

Nonconvex Optimization and Its Applications

Volume 90

Managing Editor:

Panos Pardalos, University of Florida

Advisory Board:

J.R. Birge, University of Chicago, USA

Ding-Zhu Du, University of Minnesota, USA

C.A. Floudas, Princeton University, USA

J. Mockus, Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, Lithuania

H.D. Sherali, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, USA

G.E. Stavroulakis, Technical University Braunschweig, Germany

H. Tuy, National Centre for Natural Science and Technology, Vietnam

Shashi Kant Mishra • Shou-Yang Wang
Kin Keung Lai

Generalized Convexity and Vector Optimization

 Springer

Dr. Shashi Kant Mishra
Banaras Hindu University
Faculty of Science
Department of Mathematics
Varanasi-221005
India
shashikant.dr@ gmail.com

Prof. Shou-Yang Wang
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Academy of Mathematics
and Systems Sciences
100080 Beijing
People's Republic of China
sywang@amss.ac.cn

Prof. Kin Keung Lai
City University of Hong Kong
Department of Management Sciences
Faculty of Business
83 Tat Chee Avenue
Kowloon Tong
Hong Kong
mskklai@cityu.edu.hk

ISBN 978-3-540-85670-2 e-ISBN 978-3-540-85671-9

Nonconvex Optimization and Its Applications ISSN 1571-568X

Library of Congress Control Number: 2008936488

© 2009 Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilm or in any other way, and storage in data banks. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the German Copyright Law of September 9, 1965, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Violations are liable to prosecution under the German Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

Cover design: WMX Design GmbH, Heidelberg

Printed on acid-free paper

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

springer.com

Preface

The present lecture note is dedicated to the study of the optimality conditions and the duality results for nonlinear vector optimization problems, in finite and infinite dimensions. The problems include are nonlinear vector optimization problems, symmetric dual problems, continuous-time vector optimization problems, relationships between vector optimization and variational inequality problems.

Nonlinear vector optimization problems arise in several contexts such as in the building and interpretation of economic models; the study of various technological processes; the development of optimal choices in finance; management science; production processes; transportation problems and statistical decisions, etc.

In preparing this lecture note a special effort has been made to obtain a self-contained treatment of the subjects; so we hope that this may be a suitable source for a beginner in this fast growing area of research, a semester graduate course in nonlinear programming, and a good reference book. This book may be useful to theoretical economists, engineers, and applied researchers involved in this area of active research.

The lecture note is divided into eight chapters:

Chapter 1 briefly deals with the notion of nonlinear programming problems with basic notations and preliminaries.

Chapter 2 deals with various concepts of convex sets, convex functions, invex set, invex functions, quasiinvex functions, pseudoinvex functions, type I and generalized type I functions, V-invex functions, and univex functions.

Chapter 3 covers some new type of generalized convex functions, such as Type I univex functions, generalized type I univex functions, nondifferentiable d-type I, nondifferentiable pseudo-d-type I, nondifferentiable quasi d-type I and related functions, and similar concepts for continuous-time case, for nonsmooth continuous-time case, and for n-set functions are introduced.

Chapter 4 deals with the optimality conditions for multiobjective programming problems, nondifferentiable programming problems, minimax fractional programming problems, mathematical programming problems in Banach spaces, in complex spaces, continuous-time programming problems, nonsmooth continuous-time programming

problems, and multiobjective fractional subset programming problems under the assumptions of some generalized convexity given in Chap. 3.

In Chap. 5 we give Mond–Weir type and General Mond–Weir type duality results for primal problems given in Chap. 4. Moreover, duality results for nonsmooth programming problems and control problems are also given in Chap. 5.

Chapter 6 deals with second and higher order duality results for minimax programming problems, nondifferentiable minimax programming problems, nondifferentiable mathematical programming problems under assumptions generalized convexity conditions.

Chapter 7 is about symmetric duality results for mathematical programming problems, mixed symmetric duality results for nondifferentiable multiobjective programming problems, minimax mixed integer programming problems, and symmetric duality results for nondifferentiable multiobjective fractional variational problems.

Chapter 8 is about relationships between vector variational-like inequality problems and vector optimization problems under various assumptions of generalized convexity. Such relationships are also studied for nonsmooth vector optimization problems as well. Some characterization of generalized univex functions using generalized monotonicity are also given in this chapter.

Varanasi, India
Beijing, China
Hong Kong

Shashi Kant Mishra
Shou-Yang Wang
Kin Keung Lai

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Nonlinear Symmetric Dual Pair of Programming Problems	3
1.2	Motivation	4
2	Generalized Convex Functions	7
2.1	Convex and Generalized Convex Functions	8
2.2	Invex and Generalized Invex Functions	10
2.3	Type I and Related Functions	12
2.4	Univex and Related Functions	16
2.5	V-Invex and Related Functions	18
2.6	Further Generalized Convex Functions	22
3	Generalized Type I and Related Functions	25
3.1	Generalized Type I Univex Functions	25
3.2	Nondifferentiable d -Type I and Related Functions	27
3.3	Continuous-Time Analogue of Generalized Type I Functions	28
3.4	Nondifferentiable Continuous-Time Analogue of Generalized Type I Functions	31
3.5	Generalized Convex Functions in Complex Spaces	32
3.6	Semilocally Connected Type I Functions	33
3.7	$(\mathbb{F}, \rho, \sigma, \theta)$ -V-Type-I and Related n -Set Functions	36
3.8	Nondifferentiable d -V-Type-I and Related Functions	38
3.9	Nonsmooth Invex and Related Functions	40
3.10	Type I and Related Functions in Banach Spaces	41
4	Optimality Conditions	45
4.1	Optimality Conditions for Vector Optimization Problems	45
4.2	Optimality Conditions for Nondifferentiable Vector Optimization Problems	48
4.3	Optimality Conditions for Minimax Fractional Programs	51

4.4	Optimality Conditions for Vector Optimization Problems on Banach Spaces	56
4.5	Optimality Conditions for Complex Minimax Programs on Complex Spaces	58
4.6	Optimality Conditions for Continuous-Time Optimization Problems	60
4.7	Optimality Conditions for Nondifferentiable Continuous-Time Optimization Problems	67
4.8	Optimality Conditions for Fractional Optimization Problems with Semilocally Type I Pre-invex Functions	73
4.9	Optimality Conditions for Vector Fractional Subset Optimization Problems	80
5	Duality Theory	91
5.1	Mond–Weir Type Duality for Vector Optimization Problems	91
5.2	General Mond–Weir Type Duality for Vector Optimization Problems	94
5.3	Mond–Weir Duality for Nondifferentiable Vector Optimization Problems	96
5.4	General Mond–Weir Duality for Nondifferentiable Vector Optimization Problems	99
5.5	Mond–Weir Duality for Nondifferentiable Vector Optimization Problems with d –Univex Functions	101
5.6	General Mond–Weir Duality for Nondifferentiable Vector Optimization Problems with d –Univex Functions	105
5.7	Mond–Weir Duality for Nondifferentiable Vector Optimization Problems with d –Type-I Univex Functions	107
5.8	General Mond–Weir Duality for Nondifferentiable Vector Optimization Problems with d –Type-I Univex Functions	111
5.9	First Duality Model for Fractional Minimax Programs	114
5.10	Second Duality Model for Fractional Minimax Programs	117
5.11	Third Duality Model for Fractional Minimax Programs	119
5.12	Mond–Weir Duality for Nondifferentiable Vector Optimization Problems	121
5.13	Duality for Vector Optimization Problems on Banach Spaces	126
5.14	First Dual Model for Complex Minimax Programs	128
5.15	Second Dual Model for Complex Minimax Programs	132
5.16	Mond–Weir Duality for Continuous–Time Vector Optimization Problems	135
5.17	General Mond–Weir Duality for Continuous–Time Vector Optimization Problems	138
5.18	Duality for Nondifferentiable Continuous–Time Optimization Problems	141
5.19	Duality for Vector Control Problems	144
5.20	Duality for Vector Fractional Subset Optimization Problems	152

