



Tibor Illés, Petra Renáta Rigó and
Roland Török

**New predictor-corrector
interior-point algorithm with
AET function having
inflection point**

<http://unipub.lib.uni-corvinus.hu/7724>

NEW PREDICTOR-CORRECTOR INTERIOR-POINT ALGORITHM WITH AET FUNCTION HAVING INFLECTION POINT

TIBOR ILLÉS¹, PETRA RENÁTA RIGÓ^{1,*}, ROLAND TÖRÖK²

¹*Corvinus Center for Operations Research at Corvinus Institute for Advanced Studies, Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary;*

²*Doctoral School of Economics, Business and Informatics, Corvinus University of Budapest*

15.11.2022.

Abstract. In this paper we introduce a new predictor-corrector interior-point algorithm for solving $P_*(\kappa)$ -linear complementarity problems. For the determination of search directions we use the algebraically equivalent transformation (AET) technique. In this method we apply the function $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$ which has inflection point. It is interesting that the kernel corresponding to this AET function is neither self-regular, nor eligible. We present the complexity analysis of the proposed interior-point algorithm and we show that its iteration bound matches the best known iteration bound for this type of PC IPAs given in the literature. It should be mentioned that usually the iteration bound is given for a fixed update and proximity parameter. In this paper we provide a set of parameters for which the PC IPA is well defined. Moreover, we also show the efficiency of the algorithm by providing numerical results.

JEL code: C61

Keywords. Predictor-corrector; Linear complementarity problems; Interior-point algorithm; Complexity analysis.

1. INTRODUCTION

Linear complementarity problems (LCPs) are intensively studied due to the fact that they have several applications in different fields, such as economics, optimization theory and engineering, see [6, 20]. The Karush-Kuhn-Tucker optimality conditions of linear programming (LP) and quadratic optimization problems lead to LCPs. The Arrow-Debreu competitive market equilibrium problem with linear and Leontief utility functions can also be formulated as LCP [54]. Bras et al. [3] showed that LCP can be used to test copositivity of matrices. Wang and Sun analysed sparse Markowitz portfolio selection by using stochastic LCP approach, see [53].

The LCPs can be solved by using several methods, such as different pivot and criss-cross algorithms [8, 9, 21, 22]. Fukuda and Terlaky gave a general form of the dual of the LCPs for oriented matroids [22]. Later, Csizmadia and Illés analysed it for LCPs related to the criss-cross algorithm [8]. Several interior-point algorithms (IPAs) have been also introduced for $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs, see [6, 27, 28, 35, 37, 46]. Illés et al. gave existentially polytime (EP) theorem for the dual LCP with arbitrary matrix and they proposed IPAs to solve LCPs with general matrices in EP-sense. This means that their generalized IPAs either solve the problems with rational coefficient matrix in polynomial time or give a

*Corresponding Author.

E-mail addresses: tibor.illes@uni-corvinus.hu (Tibor Illés), petra.rigo@uni-corvinus.hu (Petra Renáta Rigó), undefined roland.torok@stud.uni-corvinus.hu (Roland Török).

polynomial size certificate that the matrix is not $P_*(\bar{\kappa})$ with a priori fixed, positive $\bar{\kappa}$, see [27–29]. These results have been summarized in [41].

For detailed study on LCPs we refer the reader to the books of Cottle et al. [6] and Kojima et al. [35]. In the book of Kojima et al. [35] the theory of interior-point algorithms for solving LCPs is highlighted. The LCPs belong to the class of NP-complete problems, see [5, 35]. However, Kojima et al. [35] proved that assuming that the problem’s matrix has a special property, i.e. it is $P_*(\kappa)$ -matrix, the IPAs give approximate solution for LCPs in polynomial complexity in the size of the problem, the handicap of the problem’s matrix and the bitsize of the data. Illés [30] et al. proposed a rounding procedure that computes a maximally complementary (exact) solution in polynomial time from an ε -optimal solution produced by IPAs for $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs with appropriate $\varepsilon > 0$.

Predictor-corrector (PC) IPAs turned out to be efficient in practice. They perform in a major iteration a predictor and one or several corrector steps. The predictor step is a greedy step and aims to approach the optimal solution set of the corresponding problem. After a predictor step the obtained strictly feasible solution may not be in a small neighbourhood of the central path. Hence, the corrector step is responsible for returning the iterate in the designated small neighbourhood. Mizuno, Todd and Ye [40] provided the first PC IPA for LP problems, which uses only one corrector step in a main iteration. Miao [39] extended this IPA to $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs. When only one step is needed to return into the small neighbourhood of the central path, then we call these methods Mizuno-Todd-Ye-type (MTY-type) of PC IPAs. Potra and Sheng [46] introduced a MTY-type PC IPA for $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs. Illés and Nagy [26], Kheirfam [33], Darvay et al. [14, 15] also introduced MTY-type PC IPAs.

Defining a proper search direction plays an important role in the analysis of the IPAs. As mentioned before, Peng et al. [42] provided the notion of self-regular barrier and they determined new long-step IPAs. Later on, Darvay [10] introduced the *algebraically equivalent transformation* (AET) technique to determine search directions in case of LP problems. He applied a continuously differentiable and invertible function on the nonlinear equation of the system characterizing the central path. In his work, Darvay used the square root function in the AET technique. Following his result, a large amount of papers appeared, where IPAs based on the AET technique were proposed, see [14, 15, 31, 34, 48]. In [31] the authors defined a new class of AET functions in order to define primal-dual IPAs for solving $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs and the function $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$ is member of this class. In this paper we introduce a new PC IPA for solving $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs which is based on the AET function $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 some basic concepts and results related to the theory of $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs are presented. Section 3 is devoted to define the new PC IPA which is based on a new search direction. Section 4 contains the complexity analysis of the new PC IPA. In Section 5 we provide a set of parameters for which the PC IPA is well defined. Section 6 summarizes numerical results that show the efficiency of the algorithm. In Section 7 some concluding remarks and further research plans are enumerated.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Linear complementarity problems and $P_*(\kappa)$ -matrices. In the linear complementarity problems (LCPs) we search for vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfy the following constraints:

$$-M\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (LCP)$$

where $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and \mathbf{xs} is the componentwise product of vectors \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{s} . We use the following notations to denote feasible region, the interior and the solutions set of LCPs:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F} &:= \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{R}_{\oplus}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\oplus}^n : -M\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{q}\}, \\ \mathcal{F}^+ &:= \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^n : -M\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{q}\}, \\ \mathcal{F}^* &:= \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{F} : \mathbf{xs} = \mathbf{0}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that \mathbb{R}_{\oplus}^n denotes the n -dimensional nonnegative orthant and \mathbb{R}_+^n the positive orthant.

Thoroughout the paper we assume that $\mathcal{F}^+ \neq \emptyset$ and M is a $P_*(\kappa)$ -matrix, see [35]. We present the central path problem for (*LCP*) as follows:

$$-M\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{q} \quad \mathbf{xs} = \mu\mathbf{e}, \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s} > \mathbf{0}. \quad (CPP)$$

where \mathbf{e} denotes the n -dimensional all-one vector and $\mu > 0$. Kojima et al. [35] proved the uniqueness of the central path for $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs. They also showed that the sequence $\{(\mathbf{x}(\mu), \mathbf{s}(\mu)) \mid \mu > 0\}$ of solutions lying on the central path parameterised by $\mu > 0$ approaches the solution (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) of the (*LCP*).

2.2. Algebraic equivalent transformation technique. We present the AET technique in case of $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs. Note that the AET method was introduced by Darvay [10] for LP problem. Let $\varphi : (\bar{\xi}, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $0 \leq \bar{\xi} < 1$, be a continuously differentiable function, such that $\varphi'(t) > 0$, $\forall t > \bar{\xi}$. We also use the notation $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = [\varphi(x_1), \varphi(x_2), \dots, \varphi(x_n)]^T$. In this way, system (*CPP*) can be written in the following form:

$$-M\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{q} \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s} > \mathbf{0}, \quad \varphi\left(\frac{\mathbf{xs}}{\mu}\right) = \varphi(\mathbf{e}), \quad (CPP_{\varphi})$$

The Newton-system is

$$\begin{aligned}-M\Delta\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{s} &= \mathbf{0}, \\ S\Delta\mathbf{x} + X\Delta\mathbf{s} &= \mathbf{a}_{\varphi},\end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\mathbf{a}_{\varphi} = \mu \frac{\varphi(\mathbf{e}) - \varphi\left(\frac{\mathbf{xs}}{\mu}\right)}{\varphi'\left(\frac{\mathbf{xs}}{\mu}\right)}. \quad (2.4)$$

