

# Levitin-Polyak Well-posedness for Split Equilibrium Problems

Soumitra Dey <sup>a, \*</sup>, Aviv Gibali <sup>b</sup>, and Simeon Reich<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Mathematics, The Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel;

<sup>b</sup> Department of Mathematics, Braude College, Karmiel, Israel

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled August 16, 2022

## ABSTRACT

The notion of well-posedness has drawn the attention of many researchers in nonlinear analysis in connection with problems where the exact solution is unknown or may be costly to compute. Well-posedness guarantees the convergence of a sequence of approximate solutions obtained by iterative methods to the exact solution of the given problem. Motivated by these facts, we extend here the concept of Levitin-Polyak well-posedness to split equilibrium problems in infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. We establish, in particular, a metric characterization of Levitin-Polyak well-posedness by perturbations. We also show an equivalence between Levitin-Polyak well-posedness by perturbations for split equilibrium problems and the existence and uniqueness of their solutions under certain finite-dimensional assumptions on the mappings involved.

## KEYWORDS

Approximating sequence; Equilibrium problem; Perturbation; Split equilibrium problem; Split variational inequality problem; Well-posedness

## 2010 MATHEMATICS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION

49K40; 49J40; 90C31; 47H10; 47J20

## 1. Introduction

The concept of well-posedness is one of the most important and interesting topics in nonlinear analysis and optimization theory. It has been studied, for example, in connection with variational inequalities (VIs), equilibrium problems (EPs) and inverse problems (IPs). The notion of well-posedness for a minimization problem was first introduced and examined by Tykhonov [1] in metric spaces. Recall that a minimization problem is said to be well posed (or correctly posed) if its solution set is a singleton and every minimizing sequence converges to this unique solution (see, for instance, [2]). In practice, the minimizing sequence generated by a numerical method may fail to lie inside the feasible set although the sequence of the distances of its elements to the feasible set does tend to zero. Such a sequence is called a generalized minimizing sequence for the minimization problem at hand. Levitin and Polyak [3] modified the notion of Tykhonov well-posedness by replacing minimizing sequences by generalized minimizing sequence. Since the requirement that the solution set be a singleton may

---

\* Corresponding author. Email: deysoumitra2012@gmail.com

be too restrictive when one deals with applications to optimal control or mathematical programming problems, the above definition of well-posedness was relaxed by Furi and Vignoli [2]. This has led researchers to study the notion of well-posedness by focusing their attention on problems which have a non-singleton solution set. Motivated by this fact, Zolezzi [4,5] introduced the concept of parametric minimization problems and extended well-posedness and well-posedness by perturbations to this more general setting. Later on, well-posedness and Levitin-Polyak (LP) well-posedness were studied by many authors (see, for instance, [6,7]) and references therein.

It is well known that minimization problems and variational inequality (VI) problems are closely related. Moreover, VIs are a useful tool for solving diverse analysis and optimization problems such as systems of linear and nonlinear equations, complementarity problems and saddle point problems. For more applications, see [8,9] and references therein.

Let  $C$  be a nonempty, closed and convex subset of a real Hilbert space  $H$ , and let  $g : H \rightarrow H$  be a single-valued mapping. Then a VI problem consists of finding a point  $x^* \in C$  with the following property:

$$\langle g(x^*), x - x^* \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in C. \quad (1)$$

Lucchetti and Patrone in [10,11] were the first to extend the well-posedness concept to VIs. The Levitin-Polyak well-posedness was studied by Hu et al. [12] as well as by Huang et al. [13,14]. Later on, the concept of well-posedness by perturbations for mixed variational inequality problems was introduced by Feng et al. [15]. Numerical algorithms for solving VIs can be found in [8]. At this point we recall that VIs were first introduced and studied by Stampacchia [16] (in a finite-dimensional Euclidean space). Thereafter many researchers studied VIs and explored various directions in both finite- and infinite-dimensional settings. See, for instance, [8,17,18].

Equilibrium problems (EP) constitute an important generalization of variational inequalities. Let  $C$  be a nonempty, closed and convex subset of a real Hilbert space  $H$ , and let  $f : H \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bifunction. With these data, the equilibrium problem, denoted by  $EP(f, C)$ , consists of finding a point  $x^* \in C$  such that

$$f(x^*, x) \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in C. \quad (2)$$

Equilibrium problems were first introduced and studied by Blum and Oettli [19]. In recent years EPs have received a lot of attention because they contain as special cases diverse problems such as optimization problems [5], saddle point problems [20], VIs [16,21] and Nash EPs [8]. Moreover, EPs stand at the core of many applications as a modelling tool for various practical problems arising *inter alia* in game theory, physics and economics. Another important feature of EPs is that they make it possible to consider all these special cases in a unified manner. As EPs are a common extension of minimization problems, saddle point problems and VIs, their well-posedness concepts originate in the well-posedness concepts already introduced for these problems (see, for instance, [20,22]) and references therein. Iterative algorithms for solving EPs can be found, for example, in [24–26]. More recently, Cotrina et al. [27] studied EPs in Euclidean spaces and introduced the concept of projected solutions to EPs with moving constraint sets. These are commonly known as quasi-equilibrium problem (QEP).