6	Second and Higher Order Duality	165
6.1	Second Order Duality for Nonlinear Optimization Problems	165
6.2	Second Order Duality for Minimax Programs	169
6.3	Second Order Duality for Nondifferentiable Minimax Programs ...	176
6.4	Higher Order Duality for Nonlinear Optimization Problems	181
6.5	Mond–Weir Higher Order Duality for Nonlinear Optimization Problems	184
6.6	General Mond–Weir Higher Order Duality for Nonlinear Optimization Problems	188
6.7	Mangasarian Type Higher Order Duality for Nondifferentiable Optimization Problems	189
6.8	Mond–Weir Type Higher Order Duality for Nondifferentiable Optimization Problems	193
6.9	General Mond–Weir Type Higher Order Duality for Nondifferentiable Optimization Problems	195
7	Symmetric Duality	199
7.1	Higher Order Symmetric Duality	199
7.2	Mond–Weir Type Higher Order Symmetric Duality	203
7.3	Self Duality	209
7.4	Higher Order Vector Nondifferentiable Symmetric Duality	210
7.5	Minimax Mixed Integer Optimization Problems	214
7.6	Mixed Symmetric Duality in Nondifferentiable Vector Optimization Problems	215
7.7	Mond–Weir Type Mixed Symmetric First and Second Order Duality in Nondifferentiable Optimization Problems	224
7.8	Second Order Mixed Symmetric Duality in Nondifferentiable Vector Optimization Problems	232
7.9	Symmetric Duality for a Class of Nondifferentiable Vector Fractional Variational problems	241
8	Vector Variational-like Inequality Problems	255
8.1	Relationships Between Vector Variational-Like Inequalities and Vector Optimization Problems	255
8.2	On Relationships Between Vector Variational Inequalities and Vector Optimization Problems with Pseudo-Univexity	260
8.3	Relationship Between Vector Variational-Like Inequalities and Nondifferentiable Vector Optimization Problems	264
8.4	Characterization of Generalized Univex functions	269
8.5	Characterization of Nondifferentiable Generalized Invex Functions .	275
	References	281
	Index	293

Chapter 1

Introduction

Nonlinear vector optimization (NVO) deals with optimization models with at least one nonlinear function, also called continuous optimization or smooth optimization. A general model is in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } f(x) \\ & \text{subject to} \\ & \quad x \in X \\ & \quad g_i(x) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m \\ & \quad h_j(x) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k. \end{aligned}$$

Functions $f : X \rightarrow R$, $g : X \rightarrow R^m$ and $h : X \rightarrow R^k$ are assumed to be continuously differentiable (*i.e.*, smooth functions), and $X \subseteq R^n$ is assumed to be open.

Let $K = \{x : x \in X, g(x) \leq 0, h(x) = 0\}$ denote the set of all feasible solutions of the problem (P).

Linear programming aroused interest in constraints in the form of inequalities and in the theory of linear inequalities and convex sets. The study of Kuhn–Tucker (Kuhn was a student of Tucker and became the principal investigator, worked together on several projects dealing with linear and nonlinear programming problems under generous sponsorship of the Naval Research from 1948 until 1972) appeared in the middle of this interest with a full recognition of such developments.

Kuhn–Tucker (1951) first used the name “Nonlinear Programming.” However, the theory of nonlinear programming when the constraints are all in the form of equalities has been known for a long time. The inequality constraints were treated in a fairly satisfactory manner by Karush (1939) in his M.Sc. thesis, at the Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago. A summary of the thesis was published as an appendix to: Kuhn (1976). Karush’s work is apparently under the influence of a similar work in the calculus of variations by Valentine (1937). As a struggling graduate student meeting requirements for going on to his Ph.D., the thought of publication never occurred to Karush and he was not encouraged to publish his Master’s thesis by his supervisor L.M. Graves. At that time, no one anticipated the future

interest in these problems and their potential practical applications. The school of classical calculus of variations at Chicago also popularized the theory of optimal control under the name of the “Pontryagin’s maximum principle.”

It was not the calculus of variations, optimization or control theory that motivated Fritz John, but rather the direct desire to find a method that would help to prove inequalities as they occur in geometry. Next to Karush, but still prior to Kuhn and Tucker, Fritz John (1948) considered the nonlinear programming problem with inequality constraints.

In May of 1948, Dantzig visited von Neumann in Princeton to discuss potential connections between the then very new subject of linear programming and the theory of games. Tucker happened to give Dantzig a lift to the train station for his return trip to Washington DC. On the way, Dantzig gave a short exposition of what linear programming was, using the transportation problem as a simple illustrative example. This sounded like Kirkhoff’s Law to Tucker and he made this observation during the ride, but thought little about it until September of 1949.

On leave at Stanford in the fall of 1949, Tucker had a chance to return to the question: what was the relation between linear programming and the Kirkhoff-Maxwell treatment of electrical networks. It was at this point that Tucker (1957) recognized the parallel between Maxwell’s potentials and Lagrange multipliers, and identified the underlying optimization problem of minimizing heat loss. Tucker then wrote Gale and Kuhn, inviting them to do a sequel to (Gale et al. 1951). Gale declined, Kuhn accepted and paper developed by correspondence between Stanford and Princeton shifted emphasis from the quadratic case to the general nonlinear programming problem and to properties of *convexity* that imply the *necessary conditions for an optimum are also sufficient*.

A convex nonlinear programming problem can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{(P)} \quad & \text{minimize } f(x) \\
 & \text{subject to} \\
 & x \in X \\
 & g_i(x) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m \\
 & h_j(x) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k.
 \end{aligned}$$

Functions f , g and h are assumed to be convex.

Nicest among nonlinear programs, useful necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for global minimum are only known for convex programming problems.

The *Fritz John necessary condition* (John 1948) for a feasible point x^* to be optimal for (P) is the existence of $\lambda_0^* \in R$, $\lambda^* \in R^m$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda_0^* \nabla f(x^*) + \lambda^{*T} \nabla g(x^*) &= 0 \\
 \lambda^{*T} g(x^*) &= 0 \\
 (\lambda_0^*, \lambda^*) &\geq 0, (\lambda_0^*, \lambda^*) \neq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

There are no restrictions on the objective and constraint functions, apart from the differentiability.

However, by imposing a *regularity condition* on the constraint function, the λ_0^* may, without loss of generality, be taken as 1, and we obtain the *Kuhn–Tucker necessary conditions* (Kuhn–Tucker 1951): there exists $\lambda^* \in R^m$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla f(x^*) + \lambda^{*T} \nabla g(x^*) &= 0 \\ \lambda^{*T} g(x^*) &= 0 \\ \lambda^* &\geq 0, \lambda^* \neq 0.\end{aligned}$$

There are a variety of regularity conditions, or constraint qualifications, which yield the Kuhn–Tucker necessary conditions. Some requires differentiability with no notion of convexity, and some have an assumption of convexity.

If the functions involved in the problem are convex then the necessary conditions for optimality are also sufficient.

In nonlinear programming, if the model is nonconvex, no efficient algorithm can guarantee finding a global minimum. So, one has to compromise with various types of solution expected. However, for convex programs, every local minimum is a global minimum. For convex programs, any method finding a local minimum will find a global minimum. Moreover, any stationary point is a global minimum in the case of convex programs.

1.1 Nonlinear Symmetric Dual Pair of Programming Problems

It is well known that every linear program is symmetric in the sense that the dual of the dual is the original problem. However, this is not the case with a general nonlinear programming problem.

Dantzig et al. (1965) introduced the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{minimize } & f(x, y) - y^T \nabla_y f(x, y) \\ \text{subject to } & \\ & \nabla_y f(x, y) \leq 0 \\ & x \geq 0, y \geq 0,\end{aligned}$$

Its symmetric dual is

$$\begin{aligned}\text{maximize } & f(u, v) - u^T \nabla_u f(u, v) \\ \text{subject to } & \\ & \nabla_u f(u, v) \leq 0 \\ & u \geq 0, v \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Mond and Weir (1981) proposed a relaxed version of the problems given by Dantzig et al. (1965). The problem of Mond and Weir has an advantage that one can use more generalized class of convex functions and the objective functions of the primal and dual problems are similar:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } f(x, y) \\ & \text{subject to} \\ & \quad y^T \nabla_y f(x, y) \leq 0 \\ & \quad x \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

Its symmetric dual is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize } f(u, v) \\ & \text{subject to} \\ & \quad u^T \nabla_u f(u, v) \leq 0 \\ & \quad v \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

These problems have direct connections with two person zero sum games.