It can be observed that for different functions φ we obtain different search directions. Let

$$\mathbf{v} = \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{xs}}{\mu}}, \quad \mathbf{d} = \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{s}}}, \quad \mathbf{d}_x = \frac{\mathbf{d}^{-1}\Delta\mathbf{x}}{\sqrt{\mu}} = \frac{\mathbf{v}\Delta\mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}}, \quad \mathbf{d}_s = \frac{\mathbf{d}\Delta\mathbf{s}}{\sqrt{\mu}} = \frac{\mathbf{v}\Delta\mathbf{s}}{\mathbf{s}}. \quad (2.5)$$

Using (2.5) we get

$$\Delta\mathbf{x} = \frac{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{d}_x}{\mathbf{v}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta\mathbf{s} = \frac{\mathbf{s}\mathbf{d}_s}{\mathbf{v}}.$$

Substituting these in the second equation of system (2.3) we obtain:

$$\frac{\mathbf{xs}\mathbf{d}_x}{\mathbf{v}} + \frac{\mathbf{xs}\mathbf{d}_s}{\mathbf{v}} = \mu \frac{\varphi(\mathbf{e}) - \varphi\left(\frac{\mathbf{xs}}{\mu}\right)}{\varphi'\left(\frac{\mathbf{xs}}{\mu}\right)}. \quad (2.6)$$

The scaled system of the transformed Newton system (2.3) is

$$\begin{aligned}-\bar{M}\mathbf{d}_x + \mathbf{d}_s &= \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathbf{d}_x + \mathbf{d}_s &= \mathbf{p}_{\varphi},\end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

where $\bar{M} = DMD$, $D = \text{diag}(\mathbf{d})$ and

$$\mathbf{p}_\varphi = \frac{\varphi(\mathbf{e}) - \varphi(\mathbf{v}^2)}{\mathbf{v}\varphi'(\mathbf{v}^2)}. \quad (2.8)$$

It can be shown that the scaled transformed Newton system (2.7) has a unique solution, see [14].

2.3. Special case of the new class of AET. In this paper we deal with the AET function $\varphi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}. \quad (2.9)$$

This functions was firstly used in [31], where the authors introduced a whole new class of AET functions for PD IPAs. Up to our best knowledge this is the first AET function analysed in the literature of IPAs which has inflection point.

Using (2.4) and (2.8) we can calculate the corresponding \mathbf{a}_φ and \mathbf{p}_φ in this case:

$$\mathbf{a}_\varphi = \mu \frac{\mathbf{e} - \frac{\mathbf{x}^2 \mathbf{s}^2}{\mu^2} + \frac{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}}{\mu} - \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}}{\mu}}}{2\frac{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}}{\mu} - \mathbf{e} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}}}} = \frac{4\mu^2\sqrt{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}} + 2\mu\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}\sqrt{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}} - 3\mu\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}\sqrt{\mu}}{2(4\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}\sqrt{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}} - 2\mu\sqrt{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}} + \mu\sqrt{\mu})} - \frac{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}}{2} \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$\mathbf{p}_\varphi = \frac{\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}^4 + \mathbf{v}^2 - \mathbf{v}}{2\mathbf{v}^3 - \mathbf{v} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{e}} = \frac{2(\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v})(\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{v}^2 + \mathbf{v}^3)}{4\mathbf{v}^3 - 2\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{e}}. \quad (2.11)$$

Hence, in our case the coordinate function c_f of \mathbf{p}_φ is

$$c_f(t) = \frac{2(1 - t^4 + t^2 - t)}{4t^3 - 2t + 1}. \quad (2.12)$$

In the following section we present the new PC IPA for solving $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs.

3. PREDICTOR-CORRECTOR INTERIOR POINT ALGORITHM BASED ON A NEW AET FUNCTION

Several IPAs use firstly corrector steps and after that predictor step, these algorithms are called corrector-predictor IPAs, see Potra [43]. The reason for using these methods is that after a corrector step we reach a proper neighbourhood of the central path. Our IPA also performs firstly a corrector step and after that a predictor one.

3.1. Corrector step. The scaled corrector system coincides with system (2.7) with \mathbf{p}_φ given in (2.11).

This system has the following solution:

$$\mathbf{d}_x^c = (I + \bar{M})^{-1}\mathbf{p}_\varphi, \quad \mathbf{d}_s^c = \bar{M}(I + \bar{M})^{-1}\mathbf{p}_\varphi.$$

Using this and (2.5) the search directions $\Delta^c \mathbf{x}$ and $\Delta^c \mathbf{s}$ can be calculated. The point after a corrector step is

$$\mathbf{x}^+ = \mathbf{x} + \Delta^c \mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{s}^+ = \mathbf{s} + \Delta^c \mathbf{s}.$$

In the next subsection we deal with the predictor step.

3.2. Predictor step. Based on (2.10) the vector \mathbf{a}_φ can be represented as

$$\mathbf{a}_\varphi = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}, \mu) + g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}),$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_\oplus \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ with $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}, 0) = \mathbf{0}$ and $g : \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. Since, we would like to make as greedy predictor step as possible, we set $\mu = 0$ in this decomposition.

Then, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} -M\Delta^p\mathbf{x} + \Delta^p\mathbf{s} &= \mathbf{0}, \\ S\Delta^p\mathbf{x} + X\Delta^p\mathbf{s} &= g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

In the specific case, when we set $\mu = 0$ in \mathbf{a}_φ then $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{s}$ is computed. Using (2.5) and (3.1) we get the scaled predictor system

$$\begin{aligned} -\bar{M}_+\mathbf{d}_x^p + \mathbf{d}_s^p &= \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathbf{d}_x^p + \mathbf{d}_s^p &= -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{v}^+, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mathbf{v}^+ = \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{x}^+\mathbf{s}^+}{\mu}}$, $\mathbf{d}^+ = \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{x}^+}{\mathbf{s}^+}}$, $D^+ = \text{diag}(\mathbf{d}^+)$, $\bar{M}_+ = D^+MD^+$ and which has the solution:

$$\mathbf{d}_x^p = -\frac{1}{2}(I + \bar{M}_+)^{-1}\mathbf{v}^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{d}_s^p = -\frac{1}{2}\bar{M}_+(I + \bar{M}_+)^{-1}\mathbf{v}^+.$$

From this and (2.5) we can calculate the predictor search directions $\Delta^p\mathbf{x}$ and $\Delta^p\mathbf{s}$. The point after a predictor step is

$$\mathbf{x}^p = \mathbf{x}^+ + \theta\Delta^p\mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{s}^p = \mathbf{s}^+ + \theta\Delta^p\mathbf{s}, \quad \mu^p = \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)\mu,$$

where $\theta \in (0, 1)$ is the update parameter.

Let us define the proximity measure, which is used to measure the distance of the iterates (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) from the central path:

$$\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}, \mu) := \delta(\mathbf{v}) := \frac{\|\mathbf{p}_\varphi\|}{2} = \left\| \frac{(\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v})(\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{v}^2 + \mathbf{v}^3)}{4\mathbf{v}^3 - 2\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{e}} \right\|. \quad (3.3)$$

The neighbourhood is given in the following way:

$$\mathcal{N}_2(\tau, \mu) := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{F}^+ : \delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}, \mu) \leq \tau\}, \quad (3.4)$$

where δ is given in (3.3), τ is a threshold parameter and $\mu > 0$.

The PC IPA for solving $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs is given in Algorithm 1.

In the next section we present the complexity analysis of the proposed PC IPA.

4. ANALYSIS OF THE PREDICTOR-CORRECTOR ALGORITHM

In this section we present the complexity analysis of the proposed PC IPA. In the first part we deal with the corrector step. This is a full-Newton step, so the analysis of this part is very similar to that of small-update IPA presented in [31] for the special case when $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$. We summarize the lemmas and corollaries used in this case.

The first lemma refers to the strict feasibility of the corrector step.

Lemma 4.1. [Corollary 3.1 in [31]] *Let $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{F}^+$ be given, such that $\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}; \mu) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+4\kappa}}$. In case of $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$ we have that $(\mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{s}^+) \in \mathcal{F}^+$.*

The next lemma shows the quadratic convergence of the corrector step.

