Algunos resultados del tipo de Farkas

Miguel A. Goberna

Dep. de Estadística e Investigación Operativa Universidad de Alicante

VII Encuentro de Análisis Funcional y Aplicaciones Jaca, Abril 7-9, 2011.

æ

- The classical Farkas' lemma
- Semi-infinite Farkas-type results

æ

-

- The classical Farkas' lemma
- Semi-infinite Farkas-type results
- Infinite Farkas-type results

- The classical Farkas' lemma
- Semi-infinite Farkas-type results
- Infinite Farkas-type results
- Approximate infinite Farkas-type results

Miguel A. Goberna

• Consider the optimization problem

(P) min f(x) s.t. $x \in A$,

where A is the *feasible set*, with $\emptyset \neq A \subset X$ (the *decision space*), and $f: X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is the *objective function*.

• Consider the optimization problem

(P) min f(x) s.t. $x \in A$,

where A is the *feasible set*, with $\emptyset \neq A \subset X$ (the *decision space*), and $f: X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is the *objective function*.

• $a \in A$ is a global minimum (or minimizer) of (P) when

$$x \in A \Rightarrow f(x) \ge f(a)$$

• Consider the optimization problem

(P) min f(x) s.t. $x \in A$,

where A is the *feasible set*, with $\emptyset \neq A \subset X$ (the *decision space*), and $f: X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is the *objective function*.

• $a \in A$ is a global minimum (or minimizer) of (P) when

$$x \in A \Rightarrow f(x) \ge f(a)$$

• A Farkas-type result is a characterization of the inclusion

 $A \subset [g \le 0] := \{x \in X : g(x) \le 0\}$

• Consider the optimization problem

(P) min f(x) s.t. $x \in A$,

where A is the *feasible set*, with $\emptyset \neq A \subset X$ (the *decision space*), and $f: X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is the *objective function*.

• $a \in A$ is a global minimum (or minimizer) of (P) when

$$x \in A \Rightarrow f(x) \ge f(a)$$

- A Farkas-type result is a characterization of the inclusion
 A ⊂ [g ≤ 0] := {x ∈ X : g (x) ≤ 0}
- By extension: each characterization of the containment of two sets, A ⊂ B, can be seen as an extended Farkas' lemma.

• Consider the optimization problem

(P) min f(x) s.t. $x \in A$,

where A is the *feasible set*, with $\emptyset \neq A \subset X$ (the *decision space*), and $f: X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is the *objective function*.

• $a \in A$ is a global minimum (or minimizer) of (P) when

$$x \in A \Rightarrow f(x) \ge f(a)$$

• A Farkas-type result is a characterization of the inclusion

$$A \subset [g \leq 0] := \{x \in X : g(x) \leq 0\}$$

- By extension: each characterization of the containment of two sets, A ⊂ B, can be seen as an extended Farkas' lemma.
- The expression "Farkas' lemma" appears in the title (abstract) of more than 50 (180) papers reviewed in MathScinet.

• Consider a particle moving within a body $F = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : f_t(x) \le 0 \ \forall t \in T\}$ (*T* finite, $f_t \in C^1$ $\forall t \in T$) owing to the action of a conservative field with potential function $f \in C^1$.

- Consider a particle moving within a body $F = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : f_t(x) \le 0 \ \forall t \in T\}$ (*T* finite, $f_t \in C^1$ $\forall t \in T$) owing to the action of a conservative field with potential function $f \in C^1$.
- The set of active constraints of $a \in F$ is

$$T(a):=\left\{ t\in T:f_{t}\left(a\right) =0\right\} .$$

- Consider a particle moving within a body $F = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : f_t(x) \le 0 \ \forall t \in T\}$ (*T* finite, $f_t \in C^1$ $\forall t \in T$) owing to the action of a conservative field with potential function $f \in C^1$.
- The set of active constraints of $a \in F$ is

$$T(a):=\left\{ t\in T:f_{t}\left(a\right) =0\right\} .$$

 Ostrogradski asserted in 1838 that, if a ∈ F is an equilibrium point (i.e., a *local minimum* of f on F), then

$$\begin{cases} x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \langle \nabla f_t(a), x \rangle \leq 0 \ \forall t \in \mathcal{T}(a) \\ \subset \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \langle \nabla f(a), x \rangle \geq 0 \right\} \end{cases}$$
(1)

(true whenever{ $\nabla f_{t}\left(a\right)$, $t\in\mathcal{T}\left(a
ight)$ } is linearly independent).

- Consider a particle moving within a body $F = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : f_t(x) \le 0 \ \forall t \in T\}$ (*T* finite, $f_t \in C^1$ $\forall t \in T$) owing to the action of a conservative field with potential function $f \in C^1$.
- The set of active constraints of $a \in F$ is

$$T(a):=\left\{ t\in T:f_{t}\left(a\right) =0\right\} .$$

 Ostrogradski asserted in 1838 that, if a ∈ F is an equilibrium point (i.e., a *local minimum* of f on F), then

$$\begin{cases} x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \langle \nabla f_t(a), x \rangle \le 0 \ \forall t \in T(a) \\ \subset \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \langle \nabla f(a), x \rangle \ge 0 \right\} \end{cases}$$
(1)

(true whenever{ $\nabla f_t(a)$, $t \in T(a)$ } is linearly independent).

