Perturbed optimization in Banach spaces II: a theory based on a strong directional constraint qualification

J. Frederic Bonnans, Roberto Cominetti

INRIA

INSTITUT NATIONAL DE RECHERCHE EN INFORMATIQUE ET EN AUTOMATIQUE

Perturbed Optimization in Banach Spaces II : A Theory Based on a Strong Directional Constraint Qualification

J. Frédéric BONNANS
Roberto COMINETTI

N° 2161
Janvier 1994

PROGRAMME 5

Traitement du signal,
automatique et
productique

Rapport
de recherche

1994

PERTURBED OPTIMIZATION IN BANACH SPACES II: A THEORY BASED ON A STRONG DIRECTIONAL CONSTRAINT QUALIFICATION

OPTIMISATION AVEC PERTURBATION DANS LES ESPACES DE BANACH II: UNE THÉORIE BASÉE SUR UNE CONDITION DE QUALIFICATION DIRECTIONNELLE FORTE

J. FRÉDÉRIC BONNANS* AND ROBERTO COMINETTI†

Abstract. We study the sensitivity of the optimal value and optimal solutions of perturbed optimization problems in two cases. The first one is when multipliers exist but only the weak (and not the strong) second order sufficient optimality condition is satisfied. The second case is when no Lagrange multipliers exist. We introduce a directional constraint qualification stronger than in part I of this paper. We give sharp upper estimates of the cost based on paths varying as the square root of the perturbation parameter and, under a *no gap* condition, we obtain the first term of the expansion for the cost, and also for exact and approximate solutions when multipliers exist. We show in the appendix that the strong directional constraint qualification is satisfied for a large class of problems, including regular problems in the sense of Robinson.

Résumé. Nous étudions la sensibilité du coût optimal et des solutions de problèmes d'optimisation dans deux cas. Le premier est quand des multiplicateurs existent mais seule la condition suffisante d'optimalité faible est satisfaite. Le second cas est lorsque l'ensemble des multiplicateurs est vide. Nous introduisons une condition de qualification directionnelle plus forte que dans la première partie de l'article. Nous obtenons des estimations supérieures fortes pour le coût, basées sur des chemins variant comme la racine carrée du paramètre de perturbation et, sous une hypothèse d'écart nul, nous obtenons le premier terme du développement du coût, et aussi des solutions exactes et approchées quand l'ensemble des multiplicateurs n'est pas vide. Nous montrons en annexe que la condition de qualification directionnelle forte est satisfaite dans une classe de problèmes assez grande, qui contient les problèmes réguliers au sens de Robinson.

Key words. Sensitivity analysis, marginal function, square root expansion, approximate solutions, directional constraint qualification, regularity and implicit function theorems, convex duality.

AMS subject classifications. 46N10, 47H19, 49K27, 49K40, 58C15, 90C31

1. Introduction. This paper is the second in a trilogy devoted to the analysis of parametric optimization problems of the form

$$(P_u) \qquad \min_x \{f(x,u) : G(x,u) \in K\}$$

with X and Y Banach spaces, K a closed convex subset of Y, and $f(x,u), G(x,u)$ mappings of class C^2 from $X \times \mathbb{R}$ into $\mathbb{R}$ and Y respectively. We denote the feasible

* INRIA-Rocquencourt, B.P. 105, 78153 Rocquencourt, France

† Universidad de Chile, Casilla 170/3 Correo 3, Santiago, Chile. Partially supported by Fundación Andes and Conicyt.

set, value function, and set of solutions of (P_u) as

$$\begin{aligned} F(u) &:= \{x \in X \ : \ G(x,u) \in K\}, \\ v(u) &:= \inf\{f(x,u) \ : \ x \in F(u)\}, \\ S(u) &:= \{x \in F(u) \ : \ f(x,u) = v(u)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly $v(P)$, $F(P)$, $S(P)$ will denote the optimal value, feasible set, and solution set of an optimization problem (P).

Our aim is to study the expansion of $v(u)$ and possibly $S(u)$ in the vicinity of a local solution x_0 of (P_u). Such sensitivity analysis usually rely (among other assumptions) upon stability properties of the feasible set $F(u)$ which follow from so-called *constraint qualification conditions*. In part I of this work [4] we considered the following generalization of Gollan's condition [10] (see also [1])

$$(DCQ) \quad 0 \in \operatorname{int}\left[G(x_0,0) + G'(x_0,0)X \times (0,\infty) - K\right],$$

which is a *directional* version of Robinson's constraint qualification [14]

$$(CQ) \quad 0 \in \operatorname{int}\left[G(x_0,0) + G'_x(x_0,0)X - K\right].$$

Under (DCQ) we obtained the following upper estimate of the optimal value:

$$v'_+(0) \leq v(L) \tag{1.1}$$

where $v'_+(0)$ and $v'_-(0)$ denote the upper and lower Dini derivatives of the value function:

$$\begin{aligned} v'_+(0) &:= \limsup_{u\downarrow 0} \frac{v(u)-v(0)}{u}, \\ v'_-(0) &:= \liminf_{u\downarrow 0} \frac{v(u)-v(0)}{u}, \end{aligned}$$

and (L) is the problem with linearized data:

$$(L) \qquad \min_d\{f'(x_0,0)(d,1) : \ G'(x_0,0)(d,1) \in T_K(G(x_0,0))\}.$$

Using duality theory we could prove that $v(D) = v(L) < \infty$, where (D) is the problem

$$(D) \qquad \max\{\mathcal{L}'_u(x_0,\lambda,0) : \lambda \in \Lambda_0\},$$

with $\mathcal{L}$ the Lagrangian and Λ_0 the set of multipliers associated with x_0, that is, denoting by $N_K(y)$ the cone of outward normals at a point $y \in K$:

$$\begin{gathered} \mathcal{L}(x,\lambda,u) := f(x,u) + \langle \lambda, G(x,u)\rangle, \\ \Lambda_0 := \{\lambda \in Y^* : \lambda \in N_K(G(x_0,0));\ \mathcal{L}'_x(x_0,\lambda,0) = 0\}. \end{gathered}$$

It follows that under (DCQ), $v(L)$ is finite if and only if Λ_0 is not empty.

Define a *path* as a mapping $u \to x_u$ from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to X, with $x_u \to x_0$ when $u \downarrow 0$. The path is said to be feasible if $G(x_u,u) \in K$ for u small enough. Under a strong second order condition on the Lagrangian it can be checked [4] that any $o(u)$-optimal path x_u, *i.e.* a feasible path x_u such that $f(x_u,u) \leq v(u) + o(u)$, satisfies also $x_u = x_0 + O(u)$. In this case $v'(0)$ exists, being equal to $v(L)$, and some estimates for the second-order variation of $v(u)$ can be obtained. Under additional assumptions we could prove that in fact

$$v(u) = v(0) + u\, v(L) + \frac{1}{2}u^2\, v(\tilde{Q}) + o(u^2), \tag{1.2}$$

where $(\tilde{Q})$ is a subproblem involving the expansion of order 1 and 2 of the data at $(x_0, 0)$. A remarkable property in this case is that every weak limit of $(x_u - x_0)/u$, with x_u an $o(u^2)$-optimal path, belongs to $S(\tilde{Q})$.

The available perturbation theory for nonlinear programming shows that this is not the end of the story. Under the directional qualification hypothesis of Gollan [10] and the weak second order sufficient condition, it appears [9, Gauvin and Janin] that $v'(0)$ exists but may be strictly less than $v(L)$. In that case, a path of $o(u)$-solutions satisfies only $x_u = x_0 + O(\sqrt{u})$. One can still formulate [6, Bonnans, Ioffe and Shapiro] a subproblem (M) such that $v'(0) = v(M)$ and $S(M)$ coincides with the limit points of $(x_u - x_0)/\sqrt{u}$ where x_u ranges over the set of all possible $o(u)$-optimal paths. For this it is necessary to assume the existence of at least one multiplier. A similar theory for the case when no multiplier exists has been developed in [3, Bonnans]: here the variation of the cost as well that of the solutions is of order $O(\sqrt{u})$.

