A Spectral Bundle Method for Sparse Semidefinite Programs

Hesam Mojtahedi, Feng-Yi Liao, and Yang Zheng

Abstract— **Semidefinite programs (SDPs) have found a wide range of applications in the field of control. To improve scalability, it is important to exploit the inherent sparsity for solving SDPs. In this paper, we develop a new spectral bundle algorithm that solves sparse SDPs without introducing additional variables. We first apply the standard chordal decomposition to replace a large positive semidefinite (PSD) constraint with a set of smaller coupled constraints. Then, we use the exact penalty method to move the PSD constraints into the cost function. This leads to an equivalent non-smooth penalized problem, which can be solved by bundle methods. We present a new efficient spectral bundle algorithm, where subgradient information is incorporated to update a lower approximation function at each iteration. We further establish sublinear convergences in terms of objective value, primal feasibility, dual feasibility, and duality gap. Under Slater's condition, the algorithm converges with the rate of $\mathcal{O}\left(1/\epsilon^3\right)$, and the rate improves to $\mathcal{O}\left(1/\epsilon\right)$ when strict complementarity holds. Finally, our numerical results support the theoretical guarantees.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Semidefinite programs (SDPs) are an important sub-field of optimization that involves the minimization of a linear objective function over the cone of positive semidefinite (PSD) matrices with linear constraints. The standard primal and dual forms of SDPs are in the form of

$$\min_X \ \langle C, X \rangle$$
$$\text{subject to} \ \ \langle A_i, X \rangle = b_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m \quad (1)$$
$$X \in \mathbb{S}^n_+,$$

$$\max_{y,Z} \ b^\top y$$
$$\text{subject to} \ \ Z + \sum_{i=1}^m A_i y_i = C, \quad (2)$$
$$Z \in \mathbb{S}^n_+,$$

where $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m, C \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are problem data, $\mathbb{S}^n_+$ stands for the cone of positive semidefinite (PSD) matrices, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the standard matrix inner product. SDPs have important applications in numerous fields such as combinatorial optimization [1], control theory [2], machine learning [3]. Many graph-theoretic problems have been addressed using SDPs, including maximum cut, graph partitioning, and matrix completion [4].

In theory, SDPs can be solved to arbitrary accuracy in polynomial time using interior-point methods [5]. However, due to its computational complexity, it is often impractical to solve a large-scale SDP considering memory and time

shortages [6], [3]. The state-of-the-art solvers for SDPs, such as MOSEK [7], can solve only medium-sized problems ($n, m \leq 1000$ in (1)) on regular laptops. Improving the scalability of solving SDPs has received extensive research interest [3], [6], [8]. First-order algorithms are one promising direction for computational scalability when solutions of moderate accuracy are required. For example, a general conic solver based on the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) was developed in [9]. This approach has been extended in [10] to exploit the underlying sparsity in SDPs based on chordal decomposition. We refer interested readers to [6, Section 3] for a recent survey. Although first-order methods significantly improve computational efficiency, obtaining high-accuracy solutions remains challenging and may require an unacceptable number of iterations due to the slow convergence.

Another approach is to apply structured decomposition to decompose a large PSD matrix $X \in \mathcal{S}^n_+$ into structured ones that are easier to impose positivity [6], [11]. For a sparse matrix X, we can associate it with a graph, and the principal submatrices can be identified by maximal cliques of the sparsity graph (see Section II). If the sparsity graph is *chordal*, which means that all cycles of length greater than three have an edge between nonconsecutive vertices in a cycle, a clique-based decomposition is guaranteed to exist for sparse PSD matrices [12]. In this case, it is possible to equivalently replace a large matrix constraint $X \in \mathcal{S}^n_+$ with a set of smaller and coupled matrix constraints. This chordal decomposition strategy, combined with a dual result on the existence of PSD matrix completions, significantly reduces the computational complexity of SDPs that involve sparse PSD matrices [6], [13], [14].

Among wide-ranging algorithms to solve SDPs efficiently [3], [15], bundle methods proposed in [16] show fast practical convergence and enjoy low computation complexity. Bundle methods are used to minimize the maximal eigenvalue of an affine matrix function. The bundle method is a general iterative method for optimizing non-smooth convex functions, and at each step it calculates the function value and subgradient for a specific point. The new point is obtained by minimization of the local cutting plane model [17], augmented with a regularization term. In the case of eigenvalue optimization, the subgradient is formed using an eigenvector to the maximal eigenvalue.

In this work, inspired by [18], we propose a first-order bundle method to solve a primal sparse SDP that has at least one high-rank optimal solution. Specifically, instead of solving (1) directly, benefiting from chordal sparsity property, we decompose the large semidefinite constraint in (1) into sev-

eral smaller ones. We emphasize that the smaller semidefinite constraints are interdependent in general. In several prior methods, such as those outlined in [6], numerous additional consensus constraints have been introduced, In despite of that, our framework does not introduce extra variables. Accordingly, we consider an equivalent penalization primal problem provided with a lower bound for the penalization parameter ρ. Finally, we solve a non-smooth constrained convex optimization problem by carrying out the proposed algorithm. The results show that the algorithm converges to very highly accurate solutions within a few iterations. Assuming Slater's condition, the algorithm converges as $\mathcal{O}\left(1/\epsilon^3\right)$. If the problem satisfies strict complementarity, the convergence rate is enhanced to $\mathcal{O}\left(1/\epsilon\right)$.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. We present some preliminaries in Section II, covering chordal graphs and generic bundle methods. In Section III, we introduce an exact penalization for sparse SDPs. This allows us to develop a new spectral bundle algorithm in Section IV. We present numerical results in Section V, and conclude the paper in Section VI. Some technical proofs are provided in our technical report [?].

Notation. For simplicity, in (1) and (2), we define the affine mapping $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ as $\mathcal{A}(\cdot) = \left[\langle A_1, \cdot \rangle, \ldots, \langle A_m, \cdot \rangle\right]^\mathsf{T}$ and the adjoint operator $\mathcal{A}^* : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{S}^n$ as $\mathcal{A}^*(y) = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i y_i$. Given a matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, we denote $\|X\|_2 = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}\left(X^\mathsf{T} X\right)}$ and $\|X\|_\mathrm{F} = \sqrt{\langle X, X \rangle}$ as the spectral norm and Frobenius norm, respectively. We also use $\|x\|_2 = \sqrt{x^\mathsf{T} x}$ to denote the l_2 norm of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we review some background on graph theory, matrix decomposition, and bundle methods for non-smooth optimization.

A. Chordal graphs and matrix decomposition

A graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is defined by a set of vertices $\mathcal{V}$ and a set of edges $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$. A graph is called *undirected* if the edges do not have orientations, i.e., $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \Leftrightarrow (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$. A subset of vertices $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ is called a *clique* if every pair of vertices in $\mathcal{C}$ is connected by an edge. A clique is maximal if it is not a subset of any other clique. We use $|\mathcal{C}|$ to denote the number of vertices in the clique. A cycle in a graph is defined as a sequence of vertices and edges that begins and ends at the same vertex. A chord is an edge between two non-consecutive vertices in a cycle. An undirected graph $\mathcal{G}$ is called *chordal* if it contains at least one chord in every cycle of length greater than three. There are efficient algorithms, such as the maximal cardinality search [19] to identify chordal graphs and their maximal cliques.

Given a graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, a matrix $X \in \mathbb{S}^n$ has sparsity pattern $\mathcal{E}$ if $X_{i,j} = X_{j,i} = 0,\ \forall (i,j) \notin \mathcal{E}, i \neq j$. We denote the space of sparse symmetric matrices by

$$\mathbb{S}^n(\mathcal{E}, 0) := \left\{ X \in \mathbb{S}^n \mid X_{ij} = 0,\ \text{if } (i,j) \notin \mathcal{E}, i \neq j \right\}.$$

Given a matrix $X \in \mathbb{S}^n$, let $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}^n(\mathcal{E},0)}(X)$ be the projection onto $\mathbb{S}^n(\mathcal{E}, 0)$ with respect to the Frobenius norm, i.e.,

$M = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}^n(\mathcal{E},0)}(X)$ with $M_{ij} = 0$, if $(i,j) \notin \mathcal{E}, i \neq j$ and $M_{ij} = X_{ij}$, otherwise. Then, we define the cone of positive-semidefinite completable matrices as

$$\mathbb{S}_+^n(\mathcal{E}, ?) := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}^n(\mathcal{E},0)}\left(\mathbb{S}_+^n\right).$$

In other words, $X \in \mathbb{S}_+^n(\mathcal{E}, ?)$ if some (or all) of the zero entries X_{ij} with $(i,j) \notin \mathcal{E}, i \neq j$ can be replaced with nonzeros to obtain a PSD matrix $\bar{X} \in \mathbb{S}_+^n$. We call $\bar{X}$ the PSD completion of $X \in \mathbb{S}_+^n(\mathcal{E}, ?)$.

