

# GENERICITY OF WELL-POSED VECTOR OPTIMIZATION PROBLEMS

MATTEO ROCCA

ABSTRACT. In this paper we consider well-posedness properties of vector optimization problems with objective function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  where  $X$  and  $Y$  are Banach spaces and  $Y$  is partially ordered by a closed convex pointed cone with nonempty interior. The vector well-posedness notion considered in this paper is the one due to Dentcheva and Helbig [5], which is a natural extension of Tykhonov well-posedness for scalar optimization problems. When a scalar optimization problem is considered it is possible to prove (see e.g. [22]) that under some assumptions the set of functions for which the related optimization problem is well-posed is dense or even more in "big" i.e. contains a dense  $G_\delta$  set (these results are called genericity results). The aim of this paper is to extend these genericity results to vector optimization problems.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Well-posedness properties are important qualitative characterizations for scalar and vector optimization problems. In particular, the notion of well-posedness plays a central role in stability theory for scalar optimization (see e.g. [6]). The well-posedness notion for scalar functions dates back to Hadamard [12] and to Tykhonov in [27]. Extensions to vector and set-valued cases are presented in several papers and are still a topic of research (see e.g. [1], [2],[20], [5], [6], [22], [24], [15], [16], [11], [4]). In [24] a classification of vector well-posedness notions in two classes is given: pointwise and global notions. The definitions of the first group consider a fixed efficient point (or the image of an efficient point) and deal with well-posedness of the vector optimization problem at this point. This approach imposes that the minimizing sequences related to the considered point are well-behaved. Since in the vector case the solution set is typically not a singleton, there is also a class of definitions, the so-called global notions, that involve the efficient frontier as a whole.

In the scalar optimization, a crucial point is the identification of classes of objective functions for which the related optimization problem enjoys well-posedness properties. It is known (see e.g. [6]) that scalar optimization problems with convex objective function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $X$  finite-dimensional,

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 90C25, 90C26, 90C29.

*Key words and phrases.* vector optimization, well-posedness, scalarization.

enjoy well-posedness properties. Similarly, it is known that vector optimization problems with cone-convex objective function functions  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  with  $X$  and  $Y$  finite-dimensional, enjoy well posedness properties (see. eg. [24]).

When functions  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $X$  infinite-dimensional are considered, it is known that convexity does not guarantee well-posedness (see e.g. [6]). In this case it is interesting to find sets of functions for which the subset of well-posed functions is dense (when a suitable topology on the considered set of functions is introduced). A stronger version of these results leads to find sets of functions for which the subset of well-posed functions is "big" in the sense of Baire category, i.e. contains a dense  $G_\delta$  set (see e.g. [17], [22] and references therein).

The aim of this paper is to extend this kind of results, called genericity results, to vector optimization problems with objective function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  where  $X$  and  $Y$  are Banach spaces. In our investigation we will focus on the pointwise well-posedness notion for vector functions due to Dentcheva and Helbig [5].

The outline of the paper is the following. In Section 2 we introduce the notation and we recall some preliminary notions. In Section 3 we recall some scalar and vector well-posedness notions. In Section 4 we give results concerning density of well-posed vector optimization problems, without convexity assumptions. Section 5 is devoted to genericity results under cone-convexity assumptions.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Banach spaces,  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $C \subseteq Y$  a closed, convex, pointed cone with nonempty interior, endowing  $Y$  with a partial order in the following way

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} y_1 \leq_C y_2 &\iff y_2 - y_1 \in C \\ y_1 <_C y_2 &\iff y_2 - y_1 \in \text{int } C \end{aligned}$$

In the following for a set  $A \subseteq X$  we denote by  $\text{diam } A$  the diameter of  $A$ , i.e.

$$\text{diam } A = \sup\{\|x - y\| : x, y \in A\}$$

We denote respectively by  $B$  the closed unit ball both in  $X$  and  $Y$  (from the context it will be clear to which space we refer).

We denote by  $Y^*$  the topological dual space of  $Y$  and by  $C^*$  the positive polar cone of  $C$ , i.e.

$$C^* = \{\xi \in Y^* : \langle \xi, c \rangle \geq 0, \forall c \in C\}$$

Consider the vector optimization problem

$$(X, f) \quad \min f(x), \quad x \in X.$$

A point  $\bar{x} \in X$  is called an efficient solution for problem  $(X, f)$  when

$$(f(X) - f(\bar{x})) \cap (-C) = \{0\}$$

We denote by  $\text{Eff}(X, f)$  the set of all efficient solutions for problem  $(X, f)$ . A point  $\bar{x} \in X$  is called a weakly efficient solution for problem  $(X, f)$  when

$$(f(X) - f(\bar{x})) \cap (-\text{int } C) = \emptyset.$$

We denote by  $\text{WEff}(X, f)$  the set of weakly efficient solutions for problem  $(X, f)$ . We recall also (see e.g.[3]) that a point  $\bar{x} \in X$  is said to be a strictly efficient solution for problem  $(X, f)$  when, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$(2.2) \quad (f(X) - f(\bar{x})) \cap (\delta B - C) \subseteq \varepsilon B$$

We denote by  $\text{StEff}(X, f)$  the set of strictly efficient solutions for problem  $(X, f)$ . Clearly  $\text{StEff}(X, f) \subseteq \text{Eff}(X, f) \subseteq \text{WEff}(X, f)$ .

