

SUPERLINEAR CONVERGENCE OF AN INFEASIBLE PREDICTOR-CORRECTOR PATH-FOLLOWING INTERIOR POINT ALGORITHM FOR A SEMIDEFINITE LINEAR COMPLEMENTARITY PROBLEM USING THE HELMBERG–KOJIMA–MONTEIRO DIRECTION*

CHEE-KHIAN SIM[†]

Abstract. An interior point method (IPM) defines a search direction at each interior point of a region. These search directions form a direction field which in turn gives rise to a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs). The solutions of the system of ODEs can be viewed as underlying paths in the interior of the region. In [C.-K. Sim and G. Zhao, *Math. Program. Ser. A*, 110 (2007), pp. 475–499], these off-central paths are shown to be well-defined analytic curves, and any of their accumulation points is a solution to a given monotone semidefinite linear complementarity problem (SDLCP). The study of these paths provides a way to understand how iterates generated by an interior point algorithm behave. In this paper, we give a sufficient condition using these off-central paths that guarantees superlinear convergence of a predictor-corrector path-following interior point algorithm for SDLCP using the Helmberg–Kojima–Monteiro (HKM) direction. This sufficient condition is implied by a currently known sufficient condition for superlinear convergence. Using this sufficient condition, we show that for any linear semidefinite feasibility problem, superlinear convergence using the interior point algorithm, with the HKM direction, can be achieved for a suitable starting point. We work under the assumption of strict complementarity.

Key words. semidefinite linear complementarity problem, linear semidefinite feasibility problem, interior point method, superlinear convergence, Helmberg–Kojima–Monteiro direction

AMS subject classifications. 90C51, 90C22, 34C05

DOI. 10.1137/090779279

1. Introduction. The notion of a central path is introduced by Sonnevend [36] in 1985 to interior point methods (IPMs). The central path plays a key role in the path-following IPM. Besides the central path, “nearby” paths that lead to optimal solutions of a monotone semidefinite linear complementarity problem (SDLCP) also play an important role in the study of convergence behavior of a path-following interior point algorithm on a monotone SDLCP. This is so because, in practice, iterates generated by the algorithm may not always lie on the central path. [3] provides a good reference on the basic geometry of these paths. Fast local convergence of IPMs has been successfully proved by relating it to the boundedness of derivatives of underlying paths in [26, 39, 44, 45]. See also [37, 38].

The convergence analysis using a path-following interior point algorithm on semidefinite programs (SDPs), and hence on SDLCPs, is considered to be more difficult than on linear programs. This arises mainly due to the difficulty in maintaining symmetry in the linearized complementarity [46]. Researchers working in the IPM area have proposed ways to overcome this problem, which result in different symmetrized search directions [2, 14, 18, 27, 29, 31, 32, 43], along which iterates generated by interior point algorithms move. Among these search directions, the Helmberg–Kojima–Monteiro (HKM) and Nesterov–Todd (NT) directions have been implemented in existing SDP solvers.

*Received by the editors December 7, 2009; accepted for publication (in revised form) October 29, 2010; published electronically January 6, 2011.

<http://www.siam.org/journals/siopt/21-1/77927.html>

[†]Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong (macksim@inet.poly.edu.hk). The author’s work was supported by grant Poly U5021/09P.

There are various ways in which underlying paths, using these different search directions, for SDLCPs are defined in the literature [7, 19, 21, 25, 33, 11]. Paths arising from different search directions are likely to behave differently from each other. In [33], a definition of underlying paths for SDLCPs, using ordinary differential equations (ODEs), is proposed. This definition of an underlying path will be used in this paper.

The study of these paths provides a viable way to understand how iterates generated by an interior point algorithm behave. It has been shown that off-central paths corresponding to the Alizadeh–Haeberly–Overton (AHO) direction are analytic at solutions of an SDLCP [21, 25]. Superlinear convergence of iterates generated by existing interior point algorithms using the AHO direction (which does not, say, perform “narrowing” of the neighborhood) is hence possible [2, 17, 20, 24]. On the other hand, for the HKM direction, conditions [19, 34, 35, 11] are needed to ensure that off-central paths are analytic at solutions of an SDLCP for different definitions of these paths. Superlinear convergence of iterates generated by an interior point algorithm using the HKM direction can only be proven under further modifications of the algorithm, for example, by performing “narrowing” of the neighborhood [16]. Other sufficient conditions for superlinear convergence of the algorithm have been suggested in [19, 22, 23].

Under a strict complementarity assumption, in this paper we give a sufficient condition that ensures superlinear convergence of an infeasible predictor-corrector primal-dual path-following interior point algorithm for the HKM direction, using off-central paths. We do this in section 4. In section 2, we give precise definition of an SDLCP, show how an SDP can be written as an SDLCP, and also define the off-central path which we are studying in this paper. In section 3, we describe a transformation on the ODE system that defines an off-central path. We end up with a transformed ODE system that we use in section 4. In section 5, we show that the class of linear semi-definite feasibility problems¹ always enjoys superlinear convergence with the infeasible predictor-corrector primal-dual path-following interior point algorithm without further modifications to the algorithm for suitable starting points. We do this using the sufficient condition derived in section 4.

1.1. Notations and common definitions. The space of symmetric $n \times n$ matrices is denoted by S^n . Given matrices X and Y in $\mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, the standard inner product is defined by $X \bullet Y \equiv \text{Tr}(X^T Y)$, where $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the trace of a matrix. If $X \in S^n$ is positive semidefinite (resp., positive definite), we write $X \succeq 0$ (resp., $X \succ 0$). The cone of positive semidefinite (resp., positive definite) symmetric matrices is denoted by S_+^n (resp., S_{++}^n). The identity matrix is denoted by I_n , where n stands for the size of the matrix. In case the subscript is absent from I , the size of the identity matrix should be clear from the context.

$\|\cdot\|$ for a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ refers to its Euclidean norm, and for a matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ it refers to its Frobenius norm.

¹Note that the class of linear semidefinite feasibility problems is an important class of problems that has wide applicability in many areas, for example, in control theory [6], among others. A projective method is used in [9] to solve a linear semidefinite feasibility problem. This method is extended to solve the convex feasibility problem in [1] and the conic feasibility problem in [12]. A cutting plane method is also used to solve the convex feasibility problem, in particular, the semidefinite feasibility problem in [8, 10, 40, 42]. In all these works, the assumption that the interior of the feasible region is nonempty is always made. In this paper, we do not need such an assumption to show superlinear convergence using the existing infeasible predictor-corrector primal-dual path-following interior point algorithm on a linear semidefinite feasibility problem. Only a strict complementarity assumption and a suitable initial point are needed.

For a matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, we denote its component at the i th row and j th column by X_{ij} . Also, $X_{i\cdot}$ denotes the i th row of X and $X_{\cdot j}$ the j th column of X . In case X is partitioned into blocks of submatrices, then X_{ij} refers to the submatrix in the corresponding (i, j) position.

Given square matrices $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $\text{Diag}(A_1, \dots, A_m)$ is a square matrix with A_i as its diagonal blocks arranged in accordance to the way they are lined up in $\text{Diag}(A_1, \dots, A_m)$. All the other entries in $\text{Diag}(A_1, \dots, A_m)$ are taken to be zero.

Given functions $f : \Omega \rightarrow E$ and $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{++}$, where Ω is an arbitrary set, E is a normed vector space, and a subset $\tilde{\Omega} \subseteq \Omega$, we write $f(w) = O(g(w))$ for all $w \in \tilde{\Omega}$ to mean that $\|f(w)\| \leq Mg(w)$ for all $w \in \tilde{\Omega}$, where $M > 0$ is a positive constant. Suppose we have $E = S^n$. Then we write $f(w) = \Theta(g(w))$ if for all $w \in \tilde{\Omega}$, $f(w) \in S_{++}^n$, $f(w) = \mathcal{O}(g(w))$, and $f(w)^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(1/g(w))$. What the subset $\tilde{\Omega}$ is should be clear from the context. Usually, $\tilde{\Omega} = (0, \bar{w})$ for a small $\bar{w} > 0$. Given $\tilde{\Omega} = (0, \bar{w})$, we write $f(w) = o(g(w))$ to mean that $\|f(w)\|/g(w) \rightarrow 0$ as $w \rightarrow 0$.

In this paper, a reference written after the name of a proposition means a reference to a similar result, which has been generalized in the paper.

2. Definitions of an SDLCP and an off-central path. Let us consider the following system defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & XY = 0, \\ (2) \quad & A(X) + B(Y) = q, \\ (3) \quad & X, Y \in S_+^n, \end{aligned}$$

where $A, B : S^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n}}$ are linear operators mapping S^n to the space $\mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n}}$, where $\tilde{n} := n(n+1)/2$. Hence A and B have the form $A(X) = (A_1 \bullet X, \dots, A_{\tilde{n}} \bullet X)^T$, respectively, $B(Y) = (B_1 \bullet Y, \dots, B_{\tilde{n}} \bullet Y)^T$, where $A_i, B_i \in S^n$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{n}$. Also, $q \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n}}$.

The SDLCP is to find a solution to system (1)–(3). We also called the system (1)–(3) SDLCP.

We have the following assumptions on system (1)–(3) throughout the paper.

Assumption 2.1.

- (a) SDLCP (1)–(3) is monotone; i.e., $A(X) + B(Y) = 0$ for $X, Y \in S^n \Rightarrow X \bullet Y \geq 0$.
- (b) There exists at least one solution to SDLCP (1)–(3).
- (c) $\{A(X) + B(Y) : X, Y \in S^n\} = \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n}}$.

The first assumption is satisfied for the class of SDPs, with equality for $X \bullet Y$ instead of inequality. The last assumption is a technical assumption that can be satisfied for any given SDP.

An SDP in its primal and dual forms is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{P}) \quad & \min \quad C \bullet X \\ & \text{subject to} \quad A_i \bullet X = b_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\ & \quad \quad \quad X \in S_+^n, \\ (\mathcal{D}) \quad & \max \quad \sum_{i=1}^m b_i y_i \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i + Y = C, \\ & \quad \quad \quad Y \in S_+^n. \end{aligned}$$

It is without loss of generality that we assume $A_i, i = 1, \dots, m$, are linearly independent.