Given a clique $\mathcal{C}_k$ of graph $\mathcal{G}$, we define an index matrix $E_{\mathcal{C}_k} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_k| \times n}$ as follow

$$\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}\right)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathcal{C}_k(i) = j \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Given a matrix $X \in \mathbb{S}^n$, the operation $E_{\mathcal{C}_k} X E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T} \in \mathbb{S}^{|\mathcal{C}_k|}$ selects the submatrix indexed by $\mathcal{C}_k$. Alternatively, given $Y \in \mathbb{S}^{|\mathcal{C}_k|}$, the operation $E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T} Y E_{\mathcal{C}_k} \in \mathbb{S}^n$ expands Y into a sparse $n \times n$ matrix that contains Y as its principal submatrix indexed $\mathcal{C}_k$, and zero otherwise.

Theorem 1 ([6]): Given a chordal graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with maximal cliques $\mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_p$, we have $X \in \mathbb{S}_+^n(\mathcal{E}, ?)$ if and only if $E_{\mathcal{C}_k} X E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T} \in \mathbb{S}_+^{|\mathcal{C}_k|}, \forall k = 1, \ldots, p$.

This result replaces a large constraint $X \in \mathbb{S}_+^n(\mathcal{E}, ?)$ with a set of smaller PSD constraints, indexing by the cliques. If the chordal graph has small cliques, we can expect computational improvements, which have been widely used in the literature (see [6] for a survey). In this paper, we will exploit Theorem 1 to develop a new spectral bundle method for sparse SDPs.

B. Bundle methods

The bundle method [20] is a standard technique to solve a non-smooth convex optimization problem of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}_0} \quad & f(x) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & x \in \mathcal{X}_0, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a convex (possibly non-differentiable) function and $\mathcal{X}_0$ is a simple convex set. We refer the interested reader to [20] for a detailed discussion on bundle methods. We only introduce a few key ingredients below.

One key step in the bundle method is to construct a lower approximation $\hat{f}_t(x)$ of the objective function $f(x)$ at each iteration t, i.e., $\hat{f}_t(x) \leq f(x), \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_0$. One standard way is to use a subgradient to form an under-estimator $\hat{f}(x) = f(\hat{x}) + \langle g, x - \hat{x} \rangle$ where g is a subgradient of f at point $\hat{x}$, but other methods also exist [16]. At each iteration of the bundle method, we perform the following proximal step

$$y_{t+1} \in \operatorname*{argmin}_x \hat{f}_t(x) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x - x_t\|^2, \tag{4}$$

where x_t is the current reference point and $\alpha > 0$ regulates the deviation from the reference point. If the candidate point y_{t+1} gives a sufficient descent in the true cost function, i.e. let $\beta \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$f(y_{t+1}) \leq f(x_t) - \beta \left(f(x_t) - \hat{f}_t(y_{t+1}) \right),$$

then we update the current (reference) iterate $x_{t+1} = y_{t+1}$ (*descent step*); otherwise, the reference point does not change, $x_{t+1} = x_t$ (*null step*). In either case, y_{t+1} will be used to update the lower approximation function $\hat{f}_{t+1}(x)$.

The bundle method is guaranteed to return a converging sequence x_t to a minimizer of (3) (if exists), when the lower approximation model $\hat{f}_t$ satisfies the following properties [21]

$$\hat{f}_{t+1}(x) \leq f(x), \ \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_0, \quad \text{(5a)}$$

$$\hat{f}_{t+1}(x) \geq f(y_{t+1}) + \langle g_{t+1}, x - y_{t+1} \rangle, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_0, \quad \text{(5b)}$$

$$\hat{f}_{t+1}(x) \geq \hat{f}(y_{t+1}) + \langle s_{t+1}, x - y_{t+1} \rangle, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_0, \quad \text{(5c)}$$

where g_{t+1} is a subgradient of $f(x)$ at y_{t+1}, and $s_{t+1} = \alpha(x_t - y_{t+1})$. We refer the readers to [21] for more details.

III. Exact penalization for sparse SDPs

In this section, we introduce an exact penalization of sparse SDPs (1) into the form of (3). This allows us to develop the spectral bundle method in the next section.

A. Exact penalization for constrained convex optimization

Consider a constrained convex optimization problem:

$$\min_x \quad f(x)$$
$$\text{subject to} \quad g_i(x) \leq 0, \ i = 1, \ldots, m, \quad \text{(6)}$$
$$x \in \mathcal{X}_0,$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \ldots, m$ are (possibly non-differentiable) convex functions, $\mathcal{X}_0 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a convex closed set. The idea of exact penalty methods is to reformulate (6) by introducing an exact penalty function

$$P(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m \max\{0, g_i(x)\}.$$

We then consider a penalized problem

$$\min_x \quad \Phi_\rho(x) := f(x) + \rho P(x)$$
$$\text{subject to} \quad x \in \mathcal{X}_0, \quad \text{(7)}$$

where $\rho > 0$ is a penalty parameter. It is known that when choosing ρ large enough and assuming Slater's condition, problems (6) and (7) are equivalent to each other in the sense that they have the same optimal value and solution set [22, Theorem 7.21]. Therefore, we can transform some nonsmooth constraints that are hard to handle in (6) into the nonsmooth cost in (7). Then, we can apply the bundle method (cf. Section II-B) to solve the nonsmooth problem (7).

B. Non-smooth penalization of sparse SDPs

We consider the standard primal SDP (1). In many practical applications, the matrices $A_1, \ldots, A_m, C$ in problem data are often sparse [6]. If they share a common sparsity pattern $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, i.e., $C \in \mathbb{S}^n(\mathcal{E}, 0), A_i \in \mathbb{S}^n(\mathcal{E}, 0), i = 1, \ldots, m$, we refer to this graph as *aggregate sparsity* pattern. It is not difficult to verify that (1) is equivalent to

$$\min_X \quad \langle C, X \rangle$$
$$\text{subject to} \quad \langle A_i, X \rangle = b_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m, \quad \text{(8)}$$
$$X \in \mathbb{S}^n_+(\mathcal{E}, ?).$$

Without loss of generality, we assume the aggregate sparsity pattern $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is a chordal graph with maximal cliques $\mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_p$ (otherwise a suitable chordal extension can be performed). Then, Theorem 1 allows us to reformulate problem (8) into

$$\min_X \quad \langle C, X \rangle$$
$$\text{subject to} \quad \langle A_i, X \rangle = b_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m \quad \text{(9)}$$
$$E_{\mathcal{C}_k} X E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T} \in \mathbb{S}^{|\mathcal{C}_k|}_+, \quad k = 1, \ldots, p.$$

The possibly large semidefinite constraint in (1) is replaced by several smaller constraints in (9). This decomposition (9) underpin many scalable algorithms for solving sparse SDPs [6], [10], [23]. Note that the submatrices $E_{\mathcal{C}_k} X E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}$ induced by maximal cliques may overlap, therefore the semidefinite constraints in (9) are coupled. Many previous techniques in [6], [10], [23] introduce a large number of extra consensus constraints such as $X_k = E_{\mathcal{C}_k} X E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}$.

In this work, we introduce further reformulations which allow us to solve (9) directly without adding extra variables. It is clear that (9) is equivalent to

$$\min_X \quad \langle C, X \rangle$$
$$\text{subject to} \quad \langle A_i, X \rangle = b_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m \quad \text{(10)}$$
$$\lambda_{\max} \left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X) E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T} \right) \leq 0, \ k = 1, \ldots, p.$$

The eigenvalue constraints in (10) are non-smooth. Similar to (7), we then apply the exact penalty method to get the following formulation

$$\min_X \quad \langle C, X \rangle + \rho \sum_{k=1}^p \max \left\{ 0, \lambda_{\max} \left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X) E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T} \right) \right\}$$
$$\text{subject to} \quad \langle A_i, X \rangle = b_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m. \quad \text{(11)}$$

Unlike previous results in [6], [10], [23], this formulation (11) only has a single matrix variable X (with no extra variables). It is clear (11) is in the form of (3). We will develop a spectral bundle method to solve (11) in Section IV.

C. Properties and assumptions

Before developing the spectral bundle method, we expect that problems (11) and (1) are equivalent when the penalty parameter ρ is large enough. In particular, let us consider the Lagrange dual problem of (9), which is

$$\max_{y, Y_k} \quad b^\mathsf{T} y$$
$$\text{subject to} \quad C - \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i = \sum_{k=1}^p E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T} Y_k E_{\mathcal{C}_k}, \quad \text{(12)}$$
$$Y_k \in \mathbb{S}^{|\mathcal{C}_k|}_+, \quad k = 1, \ldots, p.$$

It can be verified that (12) is also equivalent to (2). We denote the optimal solution set of the decomposed primal SDP (9) and dual SDP (12) by $\mathcal{P}^\star$ and $\mathcal{D}^\star$ respectively. Throughout the paper, we make the following assumptions.

Assumption 1: The primal and dual SDPs (1) and (2) satisfy Slater's condition, i.e., they are strictly feasible.

Assumption 2: The optimal solution sets for (9) and (12), i.e., $\mathcal{P}^\star$ and $\mathcal{D}^\star$, are compact.

It can be verified that the problem (9) and (12) also satisfy Slater's condition by Assumption 1. We have the following technical result, and its proof is provided in [?].

