

# Local Convergence Analysis of ADMM for Nonconvex Composite Optimization

Xi-yuan Xie<sup>1</sup>, Li-hua Yang<sup>1</sup> and Qia Li<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Mathematics, Sun Yat-sen University, 135 Xingang West Road, Guangzhou, 510275, Guangdong, China.

<sup>2</sup> School of Computer Science and Engineering, Guangdong Province Key Laboratory of Computational Science, Sun Yat-sen University, 135 Xingang West Road, Guangzhou, 510275, Guangdong, China.

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: [liqia@mail.sysu.edu.cn](mailto:liqia@mail.sysu.edu.cn);  
Contributing authors: [xiexy65@mail2.sysu.edu.cn](mailto:xiexy65@mail2.sysu.edu.cn);  
[mcsylh@mail.sysu.edu.cn](mailto:mcsylh@mail.sysu.edu.cn);

## Abstract

In this paper, we study the local convergence of the standard ADMM scheme for a class of nonconvex composite problems arising from modern imaging and machine learning models. This problem is constrained by a closed convex set, while its objective is the sum of a continuously differentiable (possibly nonconvex) smooth term and a polyhedral convex nonsmooth term composed with a linear mapping. Our analysis is mainly motivated by the recent works of Rockafellar [29, 30]. We begin with an elementary proof of a key local strong convexity property of the Moreau envelope of polyhedral convex functions. Building on this property, we show that the strong variational sufficiency condition holds for the considered problem under appropriate assumptions. Using the strong variational sufficiency condition, we further derive a descent inequality for the ADMM iterates, in a form analogous to the classical descent analysis of ADMM for convex problems. As a consequence, for a suitable choice of the penalty parameter, we establish local convergence of the ADMM scheme to a primal–dual solution, and a local linear convergence rate for the case where the constraint set is polyhedral convex.

---

<sup>0</sup>The work of Qia Li is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.12471098). The work of Li-hua Yang is supported by the Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (No.2024A1515010988).

Finally, we present three analytic examples to illustrate the applicability of our local convergence result and the necessity of the local assumptions.

**Keywords:** nonconvex composite optimization, ADMM, polyhedral convex function, Moreau envelope, strong variational sufficiency, local convergence

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

## 1 Introduction

Nonconvex composite optimization has attracted great attention due to its applications to various modern image processing and machine learning models, while the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) is one of the most widely used methods for solving this type of problem, see, [2, 6, 8, 15, 22, 23, 26, 31, 36], for example. In this paper, we consider a class of nonconvex composite optimization problems as follows:

$$\min_{x \in C} F(x) := f(x) + g(Ax) \quad (1)$$

where the mapping  $A : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is linear,  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is a nonempty convex set,  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuously differentiable on  $C$ , and  $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  is polyhedral convex. We further assume that

$$\text{dom } g \cap \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid Ax = y, x \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \cap \text{ri}(C) \neq \emptyset.$$

The ADMM can be easily adapted to address Problem (1). We first reformulate (1) into the following equality-constrained problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & f(x) + g(y) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Ax = y \\ & x \in C. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The augmented Lagrangian function of Problem (2) is then defined by

$$\begin{aligned} L_\beta(x, y, \lambda) := & f(x) + \delta_C(x) + g(y) \\ & + \langle \lambda, Ax - y \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax - y\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the Lagrange multiplier and  $\beta > 0$  is a penalty parameter. Now, following the standard procedure of ADMM, we obtain an ADMM iterative scheme for solving (2) as follows:

$$x^{k+1} = \arg \min_{x \in C} f(x) + \langle \lambda^k, Ax \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax - y^k\|^2, \quad (3a)$$

$$y^{k+1} = \arg \min_y g(y) + \langle \lambda^k, -y \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax^{k+1} - y\|^2, \quad (3b)$$

$$\lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k + \beta(Ax^{k+1} - y^{k+1}). \quad (3c)$$

In the case that  $f$  is convex, the convergence of (3) and other variants of ADMM is extensively studied and well understood, see, [5, 7, 9–14, 16, 17, 19, 25, 32, 37], for example. However, when  $f$  is nonconvex, the convergence analysis of ADMM is generally much more challenging. Although there is a considerable number of works regarding the convergence of ADMM for nonconvex composite optimization [4, 18, 20, 21, 24, 34, 35, 38], we find they are not applicable to investigating the convergence of (3) for solving (1), which is mainly due to the presence of the convex constrained set  $C$ . In fact, for Problem (1) with  $C = \mathbb{R}^n$ , some results in [21, 24, 35] are available for analyzing the convergence of a variant of (3), which simply changes the order of minimizing  $x$  and  $y$  as follows

$$y^{k+1} = \arg \min_y g(y) + \langle \lambda^k, -y \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax^k - y\|^2, \quad (4a)$$

$$x^{k+1} = \arg \min_{x \in C} f(x) + \langle \lambda^k, Ax \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax - y^{k+1}\|^2, \quad (4b)$$

$$\lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k + \beta(Ax^{k+1} - y^{k+1}). \quad (4c)$$

Specifically, these results indicate that if  $A$  is a nonsingular square matrix, then any cluster point of the solution sequence generated by (4) is a stationary point, provided that the penalty parameter  $\beta$  is chosen sufficiently large. Moreover, in [24, 35] global convergence of the entire sequence is established by assuming the KL property [1], while in [21] global convergence and local linear convergence are shown via an error bound condition. We note that the above results and their analysis techniques cannot be extended to address the case of  $C \neq \mathbb{R}^n$ , and thus the convergence of (3) and (4) for solving Problem (1) remains unknown, to the best of our knowledge.

Recently, in [30] Rockafellar conducts local convergence analysis of the augmented Lagrangian method (ALM) for nonconvex composite optimization which restricts  $C = \mathbb{R}^n$  and replaces  $g \circ A$  of Problem (1) by the composition of a convex function and a nonlinear mapping. The principal idea therein is to assume that the *strong variational sufficiency condition* [29, Theorem 1] holds for the augmented Lagrangian function, which actually reduces to the strong second-order sufficient condition (SOSC) when applied to the classical nonlinear programming problems [29, Theorem 5]. Subsequently, the authors in [40] extend the (strong) variational sufficient condition to nonsmooth composite optimization problems on Riemannian manifolds. While in [33], the authors use a weaker version of the SOSC to analysis the local convergence of ALM.

Note that the convergence issue of ADMM scheme (3) remains open, and motivated by the work [29, 30], we introduce the strong variational sufficiency condition to Problem (1) and prove the local convergence of (3) under this

condition. Our work is the first one that studies the convergence of ADMM for nonconvex composite optimization based on the strong variational sufficiency condition. The main contributions are summarized as follows. First, we provide an elementary proof of the local strong convexity of the Moreau envelope for polyhedral convex functions. Building upon this, we show that the strong variational sufficiency condition holds for Problem (1) under some appropriate assumptions. Second, using the strong variational sufficiency condition, we derive a descent inequality for the ADMM iterates, which shares a similar structure with those obtained in the analysis of classical ADMM for convex problems. With the help of this, we prove the local convergence of ADMM scheme (3), and obtain a local linear convergence rate for the case where  $C$  is a polyhedral convex set. Finally, we present three analytic examples to illustrate our local convergence result of the ADMM scheme (3).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents preliminaries that will be used in this paper. Section 3 discusses the strong variational sufficiency of Problem (1). Section 4 establishes the convergence of ADMM scheme (3). Section 5 presents three illustrative examples. Finally, we conclude this paper in Section 6.

