

New results on the local-nonglobal minimizers of the generalized trust-region subproblem *

Wenbao Ai[†], Mengxiao Zhang[†], Jianhua Yuan[†]

Abstract

In this paper, we study the local-nonglobal minimizers of the Generalized Trust-Region subproblem (*GTR*) and its Equality-constrained version (*GTRE*). Firstly, the equivalence is established between the local-nonglobal minimizers of both (*GTR*) and (*GTRE*) under assumption of the joint definiteness. By the way, a counterexample is presented to disprove a conjecture of Song-Wang-Liu-Xia [SIAM J. Optim., 33(2023), pp.267-293]. Secondly, if the Hessian matrix pair is jointly positive definite, it is proved that each of (*GTR*) and (*GTRE*) has at most two local-nonglobal minimizers. This result first confirms the correctness of another conjecture of Song-Wang-Liu-Xia [SIAM J. Optim., 33(2023), pp.267-293]. Thirdly, if the Hessian matrix pair is jointly negative definite, it is verified that each of (*GTR*) and (*GTRE*) has at most one local-nonglobal minimizer. In special, if the constraint is reduced to be a ball or a sphere, the above result is just the classical Martínez's. Finally, an algorithm is proposed to find all the local-nonglobal minimizers of (*GTR*) and (*GTRE*) or confirm their nonexistence in a tolerance. Preliminary numerical results demonstrate the effectiveness of the algorithm.

Keywords Quadratically constrained quadratic programming, Generalized trust-region subproblem, Local-nonglobal minimizers, Joint definiteness of two matrices

Mathematics Subject Classification 90C20, 90C26, 90C32, 90C46

1 Introduction

Let us consider the following Generalized Trust-Region (*GTR*) subproblem

$$\begin{aligned} (GTR) \quad & \min_{x \in \mathcal{R}^n} f_0(x) = x^T A_0 x + 2b_0^T x \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad f_1(x) = x^T A_1 x + 2b_1^T x + c_1 \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

and its Equality-constrained (*GTRE*) version:

$$\begin{aligned} (GTRE) \quad & \min_{x \in \mathcal{R}^n} f_0(x) = x^T A_0 x + 2b_0^T x \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad f_1(x) = x^T A_1 x + 2b_1^T x + c_1 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

*This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants Nos. 12171052, 12171051). This work was also supported by Beijing Natural Science Foundation (Grants No. Z220004).

[†]with School of Science, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, and also with Key Laboratory of Mathematics and Information Networks, Ministry of Education, Beijing 100876, China (aiwb@bupt.edu.cn, zhang-mengxiao@bupt.edu.cn, jianhuayuan@bupt.edu.cn). Corresponding author's Email: aiwb@bupt.edu.cn

where $A_0, A_1 \in \mathcal{S}^n$, $b_0, b_1 \in \mathcal{R}^n$ and $c_1 \in \mathcal{R}$. According to S-lemmas about inequality [17, 26] and equality [25], the problems (*GTR*) and (*GTRE*) have strong duality under mild conditions. So one can easily find their global minimizers by solving their Lagrangian dual problems. In this paper we shall deeply study their local-nonglobal minimizers, because they play an important role in globally solving nonconvex quadratically multi-constrained quadratic programming as follows:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{R}^n} \{f_0(x) \mid f_1(x) \leq 0, f_2(x) \leq 0, \dots, f_m(x) \leq 0\}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $m \geq 2$ and each f_i is a quadratic (or linear) function of x for $i = 2, 3, \dots, m$. Specifically, all the local-nonglobal minimizers of (1.1) that satisfy the constraints $f_i(x) \leq 0$ for all $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, m\}$ are also local minimizers of (1.3), and one of them may possibly be a global minimizer of (1.3) when the hard case occurs that the Hessian of the Lagrangian of (1.3) has at least one negative eigenvalue at all Karush–Kuhn–Tucker points. It should be indicated that, when $m = 2$ and $f_2(x)$ is a strictly convex quadratic function, the model (1.3) is just the famous generalized Celis-Dennis-Tapia subproblem (some newest advances involving the CDT subproblem may be found in [4, 7, 27, 28]). And when each f_i is a linear function of x ($i = 2, 3, \dots, m$), the model (1.3) is referred to as generalization of the extended trust-region subproblem [12], which has applications in financial engineering [14].

If $A_1 \succ 0$, (*GTR*) and (*GTRE*) are substantially the trust-region subproblem and its equality-constrained version, respectively. Characteristics and computational methods of their local-nonglobal minimizers have been deeply studied [9, 13, 15, 23, 24]. The first significant result was contributed by Martínez [15] in 1994, in which it was proved that the trust-region subproblem and its equality-constrained version have at most one local-nonglobal minimizer. In 1998, Lucidi, Palagi and Roma [13] indicated further that, for the trust-region subproblem, the corresponding multiplier to the local-nonglobal minimizer must be positive. In 2005, two new algorithms computing the local-nonglobal minimizer of the trust-region subproblem were proposed by Fortin [9]. In 2020, a necessary and sufficient optimality condition was presented by Wang and Xia [24], which eliminates the gap between the necessary and sufficient conditions for the local-nonglobal minimizer of the trust-region subproblem. Recently (in 2022), Wang, Song and Xia [23] showed that the local-nonglobal minimizer of the trust-region subproblem has the second smallest objective function value among all KKT points.

The results on the local-nonglobal minimizer of the trust-region subproblem and its equality-constrained version have generated wide applications in theoretical analysis and algorithm design for some interesting special cases of (1.3) (see [3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 18, 19]). For example, Beck and Bienstock et al. [3, 5] considered the following problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{R}^n} \{f_0(x) \mid \|x - a_i\|^2 \leq d_i^2, i \in I_1; \|x - a_i\|^2 \geq d_i^2, i \in I_2; a_i^T x \leq d_i, i \in I_3\}, \quad (1.4)$$

where $a_i \in \mathcal{R}^n$ and $d_i \in \mathcal{R}$ for each index i . Based on the result of Martínez [15], Bienstock and Michlka [5] proved that, for each fixed pair $|I_1|$ and $|I_2|$, (1.4) can be solvable in polynomial time by enumerating all the candidates for its global minimizers under certain mild conditions. Moreover, Beck and Pan [3] proposed a branch and bound algorithm for (1.4), in which one needs to find all the global and nonglobal minimizers of $f_0(x)$ on a sphere or a low-dimensional sphere. Recently, Rontsis et al. [18] presented an active-set algorithm for a special case of (1.4), which needs also to compute all the global and nonglobal minimizers of $f_0(x)$ on a sphere or a low-dimensional sphere.

If $A_1 \not\succeq 0$, not much progress has only been made recently in the local-nonglobal minimizers of (*GTR*) and (*GTRE*). In 2020, Taati and Salahi [21] tried to characterize the local-nonglobal

minimizers of (GTR) under assumption of the joint positive definiteness, and proved that the number of the local-nonglobal minimizers of (GTR) is no more than $2n + 1$. In 2021 and 2023, Xia’s team [20, 22] further proved that, if (GTR) (or $(GTRE)$) satisfies three assumptions that “ $A_1 \neq 0$ ”, “the Slater’s condition (or the two-side Slater’s condition) holds” and “the joint definiteness holds”, then the local-nonglobal minimizers must also satisfy the sufficient optimality conditions and their number is no more than $\min\{\text{rank}(A_1) + 1, n\}$. Particularly, the homogeneous (GTR) and $(GTRE)$ have no local-nonglobal minimizers if only “ $c_1 \neq 0$ ”. Moreover, Xia’s team conjectured in [20, Conjecture 5.6] that (GTR) has at most two local-nonglobal minimizers under two assumptions that “the Slater’s condition holds” and “ $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \succ 0$ for some $\mu_1 \geq 0$ ”.

In this paper we focus on the local-nonglobal minimizers of (GTR) and $(GTRE)$, and try to address some challenging issues, such as their number and how to efficiently compute them. The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- The equivalence is established between the local-nonglobal minimizers of (GTR) and $(GTRE)$ if only $n \geq 2$ and $\mu_0 A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \succ 0$ for some $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ (which we call the joint definiteness).
- It is proved that, if $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \succ 0$ for some $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ (which we call the joint positive definiteness), $(GTRE)$ (or (GTR)) has at most two local-nonglobal minimizers. So Conjecture 5.6 of [20] is confirmed to be true.
- It is proved that, if $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \prec 0$ for some $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ (which we call the joint negative definiteness), $(GTRE)$ (or (GTR)) has at most one local-nonglobal minimizer. In special, if A_1 is an identity matrix, the above result is just the classical Martínez’s [15].
- An efficient algorithm is proposed to find all local-nonglobal minimizers of $(GTRE)$ (or (GTR)) or confirm their nonexistence in a tolerance.
- It is demonstrated by a counterexample that Conjecture 5.10 of [20] is not true (see Remark 2.15).

We believe that our new results will help researchers to deal with the hard case of the model (1.4).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we study basic properties about the local-nonglobal minimizers of (GTR) and $(GTRE)$. In special, a counterexample is presented to show that Conjecture 5.10 of [20] is not true. In Section 3, the theory involving the number of local-nonglobal minimizers is perfectly established. In Section 4, a bisection-based algorithm is proposed to find out all local-nonglobal minimizers, and preliminary numerical results are showed.

Notation: Let S^n denote the set of all the $n \times n$ real symmetric matrices. For any matrix $A \in S^n$, $A \succeq 0$ (or $\succ 0$) denotes that A is positive semidefinite (or positive definite), and $\det(A)$ denotes the determinant of A . For any matrix $B \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times n}$, $\text{rank}(B)$, $\text{Null}(B)$ and $\text{Range}(B)$ denote the rank, the null subspace and the range subspace of B , respectively. Moreover, I denotes the identity matrix of order n . Finally, for a smooth function $f : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$, f' denotes the first derivatives of f .

2 Basic properties of the local-nonglobal minimizers

In this section, we shall study several basic properties that involve the local-nonglobal minimizers of the problems $(GTRE)$ and (GTR) . Some of them are well known but improved by us in their

assumptions or proofs. And some of them are first presented by us. These properties lay a strong foundation for our further discussions in the next section.

Firstly we state the classical optimality conditions for local minimizers of (*GTRE*) and (*GTR*), respectively.

Lemma 2.1 ([2, Chapter 4]). **(1) (The necessary optimality conditions for (*GTRE*))** *If x^* is a local minimizer of (*GTRE*) and $\nabla f_1(x^*) \neq 0$, then $f_1(x^*) = 0$ and there exists a Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* \in \mathcal{R}$ such that*

$$\nabla f_0(x^*) + \mu^* \nabla f_1(x^*) = 0, \quad (2.1a)$$

$$v^T (A_0 + \mu^* A_1) v \geq 0, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{R}^n \text{ satisfying } \nabla f_1(x^*)^T v = 0. \quad (2.1b)$$

(2) (The sufficient optimality conditions for (*GTRE*)) *If $f_1(x^*) = 0$ and there exists a Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* \in \mathcal{R}$ satisfying (2.1a) and*

$$v^T (A_0 + \mu^* A_1) v > 0, \quad \forall 0 \neq v \in \mathcal{R}^n \text{ satisfying } \nabla f_1(x^*)^T v = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

then x^ is a strict local minimizer of (*GTRE*).*

(3) (The necessary optimality conditions for (*GTR*)) *If x^* is a local minimizer of (*GTR*) and $\nabla f_1(x^*) \neq 0$, then $f_1(x^*) \leq 0$ and there exists a Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* \geq 0$ such that (2.1a) and the complementary condition*

$$\mu^* f_1(x^*) = 0 \quad (2.3)$$

hold. Moreover, if $\mu^ = 0$, then x^* is a global minimizer of (*GTR*); and if $\mu^* > 0$ then (2.1b) holds.*

(4) (The sufficient optimality conditions for (*GTR*)) *If $f_1(x^*) = 0$ and there exists a Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* > 0$ satisfying (2.1a) and (2.2), then x^* is a strict local minimizer of (*GTR*).*

The following two lemmas were essentially contributed by Moré [16], which tells us how to test the global minimizers of (*GTRE*) and (*GTR*) under some assumptions.