Written in the form (2), in this case $A_i = 0, i = m + 1, \dots, \tilde{n}$, while $B_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, m$, and $B_i, i = m + 1, \dots, \tilde{n}$, linearly independent, are obtained from the subspace in S^n orthogonal to the space spanned by $A_i, i = 1, \dots, m$.

It has been shown in [15] that a monotone SDLCP is reducible to an SDP. Hence, we may consider $A_i = 0, i = m + 1, \dots, \tilde{n}$, while $B_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, m$, in (2) from now onward, although the results in this paper, such as Theorem 4.3, also hold for any SDLCP satisfying (1)–(3), without having $A_i = 0, i = m + 1, \dots, \tilde{n}$, and $B_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, m$, in (2).

Let us now define the infeasible off-central path for an SDLCP passing through a point (X_0, Y_0) , $X_0, Y_0 \succ 0$, using an ODE system.

DEFINITION 2.1. *The solution $(X(\mu), Y(\mu))$, $X(\mu), Y(\mu) \succ 0$, where $\mu > 0$, to*

$$(4) \quad H_P(XY' + X'Y) = \frac{1}{\mu} H_P(XY),$$

$$(5) \quad A(X') + B(Y') = \frac{1}{\mu} (A(X) + B(Y) - q),$$

with the initial condition $(X(\bar{\mu}_0), Y(\bar{\mu}_0)) = (X_0, Y_0)$, $X_0, Y_0 \succ 0$, $\bar{\mu}_0 = \text{Tr}(X_0 Y_0)/n$, is the infeasible off-central path² for an SDLCP, corresponding to P , passing through (X_0, Y_0) . Here, $H_P(U) := \frac{1}{2}(PUP^{-1} + (PUP^{-1})^T)$, and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is an invertible matrix.

In the above definition, X' and Y' stand for the first derivative of X and Y w.r.t. μ , respectively.

We use $\bar{\mu}_0$ to denote the initial starting point for μ in the ODE system (4), (5) to distinguish it from μ_0 , which is the duality gap divided by n for the initial iterate using Algorithm 4.1.

Assuming P is an analytic function of X, Y and $PXY P^{-1}$ is always symmetric (such P include the well-known directions like the HKM (and its dual) and NT directions), it is proved in [33] that when $A(X_0) + B(Y_0) = q$, the off-central path, $(X(\mu), Y(\mu))$, is well defined, unique, analytic over $\mu \in (0, \infty)$, and any of its accumulation points is a solution to (1)–(3). It is easy to see that these also hold when we consider an infeasible³ off-central path when $A(X_0) + B(Y_0) \neq q$.

Remark 2.1. Due to linearity, (5) can also be written as

$$(6) \quad A(X') + B(Y') = r_0 / \bar{\mu}_0,$$

where r_0 is given by

$$A(X_0) + B(Y_0) - q.$$

Hence, we have that $(X(\mu), Y(\mu))$ satisfies

$$(7) \quad A(X) + B(Y) = q + \mu r_0 / \bar{\mu}_0.$$

Remark 2.2. It is easy to see, using (4), that the parameter μ in the ODE system (4)–(5) (or (4), (6)) is actually the duality gap, $X(\mu) \bullet Y(\mu)$, divided by n , at the point $(X(\mu), Y(\mu))$ on the path.

²[33] provides a good background to understand why we define an off-central path in this way.

³From now onward, we omit the word “infeasible” when we mention off-central path.

3. An investigation on ODE system (4), (6). In this paper, we consider only the (dual) HKM search direction, where $P = Y^{1/2}$. Hence, (4) and (6) can be written as

$$(8) \quad H_{Y^{1/2}}(XY' + X'Y) = \frac{1}{\mu} H_{Y^{1/2}}(XY),$$

$$(9) \quad A(X') + B(Y') = r_0/\bar{\mu}_0,$$

where $r_0 = A(X_0) + B(Y_0) - q$ and $\mu > 0$.

Written in matrix-vector form, the above ODE system (8), (9) can be rewritten as

$$(10) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A} & \mathcal{B} \\ I & X \otimes_s Y^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \text{svec}(X') \\ \text{svec}(Y') \end{pmatrix} = (1/\mu) \begin{pmatrix} \mu r_0/\bar{\mu}_0 \\ \text{svec}(X) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The operation $\otimes_s$ and the map “svec” are used extensively in this paper. For their definitions and properties, the reader can refer to pp. 775–776 and the appendix of [41].

The matrices $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are derived from the operators A and B , respectively, and are given by

$$(11) \quad \mathcal{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{svec}(A_1)^T \\ \vdots \\ \text{svec}(A_{\tilde{n}})^T \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{svec}(B_1)^T \\ \vdots \\ \text{svec}(B_{\tilde{n}})^T \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since we assume that $A_i = 0, i = m+1, \dots, \tilde{n}$, and $B_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, m$, we can write $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ as

$$(12) \quad \mathcal{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{B}_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathcal{A}_1$ consists of m rows and has full row rank (which follows from Assumption 2.1(c)), while $\mathcal{B}_1$ consists of $\tilde{n} - m$ rows and also has full row rank (which follows from Assumption 2.1(c)).

Making use of the special structure of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ in (12), we perform block Gaussian elimination on $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ individually to obtain

$$(13) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (A_1)_{11} & (A_1)_{12} \\ (A_1)_{12}^T & (A_1)_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \vdots \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (A_{j_1})_{11} & (A_{j_1})_{12} \\ (A_{j_1})_{12}^T & (A_{j_1})_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (A_{j_1+1})_{12} \\ (A_{j_1+1})_{12}^T & (A_{j_1+1})_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \vdots \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (A_{j_1+j_2})_{12} \\ (A_{j_1+j_2})_{12}^T & (A_{j_1+j_2})_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (A_{j_1+j_2+1})_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \vdots \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (A_m)_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (B_1)_{11} & (B_1)_{12} \\ (B_1)_{12}^T & (B_1)_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \vdots \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (B_{k_1})_{11} & (B_{k_1})_{12} \\ (B_{k_1})_{12}^T & (B_{k_1})_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (B_{k_1+1})_{11} & (B_{k_1+1})_{12} \\ (B_{k_1+1})_{12}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \vdots \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (B_{k_1+k_2})_{11} & (B_{k_1+k_2})_{12} \\ (B_{k_1+k_2})_{12}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (B_{k_1+k_2+1})_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \vdots \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (B_{\tilde{n}-m})_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T \end{pmatrix},$$

respectively.

Henceforth, we assume $(\mathcal{A} \ \mathcal{B})$ is of the form (12) with $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ taking the form in (13).

To analyze superlinear convergence, besides Assumptions 2.1(a)–2.1(c), we need an additional assumption as stated below.

Assumption 3.1. There exists a strictly complementary solution (X^*, Y^*) to the SDLCP (1)–(3). That is, $X^* + Y^* \succ 0$.

Assumption 3.1 is currently needed in the literature [16, 22, 23] to show superlinear convergence using an interior point algorithm on an SDLCP or SDP. See also [12].

Henceforth, we assume that Assumptions 2.1(a)–2.1(c) and 3.1 always hold in this paper.

Since X^* and Y^* commute, they are jointly diagonalizable by some orthogonal matrix Q . So, using this orthogonal similarity transformation of the matrices in the SDLCP (1)–(3), we may assume without loss of generality that

$$(14) \quad X^* = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_{11}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda_{22}^* \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\Lambda_{11}^* = \text{Diag}(\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_{k_0}^*) \succ 0$ and $\Lambda_{22}^* = \text{Diag}(\lambda_{k_0+1}^*, \dots, \lambda_n^*) \succ 0$. Here, $\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_n^*$ are real numbers greater than zero.

Hereafter, whenever we partition a matrix $S \in S^n$, we do it in a similar way; i.e., S is always partitioned as $\begin{pmatrix} S_{11} & S_{12} \\ S_{12}^T & S_{22} \end{pmatrix}$, where $S_{11} \in S^{k_0}$, $S_{22} \in S^{n-k_0}$, and $S_{12} \in \mathfrak{R}^{k_0 \times (n-k_0)}$.

First, let us make a few observations on the off-central paths defined in Definition 2.1 in the following propositions.

PROPOSITION 3.1. (see [25, Lemma 3.7]). *The set $\mathcal{U}$ defined by*

$$\{(X(\mu), Y(\mu)) \in S_{++}^n \times S_{++}^n : 0 < \mu \leq \bar{\mu}_0, \lambda_{\min}(XY)(\bar{\mu}_0) \geq D, \\ \|X(\bar{\mu}_0)\| \leq C, \|Y(\bar{\mu}_0)\| \leq C\}$$

is bounded for fixed $\bar{\mu}_0, C, D > 0$. Here, $\lambda_{\min}(XY)(\bar{\mu}_0)$ is the minimum eigenvalue of $X(\bar{\mu}_0)Y(\bar{\mu}_0)$.

Proof. Consider $(X(\mu), Y(\mu)) \in \mathcal{U}$, with $(X(\bar{\mu}_0), Y(\bar{\mu}_0)) = (X_0, Y_0)$.

We have by Remark 2.2, $X(\mu) \bullet Y(\mu) = (\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)X(\bar{\mu}_0) \bullet Y(\bar{\mu}_0) = n\mu$.

Note that (X^*, Y^*) satisfies $A(X^*) + B(Y^*) = q$, and $(X(\mu), Y(\mu))$ satisfies $A(X(\mu)) + B(Y(\mu)) = q + (\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)r_0$.