The aim of this paper is to extend these two theories to the Banach space setting. To this end we need a constraint qualification that is still directional, but stronger than (DCQ). Specifically, in addition to (DCQ) we need the restorability property below that, roughly speaking, asserts that to certain almost feasible *square root* paths (*i.e.* paths satisfying $x_u = x_0 + O(\sqrt{u})$), one can associate a sufficiently close feasible path. In the case of nonlinear programming, that stronger hypothesis $(SDCQ)$ below still reduces to the condition of Gollan [10] used in [9, 3, 6] so we recover the main results of these three references. Square root paths have already been used in a Banach space setting, see [2, Barbet] and Ioffe [11],[12]. However our qualification condition is weaker than those in the above references.

As in part I of this paper, in our extension to the Banach space setting, an additional difficulty related to the possible curvature of the convex K appears. To be more precise, let us recall the definition of first and second order tangent sets:

$$\begin{aligned} T_K(y) &:= \{h \in Y : \text{ there exists } o(t) \text{ such that } y + th + o(t) \in K\}, \\ T_K^2(y,h) &:= \{k \in Y : \text{ there exists } o(t^2) \text{ such that } y + th + \frac{1}{2}t^2 k + o(t^2) \in K\}. \end{aligned}$$

The fact that in general 0 does not belong to the set $T_K^2(y,h)$ may cause a *gap* between our upper and lower estimates. Some cases when the curvature makes no contribution to the second order variation of the cost were analyzed in part I, yielding the expansion (1.2) under a condition of generalized polyhedricity. We state in this paper some results of a similar nature. On the other hand, in part III [5] we will "fill the gap" for semi-infinite programming problems, a case where the curvature term may be handled (under some hypotheses) to yield sharper lower estimates.

The paper is organized as follows: in §2, we describe the strong directional constraint qualification $(SDCQ)$. Then in §3 we develop a perturbation theory assuming the set of multipliers Λ_0 to be nonempty, whereas §4 deals with the case when Λ_0 is empty. In both cases we obtain sharp upper estimates as well as some lower estimates of the cost. Under a *no gap* condition we obtain the first term in the expansion of the cost and approximate solutions. Finally in the appendix we give some sufficient conditions for $(SDCQ)$.

2. The strong directional qualification condition. Our upper estimates are based on paths that vary as the square root of the perturbation parameter. Specifically, we consider paths satisfying, for given d, w in X, the two conditions:

$$x_u = x_0 + \sqrt{u}d + uw + o(u), \tag{2.3}$$

$$dist(G(x_u, u), K) = o(u). \tag{2.4}$$

Note that we can express (2.4) using the concept of second order tangent set. Namely, if x_u satisfies (2.3) then the expansion

$$G(x_u, u) = G(x_0, 0) + \sqrt{u}G'_x(x_0, 0)d + u[G'(x_0, 0)(w, 1) + \frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0, 0)dd] + o(u),$$

shows that (2.4) is equivalent to

$$\Psi_G(w, d) \in T_2^K(d), \tag{2.5}$$

where we have set

$$\begin{aligned} T_2^K(d) &:= \frac{1}{2}T_K^2(G(x_0, 0), G'_x(x_0, 0)d), \\ \Psi_G(w, d) &:= G'(x_0, 0)(w, 1) + \frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0, 0)dd, \\ \Psi_f(w, d) &:= f'(x_0, 0)(w, 1) + \frac{1}{2}f''_x(x_0, 0)dd. \end{aligned}$$

REMARK. The set $T_2^K(d)$ should not be confused with the set

$$T_K^2(d) := T_K^2(G(x_0, 0), G'(x_0, 0)(d, 1))$$

defined in part I of this paper and which will not be used here.

DEFINITION 1. *We say that x_0 is* restorable *(with respect to G and K) if, given a path x_u satisfying* (2.3) *and* (2.4), *then for each $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently close to* 1 *we can find $w_\gamma \in X$ and a feasible path*

$$x_u^\gamma = x_0 + \gamma\sqrt{u}d + uw_\gamma + o(u) \tag{2.6}$$

with $\lim_{\gamma \to 1} w_\gamma = w$.

We say that the strong directional constraint qualification ($SDCQ$) *holds at x_0 if x_0 is restorable and the weak directional constraint qualification* (DCQ) *holds.*

We discuss some sufficient conditions for ($SDCQ$) in the appendix. In particular we show that for equality-inequality constrained problems (*i.e.* when $Y = Y_1 \times Y_2$ with Y_1 and Y_2 Banach spaces and $K = \{0\} \times K_2$ with $\text{int}(K_2)$ nonempty) property ($SDCQ$) is equivalent to (DCQ). The sufficient condition in the appendix includes in fact a broader class of problems. For the sake of simplicity we prefer to postulate the restoration property.

Before proceeding with the sensitivity analysis we summarize in the next lemma four general properties $(P1) - (P4)$ which will be of constant use throughout the paper. Here $\sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d)) := \sup\{\langle\lambda, k\rangle : k \in T_2^K(d)\}$ denotes the support function of $T_2^K(d)$.

LEMMA 2.1. *For every $d \in X$ we have*

($P1$) $T_2^K(d) + T_K(G(x_0,0)) - \mathbb{R}_+ G'_x(x_0,0)d \subset T_2^K(d)$.

($P2$) *If* (DCQ) *holds then* $0 \in \operatorname{int}[T_K(G(x_0,0)) - G'(x_0,0)X \times \{1\}]$.

($P3$) $T_2^K(\gamma d) = \gamma^2 T_2^K(d)$ *for all* $\gamma > 0$.

($P4$) *If* $T_2^K(d) \neq \phi$ *then the following are equivalent*

  (a) $\sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d)) \leq 0$.

  (b) $\sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d))$ *is finite.*

  (c) $\lambda \in N_K(G(x_0,0))$ *and* $\langle \lambda, G'_x(x_0,0)d\rangle = 0$.

Proof. Properties ($P1$) and ($P2$) are straightforward consequences of [8, Prop. 3.1] and [4, Lemma B.3] respectively, while ($P3$) is an easy exercise.

Let us prove ($P4$). Since $T_2^K(d) \neq \phi$ the implication $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$ is straightforward. Also, the nonemptyness of $T_2^K(d)$ implies $G'_x(x_0,0)d \in T_K(G(x_0,0))$ and then $(b) \Rightarrow (c)$ follows from property ($P1$). To prove $(c) \Rightarrow (a)$ let us pick $y \in T_2^K(d)$ and choose $y_t \to y$ with $z_t := G(x_0,0) + tG'_x(x_0,0)d + t^2 y_t \in K$. Using (c) we deduce

$$0 \geq \langle \lambda, z_t - G(x_0,0)\rangle = \langle \lambda, tG'_x(x_0,0)d + t^2 y_t\rangle = t^2\langle \lambda, y_t\rangle,$$

so that $\langle \lambda, y\rangle = \lim\langle \lambda, y_t\rangle \leq 0$ proving (a). □

3. Perturbation analysis assuming the existence of multipliers. In this section we study the case when $\Lambda_0 \neq \phi$. First we give an upper-estimate of $v'_+(0)$, which we can express as a supremum of a certain function over Λ_0. We then rely on second-order conditions to obtain lower estimates for $v'_-(0)$ and to investigate the coincidence of both estimates.

3.1. Sharp first-order upper estimates of the cost. Let C_0 denote the cone of critical directions at x_0, *i.e.*

$$C_0 := \{d \in X : \; f'_x(x_0,0)d \leq 0; \; G'_x(x_0,0)d \in T_K(G(x_0,0))\}.$$

When $\Lambda_0 \neq \phi$ one has in fact $f'_x(x_0,0)d = 0$ for all $d \in C_0$. To a path satisfying (2.3) and (2.4) is associated the constraint (2.5), whereas $\Psi_f(w,d)$ is the first term of the expansion of the cost. This leads to the problem

$$(L^d) \qquad \inf_{w \in X}\{\Psi_f(w,d) : \Psi_G(w,d) \in T_2^K(d)\},$$

and its dual:

$$(D^d) \qquad \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_0}\{\mathcal{L}'_u(x_0,\lambda,0) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}''_x(x_0,\lambda,0)dd - \sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d))\},$$

as well as

$$(\tilde{L}) \qquad \inf_d\{v(L^d) : d \in C_0\}$$

THEOREM 3.1. *Assume* Λ_0 *to be nonempty and* ($SDCQ$). *Then*

$$v'_+(0) \leq v(\tilde{L}) = \inf_{d \in C_0} v(D^d) \leq v(L) < \infty.$$

In particular, if $v(\tilde{L})$ *is finite, then*

$$v(u) \leq v(0) + uv(\tilde{L}) + o(u).$$

The theorem is an immediate consequence of the next two lemmas. The first one gives the primal upper-estimate of $v'_+(0)$.