He also asserted that

 $(1) \Leftrightarrow -\nabla f(a) \in \operatorname{cone} \left\{ \nabla f_t(a), t \in T(a) \right\}.$

 1894: the physicist Farkas observes that it is necessary to characterize the inclusion A ⊂ [g ≥ 0] when A is described by means of linear functions and g is linear too.

- 1894: the physicist Farkas observes that it is necessary to characterize the inclusion A ⊂ [g ≥ 0] when A is described by means of linear functions and g is linear too.
- 1902: he gives the 1st correct proof of the linear/linear Farkas' lemma: given $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle a_t, x \rangle \le 0 \ \forall t \in T\} \neq \emptyset, \ T \text{ finite,}$ $A \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle a, x \rangle \le 0\}$

 $\Leftrightarrow a \in \operatorname{cone} \{a_t, t \in T\}$

- 1894: the physicist Farkas observes that it is necessary to characterize the inclusion A ⊂ [g ≥ 0] when A is described by means of linear functions and g is linear too.
- 1902: he gives the 1st correct proof of the linear/linear Farkas' lemma: given $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle a_t, x \rangle \le 0 \ \forall t \in T\} \ne \emptyset, T \text{ finite,}$ $A \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle a, x \rangle \le 0\}$ $\Leftrightarrow a \in \text{cone} \{a_t, t \in T\}$
- 1911: Minkowski proves the affine/affine Farkas' lemma: given A = {x ∈ ℝⁿ : ⟨a_t, x⟩ ≤ b_t ∀t ∈ T} ≠ Ø, T finite,

$$A \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} : \langle a, x \rangle \leq b\}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \in \operatorname{cone} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_{t} \\ b_{t} \end{pmatrix}, t \in T; \begin{pmatrix} 0_{n} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

Optimality in Nonlinear Programming (Kuhn-Tucker, 1951).

- Optimality in Nonlinear Programming (Kuhn-Tucker, 1951).
- Duality theory in Linear Programming (Gale-Kuhn-Tucker, 1951).

- Optimality in Nonlinear Programming (Kuhn-Tucker, 1951).
- Duality theory in Linear Programming (Gale-Kuhn-Tucker, 1951).
- Oata mining (Mangasarian, 2002).

- Optimality in Nonlinear Programming (Kuhn-Tucker, 1951).
- Duality theory in Linear Programming (Gale-Kuhn-Tucker, 1951).
- Oata mining (Mangasarian, 2002).
- Seconomics (reviewed by Franklin, 1983).

- Optimality in Nonlinear Programming (Kuhn-Tucker, 1951).
- Duality theory in Linear Programming (Gale-Kuhn-Tucker, 1951).
- Oata mining (Mangasarian, 2002).
- Sconomics (reviewed by Franklin, 1983).
- Moment problems (idem).

- Optimality in Nonlinear Programming (Kuhn-Tucker, 1951).
- Duality theory in Linear Programming (Gale-Kuhn-Tucker, 1951).
- Oata mining (Mangasarian, 2002).
- Sconomics (reviewed by Franklin, 1983).
- Moment problems (idem).
 - A state-of-the-art survey at the end of the 20th Century: Jeyakumar (2000).

References

Gale-Kuhn-Tucker, Linear programming and the theory of games. In: *Activity Analysis of Production and Allocation*, pp. 317-329, J. Wiley, 1951.

Kuhn-Tucker, Nonlinear programming. In: *Proc. 2nd Berkeley Symp. on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, pp. 481-492, UCL, 1951.

Franklin, Mathematical methods of economics, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 90 (1983) 229-244.

Jeyakumar, Farkas' lemma: Generalizations. In *Encyclopedia of Optimization II*, pp. 87-91, Kluwer, 2001.

Mangasarian, Set containment characterization, *J. Global Optim.* 24 (2002) 473-480.

Miguel A. Goberna

• A Farkas-type result involving

$$A = \{x \in X : f_t(x) \le 0 \ \forall t \in T\}$$

is semi-infinite when either card T or dim X is finite (but not both).

• A Farkas-type result involving

$$A = \{x \in X : f_t(x) \le 0 \ \forall t \in T\}$$

is semi-infinite when either card T or dim X is finite (but not both).

1924: Haar considers X = C(I), where I ⊂ ℝ is a compact interval, equipped with the scalar product
(f, g) = ∫_I f(s) g(s) ds, a ∈ X, and
A = {x ∈ X : (a_t, x) ≤ 0 ∀t ∈ T} such that {a_t, t ∈ T} is linearly independent (⇒ T finite).

• A Farkas-type result involving

$$A = \{x \in X : f_t(x) \le 0 \ \forall t \in T\}$$

is semi-infinite when either card T or dim X is finite (but not both).

