

## On sufficient conditions of optimality of second order

by S. ROLEWICZ (Warszawa)

*Dedicated to the memory of Jacek Szarski*

Let  $f, g_1, \dots, g_m$  be real valued continuously differentiable functions defined on a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ . We consider a following optimization problem

$$(1) \quad f(x) \rightarrow \inf, \quad g_i(x) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Under hypotheses that at  $x_0 \in \Omega$  all constraints  $g_i$  are active (i.e.  $g_i(x_0) = 0, i = 1, \dots, m$ ), that the gradients of  $g_i$  taken at  $x_0, \nabla g_i$ , are linearly independent, that the necessary Kuhn-Tucker conditions holds (i.e. there are  $\lambda_i \geq 0$  such that the gradient of the Lagrangian

$$(2) \quad L(x) = f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i g_i(x)$$

taken at the point  $x_0$  is equal to 0

$$(3) \quad \nabla L(x_0) = 0$$

it was shown in [5] that  $x_0$  is a local solution of problem (1) if and only if it is a local solution of a following reduced problem

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} f(x) &\rightarrow \inf, \\ g_i(x) &= 0 \quad \text{if } \lambda_i > 0, \\ g_i(x) &\leq 0 \quad \text{if } \lambda_i = 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the present note it will be shown how the classical second order conditions of sufficiency for problem (1) (see [1], [4], a historical discussion of the subject is given in [2]) follows from the above mentioned result of [5].

Let

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} T_i &= \{x: (\nabla g_i, x) = 0\} \quad \text{if } \lambda_i > 0, \\ T_i &= \{x: (\nabla g_i, x) \leq 0\} \quad \text{if } \lambda_i = 0. \end{aligned}$$

A following theorem extends the classical one.

**THEOREM.** *Let  $f, g_1, \dots, g_m$  be  $k$ -time continuously differentiable functions. Let at  $x_0$  all constraints  $g_i$  be active (i.e.  $g_i(x_0) = 0, i = 1, \dots, m$ ). Suppose that there are  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \geq 0$  such that the differentials to the order  $k-1$  of the Lagrangian (2) are equal to 0 on the whole space  $\mathbf{R}^n$ ,*

$$(6) \quad d^i L(x_0, h) = 0, \quad h \in \mathbf{R}^n, \quad i = 1, \dots, k-1,$$

and that

$$(7) \quad d^k L(x_0, h) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad h \neq 0, h \in T$$

where

$$(8) \quad T = \bigcap_{i=1}^m T_i.$$

Then  $x_0$  is a local minimum of problem (1).

**Proof.** At the beginning we shall prove the theorem under an additional hypothesis that the gradients of  $g_i$  taken at the point  $x_0, \nabla g_i$ , are linearly independent. In this case, basing on the result of [5], it is enough to prove that  $x_0$  is a local minimum of problem (4).

Using compactness arguments it is easy to show that there is  $c > 0$  such that

$$(9) \quad d^k L(x_0, h) \geq c \|h\|^k \quad \text{for} \quad h \in T.$$

Since  $d^k L(x_0, h)$  is a homogeneous polynomial of order  $k$ , there is an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$(10) \quad d^k L(x_0, h) \geq \frac{1}{2} c \|h\|^k \quad \text{for} \quad h \in T_\varepsilon,$$

where

$$(11) \quad T_\varepsilon = \{h \in \mathbf{R}^n : \text{dist}(h, T) \leq \varepsilon \|h\|\}$$

(compare [3]).

Continuity of gradients of  $f, g_1, \dots, g_m$  imply that for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a neighbourhood of zero  $Q$  such that

$$(12) \quad Q \cap \{h : g_i(x_0 + h) = 0 \text{ for } \lambda_i > 0, g_i(x_0 + h) \leq 0, \text{ for } \lambda_i = 0\} \subset T_\varepsilon.$$

Formulae (10) and (12) imply the theorem under the additional hypothesis that the gradients  $\nabla g_i$  are linearly independent.

Now we shall show that this hypothesis is superfluous. Let

$$(13) \quad p = \dim(\text{span}(\nabla g_i))$$

and let

$$(14) \quad r = \dim(\text{span}(\nabla g_i, \lambda_i > 0)).$$

We can choose the functions

$$(15) \quad \bar{g}_j(x) = g_{i_j}(x), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, p,$$

in such a way that the gradients of  $\bar{g}_j$  taken at the point  $x_0$  are linearly independent and  $\lambda_{ij} > 0$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, r$ .

Now we shall consider a following problem

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} f(x) &\rightarrow \inf, \\ \bar{g}_j(x) &= 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, r, \\ \bar{g}_j(x) &\leq 0, \quad j = r+1, \dots, p. \end{aligned}$$

Any local solution of problem (16) is a local solution of problem (4). It is easy to verify that the set

$$(17) \quad T' = \{x: (\nabla \bar{g}_j, x) = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, r, \quad (\nabla \bar{g}_j, x) \leq 0, \\ j = r+1, \dots, p\}$$

is precisely equal to the set  $T$ . It finishes the proof of the theorem.

For  $k = 2$  we obtain as a particular case the classical theorem [1], [4].

The condition that the differentials  $d^i L(x_0, h)$  vanish on the whole space  $\mathbf{R}^n$  cannot be replaced by the weaker condition that they vanish on  $T$ .

EXAMPLE. Let

$$(18) \quad f(x, y, z) = x + 2y + y^2 - 2x^2 - z^2.$$

Let

$$(19) \quad g_1(x, y, z) = -(x+y) + z^2, \quad g_2(x, y, z) = -y + z^4.$$

Let  $x_0 = (0, 0, 0)$ . It is easy to verify that the space  $T$  is of the form  $T = \{(0, 0, z), z \in \mathbf{R}\}$ . The both Lagrange multipliers are equal to one,  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 1$ , and the Lagrangian  $L(x)$  is equal to

$$(20) \quad L(x) = z^4 - 2x^2 + y^2.$$

Hence for  $h \in T$

$$(21) \quad d^i L(x_0, h) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, \dots$$

and

$$(22) \quad d^4 L(x_0, h) = 4! \|h\|^4.$$

On the other hand, by the result of [5],  $(0, 0, 0)$  is not a local minimum of function (18) with constraints (19).

#### References

- [1] M. R. Hetenes, *An indirect sufficiency proof for the problem of Bolza in non-parametric form*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 62 (1947), p. 509-535.
- [2] F. Lempio and J. Zowe, *Higher order optimality conditions* (preprint of Math. Inst. Univ. Bayreuth).

- [3] H. Maurer and J. Zowe, *First and second-order necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for infinite-dimensional programming problems*, Math. Programming, 16 (1979), p. 98–110.
- [4] E. J. McShane, *Sufficient conditions for a weak relative minimum in the problem of Bolza*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 52 (1942), p. 344–379.
- [5] S. Rolewicz, *On sufficient conditions of optimality in mathematical programming*, Operation Research Verf. 40 (1981), p. 149–152.

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 19.09.1980*

---