Lemma 2.2 ([16, Theorem 3.2]). *Suppose that $A_1 \neq 0$ and that (*GTRE*) satisfies the two-side Slater's condition:*

$$\exists \tilde{x}, \bar{x} \in \mathcal{R}^n \text{ such that } f_1(\tilde{x}) < 0 < f_1(\bar{x}). \quad (2.4)$$

A vector x^ is a global minimizer of (*GTRE*) if and only if $f_1(x^*) = 0$ and there exists a Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* \in \mathcal{R}$ satisfying (2.1a) and $A_0 + \mu^* A_1 \succeq 0$.*

Lemma 2.3 ([1, Theorem 1]). *Suppose that (*GTR*) satisfies the Slater's condition:*

$$\exists \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{R}^n \text{ such that } f_1(\tilde{x}) < 0. \quad (2.5)$$

A vector x^ is a global minimizer of (*GTR*) if and only if $f_1(x^*) \leq 0$ and there exists a Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* \geq 0$ satisfying (2.1a) and*

$$\mu^* f_1(x^*) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad A_0 + \mu^* A_1 \succeq 0.$$

The following lemma tells us that any local-nonglobal minimizer of (*GTRE*) or (*GTR*) is a regular point. Its (*GTR*) version was first given by Taati and Salahi [21, Lemma 2.5], and its (*GTRE*) version was conditionally presented by Wang, Song and Xia [22, Theorem 2.3]. Here we present a combined proof for both (*GTR*) and (*GTRE*) more brief than ones in [21, 22], and show that those preconditions on (*GTRE*) given in [22] can be got rid off.

Lemma 2.4 ([21, Lemma 2.5]; [22, Theorem 2.3]). *If x^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTRE) or (GTR), then $f_1(x^*) = 0$ and $\nabla f_1(x^*) \neq 0$ (i.e. x^* is a regular point).*

Proof. It is apparent that $f_1(x^*) = 0$. As x^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer, there is a feasible solution $\hat{x} \neq x^*$ of (GTRE) (or (GTR)) such that

$$f_0(\hat{x}) - f_0(x^*) < 0. \quad (2.6)$$

Put $\hat{d} = \hat{x} - x^*$. Suppose by contradiction that $\nabla f_1(x^*) = 0$. Then one has

$$\hat{d}^T A_1 \hat{d} = f_1(x^*) + \nabla f_1(x^*)^T \hat{d} + \hat{d}^T A_1 \hat{d} = f_1(\hat{x}) = 0 \text{ (or } \leq 0),$$

which implies that

$$f_1(x^* + t\hat{d}) = f_1(x^*) + t\nabla f_1(x^*)^T \hat{d} + t^2 \hat{d}^T A_1 \hat{d} = 0 \text{ (or } \leq 0), \forall t \in \mathcal{R},$$

that is the straight line $\{x^* + t\hat{d} \mid t \in \mathcal{R}\}$ is feasible to (GTRE) (or (GTR)). So, due to x^* is a local minimizer, there is a positive number $\delta > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq f_0(x^* + t\hat{d}) - f_0(x^*) = t\nabla f_0(x^*)^T \hat{d} + t^2 \hat{d}^T A_0 \hat{d}, \quad \forall t \in (-\delta, \delta),$$

which implies that $\nabla f_0(x^*)^T \hat{d} = 0$ and $\hat{d}^T A_0 \hat{d} \geq 0$. Taking $t = 1$, one obtains that

$$f_0(\hat{x}) - f_0(x^*) = f_0(x^* + \hat{d}) - f_0(x^*) = \hat{d}^T A_0 \hat{d} \geq 0, \quad (2.7)$$

which contradicts with (2.6). Thus $\nabla f_1(x^*) \neq 0$ and the proof is completed. \square

The following lemma shows that, if (GTRE) has a local-nonglobal minimizer, then $f_1(x)$ is not a linear function.

Lemma 2.5. *If x^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTRE), then $A_1 \neq 0$.*

Proof. As x^* is nonglobal, there exists another vector $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{R}^n$ satisfying $f_1(\hat{x}) = 0$ and $\hat{x} \neq x^*$ such that (2.6) holds. Put $\hat{d} = \hat{x} - x^*$. Suppose by contradiction that $A_1 = 0$. Then the straight line $\{x^* + t\hat{d} \mid t \in \mathcal{R}\}$ connecting x^* and \hat{x} is feasible to (GTRE). Exactly following the proof of Lemma 2.4, one obtains the relation (2.7) also, which contradicts with (2.6). The proof is completed. \square

Remark 2.6. *The conclusion in Lemma 2.5 is not true for (GTR), that is, (GTR) may have a local-nonglobal minimizer even if $A_1 = 0$. For example, the problem*

$$\min\{x_1^2 - x_2^2 \mid -x_1 + x_2 \leq 0\}$$

has a local-nonglobal minimizer $[1, 1]^T$.

The following lemma was essentially contributed by Moré [16].

Lemma 2.7 ([16, Lemma 3.1]). *If there is a vector $x^* \in \mathcal{R}^n$ such that $f_1(x^*) = 0$ and $\nabla f_1(x^*) \neq 0$, then the function f_1 is indefinite., that is, it satisfies the two-side Slater's condition (2.4).*

Proof. As $\nabla f_1(x^*) \neq 0$, there is a positive number $\delta > 0$ such that

$$h(t) := \|\nabla f_1(x^*)\|^2 + t\nabla f_1(x^*)^T A_1 \nabla f_1(x^*) > 0, \forall t \in [-\delta, \delta].$$

Take $\tilde{x} := x^* - \delta \nabla f_1(x^*)$ and $\bar{x} := x^* + \delta \nabla f_1(x^*)$. Note that $f_1(x^*) = 0$. Thus one obtains that

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(\tilde{x}) &= f_1(x^*) - \delta \|\nabla f_1(x^*)\|^2 + \delta^2 \nabla f_1(x^*)^T A_1 \nabla f_1(x^*) = -\delta h(-\delta) < 0 \text{ and} \\ f_1(\bar{x}) &= f_1(x^*) + \delta \|\nabla f_1(x^*)\|^2 + \delta^2 \nabla f_1(x^*)^T A_1 \nabla f_1(x^*) = \delta h(\delta) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

So $f_1(x)$ satisfies the two-side Slater's condition (2.4). \square

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose that the functions f_0, f_1 and a multiplier μ^* satisfy the first-order condition (2.1a) at x^* . If $\nabla f_1(x^*) \neq 0$, then such the multiplier values μ^* that satisfy (2.1a) at x^* are unique.*

Proof. Assume that there is another multiplier μ_1^* satisfying (2.1a), that is, $\nabla f_0(x^*) + \mu_1^* \nabla f_1(x^*) = 0$. Then one obtains that

$$(\mu_1^* - \mu^*) \nabla f_1(x^*) = 0 \implies \mu_1^* = \mu^*, \text{ due to } \nabla f_1(x^*) \neq 0,$$

which means that the corresponding Lagrangian multiplier values μ^* are unique. \square

The following result was conditionally presented by Wang, Song and Xia [22, Theorem 3.1].

Lemma 2.9 ([22, Theorem 3.1]). *If x^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTR) and $\mu^* \geq 0$ is the Lagrangian multiplier satisfying (2.1a) at x^* , then $\mu^* > 0$.*

Proof. As x^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTR), one has $f_1(x^*) = 0$ and $\nabla f_1(x^*) \neq 0$ from Lemma 2.4. Then the conclusion “ $\mu^* > 0$ ” follows directly from Lemma 2.1(3). \square

Remark 2.10. *Note that, for (GTRE), the optimal Lagrangian multiplier of a local-nonglobal minimizer may be equal to zero. For example, the problem*

$$\min\{x_1^2 - 2x_1 - x_2^2 \mid x_1 x_2 = 0\}$$

has a unique local-nonglobal minimizer $x^ = [1, 0]^T$ with the corresponding optimal Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* = 0$.*

The following lemma was first conditionally given by Taati and Salahi [21, Lemma 3.1]. As its proof can directly follow the proof of [21, Lemma 3.1], we omit the proof.

Lemma 2.11 ([21, Lemma 3.1]). *If x^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTRE) or (GTR) and μ^* is the Lagrangian multiplier satisfying (2.1a) at x^* , then the matrix $A_0 + \mu^* A_1$ has exactly one negative eigenvalue.*

The following result plays an important role in this section. It shows that, for a local-nonglobal minimizer x^* of (GTRE) or (GTR) and its associated Lagrangian multiplier μ^* , any vector \bar{v} in the tangent space $\{\bar{v} \in \mathcal{R}^n \mid \nabla f_1(x^*)^T \bar{v} = 0\}$ satisfies either the sufficient condition (2.2) or the following relation (2.9).

Lemma 2.12. *If x^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTRE) or (GTR), then there exists a Lagrangian multiplier μ^* such that (2.1a) and (2.1b) hold, and for any nonzero vector $\bar{v} \in \mathcal{R}^n$ that satisfies*

$$\nabla f_1(x^*)^T \bar{v} = 0 \text{ and } \bar{v}^T (A_0 + \mu^* A_1) \bar{v} = 0, \quad (2.8)$$

there must be

$$\bar{v}^T A_0 \bar{v} = \bar{v}^T A_1 \bar{v} = 0. \quad (2.9)$$

Proof. As x^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTRE) or (GTR), Lemmas 2.4, and 2.1 guarantee that, there exists a Lagrangian multiplier μ^* such that $f_1(x^*) = 0$, $\nabla f_1(x^*) \neq 0$, (2.1a) and (2.1b) hold. And from Lemma 2.11, the Hessian matrix $A_0 + \mu^* A_1$ has exactly one negative eigenvalue, say $\sigma_1 < 0$, with a corresponding unit eigenvector v_1 and $v_1^T (A_0 + \mu^* A_1) v_1 = \sigma_1 < 0$, which has apparently that

$$\nabla f_1(x^*)^T v_1 \neq 0 \quad (\text{due to (2.1b)}). \quad (2.10)$$

Since $\bar{v}^T A_1 \bar{v} = 0$ implies $\bar{v}^T A_0 \bar{v} = 0$ from (2.8), we suppose by contradiction that the vector \bar{v} taken by (2.8) satisfies

$$\bar{v}^T A_1 \bar{v} \neq 0. \quad (2.11)$$

Note that (2.8) and (2.10) imply that the two vectors v_1 and \bar{v} are linearly independent. Define

$$x(\alpha, \beta) := x^* + \alpha v_1 + \beta \bar{v},$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{R}$. Consider the following equation in α and β

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= f_1(x(\alpha, \beta)) \\ &= f_1(x^*) + \nabla f_1(x^*)^T (\alpha v_1 + \beta \bar{v}) + (\alpha v_1 + \beta \bar{v})^T A_1 (\alpha v_1 + \beta \bar{v}) \\ &= \nabla f_1(x^*)^T v_1 \alpha + v_1^T A_1 v_1 \alpha^2 + 2v_1^T A_1 \bar{v} \alpha \beta + \bar{v}^T A_1 \bar{v} \beta^2 \\ &= (\bar{v}^T A_1 \bar{v}) (-\gamma_1 \alpha - \gamma_2 \alpha^2 - 2\gamma_3 \alpha \beta + \beta^2), \\ &\implies \beta^2 - 2\gamma_3 \alpha \beta - \gamma_1 \alpha - \gamma_2 \alpha^2 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

where $\gamma_1 = -\frac{\nabla f_1(x^*)^T v_1}{\bar{v}^T A_1 \bar{v}}$, $\gamma_2 = -\frac{v_1^T A_1 v_1}{\bar{v}^T A_1 \bar{v}}$, $\gamma_3 = -\frac{v_1^T A_1 \bar{v}}{\bar{v}^T A_1 \bar{v}}$. From (2.10) and (2.11) there is $\gamma_1 \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\gamma_1 > 0$. Then one can always find a positive number $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\gamma_1 \alpha + \gamma_2 \alpha^2 = (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \alpha) \alpha > 0, \quad \forall \alpha \in (0, \delta],$$

which guarantees that the equation (2.12) has two distinct real roots about β

$$\beta = \gamma_3 \alpha \pm \sqrt{\gamma_3^2 \alpha^2 + \gamma_1 \alpha + \gamma_2 \alpha^2}, \quad \forall \alpha \in (0, \delta];$$

one root is positive and the other is negative. So we define the function $\beta(\alpha)$

$$\beta(\alpha) := \begin{cases} \gamma_3 \alpha + \sqrt{\gamma_3^2 \alpha^2 + \gamma_1 \alpha + \gamma_2 \alpha^2} & \text{as } v_1^T \bar{v} \geq 0, \\ \gamma_3 \alpha - \sqrt{\gamma_3^2 \alpha^2 + \gamma_1 \alpha + \gamma_2 \alpha^2} & \text{as } v_1^T \bar{v} < 0, \end{cases} \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, \delta],$$

such that

$$\beta(\alpha) v_1^T \bar{v} \geq 0, \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, \delta].$$