Censor et al. [17, Section 2] introduced the general split inverse problem (SIP) in which there are given two vector spaces,  $X$  and  $Y$ , and a bounded linear operator  $A : X \rightarrow Y$ . In addition, two inverse problems are involved. The first one, denoted by

$IP_1$ , is formulated in the space  $X$  and the second one, denoted by  $IP_2$ , is formulated in the space  $Y$ . Given these data, the Split Inverse Problem (SIP) is formulated as follows:

$$\text{find a point } x^* \in X \text{ that solves } IP_1 \quad (3)$$

such that

$$\text{the point } y^* = Ax^* \in Y \text{ solves } IP_2. \quad (4)$$

SIPs are quite general because they enable one to obtain various split problems by different choices of  $IP_1$  and  $IP_2$ . An important example is the split variational inequality (SVI). Let  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  be two real Hilbert spaces, and let  $C$  and  $Q$  be two nonempty, closed and convex subsets of  $H_1$  and  $H_2$ , respectively. Let  $f : H_1 \rightarrow H_1$  and  $g : H_2 \rightarrow H_2$  be two single-valued mappings and let  $A : H_1 \rightarrow H_2$  be a bounded linear operator. The SVI is defined as follows:

$$\text{Find } (x^*, y^*) \in H_1 \times H_2 \text{ such that } \begin{cases} x^* \in C, & y^* \in Q, & y^* = Ax^*, \\ \langle f(x^*), x - x^* \rangle \geq 0 & \forall x \in C, \\ \langle g(y^*), y - y^* \rangle \geq 0 & \forall y \in Q. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Recently, Hu et al. [28] introduced and studied the LP well-posedness of the SVI (5) in reflexive Banach spaces. For more details regarding SVIs, the reader is referred to [17,29,30] and references therein. Observe that if  $C = Q$ ,  $f = g$ ,  $H_1 = H_2 = H$  and  $A = I$ , where  $I$  denotes the identity operator, then the SVI (5) is reduced to the classical VI (1).

Another SIP instance is the split equilibrium problem (SEP); see Moudafi [31]. Let  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  be two real Hilbert spaces, and let  $C$  and  $Q$  be two nonempty closed and convex subsets of  $H_1$  and  $H_2$ , respectively. Let  $f : H_1 \times H_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $g : H_2 \times H_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be two single-valued bifunctions, and let  $A : H_1 \rightarrow H_2$  be a bounded linear operator. With these data, the  $SEP(f, g, C, Q)$  is defined as follows:

$$\text{Find } (x^*, y^*) \in H_1 \times H_2 \text{ such that } \begin{cases} x^* \in C, & y^* \in Q, & y^* = Ax^*, \\ f(x^*, x) \geq 0 & \forall x \in C, \\ g(y^*, y) \geq 0 & \forall y \in Q. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

In 2012 He [32] studied the  $SEP(f, g, C, Q)$  and established weak and strong convergence theorems for a new class of iterative methods for solving it. Later, Dinh et al. [33] proposed new extragradient algorithms for solving  $SEP(f, g, C, Q)$ . For more details and results in this direction, consult [34–36].

Recalling that perturbing a problem may help achieve stability [5], and motivated and inspired by the concept of LP well-posedness by perturbations for variational inequalities, in the present paper we introduce and extend this concept to split equilibrium problems (6).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 some useful definitions and results are collected. In Section 3 we introduce the concepts of an approximating sequence and a generalized approximating sequence for the  $SEP(f, g, C, Q)$ . Also in this section, we introduce various kinds of well-posedness for the  $SEP(f, g, C, Q)$ . In Section 4 we establish the metric characterization for (generalized) LP well-posedness by perturbations for the  $SEP(f, g, C, Q)$ . In Section 5 we prove that the well-posedness by

perturbations of the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is equivalent to the existence and uniqueness of its solution. Finally, in Section 6 we present some conclusions.

## 2. Preliminaries

In this section we present some basic definitions and results which are useful in the rest of the paper. For more information and results, see, for example, [21,37–41] and references therein.

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two nonempty subsets of a real Hilbert space  $H$ . The *Hausdorff metric*  $H(\cdot, \cdot)$  between  $A$  and  $B$  is defined by

$$H(A, B) := \max \{D(A, B), D(B, A)\},$$

where  $D(A, B) := \sup_{a \in A} d(a, B)$  with  $d(a, B) := \inf_{b \in B} \|a - b\|$ . Let  $\{A_n\}$  be a sequence of subsets of  $H$ . We say that the sequence  $\{A_n\}$  converges to  $A$  if  $H(A_n, A) \rightarrow 0$ . It is not difficult to see that  $\{D(A_n, A)\} \rightarrow 0$  if and only if  $\{d(a_n, A)\} \rightarrow 0$ , uniformly for all selections  $a_n \in A_n$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $C$  be a nonempty convex subset of a real Hilbert space  $H$ . Then for each  $x \in H$ , the distance function  $d(x, C)$  (defined above) is continuous and convex.*

The *diameter* of a set  $A$  is defined by

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

The *Kuratowski measure of noncompactness* of a set  $A$  is defined by

$$\mu(A) := \inf \{\epsilon > 0 : A \subset \cup_{i=1}^n A_i, \text{diam}(A_i) < \epsilon, i = 1, 2, \dots, n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two nonempty subsets of a real Hilbert space  $H$ . Then*

$$|\mu(A) - \mu(B)| \leq 2H(A, B).$$

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $C$  and  $Q$  be two nonempty subsets of real Hilbert spaces  $H_1$  and  $H_2$ , respectively. A mapping  $f : C \times Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be *upper semi-continuous at a point*  $(x, y)$  in  $C \times Q$  if for every sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n)\} \subset C \times Q$  with  $(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow (x, y)$ , we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n, y_n) \leq f(x, y).$$

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $C$  be a nonempty subset of a real Hilbert space  $H$  and let  $f : C \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a given bifunction.