The optimization problems discussed above are only finite-dimensional. However, a great deal of optimization theory is concerned with problems involving infinite dimensional case. Two types of problems fitting into this scheme are variational and control problems. Hanson (1964) observed that variational and control problems are continuous-time analogue of finite dimensional nonlinear programming problems. Since then the fields of nonlinear programming and the calculus of variations have to some extent merged together within optimization theory, hence enhancing the potential for continued research in both fields. These types of problems are studied in Sect. 4.6, 4.7, and 5.16–5.19.

1.2 Motivation

Convexity is one of the most frequently used hypotheses in optimization theory. It is usually introduced to give global validity to propositions otherwise only locally true (for convex functions, for instance, any local minimum is also a global minimum) and to obtain sufficient conditions that are generally only necessary, as with the Kuhn–Tucker conditions in nonlinear programming. In microeconomics, convexity plays a fundamental role in general equilibrium theory and in duality results. In particular, in consumer theory, the convexity of preference ensures the existence of a demand function. In game theory, convexity ensures the existence of an equilibrium solution.

Convexity assumptions are often not satisfied in real-world economic models; see Arrow and Intriligator (1981). The necessary KKT conditions imply a maximum under some condition weaker than convexity. It suffices if $-f$ is pseudo-convex and each $-g_i$ is pseudo-concave, or less restrictively if the vector $-(f, g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m)$ is

invex. An economic model where an objective function is to be maximized, subject to constraints on the economic processes involved, leads to a nonlinear programming problem. It is well known that, under some restrictions, a maximum may be described by a Lagrangian function. The Lagrangian has a zero gradient at a maximum point, but this is not enough to imply a maximum, unless additional restrictions, such as concavity or quasi-concavity are imposed, but these often do not hold for many practical problems, so go for invexity, pseudo-invexity, etc.

In the past century, the notion of a convex function has been generalized in various ways, either by an extension to abstract spaces, or by a change in the definition of convexity. One of the more recent generalizations, for instance, is due to Hanson, who introduced *invex* functions in 1981: $f : R^n \rightarrow R$ is invex whenever it is differentiable and there exists a function $\eta : R^n \times R^n \rightarrow R^n$ such that $f(x) - f(y) \geq \nabla f(x) \eta(x, y)$. Many important properties of convex functions are preserved within a wider functional environment, for example, a local minimum is also a global minimum if the function involved is invex.

However, invexity is not the only generalization of convexity. In fact, after the work of Hanson (1981), mathematicians and other practitioners started attempting to further weakening of the concept of invexity. This has finally led to a whole field of research, known as “generalized convexity.” It is impossible to collect the entire progress on the subject in one book, as there has been eight international conferences on generalized convexity. However, there is no book on the topic dealing with some generalized convexity and various nonlinear programming problems. This is a desperate need of advanced level students or new researchers in this field.

Chapter 2

Generalized Convex Functions

Convexity is one of the most frequently used hypotheses in optimization theory. It is usually introduced to give global validity to propositions otherwise only locally true, for instance, a local minimum is also a global minimum for a convex function. Moreover, convexity is also used to obtain sufficiency for conditions that are only necessary, as with the classical Fermat theorem or with Kuhn-Tucker conditions in nonlinear programming. In microeconomics, convexity plays a fundamental role in general equilibrium theory and in duality theory. For more applications and historical reference, see, Arrow and Intriligator (1981), Guerraggio and Molho (2004), Islam and Craven (2005). The convexity of sets and the convexity and concavity of functions have been the object of many studies during the past one hundred years. Early contributions to convex analysis were made by Holder (1889), Jensen (1906), and Minkowski (1910, 1911). The importance of convex functions is well known in optimization problems. Convex functions come up in many mathematical models used in economics, engineering, etc. More often, convexity does not appear as a natural property of the various functions and domain encountered in such models. The property of convexity is invariant with respect to certain operations and transformations. However, for many problems encountered in economics and engineering the notion of convexity does no longer suffice. Hence, it is necessary to extend the notion of convexity to the notions of pseudo-convexity, quasi-convexity, etc. We should mention the early work by de de Finetti (1949), Fenchel (1953), Arrow and Enthoven (1961), Mangasarian (1965), Ponstein (1967), and Karamardian (1967). In the recent years, several extensions have been considered for the classical convexity. A significant generalization of convex functions is that of invex functions introduced by Hanson (1981). Hanson's initial result inspired a great deal of subsequent work which has greatly expanded the role and applications of invexity in nonlinear optimization and other branches of pure and applied sciences.

In this chapter, we shall discuss about various concepts of generalized convex functions introduced in the literature in last thirty years for the purpose of weakening the limitations of convexity in mathematical programming. Hanson (1981) introduced the concept of invexity as a generalization of convexity for scalar constrained optimization problems, and he showed that weak duality and sufficiency of

the Kuhn-Tucker optimality conditions hold when invexity is required instead of the usual requirement of convexity of the functions involved in the problem.

2.1 Convex and Generalized Convex Functions

Definition 2.1.1. A subset X of R^n is convex if for every $x_1, x_2 \in X$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$, we have

$$\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2 \in X.$$

Definition 2.1.2. A function $f : X \rightarrow R$ defined on a convex subset X of R^n is convex if for any $x_1, x_2 \in X$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$, we have

$$f(\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2) \leq \lambda f(x_1) + (1 - \lambda)f(x_2).$$

If we have strict inequality for all $x_1 \neq x_2$ in the above definition, the function is said to be strictly convex.

Historically the first type of generalized convex function was considered by de Finetti (1949) who first introduced the quasiconvex functions (a name given by Fenchel (1953)) after 6 years.

Definition 2.1.3. A function $f : X \rightarrow R$ is quasiconvex on X if

$$f(x) \leq f(y) \Rightarrow f(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) \leq f(y), \quad \forall x, y \in X, \forall \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

or, equivalently, in non-Euclidean form

$$f(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) \leq \max\{f(x), f(y)\}, \quad \forall x, y \in X, \forall \lambda \in [0, 1].$$

For further study and characterization of quasiconvex functions, one can see Giorgi et al. (2004).

In the differentiable case, we have the following definition given in Avriel et al. (1988):

Definition 2.1.4. A function $f : X \rightarrow R$ is said to be quasiconvex on X if

$$f(x) \leq f(y) \Rightarrow (x - y) \nabla f(y) \leq 0, \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

An important property of a differentiable convex function is that any stationary point is also a global minimum point; however, this useful property is not restricted to differentiable convex functions only. The family of pseudoconvex functions introduced by Mangasarian (1965) and under the name of semiconvex functions by Tuy (1964), strictly includes the family of differentiable convex functions and has the above mentioned property as well.

Definition 2.1.5. Let $f : X \rightarrow R$ be differentiable on the open set $X \subset R^n$; then f is pseudoconvex on X if:

$$f(x) < f(y) \Rightarrow (x - y) \nabla f(y) < 0, \quad \forall x, y \in X$$

or equivalently if

$$(x - y) \nabla f(y) \geq 0 \Rightarrow f(x) \geq f(y), \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

From this definition it appears obvious that, if f is pseudoconvex and $\nabla f(y) = 0$, then y is a global minimum of f over X . Pseudoconvexity plays a key role in obtaining sufficient optimality conditions for a nonlinear programming problem as, if a differentiable objective function can be shown or assumed to be pseudoconvex, then the usual first-order stationary conditions are able to produce a global minimum.

The function $f : X \rightarrow R$ is called *pseudoconcave* if $-f$ is pseudoconvex.