**Definition 2.1.** [21] A function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , is said to be  $C$ -convex if  $\forall x, z \in X$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$  it holds

$$f(tx + (1 - t)z) \in tf(x) + (1 - t)f(z) - C$$

**Proposition 2.2.** (see e.g. [21])  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is  $C$ -convex if and only if functions  $g_\xi(x) = \langle \xi, f(x) \rangle$  are convex for every  $\xi \in C^*$ .

We recall also that a function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is said to be  $*$ -quasiconvex when functions  $g_\xi(x) = \langle \xi, f(x) \rangle$  are quasiconvex for every  $\xi \in C^*$  (see e.g. [19]).

For  $y \in Y$ ,  $L_f^C(y) := \{x \in X : f(x) \in y - C\}$  is the level set of  $f$ . We say that  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is  $C$ -lower semicontinuous ( $C$ -lsc for short) when  $L_f^C(y)$  is closed for every  $y \in Y$  [21].

Now, we recall, the notion of oriented distance between a point  $y \in Y$  and a set  $A \subseteq Y$ , denoted by  $D_A(y)$ .

**Definition 2.3.** For a set  $A \subseteq Y$  the oriented distance is the function  $D_A : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$  defined as

$$(2.3) \quad D_A(y) = d_A(y) - d_{Y \setminus A}(y)$$

with  $d_\emptyset(y) = +\infty$ .

Function  $D_A$  was introduced in [13, 14] to analyze the geometry of non-smooth optimization problems and obtain necessary optimality conditions. The next result summarizes some basic properties of function  $D_A$ .

**Proposition 2.4.** [28, 8] *If the set  $A$  is nonempty and  $A \neq Y$ , then*

1.  $D_A$  is real valued;
2.  $D_A$  is 1-Lipschitzian;
3.  $D_A(y) < 0$  for every  $y \in \text{int } A$ ,  $D_A(y) = 0$  for every  $y \in \partial A$  and  $D_A(y) > 0$  for every  $y \in \text{int}(Y \setminus A)$ ;
4. if  $A$  is closed, then it holds  $A = \{y : D_A(y) \leq 0\}$ ;

5. if  $A$  is convex, then  $D_A$  is convex;
6. if  $A$  is a cone, then  $D_A$  is positively homogeneous;
7. if  $A$  is a closed convex cone, then  $D_A$  is nonincreasing with respect to the ordering relation induced on  $Y$ , i.e. the following is true: if  $y_1, y_2 \in Y$  then  $y_1 - y_2 \in A \Rightarrow D_A(y_1) \leq D_A(y_2)$ ; if  $A$  has nonempty interior, then  $y_1 - y_2 \in \text{int } A \Rightarrow D_A(y_1) < D_A(y_2)$ ;
8. It holds

$$(2.4) \quad D_A(y) = \max_{\xi \in C^* \cap \partial B} \langle \xi, y \rangle$$

where  $\partial A$  denotes the boundary of the set  $A$ .

**Theorem 2.5.** [24] *If  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is  $C$ -convex, then for every  $y \in Y$ , function  $D_{-C}(f(x) - y)$  is convex.*

We associate to problem  $(X, f)$  the scalar problem

$$(X, D_{-C}) \quad \min D_{-C}(f(x) - f(\bar{x})), \quad x \in X$$

with  $\bar{x} \in X$ . The relations of the solutions of this problem with those of problem  $(X, f)$  are investigated in [28, 24, 8]. For the convenience of the reader, we quote the characterization of efficient points and weakly efficient points.

**Theorem 2.6.** [28, 24, 8] *Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ .*

1.  $\bar{x} \in \text{WEff}(X, f)$  if and only if  $\bar{x}$  is a solution of problem  $(X, D_{-C})$ .
2. If  $\bar{x}$  is the unique solution of problem  $(X, D_{-C})$ , then  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$ .

### 3. WELL-POSEDNESS FOR SCALAR AND VECTOR OPTIMIZATION PROBLEMS

**3.1. Well-posedness for scalar optimization problems.** In this section we recall the notion of well-posedness for functions  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  introduced by Tykhonov [27]. For a complete treatment of this notion and of its generalizations one can refer to [6, 22]. Clearly in this case problem  $(X, f)$  reduces to a scalar minimization problem.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Problem  $(X, f)$  is said to be Tykhonov well-posed (T-wp for short) if:

1. there exists a unique  $\bar{x} \in X$  such that  $f(\bar{x}) \leq f(x), \forall x \in X$ ;
2. every sequence  $x_n$  such that  $f(x_n) \rightarrow \inf_X f$  is such that  $x_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ .

Next proposition provides a useful characterization of Tykhonov well-posedness. It is called the Furi-Vignoli criterion [7].

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be lsc. The following alternatives are equivalent:*

1. Problem  $(X, f)$  is T-wp;
2.  $\inf_{a > \inf_X f} \text{diam } L_f(a) = 0$ , where  $L_f(a) = \{x \in X : f(x) \leq a\}$ .

