = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{-1/2})$ ,  $\hat{\delta} = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{1/2})$ ,  $\hat{T} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ , and  $\hat{N} = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{1/2}\epsilon^{-2}\log\hat{\epsilon}_0^{-1})$ , where  $\kappa = L_{\nabla h}/\sigma_y$  is the condition number of the maximization part. Consequently, by setting  $\hat{\epsilon}_0 = \epsilon/2$ , Algorithm 1 achieves an operation complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{1/2}\epsilon^{-2}\log\epsilon^{-1})$ , measured by the number of evaluations of  $\nabla h$  and the proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$ , for computing an  $\epsilon$ -primal-dual stationary point of the nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax problem (6). This improves the best-known complexity bound previously obtained by [32, Algorithm 1] by a factor of  $\epsilon^{-1/2}$ . In addition, an alternating gradient projection (AGP) method was recently proposed in [60] for a subclass of unconstrained minimax problems of the form (6), specifically those where  $p$  and  $q$  are indicator functions of convex compact sets. A complexity bound is established for AGP in terms of the norm of a gradient mapping, which has slightly better dependence on  $\epsilon$  (up to a logarithmic factor) than our result. However, it has significantly worse dependence on the condition number  $\kappa$  due to the lack of an acceleration scheme in AGP.

### 3 A first-order augmented Lagrangian method for nonconvex-strongly-concave constrained minimax optimization

In this section, we propose a first-order augmented Lagrangian (FAL) method in Algorithm 2 for problem (1), and study its complexity for finding an approximate KKT point of (1). The proposed FAL method follows a similar framework as [32, Algorithm 3]. Specifically, at each iteration, the FAL method finds an approximate primal-dual stationary point of an AL subproblem in the form of

$$\min_x \max_y \mathcal{L}(x, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}; \rho), \quad (17)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the AL function associated with problem (1) defined in (4),  $\lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{\tilde{n}}$  and  $\lambda_{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{\tilde{m}}$  are Lagrangian multiplier estimates, and  $\rho > 0$  is a penalty parameter, which are updated by a standard scheme. By Assumption 1, it is not hard to observe that (17) is a special case of nonconvex-strongly-concave unconstrained minimax problem (6). Consequently, our FAL method applies Algorithm 1 to find an approximate primal-dual stationary point of (17).

Before presenting the FAL method for (1), we let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}}(x, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}; \rho) &:= F(x, y) + \frac{1}{2\rho} (\|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}} + \rho c(x)\|_+^2 - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\|^2), \\ c_{\text{hi}} &:= \max\{\|c(x)\| \mid x \in \mathcal{X}\}, \quad d_{\text{hi}} := \max\{\|d(x, y)\| \mid (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_x(\cdot, y, \lambda_x; \rho)$  can be viewed as the AL function for the minimization part of (1), namely, the problem  $\min_x \{F(x, y) | c(x) \leq 0\}$  for any  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Besides, we make one additional assumption below regarding the availability of a nearly feasible point for the minimization part of (1). Given the possible nonconvexity of  $c_i$ 's, it will be used to specify an initial point for solving the AL subproblems (see step 2 of Algorithm 2) so that the resulting FAL method outputs an approximate KKT point of (1) nearly satisfying the constraint  $c(x) \leq 0$ .

**Assumption 3.** For any given  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , a  $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ -nearly feasible point  $x_{\text{nf}}$  of problem (1), namely  $x_{\text{nf}} \in \mathcal{X}$  satisfying  $\|[c(x_{\text{nf}})]_+\| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ , can be found.

**Remark 3.** A very similar assumption as Assumption 3 was considered in [5, 19, 32, 33, 56]. In addition, when the error bound condition  $\|[c(x)]_+\| = \mathcal{O}(\text{dist}(0, \partial(\|[c(x)]_+\|^2 + \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)))^{\nu})$  holds on a level set of  $\|[c(x)]_+\|$  for some  $\nu > 0$ , Assumption 3 holds for problem (1) (e.g., see [30, 42]). In this case, one can find the above  $x_{\text{nf}}$  by applying a projected gradient method to the problem  $\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|[c(x)]_+\|^2$ .

We are now ready to present the aforementioned FAL method for solving problem (1).

---

**Algorithm 2** A first-order augmented Lagrangian method for problem (1)

---

**Input:**  $\varepsilon, \tau \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\epsilon_k = \tau^k$ ,  $\rho_k = \epsilon_k^{-1}$ ,  $\Lambda > 0$ ,  $\lambda_x^0 \in \mathbb{B}_{\Lambda}^+$ ,  $\lambda_y^0 \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{\tilde{m}}$ ,  $(x^0, y^0) \in \text{dom } p \times \text{dom } q$ , and  $x_{\text{nf}} \in \text{dom } p$  with  $\|[c(x_{\text{nf}})]_+\| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ .

1: **for**  $k = 0, 1, \dots$  **do**

2:   Set

$$x_{\text{init}}^k = \begin{cases} x^k, & \text{if } \mathcal{L}_x(x^k, y^k, \lambda_x^k; \rho_k) \leq \mathcal{L}_x(x_{\text{nf}}, y^k, \lambda_x^k; \rho_k), \\ x_{\text{nf}}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3:   Call Algorithm 1 with  $\epsilon \leftarrow \epsilon_k$ ,  $\hat{\epsilon}_0 \leftarrow \epsilon_k/2$ ,  $(x^0, y^0) \leftarrow (x_{\text{init}}^k, y^k)$ ,  $\sigma_y \leftarrow \sigma$  and  $L_{\nabla h} \leftarrow L_k$  to find an  $\epsilon_k$ -primal-dual stationary point  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  of

$$\min_x \max_y \mathcal{L}(x, y, \lambda_x^k, \lambda_y^k; \rho_k) \quad (19)$$

where

$$L_k = L_{\nabla f} + \rho_k L_c^2 + \rho_k c_{\text{hi}} L_{\nabla c} + \|\lambda_x^k\| L_{\nabla c} + \rho_k L_d^2 + \rho_k d_{\text{hi}} L_{\nabla d} + \|\lambda_y^k\| L_{\nabla d}. \quad (20)$$

4:   Set  $\lambda_x^{k+1} = \Pi_{\mathbb{B}_{\Lambda}^+}(\lambda_x^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1}))$  and  $\lambda_y^{k+1} = [\lambda_y^k + \rho_k d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})]_+$ .

5:   If  $\epsilon_k \leq \varepsilon$ , terminate the algorithm and output  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$ .

6: **end for**

---

**Remark 4.** (i)  $\lambda_x^{k+1}$  results from projecting onto a nonnegative Euclidean ball the standard Lagrangian multiplier estimate  $\tilde{\lambda}_x^{k+1}$  obtained by the classical scheme  $\tilde{\lambda}_x^{k+1} = [\lambda_x^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+$ . It is called a safeguarded Lagrangian multiplier in the relevant literature [2, 3, 23], which has been shown to enjoy many practical and theoretical advantages (see [2] for discussions).

(ii) In view of Theorem 1, one can see that an  $\epsilon_k$ -primal-dual stationary point of (19) can be successfully found in step 3 of Algorithm 2 by applying Algorithm 1 to problem (19). Consequently, Algorithm 2 is well-defined.

In the remainder of this section, we study iteration and operation complexity for Algorithm 2. Recall that  $\mathcal{X} = \text{dom } p$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = \text{dom } q$ . To proceed, we make one additional assumption that a generalized Mangasarian-Fromowitz constraint qualification (GMFCQ) holds for the minimization part of (1), a uniform Slater's condition holds for the maximization part of (1), and  $F(\cdot, y)$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X}$  for any  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Specifically, GMFCQ and the Lipschitz continuity of  $F(\cdot, y)$  will be used to bound the amount of violation on feasibility and complementary slackness by  $(x^{k+1}, \lambda_x^{k+1})$  for the minimization part of (1) with  $\lambda_x^{k+1} = [\lambda_x^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+$  (see Lemma 8). Likewise, the uniform Slater's condition will be used to bound the amount of violation on feasibility and complementary slackness by  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}, \lambda_y^{k+1})$  for the maximization part of (1) (see Lemmas 4 and 5).

**Assumption 4.** (i) There exist some constants  $\delta_c, \theta > 0$  such that for each  $x \in \mathcal{F}(\theta)$  there exists some  $v_x \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$  satisfying  $\|v_x\| = 1$  and  $v_x^T \nabla c_i(x) \leq -\delta_c$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{A}(x; \theta)$ , where  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$  is the tangent cone of  $\mathcal{X}$  at  $x$ , and

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} | \|[c(x)]_+\| \leq \theta\}, \quad \mathcal{A}(x; \theta) = \{i | c_i(x) \geq -\theta, 1 \leq i \leq \tilde{n}\}. \quad (21)$$

- (ii) For each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , there exists some  $\hat{y}_x \in \mathcal{Y}$  such that  $d_i(x, \hat{y}_x) < 0$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \tilde{m}$ , and moreover,  $\delta_d := \inf\{-d_i(x, \hat{y}_x) | x \in \mathcal{X}, i = 1, 2, \dots, \tilde{m}\} > 0$ .
- (iii)  $F(\cdot, y)$  is  $L_F$ -Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X}$  for any  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ .

**Remark 5.** (i) Assumption 4(i) can be viewed as a robust counterpart of MFCQ. It implies that MFCQ holds for all the minimization problems, resulting from the minimization part of (1) by fixing  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  and perturbing  $c_i(x)$  at most by  $\theta$ .

- (ii) The latter part of Assumption 4(ii) can be weakened to the one that the pointwise Slater's condition holds for the constraint on  $y$  in (1), that is, there exists  $\hat{y}_x \in \mathcal{Y}$  such that  $d(x, \hat{y}_x) < 0$  for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Indeed, if  $\delta_d > 0$ , Assumption 4(ii) holds. Otherwise, one can solve the perturbed counterpart of (1) with  $d(x, y)$  being replaced by  $d(x, y) - \epsilon$  for some suitable  $\epsilon > 0$  instead, which satisfies Assumption 4(ii).
- (iii) In view of Assumption 1, one can observe that if  $p$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $F(\cdot, y)$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X}$  for any  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Thus, Assumption 4(iii) is mild.

In addition, to characterize the approximate solution found by Algorithm 2, we review a notion so-called an  $\varepsilon$ -KKT solution of problem (1), which was introduced in [32, Definition 2].

**Definition 2.** For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $(x, y)$  is said to be an  $\varepsilon$ -KKT point of problem (1) if there exists  $(\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}) \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{\tilde{n}} \times \mathbb{R}_{+}^{\tilde{m}}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(0, \partial_x F(x, y) + \nabla c(x) \lambda_{\mathbf{x}} - \nabla_x d(x, y) \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}) &\leq \varepsilon, \\ \text{dist}(0, \partial_y F(x, y) - \nabla_y d(x, y) \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}) &\leq \varepsilon, \\ \| [c(x)]_{+} \| &\leq \varepsilon, \quad |\langle \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}, c(x) \rangle| \leq \varepsilon, \\ \| [d(x, y)]_{+} \| &\leq \varepsilon, \quad |\langle \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}, d(x, y) \rangle| \leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $\mathcal{X} = \text{dom } p$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = \text{dom } q$ . To study complexity of Algorithm 2, we define

$$f^*(x) := \max\{F(x, y) | d(x, y) \leq 0\}, \quad (22)$$

$$F_{\text{hi}} := \max\{F(x, y) | (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}, \quad F_{\text{low}} := \min\{F(x, y) | (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}, \quad (23)$$

$$\Delta := F_{\text{hi}} - F_{\text{low}}, \quad r := 2\delta_d^{-1}\Delta, \quad (24)$$

$$K := \lceil \log \varepsilon / \log \tau \rceil_{+}, \quad \mathbb{K} := \{0, 1, \dots, K + 1\}, \quad (25)$$

where  $\delta_d$  is given in Assumption 4, and  $\varepsilon$  and  $\tau$  are some input parameters of Algorithm 2. For convenience, we define  $\mathbb{K} - 1 = \{k - 1 | k \in \mathbb{K}\}$ . One can observe from Assumption 1 that  $F_{\text{hi}}$  and  $F_{\text{low}}$  are finite. Besides, one can easily observe that

$$f^*(x) \geq F_{\text{low}}, \quad F(x, y) - f^*(x) \leq \Delta \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}. \quad (26)$$

We are now ready to present an *iteration and operation complexity* of Algorithm 2 for finding an  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ -KKT solution of problem (1), whose proof is deferred to Section 5.