Functions that are both pseudoconvex and pseudoconcave are called *pseudolinear*. Pseudolinear functions are particularly important in certain optimization problems, both in scalar and vector cases; see Chew and Choo (1984), Komlosi (1993), Rapcsak (1991), Kaul et al. (1993), and Mishra (1995).

The following result due to Chew and Choo (1984) characterizes the class of pseudolinear functions.

Theorem 2.1.1. Let $f : X \rightarrow R$, where $X \subset R^n$ is an open convex set. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) f is pseudolinear.
- (ii) For any $x, y \in X$, it is $(x - y) \nabla f(y) = 0$ if and only if $f(x) = f(y)$.
- (iii) There exists a function $p : X \times X \rightarrow R_+$ such that

$$f(x) = f(y) + p(x, y) \cdot (x - y) \nabla f(y).$$

The class of pseudolinear functions includes many classes of functions useful for applications, e.g., the class of linear fractional functions (see, e.g., Chew and Choo (1984)).

An example of a pseudolinear function is given by $f(x) = x + x^3$, $x \in R$. More generally, Kortanek and Evans (1967) observed that if f is pseudolinear on the convex set $X \subset R^n$, then the function $F = f(x) + [f(x)]^3$ is also pseudolinear on X .

For characterization of the solution set of a pseudolinear program, one can see Jeyakumar and Yang (1995).

Ponstein (1967) introduced the concept of strictly pseudoconvex functions for differentiable functions.

Definition 2.1.6. A function $f : X \rightarrow R$, differentiable on the open set $X \subset R^n$, is strictly pseudoconvex on X if

$$f(x) \leq f(y) \Rightarrow (x - y) \nabla f(y) < 0, \quad \forall x, y \in X, x \neq y,$$

or equivalently if

$$(x - y) \nabla f(y) \geq 0 \Rightarrow f(x) > f(y), \quad \forall x, y \in X, x \neq y.$$

The comparison of the definitions of pseudoconvexity and strict pseudoconvexity shows that strict pseudoconvexity implies pseudoconvexity. Ponstein (1967) showed that pseudoconvexity plus strict quasiconvexity implies strict pseudoconvexity and that strict pseudoconvexity implies strict quasiconvexity.

In a minimization problem, if the strict pseudoconvexity of the objective function can be shown or assumed, then the solution to the first-order optimality conditions is a unique global minimum. Many other characterizations of strict pseudoconvex functions are given by Diewert et al. (1981).

Convex functions play an important role in optimization theory. The optimization problem:

$$\text{minimize } f(x) \text{ for } x \in X \subseteq R^n, \quad \text{subject to } g(x) \leq 0,$$

is called a convex program if the functions involved are convex on some subset X of R^n . Convex programs have many useful properties:

1. The set of all feasible solutions is convex.
2. Any local minimum is a global minimum.
3. The Karush–Kuhn–Tucker optimality conditions are sufficient for a minimum.
4. Duality relations hold between the problem and its dual.
5. A minimum is unique if the objective function is strictly convex.

However, for many problems encountered in economics and engineering the notion of convexity does no longer suffice. To meet this demand and the convexity requirement to prove sufficient optimality conditions for a differentiable mathematical programming problem, the notion of invexity was introduced by Hanson (1981) by substituting the linear term $(x - y)$, appearing in the definition of differentiable convex, pseudoconvex and quasiconvex functions, with an arbitrary vector-valued function.

2.2 Invex and Generalized Invex Functions

Definition 2.2.1. A function $f : X \rightarrow R$, X open subset of R^n , is said to be invex on X with respect to η if there exists vector-valued function $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow R^n$ such that

$$f(x) - f(y) \geq \eta^T(x, y) \nabla f(y), \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

The name “invex” was given by Craven (1981) and stands for “invariant convex.”

Similarly f is said to be *pseudoinvex* on X with respect to η if there exists vector-valued function $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow R^n$ such that

$$\eta^T(x, y) \nabla f(y) \geq 0 \Rightarrow f(x) \geq f(y), \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

The function $f : X \rightarrow R$, X open subset of R^n , is said to be *quasiinvex* on X with respect to η if there exists vector-valued function $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow R^n$ such that

$$f(x) \leq f(y) \Rightarrow \eta^T(x, y) \nabla f(y) \leq 0, \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

Craven (1981) gave necessary and sufficient conditions for function f to be invex assuming that the functions f and η are twice continuously differentiable.

Ben-Israel and Mond (1986) and Kaul and Kaur (1985) also studied some relationships among the various classes of (generalized) invex functions and (generalized) convex functions. Let us list their results for the sake completion:

- (1) A differentiable convex function is also invex, but not conversely, see example, Kaul and Kaur (1985).
- (2) A differentiable pseudo-convex function is also pseudo-invex, but not conversely, see example, Kaul and Kaur (1985).
- (3) A differentiable quasi-convex function is also quasi-invex, but not conversely, see example, Kaul and Kaur (1985).
- (4) Any invex function is also pseudo-invex for the same function $\eta(x, \bar{x})$, but not conversely, see example, Kaul and Kaur (1985).
- (5) Any pseudo-invex function is also quasi-invex, but not conversely.

Further insights on these relationships can be deduced by means of the following characterizations of invex functions:

Theorem 2.2.1. (Ben-Israel and Mond (1986)) *Let $f : X \rightarrow R$ be differentiable on the open set $X \subset R^n$; then f is invex if and only if every stationary point of f is a global minimum of f over X .*

It is adequate, in order to apply invexity to the study of optimality and duality conditions, to know that a function is invex without identifying an appropriate function $\eta(x, \bar{x})$. However, Theorem 2.2.1 allows us to find a function $\eta(x, \bar{x})$, when $f(x)$ is known to be invex; viz.

$$\eta(x, \bar{x}) = \begin{cases} \frac{[f(x) - f(\bar{x})] \nabla f(\bar{x})}{\nabla f(\bar{x}) \nabla f(\bar{x})}, & \text{if } \nabla f(\bar{x}) \neq 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } \nabla f(\bar{x}) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Remark 2.2.1. If we consider an invex function f on set $X_0 \subseteq X$, with X_0 not open, it is not true that any local minimum of f on X_0 is also a global minimum. Let us consider the following example.

Example 2.2.1. Let $f(x, y) = y(x^2 - 1)^2$ and $X_0 = \{(x, y) : (x, y) \in R^2, x \geq -1/2, y \geq 1\}$. Every stationary point of f on X_0 is a global minimum of f on X_0 , and therefore f is invex on X_0 . The point $(-1/2, 1)$ is a local minimum point of f on X_0 , with $f(-1/2, 1) = 9/16$, but the global minimum is $f(1, y) = f(-1, y) = 0$.

In order to consider some type of invexity for nondifferentiable functions, Ben-Israel and Mond (1986) and Weir and Mond (1988) introduced the following function:

Definition 2.2.2. A function $f : X \rightarrow R$ is said to be pre-invex on X if there exists a vector function $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow R^n$ such that

$$(y + \lambda \eta(x, y)) \in X, \quad \forall \lambda \in [0, 1], \quad \forall x, y \in X$$

and

$$f(y + \lambda \eta(x, y)) \leq \lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)f(y), \quad \forall \lambda \in [0, 1], \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

Weir and Mond (1988a) gave the following example of a pre-invex function which is not convex.

Example 2.2.2. $f(x) = -|x|$, $x \in R$. Then f is a pre-invex function with η given as follows:

$$\eta(x, y) = \begin{cases} x - y, & \text{if } y \leq 0 \quad \text{and } x \leq 0 \\ x - y, & \text{if } y \geq 0 \quad \text{and } x \geq 0 \\ y - x, & \text{if } y > 0 \quad \text{and } x < 0 \\ y - x, & \text{if } y < 0 \quad \text{and } x > 0. \end{cases}$$

As for convex functions, any local minimum of a pre-invex function is a global minimum and nonnegative linear combinations of pre-invex functions are pre-invex. Pre-invex functions were utilized by Weir and Mond (1988a) to establish proper efficiency results in multiple objective optimization problems.