(1)  $f : C \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be *monotone* if

$$f(x, y) + f(y, x) \leq 0 \quad \forall x, y \in C.$$

(2)  $f : C \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be *hemicontinuous* if

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} f(x + t(y - x), y) \leq f(x, y) \quad \forall x, y \in C.$$

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $C$  be convex subset of a real Hilbert space  $H$  and let  $f : C \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a monotone and hemicontinuous bifunction. Assume that*

- (1)  $f(x, x) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in C$ .
- (2) For every  $x \in C$ ,  $f(x, \cdot)$  is convex.

Then for a given  $x^* \in C$ , we have

$$f(x^*, x) \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in C$$

if and only if

$$f(x, x^*) \leq 0 \quad \forall x \in C.$$

### 3. Approximating sequences and Levitin-Polyak well-posedness

In this section we introduce approximating sequences and generalized approximating sequences for the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ , and introduce the generalized Levitin-Polyak well-posedness notions for the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . For simplicity we denote by  $S$  the solution set of  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ .

Let  $N$  be a normed space of parameters and let  $M \subset N$  be a closed ball centered at  $p^* \in M$ . Let  $\tilde{f} : M \times H_1 \times H_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\tilde{g} : M \times H_2 \times H_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be two functions such that

$$\tilde{f}(p^*, \cdot, \cdot) = f(\cdot, \cdot) \text{ and } \tilde{g}(p^*, \cdot, \cdot) = g(\cdot, \cdot).$$

The perturbed  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is defined as follows:

$$\text{Find } (x^*, y^*) \in H_1 \times H_2 \text{ such that } \begin{cases} x^* \in C, & y^* \in Q, & y^* = Ax^*, \\ \tilde{f}(p, x^*, x) \geq 0 & \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(p, y^*, y) \geq 0 & \forall y \in Q. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Clearly, when  $p = p^*$  for every  $p \in M$ , then (7) reduces to the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $\{p_n\} \subset M$  with  $p_n \rightarrow p^*$  and let  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  be a sequence in  $H_1 \times H_2$ .

- (1) The sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  is called an *approximating sequence* corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  for the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  if there exists  $0 < \epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  such that

$$\begin{cases} x_n \in C, & y_n \in Q, & \|y_n - Ax_n\| \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \tilde{f}(p_n, x_n, x) \geq -\epsilon_n & \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(p_n, y_n, y) \geq -\epsilon_n & \forall y \in Q. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

- (2) The sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  is called a *generalized approximating sequence* corre-

sponding to  $\{p_n\}$  for the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  if there exists  $0 < \epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  such that

$$\begin{cases} d(x_n, C) \leq \epsilon_n, & d(y_n, Q) \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \|y_n - Ax_n\| \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \tilde{f}(p_n, x_n, x) \geq -\epsilon_n & \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(p_n, y_n, y) \geq -\epsilon_n & \forall y \in Q. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Observe that if  $p_n = p^*$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then (8) coincides with the approximating sequence definition in [42].

**Definition 3.2.** The  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is said to be well posed by perturbations if its solution set  $S$  is a singleton and for any  $\{p_n\} \subset M$  with  $p_n \rightarrow p^*$ , every approximating sequence corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  converges to the unique solution to the problem. We say that  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is well posed by perturbations in the generalized sense if  $S \neq \emptyset$  and for any  $\{p_n\} \subset M$  with  $p_n \rightarrow p^*$ , every approximating sequence corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  has a subsequence which converges to some element of  $S$ .

**Remark 1.**

- (i) If  $p = p^*$ , then Definition 3.2 coincides with the definition of well-posedness for the split equilibrium problem given in [42].
- (ii) If  $f = g, C = Q, H_1 = H_2 = H$  is a real Banach space, and  $A = I$ , then Definition 3.2 coincides with the definitions in Fang et al. [22] of well-posedness and generalized well-posedness by perturbations for the  $\text{EP}(f, C)$ .

**Definition 3.3.** The  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is called Levitin-Polyak well posed by perturbations if  $S$  is a singleton and for any  $\{p_n\} \subset M$  with  $p_n \rightarrow p^*$ , every generalized approximating sequence corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  converges to the unique solution. We say that  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is LP well posed by perturbations in the generalized sense if  $S \neq \emptyset$  and for any  $\{p_n\} \subset M$  with  $p_n \rightarrow p^*$ , every generalized approximating sequence corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  has a subsequence which converges to some element of  $S$ .

If  $f = g, C = Q, H_1 = H_2 = H$  and  $A = I$ , then Definition 3.3 reduces to the Definitions of LP well-posedness and generalized LP well-posedness by perturbations for  $\text{EP}(f, C)$ .

Given  $\epsilon \geq 0$ , define the following set:

$$S(\epsilon) := \bigcup_{p \in \mathbb{B}(p^*, \epsilon)} \left\{ (z, w) \in H_1 \times H_2 : d(z, C) \leq \epsilon, d(w, Q) \leq \epsilon, \right. \\ \left. \|w - Az\| \leq \epsilon; \tilde{f}(p, z, x) \geq -\epsilon \quad \forall x \in C; \tilde{g}(p, w, y) \geq -\epsilon \quad \forall y \in Q \right\},$$

where  $\mathbb{B}(p^*, \epsilon)$  denotes the closed ball of radius  $\epsilon$  centered at  $p^*$ .