The following result regarding well-posedness of convex functions defined on a finite-dimensional space is well-known.

**Theorem 3.3.** (see e.g. [6]) *Let  $X$  be finite-dimensional and  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function with a unique minimizer. Then problem  $(X, f)$  is T-wp.*

Theorem 3.3 does not hold when  $X$  is infinite-dimensional as the following example shows (see e.g. [6]).

**Example 3.4.** Let  $X$  be a separable Hilbert space with orthonormal basis  $\{e_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Let  $f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \frac{\langle x, e_n \rangle^2}{n^2}$ . Then  $f$  is continuous, convex and has  $\bar{x} = 0$  as unique minimizer, but problem  $(X, f)$  is not T-wp. Indeed the sequence  $\sqrt{n}e_n$  is an unbounded minimizing sequence.

Consider now the space

$$\Gamma := \{f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : f \text{ is convex and lower semicontinuous}\}.$$

We endow  $\Gamma$  with a distance compatible with the uniform convergence on bounded sets. Fix  $\theta \in X$  and set for any two functions  $f, g \in \Gamma$  and  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\|f - g\|_i = \sup_{\|x - \theta\| \leq i} |f(x) - g(x)|.$$

If  $\|f - g\|_i = \infty$  for some  $i$ , then set  $d(f, g) = 1$ , otherwise

$$d(f, g) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \frac{\|f - g\|_i}{1 + \|f - g\|_i}.$$

When  $X$  is infinite-dimensional, it can be shown that the set of functions  $f \in \Gamma$  such that problem  $(X, f)$  is T-wp is "big" in the sense that contains a dense  $G_\delta$  set (see e.g. [22])

**Theorem 3.5.** [22] *Let  $X$  be a Banach space and consider the set  $\Gamma$ , equipped with the topology of uniform convergence. Then the set of functions  $f \in \Gamma$  such that problem  $(X, f)$  is T-wp contains a dense  $G_\delta$  set.*

If the convexity assumption is dropped weaker variants of Theorem 3.5 hold, in which density of the class of functions  $f \in \Gamma$  such that problem  $(X, f)$  is T-wp is proven. Next results (see e.g. [22]) will be useful in the following.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , assume  $f$  has a minimum point  $\bar{x} \in X$  and let  $g(x) = f(x) + a\|x - \bar{x}\|$  with  $a > 0$ . Then problem  $(X, g)$  is T-wp.*

**Theorem 3.7. (Ekeland's Variational Principle)** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a lsc, lower bounded function. Let  $\varepsilon > 0, r > 0$  and  $\bar{x} \in X$  be such that  $f(\bar{x}) < \inf_X f + r\varepsilon$ . Then, there exists  $\hat{x} \in X$  enjoying the following properties:*

1.  $\|\hat{x} - \bar{x}\| < r$ ;
2.  $f(\hat{x}) < f(\bar{x}) - \varepsilon\|\bar{x} - \hat{x}\|$ ;
3. Problem  $(X, g)$  with  $g(x) = f(x) + \varepsilon\|\hat{x} - x\|$  is T-wp.

**3.2. Well-posedness for vector optimization problems.** Several generalizations of the notion of well-posedness to vector functions have been proposed. We refer to [24] for a survey on the topic and a study of the relations among different well-posedness concepts. In that paper vector well-posedness notions have been divided in two classes: pointwise and global notions. Notions in the first class define the well-posedness of a vector problem with respect to a fixed efficient solution, while in the global notions the set of efficient solutions or weakly efficient solutions is considered as a whole.

In this paper we focus on the notion of well-posedness due to Dentcheva and Helbig [5] (DH-well-posedness) which is a pointwise notion according to [24].

**Definition 3.8.** Let  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Problem  $(X, f)$  is said to be DH-well-posed (DH-wp for short) at  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$  if

$$\inf_{\alpha > 0} \text{diam } L_f^C(f(\bar{x}) + \alpha c) = 0, \quad \forall c \in C,$$

where  $L_f^C(f(\bar{x}) + \alpha c) = \{x \in X : f(x) \in f(\bar{x}) + \alpha c - C\}$ .

In [24] it has been proven that DH-well-posedness is the strongest among the pointwise well-posedness notions, that is if problem  $(X, f)$  is DH-wp at  $\bar{x} \in X$  then it is well-posed at  $\bar{x}$  according to the other pointwise well-posedness notions known in the literature. The next result gives a useful characterization of DH-well-posedness.

**Theorem 3.9.** [11, 24] *Problem  $(X, f)$  is DH-well-posed at  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$  if and only if problem  $(X, D_{-C})$  is T-wp.*

The following theorem (see [24]) gives a generalization of Theorem 3.3.