## 2 Notation and Preliminaries

**Notation.** The set of extended real numbers is denoted by  $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ . For a function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , the classical directional derivative at  $x$  along  $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $\varphi'(x; d)$ . The set of the global minimizers of  $\varphi$  is denoted by  $\operatorname{argmin} \varphi := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \varphi(x) = \inf_z \varphi(z)\}$ . The conjugate function of  $\varphi$  is denoted by  $\varphi^*$ , and  $\operatorname{dom} \varphi := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \varphi(x) < \infty\}$ . In addition,  $\partial\varphi$ ,  $\nabla\varphi$  and  $\nabla^2\varphi$  denote the subdifferential, the gradient and the Hessian of  $\varphi$  respectively wherever they exist. For a nonempty set  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\delta_C$  denotes the indicator function of  $C$ ,  $P_C$  denotes the projection operator of  $C$ ,  $T_C(x)$  and  $N_C(x)$  denote the tangent cone and normal cone of  $C$  at  $x \in C$  respectively,  $\operatorname{aff}_C$  denotes the smallest affine space that contains the set  $C$  and  $V_C := \operatorname{aff}_C - x$  for any  $x \in C$ ,  $\operatorname{conv}(C)$  denotes the smallest convex set that contains the set  $C$ . For a cone  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , its polar cone is defined as  $C^\circ := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid w^\top v \leq 0, \forall v \in C\}$ . For symmetric matrices  $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $A \succeq B$  means that  $T := A - B$  is positive semidefinite.

**Preliminaries.** For Problem (1), it holds that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\partial(g(Ax) + \delta_C(x)) = \partial\delta_C(x) + A^\top \partial g(Ax), \quad (5)$$

from [27, Theorem 23.8 and 23.9]. Furthermore, suppose that  $\bar{x}$  is a local minimum point of Problem (1), by (5) and [3, Theorem 3.72], there exists a multiplier  $\bar{\lambda}$  such that

$$0 \in \partial\delta_C(\bar{x}) + \nabla f(\bar{x}) + A^\top \bar{\lambda}, \quad \bar{\lambda} \in \partial g(A\bar{x}). \quad (6)$$

For function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , its Moreau envelope function is defined as

$$M_\varphi^\mu(x) := \inf_y \varphi(y) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|y - x\|^2,$$

where constant  $\mu > 0$ , and its proximal mapping is defined by

$$\text{prox}_{\mu\varphi}(x) := \arg \min_y \varphi(y) + \frac{1}{2\mu} \|y - x\|^2.$$

**Proposition 1** ([13, Proposition 6]). *Let  $\mu > 0$  and  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  be a proper closed convex function, then for every  $w \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , there exists a unique pair  $(u_w, \lambda^w)$  satisfying*

$$w = u_w + \mu\lambda^w, \quad u_w \in \text{dom } \varphi, \quad \lambda^w \in \partial g(u_w),$$

where  $u_w = \text{prox}_{\mu\varphi}(w)$  and  $\mu\lambda^w = \text{prox}_{(\mu\varphi)^*}(w)$ .

By Proposition 1 and [3, Theorem 4.20], for a proper closed convex function  $\varphi$ , it holds for any  $\mu > 0$  that

$$\begin{aligned} x \in \partial\varphi^*(\lambda) &\iff \lambda \in \partial\varphi(x) \\ &\iff \lambda = \nabla M_\varphi^\mu(x + \mu\lambda) \\ &\iff x = \text{prox}_{\mu\varphi}(x + \mu\lambda). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

A differentiable function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is convex if and only if

$$\langle \nabla\varphi(x) - \nabla\varphi(y), x - y \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Moreover, according to Rademacher's Theorem [28, Theorem 9.60], if  $\nabla\varphi$  is locally Lipschitz continuous,  $\nabla^2\varphi$  exists almost everywhere. In this case,  $\varphi$  is convex if and only if  $\nabla^2\varphi$  is positive semidefinite wherever it exists [29, Section 3]. Given a nonempty closed convex set  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , it holds that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $y \in C$ ,

$$\langle y - P_C(x), x - P_C(x) \rangle \leq 0. \tag{8}$$

A set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is called a polyhedral convex set if it can be represented as the intersection of some finite collection of closed half-spaces. That is, there exist a matrix  $c \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and a vector  $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Ax \leq b\}$ , where  $Ax \leq b$  denotes the system of inequalities  $A_i^\top x \leq b_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , where  $A_i^\top$  is the  $i$ -th row of  $A$ . In particular,  $S$  is called a convex cone if  $b = 0$ . For a given  $x \in S$ , let  $I(x) := \{i \mid A_i^\top x = 0\}$ , then tangent cone  $T_S(x) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid A_i^\top v \leq 0, i \in I(x)\}$ , and normal cone  $N_S(x) = \{\sum \lambda_i A_i^\top \mid \lambda_i \geq 0, i \in I(x)\}$  are polyhedral convex cones [28, Theorem 6.46]. A polyhedral convex function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is a convex function

whose epigraph is a polyhedral convex set. It can be equivalently described as  $\text{dom } \varphi$  is a polyhedral convex set on which  $\varphi$  is piecewise linear (affine) [27, Corollary 19.1.2]. Namely,  $\varphi$  has the form

$$\varphi(x) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{a_i^\top x + b_i\} + \delta_D(x)$$

where  $D := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Hx \leq y\}$  with some  $H \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ .

With piecewise linearity, for  $x \in \text{dom } \varphi$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the one-sided directional derivatives have the distinguishing feature as:  $\forall \rho_0 > 0$ ,  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$ , such that

$$\varphi'(x; w) = \frac{\varphi(x + tw) - \varphi(x)}{t}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\|w\| < \rho_0$ ,  $t < \varepsilon$ . In addition,  $\partial\varphi(x)$  is a polyhedral set [27, Theorem 23.10], and if  $\varphi'(x; w) < \infty$ , there exists  $\lambda(w) \in \partial\varphi(x)$  such that  $\varphi'(x; w) = \langle \lambda, w \rangle$ . Moreover, it holds that  $\forall \rho_0 > 0$ ,  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$ , such that if  $\eta \in T_{\partial\varphi(x)}(\lambda)$  with  $\|\eta\| < \rho_0$ , and  $t < \varepsilon$ , then

$$\lambda + t\eta \in \partial\varphi(x), \quad (10)$$

The conjugate function  $\varphi^*$  of  $\varphi$  is also a polyhedral convex function [27, Theorem 19.2], and it holds that

$$T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda) = [N_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda)]^o = [T_{\partial g^*(\lambda)}(y)]^o. \quad (11)$$

Let

$$T_\varphi(x \mid \lambda) := \{w \mid \varphi'(x; w) = \langle \lambda, w \rangle\}, \quad (12)$$

$$T_{\varphi^*}(\lambda \mid x) := \{\eta \mid \varphi^{*\prime}(\lambda; \eta) = \langle x, \eta \rangle\}. \quad (13)$$

Note that  $\lambda \in \partial\varphi(x)$  plays the role of a "gradient" restricted to the convex cone  $T_\varphi(x \mid \lambda)$ . Clearly, it is possible that  $T_\varphi(x \mid \lambda) = \{0\}$ . For example, if  $\varphi(x) := x$  with  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $T_\varphi(0 \mid \frac{1}{2}) = \{0\}$ . For a polyhedral convex function  $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , by  $\lambda \in \partial\varphi(x) \iff x \in \partial\varphi^*(\lambda)$  and (9), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} T_\varphi(x \mid \lambda) &= \{w \mid \lambda \in \partial\varphi(x + tw) \text{ for small } t > 0\} = T_{\partial\varphi^*(\lambda)}(x), \\ T_{\varphi^*}(\lambda \mid x) &= \{\eta \mid x \in \partial\varphi^*(\lambda + t\eta) \text{ for small } t > 0\} = T_{\partial\varphi(x)}(\lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Through the relations in (14), the tangent cones  $T_{\partial\varphi^*(\lambda)}(x)$  and  $T_{\partial\varphi(x)}(\lambda)$  can be characterized by  $T_\varphi(x \mid \lambda)$  and  $T_{\varphi^*}(\lambda \mid x)$  respectively, a representation that can be more accessible.

The following error bound result plays a fundamental role in our linear convergence rate analysis.

**Proposition 2** ([39, Theorem 3.3]). *Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$  be a piecewise linear multifunction. For any  $\kappa > 0$ , there exists  $\eta > 0$  such that*

$$\text{dist}(u, T^{-1}(0)) \leq \text{dist}(0, T(u)), \quad \forall \|u\| \leq \kappa.$$

The speed of convergence is characterized by using the notions of Q-linear and R-linear rates. A sequence  $\{z^k\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^b$  converging to  $z^* \in \mathbb{R}^b$  is said to converge Q-linearly (quotient-linear) if there exists a constant  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|z^{k+1} - z^*\|}{\|z^k - z^*\|} \leq \rho.$$

It converges R-linearly (root-linear) if there exists a sequence  $\{\varepsilon_k\}$  converging Q-linearly to zero such that  $\|z^k - z^*\| \leq \varepsilon_k$  for all sufficiently large  $k$ , or equivalently, if  $\|z^k - z^*\| \leq C\rho^k$  for some  $C > 0$  and  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ .

### 3 Strong Variational Sufficiency for Problem (1)

In this section, we extend the strong variational sufficiency defined in [29, Theorem 1] to Problem (1), and show that it holds under mild assumptions. To this end, we first introduce the reduced augmented Lagrangian function  $l_\beta(x, \lambda) : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  of Problem (1) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} l_\beta(x, \lambda) &:= \min_y L_\beta(x, y, \lambda) \\ &= f(x) + M_g^{1/\beta} \left( Ax + \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \right) + \delta_C(x) - \frac{1}{2\beta} \|\lambda\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The definition of strong variational sufficiency for Problem (1) is formally stated below.

**Definition 1.** Let  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$  satisfy the first-order optimal condition (6). We say the strong variational sufficiency for Problem (1) holds with respect to  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  if, for sufficiently large  $\beta \geq 0$ , there exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$  of  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  such that the reduced Lagrangian  $l_\beta$  is strongly convex in  $x$  when  $\lambda \in \Lambda_\beta$  and concave in  $\lambda$  when  $x \in \mathcal{X}_\beta$ .

**Corollary 3.** *Assume that the strong variational sufficiency for Problem (1) holds with respect to  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  with  $\beta > 0$  and  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$ . If  $(x^*, \lambda^*)$  is a saddle point of  $l_\beta(x, \lambda)$  relative to  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$ , then  $x^* = \bar{x}$ .*

*Proof* By the relationship (7), the first-order optimal condition (6) can be equivalently reformulated as

$$0 \in \partial_x l_\beta(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda}), \quad 0 \in \partial_\lambda [-l_\beta](\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda}). \quad (16)$$

Hence,  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  is a saddle point of  $l_\beta(x, \lambda)$  relative to  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$ . By the definition of saddle point, it holds that

$$l_\beta(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda}) \leq l_\beta(x^*, \bar{\lambda}) \leq l_\beta(x^*, \lambda^*) \leq l_\beta(\bar{x}, \lambda^*) \leq l_\beta(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda}),$$

which implies that  $l_\beta(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda}) = l_\beta(x^*, \bar{\lambda})$ . Since  $l_\beta(x, \bar{\lambda})$  is strongly convex in  $x$ , it follows that  $\bar{x} = x^*$ .

To establish the strong variational sufficiency, we shall prove the local strong convexity of the Moreau envelope  $M_g^\mu$  by Lemma 4, Lemma 5 and Proposition 6. Although this result is implicitly implied by [29, Theorem 4], the proof therein make extensive use of abstract concepts from convex analysis, and is thus somewhat inaccessible to many readers. In contrast, our proof exploits the intrinsic structure of a polyhedral convex function and only uses elementary principles, making itself accessible to a broader audience.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  be a polyhedral convex function, and  $\mu > 0$ . If  $y \in \text{dom } g$ ,  $\lambda \in \partial g(y)$ , then for all  $\rho_0 > 0$ , there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$ , such that if  $\|w\| < \rho_0$ ,  $t < \varepsilon$ ,*

$$\nabla M_g^\mu(y + \mu\lambda + tw) = \lambda + \frac{t}{\mu} P_{T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda)}[w].$$

*Proof* Suppose that

$$g(y) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{a_i^\top y + b_i\} + \delta_D(y),$$

where  $D := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid By \leq b\}$  with some  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Hence, for  $y \in D$ ,

$$\partial g(y) = \text{conv}\{a_j \mid j \in J(y)\} + \partial \delta_D(y),$$

where  $J(y) = \{i \mid a_i^\top y + b_i = g(y)\}$ . Moreover, for given  $\rho_0 > 0$ , there exists  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ , such that  $y + tw \in D$  and

$$g(y + tw) > a_i^\top (y + tw) + b_i, \quad i \notin J$$

when  $w \in T_D(y)$ ,  $\|w\| < \rho_0$ ,  $t < \varepsilon_{\rho_0}$ . Note that

$$N_D(y) = \partial \delta_D(y)$$

and  $\delta_D(y + tw) = \sup_{v \in N_D(y)} v^\top (tw)$ , then for any  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\|w\| < \rho_0$ ,  $t < \varepsilon_{\rho_0}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} g(y + tw) &= \max_{j \in J} a_j^\top (y + tw) + b_j + \delta_D(y + tw) \\ &= [\max_{j \in J} ta_j^\top w + \delta_D(y + tw)] + g(y) \\ &= [\max_{\lambda \in \partial g(y)} t\bar{\lambda}^\top w] + g(y). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

For  $\lambda \in \partial g(y)$ , from (10), there exists  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{\rho_0} > 0$ , such that if  $\|w\| < \rho_0$ , and  $0 \leq \hat{t} < \hat{\varepsilon}_{\rho_0}$ , it holds that

$$\lambda + \hat{t} P_{T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda)}[w] \in \partial g(y). \tag{18}$$

For  $w$  with  $\|w\| < \rho_0$ , let  $\tilde{w} := w - P_{T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda)}[w]$ , then  $\|\tilde{w}\| \leq \|w\|$  and for any  $\bar{\lambda} \in \partial g(y)$ ,

$$\tilde{w}^\top (\bar{\lambda} - \lambda - \hat{t} P_{T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda)}[w]) \leq 0,$$

which comes from (8) with  $\bar{\lambda} - \lambda \in T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda)$ . Combining this, (17) and (18),

$$g(y + t\tilde{w}) = t(\lambda + \hat{t} P_{T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda)}[w])^\top \tilde{w} + g(y), \tag{19}$$

which (by the convexity of  $g$ ) yields that

$$\lambda + \hat{t} P_{T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda)}[w] \in \partial g(y + t\tilde{w}). \tag{20}$$

Let  $t := \hat{t}\mu$  with  $\hat{t} \leq \min\{\hat{\varepsilon}_{\rho_0}, \varepsilon_{\rho_0}/\mu\}$ , then by (7) and (20), we have

$$\nabla M_g^\mu(y + \mu\lambda + tw) = \lambda + \frac{t}{\mu} P_{T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda)}[w].$$

The previous lemma leads to a characterization of points where  $M_g^\mu$  is twice differentiable.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  be a polyhedral convex function. Assume that  $x \in \text{dom } \varphi$ , then the following statements hold:*

(i) *if  $\lambda \in \text{ri } \partial g(y)$ , then for any  $\mu > 0$ , it holds that*

$$\nabla^2 M_g^\mu(y + \mu\lambda) = \frac{1}{\mu} P_{V_{\partial g(y)}}, \quad (21)$$

(ii) *if there exists  $\mu > 0$  such that (21) holds, then  $\lambda \in \text{ri } \partial g(y)$ .*

*Proof* We first prove item (i). Let  $\mu > 0$  be given. By Lemma 4, for any  $\rho_0 > 0$ , there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that when  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\|w\| < \rho_0$ ,  $0 \leq t < \varepsilon$ ,

$$\nabla M_g^\mu(y + \mu\lambda + tw) = \lambda + \frac{t}{\mu} P_{T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda)}[w]. \quad (22)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\nabla M_g^\mu(y + \mu\lambda + tw) - \nabla M_g^\mu(y + \mu\lambda)}{t} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu} P_{T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda)}[w]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

As this convergence is locally uniform,  $\nabla^2 M_g^\mu(y + \mu\lambda)$  exists if and only if  $T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda) = V_{\partial g(y)}$ . Since  $T_{\partial g(y)}(\lambda) = V_{\partial g(y)}$  is equivalent to  $\lambda \in \text{ri } \partial g(y)$ , item (i) holds.

On the other hand, let  $\mu > 0$  such that (21) holds. Then item (ii) holds from (21) and (23).

Using Lemma 5 and the Moreau decomposition (Proposition 1), i.e., for any  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $w = y + \mu\lambda$  with  $y = \text{prox}_{\mu g}(w)$  and  $\lambda \in \partial g(y)$ , we now derive a lower bound of  $\nabla^2 M_g^\mu(w)$  if it exists.