Let

$$\hat{X}(\mu) = (1 - \mu/\bar{\mu}_0)X^* + (\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)X_0, \quad \hat{Y}(\mu) = (1 - \mu/\bar{\mu}_0)Y^* + (\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)Y_0.$$

Then

$$A(\hat{X}(\mu) - X(\mu)) + B(\hat{Y}(\mu) - Y(\mu)) = (1 - \mu/\bar{\mu}_0)q + (\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)(q + r_0) - q - (\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)r_0 \\ = 0.$$

Hence, by Assumption 2.1(a),

$$(\hat{X}(\mu) - X(\mu)) \bullet (\hat{Y}(\mu) - Y(\mu)) \geq 0.$$

That is,

$$\hat{X}(\mu) \bullet \hat{Y}(\mu) - \hat{X}(\mu) \bullet Y(\mu) - X(\mu) \bullet \hat{Y}(\mu) + X(\mu) \bullet Y(\mu)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (1 - \mu/\bar{\mu}_0)(\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)X^* \bullet Y_0 + (1 - \mu/\bar{\mu}_0)(\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)X_0 \bullet Y^* + n\mu^2/\bar{\mu}_0 \\
&\quad - (1 - \mu/\bar{\mu}_0)X^* \bullet Y(\mu) - (\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)X_0 \bullet Y(\mu) - (1 - \mu/\bar{\mu}_0)X(\mu) \bullet Y^* \\
&\quad - (\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)X(\mu) \bullet Y_0 + X(\mu) \bullet Y(\mu) \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1 - \mu/\bar{\mu}_0)(X^* \bullet Y(\mu) + X(\mu) \bullet Y^*) + (\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)(X_0 \bullet Y(\mu) + X(\mu) \bullet Y_0) \\
&\leq (1 - \mu/\bar{\mu}_0)(\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)(X^* \bullet Y_0 + X_0 \bullet Y^*) + n\mu^2/\bar{\mu}_0 + X(\mu) \bullet Y(\mu) \\
&= (1 - \mu/\bar{\mu}_0)(\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)(X^* \bullet Y_0 + X_0 \bullet Y^*) + n\mu^2/\bar{\mu}_0 + n\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1/\mu - 1/\bar{\mu}_0)(X^* \bullet Y(\mu) + X(\mu) \bullet Y^*) + (1/\bar{\mu}_0)(X_0 \bullet Y(\mu) + X(\mu) \bullet Y_0) \\
&\leq (1 - \mu/\bar{\mu}_0)(1/\bar{\mu}_0)(X^* \bullet Y_0 + X_0 \bullet Y^*) + n\mu/\bar{\mu}_0 + n \\
&\leq M_1,
\end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \mu \leq \bar{\mu}_0$, where $M_1 > 0$ depends only on $\bar{\mu}_0, C$.

Therefore,

$$X_0 \bullet Y(\mu) \leq \bar{\mu}_0 M_1, \quad X(\mu) \bullet Y_0 \leq \bar{\mu}_0 M_1.$$

We have, for $0 < \mu \leq \bar{\mu}_0$,

$$\|X(\mu)\| \leq \bar{\mu}_0 M_1 / \lambda_{\min}(Y_0), \quad \|Y(\mu)\| \leq \bar{\mu}_0 M_1 / \lambda_{\min}(X_0).$$

Since $\|X_0\| \leq C$ and $\|Y_0\| \leq C$, together with $\lambda_{\min}(X_0 Y_0) \geq D$, we must have that $\lambda_{\min}(X_0)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(Y_0)$ are uniformly bounded from below by a positive constant independent of $(X(\mu), Y(\mu))$ chosen from $\mathcal{U}$. Hence, we are done. $\square$

PROPOSITION 3.2. (see [34, Lemma 2.2]). $Y_{11}(\mu)$ and $X_{22}(\mu)$ are equal to $\mathcal{O}(\mu)$, and $\|X_{12}(\mu)\|$ and $\|Y_{12}(\mu)\|$ are equal to $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\mu})$, where the bounds are not dependent on any off-central path $(X(\mu), Y(\mu))$ as long as $\lambda_{\min}(XY)(\bar{\mu}_0) \geq D$, $\|X(\bar{\mu}_0)\| \leq C$, $\|Y(\bar{\mu}_0)\| \leq C$ for fixed $\bar{\mu}_0, C, D > 0$.

PROPOSITION 3.3. (see [34, Lemma 2.3]). $X_{11}(\mu)$ and $Y_{22}(\mu)$ are equal to $\Theta(1)$, and $X_{22}(\mu)$ and $Y_{11}(\mu)$ are equal to $\Theta(\mu)$, where the bounds are not dependent on any off-central path $(X(\mu), Y(\mu))$ as long as $\lambda_{\min}(XY)(\bar{\mu}_0) \geq D$, $\|X(\bar{\mu}_0)\| \leq C$, $\|Y(\bar{\mu}_0)\| \leq C$ for fixed $\bar{\mu}_0, C, D > 0$.

The proof of Proposition 3.2 and that of Proposition 3.3 are similar to that of Lemma 2.2 and that of Lemma 2.3 in [34],⁴ respectively, and hence will not be shown here again. See also Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11 of [25].

From these propositions, we have that

$$X(\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1) & O(\sqrt{\mu}) \\ O(\sqrt{\mu}) & \Theta(\mu) \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y(\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(\mu) & O(\sqrt{\mu}) \\ O(\sqrt{\mu}) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
X(\mu) &= \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\mu}I \end{pmatrix} \tilde{X}(\mu) \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\mu}I \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y(\mu) &= \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\mu}I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \tilde{Y}(\mu) \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\mu}I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

⁴Proofs for these lemmas can be found at <http://www.math.nus.edu.sg/~matzgy/publist.html>.

where

$$\tilde{X}(\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1) & O(1) \\ O(1) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{Y}(\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1) & O(1) \\ O(1) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Before we go on, let us define new matrices $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_1(t)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1(t)$ as follows:

$$(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_1(t))_i := \begin{cases} \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (A_i)_{11} & t(A_i)_{12} \\ t(A_i)_{12}^T & t^2(A_i)_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T, & 1 \leq i \leq j_1, \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (A_i)_{12} \\ (A_i)_{12}^T & t(A_i)_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T, & j_1 + 1 \leq i \leq j_1 + j_2, \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (A_i)_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T, & j_1 + j_2 + 1 \leq i \leq m, \end{cases}$$

$$(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1(t))_j := \begin{cases} \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} t^2(B_j)_{11} & t(B_j)_{12} \\ t(B_j)_{12}^T & (B_j)_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T, & 1 \leq j \leq k_1, \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} t(B_j)_{11} & (B_j)_{12} \\ (B_j)_{12}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T, & k_1 + 1 \leq j \leq k_1 + k_2, \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (B_j)_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T, & k_1 + k_2 + 1 \leq j \leq \tilde{n} - m, \end{cases}$$

where $t^2 = \mu$.

The following proposition relates the above-defined new matrices with $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$.

PROPOSITION 3.4.

$$\mathcal{A}_1 \left(\begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & tI \end{pmatrix} \otimes_s \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & tI \end{pmatrix} \right) = \text{Diag}(I_{j_1}, tI_{j_2}, t^2 I_{m-j_1-j_2}) \bar{\mathcal{A}}_1(t),$$

$$\mathcal{B}_1 \left(\begin{pmatrix} tI & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \otimes_s \begin{pmatrix} tI & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \right) = \text{Diag}(I_{k_1}, tI_{k_2}, t^2 I_{\tilde{n}-m-k_1-k_2}) \bar{\mathcal{B}}_1(t).$$

Proof. The proposition is clear from the definitions of the new matrices and (13). $\square$

Remark 3.1. Let

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}(t) := \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mathcal{A}}_1(t) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{\mathcal{B}}(t) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{\mathcal{B}}_1(t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{A} \left(\begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & tI \end{pmatrix} \otimes_s \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & tI \end{pmatrix} \right) = \text{Diag}(I_{j_1}, tI_{j_2}, t^2 I_{m-j_1-j_2}, I_{k_1}, tI_{k_2}, t^2 I_{\tilde{n}-m-k_1-k_2}) \bar{\mathcal{A}}(t),$$

$$\mathcal{B} \left(\begin{pmatrix} tI & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \otimes_s \begin{pmatrix} tI & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \right) = \text{Diag}(I_{j_1}, tI_{j_2}, t^2 I_{m-j_1-j_2}, I_{k_1}, tI_{k_2}, t^2 I_{\tilde{n}-m-k_1-k_2}) \bar{\mathcal{B}}(t).$$

PROPOSITION 3.5. We have

$$(15) \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{q} \\ 0 \\ \hat{\hat{q}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\hat{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{j_1}$, $\hat{\hat{q}} \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1}$ (whose first entry starts at the $m+1$ entry of q).

Proof. Observe that $(X(\mu), Y(\mu))$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X) + \mathcal{B}\text{svec}(Y) = q + \mu r_0 / \bar{\mu}_0.$$

Hence,

$$(16) \quad \text{Diag}(I_{j_1}, tI_{j_2}, t^2I_{m-j_1-j_2}, I_{k_1}, tI_{k_2}, t^2I_{\tilde{n}-m-k_1-k_2})(\bar{\mathcal{A}}(t)\text{svec}(\tilde{X}) \\ + \bar{\mathcal{B}}(t)\text{svec}(\tilde{Y})) = q + t^2r_0/\bar{\mu}_0,$$

where $\mu = t^2$.

We see from (16) by taking $t \rightarrow 0$ that q has the required form (15). $\square$

Now the inverse of the matrix on the extreme left in the ODE system (10) is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} -(X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1} & I + (X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}\mathcal{A} \\ \mathcal{G}^{-1} & -\mathcal{G}^{-1}\mathcal{A} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathcal{G}(\mu) := \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A}(X \otimes_s Y^{-1})$.

Therefore, (10) can be written as

$$(17) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \text{svec}(X') \\ \text{svec}(Y') \end{pmatrix} \\ = \frac{1}{\mu} \begin{pmatrix} -\mu(X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}(r_0/\bar{\mu}_0) + \text{svec}(X) + (X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X) \\ \mu\mathcal{G}^{-1}(r_0/\bar{\mu}_0) - \mathcal{G}^{-1}\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mu > 0$.

We have the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 3.6.