Therefore, one obtains the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
x(0, \beta(0)) &= x^* \text{ and } x(\alpha, \beta(\alpha)) \neq x^*, \forall \alpha \in (0, \delta]; \\
x(\alpha, \beta(\alpha)) &\longrightarrow x^* \text{ (as } \alpha \longrightarrow 0^+); \\
f_1(x(\alpha, \beta(\alpha))) &\equiv 0, \forall \alpha \in [0, \delta]; \\
f_0(x(\alpha, \beta(\alpha))) - f_0(x^*) &= f_0(x(\alpha, \beta(\alpha))) + \mu^* f_1(x(\alpha, \beta(\alpha))) - (f_0(x^*) + \mu^* f_1(x^*)) \\
&= (\alpha v_1 + \beta(\alpha) \bar{v})^T (A_0 + \mu^* A_1) (\alpha v_1 + \beta(\alpha) \bar{v}) \\
&= \sigma_1 (\alpha^2 + 2\alpha\beta(\alpha) v_1^T \bar{v}) < 0, \forall \alpha \in (0, \delta];
\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts with x^* being a local-nonglobal minimizer. Thus the proof is completed. \square

Remark 2.13. Such the nonzero vector \bar{v} as shown in the above lemma may indeed appear in practice. Consider the following problem

$$\min\{x_1 x_2 - x_2^2 \mid -x_1 x_2 = (\text{or } \leq) 0\}.$$

It has local-nonglobal minimizers $x^* = [\alpha, 0]^T$ for all $\alpha \neq 0$ with $f_1(x^*) = 0$ and $\nabla f_1(x^*) = [0, -\alpha]^T$. These local-nonglobal minimizers have the same optimal Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* = 1$. The corresponding Lagrangian Hessian matrix is

$$A_0 + \mu^* A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & -1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix},$$

which has a zero eigenvalue with a unit eigenvector $\bar{v} = [1, 0]^T$. And \bar{v} satisfies

$$\nabla f_1(x^*)^T \bar{v} = \bar{v}^T A_0 \bar{v} = \bar{v}^T A_1 \bar{v} = 0.$$

This example also shows that, if f_0 and f_1 are both homogeneous but $c_1 = 0$, (GTRE) and (GTR) may still have local-nonglobal minimizers.

Remark 2.14. The converse proposition of Lemma 2.12 is not true. Consider a counterexample as follows:

$$\min\{f_0(x) = 2x_1 x_2 - 2x_2 x_3 + x_3^2 - 2x_1 \mid f_1(x) = 2x_2 x_3 + 2x_1 = (\text{or } \leq) 0\}. \quad (2.13)$$

Take $x^* = [0, 0, 0]^T$ and $\mu^* = 1$. One can easily verify that the point x^* and the multiplier μ^* satisfy $f_1(x^*) = 0$ and $\nabla f_1(x^*) = [2, 0, 0]^T \neq 0$, the necessary optimality conditions (2.1a) and (2.1b), where

$$A_0 + \mu^* A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

And all the vectors that satisfy (2.8) are just $\bar{v} = [0, \alpha, 0]^T$ ($\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{R}$), which certainly satisfy (2.9) too. However, x^* is not a local minimizer of (2.13) yet, because the point pencil $x(t) = [-t^3, t, t^2]^T$ ($t \in \mathcal{R}$) satisfy $f_1(x(t)) = 0$, $x(0) = x^*$ and $f_0(x(t)) = -t^4 < 0 = f_0(x^*) \forall t \neq 0$.

Remark 2.15. By slightly redeveloping the problem (2.13), one can also verify that a conjecture presented by Xia's team [20, Conjecture 5.10] is not true. Observe the following example.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & f_0(x) = x^T A_0 x = 2x_1x_2 - 2x_2x_3 + x_3^2 - 2x_1x_4 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f_1(x) = x^T A_1 x - 1 = x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 - 1 = 0, \\ & f_2(x) = x^T A_2 x - 1 = 2x_2x_3 + 2x_1x_4 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 - 1 \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Firstly, the problem (2.14) satisfies the Slater's condition and the joint definiteness condition i.e. $\exists \mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{R}$ s.t. $\mu_0 A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 + \mu_2 A_2 \succ 0$. Moreover, the point $x^* = [0, 0, 0, 1]^T$ and the multiplier pair $(\mu_1^*, \mu_2^*) = (-1, 1)$ satisfy $f_1(x^*) = 0 = f_2(x^*)$ and the necessary optimality conditions

$$\begin{aligned} & (A_0 + \mu_1^* A_1 + \mu_2^* A_2)x^* = 0 \text{ and} \\ & v^T (A_0 + \mu_1^* A_1 + \mu_2^* A_2)v \geq 0, \forall v \in \mathcal{R}^4 \text{ satisfying } v^T A_1 x^* = 0 = v^T A_2 x^*, \text{ where} \\ & A_0 + \mu_1^* A_1 + \mu_2^* A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

And there is a nonzero vector $\bar{v} = [0, 1, 0, 0]^T$ such that $\bar{v}^T A_1 x^* = 0 = \bar{v}^T A_2 x^*$ and $\bar{v}^T (A_0 + \mu_1^* A_1 + \mu_2^* A_2)\bar{v} = 0 = \bar{v}^T (A_2 - A_1)\bar{v}$. However, x^* is not a local minimizer of (2.14) yet, because the point pencil

$$x(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t^6 + t^2 + t^4 + 1}} [-t^3, t, t^2, 1]^T, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{R}$$

satisfy $f_1(x(t)) = 0 = f_2(x(t))$, $x(0) = x^*$ and $f_0(x(t)) = -t^4/(t^6 + t^2 + t^4 + 1) < 0 = f_0(x^*) \quad \forall t \neq 0$.

By using Lemma 2.12, we obtain an important property involving the strict local-nonglobal minimizers of (GTRE) and (GTR) under no assumptions.

Lemma 2.16. If x^* is a strict local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTRE) or (GTR), then there is a Lagrangian multiplier μ^* such that the sufficient optimality conditions (2.1a) and (2.2) hold.

Proof. As x^* is a strict local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTRE) or (GTR), it holds that $f_1(x^*) = 0$ and $\nabla f_1(x^*) \neq 0$, and there exists a unique Lagrangian multiplier μ^* such that the necessary optimality conditions (2.1a) and (2.1b) hold, due to Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.8. We suppose by contradiction that (2.2) is violated, that is, there is a nonzero vector $\bar{v} \in \mathcal{R}^n$ that satisfies (2.8). From Lemma 2.12, \bar{v} also satisfies (2.9). Then for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$, one has

$$\begin{cases} f_1(x^* + \alpha \bar{v}) = f_1(x^*) + \alpha (\nabla f_1(x^*))^T \bar{v} + \alpha^2 \bar{v}^T A_1 \bar{v} = 0 + 0 + 0 = 0, \\ f_0(x^* + \alpha \bar{v}) = f_0(x^*) - \alpha \mu^* (\nabla f_1(x^*))^T \bar{v} + \alpha^2 \bar{v}^T A_0 \bar{v} = f_0(x^*) - 0 + 0 = f_0(x^*), \end{cases}$$

which contradicts with the assumption that x^* is a strict local-nonglobal minimizer. \square

By the above lemma, one can reveal another interesting property about the strict local-nonglobal minimizers of (GTRE) and (GTR), which is stated as follows.

Lemma 2.17. If x^* is a strict local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTRE) or (GTR) and μ^* is the corresponding Lagrangian multiplier to x^* , then the matrix $A_0 + \mu^* A_1$ is nonsingular.

Proof. From Lemma 2.11, the matrix $A_0 + \mu^* A_1$ has exactly one negative eigenvalue, say $\sigma_1 < 0$, with a unit eigenvector v_1 . Suppose on the contrary that $A_0 + \mu^* A_1$ has a zero eigenvalue, say $\sigma_2 = 0$ with one other unit eigenvector v_2 . It is apparent that v_2 are linearly independent of v_1 . Furthermore, from Lemma 2.16, one yields

$$\nabla f_1(x^*)^T v_2 \neq 0.$$

Define a vector

$$\hat{v} := v_1 - \frac{\nabla f_1(x^*)^T v_1}{\nabla f_1(x^*)^T v_2} v_2 \neq 0.$$

Then one obtains that

$$\hat{v}^T (A_0 + \mu^* A_1) \hat{v} = \sigma_1 < 0, \quad \nabla f_1(x^*)^T \hat{v} = 0 \text{ and } \hat{v} \neq 0,$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Now we are ready to present two key theorems of this section, which characterize whether or not a point x^* is a strict local-nonglobal minimizer of (*GTRE*) (or (*GTR*)) under no assumptions.

Theorem 2.18. *A vector x^* is a strict local-nonglobal minimizer of (*GTRE*), if and only if the following three conditions hold: (i) $f_1(x^*) = 0$; (ii) there exists a Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* \in \mathcal{R}$ such that the sufficient optimality conditions (2.1a) and (2.2) hold with $A_0 + \mu^* A_1 \not\geq 0$; (iii) $A_1 \neq 0$.*

Proof. “ \implies ”. As x^* is a strict local-nonglobal minimizer of (*GTRE*), the three conditions follow directly from Lemmas 2.4, 2.1, 2.11, 2.16 and 2.5.

“ \impliedby ”. Assume that the three conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) hold. According to Lemma 2.1(2), the conditions (i) and (ii) guarantee that x^* is a strict local minimizer of (*GTRE*). So one needs only to verify that x^* is not a global minimizer. In fact, the condition (ii) ensures $\nabla f_1(x^*) \neq 0$ because otherwise then (2.2) implies $A_0 + \mu^* A_1 \succ 0$, which contradicts with $A_0 + \mu^* A_1 \not\geq 0$. Therefore, the function f_1 satisfies the two-side Slater’s condition and the current μ^* is the unique optimal Lagrangian multiplier corresponding to x^* , due to Lemmas 2.7 and 2.8. Then, from the condition (iii), $A_0 + \mu^* A_1 \not\geq 0$ and Lemma 2.2, one obtains that x^* is not a global minimizer. The proof is completed. \square

Theorem 2.19. *A vector x^* is a strict local-nonglobal minimizer of (*GTR*), if and only if the following two conditions hold: (i) $f_1(x^*) = 0$; (ii) there exists a Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* > 0$, such that the sufficient optimality conditions (2.1a) and (2.2) hold with $A_0 + \mu^* A_1 \not\geq 0$.*

Proof. The proof process can directly follow that of Theorem 2.18, except Lemmas 2.3 and 2.9 need to be utilized additionally. So we omit it. \square

Now we introduce the concept of the joint definiteness of two matrices.

Definition 2.20. *We say that two symmetric matrices A_0 and A_1 are jointly definite if $\exists \mu_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{either } & A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \succ 0 \quad (\text{jointly positive definite}) \\ \text{or } & A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \prec 0 \quad (\text{jointly negative definite}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

Note that Definition 2.20 can be equivalently stated as follows: we say that A_0 and A_1 are jointly definite if

$$\exists \mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{R} \text{ such that } \mu_0 A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \succ 0. \quad (2.16)$$

The following theorem shows that, under only the assumption that A_0 and A_1 are jointly definite, all the local-nonglobal minimizers of $(GTRE)$ and (GTR) must be strict, and so they all satisfy the sufficient optimality conditions (2.1a) and (2.2) according to Theorems 2.18 and 2.19. Similar results ([20, Theorem 4.8], [22, Theorems 3.2 and 3.3]) were presented by Xia's team under stricter assumptions than ours.

