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Abstract In this work we show the consistency of an approach for solving robust optimization problems using sequences of sub-problems generated by ergodic measure preserving transformations.

The main result of this paper is that the minimizers and the optimal value of the sub-problems converge, in some sense, to the minimizers and the optimal value of the initial problem, respectively. Our result particularly implies the consistency of the scenario approach for nonconvex optimization problems. Finally, we show that our method can be used to solve infinite programming problems.

Keywords Stochastic optimization · scenario approach · robust optimization · epi-convergence · ergodic theorems.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) MSC 90C15 · 90C26 · 90C90 · 60B11

1 Introduction

Robust optimization (RO) corresponds to a field of optimization dedicated to the study of problems with uncertainty. In this class of models, the constraint set is given by the set of points, which satisfy all (or in the presence of measurability, almost all) possible cases. Roughly speaking, an RO problem corresponds to the following mathematical optimization model

\[
\begin{align*}
\min g(x) \\
\text{s.t. } x & \in M(\xi), \text{ almost surely } \xi \in \Xi,
\end{align*}
\]  

where \(X\) is a Polish space, \((\Xi, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})\) is a probability space, \(M : \Xi \to X\) is a measurable multifunction with closed values and \(g : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}\) is a lower semicontinuous function. We refer to \cite{4, 5, 18, 21, 22} and the references therein for more details and applications.

This work was partially supported by CONICYT Chile under grant Fondecyt regular 1190110.
When the number of possible scenarios $\xi \in \Xi$ is infinite in Problem (1), the computation of necessary and sufficient optimality conditions presents difficulties and requires a more delicate analysis than a simpler optimization problem. As far as we know, only works related to infinite programming deal directly with infinite-many constraints (see, e.g., [14, 17] and the references therein). For that reason, it is necessary to solve an approximation of Problem (1). In this regard, the so-called *scenario approach* emerges as a possible solution. The *scenario approach* corresponds to a min-max approximation of the original robust optimization problem using a sequence of samples. It has used to provide an approximate solution to convex and nonconvex optimization problems (see, e.g., [8–10]). Furthermore, the consistency of this method has been recently provided in [7] for convex optimization problems.

The intention of this work is to provide the consistency of the following method used to solve RO problems: Consider an *ergodic measure preserving transformation* $T : \Xi \to \Xi$, then one can systematically solve the sequence of optimization problems

$$\min g_n(x)$$

s.t. $x \in M(T^k(\xi)); \ k = 1, \ldots, n$,

(2)

where $g_n$ is a sequence of functions, which converge continuously to the objective function $g$, and $T^k$ represents the $k$-times composition of $T$. Here, the desired conclusion is that the optimal value and the minimizers of (2) converge, in some sense, to the optimal value and the minimizers of (1) for almost all possible choices of $\xi \in \Xi$. This conclusion is established in Corollary 3.1, which follows directly from our main result Theorem 3.1.

The key point in our results is to make a connection among three topics: (i) the ideas of *scenario approach*, (ii) an *ergodic theorem for random lower semicontinuous functions* established in [1, Theorem 1.1], and (iii) the *theory of epigraphical convergence of functions*. After that, and due to the enormous developments in the theory of epi-convergence (see, e.g., [2, 20]), we can quickly establish some link between the minimizers and the optimal value of the robust optimization problem (1) and its corresponding approximation (2).

As a consequence of this method, we obtain the consistency of the *scenario approach* for nonconvex optimization problems. More precisely, in this method one considers a drawing of independent and $\mathbb{P}$-distributed random function $\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots$, and systematically solves the sequence of optimizations problems.

$$\min g_n(x)$$

s.t. $x \in M(\xi_k); \ k = 1, \ldots, n$.

(3)

Again, the conclusion relies on showing that the optimal value and the minimizers of (3) converges to the solution of (1) for almost all possible sequences $(\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots)$.

It is worth mentioning that our method allows us to solve nonconvex optimization problems and to consider a perturbation of the objective function $g$ in (2) and (3), which is not guaranteed by the results of [7]. Here, it has not escaped our notice that the perturbation of $g$ could be useful to ensure smoothness of the objective function in (2) and (3). On the other hand, the functions $g_n$ could be used to guarantee the existence and uniqueness of the numerical solutions of (2) and (3).