**Theorem 2.** Suppose that Assumptions 1, 3 and 4 hold. Let  $\{(x^k, y^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$  be generated by Algorithm 2,  $D_{\mathbf{x}}$ ,  $D_{\mathbf{y}}$ ,  $c_{\text{hi}}$ ,  $d_{\text{hi}}$ ,  $\Delta$  and  $K$  be defined in (10), (18), (24) and (25),  $L_F$ ,  $L_{\nabla f}$ ,  $L_{\nabla d}$ ,  $L_{\nabla c}$ ,  $L_c$ ,  $L_{\nabla d}$ ,  $L_d$ ,  $\delta_c$ ,  $\delta_d$  and  $\theta$  be given in Assumptions 1 and 4,  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\tau$ ,  $\Lambda$  and  $\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0$  be given in Algorithm 2, and

$$L = L_{\nabla f} + L_c^2 + c_{\text{hi}} L_{\nabla c} + \Lambda L_{\nabla c} + L_d^2 + d_{\text{hi}} L_{\nabla d} + L_{\nabla d} \sqrt{\|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{2(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1 - \tau}}, \quad (27)$$

$$\alpha = \min \left\{ 1, \sqrt{8\sigma/L} \right\}, \quad \delta = (2 + \alpha^{-1})LD_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \max\{2\sigma, L/4\}D_{\mathbf{y}}^2, \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M &= 16 \max \left\{ 1/(2L_c^2), 4/(\alpha L_c^2) \right\} [81/\min\{L_c^2, \sigma\} + 3L]^2 \\ &\quad \times \left( \delta + 2\alpha^{-1} \left( \Delta + \frac{\Lambda^2}{2} + \frac{3}{2} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{3(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1 - \tau} + \rho_k d_{\text{hi}}^2 + LD_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$T = \left[ 16 \left( 2\Delta + \Lambda + \frac{1}{2}(\tau^{-1} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2) + \frac{\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}}{1 - \tau} + \frac{\Lambda^2}{2} \right) L + 8(1 + \sigma^{-2}L^2) \right]_{+}, \quad (30)$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{K+1} = [\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^K + c(x^{K+1})/\tau^K]_{+}. \quad (31)$$

Suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{-1} \geq \max \left\{ 1, \theta^{-1} \Lambda, \theta^{-2} \left\{ 4\Delta + 2\Lambda + \tau^{-1} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{2(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1 - \tau} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + L_c^{-2} + \sigma^{-2} L + \Lambda^2 \right\}, \frac{4\|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2}{\delta_d^2 \tau} + \frac{8(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{\delta_d^2 \tau (1 - \tau)} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Then the following statements hold.

- (i) Algorithm 2 terminates after  $K + 1$  outer iterations and outputs an approximate stationary point  $(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1})$  of (1) satisfying

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial_x F(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1}) + \nabla c(x^{K+1}) \tilde{\lambda}_x^{K+1} - \nabla_x d(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1}) \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{K+1}) \leq \varepsilon, \quad (33)$$

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial_y F(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1}) - \nabla_y d(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1}) \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{K+1}) \leq \varepsilon, \quad (34)$$

$$\|[c(x^{K+1})]_+\| \leq \varepsilon \delta_c^{-1} (L_F + 2L_d \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}) + 1), \quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{K+1}, c(x^{K+1}) \rangle| \leq \varepsilon \delta_c^{-1} (L_F + 2L_d \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}) + 1) \\ \times \max\{\delta_c^{-1} (L_F + 2L_d \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}) + 1), \Lambda\}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$$\|[d(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1})]_+\| \leq 2\varepsilon \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}), \quad (37)$$

$$|\langle \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{K+1}, d(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1}) \rangle| \leq 2\varepsilon \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}) \max\{2\delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}), \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|\}. \quad (38)$$

- (ii) The total number of evaluations of  $\nabla f$ ,  $\nabla c$ ,  $\nabla d$  and proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$  performed in Algorithm 2 is at most  $N$ , respectively, where

$$\begin{aligned} N = 3397 \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{L/(2\sigma)} \right\} T(1 - \tau^{7/2})^{-1} \\ \times (\tau\varepsilon)^{-7/2} (20K \log(1/\tau) + 2(\log M)_+ + 2 + 2 \log(2T)). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

**Remark 6.** (i) The condition (32) on  $\varepsilon$  is to ensure that the final penalty parameter  $\rho_K$  in Algorithm 2 is large enough so that feasibility and complementarity slackness are nearly satisfied at  $(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1}, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^{K+1}, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{K+1})$ .

- (ii) One can observe from Theorem 2 that Algorithm 2 enjoys an iteration complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\log \varepsilon^{-1})$  and an operation complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-3.5} \log \varepsilon^{-1})$ , measured by the amount of evaluations of  $\nabla f$ ,  $\nabla c$ ,  $\nabla d$  and proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$ , for finding an  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ -KKT solution  $(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1})$  of (1) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist} \left( \partial_x F(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1}) + \nabla c(x^{K+1}) \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}} - \nabla_x d(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1}) \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{K+1} \right) \leq \varepsilon, \\ \text{dist} \left( \partial_y F(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1}) - \nabla_y d(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1}) \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{K+1} \right) \leq \varepsilon, \\ \|[c(x^{K+1})]_+\| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \quad |\langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{K+1}, c(x^{K+1}) \rangle| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \\ \|[d(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1})]_+\| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \quad |\langle \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{K+1}, d(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1}) \rangle| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{K+1} \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{\tilde{n}}$  is defined in (31) and  $\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{K+1} \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{\tilde{m}}$  is given in Algorithm 2.

- (iii) It shall be mentioned that an  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ -KKT solution of (1) can be found by [32, Algorithm 3] with an operation complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-4} \log \varepsilon^{-1})$  (see [32, Theorem 3]). As a result, the operation complexity of Algorithm 2 improves that of [32, Algorithm 3] by a factor of  $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$ .

## 4 Numerical results

In this section, we conduct some preliminary experiments to test the performance of our proposed method (namely, Algorithms 1 and 2), and compare them with an alternating gradient projection method (AGP) [60, Algorithm 1] and an augmented Lagrangian method (ALM) [32, Algorithm 3], respectively. All the algorithms are coded in Matlab, and all the computations are performed on a laptop with a 2.30 GHz Intel i9-9880H 8-core processor and 16 GB of RAM.

## 4.1 Unconstrained nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax optimization with quadratic objective

In this subsection, we consider the problem

$$\min_x \max_y x^T Ax + x^T By + y^T Cy + c^T x + d^T y + \mathcal{I}_{[-1,1]^n}(x) - \mathcal{I}_{[-1,1]^m}(y), \quad (40)$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ,  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , and  $\mathcal{I}_{[-1,1]^n}(\cdot)$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{[-1,1]^m}(\cdot)$  are the indicator functions of  $[-1, 1]^n$  and  $[-1, 1]^m$  respectively.

For each pair  $(n, m)$ , we randomly generate 10 instances of problem (40). Specifically, we construct  $A = UDU^T$ , where  $U = \text{orth}(\text{randn}(n))$ , and  $D$  is a diagonal matrix with entries independently drawn from a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation 0.1. Matrix  $C$  is generated in a similar manner, except the diagonal entries of the corresponding matrix are drawn independently from a uniform distribution over  $[2, 3]$ . In addition, we randomly generate vectors  $c$  and  $d$  with all the entries independently drawn from a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation 0.1.

Notice that (40) is a special case of (6) with  $h(x, y) = x^T Ax + x^T By + y^T Cy + c^T x + d^T y$ ,  $p(x) = \mathcal{I}_{[-1,1]^n}(x)$ , and  $q(y) = \mathcal{I}_{[-1,1]^m}(y)$  and can be suitably solved by Algorithm 1 and AGP [60, Algorithm 1]. In addition, problem (40) is equivalent to as the following minimization problem

$$\min_x \Phi(x), \quad (41)$$

where  $\Phi$  is the hyper-objective function defined as

$$\Phi(x) = \max_y x^T Ax + x^T By + y^T Cy + c^T x + d^T y + \mathcal{I}_{[-1,1]^n}(x) - \mathcal{I}_{[-1,1]^m}(y).$$

For Algorithm 1, we set the parameters to  $(\epsilon, \hat{\epsilon}_0) = (10^{-2}, 5 \times 10^{-3})$ . For AGP, we use the parameter settings as specified in [60, Subsection 3.1]. Both algorithms are initialized with the all-one vector. Each algorithm is terminated once a  $10^{-2}$ -primal-dual stationary point  $(x^k, y^k)$  of (40) is found for some  $k$ , and the pair  $(x^k, y^k)$  is returned as an approximate solution to (40).

The computational results of the aforementioned algorithms on the randomly generated instances are presented in Table 1. Specifically, the values of  $n$  and  $m$  are listed in the first two columns. For each pair  $(n, m)$ , the average initial hyper-objective value  $\Phi(x^0)$ , the average final hyper-objective value  $\Phi(x^k)$ , and the average CPU time (in seconds) over 10 random instances are reported in the remaining columns. It can be observed that both Algorithm 1 and AGP [60, Algorithm 1] yield approximate solutions with comparable hyper-objective values, which are significantly lower than the initial value. However, Algorithm 1 consistently achieves significantly lower CPU times, which may be attributed to its more favorable dependence on condition numbers.

$n$	$m$	Initial hyper-objective value	Final hyper-objective value		CPU time (seconds)	
			Algorithm 1	AGP	Algorithm 1	AGP
50	50	4.30	-0.30	-0.29	19.3	100.0
100	100	10.34	-1.13	-1.10	82.6	428.6
150	150	22.16	-1.01	-1.09	176.5	910.3
200	200	32.52	-1.43	-1.39	222.6	1141.1
250	250	69.19	-1.80	-1.83	312.7	1219.1
300	300	108.76	-2.11	-2.07	400.2	1245.5
350	350	124.88	-2.06	-2.09	483.0	1366.9
400	400	175.78	-2.17	-2.13	512.9	1443.3

Table 1: Numerical results for problem (40)

## 4.2 Constrained nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax optimization with quadratic objective and linear constraints

In this subsection, we consider the problem

$$\min_{\tilde{A}x \leq \tilde{b}} \max_{\tilde{A}x + \tilde{B}y \leq \tilde{b}} x^T Ax + x^T By + y^T Cy + c^T x + d^T y + \mathcal{I}_{[-1,1]^n}(x) - \mathcal{I}_{[-1,1]^m}(y), \quad (42)$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ,  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n} \times n}$ ,  $\tilde{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n}}$ ,  $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{m} \times n}$ ,  $\tilde{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{m} \times m}$ ,  $\tilde{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{m}}$ , and  $\mathcal{I}_{[-1,1]^n}(\cdot)$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{[-1,1]^m}(\cdot)$  are the indicator functions of  $[-1, 1]^n$  and  $[-1, 1]^m$  respectively.

For each tuple  $(n, m, \tilde{n}, \tilde{m})$ , we randomly generate 10 instances of problem (42). Specifically, we construct  $A = UDU^T$ , where  $U = \text{orth}(\text{randn}(n))$ , and  $D$  is a diagonal matrix with entries independently drawn from a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation 0.1. Matrix  $C$  is generated in a similar manner, except its diagonal entries are independently drawn from a uniform distribution over  $[10, 11]$ . In addition, we randomly generate matrices  $B$ ,  $\tilde{A}$ ,  $\tilde{A}$ ,  $\tilde{B}$ , and vectors  $c, d, \tilde{b}$  with all the entries independently drawn from a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation 0.1. Finally, we randomly generate  $x_{\text{nf}} \in [-1, 1]^n$  by first sampling each entry independently from a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation 0.1, then projecting the resulting vector onto  $[-1, 1]^n$ . We choose  $\hat{b}$  such that  $x_{\text{nf}}$  is 0.1-nearly feasible (see Assumption 3) for problem (42).