LEMMA 3.2. *Assuming (SDCQ) we have*

$$v'_+(0) \leq v(\tilde{L}) \leq v(L) < \infty.$$

Proof. Let $d \in C_0$ and take a feasible $w \in F(L^d)$. Using the restorability property we may find $w_\gamma \to w$ and feasible paths of the form

$$x_u^\gamma = x_0 + \gamma\sqrt{u}d + uw_\gamma + o(u).$$

Expanding $f(x_u^\gamma, u)$ and using the fact that d is critical, it follows

$$v(u) \leq f(x_u^\gamma, u) \leq f(x_0, 0) + u\Psi_f(w_\gamma, \gamma d) + o(u)$$

so that $v'_+(0) \leq \Psi_f(w_\gamma, \gamma d)$. Passing to the limit when $\gamma \uparrow 1$ we deduce $v'_+(0) \leq \Psi_f(w, d)$, and taking the infimum over $w \in F(L^d)$ and $d \in C_0$ we get

$$v'_+(0) \leq v(\tilde{L}).$$

We conclude by noting that for $d = 0$ problem (L^d) reduces to problem (L), and that $v(L) < \infty$ by [4, Prop. 2.2]. □

Let us prove next the dual expression for $v(\tilde{L})$.

LEMMA 3.3. *Assume Λ_0 to be nonempty and (SDCQ). For each $d \in C_0$ we have*
(i) $v(D^d) \leq v(L^d)$.
(ii) if (L^d) is feasible then, for all $\gamma \in (0,1)$, $v(D^{\gamma d}) = v(L^{\gamma d}) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $S(D^{\gamma d})$ is nonempty and bounded.
(iii) if (L^d) is infeasible then $v(D^{\gamma d}) = \infty$ for all $\gamma > 1$.
(iv) $\limsup_{\gamma\uparrow 1} v(D^{\gamma d}) \leq v(D^d)$.
As a consequence we obtain

$$v(\tilde{L}) = \inf_{d\in C_0} v(D^d). \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. Let us begin by showing that (3.7) is a consequence of $(i) - (iv)$. The inequality $v(\tilde{L}) \geq \inf_{d\in C_0} v(D^d)$ is obvious from (i). To show the converse inequality it suffices to check that $v(D^d) \geq v(\tilde{L})$ for those $d \in C_0$ such that $v(D^d) < \infty$. By (iii) this implies $(L^{\gamma d})$ is feasible for each $\gamma \in (0,1)$ and then (ii) gives $v(D^{\gamma d}) = v(L^{\gamma d}) \geq v(\tilde{L})$ for all $\gamma \in (0,1)$. We conclude by letting $\gamma \uparrow 1$ and using (iv).

We now prove properties (i)–(iv).

(i) It suffices to show that if w and λ are feasible for (L^d) and (D^d) respectively, then the dual cost is not greater than the primal one. From the primal constraint it follows

$$\sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d)) \geq \langle \lambda, \Psi_G(w,d) \rangle,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_f(w,d) &\geq \Psi_f(w,d) + \langle \lambda, \Psi_G(w,d)\rangle - \sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d)) \\ &= \mathcal{L}'_u(x_0,\lambda,0) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}''_x(x_0,\lambda,0)dd - \sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d)), \end{aligned}$$

as was to be proved.

(ii) We first claim that $v(L^d)$ and $v(D^d)$ are finite and equal with $S(D^d)$ nonempty and bounded, whenever

$$Y = \mathrm{I\!R}_+[T_2^K(d) - G'(x_0,0)X \times \{1\} - \frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0,0)dd]. \tag{3.8}$$

In order to motivate this relation, let us consider the family of problems obtained by perturbing additively the constraint of (L^d), that is $\min_{w\in X} \varphi(w,y)$ with

$$\varphi(w,y) := \begin{cases} \Psi_f(w,d) & \text{if } \Psi_G(w,d) + y \in T_2^K(d), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Property (3.8) amounts to $Y = \mathrm{I\!R}_+ \bigcup_w \operatorname{dom} \varphi(w,\cdot)$ so we may apply the convex duality theorem of part I [4, Thm. A.2] to deduce

$$v(L^d) = \inf_{w\in X} \varphi(w,0) = - \min_{\lambda \in Y^*} \varphi^*(0,\lambda) \tag{3.9}$$

as well as the boundedness and nonemptyness of the set of dual solutions. Now we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^*(0,\lambda) &= \sup_{w\in X, y\in Y} \{\langle \lambda, y\rangle - \Psi_f(w,d) : \Psi_G(w,d) + y \in T_2^K(d)\}, \\ &= \sup_{w\in X} \{\sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d)) - \mathcal{L}'(x_0,\lambda,0)(w,1) - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}''_x(x_0,\lambda,0)dd\}. \end{aligned}$$

Maximizing over w we deduce that $\varphi^*(0,\lambda) = \infty$ if $\mathcal{L}'_x(x_0,\lambda,0) \neq 0$, and then using $(P4)$ we get

$$\varphi^*(0,\lambda) = \begin{cases} \sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d)) - \mathcal{L}'_u(x_0,\lambda,0) - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}''_x(x_0,\lambda,0)dd & \text{if } \lambda \in \Lambda_0, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This and (3.9) imply the equality $v(L^d) = v(D^d)$. Moreover, since the dual is attained, property $(P4)$ shows that this common value is finite. This proves our claim.

In view of the previous discussion, to prove (ii) it suffices to check that for each $\gamma \in (0,1)$ property (3.8) holds with d replaced by $d_\gamma := \gamma d$. To see this let us choose a feasible $w \in F(L^d)$, that is,

$$G'(x_0,0)(w,1) + \frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0,0)dd \in T_2^K(d).$$

Multiplying by γ^2 and using $(P3)$ we deduce

$$G'(x_0,0)(\gamma^2 w,\gamma^2) + \frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0,0)d_\gamma d_\gamma \in T_2^K(d_\gamma).$$

From this and $(P1)$ we get

$$T_K(G(x_0,0)) - G'(x_0,0)X \times \{1-\gamma^2\} \subset T_2^K(d_\gamma) - G'(x_0,0)X \times \{1\} - \frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0,0)d_\gamma d_\gamma,$$

which multiplied by $\mathrm{I\!R}_+$ and using $(P2)$ yields (3.8) for d_γ as required.

(iii) Let $\gamma > 1$ and set $d_\gamma := \gamma d$ as before. If $T_2^K(d)$ is empty, by $(P3)$ so is $T_2^K(d_\gamma)$ and then $\sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d_\gamma)) = -\infty$, hence $v(D^{\gamma d}) = \infty$.

Let us then assume $T_2^K(d)$ to be nonempty. Since (L^d) is infeasible, the convex set $T_2^K(d) - G'(x_0,0)X \times \{1\}$ does not contain $\frac{1}{2}G_x''(x_0,0)dd$. But $(P1)$ and $(P2)$ show that this convex set has a nonempty interior, so that the Hahn-Banach theorem gives a nonzero $\mu \in Y^*$ that separates the set and the point, that is,

$$(3.10) \qquad \langle \mu, G'(x_0,0)(w,1) + \frac{1}{2}G_x''(x_0,0)dd\rangle \geq \sigma(\mu, T_2^K(d)) \quad \text{for all } w \in X.$$

This inequality and property $(P4)$ imply $\mu \in N_K(G(x_0,0))$. Also, taking the infimum over $w \in X$ we deduce $\mu \circ G_x'(x_0,0) = 0$ (that is to say, μ is a *singular multiplier*, as defined in the next section) so that for each $\lambda \in \Lambda_0$ and $t > 0$ we have $\lambda + t\mu \in \Lambda_0$. Since $S(D)$ is bounded (see [4, Prop. 3.1]) it follows that

$$\langle \mu, G_u'(x_0,0)\rangle < 0.$$

With these observations property (3.10) reduces to

$$\Xi(\mu,d) := \langle \mu, G_u'(x_0,0) + \frac{1}{2}G_x''(x_0,0)dd\rangle - \sigma(\mu, T_2^K(d)) \geq 0,$$

which multiplied by γ^2 and using $(P3)$ gives

$$(3.11) \qquad \Xi(\mu, d_\gamma) \geq (1-\gamma^2)\langle \mu, G_u'(x_0,0)\rangle > 0.$$

Let us fix $\lambda \in \Lambda_0$. Since $\Xi(\cdot, d_\gamma)$ is positively homogeneous and concave, and since $\lambda + t\mu \in \Lambda_0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} v(D^{\gamma d}) &\geq f_u'(x_0,0) + \frac{1}{2}f_x''(x_0,0)d_\gamma d_\gamma + \Xi(\lambda + t\mu, d_\gamma) \\ &\geq f_u'(x_0,0) + \frac{1}{2}f_x''(x_0,0)d_\gamma d_\gamma + \Xi(\lambda, d_\gamma) + t\Xi(\mu, d_\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

To conclude we observe that $(P4)$ implies the finiteness of $\Xi(\lambda, d_\gamma)$, so that letting $t \uparrow \infty$ and using (3.11) we get $v(D^{\gamma d}) = \infty$.