Lemma 4.2. [Corollary 3.2 in [31]] *Let $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{F}^+$ and $\bar{\mathbf{v}} = \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{x}^+\mathbf{s}^+}{\mu}}$ be given, such that $\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}; \mu) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+4\kappa}}$. In case of $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$ we have that*

$$\delta(\mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{s}^+; \mu) \leq 2(10 + 4\kappa)\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}; \mu)^2.$$

Algorithm 1: New PC IPA for $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be the accuracy parameter, $0 < \theta < 1$ the update parameter and τ the proximity parameter. Furthermore, a known upper bound κ of the handicap $\hat{\kappa}(M)$ is given. Assume that for $(\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{s}^0)$ the $(\mathbf{x}^0)^T \mathbf{s}^0 = n\mu^0$, $\mu^0 > 0$ holds such that $\delta(\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{s}^0, \mu^0) \leq \tau$.

begin

$k := 0$;

while $(\mathbf{x}^k)^T \mathbf{s}^k > \epsilon$ **do begin**

(corrector step)

compute $(\Delta^c x^k, \Delta^c s^k)$ from system (2.7) using (2.5);

let $(\mathbf{x}^+)^k := \mathbf{x}^k + \Delta^c x^k$ and $(\mathbf{s}^+)^k := \mathbf{s}^k + \Delta^c s^k$;

(predictor step)

compute $(\Delta^p x^k, \Delta^p s^k)$ from system (3.2) using (2.5);

let $(\mathbf{x}^p)^k := (\mathbf{x}^+)^k + \theta \Delta^p \mathbf{x}^k$ and $(\mathbf{s}^p)^k := (\mathbf{s}^+)^k + \theta \Delta^p \mathbf{s}^k$;

(update of the parameters and the iterates)

$(\mu^p)^k = \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \mu^k$;

$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} := (\mathbf{x}^p)^k$, $\mathbf{s}^{k+1} := (\mathbf{s}^p)^k$, $\mu^{k+1} := (\mu^p)^k$;

$k := k + 1$;

end

end.

In the following lemma an upper bound is given on the duality gap.

Lemma 4.3. [Corollary 3.3 in [31]] Let $\delta := \delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}; \mu)$ and suppose that the vectors \mathbf{x}^+ and \mathbf{s}^+ are obtained using a full-Newton step, thus $\mathbf{x}^+ = \mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{s}^+ = \mathbf{s} + \Delta \mathbf{s}$. In case of $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$ we have

$$(\mathbf{x}^+)^T \mathbf{s}^+ \leq \mu(n + 9\delta^2).$$

We present technical lemmas that will be used later in the analysis. The following result is independent from the selection of the AET function. Let

$$\mathbf{q}_\varphi = \mathbf{d}_x^c - \mathbf{d}_s^c. \quad (4.1)$$

Lemma 4.4. [Lemma 5.4 in [14]] The following inequality holds:

$$\|\mathbf{q}_\varphi\| \leq 2\sqrt{1 + 4\kappa} \delta,$$

where $\delta = \delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}, \mu)$.

Throughout this section we assume that M is a $P_*(\kappa)$ -matrix for a given $\kappa \geq \hat{\kappa}(M) \geq 0$ upper bound.

Easy computations lead (for details see [14], page 2641) to the following inequality

$$(1 + 4\kappa) \sum_{i \in I_+} d_{x_i}^p d_{s_i}^p + \sum_{i \in I_-} d_{x_i}^p d_{s_i}^p \geq 0, \quad (4.2)$$

The next lemma is a technical one which will be used later in the analysis.

Lemma 4.5. Let $\bar{f} : (\bar{d}, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a function, where $\bar{d} > 0$ and $|\bar{f}(t)| \geq \bar{k}|1-t|$, for $t > \bar{d}$, where $\bar{k} > 0$. Then,

$$\|\bar{f}(\mathbf{v})\| \geq \bar{k}\|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}\|.$$

Proof. We have

$$\|\bar{f}(\mathbf{v})\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{f}(v_i))^2} \geq \bar{k} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (1-v_i)^2} = \bar{k}\|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}\|,$$

which leads to the result. \square

The following result depends on the current AET function $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$, therefore we need to prove a similar result to that of Lemma 5.3. in [14]. Since many steps of the proof of our new lemma is very similar to the proof of the earlier result, therefore we only focus on the differences caused by the new AET function.

Lemma 4.6. Let $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$. Then,

$$\|\mathbf{d}_x^p \mathbf{d}_s^p\| \leq \frac{n \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\right) (1 + 4\delta^+)^2}{2},$$

$$\text{where } \delta^+ = \delta(\mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{s}^+, \mu) = \left\| \frac{(\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}^+)(\mathbf{e} + (\mathbf{v}^+)^2 + (\mathbf{v}^+)^3)}{4(\mathbf{v}^+)^3 - 2\mathbf{v}^+ + \mathbf{e}} \right\|.$$

Proof. We use the second equation of the scaled predictor system (3.2) and we obtain the following:

$$\sum_{i \in I_+} d_{x_i}^p d_{s_i}^p \leq \frac{1}{4} \|\mathbf{d}_x^p + \mathbf{d}_s^p\|^2 = \frac{\|\mathbf{v}^+\|^2}{16}.$$

Using the previous bound and (4.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}^+\|^2 &\geq \frac{1}{4} \|\mathbf{v}^+\|^2 = \|\mathbf{d}_x^p + \mathbf{d}_s^p\|^2 = \|\mathbf{d}_x^p\|^2 + \|\mathbf{d}_s^p\|^2 + 2 \left(\sum_{i \in I_+} d_{x_i}^p d_{s_i}^p + \sum_{i \in I_-} d_{x_i}^p d_{s_i}^p \right) \\ &\geq \|\mathbf{d}_x^p\|^2 + \|\mathbf{d}_s^p\|^2 - 8\kappa \sum_{i \in I_+} d_{x_i}^p d_{s_i}^p \\ &\geq \|\mathbf{d}_x^p\|^2 + \|\mathbf{d}_s^p\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\kappa \|\mathbf{v}^+\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This means that $\|\mathbf{d}_x^p\|^2 + \|\mathbf{d}_s^p\|^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\right) \|\mathbf{v}^+\|^2$. Exactly on the same way as in [14] (page 2642) we get

$$\|\mathbf{v}^+\| \leq \sqrt{n}(\sigma^+ + 1), \quad (4.3)$$

where $\sigma^+ = \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}^+\|$. Now we need to compute a lower bound on δ^+ . Using Lemma 4.5 we derive

$$\delta^+ = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \frac{2(\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}^+)(\mathbf{e} + (\mathbf{v}^+)^2 + (\mathbf{v}^+)^3)}{4(\mathbf{v}^+)^3 - 2\mathbf{v}^+ + \mathbf{e}} \right\| = \|\bar{f}(\mathbf{v})\| \geq \frac{1}{4} \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}^+\| = \frac{\sigma^+}{4}, \quad (4.4)$$

where $\bar{f}(t) = \frac{(1-t)(1+t^2+t^3)}{4t^3-2t+1}$ and it can be shown that $|\bar{f}(t)| \geq \frac{1}{4}|1-t|$. Using (4.3) and (4.4) we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{v}^+\| \leq \sqrt{n}(1 + 4\delta^+). \quad (4.5)$$

From the previous steps,

$$\|\mathbf{d}_x^p \mathbf{d}_s^p\| \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|\mathbf{d}_x^p\|^2 + \|\mathbf{d}_s^p\|^2) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\right) \|\mathbf{v}^+\|^2 \leq \frac{n(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2})(1 + 4\delta^+)^2}{2},$$

which yields the result. \square

In the next part we deal with the predictor step. Consider the following notations:

$$\mathbf{x}^p(\alpha) = \mathbf{x}^+ + \alpha \theta \Delta^p \mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{s}^p(\alpha) = \mathbf{s}^+ + \alpha \theta \Delta^p \mathbf{s},$$

for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$. We have

$$\mathbf{x}^p(\alpha) = \frac{\mathbf{x}^+}{\mathbf{v}^+} (\mathbf{v}^+ + \alpha \theta \mathbf{d}_x^p), \quad \mathbf{s}^p(\alpha) = \frac{\mathbf{s}^+}{\mathbf{v}^+} (\mathbf{v}^+ + \alpha \theta \mathbf{d}_s^p).$$

Using the second equation of the scaled predictor system (3.2) and the computations given in (5.17), page 2643 in [14], we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^p(\alpha) \mathbf{s}^p(\alpha) &= \mu \left((\mathbf{v}^+)^2 + \alpha \theta \mathbf{v}^+ \left(-\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{v}^+ \right) + \alpha^2 \theta^2 \mathbf{d}_x^p \mathbf{d}_s^p \right) \\ &= \mu \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \alpha \theta\right) (\mathbf{v}^+)^2 + \alpha^2 \theta^2 \mathbf{d}_x^p \mathbf{d}_s^p \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