The set  $S(\epsilon)$  is called the approximate solution set of  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . It is obvious that  $S \subset S(\epsilon)$  for each  $\epsilon > 0$  and moreover,  $S(\epsilon) \subset S(\tilde{\epsilon})$  for every  $0 \leq \epsilon < \tilde{\epsilon}$ .

#### 4. Metric characterization

The metric characterization introduced by Furi and Vignoli [2] plays an essential role in the theory of well-posedness. In this section we establish a Furi-Vignoli type metric characterization of (generalized) LP well-posedness by perturbations for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *SEP( $f, g, C, Q$ ) is LP well posed by perturbations if and only if its solution set  $S$  is nonempty and  $\text{diam}(S(\epsilon)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is LP well-posed by perturbations. By the definition of LP well-posedness by perturbations for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ , the solution set  $S$  is a singleton and therefore nonempty.

We claim that  $\text{diam}(S(\epsilon)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . suppose to the contrary that  $\text{diam}(S(\epsilon)) \not\rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Then there exist  $\delta > 0$ ,  $0 < \epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ ,  $(x_n, y_n) \in S(\epsilon_n)$ , and  $(\tilde{x}_n, \tilde{y}_n) \in S(\epsilon_n)$  such that

$$\|(x_n, y_n) - (\tilde{x}_n, \tilde{y}_n)\| > \delta \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (10)$$

Since  $(x_n, y_n) \in S(\epsilon_n)$  and  $(\tilde{x}_n, \tilde{y}_n) \in S(\epsilon_n)$ , there exist  $p_n \in \mathbb{B}(p^*, \epsilon_n)$  and  $\tilde{p}_n \in \mathbb{B}(p^*, \epsilon_n)$  such that

$$\begin{cases} d(x_n, C) \leq \epsilon_n, & d(y_n, Q) \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \|y_n - Ax_n\| \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \tilde{f}(p_n, x_n, x) \geq -\epsilon_n \quad \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(p_n, y_n, y) \geq -\epsilon_n \quad \forall y \in Q, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} d(\tilde{x}_n, C) \leq \epsilon_n, & d(\tilde{y}_n, Q) \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \|\tilde{y}_n - A\tilde{x}_n\| \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \tilde{f}(\tilde{p}_n, \tilde{x}_n, x) \geq -\epsilon_n \quad \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(\tilde{p}_n, \tilde{y}_n, y) \geq -\epsilon_n \quad \forall y \in Q. \end{cases}$$

When combined with the facts that  $p_n \rightarrow p^*$  and  $\tilde{p}_n \rightarrow p^*$ , this implies that  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  (respectively,  $\{(\tilde{x}_n, \tilde{y}_n)\}$ ) is a generalized approximating sequence corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  (respectively,  $\{\tilde{p}_n\}$ ) for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . Therefore,  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  and  $\{(\tilde{x}_n, \tilde{y}_n)\}$  both converge to the unique solution of  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ , a contradiction to (10).

Conversely, suppose  $S$  is nonempty and  $\text{diam}(S(\epsilon)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . It is clear that  $S \subset S(\epsilon)$  for every  $\epsilon > 0$ . Since  $\text{diam}(S(\epsilon)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  and  $S \subset S(\epsilon)$  for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , it follows that  $S$  is singleton.

Let  $\{p_n\} \subset M$  with  $p_n \rightarrow p^*$  and let  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  be a generalized approximating sequence corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . Then there exists  $0 < \epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  such that

$$\begin{cases} d(x_n, C) \leq \epsilon_n, & d(y_n, Q) \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \|y_n - Ax_n\| \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \tilde{f}(p_n, x_n, x) \geq -\epsilon_n \quad \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(p_n, y_n, y) \geq -\epsilon_n \quad \forall y \in Q. \end{cases}$$

Let  $\tilde{\epsilon}_n = \max\{\epsilon_n, \|p_n - p^*\|\}$ . Then  $\{(x_n, y_n)\} \in S(\tilde{\epsilon}_n)$  and  $\tilde{\epsilon}_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let  $(x^*, y^*)$  be the unique solution of  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . It is clear that  $(x^*, y^*) \in S(\tilde{\epsilon}_n)$ . Therefore,

$$\|(x_n, y_n) - (x^*, y^*)\| \leq \text{diam}(S(\tilde{\epsilon}_n)) \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  is arbitrary, this means that every generalized approximating sequence corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  converges to the unique solution of  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ .

Hence,  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is LP well posed and the proof is complete.  $\square$

Our next result shows that if  $\tilde{f}$  and  $\tilde{g}$  are two upper semi-continuous functions, then Theorem 4.1 still holds under a weaker assumption on the solution set  $S$  of  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ .

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $\tilde{f} : M \times H_1 \times H_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and let  $\tilde{g} : M \times H_2 \times H_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be two functions such that  $\tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, x)$  and  $\tilde{g}(\cdot, \cdot, y)$  are upper semi-continuous for each  $(x, y) \in H_1 \times H_2$ . Then  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is LP well posed by perturbations if and only if*

$$S(\epsilon) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall \epsilon > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{diam}(S(\epsilon)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (11)$$

**Proof.** The necessity part follows directly from Theorem 4.1. For the sufficiency part, suppose condition (11) holds. Since  $S \subset S(\epsilon)$  for each  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  admits at most one solution.