(iv) Using $(P3)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v(D^{\gamma d}) &= \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_0} \{\mathcal{L}_u'(x_0,\lambda,0) + \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\mathcal{L}_x''(x_0,\lambda,0)dd - \gamma^2\sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d))\}, \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_0} \{(1-\gamma^2)\mathcal{L}_u'(x_0,\lambda,0) + \gamma^2 v(D^d)\} \\ &= (1-\gamma^2)v(L) + \gamma^2 v(D^d). \end{aligned}$$

As $v(L) < \infty$, passing to the limit with $\gamma \uparrow 1$ we get the desired inequality. □

REMARK. If (CQ) holds then (L^d) is feasible for all $d \in C_0$, so that $v(D^d) = v(L^d)$. Otherwise the previous lemma shows that $v(D^{\gamma d}) = v(L^{\gamma d})$ except for at most an exceptional value γ_0. The optimal values are finite for $\gamma < \gamma_0$ and equal to $+\infty$ for $\gamma > \gamma_0$. The following lemma shows that $\gamma_0 = 0$ iff $T_2^K(d)$ is empty. It will be useful in §4 as well.

LEMMA 3.4. *Assume (DCQ) and suppose $T_2^K(d)$ is not empty. Then, letting $d_\gamma := \gamma d$ we have $F(L^{d_\gamma}) \neq \phi$ for all $\gamma > 0$ sufficiently small.*

Proof. Taking $k \in T_2^K(d)$ and using $(P2)$ we get

$$\frac{\gamma^2}{2}G_x''(x_0,0)dd - \gamma^2 k \in T_K(G(x_0,0)) - G'(x_0,0)X \times \{1\}$$

for all $\gamma > 0$ sufficiently small. Then, using $(P1)$ and $(P3)$ we deduce

$$\frac{1}{2}G_x''(x_0,0)d_\gamma d_\gamma \in T_2^K(d_\gamma) - G'(x_0,0)X \times \{1\}.$$

so we may find $w \in X$ with $\Psi_G(w, d_\gamma) \in T_2^K(d_\gamma)$. □

We end this section by giving a condition under which the upper estimate of Theorem 3.1 coincides with $v(L)$. Using (P4), it is easy to see that this condition is satisfied in particular if (P_0) is *convex* in the sense that for all $y \in K$ and $\lambda \in N_K(y)$, the mapping $\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \lambda, 0)$ is convex. In that case the right-derivative $v'(0)$ is actually equal to $v(L)$ (see [4, Prop. 3.2]).

PROPOSITION 3.5. *Assume $(SDCQ)$. Then $v(\tilde{L}) = v(L)$ whenever*

$$\inf_{d\in C_0} \sup_{\lambda\in S(D)} \{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_x''(x_0,\lambda,0)dd - \sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d))\} \geq 0.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.3, and using the equality $v(L) = v(D)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} v(\tilde{L}) &= \inf_{d\in C_0} v(D^d) \\ &\geq \inf_{d\in C_0} \sup_{\lambda\in S(D)} \{\mathcal{L}_u'(x_0,\lambda,0) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_x''(x_0,\lambda,0)dd - \sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d))\} \\ &\geq v(L) + \inf_{d\in C_0} \sup_{\lambda\in S(D)} \{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_x''(x_0,\lambda,0)dd - \sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d))\} \\ &\geq v(L), \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude with Lemma 3.2. □

3.2. Lower estimates and expansion of solutions. We derive next some lower estimates for $v'_-(0)$. As $v'_-(0) \leq v'_+(0) \leq v(\tilde{L})$ whenever $(SDCQ)$ holds, this is only of interest if $v(\tilde{L}) > -\infty$. We give conditions which imply $v'_-(0) > -\infty$, based on a result of part I (Prop. 6.1) that we recall for the convenience of the reader.

For each set $\Omega \subset \Lambda_0$ we consider the second order condition

$$SOC(\Omega) \quad \text{There exist } \alpha, \epsilon > 0 \text{ s.t. } \max_{\lambda\in\Omega} \mathcal{L}_x''(x_0,\lambda,0)dd \geq \alpha\|d\|^2 \quad \forall\, d \in C_\epsilon,$$

where

$$C_\epsilon := \{d \in X : f_x'(x_0,0)d \leq \epsilon\|d\|,\ G_x'(x_0,0)d \in T_K(G(x_0,0)) + \epsilon\|d\|B_Y\}.$$

Note that for $\epsilon = 0$ the *extended critical cone* C_ϵ reduces to the critical cone C_0.

PROPOSITION 3.6. *Assume (DCQ), and suppose $SOC(\Omega)$ holds for some bounded $\Omega \subset \Lambda_0$. Then, for each $O(u)$-optimal path x_u, we have $x_u = x_0 + O(\sqrt{u})$.*

Consider now the function

$$\Pi(d) := \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda_0} \{\mathcal{L}_u'(x_0,\lambda,0) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_x''(x_0,\lambda,0)dd\},$$

and the subproblems

$$(\tilde{D}) \qquad \min\{\Pi(d) : d \in C_0\},$$

$$(\tilde{D}_\epsilon) \qquad \min\{\Pi(d) : f'_x(x_0,0)d \le \epsilon, G'_x(x_0,0)d \in T_K(G(x_0,0))\}.$$

Note that $v(\tilde{D}_\epsilon)$ is a decreasing function of ϵ; in particular $\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0} v(\tilde{D}_\epsilon) \le v(\tilde{D})$. Moreover, from (P4) we get $\Pi(d) \le v(D^d)$ and with Theorem 3.1 we deduce

$$\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0} v(\tilde{D}_\epsilon) \le v(\tilde{D}) \le v(\tilde{L}). \tag{3.12}$$

PROPOSITION 3.7. *Assume (DCQ), the existence of an $o(u)$-optimal path, and $SOC(\Omega)$ for some bounded $\Omega \subset \Lambda_0$. Then $v'_-(0) > -\infty$ and*
(i) If (CQ) holds, then for each $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$v'_-(0) \ge v(\tilde{D}_\epsilon). \tag{3.13}$$

(ii) If any of the following conditions hold:
(a) the path may be expanded as $x_u = x_0 + \sqrt{u}d_0 + o(\sqrt{u})$,
(b) X is reflexive and $d \to \mathcal{L}''_x(x_0,\lambda,0)dd$ is weakly l.s.c. at each $d \in C_0$,
then the previous lower bound may be strengthened to

$$v'_-(0) \ge v(\tilde{D}). \tag{3.14}$$

Proof. Let x_u be an $o(u)$-optimal path. By Proposition 3.6 $d_u := (x_u - x_0)/\sqrt{u}$ stays bounded as $u \downarrow 0$ and then for each $\lambda \in \Lambda_0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} v(u) &= f(x_u,u) + o(u), \\ &\ge v(0) + \mathcal{L}(x_u,\lambda,u) - \mathcal{L}(x_0,\lambda,0), \\ &\ge v(0) + u[\mathcal{L}'_u(x_0,\lambda,0) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}''_x(x_0,\lambda,0)d_ud_u] + o_\lambda(u), \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

with $\|o_\lambda(u)\|/u \to 0$ uniformly when λ varies over bounded sets. From this and the boundedness of d_u, it follows that $v'_-(0) > -\infty$.