The rest of the paper is organized as follow: In Section 2 we summarize the main definitions and notions using in the presented manuscript. Next, we divide Section 3 into two subsections. The first one gives us a generalization of the *scenario approach* using *ergodic measure preserving transformation* instead of a sequence of independent and identically $\mathbb{P}$-distributed random functions. The second one aims to give a direct proof of the consistency of the *scenario approach* for nonconvex
optimization problems using the results of Subsection 3.1. Finally, in Section 4 we show that our ergodic approach can be applied to problems related to infinite programming.

2 Notation and Preliminary

In the following, we consider that \((X, d)\) is a Polish space, that is to say, a complete separable metric space and \((\Xi, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})\) is a complete probability space. The Borel \(\sigma\)-algebra on \(X\) is denoted by \(\mathcal{B}(X)\), which we recall is the smallest \(\sigma\)-algebra containing all open sets of \(X\).

For a function \(f : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}\), a set \(C \subseteq X\) and \(\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\), we define the \(\alpha\)-sublevel set of \(f\) on \(C\) as
\[
\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha}(f, C) := \{x \in C : f(x) \leq \alpha\},
\]
when \(C = X\), we omit the symbol \(C\). We say that \(f\) is lower semicontinuous (lsc) if for all \(\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\) the \(\alpha\)-sublevel set of \(f\) on \(X\) is closed.

Following [2], let us consider a set \(C \subseteq X\) and \(\varepsilon \geq 0\). We define the \(\varepsilon\)-infimal value of \(f\) on \(C\) by
\[
v_{\varepsilon}(f, C) := \begin{cases} 
\inf_C f + \varepsilon, & \text{if } \inf_C f > -\infty, \\
-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, & \text{if } \inf_C f = -\infty.
\end{cases}
\]
with the convention \(\frac{1}{0} = +\infty\). We omit the symbol \(C\), or \(\varepsilon\) when \(C = X\), or when \(\varepsilon = 0\), respectively.

Furthermore, we define the \(\varepsilon\)-argmin of \(f\) on \(C\) by
\[
\varepsilon\text{-argmin}_C f := \{x \in C : f(x) \leq v_{\varepsilon}(f, C)\},
\]
again we omit the symbol \(C\), or \(\varepsilon\) when \(C = X\) or when \(\varepsilon = 0\), respectively.

For a set \(A \subseteq X\), we define the indicator function of \(A\), given by,
\[
\delta_A(x) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \in A, \\
+\infty, & \text{if } x \notin A.
\end{cases}
\]

A function \(f : \Xi \times X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}\) is called a random lower semicontinuous function (also called a normal integrand function) if
(i) the function \((\xi, x) \mapsto f(\xi, x)\) is \(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}(X)\)-measurable, and
(ii) for every \(\xi \in \Xi\) the function \(f_{\xi} := f(\xi, \cdot)\) is lsc.

Let us consider a set-valued map (also called a multifunction) \(M : \Xi \rightrightarrows X\). We say that \(M\) is measurable if for every open set \(U \subseteq X\) the set
\[
M^{-1}(U) := \{x \in X : M(x) \cap U \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{A}.
\]

For more details about the theory of normal integrand and measurable multifunctions we refer to [3][11][15][20].

Consider a sequence of sets \(S_n \subseteq X\). We set \(\liminf_{n \to \infty} S_n\) and \(\limsup_{n \to \infty} S_n\) as the inner-limit and the outer-limit, in the sense of Painlevé-Kuratowski, of the sequence \(S_n\), respectively, that is to say,
\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} S_n := \left\{ x \in X : \limsup_{n \to \infty} d(x, S_n) = 0 \right\}
\]
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} S_n := \left\{ x \in X : \liminf_{n \to \infty} d(x, S_n) = 0 \right\},
\]
where $d(x, S_n) := \inf \{d(x, y) : y \in S_n\}$.

Now, let us recall some notations about the convergence of functions.

**Definition 2.1** Let $f_n : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a sequence of functions. The functions $f_n$ are said to epi-converge to $f$, denoted by $f_n \xrightarrow{e} f$, if for every $x \in X$

a) $\liminf_{n \to \infty} f_n(x_n) \geq f(x)$ for all $x_n \to x$.

b) $\limsup_{n \to \infty} f_n(x_n) \leq f(x)$ for some $x_n \to x$.

We refer to [2, 20] for more details about the theory of epi-graphical convergence.

Also, we will need the following notation, which is equivalent to uniform convergence over compact sets for continuous functions (see, e.g., [20]).