Let  $\{p_n\} \subset M$  with  $p_n \rightarrow p^*$  and let  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  be a generalized approximating sequence corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . Then there exists a positive sequence  $\{\epsilon_n\}$  such that  $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  and

$$\begin{cases} d(x_n, C) \leq \epsilon_n, & d(y_n, Q) \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \|y_n - Ax_n\| \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \tilde{f}(p_n, x_n, x) \geq -\epsilon_n & \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(p_n, y_n, y) \geq -\epsilon_n & \forall y \in Q. \end{cases}$$

Set  $\tilde{\epsilon}_n = \max\{\epsilon_n, \|p_n - p^*\|\}$ . Then  $\{(x_n, y_n)\} \in S(\tilde{\epsilon}_n)$  and  $\tilde{\epsilon}_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . From condition (11) it follows that  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  is a Cauchy sequence. Let  $(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow (x^*, y^*)$ . Since  $\tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, x)$  and  $\tilde{g}(\cdot, \cdot, y)$  are upper semi-continuous for each  $(x, y) \in H_1 \times H_2$ , and  $d(\cdot, C)$  is continuous, we have

$$\begin{cases} x^* \in C, & y^* \in Q, & y^* = Ax^*, \\ \tilde{f}(p^*, x^*, x) \geq 0 & \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(p^*, y^*, y) \geq 0 & \forall y \in Q. \end{cases}$$

That is,

$$\begin{cases} x^* \in C, & y^* \in Q, & y^* = Ax^*, \\ f(x^*, x) \geq 0 & \forall x \in C, \\ g(y^*, y) \geq 0 & \forall y \in Q. \end{cases}$$

This implies that  $(x^*, y^*)$  is the unique solution to  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . Thus  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is indeed LP well posed by perturbations as asserted.  $\square$



Next, we use the Hausdorff metric to present a characterization of generalized LP well-posedness by perturbations for the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . The concept of generalized well-posedness enables to remove the assumption that the solution set  $S$  of the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is a singleton.

**Theorem 4.3.**  *$\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is LP well posed by perturbations in the generalized sense if and only if the solution set  $S$  of  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is nonempty compact and*

$$H(S(\epsilon), S) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (12)$$

**Proof.** First, we tackle the necessity part. To this end, suppose the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is LP well-posed by perturbations in the generalized sense. It is clear that  $\emptyset \neq S \subset S(\epsilon)$  for each  $\epsilon > 0$ . We claim that  $S$  is compact. Indeed, let  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  be a sequence in  $S$  and consider  $\{p_n\} \subset M$  with  $p_n \rightarrow p^*$ . Since  $S \subset S(\epsilon)$  for each  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  is a generalized approximating sequence corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . By the definition of the generalized LP well-posedness by perturbations of  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ , the sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  has a subsequence converging to some element of  $S$ . Thus  $S$  is indeed compact, as claimed.

Next, we consider condition (12). Suppose to the contrary that condition (12) does not hold true. Then there exist a number  $\tau > 0$ , a sequence  $\{\epsilon_n > 0\}$  decreasing to 0, and  $(x_n, y_n) \in S(\epsilon_n)$  such that

$$(x_n, y_n) \notin S + \mathbb{B}(0, \tau) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (13)$$

Since  $(x_n, y_n) \in S(\epsilon_n)$ , there exists  $p_n \in \mathbb{B}(p^*, \epsilon_n)$  such that

$$\begin{cases} d(x_n, C) \leq \epsilon_n, & d(y_n, Q) \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \|y_n - Ax_n\| \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \tilde{f}(p_n, x_n, x) \geq -\epsilon_n \quad \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(p_n, y_n, y) \geq -\epsilon_n \quad \forall y \in Q. \end{cases}$$

When combined with the fact that  $p_n \rightarrow p^*$ , this implies that  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  is a generalized approximating sequence corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ .

By the definition of generalized LP well-posedness by perturbations of  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ , the sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  has a subsequence which converges to some element of  $S$ , a contradiction to (13). Hence,

$$H(S(\epsilon), S) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

For the sufficiency part, suppose that  $S$  is nonempty and compact, and that condition (12) holds. Let  $\{p_n\} \subset M$  with  $p_n \rightarrow p^*$  and let  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  be a generalized approximating sequence corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . Then there exists a positive sequence  $\{\epsilon_n\}$  such that  $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  and  $(x_n, y_n) \in S(\epsilon_n)$  with

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_n = \max\{\epsilon_n, \|p_n - p^*\|\} \rightarrow 0.$$

Using condition (12), we get

$$\begin{aligned} d((x_n, y_n), S) &\leq D(S(\tilde{\epsilon}_n), S) \\ &= \max\{D(S(\tilde{\epsilon}_n), S), D(S, S(\tilde{\epsilon}_n))\} \\ &= H(S(\tilde{\epsilon}_n), S) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $S$  is compact, the sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  has a subsequence which converges to some element of  $S$ . Hence  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is indeed LP well posed by perturbations in the generalized sense.  $\square$

We now establish the following theorem by assuming continuity of  $\tilde{f}$  and  $\tilde{g}$ , and by weakening the condition imposed on the solution set  $S$  via the Kuratowski measure of noncompactness.