- 1924: Haar considers X = C(I), where $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a compact interval, equipped with the scalar product $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_{I} f(s) g(s) ds$, $a \in X$, and $A = \{x \in X : \langle a_t, x \rangle \leq 0 \ \forall t \in T\}$ such that $\{a_t, t \in T\}$ is linearly independent ($\Rightarrow T$ finite).
- He proves the following linear/linear Farkas lemma:

$$A \subset \{x \in X : \langle a, x \rangle \le 0\}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow a \in \operatorname{cone} \{a_t, t \in T\}$$

• Consider the problem

(LSIP) min $\langle c, x \rangle$ s.t. $x \in A =: \{ \langle a_t, x \rangle \leq b_t, t \in T \}$, where $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ and T is infinite. • Consider the problem

(LSIP) min $\langle c, x \rangle$ s.t. $x \in A =: \{ \langle a_t, x \rangle \leq b_t, t \in T \}$,

where $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ and T is infinite.

• 1969: Charnes-Cooper-Kortanek prove a strong duality theorem for (LSIP) under the following CQ:

(**FM**) cone $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_t \\ b_t \end{pmatrix}, t \in T; \begin{pmatrix} 0_n \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$ is closed.

• Consider the problem

(LSIP) min $\langle c, x \rangle$ s.t. $x \in A =: \{ \langle a_t, x \rangle \leq b_t, t \in T \}$,

where $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ and T is infinite.

• 1969: Charnes-Cooper-Kortanek prove a strong duality theorem for (LSIP) under the following CQ:

$$(\mathsf{FM}) \quad \mathrm{cone} \left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c} a_t \\ b_t \end{array} \right), t \in T; \left(\begin{array}{c} 0_n \\ 1 \end{array} \right) \right\} \text{ is closed.}$$

In many LSIP applications T is compact, t → at and t → bt are continuous, and ∃x such that (at, x) < b ∀t ∈ T. Then (FM) holds.

• 1981: GLP take $X = \mathbb{R}^n$, T arbitrary, and $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle a_t, x \rangle \leq b_t \ \forall t \in T\} \neq \emptyset$, "showing" the following affine/affine Farkas' lemma:

$$A \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} : \langle a, x \rangle \leq b\} \\ \Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \in \operatorname{cl}\operatorname{cone} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_{t} \\ b_{t} \end{pmatrix}, t \in T; \begin{pmatrix} 0_{n} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$
(2)

• 1981: GLP take $X = \mathbb{R}^n$, T arbitrary, and $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle a_t, x \rangle \leq b_t \ \forall t \in T\} \neq \emptyset$, "showing" the following affine/affine Farkas' lemma:

$$A \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} : \langle a, x \rangle \leq b\} \\ \Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \in \operatorname{cl}\operatorname{cone} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_{t} \\ b_{t} \end{pmatrix}, t \in T; \begin{pmatrix} 0_{n} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$
(2)

• As in LP, from (2), $a \in A$ is a minimizer of (LSIP) iff

$$-c \in \operatorname{cl}\operatorname{cone}\left\{a_{t}, t \in T\left(a\right)\right\}.$$
(3)

• 1981: GLP take $X = \mathbb{R}^n$, T arbitrary, and $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle a_t, x \rangle \leq b_t \ \forall t \in T\} \neq \emptyset$, "showing" the following affine/affine Farkas' lemma:

$$A \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} : \langle a, x \rangle \leq b\} \\ \Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \in \operatorname{cl}\operatorname{cone} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_{t} \\ b_{t} \end{pmatrix}, t \in T; \begin{pmatrix} 0_{n} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$
(2)

• As in LP, from (2), $a \in A$ is a minimizer of (LSIP) iff

 $-c \in \operatorname{cl}\operatorname{cone}\left\{a_{t}, t \in T\left(a\right)\right\}.$ (3)

• Moreover, under the (**FM**) CQ, we can eliminate "cl" from (3) (*non-asymptotic optimality theorem*).

• The containment of closed convex sets can be easily characterized from the affine/affine Farkas' lemma:

- The containment of closed convex sets can be easily characterized from the affine/affine Farkas' lemma:
- Define the *weak dual* (closed) *cone* of a closed convex set *F* as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\leq} := \left\{ egin{pmatrix} a \ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : a'x \leq b, \ \forall x \in \mathcal{F}
ight\}$$

- The containment of closed convex sets can be easily characterized from the affine/affine Farkas' lemma:
- Define the *weak dual* (closed) *cone* of a closed convex set *F* as

$$\mathcal{K}_F^{\leq} := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : a'x \leq b, \ \forall x \in F
ight\}$$

• Then, given two closed convex sets F and G,

 $F \subset G \Leftrightarrow K_{\overline{G}}^{\leq} \subset K_{\overline{F}}^{\leq}$

- The containment of closed convex sets can be easily characterized from the affine/affine Farkas' lemma:
- Define the *weak dual* (closed) *cone* of a closed convex set *F* as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\leq} := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : a'x \leq b, \ \forall x \in \mathcal{F} \right\}$$

• Then, given two closed convex sets F and G,

 $F \subset G \Leftrightarrow K_{\overline{G}}^{\leq} \subset K_{\overline{F}}^{\leq}$

The stability of the inclusion F ⊂ G is related with the condition F ⊂ int G.