Proposition 1: Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the non-smooth penalized formulation (10) is equivalent to the original primal SDP (1) if we choose

$$\rho > \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}^\star} := \max_{(y^\star, \{Y_k^\star\}) \in \mathcal{D}^\star} \left\{ \mathbf{tr}(Y_1^\star), \mathbf{tr}(Y_2^\star), \ldots, \mathbf{tr}(Y_p^\star) \right\}.$$

Finally, we introduce a notion of strict complementarity.

Definition 1 (strict complementarity): A pair of optimal solutions $(X^\star, \{y^\star, Y_k^\star\}) \in \mathcal{P}^\star \times \mathcal{D}^\star$ in (9) and (12) satisfies *strict complementarity* if

$$\mathrm{rank}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k} X^\star E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T} \right) + \mathrm{rank}\left(Y_k^\star \right) = |\mathcal{C}_k|, \ k = 1, \ldots, p.$$

If such a pair exists, we say the decomposed SDPs (9) and (12) satisfy strict complementarity.

IV. A SPECTRAL BUNDLE METHOD

In this section, we introduce a spectral bundle algorithm to solve the penalized nonsmooth problem (11).

A. Constructions of lower-approximation model

For simplicity, we denote the cost function in (11) as

$$G(X) := \langle C, X \rangle + \rho \sum_{k=1}^p \max\left\{ 0, \lambda_{\max}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T} \right) \right\}.$$

As discussed in Section II-B, one key step in the bundle method is to construct an appropriate lower approximation model for $G(X)$ that satisfies (5a) to (5c). Our strategy for constructing a lower-approximation model is motivated by [16] and [18, Section 2.2] that focus on the dual SDP (2).

In particular, for each clique k, we use an orthonormal matrix $P_k \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_k| \times r}$, where $r \leq \max_k |\mathcal{C}_k|$, such that $P_k^\mathsf{T} P_k = I_{|\mathcal{C}_k| \times |\mathcal{C}_k|}$, and construct a lower approximation:

$$\hat{G}_{\{P_k\}}(X) = \langle C, X \rangle + \rho \sum_{k=1}^p \max_{\substack{S_k \in \mathbb{S}_+^r, \\ \mathbf{tr}(S_k) \leq 1}} \left\langle P_k S_k P_k^\mathsf{T}, E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T} \right\rangle. \quad (13)$$

By definition, we observe

$$\hat{G}_{\{P_k\}}(X) \leq G(X), \quad \forall X \in \mathbb{S}^n$$

due to the fact

$$\max\left\{ \lambda_{\max}(-X), 0 \right\} = \max_{S \in \mathbb{S}_+^n, \mathbf{tr}(S) \leq 1} \langle S, -X \rangle, \quad \forall X \in \mathbb{S}^n,$$

and $\{P_k S P_k^\mathsf{T} \in \mathbb{S}_+^n \mid S \in \mathbb{S}_+^r, \mathbf{tr}(S) \leq 1\} \subseteq \{S \in \mathbb{S}_+^n \mid \mathbf{tr}(S) \leq 1\}$. Therefore, $\hat{G}_{\{P_k\}}(X)$ in (13) serves as an underestimator that meets (5a).

We can also verify the subgradient lower bound condition (5b) when we choose P_k spanning the top eigenvector associated with $E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}$. Another modification is required to ensure that the condition (5c) is fulfilled. Along with selecting past and current eigenvectors to generate P_k,

the spectral bundle approach in [16] retains a thoughtfully chosen weight to incorporate past information. Notably, we introduce a constant matrix $\bar{W}_k \in \mathbb{S}_+^{|\mathcal{C}_k|}$ for each clique k with $\mathbf{tr}\left(\bar{W}_k \right) = 1$, and define the set, $k = 1, \ldots, p$

$$\hat{\mathcal{W}}_k := \{ \gamma_k \bar{W}_k + P_k S_k P_k^\mathsf{T} \mid S_k \in \mathbb{S}_+^r, \\ \gamma_k \geq 0, \gamma_k + \mathbf{tr}(S_k) \leq 1 \}, \quad (14)$$

and refine the lower approximation function below

$$\hat{G}_{\{\bar{W}_k, P_k\}}(X) \\ = \langle C, X \rangle + \rho \sum_{k=1}^p \max_{W_k \in \hat{\mathcal{W}}_k} \left\langle W_k, E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T} \right\rangle. \quad (15)$$

It is evident that the lower approximation model (15) provides a better estimate than (13). Letting $\gamma_k = 0$ reduce (15) to (13); hence (15) satisfies (5a), (5b), and as well as (5c) by meticulously constructing $\bar{W}_k$ and P_k at each iteration.

B. A spectral bundle algorithm

Following Section II-B, we present a spectral bundle algorithm to solve (11) based on the lower approximation model (15). In this algorithm, we will construct a lower approximation model $\hat{G}_{\{\bar{W}_{t,k}, P_{t,k}\}}(X_t)$ and update the model parameters $\{\bar{W}_{t,k}\}, \{P_{t,k}\}$, and the set $\hat{\mathcal{W}}_{t,k} := \{\gamma_{t,k} \bar{W}_{t,k} + P_{t,k} S_{t,k} P_{t,k}^\mathsf{T} \mid \gamma_{t,k} \geq 0, S_{t,k} \in \mathbb{S}_+^r, \gamma_{t,k} + \mathbf{tr}(S_{t,k}) \leq 1\}$ at each iteration t. The overall algorithm is listed in Algorithm 1, which has the following steps:

Pre-processing: The algorithm starts by extracting aggregate sparsity pattern of the problem data and computing the maximal cliques $\mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_p$. This step can be performed very efficiently, e.g., using algorithms in [?].

Initialization: The algorithm is initiated with a random reference point $\Omega_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and $P_{0,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_k| \times r}$ by setting the top r eigenvectors of $E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-\Omega_0)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^T$ as their columns, We then choose any symmetric matrix $\bar{W}_{0,k} \in \mathbb{S}_+^n$ with $\mathbf{tr}\left(\bar{W}_{0,k} \right) = 1$, and construct the initial under-estimator $\hat{G}_{\{\bar{W}_{0,k}, P_{0,k}\}}(X)$ as in (15).

Solving the master problem: Similar to (4), our algorithm solves the following problem at iteration $t \geq 0$ to get the next iteration parameters and the candidate reference point

$$\left(X_{t+1}^\star, S_{t,k}^\star, \gamma_{t,k}^\star \right) \\ = \operatorname*{argmin}_{X \in \mathcal{X}_0} \hat{G}_{\{\bar{W}_{t,k}, P_{t,k}\}}(X) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|X - \Omega_t\|_F^2, \quad (16)$$

where $\mathcal{X}_0 = \{X \in \mathbb{S}^n \mid \langle A_i, X \rangle = b_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, and Ω_t is the reference point at iteration t and α is the penalization parameter which penalizes the deviation from the reference point at each iteration.

Update reference point: The algorithm updates the reference point if the following condition holds

$$\beta \left(G\left(\Omega_t \right) - \hat{G}_{\{\bar{W}_{t,k}, P_{t,k}\}}\left(X_{t+1}^\star \right) \right) \\ \leq G\left(\Omega_t \right) - G\left(X_{t+1}^\star \right), \quad (17)$$

where $\beta \in (0, 1)$. This condition indicates that if the actual cost reduction $G\left(\Omega_t \right) - G\left(X_{t+1}^\star \right)$ is greater or equal than β portion of the approximate reduction $G\left(\Omega_t \right) - $

Algorithm 1 Spectral bundle method for sparse SDPs
___
Require: Problem data $A_1, \ldots, A_m, C \in \mathbb{S}^n$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
Require: Parameters $r_\mathrm{p} \geq 0, r_\mathrm{c} \geq 1, \alpha > 0, \beta \in (0,1)$,
  $\epsilon \geq 0$. An initial point $\Omega_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n$.
  Pre-processing: Extract aggregate sparsity pattern of the
  problem data and compute cliques.
  Initialization: Let $r = r_\mathrm{p} + r_\mathrm{c}$. Initialize $\bar{W}_{0,k} \in \mathbb{S}_+^{|\mathcal{C}_k|}$,
  with $\mathbf{tr}\left(\bar{W}_{0,k}\right) = 1$, and construct $P_{0,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_k| \times r}$ with
  its columns set to the top r orthonormal eigenvectors of
  $E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-\Omega_0)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^T$.
  for $t = 0, \ldots, t_{\max}$ **do**
    Solve (16) to obtain $X_{t+1}^\star, \gamma_{k,t}^\star$, and $S_{k,t}^\star$.
    master problem
    If $G(\Omega_t) - \hat{G}_{\{\bar{W}_{t,k}, P_{t,k}\}}(X_{t+1}^\star) \leq \epsilon$, then stop.
    Set $\Omega_{t+1} = \begin{cases} X_{t+1}^\star, & \text{if (17) holds.} \quad \text{\\\textit{descent step}} \\ \Omega_t, & \text{otherwise.} \quad\;\; \text{\\\textit{null step}} \end{cases}$
    Compute $P_{k,t+1}$ as (18) and $\bar{W}_{k,t+1}$ as (19).
    update model
  end for
___

$\hat{G}_{\{\bar{W}_{t,k}, P_{t,k}\}}\left(X_{t+1}^\star\right)$, a *decent step* happens and the algorithm updates the reference point, i.e., $\Omega_{t+1} = X_{t+1}^\star$. Otherwise, a *null step* happens and the reference point does not change, i.e., $\Omega_{t+1} = \Omega_t$.