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $\tilde{f} : M \times H_1 \times H_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\tilde{g} : M \times H_2 \times H_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be two functions such that  $\tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, x)$  and  $\tilde{g}(\cdot, \cdot, y)$  are upper semi-continuous for each  $(x, y) \in H_1 \times H_2$ . Then  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is LP well posed by perturbations in the generalized sense if and only if*

$$S(\epsilon) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall \epsilon > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(S(\epsilon)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (14)$$

**Proof.** Suppose  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is LP well posed by perturbations in the generalized sense. Then  $S(\epsilon) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $\epsilon > 0$ . Appealing to Theorem 4.3, we get

$$H(S(\epsilon), S) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (15)$$

Under our assumptions, it is not difficult to show (using similar technique to those employed in the proof of Theorem 4.3) that  $S$  is compact. Hence  $\mu(S) = 0$ . Therefore we have

$$\mu(S(\epsilon)) \leq 2H(S(\epsilon), S) + \mu(S) = 2H(S(\epsilon), S). \quad (16)$$

Using (15) and (16), we see that

$$\mu(S(\epsilon)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Conversely, suppose condition (14) holds. Since  $\tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, x)$  and  $\tilde{g}(\cdot, \cdot, y)$  are upper semi-continuous for each  $(x, y) \in H_1 \times H_2$ , the set  $S(\epsilon)$  is closed for each  $\epsilon > 0$ . It is obvious that

$$S = \bigcap_{\epsilon > 0} S(\epsilon).$$

Since  $\mu(S(\epsilon)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , using Theorem [37] (pp. 412), one can show that  $S$  is nonempty compact and

$$H(S(\epsilon), S) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, by Theorem 4.3,  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is LP well posed by perturbations in the generalized sense. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. Well-posedness and uniqueness of solution

One of the most interesting problems in the theory of well-posedness for variational inequalities is to establish the equivalence between well-posedness by perturbations and uniqueness of the solution. In this section we prove that the LP well-posedness by perturbations of the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is equivalent to the existence and uniqueness of its solution under mild assumptions on the associated mappings.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $C$  and  $Q$  be nonempty, closed and convex subsets of finite-dimensional real Hilbert spaces  $H_1$  and  $H_2$ , respectively. Let  $N$  be a normed space of parameters and let  $M \subset N$  be a closed ball centered at  $p^* \in M$ . Let  $\tilde{f} : M \times H_1 \times H_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\tilde{g} : M \times H_2 \times H_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be functions which satisfy the following conditions:*

- (i)  $\tilde{f}(p^*, \cdot, \cdot)$  and  $\tilde{g}(p^*, \cdot, \cdot)$  are hemicontinuous.
- (ii)  $\tilde{f}(p, \cdot, \cdot)$  and  $\tilde{g}(p, \cdot, \cdot)$  are both monotone for all  $p \in M$ .
- (iii)  $\tilde{f}(p, x, \cdot)$  and  $\tilde{g}(p, y, \cdot)$  are both convex for all  $p \in M$ ,  $(x, y) \in H_1 \times H_2$ .
- (iv)  $\tilde{f}(p^*, x, x)$  and  $\tilde{g}(p^*, y, y)$  are nonnegative for every  $(x, y) \in H_1 \times H_2$ .
- (v)  $\tilde{f}(\cdot, x, \cdot)$  and  $\tilde{g}(\cdot, y, \cdot)$  are both continuous for all  $(x, y) \in H_1 \times H_2$ .

Then  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is Levitin-Polyak (LP) well posed by perturbations if and only if  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  has a unique solution.

**Proof.** The necessity part of the theorem is straightforward and thus we present only the sufficiency part. Suppose that  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  has a unique solution and let  $(x^*, y^*) \in C \times Q$  be the unique solution of  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . That is,  $(x^*, y^*) \in H_1 \times H_2$  and

$$\begin{cases} x^* \in C, & y^* \in Q, & y^* = Ax^*, \\ f(x^*, x) \geq 0 & \forall x \in C, \\ g(y^*, y) \geq 0 & \forall y \in Q. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Let  $\{p_n\} \subset M$  with  $p_n \rightarrow p^*$  and let  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  be a generalized approximating sequence corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  for  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . Then there exists a positive sequence  $\{\epsilon_n\}$  such that  $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  and

$$\begin{cases} d(x_n, C) \leq \epsilon_n, & d(y_n, Q) \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \|y_n - Ax_n\| \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \tilde{f}(p_n, x_n, x) \geq -\epsilon_n & \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(p_n, y_n, y) \geq -\epsilon_n & \forall y \in Q. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Since  $\tilde{f}(p_n, \cdot, \cdot)$  and  $\tilde{g}(p_n, \cdot, \cdot)$  are monotone, it follows from (18) that

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{f}(p_n, x, x_n) \leq -\tilde{f}(p_n, x_n, x) \leq \epsilon_n & \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(p_n, y, y_n) \leq -\tilde{g}(p_n, y_n, y) \leq \epsilon_n & \forall y \in Q. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Since  $\tilde{f}(\cdot, x, \cdot)$  and  $\tilde{g}(\cdot, y, \cdot)$  are continuous, it follows from (19) that

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{f}(p^*, x, x^*) \leq -\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{f}(p_n, x_n, x) \leq 0 & \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(p^*, y, y^*) \leq -\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{g}(p_n, y_n, y) \leq 0 & \forall y \in Q. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Using (18) and (19), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} d(x_n, C) \leq \epsilon_n, & d(y_n, Q) \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \|y_n - Ax_n\| \leq \epsilon_n, \\ \tilde{f}(p_n, x, x_n) \leq \epsilon_n \quad \forall x \in C, \\ \tilde{g}(p_n, y, y_n) \leq \epsilon_n \quad \forall y \in Q. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Now we have to show that the sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  is bounded. Suppose to the contrary that that the sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  is not bounded. With no loss of generality, we may assume that  $\|(x_n, y_n)\| \rightarrow \infty$ . Set  $u^* = (x^*, y^*)$ ,  $u_n = (x_n, y_n)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} t_n &= \frac{1}{\|(x_n, y_n) - (x^*, y^*)\|} = \frac{1}{\|u_n - u^*\|}, \\ v_n = (z_n, w_n) &= u^* + t_n(u_n - u^*) = ((1 - t_n)x^* + t_nx_n, (1 - t_n)y^* + t_ny_n). \end{aligned}$$

We may assume that  $t_n \in (0, 1]$  and  $v_n \rightarrow \tilde{v} = (\tilde{z}, \tilde{w}) \neq u^*$ .