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be finite-dimensional. Assume  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is a  $C$ -convex function,  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$  and  $f^{-1}(f(\bar{x})) = \{\bar{x}\}$ . Then problem  $(X, f)$  is DH-wp at  $\bar{x}$ .*

DH-well-posedness imposes some restrictions on the set  $\text{Eff}(X, f)$ . Indeed, if problem  $(X, f)$  is DH-well-posed at  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$  then  $\bar{x} \in \text{StEff}(X, f)$ . This property is typical of the vector case and shows that most of the vector well-posedness notions require implicitly stronger properties than the simple good behavior of minimizing sequence

**Theorem 3.11.** [24] *If  $F : X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous and problem  $(X, f)$  is DH-wp at  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$ , then  $\bar{x} \in \text{StMin}(X, f)$ .*

#### 4. DENSITY OF DH-WELL-POSED FUNCTIONS

The first result in this section shows that if the set of functions

$$\mathcal{H} = \{f : X \rightarrow Y : \text{Eff}(X, f) \neq \emptyset\}$$

is endowed with the topology of uniform convergence on bounded sets, then the set of functions  $g \in \mathcal{H}$  enjoying DH-wp properties is dense in  $\mathcal{H}$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ . Then, for every  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$ , there exists a sequence of functions  $f_n : X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in the uniform convergence on bounded sets,  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f_n)$  for every  $n$  and problem  $(X, f_n)$  is DH-wp at  $\bar{x}$ . Further, if  $f$  is continuous then  $\bar{x} \in \text{StEff}(X, f_n)$  for every  $n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $k^0 \in \text{int } C$  be fixed and consider the sequence of functions

$$f_n(x) = f(x) + \frac{1}{n}\|x - \bar{x}\|k^0$$

Since  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$ , it holds

$$(4.1) \quad f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \notin -C, \quad \forall x \in X, \quad x \neq \bar{x}$$

Hence

$$f(x) - f_n(\bar{x}) = f(x) - f(\bar{x}) + \frac{1}{n}\|x - \bar{x}\|k^0 \notin -C, \quad \forall x \in X, \quad x \neq \bar{x}$$

since (4.1) holds. Hence  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f_n) \forall n$ . Since  $\text{Eff}(X, f_n) \subseteq \text{WEff}(X, f_n)$ , Theorem 2.6 implies  $D_{-C}(f_n(x) - f_n(\bar{x})) \geq 0$  for every  $x \in X$ . Now we prove problem  $(X, f_n)$  is DH-wp at  $\bar{x}$  for every  $n$ . From Theorem 3.9 we know that problem  $(X, f)$  is DH-wp at  $\bar{x} \in X$  if and only if the scalar problem  $(X, D_{-C})$  is T-wp at  $\bar{x}$ . Since  $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$ ,  $C^*$  has a closed convex weak\*-compact base

$$(4.2) \quad G = \{\xi \in C^* : \langle \xi, k^0 \rangle = 1\}$$

(see e.g. [18]). According to [24] there exists a constant  $\alpha > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{-C}(f_n(x) - f_n(\bar{x})) &\geq \alpha \max_{\xi \in G} \langle \xi, f_n(x) - f_n(\bar{x}) \rangle \\ &= \alpha \max_{\xi \in G} \langle \xi, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) + \frac{1}{n}\|x - \bar{x}\|k^0 \rangle \\ &= \alpha \max_{\xi \in G} \langle \xi, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle + \frac{1}{n}\|x - \bar{x}\| \end{aligned}$$

For a fixed  $n$ , let  $x_k$  be a minimizing sequence for  $D_{-C}(f_n(x) - f_n(\bar{x}))$ , that is  $D_{-C}(f_n(x_k) - f_n(\bar{x})) \rightarrow 0$ . If  $x_k \not\rightarrow \bar{x}$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} D_{-C}(f_n(x_k) - f_n(\bar{x})) &\geq \alpha \max_{\xi \in G} \langle \xi, f(x_k) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle + \frac{1}{n}\|x_k - \bar{x}\| \\ &\geq \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n}\|x_k - \bar{x}\| > 0 \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts to  $x_k$  minimizing sequence for  $D_{-C}(f_n(x) - f_n(\bar{x}))$  (the last inequality follows since  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$  implies  $\max_{\xi \in G} \langle \xi, f(x_k) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in X$ ). Hence  $x_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$  and problem  $(X, f_n)$  is DH-wp at  $\bar{x}$ . Finally, we get the desired result observing that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in the uniform convergence on bounded sets. If  $f$  is continuous, then apply Theorem 3.11 to conclude the proof.  $\square$

To prove the second density result in this section we need the following definition and the next lemma.

**Definition 4.2.** [11] We say that  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is  $C$ -bounded from below by  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$  when  $\inf_{x \in X} \langle \xi, f(x) \rangle > -\infty$ .

Let  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$ , consider function

$$h_{\bar{\xi}}(x) = \langle \bar{\xi}, f(x) \rangle$$

and the associated scalar minimization problem

$$(X, h_{\bar{\xi}}) \quad \min h_{\bar{\xi}}(x), \quad x \in X$$

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$  and  $\bar{\xi} \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ . If problem  $(X, h_{\bar{\xi}})$  is T-wp at  $\bar{x}$ , then problem  $(X, f)$  is DH-wp at  $\bar{x}$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality let  $\bar{\xi} \in C^* \cap \partial B$ . Assume problem  $(X, f)$  is not DH-wp at  $\bar{x}$ . Since  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f) \subseteq \text{WEff}(X, f)$ , by Theorem 2.6 it holds  $D_{-C}(f(x) - f(\bar{x})) \geq 0$ , for every  $x \in X$  and by Theorem 3.9 problem  $(X, D_{-C})$  is not T-wp. Then there exists a sequence  $x_n \in X$  such that  $D_{-C}(f(x_n) - f(\bar{x})) \rightarrow 0$  but  $x_n \not\rightarrow \bar{x}$ . Since, by Proposition 2.4

$$D_{-C}(f(x_n) - f(\bar{x})) = \max_{\xi \in C^* \cap \partial B} \langle \xi, f(x_n) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle$$

it follows

$$D_{-C}(f(x_n) - f(\bar{x})) \geq \langle \bar{\xi}, f(x_n) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle = h_{\bar{\xi}}(x_n) - h_{\bar{\xi}}(\bar{x})$$

