

SUFFICIENT OPTIMALITY CONDITIONS FOR MULTI – OBJECTIVE PROGRAMMING PROBLEMS WITH BEN-TAL ALGEBRAIC OPERATIONS

Ioana ILEANA¹

¹University of Bucharest, Doctoral School of Mathematics, Bucharest, Romania

1. PRELIMINARIES AND RELATED RESULTS

Let $\mathbb{R}^n$ be the n -dimensional Euclidian space, and $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+$ the sets of all real numbers and nonnegative numbers, respectively. Throughout this paper, the following convention for vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$ will be followed:

- $x < y$ if and only if $x_i < y_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$,
- $x \leq y$ if and only if $x_i \leq y_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$,
- $x \leq y$ if and only if $x_i \leq y_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, but $x \neq y$
- $x > y$ is the negation of $x < y$.

Now, let us recall generalized operations of addition and multiplication introduced by Ben-Tal.

- 1) Let h be an n vector-valued continuous function, defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and possessing an inverse function h^{-1} . Define the h -vector addition of $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$x \oplus y = h^{-1}(h(x) + h(y))$$

and the h scalar multiplication of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\alpha \otimes x = h^{-1}(\alpha h(x)).$$

- 2) Let φ be a real-valued continuous function, defined on $\mathbb{R}$ and possessing an inverse function φ^{-1} . Then, the φ -addition of two numbers, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, is given by

$$\alpha [+] \beta = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta)),$$

and the φ -scalar multiplication of $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\beta [\cdot] \alpha = \varphi^{-1}(\beta \varphi(\alpha)).$$

Denote

$$\oplus_{i=1}^m x^i = x^1 \oplus x^2 \oplus \dots \oplus x^m, x^i \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

$$[\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i] = \alpha_1 [+] \alpha_2 [+] \dots [+] \alpha_m, i = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

$$\alpha [-] \beta = \alpha [+] ((-1) [\cdot] \beta), \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$$

In the above Ben-Tal generalized algebraic operations, it is worth noting that $\beta [\cdot] \alpha$ may not be equal to $\alpha [\cdot] \beta$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. In addition it is clear that $1 \otimes x = x$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $1 [\cdot] \alpha = \alpha$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the following conclusions can be obtained with ease

$$\varphi(\alpha [\cdot] \beta) = \alpha \varphi(\beta), h(\alpha \otimes x) = \alpha h(x),$$

$$\alpha [-] \beta = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) - \varphi(\beta)).$$

Avriel introduced the following concept, which plays an important role in our paper.

Definition 2.1 Let f be a real-valued function defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$, denote $\hat{f}(t) = \varphi(f(h^{-1}(t)))$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

For simplicity, write $\hat{f}(t) = \varphi f h^{-1}(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The function f is said to be (h, φ) -differentiable at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ if $\hat{f}(t)$ is differentiable at $t = h(x)$, and denoted by $\nabla^* f(x) = h^{-1}(\nabla \hat{f}(t)|_{t=h(x)})$. In addition, it is said that f is

(h, φ) -differentiable on $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ if it is (h, φ) -differentiable at each $x \in X$. A vector valued function is called (h, φ) -differentiable on $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ if each of its components is (h, φ) -differentiable on X .

If f is differentiable at x , then f is (h, φ) -differentiable at x . We obtain this fact by setting h and φ are identity functions, respectively. However, the converse is not true.

Definition 2.2 Let X be a nonempty subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ a functional $F: X \times X \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is called (h, φ) -sublinear if for any $x, \bar{x} \in X$,

$$F(x, \bar{x}; a_1 + a_2) \leq F(x, \bar{x}; a_1) [+] F(x, \bar{x}; a_2), \forall a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$F(x, \bar{x}; \alpha \otimes a) \leq \alpha [-] F(x, \bar{x}; a), \forall a \in \mathbb{R}^n, \alpha \geq 0,$$

From the above definition, we can easily obtain that if F is a (h, φ) -sublinear functional then

$$F(x, \bar{x}; \oplus_{i=1}^m a_i) \leq [\sum_{i=1}^m F(x, \bar{x}; a_i)], a_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, \dots, m$$

We collect the following properties of Ben-Tal generalized algebraic operations and (h, φ) -differentiable functions from literature, which will be used in the sequel.