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mu(X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}(r_0/\bar{\mu}_0) + \text{svec}(X) + (X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X) \\ & \quad = (1/2)((X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}(-\mu r_0/\bar{\mu}_0 + q) + \text{svec}(X)), \\ & \mu\mathcal{G}^{-1}(r_0/\bar{\mu}_0) - \mathcal{G}^{-1}\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X) = (1/2)(\mathcal{G}^{-1}(\mu r_0/\bar{\mu}_0 - q) + \text{svec}(Y)), \end{aligned}$$

where (X, Y) satisfies $\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X) + \mathcal{B}\text{svec}(Y) = q + \mu r_0 / \bar{\mu}_0$.

Proof. We need only show the first equality. The second equality can be shown in a similar manner.

The equality is shown by

$$\text{svec}(X) + (X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X) = (1/2)(\text{svec}(X) + (X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}(q + \mu r_0 / \bar{\mu}_0)).$$

This is true since

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{svec}(X) + (X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X) \\ & = \text{svec}(X) + [\mathcal{B}(X \otimes_s Y^{-1})^{-1} - \mathcal{A}]^{-1}\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X) \\ & = (1/2)(\text{svec}(X) + [\mathcal{B}(X \otimes_s Y^{-1})^{-1} - \mathcal{A}]^{-1}q - [\mathcal{B}(X \otimes_s Y^{-1})^{-1} - \mathcal{A}]^{-1}\mathcal{B}\text{svec}(Y) \\ & \quad + \text{svec}(X) + [\mathcal{B}(X \otimes_s Y^{-1})^{-1} - \mathcal{A}]^{-1}\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X) + (X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}(\mu r_0 / \bar{\mu}_0)) \\ & = (1/2)(\text{svec}(X) + (X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}(q + \mu r_0 / \bar{\mu}_0)), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from $\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X) + \mathcal{B}\text{svec}(Y) = q + \mu r_0 / \bar{\mu}_0$. $\square$

Using (17) and Proposition 3.6, (10) can be written as

$$(18) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \text{svec}(X') \\ \text{svec}(Y') \end{pmatrix} = (1/2\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} (X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}(-\mu r_0/\bar{\mu}_0 + q) + \text{svec}(X) \\ \mathcal{G}^{-1}(\mu r_0/\bar{\mu}_0 - q) + \text{svec}(Y) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Observe using Propositions 3.4, 3.5, and Remark 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} (X \otimes_s Y^{-1})\mathcal{G}^{-1}(-\mu r_0/\bar{\mu}_0 + q) &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\mu}I \end{pmatrix} \otimes_s \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\mu}I \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad \times (\tilde{X} \otimes_s \tilde{Y}^{-1})\tilde{\mathcal{G}}^{-1}(-\sqrt{\mu}\tilde{r}_0/\bar{\mu}_0 + q), \\ \mathcal{G}^{-1}(\mu r_0/\bar{\mu}_0 - q) &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\mu}I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \otimes_s \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\mu}I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad \tilde{\mathcal{G}}^{-1}(\sqrt{\mu}\tilde{r}_0/\bar{\mu}_0 - q). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mu) := \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\sqrt{\mu}) - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\sqrt{\mu})(\tilde{X} \otimes_s \tilde{Y}^{-1})$, and

$$(19) \quad \tilde{r}_0 = \text{Diag} \left(\sqrt{\mu}I_{j_1}, I_{j_2}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}}I_{m-j_1-j_2}, \sqrt{\mu}I_{k_1}, I_{k_2}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}}I_{\tilde{n}-m-k_1-k_2} \right) r_0.$$

Hence, (18) can be written as

$$(20) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \text{svec}(X') \\ \text{svec}(Y') \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2\mu}T,$$

where

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} \left(\begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\mu}I \end{pmatrix} \otimes_s \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\mu}I \end{pmatrix} \right) ((\tilde{X} \otimes_s \tilde{Y}^{-1})\tilde{\mathcal{G}}^{-1}(-\sqrt{\mu}\tilde{r}_0/\bar{\mu}_0 + q) + \text{svec}(\tilde{X})) \\ \left(\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\mu}I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \otimes_s \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\mu}I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \right) (\tilde{\mathcal{G}}^{-1}(\sqrt{\mu}\tilde{r}_0/\bar{\mu}_0 - q) + \text{svec}(\tilde{Y})) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We are going to use this ODE system (20) in our investigation on sufficient conditions for superlinear convergence using an interior point algorithm on an SDLCP.

4. Sufficient conditions for superlinear convergence. We consider an infeasible predictor-corrector primal-dual path-following interior point algorithm to solve an SDLCP. We consider only the (dual) HKM search direction, where $P = Y^{1/2}$, in this paper.

Notice that the infeasible central path, $(X^c(\mu), Y^c(\mu))$, $\mu > 0$, with $(X^c(\bar{\mu}_0), Y^c(\bar{\mu}_0)) = (X_0^c, Y_0^c)$, which is a special off-central path, satisfies

$$(21) \quad XY = \mu I, \quad A(X) + B(Y) = q + (\mu/\bar{\mu}_0)r_0, \quad X, Y \in S_{++}^n,$$

where

$$(22) \quad X_0^c Y_0^c = \bar{\mu}_0 I, \quad X_0^c, Y_0^c \in S_{++}^n.$$

The existence of the infeasible central path is guaranteed and has been discussed in [25, 28, 30].

We consider the following neighborhood of the infeasible central path:

$$\mathcal{N}(\beta, \tau) := \{(X, Y) \in S_{++}^n \times S_{++}^n; \|Y^{1/2}XY^{1/2} - \tau I\| \leq \beta\tau\}.$$

Let us now describe the infeasible predictor-corrector primal-dual path-following interior point algorithm for the sake of completeness. The algorithm is from [23].

In the algorithm, solving the following linear system for $(U, V) \in S^n \times S^n$ plays an important role:

$$(23) \quad Y^{1/2}(XV + UY)Y^{-1/2} + Y^{-1/2}(VX + YU)Y^{1/2} = 2(\sigma\tau I - Y^{1/2}XY^{1/2}),$$

$$(24) \quad A(U) + B(V) = -\bar{r}.$$

The algorithm is described as follows.

ALGORITHM 4.1. Choose $\beta_1 < \beta_2$, with $\beta_2^2/(2(1-\beta_2)^2) \leq \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \beta_2/(1-\beta_2) < 1$. Choose $(X_0, Y_0) \in \mathcal{N}(\beta_1, \tau_0)$ with $\tau_0 = \mu_0 = X_0 \bullet Y_0/n$, and set $\psi_0 = 1$. For $k = 0, 1, \dots$, do (a1) through (a5):

(a1) Set $X = X_k$, $Y = Y_k$, $\psi = \psi_k$, $\tau = \tau_k$, and define

$$r = A(X) + B(Y) - q.$$

(a2) If $\max\{X \bullet Y, \|r\|\} \leq \epsilon$, then report (X, Y) as an approximate solution to (1)–(3) and terminate.

(a3) Find the solution U, V of the linear system (23), (24), with $\sigma = 0$, $\bar{r} = r$. Define

$$\bar{X} = X + \bar{\alpha}U, \quad \bar{Y} = Y + \bar{\alpha}V,$$

where the steplength $\bar{\alpha}$ satisfies

$$(25) \quad \alpha_1 \leq \bar{\alpha} \leq \alpha_2.$$

Here,

$$(26) \quad \alpha_1 = \frac{2}{\sqrt{1 + 4\delta/(\beta_2 - \beta_1)} + 1},$$

$$(27) \quad \delta = \frac{1}{\tau} \|Y^{1/2}UVY^{-1/2}\|,$$

and

$$\alpha_2 = \max\{\tilde{\alpha} \in [0, 1]; (X + \alpha U, Y + \alpha V) \in \mathcal{N}(\beta_2, (1 - \alpha)\tau) \forall \alpha \in [0, \tilde{\alpha}]\}.$$

Set $\psi_+ = (1 - \bar{\alpha})\psi$. If $\bar{\alpha} = 1$, then $(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$ solves (1)–(3) and terminate.

(a4) Find the solution U_1, V_1 of the linear system (23), (24), with $\sigma = (1 - \bar{\alpha})$, $\bar{r} = 0$. Set

$$X_+ = \bar{X} + U_1, \quad Y_+ = \bar{Y} + V_1, \\ \tau_+ = (1 - \bar{\alpha})\tau.$$

(a5) Set

$$X_{k+1} = X_+, \quad Y_{k+1} = Y_+, \\ \tau_{k+1} = \tau_+, \quad \psi_{k+1} = \psi_+.$$

We have the following theorem on the above algorithm.

THEOREM 4.1. (see [23, Theorem 2.6]).⁵ For any integer $0 \leq k < K_0$, where $K_0 = \infty$ if $\bar{\alpha} \neq 1$ for all iterations, Algorithm 4.1 defines a pair

$$(X_k, Y_k) \in \mathcal{N}(\beta_1, \tau_k),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} r_k &:= A(X_k) + B(Y_k) - q = \psi_k r_0, \\ \tau_k &= \psi_k \tau_0, \\ (1 - \beta_1)\tau_k &\leq \mu_k = (X_k \bullet Y_k)/n \leq (1 + \beta_1)\tau_k, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\psi_0 = 1, \quad \psi_k = \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} (1 - \bar{\alpha}_j),$$

and $\bar{\alpha}_j$ is defined by (25).

Observe from the theorem that we have $\tau_{k+1} = (1 - \bar{\alpha}_k)\tau_k$. Convergence of τ_k to zero implies that any accumulation point of (X_k, Y_k) is a solution to (1)–(3).

The following theorem states the complexity results of Algorithm 4.1.

THEOREM 4.2. (see [23, Corollary 3.9]).⁶ Assume that in Algorithm 4.1 we choose a starting point of the form $X_0 = Y_0 = \rho I$, where $\rho > 0$ is a constant. Let

$$\epsilon_0 = \max\{X_0 \bullet Y_0, \|r_0\|\},$$

and let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Then the following statements hold:

- (i) The algorithm terminates with an ϵ -approximate solution $(X_k, Y_k) \in S_+^n \times S_+^n$ with

$$0 \leq X_k \bullet Y_k \leq \epsilon, \quad \|r_k\| \leq \epsilon,$$

in a finite number of steps $k = K_\epsilon < \infty$.