Notice that (42) is a special case of (1) with

$$f(x, y) = x^T Ax + x^T By + y^T Cy + c^T x + d^T y, \quad p(x) = \mathcal{I}_{[-1, 1]^n}(x), \\ q(y) = \mathcal{I}_{[-1, 1]^m}(y), \quad c(x) = \tilde{A}x - \hat{b}, \quad d(x, y) = \tilde{A}x + \tilde{B}y - \tilde{b},$$

and can be suitably solved by Algorithm 2 and ALM [32, Algorithm 3]. In addition, problem (42) is equivalent to the following minimization problem

$$\min_{\tilde{A}x \leq \hat{b}} \Phi(x), \quad (43)$$

where  $\Phi$  is the hyper-objective function defined as

$$\Phi(x) = \max_{\tilde{A}x + \tilde{B}y \leq \hat{b}} x^T Ax + x^T By + y^T Cy + c^T x + d^T y + \mathcal{I}_{[-1, 1]^n}(x) - \mathcal{I}_{[-1, 1]^m}(y).$$

We choose the parameters as  $(\varepsilon, \tau, \Lambda) = (10^{-2}, 0.5, 10)$  for both Algorithm 2 and ALM [32, Algorithm 3], and initialize them at zero. The algorithms are terminated once a  $10^{-2}$ -relative-KKT point<sup>2</sup>  $(x_k, y_k)$  of (42) is found for some  $k$ , and we output  $(x_k, y_k)$  as an approximate solution to (42).

The computational results of the aforementioned algorithms for the instances randomly generated above are presented in Table 2. Specifically, the values of  $n$ ,  $m$ ,  $\tilde{n}$ , and  $\tilde{m}$  are listed in the first four columns. For each tuple  $(n, m, \tilde{n}, \tilde{m})$ , the average initial hyper-objective value  $\Phi(x^0)$ , the average final hyper-objective value  $\Phi(x^k)$ , and the average CPU time (in seconds) over 10 random instances are given in the rest of the columns. We observe that both Algorithm 2 and ALM [32, Algorithm 3] produce approximate solutions with comparable hyper-objective values that are significantly lower than the initial ones. Moreover, Algorithm 2 consistently achieves substantially lower CPU times since it effectively exploits the strong concavity structure of the problem.

$n$	$m$	$\tilde{n}$	$\tilde{m}$	Initial hyper-objective value	Final hyper-objective value		CPU time (seconds)	
					Algorithm 2	ALM	Algorithm 2	ALM
50	100	5	10	-0.52	-183.09	-183.18	332.8	1111.9
100	200	10	20	-0.40	-625.04	-625.76	2001.9	2996.1
150	300	15	30	-0.45	-895.71	-895.02	4535.1	6396.9
200	400	20	40	-0.34	-1255.49	-1254.74	6252.2	9653.4
250	500	25	50	-0.45	-1631.83	-1632.54	8343.8	13522.1

Table 2: Numerical results for problem (42)

## 5 Proof of the main result

In this section we provide a proof of our main results presented in Sections 2 and 3, which are particularly Theorems 1 and 2.

### 5.1 Proof of the main results in Section 2

In this subsection we prove Theorem 1. Before proceeding, let  $\{(x^k, y^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{T}}$  denote all the iterates generated by Algorithm 1, where  $\mathbb{T}$  is a subset of consecutive nonnegative integers starting from 0. Also, we define  $\mathbb{T} - 1 = \{k - 1 : k \in \mathbb{T}\}$ . We first establish two lemmas and then use them to prove Theorem 1 subsequently.

The following lemma shows that an approximate primal-dual stationary point of (7) is found at each iteration of Algorithm 1, and also provides an estimate of operation complexity for finding it.

<sup>2</sup>We say  $(x, y)$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -relative-KKT point of (42) if it is an  $(|\Phi(x)| + 1)\varepsilon$ -KKT point of (42).

**Lemma 1.** Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Let  $\{(x^k, y^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{T}}$  be generated by Algorithm 1,  $H^*$ ,  $D_{\mathbf{x}}$ ,  $D_{\mathbf{y}}$ ,  $H_{\text{low}}$ ,  $\hat{\alpha}$ ,  $\hat{\delta}$  be defined in (6), (10), (11), (12) and (13),  $L_{\nabla h}$  be given in Assumption 2,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\hat{\epsilon}_k$  be given in Algorithm 1, and

$$\hat{N}_k := 3397 \left[ \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{\frac{L_{\nabla h}}{2\sigma_y}} \right\} \log \frac{4 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2L_{\nabla h}}, \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2\sigma_y}, \frac{4}{\hat{\alpha}L_{\nabla h}} \right\} \right\} \left( \hat{\delta} + 2\hat{\alpha}^{-1}(H^* - H_{\text{low}} + L_{\nabla h}D_{\mathbf{x}}^2) \right)}{[9L_{\nabla h}^2 / \min\{L_{\nabla h}, \sigma_y\} + 3L_{\nabla h}]^{-2} \hat{\epsilon}_k^2} \right]_+. \quad (44)$$

Then for all  $0 \leq k \leq \mathbb{T} - 1$ ,  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  is an  $\hat{\epsilon}_k$ -primal-dual stationary point of (7). Moreover, the total number of evaluations of  $\nabla h$  and proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$  performed at iteration  $k$  of Algorithm 1 for generating  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  is no more than  $\hat{N}_k$ , respectively.

*Proof.* Let  $(x^*, y^*)$  be an optimal solution of (6). Recall that  $H$ ,  $H_k$  and  $h_k$  are respectively given in (6), (7) and (8),  $\mathcal{X} = \text{dom } p$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = \text{dom } q$ . Notice that  $x^*, x^k \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{k,*} := \min_x \max_y H_k(x, y) &= \min_x \max_y \{H(x, y) + L_{\nabla h}\|x - x^k\|^2\} \\ &\leq \max_y \{H(x^*, y) + L_{\nabla h}\|x^* - x^k\|^2\} \stackrel{(6)(10)}{\leq} H^* + L_{\nabla h}D_{\mathbf{x}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Moreover, by  $\mathcal{X} = \text{dom } p$ ,  $\mathcal{Y} = \text{dom } q$ , (10) and (11), one has

$$H_{k,\text{low}} := \min_{(x,y) \in \text{dom } p \times \text{dom } q} H_k(x, y) = \min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \{H(x, y) + L_{\nabla h}\|x - x^k\|^2\} \stackrel{(11)}{\geq} H_{\text{low}}. \quad (46)$$

In addition, by Assumption 2 and the definition of  $h_k$  in (8), it is not hard to verify that  $h_k(x, y)$  is  $L_{\nabla h}$ -strongly-convex in  $x$ ,  $\sigma_y$ -strongly-concave in  $y$ , and  $3L_{\nabla h}$ -smooth on its domain. Also, recall from Remark 1 that  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  results from applying Algorithm 3 to problem (7). The conclusion of this lemma then follows by using (45) and (46) and applying Theorem 3 to (7) with  $\bar{\epsilon} = \hat{\epsilon}_k$ ,  $\sigma_x = L_{\nabla h}$ ,  $\sigma_y = \sigma$ ,  $L_{\nabla h} = 3L_{\nabla h}$ ,  $\bar{\alpha} = \hat{\alpha}$ ,  $\bar{\delta} = \hat{\delta}$ ,  $\bar{H}_{\text{low}} = H_{k,\text{low}}$ , and  $\bar{H}^* = H_{k,*}$ .  $\square$

The following lemma provides an upper bound on the least progress of the solution sequence of Algorithm 1 and also on the last-iterate objective value of (6).

**Lemma 2.** Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Let  $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{T}}$  be generated by Algorithm 1,  $H$ ,  $H^*$  and  $D_{\mathbf{y}}$  be defined in (6) and (10),  $L_{\nabla h}$  be given in Assumption 2, and  $\epsilon$ ,  $\hat{\epsilon}_0$  and  $\hat{x}^0$  be given in Algorithm 1. Then for all  $0 \leq K \leq \mathbb{T} - 1$ , we have

$$\min_{0 \leq k \leq K} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \leq \frac{\max_y H(\hat{x}^0, y) - H^*}{L_{\nabla h}(K+1)} + \frac{2\hat{\epsilon}_0^2(1 + \sigma_y^{-2}L_{\nabla h}^2)}{L_{\nabla h}^2(K+1)}, \quad (47)$$

$$\max_y H(x^{K+1}, y) \leq \max_y H(\hat{x}^0, y) + 2\hat{\epsilon}_0^2(L_{\nabla h}^{-1} + \sigma_y^{-2}L_{\nabla h}). \quad (48)$$

*Proof.* For convenience of the proof, let

$$H^*(x) = \max_y H(x, y), \quad (49)$$

$$H_k^*(x) = \max_y H_k(x, y), \quad y_*^{k+1} = \arg \max_y H_k(x^{k+1}, y). \quad (50)$$

One can observe from these, (7) and (8) that

$$H_k^*(x) = H^*(x) + L_{\nabla h}\|x - x^k\|^2. \quad (51)$$

By this and Assumption 2, one can also see that  $H_k^*$  is  $L_{\nabla h}$ -strongly convex on  $\text{dom } p$ . In addition, recall from Lemma 1 that  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  is an  $\hat{\epsilon}_k$ -primal-dual stationary point of problem (7) for all  $0 \leq k \leq \mathbb{T} - 1$ . It then follows from Definition 1 that there exist some  $u \in \partial_x H_k(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  and  $v \in \partial_y H_k(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  with  $\|u\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}_k$  and  $\|v\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}_k$ . Also, by (50), one has  $0 \in \partial_y H_k(x^{k+1}, y_*^{k+1})$ , which, together with  $v \in \partial_y H_k(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  and  $\sigma_y$ -strong concavity of  $H_k(x^{k+1}, \cdot)$ , implies that  $\langle -v, y^{k+1} - y_*^{k+1} \rangle \geq \sigma_y\|y^{k+1} - y_*^{k+1}\|^2$ . This and  $\|v\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}_k$  yield

$$\|y^{k+1} - y_*^{k+1}\| \leq \sigma_y^{-1}\hat{\epsilon}_k. \quad (52)$$

In addition, by  $u \in \partial_x H_k(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$ , (7) and (8), one has

$$u \in \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) + \partial p(x^{k+1}) + 2L_{\nabla h}(x^{k+1} - x^k). \quad (53)$$

Also, observe from (7), (8) and (50) that

$$\partial H_k^*(x^{k+1}) = \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y_*^{k+1}) + \partial p(x^{k+1}) + 2L_{\nabla h}(x^{k+1} - x^k),$$

which together with (53) yields

$$u + \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y_*^{k+1}) - \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) \in \partial H_k^*(x^{k+1}).$$

By this and  $L_{\nabla h}$ -strong convexity of  $H_k^*$ , one has

$$H_k^*(x^k) \geq H_k^*(x^{k+1}) + \langle u + \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y_*^{k+1}) - \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}), x^k - x^{k+1} \rangle + L_{\nabla h} \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2/2. \quad (54)$$

Using this, (51), (52), (54),  $\|u\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}_k$ , and the Lipschitz continuity of  $\nabla h$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H^*(x^k) - H^*(x^{k+1}) &\stackrel{(51)}{=} H_k^*(x^k) - H_k^*(x^{k+1}) + L_{\nabla h} \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(54)}{\geq} \langle u + \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y_*^{k+1}) - \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}), x^k - x^{k+1} \rangle + 3L_{\nabla h} \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2/2 \\ &\geq (-\|u + \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y_*^{k+1}) - \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})\| \|x^k - x^{k+1}\| + L_{\nabla h} \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2/2) + L_{\nabla h} \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\geq -(2L_{\nabla h})^{-1} \|u + \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y_*^{k+1}) - \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})\|^2 + L_{\nabla h} \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\geq -L_{\nabla h}^{-1} \|u\|^2 - L_{\nabla h}^{-1} \|\nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y_*^{k+1}) - \nabla_x h(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})\|^2 + L_{\nabla h} \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\geq -L_{\nabla h}^{-1} \hat{\epsilon}_k^2 - L_{\nabla h} \|y^{k+1} - y_*^{k+1}\|^2 + L_{\nabla h} \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(52)}{\geq} -(L_{\nabla h}^{-1} + \sigma_y^{-2} L_{\nabla h}) \hat{\epsilon}_k^2 + L_{\nabla h} \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second and fourth inequalities follow from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, and the third inequality is due to Young's inequality, and the fifth inequality follows from  $L_{\nabla h}$ -Lipschitz continuity of  $\nabla h$ . Summing up the above inequality for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$  yields

$$L_{\nabla h} \sum_{k=0}^K \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 \leq H^*(x^0) - H^*(x^{K+1}) + (L_{\nabla h}^{-1} + \sigma_y^{-2} L_{\nabla h}) \sum_{k=0}^K \hat{\epsilon}_k^2. \quad (55)$$

In addition, it follows from (6), (10) and (49) that

$$H^*(x^{K+1}) = \max_y H(x^{K+1}, y) \geq \min_x \max_y H(x, y) = H^*, \quad H^*(x^0) = \max_y H(x^0, y). \quad (56)$$

These together with (55) yield

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\nabla h}(K+1) \min_{0 \leq k \leq K} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 &\leq L_{\nabla h} \sum_{k=0}^K \|x^k - x^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq \max_y H(x^0, y) - H^* + (L_{\nabla h}^{-1} + \sigma_y^{-2} L_{\nabla h}) \sum_{k=0}^K \hat{\epsilon}_k^2, \end{aligned}$$

which, together with  $x^0 = \hat{x}^0$ ,  $\hat{\epsilon}_k = \hat{\epsilon}_0(k+1)^{-1}$  and  $\sum_{k=0}^K (k+1)^{-2} < 2$ , implies that (47) holds.