From (4.6) and following the same ideas as in [14], we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^p(\alpha) \mathbf{s}^p(\alpha)}{\mu \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \alpha \theta\right)} \right) &= \min \left((\mathbf{v}^+)^2 + \frac{\alpha^2 \theta^2}{1 - \frac{1}{2} \alpha \theta} \mathbf{d}_x^p \mathbf{d}_s^p \right) \\ &\geq \min \left((\mathbf{v}^+)^2 - \frac{\alpha^2 \theta^2}{1 - \frac{1}{2} \alpha \theta} \|\mathbf{d}_x^p \mathbf{d}_s^p\|_\infty \mathbf{e} \right) \\ &\geq \min \left((\mathbf{v}^+)^2 - \frac{\theta^2}{1 - \frac{1}{2} \theta} \|\mathbf{d}_x^p \mathbf{d}_s^p\|_\infty \mathbf{e} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that

$$h(\alpha) = \frac{\alpha^2 \theta^2}{1 - \frac{1}{2} \alpha \theta}$$

is strictly increasing for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ and each fixed $0 < \theta < 1$. Moreover, using

$$|1 - v_i^+| \leq \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}^+\|, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n$$

we have

$$1 - \sigma^+ \leq v_i^+ \leq 1 + \sigma^+, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Using this and (4.4) we have

$$\min (\mathbf{v}^+)^2 \geq (1 - \sigma^+)^2 \geq (1 - 4\delta^+)^2 \quad (4.8)$$

From Lemma 4.6 and (4.8) and using that $\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq \|\cdot\|$ we obtain

$$\min \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^p(\alpha) \mathbf{s}^p(\alpha)}{\mu \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \alpha \theta\right)} \right) \geq (1 - 4\delta^+)^2 - \frac{n \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\right) (1 + 4\delta^+)^2 \theta^2}{2 - \theta} =: u(\delta^+, \theta, n). \quad (4.9)$$

Now, it is clear that $u(\delta^+, \theta, n) > 0$ is sufficient for strict feasibility, namely $\mathbf{x}^p(\alpha) \mathbf{s}^p(\alpha) > 0$ for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. Therefore, $\mathbf{x}^p(\alpha)$ and $\mathbf{s}^p(\alpha)$ do not change sign on $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. Since $\mathbf{x}^p(0) = \mathbf{x}^+ > \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{s}^p(0) = \mathbf{s}^+ > \mathbf{0}$, we can conclude that $\mathbf{x}^p(1) = \mathbf{x}^p > \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{s}^p(1) = \mathbf{s}^p > \mathbf{0}$.

We are ready to summarize the previous analysis in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7. Let $(\mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{s}^+) > \mathbf{0}$ and $\mu > 0$ such that $\delta^+ := \delta(\mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{s}^+, \mu) < \frac{1}{4}$. Furthermore, let $0 < \theta < 1$. Let $\mathbf{x}^p = \mathbf{x}^+ + \theta \Delta^p \mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{s}^p = \mathbf{s}^+ + \theta \Delta^p \mathbf{s}$ be the iterates after a predictor step. Then, in case of $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$, we have $\mathbf{x}^p, \mathbf{s}^p > \mathbf{0}$ if $u(\delta^+, \theta, n) > 0$, where

$$u(\delta^+, \theta, n) := (1 - 4\delta^+)^2 - \frac{n \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\right) (1 + 4\delta^+)^2 \theta^2}{2 - \theta}.$$

This result is very similar to Lemma 5.5. [14] and the proof differs only in those parts that are effected by the AET function φ . Later, we will present how could we fix the parameters to get $u(\delta^+, \theta, n) > 0$.

Let us introduce

$$\mathbf{v}^p = \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{x}^p \mathbf{s}^p}{\mu^p}}, \quad (4.10)$$

where $\mu^p = \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \mu$. The next lemma analyses the effect of a predictor step and the update of μ on the proximity measure.

Lemma 4.8. Let $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$, $\delta^+ := \delta(\mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{s}^+, \mu) < \frac{1}{4}$, $\mu^p = \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) \mu$, where $0 < \theta < 1$, and let \mathbf{x}^p and \mathbf{s}^p denote the iterates after a predictor step. Then,

$$\delta^p := \delta(\mathbf{x}^p, \mathbf{s}^p, \mu^p) \leq 2(10 + 4\kappa)\delta^2 + \frac{2\theta^2}{2 - \theta} n \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\right) (1 + 4\delta^+)^2,$$

where $\delta := \delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}, \mu)$.

Proof. Let us compute δ^p by using (2.11)

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^p &:= \left\| \frac{(\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}^p) \left(\mathbf{e} + (\mathbf{v}^p)^2 + (\mathbf{v}^p)^3\right)}{4(\mathbf{v}^p)^3 - 2\mathbf{v}^p + \mathbf{e}} \right\| \\ &= \left\| (\mathbf{e} - (\mathbf{v}^p)^2) \frac{(\mathbf{e} + (\mathbf{v}^p)^2 + (\mathbf{v}^p)^3)}{(\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{v}^p) \left(4(\mathbf{v}^p)^3 - 2\mathbf{v}^p + \mathbf{e}\right)} \right\| \\ &= \left\| (\mathbf{e} - (\mathbf{v}^p)^2) g(\mathbf{v}) \right\| \leq 2 \left\| \mathbf{e} - (\mathbf{v}^p)^2 \right\|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where we used that for the function $g: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $g(t) = \frac{1+t^2+t^3}{(1+t)(4t^3-2t+1)}$ we have $|g(t)| \leq 2$, for all $t > 0$. It should be mentioned that the last inequality of (4.11) can be obtained by using a modified version of Lemma 4.5.

From (4.6) we have

$$(\mathbf{v}^p)^2 = (\mathbf{v}^+)^2 + \frac{\theta^2}{1 - \frac{1}{2}\theta} \mathbf{d}_x^p \mathbf{d}_s^p, \quad (4.12)$$

hence we have

$$\delta^p \leq 2 \left\| \mathbf{e} - (\mathbf{v}^+)^2 - \frac{\theta^2}{1 - \frac{1}{2}\theta} \mathbf{d}_x^p \mathbf{d}_s^p \right\| \leq 2 \left(\left\| \mathbf{e} - (\mathbf{v}^+)^2 \right\| + \frac{\theta^2}{1 - \frac{1}{2}\theta} \left\| \mathbf{d}_x^p \mathbf{d}_s^p \right\| \right). \quad (4.13)$$

Using (4.12) and inequality (5.25) given in [14] we get

$$\left\| \mathbf{e} - (\mathbf{v}^+)^2 \right\| \leq \left\| \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}^2 - \mathbf{v} \mathbf{p}_\varphi \right\| + \left\| \frac{\mathbf{p}_\varphi^2}{4} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\mathbf{q}_\varphi^2}{4} \right\|, \quad (4.14)$$

where \mathbf{q}_φ is as given in (4.1). Using (2.11), after some calculations we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}^2 - \mathbf{v}\mathbf{p}_\varphi\| &= \left\| \frac{-2\mathbf{v}^5 + 4\mathbf{v}^3 + \mathbf{v}^2 - 4\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{e}}{4\mathbf{v}^3 - 2\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{e}} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \frac{(4\mathbf{v}^3 - 2\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{e})(-2\mathbf{v}^5 + 4\mathbf{v}^3 + \mathbf{v}^2 - 4\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{e})}{(\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v})^2(\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{v}^2 + \mathbf{v}^3)^2} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{p}_\varphi^2}{4} \right\| \\ &= \left\| h(\mathbf{v}) \frac{\mathbf{p}_\varphi^2}{4} \right\| \leq 8 \left\| \frac{\mathbf{p}_\varphi^2}{4} \right\|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

where in the last inequality we used that $|h(t)| \leq 8$, for all $t > 0$, where

$$h(t) = \frac{(4t^3 - 2t + 1)(-2t^5 + 4t^3 + t^2 - 4t + 1)}{(1-t)^2(1+t^2+t^3)^2} = \frac{(-4t^3 + 2t - 1)(2t^3 + 4t^2 + 2t - 1)}{(1+t^2+t^3)^2}.$$

Note that the last inequality of (4.15) can be derived by using a modified version of Lemma 4.5. Using Lemma 4.4, (3.3), (4.14) and (4.15) we have

$$\|\mathbf{e} - (\mathbf{v}^+)^2\| \leq 9 \left\| \frac{\mathbf{p}_\varphi^2}{4} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\mathbf{q}_\varphi^2}{4} \right\| \leq 9 \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{p}_\varphi\|}{2} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{q}_\varphi\|}{2} \right)^2 \leq (10 + 4\kappa)\delta^2. \quad (4.16)$$

From Lemma 4.6, (4.11) and (4.16) we get

$$\delta^p \leq 2(10 + 4\kappa)\delta^2 + \frac{2\theta^2}{2-\theta}n \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\right) (1 + 4\delta^+)^2, \quad (4.17)$$

which gives the result. \square

The next lemma provides an upper bound for the duality gap after a main iteration.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$ and $0 < \theta < 1$. If \mathbf{x}^p and \mathbf{s}^p are the iterates obtained after the predictor step of the algorithm, then*

$$(\mathbf{x}^p)^T \mathbf{s}^p \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta^2}{8}\right) (\mathbf{x}^+)^T \mathbf{s}^+ < \frac{2(n + 9\delta^2)\mu^p}{2 - \theta}.$$