- The containment of closed convex sets can be easily characterized from the affine/affine Farkas' lemma:
- Define the *weak dual* (closed) *cone* of a closed convex set *F* as

$$\mathcal{K}_{F}^{\leq} := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : a'x \leq b, \ \forall x \in F
ight\}$$

• Then, given two closed convex sets F and G,

 $F \subset G \Leftrightarrow K_{\overline{G}}^{\leq} \subset K_{\overline{F}}^{\leq}$

- The stability of the inclusion F ⊂ G is related with the condition F ⊂ int G.
- F and int G are e-convex sets (i.e., intersections of open halfspaces).

• Define the strict dual (e-convex) cone of an e-convex set F as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{F}}^{<} := \left\{ egin{pmatrix} a \ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : a'x < b, \ orall x \in \mathcal{F}
ight\}$$

• Define the strict dual (e-convex) cone of an e-convex set F as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{F}}^{<} := \left\{ egin{pmatrix} \mathsf{a} \ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \mathsf{a}' x < \mathsf{b}, \ orall x \in \mathcal{F}
ight\}$$

• 2006: GJD show that, given two e-convex sets F and G,

• Define the strict dual (e-convex) cone of an e-convex set F as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{F}}^{<} := \left\{ egin{pmatrix} \mathsf{a} \ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \mathsf{a}' x < \mathsf{b}, \ orall x \in \mathcal{F}
ight\}$$

• 2006: GJD show that, given two e-convex sets F and G,

 $F \subset G \Leftrightarrow K_G^< \subset K_F^<$

• Some properties of the dual cones:

• Define the strict dual (e-convex) cone of an e-convex set F as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{F}}^{<} := \left\{ egin{pmatrix} \mathsf{a} \ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \mathsf{a}' x < \mathsf{b}, \ orall x \in \mathcal{F}
ight\}$$

• 2006: GJD show that, given two e-convex sets F and G,

- Some properties of the dual cones:
- $\operatorname{cl} K_F^< = K_{\operatorname{cl} F}^\leq$.

• Define the strict dual (e-convex) cone of an e-convex set F as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{F}}^{<} := \left\{ egin{pmatrix} \mathsf{a} \ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \mathsf{a}' x < \mathsf{b}, \ orall x \in \mathcal{F}
ight\}$$

• 2006: GJD show that, given two e-convex sets F and G,

- Some properties of the dual cones:
- $\operatorname{cl} K_F^{<} = K_{\operatorname{cl} F}^{\leq}$.
- F is open iff $K_F^{<} \cup \{0_{n+1}\}$ is closed. Then, $K_F^{<} = K_{cl}^{\leq} \setminus \{0_{n+1}\}.$

• Define the strict dual (e-convex) cone of an e-convex set F as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{F}}^{<} := \left\{ egin{pmatrix} {a} \ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : a'x < b, \ orall x \in \mathcal{F}
ight\}$$

• 2006: GJD show that, given two e-convex sets F and G,

- Some properties of the dual cones:
- $\operatorname{cl} K_F^{<} = K_{\operatorname{cl} F}^{\leq}$.
- F is open iff $K_F^{\leq} \cup \{0_{n+1}\}$ is closed. Then, $K_F^{\leq} = K_{clF}^{\leq} \setminus \{0_{n+1}\}.$
- If $K_F^{<}$ is relatively open, then F is closed.

• Define the strict dual (e-convex) cone of an e-convex set F as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{F}}^{<} := \left\{ egin{pmatrix} \mathsf{a} \ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \mathsf{a}' x < \mathsf{b}, \ orall x \in \mathcal{F}
ight\}$$

• 2006: GJD show that, given two e-convex sets F and G,

- Some properties of the dual cones:
- $\operatorname{cl} K_F^{<} = K_{\operatorname{cl} F}^{\leq}$.
- F is open iff $K_F^{<} \cup \{0_{n+1}\}$ is closed. Then, $K_F^{<} = K_{cl F}^{\leq} \setminus \{0_{n+1}\}.$
- If $K_F^{<}$ is relatively open, then F is closed.
- If F is compact, then $K_F^{\leq} = \operatorname{int} K_{dF}^{\leq}$ (open).

References

Charnes-Cooper-Kortanek, On the theory of semi-infinite programming and a generalization of the Kuhn-Tucker saddle point theorem for arbitrary convex functions, *Naval Res. Logist. Quart.* 16 (1969) 41–51. Goberna-López-Pastor, J. Farkas-Minkowski systems in semi-infinite programming, Appl. Math. Optim. 7 (1981) 295–308. Goberna-Jeyakumar-Dinh (2006), Dual characterizations of set containments with strict convex inequalities. *J. Global Optim.* 34, 33-54.

Some sequels

Tapia-Trosset, An extension of the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker necessity conditions to infinite programming, *SIAM Review* 36 (1994) 1-17. Li-Nahak-Singer, Constraint qualifications for semi-infinite systems of convex inequalities, *SIAM J. Optim.* 11 (2000) 31-52. Jeyakumar, Characterizing set containments involving infinite convex constraints and reverse-convex constraints. *SIAM J. Optim.* 13 (2003) 947-959.