**Proposition 6.** *Suppose that  $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is a polyhedral convex function and  $\mu > 0$ . Let  $\bar{w} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be given, admitting the decomposition  $\bar{w} = \bar{y} + \mu\bar{\lambda}$  where  $\bar{y} = \text{prox}_{\mu g}(\bar{w})$  and  $\bar{\lambda} \in \partial g(\bar{y})$ . Then, there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{w}$  such that for any  $w \in U$ , if  $\nabla M_g^\mu$  is differentiable at  $w$ , then the following inequality holds:*

$$\nabla^2 M_g^\mu(w) \succeq \frac{1}{\mu} (I - P_{S(\bar{y}|\bar{\lambda})}), \quad (24)$$

where

$$S(\bar{y} | \bar{\lambda}) = T_g(\bar{y} | \bar{\lambda}) - T_g(\bar{y} | \bar{\lambda})$$

is the smallest subspace containing the tangent cone  $T_g(\bar{y} | \bar{\lambda})$ .

*Proof* Since  $g^*$  is also a polyhedral convex function [27, Theorem 19.2], by (9), there exists a neighborhood  $\Lambda$  of  $\bar{\lambda}$  such that

$$\partial g^*(\lambda) \subseteq \partial g^*(\bar{\lambda}), \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda. \quad (25)$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\partial g^*(\lambda)}(y) &\subseteq T_{\partial g^*(\bar{\lambda})}(y) \\ &\subseteq T_{\partial g^*(\bar{\lambda})}(\bar{y}) - T_{\partial g^*(\bar{\lambda})}(\bar{y}) \\ &= V_{\partial g^*(\bar{\lambda})}, \end{aligned}$$

which by (14) can be equivalently reformulated as

$$T_g(y \mid \lambda) \subseteq T_g(y \mid \bar{\lambda}) \subseteq S(\bar{y} \mid \bar{\lambda}) = V_{\partial g^*(\bar{\lambda})}. \quad (26)$$

Note that  $\lambda(w) := \text{prox}_{(\mu g)^*}(w)/\mu \in \Lambda$  is continuous with respect to  $w$ . Hence, there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{w}$  such that for any  $w \in U$ ,  $\lambda(w) \in \Lambda$ . By Proposition 1, this together with (7) and (25) yields that

$$y(w) \in \partial g^*(\lambda(w)) \subseteq \partial g^*(\bar{\lambda}),$$

where  $y(w) = \text{prox}_{\mu g}(w) = w - \mu\lambda(w)$ . Invoking Lemma 5, if  $\nabla M_g^\mu$  is differentiable at  $w$ , then

$$T_{\partial g(y(w))}(\lambda(w)) = V_{\partial g(y(w))},$$

and  $\nabla^2 M_g^\mu(w) = \frac{1}{\mu} P_{V_{\partial g(y(w))}}$ . Therefore, by this and (11), it holds that

$$\nabla^2 M_g^\mu(w) = \frac{1}{\mu} (I - P_{T_g(y \mid \lambda)}).$$

Combining it with (26), we complete the proof.

Note that for a given nonempty convex set  $C$ ,  $\text{aff}(C)$  is the smallest affine space that contains  $C$ , and  $\text{aff}(C) - x = \text{aff}(C) - y$  for any  $x, y \in C$ . Hence, we define  $V_C := \text{aff}(C) - x$  where  $x$  is an arbitrary point in  $C$ .

*Assumption 1.*

- (i) Pair  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  satisfies the first-order optimal condition (6).
- (ii) There exists a neighborhood  $U_{\bar{x}}$  of  $\bar{x}$  on which  $\nabla^2 f(x)$  exists and is continuous. Moreover,  $\nabla^2 f(\bar{x})$  positive definite relative to the subspace  $V_C \cap S_A(\bar{x} \mid \bar{\lambda})$  where

$$S_A(\bar{x} \mid \bar{\lambda}) := \{v \mid Av \in S(A\bar{x} \mid \bar{\lambda})\}.$$

Next, by leveraging Proposition 6, we derive that the strong variational sufficiency for Problem (1) holds with respect to  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  satisfying Assumption 1.

**Proposition 7.** *Assume that  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  satisfies Assumption 1. Then, the strong variational sufficiency for Problem (1) holds with respect to  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$ .*

*Proof* Let  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$  satisfy  $P_{S(A\bar{x} \mid \bar{\lambda})} = QQ^\top$ , and let  $P := I - QQ^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ . By the property of  $f$  assumed in Assumption 1 (ii), there exists  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that  $\nabla^2 f(\bar{x}) + \beta_0 A^\top P A$  is positive definite relative to the subspace  $V_C$ . Hence, by the continuity of  $\nabla^2 f$ , there exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{X}_1$  of  $\bar{x}$  on which

$$F_{\beta_0} := f(x) + \frac{\beta_0}{2} x^\top A^\top P A x + \delta_C(x)$$

is strongly convex.

On the other hand, by Proposition 6, there exists a neighborhood  $U_{\bar{w}}$  around  $\bar{w} := A\bar{x} + \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\beta}$  such that  $\nabla^2 M_g^{1/\beta}(w) \succeq \beta P$  for any  $w \in U_{\bar{w}}$  if  $\nabla^2 M_g^{1/\beta}(w)$  exists. By continuity, there exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{X} \times \Lambda_\beta$  of  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  such that for any  $(x, \lambda) \in \mathcal{X} \times \Lambda_\beta$ ,  $w := Ax + \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \in U_{\bar{w}}$ . For a given  $\lambda \in \Lambda_\beta$ , the mapping  $x \mapsto \nabla M_g^{1/\beta}(Ax + \frac{\lambda}{\beta})$  is Lipschitz continuous. Therefore, by Rademacher's Theorem [28, Theorem 9.60], the Hessian  $\nabla^2 M_g^{1/\beta}(Ax + \frac{\lambda}{\beta})$  exists almost everywhere on  $\mathcal{X}$ . It follows that for any  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ ,  $M_g^{1/\beta}(Ax + \frac{\lambda}{\beta}) - \frac{\beta_0}{2} x^\top A^\top P A x$  is convex on  $\mathcal{X}$  [29, Section 3].

Let  $\mathcal{X}_\beta := \mathcal{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Then, for any  $\lambda \in \Lambda_\beta$ ,  $l_\beta(x, \lambda)$  is strongly convex on  $\mathcal{X}_\beta$ . As

$$M_g^{1/\beta}(Ax + \frac{\lambda}{\beta}) - \frac{1}{2\beta} \|\lambda\|^2 = \sup_z \langle Ax, z \rangle - g^*(z) - \frac{1}{2\beta} \|z - \lambda\|^2,$$

$l_\beta(x, \lambda)$  is concave on  $\Lambda_\beta$  for any  $x$ .

## 4 Local Convergence Analysis

In this section, we establish the local convergence of ADMM scheme (3) for Problem (2) under Assumption 1. Our analysis proceeds in two main steps. First, we derive a key inequality whose structure is similar to those obtained in the analysis of classical ADMM for convex problems. Subsequently, building upon this fundamental inequality and local duality established in Proposition 7, we prove the local convergence of the sequence generated by ADMM scheme (3).

**Proposition 8.** *Let  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  satisfy Assumption 1, and let  $\beta_0 > 0$  be chosen such that  $(\nabla^2 f(\bar{x}) + \beta_0 A^\top P A)$  is positive definite relative to subspace  $V_C$ . Then, for any  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ , there exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$  of  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  with the following property: if  $y^k \in \text{dom } g$ ,  $\lambda^k \in \Lambda_\beta \cap \partial g(y^k)$  and  $x^{k+1}$  generated by (3a) lies in  $\mathcal{X}_\beta$ , then the subsequent iterate  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})$  generated by (3) satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & l_{\beta_0}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^*) - l_{\beta_0}(\bar{x}, \lambda^*) + \frac{\theta\beta - \beta_0}{2} (x^{k+1} - \bar{x})^\top A^\top P A (x^{k+1} - \bar{x}) \\ & \leq \frac{\beta}{2} (\|y^k - \bar{y}\|^2 - \|y^{k+1} - \bar{y}\|^2) + \frac{1}{2\beta} (\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2) \\ & \quad - \frac{\beta}{2} \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 - \frac{(1-\theta)\beta - \beta_0}{2\beta^2} \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where  $(\bar{x}, \lambda^*)$  is any saddle point of  $l_{\beta_0}(x, \lambda)$  defined in (15) relative to  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$ ,  $\theta \in [0, 1]$  and  $\bar{y} = A\bar{x}$ .