To prove (i) we apply Robinson's theorem [14] to the mapping $\tilde{G}(x) := G(x_0,0) + G'_x(x_0,0)(x-x_0)$ in order to find $\tilde{x}_u = x_u + o(\sqrt{u})$ such that $\tilde{G}(\tilde{x}_u) \in K$. Then, by suitably modifying the small term $o_\lambda(u)$, in (3.15) we can replace d_u by $\tilde{d}_u := (\tilde{x}_u - x_0)/\sqrt{u}$. Moreover, under (CQ) we know that Λ_0 is bounded so that taking supremum over λ we get

$$v(u) \ge v(0) + u\Pi(\tilde{d}_u) + o(u),$$

from which (3.13) follows.

To show (ii), let us choose $u_k \downarrow 0$ realizing the lower limit $v'_-(0)$. When (a) holds we have $d_{u_k} \to d_0$, while in case (b) we may assume that $d_{u_k} \rightharpoonup d_0$. In both cases, $d_0 \in C_0$ and using (3.15) we get

$$v'_-(0) \ge \mathcal{L}'_u(x_0,\lambda,0) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}''_x(x_0,\lambda,0)d_0d_0,$$

where in case (b) we use the weak l.s.c. of $\mathcal{L}''_x(x_0, \lambda, 0)dd$. Taking the supremum over $\lambda \in \Lambda_0$ we conclude (3.14). □

We now analyze under which conditions the gap between the estimate of Theorem 3.1 and (3.14) is null. We start with sufficient conditions for the equality between the optimal values of the subproblems giving the upper and lower estimates. We define *extended polyhedricity of the second kind* (for problem (P_0), at point x_0) as

$$0 \in T_2^K(d) \text{ for all } d \text{ in a dense subset of } C_0.$$

We note that in the definition of *extended polyhedricity* given in part I, the set $S(L)$ was considered instead of C_0. If the constraints are unperturbed, then $S(L) = C_0$ and both definitions coincide.

PROPOSITION 3.8. *Assume Λ_0 non empty and $(SDCQ)$. If one of the two following conditions hold:*

(a) $0 \in T_2^K(d)$ for all d in C_0,

(b) (CQ) and extended polyhedricity hold,

then $v(\tilde{L}) = v(\tilde{D})$ and $S(\tilde{L}) \subset S(\tilde{D})$.

Proof. From $(P4)$ it follows that when $0 \in T_2^K(d)$ we have $\sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d)) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda_0$, and then $\Pi(d) = v(D^d)$. Consider now a minimizing sequence $\{d^k\}$ for $(\tilde{D})$ satisfying $\sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d^k)) = 0$. The existence of such a sequence is obvious in case (a), while in case (b) it is a consequence of the fact that, due to (CQ), $\Pi(d)$ is continuous. Along this sequence we have, by Theorem 3.1, $\Pi(d^k) = v(D^{d^k}) \geq v(\tilde{L})$. It follows that $v(\tilde{L}) \leq v(\tilde{D})$. Reminding (3.12), we get $v(\tilde{L}) = v(\tilde{D})$. The inclusion $S(\tilde{L}) \subset S(\tilde{D})$ follows easily from this. □

The final result of this section gives a formula for the marginal value $v'(0)$, and analyzes the behaviour of paths of approximate solutions.

THEOREM 3.9. *Assume X reflexive, the existence of an $o(u)$-optimal path, $\mathcal{L}''_x(x_0, \lambda, 0)dd$ weakly l.s.c., and one of the two hypotheses below:*

(i) (CQ), $SOC(\Lambda_0)$ and extended polyhedricity,

(ii) $(SDCQ)$, $SOC(\Omega)$ for some bounded $\Omega \subset \Lambda_0$, and $0 \in T_2^K(d)$ for all d in C_0.

Then

(a) There exists $v'(0) = v(\tilde{L}) = v(\tilde{D})$, and $S(\tilde{L}) \subset S(\tilde{D})$.

(b) For every $o(u)$-optimal path x_u, the weak accumulation points of $(x_u - x_0)/\sqrt{u}$ belong to $S(\tilde{D})$.

(c) If $d_0 \in S(\tilde{L})$ and $w_0 \in S(L^{d_0})$, then there exists an $o(u)$-optimal path of the form $x_u = x_0 + \sqrt{u}d_0 + o(\sqrt{u})$.

Proof. (a) This follows combining Theorem 3.1 and Propositions 3.7 and 3.8.

(b) Let d_0 be a weak limit point of $(x_u - x_0)/\sqrt{u}$. Expanding the Lagrangian as in (3.15) we get $v(\tilde{D}) = v'(0) \geq \Pi(d_0)$. As d_0 is feasible for $v(\tilde{D})$, d_0 is a solution of $v(\tilde{D})$.

(c) Using $(SDCQ)$ let us select $w_\gamma \to w_0$ and feasible paths of the form $x_u^\gamma = x_0 + \gamma\sqrt{u}d_0 + uw_\gamma + o_\gamma(u)$, with (for each γ) $\|o_\gamma(u)\|/u \to 0$ when $u \to 0$. Take $\gamma_k \uparrow 1$ and choose a strictly decreasing sequence $u_k \downarrow 0$ such that

$$\|o_{\gamma_k}(u)\| \leq \frac{u}{k} \qquad \forall u \in [0, u_k]$$

from which we construct the feasible path

$$x_u = x_u^{\gamma_k} \qquad \forall u \in [u_{k+1}, u_k).$$

Then we have

$$\|x_u - x_0 - \sqrt{u}d_0\| \le \sqrt{u}(1-\gamma_k)\|d_0\| + u\|w_{\gamma_k}\| + \frac{u}{k}, \qquad \forall u \in [u_{k+1}, u_k)$$

from which we get $x_u = x_0 + \sqrt{u}d_0 + o(\sqrt{u})$. Also, a second order expansion implies that for $u \in [u_{k+1}, u_k)$ we have

$$f(x_u, u) = f(x_0, 0) + u[f'(x_0, 0)(w_{\gamma_k}, 1) + \frac{1}{2}f''_x(x_0, 0)d_0d_0] + o(u)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_u, u) &= f(x_0, 0) + u\Psi_f(w_0, d_0) + o(u) \\ &= v(0) + uv(\tilde{L}) + o(u) = v(u) + o(u). \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows. □

4. Perturbation analysis assuming nonexistence of multipliers.

4.1. Preliminaries. In this section we analyze the situation when the set of multipliers Λ_0 is empty, extending the theory of perturbed singular nonlinear programs of [3]. The qualitative behaviour is radically different from the case studied in §3, so that we are led to introduce some new objects. Indeed, if Λ_0 is empty we have $v(L) = -\infty$ and by part I it follows that $v'(0) = -\infty$.

We will check that, under suitable second order assumptions, the variation of the cost is of order $O(\sqrt{u})$. This leads us to define, analogously to the Dini derivatives, the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} v^{\#}(0) &:= \limsup_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{v(u) - v(0)}{\sqrt{u}}, \\ v_{\#}(0) &:= \liminf_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{v(u) - v(0)}{\sqrt{u}}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the singular Lagrangian, the set of singular multipliers (at x_0, for problem (P_0)) and the set of *normalized* singular multipliers as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{L}}(x, \lambda, u) &:= \langle \lambda, G(x, u) \rangle, \\ \Lambda^s &:= \{\lambda \in Y^* \setminus \{0\} : \lambda \in N_K(G(x_0, 0)),\ \hat{\mathcal{L}}'_x(x_0, \lambda, 0) = 0\}, \\ \Lambda^s_N &:= \{\lambda \in \Lambda^s : \|\lambda\| \le 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

The next proposition shows that Λ_0 and Λ^s are both empty only in some very special situations.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *If both Λ_0 and Λ^s are empty, then the set*

$$\mathcal{A} := \mathbb{R}_+[K - G(x_0, 0)] - G'_x(x_0, 0)X$$

is dense in Y but not equal to Y.

