

## ON STABILITY IN QUASICONVEX SEMI-INFINITE OPTIMIZATION

Dorđe DUGOŠIJA

*University of Belgrade, Mathematical Faculty, Studentski trg 16,  
11000 Belgrade, Yugoslavia*

**Abstract.** The paper gives sufficient conditions for the stability of the parametric semi-infinite problem with the quasiconvex objective and constraint functions. The obtained result generalizes results concerning parametric linear semi-infinite optimization [4], as well as the stability results for convex case [1], [3], [5].

*Key words and phrases:* Parametric semi-infinite optimization, stability

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Consider the following parametric semi-infinite optimization problem

$$(P_\theta) : \quad \inf f(x, \theta)$$

subject to

$$g_t(x, \theta) \leq 0, \quad t \in T$$

where:

- (1)  $x \in E^n$ ;
- (2)  $T$  is a compact topological space;
- (3) parameter  $\theta$  belongs to a metric space  $\Theta$ ;
- (4) functions  $(x, \theta) \mapsto f(x, \theta)$  and  $(x, \theta, t) \mapsto g_t(x, \theta, t)$  are continuous;
- (5) for every  $\theta \in \Theta$  and  $t \in T$ , functions  $x \mapsto f(x, \theta)$  and  $x \mapsto g_t(x, \theta)$  are quasiconvex on  $E^n$ .

Recall that a function  $f : E^n \rightarrow R$  is quasiconvex iff for every  $x, y \in E^n$  and  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$f(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) \leq \max\{f(x), f(y)\},$$

and strictly quasiconvex iff for every  $x, y \in E^n$ ,

$$f(x) < f(y) \text{ implies } f(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) < f(y), \quad \forall \lambda \in (0, 1).$$

For a fixed parameter  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $(P_\theta)$  is a quasiconvex semi-infinite problem. Denote by

$$\begin{aligned} X(\theta) & \text{ the set of feasible points,} \\ S(\theta) & \text{ the set of optimal solutions,} \end{aligned}$$

of the problem  $(P_\theta)$ . The aim of the paper is to show some sufficient conditions under which the problem  $(P_\theta)$  is stable at a point  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ , i.e. the following is valid:

- (i)  $S(\theta)$  is not empty for every parameter  $\theta$  in some neighbourhood  $N(\theta_0)$  of the point  $\theta_0$ ;
- (ii) for every sequence  $(\theta_n)$ ,  $\theta_n \in N(\theta_0)$  such that  $\theta_n \rightarrow \theta_0$ , the sequence of arbitrary chosen optimal solutions  $(s(\theta_n))$  is bounded with accumulation points in  $S(\theta_0)$ .

This notion of stability was introduced in Eremin-Astafiev [1].

REMARK. It could be easily proved that stability of  $(P_\theta)$  at  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$  implies that the function  $\theta \mapsto S(\theta)$  is upper semicontinuous at  $\theta_0$  in the sense of Berge. Conversely, upper semicontinuity of the function  $\theta \mapsto S(\theta)$  implies stability of  $(P_\theta)$  under additional conditions such as

- (i)  $S(\theta_0)$  is a nonempty and bounded set and
- (ii)  $S(\theta)$  is not empty, for every  $\theta$  in some neighbourhood of  $\theta_0$  (see [2, Th. 7.5]).

We need also the following definitions. We say that a sequence  $(C_n)$ ,  $C_n \subset E^m$  is convergent to a  $C \subset E^m$ , denoted by  $C_n \rightarrow C$ , iff  $C = \limsup C_n = \liminf C_n$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf C_n &= \{x \in E^m \mid x = \lim x_n \text{ for some } (x_n), x_n \in C_n, n \in N\}, \\ \limsup C_n &= \{x \in E^m \mid x \text{ is an accumul. point for some } (x_n), x_n \in C_n, n \in N\}. \end{aligned}$$

For a given function  $\theta \mapsto C(\theta)$ ,  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $C(\theta) \subset E^m$  and  $C \subset E^m$ , we say also that  $C(\theta) \rightarrow C$  as  $\theta \rightarrow \theta_0$ , ( $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ ) iff  $C(\theta_n) \rightarrow C$ , for every sequence  $(\theta_n)$ ,  $\theta_n \in \Theta$  such that  $\theta_n \rightarrow \theta_0$ .