Theorem 2.21. *Suppose that A_0 and A_1 are jointly definite. Then $(GTRE)$ and (GTR) have no nonstrict local-nonglobal minimizers.*

Proof. As A_0 and A_1 are jointly definite, the formula (2.16) holds. We suppose by contradiction that $(GTRE)$ (or (GTR)) has one nonstrict local-nonglobal minimizer x^* . By using Lemmas 2.1 and 2.12, there exists a Lagrangian multiplier μ^* and a nonzero vector $\bar{v} \neq 0$ such that $(\nabla f_0(x^*) + \mu^* f_1(x^*))^T \bar{v} = \bar{v}^T (A_0 + \mu^* A_1) \bar{v} = \bar{v}^T A_0 \bar{v} = \bar{v}^T A_1 \bar{v} = 0$. It implies that $\bar{v}^T (\mu_0 A_0 + \mu_1 A_1) \bar{v} = 0$, which contradicts with the joint definiteness assumption (2.16). \square

The following theorem establishes a connection between the local-nonglobal minimizers of $(GTRE)$ and (GTR) , which will play a crucial role in the remaining discussions about the number of the local-nonglobal minimizers of (GTR) in the next section.

Theorem 2.22. *Suppose that A_0 and A_1 are jointly definite, and suppose that $n \geq 2$. A vector x^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTR) if and only if x^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of the corresponding $(GTRE)$ with $\mu^* > 0$.*

Proof. “ \Leftarrow ”. It follows directly from Theorems 2.21, 2.18 and 2.19.

“ \Rightarrow ”. Assume that x^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTR) . By Theorems 2.21 and 2.19, there exists a Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* > 0$ such that $f_1(x^*) = 0$ and the sufficient optimality conditions (2.1a) and (2.2) hold with $A_0 + \mu^* A_1 \not\preceq 0$. From Theorem 2.18, one needs only to verify $A_1 \neq 0$ to complete the proof. We suppose by contradiction that $A_1 = 0$. It yields that

$$\begin{cases} \mu_0 A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \succ 0 (\because (2.16)) \implies \mu_0 A_0 \succ 0 \\ A_0 + \mu^* A_1 \not\preceq 0 \implies A_0 \not\preceq 0 \end{cases} \implies A_0 \prec 0. \quad (2.17)$$

(2.17) means from the assumption “ $n \geq 2$ ” that $A_0 = A_0 + \mu^* A_1$ has at least two negative eigenvalues, which contradicts with Lemma 2.11. \square

Remark 2.23. *The assumption “ $n \geq 2$ ” is necessary in the above theorem, which is illustrated by the following counterexample. The (GTR) problem*

$$\min\{x(1-x) \mid x-1 \leq 0\} \quad (2.18)$$

satisfies (2.16) and has a strict local-nonglobal minimizer $x^ = 1$. However, $x^* = 1$ is a global minimizer of the corresponding $(GTRE)$ problem: $\min\{x(1-x) \mid x-1 = 0\}$.*

The proof process of the above theorem reveals a fact as follows.

Corollary 2.24. *Suppose that A_0 and A_1 are jointly definite, and suppose that $n \geq 2$. If (GTR) has a local-nonglobal minimizer, then $A_1 \neq 0$.*

3 The number of the local-nonglobal minimizers

In this section, we shall discuss how many local-nonglobal minimizers the problem (*GTR*) or (*GTR*) may have under the joint definiteness condition (2.15). On this issue, by Theorem 2.22, the problem (*GTR*) may come down to the problem (*GTR*) except for the trivial case “ $n = 1$ ”. So we need only to consider the problem (*GTR*). And the problem (*GTR*) defined in (1.2) is exactly as same as the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathcal{R}^n} \quad & f_0(x) + \mu_1 f_1(x) = x^T(A_0 + \mu_1 A_1)x + 2(b_0 + \mu_1 b_1)x + \mu_1 c_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f_1(x) = x^T A_1 x + 2b_1^T x + c_1 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where μ_1 is given by (2.15) such that $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \succ 0$ or $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \prec 0$. Perform a Cholesky factorization on $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1$ or $-(A_0 + \mu_1 A_1)$ such that $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 = \pm LL^T$, where L is a lower triangular matrix with positive diagonal elements. Then one finds an invertible linear transformation with a parallel translation

$$x = Q^T y + q \quad (3.2)$$

such that $f_0(Q^T y + q) + \mu_1 f_1(Q^T y + q) = \pm \|y\|^2 + c_0$, where $Q = L^{-1}$, $q = \mp Q^T Q(b_0 + \mu_1 b_1)$ and $c_0 = (b_0 + \mu_1 b_1)^T q + \mu_1 c_1$. Compute

$$g(y) := f_1(Q^T y + q) = y^T A y + 2b^T y + c,$$

where $A = Q A_1 Q^T$, $b = Q A_1 q + Q b_1$ and $c = q^T A_1 q + 2b_1^T q + c_1$. Then the problem (3.1) is equivalently converted into the problem (3.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{y \in \mathcal{R}^n} \quad & \|y\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & g(y) = y^T A y + 2b^T y + c = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

or the problem (3.4)

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{y \in \mathcal{R}^n} \quad & -\|y\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & g(y) = y^T A y + 2b^T y + c = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

In this section, we always denote the eigenvalue decomposition of A by

$$A = V \Lambda V^T, \quad \Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n), \quad V = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n], \quad (3.5)$$

where $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ and V is an orthogonal matrix. Define

$$r_i := v_i^T b, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (3.6)$$

3.1 On the problem (3.3)

We first discuss the problem (3.3). For this problem, the following lemma describes the range of the corresponding Lagrangian multiplier to a local-nonglobal minimizer.

Lemma 3.1. *If y^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of the problem (3.3), then $g(y^*) = 0$ and there is a unique Lagrangian multiplier $0 \neq \mu^* \in \mathcal{R}$ such that*

$$(I + \mu^* A) y^* + \mu^* b = 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Moreover, if $\mu^* > 0$ then $\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\} < \frac{1}{|\mu^*|} < -\lambda_1$ and $r_1 \neq 0$; else if $\mu^* < 0$ then $\max\{\lambda_{n-1}, 0\} < \frac{1}{|\mu^*|} < \lambda_n$ and $r_n \neq 0$.

Proof. As y^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of the problem (3.3), by applying Theorems 2.18 and 2.21 to the problem (3.3), one has $g(y^*) = 0$ and finds a unique Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* \in \mathcal{R}$ such that the sufficient optimality conditions (2.1a) and (2.2) hold with $I + \mu^*A \not\equiv 0$, which implies that (3.7) holds and $\mu^* \neq 0$. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.11 and Lemma 2.17, $I + \mu^*A$ is a nonsingular matrix with exactly one negative eigenvalue, which means that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \mu^* > 0 &\implies 1 + \mu^*\lambda_1 < 0 < 1 + \mu^*\lambda_2 \implies \max\{-\lambda_2, 0\} < \frac{1}{|\mu^*|} < -\lambda_1; \\ \text{if } \mu^* < 0 &\implies 1 + \mu^*\lambda_n < 0 < 1 + \mu^*\lambda_{n-1} \implies \max\{\lambda_{n-1}, 0\} < \frac{1}{|\mu^*|} < \lambda_n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

So $v_i^T(I + \mu^*A)v_i = 1 + \mu^*\lambda_i$ ($i = 1, n$), (3.8) and the necessary optimality condition (2.1b) guarantees that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \mu^* > 0 &\implies 0 \neq v_1^T \nabla g(y^*) = 2v_1^T(Ay^* + b) = 2(\lambda_1 v_1^T y^* + r_1), \\ \text{if } \mu^* < 0 &\implies 0 \neq v_n^T \nabla g(y^*) = 2v_n^T(Ay^* + b) = 2(\lambda_n v_n^T y^* + r_n), \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

where the vectors v_i ($i = 1, n$) are unit eigenvectors of the matrix A defined in (3.5). Note that from (3.7) one obtains that

$$\mu^* r_i = \mu^* v_i^T b = -v_i^T (I + \mu^*A) y^* = -(1 + \mu^*\lambda_i) v_i^T y^*, \quad (i = 1, n),$$

which deduces that

$$v_1^T y^* = \frac{-\mu^* r_1}{1 + \mu^*\lambda_1} \text{ and } v_n^T y^* = \frac{-\mu^* r_n}{1 + \mu^*\lambda_n}, \quad (3.10)$$

where $(1 + \mu^*\lambda_1)(1 + \mu^*\lambda_n) \neq 0$ because of the nonsingularity of $I + \mu^*A$. Substituting (3.10) into (3.9) yields that

$$\begin{cases} \text{if } \mu^* > 0, 0 \neq v_1^T \nabla g(y^*) = \frac{2r_1}{1 + \mu^*\lambda_1} \implies r_1 \neq 0, \\ \text{if } \mu^* < 0, 0 \neq v_n^T \nabla g(y^*) = \frac{2r_n}{1 + \mu^*\lambda_n} \implies r_n \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

The proof is completed. \square

Note that the case “ $\mu^* < 0$ ” can exactly regarded as the situation “ $-\mu^* > 0$ with the equality constraint $-g(y^*) = 0$ ”. Thus, from now on, we focus on discussing the case “ $\mu^* > 0$ ”. Put $\eta^* = 1/\mu^*$. One knows from Lemma 3.1 that a local-nonglobal minimizer y^* with $\eta^* > 0$ for the problem (3.3) must satisfy

$$\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\} < \eta^* < -\lambda_1, r_1 \neq 0, y^* = -(A + \eta^*I)^{-1}b \text{ and } g(y^*) = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

Since the matrix $A + \eta I$ is nonsingular for all $\eta \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$, we define a vector function $y_1(\eta)$ and a function $\psi_1(\eta)$ by

$$\begin{cases} y_1(\eta) := -(A + \eta I)^{-1}b = -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{\lambda_i + \eta} v_i, \\ \psi_1(\eta) := g(y_1(\eta)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i r_i^2}{(\lambda_i + \eta)^2} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2r_i^2}{\lambda_i + \eta} + c, \end{cases} \quad \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1), \quad (3.12)$$

where $\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\} < -\lambda_1$ and $r_1 \neq 0$. Note that η^* in (3.11) is a zero point of ψ_1 . A natural question is: how many zero points may the function ψ_1 have on the interval $(\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1)$? To answer this question, we list several useful properties about $y_1(\eta)$ and $\psi_1(\eta)$:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} y_1(\eta) \neq 0, \quad \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1); \\ \nabla g|_{y_1(\eta)} = 2Ay_1(\eta) + 2b = -2\eta y_1(\eta) \neq 0, \quad \forall \eta \in (\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1); \\ \psi_1(\eta) \rightarrow -\infty \text{ as } \eta \rightarrow (-\lambda_1)^-; \\ \psi_1'(\eta) = 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i^2}{(\lambda_i + \eta)^3} = 2\eta\phi_1(\eta), \quad \text{where } \phi_1(\eta) := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i^2}{(\lambda_i + \eta)^3}; \\ \phi_1'(\eta) = -3 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i^2}{(\lambda_i + \eta)^4} < 0, \quad \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1). \end{array} \right. \quad (3.13)$$

Based on the negativeness of ϕ_1' , one can obtain the following lemma, which tells us that ψ_1 has at most three zero points on the interval $(-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\} < -\lambda_1$ and $r_1 \neq 0$ for the problem (3.3). When $-\lambda_2 \geq 0$, then either $\psi_1'(\eta) < 0 \quad \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$, or $\exists \eta_0 \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$ such that*

$$\psi_1'(\eta) \begin{cases} > 0, & \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, \eta_0), \\ = 0, & \eta = \eta_0, \\ < 0, & \forall \eta \in (\eta_0, -\lambda_1). \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

And when $-\lambda_2 < 0$, then the signs of ψ_1' belong to one of the following four cases:

$$\text{Case 1. } \psi_1'(\eta) \begin{cases} > 0, & \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, 0), \\ = 0, & \eta = 0, \\ < 0, & \forall \eta \in (0, -\lambda_1); \end{cases} \quad (3.15a)$$

$$\text{Case 2. } \psi_1'(\eta) \begin{cases} < 0, & \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, 0), \\ = 0, & \eta = 0, \\ < 0, & \forall \eta \in (0, -\lambda_1); \end{cases} \quad (3.15b)$$

$$\text{Case 3. } \psi_1'(\eta) \begin{cases} < 0, & \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, \eta_0), \\ = 0, & \eta = \eta_0, \\ > 0, & \forall \eta \in (\eta_0, 0), \\ = 0, & \eta = 0, \\ < 0, & \forall \eta \in (0, -\lambda_1); \end{cases} \quad (3.15c)$$

$$\text{Case 4. } \psi_1'(\eta) \begin{cases} < 0, & \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, 0), \\ = 0, & \eta = 0, \\ > 0, & \forall \eta \in (0, \eta_0), \\ = 0, & \eta = \eta_0, \\ < 0, & \forall \eta \in (\eta_0, -\lambda_1). \end{cases} \quad (3.15d)$$