Lemma 2.1 suppose that f is a real-valued function defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and (h, φ) -differentiable at $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, the following statements hold:

- (a) Let $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Then

$$\oplus_{i=1}^m (\lambda_i \otimes x^i) = h^{-1}(\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i h(x^i)), \oplus_{i=1}^m x^i = h^{-1}(\sum_{i=1}^m h(x^i)).$$

- (b) Let $\mu_i, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^m (\mu_i \varphi(\alpha_i)) = \varphi^{-1}(\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \varphi(\alpha_i)), [\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i] = \varphi^{-1}(\sum_{i=1}^m \varphi(\alpha_i)).$$

- (c) For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha [\cdot] f$ is (h, φ) -differentiable at $\bar{x}$ and $\nabla^*(\alpha [\cdot] f(\bar{x})) = \alpha \otimes \nabla^* f(\bar{x})$.

We need more properties of Ben-Tal generalized algebraic operations.

Lemma 2.2 Let $i=1,2,\dots,m$. The following statements hold:

- (a) For $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\alpha[\cdot](\beta[\cdot]\gamma) = \beta[\cdot](\alpha[\cdot]\gamma) = (\alpha\beta)[\cdot]\gamma$
- (b) For $\beta, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\beta[\cdot](\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i) = \sum_{i=1}^m (\beta[\cdot]\alpha_i)$.
- (c) For $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\gamma[\cdot](\alpha[-]\beta) = (\gamma[\cdot]\alpha)[-](\gamma[\cdot]\beta)$.
- (d) For $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ then $\sum_{i=1}^m (\alpha[-]\beta) = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i [-] \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^m (\alpha[+]\beta) = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i [+]\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i$$

Lemma 2.3 Suppose that function φ , appears in Ben-Tal generalized algebraic operations, is strictly monotone with $\varphi(0) = 0$. Then, the following statements hold:

- (a) Let $\gamma \geq 0, \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\alpha \leq \beta$. Then $\gamma[\cdot]\alpha \leq \gamma[\cdot]\beta$.
- (b) Let $\gamma \geq 0, \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\alpha < \beta$. Then $\gamma[\cdot]\alpha \leq \gamma[\cdot]\beta$.
- (c) Let $\gamma > 0, \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\alpha < \beta$. Then $\gamma[\cdot]\alpha < \gamma[\cdot]\beta$.
- (d) Let $\gamma < 0, \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\alpha \geq \beta$. Then $\gamma[\cdot]\alpha \leq \gamma[\cdot]\beta$.
- (e) Let $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}, i \in M=\{1,2,\dots,m\}$. If $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$, for any $i \in M$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i.$$

If $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$ for any $i \in M$ and there exists at least an index $k \in M$ such that $\alpha_k < \beta_k$ then

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i < \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i.$$

Lemma 2.4 Suppose that φ is a continuous one-to-one strictly monotone and onto function with $\varphi(0)=0$.

Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\alpha < \beta \Leftrightarrow \alpha[-]\beta < 0$$

$$\alpha \leq \beta \Leftrightarrow \alpha[-]\beta \leq 0$$

$$\alpha[+]\beta < 0 \Rightarrow \alpha < (-1)[\cdot]\beta$$

$$\alpha[+]\beta < 0 \Rightarrow \alpha < (-1)[\cdot]\beta$$

$$\alpha[+]\beta \leq 0 \Rightarrow \alpha \leq (-1)[\cdot]\beta$$

Throughout this paper, we further assume that h is a continuous one-to-one and onto function with $h(0) = 0$.

Similarly, suppose that φ is a continuous one-to-one strictly monotone and onto function with $\varphi(0) = 0$.

Under the above assumptions, it is clear that $0[\cdot]\alpha = \alpha[\cdot]0=0$, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let X be a nonempty subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $C: X \times X \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is (h, φ) -convex and the functions:

$f = (f_1, \dots, f_k): X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ and $a = (a_1, \dots, a_m): X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ are (h, φ) -differentiable on the set X , with respect to the same (h, φ) . Let $\rho = (\rho^1, \rho^2)$, where $\rho^1 = (\rho_1^1, \dots, \rho_k^1) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $\rho^2 = (\rho_1^2, \dots, \rho_m^2) \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

Let $\theta(\cdot, \cdot): X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Consider the following multi-objective programming problem:

$(P_1)_{h,\varphi}$: $\min f(x) = (f_1(x), \dots, f_k(x)), x \in X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, such that $a(x) \leq 0$.