Update the under-estimator model: The algorithm updates the approximator at each iteration to improve the approximation accuracy at the candidate reference point. Similar to [18, Section 2.2], to compute $\bar{W}_{t+1,k}, P_{t+1,k}$, we apply eigenvalue decomposition to small matrices $S_{k,t}^\star$ as below

$$S_{t,k}^\star = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{k,1} & Q_{k,2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{k,1} & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_{k,2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q_{k,1}^\mathsf{T} \\ Q_{k,2}^\mathsf{T} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $Q_{k,1} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r_\mathrm{p}}$ and $Q_{k,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r_\mathrm{c}}$ contain the orthonormal eigenvectors associated with eigenvalues $\Sigma_{k,1}$ and $\Sigma_{k,2}$ respectively, $\Sigma_{k,1}$ consists of the largest r_p eigenvalues, and $\Sigma_{k,2}$ consists of the rest of the eigenvalues. We compute the $V_{t,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_k| \times r_\mathrm{c}}$ with its columns being the top $r_\mathrm{c} \geq 1$ orthonormal eigenvectors of $E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X_{t+1}^\star)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}$ which captures the current sub-gradient information of the spectral bundle. Then, the next parameter $P_{t+1,k}$ is updated as

$$P_{t+1,k} = \mathrm{orth}\left(\begin{bmatrix} V_{t,k}, & P_{t,k}Q_{1,k} \end{bmatrix}\right). \quad (18)$$

The update of the weight matrices $\bar{W}_{t,k}$ captures the remaining past information

$$\bar{W}_{t+1,k} = \frac{\left(\gamma_{t,k}^\star \bar{W}_{t,k} + P_{t,k}Q_{k,2}\Sigma_{k,2}Q_{k,2}^\mathsf{T}P_{t,k}^\mathsf{T}\right)}{\gamma_{t,k}^\star + \mathbf{tr}\left(\Sigma_{k,2}\right)}, \quad (19)$$

where $\bar{W}_{t+1,k}$ has been normalized with $\mathbf{tr}(\bar{W}_{t+1,k}) = 1$. In the case that $r_\mathrm{p} = 0$, the parameter updates in (18) and (19) become $P_{t+1,k} = V_{t,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_k| \times r}$ and $\bar{W}_{t+1,k} = \frac{W_{t,k}^\star}{\mathbf{tr}\left(W_{t,k}^\star\right)}$ respectively, where $W_{t,k}^\star$ is the optimal solution of $\gamma_k \bar{W}_{t,k} + P_{t,k}S_kP_{t,k}^\mathsf{T}$ in (16).

C. Computational details

Solving the regularized master problem in (16) is the main computation in Algorithm 1. Therefore, it is crucial to solve the master problem efficiently. We summarize the computation details in Proposition 2. For notational simplicity, we define the linear mapping $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k} : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{S}^{|\mathcal{C}_k|}$ as $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(X) = E_{\mathcal{C}_k}XE_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k} : \mathbb{S}^{|\mathcal{C}_k|} \to \mathbb{S}^n$ as $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(X) = E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}XE_{\mathcal{C}_k}$.

Proposition 2: The master problem (16) is equivalent to the following problem

$$\max_{\substack{W_k \in \hat{\mathcal{W}}_{t,k} \\ y \in \mathbb{R}^m}} \left\langle C - \rho \sum_{k=1}^p \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_k), \Omega_t \right\rangle + \langle b - \mathcal{A}(\Omega_t), y \rangle$$
$$- \frac{1}{2\alpha} \left\| \rho \sum_{i=k}^p \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_k) + \mathcal{A}^*(y) - C \right\|_\mathrm{F}^2. \quad (20)$$

The optimal solution of X in (16) is recovered by

$$X_{t+1}^\star = \Omega_t + \frac{1}{\alpha}\left(\rho \sum_{k=1}^p \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_k) + \mathcal{A}^*(y) - C\right). \quad (21)$$

The proof is based on strong duality and the details are provided in the appendix. When the iterate Ω_t is feasible, i.e., $\mathcal{A}(\Omega_t) = b$, (20) can be simplified as

$$\max_{\substack{W_k \in \hat{\mathcal{W}}_{t,k} \\ y \in \mathbb{R}^m}} \left\langle C - \rho \sum_{k=1}^p \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_k), \Omega_t \right\rangle$$
$$- \frac{1}{2\alpha} \left\| \rho \sum_{k=1}^p \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_k) + \mathcal{A}^*(y) - C \right\|_\mathrm{F}^2.$$

D. Convergence guarantees

We present the convergence guarantee for Algorithm 1 when strong duality holds for (9) and (12). Our analysis is motivated by [21, Section 3.1] that solves dual SDP (2).

Theorem 2: Suppose strong duality holds for (9) and (12). Given any $\beta \in (0,1)$, $r_\mathrm{c} \geq 1$, $r_\mathrm{p} \geq 0$, $\alpha > 0$, $r = r_\mathrm{c} + r_\mathrm{p}$, $\rho > (2\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{y}^\star} + 1)$, $P_{0,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}, \forall 1 \leq k \leq p$, $\Omega_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n$, and target accuracy $\epsilon > 0$, then Algorithm 1 outputs iterates $\left(\Omega_t, \{W_{t,k}^\star\}, y_t^\star\right)$ with

$$G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star) \leq \epsilon, \quad (22a)$$

$$\left\| \rho \sum_{k=1}^p \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}\left(W_{t,k}^\star\right) - C + \mathcal{A}^*(y_t^\star) \right\|_\mathrm{F}^2 \leq \epsilon, \; W_{t,k}^\star \succeq 0, \quad (22b)$$

$$\lambda_{\min}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}\Omega_t E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right) \geq -\epsilon, 1 \leq k \leq p, \quad (22c)$$

$$|\langle C, \Omega_t \rangle - \langle b, y_t^\star \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}, \quad (22d)$$

by taking some iteration $t \leq \mathcal{O}\left(1/\epsilon^3\right)$. If additionally, the strict complementarity (see Definition 1) holds, then the conditions above are reached by some iteration $t \leq \mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$.

One main step for the proof of Theorem 2 is to connect the primal feasibility, dual feasibility, and primal-dual optimality to the cost value gap. We summarize those connections in the following lemma.

Lemma 1: Under the parameters in Theorem 2, at each descent step $t > 0$, the following results hold.

- The approximate dual feasibility satisfies

$$\left\| \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_{t,k}^\star) - C + \mathcal{A}^*(y_t^\star) \right\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2$$
$$\leq \frac{2\alpha}{\beta}(G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star)).$$

- The approximate primal feasibility satisfies

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(\Omega_{t+1})) \geq \frac{-(G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star))}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}^\star} + 1}, 1 \leq k \leq p,$$
$$\text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}(\Omega_{t+1}) = b.$$

- The approximate primal-dual optimality satisfies

$$\langle C, \Omega_{t+1} \rangle - \langle b, y_t^\star \rangle \geq \left(-(G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star))\frac{p\rho}{\mathcal{D}_{y^\star} + 1} \right)$$
$$- \mathcal{D}_{\Omega_0} \sqrt{\frac{2\alpha}{\beta}(F(\Omega_t) - F(X^\star))},$$

$$\langle C, \Omega_{t+1} \rangle - \langle b, y_t^\star \rangle \leq \left(\frac{1 - \beta}{\beta}(G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star)) \right)$$
$$+ \mathcal{D}_{\Omega_0} \sqrt{\frac{2\alpha}{\beta}(G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star))},$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{\Omega_0} = \sup_{G(\Omega_t) \leq G(\Omega_0)} \|\Omega_t\|_{\mathrm{F}}$ is maximum norm value over the sublevel set which is bounded.

Lemma 2 (quadratic growth): Under Assumption 2 and the selection of parameters in Theorem 2, for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ and X in the sub-level set $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon := \{X \in \mathbb{S}^n \mid G(X) \leq G(X^\star) + \epsilon, \mathcal{A}(X) = b, \|X\|_{\mathrm{F}} < \infty\}$, there exist some constants $\zeta \geq 1$ and $\mu > 0$ such that

$$G(X) - G(X^\star) \geq \mu \cdot \mathrm{dist}^\zeta(X, \mathcal{P}^\star).$$

Furthermore, if SDPs (9) and (12) satisfy strict complementarity, the exponent term $\zeta = 2$.

The proofs for Lemma 1 and 2 are provided in the appendix. With Lemmas 1 and 2, we are ready to prove Theorem 2 by utilizing convergence results in [21], [24].