Since problem  $(X, h_{\bar{\xi}})$  is T-wp at  $\bar{x}$ , it follows that  $\bar{x}$  is a minimum point for  $h_{\bar{\xi}}$  and hence  $h_{\bar{\xi}}(x_n) - h_{\bar{\xi}}(\bar{x}) = \langle \bar{\xi}, f(x_n) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle \geq 0 \forall n$ . From  $D_{-C}(f(x_n) - f(\bar{x})) \rightarrow 0$  it follows  $h_{\bar{\xi}}(x_n) \rightarrow h_{\bar{\xi}}(\bar{x})$  which contradicts problem  $(X, h_{\bar{\xi}})$  is T-wp since  $x_n \not\rightarrow \bar{x}$ .  $\square$

In the next result we drop the assumption  $\text{Eff}(x, f) \neq \emptyset$  and we show that if the set of functions

$$\mathcal{H}' = \{f : X \rightarrow Y : \exists \xi \in C^* \text{ such that } f \text{ is } C\text{-bounded from below by } \xi\}$$

is endowed with the topology of uniform convergence on bounded sets, then the set of functions  $g \in \mathcal{H}'$  enjoying DH-wp properties is dense in  $\mathcal{H}'$ . We endow  $\mathcal{H}'$  with a distance compatible with the uniform convergence on bounded sets (see e.g. [22]). Fix  $\theta \in X$  and set for any two functions  $f, g \in \mathcal{H}'$  and  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\|f - g\|_i = \sup_{\|x - \theta\| \leq i} \|f(x) - g(x)\|.$$

If  $\|f - g\|_i = \infty$  for some  $i$ , then set  $d(f, g) = 1$ , otherwise

$$(4.3) \quad d(f, g) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \frac{\|f - g\|_i}{1 + \|f - g\|_i}.$$

**Theorem 4.4.** *Assume there exists  $\bar{\xi} \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is  $C$ -bounded from below by  $\bar{\xi}$  and  $\langle \bar{\xi}, f(x) \rangle$  is lsc with respect to  $x \in X$ . Then, there exists a sequence of functions  $f_n : X \rightarrow Y$  uniformly converging to*

$f$  on the bounded sets, such that  $\text{Eff}(X, f_n) \neq \emptyset$  for every  $n$  and problem  $(X, f_n)$  is DH-wp at some  $\bar{x}_n \in \text{Eff}(X, f_n)$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $\sigma > 0$  and take  $j$  so large that setting  $g(x) = f(x) + \frac{1}{j}\|x - \theta\|k^0$  with  $k^0 \in \text{int } C$  such that  $\langle \bar{\xi}, k^0 \rangle = 1$ , it holds  $d(f, g) < \frac{\sigma}{2}$ . Now set

$$(4.4) \quad g_{\bar{\xi}}(x) = \langle \bar{\xi}, g(x) \rangle = \langle \bar{\xi}, f(x) \rangle + \frac{1}{j}\|x - \theta\|$$

and observe that  $g_{\bar{\xi}}(x)$  is lower bounded by Definition 4.2. Hence, we can find  $M > 0$  such that

$$\{x \in X : g_{\bar{\xi}}(x) \leq \inf_{x \in X} g_{\bar{\xi}}(x) + 1\} \subseteq B(\theta, M)$$

Let  $s = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2^k}(k + M)\|k^0\|$  and apply Theorem 3.7 with  $\varepsilon = \frac{\sigma}{2s}$  and arbitrary  $r$  to find a point  $\bar{x} = \bar{x}_\sigma \in X$  such that  $\|\bar{x} - \theta\| \leq M$ ,  $\bar{x}$  is the unique minimizer of

$$h_{\bar{\xi}}(x) = \langle \bar{\xi}, g(x) \rangle + \varepsilon\|x - \bar{x}\|$$

and problem  $(X, h_{\bar{\xi}})$  is T-wp at  $\bar{x}$ . Let

$$h(x) = g(x) + \varepsilon\|x - \bar{x}\|k^0$$

and observe that since  $\bar{x}$  minimizes  $h_{\bar{\xi}}(x)$ , it holds

$$h_{\bar{\xi}}(x) - h_{\bar{\xi}}(\bar{x}) = \langle \bar{\xi}, h(x) - h(\bar{x}) \rangle > 0, \quad \forall x \in X \setminus \{\bar{x}\}$$

which implies

$$D_{-C}(h(x) - h(\bar{x})) = \max_{\xi \in C^* \cap \partial B} \langle \xi, h(x) - h(\bar{x}) \rangle \geq$$

$$\langle \bar{\xi}, h(x) - h(\bar{x}) \rangle > 0, \quad \forall x \in X \setminus \{\bar{x}\}$$