Finally, we show that (48) holds. Indeed, it follows from (10), (49), (55), (56),  $\hat{\epsilon}_k = \hat{\epsilon}_0(k+1)^{-1}$ , and  $\sum_{k=0}^K (k+1)^{-2} < 2$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_y H(x^{K+1}, y) &\stackrel{(49)}{=} H^*(x^{K+1}) \stackrel{(55)}{\leq} H^*(x^0) + (L_{\nabla h}^{-1} + \sigma_y^{-2} L_{\nabla h}) \sum_{k=0}^K \hat{\epsilon}_k^2 \\ &\stackrel{(56)}{\leq} \max_y H(x^0, y) + 2\hat{\epsilon}_0^2 (L_{\nabla h}^{-1} + \sigma_y^{-2} L_{\nabla h}). \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from this and  $x^0 = \hat{x}^0$  that (48) holds.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1 using Lemmas 1 and 2.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** Suppose for contradiction that Algorithm 1 runs for more than  $\widehat{T} + 1$  outer iterations, where  $\widehat{T}$  is given in (14). By this and Algorithm 1, one can then assert that (9) does not hold for all  $0 \leq k \leq \widehat{T}$ . On the other hand, by (14) and (47), one has

$$\min_{0 \leq k \leq \widehat{T}} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \stackrel{(47)}{\leq} \frac{\max_y H(\hat{x}^0, y) - H^*}{L_{\nabla h}(\widehat{T} + 1)} + \frac{2\hat{\epsilon}_0^2(1 + \sigma_y^{-2}L_{\nabla h}^2)}{L_{\nabla h}^2(\widehat{T} + 1)} \stackrel{(14)}{\leq} \frac{\epsilon^2}{16L_{\nabla h}^2},$$

which implies that there exists some  $0 \leq k \leq \widehat{T}$  such that  $\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \leq \epsilon/(4L_{\nabla h})$ , and hence (9) holds for such  $k$ , which contradicts the above assertion. Hence, Algorithm 1 must terminate in at most  $\widehat{T} + 1$  outer iterations.

Suppose that Algorithm 1 terminates at some iteration  $0 \leq k \leq \widehat{T}$ , namely, (9) holds for such  $k$ . We next show that its output  $(x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) = (x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  is an  $\epsilon$ -primal-dual stationary point of (6) and moreover it satisfies (69). Indeed, recall from Lemma 1 that  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  is an  $\hat{\epsilon}_k$ -primal-dual stationary point of (7), namely, it satisfies  $\text{dist}(0, \partial_x H_k(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})) \leq \hat{\epsilon}_k$  and  $\text{dist}(0, \partial_y H_k(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})) \leq \hat{\epsilon}_k$ . By these, (6), (7) and (8), there exists  $(u, v)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} u &\in \partial_x H(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) + 2L_{\nabla h}(x^{k+1} - x^k), \quad \|u\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}_k, \\ v &\in \partial_y H(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}), \quad \|v\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}_k. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows that  $u - 2L_{\nabla h}(x^{k+1} - x^k) \in \partial_x H(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  and  $v \in \partial_y H(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$ . These together with (9), (10), and  $\hat{\epsilon}_k \leq \hat{\epsilon}_0 \leq \epsilon/2$  (see Algorithm 1) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(0, \partial_x H(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})) &\leq \|u - 2L_{\nabla h}(x^{k+1} - x^k)\| \leq \|u\| + 2L_{\nabla h}\|x^{k+1} - x^k\| \stackrel{(9)}{\leq} \hat{\epsilon}_k + \epsilon/2 \leq \epsilon, \\ \text{dist}(0, \partial_y H(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})) &\leq \|v\| \leq \hat{\epsilon}_k < \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the output  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  of Algorithm 1 is an  $\epsilon$ -primal-dual stationary point of (6). In addition, (16) holds due to Lemma 2.

Recall from Lemma 1 that the number of evaluations of  $\nabla h$  and proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$  performed at iteration  $k$  of Algorithm 1 is at most  $\hat{N}_k$ , respectively, where  $\hat{N}_k$  is defined in (44). Also, one can observe from the above proof and the definition of  $\mathbb{T}$  that  $|\mathbb{T}| \leq \widehat{T} + 2$ . It then follows that the total number of evaluations of  $\nabla h$  and proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$  in Algorithm 1 is respectively no more than  $\sum_{k=0}^{|\mathbb{T}|-2} \hat{N}_k$ . Consequently, to complete the rest of the proof of Theorem 1, it suffices to show that  $\sum_{k=0}^{|\mathbb{T}|-2} \hat{N}_k \leq \widehat{N}$ , where  $\widehat{N}$  is given in (15). Indeed, by (15), (44) and  $|\mathbb{T}| \leq \widehat{T} + 2$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{|\mathbb{T}|-2} \hat{N}_k &\stackrel{(44)}{\leq} \sum_{k=0}^{\widehat{T}} 3397 \times \left[ \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{\frac{L_{\nabla h}}{2\sigma_y}} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \times \log \frac{4 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2L_{\nabla h}}, \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2\sigma_y}, \frac{4}{\hat{\alpha}L_{\nabla h}} \right\} \right\} \left( \hat{\delta} + 2\hat{\alpha}^{-1}(H^* - H_{\text{low}} + L_{\nabla h}D_{\mathbf{x}}^2) \right)}{[9L_{\nabla h}^2 / \min\{L_{\nabla h}, \sigma_y\} + 3L_{\nabla h}]^{-2}\hat{\epsilon}_k^2} \left. \right]_+ \\ &\leq 3397 \times \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{\frac{L_{\nabla h}}{2\sigma_y}} \right\} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{k=0}^{\widehat{T}} \left( \left( \log \frac{4 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2L_{\nabla h}}, \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2\sigma_y}, \frac{4}{\hat{\alpha}L_{\nabla h}} \right\} \right\} \left( \hat{\delta} + 2\hat{\alpha}^{-1}(H^* - H_{\text{low}} + L_{\nabla h}D_{\mathbf{x}}^2) \right)}{[9L_{\nabla h}^2 / \min\{L_{\nabla h}, \sigma_y\} + 3L_{\nabla h}]^{-2}\hat{\epsilon}_k^2} \right)_+ + 1 \right) \\ &\leq 3397 \times \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{\frac{L_{\nabla h}}{2\sigma_y}} \right\} \\ &\quad \times \left( (\widehat{T} + 1) \left( \log \frac{4 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2L_{\nabla h}}, \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2\sigma_y}, \frac{4}{\hat{\alpha}L_{\nabla h}} \right\} \right\} \left( \hat{\delta} + 2\hat{\alpha}^{-1}(H^* - H_{\text{low}} + L_{\nabla h}D_{\mathbf{x}}^2) \right)}{[9L_{\nabla h}^2 / \min\{L_{\nabla h}, \sigma_y\} + 3L_{\nabla h}]^{-2}\hat{\epsilon}_0^2} \right)_+ \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \widehat{T} + 1 + 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\widehat{T}} \log(k+1) \right) \stackrel{(15)}{\leq} \widehat{N}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (15) and  $\sum_{k=0}^{\widehat{T}} \log(k+1) \leq \widehat{T} \log(\widehat{T} + 1)$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$

## 5.2 Proof of the main results in Section 3

In this subsection, we provide a proof of our main result presented in Section 3, which is particularly Theorem 2. Before proceeding, let

$$\mathcal{L}_y(x, y, \lambda_y; \rho) = F(x, y) - \frac{1}{2\rho} (\|[\lambda_y + \rho d(x, y)]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_y\|^2). \quad (57)$$

In view of (4), (22) and (57), one can observe that

$$f^*(x) \leq \max_y \mathcal{L}_y(x, y, \lambda_y; \rho) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \lambda_y \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\tilde{m}}, \rho > 0, \quad (58)$$

which will be frequently used later.

We next establish several lemmas that will be used to prove Theorem 2 subsequently. The next lemma provides an upper bound for  $\{\lambda_y^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 4 hold. Let  $\{\lambda_y^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$  be generated by Algorithm 2,  $D_y$  and  $\Delta$  be defined in (10) and (24), and  $\tau$ , and  $\rho_k$  be given in Algorithm 2. Then we have*

$$\rho_k^{-1} \|\lambda_y^k\|^2 \leq \|\lambda_y^0\|^2 + \frac{2(\Delta + D_y)}{1 - \tau} \quad \forall 0 \leq k \in \mathbb{K} - 1. \quad (59)$$

*Proof.* Its proof is similar to that of [32, Lemma 5] and thus omitted.  $\square$

The following lemma establishes an upper bound on  $\|d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})\|$  for  $0 \leq k \in \mathbb{K} - 1$ .

**Lemma 4.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 4 hold. Let  $D_y$  and  $\Delta$  be defined in (10) and (24),  $\delta_d$  be given in Assumption 4, and  $\tau$ ,  $\epsilon_k$  and  $\rho_k$  be given in Algorithm 2. Suppose that  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}, \lambda_y^{k+1})$  is generated by Algorithm 2 for some  $0 \leq k \in \mathbb{K} - 1$  with*

$$\rho_k \geq \frac{4\|\lambda_y^0\|^2}{\delta_d^2} + \frac{8(\Delta + D_y)}{\delta_d^2(1 - \tau)}. \quad (60)$$

*Then we have*

$$\|d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})\| \leq \rho_k^{-1} \|\lambda_y^{k+1}\| \leq 2\rho_k^{-1} \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_y). \quad (61)$$

*Proof.* Its proof is similar to that of [32, Lemma 6] and thus omitted.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 4 hold. Let  $D_y$  and  $\Delta$  be defined in (10) and (24), and  $\delta_d$  be given in Assumption 4,  $\tau$ ,  $\epsilon_k$ ,  $\rho_k$  and  $\lambda_y^0$  be given in Algorithm 2. Suppose that  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}, \lambda_x^{k+1}, \lambda_y^{k+1})$  is generated by Algorithm 2 for some  $0 \leq k \in \mathbb{K} - 1$  with*

$$\rho_k \geq \frac{4\|\lambda_y^0\|^2}{\delta_d^2 \tau} + \frac{8(\Delta + D_y)}{\delta_d^2 \tau (1 - \tau)}. \quad (62)$$

*Let*

$$\tilde{\lambda}_x^{k+1} = [\lambda_x^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+.$$

*Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(0, \partial_x F(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) + \nabla c(x^{k+1}) \tilde{\lambda}_x^{k+1} - \nabla_x d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) \lambda_y^{k+1}) &\leq \epsilon_k, \\ \text{dist}(0, \partial_y F(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) - \nabla_y d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) \lambda_y^{k+1}) &\leq \epsilon_k, \\ \|d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})\| &\leq 2\rho_k^{-1} \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_y), \\ |\langle \lambda_y^{k+1}, d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) \rangle| &\leq 2\rho_k^{-1} \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_y) \max\{\|\lambda_y^0\|, 2\delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_y)\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Its proof is similar to that of [32, Lemma 7] and thus omitted.  $\square$

The following lemma provides an upper bound on  $\max_y \mathcal{L}(x_{\text{init}}^k, y, \lambda_x^k, \lambda_y^k; \rho_k)$  for  $0 \leq k \in \mathbb{K} - 1$ , which will subsequently be used to derive an upper bound for  $\max_y \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, y, \lambda_x^k, \lambda_y^k; \rho_k)$ .

**Lemma 6.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 3 and 4 hold. Let  $\{(\lambda_x^k, \lambda_y^k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$  be generated by Algorithm 2,  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $D_y$ ,  $F_{\text{hi}}$  and  $\Delta$  be defined in (4), (10), (23) and (24), and  $\tau$ ,  $\rho_k$ ,  $\Lambda$  and  $x_{\text{init}}^k$  be given in Algorithm 2. Then for all  $0 \leq k \in \mathbb{K} - 1$ , we have*

$$\max_y \mathcal{L}(x_{\text{init}}^k, y, \lambda_x^k, \lambda_y^k; \rho_k) \leq \Delta + F_{\text{hi}} + \Lambda + \frac{1}{2}(\tau^{-1} + \|\lambda_y^0\|^2) + \frac{\Delta + D_y}{1 - \tau}. \quad (63)$$

*Proof.* Its proof is similar to that of [32, Lemma 8] and thus omitted.  $\square$

The next lemma shows that an approximate primal-dual stationary point of (19) is found at each iteration of Algorithm 2, and also provides an estimate of operation complexity for finding it.