Proof. As $r_1 \neq 0$ ensures that

$$\phi_1'(\eta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{-3r_i^2}{(\lambda_i + \eta)^4} \leq \frac{-3r_1^2}{(\lambda_1 + \eta)^4} < 0, \quad \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1), \quad (3.16)$$

the function ϕ_1 is strictly monotone decreasing on the interval $(-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$. Note that

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow (-\lambda_1)^-} \phi_1(\eta) = -\infty.$$

So, either $\phi_1(\eta) < 0 \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$, or ϕ_1 has a unique zero point $\eta_0 \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$ such that

$$\phi_1(\eta) \begin{cases} > 0, & \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, \eta_0); \\ = 0, & \eta = \eta_0; \\ < 0, & \forall \eta \in (\eta_0, -\lambda_1). \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

When $-\lambda_2 \geq 0$, the desired conclusion is true straightforwardly because both $\psi_1'(\eta)$ and $\phi_1(\eta)$ have exactly the same signs on the interval $(-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$. When $-\lambda_2 < 0$, (3.15a), (3.15b), (3.15c) and (3.15d) can directly follow from the signs of ϕ_1 in accordance with the four cases: the non-existence of η_0 , $\eta_0 = 0$, $\eta_0 < 0$ and $\eta_0 > 0$, respectively. \square

Remark 3.3. By Lemma 3.2, the signs of ψ_1' on the interval $(\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1)$ satisfy that either $\psi_1'(\eta) < 0 \forall \eta \in (\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1)$, or $\exists \eta_0 \in (\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1)$ such that

$$\psi_1'(\eta) \begin{cases} > 0, & \forall \eta \in (\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, \eta_0), \\ = 0, & \eta = \eta_0, \\ < 0, & \forall \eta \in (\eta_0, -\lambda_1). \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

So, on the interval $(\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1)$, the zero points of ψ_1 must belong to one of the following three cases: **(i)** ψ_1 has no zero points; **(ii)** ψ_1 has one zero point η_1 with $\psi_1'(\eta_1) \leq 0$; **(iii)** ψ_1 has two zero points η_1 and η_2 with $\psi_1'(\eta_1) < 0$ and $\psi_1'(\eta_2) > 0$, respectively.

In order to figure out whether or not the zero points of ψ_1 on the interval $(\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1)$ admit local-nonglobal minimizers of the problem (3.3), one needs further to define two matrices $W_1(\eta) \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times (n-1)}$ and $B_1(\eta) \in \mathcal{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)}$ by

$$\begin{cases} W_1(\eta) = \frac{r_1}{\lambda_1 + \eta} [v_2, v_3, \dots, v_n] - v_1 u^T, \\ B_1(\eta) = W_1(\eta)^T (A + \eta I) W_1(\eta) = \tilde{B}_1(\eta) + (\lambda_1 + \eta) u u^T, \end{cases} \quad \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_1(\eta) &= \frac{r_1^2}{(\lambda_1 + \eta)^2} \text{diag}(\lambda_2 + \eta, \lambda_3 + \eta, \dots, \lambda_n + \eta) \text{ and} \\ u &= \left[\frac{r_2}{\lambda_2 + \eta}, \frac{r_3}{\lambda_3 + \eta}, \dots, \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n + \eta} \right]^T. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to the proof in Theorem 3.1 of [15], one can verify that, under the assumptions that “ $\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\} < -\lambda_1$ ” and “ $r_1 \neq 0$ ”, for all $\eta \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$ the matrices $W_1(\eta)$ and $B_1(\eta)$ satisfy the following properties:

$$\begin{cases} \text{rank}(W_1(\eta)) = n - 1, \\ \nabla g(y_1(\eta))^T W_1(\eta) = 0 \quad (\text{by } \nabla g|_{y_1(\eta)} = -2\eta y_1(\eta)), \\ \det(B_1(\eta)) = h_1(\eta)\phi_1(\eta) \quad (\text{by Schur complement formula}), \end{cases} \quad (3.19)$$

where $h_1(\eta) = \frac{r_1^{2n-4}(\lambda_2 + \eta) \cdots (\lambda_n + \eta)}{(\lambda_1 + \eta)^{2n-5}} < 0$ and $\phi_1(\eta)$ is defined in (3.13). The following lemma shows that the positive definiteness of $B_1(\eta)$ can be determined by only the positiveness of its determinant.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ and $r_1 \neq 0$ for the problem (3.3). Then for each $\eta \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$, $B_1(\eta) \succ 0$ if and only if $\phi_1(\eta) < 0$.*

Proof. “ \implies ”. Apparently $B_1(\eta) \succ 0 \implies \det(B_1(\eta)) > 0 \implies \phi_1(\eta) < 0$.

“ \impliedby ”. Suppose by contradiction that there is a number $\eta_1 \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$ such that $\phi_1(\eta_1) < 0$ but $B_1(\eta_1) \not\succeq 0$. Note that $\phi_1(\eta_1) < 0$ means $\det(B_1(\eta_1)) > 0$, which implies that $B_1(\eta_1)$ is nonsingular and must have at least one negative eigenvalue. On the other hand, one can easily verify that there is a sufficiently small positive number $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B_1(\eta) \succ 0$ for all $\eta \in [-\lambda_1 - \varepsilon, -\lambda_1] \subseteq (\eta_1, -\lambda_1)$. Therefore, from the continuity of $B_1(\eta)$ on the closed interval $[\eta_1, -\lambda_1 - \varepsilon]$, there exists a number $\eta_2 \in (\eta_1, -\lambda_1 - \varepsilon)$ such that

$$\det(B_1(\eta_2)) = 0 \implies \phi_1(\eta_2) = 0,$$

which contradicts with $\phi_1(\eta_1) < 0$ and $\eta_1 < \eta_2$, because $\phi_1(\eta)$ is strictly monotone decreasing on the interval $(-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$ from (3.16). \square

From Lemma 3.4, one can obtain the following theorem, which indicates that any zero point η^* of ψ_1 on the interval $(\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1)$ with $r_1 \neq 0$ admits a local-nonglobal minimizer of the problem (3.3) if and only if $\psi_1'(\eta^*) < 0$.

Theorem 3.5. *The problem (3.3) has a local-nonglobal minimizer y^* with $\mu^* = 1/\eta^* > 0$ if and only if $\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\} < \eta^* < -\lambda_1$, $r_1 \neq 0$, $y^* = y_1(\eta^*)$, $\psi_1(\eta^*) = 0$ and $\psi_1'(\eta^*) < 0$, where $y_1(\eta)$ and $\psi_1(\eta)$ are defined by (3.12).*

Proof. “ \implies ”. Assume that y^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of (3.3) with $\mu^* = 1/\eta^* > 0$. By Lemma 3.1, y^* and η^* satisfy (3.11), that is,

$$\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\} < \eta^* < -\lambda_1, r_1 \neq 0, y^* = y_1(\eta^*) \text{ and } \psi_1(\eta^*) = g(y_1(\eta^*)) = g(y^*) = 0.$$

Moreover, (3.19) guarantees that $\text{Null}(\nabla g(y^*)^T) = \text{Range}(W_1(\eta^*))$, which yields from Theorems 2.18 and 2.21 that $B_1(\eta^*) \succ 0$. Then, by using Lemma 3.4, one has

$$\phi_1(\eta^*) < 0 \implies \psi_1'(\eta^*) = 2\eta^* \phi_1(\eta^*) < 0.$$

“ \Leftarrow ”. Note that the condition “ $\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\} < \eta^* < -\lambda_1$ ” implies that $\lambda_1 < 0$, which means that $A \neq 0$. Then one can easily verify that the point $y^* = y_1(\eta^*)$ and the multiplier $\mu^* = 1/\eta^*$ satisfy all the three conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) given in Theorem 2.18, except for the sufficient optimality condition (2.2). From (3.13) and (3.19), one obtains that $\nabla g(y^*) \neq 0$ and $\text{Null}(\nabla g(y^*)^T) = \text{Range}(W_1(\eta^*))$. So, if one verifies $B_1(\eta^*) = W_1(\eta^*)^T(A + \eta^*I)W_1(\eta^*) \succ 0$, then (2.2) holds. In fact, one deduces from $\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\} < \eta^*$ and $\psi'_1(\eta^*) = 2\eta^*\phi_1(\eta^*) < 0$ that

$$\phi_1(\eta^*) < 0 \implies B_1(\eta^*) \succ 0 \text{ (by Lemma 3.4).}$$

Therefore, by Theorem 2.18, $y^* = y_1(\eta^*)$ is a local-nonglobal minimizer of (3.3) with $\mu^* = 1/\eta^* > 0$. \square

Example 3.6.

$$\min \{y_1^2 + y_2^2 \mid g(y_1, y_2) = -4y_1^2 + y_2^2 + 2y_1 + 16y_2 + 45 = 0\}. \quad (3.20)$$

This problem has $\lambda_1 = -4$, $\lambda_2 = 1$, $r_1 = 1$ and $r_2 = 8$. As shown in Figure 3.1, the function

$$\psi_1(\eta) = \frac{-4}{(-4 + \eta)^2} + \frac{64}{(1 + \eta)^2} - \frac{2}{-4 + \eta} - \frac{128}{1 + \eta} + 45, \quad \eta \in (-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1) = (-1, 4),$$

has three zero points: $\eta_1 = -0.3512$, $\eta_2 = 1.1829$ and $\eta_3 = 3.6018$ with $\psi'(\eta_1) < 0$, $\psi'(\eta_2) > 0$, $\psi'(\eta_3) < 0$. According to Theorem 3.5, $\eta_3 = 3.6018$ admits a local-nonglobal minimizer of the problem (3.20) with a positive multiplier $1/\eta_3$.




Figure 3.1: $\psi_1(\eta)$ has three zero points on $(-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$

Remark 3.7. If $\eta^* > 0$ admits a local-nonglobal minimizer $y_1(\eta^*)$ of (3.3) by Theorem 3.5, then $x^* = Q^T y_1(\eta^*) + q = q - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{\lambda_i + \eta^*} Q^T v_i$ is just a local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTRE) with the multiplier $\mu_1 + 1/\eta^*$. Moreover, if $\mu_1 + 1/\eta^* > 0$, then x^* is also a local-nonglobal minimizer of (GTR).

Now let us consider the case “ $\mu^* < 0$ ”. This case can be exactly regarded as the case “ $-\mu^* > 0$ ” with the equality constraint “ $-g(y) = y^T(-A)y + 2(-b)^T y + (-c) = 0$ ”. Thus one may define a vector function $y_2(\eta)$ and a function $\psi_2(\eta)$ by

$$\begin{cases} y_2(\eta) := -(-A + \eta I)^{-1}(-b) = -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{\lambda_i - \eta} v_i, \\ \psi_2(\eta) := -g(y_2(\eta)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{-\lambda_i r_i^2}{(\lambda_i - \eta)^2} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2r_i^2}{\lambda_i - \eta} - c, \end{cases} \quad \forall \eta \in (\lambda_{n-1}, \lambda_n). \quad (3.21)$$

And then, applying Theorem 3.5 to (3.21), one gets the following result directly.

Corollary 3.8. y^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of the problem (3.3) with $\mu^* = -1/\eta^* < 0$ if and only if $\max\{\lambda_{n-1}, 0\} < \eta^* < \lambda_n$, $r_n \neq 0$, $y^* = y_2(\eta^*)$, $\psi_2(\eta^*) = 0$ and $\psi_2'(\eta^*) < 0$.

Note that $y_1(\eta)$, $y_2(\eta)$, $\psi_1(\eta)$ and $\psi_2(\eta)$ have relations as follows:

$$y_2(\eta) = y_1(-\eta) \text{ and } \psi_2(\eta) = -\psi_1(-\eta), \quad \forall \eta \in (\lambda_{n-1}, \lambda_n).$$

So Corollary 3.8 can equivalently restated as follows, based on $y_1(\eta)$ and $\psi_1(\eta)$.