Since  $f$  is continuous in the first and third variables and convex in the third variable, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, \tilde{z}) &= \tilde{f}(p^*, x, \tilde{z}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{f}(p_n, x, z_n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{f}(p_n, x, (1 - t_n)x^* + t_nx_n) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [(1 - t_n)\tilde{f}(p_n, x, x^*) + t_n\tilde{f}(p_n, x, x_n)] \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n\epsilon_n = 0 \quad \forall x \in C. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Since  $\tilde{g}$  is continuous in the first and third variables and convex in the third variable, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(y, \tilde{w}) &= \tilde{g}(p^*, y, \tilde{w}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{g}(p_n, y, w_n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{g}(p_n, y, (1 - t_n)y^* + t_ny_n) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [(1 - t_n)\tilde{g}(p_n, y, y^*) + t_n\tilde{g}(p_n, y, y_n)] \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n\epsilon_n = 0 \quad \forall y \in Q. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(z_n) - w_n\| &= \|A((1 - t_n)x^* + t_nx_n) - (1 - t_n)y^* - t_ny_n\| \\ &= t_n\|Ax_n - y_n\| \leq t_n\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Since  $z_n \rightarrow \tilde{z}$  and  $w_n \rightarrow \tilde{w}$ , it follows that  $A(\tilde{z}) = \tilde{w}$ .

Using Lemma 2.1, (21), and  $x^* \in C$  ( $d(x^*, C) = 0$ ), we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(z_n, C) &= d((1 - t_n)x^* + t_nx_n, C) \\ &\leq (1 - t_n)d(x^*, C) + t_nd(x_n, C) \\ &\leq t_n\epsilon_n. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (25), we find that  $\tilde{z} \in C$ . Similarly, we can show that  $\tilde{w} \in Q$ . Using Lemma 2.5 and the uniqueness of the solution to SEP, it is not difficult to show that  $(\tilde{z}, \tilde{w}) = (x^*, y^*) = u^*$ , which is a contradiction. Thus  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded.

Let  $\{u_{n'}\}$  be any convergent subsequence of  $\{u_n\}$  with limit  $\hat{u} = (\hat{x}, \hat{y})$ . By our assumptions, it is not difficult to show that  $\hat{u} = (\hat{x}, \hat{y})$  is a solution to  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . Since  $(x^*, y^*) = u^*$  is the unique solution to  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ , we find that  $\hat{u} = u^*$  and thus the generalized approximating sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  corresponding to  $\{p_n\}$  converges to the unique solution to  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$ . Therefore, the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is indeed LP well posed by perturbations. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 6. Conclusion

In this paper we introduced the perturbed split equilibrium problem and extended the notions of various kinds of Levitin-Polyak well-posedness by perturbations for the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  in infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. We also showed that Levitin-Polyak well-posedness by perturbations for the  $\text{SEP}(f, g, C, Q)$  is equivalent to the existence and uniqueness of its solution in finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces.

An open and interesting question arising from the above results and, in particular, from Theorem 5.1, is the validity of Theorem 5.1 in infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces.

## Acknowledgements

The first author gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the Post-Doctoral Program at the Technion – Israel Institute of Technology. Simeon Reich was partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation (Grant 820/17), by the Fund for the Promotion of Research at the Technion and by the Technion General Research Fund.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Data availability statement

The authors acknowledge that the data presented in this study must be deposited and made publicly available in an acceptable repository, prior to publication.