**Definition 2.2** We say that a sequence of functions $f_n : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ converges continuously to $f$, if for every $x \in X$ and every $x_n \to x$ we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} f_n(x_n) = f(x).$$

The following definition is an extension of the notation eventually level-bounded used in finite-dimension setting, which can be found in [20, Chapter 7.E]. We extend this notation as follows:

Consider a sequence of functions $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a sequence of sets $(C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. We say that a sequence of functions $f_n$ is eventually level-compact on $C_n$, if for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists $n_\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\bigcup_{n \geq n_\alpha} \text{lev}_{\leq \alpha}(f_n, C_n)$$

is relatively compact.

In particular, if $C_n = X$, we simply say that $f_n$ is eventually level-compact.

The following lemma shows that the sum of an epi-convergence sequence and a continuously converge sequence epi-converges to the sum of limits.

**Lemma 2.1** Consider sequences of functions $p_n, q_n : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ such that $p_n$ converges equicontinuously to $p$ and $q_n$ epi-converges to $q$. Then, $p_n + q_n \xrightarrow{e} p + q$.

**Proof** Consider $x \in X$ and a sequence $x_n \to x$, then

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} (p_n + q_n)(x_n) \geq \liminf_{n \to \infty} p_n(x_n) + \liminf_{n \to \infty} q_n(x_n) \geq p(x) + q(x).$$

Now, by definition of epi-convergence we know that there exists $x_n \to x$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} q_n(x_n) \leq q(x).$$

Moreover, $\limsup_{n \to \infty} p_n(x_n) = p(x)$, and consequently

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} (p_n + q_n)(x_n) \leq \limsup_{n \to \infty} p_n(x_n) + \limsup_{n \to \infty} q_n(x_n) \leq p(x) + q(x).$$

The following result corresponds to a slight generalization of [2, Proposition 2.9] (see also [20, Proposition 7.30]), where only sequences $\varepsilon_n \to 0$ were considered.

**Proposition 2.1** Let $f_n \xrightarrow{e} f$ and $\varepsilon_n \geq 0$ be a sequence such that $\varepsilon = \limsup_{n \to \infty} \varepsilon_n < +\infty$. Then,
a) \( \limsup v_{\varepsilon_n}(f_n) \leq v_{\varepsilon}(f) \).

b) \( \limsup \varepsilon_n \cdot \argmin f_n \subseteq \varepsilon \cdot \argmin f. \)

**Proof** First let us prove a), on the one hand if \( \limsup v_{\varepsilon_n}(f_n) = -\infty \) the conclusion is trivial, so we can assume that \( \limsup v_{\varepsilon_n}(f_n) > -\infty \), and by passing to a subsequence, we also assume that \( \inf f_n > -\infty \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). By definition of epi-convergence we have that for every \( x \in X \) there exists \( x_n \to x \) such that \( f(x) \geq \limsup f_n(x_n) \).

It implies that

\[
-\infty < \limsup v_{\varepsilon_n}(f_n) = \limsup (\inf f_n + \varepsilon_n) \leq \limsup (f_n(x_n) + \varepsilon_n) \leq f(x) + \varepsilon,
\]

which yields that \( -\infty < \limsup v_{\varepsilon_n}(f_n) \leq \inf f(x) + \varepsilon = v_{\varepsilon}(f). \)

Now, we focus on b). Consider a sequence of points \( x_k \in \varepsilon_{nk} \cdot \argmin f_{nk} \) such that \( x_k \to x \). Then, by definition of epi-convergence and part a) we have that

\[
f(x) \leq \liminf f_{nk}(x_{nk}) \leq \liminf v_{\varepsilon_{nk}}(f_{nk}) \leq v_{\varepsilon}(f),
\]

which completes the proof of b).

3 Consistency of the Approach to Robust Optimization Problems

In this section we consider the following optimization problem

\[
\begin{align*}
\min g(x) \\
s.t. \ x \in M_{a.s.},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( M_{a.s.} := \{ x \in X : x \in M(\xi) \text{ a.s.} \} \), \( g : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{ +\infty \} \) is an lsc function and \( M : \Xi \to X \) is a measurable multifunction with closed values. We study two approaches for solving (R). The first one corresponds to an approach using ergodic measure preserving transformation. In this subsection we show the consistency of this method. In the second subsection, we show that our results imply the consistency of the scenario approach method.