Hence, Theorem 2.6 implies  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, h)$ . Combining Theorem 2.6 and Lemma 4.3, we obtain that problem

$$(X, h) \quad \min h(x), \quad x \in X$$

is DH-wp at  $\bar{x}$ . Now observe that

$$\|h(x) - g(x)\|_i \leq \varepsilon\|k^0\|(i + M)$$

It follows  $d(h, g) \leq \varepsilon s = \frac{\sigma}{2}$  and then  $d(f, h) < \sigma$ . Take now  $\sigma = \frac{1}{n}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and set  $\bar{x}_n = \bar{x}_\sigma$  to complete the proof.  $\square$

The next result shows that under some hypotheses, the assumption in Theorem 4.4 is weaker than the assumption in Theorem 4.1. We recall the following fundamental result.

**Theorem 4.5. (Sion's Minimax Theorem [25, 26])** *Let  $Z$  be a compact convex subset of a linear topological space and  $W$  a convex subset of a linear topological space. Let  $g$  be a real-valued function on  $Z \times W$  such that*

- i)  $g(\cdot, w)$  is upper semicontinuous and quasi-concave on  $Z \forall w \in W$ ;
- ii)  $g(z, \cdot)$  is lower semicontinuous and quasi-convex on  $W \forall z \in Z$ .

Then

$$\sup_{z \in Z} \inf_{w \in W} f(z, w) = \inf_{w \in W} \sup_{z \in Z} f(z, w)$$

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be  $*$ -quasiconvex and  $C$ -lsc with respect to  $x \in X$ , for every  $\xi \in C^*$ . Then, if  $\text{Eff}(X, f) \neq \emptyset$ , there exists  $\bar{\xi} \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $f$  is  $C$ -bounded from below by  $\bar{\xi}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $\text{Eff}(X, f) \neq \emptyset$  and let  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$ . Ab absurdo assume that for every  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$  it holds

$$\inf_{x \in X} \langle \xi, f(x) \rangle = \inf_{x \in X} \langle \xi, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle = -\infty$$

Since  $\text{int} C \neq \emptyset$ ,  $C^*$  has a weak\*-compact base  $G$ . Function  $g(\xi, x) = \langle \xi, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle$ ,  $\xi \in G$ ,  $x \in X$ , is linear and continuous with respect to  $\xi$  and quasiconvex with respect to  $x$ . Further, since  $f$  is  $C$ -lsc with respect to  $x \in X$ ,  $g(\xi, x)$  is lsc with respect to  $x \in X$ . Since  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$ , it holds  $\max_{\xi \in G} \langle \xi, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle \geq 0$  for every  $x \in X$ . Apply Sion's Minimax Theorem to get the following chain of equalities

$$-\infty = \sup_{\xi \in G} \inf_{x \in X} \langle \xi, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle = \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{\xi \in G} \langle \xi, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle$$

which implies there exists  $\tilde{x} \in X$  such that  $\sup_{\xi \in G} \langle \xi, f(\tilde{x}) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle < 0$ . A contradiction to  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$ .  $\square$

Generalized convexity assumptions in the previous result cannot be removed as the following example shows.

**Example 4.7.** Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $Y = \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $C = C^* = \mathbb{R}_+^2$ ,  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  defined as  $f(x) = (x, -xe^x)$  is not  $*$ -quasiconvex. We have  $\text{Eff}(X, f) = [0, +\infty) \neq \emptyset$  but for any  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$  we have  $\inf_{x \in X} \langle \xi, f(x) \rangle = -\infty$ . Hence does not exist  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $\langle \xi, f(x) \rangle$  is bounded from below.

## 5. GENERICITY OF DH-WELL-POSEDNESS FOR $C$ -CONVEX FUNCTIONS

In this section we show that the set of  $C$ -convex and  $C$ -lsc functions enjoying DH-well-posedness properties contains a dense  $G_\delta$  set. To prove the main theorem in this section we need some preliminary results.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a convex and lsc function,  $\bar{x} \in X$  and set  $g(x) = f(x) + a\|x - \bar{x}\|^\alpha$ ,  $a > 0, \alpha \geq 1$ . Then  $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow +\infty} g(x) = +\infty$ . Furthermore  $g(x)$  is lower bounded.*

*Proof.* We prove that for every sequence  $x_n \in X$  with  $\|x_n\| \rightarrow +\infty$  it holds  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} g(x_n) = +\infty$ . Denote by  $X^*$  the topological dual space of  $X$ . Since  $f(x)$  is convex, the set  $\partial f(\bar{x}) \subseteq X^*$  of all subgradients of  $f$  at  $\bar{x}$  is nonempty and by definition of subgradient [10], for every continuous linear

functional  $v \in \partial f(\bar{x})$  it holds  $f(x) \geq f(\bar{x}) + v(x - \bar{x}), \forall x \in X$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} g(x_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} [f(x_n) + a \|x_n - \bar{x}\|^\alpha] \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (f(\bar{x}) + v(x_n - \bar{x}) + a \|x_n - \bar{x}\|^\alpha) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left[ f(\bar{x}) + \|x_n - \bar{x}\|^\alpha \left( v \left( \frac{x_n - \bar{x}}{\|x_n - \bar{x}\|} \right) \|x_n - \bar{x}\|^{1-\alpha} + a \right) \right] \\ &= +\infty . \end{aligned}$$