Corollary 3.9. y^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of the problem (3.3) with $\mu^* = -1/\eta^* < 0$ if and only if $\max\{\lambda_{n-1}, 0\} < \eta^* < \lambda_n$, $r_n \neq 0$, $y^* = y_1(-\eta^*)$, $\psi_1(-\eta^*) = 0$ and $\psi_1'(-\eta^*) < 0$.

Consider Example 3.6 again. By using Corollary 3.9, one can verify that $\eta_1 = -0.3512$ admits another local-nonglobal minimizer of the problem (3.20), which corresponds to the multiplier $1/\eta_1 < 0$. Therefore, the problem (3.20) given in Example 3.6 has exactly two local-nonglobal minimizers, with the multiplier values $1/\eta_1 < 0$ and $1/\eta_3 > 0$, respectively.

Summarizing Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 (Remark 3.3), Theorem 3.5 and Corollary 3.8, one obtains the following result, which involves the number of the local-nonglobal minimizers of (GTRE) under the assumption that $\exists \mu_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \succ 0$.

Theorem 3.10. Suppose that A_0 and A_1 are jointly positive definite, that is, $\exists \mu_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \succ 0$. Then the following statements are true.

(i) If A_1 is semidefinite i.e. $A_1 \succeq 0$ or $A_1 \preceq 0$, the problem (GTRE) has at most one local-nonglobal minimizer.

(ii) If A_1 is indefinite i.e. $\exists \bar{x}, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{R}^n$ such that $\bar{x}^T A_1 \bar{x} < 0 < \tilde{x}^T A_1 \tilde{x}$, the problem (GTRE) has at most two local-nonglobal minimizers.

Proof. According to the former analysis in this section, the assumption that “ $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \succ 0$ ” guarantees that (GTRE) is equivalent to the problem (3.3). Moreover, from Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 (Remark 3.3), Theorem 3.5 and Corollary 3.8, the problem (3.3) has at most two local-nonglobal minimizers $y_1(\eta_1^*)$ and $y_2(\eta_2^*)$. One local-nonglobal minimizer $y_1(\eta_1^*)$ corresponds to $\lambda_1 < 0$, and the other $y_2(\eta_2^*)$ corresponds to $\lambda_n > 0$, which ensures that both the statements (i) and (ii) are all true, because A and A_1 have the same inertia indices duo to $A = Q A_1 Q^T$ and $\det(Q) \neq 0$. \square

Remark 3.11. As we see, the problem (3.20) in Example 3.6 has exactly two local-nonglobal minimizers with the multiplier values $1/\eta_1 \approx -2.8474$ and $1/\eta_3 \approx 0.2776$, respectively. So the upper bound of the number of the local-nonglobal minimizers given by Theorem 3.10 is **tight**.

Applying Theorems 2.22 and 3.10 to (GTR), one immediately gets the following corollary involving the number of the local-nonglobal minimizers of (GTR).

Corollary 3.12. Suppose that A_0 and A_1 are jointly positive definite. Then the following three statements are true.

(i) If A_1 is semidefinite i.e. $A_1 \succeq 0$ or $A_1 \preceq 0$, the problem (GTR) has at most one local-nonglobal minimizer.

(ii) If A_1 is indefinite i.e. $\exists \bar{x}, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{R}^n$ such that $\bar{x}^T A_1 \bar{x} < 0 < \tilde{x}^T A_1 \tilde{x}$, the problem (GTR) has at most two local-nonglobal minimizers.

Proof. If $n = 1$, the desired conclusions are true apparently. And if $n \geq 2$, the desired conclusions follow directly from Theorems 2.22 and 3.10. \square

Remark 3.13. *The upper bound of the number of the local-nonglobal minimizers given by Corollary 3.12 is also tight. By slightly modifying the problem (3.20), one gets the following problem:*

$$\min \{x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 4f_1(x_1, x_2) \mid f_1(x_1, x_2) = -4x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 2x_1 + 16x_2 + 45 \leq 0\}. \quad (3.22)$$

Utilizing the problem (3.20), one can easily obtain that (3.22) has exactly two local-nonglobal minimizers with the multiplier values $4 + 1/\eta_1 \approx 1.1526$ and $4 + 1/\eta_3 \approx 4.2776$, respectively.

3.2 On the problem (3.4)

For the problem (3.4), one obtains an analogy to Lemma 3.1 by following the proof of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.14. *Suppose that $n \geq 2$. If y^* is a local-nonglobal minimizer of the problem (3.4), then $g(y^*) = 0$ and there is a unique Lagrangian multiplier $0 \neq \mu^* \in \mathcal{R}$ such that*

$$(-I + \mu^* A) y^* + \mu^* b = 0.$$

Moreover, if $\mu^ > 0$ then $\max\{\lambda_1, 0\} < \frac{1}{|\mu^*|} < \lambda_2$ and $r_1 \neq 0$; else if $\mu^* < 0$ then $\max\{-\lambda_n, 0\} < \frac{1}{|\mu^*|} < -\lambda_{n-1}$ and $r_n \neq 0$.*

Remark 3.15. *In the above lemma, the assumption “ $n \geq 2$ ” is necessary. Consider the following problem $\min\{-y^2 \mid y(y-1) = 0\}$. It has a local-nonglobal minimizer $y^* = 0$, but the corresponding Lagrangian multiplier $\mu^* = 0$.*

Similarly to the problem (3.3), our discussions focus first on the local-nonglobal minimizers of the problem (3.4) with $\mu^* = 1/\eta^* > 0$. Following (3.12), one may define a vector function $y_3(\eta)$ and a function $\psi_3(\eta)$ by

$$\begin{cases} y_3(\eta) := -(A - \eta I)^{-1} b = -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{\lambda_i - \eta} v_i, \\ \psi_3(\eta) := g(y_3(\eta)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i r_i^2}{(\lambda_i - \eta)^2} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2r_i^2}{\lambda_i - \eta} + c, \end{cases} \quad \forall \eta \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2), \quad (3.23)$$

where $\max\{\lambda_1, 0\} < \lambda_2$ and $r_1 \neq 0$. Both functions have the following properties:

$$\begin{cases} y_3(\eta) \neq 0, \quad \forall \eta \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2); \\ \nabla g|_{y_3(\eta)} = 2\eta y_3(\eta) \neq 0, \quad \forall \eta \in (\max\{\lambda_1, 0\}, \lambda_2); \\ \psi_3(\eta) \rightarrow \begin{cases} -\infty, & \text{if } \lambda_1 < 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } \lambda_1 \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{as } \eta \rightarrow \lambda_1^+; \\ \psi_3'(\eta) = 2\eta \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i^2}{(\lambda_i - \eta)^3} = 2\eta \phi_3(\eta), \quad \text{where } \phi_3(\eta) := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i^2}{(\lambda_i - \eta)^3}; \\ \phi_3'(\eta) = 3 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i^2}{(\lambda_i - \eta)^4} > 0, \quad \forall \eta \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2). \end{cases} \quad (3.24)$$

Utilizing the positiveness of $\phi_3'(\eta)$, one obtains an analogy to Remark 3.3.

Lemma 3.16. *Suppose that $n \geq 2$, $\max\{\lambda_1, 0\} < \lambda_2$ and $r_1 \neq 0$ for the problem (3.4). Then, on the open interval $(\max\{\lambda_1, 0\}, \lambda_2)$, the signs of ψ'_3 must belong to one of the following three cases: (i) $\psi'_3(\eta) < 0$; (ii) $\psi'_3(\eta) > 0$; (iii) $\exists \eta_0 \in (\max\{\lambda_1, 0\}, \lambda_2)$ such that*

$$\psi'_3(\eta) \begin{cases} < 0, & \forall \eta \in (\max\{\lambda_1, 0\}, \eta_0), \\ = 0, & \eta = \eta_0, \\ > 0, & \forall \eta \in (\eta_0, \lambda_2). \end{cases} \quad (3.25)$$

Proof. As $\psi'_3(\eta) = 2\eta\phi_3(\eta)$, both ψ'_3 and ϕ_3 have the same signs on the interval $(\max\{\lambda_1, 0\}, \lambda_2)$. Note that $\phi'_3(\eta) > 0$ for all $\eta \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. So, on the open interval (λ_1, λ_2) , ϕ_3 is strictly monotone increasing with $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \lambda_1^+} \phi_3(\eta) = -\infty$ and has at most one zero point. Firstly, if $\phi_3(\eta)$ has no zero points on the interval (λ_1, λ_2) then $\phi_3(\eta) < 0$ for all $\eta \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, which implies that $\psi'_3(\eta) < 0$ for all $\eta \in (\max\{\lambda_1, 0\}, \lambda_2)$. Secondly, if $\phi_3(\eta)$ has a zero point $\eta_0 \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ with $\eta_0 \leq 0$, then $\phi_3(\eta) > 0$ for all $\eta \in (\eta_0, \lambda_2)$, which means that $\psi'_3(\eta) > 0$ for all $\eta \in (\max\{\lambda_1, 0\}, \lambda_2) = (\eta_0, \lambda_2)$. Finally, if $\phi_3(\eta)$ has one zero point $\eta_0 \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ with $\eta_0 > 0$, then (3.25) holds apparently. \square

The above lemma shows that ψ_3 has at most two zero points on the interval $(\max\{\lambda_1, 0\}, \lambda_2)$. Similar to the problem (3.3), in order to figure out whether or not the zero points admit local-nonglobal minimizers of the problem (3.4), we need further to define $W_3(\eta) \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times (n-1)}$ and $B_3(\eta) \in \mathcal{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)}$ by

$$\begin{cases} W_3(\eta) = \frac{r_1}{\lambda_1 - \eta} [v_2, v_3, \dots, v_n] - v_1 \tilde{u}^T, \\ B_3(\eta) = W_3(\eta)^T (A - \eta I) W_3(\eta) = \tilde{B}_3(\eta) + (\lambda_1 - \eta) \tilde{u} \tilde{u}^T, \end{cases} \quad \forall \eta \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2),$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{B}_3(\eta) = \frac{r_1^2}{(\lambda_1 - \eta)^2} \text{diag} (\lambda_2 - \eta, \lambda_3 - \eta, \dots, \lambda_n - \eta) \\ \tilde{u} = \left[\frac{r_2}{\lambda_2 - \eta}, \frac{r_3}{\lambda_3 - \eta}, \dots, \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n - \eta} \right]^T. \end{cases}$$

If only $\max\{\lambda_1, 0\} < \lambda_2$ and $r_1 \neq 0$, the matrices $W_3(\eta)$ and $B_3(\eta)$ satisfy the following properties:

$$\begin{cases} \text{rank} (W_3(\eta)) = n - 1, \\ \nabla g (y_3(\eta))^T W_3(\eta) = 0, \\ \det (B_3(\eta)) = h_3(\eta) \phi_3(\eta), \end{cases} \quad \forall \eta \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2), \quad (3.26)$$

where $h_3(\eta) = \frac{r_1^{2n-4} (\lambda_2 - \eta) \cdots (\lambda_n - \eta)}{(\lambda_1 - \eta)^{2n-5}} < 0$. From (3.26), one can yield the following lemma by repeating the proof process of Lemma 3.4.

Lemma 3.17. *Suppose that $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ and $r_1 \neq 0$ for the problem (3.4). Then for each $\eta \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, $B_3(\eta) \succ 0$ if and only if $\phi_3(\eta) < 0$.*

Based on Lemmas 3.14 and 3.17, and by following the proof of Theorem 3.5, one can also obtain a necessary and sufficient test condition for a local-nonglobal minimizer of the problem (3.4) with a positive multiplier. It is stated in the following theorem and the corresponding proof is omitted.

Theorem 3.18. *Suppose that $n \geq 2$. The problem (3.4) has a local-nonglobal minimizer y^* with $\mu^* = 1/\eta^* > 0$ if and only if $\max\{\lambda_1, 0\} < \eta^* < \lambda_2$, $r_1 \neq 0$, $y^* = y_3(\eta^*)$, $\psi_3(\eta^*) = 0$ and $\psi_3'(\eta^*) < 0$.*

The local-nonglobal minimizers of the problem (3.4) are just the local-nonglobal maximizers of the problem (3.3). Moreover, $y_1(\eta)$, $y_3(\eta)$, $\psi_1(\eta)$ and $\psi_3(\eta)$ have the following relations:

$$y_3(\eta) = y_1(-\eta) \text{ and } \psi_3(\eta) = \psi_1(-\eta), \quad \forall \eta \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

So Theorem 3.18 may be equivalently expressed by using $y_1(\eta)$ and $\psi_1(\eta)$.