3.1 Approach by Measure Preserving Transformations

Now, we consider the following approach using ergodic measure preserving transformation. First, let us formally introduce this notion. Consider a (complete) probability space \( (\Xi, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}) \) and a measurable function \( T : \Xi \to \Xi \). We say that \( T \) preserves measure if

\[
\mathbb{P}(T^{-1}(A)) = \mathbb{P}(A), \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A}.
\]

Furthermore, we say that \( T \) is ergodic provided that for all \( A \in \mathcal{A} \)

\[
A = T^{-1}(A) \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(A) = 0, \text{ or } \mathbb{P}(A^c) = 0.
\]

Consequently, we say that \( T \) is an ergodic measure preserving transformation provided that \( T \) satisfies (4) and (5).
We consider a sequence of lsc functions $g_n$, which converge continuously to $g$, let us consider an ergodic measure preserving transformation $T : \Xi \to \Xi$. With this setting, we define the following family of optimization problems: For a point $\xi \in \Xi$ we define

$$\min g_n(x)$$

$$s.t. \ x \in E_n(\xi) := \bigcap_{k=1}^n M(T^k(\xi)), \quad (\xi_n(\xi))$$

where $T^k$ denotes the $k$-times composition of $T$. In order to show more clearly the link of epigraphical convergence and the relation between $\mathbb{R}$ and $E_n(\xi)$, let us define the functions $f_n : \Xi \times X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $f : \Xi \times X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ by

$$f_n(\xi, x) := g_n(x) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{M(T^k(\xi))}(x),$$

$$f(\xi, x) := g(x) + \delta_{\mu_\infty}(x).$$

With this notation we can write the relationship between $\mathbb{R}$ and $E_n(\xi)$ in a functional formulation.

**Theorem 3.1** Under the above setting we have that $f_n(\xi, \cdot) \xrightarrow{\epsilon} f$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. Consequently for any measurable sequence $\varepsilon_n : \Xi \to (0, +\infty)$ with $\varepsilon(\xi) := \limsup \varepsilon_n(\xi) < +\infty$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. we have that:

a) $\limsup_{n \to \infty} \varepsilon_n(\xi)(f_n(\xi, \cdot)) \leq \varepsilon(\xi)(f), \mathbb{P}$-a.s.

b) $\limsup_{n \to \infty} \varepsilon_n(\xi)$-argmin $f_n(\xi, \cdot) \subseteq \varepsilon(\xi)$-argmin $f$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.

**Proof** Let us consider the sequence of functions

$$p_n(x) := g_n(x) \quad \text{and} \quad q_n(\xi, x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{M(T^k(\xi))}(x)$$

It is not difficult to see that the function $(\xi, x) \to \delta_{M(\xi)}(x)$ is a random lsc function and the function $\xi \to \inf \delta_{M(\xi)}(x)$ is summable. Then, by [10, Theorem 1.1], we have that

$$q_n(\xi, \cdot) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{E}_\xi(\delta_{M(\xi)}(\cdot)) = \delta_{\mu_\infty}(\cdot), \mathbb{P}$-a.s.$$

Now, define $\tilde{\Xi} := \{\xi \in \Xi : q_n(\xi, \cdot) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}} \delta_{\mu_\infty}\}$, it follows that $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Xi}) = 1$. Thus for all $\xi \in \tilde{\Xi}$ we apply Lemma[24] which implies that for all $\xi \in \tilde{\Xi}$, we have $p_n + q_n(\xi, \cdot) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}} f$, that is to say, $f_n(\xi, \cdot) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}} f$ for all $\xi \in \tilde{\Xi}$.

Now, by Proposition[24] we have that for all $\xi \in \tilde{\Xi}$,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \varepsilon_n(\xi)(f_n(\xi, \cdot)) \leq \varepsilon(\xi)(f), \text{ and}$$

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \varepsilon_n(\xi)$-argmin $f_n(\xi, \cdot) \subseteq \varepsilon(\xi)$-argmin $f,$

which concludes the proof.
When there are additional assumptions about the feasibility and compactness of the optimization problems (R) and \( E_n(\xi) \) we can establish a tighter conclusion. We translate the hypothesis into notation of the problems (R) and \( E_n(\xi) \), respectively.