Proof. Using (4.6) with $\alpha = 1$ and (4.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{x}^p)^T \mathbf{s}^p &= \mu^p \mathbf{e}^T (\mathbf{v}^p)^2 = \mu \mathbf{e}^T \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) (\mathbf{v}^+)^2 + \theta^2 \mathbf{d}_x^p \mathbf{d}_s^p \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) (\mathbf{x}^+)^T \mathbf{s}^+ + \mu \theta^2 (\mathbf{d}_x^p)^T \mathbf{d}_s^p. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Using the technique given in the proof of Lemma 5.7 given in [14] we obtain

$$(\mathbf{x}^p)^T \mathbf{s}^p \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta^2}{8}\right) (\mathbf{x}^+)^T \mathbf{s}^+.$$

If $0 < \theta < 1$, then

$$1 - \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta^2}{8} < 1. \quad (4.19)$$

Using this, $\mu^p = \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)\mu$, (4.19) and Lemma 4.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{x}^p)^T \mathbf{s}^p &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta^2}{8}\right) (\mathbf{x}^+)^T \mathbf{s}^+ \\ &< (\mathbf{x}^+)^T \mathbf{s}^+ < \mu(n + 9\delta^2) = \frac{2(n + 9\delta^2)\mu^p}{2 - \theta}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

which yields the result. \square

In the following section we provide a set of parameters for which the PC IPA is well defined. This means that if we have a feasible solution for which $\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}, \mu) \leq \tau$, then after a corrector and predictor step we will get that $\delta^p(\mathbf{x}^p, \mathbf{s}^p, \mu^p) \leq \tau$. We use some ideas given in [17].

5. COMPLEXITY BOUND

We introduce the following notation:

$$L(\tau) = \frac{(1-2\tau)^2}{(1+2\tau)^2}. \quad (5.1)$$

The next lemma gives a condition related to the parameters τ and θ for which the PC IPA is well defined.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$, $\tau = \frac{1}{2r(10+4\kappa)}$, where $r \geq 2$ and $0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{q(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}}$, where $q \geq 2$. If*

- i. $r \leq \frac{2}{5}q$,
- ii. $\frac{n(1+\frac{\kappa}{2})\theta^2}{2-\theta} < L(\tau)$,

then the PC IPA proposed in Algorithm 1 is well defined.

Proof. Let $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{F}^+$ such that $\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}, \mu) \leq \tau$. After a corrector step, applying Lemma 4.2 we have

$$\delta^+ := \delta(\mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{s}^+, \mu) \leq 2(10+4\kappa)\delta^2,$$

which is monotonically increasing with respect to δ . Using this and $r \geq 2$ we get

$$\delta^+ \leq 2(10+4\kappa)\tau^2 = \frac{1}{2r^2(10+4\kappa)} = \frac{1}{r}\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}\tau. \quad (5.2)$$

Using $\frac{n(1+\frac{\kappa}{2})\theta^2}{2-\theta} < L(\tau)$ and (5.2) we obtain

$$(1-4\delta^+)^2 - \frac{n(1+\frac{\kappa}{2})\theta^2(1+4\delta^+)^2}{2-\theta} > (1-2\tau)^2 - \frac{n(1+\frac{\kappa}{2})\theta^2}{2-\theta}(1+2\tau)^2 > 0, \quad (5.3)$$

where we used that the function appearing on the left hand side is increasing with respect to δ^+ . Condition $\bar{u}(\delta^c, \theta, r) > 0$ from Lemma 4.7 is satisfied. Furthermore, using $\tau = \frac{1}{2r(10+4\kappa)}$, $r \geq 2$ and (5.2) we have $\delta^+ \leq \frac{1}{4r(10+4\kappa)} < \frac{1}{80} < \frac{1}{4}$. From Lemma 4.8, after a predictor step and a μ -update we have

$$\delta^p \leq 2(10+4\kappa)\delta^2 + \frac{2\theta^2}{2-\theta}n\left(1+\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)(1+4\delta^+)^2, \quad (5.4)$$

where $\delta := \delta(x, s, \mu)$.

Using $\theta \leq \frac{1}{q(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}}$ and $\kappa \geq 0$ we get

$$\frac{2}{2-\theta} \leq \frac{20q}{20q-1}. \quad (5.5)$$

We also consider

$$\theta \leq \frac{1}{q(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{1}{q\left(1+\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)\sqrt{n}}. \quad (5.6)$$

Using (5.5) and (5.6) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2n\left(1+\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)\theta^2}{2-\theta} &\leq n\left(1+\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)\frac{20q}{20q-1}\frac{1}{q(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}}\frac{1}{q\left(1+\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)\sqrt{n}} \\ &= \frac{20}{q(20q-1)}\frac{1}{10+4\kappa} = \frac{40r}{(20q-1)q}\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Using (5.2) and $\kappa \geq 0$ we obtain

$$\delta^+ \leq 2(10+4\kappa)\delta^2 \leq \frac{1}{r}\tau = \frac{1}{2r^2(10+4\kappa)} \leq \frac{1}{20r^2}. \quad (5.8)$$

From (5.7) and (5.8) we get

$$\frac{2n\left(1+\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)\theta^2(1+4\delta^+)^2}{2-\theta} \leq \frac{40r}{(20q-1)q}\left(1+\frac{1}{5r^2}\right)^2\tau. \quad (5.9)$$

From $r \geq 2$, $q \geq 2$ and $r \leq \frac{2}{5}q$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{40r}{(20q-1)q}\left(1+\frac{1}{5r^2}\right)^2 &= 40\frac{r}{q}\frac{1}{20q-1}\left(1+\frac{1}{5r^2}\right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{40}{39}\cdot\frac{2}{5}\cdot\frac{441}{400} < \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

From (5.2), (5.4), (5.9) and (5.10) we get

$$\delta^p < \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\tau = \tau, \quad (5.11)$$

hence the PC IPA is well defined, hence if we have a feasible solution for which $\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}, \mu) \leq \tau$, then after a corrector and predictor step we will get that $\delta^p(\mathbf{x}^p, \mathbf{s}^p, \mu^p) \leq \tau$. \square

The following lemma gives a sufficient condition for satisfying Condition ii. from Lemma 5.1.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$, $\tau = \frac{1}{2r(10+4\kappa)}$, where $r \geq 2$ and $0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{q(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}}$, where $q \geq 2$. Consider L given in (5.1). If*

$$\frac{1}{q^2} < L\left(\frac{1}{20r}\right), \quad (5.12)$$

then condition ii. of Lemma 5.1 is satisfied.

Proof. From $0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{q(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}}$ and $q \geq 2$ we have

$$\frac{1}{2-\theta} \leq 1. \quad (5.13)$$

Furthermore, using the properties of the function φ , (5.6) and $\kappa \geq 0$ we get

$$\frac{n\left(1+\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)\theta^2}{2-\theta} \leq n\left(1+\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)\frac{1}{q^2\left(1+\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^2n} = \frac{1}{q^2\left(1+\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)} \leq \frac{1}{q^2}. \quad (5.14)$$

Besides this, from $\tau = \frac{1}{2r(10+4\kappa)}$ and $\kappa \geq 0$ we obtain

$$\tau \leq \frac{1}{20r}. \quad (5.15)$$

It should be mentioned that the function $L(\tau)$ is strictly decreasing with respect to τ , hence using (5.15) we obtain

$$L(\tau) \geq L\left(\frac{1}{20r}\right). \quad (5.16)$$

In this way, using (5.12), (5.13), (5.14) and (5.16) we obtain

$$\frac{n\left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\right)\theta^2}{2 - \theta} \leq \frac{1}{q^2} < L\left(\frac{1}{20r}\right) \leq L(\tau),$$

which yields the result. \square

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$, $\tau = \frac{1}{2r(10+4\kappa)}$, where $r \geq 2$ and $0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{q(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}}$, where $q \geq 2$. If Condition i. from Lemma 5.1 is satisfied, then Condition ii. from Lemma 5.1 also holds.*

Proof. Consider the following function

$$z(r) = \frac{2\left(1 + \frac{1}{10r}\right)}{5r\left(1 - \frac{1}{10r}\right)},$$

which is decreasing with respect to r . Thus, for $r \geq 2$ we have

$$z(r) \leq z(2) < 1. \quad (5.17)$$

Using (5.17) and Condition i. of Lemma 5.1 we obtain that

$$q \geq \frac{5}{2}r > \frac{1}{\sqrt{L\left(\frac{1}{20r}\right)}}.$$

Hence, if Condition i. of Lemma 5.1 holds, then (5.12) is satisfied. Using Lemma 5.2, we obtain that Condition ii. from Lemma 5.1 also holds. \square

Corollary 5.1. *Let $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$, $\tau = \frac{1}{2r(10+4\kappa)}$, where $r \geq 2$ and $0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{q(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}}$. If $q \geq \frac{5}{2}r$, then the PC IPA proposed in Algorithm 1 is well defined.*