Corollary 3.19. *Suppose that $n \geq 2$. The problem (3.4) has a local-nonglobal minimizer y^* with $\mu^* = 1/\eta^* > 0$ if and only if $\max\{\lambda_1, 0\} < \eta^* < \lambda_2$, $r_1 \neq 0$, $y^* = y_1(-\eta^*)$, $\psi_1(-\eta^*) = 0$ and $\psi_1'(-\eta^*) > 0$.*

Let us consider the local-nonglobal maximizers of Example 3.6, that is, we consider the following problem.

Example 3.20.

$$\min \{-y_1^2 - y_2^2 \mid g(y_1, y_2) = -4y_1^2 + y_2^2 + 2y_1 + 16y_2 + 45 = 0\}. \quad (3.27)$$

Applying Corollary 3.19 to the problem (3.27), one can obtain that it has no local-nonglobal minimizers with positive multipliers.

Similarly to the problem (3.3), the case “ $\mu^* < 0$ ” in the problem (3.4) can be also regarded as the case “ $-\mu^* > 0$ ” with the equality constraint “ $-g(y) = y^T(-A)y + 2(-b)^T y + (-c) = 0$ ”. So one defines a vector function $y_4(\eta)$ and a function $\psi_4(\eta)$ by

$$\begin{cases} y_4(\eta) := -(-A - \eta I)^{-1}(-b) = y_1(\eta), \\ \psi_4(\eta) := -g(y_4(\eta)) = -g(y_1(\eta)) = -\psi_1(\eta), \end{cases} \quad \forall \eta \in (-\lambda_n, -\lambda_{n-1}). \quad (3.28)$$

And then the following corollary is obtained by applying Theorem 3.18 to (3.28).

Corollary 3.21. *Suppose that $n \geq 2$. The problem (3.4) has a local-nonglobal minimizer y^* with $\mu^* = -1/\eta^* < 0$ if and only if $\max\{-\lambda_n, 0\} < \eta^* < -\lambda_{n-1}$, $r_n \neq 0$, $y^* = y_4(\eta^*)$, $\psi_4(\eta^*) = 0$ and $\psi_4'(\eta^*) < 0$.*

Similarly to Corollary 3.19, the above corollary may be also restated by using $y_1(\eta)$ and $\psi_1(\eta)$.

Corollary 3.22. *Suppose that $n \geq 2$. The problem (3.4) has a local-nonglobal minimizer y^* with $\mu^* = -1/\eta^* < 0$ if and only if $\max\{-\lambda_n, 0\} < \eta^* < -\lambda_{n-1}$, $r_n \neq 0$, $y^* = y_1(\eta^*)$, $\psi_1(\eta^*) = 0$ and $\psi_1'(\eta^*) > 0$.*

Applying Corollary 3.22 to Example 3.20, one can verify that $\eta_2 = 1.1829$ admits a local-nonglobal minimizer of Example 3.20 with the multiplier $-1/\eta_2 < 0$.

Combining Lemmas 3.14 and 3.16, Theorem 3.18, Corollaries 3.19, 3.21 and 3.22, one can obtain a novel result as follows: under the assumption that $\exists \mu_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \prec 0$, the problem (GTRE) has at most one local-nonglobal minimizer.

Theorem 3.23. *Suppose that A_0 and A_1 are jointly negative definite, that is, $\exists \mu_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \prec 0$. Then the problem (GTRE) has at most one local-nonglobal minimizer.*

Proof. If $n = 1$, the desired conclusion is true apparently. So we need only to consider the case: “ $n \geq 2$ ”. Note that, under the assumption that $\exists \mu_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 \prec 0$, the problem (GTRE) can be exactly transformed into the problem (3.4). Thus one needs only to prove that, at the case of “ $n \geq 2$ ”, the problem (3.4) has at most one local-nonglobal minimizer.

From Lemmas 3.14 and 3.16, Theorem 3.18 and Corollary 3.21, the problem (3.4) has possibly at most two local-nonglobal minimizers $y_3(\eta_3^*)$ and $y_4(\eta_4^*)$. Wherein they have to satisfy that

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 \neq 0, \max\{\lambda_1, 0\} < \eta_3^* < \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n, \psi_3(\eta_3^*) = 0, \psi_3'(\eta_3^*) < 0, \text{ and} \\ r_n \neq 0, \max\{-\lambda_n, 0\} < \eta_4^* < -\lambda_{n-1} \leq \dots \leq -\lambda_1, \psi_4(\eta_4^*) = 0, \psi_4'(\eta_4^*) < 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

which implies $\lambda_2 > 0$ and $\lambda_{n-1} < 0$. If $n \geq 3$, (3.29) makes λ_2 satisfy $0 < \lambda_2 < 0$, which is a contradiction. If $n = 2$, by using Corollaries 3.19 and 3.22, (3.29) can be reformulated into $r_1 r_2 \neq 0$, $-\lambda_2 < -\eta_3^* < 0 < \eta_4^* < -\lambda_1$, $\psi_1(-\eta_3^*) = \psi_1(\eta_4^*) = 0$, $\psi_1'(-\eta_3^*) > 0$ and $\psi_1'(\eta_4^*) > 0$, which is also a contradiction according to Lemma 3.2. Thus it is impossible that there exist both $y_3(\eta_3^*)$ and $y_4(\eta_4^*)$ simultaneously. \square

Combining Theorems 2.22 and 3.23, one immediately gets the following corollary.

Corollary 3.24. *Suppose that A_0 and A_1 are jointly negative definite. Then the problem (GTR) has at most one local-nonglobal minimizer.*

Proof. If $n = 1$, the desired conclusion is true apparently. And if $n \geq 2$, the desired conclusion follows directly from Theorems 2.22 and 3.23. \square

Remark 3.25. *If A_1 is an identity matrix, then the results in Theorem 3.23 and Corollary 3.24 are reduced to be just the Martínez’s [15]. So the upper bound of the number of the local-nonglobal minimizers given by Theorem 3.23 and Corollary 3.24 is tight.*

4 Computation of the local-nonglobal minimizers

In this section, we discuss how to compute all the local-nonglobal minimizers of (GTRE) with $n \geq 2$ under the joint definiteness condition (the local-nonglobal minimizers of (GTR) are also found by Theorem 2.22). Firstly, for any symmetric matrices A_0 and A_1 , one can use Guo-Higham-Tisseur’s algorithm [10] to determine whether they both are jointly definite or not. If their joint definiteness holds, one finds $A_0 + \mu_1 A_1 = \text{sgn} LL^T$ from Guo-Higham-Tisseur’s algorithm, where L is a lower triangular matrix with positive diagonal elements and sgn is a sign number: $\text{sgn} = 1$ or -1 . Secondly, by using the formula (3.2), one transforms equivalently (GTRE) into the problem (3.3) (or (3.4)). Thirdly, one solves (3.3) (or (3.4)) to find all its local-nonglobal minimizers y^* . Finally, one retransforms y^* into x^* by using the formula (3.2). So the key issue is how to compute all the local-nonglobal minimizers of (3.3) (or (3.4)).

In order to compute the local-nonglobal minimizers of the problems (3.3) and (3.4), we present two lemmas to provide a theoretical basis for our algorithm design.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that $\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\} < -\lambda_1$ and $r_1 \neq 0$. Then the problem (3.3) has a local-nonglobal minimizer with $\mu^* > 0 \iff \exists \tilde{\eta} \in (\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1)$ such that $\psi_1(\tilde{\eta}) > 0$, where $\psi_1(\eta)$ is defined in (3.12).*

Proof. “ \implies ”. Assume that the problem (3.3) has a local-nonglobal minimizer y^* with $\mu^* = 1/\eta^* > 0$. From Theorem 3.5, it holds that $\eta^* \in (\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1)$, $y^* = y_1(\eta^*)$, $\psi_1(\eta^*) = 0$ and $\psi'_1(\eta^*) < 0$. Then by Lemma 3.2 (Remark 3.3), $\exists \epsilon > 0$ such that $\psi'_1(\eta) < 0$ for all $\eta \in [\eta^* - \epsilon, -\lambda_1] \subseteq (\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1)$, which implies that $\psi_1(\eta^* - \epsilon) > 0 = \psi_1(\eta^*)$. So $\tilde{\eta} := \eta^* - \epsilon$ is just the desired.

“ \impliedby ”. Assume that $\exists \tilde{\eta} \in (\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1)$ such that $\psi_1(\tilde{\eta}) > 0$. Note from (3.13) that $\psi_1(\eta) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $\eta \rightarrow (-\lambda_1)^-$. Thus, from the continuity of $\psi_1(\eta)$ on $[\tilde{\eta}, -\lambda_1)$, there exists a $\eta^* \in (\tilde{\eta}, -\lambda_1)$ such that $\psi_1(\eta^*) = 0$. If one can verify that $\psi'_1(\eta^*) < 0$, then by Theorem 3.5 the point $y_1(\eta^*)$ is just a local-nonglobal minimizer of the problem (3.3) with $\mu^* = 1/\eta^* > 0$, and the proof is completed. In fact, we suppose by contradiction that $\psi'_1(\eta^*) \geq 0$. It, together with $\eta^* > 0$, implies from Lemma 3.2 (Remark 3.3) that (3.18) holds and $\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\} < \tilde{\eta} < \eta^* \leq \eta_0 < -\lambda_1$, which leads to $\psi'_1(\eta) > 0 \forall \eta \in (\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, \eta_0)$ by using (3.18). So one has $0 < \psi_1(\tilde{\eta}) < 0 = \psi_1(\eta^*)$, which is a contradiction. \square

Following the statement and proof of Lemma 4.1, one can also find a similar result about the problem (3.4).

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that $n \geq 2$, $\max\{\lambda_1, 0\} < \lambda_2$ and $r_1 \neq 0$. Then the problem (3.4) has a local-nonglobal minimizer with $\mu^* > 0 \iff \exists \tilde{\eta} \in (\max\{\lambda_1, 0\}, \lambda_2)$ such that $\psi_3(\tilde{\eta}) < 0$, and if $\lambda_1 < 0$ there is $\psi_3(0) > 0$, where $\psi_3(\eta)$ is defined in (3.23).*

Now we describe our algorithm.

Algorithm 1 The main routine

Input: $A \in \mathcal{S}^n$, $b \in \mathcal{R}^n$, $c \in \mathcal{R}$, a sign number sgn .

Output: $\mu_k^* \in \mathcal{R}$ and $y_k^* \in \mathcal{R}^n$, $k = 1, 2$.

- 1: Make an eigenvalue decomposition of A : $A = V\Lambda V^T$, $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ with $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ and $V = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n]$ with $V^T V = I$. Put $r_i = v_i^T b$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. If $sgn = -1$, go to Line 4.
- 2: Set $U_1 = \max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}$, $U_2 = -\lambda_1$, $r = r_1$, $\psi(\eta) = \psi_1(\eta)$ and $\psi'(\eta) = \psi'_1(\eta)$. Call Subalgorithm 2 and return η^* . If $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, put $\mu_1^* = \text{NaN}$ and $y_1^* = \text{NaN}$. Otherwise, put $\mu_1^* = 1/\eta^*$ and $y_1^* = -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{\lambda_i + \eta^*} v_i$.
- 3: Set $U_1 = \max\{\lambda_{n-1}, 0\}$ and $U_2 = \lambda_n$, $r = r_n$, $\psi(\eta) = \psi_2(\eta)$ and $\psi'(\eta) = \psi'_2(\eta)$. Call Subalgorithm 2 and return η^* . If $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, put $\mu_2^* = \text{NaN}$ and $y_2^* = \text{NaN}$, go to Line 6. Otherwise, put $\mu_2^* = -1/\eta^*$ and $y_2^* = -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{\lambda_i - \eta^*} v_i$, go to Line 6.
- 4: Set $U_1 = \max\{\lambda_1, 0\}$, $U_2 = \lambda_2$, $r = r_1$, $\lambda = \lambda_1$, $\psi(\eta) = \psi_3(\eta)$ and $\psi'(\eta) = \psi'_3(\eta)$. Call Subalgorithm 3 and return η^* . If $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, put $\mu_1^* = \text{NaN}$ and $y_1^* = \text{NaN}$. Otherwise, put $\mu_1^* = 1/\eta^*$, $y_1^* = -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{\lambda_i - \eta^*} v_i$, $\mu_2^* = \text{NaN}$, $y_2^* = \text{NaN}$, and then go to Line 6.