Proof. If $\mathcal{A} = Y$ we know that $\Lambda_0 \neq \phi$ [13, 14]. Suppose next that $\mathcal{A}$ is not dense in Y and select $y \in Y$ not belonging to the closure of $\mathcal{A}$. By the Hahn-Banach theorem there exists $\lambda \in Y^* \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$\langle \lambda, y \rangle > \langle \lambda, t[k - G(x_0, 0)] - G'_x(x_0, 0)w \rangle \quad \text{for all } w \in X,\ k \in K,\ t > 0.$$

Taking the supremum over $w \in X$, we get $\lambda \circ G'_x(x_0, 0) = 0$, and letting $t \uparrow \infty$ we deduce $\langle \lambda, k - G(x_0, 0) \rangle \le 0$ for all $k \in K$ so that $\lambda \in N_K(G(x_0, 0))$ and then $\Lambda^s \neq \phi$. □

4.2. Upper estimate of the cost. In order to obtain upper estimates for $v^{\#}(0)$ we consider the following optimization problems:

$$(\hat{L}) \qquad \min_{d\in C_0}\left\{f'_x(x_0,0)d : \frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0,0)dd \in T_2^K(d) - G'(x_0,0)X \times \{1\}\right\},$$

and

$$(\hat{D}) \qquad \min_{d\in C_0}\left\{f'_x(x_0,0)d : \frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0,0)dd \in \overline{T_2^K(d) - G'(x_0,0)X \times \{1\}}\right\}.$$

Problem $(\hat{L})$ gives in a natural way a primal upper-estimate of the value function (if we have in mind paths satisfying (2.3) and (2.4)), whereas $(\hat{D})$ will provide a comparison with the estimate of $v_{\#}(0)$. We remark that, when Λ^s is not empty, problem $(\hat{D})$ is equivalent to

$$(\hat{D}') \quad \min_{d\in C_0}\left\{f'_x(x_0,0)d : \hat{\mathcal{L}}'_u(x_0,\lambda,0) + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\mathcal{L}}''_x(x_0,\lambda,0)dd \le \sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d)),\ \forall\ \lambda\in\Lambda^s\right\}.$$

To prove this equivalence it suffices to check that the constraints in $(\hat{D})$ and $(\hat{D}')$ coincide, which follows from the next result applied with $y = G'_u(x_0,0)+\frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0,0)dd$.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *If $\Lambda^s \neq \phi$ then the following are equivalent*
(a) $y \in \overline{T_2^K(d) - G'_x(x_0,0)X}$
(b) $\langle\lambda, y\rangle \le \sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d))$ for all $\lambda\in\Lambda^s$.

Proof. Both (a) and (b) are false if $T_2^K(d)$ is empty so we may assume the contrary. The implication $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$ is straightforward and the converse follows by a separation argument: indeed, if (a) fails we may find a *strictly* separating hyperplane, that is, $\lambda\in Y^*\setminus\{0\}$ and $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\langle\lambda, y\rangle > \alpha \ge \langle\lambda, k - G'_x(x_0,0)w\rangle$$

for all $k\in T_2^K(d), w\in X$. Taking supremum over $w\in X$ it follows that $\lambda\circ G'_x(x_0,0) = 0$ and then taking supremum over k we deduce

$$(4.16) \qquad \langle\lambda, y\rangle > \alpha \ge \sigma(\lambda, T_2^K(d)).$$

Using this and $(P4)$ we get $\lambda\in N_K(G(x_0,0))$ so that $\lambda\in\Lambda^s$ and (4.16) contradicts (b). □

We now state the upper-estimate.

THEOREM 4.3. *If $(SDCQ)$ holds then*

$$v^{\#}(0) \le v(\hat{L}) = v(\hat{D}) \le 0,$$

so that when $v(\hat{L})$ is finite we have

$$v(u) \le v(0) + \sqrt{u}v(\hat{L}) + o(\sqrt{u}).$$

In addition, $v(\hat{L}) < 0$ iff there exists a direction d such that $f'_x(x_0,0)d < 0$ and $T_2^K(d) \neq \phi$.

Proof. We begin by showing $v^{\#}(0) \leq v(\hat{L}) \leq 0$. Let $d \in F(\hat{L})$ and select $w \in X$ such that $G'(x_0,0)(w,1) + \frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0,0)dd \in T_2^K(d)$. Using the restorability property we may find feasible paths of the form $x_u^\gamma = x_0 + \gamma\sqrt{u}d + uw_\gamma + o(u)$ with $w_\gamma \to w$ as $\gamma \uparrow 1$. Expanding f it follows that

$$v(u) \leq f(x_u^\gamma, u) = f(x_0,0) + \gamma\sqrt{u}f'_x(x_0,0)d + o(\sqrt{u})$$

from which we deduce

$$v^{\#}(0) \leq \gamma f'_x(x_0,0)d.$$

Letting $\gamma \uparrow 1$ and then taking the infimum over $d \in F(\hat{L})$ we get $v^{\#}(0) \leq v(\hat{L})$. Moreover, $(P2)$ implies $0 \in F(\hat{L})$ so that $v(\hat{L}) \leq 0$.

We prove next $v(\hat{L}) = v(\hat{D})$. Since clearly $v(\hat{D}) \leq v(\hat{L})$ it suffices to show that $v(\hat{L}) \leq f'_x(x_0,0)d$ for each $d \in F(\hat{D})$. Let $d \in F(\hat{D})$ and select sequences $k_n \in T_2^K(d)$,$w_n \in X$ such that $\frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0,0)dd = \lim_n[k_n - G'(x_0,0)(w_n,1)]$. Using $(P2)$ we find that given any $t > 0$ we will have for all n large enough

$$\frac{1}{2}tG''_x(x_0,0)dd - tk_n + tG'(x_0,0)(w_n,1) \in T_K(G(x_0,0)) - G'(x_0,0)X \times \{1\}$$

which rearranged gives

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{t}{1+t}G''_x(x_0,0)dd \in \frac{t}{1+t}k_n + T_K(G(x_0,0)) - G'(x_0,0)X \times \{1\}. \tag{4.17}$$

Letting $d_t := \sqrt{t/(1+t)}d$ and using $(P1)$ and $(P3)$ we deduce

$$\frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0,0)d_td_t \in T_2^K(d_t) - G'(x_0,0)X \times \{1\}.$$

Hence $d_t \in F(\hat{L})$ and then

$$v(\hat{L}) \leq f'_x(x_0,0)d_t.$$

Letting t tend to $+\infty$ we conclude $v(\hat{L}) \leq f'_x(x_0,0)d$ as required.

We conclude by proving the sufficient condition for $v(\hat{L}) < 0$ (the necessity is evident). If $d \in X$ is such that $f'_x(x_0,0)d < 0$ and $T_2^K(d) \neq \phi$, from Lemma 3.4 we get $\alpha d \in F(\hat{L})$ for all $\alpha > 0$ sufficiently small, so that $v(\hat{L}) \leq \alpha f'_x(x_0,0)d < 0$. □

REMARK. From the estimate (1.1) we already know that $v_{\#}(0) \leq 0$. Henceforth Theorem 4.3 improves the upper-estimate of the cost only if $v(\hat{L}) < 0$.

4.3. Lower estimates and expansion of solutions. As in the case when $\Lambda_0 \neq \phi$, we will give a lower estimate of the cost which is sharp when the contribution of the curvature of K happens to be null.

We consider the *singular* second order conditions

$$(SSOC) \quad \text{there exist } \alpha, \epsilon > 0 \text{ s.t. } \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_N^*} \hat{\mathcal{L}}''_x(x_0,\lambda,0)dd \geq \alpha\|d\|^2 \quad \forall\, d \in C_\epsilon.$$

PROPOSITION 4.4. *If $(SSOC)$ holds, then for each $O(\sqrt{u})$-optimal path x_u we have $x_u = x_0 + O(\sqrt{u})$.*

Proof. Let x_u be an $O(\sqrt{u})$-optimal path and let $\beta_u := \|x_u - x_0\|$, $d_u := (x_u - x_0)/\beta_u$. For each $\lambda \in \Lambda^s_N$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \hat{\mathcal{L}}(x_u, \lambda, u) - \hat{\mathcal{L}}(x_0, \lambda, 0), \\ &= u\hat{\mathcal{L}}'_u(x_0, \lambda, 0) + \frac{\beta_u^2}{2}\hat{\mathcal{L}}''_x(x_0, \lambda, 0)d_u d_u + o(u) + o(\beta_u^2). \end{aligned}$$

The small terms $o(u)$ and $o(\beta_u^2)$ may be chosen independent of $\lambda \in \Lambda^s_N$, so we may take supremum to deduce

$$\beta_u^2 \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda^s_N} \mathcal{L}''_x(x_0, \lambda, 0)d_u d_u \leq O(u) + o(\beta_u^2). \tag{4.18}$$