*Proof* By Proposition 7, there exists  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that for any  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ , there exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$  of  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  on which the reduced Lagrangian  $l_\beta(x, \lambda)$  is strongly convex in  $x$  and concave in  $\lambda$ . For given  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ , by the relationship (7), the first-order optimal condition (6) can be equivalently reformulated as

$$0 \in \partial_x l_\beta(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda}), \quad 0 \in \partial_\lambda [-l_\beta](\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda}). \quad (28)$$

Therefore,  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  is a saddle point of  $l_\beta(x, \lambda)$  relative to  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$ . Moreover,  $F_{\beta_0}$  is strongly convex in  $\mathcal{X}_\beta$  as shown in Proposition 7. Then, by the optimality condition of (3a), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f(x^{k+1}) + \langle \lambda^k, Ax^{k+1} \rangle + \frac{\beta_0}{2} x^{k+1 \top} A^\top P A x^{k+1} \\ & \leq f(\bar{x}) + \langle \lambda^k, A\bar{x} \rangle + \frac{\beta_0}{2} \bar{x}^\top A^\top P A \bar{x} \\ & \quad + \langle \beta_0 A^\top P A x^{k+1} + \beta A^\top (Ax^{k+1} - y^k), \bar{x} - x^{k+1} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

It can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} & f(x^{k+1}) + \langle \lambda^k, Ax^{k+1} \rangle - \frac{\beta_0}{2} (x^{k+1} - \bar{x})^\top A^\top P A (x^{k+1} - \bar{x}) \\ & \leq f(\bar{x}) + \langle \lambda^k, A\bar{x} \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|A\bar{x} - y^k\|^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax^{k+1} - A\bar{x}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Let  $\bar{y} := A\bar{x}$ . By the optimality condition of (3b) and the convexity of  $g$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & g(y^{k+1}) + \langle \lambda^k, -y^{k+1} \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax^{k+1} - y^{k+1}\|^2 \\ & \leq g(\bar{y}) + \langle \lambda^k, -\bar{y} \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax^{k+1} - \bar{y}\|^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} \|y^{k+1} - \bar{y}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

On the other hand, by (3b) and (3c), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & g(y^{k+1}) + \langle \lambda^k, Ax^{k+1} - y^{k+1} \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax^{k+1} - y^{k+1}\|^2 \\ & = M_g^{1/\beta} (Ax^{k+1} + \frac{\lambda^k}{\beta}) - \frac{1}{2\beta} \|\lambda^k\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

and

$$\lambda^{k+1} = \nabla M_g^{1/\beta} (Ax^{k+1} + \frac{\lambda^k}{\beta}) \in \partial g(y^{k+1}). \quad (32)$$

By Proposition 7, there exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$  of  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  such that for  $\lambda^k \in \Lambda_\beta$ , the function

$$G_\beta := M_g^{1/\beta} (Ax + \frac{\lambda^k}{\beta}) - \frac{\beta}{2} x^\top A^\top P A x$$

is convex on  $\mathcal{X}_\beta$ . Hence, using (32) and the fact that  $x \in \mathcal{X}_\beta$ , we have

$$G_\beta(x^{k+1}, \lambda^k) - G_\beta(\bar{x}, \lambda^k) \quad (33)$$

$$\leq -\langle A^\top \lambda^{k+1} - \beta A^\top P A x^{k+1}, \bar{x} - x^{k+1} \rangle. \quad (34)$$

By Combining formulas (31) and (33) with

$$\begin{aligned} & M_g^{1/\beta} (A\bar{x} + \frac{\lambda^k}{\beta}) - \frac{1}{2\beta} \|\lambda^k\|^2 \\ & \leq g(\bar{y}) + \langle \lambda^k, A\bar{x} - \bar{y} \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|A\bar{x} - \bar{y}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & g(y^{k+1}) + \langle \lambda^k, -y^{k+1} \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax^{k+1} - y^{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} (x^{k+1} - \bar{x})^\top A^\top P A (x^{k+1} - \bar{x}) \\ & \leq g(\bar{y}) + \langle \lambda^k, -\bar{y} \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|Ax^{k+1} - \bar{y}\|^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} \|y^{k+1} - \bar{y}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\beta} \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

As  $g$  is convex,  $\lambda^k \in \partial g(y^k)$ , and  $\lambda^{k+1} \in \partial g(y^{k+1})$ , we have

$$\|Ax^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{\beta^2} \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2 + \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|^2.$$

Furthermore, multiplying both sides of equation (30) by  $(1 - \theta)$  and both sides of equation (35) by  $\theta$  with  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , and adding them with equation (29), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & L_\beta(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}, \lambda^k) + \frac{\theta\beta - \beta_0}{2} (x^{k+1} - \bar{x})^\top A^\top PA(x^{k+1} - \bar{x}) \\ & \leq f(\bar{x}) + g(\bar{y}) + \frac{\beta}{2} (\|y^k - \bar{y}\|^2 - \|y^{k+1} - \bar{y}\|^2) \\ & \quad - \frac{1 - \theta}{2\beta} \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Let  $(\bar{x}, \lambda^*)$  be a saddle point of  $l_{\beta_0}$  relative to  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$ . Then, we have

$$l_{\beta_0}(\bar{x}, \lambda^*) = f(\bar{x}) + g(A\bar{x}) = f(\bar{x}) + g(\bar{y}). \quad (37)$$

Finally, Combining equations (36), (37), and

$$\begin{aligned} & l_{\beta_0}(x^{k+1}, \lambda^*) \\ & \leq f(x^{k+1}) + g(y^{k+1}) + \langle \lambda^*, Ax^{k+1} - y^{k+1} \rangle + \frac{\beta_0}{2} \|Ax^{k+1} - y^{k+1}\|^2 \\ & = L_\beta(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}, \lambda^k) + \frac{\beta_0}{2\beta^2} \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\beta} (\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

we obtain (27).

Based on Proposition 8, we now present the local convergence result for the ADMM scheme (3) applied to Problem (2).

**Proposition 9.** *Assume that  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  satisfies Assumption 1. Let the sequence  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})$  be generated by ADMM scheme (3). Then, there exists  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that for any  $\beta > 2\beta_0$ , there exists a closed neighborhood  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$  of  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  with the following property: if the initial pair  $(y^0, \lambda^0)$  satisfies*

$$\lambda^0 \in \Lambda_\beta \cap \partial g(y^0), \quad B(\bar{\lambda}, r) \subset \Lambda_\beta \quad (38)$$

where  $r^2 = \beta^2 \|y^0 - A\bar{x}\|^2 + \|\lambda^0 - \bar{\lambda}\|^2$ , and  $x^k \in \mathcal{X}_\beta$  for all  $k \geq 1$ , then the sequence  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})$  converges to  $(\bar{x}, A\bar{x}, \lambda^*)$ , where

$$\lambda^* \in \mathcal{M}^* := \{\lambda \in \Lambda_\beta \mid \partial_x l_\beta(\bar{x}, \lambda) = 0, \quad \partial_\lambda l_\beta(\bar{x}, \lambda) = 0\}.$$