**Lemma 7.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 3 and 4 hold. Let  $D_{\mathbf{x}}$ ,  $D_{\mathbf{y}}$ ,  $L_k$ ,  $F_{\text{hi}}$  and  $\Delta$  be defined in (10), (20), (23) and (24),  $\tau$ ,  $\epsilon_k$ ,  $\rho_k$ ,  $\Lambda$  and  $\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0$  be given in Algorithm 2, and*

$$\alpha_k = \min \left\{ 1, \sqrt{8\sigma/L_k} \right\}, \quad (64)$$

$$\delta_k = (2 + \alpha_k^{-1})L_k D_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \max \{2\sigma, \alpha_k L_k/4\} D_{\mathbf{y}}^2, \quad (65)$$

$$M_k = \frac{16 \max \{1/(2L_k), \min \{1/(2\sigma), 4/(\alpha_k L_k)\}\} \rho_k}{[9L_k^2/\min\{L_k, \sigma\} + 3L_k]^{-2} \epsilon_k^2} \times \left( \delta_k + 2\alpha_k^{-1} \left( \Delta + \frac{\Lambda^2}{2\rho_k} + \frac{3}{2} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{3(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1-\tau} + \rho_k d_{\text{hi}}^2 + L_k D_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \right) \right) \quad (66)$$

$$T_k = \left[ 16 \left( 2\Delta + \Lambda + \frac{1}{2}(\tau^{-1} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2) + \frac{\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}}{1-\tau} + \frac{\Lambda^2}{2\rho_k} \right) L_k \epsilon_k^{-2} + 8(1 + \sigma^{-2} L_k^2) \epsilon_k^2 - 1 \right]_+, \quad (67)$$

$$N_k = 3397 \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{L_k/(2\sigma)} \right\} \times ((T_k + 1)(\log M_k)_+ + T_k + 1 + 2T_k \log(T_k + 1)). \quad (68)$$

Then for all  $0 \leq k \leq K-1$ , Algorithm 2 finds an  $\epsilon_k$ -primal-dual stationary point  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  of problem (19) that satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \max_y \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k) &\leq \Delta + F_{\text{hi}} + \Lambda + \frac{1}{2}(\tau^{-1} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2) + \frac{\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}}{1-\tau} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (L_k^{-1} + \sigma^{-2} L_k) \epsilon_k^2. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Moreover, the total number of evaluations of  $\nabla f$ ,  $\nabla c$ ,  $\nabla d$  and proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$  performed in iteration  $k$  of Algorithm 2 is no more than  $N_k$ , respectively.

*Proof.* Observe from (1) and (4) that problem (19) can be viewed as

$$\min_x \max_y \{h(x, y) + p(x) - q(y)\},$$

where

$$h(x, y) = f(x, y) + \frac{1}{2\rho_k} (\|[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x)]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2) - \frac{1}{2\rho_k} (\|[\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k + \rho_k d(x, y)]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2).$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x h(x, y) &= \nabla_x f(x, y) + \nabla c(x)[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x)]_+ + \nabla_x d(x, y)[\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k + \rho_k d(x, y)]_+, \\ \nabla_y h(x, y) &= \nabla_y f(x, y) + \nabla_y d(x, y)[\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k + \rho_k d(x, y)]_+. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Assumption 1(iii) that

$$\|\nabla c(x)\| \leq L_c, \quad \|\nabla d(x, y)\| \leq L_d \quad \forall (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}.$$

In view of the above relations, (18) and Assumption 1, one can observe that  $\nabla c(x)[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x)]_+$  is  $(\rho_k L_c^2 + \rho_k c_{\text{hi}} L_{\nabla c} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\| L_{\nabla c})$ -Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X}$ , and  $\nabla d(x, y)[\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k + \rho_k d(x, y)]_+$  is  $(\rho_k L_d^2 + \rho_k d_{\text{hi}} L_{\nabla d} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k\| L_{\nabla d})$ -Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . Using these and the fact that  $\nabla f(x, y)$  is  $L_{\nabla f}$ -Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  and  $f(x, \cdot)$  is  $\sigma$ -strongly-concave on  $\mathcal{Y}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , we can see that  $h(x, \cdot)$  is  $\sigma$ -strongly-concave on  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and  $h(x, y)$  is  $L_k$ -smooth on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  for all  $0 \leq k \leq K-1$ , where  $L_k$  is given in (20). Consequently, it follows from Theorem 1 that Algorithm 1 can be suitably applied to problem (19) for finding an  $\epsilon_k$ -primal-dual stationary point  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  of it.

In addition, by (4), (26), (57), (58) and  $\|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\| \leq \Lambda$  (see Algorithm 2), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_x \max_y \mathcal{L}(x, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k) \stackrel{(4)(57)}{=} \min_x \max_y \left\{ \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{y}}(x, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k) + \frac{1}{2\rho_k} (\|[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x)]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2) \right\} \\ & \stackrel{(58)}{\geq} \min_x \left\{ f^*(x) + \frac{1}{2\rho_k} (\|[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x)]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2) \right\} \stackrel{(26)}{\geq} F_{\text{low}} - \frac{1}{2\rho_k} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 \geq F_{\text{low}} - \frac{\Lambda^2}{2\rho_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Let  $(x^*, y^*)$  be an optimal solution of (1). It then follows that  $c(x^*) \leq 0$ . Using this, (4), (23) and (59), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_x \max_y \mathcal{L}(x, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k) \leq \max_y \mathcal{L}(x^*, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k) \\ & \stackrel{(4)}{=} \max_y \left\{ F(x^*, y) + \frac{1}{2\rho_k} (\|[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^*)]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2) - \frac{1}{2\rho_k} (\|[\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k + \rho_k d(x^*, y)]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2) \right\} \\ & \leq \max_y \left\{ F(x^*, y) - \frac{1}{2\rho_k} (\|[\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k + \rho_k d(x^*, y)]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2) \right\} \\ & \stackrel{(23)}{\leq} F_{\text{hi}} + \frac{1}{2\rho_k} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2 \stackrel{(59)}{\leq} F_{\text{hi}} + \frac{1}{2} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}}{1 - \tau}, \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where the second inequality is due to  $c(x^*) \leq 0$ . Moreover, it follows from this, (4), (18), (23), (59),  $\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{\tilde{m}}$  and  $\|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\| \leq \Lambda$  that

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{L}(x, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k) \stackrel{(4)}{\geq} \min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \left\{ F(x, y) - \frac{1}{2\rho_k} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\rho_k} \|[\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k + \rho_k d(x, y)]_+\|^2 \right\} \\ & \geq \min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \left\{ F(x, y) - \frac{1}{2\rho_k} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\rho_k} (\|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k\| + \rho_k \|d(x, y)\|_+\|^2) \right\} \\ & \geq \min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \left\{ F(x, y) - \frac{1}{2\rho_k} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 - \rho_k^{-1} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k\|^2 - \rho_k \|d(x, y)\|_+\|^2 \right\} \\ & \geq F_{\text{low}} - \frac{\Lambda^2}{2\rho_k} - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 - \frac{2(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1 - \tau} - \rho_k d_{\text{hi}}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where the second inequality is due to  $\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{\tilde{m}}$  and the last inequality is due to (18), (23), (59) and  $\|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\| \leq \Lambda$ .

To complete the rest of the proof, let

$$H(x, y) = \mathcal{L}(x, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k), \quad H^* = \min_x \max_y \mathcal{L}(x, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k), \quad (73)$$

$$H_{\text{low}} = \min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{L}(x, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k). \quad (74)$$

In view of these, (63), (70), (71), (72), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_y H(x_{\text{init}}^k, y) \stackrel{(63)}{\leq} \Delta + F_{\text{hi}} + \Lambda + \frac{1}{2} (\tau^{-1} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2) + \frac{\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}}{1 - \tau}, \\ & F_{\text{low}} - \frac{\Lambda^2}{2\rho_k} \stackrel{(70)}{\leq} H^* \stackrel{(71)}{\leq} F_{\text{hi}} + \frac{1}{2} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}}{1 - \tau}, \\ & H_{\text{low}} \stackrel{(72)}{\geq} F_{\text{low}} - \frac{\Lambda^2}{2\rho_k} - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 - \frac{2(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1 - \tau} - \rho_k d_{\text{hi}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using these, (24), and Theorem 1 with  $x^0 = x_{\text{init}}^k$ ,  $\epsilon = \epsilon_k$ ,  $\hat{\epsilon}_0 = \epsilon_k/2$ ,  $L_{\nabla h} = L_k$ ,  $\sigma_y = \sigma$ ,  $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha_k$ ,  $\hat{\delta} = \delta_k$ , and  $H$ ,  $H^*$ ,  $H_{\text{low}}$  given in (73) and (74), we can conclude that Algorithm 1 performs at most  $N_k$  evaluations of  $\nabla f$ ,  $\nabla c$ ,  $\nabla d$  and proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$  for finding an  $\epsilon_k$ -primal-dual stationary point of problem (19) satisfying (69).  $\square$

The following lemma provides an upper bound on  $\|c(x^{k+1})\|_+$  and  $|\langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}, c(x^{k+1}) \rangle|$  for  $0 \leq k \leq K-1$ , where  $\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}$  is given below.

**Lemma 8.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 3 and 4 hold. Let  $D_{\mathbf{y}}$ ,  $\Delta$  and  $L$  be defined in (10), (24) and (27),  $L_F$ ,  $L_c$ ,  $\delta_c$  and  $\theta$  be given in Assumption 4, and  $\tau$ ,  $\rho_k$ ,  $\Lambda$  and  $\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0$  be given in Algorithm 2. Suppose*

that  $(x^{k+1}, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1})$  is generated by Algorithm 2 for some  $0 \leq k \leq K-1$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_k \geq \max \left\{ \theta^{-1} \Lambda, \theta^{-2} \left\{ 4\Delta + 2\Lambda + \tau^{-1} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{2(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1-\tau} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + L_c^{-2} + \sigma^{-2} L + \Lambda^2 \right\}, \frac{4\|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2}{\delta_d^2 \tau} + \frac{8(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{\delta_d^2 \tau (1-\tau)} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

Let

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} = [\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+. \quad (76)$$

Then we have

$$\|[c(x^{k+1})]_+\| \leq \rho_k^{-1} \delta_c^{-1} (L_F + 2L_d \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}) + 1), \quad (77)$$

$$|\langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}, c(x^{k+1}) \rangle| \leq \rho_k^{-1} \delta_c^{-1} (L_F + 2L_d \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}) + 1) \max\{\delta_c^{-1} (L_F + 2L_d \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}) + 1), \Lambda\}. \quad (78)$$

*Proof.* One can observe from (4), (26), (57) and (58) that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_y \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k) &= \max_y \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{y}}(x^{k+1}, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k) + \frac{1}{2\rho_k} (\|[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2) \\ &\stackrel{(58)}{\geq} f^*(x^{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2\rho_k} (\|[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2) \\ &\stackrel{(26)}{\geq} F_{\text{low}} + \frac{1}{2\rho_k} (\|[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+\|^2 - \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

By this inequality, (69) and  $\|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\| \leq \Lambda$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+\|^2 &\leq 2\rho_k \max_y \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k) - 2\rho_k F_{\text{low}} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\rho_k \max_y \mathcal{L}(x^{k+1}, y, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k, \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k; \rho_k) - 2\rho_k F_{\text{low}} + \Lambda^2 \\ &\stackrel{(69)}{\leq} 2\rho_k \Delta + 2\rho_k F_{\text{hi}} + 2\rho_k \Lambda + \rho_k (\tau^{-1} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2) + \frac{2\rho_k (\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1-\tau} \\ &\quad + L_k^{-1} \epsilon_k^2 + \sigma^{-2} L_k \epsilon_k^2 - 2\rho_k F_{\text{low}} + \Lambda^2. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (24) and  $\rho_k^2 \|[c(x^{k+1})]_+\|^2 \leq \|[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+\|^2$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|[c(x^{k+1})]_+\|^2 &\leq \rho_k^{-1} \left( 4\Delta + 2\Lambda + \tau^{-1} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{2(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1-\tau} \right) \\ &\quad + \rho_k^{-2} (L_k^{-1} \epsilon_k^2 + \sigma^{-2} L_k \epsilon_k^2 + \Lambda^2). \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

In addition, we observe from (20), (27), (59),  $\rho_k \geq 1$  and  $\|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\| \leq \Lambda$  that for all  $0 \leq k \leq K$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_k L_c^2 &\leq L_k = L_{\nabla f} + \rho_k L_c^2 + \rho_k c_{\text{hi}} L_{\nabla c} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\| L_{\nabla c} + \rho_k L_d^2 + \rho_k d_{\text{hi}} L_{\nabla d} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k\| L_{\nabla d} \\ &\leq L_{\nabla f} + \rho_k L_c^2 + \rho_k c_{\text{hi}} L_{\nabla c} + \Lambda L_{\nabla c} + \rho_k L_d^2 + \rho_k d_{\text{hi}} L_{\nabla d} \\ &\quad + L_{\nabla d} \sqrt{\rho_k \left( \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{2(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1-\tau} \right)} \leq \rho_k L. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Using this relation, (75), (79),  $\rho_k \geq 1$  and  $\epsilon_k \leq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|[c(x^{k+1})]_+\|^2 &\leq \rho_k^{-1} \left( 4\Delta + 2\Lambda + \tau^{-1} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{2(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1-\tau} \right) \\ &\quad + \rho_k^{-2} ((\rho_k L_c^2)^{-1} \epsilon_k^2 + \sigma^{-2} L \epsilon_k^2 \rho_k + \Lambda^2) \\ &\leq \rho_k^{-1} \left( 4\Delta + 2\Lambda + \tau^{-1} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{2(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1-\tau} \right) \\ &\quad + \rho_k^{-1} (L_c^{-2} + 4\sigma^{-2} L + \Lambda^2) \stackrel{(75)}{\leq} \theta^2, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (21) implies that  $x^{k+1} \in \mathcal{F}(\theta)$ .