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$, $(\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{s}^0) \in \mathcal{F}^+$, $\tau = \frac{1}{2r(10+4\kappa)}$, where $r \geq 2$ and $0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{q(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}}$, where $q \geq \frac{5}{2}r$. Furthermore, let $\mu^0 = \frac{(\mathbf{x}^0)^T \mathbf{s}^0}{n}$ and $\delta(\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{s}^0, \mu^0) \leq \tau$. Moreover, let \mathbf{x}^k and \mathbf{s}^k be the iterates obtained after k iterations of Algorithm 1. Then, $(\mathbf{x}^k)^T \mathbf{s}^k \leq \epsilon$ for*

$$k \geq 1 + \left\lceil \frac{2}{\theta} \log \frac{3(\mathbf{x}^0)^T \mathbf{s}^0}{2\epsilon} \right\rceil.$$

Proof. Using $\tau = \frac{1}{2r(10+4\kappa)}$, $r \geq 2$, $n \geq 1$ and $\kappa \geq 0$, we get

$$\delta^2 \leq \frac{1}{16(10+4\kappa)^2} < \frac{n}{1600}. \quad (5.18)$$

Using Lemma 4.9 we have

$$(\mathbf{x}^k)^T \mathbf{s}^k < \frac{2(n+9\delta^2)\mu^k}{2-\theta} < \frac{1609n\mu^k}{1600\left(1-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)} < \frac{3}{2}\left(1-\frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{k-1} (\mathbf{x}^0)^T \mathbf{s}^0.$$

The inequality $(\mathbf{x}^k)^T \mathbf{s}^k \leq \epsilon$ holds if $\frac{3}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{k-1} (\mathbf{x}^0)^T \mathbf{s}^0 \leq \epsilon$. We take logarithms, hence

$$(k-1) \log \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) + \log \frac{3(\mathbf{x}^0)^T \mathbf{s}^0}{2} \leq \log \epsilon.$$

From $\log(1+\theta) \leq \theta$, $\theta \geq -1$, it follows that the above inequality holds if

$$-\frac{\theta}{2}(k-1) + \log \frac{3(\mathbf{x}^0)^T \mathbf{s}^0}{2} \leq \log \epsilon.$$

This yields the desired result. \square

Theorem 5.1. Let $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$, $\tau = \frac{1}{2r(10+4\kappa)}$, where $r \geq 2$ and $0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{q(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}}$, where $q \geq \frac{5}{2}n$. Then, the PC IPA proposed in Algorithm 1 is well defined and it performs at most

$$\mathcal{O} \left((10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n} \log \frac{3n\mu^0}{2\epsilon} \right)$$

iterations. The output is a pair (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) satisfying $\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{s} \leq \epsilon$.

Proof. The result follows from Corollary 5.1 and Lemma 5.4. \square

Corollary 5.2. Let $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$ and consider $0 < \tau \leq \frac{1}{40+16\kappa}$ and $0 < \theta \leq \frac{4}{5\sqrt{n}}\tau$. Then, the PC IPA proposed in Algorithm 1 is well defined and it performs at most

$$\mathcal{O} \left((10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n} \log \frac{3n\mu^0}{2\epsilon} \right)$$

iterations. The output is a pair (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) satisfying $\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{s} \leq \epsilon$.

Proof. If $\tau \leq \frac{1}{40+16\kappa}$, then we can find $r \geq 2$ such that

$$\tau = \frac{1}{2r(10+4\kappa)}. \quad (5.19)$$

Using $\theta \leq \frac{4}{5\sqrt{n}}\tau$ and $\tau \leq \frac{1}{40+16\kappa}$ we have

$$\theta \leq \frac{4}{5\sqrt{n}}\tau \leq \frac{1}{5(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}}.$$

Hence, we can find $q \geq 5$ such that

$$\theta = \frac{1}{q(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}}. \quad (5.20)$$

Moreover, from (5.19), (5.20) and $\theta \leq \frac{4}{5\sqrt{n}}\tau$ we have

$$\theta = \frac{1}{q(10+4\kappa)\sqrt{n}} = \frac{2\tau r}{q\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{4}{5\sqrt{n}}\tau,$$

therefore $q \geq \frac{5}{2}r$ holds. All conditions from Lemma 5.1 are satisfied, hence from Corollary 5.1 and Lemma 5.4 we obtain the desired result. \square

6. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We implemented a variant of the proposed PC IPA in the C++ programming language. There is a detailed explanation about the implementation in [50]. We did all computations on a desktop computer with Intel quad-core 3.3 GHz processor and 16 GB RAM.

We used Algorithm 2 in our implementation. We set the values $\theta = 0.999$ and $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$ and the maximum of α to 3. We do not give upper bound for the proximity parameter τ and we observe that in some cases the value of the proximity measure might become very large. However, we ensure that feasibility holds in all cases.

Algorithm 2: Implemented PC IPA for $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs

Let $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$ be the accuracy parameter, $\theta = 0.999$ the update parameter and $\tau > 0$ the proximity parameter, $\sigma = 0.9999$ decrease parameter, $0 < \alpha < 3$ the step length.

Assume that for $(\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{s}^0) \in \mathcal{F}^+$, the $(\mathbf{x}^0)^T \mathbf{s}^0 = n\mu^0$, $\mu^0 > 0$ holds such that $-M\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{q}$ for a given matrix M and vector \mathbf{q} .

begin

$k := 0$;

while $(\mathbf{x}^k)^T \mathbf{s}^k > \epsilon$ **do begin**

$(\mu^p)^k = (1 - \theta)\mu^k$;

(predictor step)

compute $(\Delta^p x^k, \Delta^p s^k)$ from system (3.2) using (2.5);

calculate local κ with $\kappa(\Delta^p x^k) = -\frac{1}{4} \frac{\Delta^p(x^k)^T M \Delta^p x^k}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_+(\Delta^p(x^k))} \Delta^p x_i^k (M \Delta^p x^k)_i}$

compute α with

$\alpha_{x_h} := \{-\frac{x_i}{\Delta x_i} : \Delta x_i < 0\}$ and $\alpha_{s_h} := \{-\frac{s_i}{\Delta s_i} : \Delta s_i < 0\}$

$\alpha_h := \sigma \cdot \min\{\alpha_{x_h}, \alpha_{s_h}\}$

$\alpha := \min\{\alpha_h, 3\}$

let $(\mathbf{x}^p)^k := \mathbf{x}^k + \alpha \Delta^p \mathbf{x}^k$ and $(\mathbf{s}^p)^k := \mathbf{s}^k + \alpha \Delta^p \mathbf{s}^k$;

(corrector step)

compute $(\Delta^c x^k, \Delta^c s^k)$ from system (2.7) using (2.5);

compute α with

$\alpha_{x_h} := \{-\frac{x_i}{\Delta x_i} : \Delta x_i < 0\}$ and $\alpha_{s_h} := \{-\frac{s_i}{\Delta s_i} : \Delta s_i < 0\}$

$\alpha_h := \sigma \cdot \min\{\alpha_{x_h}, \alpha_{s_h}\}$

$\alpha := \min\{\alpha_h, 3\}$

let $(\mathbf{x}^+)^k := (\mathbf{x}^p)^k + \alpha \Delta^c x^k$ and $(\mathbf{s}^+)^k := (\mathbf{s}^p)^k + \alpha \Delta^c s^k$;

(update of the parameters and the iterates)

$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} := (\mathbf{x}^+)^k$, $\mathbf{s}^{k+1} := (\mathbf{s}^+)^k$, $\mu^{k+1} := \left(\frac{(\mathbf{x}^{k+1})^T \mathbf{s}^{k+1}}{n} \right)^k$;

$k := k + 1$;

end

end.

In the literature there are only a few numerical results about LCPs, where the problem's matrix has positive handicap. Gurtuna et al. [24] and Asadi et al. [1] provided numerical results based on 2×2 or 3×3 matrices that are related to $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs having positive handicap. Darvay et al. [14] presented numerical results on $P_*(\kappa)$ -problems that were generated by Illés and Morapitiye [25] and on $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCPs with matrix having exponential handicap, see (6.1). They also used their PC IPA to solve special, non-sufficient LCPs.

They tested copositivity of matrices and they obtained promising results in spite of the fact that they did not have $P_*(\kappa)$ -matrices in those cases.

It is proven by De Klerk and E.-Nagy [18] that the handicap of the matrix can be exponential in the size of the problem. They considered a matrix which was proposed by Csizmadia:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.1)$$

and E.-Nagy proved that $\hat{\kappa}(M) = 2^{2n-8} - 0.25$, see [19].

We tested our implementation on problems generated using matrix (6.1) in order to show promising results on problems that have exponential handicap. We compared our algorithm with other PC IPA that was presented in [14].