2.3 Type I and Related Functions

Subsequently, Hanson and Mond (1982) introduced two new classes of functions which are not only sufficient but are also necessary for optimality in primal and dual problems, respectively. Let

$$P = \{x : x \in X, g(x) \leq 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad D = \{x : (x, y) \in Y\},$$

where $Y = \{(x, y) : x \in X, y \in R^m, \nabla_x f(x) + y^T \nabla_x g(x) = 0; y \geq 0\}$.

Hanson and Mond (1982) defined:

Definition 2.3.1. $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ as Type I objective and constraint functions, respectively, with respect to $\eta(x)$ at \bar{x} if there exists an n -dimensional vector function $\eta(x)$ defined for all $x \in P$ such that

$$f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \geq [\nabla_x f(\bar{x})]^T \eta(x, \bar{x})$$

and

$$-g(\bar{x}) \geq [\nabla_x g(\bar{x})]^T \eta(x, \bar{x}),$$

the objective and constraint functions $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are called strictly Type I if we have strict inequalities in the above definition.

Definition 2.3.2. $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ as Type II objective and constraint functions, respectively, with respect to $\eta(x)$ at \bar{x} if there exists an n -dimensional vector function $\eta(x)$ defined for all $x \in P$ such that

$$f(\bar{x}) - f(x) \geq [\nabla_x f(x)]^T \eta(x, \bar{x})$$

and

$$-g(x) \geq [\nabla_x g(x)]^T \eta(x, \bar{x}).$$

the objective and constraint functions $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are called strictly Type II if we have strict inequalities in the above definition.

Rueda and Hanson (1988) established the following relations:

1. If $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are convex objective and constraint functions, respectively, then $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are Type I, but the converse is not necessarily true, as can be seen from the following example.

Example 2.3.1. The functions $f: (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ and $g: (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ defined by $f(x) = x + \sin x$ and $g(x) = -\sin x$ are Type I functions with respect to $\eta(x) = \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}\right) \left(\sin x - \frac{1}{2}\right)$ at $\bar{x} = \pi/6$, but $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are not convex with respect to the same $\eta(x) = \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}\right) \left(\sin x - \frac{1}{2}\right)$ as can be seen by taking $x = \pi/4$ and $\bar{x} = \pi/6$.

2. If $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are convex objective and constraint functions, respectively, then $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are Type II, but the converse is not necessarily true, as can be seen from the following example.

Example 2.3.2. The functions $f: (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ and $g: (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ defined by $f(x) = x + \sin x$ and $g(x) = -\sin x$ are Type II functions with respect to $\eta(x) = \frac{(\frac{1}{2} - \sin x)}{\cos x}$ at $\bar{x} = \pi/6$, but $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are not convex with respect to the same $\eta(x) = \frac{(\frac{1}{2} - \sin x)}{\cos x}$ at $\bar{x} = \pi/6$.

3. If $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are strictly convex objective and constraint functions, respectively, then $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are strictly Type I, but the converse is not necessarily true, as can be seen from the following example.

Example 2.3.3. The functions $f: (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ and $g: (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ defined by $f(x) = -x + \cos x$ and $g(x) = -\cos x$ are strictly Type I functions with respect to $\eta(x) = 1 - \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \cos x$ at $\bar{x} = \pi/4$, but $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are not strictly convex with respect to the same $\eta(x) = 1 - \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \cos x$.

4. If $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are strictly convex objective and constraint functions, respectively, then $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are strictly Type II, but the converse is not necessarily true, as can be seen from the following example.

Example 2.3.4. The functions $f : (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ and $g : (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ defined by $f(x) = -x + \cos x$ and $g(x) = -\cos x$ are strictly Type II functions with respect to $\eta(x) = \frac{(\cos x - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2})}{\sin x}$ at $\bar{x} = \pi/4$, but $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are not strictly convex with respect to the same $\eta(x) = 1 - \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \cos x$.

Rueda and Hanson (1988) defined:

Definition 2.3.3. $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ as pseudo-Type I objective and constraint functions, respectively, with respect to $\eta(x)$ at \bar{x} if there exists an n -dimensional vector function $\eta(x)$ defined for all $x \in P$ such that

$$[\nabla_x f(x)]^T \eta(x, \bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow f(\bar{x}) - f(x) \geq 0$$

and

$$[\nabla_x g(x)]^T \eta(x, \bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow -g(x) \geq 0.$$

Definition 2.3.4. $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ as quasi-Type I objective and constraint functions, respectively, with respect to $\eta(x)$ at \bar{x} if there exists an n -dimensional vector function $\eta(x)$ defined for all $x \in P$ such that

$$f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \leq 0 \Rightarrow [\nabla_x f(\bar{x})]^T \eta(x, \bar{x}) \leq 0.$$

and

$$-g(x) \leq 0 \Rightarrow [\nabla_x g(x)]^T \eta(x, \bar{x}) \leq 0.$$

Pseudo-Type II and quasi-Type II objective and constraint functions are defined similarly.

It was shown by Rueda and Hanson (1988) that:

1. Type I objective and constraint functions \Rightarrow pseudo-Type I objective and constraint functions, but the converse is not necessarily true, as can be seen from the following example.

Example 2.3.5. The functions $f : (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ and $g : (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ defined by $f(x) = -\cos^2 x$ and $g(x) = -\cos x$ are pseudo-Type I functions with respect to $\eta(x) = -\frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\right) \cos x$ at $\bar{x} = -\pi/4$, but $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are not Type I with respect to the same $\eta(x) = -\frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\right) \cos x$ as can be seen by taking $x = 0$.

2. Type II objective and constraint functions \Rightarrow pseudo-Type II objective and constraint functions, but the converse is not necessarily true, as can be seen from the following.

Example 2.3.6. The functions $f : (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ and $g : (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ defined by $f(x) = -\cos^2 x$ and $g(x) = -\cos x$ are pseudo-Type II functions with respect to $\eta(x) = \sin x \left(\cos x - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\right)$ at $\bar{x} = -\pi/4$, but $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are not Type II with respect to the same $\eta(x) = \sin x \left(\cos x - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\right)$ as can be seen by taking $x = \pi/3$.

3. Type I objective and constraint functions \Rightarrow quasi-Type I objective and constraint functions, but the converse is not necessarily true, as can be seen from the following example.

Example 2.3.7. The functions $f : (0, \pi) \rightarrow R$ and $g : (0, \pi) \rightarrow R$ defined by $f(x) = \sin^3 x$ and $g(x) = -\cos x$ are quasi-Type I functions with respect to $\eta(x) = -1$ at $\bar{x} = \pi/2$, but $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are not Type I with respect to the same $\eta(x) = -1$ as can be seen by taking $\bar{x} = \pi/4$.

4. Type II objective and constraint functions \Rightarrow quasi-Type II objective and constraint functions, but the converse is not necessarily true, as can be seen from the following example.

Example 2.3.8. The functions $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow R$ and $g : (0, \infty) \rightarrow R$ defined by $f(x) = -\frac{1}{x}$ and $g(x) = 1 - x$ are quasi-Type II functions with respect to $\eta(x) = 1 - x$ at $\bar{x} = 1$, but $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are not Type II with respect to the same $\eta(x) = 1 - x$ as can be seen by taking $x = 2$.

5. Strictly Type I objective and constraint functions \Rightarrow Type I objective and constraint functions, but the converse is not necessarily true, as can be seen from the following example.

Example 2.3.9. The functions $f : (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ and $g : (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ defined by $f(x) = -\sin x$ and $g(x) = -\cos x$ are Type I functions with respect to $\eta(x) = \sin x$ at $\bar{x} = 0$, but $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are not strictly Type I with respect to the same $\eta(x) = \sin x$ at $\bar{x} = 0$.

6. Strictly Type II objective and constraint functions \Rightarrow Type II objective and constraint functions, but the converse is not necessarily true, as can be seen from the following example.