Proof of Theorem 2. It remains to verify that Algorithm 1 satisfy (5a) to (5c). For notational convenience, we use $\hat{G}_t(X)$ to denote the approximation model $\hat{G}_{\{\bar{W}_{t,k}, P_{t,k}\}}(X)$ at iteration t. First, by the construction of $P_{t,k}$ and $\bar{W}_{t,k}$ in (18) and (19), we have $(P_{t,k})^\mathsf{T} P_{t,k} = I$, $\bar{W}_{t,k} \succeq 0$, and $\mathrm{tr}(\bar{W}_{t,k}) = 1$. It follows that

$$\hat{\mathcal{W}}_{t,k} \subset \{W \in \mathbb{S}_+^{|\mathcal{C}_k|} \mid \mathrm{tr}(W) \leq 1\},$$

which implies

$$\max_{W_k \in \hat{\mathcal{W}}_{t,k}} \langle W_k, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X) \rangle$$
$$\leq \max_{\mathrm{tr}(W) \leq 1, W \in \mathbb{S}_+^r} \langle W, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X) \rangle$$
$$= \max\{\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(X)), 0\}, \forall X \in \mathbb{S}^n, 1 \leq k \leq p.$$

Therefore, the global lower-bound property (5a) is satisfied.

Second, since the update in (18) includes a subgradient information of $\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X_{t+1}^\star))$, there exists a normalized vector $e_k \in \mathbb{R}^r$ such that $P_{t+1,k}e_k = v_k$, where v_k is a subgradient of $\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X_{t+1}^\star))$. If $\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X_{t+1}^\star)) >$

0, we let $\gamma_{t+1,k} = 0$ and $S_{t+1,k} = e_k(e_k)^\mathsf{T}$, otherwise, we let $\gamma_{t+1,k} = 0$ and $S_{t+1,k} = 0$. It follows that

$$\hat{G}_{t+1}(X)$$
$$\geq \langle C, X \rangle + \rho \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \langle P_{t+1,k}(e_k(e_k)^\mathsf{T})P_{t+1,k}^\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X) \rangle$$
$$= \langle C, X \rangle + \rho \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \langle v_k v_k^\mathsf{T}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X) \rangle$$
$$= \langle C, X_{t+1}^\star \rangle + \rho \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X_{t+1}^\star))$$
$$+ \langle C - \rho \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(v_k v_k^\mathsf{T}), X - X_{t+1}^\star \rangle$$
$$= G(X_{t+1}^\star) + \langle g_{t+1}, X - X_{t+1}^\star \rangle, \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{X}_0,$$

where $g_{t+1} = C - \rho \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(v_k v_k^\mathsf{T}) \in \partial G(X_{t+1}^\star)$ and $\mathcal{I} = \{k \mid \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X_{t+1}^\star)) > 0, 1 \leq k \leq p\}$, which verified the second property (5b).

Third, we first argue that the optimal solution at step t is within the feasible region of the next iteration. Recalling the update procedure of the matrix $P_{t+1,k}$ in (18), there exists matrices $\bar{Q}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_k| \times r}$ with normalized columns such that $P_{t+1,k}\bar{Q}_k = P_{t,k}Q_{1,k}$. By letting $\gamma_{t+1} = \gamma_{t,k}^\star + \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_{k,2})$ and $S_{t+1,k} = \bar{Q}_k\Sigma_{1,k}\bar{Q}_k^\mathsf{T}$, we recover the solution

$$W_{t,k}^\star = \gamma_{t+1}\bar{W}_{t+1,k} + P_{t+1,k}S_{t+1,k}P_{t+1,k}^\mathsf{T}$$
$$= (\gamma_{t,k}^\star + \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_{k,2}))\bar{W}_{t,k} + P_{t+1,k}\bar{Q}\Sigma_{1,k}\bar{Q}^\mathsf{T}P_{t+1,k}^\mathsf{T}$$
$$= (\gamma_{t,k}^\star + \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma_{k,2}))\bar{W}_{t,k} + P_{t,k}Q_{1,k}\Sigma_{1,k}Q_{1,k}^\mathsf{T}P_{t,k}^\mathsf{T}.$$

Hence, it follows that

$$\hat{G}_{t+1}(X)$$
$$\geq \langle C, X \rangle + \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \langle W_{t,k}^\star, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X) \rangle$$
$$= \left\langle C - \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_{t,k}^\star), X_{t+1}^\star \right\rangle$$
$$+ \left\langle C - \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_{t,k}^\star) + \mathcal{A}^*(y_t^\star), X - X_{t+1}^\star \right\rangle$$
$$= \hat{G}_{t+1}(X_{t+1}^\star) + \langle \alpha(X_{t+1}^\star - \Omega_t), X - X_{t+1}^\star \rangle, \forall X \in \mathcal{X}_0,$$

where the first equality uses the fact that $\langle \mathcal{A}^*(y_t^\star), X - X_{t+1}^\star \rangle = 0$, the second equality uses the optimality condition (21) and the normal cone of an affine set $\mathcal{X}_0$ is $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}_0}(X_{t+1}^\star) = \{\mathcal{A}^*(y) \mid y \in \mathbb{R}^m\}$. Hence, we have proved $\alpha(X_{t+1}^\star - \Omega_t) \in \partial\hat{G}(X_{t+1}^\star) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}_0}(X_{t+1}^\star)$ and the third property (5c) is verified. Finally, we show that $G(X)$ is $(\|C\|_{\mathrm{F}} + \rho p)$-Lipschitz continuous. In particular,

$$|G(Y) - G(X)|$$
$$\leq |\langle C, Y - X \rangle| + \rho \sum_{i=1}^{p} \big| \max\{0, \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-Y))\}$$
$$- \max\{0, \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X))\} \big|, \forall Y, X \in \mathbb{S}^n.$$

The first term can be bounded by Cauchy Schwarz inequality

$$|\langle C, Y - X \rangle| \leq \|C\|_{\mathrm{F}}\|Y - X\|_{\mathrm{F}}.$$

Fig. 1: Block-arrow sparsity pattern [25]: the number of blocks: l; block size: d; the width of the arrow head: h.

The second term can be bounded using the fact that the function $\max\{0, x\}$ is 1-Lipschitz and $\lambda_{\max}(Y - X) \leq \|Y - X\|_2, \forall X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. It follows that $\forall 1 \leq k \leq p$,

$$\max\{0, \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-Y))\} - \max\{0, \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X))\}$$
$$\leq |\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-Y + X))|$$
$$\leq \|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-Y + X)\|_2$$
$$\leq \|-Y + X\|_2$$
$$\leq \|Y - X\|_F.$$

Combining the upper bounds leads to

$$|G(Y) - G(X)| \leq (\|C\|_F + \rho p) \|Y - X\|_F.$$

By the results in [21], the convergence rate is $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^3)$ when the objective function is Lipschitz continuous and improved to $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ when quadratic growth Lemma 2 is satisfied.

V. IMPLEMENTATION AND NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we present the numerical results of Algorithm 1 to show the efficiency and convergence of the algorithm. All the experiments were executed in MATLAB R2022b on Windows PC with 3.61 GHz speed and 32.0 GB RAM [1]. We consider SDPs with a block-arrow sparsity pattern and overlapping maximal cliques. The block-arrow sparsity pattern is shown in Figure 1 which has l maximal cliques of size $d + h$. The problem data is generated with additional strict complementarity property and has at least one high-rank primal optimal solution.

For the implementation, we reformulate the master problem in Algorithm 1 into a quadratic program (QP) form,

$$\min_{v \in \mathbb{R}^{p+pr^2}} \quad v^\mathsf{T} Q v + q^\mathsf{T} v + c$$
$$\text{subject to} \quad \gamma_k \geq 0, S_k \in \mathbb{S}_+^r,$$
$$\gamma_k + \mathbf{tr}(S_k) \leq \rho, k = 1, \ldots, p,$$

where $v = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 & \cdots & \gamma_p & \mathrm{vec}(S_1)^\mathsf{T} & \cdots & \mathrm{vec}(S_p)^\mathsf{T} \end{bmatrix}^\mathsf{T}$ and $\mathrm{vec}(\cdot)$ denotes the vectorization operation, then solve it using interior point method MOSEK [7]. We note that the above problem only involves p nonnegative variable and p small positive semidefinite variables, and the time complexity depends on the sub-problem solver.

We run Algorithm 1 for two settings:

Fig. 2: The relative optimality gap of different choices of (r_c, r_p) for two random SDPs with $\mathrm{rank}(X^\star) = 2000$ and $\mathrm{rank}(X^\star) = 200$ on the left and right respectively.

TABLE I: Computational results on solving two random SDPs with blow-arrow sparsity pattern and primal solutions being high-rank. Dimension of the data is calculated by $n = d \times l + h$.

DESCR.	(r_p, r_c)	Semi Opt.	Affine Opt.	Dual Gap	Cost Opt.
$d=20$	$(0,2)$	$-0.63e{-}2$	$1.06e{-}7$	$2.08e{-}6$	$4.64e{-}6$
$l=10$	$(0,3)$	$-3.67e{-}4$	$1.14e{-}9$	$2.36e{-}7$	$7.05e{-}8$
$h=4$	$(0,4)$	$-3.47e{-}8$	$2.45e{-}11$	$4.54e{-}9$	$1.04e{-}10$
$m=100$	$(0,5)$	$-1.01e{-}10$	$4.74e{-}12$	$1.61e{-}8$	$1.01e{-}10$
$d=50$	$(0,2)$	$-0.292e{-}1$	$2.05e{-}8$	$9.07e{-}8$	$2.02e{-}5$
$l=40$	$(0,3)$	$-0.11e{-}2$	$3.83e{-}10$	$1.76e{-}8$	$4.03e{-}7$
$h=4$	$(0,4)$	$-2.25e{-}5$	$6.30e{-}11$	$9.16e{-}11$	$1.61e{-}9$
$m=1000$	$(0,5)$	$-1.03e{-}5$	$4.17e{-}11$	$9.67e{-}10$	$5.15e{-}9$

1) A Small-scale problem with dimensions $d = 20, l = 10, h = 4$, and $m = 100$.
2) A large-scale problem with dimensions $d = 50, l = 40, h = 4$, and $m = 1000$.