(the last equality follows since a continuous linear functional is bounded). To prove that  $g(x)$  is lower bounded observe that for every  $M \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists  $k > 0$  such that  $g(x) > M$  for  $\|x\| > k$ . If we take  $A = \{x \in X : \|x\| \leq k\}$ ,  $g(x)$  is lower bounded on the bounded set  $A$  (see e.g. [22]), which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.2.** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a  $C$ -convex,  $C$ -lsc function and for  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$  and  $a > 0, \alpha \geq 1$  set  $g_\xi(x) = \langle \xi, f(x) \rangle + a \|x - x^0\|^\alpha$ . Then,  $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow +\infty} g_\xi(x) = +\infty$  and  $g$  is lower bounded.*

*Proof.* The proof follows from Proposition 5.1 since  $f$   $C$ -convex and  $C$ -lsc implies  $g$  convex and lsc for every  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ .  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the set of  $C$ -convex and  $C$ -lsc functions  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ . We endow  $\mathcal{F}$  with the distance defined by (4.3), compatible with the topology of uniform convergence on bounded sets.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the set of  $C$ -convex and  $C$ -lsc functions endowed with the topology of uniform convergence on bounded sets and let  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  be the set of functions  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $\text{Eff}(X, f) \neq \emptyset$  and problem  $(X, f)$  is DH-wp at some point  $\bar{x} \in \text{Eff}(X, f)$ . Then  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  contains a dense  $G_\delta$  set .*

*Proof.* The initial argument of the proof is inspired to that of Theorem 2.1 in [23]. If we fix  $k^0 \in \text{int } C$ , we can find  $\bar{\xi} \in C^*$  such that  $\langle \bar{\xi}, k^0 \rangle = 1$ . Consider the set

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{z : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } z(x) = \langle \bar{\xi}, f(x) \rangle, f \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

Since  $f$  is  $C$ -lsc,  $z$  is lsc. Endow  $\mathcal{Z}$  with the topology of uniform convergence on bounded sets and let  $S : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  be the map  $S(f) = z$ , with  $z$  defined as before. Then  $S$  is a continuous map. Let

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{A}_n = \{z \in \mathcal{Z} : \exists a > \inf_{x \in X} z, \text{diam } L_z(a) < \frac{1}{n}\}$$

where  $L_z(a) = \{x \in X : z(x) \leq a\}$ . Observe that  $L_z(a)$  are closed convex sets since  $z$  is convex and lsc. Then, it is known (see e.g. [22]) that if  $z_n \rightarrow z$  in the uniform convergence, then  $\text{diam } L_{z_n}(a) \rightarrow \text{diam } L_z(a)$ , which gives continuity of the diam function. Hence  $\mathcal{A}_n$  is an open set for all  $n$  and this implies  $S^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_n)$  is an open set for all  $n$ . We claim that the set  $\mathcal{W}$  of

those functions  $h \in \mathcal{F}$  such that problem  $(X, S(h))$  is T-wp is dense in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Since

$$\mathcal{W} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{+\infty} S^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_n)$$

then it is a  $G_\delta$  set i.e. the countable intersection of open sets. Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $\sigma > 0$  and take  $j$  so large that setting  $g(x) = f(x) + \frac{1}{j}\|x - \theta\|k^0$  it holds  $d(f, g) < \frac{\sigma}{2}$ . Setting  $g_{\bar{\xi}}(x) = \langle \bar{\xi}, g(x) \rangle$  we have  $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow +\infty} g_{\bar{\xi}}(x) = +\infty$  and  $g_{\bar{\xi}}$  is lower bounded by Corollary 5.2. The proof now follows along the lines of Theorem 4.4. We can find  $M > 0$  such that

$$\{x \in X : g(x) \leq \inf_{x \in X} g(x) + 1\} \subseteq B(\theta, M)$$

Let  $h : X \rightarrow Y$  be defined as

$$h(x) = g(x) + \varepsilon\|x - \bar{x}\|k^0$$

and let  $s = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2^k}(k + M)\|k^0\|$ . Apply Theorem 3.7 with  $\varepsilon = \frac{\sigma}{2s}$  and arbitrary  $r$  to find a point  $\bar{x} = \bar{x}_\sigma \in X$  such that  $\|\bar{x} - \theta\| \leq M$ ,  $\bar{x}$  is the unique minimizer of

$$S(h)(x) = \langle \bar{\xi}, g(x) \rangle + \varepsilon\|x - \bar{x}\|$$

and problem  $(X, S(h))$  is T-wp at  $\bar{x}$  and hence  $h \in \mathcal{W}$ . This implies that problem  $(X, h)$  is DH-wp at  $\bar{x}$  by Lemma 4.3. Now observe that