Example 2.3.10. The functions $f : (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ and $g : (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow R$ defined by $f(x) = -\sin x$ and $g(x) = -e^{-x}$ are Type II functions with respect to $\eta(x) = 1$ at $\bar{x} = 0$, but $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are not strictly Type I with respect to the same $\eta(x)$ at $\bar{x} = 0$.

Kaul et al. (1994) further extended the concepts of Rueda and Hanson (1988) to pseudo-quasi Type I, quasi-pseudo Type I objective and constraint functions as follows.

Definition 2.3.5. $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ as quasi-pseudo-Type I objective and constraint functions, respectively, with respect to $\eta(x)$ at \bar{x} if there exists an n -dimensional vector function $\eta(x)$ defined for all $x \in P$ such that

$$f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \leq 0 \Rightarrow [\nabla_x f(\bar{x})]^T \eta(x, \bar{x}) \leq 0$$

and

$$[\nabla_x g(x)]^T \eta(x, \bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow -g(x) \geq 0.$$

Definition 2.3.6. $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ as pseudo-quasi-Type I objective and constraint functions, respectively, with respect to $\eta(x)$ at \bar{x} if there exists an n -dimensional vector function $\eta(x)$ defined for all $x \in P$ such that

$$[\nabla_x f(\bar{x})]^T \eta(x, \bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \geq 0$$

and

$$-g(x) \leq 0 \Rightarrow [\nabla_x g(x)]^T \eta(x, \bar{x}) \leq 0.$$

2.4 Univex and Related Functions

Let f be a differentiable function defined on a nonempty subset X of R^n and let $\phi : R \rightarrow R$ and $k : X \times X \rightarrow R_+$. For $x, \bar{x} \in X$, we write $k(x, \bar{x}) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} b(x, \bar{x}, \lambda) \geq 0$.

Bector et al. (1992) defined b-invex functions as follows.

Definition 2.4.1. The function f is said to be B-invex with respect to η and k , at \bar{x} if for all $x \in X$, we have

$$k(x, \bar{x}) [f(x) - f(\bar{x})] \geq [\nabla_x f(\bar{x})]^T \eta(x, \bar{x}).$$

Bector et al. (1992) further extended this concept to univex functions as follows.

Definition 2.4.2. The function f is said to be univex with respect to η , ϕ and k , at \bar{x} if for all $x \in X$, we have

$$k(x, \bar{x}) \phi [f(x) - f(\bar{x})] \geq [\nabla_x f(\bar{x})]^T \eta(x, \bar{x}).$$

Definition 2.4.3. The function f is said to be quasi-univex with respect to η , ϕ and k , at \bar{x} if for all $x \in X$, we have

$$\phi [f(x) - f(\bar{x})] \leq 0 \Rightarrow k(x, \bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x})^T \nabla_x f(\bar{x}) \leq 0.$$

Definition 2.4.4. The function f is said to be pseudo-univex with respect to η , ϕ and k , at \bar{x} if for all $x \in X$, we have

$$\eta(x, \bar{x})^T \nabla_x f(\bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow k(x, \bar{x}) \phi [f(x) - f(\bar{x})] \geq 0.$$

Bector et al. (1992) gave the following relations with some other generalized convex functions existing in the literature.

1. Every B-invex function is univex function with $\phi : R \rightarrow R$ defined as $\phi(a) = a, \forall a \in R$, but not conversely.

Example 2.4.1. Let $f : R \rightarrow R$ be defined by $f(x) = x^3$, where,

$$\eta(x, \bar{x}) = \begin{cases} x^2 + \bar{x}^2 + x\bar{x}, & x > \bar{x} \\ x - \bar{x}, & x \leq \bar{x} \end{cases}$$

and

$$k(x, \bar{x}) = \begin{cases} \bar{x}^2/(x - \bar{x}), & x > \bar{x} \\ 0, & x \leq \bar{x}. \end{cases}$$

Let $\phi : R \rightarrow R$ be defined by $\phi(a) = 3a$. The function f is univex but not b-invex, because for $x = 1, \bar{x} = 1/2, k(x, \bar{x}) \phi[f(x) - f(\bar{x})] < \eta(x, \bar{x})^T \nabla_x f(\bar{x})$.

2. Every invex function is univex function with $\phi : R \rightarrow R$ defined as $\phi(a) = a, \forall a \in R, k(x, \bar{x}) \equiv 1$, but not conversely.

Example 2.4.2. The function considered in above example is univex but not invex, because for $x = -3, \bar{x} = 1, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) < \eta(x, \bar{x})^T \nabla_x f(\bar{x})$.

3. Every convex function is univex function with $\phi : R \rightarrow R$ defined as $\phi(a) = a, \forall a \in R, k(x, \bar{x}) \equiv 1$, and $\eta(x, \bar{x}) \equiv x - \bar{x}$, but not conversely.

Example 2.4.3. The function considered in above example is univex but not convex, because for $x = -2, \bar{x} = 1, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) < (x - \bar{x})^T \nabla_x f(\bar{x})$.

4. Every b-vex function is univex function with $\phi : R \rightarrow R$ defined as $\phi(a) = a, \forall a \in R$, and $\eta(x, \bar{x}) \equiv x - \bar{x}$, but not conversely.

Example 2.4.4. The function considered in above example is univex but not b-vex, because for $x = \frac{1}{10}, \bar{x} = \frac{1}{100}, k(x, \bar{x}) [f(x) - f(\bar{x})] < (x - \bar{x})^T \nabla_x f(\bar{x})$.

Rueda et al. (1995) obtained optimality and duality results for several mathematical programs by combining the concepts of type I functions and univex functions. They combined the Type I and univex functions as follows.

Definition 2.4.5. *The differentiable functions $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are called Type I univex objective and constraint functions, respectively with respect to $\eta, \phi_0, \phi_1, b_0, b_1$ at $\bar{x} \in X$, if for all $x \in X$, we have*

$$b_0(x, \bar{x}) \phi_0 [f(x) - f(\bar{x})] \geq \eta(x, \bar{x})^T \nabla_x f(\bar{x})$$

and

$$-b_1(x, \bar{x}) \phi_1 [g(\bar{x})] \geq \eta(x, \bar{x})^T \nabla_x g(\bar{x}).$$

Rueda et al. (1995) gave examples of functions that are univex but not Type I univex.

Example 2.4.5. The functions $f, g : [1, \infty) \rightarrow R$, defined by $f(x) = x^3$ and $g(x) = 1 - x$, are univex at $\bar{x} = 1$ with respect to $b_0 = b_1 = 1, \eta(x, \bar{x}) = x - \bar{x}, \phi_0(a) = 3a, \phi_1(a) = 1$, but g does not satisfy the second inequality of the above definition at $\bar{x} = 1$.

They also pointed out that there are functions which are Type I univex but not univex.

Example 2.4.6. The functions $f, g : [1, \infty) \rightarrow R$, defined by $f(x) = -1/x$ and $g(x) = 1 - x$, are Type I univex with respect to $b_0 = b_1 = 1, \eta(x, \bar{x}) = -1/(x - \bar{x}), \phi_0(a) = a, \phi_1(a) = -a$, at $\bar{x} = 1$, but g is not univex at $\bar{x} = 1$.

Following Rueda et al. (1995), Mishra (1998b) gave several sufficient optimality conditions and duality results for multiobjective programming problems by combining the concepts of Pseudo-quasi-Type I, quasi-pseudo-Type I functions and univex functions.

2.5 V-Invex and Related Functions

Jeyakumar and Mond (1992) introduced the notion of V-invexity for a vector function $f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_p)$ and discussed its applications to a class of constrained multiobjective optimization problems. We now give the definitions of Jeyakumar and Mond (1992) as follows.

Definition 2.5.1. A vector function $f : X \rightarrow R^p$ is said to be V-invex if there exist functions $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow R^n$ and $\alpha_i : X \times X \rightarrow R^+ - \{0\}$ such that for each $x, \bar{x} \in X$ and for $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$,

$$f_i(x) - f_i(\bar{x}) \geq \alpha_i(x, \bar{x}) \nabla f_i(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x}).$$

for $p = 1$ and $\bar{\eta}(x, \bar{x}) = \alpha_i(x, \bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x})$ the above definition reduces to the usual definition of invexity given by Hanson (1981).