- (ii) If $\max\{\|X^*\|, \|Y^*\|\} \leq \rho$, where (X^*, Y^*) solves (1)–(3), then

$$K_\epsilon = O(n \ln(\epsilon_0/\epsilon)).$$

- (iii) For any choice of $\rho > 0$, there is an index $k = \hat{K}_\epsilon = O(n \ln(\epsilon_0/\epsilon))$ such that either

(iiia) $(X_k, Y_k) \in S_+^n \times S_+^n$ satisfies $0 \leq X_k \bullet Y_k \leq \epsilon$, $\|r_k\| \leq \epsilon$, or

(iiib) $\bar{\alpha} \leq 1/[n(1 + 29/\sqrt{\beta_2 - \beta_1})]$, and there is no solution (X^*, Y^*) to (1)–(3) with $\max\{\|X^*\|, \|Y^*\|\} \leq \rho$.

Superlinear convergence of iterates (X_k, Y_k) generated by Algorithm 4.1 means

$$(28) \quad \frac{\tau_{k+1}}{\tau_k} = (1 - \bar{\alpha}_k) \rightarrow 0.$$

From step (a3) of Algorithm 4.1, we observe that if $(\alpha_1)_k \rightarrow 1$, then superlinear convergence of the algorithm occurs. Now $(\alpha_1)_k \rightarrow 1$ if and only if

$$(29) \quad \delta_k = \frac{1}{\tau_k} \|Y_k^{1/2} U_k V_k Y_k^{-1/2}\| \rightarrow 0.$$

⁵Theorem 2.6 of [23] considers the case of primal-dual SDP; we have verified that the theorem also holds for monotone SDLCP.

⁶Corollary 3.9 of [23] considers the case of primal-dual SDP; we have verified that the corollary also holds for monotone SDLCP.

By Theorem 4.1, (29) is equivalent to

$$(30) \quad \delta'_k = \frac{1}{\mu_k} \|Y_k^{1/2} U_k V_k Y_k^{-1/2}\| \rightarrow 0.$$

Here, the subscript “ k ” in the symbols above stands for the k th iteration of the algorithm.

A currently weak sufficient condition for superlinear convergence (28) using Algorithm 4.1, as given in [22] (see also [19]), is

$$(31) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} X_k Y_k / \sqrt{\tau_k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} X_k Y_k / \sqrt{\mu_k} = 0$$

when applied to SDPs. This follows by showing that (29) or (30) holds true. In Proposition 4.5 below, we give another proof to show that (31) implies superlinear convergence using Algorithm 4.1 on an SDP.

In the rest of this section, we discuss sufficient conditions that ensure superlinear convergence using Algorithm 4.1.

Given iterates (X_k, Y_k) generated by Algorithm 4.1, we have $(X_k, Y_k) \in \mathcal{N}(\beta_1, \tau_k)$. Let the off-central path passing through (X_k, Y_k) when $\mu = \mu_k$ be denoted by $(X^k(\mu), Y^k(\mu))$. Also, let $(X_0^k, Y_0^k) = (X^k(\bar{\mu}_0), Y^k(\bar{\mu}_0))$, where $\bar{\mu}_0 > 0$ is fixed to be less than $(1 - \beta_1)\tau_0$.

We have the following proposition on (X_0^k, Y_0^k) .

PROPOSITION 4.1. *We have (X_0^k, Y_0^k) satisfies $\lambda_{\min}(X_0^k Y_0^k) \geq D$, $\|X_0^k\| \leq C$, $\|Y_0^k\| \leq C$ for all $k \geq 0$. Here, C and D are some fixed numbers greater than zero.*

Proof. We have

$$(X_k, Y_k) \in \mathcal{N}(\beta_1, \tau_k)$$

by Theorem 4.1. Hence, it is clear that

$$|\lambda_{\min}(X_k Y_k) - \tau_k| \leq \beta_1 \tau_k.$$

Therefore,

$$(32) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min}(X_k Y_k) &\geq (1 - \beta_1)\tau_k \\ &\geq \frac{1 - \beta_1}{1 + \beta_1} \mu_k, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Theorem 4.1.

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min}(X_k Y_k) &= \lambda_{\min}(X^k(\mu_k) Y^k(\mu_k)) \\ &= \frac{\mu_k}{\bar{\mu}_0} \lambda_{\min}(X_0^k Y_0^k), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds true by Theorem 2.2 of [33].

Together with (32) we have

$$\lambda_{\min}(X_k^0 Y_k^0) \geq \frac{(1 - \beta_1)\bar{\mu}_0}{1 + \beta_1}.$$

Now, by Theorem 4.1,

$$(33) \quad A(X_k) + B(Y_k) = q + \frac{\tau_k}{\tau_0} (A(X_0) + B(Y_0) - q).$$

Also, we have

$$(34) \quad \begin{aligned} A(X_k) + B(Y_k) &= A(X^k(\mu_k)) + B(Y^k(\mu_k)) \\ &= q + \frac{\mu_k}{\bar{\mu}_0} (A(X_0^k) + B(Y_0^k) - q). \end{aligned}$$

Putting (33) and (34) together and upon manipulations, we get

$$\begin{aligned} A\left(X_0^k - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} X_0\right) + B\left(Y_0^k - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} Y_0\right) &= \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) q \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) (A(X^*) + B(Y^*)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &A\left(X_0^k - \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} X_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) X^*\right)\right) \\ &+ B\left(Y_0^k - \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} Y_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) Y^*\right)\right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 2.1(a), we have

$$\left(X_0^k - \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} X_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) X^*\right)\right) \bullet \left(Y_0^k - \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} Y_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) Y^*\right)\right) \geq 0.$$

Expanding the expression above and upon manipulations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &X_0^k \bullet \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} Y_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) Y^*\right) + \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} X_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) X^*\right) \bullet Y_0^k \\ &\leq X_0^k \bullet Y_0^k + \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} X_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) X^*\right) \bullet \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} Y_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) Y^*\right) \\ (35) \quad &= n\bar{\mu}_0 + \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} X_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) X^*\right) \bullet \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} Y_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) Y^*\right). \end{aligned}$$

From our choice of $\bar{\mu}_0$ and that $1/(1 + \beta_1) \leq \tau_k/\mu_k \leq 1/(1 - \beta_1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} Y_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) Y^* &\succeq \frac{1 - \beta_1}{1 + \beta_1} Y_0 \succ 0, \\ \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} X_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) X^* &\succeq \frac{1 - \beta_1}{1 + \beta_1} X_0 \succ 0, \end{aligned}$$

and hence using (35) from which

$$\begin{aligned} &X_0^k \bullet \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} Y_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) Y^*\right) \\ &\leq n\bar{\mu}_0 + \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} X_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) X^*\right) \bullet \left(\frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} Y_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0}\right) Y^*\right), \end{aligned}$$

we obtain $\|X_0^k\| \leq C$ for some positive constant C for all $k \geq 0$. The same holds for $\|Y_0^k\|$. $\square$

Hence, using Proposition 4.1, by Propositions 3.1–3.3, the off-central paths $(X^k(\mu), Y^k(\mu))$ generated from iterates (X_k, Y_k) satisfy

$$(36) \quad X^k(\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1) & O(\sqrt{\mu}) \\ O(\sqrt{\mu}) & \Theta(\mu) \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y^k(\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(\mu) & O(\sqrt{\mu}) \\ O(\sqrt{\mu}) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}$$

independent of k .

As a special case, we have

$$(37) \quad X_k = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1) & O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & \Theta(\mu_k) \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_k = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(\mu_k) & O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that (37) has been established, for example, in [16, 19, 22, 25]. In (36), we establish a stronger result than (37) in that a similar property as (37) also holds for off-central paths derived from these iterates.

We have the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 4.2. (see [16, Lemma 6.2]).

$$Y_k^{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_k^{-1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & O(1) \\ O(1) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. Let

$$Y_k^{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} Z_{11}(\mu_k) & Z_{12}(\mu_k) \\ Z_{12}^T(\mu_k) & Z_{22}(\mu_k) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $Z = Y^{1/2}$.

Since $Y_k^{1/2} Y_k^{1/2} = Y_k$, we have from

$$Z_{11}(\mu_k)^2 + Z_{12}(\mu_k) Z_{12}^T(\mu_k) = (Y_k)_{11} = \Theta(\mu_k)$$

that

$$Z_{11}(\mu_k) = O(\sqrt{\mu_k}), \quad Z_{12}(\mu_k) = O(\sqrt{\mu_k}).$$

Also, from

$$Z_{12}^T(\mu_k) Z_{12}(\mu_k) + Z_{22}(\mu_k)^2 = \Theta(1)$$

and $Z_{12}(\mu_k) = O(\sqrt{\mu_k})$,

$$Z_{22}(\mu_k) = \Theta(1).$$

Therefore,

$$Y_k^{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now

$$(38) \quad Y_k = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\mu_k} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \tilde{Y}_k \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\mu_k} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\tilde{Y}_k$ remains symmetric, positive definite as k tends to infinity, by (37). Hence,

$$\tilde{Y}_k^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1) & O(1) \\ O(1) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using (38), we obtain

$$Y_k^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right) & O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) \\ O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By $Y_k^{-1/2}Y_k^{-1/2} = Y_k^{-1}$, a similar approach as above yields the following:

$$Y_k^{-1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & O(1) \\ O(1) & O(1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now $Y_k^{1/2}Y_k^{-1/2} = I$ implies that

$$Y_k^{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_k^{-1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & O(1) \\ O(1) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}. \quad \square$$

The proof for the above proposition is slightly different from that in [16], and hence we show it here.

Let us now look more closely at (30), which is the same as

$$(39) \quad Y_k^{1/2}U_kV_kY_k^{-1/2} = o(\mu_k).$$

We give below an equivalent formulation of (39), using Proposition 4.2.