## 2. CONDITIONS FOR STABILITY

The following theorem gives sufficient conditions for the stability of  $(P_\theta)$ .

**THEOREM 1.** *A quasiconvex parametric semi-infinite problem  $(P_\theta)$  is stable at  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ , if the following conditions are satisfied*

- (i)  $S(\theta_0)$  is a nonempty bounded set,
- (ii)  $X(\theta) \rightarrow X(\theta_0)$  as  $\theta \rightarrow \theta_0$ .

**PROOF.** According to [3, Th. I.3.3], the function  $\theta \mapsto S(\theta)$  is upper semicontinuous at  $\theta_0$ . Keeping in mind the results from the Remark, the conclusion follows if we



show that  $S(\theta) \neq \emptyset$ , for every  $\theta$  in a neighbourhood of  $\theta_0$ . Suppose the contrary. Then there exists a sequence  $(\theta_n)$ , such that  $\theta_n \rightarrow \theta_0$  and  $S(\theta_n) = \emptyset$ ,  $n \in N$ . Let  $x_0 \in S(\theta_0)$  and  $K(0, r)$  be a ball with the center 0 and the radius  $r$  such that  $S(\theta_0) \subset K(0, r)$ . Since  $X(\theta_n) \rightarrow X(\theta_0)$ , there exists  $(x_n)$ ,  $x_n \in X(\theta_n)$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ . Let us prove that, for every  $n \in N$ , there exists a direction  $d_n \neq 0$  such that for every  $t \geq 0$

$$x_n + td_n \in X(\theta_n) \tag{1}$$

and

$$f(x_n + td_n, \theta_n) \leq f(x_n, \theta_n). \tag{2}$$

Since  $S(\theta_n) = \emptyset$ , we can find a sequence  $(y_m)$ ,  $y_m \in X(\theta_n)$  such that  $\|y_m\| \rightarrow \infty$  and  $f(y_m, \theta_n) \rightarrow -\infty$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $d_n$  be an accumulation point of  $(y_m/\|y_m\|)$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $d_n = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (y_m/\|y_m\|)$ . Since  $X(\theta_n)$  is a convex set, for  $t \geq 0$  and  $m \geq m_0$ , we have

$$\left(1 - \frac{t}{\|y_m\|}\right) x_n + \frac{t}{\|y_m\|} y_m \in X(\theta_n).$$

Putting  $m \rightarrow \infty$  yields (1). Quasiconvexity of  $f$  yields

$$f\left(\left(1 - \frac{t}{\|y_m\|}\right) x_n + \frac{t}{\|y_m\|} y_m, \theta_n\right) \leq \max\{f(x_n, \theta_n), f(y_m, \theta_n)\} = f(x_n, \theta_n)$$

and  $m \rightarrow \infty$  implies (2). Choosing  $t_n \geq 0$  such that  $y_n = x_n + t_n d_n \in K(0, 2r) \setminus K(0, r)$ , we find a bounded sequence  $(y_n)$ , which has an accumulation point  $y_0$  in  $X(\theta_0) \setminus S(\theta_0)$ . From  $f(y_n, \theta_n) \leq f(x_n, \theta_n)$  we obtain  $f(y_0, \theta_0) \leq f(x_0, \theta_0)$ , contradicting  $y_0 \notin S(\theta_0)$ .

The condition (ii) in Theorem 1 is hard to check. Hence, the following result is of interest:

**THEOREM 2.** *Assume that the problem  $(P_\theta)$  from the introduction satisfies:*

- (i) *the functions  $x \mapsto g_t(x, \theta_0)$ ,  $t \in T$  are strictly quasiconvex and*
- (ii) *there exists  $x_0 \in E^n$  such that, for all  $t \in T$ ,  $g_t(x_0, \theta_0) < 0$  (Slater's condition).*

*Then  $X(\theta) \rightarrow X(\theta_0)$  as  $\theta \rightarrow \theta_0$ .*

In the proof we use the following lemma which has the interest of its own.