It follows from  $x^{k+1} \in \mathcal{F}(\theta)$  and Assumption 4(i) that there exists some  $v \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}}(x^{k+1})$  such that  $\|v\| = 1$  and  $v^T \nabla c_i(x^{k+1}) \leq -\delta_c$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{A}(x^{k+1}; \theta)$ , where  $\mathcal{A}(x^{k+1}; \theta)$  is defined in (21). Let  $\bar{\mathcal{A}}(x^{k+1}; \theta) = \{1, 2, \dots, \tilde{n}\} \setminus \mathcal{A}(x^{k+1}; \theta)$ . Notice from (21) that  $c_i(x^{k+1}) < -\theta$  for all  $i \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(x^{k+1}; \theta)$ . In addition, observe from (75) that  $\rho_k \geq \theta^{-1}\Lambda$ . Using these and  $\|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\| \leq \Lambda$ , we obtain that  $(\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1}))_i \leq \Lambda - \rho_k \theta \leq 0$  for all  $i \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(x^{k+1}; \theta)$ . By this and the fact that  $v^T \nabla c_i(x^{k+1}) \leq -\delta_c$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{A}(x^{k+1}; \theta)$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} v^T \nabla c(x^{k+1}) \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} &\stackrel{(76)}{=} v^T \nabla c(x^{k+1}) [\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+ = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}} v^T \nabla c_i(x^{k+1}) ([\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+)_i \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}(x^{k+1}; \theta)} v^T \nabla c_i(x^{k+1}) ([\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+)_i + \sum_{i \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(x^{k+1}; \theta)} v^T \nabla c_i(x^{k+1}) ([\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+)_i \\ &\leq -\delta_c \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}(x^{k+1}; \theta)} ([\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+)_i = -\delta_c \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}} ([\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+)_i \stackrel{(76)}{=} -\delta_c \|\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

Since  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  is an  $\epsilon_k$ -primal-dual stationary point of (19), it follows from (4) and Definition 1 that there exists some  $s \in \partial_x F(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$  such that

$$\|s + \nabla c(x^{k+1}) [\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+ - \nabla_x d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) [\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k + \rho_k d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})]_+\| \leq \epsilon_k,$$

which along with (76) and  $\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1} = [\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^k + \rho_x d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})]_+$  implies that

$$\|s + \nabla c(x^{k+1}) \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} - \nabla_x d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\| \leq \epsilon_k. \quad (82)$$

In addition, since  $v \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}}(x^{k+1})$ , there exist  $\{z^t\} \subset \mathcal{X}$  and  $\{\alpha_t\} \downarrow 0$  such that  $z^t = x^{k+1} + \alpha_t v + o(\alpha_t)$  for all  $t$ . Also, since  $s \in \partial_x F(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})$ , one has  $s = \nabla_x f(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) + s_p$  for some  $s_p \in \partial p(x^{k+1})$ . Using these and Assumptions 1 and 4(iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle s, v \rangle &= \langle \nabla_x f(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}), v \rangle + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_t^{-1} \langle s_p, z^t - x^{k+1} \rangle \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_t^{-1} (f(z^t, y^{k+1}) - f(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_t^{-1} \langle s_p, z^t - x^{k+1} \rangle \\ &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_t^{-1} (f(z^t, y^{k+1}) - f(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_t^{-1} (p(z^t) - p(x^{k+1})) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_t^{-1} (F(z^t, y^{k+1}) - F(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})) \leq L_F \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_t^{-1} \|z^t - x^{k+1}\| = L_F, \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

where the second equality is due to the differentiability of  $f$ , the first inequality follows from the convexity of  $p$  and  $s_p \in \partial p(x^{k+1})$ , the second inequality is due to the  $L_F$ -Lipschitz continuity of  $F(\cdot, y^{k+1})$ , and the last equality follows from  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_t^{-1} \|z^t - x^{k+1}\| = \|v\| = 1$ .

By (81), (82), (83), and  $\|v\| = 1$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_k &\geq \|s + \nabla c(x^{k+1}) \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} - \nabla_x d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\| \cdot \|v\| \\ &\geq \langle s + \nabla c(x^{k+1}) \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} - \nabla_x d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}, -v \rangle \\ &= -\langle s - \nabla_x d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) \lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}, v \rangle - v^T \nabla c(x^{k+1}) \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} \\ &\stackrel{(81)}{\geq} -\langle s, v \rangle - \|\nabla_x d(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1})\| \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\| \|v\| + \delta_c \|\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_1 \\ &\geq -L_F - L_d \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\| + \delta_c \|\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to  $\|v\| = 1$  and Assumptions 1(i) and 1(iii). Notice from (75) that (60) holds. It then follows from (61) that  $\|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\| \leq 2\delta_d^{-1}(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})$ , which together with the above inequality and  $\epsilon_k \leq 1$  yields

$$\|\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\| \leq \|\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\|_1 \leq \delta_c^{-1}(L_F + L_d \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^{k+1}\| + \epsilon_k) \leq \delta_c^{-1}(L_F + 2L_d \delta_d^{-1}(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}) + 1). \quad (84)$$

By this and (76), one can observe that

$$\|[c(x^{k+1})]_+\| \leq \rho_k^{-1} \|[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+\| = \rho_k^{-1} \|\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\| \leq \rho_k^{-1} \delta_c^{-1}(L_F + 2L_d \delta_d^{-1}(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}) + 1).$$

Hence, (77) holds as desired.

We next show that (78) holds. Indeed, by  $\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} \geq 0$ , (77) and (84), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}, c(x^{k+1}) \rangle &\leq \langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}, [c(x^{k+1})]_+ \rangle \leq \|\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\| \| [c(x^{k+1})]_+ \| \\ &\stackrel{(77)(84)}{\leq} \rho_k^{-1} \delta_c^{-2} (L_F + 2L_d \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}) + 1)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

Notice that  $\langle \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1}) \rangle = \|[\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k + \rho_k c(x^{k+1})]_+\|^2 \geq 0$ . Hence, we have

$$-\langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}, \rho_k^{-1} \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k \rangle \leq \langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}, c(x^{k+1}) \rangle,$$

which along with  $\|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\| \leq \Lambda$  and (84) yields

$$\langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}, c(x^{k+1}) \rangle \geq -\rho_k^{-1} \|\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}\| \|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^k\| \geq -\rho_k^{-1} \delta_c^{-1} (L_F + 2L_d \delta_d^{-1} (\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}) + 1) \Lambda.$$

The relation (78) then follows from this and (85).  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2 using Lemmas 5, 7 and 8.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** (i) Observe from the definition of  $K$  in (25) and  $\epsilon_k = \tau^k$  that  $K$  is the smallest nonnegative integer such that  $\epsilon_K \leq \varepsilon$ . Hence, Algorithm 2 terminates and outputs  $(x^{K+1}, y^{K+1})$  after  $K+1$  outer iterations. It follows from these and  $\rho_k = \epsilon_k^{-1}$  that  $\epsilon_K \leq \varepsilon$  and  $\rho_K \geq \varepsilon^{-1}$ . By this and (32), one can see that (62) and (75) holds for  $k = K$ . It then follows from Lemmas 5 and 8 that (33)-(38) hold.

(ii) Let  $K$  and  $N$  be given in (25) and (39). Recall from Lemma 7 that the number of evaluations of  $\nabla f$ ,  $\nabla c$ ,  $\nabla d$ , proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$  performed by Algorithm 1 at iteration  $k$  of Algorithm 2 is at most  $N_k$ , where  $N_k$  is given in (68). By this and statement (i) of this theorem, one can observe that the total number of evaluations of  $\nabla f$ ,  $\nabla c$ ,  $\nabla d$ , proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$  performed in Algorithm 2 is no more than  $\sum_{k=0}^K N_k$ , respectively. As a result, to prove statement (ii) of this theorem, it suffices to show that  $\sum_{k=0}^K N_k \leq N$ . Recall from (80) and Algorithm 2 that  $\rho_k L_c^2 \leq L_k \leq \rho_k L$  and  $\rho_k \geq 1 \geq \epsilon_k$ . Using these, (28), (29), (30), (64), (65), (66) and (67), we obtain that

$$1 \geq \alpha_k \geq \min \left\{ 1, \sqrt{8\sigma/(\rho_k L)} \right\} \geq \rho_k^{-1/2} \alpha, \quad (86)$$

$$\delta_k \leq (2 + \rho_k^{1/2} \alpha^{-1}) \rho_k L D_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \max\{2\sigma, \rho_k L/4\} D_{\mathbf{y}}^2 \leq \rho_k^{3/2} \delta, \quad (87)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_k &\leq \frac{16 \max \left\{ 1/(2\rho_k L_c^2), 4/(\rho_k^{-1/2} \alpha \rho_k L_c^2) \right\}}{[9\rho_k^2 L^2 / \min\{\rho_k L_c^2, \sigma\} + 3\rho_k L]^{-2} \epsilon_k^2} \times \left( \rho_k^{3/2} \delta + 2\rho_k^{1/2} \alpha^{-1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left( \Delta + \frac{\Lambda^2}{2} + \frac{3}{2} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{3(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1-\tau} + \rho_k d_{\mathbf{hi}}^2 + \rho_k L D_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{16\rho_k^{-1/2} \max \left\{ 1/(2L_c^2), 4/(\alpha L_c^2) \right\}}{\rho_k^{-4} [9L^2 / \min\{L_c^2, \sigma\} + 3L]^{-2} \epsilon_k^2} \times \rho_k^{3/2} \left( \delta + 2\alpha^{-1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left( \Delta + \frac{\Lambda^2}{2} + \frac{3}{2} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2 + \frac{3(\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}})}{1-\tau} + d_{\mathbf{hi}}^2 + L D_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \right) \right) \leq \epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k^5 M, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} T_k &\leq \left[ 16 \left( 2\Delta + \Lambda + \frac{1}{2}(\tau^{-1} + \|\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}^0\|^2) + \frac{\Delta + D_{\mathbf{y}}}{1-\tau} + \frac{\Lambda^2}{2} \right) \epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k L \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 8(1 + \sigma^{-2} \rho_k^2 L^2) \epsilon_k^{-2} - 1 \right]_+ \leq \epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k T, \end{aligned}$$

where (88) follows from (28), (29), (30), (86), (87),  $\rho_k L_c^2 \leq L_k \leq \rho_k L$ , and  $\rho_k \geq 1 \geq \epsilon_k$ . By the above