- 5: Set $U_1 = \max\{-\lambda_n, 0\}$, $U_2 = -\lambda_{n-1}$, $r = r_n$, $\lambda = \lambda_n$, $\psi(\eta) = \psi_4(\eta)$ and $\psi'(\eta) = \psi'_4(\eta)$. Call Subalgorithm 3 and return η^* . If $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, put $\mu_2^* = \text{NaN}$ and $y_2^* = \text{NaN}$. Otherwise, put $\mu_2^* = -1/\eta^*$, $y_2^* = -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{\lambda_i + \eta^*} v_i$.
 - 6: Output μ_1^* and y_1^* , μ_2^* and y_2^* , and then stop.
-

In Subalgorithm 2, bisection method is used on $(\max\{-\lambda_2, 0\}, -\lambda_1)$ and $(\max\{\lambda_{n-1}, 0\}, \lambda_n)$.

Subalgorithm 2 For the problem (3.3)

Input: $\psi(\eta)$, $\psi'(\eta)$, U_1 , U_2 , r and a tolerance $\epsilon > 0$.

Output: η^* .

- 1: Ask $U_1 < U_2$ and $r \neq 0$? No, put $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, output η^* and then stop. Yes, set $temp = 0$.
 - 2: Set $\eta = \frac{U_1 + U_2}{2}$, and compute $\psi(\eta)$.
 - 3: If $\psi(\eta) > 0$, update $temp = 1$ and $U_1 = \eta$, go to Line 6; else if $\psi(\eta) = 0$, go to Line 4; else i.e. $\psi(\eta) < 0$, go to Line 5.
 - 4: Compute $\psi'(\eta)$. If $\psi'(\eta) > 0$, update $temp = 1$ and $U_1 = \eta$, go to Line 6; else if $\psi'(\eta) = 0$, put $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, output η^* and then stop; else i.e. $\psi'(\eta) < 0$, put $\eta^* = \eta$, output η^* and then stop.
 - 5: Compute $\psi'(\eta)$. If $\psi'(\eta) > 0$, update $U_1 = \eta$, go to Line 6; else if $\psi'(\eta) = 0$, put $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, output η^* and then stop; else i.e. $\psi'(\eta) < 0$, update $U_2 = \eta$, go to Line 6.
 - 6: If $U_2 - U_1 > \epsilon$, then go to Line 2. Otherwise, if $temp = 0$, put $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, output η^* and then stop; else i.e. $temp = 1$, put $\eta^* = U_2$, output η^* and then stop.
-

In Subalgorithm 3, bisection method is used on $(\max\{\lambda_1, 0\}, \lambda_2)$ and $(\max\{-\lambda_n, 0\}, -\lambda_{n-1})$.

Subalgorithm 3 For the problem (3.4)

Input: $\psi(\eta)$, $\psi'(\eta)$, U_1 , U_2 , r , λ and a tolerance $\epsilon > 0$.

Output: η^* .

- 1: Ask $U_1 < U_2$ and $r \neq 0$? No, put $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, output η^* and then stop. Yes, if $\lambda < 0$ then ask $\psi(0) > 0$? no, put $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, output η^* and then stop; yes, set $temp = 0$.
 - 2: Set $\eta = \frac{U_1 + U_2}{2}$, and compute $\psi(\eta)$.
 - 3: If $\psi(\eta) < 0$, update $temp = 1$ and $U_2 = \eta$, go to Line 6; else if $\psi(\eta) = 0$, then go to Line 4; else i.e. $\psi(\eta) > 0$, go to Line 5.
 - 4: Compute $\psi'(\eta)$. If $\psi'(\eta) > 0$, update $temp = 1$ and $U_2 = \eta$, go to Line 6; else if $\psi'(\eta) = 0$, put $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, output η^* and then stop; else i.e. $\psi'(\eta) < 0$, put $\eta^* = \eta$, output η^* and then stop.
 - 5: Compute $\psi'(\eta)$. If $\psi'(\eta) > 0$, update $U_2 = \eta$, go to Line 6; else if $\psi'(\eta) = 0$, put $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, output η^* and then stop; else i.e. $\psi'(\eta) < 0$, update $U_1 = \eta$, go to Line 6.
 - 6: If $U_2 - U_1 > \epsilon$, go to Line 2. Otherwise, if $temp = 0$, put $\eta^* = \text{NaN}$, output η^* and then stop; else i.e. $temp = 1$, put $\eta^* = U_1$, output η^* and then stop.
-

Here we present preliminary numerical experiments to show the performance of our algorithms (**due to limited space, we can only show some simple numerical results of the problem (3.3), but the problem (3.4) has really similar numerical results**). All the elements of the matrix A and the vector b are randomly generated on the interval $[-100, 100]$. However, the constant c is adaptively adjusted to ensure that $\psi_1(\eta)$ has zeros on the interval $(-\lambda_2, -\lambda_1)$. The tolerance ϵ is always taken as $\epsilon = 1e - 5$.

All the experiments were performed in Python 3.12 on a Laptop with an Intel Core i5-11320H (3.20GHz) processor and 16 GB of RAM. For each n , we generate 1000 examples, and record the average values of some indices. Wherein “Eig_time(s)”, “Bis_time(s)”, “Bis_iter” and “Num_LNGM” denote the running time of the eigenvalue decomposition of A , the running time and the iteration number of Subalgorithm 2, and the number of local-nonglobal minimizers of the problem (3.3). Certainly, the average running time of Algorithm 1 is roughly equal to the sum of Eig_time and Bis_time.

Table 4.1: Numerical results of the problem (3.3) with n from 100 to 10000

n	Eig_time(s)	Bis_time(s)	Bis_iter	Num_LNGM
100	4.24e-3	4.66e-4	45.03	1.000
200	2.05e-2	6.21e-4	44.91	1.000
300	4.56e-2	8.81e-4	44.79	1.000
400	8.18e-2	7.45e-4	44.38	1.000
500	0.13	8.81e-4	44.48	1.000
600	0.21	1.27e-3	44.15	1.000
700	0.27	1.55e-3	44.31	1.000
800	0.42	1.42e-3	44.01	1.000
900	0.51	1.47e-3	44.03	1.000
1000	0.58	1.35e-3	44.16	1.000
2000	4.19	3.57e-3	43.85	1.000
3000	9.84	3.25e-3	43.34	1.000
4000	20.76	4.06e-3	43.37	1.000
5000	35.54	4.65e-3	43.23	1.000
6000	65.29	5.51e-3	43.14	1.000
7000	99.41	6.33e-3	43.30	1.000
8000	143.12	7.18e-3	43.16	1.000
9000	345.09	1.04e-2	43.06	1.000
10000	422.81	1.07e-2	42.83	1.000

In Table 4.1, one can easily observe that, the running time of Algorithm 1 comes mainly from Eig_time, and Subalgorithm 2 is insensitive to the dimension n . In fact, the computational cost of Subalgorithm 2 comes mainly from evaluating $\psi(\eta)$ and $\psi'(\eta)$, which is equal to $O(n)$.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] S. Adachi and Y. Nakatsukasa, *Eigenvalue-based algorithm and analysis for nonconvex QCQP with one constraint*, Math. Program., 173 (2019), pp. 79–116.

- [2] M.S. Bazaraa, H. D. Sherali and C. M. Shetty, *Nonlinear Programming: Theory and Algorithms 3rd*, 2006.
- [3] A. Beck and D. Pan, *A branch and bound algorithm for nonconvex quadratic optimization with ball and linear constraints*, J Glob. Optim., 69 (2017), pp. 309–342.
- [4] D. Bienstock, *A note on polynomial solvability of the CDT problem*, SIAM J. Optim., 26(1) (2016), pp. 488–498.
- [5] D. Bienstock and A. Michalka, *Polynomial solvability of variants of the trust-region subproblem*, Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms, (2014), pp. 380–390.
- [6] I. M. Bomze and M. L. Overton, *Narrowing the difficulty gap for the Celis-Dennis-Tapia problem*, Math. Program., 151 (2015), pp. 459–476.
- [7] L. Consolini and M. Locatelli, *Sharp and fast bounds for the Celis-Dennis-Tapia problem*, SIAM J. Optim., 33(2) (2023), pp. 868–898.
- [8] Z. Deng, C. Lu, Y. Tian and J. Luo, *Globally solving extended trust region subproblems with two intersecting cuts*, Optim. Lett., 14 (2020), pp. 1855–1867.
- [9] C. Fortin, *Computing the local-nonglobal minimizer of a large scale trust-region subproblem*, SIAM J. Optim., 16(1) (2005), pp. 263–296.
- [10] C. Guo, N. J. Higham, and F. Tisseur, *An improved arc algorithm for detecting definite hermitian pairs*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 31(3) (2010), pp. 1131–1151.
- [11] Y. Hsia and R. L. Sheu, *Trust region subproblem with a fixed number of additional linear inequality constraints has polynomial complexity*, (2013), arXiv:1312.1398.
- [12] R. Jiang and D. Li, *Exactness conditions for semidefinite programming relaxations of generalization of the extended trust region subproblem*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 48(3) (2022), pp. 1235–1253.
- [13] S. Lucidi, L. Palagi, and M. Roma, *On some properties of quadratic programs with a convex quadratic constraint*, SIAM J. Optim., 8(1) (1998), pp. 105–122.
- [14] H. Luo, Y. Chen, X. Zhang, D. Li, and H. Wu, *Effective algorithms for optimal portfolio deleveraging problem with cross impact*, Mathematical Finance, 34(1) (2024), pp. 36–89.
- [15] J. M. Martínez, *Local minimizers of quadratic functions on euclidean balls and spheres*, SIAM J. Optim., 4(1) (1994), pp. 159–176.
- [16] J. J. Moré, *Generalizations of the trust region problem*, Optim. Methods Softw., 2 (1993), pp. 189–209.
- [17] I. Pólik and T. Terlaky, *A survey of the S-lemma*, SIAM Rev., 49(3) (2007), pp. 317–418.
- [18] N. Rontsis, P. J. Goulart, and Y. Nakatsukasa, *An active-set algorithm for norm constrained quadratic problems*, Math. Program., 193 (2022), pp. 447–483.
- [19] M. Salahi, A. Taati, and H. Wolkowicz, *Local nonglobal minima for solving large-scale extended trust-region subproblems*, Comput. Optim. Appl., 66 (2017), pp. 223–244.
- [20] M. Song, J. Wang, H. Liu, and Y. Xia, *On local minimizers of nonconvex homogeneous quadratically constrained quadratic optimization with at most two constraints*, SIAM J. Optim., 33(1) (2023), pp. 267–293.
- [21] A. Taati and M. Salahi, *On local-nonglobal minimizers of quadratic optimization problem with a single quadratic constraint*, Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim., 41(8) (2020), pp. 969–1005.

- [22] J. Wang, M. Song, and Y. Xia, *On local minimizers of generalized trust-region subproblem*, (2021), arXiv:2108.13729.
- [23] J. Wang, M. Song, and Y. Xia, *On local nonglobal minimum of trust-region subproblem and extension*, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 195 (2022), pp. 702–722.
- [24] J. Wang and Y. Xia, *Closing the gap between necessary and sufficient conditions for local non-global minimizer of trust region subproblem*, *SIAM J. Optim.*, 30(3) (2020), pp. 1980–1995.
- [25] Y. Xia, S. Wang, and R. L. Sheu, *S-lemma with equality and its applications*, *Math. Program.*, 156 (2016), pp. 513–547.
- [26] V. A. Yakubovich, *S-procedure in nonlinear control theory*, *Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta*, 1 (1971), pp. 62–77 (in Russian).
- [27] J. Yuan, M. Wang, W. Ai, and T. Shuai, *New results on narrowing the duality gap of the extended Celis–Dennis–Tapia problem*, *SIAM J. Optim.*, 27(2) (2017), pp. 890–909.
- [28] Y. Yuan, *Recent advances in trust region algorithms*, *Math. Program.*, 151 (2015), pp. 249–281.