Definition 2.5.2. A vector function $f : X \rightarrow R^p$ is said to be V-pseudoinvex if there exist functions $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow R^n$ and $\beta_i : X \times X \rightarrow R^+ - \{0\}$ such that for each $x, \bar{x} \in X$ and for $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \nabla f_i(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i(x, \bar{x}) f_i(x) \geq \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i(x, \bar{x}) f_i(\bar{x}).$$

Definition 2.5.3. A vector function $f : X \rightarrow R^p$ is said to be V-quasiinvex if there exist functions $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow R^n$ and $\delta_i : X \times X \rightarrow R^+ - \{0\}$ such that for each $x, \bar{x} \in X$ and for $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \delta_i(x, \bar{x}) f_i(x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^p \delta_i(x, \bar{x}) f_i(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^p \nabla f_i(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x}) \leq 0.$$

It is evident that every V-invex function is both V-pseudo-invex (with $\beta_i(x, \bar{x}) = \frac{1}{\alpha_i(x, \bar{x})}$) and V-quasi-invex (with $\delta_i(x, \bar{x}) = \frac{1}{\alpha_i(x, \bar{x})}$). Also if we set $p = 1$, $\alpha_i(x, \bar{x}) = 1$, $\beta_i(x, \bar{x}) = 1$, $\delta_i(x, \bar{x}) = 1$ and $\eta(x, \bar{x}) = x - \bar{x}$, then the above definitions reduce to those of convexity, pseudo-convexity and quasi-convexity, respectively.

Definition 2.5.4. A vector optimization problem:

$$(VP) \quad V - \min(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_p) \quad \text{subject to } g(x) \leq 0,$$

where $f_i : X \rightarrow R, i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ and $g : X \rightarrow R^m$ are differentiable functions on X , is said to be V-invex vector optimization problem if each f_1, f_2, \dots, f_p and g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m is a V-invex function.

Note that, invex vector optimization problems are necessarily V-invex, but not conversely. As a simple example, we consider following example from Jeyakumar and Mond (1992).

Example 2.5.1. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x_1, x_2 \in R} & \left(\frac{x_1^2}{x_2}, \frac{x_1}{x_2} \right) \\ \text{subject to} & 1 - x_1 \leq 1, 1 - x_2 \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then it is easy to see that this problem is a V-invex vector optimization problem with $\alpha_1 = \frac{\bar{x}_2}{x_2}, \alpha_2 = \frac{\bar{x}_1}{x_1}, \beta_1 = 1 = \beta_2$, and $\eta(x, \bar{x}) = x - \bar{x}$; but clearly, the problem does not satisfy the invexity conditions with the same η .

It is also worth noticing that the functions involved in the above problem are invex, but the problem is not necessarily invex.

It is known (see Craven (1981)) that invex problems can be constructed from convex problems by certain nonlinear coordinate transformations. In the following, we see that V-invex functions can be formed from certain nonconvex functions (in particular from convex-concave or linear fractional functions) by coordinate transformations.

Example 2.5.2. Consider function, $h : R^n \rightarrow R^p$ defined by $h(x) = (f_1(\phi(x)), \dots, f_p(\phi(x)))$, where $f_i : R^n \rightarrow R, i = 1, 2, \dots, p$, are strongly pseudo-convex functions with real positive functions $\alpha_i, \phi : R^n \rightarrow R^n$ is surjective with $\phi'(\bar{x})$ onto for each $\bar{x} \in R^n$. Then, the function h is V-invex.

Example 2.5.3. Consider the composite vector function $h(x) = (f_1(F_1(x)), \dots, f_p(F_p(x)))$, where for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, p, F_i : X_0 \rightarrow R$ is continuously differentiable and pseudolinear with the positive proportional function $\alpha_i(\cdot, \cdot)$, and $f_i : R \rightarrow R$ is convex. Then, $h(x)$ is V-invex with $\eta(x, y) = x - y$. This follows from the following convex inequality and pseudolinearity conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(F_i(x)) - f_i(F_i(y)) & \geq f_i'(F_i(y))(F_i(x) - F_i(y)) \\ & = f_i'(F_i(y))\alpha_i(x, y)F_i'(y)(x - y) \\ & = \alpha_i(x, y)(f_i \circ F_i)'(y)(x - y). \end{aligned}$$

For a simple example of a composite vector function, we consider

$$h(x_1, x_2) = \left(e^{x_1/x_2}, \frac{x_1 - x_2}{x_1 + x_2} \right), \quad \text{where } X_0 = \{(x_1, x_2) \in R^2 : x_1 \geq 1, x_2 \geq 1\}.$$

Example 2.5.4. Consider the function $H(x) = (f_1((g_1 \circ \psi)(x)), \dots, f_p((g_p \circ \psi)(x)))$, where each f_i is pseudolinear on R^n with proportional functions $\alpha_i(x, y), \psi$ is a

differentiable mapping from R^n onto R^n such that $\psi'(y)$ is surjective for each $y \in R^n$, and $f_i : R \rightarrow R$ is convex for each i . Then H is V -invex.

Jeyakumar and Mond (1992) have shown that the V -invexity is preserved under a smooth convex transformation.

Proposition 2.5.1. *Let $\psi : R \rightarrow R$ be differentiable and convex with positive derivative everywhere; let $h : X_0 \rightarrow R^p$ be V -invex. Then, the function*

$$h_\psi(x) = (\psi(h_1(x)), \dots, \psi(h_p(x))), \quad x \in X_0$$

is V -invex.

The following very important property of V -invex functions was also established by Jeyakumar and Mond (1992).

Proposition 2.5.2. *Let $f : R^n \rightarrow R^p$ be V -invex. Then $y \in R^n$ is a (global) weak minimum of f if and only if there exists $0 \neq \tau \in R^p$, $\tau \geq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^p \tau_i f'_i(y) = 0$.*

By Proposition 2.5.2, one can conclude that for a V -invex vector function every critical point (i.e., $f'_i(y) = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, p$) is a global weak minimum.

Hanson et al. (2001) extended the (scalarized) generalized type-I invexity into a vector (V -type-I) invexity.

Definition 2.5.5. *The vector problem (VP) is said to be V -type-I at $\bar{x} \in X$ if there exist positive real-valued functions α_i and β_j defined on $X \times X$ and an n -dimensional vector-valued function $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow R^n$ such that*

$$f_i(x) - f_i(\bar{x}) \geq \alpha_i(x, \bar{x}) \nabla f_i(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x})$$

and

$$-g_j(\bar{x}) \geq \beta_j(x, \bar{x}) \nabla g_j(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x}),$$

for every $x \in X$ and for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

Definition 2.5.6. *The vector problem (VP) is said to be quasi- V -type-I at $\bar{x} \in X$ if there exist positive real-valued functions α_i and β_j defined on $X \times X$ and an n -dimensional vector-valued function $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow R^n$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \tau_i \alpha_i(x, \bar{x}) [f_i(x) - f_i(\bar{x})] \leq 0 \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^p \tau_i \eta(x, \bar{x}) \nabla f_i(\bar{x}) \leq 0$$

and

$$-\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \beta_j(x, \bar{x}) g_j(\bar{x}) \leq 0 \Rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \eta(x, \bar{x}) \nabla g_j(\bar{x}) \leq 0,$$

for every $x \in X$.

Definition 2.5.7. The vector problem (VP) is said to be pseudo-V-type-I at $\bar{x} \in X$ if there exist positive real-valued functions α_i and β_j defined on $X \times X$ and an n -dimensional vector-valued function $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \tau_i \eta(x, \bar{x}) \nabla f_i(\bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^p \tau_i \alpha_i(x, \bar{x}) [f_i(x) - f_i(\bar{x})] \geq 0$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \eta(x, \bar{x}) \nabla g_j(\bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \beta_j(x, \bar{x}) g_j(\bar{x}) \geq 0,$$

for every $x \in X$.