PROPOSITION 4.3. *We have*

$$Y_k^{1/2}U_kV_kY_k^{-1/2} = o(\mu_k)$$

if and only if

$$U_kV_k = \mu_k^2 \begin{pmatrix} o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right) & o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k^{3/2}}\right) \\ o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof: Let

$$\begin{pmatrix} H_{11} & H_{12} \\ H_{21} & H_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\mu_k^2} U_kV_k.$$

Then, by Proposition 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned} & Y_k^{1/2}U_kV_kY_k^{-1/2} \\ &= \mu_k^2 \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H_{11} & H_{12} \\ H_{21} & H_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & O(1) \\ O(1) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \mu_k^2 \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1) & O(1) \\ O(1) & \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H_{11} & H_{12} \\ H_{21} & H_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1) & O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & \Theta(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mu_k^2 \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1)H_{11} + O(1)H_{21} & \Theta(1)H_{12} + O(1)H_{22} \\ O(1)H_{11} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right)H_{21} & O(1)H_{12} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right)H_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1) & O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & \Theta(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \mu_k^2 \begin{pmatrix} (\Theta(1)H_{11} + O(1)H_{21})\Theta(1) + (\Theta(1)H_{12} + O(1)H_{22})O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ \left(O(1)H_{11} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right)H_{21}\right)\Theta(1) + \left(O(1)H_{12} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right)H_{22}\right)O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ (\Theta(1)H_{11} + O(1)H_{21})O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) + (\Theta(1)H_{12} + O(1)H_{22})\Theta(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ \left(O(1)H_{11} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right)H_{21}\right)O(\sqrt{\mu_k}) + \left(O(1)H_{12} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right)H_{22}\right)\Theta(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

It can be verified easily using the above expression for $Y_k^{1/2}U_kV_kY_k^{-1/2}$ that if

$$(40) \quad H_{11} = o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right),$$

$$(41) \quad H_{12} = o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k^{3/2}}\right),$$

$$(42) \quad H_{21} = o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right),$$

$$(43) \quad H_{22} = o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right),$$

then

$$Y_k^{1/2}U_kV_kY_k^{-1/2} = o(\mu_k).$$

On the other hand, suppose

$$Y_k^{1/2}U_kV_kY_k^{-1/2} = o(\mu_k).$$

Then

$$U_kV_k = Y_k^{-1/2} \begin{pmatrix} o(\mu_k) & o(\mu_k) \\ o(\mu_k) & o(\mu_k) \end{pmatrix} Y_k^{1/2}.$$

Using Proposition 4.2 again, we show that (40)–(43) hold. $\square$

Hence, we have the following theorem, which gives a sufficient condition for superlinear convergence using Algorithm 4.1.

THEOREM 4.3. *Let (X_k, Y_k) be generated by Algorithm 4.1 and $(X^k(\mu), Y^k(\mu))$ be its corresponding off-central path, $k = 0, 1, \dots$. If*

$$(44) \quad (X^k)'(\mu_k)(Y^k)'(\mu_k) = \begin{pmatrix} o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right) & o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k^{3/2}}\right) \\ o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right) \end{pmatrix},$$

then (X_k, Y_k) converges superlinearly.

Proof. Observe by comparing (4), (5) with (23), (24) (when $\sigma = 0$ and $\bar{r} = A(X_k) + B(Y_k) - q$) that

$$(X^k)'(\mu_k) = -\frac{1}{\mu_k}U_k, \quad (Y^k)'(\mu_k) = -\frac{1}{\mu_k}V_k.$$

The result then follows from (25)–(28), (30), and Proposition 4.3. $\square$

Remark 4.1. The sufficient condition for superlinear convergence using Algorithm 4.1 given in the above theorem is weaker than condition (31). This is because for the class of linear semidefinite feasibility problems, we see in section 5 that

$$(X^k)'(\mu_k) = \begin{pmatrix} o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right) & o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) \\ o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & o(1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (Y^k)'(\mu_k) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) \\ \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right) \end{pmatrix},$$

which is clearly not equal to (48), with the latter being implied by condition (31).

The currently known sufficient condition (31) for superlinear convergence of iterates (X_k, Y_k) generated by Algorithm 4.1 is equivalent to

$$(45) \quad (X_k Y_k)_{12} = o(\sqrt{\mu_k}).$$

In the proposition below, we show that (45) can be written in terms of the convergence rate of block entries of X_k and Y_k individually.

PROPOSITION 4.4.

$$(X_k Y_k)_{12} = o(\sqrt{\mu_k})$$

if and only if

$$(46) \quad (X_k)_{12} = o(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \quad \text{and} \quad (Y_k)_{12} = o(\sqrt{\mu_k}).$$

Proof. Suppose (X_k, Y_k) satisfies

$$(X_k Y_k)_{12} = o(\sqrt{\mu_k}).$$

Let $(\tilde{X}_k, \tilde{Y}_k)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} X_k &= \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\mu_k} I \end{pmatrix} \tilde{X}_k \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\mu_k} I \end{pmatrix}, \\ Y_k &= \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\mu_k} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \tilde{Y}_k \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\mu_k} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

are the sequence of iterates corresponding to (X_k, Y_k) , with any accumulation point $(\tilde{X}^*, \tilde{Y}^*)$.

We have

$$(\tilde{X}_k \tilde{Y}_k)_{12} = o(1).$$

Hence,

$$(\tilde{X}^* \tilde{Y}^*)_{12} = 0.$$

We have

$$(\tilde{Y}^*)_{12}^T (\tilde{X}^* \tilde{Y}^*)_{12} = 0.$$

Hence,

$$(\tilde{Y}^*)_{12}^T (\tilde{X}^*)_{11} (\tilde{Y}^*)_{12} + (\tilde{Y}^*)_{12}^T (\tilde{X}^*)_{12} (\tilde{Y}^*)_{22} = 0.$$

Therefore, $(\tilde{Y}^*)_{12} \bullet (\tilde{X}^*)_{12} = -\text{Tr}((\tilde{Y}^*)_{12}^T (\tilde{X}^*)_{11} (\tilde{Y}^*)_{12} (\tilde{Y}^*)_{22}^{-1}) \leq 0$.

On the other hand,

$$\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X_k) + \mathcal{B}\text{svec}(Y_k) = q + \frac{\mu_k}{\bar{\mu}_0}(\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X_0^k) + \mathcal{B}\text{svec}(Y_0^k) - q)$$

implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\sqrt{\mu_k})\text{svec}(\tilde{X}_k) + \bar{\mathcal{B}}(\sqrt{\mu_k})\text{svec}(\tilde{Y}_k) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\mu_k}{\bar{\mu}_0}\right) q + \text{Diag}\left(I_{i_1}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}I_{i_2}, \frac{1}{\mu_k}I_{\tilde{n}-i_1-i_2}\right) \frac{\mu_k}{\bar{\mu}_0}(\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X_0^k) + \mathcal{B}\text{svec}(Y_0^k)), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\text{Diag}\left(I_{i_1}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}I_{i_2}, \frac{1}{\mu_k}I_{\tilde{n}-i_1-i_2}\right) q = q$.

As $\mu_k \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{A}}(0)\text{svec}(\tilde{X}^*) + \bar{\mathcal{B}}(0)\text{svec}(\tilde{Y}^*) &= q + \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_0} \left(\bar{\mathcal{A}}(0)\text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (X_0^*)_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \bar{\mathcal{B}}(0)\text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (Y_0^*)_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where (X_0^k, Y_0^k) converges to (X_0^*, Y_0^*) .

That is,

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}(0)\text{svec} \left(\tilde{X}^* - \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_0} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (X_0^*)_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right) + \bar{\mathcal{B}}(0)\text{svec} \left(\tilde{Y}^* - \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_0} \begin{pmatrix} (Y_0^*)_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) = q.$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\mathcal{A}}(0)\text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\tilde{X}^*)_{12} \\ (\tilde{X}^*)_{12}^T & (\tilde{X}^*)_{22} - (1/\bar{\mu}_0)(X_0^*)_{22} \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \bar{\mathcal{B}}(0)\text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (\tilde{Y}^*)_{11} - (1/\bar{\mu}_0)(Y_0^*)_{11} & (\tilde{Y}^*)_{12} \\ (\tilde{Y}^*)_{12}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

using the structure of q in Proposition 3.5 and by monotonicity,⁷

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\tilde{X}^*)_{12} \\ (\tilde{X}^*)_{12}^T & (\tilde{X}^*)_{22} - (1/\bar{\mu}_0)(X_0^*)_{22} \end{pmatrix} \bullet \begin{pmatrix} (\tilde{Y}^*)_{11} - (1/\bar{\mu}_0)(Y_0^*)_{11} & (\tilde{Y}^*)_{12} \\ (\tilde{Y}^*)_{12}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0.$$

Hence, $(\tilde{Y}^*)_{12} \bullet (\tilde{X}^*)_{12} \geq 0$.

With $(\tilde{Y}^*)_{12} \bullet (\tilde{X}^*)_{12} = -\text{Tr}((\tilde{Y}^*)_{12}^T (\tilde{X}^*)_{11} (\tilde{Y}^*)_{12} (\tilde{Y}^*)_{22}^{-1}) \leq 0$, we have $\|(\tilde{X}^*)_{11}^{1/2} (\tilde{Y}^*)_{12} (\tilde{Y}^*)_{22}^{-1/2}\| = 0$, which implies that $(\tilde{Y}^*)_{12} = 0$, and we are done.

The if direction follows trivially. $\square$

We now give an alternative proof to show that (31) is a sufficient condition for superlinear convergence by showing that (46) implies (44).

PROPOSITION 4.5. *Suppose the iterates (X_k, Y_k) generated by Algorithm 4.1 satisfy*

$$(47) \quad X_k = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1) & o(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ o(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & \Theta(\mu_k) \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_k = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(\mu_k) & o(\sqrt{\mu_k}) \\ o(\sqrt{\mu_k}) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix};$$

⁷See the proof of Proposition 2.3 in [34], which can be found at <http://www.math.nus.edu.sg/~matzgy/publist.html>.

that is, (31) is satisfied. Then

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} (X^k)'(\mu_k) &= \begin{pmatrix} o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right) & o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) \\ o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix}, \\ (Y^k)'(\mu_k) &= \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1) & o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) \\ o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, superlinear convergence of (X_k, Y_k) follows.