inequalities, (68), (80),  $T \geq 1$  and  $\rho_k \geq 1 \geq \epsilon_k$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^K N_k &\leq \sum_{k=0}^K 3397 \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{\rho_k L / (2\sigma)} \right\} \\
&\quad \times ((\epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k T + 1) (\log(\epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k^5 M))_+ + \epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k T + 1 + 2\epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k T \log(\epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k T + 1)) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^K 3397 \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{L / (2\sigma)} \right\} \times \epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k^{3/2} ((T + 1) (\log(\epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k^5 M))_+ + T + 1 + 2T \log(\epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k T + 1)) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^K 3397 \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{L / (2\sigma)} \right\} T \epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k^{3/2} ((2 \log(\epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k^5 M))_+ + 2 + 2 \log(2\epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k T)) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^K 3397 \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{L / (2\sigma)} \right\} T \epsilon_k^{-2} \rho_k^{3/2} (12 \log \rho_k - 8 \log \epsilon_k + 2(\log M)_+ + 2 + 2 \log(2T)), \tag{89}
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of  $K$  in (25), one has  $\tau^K \geq \tau\varepsilon$ . Also, notice from Algorithm 2 that  $\rho_k = \tau^{-k}$ . It then follows from these, (39) and (89) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^K N_k &\leq \sum_{k=0}^K 3397 \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{L / (2\sigma)} \right\} T \epsilon_k^{-7/2} (20 \log(1/\epsilon_k) + 2(\log M)_+ + 2 + 2 \log(2T)) \\
&= 3397 \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{L / (2\sigma)} \right\} T \sum_{k=0}^K \tau^{-7k/2} (20k \log(1/\tau) + 2(\log M)_+ + 2 + 2 \log(2T)) \\
&\leq 3397 \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{L / (2\sigma)} \right\} T \sum_{k=0}^K \tau^{-7k/2} (20K \log(1/\tau) + 2(\log M)_+ + 2 + 2 \log(2T)) \\
&\leq 3397 \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{L / (2\sigma)} \right\} T \tau^{-7/2K} (1 - \tau^4)^{-1} \\
&\quad \times (20K \log(1/\tau) + 2(\log M)_+ + 2 + 2 \log(2T)) \\
&\leq 3397 \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{L / (2\sigma)} \right\} T (1 - \tau^{7/2})^{-1} \\
&\quad \times (\tau\varepsilon)^{-7/2} (20K \log(1/\tau) + 2(\log M)_+ + 2 + 2 \log(2T)) \stackrel{(39)}{=} N,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second last inequality is due to  $\sum_{k=0}^K \tau^{-7k/2} \leq \tau^{-7K/2} / (1 - \tau^{7/2})$ , and the last inequality is due to  $\tau^K \geq \tau\varepsilon$ . Hence, statement (ii) of this theorem holds as desired.  $\square$

## Declarations

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

## References

- [1] K. Antonakopoulos, E. V. Belmega, and P. Mertikopoulos. Adaptive extra-gradient methods for min-max optimization and games. In *The International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [2] E. G. Birgin and J. M. Martínez. *Practical Augmented Lagrangian Methods for Constrained Optimization*. SIAM, 2014.
- [3] E. G. Birgin and J. M. Martínez. Complexity and performance of an augmented Lagrangian algorithm. *Optim. Methods and Softw.*, 35(5):885–920, 2020.
- [4] N. Cesa-Bianchi and G. Lugosi. *Prediction, learning, and games*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [5] X. Chen, L. Guo, Z. Lu, and J. J. Ye. An augmented Lagrangian method for non-Lipschitz nonconvex programming. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 55(1):168–193, 2017.
- [6] Z. Chen, Y. Zhou, T. Xu, and Y. Liang. Proximal gradient descent-ascent: variable convergence under KL geometry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04653*, 2021.

- [7] F. H. Clarke. *Optimization and nonsmooth analysis*. SIAM, 1990.
- [8] B. Dai, A. Shaw, L. Li, L. Xiao, N. He, Z. Liu, J. Chen, and L. Song. SBEED: Convergent reinforcement learning with nonlinear function approximation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1125–1134, 2018.
- [9] Y.-H. Dai, J. Wang, and L. Zhang. Optimality conditions and numerical algorithms for a class of linearly constrained minimax optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 34(3):2883–2916, 2024.
- [10] Y.-H. Dai and L. Zhang. Optimality conditions for constrained minimax optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.09730*, 2020.
- [11] Y.-H. Dai and L.-W. Zhang. The rate of convergence of augmented lagrangian method for minimax optimization problems with equality constraints. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of China* 12, pages 265–297, 2024.
- [12] S. S. Du, J. Chen, L. Li, L. Xiao, and D. Zhou. Stochastic variance reduction methods for policy evaluation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1049–1058, 2017.
- [13] J. Duchi and H. Namkoong. Variance-based regularization with convex objectives. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(1):2450–2504, 2019.
- [14] X. Fu and E. Modiano. Network interdiction using adversarial traffic flows. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2019-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 1765–1773. IEEE, 2019.
- [15] G. Gidel, H. Berard, G. Vignoud, P. Vincent, and S. Lacoste-Julien. A variational inequality perspective on generative adversarial networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [16] D. Goktas and A. Greenwald. Convex-concave min-max stackelberg games. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:2991–3003, 2021.
- [17] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2672–2680, 2014.
- [18] I. J. Goodfellow, J. Shlens, and C. Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- [19] G. N. Grapiglia and Y. Yuan. On the complexity of an augmented Lagrangian method for nonconvex optimization. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 41(2):1508–1530, 2021.
- [20] Z. Guo, Y. Yan, Z. Yuan, and T. Yang. Fast objective & duality gap convergence for non-convex strongly-concave min-max problems with pl condition. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24:148–1, 2023.
- [21] N. Ho-Nguyen and S. J. Wright. Adversarial classification via distributional robustness with wasserstein ambiguity. *Mathematical Programming*, 198(2):1411–1447, 2023.
- [22] F. Huang, S. Gao, J. Pei, and H. Huang. Accelerated zeroth-order momentum methods from mini to minimax optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.08170*, 3, 2020.
- [23] C. Kanzow and D. Steck. An example comparing the standard and safeguarded augmented Lagrangian methods. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 45(6):598–603, 2017.
- [24] A. Kaplan and R. Tichatschke. Proximal point methods and nonconvex optimization. *Journal of global Optimization*, 13(4):389–406, 1998.
- [25] W. Kong and R. D. Monteiro. An accelerated inexact proximal point method for solving nonconvex-concave min-max problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(4):2558–2585, 2021.
- [26] D. Kovalev and A. Gasnikov. The first optimal algorithm for smooth and strongly-convex-strongly-concave minimax optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:14691–14703, 2022.
- [27] C. Laidlaw, S. Singla, and S. Feizi. Perceptual adversarial robustness: Defense against unseen threat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.12655*, 2020.

- [28] T. Lin, C. Jin, and M. Jordan. On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6083–6093, 2020.
- [29] T. Lin, C. Jin, and M. I. Jordan. Near-optimal algorithms for minimax optimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2738–2779, 2020.
- [30] S. Lu. A single-loop gradient descent and perturbed ascent algorithm for nonconvex functional constrained optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 14315–14357, 2022.
- [31] S. Lu, I. Tsaknakis, M. Hong, and Y. Chen. Hybrid block successive approximation for one-sided non-convex min-max problems: algorithms and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 68:3676–3691, 2020.
- [32] Z. Lu and S. Mei. A first-order augmented Lagrangian method for constrained minimax optimization. *Mathematical Programming* 213, pages 1063–1104, 2025.
- [33] Z. Lu and Y. Zhang. An augmented Lagrangian approach for sparse principal component analysis. *Math. Program.*, 135(1-2):149–193, 2012.
- [34] L. Luo, H. Ye, Z. Huang, and T. Zhang. Stochastic recursive gradient descent ascent for stochastic nonconvex-strongly-concave minimax problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:20566–20577, 2020.
- [35] A. Madry, A. Makelov, L. Schmidt, D. Tsipras, and A. Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [36] G. Mateos, J. A. Bazerque, and G. B. Giannakis. Distributed sparse linear regression. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 58:5262–5276, 2010.
- [37] O. Nachum, Y. Chow, B. Dai, and L. Li. DualDICE: Behavior-agnostic estimation of discounted stationary distribution corrections. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2315–2325, 2019.
- [38] M. Nouiehed, M. Sanjabi, T. Huang, J. D. Lee, and M. Razaviyayn. Solving a class of non-convex min-max games using iterative first order methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [39] D. M. Ostrovskii, A. Lowy, and M. Razaviyayn. Efficient search of first-order Nash equilibria in nonconvex-concave smooth min-max problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(4):2508–2538, 2021.
- [40] S. Qiu, Z. Yang, X. Wei, J. Ye, and Z. Wang. Single-timescale stochastic nonconvex-concave optimization for smooth nonlinear td learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.10103*, 2020.
- [41] A. Rakhlin and K. Sridharan. Optimization, learning, and games with predictable sequences. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3066–3074, 2013.
- [42] M. F. Sahin, A. Eftekhari, A. Alacaoglu, F. Latorre, and V. Cevher. An inexact augmented Lagrangian framework for nonconvex optimization with nonlinear constraints. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [43] J. Salmeron, K. Wood, and R. Baldick. Analysis of electric grid security under terrorist threat. *IEEE Transactions on power systems*, 19(2):905–912, 2004.
- [44] M. Sanjabi, J. Ba, M. Razaviyayn, and J. D. Lee. On the convergence and robustness of training gans with regularized optimal transport. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [45] S. Shafieezadeh-Abadeh, P. M. Esfahani, and D. Kuhn. Distributionally robust logistic regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, page 1576–1584, 2015.
- [46] J. Shamma. *Cooperative Control of Distributed Multi-Agent Systems*. Wiley-Interscience, 2008.
- [47] A. Sinha, H. Namkoong, and J. C. Duchi. Certifying some distributional robustness with principled adversarial training. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.

- [48] J. C. Smith, M. Prince, and J. Geunes. Modern network interdiction problems and algorithms. In *Handbook of combinatorial optimization*, pages 1949–1987. Springer New York, 2013.
- [49] J. Song, H. Ren, D. Sadigh, and S. Ermon. Multi-agent generative adversarial imitation learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [50] V. Syrgkanis, A. Agarwal, H. Luo, and R. E. Schapire. Fast convergence of regularized learning in games. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, page 2989–2997, 2015.
- [51] B. Taskar, S. Lacoste-Julien, and M. Jordan. Structured prediction via the extragradient method. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, page 1345–1352, 2006.
- [52] I. Tsaknakis, M. Hong, and S. Zhang. Minimax problems with coupled linear constraints: Computational complexity and duality. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 33(4):2675–2702, 2023.
- [53] J. Wang, T. Zhang, S. Liu, P.-Y. Chen, J. Xu, M. Fardad, and B. Li. Adversarial attack generation empowered by min-max optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [54] D. Ward and J. M. Borwein. Nonsmooth calculus in finite dimensions. *SIAM Journal on control and optimization*, 25(5):1312–1340, 1987.
- [55] W. Xian, F. Huang, Y. Zhang, and H. Huang. A faster decentralized algorithm for nonconvex minimax problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- [56] Y. Xie and S. J. Wright. Complexity of proximal augmented Lagrangian for nonconvex optimization with nonlinear equality constraints. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 86(3):1–30, 2021.
- [57] H. Xu, C. Caramanis, and S. Mannor. Robustness and regularization of support vector machines. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10:1485–1510, 2009.
- [58] L. Xu, J. Neufeld, B. Larson, and D. Schuurmans. Maximum margin clustering. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, page 1537–1544, 2005.
- [59] T. Xu, Z. Wang, Y. Liang, and H. V. Poor. Gradient free minimax optimization: Variance reduction and faster convergence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09361*, 2020.
- [60] Z. Xu, H. Zhang, Y. Xu, and G. Lan. A unified single-loop alternating gradient projection algorithm for nonconvex-concave and convex-nonconcave minimax problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 201(1):635–706, 2023.
- [61] J. Yang, S. Zhang, N. Kiyavash, and N. He. A catalyst framework for minimax optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5667–5678, 2020.
- [62] H. Zhang, J. Wang, Z. Xu, and Y.-H. Dai. Primal dual alternating proximal gradient algorithms for nonsmooth nonconvex minimax problems with coupled linear constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.04672*, 2022.
- [63] J. Zhang, P. Xiao, R. Sun, and Z. Luo. A single-loop smoothed gradient descent-ascent algorithm for nonconvex-concave min-max problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:7377–7389, 2020.
- [64] R. Zhao. A primal-dual smoothing framework for max-structured non-convex optimization. *Mathematics of operations research*, 49(3):1535–1565, 2024.