## References

- [1] Tykhonov, A. N. (1966). On the stability of the functional optimization problem. *USSR J. Comput. Math. Math. Phys.* 6:631-634.
- [2] Furi, M., Vignoli, A. (1970). About well-posed optimization problems for functionals in metric spaces. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 5(3):225-229.
- [3] Levitin, E. S., Polyak, B. T. (1966). Convergence of minimizing sequences in conditional extremum problems. *Sov. Math. Dokl.* 7:764-767.
- [4] Zolezzi, T. (1995). Well-posedness criteria in optimization with application to the calculus of variations. *Nonlinear Anal. TMA* 25:437-453.
- [5] Zolezzi, T. (1996). Extended well-posedness of optimization problems. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 91:257-266.
- [6] Huang, X. X., Yang, X. Q. (2006). Generalized Levitin–Polyak well-posedness in constrained optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.* 17:243-258.
- [7] Dontchev, A. L., Zolezzi, T. (1993). *Well-posed optimization problems*. Berlin: Springer.
- [8] Facchinei, F., Pang, J. S. (2003). *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems*. Vol. I+II. New-York: Springer.
- [9] Ferrentino, R. (2007). Variational inequalities and optimization problems. *Appl. Math. Sci.* 47:2327-2343.
- [10] Lucchetti, R., Patrone, F. (1981). A characterization of Tyhonov well-posedness for minimum problems, with applications to variational inequalities. *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.* 3(4):461-476.
- [11] Lucchetti, R., Patrone, F. (1982/83). Some properties of well-posed variational inequalities governed by linear operators. *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.* 5(3):349-361.
- [12] Hu, R., Fang, Y. P. (2010). Levitin-Polyak well-posedness of variational inequalities. *Nonlinear Anal.* 72:373-381.
- [13] Huang, X. X., Yang, X. Q. (2007). Levitin-Polyak well-posedness in generalized variational inequality problems with functional constraints. *J. Ind. Manag. Optim.* 3:671-684.
- [14] Huang, X. X., Yang, X. Q., Zhu, D. L. (2009). Levitin-Polyak well-posedness of variational inequality problems with functional constraints. *J. Glob. Optim.* 44(2):159-174.
- [15] Fang, Y. P., Huang, N. J., Yao, J. C. (2010). Well-posedness by perturbations of mixed variational inequalities in Banach spaces. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 201(3):682-692.
- [16] Stampacchia, G. (1964). Formes bilineaires coercitives sur les ensembles convexes. *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de l'Académie des sciences* 258:4413-4416.
- [17] Censor, Y., Gibali, A., Reich, S. (2012). Algorithms for the split variational inequality problem. *Numer. Algorithms* 59(2):301-323.
- [18] Dong, Q. L., Lu, Y. Y., Yang, J., He, S. (2017). Approximately solving multi-valued variational inequalities by using a projection and contraction algorithm. *Numer. Algorithms* 76(3):799-812.
- [19] Blum, E., Oettli, W. (1993). From optimization and variational inequalities to equilibrium problems. *Math. Stud.* 63:1-23.
- [20] Bianchia, M., Kassay, G., Pini, R. (2010). Well-posed equilibrium problems. *Nonlinear Anal.* 72:460-468.
- [21] Blum, E., Oettli, W. (1994). From optimization and variational inequalities to equilibrium problems. *Math. Student* 63:123-145.
- [22] Fang, Y. P., Hu, R., Huang, N. J. (2008). Well-posedness for equilibrium problems and for optimization problems with equilibrium constraints. *Comput. Math. Appl.* 55:89-100.
- [23] Hieu, D. V., Gibali, A. (2020). Strong convergence of inertial algorithms for solving equilibrium problems. *Optim. Lett.* 14:1817-1843.
- [24] Liu, Y., Kong, H. (2019). The new extragradient method extended to equilibrium problems. *Revista de la Real Academia de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales. Serie A. Matemáticas* 113:2113-2126.
- [25] Jolaoso, L. O., Alakoya, T. O., Taiwo, A., Mewomo, O. T. (2020). Inertial extragradient method via viscosity approximation approach for solving equilibrium problem in Hilbert

- space. *Optimization* 70:387-412.
- [26] Hieu, D. V., Cho, Y. J., Xiao, Y. -B. (2018). Modified extragradient algorithms for solving equilibrium problems. *Optimization* 67:2003-2029.
  - [27] Cotrina, J., Zúñiga, J. (2019). Quasi-equilibrium problems with non-self constraint map. *J. Global Optim.* 75:177-197.
  - [28] Hu, R., Fang, Y. P. (2016). Characterizations of Levitin-Polyak well-posedness by perturbations for the split variational inequality problem. *Optimization* 65(9):1717-1732.
  - [29] Ali, B., Harbau, M. H. (2019). Convergence Theorems for Pseudo monotone Equilibrium Problem, Split Feasibility Problem, and Multivalued Strictly Pseudo contractive Mappings. *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.* 40(10):1194-1214.
  - [30] Ansari, Q. H., Nimana, N., Petrot, N. (2014). Split hierarchical variational inequality problems and related problems. *Fixed Point Theory Appl.* 2014:208.
  - [31] Moudafi, A. (2011). Split monotone variational inclusions. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 150:275-283.
  - [32] He, Z. (2012). The split equilibrium problem and its convergence algorithms. *J. Inequal. Appl.* 2012:16.
  - [33] Dinh, B. V., Son, D. X., Anh, T. V. (2015). Extragradient algorithms for split equilibrium problem and nonexpansive mapping. arXiv:1508.04914.
  - [34] Li, J. (2019). Split equilibrium problems for related games and applications to economic theory. *Optimization* 68(6):1203-1222.
  - [35] Hieu, D. V. (2020). Projection methods for solving split equilibrium problems. *J. Ind. Manag. Optim.* 16(5):2331-2349.
  - [36] Suleiman, Y. I., Kumam, P., Rehman, H. ur, Kumam, W. (2021). A new extragradient algorithm with adaptive step-size for solving split equilibrium problems. *J. Inequal. Appl.* 2021:136.
  - [37] Kuratowski, K. (1968). *Topology*. Vol. I+II. New-York: Academic Press.
  - [38] Klein, E., Thompson, A. C. (1984). *Theory of Correspondences*. New-York: Wiley.
  - [39] Bauschke, H. H., Combettes, P. L. (2011). *Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces*. New-York: Springer.
  - [40] Rakocevik, V. (1998). Measure of noncompactness and some applications. *FILOMAT* 12(2):87-120.
  - [41] Cotrina, J., Garcia, Y. (2008). Equilibrium problems: existence results and applications. *Set-Valued Var. Anal* 26:159-177.
  - [42] Dey, S., Vetrivel, V., Xu, H. K. Well-posedness for the split equilibrium problem. *Preprint*.