Inspired by [18, Section 5], we choose different configurations of the parameters r_p and r_c. The parameter r_p is fixed to be 0, while different r_c is considered since r_p does not have much influence on the convergence rate both theoretically and numerically as shown in [18, Section 5]. The numerical results are presented in Figure 2 and Table I. In Table I, "Semi Opt.", "Affine Opt.", "Dual Gap", and "Cost Opt." denote the following optimality criteria

$$\lambda_{\min}(\Omega_{t+1}), \quad \frac{\|C - \mathcal{A}^*(y) - W_t^\star\|_F}{1 + \|C\|},$$
$$\frac{|\langle C, \Omega_{t+1}\rangle - \langle b, \omega_t \rangle|}{1 + |\langle C, \Omega_{t+1}\rangle| + \langle b, \omega_t \rangle|}, \quad \frac{G(\Omega_{t+1}) - G^\star}{G^\star},$$

where $G^\star$ denotes the true optimal value. In both small-scale and large-scale problems, Algorithm 1 converges to the optimal solution set in terms of objective value, primal feasibility, dual feasibility, and duality gap within a moderate number of iterations. In addition, we empirically observe that there is a major improvement in the accuracy when the parameter r_c is chosen as large as $\mathrm{rank}(Z^\star)$ in (2) for

---

[1] Our code is available at https://github.com/soc-ucsd/SBM-PrimalAndDual.

two different problems, which coincides with the analogous theoretical guarantees in [18].

VI. Conclusions

In this paper, we develop a new variant of the spectral bundle methods for sparse SDPs. This approach breaks down a large positive semidefinite constraint into several smaller ones by performing chordal decomposition. We introduce an equivalent non-smooth convex optimization problem by taking the constraints into the objective function. Instead of introducing additional consensus variables as the previous work [6], this framework solves the non-smooth problem using a new spectral bundle method in Algorithm 1. Under a mild condition, the algorithm converges as $\mathcal{O}\left(1/\epsilon^3\right)$. If the problem satisfies strict complementarity, the convergence rate is improved to $\mathcal{O}\left(1/\epsilon\right)$. This novel algorithm opens up a new way to handle scalability issues in solving large-scale SDPs. Future directions include performing extensive numerical comparsion, examining additional problems with the aforementioned assumptions, and investigating convergence behaviors when the master problem is solved inexactly.

References

[1] F. Alizadeh, "Interior point methods in semidefinite programming with applications to combinatorial optimization," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 13–51, 1995.

[2] S. Boyd, L. El Ghaoui, E. Feron, and V. Balakrishnan, *Linear matrix inequalities in system and control theory*. SIAM, 1994.

[3] A. Majumdar, G. Hall, and A. Ahmadi, "Recent scalability improvements for semidefinite programming with applications in machine learning, control, and robotics," *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 3, pp. 331–360, May 2020.

[4] M. X. Goemans and D. P. Williamson, "Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming," *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 1115–1145, 1995.

[5] L. Vandenberghe and S. Boyd, "Semidefinite programming," *SIAM Review*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 49–95, 1996.

[6] Y. Zheng, G. Fantuzzi, and A. Papachristodoulou, "Chordal and factor-width decompositions for scalable semidefinite and polynomial optimization," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 52, pp. 243–279, 2021.

[7] M. ApS, *The MOSEK optimization toolbox for MATLAB manual. Version 9.0.*, 2019.

[8] Y. Zheng, G. Fantuzzi, and A. Papachristodoulou, *Decomposition Methods for Large-Scale Semidefinite Programs with Chordal Aggregate Sparsity and Partial Orthogonality*, pp. 33–55. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018.

[9] B. O'donoghue, E. Chu, N. Parikh, and S. Boyd, "Conic optimization via operator splitting and homogeneous self-dual embedding," *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, vol. 169, p. 1042–1068, jun 2016.

[10] Y. Zheng, G. Fantuzzi, A. Papachristodoulou, P. Goulart, and A. Wynn, "Chordal decomposition in operator-splitting methods for sparse semidefinite programs," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 180, no. 1, p. 489–532, 2020.

[11] A. A. Ahmadi and A. Majumdar, "Dsos and sdsos optimization: more tractable alternatives to sum of squares and semidefinite optimization," *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 193–230, 2019.

[12] J. Agler, W. Helton, S. McCullough, and L. Rodman, "Positive semidefinite matrices with a given sparsity pattern," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 107, pp. 101–149, 1988.

[13] M. Fukuda, M. Kojima, K. Murota, and K. Nakata, "Exploiting sparsity in semidefinite programming via matrix completion i: General framework," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 647–674, 2001.

[14] L. Vandenberghe and M. S. Andersen, "Chordal graphs and semidefinite optimization," *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 241–433, 2015.

[15] R. Monteiro, "First- and second-order methods for semidefinite programming," *Math. Program.*, vol. 97, pp. 209–244, 07 2003.

[16] C. Helmberg and F. Rendl, "A spectral bundle method for semidefinite programming," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 673–696, 2000.

[17] J. E. Kelley, Jr, "The cutting-plane method for solving convex programs," *Journal of the society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 703–712, 1960.

[18] L. Ding and B. Grimmer, "Revisiting spectral bundle methods: Primal-dual (sub)linear convergence rates," 2022.

[19] R. E. Tarjan and M. Yannakakis, "Simple linear-time algorithms to test chordality of graphs, test acyclicity of hypergraphs, and selectively reduce acyclic hypergraphs," *SIAM Journal on computing*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 566–579, 1984.

[20] C. Lemaréchal and J. Zowe, *A Condensed Introduction to Bundle Methods in Nonsmooth Optimization*, pp. 357–382. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 1994.

[21] M. Díaz and B. Grimmer, "Optimal convergence rates for the proximal bundle method," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.07874*, 2021.

[22] A. Ruszczynski, *Nonlinear Optimization*. Princeton University Press, 2011.

[23] Y. Sun, M. S. Andersen, and L. Vandenberghe, "Decomposition in conic optimization with partially separable structure," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 873–897, 2014.

[24] K. C. Kiwiel, "Efficiency of proximal bundle methods," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 104, no. 3, pp. 589–603, 2000.

[25] Y. Zheng, G. Fantuzzi, A. Papachristodoulou, P. Goulart, and A. Wynn, "Chordal decomposition in operator-splitting methods for sparse semidefinite programs," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 180, no. 1-2, pp. 489–532, 2020.

[26] M. L. Overton, "Large-scale optimization of eigenvalues," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 88–120, 1992.

[27] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex analysis*, vol. 18. Princeton university press, 1970.

[28] D. Drusvyatskiy, H. Wolkowicz, *et al.*, "The many faces of degeneracy in conic optimization," *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 77–170, 2017.

[29] J. F. Sturm, "Error bounds for linear matrix inequalities," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 1228–1248, 2000.

A. Proof of Proposition 1

Before proving Proposition 1, we first review two technical lemmas to facilitate the proof.

Theorem 3 ([22, Theorem 7.21]): Suppose that problem (6) satisfies Slater's constraint qualification condition. Then, there exists a constant $\rho_0 \geq 0$ such that for all $\rho > \rho_0$, a point $\hat{x}$ is an optimal solution of problem (6) if and only if it is an optimal solution of problem (7). In particular, we can choose $\rho_0 = \sup_{\mu \in M} \|\mu\|_\infty$, where $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is the set of Lagrange multipliers associated with $g_i(x) \leq 0, i = 1, \ldots, m$.

Lemma 3 ([26, Theorem 2]): Given a symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbb{S}^n$. Suppose its maximal eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ has multiplicity t. Then, we have

$$\partial \lambda_{\max}(A) = \left\{ QUQ^\mathsf{T} \mid U \in \mathbb{S}_+^t, \mathbf{tr}(U) = 1 \right\},$$

where the columns of $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times t}$ forms an orthonormal set of the eigenvectors for $\lambda_{\max}(A)$.

We are ready to prove Proposition (1) by applying Theorem (3). Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ be the set of all Lagrange multipliers associated with the inequality constraints $\lambda_{\max}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X^\star)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right) \leq 0, k = 1, \ldots, p$, in (10). Consider $\bar{M} = \left\{ \mathrm{tr}(Y_1^\star), \mathrm{tr}(Y_2^\star), \ldots, \mathrm{tr}(Y_p^\star) | (y^\star, Y_k^\star) \in \mathcal{D}^\star \right\}$, where $\mathcal{D}^\star$ is the optimal solution set in (12). It is sufficient to show $M = \bar{M}$. We start the proof by denoting the KKT optimally condition for (10):

$$0 \in C + \sum_{k=1}^p \alpha_k \partial \left(\lambda_{\max}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right)\right) - \sum_{i=1}^m A_i y_i. \quad (23a)$$

$$\alpha_k \lambda_{\max}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right) = 0, \alpha_k \geq 0, k = 1, \ldots, p. \quad (23b)$$

$$\lambda_{\max}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right) \leq 0, k = 1, \ldots, p. \quad (23c)$$

$$\langle A_i, X \rangle = b_i, i = 1, \ldots, m. \quad (23d)$$

The proof has two directions. We will show $\bar{M} \subseteq M$, and $M \subseteq \bar{M}$ respectively.