**Corollary 3.1** Let us assume that (R) is feasible, and the sequence of function \( g_n \) is eventually level compact on \( E_n(\xi) \) \( \mathbb{P} \)-a.s. \( \xi \in \Xi \). Then,

a) \( \lim_{n \to \infty} v(g_n, E_n(\xi)) = v(g, M_{as}) \), \( \mathbb{P} \)-a.s.

b) For any measurable sequence \( \varepsilon_n : \Xi \to (0, +\infty) \) with \( \varepsilon_n(\xi) \to 0 \), \( \mathbb{P} \)-a.s. we have that

\[
\emptyset \neq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \varepsilon_n(\xi) \cdot \arg\min_{E_n(\xi)} g_n \subseteq \arg\min_{M_{as}} g, \text{ \( \mathbb{P} \)-a.s.}
\]

c) \[
\bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \liminf_{n \to \infty} \varepsilon \cdot \arg\min_{E_n(\xi)} g_n = \arg\min_{M_{as}} g = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \varepsilon \cdot \arg\min_{E_n(\xi)} g_n, \text{ \( \mathbb{P} \)-a.s.}
\]

**Proof** Consider the notation given in (6). Let us define \( \alpha := \max\{\inf f + 1, 1\} \), we have that \( \alpha < +\infty \) due to the feasibility of (R). Consider a set \( \hat{\Xi} \) of full measure such that for all \( \xi \in \hat{\Xi} \)

(i) \( (f_n(\xi, \cdot))_n \in \mathbb{N} \) is eventually level compact,

(ii) \( \varepsilon_n(\xi) \to 0 \),

(iii) \( \limsup_{n \to \infty} \varepsilon_n(\xi) \cdot \arg\min_{E_n(\xi)} f_n(\xi, \cdot) \subseteq \arg\min f \).

Fix \( \xi \in \hat{\Xi} \) and a sequence \( x_k(\xi) \in \varepsilon_{n_k}(\xi) \cdot \arg\min_{E_n(\xi)} f_{n_k}(\xi, \cdot) \), so there exists some \( n_\xi \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for all \( n \geq n_\xi \)

\[
\varepsilon_n(\xi) \leq 1, \text{ and } \bigcup_{n \geq n_\xi} \text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} f_n \text{ is relatively compact.}
\]

This implies that the sequence \( (x_k(\xi))_{k \geq n_\xi} \) belongs to a compact set, so it has an accumulation point. Consequently, we have that \( \limsup_{n \to \infty} \varepsilon_n \cdot \arg\min f_n(\xi, \cdot) \neq \emptyset \), which proves b).

Now, by [2, Theorem 2.11] we conclude that \( \lim_{n \to \infty} v(f_n(\xi, \cdot)) = v(f) \) for all \( \xi \in \hat{\Xi} \), which concludes the proof of a). Finally, using [2, Theorem 2.12] we get that c) holds.

### 3.2 Approach by Samples

In this section we consider \( (\Xi^\infty, \mathcal{A}^\infty, \mathbb{P}^\infty) \) as the denumerable product of the probability space \( (\Xi, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}) \).

As in the previous section, we consider a sequence of lsc functions \( g_n \), which converge continuously to \( g \), let us define the following family of optimization problems: For each \( \omega = (\xi_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in \Xi^\infty \) we set

\[
\min g_n(x) \quad \text{s.t. } x \in S_n(\omega) := \bigcap_{k=1}^n M(\xi_k), \quad (S_n(\omega))
\]
Let us define \( f_n : X^\infty \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \) given by

\[
f_n(\omega, x) := g_n(x) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \delta_{M(\xi_k)}(x),
\]

\[
f(x) := g(x) + \delta_{M_{as}}(x).
\]

(7)

The following results corresponds to the scenario approach version of Theorem 3.1

**Theorem 3.2** Under the above setting we have that \( f_n(\omega, \cdot) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^\infty\text{-a.s.}} f \), \( \mathbb{P}^\infty\text{-a.s.} \). Consequently for any measurable sequence \( \varepsilon_n : X^\infty \rightarrow (0, +\infty) \) with \( \varepsilon(\omega) := \limsup \varepsilon_n(\omega) < +\infty \), \( \mathbb{P}^\infty\text{-a.s.} \) we have that:

a) \( \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n(\omega)(f_n(\omega, \cdot)) \leq \varepsilon(\omega)(f) \), \( \mathbb{P}^\infty\text{-a.s.} \).

b) \( \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n(\omega)\cdot \text{argmin} f_n(\omega, \cdot) \subseteq \varepsilon(\omega)\cdot \text{argmin} f \), \( \mathbb{P}^\infty\text{-a.s.} \).

