REVUE D'ANALYSE NUMÉRIQUE ET DE THÉORIE DE L'APPROXIMATION Rev. Anal. Numér. Théor. Approx., vol. 33 (2004) no. 2, pp. 183-187 ictp.acad.ro/jnaat

E-CONVEX PROGRAMMING

LIANA LUPȘA* and DOREL I. DUCA*

Dedicated to Professor Elena Popoviciu on the occasion of her 80th birthday.

Abstract. In [6] one shows that some of the results obtained in [5] on E-convex programming are incorrect. In this paper we recover these results in the new hypotheses.

MSC 2000. 52A07, 90C29.

Keywords. *E*-convex functions, slack 2-convex set with respect to a given set, *E*-convex programming problems.

1. INTRODUCTION

The concepts of E-convex set and E-convex function were introduced in Ref. [5]. For convenience, we remind these definitions.

DEFINITION 1. A set $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be E-convex if there is a map $E : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

(1) $(1-\lambda)E(x) + \lambda E(y) \in M$, for each $x, y \in M$ and $0 \le \lambda \le 1$.

DEFINITION 2. A function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be E-convex on a set $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ if there is a map $E : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that M is an E-convex set and

(2)
$$f(\lambda E(x) + (1-\lambda)E(y)) \le \lambda f(E(x)) + (1-\lambda)f(E(y)),$$

for each $x, y \in M$ and $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$.

Unfortunately, some of the results obtained in Ref. [5] are incorrect. Indeed, in Ref. [6] one shows that all the results obtained in Ref [5] on E-convex programming are incorrect. In this paper we recover these results in the new hypotheses.

First we remark that, according to Definition 1, each set $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is *E*-convex. Indeed, the empty set is *E*-convex for any map $E : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and, if $M \neq \emptyset$ and $m \in M$, then the map *E* defined by

(3)
$$E(x) = m$$
, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

satisfies (1), for all $x, y \in M$ and all $0 \le \lambda \le 1$.

^{*&}quot;Babeş-Bolyai" University, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Sciences, 1 Kogălniceanu St., 400084 Cluj-Napoca, Romania, e-mail: {llupsa,dduca}@math.ubbcluj.ro.

Therefore, we shall restrict this concept to the following definition:

DEFINITION 3. Let $E : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a given map. We say that a subset M of \mathbb{R}^n is E-convex if

(4)
$$(1-t)E(x) + tE(y) \in M,$$

for all $x, y \in M$ and all $0 \le t \le 1$.

It is also obvious that, according to Definition 2, each function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is *E*-convex on each non-empty subset *M* of \mathbb{R}^n . Indeed, let $m \in M$; then, the map $E : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by (3) satisfies (2), for all $x, y \in M$ and all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ (according to the remark above, the set *M* is *E*-convex).

Therefore, we shall also restrict this concept to the following definition:

DEFINITION 4. Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a non-empty subset of \mathbb{R}^n and $E : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a map. A function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be E-convex on M if M is E-convex and

(5)
$$f((1-t)E(x) + tE(y)) \le (1-t)f(E(x)) + tf(E(y)),$$

for all $x, y \in M$ and all $0 \leq t \leq 1$.

Because, in the following, we use the notion of slack 2-convexity with respect to a given set (see [3], or [1]) we remind this notion.

DEFINITION 5. Let A and B be two non-empty subsets of \mathbb{R}^n . We say that A is slack 2-convex with respect to B if for each $x, y \in A \cap B$ and each $t \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$(1-t)x + ty \in B,$$

we have

 $(1-t)x + ty \in A.$

REMARK 1. If the set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is slack 2-convex with respect to the set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, then the set $A \cap C$ is also slack 2-convex with respect to B, for all sets $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$.

2. E-CONVEX PROGRAMMING

Let $E : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a function and $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an *E*-convex set. We consider the following *E*-convex programming problem:

(P)
$$\begin{cases} f(x) \to \min \\ g_i(x) \le 0, \ i \in \{1, ..., m\} \\ x \in M, \end{cases}$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, $i \in \{1, ..., m\}$, are *E*-convex functions.

THEOREM 6. The set of the feasible solutions of Problem (P), i.e. the set

$$S = \{x \in M \mid g_i(x) \le 0, \text{ for all } i \in \{1, ..., m\}\},\$$

and the set

$$S_E = S \bigcap E(M)$$

are slack 2-convex with respect to E(M).

Proof. If we can prove that S is slack 2-convex with respect to E(M) then, in view of Remark 1, we get that S_E is also slack 2-convex with respect to E(M).

Let x', x'' be two elements of $S \cap E(M)$ and $t \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$(1-t)x' + tx'' \in E(M).$$

Then we have

$$g_i(x') \le 0$$
 and $g_i(x'') \le 0$, for all $i \in \{1, ..., m\}$,

and there are $y', y'' \in M$ such that

$$x' = E(y')$$
 and $x'' = E(y'')$.