Doagooei-Mohebi, Dual characterizations of the set containments with strict cone-convex inequalities in Banach spaces, *J. Global Optim.* 43 (2009) 577-591.

Suzuki-Kuroiwa, Set containment characterization for quasiconvex programming, *J. Global Optim.* 45 (2009) 551-563.

Suzuki, Set containment characterization with strict and weak quasiconvex inequalities, *J. Global Optim.* 47 (2010) 273-285.

Miguel A. Goberna

1966: Chu considers a lcHtvs X, whose topological dual X* is equipped with the w*- topology, T is arbitrary, a, a_t ∈ X*, b_t, b ∈ ℝ, and A = {x ∈ X : ⟨a_t, x⟩ ≤ b_t ∀t ∈ T} ≠ Ø.

- 1966: Chu considers a lcHtvs X, whose topological dual X* is equipped with the w*- topology, T is arbitrary, a, a_t ∈ X*, b_t, b ∈ ℝ, and A = {x ∈ X : ⟨a_t, x⟩ ≤ b_t ∀t ∈ T} ≠ Ø.
- His afine/affine Farkas' lemma establishes that

$$A \subset \{x \in X : \langle a, x \rangle \le b\}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (a, b) \in \text{cl cone} \{(a_t, b_t), t \in T; (0, 1)\}$$

- 1966: Chu considers a lcHtvs X, whose topological dual X* is equipped with the w*- topology, T is arbitrary, a, a_t ∈ X*, b_t, b ∈ ℝ, and A = {x ∈ X : ⟨a_t, x⟩ ≤ b_t ∀t ∈ T} ≠ Ø.
- His afine/affine Farkas' lemma establishes that

$$A \subset \{x \in X : \langle a, x \rangle \le b\}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (a, b) \in \text{cl cone} \{(a_t, b_t), t \in T; (0, 1)\}$$

• Denote by $\Gamma(X)$ the set of proper lsc convex functions from X.

- 1966: Chu considers a lcHtvs X, whose topological dual X* is equipped with the w*- topology, T is arbitrary, a, a_t ∈ X*, b_t, b ∈ ℝ, and A = {x ∈ X : ⟨a_t, x⟩ ≤ b_t ∀t ∈ T} ≠ Ø.
- His afine/affine Farkas' lemma establishes that

$$A \subset \{x \in X : \langle a, x \rangle \le b\}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (a, b) \in \text{cl cone} \{(a_t, b_t), t \in T; (0, 1)\}$$

- Denote by $\Gamma(X)$ the set of proper lsc convex functions from X.
- 2006: DGL replace the continuous affine functionals by elements of $\Gamma(X)$, exploiting the fact that these functions are the supremum of continuous affine functionals.

• More precisely, defining the *Fenchel conjugate* of $h \in \Gamma(X)$ as

$$h^*(u) = \sup\{\langle u, x \rangle - h(x) : x \in \text{dom } h\},\$$

one gets $h^{**} = h$.

• More precisely, defining the *Fenchel conjugate* of $h \in \Gamma(X)$ as

$$h^*(u) = \sup\{\langle u, x \rangle - h(x) : x \in \text{dom } h\},\$$

one gets $h^{**} = h$.

• Let X, X^{*} and T be as above, $f, f_t \in \Gamma(X)$, $\forall t \in T$, and $A = \{x \in X : f_t(x) \le 0 \ \forall t \in T\} \neq \emptyset$.

• More precisely, defining the *Fenchel conjugate* of $h \in \Gamma(X)$ as

$$h^*(u) = \sup\{\langle u, x \rangle - h(x) : x \in \text{dom } h\},\$$

one gets $h^{**} = h$.

- Let X, X^{*} and T be as above, $f, f_t \in \Gamma(X)$, $\forall t \in T$, and $A = \{x \in X : f_t(x) \le 0 \ \forall t \in T\} \neq \emptyset$.
- The convex/convex Farkas' lemma establishes that

$$A \subset [f \le 0] \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{epi} f^* \subset \operatorname{cl} \operatorname{cone} \left\{ \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \operatorname{epi} f_t^* \right\}$$

• More precisely, defining the Fenchel conjugate of $h \in \Gamma(X)$ as

$$h^*(u) = \sup\{\langle u, x \rangle - h(x) : x \in \text{dom } h\},\$$

one gets $h^{**} = h$.

- Let X, X^{*} and T be as above, $f, f_t \in \Gamma(X)$, $\forall t \in T$, and $A = \{x \in X : f_t(x) \le 0 \ \forall t \in T\} \neq \emptyset$.
- The convex/convex Farkas' lemma establishes that

$$A \subset [f \le 0] \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{epi} f^* \subset \operatorname{cl} \operatorname{cone} \left\{ \bigcup_{t \in T} \operatorname{epi} f_t^* \right\}$$

This version does not provide a characterization of global optimality.

• We say that the Farkas-Minkowski CQ holds whenever (FM) $\operatorname{cone}\left\{\bigcup_{t\in\mathcal{T}}\operatorname{epi} f_t^*\right\}$ is weak*-closed.