**LEMMA.** *Let  $T$  be a compact set and let  $(x, t) \mapsto g_t(x)$  be a continuous function on  $E^n \times T$  which is strictly quasiconvex in  $x$  for every  $t \in T$ . If the Slater's condition*

$$\exists x_0 \in E^n \forall t \in T g_t(x_0) < 0$$

*is satisfied, then*

$$\text{int}\{x \mid g_t(x) \leq 0, t \in T\} = \{x \mid g_t(x) < 0, t \in T\}.$$



PROOF. Let  $a \in E^n$  be such that  $g_t(a) < 0$  for all  $t \in T$ . Assume  $a \notin \text{int}\{x \mid g_t(x) \leq 0, t \in T\}$ . Then, there exist sequences  $(x_n)$  and  $(t_n)$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow a$  and  $g_{t_n}(x_n) > 0$ , for  $n \in N$ . Since  $T$  is compact, there is a subsequence  $(t_{n_k})$ ,  $t_{n_k} \rightarrow t_0$ ,  $t_0 \in T$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Using the continuity, from  $g_{t_{n_k}}(x_{n_k}) > 0$ , if  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain  $g_{t_0}(a) \geq 0$ , which is a contradiction. On the other hand, let  $a \in \text{int}\{x \mid g_t(x) \leq 0, t \in T\}$ . Then, for each  $x$  in some neighbourhood  $K(a, r)$ , we have  $g_t(x) \leq 0, t \in T$ . Assume that for some  $t \in T$ ,  $g_t(x) = 0$  and let  $b \in K(a, r)$  be such that  $a$  is a convex combination of  $x_0$  and  $b$ . Since  $0 = g_t(a) \leq \max\{g_t(x_0), g_t(b)\} \leq 0$ , it must be  $g_t(b) = 0$ . Using the strict quasiconvexity of  $g_t$ , we obtain a contradiction  $g_t(a) < g_t(b) = 0$ . Hence,  $g_t(a) < 0$ , which completes the proof.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. Let  $\theta_n \rightarrow \theta_0$ . We show first that  $x_0$  is a Slater's point of the sets  $X(\theta_n)$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ . Assume the contrary. Then, for some subsequence  $(t_{n_k})$ ,  $t_{n_k} \in T$  we have  $g_{t_{n_k}}(x_0, \theta_{n_k}) \geq 0$ . Since  $T$  is compact, there exists an accumulation point  $t_0 \in T$  of  $(t_{n_k})$ . Using the continuity, we get  $g_{t_0}(x_0, \theta_0) \geq 0$ , which is a contradiction. Hence,  $X(\theta_n) \neq \emptyset$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ . Assume that  $x \in \limsup X(\theta_n)$ . Then, there exists  $(x_n)$ ,  $x_n \in X(\theta_n)$ ,  $n \in N$ , such that  $x$  is an accumulation point of  $(x_n)$ . Using the continuity, from  $g_t(x_n, \theta_n) \leq 0, t \in T$ , we find  $g_t(x_0, \theta_0) \leq 0, t \in T$ . Hence,

$$\limsup X(\theta_n) \subset X(\theta_0).$$

The proof will be completed if we show that

$$X(\theta_0) \subset \liminf X(\theta_n).$$

Since,  $X(\theta_0) = \text{cl int}X(\theta_0)$ , it is sufficient to show that

$$\emptyset \neq \text{int}X(\theta_0) \subset \liminf X(\theta_n). \quad (3)$$

According to the Lemma, we have

$$\text{int}X(\theta_0) = \{x \mid g_t(x, \theta_0) < 0, t \in T\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Let  $a \in \text{int}X(\theta_0)$ . As in the proof of the Lemma, we could show that  $a$  is a Slater's point of  $X(\theta_n)$ , for all  $n \geq n_0$ . The sequence  $(x_n)$ ,  $x_n = a$  for  $n \geq n_0$ , is convergent to  $a$  and satisfies  $x_n \in X(\theta_n)$ . This yields (3). Hence,  $X(\theta) \rightarrow X(\theta_0)$  as  $\theta \rightarrow \theta_0$ .