Proof. Let $(\tilde{X}^*, \tilde{Y}^*)$ be any accumulation point of $(\tilde{X}_k, \tilde{Y}_k)$, where $\tilde{X}_k, \tilde{Y}_k$ are related to X_k, Y_k by

$$\begin{aligned} X_k &= \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\mu_k}I \end{pmatrix} \tilde{X}_k \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\mu_k}I \end{pmatrix}, \\ Y_k &= \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\mu_k}I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \tilde{Y}_k \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\mu_k}I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (47), $(\tilde{X}^*)_{12} = (\tilde{Y}^*)_{12} = 0$.

Without loss of generality in argument, let $(\tilde{X}_k, \tilde{Y}_k)$ converge to $(\tilde{X}^*, \tilde{Y}^*)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then, because $(\tilde{X}^*)_{12} = (\tilde{Y}^*)_{12} = 0$, we have

$$(\tilde{X}_k \otimes_s \tilde{Y}_k^{-1}) \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_k^{-1} q \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} -(\tilde{X}^*)_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & (\tilde{X}^*)_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_k^{-1} q \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} -(\tilde{Y}^*)_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & (\tilde{Y}^*)_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence,

$$(49) \quad (\tilde{X}_k \otimes_s \tilde{Y}_k^{-1}) \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_k^{-1} q + \text{svec}(\tilde{X}_k) = \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} o(1) & o(1) \\ o(1) & \Theta(1) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$(50) \quad -\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_k^{-1} q + \text{svec}(\tilde{Y}_k) = \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(1) & o(1) \\ o(1) & o(1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

(48) then follows using (49), (50) on (20).

The superlinear convergence of (X_k, Y_k) can be easily seen, as (48) implies (44). $\square$

5. Superlinear convergence for a class of SDPs. Consider the class of linear semidefinite feasibility problems when we either have $C = 0$ in $(\mathcal{P})$ or $b_i = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, in $(\mathcal{D})$.

As mentioned in section 2, Assumption 2.1(a) is satisfied for any SDP and hence for a linear semidefinite feasibility problem. Assumption 2.1(b) can also be satisfied for any given linear semidefinite feasibility problem as long as the feasible regions of $(\mathcal{P})$ and $(\mathcal{D})$ are nonempty. This can be seen easily by choosing an optimal solution to be any feasible $X \in S_+^n$, and $y_i = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $Y = 0$ in case $C = 0$, and $X = 0$, and any feasible $(y_1, \dots, y_m, Y)$, $Y \in S_+^n$ in case $b_i = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Assumption 2.1(c) can be satisfied in principle by considering an equivalent linear semidefinite feasibility

problem if the original linear semidefinite feasibility problem does not satisfy this assumption.

A question arises whether Assumption 3.1 is automatically satisfied for any given linear semidefinite feasibility problem. In the below example, we show that it is not necessarily true.

Example 5.1. Let $n = 4$ and $m = 4$. Define $C = 0$, $b_1 = 1$, $b_i = 0, i = 2, 3, 4$,

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$A_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It can be shown easily that the optimal solution to $(\mathcal{P})$ is of the form

$$X^* = \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & 0 & 0 \\ x_{12} & 1 - x_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0,$$

and the optimal solution to $(\mathcal{D})$ is of the form

$$y_1^* = 0, \quad y_2^* \leq 0, \quad y_3^* = 0, \quad y_4^* = 0,$$

$$Y^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -y_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0.$$

Hence, the strict complementarity condition does not hold for this example.

Therefore, for a linear semidefinite feasibility problem, Assumptions 2.1(a)–2.1(c) are not really necessary, since they can be satisfied, while Assumption 3.1 is needed.

For a linear semidefinite feasibility problem, we have that q in (2) has its last $\tilde{n} - m$ entries equal to zero in case $C = 0$ and its first m entries equal to zero in case $b_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, m$. In the former, $\hat{q} = 0$ and in the latter, $\hat{q} = 0$ in Proposition 3.5.

We have the following theorem, which follows by applying Theorem 4.3 from section 4.

THEOREM 5.1. *Assume Assumption 3.1. Let (X_k, Y_k) be iterates generated using Algorithm 4.1 on a linear semidefinite feasibility problem with the initial iterate (X_0, Y_0) satisfying*

$$(51) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (A_{j_1+j_2+1})_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \vdots \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (A_m)_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T \end{pmatrix} \text{svec}(X_0) = 0 \quad \text{or}$$

$$(52) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (B_{k_1+k_2+1})_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \vdots \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} (B_{\tilde{n}-m})_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T \end{pmatrix} \text{svec}(Y_0) = 0,$$

where $C = 0$ in the former and $b_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, m$, in the latter.

Then the iterates converge superlinearly.

Proof. We need only prove this for a linear semidefinite feasibility problem when $C = 0$. The proof for the case when $b_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, m$, is similar.

Consider the corresponding $(\tilde{X}_k, \tilde{Y}_k)$ to (X_k, Y_k) . Let $(\tilde{X}^*, \tilde{Y}^*)$ be any accumulation point of $(\tilde{X}_k, \tilde{Y}_k)$. Without loss of generality, let $(\tilde{X}_k, \tilde{Y}_k) \rightarrow (\tilde{X}^*, \tilde{Y}^*)$. Also, let $(X_0^k, Y_0^k) \rightarrow (X_0^*, Y_0^*)$.

Note that by (7) and Theorem 4.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X_k) + \mathcal{B}\text{svec}(Y_k) &= q + \frac{\mu_k}{\bar{\mu}_0} r_0^k \\ &= q + \frac{\tau_k}{\tau_0} r_0, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r_0^k &= \mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X_0^k) + \mathcal{B}\text{svec}(Y_0^k) - q, \\ r_0 &= \mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X_0) + \mathcal{B}\text{svec}(Y_0) - q. \end{aligned}$$

We therefore have

$$(53) \quad r_0^k = \frac{\tau_k \bar{\mu}_0}{\mu_k \tau_0} r_0.$$

From (51), we have using (53) that

$$(54) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (A_{j_1+j_2+1})_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T \\ \vdots \\ \text{svec} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (A_m)_{22} \end{pmatrix}^T \end{pmatrix} \text{svec}(X_0^k) = 0.$$

Now observe that

$$\mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X_k) + \mathcal{B}\text{svec}(Y_k) = q + \frac{\mu_k}{\bar{\mu}_0} r_0^k.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Diag}(I_{j_1}, \sqrt{\mu_k} I_{j_2}, \mu_k I_{m-j_1-j_2}, I_{k_1}, \sqrt{\mu_k} I_{k_2}, \mu_k I_{\tilde{n}-m-k_1-k_2}) \times \\ &[\bar{\mathcal{A}}(\sqrt{\mu_k})(\tilde{X}_k \otimes_s \tilde{Y}_k^{-1}) + \bar{\mathcal{B}}(\sqrt{\mu_k})] \text{svec}(\tilde{Y}_k) = q + \frac{\mu_k}{\bar{\mu}_0} r_0^k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(\bar{\mathcal{A}}(\sqrt{\mu_k})(\tilde{X}_k \otimes_s \tilde{Y}_k^{-1}) + \bar{\mathcal{B}}(\sqrt{\mu_k})) \text{svec}(\tilde{Y}_k) = q + \frac{\sqrt{\mu_k}}{\bar{\mu}_0} \tilde{r}_0^k,$$

where we have used the fact that besides the first j_1 entries of q , the rest of entries of q are zero. $\tilde{r}_0^k$ is defined by (19).

Let $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then, using (54), we obtain

$$(\bar{\mathcal{A}}(0)(\tilde{X}^* \otimes_s (\tilde{Y}^*)^{-1}) + \bar{\mathcal{B}}(0))\text{svec}(\tilde{Y}^*) = q + \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_0} \text{Diag}(0, 0, 0, 0, 0, I_{\tilde{n}-m-k_1-k_2})r_0^*,$$

where $r_0^* = \mathcal{A}\text{svec}(X_0^*) + \mathcal{B}\text{svec}(Y_0^*) - q$.

Therefore,

$$(\bar{\mathcal{B}}(0) - \bar{\mathcal{A}}(0)(\tilde{X}^* \otimes_s (\tilde{Y}^*)^{-1}))\text{svec}(\tilde{Y}^*) = -q + \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_0} \text{Diag}(0, 0, 0, 0, 0, I_{\tilde{n}-m-k_1-k_2})r_0^*.$$

Hence,

$$(55) \quad (\tilde{X}_k \otimes_s \tilde{Y}_k^{-1})\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_k^{-1}(-\sqrt{\mu_k}\tilde{r}_0^k/\bar{\mu}_0 + q) \rightarrow -\text{svec}(\tilde{X}^*),$$

$$(56) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_k^{-1}(\sqrt{\mu_k}\tilde{r}_0^k/\bar{\mu}_0 - q) \rightarrow \text{svec}(\tilde{Y}^*)$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$, where we recall that $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_k = \bar{\mathcal{B}}(\sqrt{\mu_k}) - \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\sqrt{\mu_k})(\tilde{X}_k \otimes_s \tilde{Y}_k^{-1})$.

Hence, from (20), we see using (55), (56) that

$$(X^k)'(\mu_k) = \begin{pmatrix} o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right) & o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) \\ o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & o(1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (Y^k)'(\mu_k) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) \\ \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k}}\right) & \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\mu_k}\right) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, (44) holds, and superlinear convergence of (X_k, Y_k) then follows from Theorem 4.3. $\square$

In particular, the following corollary of Theorem 5.1 follows immediately.

COROLLARY 5.1. *If the interior of the primal feasible region is nonempty in case $C = 0$ or the interior of the dual feasible region is nonempty in case $b_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, m$, then the iterates generated by Algorithm 4.1 converge superlinearly.*

We have the following final remark.