- We say that the Farkas-Minkowski CQ holds whenever (FM) $\operatorname{cone}\left\{\bigcup_{t\in\mathcal{T}}\operatorname{epi} f_t^*\right\}$ is weak*-closed.
- 2007: DGLS provide the following asymptotic convex/reverse-convex Farkas' lemma: if (FM) holds, then

$$A \subset [f \ge 0] \Leftrightarrow 0 \in \operatorname{cl}\left(\operatorname{epi} f^* + \operatorname{cone}\left\{\bigcup_{t \in T} \operatorname{epi} f_t^*\right\}\right)$$

- We say that the Farkas-Minkowski CQ holds whenever (FM) $\operatorname{cone}\left\{\bigcup_{t\in\mathcal{T}}\operatorname{epi} f_t^*\right\}$ is weak*-closed.
- 2007: DGLS provide the following asymptotic convex/reverse-convex Farkas' lemma: if (FM) holds, then

$$A \subset [f \ge 0] \Leftrightarrow 0 \in \operatorname{cl}\left(\operatorname{epi} f^* + \operatorname{cone}\left\{\bigcup_{t \in T} \operatorname{epi} f_t^*\right\}\right)$$

• Recall the closedness condition of Burachik-Jeyakumar (2005):

(CC)
$$\operatorname{epi} f^* + \operatorname{cl} \operatorname{cone} \left\{ \bigcup_{t \in T} \operatorname{epi} f_t^* \right\}$$
 is weak*-closed

• Each of the following conditions implies (CC):

- Each of the following conditions implies (CC):
- $epif^* + cone \{\bigcup_{t \in T} epif_t^*\}$ is weak*-closed.

- Each of the following conditions implies (CC):
- $epif^* + cone \{\bigcup_{t \in T} epif_t^*\}$ is weak*-closed.
- (FM) holds and f is linear.

- Each of the following conditions implies (CC):
- $epif^* + cone \{\bigcup_{t \in T} epif_t^*\}$ is weak*-closed.
- **(FM)** holds and *f* is linear.
- (FM) holds and f is continuous at some point of F.

- Each of the following conditions implies (CC):
- $epif^* + cone \{\bigcup_{t \in T} epif_t^*\}$ is weak*-closed.
- (FM) holds and f is linear.
- (FM) holds and f is continuous at some point of F.
 - 2007: DGLS provide the following non-asymptotic convex/reverse-convex Farkas' lemma: if (CC) holds, then

$$A \subset [f \ge 0] \Leftrightarrow 0 \in \operatorname{epi} f^* + \operatorname{cone} \left\{ \bigcup_{t \in T} \operatorname{epi} f_t^* \right\}$$

References

Burachik-Jeyakumar, Dual condition for the convex subdifferential sum formula with applications, *J. Convex Analysis* 12 (2005) 279-290.

Chu, Generalization of some fundamental theorems on linear inequalities. *Acta Mathematica Sinica* 16 (1966) 25-40. Dinh-Goberna-López, From linear to convex systems: consistency, Farkas' lemma and applications, *J. Convex Analysis* 13 (2006) 279-290.

Dinh-Goberna-López-Son, New Farkas-type constraint qualifications in convex infinite programming, *ESAIM: COCV* 13 (2007) 580-597.

Some sequels

Dinh-Vallet-Nghia, Farkas-type results and duality for DC programs with convex constraints, *J. Convex Anal.* 15 (2008) 235-262.

Li-Ng-Pong, Constraint qualifications for convex inequality systems with applications in constrained optimization, *SIAM J. Optim.* 19 (2008) 163-187.

Fang-Li-Ng, Constraint Qualifications for Extended Farkas's lemma and Lagrangian Dualities in Convex Infinite Programming, *SIAM J. Optim.* 20 (2009) 1311-1332.

Jeyakumar-Li, Farkas' lemma for separable sublinear inequalities without qualifications, *Opt. Letters* 3 (2009) 537-545.

Dinh-Mordukhovich-Nghia, Subdifferentials of value functions and optimality conditions for DC and bilevel infinite and semi-infinite programs, *Math. Programming* 123 (2010) 101-138.

Fang-Li-Ng, Constraint qualifications for optimality conditions and total Lagrange dualities in convex infinite programming, *Nonlinear Anal.* 73 (2010) 1143-1159.

Volle, Theorems of the Alternative for Multivalued Mappings and Applications to Mixed Convex\Concave Systems of Inequalities, *Set-Valued Var. Anal.* 18 (2010) 601-616.

Approximate infinite Farkas-type results

Miguel A. Goberna

Approximate infinite Farkas-type results

• The objective of this section is to provide very general optimality conditions (without CQ nor CC conditions).

- The objective of this section is to provide very general optimality conditions (without CQ nor CC conditions).
- Let X and Z be lcHtvs with corresponding topological duals X* and Z* endowed with the w*-topology.