**Proof** Consider the shift on \( X^\infty \), that is, \( T : X^\infty \rightarrow X^\infty \) given by

\[
T((\xi_i)_{i=1}^\infty) = (\xi_{i+1})_{i=1}^\infty,
\]

(8)

by [12] Proposition 2.2] \( T \) is an ergodic measure preserving transformation (For more details we refer to [12][24]). Furthermore, we extend the measurable multifunction \( M \) to \( X^\infty \) just by defining \( \tilde{M} : X \rightarrow X \) by \( \tilde{M}(\omega) = M(\xi_1) \), where \( \omega = (\xi_i)_{i=1}^\infty \). Using notation (7) we get

\[
f_n(\omega, x) := g_n(x) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \delta_{\tilde{M}(T^n(\omega))}(x) = g_n(x) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \delta_{M(\xi_k)}(x),
\]

(9)

\[
f(x) := g(x) + \delta_{M_{as}}(x) = g(x) + \delta_{M_{as}}(x).
\]

Then, Theorem 3.1 gives us that for almost all \( \omega = (\xi_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in X^\infty \)

i) \( f_n(\omega, \cdot) \rightarrow f \),

ii) \( \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n(\omega)(f_n(\omega, \cdot)) \leq \varepsilon(\omega)(f) \),

iii) \( \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n(\omega)\cdot \text{argmin} f_n(\omega, \cdot) \subseteq \varepsilon(\omega)\cdot \text{argmin} f \)

**Remark 3.1** It is worth mentioning that Theorem 3.2 can be proved using the same proof given in Theorem 3.1 copied step by step, but using [11] Theorem 2.3 instead of [10] Theorem 1.1.

Similar to the previous subsection, we can get more precise estimations under some compactness assumptions. The proof of this result follows considering the representation of (7) given in (8) using the shift transformation defined in (9), and also it can follow mimicking the proof of the Corollary step by step, and using Theorem 3.2 instead of Theorem 3.1

**Corollary 3.2** Let us assume that \( S_n \) is feasible, and the sequence of functions \( g_n \) is eventually level compact on \( S_n(\omega) \) \( \mathbb{P}^\infty\text{-a.s.} \). \( \omega \in X^\infty \). Then,

a) \( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(g_n, S_n(\omega)) = v(g, M_{as}) \), \( \mathbb{P}^\infty\text{-a.s.} \). \( \omega \in X^\infty \).

b) For any measurable sequence \( \varepsilon_n : X^\infty \rightarrow (0, +\infty) \) with \( \varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0 \), \( \mathbb{P}^\infty\text{-a.s.} \). we have that

\[
\emptyset \neq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n(\omega)\cdot \text{argmin} g_n \subseteq \text{argmin}_{M_{as}} g, \mathbb{P}^\infty\text{-a.s.} \omega \in X^\infty.
\]
Remark 3.2 It has not escaped our notice that in [19] the authors did not show the consistency of the scenario approach with a perturbation over the objective function \( g \) as in \( S_n(\omega) \). Furthermore, only linear objective function and convex constraint sets were considered in [19].

4 Application to Infinite Programming Problems

In this part of the work, we use the result of Section 3.1 to show that a sequence of sub-problems can be used to give an approach for infinite programming problems.

Consider the following problem of infinite programming (semi-infinite programming, if \( S \) is a subset of \( \mathbb{R}^n \))

\[
\min g(x) \\
\text{s.t. } x \in \bigcap_{s \in S} M(s),
\]

where \( S \) is a topological space, and \( M : S \rightarrow X \) is an outer-semicontinuous set-valued map, that is to say, for every net \( s_\nu \rightarrow s \) and every sequence \( x_\nu \in M(s_\nu) \) with \( x_\nu \rightarrow x \) we have \( x \in M(s) \).

We denote by \( \mathcal{A} \) any \( \sigma \)-algebra, which contains all open subsets on \( T \), and consider a strictly positive finite measure, that is to say, \( \mu(S) < +\infty \) and

\( \mu(U) > 0 \), for every open set \( U \subseteq S \),

let us consider an ergodic measure preserving transformation \( T : S \rightarrow S \). With this framework, we define the sequence of optimization problems

\[
\min g_n(x) \\
\text{s.t. } x \in I_n(s) := \bigcap_{k=1}^{n} M(T^k(s)),
\]

where \( g_n \) converges continuously to \( g \). As a simple application of Theorem 3.1, we get the following result, which gives us a relation between Problems \( I_n(s) \) and \( I \).