If for some sequence $u_n \downarrow 0$ one has $\beta_{u_n}^2/u_n \uparrow \infty$, then for n large enough d_{u_n} is in C_ϵ. With $(SSOC)$ and (4.18), we obtain a contradiction. □

To obtain the desired lower estimate for $v_\#(0)$ we consider a *relaxed* version of problem $(\hat{D})$, namely

$$(\hat{R}) \qquad \min_{d \in C_0} \left\{ f'_x(x_0, 0)d : \frac{1}{2}G''_x(x_0, 0)dd \in \overline{T_K(G(x_0, 0)) - G'(x_0, 0)X \times \{1\}} \right\}.$$

As for problem $(\hat{D})$, when Λ^s is not empty one may use Proposition 4.2 (with $d = 0$) to derive the following equivalent formulation for $(\hat{R})$:

$$(\hat{R}') \qquad \min_{d \in C_0} \left\{ f'_x(x_0, 0)d : \hat{\mathcal{L}}'_u(x_0, \lambda, 0) + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\mathcal{L}}''_x(x_0, \lambda, 0)dd \leq 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Lambda^s \right\}.$$

Comparing with $(\hat{D}')$ and using (P4), we see that $F(\hat{D}') \subset F(\hat{R}')$. As these two problems have the same cost, it follows that

$$v(\hat{R}) = v(\hat{R}') \leq v(\hat{D}') = v(\hat{D}). \tag{4.19}$$

PROPOSITION 4.5. *Assume there exists an $o(\sqrt{u})$-optimal path x_u. If $(SSOC)$ is satisfied then $v_\#(0) > -\infty$. Moreover, if any of the two following properties hold*

(a) *the path may be expanded as $x_u = x_0 + \sqrt{u}d_0 + o(\sqrt{u})$,*

(b) *X is reflexive and for each $\lambda \in \Lambda^s$ the mapping $d \to \hat{\mathcal{L}}''_x(x_0, \lambda, 0)dd$ is weakly l.s.c. at every $d_0 \in C_0$,*

then

$$v_\#(0) \geq v(\hat{R}). \tag{4.20}$$

Proof. By Proposition 4.4 we have $x_u = x_0 + O(\sqrt{u})$ and then

$$v(u) = f(x_u, u) + O(\sqrt{u}) = f(x_0, 0) + O(\sqrt{u})$$

so that $v_\#(0) > -\infty$.

Now let us choose $u_n \downarrow 0$ realizing the lower limit $v_\#(0)$ and let $d_n := (x_{u_n} - x_0)/\sqrt{u_n}$. When (a) holds we have $d_n \to d_0$, while in case (b) we may assume that $d_n \rightharpoonup d_0$ for some $d_0 \in X$. In both cases, $d_0 \in C_0$ and we have

$$v_\#(0) = f'_x(x_0, 0)d_0.$$

On the other hand for all $\lambda \in \Lambda^s$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \hat{\mathcal{L}}(x_u, \lambda, u) - \hat{\mathcal{L}}(x_0, \lambda, 0), \\ &= u\hat{\mathcal{L}}'_u(x_0, \lambda, 0) + \frac{u}{2}\hat{\mathcal{L}}''_x(x_0, \lambda, 0)d_u d_u + o(u), \end{aligned}$$

so that, using in case (b) the l.s.c. of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}''_x(x_0, \lambda, 0)dd$ we get

$$0 \geq \hat{\mathcal{L}}'_u(x_0, \lambda, 0) + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\mathcal{L}}''_x(x_0, \lambda, 0)d_0 d_0.$$

It follows that $d_0 \in F(\hat{R}')$. Combining with (4.19) we get

$$v(\hat{R}) = v(\hat{R}') \leq f'_x(x_0, 0)d_0 = v_{\#}(0)$$

as was to be proved. □

REMARK. Let us put together the different relations between optimal values. If $(SDCQ)$ holds, and the conclusion of Proposition 4.5 is true, then

$$v(\hat{R}) = v(\hat{R}') \leq v_{\#}(0) \leq v^{\#}(0) \leq v(\hat{D}') = v(\hat{D}) = v(\hat{L}) \leq 0.$$

In our next statement, we give a condition under which the above optimal values are equal. This gives the first term of the expansion of the optimal value $v(u)$.

THEOREM 4.6. *Assume the existence of an $O(\sqrt{u})$-optimal path x_u, $(SSOC)$, X reflexive, the l.s.c. of $d \to \hat{\mathcal{L}}''_x(x_0, \lambda, 0)dd$ for each $\lambda \in \Lambda^s$, $(SDCQ)$ and finally*

$$0 \in T_2^K(d), \ \forall d \in C_0.$$

Then $v(\hat{R}) = v(\hat{D})$, $S(\hat{R}) = S(\hat{D})$ and

$$v(u) = v(0) + \sqrt{u}\, v(\hat{D}) + o(\sqrt{u}). \tag{4.21}$$

Proof. The equivalence between $(\hat{R})$ and $(\hat{D})$ follows by noticing that when $0 \in T_2^K(d)$ then (see [8, Prop. 3.1])

$$T_2^K(d) = \overline{T_K(G(x_0, 0)) - \mathbb{R}_+ G'_x(x_0, 0)d},$$

from which we deduce

$$\overline{T_2^K(d) - G'(x_0, 0)X \times \{1\}} = \overline{T_K(G(x_0, 0)) - G'(x_0, 0)X \times \{1\}}.$$

The expansion of $v(u)$ then follows from Theorem 4.3 and Proposition 4.5. □

5. Appendix: Checking the strong directional constraint qualification. We give some sufficient conditions allowing to check $(SDCQ)$ in the case of *decomposed* constraints of the form: $Y := Y_1 \times Y_2$ with Y_1 and Y_2 Banach spaces, $K := K_1 \times K_2$ with K_1 and K_2 closed convex subsets of Y_1 and Y_2. We denote $G = (G_1, G_2)$ the components of G and we consider the decomposed directional constraint qualification:

$$(DDCQ) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (i) & 0 \in \operatorname{int}[G_1(x_0, 0) + G'_1(x_0, 0)X \times \{0\} - K_1], \\ (ii) & \text{There exists } \bar{w} \in X \text{ such that } G'_1(x_0, 0)(\bar{w}, 1) \in \operatorname{Rec}(K_1) \text{ and} \\ & G_2(x_0, 0) + \alpha G'_2(x_0, 0)(\bar{w}, 1) \in \operatorname{int} K_2 \text{ for some } \alpha > 0. \end{array} \right.$$

where $\mathrm{Rec}(K_1)$ denotes the recession cone of K_1, that is

$$\mathrm{Rec}(K_1) := \limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{K_1}{t}.$$

In order to illustrate this condition, let us mention two particular cases. The first one is when $K_2 = Y_2$ so that the constraint is only with K_1. Then $(DDCQ)$ reduces to Robinson's condition [14]. The second case is when $K_1 = \{0\}$. Then $(DDCQ)$ (i) amounts to the surjectivity of $G'_{1x}(x_0, 0)$, and $(DDCQ)$ appears as a natural generalization of Gollan's condition [10] used in the afore mentioned literature devoted to nonlinear programming.

THEOREM 5.1. *$(DDCQ)$ implies $(SDCQ)$.*

Proof. We first prove that x_0 is restorable. Let x_u be a path satisfying (2.3) and (2.4). Choose $w_\gamma := \gamma^2 w + (1-\gamma^2)\bar{w}$ and consider

$$y_u := x_0 + \gamma\sqrt{u}d + uw_\gamma. \tag{5.22}$$

Expanding in series we get

$$\begin{aligned} G(y_u, u) &= G(x_0, 0) + \gamma\sqrt{u}G'_x(x_0, 0)d + u\Psi_G(w_\gamma, \gamma d) + o(u), \\ &= G(x_0, 0) + \gamma\sqrt{u}G'_x(x_0, 0)d + \gamma^2 u\Psi_G(w, d) + \\ &\quad + (1-\gamma^2)uG'(x_0, 0)(\bar{w}, 1) + o(u), \\ &= G(x(\gamma^2 u), \gamma^2 u) + (1-\gamma^2)uG'(x_0, 0)(\bar{w}, 1) + o(u). \end{aligned}$$

Using $(DDCQ)$ (ii) and (2.4) we deduce $d(G_1(y_u, u), K_1) = o(u)$. Then $(DDCQ)$ (i) allows us to use Robinson's theorem to find a small correction x_u^γ of y_u,

$$x_u^\gamma = x_0 + \gamma\sqrt{u}d + uw_\gamma + o(u), \tag{5.23}$$

such that $G_1(x_u^\gamma, u) \in K_1$.