- First, we prove $\bar{M} \subseteq M$. For any primal-dual optimal solution for (9) and (12) denoted by $X^\star$ and $(y^\star, Y_k^\star)$ respectively, it suffices to show $\alpha_k = \mathbf{tr}(Y_k^\star)$ satisfies (23). It is clear that $X^\star$ satisfies (23c) and (23d). Therefore, it remains to prove (23a) and (23b) are also satisfied. For index k such that $\lambda_{\max}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X^\star)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right) = 0$, it is trivial that (23b) is satisfied. For index k such that $\lambda_{\max}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X^\star)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right) < 0$, we know $Y_k^\star = 0$ due to the complementary slackness $\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}X^\star E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right)Y_k^\star = 0$. Choosing $\alpha_k = \mathbf{tr}(Y_k^\star) = 0$ also satisfies (23b). We then move on to prove (23a). From complementary slackness

$$\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}X^\star E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right)Y_k^\star = Y_k^\star \left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}X^\star E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right)$$
$$= X^\star \left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}Y_k^\star E_{\mathcal{C}_k}\right) = 0,$$

it is easy to see that

$$\mathrm{range}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}Y_k^\star E_{\mathcal{C}_k}\right) \subseteq \mathrm{null}\left(X^\star\right),$$
$$\mathrm{range}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}X^\star E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right) \subseteq \mathrm{null}\left(Y_k^\star\right).$$

From Lemma 3, we know that

$$\partial\left(\lambda_{\max}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X^\star)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right)\right)$$
$$\in \left\{ E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}QUQ^\mathsf{T}E_{\mathcal{C}_k} \mid U \in \mathbb{S}_+^t, \mathbf{tr}(U) = 1 \right\},$$

where $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_k| \times t}$ is the orthonormal eigenvectors matrix corresponding to $\lambda_{\max}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X^\star)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right)$ (or $\lambda_{\min}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(X^\star)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right)$ equivalently) with t multiplicities. Therefore, it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}Y_k^\star E_{\mathcal{C}_k} = C - \sum_{i=1}^m A_i y_i^\star$$

$$\in -\sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{tr}(Y_k^\star)\partial\left(\lambda_{\max}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X^\star)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right)\right).$$

Hence, choosing $\alpha_k = \mathbf{tr}(Y_k^\star)$ ensures (23a) is satisfied.

- Second, we prove $M \subseteq \bar{M}$. Note that it is equivalent to prove $\forall \{\alpha_k\} \notin \bar{M}$, we can not find $(X^\star, y^\star)$ that satisfies (23). This is obvious since

$$\sum_{i=1}^p E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}Y_k^\star E_{\mathcal{C}_k} = C - \sum_{i=1}^m A_i y_i^\star$$

$$\notin -\sum_{k=1}^p \alpha_k\partial\left(\lambda_{\max}\left(E_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-X^\star)E_{\mathcal{C}_k}^\mathsf{T}\right)\right).$$

if $\{\alpha_k\} \notin M$, which completes the proof.

B. Proof of Proposition 2

We rewrite the master problem (16) as

$$\min_{X \in \mathcal{X}_0} \max_{W_k \in \hat{\mathcal{W}}_{t,k}} \langle C, X \rangle - \rho \sum_{k=1}^p \langle \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(X), W_k \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|X - \Omega_t\|_\mathrm{F}^2.$$

Using the fact that $\hat{\mathcal{W}}_{t,k}$ is bounded and strong duality holds for the above problem, we can switch the order of the maximization and minimization [27, Corollary 37.3.2] and recast the problem as

$$\max_{W_k \in \hat{\mathcal{W}}_{t,k}} \min_{X \in \mathcal{X}_0} \langle C, X \rangle - \rho \sum_{k=1}^p \langle \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(X), W_k \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|X - \Omega_t\|_\mathrm{F}^2.$$

Since the above objective function is a strongly convex function in terms of X, strong duality also holds for the inner minimization. We can derive the dual of the inner problem to remove the affine constraints. To derive the dual problem, we introduce a dual variable $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and form the Lagrangian function

$$L(X, y) := \langle C, X \rangle - \rho \sum_{k=1}^p \langle \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(X), W_k \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|X - \Omega_t\|_\mathrm{F}^2$$
$$+ y^\mathsf{T}\left(b - \mathcal{A}(X)\right).$$

The dual function is defined as $g(y) := \min_X L(X, y)$ with the unique minimizer

$$X^\star = \Omega_t + \frac{1}{\alpha}\left(\rho \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_k) + \mathcal{A}^*(y) - C\right).$$

By substituting $X^\star$ in the Lagrangian function, we compute the dual function

$$g(y) = \left\langle C - \rho \sum_{i=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_k), \Omega_t \right\rangle + \langle b - \mathcal{A}(\Omega_t), y \rangle$$
$$- \frac{1}{2\alpha} \left\| \rho \sum_{i=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_k) + \mathcal{A}^*(y) - C \right\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2.$$

Therefore, the master problem (16) can be simplified as

$$\max_{W_k \in \hat{\mathcal{W}}_{t,k}} \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left\langle C - \rho \sum_{i=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_k), \Omega_t \right\rangle + \langle b - \mathcal{A}(\Omega_t), y \rangle$$
$$- \frac{1}{2\alpha} \left\| \rho \sum_{i=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_k) + \mathcal{A}^*(y) - C \right\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2,$$

which completes the proof.

C. Proof of Lemma 1

For notational convenience, we denote $\hat{G}_t$ as the approximation model $\hat{G}_{\{\bar{W}_{t,k}, P_{t,k}\}}$ at iteration t. First, from the definition of the descent step and $X^\star$ being the minimizer, we know that

$$G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star) \geq \beta \left(G(\Omega_t) - \hat{G}_t(X_{t+1}^\star) \right). \quad (24)$$

We also note that $X_{t+1}^\star$ minimizes the master problem

$$\hat{G}_t(X_{t+1}^\star) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \| X^\star - \Omega_t \|_{\mathrm{F}}^2 \leq \hat{G}_t(\Omega_t) \leq G(\Omega_t),$$

which implies

$$\left(G(\Omega_t) - \hat{G}_t(X_{t+1}^\star) \right)$$
$$\geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \| X^\star - \Omega_t \|_{\mathrm{F}}^2$$
$$= \frac{1}{2\alpha} \left\| \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_{t,C_k}^\star) + \mathcal{A}^*(y) - C \right\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2,$$

where the last equality uses the optimality condition in (21) and the construction $W_{t,C_k}^\star = \gamma_{t,k}^\star \bar{W}_{t,k} + P_{t,k} S_{t,k}^\star P_{t,k}^\mathsf{T}$. Combining (24) with the above inequality yields

$$G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star) \geq \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \left\| \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_{t,C_k}^\star) + \mathcal{A}^*(y) - C \right\|_{\mathrm{F}}^2,$$

which finishes the proof for the approximate dual feasibility.

Second, by the fact that a descent step implies a drop in the cost value, we have

$$G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star)$$
$$\geq G(\Omega_{t+1}) - G(X^\star)$$
$$= \langle C, \Omega_t - X^\star \rangle + \rho \sum_{i=1}^{p} \max \{ 0, \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(-\Omega_t)) \}$$
$$= \langle C, \Omega_t - X^\star \rangle - \rho \sum_{i=1}^{p} \min \{ 0, \lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(\Omega_t)) \}.$$

The first term can be bounded by strong duality

$$\langle C, \Omega_t - X^\star \rangle = \left\langle \mathcal{A}^*(y^\star) + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(Y_k^\star), \Omega_t - X^\star \right\rangle$$
$$= \sum_{k=1}^{p} \langle Y_k^\star, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(\Omega_t) \rangle$$
$$\geq \sum_{k=1}^{p} \| Y_k^\star \|_* \min\{0, \lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(\Omega_t))\}$$
$$\geq \sum_{k=1}^{p} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}^\star} \min\{0, \lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(\Omega_t))\}$$

where the first equality comes from strong duality, the second uses the definition of the adjoint operator, i.e., $\langle \mathcal{A}^*(y), X \rangle = \langle \mathcal{A}(X), y \rangle$, the fact that Ω_t and $X^\star$ both satisfy the affine constraints, complementarity slackness $\langle Y_k^\star, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(X^\star) \rangle = 0$, and cyclic property of trace operation. Therefore,

$$G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star)$$
$$\geq \sum_{k=1}^{p} (\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}^\star} - \rho) \min\{0, \lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(\Omega_t))\}$$
$$\geq (\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}^\star} - \rho) \min\{0, \lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(\Omega_t))\}, \forall 1 \leq k \leq p,$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that $(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}^\star} - \rho) \min\{0, \lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(\Omega_t))\} \geq 0, \forall 1 \leq k \leq p$. Along with the assumption $\rho > (2\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}^\star} + 1)$, this implies

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(\Omega_t)) \geq \frac{-(G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star))}{(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}^\star} + 1)}, \forall 1 \leq k \leq p. \quad (25)$$

This completes the proof for approximate primal feasibility.