## A A modified optimal first-order method for strongly-convex-strongly-concave minimax problem

In this part, we present a modified optimal first-order method [32, Algorithm 1] in Algorithm 3 below for finding an approximate primal-dual stationary point of strongly-convex-strongly-concave minimax problem

$$\bar{H}^* = \min_x \max_y \{ \bar{H}(x, y) := \bar{h}(x, y) + p(x) - q(y) \}, \quad (90)$$

which satisfies the following assumptions.

**Assumption 5.** (i)  $p : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $q : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  are proper convex functions and continuous on  $\text{dom } p$  and  $\text{dom } q$ , respectively, and moreover,  $\text{dom } p$  and  $\text{dom } q$  are compact.

(ii) The proximal operators associated with  $p$  and  $q$  can be exactly evaluated.

(iii)  $\bar{h}(x, y)$  is  $\sigma_x$ -strongly-convex- $\sigma_y$ -strongly-concave and  $L_{\nabla \bar{h}}$ -smooth on  $\text{dom } p \times \text{dom } q$  for some  $\sigma_x, \sigma_y > 0$ .

For convenience of presentation, we introduce some notation below, most of which is adopted from [26]. Let  $\mathcal{X} = \text{dom } p$ ,  $\mathcal{Y} = \text{dom } q$ ,  $(x^*, y^*)$  denote the optimal solution of (90),  $z^* = -\sigma_x x^*$ , and

$$D_{\mathbf{x}} := \max\{\|u - v\| \mid u, v \in \mathcal{X}\}, \quad D_{\mathbf{y}} := \max\{\|u - v\| \mid u, v \in \mathcal{Y}\}, \quad (91)$$

$$\bar{H}_{\text{low}} = \min\{\bar{H}(x, y) \mid (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}, \quad (92)$$

$$\hat{h}(x, y) = \bar{h}(x, y) - \sigma_x \|x\|^2/2 + \sigma_y \|y\|^2/2,$$

$$\mathcal{G}(z, y) = \sup_x \{\langle x, z \rangle - p(x) - \hat{h}(x, y) + q(y)\},$$

$$\mathcal{P}(z, y) = \sigma_x^{-1} \|z\|^2/2 + \sigma_y \|y\|^2/2 + \mathcal{G}(z, y),$$

$$\vartheta_k = \eta_z^{-1} \|z^k - z^*\|^2 + \eta_y^{-1} \|y^k - y^*\|^2 + 2\bar{\alpha}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}(z_f^k, y_f^k) - \mathcal{P}(z^*, y^*)), \quad (93)$$

$$a_x^k(x, y) = \nabla_x \hat{h}(x, y) + \sigma_x(x - \sigma_x^{-1} z_g^k)/2, \quad a_y^k(x, y) = -\nabla_y \hat{h}(x, y) + \sigma_y y + \sigma_x(y - y_g^k)/8,$$

where  $\bar{\alpha} = \min\{1, \sqrt{8\sigma_y/\sigma_x}\}$ ,  $\eta_z = \sigma_x/2$ ,  $\eta_y = \min\{1/(2\sigma_y), 4/(\bar{\alpha}\sigma_x)\}$ , and  $y^k, y_f^k, y_g^k, z^k, z_f^k$  and  $z_g^k$  are generated at iteration  $k$  of Algorithm 3 below. By Assumption 5, one can observe that  $D_{\mathbf{x}}, D_{\mathbf{y}}$  and  $\bar{H}_{\text{low}}$  are finite.

We are now ready to review a modified optimal first-order method [32, Algorithm 1] for solving (90) in Algorithm 3. It is a slight modification of an optimal first-order method [26, Algorithm 4] by incorporating a forward-backward splitting scheme and a verifiable termination criterion (see steps 23-25 in Algorithm 3) in order to find an  $\bar{\epsilon}$ -primal-dual stationary point of problem (90) for any prescribed tolerance  $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$ .

---

**Algorithm 3** A modified optimal first-order method for problem (90)

---

**Input:**  $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$ ,  $\bar{z}^0 = z_f^0 \in -\sigma_x \text{dom } p$ ,<sup>3</sup>  $\bar{y}^0 = y_f^0 \in \text{dom } q$ ,  $(z^0, y^0) = (\bar{z}^0, \bar{y}^0)$ ,  $\bar{\alpha} = \min \left\{ 1, \sqrt{8\sigma_y/\sigma_x} \right\}$ ,  $\eta_z = \sigma_x/2$ ,  $\eta_y = \min \{1/(2\sigma_y), 4/(\bar{\alpha}\sigma_x)\}$ ,  $\beta_t = 2/(t+3)$ ,  $\zeta = (2\sqrt{5}(1+8L_{\nabla\bar{h}}/\sigma_x))^{-1}$ ,  $\gamma_x = \gamma_y = 8\sigma_x^{-1}$ , and  $\bar{\zeta} = \min\{\sigma_x, \sigma_y\}/L_{\nabla\bar{h}}^2$ .

1: **for**  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  **do**

2:    $(z_g^k, y_g^k) = \bar{\alpha}(z^k, y^k) + (1 - \bar{\alpha})(z_f^k, y_f^k)$ .

3:    $(x^{k,-1}, y^{k,-1}) = (-\sigma_x^{-1}z_g^k, y_g^k)$ .

4:    $x^{k,0} = \text{prox}_{\zeta\gamma_x p}(x^{k,-1} - \zeta\gamma_x a_x^k(x^{k,-1}, y^{k,-1}))$ .

5:    $y^{k,0} = \text{prox}_{\zeta\gamma_y q}(y^{k,-1} - \zeta\gamma_y a_y^k(x^{k,-1}, y^{k,-1}))$ .

6:    $b_x^{k,0} = \frac{1}{\zeta\gamma_x}(x^{k,-1} - \zeta\gamma_x a_x^k(x^{k,-1}, y^{k,-1}) - x^{k,0})$ .

7:    $b_y^{k,0} = \frac{1}{\zeta\gamma_y}(y^{k,-1} - \zeta\gamma_y a_y^k(x^{k,-1}, y^{k,-1}) - y^{k,0})$ .

8:    $t = 0$ .

9:   **while**  $\gamma_x \|a_x^k(x^{k,t}, y^{k,t}) + b_x^{k,t}\|^2 + \gamma_y \|a_y^k(x^{k,t}, y^{k,t}) + b_y^{k,t}\|^2 > \gamma_x^{-1} \|x^{k,t} - x^{k,-1}\|^2 + \gamma_y^{-1} \|y^{k,t} - y^{k,-1}\|^2$  **do**

10:     $x^{k,t+1/2} = x^{k,t} + \beta_t(x^{k,0} - x^{k,t}) - \zeta\gamma_x(a_x^k(x^{k,t}, y^{k,t}) + b_x^{k,t})$ .

11:     $y^{k,t+1/2} = y^{k,t} + \beta_t(y^{k,0} - y^{k,t}) - \zeta\gamma_y(a_y^k(x^{k,t}, y^{k,t}) + b_y^{k,t})$ .

12:     $x^{k,t+1} = \text{prox}_{\zeta\gamma_x p}(x^{k,t} + \beta_t(x^{k,0} - x^{k,t}) - \zeta\gamma_x a_x^k(x^{k,t+1/2}, y^{k,t+1/2}))$ .

13:     $y^{k,t+1} = \text{prox}_{\zeta\gamma_y q}(y^{k,t} + \beta_t(y^{k,0} - y^{k,t}) - \zeta\gamma_y a_y^k(x^{k,t+1/2}, y^{k,t+1/2}))$ .

14:     $b_x^{k,t+1} = \frac{1}{\zeta\gamma_x}(x^{k,t} + \beta_t(x^{k,0} - x^{k,t}) - \zeta\gamma_x a_x^k(x^{k,t+1/2}, y^{k,t+1/2}) - x^{k,t+1})$ .

15:     $b_y^{k,t+1} = \frac{1}{\zeta\gamma_y}(y^{k,t} + \beta_t(y^{k,0} - y^{k,t}) - \zeta\gamma_y a_y^k(x^{k,t+1/2}, y^{k,t+1/2}) - y^{k,t+1})$ .

16:     $t \leftarrow t + 1$ .

17: **end while**

18:  $(x_f^{k+1}, y_f^{k+1}) = (x^{k,t}, y^{k,t})$ .

19:  $(z_f^{k+1}, w_f^{k+1}) = (\nabla_x \hat{h}(x_f^{k+1}, y_f^{k+1}) + b_x^{k,t}, -\nabla_y \hat{h}(x_f^{k+1}, y_f^{k+1}) + b_y^{k,t})$ .

20:  $z^{k+1} = z^k + \eta_z \sigma_x^{-1}(z_f^{k+1} - z^k) - \eta_z(x_f^{k+1} + \sigma_x^{-1}z_f^{k+1})$ .

21:  $y^{k+1} = y^k + \eta_y \sigma_y^{-1}(y_f^{k+1} - y^k) - \eta_y(w_f^{k+1} + \sigma_y y_f^{k+1})$ .

22:  $x^{k+1} = -\sigma_x^{-1}z^{k+1}$ .

23:  $\tilde{x}^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\bar{\zeta}p}(x^{k+1} - \bar{\zeta}\nabla_x \bar{h}(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}))$ .

24:  $\tilde{y}^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\bar{\zeta}q}(y^{k+1} + \bar{\zeta}\nabla_y \bar{h}(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}))$ .

25: Terminate the algorithm and output  $(\tilde{x}^{k+1}, \tilde{y}^{k+1})$  if  $\|\bar{\zeta}^{-1}(x^{k+1} - \tilde{x}^{k+1}, \tilde{y}^{k+1} - y^{k+1}) - (\nabla \bar{h}(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) - \nabla \bar{h}(\tilde{x}^{k+1}, \tilde{y}^{k+1}))\| \leq \bar{\epsilon}$ .

26: **end for**

---

The following theorem presents *iteration and operation complexity* of Algorithm 3 for finding an  $\bar{\epsilon}$ -primal-dual stationary point of problem (90), whose proof can be found in [32, Section 4.1].

**Theorem 3 (Complexity of Algorithm 3).** *Suppose that Assumption 5 hold. Let  $\bar{H}^*$ ,  $D_x$ ,  $D_y$ ,  $\bar{H}_{\text{low}}$ , and  $\vartheta_0$  be defined in (90), (91), (92) and (93),  $\sigma_x$ ,  $\sigma_y$  and  $L_{\nabla\bar{h}}$  be given in Assumption 5,  $\bar{\alpha}$ ,  $\eta_y$ ,  $\eta_z$ ,  $\bar{\epsilon}$ ,  $\bar{\zeta}$  be given in Algorithm 3, and*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\delta} &= (2 + \bar{\alpha}^{-1})\sigma_x D_x^2 + \max\{2\sigma_y, \bar{\alpha}\sigma_x/4\}D_y^2, \\ \bar{K} &= \left\lceil \max \left\{ \frac{2}{\bar{\alpha}}, \frac{\bar{\alpha}\sigma_x}{4\sigma_y} \right\} \log \frac{4 \max\{\eta_z \sigma_x^{-2}, \eta_y\} \vartheta_0}{(\bar{\zeta}^{-1} + L_{\nabla\bar{h}})^{-2}\bar{\epsilon}^2} \right\rceil_+, \\ \bar{N} &= \left\lceil \max \left\{ 2, \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_x}{2\sigma_y}} \right\} \log \frac{4 \max \{1/(2\sigma_x), \min \{1/(2\sigma_y), 4/(\bar{\alpha}\sigma_x)\}\} (\bar{\delta} + 2\bar{\alpha}^{-1}(\bar{H}^* - \bar{H}_{\text{low}}))}{(L_{\nabla\bar{h}}^2/\min\{\sigma_x, \sigma_y\} + L_{\nabla\bar{h}})^{-2}\bar{\epsilon}^2} \right\rceil_+ \\ &\quad \times \left( \left\lceil 96\sqrt{2}(1 + 8L_{\nabla\bar{h}}\sigma_x^{-1}) \right\rceil + 2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then Algorithm 3 outputs an  $\bar{\epsilon}$ -primal-dual stationary point of (90) in at most  $\bar{K}$  iterations. Moreover, the total number of evaluations of  $\nabla \bar{h}$  and proximal operators of  $p$  and  $q$  performed in Algorithm 3 is no more than  $\bar{N}$ , respectively.

---

<sup>3</sup>For convenience,  $-\sigma_x \text{dom } p$  stands for the set  $\{-\sigma_x u \mid u \in \text{dom } p\}$ .