Combining results of Theorems 1 and 2, we have an operative result concerning stability of a quasiconvex semi-infinite problem. We show by examples that our assumptions are essential.

EXAMPLE 1. Let  $M = R$ ,  $\theta_0 = 0$  and

$$(P_\theta) : \quad \begin{array}{l} \inf \quad -\theta x + y \\ \text{subject to} \\ t\theta^2 x - y \leq 1, \quad t \in [0, 1] \\ y \geq 0. \end{array}$$



Slater's condition is satisfied,  $X(\theta_0)$  is not bounded. The problem is unstable at  $\theta_0$ , since, for  $\theta_n = 1/n$ , the sequence  $s(\theta_n) = (n^2, 0)$  is unbounded.

EXAMPLE 2. Let  $M = C[0, 1] \times C[0, 1]$ ,  $\theta = (a(t), b(t)) \in M$ ,  $\theta_0 = (t, t) \in M$  and

$$(P_\theta) : \quad \begin{array}{ll} \inf & -y \\ \text{subject to} & \\ & x + a(t)y \leq b(t), \quad t \in [0, 1] \\ & x + y \leq 2 \\ & x, y \geq 0 \end{array}$$

$(P_\theta)$  is unstable at  $\theta_0$ , since for  $\theta_n = (a_n(t), b_n(t))$

$$a_n(t) = b_n(t) = \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } 1/n \leq t \leq 1; \\ 1/n, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq 1/n \end{cases}$$

$\theta_n \rightarrow \theta_0$ , but the sequence  $s(\theta_n) = (0, 1)$  does not have accumulation points in  $S(\theta_0) = \{(0, 2)\}$ . Slater's condition is not satisfied.

EXAMPLE 3. Let  $M = \mathcal{R}$ ,  $\theta_0 = 0$  and

$$(P_\theta) : \quad \begin{array}{ll} \inf & -x \\ \text{subject to} & \\ & g(x) + \theta^2 \leq 0 \\ & x \geq 0, \end{array}$$

where

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} x - 1, & x - 1 \leq 0; \\ 0, & 1 \leq x \leq 2, \\ x - 2, & x \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Problem  $(P_\theta)$  is not stable at  $\theta_0$ , since for  $\theta \rightarrow 0$ ,  $s(\theta) = 1 - \theta^2 \rightarrow 1$ , but  $S(\theta_0) = \{2\}$ . The reason lies in the fact that  $g$  is not strictly quasiconvex, although all the other conditions are satisfied.

### 3. CONCLUSION

Theorems 1 and 2 extend the results of Colgen and Schnatz ([4, p. 113–116, 216–218]) concerning parametric linear semi-infinite problem

$$(P_\theta) : \quad \begin{array}{ll} \inf & \langle c, x \rangle \\ \text{subject to} & \\ & \langle a(t), x \rangle \geq b(t), \quad t \in T \end{array}$$

where  $T$  is a compact set,  $M = C(T, E^n) \times C(T) \times E^n$ ,  $\theta = (a(t), b(t), c) \in M$ . Theorems 1 and 2 extend also the result of Brosowski ([4, Th. 11, p. 213]), where

the sublinearity of the objective function is supposed, as well as the well known stability results for the convex case ([1], [3], [5]).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Eremin I. I., Astafiev N. N., *Vvedenie v teoriiu lineinogo i vypuklogo programirovanja*, (Russ.) Nauka, Moskva 1976.
- [2] Dugošija Đ., *Prilog teorijama semiinfinitnog i višekriterijumskog programiranja*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Belgrade, 1986.
- [3] Dantzig G., Folkman J., Shapiro N., *On the continuity of the minimum set of a continuous function*, *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications* 17 (1967), 519–548.
- [4] Brosowski B., *Parametric Semi-Infinite Optimization*, Verlag Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main – Bern, 1982.
- [5] Bank B., Guddat J., Klatte D., Kummer B., Tammer K., *Non-Linear Parametric Optimization*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1982.