- The objective of this section is to provide very general optimality conditions (without CQ nor CC conditions).
- Let X and Z be lcHtvs with corresponding topological duals X* and Z* endowed with the w*-topology.
- Let f ∈ Γ(X), C be a closed convex set in X, and S be a preordering closed convex cone in Z, with positive dual cone

$$S^+ := \{z^* \in Z^* : \langle z^*, s \rangle \ge 0, \forall s \in S\}.$$

- The objective of this section is to provide very general optimality conditions (without CQ nor CC conditions).
- Let X and Z be lcHtvs with corresponding topological duals X* and Z* endowed with the w*-topology.
- Let f ∈ Γ(X), C be a closed convex set in X, and S be a preordering closed convex cone in Z, with positive dual cone

$$S^+ := \{z^* \in Z^* : \langle z^*, s \rangle \ge 0, \forall s \in S\}.$$

• Assume that $\mathcal{H}: X \to Z$ satisfies $z^* \circ \mathcal{H} \in \Gamma(X) \ \forall z^* \in S^+$ and $A \cap \operatorname{dom} f \neq \emptyset$, where $A := C \cap \mathcal{H}^{-1}(-S)$.

• We need the next concepts:

- We need the next concepts:
- Given $\varepsilon \ge 0$, the ε -subdifferential of $h: X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ at $a \in X$ is

$$\partial_{\varepsilon} h(\mathbf{a}) = \left\{ u \in X^* \mid h(x) \ge h(\mathbf{a}) + \langle u, x - \mathbf{a} \rangle - \varepsilon \, \forall x \in X \right\}.$$

- We need the next concepts:
- Given $\varepsilon \ge 0$, the ε -subdifferential of $h: X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ at $a \in X$ is

$$\partial_{\varepsilon} h(\mathbf{a}) = \left\{ u \in X^* \mid h(x) \ge h(\mathbf{a}) + \langle u, x - \mathbf{a} \rangle - \varepsilon \, \forall x \in X \right\}.$$

• The subdifferential of h at $a \in X$ is $\partial h(a) := \partial_0 h(a)$.

- We need the next concepts:
- Given $\varepsilon \ge 0$, the ε -subdifferential of $h: X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ at $a \in X$ is

$$\partial_{\varepsilon} h(\mathbf{a}) = \left\{ u \in X^* \mid h(x) \ge h(\mathbf{a}) + \langle u, x - \mathbf{a} \rangle - \varepsilon \, \forall x \in X \right\}.$$

- The subdifferential of h at $a \in X$ is $\partial h(a) := \partial_0 h(a)$.
- The *indicator function* of $C \subset X$ is $i_C(x) = 0$ if $x \in C$ and $i_C(x) = +\infty$ otherwise.

- We need the next concepts:
- Given $\varepsilon \geq 0$, the ε -subdifferential of $h: X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ at $a \in X$ is

$$\partial_{\varepsilon} h(\mathbf{a}) = \left\{ u \in X^* \mid h(x) \ge h(\mathbf{a}) + \langle u, x - \mathbf{a} \rangle - \varepsilon \, \forall x \in X \right\}.$$

- The subdifferential of h at $a \in X$ is $\partial h(a) := \partial_0 h(a)$.
- The *indicator function* of $C \subset X$ is $i_C(x) = 0$ if $x \in C$ and $i_C(x) = +\infty$ otherwise.
- The ε -normal set to C at a point $a \in C$ is defined by

$$N_{\varepsilon}(C,a)=\partial_{\varepsilon}i_{C}(a)$$
 .

• 2010: DGLV provide the following approximate convex/reverse-convex Farkas' lemma :

- 2010: DGLV provide the following approximate convex/reverse-convex Farkas' lemma :
- $A \subset [f \ge 0]$ iff there exists a net

 $(x_{1i}^*, x_{2i}^*, x_{3i}^*, z_i^*, \varepsilon_i)_{i \in I} \subset (X^*)^3 \times S^+ \times \mathbb{R}$

such that

 $f^{*}(x_{1i}^{*}) + i_{C}^{*}(x_{2i}^{*}) + (z_{i}^{*} \circ \mathcal{H})^{*}(x_{3i}^{*}) \leq \varepsilon_{i}, \ \forall i,$ $(x_{1i}^{*} + x_{2i}^{*} + x_{3i}^{*}, \varepsilon_{i}) \to (0, 0_{+}).$

- 2010: DGLV provide the following approximate convex/reverse-convex Farkas' lemma :
- $A \subset [f \ge 0]$ iff there exists a net

 $(x_{1i}^*, x_{2i}^*, x_{3i}^*, z_i^*, \varepsilon_i)_{i \in I} \subset (X^*)^3 \times S^+ \times \mathbb{R}$

such that

 $f^{*}(x_{1i}^{*}) + i_{C}^{*}(x_{2i}^{*}) + (z_{i}^{*} \circ \mathcal{H})^{*}(x_{3i}^{*}) \leq \varepsilon_{i}, \ \forall i,$ $(x_{1i}^{*} + x_{2i}^{*} + x_{3i}^{*}, \varepsilon_{i}) \to (0, 0_{+}).$

• This result provides an optimality theorem for convex optimization problems of the form

(PC) minimize f(x) s.t. $x \in C$ and $\mathcal{H}(x) \in -S$.