Theorem 4.1 Let us assume that \( (S, \mathcal{A}, \mu) \) is complete, \( I_n(s) \) is feasible, and the sequence of functions \( g_n \) is eventually level compact on \( I_n(s) \) \( \mu \)-a.e. Then,

a) \( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(g_n, I_n(s)) = v(g, M_a) \), \( \mu \)-a.e.

b) For any measurable sequence \( \varepsilon_n : S \rightarrow (0, +\infty) \) with \( \varepsilon_n(s) \rightarrow 0 \), \( \mu \)-a.e. we have that

\[ \emptyset \neq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n(s) - \argmin_{I_n(s)} g_n \subseteq \argmin_{M_a} g, \ \mu \text{-a.e.} \]

c) \( \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon - \argmin_{I_n(s)} g_n = \argmin_{M_a} g = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon - \argmin_{I_n(s)} g_n, \ \mu \text{-a.e.} \)
Proof First, by the outer-semicontinuous of $M$ we have that the optimization problem (7) is equivalent to
\[
\min g(x) \\
\text{s.t. } x \in M(s), \text{ $\mu$-a.e.}
\] (10)
Indeed, let $x \in M(s)$ for almost all $s \in S$. Then, the set $D_x := \{ s \in S : x \in M(s) \}$ is dense due to the fact that $\mu$ is a strictly positive measure. Consequently for every $s \in S \setminus D_x$ there exists $s_{\nu} \to s$, so by the outer-semicontinuous of $M$ we get that $x \in M(s)$, and consequently $x \in M(s)$ for all $s \in S$.

Next, consider the probability measure $P(\cdot) = \mu(S)^{-1}\mu(\cdot)$. Then, applying Corollary 3.1 to (10) we get that $a), b)$ and $c)$ hold with (10), and by the equivalency with (7) we conclude the proof.

5 Numerical Examples

Now, let us illustrate the above result with two different examples. The first one consider a best polynomial approximation, which in particular can be expressed as a convex optimization problem. The second one consider a non-convex optimization problem.

5.1 Best Functional Approximation

In this subsection we focus on the following optimization problem. Consider a (measurable) absolutely bounded function $f : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ and a (finite) family of linearly independent absolutely bounded functions $e_j : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ with $j = 0, \ldots, q$. We want to find the best approximation of $f$ in the linear space spanned by $\{e_j\}_{j=0}^q$. In order to solve this problems we follow [13]. Let us consider the following optimization problem:
\[
\min \beta \\
\text{s.t. } \|f - \sum_{j=0}^q x_i \cdot e_j\|_{\infty} \leq \beta.
\]
It can be equivalently expressed as
\[
\min g(x) \\
\text{s.t. } x \in M(t) \text{ a.e. } t \in [0, 1].
\] (B)
where the (measurable) set-valued map $M : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^{q+2}$ is given by
\[
M(t) := \left\{(x, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^{q+1} \times \mathbb{R} : -\beta \leq f(t) - \sum_{j=0}^q x_i \cdot e_j(t) \leq \beta \right\}
\]
and $g : \mathbb{R}^{q+2} \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by $g(x, \beta) = \beta$.

To illustrate our results let us solve numerically (B) for the particular function $f(t) = 10^2 t(2t - 1)(t - 1)(4t - 1)(4t - 3)$.
and $e_j$ the canonical base of polynomials, that is, $e_j(t) := t^j$. We use an ergodic measure preserving transformation $T(t) = t + \alpha \mod 1$, with some $\alpha \not\in \mathbb{Q}$, and systematically, we solve the sequence of optimization problems for a fixed point $\bar{t} \in [0, 1]$

$$\min g(x) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x \in M(T^k(\bar{t})), \ k = 1, \ldots, n. \quad (B_n(\bar{t}))$$

In Figure 1 we show the results of the polynomial approximation found solving Problem $B_n(\bar{t})$ for different values of $n$ and for point $\bar{t} = 0$ and $\alpha = \sqrt{7}$.

5.2 Rotation on the 2-dimensional Unit Sphere

Let us consider the following optimization problem

$$\min g(x, y) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \alpha x + \beta y \leq 6 \quad \text{for all} \ (\alpha, \beta) \in S^1,$$

where $g$ is a non-convex polynomial function with several local-minima (see Figure 2), more precisely we choose

$$g(x, y) = (x + 5)(x + 2)(x - 1)(x - 9) + y(y + 11)(y - 4)(y - 5) + xy.$$
and \( S^1 \) is the 2-dimensional unit sphere, that is to say, \( S^1 := \{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1 \} \). It is not difficult to see that the above problem is noting more than
\[
\min g(x, y) \\
\text{s.t. } x^2 + y^2 \leq 36. \tag{11}
\]

To solve this problem, we use an irrational rotation \( T : S^1 \to S^1 \), that is, \( T(\xi) = \xi \cdot e^{2\pi \theta i} \) with \( \theta \in [0, 1] \setminus \mathbb{Q} \). Here the multiplication is in the sense of complex numbers. Therefore, we have to numerically solve the following optimization problems
\[
\min g(x, y) \\
\text{s.t. } x \in U_n(\xi) \tag{U_n(\xi)}
\]

where \( U_n(\xi) := \{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \langle T^k(\xi), (x, y) \rangle \leq 6, \forall k = 1, \ldots, n \} \).