Definition 2.5.8. The vector problem (VP) is said to be quasi-pseudo-V-type-I at $\bar{x} \in X$ if there exist positive real-valued functions α_i and β_j defined on $X \times X$ and an n -dimensional vector-valued function $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \tau_i \alpha_i(x, \bar{x}) [f_i(x) - f_i(\bar{x})] \leq 0 \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^p \tau_i \eta(x, \bar{x}) \nabla f_i(\bar{x}) \leq 0$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \eta(x, \bar{x}) \nabla g_j(\bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \beta_j(x, \bar{x}) g_j(\bar{x}) \geq 0,$$

for every $x \in X$.

Definition 2.5.9. The vector problem (VP) is said to be pseudo-quasi-V-type-I at $\bar{x} \in X$ if there exist positive real-valued functions α_i and β_j defined on $X \times X$ and an n -dimensional vector-valued function $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \tau_i \eta(x, \bar{x}) \nabla f_i(\bar{x}) \geq 0 \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^p \tau_i \alpha_i(x, \bar{x}) [f_i(x) - f_i(\bar{x})] \geq 0$$

and

$$- \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \beta_j(x, \bar{x}) g_j(\bar{x}) \leq 0 \Rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \eta(x, \bar{x}) \nabla g_j(\bar{x}) \leq 0,$$

for every $x \in X$.

Nevertheless the study of generalized convexity of a vector function is not yet sufficiently explored and some classes of generalized convexity have been introduced recently. Several attempts have been made by many authors to introduce possibly a most wide class of generalized convex function, which can meet the demand of a real life situation to formulate a nonlinear programming problem and therefore get a best possible solution for the same. Recently, Aghezzaf and Hachimi (2001) introduced a new class of functions, which we shall give in next section.

2.6 Further Generalized Convex Functions

Definition 2.6.1. f is said to be weak strictly pseudoinvex with respect to η at $\bar{x} \in X$ if there exists a vector function $\eta(x, \bar{x})$ defined on $X \times X$ such that, for all $x \in X$,

$$f(x) \leq f(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow \nabla f(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x}) < 0.$$

This definition is a slight extension of that of the pseudoinvex functions. This class of functions does not contain the class of invex functions, but does contain the class of strictly pseudoinvex functions.

Every strictly pseudoinvex function is weak strictly pseudoinvex with respect to the same η . However, the converse is not necessarily true, as can be seen from the following example.

Example 2.6.1. The function $f = (f_1, f_2)$ defined on $X = R$, by $f_1(x) = x(x+2)$ and $f_2(x) = x(x+2)^2$ is weak strictly pseudoinvex function with respect to $\eta(x, \bar{x}) = x+2$ at $\bar{x} = 0$, but it is not strictly pseudoinvex with respect to the same $\eta(x, \bar{x})$ at \bar{x} because for $\bar{x} = -2$, we have

$$f(x) \leq f(\bar{x}) \text{ but } \nabla f(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x}) = 0 \not< 0.$$

Definition 2.6.2. f is said to be strong pseudoinvex with respect to η at $\bar{x} \in X$ if there exists a vector function $\eta(x, \bar{x})$ defined on $X \times X$ such that, for all $x \in X$,

$$f(x) \leq f(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow \nabla f(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x}) \leq 0.$$

Instead of the class of weak strictly pseudoinvex, the class of strong pseudoinvex functions does contain the class of invex functions. Also, every weak strictly pseudoinvex function is strong pseudoinvex with respect to the same η . However, the converse is not necessarily true, as can be seen from the following example.

Example 2.6.2. The function $f = (f_1, f_2)$ defined on $X = R$, by $f_1(x) = x^3$ and $f_2(x) = x(x+2)^2$ is strongly pseudoinvex function with respect to $\eta(x, \bar{x}) = x$ at $\bar{x} = 0$, but it is not weak strictly pseudoinvex with respect to the same $\eta(x, \bar{x})$ at \bar{x} because for $\bar{x} = -1$

$$f(x) \leq f(\bar{x}) \text{ but } \nabla f(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x}) = (0, -4)^T \not\leq 0,$$

also f is not invex with respect to the same η at \bar{x} , as can be seen by taking $\bar{x} = -2$.

There exist functions f that are pseudoinvex but not strong pseudoinvex with respect to the same η . Conversely, we can find functions that are strong pseudoinvex, but they are not pseudoinvex with respect to the same η .

Example 2.6.3. The function $f : R \rightarrow R^2$, defined by $f_1(x) = x(x-2)^2$ and $f_2(x) = x(x-3)$, is pseudoinvex with respect to $\eta(x, \bar{x}) = x - \bar{x}$ at $\bar{x} = 0$, but it is not weak strictly pseudoinvex with respect to the same $\eta(x, \bar{x})$ when $x = 2$.

Example 2.6.4. The function $f : R \rightarrow R^2$, defined by $f_1(x) = x(x-2)$ and $f_2(x) = x^2(x-1)$, is strong pseudoinvex with respect to $\eta(x, \bar{x}) = x - \bar{x}$ at $\bar{x} = 0$, but it is not pseudoinvex with respect to the same $\eta(x, \bar{x})$ at that point.

Remark 2.6.1. If f is both pseudoinvex and quasiinvex with respect to η at $\bar{x} \in X$, then it is strong pseudoinvex function with respect to the same η at \bar{x} .

Definition 2.6.3. f is said to be weak quasiinvex with respect to η at $\bar{x} \in X$ if there exists a vector function $\eta(x, \bar{x})$ defined on $X \times X$ such that, for all $x \in X$,

$$f(x) \leq f(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow \nabla f(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x}) \leq 0.$$

Every quasiinvex function is weak quasiinvex with respect to the same η . However, the converse is not necessarily true.

Example 2.6.5. Define a function $f : R \rightarrow R^2$, by $f_1(x) = x(x-2)^2$ and $f_2(x) = x^2(x-2)$, then the function is weak quasiinvex with respect to $\eta(x, \bar{x}) = x - \bar{x}$ at $\bar{x} = 0$, but it is not quasiinvex with respect to the same $\eta(x, \bar{x})$ at $\bar{x} = 0$, because $f(x) \leq f(\bar{x})$ but $\nabla f(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x}) \not\leq 0$, for $x = 2$.

Definition 2.6.4. f is said to be weak pseudoinvex with respect to η at $\bar{x} \in X$ if there exists a vector function $\eta(x, \bar{x})$ defined on $X \times X$ such that, for all $x \in X$,

$$f(x) < f(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow \nabla f(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x}) \leq 0.$$

The class of weak pseudoinvex functions does contain the class of invex functions, pseudoinvex functions, strong pseudoinvex functions and strong quasiinvex functions.

Remark 2.6.2. Notice from Examples 2.6.1–2.6.4, that the concepts of weak strictly pseudoinvex, strong pseudoinvex, weak pseudoinvex, and pseudoinvex vector-valued functions are different, in general. However, they coincide in the scalar-valued case.

Definition 2.6.5. f is said to be strong quasiinvex with respect to η at $\bar{x} \in X$ if there exists a vector function $\eta(x, \bar{x})$ defined on $X \times X$ such that, for all $x \in X$,

$$f(x) \leq f(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow \nabla f(\bar{x}) \eta(x, \bar{x}) \leq 0.$$

Every strong quasiinvex function is both quasiinvex and strong pseudoinvex with respect to the same η .

Aghezzaf and Hachimi (2001) introduced the class of weak prequasiinvex functions by generalizing the class of preinvex (Ben-Israel and Mond 1986) and the class prequasiinvex functions (Suneja et al. 1993).

Definition 2.6.6. We say that f is weak prequasiinvex at $\bar{x} \in X$ with respect to η if X is invex at \bar{x} with respect to η and, for each $x \in X$,

$$f(x) \leq f(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow f(\bar{x} + \lambda \eta(x, \bar{x})) \leq f(\bar{x}), \quad 0 < \lambda \leq 0.$$