Let X_0 denote the feasible solutions for $(P_1)_{h,\varphi}$, assumed to be nonempty, that is:

$$X_0 = \{x \in X / a(x) \leq 0\}$$

We denote $K = \{1, \dots, k\}$, $M = \{1, \dots, m\}$.

For $\bar{x} \in X_0$, we denote $M(\bar{x}) = \{j \in M, a_j(\bar{x}) = 0\}$.

Definition 2.3 For $i \in K$, (f_i, a) is $(h, \varphi) - (C, \rho, \theta)$ -type I at $\bar{x} \in X$ if for all $x \in X_0$, such that

$$f_i(x)[-]f_i(\bar{x}) \geq C_{x,\bar{x}}(\nabla^* f_i(\bar{x}))[+](\rho_i^1[\cdot]\theta(x, \bar{x})), i \in M$$

and

$$(-1)[\cdot]a_j(\bar{x}) \geq C_{x,\bar{x}}(\nabla^* a_j(\bar{x}))[+](\rho_j^2[\cdot]\theta(x, \bar{x})), j \in M$$

In the above definition $x \neq \bar{x}$ and (16) is a strict inequality, then we say that (f_i, a) is semi-strictly $(h, \varphi) - (C, \rho, \theta)$ -type I at $\bar{x}$.

Definition 2.4 For $i \in K$, (f_i, a) is said to be quasi $(h, \varphi) - (C, \rho, \theta)$ -type I at $\bar{x} \in X$ if for all $x \in C$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k f_i(x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k f_i(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^k C_{x,\bar{x}}(\nabla^* f_i(\bar{x}))[+]\sum_{i=1}^k (\rho_i^1[\cdot]\theta(x, \bar{x})) \leq 0,$$

and

$$(-1)[\cdot] \sum_{j=1}^p a_j(\bar{x}) \leq 0 \Rightarrow$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^p C_{x,\bar{x}}(\nabla^* a_i(\bar{x})) [+] \sum_{j=1}^p (\rho_j^2) [\cdot] \theta(x, \bar{x}) \leq 0.$$

Definition 2.5 For $i \in K$, (f_i, a) is said to be pseudo $(h, \varphi) - (C, \rho, \theta)$ -type I at $\bar{x} \in X$ if for all $x \in C$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k C_{x,\bar{x}}(\nabla^* f_i(\bar{x})) [+] \sum_{i=1}^k (\rho_i^1) [\cdot] \theta(x, \bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^k f_i(x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k f_i(\bar{x})$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^p C_{x,\bar{x}}(\nabla^* a_i(\bar{x})) [+] \sum_{j=1}^p (\rho_j^2) [\cdot] \theta(x, \bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow$$

$$(-1)[\cdot] \sum_{j=1}^p a_j(\bar{x}) \geq 0.$$

Definition 2.6 For $i \in K$, (f_i, a) is said to be pseudo $(h, \varphi) - (C, \rho, \theta)$ -type I at $\bar{x} \in X$ if for all $x \in C$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k f_i(x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k f_i(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^k C_{x,\bar{x}}(\nabla^* f_i(\bar{x})) [+] \sum_{i=1}^k (\rho_i^1) [\cdot] \theta(x, \bar{x}) \leq 0,$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^p C_{x,\bar{x}}(\nabla^* a_i(\bar{x})) [+] \sum_{j=1}^p (\rho_j^2) [\cdot] \theta(x, \bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow$$

$$(-1)[\cdot] \sum_{j=1}^p a_j(\bar{x}) \geq 0.$$

Definition 2.7 For $i \in K$, (f_i, a) is said to be pseudo quasi $(h, \varphi) - (C, \rho, \theta)$ -type I at $\bar{x} \in X$ if for all $x \in C$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k C_{x,\bar{x}}(\nabla^* f_i(\bar{x})) [+] \sum_{i=1}^k (\rho_i^1) [\cdot] \theta(x, \bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^k f_i(x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k f_i(\bar{x})$$

and

$$(-1)[\cdot] \sum_{j=1}^p a_j(\bar{x}) \leq 0 \Rightarrow$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^p C_{x,\bar{x}}(\nabla^* a_i(\bar{x})) [+] \sum_{j=1}^p (\rho_j^2) [\cdot] \theta(x, \bar{x}) \leq 0.$$