*Proof* Using Proposition 8 with  $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$  in (27), there exists  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that for any  $\beta > 2\beta_0$ , there exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$  of  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  such that if both  $x^{k+1}$  and  $x^k$  belong to  $\mathcal{X}_\beta$ , and the pair  $(y^k, \lambda^k)$  satisfies (38), then the pair  $(y^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})$  also satisfies (38). Therefore, by induction, if the initial pair  $(y^0, \lambda^0)$  satisfies (38), then for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the iterates  $(x^k, y^k, \lambda^k)$  generated by ADMM scheme (3) have the following properties, provided that  $x^k$  generated by (3a) belongs to  $\mathcal{X}_\beta$ : (i) the pair  $(y^k, \lambda^k)$  satisfies (38) and the inequality (27) holds with  $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ . By Proposition 7, for any  $\lambda \in \Lambda_\beta$ ,  $l_{\beta_0}(x, \lambda)$  is strongly convex, and hence there exists  $\sigma > 0$  such that

$$l_{\beta_0}(x, \lambda^*) - l_{\beta_0}(\bar{x}, \lambda^*) \geq \frac{\sigma}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2,$$

where  $(\bar{x}, \lambda^*)$  is any saddle point of  $l_{\beta_0}(x, \lambda)$  relative to  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$ . It follows from (27) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sigma}{2} \|x^{k+1} - \bar{x}\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\beta}{2} (\|y^k - \bar{y}\|^2 - \|y^{k+1} - \bar{y}\|^2) + \frac{1}{2\beta} (\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2 - \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2) \\ & \quad - \frac{\beta}{2} \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 - \frac{2\beta - 2\beta_0}{4\beta^2} \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

By summing (39) over  $k = 0, \dots, K$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sigma}{2} \sum_{k=0}^K \|x^{k+1} - \bar{x}\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\beta - 2\beta_0}{4\beta^2} \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\beta}{2} \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \|y_0 - \bar{y}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\beta} \|\lambda^0 - \lambda^*\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Letting  $K \rightarrow \infty$  yields that

$$\|x^{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \|y^{k+1} - y^k\| \rightarrow 0.$$

Since  $\lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k + \beta(Ax^{k+1} - y^{k+1})$ , we have

$$\|y^{k+1} - \bar{y}\| \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\| + \|Ax^{k+1} - A\bar{x}\|,$$

which implies that  $y^k \rightarrow \bar{y} = A\bar{x}$ . Next, we prove that the limit of sequence  $\{\lambda^k\}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{M}^*$ . By the optimality conditions of iterative scheme (3), we know that any cluster point  $\hat{\lambda}$  of  $\{\lambda^k\}$  satisfies

$$\partial_x l_\beta(\bar{x}, \hat{\lambda}) = 0, \quad \partial_\lambda l_\beta(\bar{x}, \hat{\lambda}) = 0,$$

namely,  $(\bar{x}, \hat{\lambda})$  is a saddle point of  $l_{\beta_0}(x, \lambda)$  relative to  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$  and then  $\hat{\lambda} \in \mathcal{M}^*$ . As  $y^k \rightarrow \bar{y}$  and for any  $\lambda^* \in \mathcal{M}^*$ , the sequence  $\frac{\beta}{2} \|y^k - \bar{y}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\beta} \|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2$  is decreasing, we conclude that  $\{\lambda^k\}$  converges and its limit belongs to  $\mathcal{M}^*$ .

Next, we prove the local linear convergence of the ADMM scheme (3) for the case where  $C$  is a polyhedral convex set. Suppose that  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  satisfying Assumption 1. Let  $u := (x, y, \lambda)$  and define the multifunction  $T: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^l \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^l$  by:

$$T(u) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(\bar{x}) + \nabla^2 f(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) + A^\top \lambda + N_C(x) \\ \partial g(y) - \lambda \\ Ax - y \end{bmatrix}. \quad (41)$$

Then, by Corollary 3 and Proposition 7, we obtain a subset of  $T^{-1}(0)$ .

**Lemma 10.** *Assume that  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  satisfies Assumption 1. Let  $\beta > 0$  and  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$  as stated in Proposition 9. Then, it holds that*

$$T^{-1}(0) \cap \mathcal{X}_\beta \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \Lambda_\beta = \{\bar{x}\} \times \{A\bar{x}\} \times \mathcal{M}^*. \quad (42)$$

*Proof* Let

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{l}_\beta(x, \lambda) := & \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}), x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle x - \bar{x}, \nabla^2 f(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) \rangle \\ & + M_g^{1/\beta} (Ax + \frac{\lambda}{\beta}) + \delta_C(x) - \frac{1}{2\beta} \|\lambda\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{N}$  denote the set of saddle points of  $\hat{l}_\beta$ . Then, by the definition of  $T$  and (7), we have

$$\mathcal{N} = \{(x, \lambda) \mid (x, Ax, \lambda) \in T^{-1}(0) \cap \mathcal{X}_\beta \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \Lambda_\beta\}.$$

By an argument similar to the proof of Proposition 7,  $\hat{l}_\beta(x, \lambda)$  is strongly convex in  $x$  when  $\lambda \in \Lambda_\beta$  and concave in  $\lambda$  when  $x \in \mathcal{X}_\beta$ . From condition (6),  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  is a saddle point of  $\hat{l}_\beta$  relative to  $\mathcal{X}_\beta \times \Lambda_\beta$ . Moreover, with an argument similar to the proof of Corollary 3, we deduce that  $\mathcal{N} = \{\bar{x}\} \times \mathcal{M}^*$ , and then (42) holds.

By the optimal conditions of the subproblems of ADMM scheme (3), we obtain the estimate of  $\text{dist}(0, T(u^k))$ .

**Lemma 11.** *Assume that  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  satisfies Assumption 1. Let the sequence  $u^{k+1} := (x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})$  be generated by ADMM scheme (3) under the conditions of Proposition 9. Then, for any  $\gamma > 0$ , there exists  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $k \geq K$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}^2(0, T(u^{k+1})) \leq & 2\beta^2 \|A\|^2 \|y^{k+1} - y^k\|^2 \\ & + 2\gamma^2 \|x^{k+1} - \bar{x}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta^2} \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

*Proof* By the optimal conditions of the subproblems of ADMM scheme (3), we have

$$T(u^{k+1}) = \begin{bmatrix} \beta A^\top (y^k - y^{k+1}) + s^{k+1} \\ 0 \\ \frac{1}{\beta} (\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k) \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$s^{k+1} = \nabla f(\bar{x}) + \nabla^2 f(\bar{x})(x^{k+1} - \bar{x}) - \nabla f(x^{k+1}).$$

By Proposition 9,  $\{x^{k+1}\}$  converges to  $\bar{x}$ , hence, for given  $\gamma > 0$ , there exists  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $k \geq K$ ,  $\|s^{k+1}\| \leq \gamma \|x^{k+1} - \bar{x}\|$ . Then, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain (43).

Based on Lemma 10 and Lemma 11, we now present the local linear convergence result for the ADMM scheme (3) applied to Problem (2).

**Proposition 12.** *Assume that  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  satisfies Assumption 1 and  $C$  is a polyhedral convex set. Let the sequence  $(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})$  be generated by ADMM scheme (3) under the conditions of Proposition 9,  $v^k := (x^k, \lambda^k)$ , and  $\Omega_v^* := \{A\bar{x}\} \times \mathcal{M}^*$ . Then,  $\text{dist}(v^k, \Omega_v^*)$  converges  $Q$ -linearly, and  $\{x^k\}$  converges  $R$ -linearly.*

*Proof* Let  $u^k := (x^k, y^k, \lambda^k)$ . By Proposition 9,  $\{u^k\}$  converges to a point in  $\Omega^*$ . Hence, by Lemma 10, there exists  $K_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $k \geq K_1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(u^{k+1}, T^{-1}(0)) &= \text{dist}(u^{k+1}, T^{-1}(0) \cap \mathcal{X}_\beta \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \Lambda_\beta) \\ &= \text{dist}(u^{k+1}, \Omega^*). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $C$  is a polyhedral convex set and  $g$  is polyhedral convex,  $T$  is a piecewise linear multifunction. By invoking Proposition 2, there exists  $\kappa_1 > 0$  such that for all  $k \geq K_1$

$$\text{dist}(u^{k+1}, \Omega^*) = \text{dist}(u^{k+1}, T^{-1}(0)) \leq \kappa_1 \text{dist}(0, T(u^{k+1})). \quad (44)$$

Let  $v^k := (y^k, \lambda^k)$  and  $\Omega_v^* := \{A\bar{x}\} \times \mathcal{M}^*$ . By (39) in Proposition 8 and (43) in Lemma 11, there exist  $K_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\kappa_2 > 0$  such that for all  $k \geq K_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}^2(0, T(u^{k+1})) &\leq \kappa_2 (\|v^k - \bar{v}^k\|^2 - \|v^{k+1} - \bar{v}^k\|^2) \\ &\leq \kappa_2 (\text{dist}^2(v^k, \Omega_v^*) - \text{dist}^2(v^{k+1}, \Omega_v^*)), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where  $\bar{v}^k \in \Omega_v^*$  satisfies that  $\text{dist}(v^k, \Omega_v^*) = \|v^k - \bar{v}^k\|$ . Combining (44) and (45), it holds that for all  $k \geq \max\{K_1, K_2\}$ ,

$$\text{dist}^2(v^{k+1}, \Omega_v^*) \leq \frac{\kappa_1^2 \kappa_2}{1 + \kappa_1^2 \kappa_2} \text{dist}^2(v^k, \Omega_v^*),$$

which implies that  $\text{dist}(v^k, \Omega_v^*)$  converges Q-linearly. Since

$$\|x^{k+1} - \bar{x}\| \leq \text{dist}(u^{k+1}, \Omega^*) \leq \kappa_1 \sqrt{\kappa_2} \text{dist}(v^k, \Omega_v^*),$$

it follows that  $\{x^{k+1}\}$  converges R-linearly.