Remark 5.1. We tested out examples of a linear semidefinite feasibility problem (where $C = 0$) with $n = 4$ and $m = 4$ using the SDP solver SDPT3. We tested the following different scenarios: with and without a strict complementarity condition, and different initial iterates (including those that satisfied the condition in Theorem 5.1). In all these cases (which also include Example 5.1), only linear convergence is observed, where μ_{k+1}/μ_k lies between 0.01 and 0.4 eventually. We set the tolerance for the termination of the algorithm to be 1×10^{-15} or smaller.

Acknowledgments. The author is grateful to Prof. M. Kojima for pointing out reference [15] to him. The author also wishes to thank the Associate Editor and two anonymous referees for their valuable and detailed comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. A. RAMIT, U. HELMKE, AND J. B. MOORE, *A finite steps algorithm for solving convex feasibility problems*, J. Global Optim., 38 (2007), pp. 143–160.
- [2] F. ALIZADEH, J. A. HAEBERLY, AND M. OVERTON, *Primal-dual interior-point methods for semidefinite programming: Convergence rates, stability and numerical results*, SIAM J. Optim., 8 (1998), pp. 746–768.

- [3] D. A. BAYER AND J. C. LAGARIAS, *The nonlinear geometry of linear programming*, I, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 314 (1989), pp. 499–526.
- [4] D. A. BAYER AND J. C. LAGARIAS, *The nonlinear geometry of linear programming*, II, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 314 (1989), pp. 527–581.
- [5] D. A. BAYER AND J. C. LAGARIAS, *The nonlinear geometry of linear programming*, III, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 320 (1990), pp. 193–225.
- [6] S. BOYD, L. EL GHAOU, E. FERON, AND V. BALAKRISHNAN, *Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory*, SIAM Stud. Appl. Math. 15, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1994.
- [7] C. B. CHUA, *Analyticity of weighted central paths and error bounds for semidefinite programming*, Math. Program. Ser. A, 115 (2008), pp. 239–271.
- [8] S. K. CHUA, K.-C. TOH, AND G. ZHAO, *An analytic center cutting plane method with deep cuts for semidefinite feasibility problems*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 123 (2004), pp. 291–318.
- [9] P. GAHINET AND A. NEMIROVSKI, *The projective method for solving linear matrix inequalities*, Math. Program. Ser. A, 77 (1997), pp. 163–190.
- [10] J.-L. GOFFIN, Z. LUO, AND Y. YE, *Complexity analysis of an interior cutting plane method for convex feasibility problems*, SIAM J. Optim., 6 (1996), pp. 638–652.
- [11] M. HALICKÁ AND M. TRNOVSKÁ, *Limiting behavior and analyticity of weighted central paths in semidefinite programming*, Optim. Methods Softw., 25 (2010), pp. 247–262.
- [12] D. HENRION AND J. MALICK, *Projection methods for conic feasibility problems, applications to polynomial sum-of-squares decompositions*, Optim. Methods Softw., 26 (2011), pp. 23–46.
- [13] J. X. DA CRUZ NETO, O. P. FERREIRA, AND R. D. C. MONTEIRO, *Asymptotic behavior of the central path for a special class of degenerate SDP problems*, Math. Program. Ser. A, 103 (2005), pp. 487–514.
- [14] C. HELMBERG, F. RENDL, R. J. VANDERBEI, AND H. WOLKOWICZ, *An interior-point method for semidefinite programming*, SIAM J. Optim., 6 (1996), pp. 342–361.
- [15] M. KOJIMA, M. SHIDA, AND S. SHINDOH, *Reduction of monotone linear complementarity problems over cones to linear programs over cones*, Acta Math. Vietnam., 22 (1997), pp. 147–157.
- [16] M. KOJIMA, M. SHIDA, AND S. SHINDOH, *Local convergence of predictor-corrector infeasible-interior-point algorithms for SDPs and SDLCPs*, Math. Program. Ser. A, 80 (1998), pp. 129–160.
- [17] M. KOJIMA, M. SHIDA, AND S. SHINDOH, *A predictor-corrector interior-point algorithm for the semidefinite linear complementarity problem using the Alizadeh-Haeberly-Overton search direction*, SIAM J. Optim., 9 (1999), pp. 444–465.
- [18] M. KOJIMA, S. SHINDOH, AND S. HARA, *Interior-point methods for the monotone semidefinite linear complementarity problem in symmetric matrices*, SIAM J. Optim., 7 (1997), pp. 86–125.
- [19] Z. LU AND R. D. C. MONTEIRO, *Error bounds and limiting behavior of weighted paths associated with the SDP map $X^{1/2}SX^{1/2}$* , SIAM J. Optim., 15 (2005), pp. 348–374.
- [20] Z. LU AND R. D. C. MONTEIRO, *A note on the local convergence of a predictor-corrector interior-point algorithm for the semidefinite linear complementarity problem based on the Alizadeh-Haeberly-Overton search direction*, SIAM J. Optim., 15 (2005), pp. 1147–1154.
- [21] Z. LU AND R. D. C. MONTEIRO, *Limiting behavior of the Alizadeh-Haeberly-Overton weighted paths in semidefinite programming*, Optim. Methods Softw., 22 (2007), pp. 849–870.
- [22] F. A. POTRA AND R. SHENG, *Superlinear convergence of interior-point algorithms for semidefinite programming*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 99 (1998), pp. 103–119.
- [23] F. A. POTRA AND R. SHENG, *A superlinearly convergent primal-dual infeasible-interior-point algorithm for semidefinite programming*, SIAM J. Optim., 8 (1998), pp. 1007–1028.
- [24] M. PREIß AND J. STOER, *Analysis of infeasible-interior-point paths and high-order methods for solving SDLCPs*, in Parametric Optimization and Related Topics, VII. Aportaciones Mat. 18, Sociedad Matemática, Mexico, 2004, pp. 235–251.
- [25] M. PREIß AND J. STOER, *Analysis of infeasible-interior-point paths arising with semidefinite linear complementarity problems*, Math. Program. Ser. A, 99 (2004), pp. 499–520.
- [26] S. MEHROTRA, *Quadratic convergence in a primal-dual method*, Math. Oper. Res., 18 (1993), pp. 741–751.
- [27] R. D. C. MONTEIRO, *Primal-dual path-following algorithms for semidefinite programming*, SIAM J. Optim., 7 (1997), pp. 663–678.
- [28] R. D. C. MONTEIRO AND J.-S. PANG, *On two interior-point mappings for nonlinear semidefinite complementarity problems*, Math. Oper. Res., 23 (1998), pp. 39–60.
- [29] R. D. C. MONTEIRO AND T. TSUCHIYA, *Polynomial convergence of a new family of primal-dual algorithms for semidefinite programming*, SIAM J. Optim., 9 (1999), pp. 551–577.

- [30] R. D. C. MONTEIRO AND P. R. ZANJÁCOMO, *General interior-point maps and existence of weighted paths for nonlinear semidefinite complementarity problems*, Math. Oper. Res., 25 (2000), pp. 381–399.
- [31] Y. NESTEROV AND M. TODD, *Self-scaled barriers and interior-point methods for convex programming*, Math. Oper. Res., 22 (1997), pp. 1–42.
- [32] Y. NESTEROV AND M. TODD, *Primal-dual interior-point methods for self-scaled cones*, SIAM J. Optim., 8 (1998), pp. 324–364.
- [33] C.-K. SIM AND G. ZHAO, *Underlying paths in interior point methods for the monotone semidefinite linear complementarity problem*, Math. Program. Ser. A, 110 (2007), pp. 475–499.
- [34] C.-K. SIM AND G. ZHAO, *Asymptotic behavior of Helmborg-Kojima-Monteiro (HKM) paths in interior point methods for monotone semidefinite linear complementarity problems: General theory*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 137 (2008), pp. 11–25.
- [35] C.-K. SIM, *On the analyticity of underlying HKM paths at a solution of monotone semidefinite linear complementarity problems*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 141 (2009), pp. 193–215.
- [36] G. SONNEVEND, *An analytic center for polyhedrons and new classes for linear programming*, in System Modelling and Optimization, Lect. Notes Control Inform. Sci. 84, A. Prekopa, ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985, pp. 866–876.
- [37] J. STOER AND M. WECHS, *On the analyticity properties of infeasible-interior-point paths for monotone linear complementarity problems*, Numer. Math., 81(1999), pp. 631–645.
- [38] J. STOER, M. WECHS, AND S. MIZUNO, *High order infeasible-interior-point methods for solving sufficient linear complementarity problems*, Math. Oper. Res., 23 (1998), pp. 832–862.
- [39] J. F. STURM, *Superlinear convergence of an algorithm for monotone linear complementarity problems, when no strictly complementary solution exists*, Math. Oper. Res., 24 (1999), pp. 72–94.
- [40] J. SUN, K.-C. TOH, AND G. ZHAO, *An analytic center cutting plane method for semidefinite feasibility problems*, Math. Oper. Res., 27 (2002), pp. 332–346.
- [41] M. J. TODD, K. C. TOH, AND R.H. TÜTÜNCÜ, *On the Nesterov–Todd direction in semidefinite programming*, SIAM J. Optim., 8 (1998), pp. 769–796.
- [42] K.-C. TOH, G. ZHAO, AND J. SUN, *A multiple-cut analytic center cutting plane method for semidefinite feasibility problems*, SIAM J. Optim., 12 (2002), pp. 1126–1146.
- [43] P. TSENG, *Search directions and convergence analysis of some infeasible path-following methods for the monotone semi-definite LCP*, Optim. Methods Softw., 9 (1998), pp. 245–268.
- [44] Y. YE AND K. ANSTREICHER, *On quadratic and $O(\sqrt{n}L)$ convergence of a predictor-corrector algorithm for LCP*, Math. Program. Ser. A, 62 (1993), pp. 537–551.
- [45] Y. YE, O. GÜLER, R. A. TAPIA, AND Y. ZHANG, *A quadratically convergent $O(\sqrt{n}L)$ -iteration algorithm for linear programming*, Math. Program. Ser. A, 59 (1993), pp. 151–162.
- [46] Y. ZHANG, *On extending some primal-dual interior-point algorithms from linear programming to semidefinite programming*, SIAM J. Optim., 8 (1998), pp. 365–386.