$$\|h(x) - g(x)\|_i \leq \varepsilon\|k^0\|(i + M)$$

It follows  $d(h, g) \leq \varepsilon s = \frac{\sigma}{2}$  and then  $d(f, h) < \sigma$ . Hence  $\mathcal{F}$  contains a dense  $G_\delta$  set, which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bednarczuk, E., *Well posedness of vector optimization problems*, in Jahn J., Krabs W., Recent Advances and Historical Development of Vector Optimization Problems, Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems, Vol. 294, pp. 51–61, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [2] Bednarczuk, E., *An Approach to Well-Posedness in Vector Optimization: Consequences to Stability*, Control and Cybernetics, Vol. 23, pp. 107–122, 1994.
- [3] Bednarczuk, E., *A Note on Lower Semicontinuity of Minimal Points*, Non-linear Analysis, Vol. 50, pp. 285–297, 2002.
- [4] Crespi, G.P., Kuroiwa, D. Rocca, M., *Convexity and Global Well-Posedness in Set-Optimization*, Taiwanese J. Math. Vol. 18, No. 6, 1897-1908, 2014.
- [5] Dentcheva, D., Helbig, S., *On Variational Principles, Level Sets, Well-Posedness, and  $\epsilon$ -Solutions in Vector Optimization*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, Vol. 89, pp. 325–349, 1996.
- [6] Dontchev, A.L., Zolezzi T., *Well-Posed Optimization Problems*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Vol. 1543, 1993.
- [7] Furi, M., and Vignoli, A., *A characterization of well-posed minimum problems in a complete metric space*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, Vol. 5, no 6, 452–461, 1970.
- [8] Ginchev, I., Guerraggio A., Rocca, M., *From Scalar to Vector Optimization*, Applications of Mathematics Vol. 51, 5–36, 2006.

- [9] Gopfert, A., Tammer, C., Zalinescu, C., *On the vectorial Ekeland's variational principle and minimal points in product spaces*, *Nonlinear Analysis*, Vol. 39, pp. 909–922, 2000.
- [10] Gopfert, A., Riahi H., Tammer, C., Zalinescu, C., *Variational Methods in Partially ordered spaces*, Springer Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [11] Gutiérrez C., Miglierina E., Molho E., Novo, V., *Pointwise well-posedness in set optimization with cone proper sets*, *Nonlinear Analysis*, Vol. 75, 1822–1833, 2012.
- [12] Hadamard, J., *Sur les problèmes aux dérivées partielles et leur signification physique*, *Bulletin of the University of Princeton*, Vol. 13, pp. 49–52, 1902.
- [13] Hiriart-Urruty, J.-B. *New Concepts in Nondifferentiable Programming*, *Analyse non convexe*, *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 60, pp. 57–85, 1979.
- [14] Hiriart-Urruty, J.-B. *Tangent Cones, Generalized Gradients and Mathematical Programming in Banach Spaces*, *Math. Oper. Res.*, 4, pp.79–97, 1979.
- [15] Huang, X.X., *Extended Well-Posedness Properties of Vector Optimization Problems*, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, Vol. 106, pp. 165–182, 2000.
- [16] Huang, X.X., *Extended and Strongly Extended Well-Posedness of Set-Valued Optimization Problems*, *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, Vol. 53, No 1, pp. 101–116, 2001.
- [17] Ioffe, A., Lucchetti, R., *Generic well-posedness in minimization problems*, *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, Vol. 4, pp. 343–360, 2005.
- [18] Jameson, G., *Ordered Linear Spaces*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Springer, 1970.
- [19] Jeyakumar V., Oettli W., and Natividad M. , *A solvability theorem for a class of quasiconvex mappings with applications to optimization*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 179, No. 2, 537–546, 1993.
- [20] Loridan, P., *Well-posedness in vector optimization*, *Recent developments in Well-posed variational problems* (Edited by R. Lucchetti and J. Revalski), *Mathematics and its Applications*, Vol. 331, Kluwer Academic Publisher, pp. 171–192, 1995.
- [21] Luc, D.T., *Theory of Vector Optimization*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [22] Lucchetti, R., *Convexity and well-posed problems*, Springer, New York, NY, USA, 2006.
- [23] Lucchetti R.E., Miglierina E., *Stability for convex vector optimization problems*, *Optimization*, Vol. 53, No 5-6, pp. 517–528, 2004.
- [24] Miglierina, E., Molho, E., Rocca, M., *Well-Posedness and Scalarization in Vector Optimization*, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, Vol. 126, No 2, pp. 391–409, 2005.
- [25] Sion, M., *On general minimax theorems*. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, Vol. 8, No 1, pp. 171–176, 1958.
- [26] Tuy, H., *Minimax Theorems Revisited*, *Acta Mathematica Vietnamica* 217 Vol. 29, No 3, 217-229, 2004
- [27] Tykhonov, A.N., *On the Stability of the Functional Optimization Problem*, *USSR Journal of Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, Vol. 6, No 4, pp. 631–634, 1966.
- [28] Zaffaroni, A. *Degrees of Efficiency and Degrees of Minimality*, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, Vol. 42, No 3, 1071–1086, 2003.

(M. Rocca) DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DELL'INSUBRIA,  
 VIA MONTE GENEROSO 71, 21100 VARESE, ITALY  
 Email address: [matteo.rocca@uninsubria.it](mailto:matteo.rocca@uninsubria.it)