## 5 Examples

In this section, we present three analytic examples to illustrate the local convergence result of ADMM scheme (3) for solving Problem (1). The first example demonstrates the local linear convergence of (3) under the condition specified in Assumption 1 with  $C$  being a polyhedral convex set. The second example shows that if Assumption 1 is not satisfied, we may not ensure the local convergence of ADMM scheme (3). The third example highlights that, even when Assumption 1 holds, the global convergence of ADMM scheme (3) can not be guaranteed.

**Example 1.** Consider the problem

$$\min_{x \in [-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]} -\frac{1}{2}x^2 + x. \quad (46)$$

This problem can be equivalently reformulated as Problem (2) with

$$f(x) := -\frac{1}{2}x^2, \quad g(y) := |y|, \quad A = [1], \quad C := [-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}].$$

The ADMM iterative scheme (3) in this case can be formulated explicitly as

$$x^{k+1} = \min\left\{\frac{1}{4}, \max\left\{-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{\beta y_1^k - \lambda_1^k}{\beta - 1}\right\}\right\},$$


$$\begin{aligned} y^{k+1} &= \text{prox}_{|\cdot|/\beta}(x^{k+1} + \frac{\lambda^k}{\beta}), \\ \lambda^{k+1} &= \lambda^k + \beta(x^{k+1} - y^{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\bar{x} = 0$  is the unique global minimizer of Problem (46), and the pair  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  satisfies the first-order optimal condition (6) with  $\bar{\lambda} = 0$ . Moreover,  $\nabla^2 f(\bar{x}) = -1$  satisfies Assumption 1 with the subspace  $V_C \cap S_A(\bar{x} | \bar{\lambda}) = \{0\}$ . Hence, the strong variational sufficiency holds for Problem (46) with respect to  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$ . Specifically, as

$$M_{|\cdot|}^{1/\beta}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\beta}{2}x^2, & |x| \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \\ |x| - \frac{1}{2\beta}, & |x| > \frac{1}{\beta} \end{cases}, \quad (47)$$

then for any  $\beta > 2$ ,  $l_\beta(x, \lambda)$  is  $(\beta - 1)$  strongly convex in  $x$  when  $\lambda \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$  and is concave in  $\lambda$  when  $x \in [-\frac{1}{2\beta}, \frac{1}{2\beta}]$ .

The figure 1 displays the average results over 50 independent runs with random initial points  $(y^0, \lambda^0)$  satisfying  $\beta^2 \|y^0\|^2 + \|\lambda^0\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$  for different  $\beta > 2$ . This figure clearly shows that the ADMM iteration (3) converges linearly in this case, which aligns with the local linear convergence guarantee of Proposition 12. Notably, this convergence is not covered by the existing ADMM convergence results, as the problem is nonconvex and  $C \neq \mathbb{R}$ .



**Fig. 1**  $s_k := \|x^k - \bar{x}\| + \|y^k - A\bar{x}\| + \|\lambda^k - \bar{\lambda}\|$  (in log scale) vs Iters

Next, we provide two analytic examples to show the tightness of our local convergence analysis.

**Example 2.** Consider the problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} x_1 \cos(x_2) + |x_1|. \quad (48)$$

This problem can be equivalently reformulated as Problem (2) with

$$f(x_1, x_2) := x_1 \cos(x_2), \quad g(y) := |y|,$$

and

$$A := [1, 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 2}, \quad C := \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Note that the global minimizers of Problem (48) form a set as  $P = P_1 \cup P_2$ , where

$$P_1 = \{(0, x_2) \mid x_2 \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

and

$$P_2 = \{(x_1, x_2) \mid x_2 \in \arccos(-\text{sign}(x_1)), x_1 \neq 0\},$$

where

$$\text{sign}(x_1) = \begin{cases} 1 & x_1 > 0, \\ 0 & x_1 = 0, \\ -1 & x_1 < 0. \end{cases}$$

Let  $\bar{x} := [0, 0]^\top$  and  $\bar{\lambda} := -1$ . The pair  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  satisfies the first-order optimal condition (6), but fails to satisfy Assumption 1, since  $\nabla^2 f(\bar{x})$  is not positive definite on  $S_A(\bar{x} \mid \bar{\lambda}) = \mathbb{R}^2$ . In this case, the sequence generated by (3) may diverge. Specifically, for any given  $\beta > 0$  and the initial point  $(y^0, \lambda^0) = (A\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda}) = (0, -1)$ , we obtain a divergent sequence, where  $(x_1^{2k}, y^{2k}, \lambda^{2k}) = (-\frac{2}{\beta}, 0, -1)$  and  $(x_1^{2k+1}, y^{2k+1}, \lambda^{2k+1}) = (\frac{2}{\beta}, 0, 1)$ , for all  $k \geq 1$ . Hence, Assumption 1(ii) is indispensable for convergence analysis.

**Example 3.** Consider the problem

$$\min_{x \in [-1, 1]} -\frac{1}{3}|x|^3 + |x|. \quad (49)$$

This problem can be equivalently reformulated as Problem (2) with  $A := [1]$ ,  $C := [-1, 1]$ . and

$$f(x) := -\frac{1}{3}|x|^3, \quad g(y) := |y|.$$

Note that  $\bar{x} = 0$  is the unique global minimizer of Problem (49), and the pair  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$  satisfies the first-order optimal condition (6) with  $\bar{\lambda} = 0$ . Moreover,  $\nabla^2 f(\bar{x}) = 0$  satisfies Assumption 1 with the subspace  $V_C \cap S_A(\bar{x} \mid \bar{\lambda}) = \{0\}$ . Hence, the strong variational sufficiency holds for Problem (49) with respect to  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\lambda})$ . Specifically, by (47), for any  $\beta > 1$ ,  $l_\beta(x, \lambda)$  is  $(\beta - 1/\beta)$  strongly convex in  $x$  when  $\lambda \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$  and is concave in  $\lambda$  when  $x \in [-\frac{1}{2\beta}, \frac{1}{2\beta}]$ . For a given  $\beta > 1$ , if the initial point  $(y^0, \lambda^0)$  does not satisfy (38), the sequence generated by (3) for this problem may diverge. For example, let  $\beta = 2$  and take the initial point  $(y^0, \lambda^0) := (0, -1)$ . Then, we obtain a divergent sequence, where  $(x^{2k}, y^{2k}, \lambda^{2k}) = (-1, 0, -1)$  and  $(x^{2k+1}, y^{2k+1}, \lambda^{2k+1}) = (1, 0, 1)$ , for all  $k \geq 1$ . We conclude that the global convergence of ADMM scheme (3) can not be guaranteed under Assumption 1.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we studied the local convergence of the standard ADMM scheme for a class of nonconvex composite optimization problems with convex constraints, where the objective consists of a smooth (possibly nonconvex) term and a polyhedral convex nonsmooth term composed with a linear mapping. Motivated by recent developments in variational analysis, we extended the notion of strong variational sufficiency to this setting and provided an elementary, self-contained proof of the local strong convexity of the Moreau envelope associated with polyhedral convex functions. This structural property allows one to verify the strong variational sufficiency of the reduced augmented Lagrangian under mild second-order conditions and leads to a descent inequality for ADMM iterates that closely parallels the classical convex ADMM analysis. As a consequence, we established the local convergence of the ADMM scheme to a primal–dual solution for sufficiently large penalty parameters, and obtain a local linear convergence rate for the case where the constraint set is polyhedral convex.