3. SUFFICIENT OPTIMALITY CONDITIONS

In this section, we establish sufficient optimality conditions for a feasible solution $\bar{x}$ to be a weak minimum for $(P_1)_{h,\varphi}$, under the $(h, \varphi) - (C, \rho, \theta)$ -type I and pseudo quasi $(h, \varphi) - (C, \rho, \theta)$ -type I assumptions.

Theorem 3.1 Suppose that there exist a feasible solution $\bar{x} \in C$ and $\bar{\lambda} = (\bar{\lambda}_1, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $\bar{\lambda} \geq 0$, $\bar{\mu}_j \geq 0$, $j \in M(\bar{x})$, $\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{\lambda}_i + \sum_{j=1}^m \bar{\mu}_j = 1$ such that

$$(\oplus_{i=1}^k (\bar{\lambda}_i \otimes \nabla^* f_i(\bar{x}))) \oplus (\oplus_{j \in M(\bar{x})} (\bar{\mu}_j \otimes \nabla^* a_j(\bar{x}))) = 0.$$

If for $i \in K$, $(f_i, g_{J(x)})$ is $(h, \varphi) - (C, \rho, \theta)$ -type I at $\bar{x}$ with

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^k (\bar{\lambda}_i \rho_i^1) [\cdot] \theta(\cdot, \bar{x})\right) [+]\left(\sum_{j \in J(\bar{x})} (\bar{\mu}_j \rho_j^2) [\cdot] (\theta(\cdot, \bar{x}))\right) \geq 0,$$

where $a_{J(\bar{x})} = (a_j)_{j \in J(\bar{x})}$. Then $\bar{x}$ is a weak minimum for $(P_1)_{h,\varphi}$.

Theorem 3.2 Suppose that there exist $\bar{x} \in C$ and $\bar{\lambda} = (\bar{\lambda}_1, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$,

$$\bar{\lambda} \geq 0, \bar{\mu}_j \geq 0, j \in M(\bar{x}).$$

If for $i \in K$, $(\bar{\lambda}_i [\cdot] f_i, \bar{G}_{J(x)})$ is pseudo quasi $(h, \varphi) - (C, \rho, \theta)$ -type I at $\bar{x}$ with

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^k (\rho_i^1) [\cdot] \theta(\cdot, \bar{x})\right) [+]\left(\sum_{j \in J(\bar{x})} (\rho_j^2) [\cdot] (\theta(\cdot, \bar{x}))\right) \geq 0,$$

Where $\bar{G}_{J(x)} = (\bar{G}_j)_{j \in J(x)}$, $\bar{G}_j = \bar{\mu}_j [\cdot] g_j$, then $\bar{x}$ is a weak minimum for $(P_1)_{h,\varphi}$.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- [1] Avriel, M.: *Nonlinear Programming: Analysis and Methods*, Penitence Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1976.
- [2] Ben Tal A.: *On generalized means and Generalized convex functions*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 21 (1977) 1-13.
- [3] Mishra, S. K., Noor, M. A.: *Some Nondifferentiable Multi-objective Programming Problems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 310 (2005) 626-640.
- [4] Rueda, N. G., Hanson, M. A. : *Optimality Criteria in Mathematical Programming Involving Generalized Invexity*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 130 (1998) 375-385.
- [5] Singh, C.: *Optimality Conditions in Multiobjective Differentiable Programming*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 53 (1987) 115-123.
- [6] Suneja, S. K., Srivastava, M. K.: *Optimality and Duality in Nondifferentiable Multiobjective Optimization Involving D-type I and Related Functions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 206 (1997) 465-479.
- [7] Xu, Y. H, Liu, S. Y. : *Kuhn-tucker Necessary Conditions for (h, φ) - multiobjective Optimization Problems*, Journal of Systems and Complexity 17 (2004) 472-484.