Because of the *E*-convexity of the set M, we get that

(6)
$$(1-t)x' + tx'' = (1-t)E(y') + tE(y'') \in M.$$

Also, for each $i \in \{1, ..., m\}$, we obtain

(7)
$$g_i((1-t)x' + tx'') = g_i((1-t)E(y') + tE(y''))$$
$$\leq (1-t)g_i(E(y')) + tg_i(E(y''))$$
$$= (1-t)g_i(x') + tg_i(x'')$$
$$\leq 0.$$

From (6) and (7) we get $(1-t)x' + tx'' \in S$. Therefore, in view of Definition 5, the set S is slack 2-convex with respect to E(M).

THEOREM 7. If $S \subseteq E(M)$, then the set S_0 of the optimal solutions of Problem (P) is slack 2-convex with respect to E(M).

Proof. If S_0 is the empty set, then it is slack 2-convex with respect to E(M). Suppose that it is non-empty and let $x', x'' \in S_0 \cap E(M)$. Let $t \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$x = (1-t)x' + tx'' \in E(M).$$

Applying Theorem 6, we get that $x \in S$. Let $f_0 = f(x') = f(x'')$. Because $x', x'' \in E(M)$, there exist $y', y'' \in M$ such that

$$x' = E(y')$$
 and $x'' = E(y'')$.

Because of the E-convexity of the function f, we obtain

$$f((1-t)x' + tx'') = f((1-t)E(y') + tE(y''))$$

$$\leq (1-t)f(E(y')) + tf(E(y''))$$

$$= (1-t)f(x') + tf(x'')$$

$$= (1-t)f_0 + tf_0$$

$$= f_0.$$

Therefore $x \in S_0$.

THEOREM 8. If $S \subseteq E(M)$ and $x^0 \in intS$ is a local minimum point of f with respect to S, then x^0 is an optimal solution of Problem (P).

Proof. As $x^0 \in intS \subseteq E(M)$ is a local minimum point of f, it results that there is a real number r > 0, such that

(8)
$$B(x^0, r) \subseteq E(M)$$

and

(9)
$$f(x) \ge f(x^0)$$
, for all $x \in B(x^0, r) \bigcap S$.

If we suppose that x^0 is not an optimal solution of Problem (P), then there is $x^* \in S$ such that

 $f(x^*) < f(x^0).$

Obviously,

$$||x^0 - x^*|| \ge r.$$

Let

$$t = \frac{r}{2||x^0 - x^*||}.$$

Then

(10)
$$x = (1-t)x^0 + tx^* \in B(x^0, r),$$

and (8) implies

 $x \in E(M).$

Applying Theorem 6, we obtain

 $(11) x \in S.$

On the other hand, the hypothesis $S \subseteq E(M)$ implies that there are $y^0 \in M$ and $y^* \in M$ such that

$$x^{0} = E(y^{0})$$
 and $x^{*} = E(y^{*})$.

The function f being E-convex, we have

$$f(x) = f((1 - t)E(y^{0}) + tE(y^{*}))$$

$$\leq (1 - t)f(E(y^{0})) + tf(E(y^{*}))$$

$$= (1 - t)f(x^{0}) + tf(x^{*})$$

$$< f(x^{0}).$$

The last strict inequality and the relations (10) and (11) contradict (9). Therefore, x^0 is an optimal solution of Problem (P).

REFERENCES

- CRISTESCU, G. and LUPŞA, L. Non-connected Convexities and Applications, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht-Boston-London, 2002.
- [2] DUCA D., DUCA E., LUPŞA L. and BLAGA, R., E-Convex Functions, Bulletins for Applied & Computer Mathematics, Budapest 2000; BAM 1804/2000 XCII, pp. 95–101.
- [3] LUPŞA, L., On a convexity notion, in Seminarul itinerant de ecuații funcționale, aproximare şi convexitate, 1980, 7-8 noiembrie, Timişoara, Timişoara University Publishing House, pp. 127–135, 1980 (in Romanian).
- [4] LUPŞA, L., Slack convexity with respect to a given set, in Seminarul itinerant de ecuații funcționale, aproximare și convexitate, 1985, Cluj-Napoca, "Babeş-Bolyai" University Publishing House, pp. 107–114, 1985 (in Romanian).
- YOUNNES, E. A., E-Convex Sets, E-Convex Functions, and E-Convex Programming, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 109, no. 2, pp. 439–450, 2001.
- YANG, X. M., On E-Convex Sets, E-Convex Functions, and E-Convex Programming, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 109, no. 3, pp. 699–704, 2001.

Received by the editors: March 17, 2004.