 A point a ∈ A ∩ (dom f) is a minimizer of (PC) iff there exist (η_i)_{i∈I} → 0₊ and ∀i ∈ I there also exist

 $x_{1i}^* \in \partial_{\eta_i} f(\mathbf{a}), \ x_{2i}^* \in N_{\eta_i}(C, \mathbf{a}), \ x_{3i}^* \in \partial_{\eta_i}(z_i^* \circ \mathcal{H})(\mathbf{a}), \ z_i^* \in S^+$

such that

$$0 \leq \langle z_i^*, -\mathcal{H}(a) \rangle \leq \eta_i, \forall i,$$

$$\lim_{i} (x_{1i}^* + x_{2i}^* + x_{3i}^*) = 0.$$

• Let X, Z, C, S, A and f be as below, and let $h \in \Gamma(X)$.

- Let X, Z, C, S, A and f be as below, and let $h \in \Gamma(X)$.
- 2010: DGLV provide the following approximate convex/DC Farkas' lemma without CQ nor CC condition:

- Let X, Z, C, S, A and f be as below, and let $h \in \Gamma(X)$.
- 2010: DGLV provide the following approximate convex/DC Farkas' lemma without CQ nor CC condition:
- $A \subset [f h \ge 0]$ iff $\forall x^* \in \text{dom } h^*$, there exists a net

 $(x_{1i}^*, x_{2i}^*, x_{3i}^*, z_i^*, \varepsilon_i)_{i \in I} \subset (X^*)^3 \times S^+ \times \mathbb{R}$

such that

 $f^*(x_{1i}^*) + i_{\mathcal{C}}^*(x_{2i}^*) + (z_i^* \circ \mathcal{H})^*(x_{3i}^*) \le h^*(x^*) + \varepsilon_i, \ \forall i,$

$$(x_{1i}^* + x_{2i}^* + x_{3i}^*, \varepsilon_i) \to (x^*, 0_+).$$

• The corresponding optimality theorem for DC problems of the form

(DC)
$$\begin{cases} \text{minimize} & f(x) - h(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & x \in C, \ \mathcal{H}(x) \in -S, \end{cases}$$

is as follows:

• The corresponding optimality theorem for DC problems of the form

(DC)
$$\begin{cases} \text{minimize } f(x) - h(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & x \in C, \ \mathcal{H}(x) \in -S, \end{cases}$$

is as follows:

• A point $a \in A \cap (\text{dom } f)$ is a minimizer of (DC) iff $\forall x^* \in \text{dom } h^*$ there exists a net

$$(x_{1i}^*, x_{2i}^*, x_{3i}^*, z_i^*, \varepsilon_i)_{i \in I} \subset (X^*)^3 \times S^+ \times \mathbb{R}$$

satisfying

 $f^{*}(x_{1i}^{*}) + i_{\mathcal{C}}^{*}(x_{2i}^{*}) + (z_{i}^{*} \circ \mathcal{H})^{*}(x_{3i}^{*}) \leq h^{*}(x^{*}) + h(a) - f(a) + \varepsilon_{i}, \forall i, d \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(x_{1i}^* + x_{2i}^* + x_{3i}^*, \varepsilon_i) \to (x^*, 0_+).$$

• If $a \in A \cap \text{dom } f \cap \text{dom } h$ is a local minimum of (DC), then

 $\partial h(a) \subset \limsup_{\eta \to 0_+} \bigcup_{z^* \in \partial_\eta i_{-S}(\mathcal{H}(a))} \left\{ \partial_\eta f(a) + \partial_\eta (z^* \circ \mathcal{H})(a) + N_\eta (C, a) \right\}$

- If $a \in A \cap \operatorname{dom} f \cap \operatorname{dom} h$ is a local minimum of (DC), then $\partial h(a) \subset \limsup_{\eta \to 0_+} \bigcup_{z^* \in \partial_\eta i_{-S}(\mathcal{H}(a))} \left\{ \partial_\eta f(a) + \partial_\eta (z^* \circ \mathcal{H})(a) + N_\eta(C, a) \right\}$
- or, equivalently, $\forall x^* \in \partial h(a)$, there exists a net

$$(x_{1i}^*, x_{2i}^*, x_{3i}^*, z_i^*, \eta_i)_{i \in I} \subset (X^*)^3 \times S^+ \times \mathbb{R}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} x_{1i}^* \in \partial_{\eta_i} f(\mathbf{a}), \ x_{2i}^* \in N_{\eta_i}(C, \mathbf{a}), \ x_{3i}^* \in \partial_{\eta_i}(z_i^* \circ \mathcal{H})(\mathbf{a}), \ \forall i, \\ 0 \leq \langle z_i^*, -\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}) \rangle \leq \eta_i, \ \forall i, \\ (x_{1i}^* + x_{2i}^* + x_{3i}^*, \eta_i) \longrightarrow (x^*, 0_+). \end{aligned}$$

Dinh-Goberna-López-Volle, Convex inequalities without constraint qualification nor closedness condition, and their applications in optimization. *Set-Valued and Var. Anal.* 18 (2010) 423-445.