First, we have that the global minimum of \( g \) is attained at \( (x_u, y_u) = (6.3442, -7.6398) \) and the minimum is \( g(x_u, y_u) = -5490.9 \). On the other hand the optimal value of (11) is attained at \( (x_c, y_c) = (3.2004, -5.0752) \) with value \( g(x_c, y_c) = -3519.1 \). In Table 1 we can compare different numerical solutions to Problem \( U_n(\xi) \).

![Fig. 2: Function \( g \) of Section 5.2](image-url)
Table 1: Numerical solution of Problem \( \mathcal{U}_n(\xi) \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \xi )</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( v(g, \mathcal{U}_n(\xi)) )</th>
<th>( x )</th>
<th>( y )</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( v(g, \mathcal{U}_n(\xi)) )</th>
<th>( x )</th>
<th>( y )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i\pi/10} )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3862.4</td>
<td>1.7623</td>
<td>-6.7866</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-3634.7</td>
<td>3.3542</td>
<td>-5.1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i\pi/6} )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4257.4</td>
<td>2.6753</td>
<td>-6.9091</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-3519.3</td>
<td>3.0438</td>
<td>-5.1746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i\pi/3} )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-5406.3</td>
<td>5.7143</td>
<td>-7.2882</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-3651.6</td>
<td>4.3877</td>
<td>-4.5573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i4\pi/3} )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4258.3</td>
<td>4.3254</td>
<td>-5.5167</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-3634.7</td>
<td>3.3542</td>
<td>-5.1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i7\pi/4} )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-5251.2</td>
<td>4.9946</td>
<td>-7.5369</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-3745.8</td>
<td>3.9081</td>
<td>-4.9747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i\pi/10} )</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-3519.4</td>
<td>3.3562</td>
<td>-4.9778</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-3519.4</td>
<td>3.3562</td>
<td>-4.9778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i\pi/6} )</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-3519.3</td>
<td>3.0438</td>
<td>-5.1746</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-3519.3</td>
<td>3.1230</td>
<td>-5.1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i\pi/3} )</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-3542.3</td>
<td>3.1288</td>
<td>-5.1560</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-3542.3</td>
<td>3.0304</td>
<td>-5.2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i4\pi/3} )</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-3534.0</td>
<td>3.6424</td>
<td>-4.8220</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-3534.0</td>
<td>3.5479</td>
<td>-4.8771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i7\pi/4} )</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-3524.0</td>
<td>3.6397</td>
<td>-4.8089</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-3524.0</td>
<td>3.6397</td>
<td>-4.8089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i\pi/10} )</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-3519.4</td>
<td>3.3562</td>
<td>-4.9778</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-3519.4</td>
<td>3.3562</td>
<td>-4.9778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i\pi/6} )</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-3519.3</td>
<td>3.1232</td>
<td>-5.1242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-3519.3</td>
<td>3.1232</td>
<td>-5.1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i\pi/3} )</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-3529.4</td>
<td>3.4538</td>
<td>-4.9319</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-3529.4</td>
<td>3.3599</td>
<td>-4.9866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e^{i4\pi/3} )</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-3524.6</td>
<td>3.5467</td>
<td>-4.8655</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-3524.6</td>
<td>3.4538</td>
<td>-4.9220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Conclusion and Perspectives

In this paper, we have studied the consistency of a new method for solving robust optimization problems. In counterpart to classical methods in stochastic programming, it is based on ergodic measure preserving transformation instead of sample approximation.

In particular, our approach is more general, because we can recover the results based on samples using the shift on the denumerable product of the probability space. Moreover, our results allow us to apply the technique to infinite programming problems under reasonable assumptions, and without any compactness assumption on the index set, as classical results in this field.

We believe that our analysis represents a first step in the understanding of a new approach based on ergodicity instead of a sequence of samples. A natural question relies on to understand the relation between the choice of the measure preserving transformation and the rate of convergence of the approximate sequence of minimizers. Therefore, we plan to investigate this together with extensions of our presented method.
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