We also used another versions of our implemented IPA by changing the right hand side of the Newton system and scaled system and using other AET functions and a kernel function. In this way we compared these versions with our new PC IPA with AET function $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$. The chosen AET functions are $\varphi(t) = t$ and $\varphi(t) = \sqrt{t}$. The parametric kernel function used here is $\Psi_{p,\sigma} = \frac{t^{p+1}-1}{p+1} + \frac{e^{\sigma(1-t)}-1}{\sigma}$, $p \in [0, 1]$, $\sigma \geq 1$, see [23, 52]. We set $p = 1$ and $\sigma = 5$ in our computations based on the $\Psi_{p,\sigma}$ kernel function.

We generated 10-10 (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) starting point pairs for sizes of 10, 30, 50, 70, 100 of matrix (6.1) from three different intervals, $[0, 1]^n$, $[0, 10]^n$ and $[0, 100]^n$, respectively. The results for $[0, 1]^n$ can be found in Figure 1, for $[0, 10]^n$ in Figure 2 and for $[0, 100]^n$ in Figure 3.

We can see that in these cases the number of iterations seems to be increasing slightly in spite of the exponential handicap. These results can be found in Figure 1, 2 and 3. Furthermore, it can be seen from Figure 1, 2 and 3 that if \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{s} are from the same interval, the size of the interval does not significantly change the number of iterations.

On the other hand, we generated other feasible LCP examples using the matrix (6.1) for different sizes. We generated 10-10 examples where the random starting point pairs are not from the same interval. We tested $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ with $\mathbf{s} \in [9, 11]^n$, these results can be seen in Figure 4, $\mathbf{x} \in [9, 11]^n$ with $\mathbf{s} \in [0, 1]^n$, these results can be found in Figure 5, $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 100]^n$ with $\mathbf{s} \in [9900, 11000]^n$, these results can be seen in Figure 6, $\mathbf{x} \in [9900, 11000]^n$ with $\mathbf{s} \in [0, 100]^n$, these results can be found in Figure 7.

It can be seen from Figure 4 and 5 that if \mathbf{x} values are significantly smaller than the values of \mathbf{s} the problem can be solved with less iteration number, even in case of problems with larger size. To our best knowledge this phenomenon can be explained by the small local κ value. The iteration numbers are almost constant (3 to 7 iterations, see figures). We investigated further results with larger sizes in Figures 8 and 9. In Figure 8 it can be seen that the iteration numbers slightly increase with the size, but in Figure 9 one can see that the iteration numbers are almost constant. However, if the values of \mathbf{s} are the smaller ones (see Figures 6 and 7), the solution can be computed with more iteration numbers. This phenomenon can be explained by the difference of the local κ which is relatively small compared to the value of the theoretical $\hat{\kappa}$ in the case when the values of \mathbf{x} are the smaller one and relatively high in the other case. The detailed explanation of the connection between the local κ and the change of duality gap and the step length can be found in [50].

Furthermore, we showed that, the used kernel function with $p = 1$ and $\sigma = 5$ has slightly worse iteration numbers than the shown three AET functions and the new AET function $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$ gives slightly better results than $\varphi(t) = \sqrt{t}$, as well. However, in Figures 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7 we can see that all the three AET functions have similar iteration numbers. In Figures 5 and 9 it can be seen that $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$ works slightly better than the other variants of the implemented algorithm, where the used search directions are different. Note that in those




FIGURE 1. PC IPA on the problem generated with matrix (6.1) in the size of 10, 30, 50, 70, 100 with the starting point $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ and $\mathbf{s} \in [0, 1]^n$. It can be seen that the iteration numbers for all different variants are very far from the theoretical ones.

cases where the local κ is small. In Figures 4 and 8 we can see that the PC IPA using the AET function $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$ has the same iteration number as the one which works with the AET function $\varphi(t) = t$.

7. CONCLUSION

We proposed a new PC IPA for solving $P_*(\kappa)$ -linear complementarity problems. In the AET technique we used the function $\varphi(t) = t^2 - t + \sqrt{t}$ which has inflection point. It is interesting that the kernel corresponding to this AET function is neither self-regular, nor eligible. We showed that the iteration bound of the PC IPA matches the best known iteration bound for this type of PC IPAs. We also provided a set of parameters for which the PC IPA is well defined. In order to show the efficiency of the algorithm we presented numerical results, as well. From the numerical results we can conclude that in several cases, the choice of the AET function plays important role in the number of iterations. As a future research we would like to understand which AET functions should be used in the different LCP problems in order to obtain better complexity bounds and numerical results, as well.




FIGURE 2. PC IPA on the problem generated with matrix (6.1) in the size of 10, 30, 50, 70, 100 with the starting point $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 10]^n$ and $\mathbf{s} \in [0, 10]^n$. It can be seen that the iteration numbers for all different variants are very far from the theoretical ones.




FIGURE 3. PC IPA on the problem generated with matrix (6.1) in the size of 10, 30, 50, 70, 100 with the starting point $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 100]^n$ and $\mathbf{s} \in [0, 100]^n$. It can be seen that the iteration numbers for all different variants are very far from the theoretical ones. The size of the interval does not change the iteration number.




FIGURE 4. PC IPA on the problem generated with matrix (6.1) in the size of 10, 30, 50, 70, 100 with the starting point $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ and $\mathbf{s} \in [9, 11]^n$. It can be seen that the iteration numbers are almost constant.




FIGURE 5. PC IPA on the problem generated with matrix (6.1) in the size of 10, 30, 50, 70, 100 with the starting point $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 100]^n$ and $\mathbf{s} \in [9900, 11000]^n$. It can be seen that the iteration numbers are almost constant.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

P.R. Rigó is thankful for the support of the Hungarian Research Fund, OTKA (grant no. NKFIH 142154). The research of P.R. Rigó has been supported by the ÚNKP-22-4 New National




FIGURE 6. PC IPA on the problem generated with matrix (6.1) in the size of 10, 30, 50, 70, 100 with the starting point $\mathbf{x} \in [9, 11]^n$ and $\mathbf{s} \in [0, 1]^n$. It can be seen that the iteration numbers for all different variants are very far from the theoretical ones. However, more iterations were needed to solve the problem than in case of Figures 1, 2 and 3.




FIGURE 7. PC IPA on the problem generated with matrix (6.1) in the size of 10, 30, 50, 70, 100 with the starting point $\mathbf{x} \in [9900, 11000]^n$ and $\mathbf{s} \in [0, 100]^n$. It can be seen that the iteration numbers for all different variants are very far from the theoretical ones. Even more iterations were needed than in case of Figure 6.




FIGURE 8. PC IPA on the problem generated with matrix (6.1) in the size of 10, 30, 50, 70, 100, 120, 140, 160, 180, 200 with the starting point $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ and $\mathbf{s} \in [9, 11]^n$. It can be seen that the iteration numbers are increasing.




FIGURE 9. PC IPA on the problem generated with matrix (6.1) in the size of 10, 30, 50, 70, 100, 120, 140, 160, 180, 200 with the starting point $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 100]^n$ and $\mathbf{s} \in [9900, 11000]^n$. It can be seen that the iteration numbers are almost constant.