Overall, this work clarifies the role of hidden convexity and variational structure in the local convergence of ADMM for nonconvex composite problems with constraints. It complements existing global convergence results based on KL-type arguments or error bounds, and provides a principled local theory aligned with recent advances in variational analysis. Possible directions for future research include extending the present framework to more general nonsmooth regularizers beyond the polyhedral case, investigating quantitative local convergence rates, and exploring the interaction between strong variational sufficiency and stochastic or inexact variants of ADMM arising in large-scale imaging and machine learning applications.

**Authors’ contributions.** X.-Y. Xie and Q. Li wrote the main manuscript text; all authors reviewed the manuscript.

**Conflict of interest.** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- [1] Attouch H., Bolte J., Redont P., Soubeyran A.: Proximal alternating minimization and projection methods for nonconvex problems: An approach based on the Kurdyka–Lojasiewicz inequality. *Math. Oper. Res.* **35**(2), 438–457 (2010)
- [2] Barber R.F., Sidky E.Y.: Convergence for nonconvex ADMM, with applications to CT imaging. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **25**(38), 1–46 (2024).
- [3] Beck A.: *First-Order Methods in Optimization*. SIAM, Philadelphia (2017)

- [4] Boç R.I., Nguyen D.-K.: The proximal alternating direction method of multipliers in the nonconvex setting: convergence analysis and rates. *Math. Oper. Res.* **45**(2), 682-712 (2020)
- [5] Boyd S., Parikh N., Chu E., Peleato B., Eckstein J.: Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.* **3**(1), 1-122 (2011)
- [6] Bui K., Di Z.W.: A stochastic ADMM algorithm for large-scale ptychography with weighted difference of anisotropic and isotropic total variation. *Inverse Probl.* **40**(5), 055006 (2024)
- [7] Chambolle A., Pock T.: A first-order primal-dual algorithm for convex problems with applications to imaging. *J. Math. Imaging Vis.* **40**(1), 120-145 (2011)
- [8] Chan S.H., Wang X., Elgendy O.A.: Plug-and-play ADMM for image restoration: Fixed-point convergence and applications. *IEEE Trans. Comput. Imaging* **3**(1), 84-98 (2016)
- [9] Chen C., Chan R.H., Ma S., Yang J.: Inertial proximal ADMM for linearly constrained separable convex optimization. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.* **8**(4), 2239-2267 (2015)
- [10] Chen C., He B., Ye Y., Yuan X.: The direct extension of ADMM for multi-block convex minimization problems is not necessarily convergent. *Math. Program.* **155**(1), 57-79 (2016)
- [11] Davis D., Yin W.: Faster convergence rates of relaxed Peaceman-Rachford and ADMM under regularity assumptions. *Math. Oper. Res.* **42**(3), 783-805 (2017)
- [12] Eckstein J., Bertsekas D.P.: On the Douglas—Rachford splitting method and the proximal point algorithm for maximal monotone operators. *Math. Program.* **55**(1), 293-318 (1992)
- [13] Eckstein J., Yao W.: Understanding the convergence of the alternating direction method of multipliers: Theoretical and computational perspectives. *Pac. J. Optim.* **11**(4), 619-644 (2015)
- [14] Glowinski R.: On alternating direction methods of multipliers: a historical perspective. In: *Modeling, Simulation and Optimization for Science and Technology*, pp. 59-82. Springer (2014)
- [15] Gräf M., Neumayer S., Hielscher R., Steidl G., Liesegang M., Beck T.: An image registration model in electron backscatter diffraction. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.* **15**(1), 228-260 (2022)

- [16] Han D.-R.: A survey on some recent developments of alternating direction method of multipliers. *J. Oper. Res. Soc. China* **10**(1), 1-52 (2022)
- [17] He B., Yuan X.: On the  $O(1/n)$  convergence rate of the Douglas—Rachford alternating direction method. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **50**(2), 700-709 (2012)
- [18] Hong M., Luo Z.-Q., Razaviyayn M.: Convergence analysis of alternating direction method of multipliers for a family of nonconvex problems. *SIAM J. Optim.* **26**(1), 337-364 (2016)
- [19] Hong M., Luo Z.-Q.: On the linear convergence of the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Math. Program.* **162**(1), 165-199 (2017)
- [20] Jiang B., Lin T., Ma S., Zhang S.: Structured nonconvex and nonsmooth optimization: algorithms and iteration complexity analysis. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* **72**(1), 115-157 (2019)
- [21] Jia Z., Gao X., Cai X., Han D.: Local linear convergence of the alternating direction method of multipliers for nonconvex separable optimization problems. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **188**, 1-25 (2021)
- [22] Kumar N., Sonkar M., Bhatnagar G.: Efficient image restoration via non-convex total variation regularization and ADMM optimization. *Appl. Math. Model.* **132**, 428-453 (2024)
- [23] Lanza A., Morigi S., Sgallari F.: Convex image denoising via non-convex regularization with parameter selection. *J. Math. Imaging Vis.* **56**(2), 195-220 (2016)
- [24] Li G., Pong T.K.: Global convergence of splitting methods for nonconvex composite optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.* **25**(4), 2434-2460 (2015)
- [25] Lin Z., Li H., Fang C.: *Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers for Machine Learning*. Springer, Singapore (2022)
- [26] Mancino-Ball G., Xu Y., Chen J.: A decentralized primal-dual framework for non-convex smooth consensus optimization. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* **71**, 525-538 (2023)
- [27] Rockafellar R.T.: *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, Princeton (1997)
- [28] Rockafellar R.T., Wets R.J.-B.: *Variational Analysis*. Springer, Berlin (2009)
- [29] Rockafellar R.T.: Augmented Lagrangians and hidden convexity in sufficient conditions for local optimality. *Math. Program.* **198**(1), 159-194

- (2023)
- [30] Rockafellar R.T.: Convergence of augmented Lagrangian methods in extensions beyond nonlinear programming. *Math. Program.* **199**(1), 375-420 (2023)
  - [31] Shen Z., Sun H.: Iterative adaptive nonconvex low-rank tensor approximation to image restoration based on ADMM. *J. Math. Imaging Vis.* **61**(5), 627-642 (2019)
  - [32] Sun H., Tai X.-C., Yuan J.: Efficient and convergent preconditioned ADMM for the Potts models. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **43**(2), B455-B478 (2021)
  - [33] Van Hang N.T., Sarabi E.: Convergence of augmented Lagrangian methods for composite optimization problems. *Math. Oper. Res.* **51**(1), 591-620 (2026)
  - [34] Wang F., Cao W., Xu Z.: Convergence of multi-block Bregman ADMM for nonconvex composite problems. *Sci. China Inf. Sci.* **61**(12), 122101 (2018)
  - [35] Wang Y., Yin W., Zeng J.: Global convergence of ADMM in nonconvex nonsmooth optimization. *J. Sci. Comput.* **78**, 29-63 (2019)
  - [36] Wang C., Tao M., Nagy J.G., Lou Y.: Limited-angle CT reconstruction via the  $L_1/L_2$  minimization. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.* **14**(2), 749-777 (2021)
  - [37] Yang W.H., Han D.: Linear convergence of the alternating direction method of multipliers for a class of convex optimization problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **54**(2), 625-640 (2016)
  - [38] Zhang T., Shen Z.: A fundamental proof of convergence of alternating direction method of multipliers for weakly convex optimization. *J. Inequal. Appl.* **2019**(1), 128 (2019)
  - [39] Zheng X.Y., Ng K.F.: Metric subregularity of piecewise linear multifunctions and applications to piecewise linear multiobjective optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.* **24**(1), 154-174 (2014)
  - [40] Zhou Y., Ding C., Zhang Y.: On some perturbation properties of nonsmooth optimization on Riemannian manifolds with applications (2025). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.06793>