Third, by the feasibility of Ω_{t+1}, the duality gap follows

$$\langle C, \Omega_{t+1} \rangle - \langle b, y_t^\star \rangle$$
$$= \langle C, \Omega_{t+1} \rangle - \langle \mathcal{A}(\Omega_{t+1}), y_t^\star \rangle$$
$$= \langle C, \Omega_{t+1} \rangle - \langle \mathcal{A}^*(y_t^\star), \Omega_{t+1} \rangle$$
$$= \left\langle \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_{t,k}^\star), \Omega_{t+1} \right\rangle$$
$$+ \left\langle C - \mathcal{A}^*(y_t^\star) - \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_{t,k}^\star), \Omega_{t+1} \right\rangle.$$

The lower bound of the first term follows

$$\left\langle \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(W_{t,k}^\star), \Omega_{t+1} \right\rangle$$
$$\geq \sum_{k=1}^{p} \| W_{t,k}^\star \|_* \lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_k}(\Omega_{t+1}))$$
$$\geq \sum_{k=1}^{p} \| W_{t,k}^\star \|_* \frac{-(G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star))}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}^\star} + 1}$$
$$\geq (G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star)) \sum_{k=1}^{p} \frac{-\rho}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}^\star} + 1}$$
$$= -(G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star)) \frac{p\rho}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}^\star} + 1},$$

where the second inequality uses the cyclic property of trace operation and (25) and the third inequality is due to the

construction $W^\star_{t,C_k} \leq \rho$ (14). The upper bound of the first term follows

$$\left\langle \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{C_k}(W^\star_{t,k}), \Omega_{t+1} \right\rangle$$
$$\leq \left\langle \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{C_k}(W^\star_{t,C_k}), \Omega_{t+1} \right\rangle$$
$$+ \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \max\left\{0, \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_{C_k}(-\Omega_{t+1}))\right\}$$
$$= G(\Omega_{t+1}) - \hat{G}_t(\Omega_{t+1})$$
$$\leq \frac{1-\beta}{\beta}(G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star)),$$

where the last inequality comes from a reformulation of the definition of the descent step (17).

The second term can be bounded by Cauchy inequality

$$\left| \left\langle C - \mathcal{A}^*(y^\star_t) - \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{C_k}(W^\star_{t,C_k}), \Omega_{t+1} \right\rangle \right|$$
$$\leq \left\| C - \mathcal{A}^*(y^\star_t) - \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{C_k}(W^\star_{t,C_k}) \right\|_F \|\Omega_{t+1}\|_F$$
$$\leq \mathcal{D}_{\Omega_0} \sqrt{\frac{2\alpha}{\beta}(G(\Omega_t) - G(X^\star))}.$$

Combing the lower and upper bounds for both terms finishes the proof for the approximate primal-dual optimality.

D. Proof of Lemma 2

We first note that the optimal solution set of (9) and (11) is the same and is compact by Assumption 2. The optimal solution set $\mathcal{P}^\star$ can be considered as $\mathcal{M} \cap \{X \in \mathbb{S}^n \mid \mathcal{A}(X) = b, \langle C, X \rangle = p^\star\}$, where $\mathcal{M} = \{X \in \mathbb{S}^n \mid E_{C_k} X E_{C_k} \in \mathbb{S}_+^{|C_k|}, 1 \leq k \leq p\}$. Let $\mathcal{L} := \{X \in \mathbb{S}^n \mid \langle C, X \rangle = p^\star\}$. The result in [28, Theorem 4.5.1] ensures that there exists a real constant $k_1 > 0$ and $k_2 > 0$ such that $\forall X \in \mathcal{S}_\epsilon$,

$$\mathrm{dist}^{2^d}(X, \mathcal{P}^\star)$$
$$\leq k_1 \left(\mathrm{dist}(X, \mathcal{L}) + \mathrm{dist}(X, \mathcal{M})\right)$$
$$= k_1 \left(\mathrm{dist}(X, \mathcal{L}) + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \mathrm{dist}\left(\mathcal{E}_{C_k}(X), \mathbb{S}_+^{|C_k|}\right)\right)$$
$$\leq k_1 \left(k_2|\langle C, X \rangle - \langle C, X^\star \rangle| + \sum_{k=1}^{p} |C_k| \max\{\lambda_{\max}(-\mathcal{E}_{C_k}(X)), 0\}\right)$$
$$\leq k_1 k_3 \left(|\langle C, X \rangle - \langle C, X^\star \rangle| + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \max\{\lambda_{\max}(-\mathcal{E}_{C_k}(X)), 0\}\right),$$

where $k_3 = \max\{k_2, |C_1|, \ldots, |C_k|\}$ and the second inequality applies the fact that $\mathrm{dist}\left(X, \mathbb{S}_+^{|C_k|}\right) \leq$

$|C_k| \max\{\lambda_{\max}(-X), 0\})$ for any $X \in \mathbb{S}^{|C_k|}$ and $\mathrm{dist}(X, \mathcal{L}) \leq k_2|\langle C, X \rangle - \langle C, X^\star \rangle|$ since $\mathcal{L}$ is an affine space. To characterize the relationship of $G(X) - G(X^\star)$ and $\mathrm{dist}(X, \mathcal{P}^\star)$, we then proceed to prove that for some large enough $\rho \geq 1$, the following holds

$$|\langle C, X \rangle - \langle C, X^\star \rangle| + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \max\{\lambda_{\max}(-\mathcal{E}_{C_k}(X)), 0\}$$
$$\leq G(X) - G(X^\star)$$
$$= \langle C, X \rangle - \langle C, X^\star \rangle + \rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} \max\{\lambda_{\max}(-\mathcal{E}_{C_k}(X)), 0\}.$$

In particular, if $|\langle C, X \rangle - \langle C, X^\star \rangle| = \langle C, X \rangle - \langle C, X^\star \rangle$, the inequality holds naturally. If, however, $|\langle C, X \rangle - \langle C, X^\star \rangle| = \langle C, X^\star \rangle - \langle C, X \rangle$, assuming the above inequality holds, it follows that

$$2\langle C, X \rangle - 2\langle C, X^\star \rangle$$
$$+ (\rho - 1) \sum_{k=1}^{p} \max\{\lambda_{\max}(-\mathcal{E}_{C_k}(X)), 0\} \geq 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\langle C, X \rangle - \langle C, X^\star \rangle$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2}(\rho - 1) \sum_{k=1}^{p} \max\{\lambda_{\max}(-\mathcal{E}_{C_k}(X)), 0\} \geq 0,$$

Indeed, the above inequality holds as long as $\frac{(\rho-1)}{2} > \mathcal{D}_{y^\star}$ or, equivalently, $\rho > 2\mathcal{D}_{y^\star} + 1$. Therefore, upon choosing $\rho > 2\mathcal{D}_{y^\star} + 1$, we show that there exists a constant $\mu > 0$ such that

$$\mathrm{dist}^{2^d}(X, \mathcal{P}^\star) \leq \mu \cdot (G(X) - G(X^\star)).$$

The number d is the singularity degree of (9) and is bounded [29, Lemma 3.6]. Furthermore, if there exists a pair of primal and dual solutions for (9) and (12) that satisfies strict complementarity, the singularity degree d is at most one [29, Section 5].

Lemma 4: Given a convex set $A \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a convex function $f : A \to \mathbb{R}$, if the optimal solution set of the optimization problem $\min_{x \in A} f(x)$ is compact, then for all $\epsilon > 0$, the sublevel set $C_\epsilon = \{x \in A \mid f(x^\star) \leq f(x^\star) + \epsilon\}$ is compact.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the optimal solution set of $\min_{x \in A} f(x)$. To prove the compactness of $\mathcal{X}$ implies the compactness of any sub-level set C_ϵ, it is sufficient to prove the unboundedness of C_ϵ implies the unboundedness of $\mathcal{X}$ since the sub-level of a convex function is closed. For any $\epsilon > 0$, suppose C_ϵ is unbounded, there exists a direction $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\lim_{t \to \infty} \|x^\star + td\|_2 = \infty$, where $x^\star$ is an optimal solution, while $x^\star + td \in C_\epsilon$ for all $t \geq 0$. If there exists a point $\hat{x}$ on this line such that $\hat{x} = x^\star + \hat{t}d, \hat{t} > 0$ and $f(\hat{x}) > f(x^\star)$, by [22, Equation 2.30],

$$\frac{f(x^\star + td) - f(x^\star)}{t} \geq \frac{f(x^\star + \hat{t}d) - f(x^\star)}{\hat{t}} = k > 0, \forall t \geq \hat{t},$$

which implies $f(x^\star + td) \geq f(x^\star) + tk$. As $t \to \infty$, $f(x^\star + td) \to \infty$. However, this contradicts the assumption that this line stays in the sub-level set C_ϵ. Therefore, we conclude that $f(x^\star + td) = f(x^\star), \forall t \geq 0$, and $\mathcal{X}$ is not bounded. This completes the proof. ∎