Excellence Program of the Ministry for Culture and Innovation from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Asadi, H. Mansouri, G. Lesaja, and M. Zangiabadi. A long-step interior-point algorithm for symmetric cone Cartesian $P_*(\kappa)$ -HLCP. *Optimization* 67 (2018) 2031-2060.
- [2] S. Asadi, N. Mahdavi-Amiri, Zs. Darvay and P.R. Rigó, Full-NT step feasible interior-point algorithm for symmetric cone horizontal linear complementarity problem based on a positive-asymptotic barrier function, *Optim. Methods Sofw.* (2020), DOI:10.1080/10556788.2020.1734803.
- [3] C. Brás, G. Eichfelder, and J. Júdice, Copositivity tests based on the linear complementarity problem, *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 63 (2016) 461-493.
- [4] S. Burer, *Copositive programming*, In: Handbook on semidefinite, conic and polynomial optimization, Springer, 201-218, 2012.
- [5] S.-J. Chung, NP-completeness of the linear complementarity problem, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 60 (1989) 393-399.
- [6] R. W. Cottle, J.-S. Pang, and R. E. Stone, *The Linear Complementarity Problem*, Computer Science and Scientific Computing, Academic Press, Boston, 1992.
- [7] R. W. Cottle, J.-S. Pang, and V. Venkateswaran, Sufficient matrices and the linear complementarity problem, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 114 (1989) 231-249.
- [8] Zs. Csizmadia and T. Illés, New criss-cross type algorithms for linear complementarity problems with sufficient matrices, *Optim. Methods Softw.* 21 (2006) 247-266.
- [9] Zs. Csizmadia, T. Illés, and A. Nagy, The s-monotone index selection rules for pivot algorithms of linear programming, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 221 (2012) 491-500.
- [10] Zs. Darvay, New interior point algorithms in linear programming, *Adv. Model. Optim.* 5 (2003) 51-92.
- [11] Zs. Darvay, A predictor-corrector algorithm for linearly constrained convex optimization, *Studia Univ. Babeş-Bolyai, Ser. Informatica*, 54 (2009) 121-138.
- [12] Zs. Darvay, T. Illés, B. Kheirfam, and P. R. Rigó, A corrector-predictor interior-point method with new search direction for linear optimization, *Cent. Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 28 (2019) 1123-1140.
- [13] Zs. Darvay, T. Illés, and Cs. Majoros, Interior-point algorithm for sufficient LCPs based on the technique of algebraically equivalent transformation, *Optim Lett.* 15 (2021) 357-376.
- [14] Zs. Darvay, T. Illés, J. Povh, and P.R. Rigó, Feasible corrector-predictor interior-point algorithm for $P_*(\kappa)$ -linear complementarity problems based on a new search direction, *Siam J. Optim.* 30 (2020), 2628-2658.
- [15] Zs. Darvay, T. Illés, and P.R. Rigó, Predictor-corrector interior-point algorithm for $P_*(\kappa)$ -linear complementarity problems based on a new type of algebraic equivalent transformation technique, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 298 (2022), 25-35.
- [16] Zs. Darvay, I.-M. Papp, and P.-R. Takács, Complexity analysis of a full-Newton step interior-point method for linear optimization, *Period. Math. Hung.* 73 (2016) 27-42.
- [17] Zs. Darvay and P.R. Rigó, New predictor-corrector algorithm for symmetric cone horizontal linear complementarity problems, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* (2022), DOI: 10.1007/s10957-022-02078-z.
- [18] E. De Klerk and M. E.-Nagy, On the complexity of computing the handicap of a sufficient matrix, *Math. Program.* 129 (2011) 383-402.
- [19] M. E.-Nagy, T. Illés, J. Povh, A. Varga and J. Žerovnik, Sufficient matrices: properties, generating and testing, manuscript, 2022.
- [20] M. Ferris and J. Pang, Engineering and economic applications of complementarity problems, *SIAM Review*, 39 (1997) 669-713.
- [21] K. Fukuda, M. Namiki, and A. Tamura, EP theorems and linear complementarity problems, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 84 (1998) 107-119.

- [22] K. Fukuda and T. Terlaky, Criss-cross methods: A fresh view on pivot algorithms, *Math. Program.* 79 (1997) 369-395.
- [23] M. El Ghami, I. Ivanov, J.B. Melissen, C. Roos, and T. Steihaug, A polynomial-time algorithm for linear optimization based on a new class of kernel functions, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 224 (2009) 500-513.
- [24] F. Gurtuna, C. Petra, F.A. Potra, O. Shevchenko, and A. Vancea, Corrector-predictor methods for sufficient linear complementarity problems, *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 48 (2011) 453-485.
- [25] T. Illés and S. Morapitiye, Generating sufficient matrices. In F. Friedler, editor, 8th VO-CAL Optimization Conference: Advanced Algorithms, Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest, Hungary, (2018), pages 56-61.
- [26] T. Illés and M. Nagy, A Mizuno-Todd-Ye type predictor-corrector algorithm for sufficient linear complementarity problems, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 181 (2007) 1097-1111.
- [27] T. Illés, M. Nagy, and T. Terlaky, EP theorem for dual linear complementarity problems, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 140 (2009) 233-238.
- [28] T. Illés, M. Nagy, and T. Terlaky, Polynomial interior point algorithms for general linear complementarity problems, *Alg. Oper. Res.* 5 (2010) 1-12.
- [29] T. Illés, M. Nagy, and T. Terlaky, A polynomial path-following interior point algorithm for general linear complementarity problems, *J. Global. Optim.* 47 (2010) 329-342.
- [30] T. Illés, J. Peng, C. Roos and T. Terlaky, A Strongly Polynomial Rounding Procedure Yielding a Maximally Complementary Solution for $P_*(\kappa)$ Linear Complementarity Problems, *SIAM J. Optim.* 11 (2000) 320-340.
- [31] T. Illés, P.R. Rigó and R. Török, Unified approach of primal-dual interior-point algorithms for a new class of AET functions. *Corvinus Econ. Work. Paper.* (2) (2022)
- [32] B. Kheirfam, A new infeasible interior-point method based on Darvay's technique for symmetric optimization, *Ann. Oper. Res.* 211 (2013) 209-224.
- [33] B. Kheirfam, A predictor-corrector interior-point algorithm for $P_*(\kappa)$ -horizontal linear complementarity problem, *Numer. Algorithms* 66 (2014) 349-361.
- [34] B. Kheirfam and M. Haghghi, A full-Newton step feasible interior-point algorithm for $P_*(\kappa)$ -LCP based on a new search direction, *Croat. Oper. Res. Rev.* 7 (2016) 277-290.
- [35] M. Kojima, N. Megiddo, T. Noma, and A. Yoshise, A Unified Approach to Interior Point Algorithms for Linear Complementarity Problems, vol. 538 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1991.
- [36] G. Lešaja and F.A. Potra, Adaptive full Newton-step infeasible interior-point method for sufficient horizontal LCP, *Optim. Methods Softw.* 34 (2019) 1014-1034.
- [37] G. Lešaja and C. Roos, Unified analysis of kernel-based interior-point methods for $P_*(\kappa)$ -linear complementarity problems, *SIAM J. Optim.* 20 (2010) 3014-3039.
- [38] X. Liu and F.A. Potra, Corrector-predictor methods for sufficient linear complementarity problems in a wide neighborhood of the central path, *SIAM J. Optim.* 17 (2006) 871-890.
- [39] J. Miao, A quadratically convergent $O((\kappa+1)\sqrt{n}L)$ -iteration algorithm for the $P_*(\kappa)$ -matrix linear complementarity problem, *Math. Program.* 69 (1995) 355-368.
- [40] S. Mizuno, M. Todd, and Y. Ye, On adaptive-step primal-dual interior-point algorithms for linear programming, *Math. Oper. Res.* 18 (1993) 964-981.
- [41] M. Nagy, Interior point algorithms for general linear complementarity problems, PhD thesis, Eötvös Loránd University of Sciences, Institute of Mathematics, 2009.
- [42] J. Peng, C. Roos, and T. Terlaky, *Self-Regular Functions: a New Paradigm for Primal-Dual Interior-Point Methods*, Princeton University Press, 2002.
- [43] F.A. Potra, Corrector-predictor methods for monotone linear complementarity problems in a wide neighborhood of the central path, *Math. Program.* 111 (2008) 243-272.
- [44] F.A. Potra, Interior point methods for sufficient horizontal LCP in a wide neighborhood of the central path with best known iteration complexity, *SIAM J. Optim.* 24 (2014) 1-28.

- [45] F.A. Potra and X. Liu, Predictor-corrector methods for sufficient linear complementarity problems in a wide neighborhood of the central path, *Optim. Methods Softw.* 20 (2005) 145-168.
- [46] F.A. Potra and R. Sheng, Predictor-corrector algorithm for solving $P_*(\kappa)$ -matrix LCP from arbitrary positive starting points, *Math. Program.* 76 (1996) 223-244.
- [47] F.A. Potra and R. Sheng, A large-step infeasible-interior-point method for the P^* -Matrix LCP, *SIAM J. Optim.* 7 (1997) 318-335.
- [48] P.R. Rigó, New trends in algebraic equivalent transformation of the central path and its applications, PhD thesis, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Institute of Mathematics, Hungary, 2020.
- [49] C. Roos, T. Terlaky, and J.-P. Vial, *Theory and Algorithms for Linear Optimization*, Springer, New York, USA, 2005.
- [50] R. Török, T. Illés, and P.R. Rigó, Implementation of primal-dual interior-point algorithm for solving sufficient linear complementarity problems. In S. Drobne, L. Zadnik Stirn, M. Kljajić Borštar, J. Povh, and J. Žerovnik, editors, *Proceedings of the 16th International Symposium on Operational Research in Slovenia: SOR'21, Slovenia, (2021)* pages 86-91.
- [51] P. Tseng, Co-NP-completeness of some matrix classification problems, *Math. Program.* 88 (2000) 183-192.
- [52] G. Wang and Y. Bai, Polynomial interior-point algorithms for $P_*(\kappa)$ horizontal linear complementarity problem, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 223 (2009) 248-263.
- [53] Q. Wang and H. Sun, Sparse Markowitz portfolio selection by using stochastic linear complementarity approach, *J. Ind. Manag. Optim.* 14 (2018) 541-559.
- [54] Y. Ye, A path to the Arrow-Debreu competitive market equilibrium, *Math. Program.* 111 (2008) 315-348.