Expanding $G_2(x_u^\gamma, u)$ as above, we get

$$G_2(x_u^\gamma, u) = G_2(x(\gamma^2 u), \gamma^2 u) + (1-\gamma^2)uG'_2(x_0, 0)(\bar{w}, 1) + o(u) \tag{5.24}$$

so that letting $z := G'_2(x_0, 0)(\bar{w}, 1)$ and using (2.4) we have

$$G_2(x_u^\gamma, u) = t_u + (1-\gamma^2)uz + o(u)$$

for some $t_u \in K_2, t_u \to G_2(x_0, 0)$. Moreover, letting $\alpha_u := (1-\gamma^2)u/\alpha$ we may write $G_2(x_u^\gamma, u) = (1-\alpha_u)t_u + \alpha_u r_u$ with

$$r_u = t_u + \alpha z + \alpha o(u)/(1-\gamma^2)u = t_u + \alpha z + o(1).$$

By $(DDCQ)$ (i) we have $r_u \in K_2$ for u small, and since also $t_u \in K_2$ and $\alpha_u \in (0, 1)$, it follows that $G_2(x_u^\gamma, u) \in K_2$. Hence x_u^γ is a feasible path and x_0 is restorable.

We now check that (DCQ) is satisfied. By $(DDCQ)$ (i) (see [14]) there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ such that, whenever $y_1 \in Y_1$ satisfies $\|y_1\| < \epsilon$, there exists $\hat{d} \in X$ and $k_1 \in K_1$ such that $\|\hat{d}\| < \beta\|y_1\|$ and

$$G_1(x_0, 0) + G'_1(x_0, 0)(\hat{d}, 0) - k_1 = y_1.$$

Now take d of the form $d = \hat{d} + \alpha\bar{w}$. then

$$G_1(x_0, 0) + G_1'(x_0, 0)(d, \alpha) - [k_1 + \alpha G'(x_0, 0)(\bar{w}, 1)] = y_1$$

and

$$G_2(x_0, 0) + G_2'(x_0, 0)(d, \alpha) - y_2 = G_2(x_0, 0) + \alpha G_2'(x_0, 0)(\bar{w}, 1) + G_2'(x_0, 0)(\hat{d}, 0) - y_2.$$

We may choose ϵ small so that for all $\|y_1\| < \epsilon$, $\|y_2\| < \epsilon$ we have $\|G_2'(x_0, 0)(\hat{d}, 0) - y_2\|$ small enough to deduce, using $(DDCQ)$ (ii), that the left hand-side above is in K_2. From this (DCQ) follows easily. □

We note that we do not know (even for nonlinear programming problems) if the property $d(G(x_0 + \sqrt{u}d + uw, u), K) = o(u)$ together with (DCQ) suffices or not to construct a feasible path of the form $x_u = x_0 + \sqrt{u}d_0 + uw + o(u)$ (without γ and w_γ).

PROPOSITION 5.2. *If $K := \{0\} \times K_2$ with $\text{int}(K_2)$ nonempty, then (DCQ), $(SDCQ)$, $(DDCQ)$ are equivalent and are satisfied iff the condition below $(EDCQ)$ holds:*

$$(EDCQ) \quad \begin{cases} (i) & G_1'(x_0, 0)X \times \{0\} = Y_1, \\ (ii) & \textit{There exists } \bar{w} \in X \textit{ such that } G_1'(x_0, 0)(\bar{w}, 1) = 0 \textit{ and} \\ & G_2(x_0, 0) + \alpha G_2'(x_0, 0)(\bar{w}, 1) \in \text{int } K_2 \textit{ for some } \alpha > 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Obviously each of the conditions (DCQ), $(SDCQ)$, $(DDCQ)$, $(EDCQ)$ is a consequence of the one that follows. Therefore it suffices to prove that (DCQ) implies $(EDCQ)$. From (DCQ), $G_1'(x_0, 0)X \times (0, \infty)$ contains a neighborhood of 0. Being a cone, this set is equal to Y_1. In particular there exist $d_0 \in X$, $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that $G_1'(x_0, 0)(d_0, \alpha_0) = 0$, *i.e.* $G_u'(x_0, 0) \in G_1'(x_0, 0)X \times \{0\}$. We deduce

$$Y_1 = G_1'(x_0, 0)X \times (0, \infty) = G_1'(x_0, 0)X \times \{0\},$$

i.e. $(EDCQ)$ (i) holds. Now pick $a \in \text{int}(K_2)$, close enough to $G_2(x_0, 0)$ so that there exist $d \in X$ and $\tilde{\alpha} > 0$ such that $(0, a - G_2(x_0, 0)) \in G(x_0, 0) + G'(x_0, 0)(d, \tilde{\alpha}) - K$. It is easily checked that $(EDCQ)$ (ii) is satisfied with $\bar{w} := d/\tilde{\alpha}$, $\alpha := \tilde{\alpha}/2$. □

REFERENCES

[1] A. Auslender and R. Cominetti, *First and second order sensitivity analysis of nonlinear programs under directional constraint qualification conditions*, Optimization 21 (1990), pp. 351–363.

[2] L. Barbet, *Etude de sensibilité différentielle dans un problème d'optimisation paramétré avec contraintes en dimension infinie*, Thesis, Université de Poitiers (1992).

[3] J.F. Bonnans, *Directional derivatives of optimal solutions in smooth nonlinear programming*, J. Optimiz. Theory Appl. 73(1) (1992), pp. 27–45.

[4] J.F. Bonnans and R. Cominetti, *Perturbed optimization in Banach spaces I: A general theory based on a weak directional constraint qualification*, INRIA report 2024, (1993).

[5] J.F. Bonnans and R. Cominetti, *Perturbed optimization in Banach spaces III: semi-infinite programming*, INRIA report, to appear.

[6] J.F. Bonnans, A.D. Ioffe and A. Shapiro, *Expansion of exact and approximate solutions in nonlinear programming*, in Proc. French-German Conference in Optimization, D. Pallaschke ed., Lecture Notes in Economics and Math. Systems, Springer-Verlag (1992).

[7] J.F. Bonnans and A. Shapiro, *Sensitivity analysis of parametrized programs under cone constraints*, SIAM J. Control & Opt. 30(6) (1992), pp. 1409–1422.

[8] R. Cominetti, *Metric regularity, tangent sets and second order optimality conditions*, Applied Math. & Opt. 21 (1990), pp. 265–287.

[9] J. Gauvin and R. Janin, *Directional behaviour of optimal solutions in nonlinear mathematical programming*, Math. Oper. Res. 13(4) (1988), pp. 629–649.

[10] B. Gollan, *On the marginal function in nonlinear programming*, Math. Oper. Res. 9 (1984), pp. 208–221.

[11] A.D. Ioffe, *Variational analysis of a composite function: a formula for the lower second order epi-derivative*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 160 (1990), pp. 379–405.

[12] A.D. Ioffe, *Variational analysis of a composite function : perturbations, value function and sensitivity*. Preprint, Haifa MT 880.

[13] H. Maurer and J. Zowe, *First and second order necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for infinite dimensional programming problems*, Math. Prog., 16 (1979), pp. 98–110.

[14] S.M. Robinson, *Stability theorems for systems of inequalities. Part II: differentiable nonlinear systems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 13(1976), pp. 497–513.

Unité de Recherche INRIA Rocquencourt
Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt - B.P. 105 - 78153 LE CHESNAY Cedex (France)

Unité de Recherche INRIA Lorraine Technopôle de Nancy-Brabois - Campus Scientifique
615, rue du Jardin Botanique - B.P. 101 - 54602 VILLERS LES NANCY Cedex (France)
Unité de Recherche INRIA Rennes IRISA, Campus Universitaire de Beaulieu 35042 RENNES Cedex (France)
Unité de Recherche INRIA Rhône-Alpes 46, avenue Félix Viallet - 38031 GRENOBLE Cedex (France)
Unité de Recherche INRIA Sophia Antipolis 2004, route des Lucioles - B.P. 93 - 06902 SOPHIA ANTIPOLIS Cedex (France)

EDITEUR
INRIA - Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt - B.P. 105 - 78153 LE CHESNAY Cedex (France)

ISSN 0249 - 6399

RR-2161